

From the *Transactions* of the
Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society

**Some Knights of the Household of King John with lands in
Gloucestershire**

by A. Warmington
1986, Vol. 104, 175-182

© The Society and the Author(s)

Some Knights of the Household of King John with lands in Gloucestershire

By ALLAN WARMINGTON

In April 1216 – the last, troubled, year of the reign of King John – the sheriff of Gloucester was commanded to permit one Walon de Cotes to have peaceable tenure of 60 shillings' worth of land at *Parva Campeden* which William, the earl marshal, is said to have granted to him.¹ *Parva Campeden* is generally identified with Broad Campden² which had been separated from the rest of the manor of Campden towards the end of the previous century. It seems that an earlier holder may have been Guiomar le Breton, a knight in the household of the defecting Breton magnate William de Feugieres. Guiomar had probably forfeited his land there as a result of his lord's rebellion and his own imprisonment, and the land may then have reverted into the king's hands.

Walon de Cotes could not have held the land at Broad Campden for very long, for he seems to have died in 1218 or 1219. However, there are interesting clues in the published records about his own career, and the careers of several of his contemporaries. These references also shed a little light on the status of one of the king's manors in Gloucestershire, Lower Slaughter.

Walon, and a close associate named Everard de la Beverie (Beverer, Beveriere) were men who served in the household of King John, apparently during the whole of his reign. Both received rewards from time to time for their service and their 'sustenance'. In earlier years the rewards were made either as fees paid in money from the Exchequer or as rather insecure grants of land made at the king's pleasure from his own demesnes. As time went on the grants became more diverse, and although most of the reported grants were in Gloucestershire, some of the later ones were in other parts of the country. Walon at least may eventually have married a wife and have inherited some land in Lincolnshire through her.

It is only rarely that the two are referred to explicitly as knights but the whole pattern of their careers confirms that they had attained knightly status and that they served in the royal household, the professional or mercenary part of the medieval army.³ Unfortunately we cannot say much about the origins of either of them. Sir Henry Barklay,⁴ having come across their names in the *Testa de Nevill*, suspected that they were both Flemish mercenaries.

Everard de la Beverie had held the small village of Saham Toney in Norfolk from King Richard I for some three years from 1197 to 1199, gaining therefrom revenues estimated at about £20 a year.⁵ The name la Beverie and its variants, however, seem not to occur either as a place name or as a family name in other English records of the period. If his origin was on the continent, it is possible he took his name from one of the places now called Beveren in East and West Flanders. Other possible contenders are Beuvraigne in Picardy and Beuvron in Normandy.

No reference to Walon de Cotes appears before the year 1200, though the name de Cotes is a fairly common one, occurring at this period in several counties, particularly in Lincolnshire and Huntingdonshire. Several places named Cotes are found in southern and eastern England.⁶ The surname may be derived from one of these.

The first references that bring the two knights together are in two orders issued to the Treasury from Marlborough on 20 October 1200 by the justiciar, Geoffrey fitz Peter.⁷ Both were in favour of Everard de la Beverie and 'Valon' de Cotes. The first directed that a quarterly

payment to each be made from the Exchequer out of the annual sums that each customarily received (that is 50 marks annually for Everard and £30 for Walon) until such time as an equivalent amount of land should be assigned to them.

The second order allotted them land in the king's own manor of *Slochtre* (Lower Slaughter) which, as is known, had been used for the last half century to provide pensions for servants of the king.⁸ The sheriff of Gloucester was commanded to see that the extent of the manor of Slaughter be raised to the highest value practicable with as much stock and other improvements as could be provided. From it, 'Everard de la Bever' was to be assigned 50 marks of land and Valon de Cotes the remainder of the manor, up to £30 in value. The king was to be informed of any shortfall in Walon's share below £30 and he undertook to make up the income to Walon from land elsewhere.

Even as a first impression this exercise at Slaughter appears a little unrealistic. The Pipe Roll for 1196⁹ values Slaughter, together with some land at Cheltenham (later identified as the hamlet of Westhall) at £30 in all. In that year these lands had been granted to a certain Philip Daire (or de Aire) after being in the hands of William de Pinkeigne. Lower Slaughter had then very recently been restocked and for the following three years the value of £30 for the two manors remained constant. The new stock comprised three plough teams (valued at 7s. 0d.), 100 sheep (50s. 0d.), one farm horse (4s. 0d.), six breeding sows (6s. 0d.), and twelve pigs (6s. 0d.).¹⁰

Then, in the year 1200 (as commanded in the grant to Walon and Everard) further stock was added to Slaughter in the shape of a further 100 sheep (valued at the apparently low figure of 20 shillings) and five breeding sows, valued at five shillings.¹¹ The Pipe Rolls confirm that by 1200 Everard de la Beuerie and Walon de Cotes had taken possession of Slaughter and Westhall, but the value was still only £30: £24 and £6 respectively for each place.¹²

The name of Philip de Aire, here associated with Lower Slaughter, recurs later in this story. We may assume that Philip's status was somewhat similar to the other two. The place name Aire occurs in north-eastern France (in Artois). F.B. Welch, finding an Aire in Flanders, concluded that Philip was probably a Flemish mercenary.¹³

Philip seems to have been disseised in 1200, not only of Slaughter and Westhall, but apparently of the manor of Martley in Worcestershire, which he also held. An item appears in the Pipe Roll for 1200 accounting for 33s. 4d. in respect of the sale of his chattels there.¹⁴ However, presumably in compensation, he seems that year to have had a half year's revenue of the manor of Newport in Essex (£18 8s. 7d.) by writ of the king.¹⁵ This manor was also part of the king's demesne lands and Philip may have remained in possession of Newport until his death in 1213 or 1214, though there is no reference in the Pipe Rolls to him being there in succeeding years.

The assignment of Slaughter to Walon and Everard was far from secure. Over the next few years the two knights seem to have had to persuade the king himself on several occasions to authorise payment of their dues. Indeed, according to the Pipe Rolls, Philip de Aire was back in possession both of Martley and of Slaughter and Westhall during the whole of 1202 and for the first three quarters of 1203.¹⁶

So for the time being at least Everard and Walon had lost their principal source of revenue, and in March 1202 (less than eighteen months after the original orders) the king, in Rouen, issued a command to the justiciar¹⁷ that 'Val' de Cotes be given 'that which is in arrears to him and which he ought to have of his fee'. In July 1203, in an order from the same city¹⁸ both 'Walesia' de Cotes and Everard de Bevers were to have their fees from the Exchequer in cash without delay 'as they ought and are accustomed to have' unless these should be assigned to them in land. As though this were not satisfactory, further orders were issued the same month, this time from Montfort in Brittany,¹⁹ in which the king commanded that they should have back the land at Slaughter of which they were disseised in favour of Philip de Aire; while the very next month he notified his chancellor from Falaise²⁰ that he had paid 25 marks of his fee to Everard and £15 to 'William' de

Cotes and ordered that further money be paid to them the following Easter, while the cattle and crops from their land at Slaughter for the autumn of 1203 should be retained for the use of the king.

That some of these orders were acceded to is confirmed by the Pipe Roll for 1203 which implies that Everard and Walon had the fourth quarter's revenue of £7 10s. 0d. from Slaughter and Westhall by writ of the king.²¹ The implication of the August 1203 order may be that the two knights were on active service with the king in France, and thus unable to secure the revenues from the Gloucestershire lands themselves. A cash payment may have been made as an acceptable alternative.

But the apparent inconsistencies continue. Because of the rival claimants to the estate of Lower Slaughter, there were doubtless difficulties in enforcing some of the commands being issued. Thus, just two months later, in October 1203, the king, writing from Caen,²² again commanded that the two knights be given the amount of their fees without delay, and also that they be put in possession of land that was Gilbert de Aire's 'unless we have given it to another'. Whether 'Gilbert' was a slip of the pen for the earlier 'Philip' de Aire of Slaughter is unclear; but three days later²³ in yet another order, they were to have 'so much payment in cash as Hugh Bard is accustomed to pay for the manors of Bromsgrove and [Kings] Norton which were Gilbert de Aire's' – and also the arrears of their fees.

The next year saw the end of the war in Normandy, and possibly the end of this period of service by the two knights. In that year (1204) the sheriff of Gloucester was ordered 'without delay to cause Everard de la Bever and Walon de Cotes to have that which they formerly had in the manor of *Sloctres*, with its appurtenances, as they had before we caused them to be disseised therefrom.'²⁴

For some time full time military service may not have been required from them. In any event, they seem to have remained in possession of their land for at least the next ten years.²⁵ They may have held it with considerable privileges: in June of 1205 'Walesius de Cotes and his men and the land we have given him in Gloucestershire' were to be made quit of the tallage imposed by the sheriff; and his land and all his things [*omnes res suas*] were to be kept and protected as though they were of the king's demesne, and such tallage as had been exacted was to be returned to him.²⁶

These were two men, then, who seem to have been in touch with and under the personal protection of the king. The uncertainty of their rewards during these six years could be explained by the strains of an unsuccessful war, and as being in line with the rather arbitrary dealings that characterised this king's early years. From such episodes it is possible to gain some idea of the way in which two mercenary knights secured some regular income both during and in the intervals between, periods of active military service. They seem in time of peace to have been granted some independent source of income through rights to land, while their fees were paid largely in cash for their service during the wars. There is very little evidence, however, that they made any real progress towards membership of the landholding classes in England.

The rewards were given by the king's personal authorisation, and seem to betray an unusually close relationship with him. There is no way of establishing just what this relationship was. There is however one indication: four years later a list was made of gifts to 'knights of the household of the king in the Scottish army' at Newcastle on the Feast of St Peter ad Vincula, 1209.²⁷ The list is headed by a gift of 4 marks to Everard de la Bever and Walon de Cotes, knights – an indication perhaps that they were in the first rank of the knights of the household.

These gifts probably marked the end of a second period of active service with the king, this time during his victorious campaign in Scotland. Little further is heard of the two men for some years thereafter. There is just one reference to Everard in 1212.²⁸ During the rapid march by King John that year through Yorkshire and Durham, he made a large number of advances of one

mark each to the knights of the army at Durham. One of these was to Everard de la Beurer, said at that time (for reasons that may appear) to be a knight of Essex. Walon de Cotes's name does not appear in this list, though his service with the king was not yet over.

Another series of orders concerning the lands of these two knights begins in 1215. One of them brings us back to Philip de Aire and renews the vague connection between the manors of Slaughter and of Newport in Essex. Philip de Aire had apparently died in 1213 or 1214 and under the 'lands granted away' in the Pipe Rolls for Essex in 1214 and 1215²⁹ £40 is credited to the sheriff in respect of Baldwin de Haukechierch (Hawkechurch or Haverkerk) 'who has the inheritance of Philip de Aire' in Newport. In February 1215, apparently as a confirmation of the inheritance, the chancellor, treasurer and chamberlain were ordered to release to 'Boiden de Hav'kerk half of £56 which we owe him for the year for the land that was Philip de Aire's, which we hold in our hands'.³⁰

These orders seem again to have put at risk the security of tenure of Walon and Everard over their land at Slaughter. In October 1215, presumably following some researches by Baldwin into Philip de Aire's affairs, a royal order granted Boiden de Haverkerk 'the land at Slaughter that was held by Philip de Arye, which Everard de la Bever and Walon de Cotes now hold' with all its appurtenances for their sustenance in the service of the king.³¹ It is doubtful if this grant was ever made effective, for there is no reference to it in the Pipe Rolls, and seven months later in a further order, the two knights were given back seisin of Slaughter.³²

This Baldwin seems also to have been a favourite of the king. In that same month (October 1215) for some unstated service he was given a helmet 'like that of the king' decorated with stones.³³ It may be worth saying a little about him; for the inconsistencies cited throughout this paper may be evidence of jealousies and conflicts between those to whom the king gave his favour. Two and a half years earlier Baldwin had led six named armed men from Newport into the king's service at sea – probably in King John's raids on the French coastal towns that year³⁴ – and he remained with the king thereafter. As well as the payment of February 1215, he also received a loan of ten marks in April 1215 'as he has no knight's fee'.³⁵

This was a time of civil disturbance and administrative confusion, which culminated in the occupation of London and south-east England by Prince Louis of France and his troops, supported by many English nobles. It seems that Baldwin lost Newport for some time because of these events. One order dated June 1215 purported to give him back possession 'as he had it before the discord between us and our barons started'.³⁶ This seems, however, to have been ineffective, and in March 1216 the 'upright' men of Newport were ordered that they should give their allegiance [*sint interdentes*] to Boiden de Haweskere as they had 'before the civil war between the lord king and his barons'. Then, in a further order in May that year the sheriff of Essex was commanded that he should cause Boiden to have full seisin of Newport, of which he was disseised by Gerard de Furnival at the time of the war.³⁷

Even in 1218 some confusion appears in the tenure of Newport. The Pipe Roll for that year indicates that Baldwin de Haverskecke received two sums of only £10 each in respect of Newport, while one Ralph de Toeny received two sums of £20 'in Newport for his sustenance in the service of the king, so long as the king pleases'.³⁸ Newport was obviously another of the king's manors that was regularly being granted away in the same way as Slaughter.

To revert to Walon and Everard: possibly as a recognition of the renewed insecurity of their tenure of Slaughter, there now came a flurry of further grants, two of them to both knights together: of land at Gotherington in July 1216³⁹ and at an unspecified place in Lincolnshire in May 1217 (the first year of Henry III's reign).⁴⁰ A number went to Walon alone, including the land at *Parva Campeden* in April 1216⁴¹ and some land at Woodchester near Stroud in September of the same year.⁴² Everard alone received grants in September 1216 of a hundred shillings worth

of land at Tormarton and of two hides at Windrush⁴³ and also of land, with the crops already growing there, at *Cumbe* (i.e. Gawcombe and Westcote)⁴⁴ that had been held by the widow of Walter de Baskerville. Everard did not long hold this last, for the widow Isolda was given back full seisin of *Cumbe* and the sheriff was ordered to ensure that she held it in peace and without molestation and that such of the crops, hay or cattle as had already been taken from it should be restored to her without delay.⁴⁵

The reason for these later grants is not clear. Obviously the two knights were experiencing some difficulty in their holding at Slaughter. It may be, too, that rather greater rewards were due to them as a consequence of their long and valuable service with their monarch, especially in his later domestic struggles. Possibly there had been some changes in the methods of and sources of reward over the preceding decade. The grant in Lincolnshire, made to them by the regent, William the Marshal in the first year of Henry III's reign, was explicitly 'for their sustenance in our service', implying that they were still in the king's household even as late as 1217.

Perhaps, too, an opportunity had been taken by King John, whose control over the west of England in 1215 and 1216 was more complete than elsewhere, to grant to his loyal followers some lands formerly held by barons who were in revolt or who had gone over to Louis of France. Support for this suggestion might come from research into the origins of the former holders, who included John Maltravers (Woodchester), Herves de Arescy (the Lincolnshire manor), Robert Bygot (Gotherington), Ralph de Sauscey (Tormarton) and Walter de Baskerville (Gawcombe and Westcote).

One of the expectations of a newly appointed English knight at this period is said to have been that an heiress might be found for him as wife, to help consolidate his rise in medieval society. And so it may have been with these two – though once again the facts are confusing.

At some stage Walon may have been given a lady called Catherine as wife. In February 1217, William, the earl marshal, as regent, confirmed the right of 'Gwale' de Cotes ('so long as it pleases us') to some land at *Navesby* (Navenby, Lincs). This land had been held by one Anselm de Wattene and it was 'as is said' the right and inheritance of Gwale's wife, Catherine.⁴⁶

The implication from this grant might have been that Anselm de Wattene had died and that Catherine had inherited the land, perhaps as his daughter. The position, however, is full of obscurity. Navenby, although geographically in Lincolnshire, appears then to have been part of the honor of Lancaster, and in the bailiwick of the sheriff of Lancaster. It had been in the king's hands, and in 1205 a certain Robert Ruffus had paid a ten mark fine for obtaining the land there⁴⁷ which he continued to hold until 1210. The following year it was apparently granted to the Hospitaler Friars.⁴⁸

It is hard to see either when Anselm de Wattene entered into possession of Navenby or why Gwale's claim came up in 1217. However, Anselm had evidently had seisin for a few years and had been dispossessed some time before 1217, his lands being taken back into the king's custody for a time 'because it was said that he had been killed in Flanders.'⁴⁹ More curious still, it is clear that Anselm was in fact still alive; for, four years later (by which time Walon de Cotes was already dead) £39 was to be allowed to the sheriff of Lancaster for three years 1218, 1219 and 1220 for the land at *Navensbi* that Anselm de Wattene had held in the bail of King John.⁵⁰ A few months after this the custodian of the honor of Lancaster was commanded to cause Anselm de Wattene again to have full seisin of his land at *Navensby*.⁵¹

The return of the land to its former tenant in 1221, rather than to an heir of Walon, emphasises again the strength of the phrase 'so long as it shall please us' that accompanies so many of these grants.

As for Everard, there is no evidence that he ever married. In November 1217, the sheriff of Essex was informed by Henry III's regent that the king had granted to 'our beloved and faithful

Everard de la Beueriere' custody of all the land that was John of Borham's in Essex, and the marriage of John's son and heir, and the marriage of his first-born daughter – or of the second if the first-born was already betrothed.⁵² This land was probably at Boreham and at Little Baddowe, places that John de Borham seems to have held before his death. The Pipe Roll for Essex in 1218 confirms that 'Everardus de la Beverier owes one mark for having custody of John de Borham's land and the marriage of his son and of his first-born daughter or the second if the first-born should be married.'⁵³

Little is known of this John de Borham. His name appears in the Pipe Rolls for 1205 to 1207 as paying a few marks scutage in the honor of Peverill in Essex.⁵⁴ He seems to have died about 1214, and the following year his heirs paid two marks scutage for one knight's fee in Boreham and Baddowe.⁵⁵

Everard was not, of course, given permission by this grant to marry a daughter of John de Borham. He was simply given the right to present both the son and the daughter in marriage, if they were still free. But this may be an indication that he had no offspring of his own – possibly that he had remained unmarried.

At this point the documentary evidence rather disappointingly peters out. Neither of the two knights seems to have enjoyed a long retirement from service with the king. In Walon's case the record ends with two letters from Henry III's second regent, Hubert de Burgh. The first, written in 1218, commanded the sheriff of Gloucester without delay:

'to cause Walon de Cotes to be reseised of his land in *Sloctres* with its appurtenances which the lord king John, father of the lord king Henry granted him towards his sustenance as long as it pleased him, whereof he disseised him because it was said the same was dead; but he is alive and well, as we have heard for certain.'⁵⁶

The second letter, dated just one year later⁵⁷ ordered the sheriff to pay the executors of Walon's will a debt that a certain William de Mara owed Walon from the revenues of his land in Slaughter, Salford, Westhall and Naunton, and other chattels of Walon's in the sheriff's bailiwick, without which the executors could not render a full account for the will. If he had indeed been alive in 1218, he had died a few months later.

Walon's companion, Everard, seems to have died shortly afterwards: for in October 1219 the sheriff of Essex was told that the king had granted to his treasurer, Eustace de Faukenburg, custody of the land that was John de Borham's in his bailiwick which he had granted to Everard de la Beuerier' so long as he lived.⁵⁸ He was also to obtain securities for one Baldwin Fullet to come before the court at Westminster to show by what warrant he had married his daughter to the heir of John de Borham, who, it is claimed, was in the gift of the king. Such were the complications of the earlier grant to Everard, the provisions of which seem already to have been forgotten.

Some months earlier, in February 1219, the sheriff of Gloucester had been informed that the king had granted to William the earl marshal (towards his custody of Gloucester castle, and for as long as it pleased the king) the land and appurtenances in Slaughter that King John had granted to Everard de la Beueriere for his sustenance in the king's service for so long as it pleased him. The earl was to have full seisin of the manor.⁵⁹ The earl himself died a few months after taking possession and the crops he had sown at Slaughter were accounted for to his executors later in 1219.⁶⁰

The later history of Slaughter is not the concern of this paper. However, after the death of the earl marshal it was granted to a certain Thomas Basset and in a letter of December 1221 there is another statement from which the purpose for which the king was accustomed to use Slaughter

can again be inferred. Writing to the sheriff of Gloucester,⁶¹ Hubert de Burgh implies that the new tenant had complained of an order concerning the estates and escheats taken into the king's hands. This order had been read as meaning that the sheriff was prevented from permitting Thomas to dispose of the revenues and livestock from the land at Slaughter which had been granted to him 'for his sustenance in our service for as long as it pleases us'. The sheriff was ordered that, notwithstanding the former order, he was to permit Thomas to dispose of the revenues and of the livestock on the land. Thomas's possession of Slaughter was confirmed again two months later.⁶²

Thomas Basset, a member of a more settled Gloucestershire family than Walon or Everard, seems to have been able to exert more influence. At about the same time as the above letters, the sheriff was also ordered that he should not take the view of the frankpledge in the lands of Slaughter which Thomas Basset had in the bail of the king so long as the land should remain in Thomas's hands.⁶³ That Thomas was able to exact such conditions seems to contrast with the insecure way the former tenants held Slaughter.

We commented at the start on the vagueness of the surviving evidence about the lives of these knights. We do not know anything of their families or of the social class or even the country from which they came. There is no more than a series of fleeting glimpses of two mercenary knights who served King John well during the whole of his reign and possibly also served his predecessor and his successor: service of at least fifteen and possibly twenty years. The glimpses we do get we owe to John's administrative reforms, which have ensured that, almost for the first time, documents of this kind were preserved in the royal archives.

There are some problems. These were two loyal and long serving knights of the household. Yet, because of the lack of other references to them in surviving records, one is drawn to the conclusion that neither had any lands in England other than those they held 'at the king's pleasure', and that their landless state persisted. If so and if the other men we have mentioned were in the same position, and were at all typical, then knights of the king's household may have been rather less fortunate in this respect than those under the patronage of other powerful magnates, many of whom became knights of the shire of the later 13th century.

Was this because these men were continental (Flemish, Brabantais or Angevin) mercenaries, as has been suggested? The confusion about the succession of Navenby from Anselm de Wattene and the doubts about Walon's alleged death in 1218, as well as the payment of Everard's fee in marks rather than pounds, may be indications that some of them were. The many variations in the spelling of the curious name de la Beverer and the alternation between Haverkerk and Hawkescherche and their variants seems to support a foreign origin for these two. But a Flemish mercenary would hardly have been able to gain royal favour to the extent of being granted not only the land but also the gift in marriage of the heir of a deceased English landholder. John de Borham had obviously held his land by knight's fee. Questions remain which escape explanation on the available evidence.

Notes

The page references given hereunder to the *Pipe Rolls* and *Rolls of Escheats* are to the volumes in the Pipe Roll Society's Series (NS 6 to NS 42) published between 1929 and 1969.

1. Records Commission, *Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum* (London 1835), 1, (17 John), 261.
2. See e.g. A.H. Smith (ed), *The Place Names of Gloucestershire* 1 (English Place Name Society 38), 238; S.C. Bartleet, 'The Manor and Borough of Chipping Campden', *TBGAS* 9 (1884), 150.

3. For some comments on knights of the Household, see F.M. Powicke, *Military Obligations in Medieval England* (Oxford 1962), 31, 64, 72 and passim.
4. Sir Henry Barklay, 'The Testa de Nevill Returns for the County of Gloucestershire', *TBGAS* 12 (1887/8), 281.
5. *Pipe Rolls* for 9 Rich I, 225; 10 Rich I, 77; & 1 John, 262.
6. Indeed, there were at least two in Gloucestershire: Coates near Cirencester and a lost manor of Cotes near Winchcombe.
7. T.D. Hardy (ed), *Rotuli de Liberate* (London 1844), 2 John, 3-4.
8. *VCH Glas* 6, 129-30.
9. *Pipe Roll*, 8 Rich I, 101.
10. *Roll of Escheats*, 7 Rich I, 56.
11. *Roll of Escheats*, 2 John, 119.
12. *Pipe Roll*, 3 John, 40.
13. F.B. Welch, 'Gloucestershire in the Pipe Rolls', *TBGAS* 59 (1937), 186.
14. *Pipe Roll*, 2 John, 33.
15. *Ibid.*, 36.
16. *Pipe Rolls*, 4 John, 16, 172; and 5 John, 59.
17. *Rot. de Liberate* (op. cit.), 2 John, 28.
18. *Ibid.*, 5 John, 46.
19. *Ibid.*, 52 (two separate orders).
20. *Ibid.*, 57 (two separate orders).
21. *Pipe Roll*, 5 John, 59.
22. *Rot. de Liberate*, 5 John, 68.
23. *Ibid.*, 69. A reference to a grant of land to Everard de la Buere at Bromsgrove and Norton appears in: Records Commission, *Calendarium Rotulorum Chartarum* (London 1803), 5 John, 20.
24. *Rot. de Liberate*, 5 John, 106.
25. An allowance of £30 in respect of the grant to these two knights in Slaughter and Westhall is noted in every Pipe Roll from 1204 to 1214, and again in 1218. In 1219, after Walon had died, the allowance is for the income of Everard alone.
26. *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, (op. cit.), I, (7 John), 40.
27. *Rot. de Liberate*, 11 John, 125.
28. *Praestitia Roll for 14 John* (Pipe Roll Soc, N.S.37, 1961), 90.
29. *Pipe Rolls* for 16 John, 2; and 17 John, 62.
30. *Rot. Litt. Claus. 1*, 16 John, 188b.
31. *Ibid.*, 17 John, 231b.
32. *Ibid.*, 17 John, 263b.
33. *Ibid.*, 17 John, 233.
34. *Ibid.*, 15 John, 134.
35. *Ibid.*, 16 John, 193-4.
36. *Ibid.*, 17 John, 217.
37. *Ibid.*, 17 John, 252b, 268.
38. *Pipe Roll* for 2 Hy III, 65-68.
39. *Rot. Litt. Claus. 1*, 18 John, 278.
40. *Ibid.*, 1 Hy III, 309.
41. *Ibid.*, 17 John, 261.
42. *Ibid.*, 18 John, 286b.
43. *Ibid.*, 18 John, 288.
44. *Ibid.*, 286b.
45. *Ibid.*, 289.
46. *Ibid.*, 1 Hy III, 298b. It is not certain, of course, that 'Gwale' and 'Walon' de Cotes are the same person.
47. *Pipe Rolls* for 7 John, 208; 8 John, 69; 9 John, 160; 10 John, 46; 11 John, 103; 12 John, 63. This last makes it clear that he held Navenby for half the year 1210 only.
48. *Pipe Roll* for 13 John, 82.
49. *Rot. Litt. Claus. 1*, 17 John, 218.
50. *Ibid.*, 5 Hy III, 447b.
51. *Ibid.*, 5 Hy III, 455b.
52. *Ibid.*, 3 Hy III, 342.
53. *Pipe Roll* for 3 Hy III, 75.
54. *Pipe Rolls* for 7 John, 173; 8 John, 238; 9 John, 100.
55. *Pipe Roll* for 17 John, 14.
56. *Rot. Litt. Claus. 1*, 2 Hy III, 364.
57. *Ibid.*, 3 Hy III, 393b.
58. *Ibid.*, 4 Hy III, 432.
59. *Ibid.*, 3 Hy III, 388.
60. *Ibid.*, 3 Hy III, 399.
61. *Ibid.*, 6 Hy III, 485.
62. *Ibid.*, 6 Hy III, 487b.
63. *Ibid.*, 6 Hy III, 486.