# Piety and Politics in the Kingship of Henry III

Antonia Shacklock
St Edmund's College, Cambridge
March 2021

Word Count: 78,864

This thesis is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Preface

This thesis is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except as declared in the preface and specified in the text.

It is not substantially the same as any work that has already been submitted before for any degree or other qualification except as declared in the preface and specified in the text.

It does not exceed the prescribed word limit for the History Degree Committee.

Abstract

Henry's piety has received much attention from historians. They have particularly focused on the cult of Edward the Confessor, Henry's relationship with and construction of Westminster Abbey, and his magnificent almsgiving. There has also been an appreciation that the political and the pious overlapped in a way our secular world does not fully appreciate. This thesis builds on this work. It examines Henry's standard pious acts including saint veneration, pious patronage of religious orders and institutions, and his relationships with key religious figures throughout his reign.

This thesis traces the evolution of Henry's pious acts in support of his political actions, in times of peace and in times of challenge and conflict. Case studies, covering Henry's response to military conflict, central dynastic moments, and the daily exercise of religious patronage, where evidence is available, reveal an underappreciated and complex set of pious practices which aimed at concrete results. This thesis considers general trends in Henry's pious practices and specific responses to external events. It evaluates times when Henry's authority was well established and considers how his practices altered in times of challenge, most notably the period of baronial revolt and rebellion.

Despite his employment of sophisticated pious strategies, and his sensitive ceremonial and ritual response to events, these largely ultimately failed to achieve Henry's objectives. Piety alone, however considered, was not enough to paper over his failures as a king. Indeed, the elevated sense of kingship revealed by a detailed consideration of Henry's piety only further highlighted his political failings and the difference between his elevated expectations and those of his lay and ecclesiastical subjects. However, this more nuanced picture of his piety provides a new lens through which to consider how Henry saw his role as a king, and to understand the motivations behind his actions.

Contents Page



Abbreviations

*AM* H.R. Luard, H.R., (ed.), *Annales Monastici, 5 vols (London: Longman, 1864-9).*

*CChR. Calendar of the Charter Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office,* 6 vols (London: H.M.S.0., 1903-1927).

*CFR Calendar of the Fine Rolls of the Reign of Henry III (available both on the Henry III Fine Rolls Project's website (http://www.finerollshenry3.org.uk) and within Calendar of the Fine Rolls of the Reign of Henry III 1216–1242,* ed. P. Dryburgh and B. Hartland, technical ed. A. Ciula and J.M. Vieira, 3 vols (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007-2009).

*CLR. Calendar of the Liberate Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III, 6 vols (London H.M.S.O., 1916-64).*

*CM* H.R. Luard, (ed.), *Matthaei Parisiensis, Monarchi Sancti Albani, Chronica Majora,* 7 vols (London: Longman, 1872-83).

*CPR Calendar of Patent Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office,* 6 vols (London: H.M.S.O., 1901-13).

*CR Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III preserved in the Public Record Office,* 14 vols (London: H.M.S.O, 1902-38).

Acknowledgements

Although PhDs are awarded to individuals, they are never achieved alone. There are many people I have to thank, without whom this project would never have been finished. My first thanks are to my supervisor, Dr Andrew Spencer, whose kindness, guidance, and stimulating intellectual company made many aspects of my PhD experience a joy. I also want to thank my examiners, Dr Carl Watkins, and Dr Sophie Ambler for their insightful and constructive comments.

My family have been my biggest supporters, I am so grateful to all of you (Dad, Bridget, Georgie, Dani, Florence, and Cosima). My best friend, Dr Ki Hopkins, provided me with invaluable advice and encouragement. My in-laws, Keith and Catherine, are owed special thanks for giving me the time to finish my thesis while I was on maternity leave. Above all, I must thank my husband, Sam. You never stopped believing in me and provided a calm and nurturing environment.

My final thanks are reserved for two people. The first is my son, Louis, who is too young to read this work, but who has provided Sam and I with endless joy. As proud as I am of this thesis, I will never be prouder of anything than I am of you. The final person to thank is not with us anymore: my mother. As much as I would have loved to share this moment with you, I know that your spirit has been the guiding force in my life. Above everyone else, this work is dedicated to you.

## Introduction

This thesis is primarily concerned with concepts that are elusive to describe and analyse. At its core, it examines the piety of Henry III and what that piety can tell us about his motivations and ambitions. Trying to understand a person's beliefs and motivations today is challenging, as one can never totally know another's thoughts. Trying to understand the beliefs and motivations of someone who has been dead for seven hundred and fifty years is an even more daunting task. As Paul Webster has stated, in his study of John's religion, we do not have any diaries of kings to read.[1] Furthermore, it does not appear that Henry ever wrote anything himself, compounding matters further.

The closest we can get to what we would refer to as private thoughts are accounts from confessors. To save the souls of those confessing to them, confessors and other figures wanted to know their penitents well so they could know the state of their souls to cleanse them of sin.[2] Henry, and other members of the elite, had personal confessors. The only one we know much about is John of Darlington. It is unclear when he became Henry's confessor, but by early 1256 he was a member of Henry's council and household. Darlington remained with Henry for the rest of his life, acting as an important mediator between Henry and the barons. His influence over Henry in the aftermath of the battle of Evesham is attested to by the numerous pardons and gifts made to recipients at his request.[3] Darlington, therefore, knew Henry intimately, and was with him in the most volatile period of his reign. Due to the seal of confession, no religious figure, now or in the past, would ever have written down confessions. However, accounts of

---

[1] P. Webster, *King John and Religion* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), p. 2.
[2] R. Springer, 'Confession in England and the Fourth Lateran Council', in A. Spencer and C. Watkins (ed), *Thirteenth Century England XVII: Proceeding of the Cambridge Conference 2017* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2021), 163-179, at p. 166.
[3] C.H. Lawrence, 'Darlington, John of (d.1284)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004) viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7159 (accessed 04/12/2021).

an individual's piety could be related by their confessors. This was the case for Louis IX of France, Henry's contemporary, and brother-in-law. He was canonised in August 1297, and immediately after his death, some hagiographies were written about him by two of his confessors (Geoffrey de Beaulieu and Guillaume de Chartres).[4] Their portrait of Louis is not without its limitations, but it does provide glimpses into Louis's personal devotions.[5] Unfortunately, no such documents exist for Henry, and it does not appear that Darlington ever wrote anything about him.[6]

However, one must contextualise the world in which Henry lived. The Middle Ages had very different conceptions about the individual than modern life has. As John Arnold has argued, the only way we can examine beliefs held by medieval people is by examining their actions.[7] Activity and practice reflected one's faith and one's understanding of it.[8] For medieval Christians, deeds were as important as thoughts, as actions were the embodiment of faith.[9] Additionally, in medieval culture, there was an understanding that the 'inner' and 'outer' aspects of individuals interacted, and it was important that they interacted in the 'right way'.[10] Pious acts could demonstrate one's inner belief and character. This was a belief shared by medieval writers and noblemen alike.[11] Henry would have absorbed such concepts.

---

[4] J. Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, trans. G.E. Gollrad (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), pp. 256-7, 260.
[5] For a discussion of these limitations, see Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, pp. 252-265. See also L. Grant *Blanche of Castile* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), pp. 18-19.
[6] The problem with the survival of hagiography for Louis, and not for Henry has been discussed by D. Carpenter, 'The Meetings of Kings Henry III and Louis IX', in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England X: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 2003* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), 1-30, at p. 2 and N.C. Vincent, 'King Henry III and the Blessed Virgin Mary', in R.N. Swanson (ed.) *Studies in Church History* 39 (2004), 126-146, at 127-8.
[7] J.H. Arnold, *Belief and Unbelief in Medieval Europe* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), p. 6.
[8] Ibid, p. 65
[9] Ibid, p. 40
[10] Ibid, p. 189.
[11] L. Kjaer, *The Medieval Gift and the Classical Tradition: Ideals and the Performance of Generosity in Medieval England, 1100-1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), p. 164.

But what does one mean by piety? Katie Phillips has defined piety as 'reverence or obedience to God'.[12] This is a capacious definition but is justified and the definition this thesis will adopt. Much recent work on kingly piety has taken a broad approach. Charles Farris, for example, used a range of sources in his thesis on the pious practices of Edward I to get a 'more extensive and comprehensive image of Edwardian piety'.[13] Farris focused on routine acts of piety by examining what occurred in the royal chapel, including the staffing of the chapel and the masses offered.[14] He also examined Edward's use of the *Christus Vincit*, his patronage of the Mendicants, his religious foundations, and his feeding of the poor.[15] Paul Webster has been similarly broad, looking at what he has termed the 'infrastructure' of prayer (the maintenance of chapels and chaplains, masses offered, and so on), along with John's almsgiving, the foundation of Beaulieu Abbey, and his death and burial.[16] Lindy Grant has also broadly examined Blanche of Castile's piety, looking at which religious groups she patronised, what religious works she commissioned, which saints she venerated, her almsgiving, and which religious figures surrounded her.[17] David Carpenter, in his new biography of Henry III, has synthesised recent work on Henry's piety, examining his veneration of saints, patronage of John's foundations, the religious figures who surrounded him, and his relationship with lepers, friars, and converted Jews, along with examining his religious art and architecture. Phillips

---

[12] K. Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation: The Alms-Giving and Religious Foundations of Henry III', *Reading Medieval* 43, 79-98, at 81.
[13] C.H.D.C. Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I, 1272-1307" (Royal Holloway College, University of London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2013), p. 73.
[14] Ibid, activity in the royal chapel: pp. 150, 158-161, 162, 180-1, 193-203.
[15] Ibid, *Christus Vincit*, pp. 21-2; mendicants: pp. 212-249; religious foundations: pp. 242-7; feeding of the poor: pp. 19-20.
[16] For the infrastructure of prayer, see: Webster, *John and Religion*, pp. 4, 24-6, 29-31, 46-9, 56, 173; almsgiving: pp. 114-8, 118-9; Beaulieu: p. 67; death and burial: pp. 46-9, 181. For the use of the 'infrastructure phrase', see Webster, *John and Religion*, pp. 24, 36, and 193.
[17] Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, groups she patronised; pp. 15, 118-121, 144, 172, 179, 188, 189, 207, 208, 210 , 215; religious works commissioned pp. 320, 326; saint veneration: pp. 220-2; almsgiving: pp. 218-9, 222, 223-4; religious figures around her: Simon Langton (pp. 48, 189); Robert of Saint-Germain, clerk of the king of Scotland (p. 48); Amaury of Bère (tutor of L8) (pp. 69, 96); Stephen of Tournai (tutor of L8) (p. 69); Renauld of Corbeil, bishop of Paris (pp. 144, 187); abbot of St Victor (pp. 144, 187); Stephen de Montfort, dean of Saint-Aignan at Orléons (pp. 144, 187); Master Walter Cornut, archbishop of Sens (p. 186); Adam of Chambly (p. 187); Stephen Langton (p. 190).

herself took a broad approach, examining Henry's care for the poor, sick, lepers, converted Jews and friars, alongside his relationship with Westminster Abbey, Edward the Confessor, and the Cistercian order. This thesis aims to take a similarly broad approach, looking at both the day-to-day acts of piety, and larger ceremonial events and seeks to discern whether there was an overall pattern or strategy to Henry's acts of piety.

Before analysing the historiography of Henry's piety, we must address two major factors that will influence the analysis of his pious practices: kingly piety and agency. Henry was not just anyone; he was a king. Regal piety was different from other types of piety. As Farris has argued, royal piety was the product of an inherited culture. Kings (and queens) needed to engage in what was necessary and efficacious for their salvation.[18] Ancestral commemoration was an important inherited aspect of kingly piety.[19] Kings were members of dynasties that were eternal. They were obliged to their ancestors, and to their predecessors. Webster has argued that family was an element of kingly piety that was inherited and passed on to royal children.[20] This was equally true of the leading barons of the day, like Simon de Montfort.[21] Rulers had to use their riches for the good of the Church and they could not be exclusive in their largesse.[22] Broad patronage was good patronage.

Furthermore, kings were consistently surrounded by their court, their every move was scrutinised, and they were, by their birth, role models.[23] This makes it very difficult to analyse

[18] Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I", p. 15.
[19] D.A. Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power and Personal Rule 1207-1258'* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2020), p. 279; Webster, *John and Religion*, pp. 87, 89-93.
[20] Webster, *John and Religion*, p. 109.
[21] J.R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 78; F.M. Powicke, *King Henry III and The Lord Edward*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), p. 39; S.T. Ambler, *The Song of Simon de Montfort: England's First Revolution and the Death of Chivalry* (London: Picador, 2019), especially pp. 30-33, 217-218.
[22] Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, pp. 202, 206.
[23] Philips, 'Devotion by Donation', 81.

what was personal to individual kings. However, one must not overstress the similarity between regal piety, either within a dynasty, or with contemporaries. Kings chose which practices they adopted and the scale of their devotions. As Grant has argued, kingship and queenship in the thirteenth century were still very 'personal'.[24] The government was centred on one person and their policies. Their choices could make significant differences in their realms. As will be explored in the first chapter, Henry's reign began in a set of unusual circumstances that influenced his piety.

Before examining what historians have said about Henry's agency, it will be fruitful to define what this thesis means by the term. Agency refers to the ability to make one's own decisions and to direct policy. Whether Henry had aims and ambitions that he wanted to impose on others, and whether he was able to impose his wishes have been questions that have interested historians of Henry's reign. When historians have discussed Henry's agency in politics, they have generally been scathing, with Stephen Church saying that Henry was a 'weak man who wore the imprint of the last person to sit on him'.[25] Robert Stacey also argued that Henry tended to be swayed by the last advice he had heard.[26] The question of Henry's agency has been compounded by the plethora of biographies of the major political players in his reign including Eleanor de Montfort, Simon de Montfort, Richard of Cornwall, Eleanor of Provence, and Peter des Roches, who are generally presented as influencing Henry to a greater or lesser degree and for good or ill.[27] This has also been the case for those who have analysed the roles of certain groups who played leading roles in Henry's reign including the Savoyards,

[24] Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, p. 11
[25] S. Church, *Henry III: A Simple and God-Fearing King* (Penguin, 2017), p. 26.
[26] R.C. Stacey, *Politics, Policy, and Finance under Henry III 1216-1245* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p. 35.
[27] N. Denholm-Young, *Richard of Cornwall* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1947), pp. 20, 22, 57, 98, 103, 125, 138, 144-5, 148, 154-5; M. Howell, *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth Century* England (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), pp. xviii, 48, 150, 269. 273-4; N.C. Vincent, *Peter des Roches: An Alien in English Politics, 1205-1238* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 9, 13, 330; L. J. Wilkinson, *Eleanor de Montfort: A Rebel Countess in Medieval England* (London: Continuum, 2012), pp. 43-4, 53, 60, 77; Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, pp. 127-9; Ambler, *The Song of Simon de Montfort*, pp. 204-5.

Lusignans, and Montfortian bishops.[28] Until the publication in 2020 of the first volume of Carpenter's Yale biography of Henry, the people at his court and different factions in his reign had received more attention than Henry himself.[29] Unfortunately, Carpenter's first volume ends in 1258, before the beginning of the period of baronial revolt and rebellion. We therefore, at the time of writing, have no total picture of Henry throughout his reign. As a result, Henry often comes across as a shadowy figure, present on the political stage, but eclipsed and even occasionally cowed by the charismatic and domineering personalities of other political actors of the day.[30]

However, when historians have examined Henry's piety, a very different picture of Henry emerges. He is given agency and credit for sophisticated thought. Paul Binski, for example, has, when writing about Henry's involvement in Westminster Abbey, credited Henry with long-term vision and planning.[31] By contrast, in the same work, he presents Henry as an incompetent fool in politics.[32] Two Henries are created in the historiography and this thesis tries to confront this problem.

Historians have engaged in a variety of methods to examine the piety of those they were examining. One method has been to examine the religious art and architecture commissioned by rulers. When the wealthy commissioned images, it was not just about displaying wealth and

---

[28] E.L. Cox, *The Eagles of Savoy: The House of Savoy in Thirteenth Century Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), pp. 49, 243-4, 307-8; A. Spencer, '"A Vineyard Without a Wall": The Savoyards, John de Warenne and the Failure of Henry III's Kingship', in A. Spencer and C. Watkins (ed), *Thirteenth Century England XVII: Proceedings of the Cambridge Conference 2017* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2021), 41-64, at pp. 44, 49, and 51; H.W. Ridgeway, "The Politics of The English Royal Court 1247-65, with Special Reference to the Role of the Aliens" (Oxford University, Unpublished PhD thesis, 1983), ab x; S.T. Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community of England 1213-1272* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 3, 155-6.
[29] Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power*.
[30] I use the word 'charismatic' in both its general usage and in a Weberian sense. For a discussion about Weberian charisma, see Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community*, pp. 129-132.
[31] P. Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 1.
[32] P. Binski, *The Painted Chamber at Westminster* (London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 1986), p. 6.

prestige, it was also the correct and pious way of spending money.[33] However, the choices that rulers made were personal ones. They could choose their commissions and have considerable control over their production. Those who examine Henry's piety are fortunate due to the detailed accounts of the religious art and architecture he commissioned. Although little has survived of the decoration of his royal residences, we do have sketches.

Paul Binski has looked extensively at Henry's religious art and architecture. He has examined Westminster Abbey and the Palace of Westminster. His study of the Painted Chamber provides insights into Henry's personal preferences. Henry's decoration of his bedchamber has been examined in detail.[34] It must be remembered that Henry's bedchamber was not a private place. Business was conducted there and so the decoration can reveal how Henry wished to be seen by those who visited him.[35] Two large images of the Confessor faced one another: Edward's coronation over Henry's bed and Edward giving a ring to a pauper. These images demonstrated Henry's commitment to Edward's peaceable kingship and his charity towards the poor.[36] They made a clear and public statement of Henry's priorities. Binski focused his analysis on Henry's decoration of the Chamber stressing the representations of the Confessor and the scenes of the Virtues and Vices.[37] Benjamin Wild has also focused on the Virtues and Vices scene, arguing that they were commissioned from the mid to late 1260s and represented Henry's commitment to the renewal of peace after the civil war.[38]

---

[33] Arnold, *Belief and Unbelief*, p. 53.
[34] Binski, *The Painted Chamber*, pp. 5-6, 80; B. Wild, 'Reasserting Medieval Kingship: King Henry III and the Dictum of Kenilworth', in A. Jobson (ed.), *Baronial Reform and Revolution in England, 1258-67* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016), 237-258, at p. 248.
[35] Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets*, pp. 40-2, 49-50.
[36] Ibid, pp. 34-40, 83, 89.
[37] Binski, *The Painted Chamber*, p. 6.
[38] Wild, 'Reasserting Medieval Kingship', p. 248.

Binski has also examined Henry's relationship with Westminster Abbey. He has seen it as a physical representation of Henry's beliefs and principles.[39] Henry's involvement in the rebuilding of Westminster Abbey was immense. He spent somewhere between £40,000 and £50,000 on the project and was heavily involved in all the artistic decisions.[40] To contextualise this figure, in the regnal year covering 28 October 1259 to 27 October 1260, Henry's household spent £7499 8s. 5d.[41] Henry therefore spent between five to six times his annual household expenditure. The expenditure of 1259-60 probably represent above average annual expenditure because Henry spent most of it in France trying to impress the French court and without access to the same stocks he had at home.[42] This demonstrates the scale of investment on Henry's part. Binski has seen Westminster Abbey as a 'practical incorporation' of Henry's beliefs and principles and has praised Henry's understanding of topography and placement.[43]

Sally Dixon-Smith has examined religious art in Henry's Great Halls. She has drawn particular attention to the representation of the parable of Dives and Lazarus.[44] The parable warned the wealthy to care for the poor as Jesus existed within them. These halls were used for Henry's prodigious almsgiving and the prominent display of the parable demonstrated Henry's commitment to caring for the poor.[45] Like Binski, she has used accounts and sketches of the Great Halls in Henry's residences to understand his pious practices.

The popularity of examining Henry's architectural and artistic commissions can be seen in the works of Charles Farris, Lars Kjaer, David Carpenter, Stephen Church, and Nicholas

---

[39] Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets*, p. vii.
[40] Ibid, p. 1.
[41] For an analysis of the Household Rolls, see D.A. Carpenter, 'The Household Rolls of Henry III of England (1216-1272)', *Historical Research* 80 (2007), 22-46, at 33.
[42] Carpenter, 'Household Rolls of Henry III', 34.
[43] Ibid, p. vii
[44] S. Dixon-Smith, The Image and Reality of Alms-Giving in the Great Halls of Henry III: the Reginald Taylor and Lord Fletcher Prize Essay', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 152, 79-96, at 79.
[45] Ibid, 79.

Vincent.[46] Historians who focus on Henry's contemporaries or upon later Plantagenets, have also found the examination of regal artistic commissions revealing of the mindset of their subjects.[47] Benjamin Wild has built on this focus on material culture in examining the jewels accounts of Henry III.[48] Kings used expensive items such as jewels, fine fabrics, and precious objects to accomplish various aims including enhancing their authority and encouraging donations from subjects, but it could also express a king's personality.[49] Like artistic commissions, jewels and other precious items could reflect personal preferences and outlooks.

Historians have examined the use rulers made of sacred places and dates to accomplish their aims. Rulers could enhance ceremonial events by choosing places and dates with personal importance to them. Gestures, ceremony, and rituals can all display ideas, concepts, and claims, especially in the aftermath of a crisis.[50] He points to the celebration held in London for the birth of Edward I's son, John, in July 1266. As the Londoners had supported Simon de Montfort during the period of baronial revolt and rebellion, the event provided an opportunity to display reconciliation.[51]

Johanna Dale has done the most recent and extensive work on the use of the liturgy. She has stressed that one of the important ways time was recorded in the Middle Ages was by

---

[46] Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I", pp. 20-1; Kjaer, *The Medieval Gift and the Classical Tradition,* pp. 180-2; *A Simple and God-fearing King,* pp. 34-9; Vincent, 'Henry III and the Virgin Mary', p. 135.
[47] Grant, *Blanche of Castile,* pp. 320, 326; W.M. Ormrod, 'The Personal Religion of Edward III', *Speculum* 64 (1989), 849-877, at 876; M. Prestwich, 'The Piety of Edward I' in W.M. Ormrod (ed.), *England in the Thirteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1984 Harlaxton Symposium* (Harlaxton, 1985), 120-128, at p. 128
[48] B.L. Wild, 'Secrecy, Splendour and Statecraft: The Jewel Accounts of Henry III of England, 1216-1272', *Historical Research* 83 (2010), 409-430, at 409-10.
[49] Ibid, 410.
[50] B.K.U. Weiler, 'Symbolism and Politics in the Reign of Henry III', in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England IX: Proceedings of the Durham Conference, 2001* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 15–42, at p. 17.
[51] Ibid, pp. 16-17.

the liturgical calendar.[52] There were two cycles to the liturgical calendar. The first was by Sundays and moveable feasts (such as Easter and the Ascension), the second was by saint days.[53] It was important to medieval observers that things took place when and where they were meant to, especially so for inauguration rituals. The legitimacy of such rituals could be undermined if they were not in the right place, or it could enhance legitimacy.[54]

In Latin Christendom, especially in England, France, and Germany, there was universal use of liturgically significant dates by the monarchy.[55] During Henry III's second coronation in 1220, it took place on Pentecost.[56] Although Henry had been crowned in 1216, it was in inauspicious circumstances: it was in the middle of a civil war, and he could not be crowned at Westminster Abbey.[57] The fact that Henry had a second coronation demonstrates that there was some doubt about the legitimacy of his first.

Monarchs did not only use liturgically significant days for inaugurations, but to enhance their authority more generally. Penman, in his work on Alexander II and Alexander III of Scotland, examined their use of sacred days for knightings to argue that this played a crucial role in legitimising rule, especially when authority was threatened.[58] Lindy Grant has also looked at Philip Augustus' use of Pentecost to knight his eldest son, along with other nobles, at Compiègne as a prelude to many barons vowing to go on Crusade against the Cathars.[59]

---

[52] J. Dale, *Inauguration and Liturgical Kingship in the Long Twelfth Century: Male and Female Accession Rituals in England, France and the Empire* (York: York University Press, 2019), p. 142.
[53] J. Dale, 'Royal Inauguration and the Liturgical Calendar in England, France, and the Empire c. 1050-c. 1250 in E. van Houts (ed.), *Anglo-Norman Studies 37: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2014* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), 83-89, at p. 84.
[54] Dale, *Inauguration and Liturgical Kingship,* p. 118.
[55] Dale, 'Royal Inauguration and the Liturgical Calendar', p. 84.
[56] Ibid, p. 84.
[57] D.A. Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III* (London: Methuen London, 1990), p. 13.
[58] M. Penman, 'Royal Piety in Thirteenth-Century Scotland: the Religion and Religiosity of Alexander II (1214-49) and Alexander III (1249-86)', in J. Burton, P. Schofield and B. Weiler (ed.), *Thirteenth Century England XII: Proceedings of the Gregynog Conference 2007* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 13-30, at p. 8.
[59] Grant, *Blanche of Castile,* p. 45.

Knighting ceremonies were events where royal authority was stressed. They reminded observers that they had the power to make and unmake their subjects. The bonds between rulers and vassals were stressed and it allowed rulers to display the aspects of themselves and their rule that they wished to highlight. In the case of Philip Augustus, part of his ambition for the knighting ceremonies was to persuade his subjects to serve him well by going on Crusade against the Cathars. Examining when such ceremonies were held, therefore, can reveal personal ambitions.

The opening of parliaments was another opportunity to stress royal authority and display sacrality. Penman has stressed how Robert the Bruce used liturgically significant days to open parliaments to legitimise his rule.[60] Ceremonial events like the opening of parliaments and knighting ceremonies were not just about might. As Weiler has argued, parliaments provided opportunities to display munificence and largesse, two highly desirable qualities in rulers.[61] Rulers could remind their subjects of their positive points including their piety.

Rulers could also use ceremony to display forgiveness. Henry the Young king publicly begged for his father's forgiveness for his rebellion on the vigil of Palm Sunday.[62] Palm Sunday commemorates the triumphant entry of Christ into Jerusalem. It is a joyful day, an apt one for the reconciliation between a father and prodigal son. One could argue that the vigil of a feast is not as significant as the feast itself, but one must remember that vigils were when one

[60] M. Penman, *Robert the Bruce: King of the Scots* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2014), p. 3.
[61] Weiler, 'Symbolism and Politics', p. 29.
[62] H. Bainton, 'Literate Sociability and Historical Writing in Later Twelfth-Century England' in David Bates (ed.), *Anglo-Norman Studies 34: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2011* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), 23-39, at p. 30.

prepared to celebrate a feast with all due solemnity and thus carried a liturgical weight of their own.[63]

Historians of Henry's reign have appreciated the importance of Henry's ceremonial acts, and the dates on which he chose to perform them. John Maddicott has studied the parliaments held during Henry's reign up to 1257, Benjamin Wild has examined how Henry tried to regain his authority in the aftermath of the baronial period of reform and rebellion, and David Carpenter has examined the translation ceremony of Edward the Confessor in 1269 as an event that was meant to signal the pacification of the country after the civil war.[64] This work has been crucial in understanding the period in the aftermath of Simon's death. However, there are aspects of the period that have not been studied in as much detail, and this thesis aims to engage with them, especially the question of how Henry dealt with Simon's death and its aftermath.

Historians have not only been concerned with the use of sacred days at large ceremonial events. Nicholas Vincent has examined the dates on which gifts were given and received. He noted, on examining an inventory of Henry's gifts (manuscript TNA C47/3/4/1, covering the period 17 December 1234 to 7 May 1235), that most gifts were made on Sundays, the most liturgically significant day of the week.[65] People were hoping to enhance their chance of receiving the king's favour by giving gifts with the most solemnity. Vincent also noted that

---

[63]N.C. Vincent, *The Holy Blood: King Henry III and the Westminster Blood Relic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). In this work, Vincent stressed the importance of Henry's actions on the vigil of the translation of the Confessor. It was an integral part of the ceremony. See pp. 1-3.

[64] See J. Maddicott, *The Origins of the English Parliament, 924-1327* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), especially pp. 455-472; Wild, 'Reasserting Medieval Kingship', pp. 243-4; D.A. Carpenter, 'Westminster Abbey in Politics, 1258-69' in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England VIII: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 1999* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001), 49-58, at pp. 53, 56, 58.

[65] N.C. Vincent, 'An Inventory of Gifts to King Henry III, 1234-5' in D. Crook and L. Wilkinson (ed.), *The Growth of Royal Government under Henry III* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), 121-146, at pp. 121-2, 133.

many gifts were given to Henry on Marian feast days indicating that the giver of gifts thought the Virgin was very important to Henry and that it would encourage his favour.[66]

Vincent's argument is a plausible and convincing one, however, this evidence can only demonstrate, at most, what a gift giver thought might please Henry. Mary was the chief intercessor of saints and her feast days thus an uncontroversial choice. Additionally, the choice may reflect the gift giver's veneration of Mary more than the king's. Perhaps they hoped Mary would help their cause with the king and appealed to her because of their belief in her, rather than because they believed it would please Henry. Nevertheless, the repetition of certain patterns such as consistent patronage of saints can reveal personal preferences and outlooks.

The study of royal itineraries has revealed much about kings. Plantagenet kings, including Henry III, were itinerant and spent more time travelling around their realms than in one place.[67] Julie Kanter's work has been particularly influential. She argued that itineraries were important to contemporaries.[68] They are therefore a good metric to use in evaluating kingly piety because it is a metric kings themselves used and understood. Piety was certainly one of the driving factors in a king's itinerary, but the factors that primarily drove one king, were not the same as others. Kanter's PhD compared the itineraries of John, Henry (minority and some of his personal rule), and Edward (selected years).[69] She used that data to explain what drove their choices and what main factors that determined their itineraries.[70]

---

[66] Ibid, p. 136.
[67] N.C. Vincent, 'The Pilgrimages of the Angevin Kings of England 1154-1272', in C. Morris and P. Roberts (eds.), *Pilgrimage: The English Experience from Becket to Bunyan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 12-45, at pp. 14-15.
[68] J.E. Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship: The Itineraries of the Thirteenth-Century English Kings" (King's College London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2011), p. 11.
[69] For her reasoning for choosing those years, see Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", pp. 69-70.
[70] Some of the reasons she suggested were for hunting or pleasure, see J.E. Crockford, 'The Itinerary of Edward I of England: Pleasure, Piety, and Governance' in A.L. Gascoigne, L.V. Hicks, and M. O'Doherty (eds.), *Journeying along Medieval Routes in Europe and the Middle East* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2016), 231-257, at pp. 245, 247 and Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", pp. 160-3, 279, 282, 353 and J.E.

David Carpenter, Nicholas Vincent, and Paul Webster have also examined regal itineraries. Carpenter looked at Henry's presence in the Tower at moments of crisis in his reign to demonstrate the importance of associations with places.[71] Vincent made a direct link between itineraries and liturgies, highlighting that:

> The royal year was governed by near constant movement to and from locations that in many cases housed significant relics of saints. In such a context, we should never attempt to write a narrative of the king's movements without a liturgical calendar very close to hand[72]

Webster has underlined this point by suggesting that Kanter had underestimated the role of piety in John's itinerary, arguing that it could combine with other aims and ambitions.[73] Itineraries can, therefore, potentially reveal much about a ruler's piety and how they use sacred places for their purposes.

Linked to all these approaches that look at the use royals made of sacred places and times, is saint veneration. Historians who have studied regal piety have studied their saint

---

Kanter, 'Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship: The Itineraries of John and Henry III' in J. Burton et al. (ed), *Thirteenth Century England XIII: Proceedings of the Paris Conference* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011), 11-26, at pp. 18, 25. For monitoring the land and maintaining political control, see Crockford, 'Itinerary of Edward I', p. 245 and Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", pp. 234, 256. 262-3, 277, 352. For crises, domestic and foreign, see Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", pp. 127, 157-8, 240, 241-3, 288, and Kanter, 'Itineraries of John and Henry III', pp. 18, 24. For ceremonial or displaying power, see Kanter, 'Itineraries of John and Henry III', pp. 17 and Kanter, Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", pp. 138, 142, 157. For routine business, see Kanter, 'Itineraries of John and Henry III', p. 15. For legitimising rule, see Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", pp. 135-6, 202-3. For punishment, see Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", pp. 153-4. For piety see Crockford, 'Itinerary of Edward I', p. 250 and Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", pp. 143-6, 243-4, 302-4.

[71] D.A. Carpenter, 'King Henry III and the Tower of London' in D.A. Carpenter (ed.), *The Reign of Henry III* (London: Hambledon, 1996), 199-218, at pp. 200-1.

[72] Vincent, 'An Inventory of Gifts', p. 131.

[73] P. Webster, 'Making Space for King John To Pray: The Evidence Of The Royal Itinerary', in A.L. Gasgoinge, L.V. Hicks and M. O'Doherty (ed), *Journeying Along Medieval Routes in Europe and the Middle East,* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016), 259-286, at p. 264.

veneration.[74] In Webster and Farris' case, they were responding to historiography that had either dismissed the personal religion of their king as conventional, or as totally absent.[75] Consequently, they may have over-emphasised the personal nature of their kings' saint veneration.

Saint veneration was clearly important to rulers, and they understood that saints could bring prestige as well as intervention. Royals had private relic collections that they carried with them in their chapels, and the importance of those relics can be seen in how disastrous it was when they were either lost or confiscated. John lost royal relics during the civil war when the royal baggage train sank in the Wash and Edward I ritually humiliated the Scots by removing holy relics from Edinburgh castle that included a piece of the True Cross and the inauguration stone from Scone Abbey that was sent to Westminster to be part of the English coronation chair.[76]

One of the most explored aspects of Henry III's piety is his relationship with Edward the Confessor. The importance of the Confessor to Henry makes this readily explicable. David Carpenter and Paul Binski have done the most in-depth studies with Binski placing Henry's involvement with Westminster Abbey as centred around his devotion to the saint.[77]

Carpenter has explored Henry's relationship with the Confessor. He studied the language used in the charters granting gifts to Westminster Abbey where Henry referred to

---

[74] See, for example, Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, pp. 220-222; Penman, 'Royal Piety in Thirteenth Century Scotland', pp. 13, 19-20; Penman, *Robert the Bruce*, pp. 3, 96. Webster, *John and Religion*, chapter 2, pp. 37-60 and pp. 38-40 and 41-3 in particular; Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I", pp. 46-7 for the importance of gifts to saints.
[75] Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I", pp. 12-13; Webster, *John and Religion*, pp. 1,3.
[76] Webster, *John and Religion*, p. 173; Penman, *Robert the Bruce*, p. 46.
[77] Binski, *Westminster Abbey*, pp. 83, 89, 143

Edward as his special patron.[78] He also suggested that Henry adopted the cult after the Marshal rebellion because Edward embodied consensual kingship and he could replace a father figure like Peter des Roches as a mentor who would never let him down.[79] Dixon-Smith supported Carpenter's argument that Edward provided a saintly English king for Henry to model himself on pointing to the continuous representation of the Confessor of giving a ring to a pauper in Henry's religious art.[80] This image of largesse was clearly important to Henry and he wanted people to make the connection between him and the Confessor

The focus on Henry's relationship with the Confessor has hidden the nature of his relationship with other native saints, that may situate Henry's piety within a broader Plantagenet tradition. Historians have begun to address this, with Vincent pointing to the numerous relics of English saints (including Augustine of Canterbury, St Osyth, and St Patrick) referred to in an inventory of gifts.[81] Wild has also, drawn attention to some of the other saints Henry held solemn masses for during his captivity between the battles of Lewes and Evesham. He primarily used the 1265 oblation roll as evidence for these masses.[82] I plan to add to this work by analysing which saints Henry appealed to and why. Were there specific circumstances where Henry appealed to saints? Did he believe in the efficacy of different saints at different times in his career? How consistent was his devotion to saints other than the Confessor? Through this analysis I intend to add to the picture of the subtleties of kingly interactions with saints.

---

[78] D.A. Carpenter, 'King Henry III and Saint Edward the Confessor: The Origins of the Cult', *English Historical Review* 122 (2007), 865-91, at 870.
[79] Ibid, 877-878.
[80] Dixon-Smith, 'Image and Reality in Almsgiving', 57.
[81] Vincent, 'An inventory of Gifts', p. 130.
[82] B.L. Wild, 'A Captive King: King Henry III Between the Battles of Lewes and Evesham, 1264–5', in J. Burton et al. (ed), *Thirteenth Century England XIII: Proceedings of the Paris Conference* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011), 41-56, at pp. 52-3.

Names have particular importance in dynasties, as has been recognised by Carpenter in analysing Henry choice to name his eldest son Edward. This was a significant break from tradition, and it made a public statement of Henry's attachment to the Confessor, and that he was committing the future of his dynasty to the Confessor's care.[83] There were politically expedient reasons for this naming along with pious ones.[84] The naming of Henry's second son, Edmund, has also been examined.[85] What has been less noticed is the naming of Henry's daughters. When princesses married into other royal families, they brought traditions from their families which influenced the family they joined.[86] Their naming was very important because their names, like their brothers', made public statements about their dynasty. I therefore intend to examine the naming of Henry's daughters more extensively, to ask whether the names had any spiritual significance to Henry, and what that can then tell us about his piety, and about his aims and ambitions.

Historians have also examined Henry's relationship with the Virgin Mary. Vincent wrote a seminal article on Henry III's relationship with the Virgin, tracing his devotion and comparing him favourably with his illustrious contemporary, Louis IX.[87] He examined the two surviving oblation rolls from Henry's reign to examine when Lady Mass was celebrated.[88] He also looked at the Marian elements of Westminster Abbey including relics and the construction of the Lady Chapel.[89] This drew attention to wider aspects of Henry's saint veneration. Carpenter has synthesised this work in his recent biography of Henry III.[90] This thesis will take

---

[83] Carpenter, 'Henry III and Edward the Confessor', 872
[84] Ibid, 879, 881-883.
[85] J. Creamer, 'St Edmund of Canterbury and Henry III in the Shadow of Thomas Becket' in J. Burton, P. Schofield and B. Weiler (ed.), *Thirteenth Century England XIV: Proceedings of the Aberystwyth and Lampeter Conference 2011* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), 129-139, at p. 130.
[86] Grant, *Blanche of Castile,* pp.182, 192, 207, 215-7, 226-7, 314-5, 326.
[87] Vincent, 'Henry III and the Virgin Mary', 146.
[88] Ibid, 137.
[89] Ibid, 140.
[90] Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power,* pp. 313-5.

a broader look at the saints that Henry venerated, whether they had a local following, or a universal one and any potential implications arising from this.

Historians have utilised surviving letters, speeches, and statutes of Henry III, or of those who knew him. One such source are the surviving letters of Robert Grosseteste. Binski has drawn attention to Grosseteste's reply to a letter Henry sent him asking what unction conferred on kings. Did it make them like priests? Grosseteste dismissed this suggestion, warning Henry of King Uzziah who contracted leprosy for usurping priestly power.[91] Henry's letter to Grosseteste does not survive but the answer reveals that Henry did think about that question, providing an insight into his self-perception.

Some speeches that were allegedly written by, or about, Henry survive. Clanchy believed that Henry's political speeches could tell us much, including about his beliefs and piety.[92] His admonitions to the sheriffs in the Exchequer speech of 1250 demanded that blasphemers be punished and that he had some royal jurisdiction over this, rather than it being a matter for the clergy. Clanchy used evidence like this to suggest that Henry had a sacramental view of his office.[93]

Wild has examined the text of the Dictum of Kenilworth to gain an insight into Henry's perspective. The Dictum was negotiated in the aftermath of Evesham and provided a pathway for the rebels to make peace with the king.[94] This was a critical time in Henry's life. He had nearly lost everything, including his life, during his captivity and the Dictum provided him

[91] Binski, *Westminster Abbey*, p. 145.
[92] M.T. Clanchy, 'Did Henry III have a Policy?' *History*, 53 (1968), 203–16, at 205.
[93] Ibid, 213-4.
[94] For the full text of the Dictum, see R.F. Treharne and I.J. Sanders (ed), *Documents of the Baronial Movement of Rebel and Rebellion 1258-67* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), pp. 316-337.

with the opportunity to make statements about his kingship, including his piety.[95] Wild has pointed to the religious aspect in the proem of the Dictum and to clauses two and three where the authors humbly beg Henry to appoint could justices who would observe Magna Carta.[96]

Historians have also looked at what people were reported to have said about Henry. Phillips has suggested that looking at what lay contemporaries said about a person was a better way to explore what they were like. This point applies especially for Louis IX who was canonised not long after his death, and so his life was shaped to fit hagiographical traditions.[97] Carpenter and Church have examined some of the lay accounts about Henry, especially about his piety.[98] This thesis will make extensive use of chronicles and the positives and negatives of chronicles are sources will be examined below.

In recent years historians have appreciated that the day-to-day pious practices of kings can reveal much and should not be dismissed as convention or as unimportant in understanding regal piety. Farris and Webster have studied this extensively, with Farris devoting significant space in his thesis to matters that occurred in the king's chapel, especially the staffing of the chapel and the masses Edward requested.[99] Webster and Ormrod have also looked at the staffing of the chapel.[100] Webster stresses that John maintained what he termed the 'infrastructure' for prayer and that such evidence should be used to demonstrate the sincerity of John's belief in prayer.[101]

---

[95] Henry was nearly killed at Evesham. See Ambler, *Song of Simon de Montfort,* p. 327.
[96] Wild, 'Reasserting Medieval Kingship', pp. 248-50.
[97] Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 81.
[98] Carpenter, 'Meetings of Henry III and Louis IX', p. 28. Church, *A Simple and God-Fearing King,* p. 37.
[99] Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I", pp. 149-211, especially pp. 162-5, 166-7; Webster, *John and Religion,* pp. 24-6.
[100] Ormrod, 'Personal Religion of Edward III', 865-7; Webster, *John and Religion,* p. 26.
[101] Webster, *John and Religion,* p. 193.

The Mass was central to medieval Christianity and Binski, Carpenter, Dixon-Smith, Farris, and Webster have all looked at how their kings engaged in mass, whether it was about the number of times they heard mass daily, the types of masses they attended, the offerings they made at mass, or the masses they engaged in when they were experiencing crises.[102] The repetition of pious practices can demonstrate what kings felt to be most important. As Farris has argued, the everyday pious practices of kings expressed their faith as much as grand gestures did.[103] Due to the itinerant nature of Plantagenet kingships, kings could rarely visit a church without making an offering.[104] We cannot know what the king was thinking when he made the offering, but there was an understanding that he needed to engage in such practices to accumulate grace for himself and his family. Daily offerings of wax and travelling alms are harder to track, especially for Henry's reign, due to the lack of survival of sources that record such things, but the everyday practices were the foundations upon which all other kingly piety rested. Therefore, I intended to examine some of the more mundane aspects of Henry's piety.

While the mundane is an area that requires more study, such study rests, and builds, on the work of those who have studied some of the grand acts of piety and ritual. Grand ceremonies where rituals were performed were an important part of medieval society. Symbolism was well-understood in the medieval mind across society and kings, at the apex of society, were expected to perform rituals in the correct way.[105]

---

[102] Binski, *Westminster Abbey*, p. 146; Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power*, pp. 310-3 and Carpenter, 'The Meetings of Henry III and Louis IX', p. 27; S. Dixon-Smith, "Feeding the Poor to Commemorate the Dead: the *Pro Anima* Almsgiving of Henry III of England 1227-1272" (University College London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2003), p. 117; Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I", pp.162-5, 170-3, 203-7.
[103] Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I", p. 16.
[104] Ibid, p. 35.
[105] Kjaer, *The Medieval Gift and the Classical Tradition*, pp. 8, 172-3.

One crucial ritual aspect of kingship was lavish hospitality. Due to the charitable nature of hospitality, piety was fundamentally tied up with feasting and gift-giving.[106] No understanding of this element of Henry's piety can exist without reference to Dixon-Smith's work on his *pro anima* alms. These were the large-scale caterings for the poor that he organised for prayers for the souls of his family (immediate and more broadly defined).[107] Henry was heavily involved in planning these events, implying that these actions reflect his thinking and values.[108]

*Pro anima* almsgiving allowed people to harvest prayers for themselves and for souls in Purgatory.[109] The dynastic element of Henry's almsgiving has been stressed by Dixon-Smith.[110] What is truly impressive was its scale. To commemorate the death of his sister, Empress Isabella, he had 102,000 poor fed, an astronomical amount.[111] His extravagant almsgiving has caused historians to emphasise its role in Henry's piety with Farris describing it as 'perhaps the defining feature' of his personal piety.[112] Almsgiving was undoubtedly important, but it was also important to Henry's contemporaries, and we must be careful not to only focus on the grand acts of charity.[113]

Historians have also studied regal piety by identifying the religious figures who surrounded royals. This is not a new approach. Clanchy, in 1968, pointed to the potential

---

[106] L. Kjaer, "The Practice, Politics, and Ideals of Aristocratic Generosity in Thirteenth-Century England" (University of Cambridge, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2012), p. 13.
[107] For examples of who Henry commemorated, see Dixon-Smith, "*Pro Anima* almsgiving of Henry III", pp. 185-8 (Richard I), 189-191 (John), 203-7 (Joan), 212-3 (Empress Isabella); 223 (Hugh X de Lusignan), and 208-11 (Eleanor of Brittany).
[108] Ibid, p. 17.
[109] Ibid, p. 115.
[110] Dixon-Smith, Image and Reality in Almsgiving', 88-89.
[111] Dixon-Smith, "Pro anima Almsgiving of Henry III", p. 212.
[112] Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I". p. 24.
[113] See Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, pp. 218-9, 222, 223-4 and Webster, *John and Religion*, pp. 110-130, especially 110, 114-8, 118-9.

influence of canonists who had links with Henry's family, or were at his court.[114] More recent work on Henry and the leading figures of his court has followed his approach. Margaret Howell examined those who surrounded Eleanor of Provence and their potential influence as did Maddicott in his biography of Simon de Montfort.[115] Carpenter has pointed to Henry's exposure to reforming bishops, and other religious men who surrounded him at court, including John of Darlington.[116] He has suggested that having a Dominican confessor would have made Henry very aware of the benefits of sermons due to the Dominicans' focus on preaching.[117] These approaches follow the sentiment of Grant when she stressed that Blanche of Castile's piety was 'informed by what the churchmen around her would have considered proper Christian fear before the only too imminent judgement of God'.[118] This is undoubtedly true, but due to the lack of surviving correspondence or detailed accounts about who Henry talked to, and about what, it is difficult to get to the core of what Henry believed.

A final area that historians of royal piety have explored is what I am terming 'pious patronage'. By this I mean grants or gifts to various religious groups as opposed to lay figures. I plan to emulate and expand on Phillips' work in gathering data about gifts made to ecclesiastical recipients and analysing what this can reveal about Henry's piety.[119] Carpenter, Grant, Farris, Howell, and Prestwich have all looked at these types of gifts to analyse what this patronage can reveal about the piety of the person they focus on.[120] Historians have also

---

[114] Clanchy, 'Did Henry III Have a Policy?', 211.
[115] Howell, *Eleanor of Provence,* pp. 92-5; Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort,* pp. 79-82, 84-5, 86, 91-2.
[116] Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power,* pp. 282-3.
[117] Carpenter, 'Meetings of Henry III and Louis IX', p. 27.
[118] Grant, *Blanche of Castile,* p. 202.
[119] Phillps, 'Devotion by Donation', 79-98.
[120] Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power,* pp. 293-4 (treatment of lepers), pp. 300-4 (Converted Jews); Grant, *Blanche of Castile,* see, for lepers, p. 207; for Mendicants, pp. 189, 208, 210; for Cistercians, pp. 15, 118-121, 144, 186, 207, 210-15; for Templars, p. 188; for poor, sick, vulnerable, pp. 179 and 207; for converted Jews, p. 179; for the Victorines, p. 215. Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I", for mendicants, see pp.212-249, especially pp. 213-232; Howell, *Eleanor of Provence,* p. 92 (Franciscans); Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', for the Mendicants, see 80-1, 86, 92; for the poor and vulnerable, 82; for the converted Jews, see 91-2; Prestwich,

examined the foundations made by their subjects.[121] As Phillips has shown, Henry did not found many religious institutions; only two hospitals and a house for converted Jews.[122] She suggests several reasons for this. Firstly, she points to the exorbitant cost of Westminster Abbey.[123] Secondly, she argues that his love of almsgiving made it so that he 'preferred to direct his funds to institutions that offered tangible relief rather than spiritual succour'.[124] She placed all of this within the context of Henry's absorption of Franciscan ideals, which prized the poor, and caring for them, above all else.[125]

Henry's relationship with the most vulnerable religious people in his kingdom has not been conclusively studied. By 'vulnerable' I am referring to the poorest and neediest members of society including lepers, the sick, and the poor (both the voluntary and involuntary poor). Research on the Mendicants and hospitals is timely and this thesis aims to add to this work by looking at the broader scope of Henry's pious patronage. These smaller, consistent gifts can be more revelatory of one's personal religion as there was not the same scale of performative expectation. By examining Henry's broader pious patronage, one can better understand his more opulent acts. Grant has traced the broad pious patronage that Blanche of Castile engaged in and this thesis hopes to do something similar and contextualise Henry's pious choices.[126]

In all the approaches examined above, historians are impacted by the sources they use to answer questions. The source base available for the study of Henry's piety must be treated with care. As Dale has argued, kings look different depending on the source one views them

---

'Piety of Edward I', p, 123. Lars Kjaer's work on lay gift-giving also has argued that gift-giving was meant to reveal much about moral character. See Kjaer, *The Medieval Gift and the Classical Tradition*, pp. 182-3, 185-7.
[121] Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I", pp. 242-4 (Vale Royal), pp. 245-7 (other foundations); Philips, 'Devotion by Donation', 87-8; Webster, *John and Religion*, p. 67.
[122] Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 87-88, 91-2.
[123] Ibid, 90.
[124] Ibid, 91.
[125] Ibid, 92.
[126] Grant, *Blanche of Castile:* pp. 15, 118-121, 144, 179, 189, 207-8, 210, 215.

through.[127] England did not have an equivalent to the abbot of St Denis who recorded the deeds of the Capetian monarchy.[128] Additionally, as Vincent has pointed out, we have no contemporary biographies of the early Plantagenet kings.[129] Instead, we have chronicles and annals that are written in a specific tradition, copying Bede's model which did not focus on the individual but on the broader moral story of the time in which they wrote.[130] Kings were just actors in a story about good versus evil.

Historians of Henry's reign must contend with Matthew Paris and his *Chronica Majora.* The depth and breadth of the *Chronica* make it a very important source. Although the *Chronica* was little known outside of St Albans, abbreviated versions of it, especially the *Flores Historiarum,* became one of the most widely copied historical narratives of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in England.[131] It therefore represents a perspective that was admired by writers of chronicles.[132]

Richard Vaughan, in his influential study of Matthew Paris, was scathing about Paris's reliability as a historian arguing that Paris introduced his 'opinions, feelings and prejudices' into his work.[133] He also said that Paris could be 'careless', 'unsystematic', and 'undisciplined'.[134] Due to his 'sporadic tempering with documentary sources, and misuse of

---

[127] Dale, *Inauguration and Liturgical Kingship*, p. 10.
[128] Ibid, p. 13.
[129] N.C. Vincent, 'The Strange Case of the Missing Biographies: The Lives of the Plantagenet Kings of England 1154-1272' in D. Bates, J. Crick and S. Hamilton (ed.) *Writing Medieval Biography 750-1250* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 237-257, at p. 240.
[130] Ibid, pp. 242-3.
[131] C. Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London: London and Hambledon, 2004), p. xxi and B.K.U. Weiler, 'Matthew Paris on the writing of history', *Journal of Medieval History* 35, (2009), 254-278, at 255.
[132] B.K.U. Weiler, *Kingship, Rebellion and Political Culture: England and Germany, c.1215-c.1250* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 76-7.
[133] R. Vaughan, *Matthew Paris*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), p. 33.
[134] Ibid, pp. 130-1.

historical material, as well as his many errors', Paris was 'basically unreliable as a historical source'.[135]

More recent scholars, spearheaded by Björn Weiler, have tried to provide a more nuanced view of Paris.[136] Paris was not a scribe or copyist but a monastic historian, rooted in the Benedictine tradition, who selected and edited information to illuminate higher truths.[137] For him, the Benedictine Rule and Ideal were yardsticks against which he could judge good and bad actions.[138] Paris would have regarded the kingdom as a macrocosm of his monastery, with the interests of the community protected from the executor of authority (the abbot) by the Rule, the customs of the house, and any charters the abbot and monks had mutually agreed on to define their duties, rights, and property.[139] Ideally, a Benedictine abbey was meant to be autonomous in its relations with the outside world.[140] This perspective coloured Paris's assessments of papal-regal relations.

Paris and his contemporaries defined history as the deeds of great men.[141] Writing history was conceived of as a pious task and a duty before God and towards humankind.[142] Paris wrote in a monastic tradition that saw history's purpose as presenting good and bad examples where God rewarded the good and punished the bad.[143] Paris, and other chroniclers,

---

[135] Ibid, p. 134.
[136] See also D.A. Carpenter, 'Chronology and Truth: Matthew Paris's Chronica Majora', in forthcoming J. Clark (ed.), *Matthew Paris: A Companion* (Cambridge), 1-22, viewed online at: http://www.finerollshenry3.org.uk/content/related_papers/related_papers.html (accessed 20/05/2016), pp. 2-3, 8; Kjaer, "Practices, Politics, and Ideals", p. 250.
[137] Weiler, 'Matthew Paris on the writing of history', 257. See also Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History*, pp. 2-3, 21; M.T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307*, 3rd edition, (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), p. 320.
[138] A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England, c.530-c.1307* (London: Routledge, 1974), p. 372.
[139] Ibid, p. 373.
[140] Ibid, p. 374.
[141] Weiler, 'Paris on the Writing of History', p. 263; Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History*, p. 157.
[142] Weiler, 'Paris on the Writing of History', p. 277.
[143] Carpenter, 'Chronology and Truth', p. 10.

were therefore never trying to create objective biographies that we would recognise today. It was the deeds of the political actors within the context of salvation that were meant to be stressed.

The other contemporary chronicles of Henry's reign are also important sources.[144] Like Paris, they saw the purpose of their work in didactic terms. Many thirteenth-century English chroniclers were critical, and even hostile, towards the king and his government because their houses were often engaged in bitter struggles against their expanded claims.[145] Furthermore, many of the chronicles were written by several authors, with potentially different notions of what to select and how to present it. This could change the interpretative thrust of a chronicle. The chronicle of Bury St Edmunds had at least three authors during the thirteenth century with the author of the continuation (1265-96) revising John de Taxter's work, casting aspersions on the veracity of the miracles of Simon de Montfort's corpse that Taxter had recorded.[146]

The context in which chronicles were written changed the presentation of Henry. Many of the monastic chronicles written in England in the thirteenth century were written during the baronial wars.[147] Unlike Paris, who often revised his work and was sometimes writing considerably after the events described, most monastic chroniclers wrote about events as they happened and as they received news.[148] One of the most obvious examples that proves that this was the case is Henry's obituary in the Tewkesbury Annals on 23 March 1263.[149] Henry was not to die for another nine years. However, he had been ill for a prolonged period since the

---

[144] The main other contemporary chroniclers are the various monastic annalists along with Nicholas Trevet, Thomas of Eccleston, and the Melrose chronicler.
[145] A. Gransden 'Propaganda in English medieval Historiography', *Journal of Medieval History* 1 (1975), 363-82, at 366.
[146] Gransden, *Historical Writing in England*, pp. 395-6.
[147] Ibid, p. 407.
[148] Carpenter, 'Chronology and Truth', p. 3.
[149] For a detailed analysis of the obituary see D. A. Carpenter, 'An Unknown Obituary of King Henry III from the Year 1263' in *The Reign of Henry III* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1996), 253-260, at pp. 253-60.

summer of 1262 until early 1263. On 22 March 1263, the patent rolls recorded that Henry ordered all and sundry to swear before him that they would faithfully adhere to him and that when he died, they would aid Edward in his coronation. This letter probably led to the confusion about Henry's death.[150] Interestingly, the 1263 obituary, unlike those in 1272, praised Henry's political talents and piety. Henry was described as 'an active pilot of the kingdom; a learned reformer of peace and quiet'.[151] In early 1263, it appeared that Henry had won against his baronial opponents. This indicates that the period of 1264-8, which devastated the kingdom, coloured later assessments of Henry. The lack of revision in some chronicles may present a more accurate picture of people's reactions to events.

If possible, it is important to understand who the author or authors of chronicles were as their background would have determined the lens through which they interpreted events of the day. For example, mendicant chroniclers such as Thomas of Eccleston, Richard of Durham, and Nicholas Trevet all had different intentions in writing their work. Eccleston wanted to edify contemporary friars and to cause them to emulate their predecessors who embodied Francis's ideals.[152] Henry was therefore only mentioned incidentally in the story of the arrival and development of the Franciscan Order in England. Trevet, conversely, declared in his prologue that he wanted to remedy the lack of patriotic written histories in England that had been neglected since John's reign.[153] His aim, therefore, was the rehabilitation of reputations. It is therefore crucial to understand he motivations and intentions of the authors, as these inform how and why their portraits of Henry were formed.

---

[150] Ibid, p. 254.
[151] Ibid, 256. Translation is my own, original Latin: 'regni strenuous gubernator; pacis et quietis doctus reformator.'
[152] E. Gurney Salter (ed. and trans.), *The Coming of the Friars Minor to England and Germany, Being the Chronicles of Brother Thomas of Eccleston and Brother Jordan of Giano* (London and Toronto: J M Dent, 1926), p. 3.
[153] N. Trevet, *Annales Sex Regum Angliae, 1135–1307* ed. by T. Hog, English Historical Society 6 (London: Sumptibus Societatis, 1845), pp. 2-3.

One caveat must be added to this discussion of narrative sources. As chroniclers viewed history as the deeds of great men, they needed to be near them to gather information,[154] and would have desired a degree of accuracy. Paris knew Henry and had been asked by him to record the ceremony of the Holy Blood.[155] We cannot totally disregard Paris's portrait of Henry as a 'vicious, spiteful caricature'.[156] Paris may have been trying to represent Henry as he was, or at least how he perceived him to be. Paris's own agenda may have twisted his view of Henry, but it is unlikely that Paris completely invented things.

Much use will be made in this thesis of administrative documents, which have different limitations to them than narrative ones. They can often be brief and formulaic, making it difficult to glean motives. Ormrod, in writing about Edward III's grants, stated that they were usually a result of a long and complicated bargaining process that had little to do with the king.[157] Although Edward did not come to the throne until over fifty years after his great-grandfather, the question about how much control a king had over the production of administrative documents is a pertinent one. It is even more pertinent when examining the documents produced in Henry's reign because, as Farris has highlighted, most of the evidence that we have for Henry's piety comes from the office of the chancery.[158]

As seen above, historians have placed much emphasis on the wording of charters and writs, with Carpenter viewing the changes in language when referring to the Confessor as

[154] Weiler, 'Matthew Paris on the Writing of History', 263.
[155] H.R. Luard, (ed.), *Matthaei Parisiensis, Monarchi Sancti Albani, Chronica Majora*, 7 vols (London: Longman, 1872-83), vol. 4, pp. 644-5.
[156] R. Vaughan, *Matthew Paris*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), pp. 146-7.
[157] Ormrod, 'Personal Religion of Edward III', 851.
[158] Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I", p. 17.

revelatory of Henry's wishes.[159] Webster, in his work on John's piety, is less convinced, arguing that the wording of charters sometimes reflected the king's wishes, but at other times it reflected the will of the justiciar.[160]

However, as Dale has argued, charters can be seen as self-expressive because it is unlikely that an author would not check the final draft with the person from whom the charter was meant to come. This seems especially true for Henry as he was close to the senior chancery clerks who took his orders, as demonstrated by his gifts to them of annual robes and other sundry gifts.[161] Carpenter has argued that there was a friendly atmosphere between Henry and his chancery clerks suggesting that they knew him well, knew his desires, and wished to serve him well.[162] One can therefore glean Henry's motives from his chancery documents.

It is easy to forget that charters have religious elements to them. As Dale has argued, charters are both political and pious.[163] In charters, the relationship between king and God is often stressed with the *rex dei* phrase. The ubiquity of the phrase in the high Middle Ages in royal charters can make one forget how important the phrase was and that the sacral character of monarchy was being stressed while grants were being made.[164] As a result, both a king's power and piety were being expressed.

As this thesis is concerned with regal piety, a significant issue with using charter evidence must be raised. Charters were often reissued at the start of a reign to help to establish the new regime. It provided the opportunity for raising revenue as people sometimes had to

---

[159] Carpenter, 'Henry III and St Edward', 870.
[160] Webster, *John and Religion,* p. 16
[161] Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power,* p. 377.
[162] Ibid, p. 377.
[163] Dale, *Inauguration and Liturgical Kingship,* p. 162.
[164] Ibid, pp. 165-6.

pay to have their rights reaffirmed.[165] If the Crown waived the fee, this is significant as it makes it far more likely that the gift to a religious individual had a primarily pious motivation. When examining the gifts Henry made to religious beneficiaries, I will examine whether he waived fees or not to make assessments about the primary motivation behind the gifts.

Given the importance of the use of sacred places and times in this thesis, it is important to examine the issues that can arise from using chancery documents to determine where a king was.[166] First, are the documents accurate? Kanter has noted that sometimes the king was recorded as being somewhere that was impossible. For example, on 12 April 1203, John was placed at both Vire and Verneuil, which were more than 100 miles apart.[167] Errors like this could be due to a scribal error.[168] One can test the itinerary's by examining dating clauses in the chancery documents and by looking at the locations recorded in the household rolls.[169]

In Henry's case, we can be sure that he was where his letters placed him because in 1272 he declared that if his letters patent had a place or date that did not correspond with his location, they were "utterly forged".[170] Furthermore, during Henry's reign, unlike in the fourteenth century, the king was not frequently away from the great seal and chancery. The *teste me ipso* phrase ('witnessed by myself') was not cursory. It meant what it said, and Henry made very little use of the privy seal, unlike later monarchs.[171] Consequently, we can be quite certain of Henry's itinerary and use it to analyse his piety.

---

[165] Ibid, p. 164.
[166] For an explanation of how Henry's itinerary has been constructed, see Carpenter, 'Henry III and the Tower', pp. 200-201.
[167] Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", p. 46.
[168] Ibid, p. 46.
[169] Ibid, pp 47-8.
[170] Carpenter, 'Henry III and the Tower', p. 201.
[171] B. Wilkinson, 'The Chancery' in W.A. Morris and J.F. Willard (ed.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336, Volume I: Central and Prerogative Administration* (Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1940), 162-205, at p. 201.

The different types of documents issued by the chancery are traditionally regarded as falling into four main categories: charters, letters patent, letters close, and writs. These documents are distinguished from one another by form, content or both.[172] The term 'writ' was specialized when it referred to the original writs which began in the law courts, but it appears that chancery clerks did not make a consistent distinction between a 'letter' and a 'writ' in this period. In fact, the terms seem to have been interchangeable. For example, the Hanaper department talked of 'writs patent.'[173] The great distinction in the chancery appears to have been between charters, letters patent and letters close, hence the existence of different rolls in which they were recorded.

The traditional differences between the aforementioned documents are that, first, charters were addressed to specific groups of people whereas letters patent usually began with 'to all whom it may concern.' Letters close were usually addressed to one person or several named persons. Second, charters were attested by witnesses, letters patent ended with the clause 'in cuius rei testimonium has letteras nostras fecimus patentes' and letters close ended simply with the 'teste me ipso' clause without defining the nature of the letter.[174] Third, charters were sealed with the great seal pendant, usually affixed with silken threads; letters patent were sealed with the great seal pendant affixed with a strip of parchment and letters close had the great seal affixed so that in order to read it, one had to break the seal. Fourth, charters conferred solemn and permanent grants from the crown (such as land or liberties), letters patent were concerned with public business of more transitory importance and letters close contained orders

[172] Ibid, p. 164.
[173] Ibid, p. 165.
[174] Translation: Of the letters patent we have made, witnessed by the king.

to an individual or a group of individuals that was meant only for the recipient/ recipients and was of no further use once read.[175]

The wardrobe accounts contain much information about Henry's valuables and the cash he spent on personal expenses.[176] During Henry's reign, the wardrobe keeper received approximately a quarter of the crown's annual cash revenue. As the wardrobe keeper disbursed money for whatever the king wanted, both large (such as funding the works at Westminster) and small projects (paying for food), the accounts can reveal much about the king's personal desires and wishes, including his pious ones.[177]

However, the wardrobe accounts are not consistently detailed. Often, they only note the number of items like rings, brooches, and cups that were given out as gifts without specifying to whom the gifts were given or from whom the gifts were received. For example, it was stated that, in the forty-fifth year of the king's reign, twenty-nine of thirty-seven cloths of gold, were offered as the king's oblations. However, one can still make suggestions as to whom the gifts were given by examining evidence from other chancery documents including the close, patent, and charter rolls. An entry from the close rolls, dated 13 January 1261, stated that the king sent a cloth of gold to cover the body of the bishop of Laodicea.[178] It is quite possible that one of the twenty-nine cloths of gold that were given as gifts from the king included the one sent to the bishop of Laodicea.

---

[175] Wilkinson, 'The Chancery', p. 166.
[176] B. L. Wild, 'Introduction', in B.L. Wild (ed.), *The Wardrobe Accounts of Henry III* (London: London: Printed for the Pipe Roll Society by Acorn Print Media, Loughborough, 2012)., 2012), p. xiii and W. L. Warren, *The Governance of Norman and Angevin England 1086-1272* (London and Melbourne: Edward Arnold, 1987, 1987), p. 174.
[177] Wild, 'Introduction', in the *Wardrobe Accounts*, p. xi.
[178] *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III preserved in the Public Record Office A.D. 1259-61* (London: H.M.S.O, 1934), p. 332.

The oblation rolls can reveal much about regal piety. Oblations are offerings (of either money or objects such as cloths or jewels) made to God or to saints. Oblations could be made for various reasons and so one must evaluate the context in which the oblations were made. A major issue regarding the oblation rolls of Henry III is that only two partial oblation rolls survive for his reign. One covers the period from 28 October 1238 until 7 May 1239.[179] The other covers the period from 1 January 1265 until 6 August 1265. Furthermore, the second oblation roll only has details of oblations made from 1 January 1265 until 1 July 1265 inclusive. From 2 July 1265 until 6 August 1265, the roll only records the king's itinerary and gives a total figure of the amount spent on oblations per week.[180] This makes it very difficult to ascertain to whom the oblations were offered and where and why they were offered.

The detail in the oblation rolls varies. A typical entry reads something like this: 'On the Sunday on the octave of Easter in oblations 4d. In oblations of the lord king in his chapel after mass 5s'.[181] The first reference to oblations refers to oblations made outside the king's chapel and the second refers to the offering made by the king in his chapel after mass. The 1265 oblation roll is more detailed than the 1238/9 one, as in the 1238/9 roll, the offerings the king made after mass are mentioned but it is not mentioned whether these offerings were made *in capella sua* i.e. in the king's chapel, or not. One may be able to ascertain if oblations were made to certain places by comparing what other chancery documents reveal about the king's offerings.

Sometimes, the oblation rolls do specify where oblations were offered. On Wednesday 16 February 1239 (Ember Day following Quadragesima Sunday, the first Sunday of Lent)

[179] TNA C47/3/44.
[180] TNA E101/349/30.
[181] Ibid.

oblations of 3s. 13d. was offered at the cross of Faversham and another 13d. were offered at the corona of Thomas Becket.[182] On occasions like these, one can be certain of the intended beneficiaries of the oblations. On other occasions, one must consult the king's itinerary to suggest to whom/ where the oblations were offered.

An additional complication with the 1265 oblation roll is that the period coincides with when Simon de Montfort was the *de facto* ruler of England. It is possible, therefore, that the oblations offered during this time were given at Simon's instigation instead of Henry's. Due to the lack of survival of the oblation rolls, it is difficult to establish whether differences between the two rolls were at the instigation of Simon or due to developments in the king's piety. Wild has noted that, in 1265, in comparison to 1238/9, there was a decline in oblations offered outside the royal chapel to external churches. Nearly all the masses referred to in the 1265 roll occurred in *capella sua*. In the 1238/9 roll, references to the king's chapel hardly ever occurred and so this could imply that Simon de Montfort was trying to curtail Henry's much loved and very public celebration of mass.[183]

However, the 1238/9 oblation roll just states, in many cases, that it was either at or after mass that certain amounts of money were offered and since it is not often specified, that mass could have either occurred in the king's chapel or in local churches. Additionally, there were days covered by the 1265 oblation roll where Henry made offerings at altars. If Simon was trying to curtail Henry's public displays of piety, it seems unlikely that he would have allowed such public offerings. In addition, as Farris has pointed out, Simon de Montfort was a pious man himself and so it is unlikely that he would have impeded Henry's pious activity.[184]

---

[182] TNA C47/3/44.
[183] Wild, *The Wardrobe Accounts of Henry III*, pp. clxix-clxx.
[184] Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I", p. 35.

Furthermore, if Simon had tried to drastically alter the king's pious practices, it would have drawn attention to the fact that the king was no longer in charge.

The household rolls have been used extensively by Carpenter and Dixon-Smith. There is only partial survival of these rolls (the only complete one covers 28 October 1259 to 27 October 1260) limiting the evidence one can use.[185] The rolls record how much the household was spending each day with money going to different departments such as the buttery, pantry, and kitchen. Carpenter focused on what the rolls could reveal about the scale of Henry's hospitality and what that in turn revealed about his aims and ambitions.[186] Dixon-Smith focused on the feeding of the poor and what the scale of it can reveal about Henry's piety.[187] The household rolls also refer to the amount of wax used by the household. Some of this would have been used for candles to light rooms, but some of it would be used for religious purposes, such as in the making of votive offerings. The wax evidence has the potential to reveal certain aspects of regal piety.

The last categories of source that will be used in this thesis are accounts of art, architecture, and gifts. Most of our evidence for these is second hand.[188] The Painted Chamber, for example, was largely destroyed by fire.[189] We must rely on the records of it in the administrative documents which were not designed 'to record the more abstract ideas associated with royal intentions'.[190] However, there are copious references to Henry's works in the administrative documents, allowing us to paint a picture.[191] Few of the original gifts

[185] Carpenter, 'Household Rolls of Henry', 22.
[186] Ibid, 22.
[187] Dixon-Smith, "*Pro Anima* Almsgiving of Henry III", pp. 2, 15.
[188] Binski, *The Painted Chamber*, p. 31.
[189] Ibid, p. 4.
[190] Ibid, p. 106.
[191] Ibid, p. 4.

referred to in the documents have survived. We cannot, therefore, see many of the precious gems and ecclesiastical vestments that are referred to constantly in the chancery documents. In the case of architecture, we have records of the topography of the scenes, but there is no such context with the gifts. This could alter how we interpret them. However, the giving of such gifts can still reveal much about the giver and receiver. Giving precious gifts to a saint displayed the depth of veneration. The greater the gift, the greater the veneration.

This thesis traverses numerous historiographical approaches to regal piety. It owes significant debt to those who have examined various aspects of Henry's piety. Carpenter's chapter on Henry's piety in his Yale biography demonstrates the range of topics and approaches historians studying Henry's piety have taken.[192] However, the balance is still skewed towards the more extravagant aspects of his piety including his almsgiving and relationship with the Confessor. Phillips has added to the historiography in examining Henry's relationship with the Mendicants and what that can reveal about the philosophy of his piety.[193] Phillips, in comparing some of Henry's piety with Louis IX has begun the work of situating Henry's piety within the context of his contemporaries.[194] Chapter One will address the pious expectations of kings, placing Henry's piety in the context of his contemporaries to show what was common to them and to his ancestors and successors.

Building on the theme of regal piety, Chapter Two will contribute to the work that has examined other elements of Henry's piety, especially Katie Phillips' work. The chapter will look at general trends in pious patronage but will also explore Henry's use of the sacred in troubled times. Chapter Three will look at Henry's piety through a dynastic lens, examining

---

[192] See chapter 6 'The Piety of Henry III', in Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power*, pp. 273-348.
[193] Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 80-1, 92.
[194] Ibid, 81.

his pious practices at moments of success and vulnerability of the dynasty. Chapter Four will build on the theme of the use of piety in times of crisis, using the period of baronial revolt and rebellion as the case study for Henry's contest with Simon de Montfort, both when Simon was alive, and after his death. The last serious threat to Henry's kingship was the memory of Simon de Montfort who many lauded as a saint after he died at Evesham. The question of how piety is weaponised and remembered will be a focus of this chapter. This thesis hopes to add to the current work on Henry's piety but also to challenge the division in the historiography between Henry as a hapless politician and Henry as a sophisticated image-builder. Henry's piety played a key role in his politics and this work aims to analyse how and why Henry used piety to accomplish his ambitions.

Chapter One: Henry III and the Pious Expectations of Kingship

As has been stated in the introduction, much of kingly piety was inherited. Additionally, there was significant overlap between the pious practices of contemporaneous kings of Latin Christendom. The reasons for this are myriad, but at a fundamental level all Christian medieval kingship was based on the Bible. Biblical interpretation was limited to a small number of scholars, whose glosses on parts of the Bible became highly influential, even acquiring an 'official status' in the interpretation of kingly duties.[1] Commentators did not always agree on the best interpretations, with some commentators, like Stephen Langton, arguing for limited monarchy, and others, like Andrew of Saint-Victor, justifying extensive regal power.[2] The nature of kingship has been studied in detail in recent years.[3] What follows below is largely indebted to these scholars and is only a brief summary to understand the basis of pious expectations of kings.

The image presented of kings in the Bible is not straightforward. As Phillipe Buc has noted, the books of Exodus, Kings, and Chronicles generally present kings in a negative light. Psalms is exceptional in its positive presentation of kingship.[4] In Exodus, Pharoah dominates the narrative as an oppressive, wicked individual, whom God punishes for the oppression of the Israelites.[5] Kings and Chronicles provide the historical narrative to the creation of kings. In the

---

[1] P. Buc, *L'Ambiguïté du Livre : Prince, Pouvoir, et Peuple Dans les Commentaires de la Bible au Moyen Age,* (Paris : Beauchesne, 1994), p. 30.
[2] For Stephen Langton's arguments, see Buc, *L'Ambiguïté du Livre*, pp. 38, 62, 66, 168, 191, 251, 333, 348-9, and 400. For Andrew of Saint-Victor, see Buc, *L'Ambiguïté du Livre*, pp. 256, 270, and 283.
[3] See, in particular, S.T. Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community of England 1213-1272* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), Chapter Two 'Kingship and Royal Power in Political Thought', pp. 32-60, especially pp. 37-42; Buc, *L'Ambiguïté du Livre*, especially pp. 27-30 and 399-408 ; D.L D'Avray, '*Magna Carta*: It's Background in Stephen Langton's Academic Biblical Exegesis and its Episcopal Reception', *Studi Medievali* Serie Terza Anno XXXVIII Fasc I (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi Sull'Alto Medioevo, 1997), 423-438, especially at pp. 424 and 426.
[4] Buc, *L'Ambiguïté du Livre*, pp. 28-9.
[5] See the Bible, Exodus 8-12. References to the Bible are to modern numbering, translations from the Douay-Rheims Bible.

New Testament, kingship has a positive association in the person of Christ, who is described as the King of Kings, King of the Jews, and from the line of King David, who is one of the kings of the Bible who is, with the exclusion of his affair with Bathsheba and his manoeuvrings to have her husband killed, generally presented as a good king.[6] Medieval theologians believed they could use the histories of the Old Testament to understand the world around them and could use its lessons to shape kingly action.[7]

The Biblical origins of kings is not straightforward. Their creation became part of God's plan, and no one was meant to act against them, even if they ruled badly, because they were God's anointed. David, in his contest with Saul (the first king of the Israelites), told him:

[6] For the description of Christ as the 'King of Kings', see, for example, 1 Timothy 6: 15, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1+Timothy+6%3A15&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022) and Revelation 17: 14, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Revelation%2017%3A14&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022). For a description of Christ as the 'King of the Jews', see Matthew 2:2, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew+2%3A2&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022), Mark 15: 9 viewed online at https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Mark+15%3A+9&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022), and Luke 23: 37 viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Luke+23%3A+37&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022). For references to Christ being from the line of David, see Matthew 1:1, viewed online at https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew+1%3A1&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022), Mark 10: 47, viewed online at https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Mark+10%3A+47&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022), John 7: 42 viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=John+7%3A+42&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022), Romans 1:3, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Romans+1%3A+3&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022), 2 Timothy 2: 8, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=2+Timothy+2%3A+8&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022) and Revelation 22: 16, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Revelation+22%3A+16&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022). For some positive aspects of David's character, see 1 Samuel 18: 14, 22, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1+Samuel+18&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022) and 1 Samuel 23: 4, 10, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1+Samuel+23&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022). For an account of the Bathsheba affair, see 2 Samuel 11: 1-4, 15-17, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=2+Samuel+11&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022)

[7] Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community*, p. 32.

Behold this day thy eyes have seen, that the Lord hath delivered thee into my hand, in the cave, and I had a thought to kill thee, but my eye hath spared thee. For I said: I will not put out my hand against my lord, because he is the Lord's anointed.[8]

However, kings were created at the Israelites' request. When God heard this request, he was outraged, even though it was in response to the misbehaviour of the prophet Samuel's sons, who were to inherit his role as the Israelites' leader.[9] After consulting with God, Samuel warned the Israelites of the oppression they would endure under kings, due to their rights:

Then Samuel told all the words of the Lord to the people that had desired a king of him and said: This will be the right of the king, that shall reign over you: He will take your sons, and put them in his chariots, and will make them his horsemen, and his running footmen to run before his chariots. And he will appoint of them to be his tribunes, and centurions, and to plough his fields, and to reap his corn, and to make him arms and chariots. Your daughters also he will take to make him ointments, and to be his cooks, and bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your best olive yards, and give them to his servants. Moreover, he will take the tenth of your corn, and of the revenues of your vineyards, to give his eunuchs and servants. Your servants also and handmaids, and your goodliest young men, and your asses he will take away, and put them to his work. Your flocks also he will tithe, and you shall be his servants. And you shall cry out in that day from the face of the king, whom you have chosen to yourselves. and the Lord will not hear you in that day, because you desired unto yourselves a king.[10]

Despite these warnings, the Israelites repeated their desire for a king. Crucially, God saw the Israelites' request for a king as a rejection of his rule:

---

[8] 1 Samuel 24: 11, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1+Samuel+24%3A+11&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022)
[9] 1 Samuel 8: 1-3, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1+Samuel+8%3A+1-3&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022).
[10] 1 Samuel 8: 10-18, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1+Samuel+8%3A+10-18&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022)

And the Lord said to Samuel: Hearken to the voice of the people in all that they say to thee. For they have not rejected thee, but me, that I should not reign over them.[11]

These quotations could be used to argue that priests were superior to kings because of their more direct relationship with God.[12] This had a direct impact on how theologians interpreted kings and their relationship with them. The Old Testament abounds with examples of wicked kings who do not heed the advice of God's prophets. These prophets tried to admonish their kings, but often their advice fell on deaf ears.[13]

The Bible also discusses what role kings are meant to fulfil. Fundamentally, they are meant to uphold God's law. However, that is not meant to come directly from God to king. God's law is meant to be interpreted by his prophets, who in turn advise their kings on how to implement it.[14] These positions affected the way in which medieval bishops and other prelates interacted with their kings. Their role, in imitation of the prophets of the Bible, was one of admonition. The clerical *admonitio* consisted of remonstrating with rulers and exhorting them to 'abide by shared norms of appropriate conduct.'[15] As Björn Weiler has argued, the *admonitio*

---

[11] 1 Samuel 8: 7, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1+Samuel+8%3A+7&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022)
[12] This was the position taken by Stephen Langton. See Buc, *L'Ambiguïté du Livre,* pp. 191, 246-7.
[13] See, for example, the conduct of Saul (1 Samuel 18: 8-13), viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1+Samuel+18%3A+8-13&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022), Absalom (2 Samuel 13: 20-29, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=2+Samuel+13%3A+20-29&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022), Rehoboam (1 Kings 12: 10-11, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1+Kings+12%3A+10-11&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022), Ahab (1 Kings 15: 3-5, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1+Kings+15%3A+3-5%2C+&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022), and Joram (2 Kings 9: 21-22, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=2+Kings+9%3A+21-22%2C+&version=DRA (accessed 25/01/2022)
[14] Kings were encouraged to create their own Deuteronomy, their own law book. See D'Avray, '*Magna Carta*: It's Background', p 428.
[15] B.J.K.U. Weiler, 'Clerical *Admonitio*, letters of advice to kings and episcopal self-fashioning c.1000 to c.1200', *History* 102, 557-575, at 557. See also D.A. Carpenter, (ed and trans), *Magna Carta: With a New Commentary by David Carpenter*, (Penguin, 2015), p. 122.

was central to how prelates saw themselves.[16] By admonishing rulers, they played a pastoral role. They were ensuring the salvation of their ruler, but also of their subjects. Rulers were prominent individuals, whose actions were observed and copied by many others. An immoral king could induce immorality in others, gradually causing wide-spread pollution. No diligent prelate could allow this to happen. They were meant to advise kings on spiritual matters and to inform them when they morally transgressed.

These ideas were transmitted to all the rulers under examination in this chapter. However, individual prelates had specific outlooks and the influence of these individual prelates could be substantial. In Henry III's case, one cannot ignore the influence of Stephen Langton who had a negative view of kingship and believed it should be limited in nature.[17] John's refusal to accept Langton as the archbishop of Canterbury caused his excommunication and the Interdict placed on John's lands. Eventually, John came to terms with the pope and Langton became heavily involved in both John's reign and Henry's minority. Langton also came to play a prominent role in the shaping of Magna Carta, a document created in a political crisis.[18] Magna Carta developed and evolved during Henry's minority and his reign, and it became the yardstick against which Henry's rule was judged. The 1225 re-issue of Magna Carta became the text that were reconfirmed by Henry and Edward I during their reigns. Although the 1225 Magna did not have clause 61 of the 1215 Magna Carta, the so called 'security-clause' in it, it had moral force.[19] As David D'Avray has argued, Langton's influence was the driving force behind the 1225 re-issue of Magna Carta.[20] When Magna Carta was confirmed, the threat of

---

[16] Weiler, 'Clerical *Admonition*', 557.
[17] Buc, *L'Ambiguïté du Livre,* pp. 191, 246-7, 332-3, 400.
[18] J.C. Holt, *Magna Carta: Revised with a New Introduction by George Garnett and John Hudson*, 3rd edn. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 37.
[19] Ibid, pp. 395-397. The security clause granted the elected twenty-five barons of the land and the commune of the land the power to distrain and distress the king if they believed that the king, or his officials, were transgressing Magna Carta and refused to rectify it.
[20] D'Avray, '*Magna Carta*: Its Background', p. 424.

excommunication against those who transgressed it was reiterated.[21] Langton's actions were underpinned by his biblical scholarship which stressed that kings needed to adhere to a written volume of law that the clergy were meant to ensure their compliance with.[22] The strong link between Magna Carta and morality would have been impressed upon a young Henry.

But what textual sources, other than the Bible and Magna Carta, may have influenced Henry's understanding of his pious duties? A major issue in trying to ascertain which sources Henry had access to, is that we cannot be certain which books he possessed. Between 1066-1272, we have no record of any book that we are certain belonged to an English king.[23] However, there is a receipt from 1208 that John received from the sacrist of Reading Abbey on the eve of Palm Sunday. It appears that these were John's books being stored in Reading Abbey rather than books on loan to him. The list includes books of the Old Testament, Pliny, Valerius Maximus, Origen's *Super Vetus Testamentum,* Augustine's *Epistolae, De Civitate Dei* and *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, Peter Lombard's *Sentences,* Hugh of St Victor's *De Sacramentis Christiane fidei,* and some esoteric material like Candidus Arianus's *De Generatione divina*[24]. If these were the books John owned, then it seems logically to suggest that Henry would have inherited them and been exposed to their ideas.

However, the list is very theological in nature, undoubtedly because the Interdict, imposed because John refused to accept Stephen Langton as archbishop of Canterbury had come into effect on 24 March 1208.[25] John may have only wished to use some of these books

[21] Ibid, p. 424.
[22] Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community,* p. 5.
[23] N.C. Vincent, 'The Great Lost Library of England's Medieval Kings? Royal Use and Ownership of Books, 1066-1272' in Kathleen Doyle and Scot McKendrick (eds), *1000 Years of Royal Books and Manuscripts* (London: The British Library, 2013), 73-112, at p. 73.
[24] Ibid, p. 85.
[25] Ibid, p. 85.

to make a theological defence of his actions. We simply cannot know if he kept the books or if Henry read them.

An older scholarly suggested that Henry had a library at Westminster, but that was based on a likely transcription error. There was a person who was identified at the keep of the king's books (*librorum*), but it has now been read as the keeper of the king's children (*liberorum*).[26] We cannot, therefore, even be certain that Henry had access to a library. However, we do know that various works were dedicated to kings. In Henry III's case, Gerald of Wales's *Concerning the Instruction of Princes* was dedicated to him.[27] Whether he read it or not is another issue.

Eleanor of Provence (Henry's wife) owned a *Roman de Guillaume le Conquerant,* which was bequeathed to her grandson, the future Edward II. Kings and queens were likely to have read their books as 'romances.'[28] There is also evidence of vernacular hagiography circulating at Henry's court including a vernacular life of Edward the Confessor.[29] Finally, kings owned psalters and we know that Henry commissioned psalters for his various chapels and churches.[30] We can be certain, therefore, that Henry had good biblical knowledge and was aware of the biblical kings to emulate, and those not to be emulated.

One of the major issues historians studying Angevin piety face is the lack of biographies. This may be due to lack of survival rather than because they were never written.[31] Vincent has suggested that there was not much need to commission a biography of Henry III

---

[26] Ibid, p. 86.
[27] J. Stevenson (trans and ed), *Gerald of Wales Concerning the Instruction of Princes* (London: Penguin, 2015), p. 6.
[28] Vincent, 'The Great Lost Library', pp. 88-9.
[29] Ibid, p. 89.
[30] Ibid, p. 93.
[31] N.C. Vincent, 'The Strange Case of the Missing Biographies: The Lives of the Plantagenet Kings of England 1154-1272' in D. Bates, J. Crick and S. Hamilton (ed.) *Writing Medieval Biography 750-1250* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 237-257, at p. 251.

because England already had a royal saint: Edward the Confessor. According to Vincent, Henry was 'obsessively devoted' to the Confessor. An implication of this argument is that Henry himself was content to be overshadowed by the Confessor and to be seen as a 'mere devotee of the cult of St Edward.'[32] Vincent's portrait of Henry is of someone who fades into the background, as someone who would be remembered 'if at all' as a devotee of the Confessor.[33] This argument seems overly harsh and not totally convincing. Just because English kings could lay claim to the sanctity of the Confessor does not mean they would not have supported a serious canonisation effort for another member of their dynasty, as difficult as that would have been from the thirteenth century onwards.[34] It would only have accrued more prestige to them and their dynasty.

Another issue with studying the piety of John, Henry III, and Edward I, is the nature of the surviving sources. We are dependent on royal administrative documents that largely examine the amount of money they spent on their pious devotions. As Charles Farris has said, the study of Edward I's piety 'by and large, a study of the king's wardrobe and the clerks who worked therein'.[35] This compounds the issue of the lack of biographies or accounts from churchmen who surrounded kings. The situation is dire for John because the Interdict and his treatment of the English clergy coloured the assessments of contemporary chroniclers when writing about his reign.[36] For Henry's reign we have Matthew Paris's works with his *Chronica Majora* being one of the most detailed and broader chronicles of the thirteenth-century, but he

[32] Ibid, p. 257.
[33] Ibid, p. 257.
[34] For a discussion about the increasing complexity and difficulties of the canonisation process in the thirteenth-century see A. Vauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages,* trans by Jean Birrel, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 42-56, 420, and 498. Also see R. Bartlett, *Why can the Dead do such Great Things? Saints and Worshippers from the Martyrs to the Reformation,* (Princeton University Press: Princeton and Oxford, 2013), p. 57.
[35] C.H.D.C. Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I, 1272-1307" (Royal Holloway College, University of London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2013), p. 55.
[36] P. Webster, *King John and Religion* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), pp. 14, 131, 172, and 199.

does not often write about Henry's piety, certainly not on a day-to-day basis, and not without his biases colouring the assessment.[37]

This is not the case for Louis IX. Louis was canonised after his death and people wrote hagiography about him. All the early hagiographies were written by religious men (mostly Mendicants).[38] These accounts were written by men who knew Louis intimately. The earliest work was written by Geoffrey de Beaulieu in 1272/3, who had been Louis' confessor for the last twenty years of his life.[39] The aim of the work was to set the canonisation process in motion and so there was a strong focus on his piety.[40] One of the prominent accounts of Louis' life was by Joinville, a nobleman who had been part of Louis' inner circle.[41] Due to these works, we have detailed accounts of Louis' pious practices.

However, hagiography is a complicated genre. Its aim is to expound the saint's miracles and there are tropes and models which can obscure what a modern observer would view as a biography. Le Goff tried to tackle the issue of getting to Louis' personality, noting that it does 'still seem to escape us.'[42] He argued that the 'producers of [Louis'] memory dissolved it in commonplace ideas that they needed to make their points.'[43] However, Le Goff still felt that one could gain insights into Louis and ended his work with the question 'did Saint Louis exist?'[44] The question mark at the end demonstrating that he could give no definite answer, and

[37] This is a point that has also been noted by Katie Phillips. See K. Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation: The Alms-Giving and Religious Foundations of the Henry III', *Reading Medieval* 43 (2017), 79-98, at 79.
[38] The early Mendicant biographers were Geoffrey de Beaulieu, (see J. Le Goff, *Saint Louis,* trans. G.E. Gollrad (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), pp. 256-258); Guillaume de Chartres (see Le Goff, *Saint Louis,* pp. 258-9) and Guillaume de Saint-Panthus (see Le Goff, *Saint Louis,* pp. 260-5).
[39] Le Goff, *Saint Louis,* p. 162.
[40] Ibid, p. 257.
[41] Ibid, pp. xxiii, xxxi, 6, 91, 376-398 (especially pp. 378-81).
[42] Ibid, p. 366.
[43] Ibid, p. 366.
[44] Ibid, p. 735.

perhaps that historians should not think they can reach a conclusive answer either. As Lindy Grant has argued, the hagiography of Louis IX is problematic, but it cannot be disregarded because of the closeness of the authors of Louis' early biographies and hagiographies to Louis himself.[45] Due to the long shadow of her son, one must rely on some of the works produced by Louis's biographers to gain a picture of Blanche of Castile. Many chronicles and contemporary histories were produced during Blanche's lifetime, and we cannot dismiss their portraits of her, and, when they exist, Louis' too.

A similar issue arises when using narrative sources about Robert the Bruce. Much of the time, they reveal more about the author's politics than about Robert.[46] Due to his later reputation, which was coloured by ideas of patriotism and nationalism, much of the later presentations of Robert were connected with 'myth, propaganda or anachronism'.[47] Most of the contemporary comment on Robert that has survived is found in English monastic annals and Anglo-French chronicles, and they generally viewed Robert in a negative light.[48]

Given these limitations, the record sources that we have, especially for Henry III and Edward I, have some advantages over biographies. In some ways they can be seen as more neutral sources. They do not have strong authorial voices influenced by a particular outlook. However, narrative sources can paint vivid portraits which can, at the very least, demonstrate how authors viewed a person, or how authors wanted that person to be viewed by others. As has been discussed in the introduction, piety is both hard to define and to trace. Nevertheless,

[45] L. Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), pp. 18-19.
[46] M. Penman, *Robert the Bruce: King of the Scots* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2014), pp. 7-8.
[47] Ibid, p. 9.
[48] Ibid, p. 8.

we can compare contemporary rulers due to their shared acceptance of the importance of the Bible, and due to the transmission of the intellectual theological trends by their leading prelates.

I intend to compare the pious practices of Henry III with, primarily, John, Edward I, and Louis IX, but references will also be made to Blanche of Castile and Robert the Bruce. These comparisons are not exhaustive, the aim is to situate Henry's pious practices within the expectations of the day. Consequently, when aspects of Henry's piety are examined in the follower chapters, one has a baseline against which to compare his actions. To begin, an examination will be made of two main areas of pious practices that all rulers under examination shared: care of the poor, and saint veneration, including the patronage of sites their predecessors supported. Then, circumstances and influences specific to some of the rulers will be explored, with a final focus on the circumstances peculiar to Henry that may have shaped his pious actions and outlook.

The dynastic element of kingly piety was central. Kings were part of dynasties that were dead, alive, and yet to be. Their reigns, provided the dynasty endured, were one part of a broader narrative that they could contribute to, hopefully raising the dynasty's prestige and renown. They were expected to show respect for their predecessors and one way in which they could do that was by continuing some of their pious practices, including care for the poor. As Grant has argued, all rulers were expected to support the poor and sick.[49] All Christians were expected to care for the poor, but much more was expected of rulers due to their wealth and status.[50] This was necessary for salvation and seen as a work of mercy.[51] Christ was believed to be present in

[49] Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, p. 202.
[50] This philosophy is summed up in Luke 12: 48 'But he that knew not, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. And unto whomsoever much is given, of him much shall be required: and to whom they have committed much, of him they will demand the more.' Viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Luke+12&version=DRA (accessed 21/01/2022). See also Webster, *John and Religion*, p. 130.
[51] Webster, *John and Religion*, pp. 111 and 130.

the poor and as such they were regarded as one of the most efficacious groups to implore aid in the commemoration of the dead.[52]

One of the ways that rulers could support the poor was by giving alms. Sally Dixon-Smith has done the most detailed analysis of Henry III's almsgiving. Like Grant, she has stressed the importance of it to kings. Richard FitzNigel, in the preface of his *Dialogue of the Exchequer*, dedicated the work to Henry II and said that almsgiving was one of the key duties of a devout king during peacetime.[53] Dixon-Smith compared Henry's daily almsgiving to the poor with John, Edward, Louis, and the papacy. According to her evidence, each week Edward (depending on his finances) fed anywhere between 206 and 1,066 paupers.[54] Louis fed, on average, 840 paupers a week. Henry, by contrast, fed on average 3,500 paupers a week, outstripping even the papacy, who fed, on average, 875 paupers a week during the thirteenth century.[55] Dixon-Smith noted that the financial sources indicated that Henry was not able to feed as many paupers as he wished during times of crisis. However, even at worst, Henry still fed 100-150 paupers a day, similar to Louis's average.[56] Additionally, Henry fed thousands on most major liturgical feast days as well as the major Marian and papal feasts and his favourite English saints' days also received attention, including the feasts of Edmund, king and martyr, Becket, and Edward the Confessor.[57] Finally, Henry was most munificent in *pro anima* alms. For the soul of his sister, Isabella, Henry fed a phenomenal 102,000 paupers.[58] According to

[52] Ibid, p. 130 and S. Dixon-Smith, "Feeding the Poor to Commemorate the Dead: the *Pro Anima* Almsgiving of Henry III of England 1227-1272" (University College London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2003), pp. 2, 15.
[53] Dixon-Smith, "*Pro anima* Almsgiving", p. 78
[54] In the 1270s, Edward fed 206 paupers a week. In 1283-3, 296 paupers were fed per week. In the 1280s 1066 were fed per week. At the end of the 1290s, 666 were fed per week. See Dixon-Smith, "*Pro Anima* Almsgiving", p. 88.
[55] Dixon-Smith "*Pro Anima* Almsgiving", pp. 87-8.
[56] Ibid, pp. 89-90.
[57] Ibid, pp. 101-102.
[58] Ibid, p. 212.

Dixon-Smith, Henry's almsgiving was exceptional. This assessment has been supported by David Carpenter, Paul Webster, Charles Farris, and Katie Phillips.[59]

Rulers could also support the poor by patronising the sickest and most vulnerable among them. One such group were lepers. According to Webster, John seems to have continued a long-standing royal tradition of supporting leper communities.[60] Queen Matilda, first wife of Henry I, was a notable patron of lepers, allegedly inviting them into her chamber and washing their feet.[61] The Empress Matilda, Henry II's mother, supported the hospital of Mont-aux-Malades, outside Rouen, and numerous other leper communities. Henry the Young King also supported Mont-aux-Malades and other Rouen hospitals. Richard I granted £10 per annum in alms to the lepers of Les Andelys and John also protected Mont-aux-Malades and confirmed Richard's I's actions.[62] John also confirmed the leper house of St Stephen, Waterford, begun after 1185, to the town's poor.[63] Lepers were outcasts in society, and they produced feelings of horror. This can be seen clearly in accounts of Louis IX's interactions with them. According to Joinville, Louis' friend and courtier, Louis exclaimed that he would rather be leprous than commit a mortal sin.[64] Joinville was disgusted by this, proclaiming that he would rather have committed thirty mortal sins than be a leper. Louis chastised Joinville, saying 'there is no leprosy as ugly

---

[59] See D.A. Carpenter, 'The Meetings of Kings Henry III and Louis IX', in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England X: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 2003* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), 1-30, for the size of the feedings see pp. 7-8, 16; for the amount of money spent, see pp. 12, 19, 20. Carpenter has described Henry's almsgiving as one of the most 'striking' aspects of his piety. See D.A. Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power and Personal Rule 1207-1258'* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2020), p. 285. Webster said that Henry was 'rightly renowned' for his almsgiving (Webster, *John and Religion,* p. 110). Farris described Henry's feeding of the poor as 'perhaps the defining feature' of his personal piety (Farris, "Pious Practices of Edward I", p. 24). Phillips has described Henry's almsgiving as exceptional and extraordinary (Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation, 83).

[60] Webster, *John and Religion,* p. 100.

[61] Ibid, pp. 100-101.

[62] Ibid, p. 101.

[63] Ibid, p. 77.

[64] Le Goff, *Saint Louis,* pp. 332, 484.

as living in mortal sin.'[65] The fact that Joinville was willing to endanger his mortal soul to avoid leprosy demonstrates just how horrific a fate becoming a leper was. Furthermore, Louis's treatment of lepers made him worthy of sainthood. He did not shy away from touching them and feeding them, despite blood and pus from the leper getting on his hands. On Good Friday, on the way to Compiègne, Louis was barefoot and visiting the churches of the town. He came across a leper and kissed his hands. It was reported that the people around him were disgusted and crossed themselves.

A potential issue with the evidence Webster has used to suggest that John was a supporter of lepers is that when a king confirmed a charter, he could charge for it. This was potentially lucrative. Webster did not mention whether John charged recipients for the above charters. If he did charge the recipients, especially the poor of Waterford, the actions are not indicative of someone with a real desire to help the poor and sick.[66]

Henry was described similarly to Louis. Before departing for France in 1230 on the Brittany campaign, he chose to kiss lepers.[67] Katie Phillips has linked Henry's treatment of the poor and lepers with a Franciscan outlook.[68] She argued that Henry 'identified strongly' with mendicant values, causing him to favour the poor and sick.[69] This was similar to Louis, who Le Goff described as the 'king of the Mendicants'[70] and a 'friar king.'[71] Le Goff highlighted the

[65] Ibid, p. 332.
[66] To determine the sincerity of Henry's religious gift giving, I will examine when, if ever, he charged recipients for his gifts.
[67] M. Robson, 'A Franciscan Contribution to the *De Gestis Britonum* (1205-1279), and its continuation' in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 107 (2014), 265-314, at p. 296
[68] Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 82. Care for the poor and the sick was a fundamental aspect of Franciscan piety.
[69] Ibid, 79.
[70] Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, pp. 292, 561.
[71] Ibid, p. 82.

importance of the Mendicant philosophy on Louis' piety, stressing how he was surrounded by Mendicants and was especially attached to them.[72]

Louis may have inherited his attitude towards the poor from his mother, she also favoured the sick. She supported hospitals and had a strong attachment to poor women.[73] She frequently provided dowries for them or for poor widows' daughters.[74] Neither John nor Edward appear to have had strong preferences about the types of poor and sick individuals they patronised. Both appear to have cast a wide net in their support of the poor.[75] Edward did favour the friars but did not have the same level of regard for lepers as his father.[76] In the next chapters, trends in Henry's support of the sick and poor will be examined to ask whether that aspect of supporting the poor was as exceptional as his almsgiving or was comparable with the scale of other contemporary rulers.

The second area of overlap between the rulers under consideration was saint veneration. Veneration could be performed during a pilgrimage, either through personal visits by the king to saints' shrines, or via delegated individuals. The veneration of saints was, and still is, a fundamental component of Catholic faith and is integral to understanding the penitentiary system.[77] It was believed that powerful intercessors could save one's soul and intervene for departed souls.[78] For kings, such saints could aid their kingdoms, by interceding with God to

---

[72] Ibid, pp. 111, 254-255, 263, 367, 390, 483, 485, 612, 634, 641, and 691.
[73] Grant, *Blanche of Castile,* pp. 179, 207.
[74] Ibid, p. 205.
[75] For Edward, see Farris, "Pious Practices of Edward I", pp. 99, 249, 273. Farris viewed the breadth of Edward's piety as a positive thing, saying that by avoiding 'excessive' attention to one religious group, he avoided alienating anyone (Farris, "Pious Practices of Edward I", 249). For John, see Webster, *John and Religion,* pp. 120, 123, 129, 181, 193, 196. For Webster, John's piety was not exceptional, but he did adhere to the standards of the day (Webster, *John and Religion,* p. 193).
[76] For information about Edward's relationship with the friars see Farris "Pious Practices of Edward I", pp. 48, 212-238.
[77] P. Brown, *The Cult of Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (London: SCM Press, 1981), p. 1.
[78] See Le Goff, *Birth of Purgatory,* pp. 84, 85, 209 and 213.

accomplish the goal they were trying to achieve.[79] All the rulers under examination venerated a mixture of saints. Some saints, like the Virgin Mary, were worshipped by all and had appeal outside their individual kingdom, other saints had more local appeal.

The Virgin Mary was the chief intercessor of all saints. She was therefore the most appropriate saint to appeal to for any earthly aim one was trying to achieve. Vincent has stressed the importance of Mary to the Angevins and Capetians, arguing that their veneration of her went exceeded contemporary expectations.[80] He argued that both Louis and Henry had a lifelong devotion to Mary and that she formed part of a trinity of saints that included Christ, Mary, and their favourite native saint (St Denis for Louis and Edward the Confessor for Henry).[81] However, as Vincent himself pointed out, in the thirteenth century Mary was beginning to have a status akin to a 'fourth member of the Trinity.'[82] Her centrality to Christianity meant that she naturally would have been extensively venerated. For a ruler not to have shown immense devotion to the Virgin would have been very conspicuous. This would have been especially true when queens were pregnant, as was the case for Robert the Bruce when his wife Elizabeth was pregnant.[83]

One way in which devotion could be shown to Mary was by patronising the Cistercian order. As all Cistercian abbeys were dedicated to her, their communities were inextricably linked with the Virgin.[84] Louis, Henry, John, Edward, Blanche of Castile, and Robert the Bruce all patronised the Cistercians, but the scale of their devotion was different. John founded Beaulieu. In John's foundation charter of January 1205, John was referred to as a *confrater* of

[79] Webster, *John and Religion*, p. 37.
[80] Ibid, pp. 127, 145, 146.
[81] Ibid, p. 146.
[82] Ibid, p. 142.
[83] See, for example, Penman, *Robert the Bruce*, pp. 232-3, 247.
[84] Webster, *John and Religion*, p. 50.

the white monks, meaning that he has a 'bond of association' with the order.[85] This was unusual. Similarly, Robert the Bruce built a new chapel dedicated to Mary for the Carmelite Order in Banff.[86]

Louis founded Royaumont Abbey. Le Goff has argued that Louis was happiest amid nature with Cistercians at Royaumont and that he was equally devoted to the Cistercians and Mendicants.[87] Much of Louis's love for Cistercians came from his parents. Royaumont was founded using money Louis' father had left to found a Cistercian monastery.[88] Blanche of Castile was also a munificent patron of the Cistercians.[89] Her devotion to the Virgin was influenced by both sides of her family. Mary was the *tutrix et patrona* of Castile. Her father fought beneath a standard with Mary on it.[90] The Angevins had a long history with the Cistercian order. The Empress Matilda, Henry II, Richard I, and John all founded at least one male Cistercian house.[91] Additionally, Blanche's parents, Eleanor of England and Alfonso VIII of Castile, founded Las Huegos, a Cistercian nunnery.[92] Blanche emulated her parents by founding two Cistercian nunneries, Maubuisson or the abbey of Mary, Queen of Heaven, and Le Lys, the lily, a double reference to the flower associated with the Virgin and the arms of France.[93] She also contributed generously to three Cistercian nunneries that she did not found, Le Parc near Crèpy-en-Valois, La Joie-lès-Nemour, and Le Trésor in Eastern Normandy.[94] Additionally, she was surrounded by people who patronised Cistercian nunneries.[95] Finally, on

[85] Ibid, p. 65.
[86] Penman, *Robert the Bruce,* p. 247.
[87] Le Goff, *Saint Louis,* p. 610.
[88] Ibid, pp. 77-8.
[89] Grant, *Blanche of Castile,* pp. 15, 206
[90] Ibid, p. 220.
[91] Ibid, p. 215.
[92] Ibid, p. 215.
[93] Grant, *Blanche of Castile,* p. 121.
[94] Ibid, p. 206.
[95] Ibid, p. 215.

her death bed, she became a Cistercian nun and was dressed in their habit and buried at Maubuisson.[96]

Patronage of the Cistercians was widespread amongst rulers, and typical of the elite more generally.[97] Edward and Henry are less typical in that they did not support the Cistercians to the same extent as their predecessors and contemporaries. Edward, in the winter of 1263-4, during a dangerous sea crossing, promised the Virgin to found a Cistercian abbey should she protect him. On 13 August 1277 (two days before the Assumption of the Virgin), Edward laid the foundation stone of Vale Royal abbey. However, Vale Royal was never completed because the revenues that had been assigned to it were diverted to Edward's various military campaigns. In 1290, Edward ordered that all payments to the abbot of Vale Royal were to cease.[98] For Farris, Edward did this because he believed the needs of the kingdom outweighed the desire to build the abbey.[99]

Like his son, Henry seems to have prioritised other projects over the foundation of a Cistercian abbey. As Phillips has argued, the money Henry spent on Westminster Abbey may have prevented him from founding a Cistercian abbey.[100] She suggests that Henry preferred supporting other groups, such as the poor, who could offer immediate and consistent spiritual support in their prayers for him.[101] Nevertheless, Henry did support Cistercian foundations including Beaulieu, Netley, and Fontevrault. As has been stated, Beaulieu was John's foundation, but Henry completed it. Netley was a daughter house of Beaulieu colonised by Beaulieu monks as soon as it was founded. Peter des Roches originally bought the land that

[96] Ibid, p. 144.
[97] Ibid, p. 15 and Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 90.
[98] Farris, "Pious Practices of Edward I", p. 242.
[99] Ibid, p. 244.
[100] Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 89.
[101] Ibid, 90-91.

Netley would be built on, apparently with the intention of founding a monastery, but he died in 1238 before the project could be completed. Henry then took over the project and was often referred to as its founder.[102] Phillips has suggested that because the gifts for Netley, in its early years, came out of the vacant bishopric of Winchester rather than Henry's own resources, that Henry's connection to Netley was not that important.[103] As shall be examined below, that suggestion might not be entirely accurate. The consistency and scale of support will be explored. Additionally, just because Henry used the bishopric's funds rather than his own, that does not mean that he was insincere in his patronage, he was just saving money.

Patronage of the Cistercians was only one way of showing devotion to Mary. Other ways included making pilgrimages to her pilgrimage sites, celebrating her feast days, and making gifts at her shrines. Webster, using the surviving household rolls, has examined where John was on the leading Marian feast days, and shown that they were celebrated at court.[104] On the feast of the Purification in 1213, John paid off a gambling debt, atoning for a transgression and asking for forgiveness.[105] Robert the Bruce venerated Mary on pilgrimages and appealed to her particularly when his wife was pregnant.[106] Louis made regular pilgrimages to Marian shrines and listened to the hours of the Virgin Mary every day.[107] Edward also appears to have frequently venerated Mary. More oblation rolls and other documents survive that recorded gifts made to saints on behalf of Edward rather than Henry, and so a more accurate picture of

---

[102] 'Houses of Cistercian monks: Abbey of Netley,' in *A History of the County of Hampshire: Volume 2*, ed. H Arthur Doubleday and William Page (London: Victoria County History, 1903), 146-149. *British History Online,* viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/hants/vol2/pp146-149 (accessed 09/05/2016).
[103] Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 90.
[104] P. Webster, 'Making Space For King John To Pray: The Evidence Of The Royal Itinerary', in A.L. Gasgoinge, L.V. Hicks and M. O'Doherty (ed), *Journeying Along Medieval Routes in Europe and the Middle East,* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016), 259-286, at pp. 265-9, especially pp. 265-6 and Webster, *John and Religion,* pp. 51-2. For further comments on John's Marian devotion, see N.C. Vincent, 'King Henry III and the Blessed Virgin Mary', in R.N. Swanson (ed.) *Studies in Church History* 39 (2004), 126-146, at pp. 128, 131-2.
[105] Webster, *John and Religion,* p. 52.
[106] Penman, *Robert the Bruce,* p. 232-4.
[107] Ibid, p. 629.

Edward's Marian veneration can be drawn. Edward, either in person or by proxy, frequently offered gold clasps to Marian shrines or Marian images.[108] We have information about Edward's gifts of gold clasps for the following years: 1296/7, 1299/1300, 1300/1, a partial survival covering 1302, 1304/5 (also partial) and 1305/6. In 1296/7 18% of the gold clasp went to Marian sites and images, 10% in 1299/1300, 13% in 1300/01, 0% in 1302 (there are only two entries so this is likely to be an aberration), 9 % in 1304/5 (again, the partial survival may be keeping the percentage artificially low) and 26% in 1305/6. If one removes the figures for 1302 and 1304/5, the average percentage of clasps involved in Marian veneration is 17%,[109] demonstrating clear and consistent devotion to Mary. The extent of Henry's Marian devotion will be examined below, but suffice to say, he visited her shrines on many occasions, he invoked her aid at times of difficulty (such as when his wife was pregnant) and she was depicted in various artistic and architectural projects.[110]

Although Mary was the most important saint to have widespread appeal, other major saints did as well. For example, John venerated St Stephen. In 1199 and 1202, when he was in Caen, he went to William the Conqueror's foundation, L'Abbaye-aux-Hommes, which was dedicated to St Stephen (the foundation is also known as Abbaye de St Etienne), on St Stephen's feast (26 December).[111] He also venerated the relics and saints at Reading Abbey, many of which had been acquired by the dynasty. Eleanor of Aquitaine's father, William X of Aquitaine, gave the abbey a statue of the Christ Child and John's eldest brother, William, was born there. Reading was also the burial site of Henry I. Its most prized relic was the hand of St James the

[108] Gold clasps could be used for a variety of purposes, but they were often used to hold items of clothing together.
[109] For the figures on the gold clasps, see Farris, "Pious Practices of Edward I", pp. 195-200.
[110] See, for information about Henry's visits to Marian shrines, Vincent, 'Henry III and the Virgin Mary', pp. 133-4. For information about Henry invoking Mary's aid, see Vincent, 'Henry III and the Virgin Mary', pp. 135,141. For information about the Marian art and architecture Henry commissioned, see Vincent, 'Henry III and the Virgin Mary', pp. 135, 140.
[111] Webster, *John and Religion,* p. 52.

Great which had been brought to England by Empress Matilda when she returned from Germany in 1126, given to Reading in 1133 by Henry I. Henry II was devoted to the James the Great relic.[112] By the early 1190s John was issuing documents to Reading that called the abbey the 'church of St James.'[113] James was a saint associated with John's dynasty, because of Empress Matilda's gift, and he maintained an interest.

John also venerated the Apostle St Phillip, acquiring part of his head which had been brought to England following the sack of Constantinople. John likely granted the relic to Reading on the feast day of SS. Philip and James (1 May) in 1205. He also granted a four-day feast, attended by numerous bishops, beginning on the vigil of the feast of SS. Philip and James. Furthermore, he gave the abbey a gold reliquary decorated with precious stones to house the relics.[114]

By giving gifts to Reading, John raised the prestige of his dynasty. Reading, as the burial and birth sites of Angevins, and as a repository of relics obtained by members of the dynasty, had a status that needed to be maintained. There was familial obligation to maintain Reading and any increase in its prestige also increased John's. That is not to say that these gestures were not at least partially motivated by piety. Nor is it to say that a prestige motive undermines a pious motive, or that they cannot co-exist. It is just to say that motivations are important when assessing a ruler's piety and its nature and this thesis intends to suggest possible motives for Henry's actions.

[112] Ibid, pp. 52-3.
[113] Ibid, p. 54.
[114] Ibid, pp. 55-6.

Henry, Louis, Blanche, and Edward all venerated universal saints. All these rulers venerated St Francis. His companions sent Blanche and her husband Francis' pillow in 1228 and she made gifts to the Franciscan houses in Pontoise, Etampes, and Poitiers in 1242.[115] Edward was a consistent supporter of the Mendicants more generally, providing them with money for their buildings, general upkeep, and attendance at chapters. He also made gifts to individual friars and fed them to mark special occasions, displaying his respect for them and his belief in the efficacy of their prayers.[116] Louis and Henry's devotion to the friars, especially to the Franciscans, seems to have been more intense. According to Phillips, Henry absorbed the teaching of St Francis and that made him care particularly for the poor, sick, and lepers.[117] He had a Dominican confessor and was integral in establishing the friars in England with his extensive support for their new houses.[118] Louis' devotion to the friars has long been recognised. He was surrounded by them, had multiple Mendicant confessors who wrote hagiography about him, and his adoption of Mendicant ideals was much commented on.[119] For Grant, Louis and his sister Isabella's piety was demonstrative and focused on the 'Franciscan ideals of the poverty of Christ'.[120]

All rulers venerated the major saints from Christ's life. Farris used the household rolls from Edward's reign to trace which saints he venerated by feeding the poor on their feast days. In the roll from 1276/7 he was recorded as feeding large numbers of paupers on the feast days of John the Baptist, Mark the Evangelist, the Apostles, and Michael the Archangel.[121] Between

---

[115] Grant, *Blanche of Castile,* p. 208.
[116] Farris, "Pious Practices of Edward I", pp. 48, 212, and 231.
[117] Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 82
[118] See pp. 97-99.
[119] For information about who surrounded Louis and wrote hagiography on him, see Le Goff, *Saint Louis,* pp. 111, 162,255-265, 483, 612. For contemporary comments on Louis' relationship with the friars, see, for example, Le Goff, *Saint Louis,* pp. 82, 155, and 223.
[120] Grant, *Blanche of Castile,* p. 162.
[121] Farris, "Pious Practices of Edward I", pp. 125-6.

1296-1302, the days on which he fed 1000 or more paupers included the feast days of St Andrew, St Katherine of Alexandria, Nativity of John the Baptist, St Bartholomew, Michael the Archangel, St James the Great, SS. Simon and Jude, and Mary Magdalene.[122] What may be unique about Edward is the breadth of saints that he venerated and in the variation of his devotion to particular saints. Just as he appears to have never focused his attention on one religious house or foundation, it appears that he appealed to a broad variety of saints so that he could, in his mind, reap the maximum amount of benefit.[123]

John, Henry, Louis, Edward, Blanche, and Robert the Bruce all venerated saints local to their kingdoms. In the cases of John, Henry, and Edward, especially in the cases of Henry and Edward, their relationships with native saints were more extensive. All these kings held regard for Edward the Confessor, Edmund, king and martyr, and Becket.[124] John established a relationship with St Wulfstan during the Interdict and Henry was overwhelmingly devoted to the Confessor.[125] Edward was broader in his veneration of native saints. Using the evidence of the gold clasps that has been analysed above the percentage of the gold clasps offered to native saints in 1296/7 was 58%, 90% in 1299/1300, 74 % in 1300/01, 100% in 1302, 73% in 1304/5, and 63% in 1305/6. The average percentage (from these figures) of the gold clasps that went to

---

[122] Ibid, p. 140.
[123] Ibid, p. 273.
[124] Webster, *John and Religion,* pp. 37-40, 55, 140, 193, and 197; Farris, "Pious Practices of Edward I", pp. 126, 139-140, 174-5, 179, 187, 203, and 273-4, and A. Shacklock, 'Henry III and Native Saints', in A. Spencer and C. Watkins (ed), *Thirteenth Century England, XVII: Proceedings of the Cambridge Conference, 2017* (Woodbridge, 2021), 23-40, at pp. 27, 31, 33-6.
[125] For information about John's relationship with Wulfstan, see Webster, *John and Religion,* p. 45 and P. Draper, 'King John and St Wulfstan', *Journal of Medieval History* 10 (1984), 41-5. For a discussions about Henry's devotion to the Confessor, see P. Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400* (New Haven and London, 1995), pp. 3, 49-50, 52, 80, 83, 84 and 89; P. Binski, *The Painted Chamber at Westminster* (London, 1986), pp. 6, 13-14, 35, and 38-40; D.A. Carpenter, 'King Henry III and Saint Edward the Confessor: The Origins of the Cult', *English Historical Review* 122 (2007), 865-891, at 870, 872, 877-8, 879, and 881; D.A. Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power*, pp. 165, 183, 254, 272, 273, and 323; Dixon-Smith, "*Pro Anima* Almsgiving", pp. 91, 201-2, and 252; S. Dixon-Smith, 'The Image and Reality of Alms-Giving in the Great Halls of Henry III The Reginald Taylor and Lord Fletcher Prize Essay', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 152, 79-96, at 84.

native saints is 76%. Even if one excludes 1302 and 1304/5, the figure is 72%.[126] Native saints, therefore, received most of Edward's offerings of gold clasps, demonstrating their importance to him. The native recipients of Edward's gold clasps, who were venerated in at least three of the years under examination were: Edmund (king and martyr), Edward (king and martyr), Alban, Richard of Chichester, Augustine of Canterbury, John of Beverley, William of York, Cuthbert, Becket, Kenelm, Hugh of Lincoln, Margaret of Scotland, St Wilfred, Etheldreda, and Wulfstan.[127] The prominence of northern saints, including William of York and Cuthbert, can largely be explained by Edward's itinerary (he was travelling up to Scotland), but he still chose to venerate them, Edward was not obligated to venerate saints in his immediate vicinity. His veneration of them demonstrates that he believed in native saints' efficacy cast a wide net for blessings.

By contrast, Louis seems to have not favoured as many native saints as his English counterparts. Le Goff referred to the 'grand trilogy' that Louis worshipped: the Virgin Mary, Christ, and St Denis.[128] St Denis was the first bishop of Paris who had been martyred in the third century. Due to the confusion of the Abbot Hilduin, abbot of St Denis in the ninth century, St Denis was combined with Denys the Areopagite, the Athenian that was converted by St Paul.[129] This added prestige to St Denis' *Vita*. The abbey of St Denis became the necropolis of the Capetian dynasty along with the 'site of royal memory'.[130] Louis may not have venerated many local saints, but St Denis was an important and prestigious saint who played a significant role in Louis' understanding of his dynasty.

---

[126] For the figures on the gold clasps, see: Farris, "Pious Practices of Edward I", pp. 195-200. I have calculated the percentages.
[127] The other native saints venerated were St Edith, St Mildred, St Swithun, Edmund of Abingdon, St Martin, St Andrew.
[128] Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, p. 434
[129] Ibid, p. 266.
[130] Ibid, p. 267.

Much of Louis' attachment to saints with universal appeal seems to have been influenced by his mother. At the 1239 ceremony for the Crown of Thorns (a holy relic Louis had obtained), Blanche's advisor, Walter Cornut, archbishop of Sens, wrote an account of the acquisition of the relic which stressed Blanche's role. Louis built Sainte-Chapelle to house the Crown of Thorns and decorated with images of Louis' family, including Blanche receiving and venerating the relic.[131] Louis also created three annual services for the relic. Louis, like Blanche, especially favoured the relics of Christ.[132] Louis also venerated St Michael the Archangel along with St Maurice.[133] St Maurice was the legendary Egyptian leader of the Roman Theban division who refused emperor Maximillian's order to harass local Christians. When Louis acquired the relics of St Maurice, he built a church in Senlis to house them.[134] Louis prized the relics of universal saints as did Blanche.

However, Blanche did not just venerate universal saints. This can be seen in the naming of her children.[135] One way in which rulers could venerate saints was by naming their children after them. Blanche and Louis VIII named one son Stephen (b. 1225). This name had not been previously used in the Capetian, Angevin or Hispanic families. Grant has suggested that the choice may have been made because one of the godparents was Stephen of Sancerre.[136] He may also have been named for St Stephen the Deacon. He was a commonplace dedicatee of French cathedrals and was viewed in a similar manner to St Denis who had a 'special protective role for France.'[137]

---

[131] Grant, *Blanche of Castile,* pp. 116-117.
[132] Le Goff, p. 636,
[133] Ibid, p. 433.
[134] Ibid, p. 636.
[135] Henry's naming practices will be examined in chapter two.
[136] Grant, *Blanche of Castile,* p.154
[137] Ibid, p. 154.

It is possible that Stephen was named for both his godfather and St Stephen the Deacon. It is also possible that he was named for St Stephen, the protomartyr. Names could refer to several saints and such names may have been chosen because of their multiple meanings. The ambiguity of names raises an important point: saints cannot be always neatly categorised as 'universal' or 'native.' We can talk about saints having a more limited local appeal, with different connotations than saints that appealed to various kingdoms. However, even 'universal' saints were viewed and interpreted differently in different countries. The ambiguity between 'native' and 'universal' can be seen in the cults of Thomas Becket and Edmund of Abingdon. Since the reign of Louis VII, the Capetians developed a relationship with Becket. Louis VII allowed Becket to stay in France while he was in exile. Once Becket was murdered, as Grant has argued, Louis saw an opportunity to capitalise on the 'political embarrassment' of the Angevins. This is not to undermine Louis' belief in the efficacy of Becket. When his son, Philip Augustus felt ill in 1179, he went on pilgrimage to Canterbury to pray for Philip's recovery at Becket's tomb. By saving his heir, Becket effectively saved the Capetian dynasty. Blanche, with her Angevin heritage, also venerated Becket. Although she and her husband could not attend Becket's translation in 1220, they founded an altar to him in Notre Dame for their oldest son, also called Philip. Blanche's veneration of Becket did not end there. In 1232, Canterbury Cathedral agreed to offer masses for Blanche and her deceased husband as if they were archbishops.[138] Blanche also admired Edmund of Abingdon and asked him to bless her sons. She wanted him to stay at the French court, but he declined her offer.[139] Louis inherited this respect for the archbishops of Canterbury and was present at Edmund's translation at Pontigny in 1247.

[138] Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, pp. 220-1.
[139] Ibid, p. 222.

Despite numerous similarities, there were variations in the pious practices of all the above. As their reigns progressed, they had time to develop their personal religiosity. Edward and John differed from their fathers, but their pious practices were not notably different from most European kings except regarding aspects that pertained to their kingdoms, circumstances, and personalities.[140] Henry and Louis were more unusual, given the combination of circumstances they faced. Both came to the throne as minors (nine and twelve respectively) and were therefore open to the influence of their regents and those who surrounded them. Those who surrounded Henry as a minor included William Marshal, Peter des Roches, Hubert de Burgh, and the legates Guala and Pandulf.[141] Those who surrounded Louis included his mother and those religious figures who surrounded her (including reformists like Simon Langton, Stephen Langton's brother and the legate Romanus), and his tutor Amaury of Bène.[142]

Blanche's influence over Louis has been termed 'profound.'[143] She was the regent of France for eight years until Louis obtained his majority in 1234. Even during Louis' personal reign, she remained influential. Louis clearly trusted his mother, as can be seen by his decision to leave her in charge of the kingdom when he left on crusade in 1248.[144] The evidence we have

---

[140] Even the most recent work on John and Edward's piety (see Webster, *John and Religion* and Farris," Pious Practices of Edward I"), which was reacting to the negative historiography on their respective kings' piety and hoping to rehabilitate them, do not contend that their pious practices were particularly notable. No one has ever tried to suggest that Henry practices, overall, were outdone by either his father or his son. See Webster, *John and Religion*, pp. 1, 7, 13-14, 109, 110, 114-5, 131, 172 and Farris, "Pious Practices", pp. 16, 24, 27, 238, 241, 244, 248, 273

[141] For examinations about the relationship between Henry and the legates Guala and Pandulf, see Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power*, pp. 8-9. For the relationship between Henry and Hubert de Burgh, see Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power*, pp. 58, 59, 81-2, 112, and 122. For his relationship with William Marshal, see Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power*, pp. 1, 9, 10, and 14. For his relationship with Peter des Roches, see Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power*, pp. 6, 9. 20, and 160-1, and Vincent, *Peter des Roches: An alien in English Politics, 1205-1238* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 9-10, 13, 149, 155-6, 293, 331, and 454.

[142] Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, pp. 48, 94, and 96.

[143] Ibid, p. 1.

[144] Ibid, pp. 1-2.

examined so far attests to the influence Blanche had on Louis' piety. This was not the case for Henry. His father died when he was nine and in 1218 his mother, Isabella of Angoulême, had decided to return home.[145] Carpenter and Vincent have painted Isabella as an absentee mother.[146] Carpenter has used her departure to France to argue that 'she felt no deep bond with her children'.[147] He has looked at the letter that Henry sent his mother when he accepted her decision to leave saying he found her sad and distasteful.[148] Given Henry's age, this letter was likely more of a creation by the minority council and may reflect their thinking rather than Henry's, but Carpenter believes that this sentiment 'at least shows the bond which was supposed to exist between a mother and her children.'[149] Carpenter further argued that what he sees as Isabella's abandonment of her children might have resulted in Henry's life-long devotion to his wife and children.[150]

The major problem with both Vincent and Carpenter's assessments of Henry's relationship with his mother is the value-laden criticism of it. From a modern perspective, Isabella's actions seem cruel and non-maternal. However, she and Henry wrote to one another, and he felt enough of a connection to her to be get involved in Poitevin affairs in 1242, to welcome his half-siblings to court, and to travel to Fontevrault to translate her body.[151] Additionally, Isabella often framed her actions for the good of Henry's realm. She justified her marriage to Hugh X de Lusignan by saying that it prevented Hugh making a French marriage,

---

[145] Carpenter, *Henry III and the Rise to Power,* p. 153.
[146] Ibid, pp. 2, 14 and Vincent, 'Henry III and the Virgin Mary', p. 144.
[147] Carpenter, *Henry III and the Rise to Power,* p. 2.
[148] Ibid, p. 14.
[149] Ibid, p. 14
[150] Ibid, p. 56.
[151] For a recent account of the Poitevin campaign of 1242-3, see Carpenter, *Henry III and the Rise to Power,* pp. 255-64, especially pp. 256-7, and 262 for Isabella's role. For the arrival of his half-siblings in England, see Carpenter, *Henry III and the Rise to Power,* pp. 467-74. For the translation of Isabella's body, see Carpenter, *Henry III and the Rise to Power,* pp. 601-2.

which would have threatened Henry's lands in Poitou and Gascony.[152] Ultimately, we cannot know how much Isabella loved her children or not, but we must be careful not to judge her actions by modern standards. It is possible that she thought the best way she could protect her children was by aggressively fighting for her (and therefore their) rights in Poitou. It must be conceded, however, that Isabella never returned to England. Her lack of physical presence undoubtedly limited the influence she could have had over Henry's pious practices, in stark contrast with Blanche of Castile.

The ecclesiastical figures that surrounded Louis and Henry undoubtedly influenced their pious outlooks. For Henry, the influence of his guardian, Peter des Roches, the bishop of Winchester, must not be overlooked.[153] The influence that such figures had over the pious development of Louis and Henry was extensive because these important figures of their minorities had been exposed to the ideals of one of the papacy's greatest councils, Lateran IV (1215). Lateran IV had an enduring impact on Latin Christendom.[154] It clarified points of doctrine and, due to its focus on confession and the penitential system more generally, the nature of religious observance began to change. There was a greater focus on the interior nature of religion. The council prescribed confession at least once a year for the laity.[155] One's acts were still important, but there was a new focus on introspection, as confession calls for an

---

[152] D.A. Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III* (London: Methuen London, 1990), p. 193. For accounts of Isabella's defence of her lands, see Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III*, pp. 155, 167, and 267. For the defence of her dower, see Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III*, pp. 193, 200, 221, 267, 280, 345, 349, and 358.
[153] For Henry's relationship with Peter des Roches, and Peter's influence over him, see Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power*, pp. 6, 9. 20, and 160-1, and Vincent, *Peter des Roches*, pp. 9-10, 13, 149, 155-6, 293, 331, and 454.
[154] See A. García y Garcia, 'The Fourth Lateran Council and the Canonists' in K. Pennington and W. Hartmann (ed), *The History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140-1234: From Oration to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX (History of Medieval Canon Law)*, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2008), 367-378, at p. 367 and K. Pennington, 'The Fourth Lateran Council, its Legislation and Development of Legal Procedure', in G. Melville and J. Helmrath, *The Fourth Lateran Council: institutional Reform and Spiritual Renewal: Proceedings of the Conference Marking the Eight Hundred Anniversary of the Council Organized by the Pontifiao Comitato di Scienze Storiche (Rome, 15-17 October 2015)*, (Rome: Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Facultad de Derecho, Escuela de Derecho, 2015), p. 3.
[155] N.P. Tanner (ed), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Volume One: Nicaea I to Lateran V*, (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1990), p. 245.

examination of one's conscience. There was also a strong pastoral theme that ran through the council and the newly founded friars (Dominicans and Franciscans) became the tools of papal promulgation.[156] The friars became very popular all the way down the social scale and were leading figures in European royal courts.[157] Henry and Louis' courts were no exceptions to this, with Henry having a Dominican confessor, John of Darlington, and Louis having multiple mendicant confessors (Geoffrey of Beaulieu and Guillaume de Chartres).[158] All these men served their kings in multiple ways, politically and spiritually.[159]

The absorption of Lateran ideals made the pious practices of Louis and Henry different from their fathers.[160] The role of penance in salvation made them more conscious of the need for their sins, and those of their subjects, to be forgiven with the aid of powerful intercessors and the prayers of the most efficacious groups (like paupers and friars). It also raised the importance of confession. Louis kept both a day and night confessor lest he suddenly felt the

---

[156] It was mainly the policy of Honorius III that made the Mendicants the preferred papal tool in promulgating its ideals. See J.M. Powell, 'The Papacy and the Early Franciscans', *Franciscans Studies* 36 (1976), 248-262, but especially 256, 260-262. Canon 10 mandated that if the bishops were unable to promulgate the decrees, they need to find suitable men to do it. Those men were often Mendicants. See Powell, 'Papacy and early Franciscans' p. 256.

[157] Just some of the mendicant figures that served Louis and his family include Eudes Rigaud (archbishop of Rouen), Geoffrey de Beaulieu (confessor), Guilaume de Chartres (Louis' chaplain on his first crusade) and Guillaume de Saint-Pathus (Margaret of Provence's confessor). For the details, see: Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, pp. 29, 162 and 268.

[158] For more information about Louis's confessors, see Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, pp. 257-59. Louis' wife, Margaret, had a Franciscan confessor, Guillaume de Saint-Pathus, who wrote one of Louis' hagiography. Louis was, therefore, surrounded by mendicants. For more information about Guillaume de Saint-Pathus, see: Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, pp. 260-4. Henry's household was filled with mendicants as well. Both Henry and Eleanor had close relationship with other mendicants, namely Adam Marsh. For information about Adam and his relationship with the royal family, see: C.H. Lawrence, (ed. and trans.) *The Letters of Adam Marsh*, 2 Volumes, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), vol. 1, pp. xxxviii-xxxiv, vix, and C.H. Lawrence, 'Marsh, Adam (c.1200-1259)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) viewed online at http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/95 (accessed 12/12/14). For information about Eleanor of Provence's relationship with mendicants, see: M. Howell, *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth Century England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), pp. 92-5.

[159] For details on John of Darlington's career, see C.H. Lawrence, 'Darlington, John of (d.1284)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004) viewed online at http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7159 (accessed 18/01/2021)

[160] The English bishops enthusiastically disseminated the Lateran IV. See Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community*, p. 101.

urge to confess.[161] There is no evidence that can reveal how often Henry confessed, and how seriously he examined his conscience, but, as Carpenter pointed out in his article examining the meetings of Henry III and Louis IX, it seems likely that confession was important to Henry because he had a Dominican confessor, who would have encouraged Henry to examine his conscience.[162] This all suggests that Henry and Louis had a similar outlook when it came to their pious practices.

A final factor to analyse before examining the circumstances unique to Henry is that both he and Louis came to the throne at a time of instability. As Le Goff has noted, when a minor came to the throne, people were, at the very least, worried. For many, a minority was a 'trial to be endured'.[163] Blanche had to contend with hostility from powerful lords with large fiefdoms and the threat of Henry III possibly taking the opportunity to regain his continental possessions. Blanche also had to address the danger men like Hugh de Lusignan posed. Finally, she had to defend the rights of the Crown against the Church.[164] In sum, Louis' minority presented several challenges.

Henry's challenges, at least to begin with, were even bleaker. Henry's regents had to contend with a civil war and an invading force. Part of the reason why Henry's minority council was successful in saving Henry's crown was because of papal involvement, as John's reconciliation with Rome had involved becoming a papal vassal. When John died, Henry became the pope's ward. Pandulf, the papal legate, played an integral role in his coronation and ending the civil war. Henry never forgot his debt to Rome, and it came to his aid on numerous

---

[161] Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, p. 625.
[162] Carpenter, 'Meetings of Henry III and Louis IX', p. 27.
[163] Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, p. 49.
[164] Ibid, pp. 59, 62, and Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, pp. 80, 81, 85, 86, and 90. See also C. Hillen, 'The Minority Governments of Henry III, Henry (VII) and Louis IX compared' in B.K.U. Weiler et al. (ed), *Thirteenth Century XI: Proceedings of the Gregynog Conference, 2005* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), 46-60, at p. 59.

occasions of crisis, most importantly during the period of baronial revolt and rebellion.[165] Henry's relationship with Rome was closer and more complicated than any other ruler under examination here. Louis was certainly seen as devout; he went on crusade twice and was referred to as the most Christian king, but he would resist papal requests when he felt his rights being threatened. Louis deferred to the pope in spiritual matters, but when it came to secular or political matters, he was more circumspect.[166] For example, he stayed aloof in the papacy's war against Frederick II. He followed a policy that le Goff has phrased as 'maintaining a balance of power.'[167] That is not to say that Henry never had periods of tension with the papacy; the Sicilian Affair, for example, played a key role in the outbreak of baronial rebellion in 1258.

## Conclusion

For contemporary rulers in Latin Christendom, there was a fair degree of overlap in pious practices and outlook. This was partly because the basis of their power was biblical. Kings were ambiguous to negative figures in the Bible and there was a strong tradition of clerics expecting to admonish kings just as their biblical predecessors had. Theologians wanting to understand the nature of kingly power wrote commentaries on pertinent passages of the Bible. Due to the complicated picture presented of kings in the Bible, commentators did not always agree. Sometimes a portrait of limited monarchy dominated, sometimes it did not. However, the core messages about kingship did filter down to courts through powerful prelates. This meant that there were certain expectations of kings, namely for them to rely on their prelates for advice, especially in moral and spiritual matters.

---

[165] C. H. Lawrence, 'The Thirteenth Century', in C.H. Lawrence, *The English Church and the Papacy in the Middle Ages*, (London: Burns & Oates, 1265), 117-156, at p. 131 and Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power*, p. 56.
[166] Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, p. 114.
[167] Ibid, p. 118.

In Henry's case, the influence of Stephen Langton must be recognised. He had a view of limited monarchy, and he was integral in shaping what would become the fixed text of Magna Carta. Fundamentally, he connected excommunication with the Charters. To transgress Magna Carta became a clear sin, endangering the very soul of those who did so. This would undoubtedly have influenced Henry and would have shaped how he connected ruling with piety.

The comparisons drawn mainly between John, Edward, Henry, and Louis have demonstrated that certain things were expected from all kings, in particular their protection of the poor and their engagement in the cult of saints. Many of their actions were influenced by the dynasty they came from, and it was incumbent upon rulers to uphold prestigious family traditions. They often visited the same pilgrimage sites and continued to patronise dynastic foundations. This can be seen in the Angevin patronage of Fontevrault, and the Capetian patronage of the Cistercians. Rulers often named their children after saints and/ or after members of the family they wished to honour. Names had significance and they often had ambiguity. This can be seen from Blanche calling her son Stephen. The name could have referred to one of his godparents (Stephen of Sancerre), St Stephen the Deacon, or St Stephen the protomartyr.

Kings did not have to slavishly follow what had gone before them. They could choose to emphasise different saints, they could found new foundations, and the circumstances of their reign could shape the pious choices they made. Louis and Henry both came to the throne as minors, had tumultuous minorities, and grew up in the shadow of Lateran IV. This shaped their outlook generally and had consequences for their piety. On top of this, Henry had the melting

pot of Magna Carta and his position as a papal ward to contend with. Henry was exposed to a peculiar set of circumstances and did not have the physical presence of either of his parents since was eleven years old. To suggest that Isabella of Angoulême had no influence over her son's piety seems extreme, but she was certainly not present at a very formative age for Henry, and he could not imitate her pious practices on a day-to-day level. Nevertheless, one must be careful not to be distracted from the extravagant aspects of Henry's piety including his prolific almsgiving and his relationship with Edward the Confessor. Much of Henry's piety was like his contemporaries and he may well have owed more to his dynastic inheritance and to the pious trends in Latin Christendom more generally than has perhaps been appreciated.

# Chapter Two: The Foundations of Henry's Piety

## Routine Piety

As chapter one has demonstrated, dynastic expectations and traditions played a crucial role in shaping kingly piety. Much of it was inherited and routine, not requiring much planning. Nevertheless, these practices were the foundation of all other pious acts. To contextualise Henry's thought-out pious practices, one needs to establish what his routine pious practices were and the trends in his patronage. Once that has been established, one can examine case studies where actions may have been governed by specific events such as during periods of instability with Scotland and Wales. Can one see continuity in Henry's actions? Or were his actions constrained or influenced by the crises he experienced in his reign?

Before analysing Henry's pious acts of patronage, one needs to define what is meant by 'pious patronage'. As Katie Phillips has argued, patronage of religious recipients can refer to various acts including support of foundations, gifts (material or financial), and letters of protection for representatives of orders as they left their homes.[1] Phillips has also argued that spiritual aspects of patronage often cannot be disentangled from other motivations such as power, hence why one can suggest motivations other than the spiritual in Henry's pious patronage.[2]

The first part of this chapter looks at Henry's relationship throughout his reign with different religious groups including bishops, monasteries, friars, and hospitals. The gifts given

[1] K. Phillips, "The Leper and the King: The Patronage and Perception of Lepers and Leprosy by King Henry III of England and King Louis IX of France", (University of Reading, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2018), p. 146.
[2] Ibid, p. 151.

to them will be analysed by religious group and shall explore the nature of the gifts, the frequency and size of the gifts (in terms of monetary value), the timing of the gifts, and whether the recipients were charged for their gifts. What those gifts reveal about Henry and his outlook will be examined. The trends in Henry's pious patronage over time will be examined. Phillips has argued that although there was some continuity in Henry's 'public religiosity', his practices changed as the makeup of his court changed because it shifted his attention to different people and institutions who he was 'obliged to bestow favours for political pragmatism, rather than according to his own spiritual beliefs'.[3] This section will ask whether that is the case when examining Henry's routine piety.

Although letters of protection were acts of pious patronage, I will not be including them in my analysis. Letters of protection cannot easily be analysed in financial terms. The frequency of grants of protection to recipients does indicate favour, but the impact of them on recipients is harder to quantify than, for example, the granting of building materials for the construction of buildings. I will divide the types of gifts Henry granted religious recipients into fourteen categories: fairs and markets; liberties such as free warren[4]; exemptions and pardons; wood (used for various purposes including fuel); land; buildings; deer; other animals (such as horses and pigs); clothing (non-ecclesiastical clothing such as cloth for tunics); food (including fish and wheat); money (small grants); wine; ecclesiastical paraphernalia (including wax, vestments, and eucharist cups); and 'other' which will consist of gifts that do not fit into the previous thirteen categories. Of these categories, I will classify the fairs and markets, land, buildings, and liberties as gifts of high financial value. All the other categories consist of gifts that had little financial value and needed to be granted again and again.

[3] Ibid, pp. 10-11.
[4] Free warren allowed the recipient to hunt in the lands in question.

The chapter will proceed to examine some case studies. First, Henry's actions regarding Westminster Abbey, including his use of Westminster as a stage for important rituals will be examined. Then Henry's pious acts during or after times of crisis (domestic and international), will be examined to ask whether Henry's acts changed in response to external pressures.

To ascertain Henry's routine practices, I will analyse the years where Henry experienced no crises (in England) and was in the country. That analysis will start in 1227 (when Henry's minority ended) and end in 1272 (his death). The years that will be excluded are: 1230, 1233-4 1238, 1242-4, 1253-54, and 1258-68. In 1230, 1242-3, and 1253-4, Henry was in France on campaign. In the years 1233-4, 1238, 1244, and 1258-68, Henry experienced domestics crises and rebellions including the Marshal rebellion, Richard of Cornwall's rebellion, and the period of baronial revolt and rebellion.[5] Consequently, Henry's patronage may have been more heavily influenced by factors out of his control and was reactive.

To give an overview of Henry's pious practices, I shall examine his patronage of both wealthy and powerful religious recipients such as bishops and vulnerable groups like friars and lepers. Poor recipients relied on regular charity to function and had little, if any, political sway. By contrast, bishops had great influence on subjects, both spiritually and politically. They

[5] I have used a similar methodology to the one Julie Kanter used to justify the years of Henry's reign where she analysed his itinerary. When looking at the period of Henry's personal rule, she examined the years 1234-1241 and 1244-1252, inclusive. She omitted 1242 and 1243 due to the Poitevin campaign and stopped her analysis in 1252 due to Henry's campaign in Gascony (1253-4). She justified not looking at the rest of the reign due to the impact of the political crises that dominated most of the rest of Henry's reign (See J.E. Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship: The Itineraries of the Thirteenth-Century English Kings" (King's College London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2011), p. 70). I have also excluded 1244 due to the impact of the Paper Constitution (another political crisis). I have included 1255, 1256, and 1257 as this was before the start of the baronial rebellion and it is likely that Henry's pious patronage was not being severely impacted. Finally, I have looked at the years 1269-1272 because the kingdom had been pacified.

controlled vast lands and could act as peacemakers between the king and his subjects.[6] Their political influence can be seen in the aftermath of the battle of Evesham where it proved difficult to quell rebellion in the lands of the Montfortian bishop. Their lands encompassed most of the midlands and the south of England and their suspension deprived the rebels of their natural mediators.[7]

Similarly to bishops, monastic houses could control significant land. Patronage of monastic houses could have political importance as it could help a monarch extend their influence into lands where their authority was less secure. Louis VIII, in his patronage of monasteries in the Languedoc area, extended his influence in lands where the Cathars held sway.[8] Monastic patronage could be done for several reasons including financial, spiritual, and political ones. By examining which monastic houses Henry patronised, and why, one can gain an insight into his broader ambitions, spiritual and temporal.

It will be instructive to compare Henry's treatment of the rich and powerful religious figures with that of the vulnerable. Phillips has argued that Henry focused his patronage on friars, lepers and the poor because the prevailing trends in thirteenth-century spirituality embodied the ideals of the mendicant orders.[9] Care for the poor, sick, and needy formed the bedrock of St Francis's teaching who was emulating Christ's ministrations.[10] By absorbing Franciscan ideals, Henry was ultimately securing his and his family's salvation through imitating Christ.[11] Phillips' position supports Elizabeth Hallam's much older argument that

---

[6] S.T. Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community of England 1213-1272* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 9.
[7] F.M. Powicke, *King Henry III and The Lord Edward* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), p. 529.
[8] E.M. Hallam, "Aspects of the Monastic Patronage of the English and French Royal Houses, c. 1130-1270" in 2 vols (DPhil thesis, University of London, 1976), vol. 2, p. 219.
[9] Phillips, "The Leper and the King", p. 3.
[10] K. Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation: The Alms-Giving and Religious Foundations of Henry III', *Reading Medieval* 43, 79-98, at 79.
[11] Ibid, 92.

stated that the friaries and hospitals were the predominant beneficiaries, both generally and financially, of Henry's patronage.[12] The overview of Henry's patronage will test these conclusions to assess who Henry favoured and why.

If Henry frequently patronised certain recipients, over significant periods of time, that would imply that his regard for them remained constant, unaffected by changes in political circumstances, for example. Henry's giving of gifts with high monetary value or with the potential to accrue money to the recipients, such as the granting of fairs and markets may represent his affection for the recipients, especially if there was no charge for the grant. As has been argued in chapter one, the lack of charging for a grant is significant as it strengthens the argument that the primary motivation of the grant was for spiritual rather than financial. The reissuing of charters, for example, could be lucrative.[13] However, small scale consistent gifts of wood, wine, and alms, should not be dismissed as evidence of regard. Henry's consistent grants of gifts that were wanted and requested by religious groups demonstrate his regard to respect their wishes. Additionally, the nature of gifts may have changed during Henry's reign that were less connected with changing regard than with financial difficulties.[14]

Bishops overall, received consistent and varied patronage during Henry's reign. The most patronised bishops were: Godfrey Giffard (bishop of Worcester, 1268-1302), at 5.75 gifts p.a.; Aymer de Lusignan (elect of Winchester, 1250-60) 3.1 (if one includes 1258, 1259 and 1260) or 4.43 gifts p.a.(when those years are excluded); Walter Mauclerk (bishop of Carlisle,

---

[12] Hallam, "Aspects of the Monastic Patronage", vol. 1, p. 155.

[13] S.T. Ambler, 'The Fine Roll of Henry III, 28 October 1226-27 October 1227', from the Fine Rolls projects, Fine of the Month: December 2007, viewed online at https://finerollshenry3.org.uk/content/month/fm-08-2006.html (accessed 12/11/2022); Phillips, "The Leper and the King", p. 151.

[14] Huw Ridgeway has discussed the changing nature of Henry's patronage of the Savoyards and Lusignans in response to his financial pressures. See H.W. Ridgeway, 'Foreign Favourites and Henry III's Problems of Patronage, 1247-1258', *The English Historical Review* 104 (1989), 590-610, at 591-2, 596, and H.W. Ridgeway, "The Politics of The English Royal Court 1247-65, with Special Reference to the Role of the Aliens" (Oxford University, Unpublished PhD thesis, 1983), ab vii, 185, 202, 233.

1223-1246) at 3.33 gifts p.a.; Jocelin of Wells (bishop of Bath and Wells, 1216-42) 2.53 p.a.; Peter des Roches (bishop of Winchester 1205-38) at 2.5 gifts p.a.; Peter de Aigueblanche (bishop of Hereford, 1240-68) at 1.29 gifts p.a.; Hugh of Wells (bishop of Lincoln, 1209-1235) at 1.25 gifts p.a. and Walter de Gray (archbishop of York, 1216-55) with 1.14 gifts p.a.[15]

These bishops held their positions during different parts of Henry's reign. Walter Mauclerk, Jocelin of Wells, Hugh of Wells, and Peter des Roches were bishops during the early part of Henry's reign. Three of them were made bishops before John died in 1216 (Jocelin, Peter, and Hugh) and two of them died before Henry became a father (Hugh and Peter des Roches). Furthermore, Mauclerk became a bishop during Henry's minority and all four men were dead by 1246. Peter de Aigueblanche and Aymer de Lusignan were made bishops[16] in the middle of Henry's reign, in the years that he became a father and started to push for more ambitious foreign and domestic policy. They both witnessed at least the start of the period of baronial revolt and rebellion. Godfrey Giffard was made a bishop at the end of Henry's reign at the end of the period of baronial revolt and rebellion. Walter de Gray, due to the length of his office straddled the early to mid-parts of Henry's reign. These men therefore served as

---

[15] For some examples of the gifts granted to each bishop, see:
William Kilkenney: *CPR, 1247-58,* pp. 393, 395, 484, 486; *CR, 1254-56,* pp. 22, 207, 293, 302.
Walter Giffard: *CPR, 1266-72,* pp. 312, 438 (2), 567, 632, 643, 715; *CR, 1268-72,* pp. 195, 373 (2), 456, 472, 524, 583.
Godfrey Giffard: *CChR, v*ol. 2, pp. 115, 139; *CPR, 1266-72,* pp. 507, 580; *CR, 1268-72,* pp. 173, 190, 193, 221, 296, 363, 367, 382, 440, 458, 552.
Aymer de Lusignan; *CChR, v*ol. 1, p. 455; *CLR, 1251-60,* p. 344; *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 98; *CR, 1247-51,* pp. 452, 470, 488, 508; *CR, 1251-53,* pp. 2, 29, 165, 429; *CR, 1256-59,* pp. 172, 173.
Walter Mauclerk: *CChR,* vol. 1, pp. 52 (2), 212; *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 40; *CPR, 1225-1232,* p. 132; *CR, 1227-31,* pp. 11, 60; *CR, 1234-37,* p. 58, 213, 223; *CR, 1237-42,* p. 280, 329, 381; *CR, 1242-47,* pp. 282, 323.
Jocelin of Wells: *CChR,* vol. 1, pp. 1 (2), 4 (2), 6, 7 (3), 16, 103 (2), 216; *CLR, 1226-40,* pp. 127, 149; *CR, 1227-31,* pp. 23, 34, 47, 514; *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 92-3, 149, 152.
Peter des Roches: *CChR,* vol.1, pp.42, 139, 140 (2); *CLR, 1226-1240,* p.31; *CR, 1227-31,* pp.571, 557; *CR, 1234-37,* p.222; *CPR, 1225-1232,* p.441.
Peter de Aigueblanche: *CChR,* vol. 1, pp. 256, 259, 345; *CLR, 1240-45,* pp. 13, 16, 29; *CLR, 1251-60,* pp. 294, 322 (2); *CR, 1237-42,* p. 309, 379; *CR, 1254-56,* pp. 238, 306; *CR, 1256-59,* p. 30.
Hugh of Wells: *CChR,* vol. 1, pp. 2, 4-5, 5, 8, 33, 42 (2), 137; *CR, 1227-31,* pp. 193, 564.
Walter de Gray: *CChR,* vol. 1, pp. 42, 223, 245, 264, 386; *CPR, 1232-47,* pp. 185, 190, 395, 412; *CPR. 1247-58,* p. 412; *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 477 (2), 492; *CR, 1237-42,* p. 298, 309, 313; *CR, 1251-53,* p. 29.
The years 1258-60 of Aymer's episcopate are excluded because Aymer was in exile on the Continent.
[16] Bishop elect in Aymer's case.

bishops in very different contexts when Henry's priorities were different. It will therefore be illuminating to ask what sort of gifts they received and why to establish whether there were changes in Henry's patronage to match his changing circumstances.

Walter Mauclerk, Jocelin of Wells, Hugh of Wells, and Walter de Gray had all held premier roles in John's government. Mauclerk served in many administrative capacities under John, such as sheriff of Lincolnshire in 1204. He remained loyal to John during the Interdict and then served Henry. He served as an ambassador and the treasurer. During Richard Marshal's rebellion, he briefly lost the king's favour, but afterwards, he returned to a leading role in the king's council.[17] The Marshal's rebellion revolved around Henry's actions *per voluntatem regis* in revoking royal charters in favour of Peter des Roches and his satellites, especially Peter de Rivallis.[18] The Marshal's men suffered as the des Roches party rose. A flashpoint was when Gilbert Basset, a man of the Marshal's affinity, lost the manor of Upaven. This was a slight on the Marshal, causing him to withdraw from court and ultimately resulted in his rebellion.[19] Henry's actions made many other nobles nervous as Henry's actions were unfair and threatened the foundations of noble property-owning.[20] The rebellion was resolved when Edmund of Abingdon, archbishop of Canterbury, intervened on the Marshal's side, encouraging Henry to put des Roches and his supporters aside and to promise to uphold the ideals of Magna Carta, which did not allow arbitrary distraints.

---

[17] See N. Vincent, 'Mauclerk, Walter (d. 1248), bishop of Carlisle.' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* (Oxford, 2004), viewed online at: https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-18355 (accessed 11/08/2020).
[18] N.C. Vincent, *Peter des Roches: An alien in English Politics, 1205-1238* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 335-6.
[19] Ibid, pp. 337-9.
[20] Ibid, pp. 336, 379.

Jocelin of Wells, like his brother, Hugh of Wells, served John as a royal administrator Hugh entered royal service a few years before Jocelin and followed a similar career trajectory.[21] In 1204, Jocelin was recorded as a royal justice and in 1205, he succeeded Hugh as chief datary to charters from the itinerant royal chancery.[22] Jocelin and Hugh largely remained loyal to John. However, in 1209, Hugh left England so that his election as bishop of Lincoln would not be quashed by the pope due to England being under an Interdict.[23] Both Hugh and Jocelin returned to England in 1213, when the Interdict was lifted, and henceforth remained loyal to John. Between 1215-17, instead of attending Lateran IV, Jocelin remained in England.[24] He was present at Runneymede at the sealing of Magna Carta along with Walter de Gray, Hugh of Wells, and Peter des Roches.[25] Jocelin was also at Henry's coronation at Gloucester in 1216 and assisted in the ceremony.[26] Furthermore, Jocelin was at both the battles of Lincoln and Sandwich, pivotal battles of the civil war following John's death.[27] At the battle of Sandwich he blessed the men of the fleet and absolved those who would die fighting.[28] After victory at Sandwich, Jocelin led a procession of triumph and thanksgiving for what was seen as a miraculous victory.[29]

Peter des Roches was not just one of John's closest counsellors, but his friend.[30] He never abandoned John throughout the Interdict and was present at the defining battles of the civil war. At the battle of Lincoln in 1217, he even commanded the crossbowmen despite the

---

[21] N. Vincent, 'Jocelin of Wells: the making of a bishop in the reign of King John' in Robert Dunning (ed), *Jocelin of Wells: Bishop, Builder, Courtier* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2010), 9-33 at p. 18.
[22] Ibid, p. 18.
[23] Ibid, p. 32.
[24] Ibid, p. 10.
[25] J. Sayers, 'Jocelin of Wells and the Role of a Bishop in the Thirteenth Century', in Robert Dunning (ed), *Jocelin of Wells: Bishop, Builder, Courtier* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2010), 34-52, at p. 39.
[26] Ibid, p. 39 and Vincent, 'Jocelin of Wells', p. 10.
[27] Vincent, 'Jocelin of Wells', p. 10 and Sayers, 'Jocelin of Wells', p. 39.
[28] Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community*, p. 25.
[29] Ibid, pp. 25-6.
[30] Vincent, *Peter des Roches*, p. 9.

ecclesiastical prohibition of bishops spilling blood.[31] Until at least 1221, Peter had day-to-day custody of Henry.[32]

In 1221, the rise of Hubert de Burgh and the departure of the legate Pandulf altered the balance of power in the minority council. Peter des Roches began to lose power and influence and in 1224 he and his supporters were removed from court. He only returned to England in 1231 after returning from crusade.[33] Peter's fall from power was not imitated by Jocelin of Wells, Hugh of Wells, and Walter de Gray. In 1221, Jocelin of Wells along with Stephen Langton, and Richard Poore, the bishop of Salisbury, formed the government with Hubert de Burgh.[34] Jocelin was dominant in royal administration in the 1220s. He had custody of the castles of Bristol and Sherborne and was the sheriff of Somerset in 1223.[35] Unlike Peter des Roches, Jocelin remained in Henry's favour for the rest of his ecclesiastical career.

From 1227 to 1245, Mauclerk was granted thirty-nine grants.[36] About half of these grants were substantial in value including lands and liberties.[37] Of the nineteen lucrative or potentially lucrative gifts, four were granted in 1227, when Henry gained his majority. This enabled him to grant charters and make permanent alienations for the first time. In royal letters dated 21 January, people were invited to have their charters confirmed by 28 February 1227.

---

[31] Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community,* p. 25.
[32] Vincent, *Peter des Roches,* p. 10.
[33] Ibid, p. 10.
[34] Sayers, 'Jocelin of Wells', p. 39.
[35] Ibid, p. 39.
[36] The types of grants he received were: Manors, advowsons, and churches: *CChR,* vol.1, p. 52 (2), 212, 232; *CPR, 1225-1232*, pp. 132, 136, 232-33; *CR, 1227-31*, p. 467. Land: *CChR,* vol.1, pp. 136-137, 140; *CPR, 1225-1232*, p. 241; *CR, 1227-31*, p. 156; *CR, 1234-37*, p. 58. Confirmations of liberties: *CR, 1227-31*, p.529; *CR, 1234-37*, p. 60. Custodies: *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 182; *CR, 1227-31*, p. 60; *CR, 1234-37*, p. 445. Deer: *CR, 1227-31*, p. 468; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 115, 276, 292, 479; *CR, 1237-42*, pp. 12, 280, 329, 381. Market and fair: *CR, 1227-31*, p. 571. Trees: *CR, 1227-31*, p. 484; *CR, 1234-37*, p. 54. Wine: *CR, 1234-37*, p. 223; *CR, 1242-47*, p. 282. Pardon of a debt: *CR, 1227-31*, p. 495. Pardon of a fine for an escaped prisoner: *CR, 1242-47*, p. 323. The gifts of high value with the manors, advowsons, churches, land, and liberties.
[37] The references to these 19 substantial gifts are: *CChR,* vol.1, p. 52 (2), 136-137, 140, 212, 232; *CPR, 1225-1232*, pp. 132, 136, 232-33, 241; *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 182; *CR, 1227-31*, pp. 60, 156, 467, 529, 571; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 58, 60, 445.

This invitation provided subjects with the opportunity to secure their grants and for Henry (or his government) to make money as he could impose fines in return for these confirmations. There was a range of fines imposed upon those who received confirmation of charters.[38] Walter Mauclerk was not charged for a single grant made to him in 1227 even though all these grants were either manors or manors with appurtenances. The only time Walter was charged for any gifts granted to him was for two grants in 1228.[39] Both of these charges are relatively low demonstrating the degree of favour shown by Henry to Walter.

Mauclerk and Jocelin of Wells seem to have received their most lucrative grants between 1227-1231.[40] Thirteen of Mauclerk's nineteen lucrative gifts (68.4 %) were granted in 1231 or earlier.[41] These were all before the fall of Hubert de Burgh. Walter briefly lost favour with the rise of Peter des Roches, but in 1235 he received seven gifts including a grant of lands with control of an heir, a confirmation of liberties and rights, and a church.[42] Walter continued to receive royal patronage until the end of his life. Overall, Walter's gifts become smaller from 1237 onwards, largely consisting of deer and wine.[43] This does not necessarily mean that

---

[38] The Templars were charged 600 marks for a charter whereas the prior of Bermondsey was only charged five marks. See Ambler, 'The Fine Roll of Henry III'.

[39] In one grant Walter agreed to pay ten marks per annum to have custody of the Carlisle castle (*CR, 1227-31*, p. 60. In the other grant he agreed greed to answer for the manor of Stepney at the Exchequer for as long as the bishopric of London remained vacant. For information on Stepney manor, see *CPR, 1225-1232*, pp. 232-3 and *CFR, 1228-1229*, no. 79.

[40] Mauclerk's lucrative gifts: *CChR*, vol.1, p. 52 (2), 136-137, 140, 212, 232; *CPR, 1225-1232*, pp. 132, 136, 232-33, 241; *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 182; *CR, 1227-31*, pp. 60, 156, 467, 529, 571; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 58, 60, 445.
Jocelin's lucrative gifts: For examples of land gifts see *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 6-7, 7, 133-34; *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 121; *CR, 1227-31*, pp. 23, 58.
For liberties, see CChR, vol.1, pp. 6, 7 (2), 103; *CR, 1227-31*, p.528. For fairs and markets, see *CChR*, vol.1, p. 216; *CR, 1234-37*, p. 234. For manors, see *CChR*, vol. 1, pp. 1, 16, 75-76; *CR, 1227-31*, p. 514.

[41] 1227: *CChR*, vol.1, p.52 (2) (both manors); *CPR, 1225-1232*, pp. 132, 136 (both manors with appurtenances). 1228: *CPR, 1225-1232*, pp.232-3 (manor); *CR, 1227-31*, p. 60 (custody of Carlisle castle); 1229: *CPR, 1225-1232*, p. 241 (land with appurtenances); *CR, 1227-31*, p. 156 (one carucate of land w/ appurtenances which belonged to Bartholomew Drasebac); *CR, 1227-31*, p. 467 (land with appurtenances); *CR, 1227-31*, p. 529 (confirmation of liberties); *CR, 1227-31*, p. 571 (market and fair). 1231: *CChR*, vol.1, pp.136-137, 140 (lands). Four of these were granted in 1227 (*CChR*, vol.1, p.52 (2); *CPR, 1225-1232*, pp. 132, 136); three in 1228 (*CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 90; *CPR, 1225-1232*, pp.232-3; *CR, 1227-31*, p. 6); five in 1229 (*CPR, 1225-1232*, p. 241; *CR, 1227-31*, pp. 156, 467, 529, 571); and five in 1231 *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 136-137, 140; *CR, 1227-31*, pp. 468, 484, 495.

[42] *CChR*, vol.1, p. 212; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 54, 58, 60, 115, 117, 213

[43] See, for example, deer: *CR, 1237-42*, pp. 12, 280, 329, 381, and wine: *CR, 1242-47*, p. 282.

Walter was held in less regard than before, it may just represent a change in the types of gifts Henry regularly gave. This is a point that will be returned to after examining the gifts made to other bishops during Henry's reign.

However, unlike Walter, Jocelin was charged for some of the larger gifts he received, in 1227, 1229, and 1231.[44] The concessions granted in the 1227 charters, for 500 marks, were extensive including permission to enclose woods, make parks and assarts, and for all the men of the manor of be quit of suits of all pleas and summonses of the forest.[45] Given the breadth of concessions, although 500 marks is a hefty sum, it does not seem unreasonable given the size of the gift. In 1229, Jocelin was charged 100s per annum for a farm.[46] In 1231, Jocelin paid 300 marks for a charter that granted him significant liberties.[47] This grant was a substantial one and the charge of 300 marks seems reasonable especially because the bishop of Lincoln, Hugh of Wells, was granted the same thing but charged 500 marks for it.[48]

However, Henry made significant grants to Jocelin without charge such as a charter in 1227 that granted a phenomenal number of liberties and concessions, demonstrating high regard.[49] Jocelin continued to receive large grants throughout the late 1230s including markets

---

[44] In 1227, Jocelin was charged 500 marks and five palfreys (A palfrey is a horse that was highly valued as a riding horse in the Middle Ages) for charters concerning the disafforesting of the manors of North Curry and Congresbury with appurtenances and for having various liberties granted to him, the abbot of Glastonbury, the dean and canons of Wells, and the prior and monks of Bath and their churches (*CFR, 1226-1227,* no. 101).
In 1229 Jocelin was charged 100s. per annum for a farm (*CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 148).
In 1231, Jocelin was charge 300 marks
[45] *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 4 (2).
[46] *CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 148
[47] *CChR*, vol.1, p. 137. Liberties included Jocelin, and his successors' ability to have all his movables and produce of his lands without interference from the king or his bailiffs who were not to take any of the produce.
[48] *CFR 1230-1231*, no. 224 and no. 225.
[49] *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 6. Jocelin, his men, the abbot of Glastonbury and his men were all to be quit of various fines including tol and theam, infangenethef, pontage and passage.
Tol or Toll was a landowner's right to levy a payment on the sale of goods or cattle or on the movement of cattle through his or her lands. Theam or Team was the right to hold a court to determine the ownership of land and so could determine the person liable for the toll (Charles Arnold-Baker, *The Companion to British History*, 3rd edition (London: Longcross Press, 2008), p. 1232).

and amercements, demonstrating continued regard.[50] However the frequency of gifts made to Jocelin declined in the 1230s as thirty-two out of the forty gifts under examination were granted between 1227-1231, perhaps indicating that as Henry established himself as an independent ruler in the aftermath of his minority, that he moved away somewhat from the figures that had dominated his minority.[51]

Hugh does not seem to have been as much patronised as either Jocelin or Walter Mauclerk and was charged 500 marks in 1231 for a charter of concessions instead of the 300 marks Jocelin was charged.[52] Hugh was also charged twenty marks in 1227 for a charter that was to remove a market that was to his disadvantage.[53] Hugh did not play as big a role in Henry's minority and early personal reign as Jocelin or Walter and the scale of patronage towards him seems to support the picture of a more *quid pro quo* of Henry's early ecclesiastical patronage.

Between 1227 and 1238, Peter des Roches experienced a largely inverse pattern of patronage from that Jocelin, Mauclerk, and Hugh of Wells experienced. In 1227 he was charged £500 for the confirmation of a charter of John's that also confirmed markets and fairs established in his lands during Henry's minority.[54] During the minority several recipients

---

Infangenethef: The right of the lord of a liberty to seize and condemn his tenant or serf or another lord's tenant or serf who was on his land and committed a crime (Arnold-Baker, *Companion to British History*, p. 696).
Pontage: Toll levied for crossing a bridge (https://thehistoryofengland.co.uk/resource/glossary-of-medieval-terms/ (accessed 27/12/2022).
Passage: Toll levied for passage (https://thehistoryofengland.co.uk/resource/glossary-of-medieval-terms/ (accessed 27/12/2022).

[50] *CChR*, vol.1, p. 216; *CR, 1234-37*, p. 234. *CLR, 1226-40*, p. 276.

[51] *CChR*, Vol. 1, pp. 1 (2), 4 (2), 6, 6-7, 7 (3), 16, 43, 44, 75-6, 103, 104, 133-4, 135-6, 137, 140; *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 76, 127, 148; *CR, 1227-31*, pp. 23, 34, 47, 58, 177, 485, 514, 528, 531, 572.

[52] *CFR 1230-1231*, no. 224.

[53] *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 33.

[54] *CFR, 1226-1227*, no 161 and no 172.

obtained letters close authorizing them to set up markets and fairs. To keep these fairs and markets, recipients needed to obtain permission. Some markets, including some of des Roches' had been set up without a licence and this partially explains the size of the fine.[55] However, Peter's fine was the largest amount offered for a confirmation on the entire fine roll of October 28 1226-27 October 1227.[56] As Carpenter has argued, it was clearly punitive and reflects his unpopularity with Henry's government, especially his hated rival, Hubert de Burgh. Ultimately, the government exacted little of the £500.[57] Given that Peter left the country in 1228 and did not return until 1231, there was little point in pursuing it. In Hubert's mind, he had won his battle for supremacy with Peter des Roches and Peter was effectively in exile.

When Peter returned to England in 1231, the favour Henry held him in can be seen in the flurry of gifts he was granted.[58] Peter was only charged for one of these grants, the most generous charter. He was charged 500 marks but given the substantial nature of the gift, that is explainable.[59] The fairs and the confirmations were significant grants and the fact that Henry chose not to impose any fines demonstrates his generosity and the ascendency of the bishop.

Between 1232 and the end of February in 1234, Peter des Roches was dominant in government following the fall of Hubert de Burgh. About half of the gifts Henry granted Peter

---

[55] D.A. Carpenter, 'The Bishop of Winchester's Fine in 1227', from the Fine Rolls Project, Fine of the Month: August 2006, viewed online at https://finerollshenry3.org.uk/content/month/fm-08-2006.html (accessed 23/06/2022).
[56] D.A. Carpenter, 'Fines made with Henry III for the confirmation of charters, January-February 1227', from the Fine Rolls Project, Fine of the Month: July 2006, viewed online at https://finerollshenry3.org.uk/content/month/fm-07-2006.html (accessed 23/06/2022).
[57] Carpenter, 'The Bishop of Winchester's Fine'.
[58] Fairs: *CChR,* vol.1, p. 140 (2); *CR, 1227-31,* p. 571 (2). Confirmations: *CChR,* vol.1, p.140 (2). Pardon of scutage: *CR, 1227-31,* p. 557. Permission to take a beast: *CPR, 1225-1232,* p. 441. Advowson of church and other concessions: *CChR,* vol.1, p. 139.
[59] *CChR,* vol.1, p. 139. Peter was granted an advowson of a church plus its lands, liberties and tenements and permission to found an Augustinian house on the land.

between 1227 to 1238 were made between 1232-4.[60] About half of these gifts in 1232-4 were substantial ones including lands, manors, fairs, and grants of free warren.[61] The rest of the gifts included deer, wood for fuel and building purposes, and smaller grants of money.[62] Peter was not charged for a single grant, demonstrating the high regard Henry held him in. By the end of February 1234 Peter des Roches and his satellites were losing the king's favour. Richard Marshal was still in rebellion against the king but on 2 February the newly appointed archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund Rich, focused criticism on Peter and his allies at the council that had been convened at Westminster. At that council, Henry had promised to take Edmund's advice and started to right the wrongs he had committed against Hubert de Burgh.[63] On 14 February, Henry ordered the restoration of eight manors of Margaret de Burgh, Hubert's wife, that had been seized from her husband.[64]

As a result of the changes in his political fortunes, Peter did not receive any patronage until the very end of 1235 when, on 30 December, Peter was granted a confirmation of some liberties. This grant was to both Peter and the prior of St Swithun's, Winchester.[65] Peter was then patronised in the last months of his life (died 9 June 1238). These were substantial gifts, privileges and a messuage with appurtenances.[66] It appears that Peter never regained the favour he once had with Henry. He was not charged for any of the gifts made to him in the aftermath of the Marshal's death indicating that Henry forgave Peter but also that Peter would never reach the heights of 1231-34.

---

[60] See *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 168, 169, 176, 177; *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 221, 232; *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 140; *CR, 1231-34*, pp. 41, 69, 109, 208, 242, 265, 279, 346-7, 383 (2).
[61] Lands: *CChR*, vol.1, p. 177; *CR, 1231-34*, pp. 346-7, 383. Fairs: *CChR*, vol.1, p. 176; *CR, 1231-34*, p. 208. Free warren: *CChR*, vol.1, p. 169; *CR, 1231-34*, p. 109.
[62] Deer: *CR, 1231-34*, p. 41. Wood: *CR, 1231-34*, pp. 242, 279, 283. Money: *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 221, 232; *CR, 1231-34*, p. 69.
[63] Vincent, *Peter des Roches*, pp. 429-30.
[64] Ibid, p. 431.
[65] *CR, 1234-37*, p. 222
[66] *CR, 1237-42*, pp. 43, 49-50.

Henry's patronage of Walter de Gray was more spread out than his patronage of Jocelin, Walter Mauclerk, Hugh of Wells, and Peter des Roches. He was only granted one gift in 1227 and another one in 1229.[67] Henry's patronage of Walter de Gray continued throughout Walter's episcopate demonstrating consistent regard. Only about a third of the gifts granted to Walter can be classed as substantial gifts, consisting of liberties, custodies, and markets.[68] Henry frequently gave Walter deer.[69] He also regularly granted him pikes, bream and wood for fuel or building purposes.[70] In Walter's case, it does not appear that the scale of gifts to him decreased as Henry's reign progressed. On 18 June 1255, for example, Henry granted Walter a house, lands, and appurtenances.[71] Henry never charged Walter for any of his grants, demonstrating his generosity and the consistency of his relations with Walter.

Overall, Henry's patronage of these favoured bishops of his early reign demonstrates that the relationship he had with the individual bishops determined his actions. When they were in favour, he was very generous including the granting of financially significant gifts such as fairs and manors, often without charge. Henry was more likely to charge bishops when they were out of favour with him, just as the minority government had charged Peter des Roches. The gifts given to these favoured bishops varied in scale from manors to grants of wood for building work.

---

[67] *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 42 (1227); *CR, 1227-31*, p. 172 (1229).
[68] Liberties: *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 223, 264, 347; *CPR, 1232-47*, pp. 454; *CPR, 1247-58*, p. 395; *CR, 1227-31*, p. 172; *CR, 1234-37*, p. 318; *CR, 1247-51*, p.67. Custodies: *CPR, 1232-47*, pp. 185, 190. Markets: *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 42, 245, 386.
[69] See *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 411, 477 (2), 492; *CR, 1237-42*, pp. 149, 264, 298; *CR, 1242-47*, p. 313.
[70] Fish: *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 415, 498; *CR, 1251-53*, p. 29. Wood: *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 388, 469, 488; *CR, 1237-42*, pp. 298, 371; *CR, 1242-47*, p. 309.
[71] *CR, 1254-56*, pp. 100-101.

Peter de Aigueblanche and Aymer de Lusignan's patronage belongs to the middle of Henry's reign. Peter de Aigueblanche's episcopate lasted until 1268, but because this section is excluding the years 1258-68, a more meaningful comparison can be drawn between the two bishops. They also make for an interesting comparison as they were both foreign bishops rather than native ones. Henry's patronage of them, therefore, has the potential to throw some light on his interactions with aliens more generally.

About half of the gifts given to de Aigueblanche in the years under examination were made in 1240 and 1241, immediately after his elevation.[72] This does not appear to be uncommon for Henry. William Kilkenny was the bishop of Ely for one year and received eight grants.[73] William was not charged for any grant. Similarly, Henry never charged Peter for his gifts. Like Peter, many of Aymer's gifts date from the first year of his episcopate. In 1251, the first full year of his episcopate, he received thirteen of the forty-one gifts made to him from 1251 to 1257 inclusive.[74] Peter and Aymer were granted a variety of gifts from deer to charters in their first year as bishops.[75] However, as the 1250s progressed, Peter gifts became smaller in value, largely consisting of small sums of money and wood for building and fuel purposes.[76]

---

[72] The patronage was extensive and varied. For fairs, see *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 256 (2), 259 (2). For free warren, see *CChR*, vol.1, p. 261 (2). For land with appurtenances, see *CR, 1237-42,* p. 306. For various liberties, see *CChR*, vol.1, p. 264 (2). Deer: *CLR, 1240-45,* pp. 36, 54, 67; *CR, 1237-42,* p. 327. Money: *CLR, 1240-45,* pp. 19, 34; *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 248. Wood: *CR, 1237-42,* p. 309. Boars: *CR, 1237-42,* p. 379 Rabbits: *CLR, 1240-45,* p. 54.

[73] R.C. Stacey, 'Kilkenny, William of (d. 1256), administrator and bishop of Ely', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* (Oxford, 2004), viewed online at: https://www-oxforddnb.com.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-15527 (accessed 11/08/2020). The eight grants were *CR, 1254-56,* pp. 207, 302; *CPR, 1247-58,* pp. 393, 395, 484, 486 (all exemptions and pardons). Deer: *CR, 1254-56,* p. 22. Wine: *CR,* 1254-56, p. 293.

[74] The references for the thirteen grants are: *CR, 1247-51,* pp. 452, 460, 470, 472, 488, 502. 508, 521; *CR, 1251-53,* pp. 27, 29, 31; *CPR, 1247-58,* pp. 98, 111.

[75] For Peter, see for example, fairs *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 256 (2), 259 (2). For free warren, see *CChR*, vol.1, p. 261 (2). For land with appurtencances, see *CR, 1237-42,* p. 306. For various liberties, see *CChR*, vol.1, p. 264 (2). Deer: *CLR, 1240-45,* pp. 36, 54, 67; *CR, 1237-42,* p. 327. Money: *CLR, 1240-45,* pp. 19, 34; *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 248. Wood: *CR, 1237-42,* p. 309. Boars: *CR, 1237-42,* p. 379 Rabbits: *CLR, 1240-45,* p. 54. Mitre: *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 501-502.
For Aymer, see, for example, deer: *CR, 1247-51,* pp. 470, 488, 502; *CR, 1251-53,* pp. 31-33; liberties: *CPR, 1247-58,* pp. 98, 111; oaks: *CR, 1251-53,* pp. 29, 165.

[76] Money: *CLR, 1251-60,* pp. 294, 322 (2). Wood: *CR, 1254-56,* pp. 238, 306.

This may support Huw Ridgeway's work on Henry's patronage problems. Ridgeway argued that Henry's patronage came under serious pressure in the 1250s.[77] The decade was one of financial difficulties due to several factors. Significantly, Henry had less escheated land to give away preventing him from providing his Lusignan relatives and their dependents with similar grants he had made to the Savoyards the decade before.[78] This lack of land was exacerbated by Henry's failure to regain his continental possessions.[79] He had a finite amount of land that had dwindled by the 1250s, preventing him from granting large gifts of a lasting nature. Additionally, Magna Carta limited the ways Henry could raise money as it forbade many of the unpopular methods used by his predecessors.[80] Since 1237, Henry had been granted virtually no parliamentary taxation, hindering his ability to provide for recipients of his patronage.[81] The demands of the Sicilian Affair and the upkeep of his Savoyard dependents placed further strains on Henry's finances, as did the provision for Edward's appanage. Henry was under this pressure when he could least afford it.[82] Ridgeway argued that it was only after 1265, with the confiscation of rebel lands, that Henry could engage in patronage of the scale of pre-1250.[83]

By contrast, Aymer still received lucrative gifts during the later 1250s. In 1256, for example, Aymer was granted one fair, one market, and the privilege that all merchants coming

[77] Ridgeway, "The Politics of The English Royal Court", pp. 185, 202 and Ridgeway, 'Problems of Patronage', 591, 596.
[78] Ridgeway, 'Problems of Patronage', 600.
[79] Ibid, 596.
[80] Ibid, 598. Magna Carta prevented the king from raising money unjustly. For example, heirs were to be married without disparagement (chapter 6 of 1225 version) and set a fixed amount of £100 for heirs to pay for the possession of their barony (chapter 2 of 1225 version). This prevented the king from potentially charging extortionate amounts for heirs to be given their inheritance and so prevented the king from raising lucrative amounts for his own purposes. See J.C. Holt, *Magna Carta: Revised with a New Introduction by George Garnett and John Hudson*, 3rd edn. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 502-503.
[81] Ibid, 596.
[82] Ibid, 600 and 602.
[83] Ridgeway, "The Politics of the English Royal Court", p. 231.

to his fair were to be quit of all prises and fines.[84] These grants enabled Aymer to increase his revenues. Aymer was not charged by Henry for any grant. As Aymer was Henry's uterine brother, Henry may have reserved the most lucrative grants for him while reducing his patronage for other recipients. Henry appears to have continued the patterns of patronage enumerated above: patronage was focused on those he favoured, and charges were very rare. Henry's financial difficulties appear to have started to impact his patronage in the 1250s, but he still reserved the most lucrative grants for his half-brother.

Godfrey Giffard received the most patronage in the period 1269-72. About half of the gifts were deer.[85] He was also granted fish and wood.[86] Most of the gifts were therefore small, not imposing much financial burden on Henry. Nevertheless, Henry did make two grants of fairs and markets to Godfrey, which could have increased episcopal income.[87] Henry never charged Godfrey for any grants. Godfrey had remained loyal to Henry and served as his chancellor.[88] Henry's patronage of Godfrey seems to be about rewarding a loyal servant.

Bishops were not the only religious groups to receive consistent patronage. Henry also patronised several monastic orders including the Benedictines, Cistercians, Augustinians, Austin Canons, and Premonstratensians. Between 1227 and 1272, Henry patronised over 300 monastic houses. Excluding Westminster Abbey (which will be examined below), twenty-two houses received ten or more grants from 1227 to 1272.[89] Many of these houses had been

---

[84] *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 452, 455; *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 5.29
[85] *CR, 1268-72,* pp. 68, 190, 193, 196-7, 221, 355, 363, 372, 440, 458, 479.
[86] Bream: *CR, 1268-72,* p. 239. Wood: *CR, 1268-72,* pp. 173, 367, 382.
[87] *CChR*, vol. 2, pp. 115, 139
[88] See S.J. Davies, 'Giffard, Godfrey (1235?–1302)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10649 (accessed 27/03/2021)
[89] The twenty-two houses, in order of scale of patronage are: Beaulieu, Netley, Bury St Edmunds, Peterborough Abbey, Hailes, St Paul's (London), St Martin's (London), Winchester Cathedral, Pershore Abbey, Gloucester Abbey, Crowland Abbey, Sherborne Abbey, Flaxley Abbey, St Albans, Reading Abbey, Evesham Abbey, Thiron Abbey, Rochester Cathedral Priory, Croxton, Ivychurch Priory, Coventry Cathedral, and Shrewsbury Abbey.

founded by recent or current members of Henry's dynasty. Beaulieu, followed by Netley received the most gifts (forty-three and thirty-five respectively).[90] Beaulieu was John's foundation, Netley was Beaulieu's daughter house. Hailes Abbey, Richard of Cornwall's foundation, was the fifth most patronised house.[91] Reading Abbey, Henry I's foundation, was the fifteenth most patronised house, and Croxton, where John had died and his heart was buried, the nineteenth most patronised.[92] Other places that received more than ten grants included some of the most well-established houses that had established saint cults including Bury St Edmunds, St Albans, St Paul's (London), Gloucester Abbey, and Winchester Cathedral.[93] Other places received consistent patronage including Peterborough, Rochester, and Coventry.[94]

Of the twenty-two most patronised houses, fourteen were Benedictine houses, four were Cistercian, one Augustinian, one Cluniac, one an alien house, and one Premonstratensian.[95] Of the top ten most patronised houses, three were Cistercian (Beaulieu, Netley, and Hailes), and the rest were Benedictine. All the Benedictine houses in the top ten were well-established and relatively wealthy.[96] The Benedictine order was the oldest monastic order with the most houses

---

[90] For examples of gifts to Beaulieu, see *CChR*, vol. 1, pp. 60, 325 (2); *CLR, 1245-51*, pp.103; 324; *CLR, 1267-72*, p.152; *CR, 1227-31*, pp. 10, 33, 73; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 204, 212. For examples of gifts to Netley, see *CLR, 1226-1240*, p.455; *CLR, 1245-51*, pp. 16, 109; *CLR, 1251-60*, pp. 196, 359, *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 373, 490, 500; *CR, 1268-72*, pp. 324, 340.

[91] For examples of gifts to Hailes, see *CLR, 1251-60*, pp.39-40, 63, 395; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 68-9, 502, 505.

[92] For examples of gifts to Reading, see *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 13, 14, 15-16; *CR, 1254-56*, p. 111; *CR, 1268-72*, pp. 18, 386. For examples for gifts to Croxton, see *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 86, 131; *CR, 1227-1231*, p. 494 (3); *CR, 1234-37*, p. 139.

[93] For examples of gifts to St Edmunds, see *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 1, 209; *CLR, 1251-60*, p. 68; *CPR, 1266-72*, pp. 642-643. For examples of gifts to St Albans, see *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 190, 330; *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 512. For examples of gifts to St Paul's, see *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 199, 330; *CPR, 1266-72*, pp. 411, 540, 572. For examples of gifts to Gloucester, see *CR, 1234-37*, p. 124; *CR, 1247-51*, p.133; *CR, 1254-56*, p. 433. For examples of gifts to Winchester, see CChR, vol.1, pp. 331 (2); *CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 433; *CR, 1254-56*, p. 337; *CR, 1256-59*, p. 287.

[94] For examples of gifts to Peterborough, see *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 19-20, 24, 334; *CR, 1256-59*, pp.79-80; *CR, 1268-72*, p. 172. For examples of gifts to Rochester, see *CLR, 1240-45*, p.76; *CR, 1268-72*, pp. 346, 563. For examples of gifts to Coventry, see *CChR*, vol.1, p. 6 (2), 242, 472.

[95] Benedictine = St Edmunds, Peterborough, St Paul's, London, St Martin's, London, Winchester, Pershore, Gloucester, Crowland, St Albans, Evesham, Thiron, Rochester, Coventry, Shrewsbury. Cistercian = Beaulieu, Netley, Hailes, and Flaxley. Augustinian = Ivychurch Priory. Cluniac = Reading Abbey. Alien house = Sherborne Abbey. Premonstratensian = Croxton.

[96] Benedictine house in the top ten (in order of scale of patronage from highest to lowest): Bury St Edmunds; Peterborough; St Paul's, London; St Martin's, London; Winchester; Pershore; Gloucester.

in England so one would expect many of their houses to be patronised just on the balance of probabilities. Henry's patronage, therefore, is not necessarily indicative of regard for the order. Henry's patronage seems to have been influenced by the founder of the house or by which saints and individuals were buried there. Beaulieu, Netley, Hailes, and Croxton were all founded or associated with immediate members of Henry's family.

However, dynastic precedent and the prevailing trends in monastic patronage would have affected Henry's patronage. Until the 1290s, the Cistercians were seen as one the most fashionable and prestigious religious orders.[97] They were favoured by the elites. The Empress Matilda, Henry II, Richard I, and John all founded at least one important male Cistercian house.[98] Edward I vowed to found a Cistercian house and gave money for the foundation of Vale Royal until he had to direct funds elsewhere.[99] Both Louis IX and Blanche of Castile founded Cistercian abbeys.[100] Grant has traced Blanche's regard for the Cistercians to her Angevin heritage.[101] Henry was therefore unusual in not founding a Cistercian house. However, his extensive patronage of Beaulieu, Netley, and Hailes should be taken as evidence for his regard for the order.

Henry gave various gifts to monastic recipients. Land and liberties were not uncommon gifts, but the most common types of gifts were small in nature including trees (for fuel, building works, and repairs), wine (usually for divine service), and small amounts of money (for

[97] C.H.D.C. Farris, "The Pious Practices of Edward I, 1272-1307" (Royal Holloway College, University of London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2013), p. 248; J.C. Ward, 'Fashions in Monastic Endowment: The Foundations of the Clare Family, 1066-1314', Journal of Ecclesiastical History 32 (1981), 427-451, at 439.
[98] L. Grant, *Blanche of Castile* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), p. 215.
[99] Farris, "Pious Practices of Edward I", p. 242.
[100] Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, pp. 121, 215 and J. Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, trans. G.E. Gollrad (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), p. 610.
[101] Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, p. 215.

building works, to buy items, for expenses, and alms).[102] Of the 1,343 gifts to monastic recipients that I have analysed, Henry only charged the recipients for 5% of the gifts, or seventy-two times.[103] Furthermore, twenty-seven of those charges date from 1227, when Henry's government used Henry's attainment of his majority to raise money by issuing and extending charters.[104] Between 1227 and 1229, thirty-seven of the charges occurred (51.4 %).[105] This probably reflects the policies of those who dominated Henry's minority. The only other time there was a spike in charges was 1250-52 inclusive when nineteen charges (26.4 %) occurred, twelve of them in 1252.[106] This may be linked with Henry's drive to raise money to go on crusade. Henry was therefore generous to monastic recipients, giving them a mixture of gifts, but largely gifts that were small and responsive to immediate needs such as building materials and money.

The Templars initially received significant patronage from Henry. In 1231, Henry announced his intention to be buried in the New Temple.[107] Zachery Stewart has suggested that there were many reasons for this choice. The prestige of the order, its association with the crusade, the dynastic precedent of support, and its central location between significant lay and ecclesiastical landmarks (between Westminster Palace and the Tower, and between St Paul's and Westminster Abbey) undoubtedly all influenced Henry's burial choice.[108] Furthermore,

---

[102] For lands and liberties, see *CChR*, vol.1, p. 2 (4), 21 (3), 78, 194, 211, 232, 291 (2), 329, 350, 390, 455; *CR, 1254-56*, pp. 39, 206. For trees, see *CR, 1227-31*, pp. 9, 12, 273, 275; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 81, 95, 124, 305; *CR, 1237-42*, p. 302; *CR, 1242-47*, p. 461; *CR, 1247-51*, p. 52; *CR, 1251-53*, p. 9; *CR, 1254-56*, p. 140; *CR, 1254-56*, p. 344; *CR, 1268-72*, p. 155. For wine, see *CR, 1234-37*, p. 235; *CR, 1234-37*, p. 408; *CR, 1242-47*, p. 378; *CR, 1247-51*, p. 21; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 286-7; *CR, 1251-53*, p. 109; *CR, 1256-59*, p. 27; *CR, 1268-72*, pp. 382-3. For money, see *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 32, 131; *CLR, 1245-51*, pp. 365, 380; *CLR, 1251-60*, pp. 294, 336; *CLR, 1267-72*, pp. 73, 177, 204.
[103] See, for example, *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 1, 2 (3), 4, 8, 9, 17 (5), 98, 198, 329.
[104] See, for example, *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 1, 2 (3), 4, 8, 9, 17 (5), 32, 42.
[105] See, for example, *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 1, 2 (3), 67 (2), 70, 91, 100; *CR, 1227-1231*, pp. 62-3, 153, 215.
[106] See, for example, CChR, vol.1, pp. 347, 369, 372, 391 (2), 392, 394, 409, 410.
[107] *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 135.
[108] Z. Stewart, 'A Lesson in Patronage: King Henry III, the Knights Templar, and a Royal Mausoleum at the Temple Church in London', *Speculum* 94 (2019), 334-384, at 346-7 and 350-2.

William Marshal the Elder (d. 1219) was buried in the New Temple.[109] The Marshal had been a father figure at a formative age and Henry may have wished to honour him by being buried with him.

The patronage the Templars received seems to have been related to Henry's initial enthusiasm for them. In 1227, twenty grants were made to the order, significantly higher than in every other year under examination.[110] Since Henry was reconfirming several grants from his minority, the number may be inflated, referring to several gifts from numerous years of the minority. Nevertheless, the gifts the Templars received in 1227 were impressive and Henry only charged the Templars for seven charters.[111] For four of those charters there was a single charge: 600 marks, a substantial fine but the Templars received much in return for it. All of John and Henry II's extensive gifts to the Templars were confirmed as was the gift of Peter de Malo which gave them land in frank almoin.[112] The last of the four charters exemption from assart in numerous lands pursuant to one of John's charters.[113] Assart refers to the total clearance of shrubs and trees so that land could be converted for another use such as arable farming.[114] Consequently, the granting of exemption from assart was a significant gift.

The Templars were charged £10 in 1227 for two markets, one was a market granted by John, the other a new market. £10 is not a huge fine given the potential money markets could raise. Henry did not have full control of his government in 1227 so his later lack of charging the Templars for gifts indicates his regard for them. Excluding 1227, Henry only charged the

---

[109] Ibid, 340-1.
[110] See *CChR*, vol. 1, pp. 1, 4 (4), 5 (4), 8 (2), 16, 22, 24, 27 (3), 51; *CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 55; *CPR, 1225-1232*, p. 105.
[111] *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 1, 4, 5 (2), 8, 22, 24.
[112] *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 1 (Peter de Malo), 4 (John), 8 (Henry II). Frank almoin was when the Church or ecclesiastical figures held land partially or fully by conducting spiritual services such as saying masses for the soul (Arnold-Baker, *Companion to British History*, p. 537).
[113] *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 5.
[114] Arnold-Baker, *Companion to British History*, p. 62.

Templars twice for a gift: in 1237 and 1248. In 1237, Henry granted two and a half acres of assarted land, in frank almoin, to the brethren of the Temple in return for 6 d. per annum.[115] That is a small amount for such a wealthy order. In 1248, the master of the Templars in England and the brethren were granted free warren in the demesne lands of multiple manors.[116] They were only charged twenty marks, significantly less than the abbot of St Albans was charged for a similar charter.[117]

The Templars continued to receive multiple gifts each year, even after Henry decided to be buried in Westminster Abbey, demonstrating that although Westminster came to dominate Henry's pious patronage, the Templars retained high favour. However, like many of the recipients examined above, the nature of the gifts given to the Templars changed as Henry's reign progressed. Most of the gifts consisted of oaks and trees for building works, small amounts of money, deer, and wine.[118]

Henry seems to have preferred patronising vulnerable and poorer groups. In every year under examination, he patronised nuns. Generally, nunneries were much less well-funded than their male equivalents. Even with royal patronage, some, like the priory of Nuneaton, were not always able to support themselves.[119] Henry, in the years under examination, only charged nunneries seven times.[120] Most of the nunneries charged were wealthy, prestigious ones

---

[115] *CChR*, vol.1, p. 227 and *CFR, 1236-1237*, no 109.
[116] *CChR*, vol.1, p. 331.
[117] *CFR 1247-1248*, no. 395 (Templars) and no 368 (St Albans).
[118] Oaks and trees examples: *CR, 1227-1231*, p. 510; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 45, 309; *CR, 1242-47*, p. 287. Money examples: *CChR*, vol.1, p. 135; *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 93, 108, 160; *CLR, 1251-60*, p. 376; *CPR, 1225-1232*, p. 123; Deer examples: CR, 1234-37, pp. 88, 134, 272; *CR, 1242-47*, p. 285; *CR, 1247-51*, p. 432; *CR, 1256-59*, p. 68; *CR, 1268-72*, pp. 195, 357, 501. Wine examples: *CPR, 1225-1232*, p.105; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 88, 94, 266; *CR, 1242-47*, p. 307.
[119]W. Page (ed) 'Houses of Benedictine nuns: Priory of Nuneaton', in *A History of the County of Warwick: Volume 2*, (London, 1908), pp. 66-70. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/warks/vol2/pp66-70 (accessed 14/09/2020)
[120] See *CFR, 1226-1227*, no 142, *CFR, 1228-1229*, no. 359, *CFR, 1236-1237*, no. 246, *CFR, 1252-1253*, no 464, *CFR, 1255-1256*, no. 927, *CFR, 1256-1257*, no. 551, *CFR, 1256-1257*, no. 857.

including Caen, Wilton, Wherwell, and Barking.[121] Barking had its temporalities valued at £300 13s. 1¼d in the 1291 taxation.[122] In the same taxation, Wherwell's temporalities were valued at £201 18s. 5½d.[123] These are significant sums. In 1257, Henry charged the nuns of Wherwell 50 marks (£33 4s.) for custody of the abbey during its vacancy.[124] In 1252, the abbess of Barking paid 49.5 marks (£33) in tallage.[125] These were amounts that could be afforded by the nuns. Additionally, most of the fines from nuns that Henry levied date from the 1250s, a time when there were increased pressures on royal finances.[126] It seems these charges were related to Henry's need for money and the ability of recipients to pay.

Henry appears to have tried to support many nunneries. On average, there were 15.2 grants a year to nuns.[127] That is three times the patronage displayed to the Templars. Some of the nunneries that Henry most patronised were Tarrant, Fontevrault, Bromhale, Godstow, Lacock, Amesbury, Nunnaminster, Wherwell, Wilton, Ankerwick, and Shaftesbury. All these nunneries were based in the bordering counties of Oxford, Buckinghamshire, Berkshire, Hampshire, Wiltshire, and Dorset.[128] These counties were some of the most visited places during Henry's reign and they largely fit into the circular journey from London to Winchester

---

[121] Barking: *CFR, 1252-1253,* no 464. Caen: *CR, 1254-56,* p.439 (2) and *CFR, 1255-1256*, no 927. Wherwell: *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 551 and *CFR, 1256-1257,* nos. 551 and 591. Wilton: *CFR, 1228-1229,* no. 359.

[122] W. Page and J. Horace Round (ed), 'Houses of Benedictine nuns: Abbey of Barking', in A History of the County of Essex: Volume 2, (London, 1907), pp. 115-122. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/essex/vol2/pp115-122 (accessed 27/12/2022).

[123] H. A. Doubleday and W. Page (ed), 'Houses of Benedictine nuns: Abbey of Wherwell', in *A History of the County of Hampshire: Volume 2*, (London, 1903), pp. 132-137. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/hants/vol2/pp132-137 (27/12/2022).

[124] *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 551.

[125] *CFR, 1252-1253,* no 464. Tallage was a levy that could be imposed by a feudal superior on his tenants or by the crown on its manors and towns (Arnold-Baker, *Companion to British History,* p. 1206)

[126] See *CFR, 1252-1253*, no 464; *CPR, 1247-58,* pp. 551, 571; *CR, 1254-56,* p. 439.

[127] For some examples of his patronage, see: *CChR* vol. 1, pp. 27, 80, 128, 210, 242 (2), 372, 445*; CChR,* vol. 2, pp. 122, 179; *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 25, 64, 267, 370; *CLR, 1240-1245,* pp. 4-5, 13 (2), 50; *CLR, 1245-51, ; CLR, 1251-60,* pp. 16, 241*; CLR, 1267-72,* pp. 143, 209*; CPR, 1225-1232,* p. 271*; CPR, 1232-47,* p. 174 *; CPR, 1247-58,* pp. 38, 551*; CPR, 1266-72,* pp. 309-310, 366, 414*; CR, 1227-31,* pp. 32, 50, 177, 569*; CR, 1234-37,* pp. 55, 249, 280*; CR, 1237-42,* pp. 159, 310*; CR, 1242-47,* pp. 499, 521*; CR, 1247-51,* pp. 13, 211, 283, 310*; CR, 1254-56,* pp. 95, 110, 437*; CR, 1268-72,* pp. 360, 362, 572-3.

[128] Dorset: Tarrant and Shaftesbury. Oxford: Godstow. Berkshire: Bromhale. Buckinghamshire: Ankerwick. Hampshire: Nunnaminster and Wherwell. Wiltshire: Wilton, Lacock, and Amesbury. France (Anjou): Fontevrault.

and back again. This implies that Henry's proximity to such places influenced his patronage, demonstrating a reactive element to Henry's day-to-day patronage; he patronised places that may have petitioned him as he travelled through his realm. Henry patronised most of these houses from the beginning of his majority. He only began to patronise Tarrant, which became his most patronised nunnery, from 1235 onwards.[129] His patronage of Shaftesbury only began in 1246 but he was very generous to the house. Of these eleven houses, nine were Benedictine, Tarrant was Cistercian, and Lacock had Augustinian canonesses. The wealth of these nunneries varied from wealthy houses like Fontevrault and Shaftesbury to poor ones like Ankerwick.[130] Most of these houses had dynastic links, an element that will be explored in greater detail in the next chapter. Tarrant was where Henry's sister, Joan, was buried in 1238.[131] Fontevrault was effectively an Angevin mausoleum as it was the burial site of Henry II, Eleanor of Aquitaine, and Richard I.[132] Additionally, Henry's mother, Isabella of Angoulême, was buried there in 1246. Amesbury was founded by Elfrida, widow of King Edgar, and it was refounded by Henry II in 1177 as part of the commutation of his crusading vow.[133] Nunnaminster was jointly founded by Alfred and his wife Ealhswith.[134] Wherwell was also founded by Elfrida.[135] Wilton was the burial site of the nun and saint, Edith of Wilton, only daughter of King Edgar.[136]

---

[129] *CChR*, vol.1, p. 210.

[130] See W. Page (ed), 'Houses of Benedictine nuns: The priory of Ankerwick', in *A History of the County of Buckingham: Volume 1*, (London, 1905), pp. 355-357. *British History Online.* Viewed at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/bucks/vol1/pp355-357 (accessed 29/12/2022).

[131] W. Page (ed), 'House of Cistercian nuns: The abbey of Tarrant Kaines', in *A History of the County of Dorset: Volume 2*, (London, 1908), pp. 87-90. *British History Online.* Viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/dorset/vol2/pp87-90 (accessed 29/12/2022).

[132]

[133] R.B. Pugh and Elizabeth Crittall (ed), 'Houses of Benedictine nuns: Abbey, later priory, of Amesbury', in *A History of the County of Wiltshire: Volume 3*, London, 1956), pp. 242-259. *British History Online*. Viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/wilts/vol3/pp242-259 (accessed 29/12/2022).

[134] H Arthur Doubleday and W. Page (ed), Nunnaminster (Abbey of St Mary, Winchester)', in *A History of the County of Hampshire: Volume 2*, (London, 1903), pp. 122-126. *British History Online.* Viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/hants/vol2/pp122-126 (accessed 29/12/2022).

[135]Arthur Doubleday and W. Page (ed), 'Houses of Benedictine nuns: Abbey of Wherwell', in *A History of the County of Hampshire: Volume 2*, (London, 1903), pp. 132-137. *British History Online.* Viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/hants/vol2/pp132-137 (accessed 27/12/2022).

[136]R.B. Pugh and Elizabeth Crittall (ed), 'Houses of Benedictine nuns: Abbey of Wilton', in *A History of the County of Wiltshire: Volume 3*, (London, 1956), pp. 231-242. *British History Online.* Viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/wilts/vol3/pp231-242 (accessed 27/12/2022).

Finally, Alfred the Great was thought to be the founder of Shaftesbury and it was patronised by Anglo-Saxon, Norman, and Plantagenet kings.[137] Dynastic precedent, therefore, played a significant role in Henry's patronage of nunneries, but it was not the only determining factor.

Most of Henry's gifts to nuns were small (78.7 %).[138] Wood accounted for 24.2 % of the gifts.[139] Small grants of money were the next most frequent gifts, at 22.9 %.[140] As has been seen so far, the percentage of gifts with small financial value increases over time. Between 1227-1229, 44.3 % of the gifts were small in nature; in the 1230s, 64.0 %; in the 1240s, 85.9 %; in the 1250s, 84.9%, and 1269-73, 81.1 %.[141] As Henry's financial difficulties mounted, his patronage changed to focus on gifts of smaller value that would still provide spiritual succour.

Henry was particularly generous to the friars. From 1231 onwards, which coincided with the arrival and expansion of the Dominican and Franciscan orders, Henry gave at least eight gifts yearly to the friars. If one includes the twenty-five chosen years from 1227-72, Henry granted, on average, 19.6 gifts per annum. If one starts in 1231, that average increases to 22.2.[142] The friars were the most patronised group by the king. As far as I can ascertain,

---

[137] W. Page (ed), 'House of Benedictine nuns: The abbey of Shaftesbury', in *A History of the County of Dorset: Volume 2*, (London, 1908), pp. 73-79. *British History Online*. Viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/dorset/vol2/pp73-79 (accessed 29/12/2022).

[138] I calculated this figure by first categorising all the gifts as explained above. I then divided the categories into 'small value' and 'large value'. As explained above, I classified lands, liberties, buildings, markets and fairs as large in value. All the other gifts, with one or two exceptions (such as a large grant of money), were classified as small value. I then divided the number of small gifts into the overall numbers of gifts to obtain a percentage.

[139] See, for example *CR, 1227-1231*, pp. 32, 483, 486, 569; *CR, 1231-34*, pp. 3, 5; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 50, 94, 282; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 472, 481; *CR, 1237-42*, p. 274; *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 492, 500; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 76, 139, 196, 392, 487; *CR, 1251-53*, pp. 26, 118; *CR, 1254-56*, pp. 143, 252, 299; *CR, 1256-59*, pp. 15, 95 (2), 278; *CR, 1268-72*, pp. 79, 80, 199 (2), 379, 451; *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 60, 267; *CLR, 1245-51*, p. 69.

[140] See, for example, *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 64, 440; *CR, 1247-51*, p.319 *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 25, 51, 64, 106, 109, 130, 280, 416; *CLR, 1240-45*, pp. 4-5, 6, 25, 284; *CLR, 1245-51*, pp. 15, 57-8, 63, 97, 113 (2), 183, 252; *CLR, 1251-60*, pp. 7, 14, 241, 296, 404; *CLR, 1267-72*, pp. 157, 209, 227.

[141] See footnote 158 for how these figures were calculated.

[142] For examples of patronage, see: *CChR*, vol. 1, pp. 70, 226; *CChR*, vol. 2, pp. 118, 123, 168; *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 282, 368-9 (3), 394, 439, 470 (2); *CLR, 1240-1245*, pp. 13 (2), 15, 83, 283; *CLR, 1245-51*, pp. 17, 24, 82, 167, 288, 360; *CLR, 1251-60*, pp. 15, 65, 196, 319, 322, 392; *CLR, 1267-72*, pp. 220, 227, 228; *CPR, 1232-47*, pp. 180 (2), 451; *CPR, 1247-58*, pp. 8, 39, 168, 398, 608; *CPR, 1266-72*, pp. 323, 397, 420, 505, 530, 620; *CR, 1227-31*, pp. 11, 169, 468; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 160, 433; *CR, 1237-42*, pp. 265, 292; *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 298, 367, 392, 517;

Henry never charged the friars for gifts, even when he granted them land.[143] The overwhelming majority of Henry's gifts to the friars were small in nature (97.2 %) with over 53.9 % being grants of wood for fuel or for building works.[144] A further 26.2 % of the gifts were small amount of money for various purposes including for building works, expenses, clothing, and food.[145] Unlike the religious groups examined so far, however, one does not observe a noticeable drop in the value of gifts made. In the 1230s, 87.6 % of the gifts were of small value; in the 1240s, 92.8 % were, in the 1250s, 96.5 % were and in 1269-72, 92.3 % were. This can be linked to the *raison d'être* of the friars. Their actions were meant to be guided by evangelical poverty which influenced what gifts they could accept.[146] Greater gifts would have hindered their adherence to their founders' values.[147] By respecting the friars' boundaries, Henry displayed true regard for them and, as Phillips has noted, resulted in his patronage being so focused towards the poor and sick.[148]

Henry's embracement of the friars' ideals (of care for the poor) can be seen in his patronage of lepers, hospitals, hermits, and anchoresses. As was discussed in chapter one, Henry's patronage of lepers was rooted in dynastic tradition. The kings and queens of England

---

*CR, 1247-51,* pp. 134, 187, 298, 497; *CR, 1251-53,* pp. 34, 123; *CR, 1254-56,* pp. 51-2, 125, 292, 354; *CR, 1256-59,* pp. 32, 38, 48, 94; *CR, 1268-72,* pp. 16-17, 18 (2), 199, 360, 442, 455.

[143] For examples of the gifts of land without charges, see *CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 282; *CLR, 1245-51,* p. 65; *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 459; *CPR, 1266-72,* pp. 321, 530; *CR, 1227-1231,* p.11; *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 284, 316, 433, 495-5, 497; *CR, 1242-47,* pp. 392, 517.

[144] For examples of gifts of wood, see *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 398, 404 (2); *CLR, 1240-45,* pp. 283,294, 295; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 27, 31, 80, 137, 167, 196, 322; *CLR, 1251-60,* pp. 25, 93, 95; *CLR, 1267-72,* pp. 101, 138 (2) *CR, 1227-1231,* pp. 169, 480, 510; *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 64, 95, 96, 138, 249, 462 (2), *CR, 1237-42,* pp. 1, 265, 292; *CR, 1242-47,* pp. 462, 492, 524; *CR, 1251-53,* pp. 123, 142; *CR, 1254-56,* pp. 112, 335; *CR, 1256-9,* pp. 71, 72, 96; *CR, 1268-72,* pp. 220, 232, 334, 452, 453 (3).

[145] Money for building work: *CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 402; *CLR, 1240-45,* pp. 27, 57; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 244, 255; *CLR, 1267-72,* p. 127; *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 492 *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 287. Money for expenses: *CLR, 1267-72,* pp. 136, 224. Money for food: *CLR, 1251-60,* pp. 319, 322, 346 (2). Money for clothing: *CLR, 1240-45,* p.85, 87, 93 (2); *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 16 (2), CPR, 1232-47, pp. 466, 467. Quite often, money granted to the friars had no specific recorded purpose and could have been used as the friars saw fit. For examples of such grants see *CLR, 1226-1240,* p.394, 441, 492-3, *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 6, 17, 28 (3), 52-4, 113; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 159, 167, 333; *CLR, 1267-72,* p. 231; *CPR, 1266-72,* pp. 319-320, 320, 403-404.

[146] M. Robson, *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), p. 57.

[147] Robson, *Franciscans in the Middle Ages,* pp. 17, 44-46, 57 and 90.

[148] Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 79.

had founded and patronised leper house since the early 12th century.[149] Henry patronised leper houses that had dynastic links including three houses that were founded by John (Hospital of St Leonard, Lancaster**;** Priory of Maiden Bradley; Hospital of St Lawrence, Bristol).[150] He also patronised houses without dynastic links because lepers were *pauperes Christi*, extreme examples of the sick and poor. Consequently, they were seen as powerful intercessors with God.[151] By supporting a range of leper houses, not just those with dynastic links, Henry was embodying Christological ideals.

Henry's treatment of the lepers was akin to his treatment of the friars. There are seven references to lepers in the fine rolls of Henry III.[152] Four of those references are from after 1227 and three of those references refer to money or corn being given to the lepers.[153] The last entry, dated 21 October 1256, states that the master of the lepers of St Leonard's, Derby, is to pay one mark for having a writ for a plea of trespass before the justices of York.[154] That is a relatively low sum. Like the friars, they were not charged for significant grants of lands and liberties. They also received many gifts that were small in value. However, unlike the friars, 30.6 % of their gifts were lands or liberties.[155] Like many of the above religious groups, overall, the financial value of the gifts to the lepers decreased as Henry's reign progressed. For example, in 1229, 75 % of the gifts given were of high value. In 1240, 1241, 1247, 1248, 1249, 1250, and 1257, 100 % of the gifts were small in nature. Small grants of money and wood (usually

---

[149] Phillips, "The Leper and the King", p. 153.
[150] Examples of gifts to Hospital of St Leonard, Lancaster: *CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 23; *CR, 1227-1231,* pp. 182, 277. Priory of Maiden Bradley: *CChR,* vol.1, p. 84; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 126, 240; *CR, 1227-1231,* p. 128; *CR, 1234-37,* p. 282; *CR, 1242-47,* p. 294; *CR, 1247-51,* p. 375. Hospital of St Lawrence, Bristol: *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 20.
[151] Phillips, "The Leper and the King", p. 108.
[152] *CFR, 1224-1225,* nos. 11 and 88; *CFR, 1226-1227,* no. 143; *CFR, 1234-1235,* nos. 99 and 100; *CFR, 1236-1237,* no. 57; *CFR, 1255-1256,* no. 1290.
[153] Four references: *CFR, 1234-1235,* nos. 99 and 100; *CFR, 1236-1237,* no. 57; *CFR, 1255-1256,* no. 1290. Money references: *CFR, 1234-1235,* nos. 99 and 100. Corn reference: *CFR, 1236-1237,* no. 57.
[154] *CFR, 1255-1256,* no. 1290.
[155] See, for example, the following grants of land and liberties: *CChR,* vol. 1, pp.41-42, 84, 94; *CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 23; *CLR, 1245-51,* p. 91; *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 139; *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 60, 61, 65; *CR, 1247-51,* p. 421

for fuel and building materials) were the most popular gifts.[156] Interestingly, no gifts were made to lepers between 1269 and 1272.

Hospitals were clearly important to Henry. His only certain new religious foundations were hospitals: the Hospital of St John without the East Gate of Oxford, and the Hospital at Ospringe in Kent. Ospringe and the Hospital of St John were founded in around 1235.[157] In his support of hospitals Henry emulated his father and his contemporary, Blanche of Castile.[158] Henry never charged a hospital for a gift, even when granting substantial lands. If one examines the gifts given to all the hospitals that Henry patronised, 26.0 % consisted of lands or liberties and 39.9 % were either wood or small grants of money.[159] However, when one removes the gifts granted to Henry's foundations, between 1235 and 1272[160], 50 % of the gifts granted consisted of either wood or small grants of money. 19.6 % of the gifts were either lands or liberties. Henry's foundations received a substantial proportion of the gifts he granted 1227-1272 (22. 5 %). That figure rises to 29.8% 1235-1272. Between 1235-1272, there were thirty-four grants of lands and liberties to hospitals. Sixteen of those gifts (47.1 %) went to Henry's foundations and lands and liberties accounted for 41.0 % of the gifts Henry granted his foundations.[161] Predictably, most of the major gifts made to hospitals during Henry's reign were to his own foundations. The predominance of gifts of small value to hospitals reinforce

---

[156] Wood examples: *CR, 1227-1231,* pp.12, 182, 568; *CR, 1231-34,* p. 6; *CR, 1234-37,* p.36; *CR, 1242-47,* p. 294; *CR, 1247-51,* p. 200, 495; *CR, 1254-56,* p. 309. Money examples: *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 253, 416, 438; *CLR, 1240-45,* p. 63; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 19, 173, 248, 334; *CLR, 1251-60,* pp. 93, 315; *CPR, 1225-1232,* p. 247.
[157] Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 87.
[158] Grant, *Blanche of Castile,* p. 207; P. Webster, *King John and Religion* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), p. 101.
[159] Examples of lands and liberties: *CChR,* vol.1, pp. 28, 48, 78, 79, 99, 238, 257, 283, 402, *CR, 1227-1231,* pp. 500, 530; *CR, 1234-37,* p. 98, 493, 495; *CR, 1247-51,* pp. 7-8, 212, 280. Examples of wood and money: *CChR,* vol.1, p. 79 (2), 142, 191, 293 ; *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 160, 405; *CLR, 1240-45,* p. 58; *CLR, 1267-72,* p.110, 221; *CPR, 1225-1232,* p. 199; *CR, 1227-1231,* p. 184; *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 121, 243; *CR, 1247-51,* pp. 260, 455; *CR, 1251-53,* p. 95; *CR, 1254-56,* pp. 345; *CR, 1256-59,* p. 97; *CR, 1268-72,* pp. 194, 220, 376.
[160] In the years under examination where the crisis years have been removed (1230, 1238, 1242, 1243, 1244, 1253, 1254, 1258-68).
[161] Lands and liberties to Henry's foundations: *CChR,* vol. 1, pp. 238 (2), 257, 294-5, 295, 307-8, 391; *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 98, 493, 495; *CP, 1237-42,* pp. 333, 438; *CR, 1247-51,* pp. 212, 243; *CR, 1251-53,* p. 6; *CR, 1254-56,* pp. 99-100.

the patterns seen so far in Henry's patronage of religious institutions and in his general focus on small gifts for less wealthy and established recipients.

Finally, Henry's patronage of ascetic religious figures, including hermits and anchoress largely consisted of small gifts of wood and money. 87.5 % of the gifts granted to these recipients were small in nature. 35.9 % were grants of wood, and 35.9 % were small grants of money.[162] These recipients were never charged for their gifts, reflecting Henry's desire to support the most vulnerable in his kingdom whose lives were marked by poverty.

Henry's patronage of recipients I have termed 'vulnerable' differed from his patronage of wealthy established orders and figures. Overall, Henry's patronage of the vulnerable focused on smaller, more practical, consistent gifts such as wood, building materials, clothing, food, and money. The established group, overall, received 40.4% of the wood gifts, 54.5% of the building materials, 53.6% of the clothing, 48.1 % of the food, and 51.7% of the money.[163] The established group received 79.4% of the charters granting fairs and markets, 78.1% of the

---

[162] Examples of wood grants: *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 221, 409; *CR, 1237-42,* p. 269; *CR, 1242-47,* pp. 370, 400, 499; *CR, 1247-51,* p.145; *CR, 1251-53,* p. 124; *CR, 1268-72,* p. 362. Examples of money grants: *CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 259; *CLR, 1240-45,* p. 70; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 47, 118, 285; *CLR, 1251-60,* pp. 40, 315.

[163] For examples of wood patronage, see: *CChR,* vol. 1, pp. 140, 238, 264 (2); *CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 398; *CLR, 1240-5,* pp. 13, 289; *CR, 1227-31,* pp. 12 (2), 13, 268, 273, 484, 520; *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 45, 124, 139, 257; *CR, 1237-42,* pp. 163, 309; *CR, 1242-47,* pp. 330, 415, 519; *CR, 1247-51,* pp. 52 (2), 196, 277, 448; *CR, 1251-53,* pp. 3, 294, 478-9; *CR, 1254-56,* pp. 62, 284; *CR, 1256-59,* p. 26; *CR, 1268-72,* pp. 109, 270, 572-3, 601-2. For buildings: *CChR,* vol. 1, pp. 84, 86, 87, 194-5, 226, 287, 346; *CLR, 1226-40,* pp. 385, 439; *CLR, 1240-45,* p. 88; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 19, 271; *CLR, 1267-72,* pp. 70, 502; *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 591; *CPR, 1266-72,* p. 632; *CR, 1227-31,* pp. 128, 181, 518-9; *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 75, 203, 489; *CR, 1247-51,* pp. 65, 567; *CR, 1268-72,* p. 331. For clothing, see: *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 79, 94, 495; *CLR, 1240-5,* p. 76; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 84 (2), 151-2 (3), 173; *CLR, 1251-60,* pp. 8-9 (2), 39-40 (3); *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 60; *CR, 1237-42,* pp. 288, 337, 375; *CR, 1242-47,* pp. 373, 442; *CR, 1247-51,* p. 472; *CR, 1251-53,* p. 46; *CR, 1254-56,* p. 311; *CPR, 1266-72,* pp. 524, 529. Food: *CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 377; *CLR, 1240-5,* p. 41; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 155, 188; *CLR, 1267-72,* p. 74; *CPR, 1225-1232,* p. 226; *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 259; *CPR, 1266-72,* p. 502; *CR, 1234-37,* p. 464; *CR, 1242-47,* pp. 382, 469; *CR, 1251-53,* pp. 29, 122; *CR, 1254-56,* pp. 34, 84. Money: *CChR,* vol. 1, pp. 78, 219, 327; *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 79, 92-3, 110, 133, 416; *CLR, 1240-5,* pp. 9, 41, 78, 309; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 43, 99, 176, 271, 339, 357; *CLR, 1251-60,* pp. 213, 239, 275, 376; *CLR, 1267-72,* pp. 270, 391-2; *CPR, 1225-1240,* pp. 80, 196-7; *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 121; *CR, 1227-31,* pp. 531 (2); *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 231, 453; *CR, 1242-47,* pp. 325, 485; *CR, 1247-51,* pp. 26, 329; *CR, 1251-53,* pp. 8, 69; *CR, 1254-56,* p. 289; *CR, 1268-72,* pp. 18 (2), 242.

liberties, 95.2% of the deer, and 77.9% of the wine.[164] Due to the nature of these vulnerable groups, such as the friars and the lepers, they simply did not have enough land to hold fairs or markets. Furthermore, Henry's patronage of such groups mirrored changes in religious patronage across Europe. J.C. Ward, in her analysis of the monastic patronage of the Clares, noted that as the twelfth century progressed, their patronage focused on increasingly poor groups, from Benedictines to Cistercians, to friars in the thirteenth century. The reasons for such changes were linked to cost (the Cistercians lived more austere lives than the Benedictines), patronage fashions, and the regard in which the orders were held.[165] All these factors would have influenced Henry's patronage and helps to explain why he only made two new foundations during his reign. With the loss of Normandy, Henry had less land available to give away and he could secure spiritual benefits at a low cost to himself.[166]

However, just because gifts were small in terms of monetary worth, they still made a substantial difference to the recipients, especially the poorer ones.[167] This should remind one that consistent, small gifts were just as important as one extensive charter in maintaining religious institutions. The friars, for example, arrived in England at the start of Henry's reign and largely developed in the kingdom due to his patronage.[168] Like lepers, the friars' poverty

---

[164] Charters grating fairs and markets: *CChR*, vol. 1, pp. 70, 84, 96, 190, 219, 220, 243, 284, 312, 338, 472; *CChR*, vol. 2, pp. 115, 123, 131, 149, 156, 169, 181; *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 34; *CPR, 1247-58*, p. 529; *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 538; *CR, 1227-31*, pp. 41, 193, 571; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 42-3, 61; *CR, 1237-42*, p. 3; *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 450, 523; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 156, 452. Liberties: *CChR*, vol. 1, pp. 78. 84 (2), 103, 140, 217, 258, 294-5, 344, 367, 403, 443, 472; *CChR*, vol. 2, pp. 138, 143, 148, 180; *CPR, 1232-47*, pp. 121, 458; *CPR, 1247-58*, pp. 396 (2); *CPR, 1266-72*, pp. 340, 365, 601-2; *CR, 1227-31*, pp. 37, 172, 281, 529; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 76, 142, 289; *CR, 1237-42*, p. 458; *CR, 1242-47*, p. 501; *CR, 1247-51*, p. 128; *CR, 1254-56*, p. 39; *CR, 1268-72*, p. 223. Deer: *CChR*, vol. 1, pp. 206, 210; *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 458; *CR, 1227-31*, p. 572; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 25, 116, 135, 385, 494; *CR, 1237-42*, pp. 149, 151, 280; *CR, 1256-59*, pp. 26, 68, 172, 374, 495; *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 230, 452, 528; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 51, 61, 136, 252; *CR, 1251-53*, p. 49; *CR, 1254-56*, pp. 120, 331. Wine: *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 432 (3), 455; *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 41; *CLR, 1245-51*, pp. 60, 485; *CLR, 1251-60*, pp. 4, 11, 315; *CLR, 1267-72*, pp. 113, 153, 176; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 85, 100, 235; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 194, 269, 286-7, 486; *CR, 1251-53*, pp. 8-9, 102; *CR, 1254-56*, pp. 62, 196; *CR, 1256-59*, pp. 27, 132; *CR, 1268-72*, pp. 382-3.

[165] Ward, "Fashions in Monastic Endowment", 439.

[166] For a discussion on how the availability of land affected the Clare family's patronage, see Ward, "Fashions in Monastic Endowment", 442 and 446.

[167] Hallam, "Aspects of Monastic Patronage", vol. 1, p. 155.

[168] Ibid, vol. 1, pp. 154-5.

meant that they were far more dependent on royal patronage. Henry's patronage had the potential to have a more transformative effect on vulnerable groups. St Edmunds, St Albans, and Westminster were all wealthy long before Henry patronised them and they had received patronage from numerous sources. Henry's patronage was certainly desired, but they were not in as precarious a position as those poorer institutions and individuals.

Piety and Itinerary

Before analysing the case study of Westminster Abbey, a final aspect of Henry's piety to examine is his presence at certain places on liturgically significant days. By analysing Henry's itineraries, one can judge how important a place and its saint were to Henry. This is especially so for important liturgical days as they usually involved more planning and greater almsgiving. Locations had different aspects to them depending on spiritual and temporal factors. It was believed that the closer one was to a saint, the more efficacious their prayers. They were believed to have a 'hotline' to God, hence the importance of pilgrimage.[169] By going to places like Winchester, for example, Henry was appealing to local saints, (such as St Edmund whose relics were held at Bury St Edmunds) hoping to obtain their intercession. As Henry took pains to be near certain tombs across the country, he made a conscious effort to display his devotion suggesting the importance of such saints to him.

This is not surprising given the amount of time Henry spent at Westminster every year. Using the figures that Julie Kanter calculated in her thesis, between 1234-1252 (excluding the years 1242-3 as Henry was in Poitou), Henry spent 28 % of his time at Westminster.[170] I then

[169] P. Brown, *The Cult of Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (London: SCM Press, 1981), pp. 3-4.

[170] I calculated this figure by adding together the percentages of time spent at Westminster that Kanter calculated in her thesis. For the figures for each year see Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", Appendix: Personal

used the itinerary composed by T. Craib in the National Archives to calculate the percentage of time Henry spent out Westminster between 1255-72 inclusive. Following Kanter's methodology, I subtracted the days where Henry's location was uncertain and calculated the percentage of time spent at a location out of the days where Henry's location was certain.[171] Between 1255-72, Henry spent every year, on average, 39.2 % of his time at Westminster.

---

Rule of Henry III Section, pp. 1019, 1039, 1058, 1078, 1096, 1114, 1132, 1151, 1171, 1190, 1209, 1227, 1246, 1264, 1282, 1301, 1320. I then added these figures together (18 + 24 + 8 + 24 + 15 + 45 + 57 + 33 + 30 + 23 +24 + 30 + 33 + 34 + 32 + 20 + 26 = 476) and then divided by the number of years Kanter had calculated figures for (476/17 = 28).

[171] For example, in the year 1255, I counted forty days where Henry's location was uncertain. I was therefore calculating percentages out of 325 days (365-40 = 325). I then counted the number of days where Westminster was recorded as Henry's location (88 days) and calculated the percentage (88/325) x 100 = 27.1 % (to one decimal place). Please see T. Craib (ed), *Itinerary of Henry III, 1215-1272,* (London, P.R.O, 1923), pp. 244-250 for raw data for 1255.

In 1256 (a leap year), there were 72 days where Henry's location was unknown, 294 known. He spent 74 days at Westminster. (74/ 294) x 100 = 25.2 %.

In 1257, 80 days = unknown. 365-80 = 285. Henry was at Westminster for 139 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (139/285) x 100 = 48.8 %.

In 1258, 76 days = unknown. 365-76 = 289. Henry was at Westminster for 121 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (121/289) x 100 = 41.9 %.

In 1259, 65 days = unknown. 365-65 = 300. Henry was at Westminster for 159 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (159/300) x 100 = 53.0 %.

In 1260 (leap year), 63 days = unknown. 366-63 = 303. Henry was at Westminster for 121 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (121/303) x 100 = 39.9 %.

In 1261, 39 days = unknown. 365-39 = 326. Henry was at Westminster for 17 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (17/326) x 100 = 5.2 %.

In 1262, 108 days = unknown. 365-108 = 257. Henry was at Westminster for 97 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (97/257) x 100 = 37.7 %.

In 1263, 130 days = unknown. 365-130 = 235. Henry was at Westminster for 144 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (144/235) x 100 = 61.3 %.

In 1264 (leap year), 119 days = unknown. 366- 119 = 247. Henry was at Westminster for 16 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (16/247) x 100 = 6.5 %.

In 1265, 41 days = unknown. 365-41 = 324. Henry was at Westminster for 132 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (132/324) x 100 = 40.7 %.

In 1266, 73 days = unknown. 365-73 = 292. Henry was at Westminster for 62 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (62/292) x 100 = 21.2 %.

In 1267, 78 days = unknown. 365-78 = 287. Henry was at Westminster for 30 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (30/287) x 100 = 10.5 %.

In 1268 (leap year), 114 days = unknown. 366-114 = 252. Henry was at Westminster for 116 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (116/252) x 100 = 46.0 %.

In 1269, 94 days = unknown. 365-94 = 271. Henry was at Westminster for 138 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (138/271) x 100 = 50.9 %.

In 1270, 86 days = unknown. 365-86 = 279. Henry was at Westminster for 154 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (154/279) x 100 = 55.2 %.

In 1271, 68 days = unknown. 365-68 = 297. Henry was at Westminster for 219 days. So, percentage of time spent at Westminster (219/297) x 100 = 73.7 %.

In 1272 (leap year), 78 days = unknown. Henry died 16 November. 16 November to 31 December = 46 days. 46 + 78 = 124 days (combination of when Henry was dead and unknown days). 366-124 = 242. Henry was at Westminster for 147 days. So, percentage of time Henry spent at Westminster (147/242) x 100 = 60.7 %.

Overall, between 1227-1272 inclusive, Henry spent, on average, 33.6 % of his year at Westminster.

However, Henry seems to have made a concerted effort to spend certain feast days at Westminster. David Carpenter has drawn attention to Henry's desire to spend the Confessor's feast days in Westminster. From 1238 onwards Henry was almost always present at Westminster for the obit feast (5 January) of the Confessor.[172] For four of the seven feasts that Henry missed, he was abroad. The Confessor's translation feast (13 October) was, as Carpenter has noted, around the Michaelmas sessions of bench and exchequer, so one would expect Henry to be at Westminster. However, Henry seems to have made a concerted effort to return to Westminster for the feast after 1234. In 1229 and 1232, Henry left Westminster after the sessions and before the feast.[173]

During normal years Henry was present at Westminster for the obit feast of the Confessor for 60 % and for 73.9% of the translation feasts. He also spent most of the Marian feasts at Westminster along with the moveable feasts including those in Lent and Easter.[174] He

---

[172] D.A. Carpenter, 'King Henry III and Saint Edward the Confessor: The Origins of the Cult', *English Historical Review* 122 (2007), 865-91, at 868.
[173] Ibid, 869.
[174] Percentage of time spent at Westminster on liturgically significant dates throughout his reign (I calculated these percentages by looking at Kanter and Craig's itineraries and recording where Henry was on the below days and the calculating percentages)
1) Translation of the Confessor, Good Friday, and Easter (all 84%)
2) Maundy Thursday (76%)
3) Purification (62%)
4) Pentecost, Palm Sunday, Obit feast of the Confessor (60% each)
5) Annunciation, Shrove Tuesday, Ash Wednesday, Ascension (all 56%)
6) Conversion of Paul (54.3%)
7) Passion Sunday and St Peter *in Cathedra* (52% each)
8) Decollation of Paul (36%)
9) Trinity, All Saints, and Obit of St Swithun (32 % each)
10) Assumption of the Virgin Mary, Nativity of the Virgin Mary, Translation of Becket, All Souls, SS. Peter and Paul (28% each)
11) Edmund, king and martyr (25%)
12) Translation of St Swithun and St Peter Ad Vincula (24%)
13) Nativity of John the Baptist (20%)
14) Edmund Rich and Advent (16.7% each)

also was present for the papal feasts, but especially for the feasts of St Peter *in Cathedra* (52% of the time) and the Conversion of Paul (54.3%).[175] Westminster was not just dedicated to the Confessor but to St Peter as well. The lives of the Confessor framed Edward's rebuilding of Westminster as gratitude for the role that God and the pope for their roles in winning his kingdom. Instead of fulfilling his vow to go on pilgrimage to Rome, at the request of his barons who did not wish him to leave his kingdom, Edward rebuilt the abbey in honour of St Peter. Westminster, therefore, always had a papal aspect to it, and this should not be overlooked.[176]

One does have to contextualise the above figures. During his majority, Westminster was, by some margin, Henry's favourite destination. Not all the reasons for this were religious. Even before his reign, Westminster was becoming the political and financial centre of England. Henry's minority had encouraged this centralisation due to its length. Henry's desire for a more comfortable itinerary amplified this trend.[177] One could argue, therefore, that the high percentage of feasts being celebrated at Westminster, are only indicative of Henry's regard for Westminster in general. However, once one examines the figures, it becomes clear that Henry made a concerted effort to be in Westminster for liturgically significant events. Between 1227 and1272 (minus the crisis years)[178] Henry spent on average 29 % of his year at Westminster but was present, for example, for Good Friday, Easter, and the translation feast of the Confessor 84% of the time. The importance that Westminster held for Henry as a centre of pious devotions cannot be overstated.

---

15) Decollation of John the Baptist (16%)
16) Exaltation of the Cross (12%)

[175] To examine the itinerary raw data, see Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", especially 'Appendix: Personal rule of Henry III', pp. 1002-1328. See also Craib (ed), *Itinerary of Henry III.*

[176] T.S. Fenster and J. Wogan-Browne (trans. and ed.), *The History of Saint Edward the King* (Arizona: Arizona University Press, 2008), p. 74.

[177] Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", p. 36.

[178] 1230, 1233-4, 1238, 1242-3, 1244, 1253-4, 1258-68.

Due to the dominance of Westminster in Henry's itinerary, it is illuminating to see which other places Henry favoured. Winchester was a popular location, especially over the Christmas period (including the feasts of St Stephen, the Holy Innocents, and the obit of Thomas Becket).[179] Christmas was one of the most important periods in Latin Christendom. That Henry chose to favour Winchester over Westminster during the Christmas period is significant and demonstrates its importance to him. There were many reasons for Henry's attachment to Winchester. First, he was born there and that would have created an emotional tie, as the place and time of one's birth was important in the medieval period.[180] Jacques Le Goff has stressed that Saint Louis was born on a day associated with mourning and that played an important role in his development.[181] Second, Henry had personal ties to many of the bishops of Winchester. Peter des Roches and Aymer de Lusignan are the salient examples. Third, there were important dynastic links. Winchester had been the capital of the Wessex kingdom and the burial site of many notable Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman royalty. Furthermore, Winchester was also the site of the crown-wearings of his Norman predecessors, held at Easter, Pentecost and Christmas. Winchester can also be regarded as the literal start of the Angevin dynasty.[182] It was there, in 1153, where Stephen made peace with Matilda, making the future Henry II his heir.[183] Richard I and John also used Winchester to re-establish their authority after times of crisis.[184]

---

[179] Henry was at Winchester on Christmas eve in 1231, 1235, 1236, 1246, 1247, 1249, 1250, 1255, 1267, 1268, 1271. He was there on Christmas in 1231, 1235, 1236, 1237, 1246, 1247, 1248, 1249, 1250, 1255, 1267, 1268, 1269, 1270, 1271. Henry was at Winchester on St Stephen's day in 1231, 1235, 1236, 1237, 1238, 1246, 1247, 1249, 1250, 1255, 1267, 1268, 1269, 1270, 1271. Henry was at Winchester on Feast of Holy Innocents in 1246, 1247, 1249, 1250, 1255, 1267, 1268, 1269, 1270, 1271. Henry was at Winchester on obit feast of Thomas Becket in 1246, 1247, 1249, 1250, 1255, 1267, 1269, 1270, 1271.

[180] Christ's place of birth was very important, Joseph had to return to his place of birth at the time of Jesus' birth. See Luke 2: 1-7. Viewed online at https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Luke+2%3A+1-7&version=DRA (accessed 28/05/2023).

[181] See le Goff, *Saint Louis*, pp. 6, 202, 301, 724.

[182] R. Bartlett, *England Under the Normans and Angevin Kings 1075-1225* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 128-129.

[183] For a detailed examination of these themes, see: A. Shacklock, 'Henry III and Native Saints', in A. Spencer and C. Watkins (ed), *Thirteenth Century England XVII: Proceedings of the Cambridge Conference 2017* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2021), 23-40, at p. 28.

[184] Bartlett, *England under the Normans and Angevins*, p. 129

On the feast of the Immaculate Conception Henry was often at Clarendon.[185] Clarendon is very near Winchester so it is possible that Henry visited places in the immediate vicinity and those could have been churches associated with Winchester saints or royals. However, there is no certain evidence either way. Clarendon was one of Henry's popular residences, which he made more comfortable.[186] The feast would still have been important to Henry, but he may not have felt a need to be anywhere with specific religious significance. Clarendon may well have been the most comfortable of his residences on his way to Winchester for Christmas.

A similar motivation may be at play for the feast of the Circumcision.[187] Henry's most popular destination was Guildford. Guildford was a convenient stop on Henry's route from Winchester to London. The circular journey from London to Winchester via Clarendon and then back to London via Guildford indicates the regularity of Henry's journeys to and from Winchester. They underline the importance of Winchester to Henry.

Westminster

Henry's ecclesiastical patronage was varied but Westminster Abbey dominated such patronage. Henry's devotion to Westminster was unprecedented. He elevated Westminster to

[185] Henry was at Clarendon on the feast of the Immaculate Conception in 1239, 1246, 1249, 1250, 1256, 1267, 1268, 1269, 1271.
[186] See Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", p. 36
[187] Henry was at Guildford on the feast of the Circumcision in 1235, 1238, 1239, 1247, 1248, 1250, 1251, 1253, 1268, 1269 and 1270. Henry was at Winchester during the period 24-29 December inclusive before going to Guildford in 1235, 1238, 1247, 1248, 1250, 1268, 1269 and 1270. Henry, therefore, followed the loop from London to Winchester and then to Guildford, eight times in the twelve (two thirds of the time) when Henry is recorded at being at Guildford on the feast of the Circumcision. There were years when Henry was at Winchester in the Christmas period and then not at Guildford and vice versa. This supports the contention that Henry was following a well-trodden route to make the Christmas journey to and from Winchester.

the centre of power and turned it into a dynastic church. This was quite different to the actions of his predecessors. One could see Henry's relationship with Westminster as unique but is it important not to over stress Henry's innovation. The Middle Ages was not an age where innovation was lauded; any change was justified with reference to tradition and precedent. Henry worked within conservative structures. A king patronising a religious institution was not a radical act, but an expected element of kingly piety. Nevertheless, understanding the flavour or focus of Henry's piety does illuminate who and what were important to him.

Westminster Abbey and Edward the Confessor have received much scholarly attention.[188] This is understandable given that the abbey was perhaps the most striking visual statement of Henry's kingship. He was integral to transforming the abbey into a grander place with strong dynastic links. Henry's involvement in the abbey, be it architectural, financial, or spiritual, was near total. He was aware of the power of images and the context in which they were seen. Westminster became the focal point of his kingship.

Henry used Westminster to stage important acts of political theatre. Henry took the time to try to design the events to accomplish his aims. Such events were displays of pomp and

[188] See, for examples of work on Westminster Abbey, P. Binski, *The Painted Chamber at Westminster* (London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 1986); P. Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995); D.A. Carpenter, 'King Henry III and the Cosmati Work at Westminster Abbey' in D.A. Carpenter (ed.), *The Reign of Henry III* (London: Hambledon, 1996), 409-425; D.A. Carpenter, 'Westminster Abbey in Politics, 1258-69' in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England VIII: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 1999* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001), 49-58; N.C. Vincent, *The Holy Blood: King Henry III and the Westminster Blood Relic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). For work on Edward the Confessor, see P. Binski, P., 'Reflections on *La estoire de Seint Aedward le rei*: hagiography and kingship in thirteenth-century England', *Journal of Medieval History* 16 (1990), 333-350; Carpenter, 'Origins of the Cult', Fenster, and Wogan-Browne, *The History of Saint Edward the King*.

ceremony and attracted contemporary comment, but Henry's consistent patronage is illuminating because Westminster would not have been a suitable backdrop for displays of royal power without the consistent patronage that allowed the community there to grow and thrive. Westminster Abbey, during Henry's reign, was the most well-patronised religious house in his realm. From 1227 to 1272, Henry, whether in the form of patronising the monks of Westminster, or the saints buried or associated with Westminster, gave gifts to such recipients at least once every year except for 1227, 1231 and 1264.[189] David Carpenter has argued that Henry's close relationship with the Confessor really developed in the aftermath of the Marshal rebellion in 1234 and his argument is a strong one.[190] The lack of patronage in 1227 and 1231 can be explained, therefore, due to the king's early lack of commitment to the place. In 1264, the country was in the throes of civil war, and, after 14 May, Henry was Simon de Montfort's prisoner. Resources were being directed by the Montfortian government, which was more focused on winning a civil war than spending money on extravagant pious acts.[191] During the normal years under examination Henry made, on average, 10.9 grants per annum.[192] The years 1235 to 1256 were those of his most extensive patronage and this can be linked with the most active phase of the rebuilding of the abbey.[193]

During the years of crisis (1230, 1233-4, 1238, 1242-3, 1244, 1253-4, 1258-68) in Henry's reign, he gave a yearly average of 7.3 gifts to the abbey per annum.[194] This can be

---

[189] For some examples of royal patronage of Westminster, see *CChR*, vol. 1, pp. 67, 203, 209, 219; *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 282, 374, 453; *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 41; *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 246; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 119, 130, 285; *CR, 1237-42*, p. 149; *CR, 1247-51*, p. 460; *CR, 1254-56*, p. 437; *CR, 1268-72*, p. 109.
[190] Carpenter, 'Origins of the Cult', 866.
[191] Personal devotions were different. Simon does not appear to have prevented Henry from giving his oblations in 1265.
[192] See footnote 101 for some examples.
[193] For examples of this patronage, see: *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 263, 282, 393, 425, 461-2; *CLR, 1240-45*, pp. 4, 8, 286, 296-7, 310; *CLR, 1245-51*, pp. 75, 139; *CLR, 1251-60*, p. 194; *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 502; *CPR, 1247-58*, p. 76; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 117, 130, 142, 230, 254, 278, 423; *CR, 1237-42*, pp. 149, 292; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 54, 65, 158, 264, 496; *CR, 1251-53*, pp. 122, 138; *CR, 1254-56*, pp. 336, 358.
[194] See, for example: *CChR*, vol. 1, p.268; *CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 306; *CLR, 1240-5*, p. 117 (2), 214, 241; *CLR, 1251-60*, p. 180; *CLR, 1260-67*, p. 292; *CPR, 1232-47*, pp. 4. 381; *CPR, 1247-58*, pp. 196, 634; *CPR, 1258-66*, pp. 226,

linked to Henry having other pulls on his time and resources. This was particularly the case in the period of baronial revolt and rebellion. However, work on Westminster Abbey did continue during this time.[195] On the eve of the battle of Evesham, about one hundred craftsmen were working on the abbey.[196] Furthermore, between January 1264 and November 1272, the average amount of money spent on the abbey was £1163, a phenomenal sum. However, this was half the annual average spent between 1246 and 1259 demonstrating the baronial revolt impacted progress.[197] Furthermore, during the rebellion, spending on Westminster was largely directed by the barons. Carpenter argued that this was due to a desire to present a 'business as usual' front (it would have been obvious that Henry did not control his government if work had stopped on his most beloved and visual statement of his kingship) and to give the royalist abbey a different emphasis, most pertinently seen in the sixteen heraldic shields in the abbey that included five shields of members of the council of fifteen.[198] Henry's spending, including on pious projects, was curtailed.

However, if one excludes those years of baronial revolt and rebellion from the analysis, the average number of gifts increase to 12.2 gifts per annum, higher than the normal years.[199] This suggests that in times of difficulty (but not total disarray, as was the case for some of 1258-68), Henry turned his attention to Westminster, possibly hoping to increase his standing with those associated with Westminster (both earthly and saintly) and with God.

---

540; *CR, 1231-4,* pp. 345-6, 401, 408, 409; *CR, 1237-42,* p. 63; *CR, 1256-59,* pp. 425, 445; *CR, 1259-61,* pp. 75, 81, 409; *CR, 1261-4,* pp. 62, 208, 316, 344; *CR, 1264-8,* pp. 69, 442.

[195] D.A. Carpenter, 'Westminster Abbey in Politics, 1258-69' in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England VIII: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 1999*, (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001), 49-58 at p. 50.

[196] Ibid, p. 51.

[197] Ibid, p. 49.

[198] Ibid, pp. 52-3.

[199] See, for example: *CChR,* vol. 1, pp. 268, 269; *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 234, 306, 353; *CLR, 1240-5,* p. 117 (2), 228; *CLR, 1251-60,* pp. 180, 187-8; *CPR, 1247-58,* pp. 196, 634; *CR, 1231-4,* pp. 345-6, 401, 408, 409; *CR, 1237-42,* p. 63; *CR, 1242-47,* pp. 50, 132.

The recipients of Henry's patronage can be divided into two main groups: men associated with the abbey including the abbot, monks, and chaplains, and the saints associated with Westminster. The abbots of Westminster received near constant patronage from the king with multiple gifts for most years of the reign.[200] Chaplains were often sought and paid to minister in the various chapels at Westminster. Sometimes Henry paid them for singing 'Christus Vincit' on important days such as at Eleanor of Provence's purifications or on dates of liturgical or personal significance including the feast days of the Confessor and papal feast days.[201] Chaplains were also appointed to say prayers for dead members of Henry's family including Raymond of Provence (his father-in-law) and the faithful more generally.[202] As has been explored in detail by Sally Dixon-Smith, Henry fed large numbers of the poor on liturgically significant feast days.[203] He also commemorated members of his dynasty who had died. He filled the halls of Westminster with the most vulnerable members of his kingdom, believing in the efficacy of their prayers. Such generous and inclusive pious practices would have left a strong impression on those who were part of the feedings and on those who witnessed it. Henry could display his magnanimity. A king's generosity, appropriately channelled, was as a powerful weapon. The scale of Henry's generosity was leviathan and the inclusive nature of it stressed the paternal aspect of his kingship. His displays of generosity had the potential to raise his prestige as it demonstrated the effect his good will could have, and the danger of not having it. Henry's actions towards his subjects, whether they were the powerful abbots of Westminster, or blind beggars, reiterated his power in all its myriad forms. Henry's continuous use of Westminster Abbey and Westminster palace to stage important events

---

[200] See, for example: *CChR*, vol. 1, pp. 67, 203, 209, 219, 304; *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 245, 306, 374; *CLR, 1240-45,* pp. 78, 307; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 151-2; *CPR, 1225-32,* pp. 477-78; *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 381; *CPR, 1266-72,* p. 181; *CR, 1231-4,* pp. 345-6, 401 (2), 409; *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 119, 130, 142; *CR, 1242-47,* p. 50; *CR, 1247-51,* p. 181; *CR, 1251-53,* p. 373; *CR, 1256-59,* p. 23; *CR, 1261-4,* pp. 344, 409.
[201] See: *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 197, 202, 234, 296, 377, 496; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 14-15, 168-9, 214; *CLR, 1251-60,* p. 155 (2); *CR, 1237-42,* p. 366; *CR, 1237-42,* p. 319; *CR, 1242-47,* p. 164.
[202] *CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 202; *CR, 1227-31,* p. 366.
[203] S. Dixon-Smith, "Feeding the Poor to Commemorate the Dead: the *Pro Anima* Almsgiving of Henry III of England 1227-1272" (University College London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2003). pp. 273-8 in particular.

provided him with an opportunity to present himself to a large audience and to reaffirm that type of king he wished to be.

The audience that Henry appealed to could be both a physical audience (such as the recipient of his patronage or the witnesses of his ceremonies) and a spiritual one (God and the saints). The line between spiritual and physical is not always clear cut, but there were actions that were primarily aimed at saints (such as when small gifts were granted in an ad hoc way) and others that were more ostentatious acts of piety. Both are important in understanding Henry's mindset.

Henry's gifts to persons associated with Westminster were varied in scope. One can divide the types of gifts under the following categories: grants of lands, liberties, and fairs; money for the works at Westminster (including the decoration of the abbey) or for the expenses of those who inhabited the abbey; payments for services (such as for chaplains, either to fund their prayers for the dead or to pay them for singing the 'Christus Vincit' on days of liturgical, or dynastic, significance); gifts for the materials of the building (such as trees and marble); gifts of food (such as venison or food for feasts); oblations and offerings (these could take a variety of forms such as money, wax for tapers, wine for divine services, vestments and items for the mass such as censers).[204] Henry's gifts to the abbey, either directly to the church or to

[204] See for land: *CChR*, vol. 1, pp. 219, 250; *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 181; *CR, 1234-37*, p.149, 230. Liberties: *CChR*, vol. 1, pp. 208-9, 333, 442; *CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 245; *CPR, 1247-58*, p. 396; *CR, 1234-37*, p. 261(3); *CR, 1251-53*, pp. 83-4. Fairs: *CChR*, vol. 1, pp. 67, 208, 286, 334, 452; *CPR, 1247-58*, p. 76. Money/ Expenses/ Payments: *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 243-4, 466; *CLR, 1245-51*, p. 139; *CLR, 1251-60*, p. 49; *CLR, 1267-72*, p. 184; *CPR, 1247-58*, p. 118. Building materials (especially wood): *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 654; *CR, 1237-42*, p. 149; *CR, 1247-51*, p. 496; *CR, 1251-53*, pp. 138-173; *CR, 1254-56*, pp. 30, 112, 280. Deer/ other animals: *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 210; *CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 262; *CLR, 1245-51*, p. 21; *CR, 1234-37*, p. 119; *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 441, 521; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 175, 181, 238, 296; *CR, 1254-56*, pp. 98 (2), 315; *CR, 1256-59*, pp. 23, 169; *CR, 1268-72*, pp. 74, 209-10, 482. Wax: *CChR*, vol. 1, pp. 219 (2); *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 243-4, 263, 322; *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 310; *CLR, 1245-51*, pp. 111, 174; *CLR, 1251-60*, pp. 332, 297, 401; *CPR, 1247-58*, p. 406; *CR, 1237-42*, p. 63; *CR, 1251-53*, p. 162; *CR, 1254-56*, p. 358. Wine: *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 244; *CLR, 1267-72*, pp. 124, 178, 205; *CPR, 1247-58*, pp. 44, 508; *CR, 1237-42*, p. 292; *CR, 1247-51*, p. 496; *CR, 1251-53*, pp. 3-4; *CR, 1254-56*, pp. 26, 336, 360; *CR, 1268-72*, p. 75. Vestments/ cloths: *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 243-4, 393, 399, 404-5, 426; *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 22; *CLR, 1245-51*, pp.

recipients such as the abbot of Westminster, helped to raise the abbey's prestige. Henry spent phenomenal sums of making items for the mass and in filling the church with massive tapers on significant days.[205] Such gifts would have fundamentally enhanced the interior of the church. Henry's extensive involvement in the expansion of Westminster Abbey means that one can clearly see how Henry wished his kingship to be seen, in visual terms. Henry also engaged in detailed building work of Westminster Palace and its decoration complemented that of the abbey, presenting the elevated nature of his kingship.

Westminster as a stage: crusading ceremonies

Henry's dedicated focus on Westminster made it the perfect stage for planned acts of political theatre. Henry's crusading ceremonies will be examined as a case study of Henry's planned pieces of political theatre. During the ceremonies, Henry could display his ideal kingship to large audiences which often contained the leading magnates of the day. These people were meant to be active participants in the occasions as they provided the opportunity to create, re-establish, and re-affirm the bonds of loyalty between the king and his subjects.

Henry took the cross in 1250 and reaffirmed his crusading commitments in 1252. He engaged in similar actions in both ceremonies. He summoned important magnates as witnesses[206], enabling him to display his kingship associated with a noble and prestigious act. Henry used liturgically significant dates as the backdrop to his oaths. In 1250, he made his oath

151-2; *CLR, 1251-60,* pp. 195, 209, 247; *CR, 1237-42,* p. 149; *CR, 1242-47,* pp. 371, 497; *CR, 1254-56,* pp. 240, 287-8. Oblations/ obols: *CChR,* vol. 1, p. 304; *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 462, 478 (2), 487, 489, 495; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 57-8; *CLR, 1251-60,* p. 416; *CLR, 1267-72,* p. 237; *CR, 1242-47,* p. 335; *CR, 1247-51,* p. 463; *CR, 1251-53,* p. 148; *CR, 1256-59,* p. 68.

[205] See, for example: *CChR,* vol. 1, pp. 219, 304; *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 243-4, 263, 388-9, 399, 442-3; *CLR, 1240-5,* pp. 22, 73, 83, 310; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 81, 111, 174; *CLR, 1251-60,* pp. 332, 362, 401; *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 406; *CR, 1237-42,* p. 162; *CR, 1242-47,* p. 448; *CR, 1247-51,* p. 4; *CR, 1251-53,* p. 162; *CR, 1254-56,* p. 358.

[206] *CM,* vol. v, pp. 100-101, 279-80.

on Laetare Sunday, the mass that began with Isaiah 66: 10, which began with the phrase 'Rejoice, o Jerusalem'. This passage states that Jerusalem will enjoy God's favour and protection.[207] There was no more apt liturgical day on which to take the Cross. The ceremony was, therefore, elevated, raising the prestige of the occasion and, implicitly, presenting Henry as Jerusalem's potential saviour. Laetare Sunday was in the middle of Lent, a time of sacrifice and solemnity. Henry's vow could, therefore, be framed in the terms of self-sacrifice. Additionally, Laetare Sunday can also be seen as the light amidst the gloom of Lent as it was a day of celebration. Henry's crusade could be presented as the tool that would lead Latin Christendom out of the gloom of defeat in the Holy Land.[208]

In 1252 Henry reaffirmed his vow at a parliament summoned for the translation feast of the Confessor.[209] This was a deliberate choice. Not only was the Confessor Henry's favourite saint, and therefore the most efficacious saint to pray to, but due to his associations with English good rule, he acted as a symbol of Englishness to Henry's subjects.[210] Henry's desire to be associated with English saints, and his belief in their efficacy can be seen in the pilgrimage he made just before the 1252 parliament. He visited St Albans, Bury St Edmunds, and Ely.[211] All these places were associated with Anglo-Saxon saints.

An important aspect of making crusading vows was setting one's affairs in order. Crusading, as the case of Richard the Lionheart demonstrated, was potentially perilous. Crusades were seen as moral wars that required moral support as well as men, money, and

[207]For the Isiah passage, see: The Bible, Douay-Rheims 1899 American Edition (DRA), viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Isaiah+66&version=DRA (accessed 06/06/2022).
[208] I am grateful to Dr A Spencer for this point.
[209] *CM*, vol. v, pp. 320-1.
[210] As argued by David Carpenter in Carpenter, 'The Origins of the cult', 883.
[211] Kanter, 'Personal rule of Henry III', pp. 1307-8.

material.[212] It was necessary, therefore, to morally cleanse oneself and one's kingdom. In 1250, Henry tried to make amends for his behaviour towards the Londoners, including the women and boys aged twelve and above.[213] Henry summoned them to appear before him at Westminster, in the Great Hall, and he tearfully and humbly asked for their forgiveness, confessing that he had unjustly taken possession of their property.[214] The citizens agreed to forgive him, and it was only then that Henry received the cross from Boniface of Savoy. At this ceremony, Henry engaged in a display of power. A sentence of excommunication was pronounced against William de Beauchamp (due to violence against the freedom of the hundred of Oswaldeslave).[215] This was another display of the king's justice both in making amends and appropriately punishing wrong doers. Henry would have hoped that these actions would have pleased not only his subjects but also God and the saints, encouraging all to support his endeavours.

In a similar way, Henry prepared to cleanse his household and kingdom. He expelled many people from both his household and his queen's.[216] Around the time of the oath ceremony, Henry issued orders to the bishop of Chichester and Master Hugh of St Edmunds to take aids from people who wanted to support the crusade but were unable to go. Such people were to be relieved from paying usury to his Jews for five years. Furthermore, these people were to have swifter justice in the king's courts. These privileges were renewed and reissued on the feast of the Ascension, raising the significance of the grant and more clearly associating

---

[212] W.C. Jordan, 'Anti-corruption campaigns in thirteenth-century Europe', *Journal of Medieval History* 35 (2009), 204-219, at 217.
[213] T. Stapleton (ed.), *De Antiquis Legibus Liber Cronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londoniarum et quaedam, que contingebant temporibus illis ab anno MCLXXVIII ad annum MCCLXXIV cum appendice* (London: J B Nichols, 1846), p. 16.
[214] *CM*, vol. v, pp. 100-101.
[215] *AM*, vol. 4, p. 439.
[216] 'Annals of the Priory of Dunstable', *AM*, vol. 3, p. 184.

it with the king's piety.[217] These privileges were to encourage as much support for the venture as possible and they displayed ideal kingship, promising swifter judgement.

These two crusading ceremonies must be seen in the light of Henry's competition with Louis IX. Louis left on crusade in 1248 and was captured in 1250. Lloyd has argued that Henry's actions in 1250 were opportunistic and that he began to see himself as another Lionheart.[218] Henry emulated Louis both in his ceremonies and in making spiritual preparations. In 1247, Louis summoned a great court in mid-Lent (same date as Henry's ceremony in 1250) to persuade his magnates and prelates to join him on crusade.[219] Louis then patronised his favoured religious houses including Blanche of Castile's foundations, Le Lys and Maubuisson, and the preparation of his soul culminated at Sainte Chapelle with the translation of the Crown of Thorns.[220] Louis prepared his kingdom by tackling bribery, corruption, laxity in office, and the lack of accountability and transparency in local and central government.[221] He focused on the character of men becoming officials, scrutinising their spending, and choosing men of irreproachable morality (usually friars) to investigate any accusations of misconduct.[222]

Unfortunately for Henry, his actions were not received as well as Louis'. This can be exemplified by the treatment of Simon de Montfort when complaints were made about him when he was the royal lieutenant in Gascony. Henry sent Simon to govern Gascony to provide stability in his continental possessions. Simon's high-handed rule provoked discontent amongst

---

[217] *CPR, 1247-58,* pp. 164, 168.
[218] S. Lloyd, 'King Henry III, the Crusade and the Mediterranean' in M. Jones and M. Vale (ed), *England and her Neighbours, 1066-1453: Essays in Honour of Pierre Chaplais*, 137-150, at pp. 107-8.
[219] Grant, *Blanche of Castile,* p. 132.
[220] Ibid, pp. 134-5.
[221] Jordan, 'Anti-corruption campaigns', 217.
[222] Ibid, 209-210, 212-213.

the Gascons and they complained to Henry. In response to the complaints, an inquiry was conducted into Simon's conduct, just as Louis had conducted into his officials accused of misconduct.[223] However, as Sophie Ambler has argued, the way in which Simon's trial was conducted was highly irregular. First, the complainants were not asked specific questions, allowing them to raise whatever they pleased. Second, the accusations were not subject to proof allowing complainants not to suffer repercussions for slander. Third, Simon was not initially allowed to respond to the complaints. Finally, no one had been appointed as the judge in contravention of Simon's right as a free man to be judged by his peers, as enshrined in Magna Carta.[224] By contrast, Louis' inquiries were subject to proof, and allowed the defendant to respond.[225] Essentially, Henry presided over a half-baked version of Louis' inquiries and it provoked discontent, making him appear unjust and inconsistent. This episode is but one example of how Henry's conduct made the English court uneasy because, as Ambler has argued, he seemed to be ignoring judicial rights and the arbitrary nature of the investigation did not inspire confidence.[226] The crusading ceremonies, especially 1252, exposed the rift between how he saw himself and how others perceived him. Paris stressed the hollowness of Henry's promises. Despite promising to make amends with the Londoners, Henry never did, and his magnates were deeply sceptical about giving him any money.[227] He had a poor track record and neither of these ceremonies, despite his displays of contrition and solemnity, convinced anyone that he could be trusted either to fulfil his vow, or to be successful should he depart for the Holy Land.[228]

---

[223] S.T. Ambler, *The Song of Simon de Montfort: England's First Revolution and the Death of Chivalry* (London: Picador, 2019), pp. 119-120.
[224] Ibid, pp. 117-118.
[225] Ibid, p. 120.
[226] Ibid, p. 120.
[227] *CM*, vol. v, pp. 100-101.
[228] Matthew Paris' accounts of the ceremonies reveal the suspicion of Henry's subjects about his promises to go on crusade. See *CM*, vol. v, pp. 100-101 and pp. 324-6.

Times of crisis, domestic and international

Henry also engaged in ceremonial displays of power in order win support, both physical and spiritual, at times of crisis. This can most obviously be seen in his preparations to leave the kingdom for the continent, and on returning home. It was risky for a king to leave his kingdom or to move from the centre of his power. His fate was inextricably linked to the fate of his kingdom. The king's subjects, therefore, had a vested interest in his success and return. Henry played on this and used his returns to stage opulent displays of kingship. This was a way for him to try and control the narrative about his continental ambitions, trying to highlight successes, and minimise failures.

Henry also used times of crisis with Scotland and Wales to display his piety. This section will examine who Henry patronised and venerated and explore what that may indicate about his ambitions and how he wished to be perceived. Henry was not just concerned with how his subjects perceived of his endeavours. He would have been more concerned with how God and the saints viewed him. The saints, due to their intercessory powers, could aid Henry in any imaginable way. Ultimately, God would judge his success as a king. Spiritual support was more powerful than any physical one and Henry appealed to the saints he believed were most efficacious. It must be remembered, however, that one ought not to see saint veneration as only being about Henry's relationship with a particular saint. No regal action was purely personal. Ordering for oblations to be made for a saint may not have resulted in many subjects seeing it, but the repetition of those acts helped to inflate the image of Henry as a pious figure supported by important saints.

Wales

The 1245 Welsh campaign came about due to the death of Gruffudd, Dafydd, ruler of Gwynedd's half-brother. Gruffudd had been Henry's hostage to ensure Dafydd's submission to Henry in 1241 after he had rebelled. Henry was overlord of Wales and so expected the loyalty of men like Dafydd. His taking of Gruffudd as a hostage was meant to ensure Dafydd's good behaviour. Gruffudd was held in the Tower of London but in March 1244, he tried to escape by creating a rope from his bedsheets and tablecloths. Unfortunately for Gruffudd, the rope broke, and he fell to his death. With his half-brother dead, Dafydd had the freedom to rebel again and he declared himself the prince of Wales and mustered the chieftains of Wales.[229] In response, Henry travelled to Deganwy (which he reached on 25 August 1245) to build a castle there.

Before arriving at Deganwy, Henry engaged in spiritual preparations. In July and August, the friars received particular attention with the Franciscans of Oxford, Gloucester, and Scarborough receiving patronage.[230] The Dominicans of Gloucester and Wilton also received attention.[231] The Franciscans of Oxford and Gloucester received Henry's patronage when he was in their vicinity, suggesting that his patronage was in response to their requests for immediate aid. The Franciscans of Oxford and Franciscans and Dominicans of Gloucester received wood for fuel and for building purposes.[232] The Dominicans of Wilton also received wood for their church, but this was a confirmation by Henry of a gift made by William Longsword to them.[233] Henry was at Woodstock when he made this grant and it was not due

[229] For an account of the build-up to the Deganwy campaign, see Ambler, *Song of Simon de Montfort*, pp. 104-5.
[230] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 313; *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 459; *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 332, 334.
[231] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 318; *CR, 1242-47*, p. 325.
[232] *CLR, 1240-45*, pp. 313, 318; *CR, 1242-47*, p. 332.
[233] *CR, 1242-47*, p. 325.

to him being near the Dominicans, but he was still responding to their immediate needs. No recipient was charged for their gifts.

Unlike all the other gifts to the friars in the leadup to Henry's arrival at Deganwy, the gifts to the Franciscans of Scarborough were very generous. Henry gave them a licence to construct living quarters on land that he had received from William, son of Robert de Morpath.[234] Henry further stressed that the Franciscans were not to be impeded in transferring their church and buildings to the land he had granted them.[235] Henry did not charge the Franciscans for this generous grant. Henry's generosity to the friars before reaching Deganwy fits into his usual pattern of generosity towards them but also demonstrates his belief in the efficacy of their prayers.

Henry also seems to have tried to draw strength from his family before arriving at Deganwy. On 1 July Henry made a generous grant to the Maud, the abbess of Tarrant, and the nuns there. Tarrant was the burial site of Henry's sister Joan, demonstrating Henry's desire to make a link with part of his dynasty before engaging in an action that could threaten it (by potentially dying). Henry granted the nuns all the land of Gussich All Saints that had been held by Hubert Purgais. The nuns were to hold the land quit of service to the king and Henry stressed that neither he nor Hubert were exact anything from the abbess for the land.[236] Henry did not charge the nuns for this charter, instead granting it in frank almoin.[237] Like the gift to the Franciscans of Scarborough, this grant of land was very generous and demonstrates Henry's desire to gain spiritual succour at a time of uncertainty.

---

[234] *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 459.
[235] *CR, 1242-47,* p. 334.
[236] *CChR,* vol.1, p. 285.
[237] Frank almoin (or frankalmoign) was a tenure in which a church held some of their lands in return for saying masses for the grantor's soul (see C. Arnold-Baker, *The Companion to British History,* 3rd edition (London: Longcross Press, 2008), p. 537).

A final way in which Henry secured spiritual support before reaching Deganwy was in his veneration of Anglo-Saxon saints. On his journey to Chester, where his army was, Henry made extensive preparations for the veneration of the Confessor, working on the assumption that he might not be present at Westminster for the translation feast. In a charter granted to Westminster Abbey and the 'glorious King Edward', two fairs were granted in the abbey's lands for the two feasts of the Confessor.[238] Additionally, Henry provided instructions for how the translation feast of the Confessor was to be celebrated. Twenty candles, made from 400 lbs of wax, were to be placed around the Confessor's shrine to burn for the entirety of the vigil and day of the translation feast.[239] Henry also stated that on the Confessor's feast, the great hall of Westminster was to be filled with paupers who were to be fed.[240] Most interestingly, he made specific instructions about a banner to be offered to the saint. The large banner was to be made of black and yellow Kendal with a red dragon on the banner. The banner was to be placed in Westminster Abbey.[241] The dragon standard had been carried by the kings of England since the Anglo-Saxon age. It had been borne by Richard the Lionheart during the Third Crusade and by John, during the civil war that followed his rejection of Magna Carta.[242] By making his own version of the dragon standard, Henry was invoking comparisons between his ancestors and making a statement about his power. By offering the standard to the Confessor, Henry was invoking the aid of this peaceable saint for success in his campaign against the Welsh. This is surprising in some ways because by the thirteenth century, the raising of the dragon standard had a particular meaning: that no quarter was to be given.[243] By making this banner, Henry was making it clear to those who would stand against him that he would be as unyielding as his

[238] *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 286
[239] *CR, 1242-47*, p. 331.
[240] Ibid, p. 331.
[241] Ibid, p. 331.
[242] Ambler, *Song of Simon de Montfort*, p. 274.
[243] Ibid, p. 274.

ancestors. However, the Confessor was capable of violence, as Matthew Paris' *Estoire* showed. He was described as cruel to his enemies and Harold had asked for the saint's aid against Tostig (his brother who was fighting for Harald Hardrada, another claimant to the English throne).[244] The Confessor healed Harold's festering wound and secured his victory at Stamford Bridge, where both Hardrada and Tostig were killed.[245] When pushed, therefore, the Confessor could be ferocious and unforgiving against England's enemies. Perhaps Henry felt the need to invoke this aspect of the Confessor's character to steel him to do what had to be done for the good of the kingdom.

During Henry's journey to Chester in 1245 to meet his army, he took advantage of being in Gloucester to visit the abbey and the shrines of Anglo-Saxon saints there. Gloucester Abbey was the site of Henry's first coronation. Being there may have helped Henry to feel more secure, reminding him of the power that was vested in him during a period of uncertainty (civil war). Henry made specific plans for his devotions. He requested that he have thirty-six obols to offer on the feast of St James the Apostle (25 July).[246] There were shrines in the cathedral to St Ethelberht and St Kenelm, both royal Anglo-Saxon martyrs. Henry may well have hoped that his actions at Gloucester would act as a reminder of his coronation and act as a reaffirmation of his regal power, to steel him before engaging with the enemy. At Worcester, Henry may have hoped to achieve something similar. He intended to offer sixty obols of musc on the feast day of St Peter Ad Vincula (1 August).[247] Worcester was the site of his father's burial so in giving offerings there he not only venerated the saints there (such as St Wulfstan), he also honoured his father hoping that he would add glory to his dynasty. By making those offerings on an important papal feast day, Henry may well have hoped to ensure the aid and

[244] Fenster and Browne, *The History of Saint Edward,* pp. 65, 106-108.
[245] Ibid, pp. 107-8.
[246] *CR, 1242-47,* p. 330.
[247] Ibid, p. 330.

support of a variety of saints who would aid him in a time of need. His broad patronage of saints would also have displayed to observers that he had broad spiritual support that could translate into earthly action.

Henry continued to venerate the Confessor when he reached his army at Chester. On 19 August 1245, he ordered twelve obols of musc to be offered at the Confessor's shrine at Westminster.[248] The reiteration of his veneration of the Confessor may signify a degree of fear and uncertainty on Henry's part. On the cusp of war (potentially), Henry felt the need to appeal for the aid of his favourite saint.

Henry's spiritual preparations, however, did not translate into success in Wales. The Deganwy campaign was a disaster. Henry decided to build a castle at Deganwy on the ruins of a Welsh fortress. The site was too high for supplies to be delivered by river and too far from the coast for them to be delivered by sea. The Welsh attacked the supply lines, starving the English army. The situation was exacerbated at the beginning of September when the earl of Gloucester arrived with a large retinue.[249] Many men died for no gain.[250] After Henry returned to England, when he was at Woodstock, on 21 November he ordered the sheriff of Oxford to place 150 tapers in Osney Abbey (Oxfordshire) which were to burn continuously at mass to be celebrated for the soul of John de Salinis, a former yeoman of Henry's, and for the souls of those who had died serving him in Wales. He further ordered 400 loaves be distributed to 400 poor after his arrival from Wales for the souls of John de Salinis and those who died in

[248] Ibid, p. 335.
[249] Ambler, *Song of Simon de Montfort*, p. 105.
[250] Ibid, p. 108.

Wales.[251] Sophie Ambler has interpreted this order to mean that 400 people died on the Welsh campaign, and this seems a reasonable interpretation.[252]

During the campaign, Henry did not engage in as extensive ecclesiastical patronage as he did before the campaign, but he did continue to support the friars, especially those either in the vicinity to him or in places where his authority was less secure. He offered protection until All Saints for the Franciscans of Launvais and on 11 September he ordered twelve men investigate whether the street that he had granted to the Franciscans of Chester had been to the damage of the citizens of Chester. He also granted those Franciscans the rock necessary to construct their buildings.[253] By showing himself to be a good lord and protector to poor and vulnerable religious individuals, Henry was displaying good kingship and it may have been a way of trying to impose his authority as well as securing spiritual support from an efficacious group at a time of great stress.

In the aftermath of the failed Deganwy campaign, Henry seems to have engaged in extensive ecclesiastical patronage perhaps both in a way to give thanks for surviving the affair and as a way of drawing of line under the failure. Once again, the friars received much attention. The Franciscans of Shrewsbury, Bridgwater, Ireland, Waterford, and Chester received gifts as did the Dominicans of Shrewsbury, Stamford, London, and Canterbury.[254] Henry therefore patronised friars from a substantial geographical range, but some of them were not long distances from parts of Wales (Chester, Shrewsbury and Bridgwater).[255] The Franciscans of

[251] *CLR, 1245-51,* p. 8.
[252] Ambler, *Song of Simon de Montfort,* p. 108.
[253] *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 460 and *CR, 1242-47,* p. 339.
[254] *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 4 (2), 6, 16, 17; *CPR, 1232-47,* pp. 466 (2), 467 (2); *CR, 1242-47,* pp. 367 (2), 374.
[255] Chester: *CLR, 1245-51,* p. 6. Shrewsbury: *CLR, 1245-51,* p. 4 (2); *CR, 1242-47,* p. 367. Bridgwater: *CR, 1242-47,* p. 367.

Ireland also received gifts largely in the form of annual amounts of money for their tunics.[256] Most of the gifts given to the friars were small ones, including building materials and money for robes or other business.[257] Henry was responding to their needs and displaying broad patronage.

Henry's patronage of Irish ecclesiastical figures extended beyond the Franciscans. He also patronised the bishops of Ossory and Dromore. Both men had been recently elected to their positions (the bishop of Ossory had been elected in February 1244 and Henry assented to the bishop of Dromore's election on 1 October 1245).[258] The bishop of Ossory, Geoffrey de Tourville, who had been a royal clerk and administrator before his episcopal elevation, received significant attention.[259] On 28 October 1245, Geoffrey was granted fairs at five of his manors along with free warren in all of the demesne lands of those manors (this allowed the bishop to hunt in all those lands).[260] This was a very generous grant and Geoffrey was not charged for it. Furthermore, on 13 November, Geoffrey was given both a silver chalice and a ship to allow him to cross to Ireland.[261]

Henry had little to no interest in Ireland during his reign and so it is germane to ask why he patronised Irish groups at that time. A plausible suggestion is that, at a time of uncertainty, Henry felt the need to ensure that other parts of his kingdom, where he had less direct control, were safe and loyal to him. In this case it is impossible to know for sure what motivated

---

[256] *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 466 (2), 467 (2).
[257] Building materials: *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 4 (2), 6; *CR, 1242-47,* p. 367 (2), Money for robes: *CLR, 1245-51,* p. 16; *CPR, 1232-47,* pp. 466 (2), 467 (2) Money for other business: *CLR, 1245-51,* p. 17.
[258] *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 461.
[259]D. Beresford, 'Geoffrey de Tourville', *Dictionary of Irish Biography,* viewed online at: https://www.dib.ie/biography/tourville-geoffrey-de-a8607 (accessed 11/06/2022).
[260] *CChR*, vol.1, p. 289
[261] *CLR, 1245-51,* p. 6 (2).

Henry's actions, but he does appear to have done something similar things at other times of uncertainty.[262]

Henry not only patronised ecclesiastical figures, he also displayed support for dynastic foundations as he had on his journey to Wales. He patronised Beaulieu, Netley, and Tarrant. He granted wine for divine services to both Beaulieu and Netley in November and December, and he granted more land to the nuns of Tarrant.[263] He also stated that the nuns did not have to contribute towards his eldest daughter's marriage, whenever that marriage was to occur.[264] Once again, Henry did not charge any of these recipients for the gifts made to them and the gifts seem to have been motivated by a desire to honour members of his dynasty in the aftermath of a time of crisis for him. It was also a way for Henry to draw strength from his dynasty after a time of insecurity.

Just as Henry had before the Welsh campaign, Henry again venerated Anglo-Saxon saints. In October, when on his journey back to Westminster, Henry ordered that a red or velvet samite be offered at Queen Edith's tomb.[265] Edith was not a saint, but she was the Confessor's wife and seen as devout. Henry's respect for Edith was associated with his relationship with the Confessor and his offerings can be interpreted as a way of re-establishing the dynastic and spiritual ties with the Confessor and his family. By stressing his connections with holy members of his dynasty, including their families, Henry enhanced his own authority as he could argue that he was from holy stock. Henry also re-iterated his relationship with St Edmund, king and martyr. In was on 22 November, two days after St Edmund's feast day, that Henry made

[262] See chapter four for Henry's actions during the period of baronial revolt and rebellion.
[263] Beaulieu: CLR, 1245-51, p. 8. Netley: CLR, 1245-51, p. 16. Tarrant: *CR, 1242-47*, p. 375.
[264] *CR, 1242-47*, p. 375.
[265] *CR, 1242-47*, p. 344.

the order referred to above for the souls of those who had died in Wales.[266] By appealing to St Edmund for the souls of those who had died, he was calling down the saint's blessing upon him and on those who had died in his service.

In November, when he had returned to Westminster, Henry ordered that all the samite that he held was to make capes and vestments for the choir in time for Christmas. Furthermore, four golden silk cloths were to be sewn together to make one cloth that he would offer at Westminster.[267] One can reasonably assume that this cloth was offered at Christmas time and, most likely, to the Confessor. Christmas was one of the most joyful liturgical feasts and it provided Henry with the opportunity to present himself as a good father to his realm in the aftermath of an event where he had failed him men. The gifts may also have been a way for Henry to try and take comfort and solace in his favourite saint after a difficult time.

Tensions flared up with Wales again in 1257 (most likely due to Edward's high-handedness) but Henry was able to diffuse tensions, at least for a short time.[268] Henry arrived at Chester on 6 August to meet his army. Just before arriving, he engaged in broad patronage in terms of ecclesiastical recipients. On 20 July, on the day that he wrote to the treasurer instructing him to provide him with tents, armour, wax, and other necessities that he and his army needed, Henry made grants to the prioress and nuns of Aconbury, the dean and chapter of St Peter's York, the abbot of Peterborough, and the prior of Luffield.[269] Most of these gifts were small in nature including oaks for building works and deer, but the grant to the prioress

---

[266] *CLR, 1245-51,* p. 8.
[267] *CR, 1242-47,* p. 371.
[268] For an account of Edward's role in provoking events in 1257, see M. Prestwich, *Edward I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997), pp. 17-18 in particular.
[269] *CR, 1256-59,* p. 79 (instructions to treasurer); *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 571 (prioress and nuns of Aconbury); *CR, 1256-59,* pp. 78-9 (dean and chapter of St Peter's, York); *CR, 1256-59,* pp. 79-80 (abbot of Peterborough); *CR, 1256-59,* p. 80 (prior of Luffield).

and nuns of Aconbury was more extensive.[270] They were granted herbage[271] and all the issues and easements of all the wood of the king's demesnes of Aconbury for seven years. Additionally, no forester or king's bailiff was to interfere in the woods except to ensure that the woods were not destroyed.[272] The nuns were charged £8 per annum for this grant, but given the scale of the grant, the charge does not seem excessive.[273] As was the case in 1245, it appears that Henry prepared himself for clashes in Wales both spiritually and physically and used his patronage of ecclesiastical recipients to accrue spiritual support before a potentially dangerous event.

During his time in camp in parts of Wales, Henry still engaged in some ecclesiastical patronage despite his attention being focused elsewhere. This demonstrates how important spiritual support was to Henry at times of crisis. Notably, the patronised places either in Wales or near the border. He provided the Prior Provincial of the Dominican order with 100 shillings for the accommodation of their chapter which was being held at Gloucester.[274] He also provided protection without term for the Franciscans of Llanfes.[275] Finally, which at Chester, on 15 September, Henry granted the abbot and convent of St Werburgh, Chester, a weekly market and annual fair, which he did not charge them for.[276]

After the campaign in Wales had been resolved, Henry engaged in broad patronage of ecclesiastical recipients. Some of these recipients, including the archdeacon of Gloucester, abbot of Pershore, Franciscans of Bridgnorth, Dominicans of Gloucester, and various

---

[270] *CR, 1256-59,* pp. 79-80 (bucks); *CR, 1256-59,* p. 80 (oaks).
[271] The right of pasture on another person's land.
[272] *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 571.
[273] *CFR, 1256-1257,* no. 857.
[274] *CLR, 1251-60,* p. 392.
[275] *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 575.
[276] *CChR,* vol. 1, p. 473.

Worcester based recipients, were from places near the Welsh border and so may have been patronised to help shore up Henry's authority in places where his authority was weaker, other recipients seem to have been patronised because Henry was in the vicinity.[277] This can be seen in the patronage of the abbot and monks of Abingdon and the hospital of St John outside the easter gate of Oxford.[278] In the case of many of the Worcester based recipients, including the prioress and nuns of Westwood, the prioress of Cookhill, and the lepers of St Mary without Worcester, it appears that Henry may have been prompted by being in the vicinity, but it also served his purposes of shoring up his authority in a place away from his centre of power.[279]

Henry did not charge any of the ecclesiastical recipients of his patronage in the aftermath of his Welsh campaign. Admittedly, most of the gifts were small in nature, with many of them consisting of oaks for use in building works or repairs.[280] However, these were all gifts the recipients needed, and it was a way for Henry to display his generosity and to give thanks to God for a resolution to his problems in Wales. It was also a way of encouraging ecclesiastical groups to support him and to use their prayers to support his ambitions.

As in 1245, Henry patronised dynastic foundations in the aftermath of his Welsh campaign. Henry patronised Hailes and Faversham.[281] By commemorating his ancestors in the aftermath of a difficult event, Henry was reminding himself that he was from an illustrious dynasty and that he was playing a role in protecting it from sources that meant it harm. It was a way of reconnecting with his ancestors, displaying his regard for them, and reminding himself

---

[277] *CR, 1256-59,* p. 97 (archdeacon of Gloucester); *CR, 1256-59,* p. 99 (abbot of Pershore); *CR, 1256-59,* p. 96 (Franciscans of Bridgnorth); *CR, 1256-59,* pp. 95-6 (Dominicans of Gloucester); *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 580; *CR, 1256-59,* pp. 95 (2), 96 (Worcester recipients).
[278] *CR, 1256-59,* p. 97 (2) (Abingdon based recipients); *CR, 1256-59,* p. 97 (hospital of St John outside the eastern gate of Oxford).
[279] *CR, 1256-59,* p. 95 (nuns of Westwood); *CR, 1256-59,* p. 95 (prioress of Cookhill); *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 580 (lepers of St Mary).
[280] *CR, 1256-59,* pp. 94-5, 95 (3), 95-6, 96 (2), 97 (3), 99.
[281] Hailes: *CLR, 1251-60,* p. 395; Faversham: *CR, 1256-59,* p.156.

about what was important. Henry also displayed regard and thanks for perhaps his most loved ancestor: Edward the Confessor. On 1 October, his fifty-first birthday, he ordered that he be provided with a cape with precious jewels to offer at the shrine on his return.[282] He also ordered that a golden communion chalice worth three or four marks be found for his use.[283] It is probable that this goblet was either to be given to Westminster Abbey or to the Confessor, at his shrine, more specifically. By doing this on his birthday, he made a more explicit link with the Confessor, renewing the bonds on a day of new beginnings and remembrances.

Scotland

Henry engaged in similar practices during times of tension with Scotland. In 1244, the kingdoms of Scotland and England came as close as they were to come in Henry's reign to engaging in battle. The issue revolved around the definition of the Anglo-Scottish border.[284] On his journey north, Henry patronised a wide range of religious recipients including bishops, nuns, monks, friars, and lepers.[285] He never charged any religious recipient for a gift. This implies that Henry was trying to secure a wide range of spiritual support during a crisis. Overall, his patronage seems to have been reactive. He generally gave gifts to those in his immediate vicinity. For example, the abbess of St Mary de Pratis, Northampton, received the messuage and appurtenances from a murderer who had abjured the realm when Henry was in Northampton.[286] However, there were exceptions to this rule. Those who received gifts before

[282] *CR, 1256-59*, p. 97.
[283] *CR, 1256-59*, pp. 97-8.
[284] R. Anderson, *History of Scotland* (London & Edinburgh, 1874), p. 28.
[285] Bishops: *CChR*, vol.1, p. 278; *CPR, 1232-47*, pp. 432, 433; *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 192, 195, 197, 203, 206, 214, 218.
Nuns: *CChR*, vol.1, p. 279; *CLR, 1240-45*, pp. 244, 250; *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 208, 215.
Monks: *CChR*, vol.1, p. 279; *CLR, 1240-45*, pp. 244, 251; *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 204 (2), 206 (2), 207, 210, 212.
Friars: *CLR, 1240-45*, pp. 244, 246 (2), 247, 248, 250 (2), 251, 252, 253; *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 201, 207.
Lepers: *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 430 (2).
[286] *CR, 1242-47*, p. 208.

the Treaty of Newcastle (14 August 1244) was sealed who were not near Henry when he patronised him were: the bishop of Carlisle; bishop of Llandaff; archbishop elect of Canterbury; bishop of Emly; abbot of Fécamp; abbot of Westminster; bishop and convent of Rochester; the Franciscans of Lewes, Reading, and Bruges, and the Dominicans of Shrewsbury and Canterbury.[287]

In the case of the bishops, most of their dioceses were on the edges of Henry's dominions and where loyalty to him might not assured. Bishops could hold substantial sway over their congregations and securing their support was vital for the exercise of royal authority. The patronage of churchmen was not always about pious aims. Sometimes the motives were also political and personal to the king. Emly was an Irish bishopric and Landaff a Welsh one. As we have seen from the Welsh campaign of 1245, relations between Wales and England were not always harmonious. Henry may have worried that unrest in Scotland could have triggered unrest in his other dominions where he was less present. This may also explain Henry's decision to patronise the Franciscans of Bruges (in Gascony). Fécamp was in Normandy and Henry may have been reaffirming a link with his lost continental possession. Henry's patronage of the bishop of Carlisle may be linked with the fact that the diocese of Carlisle was on the border with Scotland and Henry needed the support of a powerful mediator to help calm tensions. However, the patronage of the other recipients does not seem to be linked

[287] References for the following recipients:
Bishop of Carlisle: *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 195, 197, 206, 218.
Bishop of Llandaff: CPR, 1232-47, pp. 432, 433; *CR, 1242-47,* p. 214.
Archbishop elect of Canterbury: *CR, 1242-47*, p. 192.
Bishop of Emly: *CChR*, vol.1, p. 278.
Abbot of Fécamp: *CR, 1242-47*, p. 206.
Abbot of Westminster: *CR, 1242-7*, pp. 206, 207.
Abbot and convent of Rochester: *CLR, 1240-45,* p. 251.
Franciscans of Lewes: *CR, 1242-47,* p. 207.
Franciscans of Reading: *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 248.
Franciscans of Bruges: *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 253.
Dominicans of Shrewsbury: *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 253.
Dominicans of Canterbury: *CR, 1242-47,* p. 201.

to any other potential aim other than to secure spiritual support in his endeavours. Furthermore, Henry only gifted the abbot of Fécamp three bucks; the Franciscans of Bruges received 40s., and the elect of Canterbury four bucks.[288] These were not large gifts and would not, on their own, have secured political support. By contrast, the bishop of Carlisle received land as well as deer[289], with no charge; the bishop of Emly received a fair[290], with no charge, suggesting that Henry may have wanted more in return from them than for those he only gave small gifts to. These larger gifts also contrast with most gifts made to religious recipients before the Treaty of Newcastle. Most of them consisted of small amounts of money, deer, and wood for building works.[291]

In preparation for his journey north, Henry appealed to the Confessor. A thousand lbs of wax were to be used for candles to shine bright in the king's absence.[292] The number of candles that could be made from that amount of wax would have been numerous and would have made a lasting impression on anyone who saw them. Henry would have hoped that, above others, the Confessor would be impressed and would aid him. Henry also went on a pilgrimage of the East Anglian sites in June, before heading to Scotland, displaying veneration of Anglo-Saxon saints. In preparation for his arrival at Bury St Edmunds, Henry ordered 1,000 tapers be ready around St Edmund's shrine and another 1,500 tapers for St Etheldreda at Ely.[293] Henry desired, primarily, the aid of royal Anglo-Saxon saints just as in 1245 against the Welsh. The

---

[288] Abbot of Fécamp: *CR, 1242-47*, p. 206. However, the abbot of Fécamp was still a land holder in England and the gift may have not had any special meaning. I am grateful to Dr Andrew Spencer for this observation.
Franciscans of Bruges: *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 253.
Elect of Canterbury: *CR, 1242-47*, p. 192.
[289] *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 195, 197, 206, 218.
[290] *CChR*, vol.1, p. 278.
[291] Examples of gifts of:
Money: *CLR, 1240-45*, pp. 244 (2), 250 (2), 251, 252, 253; *CR, 1242-47*, p. 210.
Deer: *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 192, 195, 197, 203, 206 (3).
Wood for building works: *CLR, 1240-45*, pp. 244, 246 (3), 247 (2), 248, 250; *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 201, 204, 212.
[292] *CLR, 1240-5*, p. 254.
[293] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 244 (2).

English nature of these saints contrasted with the Welsh and the Scottish. One could interpret this veneration in multiple ways. One could see this as Henry stressing the English part of his heritage, demarcating himself from the Scots. One could also interpret it as a prayer for peace between two dynasties who have a shared Anglo-Saxon heritage (via Matilda of Scotland) and who were intertwined by marriage.[294]

The pilgrimage added sixteen days to Henry's journey north. It took him sixty days to reach Newcastle, starting at Westminster. The pilgrimage was therefore a substantial detour demonstrating how important Henry felt the spiritual support of his English saints were before potentially going to war. Henry also sought the aid of other saints. Before his arrival in York, Henry requested that 150 tapers made of 1 lb of wax each and 1,000 tapers of half a pound each be placed before William of York's altar.[295] He also had 150 tapers of 1 lb each and 1,000 tapers of ½ lb each to be placed before the altar of St Cuthbert, a Durham saint.[296] These saints did not receive consistent attention from Henry except when he was in the vicinity. This is not to undermine the genuine appeal to such saints but there was a political element in Henry's veneration. William and Cuthbert were very popular saints in the places where their respective shrines were (York and Durham). Henry certainly hoped that powerful local saints would help him, but his patronage also associated him with native saints, once again underlining his Englishness and magnifying that the Scots were not English.

Henry did not only appeal to local saints. He ordered precious vestments to be offered in his stead at Westminster, on the feast days of St Peter Ad Vincula (1 August) demonstrating

[294] I am gratful to Dr Andrew Spencer for this suggestion
[295] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 254.
[296] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 254.

his belief in Peter's efficacy and that he venerated a range of saints to provide spiritual support in a time of need.[297]

War between England and Scotland was avoided with the Treaty of Newcastle defining the Anglo-Scottish border and promising Henry's eldest daughter, Margaret, in marriage to the future Alexander III. Henry engaged in similarly broad patronage as he did before the treaty, giving gifts to bishops, monks, nuns, and friars. Again, much of this patronage was reactive, triggered by proximity to recipients.[298] Again, the gifts largely consisted of deer, wood, and small sums of money.[299] Most of the recipients were not the same as those patronised before the treaty. The same was true for the veneration of William of York and Cuthbert. It is possible that Henry gave oblations to these saints after the treaty, but as only two partial rolls survive, one cannot know. One can say that there were no detailed preparations put in place, no instructions for gifts to their shrines, and no instructions for tapers to burn. This indicates that Henry cared more about receiving a one-off intercession and not with developing a relationship with saints who were out of his normal itineraries. This is perhaps to be expected but it does raise the question of why Henry did not thank the saints for their aid in resolving his issues. This perhaps suggests that there was a strongly political element in their veneration. There was no need to make the demarcation between England and Scotland after hostilities had ended.

---

[297] *CR, 1242-47*, p. 209.
[298] Abbot of St Mary's, York, received a stag when Henry was at Sherburn, North Yorkshire (*CR, 1242-47*, p. 223). Dean of York received bream when Henry was at Sherburn, North Yorkshire (*CR, 1242-47*, p. 223). Prior of Lenton (in Nottingham) received 7 bucks when the king was in Nottingham (*CR, 1242-47*, p. 224). Franciscans of Nottingham received wood for fuel when Henry was in Nottingham (*CLR, 1240-45*, p. 262)
[299] See, for example:
Deer: *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 222, 223, 224 272.
Wood: *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 262; *CR, 1242-47*, pp. 224 (2), 267.
Money: CLR, 1240-45, pp. 262, 274, 283.

By contrast, Henry rewarded the Anglo-Saxon saints he had appealed to in preparation for battle with the Scots. He offered a brooch with precious stones at the Confessor's shrine.[300] St Edmund was rewarded with three times the number of tapers (also at ½ lb each) as Henry had offered him in June.[301] Along with the Confessor, Edmund was rewarded for his role in the king's victory.[302]

Henry also patronised episcopal saints. A eucharistic cup worth 5 marks was given to Catesby Abbey.[303] Catesby was one of the earliest sites associated with Edmund of Abingdon as his sisters were nuns there. Although he had not yet been canonised, he was already being treated as a saint. Henry's relationship with the former archbishop of Canterbury had soured towards the end of the archbishop's life and his cult had to potential to have a distinctly anti-royal element. He crafted his image as a successor to Becket and was buried at Pontigny, the site of Becket's exile. By appealing to Edmund, after a crisis, Henry displayed his reconciliation with Edmund to God. The cup given to Catesby may reflect a more personal and reflective request from Henry. The timing of it coincides with his request for a brooch for the Confessor suggesting that Henry was thanking those he felt were responsible for his agreement with Alexander.

## The Continent: Poitou and Gascony

### Poitou

[300] *CLR, 1240-5*, p. 264
[301] Ibid, p. 264.
[302] For the rewards to the Confessor, see, for example: *CLR, 1240-5*, p. 264.
[303] Ibid, pp. 262-3. For the dynastic context of these gifts, made when Eleanor was pregnant with Edmund, see chapter 2.

Before leaving for France in 1230 (Breton campaign) and 1242 (Poitevin campaign), Henry's patronage focused on the vulnerable with nuns, friars, lepers, and hospitals receiving much attention.[304] This is not unusual, and like discussed above, much of Henry's gifts were small in nature, with oaks being a favoured gift. Henry's patronage focused on vulnerable groups demonstrating his belief in the efficacy of their intercession. Perhaps one of the most illustrative examples of the importance to Henry of caring for the neediest members of his kingdom can be seen in his conduct before leaving for France in 1230. In the *De Gestis Britonum* Henry was recorded as:

Eodem autem die quo navem ascendit spiritu humilitatis ductus omnes pauperes et infirmos et eciam leprosos osculatus est et multa bona illis erogare fecit, sed ipse nichil dignum ibi operatus.[305]

Henry chose to kiss the lepers. he phrase 'eciam leproses' (even lepers) is significant here.[306] Although 'etiam' can mean 'also' and 'furthermore'[307], it can also mean 'even'. If the author meant the phrase to mean 'even lepers', that would have stressed how abnormal Henry's actions were. Henry's actions do seem to have been unusual. Henry continued to kiss lepers

[304] In 1230: Friars: *CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 171; *CR, 1227-31,* p. 310; Nuns: *CChR,* vol. 1, pp. 269, 271-2, 274; *CLR, 1240-5,* pp. 125, 127. *CPR, 1232-47,* pp. 284, 287; *CR, 1237-42,* pp. 422, 424. Poor (Nuns and Hospitals): *CLR, 1226-1240,* p.174; *CPR, 1225-1232,* p. 331. *CR, 1227-31,* pp. 321-2, 324, 344. In 1242: Lepers: *CChR,* vol. 1, p. 269; *CPR, 1232-47,* pp. 289, 341. Friars: *CR, 1237-42,* pp. 415 (2), 419, 423, 424 (2), 425, 426-7; *CLR, 1240-5,* pp. 121, 122, 125 (2), 135-6; *CR, 1237-42,* pp. 415 (2), 419, 423, 424 (2), 425, 426-7. Lepers: *CChR,* vol.1, p. 269.

[305] M. Robson, 'A Franciscan Contribution to the *De Gestis Britonum* (1205-1279), and its continuation', in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 107 (2014), p. 296. My translation: On the same day when Henry embarked upon his journey, driven by the spirit of humility, he kissed all the poor and infirm, even the lepers, and carried out many other good works, but he accomplished nothing of any worth abroad (the Latin says 'ibi' which translates as 'there' but as the text is referring to the place Henry was embarking to, I have used the word abroad as this captures the sense of the paragraph).

[306] Louis IX was also known as being generous to lepers, often feeding them from his own hands and touching him. Joinville, Louis IX's lay biographer who was in Louis' inner circle, was repelled by lepers saying to Louis, that he would rather have committed mortal sins than become a leper (see Le Goff, *Saint Louis,* p. 620. This demonstrates that Henry and Louis' contact with lepers was unusual and attracted comment. For more information about Louis' relationship with lepers, see: Le Goff, *Saint Louis,* pp. 637, 509, 719, 720.

[307] I am grateful to Dr Sophie Ambler for this point.

throughout his life, and it attracted international attention, positive and negative. Louis IX's hagiographers noted it with approval, whereas Joinville, Louis' secular biographer, was repulsed by it and was upbraided by Louis who viewed Henry's actions as pious.[308] The ambivalent reaction to Henry's acts reflects the ambiguity of lepers' status. As Katie Phillips has argued, there were conflicting images of lepers in the Bible that permeated thirteenth century society.[309] Lepers suffered social stigma and could lose their rights of property and inheritance.[310] Simultaneously, Christ had favoured them and encouraged his apostles to heal them.[311] Their extreme suffering made them efficacious intercessors with God.[312] Henry clearly believed this and that in return for his gifts, he expected prayers and intercession. This philosophy applied to Henry's patronage of the poor and vulnerable. Henry undoubtedly believed that showing concern to the most vulnerable in his kingdom would increase his standing with God by displaying his paternalistic concern for all members of his kingdom.

The above episode is one of the more detailed accounts of Henry's pious actions. Other episodes are not as well recorded but the evidence we do have indicates that 1230 was not a one-off. Before departing for Poitou in 1242, the lepers received attention. The leprous maidens of St James, London, for example, were given an extensive grant of lands, holdings, liberties, freedoms and quittances.[313] This was different from the majority of other gifts that were small in nature.[314] Nuns and friars also consistently received regal attention before both domestic and

---

[308] Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 85.
[309] Phillips, "The Leper and the King", pp. 3, 14-15.
[310] Ibid, p. 80.
[311] Ibid, p. 15.
[312] Ibid, p. 108.
[313] *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 269.
[314] Money and wood are the most common gifts. See, for example of gifts of money: *CLR, 1240-45*, pp. 13, 63; *CLR, 1245-51*, p. 173. For examples of wood gifts, see: *CPR, 1247-58*, p. 20; *CR, 1227-31*, p. 509; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 200, 495.

continental expeditions.[315] There was not an explicit quid pro quo in that a king could expect support in return for gifts but, there was an implicit expectation that patronage was not without strings attached.

The 1242-3 Poitevin campaign was perhaps Henry's most inglorious defeat on the continent. He failed to win back his lands in Poitou and was betrayed by his stepfather, Hugh X de Lusignan. Henry appears to have tried to wipe the memory of the event both from his own memory and from his subjects'. He made detailed preparations for his return by ordering various religious figures, including abbots and priors, to procure horses, carriages, and outriders to announce him with all appurtenances.[316] Nearly all the English nobles met him at Winchester. Henry ordered that the city was to be adorned by garlands and with lighted tapers. Citizens were to be in holiday dress and the bells were to ring out in joy. Furthermore, four of the most important citizens and burgesses of each city or borough, were to come and meet him in rich garments.[317]

Henry's desire for his important subjects to meet him at Winchester was not just because Winchester was on the route from Portsmouth to London, it also had dynastic links that have been explored above.[318] Henry emulated his prestigious uncle trying, perhaps, to demonstrate to his subjects that this defeat was only a temporary setback. However, the pomp and ceremony did not prevent people from seeing the Poitevin campaign as anything other than an unmitigated disaster. The scale of the pomp and ceremony highlighted the gulf between

---

[315] For examples of such patronage abroad, see footnote 156. For domestic patronage (such as when Henry was having difficulties with the Welsh and Scottish see: Friars: *CPR, 1247-58,* pp. 575 (2); *CR, 1256-59,* pp. 73, 75, 88-9. Nuns: *CChR,* vol. 1, p. 472; *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 571. Hospitals: *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 571 (2).
[316] *CM,* vol. iv, p. 255
[317] Ibid, p. 255.
[318] See Shacklock, 'Henry III and Native Saints', p. 28.

fantasy and reality. The scale of the celebration implied a triumph. The ceremony did not reflect reality and observers like Matthew Paris were unimpressed.[319]

As one might expect, the Confessor, being Henry's favoured saint, received much patronage. Before leaving for Poitou in 1242, Henry went on a pilgrimage around East Anglian sites in March before heading back to Windsor and then Westminster before heading to Winchester and Portsmouth.[320] He arranged for twenty-four half-penny weights of musk to be offered at the great altar of Westminster on the feast days of the Confessor for his and his family's health. These were always to be offered by the king and his family, or by the treasurer if all members of the immediate family were outside the kingdom.[321] Henry also ordered four tapers were to be maintained around the Confessor's shrine with more candles being lit on his feast days. These actions were to be carried out indefinitely until a suitable land endowment could be made to finance them.[322] Such actions demonstrate Henry's devotion to the saint and his desire to harvest good will before leaving on a potentially perilous journey.

Henry's ability to use his veneration of local saints to achieve several aims continued whilst he was abroad. In 1243, at sometime between 15 and 27 May, safe conduct was granted to the bearers of the relics St Quiteria to Eleanor of Provence in Bordeaux and for their return journey.[323] Those relics were probably requested for the health of Eleanor and Henry's young daughter, Beatice who had been born in Bordeaux on 25 June 1242. She was not, therefore, yet a year old and given the perils of infancy, Henry may have felt the need for the intercession of a powerful local saint, treasured by the locals. Henry use of Quiteria's relics may not have just

[319] *Flowers of History,* vol. 2, pp. 207-13, 217.
[320] See *Itinerary of Henry III,* pp. 162-3.
[321] *CChR,* vol. 1, p. 268.
[322] Ibid, vol. 1, p. 268.
[323] *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 377.

been about efficacy. He may well have wanted to show the Gascons that he appreciated their saint and that he felt a similar love for her as they felt. This was a way of Henry integrating himself into the spiritual world of Gascony, making himself palatable to the Gascons, but also establishing his authority by making his presence felt in their spiritual life.

Gascony

Henry returned home from Gascony in 1254 having quelled rebellion and arranged for Edward to marry Eleanor of Castile, thus protecting Gascony's borders. He had also met Louis IX on his return journey and developed a good relationship with him.[324] Henry likely saw the Gascon campaign as a total success and celebrated in style as when he returned home. Richard of Cornwall and most of the nobles greeted him and gave him expensive gifts at Dover.[325] There, on the obit feast of Thomas Becket, Henry had a sumptuous banquet with his magnates. The following Sunday, Henry was received into London with honour by the clergy and populace.[326] London, as it had been in 1243, was decked out in tapestries.[327] Henry also used the occasion of his return to display his good lordship. Just after the Epiphany feast (commemorating the three Magi), Henry made the Londoners answer for the escape of John de Frome. New sheriffs were elected, and the Londoners were fined.[328] This was a display of power to underline the return of royal authority in England.

[324] D.A. Carpenter, 'The Meetings of Kings Henry III and Louis IX', in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England X: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 2003* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), pp. 1–30, at pp. 19, 21.
[325] *CM*, vol. v, p. 484.
[326] 'Annals of Dunstable', in *AM*, vol. iii, p. 194.
[327] *Liber de Antiquis*, p. 22.
[328] Ibid, p. 22.

However, just like in 1243, Henry's conduct and motives were questioned, especially by Matthew Paris. He presented Henry as ungrateful for the gifts that were given to him, demanding more expensive ones.[329] Whether this is accurate is not certain, but as Lars Kjaer has argued, Paris' desire in his *Chronica Majora* (that was aimed at a largely monastic audience) was to demonstrate Henry's poor judgement and bad rule in his inability to appreciate the gifts of his subjects.[330] Paris was writing within the patristic tradition that saw bad rulers as willing to manipulate ceremonies, especially of a divine nature, to their own interests.[331] For Paris, Henry was a bad receiver of gifts because he did not appreciate the intention behind the gifts and cared only for their material value. His conduct also displayed a lack of regard for his loving subjects.[332] This would have demonstrated to a monastic audience Henry's poor rule.[333] However, Paris authorial intentions may have clouded his interpretation of the event. As Kjaer has noted when he examined Paris's different accounts of Henry's celebration of Christmas in 1251 in the *Chronica Majora* and the *Historia Anglorum* (aimed at a courtly audience), Paris could present the same event very differently.[334] The account in the *Historia Anglorum* highlighted the unity and positive aspects of the occasion.[335] What made the account in the *Chronica Majora* negative were Paris' interpretation of acts. In 1254, in the *Chronica Majora,* Paris interpreted Henry's actions as avaricious, but from a lay perspective, the act can be seen very differently. By giving Henry expensive gifts on his return, magnates re-established their bonds of fealty with him. These gifts represented the esteem in which Henry was held. Inexpensive gifts would have been insulting, particularly after a successful campaign.

---

[329] *CM*, vol. v, pp. 484-5.
[330] L. Kjaer, *The Medieval Gift and the Classical Tradition: Ideals and the Performance of Generosity in Medieval England, 1100-1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), pp. 89-90; L. Kjaer, 'Matthew Paris and the Royal Christmas: Ritualised Communication in Text and Practice' in J. Burton, P. Schofield and B. Weiler (ed.), *Thirteenth Century England XIV: Proceedings of the Aberystwyth and Lampeter Conference 2011* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), 141-154, at p. 145.
[331] Kjaer, 'Matthew Paris and the Royal Christmas', p. 148.
[332] Kjaer, *The Medieval Gift,* p. 90.
[333] Kjaer, 'Matthew Paris and the Royal Christmas', p. 147.
[334] Ibid, p. 154.
[335] Ibid, p. 154.

This was not necessarily about greed, but more about status and the re-establishment regal power.

Henry made use of his journeys near continental shrines in 1254, on his journey across France, back to England. He used the opportunity of Louis IX's granting him safe conduct to visit Pontigny, the burial site of Edmund of Abingdon and the site of Becket's exile.[336] This provided Henry with the opportunity to display his devotion to two former archbishops of Canterbury and to display a good relationship with both, enhancing his authority in the eyes of God and in that of those who witnessed his veneration. These actions can be interpreted as a way of Henry co-opting saints whose relations with the Crown had been contentious. It was a way of presenting the relationships of these former archbishops of Canterbury with their kings as less antagonistic.[337] There was also the opportunity of making symbolic reconciliation, drawing a line under any unpleasantness.

## Conclusion

Henry III's routine piety was broad in terms of recipients and the types of gifts given. He very rarely charged recipients for gifts even when he granted significant lands and liberties. Most of the charges made occurred before 1234, before Henry had decided on the nature of his government. Additionally, Henry's charges seem to have been related to who could pay or who was out of favour. Henry rarely charged poorer recipients for gifts. Powerful religious figures,

[336] Carpenter, 'The Meetings of Kings Henry III and Louis IX', p. 3.
[337] As argued by Joseph Creamer about Edmund of Abingdon in J. Creamer, 'St Edmund of Canterbury and Henry III in the Shadow of Thomas Becket' in J. Burton, P. Schofield and B. Weiler (ed.), *Thirteenth Century England XIV: Proceedings of the Aberystwyth and Lampeter Conference 2011* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), 129-139, at p. 131. For a discussion about the impact of the sanctity of Edmund on the conduct of other archbishops of Canterbury, Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community*, pp. 68, 117-8.

like bishops, could support Henry politically and his patronage of bishops demonstrates his understanding of their power especially at times of crisis such as during the 1245 Welsh campaign. Henry seems to have favoured patronising bishops who served him as ambassadors or in administrative roles. The nature of Henry's patronage of bishops seems to have changed as he experienced financial strain from the 1250s onwards. Overall, gifts became smaller in nature. The exception was Aymer de Lusignan, Henry's half-brother, who continued to receive lucrative gifts.

Henry's patronage of monastic recipients was broad, and he favoured many houses that had dynastic connections such as Tarrant, where his sister Joan was buried. However, dynastic links were not the only reason for his patronage. Henry was very supportive of vulnerable recipients including the poor, friars, lepers, and hospitals. His consistent gifts, though small in nature, made a significant impact on the recipients. Henry's focus on the vulnerable fitted into the prevailing trends of the thirteenth century that was moving away from established orders like the Benedictines towards the Mendicants.

Henry built on routine piety by engaging in various ritual ceremonies. Westminster, and Westminster Abbey in particular, provided the backdrop for Henry's kingship. Henry used Westminster not only as an administrative centre but as a spiritual centre. His devotion to the Confessor meant that he held important ceremonies there to accrue grace to the Confessor and to ensure the Confessor's support for his endeavours as was the case for his crusading vow ceremonies in 1250 and 1252. Westminster was the stage on which he could display his kingship to his subjects in the hope that they would support him. He used liturgically significant dates to enhance the sacrality of the ceremonies and to accrue prestige.

At times of crisis, Henry's pious acts had to be more flexible. This can be seen in his Welsh, Scottish, Poitevin, and Gascon campaigns. During and after these campaigns, Henry engaged in his usual broad patronage and responded to requests from recipients in the area. Generally, Henry made gifts to recipients in his immediate vicinity. In addition, Henry engaged in the veneration of his favoured saints, namely the Confessor and other Anglo-Saxon saints, demonstrating his belief in their efficacy. He also venerated important local saints such as William of York, St Cuthbert, and St Quiteria, demonstrating the breadth of his saint veneration and his ability to use local saints to appeal to the people who venerated that saint. Henry tended to commemorate his ancestors before and after moments of crisis such as when he visited Worcester on the 1245 Welsh campaign.

It is difficult to know the impact of Henry's pious acts on his political image. Consistent gifts to pious recipients would have resulted in accruing prayers, and so the support of God, but the political impact is harder to pin down. Henry's acts during ceremonies make it clear that he wished to make statements about his kingship such as the morality of it as he tried to display during his crusading ceremonies. A key problem with interpreting Henry's ritual ceremonies is that we often must rely on the accounts of Matthew Paris, especially the *Chronica Majora.* The *Chronica* was written for a monastic audience who had a didactic outlook. Paris interpreted Henry's actions against his personal yardsticks rather than trying to understand Henry's acts from his perspective. It is hard to know how lay audiences interpreted Henry's acts. However, Henry's acts must have achieved some of his aims given the large periods of domestic peace during his realm. His pious acts contributed to his image of at least an acceptable king, if not an ideal one.

## Chapter Three: Piety and Dynasty

### Introduction

As has been demonstrated, Henry's concern for spiritual aid and validation at times of importance for the dynasty was extensive. For Henry, God was the most important witness of his actions. He would ultimately be answerable to him and needed his support to be successful. However, Henry was the king of a realm also beset with earthly and material concerns. Henry desired a peaceful kingdom, so he needed to impress his subjects. His pious actions were meant to be emulated but he also had to convince his subjects that he was worth emulating. Henry used his piety to send various messages to his subjects. He also was concerned with integrating his foreign relatives into his kingdom and court. He used his piety to present England, in both earthly and spiritual terms, to his relatives and displayed how he wished them to treat native saints.

To gain an overview of the dynastic aspect of Henry's piety, the major translation ceremonies of Henry's minority will be examined to analyse whether Henry continued the practices he had observed. The chapter will then investigate the period of Henry's personal rule (1234-58) to explore the impact becoming a father had on Henry's pious practices. The major births and marriages of Henry's family will be examined to ascertain how Henry viewed his dynasty and how he wanted it to be perceived. Chapter four will focus on the period 1258-72 of Henry's reign and so will not be investigated here. Finally, Henry's ancestral commemoration will be analysed to ascertain how Henry viewed his ancestors. This chapter will ask which ancestors Henry commemorated, when he commemorated them, and why he did so.

Minority (Henry as boy)

The translation of St Wulfstan at the church of Worcester was one of three significant saint translations that occurred during Henry's minority. The other two were of St Osmund at Salisbury, and Thomas Becket at Canterbury. All three were impressive affairs that Henry and various ecclesiastical and lay prelates attended. All three were native saints. They would have had a lasting effect on Henry as they occurred at formative ages (10-12) and as shall be examined below, seem to have provided a blueprint that Henry followed in his saintly veneration, especially for Edward the Confessor.

John was buried at Worcester. John left Henry with a complicated inheritance both spiritually and physically. Henry came to the throne during a civil war and John was remembered negatively by both lay and ecclesiastical figures. As Webster has argued, due to the interdict and the fact that nearly all writers that were John's contemporaries were churchmen, the narrative of 'bad' king John became established.[1] These views then evolved into a 'coherent condemnation' of John's reign and Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris turned John into a caricature that highlighted his failures as a king and painted him as an irreligious ruler.[2] In Paris' *Chronica*, when he wished to strongly criticise Henry, he compared him to his father. In 1250, for example, when criticising Henry's enrichment of foreigners at the expense of his native men, Paris stated that Henry was following his father's example.[3] It was a comparison to underline just how wrong Henry's actions were. The spectre of John loomed; Henry had to be careful not to mimic his father's actions or to celebrate him too publicly. Nevertheless, John was still his father and Henry's guardian, Peter des Roches,

[1] P. Webster, *King John and Religion* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), pp. 13-14.
[2] Ibid, p. 14.
[3] *CM*, vol. 5, p. 229.

preserved a more positive picture of him.[4] Henry's relationship with Worcester must be seen in this context.

St Wulfstan's remains were translated on 7 June 1218 when the cathedral was consecrated.[5] The date was the Thursday of Whitsun week, a period of celebration in the liturgical calendar, making it an apt date to consecrate a church. Various lay and ecclesiastical prelates were present at the event and five bishops dedicated the church with the ceremony led by Silvester of Evesham, the bishop of Worcester.[6] Wulfstan's bones were translated to a shrine near the high altar and John's remains were also moved[7] as he had been buried next to St Wulfstan's shrine in 1216. Wulfstan's remains were placed in a silver and gold box encrusted with jewels. The elevation of Wulfstan also elevated John's remains which may have encouraged Henry to think about his father's soul and of the importance of being buried close to a saint who could intercede on one's behalf.

St Wulfstan was a former bishop of Worcester whose episcopate covered the reigns of Edward of Confessor, Harold, the Conqueror, and William Rufus. He was one of the few English clerics who retained his position after the Conquest.[8] His legend presented him as refusing to resign his episcopate when request to by the new archbishop of Canterbury, Lanfranc. He argued that he could only resign his staff to the person who had appointed him, Edward the Confessor.[9] During his dispute with the pope, John used this argument to justify

---

[4] N.C. Vincent, *Peter des Roches: An alien in English Politics, 1205-1238* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 10.
[5] R.R. Darlington (ed), *The Vita Wulstani of William Malmesbury to which are added the extant abridgements of this work and the miracles and translation of St Wulstan,* (London: The Royal Historical Society, 1928), p. 185; 'Annals of the Monastery of Tewkesbury', *AM,* vol. 1, p. 63; 'Annales of Bermondsey', *AM,* vol. 3, p. 454; 'Wykes' Chronicle', *AM,* vol. 4, p. 61; 'Annals of Worcester', *AM,* vol. 4, p. 384.
[6] 'Annals of Waverley', *AM,* vol. 2, p. 289.
[7] Ibid, p. 289.
[8] D.H. Farmer, *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints,* 5th edition revised, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 84.
[9] P. Draper, 'King John and St Wulfstan', *Journal of Medieval History* 10 (1984), 41-50, at 46.

his authority in the appointment of bishops.[10] Draper has argued that this element of Wulfstan made him an attractive saint for John to venerate and formed part of his decision to be buried with him.[11] John was limited in his burial choices but he had venerated Wulfstan since at least 1200, indicating that his regard for the saint was genuine.[12] John's attachment to an English saint may have influenced Henry's later attachment to English saints.

However, the evidence of Henry's interaction with Worcester during his minority does not suggest he had a special relationship with the place. Other than the gifts given around the 1216 translation ceremony, the only gifts granted to Silvester of Evesham were an aid from his tenants to offset the debts incurred in John's service[13] and a grant of protection of the bishop's lands and tenants as Silvester intended to go on crusade.[14] During the minority there were no gifts to Worcester, only a demand in 1216 for the citizens of Worcester to pay the £100 they had promised John.[15] As Henry did not have full control of his government as a minor, he did direct patronage towards Worcester and Wulfstan. In the section covering Henry's patronage as an adult, Henry's actions towards Wulfstan and Worcester will be compared to determine whether Worcester became important to Henry and what that patronage reveals about his commemoration of John.

The second major translation ceremony of Henry's minority was that of Osmund at Salisbury. Osmund was a former bishop of Salisbury who had served in royal administration under the Conqueror, including as the chancellor.[16] Richard Poore, bishop of Salisbury (1217-1225), was one of the dominant figures of the minority and was a central figure in moving the

---

[10] Ibid, 46, 48. Webster, *John and Religion*, p. 48.
[11] Draper, 'King John and St Wulfstan', 48.
[12] Webster, *John and Religion*, p. 48.
[13] *CPR, 1216-1225*, p. 144.
[14] *CPR, 1216-1225*, p. 163.
[15] *CPR, 1216-1225*, p. 10.
[16] Farmer, *Oxford Dictionary of Saints*, p. 63.

church from Old Sarum to New Sarum.[17] The move was partially done to get Osmund officially canonized. The foundation stone of the cathedral was laid on 28 April 1220. This ceremony was attended by Henry, the legate, Stephen Langton, and many other magnates.[18] Richard Poore led the ceremony and laid the first stone (for Pope Honorius III who had allowed the translation), Langton the second. The Earl of Salisbury and his wife also laid foundational stones. Many nobles then promised alms for the building of the church.[19] The ceremony brought prominent lay and ecclesiastical figures together, unified in a pious endeavour, symbolizing the unity of the kingdom in the aftermath of the civil war. Nineteen days later, on 17 May (Pentecost that year) Henry had his second coronation that contrasted greatly with his haphazard first coronation. One can see the translation ceremony at Salisbury as a way of accruing as much good will as possible in the run up to the coronation.

Henry's relationship with Salisbury during his minority was largely limited to his patronage around the convocation of the new cathedral on 28 September 1225. Like in 1220, the event was attended by domestic and international figures including the bishop of Ebro from Normandy and Cardinal Otho.[20] During his majority, Henry's patronage of Salisbury largely focused on the bishops of Salisbury.[21] Occasionally he patronised the church of Salisbury, but the gifts were largely small in nature, including grants of wood.[22] The spike in patronage of Salisbury occurred 1244-1258. It is only between these dates that gifts explicitly for St Osmund are mentioned and these gifts largely consisted of offerings of expensive cloths.[23] This patronage of Osmund can be linked with the building of the cathedral, which was dedicated in

---

[17] W.H. Rich Jones, (ed), *The Register of St Osmund*, Vol. 2 (London: Longman & Co, 1884), p. 12.
[18] Ibid, p. 12.
[19] Ibid, p. 13.
[20] Rich Jones, *Register of St Osmund*, vol. 2, p. 40.
[21] See, for example, *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 43, 51, 110 (2); *CLR, 1245-51*, pp. 151-152; *CR, 1237-42*, p. 268; *CR, 1242-47*, p. 516; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 47, 140, 205, 237, 335, 478-9; *CR, 1251-53*, pp. 77 (2), 349; *CR, 1256-59*, pp. 65, 257-8; *CR, 1259-61*, p. 132; *CR, 1261-64*, p. 54; CR, 1264-68, p. 454.
[22] *CPR, 1258-66*, p.308 (protection); *CR, 1231-34*, p. 370 (wood); *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 279 (wood), 280 (wood); *CR, 1237-42*, p. 268 (deer); *CR, 1242-47*, p. 492 (amercements); *CR, 1247-51*, p. 252 (deer).
[23] *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 143, 166; *CR, 1256-59*, pp. 265, 275.

Michaelmas 1258 in Henry's presence and that of numerous prelates.[24] Henry's involvement with Salisbury and St Osmund seems to have been reactive rather than being driven by his attachment to the saint.

Henry's second coronation was sandwiched between two major translations, the ones at Salisbury and Canterbury. Becket's translation at Canterbury on 7 July 1220 was an event of international significance.[25] Langton began planning the event two years previously when he proclaimed the event throughout Europe.[26] He worked closely with the designers of the new shrine, Elias of Dereham and Walter of Colchester, to create a magnificent tomb.[27] Becket's shrine was 'unrivalled in England' due to its elevated position in the cathedral.[28]

The 1220 translation was the culmination of Langton's efforts to elevate Becket and to use the ceremony to bring unity to the kingdom. He was central in securing the papal benediction for the translation and in planning the ceremony.[29] The date of the translation was the death date of Henry II (who died on the night of 6 to 7 July).[30] The ceremony played an important role in re-establishing the authority of the English monarchy.[31] By combining the anniversary of Henry II's death with the translation, a clear link was made between Henry II and Becket, demonstrating further spiritual reconciliation between the two. Katherine Emery has argued that in combination with his coronation at Westminster on Pentecost in 1220, Langton wanted to imbue all saintly protectors that John had lacked and to demonstrate to

---

[24] *CR, 1256-59*, p. 265; *CM*, vol. 5, p. 719.
[25] K. Emery, 'Architecture, Space and Memory: Liturgical Representation of Thomas Becket, 1170-1220', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 173 (2020), 61-77, at 68.
[26] J.C. Wall, *Shrines of British Saints* (London: Methuen & Co, 1905), p. 160.
[27] Emery, 'Architecture, Space, and Memory', 68.
[28] Wall, *Shrines of British Saints*, p. 159.
[29] 'Life and Translation of St Thomas à Becket', in Josiah Cox Russell and John Paul Heironimus (ed.), *The Shorter Latin Poems of Master Henry of Avranches Relating to England* (Cambridge, MA: The Medieval Academy of America, 1935), p. 64
[30] Ibid, p. 65; Wall, *Shrines of British Saints*, p. 158
[31] Emery, 'Architecture, Space, and Memory', 68).

observers to Henry could act as an arbitrator between opposing parties.[32] This combination of pious ceremonies and political aims was repeated multiple times during Henry's majority most notably in the 1269 translation ceremony of Edward the Confessor. The 1269 ceremony was a cumulation of events aimed at reconciling rebels with the king. The blueprint of using an opulent religious ceremony to make statements about his kingdom and kingship seems to have been laid for Henry during his minority.

Langton's actions during the ceremony seem to have also provided a template for Henry to follow in his ceremonial events.[33] Langton involved Henry heavily in the ceremony. On the vigil of the ceremony, Henry emulated Langton in praying through the night before leading the procession along the nave, in front of Pandulf, Langton, and the archbishop of Reims (the primate of France).[34] He was too young to carry the feretory but four of the 'highest nobles in the realm' carried it under a canopy of a cloth of gold and flanked by prelates carrying tapers.[35] According to Henry of Avranches, the banquet following the translation was attended by 33,000 people. This was probably an exaggeration, but Langton certainly spent liberally.[36] He provided free provision for man and beast on all roads approaching Canterbury and his successors were still paying off the debt thirty years later.[37] Such an opulent event must have influenced Henry's understanding of ritual events and made him understand the importance of magnificence in making political statements and in securing the protection for his dynasty from efficacious saints.

---

[32] Ibid, 68.
[33] One can see this in the architecture of Westminster Abbey. Like Becket, the Confessor was honoured with a chapel to the east of the high altar and the provision of the shrine was considered in the architectural plans (Wall, *Shrines of British Saints*, p. 19).
[34] Ibid, 67; Wall, *Shrines of British Saints*, p. 158-9.
[35] Emery, 'Architecture, Space, and Memory', 67.
[36] Ibid, 68.
[37] Ibid, 69.

Personal rule (Henry as father)

During Henry's personal rule he had full control over his pious choices. His devotion to the Confessor became an integral part of his piety, which has been referred to as 'almost obsessional'.[38] Henry's piety was different from his predecessors, but he continued to venerate saints who had been important to them. Henry became a father for the first time in 1239, building his own family and adding to the existing dynasty. The births of his children, and the marriages of important members of his dynasty provided opportunities for Henry to venerate his favourite saints in the hope that those saints would protect and add to his family. Such important dynastic occasions also provided opportunities to make statements about his dynasty to large audiences by using his pious practices to present himself in certain lights.

Edward the Confessor became the most important native saint to Henry in the early 1230s, but especially after the Marshal rebellion of 1233-34. David Carpenter has referred to Edward as Henry's 'spiritual mentor' and has written extensively on Henry's relationship with the Confessor.[39] Edward was the perfect saint for Henry and the style of kingship he wished to practise. He was a regal saint who was both English and Norman. He was remembered as a holy, peaceable king and Henry, who was neither bellicose nor successful militarily, wished to be compared with him. Like Edward, Henry was referred to as a 'rex simplex.' At best, the

[38] Draper, 'King John and St Wulfstan', 47.
[39] D.A. Carpenter, 'King Henry III and Saint Edward the Confessor', *English Historical Review* 122 (2007), 865-91, at 878. The influence of the Confessor on Henry piety is certainly important, but his influence is sometimes over-emphasised at the expense of other saints. For a general picture of Henry's relationship with the Confessor, see P. Binski, 'Reflections on *La estoire de Seint Aedward le rei:* hagiography and kingship in thirteenth-century England', *Journal of Medieval History* 16 (1990), 333-350; J. Alexander and P., Binski, (ed.), *Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England 1200-1400* (London: Royal Academy of Arts in association with Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987); P. Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400* (New Haven and London: Academy of Arts in association with Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1995); D.A. Carpenter, 'The Burial of King Henry III, the Regalia and Royal Ideology' in D.A. Carpenter (ed.), *The Reign of Henry III* (London: Hambledon, 1996), pp. 427-461; D.A. Carpenter, 'Westminster Abbey in Politics, 1258-69' in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England VIII: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 1999* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001 (2001), pp. 49-58; N.C. Vincent, *The Holy Blood: King Henry III and the Westminster Blood Relic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

term means a king who preferred a simple life, at worst, someone who was naïve or just plain stupid.[40] This more derogatory meaning was levelled at both Henry and Edward (at least in Edward's hagiography[41]) and the comparison to the Confessor made the moniker less insulting.[42] Additionally, Edward's mixed race of English and Norman may have appealed to Henry. Edward's mother, Emma, was Norman, and his father Æthelred the Unready, was English. Henry had English (via Margaret of Scotland) and Norman ancestry. Edward spent his early life in exile in Normandy before retiring in triumph to reclaim his rightful inheritance.[43] Henry, at least at the start of his reign, was aware of his continental inheritance and was undoubtedly pained by the loss of Normandy. He did try to regain it and he may have hoped that the Confessor would have aided in claiming his rightful continental possessions.[44] Nevertheless, there was a difference between the Confessor as a man and in the historiography. The Norman aspect, as one can see in Matthew Paris' account, is largely absent.[45] His Englishness and commitment to England was what was stressed. Henry was aware of this, and his use of a saint seen as English fitted into the re-centring of the kingdom in the aftermath of the loss of Normandy. Barons were now mainly native born rather than having cross-Channel dominions. It is possible that Henry used the Confessor for a variety of reasons. He may not

---

[40] For a discussion of the 'rex simplex' moniker, see S. T. Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community of England 1213-1272* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 3.

[41] For a discussion about the difference between how Edward was presented as a saint in comparison to his actual acts, see T. Licence, *Edward the Confessor: Last of the Royal Blood* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2020), pp. 4-5.

[42] Both men were described as *simplex* again and again. It was not a secret. Henry knew about such attacks. See Carpenter, 'Henry III and Saint Edward the Confessor', 891.

[43] Licence, *Edward the Confessor*, p. 47.

[44] I am grateful for Dr Andrew Spencer's suggestion.

[45] Paris stressed that Edward favoured his 'natural' men. In reality, Edward was castigated by his Anglo-Saxon supporters for appointing Normans to key governmental positions. Paris, for example, passed over the Norman origins of Edward's chamberlain Hugolin. Paris also associated tyranny, duplicity, and cruelty with Danes. The xenophobic aspect must not be forgotten particularly because this work was dedicated to Eleanor of Provence. Paris's presentation of the Confessor, built on past lives of the Confessor and presented him as an ideal **English** king. For details about all these points, see T.S. Fenster, and J. Wogan-Browne (trans. and ed.), *The History of Saint Edward the King* (Arizona: Arizona University Press, 2008), pp. 3, 19, 55, 57, 58, 59. There were key differences between the man and the saint that would be presented. Edward himself contributed and developed the narrative about himself that created this image of a simple king surrounded by wicked advisors. For a discussion of this, see Licence, *Edward the Confessor*, pp. 250-252.

have been able to stress the Norman part of the Confessor to his subjects, but that does not mean that Henry did not see the Confessor in a different light on a personal level. The stress on the Englishness of the Confessor meant that Henry could display his desire to rule as a consciously English king. Furthermore, Edward was associated with good government.[46] Henry could use his devotion to the Confessor to display his intention to rule according to the laws of the land, but especially to Magna Carta. In sum, the Confessor enabled Henry to display himself in a positive light to God, and to his subjects. As shall be examined below, Henry's intention to rule like the Confessor did not stop him from failing, but it does provide an insight into how he wished to be seen.

As one might expect given the importance of the Confessor to Henry, he appealed to him at moments of dynastic triumph and strain. Sometimes Henry was asking for aid for himself, or his immediate family, such as during Eleanor's pregnancies. At other times Henry was thinking more generally about his dynasty and his kingdom. One can use Kantorowicz's classic distinction between King and king to understand the difference between the personal ambitions of the king for himself (and those close to him) and his ambitions for his dynasty and kingdom. There was not the same modern distinction between public and private acts, but one's analysis of who the audience was can lead to an understanding of Henry's more personal ambitions, and those for his dynasty. None of Henry's actions were completely 'personal' because kings were rarely alone and were meant to be examples to emulate. According to Kantorowicz, the king ought to be seen as the king as a man, capable of mistakes. The King, by contrast, referred to the office of the king and was composed of inalienable rights and

[46] Carpenter, 'Henry III and Saint Edward the Confessor', 882.

expectations.[47] It is not easy to disentangle a king's personal ambitions from his ambitions for the kingdom as they often overlapped.

Births

Healthy pregnancies and children were necessary for the continuation of the dynasty. While the queen was pregnant, much of Henry's pious practices (both what he performed himself and that he made others do on his behalf) were of a personal nature. He appealed for the blessing of saints on his wife and children. The Confessor received the lion's share of Henry's veneration.

During Eleanor's pregnancy with Edward Henry showed great generosity to the Confessor. In April 1239, when Eleanor was about seven months pregnant, Henry paid 50*s*. for the maintenance of great tapers around the Confessor's shrine.[48] Furthermore, he offered an expensive banner that was to hang near Edward's shrine. He also instructed a goldsmith to make a banner, worth £4 2*s*. 9 ½ *d*., that was to be hung near Edward's shrine.[49] As Eleanor's due date crept closer, Henry's generosity increased. In early June, he paid for two silk gilt banners, a silver-gilt crown, and a pall to be offered at Westminster.[50] These gifts may have been for the Confessor but as Westminster contained the remains of other Anglo-Saxon figures including Edith-Matilda and Edith of Wessex, the gifts could have been for them too. They were the two most important women in relation to the Confessor. Their connections to the saint would have made them important to Henry, especially so in the case of Edith-Matilda who was

[47] E. H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology with a new preface by William Chester Jordan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), p. 7.
[48] *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 374, 376-377.
[49] Ibid, pp. 388-389.
[50] Ibid, pp. 388-9.

his own direct ancestor. This idea is supported by another writ, made on the same date as above that ordered tapers to be placed in the church of Holy Trinity, London.[51] Holy Trinity, Aldgate, was the foundation of Edith-Matilda and it may have been where she intended to be buried.[52] By making offerings at Edith-Matilda's foundation, Henry was stressing how the future of his dynasty was connected to its past, both Anglo-Saxon and Norman. Additionally, Henry may have hoped that by appealing to Edith-Matilda, he secured her aid in protecting his wife.

Henry did something similar when Eleanor was pregnant with Margaret. Due to the closeness in age between Edward and Margaret (about 15 months), it is not always clear to which child the pious practices refer. It does appear that Henry marked Edward's first birthday (17/18 June 1240) by offering a clasp to St Edward on 17 June 1240.[53] Henry thanked the saint who had protected his namesake so far. Around Margaret's birth, the Confessor was thanked for protecting her and her mother. On the feast of Michaelmas (29 September), four baudekins[54] were bought and offered to St Edward. A gold buckle was also offered there along with a green banner with a gold cross and gold images on both sides.[55] The liberate writ does not specify whether these offerings were made in preparation for the queen's labour but given that Henry made similar offerings at a similar time before the birth of Edward, it is likely that Henry made these offerings not only to demonstrate veneration of St Edward on the feast of Michaelmas but also to ensure the support of the saint for his wife's labour.

---

[51] Ibid, pp. 388-389.
[52] J.C. Parsons, '"Never was a body buried in England with such solemnity and honour": The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens to 1500', in A.J. Duggan (ed.), *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference Held at King's College London April 1995* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997), pp. 320-1.
[53] *CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 478.
[54] Baudekin was the richest material used in garments in the Middle Ages. It consisted of gold and silk and was embroidered. Baudekins were originally made in Baghdad. See 'Baudekin', *Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary,* published 1913 by G. & C. Merriam Co., viewed online at https://www.thefreedictionary.com/Baudekin (accessed 18/03/2023).
[55] *CLR, 1267-72,* p. 254.

Henry also appealed to Thomas Becket at crucial moments for the dynasty. Between the births of Edward and Margaret, in July 1240, Henry prepared for Becket's veneration around his translation feast. He ordered forty obols of musc to be bought and delivered to him on the Thursday before the translation feast.[56] Henry was in Canterbury himself between 13 and 15 July.[57] It seems likely that Henry was appealing to Becket for several purposes. He would have wanted to secure Becket's blessing for Edward, Margaret, and Eleanor. His patronage would have been witnessed by those in Canterbury Cathedral and those in the vicinity. His acts were public in the sense that multiple individuals would have seen them, but it was not a full ceremonial event with the magnates of the kingdom in attendance. The births of royal children were important occasions that one would want the kingdom to know about, but gifts made at shrines, in the king's absence, were more concerned with blessings directed at Henry, his wife and their children.

It appears that Henry made a special effort to be at Canterbury in July 1240. Throughout his reign, Henry generally only visited Canterbury when there was a specific reason to pass through it, such as when travelling to the continent. Immediately after his visit, Henry pardoned the monks of Canterbury of forty marks which they owed him for the protection of their liberties. Henry then had that money spent on four candles to be placed around Becket's shrine.[58] Henry's protection of the Canterbury monks, without fine, was generous and displayed his desire to protect the liberties for which Becket had died.

As was the case for his elder children, Henry appealed to the Confessor, Becket, and other English saints when Eleanor was pregnant with Beatrice. Henry and Eleanor went on an East Anglian pilgrimage when Eleanor was six or seven months pregnant. Beatrice was born

---

[56] *CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 478.
[57] J.E. Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship: The Itineraries of the Thirteenth-Century English Kings", unpublished PhD thesis, King's College London, (2011), pp. 1119-1120.
[58] *CR, 1237-42,* p. 208.

on the continent on 24 June 1242, during Henry's disastrous expedition to Poitou of 1242-3. His actions in April and May coincided with his preparations for the campaign and were both about securing aid for his unborn child and for success in the Poitevin campaign. Henry focused on English regal saints especially the Confessor, and the kings and martyrs Edward and Edmund.[59] Before Henry and Eleanor left for France, at Easter (20 April that year), Henry made a grant to 'Edward the King' for the safety of his, the queen's, and their children's souls, of 24 obols of musc by way of chevage that was to be laid upon the great altar at Westminster by either the king, queen, or their heirs, if they were in the kingdom, or by the treasurer, half on the obit feast of the Confessor and half on the translation feast.[60] Chevage was a payment made by a villein to live outside his lordship.[61] The use of the word in the charter indicates that Henry viewed Edward as his spiritual lord who would protect him and his family.

On Easter Sunday, Henry granted the prior and church of St Thomas the Martyr, Royston, a yearly fair there on the vigil and feast of Becket.[62] At the same time, the prior of Witham was granted protection.[63] Witham was one of the places founded by Henry II in recompense for Becket's murder.[64] Henry also appealed to St Alban. He visited St Alban's Abbey at the start of April.[65] Despite being a Roman soldier, Alban was the protomartyr of Britain.[66] In preparation for his arrival, Henry ordered the sheriff of Essex and Hertfordshire to make tapers from 175 lbs of wax worth £4 7s. 6d. These tapers were placed in the abbey.[67] St Albans Abbey contained the relics of St Alban and St Amphibalus, the cleric sheltered by

---

[59] Henry made offerings of necklaces, obols of must and various liberties. For more details see *CR, 1237-42,* pp. 403, 404-5.
[60] *CChR*, vol.1, p. 268.
[61] C. Arnold-Baker, *The Companion to British History*, 3rd edition (London: Longcross Press, 2008), p. 289.
[62] *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 268.
[63] *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 279.
[64] Houses of Carthusian monks: The priory of Witham', in *A History of the County of Somerset: Volume 2,* ed. William Page (London, 1911), 123-128. *British History Online,* viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/som/vol2/pp123-128 (accessed 19/05/2023).
[65] *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 268.
[66] Farmer, *Oxford Dictionary of Saints,* pp. 9-10.
[67] *CLR, 1240-45,* p. 115.

Alban.[68] On 7 April 1242, the morrow of Passion Sunday, Henry granted protection, without term, to the abbot and monks of St Albans.[69] On 16 April 1242, Holy Wednesday, Henry gave the abbot of St Albans fifteen oaks for timber for the abbey's new hall.[70] By visiting St Albans during Lent and making grants on holy days, Henry enhanced the potential efficacy of his gifts, making it more likely, in his mind, that these local saints would help his dynasty, not only by ensuring the health of his unborn child, but also the health of his kingship, by ensuring the accomplishment of his continental ambitions.

When Eleanor was pregnant with Edmund, Henry engaged in similar acts. On 6 December 1244, Henry offered a silk cloth at St Edward's shrine and, on 13 December 1244, ordered 6 marks of gold in obols of musc and 100 obols to be offered there.[71] On Epiphany[72] Henry paid for two rings with precious stones to be offered at the Confessor's shrine. He spent an extraordinary £73 4*d*. on a ring with a great sapphire that he offered at the shrine on the same day.[73] On the day of Edmund's birth, 16 January 1245, 5 marks were spent on an embroidered chasuble that was offered at the great altar at Westminster, thanking all the saints associated with Westminster Abbey.[74]

Before Edmund's birth, Henry, appealed directly to Becket. During the latter stages of Eleanor's pregnancy 1,000 candles were placed around Becket's shrine at Canterbury and another 1,000 candles were placed in the church of St Augustine (of Canterbury) for the preservation of the queen and for her safe delivery.[75]

---

[68] Farmer, *Oxford Dictionary of Saints*, p. 17.
[69] *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 280.
[70] *CR, 1237-42*, p. 413.
[71] *CR, 1242-7*, pp. 274, 277.
[72] 6 January, the morrow of the feast of the obit of the Confessor.
[73] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 284.
[74] Ibid, p. 288.
[75] M. Howell, 'The Children of King Henry III and Eleanor of Provence', in P.R. Coss and S.D. Lloyd (ed.), *Thirteenth Century England IV: Proceedings of The Newcastle Upon Tyne Conference 1991* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1992), p. 63.

Henry also appealed to Edmund of Abingdon. Edmund's birth provided the opportunity for spiritual reconciliation. After Archbishop Edmund died on 16 November 1240, he was immediately seen as a saint. He was canonised extremely quickly, on 16 December 1246. Despite the potential threat the new cult posed to Henry because it could be used to level criticism at his government[76], one must not forget that, at least for some time, Henry held Edmund in high esteem. Edmund had played a crucial role in the cessation of hostilities during the Marshal rebellion and the reconciliation of the rebels with the king.[77] For C.H. Lawrence, Henry could 'hardly forget that he owed his throne to the clergy'.[78] Edmund was in a line of prominent clergymen including the pope, various legates, and Langton who had helped to stabilise his kingdom. Edmund may not have directly given Henry his throne but his role in pacifying the kingdom was important. During the rebellion Edmund had 'remade' Henry in the image of a good king, making him palatable to those who had rebelled against him, presenting him as someone who had atoned for his actions and would be driven by the spirit of justice.[79] All these personal factors undoubtedly influenced Henry's relationship with the saint.

There were practical reasons for supporting Edmund's cult. The thirteenth century was an unprecedented time for the canonisation of English episcopal saints. Six bishops were canonised and three of the six were alive during the thirteenth century.[80] By 1246, four of those six bishops had been canonised.[81] The canonisation of another English episcopal saint would have accrued further prestige to the kingdom, underlining its position as a fount of pious

---

[76] J. Creamer, 'St Edmund of Canterbury and Henry III in the Shadow of Thomas Becket' in J. Burton, P. Schofield and B. Weiler (ed.), *Thirteenth Century England XIV: Proceedings of the Aberystwyth and Lampeter Conference 2011* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), p. 131.
[77] C.H. Lawrence (trans. and ed.), *The Life of St Edmund by Matthew Paris* (London: Alan Sutton, 1996), pp. 132-3.
[78] Ibid, p. 158.
[79] Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community,* pp. 73-6.
[80] Ibid, p. 21. The bishops were: Hugh of Lincoln (1140-1200), Edmund Rich (c.1174-1240), and Richard of Chichester (1197-1253).
[81] The four were: Wulstan of Worcester in 1203, Hugh of Lincoln in 1219, William of York in 1223, and Lawrence O'Toole of Dublin in 1226. See Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community,* note 57, p. 21.

excellence. The belief in Edmund's efficacy would have been an important factor. Additionally, although Paris' *Life of St Edmund* likely exaggerated the extent of the rift between Henry and Edmund when he died, relations must have been strained due to Henry's interference in episcopal elections.[82] Henry never had the opportunity to resolve issues with Edmund because he died unexpectedly on his way to Rome to deal with various matters at the papal court including his litigation with the church of Rochester and his own chapter.[83] By appealing to Edmund in the lead up to his son's birth, Henry effected a spiritual reconciliation that began in September 1244, when Eleanor was about five months' pregnant with Edmund, and Henry was returning south after peace had been made between him and the king of Scotland.[84] During that journey, Henry ordered the sheriff of Northampton to buy a chalice to hang over Catesby's altar.[85] Catesby was the earliest centre of Edmund's cult in England because Edmund had left a cloak and triptych to his sisters.[86] The successful resolution to affairs with Scotland may have prompted Henry to reflect on the saints he believed would help him to maintain peace and to ensure harmony in the kingdom both for his subjects and, most importantly, his family.

Furthermore, as the due date grew near, on 14 January 1245, Henry gave £10 as a gift for the use of the convent of Catesby in thanks for Edmund's two sisters delivering the pall of St Edmund of Abingdon to Westminster for the queen's delivery.[87] Henry believed in Edmund's efficacy so much that he literally covered his son in something belonging to him. After these actions, it seems highly plausible that one reason why Edmund was called Edmund was in honour of the saintly archbishop. Eleanor had invoked the aid of St Margaret for Margaret's birth and part of the reason why their daughter was called Margaret was in thanks

[82] Lawrence, *The Life of St Edmund,* p. 171.
[83] Ibid, p. 175.
[84] Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", p. 1158.
[85] *CLR, 1240-45,* pp. 262-263.
[86] Creamer, 'St Edmund of Canterbury and Henry III', pp. 129-130.
[87] *CLR, 1240-45,* p. 284.

for her aid. It is reasonable to assume a similar dynamic here. Edmund of Abingdon had played a role in the health of Henry's second son.[88] Naming one's child after a saint was a permanent mark of thanks and invited comparisons and expectations that were associated with the saint. The importance of naming will be examined in greater detail below, but suffice to say, it was a significant decision. Nevertheless, the name Edmund was associated with other native saints, most notably with Edmund, king and martyr. As has been explored above, Henry did venerate Edmund the martyr during Eleanor's pregnancy, and it seems likely that the regal nature of that saint was important to Henry in naming his second son. Henry seems to have sought the blessing of two saintly namesakes.

Henry also appealed to Becket for Edmund's health. Henry arranged for Eleanor, on the obit feast of Becket (29 December), to translate the reliquary of Becket's arm to a new place in the church.[89] Additionally, Becket's obit feast was also King David's feast day. All kings wished to be another David and so regal and episcopal elements combined on that day. Henry was clearly harvesting blessings for his wife and unborn son.

Henry also thanked saints after the birth of healthy children. Once again Henry venerated a mixture of native and universal saints with the Virgin and the Confessor receiving most attention. These acts can be divided into the queen's purification ceremonies and more personal acts of devotion including pilgrimages and gifts to shrines. Those acts acted in tandem to offer Henry's heartfelt thanks to the saints who protected his family.

Eleanor's purification ceremonies were public dynastic events where dynastic statements could be made. The purification ceremony emulated the Virgin's purification so that she could enter the Temple after giving birth. Queens were meant to emulate the Virgin as

[88] Creamer, 'St Edmund of Canterbury and Henry III', pp. 130, 139.
[89] *CR, 1242-7,* p.276.

she was the ultimate queen in her role as the Queen of Heaven and the chief intercessor of all saints. Due to these roles, the Virgin was the most obvious saint to appeal to for matters related to children. Henry held the Virgin in high regard. His veneration of her was consistent and important to him. However, one must be careful of reading too much into the veneration of popular universal saints. Nicholas Vincent has examined the Angevin veneration of the Virgin Mary. He stressed that the Virgin was especially important to Henry, more so than to his immediate predecessors and at least as important as to Louis IX, whose devotion to the Virgin has been seen as exceptional.[90] It seems fair to argue that Henry was devoted to the Virgin, but whether it was exceptional seems harder to argue with certainty. Vincent has acknowledged that one could, due to the growth of the Virgin's cult, view Henry's devotions as nothing more than the standard that would have been expected of any pious thirteenth-century ruler.[91] However, he was not convinced of this argument, believing Henry's devotion went far beyond what was expected.[92] This seems extremely difficult to prove with certainty and one is on safer grounds in arguing that due to the fact that her cult reached its zenith in the thirteenth century, it would have been unusual had Henry not shown extensive patronage to her.

Henry's joy at the birth of his first child can be seen in his arrangement for Eleanor's purification. 500 paens of the *Laudes Regiae* were sung in celebration and Eleanor was met by numerous noblewomen in London who accompanied her to Westminster Abbey.[93] Eleanor's purification ceremony for Edward took place forty-three days after his birth, on Sunday 31 July 1239, the vigil of St Peter ad Vincula. The date is important. Purifications were usually held forty days after the birth, but the date was the nearest Sunday, the most holy day of the week,

---

[90] N.C. Vincent, 'King Henry III and the Blessed Virgin Mary', in R.N. Swanson (ed.), *Studies in Church History: The Church and Mary,* Vol. 39 (2004), 126-146, at pp. 134, 145-6.
[91] Ibid, p. 142.
[92] Ibid, pp. 145-6.
[93] M. Howell, *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth Century England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), p. 28. Paens are songs of praise or triumph. *Laudes Regiae* is a hymn of rejoicing. An alternative title is Christus vincit! Christus regnat! Christus imperat! (Christ conquers, Christ reigns, Christ commands).

and it coincided with the vigil of an important papal feast. The next day, Henry offered twenty-four obols of musc and a bezant to St Edward.[94] Henry was therefore combining venation of papal and native saints to demonstrate the breadth of his piety and to perhaps demonstrate his dynasty's commitment to the papacy. Henry held both England and Ireland from the papacy and paid a yearly tribute to Rome[95], and his saint veneration at moments of dynastic triumph demonstrates his affection for the papacy.

Eleanor's purification for Margaret's birth was also held at Westminster around the middle of November. In preparation for the ceremony Henry ordered two pieces of baudekin to be bought and used 'as enjoined by the king at the solemnity of the queen's purification.'[96] The queen's purification was held at Westminster and 150 candles were lit for the occasion and 5 marks were paid for a special candle for Eleanor's personal use in the ceremony.[97] A liberate writ dated 22 November 1240 refers to various offerings made on the octaves of St Martin (Sunday 18 November 1240), around the time of the queen's purification. A staggering £10 9s. 6d. was spent on the making of two chasubles (priest vestment) of samite with orphreys and cloths of Arest as their linings. One was placed in the king's chapel and one in the queen's. Two copes made of cloths of gold and Arest were bought and offered by the king at Westminster along with an embroidered amice[98], a tunic, and a dalmatic.[99]

Unfortunately, as Beatrice's was born on the continent there is no evidence in the chancery documents about what occurred during her purification ceremony.[100] It is likely that similar saints were appealed to as had been done for Beatrice's older siblings. Eleanor's

---

[94] *CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 488.
[95] D.A. Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III* (London: Methuen London, 1990), p. 13.
[96] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 2.
[97] *CLR 1240-45*, p. 29 and *CR, 1237-42*, p. 233.
[98] A liturgical garment.
[99] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 8. A damaltic is a wide-sleeved long, loose vestment open at the sides, worn by deacons and bishops, and by monarchs at their coronation.
[100] As pointed out by Margaret Howell in 'The Children of Henry and Eleanor', p. 62.

purifications with Edmund and Katherine were like Edward and Margaret's. Eleanor's purification for Edmund took place at Westminster, around 24 February 1245.[101] There, a feast was held where 200 rabbits and 500 hares served.[102] £20 was spent on an embroidered cope of samite that was offered at Westminster and *Christus Vincit* was sung before the queen.[103] In preparation for Eleanor's purification for Edmund, Edward son of Odo was give twenty marks to make a case in honour of St Bartholomew to place his arm bone in. This added a universal aspect to the ceremony.[104]

As Henry was in Gascony when Katherine was born in 1253, we have less evidence of the ceremony as we have for Edward, Margaret, and Edmund. However, we do know that Eleanor celebrated her purification with a great banquet as Westminster with many lay and ecclesiastical prelates present, just as had occurred with her other children born in England.[105] As Howell has argued, Eleanor appreciated that she had to maintain 'all the magnificence of royal state' in Henry's absence.[106] However, Eleanor also maintained her husband's devotion to the Confessor by having her purification on his obit feast. The obit feast in 1254 was on a Monday[107], instead of the Sunday before or Epiphany, a significant feast. The obit feast was more important to Eleanor and Henry than the Epiphany. Eleanor, understanding the importance of the Confessor and his protection of her previous children, appealed to a saint that was not just efficacious but tied up to the dynasty's identity.

Before and after the purification ceremonies of their children, Henry and Eleanor venerated various saints in thanks for their survival and to receive their favour for their

---

[101] *CLR, 1240-45,* p. 289.
[102] *CLR, 1240-45,* p. 289.
[103] *CLR, 1240-45,* pp. 288 and 292.
[104] *CR, 1242-7,* p. 286.
[105] Howell, *Eleanor of Provence,* p. 118.
[106] Ibid, p. 118.
[107] See C.R. Cheney, (ed), *A Handbook of Dates: For Students of History, Revised by Michael Jones*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 198.

continued health. Two days after Edward's birth, Henry made a yearly grant to the church and monks of Westminster 'for the reverence of the glorious Confessor and King, Edward' of a tun of wine to be received by them on the morrow of St Boltolph (18 June), Edward's birthdate, to be used in the celebration of divine service.[108] By making an explicit link between his son and the Confessor, that the monks re-iterated every year, Henry made a clear promise to honour the Confessor in every way he could and to seek the continual protection of the saint for his heir.

Further gifts were offered at the Confessor's shrine after the purification ceremony including two images made of gold and precious stones, a gilded silver candlestick, a banner, seventy obols of musc, half an ounce of gold, a silk cloth made of two pieces of baudekin, and 500 tapers of wax.[109] On 20 August 1239 three cameos worth 10 s. were placed at St Edward's shrine.[110]

Henry also intended to go on an East Anglian pilgrimage after the purification ceremony as evinced by wine being sent to the leading East Anglian pilgrimage site including St Edmunds, Bromholm, Walsingham and Norwich. Most of these sites were associated with Anglo-Saxon saints such as St Edmund and Edith of Wilton.[111] Other sites were associated with universal saints, notably Mary at Walsingham. For whatever reason, Henry did not go on the pilgrimage, but the wine was most likely used in divine service to celebrate Edward's birth. Henry gave other types of gifts including ecclesiastical vestments.[112] The variety of native saints appealed to in the early months of Edward's life indicates that Henry's piety encompassed a much wider range of saints than just Edward the Confessor. Henry's connection

---

[108] *CChR*, vol.1, p. 244.
[109] *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 404-405.
[110] *CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 408.
[111] *CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 409. Edith of Wilton (961-84) was the illegitimate daughter of King Edgar of England and became a nun at Wilton, the place where her mother, Wulfthryth, had been a novice. Following her death, she became the patron saint of her community at Wilton abbey. Edith built at church at Wilton that was dedicated to St Denis. She died 3 weeks after the dedication of the church and was buried there. See Farmer, *Oxford Dictionary of Saints*, pp. 135-6. This church is most likely the church referred to as St Edith's church.
[112] *CR, 1237-42*, p. 155.

to the Confessor was undoubtedly very important to him, but the wider context of his personal piety ought not to be ignored.

As was the case during the purification ceremony, Henry thanked papal saints and the Virgin. Just over a week after Edward's birth, on 28 June 1239 (vigil of the feast of SS. Peter and Paul), Henry ordered that a 4 lbs taper be made and offered at the church of St Mary, Walsingham at Virgin's the altar 'in her honour.' On the same day, Henry ordered the sheriffs of Oxford and Kent to each have 4 lbs tapers made and offered at the chapels of Caversham and Dover castle, respectively.[113] Caversham was the second most popular pilgrimage site for the Virgin and the chapel at Dover Castle was dedicated to Thomas Becket. By giving thanks on a day associated with papal saints to the Virgin and Becket, Henry displayed his appreciation of a range of saints.

Henry continued to appeal to the Virgin for Edward's health, involving Edward in his veneration. On 29 October 1239, Henry ordered a tunic of good samite, the height of baby Edward, to be made and offered by Edward at the church of St Mary at Southwark. Henry also offered three standards of ruby cendal at the same place.[114] On 16 December 1239, Henry ordered the bailiffs of Windsor to find a chaplain who would celebrate the mass of the Virgin for the 'good estate and health' of Edward.[115] Henry put the care of his child in the Virgin's hands.

Henry appealed to a mixture of native and universal saints after Margaret was born. Around the purification ceremony for Eleanor after Margaret's birth, on 21 November 1240, Henry ordered the sheriff of Norfolk to buy 1,000 lbs of wax, 500 of which was to be given to

[113] *CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 398.
[114] *CR, 1237-42*, p. 149.
[115] *CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 435.

the sacristan of St Edmunds to make 1,000 tapers to be placed around St Edmund's shrine.[116] Edmund was a tenth-century king who was murdered by the Vikings for his faith. Henry would have been proud of that and in displaying respect for the saint, he both honoured the saint and displayed the sanctity and importance of his dynasty.

Henry also appealed to the Virgin after Margaret was born. 500 lbs of wax to make 1,000 tapers was given to the sacristan of Walsingham to be placed in the chapel of St Mary on the feast of the Immaculate Conception (8 December).[117] Henry also venerated the Virgin after Edmund's birth. On the feast of the Annunciation in 1245, two months after Edmund's birth, Henry was at Walsingham. This was part of an East Anglian pilgrimage which also took part during Lent heightening the sacredness of the occasion. This demonstrates a recognition of the Virgin's preeminent position, as the mother of God, to protect children.

On the same pilgrimage, Henry thanked English saints including St Albans and St Edmund.[118] St Edmund was immortalised in the king's chamber at Brill as a window was blocked and painted with a standing image of Edmund. Whenever Henry visited Brill, therefore, he would be reminded of what he owed the saint.[119] Henry offered wine and wax at the pilgrimage sites enabling them to continue to function and displayed his attachment to Anglo-Saxon saints.

A final way one can see Henry's attachments to various saints is in the naming of his children. Names were important, especially for royal children. Individuals who had the same name were naturally compared. This was especially true when someone was named after a saint. As has been stated, Henry named his first son after Edward the Confessor. This displays

---

[116] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 9.
[117] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 9.
[118] Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", pp. 1174-5.
[119] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 306.

the strength of Henry's attachment to the saint. This was a radical choice. Henry broke nearly 200 years of tradition by giving his heir an English name, making his choice unusual and prominent.[120] This publicly demonstrated his strong connections to, and pride in, his Anglo-Saxon heritage. It also associated his rule with the Confessor's positive reputation whose laws were regarded as the cornerstone of good government.[121] The naming was, in some ways, an acknowledgement of the changed nature of the Angevin Empire. The only remaining continental possession of the kings of England was Gascony. England was the centre of power and Henry turned to English saints for a variety of reasons. However, this should not be overstated as the evidence examined below about ancestral commemoration reveals a more complex picture.

The names of Henry's other children reveal further links to the Anglo-Saxon royal past. Edmund was named after two Edmunds: Edmund, king and martyr, and Edmund of Abingdon. Margaret was likely named for two saints called Margaret. Margaret of Antioch was directly appealed to by Eleanor during labour. She was the patron saint of childbirth, making her an obvious choice to appeal to and thank.[122] However, the name Margaret had strong Anglo-Saxon connotations as well. Margaret of Scotland was Edith-Matilda's mother. She was canonised by Pope Innocent IV in 1250 but she had been considered a saint not long after her death in 1093.[123] It is probably no coincidence that Henry named his two eldest children in honour of saints from the House of Wessex. By naming his children after English saints, he publicly associated his dynasty with them and demonstrated his desire to emulate their positive qualities and to be associated with those qualities.

---

[120] Carpenter, 'Henry III and Saint Edward the Confessor', 866.
[121] Ibid, 882.
[122] *CM*, vol. iv, p. 48 and N. Orme, *Medieval Children* (New Haven and London, 2001), p. 18.
[123] G.W.S. 'Margaret [St Margaret] (d. 1093), queen of Scots, consort of Malcolm III' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004). Viewed online at: https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-18044, (accessed 24/10/19).

However, one must be careful not to dismiss another possible point of origin for names. Margaret Howell has argued that Margaret was named after her aunt.[124] However, there is no reason to suspect that a name was only given for one reason. The name Margaret worked on multiple levels, after a saint and after family on her paternal and maternal line. The plasticity of the name is important, demonstrating numerous attachments to both earthly and spiritual figures who would show good will towards the child.

Beatrice and Katherine do not seem to have been named after English saints. Beatrice was named after her maternal grandmother (Beatrice of Savoy), demonstrating a further connection with Eleanor's family.[125] It was not uncommon for royal princesses to be named after family members. Katherine was not a name of any immediate family member and so is conspicuously different. Katherine was born on St Katherine's day.[126] She was the only child (that we know of) who did not reach adulthood and although she may not have been obviously unwell when she was born, she certainly became so with Matthew Paris describing her as 'muta et inutilis' (dumb and fit for nothing).[127] It has been argued by Badham, Oosterwijk, and

---

[124] Howell, *Eleanor of Provence*, p. 30.
[125] Ibid, p. 35.
[126] 25 November.
[127] *CM*, vol. v, p. 632. Katherine may have had a degenerative disorder like Rett's syndrome where symptoms only start to develop later after an apparently normal birth and early development. For a discussion of Katherine's potential condition, see S. Badham and S. Oosterwijk, 'The Tomb Monument of Katherine, Daughter of Henry III and Eleanor of Provence (1253-7)', *The Antiquaries Journal* 92 (2012), 169-196, at 170.

In the Chetham MS of the *Flores Historiarum*, partially written by Matthew Paris, there is a mention of Richard, John, William, and Henry as children of Henry III and Eleanor of Provence (See Howell, 'The Children of Henry and Eleanor', p. 57). This section of the MS dates, according to Margaret Howell, to the fourteenth century (Howell, 'The Children of Henry and Eleanor', pp. 59-60). There are also references to these children in fifteenth century genealogical rolls (Howell, 'The Children of Henry and Eleanor', p. 59). In Howell's article on Henry and Eleanor's children she noted that although it was striking that there was no contemporary evidence of these children one should not easily dismiss the entry in the Chetham MS because information inserted to this MS at the same time on the burials of two young Valence children and of the Bohun children has been authenticated by other evidence including grave slabs and household rolls. Furthermore, Eleanor was 21 when Edmund was born and 30 when Katherine was born. It seems very strange that there was a long absence of children from a previously very fertile marriage at a time of high fertility for Eleanor (Howell, 'The Children of Henry and Eleanor', p. 71). These four children may have been miscarriages or stillbirths and so may not have attached contemporary chronicle attention (Howell, 'The Children of Henry and Eleanor', p. 72).

However, the absence of any evidence in the chancery rolls is striking and raises doubts about the existence of other children (as Howell herself has noted, see Howell, 'The Children of Henry and Eleanor', p. 65). Even if

Howell that it is unlikely that Katherine was obviously sick when she was born because of the lavish nature of Eleanor's purification.[128] Furthermore, as was the case with their other children, five lengths of gold cloth embroidered with the royal arms was offered at Westminster Abbey, suggesting there was no obvious case for concern.[129] However, just because things may have seemed ordinary at the time of the purification does not mean Katherine was well on the day of her birth. We do not know what offerings Eleanor may have made on the day. Eleanor may have felt the need to appeal to a saint directly and Katherine was an obvious choice.

Marriages

Dynastic marriages were occasions of great prestige and provided public occasions for Henry to welcome new members into his family in a style he deemed appropriate. These new members were usually foreigners, potentially with different customs and expectations than Henry's natural subjects. Xenophobia certainly existed in medieval England including amongst the English elite. We have copious evidence of this in the writing of Matthew Paris, especially

---

Eleanor had suffered miscarriages or stillbirths, given what devoted parents she and Henry were, it seems unlikely that there would not have been some record of offerings made to the Confessor and other saints for the souls of those children. To lose a child, at any point in a pregnancy, is devasting for the parents-to-be, and a time of grief. It seems almost inconceivable that at such a time neither Henry nor Eleanor appealed to saints for comfort. Their grief would not have just been for them on a personal level, but on a dynastic level too.

Howell has suggested that another explanation for the gap between Edmund and Katherine's birth may have been because that they had other disabled children who were more visibly affected and so their births may not have been a cause of rejoicing (Howell, 'The Children of Henry and Eleanor', p. 71). This argument is not very convincing. Henry and Eleanor loved Katherine intensely and were devasted by her loss. If they had had another disabled child with high needs, they would have been more intense with their appeals to saints because they would have had more need of spiritual intervention. It seems very unlikely that Henry would not have made offerings for his children at the Confessor's shrine and that, especially if a child had been stillborn, they would have been buried splendidly.

Nevertheless, the gap between Edmund and Katherine's (nearly nine years) is intriguing and we cannot have a firm answer about how many children Henry and Eleanor had.

[128] Howell, 'The Children of Henry and Eleanor', p. 64 and S. Badham and S. Oosterwijk, 'The Tomb Monument of Katherine, Daughter of Henry III and Eleanor of Provence (1253-7)', *The Antiquaries Journal* 92 (2012), 169-196, at 170.

[129] Howell, 'The Children of Henry III and Eleanor of Provence', p. 64.

in the *Chronica Majora*.[130] Paris had his own agenda and perspective in writing his chronicle but given the excellence of his sources (Henry and Richard of Cornwall were sources), it seems likely that Paris presented some of the real feelings towards foreigners that were circulating in the English court, including hostile views.[131] Henry would have been aware of those feelings and would have thought about how to encourage integration between natives and foreigners, especially between foreigners joining his family.

Before analysing the leading dynastic marriages of Henry's reign, we need to establish the nature of attitudes towards foreigners and why they sometimes provoked ire. At the root of much of the criticism levelled against foreigners during Henry's reign seems to have been money. Huw Ridgeway's work on the patronage of the Savoyards and Lusignans has demonstrated that Henry's patronage of these groups put strains on his finances.[132] The situation worsened in the 1250s as Henry tried to patronise both the Savoyards (who had arrived in England a decade earlier than the Lusignans) and Lusignans when he had less money and land available.[133] Henry tried to pursue policies that he simply did not have the money to pursue[134], most notably his desire to conquer Sicily for the pope to make his son Edmund king of Apulia. In his agreement with the pope, he had to provide and assemble an army to invade Sicily, and pay for the debts the papacy had incurred fighting the Hohenstauffens.[135] Henry's cash flow problems were exacerbated by his inability to rule as his predecessors had due to the

---

[130] See, for example, *CM*, vol. 3, pp. 388, 410, 411-12, 412; *CM*, vol. 4, pp. 48, 236; *CM*, vol. 5, pp. 363, 440, 509, 514, 575-6.
[131] For a discussion about Paris' sources, see R. Vaughan, *Matthew Paris*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), pp. 13-20 especially.
[132] H.W. Ridgeway, "The Politics of The English Royal Court 1247-65, with Special Reference to the Role of the Aliens" (Oxford University, Unpublished PhD thesis, 1983), pp. 210-1, 233; H.W. Ridgeway, 'Foreign Favourites and Henry III's Problems of Patronage, 1247-1258', *The English Historical Review* 104 (1989), 590-610, at 591. Margaret Howell has also talked about the strain Henry's patronage of foreigners put on his finances. See Howell, *Eleanor of Provence*, p. 56.
[133] Ridgeway, "The Politics of the English Royal Court", p. 233; Ridgeway, 'Problems of Patronage', 591.
[134] Ridgeway, "The Politics of the English Royal Court", p. 406.
[135] See *CM*, vol. 5, pp. 470, 515, and B.K.U. Weiler, 'Henry III and the Sicilian Business: A Reinterpretation', *Historical Research*, 74 (2001), 127–50, at 128, and B.K.U. Weiler, 'Matthew Paris on the writing of history', *Journal of Medieval History* 35 (2009), 254-278, at 73.

impact of Magna Carta and requirement that he could not impose a tax without the consent of his nobles, limiting his freedom of action.[136]

Paris' portrayal of foreigners needs to be seen in this context. His portrayal of foreigners could be nuanced. He extolled the virtues of some of Henry's foreign relatives. Paris referred to William, elect of Valence, as a man of distinction, but also criticised him for leaving England laden down with gifts, to the detriment of the kingdom.[137] Initially, he was critical of Boniface of Savoy, arguing that Henry elevated him to a position he was ill qualified for and had manipulated the Canterbury election.[138] In the 1250s, however, Boniface obtained Paris' approval by standing with other members of the episcopate in resisting Henry's financial demands.[139] In August 1257, the clergy assembled at Canterbury and discussed how to respond to Henry's demands for his Sicilian venture.[140] Boniface was able to present himself as 'the champion of English episcopal unity and Becket's successor' by demanding that Henry would only receive money if he promised to reform his conduct and swear to adhere to Magna Carta.[141] For Paris, Boniface's foreign extraction was not the issue, his conduct was what mattered. Provided he was willing to adhere to English traditions and principles, Paris viewed him positively. Paris also presented Peter of Savoy in a positive way because of his prudence. Before Peter left England in 1242, he resigned custody of the castles Henry had granted him because he was afraid that such an elevation would displease the nobles of England and this prudence calmed native nobles' feelings.[142] Unlike many of the Savoyards, Paris was overwhelmingly negative about the Lusignans. This negativity was linked to their

[136] Ridgeway, "The Politics of the English Royal Court", p. 233.
[137] *CM*, vol. 3, pp. 335, 388.
[138] Ibid, vol. 4, pp. 104-5.
[139] Ibid, vol. 5, p. 374.
[140] Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community*, p. 98.
[141] Ibid, p. 99.
[142] *CM*, vol. 4, pp. 177-8.

rapaciousness and lack of adherence to the rights and laws of the kingdom. Henry turned a blind eye to their behaviour.[143] Again, their foreign origin was not the issue, their conduct was.

Nevertheless, Paris' picture of foreigners can be vicious and xenophobic. Consistently, he presents foreigners as selfish and fattening themselves on the wealth of the kingdom to the detriment of Henry's natural subjects.[144] He also, in 1253, reacted to Henry's plan to marry English and foreign spouses with disgust and objected to the mixing of English blood with the scum of foreigners (faecibus alienorum).[145] The worst of Paris' xenophobia seems to be reserved for an amorphous concept of 'foreigners' who helped Henry carry out his ambitions that Paris did not approve of.[146] Foreigners were vulnerable in ways native borns were not. Henry's Lusignan brothers relied on him for their position. His patronage gave them power and as Henry had little land to give to them, they were reliant on his money. What was given could be easily taken away and once foreigners lost the king's favour, they were vulnerable to attack without protection.

It was important, therefore, for royal weddings to set the tone for future relations and to present those joining the dynasty as amenable to English customs and traditions. Their marriages to English spouses provided a stage to demonstrate the prestige of the dynasty and how Henry wanted the new members of his family and his kingdom to view his dynasty. This section will examine five of the major marriages (Henry to Eleanor of Provence, Simon de Montfort to Eleanor, Richard of Cornwall to Sanchia of Provence, Margaret to Alexander III of Scotland, and Edward to Eleanor of Castile) that took place during Henry's personal rule and shall examine whether Henry's actions evolve over time. It shall also examine how

---

[143] Ibid, vol. 5, p. 689.
[144] Ibid, vol. 3, pp. 381, 383, 388, 410-1; vol. 5, p. 440
[145] *CM*, vol. 5, p. 363.
[146] Most obviously seen in Paris' comment on Henry's actions in 1250 where Paris said that Henry was openly following **his father's** example, enticing foreigners to his court, enriching them and despoiling his English subjects (*CM*, vol. 5, p. 229).

successful Henry was in trying to make his new relations welcome to his subjects and how successful he was in projecting the prestige of his dynasty.

a) Henry to Eleanor of Provence (14 January 1236)

The most important dynastic marriage of Henry's reign was his own to Eleanor of Provence. A smooth succession depended on the production of a male heir. Henry wanted to accrue as much support as possible for a successful marriage (both from his subjects and the saints). The marriage also allowed Henry to engage in image building, to present his ideal kingship, and to use the ceremony to commit his kingship to a new beginning as an important chapter in his life was to begin. One way he did these things was by using his marriage symbolically to mark his commitment to the ideals of Magna Carta. Henry not only committed to a new beginning in a symbolic way, but in a tangible legal way too. Due to the aftermath of the Marshal rebellion, which Henry's style of kingship had driven, Henry needed publicly to display his commitment to good kingship.[147] Instead of ruling *per voluntatem*, which was unacceptable to his barons, Henry had promised to adhere to Magna Carta and the ideals enshrined within it.[148] The Statute of Merton, enacted on 23 January 1236, committed the Crown to ruling in the spirit of Magna Carta and it was particularly focused on the most vulnerable in society, especially widows and minors. The statute aimed to prevent the robbing of widows of their dowry and to prevent the accumulation of interest against a minor from the time of the death of their predecessor until they came of age.[149] The statute was a public commitment to good and fair rule. It was also closely linked to Henry's religion. Paris stressed that concern for his soul and the improvement of his kingdom drove the king.[150] Henry saw the

[147] See, for a detailed account of the Marshal rebellion and its background, Vincent, *Peter des Roches*, pp. 340-430.
[148] S. Church, *Henry III: A Simple and God-Fearing King* (Penguin, 2017), pp. 21, 23.
[149] *CM*, vol. 3, pp. 341-2.
[150] Ibid, vol. 3, p. 341.

abolition of evil customs as important not only for his own soul, but also of that of his ancestors and heirs.[151] Henry needed to cleanse his soul and the kingdom to produce the ideal conditions for his heir. Additionally, good customs were associated with the Confessor, Henry's special saint.[152] Edward's piety was inextricably connected to his good rule and Henry wanted to emulate that.

Henry not only made commitments to the future, he also looked to the past. He crowned Eleanor on the morrow of the feast day of St Wulfstan, whose shrine John was buried before. One could argue that Wulfstan did not mean much to John, given that his burial choices were limited due to the civil war. However, from 1232 onwards, as we have seen, Henry remained a loyal patron to Worcester and viewed the place as associated with his father. Henry was welcoming Eleanor to his family, alive and dead.[153]

Henry used Eleanor's coronation as a reason for wearing his crown, which was not a frequent occurrence. This contrasted with the Norman kings who wore their crowns three times a year at the most liturgically significant feasts: Easter, Pentecost and Christmas.[154] This makes his decisions on when to where his crown as significant. The most important occasion on which a king wore his crown was at his coronation and so, by wearing one of the symbols of his

---

[151] D.A. Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power and Personal Rule 1207-1258* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2020), p. 183.
[152] Carpenter, 'King Henry III and Saint Edward the Confessor', 882.
[153] For a further discussion about John and St Wulstan see Draper, 'King John and St Wulfstan', 41-50. It may be argued that the dynastic link with St Wulfstan would perhaps have been more explicit had Eleanor been crowned on Wulfstan's actual feast day, rather than the morrow. This argument can be countered by the fact that the vigil, day, and morrow of a saint's day were all associated with the saint and so the morrow of a feast day was no less important than the day itself. One can see this in Henry's grants of fairs on the dates of the requested saints which included the vigil, day, and morrow. See: *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 32, 34, 42, 58, 60, 61, 62, 472, 473 and *CChR*, vol. 2, p. 62. These are just a handful of examples from the charter rolls. Additionally, the 20 January 1236 was a Sunday, the traditional day of coronation making it harder to have had his queen crowned on a Saturday.
[154] R. Bartlett, *England Under the Normans and Angevin Kings 1075-1225* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 128. John Maddicott has pointed out that the Normans were not rigid in the dates and places where they wore their crowns. William the Conqueror's crown-wearing were not always in the places laid out by the Peterborough chronicler in his obituary of William (see J. Maddicott, *The Origins of the English Parliament, 924-1327* (Oxford, 2010), p. 58).

power, he reminded all observers of his status and power. It also reminded observers of beginnings, a symbolic reaffirmation of the coronation. To use Robert Bartlett's phrase, such events can be seen as "re-coronations" and they were a feature of previous Angevin kingships.[155] By Bartlett's reckoning, John had three "re-coronations", including at the coronation of his queen, Isabella of Angôuleme. Richard I wore his crown in the aftermath of his capture and ransom to re-establish his power.[156] By wearing his crown, Henry stressed that he was entering a new phase of his reign. He linked Eleanor to the past of his dynasty but also to a future vision of his dynasty, with strong links to English saints. She was the vessel through which, he hoped, his dynasty would continue. His marriage was the most important event in the continuation of the dynasty.

Henry continued to involve Eleanor in the veneration of Anglo-Saxon saints after her coronation. Henry took Eleanor on a pilgrimage that included East Anglian pilgrimage sites. It began on 9 March 1236, Laetare Sunday. From 22 March 1236 (day before Palm Sunday) until 25 March 1236 the royal party was at St Albans, which happened to be both Holy Tuesday and the feast of the Annunciation.[157] Henry therefore used one of the most holy parts of the liturgical year to display his veneration to Anglo-Saxon saints, and the protomartyr of Britain. While he was on this pilgrimage, Henry used the occasion to make offerings to places in the vicinity.[158] His munificence was meant to impress his new queen and to introduce her to the powerful saints of England. He wanted her to appeal to the saints he venerated, resulting in the blessing of powerful English saints for their marriage.

---

[155] Bartlett, *England Under the Normans*, p. 128.
[156] Ibid, p. 129.
[157] Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", pp. 1042-3.
[158] See, for example, *CChR*, vol.1, p. 218.

b) Simon de Montfort and Eleanor (7 January 1238)

Unlike the other marriages examined below, Simon de Montfort's marriage to Henry's sister, Eleanor, was highly unorthodox. It was carried out in secret and once discovered, caused uproar for Eleanor was a wealthy widow and Henry's sister who had sworn an oath of chastity to the archbishop of Canterbury after her first husband's death.[159] By contrast, Simon was a new foreign favourite with no title or lands. In the eyes of many of his magnates, Henry had allowed his sister to be disparaged and had thus violated Magna Carta.[160] Richard of Cornwall, a man alert to any potential threats to his rights or wealth and who was the heir-presumptive at this point, was furious when he discovered the marriage, and he led the short-lived rebellion against Henry.[161]

Henry was clearly an active participant in the wedding, despite what he would later claim. Eleanor and Simon were married in a small chapel of his in the corner of his chamber in the palace of Westminster. Furthermore, he was present at the marriage and joined the couple's hands together. His own chaplain, Walter, carried out the service.[162] Henry's actions suggest that the king knew exactly what he was doing and was trying to mitigate for the fallout that would occur when the marriage became public knowledge. The date of the marriage was only two days after the obit feast of Henry's beloved saint, Edward the Confessor. This implies that he desired to invoke the aid of the Confessor by having the marriage performed near his feast day. Henry also had 'Christus Vincit', a song that proclaimed the magnificence of monarchy, sung before him in his chapel on the feast of the Epiphany (6 January), the day before the marriage took place.[163] Simon and Eleanor's children could have had a claim to the throne as

---

[159] Ibid, p. 38.
[160] For an account of the marriage and the problems associated with Simon de Montfort see L. J. Wilkinson, *Eleanor de Montfort: A Rebel Countess in Medieval England* (London: Continuum, 2012), p. 61.
[161] N. Denholm-Young, *Richard of Cornwall* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1947), p. 35
[162] Wilkinson, *Eleanor de Montfort*, pp. 64-5.
[163] *CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 311.

Henry and the queen had no children and Richard of Cornwall only had one surviving son (Henry) who was two years old. Richard's elder two children (John and Isabella) had both died at a year old or younger.[164] There was no guarantee that Henry of Cornwall would reach adulthood. The future of the dynasty was precarious in January 1238 and Henry appealed to the Confessor to protect a marriage which could produce the heir to the throne.

c) Sanchia of Provence and Richard of Cornwall (23 November 1243)

Richard of Cornwall married Sanchia of Provence after his first wife, Isabella, died.[165] By marrying Sanchia (one of Eleanor of Provence's sisters) to Richard, Henry deepened the ties between his family and the Savoyards. The Savoyards were not universally liked, and so the wedding was an opportunity to allay fears that the Savoyards would not adopt English customs and traditions, including the veneration of Anglo-Saxon saints. Henry was sensitive to his Anglo-Saxon inheritance, and he appealed to St Edmund on his journey to meet Sanchia and her mother, Beatrice, at Dover. On 20 November 1243, Edmund's obit feast, when Henry was at Rochester, he wrote to the sheriff of Norfolk and ordered him to make 300 candles which were to be placed around St Edmund's shrine, to burn there on his vigil and feast. The sheriff was also ordered to go to the shrine in person to offer twelve obols of musc for the king's chevage.[166] The use of the word chevage, as was used during Eleanor's pregnancy with Beatrice further demonstrates Henry's regard for Edward as his spiritual lord who he hoped would intercede on his family's behalf to ensure a happy and fruitful union between Richard and Sanchia.

---

[164] Denolm-Young, *Richard of Cornwall*, p. 18.
[165] Isabella died in childbirth on 17 January 1240. See Denolm-Young, *Richard of Cornwall*, pp. 18-19.
[166] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 198. Obols were ancient Greek coins used for currency but also weight. Musc is a scent used in liturgical services. An obol of music was therefore a weight of musc.

Henry not only wanted to welcome Sanchia into his family by involving her in his pious acts, he also wanted to impress her and those who arrived with her by demonstrating the prestige of the dynasty she was joining. This can be seen before, during, and after Sanchia's wedding. Henry made lavish preparations for their arrival. On 7 November 1243, Henry wrote to the keepers of the archbishopric of Canterbury, ordering them and the keeper of Becket's shrine to have up to 300 marks to make three golden images of the saint and to place them on the shrine.[167] Henry had Sanchia and Beatrice visit Canterbury before the wedding. When they were at Canterbury, Henry spent £64 12s. on the purchase of 2,440 lbs of wax to make candles that were to be placed in the churches of the Holy Trinity, St Augustine, St Gregory, and St Sepulchre, Canterbury.[168] This was a way of showing his connection with Becket but also to all the major churches in Canterbury, and therefore to the various saints associated with Canterbury, the birthplace of English Christianity.

On 8 November 1243, while he was at Canterbury, on his way to Dover, Henry ordered the sheriffs of London to buy a phenomenal 2,000 lbs of wax, to be delivered to William de Haverhull and Edward, son of Odo, to 'carry out' the king's orders.[169] It is not certain what this wax was for but given that Edward son of Odo was the keeper of the king's works at Westminster, it seems likely that it was to make numerous candles that were to burn at the Confessor's shrine and in other places in the abbey, potentially before the tombs of Edith, the Confessor's wife, and Edith-Matilda.[170] Sanchia and Richard were married at Westminster, most likely surrounded by those candles. Such a sight would have been magnificent, impressing those who observed it, indicating the spiritual might of Henry's dynasty, and encouraging the

[167] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 196.
[168] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 211.
[169] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 196.
[170] *CR, 1242-7*, p. 138.

Savoyards to respect it. The sight of the candles would have been an impressive visual statement about the wealth (in both a literal and spiritual way) of Henry's kingship.

Richard of Cornwall's marriage to Sanchia of Provence was conducted in the aftermath of the disastrous Poitevin campaign. It took place only a month after Henry returned from Poitou and was a sumptuous affair. Matthew Paris described the event in detail, noting that 30,000 dishes were prepared for it. He remarked that 'world pomp, and every kind of vanity and glory was displayed…but these only proved how transitory and contemptible are such joys.'[171] Paris may well have been derisory about the extravagance of the marriage feast, but the extravagance was meant to impress Sanchia and the Savoyards with Henry's prestige and piety. A few days after Richard's marriage, Henry had four squared tapers of 100 lbs of wax each and fifteen measures[172] of himself to burn continually day and night around the shrine of St Edward at Christmas.[173] On 18 December 1243, Henry, ordered Edward son of Odo to bring two vestments to him, and to buy the most precious vestment that could found in London. It seems very likely that the three vestments referred to in the close rolls were given to the major Anglo-Saxon kings and queens whom Henry highly regarded including Edith of Wessex, Edward the Confessor, and Edith-Matilda. It may be no coincidence that the order was issued on 18 December: that was Edith of Wessex's obit day. Henry's veneration demonstrated that he wanted their blessing for Richard's wedding but also that he wanted the Savoyards to know of his preferences and emulate them.

Henry also involved his new family members in the veneration of Edith of Wessex, the Confessor's wife. In December 1243, 10,000 paupers were to be fed for Edith's soul.[174] Henry may have hoped that Sanchia would have taken the veneration of Edith to heart. She was a

---

[171] *CM*, vol. iv, p. 263.
[172] A wax offering, usually offered for votive reasons, that was the size and dimensions of the supplicant
[173] *CR, 1242-7*, p. 138.
[174] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 210.

perfect example of a supportive English wife. Sanchia was marrying into the English royalty and Henry hoped that she would absorb the elements of his dynasty that he was most proud of. Due to the logistic of feeding 10,000 paupers, it is unlikely that they would have been gathered and fed on 18 December. It is probably more likely that they were fed at Christmas. On 9 December, Henry ordered 4,000 paupers be fed in the great hall at Westminster for the soul of his sister, Isabella.[175] Henry referred, in his instructions, to his sister's anniversary and said that the feeding of the poor was to mark the occasion. The date on which the paupers were fed (14 December) was not her anniversary (she died 1 December 1241) but the display of largesse was the most important thing. Isabella had been the Holy Roman Empress. By celebrating these women's lives, he stressed both the pious and prestigious aspects of his dynasty, hoping to impress both his subjects and the Savoyards. However, the opinion of the Savoyards would have, most likely, been the most important thing for Henry. Henry would have hoped that such displays may have encouraged the Savoyards to embrace his favoured native saints.

Henry's devotions, and his attempts to involve his new family, continued through January 1244. The obit feast of the Confessor was celebrated sumptuously, and he paid particular attention to the health of his immediate family. On the feast of the Circumcision 1244, 6,000 paupers were fed at Westminster for the souls of the king, queen, and their children.[176] The scale of feeding was, once again, designed to impress and to encourage Savoyard integration both within the physical kingdom and in Henry's spiritual kingdom.

Henry may have hoped that, by impressing the Savoyards with his pious practices, and by displaying the magnificence of his dynasty in terms of prestige and piety, he would encourage them to respect and support him. By inviting the Savoyards to join his dynasty, he

[175] *CR, 1242-7*, p. 140.
[176] *CR, 1242-7*, p. 150.

may have hoped that his subjects would have looked more favourably upon them, perhaps believing that Savoyard and English ambitions overlapped. There was a physical representation of this union: on 1 February 1244, Henry sent a silken cloth with golden stars which was to make a border of a cloth of green cendal[177] which had the arms of the king, Richard of Cornwall, and Provence, which was to hang from the back of the great cross at Westminster.[178] This cloth demonstrated the union of the Savoyard and Angevin families physically and symbolically into the spiritual world centred on Westminster and the Confessor.

d) Margaret to Alexander III (25 December 1251)

Margaret's wedding to Alexander was the first marriage of Henry's children.[179] If none of Henry's other children had children, Margaret and Alexander's children had the potential to be heirs to the throne. Consequently, Henry would have wanted to accrue as much good will for the marriage both in terms of securing intercession of saints, and by securing the support of leading Scottish and English magnates for the marriage.

As he travelled with Margaret and their entourage to York (where the marriage was to take place), Henry took a meandering route. He travelled through Reading, Oxford, Winchcombe, Gloucester, Tewkesbury, Evesham and Worcester before heading to Nottingham and then onwards to York.[180] There were much more direct routes. One obvious reason for this was the dedication ceremony of Richard of Cornwall's foundation, Hailes Abbey. Richard

[177] Sendal, cendal or sandal is a thin and light silk material, chiefly used to make ceremonial clothing church vestments and banners.
[178] *CR, 1242-7*, p. 153. The text in the rolls does not specify which cross, it just says 'dorsum crucis' i.e back of the cross. A line follows that said 'et appendi faciat pannum illum ad dorsum magne' (My translation: And that garment/ cloth/ banner is to be appended to the back of the large cross'
[179] For the background of this marriage, see chapter 2, especially p. 135.
[180] For the itinerary, see Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", p. 1290.

founded the place in 1246 and its dedication ceremony was 20 November 1251, the feast day of Edmund, king and martyr.[181] The details of the ceremony will be analysed below, but what can be said is that Henry used the opportunity of his daughter's marriage to display the scale of pious patronage of his dynasty.

In preparation for his arrival in York, on 25 November 1251, Henry ordered two buckles of gold to be made so that he could offer them at William of York's shrine on Christmas Eve.[182] William of York (d. 1154) was a former archbishop of York who was of noble birth. He finally became the archbishop in 1153 after a disputed election in 1140. He died suddenly in 1154, possibly by poison. Miracles were soon reported at his tomb in York cathedral and he was regarded as a victim of injustice and a saint. He was canonised in 1227. He was a very popular local saint because there were few local saints' relics in York, in contrast to Durham and Beverley.[183] The cult did not have much support elsewhere. Henry's choice to patronise William on the eve of his daughter's wedding demonstrates his belief in the efficacy of local native saints and was a way of displaying his appreciation of a saint who meant much to the locals. It was also a way of Henry displaying the sanctity of England to Scottish observers.

Henry also appealed to Edmund of Abingdon to secure blessing for Margaret's marriage. On 4 November 1251, Henry granted the abbot and monks of Pontigny 20 marks per annum to provide and maintain four candles that were to continuously burn around Edmund's shrine.[184] Henry also gave the abbot of Pontigny £60 a year.[185] Pontigny was the site of Becket's exile and Edmund's burial place. By patronising the residents of Pontigny, Henry displayed his respect for the saint and desire for his aid.

---

[181] See: *CR, 1251-3,* p.11 (2) and Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", p. 1290.
[182] *CR, 1251-3,* p. 15.
[183] Farmer, *Oxford Dictionary of Saints,* p. 83.
[184] *CChR,* vol. 2, p. 369.
[185] *CLR, 1251-60,* p. 12.

Additionally, Henry patronised Catesby because of its connections with Edmund in the December of 1251. These gifts varied in nature and included the quittance of certain customs such as pontage.[186] Henry did not charge the priory for any of the gifts, demonstrating the pious motivation of the grants. By rewarding the people and places associated with Edmund, Henry displayed his devotion to Edmund and his desire for the saint to bless Margaret's marriage and the good relations between England and Scotland that Henry hoped to foster.

Just before the wedding ceremony, and during it, Henry gave opulent gifts to both the bride and groom. They were supplied with a variety of gifts including vestments, cups, and dishes.[187] To knight Alexander, Henry supplied him with a knight's paraphernalia including a beautiful sword with a pommel and scabbard made of silver.[188] Alexander was knighted, along with twenty other youths, on Christmas Day 1251.[189] The holiness of the day increased the prestige of the occasion further. Alexander's knighting was accompanied by provisions of shoes and clothes for paupers, probably in the hope for harvesting what were seen as the most efficacious prayers possible.[190] Such a display of largesse and piety emphasised the elements of Henry's kingship that he saw as the most important: opulence, ceremony, and piety. Henry was displaying all he hoped his new son-in-law would absorb, showing him the power of his dynasty.

However, the opulence of the ceremony did not achieve all Henry wished. He had hoped that when he knighted Alexander, he would perform homage to him for all his lands in

---

[186] *CChR*, vol.1, p. 372 and *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 120. The charter roll in volume one, p. 372, only says that the nuns were granted 'diverse gifts.' The lack of detail is frustrating, but it is likely that liberties would have been granted to them, along with fairs and other substantial gifts. This is the case in numerous charter roll entries for recipients who receive multiple gifts in the same entry.
[187] *CR, 1251-3,* pp. 1-2, 12-14 and 18-19.
[188] *CR, 1251-3,* p. 12.
[189] *CM*, vol. v, p. 267.
[190] *CLR, 1251-60,* p. 10. Also see S. Dixon-Smith, "Feeding the Poor to Commemorate the Dead: the *Pro Anima* Almsgiving of Henry III of England 1227-1272" (University College London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2003), pp. 2, 15.

Scotland, not just those in England. Alexander declined the offer arguing that he had to consult his nobles first.[191] Nevertheless, as Weiler has argued, Henry did not go away empty-handed. The meeting resulted in his arbitration between the factions in Scotland and deciding the composition of Alexander's regency council. Henry effectively performed the function of an overlord who had acted on behalf of an under-age vassal.[192] By doing so Henry publicly welcomed Alexander into his family but also demonstrated that he held the upper hand in their relationship.

e) Edward and Eleanor of Castile (1 November 1254)

Paris portrayed Edward and Eleanor's marriage as being of no use to the kingdom and Henry as a fool for agreeing to it. He directed his ire towards Sancho, the bishop-elect of Toledo and Eleanor's brother, accusing him of having avaricious aims.[193] Not all foreigners were portrayed in negative lights, Paris sometimes portrayed Boniface of Savoy in a positive light. It has traditionally been argued in the historiography, especially by Ridgeway, that overall, the Savoyards were much more prudent than the Lusignans and had much broader, more 'helpful' roles.[194] Andrew Spencer has challenged this interpretation, arguing that the Savoyards pursued their interests at the detriment of Henry's.[195] He views the Sicilian Affair as being driven by Savoyard interests and notes that the Savoyard's behaviour was just as provocative as that of the Lusignans.[196] Peter of Savoy received extensive patronage including the custody of the heir

[191] *CM*, vol. v, p. 268.
[192] B. Weiler, 'Knighting, Homage and the Meaning of Ritual: The Kings of England and their Neighbours in the Thirteenth Century', *Viator* 37 (2006), 275-299, at 291.
[193] *CM*, vol. v, pp. 509-510.
[194] Ridgeway, "The Politics of the English Royal Court", p. ab. Vi.
[195] A.M. Spencer, '"A Vineyard Without a Wall": The Savoyards, John de Warenne and the Failure of Henry III's Kingship', in A. Spencer and C. Watkins (ed), *Thirteenth Century England XVII: Proceedings of the Cambridge Conference 2017* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2021), 41-64, at p. 53. Spencer singles out Beatrice of Savoy as particularly manipulative (see p. 52).
[196] Ibid, pp. 53, 57.

to the earldom of Warenne's lands in Sussex 'during pleasure'.[197] Warenne's long minority led to the permanent loss of the Lincolnshire towns of Stamford and Grantham and Warenne held the Savoyards responsible.[198] Spencer described the Savoyards as the 'unwitting poison at the heart' of Henry's kingship that he drank 'willingly' without realising the dire consequences.[199] Spencer's interpretation is perhaps too extreme, but he is correct to challenge the narrative that the Lusignans were 'bad', and the Savoyards were 'good'. At the start of the baronial rebellion, the Lusignans fell from power, rather than the Savoyards, but they were eventually attacked by the wave of xenophobia that baronial propaganda unleashed.[200] As Spencer has demonstrated, the lack of appearance of English nobles in the charter witness lists of the 1240s and 1250s is telling and would not have been due to Henry's of desire to have them there, but because of the nobles felt their opinions were not being listened to. By 1254, when Edward's marriage took place, the resentment felt towards Henry's foreign relatives had festered. Paris' accounts most likely reflect this resentment and Henry would have been very aware of the lack of English nobles as his court. He may have hoped that Edward's marriage could act as a new beginning, presenting his daughter-in-law as a positive addition to the kingdom.

As in the case of Sanchia, Henry involved his daughter-in-law in his pious practices. On 22 August 1255, in preparation for Eleanor's arrival, Henry ordered that twelve silk cloths were to be bought and sent immediately to Dover for Eleanor's arrival so that she could make oblations at the major houses between Dover and Westminster.[201] Eleanor was also given three gold-wrought cloths and six cloths of silk for her to offer at diverse churches in England on her arrival in England.

---

[197] Ibid, p. 59.
[198] Ibid, p. 60.
[199] Ibid, p. 64.
[200] The Londoners threw rocks and other missiles at Eleanor of Provence as she tried to escape the Tower in July 1263.
[201] *CR, 1254-6*, p. 128.

Henry also intended to offer three gold-wrought cloths and two pieces of cendal at Westminster on the translation feast of Edward the Confessor.[202] Henry's offerings would coincide with Eleanor's celebration of the same feast at Canterbury because Henry ordered that she be given the necessities to celebrate the feast.[203] Henry also ordered two golden brooches to be bought so that Eleanor could offer one at Becket's shrine and the other at Edward's shrine at Westminster.[204] On 18 October 1255, Eleanor's steward was given 50 marks for her expenses and 3 ½ marks to pay for a gold buckle, which she was to offer at the shrine of St Edward when she arrived at Westminster.[205] By combining veneration to both Becket and Edward and ensuring that Edward's translation feast was honoured at both Canterbury and Westminster, Henry clearly displayed his commitment to both the Confessor and Becket to both Eleanor and his subjects.

In a similar way to Margaret's marriage, Edward's was also contracted to protect the borders of Henry's dominions. His wedding took place on 1 November 1254 at the Abbey of Santa María la Real de Las Huelgas in the city of Burgos, the capital of Castile.[206] One of the marriage's primary purposes was to deal with the Castilian threat to Gascony. In the Treaty of Burgos (1254), Alphonso X surrendered his claims to Gascony and recognised Edward as its lord. In return, Edward married Eleanor of Castile, Alphonso's sister. Just like Margaret's marriage, Edward's was intended to unite two contending dynasties.[207]

Edward and Eleanor married on the feast of All Saints, a day that celebrated all saints, universal and local, making it a day of symbolic unity. Both Henry and Alphonso would have

---

[202] *CLR, 1251-60*, p. 247.
[203] *CR, 1254-6*, pp. 144-5.
[204] *CR, 1254-6*, p. 128.
[205] *CLR, 1251-60*, p. 243.
[206] J.C. Parsons, 'Eleanor (1241–1290)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford, 2004; online edn, Jan 2006), viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8619 (accessed 19/05/2023)
[207] Weiler, 'Knighting, Homage, and the Meaning of Ritual', 284-5.

hoped that the auspicious start would lead to a long period of concord between the English and Castilian thrones. The Abbey of Las Huelgas had a connection with Henry's family. It was founded in 1187 by Alphonso VIII of Castile at the behest of his wife, Eleanor of England, Henry II's daughter (and Henry III's aunt).[208] By holding the marriage there, the symbolism of the re-joining of their families was underlined and the interconnected nature of the dynasties of Castile and England was emphasised.

It appears that Henry made certain concessions regarding Edward's marriage to appease Alphonso. It was unusual for the groom to travel to the bride. Weiler has suggested that the reason was to appease Alphonso.[209] Henry allowed Alphonso to knight Edward, and, from an external perspective, it appeared that Alphonso was playing the role of a superior lord knighting his vassal. However, Edward did not perform homage and so was not Alphonso's vassal. Symbolically, the marriage ceremony enabled both sides to appear prestigious. Alphonso's reputation as a warrior made it an honour, in Paris's eyes, for Edward to be knighted by him.[210] The knighting ceremony was, in many ways, a compromise to enable both sides portray their dynasties as prestigious and united.

## Ancestral Commemoration

Ancestral commemoration was an essential duty. Unless one was a saint, or damned, everyone else went to Purgatory after they died.[211] Purgatory was a place of atonement where

[208] L. Grant, *Blanche of Castile* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), p. 215.
[209] Weiler, 'Knighting, Homage', 287.
[210] *CM*, vol. v, p. 450.
[211] By 1200 Purgatory was formally known. The theology of Purgatory largely developed in the twelfth century. Peter the Chanter (d. 1197) helped to fashion Purgatory. These ideas were disseminated by the teachers of the schools and preachers, especially the friars. However, it took some time, during the thirteenth century, for the church to integrate Purgatory into its theology of the Last Things long after the idea had taken root in the teachers and preachers. For a good discussion about the development of Purgatory, and other theological changes in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, see C. S. Watkins, *History and the Supernatural in Medieval*

one's soul was purified of its sins. The length of one's stay in Purgatory depended not only on the severity of one's sins, but also the prayers of the living.[212] By having masses sung for the departed, one was not only aiding salvation, one was also honouring the memory of the person who had died. This was important for kings. They were not only meant to ensure the salvation of their earthly kingdom, they also had to aid their ancestors, for the good of the dynasty.

Henry engaged in personal and public commemoration of his ancestors by patronising places founded or supported by members of his dynasty. Ceremonies of dedication were public events where Henry could display the might and prestige of the dynasty. Sometimes Henry's commemoration of his ancestors may have been about steeling himself before important moments in his reign. His ancestors (especially the kings) knew the burdens of kingship, and he may have felt closer to them because of it. By commemorating them, Henry reminded himself, and God, about the positive aspects of his dynasty. He desired to emulate their successes. Reminding himself about their qualities affected his perception of the issue he was facing. Members of his dynasty had faced adversity, and some had triumphed.

John was Henry's immediate predecessor and father; he was therefore a key ancestor to commemorate. There are five religious institutions that were associated with John: Worcester; Beaulieu (his foundation); Netley (a daughter house of Beaulieu); Croxton (where John died and his heart was buried) and Fontevrault (the Angevin mausoleum).[213] As

---

*England*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), especially pp. 171-201. For an understanding about the long-standing practice of prayers for the dead, see P.J. Geary, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1994), especially pp. 2, 86-7.
During Henry's reign, the idea and penitential practices linked with Purgatory were well-developed. His pious development occurred in the aftermath of Lateran IV. Lateran IV enshrined the changes in theology that changed the understanding of prayers for the dead. Anselm, c. 1100, had argued that only monks and nuns had a strong chance of salvation. By c 1200 with Hugh of Lincoln, this goal was within the reach of a penitent sinner (See Watkins, *History and the Supernatural*, p. 200). This, potentially, could include John, whose salvation Henry may have (rightly) worried about.

[212] For a good overviewed of Purgatory and the penitential system, see J. Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. by A. Goldhammer (London: Scolar Press, 1984), especially pp. 177-193 for thirteenth century developments.

[213] For information about Croxton: "House of Premonstratensian canons: The abbey of Croxton Kerrial," in *A History of the County of Leicestershire: Volume 2*, ed. W G Hoskins and R A McKinley (London: Victoria

Fontevrault was associated with many of Henry's ancestors, his patronage of it shall be examined below. Henry interacted with all these sites with consistent patronage, especially in moments of need. This can be seen in his patronage of Worcester. The first gifts that Henry made to Worcester, after the end of his minority, were in 1232 and coincided with the rise of Peter des Roches from May-July 1232.[214] Peter's rise and influence over Henry seems to have encouraged John's commemorations, reminding Henry perhaps of his filial obligations, as he granted three charters to Worcester including one that granted the church of Bromsgrove, in frank almoin, to the prior and monks of Worcester. In return for this gift, the prior and monks were to celebrate John's anniversary and Henry's, after his death.[215] Henry, as was usually the case in his pious patronage, Henry did not charge the prior and monks for his gifts, demonstrating the generosity of his patronage.

Henry continued his patronage of Worcester at times of importance for his dynasty. After his marriage, in July 1236, Henry made grants of a weekly market and of protection without term, for no charge.[216] Additionally, at an uncertain date in 1238, 60s. were offered at Wulfstan's shrine.[217] This may have occurred in the aftermath of Simon and Eleanor de Montfort's marriage. Henry may have been trying to invoke the aid of a saint who his father had trusted for his salvation. Perhaps Henry hoped that Wulfstan would smile on the son of one of his important benefactors and aid him in his own marriage and in his sister's.

The birth of Edmund seems to have encouraged more patronage to Worcester. On 24 January 1245, a chasuble was sent there in the aftermath of Edmund's birth.[218] This supports

---

County History, 1954), 28-31. *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/leics/vol2/pp28-31 (accessed 04/11/2019).

[214] For a thorough examination of Peter des Roches' role in Henry's development, see Vincent, *Peter des Roches:* especially pp. 292-465. For the gifts, see *CChR*, vol. 1, pp. 154, 154-5; *CR, 1231-34*, p. 64.

[215] *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 154-155; *CR, 1231-4*, p. 64.

[216] *CChR*, vol.1, p. 220 and *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 155.

[217] *CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 330.

[218] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 286.

the picture of Henry displaying attachment to Worcester at times when he felt the need to gain strength from remembering his ancestors. They had faced issues too and had (in some cases) got through it. In the same year, sixty obols were offered at Worcester on the feast day of St Peter Ad Vincula.[219]

Similar trends can be observed in his patronage of Beaulieu.[220] Beaulieu received consistent patronage, demonstrating the importance to Henry of commemorating his father and ensuring his salvation. Beaulieu was the site that received the most attention of all the places associated with John. Between 1227 and 1272, in nearly every single year of the reign, even in those when Henry was suffering crises of his kingship, Henry made at least one gift but, more often than not, he made multiple gifts including grants of fairs, grants of various liberties and privileges such as allowing the abbots animals to have free entry and exit (of the forest), money to finish the building of the church, wood for either fuel or buildings, wine to celebrate divine services and various other gifts including chalices, copes and vestments.[221] It was extremely rare for Henry to charge the abbot of Beaulieu for any gift. The only two charges I could uncover were on 20 June 1256[222] when the abbot was to pay either three marks of gold or 30 marks for a writ to say that his charter was to be kept, and on 7 May 1257[223] when the abbot was charged two marks of gold for a writ of grace. Henry's finances were under extreme strain in 1256 and 1257 causing him to charge for gifts he usually would not. We have also seen this in the Henry's patronage of other religious institutions in chapter two. However, the charges were not high.

---

[219] *CR, 1242-47,* p. 330.
[220] For more information about Henry's patronage of Beaulieu, see chapter 2, pp. 89-91, 127.
[221] See, for example, *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 22, 131; *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 24, 26, 447, 476; *CLR, 1240-45,* p. 278; *CLR, 1245-51,* pp. 8, 51, 103, 324, 396; *CLR, 1251-60,* pp. 150, 181, 256, 339, 445; *CLR, 1260-67,* pp. 14, 70; *CLR, 1260-67,* pp. 164, 199; *CLR, 1267-72,* pp. 6, 57, 127; *CPR, 1225-1232,* pp. 264-5; *CR, 1227-31,* pp. 7, 181, 273, 494; *CR, 1231-4,* p. 179, 200; *CR, 1234-37,* p. 139; *CR, 1237-42,* pp. 410, 448; *CR, 1242-47,* pp. 12, 107; *CR, 1247-51,* pp. 68-9, 247; *CR, 1251-53,* p. 111; *CR, 1261-64,* p. 331; *CR, 1268-72,* pp. 382-3.
[222] *CFR, 1255-56,* no. 677.
[223] *CFR, 1256-57,* no. 618.

Henry also patronised Beaulieu at moments of dynastic importance. On 4 January 1236, the vigil of the Confessor's obit feast, ten days before his wedding, Henry granted the abbot of Beaulieu one tun of the king's prisage wine as a gift.[224] This wine may have been used in divine services. Beaulieu may have been where John initially wished to be buried there before the circumstances of his death forced him to choose a burial site in his vicinity.[225] This would have ensured prayers for John's soul at a time when Henry was thinking about his dynasty more generally.

Henry also took advantage of the dedication ceremony of Beaulieu Abbey on 17 June 1246 to make dynastic statements. The ceremony was held on Edward's seventh birthday making a clear connection between John (past of dynasty) and Edward (future of dynasty). The ceremony was attended by Henry, Eleanor of Provence, Richard of Cornwall, Edward, and numerous prelates and magnates.[226] £7 9s. was paid for a diaper and orphreys offered at Beaulieu, a substantial sum.[227] Additionally, Henry made an extremely generous grant on 16 June 1246.[228] He promised that he and his heirs would satisfy any Norman heirs who had rights over the manors in Hailes, where Richard had founded a Cistercian abbey so that the abbey would be unharmed.[229] By making this grant on the eve of the Beaulieu ceremony, Henry was committing himself to the protection of Cistercian abbeys associated with his immediate family, demonstrating his piety but also the interconnectedness of his family's piety and generosity.

---

[224] *CR, 1234-37*, p. 224.
[225] For a discussion about John's choice of burial site and the context of his burial see: Draper, 'King John and St Wulfstan', 41-50, especially 47-50; P. Webster, "King John's Piety, c.1199-c.1216" (University of Cambridge, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2007), pp. 60-1 and Webster, *John and Religion*, p. 46.
[226] *CM*, vol. 4, p. 562.
[227] *CLR, 1245-51*, p. 84.
[228] The grant itself was generous, but there was also no charge for the charter, making it even more generous.
[229] *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 294.

Netley Abbey received similar patronage to Beaulieu. It was a daughter house of Beaulieu colonised by Beaulieu monks as soon as it was founded. Peter des Roches originally bought the land that Netley would be built on, apparently with the intention of founding a monastery, but he died in 1238 before the project could be completed. Henry then took over the project and was often referred to as its founder.[230] The idea to found the abbey was Peter's and this demonstrates Henry's attachment to his former guardian.[231] Peter's influence over Henry seems to have extended after his death. The abbey was dedicated to Edward the Confessor and the Virgin Mary, saints who have been referred to as Henry's 'spiritual mother and father.'[232] Due to Netley's relationship with Beaulieu, Henry probably associated it with his earthly father as well as his spiritual one and Netley received as generous treatment from Henry as Beaulieu did. Every year, from its foundation in 1239 until 1271 inclusive, except for 1245, 1249, and 1260, Netley received grants and gifts, often many times each year. The gifts and grants consisted of wine, wood for fuel and buildings, land, liberties and privileges, markets and fairs, pardons from debts and grants of protection sometimes with terms and sometimes without. The king also made gifts of beautiful chalices and copes.[233] Henry only charged the abbot of Netley once for a gift, on 20 March 1251 when the abbot paid £100 for two charters. One of those charters was a charter of liberties; the other was a charter that granted free warren, a market and a fair. However, Henry immediately returned the money by giving

---

[230] 'Houses of Cistercian monks: Abbey of Netley,' in *A History of the County of Hampshire: Volume 2*, ed. H Arthur Doubleday and William Page (London: Victoria County History, 1903), 146-149. *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/hants/vol2/pp146-149 (accessed 09/05/2016).
[231] See 'Abbey of Netley' and Vincent, *Peter des Roches*, pp. 477-8.
[232] Vincent has suggested that the Virgin might have been viewed by Henry as a surrogate mother because Isabella of Angoulême was an 'absentee mother' (Vincent, 'King Henry III and the Virgin'. Carpenter has referred to Edward the Confessor as Henry's spiritual 'mentor' (Carpenter, 'King Henry III and Saint Edward', 878)
[233] *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 250-251, 259-260, 354, 371; *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 415, 438, 455; *CLR, 1240-45*, pp. 2, 108, 164, 221; *CLR, 1245-51*, pp. 60, 109, 274, 323, 337, 347, 410; *CLR, 1251-60*, pp. 26, 98, 160, 196, 277, 359, 429, 450; *CLR, 1260-67*, pp. 17, 36; *CLR, 1260-67*, pp. 83, 118, 134, 141, 197, 251; *CLR, 1267-72*, pp. 7, 113, 153, 176, 199; *CPR, 1232-47*, pp. 333, 421, 423; *CPR, 1247-58*, p. 8; *CPR, 1258-66*, p. 440; *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 70, 569, 577; *CR 1237-42*, p. 398; *CR 1242-7*, pp. 22, 79, 131 , 170, 183, 190, 387; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 256, 373, 416, 433, 452, 484-5, 490, 500; *CR, 1251-3*, pp. 110, 272, 296, 332-3, 407; *CR, 1254-6*, p. 39; *CR, 1261-4*, pp. 318, 332, 318; *CR 1264-8*, pp. 279-80; *CR, 1268-72*, pp. 166, 324, 340.

£100 to the abbot for the works on his church.[234] This again demonstrates Henry's generosity and concern for his father's soul.

At many times of difficulty, Henry seems to have appealed to Croxton. On 9 July 1244 a chasuble adorned with orphreys was given to the abbot of Croxton to celebrate the anniversary of John's death along with twenty oaks.[235] The timing of the gift appears significant as this was in the aftermath of Henry's Poitevin campaign which forced him, in November 1244, to call a parliament and ask his nobles for money. Henry may well have wanted the monks to think of both him and his father at this difficult time. Henry was very consistent and generous in his gifts to Croxton, and he never charged them for his gifts.[236] From 1227 to 1235, he granted them land, liberties, markets and 100s. per annum 'for the soul of King John' until he could provide them with 100s. of land.[237] Henry's concern for his father's soul was on full display in his patronage of Croxton.

Henry's patronage of Amesbury was inextricably linked with the darker side of John's legacy. Amesbury became the burial site of Eleanor of Brittany, Henry's cousin. John was seen by many as responsible for the death of her brother Arthur.[238] She presented Henry with something of a dilemma. As his cousin, she deserved his protection, but she presented a threat to his throne and represented a reminder of his father's ill actions. Henry felt the need to atone

---

[234] *CFR, 1250-51,* no. 391.
[235] *CLR, 1240-45,* p. 250 and *CR, 1242-7,* p. 209.
[236] During Henry's minority, on 19 October 1219, the abbot gave the king a palfrey in exchange for a grant of a weekly market (see *CFR, 1218-1219,* no. 427). Henry was not in control of his government at that time and so this charge is unlikely to represent Henry's views. During his majority Henry did charge the abbot 60 marks for gold that the abbot had requested (see *CFR, 1246-1257,* no. 463). This fine refers to a straightforward transaction (abbot buying gold from the king for a purpose) and so is a gift in the same way all the other evidence presented in this chapter is.
[237] *CChR,* vol.1, pp. 22, 131; *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 24, 26; *CPR, 1225-1232,* pp. 264-5; *CR, 1227-31,* p. 7, 181, 273, 494; *CR, 1231-4,* p. 179, 200; *CR, 1234-37,* p. 13.
[238] *CM,* vol. 2, p. 480.

for his father's actions, not only for John's salvation, but to wipe the stain from the dynasty as well.[239]

Henry was as generous to his cousin as he could be while keeping her in captivity. He never allowed her to marry, to wipe out a rival line, but he kept her in comfort and in a style befitting her rank. Between 1228 and her death in 1241, Eleanor received gifts and grants from Henry every year but one (1231). Most frequently, grants of money were made to enable Eleanor for her alms and money was granted to her keepers for her maintenance.[240] She was also given clothing for her and her attendants along with frequent gifts of deer.[241]

It was easier for Henry to be generous to Eleanor's memory. Once she died, the rival line died out, and Henry did not have to balance harshness with generosity. After her death, Henry was insistent that her obsequies be observed with all solemnity and honour.[242] Henry obeyed Eleanor's wishes when he had her translated to Amesbury as he learnt that she desired to be buried there.[243] There is no proof that Eleanor ever visited Amesbury or had any contact with it. There was also no family tradition of burial there. The closest possible relative of Eleanor's associated with Amesbury was Adela of Brittany, a member of the ducal house who had been brought up at or associated with Amesbury. Before 1233, a kinswoman of both Henry and Eleanor, Alpesia, had been a nun there. None of these were close associations so there must

---

[239] For a brilliant discussion of these factors see G. Seabourne, 'Eleanor of Brittany and her treatment by King John and Henry III', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 51 (2007), 73-110, Especially 79-83. Nicholas Vincent has also pointed to Henry's desire to atone for his father's sins in relation to Arthur and Eleanor of Brittany. See N. C. Vincent, 'The Pilgrimages of the Angevin Kings of England 1154-1272', in C. Morris and P. Roberts (eds.), Pilgrimage: The English Experience from Becket to Bunyan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 12-45, at p. 23.

[240] Money for Eleanor's alms: *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 76, 12, 153, 159, 178, 213, 238. Money for maintenance (both for Eleanor and for those in charge of her custody): *CLR, 1226-1240,* 166, 178, 298, 308, 377, 413, 463, 495.

[241] Clothing: *CLR, 1226-1240,* pp. 178, 202, 216, 22 and Wild, *The Wardrobe Accounts of Henry III* (London: Pipe Roll Society, 2012), pp. 7, 11, 23, 24, 29, 39, 42. Deer: *CR, 1231-4,* pp. 101, 219, 487; *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 102, 104 and Wild, *The Wardrobe Account of Henry III,* pp. 5, 27.

[242] *CLR, 1240-45,* p. 68.

[243] *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 261.

have been another reason for Eleanor's choice.[244] Amesbury was a daughter house of Fontevrault, the burial site of multiple Angevins. Did this represent Eleanor's 'submission' to the Angevins?[245] There was a much older association between Fontevrault and the Breton ducal house from the time of Robert of Arbrissel and Countess Ermengard. Henry II, Eleanor of Aquitaine, Richard I, John, and Henry III may all have shown patronage towards Amesbury long before Eleanor chose to be buried there but the connection of the ducal house to Amesbury seems a more likely reason for her selection.[246] Furthermore, Amesbury was dedicated to the Virgin and St Melor. Amesbury also claimed to have the relics of St Melor. St Melor was a saint of Brittany who was allegedly murdered by his uncle when he was 7 years old.[247] This may have been Eleanor's primary reason to be buried at Amesbury as the connection with the fate of Arthur of Brittany cannot be ignored.

It is unlikely that Henry was unaware of St Melor, but that did not prevent him from commemorating her. In fact, it may have encouraged the commemoration. When Eleanor of Provence was heavily pregnant with Beatrice, just before Henry left for Poitou, he displayed patronage to both his father's foundation but also the site of Eleanor of Brittany's burial. On 7 April 1242, Henry granted protection, without term, to the abbot and monks of Beaulieu, John's Cistercian foundation.[248] On 30 April 1242, he granted protection to the prioress and church of Amesbury.[249] Henry was clearly thinking about his father, but he was also trying to atone for John's actions. Henry was most likely concerned for numerous things: one, the safety of his and his father's soul in preparation for a potential perilous campaign; two, receiving

[244] Seabourne, 'Eleanor of Brittany', 105.
[245] Ibid, p. 106.
[246] Ibid, p. 105.
[247] Farmer, *Oxford Dictionary of Saints*, p. 318.
[248] *CR, 1237-42*, p. 413.
[249] *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 284.

forgiveness from Eleanor and three, hoping that such an act would save his wife and child from danger.

Henry's desire to make things spiritually right with Geoffrey's children can be seen in his actions in July 1268. On 9 July 1268, he made a gift to the prioress and nuns of Amesbury 'for souls of Arthur of Brittany and Eleanor his sister' of £48 p.a. and the prioress and nuns were instructed to celebrate the obits of Arthur and Eleanor along with the obits of Henry III and Eleanor of Provence after their deaths.[250] Henry made this gift in the aftermath of the baronial period of revolt and rebellion and may have felt that he needed to wipe away any guilt associated with his dynasty if his realm was to maintain stability. More generally, by showing devotion to Amesbury after Eleanor's death, Henry could control the narrative surrounding it. In a similar way to the Angevin's co-opting of Becket for their dynasty, Henry seems to have tried to neutralise the potential for an anti-royal cult developing at Amesbury by supporting it. Amesbury was even the place where Eleanor of Provence retired to. Eleanor of Provence died and was buried there.[251]

Henry came from a dynasty of generous patrons of ecclesiastical groups. Reading was Henry I's foundation and it attracted considerable patronage. Between 1227 and 1271 gifts and grants were made in twenty-eight of the forty-four years. The grants and gifts to Reading included grants of liberties and privileges, confirmations of gifts of predecessors, money, deer and other animals, yearly and weekly market, wax to make tapers, obols of musc and offerings of cloths, letters of protection and respite from various payments.[252]

---

[250] *CChR*, vol. 2, p. 100.
[251] Howell, *Eleanor of Provence*, pp. 303, 311-12.
[252] *CChR*, vol. 1, 14, pp. 15-16, 116, 128, 187; *CChR*, vol. 2, p. 175; *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 109, 149; *CLR, 1240-45*, pp. 73, 107, 317; *CLR, 1245-51*, pp. 36, 68; *CPR, 1225-1232*, p. 333; *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 501; *CPR, 1247-58, pp.* 152, 208, 635; *CPR, 1258-66*, p. 299, 598, 599; *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 197; *CR, 1227-1231*, pp 499, 456, 523; *CR, 1231-4*, p. 88; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 204, 441; *CR, 1237-42*, pp. 3, 99, 376; *CR, 1242-7*, pp. 318, 391, 404; *CR, 1247-51*, p. 389; *CR, 1251-3*, pp. 1-2, 211; *CR, 1256-9*, p. 105; *CR, 1259-61*, pp. 358, 498-99; *CR, 1261-4*, p. 38; *CR, 1264-8*, pp. 163, 182; *CR, 1268-72*, p. 18.

Henry may well have given more oblations to Reading in a more spontaneous or reactive manner because he was frequently at Reading during his reign and so had multiple opportunities to visit the abbey and make offerings. An example of such a visit was before Henry went to Canterbury to meet his bride.[253] As Henry was at Marlborough on 1 January, Reading on 7 January, Windsor on 10th, Rochester on 13th, and Canterbury on 14th. Reading was, therefore, a natural stopping point on his journey to Canterbury. That does not mean that Reading was not important to him. He had the opportunity to show his respects to his ancestors just before an important transformation for his dynasty. Given the nature of his trip, it seems highly plausible that Henry would have visited Henry I's tomb, reminding himself of the prestige of his dynasty. Henry appears to have done something similar in the last months of Eleanor's pregnancy with Edward. He had an extended visit to Reading from 19-25 May inclusive, which meant that he spent the feast of the Holy Trinity there, an important liturgical date.[254] Henry most likely visited Reading Abbey, which was not only the foundation and burial site of Henry I, but also the burial site of William, the first son of Henry II and Eleanor of Aquitaine, who died in infancy. It was also the burial site of parts of Edith-Matilda, the wife of Henry I and the woman through whom Henry III could trace his Anglo-Saxon roots.[255] However, due to the lack of survival of the oblation rolls (only two partial ones survive), it is impossible to make a secure judgement.

Henry commemorated numerous places associated with his ancestors on the continent, where many had been buried due to the range and scope of the Angevin empire. John's incompetence culminated in the loss of Normandy in 1204. It was a particular blow and caused a re-centring on England. Henry had not even been born when Normandy was lost and, by

---

[253] Kanter, "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship", p. 1041.
[254] Ibid, pp. 1100-1101.
[255] Houses of Benedictine monks: The abbey of Reading', in P. H. Ditchfield and W. Page (ed.) *A History of the County of Berkshire: Volume 2*, (London, 1907), pp. 62-73. *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/berks/vol2/pp62-73 (accessed 25/08/2017).

1239, a new generation of barons had been exclusively born and raised in England, with few direct links to the continent.[256] Nevertheless, Henry never seems to have stopped patronising sites on the continent associated with his ancestors. He was aware of his inheritance, and it was not implausible, certainly at the start of Henry's reign, that the lost lands would be recovered. Henry gave up these claims in 1259 in the Treaty of Paris[257], but his patronage of places on the continent implies, at the very least, that Henry had not given up on the memory of more glorious days for his dynasty.

The Empress Matilda had numerous sites associated with her in Normandy. Bec Hellouin was her burial site and Valasse was her foundation.[258] Henry's patronage was extensive, with grants being made in 1227, 1234, 1242, 1244, 1246, 1248, 1252, 1256, 1258, 1261, 1262, 1266 and 1272.[259] Even the period of baronial revolt and rebellion did not stop Henry's patronage.[260] The high point of Henry's patronage of Bec was 1246, coming after Henry's mother's death on 4 June 1246. Isabella's death may have encouraged Henry to remember the mother of the Angevin dynasty. In addition, most of these grants were of lands, liberties, and fairs, with no charge.[261] Therefore, Henry consistently displayed generous patronage to Bec Hellouin, demonstrating a clear commitment. In contrast, Henry's patronage of Valasse was limited to one grant. On 10 July 1239, Henry made a yearly grant of 10 marks to the monks of Valasse so that they would pray yearly on Edward's birthday for his 'good

---

[256] D.A. Carpenter, 'King Henry III's "Statute" against Aliens: July 1263', *The English Historical Review*, 107 (1992), 925-944, at 926.
[257] D.A. Carpenter, 'The Meetings of Kings Henry III and Louis IX', in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England X: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 2003* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), 1–30, at p. 6.
[258] M. Chibnall, 'Matilda (1102–1167)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford, 2004), viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18338 (accessed 07/08/2017).
[259] *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 8, 307, 331, 409; *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 137; *CPR, 1258-66*, pp. 30, 135; *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 684; *CR, 1231-4*, p. 515; *CR, 1242-7*, pp. 182, 450; *CR, 1254-6*, p. 437; *CR, 1256-9*, pp. 345, 406; *CR, 1261-4*, pp. 108-9, 146-7, 159-160. *CR, 1264-8*, p. 188.
[260] Benjamin Wild has pointed to the continuity of some of Henry's pious patronage, despite the impact of Henry being a captive between the battles of Lewes and Evesham. See B.L.Wild, 'A Captive King: King Henry III Between the Battles of Lewes and Evesham, 1264–5', in J. Burton et al. (ed), *Thirteenth Century England XIII: Proceedings of the Paris Conference* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011), 41-56, at p. 52.
[261] *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 307; *CR, 1242-47*, p. 450.

estate and health.'[262] This grant is a particularly important one as the monks were expected to pray for Edward's health for as long as he lived. The linking of the future of his dynasty with a place founded by the mother of the Angevin dynasty stressed Henry's regard for Matilda and his desire to thank those praying for her and his son's souls.

Henry's treatment of Bec Hellouin is in marked contrast to his patronage of other continental sites with links to his ancestors. William the Conqueror and Matilda of Flanders' foundations, Abbaye les Hommes and Abbey aux Dames respectively, received little interaction from Henry other than for the administrative links between the abbeys' English lands. The documents only talk about fines for protection and custody of lands.[263] The abbess of Abbaye aux Dames had to pay fealty and money for having things such as attorneys to plead her cases in court.[264] None of these interactions had anything to do with ancestral commemoration.

This was not the case for Rouen, the burial site of Henry, the Young King, and Richard I's heart. Rouen's lands in England were granted markets and fairs, for no charge.[265] Additionally, on 25 February 1251, Henry requested that the archbishop of Rouen and the bishops, abbots, priors and other religious men inscribe the day of the death of his mother into their book of martyrs to celebrate masses and prayers for her soul especially on the day of her death (4 June).[266] Perhaps Rouen received more of Henry's attention because those buried there were more closely related to Henry.

---

[262] *CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 401.
[263] *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 311 and *CR, 1264-8,* p. 261.
[264] *CPR, 1258-66,* p. 46; *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 97. *CR, 1227-1231,* pp. 435-6
[265]*CChR*, vol.1, pp. 46, 322; *CLR, 1245-51*, p. 231. *CPR, 1266-72*, pp. 229, 529.
[266] *CPR, 1247-58,* p. 89.

Fontevrault was possibly the most prestigious burial site of Henry's ancestors on the continent. Richard I, Henry II, and Eleanor of Aquitaine were all buried there.[267] Consequently, Fontevrault received consistent attention.[268] Henry also very rarely made the abbey pay fines for the documents created for them despite the generosity of numerous of his gifts. It is worth tracing the flow of gifts throughout Henry's reign as there are flashpoints where Henry was not only consistently generous to Fontevrault but also to its daughter houses in England including Amesbury,[269] Nuneaton,[270] and Westwood.[271] Intriguingly, Henry tended to be particularly generous to Fontevrault either just before, during, or after a departure for the Continent.[272] For example, in 1243 during the Poitevin campaign, Henry granted £10 per annum to the abbess and convent so that they would perpetually celebrate his own anniversary and the anniversaries of his ancestors, his queen, his children, and his successors.[273] At times of crisis, Henry was thinking about his dynasty and felt the need to secure their salvation, perhaps in the hope that his conduct would impress the recipients who, in turn, would impress God who would aid Henry as well as his ancestors.

---

[267] T.S. R. Boase, 'Fontevrault and the Plantagenets', *The Journal of the British Archaeological Association Third Series*, 34 (1971), 1-10, at 6-7.

[268] Nearly every single year of the reign, at least one, and more frequently, multiple grants were made: *CChR*, vol.1, p. 242 *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 55, 106, 239, 241, 296, 421, 500; *CLR, 1240-45*, pp. 80, 86, 157,270-1; *CLR, 1245-51*, pp. 36 (2), 310; *CLR, 1251-60*, p. 7, 139, 228, 404, 483, *CLR, 1260-67*, p. 112; *CLR, 1267-72*, p. 53, 157, 227; *CPR, 1225-1232*, pp. 395, 490; *CPR, 1232-47*, pp. 62, 373, 383 (2), 384; *CPR, 1247-58*, p. 260, 383; *CPR, 1258-66*, p. 458 *CR, 1227-1231*, pp. 32, 167, 569; *CR, 1231-4*, pp. 470, 488; *CR, 1242-7*, p. 396, 486; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 213; *CR, 1251-3*, p. 267; *CR, 1251-3*, p. 396; *CR, 1259-61*, pp. 225-6; *CR, 1259-61*, pp. 94, 449; *CR, 1261-4*, p. 146.

[269] *CChR*, vol.1, p. 80; *CChR*, vol.2, p. 100; *CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 195, 438; *CLR, 1245-51*, p. 63, 100; *CPR, 1225-1232*, p. 276, 337; *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 284; *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 244; *CR, 1227-1231*, p. 486; *CR, 1231-34*, p. 3, 46, 370; *CR, 1237-42*, p. 159, 316; *CR, 1242-7*, p. 486; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 178-9, 247; *CR, 1254-6*, pp. 95, 334; *CR, 1256-9*, p. 111.

[270] *CPR, 1225-1232*, p. 276; *CR, 1268-72*, p. 538.

[271] *CLR, 1245-51*, pp. 57-58; *CR, 1231-4*, pp. 224, 271 *CR, 1237-42*, p. 310; *CR, 1247-51, p.* 319; *CR, 1254-6*, p. 344; *CR, 1256-9*, p. 95; *CR, 1264-8*, p. 331) and Leighton (*CLR, 1240-45*, pp. 157, 270-1; *CLR, 1245-51*, pp. 36, 310; *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 296; *CR, 1268-72*, p. 538 *CR, 1227-1231*, p. 32; *CR, 1242-7*, pp. 303-4, 307; *CR, 1259-61*, pp. 300-301; *CR, 1268-72*, p. 538; *CR, 1268-72*, p. 53.

[272] See, for example *CR, 1227-1231*, p. 569; *CPR, 1225-1232*, p. 490. (in 1231); *CLR, 1245-51*, p. 36, 57-8; *CR, 1242-7*, pp. 396, 486. (for 1253); *CPR, 1247-58*, p. 383 (for 1254).

[273] *CPR, 1232-47*, pp. 373, 383, 284. For other examples, see *CChR*, vol.1, p. 242 and *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 86.

Henry not only patronised Fontevrault when he was concerned with continental ambitions. He also patronised it at times of domestic strain or uncertainty. In July 1234, in the aftermath of the death of Richard Marshal, Henry made three grants of various liberties and privileges to the abbey and convent of Fontevrault including a grant of £40 so that the nuns would celebrate the anniversaries of King John and Henry, when he died.[274] The specific mention of John indicates that Henry associated him, and other family members, with Fontevrault.

When Eleanor was pregnant with Edmund, at the end of October in 1244, Henry increased his annual gift to Fontevrault. Henry added an additional £10 p.a. to gifts to Fontevrault so that the nuns would celebrate the anniversaries of his ancestors, himself, his queen, his children and his successors when they died.[275] Henry was clearly thinking about all members of his dynasty, alive and dead, as the queen's delivery date drew nearer.

During the period of reform and rebellion, Henry made grants to Fontevrault when he controlled his government. This happened at the end of 1261 and for some of 1262.[276] Grants to Fontevrault only began again after the battle of Evesham.[277] At the end of July 1272, when gravely ill, Henry thought about the abbess of Fontevrault, ensuring that she was paid all that she was owed.[278] Henry nearly died in July and he would have pondered about the inheritance he was to leave his son. The grant to the abbess indicates that Henry still wanted ties to Fontevrault, potentially hoping that Edward would regain all that had been lost. It is rather fitting that Edward sent Henry's heart to be buried at Fontevrault.[279] It appears that Henry never

[274] *CR, 1231-4,* pp. 470 and 488; *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 62.
[275] *CLR, 1240-45,* pp. 270-271.
[276] *CR, 1259-61,* p. 449; *CR, 1261-4,* p. 146; *CLR, 1260-67,* p. 112.
[277] *CLR, 1267-72,* pp. 53, 157; *CPR, 1258-66,* p. 458.
[278] *CLR, 1267-72,* p. 227.
[279] Boase, 'Fontevrault and the Plantagenets', 7.

forgot the continental aspect of his dynasty, and a part of him, it seems, never forgot what the Angevin empire once was.

Tarrant Abbey was the burial place of his sister Joan. Tarrant Abbey was in Dorset and not Scotland as one might expect a Queen of Scotland's burial site to be. Joan died on 4 March 1238 but even before that date, Henry had a history of patronising it. His patronage began in 1235 with the confirmation of a variety of gifts.[280] On 23 January 1236, Henry gave seisin to the abbess and nuns there of the honour of Craneburn after an inquisition found them the rightful owners.[281] This occurred on the same day as the issuing of the Provisions of Merton and fits into Henry's pattern of trying to correct wrongs and rule fairly in the aftermath of his marriage to Eleanor of Provence. 1237 saw multiple grants being made to Tarrant with gifts including wood for fuel, £40 of the queen's gold for the use of the nuns and various other gifts.[282]

From 1238 (after Joan's death) to 1253, except 1241, Henry gave at least one grant or gift to Tarrant, often multiple ones every year. These gifts included money, lead, wine, food, animals, land, was for divine services, rents, letters of protection and exclusion from certain payments such as a contribution to the aid for the marriage of the king's eldest daughter.[283] From 1245 onwards, Henry frequently ensured that the abbey had enough wax to celebrate the anniversary of Joan's death and caused two tapers to be burnt in the abbey, one at the site of Joan's grave, another elsewhere in the abbey. These tapers were to burn day and night.[284] In 1248, the abbess was granted £9 of yearly rent so that she could maintain two tapers to burn

---

[280] *CChR*, vol.1, p. 210.
[281] *CR, 1234-37*, p. 234.
[282] *CLR, 1226-1240*, p. 267, 280, 281; *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 175; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 439, 472, 507; *CR, 1237-42*, p. 15.
[283] *CChR*, vol.1, pp. 271-273, 285; *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 355, 374, 418, 432; *CLR, 1240-45*, pp. 15, 127, 290; *CLR, 1245-51*, pp. 29, 62, 63, 64, 69, 97, 155, 201, 358; *CLR, 1251-60*, pp. 59, 87, 91, 138; *CPR, 1232-47*, pp. 214, 483; *CPR, 1247-58*, p. 45; *CR, 1237-42*, pp. 48, 78; *CR, 1242-7*, pp. 53, 77, 152, 288, 375, 489, 500; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 13, 244, 283, 384, *CR, 1251-3*, pp. 122.
[284] *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 290; *CLR, 1245-51*, p. 29, 62, 97, 201, 358; *CLR, 1251-60*, p. 59; *CPR, 1232-47*, p. 483.

continuously before Joan's tomb.[285] At the end of 1252, Henry had a stone made that was to be placed over Joan's body and, on the day when the stone was placed over the body (in 1253), he had 500 paupers fed at Tarrant for her soul.[286] After 1253, there was no other grant to Tarrant until 19 August 1259 when, after Henry had granted the manor of Bere to Simon and Eleanor de Montfort, the abbess was to be given the corn of the manor because she had cultivated that land.[287] This grant was therefore about correcting an injustice that the abbess had endured. This may have been done by Henry because, at that time, his kingship was in crisis, and he was not in total charge of his government. Maybe this grant was made to try and secure support at a time when he desperately needed it. There was then no other grant to Tarrant until 1270 when Prince Edmund's grant of the manor of Bere to the abbess and nuns of Tarrant was confirmed.[288] This is a sign that Henry passed on his attachment to places associated with family members to his children.

## Conclusion

Henry's pious practices as an adult were influenced by the major translation ceremonies he witnessed as a child, especially the translations of St Wulfstan and Thomas Becket. The combination of grand ceremonial and piety was one that Henry repeated throughout his reign, especially at moments of dynastic significance such as royal births and marriages. The translations of Henry's minority also focused on native saints and Henry's veneration of Becket may have been strongly influenced by what he saw in 1220.

---

[285] *CLR, 1245-51,* p. 201.
[286] *CLR, 1251-60,* pp. 91, 138.
[287] *CR, 1256-9,* p. 426.
[288] *CPR, 1266-72,* p. 498.

During his adult life, Henry seems to have preferred venerating native saints, especially Edward the Confessor. He favoured other English regal saints and episcopal ones such as Becket and Edmund of Abingdon. He also appealed to saints such as St Kenelm and William of York in situations where he needed aid quickly. This can also be seen in the naming of his sick daughter Katherine, after the saint day she was born on. Just because Henry appealed to other saints in an ad hoc way does not mean that Henry did not think he was benefitting from them. His proximity to them made them more powerful and he believed in their potency.

Henry also appealed to universal saints, usually when these saints were serving a particular purpose. The Virgin was appealed to regularly, usually surrounding the pregnancies, births and purification ceremonies associated with the royal children. As the Mother of God, she was an obvious person to appeal to for the safety of children. Henry also venerated papal saints, perhaps due to the connection between the Confessor and Rome, and due to his own relationship with Rome. Time and again in his reign, the papacy (usually in the form of legates) helped Henry when he was facing difficulties.

However, if one looks at Henry's piety overall, the only universal saints that received consistent patronage were the Virgin and St Peter. The Virgin was received more attention and she was often appealed to in specific circumstances. Henry was more consistent in his relationships with native saints especially the Anglo-Saxon regal saints, specifically Edward the Confessor and Edmund king and martyr, and the English episcopal saints, Becket and Edmund of Abingdon. This indicates that Henry's outlook, for saint veneration at least, was more insular than universal, possibly demonstrating his recognition that his dynasty now had an English focus due to the loss of his continental possessions. Henry's veneration of English saints also chimes with the changing veneration practices in England during the late twelfth and early thirteenth century. As Draper has argued, many Anglo-Saxon cults were more

actively promoted and several saints were translated to more elaborate shrines such as St Frideswide at Oxford in 1180.[289] Furthermore, numerous churches where saints were buried rebuilt the east end of the church to provide grander settings for shrines such as for St Swithun at Winchester, St Etheldreda at Ely, and St Erkenwald at St Paul's, London.[290] During Henry's reign, the trend of veneration of English saints continued in the canonisation of six bishops by 1262.[291] Henry's veneration patterns chimed with the changing practices across England. His veneration of native saints may well have been connected with a desire to display himself as an English king, cognisant of native feeling and practice.

Public dynastic events such as purification ceremonies and marriage ceremonies where events where the dynasty could be reaffirmed. The positive aspects could be displayed to both subjects and those joining the dynasty. Henry used his pious acts and saint veneration to display how he wished to be seen by his subjects and foreign relatives. The Confessor, for example, was associated with good government. By venerating him and displaying the desire to emulate him, Henry demonstrated his commitment to good rule. Henry also used such occasions to display the prestige and might of his dynasty to subjects and foreign relatives. By exhibiting the depth of English sanctity and encouraging them to take up his pious practices, Henry hoped to integrate his foreign relatives into the spiritual landscape of England and make them potentially more acceptable to his native subjects.

However, Henry's foreign relatives and their affinities could not just expect that venerating English saints would make them embraced by the English nobles. Thirteenth-century attitudes towards foreigners were complex and those attitudes depended on who held the view and about whom it was held. Not all of Henry's foreign relatives were viewed

[289] Draper, 'King John and Saint Wulfstan', 48
[290] Ibid, 48.
[291] Wulstan of Worcester in 1203, Hugh of Lincoln in 1219, William of York in 1223, Lawrence O'Toole of Dublin in 1226, Edmund of Abingdon in 1246, and Richard of Chichester in 1262.

negatively all the time. Boniface of Savoy became viewed as a defender of the liberties of the church of England. The issue many of Henry's foreign relatives faced was that Henry's patronage was stretched beyond breaking point. He simply did not have enough money or land to appease his native barons and his foreign relatives. The resentment and mistrust one finds in Paris' *Chronica* reflects at least some of the feelings circulating at Henry's court. Paris had excellent sources including several native barons[292] and they undoubtedly complained about their perceived lack of fair treatment. These feelings eventually boiled over in 1258, resulting in the period of baronial revolt and rebellion. No ceremony could fix the fundamental problems in Henry's kingship.

Unlike his actions for royal births and marriages, Henry's ancestral commemoration often consisted of small grants and gifts to places associated with his ancestors. These were important gifts to the recipients, and they and their communities would have known about it but there was not the same degree of pomp and ceremony. It was more transactional and mundane. However, that does not mean it was not important. Those gifts, primarily, ensured that prayers were being harvested for his ancestors. This was needed for their salvation and Henry was painfully aware that John needed the most prayers. John left Henry with a complicated inheritance, in both an earthly and spiritual sense. His father was viewed so negatively that Henry had to not invite any comparisons between them. However, he was still his father, and had inherited his crown from him. Henry's appreciation of his father can be seen in how he thought of him at important dynastic moments, such as when he married Eleanor of Provence. Nevertheless, the concern for his father's soul never left Henry and his difficult relationship with Eleanor of Brittany is an example of Henry feeling the need to atone for his father's actions. Henry needed to atone for his father's sins to cleanse the dynasty of its bad

[292] Such as Richard of Cornwall and Richard, earl of Gloucester. See Vaughan, *Matthew Paris*, p. 13.

actions. Henry's actions for his cousin in the run up to his marriage indicates just how important this atonement was to him to ensure the continuance of his dynasty.

Chapter Four: Henry III, Simon de Montfort, and the Battle for Spiritual Supremacy, 1258-72

The period of baronial revolt and rebellion (1258-68) has long been recognised as a pivotal moment in both Henry III and Simon de Montfort's lives.[1] The earthly battle between the two and their supporters fascinated contemporaries and continues to attract attention.[2] However, Simon and Henry not only engaged in political battles for the control of the kingdom. There was also a spiritual battle that took place before God, the Church (domestic and international), and lay observers. The spiritual aspect of Simon's actions during this period has been sensitively analysed, with John Maddicott and Sophie Ambler demonstrating how integral Simon's piety was in shaping the reform agenda.[3] Ambler has also worked extensively on the roles of bishops in the political community during Henry's reign, including the Montfortian bishops' role in defending the extraordinary supplantation of a divinely ordained monarch.[4]

[1] S.T. Ambler, 'Simon de Montfort and King Henry III: The First Revolution in English History, 1258-1265', *History Compass* 11 (2013), 1076-1087. The importance of the period to historians, and the depth and breadth of scholarship in the period can be seen in Jobson's collected essays: A. Jobson (ed.), *Baronial Reform and Revolution in England, 1258-67* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016); A. Jobson, *The First English Revolution: Simon de Montfort, Henry III and the Barons' War* (London: Continuum, 2012) (a good narrative of the period). For a collection of the major sources of this period, see R.E. Treharne and I.J. Sanders, (ed.), *Documents of the Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion 1258-67* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973).

[2] For the best accounts of these struggles see S.T. Ambler, *The Song of Simon de Montfort: England's First Revolution and the Death of Chivalry* (London: Picador, 2019) and J. R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). Treharne's account of the period is still foundational: R.F. Treharne, *The Baronial Plan of Reform, 1258-1263* 2nd edition (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1971).

[3] Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, pp. 77-105, 117, 206, 271, 347. Ambler, *Song of Simon de Montfort*, pp. 271, 273, 276, 277-9, 299, 324, 326. See also J. Jahner, *Law and Literature in the Era of Magna Carta*, (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2019), pp. 175 and 178.

[4] See S.T. Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community of England 1213-1272* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017); S.T. Ambler, 'On Kingship and Tyranny: Grosseteste's Memorandum and its place in the Baronial Reform Movement', in J.E. Burton, P.R. Scholfield and B.K.U. Weiler, (ed), *Thirteenth century England XIV. Proceedings of the Aberystwyth and Lampeter Conference, 2011*, (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), pp. 115-128; S.T. Ambler, 'The Montfortian Bishops and the Justification of Conciliar Government in 1264', *Historical Research*, 85 (2012), 193-209. S.T. Ambler, 'The Montfortian Bishops', in A. Jobson (ed.), *Baronial Reform and Revolution in England, 1258-67* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016), pp. 139-151.

Despite the appreciation of how Simon used his piety to drive and defend the Provisions of Oxford, the role that Henry's piety played in parrying Montfortian propaganda has not been fully appreciated. This may be linked with the lack of biographical attention to this part of Henry's reign. David Carpenter's Yale biography of Henry is in two volumes and, at the time of writing, only the first one has been published.[5] This volume ends before the start of the reform period and so Henry's overall perspective is missing.

However, Benjamin Wild and David Carpenter have examined Henry's pious practices during this period so some of Henry's perspective has been examined. In his article examining the meetings between Henry and Louis IX, Carpenter stressed Henry's conspicuous consumption and lavish hospitality to argue that Henry used hospitality to demonstrate that, despite the humiliation he had suffered in 1258, his kingship was still intact.[6] Carpenter further argued that Henry's hospitality and almsgiving helped to strengthen his relationship with Louis and enhanced his reputation in France for piety and munificence.[7] This chapter will build on the conclusions drawn by Carpenter, examining the role that Henry's pious acts played in convincing various audiences of his right to rule, and the morality of his cause.

This chapter will also build on the work of Wild. Wild has argued that Henry's authority between the battles of Lewes and Evesham was severely limited, unlike in June 1258 – Jan 1261.[8] He analysed two broad types of sources to support this argument: the chancery rolls including the charter witness lists to see who was at court and who was receiving gifts,

---

[5] See D.A. Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power and Personal Rule 1207-1258'* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2020).
[6] D.A. Carpenter, 'The Meetings of Kings Henry III and Louis IX', in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England X: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 2003* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), 1–30, at p. 17.
[7] Ibid, p. 21.
[8] B.L. Wild, 'A Captive King: King Henry III Between the Battles of Lewes and Evesham, 1264–5', in J. Burton et al. (ed), *Thirteenth Century England XIII: Proceedings of the Paris Conference* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011), 41-56, at p. 41.

and the wardrobe material to analyse who served Henry and how much was spent on gifts and oblations.[9] Wild's interpretations of the evidence will be examined, and this work will add to the picture of Henry's pious practices during a time of extreme vulnerability, asking what Henry thought his actions would achieve.

Wild examined Henry's ceremonial actions during the siege of Kenilworth. He used the partial household roll that covers parts of the siege of Kenilworth[10] to demonstrate how Henry viewed his kingship and how he used art and ceremony to 'overawe his subjects'.[11] Henry was very aware of his audience and used ceremony during the siege to demonstrate that he was in control and had the support of God, the papacy, and the English church.[12]

A final area of the baronial period of reform and rebellion that has received recent attention pertinent to this chapter is the Dictum of Kenilworth. The Dictum of Kenilworth was the agreement reached between Henry and the rebels that enabled them to regain their inheritances. Wild, examined the text of the Dictum from a ceremonial and 'non-verbal communication' perspective.[13] Wild stressed the religious aspects of the Dictum with its prayer-like opening and references to saints.[14] Henry used both persuasion and coercion to convince various audiences, including his subjects, God, and the saints, that he, not Simon, was in the right.

---

[9] Ibid, pp. 42 and 44.
[10] Lasted 25 June-13 December 1265
[11] B.L. Wild, 'The Siege of Kenilworth Castle, 1266' in *English Heritage Historical Review* 5 (2010), 12-23, at 13.
[12] Ibid, 19-20.
[13] B.L. Wild, 'Reasserting Medieval Kingship: King Henry III and the Dictum of Kenilworth', in A. Jobson (ed.), *Baronial Reform and Revolution in England, 1258-67* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016), 237-258, at p. 238.
[14] Ibid, p. 248.

This chapter shall be divided into two sections. The first will cover the period from 1258 to the battle of Evesham[15] when Simon died. The second section will cover from Simon's death to Henry's in 1272. Simon's death caused as many problems as it solved. Simon presented himself and his followers as crusaders, willing to die for a noble and just cause. Despite dying excommunicate, many believed that he had suffered martyrdom and was a saint.[16] This was one factor that encouraged some of Simon's supporters to continue to resist Henry. Henry had to navigate Simon's dangerous legacy, until his death. The last part of this chapter will examine how Simon and Henry were remembered to analyse how successful Henry was in countering Simon's narrative

## Part One: Before Evesham (1258-1265)

### Before Lewes: Provisions of Oxford to Battle of Lewes (April 1258 – 14 May 1264)

Before examining Henry's pious actions to secure blessings from God and the saints during the period of baronial revolt and rebellion, it is necessary to understand the narrative that Henry had to counter. The Provisions of Oxford, imposed on Henry in 1258, were more than just political reforms.[17] They threatened the basis of kingly power as they, amongst other things, removed Henry's ability to choose his own advisors and castellans, and forced the chief justiciar, treasurer, and chancellor to only serve a year and make an account of their actions before the council.[18] The council, rather than the king, would direct government. This was

[15] 4 August 1265.
[16] For the fullest account of Simon's miracles, see his miracle collection in J.O. Halliwell (ed), *The Chronicle of William de Rishanger of the Barons' War, the Miracles of Simon de Montfort* (London: The Camden Society, 1840), pp. 67-110.
[17] For the full text of the Provisions, see Treharne and Sanders, *Documents of the Baronial Movement,* pp. 96-113.
[18] These were chapters in the Provisions of Oxford, chapter six, seven, eight, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, and sixteen. See pp. 100-109.

alarming, but what was perhaps more so was that, from the outset, the Provisions of Oxford had a moral aspect to them which was largely influenced by Simon de Montfort's outlook. John Maddicott has written that, for Simon, the Provisions of Oxford were about religion and conscience.[19] When Simon's role in reform became more central, particularly between 1263-5, Simon turned the defence of the Provisions into a holy cause.[20] His presentation of the Provisions was buttressed when nearly half of the English episcopate supported him over Henry. Furthermore, after the battle of Lewes, the bishops provided the intellectual justification of the reform movement, threatening to excommunicate those who did not follow Simon's decrees.[21] The ritual conclusion of these strands of thought occurred during the parliament at Westminster that lasted from 20 January – 11 March.[22] At the end of the parliament, nine bishops, in full liturgical regalia, held lighted candles and pronounced a sentence of excommunication against anyone who broke Magna Carta, the Charter of the Forest, the Provisions of Westminster (a development on the Provisions of Oxford) or any who acted, in any way, against the Montfortian constitution.[23] Henry, therefore, had to contend with the religious baggage that came with the Provisions of Oxford. It was not enough for him to question the content of the Provisions, he had to demonstrate that they were unholy and that his oath to them had been extracted under duress. Henry's pious actions had to counter the narrative that the reformers, especially Simon de Montfort, professed about the Provisions of Oxford. Only then could his regal status be regained.

The first opportunity Henry had to free himself from the Provisions of Oxford was in 1259 when he travelled to France to finish negotiating the Treaty of Paris. In France, Henry

[19] Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, p. 271.
[20] Ibid, p. 271.
[21] Amber, *Bishops in the Political Community*, p. 8.
[22] Ambler, *Song of Simon de Montfort*, p. 296.
[23] Ibid, p. 298.

was away from the council's control and could exploit baronial divisions and inform Louis of his predicament and need for help.[24] As Carpenter has analysed how Henry's pious and hospitable acts influenced his negotiations with Louis [25], this section will only note it for context against the other actions he did and the other audiences Henry was trying to appeal to.

Significantly, Henry tried to appeal to the religious in England. Although Henry cared deeply for the poorest and most vulnerable in his kingdom, his patronage of them was not part of any concerted effort to persuade them to support him. They had very little power. Their prayers were efficacious, but they alone would not re-establish his authority.[26] Bishops, however, were powerful, spiritually, and practically. They occupied both spiritual and lay spheres. They were powerful landowners and had great influence over their flocks. They could appeal to the king on behalf of their congregation and their support was vital for ensuring the king's authority and legitimacy. This can be seen most clearly in the role that the Montfortian bishops played in supporting the Montfortian regime. However, in 1258, the bishops had not picked a side and played little role in political events. As Ambler has argued, bishops traditionally act as mediators and peacekeepers. Bishops had a duty to reprimand kings for moral transgressions. This duty can be traced back to the Anglo-Saxon period.[27]

In 1258, Henry would not have envisaged that nearly half of the episcopate would abandon him. Generally, the English episcopate had little to do with baronial reform in its earliest stages. Ambler has suggested that this was because the actions of the reforming council

---

[24] Powicke has suggested that Henry may have lingered longer in France than his convalescence from tertian fever required. See F.M. Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward,* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), p. 411. See also Powicke, *Henry III and the Lord Edward,* pp. 411-416.
[25] Carpenter, 'Meetings of Henry III and Louis IX', pp. 7, 19, 20, 21.
[26] For details of Henry's treatment of the vulnerable, see Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward,* pp. 126-30, 138 and 152-3.
[27] Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community,* pp. 4-5. See also chapter one, pp

of 1258 were too radical for them to countenance.[28] However, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Boniface of Savoy offered Henry no help. Unlike Edmund of Abingdon in 1234,[29] he made no attempt to reconcile the reformers and the king. He could have mediated between them and moderated the reforms.[30] As the head of the English church, the other bishops looked to him as their leader. By choosing not to intervene, and not to attempt to support the king in a constructive way, Boniface gave the reformers, whether he intended it or not, more power and legitimacy. This must have greatly disappointed Henry as they were kin and he had engineered his rise to the archbishopric.

However, by 1261, Henry was doing all he could to appeal to the English bishops, including Boniface. In 1261, Henry regained control of his government. He did this by alternating between coercion and persuasion. This was mainly achieved by stays in the Tower and outside it. The militaristic side of Henry's return to power was balanced with acts of piety for all observers to see. Henry also needed to persuade earthly observers of his right to rule. During Henry's three stays in the Tower, he made grants to bishops. This was most likely done to both remind bishops of their obligations to him and to encourage them to support him by helping him re-establish his authority. Henry made gifts to the bishops of Salisbury, Exeter, London, Rochester and the Archbishop of Canterbury.[31] The Bishop of Salisbury in 1261 was Giles of Bridport. He was one of the council of twenty-four in 1258 and was chosen by the king, in 1261, to arbitrate between him and the barons. He was also committed to pastoral

[28] Ibid, p. 105.
[29] The Marshal rebellion is examined in more detail in this thesis p. 78.
[30] Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community*, pp. 105-6. For another account of Boniface's role in the period of baronial revolt and rebellion, see L.E. Wilshire, 'Boniface of Savoy, Carthusian and Archbishop of Canterbury, 1207-1270' in J. Hogg (ed.) *Analecta Cartusiana* 31 (1977), 1-90. See pp. 51- 86 for the reform period. Wiltshire presents Boniface on the side of the reformers and paints his departure for France in 1262 as voluntary exile.
[31] To the bishop of Salisbury: *CR, 1259-61*, pp. 349, 406. To the bishop of Exeter: *CR, 1259-61*, p. 355. To the bishop of London: *CPR, 1258-66*, p. 187 and *CR, 1261-4*, p. 2. To the bishop of Rochester: *CPR, 1258-66*, p. 168. To the archbishop of Canterbury: *CChR*, vol. 2, pp. 37, 38.

reform and was no pawn of the king.[32] He was granted ten living dams of bream on 22 February 1261 and six bucks on 12 July 1261.[33] The Bishop of Exeter was Walter of Bronescombe. In 1250, he acted for Henry at the papal *curia* to confirm Aymer de Lusignan's election to the Bishopric of Winchester. In 1251, he was Henry's proctor at the papal *curia*. As Bishop of Exeter (elected 23 February 1258) he continued in royal service, acting as a royal negotiator and adviser. In early 1263, he was one of Henry's proctors at Louis's court. According to Denton, Walter was 'one of the few markedly royalist bishops among a generally Montfortian episcopate'.[34] Henry's patronage of Walter can be seen as expected, due to his faithful service, but Henry needed to retain the loyalty of men who supported him. Walter was granted on 7 March twenty dams of bream and forty pikes for his fishponds.[35] These were quite generous grants, and there was no charge for them, demonstrating Henry's regard for both bishops.

However, the Bishops of London and Rochester, and the Archbishop of Canterbury all received greater gifts. The Bishop of London not only received wine but was allowed to retain the ecclesiastical benefices that he had from the king's patronage at the time of his election to bishop, provided the pope would provide an indulgence.[36] Furthermore, Henry ordered the bailiffs and lieges of Ireland to protect the bishop's benefices in Ireland.[37] This grant was potentially lucrative due to the incomes from various benefices. The Bishop of London at the time was Henry de Wingham, a former royal clerk who had been made the king's chancellor on 5 January 1255. He also accompanied the king abroad in November 1259. In 1260 he was

[32] P. Hoskin, 'Bridport, Giles of (d. 1262)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004), viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3403 (accessed 20/02/2022).
[33] *CR, 1259-61,* pp. 349 and 406.
[34] J.H. Denton, 'Bronescombe, Walter of [Walter de Exonia] (c. 1220–1280), bishop of Exeter.' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2004), viewed online at: https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-37225 (accessed 20/02/2022).
[35] *CR, 1259-61,* p. 355.
[36] For the wine, see *CR, 1261-4,* p. 2.
[37] *CPR, 1258-66,* p. 187

one of the two neutral bishops of the committee of six bishops chosen to investigate the charges against Simon de Montfort. His prudence and moderation were praised by the chroniclers.[38] He was therefore no staunch royalist and was respected by a variety of individuals with different ambitions. He was a vital person who Henry needed to convince to act on his behalf.

The Bishop of Rochester's brother Abel of St Martin and John de Estwood were given permission to make attorneys in the bishop's name for one year. The bishop was in Rome at the time and this grant allowed for the bishop's business to be conducted back in England.[39] The Bishop of Rochester at this time was Lawrence of St Martin. He was a royal clerk who may have served William de Valence, one of Henry's half-brothers. In 1244 he became one of Henry's chief advisers in ecclesiastical affairs and was a member of the English delegation at the Council of Lyons in 1245. When he was elected bishop, Henry supported his candidacy. Lawrence remained in royal service as bishop. According to Joan Greatrex, Lawrence played no 'active' role during the period of baronial revolt and rebellion but the sack of Rochester by the barons in 1264 may have been an 'act of revenge' against Lawrence because of his association with Henry.[40]

Boniface of Savoy received the most generous gifts from Henry while he was in the Tower. This is perhaps indicative of just how much Henry needed his support. He was granted two charters. The first granted him and his successors a weekly market at Petersfield, the second granted a weekly market and fair on the vigil, feast, and morrow of St Dunstan at his

---

[38] A.J. Musson, 'Wingham, Henry of (d. 1262)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford Univerity Press: Oxford, 2004), viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29742 (accessed 10/03/2022).
[39] *CPR, 1258-66,* p. 168.
[40] J. Greatrex, 'St Martin, Laurence de (d. 1274), bishop of Rochester.' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), viewed online at: https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-50343 (accessed 22/02/2022).

manor of Mayfield. The second charter also granted another weekly market and a yearly fair on the vigil, day, and morrow of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary at his manor of Harrow.[41] Most significantly, Henry did not make Boniface pay for the issuing of these charters. This highlights Henry's generosity towards Boniface. Despite being the queen's uncle, he was no pawn of Henry's. He had acted against the king when he felt it was appropriate.[42]

Henry also allowed the Bishop of Connor to be confirmed without taking fealty from him. He instead allowed the dean and chapter of Armagh, 'to save the labour and expense of the new bishop' to take his fealty, provided that these actions would not be drawn into a precedent to the prejudice of the king's rights.[43] This generosity may well just represent the reality of Henry's power at the start of 1261; he had no time to interfere in an election especially one in Ireland. Additionally, Katherine Harvey has stressed that disagreements over episcopal elections during the thirteenth-century were rare. Most of the appeals made to Rome in this period originated from discord in the electing chapter or due to unhappiness with archepiscopal decisions.[44] There are examples of Henry getting heavily involved in the Winchester bishopric, but generally he favoured persuasion tactics. Mostly, cathedral chapters accepted the candidate supported by the king.[45] One could therefore argue that Henry's lack of interference reflects the limits of his power. Even if he disagreed with a candidate, especially in Ireland, there may not have been much he could do. Nevertheless, Henry was under no obligation to confirm elections and by displaying magnanimity to the Irish religious he may have hoped to encourage them to think of him as their generous and just lord who would defend their privileges. Perhaps

---

[41] *CChR*, vol. 2, p. 38.
[42] For a thorough discussion of Boniface of Savoy's role during Henry's reign see Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community*, especially, pp. 13, 105-6, 123-4, and 137. See also, Wilshire, 'Boniface of Savoy, Carthusian and Archbishop of Canterbury', see especially pp. 41-87.
[43] *CPR, 1258-66*, p. 146.
[44] K. Harvey, *Episcopal Appointments in England c.1214-1344: From Episcopal Election to Papal Provision*, (Ashgate: Farnham, 2014), p. 71
[45] Ibid, pp. 76-7.

this was an effective strategy, no Irish bishops became Montfortian bishops. Additionally, the privacy of such an act may have served to convince the recipients that the king was genuine and so encouraged them to support him.

The bishops who received multiple gifts from the king were, therefore, a mixture of men. Some had long histories of royal service but none of them followed Henry blindly. Such men had the potential to be acceptable arbitrators to both the king and the barons. Henry was clearly aware, therefore, that these were the sorts of men who would enable him to reach a settlement with his barons, which did occur with the treaty of Kingston. Most of the gifts that Henry granted the bishops while he was in the Tower were small and private acts. These private acts would have only been known to the recipients, but they still would have encouraged those whom Henry wished to encourage to support him, and the privacy of the acts may have encouraged them to aid him.

Henry also rewarded those who had served him, or his family, well. This can be seen in Henry's generosity towards the Abbot of Peterborough, a known associate of Edward. He helped Edward fund his rebellion against his father in 1260 and was made treasurer in June 1261.[46] On 27 March 1261, two days after the feast of the Annunciation, Henry, at the insistence of the abbot, gave eight oaks to Henry de Fraxino, the abbot's nephew, from the forest of Axiholt.[47] Both the Abbot of Peterborough and the Archdeacon of Ely, who was a papal chaplain and became Henry's chancellor, received royal patronage and this would have

[46] H.W. Ridgeway, 'What Happened in 1261?', in A. Jobson (ed), *Baronial Reform and Revolution in England, 1258-67* (Boydell Press: Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016), 89-108, at p. 96.
[47] *CR, 1259-61,* pp. 363-4.

made it clear to the recipients of the king's gifts that those who were loyal to the king would be rewarded.[48]

Henry also appealed to saints to help him recover his power. He was flexible in appealing to local saints as can be seen by Henry's preparation before the battle of Northampton in April 1264. He took advantage of his location close to Oxford to appeal to St Frideswide, even though it was believed to be bad luck for a king to enter her church in Oxford. Frideswide was an English princess who took a vow of celibacy. Despite this, the Mercian king Æthelbald wanted to seduce her. She escaped him by fleeing to Oxford. He was punished for his actions by being temporarily blinded but was cured at Bampton via her intercession.[49] Despite this legend, John of Darlington, Henry's confessor, convinced him to risk entering her church.[50] Henry's actions were clearly well-known and well-regarded. The annalist of Osney stated that Henry entered the church with great devotion and that God rewarded his piety with victory.[51]

Due to the fortuitous chronicle record detailing Henry's interactions with St Frideswide before the battle at Northampton, it becomes apparent just how important the veneration of saints was and how willing Henry was to take advantage of his surroundings. Before 1264, there was very little reference in the governmental documents to St Frideswide but before and after the battle of Northampton, she received attention that was linked, in the minds of contemporaries, with earthly success. Henry believed in her efficacy and thanked her for his success.

---

[48] To the abbot of Peterborough: *CR, 1259-61,* 363-4 and 414. To the archdeacon of Ely: *CPR, 1258-66,* 166. *CR, 1259-61,* pp. 415, 463.
[49] D.H. Farmer, *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints,* 5th edition revised, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 315-6.
[50] W.A. Wright (ed.), *The Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester,* 2 parts (London, H.M.S.O., 1887), p. 747.
[51] 'Annals of Osney' in *Annales Monastici,* 5 vols (London: Longman, 1864-9), vol. 4, pp. 142-3. Henceforth *Annales Monastici* will be referred to as *AM.*

In the St Frideswide case, one not only has chronicle evidence but governmental records. On 25 March, Henry made a grant 'for the weal of the souls of the king, his ancestors and successors' to the prior of St Frideswide's 100s p.a. for the maintenance of a chaplain to celebrate divine service in St Frideswide's honour.[52] Henry may have purposely made the gift on the Annunciation to highlight Frideswide's similarity to Mary as a pious virgin. Furthermore, the illustrious date would have raised the prestige of the gift, showing deeper veneration for Frideswide. He gave two and a half marks for maintaining four wax candles to burn continuously around her shrine.[53] Henry also patronised the prior and convent of St Frideswide by giving them two oaks.[54] Additionally, he granted two pardons, specifically 'out of reverence for St Frideswide', one of them to Juliana, an outlaw's the wife, who had received her husband when he was an outlaw.[55] The veneration of St Frideswide was extensive and the setting up of a chaplain to perpetually celebrate mass for her is notable. By doing so, Henry was leaving an indelible mark on the church of St Frideswide. The extent of the patronage before the battle of Northampton may be linked with the seriousness that Henry faced. The greater the gift, the greater the hope was that prayers would be answered.

## 2) A 'Captive king': between Lewes and Evesham[56]

[52] *CPR, 1258-66,* p. 308.
[53] Ibid, p. 308.
[54] *CR, 1261-4,* p. 335.
[55] *CPR, 1258-66,* p. 309 (2).
[56] This is Benjamin Wild's phrase. See B.L. Wild, 'A Captive King: King Henry III Between the Battles of Lewes and Evesham, 1264–5', in J. Burton et al. (ed), *Thirteenth Century England XIII: Proceedings of the Paris Conference* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011), 41-56, at p. 41.

So far, this section has focused on times where Henry's authority may not have been secure, but he did have some latitude in his actions. This was particularly so in 1261 and 1262 when he believed he had defeated his barons. This was not the case after the battle of Lewes when Henry was Simon's captive. Simon was the *de facto* ruler of the kingdom. Henry had little control over many of his actions, and Simon used him in ceremonies as a prop. This can most clearly be seen in the 1265 parliament that began on 20 January 1265. On 14 February, a special meeting was held in the Chapter House of Westminster Abbey. At the meeting, the Montfortians declared that Henry had sworn an oath that neither he nor Edward would act against Simon, Gilbert de Clare (Earl of Gloucester), the citizens of London, or anyone who supported them. They further declared that Henry had promised to uphold Magna Carta, the Charter of the Forest, and the Montfortian constitution. Henry may have been present at the ceremony, but he took no active part in it and did not speak. This was incredible. Henry had designed the Chapter House as a grand venue for his speech-making. As Ambler has remarked, by appropriating the Chapter House and denying Henry the right to speak, a potent point was being made about who was holding power.[57] The event also demonstrated the depths of Henry's humiliation and powerlessness. At this nadir in Henry's life, the only recourse for aid was from God and the saints.

Fortunately, a partial oblation roll covers the period from 1 January 1265 to 4 August 1265 (date of the battle of Evesham). The roll is detailed in describing which masses were dedicated to saints, the oblations offered in the royal chapel, and the oblations offered outside the royal chapel, and there is some specific information about gold coins being offered before

[57] Ambler, *Song of Simon de Montfort*, p. 297 and Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community*, p. 181.

saints' relics and altars. The detailed information stops on 2 July. After that, only Henry's location is recorded.[58]

Only one other partial oblation roll has survived, covering 28 October 1238 to 7 May 1239. All these entries are detailed, none of them only record location.[59] If one counts the days where there is more information than just the location in the 1265 oblation roll, 182 days are covered. In the 1238/9 roll, 192 days are covered. This means that both rolls cover a similar period and the total amount spent in these periods can be better compared. Wild noted this in his analysis of these rolls and made direct comparisons between Henry's actions on the same liturgical feast days.[60] He observed that, despite Henry's straitened circumstances, a similar amount was spent on oblations and alms in both rolls.[61] The total spent in 1238/9 was £56 3*s* 6*d*.[62] In 1265, it was £58 15*s* 3*d*.[63] On average, 70*d* was spent each day in 1238/9 and 78*d* in 1265. As Wild has highlighted, what is noticeably different between the two rolls is the amount of money that was spent on masses, instead of oblations. More was spent on masses rather than oblations[64] In 1265, one can be certain that the money spent on masses was in the royal chapel.[65] In 1238/9, it is less clear, but I have only included the figures for masses that were not specified as being for services or events outside the royal chapel.

The money spent on alms when Henry was travelling is specified in both rolls, making it likely that, provided there is no contrary information, one can assume that the money for masses refers to masses in the royal chapel. In 1238/9, a total of £17 10*s* 8*d* was spent on chapel

[58] TNA E101/349/30.
[59] TNA C 47/3/44.
[60] Wild, 'A Captive King', pp. 52-54 in particular.
[61] Ibid, p. 52.
[62] TNA C 47/3/44.
[63] TNA E101/349/30.
[64] Wild, 'A Captive King', p. 52.
[65] TNA E101/349/30.

masses. The average amount spent daily on such masses was 22*d*.[66] This contrasts with 1265 when the total amount spent on masses was £39 5*s* 6*d*, and the daily average 53*d*.[67] The daily average amount of oblations offered outside the chapel was 10*d*. in 1238/9, and 2*d* in 1265. In sum, the amount of money spent on oblations, as a total, does not appear to have changed much since 1238/9. The lack of survival of other rolls prevents any certainties but the change in where the money was being directed is interesting. Simon, being a pious man, would not have wanted to prevent Henry making oblations to God and the saints, at a personal level, as reducing the scale of one's veneration could imperil a soul.[68] However, he would have been concerned with any larger earthly group who witnessed his oblations. As Wild has noted, Henry's almsgiving suffered in 1265.[69] It was his standard practice to give 4*s*. 2*d*. when he was travelling. The last time such alms were given was 8 May 1265.[70] After that, despite travelling, no more alms were given. Henry's public pious acts, including the giving of alms, had the potential to encourage earthly observers to view him more favourably. Simon, whose authority became more and more precarious as 1265 progressed (especially after Gloucester's defection to the royalist cause and Edward's escape from captivity), would have become increasingly paranoid about who he could trust, and how long he was to remain in power.[71] Simon would have wanted to avoid anything that had the potential to give Henry any advantage over him.

A key argument that Wild made when he compared the two surviving oblation roles was about solemn masses. He used the technical definition of a solemn mass to define it as a mass where most parts of it were sung, incense was used, and a deacon and a subdeacon

[66] TNA C 47/3/44.
[67] TNA E101/349/30.
[68] For a detailed examination of Simon's religion, see Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, pp. 77-105.
[69] Wild, 'A Captive King', p. 54.
[70] TNA E101/349/30.
[71] For a narrative of this time, see Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, pp. 331-345.

officiated with the priest.[72] Taking this definition, Wild argued that a solemn mass would have been 'more visually and acoustically impressive'.[73] He noted that no solemn masses were mentioned in the other surviving oblation roll and suggested that Henry was engaging in more elaborate masses to obtain 'deliverance' from his current situation.[74] He also argued that the solemn mass evidence indicated that Henry was being permitted 'a certain freedom in his religious devotions'.[75]

Although certain parts of Wild's argument are convincing, especially the idea that Henry celebrated elaborate masses to secure saintly support, there are some problems with it. Significantly, he states there were no solemn masses in the 1238/9 oblation but does not fully explore the implications. It seems implausible that a king as pious as Henry and as fond of ceremony, with a track record of extravagant, public displays, held no solemn masses in 192 days. What also seems bizarre about the 1238/9 oblation roll is there is only one mass which is dedicated to a saint: the Virgin Mary (and that is one of the masses performed that day) on 27 April, not a liturgically significant day that year.[76] A problem one has with the evidence from these partial oblation rolls is that it is hard to establish a baseline. These rolls were written nearly thirty years apart, probably by a different person or people. They may have recorded things differently and the way royal masses were recorded may be changed. It is possible that there was no distinction drawn between different types of masses in the 1238/9 roll. The 1265 roll is more detailed than the 1238/9 one. This might be due to the circumstances of Henry's captivity, but it may also be because the way in which information was recorded changed. Unfortunately, due to the lack of survival of other oblation rolls, we cannot know for certain

[72] Wild, 'A Captive King', pp. 52-3.
[73] Ibid, p. 53.
[74] Ibid, p. 53.
[75] Ibid, p. 54.
[76] TNA C 47/3/44.

what was the standard practice for scribes recording royal oblations, but for Henry to have not had a single elaborate mass in the days recorded in 1238/9, which included important liturgical feast days such as Shrove Tuesday, Ash Wednesday, Easter, and the Ascension seems unlikely.

Due to the potential problem with the solemn mass argument, it seems important to view both solemn and 'regular' masses as important in trying to analyse Henry's devotions. The broad range of saints that Henry appealed to in 1265 is striking. Between 1 January – 1 July, masses were dedicated to twenty-seven recipients. Two of the masses were dedicated to the anniversaries of Henry's sister Joan, and his mother, Isabella of Angoulême. These occurred on the anniversaries of Henry's relatives. One mass was dedicated to the Trinity. All the other masses were dedicated to saints. Twenty-four of these saints were only honoured with one mass such as St Agatha, St Valentine, and St Julian.[77] Most of these masses were dedicated to the saint whose feast day it was.[78] Only St Stephen, St John the Evangelist, St Agnes, St Batilda, St Milburga, St David, St Peter (St Peter *in Cathedra*) and St Augustine had masses dedicated to them on days that were not their feast days. This suggests that more thought was put into dedicating masses to them. It made a lot of sense to dedicate a mass to the saint whose feast day it was. To choose another saint was a more conscious choice. However, three of the feast days, St Peter *in Cathedra*, St Milburga, and St David, were either one or two days after the actual feast, suggesting the choice was connected to the proximity of the feast. Having said that, the masses devoted to a saint on a day that was not on or close to their feast day may not reveal much about Henry's regard for them. Henry did not choose to dedicate every mass to the saint whose feast day it was. He dedicated a single mass to seven native (English or Anglo-

[77] These saints were: Edward the Confessor, the Virgin Mary, Thomas Becket, St Stephen, John the Evangelist, St Marcellus, St Julian, St Agnes, St Batilda, St Blaise, St Agatha, St Peter, St Matthew, St Milburga, St Chad, St David, St Mark, St Erconwald, St John of Beverley, St Augustine, St Osyth, St Paul, St Etheldreda, and St Valentine.

[78] St Marcellus, St Julian, St Blaise, St Agatha, St Matthew, St Chad, St Mark, St Erconwald, St John of Beverley, St Osyth, St Etheldreda, St Paul, and St Valentine.

Saxon) saints (St Batilda, St Milburga, St Chad, St Osyth, St Etheldreda, St Erconwald, and John of Beverley). Henry had shown some regard for these saints during earlier times in his reign. On his East Anglian pilgrimages, St Etheldreda received attention and John of Beverley and William of York received attention when he was in the vicinity of their cult centres.[79] One must be careful about reading too much into the dedication of masses, but what it does demonstrate is that Henry thought about the saints in question enough to dedicate a mass to them in the hope to gain their aid during his struggle with Simon de Montfort.

As Wild has argued, the two saints that had the most masses dedicated to them were Edward the Confessor and the Virgin Mary.[80] Twenty-eight masses were dedicated to the Confessor, demonstrating Henry's reliance on the saint in his time of need. Twelve masses were dedicated to Mary.[81] All but one of them were on Saturday.[82] Saturday was the Virgin's day and so one would expect masses to be dedicated to her. However, every Saturday mass was not dedicated to Mary. In many cases in 1265, the mass was not recorded as being dedicated to anyone. The only other saint who had multiple masses dedicated to him was Thomas Becket and that only occurred three times. Henry's veneration of Becket should be seen in the context of his veneration of other native saints. Many of the native saints who had at least one mass dedicated to them (St Batilda, St Milburga, St Osyth and St Etheldreda) were saints with royal connections who had been subject to violence. St Osyth, example, was the niece of Wulfhere, king of the Mercians. She desired to remain a virgin and founded a community in Chich. She was kidnapped by pirates who beheaded her because she refused to

[79] For details on Henry's treatment of William of York, see above, pp. 134-5, 144, 185, 207. For St Etheldreda, see p. 133. For John of Beverley, see p. 185.
[80] Wild, 'A Captive King', p. 53
[81] Wild focused on the solemn masses alone, rather than the total number of masses to a saint. For his numbers on solemn masses, see Wild, 'A Captive King', p. 53. However, even with his focus on solemn masses, his point on which saints received the most attention is the same as mine.
[82] TNA E101/349/30.

worship idols.[83] This was perhaps a pointed gesture on Henry's part to his captors. Henry probably felt a kindred spirit with them as he too had been humiliated and he may have feared that he would suffer a death which could be construed as martyrdom. This was a credible fear as Simon had threatened to execute Richard of Cornwall at Lewes unless Edward surrendered.[84] Additionally, Simon, before the battle of Evesham, put Henry in borrowed armour and sent him onto the battlefield, with the hope that he might be killed in the heat of battle.[85] These native saints would surely be disposed to intercede for him in his hour of need.

The 1265 oblation roll contains details about special offerings made outside the chapel. The roll specifies that on three occasions, on the feasts of the Conversion of Paul (25 January), Maundy Thursday (2 April) and Easter Sunday (5 April), Henry made offerings to the Confessor's shrine. The highest amount offered was on the Conversion of Paul (£7 3s 3d and seven obols, the highest daily amount in the roll).[86] Westminster Abbey was also dedicated to St Peter.[87] Via the offering, Henry seems to have combined his regard for the papacy and the Confessor. During 1261 and 1262, the papacy helped Henry return to power.[88] He clearly believed they could help again in the form of intercession from St Peter himself. It is hard to say how many people may have witnessed Henry's pious actions or what other actions may have supported his veneration. There is no household roll covering this period, so we cannot know how many paupers Henry fed on this day or if a feast was held. Given what is known of this period, and that Simon humiliated him ritually, is unlikely that Simon let Henry engage in

[83] J. Blair, 'Osgyth [St Osgyth, Osyth, Osith] (fl. late 7th cent.), abbess of Chich. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), viewed online at: https://doi-org.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/20931(accessed 30/03/2021).
[84] This information was relayed to me by Dr Andrew Spencer.
[85] Ambler, *Song of Simon de Montfort*, p. 327.
[86] TNA E101/349/30.
[87] T.S. Fenster and J. Wogan-Browne, (trans. and ed.), *The History of Saint Edward the King* (Arizona: Arizona University Press, 2008), p. 74.
[88] For the papal documents against the Provisions, by Alexander IV and Urban IV, see Treharne and Sanders, *Documents of the Baronial Movement*, pp. 238-247 (Alexander's letters), and pp. 248-251.

his normal acts of largesse.[89] That does not mean that Henry's actions were worthless in terms of persuading an earthly audience of his piety, demonstrating a key quality needed in a ruler. Even displaying one's piety to a small audience, especially if it contained powerful lay or ecclesiastical prelates, could persuade those wavering in their support for Simon to help Henry. However, the only audience that Henry could be certain of in viewing his pious acts were God and the saints. Ultimately, given God's omnipotence, Henry would have placed his faith in Him and other efficacious saints.

On Maundy Thursday, Henry offered one gold coin at Edward's shrine and spent 8*s* 4*d* on tunics for 100 paupers.[90] In normal times, from the partial evidence that has survived, Henry fed 150 paupers when the queen was with him, and 100 paupers when she was not.[91] The queen was in France at this time, trying to raise an army and support from continental rulers to return Henry to power. Given the liturgical significance of the day and Henry's past actions, 100 paupers is a low number. In 1260, Henry fed 321 paupers on Maundy Thursday. Henry had more control over his expenditure in 1260 and it seems like a more accurate reflection of his desires.[92] It seems that Simon was reducing Henry's more public expenditure to reduce the visibility of Henry's virtues.

By venerating the Confessor on a liturgically important day Henry stressed the importance of the Confessor to him and appealed to him to rescue him. He did the same thing on Easter Sunday, offering another gold coin at the Confessor's shrine. Henry also offered gifts

---

[89] For an account of the humiliation, see Ambler, *Song of Simon de Montfort*, p. 297 and Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community*, p. 181.
[90] TNA E101/349/30.
[91] For a detailed analysis of the almsgiving in the 1259/60 household roll, see S. Dixon-Smith, "Feeding the Poor to Commemorate the Dead: the *Pro Anima* Almsgiving of Henry III of England 1227-1272" (University College London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2003), pp. 273-278.
[92] TNA E101/349/27.

at Westminster Abbey more generally, eight times (obit of the Confessor, Epiphany, Purification, Annunciation, Good Friday, Easter Saturday, Easter Sunday, and Palm Sunday). On the feast of the Annunciation, one gold coin was offered at the girdle of the Virgin Mary in Westminster Abbey.[93] This implies that that offering was for the Virgin Mary, rather than the Confessor. On the Purification, the Virgin was most likely the intended recipient of the offering. As the coin was offered at the great altar at Westminster, Henry may have been thinking about the other saints and individuals associated with the church. This blanket veneration may have been at play in the major liturgical feasts listed above. Another three coins were offered at the great altar at Westminster, one on each day (obit feast of the Confessor, Epiphany and Palm Sunday), and it is probable that the offerings were for a variety of individuals associated with the abbey. On the other two feast days where one gold coin was offered (Good Friday and Easter Saturday), it is only stated that they were offered at Westminster church suggesting that the offerings were not just for one saint.[94]

On Easter Saturday, 5*s* was spent on a pilgrimage around London and 49*s* 6*d* were offered for the churches in the city of London.[95] It is not clear whether the offerings at the churches were made by Henry or a proxy, but the more public nature of these offerings may have provided Henry with an opportunity to convince the Londoners, who were staunch supporters of Montfort, that he was as pious as his rival and desired their support.

Henry also made offerings to Anglo-Saxon saints. When he was still a captive, he took advantage of being in the Gloucester and Hereford (26 April – 1 August) and made offerings to St Kenelm and St Æthelberht'. As was the case with the masses dedicated to native saints,

[93] TNA E101/349/30.
[94] Ibid.
[95] Ibid.

Henry's appeal to these men was linked with his desire to associate himself with royal martyrs. Unlike with the masses mentioned above, many of his interactions with these saints were performed outside the king's chapel and so were intended to send a public message to those of his subjects who were present. On 27 April 1265, Henry was in Gloucestershire, and he offered one gold coin at Kenelm's shrine. Kenelm's legend portrayed him as a boy king who was martyred when he was murdered by on his sister's orders..[96] Like St Kenelm, Henry had been a boy king and was currently having trouble with his own sister and her ambitious husband.[97] The public devotion shown to Kenelm, on a day when Henry may have been thinking about the unhappy fate of his extended family, represented a clear dig at Simon de Montfort and was a way of warning his subjects of the true nature of his relationship with Simon.

Henry's use of St Æthelberht' demonstrates the responsive nature of his piety. He took advantage of his presence at Hereford to stress his English links. Like St Kenelm, St Æthelberht' had also suffered martyrdom. He was beheaded by Offa, king of Mercia, in 794. Originally Offa offered his daughter in marriage to Æthelberht', but why he changed his mind and had him killed is a mystery. The execution was said to have taken place at Sutton Walls, four miles from Hereford and, allegedly, a pious monk moved the body to the site of Hereford Cathedral.[98] On 11 May 1265, there was a solemn mass at the dedication of Hereford Cathedral and at that mass Henry offered 5s. at the great altar.[99] The church was dedicated to St Æthelberht' and the Virgin Mary and so Henry was showing devotion to both of those saints. The next day, Henry offered 20d. at Æthelberht''s shrine. That date was two days before the anniversary of the battle of Lewes and it is possible that Henry was trying to invoke the aid of a local, royal saint to expunge the memory of the defeat on that day. Henry continued to make

[96] Farmer, *Oxford Dictionary of Saints*, p. 253.
[97] In reality, Kenelm had died as an adult, but the story of the boy king persisted.
[98] Farmer, *Oxford Dictionary of Saints*, p. 151.
[99] E101/349/30.

offerings at the shrine. He even made offerings on important liturgical dates to increase the prestige of the gifts. He made offerings on the vigil of the Ascension, on Pentecost, and the morrow of Pentecost. On the feast (20 May) and morrow of St Æthelberht' he made offerings at Æthelberht''s shrine. On the saint's feast day, he made a particularly generous offering (when compared to offerings made during the period) of 5s.[100] It is also worth bearing in mind that while the king was at Hereford there were other days when masses were mentioned but there was no indication about whether the mass was dedicated to a saint. It is possible that Henry displayed more devotion to St Æthelberht'.[101] What Henry's devotion to St Æthelberht' demonstrates is that he was prepared to use local saints to his advantage in the only way that he had left to him. He emphasised his English roots, portrayed himself as a victim who could become a martyr, and used his proximity to the saint in question to call upon their spiritual power to aid him in his plight.

## Part Two: After Evesham

Simon's death on the battlefield at Evesham did not bring his rivalry with Henry to an end. If anything, death made Simon more dangerous to Henry. Immediately after Simon's death, miracles were associated with him. The most extensive account of Simon's miracles can be found in his miracle collection, but the Lanercost chronicle also has a detailed account.[102] The Lanercost chronicler endowed Simon with 'heavenly wisdom', painting him as a protector of the English Church and kingdom.[103] He compared him to St Peter, dubbing him Simon the

[100] Ibid.
[101] Ibid.
[102] For a through account of Simon and his miracles, see Halliwell. (ed.), *The Miracles of Simon de Montfort*, pp. 67-110. For the Lanercost chronicle, see J. Stevenson (ed.), *Chronicon de Lanercost 1201-1346* (Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1839).
[103] *Chronicon de Lanercost*, pp. 99, 101-2.

Less due to his vigils and prayers.[104] He also stated that the man who had defiled Simon's body by removing the genitals suffered a horrible death.[105]

Multiple observers painted Simon's victory over Henry at Lewes as divinely inspired.[106] The Lanercost chronicler also disparaged the royalists. Before the battle, Henry stayed at Lewes Priory and the chronicler compared their actions with their virtuous counterparts. While Simon's men were confessing and receiving the cross, the royalists ate and drank to excess and even committed obscene acts with prostitutes on the altar of St Pancras (whom Lewes Priory was dedicated to) in the priory.[107] These accounts present Simon as a more pious and worthy man than Henry. Henry simply does not have the same positive portrayal as Simon in many contemporary sources, especially those that were composed during the period of baronial revolt and rebellion.

However, this does not necessarily mean that Simon was far more popular and admired than Henry. As Ambler has convincingly argued, Simon benefitted immensely from the infrastructure of the Church, via the support of Montfortian churchmen. The English Church 'had the infrastructure, and its clergy the experience, to communicate political programmes'.[108] The English Church had been involved in disseminating the texts of momentous charters including Henry I's Coronation Charter. Most significantly, especially after 1225, when the sentence of excommunication became the mode of enforcement of Magna Carta and the

---

[104] Ibid, p. 111-113.
[105] Ibid, p. 117.
[106] See, for example, 'Annals of Dunstable', *AM,* vol. 3, p. 232; 'Wykes' Chronicle', *AM,* vol. 4, p. 152; 'Annals of Worcester', *AM,* vol. 4, p. 451; *Chronicon de Lanercost,* p. 74. The most detailed account that portrays Simon as a holy defender of England who was an instrument of God can be found in the *Song of Lewes.* See P. Coss, P(ed.), *Thomas Wright's Political Songs of England: From the Reign of John to that of Edward II, with a new introduction by Peter Coss* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), especially pp. 75 and 78.
[107] *Chronicon de Lanercost,* p. 74.
[108] Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community,* p. 176.

'balance of responsibility for publicizing the Charter tilted towards the bishops'[109], churchmen were accustomed to 'publicizing political programmes on an ambitious scale'.[110] Furthermore, men who would become lead supporters of the Montfortian regime had experience of disseminating political programmes. Richard Gravesend, for example, who was made the bishop of Lincoln in 1258 and became a Montfortian bishop, had, as the dean of Lincoln in 1255, publicised Magna Carta and the Charter of the Forest and the accompanying sentence of excommunication.[111] In sum, Simon's supporters had the power and apparatus to support him and present him in the best possible light. Henry III and the royalists were well-aware of the disadvantage they were at. In 1262, when Henry briefly regained control over his government, he ordered the arrest of anyone who presumed 'to persuade the people or preaches against us and our honour'.[112] John Mansel, one of Henry's leading counsellors, despaired at the situation wishing that Henry had the same standard of preachers supporting him as Simon had.[113] He knew how crucial it was to win this propaganda war of whose cause was right and just. Henry did not have preachers supporting his cause and that hamstrung him in trying to persuade people to support him. The frustration and anger that likely resulted from this situation led Henry, in the aftermath of the battle of Evesham, to want to obliterate everything connected with Simon. His attitude softened in the face of resolute opposition, but he did all he could to strip Simon of his halo.

Evesham to start of the Siege of Kenilworth (4 August 1265 to 24 June 1266)

[109] Ibid, p. 176.
[110] Ibid, p. 177.
[111] Ibid, p. 177.
[112] Ibid, p. 145.
[113] Ibid, p. 145 n. 123.

From the battle of Evesham to the start of the siege of Kenilworth, Henry began to try and regain his authority. A key element in his recovery of power was how he chose to treat Simon's memory and those who had supported him. Henry appears to have engaged in a mixture of conciliatory and aggressive acts to recover his former position.

One of the ways Henry tried to present himself as magnanimous and worthy of his return to power was in his use of the sacred. Immediately after the battle of Evesham, Henry took advantage of his location to thank local saints. Henry celebrated his victory in the city of Worcester. He remained there for five days (5 – 9 August 1265 inclusive). He then stayed at Gloucester for most of the rest of August.[114] Henry then remained in Gloucester for three weeks. This was a deliberate choice and seems to have been for numerous reasons, both pious and practical. One reason may well have been to give thanks to St Kenelm and St Æthelberht. This is likely because of Henry's veneration of them while a captive. He nearly died at Evesham, but these royal martyrs had played a role in his salvation.

Henry also used sacred places to legitimise his actions. On 16 September 1265, at Winchester, peace was proclaimed. As the capital of Wessex kingdom, the burial site of numerous royal Anglo-Saxons, and as the literal starting point of the Angevin dynasty (where Stephen made Henry of Anjou his heir).[115] By proclaiming peace there, Henry was making a conscious link with the English aspect of his dynasty, appealing to his native barons, and displaying his desire to rule with England's interests in mind.

[114] T. Craib (ed), *Itinerary of Henry III, 1215-1272,* (London, P.R.O, 1923), pp. 309-10.
[115] For a thorough discussion of Winchester's importance to Henry, see above, pp. 90, 93, 103, 107-8, 139-40, 208.

Henry also tried to appeal to the religious in his realm. He needed to prove that he was more worthy of their support and respect than Simon had ever been. The least powerful religious had suffered greatly from the disturbances in the realm. The Montfortians had been vicious in plundering places associated with royalists, aliens, and courtiers in 1263. During their plundering, anyone who was in the way, whether they were connected to the primary targets of not, suffered. These movements happened in the countryside and London.[116] The consequences of the disorders of 1263 dogged Simon de Montfort for most of the rest of his life. They associated his cause with violence, injustice, impiety, and greed.[117] Even the chroniclers who held Simon in high regard were critical of his conduct.[118]

Only six days after Evesham, Walter Giffard was made chancellor. In the closing years of Henry's reign, Walter became one of the king's most influential clerical counsellors and, due to the frequent absence of Boniface of Savoy, the *de facto* leader of the English church.[119] Between the end of August until mid-November, Walter received gifts of deer and other goods.[120] Henry also granted gifts to Walter's family members such as on 12 October 1265 to Maud, Walter's sister and the widow of William de Ebroicis, who had died at Evesham, the manors of her late husband to hold to the value of £60 per annum with wards, reliefs, and escheats.[121] Many of these acts would only have been known to the recipients but Walter's elevation to the king's chancellor would have been an act viewed by a much larger audience and would have demonstrated the king's regard for the bishop. It would also have demonstrated to a wider audience that the king would reward loyalty.

---

[116] Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, p. 234.
[117] Ibid, p. 237.
[118] See, for example, T. Stapleton, (ed.), *De Antiquis Legibus Liber Cronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londoniarum et quaedam, que contingebant temporibus illis ab anno MCLXXVIII ad annum MCCLXXIV cum appendice* (London: J B Nichols, 1846), p. 74 ; Luard, 'Annals of Dunstable', *AM*, vol. 3, p. 232.
[119] R. B. Dobson, 'Giffard, Walter (c.1225–1279)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford, 2004; online edn, Oct 2008), viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10654 (accessed 10/11/2017).
[120] *CR, 1264-8*, 69 and 70.
[121] *CPR, 1258-66*, p. 462.

The same is true for the bishop of Carlisle, Robert de Chaury who had also remained loyal to Henry. He had accompanied Henry to France in 1259 and was with him when he was Simon's prisoner.[122] He was clearly, therefore, someone Henry trusted and was grateful to. Unlike in Walter Giffard's place, Henry's grant to Robert was a private one. On 16 October 1265, Henry granted that Robert would not be distrained of his goods or possessions within his manor of Mymmes for the payment of debts for which he was bound to the king and to others.[123] Many of these grants made to the above bishops occurred around the time when Henry disinherited both those who had stood against him and their heirs. This implies that Henry felt secure enough to start displaying to the recipients of his patronage who was in favour and who was not.

A final more conciliatory method Henry employed to convince people to make peace was through ceremonial displays of magnanimity and opulence. These continued in the aftermath of demonstrating that the best of Henry's kingship had returned. Henry celebrated Christmas in ostentatious style at Northampton. On 20 December 1265, Henry wrote to the keepers of the city of London that he desired a thousand pounds of wax that was to be delivered by the keeper of the exchange of London and Canterbury to the king at Northampton with all haste.[124] Christmas was a time of rejoicing and provided a perfect opportunity to try and start anew, to draw a line under de Montfort's government. By holding Christmas at Northampton, the site of royalist victory before the humiliation of Lewes, Henry was symbolically erasing his captivity. Had the royalist army continued to succeed, Henry would have held an opulent ceremony, thanking God and displaying to his subjects that favour God had granted him.

---

[122] H. Summerson, 'Chaury, Robert de (d. 1278)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford, 2007) online edn, May 2008, viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/95124 (accessed 10/11/2020)
[123] *CPR, 1258-66*, p. 492.
[124] *CLR, 1260-67*, p. 191.

However, Henry's conciliatory acts did not last long. As Adrian Jobson has argued, in the weeks after Evesham the rebels' morale was rock-bottom.[125] On 7 August, Wallingford and Berkhamsted capitulated and on 14 August, Luke de Tany opened Chester's gates to Edward.[126] Additionally, the rebels released all the royalist prisoners that had been held since Lewes in a show of good faith. Simon de Montfort junior, despite all he had endured, was prepared to treat with Henry and received royal letters of protection in September.[127] Henry and the royalists were initially able to end the civil war in a short period of time. However, Henry made a grave miscalculation by choosing vengeance over reconciliation. He authorised the royalists to seize rebel estates and they engaged in pillaging.[128] Henry's ceremonial actions matched this vindictive tone, beginning at the parliament he called on the Nativity of the Virgin Mary. Even though Mary was the chief intercessor and could have been presented as the olive branch between Henry and his subjects, Henry instead deprived the city of London of its ancient liberties and privileges. Furthermore, the rebel leaders were imprisoned.[129] It must be remembered that Henry made a great show of taking counsel before making his decision about the Londoners. It was meant to make him seem fair.

Henry then convoked a parliament at Westminster that opened on the translation feast of the Confessor, 13 October. There, Henry wore his crown, displaying his regal majesty and underlining his resumption of power. Henry disinherited all those who had stood against him and their heirs.[130] The punitive nature of the disinheritance, on a feast day of the Confessor, a

---

[125] Jobson, *The First English Revolution,* p. 149.
[126] Ibid, p. 149.
[127] Ibid, p. 150.
[128] Ibid, p. 150.
[129] J.A. Giles, (trans. and ed.), *Matthew Paris English History from the year 1235 to 1273,* 3 vols (London: Henry G Bohn, 1852-4), vol. 3, Ibid, p. 356.
[130] Wright, *Robert of Gloucester,* pp. 767-8 and Gransden, *Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds,* p. 32.

king associated with peace and tranquillity, was jarring, and unusually vengeful for Henry. This demonstrated just how much Henry hated de Montfort. Even the heirs of people who may have been coerced into fighting for Simon faced total ruin.

Henry then made a display of destroying Simon's legacy. On the 26 October, at Canterbury, Henry made his son Edmund the earl of Leicester and seneschal of England.[131] It was a symbolic and literal takeover of the earldom of Leicester to the royal family. Edmund's creation as the earl of Leicester would have demonstrated to all powerful men of the kingdom that no quarter would be given to anyone who adhered to the dead earl. For Henry, due to his humiliation, the death of Montfort, was not enough to satisfy his desire for revenge. He wanted to obliterate every memory of him.

Just after this date the legate Ottobuono and Eleanor of Provence arrived in England. Ottobuono provided the spiritual arm to the punishment of those who had rebelled against Henry. The legate summoned all the prelates of England to assemble on 1 December at London. At this council the bishops of London, Winchester, Lincoln, and Chichester were publicly accused of aiding and counselling Simon against Henry and the honour of the kingdom. They were also accused, rightly, of excluding the legate from England. They were instructed to appear before him again in Easter 1266.[132] Two bishops, Richard Gravesend of Lincoln, and John Gervase of Winchester, proffered expensive fines for the recovery of Henry's favour, 500 marks and 1000 marks respectively.[133]

---

[131] Powicke, *Henry III and the Lord Edward*, p. 518.
[132] Ambler, *Bishops on the Political Community*, p. 187.
[133] Ibid, p. 187.

On 6 December 1265, Ottobuono held a council at New Temple in London, and he excommunicated Simon and all his supporters.[134] It was an aggressive act, aimed at publicly punishing those who had abandoned Henry. It was also, in the eyes of Henry and Ottobuono, a necessary cleansing. The suspended bishops had disobeyed Henry and the papacy. Their actions were sacrilegious. They had misused their power of excommunication and followed a traitorous excommunicate. Bishops were the kings of their dioceses. Like kings, their behaviour was meant to be emulated and they had a duty to not lead their flock astray. Due to their spiritual role, they had a greater latitude to cause irreparable damage to their congregations. As king, Henry could not allow such men to lead his subjects to Hell. Anger and vindictiveness certainly played a role in Henry's treatment of the Montfortian bishops, but one must not forget the religious aspect. The annalist of Dunstable presented Henry and the legate of one mind, who acted as they did because they had seen the physical and spiritual destruction of the kingdom. The annalist stressed that danger to souls was paramount in their attempts to reform the king and pacify the kingdom[135] Henry could only do that with people he trusted. Henry simply could not trust the suspended bishops, on and personal level, and for the good of his kingdom.

Siege of Kenilworth (25 June to 13 December 1266)

Henry's vindictive actions in the aftermath of Evesham extended the period of rebellion. After he disinherited all who had stood against him and their heirs at a parliament held on the translation feast of the Confessor, he ensured that the rebels would be resolute in their opposition to him. Many of them retreated to Kenilworth castle and prepared for a siege.

[134] A. Gransden, (ed. and trans.), *The Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds 1212-1301* (London: Nelson, 1964), p. 33.
[135] Luard, 'Annals of Dunstable', *AM*, vol. 3, p. 242.

The siege began on 25 June 1266 and ended 13 December 1266. It was the longest siege in English history.[136] During the siege, the Dictum of Kenilworth (issued 31 October 1266) was negotiated that agreed terms of the rebels' surrender.[137] They were considerably less draconian than the previous terms, but they were still punitive, and some rebels held out, especially in Ely.

One of the ways Henry tried to present himself in a favourable light was in his saint veneration, especially of Richard of Chichester, the former bishop of Chichester who had died in 1253 and had been canonised on 25 January 1262.[138] This was not the first time Henry had acknowledged the saint. The partial oblation roll of 1265, recorded 15 April as Richard's feast day. His actual feast day was 3 April.[139] Most of the entries in the roll do not refer to which saint's day it was. Therefore, the reference is significant, even if it was erroneous. Richard was only recently canonised and so a mistake is understandable. Whoever wrote the entry thought enough about Richard to mark his feast day. Whether Henry was concerned with the date in 1265 is unclear but his actions in 1266 suggest he may have had regard for the saint before. As Richard died in 1253, one cannot say for certain whether he would have become a Montfortian bishop or not. Walter de Cantilupe, the bishop of Worcester and one of Montfort's most ardent supporters, had led the inquiry into Richard's sanctity.[140] Richard had a similar outlook to the men who became Montfortian bishops. It is possible that he may have supported Simon. However, as Richard had not had the opportunity to pick a side, royalist or Montfortian, it provided Henry with the opportunity to present himself in a favourable light. It also allowed

[136] Wild, 'Siege of Kenilworth Castle', 13.
[137] See Wild, 'Reasserting Medieval Kingship', pp. 255-258. For the full text of the Dictum, see Treharne and Sanders, *Documents of the Baronial Movement,* pp. 316-337.
[138] For an account of Richard's life and sainthood, see C.H. Lawrence, 'Wyche, Richard of [St Richard of Chichester] (d.1253)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004); online edn, Jan 2008, viewed online at http://www.oxfordednb.com/view/article/23522 (accessed 30/03/2021).
[139] TNA E101/349/30.
[140] Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community,* p. 21.

him to display his affection for a saint who could be seen as embodying elements that the Montfortian bishops believed they embodied.

Henry had not had a straightforward relationship with Richard during his lifetime. Although Cardinal Odo of Chateauroux, in his eulogy of Richard, stressed that Henry was heavily involved in the canonisation process, he initially refused to accept Richard's election as bishop.[141] It was only when he was admonished by the pope that he relented.[142] Ralph Bocking, in his *Life* of St Richard presented Henry's poor conduct to the influence of evil courtiers who perverted Henry's 'naturally kind and…catholic' heart.[143] Henry's change of heart came due to the persuasion of good prelates who encouraged him to examine his conscience.[144] Bocking supported Cardinal Odo's presentation of Henry being highly involved in Richard's canonisation process by sending supplicatory letters attesting to Richard's holiness and miracles.[145] Due to his ambiguous relationship with Richard, which seems to have been similar to Henry's relationship with Richard's mentor, Edmund of Abingdon, Richard was an important saint for Henry to appropriate. Like Edmund, Richard was 'deemed to have been cast in the Becket mould'.[146] Becket's legacy was complicated for the Angevins. When bishops presented themselves, or were presented as Becket-like prelates, there was a danger for the current king, due to the criticism that could be levelled at them. A way of countering this danger was by venerating Becket and presenting oneself as a good king who listened to appropriate admonishments. This was particularly important for Henry to do when his was trying to rebuild his authority. Henry had to rebuild both his temporal and moral authority. By

[141] D. Jones (ed), *Saint Richard of Chichester: The Sources for his Life,* (Sussex Record Society: Lewes, 1995), p. 76.
[142] Ibid, pp. 176-7.
[143] Ibid, p. 175. See also pp. 173-5.
[144] Ibid, pp. 176-7.
[145] Ibid, p. 226.
[146] Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community,* p. 21.

displaying veneration for a saint who embodied the ideals that Simon was meant to possess, such as a commitment to ascetic ideals, Henry could try to portray himself as moral and worthy of respect and support. Additionally, perhaps Henry felt he could better rely on a saintly bishop rather than one whose loyalty he doubted.

The scale of Henry's wax used on Richard's feast day and the days surrounding it was exceptional. On the feast's vigil, Henry used 109 lbs in the chapel, and 144 lbs in total (the third highest amount in the household roll, behind St Peter in Cathedra's vigil and Easter Saturday and Sunday). That is over three times the amount used in the chapel on the vigil of the Assumption (38 lbs). On the feast day, 74 lbs was used. On 1 April, 33.5 lbs was used.[147] There was a public element to Henry's veneration of St Richard of Chichester. Henry may have been trying to demonstrate to his bishops that he was worthy of their support, at least as worthy as Simon de Montfort.

The Dictum of Kenilworth demonstrates the combination of piety and punitive actions. There was a distinctly religious feel to the Dictum. Wild has argued, convincingly, that the language and tenor of the Dictum suggests that Henry influenced it.[148] It therefore represented Henry's outlook and concept of himself in 1265. As Wild has argued, the proem of the Dictum was prayer-like and invoked Mary and all the saints. It was also dedicated to the Catholic Church and Pope Clement IV.[149] Henry was referred to in the text as the 'most Christian prince', a moniker normally reserved for the king of France.[150] This invocation of the saints was characteristic of the papal chancery. Additionally, the Roman calendar was used to date

[147] E101/667/50. Note: the figures referred to above are to the amount of wax that went to the chapel.
[148] Wild, 'Reasserting Medieval Kingship', p. 237.
[149] Ibid, p. 248. For the full text of the Dictum, see Treharne and Sanders, *Documents of the Baronial Movement*, pp. 316-337.
[150] Treharne and Sanders, *Documents of the Baronial Movement*, p. 319. 'Christianissimi princeps domnini Henrici regis Angliae' (ibid, p. 318).

the Dictum.[151] Henry was presented in the Dictum as the font of moral and political authority. The papal aspect would have encouraged listeners to associate him with the papacy and with papal power.

Wild has made a strong case about the Dictum explicitly linked piety to ruling. He argued that the Dictum's authors stressed that God alone would guide their decisions. Clause two urged Henry 'with reverence' and 'in his piety' to appoint justices who would work in God's interests and not their own.[152] The Dictum appropriated some of the ideas of the reformers but made it clear that it was contingent on royal approval. Clause three begged Henry to protect the liberties and customs of the English Church. In clause four there was an allusion to the Provisions of Westminster, but it was referred to as a grant and any necessary measures for the reform of the realm would be done 'at his pleasure'.[153]

The pious theme that Wild has identified runs through the rest of the Dictum. It was stressed, regarding the treatment of the disinherited, that the authors promised to proceed 'in the way of God and the path of equity'.[154] Notably, the legate's assent to these measures was highlighted. Clause fourteen demanded that the disinherited had to swear on the Holy Gospels and that they would suffer 'fitting and satisfactory penance under judgment of the Church'.[155] Earthly and spiritual punishments were combined, demonstrating the symbiotic nature of the relationship between Henry and the legate. Their unity was clear from the Dictum, indicating to observers that Henry was a favoured son of Rome, with all the benefits that might entail. Chapters thirty-eight and thirty-nine stressed the moral penalties for those who broke their

[151] Wild, 'Reasserting Medieval Kingship', p. 249.
[152] Treharne and Sanders, *Documents of the Baronial Movement,* p. 321. 'cum reuerencia' and 'ipsius pietati', p. 320.
[153] Ibid, p. 321. 'ex eius beneplacito', p. 320.
[154] Ibid, p. 325. 'voluntes secundum Deum et equitatis', p. 324.
[155] Ibid, p. 329. 'et subeant satisfaccionem competentem et penitenciam secundum iudicium ecclesie', p. 328.

word, took revenge, or refused to consent, they would not only be pursued as enemies of the peace of the realm but as enemies of the church as well.[156]

The threat of moral censure and imperilling of souls was most clearly laid out in chapter eight which followed the trope of begging the king and the legate for things that they had already decided on. Henry did not have to be begged to forbid people from considering Simon de Montfort as holy. The obsequious tone of the Dictum was so because Henry's authority was still insecure, and he seems to have compensated by using language to increase his prestige. Importantly, Henry confronted the legacy of Simon's sanctity. Any talk about Simon's sanctity was forbidden under distraint of the Church and emphasised Simon had died excommunicate and that if anyone spoke about his 'vain and fatuous' miracles, corporal punishment was threatened.[157] The promised combination of secular and spiritual punishment highlighted Henry's political and moral authority, making any resistance to him futile.

The date on which the Dictum was issued had significance. The Dictum was sealed on 1 November, the feast of All Saints, a day that could be seen as a perfect one for reconciliation and forgiveness. This was because all saints were commemorated, and the unity of the saints was emphasised on this day. The provisions of the Dictum were approved both by corporeal oaths and by the placing of the seals of all the prelates of the English.[158] The making of oaths mimicked the Provisions of Oxford and a unified picture of the prelates was presented, making resistance seem useless as well as immoral.[159]

---

[156] Ibid, pp. 336-7.
[157] Ibid, pp. 323. 'uana et fatua', p. 322.
[158] Luard, 'Annals of Osney', *AM*, vol. 4, pp. 190-1.
[159] The Provisions of Oxford were full of oaths. Chapter four lays out the oath for the Community of England, chapter five is the text of the oath of the twenty-four, chapter six the oath of the chief justiciar, chapter seven the oath of the chancellor of England, and chapter eight the oath of the castellans. See Treharne and Sanders, *Documents of the Baronial Movement*, pp. 101-103.

The Dictum of Kenilworth represented a softening of Henry's vindictiveness as it had become clear that the rebels had to be negotiated with. A combination of bishops and laymen were chosen to negotiate with the rebels who were acceptable to them.[160] The acceptance of some elements of the reform programme in the Dictum was an olive branch to the rebels and made it appear that Henry could be negotiated with.

Gloucester's rebellion

However, the Dictum of Kenilworth, and Henry actions, pious and practical, did not pacify the realm. This is because the terms of the Dictum were still harsh. All those who had willingly supported Simon such as those who had fought against Henry at Northampton, had been captured of Kenilworth, fought at Evesham or Chesterfield, and so on, were to pay five times the annual value of their lands.[161] Those who were coerced into fighting but who neither fought nor did evil, still had to pay a ransom of one year's value of their lands.[162] Richard de Clare, the earl of Gloucester, unimpressed with Henry's conduct towards the rebels and Londoners, who had been fined exorbitant sums to recover Henry's favour, began a rebellion in 1267.[163] Although Gloucester had played an important role in freeing Edward from his captivity, he had been on Simon's side for much of the reform period. He had the potential to be another Simon. In many ways Gloucester was acting in the mould of Simon de Montfort, defending those with less power against Henry's tyranny.

[160] See Treharne and Sanders, *Documents of the Baronial Movement*, pp. 318-9.
[161] Ibid, pp. 324-325.
[162] Ibid, pp. 332-333.
[163] See Powicke, *Henry III and the Lord Edward*, pp. 542-546 for an account of Gloucester's rebellion and Jobson, *The First English Revolution*, pp. 159-160.

Gloucester's rebellion was brought about by several factors. According to Adrian Jobson, Gloucester was motivated by a 'combination of personal grievances, territorial ambitions and a strong attraction to the principles of reform'.[164] Like Jobson, Powicke contextualised Gloucester's actions by portraying him as becoming increasingly dissatisfied at the rebels' treatment and as someone who had tried to act as a moderating force in the aftermath of Evesham, especially at Kenilworth.[165] However, Powicke stressed the role of Gloucester's character in deciding his actions, describing him as 'impulsive' and 'no statesman' who was 'at the mercy of his personal grievances'.[166] When reading Powicke's account of Gloucester's actions in 1266 and 1267, one gets the impression that Powicke was struggling to reconcile his image of an impulsive earl motivated by personal ambitions with someone whose actions helped bring about peace in the realm by acting as an advocate for those he felt had been treated unfairly. Powicke conceded that Gloucester's actions led to peace and that he calculated that the best way to bring the 'diehard royalists to reason' was by occupying London.[167] This implies that Gloucester was very capable of making long term, calculated plans for the benefit of others, and not just for himself. As Jobson has noted, Gloucester had benefitted the most from the policy of disinheritance. Despite this, he consistently advocated for moderating the terms towards the disinherited. He had played an important role in the construction of the Dictum of Kenilworth and in February 1267 he had unsuccessfully petitioned that the rebels' estates be immediately restored.[168]

---

[164] Jobson, *The First English Revolution,* p. 159.
[165] Powicke, *Henry III and the Lord Edward,* pp. 541-2.
[166] Ibid, p. 542.
[167] Ibid, p. 543.
[168] Jobson, *The First English Revolution,* p. 159.

However, one cannot ignore Gloucester's dispute with Roger Mortimer over control of the Brecknock lordship as a significant factor in motivating Gloucester's actions.[169] For Powicke, Gloucester's 'political indignation' was increased substantially by his quarrel with Mortimer.[170] In many ways, Gloucester felt he had not been sufficiently rewarded for his integral role in restoring Henry to the throne.[171] However, the quarrel between Mortimer and Gloucester was not just about land, they disagreed about how to treat the disinherited.[172] Principle at least partially motivated Gloucester. By rebelling and supporting those out of royal favour, he was taking a big risk. After all, Simon de Montfort had been one of the leading magnates of the realm before he took up arms against the Crown. He had died in a horrific manner, and there was no guarantee when Gloucester rebelled that he would not suffer the same fate.

Jobson and Powicke have stressed that Gloucester acted on behalf of the disinherited, namely those who were still holding out in Ely, but he also acted for the Londoners' benefit. They had also been unfairly treated by Henry. As John McEwan has argued, there is little evidence that the Londoners took part in Evesham, but in the weeks that followed the battle Henry imprisoned individuals, confiscated property, and imposed an exorbitant fine on the entire population.[173] Just as in the case of Simon, Gloucester's cause was a noble one and he could be portrayed as fighting for the rights of the vulnerable and ostracised. It was a danger narrative to counter.

---

[169] Ibid, p. 159.
[170] Powicke, *Henry III and the Lord Edward,* p. 542.
[171] As argued by Jobson in *The First English Revolution,* p. 159.
[172] Ibid, p. 159.
[173] J.A. McEwan, 'Civic Government in Troubled Times: London c.1263-1270' in A. Jobson (ed.), *Baronial Reform and Revolution in England, 1258-1267* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016), 125-138, at p. 130.

Gloucester arrived outside London's walls on 8 April 1267 with a sizeable army. The legate Ottobuono, unaware that Gloucester was acting against Henry allowed Gloucester and his men to enter London on 9 April. On 11 April the rebel leader John d'Eyvill and his men arrived from Ely to join Gloucester. Several leading magnates, including Richard of Cornwall intervened and advised Henry to grant more concessions to the rebels. Between 31 May and 15 June, the day on which peace was agreed with Gloucester, talks were conducted between Gloucester and the royalists every day.[174]

During the two months of Gloucester's rebellion, Henry seems to have continued to make gifts to religious individuals, perhaps as a way of displaying his moral authority. He patronised a mixture of recipients from the archbishop of York to the Carmelites of Cambridge. Friars, nuns, and converts were among those less affluent recipients of Henry's favour.[175] Many of the grants that Henry made in this period were simple grants of protection.[176] A typical example of this was a grant to the warden and brethren of the hospital of SS. James and John, Royston (Hertford) of protection for two years.[177] Although such grants are not impressive in monetary terms or prestige, they still reflected Henry's desire to protect those who had suffered, and were still suffering, due to the unrest in the kingdom. It was important for Henry to appear like a good lord to individuals across his kingdom at a time where he was being presented as vindictive in his conduct towards the disinherited.

---

[174] Powicke, *Henry III and the Lord Edward*, p. 544.
[175] For the Archbishop of York, see *CR, 1264-8*, pp.311-2, 312; *CLR, 1260-67*, p.272; *CPR, 1266-72*, pp. 53, 54, 58, 59. For friars, including Carmelites, see *CR, 1264-8*, pp. 308, 309; *CLR, 1260-67*, p. 269. For nuns, see *CChR*, vol. 2, p. 75; *CR, 1264-8*, p. 309; *CPR, 1266-72*, pp. 65 and 69. For converts, see *CPR, 1266-72*, pp. 55 and 70.
[176] See, for example, *CPR, 1266-72*, pp. 56, 57 (2), 62, 65, 66, 68, 69, and 70.
[177] *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 56.

Henry did make some generous grants during the period of Gloucester's rebellion. One person who benefitted the most was the Archbishop of York. On 8 April, he received a pardon of the tenth that the pope had granted Henry.[178] On 2 May, he was granted 250 marks for the arrears he had incurred as the chancellor of York cathedral.[179] These grants would have significantly helped the archbishop's finances. Henry was also generous to the Abbess of Wherewell. He granted her and her successors a weekly market on Wednesday at her manor of Wherewell.[180] As was Henry's normal *modus operandi,* he did not charge the abbess for the issuing of the charter. The context of the civil war makes this grant more generous as wars are expensive and any source of income would have been welcome in securing funds to pay for war costs. However, most of the gifts were small, consisting of wood, wine, deer, and small amounts of money.[181] One could argue that such small gifts would have made no difference in convincing people to support Henry during his contest with Gloucester. However, these gifts fit into the general pattern that has emerged in this chapter of Henry continuing to make gifts and grants to a range of religious individuals, including those who depended on frequent small gifts and protections to continue to exist. This fits into the picture that Katie Phillips has presented of Henry's pious patronage of directing his funds to 'institutions that offered tangible relief rather than spiritual succour'.[182] Henry seems to have tried to keep up his patronage of the poor and vulnerable during this crisis. These small grants to the neediest in his kingdom demonstrated his commitment to protecting those in his kingdom who most needed his help and was a way of demonstrating the morality of his rule at a time when it could be questioned.

---

[178] Ibid, p. 53.
[179] *CLR, 1260-67,* p. 272.
[180] *CChR,* vol. 2, p. 75.
[181] For gifts of wood see, for example, *CR, 1264-8,* pp. 307, 308, 309 (2), and 312. For gifts of wine, see *CR, 1264-8,* p. 313. For gifts of money, see *CLR, 1260-67,* pp. 276 and 269 (2). For gifts of deer, see *CR, 1264-8,* pp. 311-2, and 312.
[182] K. Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation: The Alms-Giving and Religious Foundations of Henry III', *Reading Medieval* 43, 79-98, at 91.

Once terms were reached with Gloucester on 15 June, Henry seems to have continued his policy of making small gifts to a variety of religious recipients to demonstrate the magnanimity of his rule. Between 15 June and 1 July (when the rebel leader John d'Eyvill came to terms) Henry made several gifts to religious recipients. Many of the grants were those of protection and safe conduct along with gifts of money, deer, wood, and wine.[183] Most of the recipients were abbots and priors, especially the abbot of Stratford.[184] Given Henry's location was London, such gifts represent the responsive element of his piety. Between 1 July and 1 August (the deadline that Henry gave the remaining rebels to come to terms), Henry's pious patronage was more generous and encompassed a wider range of recipients including converts, nuns, and the archbishop of York.[185] Henry also made more generous grants, with the Dominicans of Bamburgh, Northumberland, receiving ten acres of land. This grant was initially made on 5 July, but on 12 July, another grant was made that elaborated on the gift stating that the land was to be valued at 40s. per annum, which was to be deducted from the farm of the town for the building of an oratory and other buildings 'to be inhabited after the manner of their order'.[186] As usual, Henry did not charge the friars for this land. John of Darlington was heavily involved in pacifying the kingdom in the aftermath of Evesham. One can see the generosity Henry displayed to the Dominicans of Bamburgh as a reflection of his regard for John and for the Order more generally. One can also see it as a reflection of Henry's belief in the efficacy of the prayers of friars and part of his strategy to show himself as a protector of the needy and those who embodied the Apostolic ideal. Cumulatively, such acts would have demonstrated to the recipients and the wider community the merciful nature of Henry's rule.

---

[183] Protection and safe conduct: *CPR, 1266-72,* pp. 76 (2), 77, 80, and 82. Money: *CLR, 1260-67*, p. 277. Deer: *CR, 1264-8*, pp. 317-8. Wood: *CR, 1264-8*, p. 312 and *CLR, 1266-72*, p. 78. Wine: *CR, 1264-8*, p. 313.
[184] Abbot of Stratford: *CR, 1264-8*, pp. 312 and 313 (2); *CLR, 1260-7*, p. 277. Other abbots: *CPR, 1266-72*, pp. 72, 76, 77, and 80.
[185] Nuns: *CR, 1264-8*, p. 321. Archbishop of York: *CR, 1264-8*, p. 323 and *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 88. Converts: *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 84.
[186] 5 July grant: *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 84. 12 July grant: *CChR*, vol.2, p. 77.

Such an image may have played a role in convincing the last rebel holdouts to capitulate. These acts, in and of themselves, would not have caused rebels to capitulate, but they added to the picture of a merciful king prepared to compromise.

Henry's pious patronage was done in tandem with his public and symbolic acts in forgiving Gloucester. After terms had been reached, Gloucester broke apart his defences that ran between the city of London and the Tower.[187] By doing this, Gloucester displayed his submission as he destroyed the tools of his rebellion. Henry then entered London in triumph, symbolically underlining his success and power. Gloucester's capitulation demonstrated to the Londoners that he accepted Henry's authority and that they should too.

Henry then publicly forgave Gloucester. He remitted his anger against Gloucester, his household, his fellowship, the Londoners, and many other rebels who capitulated due to Gloucester's intervention. Gloucester then swore an oath that he would not wage war against Henry and found sureties in a penalty of 10,000 marks. This surety was to be reviewed by the pope, who would determine whether it was appropriate or not.[188] Peace was then proclaimed with voices and bells. The auditory bombardment would have engaged a large audience of subjects, high and low, lay, and ecclesiastical. This all occurred on 18 June 1267.[189] This date is significant. It was Edward's twenty-eighth birthday. By proclaiming peace on this date, Henry made an explicit link between peace and the future of his dynasty. It was a way of drawing a line under a devastating period, both for him personally, and for the kingdom. Not only had Henry triumphed against the rebels, but he had also forgiven them and mended the rift, reunifying the kingdom which now looked to the future.

---

[187] Stapleton, *De Antiquis Legibus*, pp. 92-3 and Riley, *Chronicles of the Mayors and Sheriffs*, p. 97.
[188] Stapleton, *De Antiquis Legibus*, p. 92.
[189] Powicke, *Henry III and the Lord Edward*, p. 545.

Henry used the occasion of peace made with Gloucester to stress his adherence to the ideals of the reform movement by taking counsel.[190] In a letter that laid out the terms of the peace agreement between Henry and Gloucester, it was stressed that it was done by the 'counsel and assent' of Richard of Cornwall, the earls, barons and commons of the land.[191] Henry wanted the legitimacy of his actions to be beyond reproach. Taking broad counsel and listening to his natural counsellors gave substance to his actions and demonstrated his desire to rule fairly. This enabled Henry to move on from the shackles of Simon's legacy.

After negotiations had concluded, the legate lifted the general interdict he had placed on London. Two men made oaths before the legate's commissioners at Saint Paul's, where they swore upon the souls of all the commons, that they would abide by the award of the Holy Church.[192] The public nature of the oaths enhanced their significance and demonstrated an acknowledgement of wrong and submission to Henry. The legate's role enhanced the moral right of Henry's negotiations and demonstrated the support of the Church.

After Gloucester and Henry came to an agreement, the resistance to the king was minimal. Consequently, the legate engaged in joyful celebration. On the vigil of St George's feast day 1268, the legate celebrated a general council at St Paul's Cathedral in London where all ecclesiastical prelates were present and Nicholas de Ely was made bishop of Winchester.[193] Additionally, various constitutions and statutes were confirmed, and all present swore to

---

[190] Taking counsel was a well-established mark of good kingship and a theme that was present in many of the documents created during the period of baronial revolt and rebellion. See, for example, Henry's letter to the barons of England, dated 2 May 1258 where he stated that because his business affected both himself and the kingdom, he wished to reform the realm 'by the counsel of our loyal subjects' (Treharne and Saunders, *Documents of the Baronial Reform Movement*, p. 73).
[191] Riley, *Chronicles of the Mayors and Sheriffs*, p. 99 and Stapleton, *De Antiquis Legibus*, p. 94.
[192] Stapleton, *De Antiquis Legibus*, pp. 92-3 and Riley, *Chronicles of the Mayors and Sheriffs*, p. 97.
[193] Luard, 'Annals of Osney', in *AM*, vol. 4, pp. 215-6.

observe them.[194] Notably, the Sunday on which the council was held was when the incipit 'Ego sum Pastor Bonus' (I am the Good Shepherd) was used. This was undoubtedly a deliberate choice, reminding the bishops who was the ultimate source of emulation (Christ). The conciliatory aspect of Christ was meant to live in them. Their role as shepherds was not to take sides in matters concerning their flocks, but to live up to high ideals and encourage their flocks to do the same. Significantly, it was at this council where Simon de Montfort and those who had been excommunicated for their part in the revolt were absolved.[195] This display of forgiveness by the legate, with Henry's support, was a major set piece in the mending of the kingdom's wounds. There had been an acceptance that Simon's legacy could not be completely ignored. His political legacy was absorbed in the Statute of Marlborough (18 November 1267) and his soul was set at rest with Henry, and Rome, forgiving him. This was a magnanimous gesture, almost Christ-like in the willingness to forgive an obdurate traitor. Whether Henry personally forgave Simon is uncertain, but he was aware that he needed to end the rebellion that became intertwined with Simon. It was the only way to ensure peace in his realm.

## 1268-9: Ceremonies of Peace and Reconciliation

Henry used the Statute of Marlborough (19 November 1267) to display his magnanimity and to appropriate the acceptable aspects of the reform agenda. The statute essentially reintroduced many parts of the repudiated Provisions of Westminster, with the preamble stating that the purpose of the Statute was to ensure peace and justice in the land and to remove dissent.[196] The Statute was a concession on the part of the Crown, but it was also a

[194] Luard, 'Annals of Waverley', in *AM,* vol. 2, p. 375 and 'Annals of Winchester', in *AM,* vol. 2, pp. 106-7.
[195] Ibid, p. 39.
[196] 'Appendix 3: The Statute of Marlborough of 1267' in P. Brand, *Kings, Barons and Justices: The Making and Enforcement of Legislation in Thirteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 454-455.

clever ploy to take up the popular aspects of the reform movement without taking up the more radical, centrally focused reforms. Henry balanced this conciliatory move with welcoming certain men into the knighthood. It was another way of displaying his authority, both in terms of generosity, but also in underlining that it was at his discretion that concessions were made, and power granted. Bolando de Rupee was knighted on the feast day of St Edmund, king and martyr (20 November).[197] This date focused on the martyrdom of an Anglo-Saxon king as well as pointing to the future nature of Henry's kingship due to his granting of significant reforms. The Christmas period then saw the knighting of two other men (Walter de Lynd and Betram de Turri).[198] The joy of Christmas heightened the prestige and significance of the ceremonies and would have been structured to impress observers.

The parliament held on the Nativity of John the Baptist in 1268 was the last act in defeating the last of the rebels. Before the parliament, public processions were held in England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland where all the faithful were to thank God for the restoration of peace and that it would continue.[199] At the parliament, Henry, the legate, and all the magnates of the realm were present.[200] The parliament was held on the feast of the Nativity of John the Baptist, just as the peace ceremony between Gloucester, the Londoners and the Crown had been, underscoring the unifying and forgiving theme. Due to the recent history associated with Northampton, there was an implicit hint at royal power and authority. The overlap between secular and religious aims can be seen in the actions of Gloucester. At the legatine council, he swore on the high altar of St Paul's, before the legate, that he would never bear arms against

[197] *CR, 1264-8*, p. 407.
[198] Ibid, pp. 410 and 422.
[199] B.K.U. Weiler, 'Symbolism and Politics in the Reign of Henry III', in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England IX: Proceedings of the Durham Conference, 2001* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 15–42, at pp. 26-7.
[200] Luard, 'Annals of Winchester', in *AM*, vol. 2, pp. 106-7.

Henry, except in self-defence.[201] At the parliament, Gilbert reiterated his support for Henry by swearing to go on crusade with Edward, Edmund and at least 120 other nobles and knights.[202] A crusading vow was one of, if not the most, important vows one could ever make. By making a vow that bound him and his fate to the heirs to the throne, Gilbert displayed unquestionable loyalty to the Crown. Due to the involvement of other leading figures such as Henry of Almain and many other nobles, the crusade became the unifying theme that bound the powerful men of the land together. A shared endeavour created a strong sense of identity and common cause. This publicly symbolised how the kingdom had been made anew and was united behind the heir in a noble and just cause. Edward was, in some ways, replacing de Montfort as the crusading hero. Edward did not have the same baggage Henry had and had proven himself in battle. He was the one who defeated Simon. It is fitting that, symbolically, he obscured the memory of Simon, taking up the mantle of crusade and succeeding where his father had failed.

The translation feast of the Confessor in 1269, and its failure to achieve what Henry wanted it to achieve, underlines that the kingdom was looking to the future in the form of Edward. The ceremony was meant to be a ceremony of joy, unity, reconciliation, and peace. The opulence of the new shrine to the Confessor was meant to impress both God and his subjects, and it associated his rule with the Confessor's peace and tranquillity.[203] Symbolically, Henry connected himself with an English saint in the aftermath of rebellion that had been connected to the exclusion of English magnates at the expense of foreigners.

---

[201] Gransden, *Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds*, p. 38.
[202] Luard, 'Annals of Osney', in *AM*, vol. 4, pp. 216-7, 'Annals of Waverley', in *AM*, vol. 2, p. 375, 'Annals of Worcester', in *AM*, vol. 4, pp. 457-8, 'Wyke's Chronicle', in *AM*, vol. 4, p. 218.
[203] Gransden, *Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds*, pp. 45-6. See also D.A. Carpenter, 'King Henry III and the Cosmati Work at Westminster Abbey' in D.A. Carpenter (ed.), *The Reign of Henry III* (London: Hambledon, 1996), pp. 409-425.

The ceremony was attended by all the major political players, including Richard of Cornwall, Edmund Crouchback, Lord Edward, John de Warenne (earl of Surrey) and Gloucester.[204] Additionally, all the leading ecclesiastical magnates were there along with the citizens of Winchester and London.[205] The ceremony was planned to be the event of the year, if not the decade. By involving the important members of his kingdom in a ceremony that championed monarchy, wealth, and unity, Henry could symbolically close the chapter on the civil war. He could also stress his fully regained power. He planned to do that by wearing his crown. The crown was a physical representation of monarchical power. Henry did not often wear his crown, making the times he did significant. However, the crown wearing did not occur due to the outbreak of hostilities between the citizens of London and Winchester. They disagreed over who had to right to act as the butler to the king. The violence of this disagreement made Henry shelve his plans.[206]

As was often the case with Henry, reality did not live up to his expectations. The translation ceremony was certainly an awesome event that would have been a feast for the senses. It also displayed Henry's piety, his wealth, and his desire to rule well. However, it could not, on its own, erase all the memories of Henry's poor decisions. He had a lot more goodwill in 1269 than in 1258, but decades of his rule made his subjects wary about his intentions and abilities. This was not the case for his son.

Death and memory

204 'Wykes' Chronicle', in *AM*, vol. 4, p. 226.
205 See 'Annals of Waverley', in *AM*, vol. 2, p. 375 and 'Annals of Winchester', in *AM*, vol. 2, p. 108.
206 D.A. Carpenter, 'Westminster Abbey in Politics, 1258-69' in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England VIII: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 1999* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001), 49-58, at p. 58.

Henry died in his own bed, with his kingdom pacified.[207] During his captivity, but particularly at the battle of Evesham, that must have seemed like a remote possibility. Simon, conversely, was hacked to pieces on the battlefield. His head, hands, feet, and genitals were sent to diverse places to his enemies as a mark of dishonour.[208] What was left of him was buried before the altar at Evesham Abbey by the canons. The grave was visited as holy ground by many commoners until Henry had his remains buried in a secret location elsewhere in the church.[209] Henry was buried with great splendour before the great altar at Westminster, the site of the Confessor's burial site before his translation in 1269. It was not until 1290 when Henry's body was translated to the tomb made by Cosmati marblers besides the Confessor's shrine.[210]

Henry's obituaries were fairly uniform. Some were extremely basic, noting the day he died, the day he was buried, where he was buried, and the length of his reign.[211] Of the more detailed accounts, Henry's piety was uniformly praised.[212] Katie Phillips has discussed the references to Henry's piety in the chronicles. She argued that thirteenth century writers rarely discussed Henry's piety.[213] She argued that Paris's *Chronica* contains only one incident that explicitly praises Henry's piety: when he fasted the night before the ceremony of the Holy

---

[207] Powicke has stressed how much better the kingdom was from the beginning of Henry's reign. See Powicke, *Henry III and the Lord Edward,* p. 588.
[208] Halliwell (ed.), *The Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* pp. 109-110 and Stevenson, J., (ed. and trans.), *A Medieval Chronicle of Scotland: The Chronicle of Melrose, facsimile reprint of the London 1850s original* (Lampeter: Llanerch, 1991), pp. 107-120.
[209] For a thorough examination of Simon's burial, see D. Cox, 'The Tomb of Simon de Montfort', *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society 3rd Series,* 26, 159-71, at 169.
[210] D.A. Carpenter, 'The Burial of King Henry III, the Regalia and Royal Ideology' in D.A. Carpenter (ed.), *The Reign of Henry III* (London: Hambledon, 1996), 409-425, at p. 428. For details about the Cosmati works, see Carpenter, 'King Henry and the Cosmati Work', pp. 409-425.
[211] See Gransden, *Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds,* p. 53; Luard. 'Annals of Dunstable', *AM,* vol. 3, p. 254 'Annals of Waverley', *AM*, vol. 2, p. 378; 'Annals of Winchester', *AM,* vol. 2, p. 112; 'Annals of Worcester', *AM,* vol. 4, p. 461; T. Stapleton, (ed.), *De Antiquis Legibus Liber Cronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londoniarum et quaedam, que contingebant temporibus illis ab anno MCLXXVIII ad annum MCCLXXIV cum appendice* (London: J B Nichols, 1846), pp. 159-60 ; W.A. Wright, (ed.) *The Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester,* 2 parts (London, H.M.S.O., 1887), p. 876.
[212] *Flores Historiarum,* vol. 2, p. 454; Luard, 'Annals of Osney', *AM,* vol. 4, pp. 253-4; 'Wykes Chronicle', *AM,* vol. 4, p. 252; H. Rothwell, (ed.), *The Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1957), p. 212; Stevenson, *Chronicon de Lanercost,* p. 94; N. Trevet, *Annales Sex Regum Angliae, 1135–1307* ed. by T. Hog, *English Historical Society* 6 (London: Sumptibus Societatis, 1845), p. 280.
[213] Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 79.

Blood where he was described as a *princeps Christianissimus.*[214] Phillips' characterisation of Paris' comments on Henry's piety seems overly negative. The example she notes is certainly the most effusive praise, but it is not the only example. Not only was Henry referred to as a *princeps Christianissimus,* he was also compared to Heraclius, the emperor who recovered the True Cross.[215] This is an extraordinary comparison. This praise is not just explicit, it is hyperbolic.

It is certainly true that much of Paris' descriptions of Henry's piety are just that: descriptions. When commenting on Henry's visits to St Albans and the gifts he made, Paris did not comment after describing the gifts that Henry was pious or devoted to the saints he was making offerings to.[216] When describing Henry's reaction to the canonisation of Edmund of Abingdon and in his description of Henry's visit to Edmund's tomb when he was in France in 1254, Paris made no comment on what these actions might reveal about Henry's piety or internal disposition.[217] At times, Paris deliberately questioned Henry's sincerity. An example of this was in his account of Henry's vow to go on crusade in 1250. He pointed to 'evil interpreters' who thought that Henry took the vow to raise money from his nobles under the pretence of going on crusade. Paris then stated that 'more reasonable' people wanted to reserve judgement.[218] It was not uncommon for Paris to put disparaging remarks about Henry's intentions in the mouths of bystanders.[219] It was a method of voicing his own criticism of Henry when he did not want to explicitly say what he believed. One can certainly trace a strand that runs through the *Chronica* that suggests that Henry was sometimes an impious king.

---

[214] Ibid, 79.
[215] *CM*, vol. iv, p. 641.
[216] See *CM*, vol. iv, p. 402 and *CM*, vol. v, pp. 233-4, 257-8, 319-20.
[217] See *CM*, vol. iv, p. 586 and *CM*, vol. v, p. 475.
[218] *CM*, vol. v, p. 102.
[219] *CM*, vol. iii, p. 413; *CM*, vol. iv, pp. 48, 181, 650; *CM*, vol. v, pp. 7-8, 55, 128, 368, 399-400, 409-10, 485, 509, and 522.

However, although there is no other episode where Paris' praise of Henry's piety reaches that of the ceremony of the Holy Blood, Paris does show respect and admiration for Henry's piety, which I would describe as explicit. In 1254, when describing Henry's visits to the various churches and famous places to make offerings, Paris described Henry as paying due devotion in his gifts and actions.[220] Additionally, in 1256, when describing a visit from Henry to St Albans where Henry gave palls to the altars of St Alban, St Amphibalus, St Wulfstan, and St Mary, Paris stated that he gave 'devote secundam suam consuetudinem adorans' (worshipping with devotion according to his custom).[221] In this example, Paris was not just commenting on one act of piety but accepting that Henry consistently worshipped in a devoted manner.

Perhaps the most prominent example of Paris' praise for Henry's piety can be seen in a comment he made about Henry under the year 1255. Paris remarked with clear admiration that no king, not even King Offa, the founder of St Albans, nor any of the other kings of England had ever contributed as many gifts including palls and rings with precious gems.[222] This is very high praise indeed. By Paris' reckoning, Henry was even more generous to St Albans than at least two saints, St Edward, king and martyr, and St Edward the Confessor. The praise here does seem explicit.

Phillips argued that, with a few exceptions, 'most, if not all' references to Henry's piety in the contemporary chronicles only appear in the obituaries.[223] The Waverley annalist and

[220] Ibid, vol. v, p. 479.
[221] Ibid, vol. v, p. 574.
[222] *CM*, vol. v, pp. 489-90.
[223] Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 80.

author of the Furness chronicle are, for Phillips, the two main exceptions to the rule.[224] However, once again, Phillips' characterisation of the chroniclers' references to Henry's piety seems overly critical. Notably, Phillips did not look at Wykes' chronicle. Wykes referred to Henry, in 1266, as *christianissimo* (the most Christian) and, in his obituary as *rex Anglorum serenissimus* (the most serene king of England) and *piae recordationis* (of pious memory).[225] The Annals of Dunstable and the Annals of Osney have more references to Henry's piety than Phillips implies in her article. When writing about the Marshal rebellion of 1234, the Dunstable annalist compared Henry to David in his regret over Richard Marshal's death. Henry allegedly groaned like David over the death of Saul and his son Jonathan. The annalist also referred to Henry as *piissimus* (the most pious) and desirous to correct the errors he had made.[226] Additionally, when analysing the actions of Henry and the legate in 1266, the Dunstable annalist stated that they recognised the danger to souls that the civil war was causing and wanted to reach a peace agreement so that the reform of the realm could be accomplished.[227] This episode recognises Henry's concern for the salvation of his kingdom.

In discussing the annals of Osney, Phillips points to the comment in Henry's obituary where it was stated that he loved the "beautiful house of God" more than his predecessors,[228] but there are many other positive references in the annals about Henry's piety. Under the year 1234, Henry was described as fearing God, being particularly devoted in almsgiving, and as someone who increased the revenues of monasteries, founded churches, and provided for a house of converted Jews.[229] He was also referred to as *pater erat pauperum et moereritium*

[224] Ibid, 79-80.
[225] 'Wykes' Chronicle', *AM*, vol. 4, pp. 215 and 252.
[226] 'Annals of Dunstable', *AM*, vol. 3, p. 137.
[227] Ibid, p. 242.
[228] Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 80.
[229] 'Annals of Osney', *AM*, vol. 4, p. 77.

*consolator*.[230] When Henry, in 1264, entered St Frideswide's church, he was described as doing it with great devotion.[231] In describing the translation ceremony of Edward the Confessor in 1269, the annalist stated that it was a glorious spectacle to the praise and glory of both Christ and the Confessor.[232] Henry organised this event and played a central role. It was his devotion to the Confessor that drove the event and the annalist praised it. The annalist also praised Henry's conduct towards the Norwich citizens who had set fire to the bishop of Norwich's palace after a dispute between Norwich cathedral and Norwich citizens. Henry was described as consulting with his barons before setting off to Norwich to punish the malefactors and the annalist noted with satisfaction that they were deservedly harshly punished.[233] Henry did this in 1272, when he was unwell and a few months before he died. The annalist may not have explicitly praised Henry's piety *per se,* but Henry was fulfilling his role as a king by providing the secular punishment for those who had committed sacrilege. Finally, in Henry's obituary, the annalist also said that Henry had done many miraculous things for both the people and the clergy, high praise indeed. The annalist did then undercut some of the praise by saying that Henry loved aliens over the English and endowed them with countless possessions.[234]

An important thing to note when using evidence from the contemporary monastic annals is that multiple authors contributed to its construction. This can be clearly seen in the shifts in tone and allegiance in the annals. The Annals of Waverley have some of the most detailed accounts of the monastic annals of Henry's piety, but the obituary written about Henry was brief and just stated when and where he was buried.[235] The Annals of Dunstable are generally positive about Henry's piety, when it is mentioned, but under the year 1263, the

[230] Ibid, p. 77. 'He was a father to the poor and a consoler of those who mourned.'
[231] Ibid, pp. 142-3.
[232] Ibid, pp. 228-9.
[233] Ibid, p. 251.
[234] Ibid, pp. 253-4. Phillips also refers to this disparaging remark. See Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 80.
[235] 'Annals of Waverley', *AM,* vol. 2, p. 378.

author of that part of the annals presented Simon de Montfort as refusing to surrender to Henry and calling him a perjurer and apostate. Additionally, the annalist makes a clear distinction between Simon's men who confess their sins and take the cross before marching on London, and Henry's men who do not. This comparison made Henry and his men seem irreligious.[236] The evidence from the annals about Henry's piety and how he was remembered is not always straightforward, but no annalist was overwhelmingly negative in their assessment of Henry's piety. Usually, there are positive episodes related, and none of the obituaries describe Henry as irreligious or immoral.

Furthermore, even the Melrose chronicler, who recorded Simon's miracles, referred to Henry as Edward's 'worthy' father and religious.[237] However, his politics were poorly reviewed.[238] There is a notable exception and that was an obituary written in error. In 1263, the Tewkesbury annalist referred to Henry as a vigorous ruler of the kingdom and a learned reformer of peace and tranquillity, as well as being a lover of the holy church and copious in his almsgiving and a protector of widows and orphans.[239] This should serve as a reminder that the context in which someone dies influences people who reflect on their lives. The Tewkesbury obituary was written before Lewes, Evesham, and the years of unrest that followed. The whole kingdom suffered as a result, and Tewkesbury was very near Evesham

[236] 'Annals of Dunstable', *AM*, vol. 3, p. 226.
[237] Stevenson, *The Chronicle of Melrose*, p. 122.
[238]See Luard, 'Annals of Osney', *AM*, vol. 4, p. 254; Rothwell, *Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough*, p. 212; Stevenson, *Chroncicle of Melrose*, 122.
[239] For a through discussion of the obituary, see D.A. Carpenter, 'An Unknown Obituary of King Henry III from the Year 1263' in D.A. Carpenter (ed.), *The Reign of Henry III* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1996), 253-260. The Latin of the obituary is: Obiit Henricus rex Angliae, filius regis Johannis; ecclesiae sancta versus amator et ornator; religiosorum tutor et consolator; regni strenuous gubernator; pacis et quietis doctus reformator; elemosine indigentibus copiosus condonator; viduis et orphanis pius semper auxiliator (taken from Carpenter, 'Obituary of King Henry III', p. 260. My translation of the obituary: Henry, king of England and son of king John, died, [he was] a lover and enhancer of the holy church, a guardian and consoler of the religious, a vigorous ruler of the kingdom, a learned reformer of peace and tranquillity, a granter of copious alms to the poor (and needy), and always a pious helper of widows and orphans.'

and in the thick of baronial activity. The Tewkesbury annals end in 1263 so it is impossible to know how the obituary would have altered.

Perhaps the most extraordinary obituary was written by a Westminster monk. It was by far the most complementary of his obituaries. The monk was a royalist but so too was Wykes who, although effusive in his comments on Henry's piety, had nothing to say on his political actions.[240] The Westminster monk began with praise for his piety, referring to him as a 'devout worshipper of God' and the 'illustrious king of England', before saying:

> How great was this king's innocence, how great his patience, how great his devotion to the service of his saviour, the Lord knows, and they too, who faithfully adhered to him. And moreover, how great his deserts in this life were in the eyes of God, is abundantly testified by the miracles which happened after his death.[241]

Unfortunately, the author does not go into details about Henry's miracles, but the fact they are mentioned at all suggests that some people believed in his sanctity. It is possible, that had Henry died at Evesham, he may have been considered a saint. There was a report that when Louis IX's remains were being interred at Saint-Denis, the funeral cortège passed announcing that Louis was a saint and an Englishman remarked that his king was no less of one.[242] The context of this remark is important. It may have been more about making a favourable comparison between Henry and Louis, about placing Henry on the same level as Louis to make England seem as blessed with holy kings as France, but the comment would have been ridiculous had there been no basis to the belief in Henry's piety. At the very least, the comment reveals that the author believed it was a plausible thing to have been said about Henry.

---

[240] 'Wykes Chronicle', *AM*, vol. 4, p. 252.
[241] Yonge, *Flowers of History*, vol. 2, p. 454.
[242] J. Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, trans. G.E. Gollrad (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), p. 370.

Whether Henry would have been officially canonised or not is a harder question to answer. By the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, canonisation had become a long and complicated process. Those who wanted to have a person canonised had to make preliminary enquiries and write up the results in a petition to the Apostolic See.[243] If the evidence was deemed acceptable, the papal chancery then investigated and produced a report that was then presented to the pope, who then summoned the cardinals in a secret consistory where all present members of the Sacred College gave their opinion.[244] There was then a second consistory where the pope consulted the bishops and archbishops present and pronounced a sentence. There was then a third consistory held in a bigger room in public where the pope signalled his intention to canonise someone. A few days later, a liturgical ceremony was held, and the news presented to the prelates and faithful.[245]

There was a high failure rate for canonisation attempts.[246] The duration of the initial investigation could be very long and generally the length increased from the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries.[247] Additionally, many investigations had to be repeated because the papacy felt that they were not thorough enough.[248] Against this background, Louis IX's canonisation does seem quite extraordinary.

However, a person did not need to be canonised to be considered a saint and venerated as one. Vauchez suggested that England produced a number of 'political martyrs' in the late

[243] A. Vauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*, trans by Jean Birrel, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 42.
[244] Ibid, pp. 42-43, 55.
[245] Ibid, pp. 55-6.
[246] Ibid, p. 51.
[247] Ibid, pp. 44-5.
[248] Ibid, p. 54.

Middle Ages.[249] When writing about Edward II, Vauchez stated that there had been a 'surge of emotion' throughout the country and his tomb became a popular place of pilgrimage despite the displeasure of contemporary ecclesiastical chroniclers.[250] Vauchez's characterisation of the feeling throughout England about Edward II seems optimistic. Edward had been very unpopular in many quarters. However, the circumstances of his death, and his royal blood undoubtedly helped to form more favourable views of Edward in his afterlife rather than his life. Henry, at the very least, had a better reputation for piety than his grandson, and was not seen as vicious. It is reasonable to suggest that if Edward II was considered by some to be a saint after his death, Henry, had he been murdered, may have been considered by more people to be a saint.

However, one can only speculate on how Henry may have been perceived based on a hypothetical situation. Simon de Montfort did die what was viewed by many as a martyr's death. The miracle collection we have of Simon's miracles is detailed and displays the depth of feeling Simon evoked. As a rough count, in the miracle collection, over 150 individuals who experienced miracles are named. These people include men, women, rich, poor, lay and religious.[251] The recipients of Simon's miracles came from all over the country including London, Evesham, Gloucester, Sepham Burland, Leominster, Lincoln and Lincolnshire, Hereford, Ireland, Bedford, Chipping Norton (Oxfordshire), Essex, Peterborough, Sapcote (Leicestershire), Northampton, Canterbury.[252] The miracle collection also abounds with

[249] Ibid, p. 155.
[250] Ibid, p. 160.
[251] See, for example, male recipients: Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* pp. 68, 83, 87, 106; female recipients: Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* pp. 70, 72, 73, 89; rich recipients: Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* pp. 68-9, 75-6, 83; poor recipients: Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* p. 77; lay recipients: Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* pp. 67-8, 68, 68-9, 83; religious recipients: Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* pp. 69, 77, 87, 106.
[252] See, for example, people from London (Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* pp. 105, 108), from Evesham (Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* pp. 67-8), from Gloucester (Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* p. 91 (2)), from Sepham Burland (Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* p. 69), from Leominster (Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* p. 70), Lincoln and Lincolnshire (Halliwell, *Miracles of*

examples of entire parishes, convents, villages, and so on, prepared to swear to the veracity of the related miracles.[253] This all demonstrates the widespread appeal of Simon's cult.

The miracle collection reveals several interesting aspects. Firstly, most of Simon's recorded miracles were healing ones. A typical example of Simon's healing power can be seen in the case of William of London, a chaplain, and the rector of the church of Heckington in Lincolnshire. He was in very ill health and was unable to go anywhere without assistance and had to be carried on a stretcher. He offered a measure to Simon and Simon healed him. As a mark of his recovery, William sent an image of wax in a reliquary to Evesham.[254] This template of a person being sick, offering a measure to Simon, and then being healed, is repeated in the miracle collection.[255]

Another striking element in the miracle collection is that people did not need to travel to Evesham to be healed by Simon. Many of the measures offered to Simon were not made at Evesham[256], and most of the recorded miracles did not occur there either.[257] Part of the reason for this may be, as has been stated above, because Henry had Simon's body moved to try and prevent the cult from growing. It was not clear exactly where Simon was buried after he was moved, making it more difficult for there to be a specific locus of the cult. Simon's spring was potentially the locus after Simon's body was moved, but the fact that people reported being

---

*Simon de Montfort,* pp. 71, 106, 107), Hereford (Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* pp. 72, 90), Ireland, (Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* p. 73), Bedford (Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* p. 73), Chipping Norton, Oxfordshire (Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* p. 74), Essex (Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* pp. 75-6, 83), Peterborough (Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* pp. 81-2), Sapcote, Leicestershire (Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* p. 87), Northampton (Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* p. 97), and Canterbury (Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* p. 101).

[253] See, for example, Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* pp. 68-9, 70, 75, 81-2, 89.

[254] Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort,* p. 106.

[255] Ibid, pp. 71, 75-6, 83, 87, 89.

[256] Ibid, pp. 70, 72, 77, 87, 89.

[257] Ibid, pp. 68, 68-9, 69.

healed all over the country, without being near Simon's body, testifies to the power people believed he had. This was despite papal and royal hostility.

The miracle collection reveals that Simon was not just a saint who healed. He also had the power to punish detractors and appear in people's dreams. A monk from Peterborough related a tale of the convent debating Simon's sanctity. One of the monks disparaged Simon and quoted John 7: 12 from the Bible: 'and there was much murmuring among the multitude concerning him. For some said: He is a good man. And others said: no, but he seduceth the people'.[258] The choice of this quotation must have been deliberate. Christ is the person being talked about in the above quotation, making the comparison between Simon and Christ explicit and marking Simon out a martyr whose true goodness was not appreciated in his life. The comparison also served to underline the wrongness of the disparaging monk's position.

After the monk disparaged Simon, he went to bed and was visited in his dream by a knight with a sword in his right hand and a piglet in the other. The knight ordered the monk to eat. The monk obeyed and the soldier told him to stop and tell the other monks what had happened. When the monk awoke, he found blood spots in and outside his mouth. Those other monks who had doubted Simon's sanctity recognised the truth and begged pardon for their actions. The marks on the face of the monk who had dreamed of Simon disappeared once he asked for forgiveness.[259] A similar event was related about Robert the deacon who disparaged Simon at a banquet. Robert lost the power of speech and was unable to move his hands or feet. Only the prayers of the guests at the banquet revived Robert and he promised never the disparage the earl again.[260]

---

[258] Ibid, p. 81. Also see John 7:12, viewed online at: https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=John+7%3A+12&version=DRA (accessed 10/02/2022).
[259] Halliwell, *Miracles of Simon de Montfort*, pp. 81-2.
[260] Ibid, p. 89.

The above two examples displayed Simon's ability to forgive those who doubted him, but he could also be unforgiving. Four citizens of Hereford related the tale of Philip, a chaplain, who goaded Simon into breaking his neck. He said that if Simon was holy, he wanted the Devil to break his neck, or for a miracle to be performed before he arrived home. Unfortunately for Philip, Simon intervened to have Philip's neck broken. Philip's servant who witnessed Philip's fall from his horse went mad for about two weeks after the event. He had to be kept in chains for that period.[261] This more vindictive aspect of Simon can also be seen in his warning to Margaret, wife of William Mauncelle, who was a member of the household of the earl of Gloucester. She had disparaged Simon, but once he appeared to her in a vision, she lost her senses, and only improved by begging for his forgiveness. When Simon, in a vision, healed Margaret, she asked him what would become of those who were his enemies and adversaries. Simon replied that some would be forgiven, but some would die evil deaths.[262] This image of Simon judging the living and almost condemning the souls of his enemies is Christlike in some ways. Ultimately, on the Day of Judgement, Christ will judge the living and the dead.[263] Simon, with God working through him, was being presented as playing a similar role to Christ.

The stories in the miracle collection about Simon's punishment of non-believers in his sanctity demonstrates both the power some people believed Simon had as a saint, but it also reveals the contested nature of his sanctity and that those who wrote about his miracles had to contend with a difficult subject matter. Simon had died excommunicate. He had been absolved by the legate in 1268, but the fact that he had been an excommunicate for any length of time presented difficulties for those who wished to stress Simon's sanctity. In some ways, these

[261] Ibid, p. 90.
[262] Ibid, pp. 99-100.
[263] See 2 Timothy 4: 1.

examples of Simon punishing non-believers are defensive, and acknowledge that not everyone believed he was a saint. One can see this most clearly in the *Flowers of History*. In this account, Simon was painted as a sacrilegious, merciless, cruel and avaricious monster. Henry, in his mercy and clemency which, according to the author, the rebels did not deserve, was Christlike in his actions.[264] He stopped short of saying that de Montfort was burning in Hell, but images of Simon have survived in illustrated Apocalypses that explicitly place Simon in Hell.

The first manuscript that has representations of Simon is the Lambeth Apocalypse. Laura Slater has argued that the work was a product of a workshop that operated in London between c. 1260-75 and it contains devotional and pastoral miniatures that depict the miracles of the Virgin Mary and various saints.[265] We cannot be certain who the principal donor was, but due to the image of a widow with the Quincy and Ferrers arms in the manuscript, two possible contenders emerge: Margaret de Ferrers or Eleanor de Quincy.[266] Both these women knew Simon or members of his household and they probably held baronial sympathies.[267] That being said the representation of Simon's arms in the manuscript is not straightforward. In a scene depicting the horsemen of the Apocalypse, on fol. 5r of the Lambeth Apocalypse, there is what Slater refers to as a possible 'refraction' of Simon de Montfort's arms on the second horseman of the Apocalypse. The de Montfort arms are not completely accurate. The lion on the de Montfort arms is black rather than its normal silver.[268] In Revelation 6:4, this second horseman, on a red horse is described in the following way:

---

[264] Yonge, *Flowers of History,* vol. 2, pp. 431-433. Trevet's account is less vicious, probably because more time had elapsed. See: Trevet, *Annales Sex Regum Angliae,* p. .263.
[265] L. Slater, *Art and Political Thought in Medieval England, c. 1150-1350,* (Boydell Press: Woodbridge, 2018), pp. 131-2.
[266] Ibid, pp. 132-3.
[267] Ibid, pp. 133-4.
[268] Ibid, p. 134.

And there went out another horse that was red: and to him that sat thereon, it was given that he should take peace from the earth, and that they should kill one another, and a great sword was given to him.[269]

The shield depiction can be seen as a negative depiction of Simon, as the man who would take peace from the earth but, as Slater has argued, it may refer to a negative depiction of the baronial period of revolt and rebellion.[270] The costs of war, especially a civil war, could be very high indeed, and if this manuscript was made after 1265, both Margaret and Eleanor would have seen its devasting effects first-hand. Additionally, Slater argued:

by potentially identifying Montfort's actions with the Apocalypse horseman associated with (civil) war and bloodshed, the image places current or recent events in England in the context of eschatological rather than earthly struggle.[271]

As she argues, the Lambeth Apocalypse was designed for close use over many years and its pictorial narrative was likely designed by clerical advisers. Such works were expected to be read carefully and they were 'designed to reward repeated and sustained looking, containing 'hidden surprises' multiple interpretative possibilities and unexpected depths, which may have been exactly what the patron demanded'.[272]

Slater is certainly correct in pointing to the ambiguity of images and that they could function on many levels. However, even if the image of one of the horsemen of the Apocalypse with Simon's arms is only meant to comment on the evils of war, a direct link was made

[269]See https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=revelation+6%3A4&version=DRA (accessed 08/03/2022).
[270] Slater, *Art and Political Thought*, p. 135.
[271] Ibid, p. 135.
[272] Ibid, p. 135.

between strife and heraldry associated with the de Montfort family. It is not a flattering depiction.

The images in the Lambeth Apocalypse are potentially ambiguous, but the images are less so in other illustrated apocalypses that have royalist patronage, as one might expect given the bias of the patrons. The first apocalypse which depicts Simon in an unambiguously negative light is the Trinity Apocalypse. The patronage of the work is not entirely clear, but Eleanor of Castile has been suggested as the patron.[273] Fol. 23r of the Trinity Apocalypse depicts the summoning of the army of the Beast, identified in the commentary with the Antichrist. In the image there are eight horsemen at the forefront of the army. The arms of Simon de Montfort are clearly represented and unlike in the Lambeth Apocalypse, the colours are completely correct. The soldier with Simon de Montfort's arms is behind at least five of the eight figures. Unlike those in front of him, he is bareheaded except for chainmail. All the other riders have a helmet or a crown. Additionally, unlike the others, who have bulging eyes and prominent noses, the 'Montfort' figure has a closed, downturned mouth and sunken eyes.[274] The figure is hunched and has a worried 'even fearful expression' that 'contrasts with the open, shouting mouths and focused gazes of the riders at the head of the army'.[275] The figure's shield is held up defensively and he has no weapon. The figure is less colourful than the other figures.[276] As Slater has argued, all of this makes the 'Montfort' figure like a 'fearful minion in the army of the Beast, rather than one of its bloodthirsty leaders'.[277] This made the 'Montfort' figure appear weak, unlike in the Lambeth Apocalypse where the 'Montfort' figure was a clear leader. This

[273] Ibid, p. 147.
[274] Ibid, p. 148.
[275] Ibid, p. 148.
[276] Ibid, p. 148.
[277] Ibid, p. 149.

may reflect the patron's desire to emasculate the 'Montfort' figure to undermine Simon de Montfort and his legacy.

One of the most compelling arguments that Slater makes about the Trinity Apocalypse is that she challenges the dating of the manuscript. Some art historians have argued that the manuscript dates from c. 1255 but Slater has termed this 'problematic'.[278] Although stylistically the manuscript can be dated to c. 1255-1265, a post 1265 date 'remains more likely for such explicit vilification of a former royal brother-in-law'.[279] Slater also points to another piece of evidence in the Trinity Apocalypse that would support at 1260s date. On fol. 23v, there is a depiction of birds eating the flesh of the defeated dead army. One of the corpses is identical to the 'Montfort' figure found depicted in the army of the beast.[280] The figure does not have de Montfort's shield, but it does appear to be the same person.[281] For Slater, the images on fol. 23r and fol. 23v are a:

> succinct visual dismissal of the baronial cause: identifying it through its leader with the Antichrist, while deriding Montfort as a warrior, attacking his charisma as a political leader and emphasising the totality and finality of his defeat[282]

Slater's argument is extremely convincing and presents a clear image that the patron or patrons of the manuscript despised Simon de Montfort, viewed him as a devilish figure, and wanted to deride all he stood for.

[278] Ibid, p. 147.
[279] Ibid, p. 149.
[280] Ibid, p. 149.
[281] Ibid, p. 150.
[282] Ibid, p. 150.

The final depiction of Simon de Montfort as a hellish figure can be seen in the Douce Apocalypse. Slater has dated this manuscript from 1260-1270. It is similar in style and iconography to the Trinity Apocalypse.[283] This manuscript is a vernacular translation of Revelation and on its opening page there is a historiated initial that has Eleanor of Castile and the Lord Edward kneeling before it.[284] As Slater has argued 'although this may not relate to the date of the illustrated Latin Apocalypse text' we can be more certain that the Douce Apocalypse has a royal provenance than the Trinity one.[285] The images contained within the Douce Apocalypse, therefore, can be seen as the most accurate reflection of the royalist position on Simon de Montfort. On fol. 31r of the Douce Apocalypse Simon de Montfort's arms are visible among the army of the Beast but they are on a square banner indicating his rank as a leader. His arms' tinctures are incorrect. There is a black lion on a yellow background. This colour choice can be seen as related to the iconography of Judas and its associations with betrayal. Furthermore, the men fighting under the Montfortian banner are depicted as Saracens as they have curved scimitars (contemporary Arabic weaponry) and they have dark, grimacing faces. The darkness of these figures was meant to demonstrate their allegiance with the Devil and the sinful nature of their souls. Muslims were often presented in Christian art as ugly and big to demonstrate their so-called 'monstrous' nature.[286] As Slater has argued, the details stressed the excommunicate status of Simon de Montfort at his death 'directly attacking the religious and crusading dimension of the baronial cause'.[287] Interestingly, on fol. 87r, Gilbert de Clare's arms were depicted in the army of the Beast as well.[288] This perhaps implies that the date of the manuscript was after the battle of Evesham but before 1268 when the legate held a ceremony

[283] Ibid, p. 151.
[284] Ibid, p. 151.
[285] Ibid, p. 151.
[286] Ibid, pp. 151-152.
[287] Ibid, p. 153.
[288] Ibid, p. 153.

of reconciliation and Edward and Gilbert swore to go on crusade along with other leading members of the nobility.

All the above three manuscripts can be dated from between c. 1250-1270. The precise dating is hard to ascertain with certainty but given the ways in which the figures that look Montfortian were depicted, it seems more likely that they date from the latter end of the date range, especially in the case of the Trinity Apocalypse and Douce Apocalypse. As Slater has noted, it was not uncommon for Simon to be presented as a member of the army of the Beast, and that image remained at least in royal circles. At Edward's funeral in 1307, Simon was referred to as the lion that David (i.e., Henry III) had to be saved from. The sermon also referred to Simon as the hand of the Beast.[289] The depth of feeling that Simon provoked did not die with him. The Douce Apocalypse has the most disparaging presentation of the de Montfort arms, and it seems highly convincing that the target is Simon de Montfort specifically, and that the aim was to deride him and, crucially, to undermine any presentation of him as a saint. We can be fairly certain that this was the royalist position, especially Edward's. Even though Simon was absolved by legate Ottobuono in 1268 for his sins, it seems unlikely that Edward ever forgave Simon for what he had inflicted on both him and his father. Simon's cult and his reputation for sanctity presented a difficulty for the royal family and one of the ways in which that narrative was countered was in the works of art that they commissioned. Illustrated Apocalypses were works of high status and likely to be displayed. They were also personal items that were to be re-read. It is hard to know how widely disseminated the images of the Montfortian figures in the above Apocalypses were. However, at the very least the images in the Douce Apocalypse do display a royalist interpretation and that the royal family felt the need to disparage Simon. It was not enough that he had been brutally murdered at Evesham,

[289] Ibid, p. 153.

everything about him and what he stood for had to be obliterated. One of the ways of doing that was by mocking him and presenting him as irreligious and burning in Hell. This represents the danger that Simon's memory still posed for the royal family. There would have been no need to deny Simon's sanctity had it not been demonstrably believed in.

## Conclusion

Simon de Montfort was a thorn in Henry's side for most of the time they knew one another. He became actively dangerous to him in 1258 when he was one of the leaders of the baronial reform movement. The Provisions had a moral element to them, and this made it difficult for Henry, as a pious king, to totally ignore. He tried to present them as damaging and impious due to their assault on the rights of a divinely appointed king. Despite his best attempts, the Provisions had become too important to ignore. They were, in many ways, the logical conclusion of the absorption of Magna Carta as a yardstick against which good kingship (which was also moral kingship) was judged.

Between 1258 and 1263, the upper hand switched between Henry and Simon. At times where Henry regained control, he engaged in a mixture of harsh acts and generous ones. He had to convince his subjects, lay and ecclesiastical of his position and of his worthiness of their support. An error Henry made in this period was to try to completely annul the Provisions, and to use the papacy to threaten excommunication. For anyone who was wavering in their support for Henry, his extreme actions made them more recalcitrant. Henry did try and use his veneration of saints to display his piety (and a key reason for people to support him and see him as better than Simon de Montfort) to observers, lay and spiritual, English and not. On a

personal level, Henry strengthened his relationships with a variety of saints who fit his purposes. He also engaged in broader saint veneration.

The extraordinary abandonment of Henry by seven Montfortian bishops is connected to the gulf between Henry's promises, and reality. Simon did not have that baggage and was viewed as devout by some of the leading ecclesiastical figures of the day. He was a magnetic individual whose force of personality overshadowed Henry. Throughout 1263-5, Simon encouraged the magnates of the land, lay and ecclesiastical of his desire to fight for the Provisions to ensure good government. Once Henry lost at Lewes and had been reduced to a cipher, the only option open to his was his piety, and mainly personal piety. The oblation rolls reveal how much more of the money was being directed to inside the royal chapel than outside of it. Henry's veneration of saints during the nadir of his kingship reveals his anxieties and his genuine fear that he would be martyred.

Simon's death at Evesham caused as many problems as it solved. Henry, unlike Simon, never had preachers on his side making his case. Many believed Simon had a died a martyr's death and the miracle collection of Simon de Montfort reveals the depth of belief in his sanctity. Henry undermined his position by engaging in a vindictive policy towards the rebels and the pious acts and pious patronage that he did engage in was directed towards those who had been loyal to him. He undercut his attempts to appear magnanimous by treating the rebels unfairly. During the Siege of Kenilworth, Henry had to modify his position, allowing rebels to regain their lands. Gloucester's rebellion forced Henry to modify his behaviour towards the rebels again and finally allowed peace to be attained. Henry's acts of political reconciliation were accompanied with ceremonial and pious acts that painted himself in a merciful light and promised an end to rancour.

Simon and Henry were remembered in very different ways. Unlike Simon, Henry died in his own bed. Many of his obituaries present him as a pious man but not, with one exception, as a saint. Even the account that talked about Henry's miracles gave no details and the reference to miracles feels more like an artistic flourish rather than revelatory of deep feeling. Simon seems to have provoked both extremes. The miracle collection provides detailed accounts testifying to the range of his miracles and the depth of belief in his sanctity. He was clearly considered a saint despite dying excommunicate. However, he was also seen in a negative light. The Lambeth Apocalypse, the Trinity Apocalypse, and the Douce Apocalypse all present figures with Montfortian heraldry as hellish creatures, usually as members of the Army of the Beast. The Douce Apocalypse is the most strident in its presentation of the 'Montfort' figure as a demonic and weak creature. It is the only manuscript that has been examined in this chapter that has a certain royalist provenance and so pithily demonstrates what members of the royal family felt about Simon de Montfort. This feeling, as can be seen from the Lambeth Apocalypse, was not just restricted to the royal family. At the very least, many people suffered during the civil war. Simon played an integral role in igniting and maintaining the war, and some blame for the atrocities committed must be laid at his door, as well as at the royalists. Simon was a controversial character in life, death, and afterlife. Henry, and Edward, never managed to obliterate his memory, and the impact he had on both men, when alive and dead, was profound.

Conclusion

Henry's piety cannot be understood unless it is contextualised. Regal piety was different from all other types of piety due to the nature of kingship. Ultimately, kings owed their positions to God. The portrayal of kings in the Bible was not straightforward,[1] but they were expected to rule justly and protect the law, which was, ultimately, divine law.[2] Stephen Langton, whose influence was key in the 1225 reissue of Magna Carta, and in Henry's minority, believed that the clergy had to ensure that kings adhered to a written volume of law.[3] Salvation lay more with bishops than kings, but their position at the apex of society meant their example had the potential to damn their subjects if they fell short. Ruling was, fundamentally, a moral action.

As Farris has noted, royal piety was the product of an inherited culture.[4] One king's reign was a link in a bigger dynastic chain; they had to be aware of what had preceded them and what would succeed them. Consequently, one can see overlap between the pious practices of John, Henry, Edward, Blanche of Castile, and Louis. All of them venerated native saints, engaged in almsgiving, and patronised their favoured religious institutions and individuals. However, each modified what they practised depending on personal preference and the pious trends of the day. Their own perception of their pious duties also shaped their pious decisions.

[1] P. Buc, *L'Ambiguïté du Livre: Prince, Pouvoir, et Peuple Dans les Commentaires de la Bible au Moyen Age,* (Paris : Beauchesne, 1994), pp. 28-9. Also see above, pp. 38-41.
[2] D.L. D'Avray, '*Magna Carta*: It's Background in Stephen Langton's Academic Biblical Exegesis and its Episcopal Reception', *Studi Medievali* Serie Terza Anno XXXVIII Fasc I (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi Sull'Alto Medioevo, 1997), 423-438, at p. 428.
[3] S.T. Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community of England 1213-1272* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 5.
[4] C.H.D.C. Farris, C.H.D.C., "The Pious Practices of Edward I, 1272-1307" (Royal Holloway College, University of London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2013), p. 15.

Many of Henry and Louis' pious practices overlapped, for several reasons. First, they both came to the throne as minors under the influence of figures who had absorbed the ideals of Lateran IV (Peter des Roches and Blanche of Castile). Second, their long minorities created a gap between their pious practices and those of their fathers', presenting opportunities for new practices to be adopted.[5] This was enhanced for Henry due to his father's evil reputation, enshrined in the work of Matthew Paris and Roger of Wendover.[6] Henry's magnates wanted a complete repudiation of John. John was not a pious man, and at best one can regard his practices as acceptable in his day, with a 'credit and debit' conception. For example, if he missed a mass, he could pay to make up for it rather than examine his conscience and regret what he had done.[7] After Lateran IV, with its focus on interior religious practices including penance and contrition, such a conception of pious actions was unacceptable.

Other factors specific to Henry's circumstances influenced his piety. Unlike Louis, Henry lacked a strong parental influence over his pious development. John died when he was nine and his mother left England in 1218, never to return.[8] That is not to say Henry did not have a relationship with his mother, but she was not present to influence his pious practices on a day-to-day basis. Consequently, he had the potential to be more greatly influenced by the ecclesiastical figures surrounding him.

One of the central problems that this thesis has had to grapple with is how to discern Henry's motives from the evidence base. It is hard enough to infer motives from the actions of

---

[5] See above pp. 66-8.
[6] For a discussion of this caricature and how it coloured later assessments of John, see P. Webster, *King John and Religion* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), pp. 14-15.
[7] Webster, *John and Religion*, p. 13.
[8] D.A. Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power and Personal Rule 1207-1258'* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2020), p. 153.

living people let alone from one who has been dead for over 800 years. However, as John Arnold has argued, we can infer beliefs from actions especially for the medieval period. One's activity was meant to reflect one's faith and one's understanding of it.[9] For medieval Christians, one's deeds were as important as one's thoughts and actions were the embodiment of faith.[10] Henry's pious actions, therefore, reflected what he thought and they were informed by his understanding of faith.

Before examining Henry's more ostentatious acts of piety, it is necessary to discuss his routine piety. Just because this piety was routine does not mean that it was unimportant, it laid the foundation for all his other acts. Consistent patronage of religious recipients accrued Henry spiritual succour that enabled him to rule and affirmed his fitness for rule. Henry's patronage was broad, covering monks, nuns, friars, hospitals, and lepers. The scale of his patronage varied from a tun of wine to a detailed charter granting fairs, markets and other liberties and privileges.[11] He also rarely charged religious recipients for their gifts, even when they were lucrative. Furthermore, many of the charges that Henry did impose were done either in 1227, when his minority council took advantage of him attaining his majority to charge those seeking confirmations of charters made during the minority, or in years when his finances were under the most strain, such as in the 1250s.[12] This demonstrates that the primary aim of those grants were pious.

Henry's patronage of bishops was varied and consistent. When one examines the bishops who received the most patronage during Henry's reign, one finds certain similarities.

---

[9] J.H. Arnold, *Belief and Unbelief in Medieval Europe* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), pp. 6. 65.
[10] Ibid, p. 40.
[11] See above, pp. 74-103.
[12] See, for example, *CFR, 1226-27*, nos 161, 172; *CFR, 1228-29*, no 79; *CFR, 1252-53*, mo 464; *CFR, 1255-56*, no 927.

Overall, the bishops who received significant patronage either served or had served Henry or John in an administrative fashion (such as Jocelin of Wells, Peter des Roches, and Godfrey Giffard). In Aymer de Lusignan's case, his biological relationship to Henry determined his high favour. They also were rarely charged for their gifts. Many of those who were charged were charged in 1227 due to the minority's council desire to use Henry's attainment of his majority to raise money by charging for the confirmation of charters.[13] However, the types of gifts given to Henry's favoured bishops changed as his reign progressed. Except for Aymer, most of the bishops favoured in the mid-later years of Henry's reigns received less lucrative gifts, with a dominance of deer, wood (for fuel or building work), and small grants of money. This seems to support Huw Ridgeway's argument that as financial pressures increased on Henry in the 1250s, his patronage was squeezed.[14]

Henry's patronage of established orders seems to have been linked with dynastic connections. The houses that Henry most patronised throughout his reign included Beaulieu (John's foundation), Netley (daughter house of Beaulieu), and Hailes (Richard of Cornwall's foundation). Dynastic links strongly influenced Henry's patronage. Henry also heavily patronised places with well-established cult centres including Bury St Edmunds, demonstrating his attachment to local saints.[15] Again, Henry rarely charged these recipients for gifts.

In the early years of his reign, Henry enthusiastically supported the Templars. He initially wished to be buried in the New Temple[16], but his plans changed due to his desire to be

[13] See, for example, *CChR*, vol. 1, p. 6; *CFR, 1226-1227*, no 161 and no 172.
[14] H.W. Ridgeway, 'Foreign Favourites and Henry III's Problems of Patronage, 1247-1258', *The English Historical Review* 104 (1989), 590-610, at 591, 596; H.W. Ridgeway, "The Politics of The English Royal Court 1247-65, with Special Reference to the Role of the Aliens" (Oxford University, Unpublished PhD thesis, 1983), pp. 185, 202.
[15] See above, pp. 89-92.
[16] Z. Stewart, 'A Lesson in Patronage: King Henry III, the Knights Templar, and a Royal Mausoleum at the Temple Church in London', *Speculum* 94 (2019), 334-384, at 346-7.

buried with the Confessor in Westminster Abbey. Even with that change, the Templars were very rarely charged for their gifts.

Henry supported not only well-established orders, he also patronised a group of people this thesis has termed 'vulnerable'. Generally, nunneries were less wealthy than their male counterparts and some struggled to stay afloat. On the rare occasions that Henry did charge nunneries for gifts, he seems to have only charged those that were wealthy, such as Barking.[17] Additionally, most of the charges seem to have occurred in the 1250s, when Henry's finances were under the most strain.

Henry seems to have had special regard for friars, lepers, the sick, and poor. From 1231, the friars received multiple gifts every year.[18] Most of these gifts were small in value but this was linked with the philosophy of the friars who were meant to live lives of poverty. Henry's patronage of lepers had dynastic precedents and chimed with the Franciscan ideals of care for the sick and poor.[19] The only new foundations we can certainly attribute to Henry were two hospitals: Ospringe and the Hospital of St John without the East Gate of Oxford. Most of Henry's patronage of hospitals focused on these sites and most of the larger grants or money and liberties went to his foundations. Most other gifts to hospitals consisted of small grants of money and wood.[20]

---

[17] *CFR, 1252-1253*, no 464.
[18] See above, pp. 97-99.
[19] K. Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation: The Alms-Giving and Religious Foundations of Henry III', *Reading Medieval* 43, 79-98, at 79.
[20] Examples of wood and money: *CChR*, vol.1, p. 79 (2), 142, 191, 293 ; *CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. 160, 405; *CLR, 1240-45*, p. 58; *CLR, 1267-72*, p.110, 221; *CPR, 1225-1232*, p. 199; *CR, 1227-1231*, p. 184; *CR, 1234-37*, pp. 121, 243; *CR, 1247-51*, pp. 260, 455; *CR, 1251-53*, p. 95; *CR, 1254-56*, pp. 345; *CR, 1256-59*, p. 97; *CR, 1268-72*, pp. 194, 220, 376.

Generally, Henry's patronage of vulnerable recipients focused on small, practical gifts whether the established orders and bishops were more likely to receive more lucrative gifts, at least until Henry's financial issues limited the types of gifts he could give. Despite his financial pressures, Henry rarely charged religious recipients for gifts, even extensive grants of lands and liberties.[21] In many ways Henry's focus on vulnerable recipients was in line with the changing patronage styles of the thirteenth century outlined by Ward: a move from the established orders to groups like the friars.[22] It also demonstrates Henry's absorption of Franciscan ideals that Katie Phillips has noted.[23]

Another crucial aspect of Henry's routine piety was Westminster Abbey. Westminster became the centre of power and piety. The Confessor was buried there and was the centre of his cult. Henry started to expand and rebuild the Abbey from 1245 onwards. The translation ceremony of the Confessor in October 1269 was the symbolic completion of work at the Abbey. Westminster was the premier destination generally, and for liturgically significant feast days including papal feast days such as St Peter Ad Vincula and SS. Peter and Paul. The papal aspect of Westminster Abbey must not be forgotten. Edward the Confessor rebuilt in in lieu of a pilgrimage to Rome, to thank God and the pope for their role in securing his throne.[24] Henry's presence at Westminster was not always just about Edward.

During Henry's reign, Westminster became the centre of all aspects of his kingship including government and administration. It was the site of many of Henry's ceremonial

---

[21] For example, the friars were never charged for grants of land and liberties. For examples of the gifts of land without charges, see *CLR, 1226-1240,* p. 282; *CLR, 1245-51,* p. 65; *CPR, 1232-47,* p. 459; *CPR, 1266-72,* pp. 321, 530; *CR, 1227-1231,* p.11; *CR, 1234-37,* pp. 284, 316, 433, 495-5, 497; *CR, 1242-47,* pp. 392, 517.
[22] J.C. Ward, 'Fashions in Monastic Endowment: The Foundations of the Clare Family, 1066-1314', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 32 (1981), 427-451, at 439.
[23] K. Phillips, 'Devotion by Donation', 79.
[24] See T.S. Fenster and J. Wogan-Browne, (trans. and ed.), *The History of Saint Edward the King* (Arizona: Arizona University Press, 2008), pp. 71-4.

displays, including weddings, and other moments of joy such as when Henry returned from the continent. Westminster was the backdrop to Henry's kingship. His detailed patronage of the place and the monks resulted in an impressive site that projected strength, opulence, and sanctity.[25] Westminster was the biggest physical demonstration of the style of kingship Henry practiced and how he wished to be seen.

Another conventional aspect of Henry's piety was his ancestral commemoration. The penitential system in the thirteenth century encouraged people to pay for masses to be said for the souls of the dead.[26] Everyone, except the damned and saints, went to Purgatory. The time one spent in Purgatory was linked with the scale of one's sins but, one's time in Purgatory could be expedited by one's successors having masses sung for their souls. As the head of a dynasty that was alive, dead, and yet to be, Henry was responsible for the health of that dynasty. Any stain on his dynasty, such as John's problematic relationship with the English church and his own magnates, had to be expunged for the well-being of the dynasty. If not, it had the potential to negatively influence observers' (both earthly and spiritual) perception of the dynasty, making it seem less worthy. Henry's treatment of Eleanor of Brittany was largely due to the guilt he felt for how she had been treated. Henry was searching for God's forgiveness for his dynasty, but for John in particular.

Henry was broad in his patronage of places associated with dynastic ancestors, with gifts being made either side of the Channel. Westminster was the most patronised site but Beaulieu, Worcester, Croxton, Netley, Tarrant and Amesbury were the English sites heavily patronised during Henry's reign. All these places were associated with his immediate family.

---

[25] See above pp. 109-114.
[26] For a good explanation of the penitential system and Purgatory, see J le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. by A. Goldhammer (London: Scolar Press, 1984).

Beaulieu, Worcester, Croxton and Netley were all associated with John. Perhaps Henry's extensive patronage suggests how much John meant to him but also his concern over his father's salvation. Tarrant was where Henry's sister, Joan, was buried. He had patronised the site before she died but the scale of his patronage significantly increased after she was buried there. Amesbury was where Eleanor of Brittany chose to be buried. The choice of Amesbury may have been linked to the fact that it was dedicated to SS. Mary and Melor. St Melor was a saint of Brittany who was allegedly murdered by his uncle when he was seven years old.[27] This seemed a direct nod at John's alleged murder of Arthur of Brittany. By associating his dynasty with Amesbury (so much so that Eleanor of Provence retired there towards the end of her life), Henry neutralised the potential anti-Angevin sentiment to be associated with the site.

Henry was also generous to sites on the continent. Some of the places he patronised included Rouen, Bec Hellouin, L'Abbaye les Hommes, and L'Abbaye aux Dames. The most patronised place was Fontevrault. This is not surprising because Fontevrault was, essentially, the Angevin mausoleum where Henry II, Eleanor of Aquitaine, Richard II, and Isabella of Angoûleme were buried. John's heart was buried there, and Henry's heart was sent there by Edward after his death. Henry clearly felt a deep connection with Fontevrault and wanted to secure the salvation of his dynasty.[28]

A final element of Henry's routine piety was his general appeals to saints to secure blessings for a variety of reasons. Saints were powerful intercessors with God who could accomplish several things. Henry favoured certain saints and venerated them at times of normalcy as well as times of crisis. Henry's favourite saint was Edward the Confessor.

[27] D.H. Farmer, *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints*, 5th edition revised, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 318.
[28] For details about ancestral commemoration, see above, pp. 190-206.

Numerous offerings were given to him and Westminster Abbey every year after the start of Henry's personal rule. Edmund, king and martyr, was another frequent recipient of Henry's patronage. Henry also appealed to English episcopal saints, namely Thomas Becket and Edmund Rich. The anti-royal potential in both cults presented some difficulty. These figures could, and indeed were, called upon by those who opposed royal policy, most notably during the period of baronial revolt and rebellion.[29] Nonetheless, Henry did neutralise their risk by associating himself with them. Henry's son, Edmund, was not only named after Edmund, king and martyr, he was also named after Edmund Rich. The naming of his child after Edmund Rich marked a permanent ceremonial commitment to Edmund's ideals and demonstrated that Henry and Edmund were spiritually reconciled.

Henry's commitment to native saints demonstrated his desire to display his commitment to England and his conception of himself as English. He was proud of England's premier saints and demonstrated his desire to emulate them. This was a message that would have resonated well with his subjects. However, one must not forget the universal aspects of Henry's kingship. Even if one discounts his continental possessions, which undoubtedly made him have a more continental outlook, due to the shared religious practices of Christians in Latin Christendom, he venerated many universal saints. Papal saints and the Virgin Mary received the most patronage, with the Virgin being the most popular. This is not surprising given her role as the Queen of Heaven and chief intercessor with God. Additionally, the thirteenth century saw the rise of cult of the Virgin.[30] Due to changes in theological and devotional positions, the human suffering of Christ was elevated. This exalted the position of Mary due to

[29] See, for example, S.T. Ambler, *The Song of Simon de Montfort: England's First Revolution and the Death of Chivalry* (London: Picador, 2019), p. 278.
[30] Nicholas Vincent has argued that by the thirteenth century, Mary was acquiring a status 'close to the fourth member of the Trinity'. See N.C. Vincent, 'King Henry III and the Blessed Virgin Mary', in R.N. Swanson (ed.) *Studies in Church History* 39 (2004), 126-146, at 142.

the focus on her suffering for the fate of her son. To have not venerated the Virgin would have been unthinkable. One cannot say that Henry's veneration of the Virgin was particularly special.

Henry's use of the sacred during grand ceremonial events seems to have been inspired by some of the events he witnessed as a child. The translations of SS. Wulfstan, Osmund, and Becket were all opulent affairs attended by premier guests. Becket's translation was an event of international significance. Langton spent so liberally on the event that his successors were still paying back the debt thirty years later.[31] Henry was involved in all three ceremonies and saw the interaction of pious and political aims. Langton organised Becket's translation, which followed Henry's second coronation, which itself followed the dedication of Salisbury. Becket was translated on the day on which Henry II had died, making a permanent link between the Angevin dynasty and the saint. Henry learned from Langton the importance of gathering aid from saintly intercessors to enable him to act as an effective king and of displaying that support to those he intended to impress.

One of Henry's most important jobs as king was to produce an heir. As a result, royal marriages, births, and purification ceremonies were important pieces of dynastic bombast. These occasions provided Henry with the opportunity to reimagine his dynasty, stressing the aspects of his dynasty he wished to promote. He named at least two of his children after Anglo-Saxon saints (Edward and Edmund), publicly demonstrating his commitment to good English rule. His eldest daughter, Margaret was probably named after both Margaret of Antioch and Margaret of Scotland, demonstrating another Anglo-Saxon link to his subjects.[32]

---

[31] K. Emery, 'Architecture, Space and Memory: Liturgical Representation of Thomas Becket, 1170-1220', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 173 (2020), 61-77, at 68.
[32] See above, pp. 169-172.

Dynastic marriages were times also public occasions where Henry could make statements about his kingship and piety. It was also a time to introduce and integrate new members of the dynasty. Many of these new members were foreigners, sometimes with different customs and outlooks from Henry's subjects. Paris' *Chronica Majora* contains attacks against several of Henry's foreign relatives (Savoyard and Lusignan).[33] These likely reflect some of the prejudices and resentments surrounding Henry's court because some of Paris' informants were leading magnates.[34] Henry would have been aware of criticisms of his relatives and the concern leading members of his kingdom might have had about new family members. He therefore used marriage ceremonies to stress the Englishness of his kingship and his commitment to fair and just rule. Just after Henry married Eleanor of Provence, he enacted the Statute of Merton which committed the Crown to ruling in the spirit of Magna Carta by protecting the most vulnerable in society, especially widows and minors.[35] The statute was a public commitment to good and fair rule. Henry also included these foreign relatives in the veneration of English saints, especially Edward the Confessor. This displayed the prestige of the dynasty to those joining the dynasty and to those witnessing the event. It was a way of symbolically welcoming them into the dynasty and portraying the new members as being part of an English spiritual world.

Henry had to alter his pious practices depending on the circumstances that he faced. In normal times, Henry had more control over who he chose to venerate, to patronise and to thank. Henry's relationship with the Confessor was very important, but he showed great flexibility in times of stress. This can be seen in his appeals to St Frideswide before the battle of Lewes, and

[33] See *CM*, vol. 3, pp. 388, 410, 411-12, 412; *CM*, vol. 4, pp. 48, 236; *CM*, vol. 5, pp. 363, 440, 509, 514, 575-6.
[34] For information about Paris' informants see R. Vaughan, *Matthew Paris*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), pp. 13-20.
[35] *CM*, vol. 3, pp. 341-2.

his appeals to St Kenelm and St Ethelbehrt when Simon was hauling him around Gloucester.[36] Henry was responsive to the needs of the time and venerated local saints to gain the good will of local observers. This can be seen in his veneration of St Quiteria and St Cuthbert and St William of York at times when he was in Gascony and experiencing domestic crises with Scotland.[37]

The biggest crisis of Henry's reign was the period of baronial revolt and rebellion. The Provisions of Oxford threatened the very foundation of kingships and were made even more complex for Henry to deal with because of the involvement of Simon de Montfort. He did not become the undisputed leader of the movement until 1263, but he was heavily involved and pressed his stamp on it. By 1258, Simon had long been a thorn in Henry's side. During the period of baronial revolt and rebellion, he became dangerous, to the point in 1265, at Evesham where he literally wanted to kill the king.[38]

One of the most difficult aspects of the baronial rebellion for Henry to deal with was that Simon made the Provisions more than reforms, he made them a noble cause that became a crusading one from 1263 onwards. The narrative that Simon put out had to be countered if Henry was to free himself from the Provisions. In tandem with his political acts, Henry used pious acts to present himself as a worthy, pious king. He engaged in his normal broad patronage but was also flexible in his pious choices such as when he venerated St Frideswide on the eve of the battle of Northampton despite the superstition that kings were not meant to enter her church.[39]

---

[36] For St Frideswide, see above pp. 222-223. For Ethelbehrt and Kenelm, see pp. 232-233.
[37] See above, for St Quiteria, p. 140. For Cuthbert, pp. 134-5. For William of York, pp. 134-5, 185, 207.
[38] Ambler, *Song of Simon de Montfort*, p. 327.
[39] See above, pp. 222-3.

Despite Henry's pious acts, over half the episcopate sided with de Montfort and provided the intellectual justification for his regime.[40] Despite Henry's best efforts, despite the sensitivity in his saint veneration and patronage of figures such as the bishop of Connor who held lands in areas of his kingdom where his authority was less secure, people were sceptical of Henry's motives.[41] His pious acts and ceremonial displays were not enough to detract from his failings as a king.

After his loss at Lewes, Henry became Simon's captive. He no longer had control over his government and could only appeal to the saints for aid. The fortuitous survival of a partial oblation roll covering the period in the lead up to the battle of Evesham demonstrates the flexibility of Henry's personal piety.[42] His veneration of Kenelm and Ethelbehrt reveal his anxieties about potentially being killed and his hope that these English regal saints would protect him. His veneration also further demonstrates the flexibility in Henry's personal piety.

Simon's death at Evesham did not end Henry's troubles. Henry, unlike Simon, never had preachers on his side making his case.[43] Simon was immediately viewed by some as a martyr, making him dangerous and a potential symbol of rebellion. Henry's initial way of tackling the problem was to obliterate and punish everything and everyone associated with Simon. However, this ultimately undermined the pious acts he was engaging in to pacify the kingdom. He engaged in vindictive policies against the rebels when, in 1265, he disinherited not only those who had stood against him, but their heirs as well.[44] Such acts undermined his attempts to appear magnanimous and just. Gradually, Henry was forced to modify his position

[40] Amber, *Bishops in the Political Community*, p. 8.
[41] For the treatment of the bishop of Connor, see above p. 220.
[42] TNA E101/349/30.
[43] Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community*, p. 145 n. 123.
[44] A. Gransden, (ed. and trans.), *The Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds 1212-1301* (London: Nelson, 1964), p. 32.

due to the Siege at Kenilworth, and then due to Gloucester's rebellion. Only then was peace attained and Henry engaged in acts of political reconciliation accompanied by pious acts. In a general council held in April 1268, the legate publicly forgave Simon and all who had supported him.[45] This ceremony of spiritual forgiveness was then followed by a parliament held on the Nativity of John the Baptist where Gloucester, Edward, Edmund, and at least 120 other nobles and knights took the cross.[46] This was the symbolic union between the nobles of the land engaging in a moral endeavour. With the focus on Edward and his generation, the ceremony looked to the future of the Plantagenet dynasty. The final ceremony of reconciliation was the translation ceremony of Edward the Confessor in 1269 where Henry reiterated his devotion to the Confessor and his hope that the saint would ensure the peace of the realm.

Despite Henry's actions, he never inspired the same feelings that Simon de Montfort. One obituary did refer to Henry as a saint but gave no details of his miracles, making the reference look like an artistic flourish rather than genuine sentiment.[47] Simon's miracle collection contained detailed accounts testifying to the range of his powers.[48] Despite dying excommunicate, he was strongly believed to be a saint. However, Simon appears to have provoked both extremes. Simon was portrayed negatively in the Lambeth Apocalypse, the Trinity Apocalypse, and the Douce Apocalypse. In these works, there are figures with Montfortian heraldry as members of the Army of the Beast.[49] The Douce Apocalypse is particularly vitriolic which is unsurprising given its royal provenance.[50] This depth of feeling

---

[45] Luard, 'Annals of Osney', in *AM,* vol. 4, pp. 215-6.
[46] Luard, 'Annals of Osney', in *AM,* vol. 4, pp. 216-7, 'Annals of Waverley', in *AM,* vol. 2, p. 375, 'Annals of Worcester', in *AM,* vol. 4, pp. 457-8, 'Wyke's Chronicle', in *AM,* vol. 4, p. 218.
[47] C.D. Yonge (ed. And trans.), *The Flowers of History, especially such as relate to the affairs of Britain from the beginning of the world to the year 1307 collected by Matthew of Westminster,* 2 vols (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853), vol. 2, p. 454.
[48] J.O. Halliwell (ed), *The Chronicle of William de Rishanger of the Barons' War, the Miracles of Simon de Montfort* (London: The Camden Society, 1840), pp. 67-110.
[49] For a discussion of these figures, see L. Slater, *Art and Political Thought in Medieval England, c. 1150-1350,* (Boydell Press: Woodbridge, 2018), pp. 131-154.
[50] Slater, *Art and Political Thought,* p. 151.

was not just limited to the royal family, as can be seen from the Lambeth Apocalypse. Simon played an integral role in igniting and maintaining the rebellion and the presence in his miracle collection of him punishing those who doubt his sanctity reveals just how controversial a figure Simon was in life, death, and afterlife. By contrast, Henry was a much less controversial figure.

One cannot know definitively the role that piety played in saving Henry's kingship, but it undoubtedly helped. It was much easier to justify supporting a monarch who had some redeeming qualities especially after Simon's period as the *de facto* king of England. One cannot say how far Henry's reputation for generous practices, especially his monumental almsgiving, prevented some of his subjects from acting against him. What seems very plausible is that he was held in high regard by those who had benefitted from his charitable actions. In a sense, he was remembered in a similar way to the Confessor, a *rex simplex*, but a good man. That was probably how Henry would have preferred it.

Bibliography

Archival sources

TNA C47/3/44
TNA E101/349/27
TNA E101/349/30
TNA E101/667/50

Primary sources (printed)

*Calendar of the Charter Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office,* 6 vols (London: H.M.S.0., 1903-1927).

Calendar of the Fine Rolls of the Reign of Henry III (available both on the Henry III Fine Rolls Project's website (http://www.finerollshenry3.org.uk) and within Calendar of the Fine Rolls of the Reign of Henry III 1216–1242, ed. P. Dryburgh and B. Hartland, technical ed. A. Ciula and J.M. Vieira, 3 vols (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007-2009).

*Calendar of the Liberate Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III,* 6 vols (London H.M.S.O., 1916-64).

*Calendar of Patent Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office,* 6 vols (London: H.M.S.O., 1901-13).

Cheney, C.R., and Powicke, F.M., (ed), *Councils & Synods With Other Documents Relating to the English Church II A.D. 1205-1313: Part I 1205-1265* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964).

*Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III preserved in the Public Record Office,* 14 vols (London: H.M.S.O, 1902-38).

Coss, P., (ed.), *Thomas Wright's Political Songs of England: From the Reign of John to that of Edward II, with a new introduction by Peter Coss* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Craib, T., (ed), *Itinerary of Henry III, 1215-1272,* (London, P.R.O, 1923).

Darlington, R.R., *The Vita Wulstani of William Malmesbury to which are added the extant abridgements of this work and the miracles and translation of St Wulstan,*(London: The Royal Historical Society, 1928).

Fenster, T.S., and Wogan-Browne, J., (trans. and ed.), *The History of Saint Edward the King* (Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2008).

Giles, J.A., (trans. and ed.), *Matthew Paris English History from the year 1235 to 1273,* 3 vols (London: Henry G Bohn, 1852-4).

Giles, J.A., (trans. and ed.), *Roger of Wendover's Flowers of History: formerly ascribed to Matthew Paris,* 2 vols (Felinfach: Llanerch, 1996).

Gransden, A., (ed. and trans.), *The Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds 1212-1301* (London: Nelson, 1964).

Halliwell, J.O., (ed), *The Chronicle of William de Rishanger of the Barons' War, the Miracles of Simon de Montfort* (London:The Camden Society, 1840).

Hewlett, H.C., (ed), *Roger de Wendover Liber Qui Dicitur Flores Historiarum Regis Secundi Primo The Flowers of History by Roger of Wendover from the Year of Our Lord 1154* 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

Lawrence, C.H., (ed. and trans.) *The Letters of Adam Marsh,* 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006).

Lawrence, C.H., (trans. and ed.), *The Life of St Edmund by Matthew Paris* (London: Alan Sutton, 1996).

Luard, H.R., (ed.), *Annales Monastici,* 5 vols (London: Longman, 1864-9).

Luard, H.R., (ed.), *Matthaei Parisiensis, Monarchi Sancti Albani, Chronica Majora,* 7 vols (London: Longman, 1872-83).

Morris, M., (ed.), *The Royal Charter Witness Lists of Henry III (1216-1272) from the Charter Rolls in the Public Record Office,* 2 vols (Kew: List and Index Society, 2001).

O'Meara, J.J., (ed. and trans.), *Gerald of Wales's The History and Topography of Ireland* (London: Penguin, 1982).

Riley, H.T., (ed. and trans.), *Chronicles of the Mayors and Sheriffs of London, A.D. 1188 to A.D. 1274* (London: Trübner, 1863).

Rothwell, H., (ed.), *The Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1957).

Russell, J.C., and Heironimus, J. P., (ed.), *The Shorter Latin Poems of Master Henry of Avranches Relating to England* (Cambridge, MA: The Medieval Academy of America, 1935).

Salter, E. G., (ed. and trans.) *The Coming of the Friars Minor to England and Germany, Being the Chronicles of Brother Thomas of Eccleston and Brother Jordan of Giano* (London and Toronto: J M Dent, 1926).

Stapleton, T., (ed.), *De Antiquis Legibus Liber Cronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londoniarum et quaedam, que contingebant temporibus illis ab anno MCLXXVIII ad annum MCCLXXIV cum appendice* (London: J B Nichols, 1846).

Stevenson, J., (ed. and trans.), *A Medieval Chronicle of Scotland: The Chronicle of Melrose, facsimile reprint of the London 1850s original* (Lampeter: Llanerch, 1991).

Stevenson, J., (ed.), *Chronicon de Lanercost 1201-1346* (Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1839).

Tanner, N.P., (ed), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Volume One: Nicaea I to Lateran V* (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1990).

The Bible, English Standard Version, viewed online at: https://biblehub.com (accessed 10/03//2021).

Treharne, R.E., and Sanders, I.J. (ed.), *Documents of the Baronial Movement of Rebel and Rebellion 1258-67* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973).

Trevet, N., *Annales Sex Regum Angliae, 1135–1307* ed. by T. Hog, *English Historical Society* 6 (London: Sumptibus Societatis, 1845).

Wild, B.L., (ed.), *The Wardrobe Accounts of Henry III* (London: Printed for the Pipe Roll Society by Acorn Print Media, Loughborough, 2012).

Wright, W.A., (ed.) *The Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester,* 2 parts (London, H.M.S.O., 1887).

Yonge, C.D., (ed. and trans.), *The Flowers of History, especially such as relate to the affairs of Britain from the beginning of the world to the year 1307 collected by Matthew of Westminster,* 2 vols (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853).

Secondary Sources

*A History of the County of Bedford: Volume 1*. (London: Victoria County History 1904). *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/beds/vol1. (accessed 25/03/2021).

Alexander, J., and Binski, P., (ed.), *Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England 1200-1400* (London: Royal Academy of Arts in association with Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987).

Ambler, S.T., *Bishops in the Political Community of England 1213-1272* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

Ambler, S.T., 'Magna Carta: Its Confirmation at Simon de Montfort's Parliament of 1265', *English Historical Review* 130 (2015), 801-830.

Ambler, S.T., 'On Kingship and Tyranny: Grosseteste's Memorandum and its place in the Baronial Reform Movement', in J.E. Burton, P.R. Scholfield and B.K.U. Weiler, (ed), *Thirteenth century England XIV. Proceedings of the Aberystwyth and Lampeter Conference, 2011*, (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), 115-128.

Ambler, S. T., 'Simon de Montfort and King Henry III: The First Revolution in English

History, 1258-1265', *History Compass* 11 (2013), 1076-1087.

Ambler, S.T., 'The Montfortian Bishops and the Justification of Conciliar Government in 1264', *Historical Research*, 85 (2012), 193-209.

Ambler, S.T., 'The Montfortian Bishops', in A. Jobson (ed.), *Baronial Reform and Revolution in England, 1258-67* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016), 139-151.

Ambler, S.T., *The Song of Simon de Montfort: England's First Revolution and the Death of Chivalry* (London: Picador, 2019).

Ambler, S.T., 'The Fine Roll of Henry III, 28 October 1226-27 October 1227', from the Fine Rolls projects, Fine of the Month: December 2007Viewed online at: https://finerollshenry3.org.uk/content/month/fm-08-2006.html (accessed 12/11/2022)

Angold, M.J., Baugh, G.C., Chibnall, M.M., Cox, D.C., Price, D.T.W., Tomlinson, M., and Trinder, B.S., *A History of the County of Shropshire: Volume 2*, ed. A T Gaydon and R B Pugh (London, 1973), 98-101. *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/salop/vol2 (accessed 25/03/2021).

*An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Herefordshire, Volume 2, East* (London, 1932), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rchme/heref/vol2 (accessed 27/03/2021).

Anderson, R., *History of Scotland*. (London & Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers, 1874).

Arnold-Baker, C. *The Companion to British History*, 3rd edition (London: Longcross Press, 2008).

Arnold, J.H., *Belief and Unbelief in Medieval Europe* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005).

Badham, S. and Oosterwijk, S., 'The Tomb Monument of Katherine, Daughter of Henry III and Eleanor of Provence (1253-7)', *The Antiquaries Journal* 92 (2012), 169- 196.

Baggs, A.P., Kettle A.J., Lander, S.J., Thacker, A.T., and Wardle, D., *A History of the County of Chester: Volume 3*, ed. C R Elrington and B E Harris (London, 1980), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/ches/vol3 (accessed 25/03/2021).

Bainton, H., 'Literate Sociability and Historical Writing in Later Twelfth-Century England' in David Bates (ed.), *Anglo-Norman Studies 34: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2011* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), 23-39.

Barrow G.W.S., 'Margaret [St Margaret] (d. 1093), queen of Scots, consort of Malcolm III' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), viewed online at: https://doiorg.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/18044 (accessed 28/03/2021)

Bartlett, R., *England Under the Normans and Angevin Kings 1075-1225* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Bartlett, R., *Why can the Dead do such Great Things? Saints and Worshippers from the Martyrs to the Reformation* (Princeton University Press: Princeton and Oxford, 2013).

Beresford, D., 'Geoffrey de Tourville', *Dictionary of Irish Biography,* viewed online at: https://www.dib.ie/biography/tourville-geoffrey-de-a8607 (accessed 11/06/2022).

Biddle, M., 'Alban [St Alban, Albanus] (d. c. 303?), Christian martyr in Roman Britain', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), viewed online at: https://doi-org.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/272 (accessed 30/03/2021).

Binski, P., 'Reflections on *La estoire de Seint Aedward le rei:* hagiography and kingship in thirteenth-century England', *Journal of Medieval History* 16 (1990), 333-350.

Binski, P., *The Painted Chamber at Westminster* (London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 1986).

Binski, P., *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995).

Blair, J., 'Osgyth [St Osgyth, Osyth, Osith] (fl. late 7th cent.), abbess of Chich. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), viewed online at: https://doi-org.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/20931(accessed 30/03/2021).

Boase, T.S.R., 'Fontevrault and the Plantagenets', *The Journal of the British Archaeological Association 3rd series* 34 (1971), 1-10.

Brand, P., *Kings, Barons and Justices: The Making and Enforcement of Legislation in Thirteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Brown, P., *The Cult of Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (London: SCM Press, 1981).

Buc, P., *The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001).

Carpenter, D.A., 'An Unknown Obituary of King Henry III from the Year 1263' in D.A. Carpenter (ed.), *The Reign of Henry III* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1996), 253-260.

Carpenter, D.A., 'Chronology and Truth: Matthew Paris's *Chronica Majora*', in forthcoming J. Clark (ed.), *Matthew Paris: A Companion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), viewed online at: http://www.finerollshenry3.org.uk/content/related-papers/related-papers.html (accessed 20/05/2016), 1-22.

Carpenter, D.A., *Henry III: The Rise to Power and Personal Rule 1207-1258'* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2020).

Carpenter, D.A., 'King Henry III and Saint Edward the Confessor: The Origins of the Cult', *English Historical Review* 122 (2007), 865-91.

Carpenter, D.A., ‘King Henry III and the Cosmati Work at Westminster Abbey’ in D.A. Carpenter (ed.), *The Reign of Henry III* (London: Hambledon, 1996), 409-425.

Carpenter, D.A., ‘King Henry III and the Tower of London’ in D.A. Carpenter (ed.), *The Reign of Henry III* (London: Hambledon, 1996), 199-218.

Carpenter, D.A., ‘King Henry III’s “Statute” against Aliens: July 1263’, in *The English Historical Review,* 107 (1992), 925-944.

Carpenter, D.A., (ed and trans), *Magna Carta: With a New Commentary by David Carpenter*, (Penguin, 2015).

Carpenter, D.A., ‘The Bishop of Winchester’s Fine in 1227’, from the Fine Rolls Project, Fine of the Month: August 2006, viewed online at: https://finerollshenry3.org.uk/content/month/fm-08-2006.html (accessed 23/06/2022).

Carpenter, D.A., ‘The Burial of King Henry III, the Regalia and Royal Ideology’ in D.A. Carpenter (ed.), *The Reign of Henry III* (London: Hambledon, 1996), 427-461.

Carpenter, D.A., ‘The Household Rolls of Henry III of England (1216-1272)’, *Historical Research* 80 (2007), 22-46.

Carpenter, D.A., ‘The Meetings of Kings Henry III and Louis IX’, in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England X: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 2003* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), 1–30.

Carpenter, D.A., *The Minority of Henry III* (London: Methuen London, 1990).

Carpenter, D.A., ‘Westminster Abbey in Politics, 1258-69’ in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England VIII: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 1999* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001), 49-58.

Chibnall, M., ‘Matilda (1102–1167)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18338 (accessed 27/03/2021).

Church, S., *Henry III: A Simple and God-Fearing King* (Penguin, 2017).

Clanchy, M. T., ‘Did Henry III have a Policy?’ *History,* 53 (1968), 203–16.

Clanchy, M.T., *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307*, 3rd edition, (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013).

Cheney, C.R. (ed), *A Handbook of Dates: For Students of History, Revised by Michael Jones*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Cockburn, J.S., King, H.P.F. King and McDonnell, K.G.T., (ed), *A History of the County of Middlesex: Volume 1, Physique, Archaeology, Domesday, Ecclesiastical Organization, the*

*Jews, Religious Houses, Education of Working Classes To 1870, Private Education From Sixteenth Century,* (London, 1969), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/middx/vol1 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Cox, D., 'The Tomb of Simon de Montfort: An Enquiry', *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society, 3rd Series,* 26, 159-71.

Cox, E.L., *The Eagles of Savoy: The House of Savoy in Thirteenth Century Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974).

Creamer, J., 'St Edmund of Canterbury and Henry III in the Shadow of Thomas Becket' in J. Burton, P. Schofield and B. Weiler (ed.), *Thirteenth Century England XIV: Proceedings of the Aberystwyth and Lampeter Conference 2011* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), 129-139.

Crockford, J. E., 'The Itinerary of Edward I of England: Pleasure, Piety, and Governance' in A.L. Gascoigne, L.V. Hicks, and M. O'Doherty (eds.), *Journeying along Medieval Routes in Europe and the Middle East* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2016), 231-257.

Crook, J., *English Medieval Shrine,* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011).

Dale, J., 'Inauguration and Political Liturgy in the Hohenstaufen Empire, 1138-1215', *German History* 34 (2016), 191-213.

Dale, J., *Inauguration and Liturgical Kingship in the Long Twelfth Century: Male and Female Accession Rituals in England, France and the Empire* (York: York University Press, 2019).

Dale, J., 'Royal Inauguration and the Liturgical Calendar in England, France, and the Empire c. 1050-c. 1250 in E. van Houts (ed.), *Anglo-Norman Studies 37: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2014* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), 83-89.

D'Avray, D.L., '*Magna Carta*: It's Background in Stephen Langton's Academic Biblical Exegesis and its Episcopal Reception', *Studi Medievali* Serie Terza Anno XXXVIII Fasc I (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi Sull'Alto Medioevo, 1997), 423-438.

Denholm-Young, N., *Richard of Cornwall* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1947).

Denton, J.H., 'Bronescombe, Walter of (*c.*1220–1280)', rev. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37225 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Ditchfield, P.H., and Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Berkshire: Volume 2* (London, 1907), 112-113. *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/berks/vol2 (accessed 25/03/2021)

Dixon-Smith, S., 'The Image and Reality of Alms-Giving in the Great Halls of Henry III: the Reginald Taylor and Lord Fletcher Prize Essay', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 152, 79-96.

Dobson, R.B., ‘Giffard, Walter (c. 1225–1279), archbishop of York’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), viewed online at: https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezp.lib.czm.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.00 (accessed 27/03/2023).

Doubleday, A. and Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Hampshire: Volume 2* (London, 1903), 219-221 *British History Online,* viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/Vch/Hants/vol2 (accessed 25/03/2021).

Draper, P., 'King John and St Wulfstan', *Journal of Medieval History* 10 (1984), 41-50.

Duggan, A., ‘The Cult of St Thomas Becket in the Thirteenth Century’ in M. Jancey (ed.) *St Thomas Cantilupe bishop of Hereford: Essays in His Honour* (Hereford: Friends of Hereford Cathedral Publications Committee for the Dean and Chapter, 1982), 21-44.

Dunning, R.W., Wells, Jocelin of (d. 1242), bishop of Bath and Wells.‘ *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) viewed online at: https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/article/1093 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Emery, K., ‘Architecture, Space and Memory: Liturgical Representation of Thomas Becket, 1170-1220’, *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 173 (2020), 61-77.

Farmer, D.H., *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints,* 5th edition revised, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Farrer, W., and Brownbill, J., (ed), *A History of the County of Lancaster: Volume 2* (London: Victoria County History, 1908) *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/lancs/vol2 (accessed 25/03/2021).

Fryde, E.B., and Powicke, F.M., (ed.), *Handbook of British Chronology,* 2nd edition (London: Royal Historical Society, 1961).

García y Garcia, A., ‘The Fourth Lateran Council and the Canonists’ in K. Pennington and W. Hartmann (ed), *The History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140-1234: From Oration to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX (History of Medieval Canon Law),* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2008), 367-378.

Gater, G.H., and Wheeler, E.P., (ed), *Survey of London: Volume 18, St Martin-in-The-Fields II: the Strand,* (London, 1937), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol18/pt2 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Given-Wilson, C., *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London: London and Hambledon, 2004).

Goff, J. Le, *Saint Louis,* trans. G.E. Gollrad (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009).

Goff, J. Le, *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. by A. Goldhammer (London: Scolar Press, 1984).

Gransden. A., *Historical Writing in England, c.530-c.1307* (London: Routledge, 1974).

Gransden, A., 'Propaganda in English medieval historiography', *Journal of Medieval History* 1 (1975), 363-82.

Grant, L., *Blanche of Castile* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016)

Greenslade, M.W., and Pugh, R.B., (ed), *A History of the County of Stafford: Volume 3, British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/staffs/vol3 (accessed 27/03/2021)

J. Greatrex, 'St Martin, Laurence de (d. 1274), bishop of Rochester.' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), viewed online at: https://www-oxforddnbcom.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-50343 (accessed 24/06/2022).

Haines, R.M., 'Gray, Walter de (*d.* 1255)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2011), viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11566 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Harvey, K., *Episcopal Appointments in England c.1214-1344: From Episcopal Election to Papal Provision*, (Ashgate: Farnham, 2014).

Hillen, C., 'The Minority Governments of Henry III, Henry (VII) and Louis IX compared' in B.K.U. Weiler et al. (ed), *Thirteenth Century XI: Proceedings of the Gregynog Conference, 2005* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), 46-60.

Holt, J. C., *Magna Carta: Revised with a New Introduction by George Garnett and John Hudson*, 3rd edn. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

Hoskin, P., 'Bridport, Giles of (*d.* 1262)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford, 2004), viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3403 (accessed 18/05/2016).

Hoskins, W.G., and McKinley, R.A., (ed), *A History of the County of Leicestershire: Volume 2* (London: Victoria County History, 1954) *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/leics/vol2 (accessed 26/03/2021).

Howell, M., *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth Century England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998).

Howell, M., 'The Children of King Henry III and Eleanor of Provence', in P.R. Coss and S.D. Lloyd (ed.), *Thirteenth Century England IV: Proceedings of The Newcastle Upon Tyne Conference 1991* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1992), 57-72.

Jahner, J., *Law and Literature in the Era of Magna Carta*, (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2019).

Jobson, A., *The First English Revolution: Simon de Montfort, Henry III and the Barons' War* (London: Continuum, 2012).

Jobson, A., 'Introduction', in A. Jobson (ed.) *Baronial Reform and Revolution in England, 1258-67* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016), 1-12.

Jones, D., (ed), *Saint Richard of Chichester: The Sources for his Life,* (Sussex Record Society: Lewes, 1995).

Jordan, W.C., 'Anti-corruption campaigns in thirteenth-century Europe', *Journal of Medieval History* 35 (2009), 204-219.

Kanter, J.E., 'Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship: The Itineraries of John and Henry III' in J. Burton et al. (ed), *Thirteenth Century England XIII: Proceedings of the Paris Conference* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011), 11-26.

Kantorowicz, E.H., *The King's Two Bodies: a Study in Medieval Political Theology with a new preface by William Chester Jordan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).

Keynes, S., 'Emma (d. 1052)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* (Oxford, 2004), viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8794 (accessed 08/08/2017).

Kjaer, L., 'Matthew Paris and the Royal Christmas: Ritualised Communication in Text and Practice' in J. Burton, P. Schofield and B. Weiler (ed.), *Thirteenth Century England XIV: Proceedings of the Aberystwyth and Lampeter Conference 2011* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), 141-154.

Kjaer, L., *The Medieval Gift and the Classical Tradition: Ideals and the Performance of Generosity in Medieval England, 1100-1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019).

Lawrence, C.H., 'Darlington, John of (d.1284)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004) viewed online at http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7159 (accessed 16/12/14).

Lawrence, C.H., 'Marsh, Adam (c.1200-1259)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004) viewed online at http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/95 (accessed 12/12/14).

Lawrence, C.H., *St Edmund of Abingdon: A Study in Hagiography and History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960).

Lawrence, C.H., 'The Thirteenth Century' in C.H. Lawrence (ed.), *The English Church and the Papacy in the Middle Ages* (London: Burns & Oates, 1965), 117-156.

Lawrence, C.H., 'Wyche, Richard of [St Richard of Chichester] (d.1253)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004); online edn, Jan 2008, viewed online at http://www.oxfordednb.com/view/article/23522 (accessed 30/03/2021).

Lewis, C.P., and Thacker, A.T., (ed), *A History of the County of Chester: Volume 5 Part 1, the City of Chester: General History and Topography,* (London, 2003), British History Online,

viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/ches/vol5 (accessed 25/03/2021).

Licence, T., *Edward the Confessor: Last of the Royal Blood,* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2020).

Lloyd, S., 'King Henry III, the Crusade and the Mediterranean' in M. Jones and M. Vale (ed.), *England and her neighbours, 1066-1453: Essays in Honour of Pierre Chaplais* (London: Hambledon, 1989), 97-120.

Mackenzie, E., *Historical Account of Newcastle-Upon-Tyne Including the Borough of Gateshead,* British History Online, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/newcastle-historical-account (accessed 26/03/2021)

Maddicott, J.R., *Simon de Montfort* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Maddicott, J., *The Origins of the English Parliament, 924-1327* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Malden, H.E., (ed), *A History of the County of Surrey: Volume 2* (London, 1967) *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/surrey/vol2 (accessed 25/03/2021)

McEwan, J.A., 'Civic Government in Troubled Times: London c.1263-1270', in A. Jobson (ed.), *Baronial Reform and Revolution in England, 1258-1267* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016), 125-138.

Musson, A.J., 'Wingham, Henry of (*d.* 1262)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford, 2004), viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29742 (accessed 19/05/2016).

Orme, N., *Medieval Children* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001).

Ormrod, W.M., 'The Personal Religion of Edward III', *Speculum* 64 (1989), 849-877.

Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Buckingham: Volume I* (London: Victoria County History, 1905), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/bucks/vol1/p392 (27/03/2021).

Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Derby: Volume 2*, (London: London Victoria County History, 1907), *British History Online,* viewed online: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/derbs/vol2 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Page, W., (ed), '*A History of the County of Dorset: Volume 2*, (London: Victoria County History, 1908), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/dorset/vol2/pp113-116 (accessed 16/05/2016).

Page, W., and Horace Round J., (ed), *A History of the County of Essex: Volume 2* (London: Victoria county history, 1907), *British History Online,* viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/essex/vol2 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Gloucester: Volume 2* (London, 1907), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/glos/vol2 (accessed 25/03/2021)

Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Hampshire: Volume 5*, (London, 1912), 59-69. *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/hants/vol5 (accessed 23/3/2021).

Page, W., (ed), in *A History of the County of Hertford: Volume 4*, ed. William Page (London: Victoria county history, 1971), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/herts/vol4 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Page, W., Proby, G., and Norris, H.E., (ed), *A History of the County of Huntingdon: Volume 1* (London: Victoria County History, 1926), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/hunts/vol1 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Kent: Volume 2*, (London, 1926), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/kent/vol2 (accessed 25/03/2021)

Page, W., (ed), *History of the County of Lincoln: Volume 2* (London, 1906), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/lincs/vol2 (accessed 25/03/2021)

Page, W., (ed), *History of the County of London: Volume 1, London Within the Bars, Westminster and Southwark*, (London: Victoria County History, 1909), British History Online, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/london/vol1 (accessed 26/03/2021).

Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Norfolk: Volume 2* (London, 1906), British History Online, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/norf/vol2 (accessed 26/03/2021).

Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Nottingham: Volume 2* (London: London Victoria County History, 1910), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/notts/vol2 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Page, W., (ed), *The History of the County of Oxford: Volume 2* (London: London Victoria County History, 1907), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/oxon/vol2 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Somerset: Volume 2* (London: Victoria County History, 1911), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/som/vol2 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Suffolk: Volume 2* (London: Victoria County History, 1975), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/suff/vol2 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Sussex: Volume 2* (London, 1973), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/sussex/vol2 (accessed 25/03/2021)

Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Warwick: Volume 2* (London (London: Victoria county history, 1908), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/warks/vol2 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Wiltshire: Volume 3* (London: London Victoria County History, 1956), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/wilts/vol3 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of York: Volume 3* (London: Victoria County History, 1974), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/yorks/vol3 (accessed 27/03/2021).

Parsons, J.C., '"Never was a body buried in England with such solemnity and honour": The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens to 1500', in A.J. Duggan (ed.), *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference Held at King's College London April 1995* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997), reprinted in paperback in 2002, 317-337.

Penman, M., 'Royal Piety in Thirteenth-Century Scotland: the Religion and Religiosity of Alexander II (1214-49) and Alexander III (1249-86)', in J. Burton, P. Schofield and B. Weiler (ed.), *Thirteenth Century England XII: Proceedings of the Gregynog Conference 2007* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 13-30.

Penman, M., *Robert the Bruce: King of the Scots* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2014)

Pennington, K., 'The Fourth Lateran Council, its Legislation and Development of Legal Procedure', in G. Melville and J. Helmrath, *The Fourth Lateran Council: institutional Reform and Spiritual Renewal: Proceedings of the Conference Marking the Eight Hundred Anniversary of the Council Organized by the Pontifiao Comitato di Scienze Storiche* (Rome: Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, .Facultad de Derecho, Escuela de Derecho, 2015).

Phillips, K., 'Devotion by Donation: The Alms-Giving and Religious Foundations of Henry III', *Reading Medieval* 43, 79-98.

Powell, J.M., 'The Papacy and the Early Franciscans', *Franciscans Studies* 36 (1976), 248-262.

Powicke, F.M., *King Henry III and The Lord Edward*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950).

Prestwich, M., *Edward I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997).

Prestwich, M., 'The Piety of Edward I' in W.M. Ormrod (ed.), *England in the Thirteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1984 Harlaxton Symposium* (Harlaxton, 1985), 120-128.

Ridgeway, H.W., 'Foreign Favourites and Henry III's Problems of Patronage, 1247-1258', *The English Historical Review* 104 (1989), 590-610.

Ridgeway, H.W., 'What Happened in 1261?', in A. Jobson (ed), *Baronial Reform and Revolution in England, 1258-67* (Boydell Press: Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016), 89-108.

Rich Jones, W.H., (ed), *The Register of St Osmund,* Vol. 1 (London: Longman & Co, 1883).

Rich Jones, W.H., (ed), *The Register of St Osmund,* Vol. 2 (London: Longman & Co, 1884).

Riley, W.E., and Gomme, L., *Survey of London: Volume 5, St Giles-in-The-Fields, Pt II,* ed. (London, 1914), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol5/pt2. (accessed 27/03/2021).

Robson, M., 'A Franciscan Contribution to the *De Gestis Britonum* (1205-1279), and its continuation' in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 107 (2014), 265-314.

Robson, M., *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006)

Salzman, L.F., (ed), *A History of the County of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely: Volume 2* (London: Victoria County History, 1948), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/cambs/vol2 (accessed 27/03/2021).

Sayers, J.E., 'Jocelin of Wells and the Role of a Bishop in the Thirteenth Century', in Robert Dunning (ed), *Jocelin of Wells: Bishop, Builder, Courtier* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2010), 34-52.

Seabourne, G., 'Eleanor of Brittany and her treatment by King John and Henry III', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 51 (2007), 73-110.

Serjeantson, R.M., and Adkins, W.R.D., (ed), *A History of the County of Northampton: Volume 2* (London: Victoria County History, 1906), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://british-history.ac.uk/vch/northants/vol2 (accessed 27/03/2021)

Shacklock, A., 'Henry III and Native Saints', in A. Spencer and C. Watkins (ed), *Thirteenth Century England XVII: Proceedings of the Cambridge Conference 2017* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2021), 23-40.

Slater, L., *Art and Political Thought in Medieval England, c. 1150-1350,* (Boydell Press: Woodbridge, 2018).

Smith, D.M., 'Wells, Hugh of (d. 1235), bishop of Lincoln.' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004), viewed online at: https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-14061. (accessed 11/08/2020).

Spencer, A., '"A Vineyard Without a Wall": The Savoyards, John de Warenne and the Failure of Henry III's Kingship', in A. Spencer and C. Watkins (ed), *Thirteenth Century England XVII: Proceedings of the Cambridge Conference 2017* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2021), 41-64.

Springer, R., ‘Confession in England and the Fourth Lateran Council’, in A. Spencer and C. Watkins (ed), *Thirteenth Century England XVII: Proceeding of the Cambridge Conference 2017* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2021), 163-179.

Stacey, R.C., ‘Kilkenny, William of (d. 1256), administrator and bishop of Ely’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004) viewed online at : http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article115527 (accessed 27/03/2023).

Stacey, R.C., *Politics, Policy, and Finance under Henry III 1216-1245* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).

Stewart, Z., ‘A Lesson in Patronage: King Henry III, the Knights Templar, and a Royal Mausoleum at the Temple Church in London’, *Speculum 94* (2019), 334-384.

Suckling, A., *The History and Antiquities of the County of Suffolk: Volume 1*, (Ipswich: WS Crowell, 1846), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/suffolk-history-antiquities/vol11 (accessed 27/03/2021).

Summerson, H., ‘Chaury, Robert de (d. 1278)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford, 2007) online edn, May 2008, viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/95124 (accessed 10/11/2020).

Treharne, R.F., Sandersm I.J. *The Baronial Plan of Reform, 1258-1263* 2nd edition (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1971).

Vauchez, A., *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*, trans by Jean Birrel, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Vaughan, R., *Matthew Paris*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958).

Vincent, N., ’Aigueblanche, Peter d' [Peter de Aqua Blanca] (d. 1268), bishop of Hereford and royal councillor.‘ *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* (Oxford, 2004), viewed online at: https://www.oxforddnb.com.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/10/1093/ref:odnb/ 97800198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e- 22015 (accessed 11/08/20).

Vincent, N.C., ‘An Inventory of Gifts to King Henry III, 1234-5’ in D. Crook and L. Wilkinson (ed.), *The Growth of Royal Government under Henry III* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), 121-146.

Vincent, N.C., ‘Jocelin of Wells: the making of a bishop in the reign of King John’ in Robert Dunning (ed), *Jocelin of Wells: Bishop, Builder, Courtier* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2010), 9-33.

Vincent, N.C., ‘King Henry III and the Blessed Virgin Mary’, in R.N. Swanson (ed.) *Studies in Church History* 39 (2004), 126-146.

Vincent, N.C., ‘Mauclerk, Walter (*d.* 1248)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford, 2004), viewed online at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18355

(accessed 27/03/2023).

Vincent, N.C., *Peter des Roches: An alien in English Politics, 1205-1238* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Vincent, N.C., "Rivallis, Peter de (d.1262)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004) viewed online at http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23688 (accessed 19/05/2023).

Vincent, N.C., 'The Great Lost Library of England's Medieval Kings? Royal Use and Ownership of Books, 1066-1272' in Kathleen Doyle and Scot McKendrick (eds), *1000 Years of Royal Books and Manuscripts* (London: The British Library, 2013), 73-112.

Vincent, N.C., *The Holy Blood: King Henry III and the Westminster Blood Relic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Vincent, N.C., 'The Pilgrimages of the Angevin Kings of England 1154-1272', in C. Morris and P. Roberts (eds.), *Pilgrimage: The English Experience from Becket to Bunyan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 12-45.

Vincent, N.C., 'The Strange Case of the Missing Biographies: The Lives of the Plantagenet Kings of England 1154-1272' in D. Bates, J. Crick and S. Hamilton (ed.) *Writing Medieval Biography 750-1250* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 237-257.

Wall, J.C., *Shrine of British Saints,* (London: Methuen & Co, 1905)

Ward, J.C., 'Fashions in Monastic Endowment: The Foundations of the Clare Family, 1066-1314', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 32 (1981), 427-451.

Warren, W.L., *The Governance of Norman and Angevin England 1086-1272* (London: Edward Arnold, 1987).

Watkins, C.S., *History and the Supernatural in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Wayno, J.M., 'Rethinking the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215', *Speculum* 93 (2018), 611-637.

Webster, P., *King John and Religion* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015).

Webster, P., 'Making Space For King John To Pray: The Evidence Of The Royal Itinerary', in A.L. Gasgoinge, L.V. Hicks and M. O'Doherty (ed), *Journeying Along Medieval Routes in Europe and the Middle East,* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016), 259-286.

Weiler, B.K.U., 'Clerical admonitio, Letters of Advice to Kings and Episcopal Self-Fashioning, c.1000– c.1200', *History* 102 (2017), 557-575.

Weiler, B. K.U., 'Henry III and the Sicilian Business: A Reinterpretation', *Historical Research,* 74 (2001), 127–50.

Weiler, B.K.U., *Kingship, Rebellion and Political Culture: England and Germany, c.1215-*

*c.1250* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

Weiler, B.K.U., ‘Knighting, Homage and the Meaning of Ritual: The Kings of England and their Neighbours in the Thirteenth Century’, *Viator* 37 (2006), 275-299.

Weiler, B.K.U., 'Matthew Paris on the writing of history', *Journal of Medieval History* 35 (2009), 254-278.

Weiler, B.K.U., ‘Matthew Paris, Richard of Cornwall’s candidacy for the German throne, and the Sicilian Business’, *Journal of Medieval History,* xxvi (2000), 70-92.

Weiler, B. K.U., ‘Symbolism and Politics in the Reign of Henry III’, in M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (ed), *Thirteenth Century England IX: Proceedings of the Durham Conference, 2001* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 15–42.

Wild, B. L., ‘A Captive King: King Henry III Between the Battles of Lewes and Evesham, 1264–5’, in J. Burton et al. (ed), *Thirteenth Century England XIII: Proceedings of the Paris Conference* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011), 41-56.

Wild, B.L., ‘Introduction’, in B.L. Wild, (ed.), *The Wardrobe Accounts of Henry III* (London: Pipe Roll Society, 2012), xi-xxiii.

Wild, B.L., ‘Reasserting Medieval Kingship: King Henry III and the Dictum of Kenilworth’, in A. Jobson (ed.), *Baronial Reform and Revolution in England, 1258-67* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016), 237-258.

Wild, B.L., ‘Secrecy, Splendour and Statecraft: The Jewel Accounts of Henry III of England, 1216-1272’ in *Historical Research* 83 (2010), 409-430.

Wild, B.L., ‘The Development of the Wardrobe Audit and the Creation of the Wardrobe Account’ in B.L. Wild, (ed.), *The Wardrobe Accounts of Henry III* (London: Pipe Roll Society, 2012), xxv-xlvii.

Wild, B.L., ‘The Siege of Kenilworth Castle, 1266’ in *English Heritage Historical Review* 5 (2010), 12-23.

Wild, B.L., ‘The Structure of the Enrolled Wardrobe Account’ in B.L. Wild, (ed.), *The Wardrobe Accounts of Henry III* (London: Pipe Roll Society, 2012), xlvii-xlix.

Wild, B.L., ‘The Utility of the Wardrobe Account’ in B. L. Wild, (ed.), *The Wardrobe Accounts of Henry III* (London: Pipe Roll Society, 2012), xlix-lii.

Wilkinson, B., ‘The Chancery’ in W.A. Morris and J.F. Willard (ed.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336, Volume I: Central and Prerogative Administration* (Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1940), 162-205.

Wilkinson, L. J., *Eleanor de Montfort: A Rebel Countess in Medieval England* (London: Continuum, 2012)

Willis-Bund, J.W., and Page, W., (ed), *A History of the County of Worcester: Volume 2*

(London: Victoria County History, 1971), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/worcs/vol2 (accessed 27/03/2021).

Wilshire, L.E., 'Boniface of Savoy, Carthusian and Archbishop of Canterbury, 1207-1270' in J. Hogg (ed.) *Analecta Cartusiana* 31 (1977), 1-90.

Wilson, J., (ed), *A History of the County of Cumberland: Volume 2*, ed. J Wilson (London: Victoria County History, 1905), *British History Online*, viewed online at: http://ww.british-history.ac.uk/vch/cumb/vol2 (accessed 27/03/2021).

Unpublished PhD theses

Ambler, S.T., "Peacemakers and Partisans: Bishops and Political Reform in England 1213-1268" (King's College London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2012).

Dixon-Smith, S., "Feeding the Poor to Commemorate the Dead: the *Pro Anima* Almsgiving of Henry III of England 1227-1272" (University College London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2003).

Farris, C.H.D.C., "The Pious Practices of Edward I, 1272-1307" (Royal Holloway College, University of London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2013).

Hallam, E.M., "Aspects of the Monastic Patronage of the English and French Royal Houses, c. 1130-1270" in 2 vols (DPhil thesis, University of London, 1976).

Kanter, J.E., "Peripatetic and Sedentary Kingship: The Itineraries of the Thirteenth-Century English Kings" (King's College London, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2011).

Kjaer, L., "The Practice, Politics, and Ideals of Aristocratic Generosity in Thirteenth-Century England" (University of Cambridge, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2012).

Phillips, K., "The Leper and the King: The Patronage and Perception of Lepers and Leprosy by King Henry III of England and King Louis IX of France", (University of Reading, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2018).

Ridgeway, H.W., "The Politics of The English Royal Court 1247-65, with Special Reference to the Role of the Aliens" (Oxford University, Unpublished PhD thesis, 1983).

Webster, P., "King John's Piety, c.1199-c.1216" (University of Cambridge, Unpublished PhD thesis, 2007)

Webster, P., 'Henry III and England's Royal and Episcopal Saints' (University of Cambridge, Unpublished B.A. thesis).