

John de Cherleton, first lord Charlton of Powys: a biography

*'I am pope, I am king, I am bishop and abbot in my land'*



(John de Cherleton, Jesse window of St. Mary's Church, Shrewsbury.  
Picture, authors own.)

Catherine Clarke

Dissertation submitted in fulfilment  
of an MA in Medieval Studies  
University of Wales Trinity Saint David  
August 2022

## Master's Degrees by Examination and Dissertation

### Declaration Form

1. This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Name.....CATHERINE CLARKE.....

Date .....10/08/2022.....

2. This dissertation is being submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MASTERS DEGREE IN MEDIEVAL STUDIES .....

Name... ..CATHERINE CLARKE.....

Date ...10/08/2022.....

3. This dissertation is the result of my own independent work/investigation, except where otherwise stated.

Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references.

A bibliography is appended.

Name.....CATHERINE CLARKE .....

Date: .....10/08/2022.....

4. I hereby give consent for my dissertation, if accepted, to be available for photocopying, inter- library loan, and for deposit in the University's digital repository

Name.....CATHERINE CLARKE.....

Date.....10/08/2022.....

### Supervisor's Declaration.

I am satisfied that this work is the result of the student's own efforts.

Signed: C Rozier

Date: 10 August 2022

**University of Wales: Trinity Saint David  
E-Thesis Deposit Agreement**

**Details of the Work**

I would like to deposit the following item in the digital repository maintained by the University, and/or in any other repository authorized for use by the University:

**Title ... John de Cherleton, first lord Charlton of Powys: a biography  
*'I am pope, I am king, I am bishop and abbot in my land'***

This item is a product of my own research endeavours and is covered by the agreement below in which the item is referred to as "the Work". It is identical in content to that deposited in the University Library, subject to point 4 below.

I agree that the University of Wales: Trinity Saint David may electronically store, copy or translate the Work to any approved medium or format for the purpose of future preservation and accessibility. The University is not under any obligation to reproduce or display the Work in the same formats or resolutions in which it was originally deposited.

**UW: TSD Digital Repository**

I understand that work deposited in the digital repository will be accessible to a wide variety of people and institutions, including automated agents and search engines via the World Wide Web.

I understand that once the Work is deposited, the item and its metadata may be incorporated into public access catalogues or services, such as national databases of electronic theses.

**I agree as follows:**

1. That I am the author or have the authority of the author/s to make this agreement and do hereby give the University of Wales: Trinity Saint David the right to make available the Work in the way described above.
2. That the electronic copy of the Work deposited in the digital repository and covered by this agreement, is identical in content to the paper copy of the Work deposited in the University Library, subject to point 4 below.
3. That I have exercised reasonable care to ensure that the Work is original, and to the best of my knowledge, does not breach any laws including those relating to defamation, libel and copyright.
4. That I have, in instances where the intellectual property of other authors or copyright holders is included in the Work, gained explicit permission for the inclusion of that material in the Work, and in the

electronic form of the Work as accessed through the open access digital repository, or that I have identified and removed that material for which adequate permission has not been obtained and which will be inaccessible via the digital repository

5. That University of Wales: Trinity Saint David does not hold any obligation to take legal action on behalf of the Depositor, or other rights holders, in the event of a breach of intellectual property rights, or any other right, in the material deposited.
6. That I undertake to indemnify the University of Wales: Trinity Saint David against all actions, suits, proceedings, claims, demands and costs occasioned by the University in consequence of any breach of this agreement

**Name:** .....**CATHERINE CLARKE**.....

**Date:** .....**10/08/2022**.....

## Table of Contents

Abstract		i
Acknowledgements		ii
Abbreviations		iii
Introduction		1
Chapter One:	Beginnings	8
Chapter Two:	The Barony of Powys & the Ordinances of 1311	17
Chapter Three:	Bannockburn & other Disturbances	27
Chapter Four:	The Despencers	34
Chapter Five:	Edward III	41
Conclusion		47
Bibliography		52

## Abstract

John de Cherleton was born sometime in the late thirteenth century into a family based in Charlton in Shropshire. We have few details of the de Cherleton family before this time, but it is known that John and his brothers were to rise from relative obscurity to become influential and powerful men, within the church and royal court. John is an important, if less well-known figure, and was involved in many of the key issues of Edward II's reign and remained a significant figure in the Welsh Marches into the reign of Edward III. This paper begins with John's life as a soldier in the service of Edward I and in the household of Edward, Prince of Wales, before moving on to focus on his influence at court once Edward became king. It explores in detail John's close association with Gaveston, in the early years of the reign and the impact that this had on Edward's relationships with his barons, particularly Thomas of Lancaster. It demonstrates how his marriage to Hawise de la Pole, which brought with it the title of first lord Charlton of Powys, secured his family's social status and prestige. This paper will call into question previous assumptions about John de Cherleton and challenge existing accounts of his involvement in notable events, such as the Despenser Wars, by returning to primary source material. It will trace his involvement in the deposition of Edward II and the reign of Edward III and ensure that the wider context is given due consideration when examining his actions in later life. Ultimately, it will tell the story of a remarkable man, who managed to navigate successfully, the most challenging of times, to ensure that his family enjoyed wealth, power and status long after his death.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to say thank you to my husband Andrew and my daughters Daisy and Molly, for tolerating my obsession with medieval and early modern history for so many years, enabling me to complete my master's degree. The endless cups of coffee, the proof reading and listening to me ramble on about John de Cherleton, Piers Gaveston and Edward II and the importance of checking primary sources, has been very much appreciated.

As a distance learner, the friendship and support of the Lampeter online Medieval Researchers group was especially valuable. I'd like to give special thanks to Sarah in particular, for making me laugh, keeping me motivated and finding some of the most obscure references for John de Cherleton during her own research! I'd also like to thank Katie for her technical wizardry with footnotes and Word, without which my dissertation would not be so well structured or presented.

I cannot thank enough, the amazing Prof. Janet Burton for all her help and advice, and her endless patience and kindness. She supported me throughout the entire course and without her, I would not be submitting this dissertation today, nor would I be embarking on a PhD.

But finally, my biggest thanks goes to Alfie who kept me company throughout my research. He has snored his way through the reigns of three kings, many an online seminar and the months of work that went into writing this dissertation. He has never left my side.

And so, I dedicate this dissertation to Alfie.



## Abbreviations

<i>CCR</i>	Calendar of the Charter Rolls.
<i>CPR</i>	Calendar of Patent Rolls.
<i>CFR</i>	Calendar of Fine Rolls.
<i>CChR</i>	Calendar Charter Rolls.
<i>CIPM</i>	Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem.
<i>CChW</i>	Calendar of Chancery Warrants 1244-1326.
<i>PRME</i>	Parliament Rolls of Medieval England.
<i>PRO</i>	Public Record Office
<i>DNB</i>	Dictionary of National Biography.
<i>ODNB</i>	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.
<i>Vita</i>	Childs, W.R. and N. Denholm-Young, <i>Vita Edwardi Secundi: The Life of Edward the Second</i> .
<i>Conway-Davies, Opposition</i>	Conway-Davies, J., <i>The Baronial Opposition to Edward II</i> .
<i>Hamilton, Gaveston</i>	Hamilton, J. S., <i>Piers Gaveston, Earl of Cornwall 1307 - 1312</i> .
<i>Hamilton, Reassessment</i>	Hamilton, J.S., <i>A Reassessment of the Loyalty of the Household Knights of Edward II</i> .
<i>Prestwich, Unreliability</i>	Prestwich, M., <i>The Unreliability of Royal Household Knights in the Early Fourteenth Century</i> .
<i>Tebbit, Knights</i>	Tebbit, A., <i>Household Knights and Military Service under the Direction of Edward II</i> .
<i>Tebbit, Patronage</i>	Tebbit, A., <i>Royal Patronage and Political Allegiance: The Household Knights of Edward II</i> .
<i>Tout, Chapters</i>	Tout, T.F., <i>Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England, the Wardrobe, the Chamber and the Small Seals, V2</i> .



## Introduction

John de Cherleton (d. 1353) is a figure who appears in many of the accounts of the reign of Edward II, most frequently in his capacity as chamberlain and in the disputes over his position as first lord Charlton of Powys.<sup>1</sup> Lesser-known references to him concern his position in the household of Piers Gaveston and the capture of the Earl of Arundel, during the rebellion of Isabella and Mortimer. He appears in material relating to the Edwardian wars in Scotland and in biographies of other notable figures of the time, such as Thomas of Lancaster.<sup>2</sup> A detailed exploration of the life of John de Cherleton does not exist beyond that contained in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* or the account in *The Barony of Powys 1275-1360* by Richard Morgan, which, as the title suggests, focuses primarily on John's involvement with the barony.<sup>3</sup> The fractured nature of John's biography, in existing secondary sources, has resulted in a lack of wider context for the events in his life and the actions he took, and does not give due attention to his role in a number of key issues of the period. The aim of this paper is to address this matter and, in particular, highlight his importance to understanding the reign of Edward II, as it is in this period that John's influence is most apparent. It will address a number of discrepancies in the biographical scholarship and demonstrate how they have led to a misleading representation of John de Cherleton. It is hoped that this account of his life will provide a reassessment of the man, his influence, and achievements.

There is a wide selection of scholarly narratives that cover the period of John's life, such as the *Yale Monarchs* series.<sup>4</sup> Born out of a revived interest in medieval biography, they provide a rich political, social and economic history of the period and supply references for many other works and primary sources that add greater detail and in-depth analysis. There

---

<sup>1</sup> John de Cherleton and his family are variously referred to in primary and secondary sources as de Cherleton, de Chorleton, de Charleton and Charlton. I will use *de Cherleton* to refer to John and his family, and *Charlton* to refer to the lands in Shropshire from which the baronial title is taken.

<sup>2</sup> J. R. Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster, 1307-1322: A Study in the Reign of Edward II*, Oxford Historical Monographs (London: Oxford U.P., 1970).

<sup>3</sup> J. F. A. Mason, 'Charlton, John, First Lord Charlton of Powys (d. 1353), Soldier and Administrator' (Oxford University Press, 2004) <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/5165>>. This entry replaces the earlier entry by Tout T. F. Tout, 'Charlton or Cherleton, John de, First Lord Charlton of Powys (d 1353)' (Oxford University Press) <<https://doi.org/10.1093/odnb/9780192683120.013.5165>>; R. Morgan, *The Barony of Powys, 1275-1360*, Welsh Historical Review (Cardiff (GB): University of Wales Press, 1980).

<sup>4</sup> M. Prestwich, *Edward I*, Yale English Monarchs (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997); J. R. S. Phillips, *Edward II*, Yale English Monarchs (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011); W. M. Ormrod, *Edward III*, Yale English Monarchs, Yale English Monarchs (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).

are a number of notable texts on the reign of Edward II in which John is briefly mentioned by historians such as Johnstone, Tout and Haines and more recently, Katherine Warner.<sup>5</sup> John appears in a number of biographies, particularly that on *Thomas of Lancaster*, by Maddicott, whilst both Hamilton's biography of Piers Gaveston, and Chaplais's exploration of the relationship of Edward and Gaveston, have helped construct much of the early narrative for John.<sup>6</sup> Other historians, such as Mortimer, have added further context for John's later life and issues in the early reign of Edward III.<sup>7</sup>

A number of chronicles provide material for the paper and are themselves the source material for many other secondary works. Of these, the two-volume series, *The Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages, the Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, edited by William Stubbs are most useful. They contain the *Annales Londonienses* and the *Canon of Bridlington*, who both name John in relation to the Ordinances, whilst the *Chronicle of Henry Knighton* names John as the man responsible for the capture of the Earl of Arundel.<sup>8</sup> The *Vita Edwardi Secundi: the Life of Edward the Second*, edited by Childs and Denholm-Young names John as part of the retinue sent to Bristol and provides further material on the reign.<sup>9</sup> There are a variety of primary sources for the period including the *Parliament Rolls of Medieval England*, which cover the years 1275-1504, and the *Calendar of Patent Rolls and Calendar of Close Rolls*, for the reigns of Edwards I, II and III (1272-1343). Other primary source materials include the *Calendar of Charter Rolls, Volume 2, Henry III – Edward I (1257-1300); Volume 3, Edward I - Edward II (1300-1326); Volume 4,*

---

<sup>5</sup> H. Johnstone, *Edward of Carnarvon, 1284-1307* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1946); T.F. Tout, *The Reign of Edward II in English History*, Second Edition (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1936); N. Fryde, *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II, 1321-1326* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2003); R. M. Haines, *King Edward II: Edward of Caernarfon, His Life, His Reign, and Its Aftermath, 1284-1330* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003); K. Warner, *Edward II: The Unconventional King* (The Hill, Stroud: Amberley Publishing, 2017).

<sup>6</sup> Maddicott; J. S. Hamilton, *Piers Gaveston, Earl of Cornwall, 1307-1312: Politics and Patronage in the Reign of Edward II* (London, England: Wayne State University Press, 1988); P. Chaplais, *Piers Gaveston: Edward II's Adoptive Brother* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

<sup>7</sup> I. Mortimer, *The Greatest Traitor: The Life of Sir Roger Mortimer, 1st Earl of March* (London: Vintage, 2010). All references for John in secondary sources have been checked for accuracy, meaning that where a reference has been given, that reference has been traced back to primary source material. Where this has not been possible it will state in the footnotes.

<sup>8</sup> W. Stubbs, *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II. Volume 1* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); W. Stubbs, *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II. Volume 2* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). Henry Knighton and J.R. Lumby, *Chronicon Henrici Knighton, Vel Cnithon, Monachi Leycestrensis* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, by Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1889), p. 436

<sup>9</sup> W. R. Childs and N. Denholm-Young, *Vita Edwardi Secundi: The Life of Edward the Second*, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), p. 4–5.

*Edward III (1327-1341)* and the *Calendar of Fine Rolls, Volumes 2 and 3 (1307-1327)*. The material contained within the *Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland from the Death of King Alexander the Third to the Accession of Robert Bruce (1286-1306)*; the *Annales Hiberniae (1152-1350)*; the *Rolls of Scotland in the Tower of London and in the Chapter House of Westminster: Edward I. Edward II. Edward III*, and the *Calendar of Ancient Correspondence Concerning Wales (1215-1500)* are particularly useful.<sup>10</sup>

The Scottish wars of Edward I have been studied extensively and it was this scholarship that made it possible to establish the earliest events in John's life. David Bacharach's *Edward I's Centurions: Professional Soldiers in an Era of Militia Armies* explores the role of professional soldiers during the wars of Edward I in Wales and Scotland.<sup>11</sup> He describes the career paths of *centenarii* and lists in an appendix those individuals identified as serving in three or more campaigns, referencing the primary sources. This meant the original documents held in the *National Archives* and *British Library* could be examined, to ascertain John's rank, pay and leadership responsibilities, establishing his early career and itinerary. These sources could then be cross referenced in other texts, as for example in Michael Prestwich's *War, Politics and Finance under Edward I*, to provide further analysis.<sup>12</sup> There are various texts that can provide a wider context, such as those by Brown and Simpkin.<sup>13</sup> Documents included in the appendices to Chaplais's book *Piers Gaveston, Edward II's Adoptive Brother* and Harvey's *Walter of Wenlok, Abbot of Westminster*, provide evidence of how early John was considered a man of influence by those outside the royal court.<sup>14</sup> Surprisingly, the *ONDB* makes no reference at all to John's association with Gaveston, ignoring arguably the most enduring motivation for wider baronial dislike of him and concluding that it was 'probably his royalism that had aroused the antagonism of the Ordainers'.<sup>15</sup> Historians have instead focused on the conflict that his possession of the barony of Powys brought

---

<sup>10</sup> See bibliography for full details of editors/publishers.

<sup>11</sup> D. S. Bachrach, 'Edward I's Centurions: Professional Soldiers in an Era of Militia Armies', p. 110, *The Soldier Experience in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. by A.R. Bell and others, *Warfare in History* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2017).

<sup>12</sup> M. Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance under Edward I* (London, England.: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1972).

<sup>13</sup> . M. Brown, *The Wars of Scotland 1214-1371*, *The New Edinburgh History of Scotland*, Ed. R. Mason, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2010); David Simpkin, *The English Aristocracy at War: From the Welsh Wars of Edward I to the Battle of Bannockburn* (Boydell & Brewer: Boydell Press, 2008).

<sup>14</sup> P. Chaplais, *Piers Gaveston: Edward II's Adoptive Brother* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994); B. F. Harvey, *Documents Illustrating the Rule of Walter de Wenlok, Abbot of Westminster, 1283 - 1307*, *Camden Fourth Series, Volume 2* (London, England: The Royal Historical Society, 1965).

<sup>15</sup> Mason, *ODNB*.

about, in the relationship between Thomas of Lancaster and Edward II, disregarding a key factor in the king's continuing loyalty and support for John well into the Despenser years. Institutional histories of the reign, such as those by Tout and Conway-Davies, provide further analysis on the period whilst Davies and Stephenson are able to offer background material on the political and social situation in the barony of Powys and the Marches of Wales.<sup>16</sup> These have been supplemented by a number of articles.<sup>17</sup>

Digitisation of many the primary source materials has made it possible to conduct systematic searches for any references to John, his family, and associates, allowing gaps in his biography to be filled, such as the date of his wedding to Hawise, and inaccuracies in published material to be identified.<sup>18</sup> For example, the entry for John in the *DNB* by Tout, is inaccurate but remains the source for subsequent statements.<sup>19</sup> Here, Tout states that John was in communication with Mortimer during his incarceration in the Tower of London but offers no evidence in support of that statement. Morgan, repeats this claim, without providing any further evidence himself.<sup>20</sup> Whilst Morgan's paper, published in 1980, predates the *ODNB*, he did not have the same issues as Tout who had been,

handicapped by the fact that the Public Record Office's publication of the calendars of close rolls, patent rolls and other chancery records, which have cumulatively transformed our understanding of the purposes and workings of

---

<sup>16</sup> T.F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England, the Wardrobe, the Chamber and the Small Seals* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1920), II; J. Conway-Davies, *The Baronial Opposition to Edward II: Its Character and Policy* (London: Cass & Co. Ltd, 1967); R. R. Davies, *The Age of Conquest: Wales, 1063-1415* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); D. Stephenson, *Medieval Wales c.1050-1332: Centuries of Ambiguity*, (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2019).

<sup>17</sup> J. E. Burton, 'Tensions in a Border Abbey: Strata Marcella, Its Patrons, Friends and Enemies', *Monastic Europe: Medieval Communities, Landscapes and Settlement* (Brepols, 2019), p. 103–16.

<sup>18</sup> It is important to point out that I began the research for this dissertation in the summer of 2021 when the SCONUL library scheme was not working due to the pandemic. I conducted much of my research using British History Online as it had free open access during that time. As a result, many of the references that I have cited were found independently of secondary sources, as I spent a considerable amount of time searching BHO and other material that was available online such as the Charter and Fine Rolls. Other texts, such as Rymer's *Foedera* Volumes 1 and 2, and Parliamentary Writs, were available in person at the Roderic Bowen library at Lampeter University once restrictions had been lifted.

<sup>19</sup> Tout, *DNB*, p. 125–27. I have been able to check the references given by Tout, *DNB*. Most are available freely online, whilst those that are not, are available at the Roderic Bowen Library and Archives, Lampeter University. Tout joined Lampeter in 1881 and was the librarian there between 1883 and 1890, during which time he wrote the article on John in the *DNB* and was responsible for the acquisition of many of the materials that he cites. G. William. 'Thomas Frederick Tout at Lampeter: The Making of a Historian', *Thomas Frederick Tout (1855–1929): Refashioning History for the Twentieth Century*, edited by C.M. Barron and J.T. Rosenthal (University of London Press, 2019) p. 25–40.

<sup>20</sup> Morgan, p. 28.

government and society from the thirteenth century onwards, did not begin until the early 1890s and was a long way from completion in 1900.<sup>21</sup>

Furthermore, Morgan miscites other material, as when he states that Cherleton 'probably' attended Sherburn in 1321.<sup>22</sup> However, the references he provides do not support this suggestion. As we shall see, Morgan's selectivity has led to inaccuracies being propagated by later authors.

Previously, biographers and historical writers for this period have focused on those of high status and power, or those of great notoriety such as Gaveston, who were themselves often the subject of medieval biographic writings. This was 'not so much because of a lack of sources, as because of a lack of contemporary *vitae*.'<sup>23</sup> Conversely, social historians have dedicated their research to the study of ordinary people, their lives, and experiences. However, by not exploring the lives of lesser men such as John, both have failed to take advantage of an important source of information about the period, which can lead to new insights and observations on the key issues of the time. As will be shown, John was identified as a remarkably talented individual at a very young age, with his personal attributes and capabilities serving him well throughout his life, enabling him successfully to navigate decades of political upheaval and challenge, at both the national and local level. An astute and decisive individual, he ensured that his early achievements were secured and maintained for the benefit of his children and wider family, whilst his personal service and loyalty to the crown meant his position as lord of Powys was valued throughout his life.

This picture of John, as a capable and intelligent man will challenge the existing, simplistic portrayal of him as a disloyal knight.<sup>24</sup> Recent historians have used prosopography to allow the thematic exploration and analysis of the behaviour of a group of people, based on their individual biographies. Historians have utilised this approach to explore the issues of loyalty and the system of household knights, in the early fourteenth century.<sup>25</sup> Examination

---

<sup>21</sup> H. Summerson, 'T. F. Tout and the Dictionary of National Biography', *Thomas Frederick Tout (1855–1929): Refashioning History for the Twentieth Century*, edited by C.M. Barron and J.T. Rosenthal (University of London Press, 2019) p. 231–46.

<sup>22</sup> Morgan, p. 25.

<sup>23</sup> D. Bates, J. Crick, and S. Hamilton, *Writing Medieval Biography, 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Frank Barlow* (London, England.: Boydell & Brewer: Boydell Press, 2006), p. 9.

<sup>24</sup> Tebbit, *Knights*, p. 90.

<sup>25</sup> M. Prestwich, 'The Unreliability of Royal Household Knights in the Early Fourteenth Century', *Fourteenth Century England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2002); J. S. Hamilton, 'A Reassessment of the Loyalty of the Household Knights of Edward II', *Fourteenth Century England* (London, England: Boydell & Brewer,

of the lives of individuals in the knightly retinue of Edward II, in particular, has led to opinions being repeatedly reappraised and revised. This paper will highlight the dangers of extrapolating from complex individual case studies without detailed analysis of primary sources and call into question the validity of such research.

John's life illustrates how social mobility could be achieved and maintained during the period, and the resentment that this often caused amongst the existing barony. It highlights Edward II's ability to recognise talent and aptitude outside the traditional baronial court, and his capacity for stubborn loyalty and lavish generosity that would typify his reign. However, John's inherent ability largely to retain control in a region that constantly challenged the ruling elite meant that even when Edward fell, John did not. Descriptions of John's actions in primary source materials reflect his position as an English baron in control of lands that had previously been held by Welsh rulers. As we shall see, this has resulted in the language and narrative employed in some secondary sources continuing to reflect this position when discussing John's life.<sup>26</sup> For example, Morgan describes John as a man cursed with 'conceit and insensitivity' but does not explain by what standards he is making that assessment. That any detail about Hawise his wife is largely absent in existing accounts of the period, and indeed from this paper, reminds us how little attention has been given to women in historical biography until relatively recently.

Sadly, it has not been possible, given the nature of this discussion, to appraise fully Morgan's account of John with regard to much of the depth concerning the disputed barony of Powys. As such, it will only be discussed in sufficient detail as to allow an understanding of John's life and the impact that Powys had on wider political events. So, whilst the scope of this paper remains disappointingly restricted, it is hoped that with its re-examination of primary source material, this biography will challenge accepted opinion, offering an alternative explanation for John's actions and behaviour. By seeking, 'to integrate the constitutional with the biographical approach,' we too, like Powicke, will find, 'the dead

---

2012); A. Tebbit, 'Royal Patronage and Political Allegiance: The Household Knights of Edward II, 1314-21', *Thirteenth Century England* (London, England: Boydell & Brewer, 2003); Alistair Tebbit, 'Household Knights and Military Service under the Direction of Edward II', in *The Reign of Edward II: New Perspectives* (London, England: Boydell & Brewer, 2006).

<sup>26</sup> Morgan, p. 21.

entries begin to be alive' and gain new insight into the life of John de Cherleton, first Lord Charlton of Powys.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> M. Powicke in Bates, Crick, and Hamilton, p. 7.

## Chapter 1 – Beginnings

This first chapter will explore John's ascent from relative obscurity to an influential member of Edward II's court, through his friendship with Piers Gaveston. It will highlight how Edward's renowned generosity brought John into conflict with key members of the barony, that would characterise his life for many years.

John's family take their name from the estate of Charlton, described in Domesday in 1086, within the hundred of Wrockwardine in the county of Shropshire.<sup>1</sup> They are described as tenants of the fee of Charlton held by Shrewsbury Abbey and the family name appears in a variety of deeds and grants that relate to that berewick from as early as 1175. This land was granted to Shrewsbury Abbey by Oilerius, with the remaining lands of Wrockwardine held by earl Roger of Shrewsbury.<sup>2</sup> It is believed that Robert de Cherleton was father to John, Alan and Thomas de Cherleton. His three sons would rise from obscurity to become trusted servants of English kings; Thomas would become Bishop of Hereford and Justiciar of Ireland and Alan would prove to be a loyal household knight, both men worthy of further biographical exploration in their own right.<sup>3</sup>

The eldest brother, John first entered the public record in documents pertaining to the war in Scotland of Edward I, in the autumn of 1297, following the victory of William Wallace and Andrew Murray at the Battle of Stirling Bridge in September 1297.<sup>4</sup> He is named in the 'Indentures of receipt and issues of victuals' by Richard de Brimmesgrave, keeper of stores at Berwick. This document, written in Anglo-French, lists de Cherleton as garrisoned there sometime after November 1297.<sup>5</sup> No records survive of the pay of soldiers in 1296, so

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Powell-Smith, 'Land of Shrewsbury, St Alkmund, Canons Of', *Open Domesday* <<https://opendomesday.org/place/SJ5622/charlton/>> [accessed 14 December 2021].

<sup>2</sup> R. W. Eyton, *Antiquities of Shropshire* (London: John Russell Smith, 1859), ix, p. 30.& 55. Eyton notes that the land was divided into two estates, with Oilerius donating half to Shrewsbury Abbey and half to the Shrewsbury Churches of St. Mary and St. Julian.

<sup>3</sup> *Handbook of British Chronology*, ed. by E. B. Fryde, Guides and Handbooks, no. 2, 3rd ed (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society: University College, 1986), p. 250, 165; D. N. Lepine, *Charlton [Cherleton], Thomas (c. 1292–1344), Bishop of Hereford, ODNB* (Oxford University Press, 2004)

<<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/5168>>; Conway Davies, *The Baronial Opposition to Edward II*, p. 221.

<sup>4</sup> Brown, p. 349.

<sup>5</sup> TNA C 47/2/17 (1297-98) cited in Bachrach, p. 123. In Appendix 1, Bachrach lists John as a centenarii who can be identified as serving in three or more campaigns. He lists TNA C 47/2/17 (1297–1298); TNA C 47/2/20



it is impossible to say if he was there prior to this date.<sup>6</sup> He is next listed on a roll of payments for foot soldiers from Wales in 1298, which states he had charge of 99 foot-soldiers for which he received a payment of £10 17s. and a further payment of 8s. 2d.<sup>7</sup> Therefore John served Edward I as a *centenarius* or *constabularius*, with a *coopertus* or armoured war horse, receiving pay of a shilling a day as a professional soldier.<sup>8</sup> That we can identify John at all, at this early date, is only due to the huge amount of money that Edward I spent during his military campaigns from 1272 until his death. Whilst he continued to recruit in the traditional manner, the volume and detail of the documentation that survives is far greater than in earlier periods.<sup>9</sup> This allows us not only to identify individual soldiers like John, but to establish their responsibilities and career progression. The payroll documents for the years 1300, 1300-1 and a later campaign of 1304 find John serving alongside a group of other soldiers from Shropshire and Staffordshire, in the Scottish wars. They are Clement de Casterton, Edigius de Staundon, John Langele, John de Spreham, Stephen de Acton, William Griffin, Robert Dalton, and Dominus Theobald miles de Neyville.<sup>10</sup> The first of these documents relates to the campaign led by Edward I in Galloway in the summer of 1300, following the muster at Carlisle in early July. There were no Welsh called up at this time, suggesting John was representing either Staffordshire or Shropshire as a *centenarius*.<sup>11</sup> John's next appearance in the record is in the Wardrobe Accounts of Edward I for the summer campaign of 1301. This document details the costs of the infantry in the army of the Prince of Wales that advanced into Scotland via Carlisle.<sup>12</sup> There are several entries for him in this document as a *constabularius* with a *coopertus* for the county of Staffordshire. One entry records him leading 54 foot archers, for a payment of 63s. It is not known what John did between this time and when he next appears in 1304, when he is again listed as a *constabularius* with a *coopertus* for the county of

---

(1298); TNA E 101/13/34 (1300); BL Additional MS 7966A (1300–1301); TNA E 101/12/16 (1304) as evidence. These documents were viewed at The National Archive and British Library to establish more detail.

<sup>6</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 470.

<sup>7</sup> TNA C 47/2/20 cited in Bachrach, p. 123. This document is described by TNA as from the regnal year 26 Ed 1 but Bachrach identifies this as the year 1298.

<sup>8</sup> Bachrach, p. 111.

<sup>9</sup> Simpkin, *Aristocracy*, p. 1.

<sup>10</sup> TNA E 101/13/34 (1300); BL Add. MS 7966A (1301); TNA E 101/12/16 (1304), cited in Bachrach, p. 123. Dominus Theobald miles de Neyville and John de Spreham do not appear in BL Add MS 7966A.

<sup>11</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 485–86; TNA E 101/13/34 cited in Bachrach, p. 123. Unfortunately, I was unable to locate his name in this document, so I am unable to say how many men he had serving with him or his wages. Further research may identify under whose command John served and establish his part in this campaign.

<sup>12</sup> BL Add MS 79966a cited in Bachrach, p. 123. Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance under Edward I*, p. 97.

Staffordshire, now with 84 foot archers, employed for twelve days at £9 4s., plus a further eight days at £9 12s.<sup>13</sup>

These three documents highlight the issues Edward I faced during this period of his reign in raising and retaining troops and mark a change in the amount and kind of troops he mustered. To ensure that he had experienced and reliable men in the army of the Prince of Wales in 1301, Edward I had recruited Welsh men less likely to desert, so although John and his associates are listed as being from Staffordshire, the men they led were mainly Welsh.<sup>14</sup> In earlier campaigns, Edward had often opted for vast numbers of poorly trained, less well armed men but in the 1304 campaign he was more focused and strategic in the troops he mustered. For example, Clement de Casterton and Robert Dalton led crossbow men, including those from northern shire levies on the longer campaign through Scotland, whilst Edigius de Staundon, John de Chichester, John de Spreham, William de Bridesdale and William Griffin joined them with archers later in the spring, before John Langele, Stephen de Acton, Dominus Theobald miles de Neyville and John de Cherleton joined them all at the final siege of Stirling Castle.<sup>15</sup>

These records show how John can be seen as an early example of a professional soldier, who provided Edward I with the crucial knowledge and experience required for his successes in Scotland. Whilst from 1330 it became commonplace for all those campaigning for the King to be in receipt of pay, men like John represent the beginnings of the movement towards a contracted army.<sup>16</sup> John's military service records also provide us with evidence of how social mobility could be achieved at a time where there few opportunities for progression. In John's case, the wars in Scotland created a demand for well-trained, proficient soldiers, whereas in previous generations men with ambition and talent were often drawn to the church as a means of progression. Edward's campaigns offered John an alternative from the provision of salvation as a means of 'social preferment' to that of providing security.<sup>17</sup> In the time before the growth of towns and technological innovations that made 'structural' mobility possible, John was able to take advantage of 'pure' mobility, as a result of his own

---

<sup>13</sup> TNA E 101/12/16 cited in Bachrach, p. 123. Dated by Bachrach as 1304.

<sup>14</sup> Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 489.

<sup>15</sup> Bachrach, p. 111–17.

<sup>16</sup> Simpkin, *Aristocracy*, p. 5–6.

<sup>17</sup> D. Herlihy, 'Three Patterns of Social Mobility in Medieval History', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 3.No. 4 (1973), p. 625.

unique skills, abilities, and ambitions.<sup>18</sup> As a soldier, he would have joined the *bellatores*, those who fought, and was not one whose only option was to join the *laboratores*, those who worked.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, the Edwardian wars of the late thirteenth century and early fourteenth century, offered individuals who displayed an aptitude for military service and a talent for leadership the opportunity to progress from foot soldier to a leader of soldiers. However, that is not to say that John would not have had any status without the Edwardian wars. John's family, as tenants of a piece of land would have been considered the elite of the local peasantry, within their village and locality.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, John's life is remarkable, in that it he did not simply progress to the ranks of the local gentry but, as we shall see, made the transition to the parliamentary peerage as a baron.

There are no records for John de Cherleton following the siege of Stirling Castle until he is named as a yeoman in the household of Piers Gaveston, in the Roll of Horses in the Prince's Household. This document was compiled between 5<sup>th</sup> July and 6<sup>th</sup> August, in anticipation of a return to Scotland in the summer of 1306. The other yeomen in the Gaveston household were the English men John de Knockin, Richard Oliver, George Percy, Richard Wightflesh, John Albon and Herbet de Borhunte, and two Gascon men Gaveston's brother Guillaume-Arnaud de Gabaston, and his nephew Bertrand Assailit.<sup>21</sup> We can only hypothesise about the circumstances that brought John to the attention of Gaveston and the young Prince Edward, but it is highly likely to have been at Stirling castle in the summer of 1304. Gaveston served in the household of the king in Scotland in 1298, before transferring to the household of the Prince of Wales in 1300, under whom he served in 1301, 1303 and on the summer campaign of 1304.<sup>22</sup> As part of Gaveston's household retinue, John de Cherleton accompanied him on campaign in Scotland in 1306.<sup>23</sup> John may well have been with Gaveston when he, along with a group of twenty-two knights, many of whom were Marcher lords, deserted

---

<sup>18</sup> S. Carocci, 'Social Mobility and the Middle Ages', *Continuity and Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 367–404, p. 375.

<sup>19</sup> R. Horrox and W. M. Ormrod, *A Social History of England, 1200-1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 5.

<sup>20</sup> Horrox and Ormrod, p. 4.

<sup>21</sup> TNA E 101/13/7 m. 1, cited in Hamilton, *Gaveston*, p. 143, Fn 52.; G.G. Simpson and Galbraith, *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office* (London, England: Public Record Office, 1881), v, p. 194, item 444; Johnstone, p. 120.

<sup>22</sup> Hamilton, *Gaveston*, p. 29–30.

<sup>23</sup> Hamilton, *Gaveston*, p. 32-33. See Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 112–16 for details of Scottish campaign of that year.

Edward I and his son to attend a joust. It is well documented that this incident angered Edward I and it serves as a precursor to events that would lead to Gaveston's first exile.<sup>24</sup>

Evidence suggests that by this time, John had not only become a close companion of Gaveston but one that was perceived by others as having influence, for on 26<sup>th</sup> November 1306, when Walter of Wenlok, Abbot of Westminster Abbey sent a gift to Piers Gaveston, he also sent twenty shillings to John.<sup>25</sup> Wenlok's first gift in November indicates that John was already a close associate of Gaveston before the time his name appeared as a yeoman on the Roll of Horses in the summer of the same year. Powerful individuals beyond the royal household were aware of him and had identified him as a man whose favour and good will was worth cultivating.<sup>26</sup> Indeed, by the start of the Prince's wardrobe accounts in November 1306 he was being referred to as a 'scutifer de camera principis' therefore having access to the future king.<sup>27</sup> Whilst at the end of January 1307, he was nominated to attend parliament at Carlisle by the men of Shropshire, along with Clement de Casterton, his fellow soldier from the siege of Sterling castle in 1304, adding further weight to the suggestion that it was on campaign in Scotland that John first came to attention.<sup>28</sup>

On 26<sup>th</sup> February 1307, Edward I ordered that Piers should be sent overseas from 30<sup>th</sup> April and, prior to his departure the Prince of Wales made many gifts to him and his household. Amongst the gifts to John, now recorded as knight, was an aketon, made for him by Hugh de Brungere, the king's armourer.<sup>29</sup> On 24<sup>th</sup> April, Abbot Wenlok made John a further gift of twenty shillings but on this occasion did not make a gift to Gaveston, presumably assuming that his exile would reduce his influence but believing that John's influence would continue and that he was therefore worth making a further gift to.<sup>30</sup> In May, the party were at Dover before departing for Ponthieu in June.<sup>31</sup> This exile was not to be a long one, for on

---

<sup>24</sup> Hamilton, *Gaveston*, p. 34. There is a debate amongst historians about the causes of his first exile but this does not have relevance to John de Cherleton.

<sup>25</sup> Harvey, Item 227, p.119-120; 124; 201; 204; 212. These references detail the gifts to John and some of their corresponding accounts entries.

<sup>26</sup> Harvey, p. 9.

<sup>27</sup> Tout, *Chapters*, p. 319 Fn 5.

<sup>28</sup> C. Given-Wilson, P. Brand, J.R.S. Phillips, M. Ormrod, G. Martin, A. Curry and R. Horrox, *Original Documents: Edward I Parliaments, Vetus Codex, October 1307*, in *Parliament Rolls of Medieval England*, ed. (Woodbridge, 2005).

<sup>29</sup> BL Add MS 22923 cited by Tout Chapters, p. 319, I found two entries for John in Add MS 22923 but neglected to make a note of the folio numbers; Hamilton, *Gaveston*, p. 138; Morgan, p. 13.

<sup>30</sup> Chaplais, p. 64; Harvey, Item 240, p. 124; 204.

<sup>31</sup> Johnstone, p. 124.

7<sup>th</sup> July Edward I died at Burgh by Sands.<sup>32</sup> The new king immediately recalled Gaveston.<sup>33</sup> John would have been back in London, with Gaveston by the second week of August before then travelling via Carlisle to Sanquhar in Scotland, where they feasted with Edward. That autumn John would receive a further gift from Abbot Wenlok, a gilt cup with a cover and the first of many royal grants from Edward II. He was described as his 'beloved valet' when granting him free warren in his Shropshire lands at Charlton and Pontesbury, and the marriage of the son and heir of Baldwin de Insula.<sup>34</sup> At the beginning of December 1307, leaving Gaveston as regent, Edward began his journey to France to marry Isabella, daughter of Philip IV of France, departing from Dover on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 1308.<sup>35</sup> Edward chose to take John with him and John left John de Boudon to act as his attorney in his absence.<sup>36</sup>

An interesting series of letters exist which illustrate just how much influence John had by this time. Written by Roger de Aldenham sometime in the spring of 1308, they concern the disputed election of Richard de Kedyngton as Abbot of Westminster, following the death of Walter of Wenlok on Christmas day 1307. Aldenham and his party opposed the election of Kedyngton and alleged that Gaveston had been given one hundred pounds to arrange it.<sup>37</sup> In these letters, Aldenham complains bitterly about the behaviour and influence of Gaveston and also refers to John in the same manner,

and because the lord king and treasurer, at the procurement and instance of the said Peter and John de Cherleton, his secretaries, do not desist from daily multiplying their letters to the Roman court and to the King of France<sup>38</sup>

He continues, referring to John as one who 'informs the lord king every day' who has 'done many evils to us and does not desist,' arguing that if the Queen and her entourage 'knew what he was like, they would in some way resign and remove him from his control.' Furthermore, John is referred to as 'dominum Johannem de Cherleton, camerarium, secretarium predicti Petri' (Sir John de Cherleton, chamberlain, secretary to the aforesaid Peter), the first

---

<sup>32</sup> Brown, p. 348–49.

<sup>33</sup> Chaplais, p. 25.

<sup>34</sup> *CChR 1300-1326*, p. 107; Harvey, p. 212; *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 1-35, cited in Eyton, *Antiquities*, p. 33.

<sup>35</sup> K. Warner, *Edward II: The Unconventional King* (The Hill, Stroud: Amberley Publishing, 2017), p. 32–37.

<sup>36</sup> *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 43-72.

<sup>37</sup> R. Ackerman, *An History of the Abbey Church of St. Peter's Westminster; Its Antiquities and Monuments*, 2 vols (London, England: Harrison & Lee, 1812), I, p. 179–81. Chaplais, p. 115-124, *Appendix I, Westminster Abbey and Gaveston in 1308 and 1309*.

<sup>38</sup> Chaplais, p. 119. My translation from the original latin.

reference we have to John's role as a chamberlain and secretary, only at this point in time to Gaveston.<sup>39</sup> It is interesting, given his perceived level of influence at this point in time, that neither Tout's original entry for John in the *DNB* nor Mason's updated version even mention his relationship with Gaveston. Furthermore, John's appearance in these letters is not discussed elsewhere either, overlooking an important piece of evidence which shows just how influential John was in Edward's chamber as early as 1307 and how intimately his association with Gaveston was perceived by others.

Edward and John were back in England by February 7<sup>th</sup> and the coronation for Edward and Isabella was held on the 25<sup>th</sup>. By the end of March, John was acting in an official capacity at court, as he is named in the *Calendar of Patent Roles* as providing information to the king.<sup>40</sup> By this time Gaveston's personal behaviour and his influence with the King, and therefore the government of the realm, had created huge resentment amongst the nobility. The author of the *Vita Edward Secundi* stated,

...the great men of the land hated him, because he alone found favour in the king's eyes and lorded it over them like a second king, to whom all were subject and none equal.<sup>41</sup>

When parliament met at Westminster that spring there was a call for Gaveston to be exiled and his lands returned to the crown. This was justified on the basis of three articles put forward by the Earl of Lincoln. The relationship between Edward and Gaveston had pushed the country to the brink of civil war and as the nobility formed a coalition with Philip IV and other notables, Edward was forced to order Gaveston's exile at the end of May.<sup>42</sup> John and nine other members of Gaveston's household received letters of protection on 25<sup>th</sup> June 1308 when they set sail from Bristol for Ireland. John also received 'exemption, for life, in respect of his dwellinghouse,

called le Hoppedehalle, near Westminster, co. Middlesex, from livery of stewards, chamberlains, marshals and other ministers of the king.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Chaplais, p. 121. My translation from the original Latin.

<sup>40</sup> Chaplais, pp. 41–42.

<sup>41</sup> *Vita*, p. 4–5.

<sup>42</sup> Maddicott, p. 81–88.

<sup>43</sup> *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 80.

The *Vita Edward Secundi* describes how Ireland was subject to the ‘authority and power’ of Gaveston, whilst accounts in the chronicles of Ireland that suggest Gaveston was a successful military leader during his time in there.<sup>44</sup> In October, Roger Mortimer of Wigmore arrived in Ireland with his wife and if he had not already met John de Cherleton, it may be at this time that the two men became better acquainted. Certainly, Mortimer and Gaveston met, as on the 12<sup>th</sup> April 1309 Mortimer and Gaveston both witnessed a grant at Dublin and if John was chamberlain and secretary to Gaveston, as Aldenham suggests, it is likely that he would have been present for such matters.<sup>45</sup> Nothing is known about the part John played in Ireland and certainly Tout’s source makes no mention of him at this point.<sup>46</sup> That John remained in Ireland is supported by a power of attorney dated in Dublin on 16<sup>th</sup> February 1309, which has a seal attached containing a coat of arms ‘or, on a chevron, three spread eagles’ and is one of several deeds created in his absence from England, as he expanded his land holdings in Shropshire.<sup>47</sup> Eyton cites this and another deed, dated Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> September 1308, as indicating the ‘growing importance’ of John, as it refers to him as ‘Sir John de Cherleton, knight’.<sup>48</sup> However, as shown above, it is clear that he was referred to as knight as early as July 1307.<sup>49</sup> John continued to receive grants of land from Edward whilst in Ireland, as on 20<sup>th</sup> March he was granted the manor of Pontesbury to add to his existing lands and for his ‘good service rendered’.<sup>50</sup> Gaveston and John were not to remain in Ireland for long for by the end of June 1309 they were back in England and Gaveston was reinstated as the Earl of Cornwall.

The evidence thus far points to John’s remarkable ascent from little-known soldier to an intimate companion of Gaveston, to knight and important member of the king’s chamber. John’s association with Gaveston is one that historians have either only mentioned in passing or have overlooked altogether. Furthermore, no historian has recognised the importance of this connection in their analysis of the relationship between Edward and Thomas of Lancaster,

---

<sup>44</sup> Hamilton, *Gaveston*, p. 58. *Vita*, p. 13.

<sup>45</sup> J. Grace and R. Butler, *Annales Hiberniae* (Dublin: Irish Archaeological Society, 1842), p. 53; E. Curtis, *Calendar of Ormond Deeds, 1152-1350* (Dublin, 1932), p. 172.

<sup>46</sup> J. T. Gilbert, *History of the Viceroys of Ireland; with Notice of the Castle of Dublin and Its Chief Occupants in Former Times*. (London; Pasternoster Row, 1865), p. 126–28.

<sup>47</sup> M. C. Jones, ‘The Feudal Barons of Powys’, *Collections Historical & Archaeological Relating to Montgomeryshire and Its Borders*, Volumes 1-28 (London, England.: J. Russel Smith, 1868), II, p. 9.

<sup>48</sup> Eyton, *Antiquities*, p. 32.

<sup>49</sup> Tout, *Chapters*, p. 319.

<sup>50</sup> *CChR 1300-1326*, p. 127.

which we shall see is fundamental to understanding the motivations of both men. Undoubtedly, John and his family benefitted from Edward's unrestrained generosity to his favourites and close companions, one of the enduring complaints of the reign. However, whilst Gaveston came from a noble background, it is likely that John was still considered as one from a lower class, whose company Edward is reported to have enjoyed when 'he forsook the company of Lords'.<sup>51</sup> John may well have been subject to a change in how his status was defined and certainly his economic position had improved, but he had not yet substantially or permanently improved his social status.<sup>52</sup> That security was to follow in the summer of 1309 with an advantageous marriage to the heiress of one of the largest Marcher lordships.

---

<sup>51</sup> *Polychronicron Ranulphi Higden*, cited in K. Warner, p. 25. Hamilton, *Gaveston*, p. 19.

<sup>52</sup> Horrox and Ormrod, pp. 113–14.



## Chapter 2 – The Barony of Powys & the Ordinances of 1311

In the chapter that follows, the negative impact of John's close association with Gaveston will become more apparent, even with his appointment to the barony and Edward's enduring loyalty to him. This period establishes John as a key figure in the Marches, ensuring that he would continue to come into conflict with Thomas of Lancaster and his adherents. It also provides an insight into the reasons for John's actions in the years that would follow with regard to Mortimer and the Earl of Arundel.

The summer of 1309 would see John de Cherleton now recorded as a banneret of the King's household.<sup>1</sup> On 27<sup>th</sup> June Edward met Gaveston at Chester on his return from Ireland and, as John was Gaveston's secretary, and owing to the rapid nature of the following events, it is very likely that he was with him.<sup>2</sup> Two days previously, on 25<sup>th</sup> June 1309 at Lichfield, the King had ordered Roger Mortimer, Justice of Wales to take possession of the barony of Powys, following the death of Gruffudd ap Owain, who had died in his minority.<sup>3</sup> His widow Ela would be granted her dower portion, but the remainder of his lands passed to his sister, Hawise de la Pole, as sole surviving heir. The nineteen-year-old Hawise was swiftly married to John on St. Margaret's Day, 20<sup>th</sup> July. It is possible to establish the date of their marriage and Hawise's age as it appears in an entry in the *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem* recording the death of the paternal grandmother of Hawise, some months later.<sup>4</sup> This makes sense of Edward's order on 6<sup>th</sup> August, that Hawise take possession of her lands 'as hastily as possible', as the couple had already married.<sup>5</sup> On 26<sup>th</sup> August Edward ordered the lands be delivered to John de Cherleton and that John do fealty for them at the next Michaelmas with the inquisition post-mortem of Griffin de la Pole, on 15<sup>th</sup> January 1310, confirming the extent of the lands.<sup>6</sup>

The marriage of John to Hawise without any discussion with the wider baronage is an example of Edward's penchant for generosity to his favourites without thought to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Hamilton, *Reassessment*, p. 47–61; Davies, p.216.

<sup>2</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 158.

<sup>3</sup> *CFR 1307-1319*, p. 43.

<sup>4</sup> *CIPM Edward II*, pp. 145–53. Morgan wrote that the couple married sometime between the 6<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> August. This reference shows it was several weeks earlier.

<sup>5</sup> *CChW 1244-1326*, p. 295.

<sup>6</sup> *CFR 1307-1319*, p. 48; *CIPM Edward II*, p. 114-124.

financial effects on the crown purse. The creation of a new baron or even an earl, as in Gaveston's case, was not unusual, indeed between 1307 and 1397 twenty-four new earldoms were awarded to men outside the royal family. However, the men who received such elevation had to be considered suitable candidates by the wider nobility.<sup>7</sup> A king's decision to raise someone to the nobility therefore had the potential to create friction and Edward's choices clearly offended powerful earls like Lancaster and Warwick, noblemen with the capacity to instigate considerable resistance to him. That the established nobility had their own retinues of bannerets, knights and esquires, whose services and loyalty were retained by indentures, meant that hostility to any one individual would extend well beyond the particular noble. As we shall see, that a retainer of Lancaster would challenge John for possession of the barony of Powys would prove doubly unfortunate. Nonetheless, on his marriage, John himself was generous, ensuring his family benefitted from his good fortune by making grants to his family and associates.<sup>8</sup> It is likely that John's intention at this time was to use his marriage as a means of consolidating his family's social status and ensuring that the advantages of his marriage would be distributed to his brothers and their families, creating a change that would last beyond his generation.<sup>9</sup>

Gaveston was soon out of favour with the barons again and by the beginning of 1310, Edward's relationship with the baronage had deteriorated further.<sup>10</sup> A payment made to John of £60 in February, as either knight of the king's chamber or as the king's chamberlain, together with his possession of the barony of Powys, suggests that John was no longer part of Gaveston's household retinue. Indeed, he was most likely now acting as Edward's chamberlain for although, under Edward I, *camerarius* referred to any member of chamber staff, by this time it referred to the person in charge of the chamber. This is further supported by his taking receipt of a customs payment of over £660 from the Friscobaldis, with Roger de Wyngefeld, clerk of the chamber, and Robert de Clifford, Marshall of England on April 1<sup>st</sup> at Westminster.<sup>11</sup> Despite his departure from the household of the despised Gaveston, John had

---

<sup>7</sup> Horrox and Ormrod, p. 40.

<sup>8</sup> Eyton, *Antiquities*, p. 33; *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 175–205.

<sup>9</sup> C. Lansing and E. D. English, *A Companion to the Medieval World, Blackwell Companions to European History* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), p. 130–31.

<sup>10</sup> Hamilton, *Gaveston*, p. 76–77.

<sup>11</sup> Tout, *Chapters*, pp. 198, Fn. 2. Conway Davies, *Opposition*, p. 216. *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 224. Tout was inclined to the view that the payment to John of £60 'practically proves' he was in office as chamberlain before the Ordinances.

clearly made sufficient enemies of his own through his association with Gaveston, his influence with the King, and the gifts that he received as a result of his proximity to both men. Whilst he now had status, authority and wealth, he still did not have sufficient approval and support outside the king's chamber. At the February parliament, the baronage presented Edward with a petition of grievances which included an article that accused Edward of being led by evil counsellors and impoverishing the crown.<sup>12</sup> On 19<sup>th</sup> March, a preliminary list of ordinances was issued and pertinent to John was the third one, prohibiting Edward from making gifts without baronial consent.<sup>13</sup> Clearly John's marriage to Hawise could not be dissolved and her lands regranted, but the message was clear, the barons did not wish men like John to continue to benefit from Edward's favouritism.<sup>14</sup>

Edward decided in the summer of 1310, in an attempt to avoid the pressure of the Ordainers, to launch another Scottish campaign.<sup>15</sup> A muster was called and on 18<sup>th</sup> June, John and Griffin de la Pole (Hawise's uncle) were appointed commissioners of array and ordered to raise 400 troops for the Scottish war.<sup>16</sup> John took one knight and eight sergeants with him as part of Edward's household contingent. He, John de Cromwell and Robert Fitzpayn were the only bannerets in the king's livery that year and were supported by fourteen other household knights.<sup>17</sup> John entered Scotland with Edward in September, where they would remain until July 1311, when money and supplies forced the campaign to end without success.<sup>18</sup> John remained with the king at the August parliament, where Edward was presented with the Ordinances.<sup>19</sup> Edward did his best to resist them but as in the past, he was faced with civil war and was forced to capitulate to the demands of the barons and other Ordainers and on the 27<sup>th</sup> September the Ordinances were published.<sup>20</sup> Many of the Ordinances were a continuation of the baronial struggle for reform that had begun under Edward I but particular ones were aimed directly at Gaveston and men like John.<sup>21</sup> For

---

<sup>12</sup> Conway Davies, *Opposition*, p. 358–59.

<sup>13</sup> Conway-Davies, *Opposition*, p. 360; Maddicott, p. 113.

<sup>14</sup> Hamilton, *Gaveston*, p. 80.

<sup>15</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 168. His reasons for mounting this campaign will not be discussed here, see Simpkin.

<sup>16</sup> D. Macpherson, J. Caley, and W. Illingsworth, *Rotuli Scotiae, Edward I, Edward II, Edward III* (London: Record Commission, 1831), I, p. 84.

<sup>17</sup> Simpkin, 'The English Army and the Scottish Campaign of 1310-11', *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives* (Boydell & Brewer: Boydell Press, 2007), p. 19.

<sup>18</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 170–71.

<sup>19</sup> Conway-Davies, *Opposition*, p. 363; *CPR 1307-1313*, p.375-399.

<sup>20</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 176; Conway-Davies, *Opposition*, p. 366–67.

<sup>21</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 178.

example, clause 13 of the Ordinances stated that, ‘the King has been badly guided and counselled by evil counsellors, as is said above, we ordain that all the evil counsellors be ejected and dismissed altogether’.<sup>22</sup> The next clause ordered that ‘because many evils have happened owing to such counsellors and such officers’ they should be replaced, and the new officers approved by parliament. They listed many of the offices of the household but not the chamberlain, leaving Edward free to appoint this position without approval.<sup>23</sup> Although John was named as one who had ‘behaved unduly in their respective offices’ by the Canon of Bridlington in his *Life of Edward of Carnarvon*, he was not named in the Ordinances and so was able to retain his place with Edward.<sup>24</sup> However, in clause 20 the Ordainers launched a ‘vitriolic attack’ on Gaveston, ordering that he be permanently exiled from England.<sup>25</sup> So whilst the Ordainers were largely successful at this point, forcing Gaveston to leave England on 4<sup>th</sup> November, John escaped their grasp and did not accompany him.<sup>26</sup>

Whilst John had been in Scotland, his wife’s grandmother, Hawise de la Pole, had died and in November 1310 Hawise the younger inherited her lands.<sup>27</sup> On 8<sup>th</sup> August 1311, at Nottingham, John did fealty for the barony of Powys and on 18<sup>th</sup> August, the lands of Hawise the elder were delivered into his control.<sup>28</sup> Possession of these lands brought him into direct conflict with his wife’s uncle, Griffin de la Pole.<sup>29</sup> This, together with the political climate of the time, gave de la Pole the confidence to contest Hawise’s inheritance of the barony of Powys in its entirety, threatening to remove the baronial title that gave John financial security and conferred social status upon him permanently. That autumn, with the support of Thomas of Lancaster, de la Pole queried whether the lands of Powys were Welsh or English.<sup>30</sup> It would appear that de la Pole’s intention was to argue that Powys was a Welsh barony, subject to Welsh law, under which, as a woman, Hawise could not inherit. However, his argument was not supported as both his brother Owain, and his father Gruffudd had done homage to

---

<sup>22</sup> H . Rothwell, *English Historical Documents 1189-1327* (Routledge, 2010), III, p. 530.

<sup>23</sup> Rothwell, p.530-531; Tout, *Chapters*, p. 320.

<sup>24</sup> *Bridlington*, p. 40.

<sup>25</sup> Rothwell, p. 532–34; Hamilton, *Gaveston*, p. 87-88.

<sup>26</sup> Hamilton, *Gaveston*, p. 91; *CCR Edward II, 1307-13*, p. 442-448.

<sup>27</sup> *CIPM Edward II*, p. 145–53.

<sup>28</sup> *CCR 1307-1313*, p. 370–73; *CFR 1307-1319*, p. 75. See Morgan p. 14-16 for fuller account of the land disputes involving the Powys inheritance.

<sup>29</sup> Morgan, x, p. 15.

<sup>30</sup> Conway-Davies, p. 135; Morgan, p. 16. For a fuller discussion of the dispute please see the Morgan article.

Edward I for the lands. Furthermore, the very nature of the question insulted Edward and he refused to allow his chancellor to make any decision.<sup>31</sup>

Cele busoigne touche molt la dignete de nostre coroune a la quele garder nous sumes tenuz. (This business deeply touches the dignity of our crown to which we are held.)<sup>32</sup>

De la Pole had miscalculated Edward's loyalty to John, and similarly the Ordainers had significantly underestimated Edward's intent to defy them. Lancaster's opposition party soon realised that they had made a critical error in not naming the evil counsellors in the Ordinances – this had allowed Edward to maintain control of his chamber. Consequently, they followed up in late November with the *Ordinationes comitum secundae* to 'give precision to the generalities of the earlier ordinances,' and named John along with 26 others in the household ordinances. Of those named in the *Annales Londonienses*, eighteen were either related to Gaveston, or were directly linked to him.<sup>33</sup> John was ordered to be ousted from the office and service of the king, and not to come close to him. These further ordinances were a direct attack on Gaveston's associates. The hostility felt by the Ordainers towards the associates of Gaveston, even after his death, should not be underestimated in any analysis. However, as this document was drawn up after the commission granted to the Ordainers had expired, and therefore did not have the same binding nature as the Ordinances published in September, Edward did not feel obliged to acquiesce.<sup>34</sup> However, what did force John's removal from court was de la Pole's attack on Powys castle in the spring of 1312.<sup>35</sup>

Where and when John and Gaveston were last together is not known, but certainly from March to September 1312, John was in Powys dealing with the siege of Powys Castle.<sup>36</sup> The timing of the siege may well have been orchestrated by Thomas of Lancaster to create a further distraction and challenge to Edward's authority. The earls had divided the realm into four zones and Lancaster had responsibility for Wales and the west, where de la Pole and his supporters had ignored royal instructions 'to desist, under pain of forfeiture, from lying in

---

<sup>31</sup> Morgan, p. 15.

<sup>32</sup> Conway-Davies, p. 135 Fn. 3.

<sup>33</sup> Tout, *Chapters*, p. 321; Hamilton, p. 88; *Annales Londonienses*, p.200. My translation and paraphrasing from the French.

<sup>34</sup> Phillips, p. 181 Fn 306.

<sup>35</sup> Morgan, p. 16.

<sup>36</sup> Morgan, p. 17. Morgan provides greater detail of the siege of Powys castle and those involved.

wait for John de Cherleton and his men', refusing to 'so conduct himself that the king shall have to take no further steps against him'.<sup>37</sup> As a result of Edward's complete disregard for the Ordinances, Gaveston was now being pursued by the powerful earls of Lancaster, Pembroke, Hereford, Arundel and Warwick in the north of England.<sup>38</sup> Edward was compelled to assign critical forces to relieve the siege of Powys castle and, lacking the strength to raise the siege at Scarborough castle and rescue Gaveston, was powerless to prevent his surrender, 'trial' and eventual execution on 19<sup>th</sup> June.<sup>39</sup> Interestingly, the wording of the later pardon for those responsible for Gaveston's death names de la Pole.<sup>40</sup> Edward may well have believed that de la Pole's action was an integral part of the plot to seize and murder Gaveston. The attack on John's lands by one of Lancaster's retainers was not coincidental.

These events, and those which were to follow, are crucial to understanding John's actions in later years, in particular the part played by Edmund Fitzalan, earl of Arundel, as a supporter of de la Pole and his followers in the Powys dispute, and one of the earls responsible for Gaveston's death.<sup>41</sup> It is interesting to note that during this period, Roger Mortimer of Wigmore absented himself in Ireland, possibly to avoid becoming a target of the Ordainers and escape becoming embroiled in the removal of Gaveston, despite Edward 'earnestly requesting' that he support him in Scotland.<sup>42</sup> Mortimer would have been well aware of the dwindling baronial support for Edward and may have opted for the turmoil of Ireland rather than be forced to choose between supporting Edward and supporting the Ordainers.

However, the death of Gaveston did not resolve the tensions between Edward and his baron, rather as the Canon of Bridlington commented, 'perpetual hatred grew up between king and earls'.<sup>43</sup> Nor with his death did the conflict over Powys subside, instead the dispute became a fundamental issue in the reconciliation of the king to Thomas of Lancaster. In 1312, the group of barons that had co-operated in the production of the Ordinances was shattered by the death of Gaveston. Some, like Aymer de Valence, earl of Pembroke, returned to the king's camp, whilst others distanced themselves from the hardliners like Lancaster.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Chaplais, p. 82; *CCR 1307-1313*, p. 422–25.

<sup>38</sup> Maddicott, p. 123.

<sup>39</sup> Maddicott, p. 129. See Hamilton, *Gaveston*, p. 93-99 for account of Gaveston's surrender, 'trial' and execution.

<sup>40</sup> *CPR 1313-1317*, p.26, cited in Maddicott, p. 151.

<sup>41</sup> Morgan, p. 18.

<sup>42</sup> Mortimer, p. 44.

<sup>43</sup> *Bridlington*, p. 171.

<sup>44</sup> Maddicott, p. 131.

Lancaster however, had a powerful asset in negotiating a peace with the king, he had possession of the jewels and horses that he had seized after Gaveston and the king had fled from Newcastle in May 1312.<sup>45</sup> Envoys from France and the papal curia soon arrived to help broker the peace.<sup>46</sup> In the course of the negotiations the barons made concessions and promises, and returned to the matter of evil counsellors. They presented a list of eighteen persons whom they wished to be excluded from the intimacy of the king according to the regulations, and yet again John was one of those listed.<sup>47</sup> Edward ignored this request and by September, John was back with the king, receiving grants and acting once as his chamberlain.<sup>48</sup> At the beginning of October, Powys castle was formally returned to John and Hawise, and the earl of Arundel was ordered,

not to permit into his lands any of the malefactors of Powys who lately besieged the castle of La Pole with Griffin de la Pole and committed homicides and other outrages in those parts, as the king understands they have left those parts with goods stolen by them and are received in the earls' lands in the March of Wales.<sup>49</sup>

In October, Edward wrote to Aymer of Valance asking how he 'may most constrain and damage the said Gryuffydd according to the law and usage of the realm,' as his flagrant disregard for Edward's command had offended 'the royal dignity.'<sup>50</sup> In the peace negotiations between king and barons, the barons pressed for impartial judges to investigate the complaint of Griffin de la Pole, that he had been disseized of his lands by John de Cherleton, in the period after the safe-conduct was issued to Thomas of Lancaster.<sup>51</sup> Edward was forced to agree to this demand allowing a treaty to be agreed on the 20<sup>th</sup> December and on the 26<sup>th</sup> granting a commission to John de Grey, John de Wogan and Alan de la Zouche to investigate de la Pole's claim.<sup>52</sup> However, not to be out-manoeuvred, the king went beyond their request and added

---

<sup>45</sup> Maddicott, p. 131.

<sup>46</sup> Haines, p. 88; Maddicott, p. 137.

<sup>47</sup> Haines, pp. 90–91.

<sup>48</sup> *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 479–509.

<sup>49</sup> *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 479–87.

<sup>50</sup> TNA SC 1/49/13, cited in Maddicott, p. 141. The National Archives catalogue dates the letter to 21<sup>st</sup> October 1312 and states it is published in J. G. Edwards, *Calendar of Ancient Correspondence Concerning Wales*, History and Law Series (Cardiff (GB): Board of Celtic Studies University of Wales, 1935), II, p. 216. In this publication it is dated 21<sup>st</sup> October 1316. I have assumed the TNA reference to be correct but have quoted from the translation given in the Calendar.

<sup>51</sup> Morgan, p. 19; Maddicott, p. 138; J. R. S. Phillips, *Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke, 1307-1324, Baronial Politics in the Reign of Edward II* (London, England: Oxford University Press, 1972), p. 53.

<sup>52</sup> Maddicott, p. 139.

a further commission for the justices to investigate a counter claim by John and Hawise, who alleged that de la Pole,

with horses, arms, and banners displayed, approached their castle... besieged it, burned the doors of the castle and their houses, broke their park and hunted therein, cut the grass and corn growing there ... fished their stews, took away horses and colts of the price of 100*l.*, and carried away his game, fish, grass and corn.<sup>53</sup>

The signing of this treaty appeared to be a major victory for Edward as any attempts to remove John and the other counsellors had been rejected, along with any references to the Ordinances.<sup>54</sup> However, Lancaster was not satisfied with the treaty and on 13<sup>th</sup> January 1313 he rejected it.<sup>55</sup> Lancaster was unhappy with the concessions that had been made in respect of the removal of counsellors and the Ordinances, and argued that the justices that Edward had appointed to investigate de la Pole's complaint were not independent. He claimed that John had been retained by de la Zouche for a £10 fee, that Mortimer had assisted in removing de la Pole from his lands and Wogan was a member of the council that had ordered the removal.<sup>56</sup> Before he would relinquish the jewels and horses, he demanded new justices be appointed for de la Pole.<sup>57</sup> However, Lancaster's arguments were rebutted by the king's legal advisors.<sup>58</sup> Edward would not easily give way to Lancaster's demands and was prepared to go to great lengths to defend John. Finally, an agreement was reached, but Edward would still delay the appointment of new justices to address de la Pole's complaints until 3<sup>rd</sup> November 1313, and refused to extend their remit to investigate the whole matter of the Powys inheritance until 20<sup>th</sup> March 1314.<sup>59</sup> Edward would do as he was compelled, but in his own time. Subsequently, all parties involved in the death of Gaveston and the siege of Powys castle were pardoned on the 6<sup>th</sup> November 1313, ensuring the barons' commitment to subsidise the Scottish war would be fulfilled.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> *CPR 1307-1313*, p. 529–50, cited in Phillips, *Valence*, p. 54.

<sup>54</sup> Maddicott, p. 138; Hamilton, *Gaveston*, p. 105.

<sup>55</sup> Maddicott, p. 137.

<sup>56</sup> Maddicott, p. 141.

<sup>57</sup> Maddicott, p. 143.

<sup>58</sup> Maddicott, p. 144.

<sup>59</sup> Maddicott, p. 147; Phillips, *Valence*, p. 67.

<sup>60</sup> Phillips, *Valence*, p. 67.



The final settlement was not dissimilar to the treaty of December 1312, but it is clear that Edward and Lancaster had been in no hurry to resolve their underlying disagreements. Nevertheless, even before these matters had been resolved, Edward had evidently felt secure enough to leave the country, and John to leave his lands, for in May 1313 they travelled together to France for negotiations with Philip IV of France and to celebrate the knighting of Isabella's three brothers.<sup>61</sup> Edward returned on 16<sup>th</sup> July and was back in London by the 23<sup>rd</sup>.<sup>62</sup> On 26 July 1313, John was summoned to parliament and was subsequently considered to have become Lord Charlton at this point, but it would 'probably be more accurate to say that he had been acknowledged as lord of Powys in the right of his wife.'<sup>63</sup> On August 2<sup>nd</sup> at Windsor John and Hawise were given licence, 'to grant their castle and manor of la Pole, held in chief, to Master John de Cherelton'.<sup>64</sup> This served to reinforce Hawise's right in law to the Powys inheritance and, with her lineage now in possession of a male heir, undermining any future challenge that de la Pole might have should Hawise predecease John. In October, John received a grant of the wardship of another de la Pole heir, along with his lands, sending a very clear message from Edward to his opponents that John was very much still in favour and had the support of the king.<sup>65</sup>

This chapter highlights how, throughout these years, both Edward and Lancaster had attempted to manipulate the law to strengthen their own positions and suit their own purposes, with courtiers like John benefitting from the support of the king and coming under attack from men like Lancaster. His transition to the barony meant that John was able to maintain his social status even after Gaveston's death, whilst Edward protected John from the Ordainers. Edward allowed his loyalty to John to cloud his political judgement, thereby giving his enemies further opportunities to criticise and undermine his rule. The Powys dispute highlights how little Edward had learnt from the Ordinances and the death of Gaveston, allowing himself to become entrenched once again in the defence of a favourite. This allowed Thomas of Lancaster to embarrass Edward and persist in his demands for the enforcement of the Ordinances. Edward's fierce loyalty to John, to the extent that even papal

---

<sup>61</sup> *CCR 1307-13*, p. 583 cited in Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 210; Morgan, p. 20.

<sup>62</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 214.

<sup>63</sup> Mason.

<sup>64</sup> *CPR 1313-1317*, p. 1-30.

<sup>65</sup> *CFR 1307-1319*, p. 181, cited in Morgan, p. 20.

envoys became embroiled in the Powys dispute, can only be adequately explained by considering John's past association with Gaveston. That Lancaster would use his possession of the jewels belonging to the king of England as a negotiating tool, to remove John from office and assist a minor retainer such as de la Pole, is astounding. The extreme behaviour of Edward and Lancaster, in matters pertaining to John, indicates that to them both he had become symbolic of Gaveston. Indeed, the importance of this link to Gaveston is recognised by the author of the *Vita Edwardi Secundi* who observed,

But there still remain at the king's court those from Pier's intimates and members of his household, who disturb the peace of the whole country and persuade the king to seek vengeance.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> *Vita* cited in Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 220.

## Chapter 3 – Bannockburn & other Disturbances

This chapter will explore the events in John's life in the years up to his replacement as chamberlain by Hugh Despenser the Younger. During this period, he experienced significant challenges to his authority in Powys, whilst receiving further grants from Edward. He was active militarily, as a Marcher lord, but finally after many years of resistance, Thomas of Lancaster was able to secure his removal from court.

In the November 1313 parliament, Edward was granted the taxation he needed to proceed against the Scots, due for collection in June 1314.<sup>1</sup> On December 23<sup>rd</sup> he issued summons of military service to his cousin Thomas, earl of Lancaster and 'the like to seven earls and eighty-seven others' to be at Berwick-on-Tweed on June 10<sup>th</sup>.<sup>2</sup> In the months running up to what would prove to be Edward's infamous defeat, there is evidence that confirms the king's continuing support of John.<sup>3</sup> On 25<sup>th</sup> January at Windsor, John was appointed keeper of Builth Castle, by secret seal and on the 26<sup>th</sup> March the prior of Carmarthen was ordered to 'fortify it with armour and victuals without delay.'<sup>4</sup> During February and March, John continued to act as the king's chamberlain and is recorded on multiple occasions in the *Calendar of Close Rolls*.<sup>5</sup> He was a witness to the transference of the lands of the Templars to the Hospitallers made in the king's chamber at Westminster.<sup>6</sup> However, his lands in Powys continued to be troubled, only on this occasion due to the continuing rivalry between Welshpool and Montgomery.

These disturbances did not prevent John's attendance in Scotland with the king and although no wage rolls have survived from 1314, to indicate what part John played in the campaign, it is possible to speculate using other sources of evidence.<sup>7</sup> John appears in *Rotuli Scotiae* as providing 500 hobelars and foot soldiers from Powys and there is a record of the payment made to him recorded in the *Calendar of Fine Rolls* 'for the wages of him and his

---

<sup>1</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 225.

<sup>2</sup> *CCR 1313-1318*, p. 85-85, cited in Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 225. Phillips contains an account of the defeat suffered by Edward at Bannockburn.

<sup>3</sup> A good account of the campaign of 1314 is contained within G. W. S. Barrow, *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005).

<sup>4</sup> *CFR 1307-1319*, p. 188, cited in Morgan, p. 21; Davies, p. 159; *CCR 1313-1318*, p. 42-46.

<sup>5</sup> *CCR 1313-1318*, p. 38-42, p. 91-95; *CPR 1313-1317*, p. 75-106; Morgan, p. 20.

<sup>6</sup> Conway-Davies, p. 70.

<sup>7</sup> Tebbit, *Household Knights*, p. 77.

men at arms and footmen and for replacing his horses lost in the war of Scotland'.<sup>8</sup> Extrapolating from earlier payments made to John in 1304, the large amount of money he received is indicative of a significant loss of valuable war horses. This taken together with John's close association with Edward, suggests John may well have been in the escort attached to Edward. That this group included Sir Roger de Northburgh and Sir Edmund Mauley, provides further support for this suggestion. Certainly, John was an experienced soldier, and he may well have been one of the 'veteran knights and those who were more experienced,' who advised the king not to fight that day but whose 'practical and honourable advice was rejected by the younger men as lethargic and cowardly.'<sup>9</sup>

John attended the parliament at York in September 1314, where Edward came under renewed pressure from the magnates to reinstate the Ordinances.<sup>10</sup> As a result, many of Edward's household were replaced but not John. Nor was he required to return any of the grants he had received since 1310, contrary to the Ordinances.<sup>11</sup> Meanwhile, his lands remained troubled, with further issues involving Montgomery in March 1315. In May, John and his bailiffs were subject to a long list of complaints to the king made by the tenants of the castle at Builth.<sup>12</sup> The issues in John's lands highlight the difficulties he had in maintaining control there and that he was not above taking advantage his position and power. But such matters did not prevent John from continuing his work at court at Westminster, Spalding, Lincoln, York and Doncaster that year, as evidenced by multiple entries in the *Calendar of Close and Patent Rolls*, nor did it prevent him from receiving grants in his favour, or using his influence to benefit his associates.<sup>13</sup> However, it was during this time that once again, the power of Thomas of Lancaster began to climb, following his appointment as head of the king's council on 24<sup>th</sup> February 1316, heralding a renewed threat to John's authority in Powys from Lancaster's retainer, Griffin de la Pole.<sup>14</sup>

In late 1315, concerns had grown that there could be an uprising of the Welsh in north Wales and so Edward acted to put his castles there in a state of readiness. However, the

---

<sup>8</sup> *Rotuli Scotiae*, p. 119; *CFR 1307-1319*, p. 205.

<sup>9</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 233; *Vita*, p. 91; Conway-Davies, p. 220.

<sup>10</sup> *CChR 1300-1326*, p. 263.

<sup>11</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 239. Tout, *Chapters*, p. 237.

<sup>12</sup> *CPR 1313-1317*, p. 307-331, cited in Morgan, p. 21.

<sup>13</sup> *CPR 1313-1317*, p. 184-224, p. 254-285, p. 285-307, p. 332-363; *CCR 1313-1318*, p. 245-240, p. 256-259, p. 300-304.

<sup>14</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 274.

disturbances did not arise in the north but in Glamorgan, where Llwelyn Bren attacked the castle of Caerphilly on 28<sup>th</sup> January 1316.<sup>15</sup> John was ordered to 'do all in his power to quell their wickedness' and to march against the rebels in the south with Hugh Audley, justice of Chester, Roger Mortimer of Wigmore, John Somery and other marcher lords.<sup>16</sup> Whether due to the ascendance of Lancaster, or the expected problems in north Wales, or the diversionary effects of the southern rebellion, it was now that de la Pole re-ignited the troubles in Powys, preventing John from going to the aid of the south. Yet again, he had chosen a time to challenge John when Edward's authority was under threat and his forces divided. Throughout February, John was recorded as being with the king at Lincoln and so was not able to return to Wales to deal with the matter in person, or to join the forces sent to Glamorgan.<sup>17</sup> He may well have returned to Welshpool in early March in the company of John Cromwell who, on 10<sup>th</sup> March was sent to 'enforce the maintenance of the peace', with John and de la Pole ordered to appear before the king.<sup>18</sup> John did as instructed and appeared before the king on 25<sup>th</sup> April but de la Pole did not. Cromwell had been unable to enter Powys and was forced to pass on the king's orders to an associate of de la Pole. The king instructed John Waleyn, escheator south of the Trent,

to seize the said castle into the king's hands if he and the said John de Cherleton and Hawisia agree to this being done, to remain in the king's hands until justice be done between them in the king's court.<sup>19</sup>

With Walwyn too unable to trace de la Pole, the king placed de la Pole's lands in the hands of Robert Holland in August.<sup>20</sup> Matters in Powys and Glamorgan soon calmed and on 27<sup>th</sup> June, John was in Shropshire for the marriage of the heir of Roger Mortimer of Wigmore to Elizabeth de Badlesmere. Amongst the witnesses were Roger Damory, William de la Zouche, John de Sapy, Roger de Sapy and other allies of Mortimer.<sup>21</sup> This marriage tied the Mortimer heir to the fate of the Badlesmere family, a significant link terms of the events that would follow. It also highlights a lack of animosity between these men and Damory, one of Edward's

---

<sup>15</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 272.

<sup>16</sup> *CPR 1313-1317*, p 432-463 cited in Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 272.

<sup>17</sup> *CPR 1313-1317*, p 432-463; *CChR 1300-1326*, p. 314 & 227

<sup>18</sup> *CPR 1313-1317*, p 432-463 cited in Morgan, p. 22. See Morgan for further detail on the disputed lands.

<sup>19</sup> *CCR 1313-1318*, p. 350-356.

<sup>20</sup> Morgan, p. 23; *CCR 1313-1318*, p. 350-356.

<sup>21</sup> Mortimer, p. 79.

new favourites, who did not threaten the status quo in the Marches as Despenser the Younger would. Indeed, it was John that Edward would send to persuade Elizabeth de Burgh to marry Damory on 16<sup>th</sup> September 1316.<sup>22</sup> However, unrest in Bristol which had been rumbling in the background since 1313, soon demanded the Marchers attention.<sup>23</sup> Mortimer's in-law, Bartholomew de Badlesmere, constable of Bristol castle, was in dispute with the people of Bristol over 'the customs in the harbour and the market,' and other local matters. The locals, having failed to heed the instructions of Aymer de Valance, sent by Edward in early July to deal with the matter, laid seige to the town.<sup>24</sup> John and the other magnates subsequently suppressed the rebellion and returned Bristol to the king's peace, with the town's surrender on 26<sup>th</sup> July.<sup>25</sup>

Whilst Edward had hoped to commence a further campaign against the Scots by this time, the disturbances in Powys, Glamorgan and Bristol had meant that preparations for the campaign had been repeatedly cancelled.<sup>26</sup> By the summer, Lancaster had withdrawn from the king's council making the decision-making process more difficult. He would later argue that it was because Edward had refused to observe the Ordinances, no doubt in reference to Edward's continuing support for John in the conflict over Powys, continuing presence at court, and the dispute over the bishopric of Durham that was about to unfold.<sup>27</sup> It was hoped that the pardon of de la Pole on 10<sup>th</sup> October and the return of his lands at Lancaster's request, would encourage his support.<sup>28</sup> However, Edward's nomination of Thomas Charlton, John's brother, as bishop of Durham further alienated the earl from his cousin. Edward was keen to see either Thomas, or Louis de Beaumont, Isabella's choice, installed and after months of wrangling the pope installed de Beaumont as bishop in February 1317.<sup>29</sup> The defeat of Lancaster's choice for bishop removed any chance that he would support or participate in Edward's longed for Scottish campaign and it was soon cancelled completely.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> K. Warner, p. 109.

<sup>23</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 273–74.

<sup>24</sup> Phillips, *Valence*, p. 103.

<sup>25</sup> *Vita*, p. 123. Maddicott, p. 185.

<sup>26</sup> Maddicott, p. 185-6; Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 280.

<sup>27</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 275.

<sup>28</sup> Conway-Davies, p. 418.

<sup>29</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, pp. 281–82. This episode highlights the occurrence of outside interference in church elections, something which John was guilty of in his own lands. See Burton.

<sup>30</sup> Phillips, *Valence*, p. 105.

By the close of 1316, Edward and Lancaster were as far apart as ever, allowing others to become closer to the king. Men like Aymer de Valance and Bartholomew de Badlesmere, Roger Damory, Hugh d'Audley and Hugh Despenser the Younger began to exert greater influence leading to what was previously referred to as the 'middle party'.<sup>31</sup> John remained close to the king, at Christmas receiving five pounds to take to the king at Nottingham to play dice on Christmas night.<sup>32</sup> 1317 began well for John, active as Edward's chamberlain at Clarendon in February, when he was granted Edgmond, Ford and Newport in Shropshire, and recorded later that year at Westminster.<sup>33</sup> On July 28<sup>th</sup>, the muster that Edward had called was delayed until 11<sup>th</sup> September, with John on this occasion having been asked for 200 footmen from Builth and 300 from Powys.<sup>34</sup> Although at York in September 1317, he was forced to relinquish Builth castle to Humphrey de Bohun, earl of Hereford and Essex, he remained sufficiently in favour to secure grants to his associates and himself, and was active as the king's chamberlain throughout 1317 and into the spring of 1318.<sup>35</sup>

However, the situation at court had undergone a transformation in the years since Bannockburn and whilst John was still close to the king, others were closer. The king's new favourites, Roger Damory, Hugh Audley the Younger and William de Montecute, Steward of the Royal Household, were described by the *Flores Historiarum* as being more wicked than Gaveston and their influence was now outstripping that of John.<sup>36</sup> The state of affairs at the beginning of 1318, with the continuing threat from the Scots, Edward's need to ensure Lancaster's support for any future campaign, and the common desire to prevent civil war breaking out following Lancaster's withdrawal from court, resulted in desperate diplomatic efforts to resolve the tensions between the cousins. Lancaster as always, continued to stand firm on the matter of the Ordinances. As far as he was concerned the evil counsellors, such as John, had still not been removed but instead had received further advancements.

---

<sup>31</sup> Tout, *Chapters*, p. 204–5. See Conway Davies, p. 425–43 for greater detail on the middle party. However, Phillips points out that by the mid 1970's this approach had been revised and the interpretation of events by Tout and Davies is now considered outdated. It is worth mentioning here to show how the interpretations of the reign by Tout and Conway Davies have been challenged by modern historians. Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 304.

<sup>32</sup> *A brief Summary of the Wardrobe Accounts of the tenth, eleventh, and fourteenth years of King Edward the Second*, contained in a letter addressed by Thomas Stapleton, Esq. F.S.A. to John Gage, Esq. F.R.S., Director. 1836. *Archaeologia: or Miscellaneous tracts relating to antiquity, 1770-1992*, **26**, pp. 318-345

<sup>33</sup> *CPR 1313-1317*, p. 602-633; *CFR 1307-1319*, p. 317.

<sup>34</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 297; *CCR 1313-1318*, p. 560-566.

<sup>35</sup> *CChR 1300-1326*, p. 389; *CCR 1313-1318*, p. 572-584; *CPR 1317-1321*, p. 57-80; *CPR 1317-1321*, p. 80-101; Maddicott, p. 193, 370, 378.

<sup>36</sup> Maddicott, p. 192-193.

Negotiations between Lancaster and Edward appeared to make headway in April 1318, when at Leicester a settlement was agreed would allow the two men to meet.<sup>37</sup> Negotiations continued into the summer and in June it was agreed that Roger Damory, Hugh Audley the Younger, William de Montecute, Hugh Despencer the Elder and John would not 'impede or threaten Lancaster or any of his men in any way' when Edward and Lancaster finally met.<sup>38</sup> However, Edward continued to obstruct the removal of John and the other royal favourites but he was ultimately forced to concede. In July, he agreed to the removal of his favourites from court, with Lancaster's only concession being that they could attend Parliament when summonsed and respond to military calls for support.<sup>39</sup> Whilst Thomas de Cherleton remained privy seal, it was Hugh Despenser the Younger who was 'to remain his chamberlain.'<sup>40</sup> Sometime in 1318 Despenser had assumed John's position. A grant made to John at this point, 'for his good service...of the messuage and tenements without Neugate in the suburb of London,' may well have been a gesture by Edward for John's service as his chamberlain.<sup>41</sup>

By comparing the chamberlainship of Despenser with that of John, it is possible to illustrate the differences between the two men, and the inherent weaknesses in the household system under Edward II. Davies points out that, 'the officers of the household system exercised a potent and continuous influence upon the administration,' explaining Lancaster's continuing objections to the men that Edward surrounded himself with and his insistence on the upholding of the Ordinances.<sup>42</sup> Whilst John benefitted from the protection and support of the king, and improved his financial and social status as a result of his position, he had acted more as a personal servant and companion to the king, as illustrated by his visit to Elizabeth de Burgh and the delivery of cash for the king to play dice. He was certainly influential, as shown by the gifts to him from Walter of Wenlock and the letters of Roger de Aldenham, but he was never able to exert the same level of control and manipulation of Edward as Despenser soon would. Davies argues that Despenser was, 'a most painstaking and

---

<sup>37</sup> Maddicott, p. 192-215.

<sup>38</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 315.

<sup>39</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 318.

<sup>40</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 331; *PRME October 1318*.

<sup>41</sup> *CPR 1317-1321*, p. 131-169.

<sup>42</sup> Davies, p. 70-72.



prudent administrator', who given his status at birth would have received considerably more education and training in the art than John.<sup>43</sup> Indeed, John rarely witnessed charters during his time as chamberlain suggesting Despenser's role was 'enhanced' by the king.<sup>44</sup> So whilst John was plainly extremely capable, he would not have been able to match Despenser's skills and take best advantage of his position as chamberlain when it came to self- aggrandizement and domination of the king. However, that John was able to maintain his position as chamberlain at all after Gaveston's death and the constant pressure for his removal by Thomas of Lancaster, emphasises his abilities and Edward's loyalty to him.

---

<sup>43</sup> Conway-Davies, p. 103.

<sup>44</sup> Tebbit, *Patronage*, p. 206.

## Chapter 4 – The Despensers

This next chapter will show how John has been misrepresented by historians who have not conducted a thorough examination of existing, accessible primary source material and who instead have relied too heavily upon secondary sources. It will challenge the existing narrative of John's actions during this period and the language used to describe it, calling into question the results of existing prosopographic research.

With the evil counsellors removed Edward now had Lancaster's support, and so it was time to address the Scottish issue once more. On 3<sup>rd</sup> June 1319, John was summonsed to be at Newcastle by July 22<sup>nd</sup> with 500, 'hominibus peditibus' from his lands, part of the 2,400 Welsh contingent.<sup>1</sup> The events of that summer are well documented but needless to say, by the end of the year relations between Edward and Lancaster were as hostile as ever.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, with Damory, Audley and John removed from court, and Montecute in Gascony, it was Hugh Despenser the Younger now manipulating the king and whose territorial ambitions in Wales roused the hatred of the Marcher lords.<sup>3</sup> In January 1320, a prohibition of assemblies without the king's permission was issued but this did not prevent Lancaster meeting with other magnates on 22<sup>nd</sup> February.<sup>4</sup> However, whilst neither John nor the Mortimers were listed as attending, tensions continued to grow.<sup>5</sup> On 8<sup>th</sup> March, the Mortimers and others were instructed to prepare the king's castles in Wales.<sup>6</sup> At the end of March, John and other Marcher lords received an order to,

cause the king's peace to be maintained and observed throughout the said lands, and not to permit any assemblies to be made whereby the king's peace or the tranquillity of the king's people of those parts may be disturbed, and prohibiting his making any such assemblies, as complaint has reached the king that ... lands of other lords in those parts, which lands are held of the king in chief, make

---

<sup>1</sup> Maddicott, p. 243-5; *Rymer's Foedera, Volume 2*, p. 457.

<sup>2</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 342-53; Maddicott, pp. 246-52.

<sup>3</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 367.

<sup>4</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 374.

<sup>5</sup> *Rymer's Foedera, Volume 2*, p. 503.

<sup>6</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 375. CCR 1318-1323, p. 290-295.

assemblies and musters in warlike manner, whereat the king is astonished, as it is unknown why such assemblies are made.<sup>7</sup>

John was not listed amongst the Marcher lords who were invited ( but did not attend) a meeting with the with the king at Gloucester on 5<sup>th</sup> April. Conway-Davies in *Opposition* included John in this invitation, whereas in his earlier article on the Despenser war published in 1915 he did not. Unfortunately, it would appear that it is his reference in *Opposition* that has been cited by later historians. John is only listed in the king's general orders to keep the peace issued in March and April, which even included Hugh Despenser the Younger.<sup>8</sup> There is no evidence from these orders, that John was acting against the king at this point or that he played any part in the events that followed in May, which will not be discussed here.<sup>9</sup> Morgan's use of these references as 'first proof of Charlton's disenchantment with the king,' seems too strong a stance given the evidence and although Morgan does not categorically state that John was involved in the Despenser war, his narrative implies it sufficiently that others have cited his work in order to make statements such as, 'Mortimer, Hereford and Charlton, fresh from their devastation of Despenser estates,' without further support.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore in August, after Edward had been forced to agree to the exile of the Despensers, the pardon that was issued to all those involved in the Despenser war does not include John.<sup>11</sup> He does not appear to have acted against the king, or the Despensers during this period.

Not only that but inaccurate references have led to claims that John was at Sherburn in June, after Thomas of Lancaster, sensing an opportunity to forge an alliance against his cousin, Lancaster invited the Marcher lords meet with him.<sup>12</sup> The indenture drawn up there was not witnessed by John and there is no evidence that he attended. Morgan gives a variety

---

<sup>7</sup> *CCR 1318-1323*, p. 363; Conway Davies does not cite this order of 8<sup>th</sup> March, which *does* name John along with the other Marcher lords in *Baronial Opposition* but does so in his article on the Despenser War. J. Conway Davies, 'The Despenser War in Glamorgan', in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 9 (1915), p. 49.

<sup>8</sup> Conway-Davies, *Opposition*, p. 475, Fn 6. Conway-Davies cites *CCR* p. 314 as his reference for John being invited to meet with the king, but *CCR* p. 314 relates to other matters that occurred in July not March. Morgan cites p. 475 of *Opposition* and *CCR* p. 314 & 363 as evidence for John being invited to *meet* with the King at Gloucester. The *CCR* p. 363 relates to the order of 27<sup>th</sup> March to keep the peace, not the invitation to meet with the king. The correct reference for the invitation to meet with the king is *CCR* p. 364 and does not include John de Cherleton. The order to keep the peace issued on April 13<sup>th</sup> (*CCR* p. 366) is correctly cited by Morgan.

<sup>9</sup> Conway-Davies, *Despenser War*, p. 50; *Rymer's Foedera Volume 2*, pp. 447. See Mortimer p. 103-107 for a detailed account of the events that followed in May or the *CCR*, 1318-1323, p. 541.

<sup>10</sup> P. R. Dryburgh, *The Career of Roger Mortimer, First Earl of March (c.1287-1330)*, (Unpublished Ph.D., Bristol University), p. 90. Dryburgh cites Morgan p. 25.

<sup>11</sup> *CPR 1321-1324*, p. 1-30.

<sup>12</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 380. For further discussion on the wider importance of Sherburn.

of references, none of which support his assertion that John 'probably' attended Sherburn.<sup>13</sup> One of the citations he gives is Maddicott, in which a great deal of discussion takes place concerning Wilkinson's, *The Sherburn Indenture and the Attack on the Despencers*. In this paper, Wilkinson actually states that, 'John Botetourt, John Mowbray, Roger Clifford, and John Charlton are not in the indenture'. Furthermore, Maddicott does not say that John attended Sherburn.<sup>14</sup>

Following Sherburn, Lancaster continued his quest to undermine Edward, calling a meeting between himself, the barons and the Marcher lords at Doncaster on 29<sup>th</sup> November.<sup>15</sup> That John attended Doncaster is proposed by Tout and Mason, both saying that he attended the 'meeting of the good peers' on 29<sup>th</sup> November, with Tout going further and stating he fought against the king at Boroughbridge.<sup>16</sup> Turning to Tout first, as was stated earlier, he had limited access to information held in the Public Record Office at that time and so relied on other references, none of which say that John was at Doncaster or that he fought at Boroughbridge.<sup>17</sup> Similarly, none of the references given in Mason's article support John being at Doncaster, unless of course he is citing Morgan. Certainly, Morgan's narrative of the events has led to the opinion that, 'Morgan certainly believed Charlton attended the baronial assemblies at Sherburn and Doncaster', whilst Warner refers to John as one who Edward 'had pardoned for allegiance to the Contrarians in 1322.'<sup>18</sup> However, there is no evidence that John ever attended this meeting, rather he appears to have heeded Edward's instruction not

---

<sup>13</sup> Morgan, p. 25. Morgan cites *Bodley MS. Laud Miscellany, 529, f. 106.* and Maddicott Pg 267. Maddicott's citation of MS 529 is with reference to Arundel losing his castle at Clun to Mortimer. Prof. Janet Burton has kindly checked MS 529, f. 106 and there is no mention of John on this folio. B. Wilkinson, 'The Sherburn Indenture and the Attack on the Despencers, 1321', *The English Historical Review*, 63.246 (1948), 1–28 (pp. 9–10).

<sup>14</sup> Dryburgh, p.185 also interpreted Morgan in this way stating, 'Morgan certainly believed Charlton attended the baronial assemblies at Sherburn and Doncaster.'

<sup>15</sup> *Rymer's Foedera, Volume 2*, p.459. cited in Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 399. Edward's order to the barons not to attend the meeting, includes John but I have been unable to find any evidence that he actually attended. Again the references given by Morgan to support his assertion that 'Charlton himself seems to have attended the assembly' does not include John's name. Morgan, p. 25, Fn 161. Morgan references G.L. Haskins, *The Doncaster Petition, 1321*, in *The English Historical Review*, 53.211 (1938), 478–85. and Phillips, *Valence*, p. 217–18. Haskins does not say that John attended Doncaster and Phillips cites Haskins.

<sup>16</sup> Tout, *DNB*; Mason, *ONDB*.

<sup>17</sup> Tout's references here are the Parliamentary Writs, Rolls of Parliament and Rymer's *Foedera*.

<sup>18</sup> Dryburgh, p. 185. K. Warner, p. 225. Warner does not give any reference for this claim, secondary or otherwise.

to attend.<sup>19</sup> The Doncaster Petition, sent to the king by Mortimer, Lancaster and other magnates was an attempt to force Edward to comply with their wishes but Edward had already begun his attack and by the beginning of 1322 the Despenser's had been recalled and the rebellion crushed.<sup>20</sup>

The narrative to this point using terms such as 'seems' and 'probably' suggests that John was disloyal to Edward during the Despenser war, and in events leading up to the rebellion, attending both Sherburn and Doncaster. Whilst this may well be true, there is no evidence to support it and in the case of the Sherburn indentures, there is good evidence to suggest he did not attend. Furthermore, this style of narrative continues in Mason when he states that John, 'appears to have taken arms against the king,' which may account for Tebbit's unreferenced claim that John was part of the main rebel army in January 1322, which in turn is cited Warner who asserts that John was 'forced to leave his allies to go and defend his lands'.<sup>21</sup> However, John was clearly not acting for the king by this point, as when Edward arrived at Shrewsbury in mid-January he ordered,

all persons in the castle of la Pole to deliver the custody of the castle to Griffin ap Res, Res ap Griffith, Bertrand de la More, and Nicholas le Lumbard, appointed by the king to receive it,

and on the 18<sup>th</sup> issued a writ of aid for,

Robert de Sapy, Griffin ap Rees and Thomas de Wynnesbury appointed to receive in the king's name at the king's will John de Cherleton, and all who are at present in the castle of la Pole against the king, and to bring the said John to the king.<sup>22</sup>

The king took Mortimer and his uncle into custody on the 22<sup>nd</sup>, sending them to the Tower of London, and appointing Alan de Cherleton the castle and lordship of Wigmore on the 23<sup>rd</sup>.<sup>23</sup> Edward then continued his campaigning to the south before defeating and executing Lancaster at Boroughbridge on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 1322.<sup>24</sup> Edward had finally avenged the execution

---

<sup>19</sup> Edward wrote to 108 men, forbidding them to attend the meeting at Doncaster. John is named as one to whom he wrote but this is the only evidence linking him to the Doncaster meeting. The names of those he wrote to are included in *Rymer's Foedera, Volume 2, p. 459*, which would have been Tout's reference.

<sup>20</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 399–403.

<sup>21</sup> Tebbit, *Knights*, p. 90. Tebbit cites Morgan as a source for further information on John's career. K. Warner, p. 152.

<sup>22</sup> *CPR 1321-1324*, p. 30-53.

<sup>23</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 403–4. *CFR, 1307-1319*, p. 93.

<sup>24</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 405–9.

of his beloved Gaveston. For John, the man who had labelled him an evil counsellor, who had demanded his removal from Edward's chamber, and who had supported de la Pole in his pursuit of the Powys inheritance, was now dead.

Close analysis of this period of John's life has shown that there is no documentary evidence to support the idea that John conspired against the king with Thomas of Lancaster. John's experience of Lancaster was that his challenges to Edward's authority were always followed by disturbances in Powys. It is difficult to believe that that John would risk losing all he had achieved by supporting Lancaster. It is not unexpected then, that during the Despenser war and the attempt by Lancaster to create a coalition against Edward, that we find no evidence of John's participation. It is clear that he did not actively support the king in during the Marcher rebellion, remaining as he did at his castle, but this appears to be the only way in which he acted against the king. Arguably, John was sufficiently astute to avoid becoming entrenched in the rebellion, which given the outcome for Mortimer and Lancaster, was the correct decision. Furthermore, that John did not openly support Mortimer may well reflect his own lingering resentment that Mortimer chose to return to Ireland early in 1312, rather than support Edward during his dispute with the barons over Gaveston, thereby avoiding the attention of the Ordainers. This interpretation makes sense of John's immediate return to royal favour, for which there is considerable evidence, a fact that Tout and Morgan found puzzling.<sup>25</sup> For example, none of the rebellious barons were called to Parliament in York, and yet on 11<sup>th</sup> May John is there when the decision to postpone the Scottish campaign from 13<sup>th</sup> June until 24<sup>th</sup> July is made.<sup>26</sup> In July, he is once again addressed as lord of Powys and trusted to act as mainpernor for Geoffrey Beaufort and Hugh Mortimer for their part in the uprising.<sup>27</sup> Not only that, Mortimer's daughter Maud, because she had married John's son on 13<sup>th</sup> April 1319, was the only one of Mortimer's children not to be imprisoned alongside him, spared because of her association with John.<sup>28</sup> Whilst he is referred to as a 'rebel', he is soon pardoned on 11th September 1321, when his castle and lands were restored to him, before being summonsed to join the king against the Scots on the 20<sup>th</sup>.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Morgan, p. 26. Tout, *DND*.

<sup>26</sup> *Rymer's Foedera, Volume 2*, p. 486; *PRME May 1322*; Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 422.

<sup>27</sup> *CFR, 1307-1319*, p. 170–72. Morgan gives a later date of March 1323, as the date at which John was once again being addressed as Lord of Powys, citing a commission of array Morgan, p.27, Fn 172.

<sup>28</sup> Mortimer, p. 94 Fn p. 320; Mortimer, p. 121.

<sup>29</sup> *CPR 1321-1324*, p. 174–211; *Rymer's Foedera, Volume 2*, p. 496.

The Scottish campaign of the previous year had been a disaster for Edward and although John was summonsed to muster troops for a further campaign in April 1323, by May a truce between the two nations had been agreed.<sup>30</sup> In August, Mortimer escaped from the Tower of London, but there is no evidence to suggest that John was in communication with Mortimer during his imprisonment or that he played any part in assisting him in his escape. But again, the discourse surrounding John is negative, with Morgan claiming John, ‘played a remarkable game of duplicity between 1323 and 1326,’ citing Tout’s assertion that he had been, ‘in communication with his old ally, Roger Mortimer of Wigmore’. This suggestion is repeated by Mason, but Mortimer in his biography of his namesake makes no such claim nor do any of the sources for the period.<sup>31</sup> The only source for this claim would appear to be the mandate that was directed to a host of barons including both Despensers, the earl of Arundel, the earl of Pembroke, the earl of Warenne, the earl of Kent, the constable of Dover and warden of the Cinque Ports, and all the sheriffs, bailiffs and other lieges, of all counties throughout England,

prohibiting them from aiding the said Mortimer and his adherents, or from communicating with them, and commanding them to pursue the said Mortimer and his adherents with hue and cry.<sup>32</sup>

To single out John from this long list and use it as evidence of his ‘duplicity’ seems at best unfair.

The evidence of this chapter indicates the inherent danger in an overreliance on secondary source material without checking the validity of the citations given. Morgan’s use of the *DNB* entry to support his narrative of John’s life and his selective referencing combine to give a misleading and biased discussion of John. Furthermore, his language choices suggest a partisan approach to his interpretation of the available material. Whilst Morgan may indeed be correct in his assessment of John, with the aforementioned issues it becomes difficult to have confidence in his opinions.

---

<sup>30</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 425–428 & 434–453; *CPR 1321–1324*, p. 93–120.

<sup>31</sup> Mortimer, p. 129–30. Mortimer references Fryde in this matter. Fryde, p. 143. Dryburgh does not make any such claim either, despite regular references to Cherleton throughout his thesis and referenced discussion on those who did assist in Mortimer’s escape from the Tower and who he did communicate with whilst abroad.

<sup>32</sup> *CPR 1323–1324*, p. 321–368.

This period of John's life also indicates the risks attached to prosopography, when attempting to make clear distinctions in matters such as loyalty. Tebbit's argument, that the fall in household bannerets and knights between 1316 and 1322 indicated a decline in loyalty to the king, does not acknowledge that some knights were named in the Ordinances and their removal from court continually demanded.<sup>33</sup> The *Annales Londonienses* names John de Knokyn, John de la Beche, John de Sapy and Gerard Salveyn alongside John, all knights or bannerets in the household of Edward II.<sup>34</sup> Even in his reassessment Hamilton, describes John as one that 'fought against the king in 1321' when 'Hugh Despenser finally broke the loyalty of many household knights and officials at Edward II's court', but this statement is not referenced.<sup>35</sup> It is as if John's disloyalty has been so categorically proved beyond question, that it is not worthy of reference. Whilst it could be argued that this is a semantic point only, the ongoing issues concerning references for John's actions throughout this period, shows how without further primary source material and a rigorous approach to confirming the references of secondary source material, the approach of prosopography is a dangerous one to take.

---

<sup>33</sup> Tebbit, *Patronage*, p. 197.

<sup>34</sup> Hamilton, *Loyalty*, p. 47–61; Stubbs, *Chronicles, Volume 1*, p. 200.

<sup>35</sup> Hamilton, *Loyalty*, p. 55.



## Chapter 5 - Edward III

This final chapter shows how vital John's position and experience continued to be to the crown, in his appointment as justiciar of Ireland and as an established Marcher baron. It explores how he successfully negotiated the political turmoil of Edward II's deposition, the execution of Mortimer and the danger posed by Arundel during the reign of Edward III.

The tensions in Gascony had continued to grow and Edward's relationship with the French had deteriorated further. In Powys that summer discontent and dissatisfaction continued, causing Edward to make several orders for peace to be restored, insisting that John should,

bear himself peacefully towards his tenants so that dissensions may not hereafter again arise.<sup>1</sup>

Whilst, in September Edward was forced to make yet another writ as,

the said tenants refused to be obedient to the said John as they had been before the capture of his lands, and resisted him with armed force, whereat the king is moved, and now commands them to be obedient to him as their lord, on pain of the king's laying his hands on them.<sup>2</sup>

The disputes in John's lands continued in 1324, requiring the king to order Arundel to investigate.<sup>3</sup> There are few references outside of events in Powys concerning John's actions during the period between 1324 and Edward's final downfall, the details of which need not be discussed here.<sup>4</sup> And yet again there is no evidence to support an assertion by Morgan that,

when Isabella and her lover, Mortimer invaded England in 1326 Charlton joined them, hunting down royal officers and favourites.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 440 & p. 457; Morgan, p. 27; *CPR 1321-1324*, p. 261-307. See Morgan for greater detail on the disturbances in Powys.

<sup>2</sup> *CPR 1323-1324*, p. 321-368.

<sup>3</sup> Morgan p 27; *CPR 1321-1324*, p. 442-456.

<sup>4</sup> Phillips, *Edward II*, p. 471-516. See Phillips for more details.

<sup>5</sup> Morgan, x, p. 28.

The only evidence of John's involvement in any of these events comes from the Chronicle of Henry Knighton which says,

lord Edmund Earl of Arundel was taken prisoner by Lord John of Charlton in Shropshire, and was taken to Hereford...<sup>6</sup>

John may well have been gratified at his capture of Arundel at Shrewsbury on 13<sup>th</sup> April 1326, as Arundel had been one of the four earls that had presided over the 'trial' and execution of his friend Gaveston, so many years previously.<sup>7</sup> The rise to power of John's ally Mortimer did not however signal his return to the influence and stature at court, that he had enjoyed under Edward II in the years before Despenser. Maybe John's lack of support for Mortimer during the Despenser wars and rebellion, signalled that John could not be relied upon, or it could simply be that the issues that constantly appeared in Powys, meant John was forced to remain there.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, it is worth noting that between 1327 and 1331 the disputes between John and de la Pole were at their most destructive, and evidence from John's involvement in the affairs of Strata Marcella indicate his struggle for authority in his barony.<sup>9</sup> However, his son's marriage to Mortimer's daughter and his importance in maintaining peace in the Marches meant that he was not out of favour. His name continued to appear in records relating to the finance and administration of his lands and property, those of his daughter Isabella and her husband, and those of his son John.

Following the execution of Mortimer in October 1330, Edward assumed his personal reign and soon reinstated Richard Fitzalan as the third earl of Arundel and returned his lands. In order to secure the peace of the realm, in 1331 the young Edward forbade Richard to avenge his father's death.<sup>10</sup> With his strategic grant of his lands in Deuddwr to Arundel, shortly before his death in 1332, de la Pole clearly intended to ensure that the Powys dispute would continue. The was battle also taken up by de la Pole's brother-in-law, Thomas ap Rhodri, to whom he left further lands.<sup>11</sup> Edward himself did not show any animosity to John over his association with Mortimer or his father's deposition, and was soon calling upon him to raise

---

<sup>6</sup> Knighton, p. 436. My translation from the latin.

<sup>7</sup> C. Given-Wilson, *Fitzalan, Edmund, Second Earl of Arundel (1285–1326), Magnate, ONDB* (Oxford University Press, 2008); Morgan, p. 28.

<sup>8</sup> Morgan, p. 29–30.

<sup>9</sup> Burton, p. 112; Morgan, p. 29–30.

<sup>10</sup> C. Given-Wilson, *Fitzalan, Richard, Third Earl of Arundel and Eighth Earl of Surrey (c. 1313–1376), Soldier, Diplomat, and Royal Councillor, ONDB* (Oxford University Press, 2013).

<sup>11</sup> Morgan, p. 30; Burton, p. 114.

troops for his campaigns in Ireland in 1332 and Scotland in 1333.<sup>12</sup> John is recorded as acting on behalf of the king in 1335, being referred to as John de Cherleton the Elder when he visited the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield,

to hear from the bishop concerning divers affairs of the king, and to do further what the bishop shall enjoin upon him on the king's behalf.<sup>13</sup>

However, the new Earl of Arundel had not forgotten the matter of his father's death and in the early summer of 1337 men under the command of his steward Roger Lestrangle, attacked Powys whilst John was with the king.<sup>14</sup> Edward was concerned that the matter would provoke further trouble in the Marches, 'chiefly because the Welsh, from lightness of head, may rise in war,' and so ordered Lestrangle, 'not to violate the peace, but to maintain it.'<sup>15</sup> To diffuse the situation, Edward ordered that John, 'make himself ready without delay and to come to the king to take up the office of justiciary of Ireland.'<sup>16</sup> John's primary task was to ensure that, 'Richard de Maundevill and Egidia his wife, accused of the death of William de Burgh, earl of Ulster,' were taken dead or alive with the promise of, '100 marks of the gift of Matilda, countess of Ulster, late the earl's wife.'<sup>17</sup> Preparations continued apace throughout 1337, with orders issued for John to receive 500 pounds yearly, 'for which he shall keep that office and land, and he shall be twenty-man of men-at-arms with the same number of barded horses,' paid by the exchequer at Dublin.<sup>18</sup> In July, the chamberlain of north Wales was ordered to pay for six ships and the wages of the 200 Welsh foot, that John was taking with him, 'from the time of their departure from those parts until their arrival at Dublin.'<sup>19</sup> John was formally appointed justiciar of Ireland, and his brother Thomas appointed as chancellor of Ireland. John received all the powers appropriate to such a position, just as Gaveston had.<sup>20</sup> The man who had originally gone to Ireland as the secretary and friend of the justiciar, was now returning as justiciar in his own right. Whilst this appointment may well have been to avoid tension in the Marches, it may equally have been due to John's years of experience

---

<sup>12</sup> *CCR 1330-1333*, p. 482-489; *CCR 1333-1337*, p. 16-28.

<sup>13</sup> *CCR 1333-1337*, p. 516-525.

<sup>14</sup> Morgan, p. 30-31.

<sup>15</sup> *CCR 1337-1339*, p. 133-140.

<sup>16</sup> *CCR 1337-1339*, p. 133-140.

<sup>17</sup> *CCR 1337-1339*, p. 151-172.

<sup>18</sup> *CPR 1334-1338*, p. 476-508.

<sup>19</sup> *CCR 1337-1339*, p. 83-97.

<sup>20</sup> *CCR 1337-1339*, p. 238-251

as a Marcher lord and his previous knowledge of Ireland. It is likely they left soon after 20th August, when letters of protection were issued for John, Thomas de Cherleton and John's two sons, Owain and Edward, but before they left orders were sent to Dublin that the exchequer there should pay the foot soldiers,

their reasonable wages from the time when they come to Dublin, and thenceforth so long as they shall remain in the justiciary's company in the king's service.<sup>21</sup>

However, the appointment was not to be long or successful. Wrangles over money and payments blighted the venture from the start. By March 1338, the exchequer still hadn't paid, 'the centenars and vintenars of the 200 Welsh foot, whom the king sent to Ireland in the company of John de Cherleton, the elder,' and in May, John relinquished his post as justiciar.<sup>22</sup> In June, Thomas was forced to seek the support of the king in order to receive the money he was owed for his expenses that John should have given him. John was ordered to give Thomas £210 from the 1000 marks he had been granted by the king, with the exchequer at Dublin ordered to take the £210 from John's fee from his time as justiciar if he did not pay up.<sup>23</sup> However, matters of money from John's time in Ireland are more complicated than they may first appear. John himself was not paid and in July 1339 the king had to order the Dublin exchequer to pay John's arrears from his time as justiciar, as had been unable to pay the wages of his men.<sup>24</sup> It has been suggested that John was 'deposed from office on an accusation of misgovernment raised by his brother,' but this ignores that fact that John left office before Thomas's complaint to the king, and the political context of the time.<sup>25</sup> Nor does it acknowledge the failure of the exchequer at Dublin to pay John or his soldiers, which may well have led to his premature departure. John could ill afford to lose the support of his retainers and men at arms either in Ireland or in Powys. With his men going unpaid by the exchequer, the man who started out as a soldier himself in the Scottish wars of Edward I, would know the risks attached to leading a disgruntled force. John would know that the task he had been asked to do by Edward, 'to receive into the king's peace English and Irish now in

---

<sup>21</sup> *CCR 1337-1339*, p. 151-172.

<sup>22</sup> *CPR 1338-1340*, p. 80-104.

<sup>23</sup> *CCR 1337-1339*, p. 421-424, p. 291-317.

<sup>24</sup> Morgan, p. 31. Morgan states that John returned sometime between 15<sup>th</sup> May 1338 (when he surrendered the justiciarship to Thomas) and 28<sup>th</sup> July 1339. *CCR 1339-1341*, p. 156-166.

<sup>25</sup> Tout, *DNB*. The reference given by Tout is Gilbert, p. 185-88. Both use Thomas's complaint as the reason that John left the office of justiciar but that is their assumption. However, there is no evidence that supports that assumption, or that he was 'removed' from office in disgrace, as Tout suggests.

rebellion,' would be impossible without sufficient financial support.<sup>26</sup> Furthermore, John would have been well aware of Edward's demand for soldiers for his continental ambitions, that would take further men from his lands in Powys.<sup>27</sup> With Edward planning to transfer the whole court to Antwerp, suggesting he planned to be away from England for some considerable time, leaving John's nemesis the Earl of Arundel at the head of a regency council, to remain in Ireland would have left him and Powys extremely vulnerable.<sup>28</sup> His decision to return may well have been the correct one, as Edward would not permanently return to England until the close of 1340, with his own efforts blighted by a lack of money to pay his soldiers.<sup>29</sup> Indeed, the dispute with Arundel did not abate until 1343 when the two were reconciled by John's creation of a chantry at Haughmond Abbey, in remembrance of the earls father.<sup>30</sup> The ongoing dispute with Thomas ap Rhodri that had resurfaced prior to his departure to Ireland, continued in his absence and was yet another issue that would only be resolved by his return.<sup>31</sup>

In the years following his return from Ireland, John appears to have focused on Powys and his lands in the Marches whilst the politics and turbulence of the early years of the Hundred Years war reverberated away in the background. In 1343, he arranged for the marriage of his grandson John, who would become second baron Sutton of Dudley, to the daughter of Ralph Stafford, first earl of Stafford.<sup>32</sup> Whilst in 1344, his brother Thomas died and in May 1345 records show John was reluctant to support the ambitions of Edward III, refusing to muster troops to go with Prince Edward and the earl of Derby on campaign in Gascony, without first being paid.<sup>33</sup> In a letter to the Prince of Wales and his council, Roger Trumwyn, Lieutenant of the Justice of North Wales, informs them that John, 'entirely refused the writ, and sent it back, just as it was, sealed with the prince's seal of exchequer at Carnarvon.'<sup>34</sup> Trumwyn's men had mustered as requested but having gone unpaid for three days, he sent them home without payment. In a second letter, Trumwyn complains that,

---

<sup>26</sup> *CPR 1334-1338*, p. 476-508.

<sup>27</sup> *CCR 1337-1339*, p. 398-407.

<sup>28</sup> Ormrod, p. 198-201.

<sup>29</sup> Ormrod, p. 618.

<sup>30</sup> Given-Wilson, *Fitzalan, Richard*, ODNB.

<sup>31</sup> Morgan, p. 31-32; Mason.

<sup>32</sup> Mason.

<sup>33</sup> *CCR 1343-1346*, p. 279-289.

<sup>34</sup> Edwards, *Calendar*, p. 246-47.

the lord of the land of Powys, who will not obey the mandates of the prince or of his justice of North Wales. And the other lords of the land make a great noise, alleging that their men should not go out of their lordships before they have been paid their wages within the lordships, as has anciently been accustomed.<sup>35</sup>

Aside from his concerns about payment, John was quite correctly asserting his position, that as a royal tenant-in-chief he did not have to accept the orders of a prince whose status in Wales matched his own. Only a king could command a Marcher lord. John's assertion to the representative of the abbot of Clairvaux in 1333, 'Je suis papes, Je suis roys et euesques et abbes en ma terre,' 'I am pope, I am king, I am bishop and abbot in my land,' was a mantra that he was not afraid to live by.<sup>36</sup> He would not be intimidated by anyone, not even the Prince of Wales. His reluctance to campaign may also be due to his growing age and a lifetime of military service under three kings, for in 1347, unable to campaign in person, John sent three of his sons to support Edward at the siege of Calais. On this occasion John himself appears to have paid the wages of his men whilst on their journey to the port to depart for France.<sup>37</sup> He died in 1353.<sup>38</sup>

This final chapter shows how he remained valuable asset to the crown, as he had throughout his life, continuing to provide military support for campaigns both at home and abroad, and maintaining the king's peace in the March. Neither Mortimer and Isabella, or Edward III, could do without his service, which assisted him in retaining possession of his barony despite the political turmoil of the period and danger posed by Arundel. His response to the Prince of Wales's request shows his confidence in his social status at the end of his life, whilst the marriage of his grandson to the daughter of an earl highlights how those in wider society now accepted his position.

---

<sup>35</sup> Edwards, *Calendar*, p. 246–47.

<sup>36</sup> Burton, p. 114.

<sup>37</sup> W. G. D. Fletcher, 'Shropshire-Men at the French Wars of 1346-47', *Shropshire Archeological and Natrual History Society*, 28 (1905), 141–48 (p. 147). The refences for this information come the French Roll, 21 Edw. III. I have been unable to check this to establish how much he paid or which of his sons he sent.

<sup>38</sup> Eyton, *Antiquities*, p. 33.

## Conclusion

As we have seen, John led a remarkable life leaving the eldest of his nine sons to inherit the title Lord Charlton, second baron Powys, and he too, like his father before him, would become the king's chamberlain.<sup>1</sup> Sadly, the date of Hawise's death is not recorded.<sup>2</sup> John had successfully navigated the transition from foot soldier to baron and ensured that his personal success would continue to benefit his children and his wider family. With the passage of time, his low birth and close association with Gaveston, the man so hated by the barony, had become irrelevant to the lives of his children and wider society. Memories of Gaveston and the issues surrounding the reign of Edward II had faded, replaced by new concerns and political challenges. The deaths of those that had contested Hawise's right to inherit the lands of Powys meant his son John would not have to battle constantly for control of the barony.

The young John must have been a man whose talents and capabilities were apparent from a very early stage. His entry into the household of the young prince Edward shows how quickly he had impressed those around him. Whilst Edward II, as a king, has rightly received much criticism for advancing his favourites, John's early promotion was at a time when Edward I controlled his son's entourage. John's elevation would therefore have been due to his personal abilities, and arguably an element of luck. John's superiors clearly had faith in the young soldier from Shropshire. Similarly, his rapid advancement to knight was in the reign of Edward I and whilst his promotion to the barony was most definitely thanks to his relationship with Edward II, his ability to maintain possession of it for the following forty years, despite the constant challenges and attacks, is surely credit to the man. John was faced with continual rebellion in his lands, with his authority endlessly undermined by the retainers of powerful magnates like Thomas of Lancaster and the earls of Arundel, but he remained undefeated. Whilst Edward's choice to promote John met with immense hostility from the barony, others such as Abbot Wenlok and John's

---

<sup>1</sup> Ormrod, p. 319.

<sup>2</sup> I have been unable to establish a date of her death despite extensive searching. Morgan states she predeceased John but provides no reference. Their images are portrayed in the thirteenth century Jesse window in St Mary's church in Shrewsbury which appears on the frontispiece of this paper.

associates in Shrewsbury and Welshpool, would have been anxious to ingratiate themselves with him, as he now had the capacity to benefit them too. Edward's continuing loyalty to John made his own position more difficult and yet he did so. Whether this dedication to John amounted to a character flaw in Edward or showed Edward's strength of mind is open to debate. What is clear however, is John's extraordinary ability to navigate the tumultuous events of the reign; the Ordainers, the death of Gaveston, attacks by Lancaster, the Despenser wars, Mortimer's rebellion and Boroughbridge, all of which was rewarded by Edward's continuing support of him. If John did indeed fight against the king and attack the Despenser lands in the south, and conspire with Lancaster at Sherburn and Doncaster, there is certainly no evidence to support it. So, whilst there is no evidence that John fought for Edward against Mortimer, as his brother Alan did, he does not appear to have actively fought against him either. The only evidence of his disloyalty to Edward, comes from the description of him as a rebel, with reference to him remaining in his castle. However, in the later rebellion of Mortimer and Isabella, it is clear that John acted strategically and decisively, leaving no doubt that at this point he deserted Edward.

His actions and reputation meant that John prospered after Edward's deposition, into the personal reign of Edward III, again rewarded with the trust and support of the king. At this time too, John proved he was able to make the correct assessment of the political situation and did not leave his lands or his family vulnerable to the ambitions of Arundel. This does not sound like the man that has been variously described as duplicitous, violent, avaricious and greedy, the one Morgan describes as dangerous, 'cursed with conceit and insensitivity.'<sup>3</sup> This sounds like a man who was intelligent, decisive, and tenacious. Indeed, the impression that Morgan gives of John, resonates more with the character of Despenser. Yet, John was either unable or unwilling to exploit his position as chamberlain in the same way as Despenser. Whether that was due to changes that Edward made to the position of chamberlain or simply because Despenser was more adept at manipulating the king and the system to his own advantage, we do not know. That John's removal from

---

<sup>3</sup> Morgan, p. 21.



court was pursued so relentlessly by Thomas of Lancaster and the Ordainers, is ironic given the consequences of his replacement by Despenser.

Furthermore, John's biography serves as a cautionary tale for historians, of the danger of over reliance on secondary sources. Whilst secondary sources are continually subject to peer review, not all of them have been subject to the same level of rigor. Whilst Tout is of course revered and respected, Summerson points out that the,

*DNB* contains very few unequivocal references to the records themselves, probably because the publication of PRO lists and indexes began too late to give him the guidance he needed to the documents held at Chancery Lane.

He continues,

as changes in knowledge and outlook have combined to call into question the value of much of Tout's work for the *DNB*, it becomes reasonable to ask why historians should still pay any attention to it.<sup>4</sup>

Morgan's reliance on Tout and historians' subsequent reliance on Morgan, has led to a narrative of John that lacks the academic rigour that is expected of modern historical discourse. With so few accounts of the lives of the lesser-known courtiers of Edward II, this places an even greater responsibility on historians such as Morgan, to ensure that what is written is as accurate and as detached as possible. Tebbit and Hamilton's unreferenced assertions remind us that even contemporary accounts of John's life are open to question. Whilst it is unfortunate that this paper has had to devote so much of its focus to addressing the inaccuracies in the scholarship, it is hoped that by engaging more fully with primary sources, it has been able to provide an alternative narrative for John, reflecting him in a more positive light.

The digitisation of so many primary source materials now offers historians the opportunity to explore biographical accounts of men like John with greater ease. There is no reason why secondary sources cannot be checked for accuracy, especially where the references cited are ones that are so readily available. Biographers will

---

<sup>4</sup> Summerson in Barron and Rosenthal, p. 241–43.

always need to contend with the gaps in source material and address the inherent bias contained in medieval *vitae*, in order to interpret the lives of medieval people but they are no longer constrained in the way that Tout was. This offers historians a renewed opportunity to further explore the events of the period through biographical case studies of individuals. Furthermore, digitisation could well, 'transform prosopography into an astonishingly powerful device for the constitution of social and political history.'<sup>5</sup> However, as prosopography concerns itself with the average and the general not the unique and individual, there will always be limitations to its application.

Finally, despite the inaccuracies, the characterisation of John presented by Morgan, as a man who behaved disgracefully, taking advantage of every situation in order to advance his own agenda, acting without honour or loyalty, is very engaging. Morgan's research remains the only detailed account of John's actions in the barony of Powys and it is clear that John did not necessarily act with integrity with regard to his lordship of Powys. However, it must be acknowledged that the complaints made against him were made by those who not only refused to recognise his authority in Powys, but by those who actively rejected English rule more broadly. Nevertheless, there was more to John de Cherleton than his lands in Powys, and so this paper has emphasised his importance to key events of the period, particularly the impact that he had on the relationship between Edward II and Thomas of Lancaster. John's association with Gaveston is fundamental to understanding the antipathy of the cousins in the matter of the Ordinances and the dispute in Powys. John was a constant reminder to them both of Gaveston and must surely account for their extreme behaviour over matters on which they should have compromised more easily. The wider social and political backdrop has also been considered and in doing so, new light has been cast on the reasons behind John's actions and decisions.

So, whilst John's life certainly provides the opportunity to explore issues of social mobility, the politics and crises of the reign of Edward II, and the importance to the crown of maintaining control and authority in the borderlands of Wales, it is also worthy of study because it was simply extraordinary. John was a man who came

---

<sup>5</sup> Bates, Crick and Hamilton, p. 11.

from complete obscurity, from such humble origins that it is almost inconceivable that he would end his life as a wealthy and influential baron. That he would become a banneret of the king's household, a close friend of Gaveston, a trusted chamberlain to Edward II, a baron in his own right, be responsible for the capture of the earl of Arundel, and finally appointed justiciar of Ireland is remarkable. His life contributed to a substantial change in the social status of his family, one that would be maintained for generations. That his image, and that of his wife and children, can still be seen in the Jesse window of St. Mary's Church in Shrewsbury, means that his memory continues in the very area from which he first came, some seven hundred years later.



(John de Cherleton, Jesse window of St. Mary's Church, Shrewsbury.  
Picture, authors own.)

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

#### Documents

C 47/2/17 (1297–1298), Chancery Miscellanea, The National Archives.

C 47/2/20 (1298), Chancery Miscellanea, The National Archives.

SC 1/49/13, Special Collections: Ancient Correspondence of the Chancery and the Exchequer, The National Archives.

E 101/13/34 (1300), King's Remembrancer: Accounts Various, The National Archives.

E 101/12/16 (1304), King's Remembrancer: Accounts Various, The National Archives.

E 101/13/7 (1305-1306), King's Remembrancer: Accounts Various, The National Archives.

Additional MS 7966A (1300–1301), Wardrobe Accounts of the Edward I, the Queen, the Prince of Wales, the British Library.

Additional MS 22923 (1306-1307), Wardrobe Accounts, Edward II of England, when Prince of Wales, The British Library.

MS. Laud Miscellany, 529, f. 106. Ranulph Higden, Polichronicon, Bodleian Library.

#### Chronicles & Vitae

Childs, W. R., and N. Denholm-Young, eds., *Vita Edwardi Secundi: The Life of Edward the Second*, Oxford Medieval Texts, Rev. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005).

Knighton, Henry, and J.R. Lumby, *Chronicon Henrici Knighton, Vel Cnitthon, Monachi Leycestrensis* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, by Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1889)  
<<https://archive.org/details/chroniconhenric00lumbgoog/page/436/mode/2up>>.

Stubbs, W., *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II. Volume 1* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

Stubbs, W., *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II. Volume 2* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

## Calendars

Bain, Joseph, *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland, Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office, London* (Edinburgh, Scotland.: H.M. General Register House, 1881), V.

Commission, Great Britain Record, D. Macpherson, J. Caley, and W. Illingsworth, *Rotuli Scotiae in Turri Londensi Et in Domo Capitulari Westmonasteriensi Asservati: Edwardi I. Edwardi II. Edwardi III. - v.2.Ric. II. Hen. IV. V. VI. Ed. IV. Ric. III. Hen. VII. VIII*, *Rotuli Scotiae in Turri Londensi Et in Domo Capitulari Westmonasteriensi Asservati*, 1814  
<<https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=Ty5KAQAAMAAJ>>.

Edwards, J. G., ed., *Calendar of Ancient Correspondence Concerning Wales*, History and Law Series, 2 (Cardiff: Univ. Pr. Board, 1935).

Grace, J. and R. Butler, *Annales Hiberniae* (Dublin: Irish Archaeological Society, 1842), p. 53; E. Curtis, *Calendar of Ormond Deeds, 1152-1350* (Dublin, 1932).

Rothwell, H., and D. C. D., eds., *English Historical Documents. Vol. 3: 1189 - 1327 / Ed. by Harry Rothwell*, Repr (London: Routledge, 2000), iii.

Rymer, T. T.D., Hardy, *Syllabus (in English) of the Documents Relating to England and Other Kingdoms Contained in the Collection Known as 'Rymer's Foedera.'* (Great Britain: Public Record Office, 1869), ii  
<<https://archive.org/details/cu31924007439221>>.

Rymer, T., R. Sanderson, G. Holmes, J.L. Clerc, and R. de Thoyras, *Foedera, Conventiones, Literae, et Cujuscunque Generis Acta Publica: Inter Reges Angliae et Alios Quosvis Imperatores, Reges, Pontifices, Principes, Vel Communitates, Ab Ineunte Saeculo Duodecimo, Viz. Ab Anno 1101. Ad Nostra Usque Tempora, Habita Aut Tractata: Ex Autographis, Infra Secretiores Archivorum Regiorum Thesaurarias per Multa Saecula Reconditis, Fideliter Exscripta*, *Foedera, Conventiones*, v. 1 (Apud Joannem Neulme., 1745) <<https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=AhiFvgAACAAJ>>.

Simpson, G.G., and J.D. Galbraith, *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office* (London, England.: Public Record Office, 1881), v  
[https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=guU2AQAAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=guU2AQAAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false).

Stevenson, J., *Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, Scotland.: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1870), II.  
[HTTPS://ARCHIVE.ORG/DETAILS/DOCUMENTSILLUST03STEVGOOG/PAGE/N5/MODE/2UP](https://archive.org/details/documentsillust03stevgoog/page/n5/mode/2up).

### **Calendar of Patent Rolls Edward I-III**

*Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward I: Volume 3, 1292-1301*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1895. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-pat-rolls/edw1/vol3>.

*Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward I: Volume 4, 1301-1307*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1898. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-pat-rolls/edw1/vol4>.

*Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward II: Volume 1, 1307-1313*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1894. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/series/calendar-of-patent-rolls-edward-ii/vol1>.

*Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward II: Volume 2, 1313-1317*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1898. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/series/calendar-of-patent-rolls-edward-ii/vol2>.

*Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward II: Volume 3, 1317-1321*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1903. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/series/calendar-of-patent-rolls-edward-ii/vol3>.

*Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward II: Volume 4, 1321-1324*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1904. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/series/calendar-of-patent-rolls-edward-ii/vol4>.

*Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward II: Volume 5, 1324-1327*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1904. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/series/calendar-of-patent-rolls-edward-ii/vol5>.

*Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward III: Volume 1, 1327-1330*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1891. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/series/calendar-of-patent-rolls-edward-iii/vol1>.

*Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward III: Volume 2, 1330-1334*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1893. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/series/calendar-of-patent-rolls-edward-iii/vol2>.

*Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward III, Volume 3, 1334-1338*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1895. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/series/calendar-of-patent-rolls-edward-iii/vol3>.

*Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward III, Volume 4, 1338-1340*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1898. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/series/calendar-of-patent-rolls-edward-iii/vol4>.

*Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward III, Volume 5, 1340-1343*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1900. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/series/calendar-of-patent-rolls-edward-iii/vol5>.

### **Calendar of Close Rolls Edward II-III**

*Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward II: Volume 1, 1307-1313*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1892. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-close-rolls/edw2/vol1>.

*Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward II: Volume 2, 1313-1318*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1893. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-close-rolls/edw2/vol2>.

*Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward II: Volume 3, 1318-1323*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1895. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-close-rolls/edw2/vol3>.

*Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward II: Volume 4, 1323-1327*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1898. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-close-rolls/edw2/vol4>.

*Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward III: Volume 1, 1327-1330*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1896. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-close-rolls/edw3/vol1>.

*Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward III: Volume 2, 1330-1333*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1898. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-close-rolls/edw3/vol2>.

*Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward III: Volume 3, 1333-1337*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1898. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-close-rolls/edw3/vol3>.

*Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward III: Volume 4, 1337-1339*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1900. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-close-rolls/edw3/vol4>.

*Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward III: Volume 5, 1339-1341*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1901. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-close-rolls/edw3/vol5>.

*Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward III: Volume 6, 1341-1343*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1902. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-close-rolls/edw3/vol6>.

*Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward III: Volume 7, 1343-1346*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1904. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-close-rolls/edw3/vol7>.

*Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward III: Volume 8, 1346-1349*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1905. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-close-rolls/edw3/vol8>.

*Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward III: Volume 9, 1349-1354*. Ed. H C Maxwell Lyte. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1906. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-close-rolls/edw3/vol9>.



## Calendar of the Charter Rolls

Great Britain., W. R. Cunningham, Alfred Edward Stamp, R. D. Trimmer, Charles G. Crump, and H. C. Maxwell Lyte, *Calendar of the Charter Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office*, 6 v. (London: H. M. Stationery Off., 1903) <[//catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003482692](https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003482692)>

Office, Great Britain Public Record, H.C.M. Lyte, C.G. Crump, R.D. Trimmer, A.E. Stamp, and W.R. Cunningham, *Calendar of the Charter Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward I, Edward II. 1300-1326*, Calendar of the Charter Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office (H.M. Stationery Office, 1908) <<https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=lrcKAAAAYAAJ>>

## Calendar of Fine Rolls

Bland, A.E., P.V. Davies, and M.C.B. Dawes, *Calendar of the Fine Rolls, Edward I, 1272-1307, Preserved in the Public Record Office*. (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911), I <<https://archive.org/details/calendaroffinero01lond/>>.

Lyte, H. C. Maxwell, and A.E. Bland, *Calendar of the Fine Rolls, Edward II, 1307-1319, Preserved in the Public Record Office*. (London: London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1912), II <<https://archive.org/details/calendaroffinero02greauoft/>>.

## Calendar of Chancery Warrants

*Calendar of Chancery Warrants Preserved in the Public Record Office*, R. C. Fowler, v. (London: H. M. Stationery office, 1927) <[//catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000275404](https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000275404)>.

## Calendar of Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland

*Calendar of Papal Registers Relating To Great Britain and Ireland: Volume 2, 1305-1342*. Ed. W H Bliss. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1895. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-papal-registers/brit-ie/vol2>.

## Parliamentary Writs

*Parliament Rolls of Medieval England*. Eds. Chris Given-Wilson, Paul Brand, Seymour Phillips, Mark Ormrod, Geoffrey Martin, Anne Curry, and Rosemary Horrox. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/parliament-rolls-medieval>.

## Inquisitions Post Mortem

Sharp, J E E S, and A E Stamp. *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem: Volume 5, Edward II*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1908. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/inquis-post-mortem/vol5>.

Sharp, J E E S, and A E Stamp. *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem: Volume 6, Edward II*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1910. *British History Online*. Web. 19 July 2022. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/inquis-post-mortem/vol6>.

## Secondary Sources

Bachrach, D. S., *Administration and Organization of War in Thirteenth-Century England*, 1st edn (Routledge, 2020).

Barber, R., *Edward III and the Triumph of England: The Battle of Crécy and the Company of the Garter* (London: Penguin Books, 2014).

Barrow, G. W. S., *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland*, 4th ed (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005).

Bates, David, Julia Catherine Crick, and Sarah Hamilton, *Writing Medieval Biography, 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006).

Bell, Adrian R., Anne Curry, Adam Chapman, Andy King, and David Simpkin, eds., *The Soldier Experience in the Fourteenth Century*, *Warfare in History* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2017).

Brown, M., *The Wars of Scotland 1214-1371, The New Edinburgh History of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2010).

Burton, J., *Tensions in a Border Abbey: Strata Marcela, Its Patrons, Friends, and Enemies in Monastic Europe* *Medieval Communities, Landscapes and Settlement*, eds Edel Bhreathnach, Malgorzata Krasnodbska-D'Aughton & Keith Smith (Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2019).

Carocci, Sandro, 'Social Mobility and the Middle Ages', *Continuity and Change*, 26.3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 367–404.

- Chaplais, P., *Piers Gaveston: Edward II's Adoptive Brother* (Oxford: New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1994).
- Conway Davies, J., 'The Despenser War in Glamorgan', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 9 (1915), 21–64.
- Conway Davies, J., *The Baronial Opposition to Edward II: Its Character and Policy* (London: Cass & Co.Ltd, 1967).
- Dohar, W. J., 'Charlton, Lewis (d. 1369), Bishop of Hereford' (Oxford University Press, 2004) <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/5166>>.
- Eyton, R. W., *Antiquities of Shropshire*, Volume IX (London: John Russell Smith, 1859).
- Fletcher, William George Dimmock, 'Shropshire-Men at the French Wars of 1346-47', *Shropshire Archaeological and Natrual History Society*, 28 (1905), 141–48.
- Freeman, A. Z., 'The King's Penny: The Headquarters Paymasters under Edward I, 1295-1307', *Journal of British Studies*, 6.1 (1966), pp.1–22.
- Fryde, E. B., ed., *Handbook of British Chronology*, Guides and Handbooks (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society : University College, 1986).
- Fryde, Natalie, *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II, 1321-1326* (Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Gilbert, J. T., *History of the Viceroy's of Ireland; with Notice of the Castle of Dublin and It's Chief Occupants in Former Times*. (London; Pasternoster Row, 1865).
- Given-Wilson, C., 'Fitzalan, Edmund, Second Earl of Arundel (1285–1326), Magnate' (Oxford University Press, 2008) <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/9529>>.
- Given-Wilson, C., 'Fitzalan, Richard, Third Earl of Arundel and Eighth Earl of Surrey (c. 1313–1376), Soldier, Diplomat, and Royal Councillor' (Oxford University Press, 2013) <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/9534>>.
- Given-Wilson, C., 'Wealth and Credit, Public and Private: The Earls of Arundel 1306–1397', *The English Historical Review*, CVI.CCCCXVIII (1991), pp.1–26.

- Haines, Roy Martin, *King Edward II: Edward of Caernarfon, His Life, His Reign, and Its Aftermath, 1284-1330* (Montreal ; Ithaca: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 2003).
- Hamilton, J. S., *Piers Gaveston, Earl of Cornwall 1307 - 1312: Politics and Patronage in the Reign of Edward II* (Detroit, Mich: Wayne State Univ. Pr. [u.a.], 1988).
- Hamilton, J. S., 'A Reassessment of the Loyalty of the Household Knights of Edward II.', in *Fourteenth Century England* (London, England.: Boydell & Brewer), VII, 47–61.
- Hartland, B., 'English Lords in Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Century Ireland: Roger Bigod and the de Clare Lords of Thomond', *The English Historical Review*, CXXII.496 (2007).
- Harvey, B. F., *Walter de Wenlok, Abbot of Westminster*, Camden Fourth Series (London, England.: Royal Historical Society, 1965), II.
- Haskins, G. L., 'The Doncaster Petition, 1321', *The English Historical Review*, 53.211 (1938), 478–85.
- Herlihy, David, 'Three Patterns of Social Mobility in Medieval History', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 3.No. 4 (1973), 623–47, <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/i210423>>.
- Horrox, Rosemary, and W. M. Ormrod, eds., *A Social History of England, 1200-1500* (Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- Johnstone, Hilda, *Edward of Carnarvon, 1284-1307* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1946).
- Jones, M.C., and Powys-land Club, *The Feudal Barons of Powys* (J.R. Smith, 1868) <<https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=p1YBAAAAQAAJ>>.
- Lansing, Carol, and Edward D. English, eds., *A Companion to the Medieval World*, Blackwell Companions to European History (Chichester, U.K. ; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009).
- Lepine, D. N., 'Charlton [Cherleton], Thomas (c. 1292–1344), Bishop of Hereford' (Oxford University Press, 2004) <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/5168>>.
- Maddicott, J. R., *Thomas of Lancaster, 1307-1322: A Study in the Reign of Edward II*, Oxford Historical Monographs (London: Oxford U.P, 1970).

- Mason, J. F. A., 'Charlton, John, First Lord Charlton of Powys (d. 1353), Soldier and Administrator' (Oxford University Press, 2004) <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/5165>> .
- Mortimer, I., *The Greatest Traitor: The Life of Sir Roger Mortimer, 1st Earl of March* (London: Vintage, 2010).
- Ormrod, W. Mark, *Edward III*, Yale English Monarchs, First published in paperback (New Haven London: Yale University Press, 2013).
- Phillips, J. R. S., *Aymer de Valance: Earl of Pembroke, 1307 - 1324*. (Oxford, 1972).
- Phillips, J. R. S., *Edward II*, Yale English Monarchs (New Haven : Yale University Press, 2011).
- Prestwich, M., *Edward I*, Yale English Monarchs (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).
- Prestwich, M., *War, Politics and Finance under Edward I* (London, England.: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1972).
- Prestwich, M., *Plantagenet England, 1225-1360*, The New Oxford History of England (Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 2005).
- Simpkin, D., 'The English Aristocracy at War', *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives* (Boydell & Brewer: Boydell Press, 2007).
- Smith, Llinos, 'Mortimer, Roger, First Lord Mortimer of Chirk (c. 1256–1326), Baron' (Oxford University Press, 2008) <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/19353>>.
- Summerson, H., 'T. F. Tout and the Dictionary of National Biography', in *Thomas Frederick Tout (1855–1929): Refashioning History for the Twentieth Century*, eds. C. M. Barron and J. T. Rosenthal (London: University of London Press: Institute of Historical Research), pp. 231–46.
- Tebbit, Alistair, 'Royal Patronage and Political Allegiance: The Household Knights of Edward II, 1314-21.', in *Thirteenth Century England* (London, England.: Boydell & Brewer: Boydell Press, 2003), X, 197–205.
- Tebbit, Alistair, 'Household Knights and Military Service under the Direction of Edward II', in *The Reign of Edward II: New Perspectives* (Boydell & Brewer; York Medieval Press, 2006), pp. 76–96.
- Tout, T.F., *Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England, the Wardrobe, the Chamber and the Small Seals*, Volume 2 (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1920).

Tout, T.F., *The Place of the Reign of Edward II. in English History. Based Upon the Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford in 1913*, Publications of the University of Manchester. 89, v. 89 (University Press, 1914).

T.F. Tout, *The Reign of Edward II in English History*, Second Edition (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1936).

Tout, T. F., 'Charlton or Cherleton, John de, First Lord Charlton of Powys (d 1353)' (Oxford University Press) <<https://doi.org/10.1093/odnb/9780192683120.013.5165>>.

Trueman, J. H., 'The Privy Seal and the English Ordinances of 1311', *Speculum*, 31.4 (1956), pp. 611–25.

Walker, D., *Medieval Wales*, Cambridge Medieval Textbooks (Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

Warner, K., *Edward II: The Unconventional King* (The Hill, Stroud: Amberley Publishing, 2017).

Warner, K., *Isabella of France: The Rebel Queen*, (Stroud: Amberley, 2020).

Warner, Katherine, *Edward II's Nieces: The Clare Sisters : Powerful Pawns of the Crown*, 2020 <<https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=2513029>> .

Wilkinson, B., 'The Sherburn Indenture and the Attack on the Despencers, 1321', *The English Historical Review*, 63.246 (1948), 1–28, < <https://doi.org/10.1093/ehr/LXIII.CCXLVI.1> >.

### Unpublished PhD

Dryburgh, P. R., 'The Career of Roger Mortimer, First Earl of March (c.1287-1330).' (unpublished Ph.D., Bristol University).

### Websites

Anna Powell-Smith, 'Land of (Shrewsbury), St Alkmund, Canons Of', *Open Domesday* <<https://opendomesday.org/place/SJ5622/charlton/>> [accessed 14 December 2021].

## Background reading and other materials used to check references

Barber, R., *Edward III and the Triumph of England: The Battle of Crécy and the Company of the Garter* (London: Penguin Books, 2014).

Brown, C., *The Knights of the Scottish Wars of Independence* (Stroud: Tempus, 2008).

Bridgeman, Rev. G. T. O., 'The Princes of Upper Powys', in *Collections Historical & Archaeological Relating to Montgomeryshire*. (The Powys-land Club, 1868), I, 104–94, <<https://archive.org/details/montycollections10powyuoft>>.

Davies, R. R., *The Age of Conquest: Wales, 1063-1415* (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

Frame, R., *English Lordship in Ireland, 1318-1361* (Clarendon Press, 1982) <<https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=Uv-0AAAAIAAJ>>.

Hamilton, J. S., 'Edward II: Favourites, Loyalty and Kingship', in *Ruling Fourteenth Century England, Essays in Honour of Christopher Given-Wilson* (Boydell & Brewer) <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvd58tj2.9>>.

Hume, P., *The Welsh Marcher Lordships, Central & North*, ( Eardisley, England; Logaston Press: 2020).

Lieberman, M., 'The Medieval "Marches" of Normandy and Wales', *The English Historical Review*, CXXV.517 (2010), 1357–81 <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ehr/ceq342>>.

Lloyd, J.Y.W., *The History of the Princes, the Lords Marcher, and the Ancient Nobility of Powys Fadog, and the Ancient Lords of Arwystli, Cedewen, and Meirionydd; Volume 2* (Creative Media Partners, LLC, 2018) <<https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=26R3vQEACAAJ>>.

Maund, K. L., *The Welsh Kings: Warriors, Warlords, and Princes* (Stroud, Gloucestershire: Tempus Pub, 2006).

Maxwell, Sir H., *The Chronicle of Lanercost, 1272-1346* (Glasgow: MacLehose, 1913).

Mercer, Eric, *English Architecture to 1900: The Shropshire Experience* (Almeley, Herefordshire: Logaston Press, 2003).

Morris, Marc, *A Great and Terrible King: Edward I and the Forging of Britain*, 1. publ (London: Windmill Books, 2009).

Simpkin, David, *The English Aristocracy at War: From the Welsh Wars of Edward I to the Battle of Bannockburn* (Boydell & Brewer: Boydell Press, 2008).

Stephenson, D., *Medieval Wales c.1050-1332: Centuries of Ambiguity*, Rethinking the History of Wales Series (Cardiff (GB): University of Wales Press, 2019).

Tout, T.F., *The Place of the Reign of Edward II. in English History. Based Upon the Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford in 1913*, Publications of the University of Manchester. 89, v. 89 (University Press, 1914).

Walker, D., *Medieval Wales*, Cambridge Medieval Textbooks (Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990).