THE BATTLE OF BOROUGHBRIDGE AND THE BOROUGHBRIDGE ROLL.

The Boroughbridge Bridge Roll, a highly interesting and, as is proved by the writs to the Sheriff of Northampton which are attached to it, contemporary list of the persons of distinction engaged in the battle, was first published by Sir Francis Palgrave in 1830 (Parl. Writs, vol. ii, pp. 194-201). In this form it is not very readily accessible to many who are interested in such matters. In *The Genealogist*, New Series, vol. i, pp. 51 and 117, and vol. ii, pp. 30 and 98, it appears again as "Edited by James Greenstreet," and translated from the Norman-French; it might naturally therefore be supposed that there is not much left to be said on the subject. I had myself, however, compiled from the Close and Patent Rolls a list of those concerned in the rebellion before I knew of the existence of the Roll, and when I learnt that it was to be found in *The Genealogist* I expected that my labours would result in a futile and partial reproduction of what had already been given *urbi et orbi* by Mr. Greenstreet. My surprise was great to perceive that of the forty-seven names of notables I had collected, only nine or ten appeared among the 214 names scheduled in *The Genealogist*. Although I realised that this could be partly explained by the Roll being confined to those engaged in the battle and the list including those engaged in the conspiracy, I soon saw that men of note who were undoubtedly there were omitted and I began to suspect that the Roll was a sort of "Battle Abbey" affair and did not arrive at a true solution, until I examined the volume of Parliamentary Writs abovementioned, where all the contents of the Roll are reproduced.

To tell the truth, and with all respect to the late Mr. Greenstreet's memory, his "edition," though very interesting for those concerned with the armorial bearings of that time and the way in which such bearings were then described, is singularly unsatisfying from the historian's or genealogist's point of view. To begin with, it only reproduces one, though the longest, of the various lists on the dorse of the Roll, and that the one which omits all reference to the Earls of Lancaster and Hereford; moreover the list which is given jumbles together loyalists and rebels, so that no one can tell from it that Lords Hastings and Latimer were *ex parte Regis* and Lords Badlesmere and Berkeley on the other part, while the far more valuable list of 138 names of those "q'furent countr̃ le Roy" is ignored altogether, as well as the short lists of those who surrendered, those who were executed, etc.; I suppose because they contained no coats of arms.

It is very difficult to realise the purpose for which the Roll was

prepared; if as an historical account I should have expected one list of loyalists and another of rebels, each fairly exhaustive, instead of which we have a long list containing apparently principally loyalists but also several undoubted rebels, and yet which omits many of the latter who figure in the shorter list and were undoubtedly present.

It is strange, too, that nowhere in the Roll can I find any reference to Donald, Earl of Mar [S.], who captured several important prisoners, nor strangest of all to Sir Andrew de Harcla, who commanded for the King, and to whose loyalty before the battle and vigour during its progress the victory was mainly due. I am satisfied, however, that the Roll itself is not in all respects trustworthy, for it gives the names of six knights, viz.: Sir John Wilington, Sir Gilbert Talbot, Sir Phillip Darcy, Sir Robt. Wateville, Sir Adam Swillington and Sir Bartholomew Burghersh, as having been amongst those "*pendus*," all of whom can be shown from the Close or Patent Rolls to have been pardoned and who were certainly alive some years after 1322. In these circumstances I do not think I need apologise for attempting a list of my own at any rate of the most important people who, influenced by jealousy of the Despencers, engaged in this formidable though unsuccessful rebellion against Edward II. I have marked with an asterisk those whom I cannot prove to have been present, or whom I know not to have been present at the battle.

Thomas (Plantagenet), Earl of Lancaster, executed 1322.

Humphrey (de Bohun), Earl of Hereford, slain at Boroughbridge.

*Hugh Audley (senior), Kt., summoned 1321, escaped from prison at Wallingford.

Hugh Audley (junior), Kt., summoned 1317-36, pardoned.

Bartholomew Badlesmere, Banneret, summoned 1309-21, executed 1322.

*Roger Bavent, Kt., summoned 1312-21.

*Maurice Berkeley, Kt., summoned 1308-21, died in prison, 1326.

Thomas Berkeley, Kt., summoned 1329-60, released from prison, 1326.

John Botetourt, Kt., summoned 1305-24, fined and pardoned.

Thomas Bradeston, Kt., summoned 1342-60, pardoned.

Bartholomew Burghersh, Kt., summoned 1330-54.

*Ralph Camoys, Kt., summoned 1313-35, pardoned 1326/7.

*John Cherleton, Kt., summoned 1313-53, pardoned 1322.

Roger Clifford, Banneret, summoned 1319-21, executed 1322.

*Roger D'Amorie, Kt., summoned 1317, died in prison, 1322.

Philip Darcy, Banneret, summoned 1299-1332, fined and pardoned.

Adam Everingham, Kt., summoned 1309-15, fined and pardoned.

William Fitzwarine, Kt., summoned 1342.

John Giffard, Banneret, summoned 1311-21, executed 1322.

Peter Grandison, Kt., summoned 1337-49, fined and pardoned.

John Leyburne, Kt., summoned 1337-48.

John Maltravers, Kt., summoned 1330-51, escaped "*outre mer*."

*Roger Mortimer de Chircke, Kt., summoned 1307-21, taken prisoner earlier in 1321/2, died in prison in 1326.

*Roger Mortimer de Wigmore, Kt. (afterwards Earl of March), summoned 1306-26, taken prisoner earlier in 1321/2, escaped from the Tower 1323.

John Mowbray, Banneret, summoned 1307-20, executed 1322.

*John Rivers, Kt., summoned 1313-15, escaped and was "in hiding" 1322.

Adam Swillington, Banneret, summoned 1326-8, fined and pardoned.

Gilbert Talbot, Banneret, summoned 1331-43, fined and pardoned.

Henry Teyes, Banneret, summoned 1313-21, executed 1322.

William Touchet, Banneret, summoned 1299-1306, executed 1322.

Richard Waleys, Kt., summoned 1321, fined and pardoned 1324.

Robert Wateville, Banneret, summoned 1326-30, fined and pardoned.

John Wilington, Banneret, summoned 1329-38, fined and pardoned.

Besides the above thirty-three persons, who were all at some date or another summoned to Parliament, many other magnates of the same position in life, several of them being fathers, sons and ultimately heirs, or near relatives of the above joined in the revolution. Among these are to be found :—

*Sir Otho de Bodrigan, son and (in 1309) heir of Sir Henry Bodrigan, summoned 1309.

Sir Thomas Camoys, son and (in 1336) heir of Sir Ralph Camoys abovenamed.

Sir Norman Darcy, son and (in 1332) heir of Sir Philip Darcy abovenamed.

Sir John D'Eyvill, son and (*c.* 1290) heir of Sir John D'Eyvill, summoned 1264.

Sir Baldwin de Freville, son and (in 1328) heir of Sir Alex. de Freville, summoned to Newcastle 1327.

Sir Bogo de Knovill, son and (in 1306) heir of Sir Bogo de Knovill, summoned 1295-1306.

Sir Henry Leyburne, presumably brother of Sir John Leyburne abovenamed.

Sir Warine de Lisle, Banneret (father of Sir Gerard de Lisle, summoned 1357), hanged 1322.

Sir Thomas Mauduit (father of Sir John Mauduit, summoned 1342), hanged 1322.

Sir Thomas Roscelyn, son and (after 1302) heir of Sir Peter Roscelyn, summoned to a Council 1294.

Sir Nicholas Stapleton, son and (in 1314) heir of Sir Miles Stapleton, summoned 1313.

Sir Richard Talbot, brother of Sir Gilbert Talbot abovenamed.

Sir William Trussell, summoned to a Council 1342, escaped "*outre mer.*"

Sir Henry Wilington, brother of Sir John Wilington abovenamed, hanged 1322.

None of these fourteen knights were ever summoned to Parliament. It will be observed that of the forty-seven persons above enumerated who engaged in open rebellion, only ten suffered the death penalty, and having regard to the times and the very serious nature of the rebellion it is clear that no unusual or unnecessary

severity was exercised. Indeed, looking on to the events which some four years later cost Edward II his crown and life, he seems to have been sadly mistaken in foregoing the death sentence on his wife's paramour, Sir Roger Mortimer de Wigmore, when he had him in his hands, and such clemency, if clemency it was, cost him all too dear. Those who escaped with their lives escaped in the end altogether, for early in the reign of Edward III the quarrel of Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, was declared to have been a just quarrel, the lands of those engaged in it were restored, and all proceedings against them annulled.

Among those who fought on the side of the King were :—

Donald, Earl of Mar (S.), and the following Knights,
Sir Henry Beaumont, summoned 1309-32.
Sir John Clinton, summoned 1332-35.
Sir Will. Clinton, summoned 1330-7 (afterwards Earl of Huntingdon).
Sir John Cromwell, summoned 1308-35.
Sir Ralph de Greystock, summoned 1321-2.
Sir John Hastings, summoned 1313-25.
Sir John Hausted, summoned 1332-36.
Sir William Kyme, summoned 1323-37.
Sir William Latimer, summoned 1299-1327.
Sir Robert Morley, summoned 1317-57.
Sir John Peche, summoned 1321-36.
Sir Henry Percy, summoned 1322-52.
Sir John St. John de Lageham, summoned 1317-22.
Sir John Sutton de Holderness, summoned 1332-38,
And Sir William Zouche, who was doubtless either Sir W. Z. de Haryngworth, summoned 1308-48, or Sir W. Z. de Mortimer, summoned 1323-37.

Besides the above seventeen who were summoned to Parliament, the following six Knights, and of course many others, were on the side of the victors :—

Sir Andrew Harcla, afterwards Earl of Carlisle.
Sir John Hardereshull, summoned to a Council 1342.
Sir Thomas Hastang (son and [about 1328] heir of Sir Robt. Hastang, summoned 1311), summoned to a Council 1342.
Sir Warine Latimer, son and (about 1334) heir of Sir Thomas Latimer, summoned 1299-1311.
Sir John Peche, son and (about 1339) heir of Sir John Peche abovenamed.
Sir Constantine Mortimer, summoned to a Council in 1342.

None of these were ever summoned to Parliament.

Even though these lists be not exhaustive, they will serve to show how strong was the feeling of the nobility against the King (a feeling only paralleled in the case of James II some 360 years later); how powerful was the combination which Harcla routed and compelled to surrender at Boroughbridge, 16 March, 1321/2, and how well he earned the Earldom with which he was rewarded a few days later, viz. on the 25th.

The fact that no man of distinction fell in battle on the King's side, and that the aforesaid Earl of Hereford and five knights were the only ones who did so on the Barons', is an illustration of the feeble resistance offered by the rebels under the incompetent leadership of the irresolute and even cowardly Earl of Lancaster, who had retreated in disorder some ten days before from Burton-on-Trent, when attacked by the King's forces, which were commanded by the Earl of Surrey and the Earl of Kent, Edward at this crisis showing exceptional promptitude and resolution. Probably few people have ever obtained canonization and deserved it less than Saint Thomas of Lancaster.

Anyone acquainted with this period, who reads this paper may justly say that the division in the above lists between those summoned to Parliament and those who were not, is without much point or value, but I have been impelled to make it by the unhistoric factitious and absurd importance which modern Peerage doctrines have attached to certain Writs of summons; and it is difficult not to accept, say, Sir Ralph Camoys as a Lord when there is a Lord Camoys now existing, and so recognised on the ground that he represents a fraction of the hereditary (?) peerage which Sir Ralph is fondly imagined to have possessed nearly 600 years ago.

As I have shown in the case of Sir William Zouche, it is often hard certainly to identify a man merely mentioned by name as a Knight. For instance, among the rebel host were, Sir William FitzWilliam le Fils, executed at Pontefract, 1322, who was not therefore the same as Sir William FitzWilliam of Elmley, summoned to Newcastle, 1327; Sir John Lestraunge who was not, I think, Sir John Strange de Knokin, summoned in error (1313), but Sir John Strange de Ellesmere, uncle of Sir John Leyburne abovenamed, who also fought among the rebels; Sir John Lisle who may or who may not be the Sir John Lisle summoned 1305-1311; and Sir John Mauduit who can hardly be the Sir John Mauduit summoned 1342, and who was then aged about eleven, but was presumably his uncle, and brother of Sir Thomas Mauduit, executed as above: in such cases as these, where the coat armour is described, a knowledge of it would often come in handy. It is, however, devoutly to be wished for the purposes of identification, that the writers of the Plantagenet period had had sufficient prophetic instinct to realize that the gentry of their time who were summoned to Parliament by writ, would hundreds of years after their death be by action, not of the Crown but of the House of Lords, retrospectively created hereditary Peers with a limitation of the amplest character. As it is they never describe themselves nor are described by their contemporaries as other than what they really were, viz., Bannerets or Knights Bachelor; but, as Rudyard Kipling would say, "That is another story."

VICARY GIBBS.