

Chapter 10

How to Suppress a Rebellion: England 1173–74

Paul Latimer

In March 1173, Henry II's crowned, eldest son Henry surreptitiously left his father at Chinon and went to Paris, to the court of his father-in-law, Louis VII. Between then and September 1174, at the end of which peace terms were agreed, Henry II's numerous dominions, with few exceptions, were convulsed by rebellion to one degree or another.¹ Internal rebellion was supplemented in some cases with invasion from outside, most notably in Normandy, attacked by the king of France, supported by the counts of Flanders, Boulogne and Blois, and in England where the Scottish king attacked and French and Flemish troops were brought in to support the rebels. Although certainly not ignored, this substantial and relatively prolonged conflict has perhaps still not received its due from historians.²

Here the focus will be on England alone, partly for reasons of space, but also for two other reasons. For most of the period of the rebellion in England, the king's government there had to manage without the king himself, who was generally preoccupied with his continental possessions. Henry II may have made a very quick visit to England, travelling to Northampton, in the early summer of 1173, but otherwise England had to wait until 7 July 1174 for Henry to come to its aid. Within a month of his arrival then, the rebellion in England had collapsed and he was able to return to Normandy to deal with Louis VII's attempt to take Rouen. When Henry set off for England in July 1174, he would not have known that the crisis in England could be so easily wrapped up. The capture of the king of Scotland on 13 July at Alnwick, which had nothing to

¹ It took another two years to restore order in Aquitaine: W.L. Warren, *Henry II* (London, 1973), p. 142.

² There have been many accounts and discussions of the war and rebellion, with varying degrees of detail. Among more recent accounts are T.M. Jones, 'The Generation Gap of 1173–74: The War between the Two Henrys', *Albion*, 5 (1973): pp. 24–40, which contains a bibliography of earlier accounts (*ibid.*, p. 24 n. 1); Warren, *Henry II*, pp. 117–42; R. Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings 1075–1225* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 54–60; D. Carpenter, *The Struggle for Mastery: Britain 1066–1284* (London, 2003), pp. 223–7; J.D. Hosler, *Henry II: A Medieval Soldier at War, 1147–1189* (Leiden, 2007), pp. 195–219.

do with Henry's arrival in England, made his task much easier than it might have been.³ In an era when the personal role of the king in government and war was still so important, how the administration had coped mostly in the king's absence and in such a critical situation is itself of interest. A second reason that England is of particular interest is that there is a source, at this time unique to England, that allows us to examine the workings of the administration in more detail than would otherwise be possible: the pipe rolls. These continue in an unbroken series throughout the rebellion, something which did not happen in the troubles of King Stephen's reign and would not happen in the crisis of King John's reign from 1215 to 1217.⁴

It will be argued here that Henry II's government in England was well enough organized – indeed impressively organized – and well enough supported amongst the aristocracy and political classes to be able to act effectively against the king's enemies. At the same time, beneficial as these advantages were, necessary even, they were hardly sufficient; opportunities that they allowed for still had to be taken.

The ability to suppress a rebellion could not and did not depend solely on measures taken specifically for that purpose. Before talking about the actual response to the rebellion, it is necessary to deal with some conditions that had an important impact on Henry II's government's ability to respond to the revolt. In a sense, government was always, in part, about securing control of the country, and as rebellion was, if nothing else, a challenge to that control, administration

³ Warren, *Henry II*, pp. 135–6. Warren suggested the brief, 'secret' visit to England in the early summer of 1173. The evidence, a credit on the pipe roll to Robert FitzSewin, sheriff of Northamptonshire for the corrody of the king at Northampton for four days, authorized by a writ of the king himself, seems incontrovertible, but it is strange there is so little of it, even for a 'secret' visit: *ibid.*, p. 127; *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, p. 33. Most of the authorizing writs in the account for Northamptonshire were those of Richard de Lucy, the justiciar, except that there is one other credit, for the payment of knights at Northampton for 35 days starting on 9 April that is authorized by royal writ, though in this case corrected from Richard de Lucy in both versions of the roll: *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, p. 32 and n. A royal writ does not necessarily indicate the king's presence but may be indicative here. Possibly, the 23 mounted sergeants which John, dean of Salisbury, retained in the service of the king, advances towards their liveries being accounted for in Hampshire, could be connected with the king's visit: *ibid.*, p. 43.

⁴ No pipe rolls survive from King Stephen's reign, though it is likely they were produced, at least until the disgrace of Roger, bishop of Salisbury, and his nephew, Nigel, bishop of Ely, in 1139: E. King, *King Stephen* (New Haven and London, 2010), pp. 125–6. The pipe roll for the exchequer year 1214–15 shows little beyond Easter 1215. Presumably the exchequer stopped functioning in any normal way after the baronial entry into London on 17 May 1215. The exchequer did function uninterrupted throughout John's revolt against the absent Richard I, but that was a much more restricted crisis.

and policy in general had aspects that were precautionary against rebellion and could help tip the scales against it.

An obvious example of this was Henry II's extensive spending on the fabric of royal castles in the 19 years of his reign before the rebellion. While the motivation for this was not purely aimed against rebellion, let alone a specific rebellion, the fact that the king possessed many strong castles was certainly advantageous during the rebellion of 1173–74.⁵ The king of Scotland managed to take a few relatively minor castles in Cumberland, Westmorland and Northumberland, while the rebel earls of Leicester and Norfolk took and destroyed the castle of Haughley in Suffolk, but by and large Henry II's strongholds in England remained secure.⁶

Likewise, the whole normal system of royal administration through sheriffs and others, who accounted at the exchequer and received instructions and authorization to spend money through writs from the king or, more often, the justiciar, was certainly not designed solely to deal with rebellion. Yet, insofar as the system continued uninterrupted throughout the rebellion, which it did to a considerable degree, it was a system of great utility in a crisis, as well as in more normal times. There were breakdowns in the system during the rebellion, particularly in the North. For example, in the pipe roll for the exchequer year 1173–74, the account for Yorkshire consisted of the following:

Robertus de Stuteville non reddidit hoc anno comptum de firma comitatus de Euerwichsira neque de debitis regis in eodem comitatu quia nondum habuerat warantum regis de expensa qua fecerat tempore werre in servitio regis.⁷

For Carlisle and its dependencies in the same year, it was a similar situation:

Adam filius Roberti Truite non reddidit hoc anno comptum de firma comitatus vel de debitis quia nichil inde recepit hoc anno propter werram ut dicit.⁸

⁵ It is noteworthy that the number of castles where work was done increases markedly in 1172–73: R.A. Brown, 'Royal Castle-Building in England, 1154–1216', *EHR*, 70 (1955): pp. 379–80.

⁶ Warren, *Henry II*, pp. 130, 134.

⁷ 'Robert de Stuteville did not render an account this year concerning the farm of the county of Yorkshire, nor concerning the debts to the king in the same county, because he had not yet had the warrant of the king concerning the expenditure he had made in the time of war in the service of the king': *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, p. 107.

⁸ 'Adam son of Robert Truite did not render an account this year concerning the farm of the county or concerning the debts, because he received nothing from them this year on account of the war, as he says': *ibid.*

Accounting ceased in the honour of Lancaster for both of the exchequer years 1172–73 and 1173–74, though dealing with the backlog was taken up in the 1174–75 pipe roll.⁹ Northumberland, on the other hand, managed with something like a normal account, albeit it finished with large amounts still owing ‘qui remanserunt propter werram ut dicit’.¹⁰ Of the midland and southern counties, only in Kent did the sheriff fail to render an account for the exchequer year 1173–74, the year most affected by the rebellion, though in this case it seems to have been more of a bureaucratic difficulty than anything else:

Gervasius de Cornhull non reddidit comptum hoc anno de firma de Chent neque de terra episcopi Baiocensis neque de purpresturis neque de debitis Regis in hoc comitatu quia clerici et marescalli regis nondum venerant qui missi fuerant cum eo ad liberationem militum et navium faciendam de castellis Ballie sue.¹¹

For most of the country indeed the pipe roll for the period from Michaelmas 1173 to Michaelmas 1174, covering the greater part of the rebellion, looks remarkably normal, if somewhat shorter than usual for the period, even while there were signs of the war and military activity in many places. The same is true of the pipe roll of the preceding year, 1172–73, halfway through which the rebellion began.

In respect of the sheriffs who played such a large part in loyally administering this system at a local level during the rebellion, Henry II had already, as a result of his Inquest of Sheriffs in 1170, taken the opportunity extensively to reshape to his liking the roster of sheriffs.¹² While this had not been done particularly with disloyalty or rebellion in mind, it had also been part of a longer process of reducing the close relationship between some earls and sheriffs that had grown up in King Stephen’s reign and had the effect of making it more likely that sheriffs would remain loyal. It is perhaps difficult to imagine, before 1170, a sheriff of Leicestershire and Warwickshire, accounting faithfully for these shires while the earl of Leicester was in revolt.¹³

⁹ *Pipe Roll 21 Henry II*, pp. 7–10.

¹⁰ *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, pp. 105–7.

¹¹ ‘Gervase of Cornhill did not render an account this year concerning the farm of Kent, nor concerning the land of the bishop of Bayeux, nor concerning the purprestures, nor concerning the debts to the king in this county, because the clerks and marshals of the king who had been sent with him to make the wage-payment for the knights and ships of the castles of his bailiwick had not yet come’: *ibid.*, p. 1. The difficulty is dealt with by the time of the next roll: *Pipe Roll 21 Henry II*, pp. 207–12.

¹² Warren, *Henry II*, pp. 290–91.

¹³ *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, pp. 177–82; *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, pp. 139–44. Even before the rebellion, the earl of Leicester had already clashed with Bertram de Verdun, the new sheriff appointed after the Inquest of Sheriffs: *Pipe Roll 18 Henry II*, p. 109. For an examination of

One might also say that the settlement Henry II had made with the Church in 1172 over the matter of Becket's murder made it less likely that prelates of the Church would offer any comfort to the rebels. In many respects the exception to this was Hugh du Puiset, bishop of Durham, whose highly equivocal behaviour in importing French knights and Flemish troops led by his nephew Hugh de Bar, at a time when the king of Scotland was invading Northumberland for the second time, cannot but have excited suspicion.¹⁴ That the matter of Becket and its settlement was relevant here might be argued from attempts made to describe the special devotion to Becket of the rebel Young King Henry, who had spent some time as a boy in the charge of the erstwhile chancellor.¹⁵ There was one disadvantage of Henry II's settlement with the Church: he had to start filling the many vacancies that had arisen during the dispute, which did cut his revenue just before the outbreak of the revolt, not that there is much sign that financial limitations seriously inhibited the effort to suppress the revolt, given its duration.

The problems King Stephen faced when his rule was contested, and the problems that King John and Henry III faced in the conflicts of 1215–17, were both sharply exacerbated by extensive revolts in Wales. The arrangements that Henry II had made in Wales by 1172, including the establishment of Rhys ap Gruffydd as his justiciar in South Wales, were to benefit Henry II considerably during the rebellion of 1173–74.¹⁶ This was not just because Wales then presented him with few problems; it opened up Wales as a source of royal recruits and, although this is impossible to prove, perhaps played a role in decisions taken by some in the area of the southern marches not to rebel. Rhys ap Gruffydd even

the connections between earls and sheriffs in King Stephen's reign and the ways in which they diminished in Henry II's reign, see P. Latimer, 'The Earls in Henry II's Reign' (unpubl. PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 1982), pp. 102–17. For Leicestershire in Henry II's reign in particular, see *ibid.*, p. 114.

¹⁴ G.T. Lapsley, 'The Flemings in Eastern England in the Reign of Henry II', *EHR*, 21 (1906): pp. 511–12. The 300 marks the bishop of Durham apparently gave to the king of Scotland to have a truce from 14 January to the end of Easter is less reprehensible, though Henry II might expect something rather more robust from a bishop of Durham: *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hoveden*, ed. W. Stubbs, Rolls Series, 51 (4 vols, London, 1868–71), vol. 2, pp. 56–7.

¹⁵ Jones, 'Generation Gap', p. 30. See also the discussion of Henry's tutelage under Becket by M. Strickland, 'The Upbringing of the Young King', in C. Harper-Bill and N. Vincent (eds), *Henry II: New Interpretations* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 190–94.

¹⁶ Warren, *Henry II*, pp. 164–7; P. Latimer, 'Henry II's Campaign against the Welsh in 1165', *Welsh History Review*, 14 (1989): pp. 543–4.

intervened personally on Henry II's side, leading troops from Wales to the siege of the rebel-held castle of Tutbury in Staffordshire.¹⁷

So far, we have been concerned with what might be called favourable pre-existing conditions that would assist the suppression of the rebellion, but now we must turn to the response to the revolt itself.

Some of the chroniclers write as if they regard the greater part of the nobility as disloyal to Henry II or suspect in their loyalty.¹⁸ This perhaps says more about the attitude of these chroniclers to the lay nobility, or the writers' desire to dramatize the situation, than it does about reality, as the more exaggerated assessments do not seem to have been borne out by events or the royal response. It is hardly surprising that rumours of disloyalty abounded at the time of the rebellion, but it is interesting that, for the most part, the king and his government took no action on the basis of rumour until after the rebellion was safely defeated, where action was taken at all. There was no rush to confront those under suspicion, a lesson that could perhaps have been learned from the history of King Stephen's reign.¹⁹

Jordan Fantosme picks up various of these rumours of disloyalty, but they seem variable in their veracity. The bishop of Durham's loyalty is impugned, as we have seen with some justification. After the rebellion was over, his castle at Northallerton was destroyed and he was forced to relinquish his other castles.²⁰ Adjoining the city of London, which is said to be loyal,

¹⁷ *Radulphi de Diceto Opera Historica. The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto, Dean of London*, ed. W. Stubbs, Rolls Series, 68 (2 vols, London, 1876), vol. 1, p. 384. Evidence of the movement of Rhys' army can be seen in *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, pp. 21, 77, 121. There was no complete peace in Wales. Some sergeants were paid in Shropshire 'pro guerra Wallie': *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, p. 107. There was also an attack by Iorwerth ab Owain and his son Hywel on Richard FitzGilbert's land in Gwent. In 1173–74, the earl's men recaptured the castle of Usk from the Welsh and the sheriff of Gloucestershire helped supply the castle's garrison: J.E. Lloyd, *A History of Wales, from the Earliest Times to the Edwardian Conquest* (2 vols, 3rd edn, London, 1939), vol. 2, pp. 545–6; *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, p. 22.

¹⁸ See, for example, Roger of Howden in *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis. The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II and Richard I, 1169–1192*, ed. W. Stubbs, Rolls Series, 49 (2 vols, London, 1867), vol. 1, pp. 49, 71 and William of Newburgh in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed. R. Howlett, Rolls Series, 82 (4 vols, London, 1884–90), vol. 1, pp. 171–2.

¹⁹ Edmund King commented on King Stephen's arrest of the earl of Chester at the Christmas court of 1146, though it might equally be applied to the arrest of the bishops in 1139 or the arrest of Geoffrey de Mandeville in 1143: 'Here was a man – and this man was the king of England – who did not know how to behave': King, *King Stephen*, p. 228. Henry II or his representatives, in this regard, knew better. Henry's well-known, measured clemency after the defeat of the rebellion seems to have been equally well-judged: Warren, *Henry II*, pp. 136–42.

²⁰ *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, ed. and trans. R.C. Johnston (Oxford, 1981), pp. 120–21; Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings*, pp. 379–80; Warren, *Henry II*, p. 373.

Gilbert de Munfichet sun chastel ad fermé,
E dit que les Clarreaus vers lui sunt alié.²¹

There is no sign elsewhere in chronicles or pipe rolls that Gilbert de Munfichet acted disloyally or was punished for it. Of the Clares, there is no indication that Walter FitzRobert de Clare, lord of Baynard's Castle, was disloyal or fell into any disfavour with Henry II.²² Richard FitzGilbert de Clare, lord of Leinster, was called by Henry II from Ireland to Normandy. Richard answered the call and was put in charge of the frontier castle of Gisors.²³ Warren suggested that this implied suspicion and that the summons to Normandy was to prevent Ireland becoming a rebel haven, but it is just as likely that the king simply wanted the military help Richard could provide and the custody of Gisors would seem an odd appointment for one seriously under suspicion.²⁴ Concerning the other Richard de Clare, Richard FitzRoger, who succeeded his father as lord of Clare and earl of Hertford in the year the rebellion broke out, we do find, however, in 1174 once the rebellion is over, other evidence of suspicion, though no specific grounds are given for it:

Willelmus comes Glocestriae et Ricardus comes de Clare gener eius, de quibus habebatur suspicio, quod in partem adversam declinare proponerant, occurrerunt regi, suo per omnia parituri mandato.²⁵

As far as Earl Richard was concerned, that seems to have been that.

His father-in-law, William earl of Gloucester, is a more complex case. He was listed as a supporter of Henry II and actually fought for him, taking part

²¹ 'Gilbert de Munfichet has fortified his castle, and proclaims that he has the support of the earls of Clare': *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, pp. 120–21. Johnston here perhaps goes too far in translating 'les Clarreaus' as 'Earls of Clare'. Given the London context, Stenton long ago reasonably suggested that this referred, at least in the first place, to Gilbert's cousin, Walter FitzRobert de Clare, the lord of Baynard's Castle, which also adjoined London, though that the plural of 'Clarreaus' might suggest a vague extension to the whole tribe of Clares would be reasonable enough: F.M. Stenton, *Norman London: An Essay* (London, 1934), pp. 8–9.

²² Jordan Fantosme has him as the first to attack the Flemings at Fornham: *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, pp. 74–7. He was acting as an itinerant justice by 1175–76: *Pipe Roll 22 Henry II*, pp. 20, 73.

²³ G.H. Orpen, *Ireland under the Normans 1169–1216* (4 vols, Oxford, 1911–20), vol. 1, p. 315.

²⁴ Warren, *Henry II*, p. 123.

²⁵ 'William earl of Gloucester and Richard earl of Clare, his relative, concerning whom there was suspicion that they had intended to defect to the opposing side, hastened to the king ready to carry out his command in all things': *Diceto*, vol. 1, p. 385.

in the campaign that resulted in the defeat of the rebel earl of Leicester and his Flemings at Fornham.²⁶ Jordan Fantosme has the amazon-like countess of Leicester tell her husband:

Li cuens de Glowecestre fet mult a reduter;
 Mes il ad vostre sorur a muillier e a per;
 Pur tut l'aveir de France ne volsist cumencier
 De faire nul ultrage dunt eussiez desturbier.²⁷

If this means anything though, it may indicate only that Earl William would be unlikely to do any physical harm personally to Earl Robert, but that some suspicion did attach itself to Earl William seems undeniable. One relatively solid reason for this was that Earl William had ejected royal custodians from Bristol Castle during the rebellion, for which he was impeached by the king in 1175. In order to turn the king's displeasure, he was forced to surrender the castle.²⁸ In the pipe roll for 1174–75, an allowance is made to the sheriff of Gloucestershire for money given to (an unidentified) William of London for the stronghold's custody and fortification.²⁹ Whether or not the earl's ejection of royal custodians implied any leanings towards the rebels, it is noteworthy again that direct action against William, measured as it was, was only taken after the rebellion was safely over.

There are perhaps though some more subtle signs that Henry II was worried about Earl William even as the rebellion was beginning, and given the role of the earls of Gloucester in King Stephen's reign, one can understand the delicacy of the situation. Changes in sheriffs are rare with the exchequer year 1172–73, but two of the three changes concern Devon, where Henry II's uncle, Earl Reginald took over for the second half of the exchequer year from Robert FitzBernard, and Herefordshire, where William de Braose served for the second half of the year, replacing Gilbert Pipard. Even without any implication of fault concerning the former sheriffs, this represented a strengthening of shrieval muscle in the region. These were counties close to the centres of Earl William's power.³⁰

All turned out well for Henry II: Earl William, under suspicion as he was, did not rebel and fought instead for the king, but could still be punished later

²⁶ *Gesta Henrici*, vol. 1, pp. 51 n. 4, 61.

²⁷ 'The earl of Gloucester is much to be feared, but he is married to your sister, and not for all the wealth of France would he start any extravagant action that would cause you any trouble': *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, pp. 72–3.

²⁸ *Gesta Henrici*, vol. 1, p. 92.

²⁹ *Pipe Roll 21 Henry II*, p. 159.

³⁰ *Pipe Roll 18 Henry II*, pp. 1, 98; *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, pp. 38–9, 142–4. There were no changes in Gloucestershire or Dorset and Somerset. The other change was in London, a crucial place of course, a quarter of the way through the exchequer year: *Pipe Roll 18 Henry II*, pp. 143–4; *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, pp. 182–9.

for his presumption in ejecting royal custodians. An early over-reaction to the earl's behaviour at Bristol may have pushed him into rebellion and that would have represented an extremely serious addition to the king's enemies.

One of the ways in which the relative continuity of the normal government administration at the local level assisted Henry II's cause was in seizing the lands or chattels of known rebels throughout the country. For example, lands in Essex, Kent and Gloucestershire belonging to William Patric, a rebel and a tenant of the earl of Chester as lord of half of the barony of Malpas in Cheshire, were taken into royal hands by the sheriffs of those counties.³¹ Likewise, another rebel and tenant of the earl of Chester, Hamo de Masci, lord of Dunham Massey, had his lands in Wiltshire taken into royal hands.³² In 1173–74, the lands in Gloucestershire of Ernald de Bosco, the earl of Leicester's steward, were in the hands of the sheriff of Gloucester.³³ Many more examples such as this could be found. Even in counties close to the centres of rebellion, the effort was made to confiscate rebel lands.³⁴ Of course distraint was a normal means of coercing and weakening an enemy or rebel, but in a situation with numerous rebels, carrying it out effectively was no mean feat of organization; sheriffs had to be informed who was a rebel and they needed to know where the rebels' lands were. The William Patric example is perhaps particularly impressive, as his rebel activity seems to have been confined to the Norman-Breton frontier; yet the sheriffs in England were evidently informed of it.

Naturally enough, when the rebellion broke out, the king's local administration throughout the country made a special effort to make sure that castles were put in readiness. It is impossible to say how much this was controlled from the centre, with writs from the justiciar or the king, or done to some extent on local initiative and authorized after the event. The example cited above of Gervase of Cornhill's account, or rather non-account, for Kent seems to suggest that payments at least had normally to await proper authorization. Although castles were improved, repaired and garrisoned in peacetime as well, the number and extent of such activities increased with the outbreak of the revolt.³⁵ A couple of examples will serve for many; they are not hard to find.

³¹ *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, pp. 20, 88–9, 155; *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, pp. 24, 74; *Pipe Roll 21 Henry II*, pp. 218–19. William Patric or his son was captured outside Dol, and two other members of the Patric family captured with Dol itself: *Gesta Henrici*, vol. 1, pp. 56–8. See also G. Ormerod, *The History of the County Palatine and City of Chester*, 2nd edn, revised and enlarged by T. Helsby (3 vols, London, 1882), vol. 2, pp. 592–3.

³² *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, p. 34; *Pipe Roll 21 Henry II*, p. 106.

³³ *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, p. 24.

³⁴ For a long list much of which seems to be of confiscated rebel lands in Leicestershire and Warwickshire, see *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, p. 143.

³⁵ See above, n. 5.

At Salisbury, work was done on the castle, including what is probably the construction of a drawbridge into the main bailey ('pro faciendo attractu ad claudendum magnum ballium castelli'), supervised by the constable of the castle, Robert de Lucy, and the reeve, Simon. Various equipment and supplies were bought, including considerable quantities of food. Provision was also made to pay a small force of knights and sergeants, both mounted and on foot, at least from April to June 1173.³⁶ At Berkhamsted Castle, like Salisbury far from any fighting, provisions – unthreshed wheat, wine, cheeses and salt – and equipment – ropes and cables for the latrine and a mangonel, as well as iron – were purchased, works were done on the living quarters, the granary and on bridges, and liveries were paid to knights and sergeants, all accounted for by the castle's custodian, William of Windsor.³⁷

One can hardly expect the pipe rolls to provide any kind of comprehensive account of the recruitment or deployment of soldiers; that is not the purpose of the rolls, which is only, insofar as it concerns soldiers, to note money authorized to be spent on them by those who were accounting at the exchequer.³⁸ Nevertheless, in the circumstances of the 1173–74 rebellion, soldiers, both knights and sergeants, 'milites et servientes', occur frequently and sometimes the rolls give us an idea of who is responsible for organizing or leading them, where they are staying or where they are going.

Most of the entries on the pipe rolls detailing payment of soldiers concern the relatively modest garrisons in castles around the country of knights and sergeants, with occasionally a few mounted sergeants specified. These payments to garrisons could vary considerably, both in the number of soldiers and in the length of time for which they were paid. For example, in the exchequer year 1173–74 ten knights and ten sergeants staying in Worcester Castle were paid for 36 days after Robert de Lucy obtained custody of the castle, while there was also a smaller payment to an unspecified number of knights and sergeants that the sheriff, Randulf de Lench, retained in the castle.³⁹ At the castle of Newcastle-under-Lyme in Staffordshire, in 1172–73, a modest sum (£13 6s. 8d.) was paid to the sheriff, Hervey de Stratton, 'in auxilio tenendi milites at servientes in Novo Castello'.⁴⁰ In 1173–74, five knights, six mounted sergeants and ten foot sergeants in Newcastle-under-Lyme were paid for 134 days.⁴¹

³⁶ *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, pp. 96–7. There is a second account detailing a second force of knights and sergeants for 22 days, but the date is not clear: *ibid.*, pp. 101–2.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 21–2.

³⁸ A recent discussion of military organization in Henry II's dominions reveals, in effect, just how little we know: Hosler, *Henry II: A Medieval Soldier*, pp. 103–23.

³⁹ *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, p. 26.

⁴⁰ There are also payments in the same shire account to five knights and 20 sergeants for 19 weeks, though it is not clear where these knights are: *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, p. 58.

⁴¹ *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, p. 94.

Sometimes the provision made for garrisons could be more complex. In 1172–73, Robert Mantel, sheriff of Essex and Hertfordshire, Richard de Lucy himself, responsible for the farm of Colchester, and Bartholomew de Glanville, Wimar the Chaplain and William Bardulf, the three men acting as joint-sheriffs of Norfolk and Suffolk, with Wimar the Chaplain also answering for the farm of Orford, all accounted for payments regarding the knights and sergeants either at or being sent to Walton in Suffolk.⁴² Concerning the garrisons of Colchester, Orford and Norwich, we can also see one of the ways in which such payments could be organized, in references to royal writs which contain the names, numbers and periods of service of the knights and sergeants, these writs then being compared to allowances made against a number of different accounts within the roll.⁴³

The garrison at Walton and its reinforcement, and also the other East Anglian garrisons here, should be seen in the context of the rebel earl of Leicester's arrival with an army near Walton, and of Hugh Bigod, earl of Norfolk's, rebellion. After all, the two earls besieged Walton itself for four days unsuccessfully and went on to take the castle of Haughley.⁴⁴ The relationship between garrisons or their reinforcement and the events of the rebellion is sometimes made explicit in the rolls. In 1173–74, allowance was made in Norfolk and Suffolk for a payment made:

Philippo de Hasting' £20 ad tenendum milites in castello Norw' per preceptum Comitis Willelmi quando Flandrenses fuerunt ad Bungeheim et ad Framingeham per breve regis.⁴⁵

⁴² *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, pp. 20, 30, 117–18, 129.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 31, 118, 130. Such writs can be found elsewhere in the country too. See, for example, in the account of Reginald de Lucy for the 'Census' of the forest of Nottinghamshire, concerning knights and sergeants at Bolsover and Peak (Peveril) castles: *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, p. 174.

⁴⁴ *Diceto*, vol. 1, pp. 377–8. There is no sign of Haughley being defended in the pipe rolls, though that may be because Radulf Brito, the custodian of the land of Henry of Essex, to which Haughley Castle belonged, was to account to the king himself, rather than to the exchequer: *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, p. 23.

⁴⁵ 'To Philip of Hastings £20 to maintain knights in the castle of Norwich by order of Earl William when the Flemings were at Bungay and Framlingham, by the king's writ': *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, p. 38. The Earl William here is most likely William, earl of Arundel, or quite possibly William de Mandeville, earl of Essex, who had returned to England around the same time as Henry II and left again with him for Normandy in August, and is often simply referred to as 'Earl William': *ibid.*, pp. 118, 133.

Around the same time, an entry in the account for the farm of Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire made by Ebrard de Beche and Warin of Bassingbourn reads:

Et in liberationibus 20 militum retentorum in castello de Cantebr' quando Flandrenses novissime applicuerant £40 de 40 diebus scilicet a proxima die ante festum Sancti Botulphi usque ad festum Sancti Jacobi per breve regis.⁴⁶

Both these entries refer to the Flemings who landed at the Orwell estuary in May 1174 and assisted Earl Hugh for the rest of his rebellion.⁴⁷

The war was not all about garrisons though, even if the pipe rolls are most forthcoming about those. The rolls also show mobile forces on the move. In 1172–73, we see Gilbert Pipard, sheriff of Herefordshire, before he was replaced by William de Braose, arranging the payment of 100 sergeants from the Welsh March who were being sent to Normandy, a sign perhaps that conflict was already expected.⁴⁸ Three hundred and thirty sergeants, plus 100 more with hauberks and ten archers, a considerable force, were sent from Shropshire, again on the Welsh Marches, to help with the abortive siege of Leicester in 1173, their liveries paid for eight days by the sheriff. The sheriff himself, Guido L'Estrange, went to Leicester as well and consequently additional sergeants were recruited for Shropshire. Another 80 foot sergeants were sent overseas to the king, with their liveries paid by the sheriff for six days.⁴⁹ Presumably, in the case of both these forces, someone else was supposed to take responsibility for their payment thereafter.

In the exchequer year 1173–74, 166 sergeants 'de Marchia', led by Miles de Cogan and Miles le Bret, came from overseas, possibly at the time of Henry II's arrival in July 1174, and were provided for by the sheriffs of London and Middlesex.⁵⁰ Also in the miscellaneous accounts concerning London and Middlesex, a Fleming, Gerbald de Escald, was also provided with £20 for making

⁴⁶ 'And in wages for 20 knights retained in the castle of Cambridge when the Flemings had most recently landed £40 concerning 40 days, that is to say from the day before the feast of St. Botulph to the feast of St. James, by the king's writ': 16 June to 25 July 1174: *ibid.*, p. 63.

⁴⁷ *Diceto*, vol. 1, p. 381.

⁴⁸ *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, pp. 38–9.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 107. The siege succeeded in burning the town of Leicester and gaining the submission of the townsmen, but had to be broken off to deal with the king of Scotland's first invasion: *Diceto*, vol. 1, p. 376; *Chronicles*, vol. 1, p. 177.

⁵⁰ *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, p. 8. As Miles de Cogan was associated with Richard FitzGilbert in Ireland, this may well have been part of the contingent that Richard had led to Henry II's aid in Normandy. For a payment for their passage, presumably out of England again, see *ibid.*, p. 118.

advance payments to 22 knights that were with him in the service of the king.⁵¹ In Northamptonshire, two entries in the pipe roll perhaps take us to the heart of the main royal force in the Midlands in the latter stages of the rebellion:

Et in liberationibus 118 militum solidariorum qui fuerunt cum Hunfrido de Bohun Constabulario apud Norhant' de 1 vigint (vicena) £118 per brevia Ricardi de Luci.⁵²

Et in liberationibus 100 militum solidariorum qui fuerunt apud Norhant' de 20 diebus et in perditis eorum £104 5s 8d per breve regis.⁵³

We cannot be sure that these are two separate forces, or essentially refer to the same force, but in either case they represent a substantial number of knights with the royal constable, Humphrey de Bohun, cast in the leading role that some of the chronicle accounts also refer to.⁵⁴ It is interesting too that these knights are described as 'solidarius', which is usually taken to indicate some sort of mercenary soldier, equivalent to 'stipendarius', which occurs elsewhere.⁵⁵ However, in all these cases, the knights are being paid a shilling a day, so the tag 'solidarius' may simply indicate the rate of pay, although there are other examples of knights paid a shilling a day where the term is not used.⁵⁶ Seventeen knights of the 'familia regis' are also seen to be receiving payments from the assize of the borough of Nottingham, a sign of the king's arrival in the Midlands perhaps, while an isolated reference in the account for the honour of Wallingford seems to indicate the presence in England of at least a small number of Henry II's notorious Brabançons.⁵⁷

⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 14–15. He is in possession of the manor of Horncastle in 1173–74: *ibid.*, pp. 96–7. For the identification of Gerbald, see J. Conway Walter, *A History of Horncastle from the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (Horncastle, 1908), p. 11.

⁵² 'And in wages for 118 paid knights who were with the Constable, Humphrey de Bohun, at Northampton for twenty days £118, by writs of Richard de Lucy': *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, pp. 51–2.

⁵³ 'And in wages for 100 paid knights who were at Northampton for 20 days, and in their losses, £104 5s. 8d., by the king's writ': *ibid.*, p. 54.

⁵⁴ *Chronica*, vol. 2, pp. 54–5; *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, pp. 58–61, 72–5, 78–9, 114–15.

⁵⁵ 20 'militis solidarii' are also found being paid for 51 days in Lincolnshire and another force of 20, together with 140 foot sergeants receive payments for 115 days at Kenilworth: *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, pp. 96, 140.

⁵⁶ *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, pp. 30–31, 33, 97, 101–2, 134; *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, pp. 34, 55, 57, 63, 67, 94, 125, 138–9, 142–3.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 59, 88.

Although frustratingly short on detail, the delayed pipe roll accounts made by Robert de Stuteville, sheriff of Yorkshire, and Ranulf de Glanville, custodian of the honour of Lancaster and the honour of Conan earl of Richmond, reveal just how important, in conjunction with Henry II's generally stalwart castellans, their role was in the northern counties after the initial campaign against the invading Scots undertaken by Richard de Lucy and Humphrey de Bohun. The total amounts allowed to Robert and Ranulf for payments made to knights and sergeants amount to £1,228 16s. 10d. and £918 10s. 1d. respectively, monies that would have paid for quite impressive forces.⁵⁸

Twelfth-century warfare was not all about soldiers. For sieges, craftsmen and equipment were required, and here too the co-ordination and reach of Henry II's administration in England was impressive. For the siege of Leicester in 1173, equipment for siege engines was sent from Northamptonshire, 24 carpenters and their master from Staffordshire, arrows and pickaxes from Gloucester, spades and pickaxes from Worcestershire, 41 carpenters and their master from Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, while another 115 carpenters came from Warwickshire and Leicestershire, as well as further equipment.⁵⁹ Also, one of the government's most striking feats of coordination across a number of localities was in 1173, when the king wished to gather a fleet of ships near Sandwich in Kent 'ad custodiam maris'. Ships were sent from Colchester, Orford, Dunwich, and perhaps elsewhere in Norfolk and Suffolk, as well as from Lincolnshire and Yorkshire.⁶⁰

If, in part, the suppression of the rebellion was a triumph of the Angevin administration's capacity for organization – and the pipe rolls reveal just how great that was – in the end we must still return to people and events. The operation of the governmental system depended completely on the loyalty of those who operated it. The sheriffs and others who were separately responsible for other accounts in the rolls were of course vital, but they too depended on the loyalty of those in castle garrisons, or those leading, or participating in, other

⁵⁸ *Pipe Roll 21 Henry II*, pp. 7, 173–4. For the 1173 campaign in the North by the justiciar and constable, see for example *Chronica*, vol. 2, p. 54; *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, pp. 54–63.

⁵⁹ *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, pp. 33, 58, 156, 163, 173, 178. We also find a mangonel at Berkhamsted: *ibid.*, p. 21. In 1173–74, the sheriffs of Norfolk and Suffolk are credited for the cost of conducting 500 carpenters to the king at Sileham in Suffolk when he was threatening to besiege the Bigod castles. Also, from the farm of Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire, an engineer, Yvo, was paid for hiring carpenters to make machines 'quando rex venit ad Hunted' (Huntingdon): *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, pp. 38, 82. It is interesting too that, in the account for Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, although crossbowmen are nowhere mentioned specifically, there is an allowance for the acquisition of 1,000 quarrels (crossbow bolts), though in this case defence of castles is a more likely purpose: *ibid.*, p. 56.

⁶⁰ *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, pp. 2, 13, 31, 117, 132–4.

military forces. Although the pipe rolls show us a system operating through the writ and systematic accounting, we should not imagine that it was a system operated by bureaucrats and accountants. If few of the sheriffs by this time were great barons, most were men from a chivalric society intent, if they could, to use royal administrative service to become richer and more powerful. Ranulf de Glanville, the future justiciar, proved at Alnwick that his sword was just as mighty as his pen would be.⁶¹

One should also not underestimate the importance of the role of the more senior figures of the government in England. Richard de Lucy's writs are everywhere throughout the pipe rolls of these years, but he was also amongst the leaders of the army that besieged Leicester, chased the king of Scotland back over the border in 1173 and fought at the battle of Fornham. The royal constable too, Humphrey de Bohun, indisputably baronial, and of a family that would later spawn earls, if only intermittently surfacing in the pipe rolls, clearly played a crucial military role, and evidently played it well.

To these we must also add the loyal earls in England: not only Henry II's uncle, Earl Reginald, who joined Richard de Lucy at the siege of Leicester in July 1173 and fought at the battle of Fornham, but William, earl of Arundel, who also fought at Fornham, as did William, earl of Gloucester, who was discussed above. William, earl of Essex, made a late appearance in England, coming from Normandy with Henry II. All these men would likely have had their own military retinues, though we know few details.⁶²

Fortune too played a role in the suppression of the rebellion. The rebel Hugh, earl of Chester, could surely have caused more trouble in England than he managed to do on the Brittany-Normandy frontier where he was captured at Dol. Yet the reason he was there seems, at least in part, to have been that he was returning from a pilgrimage to Compostella.⁶³ The battle of Fornham was, if nothing else, the result of what turned out to be an ill-judged march by Robert, earl of Leicester. The capture of the king of Scotland at Alnwick – albeit the opportunity was skilfully exploited by the English forces – was scarcely something that had to happen. None of these events necessarily made the difference between the failure of the rebellion and its success, but they undoubtedly made its suppression easier and quicker than it would otherwise have been. As had been demonstrated in King Stephen's reign, a rebellion that for too long was not suppressed might easily become one that would never be suppressed.

⁶¹ See the dramatic account of the defeat and seizure of the king of Scotland: *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, pp. 128–35.

⁶² *Gesta Henrici*, vol. 1, pp. 58, 61; *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, pp. 118, 133, 135. The first of these pipe roll references does intriguingly mention the 'socii' of Earl William.

⁶³ As reported by Robert de Torigny: *Chronicles*, vol. 4, p. 256.

This page has been left blank intentionally