

THE SONG OF CARLAVEROCK AND THE  
PARLIAMENTARY ROLL OF ARMS AS FOUND  
IN COTT. MS. CALIG. A. XVIII IN THE  
BRITISH MUSEUM

By N. DENHOLM-YOUNG

THE Parliamentary Roll of Arms is a nominal roll of Edward I's cavalry, with their coats of arms, in a list made a few months after his death. It has been ascribed to *c.* 1312 or to the early years of Edward II. It has also been noted that the king, the earls, and other important persons to the number of 169 are followed by 941 knights arranged by counties from Cornwall to Lancashire, followed by 23 'great lords deceased' and 53 'last-minute' additions. But this at once requires qualification, for there are 81 fifteenth-century additions<sup>1</sup> made at various points in the only original manuscript.

Cott. MS. Calig. A. xviii<sup>2</sup> in the British Museum contains as Part A (fol. 3-21<sup>v</sup>) the Parliamentary Roll of Arms, hereinafter cited as PRA, side by side with Part B (fos. 23<sup>v</sup>-30<sup>v</sup>) the Song on the siege of Carlaverock Castle in June 1300 by Edward I. In between these is a brief poem on Thomas Turberville the traitor of 1295 (fol. 22). Parts A and B were both written in the early fourteenth century.

The current name of the roll comes from its inclusion by Sir Francis Palgrave in his great edition of the *Parliamentary Writs* in 1827.<sup>3</sup> A fresh collation with the manuscript was made by Mr. Oswald Barron in 1895, numbering the entries and distinguishing the fifteenth-century additions more conveniently than Palgrave had done.<sup>4</sup> But Palgrave noted very clearly instances

<sup>1</sup> The terms of blazon are somewhat different, and these entries are easily distinguishable in the manuscript by the colour and the metallic sheen of fifteenth-century ink. The printed editions take notice of them.

<sup>2</sup> For the heraldic items see Sir Anthony Wagner, *A Catalogue of Mediæval Rolls of Arms* (Society of Antiquaries, 1950), pp. 29-36, 42-50 and plate IV. On the Turberville poem see J. G. Edwards in *Essays presented to F. M. Powicke*, Oxford (1948), pp. 296-309. Part A is written in a small court or charter hand. Part B is in a larger, squarer, more bookish script. The manuscript belonged to William le Neve, Clarenceux, in 1638.

<sup>3</sup> Record Commission, i. 410-20.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Barron's edition appeared by instalments in *The Genealogist*, n.s.

where an almost contemporary reviser had deleted labels in coats of arms. This precious clue to the date of the list may have been missed by Barron, who does not distinguish typographically these signs from the far more numerous fifteenth-century additions. This use of labels, and their timely removal, is a valuable indication that the roll is not a factitious thing, but a list of living persons, which someone is trying to keep up-to-date. The roll has also been styled the Bannerets' Roll, and this in part it is. Sometimes it is called the Great Roll of Arms, a name preferable for a unique document, which, though in no sense Parliamentary, bears 'all the marks of an official survey'.<sup>1</sup>

The year 1312 has been suggested for the compilation of the PRA. But, though that year saw the birth of a son and heir to Edward II, it also saw the murder of his best friend, Piers Gaveston, who is third upon the roll. If this is a list, as seems to be intended, of persons who were all alive in one year, then, for purely historical reasons, it was not made in 1312. The most casual inspection shows that a number of persons named were by then already dead.

An approximate date can be obtained by noting that there is here an Earl of Cornwall—Piers Gaveston was created earl on 6 August 1307—but no earl marshal, whose arms conclude the list of deceased earls towards the end of the roll. In an heraldic list such an omission is glaring, and would be absurd in any such roll made before the end of 1306, when Roger Bigod died, or after 1312 when Thomas of Brotherton was invested. Against the names of Henry de Lacy and Anthony Bek are the marks which, as elsewhere in this roll, indicate that they no longer bear the arms assigned to them. This is obvious in Palgrave's edition and, since there is no question of a change of arms, can only mean that they are dead. They died in 1310 and 1311 respectively. These facts suggest August 1307 to February 1310 as the limits of date for the roll, which, except for the additions, is in one hand throughout. It was this that prompted further inquiry, for nothing happened between these dates to call for a roll of the chivalry of England, except perhaps the coronation of Edward II on 25 February 1308. A closer examination may help to suggest that the roll was drawn up while Sir Robert Clifford was acting marshal (3 September 1307—10 March 1308), and this would help to account for its presence in the vols. xi, xii, without date. It reads 'y' for the Anglo-Saxon 'thorn'. There is also an edition, which I have not seen, by Sir Harris Nicolas (1829).

<sup>1</sup> Wagner, *Catalogue of English Mediæval Rolls of Arms*, p. xvi.

Cottonian MS. side by side with the Song of Carlaverock, which was composed, it is thought, in his honour.

A man need not be twenty-one to succeed to his estates, nor to be included in a roll of arms. By special dispensation the Earl of Gloucester succeeded in 1308, at the age of eighteen.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore a man may be knighted at any age, so long, I suppose, as he can ride a horse. Henry II was knighted at the age of nine, Edward I at sixteen, Gilbert de Clare (PRA, no. 2) at sixteen, and so on. Hence if everyone in the PRA is expected to be over twenty-one, the choice of 1312 as the year of its compilation is easily explained, but as all concerned have not necessarily attained their legal majority, we are encouraged to believe that an earlier date is possible.

Some examples are here given in support of the view that the PRA, begun in its present form after August 1307, was completed before August 1308.

William de Cantelupe	died before 6 August 1308 <sup>2</sup>
Geoffrey de Camville	„ „ 21 September 1308 <sup>3</sup>
Robert Thony	„ „ 3 November 1309 <sup>4</sup>
William de Leybourne	„ „ 12 March 1310 <sup>5</sup>
Robert Fitz-Roger	„ „ 29 April 1310 <sup>6</sup>
John de Moules	„ „ 24 May 1310 <sup>7</sup>
(or de Molis)	
John of Argentine	„ „ 10 March 1308 <sup>8</sup>
(but the age of his son John is not known).	

William de Kyme is thought to be included because his father Philip had been excused from attending the Parliament of Carlisle in January 1307, and in May 1308 settled various manors upon William his son, reserving to himself an estate for life.<sup>9</sup>

On the other hand Nicholas Audley<sup>10</sup> should not stand alone before his father's death at the beginning of 1308, nor Nicholas Poinz,<sup>11</sup> and Richard de Gray of Codnor who succeeded Henry de Gray<sup>12</sup> only in September 1308 may be a parallel case to William de Kyme.

<sup>1</sup> At twenty-one the tenant must prove his age, and the inquisitions relating to this are, properly understood, of great value; but they do not tell us whether or not a man is a knight.

<sup>2</sup> PRA 154, *Cal. IPM.* v, no. 120.

<sup>4</sup> PRA 49, *ibid.*, no. 129.

<sup>6</sup> PRA 26, *ibid.*, no. 219.

<sup>8</sup> PRA 95, *ibid.*, no. 40.

<sup>10</sup> PRA 116, *Cal. IPM.* v, no. 62.

<sup>12</sup> PRA 50, *ibid.*, no. 116.

<sup>3</sup> PRA 137, *ibid.*, no. 143.

<sup>5</sup> PRA 60, *ibid.*, no. 229.

<sup>7</sup> PRA 91, *ibid.*, no. 202.

<sup>9</sup> PRA 58, *Rot. Parl.* i. 188.

<sup>11</sup> PRA 114, *ibid.*, no. 45.

The entries concerning John Fitz-Roger and John de Clavering (nos. 26, 27) are especially noteworthy. John Fitz-Roger's name is marked by the reviser for deletion, but in John de Clavering's arms, which are the same with the addition of a label, only the label is marked for cancellation. What happened was this: John de Clavering was the son of John Fitz-Roger, and so entitled to bear the same arms with a label, which was removed on his father's death. This occurred before 29 April 1310. Sir John Daubeny (no. 1077) is a like case. It is also worthy of remark that this list of over a thousand names is followed by a brief appendix of 'Great lords deceased' which the scribe would hardly have put unless the others in his roll were alive.

Now for the decision to compile such a roll as the PRA we need look no further back than Whitsuntide 1306, when Edward I, before setting out on his last campaign in Scotland, held a great mass-investiture at Westminster, followed by a banquet known to modern historians as the Feast of the Swans, since two swans formed the main dish, and upon these those present swore chivalrous vows in honour of the occasion.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, though we do not know how or when the list was begun, it includes among (a) the bannerets, (b) the local knights, and (c) the last-minute additions, persons knighted in May 1306 at the Feast of the Swans, and those knighted up to Christmas 1306. The list of knights associated with the Feast of the Swans itself surprises us by also including creations up to that Christmas. These names have not been just added to a list already in existence. They are an integral part of sections (a), (b), and (c) into which the list is divided. So that the whole list dates from after August 1307.

It is important to remember that the Swan list is not an heraldic list. It is a bare list of names on a separate roll, the heading of which is unfortunately now quite illegible, and not given by Ashmole. There is no distinction of rank, no sort of order, no mention of coats of arms. After attempting to run together the two lists we are left with two problems. How long after August 1307 was it before the scribe of Calig. A. xviii set to work? Why are only 160 or so of the 267 Swan knights

<sup>1</sup> The symbolism of the swan, a persistent but obscure thread in thirteenth-century epic literature, was associated in real life with the Tony or Thony family. Matthew Paris remarks that Roger de Thony was descended from those famous knights *qui a Cignis nomine intitulebatur* and promises further information about them which in fact he never gives. (See R. Vaughan, *Matthew Paris* (Cambridge, 1958), pp. 89, 177.)

incorporated in the PRA? One answer to the latter question is that though the heralds were royal officials, their lists—unlike the Swan list, which is a household document—were not official lists but private property. Hence the makers of the PRA did not necessarily have access to the existing Swan list.

So far as our manuscript is concerned it seems possible that the scribe was consciously working from an incomplete list, for he has so managed his space that there is plenty of room for additions. Some use was made of this in the fifteenth century. The 100 or so names that might still have been included would occupy, if written in the same way, one whole double sheet or four pages. The reason for this failure to include all the Swan knights might well be that though it took little time to copy their names on to a roll for the use of the Great Wardrobe, it would take some months to assign coats of arms to all the neophytes. They had not been asked to announce their intention to be present, and the pressure of work upon the heralds' office must have been severe, to say the least. Some indication of how it was done is seen in our list. After the county knights (nos. 170–1034) there is a short list of 'Great lords deceased' (nos. 1035–58), including nine earls, ending with the earl marshal, who died at the end of 1306, and (nos. 1030–58) some King's knights of Edward I's time. A few in this brief appendix had by 1308 been dead for many years and their inclusion is no doubt for purely heraldic reasons. The fifty-two unclassified names (1059–1104, 1105–10 are fifteenth century) include ten persons knighted in 1306 up to Christmas, the others have not yet been traced.

Now the link between the two manuscripts, the Song of Carlaverock and the PRA which we find together, could be the person of Sir Robert Clifford, who had a remarkable career as an active soldier.<sup>1</sup> The Song of Carlaverock is perhaps the last attempt by anyone in England to be a herald as well as a minstrel. The poem on this siege which it has made famous, is written in Old French (not Anglo-Norman) in octosyllabic verse, like that more famous song about an earlier marshal.

<sup>1</sup> Clifford was appointed marshal 3 September 1307 (*C.P.R.* 1307–13, p. 6). He had been reappointed as Justice of the Forest North of Trent on 22 August 1307 and he surrendered this office with the Marshalsea 12 March 1308. (*Cal. F.R.* ii. 2, 17.) He had long been Warden of the March of Scotland (Bain, ii. 170, &c.), and when not on the border may have used Nottingham Castle, of which he was Constable 1298–1307 (when the appointment was confirmed, *C.F.R.* ii. 2), as his headquarters. In July(?) August 1307 he was still on the border at or near Ayr (Bain, ii, no. 1961). He is no. 38 on the PRA.

Clifford is praised as one who was descended from the great William the Marshal through his mother,<sup>1</sup> and I take this to mean that he, too, was generous to his heralds. No other passage in the poem breathes such a warmth of feeling as that about Clifford. Of Thomas of Lancaster we are merely given the description of his arms, 'and I will not trouble you more about him that I may go on to speak of Henry [of Lancaster, a royalist] whose daily study was to resemble his good father'. Clifford, if anyone, is the hero of this song, and it was to him that the castle was entrusted when it was taken. If this is Clifford's herald, perhaps he had engaged him in 1297 in Flanders, a famous place for such men. Froissart's father was a herald painter there about that time. The terms of blazon used in the song are distinct from the terminology of the PRA.

If the date suggested for the PRA is near the mark, then it was compiled while Sir Robert Clifford was Marshal of England, and the presence of these two heraldic manuscripts under one cover is the more easily explained. The English royal heralds were still at this time classed as *Menestralli* in the household accounts, but it is clear that while the private herald might still be a minstrel, the royal heralds were a highly professional body. There were by 1290—earlier than is usually thought—two kings of arms. One, Nicholas Morel, was a tenant of the marshal in Norfolk.<sup>2</sup> Their provinces, since they were paid household officials, can probably be identified with those of the escheators, who looked after the king's demesne and feudal interests in the counties, and were always closely attached to the household both in function and by ties of personal loyalty.<sup>3</sup> But the escheators worked through and to some extent controlled the sheriffs. So there was a Norroy and a Surroy King of Arms, just as there was an escheator north and south of Trent, and it was perhaps through them, but through the sheriff's office, that the returns were made from which the PRA was compiled.

When they were not prohibiting tournaments,<sup>4</sup> or devising coats of arms, the 'minstrels' entertained the king with song, as at the feast in 1306. One of them on that occasion was a Flemish

<sup>1</sup> Ed. T. Wright, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> P.R.O. E. 101/352/24 (18-19 Ed. I). *Hist. MSS. Comm. Rep.* (MSS. of the Marquess of Lothian at Blickling Hall, Norfolk (1905)). Saxthorpe deeds, pp. 47, 48, 50. The other King of Arms was Robert le Petit.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Walter Beauchamp was Steward of the Royal Household and Walter of Gloucester his son was Escheator South of Trent.

<sup>4</sup> A. Wagner, *Heralds and Heraldry*, p. 160.

minstrel, Philip de Cambrai. It is permissible to wonder if he sang on that occasion the Carloverock song, with its allusion to the Swan knight.<sup>1</sup>

A list that could have been drawn up between 16 January 1308 and 8 August 1308 is associated with Robert de Clifford, who was acting-marshal (3 September 1307—10 March 1308) and Piers Gaveston, who with Gloucester heads the roll. But it must also be noticed that Gaveston is celebrated at the expense of Lancaster, for any known chancery, exchequer, or heraldic arrangement of counties is upset by putting Cornwall first and Lancaster last. This looks like a studied insult, at a time when Gaveston is monopolizing the favour of the king and infuriating the barons with his vulgar Gasconades. But Gaveston is in exile again from June 1308<sup>2</sup> and Clifford is out of office within a week or two of the coronation on 25 February. The compilation of a roll in this form, if not in this copy, can plausibly be assigned to the regency of Piers Gaveston, when he was left in charge—Edward II having gone to Boulogne to get married—with what Stubbs called ‘unusually wide powers’. His zest for tournaments and pageantry may have combined to some effect with the purely professional interests of the acting marshal, one of Edward I’s most experienced captains, to produce an orderly and accurate roll of arms. Even Gloucester could have been interested, for though he did not long remain with the court party, he and Gaveston had been brought up at court together and he married Gaveston’s sister at Berkhamsted on 3 November 1307. Whatever did in fact happen, Gaveston’s regency was a moment auspicious for the birth of a project which Edward I had no doubt conceived.

Something may now be said of the antecedents of this roll.

At the Feast of the Swans the Prince of Wales, the Earls of Arundel, Gloucester, and Surrey were knighted, and others, including Piers Gaveston, John le Blund, Mayor of London, and some foreigners, to the number of 259.<sup>3</sup> The prince and his circle were dubbed privately by the king, after vigils in the abbey. All the rest were then dubbed by the prince at the high

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, p. 254, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> For Gaveston’s first exile (with a pension), to take place ‘after the next tournament’ see *C.Cl.R.* (1302–7), pp. 526–7.

<sup>3</sup> The number is usually given as 267, but the last eight men in the list were knighted at Lanercost. The roll printed by Ashmole in his *Institutions, Laws, and Ceremonies of the Garter* (1693), pp. 38–39 is akin to E. 101/362/20, now illegible at the top. It goes up to Christmas 1306.

altar in the abbey. These had kept their vigils at the New Temple, where the garden walls had been laid low and fruit-trees cut down.<sup>1</sup> Some persons were knighted as bannerets, not bachelors. Thomas Bardolf was one of these. He is mentioned by Dugdale in his *Baronage*, as are all those of baronial status who were knighted at this time, as having been 'knighted by Bathing with the Prince and other ceremonies', Dugdale even states of Bardolf that he 'was made a Banneret by bathing . . .'.<sup>2</sup> The prince and twenty-six of his companions received various precious stuffs for robes and bed-linen.<sup>3</sup> The others may have received robes, as at the later ceremony at Lanercost, but there is no mention of armour, weapons, or horses, so that the real cost of becoming a knight was not much reduced.

At this feast Edward I vowed that when he had taken his vengeance upon Bruce he would never more bear arms against Christian folk, but go to the Holy Land and not return. Prince Edward vowed that he would 'never stay two nights in the same place, &c'. Trivet, who reports this, does not remember the other vows which the knights were induced to make by the multitude of minstrels in the presence of the Swans.<sup>4</sup> After the feast, the prince left for Scotland at once, and the king followed by easy stages, reaching Lanercost Priory on 29 September, where he rested until 4 March 1307. Men continued to be knighted and their names appear in the Swan list and in the body of the PRA up to Christmas 1306.<sup>5</sup> On 23 November the ineluctable old man sent out from his bed of sickness to all the counties in England further invitations to be knighted in his

<sup>1</sup> *Flor. Hist.* iii. 132; *Ann. Lond.* 146.

<sup>2</sup> There are some twenty instances of this absurdity in the *Baronage* i. 379, &c, but no warrant has been found for it in thirteenth-century chronicle or record. It is repeated with some other myths in a very readable article on 'Knighthood and Chivalry' by G. G. C. in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

<sup>3</sup> P.R.O. Chanc. Misc. 3/30.

<sup>4</sup> Trivet (*Eng. Hist. Soc.*), p. 409. In this narrative the heralds are included under the minstrels, as in the household accounts of the period. E. K. Chambers, *The Medieval Stage* (Oxford, 1903), ii, App. C, pp. 140-5 takes their names from Beriah Botfield's Roxburghe Club volume, *Manners and Household Expenses* (1840), which apparently depends upon the original roll, now P.R.O. E. 101/369/6.

<sup>5</sup> P.R.O. E. 101/369/4 is a file of 23 Privy Seal warrants for liveries of robes for men to be knighted as bachelors or bannerets at the Feast of the Swans or later in the year at Lanercost. Some are dated at Lanercost for a ceremony on 1 November (All Saints) 1306, some for Christmas 1306, and one, perhaps included in this file in error, for Christmas 1305. The persons named, except where foreigners, are on the PRA.



presence. All who wished to be *knighted by the king* were to come to Carlisle on 2 February 1307, the Feast of the Purification, and might in the meantime send to the wardrobe at Carlisle for their gear.<sup>1</sup> No complete record has been found of what happened as a result of this appeal.

Now if young men presented themselves, the king could rapidly dub them knights, but it took time for the heralds to assign to each his proper coat of arms. This would involve much checking with existing coats, assigning differences and labels or bars where necessary, and devising suitable shields for those whose families did not already possess one. It is believed that this work was carried to a point under Sir Robert Clifford as marshal at which it was possible to compile the present roll leaving, in our copy, plenty of room for additions. For there were still, by the time the list was called for, 120 Swan knights (up to Christmas 1306) not yet entered upon the roll, and there may well have been more as a result of Edward I's last appeal. The full results were never incorporated in any roll of arms that has come down to us, but the fifty-two last-minute additions include ten Swan knights.<sup>2</sup>

Though Edward I had at his court a number of distinguished foreigners, of whom at least ten are in the Swan list, and others in the household rolls, the PRA is almost exclusively British. The final count of his knights cannot be made until the roll has been re-edited.

To the heralds, the social and tenurial distinctions between knights and barons, and the military distinctions between knights bachelor and knights banneret, were to some extent irrelevant.<sup>3</sup> A man's arms were displayed on a rectangular banner attached to his lance, and if he were a bachelor this tapered off into a

<sup>1</sup> *Cal. Close Rolls*, p. 520. For Edward's stay at Lanercost with the queen and a household of some 200 persons see the admirable paper by Dr. J. R. H. Moorman in *E.H.R.* April 1952, pp. 161-72. The Privy Seal writ corresponding to the letters close is given in J. Bain, *Cal. Docs. Scotland*, ii, no. 1859, but dated 26 November 1306.

<sup>2</sup> At the very end of the roll the fifteenth-century scribe adds two Swan knights, one of whom is already in the body of the roll (Robert le Conestable PRA 1105 = Ashmole 132 and John de Mounteney PRA 419 and 1106 = Ashmole 131). This scribe, whose imitation of an earlier script suggests that he might be a herald painter, is also betrayed by his heraldic terminology, but he had access to a reliable source.

<sup>3</sup> The herald at Carlaverock says

'Il ne me puist pas souvenir  
ke baneret i fuissent plus' (ed. Wright, p. 5).

pennant or tail<sup>1</sup> which was cut off on his promotion as banneret, leaving his arms unaffected. The ceremony on the promotion of Sir John Chandos on the field in 1367 after the battle of Navarette (or Najera) by the Black Prince is vividly described by Froissart.<sup>2</sup> The Song of Carloverock cannot be understood without reference to this distinction, which is ignored in the PRA.

The PRA begins with a list of persons who are mostly barons, but listed because they are bannerets; and possibly a few barons who are not yet but will become bannerets. The question of barony *per se*, whether by tenure, writ, or creation, does not arise, and each entry must be tested separately to ascertain a man's status.

The one firm and lasting distinction between a bachelor and a banneret, other than visual, is financial. A bachelor may be of any age or social status, but the reason for his remaining a bachelor is usually that he cannot afford to pay his own troop. We are surprised, but contemporaries were not, to find that distinguished persons in middle life are still bachelors. So Fitz-Alan, who in 1295 became Warden of Scotland, was a bachelor, because his barony of Bedale was only a small one, and he could not afford promotion. He had to bargain with the Crown for a living wage.<sup>3</sup> Sir John Chandos, according to Froissart, though in actual command in Gascony before he was created lieutenant, had been unable to pay a troop to fight under his banner. During the same twelvemonth Du Gueselin was promoted from being 'a simple bachelor' to Constable of France.

To the chronicler the banneret is a *vexillifer*, and the confusing association with barony which has bedevilled modern writing on the subject is seen also in the term *nobiles vexilliferi* used by the London annalist,<sup>4</sup> and by Thomas Wykes.<sup>5</sup> The term banneret is well established in the period of the Barons' War.<sup>6</sup>

The bachelor in any context, is one who is not fully fledged.

<sup>1</sup> Note the 'Jaune baniere e pennon' (op. cit., p. 14) of John Botetourt, in 1300, although he had been Admiral of the King's Fleet in 1294/5. Fitz-Marmaduke [de Thweng] came to the siege of Carloverock with a banner and 'a full troop of good and choice bachelors' (no. 91 in the song.)

<sup>2</sup> *Chroniques*, ed. J. A. C. Buchon, cap. iv.

<sup>3</sup> J. Stevenson, *Docs.* ii. 221-7.

<sup>4</sup> *Ann. Lond.* (Rolls Series), pp. 61, 63. Cf. Rishanger (R. S.), p. 403, referring to the loss in battle of 14 *vexilla*.

<sup>5</sup> *Chron. T. Wykes* (R. S.), p. 218, states that when the Lord Edward took the Cross at Northampton in 1268, he had with him 120 knights, '22 majores ceteris et nobiliores extiterant, quos vulgariter vexilliferos appellamus.'

<sup>6</sup> *Misc. Inq.* i, nos. 260-2; J. Hunter, *Rotuli Selecti* (1834), p. 183.

He is not yet married, or not a regent master, or not a banneret. He may be an active soldier (*strenuus*) or one who cannot fight (*impotens*). The only outstanding problem concerning such men is the degree of association between, and the personal affiliations of, the men who made up the *Communitas bachelerie Angliae* of 1259. It is obvious that they approached the Lord Edward as the senior bachelor in England, and Gloucester because of his political weight. How or when the Lord Edward or his son Edward of Caernarvon became bannerets is not known.<sup>1</sup>

The knights banneret of the king's household were called king's bannerets. The bachelors, in the household rolls of 1285, 1286, and 1290 are styled king's knights, but in the admissions to the household from 1306 onwards<sup>2</sup> the knight bachelor is called *miles simplex*, and this style lasted throughout the fourteenth century. These men are the nucleus of the household cavalry, and the administrators, from the castles which they garrison, of the king's demesne. The king's knights are never called bachelors in the household records so far examined, and very rarely so styled elsewhere.

In addition to the King's knights (bachelors) and the king's (knights) bannerets, there is a group apart, the *commilitones*. The word *commilito*, an unnoticed technicality of the period, is used by Caesar and Suetonius for a fellow-soldier, and remains in current colloquial German, particularly in fencing fraternities. It was used by Edward I's wardrobe clerks in 1285-90 as the heading of lists of household knights, paid at the same rate as the King's knights or bachelors, each with one companion—8 marks for bachelors, 16 for bannerets. They are, like other King's knights, from time to time promoted bannerets. This apparently technical word may conceal some development that failed to last. But some of the *commilitones* bear the names of baronial families that have long been close to the throne. Possibly they form a *corps d'élites*, a King's Troop.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Lord Edward—he retained this style until his accession—was still a bachelor on 27 November 1260 when he granted the manor of Elham in Kent to Roger de Leybourne. The charter, dated at Paris, (cited from L.T.R. M.R., no. 94, m. 12 (17 Ed. II) in G.E.C. *Complete Peerage*, vii (1929), p. 431), is alluded to in *P.Q.W. Kent*. 681, cf. 366 and cf. *Rot. Hund.* ii. 89.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Droxford's account in P.R.O. E. 101/369/11, p. 126. This is a wardrobe book covering a number of years. Out of twenty-three King's knights named in 1285, 1286, and 1290 seventeen are certainly barons, and a couple more may be cadets of baronial houses.

<sup>3</sup> When Prince Edward left for Scotland after the feast he went *cum multis commilitonibus suis* (Hemingburgh, 248).

Though the knighting of so many young men by the king or the prince did not automatically make them King's knights, the practice, whether so intended or not, could have led to a weakening of other tenurial bonds.

The symbolism of the swan is also brought to mind by the occurrence not only in the Song of Carlaverock but twice in the PRA of Sir Robert Thony. This man, who died before 3 November 1309<sup>1</sup>, appears in the song (no. 68) as one 'who well shows that he is descended from the Knight of the Swan', a hero of medieval romance from whom the counts of Boulogne<sup>2</sup> were supposed to be descended. He is listed among the bannerets in the PRA (no. 49), where his name is marked for deletion. He is also singled out in the same way (no. 1049) among the 'great lords deceased'. His shield was 'de argent, a une maunche de goules' or in the words of the song 'Escu blanc, e baniere blanche, . . . o la vermeille manche'.

The song makes it clear that bachelors had banners too, but with a long tail. William de Leybourne, a brave man 'sanz mès et sens si', was one: 'baniere il ot o larges pans' (no. 85, PRA, no. 60). He died before 12 March 1310.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Cal. I.P.M.*, vol. v, no. 129.

<sup>2</sup> The Count of 'Boulogne' is not the Brankaleo de Boloigne (no. 261 in Ashmole's list) who was to be knighted at All Saints 1306. In the writ for livery of his robes this man appears as 'Brancaleo de Andolo la grasse de Boulogne'. The Senator of Rome of this name who died in 1258 was a friend of Henry III (*Mat. Par.* v. 724). The Privy Seal is dated at Lanercost 27 October 1306 (P.R.O. E. 101/369/4).

<sup>3</sup> *Cal. I.P.M.*, vol. v, no. 220.