

LANCASTER v. DALLINGRIDGE: A FRANCHISAL DISPUTE IN FOURTEENTH CENTURY SUSSEX

by Simon Walker

The prosecution of Sir Edward Dallingridge in 1384 by John of Gaunt is examined in detail. It is shown to have been the result of a long series of attacks on Gaunt's estates in Sussex, occasioned by the local gentry's resentment at the efficiency and novelty of the Lancastrian administration in the county. The support Dallingridge enjoyed amongst the gentry was sufficient to protect him from retribution until 1384, when John of Gaunt exploited the momentary weakness of Sir Edward's patron, Richard earl of Arundel, in order to press his case. The judicial proceedings provide some vivid details of court procedure in the late fourteenth century and show that Dallingridge personally conducted a lively defence, but he was unable to avoid sentence before a bench of justices favourable to Lancaster. The duke was, however, sensible of the power of the Sussex gentry and careful not to press his advantage. In the end, Dallingridge lost very little by his violence.

In June 1384 Sir Edward Dallingridge was attached at the suit of John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, to answer a special commission of oyer and terminer on certain charges brought against him.¹ Lancaster was clearly anxious to gain a conviction, for he proceeded concurrently against Sir Edward at the trailbaston sessions of the Rape of Pevensey, both by special bill and jury of indictment.² His anxiety is understandable for, whatever the findings of the commission, they could hardly fail to be without a wider political significance. Gaunt was at the height of his unpopularity amongst Richard II's courtiers; during the recent Salisbury Parliament he had been accused of plotting the king's death and Richard had allegedly reacted by ordering his summary execution. Yet one of his few remaining allies, the earl of Arundel, counted Dallingridge amongst his principal retainers, whilst Sir Edward himself was perhaps the most influential of the Sussex gentry at this period.³ After a long and apparently profitable career in the French wars, he was currently expanding and consolidating his Sussex estates. A servant of the Despensers and the duke of Brittany, as well as the Arundel family, Dallingridge was nevertheless a figure of political importance in his own right.⁴ In 1380 he had been chosen by the Commons as one of the three knights on the committee appointed to examine the state of the realm and his subsequent career shows him to have been an able diplomat and politician. In the aftermath of the Appellancy crisis, Dallingridge was to become an important royal councillor. When London was taken into the king's hand in 1392, Sir Edward was appointed warden of the city and his diplomacy and moderation seem to have played a large part in the eventual reconciliation between the king and citizens.⁵ In addition to the intrinsic interest of a dispute between such protagonists, the survival of an unusually full record of the commissioners' proceedings justifies a close examination of the case, for it provides a chance to examine John of Gaunt's method of action in such a dispute whilst casting an interesting sidelight on the political community of Sussex in Richard II's reign.

The occasion for the judicial commission sought by John of Gaunt was an outbreak of violence

against Nicholas Boyle, his ranger in Ashdown forest, which culminated in the murder of William Mouse, a sub-forester, in March 1384. It emerges from the presentments, however, that this was only the most recent in a constant series of attacks on the duke's Sussex estates, dating back to June 1377, when his chase at Ashdown was illegally hunted and his lands in Fletching and East Grinstead despoiled.⁶ In March 1380 the duke's underwood was fired at Ashdown and in April 1381 Dallingridge began a campaign of systematic intimidation against his estates and officials. On Good Friday he drove off livestock belonging to the duke from Fletching. A month later he appeared whilst John Broker, the duke's steward in Sussex, was holding his lord's court at Hungry Hatch and compelled him to swear an oath never to hold a court there again. For good measure, Broker was deprived of his court rolls and book of fees. In June, taking advantage of the confusion created by the Peasants' Revolt, Dallingridge and his accomplices ambushed John Delves, the Lancastrian feodary in Sussex, at Ringmer, forced him to surrender his commission from the duke and then burnt it in front of him.⁷

The suppression of the great insurrection brought a halt to Dallingridge's open violence, but this was principally because he had succeeded in his object of breaking the resistance of the duke's officials. Faced with a national crisis in his authority Gaunt chose conciliation rather than confrontation wherever possible. In August 1381 Sir Edward was appointed master forester of Ashdown, at a fee of ten marks a year, and for the next two years he and his servants seem to have been allowed to hunt the forest at will. Simon Littler, for example, caught poaching at Maresfield in February 1383, was handed over for punishment to Dallingridge, who immediately freed him and appointed him his sub-forester. The attack on Nicholas Boyle in 1384 must, therefore, be seen against a background of continuing popular unrest in Sussex in the wake of the Peasants' Revolt. At Lewes, the earl of Arundel's castle was stormed and pillaged in 1383; on the Lancastrian estates in the county, disorder and disobedience continued unchecked. Sir Thomas Hungerford, Gaunt's chief steward, was unable to levy a fine of ten shillings from Fletching because the villagers refused to have the lord's minister amongst them.⁸

Despite this disorder, Sir Edward might have remained secure in his local predominance, had it not been for the exigencies of national politics. Although removed from his master forestership of Ashdown in August 1383, Dallingridge remained in close contact with the Lancastrian administration. When he went up to Salisbury for the Parliament of April 1384 he carried with him part of the issues of the duke's Sussex lands to deliver to William Everley, his receiver.⁹ At that same Parliament, however, the Commons complained for the first time of the violence and extortion practised by the followers of the magnates. Lancaster responded to their demand for legislation on the subject by an assurance that the lords of the realm were capable of maintaining discipline amongst their own men, adding that an example would be made of any of his own followers guilty in this respect. The Commons accordingly dropped the matter but, if an example had to be made as an earnest of the lords' good faith, Gaunt's delinquent master-forester presented an obvious, perhaps not unwelcome, target. Within a fortnight of the Parliament's close the judicial commissions against Dallingridge had been issued at Lancaster's request.¹⁰

Up to this point, Lancaster's policy had been one of inaction and conciliation in the face of considerable and violent provocation. He had, in a sense, little choice for his Sussex estates were of recent acquisition and had yet to acquire the burden of loyalty and expectation that went to constitute a magnate's local standing. Indeed, in expressing so forcibly his hostility towards the duke's officials, Dallingridge was voicing the grievances of many of the Sussex gentry against a powerful but alien newcomer. As earl of Richmond, Gaunt had held the manors of Crowhurst, Burwash and Bivelham with the rape of Hastings since 1342. In 1372, however, he surrendered

these estates in the east of the county and received in exchange Queen Philippa's former manors — Willingdon, Grinstead and Maresfield as well as the forest of Ashdown and Pevensey rape and castle.¹¹ This marked a definite shift westward of Lancastrian territorial interests in Sussex and so brought the duke and his ministers into contact with a powerful new set of neighbours. Chief amongst these were John, lord de la Warr and Sir Edward Dallingridge. De la Warr was lord of the manors of Wilmington, Arlington and Folkington, close to Pevensey, and of Fletching, which marched with Maresfield. Dallingridge's lands, like de la Warr's, extended throughout Sussex but the family originated in Hartfield and Folkenhurst and it was Sir Edward's estates along the northern edge of Ashdown forest—Sheffield and his residential manor of Bolebrook—that formed the core of his inheritance.¹² The evidence suggests that in the past the estates of the Crown in this area had been laxly administered. Farmed for £30 p.a. in Queen Philippa's day, cash liveries from these same properties under Lancastrian supervision were closer to an average £45 p.a.¹³ The discrepancy is so large as to suggest that Sir John Seynclere, Queen Philippa's farmer, was receiving a preferential lease in lieu of a retaining fee and the steep rise in the issues of the estates cannot, in consequence, be regarded as direct evidence of the superior efficiency of the Lancastrian administration. Nevertheless, Seynclere's stewardship seems to have been lax, for the foresters under his supervision were themselves guilty of illegal hunting and petty extortion, the manor of Maresfield was in ruinous condition, its ministers seriously in arrears of their charge. Seynclere himself was later alleged to have detained the profits of quarrying in the forest to his own use, although they were no part of his farm, and to have prevented the Ranger from discharging his duties effectively.¹⁴

Against this background, the minute supervision exercised by the duke's council over his lands came as an unwelcome contrast, the annual tourns conducted by Sir Thomas Hungerford as an irksome financial innovation, whilst a spate of outlawries suggests that tighter control was also being kept over the Lancastrian forest rights.¹⁵ From the point of view of the Sussex gentry it was Lancaster who was the aggressor, disrupting the balance of the local community by his intrusive lordship. Resentment at the demands of the Lancastrian administration was widespread. The villagers of Folkington withdrew their suit from the duke's hundred court of Longbridge and were maintained in their defiance by John de la Warr. Even the sheriff consistently refused to hand over the profits of his tourn in the vill of Lindfield, which properly belonged to the duke, unless he was paid a mark a year for his trouble. Dallengridge could, in consequence, command considerable support in his attacks from amongst his immediate neighbours. His principal accomplices, besides his own family and servants, were Sir Thomas Sackville of Chalvington and Sir Philip Medstede.¹⁶ Sackville was Dallingridge's son-in-law and Medstede a fellow client of the earl of Arundel; the three often acted together.¹⁷ Sackville, whose estates lay principally between the Lancastrian possessions of Pevensey and Willingdon, was also responsible for abetting and receiving the murderers of William Mouse, Gaunt's subforester. Against a tight-knit gentry community of this kind, even the greatest of English magnates could not act until he was sure of his ground.

Lancaster was not, of course, entirely lacking in support amongst the Sussex gentry. His many retainers included Robert Beyvill of Little Perching, William Fifide of Shermanbury¹⁸ and Sir John Seynclere, perhaps retained as compensation for his loss of the farm of Queen Philippa's Sussex lands. None were as powerful as Dallingridge, however, nor could the Lancastrian affinity in Sussex (if it can be dignified by that term) draw on the bonds of kinship and the sense of grievance open to the duke's opponents. In this case, however, Lancaster's lack of an adequate body of local support was amply compensated by his influence on the delegates of central authority. Six justices of oyer and terminer were appointed under a commission dated 16 June but the proceedings were heard by

only three — Reginald Cobham, David Hanmere and John Holt. Holt was both a justice of Common Bench and John of Gaunt's steward at Higham Ferrers. Hanmere had been in receipt of a fee from the duke since at least 1376/7. For the trialbaston sessions in the Rape of Pevensey these three sitting justices were joined by a fourth, the ubiquitous Sir Thomas Hungerford, Lancaster's chief steward.¹⁹ The absentee justices, by contrast, included Richard, earl of Arundel, Dallingridge's principal local patron and Sir Edward Saint John, a trusted servant of the Arundel family. This is odd for, under normal circumstances, Arundel would have been expected to look after the interest of his retainer; the original appointment of justices may even have aimed at impartiality by including the partisans of both protagonists, in the hope that they would bring the opposing parties to arbitration rather than judgement. In the summer of 1384, however, Arundel was in no position to oppose Gaunt's wishes, for it was only by the duke's mediation that he had been saved from the consequences of his own tactlessness and the king's anger at Salisbury the month before.²⁰ Political coincidence had thus left Dallingridge unexpectedly exposed to Lancaster's retribution. The duke was swift to seize his opportunity.

Appointed on 16 June, the justices under both commissions sat at East Grinstead from Thursday 23 June until Wednesday 29 June. Unusually, Dallingridge appeared in the court to defend himself and it is, in consequence, possible to follow the judicial proceedings in detail and hence to identify the motives for his attack on the Lancastrian estates with some precision. The suing of a commission against him and the speed with which the justices acted upon it seems, in the first place, to have taken Sir Edward, by surprise, for his behaviour in court was violent and unruly.²¹ On first hearing the charges against him, Dallingridge immediately answered them by a wager of battle — throwing down his gauntlet in court and saying that unless his accuser was closer in blood to the King than himself, he was prepared to disprove the charges against him by his body. Such a challenge was rare, but not unknown as a legal ploy, yet since Dallingridge was accused of trespass alone it was not a recourse open to him, for the wager of battle would only lie in the writ of right or on an appeal of felony.²² Dallingridge, or rather his counsel, must have known this and his behaviour is puzzling. If his action was not simply bluster, it may have been an attempt to gain time in order to prepare a more adequate defence. On the other hand, Sir Edward's reference to the duke's precedence of blood suggests that he may have been thinking of the procedure of the court of chivalry, where the wager of battle was both permissible and more frequent.²³ Such a possibility is perhaps confirmed by Dallingridge's request, on being presented by the hundred juries, for a copy of the charges against him so that he might answer the presentments by the advice of his counsel. This was common practice in the court of chivalry but the defendant at common law did not enjoy such a right until the nineteenth century.²⁴ In consequence, the request was refused by the justices, who pointed out that he had already answered the same charges when alleged against him by the duke's counsel, upon which Dallingridge refused to plead at all and was promptly committed to the custody of the sheriff for contempt.

His confinement seems only to have been formal, for Sir Edward was certainly in court when counsel began his defence.²⁵ This began impressively enough by entering a waiver stating that the offences of which Dallingridge stood accused had occurred during the great rebellion and he could, in consequence, have claimed the benefit of a general pardon for all trespasses committed at that time, but that he had no wish to do so. Sir Edward, standing in court with his counsel, expressly confirmed this, saying that he had no wish to claim the benefit of any statute in so great a matter, and asked his counsel to reply to the charges against him. It was the common rebels, he explained, gathering together with the intention of killing the duke's officials and destroying his property, who had attacked Delves and Broker. He had indeed been there but only in his capacity as a justice of the

peace, doing his best to pacify them. Equally, he was innocent of all the trespasses and hunting offences alleged against him, apart from taking two does and two hinds by the duke's command to deliver to Sir William Croyser's wife. On the other hand, Dallingridge attempted no defence to the accusation that he had prevented the duke of Lancaster's steward from holding his court at Hungry Hatch.²⁶ He admitted the fact, arguing instead that the court there was innovation, established by the present duke, and one that drew away suitors from his own hundred court of Dean (i.e. Danehill in Horsted Keynes parish). He had, in consequence, forbidden his tenants to attend the Lancastrian court, even if summoned before it. In the same way, Dallingridge admitted the charge of carrying off four cows, six oxen and 30 sheep belonging to the duke from Fletching, stating that as the forfeited chattels of John Herlond, a convicted felon, they were rightfully his as lord of the hundred of Dean, as his ancestors had been since time out of mind.

This was the real crux of Dallingridge's grievance against John of Gaunt. The trespasses and hunting offences of which he stood accused were commonplace, even traditional, misdemeanours amongst the county gentry. His own grandfather had been convicted of very similar offences in Ashdown forest in 1315.²⁷ A landowner expected, as a matter of courtesy, to be allowed to ride over his neighbour's estates and Richard earl of Arundel's attempt to establish the inviolability of his Sussex chases in 1377 had led to considerable resentment amongst the gentry, who clearly considered him to have exceeded his rights.²⁸ The violence of Sir Edward's attacks on Lancastrian property and officials was, by contrast, exceptional, only to be explained as the reaction to a more fundamental challenge to his local standing. There is some evidence that his father, Roger Dallingridge, has been a forester of Ashdown under Queen Philippa; he certainly received gifts of deer from the forest.²⁹ Sir Edward's attack may, in consequence, have been prompted by a desire to regain a place in the forest administration lost to his family when the property passed to John of Gaunt. The denial of franchisal rights was, however, an altogether more serious matter. The profits of private courts was small, but the possession of private jurisdiction was invaluable, an indispensable adjunct of lordship, both as an instrument of authority and a means of patronage. Dallingridge's possession of the hundred of Danehill gave him lordship over men as well as lordship over land, a means of coercing and disciplining his tenants that was especially valuable at a time of increasing labour difficulties. It was this that he had sought to defend by his attacks on the Lancastrian officials who trespassed on his franchise.

Yet his defence of his seigniorial rights, though calculated to win approval amongst the local gentry, proved less successful in legal argument. Thomas Pinchbeck, Lancaster's counsel on this case, who was later to become the duke's chief steward in the south and a justice in the palatinate of Lancaster, replied that the franchisal rights in this dispute were so nearly attached to the dignity of the Crown that they could not be exercised by another without a specific royal grant — which, Pinchbeck lost no time in pointing out, the duke of Lancaster certainly possessed and Dallingridge's customary claim conspicuously lacked.³⁰ This was precisely the position adopted by Crown lawyers during Edward I's *quo warranto* inquiries³¹ and it was fully supported by two royal letters close, reciting the franchisal grants made to Lancaster in 1372, as well as by the finding of the hundred jury that Henry, late duke of Lancaster, had held a court at Hungry Hatch every three weeks, as of the honour of Leicester.³² The case was not, however, as clear cut as the jury's verdict suggests. Dallingridge's plea of long user, that his ancestors and predecessors as lords of the hundred had always exercised the rights he claimed, had long been recognized at law as sufficient warrant for possession of a franchise. If the court at Hungry Hatch was not itself an innovation, it may be that the novelty lay in the duke's sweeping interpretation of the rights it gave him, including the ability not only to justice his immediate tenants but also to exercise a supervisory jurisdiction over their

courts. It was certainly this claim to which Dallingridge most objected, but his protest was unavailing against the combination of judicial favour and royal support that Lancaster could command.³³

Having lost his principal point, Dallingridge had little better success with his other pleadings. His case was substantially undermined, when the justices reconvened on Saturday 26, by the appearance of John Bocche, who came into court and promptly confessed to being an accomplice in all the crimes charged against Dallingridge and his companions.³⁴ Bocche's appearance in court is surprising, when the sheriff could find none of the others indicted. It is so opportune, and his admission of guilt so comprehensive, that it is hard not to suspect a degree of suborning by the Lancastrian administration. Outwardly he was treated with no special leniency by the court since, on failing to appear in King's Bench he was outlawed until his surrender to the Marshalsea in 1388, but he was then paid 36 shillings towards the cost of his pardon by the duke's receiver in Sussex, which strongly suggests that some sort of plea-bargain must have been struck before Bocche appeared in court at all.³⁵ As they could hardly fail to do, the jury consequently found against Dallingridge on almost every charge, exonerating him only from the accusation of burning the duke's brushwood at Ashdown in March 1380 and the attack on his servants and property of Ringmer. They also moderated the rather exaggerated estimate of the game taken by Dallingridge and adjudged against him damages of £1,080 rather than the £2,000 originally demanded. Sir Edward once again exacerbated matters by his intransigence, for whilst Sir John Seynclere was giving evidence he declared that it was untrue, threw down his gauntlet in open court and again waged battle, this time against Seynclere. His action was certainly without legal justification this time for witnesses, although relatively common in court by the late fourteenth century, had no formal or essential part in proceedings. This suggests that Dallingridge recognized the proceedings for what they were, a challenge to his lordship, and so insisted on treating the case as a matter of honour rather than of legal form. For his contempt of court, Sir Edward was again committed to the custody of William Waleys, the Sheriff, and he remained under arrest after conviction, since he refused to make fine with the king for his trespasses. Waleys could be trusted to keep him safe, for he was also Sir John Seynclere's son-in-law.³⁶

In the short term, therefore, John of Gaunt's prosecution of Sir Edward Dallingridge had successfully vindicated his seigneurial rights in Sussex, indicated to the county gentry the limits of the earl of Arundel's protection and provided an object lesson in discipline for the benefit of the Commons. Yet the sequel to these events clearly demonstrates how exceptional were the circumstances that enabled Gaunt to bring his opponent to heel. On 16 July, little more than a fortnight after his committal to custody, the Sheriff was ordered to release Dallingridge; it has been plausibly conjectured that the earl of Arundel, benefitting from the duke's temporary absence abroad, interceded for him whilst the king was at Arundel castle in July.³⁷ This was clearly displeasing to Gaunt who, on his return from negotiating a truce with the French, had Sir Edward re-arrested in October, but this second imprisonment was again very temporary, since Dallingridge was returned to the Westminster Parliament in the following month. Sir Edward's political standing thus suffered little harm from his conviction. His accomplice, Sir Thomas Sackville, was eventually pardoned at the instance of Sir James Berners, the chamber knight, and in so far as the affair brought him into prominence as at odds with the unpopular John of Gaunt, it may even have increased Dallingridge's standing amongst the king's courtiers and hence eased his path to rapid promotion in Richard II's service.³⁸

In Sussex, as well, Gaunt was careful not to press his advantage too far. The chattels of John Herlond, which Dallingridge had illegally seized in April 1381, were never returned to the duke's ministers; he was still in dispute with the Lancastrian council over their value at the time of his

death.³⁹ John Skinner, Sir Thomas Sackville's parker, successfully followed the example of his masters and refused to pay the fine imposed on him. The tenants of Maresfield were granted two marks towards the cost of a new rental, to replace that destroyed by Dallingridge. The court at Hungry Hatch, which had so outraged him, was re-established in 1385–6 but abandoned in the following year by the advice of the duke's council and, it was specifically stated, at the suit of Sir Edward Dallingridge.⁴⁰ It was not the only source of income from the duke's estates to vanish. The violence in Ashdown meant that the profits of the forest dropped steeply whilst the bailiff of the Lancastrian franchises in the county was unable to levy the estreats imposed during the chief steward's tourn on account of the concerted legal opposition to his demands.⁴¹ For John of Gaunt, the profits of the court (29s. 2d. in 1385–6) were a small price to pay in order to maintain good relations with a man of Dallingridge's standing. He had established the principle that he was entitled to hold a court there; in practice he could well afford to abandon it. His concession paid handsome dividends for Sir Edward's son, Sir John, served Henry Bolingbroke as both earl of Derby and king of England with conspicuous loyalty.⁴² Dallingridge was soon in trouble with the law again, appearing in King's Bench in Hilary 1385 for an alleged attack on a jeweller in London, but he had little cause to abandon his violent ways.⁴³ Besides an uncomfortable couple of months in the summer of 1384 his attack on the Lancastrian estates in Sussex proved remarkably successful. In the short term, it bought him the master forestership of Ashdown; in the long term, it brought the abandonment of the court at Hungry Hatch. It was perhaps the success to be gained by such violence and the Commons' unwillingness to will the means for its effective suppression, rather than the magnates' failure to discipline their own men, that rendered the Commons' complaints at the Salisbury Parliament so unavailing.

Author: Simon Walker, All Souls College, Oxford OX1 4AL

APPENDIX

P.R.O., JUST 1/944 m.4:

Memorandum quod cum Edwardus Dalyngrugge chivaler attachiatus fuit ad respondendum Johanni¹ regi Castell' et² Leg' duci Lancastri', simul cum aliis de placito diversarum transgressionum, idemque rex dux die jovis in vigilia nativitatibus Sancti Johannis Baptist versus prefatum Edwardum transgressiones in brevi (sic) et narratione sua contentas coram prefatis justiciariis narravit et declaravit, idem edwardus coram prefatis justiciariis statim et expresse dixit quod si quis ea que in brevi (sic) et narratione predictis continentur sibi imponere voluit, nisi fuerit de propinquior consanguini domini regis quod ipse paratus fuit versus eum ea³ disrationare per corpus suum et inde coram prefatis justiciariis protinus vadiavit duellum. Insuperque⁴ cum idem Edwardus de diversis transgressionibus indictatus fuerat et per processum versus eum inde factum predicto die jovis coram prefatis justiciariis comparens, allocutus⁵ qualiter de transgressionibus predictis sibi impositis se voluit⁶ acquietare, idem Edwardus petiit a curia predicta copiam presentationum predictarum sibi liberari, ut de eis per avisamentum consilli sui domino regi potuit respondere. Et quia constabat curia quod idem Edwardus de materiis in eisdem presentationibus contentis antea ad sectam ipsius regis ducis allocutus fuit et eidem regi duci inde respondebat et tempus maturum tunc non instabat curia diversis de causis ad copiam presentationum eidem Edwardo deliberandam, per quod lectis sibi presentationibus predictis dictum fuit eidem Edwardo per curiam quod domino regi responderet de premissis transgressionibus sibi impositis, quiquidem Edwardus coram prefatis justiciariis expresse dixit quod ipse noluit domino regi inde respondere quicquid iidem justiciarii sibi inde facere voluerint nisi haberet copiam presentationum predictarum, per quod idem Edwardus pro contemptibus predictis comittitur prisonem in custodia Willelmi Waleys vicecomites, ibidem moraturus quousque domino regi pro contemptibus predictis satisfecerit. Ac postmodum cum jurata inter prefatum regem ducem et Edwardum de transgressionibus predictis ad dicendum veredictum suum coram prefatis justiciariis onerata fuerat ac quidam Johannes Sencler chivaler pro ipso rege duce diversas materias in evidendia prefate jurate declaraverat, prefatus Edwardus coram prefatis justiciariis dixit⁷ quod materie ille non continebant veritatem et protinus projecit seretecam suam coram prefatis justiciariis et petiit se admitti ad disrationandas materias predictas versus prefatum Johannem Sencler per duellum, et sic contra legem terre coram prefatis justiciariis vadiavit inde duellum per quod preceptum fuit vicecomiti quod salvo et secure custodiret prefatum Edwardum quousque domino regi satisfecerit pro contemptibus predictis.

1. Written over erasure.

2. Interlined.

3. Written over erasure.

4. *que* interlined.

5. Written over erasure.

6. Written over erasure.

7. Interlineated.

Footnotes

- ¹Public Record Office (abbreviated hereafter to P.R.O.) JUST 1/947/5.
- ²P.R.O., JUST 1/944.
- ³The Marquis Curzon of Kedleston, *Bodiam Castle, Sussex* (London, 1926), 25-8; A. Goodman, *The Loyal Conspiracy* (London, 1971), 115-16, give a brief biography.
- ⁴L. F. Salzman, ed., *Feet of Fines for the County of Sussex* 3, Sussex Record Society, 23, (1916), Nos. 2480, 2574, 2580, 2616; P.R.O., SC 8/209/10442; *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1381-5*, 55.
- ⁵T. F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, 3 (Manchester, 1928), 352; A. Tuck, *Richard II and the English Nobility* (London, 1973), 141-3. C. M. Barron, 'The Quarrel of Richard II with London', in *The Reign of Richard II*, ed. F. R. H. du Boulay and C. M. Barron (London, 1971), 192.
- ⁶P.R.O., JUST 1/947/5 m. 1; DL 29/441/7083; *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1381-5*, 580.
- ⁷P.R.O., JUST 1/944 m. 1-3; JUST 1/947/5 m. 1.
- ⁸P.R.O., JUST 1/944 m. 1; A. Reville, *Le Soulevement des Travailleurs d'Angleterre en 1381* (Paris, 1898), cxxxiv; P.R.O., DL 29/727/11938.
- ⁹E. C. Lodge and R. Somerville, eds., *John of Gaunt's Register 1379-83*, Camden Third Series, 56 (London, 1937), No. 1138; P.R.O., DL 29/727/11940.
- ¹⁰J. R. Lumby, ed., *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden*, IX, Rolls Series, (London, 1886), 40-1; *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1381-5*, 427-8.
- ¹¹*Cal. Pat. Rolls 1364-7*, 333; S. Armitage-Smith, ed., *John of Gaunt's Register 1372-6*, Camden Third Series, 21 (London, 1911) Nos. 24, 30.
- ¹²P.R.O., SC 2/206/16; *Cal. Close Rolls 1292-6*, 499; *Feudal Aids*, V, 139, 146; *Calendar of Inquisitions Post-Mortem* VI, 122; W. Hudson, ed., *The Earliest Subsidy Returns for the County of Sussex in the Years 1296, 1327, 1382*, S.R.S., 10 (1909), 188, 195.
- ¹³P.R.O., SC 6/1028/4 m. 1; DL 29/441/7082-6.
- ¹⁴*Cal. Pat. Rolls 1370-4*, 179; Armitage-Smith, Nos. 1569, 1654; P.R.O., C 260/83 No. 88—the plea is stained and damaged.
- ¹⁵E.g., P.R.O., C 88/58 Nos. 17, 58; E 101/510/28.
- ¹⁶P.R.O., DL 29/717/11939; JUST 1/944 m. 2; JUST 1/947/5 m. 3.
- ¹⁷*Cal. Pat. Rolls 1381-5*, 441; P.R.O., C 67/28B m. 13; Lodge and Somerville, No. 1165.
- ¹⁸A particular enemy of Dallingridge's—e.g. P.R.O., SC 8/207/10324.
- ¹⁹P.R.O., JUST 1/947/5 m. 1; R. Somerville, *History of the Duchy of Lancaster*, 1 (London, 1953), 373; J. R. Maddicott, *Law and Lordship: Royal Justice on Retainers in Thirteenth and Fourteenth Century England*, Past and Present Supplement 4 (1978), 72-3; P.R.O., JUST 1/944, m. 1.
- ²⁰Goodman, 144-5; *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden*, IX, 33.
- ²¹See the Appendix for what follows.
- ²²G. Neilson, *Trial by Combat* (Glasgow, 1890), 37; F. Pollock and F. W. Maitland, *The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I*, 2 (Cambridge, 1898, repr. 1968), 632-4.
- ²³This is the interpretation of Sir Robert Cotton in *A Collection of Curious Discourses*, ed. T. Hearne (London, 1771), 179.
- ²⁴Hearne, 244.
- ²⁵P.R.O. JUST 1/947/5 m. d.
- ²⁶P.R.O. JUST 1/944 m. 3.
- ²⁷L. C. Lloyd and D. M. Stenton, eds. *Sir Christopher Hatton's Book of Seals* (Oxford, 1950), No. 356.
- ²⁸P.R.O. JUST 1/943.
- ²⁹*Cal. Pat. Roll 1351-4*, 156, P.R.O. SC 6/1028/4 m. 1.
- ³⁰P.R.O. JUST 1/944 m. 2d.
- ³¹T. F. Plucknett, *The Legislation of Edward I* (Oxford 1949), 44.
- ³²P.R.O., JUST 1/947/5 m. 2d.
- ³³D. W. Sutherland; *Quo Warranto Proceedings under Edward I* (Oxford, 1963) 81-3, 182-4; P.R.O., JUST 1/947/5 m. Id.; JUST 1/944 m. 3.
- ³⁴*Ibid.*, m. 2.
- ³⁵P.R.O., C 88/61 no. 17; DL 29/728/11975 m. 1. He still came to a bad end, murdered on the high road at Sheffield in September 1392—*Cal. Pat. Roll 1391-6*, 322.
- ³⁶P.R.O., JUST 1/947/5 m. 2; JUST 1/944 mm. 4, 1d. R. F. Dell, *The Glynde Place Archives, a catalogue* (Lewes, 1964), xii.
- ³⁷*Cal. Close Rolls 1381-5*, 449; Goodman, 115.
- ³⁸*Cal. Close Rolls 1381-5*, 482-3; *Return of members of Parliament Part I: Parliament of England 1213-1702* (London, 1878), 224; *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1381-5*, 580.
- ³⁹P.R.O., DL 29/727/11944.
- ⁴⁰P.R.O., DL 29/411/7085-7.
- ⁴¹P.R.O., DL 29/728/11985 m. 2d.
- ⁴²L. Toulmin-Smith, ed., *Expeditions to Prussia and the Holy Land Made by Henry Earl of Derby*, Camden New Series, 52 (London, 1874), 304.
- ⁴³P.R.O., KB 27/495 m. 53d.
- ⁴⁴I would like to thank Christopher Whittick, of the East Sussex Record Office, for his help with this transcript.