Negotiating authority in a colonial capital: Dublin and the Windsor Crisis, 1369–78

PETER CROOKS

The English conquest of Dublin in 1170 stands as a watershed in both the history and historiography of the city. In historical terms, 'Ireland's Hastings' brought to a close the period in which control of the city of Dublin was contested by the island's provincial kingships in their struggles for supremacy.[1] For nearly 370 years after King Henry II took the city and its environs into his hands in 1171,[2] Dublin was a bastion of English power in Ireland,[3] and suffered little in the way of an assault that threatened to dislodge it from royal control.[4] There were, of course, close encounters of several kinds. In February 1317, the Dubliners famously fired the western suburbs of the city when Edward Bruce and his brother, King Robert I of Scotland, led a Scottish army within sight of the city walls.[5] Less dramatic, but more insistent, were the raids of the Gaelic Irish, launched from the mountains to the south of the city.[6] These offensives

1 Seán Duffy, 'Ireland's Hastings: the Anglo-Norman conquest of Dublin', in Christopher Harper-Bill (ed.), *Anglo-Norman Studies XX* (Woodbridge, 1998), pp 69–86. For the emergence of Dublin as *de facto* capital of Ireland in the pre-invasion period, see idem, 'Irishmen and Islesmen in the kingdoms of Dublin and Man, 1052–1171', *Ériu*, 43 (1992), 93–133. **2** A.B. Scott and F.X. Martin (eds), *Expugnatio Hibernica: the conquest of Ireland by Giraldus Cambrensis* (Dublin, 1978), pp 88–9. For discussion, see Marie Therese Flanagan, *Irish society, Anglo-Norman settlers, Angevin kingship: interactions in Ireland in the late twelfth century* (Oxford, 1989), esp. pp 120–1. **3** The development of Dublin as an 'English' city is traced in Seán Duffy, 'Town and crown: the kings of England and their city of Dublin', in Michael Prestwich, Richard Britnell and Robin Frame (eds), *Thirteenth century England X* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp 95–117; James Lydon, 'Dublin in transition: from Ostman town to English borough', in Seán Duffy (ed.), *Medieval Dublin II* (Dublin, 2001), pp 128–41. **4** For the defence of the city in the period *c.*1171–1541, see James Lydon, 'Dublin castle in the Middle Ages', in Seán Duffy (ed.), *Medieval Dublin III* (Dublin, 2002), pp 115–27; idem, 'The defence of Dublin in the Middle Ages', in Seán Duffy (ed.), *Medieval Dublin IV* (Dublin, 2003), pp 63–78. For a neglected episode from 1226 in which Dublin Castle was held against the chief governor of Ireland by Theobald II Walter (d. 1230), see Peter Crooks, ' "Divide and rule": factionalism as royal policy in the lordship of Ireland, *c.*1171–1264', *Peritia*, 19 (2005), 290. **5** J.T. Gilbert (ed.), *Chartularies of St Mary's abbey, Dublin*, 2 vols (London, 1882–4), ii, p. 353; Seán Duffy, 'The Bruce invasion of Ireland: a revised itinerary and chronology', in idem (ed.), *Robert the Bruce's Irish wars: the Scottish invasions of Ireland, 1306–1328* (Stroud, 2002), pp 35–6. **6** The increasing instability of the Leinster region from the later thirteenth century is examined in Robin Frame, 'The justiciar and the murder of the MacMurroughs in 1282', in idem, *Ireland and Britain, 1170–1450* (London and Rio Grande, 1998), pp 241–7; idem, 'Two

were no trivial matter. In September 1408, Thomas of Lancaster (d. 1421), second son of Henry IV and then the king's lieutenant in Ireland, barely escaped death when the king's Irish enemies attacked the priory of St John of Jerusalem at Kilmainham, near Dublin, where he was in residence.[7] Nonetheless, Dublin remained secure in English hands to the end of the Middle Ages.[8] As J.A. Watt put it, expounding the theme of 'the making of a colonial capital':

> Dublin was to emerge from [the fourteenth century] a bit bloody, a bit bowed but tenacious, resilient and still recognizably the capital city of colonial Ireland, its Englishness … symbolized by the grant by Henry IV to the mayor of Dublin that he might have a sword borne before him in recognition of the city's services to the English crown.[9]

The significance of the conquest of Dublin as a historiographical watershed is rather more negative. The study of 'English' Dublin – whether in terms of the city's internal political life or its role as the capital of the new English colony – remains in its infancy. The normal explanation for this neglect (the paucity of the documentary evidence) is scarcely convincing.[10] The source material is not so much exiguous as unyielding.[11] The neglect is better explained by the changed political landscape after 1171. The very certainty of English control over Dublin meant that the city seldom intruded into the arena

kings in Leinster: the crown and the MicMhurchadha in the fourteenth century', in T.B. Barry, Robin Frame and Katharine Simms (eds), *Colony and frontier in medieval Ireland: essays presented to J.F. Lydon* (London and Rio Grande, 1995), pp 155–75; J.F. Lydon, 'Medieval Wicklow: "a land of war"', in Ken Hannigan and William Nolan (eds), *Wicklow history and society: interdisciplinary essays on the history of an Irish county* (Dublin, 1994), pp 151–89; Emmett O'Byrne, *War, politics and the Irish Leinster 1156–1606* (Dublin, 2003), pp 58–102. **7** The account occurs in the chronicle of Henry Marlborough: *Bibliothèque Municipale de Troyes*, MS 1316, fo. 51; translation in Sir James Ware (ed.), *Ancient Irish Histories*, 2 vols (Dublin, 1809), ii, p. 22. The aggressors are not identified, but they were almost certainly the Irish of Leinster. Lancaster immediately proclaimed a royal service and the feudal host was instructed to meet at New Ross, Co. Wexford (Troyes, MS 1316, fo. 51; A.J. Otway-Ruthven, 'Royal service in Ireland', in Peter Crooks (ed.), *Government, war and society in medieval Ireland: essays by Edmund Curtis, A.J. Otway-Ruthven and James Lydon* (Dublin, 2008), p. 175). **8** The next great siege of the city took place during the Kildare rebellion of 1534–5 (Steven G. Ellis, *Ireland in the age of the Tudors, 1447–1603: English expansion and the end of Gaelic rule* (Harlow, 1996), pp 137–8). **9** J.A. Watt, 'Dublin in the thirteenth century: the making of a colonial capital city', in P.R. Coss and S.D. Lloyd (eds), *Thirteenth century England I* (Woodbridge, 1986), p. 157. On the civic swords of Dublin, see Claude Blair and Ida Delamer, 'The Dublin civic swords', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 85, C, no. 5 (1988), 87–142. **10** See, e.g., Watt, 'Dublin in the thirteenth century', p. 155: 'The evidence for the Dublin citizen is meagre'. **11** The late Philomena Connolly's examination of the early fourteenth-century mayor, Geoffrey Morton, is a superb example of the possibilities of reconstruction despite the absence of the records of the Dublin hundred court and guild merchant (Philomena Connolly, 'The rise and fall of Geoffrey Morton, mayor of Dublin, 1303–4', in Seán Duffy (ed.), *Medieval Dublin II* (Dublin, 2001), pp 233–51). Further prosopographical explorations of Dublin's leading

of high politics in the later Middle Ages, as it had done so frequently in the pre-invasion period. Yet, if the king's control over Dublin was not gravely threatened from without in the lifetime of the medieval lordship of Ireland, there is another more subtle sense in which royal authority in the city was tested from within.

From 1171, the land of Ireland was just one territory in the wider dominions controlled by the kings of England.[12] In such an extended polity, the state's capacity for routine physical coercion was severely restricted.[13] Consequently power could not be imposed unilaterally from the centre, but rather had to be 'negotiated'.[14] In colonial Ireland, the principals to these 'negotiations' were the crown's agents and the settler population, in particular the resident nobility or, in the case of Dublin, the city's ruling elites. The series of liberties and privileges conceded to the Dubliners by the kings of England from the late twelfth century onwards are the fruits of this process.[15] The present essay explores an occasion in the later fourteenth century when 'negotiations' broke down,[16] namely the controversial chief governorship of the Westmorland knight, Sir William Windsor (d. 1384).[17] The city's attitude to

families are urgently required. **12** See James Lydon, 'Ireland and the English crown, 1171–1541', in Crooks, *Government, war and society in medieval Ireland*, ch. 1; Ralph Griffiths, 'The English realm and dominions and the king's subjects in the later Middle Ages', in idem, *King and country: England and Wales in the fifteenth century* (London and Rio Grande, 1991), pp 33–54. **13** For illuminating discussions of the power of the medieval state, see Colin Richmond, 'Ruling classes and agents of the state: formal and informal networks of power', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 10:1 (1997), 1–26; R.R. Davies, 'The medieval state: the tyranny of a concept?', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 16:2 (2003), 280–300. In an Irish context, see Peter Crooks, 'Factions, feuds and noble power in the lordship of Ireland, *c.*1356–1496', *Irish Historical Studies*, 35:140 (2007), esp. 443. **14** Michael J. Braddick and John Walter, 'Introduction. Grids of power: order, hierarchy and subordination in early modern society', in idem (eds), *Negotiating power in early modern society: order, hierarchy and subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001). See also Jack P. Greene, 'Negotiated authorities: the problem of governance in the extended polities of the early modern Atlantic world', in idem, *Negotiated authorities: essays in colonial political and constitutional history* (Charlotsville, VA and London, 1994), pp 1–24; and Christine Daniels and Michael V. Kennedy (eds), *Negotiated empires: centers and peripheries in the Americas, 1500–1820* (New York and London, 2002). **15** See, e.g., H.B. Clarke, 'The 1192 charter of liberties and the beginnings of Dublin's municipal life', *Dublin Historical Record*, 46:1 (1993), 5–14; J.T. Gilbert et al. (eds), *Calendar of the ancient records of Dublin in the possession of the municipal corporation* [hereafter *CARD*], 19 vols (Dublin, 1889–1944), i, pp 6–24; Duffy, 'Town and crown', passim. In the period with which this essay is concerned, the most recent charter of liberties was that granted by Lionel of Antwerp at Dublin on 26 September 1363. An *inspeximus* of this charter, given under the great seal of England and dated 22 November 1363, is printed in Gearóid Mac Niocaill, *Na Buirgéisí XII–XV aois*, 2 vols (Dublin, 1964), i, pp 92–9. **16** For the vexed issues – primary among them the question of jurisdiction – that occasionally resulted in the seizure of the city's liberties into the king's hands (e.g. in 1276, 1303 and 1309), see Duffy, 'Town and crown', pp 98–100, 113–14, 116–17. **17** Sir William Windsor has generated an extensive secondary literature and relevant works are cited in the course of this essay. For brief biographies, see Philomena

Windsor is summed up by an annalist writing in Dublin, who describes the governor laconically as a 'vigorous knight in arms, but extremely grasping'.[18] Windsor's stormy relationship with the citizens of Dublin was by no means exceptional: the Dublin annals are replete with poison-pen portraits of the king's ministers.[19] The events of the period 1369–78 are, however, exceptionally well documented and provide us with a rare insight into the relationship between the king's ministers in Ireland and his city of Dublin.

The tale of Windsor's involvement with Dublin is a drama in three acts. The curtain rises on 3 March 1369, when Windsor was commissioned by Edward III to serve as the king's lieutenant of Ireland.[20] This appointment represented a continuation of the policy of large-scale military intervention funded by the English exchequer that had begun in 1361, when Edward III's son, Lionel of Antwerp, was appointed lieutenant of Ireland.[21] Like most chief governors, Windsor found it hard to make ends meet, and he sought to resolve his financial problems by seeking subsidies from a reluctant Irish parliament and imposing new customs in Irish ports.[22] This prompted outcry.[23] The city

Connolly, 'Windsor, William, Baron Windsor (1322x8–1384)', in H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (eds), *The Oxford dictionary of national biography: from the earliest times to the year 2000* [hereafter *ODNB*], 60 vols (Oxford, 2004), lix, pp 712–13; Peter Crooks, 'William of Windsor', in Seán Duffy, (ed.), *Medieval Ireland: an encyclopedia* (New York, 2005), pp 515–16. A contemporary likeness of Windsor is preserved on the 'charter roll of Waterford', beautifully reproduced in Eamonn McEneaney and Rosemary Ryan (eds), *Waterford treasures: a guide to the historical and archaeological treasures of Waterford city* (Waterford, 2004), p. 77. For the circumstances of the creation of the Waterford charter roll around the time of Windsor's first chief governorship, see Julian C. Walton, *The royal charters of Waterford* (Waterford, 1992), pp 8–10; Eamonn McEneaney, *A history of Waterford and its mayors from the 12th century to the 20th century* (Waterford, 1995), pp 71–2; McEneaney, 'The art of diplomacy: Waterford's 14th-century charter roll', *Irish Arts Review*, 21:1 (2004), 91–5. **18** Gilbert, *Chart. St Mary's*, ii, p. 282. For the annals in question – commonly, but misleadingly, called 'Case's annals' – see Bernadette Williams, 'The Dominican annals of Dublin', in Seán Duffy (ed.), *Medieval Dublin II* (Dublin, 2001), p. 152. **19** See, e.g., the hostility evinced towards Sir Robert Ufford (d. 1346); the favourable description of Sir Thomas Rokeby (d. 1357), is exceptional (Gilbert, *Chart. St Mary's*, ii, pp 385, 388, 392–3). For the chief governorships of Ufford and Rokeby, see Robin Frame, 'The justiciarship of Ralph Ufford: warfare and politics in fourteenth century Ireland', *Studia Hibernica*, 13 (1972), 7–47; idem, 'Thomas Rokeby, sheriff of Yorkshire and justiciar of Ireland', *Peritia*, 10 (1996), 274–96. **20** H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles, *The administration of Ireland, 1172–1377* (Dublin, 1963), p. 90. His powers were stipulated in his patent of appointment (*Calendar of patent rolls 1367–70*, p. 221). For discussion of the terms under which Windsor held office, see A.J. Otway-Ruthven, 'The chief governors of medieval Ireland', in Crooks, *Government, war and society in medieval Ireland*, p. 81. **21** See Philomena Connolly, 'The financing of English expeditions to Ireland, 1361–1376', in James Lydon (ed.), *England and Ireland in the later Middle Ages: essays in honour of Jocelyn Otway-Ruthven* (Dublin, 1981), pp 104–21. On Lionel's lieutenancy, see most recently Peter Crooks, ' "Hobbes", "dogs", and politics in the Ireland of Lionel of Antwerp, *c.*1361–6', in Stephen Morrillo (ed.), *Haskins Society Journal*, 16 (2005), 117–48. **22** For details of these grants, see Connolly, 'Financing of English expeditions to Ireland', pp 113–17; H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles, *The Irish parliament in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1952), pp

of Dublin was among the first communities to denounce the king's lieutenant, when an embassy of Dubliners crossed the Irish Sea to present grievances before the king in England in 1371. These remonstrations found their mark and, on 10 September 1371, the king ordered Windsor, 'to stay and altogether cease … the levying or collecting of the sums … unlawfully laid upon the mayor and commonalty and upon the citizens of Dublin in Ireland'.[24] The colonists also alleged that Windsor had tried to prevent them from petitioning the king in person. Consequently, Edward III ordered his lieutenant to allow 'free passage to the king's lieges who for lawful causes will come to him in England', since it was alleged that he had illegally hindered those 'who felt themselves aggrieved by the lieutenant and other the king's ministers of Ireland … from repairing to the king for redress'.[25]

Shortly afterwards, on 10 December 1371, Edward III ordered the treasurer and barons of the Irish exchequer to stay all legal actions against the men of Dublin.[26] This was in response to further petitions from the Dubliners to the effect that Windsor was pursuing them through the royal courts for their failure to levy the subsidies to which they had agreed in parliament.[27] The fact that the order was directed to the Irish exchequer officials is significant, since it indicates that royal confidence in Sir William Windsor had been shaken. In another letter, dated 8 December 1371, the king explicitly ordered the Irish treasurer to execute his mandates, 'any command of the said lieutenant now or hereafter to them addressed to the contrary notwithstanding'.[28] Early in 1372,

80–5. The new customs were granted at the Dublin parliament that convened on 30 July 1369 (H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles (eds), *Parliaments and councils of mediaeval Ireland* (Dublin, 1947), no. 21). The Irish pipe rolls recorded the sums collected in Dublin from these customs, e.g., 8 Aug. 1369 to 21 Jan. 1370 – £40 9*s.* 7½*d.*; 21 Jan. 1370 to 20 May 1370 – £18 18*s.* 6*d.* The original pipe rolls are no longer extant, but these figures appear in William Betham, *The origin and history of the constitution of England and of the early parliaments of Ireland* (London, 1834), pp 310–11. **23** For complaints about the imposition of these customs, see M.V. Clarke, 'William of Windsor in Ireland, 1369–76', in L.S. Sutherland and May McKisack (eds), *Fourteenth century studies by M.V. Clarke* (Oxford, 1937), pp 186–7; *Calendar of close rolls 1369–74*, pp 256–7. Windsor naturally disputed the charge that the customs were imposed without consent (G.O. Sayles (ed.), *Documents on the affairs of Ireland before the king's council* (Dublin, 1979), no. 241). **24** *Calendar of close rolls 1369–74*, p. 246; Thomas Rymer, *Foedera, conventiones, litterae et cujuscunque generis acta publica, inter Reges Angliae et alios quosvis imperatores, reges, principes, vel communitates*, ed. Adam Clarke and Frederick Holbrooke, 4 vols in 7 (London, 1816–69), iii, part 2, p. 922. On 20 October 1371, a general order was issued to Windsor to 'stay altogether the levy of all manner of tallages, fines, ransoms, and imposts by him laid upon the people in Ireland' (*Calendar of close rolls 1369–74*, pp 256–7; Rymer, *Foedera*, iii, part 2, pp 924–5). **25** *Calendar of close rolls 1369–74*, p. 257; Rymer, *Foedera*, iii, part 2, pp 924–5. **26** *Calendar of close rolls 1369–74*, pp 265–6. The Latin text of this letter is given in Rymer, *Foedera*, iii, part 2, p. 924, where it is erroneously attributed to 10 October 1371. **27** When the community of Drogheda made a similar protest to the effect that their mayor, John Frombold, had been arrested by Windsor, we hear that 'the king [was] moved to anger' (*Calendar of close rolls 1369–74*, p. 265; Rymer, *Foedera*, iii, part 2, p. 930). **28** *Calendar of*

Edward III was forced to recall Windsor and launch an investigation into the veracity of the complaints that had been made against him.[29] In May and June 1373, the new chief governor of Ireland, Sir Robert Ashton,[30] took a series of inquisitions at various locations in Ireland,[31] including one held at Dublin on 13 June 1373, in the course of which the jury made a series of allegations concerning Windsor's mistreatment of the men of Dublin.[32]

Act two opens on 20 September 1373, when Edward III – having determined that the accusations against Windsor were largely without substance – reappointed him as his representative in Ireland, but this time with the less-exalted title of 'governor and keeper'.[33] The king granted his governor authority to collect the subsidies that he had been voted during his first term in office. The colonists, however, remained recalcitrant. Consequently, in the autumn of 1375, Edward III took the unprecedented step of summoning the commons of the Irish parliament to convene before him at Westminster, presumably in the hope that they could be brow-beaten into voting funds.[34] These elections duly took place but, almost with one voice, the communities denied their representatives full power (Lat. *plena potestas*) to grant the king any subsidies. When the mayor and bailiffs of Dublin returned the writ that had commanded to them to hold elections, they recorded that the citizens of

close rolls 1369–74, p. 265; Rymer, *Foedera*, iii, part 2, p. 930. **29** The precise chronology of Windsor's departure from Ireland is unclear, since part one of the English patent roll for 46 Edward III (1372–3) is no longer extant. Irish chancery letters record that Windsor left Ireland on 20/21 March 1372, and that his successor, Gerald, earl of Kildare, took the oath of office on 22 March (Edward Tresham (ed.), *Rotulorum patentium et clausorum cancellariae Hiberniae calendarium, Hen. II–Hen. VII* [hereafter *RCH*] (Dublin, 1828), p. 82, no. 53; *RCH*, p. 84, no. 131). Exchequer records suggest that Windsor left Ireland on 9 April 1372 (Richardson and Sayles, *Admin. of Ire.*, p. 90, n. 4). **30** Ashton held the office of justiciar and served from 20 June 1372 to 2 December 1373 (Richardson and Sayles, *Admin. of Ire.*, p. 90). **31** On 28 May 1372, Ashton was ordered to investigate the charges made against Windsor (*Calendar of close rolls 1369–74*, p. 380; Rymer, *Foedera*, iii, part 2, p. 942). The Latin texts of three of these inquisitions are printed in Rymer, *Foedera*, iii, part 2, pp 977–9. **32** National Archives of the United Kingdom (Public Record Office) [hereafter TNA (PRO)], C 49/75, membrane 25. The text does not appear in Rymer, *Foedera*, but there is a calendar in Clarke, 'William of Windsor', pp 229–32. Clarke's rendering of the names of certain Dublin citizens must be treated with caution. 'Edmund Serle' (at p. 231) should read 'Edmund Berle' (cf. C 49/75, membrane 25; *Calendar of close rolls 1369–74*, p. 265). This Edmund Berle was a bailiff of Dublin in 1370–1 and thrice served as mayor of the city in 1375–6, 1382–3 and 1385–6 (H.F. Berry, 'Catalogue of the mayors, provosts and bailiffs of Dublin City, A.D. 1229 to 1447', in Howard Clarke (ed.), *Medieval Dublin: the living city* (Dublin, 1990), pp 160–1). For Berle witnessing documents as bailiff (1371) and as mayor (1375), see J.G. Smyly, 'Old deeds in the library of Trinity College – part III', *Hermathena*, 69 (May, 1947), nos. 86 and 95 respectively. **33** *Calendar of patent rolls 1370–4*, p. 340; Rymer, *Foedera*, iii, part 2, p. 990. See also *Calendar of patent rolls 1370–4*, p. 345, for the financial arrangements for his chief governorship. **34** Thomas Leland, *The History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II* (2nd ed., 3 vols, Dublin, 1814), i. 361–3. Leland's edition is 'annexed' from the edition in Joseph Ayloffe (ed.), *Calendar of the ancient charters with an introduction giving some account of the state of the public records from the conquest to the*

Dublin had 'declared, *una voce*, that they were not bound to send any one to parliaments and councils in England, yet, out of reverence for the king and saving their privileges and liberties, they … elected John Blakhorn and John White. They have granted them no power to agree to a subsidy'.[35]

A detailed account of the election in the county court of Dublin in 1375–6 is revealing of the divisiveness of Sir William Windsor's policies.[36] When the commons of County Dublin refused to grant their representatives full power, Windsor ordered the sheriff of Dublin, Reginald Talbot, to reconvene the county court. Talbot was instructed to conduct new elections, which were now to be held in the presence of two senior royal ministers, the treasurer of Ireland and the chief justice of the king's bench. Windsor further stipulated that, should the commons of County Dublin fail to grant their representatives full powers, they would be distrained in the amount of 100*s*. The result of these orders was a schism in the county court. Some 44 freeholders elected Nicholas Howth and William FitzWilliam to represent them; another 20 elected the same Nicholas Howth but, instead of FitzWilliam, returned one Richard White.[37] This deadlock doubtless reflected local rivalries within County Dublin; but it was also the product of Windsor's meddling in the electoral process. Windsor was seeking the return of a representative who would be amenable to his interests. His favoured candidate was seemingly William FitzWilliam, who had served as sheriff of Dublin during Windsor's administration,[38] and who also held the office of constable of the royal castle of Wicklow.[39] In addition, FitzWilliam held lands at Dundrum, Co. Dublin, in

present time (London, 1772), pp 444–62. **35** Clarke, 'William of Windsor', p. 236. **36** 'Documents relating to the elections in the county court of Dublin, 1375–6', in Clarke, 'William of Windsor', pp 237–41. For analysis, see James Lydon, 'William of Windsor and the Irish parliament', in Crooks, *Government, war and society in medieval Ireland*, pp 103–4. The county and city of Dublin were, of course, discrete constituencies, but the rich information on the elections in the county court is extremely valuable for reconstructing events within Dublin city. **37** When Nicholas Howth died in 1404, Henry Marlborough described him as 'a man of singular honesty' (Troyes, MS 1316, fo. 50*v*; trans. Ware (ed.), *An. Ir. Histories*, ii. 19). His career is sketched in F.E. Ball, *Howth and its owners: being the fifth part of a history of County Dublin* (Dublin, 1917), pp 8–9. **38** TNA (PRO), E 101/245/7, membrane 6; National Archives of Ireland, RC 8/30, pp 115–6, 137. **39** A writ of *liberate*, dated at Kilkenny on 20 October 1375, and witnessed by Sir William Windsor, instructs the treasurer and chamberlains of the Irish exchequer to 'pay William FitzWilliam, constable of Wicklow castle, 100*s*. arrears of his annual fee of £20 from 27 June [1375] to 17 September following, viz. a quarter year' (TNA (PRO), E 101/245/9, part 2, no. 14). This writ was issued five days before another (dated at Kilkenny, 25 October 1375) addressed to the sheriff of Dublin commanding him to cause the election of two lay persons to represent Co. Dublin before the king in England (Clarke, 'William of Windsor', p. 237) – the order that was to lead to the schism in Dublin's county court. For payments to FitzWilliam as constable, see Philomena Connolly (ed.), *Irish exchequer payments, 1270–1446* (Dublin, 1998), pp 530–31, 533–4. See also an agreement dated 25 May 1375 between the deputy treasurer of Ireland and FitzWilliam providing for the fortification of Wicklow castle, specifically that FitzWilliam shall 'complete the front wall of the castle, in length five

the archiepiscopal manor of St Sepulchre.[40] Indeed, the archbishop was soon to appoint FitzWilliam as his seneschal 'of the whole archbishopric of Dublin, to govern, hold, exercise and adjourn the archbishop's courts as often and where he thinks fit for the archbishop's advantage'.[41]

FitzWilliam's employment in the administration of the archiepiscopal estates is pertinent to this discussion because of the intimate relationship that existed between the archdiocese of Dublin and the royal administration in Ireland. In 1375, the clergy of Dublin was the only constituency to comply in full with Windsor's instructions to grant representatives full power (Lat. *potestatem de qua in dicto brevi vestro fit mentio, plenam*).[42] Professor Lydon attributed this to the fact that there was a vacancy in the archdiocese of Dublin after the death of Archbishop Thomas Mynot on 10 July 1375.[43] He might have added that, during that vacancy, the temporalities of the archdiocese were entrusted to Bishop Stephen Valle of Meath, a close ally of Sir William Windsor's who had served as treasurer of Ireland (1368–72) during the latter's first tour of duty as chief governor of Ireland.[44] As a result, Bishop Stephen became the target of several accusations made by the Irish commons.[45] Given all this, it is scarcely surprising that Windsor should have considered FitzWilliam an ally. FitzWilliam's rival in the contested election presents a stark contrast. Richard White was no friend of Windsor's. In the summer of 1376, despite the annulment of his election, White travelled to England, where he presumably remonstrated against Windsor's administration.[46]

The cacophony of complaint from Ireland coincided with mounting dissatisfaction within England about Edward III's government, grievances which ultimately exploded in the 'Good Parliament' of 1376.[47] Windsor was, by this time, closely associated with Edward III's mistress, Alice Perrers[48] – that

perches, and including three towers, with stone and cement. The wall between the towers to be 25 feet high; two towers, those above the gate and the chapel 30 feet, and the third called the Garet 27 feet' (*Calendar of ancient deeds and muniments preserved in the Pembroke Estate Office, Dublin* [hereafter *Pembroke deeds*] (Dublin, 1891), no. 64). For Wicklow castle, see Linzi Simpson, 'Anglo-Norman settlement in Uí Briúin Cualann, 1169–1350', in Hannigan and Nolan, *Wicklow History and Society*, pp 212–14. **40** James Mills (ed.), 'Notices of the manor of St Sepulchre, Dublin, in the fourteenth century', *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, 4th ser., 9 (1889), 125; *Pembroke deeds*, no. 71. **41** Charles McNeill (ed.), *Calendar of Archbishop Alen's register, c.1172–1534* (Dublin, 1950), p. 225 (a letter of notification dated 1 September 1379). For a later appointment of FitzWilliam as seneschal of the temporalities of the archbishopric of Dublin, see *Pembroke deeds*, no. 80 (26 September 1390). **42** Leland, *History of Ireland*, pp 365–6. **43** Lydon, 'William of Windsor and the Irish parliament', in Crooks, *Government, war and society in medieval Ireland*, p. 102. **44** *RCH*, p. 94, no. 168; Richardson and Sayles, *Admin. of Ire.*, p. 104. **45** Clarke, 'William of Windsor', pp 194–9. **46** The grievances of the Irish commons presented to the king in 1376 are printed in full in Clarke, 'William of Windsor', pp 184–206. **47** For which, see G.A. Holmes, *The Good Parliament* (Oxford, 1975). **48** For a recent re-assessment of Alice Perrers, see W.M. Ormrod, 'Who was Alice Perrers?', *Chaucer Review*, 40:3 (2006), 219–29. See also Chris Given-Wilson, 'Perrers [*married name*

'shameless, impudent harlot', as Thomas Walsingham calls her.[49] At some point after his return to England in 1372, Windsor had secretly married Alice,[50] and his close affiliation with the king's court *covyne* made him a focus of resentment.[51] Consequently, he was recalled from Ireland in 1376, for a second time. During 1376, the citizens of Dublin were once again extremely vocal in their critique of Windsor's administration. Moreover, their representatives were rewarded for their trouble in travelling to Westminster in 1376 to present their grievances: the king ordered payment of the expenses of the Irish commons 'in coming thither [to Westminster], there abiding, and thence returning';[52] and a number of men with Dublin connections – including Nicholas Howth, Richard Plunket, the mayor and citizens of Dublin, Richard White and John Talbot – were appointed to offices in the royal administration or granted lucrative trading privileges.[53]

The third act of the Windsor crisis has previously received scant attention from historians.[54] The action begins in the aftermath of the Good Parliament and takes place in the absence of our anti-hero, Sir William Windsor. Late in 1376, orders were issued for a new investigation of Windsor's administration. These inquiries were to be headed by a courtier, Sir Nicholas Dagworth, aided by two special attorneys acting for the king.[55] These attorneys were Richard Dere and William Stapolyn, the two men who had presented the grievances of the Irish commons to the king at Westminster in the summer of 1376.[56] Dagworth's investigation would probably have got underway in the first half of 1377, but its progress was stalled by the reassertion of the interests of the

Windsor], Alice (d. 1400/01)', *ODNB*, xliii, pp 794–5. **49** John Taylor, Wendy R. Childs and Leslie Watkiss (eds), *The St Albans chronicle: the* Cronica Maiora *of Thomas Walsingham*, i: *1376–1396* (Oxford, 2003), p. 43. **50** The marriage may have taken place before his return to Ireland in 1374 or, at the latest, shortly after Alice's disgrace in 1376. See Ormrod, 'Who was Alice Perrers?', p. 222; Holmes, *Good parliament*, pp 97–8; Sheelagh Harbison, 'William of Windsor, the court party and the administration of Ireland', in Lydon, *Eng. & Ire. in the later Middle Ages*, pp 151–4. **51** For an analysis of the 'court *covyne*', see Chris Given-Wilson, *The royal household and the king's affinity: service, politics and finance in medieval England, 1360–1413* (New Haven and London, 1986), pp 146–54. **52** *Calendar of close rolls 1374–7*, p. 373; Rymer, *Foedera*, iii, part 2, p. 1059 (where this letter close is erroneously attributed to membrane 24, rather than membrane 23, of the close roll of 50 Edward III, part 2). See also Frederick Devon (ed.), *Issues of the exchequer: being a collection of payments made out of his majesty's revenue, from King Henry III to King Henry VI inclusive* (London, 1837), p. 199. **53** *Calendar of patent rolls 1374–7*, p. 303; *CARD*, i, p. 124. **54** Maude Clarke was aware of this 'third act' and in a footnote states her hope 'at a later date to deal with the documents of the sequel'. Sadly her premature death prevented her from revisiting the episode (Clarke, 'William of Windsor', p. 161, n. 1). **55** *Calendar of patent rolls 1374–7*, p. 416. **56** The roll of grievances begins: 'Ceux sont les articles mises a conseil nostre seigneur le roy en Engleterre par Richard Deere et William Stapelyn' (Clarke, 'William of Windsor', p. 184; see also *Calendar of close rolls 1374–7*, p. 368). William Stapolyn came from a Dublin family. One 'John de Stapolyn, clerk' witnessed a deed dated 14 November 1336, in which Nicholas Bishop, a citizen and merchant of Dublin, granted to Robert, son of Geoffrey Moenes, two parts of a tenement in the parish of St Audoen,

'court party' in England by the king's son, John of Gaunt (d. 1399).[57] The death of Edward III on 21 June 1377, however, caused a further shift in power. In the new political climate, it became possible to re-open the investigation.[58]

In the autumn of 1377, Sir Nicholas Dagworth received a new commission of inquiry.[59] He was preparing to set out for Ireland late in 1377, and his investigation got underway in the spring of 1378. On 8 April and 6 May 1378, he held inquisitions at Dublin.[60] His activities provoked serious disturbances. On 18 August 1378, a letter was issued in the name of the boy-king, Richard II, addressing the king's lieges of Ireland.[61] It states that the king 'has heard of the divisions among [his lieges of Ireland] and the absence of mutual good will and of any effort to provide in common for the safety of the state against the common enemy, whereat he marvels, and commands them straitly upon their allegiance to desist from mutual strife'.[62] This letter was almost certainly issued in response to news of tumultuous events in the city of Dublin during 1378. A significant number of citizens willingly assisted Dagworth by peddling damaging information about Windsor. This cost them dearly. By December 1378, tidings had reached Westminster that some forty-four Dubliners had been indicted with 'felonies and treasons whereof they are not guilty … by malice and procurement of certain [men] who bear them ill will [for aiding Nicholas Dagworth]'.[63]

This list of forty-four Dubliners is of particular interest because it follows some sort of order of precedence. The first six men listed – Robert Stakpolle; Edmund Berle; John Passavaunt; John Beek; Walter Passavaunt the elder; and John Foylle – all hailed from important Dublin families.[64] Each member of this

Dublin (Smyly, 'Old deeds – part II', *Hermathena*, 67 (May, 1946), no. 42). **57** *Calendar of close rolls 1374–7*, p. 469. **58** The vicissitudes of the court party in England, and the ramifications of this for politics in colonial Ireland, are traced in Peter Crooks, 'Factionalism and noble power in English Ireland, *c.*1361–1423' (PhD, University of Dublin, 2007), pp 138–9. **59** *Calendar of patent rolls 1377–81*, pp 27, 52, 75. **60** TNA (PRO), E 368/157, *Recorda*, Hilary, membranes 23–4. **61** For the continual councils that governed England in the first years of Richard II's reign, see N.B. Lewis, 'The "continual council" in the early years of Richard II, 1377–80', *EHR*, 41:162 (1926), 246–51; T.F. Tout, *Chapters in the administrative history of medieval England*, 6 vols (Manchester, 1920–33), iii, pp 326–9; Nigel Saul, *Richard II* (New Haven and London, 1997), pp 28–31; Anthony Goodman, 'Richard II's councils' in Anthony Goodman and James Gillespie (eds), *Richard II: the art of kingship* (Oxford, 1999), pp 65–6. **62** *Calendar of patent rolls 1377–81*, p. 271. The text of this letter patent, which is written in Norman-French, is given in Rymer, *Foedera*, iv, p. 48. **63** *Calendar of close rolls 1377–81*, pp 172, 225. **64** The names were presumably included in a petition presented before the king's council in England in protest at their detention. The remaining thirty-eight detainees (listed in the order they appear in the records) were: Simon Hirdman; John Burley 'glover'; John Hyncle, elder; Richard Batyn; John Holdfast; Henry Waleys; John Waryn; Roger Beek; Adam Boydon; John Boydon; John Willy; Roger Morton; Richard Bertram; William Bertram; William Leyngh'; Thomas Barbour; William Bowyer; John Blossum; John Olyver; John Whyt 'smyth'; Robert Hyncle; Robert Haydon; John Babe; Walter Passavaunt, younger; William Frere; Richard Harburgh; William Wargan; Thomas Humwyn; William Hirdman; Robert Peres; John Hulle; John Holm of the

sextet had recently served as either mayor or bailiff of the city, the list opening with the incumbent mayor, Robert Stakpolle.[65] Clearly, these were not members of a Dublin rabble; rather, they numbered among the city's most eminent citizens. The last name to appear on the list of forty-four detainees is also familiar. William Stapolyn was one of the king's attorneys who had been commissioned to aid the inquiries of Sir Nicholas Dagworth.[66] It requires no great leap of imagination to see why these Dubliners should have been eager to assist Dagworth. Several of the forty-four claimed to be victims of Sir William Windsor's coercive tactics. One tale of woe must suffice. On 25 February 1371, Windsor summoned to the town of Kilkenny the mayor of Dublin (John Passavaunt), the city's two bailiffs (William Hirdman and Edmund Berle), and twelve of Dublin's better citizens, to explain why they had disregarded letters of military summons directed to them by the lieutenant.[67] Passavaunt and his fellows countered that the letters in question had in fact been addressed to men who were either out of the country, dying, or deceased, and that they themselves had received no communication from the lieutenant. Notwithstanding this defence, Passavaunt and his fellows were forbidden to leave Kilkenny until they coughed up a punitive fine of 100 marks.[68]

In light of such events, it is scarcely surprising that many of Dublin's citizens had axes to grind with Windsor. The detention of forty-four Dubliners, however, indicates that Dagworth's investigations met with formidable resistance. That opposition came from three principal sources. First, there were several members of Windsor's ousted administration who had been accused by the Dublin juries in 1378 of various misdeeds. This coterie of Windsorites included a future archbishop of Armagh, John Colton (d. 1404), then dean of St Patrick's cathedral, who had served as treasurer of Ireland during Windsor's second period as chief governor;[69] Robert Holywood, a former chief baron of the Irish exchequer;[70] and William FitzWilliam, whose election in the county court of Dublin had been disputed in 1376. These men travelled to England in

Cokstret; Richard Clerk of Tauelaghym; Walter Rede 'glover'; Robert Loghteburgh; Reynold Talbot; Richard Whit; William Stapolyn (*Calendar of close rolls 1377–81*, pp 172, 225). **65** Berry, 'Catalogue of the mayors', pp 160–1. **66** On 12 November 1377, Stapolyn and his colleague Richard Dere were reappointed as 'the king's special attorneys' in Ireland (*Calendar of patent rolls 1377–81*, p. 87). **67** All three of the civic officers here named were arrested during 1378 for aiding Dagworth (*Calendar of close rolls 1377–81*, pp 172, 225). **68** This charge was made at the inquisition held before Sir Robert Ashton in June 1373 (TNA (PRO), C 49/75, membrane 25; Clarke, 'William of Windsor', p. 230). **69** Connolly, *Irish exchequer payments*, pp 528–32. Colton was the target of a series of allegations in 1376 and 1378 (Clarke, 'William of Windsor', p. 200; E 368/157, Hilary *Recorda*, membranes 23–4). For his career, see J.A. Watt, 'John Colton, justiciar of Ireland (1382) and archbishop of Armagh (1383–1404)' in Lydon, *Eng. & Ire. in the later Middle Ages*, pp 196–213. **70** Richardson and Sayles, *Admin. of Ire.*, p. 114. Holywood was the subject of ten charges by the Irish commons in 1376 (Clarke, 'William of Windsor', pp 201–3, 207–15). His name heads the list of lay electors of William FitzWilliam in the contested election of 1375 in the Dublin county court (Clarke, 'William of Windsor', p. 239).

the summer of 1378 to rebut the charges made against them.[71] A second source of resistance came from within the incumbent royal administration. The arrest of so many of Dublin's citizens required the connivance of one of the king's ministers who was willing and able to bring judicial pressure to bear upon those who had aided Sir Nicholas Dagworth. The likely candidate is the archbishop of Dublin, Master Robert Wikeford (d. 1390). Wikeford had both opportunity and motive. He had recently been appointed chancellor of Ireland,[72] an office that enjoyed considerable judicial competence.[73] Moreover, Wikeford had a personal reason to oppose Dagworth. As a result of an inquisition taken before Dagworth in 1378, the archiepiscopal manor of Swords in north County Dublin was seized into the king's hands.[74]

The third source of resistance to Dagworth came from within the city of Dublin itself. A royal letter of 15 December 1378, addressed to the civic officers and commons of Dublin, states that the king has 'heard that strife and debate is now newly risen [within Dublin], and that certain of them are disobedient to the mayor … whereby there is no peace or good governance among them'.[75] At first sight this rift within the city's population is puzzling, since the Dubliners appear to have been of one accord in launching their salvo of accusations against Windsor between 1371 and 1378. That uniformity of opinion is, however, an illusion of the sources. Naturally, the city was made up of different interest groups. As we have seen, the proceedings of the county court of Dublin in 1375–6 reveal deep fissures within the community of County Dublin; doubtless there were similar divergences of opinion within the city of Dublin. An instructive comparison might here be made to the rancorous relationship that Richard II enjoyed with the city of London in the 1390s.[76]

71 Sayles, *Documents on the affairs of Ire.*, no. 263; *Calendar of close rolls 1377–81*, p. 224. **72** *Calendar of patent rolls 1377–81*, p. 27. He had previously been appointed chancellor on 18 July 1376, but the appointment did not take effect and William Tany continued in office (*Calendar of patent rolls 1374–7*, p. 300). For a biographical sketch, see D.B. Johnston, 'Wikeford, Robert (*d.* 1390)', *ODNB*, lviii, pp 864–5. **73** A.J. Otway-Ruthven, 'The medieval Irish chancery', in Crooks, *Government, war and society in medieval Ireland*, pp 114–15. **74** TNA (PRO), SC 8/212/10571–9. Portions of this record are printed in Sayles, *Documents on the affairs of Ire.*, no. 264 (i–iii). Other abstracts and calendars of the case may be located at: National Library of Ireland, MS 20 [Lodge abstracts], fos. 12*v*–16*r*; McNeill, *Alen's reg.*, p. 225. On Swords, see Roger Stalley, 'The archbishop's residence at Swords: castle or country retreat?', in Seán Duffy (ed.), *Medieval Dublin VII* (Dublin, 2006), pp 152–76. **75** *Calendar of close rolls 1377–81*, p. 169 (quotation); Rymer, *Foedera*, iv, pp 52–3: 'Audivimus quod debata et dissensio inter vos jam de novo est suborta, et quod quidam vestrum praefato majori inobedientes et contrariantes existunt, aliter quam secundum consuetudines et libertates civitatis praedictae [of Dublin] deberent, per quod bonum regimen, vel tranquillitas, inter vos, sicut deceret, in praesenti non habetur'. See also the minutes of a meeting of the king's council in England (Sayles, *Documents on the affairs of Ireland*, no. 257). The decisions made at this meeting, which were passed on 15 December, served as the basis for the patent letters that were drawn up and sealed on the same date. **76** A comparative exploration of the roles of Dublin and London as political capitals would

Between 1392 and 1397, the king was engaged in a protracted quarrel with the Londoners, as a result of which the city's liberties were seized into the king's hands. Not every Londoner, however, quarrelled with the king. Caroline Barron has shown that 'notwithstanding the friction between the crown and the city in these years, there was a group of Londoners, small but powerful, which supported Richard II'.[77] One famous London citizen, who turned this moment of adversity for London into a golden opportunity, was the famous Dick Whittington (d. 1423). Whittington retained the confidence of Richard II throughout the king's quarrel with London and, in 1397, the king insinuated him into the office of mayor of London, so launching the latter's glittering career.[78]

Just as Ricardian London was a diverse collectivity, so it was in Dublin in the time of Sir William Windsor. One Dubliner who can be identified positively as a supporter the Windsor administration was a citizen by the name of Nicholas Moenes. Nicholas hailed from a family, probably of Hampshire extraction, that had settled in the colony in the last decades of the thirteenth century.[79] Prominent in the financial records of that period is one William Moenes, a clerk who forged a successful career in the Irish administration between *c.*1279 and 1325, beginning as a chamberlain of the Irish exchequer in 1293 and culminating with a brief spell as chief baron in 1311–13.[80] William Moenes may have been introduced to Ireland by John Derlington, archbishop of Dublin (1279–84). He acted as executor for Archbishop Derlington after the latter's death in 1284.[81] By 1305, William Moenes was a canon of the cathedral chapter of St Patrick's, Dublin.[82] It was probably through these clerical

be useful. Such an exercise would, of course, have to allow for the vast difference in size between the two cities. For a comparative assessment of the morphological (as opposed to political or socio-economic) development of the two cities, see Howard B. Clarke, 'London and Dublin', in Francesca Bocchi (ed.), *Medieval metropolises/metropoli medievali: proceedings of the congress of the Atlas Working Group International Commission for the History of Towns* (Bologna, 1999), pp 102–25. **77** Caroline M. Barron, 'The quarrel of Richard II with London, 1392–7', in F.R.H. du Boulay and C.M. Barron (eds), *The reign of Richard II: essays in honour of May McKisack* (London, 1971), pp 198, 201. **78** Caroline M. Barron, 'Richard Whittington: the man behind the myth', in A.E.J. Hollaender (ed.), *Studies in London history presented to P.E. Jones* (London, 1969), pp 197–248; Anne F. Sutton, 'Whittington, Richard [Dick] (*c.*1350–1423)', *ODNB*, lviii, pp 770–3. **79** Ball notes that the family name originates with Meon, Hampshire (F.E. Ball, *The judges of Ireland, 1172–1922*, 2 vols (New York, 1927), p. 39). For the hundred of East Meon (spelled 'Moenis' in the thirteenth century), see William Page (ed.), *The Victoria county history of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*, iii, (London, 1908), pp 63–81. **80** Richardson and Sayles, *Admin. of Ire.*, pp 106–7, 119. See also Patrick O'Connor, 'Hurdle making in Dublin, 1302–3', *Dublin Historical Record*, 13:1 (1952), 18–22, which includes a translation by Dr Ludwig Bieler of the account of William Moenes, appointed to provide rods for hurdles in the parts of Dublin for the crossing of horses to Scotland in 1302–3 (TNA (PRO), E 101/11/3). The translation is not, however, entirely reliable (see James Lydon, 'Edward I, Ireland and the war in Scotland, 1303–1304', in Crooks, *Government, war and society in medieval Ireland*, p. 206, n. 30). **81** M.J. McEnery and Raymond Refaussé (eds), *Christ Church deeds* (Dublin, 2001), no. 186. For Derlington's early career, see Thomas Fuller, *A history of the worthies of England*, 3 vols (new ed., London, 1840), i, p. 486. **82** Henry Cotton,

connections that Gilbert, a nephew of William Moenes, acquired lands on the archiepiscopal estates that lay to the south of Dublin city.[83] With this tenurial foothold, Gilbert soon began to cut an important figure in the local society of County Dublin. In the 1320s and 1330s, he held the constableships of the royal castles of Arklow, Balyteny (that is, Powerscourt) and Newcastle McKinegan.[84] A further sign of his status is the commission he received, on 18 July 1346, to keep the peace in the Leinster marches on the side of Dublin.[85] By the last years of the fourteenth century, the family was styling itself 'lords of Moenesrath', a fusion of the family's name and 'le Rathe', that part of the manor of St Sepulchre lying north of the river Dodder (whence Rathmines).[86] Meanwhile, another branch of the family retained its mercantile interests and became prominent in the affairs of Dublin city. This was signalled by the election of one Robert Moenes, son of Nicholas, to the mayoralty of Dublin in 1319.[87] Sometime previously, Robert had married Elena, daughter of John le Decer.[88] It was a notable match, since le Decer was the mayor of Dublin famed for building a marble cistern in the city in the early years of the fourteenth century.[89] An inventory dated 3 March 1326 shows that Robert was an affluent man, with assets worth £154 6*s.* 1*d.*[90] Robert's son and heir, John, followed in

Fasti ecclesiae Hibernicae: the succession of the prelates and members of the cathedral bodies in Ireland, ii: *the province of Leinster* (Dublin, 1848), p. 193; Newport B. White (ed.), *The 'Dignitas Decani' of St Patrick's Cathedral Dublin* (Dublin, 1957), no. 70. **83** Mills, 'Notices of the manor of St Sepulchre, Dublin', pp 36, 39–40. Notes appended to an an extent of the manor of St Sepulchre from 1326 state that, 'Gilbert … was a son of Geoffrey, and nephew of William, canon of St Patrick's' (McNeill, *Alen's reg.*, p. 172). **84** Connolly, *Irish exchequer payments*, 303, 345, 350, 357, 363, 368, 377, 383, 620–1. Powerscourt, Co. Wicklow, is identified as the site of Balyteny in Liam Price, 'Powerscourt and the territory of Fercullen', *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, 83 (1953), 121–2. For Newcastle McKinegan, see Goddard H. Orpen, 'Novum Castrum McKynegan, Newcastle, County Wicklow', *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, 38:2 (1908), 126–40. **85** Robin Frame, 'Commissions of the peace in Ireland, 1302–1461', *Analecta Hibernica*, 35 (1992), no. 26; *RCH*, p. 53, no. 93. For the significance of commissions of the peace in this region, see Christopher Maginn, 'English marcher lineages in south Dublin in the late Middle Ages', *IHS*, 34:134 (2004), esp. 122–6. **86** F.E. Ball, *A history of the County Dublin: the people, parishes and antiquities from the earliest times to the close of the eighteenth century*, 6 vols (Dublin, 1902–20), ii, pp 100–1; McNeill, *Alen's reg.*, p. 234. The archiepiscopal manor of St Sepulchre is discussed in A.J. Otway-Ruthven, 'The mediaeval church lands of Co. Dublin', in J.A. Watt, J.B. Morrall and F.X. Martin (eds), *Medieval studies presented to Aubrey Gwynn, S.J.* (Dublin, 1961), pp 57–9. That portion of the manor lying within the parish of St Peter's, Co. Dublin, included the three modern townlands of Rathmines East, South and West (ibid., pp 72–3). **87** Berry, 'Catalogue of the mayors', p. 159. Robert previously served three terms as bailiff of Dublin in 1313–14, 1315–16, and 1316–17 (ibid., pp 158–9). **88** Smyly, 'Old deeds – part II', *Hermathena*, 67 (May, 1946), no. 19 (b). This deed is a grant by John le Decer, junior, to 'Robert de Moenes and Elena his wife and sister of John'. Elena was dead before 1326 and she was buried in the Franciscan priory in the city, where Robert Moenes ordered that he himself was to be buried. See the transcript of the will of Robert Moenes (ibid., no. 26). The marriage must have taken place some years previously, since Elena bore Robert at least eight children. **89** Gilbert, *Chart. St Mary's*, ii, p. 337. **90** Smyly,

the footsteps of his father and served two terms as mayor of Dublin.[91] In 1351, another Robert Moenes – a brother of the Gilbert who held 'Moenesrath'[92] – became mayor of Dublin.[93]

It was the son of the latter Robert Moenes, Nicholas, who emerges from the records of the 1370s as an adherent of Sir William Windsor.[94] Nicholas Moenes forged his career in the law. He was paid as a justice of the justiciar's bench in 1374, towards the beginning of Windsor's second tour of duty in Ireland.[95] In 1375–6, he acted as a justice of gaol delivery within Dublin, for which service he was handsomely rewarded with five pounds.[96] His activities may have made him unpopular in the city, perhaps because his advancement to high judicial office was accompanied by a programme of personal aggrandisement. In September 1373, Nicholas acquired two properties on Winetavern Street (Lat. *in vico Tabernariorum*), one of which was situated on the grounds of the old guildhall (Lat. *vetus Gyldhalla*) of the city.[97] The guildhall, or tholsel, was a structure of considerable importance, serving as the municipal assembly hall, courthouse, and merchant headquarters.[98] Before 1305, the tholsel was moved to a new location at Christchurch Place.[99] The site it formerly occupied on Winetavern Street became redundant and, in 1311, the vacant lot was granted by the city to a Dublin citizen, Robert Bristol.[1] This was the property acquired by Nicholas Moenes in 1373. In March 1374, Moenes further consolidated his holdings on Winetavern Street by acquiring another premises bordering the site of the old guildhall.[2] These acquisitions may have brought him into

'Old deeds – part II', no. 26. For a comparable tale of upward mobility within the merchant class of Dublin, see Connolly, 'The rise and fall of Geoffrey Morton', passim. **91** John was bailiff in 1323–4, 1326–7 and 1328–9; and mayor in 1335–6 and 1337–8 (Berry, 'Catalogue of the mayors', pp 158–60). **92** For this Robert as the son of Geoffrey Moenes, see *Christ Church deeds*, no. 593; Smyly, 'Old deeds – part II', no. 26. **93** Berry, 'Catalogue of the mayors', p. 159. This Robert son of Geoffrey, *c.*1326, had held the custody of two stalls owned by his cousin, Robert son of Nicholas (Smyly, 'Old deeds – part II', no. 26), an indication that the family's success was a collaborative venture. **94** For this Nicholas as the son of Robert Moenes, see Smyly, 'Old deeds – part III', no. 92; *Christ Church deeds*, nos. 720–1. **95** Elizabeth Dowse and Margaret Murphy (eds), 'Rotulus clausus de anno 48 Edward III – a reconstruction', *Analecta Hibernica*, 35 (1992), p. 138; *RCH*, p. 88, no. 81. See also Ball, *Judges of Ireland*, i, p. 88; Richardson and Sayles, *Admin. of Ire.*, p. 173, n. 7. **96** Connolly, *Irish exchequer payments*, p. 537. He also received a reward of 56*s.* 8*d.* on 15 January 1375 (TNA (PRO), E 101/245/7, membrane 4). **97** Smyly, 'Old deeds – part III', *Hermathena*, 69 (May, 1947), no. 91. For the location of the old guildhall, see Andrew Halpin, *The port of medieval Dublin: archaeological excavations at the Civic Offices, Winetavern Street, Dublin, 1993* (Dublin, 2000), pp 182–3. This report includes images (pls 1, 7) of the foundations of an impressive structure of late thirteenth-century date, which may be the old guildhall. My thanks to Dr Seán Duffy for bringing this to my attention. **98** Duffy, 'Town and crown', p. 108; Linzi Simpson, 'Historical background', in Halpin, *Port of medieval Dublin*, p. 26. **99** H.B. Clarke, *Dublin: part I, to 1610*, Irish Historic Towns Atlas 11 (Dublin, 2002), p. 23, s.vv. 'Guild hall, Winetavern St E., South of King's Gate'; 'Tholsel, Christchurch Place S.' **1** *CARD*, i, pp 109–11 ('The white book of Dublin', fos. 23–23b). **2** Smyly, 'Old deeds – part III', no. 92: 'a mesuage [*sic*] in Taverners' Street … lying between the tenement of Thomas Smothe on the north and a vacant piece of land,

competition with some of the other leading families of the city. One likely rival was the Passavaunt family, which, as we have seen, fell foul of Windsor's administration in the 1370s. In the years after the death of Nicholas Moenes (which occurred no later than January 1394),[3] the Passavaunts were to acquire the property that Nicholas had owned on Winetavern Street.[4]

It was conceivably a mixture of his affiliation to Sir William Windsor and his entanglement in urban rivalries that brought Nicholas Moenes to the attention of the Dagworth inquiry. In February 1378, Moenes was instructed not to leave Ireland pending the investigations of Sir Nicholas Dagworth.[5] Shortly afterwards, he was arrested, indicted for treasons and felonies, and imprisoned in Dublin Castle. Despite this, the chancellor of Ireland, Archbishop Wikeford of Dublin – the same man who may have been responsible, later in 1378, for engineering the false indictment of forty-four of Dublin's citizens – caused Moenes to be set free.[6] No explanation for the chancellor's release of Moenes is forthcoming. Perhaps Wikeford was prompted by personal antipathy to the Dagworth inquiries. Perhaps he knew that the Moenes family were long-standing tenants on the archiepiscopal manor of St Sepulchre. What is not in dispute is that his release of Nicholas Moenes sparked a great rebellion. Amid the turmoil, blood was spilled when Richard Dere – the second of the king's special attorneys appointed to aid Dagworth with his investigations – was killed.[7]

The affray sparked by the release of Nicholas Moenes makes it plain that the Dubliners were not entirely of one mind in 1378. The arrest of one of the king's special attorneys (William Stapolyn) and the murder of a second (Richard Dere) represent a dramatic show of defiance to the inquiries of Sir Nicholas Dagworth. Appreciation of this enables us to reach a more nuanced understanding of how royal authority was negotiated in the city of Dublin during the Windsor crisis. Certainly, ministers of the crown, such as Sir William Windsor and Archbishop Wikeford, were not afraid of using rough tactics in pursuit of their ends; but this was not their only strategy. Another tactic was rule through division. Such a policy may help explain some rather cryptic memoranda in the city's custumal, the 'chain book of Dublin'.[8] The

where the old guildhall used to be, on the south; and to the said vacant piece of land where the old guildhall used to be; and to the garden behind the said guildhall'. **3** McNeill, *Alen's reg.*, p. 231; *Christ Church deeds*, no. 777. This latter deed, dated 19 January 1394, refers to 'William Meones, cousin and heir of Nicholas Meones'. **4** Smyly, 'Old deeds – part III', no. 112; ibid., part IV, *Hermathena*, 70 (Nov., 1947), no. 123. See also ibid., part III, no. 87. The fact that, as far back as the 1370s, the concerns of the Passavaunt family intersected with those of Nicholas Moenes is shown by a deed of 1373 (*Christ Church deeds*, no. 723; see also ibid., nos. 571, 720, 746). **5** *RCH*, p. 104, no. 69. **6** Sayles, *Documents on the affairs of Ire.*, no. 253. **7** 'Item autre brief al ercevesqe de Dyvelyn qe, com il delivera Nicholl Moenes endites de felonies et tresouns hors du chaustell de Dyvelyn, par qel deliveraunce grant rebelion estoit sours en pais et Richard Dier, attourne le roy, occis et plusurs autres damages au roy faitz' (ibid.). **8** Dublin City Archive, C1/02/01 ['The Dublin city chain book'], p. 191 [fo. 68]. The parchment of this folio was trimmed in order to allow it to be

'chain book' records that at a quarter assembly of the mayor, bailiffs, jurats and commons of the city, held after Michaelmas 1378, the commons of Dublin petitioned for the censure of certain citizens who, during a meeting of the king's council held at Naas, had caused the city's liberty to be seized into the king's hands contrary to their oaths (Fr. *faire la dite ffraunchice estre seisiz en la mayn nostre dite seignur le Roi*). The minutes of the assembly further report that the commons of Dublin demanded that legal action be taken against those citizens who were 'rebelles' to the mayor; and, finally, that the council of 48 should be elected by the commons of the city (Fr. *qe xlviij soient eluz par mesme les communes ycest [pur] conseiller le maire ovesqe les jurrez come les usages et leyes de la dite [citee] demaundent*). The last of these notes suggests a departure from the prescribed procedure for the selection of the city's outer council of 48 citizens, which was reserved to the inner council of 24 jurats.[9] An early fourteenth-century document containing the 'leys et les usages de la cyte de Diueline'[10] stipulates that:

> In addition to the mayor and bailiffs, there shall be 24 jurats to protect the city. And the 24 should elect 48 of the younger men. And the 48 should elect 96. And these 96 should guard the city from ill and from damage.[11]

At Michaelmas 1378, however, the 'chain book' records that the commons of Dublin were demanding the right to elect the council of 48.

Long ago, Robin Dudley Edwards interpreted this as a sign of urban unrest, as the commonalty of Dublin sought to wrest power from the city's ruling elite.[12] We should, however, be chary of regarding the events of 1378 as

bound with the other folios that comprise the 'chain book'. Consequently, the text along the right hand side of the folio is clipped. Gilbert's calendar of this document is very much abbreviated (*CARD*, i, p. 231). The 'chain book' is paginated with arabic numerals, which appear in ink in the top corners of the *recto* and *verso* of each leaf. When editing the 'chain book' in the late nineteenth century, J.T. Gilbert inscribed new folio numbers on the MS; these appear in pencil at the bottom of each folio. I have cited the ink pagination first, followed by Gilbert's foliation in square brackets. For a concordance these numbers with Gilbert's calendar of the 'chain book', see *CARD*, i, appendix 7, 'Collation of the leaves of the Chain Book of Dublin', pp 504–5. **9** The council of 24 is first mentioned in a document dated *c.* 22 March 1220 (see Duffy, 'Town and crown', p. 114, citing H.S. Sweetman and G.F. Handcock (eds), *Calendar of documents relating to Ireland*, 5 vols (London, 1875–86), i (1171–1251), no. 935). **10** A facsimile of the opening folio of this document appears in *CARD*, i, facing p. 204. The complete text is printed in J.T. Gilbert (ed.), *Historic and municipal documents of Ireland, AD 1172–1320, from the archives of the city of Dublin* (London, 1870), no. 68, 'Laws and usages of the city of Dublin', pp 240–69 (calendared in *CARD*, i, pp 224–32). **11** The original is in Norman-French: 'Cest a sauer qe xxiiij. iurez serrunt pur garder la cyte horspris le meyre et les baillifs. E[t] les xxiiij. deiuent eslire de ioesne gentz xlviij. E[t] les xlviij deiuent eslire iiij^{xx}. et xvj. E[t] ceus quatre vyntz et xvj. garderunt la cyte de mal et de damage' (Dublin City Archive, C1/02/01, p. 101 [fo. 53*v*]; Gilbert (ed.), *Historic & municipal documents*, p. 266; *CARD,* i, p. 231). **12** R. Dudley-Edwards, 'The beginnings of municipal government in Dublin', in Howard

agitation against the oligarchic rulers of medieval Dublin. Susan Reynolds has remarked colourfully that, '[u]rban society, while undoubtedly stratified, resembled a trifle rather than a cake: its layers were blurred, and the sherry of accepted values soaked through them … it was the control of power that was the basic issue in most recorded conflicts, and misgovernment rather than discontent with the political system as such that provoked them'.[13] Reynolds's consensus interpretation is rather indulgent of the pretensions of urban governors;[14] but her assessment has the merit of alerting us to the fact that, within the municipal assembly, all those demanding to be heard were members of an elite group. If, then, the social hierarchy of medieval Dublin resembled a sherry trifle,[15] this raises the possibility that the petition for the election of the council of 48 by the commonalty, rather than by the 24 jurats, was a strategy whereby one city faction sought to enhance its power at the expense of another.[16] Furthermore, it is conceivable that those purporting to represent the 'commonalty' were encouraged in their opposition to the civic officers by members of the royal administration. Evidence in support of this suggestion comes from a petition of *c.*1378 protesting against a proposal of the mayor and bailiffs of Dublin to construct a *measonet* within the city for the keeping of 'those of whatsoever condition … who are discovered with women in suspect places'.[17] This plan to build a prison for fornicators was allegedly being implemented contrary to the will of the majority of Dublin's citizens.[18] Significantly

Clarke (ed.), *Medieval Dublin: the living city* (Dublin, 1990), p. 151. Dudley-Edwards compares the events of 1378 to the better-documented agitation at the time of the Bruce invasion recorded in the 'white book of Dublin' (Gilbert (ed.), *Hist. & mun. docs*, pp 359–65; *CARD*, i, pp 132–5). **13** Susan Reynolds, *An introduction to the history of English medieval towns* (Oxford, 1977), pp 171, 185. See also eadem, 'Medieval urban history and the history of political thought', *Urban History Yearbook* (1982), 14–23; eadem, *Kingdoms and communities in Western Europe, 900–1300* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1997), pp 203–14. **14** Stephen Rigby, 'Urban "oligarchy" in late medieval England', and Jennifer I. Kermode, 'Obvious observations on the formation of oligarchies in late medieval English towns', both in J.A.F. Thomson (ed.), *Towns and townspeople in the fifteenth century* (Gloucester, 1988), pp 62–86, 87–106; Peter Fleming, 'Telling tales of oligarchy in the late medieval town', in Michael Hicks (ed.), *Revolution and consumption in late medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2001), pp 177–93. **15** On this issue in Ireland, see Gearóid Mac Niocaill, 'Socio-economic problems of the late medieval Irish town', in D.W. Harkness and M. Dowd, *The town in Ireland: historical studies XIII* (Belfast, 1981), pp 7–21; Colm Lennon and James Murray (ed.), *The Dublin city franchise roll, 1468–1512* (Dublin, 1998), p. xxv. For Dublin's patrician class in a later period, see Colm Lennon, *The lords of Dublin in the age of the Reformation* (Dublin, 1989), pp 64–91. **16** For a similar interpretation of events in London *c.*1376, see Pamela Nightingale, 'Capitalists, crafts and constitutional change in late fourteenth century London', *Past and Present*, 124 (1989), 19–20. **17** TNA (PRO), SC 8/109/5418; printed in Sayles, *Documents on the affairs of Ire.*, no. 261. The dating of the petition is accepted by Philomena Connolly ('Irish material in the class of Ancient Petitions (SC 8) in the Public Record Office, London', *Analecta Hibernica*, 34 (1987), p. 38). **18** There is no evidence that the project was completed, although the wording of the petition suggests that construction was at least commenced. The proposed location ('une measonet apelle Tune') is unidentified. See H.B. Clarke, 'Street life in medieval Dublin', in H.B. Clarke and J.R.S.

– in terms of demonstrating that the 'commonalty' of Dublin had supporters within the royal administration – the author of the petition was Archbishop Robert Wikeford of Dublin.

If royal ministers were indeed meddling in Dublin politics, this adds a new dimension to the resistance that the city's ruling elite offered Windsor. The most obvious explanation for the hostility of the Dubliners to Windsor is resentment at his financial exactions. Many of the charges against him are of a fiscal nature, concerning, for instance, his imposition of 'new customs', or his money-making scheme of retailing merchandise purchased from foreign merchants, to the detriment of the city's merchants.[19] Yet, Dublin also suffered another, more insidious, injury in the course of the Windsor crisis. This was the humiliation that Windsor and other royal ministers inflicted upon the select group of men that comprised the city's ruling elite. The uppermost tier of Dublin's citizenry was jealously protective of its dignity. This fact emerges clearly from the panoply of municipal regulations dating from the early fourteenth century. These set out a graduated system of penalties – ranging from amercements to mutilation and incarceration – for insubordinate behaviour, for instance insulting or assaulting the civic officers,[20] or, more generally, 'any men and women of substance [Lat. *aliquem virum vel mulierem de valore*]'.[21] Prominent citizens also cultivated their status in other ways, for instance, through acts of benevolence. The public works sponsored by the mayor, John le Decer, are a case in point.[22] Another mayor, Kenwrick Sherman (d. 1351), was a generous benefactor of St Mary's abbey in Dublin, responsible for the glazing of the great east window and erection of the belfry.[23] Acts of munificence such as these sprang from a multiplicity of motives; but among them was a desire to enhance one's standing in civic life. Windsor's mistreatment of Dublin's leading citizens threatened to undermine their self-representation as natural authority figures within the city.[24]

In such circumstances, how might the authority of the king's representative be resisted? The answer lies with the role of the chief governorship of Ireland.

Phillips (eds), *Ireland, England and the continent in the Middle Ages and beyond: essays in memory of Friar F.X. Martin, o.s.a.* (Dublin, 2006), p. 153; Clarke, *Dublin: part I, to 1610*, p. 23, s.v. 'Prison, location unknown'. **19** See, e.g., Clarke, 'William of Windsor', p. 191: 'Item, le dit monsieur William fesoit vendre vynes a Dyvelyn a retaille, les queles il avoit achatee des estraunges marchantz … a grant damage nostre seigneur le roy et destruccion des liegez'. **20** Dublin City Archive, C1/02/01, pp 68–9 [fo. 37*v*–38] (Gilbert, *Historic and municipal documents*, pp 244–5; *CARD*, i, 225–6). **21** Gilbert, *Historic and municipal documents*, no. 66, 'Regulations of Dublin City', pp 232, 235; *CARD*, i, pp 219, 222. **22** Gilbert, *Chart. St Mary's*, ii, pp 337, 342; Berry, 'Catalogue of the mayors', pp 158–9. **23** Gilbert, *Chart. St Mary's*, ii, p. 391. See Benedict O'Sullivan, 'The Dominicans in medieval Dublin', in Clarke, *Medieval Dublin: the living city*, p. 90. Sherman served as mayor in 1339–40, 1340–1 and 1348–9 (Berry, 'Catalogue of the mayors', p. 159). **24** See Braddick and Walters, 'Grids of power', in idem (eds), *Negotiating power in early modern society*, pp 12, 15. See also Michael J. Braddick, 'Administrative performance: the

The authority of chief governors rested on their position as representatives of the English king in Ireland. The king's subjects owed a duty of natural obedience to the crown. Consequently, forcible resistance to the king's representative could be construed as treason. Yet, the very illustriousness of the chief governorship also provided critics with their ammunition. By carefully distinguishing the office of chief governor from the incumbent of that office, complainants could protest their loyalty while simultaneously arguing that the king's representative was failing to fulfil the core responsibilities of the crown in the colony. As James C. Scott remarks in a luminous passage: 'The basis of the claim to privilege and power creates the groundwork for a blistering critique of domination … Such a critique from within the ruling discourse is the ideological equivalent of being hoisted by one's own petard'.[25]

One forum for voicing criticisms was provided by the inquisitions taken into Windsor's misdeeds. Jury service was not simply a top-down instrument of central or local government. Rather, as Michael Braddick has written of early modern England, 'by requiring subordinates to participate in the exercise of the state's authority, [the operation of the law] also afforded them an arena and language in which to negotiate the appropriate exercise of power by their superiors'.[26] The inquisitions taken by Nicholas Dagworth in 1378, which provoked so much controversy, provide excellent examples of just such a process.[27] The jurors claimed that after Sir William Windsor returned to Ireland in April 1374, he sojourned for some seventeen weeks in the city. The Uí Bhroin of south County Dublin and modern County Wicklow were then said to be openly at war. Although Windsor was informed of the killings and felonies that were being committed, he spent the whole period idling with his retinue in Dublin Castle. Moreover, Windsor was alleged to have declared openly that, even if the whole countryside were to be burned, he would not bestir himself from the castle to resist the malice of the Irish until all the subsidies had been levied that had been granted by the Irish parliament during his first term in office.[28] The imputation here is that Windsor was neglecting the most basic duty of the crown to protect the lieges of Ireland from the king's enemies. A month later, Sir Nicholas Dagworth took a second inquisition.[29] The revelations of the jury on this occasion were still more

representation of political authority in early modern England', in ibid., pp 166–87. **25** James C. Scott, *Domination and the arts of resistance: hidden transcripts* (New Haven, 1997), p. 103. See also Joel T. Rosenthal, 'The king's "wicked advisors" and medieval baronial rebellions', *Political Science Quarterly*, 82:4 (1967), 595–618. **26** Braddick and Walters, 'Grids of power', in idem (eds), *Negotiating power in early modern society*, p. 14 (quotation). **27** TNA (PRO), E 368/157, Hilary *Recorda*, membrane 23. **28** The same charge was made in 1376, though on that occasion the record is in Norman-French: 'Item, en meisme le temps furont moultz bones gentz de la Marche ioust Dyvelyn pris et occiz, et grandz furont le rumour, cry et plente qe les lieges fesoient pur defaute deide et toutdiz le dit monsieur William gisoit en la chastelle de Dyvelyn sanz iourneye faire' (Clarke, 'William of Windsor', p. 193). **29** TNA (PRO), E 368/157, Hilary *Recorda*, membrane 23.

scandalous. They accused Windsor of conspiring falsely and contrary to his oath, and in deception of the lord king and his faithful people of Ireland, to obtain the entire land of Ireland from the king for life without paying anything for the privilege, and that he would allow his retinue to live on the king's lieges. Here was a manifest ratcheting up of the stakes. The accusation was now not just one of negligence, but of conspiracy against the crown itself. There is no need to place any credence on so wild an accusation. What is striking, however, is the success with which the civic officers of Dublin reasserted their authority. By the time the curtain fell on the Windsor crisis in December 1378, Archbishop Wikeford of Dublin had been superseded as chancellor of Ireland;[30] orders had been issued commanding that the forty-four citizens of Dublin who had suffered false indictment were to be set free;[31] and the king ordered that all the citizens of Dublin should be obedient to the mayor, who was to rule the jurats and commons in all things according to the laws, liberties and customs of the city.[32]

A cursory glance at Dublin's part in these events might lend the impression of a turbulent city, whose population was unwilling to support the king's representative in a time of dire necessity. This essay has inclined to a contrary viewpoint. Arguably, it was the actions of the king's ministers in Ireland that undermined civic order and sparked much of the turmoil. Granted, the Dubliners emerge from the records as particularly energetic rakers of muck; but this readiness to gripe about the king's ministers in no way suggests alienation from the crown itself. Rather, the city's fervent criticisms sprang from its equally fervent adherence to the crown and what it perceived as the cardinal virtues of English government. Small wonder, then, that in December 1378, the minutes of the king's council in England – without a hint of irony or incongruity – refer to the city of Dublin as the 'supreme refuge and succour of all the land [of Ireland]'.[33]

30 Rymer, *Foedera*, iv, p. 53. **31** *Calendar of close rolls 1377–81*, pp 171–2, 225. **32** *Calendar of close rolls 1377–81*, pp 169; Rymer, *Foedera*, iv, p. 53. **33** Sayles, *Documents on the affairs of Ire.*, no. 257. This essay was prepared during my tenure as a Past and Present Research Fellow at the Institute of Historical Research, London (2006–7). I would like to acknowledge my gratitude to the Past and Present Society and to the Institute for their support.