

*The Later Plantagenets* by V.H.H. Green 1966 is a survey of English History between 1307 and 1485 and is used by Dr Peter Franklin the translator of the testament of the Eighth Earl Warren 1347. He is a Doctor who translates for the British Museum and should have produced the best which could obtain anywhere. The footnote here is the eleventh of twelve sent with his translation.

11) The text calls Isabel de Holand the Earl's "compaigne", which means *wife or consort*, but Joan de Bar is the only wife mentioned in works such as V.H.H. Green, *The Later Plantagenets*.

Curiosity gaining the upper hand, I purchased a copy and proceeded to find anything about our Warren ancestor. The following excerpts are all Green has said about the Warrens.

Page 116 and 117 in the second footnote :

F.M. Powicke has stressed the barons' closeness (in blood-relationship) to the king: 'Thomas of Lancaster, Leicester, and Derby, and the earls of Pembroke and Richmond were Edward I's nephews, the earl of Hereford was his son-in-law, the earl of Gloucester his grandson, the earl of Surrey his grandson by marriage. Only the earls of Lincoln, Oxford, Warwick and Arundel were outside the royal circle, and of these Edmund FitzAlan, earl of Arundel, had married the sister of the earl of Surrey, John de Warenne.

Page 118 and 119:

A map of England and Wales showing the earldoms and greater baronies showing Surrey and Sussex belonging to Warenne.

Page 129:

Thomas of Lancaster called the king's nephew in the note on page 116 and 117 above was the richest and most powerful baron and showed every sign of incompetence in spite of the powers which had now been thrust on him. However, "Personal factors, which so often obtruded themselves into medieval politics, intensified the cleavage between the king and his cousin. It was believed that Edward had approved Earl Warren's seduction of Lancaster's wife in 1317, a bitter blow to his cousin's pride.

Page 132:

Here is a description of the trouble in the realm upon the division of the baronage of Gloucester among his three daughters. One Hugh Despenser,

husband of Eleanor of Clare, the daughter that inherited the fertile and semiautonomous marcher lordship of Glamorgan was eager to increase his holdings and influence. “Despenser wished to weld together his lordship of Glamorgan and that of Cantref Mawr in Carmarthen which was separated by the English-speaking the peninsula of Gower that had long been under control of the junior branch of the de Braose family. De Braose had tried to recoup his fallen fortunes by selling the reversion of his estate to the highest bidder. In 1320, in spite of various other provisional contracts, more especially with the powerful de Bohun, earl of Hereford, the Gower estates passed to Braose’s wealthy son-in-law, John de Mowbray. Despenser, whom de Braose had always disliked, contended that as Mowbray had not asked the king’s permission to enter upon his estates in accordance with English feudal law, his claim was null and void. Under these circumstances Gower should be escheated to the crown. The greatest moron among the barons could have foreseen that this would sooner or later mean the bestowal of Gower upon the favorite, Hugh Despenser. Before this could happen virtual civil war had broken out. Mowbray declared that he had taken over his land in accordance with the “custom of the March” which did not require a royal license, and he opposed by force the sub-escheator’s entry into Gower. He was supported by most of the marcher lords, the earls of Pembroke and Arundel alone withholding their assistance, including some like earl Warenne and John Carlton of Powys who had hitherto been close to the king; the Welch never averse to a fight and no lovers of the Despensers, gladly contributed to the general confusion by laying waste Despenser manors in south Wales.”

Page 147, 148 and 149

There arose a rift between King Edward II and Stratford archbishop of Canterbury. It grew to the point the archbishop preached a sermon on St. Thomas’ Day in praise of the martyr and attacked the infringement of Magna Carta made by the royal justices and pronounced a solemn general excommunication against all such, a step which could be interpreted as an attack on royal prerogative.. On January 26, 1341, he was placed under arrest and brought to London where he was to answer a charge of contempt; he continued to take a strong line, asserting two days after his arrest that he would excommunicate those who disregarded the privileges of the church and the liberties assured to it by Magna Carta. He annoyed the government further by hindering the collection of clerical aids. It is difficult to know how much support he received in the country: but it is possible that few people sympathized with his stand for clerical privilege. It seems likely

from the speeches of the earl of Surrey and Warenne that even the barons had no wish to go to extremes in his support; if this was so, a tactical blunder on the king's part brought him dividends. On February 10, the king issued an angry open letter to the archbishop founded upon Stratford's alleged misinterpretation of the responsibilities which as a minister he owed the king. Every means of drawing public attention to the letter was used, even to the extent of having it read out at the market cross in Canterbury. But instead of attracting support to the king it aroused sympathy for the archbishop. The king because of this strife had been unwilling to call a parliament but later thinking this might be the best way out of the difficult situation. When it met on Monday April 23, Stratford was prevented from taking his seat; but he now had a following. Protests were made in his favor by the earl of Surrey. Irritated by the presence of some of the king's intimates, he is said to have exclaimed: "Lord king, how goes this parliament? Things were not wont to be like this. They are now all turned upside down, for those who should be chief men are shut out, and other unworthy persons are here in parliament who ought not to be at such a council, but only the peers of the land, who can aid and maintain you, sire king, in our great need. And lord king, you ought to think about this." At this, so the chronicler remarks, some of those criticized by Surrey rose and coyly left the chamber. Arundel then urged: "Lord, let the archbishop come in, before you: if he can defend himself against certain accusations made against him, that is good; if not, we will ordain what it is best to do" These speeches provide a good illustration of baronial opinion. The more radical content of Stratford's own arguments is ignored; co-operation with the magnates is emphasized.

A footnote on the bottom of page 149 refers the reader to B. Wilkinson, "The Protest of the Earls of Arundel and Surrey on the Crisis of 1341", E.H.R. xlvi (1931), 177-93.

Page 407:

The next reference is a family tree of the families of the Earls of Arundel, Surrey, Essex, Hereford and Northhampton and is the one used by Dr. Peter Franklin, translator of the will of John eighth Earl of Warren and Surrey.

It is presumed this tree was the work of the author (V.H.H. Green); otherwise there is no other reference made or credit given. In my opinion

