

**‘Queen Consort, Queen Mother: The Power and Authority of  
Fourteenth-Century Plantagenet Queens’**

**Lisa Benz**

University of York  
Department of History

This thesis is submitted in fulfillment of the requirements  
for the PhD

August 2009

## Abstract

Between 1299 and 1369 there was a continuous succession of queen consorts and queen dowagers. Margaret of France was queen consort between 1299 and 1307 and died in 1318, Isabella of France was queen consort between 1308 and 1327 and she died in 1358 and Philippa of Hainault was queen consort between 1328 and 1369 when she died. A continuous transition between queens is particularly exciting for a study of queenship because an analysis of these queens' activities provides a unique opportunity to form conclusions about normative queenly behaviour, and to determine the extent to which their activities depended on circumstance and inclination. The overlapping of consorts and dowagers also allows us to study the relationships between these women. Yet there has been no full-length study which takes advantage of this exceptional period in late medieval history. This present study proposes to do so, and frames this examination around four major themes: gender; status; the concept of the crown; and power and authority.

By using administrative, visual and literary sources this study seeks to address the themes of gender, status, medieval concepts of the crown and power and authority. Through these themes it expounds upon the relationship of the ideology of queenship and the historical actions of three fourteenth-century queens. This thesis will demarcate when the queen's power is symbolic or achieved through her own initiative. It examines the extent to which gender and status dictated the nature of her power and authority, and it will use the concept of the crown to assess her royal status. It acknowledges that gender inequality existed in the medieval period; the queen could not rule in her own right, nor act as chancellor, treasurer or member of parliament. However, instead of emphasizing the queen's independence or her constraints and limitations, this study seeks to provide an even-handed analysis of how the queen acted. Overall, this thesis concludes that not only did the queen remain a visible part of the centralized monarchy, she also held official roles within government. She was embedded in the administrative apparatus of government as a wife, a mother and a widely recognized representative of the crown.

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Chapter One: Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 Gender	9
1.2 Status	12
1.3 The Crown	15
1.4 Public Sphere v. Private Sphere	16
1.5 Power and Authority	19
Symbolic Power	22
1.6 Medieval Queenship: A Historiography	24
1.7 Structure	30
<b>Chapter Two: Medieval Expectations and Modern Methodologies</b>	<b>32</b>
2.1 Iconic Images of the Queen	32
2.2 Literary Sources	38
2.3 Administrative Documents	42
<b>Chapter Three: The Queen as Intercessor: Power and Influence</b>	<b>51</b>
3.1 Intercession with King and Crown	54
The King	54
The Crown	67
3.2 Perceptions of Influence	71
3.3 Manipulating Intercession	86
3.4 Conclusion	94
<b>Chapter Four: A Royal Institution: The Queen's Household and Estates</b>	<b>96</b>
4.1 The Household	97
4.2 The Queen's Affinity	105

4.3 The Estates	118
4.4 Conclusion	133
<b>Chapter Five: Motherhood, Matriarchy and the Royal Family</b>	<b>136</b>
5.1 Gender, Power, Motherhood	138
5.2 Pregnancy, Birth, Intercession and Power	141
5.3 Childhood	157
5.4 Children as Adults	169
5.5 Conclusion	184
<b>Chapter Six: Administrator of the Realm</b>	<b>186</b>
6.1 The History of Regency in England and France	187
6.2 The Consort as Administrator	194
6.3 Isabella and the Minority of Edward III	200
October 1326- January 1327	202
February 1327-October 1328	205
October 1328-November 1330	218
6.4 Conclusion	224
<b>Chapter Seven: Conclusions</b>	<b>227</b>
<b>Appendix I: The Queens' Itinerary</b>	<b>232</b>
<b>Appendix II: Number of Intercessionary Acts</b>	<b>270</b>
<b>Appendix III: Household Members</b>	<b>273</b>
<b>Appendix IV: Lists of Estate and Income</b>	<b>288</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>298</b>

## List of Abbreviations

BL MS	British Library Manuscript.
CCR	<i>Calendar of Close Rolls, 1296-1374</i> (London 1892-1908).
CCW	<i>Calendar of Chancery Warrants, 1244-1326</i> (London, 1927).
CChR	<i>Calendar of Charter Rolls, 1247-1417</i> (London 1908).
CFR	<i>Calendar of Fine Rolls, 1272-1377</i> (London, 1911-1912).
CPR	<i>Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1292-1370</i> (London, 1894-1903).
CPMR	Thomas, A.H., and P.E. Jones (eds.), <i>Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls of the City of London, 1323-1364</i> (6 vols, Cambridge, 1926-61).
<i>Calendar of Papal Letters</i>	Bliss, W.H. et al. (eds.) <i>Calendar Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal Letters, 1198-1404</i> (London, 1893-1902).
<i>The Complete Peerage</i>	Cokayne, George E. and Vicary Gibbs (eds.), <i>The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom: extant, extinct or dormant</i> (13 vols in 6, Sutton, 1687).
DNB	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online</i> ' <a href="http://www.oxforddnb.com">http://www.oxforddnb.com</a> '.
EETS, ES	Early English Text Society, Extra Series.
EETS, OS	Early English Text Society, Old Series.
<i>Foedera</i>	Rymer, Thomas, <i>Foedera</i> , Adam, Clarke, Frederick Holbrooke and John Caley (eds.) (3 vols, London, 1816-69).
HBC	Powicke, F. Maurice and E. B. Fryde (eds.) <i>Handbook of British Chronology</i> (London, 1961).
TNA	The National Archives London.
WAM	Westminster Abbey Muniments.

## Acknowledgements

I first and foremost thank Mark Ormrod, who has gone above and beyond the expectations for, and duties of, a supervisor. Without his support, encouragement and flexibility, this thesis would never have been written. I pay particular regard to Helen Maurer, who first introduced me to queenship studies as an undergraduate and who has continued to offer academic and personal advice throughout my postgraduate career.

I have been fortunate to work in an intellectual community at the University of York whose varied expertise I was able to draw upon during the research and writing of this thesis. These include, but are not limited to: Shelagh Sneddon, Jocelyn Wogan-Browne and the members of the Anglo-Norman reading group, who helped with my French transcriptions and translations; Sarah Rees Jones, Rob Kinsey, Barbara Gribling, Catherine Casson and Bronach Kane for reading and advising on drafts; and my friends and colleagues, who acted as sounding boards during many coffee breaks. Further afield, I would like to acknowledge the help and support offered by the staff at the National Archives, London, the members of the Fourteenth Century Political Society and the Society of the White Hart.

Lastly, I thank my parents for always encouraging me to find a fulfilling goal and to have the strength to accomplish it; my extended family and friends for their interest and pride in my work; and to Graham, for his unshakable belief in my abilities.

## Chapter 1 Introduction

On 10 September 1299 Edward I married Margaret of France, sister to Philip IV, in Canterbury Cathedral in an effort to bring peace between England and France. This marriage initiated a period of uninterrupted succession between queen consort and queen dowager. There was no point between 1299 and 1369 when there was not a queen, and at times a queen consort and a queen dowager were alive simultaneously, whereas some time had passed between the death of Eleanor of Castile in 1290 and Edward I's second marriage to Margaret of France in 1299. Between 1299 and 1369, there were three queens of England: Margaret of France, Isabella of France and Philippa of Hainault. None of these queens ruled in their own right, but were queen consorts and queen mothers to Edward I, Edward II and Edward III respectively. Margaret of France was born around 1279 to Phillip III of France and his wife Mary of Brabant.<sup>1</sup> She became Edward I's second wife in 1299 and gave birth to three children. She died in February 1318. Isabella of France was the daughter of Philip IV of France and Joan of Navarre. She born in about 1295 and she married Edward II in 1308.<sup>2</sup> Edward I's wife, Margaret of France was Isabella's paternal aunt. Isabella is most known for her coup and deposition of Edward II in 1326-27. She died in Hertford Castle on 23 August 1358. Philippa was born in Hainault, to Count William of Hainault and Holland and Countess Jeanne, granddaughter of Philip III of France. The date of her birth is not entirely certain; she may have been born on 24 June 1310, but it is also possible that she was not born until 1315.<sup>3</sup>

A continuous transition between queens is particularly exciting for a study of queenship because an analysis of these queens' activities provides a unique opportunity to form conclusions about normative queenly behaviour, and to determine the extent to which their activities depended on circumstance and inclination. Such a study prompts

---

<sup>1</sup> John Carmi Parsons, 'Margaret (1279?-1318)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18046>, accessed 22 April 2009].

<sup>2</sup> John Carmi Parsons, 'Isabella (1295-1358)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14484>, accessed 22 April 2009].

<sup>3</sup> Juliet Vale, 'Philippa (1310x15?-1369)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22110>, accessed 4 March 2009].

many questions: what were the queen's prerogatives and what defined the types of authority she had? Did her sex or gender affect this authority, or was status a more influential factor? Did she share a common identity with other women or with the male landed elite? What was the relationship between these queens and what was their relationship to the king and to government? These are some of the concerns that motivate this study.

Since the nineteenth century, scholars have shown interest in Margaret, Isabella and Philippa, but many of these early studies are narrative biographies or works of antiquarians.<sup>4</sup> As a result, they contain little analysis of the practice of queenship. There have been no recent detailed studies of Margaret or Philippa. They are mostly discussed in studies focusing on Edward I, Edward II and Edward III.<sup>5</sup> Isabella has been the subject of four modern studies: two of these are popular histories and two are doctoral theses.<sup>6</sup> Margaret, Isabella and Philippa are often mentioned in general articles on the topics of queenship, kingship, politics and gender, and there are also a few which focus on them as individuals.<sup>7</sup> Yet there has been no full-length study which takes advantage of this

---

<sup>4</sup> J.H. Round, 'The Landing of Queen Isabella in 1326', *English Historical Review*, 14 (1899), 104-5; Joseph Hunter, 'The Mission of Queen Isabella to the Court of France, and of Her Long Residence in that Country', *Archaeologia*, 36 (1855), 242-256; Agnes Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England, from the Norman Conquest* (6 vols, London, 1840-1849); Blanche C. Hardy, *Philippa of Hainault and her Times* (London, 1910).

<sup>5</sup> Michael Prestwich, *Edward I* (London, 1997); Roy Martin Haines, *King Edward II: His Life, His Reign, and Its Aftermath, 1284-1330* (Montreal, 2006); W.M. Ormrod, *Edward III* (Stroud, 2005); Michael Prestwich, *The Three Edwards: War and State in England, 1272-1377* (London, 2003); Natalie Fryde, *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II, 1321-1326* (Cambridge, 1979).

<sup>6</sup> Alison Weir, *Queen Isabella: Treachery, Adultery, and Murder in Medieval England* (New York, 2005); Paul Doherty, *Isabella and the Strange Death of Edward II* (Oxford, 2003); Paul C. Doherty, 'Isabella, Queen of England, 1296-1330' (Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Oxford, 1977); Katherine Allocco, 'Intercessor, Rebel, Regent: The Political Life of Isabella of France' (Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Texas, Austin, 2004). Allocco's thesis became available during the course of the research and writing of this present thesis. The work presented in this thesis is based on my own research and will cite Allocco when this thesis relies directly on her work.

<sup>7</sup> Paul C. Doherty, 'The Date of the Birth of Isabella, Queen of England, 1308-1358', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 48 (1975), 246-248; Elizabeth A.R. Brown, 'The Political Repercussions of the Marriage of Edward II of England and Isabelle of France', *Speculum*, 63 (1988), 573-595; Caroline Shenton, 'Edward III and the Coup of 1330', in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), pp. 13-34; Claire Valente, 'The Deposition and Abdication of Edward II', *English Historical Review*, 113 (1998), 852-881; F.D. Blackley, 'Isabella of France, Queen of England (1308-1358) and the Late Medieval Cult of the Dead', *Canadian Journal of History*, 15 (1980), 23-47; Suzanne Lewis, 'Apocalypse of Isabella of France', *Art Bulletin*, 72 (1990), 224-260; Michael, A. Michael, 'The Iconography of Kingship in the Walter Milemete Treatise', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 57 (1994), 35-47; Anne Rudolf Stanton, 'Isabelle of France and her Manuscripts 1308-1358', in Kathleen Nolen (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), pp. 225-252; Anne Rudolf Stanton, 'The Psalter of Isabelle, Queen of England,



exceptional period in late medieval history. This present study proposes to do so, and frames this examination around four major themes: gender; status; the concept of the crown; and power and authority.

## 1.1 Gender

This study is interested in whether or not the queen's gender had any bearing on how she exercised her prerogatives. Did it dictate what her prerogatives were and how she exercised them? Consequently, it is important to explain why gender theory provides a useful framework for such a study, how the term gender has been used previously and how this study intends to use it. Applying modern theory without an awareness of cultural specificity risks the production of ahistorical and distorted conclusions. In the sub-discipline of deviant sexuality, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, warning not to project conclusions about modern heteronormative society on to the past, said that defining what

---

Isabelle as the Audience', *Word and Image*, 18 (2002), 1-27; Anne Rudolph Stanton, *The Queen Mary Psalter: A Study of Affect and Audience* (Philadelphia, 2001); Julia Marvin, 'Albino and Isabella: Regicidal Queens and the Historical Imagination of the Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut* Chronicles', *Arthurian Literature*, 18 (2001), 143-191; Anne Crawford, 'The Queen's Council in the Middle Ages', *English Historical Review*, 116 (2001), 1193-1211; John Carmi Parsons, '“Never was a body buried in England with such solemnity and honour”: The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens to 1500', in Anne J. Duggan (ed.), *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference Held at King's College London, April 1995* (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 317- 357; John Carmi Parsons, 'The Intercessionary Patronage of Queen Margaret and Isabella of France', in Michael Prestwich, R.H. Britnell and Robin Frame (eds.), *Thirteenth Century England, VI* (Woodbridge, 1995), pp. 145-156; John Carmi Parsons, 'Family, Sex and Power: The Rhythms of Medieval Queenship', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1998), p. 6; John Carmi Parsons, 'Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power: Some Plantagenet Evidence, 1150-1500', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1998) pp. 66-67, 71; Joanna Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 136, 150, 209; Sophie Menache, 'Isabelle of France, Queen of England: A Reconsideration', *Journal of Medieval History*, 10 (1984), 107- 124; Michael Bennett, 'Isabella of France, Anglo-French Diplomacy and Cultural Exchange in the Late 1350s', in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), pp. 215-225; Hilda Johnstone, 'Isabella, The She Wolf', *History*, 21(1936-7), 208-18; Hilda Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in W.A. Morris (ed.) *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols, The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1930-1940), vol. 1, p. 250; Hilda Johnstone, 'The Queen's Exchequer Under the Three Edwards' in J.G. Edwards (ed.) *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait* (Manchester, 1933), pp. 143-53; Chris Given-Wilson, 'The Merger of Edward III's and Queen Philippa's Households', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 51 (1978), 183-187; Veronica Sekules, 'Dynasty and Patrimony in the Self-Construction of an English Queen', in John Mitchell and Matthew Moran (eds.), *England and the Continent in the Middle Ages* (Stamford, 2000), pp. 157-174; Caroline Shenton, 'Philippa of Hainault's Churchings: the Politics of Motherhood', in Richardson Eales and Shaun Tyas (eds.), *Family and Dynasty in Late Medieval England* (Donington, 2003), pp. 105-121; Michael A. Michael, 'A Manuscript Wedding Gift From Philippa of Hainault to Edward III', *Burlington Magazine*, 127 (1985), 582-99; Michael A. Michael, 'The Little Land of England is Preferred before the Great Kingdom of France: Quartering of the Royal Arms by Edward III', in David Bukton and T.A. Heslop (eds.), *Studies in Medieval Art and Architecture presented to Peter Lasko* (Stroud, 1994), pp. 113-126.

is sexual and what is not is arbitrary and is variable on historical and cultural context.<sup>8</sup> The same argument applies to the use of gender theory in studies of the past.

However, though medieval society did not use the term gender and probably thought about gender differently from modern thinkers, considering modern ideas about gender is useful in studies of medieval society. Judith Bennett argues for the application of modern feminist theory to studies of medieval women and she addresses the anxiety many scholars show when imposing modern theory on to history.<sup>9</sup> She argues that the use of theory allows scholars to think in new ways, inspiring new lines of questioning and adding to the body of information about the Middle Ages.<sup>10</sup> She has pointed out that the growth and longevity of the study of late medieval women and gender is demonstrated through its evolution into diverse sub-fields. What started as women's history expanded to feminist history, followed by gender history and then the history of masculinity.<sup>11</sup> Gender history has loosely developed into a new term for women's history and implies equal attention to both men and women, but it also describes a specific approach that 'questions the biological foundations of gender by studying its ideological constructions and powers'.<sup>12</sup> Connecting medieval history and feminist theory also expands the audience of medieval scholarship by relating it to contemporary issues of interest.<sup>13</sup> Consequently, while it is worthwhile to be anxious about directly translating what we gather from our own modern observations and cultural experiences on to the past, it is useful to use modern feminist and gender theory in some instances. It is useful for defining terms and trends in order to lend clarity to an argument or conclusion. Modern feminist theory may also be helpful when evidence from medieval primary sources demonstrates a trend that feminist scholars have identified elsewhere. In

---

<sup>8</sup> Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York 1985), p. 22.

<sup>9</sup> Judith Bennett, 'Medievalism and Feminism', *Speculum*, 68 (1993), pp. 312, 315-16, 320-3.

<sup>10</sup> Bennett, 'Medievalism and Feminism', pp. 322-23, 325-27; Judith Bennett, 'England: Women and Gender', in S.H. Rigby (ed.), *A Companion to Britain in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2003), p. 89, Bennett cites J.C. Hold, P.J.P. Goldberg and Scott Waugh as examples of historians using gender to examine old questions in new ways.

<sup>11</sup> Bennett, 'England: Women and Gender,' p. 89.

<sup>12</sup> Bennett, 'England: Women and Gender,' p. 89.

<sup>13</sup> Bennett, 'Medievalism and Feminism', pp. 322-23, 325-27: Bennett herself, for example, uses Peggy Sandy and Joan Scott.

these situations it is helpful to compare and contrast the modern examples with conclusions made about medieval society in order to help elucidate those conclusions.

In the beginning of modern feminist theory, the term gender referred to women. As theorists took on issues such as gay marriage, fertility technology, transgender, sexuality or sexual identity and biology, the term gender has been connected to all of these issues.<sup>14</sup> Even different political and religious institutions have their own connotations for gender, which are different from the ways in which academics use the term.<sup>15</sup> It then naturally follows that a specific definition of gender needs to be identified for this thesis. According to Judith Butler, 'gender is the apparatus by which the production and the normalization of masculine and feminine take place along with the interstitial forms of the hormonal, chromosomal, psychic and performative that gender assumes'.<sup>16</sup> Likewise, S.H. Rigby argues that 'gender refers to the ways in which the biological differences between male and female are transformed into the culturally specific and socially defined categories of masculine and feminine'.<sup>17</sup> These are particularly useful definitions because they encompasses all the areas with which gender can be connected: psychological, cultural, biological and so forth. With Butler and Rigby's definitions in mind, in this study gender will refer to the different roles medieval society ascribed to men and women, and specifically to queens. However, my use of gender in this way is not necessarily the preferred usage by all feminist scholars. Judith Butler claims that some of her feminist colleagues prefer the term 'sexual difference' to

---

<sup>14</sup> Judith Butler, *Undoing Gender* (New York, 2004), pp. 1-16, Butler confronts all these issues and how they are connected to gender in her introduction and then expands on them in each chapter; Catherine A. MacKinnon, 'Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State: An Agenda for Theory,' in Nannerl O. Keohane, Michelle Z. Rosaldo, and Barbara C. Gelpi (eds), *Feminist Theory: A Critique of Ideology* (Chicago, 1982), p. 17. For an example of gender related to sexuality, MacKinnon claims that sex as gender and sex as sexuality are defined in terms of each other, but it is sexuality that determines gender, and that this is the central but never stated insight of Kate Millett, *Sexual Politics* (Urbana-Champaign, 2000). However, Judith Butler points out that this form of reducing gender to sexuality has given way to two concerns within contemporary queer theory, which are one, to separate sexuality from gender, so that to have a gender does not presuppose that one engages in sexual practice in any particular way, and two, to argue that gender is not reducible to hierarchical heterosexuality, that it takes different forms when contextualized by queer sexualities, that its binariness cannot be taken for granted: Butler, *Undoing Gender*, p. 54.

<sup>15</sup> Butler, *Undoing Gender*, pp. 181-183: Butler describes how both the Vatican and the United Nations have used gender as a code word for homosexuality.

<sup>16</sup> Butler 'Gender Regulations', p. 42.

<sup>17</sup> S.H. Rigby, *English Society in the Later Middle Ages: Class, Status, and Gender* (Basingstoke, 1995), p. 243.

gender because it indicates the socially constructed and variable implications of this concept.<sup>18</sup> However, for its purposes this study will continue to use gender in the aforesaid way.

## 1.2 Status

Not only is it possible that the queen's gender had an effect on the nature of her prerogatives, but her social status may also have affected her prerogatives. The effects of status on women's experiences and how historians study their experiences is always an issue of concern for anyone who studies women. Should women be categorized alongside men of their same status, or do all women fit into a separate group based on shared experiences that derive from being women? Do they, as some modern feminists believe, constitute a sex-class?<sup>19</sup> For example, are medieval women better studied separately as peasants, townswomen and noble women? Or can it be said that all women essentially had similar access to power and authority and should, therefore, be looked at as a single group? Marxists argue that to analyze society in terms of sex ignores class divisions among women.<sup>20</sup> A woman's social position is delineated by her family (or class) membership because the family determines one's access to economic resources, power, status and it also operates as the main apparatus of the transmission of these privileges.<sup>21</sup> Feminists argue that Marxism is 'male defined in theory and practice and that analyzing society exclusively in class terms ignores distinctive social experiences'.<sup>22</sup> Catherine Mackinnon demonstrates this idea by critiquing Rosa Luxemburg's failure to see middle class women's commonality with working class women, a short-sightedness that Mackinnon attributes to her Marxist standpoint.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Butler, *Undoing Gender*, p. 181.

<sup>19</sup> Maggie Humm, *Modern Feminisms: Political, Literary, Cultural* (New York, 1992), p. 21, 87; Mary C. Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski, 'A New Economy of Power Relations: Female Agency in the Middle Ages', in Mary C. Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 2003), p. 2.

<sup>20</sup> MacKinnon, 'Feminism, Marxism', p. 3; Rigby, *English Society*, p. 244.

<sup>21</sup> Rigby, *English Society*, p. 244.

<sup>22</sup> MacKinnon, 'Feminism, Marxism', p. 4.

<sup>23</sup> MacKinnon, 'Feminism, Marxism', p. 8.

Scholars have applied these same questions to medieval women and have drawn different conclusions. S.H. Rigby claims that 'women of medieval England constituted a ... separate category of persons who by virtue of common roles, social location and experience of social exclusion have a common interest in terms of the augmentation of their economic, political and ideological power', but that they did not have a common self-identity.<sup>24</sup> Rigby ends his discussion by concluding that the social position of any individual is the product of many different issues: 'if gender was divided by class, then classes, in turn, were crucially divided in terms of gender'.<sup>25</sup> Mavis Mate argues that though they did share certain experiences and responsibilities that were determined by their gender, the opportunities available to women were based on both her social class and her current stage in her life-cycle.<sup>26</sup> These stages in the life-cycle — single woman, wife, mother and widow — were common experiences of most women. The study of how women's roles changed according to different times in her life has been examined by several other scholars.<sup>27</sup> Scholars have also shown that there was economic stratification within the larger social groups which composed medieval society, adding another layer onto the debate of women's place within this society; for example, studies that have been done on urban women stress a social hierarchy within towns based on wealth, rank and occupation.<sup>28</sup> Despite the common experiences found within the life-

---

<sup>24</sup> Rigby, *English Society*, pp. 278-80.

<sup>25</sup> Rigby, *English Society*, p. 280.

<sup>26</sup> Mavis Mate, *Women in Medieval English Society* (Cambridge 1999), p.2.

<sup>27</sup> P.J.P. Goldberg, 'Marriage, Migration, and Servanthood: The York Cause Paper Evidence', in P.J.P. Goldberg (ed.), *Women in Medieval English Society* (Stroud, 1997), pp. 1-15; Judith Bennett, *A Medieval Life: Cecilia Penifader of Brigstock, c. 1295-1344* (Boston, 1999), pp. 121,123-25; Judith Bennett, 'Public Power and Authority in the Medieval English Countryside', in Mary Eler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), pp. 18-36; Jennifer Ward, 'Townswomen and their Households', in Richard Britnell (ed.), *Daily Life in the Late Middle Ages* (Stroud, 1998), p. 27-28, 38; Barbara Hanawalt and Anna Dronzek, 'Women in Medieval Urban Society', in Linda Mitchell (ed.), *Women in Medieval Western European Culture* (New York, 1999), pp. 38, 42; Peter Coss, *The Lady in Medieval England* (Stroud, 1998), p. 29, 33; Mate, *Women in Medieval English Society*, p. 67; Cordelia Beattie, *Medieval Single Women: The Politics of Social Classification in Late Medieval England* (Oxford, 2007).

<sup>28</sup> Ward, 'Townswomen and their Households', pp. 27, 28, 30, 39; Hanawalt and Dronzek, 'Women in Medieval Urban Society', p. 41, 43; Judith Bennett, 'Women and Men in the Brewers' Guild of London, ca. 1420', in Edwin Brezette DeWindt (ed.), *The Salt of Common Life: Individuality and Choice in the Medieval Town, Countryside and Church: Essays Presented to J. Ambrose Raftis* (Kalamazoo, 1995), p. 193; P.J.P. Goldberg, 'Female Labour, Service and Marriage in Northern Towns during the Later Middle Ages', *Northern History*, 22 (1986), p. 25.

cycle, some studies have found that wealth and birth did create differences between women in different social strata; for example, wealthy urban and noble women had access to books and may have had some degree of literacy, and married urban women acted as *femme sole*, whereas wives of the nobility did not.<sup>29</sup> Judith Bennett has expanded the classifications for medieval women even further by adding religion, legal status, ethnicity, immigrant status, sexual status, and region. She has also pointed out that when compared to other medieval categorizations, such as apprentices, townsmen, monastics, Jews or knights, women developed less of a common identity.<sup>30</sup>

No comprehensive comparative study on how class shaped the lives of medieval women has yet concluded that some social groups in late medieval England generally exercised more strict or more relaxed gender rules than others. Although it is possible that women of some classes were relatively less oppressed than women of other classes, such comparisons have been more asserted than investigated.<sup>31</sup> The studies that tackle this issue usually focus on one or two ways to measure women's independence; for example P.J.P. Goldberg compares elite, urban, and rural women's abilities to negotiate their own marriages as a way to measure their freedom of movement, concluding that lower status urban women had the most agency.<sup>32</sup> It is likely that women of each class had different access to power and authority, so that no one avenue outweighed the other in any significant way. It is true that all women were assumed to be inherently inferior to men, but scholars continue to debate the ways in which women were able to act within these limitations in similar and also different ways. This study examines how the queen's prerogatives compare to those of both noble men and noble women: was she simply the highest ranking noble woman or did she operate differently from other noble women? This study is also concerned with how the queen's rights were determined by her

---

<sup>29</sup> Goldberg, 'Marriage, Migration, and Servanthood', pp. 1-15; P.J.P. Goldberg, 'For Better, For Worse': Marriage and Economic Opportunity for Women in Town and Country', in P.J.P. Goldberg (ed.) *Women in Medieval English Society* (Stroud, 1997), 108-125; Hanawalt and Dronzek, 'Women in Medieval Urban Society', pp. 33-6; Ward 'Townswomen and their Households', pp. 38-39, 41; Bennett, 'Women and Men in the Brewers' Guild of London', p. 204; Mate, *Women in Medieval English Society*, pp. 63, 66, 71; Jennifer Ward, 'English Noble Women and the Local Community', in Diane Watt (ed.), *Medieval Women in their Communities* (Cardiff, 1997), pp. 189, 195; Coss, *The Lady in Medieval England*, pp. 30, 182.

<sup>30</sup> Bennett, 'England: Women and Gender', p. 100.

<sup>31</sup> Rigby, *English Society*, p. 280.

<sup>32</sup> Goldberg, 'For Better, For Worse': Marriage and Economic Opportunity for Women in Town and Country', pp. 108-125.

position as the king's wife. Did she receive special privileges as the king's wife, or did her role as the queen allow the king to have different types of authority over her than other noble men had over their wives, or than the king had over other noblemen?

### 1.3 The Crown

Any conclusions resulting from a study about the queen's status may help to determine her relationship to the crown. An examination of the queen's connection to 'the crown' is another central purpose of this thesis. Ernst Kantorowicz's simplified definition of 'the crown' remains the most relevant to this study:

There was the visible material crown with which the prince was invested and adorned at his coronation and there was an invisible and immaterial crown, encompassing all the royal rights and privileges indispensable for the government of the body politic.<sup>33</sup>

Kantorowicz has shown that 'the crown' is a much more dynamic and complicated concept, but for the purposes of this study his brief definition is more than sufficient.<sup>34</sup> The crown was linked to the body politic, in which the king was the head and the magnates and ministers the body. In this respect 'the crown' represented the king and the realm as a whole. Responsibility for the protection of the crown lay with these members.<sup>35</sup> As early as the twelfth century the concept of 'the crown' was used in medieval England within the administrative sphere and in relation to the king's demesne.<sup>36</sup> It is the mechanisms of this administrative sphere with which this study is concerned. The head officials of the administrative branches of the crown were in effect part of that crown; for example, the chancellor was responsible for all the letters issued under the great seal and it was his duty to refuse to seal anything deemed prejudicial to

---

<sup>33</sup> Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1957), p. 337.

<sup>34</sup> Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, p. 337.

<sup>35</sup> Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, pp. 314-383.

<sup>36</sup> Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, pp. 342-343.

the crown.<sup>37</sup> In doing this, he stood in the place of the king as a protector of the crown, but this was a narrowly defined power and ministers often refused to act entirely alone.<sup>38</sup>

Throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the administration of the crown became more bureaucratic, and some scholars, who will be discussed in detail in section 1.6 below, argue that the queen became separated from the main mechanisms of government and especially the king. They assert that this separation marginalized the role of the queen. Other scholars, also discussed below, argue that the queen was not marginalized, but they do not challenge the notion that the queen became separated from the crown. One such scholar, John Carmi Parsons, outlines the queen's diminishing official role in government, while highlighting a new emphasis on her other unofficial duties. He argues that the queen was not marginalized in the later Middle Ages, but he accepts the argument that she was distanced from official roles.<sup>39</sup> On the other hand, Theresa Earenfight is one of the few scholars who argue that the queen was still a part of the crown. Using Spanish queens as her primary example, she deconstructs the term monarchy and its application to the system of government in medieval Europe.<sup>40</sup> In doing so, she argues that the queen can be seen as a governor of the realm and she goes so far as to suggest co-rulership between the medieval king and queen.<sup>41</sup> This study evaluates the extent to which the fourteenth-century English queen was distanced from the main mechanisms of government, and explores whether she can be seen as a part of the crown.

#### 1.4 Public Sphere v. Private Sphere

When considering the nature of the queen's prerogatives, an understanding of the arena in which she exercised these powers is essential: did her actions take place in private

---

<sup>37</sup> Bertie Wilkinson, 'The Chancery' in W.A. Morris (ed.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols, The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1930-1940), vol. 1, p. 172.

<sup>38</sup> Wilkinson, 'The Chancery', p. 162.

<sup>39</sup> John Carmi Parsons, 'The Queen's Intercession in Thirteenth-Century England', in Jennifer Carpenter and Sally Beth MacLean (eds.), *Power of the Weak* (Urbana-Champagne, 1995), pp 148-177, esp. pp.149-150.

<sup>40</sup> Theresa Earenfight, 'Without the Persona of the Prince: Kings, Queens and the Idea of the Monarchy in Late Medieval Europe', *Gender and History*, 19 (2007), pp. 1-4, 10.

<sup>41</sup> Earenfight, 'Without the Persona of the Prince', pp. 4-10, 12-15.



domestic settings, or were they part of the public arena in which government happened? The division between the public and private spheres has been an issue for both modern feminist writers and medieval scholars. For modern feminists, the public sphere is the area in which work, business and politics occur, and the private sphere is made up of domestic life, for example, the home and the family. Modern feminists see this split as a sexual division of labour. First-wave feminism's main focus was to bring women out of the private sphere and gain equal opportunities for them in public institutions. They felt that contention for political activity depended on access to the public sphere and that women were denied this access.<sup>42</sup> With second-wave feminism, liberal feminists continued this desire to bring women into all public institutions. The writings of Betty Friedan, for example, explore the misery experienced by women who had no public careers and the anguish they felt as unwaged housewives and consumers.<sup>43</sup>

Maggie Humm notes that western examples of public and private are inappropriate for describing sexual hierarchies in countries where the sexual division of labour does not fit into the binary opposites of the public and private divide.<sup>44</sup> This notion also applies to historical settings. Modern definitions of public and private cannot describe historical contexts in which the division of labour does not fit into these two distinctive categories. Modern feminist historians have attempted to redefine the discipline of history, and one way in which they did so was to challenge the boundaries between public and private by describing the connections between a women's role in the family and her role in work.<sup>45</sup> One such scholar, Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, argues that the sensual and emotionally private relationships of nineteenth-century women created a women's culture which was as dynamic as public politics.<sup>46</sup>

Medieval scholars continue to debate issues of public and private as they apply them to medieval women. Most scholars agree that in the medieval period the public and private spheres overlapped rather than existed as the binary oppositions seen in later centuries because the medieval household was the fundamental institution out of which

---

<sup>42</sup> Humm, *Modern Feminisms*, pp. 11-50.

<sup>43</sup> Humm, *Modern Feminisms*, pp. 181-183.

<sup>44</sup> Humm, *Modern Feminisms*, p. 323.

<sup>45</sup> Humm, *Modern Feminisms*, p. 323.

<sup>46</sup> Humm, *Modern Feminisms*, pp. 7, 336.

came business, trade and politics. Peter Coss claims that the gentry lady strongly participated in both 'private' and 'public' spheres through the running of the household, but her actions were often masked under her husband's name.<sup>47</sup> Some studies of working women have seen the late medieval period as a 'golden age' for women because they were able to participate in both the public and private spheres through their position in the household.<sup>48</sup> In her study of female saints in Europe from 500-1100, Jane Tibbets Schulenburg claims that 'the domestic sphere was also the public sphere and it stood at the very centre of power and authority'. For Schulenburg, the household served as the noblewoman's 'powerhouse'; it provided 'nearly limitless opportunities for women whose families were politically and economically powerful'.<sup>49</sup> However, Schulenburg contends that as government developed into impersonal institutions in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the power base was removed from the household, and women lost their formal positions of influence. Judith Bennett has argued that the merging of the household and workplace did not provide women with a relatively egalitarian working relationship with men, that it was not a true partnership, but a social phenomenon which reflected patriarchal authority.<sup>50</sup> Thus, scholars tend to agree that the public and private spheres overlapped in the household, but the extent to which these roles were limiting or were sources of power is debated. It is important to stress that, no matter how one views women's significance in the public arena, most scholars agree on the fact that, in general, women were barred from public office. Peasant women did not serve as reeves, urban women did not act as mayors or hold office in guilds, and higher status women could not sit in parliament, occupy posts such of sheriff, coroner or justice of the peace.<sup>51</sup> There are, of course, a few exceptions, but these remain just that, exceptions. For example,

---

<sup>47</sup> Coss, *The Lady in Medieval England*, p. 70.

<sup>48</sup> Maryanne Kowaleski, 'Women's Work in a Market Town: Exeter in the Late Fourteenth Century', in B.A Hanawalt (ed.), *Women and Work in Preindustrial Europe* (Bloomington, 1986), p. 146; Caroline Barron, 'The 'Golden Age' of Women in Medieval London', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 15 (1990), p. 40; Joan Kelly, 'Did Women Have a Renaissance?', in *Women, History, and Theory: The Essays of Joan Kelly* (Chicago, 1986), pp. 19-50.

<sup>49</sup> Jane Tibbets Schulenburg, 'Female Sanctity: Public and Private Roles, c. 500-1100', in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), p. 105.

<sup>50</sup> Bennett, *Medieval Women, Modern Women*, pp. 147-175.

<sup>51</sup> Coss, *The Lady in Medieval England*, p. 67; Bennett, 'Public Power and Authority', p. 29; Jennifer Ward, *Women in England in the Middle Ages* (London, 2006), p. 8.

Louise Wilkinson has found evidence of two female sheriffs in the thirteenth century, but Wilkinson remarks on the extraordinary role these women played.<sup>52</sup> Judith Bennett points out that the debate is perceptual: some scholars look at the 'glass' as half full, but she sees it as half empty.<sup>53</sup> The power of women throughout history was almost always limited, but feminist historians try to find different ways of thinking about these limitations to understand women's place within these historical contexts. This study takes what might be viewed as a glass-half-full approach. It acknowledges that gender inequality existed in the medieval period, but instead of emphasizing the queen's independence or her constraints and limitations, it seeks to provide a balanced view of what the queen actually could and could not do.

### 1.5 Power and Authority

In discussing the issues that affect the way in which the queen exercised her prerogatives, we must be more specific about the form these prerogatives took. In such a discussion, the terms power and authority become useful. This study is concerned first with which of the queen's prerogatives depended upon power, and which relied on authority. Second, it is interested in how the queen's power and authority were constructed. This section will discuss how these two terms have been used by others and how they will be used in this study. For feminist scholars the relationship between gender and power is considered a given, but the exact nature of this relationship is elusive, and a single feminist theory of gender and power has yet to be developed.<sup>54</sup> Second-wave feminists were especially concerned with understanding how and why the relationship between male domination and female subordination developed. These feminists have made attempts to reconnect power and gender by redefining gender as a

---

<sup>52</sup> Louise Wilkinson, 'Women as Sheriffs in Early Thirteenth Century England', in Adrian Jobson (ed.), *English Government in the Thirteenth Century* (Woodbridge, 2004), p. 111.

<sup>53</sup> Bennett, 'Medieval Women, Modern Women', p. 163; Erler and Kowaleski, 'A New Economy of Power Relations', p. 3.

<sup>54</sup> Jantien Oldersma and Kathy Davis, 'Introduction' in Kathy Davis, Monique Leijenaar and Jantien Oldersma (eds.), *The Gender of Power* (London, 1991), p. 1; Aafke Komter, 'Gender, Power and Feminist Theory', in Kathy Davis, Monique Leijenaar and Jantien Oldersma (eds.), *The Gender of Power* (London, 1991), p. 43; Kathy Davis, 'Critical Sociology and Gender Relations' in Kathy Davis, Monique Leijenaar and Jantien Oldersma (eds.), *The Gender of Power* (London, 1991), p. 77.

'primary way of signifying relationships of power' as well as differences.<sup>55</sup> They tend to treat power in gendered relationships as repressive, though Kathy Davis has called for a replacement of this view with one that treats power not only as repressive, but as something that is negotiated by the parties in the relationship.<sup>56</sup> Unfortunately, it is difficult to understand exactly what occurs within domination and subordination power relationships because often it is difficult to determine if such relationships are predicated on gender, social class, ethnicity or nationality.<sup>57</sup> In addition to attempts within feminist scholarship to connect gender and power, feminist scholars have explored the relationship between gender and power in different disciplines, using specific examples and situations. Nonetheless, there have been few attempts to combine theoretical arguments with concrete examples.<sup>58</sup>

This lack of connection between the two areas of study is the result of a difficulty in finding a distinct feminist theory on gender and power. In fact, many studies have concerned themselves with just this question: do feminist scholars have to develop a feminist theory of power and gender, or can they use an existing social theory to explain the gendered consequences of power?<sup>59</sup> The social theory of power in general has a tradition grounded in the works of Marx, Weber and later Foucault, Lukes and Giddens, to name a few. Aafke Komter and Kathy Davis have explored this question in their own studies. They conclude that 'as long as one does not pretend to explain global categories like 'femininity' or 'gender' by means of the concept of power, but instead focuses on specific instances in which gender and power are intertwined, the concept of power may be useful for feminist theorizing.'<sup>60</sup> They also believe that no one universal theory can be

---

<sup>55</sup> Oldersma and Davis, 'Introduction', p. 3; Joan Scott 'Gender: a Useful Category of Historical Analysis', *American Historical Review*, 91 (1996), p. 1069.

<sup>56</sup> Davis, 'Critical Sociology and Gender Relations', pp. 79-81.

<sup>57</sup> Oldersma and Davis, 'Introduction', p. 6.

<sup>58</sup> Oldersma and Davis, 'Introduction', p. 12; Oldersma and Davis cite: N. Hartsock, *Money, Sex and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism* (New York, 1983) and R.W. Connell, *Gender and Power* (Cambridge, 1987).

<sup>59</sup> Komter, 'Gender, Power and Feminist Theory', p. 43.

<sup>60</sup> Komter, 'Gender, Power and Feminist Theory', p. 61; Davis, 'Critical Sociology and Gender Relations', p. 84.

used to explain the complex and varied relationships between power and gender.<sup>61</sup> There is also little agreement in how power should be defined, which means that in any study of power's relationship to gender, it is important to define exactly what is meant when this term is used.<sup>62</sup>

Medieval scholars often use terms such as, power, authority, influence, formal public power, informal power and so forth. Sometimes they use power as a blanket term for all such ideas when describing the actions of women.<sup>63</sup> Defining exactly what is meant by these terms is helpful for the reader, especially when making distinctions between the types of power women, and specifically queens, possessed. Both Helen Maurer and Judith Bennett have found modern feminist scholarship about power and gender useful in making distinctions about the types of power available to medieval women. Helen Maurer employs the distinctions between power and authority made by Michelle Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere: authority being the publicly recognized right to give direction and expect compliance, and power, the ability to get people to do things or to make things happen involving pressure, influence, persuasion and coercion.<sup>64</sup> Judith

---

<sup>61</sup> Komter, 'Gender, Power and Feminist Theory', p. 61; Davis, 'Critical Sociology and Gender Relations', p. 84.

<sup>62</sup> Davis 'Critical Sociology and Gender Relations', p. 68.

<sup>63</sup> For example, none of the following studies do not define the term power, but it is integral in their studies of medieval women: Marjorie Chibnall, 'The Empress Matilda and her Sons', in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.), *Medieval Mothering* (New York, 1996), pp. 279-294; Marion Facinger, 'A Study of Medieval Queenship Capetian France, 987-1237', *Nebraska Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, 5 (1968), 1-48; Michael Enright 'Lady with a Mead Cup—Ritual Group Cohesion and Hierarchy in the Germanic World', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 22 (1988), pp.170-203; Rachel Gibbons, 'Isabeau of Bavaria, Queen of France (1385-1422) the Creation of a Historical Villainess', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Series 6, 6 (1996), 51-73; Lois Huneycutt, 'Medieval Queenship', *History Today*, 39(1989), 16-22; Ward, 'English Noblewomen and the Local Community', pp. 186-203. Lois, Huneycutt, 'Images of Medieval Queenship' *Haskins Society Journal*, 1(1989), 61-71; Jo Ann MacNamara and Suzanne Wemple, 'The Power of Women Through the Family in Medieval Europe, 500-1100', p. 83; John Carmi. Parsons, 'The Pregnant Queen as Counsellor and the Medieval Construction of Motherhood', in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.), *Medieval Mothering* (New York, 1996), p. 42. M.C. Howell, 'Citizenship and Gender: Women's Political Status in Northern Medieval Cites', in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), pp. 37-61; Brigitte Beos Rezak, 'Women, Seals, and Power in Medieval France, 1150-1350', in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), pp. 61-82.; Schulenburg, 'Female Sanctity: Public and Private Roles, ca. 500-1100', pp. 102-127; S. G. Bell 'Medieval Women Book Owners: Arbiters of Lay Piety and Ambassadors of Culture', in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), pp. 149-187; Joan, Ferrante, 'Public Postures and Private Manoeuvres: Roles Medieval Women Play', in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), pp. 213-29; Pauline Stafford, 'Emma: The Powers of a Queen in the Eleventh Century', in Anne J. Duggan (ed.), *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference Held in King's College London April 1995* (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 3-23.

Bennett uses similar distinctions in her study of peasant society, which she acquires from Peggy Sanday.<sup>65</sup> It is useful to keep these definitions in mind when examining the roles of women and more specifically queens. Medieval scholars have measured women's access to power in many ways. In general, they have looked at the extent of the queen's ability to act independently, which may have been affected by her legal rights, her role as intercessor, her access to patronage, to education and literacy, and to monetary resources, mainly employment and trade. Such treatments of women have contributed to a better understanding of how much a woman was able to act within the limitations imposed upon her by medieval misogyny. Some of these sources of power and authority will be explored briefly in section 1.6 on queenship in this chapter and throughout the thesis.

### ***Symbolic Power***

One of the types of power or influence that the queen possessed can productively be illuminated using Pierre Bourdieu's notion of symbolic power. Bourdieu describes symbolic power as:

A power constituting the given through utterances, through making people see and believe, through confirming or transforming the vision of the world and thereby action on the world and thus the world itself, an almost magical power which enables one to obtain the equivalent of what is obtained through force by virtue of the specific act of mobilization.<sup>66</sup>

In other words, Bourdieu's symbolic power can be thought of as an ascribed power in which ability is automatically perceived or assumed, whether these abilities bear testing or not. It is a power that one receives based on a role played or a quality possessed. In terms of medieval queenship, Bourdieu's ideas allow historians to articulate a set of

---

<sup>64</sup> Louise Lamphere, 'Strategies, Cooperation, and Conflict among Women in Domestic Groups', in Michelle Z. Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere (eds.), *Women, Culture and Society* (Stanford, 1974), pp. 99-100; Michelle Z. Rosaldo, 'Women, Culture, and Society: A Theoretical Overview', in Michelle Z. Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere (eds.), *Women, Culture and Society* (Stanford, 1974), p. 21. Helen Maurer makes use of these definitions in her study, *Margaret of Anjou: Queenship and Power in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2003), p. 5.

<sup>65</sup> Bennett, 'Public Power and Authority,' p. 19; Peggy Sanday, 'Female Status in the Public Domain', in Michelle Z. Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere (eds.), *Women, Culture and Society* (Stanford, 1974), p. 190.

<sup>66</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, Matthew Adamson and Gino Raymond (trans.) (Cambridge, 2003), p. 170.

assumptions which operate in such a way to presume that when medieval society thought of the queen, it automatically coupled the queen with certain powers. The queen immediately received power by virtue of her position as queen. An example, which will be described in detail in chapter five, is the power the queen derived from motherhood. One of the expected duties of queenship was to provide an heir.<sup>67</sup> When she fulfilled this function people perceived her to be powerful as a mother and in other areas of queenship; her symbolic power and her symbolic capital increased immediately without any further activity on her part. Symbolic capital is often used in sociology and anthropology, and can be referred to as the resources available to an individual on the basis of honour, prestige or recognition and functions as an authoritative embodiment of a cultural value.<sup>68</sup> Once people perceived the queen as powerful, she was powerful to a certain extent. The queen, by virtue of her status, could begin with a large amount of symbolic power, but such positions may be lost. She needed to cultivate the symbolic power she earned from being queen through her actions and her own initiative. This study will refer to achieved power and authority as the power and authority gained from the nurturing of symbolic power. This thesis will articulate the manner in which symbolic power and achieved power function together to compose the queen's overall power.

To summarize sections 1.1 to 1.5, this study defines gender as the different roles medieval society ascribed to men and women, and it defines authority as the publicly recognized right to give direction and expect compliance, and power as the ability to encourage people to do things or to initiate events involving pressure, influence, persuasion and coercion. This thesis will demarcate when the queen's power is symbolic or achieved through her own initiative. It examines the extent to which gender and status dictated the nature of her power and authority, and it will use the concept of the crown to assess her royal status. It acknowledges that gender inequality existed in the medieval period; the queen could not rule in her own right, nor act as chancellor, treasurer or member of parliament. However, instead of emphasizing the queen's independence or her constraints and limitations, this study seeks to provide an even-handed analysis of how the queen acted.

---

<sup>67</sup> See section 6.1.

<sup>68</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, Richard Nice (trans.) (Stanford, 1990), pp. 112-121.

## 1.6 Medieval Queenship: A Historiography

In order to understand the scholarly context of this study, it is important to identify significant trends in the scholarship of queens and queenship. The early works on queens took the form of individual biographies and personal narratives, studies which were generally divorced from mainstream political history.<sup>69</sup> Little attention was given to the queen's place in medieval society or the office of queenship itself; that is, what it meant to be queen. In the early twentieth century, Hilda Johnstone focused on the administrative history of the queen and Johnstone's works continue to be significant to queenship studies today.<sup>70</sup> Research on queenship began to gain momentum with the women's movement in the 1960s with Marion Facinger's important 1968 article 'A Study of Medieval Queenship: Capetian France, 987-1237'.<sup>71</sup> Facinger argues that in Capetian France, after the mid-twelfth century, the centralization of royal power and the separation of the king and queen's households resulted in the distancing of the queen from the monarchy and her loss of an official office. Consequently, the queen's only influence on government was through a personal relationship with the king as her husband or son, a relationship that Facinger believes led to her marginalization. This idea was taken up by subsequent queenship scholars, most notably Pauline Stafford, and it was applied to women in general by Jo Ann McNamara, Suzanne Wemple and Jane Tibbets Schulenburg.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> For example, Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England*.

<sup>70</sup> Hilda Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in T.F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England* (6 vols. Manchester, 1930), vol. 5, pp. 231-289; Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', p. 250; Johnstone 'The Queen's Exchequer under the Three Edwards' pp. 143-153.

<sup>71</sup> Facinger, 'A Study of Medieval Queenship', pp. 45-46.

<sup>72</sup> Pauline Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers: The King's Wife in the Early Middle Ages* (London, 1998); Jo Ann MacNamara and Suzanne Wemple, 'The Power of Women Through the Family in Medieval Europe, 500-1000', pp. 83-101; Jo Ann MacNamara, 'Women and Power through the Family Revisited', in Mary C. Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 2003), pp. 17-30; Schulenburg, 'Female Sanctity: Public and Private Roles', p. 105; Jane Tibbets Schulenburg, *Forgetful of Their Sex: Female Sanctity and Society, ca. 500-1100* (Chicago, 1998); Pauline Stafford, 'Women and the Norman Conquest', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6<sup>th</sup> Series, 4(1996), 221-50. Also see: Judith Bennett, *Medieval Women in Modern Perspective* (Washington, D.C., 2000), pp. 19-25; Judith Bennet, 'Medieval Women, Modern Women Across the Great Divide', in David Aers (ed.), *Cultural History 1350-1600: Essays on English Communities, Identities and Writing* (London, 1992), pp. 147-75; Susan Mosher Stuard, 'The Dominion of Gender: Women's Fortunes in the High Middle Ages', in Renate Bridenthal, Claudia Koonz, Susan Mosher Stuard (eds.), *Becoming Visible: Women in European History* (Boston, 1987), pp. 153-72; Suzanne Wemple, *Women in Frankish Society: Marriage and the Cloister 500-900* (Philadelphia, 1981);



However, by the 1990s this view began to change. In the last two decades scholars have argued that, while there is no denying that the nature of the queen's powers changed after the eleventh century, the queen was not marginalized.<sup>73</sup> Markedly, John Carmi Parsons has argued that the socially acceptable roles of queens were represented by ritual displays such as her coronation, childbearing, intercession, pious acts or her burial. To gain power, queens manipulated the behind-the-scenes nature of these roles, as

---

Margaret L. King 'Book-Lined Cells: Women and Humanism in the Early Italian Renaissance', in Patricia H. Labalme (ed.), *Beyond Their Sex: Learned Women of the European Past* (New York, 1984), pp. 91-116.

<sup>73</sup> Andre Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency: The Genesis of a Vocation', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1993), p. 93-116; Lois Huneycutt, 'Medieval Queenship', p. 16; Lois Huneycutt, 'Images of Queenship', p. 62; Lois Huneycutt, 'Female Succession and the Language of Power in the Writings of Twelfth-Century Churchmen', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1998), pp. 189-202; Lois Huneycutt, 'Royal Mothers in England and Scotland' in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.) *Medieval Mothering*, (London, 1994), pp. 297-98; Lois Huneycutt, 'The Creation of a Crone: The Historical Reputation of Adelaide of Maurienne', in Kathleen Nolan (ed.) *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), pp. 27-44; Lois Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland: A Study in Medieval Queenship* (Rochester, 2003); Parsons, 'The Queen's Intercession', p. 149; Parsons, 'The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens', p. 336; John Carmi Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile: Queen and Society in Thirteenth-Century England* (London, 1995); John Carmi Parsons, 'Piety, Power and the Reputations of Two Thirteenth-Century Queens', in Theresa M. Vann, (ed.), *Queens, Regents and Potentates* (Dallas, 1993), pp. 107-23; Miriam Shadis, 'Blanche of Castile and Facing's "Medieval Queenship": Reassessing the Argument', in Kathleen Nolan (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), pp. 137-161; Paul Strohm, 'Queen's as Intercessors', *Hochin's Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts* (Princeton, 1992), p. 95; Margaret Howell, *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 266-73; Janet L. Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', in Linda Mitchell (ed.), *Women in Medieval Western European Culture* (New York, 1999), p. 180, 201-204; Elizabeth A.R. Brown, 'Diplomacy, Adultery and Domestic Politics at the Court of Philip the Fair: Queen Isabella's Mission to France 1314' in Jeffrey S. Hamilton and Patricia J. Bradley (eds.), *Documenting the Past: Essays in Medieval History Presented to George Peddy Cuttino* (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 53-83; Chibnall, 'The Empress Matilda and her Sons', pp. 279-294; Marjorie Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda: Queen Consort, Queen Mother and Lady of the English* (Oxford, 1991); George Conklin, 'Ingeborg of Denmark, Queen of France, 1193-1223', in Anne J. Duggan (ed.), *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference Held at King's College London, April 1995* (Woodbridge 1997), pp. 39-52; Gibbons, 'Isabeau of Bavaria, Queen of France (1385-1422) The Creation of an Historical Villainess', pp. 51-73; Aline G. Hornaday, 'A Capetian Queen as Street Demonstrator: Isabelle of Hainault', in Kathleen Nolan (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), pp. 77-98; Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*; Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*; Afordesia, E. McCannon, 'Two Capetian Queens as the Foreground for an Aristocrat's Anxiety in the *Vie de Saint Louis*', in Kathleen Nolan (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York 2003), pp. 163-176; Sophie Menache, 'Isabella of France Queen of England: A Reconsideration', pp. 107- 124; Ann Trindade, *Berengaria : In Search of Richard the Lionheart's Queen* (Dublin, 1999); Nicholas Vincent, 'Isabella of Angouleme: John's Jezebel', in S.D. Church (ed.), *King John: New Interpretations* (Woodbridge, 1999); Theresa Earenfight, 'Without the Persona of the Prince', p. 1-21. Many studies of early queens flag up the limitations of her authority as well as the strengths demonstrating that though she may have had more official positions than later queens, those too were limited. For example, see Pauline Stafford, 'Powerful Women in the Early Middle Ages: Queens and Abbesses', in Peter Linehan and Janet L. Nelson (eds), *The Medieval World* (London, 2001), pp. 398-415; Simon MacLean, 'Queenship, Nunneries and Royal Widowhood in Carolingian Europe', *Past and Present: A Journal of Historical Studies*, 178 (2003), 3-38.

positions of authority were denied to them.<sup>74</sup> In her new introduction to the second printing of *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers*, Pauline Stafford rescinds her earlier argument in favour of the marginalization theory:

The queen does not so obviously lack a role in the kingdoms of the high and later Middle Ages as I suggested, especially given the potential function of their lands and household in those kingdoms. I would wish to point to certain recurring structures, like the network of female relationships created by dynastic marriage...I am less confident of circumstances which ended female power and am more inclined to feel that the whole question of women and power throughout the Middle Ages is ripe for...reassessment.<sup>75</sup>

A detailed and lengthy study directly comparing early and late medieval queens and how and which of their powers and authorities changed between the late and early periods has yet to be done.

Nevertheless, the practices of late medieval queens are being assessed. Definitions of kingship are framed around the exercise of government through the system known as monarchy, or government by one individual.<sup>76</sup> Because medieval English consorts did not usually rule in their own right, queenship cannot be defined in such terms. Thus, scholars have begun to outline a set of potential powers and authorities that were open to late medieval queens, and the rest of this section will discuss how these scholars have conceptualized queenship.

Scholars have argued that many of the queen's activities were based upon her influence. As a wife and mother, the queen could exercise influence over the men in her life, and her ability to exercise influence at all stages of life was both a demonstration of her power as well as a way to increase it. The queen's use of intercession in her role as a wife and mother is one of the major applications of influence studied by historians.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Parsons, 'The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens', p. 317.

<sup>75</sup> Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers*, p xvii.

<sup>76</sup> W.M. Ormrod, 'Monarchy, Martyrdom and Masculinity: England in the Later Middle Ages', in P.H. Cullum and Katherine J. Lewis (eds.), *Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages* (Cardiff, 2004), p. 175.

<sup>77</sup> Parsons, 'Intercessionary Patronage of Queen Margaret and Isabella of France' p.191; Parsons 'The Queen's Intercession in Thirteenth-Century England', pp. 147-178; Strohm, 'Queen's as Intercessors', pp. 96-99; Huneycutt, 'Intercession and the High-Medieval Queen', pp. 126-146; Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', pp. 179-181; Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, pp. 53-66 ; Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers*, pp. 191-192.

Parsons argues that the exclusion of queens from the central government in the twelfth century made intercession more important than in the earlier period as a 'means to create and sustain impressions of power'.<sup>78</sup> The connections between the queen and female biblical figures such as Judith, Esther and especially the Virgin Mary have been noted in several scholarly studies.<sup>79</sup> According to Parsons and Janet Nelson, one way for the queen to earn the king's favour was to use her 'feminine wiles', and as a result, the queen's intercession with the king had sexual implications.<sup>80</sup> Scholars have come to realize that queens could be suspected of improper influence over the king and from the beginning of the early Middle Ages, adultery was one of the first charges brought against a queen when detractors wished to discredit her. Another popular biblical image against which the queen was compared was Jezebel.<sup>81</sup> These scholarly arguments exemplify the fine line the queen had to negotiate between legitimate power and criticism.

Parson's study of Eleanor of Castile reveals the extent to which the queen consort depended not only on her ability to influence the king, but also on conveying a sense of wealth and command through public displays of generosity and patronage, which would spread her influence throughout the kingdom.<sup>82</sup> In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, patronage was a critical part of effective royal lordship. It was an outward sign of the queen's power, but also could be used to extend that power base.<sup>83</sup> Parsons argues that if a queen had the wealth with which to patronize artists, writers, religious institutions and

---

<sup>78</sup> Parsons, 'The Queen's Intercession', p. 149; Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile*, p. 73.

<sup>79</sup> Parsons, 'The Queen's Intercession', pp. 153-157; Strohm, 'Queen's as Intercessors', pp. 96-99; Huneycutt, 'Intercession and the High-Medieval Queen', pp. 126-146; Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 7; Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', pp. 179-181.

<sup>80</sup> Parsons, 'The Queen's Intercession', p. 158; Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', p. 192.

<sup>81</sup> Parsons, 'The Queen's Intercession', p. 158; Parsons, 'The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens', pp. 332-33; Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers*, pp. 19-24, 96; Janet L. Nelson, 'Queen's as Jezebels: The Careers of Brunhild and Balthild in Merovingian History', in Derek Baker (ed.), *Medieval Women* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 31-77; Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', p. 181.

<sup>82</sup> John Carmi Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile*, pp. 55-59.

<sup>83</sup> Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', p. 204; Parsons, 'The Intercessory Patronage', p. 148; Parsons, 'Of Queens, Courts and Books', pp. 175-201; Madeline Caviness, 'Anchoress, Abbesses and Queen: Donors and Patron or Intercessors and Matrons', in June Hall McCash (ed.), *The Cultural Patronage of Medieval Women* (Athens, 1996), p. 142; Huneycutt, 'Intercession and the High Medieval Queen', p. 126; Enright, *Lady with a Mead Cup*, pp. 29-30; Nelson, 'Queens as Jezebels', p. 36; Stafford, *Queens, Concubines, and Dowagers*, p. 102; Stafford, 'Emma: The Powers of A Queen', p. 6. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 257.

so forth, then she had fully exploited the sources of income available to her, thus demonstrating her power, and to some extent her authority.<sup>84</sup> Studies of queenly patronage have shown that the types of works a queen commissioned could spread her influence in a variety of ways: it could have an impact on the court and king; in cases where she patronized a convent, it could provide for her widowhood and demonstrated her piety; it could indebt a person to her; and she could justify her power, authority and activity over a certain region or people.<sup>85</sup>

Scholars have also realized that motherhood not only defined the medieval queen's domestic role, but that it was an important source of power for the queen.<sup>86</sup> The queen's coronations served to legitimate her children as heirs to the throne, thus creating a direct connection to the queen and motherhood. Historians have pointed out that once a queen produced an heir to the throne her position became secure, and she could use this power to her advantage. When the king died, the queen had to look to her sons if she still wanted to remain active in the royal court. Queens who were fortunate enough to have sons who were in their minority might hope to be appointed regent.<sup>87</sup> Through regency, motherhood gave queens the opportunity to exercise political influence and even authority in some cases.<sup>88</sup> Moreover, even daughters could be sources of power and

---

<sup>84</sup> See Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile*, p. 73-77 for examples of the queen's sources of income; Caviness, 'Anchoress, Abbesses and Queens', p. 142 for an example of queens with sufficient revenues to be a substantial patron.

<sup>85</sup> Parsons, 'Of Queens, Courts and Books', pp. 175-201; Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile*, pp.183-184 for an argument that Eleanor of Castile manipulated her commission of the romance of Isebart to define or prescribe her role as countess and support her activity in Ponthieu; Shadis, 'Blanche of Castile and Facinger's "Medieval Queenship"', p. 149; Caviness, 'Anchoress, Abbesses and Queens', p. 154, Caviness argues that women's patronizing powers began to decline in the thirteenth century, but Parsons various works on Eleanor of Castile have cast some doubt on that line of argument; Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, pp. 253-57.

<sup>86</sup> Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 131, 146, 180; Howell, *Eleanor of Provence*, pp. 27-9, 99-100, 109; John Carmi Parsons, 'Mother, Daughters, Marriage, Power: Some Plantagenet Evidence, 1150-1500', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1993), p. 75; Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', p. 194; Parsons, 'The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens', p. 328; 'The Pregnant Queen as Counsellor', p. 42; Shadis, 'Berenguela of Castile's Political Motherhood', pp. 335-358; Chibnall, 'The Empress Matilda and her Sons', pp. 279-294.

<sup>87</sup> Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', p. 197, Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 179.

<sup>88</sup> Poulet 'Capetian Women and the Regency', p. 105; Shadis, 'Blanche of Castile and Facinger's "Medieval Queenship"', p. 153; Stafford, *Queens, Concubines, and Dowagers*, pp. 191-192, 116; Stafford, 'Powerful Women', p. 398; Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', p. 195-197; Nelson, 'Queens as Jezebels', p. 38; Parsons, 'The Queen's Intercession', p. 149; Stafford, 'Emma: The Powers of A Queen', p. 6.

interactions between mothers and daughter perpetuated the roles and powers ascribed to queens. John Carmi Parsons' studies of Plantagenet queens have been especially important in revealing mother/daughter interactions. Queens were able to expand their power base by using the concept of female networking with their own daughters, by widening of their domestic sphere of influence and increasing their influence in foreign affairs.<sup>89</sup>

Scholars have established that once the queen's son began to rule in his own right, whether he immediately succeeded upon the death of his father or a minority period was brought to an end, the queen had three options for how she would spend her widowhood: she could retire to her dowerlands, she could take the veil or she could remarry.<sup>90</sup> There has been little study on the actions of queens who quietly retired from courtly life to dowerlands. If a queen wished to remain politically active she could do so only through influence over her son, in the same way she had done as queen consort, and it is this role that has been the subject of most studies on queen dowagers.<sup>91</sup> Thus, the nature and extent of a queen's power varied according to geographical regions, circumstance, personality, and ability both of both the king and the queen.<sup>92</sup> These variations need to be taken into account when we consider any general patterns in queenship. Those queens who have not elicited much scholarly interest need to be examined, and compared and contrasted with those who have. The difference between queens of different geographical areas also needs to be studied in more depth, to truly understand the complexities of the extents and limitations of a medieval queen's powers.

---

<sup>89</sup> Shadis, 'Blanche of Castile and Facinger's "Medieval Queenship"', pp. 141, 144; Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', pp. 182, 194.

<sup>90</sup> Nelson, 'Medieval Queens', p. 190; Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 178.

<sup>91</sup> Parsons, 'Intercessory Patronage', pp. 149, 153-4; Shadis, 'Blanche of Castile and Facinger's "Medieval Queenship"', pp. 140-146; Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', pp. 194-8; Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, pp. 208-215.

<sup>92</sup> For example, Italian queens had different types of power and authority, and Castilian, Danish and Norwegian queens were often invested with more authority than English and Capetian queens. See Stafford, *Queens Concubines and Dowagers*, pp. 134-142; Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship' p. 202; Inge Skovgaard-Petersen, 'Queenship in Medieval Denmark', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1993), p. 36.

## 1.7 Structure

This thesis focuses on the ways in which Plantagenet queens exercised the power and authority they possessed as the king's wife or mother. It examines the queen as an intercessor, lord, mother and administrator, and investigates how these roles were avenues to power and authority. It asks how her gender and status dictated her power and authority in each of these areas, and it evaluates whether or not she constituted a part of the crown. This study concludes that certain aspects of the power the queen gained from intercession and motherhood were based on the queen's gender, but other features of her power were not. She possessed authority on her household and estates and this authority was based on her status as the queen. This status made her one of the most powerful members of the landed elite. This study also transforms notions about the queen's role in government; her status as the king's wife allowed her to exercise the king's power and authority in similar ways as his other ministers. The queen was a significant part of the crown and the mechanisms which conveyed the king's authority. The comparison of Margaret, Isabella and Philippa emphasizes that even though the queen had access to all of these aspects of power and authority, the manner in which, and the level to which, the queen exercised them was entirely determined by the circumstances in which she found herself. Chapter two discusses the expectations medieval society had for their queens, the sources which reveal these expectations and it outlines how this particular study approaches these sources.

Chapter three examines queenly intercession by considering the nature and frequency of the queen's access to the king and crown, contemporary perceptions of the queen's influence on the king, and how the queen and the king manipulated the queens' role as intercessor. It makes use of the queens' itineraries, and it investigates the administrative mechanisms of intercession occurring between petitioners, the queen and the crown. It concludes that intercession was about both symbolic and achieved power, but not authority, and that even though intercession was an expected role, queens could exercise it to different degrees. As a result they could not always expect success as intercessors by virtue of their office.

The fourth chapter examines the level of the queen's authority over her household and estates, and the extent to which that authority was dictated by her role as the king's wife. It challenges the notion that the fourteenth-century bureaucratization marginalized the queen through the separation of her household from that of the king. It

shows that this separation was not entirely complete; consequently it still allowed the queen access to the king and the royal administrative offices. Moreover, because of this separation the queen's household and estates gradually developed into a royal institution of its own, enabling the queen to cast a wider net of influence.

Chapter five concentrates on the ways in which the queen was able to secure power and authority through the specifically gendered role of mother. It questions whether previous scholarly assertions about power and motherhood apply in specific examples; for instance, did pregnancy and birth lead to an increase in royal favour with royal favour indicated by an escalation of intercessionary activity, grants or other new duties or favours? This chapter also develops the relationship between the queen and her children, especially the heir, by reconstructing how often they were together by searching for evidence that she participated in their education, and by asking if their relationship cultivated future loyalty. It shows how motherhood functioned as a source of both achieved and symbolic power. Margaret's roll as a step mother adds another dimension to this aspect of the study.

The final chapter considers the queen as keeper of the realm. This chapter will demonstrate that, though none of our three queens were ever regents or *custodes*, contemporaries accepted their authority to conduct business when the king was away. They aided both the regency and keeper's council and took up important positions in the chancery. It was a role automatically assigned to queens, so there was little need to define it officially. This chapter also gives an objective analysis of Edward III's minority to explore how Isabella constructed her power and authority during this period. Overall, this thesis concludes that the queen was embedded in the administrative apparatus of government as a wife, a mother and a widely recognized representative of the crown.

## Chapter Two

### Medieval Expectations and Modern Methodologies

This chapter will address what queenship meant to medieval society between approximately 1200 and 1500. It will look at the voices that spoke about queenship throughout the later Middle Ages and explore the sources that can be used to determine medieval definitions of it. Many sources, such as political writings, coronation oaths, artistic representations, histories, literature as well as administrative documents express ideological concepts and often employ iconic representations of queens. These model images were influential within the medieval cultural context by both informing and reflecting society's views about queenship. Following a brief analysis of what these sources can tell modern historians about medieval perceptions of queenship, the chapter will outline how these sources have been utilized in the subsequent chapters of this study.

#### 2.1 Iconic Images of the Queen

A wide body of literature in the form of mirrors for princes and other similar political writings emerged from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries.<sup>1</sup> Using these medieval texts, historians have developed a concept of kingship to describe a specific medieval ideology regarding how the king should exercise government.<sup>2</sup> Few of these texts mention queenship in relation to kingship, and there are a small number of treatises on the subject of queenship alone.<sup>3</sup> It is striking that even the fourteenth-century treatise of Walter

---

<sup>1</sup> See J.P. Genet (ed.), *Four English Political Tracts of the Later Middle Ages*, Camden Society, 4<sup>th</sup> Series, 18 (London, 1977), pp. ix-xix for a historiography of political writings and how they fit together as a genre.

<sup>2</sup> J.P. Genet (ed.), *Four English Political Tracts of the Later Middle Ages*, Camden Society, 4<sup>th</sup> Series, 18 (London, 1977), pp. ix-xix; W.M. Ormrod, 'Monarchy, Martyrdom and Masculinity: England in the Later Middle Ages', in P.H. Cullum and Katherine J. Lewis (eds.), *Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages* (Cardiff, 2004), p. 175.

<sup>3</sup> The following political treatises do not mention the role of the queen: J.P. Genet (ed.), 'Tractus de Regibus', in *Four English Political Tracts of the Later Middle Ages*, Camden Society, 4<sup>th</sup> Series, 18 (London, 1977), pp. 1-20; J.P. Genet (ed.), 'De Quadripatria Regis Specie', in *Four English Political Tracts of the Later Middle Ages*, Camden Society, 4<sup>th</sup> Series, 18 (London, 1977), pp. 22-39; J.P. Genet (ed.), 'Tractus de Regimine Principum ad Regem Hemicum Sextum', in *Four English Political Tracts of the Later Middle Ages*, Camden Society, 4<sup>th</sup> Series, 18 (London, 1977), pp. 40-169; Walter Milemete, *Treatise of Walter de Milemete De Nobilitatibus, Sapientiis, et Prudentiis Regum, Reproduced in Facsimile from the Unique Manuscript Preserved at Christ Church, Oxford*, M.R. James (ed.) (Oxford; 1913); John of Trevisa, *The Governance of Kings and Princes: John Trevisa's Middle English Translation*



Milemete, a text which was possibly commissioned by a queen and contains several illuminated images of queens, does not mention queenship.<sup>4</sup> A few fifteenth-century texts do mention the queen, but within the vast number of political texts these references remain a small percentage.<sup>5</sup> Hoccleve's *Regiment of Princes* is one such mirror for princes, which briefly mentions Henry V's marriage to Katherine of Valois.<sup>6</sup> Hoccleve highlights that the marriage was meant to bring peace between France and England. The emphasis of the passage as a whole is on peace, not the role of the queen. She only comprises part of the general advice that the king should strive for peace. However, from this passage, the reader can loosely extrapolate the expectation that her marriage placed the queen in the role of peacemaker. Even Christine de Pizan omits any mention of the queen in her *Livre du Corps de Policie*.<sup>7</sup> However, in her mirror written specifically for women, *Le Livre du Trésor de la Cité des Dames*, Christine places queens within the group of noble women she addresses, but it is not certain the extent to which this text was known in England.<sup>8</sup>

The lack of any political writings which expound the role of the queen might lead the modern historian to believe that there were no specific duties ascribed to the queen and that medieval contemporaries did not have a distinct idea of queenship.<sup>9</sup> It should be remembered that such political treatises were geared towards the king and his princely heirs: those who would rule in their own right. The dearth of similar texts for queens

---

*of the De Regimine Principum of Aegidius Romanus*, David C. Fowler, Charles Briggs, Paul Remley (eds.) (New York, 1997); John of Salisbury, *Ioannis Sareberiensis Episcopi Carnotensis Policratici sive De Nugis Curialium et Vestigiis Philosophorum libri VIII*, C.C.J. Webb (ed.) (2 vols, Oxford, 1909).

<sup>4</sup> Milemete, *Treatise of Walter de Milemete*, fols. 4, 31; Michael A. Michael, 'The Iconography of Kingship in the Walter Milemete Treatise', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 57 (1994), pp. 35-47.

<sup>5</sup> Jacobus de Cessolis, *Game and Playe of Chesse*, W.E.A. Axon (ed.) (St. Leonards-on Sea, 1969), pp. 27, 32; J.P. Genet (ed.), 'Considerations Right Nesserye to the Good Governance of the Prince', in *Four English Political Tracts of the Later Middle Ages*, Camden Society, 4<sup>th</sup> Series, 18 (London, 1977), pp. 174-210.

<sup>6</sup> Thomas Hoccleve, *Hoccleve's Works : The Regiment of Princes and Fourteen Minor Poems*, Frederick J. Furnivall (ed.), EETS, ES, 72 (New York, 1975).

<sup>7</sup> Christine de Pizan, *Le Livre du Corps de Policie*, Angus J. Kennedy (ed.) (Paris, 1998).

<sup>8</sup> Joanna Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 3-4; Christine de Pizan, *The Treasure of the City of Ladies or The Book of the Three Virtues*, Sarah Lawson (trans.) (London, 1985).

<sup>9</sup> Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queen*, p. 6.

tells us that medieval political theorists did not believe that sovereignty was part of the queen's duties. This silence does not, however, mean that queens were not expected to take part in the processes of monarchy, or that they did not hold valuable and important positions within the support structure of the crown.

Though a theory of queenship was not expressed explicitly in medieval political theory, a concept of queenship was articulated through iconic moments in the queen's life, such as her coronation, the birth of her children and her death. It was also shown through visual images of the queen. Such iconic moments and visual images were often tied to Marian iconography. The Virgin Mary was largely identified by her roles of intercessor and mother, also the main duties assigned to the queen.<sup>10</sup> As a result, associating the queen with Mary was a logical way to disseminate expectations of the queen's duties, not only to the queen herself, but to her subjects as well.

Through the *ordines* and rituals of coronation the king, the queen and those witnessing these rituals were reminded of the duties of monarchy. The simultaneous evolution of coronation *ordines* for the king and queen demonstrates that a theory of queenship developed alongside that of kingship throughout the middle ages. In pre-conquest England, as the king's coronation *ordo* became standardized, a section for the queen's consecration was also included in the oath, although it was some time before the queen's coronation oath was firmly established among the Anglo-Saxons.<sup>11</sup> As the queen's *ordo* developed, her status changed. A new formula was added to the Anglo-Saxon *ordo* for William the Conqueror's coronation. When Matilda, his queen, was crowned, this new formula 'made her a sharer in the royal power and the English people were to rejoice in being governed by the power of the prince and by the ability and virtue of the queen'.<sup>12</sup> Throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries a few new formulae were added to the *ordines*, but the fundamental oath essentially remained the same. The *ordo* reached its final form in 1375 in the *Liber Regalis*, and remained the same until

---

<sup>10</sup> Elizabeth Danbury, 'Images of English Queens in the Later Middle Ages', *Historian*, 46 (1995), p. 5.

<sup>11</sup> Percy Ernst Schramm, *The History of the English Coronation*, L.G.W. Legg (trans) (Oxford 1937), pp. 17, 22, 29, 59, 60, 84, 85; Janet L. Nelson, 'Early Medieval Rites of Queen-Making and the Shaping of Medieval Queenship', in Anne J. Duggan (ed.), *Queens and Queenship in Europe: proceedings of a Conference held at King's College, London, April 1995* (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 301-315.

<sup>12</sup> Schramm, *The History of the English Coronation*, p. 29.

1558.<sup>13</sup> The *ordo* preserved in the *Liber Regalis*, which had not changed much from the twelfth-century *ordo*, communicates the two main roles of queenship: intercessor and mother. The prayer, said as the queen entered the church, asked God to guard her as he did Judith, who was praised for the sacrifices she made to protect her people, and grant her the same fertility that he gave Sara, Rebecca and Rachel.<sup>14</sup>

The expectations of queenship expressed in the *Liber Regalis* were often related to Marian devotion and also found their way into iconic depictions of queens and moments in the queen's life. The concept of Mary as a mediator between heaven and earth was applied to the queen's role as an intercessor between the king and his people. Rituals surrounding the coronation picked up on these images of Mary as intercessor and used them to transmit this obligation to the queen and society at large. The coronation vigil procession from the Tower to Westminster communicated messages of peace and fertility. The pageant put on for Margaret of Anjou's entry into London provides a good example of the dissemination of these expectations. The prayers and Marian images displayed throughout the pageant conveyed two messages: an expectation to provide an heir to the throne; and a reminder that her marriage was to bring peace between England and France. In this way, she was similar to a Virgin Mediatrix, whose prayers procured peace between God and man.<sup>15</sup> The references to the peace treaty between England and France, which the marriage of Henry and Margaret was supposed to seal, extend this Marian analogy to an international level. Tomb iconography also emphasized the queen's role as peacemaker by displaying the heraldry of both her natal and marital

---

<sup>13</sup> Anne F. Sutton and P.W. Hammond (eds.), *The Coronation of Richard III: The Extant Documents* (Gloucester, 1983), p. 1; L.G.W. Legg, *English Coronation Records* (Westminster, 1901), p. xv; Schramm, *The History of the English Coronation*, pp. 74-85; Danbury, 'Images of English Queens', p. 5.

<sup>14</sup> Legg, *English Coronation Records*, p. 109: *Etiam glorie virtutisque tue triumphum in manu Judith femine olim Judaice plebi de hoste sevissimo designare voluisti: respice quesumus ad preces humilitatis nostre et super hanc famulum tuum .N. quam supplici devocione in reginam elegimus benedictionum tuarum dona multiplica...et una cum Sara atque Rebecca, Rachel beatisque reverendis feminabus fructu uteri sui secundi seu gratulari meneatur ad decorem tocius regni: statum que sancte dei excclesie regendum per christum dominium nostrum qui ex intemerate marie beate virginis aluo nasci visitare ac renovare hunc degnatus est mundum.*

<sup>15</sup> Helen Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou: Queenship and Power in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 17-24; G. Kipling, 'Margaret of Anjou's Royal Entry into London', *Medieval English Theatre*, 4 (1982), pp. 78-80; Lanyesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 141; Margaret Howell, *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1998) p. 18; John Carmi Parsons, ' "Never was a body buried in England with such solemnity and honour": The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens to 1500', in Anne J. Duggan (ed), *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference held at King's College London* (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 317, 332.

families, stressing her international links.<sup>16</sup> Queens are depicted in their coronation regalia on tombs, seals and in many illuminations, reminding their viewers of the duties entrusted to her at the moment she became queen.<sup>17</sup> Eleanor of Castile's tomb effigy portrays her at the moment of her coronation, and on seals and in illuminations the queen is usually depicted holding a sceptre floriated with a stylised fleur-de-lis. The floriated sceptre was a convention preserved long after queens were invested with avian regalia (a hawk in the place of the fleur-de-lis).<sup>18</sup> The fleur-de-lis was commonly connected to the Virgin Mary's intercessory role. John Carmi Parsons argues that the floriation of the sceptre on the seal and in art brings to mind the flowering rods of Aaron and Jesse, which were biblical images commonly associated with the Virgin Mary.<sup>19</sup> The rod symbolizes the Virgin, the roots are her human origins and the flower is her divine connection to Christ, her son.<sup>20</sup> Because the queen's sceptre mirrors Aaron and Jesse's, it connects her with the Virgin Mary's duties.

These same iconic moments and visual representations could bring to mind symbols related to the maternal aspects of queenship. If her flowering sceptre was reminiscent of Jesse's rod, it might also remind the viewer of the tree of Jesse and, by extension, the queen's responsibility to provide an heir to the throne. Images invoking motherhood, including Marian depictions, were also found in the coronation *ordines* and pageants, which were discussed above. The queen's churchings and tomb monuments focus on the queen's fertility, not only invoking Mary as mother, but also emphasizing the queen's matriarchy and heredity through displays of heraldry and depictions of ancestors and children.<sup>21</sup> Like the coronation, queenly burial practices mirrored those of

---

<sup>16</sup> Parsons, 'The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens', p. 325.

<sup>17</sup> Parsons, 'The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens', p. 325.

<sup>18</sup> John Carmi Parsons, 'Ritual and Symbol in the English Medieval Queenship to 1500', in Louise Olga Fradenburg (ed.), *Women and Sovereignty* (Edinburgh, 1992), p. 65; Brigitte Bedos Rezak, 'Women, Seals, and Power in Medieval France, 1150-1350', in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages*, (Athens, 1988), p. 75; Danbury, 'Images of English Queens', p. 4.

<sup>19</sup> Parsons, 'Ritual and Symbol in the English Medieval Queenship', p. 65; Danbury, 'Images of English Queens', p. 4.

<sup>20</sup> Parsons, 'Ritual and Symbol in the English Medieval Queenship', p. 65.

<sup>21</sup> Parsons, 'The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens', p. 327-328; Caroline Shenton, 'Philippa of Hainault's Churchings: the Politics of Motherhood', in Richardson Eales and Shaun Tyas (eds.), *Family and Dynasty in Late Medieval England* (Donington, 2003), pp. 105-121.

the king. The queen's funeral did not serve the same purpose — to denote the transfer of power between the king and his heir — but it had a similar significance.<sup>22</sup> It marked her dynastic motherhood and also communicated her duties to future queens. Both Eleanor of Castile and Philippa of Hainault, for example, included their mother's heraldic devices on their tombs and Philippa also included statuettes of both her and Edward III's family members on her tomb.<sup>23</sup> Anne Morganstern has shown how the people and heraldry included on the tomb aid in future remembrance of those people, and Parsons has argued that these familial and heraldic devices demonstrate the queens' dynastic awareness.<sup>24</sup>

Key events and visual representations of the queen present idealized visions of the queen as intercessor and mother. The queens illustrated in many of these sources are indistinct or formulaic images of women rather than individual queens, particularly in seals, illuminations, murals and sometimes tombs.<sup>25</sup> They provide stereotypes and are the symbolic conventions of a communal mindset. Consequently, these archetypal images reflect what medieval society believed these queens' contribution to monarchy should be. Not only do these images give scholars some indication of what medieval contemporaries expected from their queens, but they may also suggest how these queens viewed themselves. Queens may have had some input into how they were depicted, particularly with tombs, seals and royally commissioned manuscripts and wall paintings. If this is so, then they were also involved in promoting a distinct queenly identity. Subsequent queens would have seen these tombs, seals etc. and sought to embody these perceptions. However, it is entirely possible that queens who commissioned their own seals and tombs were making use of stock images; especially in the case of seals, which have very little variation. No matter which view one subscribes to (active choice or use of stock images) it is clear that these portrayals of queenship appear over and over again, and thus they were internalized by their audience. In this way they informed new

---

<sup>22</sup> Parsons, 'The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens', pp. 325-326.

<sup>23</sup> Parsons, 'The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens', pp. 327-328.

<sup>24</sup> Anne McGee Morganstern, 'The Tomb as Prompter for the Chantry: Four Examples from Late Medieval England', in Elizabeth Valdez and Carol Stamatis Pendergast (eds.), *Memory and the Medieval Tomb* (Aldershot, 2000), p. 87; Parsons, 'The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens', p. 327-328.

<sup>25</sup> Elizabeth Danbury, 'Images of English Queens in the Later Middle Ages', *Historian*, 46 (1995), p. 3.

audiences of the expectations for the queen and simultaneously reflected the traditional duties associated with queenship. They embodied a collective consciousness of the queen's role.

## 2.2 Literary Sources

Though medieval political theory provides little commentary on the duties of the queen, history, hagiography and literature do provide prescriptive texts for queens in the form of chronicles, *vitae* and romances. Chroniclers and hagiographers represented how a queen should and should not act. These historical and literary sources often employ polar opposite images of queens in the form of a binary opposition between Jezebel or Eve and the Virgin Mary.

Chronicles and *vitae* present accounts of historical people and events, but they have different ways of looking at history. Chroniclers believed that history should be didactic and that 'universal truths' construed from specific events were as important as providing factual accounts of the event.<sup>26</sup> They also recorded events which they perceived to be plausible.<sup>27</sup> As a result, the queens discussed in them often conformed to general stereotypes of womanly behaviour: Jezebels, who were over-mighty viragos, adulterous wives and wicked enchantresses, or Virgin Marys, who were supportive wives and mothers, and modest intercessors and peacemakers.<sup>28</sup> Biographical texts often set out to portray their subjects as paragons of virtue to be emulated by their successors, especially hagiographic texts, which were interested in providing evidence for their heroine's sainthood. Lois Huneycutt has argued that the life of Queen Margaret of Scotland was written as an *exemplum* for Margaret's daughter, Matilda, Henry I's queen.<sup>29</sup> This *vita* presents an idealized portrait of a queen, who performed the expected

---

<sup>26</sup> Chris-Given Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London, 2004), p. 4.

<sup>27</sup> Chris-Given Wilson, *Chronicles*, p. 4.

<sup>28</sup> Janet L. Nelson, 'Queens as Jezebels: The Careers of Brunhild and Balthild in Merovingian History', in Derek Baker (ed.), *Medieval Women, Dedicated and presented to Professor Rosalind M.T. Hill on the Occasion of her Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford, 1978), p. 59; Geoffrey le Baker, *Chronicon Galfredi Le Baker De Swynebroke*, E. M. Thompson (ed.) (London, 1889), p. 21; James Raine, (ed.), *Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres, Gaufridus Coldingham, Robertus de Graystaynes, et Willielmus de Chambre*, Surtees Society, 9 (London, 1839), p. 98.

<sup>29</sup> Lois Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland: A Study in Medieval Queenship* (Rochester, 2003), pp. 9-30.

activities of queenship: intercessor, peacemaker, mother, patroness and was part of the apparatus of government. Such activities were recognized as typical of queens in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.<sup>30</sup> Given the didactic purpose of this biographic text, it is reasonable to conclude that Margaret's actions described in her *vita* were considered to be ideal behaviour for queens.<sup>31</sup>

Fictional romances also present many images of queens, and most focus on the themes of motherhood and legitimacy. Queens, princesses and ladies are sometimes presented as ruling their own lands, but this action is usually secondary to the main themes of marriage and motherhood.<sup>32</sup> It is because they concentrate on these two issues that romances concerning queens often centre on themes of adultery. They offer two types of queen: the calumniated queen and the guilty queen. The general plot for the calumniated queen begins with a virtuous and chaste queen, who becomes pregnant. She is falsely accused of adultery by an evil character and is proclaimed guilty and sentenced to death. However, the queen manages to convince her accusers to commute her sentence to exile. The story then shifts to centre on the exploits of the grown male child, who eventually redeems his mother's virtue and proves his legitimacy.<sup>33</sup> The romances of *Sir Tryamour* and *Octavian* provide two examples of the calumniated queen. In *Tryamour*, the king of Aragon's steward, Marrok, tries to seduce the king's wife, Margaret, while the king is on crusade, but she refuses him. Upon the king's return, Marrok tells him that he has seen the queen in the forest with a lover. The king banishes Margaret, unaware that she bears his child. In the forest Margaret gives birth to a boy, Tryamour. Marrok's treachery is later revealed to the king, and he searches for Margaret. Much time goes by and Tryamour, now grown, comes to his father's court during a tournament, in which he jousts with the king and defeats him. In this same tournament, a feud is started between Tryamour and the family of a knight, Sir James. Eventually, Tryamour overcomes Sir James's father in trial by combat, is knighted and

---

<sup>30</sup> Lois Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland: A Study in Medieval Queenship*, pp. 9-30.

<sup>31</sup> Lois Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland: A Study in Medieval Queenship*, pp. 9-30.

<sup>32</sup> For example, Hue de Rotelande, *Ipomadon*, Rhiannon Purdie (ed.), EETS, OS, 316 (Oxford, 2001).

<sup>33</sup> H. Hudson (ed.), 'Sir Tryamour' in *Four Middle English Romances*, TEAMS Middle English Text Series (Kalamazoo, 1996), pp. 178-228. H. Hudson (ed.), 'Octavian' in *Four Middle English Romances*, TEAMS Middle English Text Series (Kalamazoo, 1996), pp. 45-114; Also see: A. Laskaya (ed.), 'Sir Gowther' in *The Middle English Breton Lays*, TEAMS Middle English Texts Series (Kalamazoo, 1995), pp. 263-308.

his mother reveals his father's identity. Tryamour marries and his parents are reunited at his marriage.

In *Octavian*, the Emperor Octavian's wife, Florence, gives birth to twins. Octavian's mother accuses Florence of adultery and arranges for her to be caught in bed with a naked man. Octavian believes his mother's accusations and sentences his wife to death. She pleads for her children and convinces the emperor to banish them instead. Driven into the forest, her son, Florentyn, is abducted by an ape, and the other, Octavian Jr., is kidnapped by a tiger. Subsequently, both Octavian Jr. and the tiger are seized by a griffin. The rest of the romance concerns Florentyn and Octavian Jr.'s separate adventures, which lead to both sons fighting for the Emperor Octavian, ignorant of his identity as their father. Eventually, Florence and the foster father of her other son Florentyn tell the story of the boys and all identities are revealed. The mother-in-law is burned.

In the story of the guilty and unsympathetic queen, the queen takes a lover, and together they usually kill the king and disinherit the heir. This son leaves court and eventually, through his feats of arms, discredits his adulterous mother and restores himself to the throne.<sup>34</sup> In *Generydes*, the king of India's wife commits adultery with their steward, Amelok. While hunting, the king is led by a magic stag to the princess of Syria, who tells him of his wife's affair and her plot to kill him. The princess of Syria eventually gives birth to the king's son and names him Generydes. When Generydes grows up, he travels to his father's court, where his father's wife tries to seduce him. Generydes leaves the court and goes to the court of the sultan of Persia. The romance recounts his adventures in Persia, but later Generydes returns to India to help his father, who has fled from his evil wife. However, Generydes must then come to the sultan of Persia's aid when Persia is invaded. He conquers the sultan's enemies, marries the sultan's daughter and then he returns to India to defeat his father's wife and her lover and subsequently succeeds to both the thrones of India and Persia.

The Guinevere/Lancelot tradition, so named for the most famous adulterers, provides another aspect of the guilty queen theme. The Guinevere tradition had such a

---

<sup>34</sup> W.A. Wright (ed.), *Generydes: A Romance in Seven-Line Stanzas*, EETS, OS, 55 (1878); L.D. Benson (ed.), *King Arthur's Death: The Middle English Stanzaic Morte Arthur and Alliterative Morte Arthur*, TEAMS Middle English Text Series (Kalamazoo, 1994); A. Lupack (ed.), *Lancelot of the Laik and Sir Tristrem*, TEAMS Middle English Text Series (Kalamazoo, 1994); Thomas Malory, *Malory: Complete Works*, Eugene Vinaver (ed.) (Oxford, 1971).



long history in both French and English literature that it had reached an iconic status by the late Middle Ages.<sup>35</sup> Guinevere's connection with adultery begins early on; she was first associated with Mordred in English chronicles and romances such as Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the King's of Britain* and in the *Alliterative Morte Arthur*.<sup>36</sup> She later becomes associated with Lancelot in Chrétien de Troyes, and in later English romances such as the *Stanzaic Morte Arthur*, *Lancelot of the Laik* and Malory's *Morte Darthur*.<sup>37</sup> The examples of the calumniated queen and the guilty queen provided here have outlined that there is generally only one positive model and one negative model for queenship in romances.

Since both historical and literary works often reflect a certain agenda of the author, it is difficult to use them to establish the actual practice of queenship. Chroniclers do not always outline their bias in the way that the writers of political treatises do, and historians can only determine their agenda through interpretations of the way in which they describe their subjects. The chronicles are by no means consistent in their portrayals; one might depict the same queen in different lights at different points in the narrative, or a particular event and a specific queen may be described differently by different chroniclers. It is tempting to take these descriptions of people and events at face value as factual accounts because chronicles record historical events. However, as this study will demonstrate in a number of places, sometimes these accounts are inaccurate. It can be difficult to know whether the events actually happened in the way they are described, or if the chronicler is employing known *topoi* to communicate his agenda to his reader. As a result, both the possibility that they reflect true events as well as the prospect that they merely present us with a stereotype of queenship must be considered. Hagiographies and *vitae* also cannot be taken as factual since their purpose was to present an ideal image of the queens they discuss. Romances cannot be directly linked with historical queens. As self-ascribed fictional pieces it is difficult to know whether they reflect life, are didactic in their intent, or are mere fantasies meant for the

---

<sup>35</sup> Helen Cooper, *The English Romance in Time: Transforming Motifs from Geoffrey of Monmouth to the Death of Shakespeare* (Oxford, 2004), p. 307.

<sup>36</sup> L.D. Benson (ed.), *King Arthur's Death: The Middle English Stanzaic Morte Arthur and Alliterative Morte Arthur*, TEAMS Middle English Text Series (Kalamazoo, 1994); Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, Lewis G. M. Thorpe (trans.) (London, 1966).

<sup>37</sup> Benson (ed.), *King Arthur's Death*; Lupack (ed.), *Lancelot of the Laik and Sir Tristrem*; Malory, *Complete Works*.

enjoyment of the reader. It is likely that they were subject to multiple interpretations and one romance could serve all three purposes. Thus, these historical and literary sources serve to tell the historian about the competing ideals, expectations and perceptions medieval writers and their audiences had about the practice of queenship. They do not, however, necessarily reflect how historical queens acted.

### 2.3 Administrative Documents

The visual and literary sources described above provide modern historians with a medieval set of beliefs about what queens should and should not do. Administrative records not only contribute to an understanding of the ideological concepts medieval society had regarding queenship, but they also tell us if and how historical queens actually practised the ideals of queenship.

All government offices and bodies reported periodically on their activities and orientations. Administrative documents were the method by which these offices recorded and then conveyed their routine business. There were several branches of administrative office, which all produced their own documents and records in the later medieval period.<sup>38</sup> These offices consisted of, though were not limited to: the chancery, exchequer, parliament, council and the royal households and estates. It should be noted here that the queen had her own administration, consisting of her chancery, exchequer, council, household and estates, which also produced these types of documents, but that she was also represented in the king's administrative records. It should also be noted that other institutions, aside from the crown, produced similar types of records. Some examples of these are: monastic and secular religious institutions; noble and gentry households and estates; civic administrative bodies and so forth.<sup>39</sup>

Administrative sources need to be used creatively to tease out both the ideology and practice of queenship, something which has not been acknowledged in previous

---

<sup>38</sup> In his seminal work, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, T.F. Tout describes the main governmental offices, and uses as his sources the records of those departments. He provides a comprehensive list of these types of documents: household ordinances, law books and reports, exchequer enrolments, chancery enrolments, wardrobe accounts, records of the great wardrobe and chamber, records of the privy wardrobe, records of seals and chancery warrants. This study will use many, but not all of these sources. See page 49 below for a list of the sources this study consults: T.F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England* (6 vols, Manchester, 1920-33), vol. 1, pp. 10-31, 34, 36-66.

<sup>39</sup> Michael T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 44-80, 145-170.

scholarship. They are important to any study of queenship for several reasons. These documents provide evidence of other normative queenly duties in addition to intercession and motherhood. The roles of lord and royal administrator are two examples, which are not generally emphasized in the iconic images of queenship. These documents also blur the line between the polar opposite images of queenship presented in the literary sources. Through an empirical analysis of governmental records, it is possible to see the different layers of queenly behaviour and remove general stereotyping from their identities. Administrative records are a genre unto themselves, and as a result they have their own diplomatic to which they must conform. Consequently, they have their own way of representing the queen within both the ideal expectations set out by society and their own diplomatic formulae.

Record sources have been exploited by historians, but the relationship and the distinction between practice and theory needs to be elucidated more clearly. It is too easy to read the archetypal expectations of queenship onto the historical queens recorded in the administrative documents, or to make conclusions based on these traditions when no evidence for the queen's actions survives. Likewise, it is easy to forget that these sources reflect the machinations of private individuals, and to focus excessively on what they tell us about the development of bureaucracy. The private intent can still be read in bureaucratic sources; John Watts has pointed out that some administrative histories tend to sacrifice the 'personal' for the 'public' and minimize the king's own involvement in the government of the realm.<sup>40</sup> In the same way that iconic images of queens can easily be placed, or rather misplaced, onto historic queens, it is all too easy to forget the personal and private manoeuvrings that occurred in the administrative arena. This study seeks to strike a balance between these approaches when investigating the nature of queenship.

In order to elucidate this approach it is useful to provide an example to show just how the different representations of the queen, as well as the actions of the queen, can be extrapolated from administrative documents. In 1308, Isabella of France, daughter of King Philip IV of France, married Edward II, king of England. Between 1308 and 1325 Isabella played a significant role on the governmental scene. Much of her impact on the political events of the period was based on her influence with the king and members of

---

<sup>40</sup> John Watts, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 82.

the nobility. There were only a few official or authoritative roles for her, mostly on her own estates and in especially appointed roles in the chancery.<sup>41</sup> By 1322 her sources of influence were reduced by the presence of the king's favourite, Hugh Despenser. The years between 1322 and 1326 have been described as the tyranny of Edward II and Hugh Despenser.<sup>42</sup> During this time, Hugh influenced the king's patronage to a level that upset most of the nobility. One aspect of the king's redistribution of patronage was the removal of many of his servants and officers, as seen in the example provided below. In 1325, despite these strains in their marriage, Edward II sent Queen Isabella as an ambassador to the French court. By the summer of 1326, as a result of growing unrest in England and further marital strife, Isabella began to seek support for an invasion of England. By January 1327 she had succeeded in leading a coup against Edward II, gaining control of government and initiating the deposition of Edward II in favour of her son. John Hotham was officially appointed as chancellor on 28 January 1327 in the presence of Isabella and others who had participated in the coup, indicating that Hotham was probably the queen's man.<sup>43</sup> TNA, SC 1/35/187 is a letter written by Isabella to Hotham, as chancellor, on 30 January 1327:

*A reverent pere en Dieu, nostre cher et bien ame sire Iohan, par la grace de Dieu euesque de Ely, chancellier nostre trescher fuiz le roy Dengleterre, Isabel par ly celle grace roine Dengleterre, dame Dirlande et contesse de Pontif, salutz et bone amour. Pour ce que nous avons entendu pour certain qe nostre bien ame sire William Thunneyk', cleric de la dite chancellerie, soleit avoir estat en court descrire au grant seal nostre trescher seigneur le roi et de manger en loustel du chancellier qui feust pur le temps tanque au darrain qe il feust ouste de cel estat sanz coulpe par le commandement Hue le Despenser et Robert de Baldoc, adonqs nos ennemis. Et nous, aians reguart a ce que le dit sire William est bon et souffisant pur la dite chancellerie et que il feust malicieusement ouste de son dit estat et sanz cause, vous prions et chargons tant come nous pouons que non contrestant le dit commandement, vous recevez le dit sire William et le*

---

<sup>41</sup> See sections 4.1-3; 6.2.

<sup>42</sup> Natalie Fryde, *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II, 1321-1326* (Cambridge, 1979); Simon Harris has pointed out that scholars now debate the extent to which this period can be described as a tyranny: Simon J. Harris, 'Petitioning in the Last Years of Edward II and the First Years of Edward III', in W.M. Ormrod, Gwilym Dodd, Anthony Musson (eds.), *Medieval Petitions: Grace and Grievance* (York, 2009), p. 174.

<sup>43</sup> Hotham previously had been chancellor between 1318 and 1320, but his removal from the office in 1320 has been attributed to his failures at the battle of Myton: M. C. Buck, 'Hotham, John (d. 1337)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13851>, accessed 4 March 2009].

*remetez en meisme lestat q il soleit tenir ou en meillour. Et ce ne vueillez laisser en nule maniere pur lamour de nous. Nostre Seignur vous quart. Doune a Eltham le xxx iour de Ianuier.*<sup>44</sup>

To the reverent father in God, our dear and well loved Sir John, by the grace of God, bishop of Ely, chancellor of our very dear son, the king of England, from Isabella, by the same grace, queen of England, lady of Ireland, countess of Ponthieu, greetings and good love. Because we understand for certain that our well loved Sir William Thunneyk, clerk of the said chancery, was accustomed to have a position in the court to write at the great seal of our very dear lord the king and to eat in the household of the chancellor, who was without fault, until the time when he was removed from this position by the order of Hugh Despenser and Robert Baldock, our enemies at that time. And we, having regard for fact that the said Sir William is good and sufficient for the said chancery, and that he was evilly removed from his said position and without cause, we ask and command you as much as we can that, notwithstanding the said order, you receive the said Sir William and return him to the same position which he is accustomed to have or to a better one. And you should not wish to fail us in any manner for the love of us. May the Lord keep you. Given at Eltham the 30<sup>th</sup> day of January.

William Thunneyk was just one casualty of Hugh's power during this period, which Isabella and her new regime were often called upon to remedy.<sup>45</sup>

Isabella's letter to Hotham appears to be a typical letter of supplication. Though it is not a formal parliamentary petition, it shows petitionary forms and also the diplomatic of official correspondence.<sup>46</sup> Because letters of supplication often made use of petitionary conventions, like petitions, they conform to a well defined set of linguistic practices.<sup>47</sup> The address, title and greeting were followed by the main body of the letter, which contained the writer's request and sometimes articulated specific ways in which the request was to be answered.<sup>48</sup> The letters always ended with a dating clause, which contained the place, day, month and sometimes the year when the letter was written.

---

<sup>44</sup> My translation. Transcription adapted from: G.O. Sayles, *Select Cases in the Court of the King's Bench*, Seldon Society, 76 (London, 1957), pp. cxlvi-cxlvii.

<sup>45</sup> Harris, 'Petitioning in the Last Years of Edward II and the First Years of Edward III', p. 183.

<sup>46</sup> Pierre Chaplais, *English Diplomatic Practice in the Middle Ages* (London, 2003), pp. 102-123; Gwilym Dodd, ' "Thomas Paunfield, the heye Court of Rightwisnesse" and the Language of Petitioning in the Fifteenth Century', in W. M. Ormrod, Gwilym Dodd and Anthony Musson (eds), *Medieval Petitions: Grace and Grievance* (York, 2009), p. 222.

<sup>47</sup> Gwilym Dodd, *Justice and Grace: Private Petitioning and the English Parliament in the Late Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2007), p. 314.

<sup>48</sup> Chaplais, *English Diplomatic Practice*, pp. 102-120, 123; Dodd, *Grace and Justice*, pp. 281-84.

There is a formal and legalistic tone to the letter similar to that of other letters written to the chancellor or chancery officials. Much of this formality derives from the language of petitioning, which characterizes many of the letters sent to the chancellor. The language of lordship is employed throughout these letters of supplication; for example *a reuerent pere en Dieu*, is a common way to address a chancellor-bishop from whom the writer desires something, and idioms, such as *trescher*, are often used to describe the relationship of others to the writer; for example, it is common to see *trescher fuiz*, *trescher dame*, *trescher roi* and so forth. Gwilym Dodd notes that these phrases emerge in parliamentary petitions in the third quarter of the fourteenth century, but they appear in these letters of supplication in the first and second quarters of the fourteenth century.<sup>49</sup> More specific to the language of petitioning were the phrases *vous nous prions* and *et ce ne vueillez laisser en nule maniere pur lamour de nous*, which occur in the majority of letters sent to the officials of the chancery, not only by the queen, but by members of the nobility in general. They appear throughout the body of letters of supplication, but they are mostly found in the beginning, when the writer conveys how they would like the chancellor to act, and at the end, when the writer reminds the chancellor that he should not disappoint, that he should grant their request on account of his love for them. The tone is submissive and acknowledges the formal and official position of the chancellor, who was responsible for ensuring that those things issued under the great seal were not prejudicial to the crown. These phrases are conventions which appear in the majority of letters of supplication written by both men and women.<sup>50</sup>

This letter demonstrates that the queen's words and meanings were expressed in this formulaic language because it is typical to this type of document. The language of petitioning may be equated with the language of intercession, and in this way, this type of administrative document illustrates the ideological expectation that the queen should act as an intercessor to the crown. The phrasing of Isabella's letter in this manner may cause the historian to believe that Isabella showed no authority in this instance, that she was merely asking for a favour with the weight of her influence behind her, and in fact,

---

<sup>49</sup> Dodd, *Justice and Grace*, p. 287.

<sup>50</sup> See section 3.1: *The Crown*.

some of her letters are just that.<sup>51</sup> Nonetheless, by looking past the diplomatic, and by placing the letter in its historical context, we can glean more about the queen's actions and place in society.

Despite the specialized forms used in letters of supplication, there was plenty of room for the writer to manipulate these forms to communicate their own agenda.<sup>52</sup> When the letter is placed alongside the events of this period a shift in the agency Isabella exercised comes to light. This letter was written at a crucial moment in Isabella's career and shows her making a transition from the influence that she enjoyed between 1308 and 1325 to a position of real authority. The date of the letter, 30 January, tells us that this letter was probably written in the period between Edward II's official deposition in January 1327 and Edward III's coronation on 1 February 1327. Chapter six explains that this was a time when Isabella's authority was most explicit.<sup>53</sup> She was probably in direct control of the great and privy seal and she can be directly connected with the appointment of officials. After the coronation, while her authority was alluded to, it is rarely recorded in such a direct and obvious way.

The context of the letter provides information that shows Isabella actively exploiting the petitionary language to demonstrate her authority in several ways. First, this letter contains a word that is unusual to this type of document: *chargons*. Margaret of France uses words of command, mainly *mandons*, in some her letters to Edward I and his chancellors.<sup>54</sup> However, Isabella's letter, both before her coup on 1326 and after Edward III attained his minority in 1330, typically omitted this phrase. Isabella, herself, may have been acutely aware that her authority could be reduced upon Edward III's coronation and so Isabella added this word to the typical *nous vous prions* to assert that she would continue to enjoy the same authority after her son's coronation.

Second, Isabella manipulated the legalese of such documents and employed rhetorical embellishments to support her authority. The description of William as *bon et sufficient* and *sanz coulpe* are specific and common phrases that establish William's legal

---

<sup>51</sup> See section 3.1: *The Crown*.

<sup>52</sup> Dodd, *Justice and Grace*, pp. 297, 301-02.

<sup>53</sup> See section 6.3. This argument was developed from a comprehensive investigation of all letters and chancery issues associated with Isabella between 1326 and 1330, including the one under discussion here.

<sup>54</sup>[The National Archives London] TNA, SC 1/28/86; SC 1/25/198, 201; SC 1/27/97; SC 1/28/86, also see section 3.1: *The Crown* for a discussion of Margaret's use of the word *mandons*.

position.<sup>55</sup> These words suggest that William more than adequately performed his role as a chancery clerk and they set up Despenser's removal of William *sanz cause*, as unjust.<sup>56</sup> Although, by right of his influence with the king, Hugh technically had the power to remove William, the use of the legalistic sounding *sanz cause* implies that Hugh exercised his influence in an illicit manner. When Isabella wrote that her command is *non contrestant le dit commandement*, she makes use of certain phraseology to indicate that her command overruled that of Hugh. The letter utilizes rhetorical flourishes, twice emphasizing the malevolence of Hugh Despenser—a characteristic typical of Isabella's letters justifying her coup. Immediately prior to and during her invasion of England in the autumn of 1326, Isabella maintained that her aim was to rid the kingdom of evil councilors.<sup>57</sup> Her letter to Bishop Hotham first claims that William was removed by Hugh Despenser and Robert Baldock *adonqs nos ennemis*, and second, it reiterates that William was *il feust malicieusement ouste de son dit estat*.<sup>58</sup> This letter not only conforms to the language of supplication described above in the usage of words such as *vous prions* and *pour l'amour de nous*, but it also exploits the legal and acquiescent language to express authority and evoke empathy.

Third, not only do the vocabulary and the date tell us about the nature of Isabella's power and authority, but the nature of the request elucidates something that the diplomatic cannot. The appointment of chancery clerks was outside of normative queenly behaviour, which means that Isabella was acting from a heightened place of authority subsequent to her coup and the deposition of Edward II. Chapter six explains that the period prior to Edward III's coronation is one when Isabella can most directly be connected to the appointments of officials.<sup>59</sup> The issue of a command that does not fall under normal queenly prerogatives displays Isabella's heightened position of authority.

---

<sup>55</sup> See J.H. Baker, *Manual of Law French* (Aldershot, 1990) for the definitions of *bon*, *sufficient* and *coulpe* in a legal context.

<sup>56</sup> See Baker, *Manual of Law French* for the definitions of *cause* in a legal context.

<sup>57</sup> For example see *Foedera* vol. IV, p. 236 which is also translated in Anne Crawford, *Letters of the Queens of England* (Stroud, 1994), p. 89.

<sup>58</sup> Dodd, 'The Language of Petitioning in the Fifteenth Century', pp. 230-231; Gwilym Dodd, *Justice and Grace*, pp. 290-302, 314-16.

<sup>59</sup> See section 6.3. This argument was developed from a comprehensive investigation of all letters and chancery issues associated with Isabella between 1326 and 1330, including the one under discussion here.



This letter shows that administrative documents can reveal a great deal about medieval queenship. Their diplomatic can tell us about the forms and language typical to their composition. Letters place the queen into the idealized role of intercessor because they make use of a language of supplication. Other aspects of this particular letter reveal that, in this situation, Isabella acted as more than an intercessor. Either Isabella or the clerk writing her letter manipulated the language and diplomatic to assert Isabella's own authority.

In the same way that we have been able to glean a great deal about queenly roles and behaviour from the aforementioned letter, this study utilizes many other types of fourteenth-century administrative sources: specifically chancery documents, including the patent, close, fine and charter rolls; exchequer records, especially those of the king and queen's households and also the accounts of their ministers and receivers. It will also draw upon petitions to the king and council, parliament rolls and extant letters written to and by the queens, kings and members of the nobility during the period covered.<sup>60</sup> This study then contextualizes them within the visual, ritual and literary sources outlined in sections 2.1 and 2.3. Due to time and space constraints, the study does not concentrate on the records of religious institutions, civic or judicial bodies in great detail, with the exception of a few instances when evidence from these sources is particularly relevant.

It should be noted that the extant number of documents varies extensively for each queen. The greatest number of documents survives for Isabella followed by Philippa and then Margaret. As a result, Margaret sometimes is not discussed in particular sections, but this does not necessarily mean that she was insignificant or that nothing can be said about her. Likewise, because more documentary evidence has survived for Isabella, some sections concentrate largely on her. This does not always indicate that she is more important than the other queens. The length at which the queens are covered in this study is dictated merely by the survival of evidence not necessarily by importance. Where similar types of evidence are available, they have been included for each of the three queens, and when direct comparisons can be made, they are explored in detail. By using administrative, visual and literary sources this study seeks to address the themes of gender, status, medieval concepts of the crown and power and authority

---

<sup>60</sup> For a more specific list of administrative documents see the unpublished and published primary sources listed in the bibliography of this thesis.

outlined in chapter one. Through these themes it expounds upon the relationship of the ideology of queenship and the historical actions of three fourteenth-century queens.

### Chapter Three

#### The Queen as Intercessor: Power and Influence

At the beginning of 1314, Queen Isabella acted as a diplomatic ambassador to France for her husband, Edward II, to negotiate over the duchy of Gascony. The circumstances under which Isabella was chosen as the ideal emissary are fully explained by E.A.R. Brown.<sup>1</sup> Brown draws our attention to a memorandum that outlines the reasons behind Edward's choice.<sup>2</sup> According to this memorandum, any French response to the queen's requests could later be rejected by Edward should the necessity arise because she had no official credentials.<sup>3</sup> It was Isabella's unofficial status and the 'behind-the-scenes' nature of intercession that made Isabella valuable as a mediator for Edward. While the death of Piers Gaveston, the birth of a son and her natal connections in France all contributed to Edward's choice of Isabella as an ambassador, her unofficial status within the court was the most significant factor. In situations such as this, it was useful for the king to have someone in his court who did not always have an official status, and the queen could fulfil this role. Brown argues, based on records of alms in Isabella's household book, that the English treated Isabella's mission as a pilgrimage.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, no specific details were given on the nature of Isabella's journey in the official documents issued in preparation for it, indicating that Edward wanted to emphasize the unofficial capacity of her visit.<sup>5</sup> However, two petitions submitted to Philip IV by Isabella have survived, demonstrating that her visit was indeed of a diplomatic nature.<sup>6</sup> Isabella's undertaking was moderately successful, with some of her requests being granted and others rejected; a typical outcome of most attempts at negotiation in the Middle Ages.

---

<sup>1</sup> Elizabeth A.R. Brown, 'Diplomacy, Adultery and Domestic Politics at the Court of Philip the Fair: Queen Isabella's Mission to France 1314', in Jeffrey S. Hamilton and Patricia J. Bradley (eds.), *Documenting the Past: Essays in Medieval History Presented to George Peddy Cuttino* (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 53-65.

<sup>2</sup> [The National Archives London,] TNA, C 47/27/8/31 as published in Brown, 'Diplomacy, Adultery', pp. 64-65, 78-80.

<sup>3</sup> Brown, 'Diplomacy, Adultery', pp. 65, 79.

<sup>4</sup> Brown, 'Diplomacy, Adultery', p. 55; TNA, E 101/375/9 fols. 24, 23, 28, 37.

<sup>5</sup> *CPR 1313-1317*, pp. 85-87.

<sup>6</sup> TNA, E 30/1530 as published in Brown, 'Diplomacy, Adultery', pp. 80-83.

This chapter will examine how Margaret of France, Isabella of France and Philippa of Hainault acted as intercessors, and the extent to which they derived power from this duty. This chapter will demonstrate that intercession is about power, the ability to get people to do things or to make things happen involving pressure, influence, persuasion and coercion, rather than authority.<sup>7</sup> When the queen did not have the authority to grant favours, she had to use her influence with the king to secure them. However, the unofficial 'behind-the-scenes' characteristics of intercession meant that it could be manipulated to further empower the queen as she used it to expand her sphere of influence. It was not necessarily a gendered activity because everyone, both male and female, took advantage of intercession, but as chapter two has demonstrated, it was a role especially emphasized for queens. This chapter will also reveal that the manner and level at which a queen exploited intercession was based on the circumstances in which she found herself and on the inclination of the queen and king.

Petitions were sent to the queen either because they pertained to her jurisdiction over her household and estates, or because her influence was deemed necessary to further the matter at hand.<sup>8</sup> This chapter is concerned with this second type of power: the queen's influence. There are several ways in which the queen could act as an intercessor. She could secure a privilege, such as a pardon, grant or appointment from the king at the behest of someone else. She could also intercede on her own initiative, beseeching the king to grant her a request. The queen could also act as a peace maker between the king and other people. Intercession's informal nature could also be manipulated by the king. Edward II took advantage of the influence Isabella had with her father, the king of France, when he sent her to France in 1314. Isabella's role as a diplomatic ambassador demonstrates the extent to which intercession could empower the queen by allowing her to act on an international scale. The queen exercised intercession most noticeably as consort, but she sometimes did so during her dowagerhood as well. Chapter five of this study will examine the queen's role as mother and dowager. However, because one queen's dowagerhood overlapped with another queen's time as consort during the early fourteenth century, this chapter will include

---

<sup>7</sup> See Section 1.5.

<sup>8</sup> Anthony Musson, 'Queenship, Lordship and Petitioning in Late Medieval England', in W. M. Ormrod, Gwilym Dodd and Anthony Musson (eds.), *Medieval Petitions: Grace and Grievance* (York, 2009), p. 162.

some discussion of the queen's intercession with the king as her son; for example, Isabella's acts of intercession with her son, Edward III, will be discussed in light of how they affected Philippa's access to Edward III.

Before proceeding, it is useful to discuss briefly how this chapter uses some of the sources to measure the queen's intercessory activities. Letters to and from the queen are used in order to establish the type of people who viewed her as an intercessor and to help reconstruct the level of her activity. Records of chancery instruments are used to study the successful acts of intercession between the queen and the king and crown. For the purposes of this study, I have focused on the chancery issues published in the Calendars of Patent, Close, Charter and Fine rolls because they are representative of systems of patronage in relation to England.<sup>9</sup> The criterion used in this study to determine if an entry on the chancery rolls represents an act of intercession is simply the presence of the phrase 'at the request, instance, or on the information of the queen'. This phrase indicates that the chancery made the issue because the queen brought the matter to the king's or the chancellor's attention. Each group of sources is representative of a different stage of intercession. Letters to the queen represent the initial phase, in which the petitioner requests that the queen use her influence in a certain matter. A letter from the queen to the king or chancellor denotes the act of intercession itself, that is, the queen presenting the issue to the king or chancellor for consideration. The chancery issue is the final step in which the request is granted and represents a successful act of intercession.

Documentation for every stage does not exist for most individual acts of intercession. However, there are times when one can link either the initial letter to the queen or the queen's letter to the crown with the final chancery issue. A letter survives addressed to Margaret of France from the citizens of Hereford, petitioning her to ask the king for a grant of murage.<sup>10</sup> Margaret of France held the farm of Hereford, making her the most likely person the citizens would approach when seeking the grant of a tax.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> It is entirely possible for the queen to appear as an intercessor in other chancery rolls such as the Gascon Rolls, for example, but because of the limitations of this study, I have not focused on sources pertaining to other parts of Plantagenet lands outside of England, except when they are particularly relevant. However, an exploratory study on the queen in the printed volume of the Gascon Rolls has resulted in only a few mentions of the queen in her intercessory capacity.

<sup>10</sup> TNA, SC 1/30/106.

<sup>11</sup> *CCR 1296-1302*, pp. 545-6.

The grant of the tax is recorded on the chancery rolls 'at the instance of Queen Margaret' in May of 1305.<sup>12</sup> Unfortunately, the letter from Margaret to the king or chancellor does not survive.

### **3.1 Intercession with King and Crown**

#### ***The King***

To be successful as an intercessor and manipulate the power associated with that role, the queen needed access to the king as a person or to the crown as an institution. The queen possessed several types of access to the king, which would facilitate successful intercessions. One major component of intercession is the ability to approach the king and to incite his interest in the request. In order to do this, having close physical proximity as well as an intimate relationship with the king was advantageous. One type of this physical closeness was a sexual relationship with the king, which the queen could use (and was indeed sometimes urged to use) in order to influence him. The queen, like any nobleman, sometimes had to contend with other people vying for and monopolizing the king's favour and contact with him. Studying the itineraries and major life events of these queens demonstrate different ways in which the queen could have access to the king. It also demonstrates certain types of barriers that could affect this access and her ability to intercede. Margaret faced a lack of physical proximity to the king, Isabella had to contend with the king's favourites and Philippa was limited by the presence of a strong queen dowager: Isabella. This section evaluates if these barriers negatively affected these queens' access to their husbands and how or if the queens were able to circumvent these barriers.

In order to determine these queens' physical proximity to the king, the queens' itineraries needed to be reconstructed. To do this, I have used household accounts of Edward I, Edward II and Edward III, and Margaret, Isabella and Philippa. In addition, I have used letters sent by the queens. The household rolls are the most useful documents for constructing the itineraries.<sup>13</sup> The queen's household rolls record the movements of

---

<sup>12</sup> *CPR 1301-1307*, p. 340.

<sup>13</sup> David Crook, 'The Last Days of Eleanor of Castile: The Death of a Queen in Nottinghamshire, November 1290', *Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire*, 94 (1990), p. 17.

her household in their margins. Likewise, the margins of the king's household rolls record his household's movements, and sometimes include notations marking when and where the queen joined his household. The queen's household and wardrobe books contain itemized entries of messengers sent to and from the queen, which sometimes give the date and the location of the queen. The surviving letters written by the queen contain the place and date they were written and so I have assumed that the queen can be located in these given places. These expenses and extant letters allow the location of the queen to be determined, or at least the location of her household.<sup>14</sup>

Nevertheless, analyzing some of the information provided by these accounts can be problematic. In the case of expenses of the carriage of the household and the wages of messengers, the dates recorded are those on which payment was rendered. The date of payment did not necessarily coincide with the actual date of the movement of the household or the delivery of the message. This discrepancy means that unless both dates were recorded, the entry on the account cannot be used to place the queen. As a result, I have only used entries for the carriage of the household and messengers that clearly record the date of the event. Since the king was responsible for the expenses of the queen when their households were together, the king's household and wardrobe accounts contain various payments of the queen's expenses within them. Consequently, records of the queen's expenses within the king's household indicate that she was with the king during the period of time covered by a particular household account. The accounts can be used to demonstrate that the queen and king were together at unspecified points within some regnal years, but the exact place date is not always clear.<sup>15</sup>

Margaret married Edward I in September 1299 and for most of their marriage he was embroiled in the war with the Scots, an activity that kept him in the north for much of their marriage.<sup>16</sup> Margaret's itinerary is patchy and can only be reconstructed with any regularity for the period between 1299 and 1301. The couple was married on 10 September 1299, but did not actually spend the day together; she feasted at Canterbury

---

<sup>14</sup> Also see the methodology for constructing the queens' itineraries in appendix I.

<sup>15</sup> See section 4.1.

<sup>16</sup> Joseph Stevenson, *The Itinerary of Edward I*, Public Record Office: Record Commission Transcripts, Series II (London, 1836). For Edward's wars in Scotland see Michael Prestwich, *Edward I* (London, 1997), pp. 469-516; Michael Prestwich, *The Three Edwards* (New York, 1990), pp. 42-53.

and the king moved on to Chartham.<sup>17</sup> However, they probably spent October together because Margaret's alms were recorded in Edward's household book for 11 and 13 October 1299. The king then left Margaret in Prince Edward's (the future Edward II) household at Langley while he journeyed north.<sup>18</sup>

However, there is some evidence that Edward I and Margaret remained close together when Edward was travelling between England and Scotland. First of all, Margaret had three children in seven years, indicating that she did have significant physical access to Edward I. By 1300 Margaret was pregnant and her itinerary indicates that she was travelling north to join the king late in her pregnancy. The households do not appear to be together at this time, but were travelling in close proximity to each other in Yorkshire. Langtoft claims that the king requested Margaret to join him in the north two separate times during their marriage.<sup>19</sup> In the first instance, Langtoft believes Edward summoned Margaret because she was pregnant. Indeed, Margaret's lying in at Brotherton occurred from 31 May to 9 September 1300, though the king was rarely at Brotherton during this time. We know that she was apart from the king in autumn of 1301, but her itinerary does not allow for further comparison with the king's.<sup>20</sup> However, she is recorded in Edward's household accounts at least once in every regnal year, indicating that they were together for at least part of every year. Margaret had some opportunity to secure acts of intercession face-to-face with the king.<sup>21</sup>

An examination of the table below comparing Margaret's acts of intercession with the time Edward spent in Scotland demonstrates that Margaret was able to act as a successful intercessor.

---

<sup>17</sup> Stephenson, *Itinerary of Edward I*, p. 142; Gervase, *Gervase of Canterbury*, H.T. Riley (ed.), Rolls Series, 73 (London, 1965), p. 31.

<sup>18</sup> TNA, E 101/356/6; TNA, E 101/355/29; TNA, E 101/355/30; appendix I.

<sup>19</sup> Pierre de Langtoft, *The Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft in French verse, from the earliest period to the death of King Edward*, T. Wright (ed.), Rolls Series, 47 (London, 1964), pp. 322-25, 348-49.

<sup>20</sup> For Margaret, Isabella and Philippa's itineraries see appendix I.

<sup>21</sup> The connection between intercession and pregnancy will be examined in chapter five.



## Margaret's acts of intercession recorded in the Chancery compared with Edward's time in Scotland

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
1299	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	1	0	0	1
1300	1	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	9
1301	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
1302	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	0	1	1	0	8
1303	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	8
1304	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	5
1305	0	0	4	3	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	10
1306	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	5
1307	2	1	3	0	0	1	X	X	X	X	X	X	7

- **Red number = month when Edward was in Scotland**
- **X = Not yet married or after Edward's death**

Edward was in Scotland for forty-three of the ninety-five months that he was married to Margaret, roughly fifty percent of their marriage. There are no recorded acts of intercession on the part of Margaret for fifty-eight of the ninety-five months they were married. Twenty-nine of these fifty-eight months were months when Edward was in Scotland. There were several months when Edward was in England when Margaret also had zero acts of intercession. There were also several months when Edward was in Scotland when acts of intercession on behalf of Margaret were recorded in the chancery. It may be significant that 1305 was the year in which she reached the zenith of intercessory activity, and Edward was in England for the entirety of that year. However, she had similar success in 1303 and Edward was in Scotland for most of that year. This analysis is not without its problems. When broken down by month and year the scale of Margaret's acts of intercession tends to flatten out and there may not be any significant deviation. Margaret's itinerary is patchy and it is possible that she may actually have joined Edward when he was in Scotland. Nevertheless, from the evidence in the form in which it survives on the chancery rolls it can be concluded that Edward's frequent visits to Scotland had little bearing on Margaret's success as an intercessor.

There is evidence of active correspondence between Margaret and Edward, in which they discuss their health, the health of their children and their whereabouts. Margaret also discusses business relating to petitions to the king.<sup>22</sup> Margaret conducted much of her intercessory activity with the king in this manner or she went through the chancellor when they were apart. Most of the surviving letters from Margaret that relate to intercession are addressed to the chancellor.<sup>23</sup> The queen's access to the king through the chancellor will be discussed in greater detail later in this section. From the available evidence it seems as if Edward's absence did not negatively affect Margaret's ability to intercede: they made efforts to travel together, Edward's household records indicate that they were together at some point every year, there is evidence of their correspondence and Margaret went directly to the chancellor when Edward was not available.

Isabella had more opportunity for physical access to Edward II than Margaret did to Edward I. Edward II was in England for longer periods of time and Isabella accompanied him when he went to France. Nonetheless, Isabella faced competition for the king's attention from two sources: Piers Gaveston and Hugh Despenser. From Isabella's itinerary, which is most complete from 1311 to 1312 and 1314 to 1316, we can see that she was with the king for significant periods of these years.<sup>24</sup> Isabella's household accounts demonstrate that, like Margaret and Edward I, when the king and queen were not together they maintained a correspondence.<sup>25</sup> There are also records of gifts exchanged, which may indicate actual affection, but could also be indicative of traditional court practice.<sup>26</sup>

Since the queen's major duties and sources of power, intercession and motherhood relied on her sexual access to the king, one cannot ignore the fact that Edward had favourites who also vied for the king's patronage. These relationships have sometimes been viewed as homosexual and sometimes not, but if such relationships

---

<sup>22</sup>TNA, SC 1/31/184; TNA, SC 1/14/111.

<sup>23</sup> TNA, SC 1/25, 198, 199, 200,201, 202, 203,204; TNA, SC 1/27/96, 97; TNA, SC 1/28/27,86; TNA, SC 1/60/123.

<sup>24</sup> See appendix I.

<sup>25</sup> F. D. Blackley and G. Hermansen (eds.), *The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England, for the Fifth Regnal Year of Edward II, 8th July 1311 to 7th July 1312* (Edmonton, 1971), pp. 208-209, 214-15, 216-217, 218-19, 220-21; TNA, E 101/375/9 fols, 33, 33v, 34; TNA, E 101/375/19; TNA, E 101/376/20; TNA, SC 1/35/29.

<sup>26</sup> TNA, E 101/375/8 fols 8, 27, 27v.

indeed occurred they might have affected Isabella's access to the king's bed.<sup>27</sup> It is not the purpose of this study to determine the extent to which Edward II was homosexual: the sources will support most interpretations. However, it will determine the extent to which Edward's relationships with his favourites might have limited Isabella's sexual access to the king.<sup>28</sup> As it is difficult to ascertain Edward's private sexual practises, it is important to examine the events of 1308-1326 while keeping in mind that extramarital sexual relationships might have occurred. To the magnates, whether or not Edward was having a homosexual or a homoerotic relationship with Gaveston or Despenser was of little consequence. What did matter to the magnates was that Edward distributed his patronage unequally among them. For the queen, it was a different matter. Not only would she be concerned with the unequal distribution of patronage, but much of her power depended on her sexual relationship with the king. If he bestowed these affections elsewhere, then a source of the queen's influence might be severed.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Roy Martin Haines, *King Edward II: His Life, His Reign, and Its Aftermath, 1284-1330* (Montreal, 2006), pp. 42-43, 66; J.R. Madicott, *Thomas of Lancaster, 1307-1322: A Study of the Reign of Edward II* (Oxford, 1970), p. 83; Jeffrey S. Hamilton, 'Menage a Roi: Edward II and Piers Gaveston', *History Today*, 49 (1999), 26-31; Jeffrey S. Hamilton, *Piers Gaveston, Earl of Cornwall, 1307-1312: Politics and Patronage in the Reign of Edward II* (Detroit, 1988), pp. 11-17. See Pierre Chaplais, *Piers Gaveston: Edward II's Adoptive Brother* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 7-10, 20-22 and Jochen Burgtof, '“With my Life, His Joyes Began and Ended” Piers Gaveston and King Edward II of England Revisited', in Nigel Saul (ed.) *Fourteenth Century England* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 31-47 for alternative views of the relationship.

<sup>28</sup> For discussion on homosexuality in the Middle Ages, the difficulty in determining medieval sexuality, and wider definitions and theory of homosexual, homoerotic, and homosocial relationships see: J. Boswell, 'Categories, Experiences and Sexuality', in Edward Stein, (ed.), *Forms of Desire: Sexual Orientation and The Social Constructionist Controversy* (New York, 1990), pp. 133-173; Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York, 1985); Allen J. Frantzen, *Before the Closet: Same-Sex Love from Beowulf to Angels in America* (Chicago, 1998), pp. 1-29; W.M. Ormrod, 'The Sexualities of Edward II', in Gwilym Dodd and Anthony Musson (eds.), *The Reign of Edward II: New Perspectives* (York, 2006), pp. 31-33; C. Dinshaw, *Getting Medieval: Sexualities and Communities, Pre- and Postmodern* (Durham, 1999), pp. 3-6; For examples of ambiguous references to Edward's relationship with his favourites see Wendy R. Childs (trans., ed.) *Vita Edwardi Secundi* (Oxford, 2005), p. 53; William Stubbs (ed.), 'Annales Londonienses', *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, Rolls Series, 76 (2 vols, London, 1965), vol 1, p. 259.

<sup>29</sup> Contemporaries urged wives to use their sexual relationship to influence their husbands. In the thirteenth century, Thomas of Chobham 'claimed that no priest is able to soften the heart of a man as is a woman... She should address her husband in the bedroom, coaxing him in the middle of his embraces and if he is, for example, a harsh, unmerciful oppressor of poor men she ought to encourage him to compassion' *Nullus enim sacerdos ita potest cor viri emollire sicut potest uxor. Unde peccatum viri sepe mulieri imputatur si per eius negligentiam vir eius negligentiam vir eius non emmendatur. Debet enim in cubiculo et inter medios amplexus virum suum blane alloqui et si durus est et immisericors et oppressor pauperum, debet eum invitare ad misericordiam.* (My translation.): Thomas of Chobham, *Summa Confessorum*, R. Broomfield (ed.) (Paris, 1968), p. 375. In the fourteenth century, Christine de Pizan advised her female readers that a wife should bring things to her husband's attention when they are alone together. Christine de Pizan, *The Treasure of the City of Ladies or the Book of the Three Virtues*, Sarah Lawson (trans.) (London, 1985), p. 64. John Carmi Parsons, 'The Pregnant Queen as Counsellor and the

There is little doubt that there was much criticism of Edward's attention to Gaveston. Yet much of the criticism laid at Gaveston's door does not mention Isabella among those who felt neglected by the king. There are three main contemporary sources which purport that Edward II ignored Isabella as a result of his friendship with Gaveston, and they all reflect the perceptions of others. The first are chronicles, and for the most part they do not mention Isabella in their discussion of Edward and Gaveston. The chroniclers who do Troklowe, Robert of Reading, and Ranulph Higden; for example, believed that Isabella was in some way harmed by Edward's favouritism of Gaveston. Troklowe claims that she did not receive enough affection; Higden writes that Edward neglected Isabella; Robert of Reading includes a scene in which Isabella begs Edward not to follow Gaveston's council.<sup>30</sup> These chronicles were written after 1327 or 1330 and tend to be pro-baronial in tone. They were probably using the events of 1308-1312 to foreshadow Isabella's coup in 1326. A newsletter also survives, which many scholars have used to support claims that a coalition consisting of Philip IV, Isabella, Queen Margaret, and the barons was formed against Gaveston.<sup>31</sup> However, this letter never actually mentions Isabella, or implies any mistreatment of her by Edward. It only implicates Queen Margaret, the earl of Lincoln and the earl of Pembroke. It is Edward II's grant of Ponthieu and Montreuil to Isabella shortly after this letter was written that historians have used as evidence to connect Isabella with this coalition.

The Kedyngton affair provides the last example that others believed in Isabella's hatred of Gaveston. In January 1308, Richard Kedyngton was elected as the abbot of Westminster Abbey. His election was resented by a faction of the monks at Westminster

---

Medieval Construction of Motherhood' in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.), *Medieval Mothering* (New York, 1996), pp. 42, 45,46, 52-55; John Carmi Parsons, 'The Queen's Intercession in Thirteenth-Century England', in Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth Maclean (eds.), *Power of the Weak*, (Illinois, 1995), p. 158.

<sup>30</sup> Robert of Reading's contribution to the *Flores Historiarum* is strongly opposed to Gaveston and in favour of Thomas of Lancaster. He is unusual in his vehemence towards Edward, he wrote soon after the deposition and before 1330. It may have been written at the behest of Isabella and Mortimer. Trokelowe's *St. Albans Chronicle* may have been written after the death of Edward II perhaps as late as 1330: Johannis de Trokelowe, *Johannis de Trokelowe et Henrici de Blaneford Chronica Et Annales*, H.T. Riley (ed.), Rolls Series, 28 (London, 1965); Robert of Reading, *Flores Historiarum*, Henry Richards Luard.(ed.), Rolls Series, 95 (3 vols, London, 1965).

<sup>31</sup> Jeff Hamilton claims that Isabella probably sided against Gaveston, and that evidence of Philip IV's participation in effort to remove Gaveston is suspect, but the evidence is too plentiful to dismiss altogether. Maddicott and Doherty seem to take this evidence as absolute fact: Hamilton, *Piers Gaveston*, p. 50; Also see: Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster*, pp. 82-86,335-336; Paul Doherty, 'Isabella, Queen of England 1296-1330' (Unpublished PhD Thesis. Exeter Collage, Oxford, 1977). pp. 29-33.

because they believed that he had received this appointment unfairly through Gaveston's patronage. They believed that Isabella would support their plan to replace Kedyngton with their own candidate because of her purported hatred for Gaveston. An enrolment of two letters outlining their plot survives in the Westminster Abbey Muniments claiming that whatever hurt Gaveston 'the queen and earls, even the pope and cardinals and even the king of France desired.'<sup>32</sup> Katherine Allocco argues that these enrolled letters were a correspondence between Isabella and the monks.<sup>33</sup> However this is not the case. These letters were not written to Isabella or by her. They cannot be used as evidence that Isabella actually felt this way, only that she was perceived to have done so. There is no evidence that their plan ever came to fruition. The barons and the monks of Westminster may have manipulated Isabella to strengthen their complaints against Gaveston. Hatred for Gaveston in general, whether justified or not, was high and blaming him for the neglect of the queen could be a powerful attack. The chronicle evidence, the newsletter from Philip IV and the letters surrounding the Kedyngton affair do indicate that some contemporaries may have believed that Piers Gaveston prevented Isabella from fulfilling some of her duties as queen, and Isabella may have even believed this herself. However, a detailed examination of Isabella's actions indicates that despite any opinion to the contrary, she was able to actively pursue her role as an intercessor.

To be successful as an intercessor and manipulate the power associated with that role, the queen needed access to the king as a person or to the crown as an institution. If Isabella was taking advantage of her sexual relationship with the king to secure his patronage for others, she had the opportunities to do so despite any other sexual relationships that Edward may have had, homosexual or otherwise. Isabella gave birth to four children, and when her itinerary can be re-constructed, it places her with Edward around the right time for conception.<sup>34</sup> Edward also had a bastard son named Adam.<sup>35</sup> Consequently, Edward had sex with women, though perhaps not exclusively.

---

<sup>32</sup> [Westminster Abbey Muniments] WAM 5460.

<sup>33</sup> Katherine Allocco, 'Intercessor, Rebel, Regent: The Political Life of Isabella of France' (Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Texas, Austin, 2004), p. 124.

<sup>34</sup> See section 5.2.

<sup>35</sup> Chris Given-Wilson and Alice Curteis, *The Royal Bastards of Medieval England* (London, 1984), p. 136.

Isabella did not become pregnant during the first three years of her marriage, which could be taken as a sign that she did not have physical access to Edward II. However, Isabella's age at her marriage provides an alternative explanation for the lack of a sexual relationship with Edward prior to 1311. Common Plantagenet practice was to consummate when the queen reached twelve, and to begin conjugal relations at the age of fifteen.<sup>36</sup> It is possible that Isabella could not conceive before 1311. The age of menarche is difficult to determine conclusively, but it is unlikely that Isabella could conceive at age twelve when she was married.<sup>37</sup> Thus, it may have been the queen's own age which prevented Isabella's sexual access to the king early in their marriage, not Gaveston. Gaveston returned from his third exile in late December 1311 or early January 1312, and Prince Edward was probably conceived around the end of February 1312 when Gaveston was travelling with the king and Isabella. Isabella would have been either fifteen or sixteen at this time. Isabella's procreative duties do not seem to have been impeded by the possible extramarital sexual practices of her husband and so neither was this highly personal physical access to the king.

The number of intercessions during her marriage supports the conclusion that she had sufficient access to her husband. The chancery records six acts of intercession in Isabella's first year as queen and four, six and five acts in each of the three subsequent years.<sup>38</sup> In 1312, the year in which Gaveston was captured and executed, there are only three recorded acts of intercession.<sup>39</sup> The recorded number of intercessions rises again to eleven in 1313, and ten and nine in the subsequent two years.<sup>40</sup> However, because Edward III's birth coincides with Piers Gaveston's death, it is impossible to determine if this increase in intercessory activity was due to the birth of an heir or the death of Edward's favourite. According to the author of the *Vita Edwardi Secundi*, Edward's

---

<sup>36</sup> John Carmi Parsons, 'Mothers and Daughters Marriage, Power: Some Plantagenet Evidence, 1150-1500', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1998), pp. 63-78.

<sup>37</sup> Aline G. Hornaday, 'A Capetian Queen as Street Demonstrator: Isabelle of Hainault', in Kathleen Nolan (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), p. 83.

<sup>38</sup> See appendix II; *CPR 1307-1313*, pp. 36,138,150,177,190, 208, 212, 311, 349, 378, 379, 393; *CCW 1244-1326*, pp. 37, 321; *CChR 1300-1326*, p. 123.

<sup>39</sup> *CCR 1307-1313* p. 433; *CCW 1244-1326*, p.148.

<sup>40</sup> *CCR 1313-1318*, p. 4, 246; *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 519; *CPR 1313-1317*, pp. 45,80, 82, 119, 166, 169, 201, 223, 254, 305, 336, 352, 370; *CCW 1244-1326*, p. 389, 406; *CFR 1307-1319*, pp. 253,255.

birth had two consequences, 'it greatly lessened the grief which the king had experienced on Pier's death, and it provided a known heir to the realm'.<sup>41</sup> Such a description highlights the importance of these two intermingled events of 1312.

Isabella's successful acts of intercession are recorded on the chancery rolls and from the evidence contained in them we may see that the queen did not need to have physical access to the king in order to act as a successful intercessor. As long as she had access to the king and crown as an institution, the queen could remain powerful. The majority of the surviving letters written by Isabella were to the chancellor on behalf of others.<sup>42</sup> Thus, if the king was too preoccupied with Gaveston to listen to Isabella's appeals, there were other traditional channels through which she could go, and it appears that she did this. There is no indication on the chancery rolls that these requests were answered positively, but they show that people at this time perceived Isabella to be a source of patronage. If we compare Isabella's intercessory activity with Margaret of France, Philippa of Hainault, and Anne of Bohemia we see that the level of Isabella's intercessory activity was normal for a queen, and could be described as high for fourteenth-century queens.<sup>43</sup> Even if Piers' death was the main factor in the increase of intercessions in 1313, it cannot be said that Isabella was inactive in securing grants, favours, or appointments from the king prior to 1313.

Hugh Despenser presents an altogether different situation than Piers Gaveston. Between 1322 and 1325, when Despenser was at the height of his power, there are few surviving documents that record significant intercessory activity on the part of Isabella. Until about 1321, prior to Despenser's exile, Isabella was still in favour at court. Her children, John (b.1316) and Eleanor (b.1318), were born as Hugh Despenser's influence over the king was on the rise, and thus he did not affect Isabella's sexual access to the king at this point. It seems unlikely that Isabella was denied sexual access to the king because Joan was probably conceived in October 1320, prior to the Despensers' banishment during the period. Isabella continued to perform important functions in

---

<sup>41</sup> *Vita Edwardii Secundi*, p. 62-63: ...*quia duos effectus Deo disponente feliciter impleuit. Dolorem namque Regis quem ex morte Petri conceperat valde mitigauit, et cetum heredem regno providit.*

<sup>42</sup> Margaret of France: TNA, SC 1/25/198, 199, 200, 202, 203, 204; TNA, SC 1/27/96; TNA, SC 1/28/27, 86, 87; TNA, SC 1/60/123. Isabella of France: TNA, SC 1/35/62, 63, 64, 111, 151, 152; TNA, SC 1/36/10, 11 39, 72, 73; TNA, SC1/37/9, 12, 36, 45, 53. Philippa of Hainault: TNA, SC 1/ 36/107; TNA, SC 1/39/164, 175; TNA, SC 1/40/30, 137; TNA, SC 1/41/82, 86; TNA, SC 1/56/26, 50.

<sup>43</sup> See appendix II.

support of Edward II. She gave birth to Edward II's last child, Joan of the Tower, in June 1321 and she acted in important areas of administration in September 1321.<sup>44</sup>

However, when Edward II revoked Hugh Despenser and his father's exile in December 1321, Isabella's influence began to decline. Her number of intercessions had already declined to nothing in 1321 and they remained at that level until after her coup in 1326. In addition, Isabella was about twenty-five at the birth of Joan, still of childbearing age, yet there is no evidence that she ever became pregnant again. It is possible that Isabella might not have been able to conceive. After Edward's deposition and death there were rumours recorded in later chronicles that she had been pregnant with Roger Mortimer's child, but she must have miscarried if indeed she was pregnant.<sup>45</sup> The sudden drop in intercessory activity when she had been so successful previously, and her sudden decline in fertility at the same time as Despenser's return from exile, suggest a direct correlation between the two.

If Isabella was manipulating sex to increase her influence with the king, she had the opportunity to do so until 1321 despite any other sexual relationships, homosexual or otherwise, that Edward may have had. For the majority of the reign Edward's extramarital relationships in no way affected Isabella's contact with Edward. The available household account evidence demonstrates that their households were often together, and that they maintained a relationship when they were apart. A reconstruction of Isabella's reproductive timeline demonstrates that they had at least a sufficiently active physical relationship. Isabella had adequate access to Edward to exercise and gain power through intercession.

Philippa faced competition from a different source than Isabella: the then dowager queen, Isabella herself. Philippa's access to Edward III was at least indirectly harmed by Isabella's actions between 1327 and 1330. The existence of a dowager queen was a double-edged sword for a new queen-consort. The dowager could act as a mentor, initiating the consort to the duties of her office, but history is ripe with stories of rivalry between queen mothers and queen consorts. Access to the king was often the source of strife because the dowager queen did not necessarily wish to relinquish her influence to

---

<sup>44</sup> See section 6.2.

<sup>45</sup> Froissart puts forth the idea that rumors were circulating that Isabella was pregnant with Mortimer's child: Jean Froissart, *Oeuvres de Froissart*, Kervyn de Lettenhove (ed.) (24 vols, Brussels, 1867-1877), vol. 2, pp. 245, 247.



the newcomer.<sup>46</sup> This is the type of situation in which Philippa found herself from 1328 to 1331.

Margaret and Isabella on the other hand seem to have had a cordial relationship, which might have helped to ease Isabella's transition into her new role. Margaret was around twenty-five, was Isabella's aunt, was French and had married into the English royal family only five years before Isabella under the same treaty. These traits would make her an ideal mentor for Isabella. John Carmi Parsons has argued this possibility, though some of his evidence is based on speculation.<sup>47</sup> Prior to Edward I's death, Margaret often interceded with Edward I on behalf of Prince Edward and he may have looked upon her as the mother he never had (Eleanor of Castile died when the prince was about five).<sup>48</sup> Parsons notes that as soon as Isabella came to England in 1308, Margaret ceased to handle petitions. The more speculative aspect of Parsons' argument derives from the presence of Margaret and Edward's sisters at Isabella's coronation. Parsons claims that:

It is very tempting to think of these adult women, experienced mediators of royal favours and influence, holding a kind of strategy conference on the new, twelve-year-old queen's assimilation into the female networks of the Plantagenet family. Among themselves they might well have reached some decisions on the management of petitions.<sup>49</sup>

While this is not improbable, there is little evidence to support this speculation. It is evident that Margaret did seem to make way for Isabella, whether intentionally or not, and that letters and meetings between the two uphold a harmonious relationship.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> For example, Adele of Champagne and Isabella of Hainault, Blanche of Castile and Margaret of Provence: Hornaday, 'Capetian Queen as Street Demonstrator', p. 81-82, Elizabeth Hallam, *Capetian France, 987-1328* (London, 2001), p. 272.

<sup>47</sup> John Carmi Parsons, 'Intercessionary Patronage of Queen Margaret and Isabella of France', in Michael Prestwich, R.H. Britnell and Robin Frame (eds.), *Thirteenth Century England, VI: Proceedings of the Durham Conference* (Woodbridge, 1995), p. 154.

<sup>48</sup> Parsons, 'Intercessory Patronage', p. 152; Hamilton, *Piers Gaveston*, p. 32; Caroline Bingham, *The Life and Times of Edward II* (London, 1973), p. 22.

<sup>49</sup> Parsons, 'Intercessory Patronage', p. 154.

<sup>50</sup> Blackley (ed.), *The Household book of Queen Isabella*, pp. 206-207, 212-216; TNA, E 101/375/9, fol. 33; TNA, E 101/375/19; TNA, E 101/376/20.

Isabella's domination of Edward III will be discussed at length in chapters five and six of this study, but this chapter will briefly provide evidence of the extent to which Isabella probably prevented Philippa's access to Edward III. Philippa's itinerary is difficult to construct, so an evaluation of how often she was with Edward III cannot be conducted adequately. Isabella's recorded cases of intercession in the chancery far outnumber Philippa's between 1327 and 1330.<sup>51</sup> However, after 1330, the number of Isabella's acts remain equal to Philippa's and low in comparison with both Margaret of France and Isabella's own acts of intercession as consorts. After Isabella's death in 1358, Philippa's recorded intercessions did not rise, but remain between zero and three or four per year. This evidence indicates that Isabella did not directly hinder Philippa's access to Edward in the sense that she was monopolizing his patronage. If she had, the number of Isabella's successful acts would have been much higher than Philippa's, and we would expect to see Philippa's rise in number at Isabella's death. Isabella's actions between 1327 and 1330 might have predisposed Edward against significant amounts of intercession from either his consort or his mother.

Now that these queens' access to the king has been examined, it is useful to briefly compare their success as intercessors in order to determine how these queens acted within their individual circumstances. Margaret and Isabella were more successful at taking advantage of their roles as intercessors than Philippa. Chancery writs were issued in significant numbers at the request of both Margaret and Isabella beginning from their arrival in England. Margaret's acts were fairly consistent from 1299 through 1307.<sup>52</sup> Isabella's fluctuated slightly more than Margaret's, but even in the years with the lowest numbers of successful acts, Isabella's rarely dropped below Margaret's.<sup>53</sup> It

---

<sup>51</sup> Philippa: *CPR 1327-1330*, pp. 370, 382, 453. Isabella: *CPR 1327-1330*, pp. 31, 100, 94, 125, 140, 169, 175, 176, 183, 189, 191, 198-99, 200, 257, 264, 300, 304, 322, 340, 357, 372, 380, 367, 378, 468, 520, 523, 542-3.

<sup>52</sup> **1299:** *CCR 1296-1302*, p. 286, **1300:** *CPR 1292-1301*, pp. 489, 491, 509, 513, 538; *CCR 1296-1302* pp. 343, 356, 368, 414. **1301:** *CCR 1296-1302*, pp. 420, 434; *CPR 1292-1301*, p. 616. **1302:** *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 37, 48-49, 56, 60, 65, 96, 102. **1303:** *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 120, 134, 135, 154-55, 163, 170, 291. **1304:** *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 239, 245; *CCR 1302-1307*, p. 179. **1305:** *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 321, 341, 339, 336, 340, 342, 378, 388, 353. **1306:** *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 416, 420, 493, 444, 464. **1307:** *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 488, 481-82, 503, 507, 507, 532.

<sup>53</sup> **1308:** *CPR 1307-1313*, pp. 36, 36, 36, 138; *CCW, 1244-1326*, p. 271; *CChR 1300-1326*, pp. 123-125. **1309:** *CPR 1307-1313*, pp. 150, 151, 177, 190. **1310:** *CPR, 1307-1313*, pp. 208, 212, 225, 227, 379; *CCW 1244-1326*, pp. 321. **1311:** *CPR, 1307-1313*, pp. 311, 349, 351, 378, 393. **1312:** *CCR 1307-1313*, pp. 433; *CFR 1307-1319*, p. 148. **1313:** *CPR, 1307-1313*, pp. 522, 577, 570, *CPR 1301-1313*, p. 585; *CCW 1244-1326*, pp. 389; *CCR, 1313-1318*, p. 4; *CPR 1313-1317*, pp. 13 & 17, 15-16, 20, 45. **1314:** *CPR*

is difficult to conclude whether Piers Gaveston affected fluctuations in Isabella's acts of intercession as several other political events, which might also have affected Isabella's influence over Edward II, coincided with Gaveston's presence at court. However, because she generally appears to have interceded as often as Margaret, Piers Gaveston did not bar her access to Edward. After 1320, Isabella's appearances on the chancery rolls as an intercessor continually decline, indicating that Hugh Despenser did affect her access to Edward II.<sup>54</sup> Philippa's successful acts remained consistently lower in number than Margaret and Isabella's with the exception of two peaks in 1331 and 1338, which coincide with the births of her first two sons.<sup>55</sup> The year 1331 also marks Edward III's first year out of the shadow of Isabella and Mortimer, which may contribute to the peak in Philippa's intercessions for that year. However, if Isabella's fall from power was a contributing factor to this peak in 1331, it did not continue to affect Philippa's intercession because the latter's successful acts subsequently drop in number.

### *The Crown*

The queen did not necessarily have to have physical access to the king's body in order to act as a successful intercessor. These examples demonstrate that as long as she had access to the king and crown as an institution, the queen could remain a powerful intercessor. The majority of the surviving letters written by Margaret, Isabella and Philippa were all to the chancellor on behalf of others, because either the king was not accessible or because it was not necessary to approach the king with the particular type

---

*1313-1317*, pp. 80, 82, 119, 131, 166, 169, 201. **1315:** *CPR 1313-1317*, pp. 223, 254, 305, 336, 370; *CFR 1307-1319*, pp. 253, 255; *CChR 1300-1326*, p. 246. **1316:** *CPR 1313-1317*, pp. 385, 436. **1317:** *CPR 1313-1317*, pp. 603, 611, 639, 644, 656, 655. *CCW 1244-1326*, p. 472; *CPR, 1317-1321*, pp. 21, 27, 4, 66; *CChR 1300-1326*, pp. 362-63. **1318:** *CPR 1317-1321*, p. 190. **1319:** *CPR 1317-1321*, pp. 271, 339; *CFR 1307-1319*, p. 397; *CPR 1317-1321*, p. 312. **1320:** *CPR 1317-1321*, p. 422, 542.

<sup>54</sup> See appendix II.

<sup>55</sup> **1328:** *CPR 1327-1330*, p. 337. **1329:** *CPR 1327-1330*, pp. 382, 453. **1331:** *CPR 1330-1334*, pp. 76, 68, 84, 106, 167, 162, 236, 228. **1332:** *CPR 1330-1334*, p. 266. **1333:** *CPR 1330-1334*, pp. 425, 415, 408. **1335:** *CPR 1334-1338*, pp. 170, 174. **1336:** *CPR 1334-1338*, pp. 251-52. **1337:** *CPR 1334-1338*, pp. 467, 398, 486, 523. **1338:** *CPR 1338-1340*, pp. 44-45, 55, 56, 57, 63, 90, 106, 163. **1339:** *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 316. **1340:** *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 432. **1341:** *CPR 1340-1343*, pp. 250, 249; *CChR 1341-1417*, p. 7. **1342:** *CPR 1340-1343*, p. 499. **1343:** *CPR 1343-1345*, pp. 103, 100, 100, 124. **1344:** *CPR 1343-1345*, pp. 157, 239-40, 372. **1345:** *CPR 1343-1345*, pp. 435, 471, 526, 549; *CPR 1345-1348*, p. 57. **1346:** *CPR 1345-1348*, pp. 133, 474. **1347:** *CPR 1345-1348*, p. 250. **1348:** *CPR 1348-1350*, pp. 20, 121, 183, 337, 248. **1349:** *CPR 1348-1350*, pp. 254, 254. **1351:** *CPR 1350-1354*, p. 72. **1352:** *CPR 1350-1354*, p. 258. **1355:** *CPR 1354-1358*, p. 263. **1356:** *CPR 1354-1358*, pp. 371, 460. **1362:** *CPR 1361-1364*, p. 276. **1363:** *CPR 1361-1364*, pp. 334, 392. **1364:** *CPR 1361-1364*, p. 520; *CPR 1364-1367*, pp. 11, 52. **1365:** *CPR 1364-1367*, p. 50. **1367:** *CPR 1364-1367*, pp. 387, 391, 415, 416, 396; *CPR 1367-1370*, p. 36.

of request.<sup>56</sup> Most of these queens' letters were written to the chancellor. Two exceptions exist from Margaret's time as consort when she forwarded a petition to the king instead of the chancellor. However, in both these letters, Edward I's children Edward and Mary requested that Margaret petition the king, indicating that the matter required the king's attention.<sup>57</sup> One of these letters forwarded a petition from the abbot of Vale Royal. Edward I had founded this abbey, which may explain why it was necessary for Margaret to direct this petition directly to the king.<sup>58</sup> Despite founding it, Edward appears to have lost interest in the Cistercians towards the end of the reign so perhaps that is why they appealed to Margaret instead of directly to him as the founder.

However, most of these queens' letters were written to the chancellor. In one such letter to John Sandal, Edward II's chancellor from 1314 to 1318, Isabella enclosed a petition directed to her from the abbot and convent of Rufford, in which the abbot begs her to ask the chancellor to grant them an appeal to the Roman curia.<sup>59</sup> In another letter Isabella asked Robert Baldock, chancellor from 1323 to 1326, to consider an enclosed petition, now lost, from a Thomas Daverset and his wife Agnes.<sup>60</sup> Philippa also wrote to Henry Cliff, keeper of the chancery rolls, in order to secure John Baliouse's release from Newgate prison, indicating that there were several officials representing the king to whom the queen could turn in order to secure successful acts of intercession.<sup>61</sup>

If the queen wanted to secure a favour from the king, she most likely appealed to their relationship as husband and wife using behind-the-scenes influence. However, how

---

<sup>56</sup> Margaret of France: TNA, SC 1/25/198, 199, 200, 202, 203, 204; TNA, SC 1/27/96; TNA, SC 1/28/27, 86, 87; TNA, SC 1/60/123. Isabella of France: TNA, SC 1/35/62, 63, 111, 151, 152; TNA, SC 1/36/10, 11 39, 72, 73; TNA, SC 1/37/9, 12, 36, 45, 53. Philippa of Hainault: TNA, SC 1/ 36/107; TNA, SC 1/39/164, 175; TNA, SC 1/40/30, 137; TNA, SC 1/41/82, 86; TNA, SC 1/56/26, 50.

<sup>57</sup> TNA, SC 1/19/112a; TNA, SC 1/14/112.

<sup>58</sup> A. P. Baggs, Ann J Kettle, S. J. Lander, A. T. Thacker, David Wardle *A History of the County of Chester: Volume 3*, in C R Elrington, B E Harris (ed.), *Victoria County History* (London, 1980), pp. 156-65; Jeffrey Denton, 'From the Foundation of Vale Royal Abbey to the Statute of Carlisle: Edward I and Ecclesiastical Patronage', in Peter Coss and S.D. Lloyd, (eds.), *Thirteenth-century England IV* (Woodbridge, 1992), pp. 123-37.

<sup>59</sup> TNA, SC 8/35/151; TNA, SC 8/37/58.

<sup>60</sup> TNA, SC 8/36/39.

<sup>61</sup> TNA, SC1/36/107; J. A. Hamilton, 'Cliffe, Henry (c.1280–1334)', rev. Roy Martin Haines, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5640>, accessed 2 May 2007].

much authority versus influence did she have when writing to the chancellor and other men affiliated with the crown? Was a letter from the queen an authoritative command that the chancellor must carry out, or merely a request, based on influence, which he could consider and then accept or refuse? This question is difficult to answer because there are few surviving petitions that can be traced all the way through to a chancery instrument. However, by examining the internal evidence of the letters some conclusions can be made.

The language of the queen's petitions to the crown indicates both the fine line a woman with power and authority had to negotiate, and the difficulty for the historian trying to ascertain just how much power or authority the queen possessed. The tone of the queens' letters tend to be submissive; the queen always used asking verbs, especially *vous prions*, when she wrote to the chancellor. The queen very rarely commanded the chancellor. Though she presents herself as asking for these favours, the subservient language of the letters may simply be formulaic and a letter from the queen to the chancellor might actually carry much more authority than a cursory reading would allow. John Carmi Parsons points out that because the queen's role as an intercessor meant that the noble petitioner must acknowledge his inferiority to her, the queen was often portrayed as submissive during acts of intercession to ease any anxiety a male noble might have had about petitioning a woman.<sup>62</sup> In the case of these letters, the queen might be making use of this device to reaffirm her subjection to the king and crown.

However, in his study of royal correspondence, Pierre Chaplais demonstrates that the king's title came first when he was writing to an inferior, and that English royal clerks observed this diplomatic practice fairly consistently in letters issued under all seals.<sup>63</sup> In the queens' letters their title usually comes before that of the chancellor, implying her superiority and undermining the potentially submissive quality of the language of her letter. To the chancellor these letters might have been more indicative of a command than a request. If this is so, then the queen had some measure of jurisdiction over government business. The language in one of Margaret of France's letters to Edward I contains an unusual turn of phrase which embodies this unique paradox of

---

<sup>62</sup> Parsons, 'The Queen's Intercession', pp. 158-159.

<sup>63</sup> Pierre Chaplais, *English Diplomatic Practice in the Middle Ages* (London, 2003), pp. 102-103.

submissiveness and assertiveness. When Margaret asked Edward to grant her a favour she used *vous nous prions et mandons*, which translates as ‘we beg you and we command you’.<sup>64</sup> She also sometimes uses this word of command when petitioning the chancellor.<sup>65</sup> It is rare to see anyone other than the king address the chancellor with *mandons*. Of course the queen could not literally command the king to do something, but as we do not see this in Philippa’s letters it might signal a greater partnership between Edward I and Margaret than the other two queens enjoyed with their respective husbands. A similar word, *chargons*, occurs in a letter from Isabella to chancellor John Hotham in 1327. However, section 1.4 has demonstrated that Isabella used this word to remind Hotham of her special position of authority at that time.<sup>66</sup>

Studying the queens’ letters to the chancellor in isolation from the letters of noblemen might lead to the conclusion that the use of the phrase *nous prions* indicates that the queen was forced to maintain a submissive posture due to her gender. Instead, it demonstrates that she participated in the wider culture of petitioning and intercession. Anthony Musson has found examples of male members of the landed elite acting as intercessors in much the same way as the queen.<sup>67</sup> This study has found a similar use of words and phrases such as *nous vous prions* (‘we ask you’) and *par l’amour de nous* (‘for the love of us’) in letters from noblemen making a request to the chancellor; for example, letters from John of Brittany, earl of Richmond, Thomas, earl of Lancaster, and Humphrey de Bohun, earl of Hereford and Essex all contain these phrases.<sup>68</sup> Other letters from members of the male landed elite do not contain the phrase *par l’amour de nous* but they do contain *vous prions* whenever they are asking the chancellor for something.<sup>69</sup> Letters from noblemen used by Bertie Wilkinson in his study of the chancery also have a submissive quality to their language (though Wilkinson does not discuss them in the context of language).<sup>70</sup> This reveals that such supplication in these

---

<sup>64</sup> TNA, SC 1/28/86.

<sup>65</sup> TNA, SC 1/25/198, 201; TNA, SC 1/27/97; TNA, SC 1/28/86, 87.

<sup>66</sup> TNA, SC 1/35/187; see section 1.4.

<sup>67</sup> Musson, ‘Queenship, Lordship and Petitioning in Late Medieval England’, pp. 161-62.

<sup>68</sup> TNA, SC 1/35/88, 119, 155.

<sup>69</sup> TNA, SC 1/35/93, 162.

<sup>70</sup> Bertie Wilkinson, ‘The Chancery’, in W.A. Morris (ed.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336*

letters is merely a result of the language of intercession in general and not connected with the gender of the queen. The noblemen also place the address first, preceding their own titles, demonstrating their inferior position to the chancellor. The practice of placing their names second to the chancellor reinforces the conclusions that because the queen's title occurs first, she was superior in rank to the chancellor. It may also indicate that she was of a higher status than many noblemen. In this way we are able to see that when the queen was not in touch with the king, she could still approach the crown through the chancellor.

A more extensive and detailed examination of letters of supplication to the crown is necessary to truly understand the queen's role in these petitions to the chancellor. However, the exploratory study conducted above provides us with even further evidence to support the conclusion that Margaret's lack of physical proximity to her husband did not hinder her ability to act as an intercessor, and Gaveston was not a threat to Isabella's access to the king. Hugh Despenser on the other hand was a greater barrier between Isabella and the king than Gaveston because Isabella's acts decline to zero by 1321 and remain so until 1327. In the case of Philippa, it has been concluded above that after 1330 Isabella did not affect Philippa's access to the king by directly monopolizing access to Edward III. Even after Isabella's reinstatement into court life, she remained equally as active as Philippa. In addition, after Isabella's death Philippa's acts of intercession did not increase. Nevertheless, Edward's position as the target of the manipulations of Isabella and Mortimer from 1326 to 1330 might have affected his receptiveness to his consort's intercessory acts. It could also be concluded that Philippa might not have possessed an inclination towards intercession, but it is unlikely that she would have ignored a duty that was ingrained into the office of queenship.

### **3.2 Perceptions of Influence**

While chancery evidence demonstrates whether or not the queen was successful as an intercessor, it does not present an accurate view of whether the queen was perceived as a viable route to the king and crown. How the queen was perceived could be very different from what she actually did. Perception is very important because it is closely tied to the queen's image and power. Chapter two has demonstrated that medieval

---

(3 vols, The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1930-1940), vol. 1 pp. 203-204.

queens were expected to act as intercessors. This expectation provided the queen with symbolic or ascribed power. By her very nature of being queen, people perceived her to be a powerful intercessor and sought her help. Consequently, even if a queen was not initially a successful intercessor, as long as people perceived her as one, they would still seek her aid. She would then be able to manipulate those requests into actual profitable intercessions and extend her network of influence. This would expand her symbolic capital. Of course, the queen needed to maintain that image to gain any power from it, creating a symbiotic relationship between actual practice and perception. When the queen actively exploited intercession and continued to secure favours from the king and crown, this power became achieved power, and in return reinforced perceptions that she was an available avenue to the king. On the other hand, if a queen was perceived as too powerful she could incur criticism. The perception of the queen's intercession may or may not coincide with how the queen actually operated as an intercessor as born out by chancery evidence. This section will present some examples of the types of people who perceived the queen as a viable route to the king. It will also examine how the queen's intercession was perceived and portrayed.

It is important to know who the queen interceded for because from this information a clear picture of the scope of her influence begins to develop. Instruments of the chancery were issued at the behest of all three queens for pardons, grants, appointments, licences, protections and exemptions to people who may have come from middling stations such as merchants, her household members, religious institutions, urban dwellers, and occasionally members of the nobility. Religious houses often petitioned the queen for aid; for example, Margaret of France wrote a letter to Edward I, discussed above, on behalf of the abbot of Vale Royal.<sup>71</sup> The original petition to the queen is lost, but it appears that Prince Edward asked her to approach the king regarding the matter, indicating that at least the prince (and probably the abbot) saw her as possessing influence over the king.<sup>72</sup> Margaret also interceded on behalf of the archbishop of Rouen, and the chancellor of Scotland as well as for members of the

---

<sup>71</sup> Margaret: TNA, SC 1/14/112, SC 1/25/199, 202; TNA, SC 1/28/27; TNA, SC 1/ 27/96; TNA, SC1/30/163. Philippa: TNA, SC 1/39/175; TNA, SC 1/40/137; TNA, SC 1/56/50. Isabella: TNA, SC 1/35/63, 151; TNA, SC 1/36/10; TNA, SC 1/38/190, 91, 195, 155; TNA, SC 1/ 36/201, 37, 58; TNA, SC 1/31/131, 37, 9.

<sup>72</sup>TNA, SC 1/14/112.



lower gentry, such as the king's yeoman.<sup>73</sup> She also engaged in joint intercession with family members more often than the other two queens. Grants were issued at the behest of Margaret and her mother, Mary of Brabant, the dowager queen of France, and grants and appointments were issued at the request of Margaret and her step children.<sup>74</sup> In 1319, Isabella sent a letter on behalf of Philip de Melton requesting that the Aldermen of London uphold the king's appointment of Philip to the office of Mace-bearer and Crier of the Guildhall, which was being ignored.<sup>75</sup> It is not clear if Philip or the king requested Isabella to send the letter, though the letter is endorsed: *coram rege*. Whoever requested the letter felt that Isabella's intervention would reinforce the king's appointment. Either Isabella's position as queen or a unique influence she had with the urban officials in London, or a combination of both, might have inspired the request for her letters. Despite this perceived influence, the king's writ and Isabella's letters were still being ignored in 1320.<sup>76</sup>

The queen was also approached to secure appointments and grants for people in her household.<sup>77</sup> In 1306 Margaret of France wrote to the chancellor requesting the presentation of John Langdon to the church of Heyford Warren.<sup>78</sup> Margaret wrote that she was promoting the brother of her clerk, Robert Langdon, providing an example of the influence gained by virtue of working in the queen's household. Robert probably went to the queen on behalf of his brother and she then went to the chancellor to secure the position. Surviving letters written to and by Isabella of France demonstrate that she was still viewed as a path to the king after the rise of Hugh Despenser, even though chancery evidence shows us that she was not actually very successful as an intercessor at this time. In 1322, Joan de Knoville addressed a petition directly to the queen asking her to intercede with the king for the release of her husband, Bogo de Knoville,

---

<sup>73</sup> *CCR 1296-1302* p. 343; *CPR 1292-1301*, p. 513; *CPR 1301-1307*, p. 120.

<sup>74</sup> *CPR 1292-1301*, p. 538; *CCR 1296-1302*, pp. 4, 14; *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 37, 96, 336.

<sup>75</sup> TNA, SC 8/86/4290; TNA SC 8/86/4290.

<sup>76</sup> TNA, SC 8/86/2487.

<sup>77</sup> Margaret: TNA, SC 1/19/112a, TNA, SC 1/25/200; TNA, SC 1/48/14; TNA, SC 1/27/97. Philippa: TNA, SC 1/39/33; TNA, SC 1/40/30; TNA, SC 1/41/86; TNA, SC 1/56/26. Isabella: TNA, SC 1/31/131; TNA, SC 1/35/64; TNA, SC 1/35/153.

<sup>78</sup> TNA, SC 1/25/200.

imprisoned in York Castle.<sup>79</sup> Though Isabella's success is unknown, the petition demonstrates that Isabella was viewed as possessing influence over the king as late as 1322. It also provides another example of the practice of female networking.

Based on the number of extant letters and petitions written to and by Philippa, she seems to have been approached as often as Margaret of France and Isabella, though her record of successful intercessions were far lower in number. However, such quantitative conclusions are always limited by the possibility of lost documents; for example, more letters survive for Isabella than the other queens, but it is possible that more existed at one point for Margaret and Philippa. Nevertheless, the same types of people seem to have approached Philippa. She also interceded for those with whom she had a special connection. The Van Arteveldes, a family of prominent Flemish merchants, took advantage of the fact that Philippa was a native of the Low Countries. Three times they asked her, as well as an unnamed 'lord', to intervene when their ships and goods were arrested in ports of England.<sup>80</sup> Philippa often interceded on behalf of the scholars of Oxford on account of Robert Inglefield's foundation of Queen's Hall, Oxford in her name.<sup>81</sup>

This study will examine the frequency of requests made to the queens by women in order to establish if medieval women identified themselves in a group held together by common experiences.<sup>82</sup> Women might have sought out the queen and the queen might have been particularly compassionate towards the plight of other women because they could empathize with each other. However, from the surviving chancery evidence it is difficult to conclude that any of these three queens were particularly sympathetic to female petitioners. All three have a similar ratio of successful acts of intercession on behalf of females, which falls far below that of acts on behalf of males. In the eight years that Margaret was consort there are seven successful acts of intercession recorded in the chancery on behalf of women out of fifty-five total acts of intercession. Isabella was Edward II's consort for eighteen years and only thirteen out of seventy-nine acts were on behalf of women. Philippa acted successfully on behalf of women only fourteen

---

<sup>79</sup> TNA, SC 8/55/2731.

<sup>80</sup> TNA, SC 1/56/57, 62, 63.

<sup>81</sup> *CPR 1340-1343*, pp. 73, 249; *CPR 1343-1345*, pp. 103, 239-40.

<sup>82</sup> See section 1.2.

times out of seventy-six acts of intercession over forty-two years.<sup>83</sup> None of the three queens interceded in significant numbers for pardons for female murderers, each securing only two pardons for homicide.<sup>84</sup> Isabella was more active in securing grants and licenses for women, and both Margaret and Isabella secured pardons on behalf of only one woman for criminal actions not related to murder.

Though chancery evidence demonstrates that the queen did not necessarily become involved in cases concerning women, there is some evidence that women believed it was more likely that their requests would be granted if they approached the queen, rather than a male intercessor.<sup>85</sup> There is some evidence of a later queen involved in female networking, and this study builds upon that evidence.<sup>86</sup> One example of female networking exists between Isabella and Eleanor Despenser in 1323. Two virtually identical letters survive, one from Isabella and one from Eleanor Despenser to William Norwich, lieutenant of the king's treasurer, requesting an increase in the amount of money for the upkeep of Joan Mortimer, held prisoner in the Tower of London.<sup>87</sup> These letters indicate that there was a correspondence between these three women, with Joan writing to either Isabella or Eleanor, or possibly to both, and then correspondence between Isabella and Eleanor beseeching the other to help. Both letters were written on the same day at the Tower of London where Joan was being held. The power hierarchy here is interesting because we do not know who was written to first and

---

<sup>83</sup> Margaret: *CCR 1296-1302*, pp. 286, 368; *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 60, 163, 378, 532; *CCR 1302-1307*, p. 258. Isabella: *CPR 1307-1313*, pp. 177, 349, 378, 570; *CPR 1313-1317*, pp. 20, 119, 131, 223, 254, 611; *CPR 1317-1321*, pp. 25, 122. Philippa: *CPR 1330-1334*, pp. 84, 222, 408, 415, 425, 486; *CPR 1338-1340*, pp. 57, 90, 316; *CPR 1343-1345*, p. 549; *CPR 1361-1364*, p. 392; *CPR 1364-1367*, pp. 387, 415; *CPR 1367-1369*, p. 6.

<sup>84</sup> Margaret: *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 60, 378. Isabella: *CPR 1307-1313*, pp. 349, 570. Philippa: *CPR 1338-1340*, pp. 90, 316.

<sup>85</sup> It would be fruitful to examine how often women approached the male magnates with requests, but that falls outside the scope of this study, which focuses specifically on queenship.

<sup>86</sup> Helen Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou: Queenship in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 60-62. In her study of Margaret of Anjou, Helen Maurer notes similar 'female networking' occurring between the queen and various female members of the nobility, in which she argues that 'it would be a mistake to argue that women were not, as a group, politically disabled or that their ability to function as independent participants in public life was not severely limited' but 'while letters, petition and warrants could always be set aside at least temporarily, even when they came from the king, the attentions of one's wife might have been harder to ignore.'

<sup>87</sup> TNA SC 1/37/45; TNA SC 1/37/4.

who felt that she needed the other woman's help. Did Isabella feel that her power was waning and that Eleanor, as the wife of the king's favourite, had more access to power through her husband? Or was it the other way around? What can be seen from these letters is that Isabella was still thought to be a woman with enough power to help the wife of one of the king's enemies. Perhaps as a woman, Joan felt that Eleanor and/or Isabella would be most sympathetic to her plight, even though Joan's husband had fought on the opposing side in the civil war of 1321-22.<sup>88</sup>

There are two examples of Margaret of France taking part in female networking. Margaret and her mother, Mary of Brabant, had a special relationship with the abbey of Caen. A letter survives in which the abbot of Saint Michael's Mount begs the queen to allow Roger of Canterbury to receive the attorneys of the abbess of Caen, claiming that the same was asked by the queen of France in previous letters. The letter is endorsed at the instance of the queen.<sup>89</sup> Margaret and her mother also secured a monetary grant for the abbess of Caen in a joint intercession recorded in the chancery.<sup>90</sup> A second petition occurred in 1306 when Alice de Chastel wrote a letter to Margaret asking her to write to the treasurer and barons of the exchequer to allow the tallies and acquittances of William de Chastel, the late sheriff of Leicester and Warwickshire, and her late husband.<sup>91</sup> Alice believed that the queen had a particularly sensitive ear to her appeal because she had unsuccessfully sued before regarding the matter. She must have felt that her next recourse of action was to take her petition to the queen.

It is difficult to conclude that queens prioritized female petitioners over male petitioners because the successful acts of intercession for males far outweighs those for females.<sup>92</sup> Several external factors affect conclusions based on these numbers. The

---

<sup>88</sup> These letters may also be indicative of a shift in the dynamics within Isabella's household. Section 4.1 has mentioned that Eleanor Despenser was a member of Isabella's household long before the 1320s, so she was not put in the household solely to act as a spy, but it is possible that her husband Hugh Despenser took advantage of her place there. The rumors of the affair between Eleanor and Edward II, are probably fictional, but the stories may have derived from a possible power struggle within Isabella's household during this period.

<sup>89</sup> TNA, SC 1/30/163.

<sup>90</sup> *CPR 1301-1307*, p. 60.

<sup>91</sup> TNA, SC 8/39/1904.

<sup>92</sup> Allocco claims that women especially benefited from Isabella's intercession. Allocco, 'The Political Life of Isabella of France', p. 115.

chancery instruments only represent successful acts of intercession; the queens could have written more letters (now lost) on behalf of women and failed, though only a few of the existing letters and petitions reflect this possibility. In general, there almost certainly would have been more male petitioners overall so that even if the queen did prioritize female petitioners, the chancery rolls would not demonstrate this trend. However, from the surviving evidence it must be concluded that queens did not favour female petitioners, even if at times they did take part in female networking. From an analysis of the type of people the queen interceded for, we can see that her sphere of influence was wide-reaching. People of many different levels of society looked to Margaret, Isabella and Philippa as a path to the king and crown. Allocco argues that Isabella's choice of petitions reflected her knowledge of the justice system in England and a desire to help reform that system.<sup>93</sup> By placing Isabella in context of both Margaret and Philippa, we can see that these types of intercessions were typical of the queen. Isabella was not atypical in her knowledge of the justice system, but there is no evidence that Isabella had a grander scheme of reforming that system. She was simply acting as previous queens had and subsequent queens would continue to act.

Both Isabella and Philippa were represented as intercessors in major political events during their husbands' reigns. The major sources for these events are chronicles, which means that the queens were perceived by the chroniclers as influential with the king and nobility. As was highlighted in chapter two, the chroniclers must be viewed cautiously as authors often had their own agendas, may have received information second hand, and were sometimes not writing contemporaneously with the events they described. They may also have been placing Isabella and Philippa into the common role of intercessor. This role often contained elements of dramatic gesture on the part of the queen persuading the king to act when no one else could. It is often difficult to determine the level of fiction attributed to these descriptions, as they cannot often be verified by other sources. This does not necessarily mean that the events described did not take place, as chronicles would be the only type of document where one would find a full account of these events. Therefore, this study will examine chronicles both as expressions of a perception of queenly behaviour, and as historical accounts. It is important to note that the chronicles, if historically accurate, provide an important

---

<sup>93</sup> Allocco, 'The Political Life of Isabella of France' pp. 132-143.

insight into the movements of the queen or, if not historically accurate, at least what was perceived as being important.

Thus far, this chapter has concentrated on times when the queen secured favours from the king for his subjects. Another type of intercession can be termed mediation, and this can occur when the queen arbitrates in a dispute between the king and his barons or acts as an ambassador to foreign kingdoms. Isabella acted as a mediator in several political crises: she was purported to have mediated between the barons and Edward during the conflict with the barons after Gaveston's murder; leading up to the Treaty of Leake and preceding Despenser's exile. Previously, these incidents were only noted by a few scholars, but none of them give more than a passing glance to them.<sup>94</sup> Evidence for Isabella's mediation after Gaveston's death comes from the *Saint Albans Chronicle*.<sup>95</sup> Her alleged participation in the negotiations leading up to the Treaty of Leake was derived from accounts in the Trivet continuation and the *Vita Edwardi Secundi*, and her involvement in securing Despenser's exile is found in the *Annales Paulini*.<sup>96</sup> Gransden dates these chronicles as contemporary with the events they recount, which may lend some credibility to their account of Isabella's mediation.<sup>97</sup>

Many aspects of the chroniclers' narratives can be verified elsewhere adding to the reliability of the chronicles on the whole, but there is no substantial external evidence to verify any of the accounts of Isabella's mediation on behalf of Edward with the barons. There is evidence to show that Isabella corresponded with the magnates and other great

---

<sup>94</sup> Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster*, p. 226; T.F. Tout, *The Place in the Reign of Edward II* (Manchester, 1936), p. 27; Doherty, 'Queen Isabella', p. 49; Menache, 'Isabelle of France', p. 108.

<sup>95</sup> Trokelowe, *Chronica Et Annales*, p. 80-81.

<sup>96</sup> Childs (trans, ed.) *Vita Edwardi Secundi*, pp. 152-153; William Stubbs (ed.), *Annales Paulini, Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, Rolls Series, 76 (2 vols, London, 1965), vol. 1, p. 297.

<sup>97</sup> Some passages in the *Saint Albans Chronicle*, including the one concerning the mediation, may be derived from first hand knowledge because the papal envoys sent to aid in the mediation stayed at St. Albans. Gransden claims that the Trivet continuation 'has little merit as a piece of historical writing', but she also claims that from internal evidence backed up by external evidence, the writer may have had a close informant at court. Much in the *Vita* has been confirmed by other sources, and Childs believes that the author was too politically aware and informed to be far from the centre of court. There is some debate about the historicity of the *Annales Paulini*. Gransden cites a few examples of stories that may have truth to them, but Richardson presents a harsh view of the accuracy of the *Annales Paulini* from 1307 to 1308. Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing*, (2 vols, London, 1974), vol. 2, pp. 2-3, 6, 8-9, 22, 25-29; H.G. Richardsen, 'Annales Paulini', *Speculum*, 23 (1948), pp. 630-638; Childs (trans, ed.), *Vita Edwardi Secundi*, pp. xxxi-xxxii; lvii.

men of the realm. From household books and accounts of the keeper of her wardrobe, William de Bouden, from 1311 to 1312 and from 1313 to 1316, there is evidence of correspondence with the earl of Warenne, the earl of Hereford, earl of Lancaster, the king of France and 'other French magnates', William Melton, Hugh Despenser, the elder Roger Mortimer, Louis of France and the archbishops of Canterbury and York.<sup>98</sup> Unfortunately, none of the recorded correspondence occurs around any of the supposed negotiations, except for letters to her uncle, Louis of France.<sup>99</sup> Isabella sent letters to her uncle at Dover in October of 1313, and the *Annales Paulini* place him as one of the envoys sent by the King of France to negotiate between Edward and the barons after Gaveston's death.<sup>100</sup> It is possible that their correspondence may have had something to do with his mission to England. Even if these communications do not substantiate the stories of these specific mediations, they do indicate that Isabella had a history of dialogue with important men in France and England.

The texts do not ascribe much motivation to the queen or give much detail explaining why the authors might include her in their accounts. The task of this section is to tease out the function of the queen's intercession in the texts. The description in the *Annales Paulini* of Isabella's involvement in Hugh Despenser's exile is brief. It only tells the reader that 'even the lady Isabella, queen of England, bowing on her knee, interceded for the common people and telling the king about the petitions of the lords and barons.'<sup>101</sup> Likewise, the *Vita*'s description of Isabella's part in the negotiation of the Treaty of Leake is very concise: 'the agreement between Edward and Lancaster was achieved at the request of the lady queen, the earl of Hereford, and other nobles whom the earl of Lancaster accounted faithful to him.'<sup>102</sup> The author of the *Saint Albans Chronicle* provides slightly more detail regarding Isabella's motivations. He claims that after Piers Gaveston's death the queen, in whose hands the hearts of the people of

---

<sup>98</sup> Blackley (ed.) *The Household Book of Queen Isabella*, pp. 206-07, 208-209, 210-11, 214-213, 218-219; TNA, E 101/375/9 fols, 33, 33v, 34; TNA, E 101/375/19; TNA, E 101/376/20.

<sup>99</sup> Allocco, 'The Political Career of Isabella of France', p. 123. Allocco uses the references to these letters between Isabella and the barons to claim that she was involved in the writing of the Ordinances. However, as we do not know the content of these letters, the claim is weak.

<sup>100</sup> Stubbs (ed.), 'Annales Paulini', p. 272; TNA, E 101/375/9.

<sup>101</sup> Stubbs (ed.), 'Annales Paulini', p. 297: *domina etiam Isabella regina Angliae pro populo genu fectendo orante, interim deprecabantur et praedicabant domino regi quod ipse petitiones et statua comitum et baronum.* (my translation).

<sup>102</sup> Childs (trans, ed.), *Vita Edwardi Secundi*, pp. 152-153.

England existed, not wanting any more destruction, mediated with the earl of Gloucester, the bishops and the prelates. The earls, along with Isabella, confronted the king in the hall of Westminster, in full Parliament.<sup>103</sup> It is revealing that in both the *Saint Albans Chronicle* and the *Annales Paulini* Isabella is shown as acting on behalf of the people. This indicates that medieval chroniclers believed that the queen should look after the 'people', and that this duty was connected with keeping peace in the realm.

If these accounts are historically accurate, then we can arrive at some conclusions about how Isabella actually practised intercession, and also how the barons and Edward used her power as an intercessor. Queens were often seen as peacemakers and it would have been in Isabella's best interest for Edward to keep peace with the barons. Isabella enjoyed access to the king and was able to perform her duty as intercessor. In the event of a disruption in Edward's authority or worse, his capture or death, Isabella's position of power would also be compromised. A queen without a king was in a vulnerable position. If these accounts are factual, Isabella was protecting her source of power: the king. In order to act as a mediator she had to be trusted and viewed as having power by both sides. Since Isabella is depicted as a successful mediator in these accounts, she increased her symbolic capital because her success was remembered and she was successively called upon. Even if these mediations are not based in fact, they still generally connect the office of queen with the role of peacemaker. The authors automatically place Isabella into the role of mediator because it was expected and implicit in queenship. Chris Given-Wilson has argued that one way in which chroniclers understood 'truth' was the extent to which their history corresponded to other comparable truths.<sup>104</sup> Since intercession was categorically expected of the queen, the

---

<sup>103</sup> Trokelowe, *Chronica Et Annales*, pp. 80-81: *Tandem, disponente Deo in cujus manu corda principum existent populum Anglicanum in tot calamitatibus diutius fluctuare nolente mediante etiam Regina una cum comite Gloverniae et Episcopis, praelibatis, rancor eorum sub tali forma mitigates est; videlicet, quod ipsi Comites, cum suis complicibus in Aula Westmonesterii in pleno Parlamento venire deberent et se Domino Regi humilare, ac de his in quibus ipsum offenderant, veniam postulare.* (my translation).

Isabella is not recorded on what remains of the parliament roll for 20 August - 16 December 1312, 18 March - 19 May 1313, 8 July - 25 July 1313, 23 September - 15 November 1313: Seymour Phillips 'Edward II: Parliaments of August 1312, March, July, September 1313, Text and Translation', in *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England*, ed. C. Given-Wilson et al., Internet version, at <http://www.sd-editions.com/PROME>, accessed on 9 March 2009. Scholarly Digital Editions, Leicester: 2005; Seymour Phillips 'Edward II: Parliaments of August 1312, March, July, September 1313 Introduction', in *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England*, ed. C. Given-Wilson et al. Internet version, at <http://www.sd-editions.com/PROME>, accessed on 9 March 2009. Scholarly Digital Editions, Leicester: 2005.

<sup>104</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London, 2004), p. 3.



chroniclers did not have any qualms about representing Isabella as a mediator in these events, even if she was not historically present.

Froissart exemplifies the automatic classification of queens by chroniclers. He places Philippa of Hainault in the role of intercessor at the famous siege of Calais in 1346-1347. After Edward had refused to release the burghers of Calais, at the request of his men a pregnant Philippa threw herself at his feet begging for the burghers' lives. Edward responds 'I wish you had been anywhere else than here: you have entreated in such a manner that I cannot refuse you; I therefore give them to you, to do as you please with them'.<sup>105</sup> Several scholars have analyzed this story from both a literary and a historical perspective, most notably Paul Strohm and John Carmi Parsons. Strohm comments that her pregnancy, her submissiveness and her place on the margins all give her a sense of authority, and both Strohm and Parsons note that she serves as a device which allows Edward to change his mind.<sup>106</sup> Parsons goes so far as to challenge the historical accuracy of the scene, calculating that Philippa could not possibly have been in the late stages of pregnancy at this time.<sup>107</sup> Thus, Froissart certainly places Philippa within the common trope of submissive intercessor, reaffirming the idea that medieval society perceived Philippa in this way even if she was not in practice a frequent intercessor. The fact that Philippa was Froissart's patron may explain her appearance in this scene. For Philippa, creating the image of a powerful intercessor was important for increasing her symbolic capital.

The *Historiae Dunelmensis* describes an act of intercession on the part of Isabella, which demonstrates the fine line a queen had to negotiate between accepted power and excessive power. Unlike the submissive portrayal of Philippa in Froissart, Isabella is presented as aggressive in the *Historiae*. Isabella begs the king to support her candidate,

---

<sup>105</sup> Lettenhove, *Oeuvres*, vol. 5, p. 215.

<sup>106</sup> Parsons, 'The Pregnant Queen', p. 53; Paul Strohm, 'Queens as Intercessors' in *Hochon's Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts* (Princeton, 1992), pp. 102-103. W.M. Ormrod notes a similar use of the queen to explain a change in the crown's policy towards the rebels involved in the Peasant's Revolt of 1381. A general amnesty, with a few exceptions, was issued by the crown at the insistence of the new queen, Anne of Bohemia. Anne had not yet married Richard II, and so her name on the pardon was merely symbolic, allowing the crown to justify the change in its policy: W.M. Ormrod, 'In Bed with Joan of Kent: the King's Mother and the Peasants Revolt of 1381', in Jocelyn Wogan-Browne (ed.), *Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts in Late Medieval Britain. Essays for Felicity Riddy* (Turnhout, 2000), pp. 288-29.

<sup>107</sup> Parsons, 'The Pregnant Queen', pp. 40-41.

Louis de Beaumont, for an appointment to the bishopric of Durham over his own candidate, Thomas Carleton, keeper of the secret seal, and over the various candidates of the other Earls.<sup>108</sup> Here she is not presented as swooping in from the sidelines and falling to her knees as Philippa is portrayed in Froissart. Instead, Isabella is described as asking the king so insistently so as to induce him to change his allegiance from Thomas Carleton to Louis de Beaumont. She says to him: 'If you love me you will act so that my kinsman Louis de Beaumont will be Bishop of Durham' and 'the king was so conquered by her prayers that he wrote to the curia on behalf of Louis'.<sup>109</sup>

This demonstrates a significant political triumph for Isabella, because the Beaumonts had come under attack from Lancaster and the other lords ordainer in the Ordinances of 1311 for holding too much influence over the king. The appointment of Louis de Beaumont to the bishopric of Durham shows that by 1317 the Beaumonts were once again part of what has been deemed the 'court party'.<sup>110</sup> Any support Edward showed for the Beaumonts would antagonize Lancaster, the king's greatest adversary. Louis and his brother Henry de Beaumont were captured on their way to Louis' consecration, a plot that has been attributed to Lancaster himself.<sup>111</sup> Either Edward II was in total disregard for the opinion of the other nobles, or he was making an overt political statement that he would continue to support the Beaumonts against Lancaster. In making this statement, he allowed Isabella's influence over him to be the cause of his turn around, and in doing so she becomes the scapegoat. Edward is described as having been *incantatus per Regina*, 'enchanted by the queen', evoking the negative stereotypes of queens with too much power.

Influence and intercession were expected duties, but only if the queen exercised them on behalf of someone else and did so in a manner that acknowledged the king's

---

<sup>108</sup> James Raine (ed.), *Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres, Gaufridus Coldingham, Robertus de Graystynes, et Willielmus de Chambre*, Surtees Society, 9 (London, 1839), p. 98.

<sup>109</sup> Raine, *Historiae Dunelmensis*, p. 98: '*pro quo ita instanter rogavit... dicens ; Domine, nunquam rogavi pro aliquot de meis. Si diligitis me, agates ut consanguineus meus Ludowicus de Bello Monte sit Episcopus Dunelmensis.*' *Rex igitur, victus [eius] precibus, electrum admittere recusavit; et pro Ludowico curiae scripsist*'.

<sup>110</sup> Linda Mitchell, *Portraits of Medieval Women: Family Marriage and Politics in England, 1225-1350* (New York, 2003), p. 99. Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster*, pp. 165, 193, 196, 200, 203, 205-206, 212, 337, 299.

<sup>111</sup> Haines, *Edward II*, p. 107.

authority. Anyone who was unhappy with the king's decisions could easily lay the blame at the queen's door, accusing her of possessing too much influence.<sup>112</sup> Several queens were accused of undue influence. Both Eleanor of Provence and Elizabeth Woodville were blamed for the king's favouritism of their families.<sup>113</sup> Howell argues that William of Savoy gained Henry III's patronage through his own influence and abilities, but Eleanor of Provence was blamed by those who suffered from Henry's relationship with William.<sup>114</sup> Historians have debated the extent to which the Woodvilles actually dominated Edward IV's court. What can be concluded is that some contemporaries, particularly Warwick, viewed the Woodvilles, and by extension the queen, as competition for influence over the king.<sup>115</sup> Margaret of Anjou served as a scapegoat when a peace between England and France (which her marriage to Henry VI was supposed to secure) failed.<sup>116</sup> Eleanor of Castile was accused of causing Edward I to rule harshly perhaps as a result of her failure to conform to positions of humility and subservience when interceding.<sup>117</sup> John Carmi Parsons argues that Edward I may have manipulated this fine line between acceptable power and excessive power. According to Parsons it is possible that Edward assigned the Jewish debts to Eleanor so that he could augment his own demesne without incurring criticism himself.<sup>118</sup>

In contrast to the negative portrayal of Isabella in the *Historiae Dunelmensis*, the *Annales Paulini* contains an account of Isabella's mediation, which mirrors the submissive account of Philippa in Froissart. The contrary depictions of Isabella in these two chronicles reflect the contrasting perceptions of queenly intercession in the Middle

---

<sup>112</sup> Parsons, 'The Queen's Intercession', pp. 158-159.

<sup>113</sup> Charles Ross, *Edward IV* (London, 1974), p. 99; Howell, *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 25-26.

<sup>114</sup> Howell, *Eleanor of Provence*, pp. 25-26.

<sup>115</sup> Jonanna Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 193-195: Laynesmith gives a thorough historiography of historians' views on the Woodvilles, mainly those of Ramsay, Ross, Lander, Griffiths, Hicks and Westervelt. Michael Hicks, *Warwick the Kingmaker* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 255-280: Michael Hicks demonstrates that the Woodville's influence at court was not the main cause of Warwick's break with Edward IV in 1467, but that they were one contributing factor.

<sup>116</sup> Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, pp. 26-29.

<sup>117</sup> John Carmi Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile: Queen and Society in Thirteenth-Century England* (New York, 1998), pp. 152-153.

<sup>118</sup> John Carmi Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile: Queen and Society in Thirteenth-Century England* (New York, 1998), pp. 152-153.

Ages. In the *Annales Paulini*'s account of the trial and exile of Hugh Despenser in 1321, the author recounts that when the earl of Pembroke, the earl of Richmond, the archbishops and the prelates mediated for peace between the king and Thomas of Lancaster, Isabella fell to her knees begging the king on behalf of the common people to hear the petitions of the earls and barons. The king yielded through the combined effort of the earls, archbishops, prelates and the queen.<sup>119</sup> The contrasting opinions of Isabella are not surprising, bearing in mind the authorship of the two chronicles. The candidates of Lancaster, Hereford and the monks of Durham were overlooked as a result of the king's support for Beaumont and considering that the *Historiae* was produced in Durham it is not surprising that Isabella would be cast in the role of the scapegoat. Scapegoating the queen allows the chronicler to censure the situation without directly criticising the king himself. The baronial opposition may have served as a source for the *Annales Paulini*'s account of Despenser's exile because the author may have used eyewitness testimony about the event from the barons staying around St. Paul's.<sup>120</sup> As a result, Isabella's participation in persuading the king to exile Despenser would have been viewed in a more positive light.

The queenly acts of intercession and mediation found in the chronicles certainly demonstrate that the queen was perceived as an intercessor by the authors of these works, and that they promoted this perception to their readers whether it was accurate or not. Isabella was perceived to have interceded between Edward and the barons on three occasions, and if in practice she did mediate between them, she was viewed as powerful by both Edward and the nobility. She acted to preserve stability in the kingdom, because her own power depended on Edward's ability to maintain his authority. Philippa, on the other hand, was simply placed into an already existing trope for queens by Froissart, perhaps to please the queen herself. However, the scene at Calais has had the effect of

---

<sup>119</sup> Stubbs, 'Annales Paulini', p. 297: *Sed Spiritus Sancti gratia interveniente, dominus Aldemarus de Valencia, comes de Penbrock, qui tunc noviter de transmarinis venit, et dominus Johannes de Britannia comes richemundiae, archiepiscopus et alii praelati, mediators pacis inter regem et comitem et barones; domina etiam isabella regina Angliae pro populo genu flectendo orante, interim deprecabantur, et praedicabant domino regi quod ipse petitiones et statua comitum et baroneum* (my translation).

<sup>120</sup> Gransden argues that the author probably gained his knowledge of the barons journey from Wales to Westminster from barons staying in the area and so it would not be unreasonable to believe that he received other information about the barons negotiations with Edward II. Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 29.

leading historians to assume that Philippa was in practice a great intercessor even though chancery evidence demonstrated otherwise.<sup>121</sup>

Popes Clement V, John XXII, Benedict XII, Clement VI, and Innocent VI, all perceived Philippa and Isabella as valuable sources of influence over the king. The pope asked Isabella and Philippa to intercede with the king for peace during the war between Scotland and England, during the war of St. Sardos and during the Hundred Years War.<sup>122</sup> John XXII begged Philippa to negotiate a reconciliation between Edward III and Isabella in 1330.<sup>123</sup> He thanked Philippa for her 'sympathy and consolation given to Queen Isabella', and begged her 'to aim at the restoration of that queen's good fame, which has been undeservedly injured'.<sup>124</sup> This request demonstrates several things: first, that Isabella's access to power was indeed damaged by her association with Mortimer and her actions during their regime; second, that Edward III was estranged from Isabella, or at least perceived as such by the pope; third, that John XXII believed that Philippa had been sympathetic to Isabella and that she had the power to aid in a reconciliation between Isabella and Edward. It is not apparent whether these two queens could actually carry out the pope's wishes. Nevertheless, the popes perceived these queens to be powerful intercessors. Whether this was because they were known to be in practice or because the queen was commonly seen in this light is difficult to ascertain. What is clear is that these queens possessed a great deal of symbolic power.

---

<sup>121</sup> The image of Philippa as a great intercessor and her role at Calais has been carried on into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: John Richard Green, *A Short History of the English People* (London, 1905), pp. 228-229; W. Worburton, *Edward III* (London, 1876), pp. 125-127; Rosemary Michell, 'The Red Queen and the White Queen: Exemplification of Medieval Queens in Nineteenth-century Britain', in Geoffrey Cubitt and Allen Warren (eds.), *Heroic Reputations and Exemplary Lives* (Manchester, 2000), pp. 157-176; Georgem Payne Ransford James, *A History of the Life of Edward, the Black Prince* (London, 1836), pp. 34-35; David Hume, *The History of England: from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution 1688* (Oxford, 1688), p. 392. These references were brought to my attention by Ms. Barbara Gribling.

<sup>122</sup> *Calendar of Papal Letters*, pp. 450, 457, 458, 462, 489, 511, 513; *Calendar of Papal Letters, 1342-1362*, pp. 20, 32, 45-50, 609, 620, 626.

<sup>123</sup> *Calendar of Papal Letters*, pp. 492, 498, 501.

<sup>124</sup> *Calendar of Papal Letters*, p. 501.

### 3.3 Manipulating Intercession

The previous sections have explored the extent to which Margaret, Isabella and Philippa actually put intercession into practise and how perceptions affected their power. The manipulation of intercession to empower the queen is a thread that runs throughout this study. This final section further examines the ways in which intercession could be manipulated by the queen and the king.

The queen could manipulate her role as intercessor to extend her power base by using intercession as a source of patronage. Patronage was an important source and demonstration of power for medieval queens. A queen had to be powerful enough to command the resources to extend her patronage and in extending patronage she could then enlarge her networks, which she could call upon if necessary. By securing appointments, grants and pardons, the queen could secure the loyalty of the people she helped. She could also increase the perceptions of her power as intercessor, which would in turn increase that power. Intercession was what can be termed an 'indirect' source of patronage. Indirect, in this case, means that the queen did not use her own means to grant patronage; she was instead using her influence with the king as currency. All three of the queens concerned in this study acted in this way. They made or instigated grants, pardons and appointments, all of which have been discussed above. Many of these grants were for members of their own household, indicating that these three queens rewarded those who served them well.<sup>125</sup> Grants to their household members consist of grants of lands, sums of money, exemptions from payment of fines or taxes, and wardships. In her geographical analysis of Isabella of France's pardons, Allocco argues that most of the areas in which Isabella successfully secured pardons were areas that later joined her during her coup in 1326.<sup>126</sup>

The queen was also able to use the power of intercession with the pope to secure favours for people, especially those in her household. Isabella and Philippa seem to have a special relationship with the pope, whereas Margaret was not active with the pope in

---

<sup>125</sup> Grants to members of the household for Margaret see: *CCR 1296-1302*, p. 356; *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 48-49, 420; *TNA, SC 1/25/198*. For Isabella see: *CPR 1307-1313*, pp. 359, 362, 378, 519; *CPR 1313-1317*, p. 88; *CCR 1307-1313*, p. 433; *CCR 1313-1318*, pp. 90, 204; *CPR 1317-1321*, pp. 66, 261; *CCW 1244-1326*, p. 356. For Philippa see: *CPR 1327-1330*, p. 343.

<sup>126</sup> Allocco, 'The Political Life of Isabella of France', p. 168.

any significant capacity.<sup>127</sup> Both Isabella and Philippa were able to obtain appointments for their household members. Philippa often made joint requests to the pope with Edward III. Usually these were for people outside the households of the king and queen, but occasionally they interceded jointly for household members of the king. However, when Philippa interceded on behalf of her household members, Edward was never mentioned in these requests.<sup>128</sup> Edward was taking advantage of the special relationship that Philippa possessed with the pope by adding Philippa's name to his requests, but, when making her own requests, Philippa did not need Edward to influence the pope. In one remarkable letter from Pope Clement VI to Philippa, Clement tells her that he will answer her request *viva voce*, thanks her for a diamond ring she has sent him and urges her to use her influence with the king regarding a matter not elucidated in the letter.<sup>129</sup> This letter demonstrates the reciprocity of the queen's intercession with the pope. Isabella and Philippa used their power with the pope at times when they were unable to do so with their husbands. Isabella took advantage of her influence with the pope prior to her estrangement with Edward II in the 1320s, but she continued to do so afterwards as well. Philippa continued to acquire favours from the pope for others, even though she was less successful at doing so with her husband; thus she was still able to extend her power base.

The king was clearly aware of the queen's power as an intercessor and he manipulated it to his own advantage. Edward II recognized Isabella's favour and influence with the English barons and in France, and he used it to his benefit. Isabella's role in the Leeds Castle incident may be viewed more as an intervention into political affairs, rather than mediation or intercession because it resulted in conflict rather than resolution. Isabella was not acting as an intercessor on this occasion, but the incident demonstrates how Edward might have exploited the power Isabella gained during her previous intercessions with the nobility. In October 1321, Isabella was on her way to

---

<sup>127</sup> Margaret only has two successful acts of intercession with the pope during her seven years as consort: *Calendar of Papal Letters, 1198-1304*, pp. 600, 607.

<sup>128</sup> Acts of intercession alongside the king for people outside their households: *Calendar of Papal Letters 1305-1342*, pp. 349, 350, 370, 380, 410, 518, 532; *Calendar of Papal Letters*, pp. 188-89, 217. Joint for members within king's household: *Calendar of Papal Letters*, pp. 338, 518, 542. Her Household without the king: *Calendar of Papal Letters, 1305-1342*, pp. 294, 319, 371, 387, 388, 391, 394, 406, 407, 408, 521, 524, 534, 544, 551; *Calendar of Papal Letters, 1342-1362*, pp. 96, 110, 156, 166, 219, 306, 478, 486, 518.

<sup>129</sup> *Calendar of Papal Letters, 1342-1362*, p. 3.

Canterbury and demanded entrance into Leeds castle, which the king had granted to Bartholomew Badlesmere. Badlesmere's wife, Margaret de Clare, was holding the castle in his absence and refused Isabella entrance. This was a slight to Isabella and by extension the king. Badlesmere then sent a large force to defend the castle and Edward besieged the castle for fifteen days. It eventually fell at the end of October 1321. The Leeds castle incident further exacerbated the tensions between Edward and the barons who had left court (Lancaster and the Marcher lords) and provided the impetus for civil war. Previously, Badlesmere had been a firm supporter of Edward II. He was often associated with what has been termed as the 'middle party' and played a key role in negotiating the Treaty of Leake. However, due to Hugh Despenser's influence at court, Badlesmere allied himself with the rebel barons under Lancaster.<sup>130</sup>

The motivations of Badlesmere and Edward as well as the extent to which the incident was premeditated by Edward have been debated. Scholars agree that it was the refusal of Badlesmere's wife to allow Isabella entrance to the castle that provided Edward with the motivation for the attack.<sup>131</sup> However, only a few scholars examine Isabella's motivation for her participation, and, with the exception of Paul Doherty, these attempts are cursory.<sup>132</sup> Menache claims that despite assertions that Isabella wanted her honour to be avenged, the attack on Leeds Castle was in Edward's best interest, not Isabella's.<sup>133</sup> Haines implies that Isabella might have been angry because Leeds castle ought to have been part of her dower, but went to Badlesmere instead.<sup>134</sup> Allocco argues that Isabella was being used in a larger political scheme by the barons to

---

<sup>130</sup> For Leeds Castle see Haines, *Edward II*, pp. 132-33; Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster*, pp.293-294; J. R. Maddicott, 'Badlesmere, Sir Bartholomew (c.1275-1322)', rev. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2006 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37140, accessed 17 June 2007.

<sup>131</sup> Haines, *Edward II*, p. 132; Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster*, p. 33; Tout, *Edward II*, p. 133; May McKissack, *The Fourteenth Century 1307-1399* (Oxford, 1959), p. 64; James Conway Davis, *The Baronial Opposition to Edward II* (New York, 1967), p. 106; Natalie Fryde, *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II, 1321-1326* (Cambridge 1979), pp. 50-51; Doherty, 'Isabella, Queen of England', pp. 83-85; Sophie Menache, 'Isabella of France Queen of England: A Reconsideration' *Journal of Medieval History* 10 (1984), pp. 108-110.

<sup>132</sup> Haines, *Edward II*, p. 132; Doherty, 'Queen Isabella', pp. 83-85; Menache, 'Isabella of France', pp. 108-110.

<sup>133</sup> Menache, 'Isabella of France', pp. 108-110.

<sup>134</sup> Haines, *Edward II*, p. 132.



send a message to Edward II.<sup>135</sup> Doherty provides the fullest analysis, arguing that Isabella was actively participating in a plan Edward devised with Despenser to punish the barons for Despenser's exile.<sup>136</sup> Doherty notes the ambiguity of Isabella's action considering that she may have cooperated in Despenser's exile. He feels that her cooperation with the barons indicates that Isabella resented the Despensers, but opposed armed rebellion. He makes the argument that Isabella was acting in an attempt to keep peace in the realm since her fortunes lay with the king.<sup>137</sup> Still Doherty does not fully investigate what Isabella had to gain and why she still felt as if her fortunes lay with the king.

If the incident was premeditated, did Isabella serve to gain any power when hindsight shows us that she actually set up the conditions for her decline in political influence? Despenser did not return until after the siege of Leeds castle, so Isabella might have believed that Despenser was no more of a threat to her than Gaveston had been, even if Despenser were to eventually return. She now held her dower lands and her position might have seemed stable to her. With Despenser gone, Isabella might have viewed the opposition as the greatest threat to her stability and with their demise there might be an end to political factions. How much better would it have been for her to help the king in this endeavour?

Since this line of reasoning is completely speculative, what might prove more fruitful to a study of queenship is an examination of why Edward saw the queen as the appropriate person to provoke Badlesmere. The *Annales Paulini* asserts that the insult to the queen inspired a huge response to the king's summons and men who had been Badlesmere's closest allies joined the king against him. If this is true, then the insult against the queen was a unifying factor for the court factions.<sup>138</sup> The barons probably developed a respect for Isabella during her previous interactions with them so that they were likely to rally around her. Lancaster stayed in the north, but the distance may account for his failure to come to the aid of either side. The Marcher lords also

---

<sup>135</sup> Allocco, 'The Political Life of Isabella of France', pp. 154-15.

<sup>136</sup> Doherty, 'Queen Isabella', pp. 83-85.

<sup>137</sup> Doherty, 'Queen Isabella', pp. 81-85.

<sup>138</sup> Including Warenne, who had fought against the king in the Marcher uprising. Stubbs (ed.), 'Annales Paulini', pp. 298-99; Menache, 'Isabella of France', p. 110; Tout, *Edward II*, pp. 132-33.

attempted to relieve Badlesmere but were too late.<sup>139</sup> The king might have recognized the unifying power the queen possessed as a result of her previous acts of intercession with the barons and exploited it. This unifying power foreshadowed her success in 1326.

The king often took advantage of the queen's influence with her natal family. Isabella's intercession between King Philip of France and Edward II in 1314, discussed in the opening of the chapter, is a prime example of this practice. Edward II manipulated Isabella's connections to the French royal family twice more during his reign. In the summer of 1320, Edward II travelled to France for the purpose of swearing homage to Philip V for the duchy of Gascony, and Isabella accompanied him. Few scholars have explored his reasons for taking Isabella with him. Most certainly, Edward brought Isabella to help suppress the problems which had arisen in Ponthieu, particularly Abbeville. The jurisdiction of Abbeville was in the hands of the French king at this time. Isabella had been highly involved in the correspondence regarding the city of Abbeville prior to their visit because she held the county of Ponthieu as part of her dower.<sup>140</sup> In one such letter the citizens of Abbeville informed her that she had lost control of the city to the king, her brother.<sup>141</sup> Isabella must have been involved in the government of her French holdings because the citizens of Abbeville wrote specifically to her about this and other issues between 1317 and 1320 as countess of Ponthieu.<sup>142</sup> Isabella accompanied her husband to France to again negotiate over the rights of jurisdiction between France and England. At a meeting in Amiens in July 1320, the king of France returned the city to Edward II and the guardian he had established there was removed.<sup>143</sup> Once again Edward can be seen taking advantage of Isabella's influence to help secure his holdings in France.

---

<sup>139</sup> Tout, *Edward II*, p. 133; Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster*, pp. 293-4.

<sup>140</sup> For all correspondence concerning Abbeville see Clovis Burnel (ed), 'Documents sur le Pontieu Conservés dans la Collection de l'Ancient Correspondence au Public Record Office de Londres (1278-1337)', *Bulletin Philologique et Historique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques*, (1920 for 1918), pp. 250-270. Also see E.H. Shealy, *The English Administration of Ponthieu, 1299-1369* (Unpublished PhD Thesis. Emory University, 1977).

<sup>141</sup> TNA, SC 1/54/115.

<sup>142</sup> TNA, SC 1/ 54/109 131, 142, 115, 136. All these are published in Burnel, *Documents sur le Pontieu* pp. 250-251, 255-256, 260-261, 268.

<sup>143</sup> E. Deprez, *Etudes de Diplomatie Anglaise* (Paris, 1908) as cited by C. Brunel, 'Documents sur Le Pontieu', p. 264.

In March of 1325 Isabella departed for France as diplomatic ambassador for Edward II yet again. This was the infamous mission from which she returned with an army to remove the king's 'evil counsellors' (the Despensers).<sup>144</sup> Scholars, who are often tainted by hindsight, have debated the reasons for Edward's choice of Isabella as his representative to France in 1325. One popular view has been that Isabella had an ulterior motive.<sup>145</sup> Other historians have challenged this view, believing there was no preconceived plan on the part of Isabella for rebellion, nor any plot concocted by King Charles, the exiled barons or the papal envoys.<sup>146</sup> Edward sent Isabella because Charles IV communicated that if Edward did so, Charles would agree to a peace.<sup>147</sup> Charles' request is the piece of evidence most historians and chroniclers use to support the claim that Charles had devised a plan to extract Isabella from England, but it is more likely that both kings were hoping to duplicate the negotiations of 1314. Charles believed that Isabella had influence with Edward II, and, consequently, he could secure a better settlement through her than he could negotiating with the envoys previously sent by Edward. Edward also saw her as the only person with significant influence over her brother, especially since Charles had specifically asked for Isabella.

The extent of Isabella's success is difficult to evaluate because Edward II was displeased with the arrangements she had reached with Charles, but in the end he agreed

---

<sup>144</sup> Isabella maintained that her aim was to rid the kingdom of the Despenser's. For example see *Foedera* vol. IV, p. 236 which is also translated in Anne Crawford, *Letters of the Queens of England* (Stroud, 1994), p. 89.

<sup>145</sup> Fryde, *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II*, p. 147: Fryde accepts the argument that there is no reason to assume that Isabella went to France because Roger Mortimer was there, but she rejects the argument that she had no ulterior motive. Doherty, 'Isabella, Queen of England', p. 109: Doherty believes that it was a 'skillfully devised ruse' to flee Despenser, possibly concocted on the part of the papal envoys and her brother the King of France.

<sup>146</sup> Doherty, 'Isabella, Queen of England', p. 113: Doherty straddles the fence by first claiming that it was a devised ruse to get Isabella out of England, but that she wanted to escape the Despensers and regain her position and status through a successful diplomatic mission abroad; F.D. Blackley, 'Isabella and the Bishop of Exeter', in T.A. Sanquist and M.R. Powicke (ed.), *Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson* (Toronto, 1968), p. 235: Blackley believes that while Isabella may have had reason for dissatisfaction with her treatment in England, she was not in league with her husband's enemies. It was not until the bishop of Exeter's visit and lack of monetary support from her husband at the end of 1325 that she moved to revolt. Haines, *Edward II*, p. 325: Haines does not believe that the 'outcome' of the trip was planned because that would have meant that everyone in England was blind to the possible dangers of sending Isabella to England.

<sup>147</sup> Haines, *King Edward II*, p. 324: Haines refers to a letter in which Edward writes to the pope recounting that the king of France has told him he would agree to a peace if Edward sent Isabella to France. Haines does not site a reference for this letter, so it is not clear if this letter still survives or if it is recorded in the chronicles that Haines then goes on to evaluate.

to them. The agreement gave Charles the right to appoint a steward in the Agenais. Edward would keep control of the castles, but their constables could not raise any additional troops without the permission of the French steward. Gascony was to be surrendered to Charles and then restored to Edward after he had performed homage at Beauvais in August. The French king was to keep those lands he had occupied before the war.<sup>148</sup> Edward may have disliked this arrangement, but Isabella was able to broker a peace that both kings eventually accepted when others had been unable to do so.

Edward III might have taken advantage of Philippa's connections in the Low Countries when he needed to secure their support against France in 1338. It is easy to overlook the importance of the Low Countries during the Hundred Years War, but the region played an integral role in the political, military and economic manoeuvrings of France and England.<sup>149</sup> It was important for Edward III to secure an alliance with the Low Countries, and so he spent 1338 to 1340 there and he took Philippa with him. The various rulers in this region had reasons to side with either France or England, making Edward's position there tenuous. Caroline Barron has argued that Edward's marriage to Philippa secured an English alliance with Hainault, but William, count of Hainault also had familial connections with France: his sister was married to Philip VI.<sup>150</sup> However, William seems to have been more closely allied with England than France.<sup>151</sup> Both John, duke of Brabant, and Louis, count of Flanders, were pro-French because of the long-time links between Brabant, Flanders and France. On the other hand, the Flemish cities of Bruges, Ghent and Ypres were pro-English due to their dependency on English wool, but for some time they practised a policy of neutrality.<sup>152</sup> Thus, it was necessary for Edward to use every method of persuasion to secure the support of the Low Countries. In 1336, Edward prohibited wool exports to the area and this forced Brabant

---

<sup>148</sup> Haines, *Edward II*, p. 324; Doherty, 'Isabella, Queen of England', pp. 117-118.

<sup>149</sup> Caroline Barron, *England and the Low Countries in the Later Middle Ages* (Stroud, 1995) pp. 1-28; H.S. Lucas, *The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, 1326-1347* (Ann Arbor, 1929), pp. 1-327.

<sup>150</sup> Christopher Allmand, *The Hundred Years War, England and France at War c.1300-c.1450* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 13; Barron, *England and the Low Countries*, p. 3.

<sup>151</sup> Lucas, *The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War*, pp. 88, 83, 109, 110, 111.

<sup>152</sup> Allmand, *The Hundred Years War*, p. 12. Barron, *England and the Low Countries*, p. 3; Lucas, *The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War*, pp. 221, 240-283.

into an alliance.<sup>153</sup> When Edward secured the title of Vicar of the Empire, the Netherlandish princes finally fell in line with him.<sup>154</sup> By taking Philippa to the continent, even if she did not take an active part in the negotiations, Edward ensured the queen's presence helped cement an alliance with William, count of Hainault. In this way Edward was making use of Philippa's symbolic power as the daughter of the count of Hainault. By 1340, however, Edward's gains in the Low Countries began to slip. His financial troubles escalated, forcing him to flee from Ghent to evade his creditors, and he was abandoned by John of Brabant and William of Hainault.<sup>155</sup> Philippa's natal ties were not enough to help Edward overcome the Netherlandish princes' reluctance to 'risk their lives, capital assets, and equipment in a war against superior numbers, led by a ruler who had not yet proved his abilities in continental warfare.'<sup>156</sup>

Edward III remembered Isabella's special relationship with the French crown. Leading up to the treaty of Brétigny in 1360, she played an integral part in entertaining King John during his English captivity. Michael Bennett asserts that, while she was excluded from the final diplomacy, through her contact with the King of France and other French captives she 'played a role in the process by which Edward's assurances were translated into a reasonable settlement'.<sup>157</sup> Edward III chose Isabella rather than his own consort Philippa because of her French heritage and her previous success as an intercessor with the French. It is possible that Edward III would have continued to rely on her expertise in negotiating with the French, but her death in 1359, before the final treaty negotiations took place, would have prevented him from doing so, if that had ever been his intent. The power Isabella derived and perpetuated as an intercessor between the English and French allowed her to exercise influence, despite Edward III's desire to limit the amount of power his wife and mother could exercise. Edward III did take

---

<sup>153</sup> Barron, *England and the Low Countries*, p. 3; Lucas, *The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War*, pp. 215, 354.

<sup>154</sup> Lucas, *The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War*, p. 293.

<sup>155</sup> Barron, *England and the Low Countries*, p. 4; Lucas, *The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War*, p. 381.

<sup>156</sup> Malcolm Vale, 'The Anglo-French Wars 1294-1340: Allies and Alliances', in Philippe Contamine, Charles Giry-Deloison, Maurice H. Keen (eds.), *Guerre et Société en France, en Angleterre et en Bourgogne XIVe-XVe Siècle* (Lille, 1991), p. 25 as cited in Barron, *England and the Low Countries*, p. 4.

<sup>157</sup> Michael Bennett, 'Isabelle of France, Anglo-French Diplomacy and Cultural Exchange in Late 1350s', in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), p. 222.

advantage of the queen's role as intercessor when it suited him. Both the king and queen pursued intercession as a means of broadening their spheres of influence. The queen took the symbolic power she received from the expectation that the queen should be an intercessor and manipulated it by completing acts of intercession to expand her power base. She was able to do this both at home in England and in her the country of her birth. The king could also exploit the symbolic power the queen possessed through her membership in royal and noble families throughout Europe.

### 3.4 Conclusion

This chapter opened with Isabella's ambassadorial mission to France in 1314 and closed with a similar one to France in 1325. The 1314 mission served to illustrate the unofficial nature of the queen's intercession. The 1325 mission demonstrates that by the end of her life, Isabella had manipulated the unofficial power of intercession so that her husband and son regularly relied on her as an unofficial ambassador. This chapter has shown that when the queen did not have the authority to grant certain favours, she had to use her influence with the king and crown. Though this power was particularly ascribed to the queen, intercession was not necessarily a gendered act. It was an integral part of medieval elite society to secure favours. Male members of the landed elite interceded for their retainers in much the same way as the queen.<sup>158</sup> Bertie Wilkinson claims that 'the great magnates, natural companions of the king, centres of patronage and power, looked with confidence to the favours in chancery which were no more than their due,' and he characterizes Queen Isabella among these 'great magnates'.<sup>159</sup> Intercession was part of the day-to-day business of being a good lord and part of the mechanisms of government. The queen was simply playing her part as a good queen by acting as an intercessor.

The amount to which the queen and others manipulated and promoted this already ascribed power to further their own personal influence depended on their circumstances and the inclination of both the king and queen. Even though intercession was expected, queens could exercise it to different degrees and could not always expect success by virtue of their office. The activities of Margaret of France, Isabella of France

---

<sup>158</sup> Musson, 'Queenship, Lordship and Petitioning in Late Medieval England', pp. 161-62.

<sup>159</sup> Wilkinson, 'The Chancery', p. 203.

and Philippa of Hainault demonstrate the various degrees and ways in which intercession could be manipulated. Isabella and Margaret were more successful in obtaining chancery issues on behalf of petitioners than Philippa. Margaret, Isabella and Philippa all had enough access to the king's body to fulfil their procreative duties, which indicates that they probably had enough physical access to the king to act as intercessors and mediators. All three took advantage of the chancellor as an extension of the king, and thus could also circumvent physical access to the king. For Isabella, the political struggles of the reign afforded her the circumstances to exploit her ascribed role as an intercessor. Isabella and Philippa's natal ties were useful to both Edward II and Edward III, who each manipulated them to their own advantage. The advantage was mutual since the queen often became involved in political and governmental issues as a result. This involvement allowed her to use and increase her power, both symbolic and achieved. For Philippa, her presence in the Low Countries in the 1330s and 1340s signalled to society that she was an influential figure. Important people, noticing and remembering her presence with the king while he negotiated for support against the French king, petitioned her for help with Edward III later on; for example, the Van Artevelde family wrote to her on more than one occasion.<sup>160</sup> On the other hand, Edward I made no use of Margaret on an international level aside from their marriage, which secured a truce with France. As a result of this truce, Edward was free to follow his ambitions in Scotland, where Margaret was of little use to him as an ambassador because it was the queen's influence with her natal family that made her useful as an ambassador of her husband. However, as chapters five and six will show, Margaret was a key figure in the royal family in which she played a political as well as a domestic role.

Queens could manipulate the expected role of intercessor when they did not have the authority to grant favours directly. This does not mean that they never had the authority to grant favours on their own. The queen had her own household and estates, which she was able to use for her own patronage. Through her unique status as a married *femme sole*, she was able to participate in the day-to-day business of government. The following chapter will explore the queen's role as a lord and magnate further.

---

<sup>160</sup> TNA, SC 1/56/57, 62, 63; TNA, SC 1/44/166.

## Chapter Four

### A Royal Institution: The Queen's Household and Estates

In 1968 Marion Facinger wrote a pioneering article on the subject of medieval queenship, in which she asserted that, after the mid twelfth century, the centralization of royal power resulted in the distancing of the queen from the monarchy and the loss of her official status. Consequently, Facinger contends that the queen's only influence on government was through a personal relationship with the king as her husband or son, a relationship that Facinger believes led to the queen's marginalization. Facinger argues that the separation of the king and queen's households during the twelfth century was a sign of the breakdown of the earlier 'partnership' enjoyed by the king and queen, and further exacerbated this supposed marginalization.<sup>1</sup> Within the last three decades, scholars of medieval queenship have argued that, while there is no denying that the nature of the queen's powers changed during the twelfth century, the queen was not marginalized, and still remained an active and visible part of the centralized monarchy.<sup>2</sup>

This chapter demonstrates that separation could become a source of power for the queen, but that the remaining institutional ties between king and queen kept her from being marginalized. It examines the level of the queen's authority over her household and estates, and the extent to which that authority was dictated by her gender or her role

---

<sup>1</sup> Marion Facinger, 'A Study of Medieval Queenship: Capetian France, 987-1237', *Nebraska Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, 5 (1968), pp. 27, 33, 35-40.

<sup>2</sup> Pauline Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers: The King's Wife in the Early Middle Ages* (London, 1998), p. xvii; Pauline Stafford rescinds her earlier argument in favour of the marginalization theory in the new introduction of the second printing of *Queen's Concubines and Dowagers*; Andre Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency: The Genesis of a Vocation', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1993), pp. 93-116; John Carmi Parsons, ' "Never was a body buried in England with such solemnity and honour": The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens to 1500', in Anne J. Duggan (ed.), *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference Held at King's College London, April 1995* (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 317, 336; Lois Huneycutt, 'Medieval Queenship', *History Today*, 39(1989), p. 16; Lois Huneycutt, 'Images of Queenship in the High Middle Ages', *Haskins Society Journal*, 1(1989), p. 62; John Carmi Parsons, 'The Queen's Intercession in Thirteenth-Century England', in Jennifer Carpenter and Sally Beth MacLean (eds.), *Power of the Weak* (Urbana, 1995), p. 149; Miriam Shadis, 'Blanche of Castile and Facinger's "Medieval Queenship": Reassessing the Argument', in Kathleen Nolan (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), pp. 137-161; Paul Strohm, 'Queens as Intercessors', *Hochin's Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts*, (Princeton, 1992), p. 95; Margaret Howell, *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 266-73; Helen Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou: Queenship and Power in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2003); Janet Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', in *Women in Medieval Western European Culture* (1999), pp. 180, 201-204; Also, many studies of early queens flag up the limitations of her authority as well as the strengths demonstrating that though she may have had more official positions than later queens, those too were limited. For example, see Pauline Stafford, 'Powerful Women in the Early Middle Ages: Queens and Abbesses', in Peter Linehan and Janet L. Nelson (eds.), *The Medieval World* (London, 2001), pp. 398-415.



as the king's wife. The ways in which the queen's relationship with the king affected her access to power and authority are examined in three contexts: her household, her affinity and her estate administration.

The examination of the queen's household demonstrates that its separation from the king's led to the creation of a royal institution with the queen at its centre. Nevertheless, the section reveals that she still possessed influence over the king and government because this division was not finite. A reconstruction of the queen's affinity explores the wider reaches of queenship as an institution and examines how far her power and influence extended, and what it meant for those who served the queen. An examination of her estate administration defines more precisely the nature of the queen's authority on her estates, keeping in mind her position as consort and mother. It highlights her position as the only married *femme sole* of the landed elite. Within this third context, the queen's access to the royal administrative bodies is examined and concludes that her access added another dimension to her power and authority, which was not enjoyed by other magnates. These three areas of study, taken together, will place her as one of the most powerful magnates and the most powerful noble woman. These three areas of examination will reinforce the notion that the queen was still an integral part of the crown.

#### **4.1 The Household**

In the medieval period the political took place in domestic settings by the head of the household. The king's household was obviously the most prominent in England and the most significant political and governmental actions took place there. This meant that the queen's roles in the household had further reaching implications than those of any other women.<sup>3</sup> This section establishes two facets of the queen's household: its existence as an independent unit and its connections with the king's household. It reveals that her domestic establishment still occupied a place within the royal domestic scene as a whole. These links connected the queen to the main mechanisms of government. However, this section will begin by introducing the queen's household in its independent state as a distinct royal institution with its own offices and personnel.

---

<sup>3</sup> Lanysmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 222.

The queen's household was the mirror image of the king's. The household contained all the residents of the queen's court and was subdivided into domestic offices such as the kitchen, the pantry, the buttery, the saucery, the scullery, the chapel and so forth, each with its own staff.<sup>4</sup> The wardrobe consisted of the wardrobe itself as well as the great wardrobe and the privy wardrobe. The wardrobe was the financial and secretarial office and the centre of the household.<sup>5</sup> The first royal wardrobe took shape early in the reign of Henry III and the formation of the queen's soon followed, established for Eleanor of Provence in 1236.<sup>6</sup> The great wardrobe was responsible for bulk stores such as wax, cloth, fur, sugar and spices, and the privy wardrobe, responsible for personal necessities, was connected to the chamber.<sup>7</sup> The chamber consisted of both the queen's bedroom, and the administrative office which dealt with the necessities of that space.<sup>8</sup>

The main officers of the wardrobe were: the keeper or treasurer, who oversaw the entire household; the controller, who kept a counter-roll of the keeper's roll; and the cofferer. The queen's keeper and controller were answerable to the king's exchequer, but everyone else was under the queen's authority.<sup>9</sup> These men were as experienced as their counterparts in the king's household, and a steady stream of movement of clerks between the royal households can be observed.<sup>10</sup> William Melton was Margaret's first cofferer, but was later transferred into the service of Prince Edward.<sup>11</sup> Likewise, William

---

<sup>4</sup> Hilda Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in W.A. Morris (ed.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols, The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1330-1940), vol. 1, p. 266.

<sup>5</sup> Hilda Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in *The English Government at Work*, p. 266

<sup>6</sup> Hilda Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in T.F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England* (6 vols, Manchester, 1920-1933), vol 5, p. 231; William Norwell, *The Wardrobe Book of William de Norwell, 12 July 1338 to 26 May 1340*, Mary Lyon, Bruce Lyon and Henry S. Lucas (eds.) (Brussels, 1983), p. xxix.

<sup>7</sup> Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, vol. 5, p. 275.

<sup>8</sup> Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, vol. 5, p. 276.

<sup>9</sup> Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in *The English Government at Work*, p. 251.

<sup>10</sup> Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in *The English Government at Work*, p. 272; Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household' in *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, vol. 5, p. 242.

<sup>11</sup> Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in *The English Government at Work*, p. 240.

de Bouden, Isabella's keeper from 1308 to 1316, had also served in Edward II's household when he was prince.<sup>12</sup>

The only visible difference between the composition of the queen's household and the king's was the presence of the queen's ladies and damsels. These women were of various stations; their jobs ranging from companion to hard labour. The first group, the ladies, were higher ranking noblewomen, such as Isabella Beaumont, lady de Vescy, and Eleanor Despenser in Isabella's household, and Sybil Beauchamp in Philippa of Hainault's.<sup>13</sup> The queen's damsels were probably part of the gentry or urban elite. They were often married to male members of her household, and seem to be engaged in actual service, though not hard labour.<sup>14</sup> Two of Isabella's damsels were sent to London 'on the affairs of the queen', and Edward II's former nurse Alice Legrave is also named among them.<sup>15</sup> The laundresses accounted for in the queens' household books indicate that there were also women engaged in hard labour in her household.<sup>16</sup>

At first glance, the queens' chambers appear to be exclusively female, and the king's chamber exclusively male. This exclusivity would mean that men did not have access to intimate knowledge about the queen. Along these lines, Roberta Gilchrist has argued that this gendered space was used to emphasize her chastity and purity.<sup>17</sup> However, Joanna Laynesmith has demonstrated that this space was more about emphasizing her status, and that this segregation was contrived in order to promote a public image of the ideal representations of the court found in the literature and art of the time.<sup>18</sup> Laynesmith has shown that, in the fifteenth century, men entered the queen's chamber on official business, and that some affairs of state, such as marriages, were

---

<sup>12</sup> Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household' in *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, vol. 5, , p. 242; F. D. Blackley and G. Hermansen (eds.), *The Household book of Queen Isabella of England, for the Fifth Regnal Year of Edward II, 8th July 1311 to 7th July 1312* (Edmonton, 1971), p. xii.

<sup>13</sup> Blackley, *The Household Book of Queen Isabella*, pp. xiii-xiv.

<sup>14</sup> Blackley, *The Household Book of Queen Isabella*, p. xiv.

<sup>15</sup> Blackley, *The Household Book of Queen Isabella*, pp. 48-49; [The National Archives London] TNA, E 101/375/9 fol. 29.

<sup>16</sup> Blackley, *The Household Book of Queen Isabella*, pp. 164-65; TNA, E 101/375/9 fols 16, 28v.

<sup>17</sup> Roberta Gilchrist, 'Medieval Bodies in the Material World: Gender, Stigma and the Body', in Sarah Kay and Miri Rubin (eds.), *Framing Medieval Bodies* (Manchester, 1994), pp. 57-58.

<sup>18</sup> Joanna Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 226-229, 244-250.

conducted in the queen's chamber specifically because its female composition made it an appropriate place for these affairs. During the minority of Edward III the transfer of the great seal occurred in Isabella's chamber, showing that affairs of state were conducted in the chambers of fourteenth-century queens as well.<sup>19</sup> The queen's chamber still played a significant role in royal government. Household accounts and livery rolls for these queens demonstrate that men were employed in their chambers. Robes were issued for pages, squires and knights of the queen's chamber, or for pages of the ladies of the chamber, which indicate that men did enter the queen's chambers for the purpose of service.<sup>20</sup>

The personnel of the queen's household often consisted of foreigners because queen consorts of this time were always foreigners themselves. This made the queen's household a particular target for criticisms. Eleanor of Provence, Eleanor of Castile, Anne of Bohemia, and Joan of Navarre were all, at one point or another, criticized for harboring 'aliens' and Isabella's household was purged of its French members in 1324.<sup>21</sup> Philippa, as Chris Given-Wilson notes, managed to avoid similar criticisms.<sup>22</sup> Similarly, there seems to be little censure of the 'foreignness' of Margaret's household in the chronicles. Such attacks provided an easy way to censure a queen who was perceived to be very influential.

The creation of a separate household with its own offices for the queen allowed her to function similarly to the king or other great magnates when she moved independently. Indeed, the households of greater nobles, such as Thomas, earl of Lancaster and Prince Edward of Woodstock, were also in the process of developing wardrobes and chambers along similar lines to that of the royal households.<sup>23</sup> The

---

<sup>19</sup> CCR 1327-1330, p. 98; see section 6.3.

<sup>20</sup> TNA, E 101/390/8 fols. 12, 4v; CCR 1364-1368, p. 482; Blackley, *The Household Book of Queen Isabella*, pp. 172-73.

<sup>21</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household and the King's Affinity: Service, Politics and Finance in England, 1360-1413* (New Haven, 1986), p. 75; John Carmi Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile: Queen and Society in Thirteenth-Century England* (London, 1995), p. 154; Howell, *Eleanor of Provence*, p. 24; TNA, C 61/36, mem. 24d.

<sup>22</sup> Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household*, p. 5.

<sup>23</sup> J.R. Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster, 1307-1322: A Study in the Reign of Edward II* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 12-13; Margaret Sharpe, 'The Household of the Black Prince', in T.F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England* (6 vols, Manchester, 1920-1933), vol. 5, pp. 314-323; Chris

queen's household was of similar size to that of an earl, whose household generally comprised around one hundred and forty members.<sup>24</sup> The total number of Isabella's household, for example, reached about one hundred and eighty people, and Philippa's reached over one hundred and thirty-five people in 1340-41.<sup>25</sup> Studies of male magnates' households have demonstrated that the retaining of servants could extend the lord's power base.<sup>26</sup> When the queen's household became partially separated from the king's she was also able to take advantage of extending her influence through recruitment of household servants, a practice which will be covered in greater detail in section 4.2 of this chapter. Yet, despite its ability to exist as an institution of its own, the creation of the queen's household, which mirrored the structure and shared the personnel of the king's, eased the intermingling of the two households. The blending of the two households gave her access to the king that other magnates would not have had, except possibly the king's children or siblings. The nature of this power manifests itself in the intercessory examples discussed in chapter three.

While the queen's household was its own organization, which functioned in the same way as other royal and noble domestic establishments, this independence was not definitive. Isabella's household supplies us with a case study, which provides evidence that the households of the king and queen could still exist as one, contrary to Facinger's argument. Of the three queens with whom this study is concerned, Isabella's household provides the best case study because her itinerary is the most complete and there are far more extant household accounts for her than for Margaret or Philippa. However, in the sparse and damaged accounts that do survive for Margaret and Philippa, similar interactions between their households and their husbands' domestic establishments can be observed. In addition to the practical reasons for choosing Isabella as an example, the study of the overlapping of Isabella and Edward's households is all the more striking because we are dealing with a supposedly dysfunctional couple.

---

Given-Wilson, *The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages: The Fourteenth-Century Political Community* (London, 1989), pp. 87-103; Norwell, *The Wardrobe Book of William de Norwell*, p. xxx.

<sup>24</sup> Given-Wilson, *The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages*, p. 89.

<sup>25</sup> Given-Wilson, *The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages*, p. 241; TNA, E 101/390/8.

<sup>26</sup> Simon Walker, *The Lancastrian Affinity, 1361-1399* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 8, 27, 84-90; Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster*, p. 8; Rosemary Horrox, *Richard III: A Study of Service* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 1-3; Michael Hicks, *Bastard Feudalism* (London, 1995), pp. 128, 147, 151.

An examination of both Edward and Isabella's household accounts and subsidiary documents relating to the various offices within the household demonstrate that the households were not completely separate entities. They often merged together, providing Isabella with adequate access to the king. During the merging of the two domestic centres, the households occupied the same location and the corresponding offices worked together to serve the king and queen. Sometimes accounts of the various offices of both the king and queen are still kept separately; for example, we might see one account for the king's kitchen and one for the queen's. Sometimes the queen's household accounts are recorded within the king's, but her accounts occupy their own section within these accounts, while at other times the queen's expenses are intermingled with those of the king under a single heading.

Since the king was responsible for the queen's expenses when their households were together, mentions of the queen in Edward's household accounts probably reflect these occasions. Edward and Isabella's household accounts and itineraries can be used to test this assertion. Between July 1315 and July 1316 fourteen household rolls and subsidiary accounts survive, six of which mention Isabella at least once. Their itineraries show that this was a year in which Edward and Isabella were together for significant periods of time.<sup>27</sup> Likewise, Isabella is also frequently mentioned in Edward's accounts for 1311 and 1313 and their itineraries corroborate that they were together for much of this time.<sup>28</sup> On the other hand, eleven household accounts survive from July 1323 to July 1324, a period in which Edward and Isabella are thought to be estranged, and she appears in only two of them. From this evidence, it may be assumed that other records of the queen in the king's accounts, even when her itinerary cannot be reconstructed, reflect times the households were together. However, the small number of extant accounts and incomplete itineraries prevent further testing of this hypothesis.

Nevertheless, the surviving accounts demonstrate the ease with which the queen and king's household overlapped, allowing Isabella access to the king and government. Lists of household members often demonstrate the merging of the two households. One such list from 1314 to 1315 still remains.<sup>29</sup> This document lists the men in the queen's

---

<sup>27</sup> See appendix I.

<sup>28</sup> See appendix I.

<sup>29</sup> TNA, E 101/378/6 mem. 1.

household alongside those of the king's under the heading bannerets, knights, men-at-arms, clerks and others of the king's household, indicating that her men were apart of the household, at least from 1314 to 1315. There are also a few instances when the title of the account includes both the offices of the king and queen, but no differentiation between the household offices is made within the account, indicating that their households became one at this time. An account of the expenses of the king and queen during Christmas 1313 claims to be an account of the king and queen, and then follows with expenses in the household offices with no differentiations between those of the king and those of the queen.<sup>30</sup>

Household members often cross-over between the two households, performing tasks for their counter household. This cross-over is seen most frequently when a payment to one member of the king's household is delivered by the hand of one of the queen's household members. In a book of prests from the wardrobe spanning the period from 1308 to 1321, payment was made 'to Robert Wodehouse, cofferer of the wardrobe of the king, for furnishing the above prest by the hand of John Clinton, valet of the queen'.<sup>31</sup> The use of the queen's valet for business in the king's wardrobe probably indicates that the two households merged together, and their itineraries support this conclusion. Thus, the queen's household members were considered a part of the king's household too; the two were not mutually exclusive.<sup>32</sup>

We rarely see a full expense account of the queen's among the king's household records. This absence of a complete account for the queen within the king's accounts is indicative of both her independence and her connection with his household. Throughout Edward II's household records we see payments for Isabella's alms, for carriage of her household, for the care of her horses and falcons, for gifts, and for messengers sent between them.<sup>33</sup> These payments appear rather sporadically throughout Edward's

---

<sup>30</sup> TNA, E 101/624/18.

<sup>31</sup> TNA, E 101/373/26 fol. 88v.

<sup>32</sup> It is possible that the queen was within the king's household at this time, but the title only indicates the eighth regnal year. We know that they were in close contact in the summer of 1314 because Edward used Isabella's privy seal and for much of 1315 they were with each other or travelling within close distances to each other.

<sup>33</sup> Alms: TNA, E 101/375/8, fol. 4; TNA, E 101/376/7 fols 4, 4v, 5; TNA, E 101/124/14, mem.1; Carriage: TNA, E 101/375/8, fol. 27; TNA, E 101/376/7 fol. 13v; TNA, E 101/376/21, mem. 1; TNA E 101/383/3, mem. 1; Horses and Falcons: TNA, E 101/373/26 fols 18, 19, 19v, 20, 21, 21v, 59v; TNA, E 101/374/15 fols 8v-9; TNA, E 101/375/18 fols 44v, 18v, 19v; TNA, E 101/377/4 mem. 1; TNA, E 101/379/19 fols. 19-

household accounts and may be somewhat random, or the king might only have covered certain expenses of the queen while she was with him, funnelling the rest of the money through her wardrobe.

Other specified expenses were also covered by the king. Edward II often paid for the expenses or wages of individual members of Isabella's household and the expenses of the members of his household accrued in Isabella's service, showing how closely related the households were. The payments are made to various valets, a member of the scullery and the nappary, to her cofferers, and to higher ranking members such as Ebulo de Montibus, her steward, and William de Bouden, her treasurer.<sup>34</sup> Many of the payments found in the king's accounts that cover Isabella's expenses are distributed to William de Bouden 'for the expenses of the household of the queen' and reflect the receipts recorded in her own household book.<sup>35</sup> It could also be that at times when the households were together, Isabella's was subsumed within those of the king so that a payment to the king's kitchen, for example, included hers as well.

Two account books exceptionally provide us with significant section devoted to the queen's household. One is an account book from 1315 to 1316 of Robert Wodehouse, controller of the king's wardrobe, and the other is a book of prests from 1310 to 1311. Both include a list of wages for the members of the offices of both households, and the former includes payment for winter robes for the queen's household.<sup>36</sup> The frequent payments of expenses for messengers in these books are particularly revealing because they demonstrate that even when the households were physically separated, the king and queen remained in regular contact.

Thus, the household accounts demonstrate that the two households merged easily into one and that Edward and Isabella allowed this intermingling to take place often. While there may have been tensions between Isabella and Edward II, throughout most of his reign they interacted with each other to such a degree that they present the image of a

---

21v, 59; TNA, E 101/381/3 mem. 11; TNA, E 101/378/9 mem. 1-2; Gifts: TNA, E 101/375/8 fols 8, 27, 27v, 28; Letters: TNA, E 101/373/26, fol. 50; TNA, E 101/375/8, fols 27v; TNA, E 101/376/26; TNA, E 101/383/3 mem. 1; TNA, E 101/381/14 mems 9-13.

<sup>34</sup> TNA, E 101/373/26 fols 88, 91; TNA, E 101/374/12 mem. 1-3; TNA, E 101/375/8 fol. 8, 25; TNA, E 101/376/7 fol. 12v, 27; TNA, E 101/377/17 mems 1-2; TNA, E 101/373/30 fol. 2v; TNA, E 101/376/11&14 fols 1v, 3, 4.

<sup>35</sup> TNA, E 101/374/2 mems 1-6; TNA, E 101/375/6 mems 1-7, TNA, E 101/376/7 mem. 1, TNA, E 101/378/4 fol. 3v.

<sup>36</sup> TNA, E 101/376/7 fol. 29-31, 92v-93v; TNA, E 101/374/5 fols 32-33v.



functional relationship. The ease with which the households could combine indicates that the king and queen had not become completely separate entities by the fourteenth century and that the queen was not separated from the main source of government: the king. She could use this access to pursue other avenues of power, such as intercession, to a greater extent than other magnates.

#### 4.2 The Queen's Affinity

The beginning of section 4.1 demonstrated that the queen's household sometimes operated independently from the king. The ability of her household to act as a single intuition meant that the queen could gather a retinue of her own. In developing her own affinity, she exercised independent authority over its members in the same way as male magnates. This section reconstructs the queen's affinity and reveals that its collective influence was equal to the most powerful lords and the king. It also explores how the queen's retinue extended her power base. However, with the autonomy of the queen's affinity being stressed, the section will also note that fluidity between the king's affinity and the queen's also existed.

In this attempt to establish the queen as a landed magnate and an institution in her own right, the existence of her own affinity must be considered alongside those of noblemen. Great lords in the fourteenth century had large retinues of servants. The only concrete evidence for these retinues comes from the surviving indentures which outline the conditions of service between magnates and their retainers. Due to the inconsistent survival rate of these indentures, reconstructing retinues can be problematic for the historian.<sup>37</sup> These retinues are loosely divided into three main categories: household servants, administrators and those of the wider affinity.<sup>38</sup> These categorizations are flexible and historians' descriptions of them are by no means consistent. Generally, the household members, excluding menial servants, were responsible for the domestic roles related to the lord's body.<sup>39</sup> The administrators fell into three main groups: estate

---

<sup>37</sup> George Holmes, *The Estates of the Higher Nobility in Fourteenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1957), pp. 59, 69, 72, 78.

<sup>38</sup> Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household*, p. 203.

<sup>39</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 14-16; Walker, *The Lancastrian Affinity*, p. 8; Holmes, *The Estates of the Higher Nobility*, p. 58; Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household*, p. 203.

officers, central administrators and councillors.<sup>40</sup> The wider affinity has been described by historians in several ways: Michael Hicks refers to it as consisting of extraordinary retainers who were usually, but not always, aristocrats, who were neither continuous residents, nor officials, nor councillors; Rosemary Horrox calls them 'subjects' who were called upon to provide information or to investigate and settle local problems, but did not administer the royal demesne; Walker defines them as an outer, fluid circle of 'well wishers'.<sup>41</sup>

The varying definitions of the last group highlights the flexible nature of the wider affinity in the Middle Ages, and draws attention to the problematic exercise of constructing a nobleman's retinue. This study will follow the parameters established by Simon Walker in his study of John of Gaunt's affinity, with the affinity being 'confined to those who possessed some material incentive for their loyalty in the form of an office or annuity'.<sup>42</sup> It will take into account 'well-wishers' or 'extraordinary retainers' when a clear case can be established for their loyalty. Service in retinues often had a familial tradition with several members of a family serving the same lord, sometimes over generations. The queen's affinity can be viewed as the personnel who comprised the institution which sprung up around her and which provided her with power and influence.

Service was a reciprocal relationship, with benefits for both the lord and retainer. Studies of bastard feudalism and royal and noble affinities have demonstrated this relationship. The retainer expected that the lord would use his influence in support of his servant, encompassing the medieval notion of 'good lordship'. This potential patronage was an inducement to service.<sup>43</sup> Members of a lord's retinue received compensation for potential service in several ways and this compensation existed within the wider concept of patronage. This patronage could come in tangible forms such as cash, grants and assignments, or in intangible measures employed in the use of influence or intercession.

---

<sup>40</sup> Michael Hicks, *Bastard Feudalism* (London, 1995), p. 52; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 15; Horrox refers to them as 'Non-household servants'; Walker, *The Lancastrian Affinity*, p. 9; Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household*, p. 203.

<sup>41</sup> Hicks, *Bastard Feudalism*, p. 57; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 13; Walker, *The Lancastrian Affinity*, pp. 8-10.

<sup>42</sup> Walker, *The Lancastrian Affinity*, p. 10.

<sup>43</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 1-3; Hicks, *Bastard Feudalism*, pp. 128, 147, 151; Walker, *The Lancastrian Affinity*, pp. 27, 84-90.

Those serving in the household were generally paid a wage, as is reflected in the household accounts of lords, kings and queens. All types of retainers, including household staff, estate ministers, lawyers and clerks, tenants and 'extraordinary' retainers, received liveries.<sup>44</sup> The king granted his retainers exchequer annuities—writs for payment at the exchequer. The king and lords with extensive estates could grant source-based annuities—farms of manors, hundreds, towns and counties, customs of ports, or issues from confiscated alien religious lands—which usually were substitutes until sufficient lands or rents could be found to reward the retainer.<sup>45</sup> The king and lords with large estates also used assignments of offices or commissions in the household, on estates, in the military, and in courts of law.<sup>46</sup> These more perceptible acts of patronage were not the only benefits to serving a lord. Lords often offered support and protection, sponsored petitions at court, or secured royal pardons for crimes or financial obligations (the issue of royal pardons was also a direct way for the king to reward service).<sup>47</sup> The queen's household was much larger than those of many magnates, but her landed income was not as high as the most well endowed magnates.<sup>48</sup> However, her very role as queen, through her access to royal institutions, placed her in a position to reward those who would serve her.

Margaret, Isabella and Philippa rewarded those who served them in all of the ways scholars have attributed to male magnates. The three queens' household accounts and rolls of livery demonstrate that all of their household members received robes for their service.<sup>49</sup> The queens often ensured that their household members, ministers and others who, 'for their good [but unidentified] service' to the queens received life maintenance.<sup>50</sup> Those who served the queen were often well provided for: they received

---

<sup>44</sup> Hicks, *Bastard Feudalism*, p. 64; Holmes, *The Estates of the Higher Nobility*, p. 59.

<sup>45</sup> J.S., Bothwell, *Edward III and the English Peerage: Royal Patronage, Social Mobility, and Political Control in Fourteenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 79-83.

<sup>46</sup> Bothwell, *Edward III and the English Peerage*, pp. 93-98.

<sup>47</sup> Bothwell, *Edward III and the English Peerage*, pp. 100-101; Walker, *The Lancastrian Affinity*, pp. 84-5.

<sup>48</sup> See section 4.3.

<sup>49</sup> For example: TNA, E 101/390/8 fols 1-5; TNA, E 101/393/15 mems 1, 3, 10; TNA, E 101/375/9 fols 29-32v; TNA, E 101/378/6 mem. 1.

<sup>50</sup> *CCR 1313-1318*, p. 204; *CCR 1349-1354*, p. 76; *CCR 1343-1346*, p. 99; *CCR 1333-1337*, p. 317.

annuities at the exchequer; issues arising from manors, towns, counties, etc; grants of custodies, manors, castles etc; exemptions from being put on assizes and juries and exemptions from recognizances, appointments, or fines at the exchequer.<sup>51</sup> Evidence of these grants survive in the form of enrolled indentures, letters issued from the queen and references in the king's chancery in the form of confirmation of such grants (discussed in section 4.3).<sup>52</sup> Sometimes the queen exploited her relationship with the king and crown to secure patronage for her retainers, but she was equally able to make grants and appointments from her own lands. Fortunately, three such indentures were recorded on a roll of Queen Philippa's letters patent from 1330 to 1341. One of these indentures granted the custody of Bristol castle, which the queen held, along with twenty pounds a year for the custody of that castle to John Hegham. A confirmation of this indenture appears on the king's patent rolls.<sup>53</sup> In another example, Queen Philippa was very generous to one of her yeomen, William Wight and his wife Elena, to whom she granted lands in Havering for the rent of a pair of hare-skin gloves given to her at Bury St. Edmunds at Christmas.<sup>54</sup>

It should not be surprising after the conclusions about the overlapping of the king and queen's households and administrative bodies, that service was often rendered to both the king and queen by the same individual, and likewise the queen or the king often rewarded members of their consort's retinue; for example, William Colby was described as both the king's clerk and the treasurer of Queen Philippa, and William Cornwall, the king's yeoman, also purveyed for Philippa's household.<sup>55</sup> This practice in no way

---

<sup>51</sup> *CCR 1296-1302*, p. 356; *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 258, 416; *CPR 1307-1313*, pp. 466, 519; *CCR 1313-1318*, p. 204; *CPR 1317-1321*, pp. 76, 108, 261; *CCR 1307-1313*, p. 427; *CFR 1319-1327*, p. 351; *CCW 1244-1326*, p. 356; *CPR 1327-1330*, p. 157; *CCR 1327-1330*, p. 370; *CCR 1330-1333*, p. 512; *CPR 1334-1338*, pp. 92, 410; *CFR 1319-1327*, p. 132; *CPR 1343-1345*, pp. 110-111; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 47; *CPR 1340-1343*, p. 481; *CCR 1333-1337*, pp. 135,176; *CCR 1341-1343*, pp. 405,623; *CCR 1359-1364*, p. 21; *CPR 1358-1361*, pp. 99, 252; *CPR 1330-1334*, p. 244; *CCR 1333-1337*, p. 324; *CPR 1330-1334*, p. 397; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 508; *CPR 1330-1334*, p. 40; *CCR 1360-1364* p. 524; *CPR, 1327-1330*, p. 544 ; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 401; *CCR 1343-1346*, p. 99; *CCR 1333-1337*, p. 317; *CPR, 1327-1330*, p. 453; *CCR 1341-1343*, p. 134.; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 87; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 240; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 47; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 92; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 392; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 549; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 109; *CPR 1334-1338*, p. 455; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 90; *CPR 1354-1358*, p. 492; *CCR 1333-1337*, p. 730; *CCR 1330-1333*, p. 325.

<sup>52</sup> TNA, C 47/9/58 mem. 1.

<sup>53</sup> TNA, C 47/9/58 mem. 1; TNA C 66/185 mem. 7; *CPR 1334-1338*, p. 123.

<sup>54</sup> *CCR 1354-1360*, p. 447.

<sup>55</sup> *CPR 1330-1334*, pp. 34, 79, 222; *CPR 1340-1343*, p. 481; *CPR 1334-1338*, p. 505: John Eston was described as the king's clerk and Philippa's receiver.

undermined the agreements between the servant and lord; scholars have found that it was not generally unusual or disruptive to social order for a servant to serve more than one lord.<sup>56</sup> There are references on the chancery rolls for rewards for 'good service' to both the king and queen (and sometimes their children); the king's servants were rewarded for their good service to the queen, or the queen obtained a grant, assignment or annuity for the king's retainers.<sup>57</sup> Philippa granted several assignments on her own lands to Edward III's 'new men': she granted a two-year lease of the manor of Banstead in Surrey to Thomas Bradeston; she gave a life grant to John Verdon of the keeping of Rockingham castle and the stewardship of the forest between the bridges of Oxford and Stafford; she leased the honour of Pontefract to the earl of Derby.<sup>58</sup> Philippa played an important part in Edward's attempts to provide these 'new men' with sufficient incomes for their new status, indicating that she was involved in political domestic affairs.

The concept of 'good lordship' was an integral part of the institution of bastard feudalism. Part of acting as a good lord was the provision of maintenance; in other words furthering the legal case of a retainer instead of allowing the law to take its course.<sup>59</sup> Scholars have debated the extent to which the concept of maintenance was actually illegal in the late Middle Ages, whether the practice was responsible for a decline in law and order and whether legislation on livery and maintenance in the fourteenth and fifteenth century was indicative of an increase in the scale and the abuse of the practice.<sup>60</sup> In light of medieval concepts of 'good lordship' and the practice of livery and maintenance, it is prudent to explore the extent to which serving the queen provided the retainer with any legal benefit.

---

<sup>56</sup> Walker, *The Lancastrian Affinity*, pp.109-111. In his study of the dual allegiances of retainers to Hugh Despenser and Edward II, Scott Waugh has highlighted the weaknesses of service to more than one lord in the 1320s. Although the unique qualities of this period should be remembered, and generally scholars have found such dual allegiances to remain functional : Scott L. Waugh, 'For King, Country, and Patron: The Despensers and Local Administration, 1321-1322', *The Journal of British Studies*, 22 (1983), 23-58.

<sup>57</sup>To both the king and queen: *CCR 1330-1333*, pp. 441, 570; *CPR 1330-1334*, pp. 33, 387; TNA, E 101/390/8 fols 3, 12; *CPR 1334-1338*, p. 320; *CPR 1338-1340*, pp. 113, 155, 238, 348-49,392; *CPR 1340-1343*, p. 529; *CPR 1343-1345*, p. 19; *CCR 1337-1339*, p. 411; *CCR 1360-1364*, p. 292; *CCR 1341-1343*, pp. 475, 656; *CPR 1358-1361*, pp. 105, 252; *CPR 1354-1358*, p. 508. King's servants for service to the queen: *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 97, 120, 245; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 90; *CPR 1364-1367*, p. 415.

<sup>58</sup> Bothwell, *Edward III and the English Peerage*, p. 134: Bothwell provides more examples.

<sup>59</sup> Hicks, *Bastard Feudalism*, p. 227

<sup>60</sup> Hicks, *Bastard Feudalism*, pp. 119-136; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 26.

There is some evidence that the queen's retainers received a certain level of financial protection. In addition to individual exemptions granted at the exchequer, those who travelled on the queen's business were often issued with letters of protection from the king's chancery at the queen's instigation.<sup>61</sup> As discussed in chapter three, Margaret, Isabella and Philippa often secured royal judicial pardons. However, very few of the beneficiaries can be definitively connected to the retinues of these queens. Often the enrolments of these pardons on the chancery rolls do not link any of those pardoned with the queens' household or estates. This does not mean that they were not members of the queens' retinues; the clerk enrolling the pardons could have left out that particular information. Since these names do not usually correspond with any of the persons I have been able to identify within the queens' household, estates or wider affinity, it is difficult to definitively conclude whether the queen secured judicial favours for her subjects. In some instances the pardoned might have been tenants on lands held by these queens, though the evidence is scanty and it is very difficult to establish the petitioner firmly as one of the queen's tenants; for example we know that in 1331, Isabella held the manors of Kingsthorpe, King's Cliff, Geddington and Brigstock in Northampton, and in 1350 secured a pardon for John Swinford of the county of Northampton for the death of John Langeton of the county of Leicester.<sup>62</sup> However, there is no indication in the chancery issue whether John Swinford was a tenant of one of these manors, making the connection tenuous at best. Philippa held the castle and town of Tickhill with its member of Gringley, and on 13 August 1331 Philippa secured a pardon for Roger Sturgeon of Gringley and Roger de Misterton of Gringley for outlawry and for failing to appear before the justices of *oyer* and *terminer* to answer an accusation of trespass against Thomas de Saundeby.<sup>63</sup> It may be possible that more of the people for whom these queens obtained pardons were tenants on their land-holdings, but the enrolment of the pardon often leaves out where these people lived. In only one instance is it possible that one of the pardoned was a servant of the queen, which might serve as evidence that she acted in this capacity. Gilbert de Berewick, steward of Queen Isabella's lands, received

---

<sup>61</sup> TNA, SC 1/35/112; *CPR 1301-1307*, p. 155; *CPR 1307-1313*, pp. 430, 452, 580-81; *CPR 1313-1317*, pp. 110, 385, 448, 618; *CPR 1317-1321*, pp. 378, 447; *CPR 1321-1324*, p. 103; *CPR 1324-1327*, pp. 96, 102, 116, 10, 126.

<sup>62</sup> *CPR, 1330-1334* p. 195.

<sup>63</sup> *CPR 1330-1334*, p. 408.

a pardon, at her insistence, for failing to appear before justices appointed to investigate felonies, trespasses and oppressions in the county of Wiltshire, because Gilbert was travelling in Chester on the queen's business.<sup>64</sup> This case seems to be in keeping with the tradition that when service to one's lord required travel, the retainer was exempt from certain legal and financial obligations.

Though this study's notion of the queen's household and affinity is based on the structure of baronial and royal affinities, the queen's household clearly had different implications from these other affinities. The original purpose of a retinue was to provide military service, and early fourteenth century indentures were mostly promises of military service.<sup>65</sup> It was in the reign of Richard II, and into the fifteenth-century that indentures for purposes other than military service proliferated, and the focus of some scholarly work has been on the retainer's peacetime service.<sup>66</sup> It was not until Richard II's reign that there were a large number of chamber knights.<sup>67</sup> The main purpose of Richard II's chamber knights' was to act as courtiers.<sup>68</sup> Though Richard entrusted his chamber knights with the most important castles in the kingdom, he did not turn them into territorial magnates or military commanders, his aim was for them to stay at court.<sup>69</sup> Not only were men retained for military purposes, but also for their personal connections, to raise the lord's following in certain areas, or because of the retainer's social importance.<sup>70</sup> By retaining, lords hoped to increase their power and influence, and thus were interested in both the quantity and quality of their servants.<sup>71</sup>

The queen did not usually need a military retinue, but it is natural that, with the separation of her household and estates from the king's, a group of 'hangers on' would

---

<sup>64</sup> CPR, 1343-1345, p. 110-11.

<sup>65</sup> Holmes, *The Estates of the Higher Nobility*, p. 80, Walker, *The Lancastrian Affinity*, pp. 40-45; Michael Powicke, *Military Obligation in Medieval England: A Study in Liberty and Duty* (Oxford, 1962), pp. 166-170; Hicks, *Bastard Feudalism*, p. 19.

<sup>66</sup> Christine Carpenter, 'The Beauchamp Affinity, A Study of Bastard Feudalism at Work', *English Historical Review*, 95 (1980), p. 519; Given-Wilson *The Royal Household*, pp. 209-223.

<sup>67</sup> Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household*, pp. 160-169.

<sup>68</sup> Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household*, p. 160.

<sup>69</sup> Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household*, p. 169.

<sup>70</sup> Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household*, p. 217.

<sup>71</sup> Hicks, *Bastard Feudalism*, pp. 69-70, 76, 140; Walker, *The Lancastrian Affinity*, pp. 51, 106.

begin to develop around her. Michael Hicks has argued that in most contexts it was not the number of the lord's retinue, but the independent status of those he retained that determined his standing and power.<sup>72</sup> Thus, the queen's affinity would serve to strengthen her power and influence throughout the realm. A study of the individuals in the queen's household demonstrates three key issues: for members of the landed elite, the queen's household was a desirable place with which to associate themselves and the significance of their own status contributed to the overall quality of the queen's affinity. Service in the queen's household could also lead to successful careers both within and outside her household. Several interconnected networks were established within the queen's household and between hers and other royal households. Should the need arise, the queen could manipulate these connections.

Serving the queen could often be the first step in a career of service or one stage among many in such a career. Several men provide us with examples of people whose service to the queen was a step in a long career of service to the crown and other members of the higher nobility. William de Ros was granted *pontage* and *pavage* at Isabella's request in 1319, which might indicate a reward for service, and his brother John, another member of Isabella's retinue, had a very successful career serving Edward II and Edward III in the 1320s and 1330s.<sup>73</sup> John de Verdon served Edward II in the 1320s and later Edward III until about 1370.<sup>74</sup> During this long career in royal service, Queen Philippa appointed him constable of Rockingham Castle and keeper of the forest there for life sometime before September 1335, a grant that was confirmed by the king on 24 July 1337.<sup>75</sup> William Inge was a highly successful lawyer in the late thirteenth century through to the last years of Edward II's reign.<sup>76</sup> Between 1311 and 1312 he received robes as a knight of Isabella's household.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Hicks, *Bastard Feudalism*, p. 76.

<sup>73</sup> *CPR 1317-1324*, p. 339; Colm McNamee, 'Ros, William de, first Lord Ros (c.1255-1316)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Oct 2005 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24079>, accessed 27 Feb 2008].

<sup>74</sup> *The Complete Peerage*, vol. XII/2, pp. 244-45.

<sup>75</sup> *CCR 1333-1337*, p. 730.

<sup>76</sup> Paul Brand, 'Inge, Sir William (c.1260-1322)', rev. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37587>, accessed 19 March 2008].

<sup>77</sup> Blackley, *The Household Book of Queen Isabella*, pp. 176-177.



Sir Walter Mauny demonstrates that one could rise very quickly through service in the queen's household. He grew up in the household of John de Beaumont, brother of William I, count of Hainault, Queen Philippa's father. In December 1327, Mauny came to England as a page in Philippa's household. Mauny started as the queen's trencherman and then became the keeper of her greyhounds. Mauny continued to serve the crown in a number of ways throughout the first half of the fourteenth century and was amply rewarded.<sup>78</sup> On 5 July 1331, a Robert de Veer [*sic*] appears as keeper of the forest of Rockingham, which was in Queen Philippa's hands.<sup>79</sup> John de Vere, the seventh earl of Oxford's eldest son, John, died around 1350, and another son, Robert, is known to have died in his father's lifetime. It is possible that our Robert is this second son.<sup>80</sup> If so, it serves to show that service in the queen's retinue could be attractive to younger sons of magnate families. Several people, who carried the names of important noble families, but whom I was unable to identify specifically were in the queens' service. They were probably second or even third sons of the heads of these families, or lesser known members of cadet branches; for example, a Nicholas de la Despense appears in both Isabella and Philippa's accounts as a king's yeoman and as a squire of the queen's chamber.<sup>81</sup> The name la Zouche appears several times in the queens' household accounts, but again I have been unable to determine in what manner, or if, these men were connected to the well-known Zouche family.<sup>82</sup> It was also possible to have a successful career completely within the queen's household. William de Bouden is a chief example of this practice. He served in the household of Edward II when he was prince, but upon Edward's marriage to Isabella in 1308, he became keeper of her household until at least 1316. He later served her in other capacities, acting as her controller when she went to France in 1325.<sup>83</sup> However, not much is known about him after 1325.

---

<sup>78</sup> For a more detailed summary of Mauny's life and career see: Jonathan Sumption, 'Mauny, Sir Walter (c.1310–1372)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17985>, accessed 4 March 2008].

<sup>79</sup> *CCR 1330-1333*, p. 325.

<sup>80</sup> Anthony Tuck, 'Vere, John de, seventh earl of Oxford (1312–1360)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28212>, accessed 27 Feb 2008].

<sup>81</sup> TNA, E 101/390/8 fol. 3, fol 12; *CCR 1341-1334*, p. 405; *CCR 1330-1333*, p. 441.

<sup>82</sup> Almaricus de la Zouche: *CPR 1330-1334*, p. 4; John de la Zouche: TNA, E 101/390/8 fols. 3,12.

<sup>83</sup> Blackley, *The Household Book of Queen Isabella*, p. xiii.

Several families served the queens over several generations, and members of these same families also served in the queen and king's households. The political prominence of these families over several generations and throughout several reigns puts the queen's retinue at the centre of political affairs. Conversely, by allying themselves with the queen these families maintained their involvement in court politics. There was a measure of continuity among the members of the queen's household, which is remarkable considering that it was not always a continuous institution. Isabella de Beaumont made a career out of serving queens. She was among the ladies of Eleanor of Castile before associating herself with Queen Isabella's household.<sup>84</sup> Queen Isabella's connections with the Beaumonts are well known, and Isabella de Beaumont, lady de Vescy appears often in Isabella's extant household accounts. Isabella de Beaumont was the second wife of John de Vescy, whom she married in 1279 or 1280. She was sister of Henry de Beaumont, who became the earl of Buchan, and Louis de Beaumont who became the bishop of Durham, through Isabella's mediation.<sup>85</sup> Isabella de Beaumont and her brother Henry allied themselves with Isabella during her coup in 1327.<sup>86</sup> Isabella's friendship with Isabella de Beaumont and her connections through her to Henry de Beaumont would explain the placement of Alice, countess of Buchan and the wife of Henry de Beaumont, as a lady of Isabella's household in 1311-1312.<sup>87</sup> Multiple members and generations of several other prominent families appear in Isabella and Philippa's households such as the Beauchamps,<sup>88</sup> the Clintons,<sup>89</sup> and the Despensers.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> Linda Mitchell, *Portraits of Medieval Women: Family Marriage and Politics in England, 1225-1350* (New York, 2003), pp. 93-94.

<sup>85</sup> See section 3.2.

<sup>86</sup> Mitchell, *Portraits of Medieval Women*, p. 101.

<sup>87</sup> Blackley, *The Household Book of Queen Isabella*, pp. 156-57.

<sup>88</sup> *CPR 1340-1343*, p 115; *The Complete Peerage*, vol. II, p. 44; *The Complete Peerage*, vol. II, p. 44; Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household*, pp. 72-73; TNA, E 101/390/8 fol. 1v; *CPR 1358-1361*, p. 42: Roger Beauchamp of Bletsoe, was described as the king's yeoman on 24 April 1337, was Philippa's bachelor and appointed keeper of Devizes Castle by her on 26 October 1340. Subsequent to 1340, Roger had a successful career serving in the French wars as early as 1346 and was made captain of Calais in 1372. He was made chamberlain of the king's household in 1377, an extremely powerful position. Roger's wife, Sybil, was one of Philippa's ladies between 1340 to 1341. She married Roger before 1336-37, so it is possible that she secured her place among Philippa's ladies by virtue of her marriage. This was very much a 'royal' marriage as both were members of the king and queen's household. Another Roger 'de Bello Campo' is recorded as Philippa's steward in 1358, but he was probably not the same Roger who served as

Section 4.1 discussed the composition of the queen's household and chamber, observing that the queen's chamber was not strictly female in its organization; the queens in this study retained knights of the household.<sup>91</sup> The question then arises: why should the queen have knights in her household? It is known that the knights of the king's household or chamber served the king by providing a social network for him, much as the queens' ladies did for the queen.<sup>92</sup> It is entirely plausible that the knights of the queen's chamber performed this function for the queen as well. They might also have served on her council, as they sometimes did for the king.<sup>93</sup> The purpose of the queen's retinue was social and administrative, but these knights could also serve a martial function in the same way as some of the king's knights did. The queen retained these knights mainly for protection as she travelled throughout the realm, but the retaining of knights by the queen indicates that her household possessed the *potential* for military mobilization. When queens travelled abroad they took large retinues with them.<sup>94</sup> Often their households were enlarged and the purpose of this was undoubtedly threefold: to

---

her bachelor in 1340, as that Roger seems to have moved from her household and into that of the kings. It is possible that this second Roger was Roger and Sybil's son.

<sup>89</sup> *CPR 1307-1307*, p. 580; W. M. Ormrod, 'Clinton, William, earl of Huntingdon (d. 1354)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/53080>, accessed 27 Feb 2008]; Blackley, *The Household Book of Queen Isabella*, pp. 156-57: The Clintons are another family with several members who served both Isabella and Philippa. A John Clinton is found listed as one of Isabella's valets in a book of prests from 1308-1320. This may be John, second lord Clinton since his mother Ida d'Odingsells accompanied Isabella during her trip to France in 1313. Ida de Clinton, the wife of William Clinton, Earl of Huntingdon, received robes in Isabella's household in 1311-1312. It was probably through Ida and William's relationship with Isabella and Philippa that John de Clinton, nephew and heir of William, found his place as a squire in Philippa's household.

<sup>90</sup> TNA, E 101/382/12; Blackley, *The Household of Queen Isabella*, pp. 156-57: The Despencers had a long history of service to the crown. Hugh the Elder served both Edward I and Edward II, and Hugh the Younger was Edward II's well known favourite. It has been asserted that Eleanor Despenser, Hugh the Younger's wife, was placed in Isabella's household in the 1320s as a spy for Edward II and Hugh Despenser, and she may have served this purpose (she was entrusted with the keeping of John of Eltham. However, she received robes as a lady of the queen's household as early as 1311-1312, long before the Despencers rapid rise in the 1320's, indicating that her service to the queen began long before any hostilities arose between Isabella and Hugh.

<sup>91</sup> *CCR 1364-1368*, p. 187; Blackley, *The Household Book of Queen Isabella*, pp. 156-157; *CCR 1360-1364*, p. 551; *CCR 1364-1368*, p. 262; *CCR 1360-1364*, p. 403; *CCR 1360-1364*, p. 257; TNA, E 101/390/8 fols 12, 3, 3v, 4; TNA, E 101/378/6; Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household*, pp. 204-07.

<sup>92</sup> Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household*, pp. 204-210.

<sup>93</sup> For chamber or household knights non-military duties see: Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household*, pp. 204-207.

<sup>94</sup> *CPR 1307-1313*, pp. 579-581; *CPR 1313-1317*, pp. 85-87; *CPR 1324-1327*, pp. 91-92.

provide the queen with people to serve her daily needs, to protect the queen, but also to demonstrate the power and strength of the queen and, by extension, the king. Though the intention was not strictly a martial one, it was also a way for the king to show his might and power, and it is possible that the use of the queen's expanded retinue was resonant of the great lord mobilizing his retainers for war.

Isabella of France was the only queen who engaged in military activity during the fourteenth century. She did so both during the Leeds Castle incident and during her coup in the autumn of 1326. As was recounted in chapter three, in October 1321, Isabella was travelling in Kent and demanded entrance to Leeds Castle, the custody of which the king had granted to Bartholomew Badlesmere. Badlesmere's wife, Margaret de Umpfraville, was holding the castle in his absence and refused Isabella entrance. Badlesmere then sent a large force to defend the castle and Edward besieged the castle for fifteen days. According to the chronicles, fights broke out between the castle garrison and the queen's 'servants'. While it is always problematic to take chronicles at face value, it is likely that these 'servants' were the queen's household knights, and so the descriptions demonstrate that the queen's retinue could serve a martial role, albeit in self-defence.<sup>95</sup> In this sense, the knights were very much the queen's personal body-guard.

In 1325-26 Isabella raised an army of retainers, which she brought with her to England and carried out the deposition of Edward II. The uniqueness of this situation must be stressed, but it was the potential martial capability of the queen's household which allowed her to do this. As mentioned in chapter three of this study, Katherine Allocco argues that most of the areas in which Isabella successfully secured pardons were areas that later joined her during her coup in 1326.<sup>96</sup> Further evidence points to Isabella actively exploiting the military potential of her retinue. Rosemary Horrox argues that patronage was usually a reward for past service, not a means by which the lord induced service.<sup>97</sup> During Edward III's minority, Isabella rewarded several individuals for service to her and Edward III 'during their time in France'.<sup>98</sup> The queen also took

---

<sup>95</sup> Natalie Fryde, *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II, 1321-1326* (Cambridge 1979), pp. 50-51.

<sup>96</sup> Katherine Allocco, *Intercessor, Rebel, Regent: The Political Life of Isabella of France* (Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Texas, Austin, 2004), p. 168.

<sup>97</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 3.

<sup>98</sup> *CCR 1327-1330* p. 69; *CPR 1327-1330*, p. 157: indenture made by Isabella and Edward III, before his ascension to Otto de Bodrigan concerning the latter's wages for the custody of the Isle of Lunday; *CChR*

advantage of many of the connections made with those mentioned above, who had served in her household. John de Ros, though married to Margaret de Gonsille, widow of Philip Despenser, allied himself to Queen Isabella, and landed with her at Harwich on 24 September 1326. In October 1326, he was made steward of the queen's household, and was steward of the royal household from 4 February 1327 to 1 March 1328, positions which were almost certainly rewards for his loyalty.<sup>99</sup> It is likely that Isabella cultivated a relationship with William Clinton, earl of Huntingdon, Ida Clinton's husband, as a result of Ida's service in her household. William was rewarded for supporting Isabella and Mortimer, and in November 1327 he escorted Philippa and her father, William, count of Hainault, to the English court for Philippa's marriage to Edward III.<sup>100</sup>

Allocco views the alliances Isabella made with Mortimer and the count of Hainault as an expansion of her retinue, and her connections with Elizabeth de Burgh, Joan de Barr, and Mary St. Pol prior to her invasion as an act of summoning support, already secured, to her new cause.<sup>101</sup> Isabella might have been recruiting new members into her affinity with the express purpose of raising an army, or she might have been calling up those already indebted to her for service in general. Again it must be emphasized that Isabella's military engagements were particular to her circumstances, but these incidents demonstrate that the queen's retinue still retained warlike characteristics. However, in general her retinue both at home and abroad symbolized the power of the queen, and by extension, the crown.

That the queen's household retained its military potential was convenient not only for the queen, but for the king as well. When Edward III went to the Low Countries in 1338-1340 he took Philippa with him. It is clear that he intended for her household knights to serve him in a martial capacity because her men-at-arms received wages from

---

1326-1341, p. 58-59: Grant in consideration of the good service rendered by the merchants and burgesses of the town of Malynes in Brabant to Isabella, queen of England the king's mother, and to the king, while he was in those parts; *CPR 1327-1330*, p. 233: for his good service to Queen Isabella and to the king when they were in parts beyond sea and after the king's arrival in England.

<sup>99</sup> Colm McNamee, 'Ros, William de, first Lord Ros (c.1255-1316)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Oct 2005 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24079>, accessed 27 Feb 2008].

<sup>100</sup> W. M. Ormrod, 'Clinton, William, earl of Huntingdon (d. 1354)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/53080>, accessed 3 March 2008].

<sup>101</sup> Allocco, 'The Political Life of Isabella of France', pp. 218-220, 226, 230.

Edward between 22 July 1338 and 16 November 1339. After 16 November, the war had ceased and Philippa's men-at-arms received no further wages from Edward, though her household received another subsidy for its expenses.<sup>102</sup> Livery for Philippa's knights and squires was also recorded on Edward III's livery rolls in 1340.<sup>103</sup> Edward was clearly mobilizing the queen's household for war along with his own. The king's ability to take advantage of the queen's household provides another reason why it was useful for her to accompany him abroad. Not only could he exploit her connections with her natal family to gain support for his war against Philip VI, as was explored in chapter three, but he could manipulate her military power to augment his own. In this way, the queen's household was still viewed as part of the king's and, consequently, the queen was still part of the institution of the crown.

The independence gained by the queen from the king's household in the later Middle Ages, in combination with the access to the king which she still maintained, allowed her household to develop as an institution and for an affinity to grow around her. The queen's affinity extended her power and influence through connections made with powerful noble families, who likewise benefited from their service with the queen. Some of the power the queen gained from the retinue was symbolic, but it also provided the potential for military action.

### 4.3 Estates

Queenship scholars agree that the queen's status was dictated by her place as the king's wife or mother, but what practical implications does this have on the day-to-day practice of queenship? Where exactly did this position situate the queen within medieval society? How does her status and the prerogatives associated with that status compare with those of noblewomen and noblemen? In order to answer these questions, a brief introduction to the development and evolution of the way in which noblewomen and queens held their dowerlands is necessary. The queen's dower comprised the bulk of her estate holdings. Married women of the landed elite were entitled to a dower for their maintenance after their husband's death. Until the thirteenth century, the dower was determined at 'the church door' and made up no more than one third of the total value of a husband's

---

<sup>102</sup> Norwell, *The Wardrobe Book of William de Norwell*, pp. lxxxiv-lxxxv, 226.

<sup>103</sup> TNA, E 101/390/8 mems. 3, 3v, 4, 12.

property.<sup>104</sup> Later, Magna Carta changed the land assigned in dower to one third of a husband's property on the day of his death.<sup>105</sup> Dower reverted back to the lord's heirs at the death of his widow, so women could not alienate it in perpetuity. The queen was also granted a dower, and for the period with which this study is concerned, it was to be valued at £4,000-£4,500, placing the queen at the lower range of landed wealth as compared with other magnates in the fourteenth century; for example, Edward of Woodstock's lands were valued at approximately £9,982 at his death, Henry of Grosmont, earl of Lancaster's, £8,380, Gilbert de Clare, earl of Gloucester's, £6,000, Aymer de Valence, earl of Pembroke's, £3,000 and William Montague, the second earl of Salisbury's, £1,000.<sup>106</sup> Thus, if wealth were the only measure of influence, the queen would not be highly positioned in the hierarchy of lordly power. From the fourteenth century, queen consorts were traditionally assigned the same lands for their dower as their predecessors.<sup>107</sup> In some ways the queen consort might be looked upon as the heiress to the dowager queen.

At the end of the thirteenth century the jointure became a popular means by which a husband supported his wife.<sup>108</sup> A jointure was land appointed in the marriage

---

<sup>104</sup> Rowena Archer, 'Rich Old Ladies: The Problem of Late Medieval Dowagers', in Tony Pollard (ed.), *Property and Politics* (Gloucester, 1984), p.17; Mitchell, *Portraits of Medieval Women*, p. 8.

<sup>105</sup> Archer, 'Rich Old Ladies', p. 17.

<sup>106</sup> Richard Barber, 'Edward , prince of Wales and of Aquitaine (1330-1376)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8523>, accessed 18 March 2008]; W. M. Ormrod, 'Henry of Lancaster , first duke of Lancaster (c.1310-1361)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12960>, accessed 18 March 2008]; J. R. S. Phillips, 'Valence, Aymer de, eleventh earl of Pembroke (d. 1324)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/942>, accessed 18 March 2008]; Michael Altschul, 'Clare, Gilbert de, eighth earl of Gloucester and seventh earl of Hertford (1291-1314)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5439>, accessed 18 March 2008]; John L. Leland, 'Montagu, William , second earl of Salisbury (1328-1397)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19002>, accessed 18 March 2008].

<sup>107</sup> Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile*, pp. 75,123; Anne Crawford, 'The King's Burden—the Consequences of Royal Marriage in Fifteenth-Century England', in Ralph Griffiths (ed.), *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1981), p. 42.

<sup>108</sup> K.B. McFarlane, *The Nobility of Later Medieval England: The Ford Lectures for 1953 and Related Studies* (Oxford, 1973), p. 64.

settlement, or in joint purchase or enfeoffment, and was held mutually by husband and wife in survivorship.<sup>109</sup> Consequently, wives held this land while their husbands were alive, and they often held all of their husbands' property in jointure, sometimes temporarily keeping the heir out of his inheritance.<sup>110</sup> The way in which the queen held her dower also changed around the same time as the development of jointure in the late thirteenth century.

From the mid-twelfth century to the mid-thirteenth century the queen's dower lands had remained in the possession of the king, while he supported the queen.<sup>111</sup> She would inherit them upon the king's death. Neither Eleanor of Provence nor Eleanor of Castile took control of their dower lands during their husband's lifetime, and it was not until the early fourteenth century, around the same time as the jointure became popular, that the queen was allowed to hold her dower lands during her husband's lifetime.<sup>112</sup> In the mid thirteenth century, Eleanor of Castile did not receive her dowerlands during her lifetime. Instead, Edward I encouraged her to purchase land to aid in her maintenance. After Eleanor of Castile's death in 1290, all the lands that Eleanor had purchased in addition to her potential dower lands were administered as an independent unit. When Edward married Margaret of France in 1299, the lands became her dower, leaving the royal demesne untouched.<sup>113</sup> Margaret of France was the first queen to take control of her dower lands before the death of the king, and Isabella followed suit.<sup>114</sup> The king was still financially responsible for the queen when their households were together; this would not change until the fifteenth century when the queen had to pay for every day she was at court.<sup>115</sup> All land now granted to the queen by the crown was considered part of her dower.

---

<sup>109</sup> Archer, 'Rich Old Ladies', p. 19.

<sup>110</sup> McFarlane, *The Nobility of Later Medieval England*, pp. 64-66.

<sup>111</sup> Anne Crawford, 'The Queen's Council in the Middle Ages', *English Historical Review*, 116 (2001), pp. 1193-95

<sup>112</sup> Crawford, 'The Queen's Council', p. 1195.

<sup>113</sup> Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile*, p. 123.

<sup>114</sup> For Margaret of France see: *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 118-119, 240, 243, 363-370, 372. For Isabella see: *CPR 1317-1321*, pp. 108, 115-116, 122-23, 132, 201-202; *CCR 1313-1318*, pp. 538, 543.

<sup>115</sup> Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 235; Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household*, p. 39.



Just as the separation of the queen's household established the queen as an institution, so did her ability to hold her dower before the death of the king. The queen did not hold this land jointly with her husband as other wives of the landed elite did. Instead she held her land as a life grant from the king in much the same way that some magnates held their estates.<sup>116</sup> Dower was held by the queen for her life with reversion to the king at her death. Theoretically her lands returned to the king so that they would be available to their heirs and in practice were normally used to dower the next queen.<sup>117</sup> This custom could create difficulties for a king who had to support both a queen consort and a dowager queen. Edward II faced this very predicament when he married Isabella of France. Margaret of France lived as dowager queen for almost ten years after Isabella and Edward's marriage, holding lands which were needed to support Isabella. Despite the difficulties this situation could cause in administering her lands during her time as consort, the queen was able to exercise authority in her own right, and to attract a retinue through which she could extend her power and authority.

Other married women of the landed elite did not exercise this level of direct authority over their estates because they held them jointly with their husbands. It is tempting to assume that jointure gave women equal authority on these estates, but this was not the case. Holding land in jointure with one's husband did not automatically designate the wife as an equal partner in the administration of their land. The common law prevented married women from controlling real and moveable property or any income earned from these lands during their marriages.<sup>118</sup> The manor courts of Havering demonstrate that when a married couple held land jointly, the husband alone swore fealty to the king and rendered suit of court.<sup>119</sup> It was only when her husband was away on business or war that a wife might hope to administer the lands on her own. Once her husband had died she was able to take full control of her dower.<sup>120</sup> If her late husband's

---

<sup>116</sup> For types of royal grants see: Bothwell, *Edward III and the English Peerage*, pp. 32-36.

<sup>117</sup> Crawford, 'The King's Burden', p. 42.

<sup>118</sup> Sara M. Butler, 'Maintenance Agreements and Male Responsibility in Late Medieval England', in Anthony Musson (ed.), *Boundaries of the Law: Geography, Gender and Jurisdiction in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Ashgate, 2005) p. 67.

<sup>119</sup> Marjorie McIntosh, *Autonomy and Community: The Royal Manor of Havering, 1200-1500* (Cambridge, 1986), p. 219; For the rights of wives see: Mitchell, *Portraits of Medieval Women*, pp. 7-9.

<sup>120</sup> Mitchell, *Portraits of Medieval Women*, pp. 6-7, 133; Rowena Archer, 'How Ladies... who live on their manors ought to manage their households and estates': Women as Landholders and Administrators in the

heirs were minors, then a widow might hold direct authority over her husband's entire estate.<sup>121</sup> If lands were held in jointure then the widow was considered the lord of her husband's estates even if the heirs were adults.<sup>122</sup> The experiences of these married women highlight the ways in which the queen was anomalous. The change in the queen's dower rights during the fourteenth century meant that the queen was the most powerful and authoritative *married* women because she was able to directly administer her estates in the same way as a male magnate, without waiting for her husband's death. The only other women at this level of society who possessed similar authority were the widows of great magnates.

Scholars have claimed that the queen held direct authority over *all* aspects of her estate administration.<sup>123</sup> This section will evaluate the validity of this claim by investigating the extent to which the queen exercised authority over her estates and how this authority was manifested. In doing so, it will consider how her role as the king's wife might have limited her authority. In other words, when and why did the king interfere with her estate administration and when did she need the king's authority to act? Little work has been done in defining the exact nature of the king's authority over the lands the queen held by his grant.<sup>124</sup> Yet, such information is crucial in defining the relationship between the king and queen, and in determining the ways in which the queen

---

Later Middle Ages', in P.J.P Goldberg (ed.), *Women is a Worthy Wight: Women in English Society c. 1200-1500* (Stroud, 1992), p. 162.

<sup>121</sup> This was only in the cases where the widow was granted the minority, for information on granting minorities see: Bothwell, *Edward III and the English Peerage*, pp. 67-69.

<sup>122</sup> McFarlane, *The Nobility of the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 64-68.

<sup>123</sup> Crawford, 'The Queen's Council'; Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in *The English Government at Work*, pp. 250-253.

<sup>124</sup> Several studies focus on administrative history of the queen's household and offices: Blackley, *The Household book of Queen Isabella*; Crawford, 'The Queen's Council in the Middle Ages'; Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, vol. 5; Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336*; Hilda Johnstone, 'The Queen's Exchequer under the Three Edwards', in J.G. Edwards (ed.), *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait* (Manchester, 1933), pp. 143-153; Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile*; Parsons, *The Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile in 1290: An Edition of British Library Additional Manuscript 35294 with Introduction and Notes* (Toronto, 1977); A.R. Myers, *Crown, Household and Parliament in Fifteenth Century England* (London, 1985).

Others have focused on cultural ideas such as space, gender, image: Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, pp. 220-261; Gilchrist, 'Medieval Bodies in the Material World: Gender, Stigma and the Body'; Others do not dedicate much space to a study of the household or estates: Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*; Howell, *Eleanor of Provence*; Michael Hicks, *Anne Nevell: Queen to Richard III* (Stroud, 2007); Paul C. Doherty, *Isabella and the Strange Death of Edward II* (Oxford, 2003).

was empowered or limited by her role as the king's wife or mother.

During the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, a more complicated administrative system was developed for the queen's household and estates because it was becoming a royal institution in its own right.<sup>125</sup> This institution became a source of direct patronage for the queen and she exercised authority as a lord over these estates. The creation of the queen's household and new dower rights led to the gradual development of the auxiliary bodies— her council, exchequer and writing offices— necessary in the administration of her household and estates, and these offices were the vehicles through which her authority was expressed. Anne Crawford and Hilda Johnstone have studied the evolution of the queen's exchequer and council during the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as an important development of estate administration.<sup>126</sup>

However, the development of the queen's writing offices has not been studied in detail. This dearth of scholarship may be for two reasons. First, it may be a widely acknowledged assumption that the queen had her own writing offices, after all, there is no question that the queen issued letters. Second, it is difficult to reconstruct these offices because there is very little extant material and it is scattered throughout numerous types of documentation and archival classifications. Nevertheless, an inquiry into the existence of the queen's writing offices is important because it was through the writs, grants, appointments and so forth issued by her letters, under her own seal, that her authority over her estates was manifested. Seals were necessary components of noble and royal correspondence because the possession of a seal was indicative of legal jurisdiction and property ownership, which was the source of power and authority in the fourteenth century.<sup>127</sup> Chaplais has outlined the use of the great, privy and signet seals by the crown.<sup>128</sup> The queen possessed seals analogous to those of the crown, which the queens used to deal with all the business related to their own household and to the administration of their lands.<sup>129</sup> Wardrobe accounts record a great seal of silver and a privy seal of gold

---

<sup>125</sup> Crawford, 'The Queen's Council', pp. 1193-1211; Johnstone, 'The Queen's Exchequer', pp. 143-48.

<sup>126</sup> Crawford, 'The Queen's Council', pp. 1193-1211; Johnstone, 'The Queen's Exchequer', pp. 143-53.

<sup>127</sup> Brigitte Beos Rezak, 'Women, Seals, and Power in Medieval France, 1150-1350', in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), p. 61.

<sup>128</sup> Pierre Chaplais, *English Diplomatic Practice in the Middle Ages* (London, 2003), pp. 94-102.

made for Margaret in 1299 by a London goldsmith.<sup>130</sup> Isabella possessed a great seal, an exchequer seal and a privy seal, and there are references in her letters to a signet seal.<sup>131</sup> A great seal and a privy seal survive for Philippa, and Johnstone claims an exchequer and secret seal existed, but no examples of them have been found.<sup>132</sup> Philippa also had her own keeper of her privy seal.<sup>133</sup> Since the queens possessed their own seals they were able to exercise authority over their own lands and those who served them.

Fourteenth-century queens also had their own chancery. Surviving letters in combination with records of letters, now lost, indicate a frequent correspondence sufficient to warrant a distinct writing office for the queen. Some of the queens' letters survive, most of which concern estate administration, acts of patronage and, in some cases, political and diplomatic concerns. The classification of Ancient Correspondence (SC 1) in the National Archives, London, contains twenty letters from Margaret, sixty-four from Isabella, and thirty-one from Philippa. Letters may also be buried deep in other classifications in the National Archives as well as in other archives, but the number of letters in Ancient Correspondence, along with other references to the queens' letters, described below, demonstrate that a complex system of estate administration existed with the queen at its head.<sup>134</sup> References to Margaret, Isabella, and Philippa's letters patent exist on the king's chancery rolls.<sup>135</sup> These letters patent generally concern grants of the queen. In addition to these records of the queen's letters in the king's chancery, there are enrolments of letters issued from Isabella's exchequer.<sup>136</sup> It is this memoranda

---

<sup>129</sup> For a description of Plantagenet queens' seals see: Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, vol. 5, pp. 286-87.

<sup>130</sup> Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, vol. 5, p. 287.

<sup>131</sup> Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in *The English Government at Work*, p. 298.

<sup>132</sup> Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in *The English Government at Work*, pp. 298-299.

<sup>133</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, 'The Merger of Edward III's and Queen Philippa's Households', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 51 (1978), p. 186; TNA, E 101/396/11 fols 17-18.

<sup>134</sup> An example of one of Philippa's letters patent, with her privy seal, exists in Minister and Receiver's accounts TNA, SC 6/1092/9. (I have identified it as such based on Hilda Johnstone's description of a privy seal for Philippa, preserved in the British Library: Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in *The English Government at Work*, p. 299, note 3).

<sup>135</sup> *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 136-137, 203, 319; *CCR 1303-1307*, pp. 37, 146; *CPR 1317-1321*, p. 34; *CPR 1330-1334*, pp. 123, 222, 414, 494-5, 565; *CPR 1334-1338*, pp. 331, 455, 506; *CCR 1330-1333* pp. 30, 269; *CCR 1333-1337*, p. 135; *CChR 1326-1341*, p. 435.

<sup>136</sup> TNA, E 163/4/30 mems 1, 1d, 4d, 5, 6.

roll to which Crawford and Johnstone refer when they claim that the queen's letters were issued under her direct authority, though neither cite it *per se*.<sup>137</sup> Evidence of Philippa's authority over her estates is preserved on a roll that contains copies of her letters patent, indentures and warrants, while her letters patent were copied on to the memoranda roll of the exchequer for 1329.<sup>138</sup> The enrolled letters were public instruments and the very exercise of enrolling them signifies their official purpose. Keeping in mind this study's definition of authority—the publicly or officially recognized right to give direction and expect compliance—the act of officially recording Philippa's letters for public use (at least for later referencing by royal administrators) signals the queen's direct authority over her estates. The most conclusive evidence that the queen had her own writing offices are records in account books of both Philippa and Isabella's wardrobes for the purchase of cloth for the robes of a clerk 'writing letters for the queen'.<sup>139</sup> The queen's household thus possessed the administrative mechanisms to exist as its own institution: a household, an exchequer, a council and a writing office. In spite of this administrative machinery, Johnstone and Crawford's claim that she held direct authority over *every* aspect of her household and estates needs to be re-evaluated.

In most cases, the queen's command was executed by virtue of her own authority. Copies of Philippa and Isabella's letters exist issuing appointments or summoning their ministers to account for lands they held by the queen's appointment, demonstrating that the queen administered her lands exactly as any male magnate did.<sup>140</sup> However, there were also times when the king exerted his own authority in the administration of her estates. The accounts associated with the queen's estates and the issues from the king's chancery demonstrate a number of instances in which the king was involved in the queen's estate administration. The phrasing of the queen's letters is one of authoritative

---

<sup>137</sup> Crawford, 'The Queen's Council', p. 1194. However, Crawford does not actually cite any of these writs, but seems to derive this information from Hilda Johnstone's article 'The Queen's Household' in *The English Government at Work*, pp. 251-291. In this article, Johnstone also makes this claim, but then offers no references. Later in the article she describes a memoranda roll of Isabella's exchequer: TNA, E 163/4/30. After a thorough examination of this roll, I believe this is where Johnstone derived her support for this claim because it contains enrolments of Isabella's letters.

<sup>138</sup> TNA, C 47/9/58; TNA, E 159/105 mem. 52d.

<sup>139</sup> [British Library] BL MS Cotton Galba E III fol. 185; Blackley, *The Household Book of Queen Isabella*, pp. 158-59 also has a similar entry for winter robes given to *Johanni Giffard clerico facienti literas regine*.

<sup>140</sup> TNA, E 163/4/30, mems. 1, 1d, 4d, 5, 6, TNA, SC 1/37/11; TNA C 47/9/58; TNA, E 159/105 mem. 52d.

command, but in some cases her grants and other business conducted under her letters patent were confirmed in the king's chancery. These confirmations indicate that there were some issues concerning estate administration that she could not directly authorize.

There is a danger in interpreting the king's involvement in the queen's estate administration as an infringement of her rights based on gender and her role as the king's wife. However, these confirmations illustrate that in many respects the queen was like the other male magnates in needing the king's assistance to be a good lord and an effective landholder. Letters of protection for household members accompanying the queen on her travels or travelling on the business of the queen were issued from the chancery, at the queen's request through letters to the chancellor.<sup>141</sup> Commissions of purveyance for the queen's household also had to be authorized by the crown.<sup>142</sup> The queen could not fell trees without the king's licence, nor could she elect verderers to her forest.<sup>143</sup> This case was probably an issue of encroachment upon the king's forest. The Forest Charter of 1217 had made the cutting of wood, pasturing and poaching on demesne lands without the king's licence illegal.<sup>144</sup> All landholders were subject to similar restrictions, so the necessity of the king's licence was not due to the queen's gender or position as the king's wife; the king treated his wife as he would treat any other lord.<sup>145</sup>

Arguably one of the most invasive actions of the king was when he redistributed the queen's lands. However, this was generally a *quid pro quo* transaction, upon which the king compensated the queen by granting her lands in another place or through another source of revenue, something he could do with anyone holding land from the crown. The king might do this if there was a dispute over the custody of the lands or the

---

<sup>141</sup> TNA, SC 1/35/112; CPR 1301-1307, p. 155; CPR 1307-1313, pp. 430, 452, 580-81; CPR 1313-1317, pp. 110, 385, 448, 618; CPR 1317-1321, pp. 378, 447; CPR 1321-1324, p. 103; CPR 1324-1327, pp. 96, 102, 116, 10, 126.

<sup>142</sup> TNA, SC 1/48/178, TNA, SC 1/63/242; CPR 1313-1317, pp. 77, 110, 618; CPR 1317-1321, pp. 138, 216-17, 326, 564; CPR 1321-1324, pp. 7, 50, 346; CPR 1330-1334, pp. 170, 393; CPR 1334-1338, pp. 427, 533.

<sup>143</sup> CCR 1302-1307, pp. 153, 175; CCR 1354-1360, p. 246; CCR 1330-1333, p. 325; CPR 1330-1334, pp. 319, 356.

<sup>144</sup> Charles Young, *The Royal Forests of Medieval England* (Philadelphia, 1979), pp. 3-32, 60-113.

<sup>145</sup> Barbara Hanawalt, 'Men's Games, King's Deer: Poaching in Medieval England', in Barbara Hanawalt (ed.), *Of Good and Ill Repute: Gender and Social Control in Medieval England* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 142-155.

king needed to use them elsewhere. Often these land transactions were made at the 'request of the king' or with 'the assent of the queen'.<sup>146</sup> It is appropriate here to question whether the absorption of her lands was actually done with the queen's assent, or if the king's request was more of an order than a choice. In truth, it may be that the statement was a mere formality. Even if that was the case, its inclusion in the chancery issues demonstrates that it was necessary for the king to create the impression that authority for the transaction came from the queen.

The king could be vindictive in exercising his prerogative to repossess land held from the crown, especially if he questioned the loyalty of the landholder. The absorption of Isabella's lands in 1324 provides an example of the king taking such action. In 1324 Edward II confiscated all of Isabella's lands with the excuse that her French origins made her a liability during the war of St. Sardos.<sup>147</sup> Isabella was not the only target of Edward's policies against the French in England because it was ordered by the king that 'all French persons living within the realm of England, including members of the households of the king or the queen consort, be taken and their lands and goods and chattels seized into the king's hands'.<sup>148</sup> Since *quid pro quo* exchanges of land between the king and queen were frequent, it was not Isabella's financial loss in 1324 that made the land transaction between Isabella and Edward extraordinary (she was compensated with a monetary allowance of 8 marks per day, about £1,000 per year) but the loss of her ability to use her lands to dispense patronage through appointments on those lands.<sup>149</sup> Edward had stripped her of an important source of power and authority.

Edward III's absorption of Isabella's lands in 1330 could also be viewed as an attempt to penalize Isabella for her part in the political turmoil of the late 1320s. However, the rapid reinstatement of her lands and estates as early as 1331 indicates that the purpose of the 1330 absorption was simply a redistribution rather than an attempt to prevent Isabella from ever exercising authority again. This also fits in with Edward's general policy of allowing those who had been a part of the Isabella/Mortimer regime to

---

<sup>146</sup> *CPR 1301-1307*, p. 261; *CCR 1302-1307*, p. 286; *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 452.

<sup>147</sup> *CCR 1323-1327*, p. 223; *CFR 1319-1327*, pp. 300-301.

<sup>148</sup> TNA, C 61/36, mem. 24d.

<sup>149</sup> John Carmi Parsons, 'Isabella (1295-1358)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14484>, accessed 18 March 2008].

regain the king's favour.<sup>150</sup> Moreover, after the redistribution of land in 1330, Isabella's dower was comprised mostly of estates from the new holdings she had been given in 1327, rather than only those she had held as part of her original dower assignment. Philippa's dower, on the other hand, was made up of a mixture of lands that were part of the traditional dower assignments and the new lands Isabella held in 1327. This reassignment of the queen's traditional dowerlands suggests that Edward III took advantage of the availability of the extra lands Isabella held in 1327 to support both his consort and his mother. The confiscation of Isabella's holdings in 1330 was as much an issue of returning the distribution of land to its conventional level, as an attempt to curtail Isabella. In doing this, Edward III was able to dower both Philippa and Isabella in a way that Edward II had not been able to do.

Alternatively, if the queen came into financial difficulties, she could expect the king's support, which other members of the baronage could not. Edward III absorbed the queen's entire household in 1360 in an attempt to help pay Philippa's debts, but her estates continued to be managed by her own ministers.<sup>151</sup> This was also a result of financial convenience, as Edward and Philippa spent much of their later years together, rather than Philippa's inability to manage her finances. The king sometimes helped his nobles financially by forgiving their debts at the exchequer, but he never helped them to the degree to which he did with Philippa. The king normally provided for the queen when she was at court, and when Edward III absorbed Philippa's household into his own, he was faced with the extra expenses of maintaining her household. As a result, she paid him £10 for every day she was at court, a compensation by queens that continued into the fifteenth century.<sup>152</sup> Thus, Isabella's experiences demonstrate that the king's redistribution or absorption of the queen's estates and household should not be seen as limiting her power and authority on the basis of her status as the king's wife or mother. Anyone holding land from the crown was subject to the king's prerogative to exercise control over that land. In contrast, Philippa shows us that the queen was sometimes in a more advantageous position than the magnates because she could expect extra support

---

<sup>150</sup> W.M. Ormrod, *Edward III* (Stroud, 2005), p. 110.

<sup>151</sup> Given-Wilson, 'The Merger of Edward III's and Queen Philippa's Households', pp. 183-184.

<sup>152</sup> Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 235; Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household*, p. 39; Given-Wilson, 'The Merger of Edward III's and Queen Philippa's Households', p. 186.



from the crown. The rest of the baronage did not receive this amount of extra support when they came into financial difficulties.

In some ways, the queen's legal status was the same as that of any other male magnate, but, as this chapter will later discuss, due to her special relationship with the king, she had certain immunities not enjoyed by other magnates, and she had access to the royal judicial apparatus. We often see the queen petitioning the chancery for commissions of *oyer et terminer*.<sup>153</sup> Any landholder who wanted to request a commission of inquisition, a view and regard, an *oyer et terminer*, an appointment to hear trespasses and so forth was required to petition the crown and the queen was not an exception.<sup>154</sup> The king was the upholder of justice and everyone, the queen included, had to approach the crown to obtain such commissions. Landholders could not initiate judicial proceedings without the king; for example, Queen Margaret made use of *oyer et terminer* for her own profit in the same manner as other magnates and the king.<sup>155</sup> In doing so, she performed an active and authoritative role in her administration. In 1302 a commission was issued to investigate trespasses in the queen's park of Camel, and more investigators were assigned to this commission in 1303.<sup>156</sup> At the end of the inquest, Margaret was granted all the fines resulting from the investigation.<sup>157</sup> The business of prosecuting these trespasses demonstrates that Queen Margaret performed an active role in the inquisitions, that she exercised authority on her estates and in the king's chancery, and that she was recognized as the lord by other prominent men of the king's administration. In 1304, Margaret wrote to the chancellor to excuse Alexander of Cheverel and Roger le Parker

---

<sup>153</sup> TNA, SC 1/25/203, 35/63, 65, 185; TNA, SC 1/36/38; TNA SC 1/38/193; TNA, SC 1/39/50; TNA, SC 1/41/81, 85, 87; TNA, SC 1/42/102; *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 85, 194; *CPR, 1307-1313*, pp. 337; *CPR 1313-1317*, p. 581; *CPR 1317-1321*, pp. 88, 170, 171, 465, 542; *CPR 1321-1324*, pp. 59, 60, 251, 315, 371, 457, 447, 450; *CPR 1330-1334*, pp. 137, 198, 144, 386, 498, 374, 356; *CPR 1343-1345*, p. 506; *CPR 1334-1338*, p. 367; *CCR 1337-1339*, p. 120, *CPR 1334-1338*, p. 577; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 69; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 75.

<sup>154</sup> TNA, SC 1/25/203, 35/63, 65, 185; TNA, SC 1/36/38; TNA SC 1/38/193; TNA, SC 1/39/50; TNA, SC 1/41/81, 85, 87; TNA, SC 1/42/102; *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 85, 194; *CPR, 1307-1313*, p. 337; *CPR 1313-1317*, p. 581; *CPR 1317-1321*, pp. 88, 170, 171, 465, 542; *CPR 1321-1324*, pp. 59, 60, 251, 315, 371, 457, 447, 450; *CPR 1330-1334*, pp. 37, 198, 144, 386, 498, 374, 356; *CPR 1343-1345*, p. 506; *CPR 1334-1338*, p. 367; *CCR 1337-1339*, p. 120, *CPR 1334-1338*, p. 577; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 69; *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 75; Richard Kauper, 'Law and Order in Fourteenth-Century England: The Evidence of Special Commissions of *Oyer and Terminer*', *Speculum*, 54 (1979), pp. 739, 747-753.

<sup>155</sup> See Kaeuper, 'Law and Order in Fourteenth-Century England' pp. 747-753 for how magnates made use of *oyer et terminer*.

<sup>156</sup> *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 85, 188.

<sup>157</sup> *CPR 1301-1307*, pp. 30, 138.

for failing to appear and pay the fines for their trespasses.<sup>158</sup> In this letter, she claimed that she wrote at the request of Aymer de Valence, earl of Pembroke, who was one of the inquisitors. In asking this of her, the earl recognized her power to accomplish business in the chancery. The earl was concurrently writing to the chancery to excuse other men from paying similar fines, and in seeking her cooperation, he acknowledged her as lord of the estate.<sup>159</sup> The resulting chancery issue excusing Alexander and Roger states that the queen had also written directly to the king himself about the matter, demonstrating her enhanced power as his wife.<sup>160</sup>

The queen was a powerful landholder in her own right and enjoyed the same legal status as elite male landholders. However, by virtue of her royal status, she enjoyed certain immunities and benefits. John Carmi Parsons has found that late thirteenth-century queens could only be sued by petition to the king's council, not in the courts of law. Her officials were exempt from prosecution for actions in her service and, like the queen, suits could only be brought against them in the king's council.<sup>161</sup> This practice still occurred in the fourteenth-century because answers to suits against the queen and her ministers were dealt with in the king's chancery. The chancery was the medium through which much of the business authorized by the council was conducted, so chancery issues concerning suits against the queen or her ministers indicate that the suit was placed before the king or his council.<sup>162</sup> Such orders came from the chancery directing Isabella to pay rent owed to the abbot of Westminster for the manor of Chippenham, which she held by the king's grant, because the abbot claimed that he was the lord of that manor and had always received rent for it.<sup>163</sup> Isabella had not been

---

<sup>158</sup> TNA, SC 1/28/86.

<sup>159</sup> TNA, SC 1/28/95.

<sup>160</sup> *CCR 1302-1307*, pp. 30, 146.

<sup>161</sup> Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile*, p. 70.

<sup>162</sup> The chancery and the council were very closely connected; for example the chancellor was often head of the king's council and the chancery itself had a council, which was not necessarily mutually exclusive from the king's council. For the relationship between the king's council and the Chancery see: W. A. Morris 'Introduction: The Council and The Chancery and Privy Seal', in W. Morris (ed.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols, The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1930-1940), vol. 1, pp. 29-77; Baldwin, 'The King's Council', in W.A. Morris (ed.), *The English Government at Work* (3 vols, The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1930-1940), vol. 1, pp. 129-161; Bertie Wilkinson 'The Chancery' in W. A. Morris (ed.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols, The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1930-1940), vol. 1, pp. 162-205.

honouring the rent she owed to the abbot, and he therefore petitioned the king to order Isabella to pay it. Likewise, Queen Margaret's ministers were ordered by the king to pay the abbot of Nutley and parson of the church of Risborough the money arising from the assignment of all animals in the park, because they received these tithes from 'time out of memory' and Margaret's bailiffs had not been paying these tithes.<sup>164</sup> The abbot of Nutley and the abbot of Westminster were required to petition the king's council to receive justice against the queen or her ministers and all judicial action taken against Margaret, Isabella and Philippa was done through the council and chancery. Unlike the queen, male magnates were not immune from liability in common law courts.

Though the queen had all the administrative bodies to act as a magnate and to operate as an institution of her own, she still had access to the crown and apparatus of the state, something that male magnates did not have. In her valuable work on the queen's exchequer, Hilda Johnstone does not address the existence of a judicial apparatus in the queen's exchequer similar to that provided by the barons of the king's exchequer in the exchequer of pleas. An examination of the interaction between the queen and king over estate administration reveals that an exchequer court did not exist for Plantagenet queens. John Carmi Parsons has found that Eleanor of Castile used the king's exchequer to enforce her rights and prosecute bailiffs.<sup>165</sup> The queen's exchequer was no more than an advanced accounting office comparable to those of many magnates whose estates produced enough revenue to require such an organization. It may be that when the queen's exchequer was developed in the fourteenth century, it was done without a judicial organization because she, as the king's wife, had full access to the judicial apparatus of his exchequer. In fact, the exchequer court seems to have been traditionally seen as both the queen and the king's court. In the twelfth century, Matilda, queen of Henry I, used her seal to record the judgment of 'her court and that of her husband', referring to the court of the exchequer, which was in development at this time.<sup>166</sup> The use

---

<sup>163</sup> *CCR 1327-1330*, p. 482.

<sup>164</sup> *CCR 1302-1307*, p. 280.

<sup>165</sup> Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile*, p. 95.

<sup>166</sup> C. Johnson (ed.), *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normanorum, 1066-1154*, vol 2, no. 10000 as cited in Judith Green, *The Government of England Under Henry I* (Cambridge, 1986), p. 42; Joseph Stevenson (ed.), *Chronica Monasterii de Abingdon*, Rolls Series, 2 (London, 1858), pp. 216-17 as cited in Lois Huneycutt, 'Public lives, private ties: Royal Mothers in England and Scotland, 1070-1204', in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.), *Medieval Mothering* (New York, 1996), p. 295.

of Matilda's seal to record this judgement may be used by scholars to assert that the queen was marginalized in the fourteenth century because she no longer presided over the exchequer court as Matilda had apparently done. However, neither the queen nor the king ever actually presided over the king's new exchequer court; it was always under the administration of a appointed official (in the twelfth century this person was Roger, bishop of Salisbury).<sup>167</sup> Thus, in both the twelfth century and the fourteenth, the exchequer court was used by the queen and the king in the same way. Neither the queen or the king presided over this court –this was the duty of the treasurer–instead, they used it for prosecutions regarding their own finances. Thus it cannot be said that the queen lost her official position in this court.

In the fourteenth century, the queen's use of the judicial functions of the king's exchequer is demonstrated in her prosecution of debts. The acknowledgements of debts due to the queen are enrolled on her exchequer records.<sup>168</sup> In these enrolments, various ministers or tenants of the queen acknowledged that they owed her a debt and arranged for a time when they would return to pay that debt. However, in order to actually prosecute debts owed to her, the queen had to act through the judicial bodies of the crown. Chancery issues exist acknowledging the seizure of lands, goods and chattels in default of debts due to the queen.<sup>169</sup> Many of these orders were cancelled upon payment of the debt to the queen's exchequer or ministers. In 1352, an order was issued to release Peter de Binbrook, who was detained by the crown by suit of Queen Isabella for money he owed her when he had been her receiver of Haverford because Isabella had notified the chancery that Peter had paid the sum in full.<sup>170</sup> The queen's use of the king's legal machinery should not necessarily be viewed as marginalization. Whereas the queen was an ordinary landholder, she, by virtue of her relationship with the king, could expect the full apparatus of the state behind her. This special status was not enjoyed by any other magnate or married noble woman. It is important to note that the queen did not have a clear and separate jurisdictional identity such as that of the king's heir in the palatinate of

---

<sup>167</sup> Green, *The Government of England Under Henry I*, p. 43.

<sup>168</sup> Acknowledgements on queen's memoranda roll: TNA, E 163/4/30 mems 5, 5d, 7.

<sup>169</sup> Acknowledgments to the queen on kings chancery rolls: *CCR 1330-1333*, pp. 180, 617; *CCR 1333-1337*, p. 655; *CPR 1334-1338*, p. 513; *CCR 1337-1339*, pp. 111, 262, 272514; *CCR 1346-1349*, p. 55; *CCR 1354-1360*, p. 496;

<sup>170</sup> *CCR 1349-1354*, p. 438.

Cheshire, for example.<sup>171</sup> Instead, she had a flexible and ambiguous position: she was both landed magnate and a part of the crown.

The queen held direct authority over her own lands, and the crown only interfered with this authority when it concerned matters that could affect the rights of the crown. The king exercised the same authorities over his wife's estates as those he exerted over the male members of the nobility. However, the queen did not have the same limitations as noblewomen had when it came to the running of her estates. Queens were not regulated by the same jointure and dower customs faced by noble women. Moreover, her position as the king's wife meant that she had access to privileges, both financial and legal, that even noblemen of the highest status did not.

#### 4.4 Conclusion

A letter from Edward III to Isabella's treasurer, John Oxendon, enrolled on Isabella's memoranda roll, emphasizes the flexible relationship between the king and queen. In this letter, Edward III relates that William Whitick of Catwick pledged his loyalty to the king for lands, held by Isabella, which he inherited from his father, and that William had paid his debts to the queen, but not to the king.<sup>172</sup> Edward wrote to the queen's treasurer to ensure that all debts were paid and loyalty pledged to both of them, suggesting a partnership between mother and son. This may have been an unequal partnership, but it seems as if the king's interest in the queen's affairs was not an issue of control, but was for the benefit of both parties.

---

<sup>171</sup> Hubert James Hewitt, *Cheshire Under the Three Edwards* (Chester, 1967) pp. 3-11; Anne Curry, 'Cheshire and the Royal Demesne', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 128 (1979), pp. 113, 119; Sharpe, 'The Household of the Black Prince', pp. 289-290.

<sup>172</sup> TNA, E 163/4/30, mem. 8: The lord king ordered this writ under his great seal in these words: 'Edward by the Grace of God, king of England, lord of Ireland and duke of Aquitaine to our beloved clerk John de Oxendon, treasurer of Queen Isabella... greetings . When through the inquisition of our beloved clerk, John de Louthre, lately our escheator this side of Trent, for the lands and tenements that were of Walter Whitick of Catwick after his death by our mandate were seized and are in our chancery, ... William [Walter's heir] pledged his loyalty to us in the second year of our reign for the lands and tenements of the said queen that she then held in the said honour from our grant after the death of the said Walter, and for his relief in this part he satisfied the debt to the said queen. We wish for the same relief from him for the summons to our exchequer which was issued to be discharged. We, wishing to be informed if the said William made his loyalty to the said queen and satisfied to her for his relief, command that you search the memoranda of the said queen ... that indeed Walter died in the second year of our reign. After whose death, William, son and heir of the said Walter, now of full age, paid the said John, bailiff of the queen, for the relief of the said ten carucates twenty shillings and ten pennies for which the said John satisfied the said queen as open for his said account. For the loyalty of the said William to the said queen nothing has been confirmed to me for the rolls of said memoranda.'. My translation.

One further example of the queen's ambiguous status occurred when, on 15 December 1341, the king issued a writ to William de Ravendale, clerk of the hanaper. The king wrote that William de Loffet had informed the king that William de Ravendale refused to deliver letters to William de Loffet unless he paid the fee for the seal of the letters, and 'because it is testified before the council by those in whom the king has confidence that all the town of Coventry belongs to Queen Isabella and that the king has no lordship therein whereby he could claim that soil,' the king ordered William de Ravendale to deliver the letters to William de Loffet without exacting payment.<sup>173</sup> The portion of the writ quoted above reveals that there was a distinction between lordship of those lands held by the queen and those held by the king, contrary to the oaths of fealty sworn at other times to both the king and queen. Similar claims appear on chancery issues regarding Queen Philippa's lands as well.<sup>174</sup> Such conflicting perceptions indicate that the king and queen's lordship over the queen's lands were not clearly defined in the early fourteenth century.

The queen's status, power and authority were unique to her position, and not strictly defined, allowing her flexibility. At times she was viewed as an independent entity, administering her lands with as much authority as a male magnate and with greater authority than other married noblewomen. Through her status as an independent lord, she was able to cultivate a network of influence, which she could manipulate if necessary. Limitations placed on her authority were dictated by her status as equal to male landholders, not her gender, or role as the king's wife or mother. However, because she was the king's wife, she enjoyed prerogatives that no other member of the landed elite did. She had access to the king and crown which she could manipulate to increase her influence and authority and she had the full backing of the apparatus of the crown behind her making her one of the most formidable magnates. Her access to the crown's financial

---

<sup>173</sup> *CCR 1341-1343*, pp. 317-318: To William de Ravendale, clerk of the hanaper. Whereas the king gave licence to William de Loffet of Coventry to retain a house raised by him in Coventry upon the highway in a lane called 'Muchel Park Strete' and now William has informed the king that the said clerk, pretending that the house was built on the king's soil and that the soil was placed out of the king's hands by reason of the grant, and, therefore, the great fee for the seal of the letters ought to be paid in accordance with the custom of the hanaper, has refused to deliver the letters to William unless he pay the great fee for the said seal, and because it is testified before the council by those in whom the king has confidence that all the town of Coventry belongs to Queen Isabella and that the king has no lordship therein whereby he could claim that soil: the king orders the said clerk to receive from William, for this aid, such fee as is received for the seal of other letters patent, which are not of great fee, and to deliver those letters to William without exacting payment of he said great fee, without deal. By C.

<sup>174</sup> *CCR 1330-1333*, pp. 136, 478.

and judicial resources substantiates the argument that the queen was not marginalized, but was still viewed as a fundamental part of the crown. Furthermore, fourteenth-century contemporaries did not always clearly or consistently view the queen as having either an independent identity or as being entirely integrated with the crown. Because of the discussions of marginalization in current scholarship on medieval queens, it is tempting to represent her as completely independent when she no longer appears as a partner to the king. However, this chapter has demonstrated that separation could become a source of power, and that the remaining institutional ties between king and queen kept her from being marginalized. The connection between the king and queen demonstrates their common interests, and that the queen was both an independent landholder and part of the notion of the crown.

## Chapter Five

### Motherhood, Matriarchy and the Royal Family

‘Let her deserve to be favourable or to rejoice in the fruits of her womb with the blessed and revered women Sara, Rebecca and Rachel to the honour of the whole kingdom and to the prestige of the holy church of God...’<sup>1</sup>

So goes the twelfth-century blessing of the queen, which was said at the entrance of the church door during her coronation ceremony. This blessing, still found in the coronation ordo in the time of Charles I, was recited at the coronations of all late medieval queen consorts. Such symbols of fertility are also found in the entrance pageants in London, which were not only seen by the queen, but all levels of medieval society.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, from the moment of her coronation the queen, and those witnessing the coronation, were aware of her expected duty to conceive an heir.<sup>3</sup>

This chapter will examine how this expectation gave queens symbolic power, how and why the king and queen promoted that symbolic power and how queens could exploit the symbolic power of motherhood to reach achieved power and even authority. To accomplish this, it examines the importance of motherhood to medieval society, the vehicles through which kings and queens advertised the queen’s motherhood and it establishes whether the queen’s symbolic power manifested itself through increased royal favour. To investigate how and if the queens advanced their symbolic power to reach achieved power it investigates the relationships these queens had with their children throughout childhood and adulthood.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> L. W. Legg, *English Coronation Records* (Westminster, 1901), pp. 37-39: *Cum Sara atque Rebecca et Rachel beatissimas reverendisq[ue] feminis fructu uteri sui secundari seu gratulari mereatur ad decorum totius regni statemq[ue] sancta dei ecclesie.*

<sup>2</sup> Helen Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou: Queenship and Power in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 17-24; G. Kipling, ‘Margaret of Anjou’s Royal Entry into London’, *Medieval English Theatre*, 4 (1982), pp. 78-80; Joanna Lanyesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503* (Oxford, 2004), p. 141; Margaret Howell, *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1998), p. 18; John Carmi Parsons, ‘“Never was a body buried in England with such solemnity and honour”: The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens to 1500’, in Anne J. Duggan (ed), *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference held at King’s College London* (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 317, 332.

<sup>3</sup> John Carmi Parsons, ‘The Pregnant Queen as Counsellor and the Medieval Construction of Motherhood’, in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.), *Medieval Mothering* (New York, 1996), p. 42; Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, p. 39; Howell, *Eleanor of Provence*, p. 16.

<sup>4</sup> See section 1.5 *Symbolic Power* for definition of achieved power.



This chapter also tackles both the common trend for historians to apply the findings of other scholars to their subjects when no evidence survives, and the reading of medieval ideological expectations of queenship onto specific medieval queens. As historians, we often work from models based on both medieval ideas and those established by modern historians, and we need to be wary of imposing such models. John Carmi Parsons, for instance, has instituted certain models for motherhood. Parsons' argument is hypothetical, yet plausibly based on some evidence from Eleanor of Castile and Eleanor of Provence and on secondary work done on European queens and on the Early Modern French nobility.<sup>5</sup> He has argued that queens not only gained symbolic capital through becoming mothers, but were able to actively exploit motherhood in order to increase their power and influence.<sup>6</sup> Parsons believes that due to their experiences in the 'marriage market', queens were seen as the most appropriate educators of their daughters. Through their knowledge of the inner workings of matrimonial diplomacy and their control of the princesses' education, queens 'obligated their husbands towards them'.<sup>7</sup> Queens could manipulate this obligation to actively participate in matrimonial diplomacy; for example, the queen could demand the delay of a marriage if the daughter was thought to be too young for childbirth or to afford time to ensure that their daughters knew how to effectively pursue their natal families' interests once they had married.<sup>8</sup> Parsons has argued that the queen could use her daughters' marriages to place herself within the male sphere at court.<sup>9</sup> He also argues that participation in marriage negotiations provided queens and noblewomen with a collective female identity.<sup>10</sup>

Others have picked up on Parsons' arguments and have automatically applied them to general studies of medieval queenship.<sup>11</sup> His conclusions may apply to

---

<sup>5</sup> John Carmi Parsons, 'Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power: Some Plantagenet Evidence, 1150-1500', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1998), pp. 63,64, 65, 72, 76, 66.

<sup>6</sup> Parsons, 'Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power', pp. 65, 71.

<sup>7</sup> Parsons, 'Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power', pp. 69, 74, 71, 75.

<sup>8</sup> Parsons, 'Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power', pp. 63, 64, 65, 71, 72, 74, 75.

<sup>9</sup> Parsons, 'Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power', p. 72.

<sup>10</sup> Parsons, 'Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power', pp. 65, 76-78.

<sup>11</sup> Janet L. Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', in Linda Mitchell (ed.), *Women in Medieval Western European Culture* (New York, 1999), p. 194.

thirteenth-century queens, but not all aspects of this paradigm see themselves through when applied to fourteenth-century queens.

This chapter argues that in order to utilize motherhood to its full potential, the queen had to emphasize her symbolic power through images of motherhood and actually perform and manipulate that role. Most queens, once they had given birth, were automatically represented as motherly figures in art, literature and ritual ceremonies by contemporaries. However, an examination of these fourteenth-century queens as mothers demonstrates that there were many factors that determine the level of agency they commanded in their role as mother: inclination, opportunity and mortality, just to name a few.

When examining early fourteenth-century queenship and motherhood, several methodological concerns need to be taken into consideration. The paucity of the documents available restricts the possible conclusions. Household accounts provide valuable insight into the contact between the queen and her children, as they demonstrate when and in what capacity the relevant households were in close proximity to each other. However, the overall survival of both the queens' and their children's household accounts is sporadic. In addition, they survive at varying rates for each queen. This makes general and comparative conclusions problematic. Even when a sufficient amount of evidence is available, the nature of the documents does not always reflect the personal and emotional interaction, which often took place in private settings. As Nicholas Orme has pointed out: 'such personal relationships are especially hard to reconstruct, since they have generally been preserved only in the conventional forms of literature and documents, behind which personal emotions can rarely be displayed'.<sup>12</sup>

### **5.1 Gender, Power, Motherhood**

Some aspects of motherhood can be considered specifically gendered sources of power, whereas queenly functions such as intercession, patronage, or the running of the household and estates were conducted by both men and women. Chapter two has shown that the implied connections between queens, the Virgin Mary, motherhood and

---

<sup>12</sup> Nicholas Orme *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings* (London, 1984), p. 42.

intercession were pervasive in rituals throughout society.<sup>13</sup> Because biologically only women could be mothers and because motherhood was connected with a divine female, motherhood can easily be viewed as a gendered role. However, these connections with the Virgin Mary were not always about biological aspects of motherhood, but were also concerned with nurturing aspects. It is important to acknowledge that in some contexts images of motherhood and nurturing could be appropriated by men. Images of male 'mothers', have been found, often Christ-mothers, but such images are appropriations of the imagery of motherhood in an attempt for males to participate in these nurturing aspects.<sup>14</sup> This nurturing image does not apply to the biological aspects of pregnancy and birth, which only a woman could perform, and about which the first part of this chapter is concerned.

A queen's role was to support and complement the king by doing what he could not, and ensuring the continuation of the dynasty.<sup>15</sup> The biological and gendered aspects of motherhood concurrently empowered and restricted her. Medieval men and, in this case kings, were anxious about their inability to participate in pregnancy and birth and the power this exclusivity could give the queen. There were several parts of pregnancy that concerned them: they could not control the queen's fertility, the gender of the child or the legitimacy of the child. In the case of the queen, pregnancy and birth also served as a reminder of the queen's sexual relationship with the king, a relationship that placed her in a position close to the king that few others enjoyed. The queen could manipulate her sexual relationship with the king to gain a great amount of power or authority, but the anxiety this caused in others created a desire to limit this sexual source of power which was inherently part of the queen's gender.<sup>16</sup> Thus, men often sought to place pregnant queens in submissive positions.<sup>17</sup> Yet at the same time, their ability to perpetuate the

---

<sup>13</sup> John Carmi Parsons, 'Ritual and Symbol in the English Medieval Queenship to 1500', in L.O. Fradenburg (ed.), *Women and Sovereignty* (Edinburgh, 1992), pp. 64-69.

<sup>14</sup> John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler, 'Introduction', in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.), *Medieval Mothering* (New York, 1996), p. xv; Caroline Walker Bynum, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Age* (Berkeley, 1984), pp. 110-69.

<sup>15</sup> Lanesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, pp. 131, 146; Parsons, 'The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations', pp. 325-26, Parsons, 'The Pregnant Queen', pp. 44, 52; Janet L. Nelson, 'Inauguration Rituals,' in P.H. Sawyer and I. N. Woods (eds.), *Early Medieval Kingship* (Leeds, 1977), p. 71.

<sup>16</sup> Lanesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 13.

<sup>17</sup> Parsons, 'The Pregnant Queen', p. 50; Parsons, 'Ritual and Symbol', pp. 60, 66.

dynasty was expected and exalted. As a result, this role simultaneously empowered the queen and limited her.

The manipulation of children to further networks of influence or for political or dynastic purposes was something that, in theory, both the king and queen could take advantage of, and was not an action defined by gender. The use of children and marriage to perpetuate the family lineage or, in the case of royal children, wider political and dynastic concerns was integral to landed and urban elite society.<sup>18</sup> Just as fathers used their children to create political and dynastic bonds, mothers used motherhood to link their natal and marital families. They could exploit the bonds of loyalty cultivated during childhood in order to extend their own networks of influence and avenues to authority through those of their adult children. Mothers, as wives, were shaped by the system of the marriage market, and so were often those best able to exploit that system for the benefit of themselves and their children.<sup>19</sup>

Most scholars now believe that medieval parents invested material and emotional resources in their children.<sup>20</sup> They argue against the queen's lack of personal involvement or neglect of her children, and the assumptions that this neglect was due to her responsibilities in the 'public' sphere.<sup>21</sup> Lois Hunneycutt has demonstrated that in the eleventh and thirteenth centuries, queens' participation in the 'public' arena in no way prevented them from being active mothers in the 'private' arena (though this study has already pointed out in its introduction that both the private and public spheres were not so easily separated in the Middle Ages).<sup>22</sup> Motherhood's inextricable link with the queen's gender and the complicated ways in which that empowered her and limited her

---

<sup>18</sup> Barbara Hanawalt, 'Female Networks for Fostering Lady Lisle's Daughters', in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.), *Medieval Mothering* (New York, 1996), p. 239.

<sup>19</sup> Parsons and Wheeler, 'Introduction', p. xv; Parsons, 'Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power', pp. 65, 75, 76.

<sup>20</sup> Lois Hunneycutt, 'Public Lives, Private Ties: Royal Mothers in England and Scotland, 1070-1204', in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.), *Medieval Mothering* (New York, 1996), p. 296, ns. 4-5.

<sup>21</sup> Ralph V. Turner, 'Eleanor of Aquitaine and her Children: An Inquiry into Medieval Family Attachment', *Journal of Medieval History*, 14(1988), pp. 321-35; Ralph V. Turner 'The Children of Anglo-Norman Royalty and Their Upbringing', *Medieval Prosopography*, 11(1990), p. 32.

<sup>22</sup> Hunneycutt, 'Royal Mothers', pp. 295-308.

is an important underlying theme of this chapter. The next three sections will evaluate how and if Margaret, Isabella and Philippa manipulated this duty to gain power.

## 5.2 Pregnancy, Birth, Intercession and Power

Motherhood was clearly important to medieval society. Consequently, when the queen gave birth, especially to a son, her symbolic capital rose in the eyes of her contemporaries. The birth of an heir was obviously important in a political system and society based on primogeniture; that the king often remained close to the queen during the birth of her first child stresses this point. Edward I was in Brotherton with Margaret of France during her first lying in June 1300.<sup>23</sup> However, he was not at Woodstock when Margaret's second son, Edmund was born.<sup>24</sup> Edward II and Isabella's households were in close proximity when Edward III was born: the king was at Sheen and the queen was at Windsor.<sup>25</sup> They were not together when her second son was born in August 1316.<sup>26</sup> Edward III was with Philippa during the births of three of their children: Edward of Woodstock, Isabella of Woodstock and Lionel of Antwerp.<sup>27</sup>

Giving birth may have served as a coming of age for the queen. It may be that when the queen gave birth, especially to a male heir, she was regarded as a fully-fledged adult and a key player in court life. Once she provided an heir, she had earned her symbolic capital. After the birth of Prince Edward of Windsor, Edward II began to rely on Isabella as a mediator in the negotiations with the barons and in the conflict that followed Gaveston's execution.<sup>28</sup> Again, it is difficult to tell if this was due to the fact that Gaveston no longer influenced the king, or to an increase in royal favour after the birth of Prince Edward. In 1318 Isabella was involved in the negotiations of the Treaty of

---

<sup>23</sup> See appendix I.

<sup>24</sup> See appendix I.

<sup>25</sup> See appendix I.

<sup>26</sup> See appendix I.

<sup>27</sup> See appendix I.

<sup>28</sup> John de Trokelowe, *Johannis de Trokelowe et Henrici de Blanford Chronica Et Annales*, H.T. Riley (ed.), Rolls Series, 28 (London, 1866), pp. 80-81; Paul C. Doherty 'Isabella, Queen of England 1296-1330' (Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Oxford, 1977), p. 49.

Leake, and on an international level, she was involved in Anglo-French negotiations over Gascony in 1314, 1320 and 1325. Some scholars have attributed her entrance into the political scene and her influence with her father and brothers to the birth of an heir.<sup>29</sup> Prior to 1324, it is difficult to assess if Isabella's activities as intercessor and diplomatic mediator derived from the birth of her children or from the death of Gaveston. In the case of the negotiations with France we have also to consider her influence as a daughter. The birth of Edward of Windsor in 1312 may have allowed the queen to be seriously considered as a key political figure by 1313, and motherhood marked this coming of age.

Philippa's first pregnancy in 1330 may have marked a coming of age and may have given her symbolic power when she had previously been allowed very little power or authority.<sup>30</sup> Edward and Philippa married in 1328, but she was not crowned until 1330 when she was five months pregnant.<sup>31</sup> This delay was unusual and it was probably Isabella who stood in the way. However, Philippa's pregnancy forced Isabella's hand; an uncrowned consort could not give birth to a rightful heir.<sup>32</sup> The coronation did not change Philippa's inability to act as queen during Edward III's minority, but the coronation served to symbolize her status as queen. This powerful symbolism may have been the reason Isabella delayed the coronation. The coronation, like pregnancy, would create the perception of Philippa's status as queen consort among her contemporaries. The perception that the queen possessed power, as discussed in chapter three, was connected to the actual practice of power in highly complex ways.<sup>33</sup> Once contemporaries believed in her power as queen, they might actively begin to seek her aid, which would allow her to practise queenship and manipulate this agency further to

---

<sup>29</sup> See below section on intercession pp. 153-157.

<sup>30</sup> Caroline Shenton, 'Philippa of Hainault's Churchings: The Politics of Motherhood', in Richardson Eales and Shaun Tyas (eds.), *Family and Dynasty in Late Medieval England* (Donington, 2003), pp. 114-116.

<sup>31</sup> W.M. Ormrod, *Edward III* (Stroud, 2005), p. 18; Shenton, 'The Churchings of Philippa of Hainault', p. 116; Roy Martin Haines, *King Edward II: His Life, His Reign, and Its Aftermath, 1284-1330* (Montreal, 2006), p. 211.

<sup>32</sup> Studies linking the legitimacy of the heir and the status of the queen with her coronation: Pauline Stafford, *Queen's Concubines and Dowagers: The King's Wife in the Early Middle Ages* (London 1998), pp. 60-92; Pauline Stafford, 'Emma: The Powers of the Queen in the Eleventh Century', in Anne J. Duggan (ed.), *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe* (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 12-13; Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', pp. 183-185, 192; Janet L. Nelson, 'Early Medieval Rites of Queen-Making and the Shaping of Medieval Queenship', in Anne J. Duggan (ed.), *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe* (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 306-07; Parsons, 'Ritual and Symbol', pp. 61-62.

<sup>33</sup> See section 3.3.

increase her power and authority. This was one reason why it was important for the king and queen to advertise the queen's motherhood, and Philippa and Edward III were especially active in the promotion of the royal family.

History and literature produced in the late medieval period demonstrate that contemporaries believed that the king must have a son to maintain the proper order of society.<sup>34</sup> Many popular romances highlight the importance of motherhood and the queen's (or lady's) role in producing an heir. Several Middle English romances from the second half of the fourteenth century are stories of queens and/or kings desperate for heirs. In *Octavian* the empress is barren for seven years until her husband endows an abbey, whereby she immediately becomes pregnant.<sup>35</sup> The king in *Sir Tryamour* desires an heir so much that he promises to go on crusade if God will give him an heir.<sup>36</sup> The mother of Sir Gowther is so desperate for a son that she fornicates with a demon to become pregnant.<sup>37</sup> *Ipomadon* contains a striking scene in which the men at court express their concern that their lady will not marry. Their main concern with her single status is the lack of an heir to rule the duchy. Of course tied into this romance is the desire to have a male ruler, but it also illustrates how important it was for a woman to fulfil her duty and provide a male heir. Only then would the proper order be attained. In some romances, the mother only appears at the beginning of the story in order to give birth to the hero.<sup>38</sup> It is true that her main purpose is that of a narrative device to move the story along, but even in her marginal position she is significant. Without the mother there could be no hero and no romance; she is a necessary component of the romance. Like these fictional mothers, the real-life queen was a necessary component of the royal family whose function was to 'move' the dynasty along.

---

<sup>34</sup> Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queen*, p. 135.

<sup>35</sup> Harriet Hudson, (ed.) 'Octavian' in *Four Middle English Romances*, TEAMS Middle English Text Series (Kalamazoo, 1996), pp. 45-114.

<sup>36</sup> Harriet Hudson, (ed.) 'Sir Tryamour' in *Four Middle English Romances*, TEAMS Middle English Text Series (Kalamazoo, 1996), pp. 178-228.

<sup>37</sup> Hue de Rotelande, *Ipomadon*, Rhiannon Purdie (ed.) EETS, OS, 316 (Oxford, 2001).

<sup>38</sup> For example see: Jennifer Fellows (ed.) 'Amis and Amiloun' in *Of Love and Chivalry: An Anthology of Middle English Romance* (London, 1993), pp. 73-146; Karl Brunner, (ed.) Richard Lowenherz [Richard Coer de Lyon] (Leipzig, 1913); R.B. Herzman et. al., (eds.), 'Bevis of Hampton' in *Four Romances of England*, TEAMS Middle English Text Series (Kalamazoo, 1999), pp.187-340. Hudson, (ed.), 'Sir Tryamour', pp. 178-228; Hudson, 'Octavian', pp. 45-114.

Chronicles as a whole do not comment on the queens as mothers in very great detail, but they do, at the very least, note the birth of royal children, consequently portraying the queens as mothers. In general, they tend to note the birth of the male heirs and occasionally they note the birth of the younger children. Murimuth's chronicle and Baker's *Chroniculum* simply note the year and birth of Edward III: 'In this year [1312] of our lord it happened that on the thirteenth day of November Queen Isabella gave birth to the son of the king at Windsor.'<sup>39</sup> There are very similar examples for Philippa and her first son, Edward of Woodstock. The *Anonimalle* chronicle and the *Polychronicon* record his birth, though the *Anonimalle* chronicle does not mention Philippa.<sup>40</sup> The *Polychronicon* does not mention Philippa at all until the birth of Edward, signalling that Philippa's motherhood was what was important to Higden.

A few chronicles record the birth of younger children. The *Annales Paulini* is one of the only chronicles to records the birth of Queen Isabella's younger children, John and Joan. The author of the *Annales Paulini* was probably a resident of St. Paul's and the chronicle focuses on events central to St. Paul's and London.<sup>41</sup> John was born at Eltham and Joan at the Tower which would explain why the chronicler probably included their births when it was not necessarily conventional to do so. The *Brut* records the birth of Edward III and Philippa's second son Lionel at Antwerp in 1338.<sup>42</sup> Lionel's birth must have been significant to this chronicler; given mortality rates in the medieval period, the birth of a second son would have been almost as important to the royal lineage as the first. For many chronicles, chronology was an important, possibly the most important,

---

<sup>39</sup> Adam Murimuth, *Adae Murimuth Continuatio chronicarum [with] Robertus de Avesbury de Gestis Mirabilibus Regis Edwardi Terti*, Edward Maunde Thompson (ed.), Rolls Series, 93 (London, 1665), p. 20 (my translation); William Stubbs(ed.), 'Vita et Mors Edwardi Secundi Regis Angliae', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, Rolls Series, 76 (2 vols., London, 1965), p. 299. Other examples include: Wendy R. Childs, (trans., ed.), *Vita Edwardi Secundi* (Oxford, 2005), p. 67. William Stubbs, (ed.), 'Annales Londonienses', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, Rolls Series, 76 (2 vols, London, 1965), vol. 1, p. 221; William Stubbs, (ed.), 'Annales Paulini', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, Rolls Series, 76 (2 vols, London, 1965), vol. 1, pp. 233, 280, 291.

<sup>40</sup> Wendy R. Childs and John Taylor (ed.), *The Anonimalle Chronicle, 1307-1334: from the Brotherton Collection MS 29*, Yorkshire Archaeological Society (Leeds, 1991), p. 143; Ranulph Higden, *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis*, C. Babington and J.R. Lumby (eds), Rolls Series, 41 (London, 1964), pp. 326-327.

<sup>41</sup> Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing c. 1307* (2 vols., London, 1974), vol 2, p. 63.

<sup>42</sup> Friedrich W. D. Brie. *The Brut, or The Chronicles of England*, EETS, OS, 136 (London, 1606-1908), p. 293.



quality of their histories.<sup>43</sup> The chronicles described above tend to be annals, chronicling the events of each year, and giving detailed descriptions of the queens as mothers was not necessarily in keeping with their function and intent. The inclusion of these events, given all that the chroniclers had to choose from, implies that the birth itself was important to them.

On the other hand, a few chronicles devote a great deal of space and detail to the queen's pregnancy and the birth of the royal children, again most typically with the heir. These chronicles tend to be chivalric chronicles, concerned more with the deeds and reputations of their heroes rather than chronology.<sup>44</sup> The chivalric chronicles were often influenced by romances such as the ones discussed above.<sup>45</sup> Froissart's description of Philippa interceding for the burghers of Calais is one of the most regularly discussed examples of pregnancy and intercession. The fictionalized account of the pregnant Philippa of Hainault's intercession at Calais indicates that for Froissart and his audience, pregnancy enhanced her influence over Edward III.<sup>46</sup> John Carmi Parsons and Paul Strohm have noted the special attention Froissart gives to Philippa's advanced pregnancy. Both have explored the various and complex implications her submissive and vulnerable (as fully pregnant) position in the scene have on conclusions about power, authority and the limitations placed upon medieval queens. They argue that her pregnancy, her submissiveness and her place on the margins demonstrate the limits placed on queens, yet also give her a sense of authority by acting as a device that allowed Edward to change his mind.<sup>47</sup> In reality, Philippa could not have been in the late stages

---

<sup>43</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London, 2004), p. 114.

<sup>44</sup> Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp. 99-102.

<sup>45</sup> Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p. 103.

<sup>46</sup> See Parsons 'The Pregnant Queen', and Strohm, 'Queens as Intercessor' in *Hochon's Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts* (Princeton, 1992), 95-119 for a full analysis of Froissart's account of Philippa of Hainault's intercession at Calais.

<sup>47</sup> Parsons, 'The Pregnant Queen', p. 53; Paul Strohm, 'Queens as Intercessors' pp. 102-103. W.M. Ormrod notes a similar use of the queen to explain a change in the crown's policy towards the rebels involved in the Peasant's Revolt of 1381. A general amnesty, with a few exceptions, was issued by the crown at the insistence of the new queen Anne of Bohemia. Anne had not yet married Richard II, and so her name on the pardon was merely symbolic, allowing the crown to justify the change in its policy: W.M. Ormrod, 'In Bed with Joan of Kent: the King's Mother and the Peasants Revolt of 1381', in Jocelyn Wogan-Browne (ed.), *Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts in Late Medieval Britain. Essays for Felicity Riddy* (Turnhout, 2000), pp. 288-29.

of pregnancy at the time of the surrender of Calais.<sup>48</sup> In whatever manner one interprets this scene – either as limiting the queen by forcing her to maintain a submissive position, or allowing her the flexibility to exercise authority – what is important for a study of representations of motherhood is the fact that Froissart overemphasized Philippa’s pregnancy. For Froissart, her fertility added to the weight of her request, further demonstrating the notion that pregnancy enhanced powers the queen already employed. In other words, her pregnancy gave her a symbolic capital that she could ‘spend’ to give weight to her act of intercession. The corresponding scene in Jean le Bel’s chronicle (on which Froissart based a great deal of his chronicle) includes Philippa’s act of intercession, but Le Bel does not describe Philippa as pregnant.<sup>49</sup> That detail is clearly an embellishment of Froissart’s and because Philippa was one of Froissart’s patrons, the detail might have been included at her request.

The importance of motherhood did not just centre on the birth of male heirs. In *The Life of the Black Prince*, the Chandos Herald describes how an unmarried Prince Edward of Woodstock reports news of his victory at Poitiers to his mother and later delivers his spoils of war to her.<sup>50</sup> The Chandos Herald provides insight into another aspect of motherhood. In place of a wife, Queen Philippa serves as her bachelor son’s lady, to whom he dedicates his chivalric exploits. For medieval contemporaries, motherhood extended past the duty of providing an heir; for them the queen remained a central figure in her male children’s lives, at least until they married.

Motherhood was clearly important to both the king and queen, who went to great lengths to promote that image with both male and female children. Philippa and Edward III were very active in promoting their family and Philippa’s role as mother. In doing so, they could add to her ascribed power by reminding society that she had fulfilled her duties. Philippa’s churchings, rather than simply emphasizing Edward’s dynastic ambitions, used symbolism to stress the domestic family: the birth of a royal son or

---

<sup>48</sup> Parsons, ‘The Pregnant Queen’, p. 40-41.

<sup>49</sup> Jean le Bel, *Cronique de Jean le Bel*, Jules Viard et Eugène Déprez (eds) (Paris, 1977), pp. 166-167. The original manuscript does not contain the pregnancy. The editors of this edition inserted the description of Philippa’s pregnancy based on Froissart, see p. 167, note 1.

<sup>50</sup> Chandos Herald, *La Vie du Prince Noir by Chandos Herald*, Diana Tyson (ed.) (Tübingen, 1975), pp. 86-89 lines 1408-1516.

daughter and Philippa as a fertile mother.<sup>51</sup> Caroline Shenton argues that Philippa must have played an active role in the preparations for these churchings because 'the expense, the personal nature of the designs and the sheer exuberance of the occasions cannot possibly have been generated without the queen's active involvement'.<sup>52</sup> Likewise, the expenses for the robes for Philippa's churching after the birth of Princess Isabella were paid out of her great wardrobe.<sup>53</sup> William and Edward de Bohun, William Clinton, Robert Ufford and Gilbert Talbot were among those who received robes. This list provides an example of the high status of some of the people who would have witnessed the symbols of motherhood stressed at these events. However, Philippa's payments for the expenses of these churchings do not necessarily indicate her agency in the preparations for the event; payments for the churchings occur in the king's household accounts too.<sup>54</sup> Thus, it is difficult to assign primary agency or personal choice to either the king or the queen in the churchings, but the evidence may indicate that they were working towards a common desire of how the churchings were to be presented to those present.

The wall paintings in St. Stephen's Chapel in Westminster comprised one of Edward and Philippa's major projects in Westminster Palace. These paintings contain images of Edward and Philippa and eight of their children, again emphasizing the importance of a large royal family.<sup>55</sup> It may be that these are examples of dynastic portraiture modeled after the statues that Philip IV commissioned at Poissy to link his family to St. Louis.<sup>56</sup> Edward might have been promoting the fruitfulness of the Plantagenet royal family in contrast with that of the Capetian as propaganda to support

---

<sup>51</sup> Shenton, 'Philippa of Hainault's Churchings' pp. 112, 120.

<sup>52</sup> Shenton, 'Philippa of Hainault's Churchings', p. 120.

<sup>53</sup> [British Library London] BL MS Cotton Galba EIII fols. 181-192.

<sup>54</sup> [The National Archives London] TNA, E 101/384/20 mems 1, 2; TNA E 101/385/4 mems 18, 24; TNA, E 101/386/2 mem. 6, TNA, E 101/386/9 mem. 15.

<sup>55</sup> For a description of the paintings see: Veronica Sekules, 'Dynasty and Patrimony in the Self-Construction of an English Queen', in John Mitchell and Matthew Moran (eds.), *England and the Continent in the Middle Ages* (Stamford, 2000), pp. 165-66; Emily Howe, 'Divine Kingship and Display: The Altar Wall Murals of St. Stephen's Chapel', *Antiquaries' Journal: Journal of the Society of Antiquaries of London*, 81 (2001), pp. 259-303.

<sup>56</sup> Sekules, 'Philippa of Hainault and her Images', p. 166.

his claims to the French throne.<sup>57</sup> Even if Edward's motivations were not as far-reaching as to connect the paintings to France, it still emphasized to the English court his fertility and dynastic ambitions, and Philippa's as well. In the paintings, the family is segregated according to sex: the sons lined up behind Edward and the daughters behind Philippa. This segregation accentuates both the dynastic patriarchy and the dynastic matriarchy which occurred side by side within the royal family.

The birth of daughters was used to advance the matriarchal elements of the royal family, highlighting the matriarchy's importance. This promotion was analogous to the dynastic symbolism used to emphasize royal patriarchy. An empirical study of the names of daughters provides some tentative evidence that queens, their daughters and sometimes their granddaughters used names for this purpose, in much the same way as the kings. The repetition of names created a group identity among female members of the royal family. However, such a study of names is problematic as many of the queens' children died without any heirs. Margaret, Isabella, and Philippa all named their firstborn daughters after the queens who preceded them. Margaret's firstborn and only daughter was named Eleanor.<sup>58</sup> It is possible that Eleanor was named after Edward I's first wife, Eleanor of Castile, but it is more likely that she was named after his mother, Eleanor of Provence. Princess Eleanor died before she was married, but Margaret's firstborn son, Thomas, named his own firstborn daughter Margaret.<sup>59</sup> Edmund married Margaret Wake, sister of Thomas Wake, and they named their daughter Joan (later to become the famous Joan of Kent).<sup>60</sup> This seems to deviate from the pattern, but Margaret Wake's mother was called Joan, and this may suggest that the passing on of female names was

---

<sup>57</sup> Sekules, 'Philippa of Hainault and her Images', p. 167.

<sup>58</sup> John Carmi Parsons, 'Margaret (1279?–1318)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18046>, accessed 17 July 2008].

<sup>59</sup> Scott L. Waugh, 'Thomas , first earl of Norfolk (1300–1338)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27196>, accessed 20 Feb 2009].

<sup>60</sup> Scott L. Waugh, 'Edmund , first earl of Kent (1301–1330)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8506>, accessed 17 July 2008].

something practised, not only by the royal family, but by members of the nobility as well.<sup>61</sup>

Isabella and Edward II named their firstborn daughter Eleanor, probably after Edward II's mother, Eleanor of Castile. Isabella's other children, John and Joan, did not have children, which prevents further study of this generation.<sup>62</sup> However, Philippa and Edward III named their firstborn daughter Isabella.<sup>63</sup> Of Philippa and Edward's eight children who survived long enough to marry, Lionel of Antwerp and John of Gaunt both named their firstborn daughters Philippa.<sup>64</sup> Princess Isabella, named her second daughter Philippa.<sup>65</sup> Edward, Joan, Mary and Thomas all died without daughters, and in some cases without children at all. Thus, until the reign of Edward III there was a trend in naming daughters after their mother or grandmother, the queen. The early deaths of Edward III's daughters prevented this trend from progressing. The iconic portrayal of the matriarchy in St. Stephen's Chapel and the passing down of female names created the impression for contemporaries that the female members of the royal family identified themselves as a collective group. A group that was equally as important as its analogue: the king and his sons.

The importance of familial commemoration is particularly well illustrated by the tomb that Philippa commissioned for herself. Philippa's tomb sets herself and the royal

---

<sup>61</sup> W. M. Ormrod, 'Wake, Thomas, second Lord Wake (1298–1349)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28408>, accessed 17 July 2008]; Scott L. Waugh, 'Edmund, first earl of Kent (1301–1330)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8506>, accessed 17 July 2008].

<sup>62</sup> Scott L. Waugh, 'John, earl of Cornwall (1316–1336)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14842>, accessed 17 July 2008]; Bruce Webster, 'Joan [Joan of the Tower] (1321–1362)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14822>, accessed 17 July 2008].

<sup>63</sup> W. M. Ormrod, 'Edward III (1312–1377)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8519>, accessed 17 July 2008]; James L. Gillespie, 'Isabella, countess of Bedford (1332–1379)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14485>, accessed 17 July 2008].

<sup>64</sup> Anthony Goodman, *John of Gaunt: The Exercise of Princely Power in Fourteenth-Century Europe* (Harlow, 1992), p. 48; W. M. Ormrod, 'Lionel, duke of Clarence (1338–1368)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16750>, accessed 17 July 2008].

<sup>65</sup> James L. Gillespie, 'Isabella, countess of Bedford (1332–1379)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14485>, accessed 17 July 2008].

family into a European context, which adds a further dimension to her symbolic power. According to Sekules, her tomb is 'a statement of conjugal authority'.<sup>66</sup> Philippa commissioned the tomb herself, and so may have had some input into what it should look like.<sup>67</sup> The weepers adorning the sides of the tomb include both Philippa and Edward's siblings, their surviving children, and several of the heads of other European royal families.<sup>68</sup> In this way, not only did Philippa emphasize her place as mother in the royal family, but she called attention to herself as a link between the English noble family and her European relatives. In advertising her natal and marital families she boosted her ascribed power. She might be highlighting her potential connections to these houses through the marriages of her children (even though she does not seem to have taken advantage of or directly helped to forge them, as will be discussed in the last section). This tomb was intended to be a double tomb with Edward III, and Philippa was again driving home the fertility and importance of the royal family, in which she was a key member.<sup>69</sup> The idea that the tomb was meant to be used as a means for the dead to communicate with the living was fairly prevalent by this time.<sup>70</sup> By placing these images on her tomb, Philippa may have intended for them to be remembered far into the future.<sup>71</sup> Both Philippa and Edward were aware of Philippa's self-image as a mother and they further encouraged the perpetuation of that image.

It is clear that medieval society believed in the importance of the queen providing a male heir. This notion is expressed even more strongly when people became anxious at the queen's failure to fulfil this duty. People became apprehensive when Eleanor of Provence did not conceive for three years after her marriage to Henry III.<sup>72</sup> Joanna Laynesmith cites a prisoner in the prior of Canterbury's gaol, who believed that Queen

---

<sup>66</sup> Sekules, 'Philippa and her Images,' p.170.

<sup>67</sup> Sekules, 'Philippa and her Images', p. 170.

<sup>68</sup> For a full list of the weepers see Sekules, 'Philippa of Hainault and her Images', pp. 172-173.

<sup>69</sup> Sekules, 'Philippa and her Images', p. 172.

<sup>70</sup> Anne McGee Morganstern, 'The Tomb as Prompter for the Chantry: Four Examples from Late Medieval England', in Elizabeth Valdez Del Alamo and Carol Stamatis Pendergast (eds), *Memory and the Medieval Tomb* (Aldershot, 2000), pp. 84, 86, 87.

<sup>71</sup> Sekules, 'Philippa and her Images', pp. 173-74.

<sup>72</sup> Nelson, *Medieval Queenship*, p. 193.

Margaret of Anjou should not be queen of England because she had not given birth to a child.<sup>73</sup> Laynesmith argues that, for this man, the queen's main function was to provide the kingdom with an heir.<sup>74</sup> In order to demonstrate that power was derived from motherhood, it is useful to offer up a comparison with a queen who had no children, and so this study will briefly examine Anne of Bohemia.

Anne is often cited as a powerful intercessor, and it has been argued that she used intercession as her main source of power because she could not provide an heir.<sup>75</sup> Studies of her acts of intercession have left varying impressions. Nigel Saul does not view her acts of intercession as having political significance.<sup>76</sup> Paul Strohm has interpreted her intercessory acts as demonstrative of expectations of medieval queenship and as public performances designed merely to show the king's mercy. Caroline Collete contradicts both Strohm and Saul, pointing out that the patent rolls contain an abundance of pardons secured 'at the request' of Anne, much more than for Philippa.<sup>77</sup> However, in the thirteen years that Anne was queen, there are only eleven acts of intercession officially recorded on both the close and patent rolls.<sup>78</sup> There are no acts of intercession recorded on the chancery rolls for Anne between the years 1385 and 1389 and between 1392 and 1394.<sup>79</sup> Anne's inability to provide the kingdom with an heir may have been one cause of her lack of successful intercessions. Anne's lack of intercessory activity might be explained by the fact that she had virtually no power ascribed to her by virtue of her motherhood, and thus could not 'spend' symbolic capital to ensure success as an intercessor. Much of the evidence for Anne's reputation as a highly powerful intercessor comes from chronicles and poems such as the Westminster

---

<sup>73</sup> Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 131.

<sup>74</sup> Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 131.

<sup>75</sup> Parsons, 'The Pregnant Queen' p. 139.

<sup>76</sup> Nigel Saul, *Richard II* (New Haven, 1997), p. 455.

<sup>77</sup> Carolyne Collete, *Performing Polity: Women and agency in the Anglo-French Tradition, 1385-1620* (Turnhout, 2006), p. 115-116.

<sup>78</sup> *CPR 1381-1385*, pp. 127, 236, 306, 401, 433; *CPR 1391-1392*, pp. 328, 333, 402, 431; *CCR 1381-1385*, pp. 105, 109.

<sup>79</sup> See appendix II.

Chronicle and Maidstone's *Concordia*.<sup>80</sup> In practice, Anne did not act as intercessor despite how she was represented by contemporary writers. Since Anne was never a mother, these authors could not comment on or embellish that particular queenly duty, as Froissart could with Philippa, so they chose to over-emphasize her intercessory activities. She was placed into the common *topos* of the queenly intercessor by chroniclers because they could mould her few acts of intercession into a universal truth much more convincingly than they could represent her as a mother when she never had any children.

Given the symbolic importance of motherhood to the queen's image and based on John Carmi Parsons and Paul Strohm's arguments for a connection between intercession and pregnancy, one would expect to observe an increase in intercessory activity around the pregnancy and birth of children. The correlation between Anne's lack of intercessions and her lack of children further strengthens this assumption. In the fifteenth century, for example, when Margaret of Anjou's pregnancy was probably well known, her current grants and privileges were confirmed by parliament and she was also granted 'full royal judicial rights on her estates and a life-right to all movables forfeited to the king'.<sup>81</sup> However, the correlation between pregnancies and increases in official acts of intercessions or any other measurable indications of increased royal favour in the form of grants recorded on the chancery rolls for Margaret, Isabella or Philippa is weak.

The first year of Margaret of France's marriage to Edward I, in which she quickly became pregnant and gave birth to a son, was one of her most successful in terms of securing requests. However, these acts were evenly spread throughout the year and they did not increase as her pregnancy became more visible. The dynastic security of the kingdom was obviously a concern of Edward I. He had only one surviving son at the time of his marriage to Margaret and he seems to have made an effort to be near his queen in order to increase the chances of conception. Thomas of Brotherton (later earl of Norfolk) was born on 1 June 1300 and was probably conceived around October 1299 within a month after Margaret and Edward I's marriage.<sup>82</sup> He had to have been

---

<sup>80</sup> Strohm, 'Queen's as Intercessors', p. 107.

<sup>81</sup> Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, p. 44. Secondary scholarship on other later medieval queens has not noted grants of this nature for any other queen.

<sup>82</sup> See appendix I; Scott L. Waugh, 'Thomas, first earl of Norfolk (1300–1338)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27196>, accessed 14 July 2008].



conceived before 3 November, because on that day Edward left Margaret in the household of his son, Edward of Caernarvon, while he travelled to York, until at least 18 November.<sup>83</sup> There is only a small increase in the number of successful acts of intercession on the chancery rolls six or seven months into Margaret's pregnancy (from around one to three).<sup>84</sup> This would have been the time when Margaret's pregnancy became clearly visible, and when one might expect to begin to see a rise in favour. After Thomas's birth, between June 1300 and January 1301 there are only four acts of intercession.

The year following the birth of Thomas – the year in which she became pregnant with Edmund – was Margaret's least successful year in terms of intercessionary acts. Edmund of Woodstock (later the earl of Kent) was born on 5 August 1301 and was probably conceived around the end of November or the beginning of December 1300.<sup>85</sup> Again, Edward might have been hoping for another rapid conception, keeping Margaret close to him while he was on campaign in Scotland.<sup>86</sup> Edward and Margaret were together in the Scottish borders from 18 September to 20 November 1300, roughly nine months before Edmund was born. After the birth of her first son and an almost immediate second pregnancy, one would expect to see a marked increase in royal favour, but this is not the case. There is no peak around six or seven months into the pregnancy as was seen with Thomas. However, in 1302, after the birth of her second son, Margaret's successful acts spring to eight. Edward was away for much of 1301, but that in itself did not usually affect Margaret's success at intercession.<sup>87</sup>

It was four years before Margaret became pregnant again, probably conceiving Eleanor around September 1305. Eleanor was born on 4 May 1306.<sup>88</sup> The birth of

---

<sup>83</sup> See appendix I. I have found no documentation for Margaret's whereabouts between 18 November 1299 and 21 April 1300, but we do know that she was in the prince's household until at least the 18<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>84</sup> See appendix II.

<sup>85</sup> Scott L. Waugh, 'Edmund, first earl of Kent (1301–1330)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8506>, accessed 14 July 2008].

<sup>86</sup> See appendix II.

<sup>87</sup> See section 3.1.

<sup>88</sup> John Carmi Parsons, 'Margaret (1279?–1318)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18046>, accessed 14 July 2008].

Eleanor seems in no way to have led to an increase in intercession for Margaret. Margaret's second peak occurred in 1305, before she was pregnant with Eleanor. Consequently, evidence from the chancery rolls does not show an increase in favour. That she had two sons in quick succession probably increased her symbolic capital and resulted in her constantly high level of intercession for the rest of her marriage. This might account for the lack of any obvious peaks around the births of her children.

Likewise, similar trends occurred for Isabella, but any analysis of an increase in intercession for her is also complicated by the constant changes in Edward II's relationships with the magnates, and his uneasy relationship with the kings of France. As chapter three discovered, Gaveston and Edward's relationship was not necessarily the reason for Isabella's failure to become pregnant for the first four years of her marriage.<sup>89</sup> In 1312, the year in which Isabella was pregnant with the future Edward III, there are only three recorded acts of intercession, compared with six in the previous years, but this can be explained by the political and social upheaval surrounding Gaveston's execution and the baronial unrest in 1312 and 1313.<sup>90</sup> The recorded number of intercessions rose in 1313, 1314, and 1315.<sup>91</sup> But because Edward III's birth coincides with Piers Gaveston's death, it is impossible to determine if the slight increase in Isabella's access to Edward II was due to the birth of an heir or the death of Edward's favourite.<sup>92</sup> In 1318, two years after her second son John was born, Isabella reached the height of her recorded intercessions. This was the year in which Margaret of France, the queen dowager, died, but Margaret had completely ceased to intercede upon the death of Edward I.<sup>93</sup> She was not, as dowager queen, impeding upon Isabella's intercessory activity, and thus her death cannot explain this rise.

---

<sup>89</sup> See sections 3.1.

<sup>90</sup> *CCR 1307-1313*, p. 433; *CCW 1244-1326*, p. 148; *CPR 1307-1313*, pp. 36, 138, 150, 177, 190, 208, 212, 311, 349, 378, 379, 393; *CCW 1244-1326*, pp. 37, 321; *CChR 1300-1326*, p. 123.

<sup>91</sup> *CCR 1313-1318*, p. 4; *CPR 1307-1313*, pp. 519, 522, 577, 579, 582; *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 45; *CCW 1244-1326*, p. 389; *CCR 1313-1318*, p. 246; *CPR 1313-1317*, pp. 80, 82, 119, 166, 169, 201, 223, 254, 305, 336, 352, 370; *CCW 1244-1326*, p. 406; *CFR 1319-1327*, pp. 253, 255.

<sup>92</sup> See section 3.1.

<sup>93</sup> Parsons, 'Intercessory Patronage of Queen Margaret and Isabella of France', in Michael Prestwich, R.H. Britnell and Robin Frame (eds.), *Thirteenth Century England, VI: Proceedings of the Durham Conference* (Woodbridge, 1995), pp. 152-153.

Chapter three has demonstrated that the Despensers had a profoundly negative effect on Isabella's success in official acts of intercession.<sup>94</sup> Her two daughters, Eleanor and Joan, born during the Despensers' rise, do not seem to have provided her with any power to counterbalance the Despensers' hold over the king. Eleanor and Joan's sex may have led to Edward's indifference to their birth, as he already had two sons. Daughters *could* be sources of power for queens, but any influence that might be gained from daughters was not as immediate as with the birth of a male heir. It would have come later, when these daughters reached adulthood and married.<sup>95</sup>

Philippa's officially recorded acts of intercession were few in number, yet she was one of the most successful queens at fulfilling the queenly duty of motherhood. Philippa had twelve children: Edward of Woodstock in 1330, Isabella in June 1332, Joan in the beginning of 1333, William of Hatfield in December 1336, Lionel of Antwerp in November 1338, John of Gaunt in March 1340, Edmund of Langley in June 1341, Blanche in 1342, Mary in 1344, Margaret in July 1346, William of Windsor in 1348, and Thomas of Woodstock in 1355.<sup>96</sup> Nine of her children survived to adulthood (both Williams and Blanche died as children). Just as we cannot concretely connect birth and pregnancy with a rise in the officially recorded intercessory activity of Margaret and Isabella, it is difficult to do so with Philippa. Philippa's most active years were in 1331 and 1338, subsequent to the birth of Edward and just prior to the birth of Lionel. However, the intercessory activity of these years was not maintained.

---

<sup>94</sup> See section 3.1.

<sup>95</sup> Parsons, 'Mothers, Daughters, Power', pp. 63-78.

<sup>96</sup> W.M. Ormrod, 'The Royal Nursery: A Household for the Younger Children of Edward III', *English Historical Review*, 120 (2005), p. 401; Ormrod, 'Edward III and His Family', *Journal of British Studies*, 26 (1987), p. 399; W. M. Ormrod, 'Edward III (1312-1377)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8519>, accessed 14 July 2008]; Richard Barber, 'Edward , prince of Wales and of Aquitaine (1330-1376)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8523>, accessed 14 July 2008]; W. M. Ormrod, 'Lionel , duke of Clarence (1338-1368)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16750>, accessed 14 July 2008]; Simon Walker, 'John , duke of Aquitaine and duke of Lancaster, styled king of Castile and León (1340-1399)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, May 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14843>, accessed 14 July 2008]; Anthony Tuck, 'Edmund , first duke of York (1341-1402)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16023>, accessed 14 July 2008]; Juliet Vale, 'Philippa (1310x15?-1369)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22110>, accessed 14 July 2008].

There is some indication that the birth of sons was related to an increase in successful intercessory activity, but this conclusion is tenuous at best. It may be that Margaret's sustained success as an intercessor was a result of the rapid birth of two sons. Isabella did experience some increase in favour at the birth of Edward III and with the birth of John of Eltham, but it is possible that the escalation was equally affected by the death of Gaveston. Likewise, there is some indication that Philippa exercised some control of royal patronage due to pregnancy and birth of her first two sons, but it was not sustained. It is clear that daughters had very little impact on the queen's success as an intercessor.

There was also no increase in grants or gifts to the queen, which would indicate a rise in favour at the birth of children. In general, any grants that might have been bestowed after the birth of the children were to maintain the proper dower assignment. Many grants after the birth of children were to provide for the extra cost of the child while he was still in the queen's household, not a direct indication of favour. Margaret was granted the manor of Leeds and the farm of the manor of Fittleton in Wiltshire, specifically for the expenses of herself and 'the king's son'.<sup>97</sup> While Edward of Woodstock remained in Philippa's household, she received all the revenue of the earldom of Chester for his maintenance.<sup>98</sup> The only indication that Isabella received royal favour from the birth of her children is a writ issued one month before Edward of Windsor was born, granting Isabella the right to dispose of her goods and jewels at her own will.<sup>99</sup> This was an unusual privilege and was not granted to any other English queen except for Margaret of Anjou.<sup>100</sup> Isabella received a large number of estates in 1318, but this was not related to the birth of John of Eltham, but rather to the death of Margaret. Because the queens held the same dower lands, Isabella had to wait for

---

<sup>97</sup> *CPR 1292-1301*, p. 604; *CCR 1303-1307*, p. 19.

<sup>98</sup> David Green, *The Black Prince* (Stroud, 2001), p. 23; Richard Barber, *Edward, Prince of Wales* (Woodbridge, 1996), p. 17.

<sup>99</sup> *Foedera*, II, i, p. 184.

<sup>100</sup> Other secondary studies on queens do not make note of such a grant for other queens, with the exception of Margaret of Anjou.

Margaret's death to begin to administer much of her dower. Margaret died a year and a half after John was born.<sup>101</sup>

Because we do not observe a direct correlation between motherhood and intercession with Margaret, Isabella and Philippa, we can only hypothesize that motherhood was one factor behind their overall influence. However, from the treatment of queens and mothers in the chronicles and literature of the period, the royal family's emphasis on queens as mothers and anxieties surrounding queens who did not produce children, it is clear that motherhood enhanced the queen's symbolic power and influence. It was important to her public image, which—as was demonstrated in chapter three—was integral to her actual ability to intercede. Motherhood established the queen as a necessary counterpart to the king; it was her duty to complement him and provide an heir. Parsons' belief that motherhood gave queens and their daughters a sense of collective identity does apply to early fourteenth-century queens. They and their husbands actively promoted this group identity.

### 5.3 Childhood

According to John Carmi Parsons, children continued to serve as avenues to power throughout the life of the queen. By exerting influence over their children and maintaining it through to their children's adulthood, a queen could enjoy significant power, especially when her son would become king.<sup>102</sup> By taking advantage of her maternal relationship, the queen acted on her symbolic power and turned it into achieved power. Through their children, queens could link their natal and marital families and teach their children to do the same in their adulthood. Royal children were expected to further their family's interests and Parsons argues that queens were instrumental in teaching their children to do this.<sup>103</sup> From her control of her children's education the

---

<sup>101</sup> John Carmi Parsons, 'Margaret (1279?–1318)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18046>, accessed 19 March 2009].

<sup>102</sup> The queens' influence over adult sons and roles as regent will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 6. For scholars who have examined the queen's exploitation of motherhood through regency as a source of power see 1.6.

<sup>103</sup> Parsons, 'Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power', pp. 69, 74.

queen gained influence with her husband as well as potential influence with her children later in life.<sup>104</sup> Maintaining a presence during childhood was one step in turning symbolic power into achieved power.

Due to the methodological problems concerning document survival rate raised in the introduction to this chapter, it is difficult to reconstruct early fourteenth-century queens' contact with their children and exactly how much agency they had in directing their children's education. From the documents that are extant, it appears that these queens played an active role in their children's upbringing, but, with the exception of Isabella, there is very little evidence to conclusively support John Carmi Parsons' assertion that queens participated in their children's education. There is no evidence that Isabella had any agency in her daughter's education, as would fit with Parsons' paradigm, but there is some evidence that she was involved with her sons' education.

A relationship with sons might have been difficult to cultivate because the firstborn son left the queen's household almost immediately and the younger boys by around the age of seven. Only daughters tended to remain with their mothers throughout childhood.<sup>105</sup> The amount of time a queen spent with the household of her sons varied from queen to queen, but some level of contact was maintained. Eleanor of Provence's contact seems to have been unrestricted. Even when her children had their own households, they were often at the same residence.<sup>106</sup> Even after the heir left the queen's household, the transition between the mother's household and his own was gradual. Joanna Laynesmith has shown that fifteenth-century queens, Margaret of Anjou and Elizabeth Woodville, maintained strong connections with their eldest son's households, though this diminished as their sons grew older.<sup>107</sup>

According to extant household accounts, Margaret of France was quite regularly in and out of her children's lives. It is likely that Thomas was in her household for a brief time after his birth. Their expenses are both accounted for on the same roll of accounts in

---

<sup>104</sup> Parsons, 'Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power', pp. 65, 72, 75.

<sup>105</sup> Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry*, p. 28. Marjorie Chibnall, 'The Empress Matilda and Her Sons', in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.), *Medieval Mothering* (New York, 1996), p. 283; Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 146; Alison Marshall, 'The Childhood and Households of Edward II's Half-Brothers, Thomas of Brotherton and Edmund of Woodstock', in Gwilym Dodd and Anthony Musson (eds.), *The Reign of Edward II: New Perspectives* (York, 2006) p. 192.

<sup>106</sup> Howell, *Eleanor of Provence*, p. 99.

<sup>107</sup> Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, pp. 147-150.

1300.<sup>108</sup> By the beginning of 1301 a separate household was established for Thomas, and Edmund joined this household shortly after his birth.<sup>109</sup> Alison Marshall's study of Thomas and Edmund's household does not consider their relationship with their mother, perhaps because evidence for contact between the two households is sparse.<sup>110</sup> However, a detailed analysis of the queen and princes' household accounts does reveal that the two were often in contact with one another. Margaret appears in some of Thomas and Edmund's household accounts between 1301 and 1305, but not in others for these same years. Consequently, there are no visible patterns of change in contact over time. Margaret and the princes' households must have been residing together sometime between 1302 and 1303 because John Weston, a knight in Thomas and Edmund's household, was sent 'on the queen's command' with messages to her ministers. John's expenses were paid for in Thomas and Edmund's household.<sup>111</sup> As with the king and queen's households, we see an overlapping of the queen and the princes' household staff. The intermingling of the households indicates that the notion of each household as a separate institution with rigid boundaries is inaccurate.<sup>112</sup> This crossover is also an indication that the households were in close proximity to each other. There is other evidence that the royal family spent time together: Elizabeth, countess of Hereford, Eleanor de Clare, Thomas, Edmund, and Margaret were all accounted for on a list of prests in Edward I's household accounts for the expenses of the royal family.<sup>113</sup> As Laynesmith found for Margaret of Anjou and Elizabeth Woodville, Margaret was also involved in Thomas' household administration because her treasurer and a clerk of her

---

<sup>108</sup> TNA, E 101/357/20 mem. 1.

<sup>109</sup> Marshall, 'The Childhood and Household of Edward II's Half-Brothers,' p. 192; Malcolm Vale, *The Princely Court: Medieval Courts and Culture in North-West Europe, 1270-1380* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 50, 105, 107.

<sup>110</sup> Marshall, 'The Household of Edward II's Half-brothers', pp. 190-204.

<sup>111</sup> TNA, E 101/363/14.

<sup>112</sup> In his volumes of his *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, Tout approaches each wardrobe and household as a separate entity and implies that the only connection between the queen and king's households was that after Eleanor of Provence, the queen's wardrobe accounted to the king's wardrobe. With the exception of the movement of major officers of the royal households between these different households, he does not take into account the extent to which all levels of the royal households crossed over: T.F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England* (6 vols, Manchester, 1920-33), vol. 1, pp. 252-253. See section 4.1.

<sup>113</sup> TNA, E 101/368/5 mem. 3.

wardrobe are recorded in Thomas and Edmund's household accounts as buying cloth and other items for the princes.<sup>114</sup> Malcolm Vale has pointed out that the princes' livery was 'said to be *de secta Regina*, that is of the same kind and quality as the liveries of the queen's household', which would indicate that there was some standardization of the households of the queen and her sons.<sup>115</sup>

An account of expenses of the queen's wardrobe covered by the king contains an entry which strongly indicates that Margaret was probably with Thomas and Edmund much more often than the other household accounts demonstrate. Elizabeth, countess of Hereford, Edward I's daughter, brought her daughter to the queen's household 'to stay in the same place as the king's sons'.<sup>116</sup> First, this is an excellent example of fostering in the queen's court, a common practice in medieval England.<sup>117</sup> Second, it illustrates that Margaret and her sons must have been together frequently if Elizabeth believed that placing her daughter there would allow her to be 'in the same place as the king's sons'. Thus, Margaret, Thomas and Edmund's surviving household accounts demonstrate that they were together at least sporadically, and the last example implies that they were probably together much more often than can be concluded from the other household accounts discussed in this section. There is no evidence to tell us the nature of Margaret's relationship with her daughter Eleanor. Eleanor does not leave any household accounts of her own, which is probably because she was living within Margaret's household. But, it is also worth noting that she does not figure in Margaret's own surviving household accounts.

Isabella was also in and out of her children's lives, but there is slightly more evidence for her involvement than for Margaret. This may be a result of more extant documentation surviving for Isabella in general. There are more household accounts and there is some art-historical evidence, which is lacking for Margaret. This demonstrates the problematic nature of drawing comparative conclusions about the contact of the queens and their children. Isabella's role in Edward III's minority will be discussed in greater detail in chapter six, but a brief examination of her early relationship with

---

<sup>114</sup> Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, pp. 147-150; TNA, E 101/360/28 mems 3,5,8.

<sup>115</sup> TNA, E 101/360/11 mem. 5d as cited in Vale, *The Princely Court*, p. 105.

<sup>116</sup> TNA, E 101/361/3 mem. 4.

<sup>117</sup> For fostering see: Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry*, pp. 28, 48-51; Hanawalt, 'Female Networks for Fostering', pp. 339-43.



Edward III may help to explain her ability to control the political scene during his minority. It may also partially account for Edward's loyalty to Isabella after 1330 and it may give reason for, to some extent, the pursuit of his claims to the French crown.

Edward of Windsor's household was established almost immediately after his birth and on 24 November 1312 Edward II granted him the counties of Chester and Flint and the cantred of Inglefield.<sup>118</sup> Isabella is only recorded as visiting the prince's household once in May of 1313, before she left for France with Edward II.<sup>119</sup> This is the only household account we have for Prince Edward, but it demonstrates that in the first year of his life, Isabella was not in close contact with him. In July 1313, Prince Edward's treasurer was paid money out of Isabella's household for carriage of his household and again for expenses in December of that year. At the feast of the Epiphany there is an entry for the prince's oblations *in presencia Regine*.<sup>120</sup> Isabella's household accounts record letters passing between mother and son in 1314 and 1315.<sup>121</sup> Like Margaret, Isabella seems to have been involved in the administration of her son's household. She may have been responsible for Hugh de Leominster's appointment as Edward's treasurer, since Hugh was her controller prior to 1313.<sup>122</sup> There are a few other references throughout Isabella's household accounts that may indicate that the prince's household was sometimes with her's. Prince Edward may have been with the queen at Westminster in May 1315 as there is a payment in the queen's household account for that year to his valet for a carriage and horses, and there is another reference to a valet of the earl of Chester (Edward) moving from Westminster to Eltham in June. Isabella was in both Westminster and Eltham in June 1315.<sup>123</sup> Just as Margaret had used Thomas's knights to carry her messages, Isabella's wardrobe accounted for a payment to one of Edward's messengers carrying letters from her to the dowager countess of Cornwall and

---

<sup>118</sup> TNA, E 101/375/3; *CChR 1300-1326*, p. 202; Edward II's half-brothers Thomas and Edmund also had their own households as infants: Marshall, 'The Childhood and Households of Edward II's Half-Brothers', p. 192.

<sup>119</sup> TNA, E 101/375/3 mems 2-4.

<sup>120</sup> TNA, E 101/375/9 fol. 19v.

<sup>121</sup> TNA, E 101/375/9 fol. 33v. TNA, E 101/376/20 mems 2-4d.

<sup>122</sup> F. D. Blackley and G. Hermansen (eds.), *The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England, for the Fifth Regnal Year of Edward II, 8th July 1311 to 7th July 1312* (Edmonton, 1971), p. xiii.

<sup>123</sup> TNA, E 101/375/19 mem. 1.

to the prince's treasurer.<sup>124</sup> This reference provides evidence that household members served in multiple households, that Isabella was involved in the administration of the prince's household and that she had contact with her son, even when they were apart.

John of Eltham was originally placed in his brother's household, but in 1320 he was moved back into Isabella's.<sup>125</sup> In 1325 John was given his own household. The extant household accounts of John of Eltham cover the period when Isabella was in France, and she is therefore not present in them.<sup>126</sup> An extant payment for the expenses of Eleanor Despenser, *in tempore* Edward II, covers the cost of the care of John. Although we do not have the exact date of this document, it illustrates a few possibilities: it is probable that the king or queen had appointed Eleanor Despenser as guardian of John while one or both of them was away, probably on their trip to France in 1320; it could also be that when Prince Edward and Prince John were sent to 'divers places in the realm' during the purging of French natives from the court, John was sent to Eleanor Despenser's household.<sup>127</sup>

There is no reference of Isabella's contact with her daughters. Other studies have shown that younger children were formally in the household of the queen and that they often moved around with their mother's household or were placed in the care of someone appointed by the queen while she was travelling.<sup>128</sup> We know that the royal children were at least sometimes in the same residence as Isabella because in 1323, the mayor of London wrote to the earl of Kent explaining that he had been unable to raise men to come to his aid during the siege of the castle of Wallingford because they were holding the city for the king 'as surety for which the queen and her children were dwelling in London'.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup> TNA, E 101/375/9 fols 33-34v.

<sup>125</sup> Scott L. Waugh, 'John , earl of Cornwall (1316–1336)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14842>, accessed 25 April 2008].

<sup>126</sup> Scott L. Waugh, 'John , earl of Cornwall (1316–1336)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14842>, accessed 25 April 2008].

<sup>127</sup> TNA, C 61/36, mem. 24d.

<sup>128</sup> W.M. Ormrod, 'The Royal Nursery', p. 401.

<sup>129</sup> *CPMR 1323-1364*, p. 1.

Scholars have noted that women, and some queens, were involved, or were portrayed as being involved, in the education of their children.<sup>130</sup> By controlling their education a queen could control the messages sent to her young children, leaving her mark on them and further cultivating an environment in which affection and loyalty could be fostered. She could begin to transform her symbolic power into achieved power by actively creating such a setting. Joanna Laynesmith makes the case that Margaret of Anjou and Elizabeth Woodville were probably involved in the education of their sons.<sup>131</sup> John Carmi Parsons has shown that queens could have international influence through the education and influence of their daughters, a point to which the chapter will return. He argues that queens could use their own experiences to teach their daughters, increasing their 'daughter's value as diplomatic brides...ultimately increasing their own influence in matrimonial diplomacy and foreign relations'.<sup>132</sup> Queens were the best educators for their daughters because they were aware of the skills and knowledge that would aid them in making good wives and queens. Often through their education, women were the disseminators of their native cultures. Eleanor of Castile's early literary education may have helped her to assimilate the cultural differences between Castile and England, and the Cistercian burial traditions she brought with her from Castile influenced Westminster Abbey's evolution.<sup>133</sup> Henry II's daughters carried English Arthurian legends to Germany, Spain and Sicily.<sup>134</sup>

There is some evidence that Isabella was involved in the education of Prince Edward. The argument for Isabella's involvement in her children's education is derived from surviving manuscripts. In the fourteenth-century *Treatise of Walter Milemete*, Isabella is depicted as the advisor and educator of her son Edward, which Elizabeth

---

<sup>130</sup> Wendy Scase, 'St. Anne and the Education of the Virgin: Literary and Artistic Traditions and their Implications,' in Nicholas Rogers (ed.), *England in the Fourteenth Century* (Stamford, 1993), 81-96; Patricia Cullum and Jeremy Goldberg, 'How Margaret Blackburn Taught her Daughters: Reading Devotional Instruction in a Book of Hours', in Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al (eds.), *Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts in Late medieval Britain, Essays for Felicity Riddy* (Turnhout, 2000), 217-26; Pamela Shingorn, ' "The Wise Mother" The Image of St. Anne Teaching the Virgin Mary, in Mary C. Erler and Maryanne Koaleski (eds.), *Gender in the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages* ( Ithaca, 2003), pp. 105-134.

<sup>131</sup> Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 153.

<sup>132</sup> Parsons, 'Mother, Daughters, Marriage, Power' p. 75.

<sup>133</sup> Parsons, 'Mother, Daughters, Marriage, Power' p. 75.

<sup>134</sup> Parsons, 'Mother, Daughters, Marriage, Power' p. 75.

Danbury has argued is evocative of the thirteenth-century image of Blanche of Castile teaching her son, Louis IX, to read.<sup>135</sup> Anne Rudolf Stanton's study of the Queen Mary Psalter also makes an interesting case that Isabella was involved in Prince Edward's education.<sup>136</sup> Even though her argument regarding Edward's education is speculative, by her own admission, Stanton's study demonstrates the emphasis on the importance of motherhood in the text and images of the manuscript. Stanton has convincingly established that Isabella was probably the original owner of the Queen Mary Psalter.<sup>137</sup> The psalter was probably given to, or commissioned by, Isabella sometime after the birth of John in 1316, by which time Edward III would have been more than four years old.<sup>138</sup> Stanton believes that it would have been idealised for instructing a family, because 'the paradigm of educational uses that were ascribed to psalters throughout the Middle Ages...were beginning to become more popular within the context of royal education'.<sup>139</sup> She argues that, since psalters were reformatted to parallel Parisian books of hours, Isabella would have been familiar with their iconography. Throughout the manuscript there are biblical images and stories which emphasize the role of motherhood.<sup>140</sup> The lengthy Old Testament preface includes the stories of Sarah, Rebecca and Rachel, the same women mentioned in the coronation *ordo* quoted at the beginning of this chapter, suggesting that such images were closely integrated in medieval life. The ideal female models in the psalter are mothers and 'are key figures...their actions direct the lives of their sons and in some cases redeem them from their own sins'.<sup>141</sup> Stanton's argument connects Isabella's patronage of the manuscript

---

<sup>135</sup> Madeline Caviness, 'Anchoress, Abbess, and Queens: Donors and Patrons or Intercessors and Matrons', in June Hall McCash (ed.), *The Cultural Patronage of Medieval Women* (Athens, 1996), pp. 135-6; Miriam Shais, 'Blanche of Castile and Facing's "Medieval Queenship": Reassessing the Argument', in Kathleen Nolan (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), pp. 143-44, 146, 149; Elizabeth Danbury, 'Images of English Queens in the Later Middle Ages', *Historian*, 46 (1995), p.7; Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 150.

<sup>136</sup> Anne Rudolf Stanton, *The Queen Mary Psalter: A Study of Affect and Audience* (Philadelphia 2001), pp. 199-203, 235.

<sup>137</sup> Stanton, *The Queen Mary Psalter*, pp. 199-203, 235.

<sup>138</sup> Stanton, *The Queen Mary Psalter*, pp. 106-7, 240.

<sup>139</sup> Stanton, *The Queen Mary Psalter*, pp. 240-41.

<sup>140</sup> Stanton, *The Queen Mary Psalter*, pp. 101-146, a lengthy portion of Stanton's book describes in detail the emphasis on motherhood in the manuscript.

<sup>141</sup> Stanton, *The Queen Mary Psalter*, p. 126.

with these images of strong mothers, as well as the stories of leaders that directly countered the faults of Edward II, and questions the possible impact these images might have had on Edward III.<sup>142</sup>

It is entirely possible that Isabella used motherhood to create links between her marital and natal countries. When Philip IV negotiated the terms of Isabella's marriage he seemed particularly interested in Edward and Isabella's future children. He may have encouraged Isabella to promote their French heritage to her children. By looking at the political issues surrounding the marriages set out in the treaty of Montreuil-sur-Mer it becomes clear that Philip viewed women as transmitters of Capetian royal authority, and may have seen Isabella or Margaret as a means by which to extend the Capetian orbit to England.

Philip IV wanted to centralize authority in France around the monarchy as well as to spread the influence of the Capetian royal family. One of Philip's lawyers, Pierre Dubois, advised Philip to achieve expansion through a system of marriage alliances, which would result in the extension of Capetian power in Europe and the peaceful acquisition of new lands.<sup>143</sup> Philip's pursuance of this strategy demonstrates that he felt women were instrumental participants in the consolidation and centralization of royal power in France, as well as disseminators of Capetian influence. Philip also saw himself as a divinely appointed justiciar, interpreting the law as he saw fit. It was Philip who was the intermediary between God and his subjects, with the French monarchy as the buttress of the church.<sup>144</sup> In order to promote this image, Philip actively cultivated the cult of St. Louis, his grandfather, and succeeded in gaining Louis's canonization in 1297.<sup>145</sup> As part of his policy of centralization of authority and expansion of influence, Philip wanted Aquitaine to come more firmly under the command of the Capetian dynasty.

---

<sup>142</sup> Stanton, *The Queen Mary Psalter*, pp. 239-241.

<sup>143</sup> Pierre Dubois, *Summaria Brevis et Compendiosa*, H. Kampf (ed.) (New York, 1936) as cited in Doherty, 'Isabella, Queen of England', p. 7.

<sup>144</sup> Elizabeth A.R. Brown, 'Persona et Gesta: the Image and Deeds of the Thirteenth-Century Capetians, 3—The case of Philip the Fair', *Viator*, 19 (1989), p. 229-30, 236; Elizabeth Hallam, 'Philip the Fair and the Cult of Saint Louis', *Studies in Church History*, 18 (1982), p. 202; Joseph R. Strayer, *The Reign Philip the Fair* (Princeton, 1980), p. 13.

<sup>145</sup> Hallam, 'The Cult of St. Louis', pp. 201-214; Brown, 'The Case for Philip the Fair', pp. 222, 225-226, 236.

There is some evidence that Philip tried to extend his policies and beliefs to England through Isabella. If the duke of Aquitaine and king of England was Isabella's son, he would have strong ties to the Capetian court. Such ties might bring the duchy more firmly under Capetian influence because the grandson of the French king might submit to the French crown's jurisdiction in the area more readily. For this to occur, it would be important for Isabella to inculcate her son with his Capetian heritage. The importance of extending Capetian influence can also be seen in Philip's concern for the future of Isabella's daughters. If Isabella died without sons, he wanted to know if her daughters would become queens of England, indicating that he was comfortable with women succeeding to the throne, and suggesting that he had some personal motive behind this question.<sup>146</sup> Philip wanted to be sure that a Capetian was on the English throne, even if it was a woman. Edward I's marriage to Margaret of France may have been a safeguard in the event of Edward II's death before his marriage to Isabella or if they did not have any children. If Margaret had sons, which she did, they would be next in line after Edward II and his heirs, still ensuring a Capetian on the throne of England. Once Isabella gave birth to a son, Philip immediately tried to assert her son's French heritage. He insisted that Edward II and Isabella's first son, the future Edward III, be named Louis after Philip's canonized grandfather, Saint Louis.<sup>147</sup>

If the notion of the Capetian king, as divine monarch over all of France, was strongly emphasized to the future English king, as duke of Aquitaine, he might prove more submissive to the French king's authority. Isabella was more than likely aware of Philip's views on kingship and perhaps was urged to impart these ideas to her sons. The English themselves described Isabella's sons as 'French natives' when they were relocated in the purge of French courtiers from the English court during the war of St. Sardos.<sup>148</sup> Philip began to give Edward significant concessions regarding Gascony in 1313 subsequent to the death of Piers Gaveston and the birth of Prince Edward, concessions which E.A.R. Brown attributes to the death of Gaveston.<sup>149</sup> Yet, in light of

---

<sup>146</sup> Elizabeth A.R. Brown, 'The Political Repercussions of the Marriage of Edward II of England and Isabelle of France', *Speculum*, 63 (1988), pp. 584-85, 593-95.

<sup>147</sup> Doherty, 'Queen Isabella of England', p. 48.

<sup>148</sup> TNA, C 61/36, mem. 24d. I'd like to thank Ms. Maureen Jurkowski for bringing this reference to my attention.

<sup>149</sup> Elizabeth A.R. Brown, 'Diplomacy, Adultery and Domestic Politics at the Court of Philip the Fair:

Philip's concern that Isabella's children were the heirs to the English throne, it is more likely that it was the birth of an heir that encouraged Philip to make concessions to Edward II, hoping that eventually Isabella's children would be the keys to bringing Aquitaine more strongly under Capetian control through their connections with the French royal family.

However, Philip could not have foreseen the dynastic crisis which would follow his death, and one wonders how he would have viewed developments in French succession practices, in light of the above argument. In 1314, three of Philip IV's daughters-in-law were arrested on accusations of adultery; the lovers were executed and the women were imprisoned. At this point none of Isabella's brothers had male heirs, and they would all die childless. Isabella has often been implicated as the foremost informer in the scandal because she was in France at the time. Isabella's supposed motivations for the accusations was to put her son in direct line for the French throne, but E.A.R. Brown has demonstrated that there is no substantial evidence connecting Isabella to the accusations. The only chronicles to discuss the scandal are in no way contemporary to the events, and therefore, they are somewhat unreliable.<sup>150</sup> Scholars can never know if Philip IV would have viewed Isabella or her son's succession to the French throne as joining France and England under the Capetian name, or as the domination of England over France. He could not have foreseen the death of his sons without male heirs, so it is unlikely that the uniting of the two realms through Isabella was one of his goals. If Isabella did stress the importance of her French ties to her son, it might in part account for the pursuance of his claims to the French throne, even if this was not what Philip had in mind. However, he clearly viewed women as equal to men in the transmission of the Capetian dynasty when it worked in his favour, and he certainly saw Isabella, Margaret and their heirs as a means of bringing Aquitaine more firmly under his control. This evidence for Philip's desire to expand Capetian influence to England creates a good case that Isabella emphasized this heritage to Edward III.

---

Queen Isabella's Mission to France 1314', in Jeffrey S. Hamilton and Patricia J. Bradley (eds.), *Documenting the Past: Essays in Medieval History Presented to George Peddy Cuttino* (Woodbridge, 1989), p. 56.

<sup>150</sup> Brown, 'Diplomacy, Adultery', pp. 74-77; Elizabeth M. Hallam, *Capetian France, 987-1328* (London, 2001), p. 363.

There is very little extant material for Philippa's relationships with the royal children, and much of what survives has been studied by W.M. Ormrod and Caroline Shenton.<sup>151</sup> Philippa seems to have been involved in the administration of the household in much the same way as Margaret and Isabella. As Ormrod has demonstrated, Philippa was involved in setting up a temporary household for Isabella, Joan, Lionel, and John in 1340 while she and Edward III were in the Low Countries.<sup>152</sup> Even though Philippa was not near her children at this time, she still showed concern for their well-being by directly participating in the appointment of certain members of their household.<sup>153</sup> Her treasurer received payment in the household accounts of this 'royal nursery'.<sup>154</sup> It is possible that her treasurer stayed in England to fill the necessary position in the children's household, especially since Philippa's own household had essentially merged with the king's while she accompanied him abroad. Nor did Philippa's absence prevent her from remaining in contact with her daughters. Isabella and Joan sent letters to their mother while she was away.<sup>155</sup> Moreover, Ormrod has found that when Philippa was in England her younger children were mainly kept in her household.<sup>156</sup> Philippa covered payments for Prince Edmund and Princess Isabella's oblations sometime between 1349 and 1351.<sup>157</sup> There are no records of a separate household established for Edmund of Langley—this of course is not unusual for younger sons, who stayed in the queen's household until they were around seven years old—and so this record of oblations indicates that Edmund and Isabella must have been residing in Philippa's household at this time.<sup>158</sup>

The evidence that survives is most revealing in respect to Philippa's relationship with her eldest son, Edward of Woodstock. As was mentioned above, the prince stayed

---

<sup>151</sup> Ormrod, 'The Royal Nursery', pp. 398-415; Shenton, 'Philippa of Hainault's Churchings' pp. 105-121.

<sup>152</sup> Ormrod, 'The Royal Nursery' pp. 401, 404.

<sup>153</sup> TNA, E 101/389/9 mem. 2 contains a payment of wages to a laundress assigned by Queen Philippa.

<sup>154</sup> TNA, E 101/389/9 mem. 1.

<sup>155</sup> TNA, E 101/389/9 mem. 2.

<sup>156</sup> I would like to thank W.M. Ormrod for making his personal notes available to me.

<sup>157</sup> TNA, E 36/205 fols 6, 6v, 7, 15.

<sup>158</sup> The Patent Rolls do not show any grants towards the establishment of a household for Edmund between 1341 and 1348.



in Philippa's household until 1333. In 1330, their New Year's gifts were enrolled on the same account, and the wages of Edward of Woodstock's treasurer were paid from Philippa's wardrobe.<sup>159</sup> In 1338, Edward of Woodstock wrote a letter to Philippa, while he was keeper of the realm, in response to her request for a shipment of wool to the Low Countries.<sup>160</sup> The letter is written in the first person, but Edward was only eight years old at this time, so it is most likely a political fiction that he initiated the letter. The letter claims that he made the decisions to hasten the shipment of wool along with his council, but it is most likely that the council was writing under the name of the prince. This letter reflects correspondence between the queen and the keeper, or the keeper's council, in their official capacities rather than a dialogue in which the queen mother attempts to use influence over her son. In 1340, the squires of the king and queen received cloth for robes from Edward of Woodstock's wardrobe, but Philippa does not appear in any of the other accounts of the prince.<sup>161</sup>

Surviving evidence indicates that Margaret of France, Isabella of France, and Philippa of Hainault played an active role in their children's upbringing. Though it is difficult to assess the amount of contact a queen's household had with those of her children, it is reasonable to conclude that these royal mothers were far from being strangers to their children. Margaret was perceived by contemporaries to be in the company of her sons often. Isabella may have played a significant part of her children's education, potentially linking both her natal and marital families through her son. Philippa seems to have shown real concern for the well-being of her children when she was absent from the realm. The extent to which such contact paved the way for further manipulation of the role of motherhood will be discussed in the next section of this chapter and in the following chapter.

#### **5.4 Children as Adults**

As this chapter has discussed, scholars have pointed out that queens could exploit relationships with their children to expand their network of influence and turn their

---

<sup>159</sup> TNA, E 101/384/18 mem. 1; TNA, E 361/2 mem 10.

<sup>160</sup> TNA, SC 1/54/29.

<sup>161</sup> TNA, E 101/388/12 mem. 1.

ascribed power into achieved power. In many cases, it was the queen's relationship with her eldest son that was the most crucial in raising and preserving the queen's influence after the death of her husband. Scholars have put forth the argument that the queen had to possess influence over her son if she wanted to remain an active participant in court life.<sup>162</sup> This seems very much in keeping with Isabella's actions. However, Parsons' model for the queen using her daughters' marriages to extend her networks of influence is not necessarily applicable in every case. Some queens did not choose to manipulate their symbolic power to gain achieved power through their daughters. This section will examine Margaret, Isabella and Philippa's continuing relationships with their children as adults, and examine the extent to which these queens actively manipulated motherhood to further their power and influence. Isabella's relationship with Edward III during his minority will be discussed in detail in chapter six of this study, but will be alluded to throughout this section.

None of the surviving evidence indicates that Margaret manipulated her role as mother to further her own power and influence through her adult children. This may simply be a case of lost documentation, but the available evidence indicates that after Edward I's death, Margaret had very little, if any, contact with her children. She does not appear in Thomas and Edmund's existing household account in Edward II's reign, and no accounts exist for Margaret herself. There are no surviving letters between, or concerning, Margaret and her children. Her daughter, Eleanor, died in 1310 when she was about three or four years old, which might explain her absence from the surviving records.<sup>163</sup>

Despite the lack of evidence for her contact with her own children, Margaret of France provides a unique opportunity to study a queen as a stepmother. As argued in the previous section, one way the queen could maintain power and authority in later life was to take advantage of her relationship with her children. As a second wife, Margaret was forced to cultivate a relationship with an heir who was not her biological child in order to create and maintain avenues of power and authority. In light of popular medieval stereotypes of stepmothers as malicious women, establishing a positive relationship with

---

<sup>162</sup> Janet L. Nelson, 'Medieval Queenship', p. 197; Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p. 179.

<sup>163</sup> John Carmi Parsons, 'Margaret (1279?-1318)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18046>, accessed 12 March 2009].

one's stepchildren might have been difficult.<sup>164</sup> However, Margaret had a very good relationship with three of Edward I's children from his marriage with Eleanor of Castile, Edward, Mary and Elizabeth. This relationship began when Margaret stayed in Mary and Edward's household between October and November 1299, following her marriage.<sup>165</sup> All three were close in age: Edward was about fifteen, Mary nineteen, and Margaret about twenty.<sup>166</sup> Edward and Mary might have looked to Margaret more as a companion rather than a stepmother. She often appears in Prince Edward's household accounts, indicating that, after her own household was established she still maintained contact with and was sometimes in close proximity to the prince.<sup>167</sup> It is striking that Margaret was always referred to as Edward II's mother, even though she was of course not his biological mother. In Edward's own household account while he was Prince of Wales, Eleanor of Castile is referred to as Lady Eleanor, once queen of England, with no allusion to her position as Edward's mother, which was normally the convention when giving the title of the queen in connection with her son.<sup>168</sup> Contemporaries, then, did not make distinctions between blood ties and marriage ties. Margaret was Edward I's wife and she was therefore Edward II's mother.

There are several examples of intercession and cooperation between Margaret and her stepchildren Edward and Mary. Both Margaret and Mary wrote to Edward I to secure an appointment on behalf of Ralph de Sodbury, Mary's servant, to the vacancy of

---

<sup>164</sup> Harriet Hudson (ed.), 'Octavian', pp. 45-114, Jean d' Arras, *Melusine*, A.K. Donald (ed.), EETS, OS, 68 (New York, 1973).

<sup>165</sup> TNA, E 101/ 355/ 29, 30.

<sup>166</sup> J. R. S. Phillips, 'Edward II (1284-1327)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8518>, accessed 20 Feb 2009]; Michael Prestwich, 'Mary (1278-c.1332)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/60121>, accessed 20 Feb 2009]; John Carmi Parsons, 'Margaret (1279?-1318)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18046>, accessed 20 Feb 2009].

<sup>167</sup> TNA, E 101/363/18 fols 3, 6, 26 contain letters from Edward to Margaret and jewels given to queen Margaret, knights and damsels, there are also payments for the preparation of the coming of the king and queen. TNA, E 101/368/4 mem. 2: she visited the prince on 12 February 1305 at Langley along with the countess of Hereford (Prince Edward's sister), the earl of Pembroke and various other knights. TNA, E 101/357/2: she used the Prince's messengers to send a letter to the king.

<sup>168</sup> TNA, E 101/363/18 fol. 3.

the church of Frampton in the bishopric of Winchester.<sup>169</sup> Robert Benedicite of Norwich received the custody of the lesser piece of the seal for recognisances of debts in the city of Norwich at the request of both Margaret and Edward of Caernarvon.<sup>170</sup> In November 1300, they were also able to secure twenty oaks from Inglewood forest for the prior and convent of Carlisle from the crown.<sup>171</sup> William le Frend of Burnton received a pardon for the death of William de Chathowe due to a request made by Margaret and Elizabeth.<sup>172</sup>

Prince Edward looked to Margaret several times to intercede with his father on his behalf. Although Edward I had made attempts to regulate the estate of his son, in July 1305 he revoked the regulations 'at the request of Queen Margaret'.<sup>173</sup> Margaret also secured a pardon from Edward I when Edward of Caernarvon and some of his companions deserted the king in Scotland.<sup>174</sup> Margaret acted as a champion for the prince, softening Edward I when he tried to control him. She might have been acting out of true affection or she might have been keeping her future position in mind when she helped Edward of Caernarvon. Edward I was old and if Margaret could secure the favour and loyalty of his son and heir, she could maintain her role at court.

However, after Edward's death in 1307 Margaret's efforts proved to have been in vain. She almost completely disappears from the records. She rarely appears in Edward II's household accounts after he became king. When she does appear, it is because her clerks were working for the new king, which indicates that she was probably at court at that time.<sup>175</sup> She came to court in September 1307, probably in preparation for the approaching nuptials of the king and Isabella in France the following January.<sup>176</sup> There

---

<sup>169</sup> TNA, SC 1/19/112a.

<sup>170</sup> CPR 1301-1307, p. 96.

<sup>171</sup> CCR 1296-1302, p. 414.

<sup>172</sup> CPR 1301-1307, p. 37.

<sup>173</sup> CPR 1301-1307, p. 342; Jeffery S. Hamilton, *Piers Gaveston, earl of Cornwall, 1307-1312: Politics and Patronage in the Reign of Edward II* (Detroit, 1988), pp. 31-32; Jeffery S. Hamilton, 'The Character of Edward II: The Letters of Edward of Caernarfon Reconsidered', in Gwilym Dodd and Anthony Musson (eds.), *The Reign of Edward II: New Perspectives* (York, 2006), pp. 12-13, 16-17.

<sup>174</sup> CCR 1302-1307, pp. 530-31; Hamilton, *Piers Gaveston*, p. 34; Hamilton, 'The Character of Edward II', pp. 16-17.

<sup>175</sup> TNA, E 101/373/15 fol. 3; TNA, E 101/373/19 mem. 2.

<sup>176</sup> TNA, E 101/373/5 mem. 3.

are no surviving letters from Margaret to Edward II, and there are only a few surviving letters from Margaret at all after 1307. All are written to the chancellor asking for letters of protection, a request for an *oyer et terminer*, and for aid in recovering her debts.<sup>177</sup> Part of this lack of correspondence may be an accident of survival, but it does indicate that, while Margaret was still active in running her estates and household, she was no longer viewed as an avenue to the king; the number of her acts of intercession drops to virtually nothing after 1307. John Carmi Parsons has made note of this decrease in Margaret's intercessory activity and has accounted for it by arguing that Margaret was deliberately making way for Isabella. The more speculative aspect of Parsons' argument derives from the presence of Margaret and Edward's older sisters at Isabella's coronation. Parsons claims that these women came to an agreement as to the distribution of petitions among them.<sup>178</sup> If Margaret was making any attempt to secure Edward II's loyalty, she does not seem to have reaped any benefits from it. In addition to the few surviving letters to the chancellor, there are records of letters between Margaret and Isabella in Isabella's household books. Margaret did not disappear entirely from court life as she did maintain contact with Isabella through these letters and meetings, but she ceased to have significant contact with the crown.<sup>179</sup>

There is also very little evidence of the extent to which Philippa might have been in contact with those children who reached maturity during her lifetime. She did not outlive Edward III, so it was not necessary for Philippa to maintain influence with her children as dowager queen in order to preserve her power. However, there is some evidence of a network of communication and influence among the members of the royal family. Sometime between 1343 and 1356, Prince Edward wrote to the keeper of his seal to order his treasurer, William Northwell, to authorize a payment to Philippa out of the issues of tin in Cornwall.<sup>180</sup> Another letter from Isabella of Woodstock and her sister Joan indicates that they were using the queen's influence to give weight to a request to the chancellor that men who served them be excused from paying certain taxes 'as [he]

---

<sup>177</sup> TNA, SC 1/35/70, 131, 164; TNA, SC 1/37/55.

<sup>178</sup> Parsons 'Intercessory Patronage of Queen Margaret and Isabella of France' p. 154.

<sup>179</sup> Blackley, *The Household Book of Queen Isabella*, pp. 206-207, 212-216; TNA, E 101/375/9, fol. 33; TNA, E 101/375/19; TNA, E 101/376/20.

<sup>180</sup> TNA, SC 1/54/96.

had done for the horsemen of our very dear lady and mother the queen'.<sup>181</sup> These two letters give some indication that the queen and the royal children maintained contact and worked together to accomplish day-to-day business.

Parsons has argued that in Eleanor of Castile's case, arranging marriages and maintaining contact with her daughters could extend the queen's power and influence. This might be looked upon as furthering and manipulating the matriarchal system within the royal family. However, this model does not apply for Margaret and Philippa. Isabella is the only one who might fit within this paradigm because she exploited her symbolic power as a mother to gain real authority. Margaret's daughter died before any marriage negotiations could take place, and so the Parsons paradigm cannot apply to her. Though Philippa, as we shall see, did not instigate or directly participate in her daughters' marriages, the queen's own marriage represented her important diplomatic position which she then passed on to her daughters. This section will not proceed in exact chronological order when considering Isabella and Philippa's involvement in marriage negotiations in order to concentrate on certain aspects of Parsons' arguments. It first concentrates on how the two queens passively contributed to their sons' and daughters' marriages and then how Isabella actively manipulated some of her children's marriages to further her power and authority.

Edward III had clear, though changing, agendas when arranging marriages for his sons.<sup>182</sup> It is difficult to ascertain if Philippa had any influence in Edward III's motivations when arranging their children's marriages, even when he was negotiating marriages for his children in the Low Countries.<sup>183</sup> While he may have exploited Philippa's connections to facilitate these negotiations, these marriages were not arranged solely because of Philippa's origins. Her natal ties in this region were a convenient tool for Edward, but they do not serve as evidence that the marriages were arranged at her instigation. If she did have any direct input in them at all, the documentary evidence does not shed light on it. Her contribution to marriage negotiations of her sons was a passive one, tied up in her natal and marital status, rather than the active manipulation of her role as mother.

---

<sup>181</sup> TNA, SC 1/40/5.

<sup>182</sup> Ormrod, 'Edward III and his Family', pp. 398-422.

<sup>183</sup> Ormrod, 'Edward III and his Family', p. 403.

It was very much the same with Philippa's daughters, and the Princess Isabella provides us with a good example. Several assumptions might be made, based on Parsons' models of queens as mothers, which would support Philippa's involvement in her daughter's marriage negotiations. Yet, the political context of these marriages does not support many of these assumptions. According to Parsons, many Plantagenet princesses' marriages were delayed because of their mothers' concern that they should not enter into a marriage too young.<sup>184</sup> Princess Isabella's very late marriage to the lord of Coucy on 27 July 1365 might be taken as evidence of this practice, or that parental indulgence allowed her to have input in her own marriage.<sup>185</sup> However, when Isabella was only three years old, Edward began to use her marriage as a bargaining tool for strengthening his position on the continent. Negotiations surrounding possible marriages for Isabella began in 1335 and continued throughout the 1340s and 1350s. Each of these marriage arrangements failed due to the political climate in which they were attempted, not because Philippa was trying to prevent an early marriage for her daughter.

In 1336, Edward initiated a proposed marriage between Alfonso of Castile's son Pedro and Isabella. Pedro ignored the idea, but continued to express a desire for an alliance with England.<sup>186</sup> Proposed alliances also occurred with Louis of Nevers, count of Flanders, one of Philip VI's supporters in the Low Countries between 1337 and 1339.<sup>187</sup> Louis of Nevers decided it was in his interests, having grown up in the French court, to ally himself with Philip rather than Edward.<sup>188</sup> On 30 March 1347, following the death of Louis of Nevers at Crécy, Edward III appointed the earl of Northampton, Reginald Cobham, and Bartholomew Burghersh to negotiate for a marriage between Louis de Mâle, Louis of Nevers' son, the count of Flanders, and Isabella. Yet again in 1349, Edward launched negotiations for a marriage between the son and heir of Charles,

---

<sup>184</sup> Parsons, 'Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power', pp. 63, 66, 75.

<sup>185</sup> Many of the primary and secondary sources for the marriage negotiations of Edward III's daughters were brought to my attention by Dr. Graham St. John: Graham E. St. John, 'Edward III and the Use of Political Dissent in France, c. 1330-1360' (Unpublished M. Phil Thesis. University of Cambridge, 2005).

<sup>186</sup> H.S. Lucas, *The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, 1326-1347* (Ann Arbor, 1929), p. 188.

<sup>187</sup> *CPR 1334-1338*, pp. 420-21.

<sup>188</sup> *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 193, 249; David Nicholas, *Medieval Flanders* (London, 1992), p. 220.

king of Bohemia and Isabella. Neither Louis de Mâle, nor the count of Bohemia seemed interested in a marriage alliance with Edward.<sup>189</sup>

Unlike in the 1330s and 1340s, the marriages that the king treated for throughout the 1350s were not for the purpose of securing foreign alliances, but were a way of rewarding some of his allies.<sup>190</sup> Princess Isabella was about eighteen in 1351 and Edward tried to arrange a marriage for her into a prominent Gascon family, the Albrets.<sup>191</sup> However, Isabella never departed for Gascony and there is no indication why the marriage never took place. It is for this reason that historians have argued that Isabella herself refused the match.<sup>192</sup> The Albrets were a great noble family in Gascony; even so the appropriateness of the match for a princess might have been raised. It might have been argued that she should have been reserved for a French royal marriage, for example. Even though Isabella did not marry until 1365, had negotiations not failed for her earlier marriages she might have been married as early as age seven.<sup>193</sup> This was not a delay based on motherly concern about age, nor a desire on Philippa's part to keep her daughter close to home nor, in the case of the earlier marriages, any refusals on Isabella's part. Consequently, none of these assumptions can be used to argue that Philippa had any input in the marriages of Princess Isabella. Philippa's other daughters' marriages were conducted in much the same way. Edward's two youngest daughters, Mary and Margaret, were both part of attempted alliances with Charles de Blois and John of Brittany. As part of the treaty agreement in 1352 that recognized Charles de Blois as duke of Brittany, Edward's youngest daughter, Margaret, was to marry Charles' son and heir.<sup>194</sup> Edward III's alliance with Alphonso of Castile finally came to fruition when his

---

<sup>189</sup> *Foedera*, III, i, pp. 111-12; *CPR 1348-1350*, p. 251.

<sup>190</sup> St. John, 'Edward III and the Use of Political Dissent in France', p. 15.

<sup>191</sup> TNA, C 61/63 mem. 6; *Foedera*, III, i, pp. 218-19, 235; *CPR 1350-1354*, p. 127.

<sup>192</sup> Mary Anne Everett Green, *Lives of the Princesses of England from the Norman Conquest*, (6 vols, London, 1857), vol. 3, p. 193.

<sup>193</sup> James L. Gillespie, 'Isabella, countess of Bedford (1332-1379)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14485>, accessed 20 Feb 2009].

<sup>194</sup> Friedrich Bock, 'Some New Documents Illustrating the Early Years of the Hundred Years War', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XV (1931), pp. 63-66.



daughter Joan almost married Pedro, Alphonso's eldest son.<sup>195</sup> Unfortunately, she died on her way to the marriage of the Black Death on 2 September 1348.<sup>196</sup>

As with their sons, the origins of the husbands of Edward and Philippa's daughters were not dictated, in the first place, by Philippa's French and Flemish connections, though they certainly were advantageous to Edward's political and martial motives. Conflicts between England and places such as France, Scotland, Spain and the Low Countries were often mediated through marriage negotiations – Queen Isabella and Queen Margaret's are good examples. That marriages were negotiated in these regions cannot serve as direct evidence that the queen initiated them. England typically attempted to secure marriage alliances in these countries to solve conflict or to increase political, economic, or martial power.

The marriage negotiations surrounding Queen Isabella's daughter, Eleanor, follow a similar pattern to those of Princess Isabella. Like Philippa, Queen Isabella did not directly take part in these negotiations. However, these queens and their daughters shared the symbolic diplomatic importance of royal marriages. Royal marriages often resulted as sureties for treaties, solving wider political disputes. Thus, marriages signified the diplomatic role these women could play. The women often played a passive role in their own marriage negotiations, but within these marriages, some went on to actively serve a diplomatic function. Isabella's role as intercessor with the king and baronage and as ambassador to France is an example of this more active diplomatic role. Like Princess Isabella, Princess Eleanor's marriage was used as a diplomatic bargaining tool several times before one was finalized, and in similar areas of Europe. In 1325 Edward II tried to arrange a marriage with Alfonso V of Castile, in 1329 a marriage was proposed to John II of France and again in 1330 negotiations occurred for a marriage to Pedro the heir of Alfonso IV of Aragon.<sup>197</sup> In 1332 Edward III successfully negotiated Eleanor's marriage to the count of Guelders as part of his agenda of using his children's marriages to extend his influence in the Low Countries.

---

<sup>195</sup> *Foedera*, III, i, p. 221; Green, *Lives of the Princesses of England*, p. 244

<sup>196</sup> Ormrod, 'The Royal Family', p. 409; Green, *Lives of the Princesses*, p. 257.

<sup>197</sup> Pierre Chaplais, *The War of Saint-Sardos*, Camden, 3<sup>rd</sup> Series, 87 (1954), pp. 214-216; Alison McHardy, 'Paying for the Wedding: Edward III as Fundraiser', in J.S. Hamilton (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England, IV* (Woodbridge, 2006), p. 43; E.W. Safford 'An Account of the Expenses of Eleanor, Sister of Edward III, on her Marriage to the count of Guelders', *Archaeologia*, 77 (1927), p. 112.

Queen Isabella did not take part in the negotiations of this marriage as she had with Joan and Edward, but she did take part in the establishment of Eleanor's temporary household for the purpose of conducting Eleanor to Guelders by appointing some of its members. Queen Isabella did not accompany her there, but many of the servants in this temporary household were drawn from Isabella's own domestic establishment.<sup>198</sup> Like Philippa, Isabella actively participated in the formation of her daughter's household. Eleanor would have been familiar with the servants of her mother's household, because she presumably resided there until her marriage. The presence of Isabella's servants in Eleanor's household might have eased Eleanor's transition from England to Guelders, a transition which Isabella would have been familiar with as a foreign-born queen. Again, Queen Isabella and Queen Philippa performed an important diplomatic function as a connection to European royal families which the king could manipulate. Their marriages to the English king were symbols of this important diplomatic function, and one that they passed on to their daughters, even if they did not actively arrange these marriages.

Isabella used her children to forge alliances in two instances, which clearly increased her influence and power: once through the marriage of Edward III to Philippa of Hainault and the other through the marriage of Joan to David II of Scotland. In the first case, Isabella used her physical control of Prince Edward to secure support for the deposition of her husband. The second was an attempt to bring stability to England after the upheaval of her coup by eliminating the Scots as an external threat. Isabella provides a compelling example because the context in which she received her authority to arrange these marriages was unique. Instead of being looked at as an anomaly, this rare situation provides fertile ground to question and explore the extremes of queenly power. Isabella's actions demonstrate that although some queens did not manipulate their children's marriages, the expectation that they could do so was still a part of medieval notions of queenship.

Isabella left France for Hainault sometime after August 1326, though the exact dates and locations of her movements are not clear.<sup>199</sup> With no backing from the French

---

<sup>198</sup> TNA, E 101/386/7 fols 3v, 4v, 7.

<sup>199</sup> See Haines for various stories about Isabella's movements in 1326: Haines, *King Edward II*, pp. 172-173; Joseph Hunter, 'The Mission of Queen Isabella to the Court of France and of her Long Residence in that Country', *Archaeologia*, 36 (1855), pp. 242-256; Andrew Wathey, 'The Marriage of Edward III and the transmission of French motets to England', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 45(1992), p. 13; Natalie Fryde, *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II, 1321-1326* (Cambridge 1979), p. 181.

king and with her English income cut off, Isabella needed both military and financial support. She found this support in Hainault, and she offered the count a marriage between her son Edward, heir to the throne, and his daughter Philippa. Such a marriage had been contemplated by Edward II and William of Hainault earlier in 1319, but to another of William's daughters.<sup>200</sup> What is striking in this case is William's acceptance of Isabella's authority to authorize this match, even while Edward II continued marriage negotiations for his son with Aragon, Castile and Portugal.<sup>201</sup> Isabella's power, in contrast to Edward II's position in England, must have been immense to induce William to support her invasion of England. The fact that the prince was in her custody probably added more weight to her promises. After Isabella's successful invasion, her marriage alliance seems to have been accepted by the English nobility. Pope John XXII was initially hesitant to grant the dispensation for the marriage because he feared of a strong link between Hainault and England, which would have been politically disadvantageous for him, not because he doubted Isabella's authority to instigate the marriage.<sup>202</sup> However, John XXII finally granted the dispensation in August 1327, one year after the initial marriage treaty and less than one month before Edward II died.<sup>203</sup>

Under the Treaty of Northampton in 1328 Isabella secured a peace with Robert Bruce. In return for peace and £20,000 England would relinquish any feudal claims to Scotland. To secure this treaty, Isabella's daughter Joan was to marry Robert's son and heir David. This peace was necessary for Isabella to bring stability to the country after the political upheaval that followed her invasion. There was not enough in the treasury to fund another war with Scotland.<sup>204</sup> However, this treaty proved highly unpopular and it was after Northampton that both Mortimer and Isabella's power and authority began to attract criticism.<sup>205</sup> Scholars have attributed Edward III's failure to attend the marriage as a sign of his rejection of the treaty, but it should not be assumed that Edward rejected the

---

<sup>200</sup> Haines, *King Edward II*, pp. 1-29, 172; Wathey, 'The Marriage of Edward III' p. 13.

<sup>201</sup> *Foedera* II, i, pp. 586-9, 590-1.

<sup>202</sup> Lucas, *The Hundred Years War*, pp. 58-62.

<sup>203</sup> *Foedera* II, ii, pp 712-714; *Calendar of Papal Letters*, p. 484.

<sup>204</sup> Ormord, *Edward III*, p. 17; Ranald Nicholson, *Edward III and the Scots The Formative Years of a Military Career, 1327-1335* (Oxford, 1965), p. 45.

<sup>205</sup> Ormord, *Edward III*, p. 17.

marriage itself.<sup>206</sup> Tension continued to surround the treaty and in the 1330s propagandists claimed that the treaty had been imposed on an unwilling king in his minority and therefore, was not binding.<sup>207</sup> It had failed to deal with the claims of the English and Scotch noblemen who had lost their Scotch lands after Bannockburn.<sup>208</sup> It was not so much that Isabella arranged the marriage that attracted criticism, but the surrendering of English claims to Scotland. The use of marriages to secure a peace treaty was by no means innovative in European politics and Isabella was acting exactly as any king who needed time to stabilize his rule. Assertions that Edward should repudiate the marriage were not a backlash against the marriage itself, but the treaty which it sealed. As chapter six discusses, the leading members of the nobility initially accepted the treaty and the marriage. It was not until at least six months later, after subsequent negotiations over the disinherited's lands failed, that Henry of Lancaster and others showed signs of dissatisfaction.<sup>209</sup> The majority of the chronicles which condemn the treaty were written after Edward III's coup in 1330.<sup>210</sup> They attack the treaty by attacking the marriage, but had the second negotiations been successful it is entirely possible that the marriage would not have been a source of contention. At the time that Isabella negotiated Joan and David's marriage, she had the power and possibly authority to do so.

After Edward III's coup in 1330, Isabella still held some influence over her son. This was most likely due to a combination of a sense of filial loyalty cultivated sometime

---

<sup>206</sup> Nicholson, *Edward III and the Scots*, p. 52

<sup>207</sup> Jonathan Sumption, *The Hundred Years War: Trial by Battle* (Philadelphia, 1990), p. 123; Nicholson, *Edward III and the Scots*, pp. 56-57.

<sup>208</sup> Sumption, *The Hundred Years War: Trial by Battle*, p. 124.

<sup>209</sup> May McKisack, *Fourteenth Century England* (Oxford, 1959), p. 100.

<sup>210</sup> Murimuth, *Continuatio Chronicarum*, pp. 57: Murimuth's chronicle was begun sometime before 1337, but was not writing contemporaneously to events until 1338, Geoffrey le Baker, *Chronicon Galfredi Le Baker De Swynebroke*, E. M. Thompson (ed.) (London, 1889), pp. 41-42: Baker's started work on his *Chronicon* after 1341; Thomas Gray, *Scalachronica* Andy King (ed., trans) (Woodbridge 2005), pp. 99-103: probably begun between 1355 and 1359; Joseph Stevenson (ed.), *Chronicon de Lanercost* (Edinburgh, 1839), p. 261: composed sometime in Edward III's reign; Brie (ed.), *The Brut*, vol.131, pp. 256-261: The Anglo-Norman *Brut* was written c. 1350 and the Middle English translation between 1350 and 1380; George James Aungier (ed.), *Chroniques de London*, Camden Society, Old Series, 28 (London, 1844), pp. 61-62: probably written after 1350 because it was based on the *Brut Chronicle*; Childs (ed., trans.), *Anonimale Chronicle 1307-1333*, pp. 141, 142: also written after 1350 because it was based on the *Brut Chronicle*. The dates for the composition of these chronicles can be found in Gransden, *Historical Writings*, pp. 12, 30, , 37, 72, 93, 115 and Lister Mathesons, *The Prose Brut: The Development of a Middle English Chronicle* (Temple, 1998), pp. 4-5.

during his childhood, his desire to swiftly restore stability to the kingdom and an attempt to restore the royal family's good name, rather than any sense of real affection. In the parliament of November 1330, Roger Mortimer was accused of usurping royal power through which he performed a number of illegal actions, including the murder of Edward II.<sup>211</sup> Nowhere in his judgment is Isabella's role in these events mentioned. As will be examined in detail in chapter six, Isabella almost certainly played a large part in Edward III's minority, but the level of both Mortimer and Isabella's involvement in the events is difficult to distinguish. Edward seemed determined to gloss over Isabella's participation in the power struggle.

After Edward's coup, all of Isabella's land holdings were taken from her control and she temporarily resided at Windsor.<sup>212</sup> In a number of sources, both contemporary and modern, it has been asserted that Isabella was confined to Castle Rising for the entirety of her life.<sup>213</sup> She did indeed spend much time there, but Michael Bennett and F.D. Blackley's studies of her last extant household book have found that Isabella continued to play an important public role.<sup>214</sup> This household book shows clearly that the queen was accepted by, and moved freely in, English society.<sup>215</sup> It is most likely that Isabella was able to participate in court society after Edward III's coup in 1330 until her death in 1358 because he wanted to restore credit to the crown after his father's disastrous reign and Edward's own tumultuous minority. The queen was a part of the crown and to restore the crown he had to restore the queen.

---

<sup>211</sup> Seymour Phillips (ed.), 'Edward III: Parliament of 1327, Text and Translation', in *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England*, ed. C. Given-Wilson et al., Internet version, at <http://www.sd-editions.com/PROME>, accessed on 2 July 2008. Scholarly Digital Editions, Leicester: 2005.

<sup>212</sup> TNA, SC 1/63/247 and TNA, E 403/254.

<sup>213</sup> Agnes Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England from the Norman Conquest* (London, 1842) vol. 2, 287-92; Hilda Johnstone, 'Isabelle, the She-Wolf of France', *History* (1936-7), 208-18; Michael Prestwich, *The Three Edwards: War and State in England, 1272-1377*, (London 2003), p. 100; Fryde claims that she was sent to a nunnery: Fryde, *The Tyranny and Fall*, p. 225. Jean Froissart, *Oeuvres de Froissart*, Kervyn de Lettenhove (ed.) (24 vols, Brussels, 1867-1877), vol. 2, p. 247.

<sup>214</sup> BL MS Cotton Galba E XIV, house hold accounts begin in October 1357; Michael Bennett, 'Isabelle of France, Anglo-French Diplomacy and Cultural Exchange in the Late 1350's', in James Boswell (ed.), *Age of Edward III* (Rochester, 2001), p. 216.

<sup>215</sup> F.D. Blackley, 'Isabella Queen of England and the Late Medieval Cult of the Dead', *Canadian Journal of History*, 15 (1980), p. 45.

On 6 August 1348, when the Saint Stephen chapel in Westminster Palace was finished, Edward dedicated it to the Virgin Mary, who had always protected him 'as a better mother'.<sup>216</sup> It may be argued that Edward's comment reflected the larger devotion to the cult of the Virgin, in which she was seen as the mother and protector of all, rather than a more specific reference to his relationship with his own mother.<sup>217</sup> However, if we look back to the 1330s, just after his coup and at the point when he reinvested Isabella with her landholdings, we see that initially Edward may have taken a much harsher attitude toward Isabella than her later involvement in court life indicates. The pope seemed to believe that Edward was not displaying the appropriate filial duty to his mother. In November 1330 the pope wrote a letter to Edward claiming that:

He heard on the third of this month that the king was not showing signs of filial affection to his mother, Queen Isabella. Should she have done anything to justify the king's behaviour to her, the pope exhorts him to remember what his mother has done for him, and what enmity and ill will she has provoked against herself in his service, and begs him to show mercy, so that he himself may find it in the day of judgment.<sup>218</sup>

The pope's message was one of forgiveness. According to him, Isabella's actions between 1326 and 1330 were motivated by selfless devotion to and concern for her son, and Edward should be grateful for this. It was not long after the pope sent his letter that Isabella was reinstated into court life. Edward probably did so out of filial duty and a desire to redeem the crown. By November 1331 Edward restored much of Isabella's dower lands and in 1334 Edward III restored the French county and lands of Ponthieu and Montreuil to Isabella 'in remembrance of the divine respect that sons should reverence their parents and of filial duty, and that she may have such increase of honour as becomes her estate'.<sup>219</sup> Whether Edward's reference to Mary as a 'better mother' in

---

<sup>216</sup> William Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, (8 vols, Farnborough, 1970), vols. 6-3, p. 1348; *Foedera*, II, iii, p. 37 as cited in Shenton, 'Philippa of Hainault's Churchings', pp. 120-21.

<sup>217</sup> For medieval ideas of the Virgin Mary as mother and protector see: Nigel Morgan 'Texts and Images of Marian Devotion', pp. 45, 50, 51; Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400-c.1580* (New Haven, 2005), pp. 256-265; W.M. Ormrod has argued that Edward III 'was clearly and firmly fixed in the English tradition of Marian devotion', W.M. Ormrod, 'The Personal Religion of Edward III', *Speculum*, 84 (1989), p. 858.

<sup>218</sup> *Calendar of Papal Letters*, p. 498.

<sup>219</sup> *CPR 1334-1338*, p. 24.

1348 was a reflection of his initial actions in 1330, or simply conventional Marian devotion, these letters from the pope indicate that Edward did not reinstate Isabella out of affection, but obligation.

After 1334, Isabella was involved in court life though not to the extent that she had been between 1308 and 1330. This was mainly because her actions allowed her to retain influence with Edward despite her role during his minority. It is difficult to construct a detailed itinerary for Isabella in the 1340s and 50s, but in the last year of her life her household moved between Eltham, Rochester, London, Sheen, Hereford, Canterbury and Leeds, indicating that she was active and visible throughout her later years.<sup>220</sup> She continued to play an active, although not as prominent, role in the political sphere because her French origins made her useful to Edward in a way nobody else could be. She played an integral part in entertaining King John during his captivity. Bennett asserts that, while she was excluded from the final negotiations of the treaty of Brétigny she nonetheless 'played a role in the process by which Edward's assurances were translated into a reasonable settlement'.<sup>221</sup> Isabella's daughter Joan visited her often while she was in England between 1357 and Isabella's death in 1358. She is recorded as having come to the queen's household on four separate occasions in 1358.<sup>222</sup> Edward also dined with his mother on a few occasions, and they exchanged letters throughout the year.<sup>223</sup> There is very little evidence that Isabella had any contact with her daughter Eleanor after her marriage to the count of Guelders in 1332, but she did send letters to Eleanor during her journey to Guelders.<sup>224</sup>

Although Margaret, Isabella and Philippa all established and sustained links with their children during childhood, their contact with them during adulthood varied. Margaret was absent from her children's lives and from her stepson's life after he became king. It was Edward III who manipulated Philippa's association with her children and her European relatives to increase his own power. Isabella was the only

---

<sup>220</sup> BL MS Cotton Galba E XIV fols 15, 16, 17, 18v, 19, 20v, 31.

<sup>221</sup> Bennett, 'Isabelle of France', p. 222.

<sup>222</sup> BL MS Cotton Galba E XIV fols 15v, 20, 22, 26; Bruce Webster, 'Joan [Joan of the Tower] (1321–1362)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14822>, accessed 27 April 2008].

<sup>223</sup> BL MS Cotton Galba E XIV fols 21, 42, 55, 56, 56v.

<sup>224</sup> TNA, E 101/386/7 fol. 7.

fourteenth-century queen to advance the power of motherhood to its greatest heights, establishing real authority for herself. Isabella extended the power of motherhood further than most queens were able to because, in the case of Prince Edward, her husband was virtually ineffective, and by the time of Joan's marriage, he had been deposed and died. Because Isabella was the only one of the three queens in this study to manipulate the role of mother, it might be concluded that, by the fourteenth century, the queen only put this power into practice when the king was weak. This conclusion complements Laynesmith's findings that queens in the fifteenth century only participated in marriage negotiations when the king was absent or incapacitated and also opposes Parsons' findings that thirteenth-century queens took an active role in arranging their children's marriages. Laynesmith demonstrates that during the occasions when Henry VI was not in a position to be involved in negotiations, Margaret of Anjou arranged potential marriages for his son, and that Edward IV selected Elizabeth Woodville to orchestrate the marriages of their daughters in the event of his death and his son's minority.<sup>225</sup> When Edward III assumed his majority, it was Isabella's link, through her role as mother, to the institution of the crown that kept her from suffering the same fate as Roger Mortimer.

## 5.5 Conclusions

There were two ways in which motherhood allowed queens to have power and authority. The first was automatically assigned to them simply due to their biological role as mothers and place in society as foreign-born queens with convenient links to other ruling families. Philippa represented the political and diplomatic importance of marriage, which she passed on to her daughters. Her husband took advantage of her natal ties in locations where he wished to strengthen his political connections. Philippa was passively involved in her children's adult lives and did not exert any agency in her children's marriages. In this respect, the power the queen gained required little active involvement in manipulating motherhood. Isabella seems to have functioned in a similar way in her daughter, Eleanor's, life. The passive quality of this power should not be interpreted as a lesser form of power. Instead, it contributed to the queen's overall importance: by giving birth to an heir she fulfilled society's expectations, and could exploit it in other arenas.

---

<sup>225</sup> Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queen's*, p. 149.



The second way in which the queen could exercise power and authority as a mother was to advance her position as mother in order to actively participate in domestic and international politics, but this required direct agency on the part of the queen. Margaret, Isabella and Philippa established links to their children during childhood. Either Margaret was not able to manipulate these contacts or chose not to do so. On the other hand, the relationship created between mother and child allowed Isabella the space to advance her symbolic power into achieved power and authority. Isabella authoritatively arranged her children's marriages when her husband, the king, was politically impotent. She claimed the authority to do this through her role as mother of the heir and through her physical control over her son. She subsequently used the power and authority gained by arranging these marriages to further extend her sphere of influence and placed herself within the male dominated court. In this way, Isabella's actions were unusual. That Isabella was able to actively arrange marriages for her children to further her power and authority during her husband's absence does not imply that queens could only act in this capacity when men allowed them to. Instead, exercising power during times when the king could not was also an avenue to authority. Because her contemporaries accepted her authority to act in this way, it seems as if they viewed motherhood as a potential avenue to authority. It demonstrates that the queen was viewed as a necessary component of the crown, possessing the ability to act for the king. Motherhood was not an inferior role, but a complementary role to the king, and integral to the future of the crown.

## Chapter Six Administrator of the Realm

There was never a queen regent in medieval England, which resulted from anxiety about ruling women and their influence over their sons, and from the political instability that might result from English royal succession practices if a woman was accepted as regent.<sup>1</sup>

The above statement made by John Carmi Parsons does not provide us with the entire picture. Though no queen in the fourteenth century was officially designated as regent or *custos*, there was a history of female regency in medieval England in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In the fourteenth century, queens still acted as administrators when the king was absent even though they were not officially given the title of regent. Before we can study how and when queens acted as administrators, a clear definition of regency needs to be established. In the later Middle Ages, three types of regency emerge, but it must be remembered that the titles offered here were not used so distinctly in the medieval period. For the sake of this study, a regency occurred when the king was unable to rule, but was not physically absent (for example, when the king was ill or incapacitated as with Edward II or Henry VI), or when he was a minor, (as with Henry III, Edward III or Richard II). The second category is that of *custos* or keeper of the realm, which occurred when the king was absent from mainland Britain. The keeper of the realm's authority was very limited, as he or she could not bestow the king's grace. The final type of 'regency' occurred when the king was unofficially absent from England, but was not abroad; for example, during Edward I, Edward II and Edward III's campaigns in Scotland or Edward II's civil war against the barons in 1321. During these periods, neither a regent nor a keeper of the realm was appointed because technically the king had not left the kingdom. However, when the king was occupied with these types of activities, the day-to-day government business was difficult to conduct. The relocation of the chancery and exchequer to York when Edward III was in Scotland is an example of one solution to this problem.<sup>2</sup> The other was for the king to rely on trusted administrators to aid him in his daily business.

---

<sup>1</sup> John Carmi Parsons, 'Family, Sex and Power: The Rhythms of Medieval Queenship', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1998), p. 7.

This chapter will demonstrate that, though none of our three queens were ever regents or *custodes*, contemporaries accepted their authority to conduct business when the king was away. They acted as administrators when the king was in Scotland, they aided both the regency and keeper's council and took up important positions in the chancery. It was probably a role automatically assigned to queens, so there was little need to define it officially. In England, for queens to act in this capacity was an unofficial expectation. The queen was also a safe choice for a regent or *custos* because she had no blood claims to the throne, unlike a royal uncle, for example. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first outlines the history of regency, particularly female regency, in England and France. The second examines Margaret, Isabella, and Philippa, narrowing its discussion of Isabella to Edward II's reign. Isabella and Edward III's minority will be treated separately due to its unique nature in English medieval government, and because of the large amount of previous historiography on the minority. This section on Edward III's minority will give an objective analysis of the minority and explore how Isabella constructed this power and authority.

### **6.1 The History of Regency in Medieval England and France**

The history of regency in medieval England and France is important to this study because it places the regencies and minorities discussed more specifically in later sections of this chapter into the context of regency as a whole. It establishes the practices that allowed Margaret, Isabella and Philippa to act as administrators of the realm, and because both Margaret and Isabella were French princesses, their actions were influenced by Capetian as well as English practices. This section takes advantage of secondary material about medieval queens and regency. Regency has not been studied in as great detail for England as has been done for France, but it is outside the scope of this study to extend a detailed analysis of primary sources beyond the three Plantagenet queens with whom this study is concerned.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, this section will only provide a summary of what is already known about queens and regency in medieval England and France.

---

<sup>2</sup> Ranald Nicholson, *Edward III and the Scots: The Formative Years of a Military Career, 1327-1335* (Oxford, 1965), p. 42.

<sup>3</sup> For France see: Andre Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency: the genesis of a vocation', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1998), pp. 93-116.

Throughout the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fifteenth centuries, there was little opportunity for regency in England. There were only five minorities between the 1130s and 1460s: Henry II, Henry III, Edward III, Richard II and Henry VI. The majority of the other opportunities queens had for government occurred when the king was absent from the realm. In the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries, queens were sometimes appointed *custos* in the king's absence, but in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries queens were never selected as regents or *custodes*. In the twelfth century, Eleanor of Aquitaine was keeper for Henry II during the first part of his reign, and in this capacity she dealt with matters of state in his name.<sup>4</sup> According to John of Salisbury, if one wanted to leave court during royal absences, Eleanor's permission was needed; a prime example of Eleanor's authority during her time as keeper of the realm.<sup>5</sup> Little secondary work has been done on Richard I or John's queens, but it appears as if they did not act as keepers of the realm for their husbands.<sup>6</sup> When Henry III went to France in 1253 he made Eleanor of Provence his keeper alongside a council.<sup>7</sup>

During the later Middle Ages there were five minorities and one incapacitated king, providing some opportunity for regency. When Henry I's only son drowned during the sinking of the White Ship in 1120 he named his daughter, Matilda as his heir. Upon his death, Matilda's cousin Stephen of Blois, in direct disregard of the oaths sworn by him and other members of the nobility to uphold Matilda as Henry's heir, challenged her right to the throne. Stephen's actions threw England into a bitter civil war.<sup>8</sup> Matilda eventually conceded her right to rule in favour of her son Henry II, who became Stephen's heir.<sup>9</sup> Lois Hunneycutt has studied contemporary reactions to Matilda's

---

<sup>4</sup> D.D.R. Owen, *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen and Legend* (Oxford, 2000), p. 45.

<sup>5</sup> Jane Martindale, 'Eleanor, *suo jure* duchess of Aquitaine (c.1122–1204)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, May 2006 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8618, accessed 29 July 2008].

<sup>6</sup> Ann Trindade, *Berengaria: In Search of Richard the Lionheart's Queen* (Dublin, 1999); Nicholas Vincent, 'Isabella of Angouleme: John's Jezebel', in S.D. Church (ed.), *King John: New Interpretations* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 199, 206-207.

<sup>7</sup> Margaret Howell, *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1998), p. 112.

<sup>8</sup> Marjorie Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda: Queen Consort, Queen Mother and Lady of the English* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 37-38, 65-87; Charles Beem ' "Woe to Thee, O Land!" The Introduction', in Charles Beem (ed.), *The Royal Minorities of Medieval and Early Modern England* (New York, 2008), p. 12.

<sup>9</sup> Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda*, p. 102.

claims, and has found that gender was not an overt issue in the succession struggle.<sup>10</sup> However, Hunnycutt has also found that these same contemporaries could only justify Matilda's rights in terms of the transmission of power to her son; as long as she was not a ruler in her own right, but acting as a regent, she could sit on the throne.<sup>11</sup> Matilda may have understood these rationalizations because, as Marjorie Chibnall has argued, after she lost the campaigns against Stephen in 1141, she altered her goal for her own succession in favour of the succession of her son.<sup>12</sup>

Henry III was the first minority after Henry II and it seems that his mother, Isabella of Angoulême, was never considered for the regency.<sup>13</sup> At his death in 1216, King John appointed thirteen executors to assist his minor son Henry III in governing and William Marshal, earl of Pembroke as his regent.<sup>14</sup> Marshal controlled the central government, but his authority depended on securing common consent from the council.<sup>15</sup> Henry III's minority was never formally brought to an end and Henry gradually began to exert more control over government as he grew older.<sup>16</sup> Later, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Eleanor of Castile, Margaret of France, Isabella of France and Philippa of Hainault were never officially made regents or *custodes*. After the minority of Edward III, the next minority in English history was Richard II's. Richard was crowned in 1377 when he was ten years old, but there was no agreed upon candidate to act as regent as William Marshal had for Henry III.<sup>17</sup> Joan of Kent, Richard's mother does not seem to have been considered for regency, perhaps because she was never crowned queen, and from 1377 to 1380 the daily business of government was conducted

---

<sup>10</sup> Lois Hunnycutt, 'Female Succession and the Language of Power in the Writings of Twelfth-Century Churchmen', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1998), p. 194.

<sup>11</sup> Hunnycutt, 'Female Succession and Languages of Power', pp. 195, 196, 197.

<sup>12</sup> Marjorie Chibnall, 'Women in Oderic Vitalis', *The Haskins Society Journal*, 2 (1990), pp. 205-06

<sup>13</sup> Nicholas Vincent, 'Isabella of Angouleme', pp. 199, 206-207.

<sup>14</sup> David Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III* (London, 1990), p. 14.

<sup>15</sup> Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III*, pp. 18, 52, 54.

<sup>16</sup> Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III*, p. 389.

<sup>17</sup> Nigel Saul, *Richard II* (New Haven, 1997), p. 27; Gwilym Dodd, 'Richard II, Fiction of Majority Rule', in Charles Beem (ed.), *The Royal Minorities of Medieval and Early Modern England* (New York, 2008), pp 109-117.

in Richard II's name by a series of 'continual councils'.<sup>18</sup> Contemporaries sometimes asserted that John of Gaunt was in control of the government, but Anthony Goodman has argued that though Gaunt was the most influential person in England, he did not attempt to exercise semi-regal control.<sup>19</sup>

Henry VI succeeded to the crown in 1422 when he was only nine months old and a regency council was established to rule in the infant king's name.<sup>20</sup> His uncle, Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, was made Henry's protector and guardian, and John, duke of Bedford was given the government of English lands in France.<sup>21</sup> When Henry VI, now an adult, became mentally incapacitated in the 1450s, Margaret of Anjou presented a bill proposing herself as regent.<sup>22</sup> Margaret was the first queen to make a claim for regency since Eleanor of Provence was made *custos* in 1253 by Henry III. Margaret based her arguments on the principle that, as his wife, she could operate as Henry VI's representative as long as her actions could be interpreted as deriving from his authority.<sup>23</sup> Margaret's bid for regency was considered by parliament, but was eventually rejected.<sup>24</sup> Still, if Margaret was not a viable candidate, her proposition would never have been considered for any length of time.

Even though, from secondary studies of these kings and queens, it seems as if the practice of female regency waned after Eleanor of Provence, Margaret's bid indicates that there was still an underlying acceptance of queens as regents.<sup>25</sup> Female regency in England was not unheard of, but there was little opportunity because there were several continuous adult successions before a minority occurred. It seems that the queen was one

---

<sup>18</sup> Saul, *Richard II*, p. 28.

<sup>19</sup> Anthony Goodman, *John of Gaunt: the Exercise of Princely Power in Fourteenth-Century Europe* (Harlow, 1992), pp. 71-73, 84.

<sup>20</sup> John Watts, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 112-117.

<sup>21</sup> R. A. Griffiths, 'Henry VI (1421-1471)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12953>, accessed 5 Aug 2008].

<sup>22</sup> Helen Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou: Queenship and Power in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2003), p. 100.

<sup>23</sup> Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, p. 109.

<sup>24</sup> Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, pp. 105-111.

<sup>25</sup> Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, pp. 100-111.

of several viable candidates for regent, and it may not have been her gender that dictated her chances of being appointed, but other external political factors. The probability of queens appearing as regents was small, but this was because chances for regency were infrequent and competitive. Margaret of Anjou's claim to regency indicates that, even though queens in the fourteenth century never acted as regents, they could still be considered for the office.

Margaret of France and Isabella of France were both French princesses, who would have internalized the Capetian customs of female regency, and subsequently retained these traditions when they came to England. Isabella's actions during the minority of Edward III are partially understood when contextualized within the traditions of her natal family. French succession practices might have influenced Isabella's view of the duties and prerogatives of queens during a minority. There were many more minorities in France during the high and late Middle Ages than in England. Consequently, there was more opportunity for female regency. André Poulet traces the practice of regency in the Capetian court, finding that regency became a queenly vocation. He argues that as queens lost their partnership with the king, they became indispensable to the role of regent and the role became more formalized as a result.<sup>26</sup> Because they had no formal power as rulers, French queens were not restrained by the same limitations as the king. French queens could not hope to take the crown themselves because Capetian women were barred from rule and the transmission of power. Moreover, their role as mother to the heir made them a logical choice for regency.<sup>27</sup> As a result, she could escape her subjugation through the very limitations that created it. The necessary survival of the Capetian dynasty provided a 'specific and indispensable institutional role for the queen'.<sup>28</sup> According to Poulet's study, Capetian queens acted predominately in the role of regent, but there are some instances of the king appointing the queen as keeper of his realm while he was absent.

Poulet begins his study of the evolution of this vocation in the eleventh century with Anne of Kiev, who unofficially shared in the regency of her son, Philip I.<sup>29</sup> In 1190,

---

<sup>26</sup> Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency', p. 105-106.

<sup>27</sup> Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency', pp. 105, 109, 114.

<sup>28</sup> Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency', p. 94.

<sup>29</sup> Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency', pp. 106-107.

Adele of Champagne was appointed *custos* of her grandson Louis VIII in an edict written by Philip II before he went on crusade. This was an important development because it officially recognized the queen, in this case the dowager queen, as *custos*.<sup>30</sup> Louis VIII, in turn, made his wife, Blanche of Castile, regent on his deathbed, granting her unlimited authority.<sup>31</sup> Poulet argues that Blanche had more power than the king himself since she was not bound by the limitations of power imposed on him by custom and by his coronation oath.<sup>32</sup> Even after Louis IX assumed his majority, he called Blanche back to court when he went on crusade, despite the dual appointment of Simon de Nesle and Mathieu de Vendome as keepers of the realm. He never granted such power to his wife, Margaret of Provence (Eleanor of Provence's sister).<sup>33</sup>

In the fourteenth century, Joan of Navarre, Isabella of France's mother, was more-or-less absent from the political scene, yet she was still appointed as regent by her husband Philip IV in the event of his death.<sup>34</sup> He granted her similar powers as those of Blanche of Castile, except for the stipulation that she must remain unmarried during her regency.<sup>35</sup> Philip may have been attempting to avoid the situation that had occurred when Anne of Kiev remarried and her second husband assumed much of the regent's power. Poulet argues that the dispute between England and France over Edward III's claim to the French throne led to the exclusion of women from royal succession.<sup>36</sup> He asserts that

---

<sup>30</sup> Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency', pp. 106-107.

<sup>31</sup> Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency', pp. 108-109; Miriam Shadis, 'Blanche of Castile and Facingier's "Medieval Queenship": Reassessing the Argument', in Kathleen Nolan (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), p. 141.

<sup>32</sup> Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency', pp. 108-109: In reality, as is seen in most regencies, Blanche's power was derived from the authority of the young king. Her name often does not appear on royal acts during Louis IX's minority and when it does, it is together with the king's. However, according to Poulet, Blanche 'legislated, dealt with foreign powers, waged war, and arranged marriages'.

<sup>33</sup> Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency', pp. 108-109.

<sup>34</sup> Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency', p.110.

<sup>35</sup> Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency', p. 110.

<sup>36</sup> Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency', p.112; Though Craig Taylor has recently argued that Salic Law was not specifically invoked in the French succession crises of 1317 and 1328. Instead arguments against women inheriting the throne and later against cognate succession were used to prevent Edward III from continuing the Capetian dynasty in France: Craig Taylor, 'Edward III and the Plantagenet Claim to the Throne', in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), pp. 156-159; Craig Taylor, 'The Salic Law and the Valois Succession to the French Crown', *French History*, 15 (2001), pp. 358-377.



this exclusion from the succession also made them obvious choices as regents because there was no fear that they could pursue a claim to the throne. During the second half of the fourteenth century and into the fifteenth, the Valois family adopted the same patterns of female regency as those exercised by the Capetians.<sup>37</sup> In 1407, Charles VI expanded Isabeau of Bavaria's power by declaring that she could act on her own initiative with the advice of a council.<sup>38</sup> Isabeau's regency was different than most French queens because she assumed regency while her husband was still alive and on his express authority. Isabeau had all the authority of a king, which was shown in her endorsement of the Treaty of Troyes, though the treaty led to criticism of the entire regency.<sup>39</sup>

Regency was an important path to power for French queens, and was unofficially connected with the practice of queenship, and thus Margaret and Isabella may have seen this as a natural position for the queen to occupy. The degree of power and/or authority connected to the office of regent varied from queen to queen and king to king. Some queens had almost absolute authority, while others were limited by political factors. Poulet has found that regency in France was automatically a part of queenship, and although regency in England has not been examined in the detail which Poulet has applied to France, this chapter will demonstrate, through examinations of Margaret, Philippa and Isabella, that this was also the case in England. Administering the realm in the absence of the king became an unofficial, yet routine, part of queenship.

---

<sup>37</sup> Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency', p. 113: Philip VI designated Joan of Burgundy as regent in the event of his death. Consequently, she obtained all the authority exercised by her husband, including judicial and financial powers. Charles V appointed his wife Joan of Bourbon to the guardianship of their children, but she was only allowed to govern the kingdom with the guidance of the dukes of Burgundy and Bourbon.

<sup>38</sup> Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency', p. 114.

<sup>39</sup> Rachel Gibbons, 'Isabeau of Bavaria, Queen of France (1385-1422): The Creation of an Historical Villainess', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6 (1996), p. 54. The events of Isabeau's regency did not directly influence Isabella's because they occurred eighty years apart, and it is doubtful that Charles was influenced by the events of 1327 to 1330. It is still worth noting one striking similarity: both queens possessed the authority to initiate peace treaties in the king's name. The negative reactions to these treaties led to criticisms of the whole minority and subsequent negative and misogynistic representations of these queens.

## 6.2 The Consort as Administrator

Even though Margaret, Isabella and Philippa were never officially made regents, they played a significant part in the ruling of the realm as one of the king's central administrators. They administered the kingdom in several ways: they handled the king's personal business while he was embroiled in conflicts within the British Isles; they aided the king and chancellor in the chancery; and they acted as part of the institution supporting the regent, who was often one of their sons. In many cases, but not all, when the king was absent from the realm the *custos* was one of the king's minor sons and he only held titular authority. There was often a regency council which administered the realm under the authority of the keeper's name. The queen often supported this administrative body along with other important members of the royal administration, such as the chancellor. At these times, the queen possessed authority instead of just power. Though she was not appointed to the official office of regent or *custos*, the evidence demonstrates that compliance to her commands was expected, and that the king trusted her to participate in the administration of the realm.

An example from Edward I's reign shows how Margaret handled Edward I's personal and official business, two areas which often overlapped in the Middle Ages. Edward sent a letter to Margaret for their nephew, Gilbert, sometime between 1301 and 1307. It is impossible to know if Edward was in Scotland when he sent it, though it is likely because he spent approximately half of that time in or around the Scottish borders.<sup>40</sup> In response to Edward's letter, Margaret sent out messengers to find Gilbert and deliver the letter. She then wrote to Edward to inform him that this had been done, and that the messengers had found Gilbert with Edward's daughter.<sup>41</sup> This was probably Gilbert de Clare whose marriage Margaret held and whose mother was Joan of Acre, Edward I's daughter from his first marriage.<sup>42</sup> This letter, as of yet, provides the only example that Margaret kept Edward I apprised of family and administrative business and also conducted important errands for him.

---

<sup>40</sup> Joseph Stevenson, *The Itinerary of Edward I*, Public Record Office: Record Commission Transcripts, Series II (London, 1836).

<sup>41</sup> [The National Archive, London] TNA, SC 1/31/184.

<sup>42</sup> *CPR 1301-1307*, p. 257; Michael Altschul, 'Clare, Gilbert de, eighth earl of Gloucester and seventh earl of Hertford (1291-1314)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5439>, accessed 7 Aug 2008].

Isabella never had the opportunity to participate in domestic government when Edward II was on the continent because she almost always accompanied him. This led to significant diplomatic roles for Isabella, which are discussed in chapter three.<sup>43</sup> Edward II entrusted Isabella with administrative duties while he was otherwise occupied with campaigns in Scotland in 1314 and 1319, and when he was embroiled in domestic conflicts with the baronage over Hugh Despenser's growing power in the Welsh Marches in the summer of 1321. During these periods Isabella performed several important functions in the chancery, acting as a substitute for the king and the chancellor. Between 26 June 1314 and 14 July 1314, Edward used Isabella's privy seal because his had been captured by the Scots during the battle of Bannockburn.<sup>44</sup> As was argued in chapter four, seals were symbols of real proprietarial and judicial authority.<sup>45</sup> It was not unusual for the king to use whoever's seal was within his reach when he could not use his own.<sup>46</sup> There were other men who could have filled the position, but Isabella's seal was treated as if it was actually the king's privy seal, not just another seal which the king had borrowed. Maxwell-Lyte notes that though Isabella's privy seal was described as a substitute for the king's, the chancery ignored this distinction, and several letters patent issued during this time by warrant of Isabella's privy seal were designated simply as *per breve de private sigillo*.<sup>47</sup> The chancery's failure to record that the warrant was issued under Isabella's seal indicates that the chancery viewed the two seals as part of the same mechanisms of government. It should also be noted that in October 1336, Edward III used Queen Philippa's secret seal in the absence of his own.<sup>48</sup> In certain circumstances, Isabella's seal became more than just a landholders seal (as we saw it used in chapter four). It became part of the crown's machinery for expressing its direct commands.

Between 11 and 22 September 1319, following the siege of Berwick, Isabella took control of the great seal as deputy chancellor.<sup>49</sup> The chancellor could delegate the work

---

<sup>43</sup> See section 3.2.

<sup>44</sup> H.C. Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes on the Use of the Great Seal of England* (London, 1926), p. 61.

<sup>45</sup> See section 4.3.

<sup>46</sup> Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes*, pp. 61-63.

<sup>47</sup> Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes*, p. 61.

<sup>48</sup> TNA, C 81/1330/ 31 as cited in Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes*, p. 63.

<sup>49</sup> Elizabeth M. Hallam, *The Itinerary of Edward II and His Household, 1307-1328*, List and Index

of sealing writs to subordinate members of his staff, but he never entrusted them with the great seal during his absence.<sup>50</sup> Instead, he sometimes appointed deputies, and when he did not there were no chancery issues during that time and government business ceased temporarily.<sup>51</sup> In September 1319, the chancellor, John Hotham, was at the battle of Myton and Isabella acted as his deputy.<sup>52</sup> The temporary deputies of the chancellor rarely had full control over the great seal, but it should be noted that the custodians of the great and privy seals were the source of all governmental instruments except in financial and judicial areas.<sup>53</sup> Moreover, because 'the importance of the seal in authenticating the acts of the crown meant it always had to be safe and available' the chancellor would only leave it in the hands of someone reliable.<sup>54</sup> Isabella must have been viewed as such in 1319 because Hotham entrusted her with this important office.

In July and September 1321, Isabella took control of the great seal again. Edward was not abroad; he was, in fact, in Westminster dealing with the earls' and barons' demands for Hugh Despenser and his father's exile.<sup>55</sup> Conveniently, Isabella was at the Tower of London for the birth of her daughter, Joan, where the chancery rolls were probably housed.<sup>56</sup> The keeper of the rolls frequently managed the chancery in the chancellor's absence and was often entrusted with the great seal.<sup>57</sup> When he was not, he worked alongside some other custodian or deputy of the chancellor. While Isabella was keeper of the great seal in 1321, she lent it to William Ayrmine, the keeper of the

---

Society, 211(London, 1984), p. 7; Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes*, pp. 295-6.

<sup>50</sup> Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes*, p. 295.

<sup>51</sup> Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes*, pp. 295-6.

<sup>52</sup> Roy Martin Haines, *King Edward II: his Life, his Reign, and its Aftermath, 1284-1330* (Montreal, 2006), pp. 266-268.

<sup>53</sup> T.F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England* (6 vols, Manchester, 1920-33), vol. 5, p. 59.

<sup>54</sup> Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes*, p. 1.

<sup>55</sup> Haines, *Edward II*, pp. 121-131.

<sup>56</sup> Birtie Wilkenson, 'The Chancery', in W. A. Morris (ed.), *English Government at Work* (2 vols. Cambridge, 1940-50), vol 1, p. 174; Bruce Webster, 'Joan [Joan of the Tower] (1321-1362)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14822>, accessed 7 Nov 2008].

<sup>57</sup> Wilkenson, 'The Chancery', p. 172; Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes*, p. 324.

chancery rolls, every day for authenticating chancery instruments.<sup>58</sup> Again, Isabella probably was not directing governmental business, but she became a significant part of the administrative machinery which fulfilled the king's orders. Her occupancy of the Tower of London, close to the office of the chancery rolls, made her the most convenient choice. It also indicates that she was still in royal favour in the summer of 1321.

Just as with Margaret and Isabella, Philippa held a senior position in the administrative system. When Edward III was in Scotland in 1336 there was no keepership. However, a roll of daily expenses of the household records that on 2 July 1336, while the king was at Perth, 'the lady queen held the hall of the king at Northampton. She called to the table the archbishop of Canterbury, seven bishops, eight barons and lords, thirty-eight knights and other great lords to consider the issue of Scotland'.<sup>59</sup> It appears that Philippa presided over a council called together to discuss Scotland. According to Bertie Wilkenson, the council was often called to advise ministers. Any important minister could assemble the council, the chancellor and treasurer, for example, and who they summoned was at their discretion.<sup>60</sup> It is impossible to know if Philippa was actually involved in the dialogue at the council, but it is clear that she was invested with the authority to summon it. The bishops and lords complied with this authority, placing her on a par with important ministers of government. Edward III relied on Philippa to act in his stead, gathering guidance from his council, and, presumably, advising him on the best course of action in Scotland.

Philippa also worked with the council when Edward was on the continent. In both 1342 and 1345 Prince Lionel was appointed keeper, but as he was only four and six years old at these times, a council was appointed to govern in his name.<sup>61</sup> Edward of Woodstock had gone to Flanders with his father, Edward III, making Lionel the most pragmatic choice for *custos*. As the king's second son, if Edward of Woodstock died without an heir, then Lionel would have been next in the line of succession. Edward of Woodstock had served previously as regent when he was a child as well.<sup>62</sup> Leaving the

---

<sup>58</sup> Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes*, pp. 324-25, 296.

<sup>59</sup> TNA, E 101/387/19 mem. 5; Caroline Shenton, *The Itinerary of Edward III and his Household, 1327-1345*, List & Index Society, 318 (2007).

<sup>60</sup> Bertie Wilkinson, 'The Chancery' in W.A. Morris (ed.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols, The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1930-1940), vol. 1, p. 187.

<sup>61</sup> *HBC*, pp. 35-36.

<sup>62</sup> *HBC*, pp. 35-36.

kingdom in the hands of the next in line to the throne made logical sense, and as a result, it was not necessarily Philippa's gender which barred her regency. Because of the magnates' active participation with the war in France, they could not serve on the council, so the king's ministers began to take their places.<sup>63</sup> Lionel's regency council included John Stratford, archbishop of Canterbury; Ralph Stratford, bishop of London; Robert Stratford, bishop of Chichester; Thomas Hatfield, bishop elect of Durham; Henry, earl of Surrey; Robert Sadinton, chancellor; William Edington, treasurer; John Sheppey, prior of Rochester; Simon Islip; William Trussell; Andrew Offord; and, as we shall see, possibly Queen Philippa.<sup>64</sup> On 29 November 1342, a chest was delivered to the council at the Tower of London, where it was opened in the presence of Queen Philippa, the chancellor and the treasurer. The chest was later delivered to a James Gerard by the command of the queen.<sup>65</sup> The council referred to in this chancery issue was undoubtedly the keeper's council, and once a decision had been made regarding the fate of the chest, it was the queen who issued the command to deliver it to James Gerard. In 1345 the queen handled a request for a *cong e d' lire* at Waltham Holy Cross. Letters from the abbey were sent to Lionel as *custos*, but it was the queen who forwarded them to the chancellor.<sup>66</sup> In both cases, Philippa was acting closely with the chancellor and others of the council, which demonstrates that she was involved in ruling in the king's absence.

The queen was so much a part of the governmental administration that contemporaries often portrayed her as holding positions of command and authority even when she did not actually take part in these incidents. As chapter four demonstrated, queens occasionally supported the king in a military capacity, just as they supported him in an administrative one.<sup>67</sup> Chroniclers often created fictions based on the queen's role to support the king in his absences. The fictional story of Philippa commanding the troops at the battle of Neville's Cross cannot serve as evidence that Philippa actually was

---

<sup>63</sup> W.M. Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government of England c. 1346-1356' (Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Oxford, 1984), p. 105.

<sup>64</sup> Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government of England', p. 105, no. 2. Ormrod does not place Philippa on the council.

<sup>65</sup> *CPR 1340-43*, p. 572.

<sup>66</sup> TNA, SC 1/39/175.

<sup>67</sup> See section 4.2

entrusted with military responsibilities in the king's absence, but it serves to show that contemporaries believed the queen could participate in military activity. According to Jean le Bel, Philippa went to Newcastle to address the English army and to appoint its commanders. She was then taken into the castle at Newcastle.<sup>68</sup> In reality, Philippa was in Ypres, in Flanders with Edward III.<sup>69</sup> Michael Prestwich claims that Jean le Bel's experience in the Weardale campaign in 1327 gave him first-hand knowledge of English and Scottish warfare, which he applied to his description of the battle of Neville's Cross.<sup>70</sup> It must be remembered that Jean le Bel was also part of the Hainaultish force that accompanied Isabella during her coup in 1326. If, as Chris Given-Wilson argues, one way in which chroniclers understood 'truth' was the extent to which their history corresponded to other comparable truths, Jean le Bel might have witnessed Isabella organizing battles in 1326 and then assumed that Philippa could have acted in a comparable way in 1346.<sup>71</sup> Much later, in the fifteenth century, Margaret of Anjou did raise troops to support her husband, Henry VI, during his incapacity and Richard, duke of York's usurpation of royal power.<sup>72</sup>

These examples provide a strong case that queens traditionally were involved in the administration of the realm when the king was absent. Although they were never officially appointed as regents, they clearly acted in this capacity. This signifies that the role of regent was automatically viewed as an aspect of queenship in the fourteenth century. Consequently, there was no need for a formal investiture of authority. As Jean le Bel's chronicle demonstrates, governing in the king's absence was such an integral part of queenship that contemporaries placed queens in these positions of command, even during times when the queens were not actually performing that function. Though the expectation of queens as regents was never plainly defined, it was clearly regarded in the later Middle Ages as an authoritative function of the queen, and there is evidence that all three queens actively practised it.

---

<sup>68</sup> Jean le Bel, *Chronique de Jean le Bel*, Jules Viard and Eugene Deprez (eds.) (Paris 1977), pp. 125-133.

<sup>69</sup> Michael Prestwich, 'The English at the Battle of Neville's Cross', in David Rollason and Michael Prestwich (ed.), *The Battle of Neville's Cross, 1346* (Stamford, 1998), p. 8.

<sup>70</sup> Prestwich, 'The English at the Battle of Neville's Cross', p. 8.

<sup>71</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London, 2004), p. 3.

<sup>72</sup> Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, pp. 159-174.

### 6.3 Isabella and the Minority of Edward III

An entire section of this chapter has been devoted to Isabella's role in the minority of Edward III because it needs to be examined in greater detail. Edward III's minority was unique in following the unprecedented deposition of a king, and because of the dramatic events surrounding it, both modern and medieval historians have devoted a large amount of attention to it. The desire to attribute power behind the governmental actions between 1327 and 1330 is strong. Scholars have assigned power to various actors, mainly Mortimer and Isabella.<sup>73</sup> Many of the instances when power and authority are attributed to Isabella and/or Mortimer are based on the assumption that the charges laid against Mortimer and the seizure of Isabella's lands in 1330 meant they were behind every aspect of government. This assumption is probably correct, but in most cases it remains merely that: an assumption. Isabella rarely appears in the documentary material surviving from the period; for example, E.L.G. Stones writes that upon the return of the English envoys, who had gone to treat with Robert Bruce in 1328, they reported the success of their mission to Isabella and Mortimer.<sup>74</sup> However, in his citation, Stones

---

<sup>73</sup> Fryde attributes joint responsibility to Isabella and Mortimer: Natalie Fryde, *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II, 1321-1326* (Cambridge 1979), p. 207; Allocco claims that Isabella was directly behind every action between 1326 and 1330, erroneously referring to her as regent: Katherine Allocco, 'Intercessor, Rebel, Regent: The Political Life of Isabella of France' (Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Texas, Austin, 2004), pp. 252-314; Dryburgh stresses Mortimer's importance in the royal administration and refers to the period as 'the Mortimer regime': Paul Dryburgh, 'The Career of Roger Mortimer, the first earl of March' (Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Bristol, 2002), pp. 109-150, 147; McKisack argues that Mortimer ruled indirectly through the queen: May McKisack, *Fourteenth Century England* (Oxford, 1959), p. 97; Haines does place power with Mortimer and Isabella, but he often takes a conservative approach. For example, he uses a non-descriptive phrase: 'those in control of the king': Haines, *King, Edward II*, pp. 177-218, 207; Ormrod claims that: 'It was Mortimer, through his intimacy with the queen and his influence over the boy king, who actually held the reins of government': W.M. Ormrod, *Edward III* (Stroud, 2005), p. 16; Elsewhere, Ormrod refers to Isabella's 'usurpation of royal sovereignty': W.M. Ormrod, 'The Sexualities of Edward II', in Gwilym Dodd and Anthony Musson (eds.), *The Reign of Edward II: New Perspectives* (York, 2006) p. 43; Wiswall attributes power to both Isabella and Mortimer: Frank Wiswall, 'Politics, Procedure and the "Non-Minority" of Edward III: Some Comparisons', in James L. Gillespie (ed.), *The Age of Richard II*. (Stroud, 1997), pp. 14, 18, 20-21; Valente places Mortimer and Isabella as the driving forces behind deposition of Edward II: Claire Valente, 'The Deposition and Abdication of Edward II', *English Historical Review*, 113 (1998), pp. 852-878; Menache assigns authority to Isabella: Sophie Menache, 'Isabelle of France', *Journal of Medieval History*, 10 (1984) p. 121; Shenton argues that Mortimer was the driving force behind the government's policies: Caroline Shenton, 'Edward II and the Coup of 1330', in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), p. 13-14; Bothwell claims that 'it was the characters of Mortimer and Isabella that really dictated': J.S. Bothwell, 'The More Things Change: Isabella and Mortimer, Edward III, and the Painful Delay of a Royal Majority (1327-1330)' in Charles Beem (ed.), *The Royal Minorities of Medieval and Early Modern England* (New York, 2008), p. 92.

<sup>74</sup> E.L.G. Stones, 'The English Mission to Edinburgh in 1328', *Scottish Historical Review*, 28 (1949), p. 127.



points out that the exchequer account in which the report is found literally reads *ad regem*. Stones claims that since Edward was only fifteen, it can be assumed that the envoys came before Isabella and Mortimer. This is exemplary of the conclusions of most studies of the reign.<sup>75</sup> Almost every action was issued under the name of the king, which was, of course, the common practice in a minority. During minorities, efforts were made to maintain the status quo that the new king was competent to rule.<sup>76</sup> This practice was observed because the lack of a single lord might prove divisive to the administration of the realm.<sup>77</sup> All authority for those acting in his stead derived from this pretence. In the minority of Edward III, this political fiction was so well constructed that it is impossible for the modern historian to truly understand the driving forces behind the king's titular authority. Thus, historians, in order to explain the events of Edward's minority, have automatically assumed that Isabella and Mortimer were in charge.

This chapter will not evaluate whether the decisions made during the minority period should be viewed as positive or negative — an issue that dominates most studies of the period. Instead, its central goal is to re-examine primary source material of the minority to produce an objective analysis of the mechanisms by which Isabella governed and to display when the level of her power or authority becomes apparent in the documents. She established and maintained her authority, unsurprisingly, through her control of Edward III, a position that motherhood automatically gave her, but which she had to actively exploit. She worked alongside the regency council, as befitted the queen and mother of the regent and heir. Her power or authority was expressed in the language of petitioning and intercession, which makes the strength of her power or authority difficult to determine. Since all of these areas were part of normative queenly behaviour, the only way to ascertain whether Isabella exercised a greater level of power and authority is to consider the nature of her requests and intercessions. In other words, did the things she asked for fall under the prerogatives of queenship? The answer is sometimes yes and sometimes no, but the number of times her requests fell outside

---

<sup>75</sup> See note 74 above.

<sup>76</sup> Frank L., Wiswall, '“Non-Minority” of Edward III', pp. 10-11; Gwilym Dodd, 'Richard II, Fiction of Majority Rule', p. 107; Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III*, pp. 18, 52-55; Saul, *Richard II*, p. 27; Watts, *Henry VI*, p. 113.

<sup>77</sup> Anthony Musson, 'Queenship, Lordship and Petitioning in Late Medieval England', in W.M. Ormrod, Anthony Musson, Gwilym Dodd (eds.), *Medieval Petitions: Grace and Grievance* (York, 2009), p. 164.

queenly privileges indicate that she did have some measure of higher authority. As long as Isabella was able to use this authority in a manner that benefited the members of the regency council and other important magnates, her authority was acceptable to her contemporaries. As we shall see, the channelling of her authority into already established mechanisms of motherhood, administration and intercession was not done because she was a woman; it was because the fiction that the king was competent and in command had to be maintained.

### **October 1326- January 1327**

The manner in which Isabella constructed her power and authority (or the manner in which it was constructed for her) differed during the period before Prince Edward's coronation, from that after it. Before the coronation, the primary way Isabella and/or those involved in the deposition of Edward II justified and extended Isabella's authority was to evoke her position as Prince Edward's mother. As chapter five demonstrated, motherhood automatically gave the queen power, but it was up to her, or those around her, to actively manipulate this position to extend her power into authority. Isabella emphasized her motherhood most often prior to the coronation and less often afterwards. All letters issued by Isabella before the coronation in January 1327 were sent from 'Isabella, queen of England, lady of Ireland, countess of Ponthieu and Prince Edward son of the king, duke of Aquitaine, earl of Chester, Ponthieu and Montreuil' or some variation on this title.<sup>78</sup> Some letters and petitions sent to, or by, Isabella and Prince Edward also add 'keeper of the realm' to Prince Edward's title, in keeping with the prince and Isabella's claim that Edward II had left the realm and therefore his son was *custos*.<sup>79</sup> Thus, Prince Edward (or those acting in his name) validated his actions by invoking the second type of regency described in the introduction of this chapter. Actions done on the 'command' or 'order' of Isabella happen more frequently prior to the coronation than after it, but they occur under her name in conjunction with the prince's. An example of the pairing of Isabella and Prince Edward's names occurs in a

---

<sup>78</sup> TNA, SC 1/49/189: written on 8 December 1326; TNA, SC 1/37/19: written October-November 1326; TNA, SC 8/74/3669: 1326- early 1327; TNA, SC 8/32/1572: This petition is addressed to the King and council, but it claims that those in the king's army during Isabella's invasion were against Queen Isabella and Prince Edward and against the estate of the realm.

<sup>79</sup> TNA, SC 1/37/19: written c. October-November 1326; *CCR 1323-1326*, pp. 655-56.

letter sent on 28 April 1328 to the treasurer and barons of the exchequer commanding them to give to Drogo de Barentyn, late sheriff of Oxford and Berkshire, the money that he had paid to Hugh Beaurepeir on the order of Queen Isabella and the king [Edward III] before his accession.<sup>80</sup> Therefore, between autumn 1326 and 1 February 1327, Isabella authorized her conduct through Edward's claim to act as *custos* and through her connection to him as his mother.

At the same time that Isabella constructed her influence through her role as mother, she seized control of the main office of government: the chancery. As chapter four and section 6.2 of this chapter demonstrated, the use and control of seals was both a symbolic and physical manifestation of authority and a sign of participation in the administration of royal government.<sup>81</sup> Before the coronation, there is evidence that Isabella controlled both the privy seal and the great seal, and used them to control government administration. She would not retain direct control over the chancery after Edward III's coronation, as will be shown. Between 26 October and 20 November 1326, Robert Wyville, the queen's clerk, held the privy seal, 'and used it instead of the great seal because the keeper of the realm had no other seal'.<sup>82</sup>

Edward II surrendered the great seal on 20 November 1326 to the bishop of Hereford, who delivered it to the queen at Martley on 26 November.<sup>83</sup> In a letter under the privy seal, Edward II agreed the great seal should be opened and used, not only for preserving the peace, but for other documents at the discretion of Queen Isabella.<sup>84</sup> Since Isabella was in control of the privy seal between 26 October and 20 November 1326, it is highly unlikely that Edward II commanded or witnessed the writing of the privy seal letter that placed the great seal under Isabella's rule. It is tempting to envision Isabella and Prince Edward jointly sealing chancery issues, but the official memorandum on the chancery roll, which records the transfer of the great and privy seals, demonstrates that Isabella and her son were technically fulfilling the same role as keeper of the great seal,

---

<sup>80</sup> *CCR 1327-1330*, pp. 277-78.

<sup>81</sup> See sections 4.3 and 6.2.

<sup>82</sup> *CCR 1323-1327*, pp. 655-56.

<sup>83</sup> *CPMR 1323-1364*, pp. 17-18.

<sup>84</sup> *CPMR 1323-1364*, pp. 17-18.

which Isabella had done for the chancellor under Edward II.<sup>85</sup> Chancery issues were sealed by the bishop of Norwich, John Hotham and also Henry Cliff, but every day the great seal was returned, in a bag, sealed by the bishop or Henry Cliff's seals, to the queen and the prince.<sup>86</sup> Nevertheless, a letter from 12 December 1326 to the bishop of Norwich does indicate that Isabella instructed the bishop on business conducted under the seal. She made a request for the issue of a writ of *liberate* in December 1326.<sup>87</sup> Writs of *liberate* ordered the treasurer and barons of the exchequer to pay money out of the royal treasury for pensions, salaries, stipends and expenditure of the royal household. The queen would not normally dictate the business of the king's exchequer, and Isabella's request indicates the level of authority she had at this time. It is very likely, though the letter does not give this specific information, that the writ was used to fund the royal household's expenses or the expenses of her invasion.

Those responsible for the coup maintained the pretence that Edward II was still ruling and Edward III was *custos*. Therefore, we find that the place-dates of all the issues for December 1326 until the coronation at the end of January are from Kenilworth. Edward II was imprisoned in Kenilworth Castle prior to his deposition. Yet, Isabella was in control of both the privy and great seal until the coronation, so Edward II could not directly warrant any chancery issues with the privy seal. Furthermore, most of the chancery issues between November 1326 and January 1327 do not make note of where the warrant for the issue originated. They do not designate it as being authorized by the privy seal, the council or king and council.<sup>88</sup> Of those few that do record the source of the warrant, most stress Isabella's relationship to Prince Edward, being warranted 'by the queen and the king's first born son'.<sup>89</sup> A few others are warranted in the name of King Edward II, on the information of the queen and one by bill of the wardrobe.<sup>90</sup> One chancery issue was warranted directly by the queen and so it officially recorded the

---

<sup>85</sup> See section 6.2.

<sup>86</sup> *CCR 1323-1327*, pp. 655-56.

<sup>87</sup> TNA, SC 1/36/8.

<sup>88</sup> *CPR 1324-1327*, pp. 336-347; *CCR 1323-1327*, pp. 653-660.

<sup>89</sup> By the queen and the prince: *CPR 1324-1327*, p. 337 (5 December), p. 340 (30 November), p. 341 (1,2,4 December), p. 344 (4 January); *CCR 1327-1330*, p. 69: they appoint William Ross keeper of Yorkshire by joint command.

<sup>90</sup> By King *CPR 1324-1327*, p. 346 (12 January); by bill of the wardrobe *CPR 1324-1327*, p. 339 (24 December).

direct authority she possessed prior to the coronation.<sup>91</sup> The fiction that Edward II was still politically active filtered down to those who were not directly involved in court politics. A parliamentary petition survives from Thomas Everingham addressed to Edward II, Isabella and the duke of Aquitaine and their council, indicating Thomas was confused about who was actually in charge of parliament.<sup>92</sup> However, the petition begins with *vous pri, chere dame* demonstrating that Thomas believed that Isabella was the one with authority.<sup>93</sup> After the coronation, while her authority was alluded to, it is rarely recorded in such a direct and obvious way. Isabella and those leading the deposition constructed their authority in 1326 in three ways: through Prince Edward's claim to *custos*, through Isabella's role as his mother, and by creating the impression that Edward II was still actively involved in government. As a result, we see a situation much like Philippa's during Lionel's keepership in the 1340s: in the king's absence, his son was appointed *custos* with his mother acting in an administrative role. Of course between November 1326 and September 1327, the king was not actually absent, but held captive. However, by setting up this traditional governmental structure, Isabella and those in control in late 1326, exploited an acceptable framework for their actions. After the coronation this practice changed: there was no need to maintain the fiction that Edward II was ruling and Isabella was rarely addressed alongside her son, indicating that she lost some measure of official authority after the coronation.

### February 1327-October 1328

The manner in which Isabella expressed her power and authority changed after February 1327. The coronation acts as a signpost for a shift in the queen's status. Edward III was now nominally ruling as king under the guidance of a minority council, and it was only a matter of time before he would have more than just titular authority. When Edward reached his majority, not only would Isabella's power be reduced, but that of the council

---

<sup>91</sup> By Queen: *CPR 1324-1327*, p. 341(1 December).

<sup>92</sup> TNA SC 8/46/2256; Shelia Sneddon 'Words and Realities: The Language and Dating of Petitions, 1326-1327' in W.M. Ormrod, Anthony Musson, Gwilym Dodd (eds.), *Medieval Petitions: Grace and Grievance* (York, 2009), p. 199.

<sup>93</sup> TNA SC 8/46/2256; Shelia Sneddon 'Words and Realities: The Language and Dating of Petitions, 1326-1327' p. 199.

as well. With every passing year, events occurred which symbolised his approaching majority, mirroring the gradual process through which Henry III came into his own majority.<sup>94</sup> Edward III's coronation in February 1327 was the first step to attaining his majority. The separation of his household from the queen's in March 1327 was the second, his marriage to Philippa in 1328 was the third, and Philippa's coronation and the birth of Edward of Woodstock, both in 1330, a fourth.<sup>95</sup> Philippa's coronation was probably delayed in an attempt to slow down this process, either by Isabella or by others on the council. Chapter five argued that Isabella delayed Philippa's coronation in order to preserve her status as the only queen, but the crowning of a new queen consort also implied that the king was reaching his manhood.<sup>96</sup> After February 1327, Isabella rarely issued commands directly, she did not control the seals openly and she is almost completely absent from official documents. Isabella maintained authority between 1327 and 1330, but she did so through the channels typically open to consort and dowager: the unofficial and expected role of administrator discussed in section 6.2 of this chapter, the role of intercessor examined in chapter three and the role of lord analyzed in chapter four. Since she made use of these channels of authority, she does not appear in positions of direct command in the official documents in the way many historians have assumed.

Isabella continued to establish and advance her power and authority through government administration, but she accomplished this through actions typical to the practice of queenship. Isabella continued to act as an administrator in conjunction with Edward III's minority council. It is not implausible that Isabella or Mortimer were sometimes on this council because, as the evidence in 6.2 has demonstrated, this was an expected part of queenship. When the regency council was established, there was no title of regent or keeper of the king's body that Isabella, or anyone else, could hold because of the uncertainty of the circumstances that created the minority. The deposition of Edward II had no concrete precedent and neither did a minority following the deposition of a king.<sup>97</sup> The situation was not the same as Henry III's minority, which served as the only

---

<sup>94</sup>Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III*, p. 389.

<sup>95</sup>TNA, E 101/382/9 mem. 5 contains a marginal note of the separation of the queen's household from the king's on 11 March.

<sup>96</sup>See section 5.1.

<sup>97</sup>Valente provides a thorough description of the deposition with a historiography of how the deposition has been seen by historians and highlights it as an unprecedented event, with which most historians agree:

precedent for Edward III's. Edward II did not appoint a specific person as regent or a regency council for his son, as King John had done.<sup>98</sup> The uncertainty of what should happen after the deposition of a king whose heir was a minor resulted in an ambiguous membership of the regency council established in January 1327. With the exception of the formal proclamation of Edward II's abdication and Edward III's accession, there are no official records of the events connected with the end of Edward II's reign. The parliament roll for January 1327 records only the petitions that were presented when parliament resumed in February after the coronation of Edward III.<sup>99</sup> The 1327 parliament rolls do not record the establishment of any official regency council. The only references to it are found in the 1330 parliament roll in the judgement of Mortimer. This 1330 roll states that:

It was ordained at the parliament of our lord the king, held at Westminster soon after his coronation, that four bishops, four earls and six barons remain close to the king to give him counsel, so that four would always be there, that is to say at least one bishop, one earl and two barons, and that no important business should be done without their assent...after which parliament, the said Roger de Mortimer, having no regard for the said assent, usurped by himself royal power.<sup>100</sup>

Consequently, it is not known who made up this council. The membership of the council has been described in various sources, but the members assigned to the council vary in each one.<sup>101</sup> It might even be suggested that these positions could be filled by

---

Claire Valente, 'The Deposition and Abdication of Edward II', pp. 852-853; Edward Peters, *The Shadow King: Rex Inutilis in Medieval Law and Literature, 751-1327* (New Haven, 1970), pp. 236-241: Peters argues that: 'In 1327 the magnates borrowed a complete deposition theory, which owed as much to the deposition of Fredrick II, Sancho II and Adolf as to any previous tradition of feudal resistance. However, though there is no indication that the magnates directly borrowed from canon law, it is plausible, see: Haines, *King Edward II*, p. 193.

<sup>98</sup> See section 6.1.

<sup>99</sup> Seymour Phillips, 'Edward III: Parliament of January 1327, Introduction', in *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England*, ed. C. Given-Wilson et al. Internet version, at <http://www.sd-editions.com/PROME>, accessed on 15 September 2008. Scholarly Digital Editions, Leicester: 2005.

<sup>100</sup> Seymour Phillips (ed.), 'Edward III: Parliament of 1327, Text and Translation', in *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England*, ed. C. Given-Wilson et al., Internet version, at <http://www.sd-editions.com/PROME>, accessed on 15 September 2008. Scholarly Digital Editions, Leicester: 2005.

<sup>101</sup> Haines, *King Edward II*, pp. 195-96: Haines discusses the different sources for the council's membership. Among them he lists the *Brut Chronicle* and the testers of the charter of liberties for the City of London contained in the 'Annales Paulini'. Also see Bothwell, 'Isabella and Mortimer, Edward III, and the Painful Delay of a Royal Majority', p. 73.

any baron, bishop or earl who was near the king. As W.M. Ormrod has argued, *concilium* was the act of counselling rather than the name of a specific official group and it is difficult to ascertain exactly who was a 'councillor'.<sup>102</sup> Henry III's minority council was not a formal body; Henry VI's was a fixed body of lords, but there were several incarnations of that council, so it is possible that Edward III's was the same.<sup>103</sup> The charge against Mortimer was that he usurped power *alone*, not that he overrode a council of which he was not a member. It is entirely possible that Mortimer was on this council at some times, and not at other times.

Given the evidence described in section 6.2 in relation to the queen's participation in government business, it may have been assumed that Isabella would act alongside this council as well. Important matters of government business occurred in Isabella's chamber with members of the council present. When John Hotham, bishop of Ely was appointed chancellor on 28 January 1327, he was given the great seal in Isabella's inner chamber in the presence of the members of the council.<sup>104</sup> A memorandum from July 1327 enrolled on the patent rolls states that Isabella was lodged in the palace of William, archbishop of York 'on Wednesday before St. Peter ad Vincula, ...in the presence of the archbishop of York, John, bishop of Ely, the chancellor, Henry, bishop of Lincoln, the treasurer John, bishop of Winchester, Geoffrey le Scrop and others of the king's council'.<sup>105</sup> Finally, on 18 January 1329, Edward III received the great seal from the chancellor, Henry Burghersh, bishop of Lincoln, in the presence of Isabella, John Warenne, earl of Surrey, Roger Mortimer, earl of March, Henry Percy, Oliver Ingham, John Darcy, and other magnates, and he subsequently used it to seal writs in their presence before returning it to the chancellor.<sup>106</sup> These examples record a number of different men filling the membership of the council that was outlined during the parliament of 1327 (as recorded on the 1330 roll). More importantly, Isabella's presence alongside these men suggest her involvement with the council.

---

<sup>102</sup> Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government of England c. 1346-1356', p. 100. Also see Watts, *Henry VI*, pp. 82-86.

<sup>103</sup> Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III*, p. 54; Watts, *Henry VI*, pp. 114-120.

<sup>104</sup> *CCR 1327-1330*, p. 98.

<sup>105</sup> *CCR 1327-1330*, p. 214.

<sup>106</sup> *CCR 1327-1330*, p. 425.



Several pieces of evidence provide the definitive verification that Isabella did not just work in conjunction with the minority council, but was on it. Two letters that Henry Burghersh, bishop of Lincoln and chancellor, wrote to Henry Cliff and William Herlaston in 1328 make it very clear that Isabella was on the council. In the first, he orders Cliff and Herlaston to issue a commission to the new constable of Wark in Northumberland because the queen, Lord Mortimer and others of the council agreed that the lord of Ross should have the castle of Wark with its appurtenances.<sup>107</sup> In the second, he sends them instructions to issue writs for the payment of Gascon officers according to the decisions of a council held in Pontefract, over which Queen Isabella presided.<sup>108</sup> The chronicler, Jean le Bel certainly believed that Isabella and Mortimer were head of the minority council when he wrote: 'The king greatly used the counsel of my lady, his mother, and the counsel of the earl of Kent and the counsel of my lord Roger Mortimer, who were the leaders of his council with many other knights, clerks and lay men'.<sup>109</sup>

This study has demonstrated above that Isabella controlled the seals prior to Edward III's coronation. After the coronation, however, evidence that Isabella acted as an administrator by controlling the seals becomes ambiguous. After the coronation, Adam Limber was appointed keeper of the privy seal, replacing Richard Wyville, the queen's clerk.<sup>110</sup> It is often assumed that Edward III and Isabella were frequently together and that Isabella thus influenced the use of the privy seal. In her unpublished doctoral thesis, Katherine Allocco argues that throughout the minority,

Documents that were simply signed "by the privy seal" rather than "by the King" or "by the King and his [regency] council" or even "by petition of the [regency] council" were most likely drafted and ratified without the advice of the king or the council. Had the king or the council been involved, then they would have been included.'<sup>111</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> TNA, SC 1/36/93.

<sup>108</sup> TNA, SC 1/36/90.

<sup>109</sup> Jean le Bel, *Chroniques* p. 101: *Il usa grand temps du conseil madame sa mere et du conseil le conte de Cayn et du conseil messire Rogier de Mortemer, qui estoient les souverains de son conseil avecques plusers aultres chevaliers, clerics, et lays.*

<sup>110</sup> Tout, *Chapters*, vol. 5. pp. 3-5.

<sup>111</sup> Allocco, 'The Political Life of Isabella of France', p. 563.

Allocco even goes so far as to argue that Isabella maintained possession of the privy seal during the regency, though she offers no substantial evidence of this.<sup>112</sup> This argument does not hold ground when compared with T.F. Tout and Bertie Wilkinson's studies of the chancery. Both have outlined the development of the office of the privy seal and shown that most privy seal warrants between 1327 and 1337 came directly from the king, but those that did not, came from the council or the keeper of the privy seal.<sup>113</sup> Thus, privy seal warrants could have originated from any of the political players of the minority: the king, Isabella, Mortimer, Lancaster or any other member of the council and administration.

When Isabella's itinerary can be established, Isabella, the king and the privy seal are often found in the same place. However, Isabella's movements are very difficult to reconstruct during this period. Her itinerary only contains a handful of definitive dates and locations, and these are found in the dates of letters written by the queen and a few household accounts.<sup>114</sup> Caroline Shenton, in her study of Edward III's itinerary, has not been able to identify the specific whereabouts of the king during much of this period.<sup>115</sup> However, she has discovered the locations of the wardrobe and the privy seal, and argues that when they were both together it was likely that the king was in that place too.<sup>116</sup> When both itineraries are compared, Isabella, the privy seal and the wardrobe are almost always in the same place as the king. Some of Isabella's letters that provided the place-dates for her itinerary were first dated by historians and antiquarians when the series of Ancient Correspondence at The National Archives, London was compiled in the nineteenth century. The historians' methodologies for dating the letters is not clear, but it may be that they dated them from the place and location of the privy seal on the assumption that Isabella was in control of it and the king. As a result, though the surviving evidence points to the conclusion that Isabella remained with her son and the privy seal, the evidence and therefore any definite conclusion are problematic. The

---

<sup>112</sup> Allocco, 'The Political Life of Isabella of France', p. 563.

<sup>113</sup> Wilkinson, 'The Chancery', pp. 170-180; Tout, *Chapters*, vol. 5, pp. 59-60. Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes*, p. 84; Joseph Conway Davies, *Baronial Opposition to Edward II* (London, 1967), p. 569.

<sup>114</sup> See appendix I.

<sup>115</sup> Shenton, *The Itinerary of Edward III*, pp. 13-67.

<sup>116</sup> Shenton, *The Itinerary of Edward III*, p. 5.

uncertainty of the place dates of Isabella's whereabouts and the number of people who could have made use of the privy seal means that there is no reason to attribute *all* privy seal warrants to Isabella, nor can we completely rule her out as a significant political player.

It is possible that Isabella appointed men who were loyal to her to administrative positions, 'queen's men', so to speak, and thus governed the realm through them. Henry Burghersh is often classified as one of these men.<sup>117</sup> Yet it is very difficult to show that she was officially behind any of these appointments. The appointments of major officials during the minority lack any mention of Isabella. Henry Burghersh was appointed treasurer from 28 March 1327 to 1 July 1328 during pleasure by the king and council. On 12 May 1328, Henry Burghersh was made chancellor when

The king delivered the great seal to Henry, bishop of Lincoln who took an oath to do faithfully what pertained to the office of the seal [chancellor] in the presence of Adam Orleton, bishop of Worcester, Roger Mortimer, William de la Zouche of Asheby, Oliver Ingham, John Crumbewell, Gilbert Talbot, the king's chamberlain, and other magnates there present.<sup>118</sup>

Neither of Henry Burghersh's appointments mention the queen, but given what has been concluded above, she may have acted alongside these men. On the other hand, John Hotham, who held the office of chancellor between 26 January 1327 and March 1328, took his oath in the presence of Queen Isabella, Henry, earl of Lancaster, Roger Mortimer and Henry de Beaumont, but this appointment was made on the eve of the coronation and so it recorded Isabella's influence when other later appointments do not. It is probable that Isabella influenced or authorized the appointment of the officials to secure her power in the central government after the coronation, but with the exception of John Hotham, this link is hard to establish definitively.

Most of the administrative and governmental documents from the minority record actions that fall under the expected queenly activities of intercession and of the management of her estates. During Edward's minority, Isabella's influence was constructed through the language of petitioning and intercession in the same way it was

---

<sup>117</sup> Tout, *Chapters*, vol. 5, pp. 4-6; Birtie Wilkinson, *The Chancery Under Edward III* (Manchester, 1929), p. 100.

<sup>118</sup> *CPR 1327-1330*, p. 58; *CCR 1327-1330*, p. 387.

prior to 1324 and subsequent to 1330.<sup>119</sup> An examination of the chancery rolls and letters written by Isabella reveals that pardons, grants and many appointments were issued at her request.<sup>120</sup> These requests may well have had a higher level of authority (a command with which compliance was expected) than before; for example, she received petitions from religious institutions asking her to secure licences for alienations of land in mortmain.<sup>121</sup> Isabella interceded for religious institutions seeking alienations in mortmain long before her coup.<sup>122</sup> Requests for pardons and appointments are slightly more ambiguous. It is likely that Isabella was able to secure appointments for her supporters because of her influence over Edward III. Nevertheless, it is impossible to know if her influence actually became a command because these appointments and pardons were framed in the language of petitioning. Isabella petitions for appointments and pardons using phrases such as ‘at the request of’, ‘I ask you’, ‘for the love of us’ and so forth. Letters and petitions from both women and men of all levels of the nobility—except the king—contain this formulaic language; for example Isabella ‘requests’ that the keeper of the rolls, Henry Cliff, notify the exchequer that she has appointed her attorneys for exchequer business.<sup>123</sup> The appointment of their own attorneys at the exchequer was something that queens often did.<sup>124</sup> As chapter four explained, debts to the queen were prosecuted at the king’s exchequer, her expenses were accounted for there and queen’s gold was paid there.<sup>125</sup> Her appointed attorneys were probably meant to represent her during this business.

---

<sup>119</sup> See section 3.1

<sup>120</sup> Pardons: *CPR 1227-1330*, pp. 94, 100, 125, 169, 175, 183, 200, 257, 357, 372, 544, 542-3. Grants: *CPR 1227-1330*, pp. 140, 189, 198-99, 264, 300, 322, 340, 380, 539, 367, 378, 468, 520, 523; *CCR 1327-1330*, p. 461; *CCR 1330-1333*, p. 50; *CChR 1326-1341*, p. 190. Other: *CPR 1227-1330*, pp. 127, 297.

<sup>121</sup> *CPR 1227-1330*, p. 176; TNA, SC 1/38/191, 192; TNA, SC 1/37/14.

<sup>122</sup> *CPR 1307-1313*, pp. 138, 190, 208, 212, 311, 351, 522; *CPR 1313-1317*, pp. 131, 166, 201, 223, 254, 640, 639; *CPR 1317-1321*, pp. 27, 21, 25, 227, 576.

<sup>123</sup> TNA, SC 1/36/100.

<sup>124</sup> Margaret: *CPR 1313-1317*, p. 259. Isabella: *CPR 1317-1321*, p. 325; *CCR 1341-1343*, pp. 35-6, 236; *CCR 1349-1354*, p. 34; *CCR 1354-1360*, p. 45; TNA, SC 1/50/168. Philippa: *CPR 1330-1334*, pp. 43, 403; *CCR 1330-1333*, p. 542; *CCR 1333-1337*, pp. 547-548, 686; *CCR 1337-1339*, pp. 111, 284; *CPR 1350-1354*, p. 43; *CPR 1358-1360*, p. 446; *CPR 1361-1364*, pp. 334, 375-76; TNA, SC 1/39/15; TNA, SC 1/56/40.

<sup>125</sup> See section 4.3 for debts to the queen in the exchequer.

The same can also be said for pardons. It is possible that Isabella was able to secure pardons by her command, but because they are made through traditional petitionary language it is difficult to know; for example, Isabella received a letter from two widows seeking pardon for murder, and in one case a successful writ of pardon exists on the chancery rolls 'at the request of Queen Isabella'.<sup>126</sup> Queens often sought pardons for murderers, both male and female.<sup>127</sup> Other successful pardons and grants on the chancery rolls resemble those recorded on the same rolls prior to 1326, so there appears to be continuity in the type and presentation of intercessory acts throughout Isabella's life. Isabella may have been successful in securing appointments and pardons from the chancery because the chancellor knew she was in very high favour with her son, rather than because she commanded the chancellor to fulfil her wishes. If this was the case, then Isabella's actions were similar to those of any queen in good standing with the king. This was a position that many queens desired; it was not necessarily a negative or unusual one. If Isabella's requests were taken as commands, they were articulated in this formulaic language because that was the manner in which such transactions were conducted, not because it was necessary to mask her authority.

Isabella continued to maintain her estates in the manner one would expect of any queen, widow or male landed elite. Of course, it should be noted here that she held far greater landed wealth than the customary £4,000. This was due to her influence with Edward III and the initial gratitude felt by the magnates immediately after her invasion and the deposition of Edward II. Letters and petitions dealing with complaints against the queen's ministers exist, but these are not handled differently from those before 1325.<sup>128</sup> In July 1329, Isabella's tenants of Ellesmere made a request to Isabella and her council for the appointment of John Laybourne as keeper of the manor there. Such a request was not outside the purview of the queen's authority on her own lands.<sup>129</sup> Likewise, when the burgesses of Lostwithiel and Truro asked the king to grant them a charter giving their towns an exclusive right to weigh tin in Cornwall, the petition was endorsed with the order to send it to the council of the queen. Isabella held Cornwall during this period and

---

<sup>126</sup> TNA, SC 1/42/110; TNA, SC 1/ 36/193; *CPR 1327-1330*, p. 372.

<sup>127</sup> See section 3.3.

<sup>128</sup> TNA, SC1/ 36/190; TNA, SC 8/257/12832; See section 4.3.

<sup>129</sup> TNA, SC 1/30/106; TNA, SC 1/37/69; TNA, SC 1/25/203.

it was the responsibility of the queen's council to aid in the administration of her landholdings, so it is not surprising that the king's council would refer the matter to the queen's.<sup>130</sup> These examples in the official documents from the period have shown that there is no discernible evidence that Isabella was acting differently than she had between 1308 and 1325.

Therefore, it may be concluded that many of Isabella's actions during the minority regime of Edward III fall under normative queenly behaviour. There is little hint that she had any heightened power or authority in the administrative documents because they frame her actions in the language of intercession. However, there is some documentary and chronicle evidence which suggest that she did exercise authority and/or a very high amount of influence. For one, the number of official acts of intercession on the part of Isabella between 1327 and 1330 is higher than at any other period in her lifetime.<sup>131</sup> This suggests that Isabella either possessed a higher amount of influence with Edward III than she had with Edward II, or than she would after the end of Edward III's minority. It could also mean that she was actually commanding the actions of government—exercising authority—and that every act, as argued above, was channelled into intercessory requests.

Because it is impossible to glean anything about Isabella's authority from the language in which these letters and petitions were written, it is necessary to look at the nature of the requests. Even though many of Isabella's letters to the chancellor contain the formal language of intercession, their content lends some insight to Isabella's control of quotidian government business. While many of her activities fall within the duties of queenship, some of her requests are unusual for a queen to make, which indicates that her administrative acts extended past those normally ascribed to queenship. A petition to Isabella exists requesting an enlargement of a previous grant made by Edward II to Napoleon, the cardinal of St. Adrianus.<sup>132</sup> The petition asks that Isabella 'command' the enlargement of the cardinal's lands, a word which would not be used if he was merely seeking her aid in petitioning the crown to enlarge the grant.<sup>133</sup> The cardinal believes that

---

<sup>130</sup> Crawford, 'The Queen's Council in the Middle Ages', *English Historical Review*, 116 (2001), p. 1193.

<sup>131</sup> See appendix II.

<sup>132</sup> TNA, SC 1/37/76.

Isabella had the authority to issue the grant. However, this letter is slightly problematic because the name of the lands held by the cardinal is illegible. If these were lands that Isabella held by the king's grant then it may have lain within her authority to enlarge the grant. If the cardinal held them directly from the king, as the letter suggests, then it would be unusual for the cardinal to write to Isabella to issue the command, implying that she had a measure of authority in land grants from the crown. A similar letter exists from the bishop of Ossory in Ireland, claiming that he desired greatly to see Isabella and her son, the king, and asking that

If it pleases you my lady [Isabella] that, by your commandment [*commandement*], I may have a writ of licence from my lady so that I can come to England into your presence and that the ministers and those of the Holy Church of the bishopric in my time may have the protection of our lord the king and yours.<sup>134</sup>

Similarly, this letter asks for Isabella's command for an action to occur. In addition, though written after the coronation, it invokes Isabella's connection to Edward as his mother, demonstrating that, though Isabella did not use this relationship as often in official documentation after the coronation, some outside the central administration did.

Isabella involved herself in several other areas in which queens normally did not act. She sent a warrant for the appointment of customs collectors at London to the chancellor on 30 January 1327, an area usually outside the prerogatives of queenship.<sup>135</sup> Since this letter was written two days before the coronation, Isabella's authority to make such an appointment may still have been constructed through her relationship to her son as *custos*. Other appointments of customs collectors, sheriffs and clerks of the king's

---

<sup>133</sup> TNA, SC 1/37/76: *Pleise a ma dame la Reine commander que Sir Neapoleon Cardinal eit aucun assignement de Cu [rest of word missing] empension de L marcs q'il avoiment du graunt nre seigneur le roi piere notre seigneur le roi qor [rest of word missing] estre revonellee du seal le roi goire est.* My transcription.

<sup>134</sup> TNA, SC 1/42/69: *A ma dame la royngne prie le son chaplain frere Richard, Evesqe de Ossorie en Hirlande que come ma dame ieo ay graunt desir de veer vostre persone et mon lige seignour nostre seginour le roy vostre filz qui dieux sauve vous prie sil vous plect ma dame que par vostre eyde et comandement puisse venir en Engleterre a vostre presence et que ieo puisse de ceo ma dame brief avoir de conge et que les ministres et les tres de seint eglise del eveschee oyent en mon temps en la protection nostre seigneur le roi et la vostre.* My transcription.

<sup>135</sup> TNA, SC 1/35/186.

chancery were not normally part of the queen's privileges, but Isabella wrote letters requesting such appointments.<sup>136</sup> Isabella also commanded the king's bench and parliament to act in certain judicial matters.<sup>137</sup> As chapter four demonstrated, while the queen used the central courts to pursue her own suits, she held no command over those courts.

During Edward II's reign, Isabella acted as an ambassador in issues of foreign diplomacy, but she never directed any matters of foreign policy. However, Isabella was involved in the foreign diplomacy during Edward III's minority. In March of 1328, the government attempted to recover the king's rights and inheritances in Gascony. Convincing the lord of Albret to support the king in this process was part of this plan.<sup>138</sup> On 9 February 1330, an unidentifiable envoy wrote from Dover to a member of the king's council that 'if it is pleasing to the king *and his mother*' the king should entice the lord of Albret to change his allegiance from the King of France to Edward.<sup>139</sup> Later, the writer reasserts this advice, asking his addressee to 'counsel the king and the lady queen, the king's mother, about the good of this business'. This letter demonstrates clearly that Isabella was involved in diplomacy, and was perhaps the authority behind it. Edward III may have been sharing authority with his mother at this point because he continued this policy of courting noble Gascon families into the 1340s.<sup>140</sup> This strategy may have been behind the negotiations between Edward and the lord of Albret for a marriage between Princess Isabella and the lord of Albret's son discussed in the previous chapter.<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>136</sup> TNA SC 1/35/182: Isabella [of France] queen mother, to Bishop of Ely, Chancellor: warrant for the appointment of the new sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk. Knaresborough, 2 February [1328]; TNA, SC 1/36/78 Isabella, queen mother, to the keepers of the Great Seal: for the re-instatement of William de Caythorp as a [chancery clerk]. Westminster, 6 August [1328-29]; *CPR 1327-1330*, p. 304: The appointment of John de Say to the office of controller of the customs of wools, hides and wool-fells in the port of London at the request of Queen Isabella; *CPR 1327-1330*, p. 31: The appointment of Robert de Poleye to the office of ulnager of Worstead in Norfolk 'at the request of Queen Isabella'.

<sup>137</sup> TNA, SC 1/42/38: the abbot of Fecamp to [IoF], queen mother: request for a dispute between the abbey and a merchant to be postponed until parliament. [c.1328]. TNA, SC 1/38/193; *CPR 1327-1330*, p. 565: Isabella requested that the chancellor heed letters of her son commanding the issue of a writ to Henry Scrope and other justices of the King's Bench to proceed in the complaint from John de Wroxhale, that he made a recognisance to Hugh Despenser the elder under duress in the time of Edward II. The writ was issued from the chancery 12 days later.

<sup>138</sup> Malcom Vale, *The Origins of the Hundred Years War* (Oxford, 2004), p. 253.

<sup>139</sup> TNA, SC 1/42/161.

<sup>140</sup> Vale, *The Origins of the Hundred Years War*, pp. 253-263.

<sup>141</sup> See section 5.4.



Contemporary chroniclers and modern scholars have almost unanimously attributed the Treaty of Northampton to the devices of Mortimer and Isabella, and ascribe all agency to one or both of them.<sup>142</sup> Again, this assumption is not improbable, but as with most of the other events discussed in this chapter, Isabella does not appear in a single source relating to the treaty itself, or the negotiations leading up to it.<sup>143</sup> The source of the envoys' authority to negotiate with Robert Bruce, the ratification of the treaty and so forth all come from the king. Isabella, Mortimer and others of the council were probably acting under the king's name, but we can never be certain. After the ratification of the treaty and after the marriage of Joan and David Bruce, Isabella was given the authority to negotiate further with Robert Bruce regarding the return of the English 'disinherited's' lands.<sup>144</sup> We do not know who chose her or why she was assigned to carry out these negotiations. She may have decided this on her own or the king and council may have decided to take advantage of her skills as an ambassador and negotiator. After all, she experienced relative success when negotiating with the King of France during Edward II's reign, but what is more striking about Isabella's mission, is what it reveals about contemporary feelings regarding her role in Edward III's minority.

If the Treaty of Northampton was as unpopular as chroniclers and modern historians describe it, and assuming that Isabella was behind it, why did the council, king and other magnates allow her to act as a negotiator afterwards? There are several possibilities: Isabella had not orchestrated the treaty at all; or that she did and continued negotiations despite its unpopularity; or the magnates were happy to support it when they thought that their lands might still be restored. Through the subsequent negotiations,

---

<sup>142</sup> The chronicles treatment of Isabella will be discussed below, but almost all of them attribute 'the shameful peace' to Isabella: Murimuth, Adam, *Adae Murimuth Continuatio chronicarum [with] Robertus de Avesbury de Gestis Mirabilibus Regis Edwardi Tertii*, Edward Maunde Thompson (ed.), Rolls Series, 93 (London, 1665), p. 57; Wendy R. Childs and John Taylor (eds.), *The Anonimale Chronicle, 1307-1334: from the Brotherton Collection MS 29*, Yorkshire Archaeological Society (Leeds, 1991), p. 141, Robert of Avesbury, *Gestis Mirabilibus Regis Edwardi Tertii*, Edward Maunde Thompson (ed.), Rolls Series, 93 (London, 1665), p. 283; Gray, Thomas, *Scalachronica*, Andy King (ed., trans) (Woodbridge 2005), p. 103; Friedrich W. D. Brie, *The Brut, or The Chronicles of England*, EETS, OS, 131, 136 (London, 1606-1908), vol. 131, p. 256; Joseph Stevenson, *Chronicon de Lanercost* (Edinburgh, 1839), p. 261; Geoffrey le Baker, 'Vita et mors Edwardi II Conscripta a Thoma de la Moore. [Chroniculum]', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, William Stubbs (ed.), Rolls Series, 76 (2 vols. London, 1965), vol. 2, p. 41; Ranald Nicholson, *Edward III and the Scots*, p. 55; Fryde, *The Tyranny and Fall*, p. 217; McKisack, *Fourteenth Century England*, p. 100; Haines, *Edward II*, pp. 198-199; Ormrod, *Edward III*, p. 17.

<sup>143</sup> *Foedera*, II, ii, pp. 724, 728, 730, 733, 740-42.

<sup>144</sup> E.L.G. Stones, 'The Treaty of Northampton, 1328', *History*, 38 (1953), pp. 57-58.

Isabella successfully regained Henry Percy's Scottish lands, and he remained loyal to the crown during Henry of Lancaster's rebellion in October 1328.<sup>145</sup> It was possible that Thomas Wake and Henry Beaumont were supposed to receive their lands, but if so, the agreement was never realised.<sup>146</sup> Wake and Beaumont subsequently became supporters of Henry of Lancaster, when previously they had been strong supporters of Isabella.<sup>147</sup> These shifting allegiances imply that it was the failure of this final negotiation which caused the subsequent criticisms of Isabella and Mortimer. W.M. Ormrod has argued that Queen Isabella's actions during the minority of Edward III disrupted gender norms, which Edward III had to bring back into balance after he assumed his majority in 1330.<sup>148</sup> However, this conclusion can be taken further to say that Isabella was only accused of or perceived as disrupting gender norms when her policies became unpopular. Immediately after the Treaty of Northampton, the landed elite were apparently cooperative, investing Isabella with the authority (or accepting her own authority) to negotiate with Bruce even after the 'shameful peace' had been ratified. It was her failure here that caused the vehement criticisms from Lancaster, Wake, Beaumont and the rest. Otherwise, the magnates had been happy for Isabella to act.

### **October 1328-November 1330**

Although Lancaster's rebellion in October of 1328 was unsuccessful, other events occurred that reflect a growing dissatisfaction with Isabella's authority and led to Edward III's coup in 1330. These events have provided historians with evidence for the assumption that Isabella commanded all of government business during the minority. However, the administrative evidence of 1328 and 1329 does not always reflect a growing discontent with Isabella on the part of the magnates, indicating that Isabella's position and popularity after 1328 fluctuated. Lancaster's accusations in October 1328 have previously been interpreted to mean that Isabella and Mortimer were dominating government to the detriment of the king, but they do not demonstrate a complete

---

<sup>145</sup> Nicholson, *Edward III and the Scots*, pp. 57-58; Stones, 'The Treaty of Northampton', pp. 57-58.

<sup>146</sup> Stones, 'The Treaty of Northampton', pp. 57-58.

<sup>147</sup> Nicholson, *Edward III and the Scots*, pp. 62-63.

<sup>148</sup> Ormrod, 'Monarchy, Martyrdom and Masculinity: England in the Later Middle Ages', pp. 175-187.

breakdown of cooperation between the two parties.<sup>149</sup> J.S. Bothwell has noted that Lancaster's rebellion produced mixed reactions among the elite: the church was divided in regards to the rebellion, and Edward III remained distanced from the events.<sup>150</sup> Lancaster continued to be active in the minority regime, being sent on diplomatic missions throughout the rest of the minority.<sup>151</sup> Isabella continued to use her power and authority through influence in the chancery and with her son. Her intercessory acts vacillate slightly throughout this period, so the small decline in 1330 may not be the result of a decline in power.<sup>152</sup>

A striking enrolment on the close rolls implies that Isabella and Edward were ruling together, but that their behaviour angered those around them. The general unrest surrounding Isabella's power during this period has caused historians to take for granted that she was behind almost every government act. On 15 July 1330, Richard Wyville, who had been a clerk in Isabella's household, was consecrated as the bishop of Salisbury.<sup>153</sup> According to a letter close, Richard, as bishop, was 'now assisting Queen Isabella and the king in directing the affairs of the realm'.<sup>154</sup> In this enrolment, Nicholas Lodelowe was accused of suggesting to the pope 'certain things to the injury of the bishop's person and the blackening of his fame, and intends prosecuting them, whereby shame and blame may arise to Queen Isabella and the king' because they had recommended him to the pope for elevation to the bishopric of Salisbury. Nicholas was ordered to cease his complaints by command of the chancery. Whatever these 'certain things' were, it seems that they were related to the way in which the queen and king were ruling the realm, as well as Richard's role in assisting them.

There is some surviving evidence that Edward and Isabella were not acting in tandem in the second half of the minority. This evidence also indicates that Edward III

---

<sup>149</sup> For Lancaster's accusations: *CPMR 1323-1364*, pp. 77-73.

<sup>150</sup> Bothwell, 'Isabella and Mortimer, Edward III, and the Painful Delay of a Royal Majority', pp. 83-82.

<sup>151</sup> *Foedera* II, ii, 766, 768, 777: to negotiate marriages between John of Eltham and Eleanor and Philip VI's children; TNA, E 101/310/7.

<sup>152</sup> Appendix II: 1327: 16, 1328: 8 1329: 10, 1330: 7.

<sup>153</sup> T.F. Tout, *Chapters*, vol. 6, pp. 10-11; *CCR 1323-1327*, p. 65: From 26 Oct 1326 to 20 Nov 1326, Robert Wyville, queens clerk, was keeper of the privy seal, and it was used instead of the great seal because the keeper of the realm, Edward of Woodstock had no other seal; *HBC*, p. 251.

<sup>154</sup> *CCR 1330-1333*, p. 156: for his appointment to the bishopric of Salisbury.

possessed some authority during his own minority. In 1330, John Akreman petitioned the king and council because he was attacked in Norwich on St. Lawrence's day [10 August] for his acquaintance with Thomas Roscelyn. Roger Mortimer and Queen Isabella commanded that he should be imprisoned at Windsor despite the fact that Edward III had given him protection on 4 February 1330.<sup>155</sup> The petition is endorsed with the king and council's decision that Mortimer and Isabella's command was to be followed. Even though the outcome favoured Isabella, it is clear that she and Mortimer were either not aware that Edward had given John Akreman protection, or they acted in disregard of Edward's grant. Either way, the unity between Edward, and Isabella and Mortimer was dissolving; Edward III was beginning to act in his own right.<sup>156</sup>

The other evidence which contributes to assumptions that Isabella was ruling the kingdom comes from the end of the minority or after November 1330. It is this evidence with which historians are most familiar, and on which they have based their assumptions that Isabella was behind most government acts during the minority. Mortimer's growing power also became a source of discontent during the last half of Edward III's minority.<sup>157</sup> It was Mortimer's ostentatious display of his wealth and his new title of earl of March that upset magnates such as Henry of Lancaster.<sup>158</sup> As his wealth increased, his actions were perceived as a threat to Edward III's kingship.<sup>159</sup> When those members of the nobility, who felt short-changed after Northampton, saw the increase in Mortimer's landed wealth, it augmented their discord. Isabella began to alienate her son by remaining allied with Mortimer after he became unpopular with the nobility, and later the king. More indicative of Isabella's authority over Edward III and the growing rift between them was a letter sent by Edward III to Pope John XXII in 1330.<sup>160</sup> In this secret letter, Edward III stated that any future correspondence originating from the king

---

<sup>155</sup> TNA, SC 8/89/4407.

<sup>156</sup> A similar example exists on the chancery rolls: *CCR 1327-1330*, p. 438.

<sup>157</sup> Ian Mortimer, *The Greatest Traitor: The Life of Sir Roger Mortimer, Ruler of England: 1327-1330* (New York, 2006), pp. 214-215, 215 no. 37; Haines, *King Edward II*, pp. 199-201.

<sup>158</sup> Dryburgh, 'The Career of Roger Mortimer', p. 109; Bothwell, 'Isabella and Mortimer, Edward III, and the Painful Delay of a Royal Majority', p. 82.

<sup>159</sup> Dryburgh, 'The Career of Roger Mortimer', p. 109

<sup>160</sup> G.C. Crump, 'Arrest of Roger Mortimer', *English Historical Review* 26(1911), pp. 331-32; Ormrod, *Edward III*, p. 18; Haines, *King Edward II*, p. 215; Tout, *Chapters*, vol. 3, pp. 29-29.

himself would contain the words *Pater Sancte*. This letter indicates that many of the actions that took place under Edward's name were not driven by Edward's own initiative, but by those in control of the mechanisms of government, rendering it impossible to differentiate between the two parties. It is important to note here that the letter, being written in the utmost secrecy, does not specifically name Isabella, Mortimer, or the council, so it is not clear exactly who had been writing under the king's name, and it could have been all three.<sup>161</sup> However, W.M. Ormrod has recently argued that Edward III may have sent this letter in an effort to promote those who were loyal to him, men such as Richard Bury and William Montague.<sup>162</sup> Thus, the letter reveals the complexities of the political situation: some other person or group was controlling governmental actions and Edward was chaffing under this domination; at the same time, given his attempts to forward the careers of Bury and Montague, Edward III retained some measure of authority and was not simply a puppet for those in real control. It is likely that he had influence in the actions of his minority government, but this only manifests itself when his authority is in opposition to that of his mother's or the council's authority.

Edward III's coup, the charges against Mortimer, and the seizure of Isabella's lands are other events which have added to notions that Isabella and Mortimer directed every aspect of the government of the realm during the minority. These are assumptions based on hindsight. Edward's decision to seize power through a coup indicates that he felt that there was no other way for him to attain his majority and has led to many of these assumptions. After Mortimer's interrogations of the king before the council at Nottingham, it became clear that Isabella and Mortimer were not going to relinquish power easily.<sup>163</sup> Chapter five has already explained Edward's reactions towards Isabella after his coup.<sup>164</sup> He placed all blame on Mortimer, but he did seize Isabella's lands. This may have been both a punishment and an attempt to restore the balance of power, thereby redeeming the crown. Letters from the pope in 1330, urging Edward to display filial loyalty to Isabella indicate that Edward may have been contemplating what his next

---

<sup>161</sup> Crump, 'Arrest of Roger Mortimer', pp. 331-32 for published transcription of the letter.

<sup>162</sup> W.M. Ormrod, 'The King's Secrets: Richard de Bury and the Monarchy of Edward III', in Chris Given-Wilson, Ann Kettle, Len Scales (eds.), *War, Government and Aristocracy in the British Isles, C.1150-1500: Essays in Honour of Michael Prestwich* (Woodbridge, 2008), pp. 166-170.

<sup>163</sup> Ormrod, *Edward III*, p. 10; Caroline Shenton, 'Edward III and the Coup of 1330', pp. 13-34.

<sup>164</sup> See section 5.4.

actions concerning his mother should be.<sup>165</sup> He began to restore her customary dower of £4,000 as early as 1331<sup>166</sup>.

The official documents of the period after the coronation contain few examples of Isabella issuing direct commands in the exercise of authority. However, an examination of the nature of her requests indicates that she probably did have unusual amounts of authority and power. These requests, reported in the customary diplomatic language of the chancery records, show that Isabella acted through the already existing avenues of power and authority available to queens because the fiction that Edward III had more than nominal authority had to be maintained. While the modes in which she enacted her power and authority are important, medieval perceptions of Isabella need to be taken into account. These official documents do give us some idea of the perceptions of some members of the landed elite, such as Henry of Lancaster and Edward III himself, but contemporary perceptions are also reflected in the chronicles.

Many chronicles contain descriptions of Isabella's power over Edward III, and they are often quite scathing. Modern historians use these chronicle descriptions to inform their assumptions that Isabella controlled most areas of government.<sup>167</sup> However, the chronicles that were written close to Edward III's minority hardly comment on Isabella's role after her invasion in 1326.<sup>168</sup> The majority of the chronicles that contain criticisms of Isabella were written several years after Edward III's 1330 coup or well into his reign.<sup>169</sup> Only two chronicles written contemporaneously with Edward III's minority

---

<sup>165</sup> *Calendar of Papal Letters*, p. 498.

<sup>166</sup> *CPR 1330-1334*, pp. 195, 225-26.

<sup>167</sup> See note 74 and 141 above.

<sup>168</sup> *The Bridlington Chronicle* was fairly contemporary with the events it records; *The Polychronicon* was begun in 1327 and continued until the 1360s; Both *The Annales Londoniensis* and *The Annales Paulini* were contemporary to the events they record. The dates for the composition of these chronicles can be found in Gransden, *Historical Writings*, pp. 9, 23-24, 25, 44, 63-64.

<sup>169</sup> *Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum*, pp. 57, 59: Murimuth's chronicle was begun sometime before 1337, but was not writing contemporaneously to events until 1338, Geoffrey le Baker, *Chronicon de Galfredi Le Baker de Swynebroke*, E. M. Thompson (ed.) (London, 1889), pp. 21, 41: Baker's started work on his *Chronicon* after 1341; Grey, *Scalachronica*, pp. 97, 99, 103, 105: probably begun between 1355 and 1359; Stevenson, *Lanercost*, pp. 254-255, 261, 265: composed sometime in Edward III's reign; Brie, *Brut Chronicle*, pp. 241, 248, 254, 256, 257-261, 263-67, 268-272: The Anglo-Norman *Brut* was written c. 1350 and the Middle English translation between 1350 and 1380; George James Aungier (ed.), *Chroniques de London*, Camden Society, Old Series, 28 (London, 1844), pp. 61-62: probably written after 1350 because it was based on the *Brut Chronicle*; Childs, *Anonimale Chronicle 1307-1333*, pp. 135, 141, 142: also written after 1350 because it was based on the *Brut Chronicle*. The dates for the composition of these chronicles

place Isabella in a position of authority: *The Flores Historiarum* and the *Chronique* of Jean le Bel, but neither censures Isabella's actions. The only times Jean le Bel can be interpreted as critiquing Isabella are when he holds her responsible for the death of the earl of Kent and when he claims that she was enclosed in a castle after 1330. Jean le Bel was an eyewitness to these events, and it has been argued that the *Flores* was written at the behest of Mortimer and Isabella.<sup>170</sup> These two chronicles reflect either how Isabella wanted to be portrayed or how eyewitnesses perceived her.

The chronicles written during Edward III's minority may have excluded any censure of Isabella in order to avoid the anger of those in control of the government, or because Isabella's power and authority was welcome and did not transgress the normal avenues of queenly power. It is likely that the later chroniclers, who offer negative and sometimes misogynistic depictions of Isabella, were influenced by the same events which underlie modern historians' assumptions that Isabella was in charge: Lancaster's demands in 1328, the parliament of 1330 and the confiscation of Isabella's lands until 1331. In one such chronicle, Geoffrey le Baker chose Jezebel as an insult for Isabella because it was a common insult for a queen. Although he used gendered language to criticise Isabella's actions against Edward II, he was not explicitly condemning her for stepping out of the bounds of queenship. Other criticisms based on negative masculine stereotypes might just as easily have been used to discredit a magnate whose access to the king upset the rest of the landed elite.<sup>171</sup> Ormrod has argued that Edward III allowed these representations of his mother to proliferate in order to restore balance to the crown.<sup>172</sup> As a result, even if the general notion that Isabella exerted authority over government is accurate, any specific details the later chroniclers give in regards to her actions are nothing more than suppositions which are not supported by the official documents.

---

can be found in Gransden, *Historical Writings*, pp. 12, 30, 37, 72, 93, 115; Lister Mathesons, *The Prose Brut: The Development of a Middle English Chronicle*, (Temple, 1998), pp. 4-5.

<sup>170</sup> Gransden, *Historical Writings*, pp. 18-22, 84-86.

<sup>171</sup> Piers Gaveston and Hugh Despenser, for example. See Ormrod 'The Sexualities of Edward II' pp. 22-47 for the broad definition and usage of sodomy. Chroniclers could turn to the word sodomy to imply any a number of eccentric behaviors.

<sup>172</sup> Ormrod, 'Monarchy, Martyrdom and Masculinity', p. 178.

## 6.4 Conclusion

These examples provide a strong case that queens habitually were involved in the administration of the realm when the king was in some way held to be absent. The practice of appointing the queen as keeper and regent during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries created the expectation that fourteenth-century queens should serve as administrators. Fourteenth-century queens were never officially appointed as officers of the realm, yet they clearly acted in this capacity, signifying that this role was automatically viewed as an aspect of queenship. As André Poulet has found in France, the English queen was never officially invested with regnal authority and so she retained a certain flexibility which may have made her useful. Governing in the king's absence was so much a part of queenship that chronicles automatically placed queens in these positions of command, even when they were not actually performing that function. Though this expectation was never plainly defined, it was clearly regarded as an authoritative function of the queen, and there is evidence that all three queens actively practised it. This conclusion has further implications to concepts of the crown. It demonstrates that the queen was incorporated into the medieval concept of the crown. Just as the chancellor and the heirs were embodiments of the king's personal authority, the queen also functioned as a conduit of the king's command. The queen's role as administrator in the fourteenth century carried the notion that the queen was one of the sources of the crown's authority into the fifteenth century, thereby creating the framework for Margaret of Anjou's bid for regency.

There are many ways in which the events and records of the minority of Edward III can be interpreted. It is possible to conclude that Isabella and/or Mortimer was in control during the entire period; she probably was, but such conclusions are based on hindsight. The sharp increase in the officially recorded acts of intercession between 1327 and 1330 is a certain indication that her influence, if not her authority, increased during this period. This chapter has sought to give an objective analysis of Edward III's minority. It in no way tries to argue that Isabella was never in a position of influence and command, but attempts to point out when this is merely assumed.

Given the significance attached to Isabella during the minority of Edward III, her absence from many of the official documents of the period is a surprisingly loud silence. When she does appear, we see her acting through traditional avenues of queenly power: motherhood, intercession and administration. Isabella did not work through these



avenues because her gender limited her to them. Motherhood, as chapter five has demonstrated, was not viewed as inferior, but instead as a complementary role to the king and integral to the future of the crown. Isabella exploited this role to justify her actions. The nobility accepted it because exploiting motherhood was something that queens did in general, and because it allowed *all* parties to work towards a common goal: the removal of evil councillors and the eventual deposition of Edward II. Isabella also employed her ability to act as an intercessor, but not because she, as a woman, had to mask her authority. As chapter three has shown, both men and women made use of a formal language of intercession during this period. Unfortunately, for the modern historian, such language does mask whether influence or command was communicated in her letters, but medieval contemporaries probably understood the writer's intent. It was also expected that Isabella would work alongside her son and the council as an administrator. The above study of Margaret, Isabella and Philippa demonstrates that queens often performed this function. It was so much a part of queenship that it never had to be officially articulated and other administrators working together with the queen never questioned her authority to do so.

The actions of the nobility suggest that, in reality, the condemnations of Isabella's actions were not a result of her gender. It is true that some of the criticisms of Isabella made use of misogynistic language. However, it is typical for medieval writers and propagandists to seize upon certain stereotypes when expressing disapproval.<sup>173</sup> Negative stereotypes of men equally were used by medieval writers to discredit male members of the nobility who were considered to be too close to the king. Prior to July 1328, the nobility accepted Isabella's position of authority and influence because it served their own interests; for example, even if Isabella's enlarged dower assignments were granted at her own instigation, the nobility was happy to reward her 'for her services in the matter of the treaty with France and in suppressing the rebellion of the Despencers and others'.<sup>174</sup> When certain members of the nobility felt that they had been neglected after the treaty of Northampton in spring of 1328, Mortimer's growing wealth

---

<sup>173</sup> See Janet L. Nelson, 'Queens as Jezebels: The Careers of Brunhild and Balthild in Merovingian History', in Derek Baker (ed.), *Medieval Women, Dedicated and presented to Professor Rosalind M.T. Hill on the occasion of her seventieth birthday* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 31-77; Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, pp. 177-78: Maurer explains how allegations of adultery and sexual transgression were linked to charges of disorder within the realm and marked Margaret of Anjou as a woman out of place.

<sup>174</sup> *CCR 1327-1330*, pp. 57-58.

and Isabella's earlier rewards compounded their feelings of disregard. Edward III also became disenchanted. This did not happen because Isabella was subverting gender norms—if that *was* what she was doing— as such a *volte face* on the part of the nobility could have happened to any male regent in such a politically charged and factious environment.

It was unusual for queens to possess as much power and authority as Isabella did during the minority of Edward III. Still, she is not necessarily an exception. Circumstance and inclination provided unique opportunities for Isabella to manipulate the already existing queenly prerogatives of intercession, estate management, motherhood and government administration to new heights. The traditions of *custos*, regent and administrator in both England and France contributed to Isabella's proclivity to push the boundaries of the already existing roles of queens. She would almost certainly have internalized the Capetian practice of automatically viewing queens as potential regents and applied it to the English expectations for the queen to support the king as an administrator. It is impossible to know if Margaret or Philippa would have acted in such a way because they did not operate under the same conditions as Isabella. Isabella is exceptional only in that she demonstrates the extremes of acceptable queenly power and authority.

## Chapter 7 Conclusions

Philippa of Hainault died at Windsor sometime before 14 August 1369.<sup>1</sup> In January 1370 a commission was issued from the chancery

To compel all men of [London] to have the streets cleansed of all dung and other filth and the pavement repaired, and to bring gravel and sand for the repair of the streets, and to imprison all those whom they find contrariant or rebellious in this in preparation for the coming of a great number of prelates, earls, barons and magnates of England to London with the body of Philippa, late queen of England.<sup>2</sup>

Edward III intended to bury his consort with all the honour suitable for a member of the royal family. Philippa was interred later that month in Westminster Abbey following the observance of her wedding anniversary.<sup>3</sup> The death of Philippa marked the end a seventy-year period in which the practice of queenship was continuous. There would not be another queen for thirteen years, and in that time it seems as if the practice of queenship began to change.<sup>4</sup>

But what did it mean to be a queen in the fourteenth century? This study has shown that the queen held a place all her own, which was determined by her gender, her status and her role in the royal family. Gender and status were inextricably linked because her gender made her a wife and mother to kings, and these roles dictated her place within medieval society. Consequently, her place in the social structure was dictated by the biological aspects of gender. Gender enabled all women to become mothers because the biology of pregnancy and birth, and the symbolic power gained from those characteristics belonged only to women. Nevertheless, the agency employed in transforming ascribed power to achieved power was not necessarily gendered. Kings

---

<sup>1</sup> Juliet Vale, 'Philippa (1310x15?-1369)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22110>, accessed 23 Feb 2009].

<sup>2</sup> *CPR 1367-1370*, p. 340-41.

<sup>3</sup> Juliet Vale, 'Philippa (1310x15?-1369)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22110>, accessed 23 Feb 2009].

<sup>4</sup> Joanna Laynesmith argues that by the mid-fifteenth century, the queen only occasionally acted as an intercessor and that there is little significant evidence for cultural patronage: Joanna Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 263-264.

utilized their children in dynastic manoeuvrings in the same way that queens could use their children to spread their influence, secure their authority, or even govern in the absence of the king. Likewise, the ideological emphasis on intercession and influence was also a consequence of gender roles. Both men and women acted as intercessors, but it was a duty especially emphasized for women. Since queens did not consistently hold appointed positions within government—they did not *always* act as an administrator for the king—intercession was one way queens could have a significant impact on political activity. She could use intercession as a source of indirect patronage when she wanted to secure a grant which was outside her authority on her estates. Since noble women did not always hold their land in jointure, they also interceded in this way with their husbands.

However, this is where the queen's similarity to other women of her rank ends. The independence associated with her status was different from that of noble women—her closest female equivalents. She received her lands through her marriage and she held those lands in the same way as a male lord who held a life grant from the king. Holding land in the same way as a male head of household meant that the king could not interfere with the queen's landholdings to any greater extent than he did other nobleman who held land from him. It was the queen's status as an independent landlord that allowed her to execute her authority over the administration of her household and estates. As a lord, the queen extended her patronage through appointments on her estates and in her household. Other married women of the landed elite were not able to exercise this level of direct authority over their estates because they held them jointly with their husbands. It is tempting to assume that jointure gave women equal authority on these estates, but this was not the case. Holding land in jointure with one's husband did not automatically designate the wife as an equal partner in administering land. The common law prevented married women from controlling real and moveable property or any income from these lands during their marriages. Noble women only managed estates in their husband's absence, or as widows.

However, being the king's wife meant that the queen enjoyed privileges that even the earls did not. She had access to the king and crown which she could manipulate to increase her influence and authority. When she could not use her land as a source of patronage she could extend her patronage through intercession with the crown. All members of the upper echelons of medieval society acted as intercessors; it was part of

being a good lord. Nevertheless, because her husband was the king, intercession gave the queen access to the most important sources of patronage in the realm. She had the full backing of the crown's apparatus behind her, making her one of the most formidable magnates. When Philippa came into financial difficulties she could call upon the king's resources to relieve her of her debts. When there were complaints against Isabella's ministers, they had to be brought before the king's council instead of the common law courts. Her status as the king's wife also put her in standing to hold positions in the royal government. The queen had to be expressly appointed to some positions, such as keeper of the great seal. On the other hand, other positions, such as keeper or administrator of the realm, were inherent to the office of queenship and did not require articulation. In these terms, her gender and her status were not limiting. They allowed her the potential to be the most privileged woman and one of the most advantaged among the male landed elite. The only other male members of elite society who might have had similar prerogatives were the other members of the royal family.

The powers and authority that went along with the queen's status made her inseparable from the institution of the crown. As a mother she was not viewed as inferior, but complementary to the king and integral to the future of the crown. The king was the head of the crown and the queen was vital in ensuring that the crown continued. The queen was also integral to the domestic establishment of the crown: the household. Since political decisions often happened in the household, she was an essential part of government as well. In addition, she also utilized the king's exchequer, and at times she presided over his council. In her administrative role, she was part of the support structure of the crown. Queenship was an administrative office in a similar way as that of chancellor, treasurer or keeper of the privy seal. It is true that the queen also had her own household and administrative machinery. Consequently, her tenants recognized her as their lord, but at other times they recognized her as part of the crown, swearing fealty to both the king and the queen. The physical manifestation of her individual authority on her estates, her seals, became more than just a landholder's seal in certain situations. They could also become part of the crown's machinery for expressing its direct commands. When this occurred, the officers of the chancery did not differentiate the queen's seals from those of the king, indicating that they were ultimately part of the same institution.

The queen's gender and status simultaneously shaped certain expectations for the queen and specific arenas in which she could act, but these were much more like guiding principles rather than hard and fast rules that always applied. The inclinations of the king and queen and the circumstances in which the queen might find herself dictated the agency she was able to wield in her various roles. Margaret, Isabella and Philippa differed in the amount of agency they exerted because they found themselves in very different circumstances. Sometimes external factors created these circumstances, and sometimes it was the tendency of the king or the queen to act that shaped the state of affairs. Domestic instability allowed Isabella a place in the political movements between Edward II and his barons, while machinations between France and England created a situation where she, as an English queen and a French princess, was the most influential negotiator. Edward II grasped the extent of the symbolic power Isabella accrued through her interventions between himself and the nobility. For example, he exploited the disrespect Bartholomew Badlesmere showed towards Isabella during the Leeds castle incident to rally his supporters and justify his actions against Badlesmere and eventually Thomas of Lancaster. The circumstances of Edward III's minority might have predisposed him against allowing significant amounts of intercession from Isabella or Philippa because he was not as inclined to hear petitions sent through the queen after 1330 as other kings before him had been. Alternatively, the political circumstances during Edward I's reign did not affect Margaret's ability to exercise influence. Edward I saw the benefits in allowing his queens' domestic and political manoeuvrings.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, because of the treaty with France, which their marriage ratified, Edward did not need to use Margaret's natal ties. He was preoccupied with Scotland during their marriage, a place where Margaret did not have any familial influence. Consequently, she did not hold any roles in international diplomacy.

---

<sup>5</sup> Eleanor of Castile was accused of causing Edward I to rule harshly perhaps as a result of her failure to conform to positions of humility and subservience when interceding. John Carmi Parsons argues that Edward I may have manipulated this fine line between acceptable power and excessive power. According to Parsons it is possible that Edward assigned the Jewish debts to Eleanor so that he could augment his own demesne without incurring criticism himself. Parsons has also found that Edward financially contributed to Eleanor's land purchases (she did not have dower lands during her lifetime). The result was that the lands Eleanor bought were administered as a single unit and were used to dower Edward's second wife during her own lifetime. This meant that the rest of the royal demesne was not touched to dower the subsequent queens. Edward clearly saw the benefit of allowing queens to act in their own right: John Carmi Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile: Queen and Society in Thirteenth-Century England* (New York, 1998), pp. 123, 152-153.

Circumstance and inclination also affected the queen's agency in motherhood. All three queens successfully gave birth to male heirs, but their ability to further the power they received from simply becoming mothers varied. Margaret was in constant contact with her own children and was a friend and champion of her stepson, but as they grew, she failed to cultivate that relationship further. There may have been several reasons for this. Perhaps the political instability which allowed Isabella to act, caused Margaret to be pushed aside. Conceivably, with the new queen, Piers Gaveston and Thomas of Lancaster, there were already too many people vying for influence with Edward II. It is also entirely possible that Margaret never intended to remain visible at court in her widowhood. She may have actively chosen to retire quietly onto her dower lands. The upheaval of 1326 to 1330 provided the circumstances for Isabella to use motherhood to attain and stabilize real authority. Philippa did not have such opportunities and so her use of motherhood was much more subtle. Edward III saw the advantage of Philippa's symbolic power and it was he who manipulated her natal ties in the Low Countries to gain support for the Hundred Years War.

The unique circumstances during Edward III's minority help to illustrate the extent to which the queen was integral to the crown. It may be that Isabella's intercessions with the barons and Edward II, and her involvement at Leeds castle had been an attempt on her part to defend the dignity of the crown, from which her power came. When she finally rebelled against the king, her justification was the protection of the king and crown from evil councillors. However, when the queen—an important part of the crown—was seen to rebel against the king, it might also have signalled to contemporaries that the crown was fractured and damaged as a result of the king's political incompetence. This may have partly accounted for Isabella's success in 1326. Her exploitation of the queen's administrative and dynastic contributions to the crown made her the most obvious person to serve as a councillor to the king during his minority. After 1330, her connection to the crown meant that Edward III was obligated to reinstate his mother if he wanted to restore prestige to the crown. This study has shown that the queen was shaped by her gender and her status, but the level to which these two factors dictated the amount of power and authority she could exercise depended on the queen's circumstances and the inclinations of the parties involved. Whether the queen had a vast quantity of agency or whether she rested on the laurels of her symbolic power, she was absolutely fundamental to the crown.

### Methodology

When constructing king's itineraries, one method used by historians and antiquarians is to trace the movements of the privy seal.<sup>1</sup> However, this cannot be done for queens because few administrative records of the movements of her seals exist, and historians are, as of yet, unsure how her writing offices operated. As a result, I have relied mainly on household accounts coupled with what does survive in the form of written correspondence.

I have used the household accounts of Edward I, Edward II and Edward III, and Margaret, Isabella and Philippa. The household rolls are the most useful documents for constructing the itineraries.<sup>2</sup> The queen's household rolls record the movements of her household in their margins. Likewise, the margins of the king's household rolls record his household's movements, and sometimes include notations marking when and where the queen joined his household. The queen's domestic accounts also record the movements of various offices of her household; the chamber, for example. The queen's household and wardrobe books also contain itemized entries of messengers sent to and from the queen, which sometimes give the date and the location of the queen. In the case of expenses of the carriage of the household and the wages of messengers, the dates recorded are those on which payment was rendered. The date of payment did not necessarily coincide with the actual date of the movement of the household or the delivery of the message. This discrepancy means that unless both dates were recorded, the entry on the account cannot be used to place the queen. As a result, I have only used entries for the carriage of the household and messengers that clearly record the date of the event.

In addition to records of messengers, I have used the place dates contained in the dating clauses of surviving letters sent by the queens. I have assumed that the queen can be located in these given places. The copies of chancery instruments recorded on the chancery rolls also occasionally give us

---

<sup>1</sup> Elizabeth M. Hallam, *The Itinerary of Edward II and His Household, 1307-1328* in List and Index Society, 211 (London, 1984); Caroline Shenton, *The Itinerary of Edward III and his Household, 1327-1345*, List and Index Society 318 (2007).

<sup>2</sup> David Crook, 'The Last Days of Eleanor of Castile: The Death of a Queen in Nottinghamshire, November 1290', *Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire*, 94 (1990), p. 17.



the specific whereabouts of the queens, and these have also been utilized. Chronicles were not used in the compilation of these itineraries because they cannot always be taken at face value due to the personal agendas of their writers, a problem which was outlined in chapter two. This is not to say that every chronicle is unreliable, but because it is difficult to discern which are and which are not, I have only used them in support of what I have found in the household accounts. These household accounts and extant letters allow the location of the queen to be determined, or at least the location of her household and the offices associated with it. It is not unreasonable to conclude that the queen was also in the same space or very close to that of her household.

**Appendix I**  
**Margaret's Itinerary**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Location of the queen</b>	<b>Location of the king</b>
<b>1299</b>		
11 October 1299	Tower of London (1)	Tower of London (2)
13 October 1299	Westminster (1)	Westminster
3 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	St Albans
4 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	St Albans
5 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	Lavendon
6 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	Thrapston
7 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	Easton
8 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	Grantham
9 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	Grantham
10 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	Grantham
11 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	Grantham
12 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	Tickhill
13 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	Tickhill
14 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	Sherburn
15 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	York
16 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	York
17 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	York

**Appendix I**  
**Margaret's Itinerary**

18 November 1299	Kings Langley (3)	York
o		
<b>1300</b>		
21 April 1300	Northampton (4)	Northampton
22 April 1300	Northampton (4)	Northampton
24 April 1300	Geddington, Rockingham (4)	Geddington, Rockingham
25 April 1300	Rockingham (4)	Rockingham
26 April 1300	Rockingham (4)	Rockingham
27 April 1300	Rockingham (4)	Rockingham
29 April 1300	Wakerly, Stamford (4)	Wakerly, Stamford
30 April 1300	Stamford (4)	Stamford
1 May 1300	Stamford (4)	Stamford
2 May 1300	Stamford (4)	Stamford
3 May 1300	Stamford (4)	Stamford
4 May 1300	Stamford (4)	Stamford
12 May 1300-23 May 1300	Clipstone (5)	Thetford, Hilborough, Hilborough, Roughton, Walsingham, Lynn, Gaywood Lynn, Tilney, Tilney, Wisbech, Wisbech, Wisbech, Spalding, Boston, Barlings, Boston, Bardney, Lincoln.
24 May 1300	Welbeck (5)	Lincoln
26 May 1300	Tickhill (5)	Hessle
27 May 1300	Doncaster (5)	Kingson-upon-Hull, Cottingham

**Appendix I**  
**Margaret's Itinerary**

28 May 1300	Hampole (5)	Beverley
30 May 1300	Wentbridge (5)	Beverley
31 May 1300- 9 September 1300	Brotherton (The birth of Thomas of Brotherton) (5)	Brotherton 1, 9, 10,11, 12 June
9 September 1300	York (5)	Holme Cultram
10 September 1300	Pontefract (5)	Holme Cultram
11 September 1300	Leming (5)	Holme Cultram
12 September 1300	Richmond (5)	Holme Cultram
13 September 1300	Barnard Castle (5)	Holme Cultram
16 September 1300	Penrith (5)	Holme Cultram, Wigton, Rose
18 September 1300	Rose (6)	Rose, Ravenhead
19 September 1300	Rose (4)	Rose
23 September 1300	Rose (4)	Rose
25 September 1300	Rose (4)	Rose
26 September 1300	Rose (4)	Rose
27 September 1300	Rose (4)	Rose
28 September 1300	Holm Cultram (4)	Holm Cultram
1 October 1300	Holm Cultram (4)	Holm Cultram
2 October 1300	Holm Cultram (4)	Holm Cultram
4 October 1300	Holm Cultram (4)	Holm Cultram
17 October 1300	Annan (4)	Annan

**Appendix I**  
**Margaret's Itinerary**

18 October 1300	Annan, Blackshaws (4)	Annan, Blackshaws
4 November 1300	Carlisle (4)	Carlisle
5 November 1300	Carlisle (4)	Carlisle
6 November 1300	Carlisle (7)	Carlisle
18 September 1300- November 20 1300	Rose, Holm Cultram and Carlisle (8)	Rose, Holm Cultram, Wigton, Carlisle, Burgh- on-Sands , Annan Blackshaws, Dumfries, Caerlaverock, Carlisle, Rose, Carlisle, Rose, Appleby Brough-under- Stainmore, Bowes and Hartforth.

**1301**

22 April 1301	Kempsey (4)	Kempsey
23 April 1301	Cradley (4)	Cradley
24 April 1301	Cradley (4)	Cradley
25 April 1301	Cradley, Hereford (4)	Cradley, Hereford
26 April 1301	Hereford, Lugwardine (4)	Hereford, Lugwardine
28 April 1301	Cradley (4)	Cradley
1 May 1301	Kempsey (4)	Kempsey
2 May 1301	Kempsey (4)	Kempsey
3 June 1301	Bishop's Ichington (9)	Nuneaton, Whitwick
4 June 1301	Molington (9)	Whitwick, Plumtree
4 June 1301	Banbury (9)	Newark
6 June 1301	Deddington (9)	Newark, Torksey

**Appendix I**  
**Margaret's Itinerary**

7 June 1301	Rousham (9)	Torksey, Butterwick
8 June 1301	Woodstock (9)	Butterwick
16 June 1301	Witney (9)	Lazenby
17 June 1301	Bampton (9)	Darlington, Merrington
19 June 1301	Witney (9)	Durham
20 June 1301- 1 October 1301	Woodstock (Birth of Edmund, later earl of Kent) (10)	King not at Woodstock during this time
2 October 1301	Witney (11)	Dunipace, Stirling
3 October 1301	Lechlade (11)	Dunipace, Stirling
4 October 1301	Swindon (11)	Dunipace, Stirling
5 October 1301	Ogbourne (11)	Dunipace, Stirling
6 October 1301	Marlborough (11)	Dunipace, Stirling
7 October 1301	Avebury (11)	Dunipace, Stirling
8 October 1301	Devizes (11)	Dunipace, Stirling
11 October 1301	Stanley (11)	Dunipace
12 October 1301	Malmesbury (11)	Dunipace
13 October 1301	Cirencester (11)	Dunipace
14 October 1301	Brimpsfield (11)	Dunipace
15 October 1301	Gloucester (12)	Dunipace
16 October 1301	Newent (12)	Dunipace
17 October 1301	Martley (12)	Dunipace

**Appendix I**  
**Margaret's Itinerary**

18 October 1301	Hereford (12)	Dunipace
20 October 1301	Malvern (12)	Dunipace,
21 October 1301	'Coherne' (12)	Emanuel Priory
22 October 1301	Poweick(12)	Emanuel Priory
25 October 1301	Worcester (12)	Linlithgow
26 October 1301	Wychbold(Wych') (12)	Linlithgow, Dunipace
27 October 1301	Bromesgrove (12)	Linlithgow, Dunipace
28 October 1301	Birmingham (12)	Linlithgow
29 October 1301	Lichfield (12)	Dunipace
30 October 1301	Burton upon Trent (12)	Dunpace, Linlithgow
3 November 1301	Berle (12)	Linlithgow
4 November 1301	'Gallon' (12)	Linlithgow
5 November 1301	'Lenton' (12)	Linlithgow
6 November 1301	Newstead(12)	Linlithgow
7 November 1301	Retford (12)	Linlithgow
8 November 1301	Worksop (12)	Linlithgow
9 November 1301	Blyth (12)	Linlithgow
10 November 1301	Doncaster (12)	Linlithgow
12 November 1301	Brotherton (12)	Linlithgow
15 November 1301	Sherburn in Elmet (12)	Linlithgow
16 November 1301	Thorpe (12)	Linlithgow, Dunipace
17 November 1301	York (12)	Linlithgow

**Appendix I**  
**Margaret's Itinerary**

18 November 1301	Overton (12)	Linlithgow
<b>1302</b>		
? <sup>1</sup>	France	
18 March 1302	Butterwick (13)	Gainsborough
4 April 1302	Devizes (14)	Bury St. Edmund's, New Market
<b>1303</b>		
<b>1304</b>		
16 March 1304	St Andrews (15)	St. Andrews
16 September 1304	Tynemouth (16)	Tynemouth
10 October 1304	Tynemouth (17)	Kirckham, Bainton
<b>1305</b>		
12 February 1305	Kings Langley (18)	Bury St. Edmund's
21 February 1305	Windsor(19)	Lamberhurst
29 June 1305	'Corneslee' (20)	Ware, Wadsmill
<b>1306</b>		
7 March 1306	Winchester (21)	Itchen Stoke, Winchester
11 March 1306	Hyde (22)	Winchester, Hyde

---

<sup>1</sup> TNA, E 101/361/27 mem. 1 is a list of necessaries for Margaret's trip to parts of France, but it does not contain any dates.



**Appendix I**  
**Margaret's Itinerary**

7 April 1306	Wolvesey (23)	Winchester and Wolvesey
11 April 1306]	Wolvesey (24)	Wolvesey
17 April 1306	Wolvesey (25)	Winchester
5 May 1306	Winchester (32)	Winchester
29 August 1306	Newburgh (26)	
<b>1307</b>		
17 August 1307	Senewhare (27)	
29 September 1307	Lenton (27)	
5 December 1307	Canterbury (28)	
<b>1308</b>		
<b>1309</b>		
<b>1310</b>		
<b>1311</b>		
<b>1312</b>		
<b>1313</b>		
12 June 1313	Bisham (29)	Pontoise
<b>1314</b>		
29 April 1314	Risborough (30)	Kingston-upon-Hull, Beverley
<b>1315</b>		
<b>1316</b>		
<b>1317</b>		

**Appendix I**  
**Margaret's Itinerary**

15 June 1317

Christchurch (31)

Westminster

**Notes**

- (1) TNA, E 101/356/6.
- (2) All place-dates for Edward I and Edward II were taken from Joseph Stevenson, *The Itinerary of Edward I*, Public Record Office: Record Commission Transcripts, Series II (London, 1836) and Elizabeth M Hallam. 'The Itinerary of Edward II and His Household, 1307-1328, in List and Index Society, 211 (London, 1984).
- (3) TNA, E 101/355/29; E101/355/30.
- (4) TNA, E 101/357/29.
- (5) TNA, E 101/358/16.
- (6) TNA, E 101/357/25 m4; TNA, E 101/357/5 mem. 2; TNA, E 101357/29; TNA, E 101/357/30 mem. 1.
- (7) TNA, E 101/357/19 mem. 1; TNA, E 101/357/25 mem. 5; TNA, E101/357/29.
- (8) TNA, E 101/357/30 mem. 1.
- (9) TNA, E 101/359/7 mem. 1.
- (10) TNA, E 101/359/7 mems. 1-3; TNA, SC 1/19/112a.
- (11) TNA, E 101/359/7 mem. 3.
- (12) TNA, E 101/359/7 mem. 4.
- (13) TNA, SC 1/27/96.
- (14) TNA, SC 1/27/97.
- (15) TNA, SC 1/60/123.
- (16) TNA, SC 1/28/86.
- (17) TNA, SC 1/28/87.
- (18) TNA, E 101/368/4 mem. 2.
- (19) TNA, SC 1/25/198.
- (20) TNA, SC 1/25/203.

**Appendix I**  
**Margaret's Itinerary**

- (21) TNA, SC 1 25/199.
- (22) TNA, SC 1/25/200.
- (23) TNA, SC 1/25/201.
- (24) TNA, SC 1/28/27.
- (25) TNA, SC 1/25/202.
- (26) TNA, SC 1/25/204.
- (27) TNA, E 101/373/5.
- (28) TNA, SC 1/35/70.
- (29) TNA, E 101/375/3 mem. 4.
- (30) TNA, SC 1/35/131.
- (31) TNA, SC 1/35/164.
- (32) DNB: Margaret of France.

**Appendix I  
Isabella's Itinerary**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Place</b>	<b>Location of the King</b>
<b>1308</b>		
February 1308	Dover (1)	Dover (2)
25 February 1308	Westminster (3)	Westminster
9 April 1308	Windsor (3)	Windsor
24 May 1308	Kingston. The queen departs for Langley. (3)	Kingston. The king departs for Windsor
<b>1309</b>		
18-19 March 1309	Stony Stratford (4)	Langley
<b>1310</b>		
<b>1311</b>		
3 February 1311	Berwick (5)	Berwick upon Tweed
17 February 1311	Berwick (6)	Berwick upon Tweed
26 February 1311	Berwick (7)	Berwick upon Tweed
July 1311	Newcastle (7)	Berwick
August 1311	Leicester (7)	Leicester on the 9th
24 August 1311	London (7)	London
5 October 1311	London (7)	London
28 October 1311	Eltham (7)	Windsor
November 1311	London (7)	Westminster

**Appendix I**  
**Isabella's Itinerary**

December 1311	Westminster (7)	Westminster
24 December 1311	Westminster (7)	Westminster
<b>1312</b>		
24 January 1312	Windsor (7)	York
February 1312	Windsor (7)	York
7 February 1312	Newport Pagnell (7)	York
8 February 1312	Northampton (7)	York
February 1312	Rufford (7)	York
21 February 1312	Thorpe (7)	York
24 February 1312	Thorpe-York (7)	York
27 February 1312	York (7)	York. The king leaves around 28th for seven days
8 March 1312	York (7)	York
April 1312	York (7)	York and Newcastle
14 April 1312	York (7)	Newcastle
18 April 1312	Thirsk (7)	Newcastle
22 April 1312	Newcastle (7)	Newcastle
26 April 1312	Tynemouth (7)	Newcastle
16 May 1312	York (7)	Tynemouth
8 June 1312	York (7)	York
10 June 1312	Howden (7)	Howden

**Appendix I  
Isabella's Itinerary**

3 July 1312	York (7)	Bullington
12 November 1312	Windsor (Birth of Edward III) (7)	Sheen
17 December 1312	Windsor (7)	Isleworth
<b>1313</b>		
4 February 1313	Eltham (8)	The king is at Sheen and his household is at Westminster
1 March 1313	Windsor (8)	Windsor
23 May 1313 -16 July 1313	France (8) (9)	France
25 December 1313	London (10)	London
<b>1314</b>		
3 January 1314	Eltham	Windsor
21 January 1314-27 April 1314	France (9)	January-March South of England April North of England
27 June-July 19 1314	Berwick, Hartlepool and York (11)	Berwick (June 19- July 12) Hartlepool, York
August 1314	York (12)	York until the 23 August
3 December 1314	Berkhampsted (13)	Leighton Buzzard but is at Berkhampsted on 4 December
7-21 December 1314	Reading (13)	King's Langley
21 December 1314-27 January 1315	Windsor (13)	Windsor, 2 January; Langley, 20 Jan; Westminster

**Appendix I**  
**Isabella's Itinerary**

**1315**

27-31 January 1315	Westminster (13)	Westminster
5 February 1315	Westminster (13)	Westminster
22 February 1315	With the household of Bishop of Chester and Margaret of France	Westminster
23 February 1315	Westminster (14)	Westminster
25 February 1315	Westminster (14)	Westminster
26-27 February 1315	London (13)	Westminster & Sheen
1 March 1315	Westminster (13)	Westminster
22 March 1315	Windsor (13)	Windsor
26 March 1315	Windsor (13)	Windsor
29 March 1315	Windsor (13)	Windsor
3 April 1315	Windsor (13)	Windsor
7 April 1315	Windsor (13)	Windsor
12 April 1315	Chertsey (13)	Sheen
19, 20, 25, 27, April 1315	Westminster (13) (14)	Westminster
2 May 1315	Westminster (14)	Westminster
8,9, 10, 12, 22, 24, 25, May 1315	Eltham (13)	Thundersley
27, 30 May 1315	Westminster (13)	Westminster

**Appendix I**  
**Isabella's Itinerary**

28 May 1315	London (13)	Westminster
2-3 June 1315	Westminster (13)	Thundersley
5-6 June 1315	Eltham (13)	Thundersley
9 June 1315	Ross (13)	Thundersley
10 June 1315	Faversham (13)	Canterbury
11 June 1315	Newenton (13)	Canterbury
14 June 1315	Winchelsea (14) (20)	Winchelsea or Hastings
16 June 1315	Winchelsea (13)	Saltwood
20 June 1315	Canterbury (13)	Sandwich or Canterbury
21 June 1315	Ross (13)	Faversham
24 June 1315	Winchelsea (13)	Thundersley
28 June 1315	Eltham (13)	Thundersley
29 June 1315	Westminster (13)	Westminster
7-12 July 1315	Westminster (13)	King's Langley on the 12th
before 16 July 1315	London (16)	King's Langley
15 July 1315	London-Eltham (16)	King's Langley
21 July- 5 August	Eltham (16)	King's Langley
9 August 1315	St Albans (16)	King's Langley, but at St. Albans on the 12th
16 August 1315	Newport Pagnell (16)	Newport Pagnell
23 August 1315	Rockingham (16)	Grantham



**Appendix I**  
**Isabella's Itinerary**

23 August 1315	Overton (16)	Grantham, but at Overton the day before
25 August 1315	Somerton (16)	Overton
27 August 1315	Lincoln (16)	Overton
29 August 1315	Sleaford (16)	Lincoln
9 September 1315	Rourn (16)	Pinchbeck
11 September 1315	Stamford (16)	Spalding
12 September 1315	Rockingham (17)	Nonemanneslonde'
13 September 1315	Rockingham (16)	Nonemanneslonde'
21 September 1315	Rockingham (16)	Fen Ditton
24 September 1315	Huntingdon (16)	Fen Ditton
25 September 1315	Barnwell (16)	Fen Ditton
28 September 1315	Newmarket (16)	Fen Ditton
2 October 1315	Bury St. Edmunds (16)	King's Lynn
4 October 1315	Colkirk (16)	King's Lynn
5 October 1315	Walsingham (16) (17)	King's Lynn
6 October 1315	Harpley (16) (17)	Harpley
7 October 1315	Walsingham (16) (17)	Harpley
9 October 1315	Bury St. Edmunds (16)	King's Lynn
10 October 1315	Newmarket (16)	Downham
12 October 1315	Barnwell (16)	New Market

**Appendix I  
Isabella's Itinerary**

17 October 1315	Huntingdon (16)	Barnwell
22 October 1315	Stamford (16)	Chesterton
26 October 1315	Nottingham (16)	Nottingham
27 October 1315	Nottingham (16)	Nottingham
28 October 1315	Newstead (16)	Newstead
30 October 1315	Clipston (16) (19)	Newstead (30-31 October ) Clipston until 27 November

**1316**

13 January 1316	Windsor (20)	Clipston
30 January 1316	Lincoln (16)	Lincoln
16 August 1316	Eltham (Birth of John of Eltham) (58)	York

**1317**

**1318**

July 1318	Woodstock (Birth of Eleanor) (58)	1- 21 July Northampton 22-27 July Woodstock
-----------	--------------------------------------	--

**1319**

1 March 1319	York (20)	York
--------------	-----------	------

**1320**

4 February 1320	York (20)	Clipston
19 June- 22 July 1320	France (9)	France

**Appendix I**  
**Isabella's Itinerary**

19 August 1320	Windsor (22)	Windsor
5 September 1320	Clarendon (23)	Clarendon
18 September 1320	Banstead (24)	Crofe (privy seal), Bindon (Wardrobe)
 <b>1321</b>		
5 July 1321	The Tower of London (58)	Westminster
 <b>1322</b>		
 <b>1323</b>		
3 February 1323	London (25)	London
17 February 1323	Tower of London (26)	Pontefract
 <b>1324</b>		
27 February 1324.	Westminster (27)	Westminster
 <b>1325</b>		
23 February 1325	Tower of London (28)	Tower of London
9 March 1325	Whitsand (29) (30)	Tower of London
10 March 1325	Calais (29) (30)	Tower of London
11 March 1325	Boulonge (29) (30)	Tower of London
12 March 1325	Montreuil (29) (30)	Tower of London
15 March 1325	Crécy (29) (30)	Tower of London
16 March 1325	Rheims (29) (30)	Burgoyne (chamber) Tower of London (Wardrobe)

**Appendix I**  
**Isabella's Itinerary**

17 March 1325	Poix (29) (30)	Burgoyn (chamber) Tower of London (Wardrobe)
18 March 1325	Beauvais (29) (30)	Westminster
19 March 1325	Ybovillers (29) (30)	Sheen
20 March 1325	Pontoise (29) (30)	Sheen, Walton
21 March 1325	Poissy (29) (30)	Henley
1 -16 April 1325	Paris (29) (30)	1- 3 April Marwell, Stoneham, Eling 4-16 Beaulieu
3 April 1325	Bois de Vincentz (29) (30)	Stoneham, Eling
17 April 1325	St. Denis (29) (30)	Beaulieu
18 April 1325	Poissy (29) (30)	Beaulieu
19 April 1325	St. Hillaire (29) (30)	Beaulieu
20-25 April 1325	Poissy (29) (30)	Beaulieu
26 April 1325	Mantes (29) (30)	Beaulieu
27 April 1325	St. Germain (29) (30)	Beaulieu
28 April 1325	Bois de Vincennes (29) (30)	Southampton, Winchester
25 May 1325	Corbeil (29) (30)	Chertsey
26 May 1325	Fontainebleau (29) (30)	Chertsey
26 May 1325	Corbeil (29) (30)	Chertsey
27-28 May 1325	Bois de Vincennes (29) (30)	Chertsey
30 May 1325	Paris (29) (30)	Chertsey
1-15 June 1325	Bois de Vincennes (29) (30)	1-10 June Bisham 10-12 June Kempton

**Appendix I**  
**Isabella's Itinerary**

		Westminster, Brugoyne 14-15 Eltham
19 June 1325	Friars Mendicants or Paris (29) (30)	Eltham
26 June 1325	Minoreesses at St. Marcellus (29) (30)	Westminster, Eltham
29 June 1325	Carthusian Friars of Paris (29) (30)	Westminster, Eltham
14 July 1325	Bourg la Reine (29) (30)	Tower of London
15 July 1325	Chastre (29) (30)	Tower of London
16 July 1325	Estemp (29) (30)	Tower of London
19 July 1325	Palace of Castel Neuf sur Loire et Jargaux (29) (30)	Tower of London
21 August 1325	St. Ey (29) (30)	Wingham
22 August 1325	Marchenoir (30)	Wingham
23 August 1325	Bois Jersey (30)	West Langdon
24 August- 5 September 1325	Castel Neuf	West Langdon
1 September 1325	Paris (31)	Langdon
6 September 1326	Coursi (30)	Dover
7 September 1325	Estemp (29) (30) (31)	Dover
8 September 1325	Mont Henry (29) (30) (31)	Dover
9, 12 September 1325	Bois de Vincennes (29) (30) (31)	Dover, Bishopsbourne
September 18 1325	Paris (29) (30) (31)	Bayham
1-14 October 1325	Bois Vincennes (29) (31)	Chiddingley, Maresfield,

**Appendix I**  
**Isabella's Itinerary**

	(32)	East Grinstead, Bletchingley Banstead, Westminster, Sheen
14 October 1325	Poissy (29) (32)	Sheen
15 October 1325	Paris (29) (32)	Sheen
20 October 1325	Paris (29) (31) (32)	Cippenham
22 October 1325	Bourget, Paris (29) (31) (32)	Cippenham
23 October 1325	St. Liz, Paris (29) (31) (32)	Cippenham
24 October 1325	Betysy, Paris (29) (31) (32)	Cippenham
25 October 1325	Paris (31)	Cippenham
26 October 1325	Paris (31)	Cippenham
27 October 1325	Perefontz (29) (31) (32)	Cippenham
28 October 1325	Soissons (29) (31) (32)	Cippenham
30 October 1325	Rheims (29) (31) (32)	Cippenham
2 November 1325	Fismes (29) (31) (32)	Cippenham
3 November 1325	Soissons (29) (31) (32)	Cippenham
4 November 1325	Jansi (29) (31) (32) (33)	Cippenham
5 November 1325	Compeigne (29) (31) (32) (33)	Cippenham
7 November 1325	Pont St. Maixence (29) Pontz (31) (32) (33)	Cippenham
8-10 November 1325	Pontz (33)	Cippenham, Windsor Park
11 November 1325	Louvre (29) (32) (33)	Windsor Park

**Appendix I  
Isabella's Itinerary**

12 November 1325	Paris (33)	Windsor Park
8 December 1325.	Paris (34)	Tower of London
 <b>1326</b>		
21 November 1326.	Hereford (35)	The king was at Monmouth Castle The court and Household were at Hereford
8 December 1326	Woodstock (36)	The king was at Kenilworth The wardrobe was at Woodstock
12 December 1326.	Woodstock (37)	The king was at Kenilworth The wardrobe was at Woodstock
 <b>1327</b>		
30 January 1327	Eltham (38)	Privy seal and wardrobe at Westminster
7 April 1327	Ramsey (39)	Privy seal and wardrobe at Ramsey
Last week of July	York (40)	Weardale Campaign
 <b>1328</b>		
2 February 1328	Knaresborough (41)	Privy seal and wardrobe at Knaresborough
 <b>1329</b>		
15 January 1329	Priory of St Andrew in Northampton (42)	Northampton

**Appendix I**  
**Isabella's Itinerary**

3 February 1329	Windsor (43)	Windsor
17 March 1329	Thame (44)	Privy seal at Islip, wardrobe at Woodstock, both at Thame two days before
25 May 1329	Dover (43)	Dover
14 September 1329	Worcester (45)	Privy seal at Gloucester
<b>1330</b>		
20 February 1330.	Windsor (46)	Privy seal at Windsor
30 May 1330.	Woodstock (47)	Privy seal at Woodstock
26 June 1330	Tewkesbury (48)	Privy seal at Gloucester
29 July 1330	Reading (49)	Privy seal at Northampton
14 October 1330	Nottingham (50)	Privy seal at Nottingham
<b>1331</b>		
<b>1332</b>		
<b>1333</b>		
<b>1336</b>		
25 July 1336	Eltham (51)	Brechin
<b>1337</b>		
<b>1338</b>		
<b>1339</b>		
<b>1340</b>		



**Appendix I**  
**Isabella's Itinerary**

**1341**

**1342**

15 February 1342

Hertford (52)

King's Langley/St. Albans

**1343**

**1344**

**1345**

**1346**

**1347**

**1348**

12 March 1348

Hertford (53)

Hertford (WMO)

**1349**

**1350**

**1351**

**1352**

**1353**

**1354**

**1355**

**1356**

17 October 1356

Hertford (54)

---

**1357**

**Appendix I**  
**Isabella's Itinerary**

19- October 1357-31 December 1357	Rochester (55)	30 November — Bristol (WMO)
21 October 1357	Eltham (55)	
26 October 1357	London (36)	---
 <b>1358</b>		
1 January-15 April 1358	Rochester (55)	14 January — Bristol 5-27 February- Parliament at Westminster (WMO)
16 April 1358	Tottenham (55)	---
17-19 April 1358	London (55)	---
20 April 1358	Sheen (55)	---
21 April 1358	The queen was at Chertsey, the household is at Upton (55)	---
29 April 1358	Sheen (55)	---
30 April-9 May 1358	London (55)	---
10 May -4 June 1358	Hereford (55)	---
5-6 June 1358	London (55)	---
7 June 1358	Dorchester (55)	---
8 June 1358	Rochester (55)	---
9 June 1358	Ospringe	---
10 -11 June 1358	Canterbury (55)	---

**Appendix I**  
**Isabella's Itinerary**

12 June- 4 July 1358	Leeds (55)	---
5 July 1358	Tottenham (55)	---
6 July -22 August 1358	Hertford (55)	12 July — Hertford to visit Isabella (57).

(1) *Foedera* ii II.

(2) All locations of the king taken from Elizabeth M. Hallam, *The Itinerary of Edward II and His Household, 1307-1328*, List and Index Society, 211 (London, 1984); Caroline Shenton, *The Itinerary of Edward III and his Household, 1327-1345*, List and Index Society, 318 (2007); and personal notes made available to me by Prof. W.M. Ormrod. WMO indicates when Ormrod's notes are used.

(3) TNA, E 101/373/7 mem. 5.

(4) TNA, SC 1/35/63, 64.

(5) TNA, SC 1/ 35/12.

(6) TNA, SC 1/63/186.

(7) F. D Blackley and G. Hermansen (eds.), *The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England, for the fifth regnal year of Edward II, 8th July 1311 to 7th July 1312* (Edmonton, 1971), pp. xxv, 11, 15, 121, 137, 139, 207, 209, 215, 235-7.

(8) TNA, E 101/375/2.

(9) Handbook of British Chronology.

(10) TNA, E 101/624/18.

(11) The king is using the queen's privy seal during this period, which may mean she is with him.

(12) TNA, E 101/ 375/9.

(13) TNA, E 101/375/19.

(14) TNA, E 101/ 375/17 mems. 3-6.

(15) TNA, E 101/375/20 mems. 3-4.

(16) TNA, E 101/376/20 mem. 3-4.

**Appendix I**  
**Isabella's Itinerary**

- (17) TNA, SC 1/35/154.
- (18) TNA, E 101/376/21.
- (19) TNA, E 101/376/26, mem. 3.
- (20) TNA, SC 1/35/151.
- (21) TNA, SC 1/36/11
- (22) TNA, SC 1/36/72.
- (23) TNA, SC 1/36/73.
- (24) TNA, SC 1/36/75.
- (25) TNA, E 101/378/9
- (26) TNA, SC 1/37/45.
- (27) TNA, SC 1/36/38.
- (28) TNA, E 101/381/3.
- (29) TNA, E 101/380/9 mems. 1- 14.
- (30) TNA, E 101/380/10 mems. 1-10.
- (31) TNA, E 101/381/18 mem. 1-4.
- (32) TNA, E 101/381/17 mem. 1-2.
- (33) TNA, E101/382/18 mem. 1-4.
- (34) TNA, SC 1/49/188.
- (35) TNA, SC 1/37/46.
- (36) TNA, SC 1/49/189.
- (37) TNA, SC 1/36/86.
- (38) TNA, SC 1/35/186, 187.
- (39) TNA, SC 1/35/183.
- (40) *CPR 1327-1330*, p. 213-14.

**Appendix I**  
**Isabella's Itinerary**

- (41) TNA, SC 1/35/182.
- (42) *CCR 1327-1330*, p. 425.
- (43) TNA, E 101/386/3 fol. 1v.
- (44) TNA, SC 1/38/192.
- (45) TNA, SC 1/38/190.
- (46) TNA, SC 1/38/191.
- (47) TNA, SC 1/38/193.
- (48) TNA, SC 1/38/195.
- (49) TNA, SC 1/38/196.
- (50) TNA, SC 1/38/194.
- (51) TNA, SC 1/39/123.
- (52) TNA, SC 1/39/155.
- (53) TNA, SC 1/40/4.
- (54) TNA, SC 1/40/135.
- (55) BL MS Cotton Galba E XIV fols 12-31.
- (56) TNA, SC 1/56/34.
- (57) BL MS Cotton Galba E XIV fol. 21.
- (58) DNB the births of John of Eltham, Eleanor of Woodstock and Joan of the Tower.

**Appendix I  
Philippa's Itinerary**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Place</b>	<b>Location of the King</b>
<b>1328</b>		
1 April 1328	Eltham (1)	Sempringham (2)
14 July 1328	Lichfield (3)	'Neuport'
30 November 1328	Westminster (3)	Westminster
<b>1329</b>		
1 January 1329	Warwick (3)	Warwick
3 February 1329	Windsor (3)	Windsor
8 October 1329	Dunstable (4)	Dunstable
9 October 1329	Dunstable (4)	Dunstable
10 October 1329	Dunstable (4)	Dunstable
11 October 1329	Dunstable (4)	Dunstable
12 October 1329	Dunstable (4)	Dunstable
<b>1330</b>		
15 June 1330	Woodstock (5)	King was at Woodstock on the 16 <sup>th</sup>
<b>1331</b>		
<b>1332</b>		
16 June 1332	Woodstock (5)	Woodstock
19 July 1332	Woodstock (churcing for Isabella) (6)	Woodstock
15 September 1332	Woodstock (7)	Waltham Abbey
<b>1333</b>		

**Appendix I  
Philippa's Itinerary**

12 February 1333	Pontefract (8)	Pontefract
8 March 1333	Woodstock (churcing for Joan) (9)	Cowick, Pontefract
27 May 1333	Bamburgh (10)	Berwick-upon-Tweed
29 September 1333	Waltham (10)	Waltham Abbey
 <b>1334</b>		
8 March 1334	Woodstock (churcing for Joan) (9)	The privy seal is at York and the wardrobe is at Woodstock
4 April 1334	Windsor Park (11)	Rockingham
 <b>1335</b>		
26 May-4 June 1335	York (12)	York (the king and queen were together during parliament)
 <b>1336</b>		
2 July 1336	Northampton (13)	Perth
19 July 1336	Carlise (14)	Cunan ? (WMO) Perth (Shenton)
15 September 1336.	Berwick-upon-Tweed (15)	Berwick-upon-Tweed (WMO) Shenton does not have a location for the king, the privy seal or the wardrobe.
6 October 1336	Newcastle (16)	Newcastle
 <b>1337</b>		

**Appendix I  
Philippa's Itinerary**

16 February 1337	Hatfield (churching William for Hatfield) (18)	Hatfield
16 March 1337	Westminster (18)	Westminster; 3 - 20 March Parliament was held.
3 June 1337.	Fotheringhay Castle (17)	Stamford/Boroughbridge/Northallerton
<b>1338</b>		
29 November 1338	Antwerp (birth of Lionel)(5)	Antwerp
<b>1339</b>		
3 January 1339	Antwerp (Churching for Lionel) (19)	Antwerp
4 January 1339	Antwerp (19) <sup>1</sup>	Antwerp
29 February 1339	Antwerp (19)	Antwerp
<b>1340</b>		
March 1340	Ghent (Birth of John of Gaunt) (5)	
<b>1341</b>		
8 March 1341	Kings Langley (20)	Kings Langley (WMO) The privy seal was at Westminster and the wardrobe was at Merton (Shenton).
5 June 1341	Kings Langley (5)	Kings Langley (WMO) The privy seal and the wardrobe were at the Tower

---

<sup>1</sup> Norwell's account says that on this day the queen was totally in the keeping of the king: *isto die fuit regina totaliter ad custus regis*. This probably indicates that the queen was with the king or at least the household for the majority of Norwell's account: *The Wardrobe Book of William de Norwell 12 July 1338 to 27 May 1340*, Mary Lyon, Bruce Lyon and Henry S. Lucas, (eds.), (Brussels, 1983).



**Appendix I**  
**Philippa's Itinerary**

of London (Shenton).

**1342**

31 January 1342	Kings Langley (21)	Nottingham (WMO) The privy seal was at the Tower of London (Shenton)
8 October 1342	Eastry (22)	Sandwich (WMO)

**1343**

**1344**

**1345**

19 July 1345	Southwick (23)	At anchor off Sluys (WMO)
3 July 1345	Sandwich (24)	Sandwich

**1346**

14 July 1346	Southwick (25)	St-Vaast-la-Hougue (WMO)
--------------	----------------	--------------------------

**1347**

**1348**

28 April 1348	Windsor (26)	Woodstock (WMO)
9 December 1348	Oxford (27)	Sandwich (WMO)

**1349**

13 October 1349	Sheen (28)	---
-----------------	------------	-----

**1350**

3 March 1350	Croydon (29)	---
22 May 1350	Colchester (30)	---

**1351**

**Appendix I**  
**Philippa's Itinerary**

12 January 1351      Reading (31)      ---

7 August 1351      Henley (32)      ---

**1352**

16 December 1352      Windsor (33)      ---

**1353**

20 March 1353      Westminster (34)      ---

**1354**

**1355**

7 January 1355      Woodstock (5)      ---

**1356**

**1357**

**1358**

12 July 1358      Marlborough (35)      Hertford (41)

**1359**

6 June 1359      Reading (36)      ---

**1360**

23 August 1360      Havering-atte-Bowe (37)      ---

8 October 1360      Havering-atte-Bowe (38)      ---

**1361**

**1362**

**1363**

**Appendix I**  
**Philippa's Itinerary**

**1364**

1 December 1364                  Windsor (39)                  ---

**1365**

**1366**

**1367**

**1368**

25 June 1368                          Windsor (40)                  ---

(1) TNA, SC 1/36/07.

(2) The whereabouts of Edward III were taken from Caroline Shenton, *The Itinerary of Edward III and his Household, 1327-1345*, List and Index Society 318 (2007); and personal notes made available to me by Prof. W.M. Ormrod. Shenton's published itinerary is currently available only until 1345. After 1345 I have made use of Ormrod's personal notes. I also note discrepancies between Shenton and Ormrod when the differences are material to my own research. The dates from Ormrod's notes are indicated by WMO after the place name.

(3) TNA, E 101/384/1 fol. 15-16v.

(4) TNA, E 101/384/14 mem. 1.

(5) DNB: Birth of Edward of Woodstock, Isabella of Woodstock, Lionel of Antwerp, John of Gaunt, Edmund of Langley, Thomas of Woodstock.

(6) TNA, E 101/386/2 mem. 6.

(7) TNA, E 101/385/19 fol. 11.

(8) TNA, SC 1/39/15.

(9) TNA, E 101/386/17.

(10) TNA, E 101/386/8 mems. 8, 14.

(11) TNA, E 101/387/8.

(12) BL MS Cotton Nero C VIII fol. 202.

**Appendix I**  
**Philippa's Itinerary**

- (13) TNA, E 101/387/ 19 mem. 5.
- (14) TNA, SC 1/39/33.
- (15) TNA, SC 1/39/34.
- (16) TNA, E 101/387/19.
- (17) TNA, SC 1/39/50.
- (18) TNA, E 101/388/2 mem. 1.
- (19) William Norwell, *The Wardrobe Book of William de Norwell 12 July 1338 to 27 May 1340*, Mary Lyon, Bruce Lyon and Henry S. Lucas, (eds.), (Brussels, 1983), pp. LII, LIII
- (20) TNA, SC 1/50/189.
- (21) TNA, SC 1/39/163.
- (22) TNA, SC 1/39/164.
- (23) TNA, SC 1/39/175.
- (24) *CCR 1343-1346*, p. 634.
- (25) TNA, SC 1/42/101.
- (26) TNA, SC 1/40/30.
- (27) TNA, SC 1/40/32.
- (28) TNA, SC 1/41/84
- (29) TNA, SC 1/56/26.
- (30) TNA, SC 1/42/102.
- (31) TNA, SC 1/40/116.
- (32) TNA, SC 1/41/82.
- (33) TNA, SC 1/41/85.
- (34) TNA, SC 1/40/137.
- (35) TNA, SC 1/41/81.

**Appendix I**  
**Philippa's Itinerary**

(36) TNA, SC 1/56/40.

(37) TNA, SC 1/41/86.

(38) TNA, SC 1/56/78.

(39) TNA, SC 1/63/249.

(40) TNA, SC 1/56/29.

(41)BL MS Cotton Galba E XIV fol. 21.

**Appendix II**  
**Acts of Intercession by Year**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Margaret</b>	<b>Isabella</b>	<b>Philippa</b>	<b>Anne</b>
Sept 1299- Dec 1300	10 (only one before Jan 1300)	x	x	x
1301	3	x	x	x
1302	8	x	x	x
1303	8	x	x	x
1304	5	x	x	x
1305	10	x	x	x
1306	5	x	x	x
1307	7	x	x	x
1308	0	6	x	x
1309	2	4	x	x
1310	2	6	x	x
1311	1	5	x	x
1312	0	3	x	x
1313	0	11	x	x
1314	0	10	x	x
1315	1	9	x	x
1316	1	3	x	x
1317	0	13	x	x
1318	0	1	x	x
1319	x	5	x	x
1320	x	3	x	x
1321	x	0	x	x
1322	x	0	x	x
1323	x	0	x	x
1324	x	0	x	x
1325	x	0	x	x
1326	x	0	x	x
1327	x	16	0	x
1328	x	8	1	x
1329	x	10	2	x
1330	x	7	0	x
1331	x	0	11	x
1332	x	0	3	x
1333	x	3	3	x
1334	x	0	0	x
1335	x	0	2	x

**Appendix II**  
**Acts of Intercession by Year**

1336	x	1	1	x
1337	x	1	6	x
1338	x	1	8	x
1339	x	0	0	x
1340	x	2	1	x
1341	x	3	3	x
1342	x	4	1	x
1343	x	3	3	x
1344	x	4	3	x
1345	x	4	5	x
1350	x	2	0	x
1351	x	2	1	x
1352	x	1	1	x
1353	x	1	0	x
1354	x	1	0	x
1355	x	5	1	x
1356	x	7	3	x
1357	x	3	0	x
1358	x	0	0	x
1359	x	x	0	x
1360	x	x	0	x
1361	x	x	0	x
1362	x	x	1	x
1363	x	x	3	x
1364	x	x	4	x
1365	x	x	0	x
1366	x	x	0	x
1367	x	x	6	x
1368	x	x	1	x
1369	x	x	0	x
1370	x	x	x	x
1371	x	x	x	x
1372	x	x	x	x
1373	x	x	x	x
1374	x	x	x	x
1375	x	x	x	x
1376	x	x	x	x
1377	x	x	x	x
1378	x	x	x	x
1379	x	x	x	x
1378	x	x	x	x

**Appendix II**  
**Acts of Intercession by Year**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Margaret</b>	<b>Isabella</b>	<b>Philippa</b>	<b>Anne</b>
1380	x	x	x	x
1381	x	x	x	x
1382	x	x	x	2
1383	x	x	x	2
1384	x	x	x	2
1385	x	x	x	0
1386	x	x	x	0
1387	x	x	x	0
1388	x	x	x	0
1389	x	x	x	0
1390	x	x	x	0
1391	x	x	x	2
1392	x	x	x	0
1393	x	x	x	0
1394	x	x	x	



### **Appendix III**

#### **The Queen's Household Members**

Appendix III contains lists of household members for Isabella of France and Philippa of Hainault. Each list is meant to be a sample to complement the information discussed in chapter four and thus only covers one year during Isabella and Philippa's lives as queen. Isabella's was compiled from the household book of Queen Isabella for 1311 to 1312 published in Blackley, F. D. and G. Hermansen (eds.), *The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England, for the fifth regnal year of Edward II, 8th July 1311 to 7th July 1312* (Edmonton, 1971), unless stated otherwise. Philippa's was compiled from a book of liveries for 1340 to 1341 (TNA, E 101/390/8), of which only part survives. As a result, the list for Philippa's household members is not as complete as Isabella's, but 1340 to 1341 offers us the most comprehensive idea of the composition of her household. A list for Margaret has not been compiled because there are not enough surviving documents from any one year to offer a representative sample.

**Appendix III:  
Queen Isabella's Household Members, 1311-1312**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Positions held/Grants for Service</b>
Margaret de Abrenythy	Damsel
Odin Apothecary	Squire/apothecary
John de Astwick	Usher of the queen's wardrobe
John de Aumbleny	Boy of John Chisoye, the queen's confessor
Lawrence Baggeshute	Keeper of the queen's horses
Robert de Baggesshute	Palfreyman
William Bale	Messenger
William Basset	Sumpterman
Henry Bateteste	Squire/Butler
William de Bath	Smith
Raymond Bauzan	Palfreyman
Isabella de Beaumont, lady de Vescy	Lady  Grant for life to Isabel de Bello Monte, Lady of Vescy, of the manor of Thoresweye in recompense of the keeping of the castle of Baumburgh, owing to her expenses in the king's service in the company of Queen Isabella <sup>1</sup>
Philip Beauvoys	In the office of the marshalsea
Matthew Beval	Squire
Robert Beval	Squire
Edmund Belville	Squire
Reginald de Belou	Squire
Philip de Beluaco	Squire
Richard Bernard	Palfreyman
John de Bilemound	Groom

**Appendix III:  
Queen Isabella's Household Members, 1311-1312**

William de Boudon	Keeper/Treasurer of the queen's wardrobe
Nicholas de Bretteville	Squires
William de Brideport	Groom
Richard le Bruer	Carter
John de Brye	Waferer
Henry Bubwythe	Sumpterman
Alice, countess of Buchan	Lady
Master Buchard	Chaplain
Ralph Burdet	Squire
Odin Bureward	Squire
Richard de Burwardesle	Watchman
Gerard de Cessoigne	Groom
William, the Chandler	Squire
William Capon	Sumpterman
John du Char	Palfreyman
Robert Chaunceler	Watchman
Thomas de Chetyngdon	Squire/Usher of the hall
Nicholas de Chileham	Squire/Marshal of the hall/Porter of the great wardrobe
John Chisoye	The queen's confessor
Lawrence de Cleware	Groom
Ida de Clinton	Lady
John de Clinton	Squire
William de Clinton	Squire
John de Codestoke	Boy of the queen's confessor , John Chisoye

**Appendix III:  
Queen Isabella's Household Members, 1311-1312**

Peter de Colyngbourne	Knight
Gilbert de Cruce	Palfreyman
John Curters	Groom of the queen's spicery
Walter Dada	Groom
Robert de Danehurst	Sumpterman
Eleanor Despenser	Damsel
John de Drayton	Ewerer
Raymond Dughty	Palfreyman
Richard de Ellefeld	Clerk of the spicery
Emeric of the buttery	Groom
Haymo de Eton	Palfreyman
Joan de Falaise	Damsel
John de Falaise	Taylor
Steven de Falaise	Groom
Richard le Fisher	Groom
John de Fleet	Cofferer/Knight
Simon Ferthyng	Squire
John de la Forde	Groom
Harvey de Fordes	Groom
John de Forest	Knight
John de Foresta	Clerk and notary of her household <sup>2</sup>
John de Foutenay	Clerk of the queen's chapel
John de Fountettes	Squire
Hugh de Fountettes	Squire

**Appendix III:  
Queen Isabella's Household Members, 1311-1312**

John Freyn	Pantler
Geoffrey de Frome	Palfreyman
Richard de Glamorgan	Cook
William de Glastonbury	Sumpterman
John Godescalke	Palfreyman
John Giffard	Clerk writing the queen's letters
Gilbert	boy of Mary de Sancto Martino
Greasch	Groom
William Griffith	Palfreyman
Guillot	boy of Joan Launge
Guillot, the smith	Groom
John de Hampton	Groom
Walter Harfront	Carter
Henry de Hemenhale	Groom
Peter de Hertford	Groom
William de Hilingdon	Scullion
Richard de Holland	In the office of the marshalsea
Hugh Hoperton	Cook
William Inge	Knight
Richard Ireland	Squire
John de Jargeaux	Chaplain <sup>3</sup>
John of the palfreys	Groom
Joan	Laundress
Thomas Keyne	Sumpterman

**Appendix III:  
Queen Isabella's Household Members, 1311-1312**

William de Kunebelle	Squire
Gafiot de Laenville	Squire
Richard of the larder	Carter
John Launge	Squire/Yeoman
	£8 a year for their lives and the life of their [John and Joan] survivors out of the farm of the city of London <sup>4</sup>
Joan Launge	Damsel
	The manor of Martaignevile in Ponthieu for her and her husband. <sup>5</sup>
Noel de Launey	Squire
John de Ledrede	Chaplain
Alice de la Legrave	Damsel
Cecily de la Legrave, daughter of Alice de la Legrave	Damsel
Roger Lenglors	Carter
Hugh de Leominster	Controller
Hugh de Lincestre	Groom
Reginald de Lisy	Squire
John le Littel	Palfreyman
Andrew de la Marche	Boy of Alice de la Legrave
Hugh de la Marche	Palfreyman
Richard de la Marche	Palfreyman
John Martel	Carter
John de la Marthe	Saucer
Matilda	Laundress
William de May	Groom

**Appendix III:  
Queen Isabella's Household Members, 1311-1312**

Michael	The queen's fool
John Moigne	Squire
John de Montacute	Squire
Peter de Monte Ozeri	Sergeant-at-arms.
Ebulo de Montibus	Steward of the queen's household/knight
	Grant during pleasure to Ebulo de Montibus, on account of his good service to the late king and the he may more becomingly serve Queen Isabella in whose train he is by the king's command, of the Templars' manors of Bruere, Askeby, Rouston and Kirkeby <sup>6</sup>
Thomas Motte	Boy of the queen's confessor, John Chisoye
William de Muchelhampton	Scullion
John de Nauntel	In the office of the marshalsea
Juliana de Nauntel	Damsel
Robert de Nauntel	Groom of the queen's chamber
Thomas de Neuport	Palfreyman
Nicholas the baker	Groom
William de Northwell	Clerk of the king's kitchen <sup>7</sup>
John de Noyun	Messengers
John le Parker	Groom
Robert le Parker	Palfreyman
Simon Pecoke	Keeper of the queen's chargers
John de Pelham	Clerk of the king's marshalsea <sup>8</sup>
Peter of the saucery	Groom
Philip of the Wardrobe	In the office of the wardrobe
John Picard	Keeper of the queen's chargers

**Appendix III:  
Queen Isabella's Household Members, 1311-1312**

Simon Picard	Sumpterman
Nicholas Pleband	Groom
John de Portes	Squire
William atte Putte	Groom
Richard de Radyng	Groom
Roger, the harbinger	Groom
Nicholas de Sadington	Groom
Isambert de Sancto Belmundo	Squire
John de Sancto Florentino	Goldsmith
John de St. Germaine	Groom
John de Sancto Laurencio	Squire
John de Sancto Licio	Squire
Mary de Sancto Martino	Damsel
Arnold Sanx	Sergeant-at-arms
John de Saunford	Groom
William le Sautreour	Squire
Simon of the larder	Groom
Robert de Snodhill	Cook
Reginald de Stanes	Sumpterman
Thomas de Stanstede	Keeper of the queen's chargers
Raymond atte Strete	Groom
Tasso Sudetz	Sumpterman
John Sullee	Banneret
William de Sulle	Knight



**Appendix III:  
Queen Isabella's Household Members, 1311-1312**

Stephen de Sulleye	Clerk of the pantry and buttery
John de Takkele	Palfreyman
Gilbert Sunninghill	Clerk of the marshalsea
Robert Tepyas	Keeper of the queen's chargers
Christian Thebaud	Groom
Master Theobald	Physician
William de Thorpe	Sumpterman
Peter Tilloy	Knight
John le Treour	Groom
Thomas Treweman	Sumpterman
Peter Trumel	Squire
Peter de Vernoun	Knight
Guy de Villers	Squire
Joan de Villers	Damsel
Margaret, daughter of John de Villiers	Damsel For her marriage to Odin Bronard, £300 for their sustenance, to be received out of the custodies and marriages which shall first fall <sup>9</sup>
Little Walter	Courier of the queen's great wardrobe
Henry de Waltham	Sumpterman
Gilbert de Walton	Keeper of the queen's chargers
William de Watford	Palfreyman
Thomas de Weston	Clerk of the queen's spicery
John de Wexbridge	Groom
William	the queen's Marshal
Hugh de Windsor	Groom

**Appendix III:  
Queen Isabella's Household Members, 1311-1312**

William de Withham	Carter
Richard de Wyford	Groom

---

<sup>1</sup> *CFR 1319-1327*, p. 132.

<sup>2</sup> *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 359.

<sup>3</sup> *CPR 1313-1317*, p. 79.

<sup>4</sup> *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 519.

<sup>5</sup> *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 362.

<sup>6</sup> *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 466 *CCR 1307-1313*, p. 427.

<sup>7</sup> William's position as the king's clerk who is paid in the queen's household, might be related to the fact that Isabella travelled with the king and Piers Gaveston for the first half of this year.

<sup>8</sup> John's position as the king's clerk who is paid in the queen's household, might be related to the fact that Isabella travelled with the king and Piers Gaveston for the first half of this year.

<sup>9</sup> *CPR, 1307-1313*, p. 378.

**Appendix III**  
**Queen Philippa's Household Members, 1340-1341**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Positions held</b>
Isabella de Beaumont, lady de Vescy	Lady
Robert de Benecastre	Valet of the stable
Robert Beverley	Marshal of the hall
John Bokely	Sumpterman
Philippa Brie	Damsel
Henry de Brigwell	Chaplain
Ralph Bromie	Valet of the stable
Peter de Bylagh	General attorney
John de Calworth	Squire
Nicholas de Calworth	Squire of the chamber
Robert Camoys	Squire
Ralph Camoysn	Squire of the chamber
Nicholas de Candelor	Valet of the stable
William de Chapele	Valet of the stable
Robert de Capell	Sumpterman
Marie de Capell	Damsel
John de Car	Sumpterman
John Chippes	Sumpterman
John de Cliffeby	Clerk of the seal
John de Clinton	Squire of the chamber

**Appendix III**  
**Queen Philippa's Household Members, 1340-1341**

Roger de Clonne	Cofferer
Master Wiliam de Clyne	Almoner
Robert de Creyk	Almoner
Thomas de Croxford	Squire
Hugh Cunillers	Squire
William de Cyrunbia	Usher
Nicholas de la Despense	Squire of the chamber
Margerie Deyme	Damsel
John Dunys	Valet of the stable
Katherine de Egeneye	Lady
John de Epton	Receiver of gold
Katherine de Fauxfich	Lady of the chamber
John Ferratori	Sumpterman
Simon Figliwode	Confessor
Edmund Flambert	Squire
Robert de Gages	Squire of the chamber
Thomas de Glaington	Clerk
Hugh de Glavill	Auditor of accounts/ attorney
Eleanor de Gistel	Lady
John Gistel, son of Lord Gistel	Squire
Gilbert Gynwydne	Squire of the chamber

**Appendix III**  
**Queen Philippa's Household Members, 1340-1341**

Guidon	Apothecary
Thomas de Hankeston	Steward of the household of the queen
John de Hapingdon	Clerk of the chapel
Hugh de Hasing	Steward of the lands of the queen
Thomas de Heche	Squire
William de Hexneby	Sumpterman
John de Heyk	Chaplain
Richard Higham	Valet of the chamber
Richard Huseslere	Sumpterman
Richard de Hyton	Valet of the chamber
Roger de Jolys	Valet of the stable
Lord Gilbert of Juneworche	Steward of the lands of the lady queen
Thomas de Kaukeston	Kepr of the household
William de Kenyngton	Sumpterman
William de Kentebury	Salsar
Thomas Kypping	Sumpterman
William de Kyrkeby	Treasurer
William de Lapton	Valet of the stable
William de London	Sergeant and tailor of queen;
Agnes de Lucy	Lady
Hugh de Madele	Sumpterman

**Appendix III**  
**Queen Philippa's Household Members, 1340-1341**

Robert de Marchia	Surveyor of the hall
John Melford	Baker
Elizabeth de Menyle	Lady
Thomas de Mildyhale	Squire
William Milton	Squire
Jacob de Moncalery	Squire
Isabella de la Monte	Lady
Radulpho de Notingham	Clerk of the chapel
Thotmas Oldyngton	Clerk of the household
John de Olveye	Valet of the chamber
Peter de Oxon'	Squire
Thomas Pallard	Valet of the chamber
Thomas Prior	Squire
John Prior	Squire
William Piron	Valet of the stable
Margerie de Ravesholm	Damsel
Robert Redmarum	Sumpterman
Edmund Rose	Squire of the chamber
Agnes Rose	Damsel
Peter de Rouche	Squire of the chamber
John Reysham	Valet of the stable
John de Saham	Valet of the tailor

**Appendix III**  
**Queen Philippa's Household Members, 1340-1341**

Elizabeth de St. Omer	Lady
Robert de Saymoy	Squire
John Scaves	Valet of the stable
Stephen Seel	Valet of the stable
John Seglestheyn	Clerk of the controller
John Seneler	Boy in the custody of the queen
Richard Slep	Valet of the stable
Thomas de Swayvesey	Valet of the chamber
Roger de Sutton	Valet of the stable
Margerie de Sutton	Damsel
Edumund de Sutton	Squire of the chamber
Nicholas de Talmarch	Squire of the chamber
Thomas de Canterbury	Clerk of the great wardrobe
Thomas Tyrel	Squire
John Talworth	Squire
Eleanor de la Vache	Lady
Jacob Vaictre	Squire
Merlin, the fidler	Minstrel
William Verdire	Valet of the chamber
John la Zouche	Marshal of the hall

## Appendix IV The Queens' Estates and Income

Margaret of France's landholdings are listed in full from September 1299 until her death in 1318. Valors surviving from July 1299, two months before she arrived in England for her marriage, are preserved in TNA E 142/2-5. These appear to be drafts of her dower assignment. Most of the lands included in these valors remained in the final assignment in September 1299. Those which have not are included in the following appendix under the date July 1299. Some of these lands were granted to Margaret in the years after her initial dower assignment in September 1299, others were never assigned to her.

B.P. Wolffe compiled a list of Isabella of France's landholdings starting from 1317 until her death in 1358 in an appendix to *The Royal Demesne in English History*. In the same appendix, he also constructed a list of Philippa of Hainault's landholdings between 1330 and 1369. This appendix does not duplicate Wolffe's, but it covers the period from 1308 to 1317, which Wolffe leaves out, and it includes wardships, which Wolffe did not include.



**Appendix IV**  
**Margaret's Estates and Income**

<b>Year</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Reference</b>	
July 1299	Cambridge	The farm of Haton	TNA, E 142/2 TNA, E 142/3 TNA, E 142/4 TNA, E 142/5	
	Devon	The manors of Lideford, Liston The farms of Schaston and Brampton	TNA, E 142/2 TNA, E 142/3 TNA, E 142/4 TNA, E 142/5	
	Dorset	The manor of Kingslous with the returns of Melbourne and hundred of Horthorne The manor of Pursok The villages of Dorchester and Lynn	TNA, E 142/2 TNA, E 142/3 TNA, E 142/4 TNA, E 142/5	
	Chester	The manors of Macclesfield, Overton and Sevneik	TNA, E 142/2 TNA, E 142/3 TNA, E 142/4 TNA, E 142/5	
	Shropshire	Part of the farm rendered by Nicholas de Audley for the manor of Ford The manor of Shrewsbury	TNA, E 142/2 TNA, E 142/3 TNA, E 142/4 TNA, E 142/5	
	Stafford	The hundred of Tatemundeslowe	TNA, E 142/2 TNA, E 142/3 TNA, E 142/4 TNA, E 142/5	
	Sept. 1299	Cambridge	The castle and town of Cambridge. The manors of Soham and Chesterton.	<i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i> , vol. 1, p. 912
		Essex	The castle and town of Hadleigh, The manors of Havering, Eastwood, Raleigh and Nayland The hundred of Rochford The towns of Waltham and Colchester The hundred Barnstaple	<i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i> , vol. 1, p. 912
		Wiltshire	The castle and town of Marlborough The hundred of Selkley The castle and town of Devizes The parks and forests of Chippenham Pewsham, Melksham The manors of Rowde, Steeple Langford , Fittleton Woodrow Stratton and Sevenhampton The boroughs and hundreds of Cricklade and	<i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i> , vol. 1, p. 912

**Appendix IV**  
**Margaret's Estates and Income**

Highworth

Southampton	<p>The castle town of Southampton</p> <p>The castle, town, park and hundred of Odiham</p> <p>The manor, town and hundred of Alton</p> <p>The castle, town and forest of Portchester</p> <p>The manor, town and hundred of Andover</p> <p>The manor, town and hundred of Basingstoke</p> <p>The manor of Brymmore</p> <p>The manor and park of Lyndhurst</p> <p>New Forest</p> <p>The bailiwicks and hundred of Redbridge</p> <p>The castle and hundred of Christchurch of Twinham</p> <p>The borough and manor of Westover</p> <p>The manor of Ringwood</p> <p>The manor and borough of Lymyngton</p> <p>The town of Portsmouth</p> <p>The city and drapery of Winchester</p>	<p><i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i>, vol. 1, p. 912</p>
Surrey	<p>The castle, town and park of Guildford,</p> <p>The manor and park of Banstead</p> <p>The town of Kingston</p>	<p><i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i>, vol. 1, p. 912</p>
Somerset	<p>The manor and park of Camel</p> <p>The manor, town, and hundred of Somerton</p> <p>The warren and pasture of Kyngesmore</p> <p>The manor Congresbury</p> <p>The manor of Axebridge</p> <p>The town and barton of Bath</p>	<p><i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i>, vol. 1, p. 912</p>
Gloucester	<p>The castle of Gloucester with the barton and tyne</p> <p>The town of Gloucester</p> <p>The town and seven hundreds of Cirencester</p> <p>The farm of Pinnock</p>	<p><i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i>, vol. 1, p. 912</p>
Dorset	<p>The manor of Gillingham</p> <p>The town of Bridport</p> <p>The town of Lyme</p>	<p><i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i>, vol. 1, p. 912</p>
Worcester	<p>The city of Worcester</p> <p>The town of Droitwich</p> <p>The manor, forest and woods of Feckenham</p> <p>The manors of Norton and Bromesgrove</p>	<p><i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i>, vol. 1, p. 912</p>
Kent	<p>The castle, manor and park of Leeds</p> <p>The manors of Ospring and Westcliff</p> <p>The manor and hundred of Middleton</p>	<p><i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i>, vol. 1, p. 912</p>
Sussex	<p>The honour of L'Aigle</p>	<p><i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i>, vol. 1, p. 912</p>

**Appendix IV**  
**Margaret's Estates and Income**

	Oxford	The town of Oxford The Oxford mills, with the meadow of Kingsmedow The manors of Hanborough, Headington Bloxham and Whitechurch The hundred without the North Gate, Oxford	<i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i> , vol. 1, p. 912
	Berkshire	The manors of Bray and Cokham	<i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i> , vol. 1, p. 912
	Chester	The manor of Hope	<i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i> , vol. 1, p. 912
	Hereford	The city of Hereford	<i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i> , vol. 1, p. 912
	Hertford	The castle and town of Hertford	<i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i> , vol. 1, p. 912
	Leicester	The manors of Bowdon and Harborough	<i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i> , vol. 1, p. 912
	Warwick	The castle and manor of Montgomery castle. The manor of Great Compton	<i>CPR 1292- 1301</i> p. 451; <i>Foedera</i> , vol. 1, p. 912
1301	Kent	The manors of Leeds and Westcliff for the maintenance of the queen and their son Thomas of Brotherton The marriage of Gilbert de Clare, son and heir of Gilbert de Clare. The marriage of Robert, son and heir of Warin de Insula	<i>CPR 1292-1301</i> , pp. 604, 592, 601.  <i>CPR 1292-1301</i> , pp. 604, 592, 601
1303	Warwick, Chester, Southampton, Worcester	Surrendered: The castle and manor of Montgomery The manors of Hope, Lymyngton and Brummore Norton, Bromsgrove and Great Compton	<i>CPR 1301-1307</i> , pp. 118-119
	Hertford, Buckingham, Suffolk, Wiltshire, Dorset, Somerset and Warwick	In lieu of above: The castle and town of Berkhamstead The manor of Risborough, Dalham and Bradford. The castle and manor of Mere. The farm of the manors of Congresbury, Axebrigde and Chedder	<i>CPR 1301-1307</i> , pp. 118-119
		The custody during the minority of the heir of the lands of the late Robert de Tateshale,	

**Appendix IV**  
**Margaret's Estates and Income**

tenant in chief, of the castle and manors of  
Buckenham and Tibenham

- |      |   |  |   |
|------|---|--|---|
| 1304 | Suffolk,<br>Wiltshire,<br>Dorset,<br>Hertford and<br>Buckingham | The manors of Dalham and Bradford.<br>The castle and manors of Mere, with the<br>park, and Riseborough, with the park.<br>The hundreds of Redelane, Whiteway and<br>Broneshull,<br>The castle and town of Berkhampstead, with<br>the honour and manors.  | <i>CPR 1301-1307,</i><br>pp .240-41.<br><i>CPR 1301-1307,</i><br>p. 261   |
|      | Worcester,<br>Warwick and<br>Chester                            | Surrendered: the manors of Norton and<br>Bromesgrove, Hope, Great Compton;<br>the manor and borough of Lymyngton;<br>castle and manor of Montgomery  | <i>CPR 1301-1307,</i><br>p. 240-41  |
| 1305 | Northampton<br>and Lincoln                                      | The forest of Savernak as appurtenant to the<br>castle and town of Marlborough<br>The town of Kingsthorpe<br>The manors of Eston, Kings Cliff, Brigstock<br>Longebenington, Steeple Langford<br>The farm which Laurence de Preston renders<br>for The manor of Gretton<br>The hundred of Fawsley<br>The town of Grimsby with the rents and<br>other appurtenances<br>The farm which the men of the soke of<br>Castre<br>The city of Winchester<br>The farm of Bath | <i>CPR 1301-1307,</i><br>pp. 368-9.<br><i>CPR 1301-1307,</i><br>p.505. <i>CCR 1302-</i><br><i>1307,</i> p 248. <i>CPR</i><br><i>1301-1307,</i> p. 367 |
|      |   | The custody during the minority of the heirs<br>of the lands of the late Hugh of Saint<br>Philbert with their marriages  |   |
| 1306 | Hampshire<br>Kent   | New Forest<br>The manor of Leeds   | <i>CPR 1301-1307,</i><br>p. 413   |
|      |   | The custody, during the minority of the<br>heirs, of all the lands which Juliana de Tany,<br>deceased, held in dower or otherwise for<br>term of her life in Stapelford Tany and<br>Elmesteile of the inheritance of Roger Tany,<br>tenant in chief  | <i>CPR 1301-1307,</i><br>p. 432   |
|      |   | The custody of the lands which Matilda, late<br>the wife of Matthew de Lovayne held in   | <i>CPR 1301-1307,</i><br>p. 425   |

**Appendix IV**  
**Margaret's Estates and Income**

dower of the inheritance of Thomas son and heir of the said Matthew.

- |      |           |   |  |
|------|-----------|---|--|
| 1307 |           | In compensation for the manor of Steeple Langford, £50 a year out of the £100 a year which the abbot of Hayles renders at the exchequer for the manor of Lecchelade   | <i>CPR 1301-1307,</i><br>p. 505                              |
|      |           | An extension of her grant, during the minority of the heir, of the lands which Matilda, late the wife of Matthew de Lovayne, tenant in chief, held in dower of the inheritance of Thomas the son and heir, of knights' fees, advowsons of churches, and other things belonging to that custody  | <i>CPR 1301-1307,</i><br>p. 522                              |
| 1309 | Hertford  | Demise by Queen Margaret to Aymer de Valence of the castle and town of Hertford, held by her in dower, subject to a yearly payment to her of £100; and grant to him for his life, in case the queen predeceases him, of the same castle and town  | <i>CPR 1307-1313,</i><br>p. 153                              |
|      | Kent      | Grant in fee to Bartholomew de Badelesmere and Margaret his wife of the reversion of the manor of Leeds, co. Kent, upon the death of Queen Margaret, tenant for life  | <i>CPR 1307-1313,</i><br>p. 197 <i>CPR 1307-1313,</i> p. 230 |
| 1310 |           | Confirmation by Edward, prince of Wales, of the lands granted to Margaret of France by Edward I   | <i>CPR 1307-1313,</i><br>pp. 216-18, 231                     |
| 1313 |           | The rents accruing from all assarts, purprestures and wastes being within the places assigned to her in dower by Edward I, as she has been hindered in levying and collecting these rents by Edward II's ministers because no mention had been made of the wastes, or of the rents accruing from such assarts, purprestures and wastes in the letters patent in which her dower was assigned to her | <i>CPR 1307-1313,</i><br>p. 527                              |
| 1314 | Cambridge | An indemnity, that if Hugh Despenser, the elder, shall predecease her, his heir being a   | <i>CPR 1313-1317,</i><br>p.105                               |

**Appendix IV**  
**Margaret's Estates and Income**

minor, by reason of which minority she may immediately upon the death of the said Hugh Despenser, the elder, re-enter the manor of Soham, Cambridgeshire, and hold it with its knights' fees, advowsons of churches and all other rights appertaining to the same, until the heir shall attain his full age

**Appendix IV**  
**Isabella's Estates and Income**

<b>Year</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Reference</b>
1308	Ponthieu and Montreuil.	The counties of Ponthieu and Montreuil.	<i>CPR 1307-1313</i> , p. 74.
1309	Chester	The manors of Macclesfield and Overton	<i>CPR 1307-1313</i> , p. 101.
	Wales	The manor of Rosfever.	<i>CPR 1307-1313</i> , p. 101.
1311	Kent	The manors of Eltham, Cray and Catford.  Grant of the custody of the lands of John Wake, tenant in chief during the minority of his heir Thomas Wake.	<i>CPR 1307-1313</i> , pp. 330
1313	Derbyshire	The manor and castle of High Peak.	<i>CPR 1313-1317</i> , p. 38.
	Northampton	The manors of Torpel and Upton	<i>CPR 1313-1317</i> , p. 38.
1314	Kent	The revision of the castle and manor of Leeds, which Queen Margaret, the king's mother, holds for her life, and which upon her death ought to revert to the king.	<i>CPR 1313-1317</i> , p. 81.
	Kent	The manor of Maundeville.	<i>CCR 1313-1318</i> , p. 144.
		Custody of the lands and tenements late of James de Bohun, during the minority of John his son and also of the marriage of the heir	<i>CPR 1313-1317</i> , p. 276
1355		The marriage of John, son and heir of John de Staunton.	<i>CPR 1354-1358</i> , p. 246.

**Appendix IV**  
**Philippa's Estates and Income**

<b>Year</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Reference</b>
1329		A yearly sum of 1,000 marks out of the exchequer towards the expenses of her chamber, until some better provision can be made for her estate.	<i>CPR 1327-1330</i> , p. 389.
1330		The king's houses in la Beol in Westminster in the city of London for her wardrobe.	<i>CPR 1330-1334</i> , p.37.
1334		£200 yearly, which has been granted to supply the insufficiency of her dower.	<i>CPR 1330-1334</i> , p. 512.
1335	Kent, Buckingham, Lincoln,	In part satisfaction of the 500 marks yearly of land and rent granted by letters patent to supplement her dower, which had proved inadequate to meet the expenses of her household, where of she has already received the manors of Middelton, Braburne, Bichyndon, Old Gainesborough, the escheats by the forfeiture of David de Strabolgi, earl of Athol, to hold with all knights' fees and other appurtenances. Towards the support of the heavy charges she has to meet daily as well in her household and chamber: 350 marks, which Thomas de Lucy has to render yearly at the exchequer for the custody, during minority of the heir, of the lands which John de Muiton of Egremount in Coupeland and in the county of Cumberland; the custody of all other lands of the said John during such minority with all appurtenances. The custody, during minority of the heir, of the lands, late of John St. Clare with the issues from the day of the death of the said John and the marriage of the heir. The custody, during minority of the heir, of all the lands late of William de la Plaunk, tenant in chief, with the marriage of the heir.	<i>CPR 1334-1338</i> , p. 61-62.  <i>CPR 1334-1338</i> , p. 79  <i>CPR 1334-1338</i> , p 97.  <i>CPR 1334-1338</i> , p. 98 .
1336		A third part of the king's prises of wines in the ports of Kingston-upon-Hull, Southampton and Bristol	<i>CPR 1330-1334</i> , p. 319.
1342		The custody of the lands etc. of the earldom of Richmond for the upkeep of the king's son John, earl of Richmond, granted to him in tail by charter.	<i>CPR 1340-1343</i> , pp. 42, 569.



**Appendix IV**  
**Philippa's Estates and Income**

- |      |  |                                  |
|------|--|----------------------------------|
| 1347 | The custody of all the lands of John de Warenne, earl of Surrey beyond Trent for the upkeep of the king's son, Edmund of Langely, to whom they have been granted in tail male.   | <i>CPR 1345-1348,</i><br>p. 371. |
|      | The houses late of John Dayre in the town of Calais.   | <i>CPR 1345-1348,</i><br>p. 566. |
| 1350 | An enlargement of the king's grant to her of the keeping of the lands late of Philip Despenser, knight, during the nonage of the heir, that, if the heir die in his nonage, leaving an heir under age, she shall retain the keeping during the nonage of the latter, and so from heir to heir. | <i>CPR 1348-1350,</i><br>p. 549. |
| 1361 | The wardship of the lands late of Reynold de Cobham.   | <i>CPR 1361-1364,</i><br>p. 86.  |
| 1362 | The wardship of the lands late of John de Well, knight, who held in chief, with the issues from the time of his death, and the marriage of the heir.   | <i>CPR 1361-1364,</i><br>p. 218. |
| 1363 | The wardship of the lands late of Joan, who was the wife of Robert FitzWauter, with the issues and the marriage of the heir.   |                                  |
| 1365 | The keeping of the lands late of Miles de Stapelton of Bedale during the nonage of the heir, with the marriage of the heir.  | <i>CPR 1364-1367,</i><br>p. 91.  |
| 1367 | The keeping of all the lands late of Walter de Colvill until the full age of the heir together with the marriage of the heir. A grant also of all the issues of the said lands from the time of Walter's death.  | <i>CPR 1367-1370,</i><br>p. 39.  |
| 1368 | The warship of all the lands late of Anthony de Lucy with the issues and the marriage of the heir until the lawful age of the heir.  | <i>CFR 1356-1368,</i><br>p. 389. |

## Bibliography

### Unpublished Primary Sources

[British Library,] BL, Cotton Galba E III.

[British Library,] BL Cotton Galba E XIV.

[The National Archives London,] TNA, C 47, Chancery Miscellanea.

[The National Archives London,] TNA, C 61, Chancery: Gascon Rolls.

[The National Archives London,] TNA, C 81, Chancery: Warrants for the Great Seal, Series I.

[The National Archives London,] TNA, E 30, Exchequer: Treasury Receipt: Diplomatic Documents.

[The National Archives London,] TNA, E 36, Exchequer: Treasury of the Receipt: Miscellaneous Books.

[The National Archives London,] TNA, E 101, Accounts Various of the Exchequer.

[The National Archives London] TNA, E 142, Exchequer: King's Remembrancer: Extents, Inquisitions and Valors of Forfeited Lands.

[The National Archives London,] TNA, E 159, King's Remembrancer: Memoranda Rolls and Enrolment Books.

[The National Archives London,] TNA, E 163, King's Remembrancer: Miscellanea of the Exchequer.

[The National Archives London,] TNA, E 361, Exchequer: Pipe Office: Enrolled Wardrobe and Household Accounts.

[The National Archives London,] TNA, E 403, Exchequer of Receipt: Issue Rolls and Registers.

[The National Archives London,] TNA, SC 1, Special Collections, Ancient Correspondence.

[The National Archives London,] TNA, SC 6, Special Collections: Ministers' and Receivers' Accounts.

[The National Archives London,] TNA, SC 8, Special Collections, Ancient Petitions.

[Westminster Abbey Muniments] WAM 5460.

## Published Primary Sources

- Arras, Jean d', *Melusine*, A.K. Donald (ed.), EETS, OS, 68 (New York, 1973).
- Benson, L.D. (ed.), *King Arthur's Death: The Middle English Stanzaic Morte Arthur and Alliterative Morte Arthur*, TEAMS Middle English Text Series (Kalamazoo, 1994).
- Blackley, F. D. and G. Hermansen (eds.), *The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England, for the Fifth Regnal Year of Edward II, 8th July 1311 to 7th July 1312* (Edmonton, 1971).
- Brunel, Clovis, (ed) 'Documents sur le Pontieu Conservés dans la Collection de l' *Ancient Correspondence au Public Record Office de Londres (1278-1337)*', *Bulletin Philologique et Historique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques*, (1920 for 1918), 231-311.
- Brunner, Karl (ed.), *Richard Lowenherz [Richard Coer de Lyon]* (Leipzig, 1913).
- Cessolis, Jacobus de, *Game and Playe of Chesse*, W.E.A. Axon (ed.) (St. Leonards-on-Sea, 1969).
- Chaplais, Pierre, *The War of Saint-Sardos*, Camden, 3<sup>rd</sup> Series, 87 (London, 1954).
- Chobham, Thomas, *Summa Confessorum*, R. Broomfield (ed.) (Paris, 1968).
- Crawford, Anne, *Letters of the Queens of England* (Stroud, 1994).
- Dubois, Pierre *Summaria Brevis et Compendiosa*, H. Kampf (ed.) (New York, 1936).
- Fellows, Jennifer (ed.) 'Amis and Amiloun' in *Of Love and Chivalry: an Anthology of Middle English Romance* (London, 1993), pp. 73-146.
- Genet, J.P. (ed.), *Four English Political Tracts of the Later Middle Ages*, Camden Society, 4<sup>th</sup> Series, 18 (London, 1977).
- Herzman, R.B. et. al., (eds.), 'Bevis of Hampton' in *Four Romances of England*, TEAMS Middle English Text Series (Kalamazoo, 1999), pp. 187-340.
- Hoccleve, Thomas, *Hoccleve's Works : The Regiment of Princes and Fourteen Minor Poems*, Frederick J. Furnivall (ed.), EETS, ES, 72 (New York, 1975).
- Hudson, H. (ed.), 'Sir Tryamour', in *Four Middle English Romances*, TEAMS Middle English Text Series (Kalamazoo, 1996), pp. 178-228.
- 'Octavian' in *Four Middle English Romances*, TEAMS Middle English Text Series (Kalamazoo, 1996), pp. 45-114.
- Johnson, C. (ed.), *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum, 1066-1154*, (2 vols, Oxford,

- 1956).
- Laskaya, A (ed.), 'Sir Gowther', in *The Middle English Breton Lays*, TEAMS Middle English Texts Series (Kalamazoo, 1995), pp. 263-308.
- Legg, L. W., *English Coronation Records* (Westminster, 1901).
- Lupack, A. (ed.), *Lancelot of the Laik and Sir Tristrem*, TEAMS Middle English Text Series (Kalamazoo, 1994).
- Malory, Thomas, *Malory: Complete Works*, Eugene Vinaver (ed.) (Oxford, 1971).
- Milemete, Walter, *Treatise of Walter de Milemete De Nobilitatibus, Sapientiis, et Prudentiis Regum, Reproduced in Facsimile from the Unique Manuscript preserved at Christ Church, Oxford*, M.R. James (ed.) (Oxford, 1913).
- Norwell, William, *The Wardrobe Book of William de Norwell 12 July 1338 to 27 May 1340*, Mary Lyon, Bruce Lyon and Henry S. Lucas (eds.) (Brussels, 1983).
- Parsons, John Carmi, *The Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile in 1290: An Edition of British Library Additional Manuscript 35294 with Introduction and Notes* (Toronto, 1977).
- Pizan, Christine, *The Treasure of the City of Ladies or The Book of the Three Virtues*, Sarah Lawson (trans.) (London, 1985).
- *Le Livre du Corps de Policie*, Angus J. Kennedy (ed.), (Paris, 1998).
- Rotelande, Hue de, *Ipomadon*, Rhiannon Purdie (ed.), EETS, OS, 316 (Oxford, 2001).
- Rymer, Thomas, *Foedera*, Adam, Clarke, Frederick Holbrook and John Caley (eds.), (3 vols, London, 1816-69).
- Salisbury, John, *Ioannis Sareberiensis Episcopi Carnotensis Policratici sive De Nugis Curialiam et Vestigiis Philosophorum Libri VIII*, C.C.J. Webb (ed.) (2 vols, Oxford, 1909).
- Sayles, G.O., (ed.), *Select Cases in the Court of the King's Bench Edward III*, Selden Society, 76 (London, 1957).
- Sutton, Anne F. and P.W. Hammond (eds.), *The Coronation of Richard III: The Extant Documents* (Gloucester, 1983).
- Trevisa, John, *The Governance of Kings and Princes: John Trevisa's Middle English Translation of the De Regimine Principum of Aegidius Romanus*, David C. Fowler, Charles Briggs, Paul Remley (eds.) (New York, 1997).
- Wright, W.A. (ed.), *Generydes: A Romance in Seven-Line Stanzas*, EETS, OS, 55 (London, 1878).

## Calendars

Bliss, W.H. et al. (eds.) *Calendar Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal Letters, 1198-1404* (London, 1893-1902).

*Calendar of Charter Rolls, 1247-1417* (London 1908)

*Calendar of Chancery Warrants, 1244-1326* (London, 1927).

*Calendar of Close Rolls, 1296-1374* (London 1892-1908).

*Calendar of Fine Rolls, 1272-1377*(London, 1911-1912).

*Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1292-1370* (London, 1894-1903).

Thomas, A.H., and P.E. Jones (eds.), *Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls of the City of London, 1323-1364* (6 vols, Cambridge, 1926-61).

## Chronicles

Aungier, George James (ed.), *Chroniques de London*, Camden Society, Old Series, 28 (London, 1844).

Baker, Geoffrey, 'Vita et mors Edwardi II Conscripta a Thoma de la Moore [Chroniculum]', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, William Stubbs (ed.), Rolls Series, 76 (2 vols. London, 1965), vol. 2.

--- *Chronicon Galfredi Le Baker De Swynebroke*, E. M. Thompson (ed.) (London, 1889).

Bel, Jean le, *Cronique de Jean le Bel*, Jules Viard et Eugène Déprez (eds) (Paris, 1977).

Brie, Friedrich W. D., *The Brut or The Chronicles of England*, EETS, OS, 131, 136 (London, 1906-1908).

Childs, Wendy R. (trans., ed.), *Vita Edwardi Secundi* (Oxford, 2005).

Childs, Wendy R and John Taylor (ed.), *The Anonimalle Chronicle, 1307-1334: from the Brotherton Collection MS 29*, Yorkshire Archaeological Society (Leeds, 1991).

Froissart, Jean, *Oeuvres de Froissart*, Kervyn de Lettenhove (ed.) (24 vols, Brussels, 1867-1877).

Gervase, *Gervase of Canterbury*, H.T. Riley (ed.), Rolls Series, 73 (London, 1965).

Gray, Thomas, *Scalachronica*, Andy King (ed., trans) (Woodbridge 2005).

- Higden, Ranulph, *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis*, C. Babington and J.R. Lumby (eds.), Rolls Series, 41 (London, 1964).
- Langtoft, Pierre, *The Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft in French verse, from the earliest period to the death of King Edward I*, T. Wright (ed.), Rolls Series, 47 (2 vols, London, 1964).
- Maxwell, Herbert (ed., trans.), *Chronicon de Lanercost* (Cribyn, 2001).
- Monmouth, Geoffrey of, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, Lewis G. M. Thorpe (trans.) (London, 1966).
- Murimuth, Adam, *Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum [with] Robertus de Avesbury de Gestis Mirabilius Regis Edwardi Tertii*, Edward Maunde Thompson (ed.), Rolls Series, 93 (London, 1665).
- Raine, James (ed.), *Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres, Gaufridus Coldingham, Robertus de Graystaynes, et Willielmus de Chambre*, Surtees Society, 9 (London, 1839).
- Reading, Robert of, *Flores Historiarum*, Henry Richards Luard (ed.) Rolls Series, 95 (3 vols, London, 1965).
- Stevenson, Joseph (ed.), *Chronica Monasterii de Abingdon*, Rolls Series, 2 (London, 1858).
- *Chronicon de Lanercost* (Edinburgh, 1839).
- Stubbs, William, (ed.), 'Annales Londonienses' in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, Rolls Series, 76 (2 vols., London, 1965), vol. 1.
- 'Annales Paulini' in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, Rolls Series, 76 (2 vols, London, 1965), vol. 1.
- 'Gesta Edwardi de Carnarvan Auctore Canonico Bridlingtoniensi [Bridlington Chronicle]' in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, Rolls Series, 76 (2 vols., London, 1965), vol. 2.
- 'Commendatio Lametabilis...Regis Edwardi' in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, Rolls Series, 76 (2 vols., London, 1965), vol. 2.
- 'Vita et Mors Edwardi Secundi Regis Anglia' in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, Rolls Series, 76 (2 vols., London, 1965) vol. 2.
- Trokelow, John *Johannis de Trokelowe et Henrici de Blaneford Chronica Et Annales*, H.T. Riley (ed), Rolls Series, 28 (London, 1866).
- Chandos Herald, *La Vie du Prince Noir by Chandos Herald*, Diana Tyson (ed.) (Tübingen, 1975).

## Reference Sources

- Baggs, A. P. et al., Wardle *A History of the County of Chester: Volume 3*, in C. R. Elrington, B E Harris (ed.), *Victoria County History* (London, 1980).
- Baker, J.H., *Manual of Law French* (Aldershot, 1990).
- Cokayne, George E. and Vicary Gibbs (eds.), *The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom: extant, extinct or dormant* (13 vols in 6, Sutton, 1687).
- Given-Wilson, Chris et al., *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England*, Internet version, at <http://www.sd-editions.com/PROME>, Scholarly Digital Editions, (Leicester, 2005).
- Hallam, Elizabeth M., 'The Itinerary of Edward II and His Household, 1307-1328 in List and Index Society, 211( London, 1984).
- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* '<http://www.oxforddnb.com>'
- Powicke, F. Maurice and E. B. Fryde( eds.), *Handbook of British Chronology* (London, 1961).
- Shenton, Caroline *The Itinerary of Edward III and his Household, 1327-1345*, List and Index Society, 318 (2007).
- Stevenson, Joseph, *The Itinerary of Edward I*, Public Record Office: Record Commission Transcripts, Series II (London, 1836).

## Secondary Sources

- Allmand, Christopher, *The Hundred Years War, England and France at War c. 1300-c. 1450* (Cambridge, 1994).
- Allocco, Katherine, 'Intercessor, Rebel, Regent: The Political Life of Isabella of France' (Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Texas, Austin, 2004).
- Archer, Rowena, 'Rich Old Ladies: The Problem of Late Medieval Dowagers', in Tony Pollard (ed.), *Property and Politics* (Gloucester, 1984), pp. 15-35.
- How Ladies...who live on their manors ought to manage their households and estates': Women as Landholders and Administrators in the Later Middle Ages', in P.J.P Goldberg (ed.), *Women is a Worthy Wight: Women in English Society c. 1200-1500*, (Stroud, 1992), pp. 149-181.
- Barber, Richard, *Edward, Prince of Wales* (Woodbridge, 1996).

- Barron, Caroline, 'Introduction', *England and the Low Countries in the Later Middle Ages* (Stroud, 1995), pp. 1-28.
- 'The 'Golden Age' of Women in Medieval London', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 15 (1990), 35-58.
- Beattie, Cordelia, *Medieval Single Women: The Politics of Social Classification in Late Medieval England* (Oxford, 2007).
- Beem, Charles, '“Woe to Thee, O Land!” The Introduction', in Charles Beem (ed.), *The Royal Minorities of Medieval and Early Modern England* (New York, 2008), pp. 1-16.
- Bell, S. G., 'Medieval Women Book Owners: Arbiters of Lay Piety and Ambassadors of Culture', in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), pp. 149-187.
- Bennett, Judith M., 'Medievalism and Feminism', *Speculum*, 68 (1993), 309-331.
- *Medieval Women in Modern Perspective* (Washington, D.C., 2000).
- 'Public Power and Authority in the Medieval English Countryside', in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), pp. 18-36.
- *A Medieval Life: Cecilia Penifader of Brigstock, c. 1295-1344* (Boston, 1999).
- 'Women and Men in the Brewers' Guild of London, ca. 1420', in Edwin Brezette DeWindt (eds.), *The Salt of Common Life: Individuality and Choice in the Medieval Town, Countryside and Church. Essays Presented to J. Ambrose Raftis* (Kalamazoo, 1995), pp. 181-232.
- 'Medieval Women, Modern Women, across the Great Divide,' in David Aers (ed.), *Culture and History, 1350-1600: Essays on English Communities, Identities and Writing* (Detroit, 1992), pp. 147-175.
- 'England: Women and Gender', in S.H. Rigby (ed.) *A Companion to Britain in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 87-106.
- Bennett, Michael, 'Isabella of France, Anglo-French Diplomacy and Cultural Exchange in Late 1350's', in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), pp. 215-225.
- Bingham, Caroline, *The Life and Times of Edward II* (London, 1973).
- Blackley, F.D., 'Queen Isabella and the Bishop of Exeter', in T.A. Sanquist and M.R. Powicke (ed.), *Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson* (Toronto, 1968), pp. 220-35.



- 'Isabella of France, Queen of England (1308-1358) and the Late Medieval Cult of the Dead', *Canadian Journal of History*, 15 (1980), 23-47.
- Bock, Friedrich, 'Some New Documents Illustrating the Early Years of the Hundred Years War', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 15 (1931), 60-99.
- Boswell, John, *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality* (Chicago, 1980).
- 'Categories, Experiences and Sexuality', in Edward Stein, (ed.), *Forms of Desire: Sexual Orientation and the Social Constructionist Controversy* (New York, 1990), 133-173.
- Bothwell, J.S., *Edward III and the English Peerage: Royal Patronage, Social Mobility, and Political Control in Fourteenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2004).
- 'The More Things Change: Isabella and Mortimer, Edward III, and the Painful Delay of a Royal Majority (1327-1330)' in Charles Beem (ed.), *The Royal Minorities of Medieval and Early Modern England* (New York, 2008), pp. 67-102.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *The Logic of Practice*, Richard Nice (trans.) (Stanford, 1990).
- *Language and Symbolic Power*, Matthew Adamson and Gino Raymond (trans.) (Cambridge, 2003).
- Brown, Elizabeth A.R., 'Diplomacy, Adultery and Domestic Politics at the Court of Philip the Fair: Queen Isabella's Mission to France 1314', in Jeffrey S. Hamilton and Patricia J. Bradley (eds.), *Documenting the Past: Essays in Medieval History Presented to George Peddy Cuttino* (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 53-83.
- 'The Political Repercussions of the Marriage of Edward II of England and Isabelle of France', *Speculum*, 63(1988), 573-595.
- 'The Marriage of Edward II of England and Isabelle of France: a Postscript', *Speculum*, 64 (1989), 373-379.
- 'Persona et Gesta: the Image and Deeds of the Thirteenth-Century Capetians, 3—The Case of Philip the Fair', *Viator*, 19 (1989), 219-246.
- Burgtof, Jochen '“With my Life, His Joyes Began and Ended” Piers Gaveston and King Edward II of England Revisited', in Nigel Saul (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 31-47.
- Butler, Judith, *Undoing Gender* (New York, 2004).
- Butler, Sara, M., 'Maintenance Agreements and Male Responsibility in Late Medieval England', in Anthony Musson (ed.), *Boundaries of the Law: Geography, Gender and Jurisdiction in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Ashgate, 2005), pp. 67-83.

- Bynum, Caroline Walker, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Age* (Berkeley, 1984), pp. 110-69.
- Carpenter, Christine, 'The Beauchamp Affinity, A Study of Bastard Feudalism at Work', *English Historical Review*, 95 (1980), 514-532.
- Carpenter, David, *The Minority of Henry III* (London, 1990).
- Chaplais, Pierre, *Piers Gaveston: Edward II's Adoptive Brother* (Oxford, 1994).
- *English Diplomatic Practice in the Middle Ages* (London, 2003).
- Caviness, Madeline 'Anchoress, Abbess, and Queen: Donors and Patrons or Intercessors and Matrons', in June Hall McCash (ed.), *The Cultural Patronage of Medieval Women* (Athens, 1996), pp. 105-154.
- Chibnall, Marjorie, *The Empress Matilda: Queen Consort, Queen Mother and Lady of the English* (Oxford, 1991).
- 'The Empress Matilda and her Sons', in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.), *Medieval Mothering* (New York, 1996), pp. 279-294.
- 'Women in Oderic Vitalis', *The Haskins Society Journal*, 2 (1990), 105-121.
- Clanchy, Michael T., *From Memory to Written Record* (Oxford, 1993).
- Collette, Carolyne, *Performing Polity: Women and Agency in the Anglo-French Tradition, 1385-1620* (Turnhout, 2006).
- Conklin, George, 'Ingeborg of Denmark, queen of France, 1193-1223', in Anne J. Duggan (ed.), *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference Held at King's College London, April 1995* (Woodbridge 1997), 39-52.
- Cooper, Helen, *The English Romance in Time: Transforming Motifs from Geoffrey of Monmouth to the Death of Shakespeare* (Oxford, 2004).
- Coss, Peter, *The Lady in Medieval England* (Stroud, 1998).
- Connell, R.W., *Gender and Power* (Cambridge, 1987).
- Crawford, Anne, 'The Queen's Council in the Middle Ages', *English Historical Review*, 116 (2001), 1193-1211.
- 'The King's Burden- the Consequences of Royal Marriage in Fifteenth-Century England', in Ralph Griffiths (ed.), *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1981), pp. 33-56.

- Crook, David, 'The Last Days of Eleanor of Castile: The Death of a Queen in Nottinghamshire, November 1290', *Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire*, 94 (1990), 17-28.
- Crump, G.C., 'The Arrest of Roger Mortimer', *English Historical Review*, 26(1911), 331-32.
- Patricia Cullum and Jeremy Goldberg, 'How Margaret Blackburn Taught her Daughters: Reading Devotional Instruction in a Book of Hours', in Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al (eds.), *Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts in Late Medieval Britain, Essays for Felicity Riddy* (Turnhout, 2000), pp. 217-26.
- Curry, Anne, 'Cheshire and the Royal Demesne', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 128 (1979), 113-38.
- Danbury, Elizabeth, 'Images of English Queens in the Later Middle Ages', *Historian*, 46 (1995), 3-9.
- Davies, Joseph Conway, *The Baronial Opposition to Edward II* (Cambridge, 1918).
- Davis, Kathy 'Critical Sociology and Gender Relations', in Kathy Davis, Monique Leijenaar and Jantien Oldersma (eds), *The Gender of Power* (London, 1991), pp. 65-86.
- Denton, Jeffrey, 'From the Foundation of Vale Royal Abbey to the Statute of Carlisle : Edward I and Ecclesiastical Patronage', in Peter Coss and S.D. Lloyd, (eds.), *Thirteenth-Century England IV* (Woodbridge, 1992), pp. 123-37.
- Dinshaw, Carolyn, *Getting Medieval: Sexualities and Communities, Pre- and Postmodern* (Durham, 1999).
- Doherty, Paul C., 'The Date and Birth of Isabella, Queen of England (1308-1358)', *Bulletin of The Institute of Historical Research*, 48 (1975), 246-248.
- *Isabella and the Strange Death of Edward II* (Oxford, 2003).
- 'Isabella, Queen of England 1296-1330' (Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Oxford, 1977).
- Dodd, Gwilym, *Justice and Grace: Private Petitioning and the English Parliament in the Late Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2007).
- 'Richard II, Fiction of Majority Rule', in Charles Beem (ed.), *The Royal Minorities of Medieval and Early Modern England* (New York, 2008), 103-160.
- 'Thomas Paunfield, the hey Court of Rightwisnesse' and the Language of Petitioning in the Fifteenth Century', in W. M. Ormrod, Gwilym Dodd and Anthony Musson (eds.), *Medieval Petitions: Grace and Grievance* (York, 2009), pp. 222-242.

- Deprez, E., *Etudes de Diplomatice Anglaise* (Paris, 1908).
- Dryburgh, Paul, 'The Career of Roger Mortimer, the first earl of March' (Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Bristol, 2002).
- Duffy, Eamon, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400-c.1580* (New Haven, 2005).
- Dugdale, William, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, (8 vols, Farnborough, 1970).
- Earenfight, Theresa, 'Without the Persona of the Prince: Kings, Queens and the Idea of the Monarchy in Late Medieval Europe', *Gender and History*, 19 (2007), 33-51.
- Eisenstein, Z.R., 'The Sexual Politics of the New Right: Understanding the "Crisis of Liberalism for the 1980s"', in Nannerl O. Keohane, Michelle Z. Rosaldo, and Barbara C. Gelpi (eds), *Feminist Theory: A Critique of Ideology* (Chicago, 1982), pp. 567-588.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke, 'Feminist Discourse and Its Discontents: Language, Power and Meaning', in Nannerl O. Keohane, Michelle Z. Rosaldo, and Barbara C. Gelpi (eds), *Feminist Theory: A Critique of Ideology* (Chicago, 1982), pp. 603-621.
- Enright, Michael, 'Lady with a Mead Cup—Ritual Group Cohesion and Hierarchy in the Germanic World', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 22 (1988), 170-203.
- Erler, Mary C. and Maryanne Kowaleski, 'A New Economy of Power Relations: Female Agency in the Middle Ages', in Mary C. Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 2003), pp. 1-16.
- Facinger, Marion F, 'A Study of Medieval Queenship Capetian France, 987-1237', *Nebraska Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, 5 (1968), 1-48.
- Ferrante, Joan 'Public Postures and Private Manoeuvres: Roles Medieval Women Play', in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), pp. 213-29.
- Frantzen, Allen J., *Before the Closet: Same-Sex Love from Beowulf to Angels in America* (Chicago, 1998).
- Fryde, Natalie, *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II, 1321-1326* (Cambridge 1979).
- Gibbons, Rachel, 'Isabeau of Bavaria, Queen of France (1385-1422) The Creation of a Historical Villainess', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Series 6, 6 (1996), 51-73.
- Gilchrist, Roberta, 'Medieval Bodies in the Material World: Gender, Stigma and the Body', in S. Kay and M. Rubin (eds.), *Framing Medieval Bodies* (Manchester,

- 1994), 43-61.
- Given-Wilson, Chris, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London, 2004).
- *The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages: the Fourteenth-Century Political Community* (London, 1989).
- 'The Merger of Edward III's and Queen Philippa's Households', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 51 (1978), 183-187.
- *The Royal Household and the King's Affinity: Service, Politics and Finance in England 1360-1413* (New Haven, 1986).
- Given-Wilson, Chris and Alice Curteis, *The Royal Bastards of Medieval England* (London, 1984).
- Gransden, Antonia, *Historical Writing*, (2 vols, London, 1974).
- Green, David, *The Black Prince* (Stroud, 2001).
- Green, John Richard, *A Short History of the English People* (London, 1905).
- Green, Judith, *The Government of England Under Henry I* (Cambridge, 1986).
- Green, Mary Anne Everett, *Lives of the Princesses of England, from the Norman Conquest* (6 vols, London, 1857).
- Goldberg, P.J.P., 'Female Labour, Service and Marriage in Northern Towns during the Later Middle Ages', *Northern History*, 22 (1986), 18-38.
- 'For Better, For Worse': Marriage and Economic Opportunity for Women in Town and Country', in P.J.P Goldberg (ed.), *Women in Medieval English Society* (Stroud, 1997), pp. 108-125.
- 'Marriage, Migration, and Servanthood: The York Cause Paper Evidence', in P.J.P Goldberg (ed.) *Women in Medieval English Society* (Stroud, 1997), pp. 1-15.
- Goodman, Anthony, *John of Gaunt: The Exercise of Princely Power in Fourteenth-Century Europe* (Harlow, 1992).
- Haines, Roy Martin, *King Edward II: His Life, His Reign, and Its Aftermath, 1284-1330* (Montreal, 2006).
- Hallam, Elizabeth, M., *Capetian France, 987-1328* (London, 2001).
- 'Philip the Fair and the Cult of Saint Louis', *Studies in Church History*, 18, (1982), 201-214.

Hamilton, Jeffrey S., 'The Character of Edward II: The Letters of Edward of Caernarfon Reconsidered', in Gwilym Dodd and Anthony Musson (eds.), *The Reign of Edward II: New Perspectives* (York, 2006), pp. 5-21.

--- 'Menage a roi: Edward II and Piers Gaveston', *History Today* 49 (1999), 26-31.

--- *Piers Gaveston, Earl of Cornwall, 1307-1312: Politics and Patronage in the Reign of Edward II* (Detroit, 1988).

Hamilton, Tracey Chapman, 'Queenship and Kingship in the French *Bible Moralisee*: The Example of Blance of Castile and Vienna ONB 2554', in Kathleen Nolan (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), 177-208.

Hanawalt, Barbara, 'Female Networks for Fostering Lady Lisle's Daughters', in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.), *Medieval Mothering* (New York, 1996), pp. 239-258.

--- 'Men's Games, King's Deer: poaching in Medieval England', in Barbara Hanawalt (ed.), *Of Good and Ill Repute: Gender and Social Control in Medieval England* (Oxford, 1998), 142-155.

Hanawalt, Barbara and Anna Dronzek, 'Women in Medieval Urban Society', in Linda Mitchell (ed.), *Women in Medieval Western European Culture* (New York, 1999), pp. 31-45.

Hardy, Blanche C., *Philippa of Hainault and her Times* (London, 1910).

Harris, Simon J., 'Petitioning in the Last Years of Edward II and the First Years of Edward III', in W.M. Ormrod, Gwilym Dodd, Anthony Musson (eds.), *Medieval Petitions: Grace and Grievance* (York, 2009), pp. 173-192.

Hartsock, N., *Money, Sex and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism* (New York, 1983).

Hewitt, Hubert James, *Cheshire Under the Three Edwards* (Chester, 1967).

Hicks, Michael, *Anne Nevell: Queen to Richard III* (Stroud, 2007).

--- *Bastard Feudalism* (London, 1995).

--- 'Changing Rolls of the Wydevilles in Yorkist Politics to 1483', in C.D. Ross (ed.), *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1979), pp. 60-86.

--- *Warwick the Kingmaker* (Oxford, 1998).

Holmes, George, *The Estates of the Higher Nobility* (Cambridge, 1957).

- Hornaday, Aline G., 'A Capetian Queen as Street Demonstrator: Isabelle of Hainault', in Kathleen Nolan (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), pp. 77-98.
- Horrox, Rosemary, *Richard III: A Study of Service* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Howe, Emily 'Divine Kingship and Display: The Altar Wall Murals of St. Stephen's Chapel' *Antiquaries' Journal: Journal of the Society of Antiquaries of London*, 81 (2001), 259-303.
- Howell, Margaret, *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1998).
- Howell, M.C., 'Citizenship and Gender: Women's Political Status in Northern Medieval Cities', in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), pp. 37-61.
- Hume, David, *The History of England: From the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution 1688* (Oxford, 1688).
- Humm, Maggie, *Modern Feminisms: Political, Literary, Cultural* (New York, 1992).
- Huneycutt, Lois, 'The Creation of a Crone: The Historical Reputation of Adelaide of Maurienne', in Kathleen Nolan (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), pp. 27-44.
- 'Female Succession and the Language of Power in the Writings of Twelfth-Century Churchmen', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1998), pp. 189-202.
- 'Images of Queenship in High Middle Ages', *Haskins Society Journal*, 1(1989), 61-71.
- *Matilda of Scotland: A Study in Medieval Queenship* (Rochester, 2003).
- 'Medieval Queenship', *History Today*, 39 (1989), 16-22.
- 'Public Lives, Private Ties: Royal Mothers in England and Scotland, 1070-1204', in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.), *Medieval Mothering* (New York, 1996), pp. 295-312.
- Hunter, Joseph, 'The Mission of Queen Isabella to the Court of France and of her Long Residence in that Country', *Archaeologia*, 36 (1855), 242-256.
- James, George Payne Ransford, *A History of the Life of Edward, the Black Prince* (London, 1836).
- Johnstone, Hilda, 'Isabella, The She Wolf', *History*, 21(1936-7), 208-18.
- 'The Queen's Household', in T.F. *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval*

- England* (6 vols, Manchester, 1920-1933), vol. 5, 231-289.
- 'The Queen's Household', in W.A. Morris (ed.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols, The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1930-1940), vol. 1, pp. 250-299.
- 'The Queen's Exchequer under the Three Edwards', in J.G. Edwards (ed.), *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait* (Manchester, 1933), pp. 143-153.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1957).
- Kaeuper, Richard, 'Law and Order in Fourteenth-Century England: The Evidence of Special Commissions of Oyer and Terminer', *Speculum*, 54 (1979).
- Kelly, Joan 'Did Women Have a Renaissance?', in *Women, History, and Theory: The Essays of Joan Kelly* (Chicago, 1986), pp. 19-50.
- King, Margaret L., 'Book-Lined Cells: Women and Humanism in the Early Italian Renaissance', in Patricia H Labalme (ed.), *Beyond Their Sex: Learned Women of the European Past* (New York, 1984), pp. 91-116.
- Kipling, G., 'Margaret of Anjou's Royal Entry into London', *Medieval English Theatre*, 4 (1982).
- Komter, Aafke, 'Gender, Power and Feminist Theory', in Kathy Davis, Monique Leijenaar and Jantien Oldersma (eds), *The Gender of Power* (London, 1991), 2-64.
- Kowaleski, Maryanne 'Women's Work in a Market Town: Exeter in the Late Fourteenth Century', in Barbara Hanawalt (ed.), *Women and Work in Preindustrial Europe* (Bloomington, 1986), pp. 145-164.
- Kristeva, Julia, 'Women's Time', in Nannerl O. Keohane, Michelle Z. Rosaldo, and Barbara C. Gelpi (eds.), *Feminist Theory: A Critique of Ideology* (Chicago, 1982), pp. 13-35.
- Lamphere, Louise, 'Strategies, Cooperation, and Conflict among Women in Domestic Groups', in Michelle Z. Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere (eds.), *Women, Culture and Society* (Stanford, 1974), pp. 89-100.
- Lander, J.R., 'Marriage and Politics in the Fifteenth Century: The Nevilles and the Wydevilles', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 36 (1963), 129-50.
- Laynesmith, Joanna, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503* (Oxford, 2004).
- Lewis, Suzanne, 'Apocalypse of Isabella of France', *Art Bulletin*, 72 (1990), 224-260.



- LoPrete, Kimberly A. 'Historical Ironies in the Study of Capetian Women' in Kathleen Nolan, *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), pp. 271-286.
- Loveday, Gee, *Women, Art and Patronage from Henry III to Edward III* (Woodbridge, 2002).
- Lucas, H.S., *The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, 1326-1347* (Ann Arbor, 1929).
- MacKinnon, A. Catherine, 'Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State: An Agenda for Theory,' in Nannerl O. Keohane, Michelle Z. Rosaldo, and Barbara C. Gelpi (eds), *Feminist Theory: A Critique of Ideology* (Chicago, 1982), pp. 1-30.
- MacLean, Simon, 'Queenship, Nunneries and Royal Widowhood in Carolingian Europe', *Past and Present: A Journal of Historical Studies* 178 (2003), 3-38.
- Maddicott, J.R., *Thomas of Lancaster, 1307-1322: A Study in the Reign of Edward II* (Oxford, 1970).
- Marshall, Alison, 'The Childhood and Households of Edward II's Half-Brothers, Thomas of Brotherton and Edmund of Woodstock', in Gwilym Dodd and Anthony Musson (eds.), *The Reign of Edward II: New Perspectives* (York, 2006), pp. 190-204.
- Marvin, Julia 'Albino and Isabella: Regicidal Queens and the Historical Imagination of the Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut* Chronicles', *Arthurian Literature*, 18 (2001), 143-191.
- Maurer, Helen, *Margaret of Anjou: Queenship and Power in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2003).
- Mate, Mavis, *Women in Medieval English Society* (Cambridge 1999).
- Maxwell-Lyte, H.C., *Historical Notes on the Use of the Great Seal of England* (London, 1926).
- McCannon, Afordesia, E., 'Two Capetian Queens as the Foreground for an Aristocrat's Anxiety in the *Vie de Saint Louis*', in Kathleen Nolan (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York 2003), pp. 163-176.
- McFarlane, K.B., *The Nobility of Later Medieval England: The Ford Lectures for 1953 and Related Studies* (Oxford, 1973).
- McKisack, May, *The Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1959).
- McHardy, Alison, 'Paying for the Wedding: Edward III as Fundraiser, 1332-33', in J.S. Hamilton (ed.) *Fourteenth Century England, IV* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 43-60.
- McIntosh, Marjorie, *Autonomy and Community: The Royal Manor of Havering, 1200-*

1500 (Cambridge, 1986).

McNamara, Jo Ann, 'Women and Power through the Family Revisited', in Mary C. Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Ithica, 2003), pp. 17-30.

McNamara Jo Ann, and Suzanne Wemple, 'The Power of Women Through the Family in Medieval Europe, 500-100', *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), pp. 83-101.

Menache, Sophie, 'Isabella of France Queen of England: A Reconsideration', *Journal of Medieval History*, 10 (1984), 107- 124.

Micheal, A. Micheal, 'The Iconography of Kingship in the Walter Milemete Treatise', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute*, 57 (1994), 35-47.

--- 'A Manuscript Wedding Gift From Philippa of Hainault to Edward III', *Burlington Magazine*, 127 (1985), 582-99.

--- 'The Little Land of England is Preferred before the Great Kingdom of France: Quartering of the Royal Arms by Edward III', in David Bukton and T.A. Heslop (eds.), *Studies in Medieval Art and Architecture presented to Peter Lasko* (Stroud, 1994), pp. 113-126.

Millett, Kate, *Sexual Politics* (Urbana, 2000).

Mitchell, Linda, *Portraits of Medieval Women: Family Marriage and Politics in England, 1225-1350* (New York, 2003).

Mitchell, Rosemary, 'The Red Queen and the White Queen: Exemplification of Medieval Queens in Nineteenth-century Britain' in Geoffrey Cubitt and Allen Warren (eds.), *Heroic Reputations and Exemplary Lives* (Manchester, 2000), pp. 157-176.

Morgan, Nigel 'Texts and Images of Marian Devotion in English Twelfth-Century Monasticism, and their Influence on the Secular Church', in Benjamin Thompson (ed.), *Monasteries and Society in Medieval Britain: Proceedings of the 1994 Harlaxton Symposium* (Stamford, 1999), pp. 117-36.

Morganstern, Anne McGee, 'The Tomb as Prompter for the Chantry: Four examples from Late Medieval England', in Elizabeth Valdez Del Alamo and Carol Stamatis Pendergast (eds), *Memory and the Medieval Tomb* (Aldershot, 2000), 81-97.

Morris, W.A. 'Introduction: The Council and The Chancery and Privy Seal', in W.A. Morris, *English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols, The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1940), vol. 1, pp. 29-77.

Mortimer, Ian, 'Sermons of Sodomy: A Reconsideration of Edward II's Sodomitical

- Reputation', in Gwilym Dodd and Anthony Musson (eds.), *The Reign of Edward II: New Perspectives* (York, 2006), pp. 48-60.
- *The Greatest Traitor: The Life of Sir Roger Mortimer, Ruler of England: 1327-1330* (New York, 2006).
- Musson, Anthony 'Queenship, Lordship and Petitioning in Late Medieval England', in W. M. Ormrod, Gwilym Dodd and Anthony Musson (eds.), *Medieval Petitions: Grace and Grievance* (York, 2009), pp. 161-62.
- Myers, A.R. *Crown, Household and Parliament in Fifteenth Century England* (London, 1985).
- Nelson, Janet L., 'Early Medieval Rites of Queen-Making and the Shaping of Medieval Queenship', in Anne J. Duggan (ed.), *Queens and Queenship in Europe: Proceedings of a Conference Held at King's College, London, April 1995* (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 301-315.
- 'Medieval Queenship', in Linda Mitchell (ed.), *Women in Medieval Western European Culture* (New York, 1999), pp.179-207.
- 'Queens as Jezebels: The Careers of Brunhild and Balthild in Merovingian History', in Derek Baker (ed.), *Medieval Women, Dedicated and Presented to Professor Rosalind M.T. Hill on the Occasion of Her Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 31-77.
- Nicholas, David, *Medieval Flanders* (London, 1992).
- Nicholson, Ranald, *Edward III and the Scots: The Formative Years of a Military Career, 1327-1335* (Oxford, 1965).
- Oldersma, Jantine and Kathy Davis, 'Introduction' in Kathy Davis, Monique Leijenaar and Jantine Oldersma (eds), *The Gender of Power* (London, 1991), pp. 1-20.
- Orme, Nicholas, *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings* (London, 1984).
- Ormrod, W.M., *Edward III*, (Stroud, 2005).
- 'Edward III's Government of England c. 1346-1356' (Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Oxford, 1984).
- 'Edward III and His Family', *Journal of British Studies*, 26 (1987), 398-422.
- 'In Bed with Joan of Kent: the King's Mother and the Peasants Revolt of 1381', in Jocelyn Wogan-Browne (ed.), *Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts in Late Medieval Britain. Essays for Felicity Riddy* (Turnhout, 2000), pp. 277-292.
- 'The King's Secrets: Richard de Bury and the Monarchy of Edward III', in Chris

Given-Wilson, Ann Kettle, Len Scales (eds.), *War, Government and Aristocracy in the British Isles, C.1150-1500: Essays in Honour of Michael Prestwich* (Woodbridge, 2008), pp. 163-178.

--- 'Love and War in 1294', in Michael Prestwich (ed.), *Thirteenth Century England, VIII: Proceedings of the Durham Conference, 1999* (Woodbridge, 2001), pp.143-152.

--- 'Monarchy, Martyrdom and Masculinity: England in the Later Middle Ages', in P.H. Cullum and Katherine J. Lewis (eds.), *Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages* (Cardiff, 2004), pp. 175-187.

--- 'The Personal Religion of Edward III', *Speculum*, 84 (1989) 849-877.

--- 'The Royal Nursery: A Household for the Younger Children of Edward III', *English Historical Review*, 120 (2005), 398-415.

--- 'The Sexualities of Edward II', in Gwilym Dodd and Anthony Musson (eds.), *The Reign of Edward II: New Perspectives* (York, 2006), pp. 22-47.

Owen, D.D.R., *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen and Legend* (Oxford, 2000).

Parsons, John Carmi, *Eleanor of Castile: Queen and Society in Thirteenth-Century England* (London, 1995).

--- 'Family, Sex and Power: The Rhythms of Medieval Queenship', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1998), pp. 1-12.

--- 'The Intercessionary Patronage of Queen Margaret and Isabella of France', in Michael Prestwich, R.H. Britnell and Robin Frame (eds.), *Thirteenth Century England, VI: Proceedings of the Durham Conference, 1999* (Woodbridge, 1995), pp. 81-97.

--- 'Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power: Some Plantagenet evidence, 1150-1500', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1998), pp. 63-78.

--- '“Never was a body buried in England with such solemnity and honour”: The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens to 1500', in Anne J. Duggan (ed.), *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference Held at King's College London, April 1995* (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 317-337.

--- 'Piety, Power and the Reputations of Two Thirteenth-Century Queens', in Theresa M. Vann, (ed.), *Queens, Regents and Potentates* (Dallas, 1993), pp. 107-23.

--- 'The Pregnant Queen as Counsellor and the Medieval Construction of Motherhood', in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.), *Medieval Mothering* (New York, 1996), pp. 39-62.

- 'Of Queens, Courts and Books: Reflections on the Literary Patronage of Thirteenth-Century Plantagenet Queens', in June Hall McCash (ed.), *The Cultural Patronage of Medieval Women* (Athens, 1996), pp. 175-201.
- 'The Queen's Intercession in Thirteenth-Century England', in Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth Maclean (eds.), *Power of the Weak*, (Illinois, 1995), pp. 147-178.
- 'Ritual and Symbol in the English Medieval Queenship to 1500', in L.O. Fradenburg (ed.), *Women and Sovereignty* (Edinburgh, 1992), pp. 60-77.
- Peters, Edward, *The Shadow King: Rex Inutilis in Medieval Law and Literature, 751-1327* (New Haven, 1970).
- Poulet, André, 'Capetian Women and the Regency: the genesis of a Vocation', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1998), pp. 93-116.
- Powicke, Michael, *Military Obligation in Medieval England: A Study in Liberty and Duty* (Oxford, 1962).
- Prestwich, Michael, *Edward I* (London, 1997).
- *The Three Edwards: War and State in England, 1272-1377* (London, 2003).
- 'The English at the Battle of Neville's Cross', in David Rollason and Michael Prestwich (ed.), *The Battle of Neville's Cross, 1346* (Stamford, 1998), pp. 1-14.
- Ramsay, J.H., *Lancaster and York: A Century of English History AD 1399-1485*, (2 vols, Oxford, 1892).
- Rezak, Brigitte Bedos, 'Women, Seals, and Power in Medieval France, 1150-1350', in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), pp. 61-82.
- Richardson, H.G., 'Annales Paulini', *Speculum*, 23 (1948), 630-638.
- Rigby, S.H., *English Society in the Later Middle Ages: Class, Status, and Gender* (Basingstoke, 1995).
- Rosaldo, Michelle Z, 'Women, Culture, and Society: A Theoretical Overview', in Michelle Z. Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere (eds.), *Women, Culture and Society* (Stanford, 1974), pp. 17-42.
- Ross, Charles, *Edward IV* (London, 1974).
- Round, J.H. 'The Landing of Queen Isabella in 1326', *English Historical Review*, 14 (1899), 104-5.

- Safford, E.W., 'An Account of the Expenses of Eleanor, Sister of Edward III, on her Marriage to the count of Guelders', *Archaeologia*, 77 (1927), 111-40.
- St. John, Graham E., 'Edward III and the Use of Political Dissent in France, c. 1330-1360' (Unpublished M. Phil Thesis. University of Cambridge, 2005).
- Sanday, Peggy, 'Female Status in the Public Domain', in Michelle Z. Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere (eds.), *Women, Culture and Society* (Stanford, 1974), pp.189-206.
- Saul, Nigel, *Richard II* (New Haven, 1997).
- Scase, Wendy, 'St. Anne and the Education of the Virgin: Literary and Artistic Traditions and their Implications,' in Nicholas Rogers (ed.), *England in the Fourteenth Century* (Stamford, 1993), pp. 81-96.
- Schowalter, Katherine "The Ingeborg Psalter: Queenship, Legitimacy, and the Appropriation of Byzantine Art in the West', in Kathleen Nolan (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), pp. 99-135.
- Schramm, Percy Ernst, *The History of the English Coronation*, L.G.W. Legg (trans) (Oxford 1937).
- Schulenburg, Jane Tibbets, 'Female Sanctity: Public and Private Roles, ca. 500-1100', in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds.), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), 102-127.
- *Forgetful of Their Sex: Female Sanctity and Society, ca. 500-1100* (Chicago,1998).
- Scott, Joan 'Gender: a Useful Category of Historical Analysis', *American Historical Review*, 91 (1996), 1053-1075.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York 1985).
- Sekules, Veronica, 'Dynasty and Patrimony in the Self-Construction of an English Queen', in John Mitchell and Matthew Moran (eds.), *England and the Continent in the Middle Ages* (Stamford, 2000), pp. 157-174.
- Shadis, Miriam, 'Berenguela of Castile's Political Motherhood: The Management of Sexuality, Marriage, and Succession', in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (eds.), *Medieval Mothering* (New York, 1996), pp. 335-358.
- 'Blanche of Castile and Facinger's "Medieval Queenship": Reassessing the Argument', in Kathleen Nolan (ed.) *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), pp. 137-162.
- Sharpe, Margaret, 'The Household of the Black Prince', in T.F. Tout (ed.), *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England* (6 vols, Manchester, 1920-1933),

vol. 5, pp. 289-431.

- Shealy, E.H., *The English Administration of Ponthieu, 1299-1369* (Unpublished PhD Thesis. Emory University, 1977).
- Shenton, Caroline, 'Edward III and the Coup of 1330'. in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), pp. 13-34.
- 'Philippa of Hainault's Churchings: the Politics of Motherhood', in Richardson Eales and Shaun Tyas (eds.), *Family and Dynasty in Late Medieval England* (Donington, 2003), pp. 105-121.
- Shingorn, Pamela '“The Wise Mother” The Image of St. Anne Teaching the Virgin Mary, in Mary C. Erler and Maryanne Koaleski (eds.), *Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 2003), pp. 105-134.
- Skovgaard-Petersen, Inge, 'Queenship in Medieval Denmark', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1993), pp. 25-42.
- Sneddon, Shelia 'Words and Realities: The Language and Dating of Petitions, 1326-1327', in W.M. Ormrod, Anthony Musson, Gwilym Dodd (eds.), *Medieval Petitions: Grace and Greivance* (York, 2009), pp. 193-206.
- Stafford, Pauline, 'Emma: The Powers of the Queen in the Eleventh Century', in Anne J. Duggan (ed), *King's Collage London April 1995* (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 3-23.
- 'Powerful Women in the Early Middle Ages: Queens and Abbesses', in Peter Linehan and Janet L. Nelson (eds.), *The Medieval World* (London, 2001), pp. 398-415
- Queens, Concubines and Dowagers: The King's Wife in the Early Middle Ages* (London, 1998).
- 'Women and the Norman Conquest', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6<sup>th</sup> Series, 4(1996), 221-50.
- Stanton, Anne Rudolf. 'Isabelle of France and her Manuscripts, 1308-1358', in Kathleen Nolen (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003), pp. 225-252.
- 'The Psalter of Isabelle, Queen of England, Isabelle as the Audience', *Word and Image*, 18 (2002), 1-27.
- *The Queen Mary Psalter: A Study of Affect and Audience* (Philadelphia, 2001).
- Stones, E.L.G., 'The English Mission to Edinburgh in 1328', *Scottish Historical Review*, 28 (1949), 121-32.
- 'The Treaty of Northampton, 1328', *History*, 38 (1953), 54-61.

- Strickland, Agnes, *The Lives of the Queens of England from the Norman Conquest*, (6 vols, London, 1840-1849).
- Strohm, Paul, 'Queens as Intercessors' in *Hochon's Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts* (Princeton, 1992), pp. 95-119.
- Stuard, Susan Mosher, 'The Dominion of Gender: Women's Fortunes in the High Middle Ages', in Renate Bridenthal and Claudia Koonz (eds.), *Becoming Visible: Women in European History* (Boston, 1987), pp. 153-72.
- Sumption, Jonathan, *The Hundred Years War: Trial by Battle*, (3 vols, Philadelphia, 1990), vol. 1.
- Taylor, Craig 'Edward III and the Plantagenet Claim to the Throne', in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), pp. 155-169.
- 'The Salic Law and the Valois Succession to the French Crown', *French History*, 15 (2001), 358-377.
- Tout, T.F., *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England* (6 vols, Manchester, 1920-1933).
- Trindade, Ann, *Berengaria: In Search of Richard the Lionheart's Queen* (Dublin, 1999).
- Turner, Ralph V., 'Eleanor of Aquitaine and her Children: An Inquiry into Medieval Family Attachment', *Journal of Medieval History*, 14(1988), 321-335.
- 'The Children of Anglo-Norman Royalty and Their Upbringing', *Medieval Prosopography*, 11(1990), 17-52.
- Vale, Malcolm, 'The Anglo-French Wars 1294-1340: Allies and Alliances' in Philippe Contamine, Charles Giry-Deloison, Maurice H. Keen (eds.), *Guerre et Societe en France, en Angleterre et en Bourongne XIVe-Xve Siecle* (Lille, 1991), pp. 15-35.
- *The Origins of the Hundred Years War* (Oxford, 2004).
- *The Princely Court: Medieval Courts and Culture in North-West Europe, 1270-1380* (Oxford, 2001).
- Valente, Claire, 'The Deposition and Abdication of Edward II', *English Historical Review*, 113 (1998), 852-881.
- Vincent, Nicholas 'Isabella of Angouleme: John's Jezebel', in S.D. Church (ed.), *King John: New Interpretations* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 165-219.
- Walker, Simon, *The Lancastrian Affinity, 1361-1399* (Oxford, 1990).
- Ward, Jennifer, 'English Noble Women and the Local Community', in Diane Watt (ed.),



- Medieval Women in their Communities* (Cardiff, 1997), pp. 186-203.
- 'Townswomen and Their Households', in Richard Britnell (ed.), *Daily Life in the Late Middle Ages* (Stroud, 1998), pp. 27-42.
- *Women in England in the Middle Ages* (London, 2006).
- Wathey, Andrew, 'The Marriage of Edward III and the Transmission of French Motets to England', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 45 (1992), 1-29.
- Watts, John, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Wagh, Scott L. 'For King, Country, and Patron: The Dispensers and Local Administration, 1321-1322', *The Journal of British Studies*, 22 (1983), 23-58.
- Weir, Alison, *Queen Isabella: Treachery, Adultery, and Murder in Medieval England* (New York, 2005).
- Wemple, Suzanne, *Women in Frankish Society: Marriage and the Cloister, 500-900* (Philadelphia, 1981).
- Westervelt, T., 'The Woodvilles in the Second Reign of Edward IV, 1471-83' (Unpublished M.Phil. Thesis. University of Cambridge, 1997).
- Wilkinson, Bertie, 'The Chancery', in W.A. Morris (ed.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols, The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1930-1940), vol. 1, pp. 162-205.
- *The Chancery Under Edward III* (Manchester, 1929).
- Wilkinson, Louise 'Women as Sheriffs in Early Thirteenth Century England', in Adrian Jobson (ed.), *English Government in the Thirteenth Century* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 111-124.
- Wiswall, Frank L., 'Politics, Procedure and the "Non-Minority" of Edward III: Some Comparisons', in James L. Gillespie (ed.), *The Age of Richard II* (Stroud, 1997), pp. 7-25.
- Wolffe, B.P., *The Royal Demesne in English History: The Crown Estate in the Governance of the Realm from the Conquest to 1509* (London, 1971).
- Warbuton, W., *Edward III* (London, 1875).
- Young, Charles, *The Royal Forests of Medieval England* (Philadelphia, 1979).