
Roman KSHANOVSKIY
master's degree of history, PhD-doktorant
Lviv national university of the name of Ivan Franco

**CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES IN THE METAMORPHOSIS
OF KNIGHTHOOD IN THIRTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND**

The article had analyzed the complex processes of the knights' evolution in the 13th century England from the standpoint of modern historiography. The study aims to broaden the historical discourse about the place of the knights in the social hierarchy. Considerable emphasis was on the ideas of historians of the 20th and early 21st century, with regard to new processes of knight's differentiation in military and civilian meanings. The author based on the authoritative British historians who trying to identify the knights' pluralism and the beginning of demilitarization their lives. The article presents the concepts of different historiography schools in relation to the development and decline of the knightly "class" under the view of the time challenges.

Keywords: knight's, England of a 13 age, controversial issues.

The disputable knight's status and their role in the "long"¹ 13th century inspires historiographical view to structure scientific conceptions, identifying their shortcomings and prospects of research. Knight's status in historical thought is quite ambivalent, its formation, in our opinion, it is appropriate to examine through transformation, fragmentation and proportion of changes in the number and importance of the knighthood in military and civil spectra.

Knights model of the 12th century in modern historiography continue to be associated with a class of warrior-horsemen and the feudal relations in England. However, the loss of a military monopoly has been observed sporadically until the end of the 12th century. Already during the reign of king Henry I Beauclerc (1100-1135), according to the source "Dialogus de Scaccario", in the counties were the knights-bailiffs, knights as escort-guards and knights-foresters and hunters².

A specialist in the Anglo-Norman period, Ph.D. Thomas Keelin Keefe (1946-1998) proceeded signs of alteration and instability of the military knight's status in the late 12th century. He divided the knights on two types: were landless, who lived for a salary as William Marshal; landing knights – the main military force of the royal power. Their social differentiation and interests contributed to the transformation

¹ The concept of "long" XIII century. (1180–1320 years) was popularized by historian M. M. Postan: Michael Postan. *The Medieval Economy and Society*. (London : Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972), 183–206.

² *Dialogus de Scaccario and Constitutio Donus Regis*. Ed. by Charles Johnson. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 134–135.

of knighthood as a stratum³. British Medievalist Nigel Saul (born 1952) described the difference between knights in the 12th and 13th century: knighthood in the 12th century – was quite modest social group; the thirteenth-century knightly class was a biblical house with many mansions, it was sharply other, more socially active and politically ambitious⁴.

A study of the number of knights is still relevant and necessary for specification their role in English society at this period. So, lecturer in Birmingham University Sally Harvey in the Domesday Book (1086) fixed⁵ hundred “knights”, which appeared under the term “militēs”⁵. However, this figure has a reservoir, because many even poor knights had more resources than were recorded in the Domesday Book⁶. If in the middle of the 12th century had to think of knights as warriors, from the end of the century their numbers requires activity definitions given the coherence in the class.

British scholar Noel Denholm-Young (1904-1975) first attempted to outline knights number in his book “Feudal Society in Thirteenth Century: The Knights” (1946) . He was analyzing knightly heraldry, came to the conclusion that at any time in 13th century was “500 knights-warriors”, “1250 actual knights”, and “3000 potential knights”⁷. The results of the study became the basis for further elaboration, criticism and objectivity of calculation.

In historiography, a prominent place is occupied by the debate around the reasons for the decline in the number of knights, especially against the background of population increase in England from about 2 million in 1086 to 7 million at the end of the 13th century⁸. For a long time was dominated by two views that were conceptualization in the mid-1960-s: Hilton’s “crisis hypothesis” and Postan’s “hypothesis of decline”. Marxist historian Rodney Howard Hilton (1916-2002) attributed the crisis with social aspects, namely the distribution of “expensive” chivalric ideals among knights in the second half of 12th century. He explained knightly crisis for class as a whole in context of increasing social standards⁹. The Cambridge University Professor Michael Moissej Postan (1899-1981) considered a key economic factor in the knights insolvency to adapt to the challenges in society. He believed that rapid inflation of 1180-1220, which continued in 1220-1260 dramatically increased the cost of knights¹⁰. Postan M. explains

³ Thomas K. Keefe. *Feudal Assessments and the Political Community under Henry II and his sons*. (Berkeley : University of California Press, 1983), 57–59.

⁴ Nigel Saul. *For Honour and Fame: Chivalry in England, 1066–1500*. (London : The Bodley Head, 2011), 66.

⁵ Sally Harvey. The Knight and Knight’s Fee in England. *Past and Present*. № 49 (Nov. 1970), 15.

⁶ Ibidem, 15.

⁷ Noël Denholm-Young. *Feudal Society in Thirteenth Century: The Knights. Collected Papers on Medieval Subjects*. (Cardiff : University of Wales Press, 1969), 83–85.

⁸ Edward Miller, John Hatcher. *Medieval England – Rural Society and economic change 1086–1348*. (London and New York : Routledge, 2014), 254.

⁹ Rodney Howard Hilton. *A Medieval Society: The West Midlands at the End of the Thirteenth Century*. (London : Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1966), 49–55.

¹⁰ *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*. Ed. by Michael Postan, 2nd edition. (Cambridge: University Press, 1966), 590–595.

this phenomenon thus: the big landowners began to grow new crops to expand the range of agricultural products; less wealthy knights often had land in poor sites, so their main earnings consisted of the rent, which was not enough for investment in agriculture¹¹. The main achievement both historians was their views are sharply opposed to the earliest positions that the period of the 13th century was a time of prosperity for the knightly class.

Since the mid-twentieth century in the historiography there has been a shift of research's emphasis to pluralistic interpretations but with the continuance mass economic dominance and binding to land relations. So, Welsh historian Reginald Treharne (1901-1967) has noticed the contrast in the number of knights during the 13th century. He first emphasized that social status has gone up as a result of two baronial wars 1215-1217 and 1264-1267, as a result increased their participation in local government and role in the formation of the Parliament¹².

The emergence of local studies since the 1970s in the UK have confirmed the problems of "objectification" information about knights transformation at the 13th century, however with accents on knights as landowners. It is necessary to pay special attention to three articles: "Sir Geoffrey de Langley and the Crisis of the Knightly Class in Thirteenth-Century England" (1975) by P. Coss¹³, "Large and small landowners in thirteenth-century England: the case of Peterborough Abbey" (1970) by E. King¹⁴ and D. Carpenter's "Was there a crisis of the knightly class in the thirteenth century? The Oxfordshire evidence"¹⁵.

Professor Medieval History at the University of Sheffield Edmund King analyzed the sources of the Abbey of Peterborough, he noticed an important feature that kept the large landowners in the 13th century – the real estate market and use its preferences. The medievalist considers it a turning point in the integrity knight's fee, and as a result the efficiency and scale of knightly service¹⁶.

Medievalist Peter Coss (born 1946) developed Hilton's and Postan's conceptions. He focused on the problem of smallholders and their land. The researcher took into account the work of Henry Gerard Richardson, in which the knight crisis happened through growth debt obligations before moneylanders¹⁷. Historian P. Coss emphasizes the dramatic increase in the cost of equipment contributed to the dilution of the knightly class. This

¹¹ Ibidem, 593.

¹² Reginald Francis Treharne. The Knights in the period reform and rebellion, 1258–1267: a critical phase in the rise of a new class. *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*. Vol. 21 (1946–48), 1–12.

¹³ Peter Coss. Sir Geoffrey de Langley and the Crisis of the Knightly Class in Thirteenth-Century England. *Landlords, Peasants and Politics in Medieval England*. Ed. by T. H. Aston. (Cambridge: University Press, 1987), 166–203.

¹⁴ Edmund King. Large and small landowners in thirteenth-century England: the case of Peterborough Abbey. *Past and Present*. № 47. (1970), 26–50.

¹⁵ David A. Carpenter. Was there a crisis of the knightly class in the thirteenth century? The Oxfordshire evidence. *English Historical Review*. Vol. 95. (1980), 721–752.

¹⁶ Edmund King. Large and Small landowners in thirteenth-century England, 45–50.

¹⁷ Henry Gerald Richardson. *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*. (London: Methuen, 1960), 161–172.

process, he explains, from a practical point of view: “*Some knight would seem to have been insufficiently endowed from the beginning. Some joined the baronial middlemen in demanding a reduction in their commitment*”¹⁸.

English historian David Carpenter (born 1947) criticized and complemented Coss’s conception. On his opinion, P. Coss underestimated ways to earning extra money for lesser knights, such as buying another land, strengthening of peasant oppression or opening local office¹⁹. Carpenter revealed the limitations Coss’s conclusions, because the focus on one family Geoffrey de Langley, whose manor, which he noted, was largely atypical for England²⁰. He initiated a new historical discourse, examined Oxfordshire’s knights in “crisis time”. Carpenter D. raised the question: “was there a crisis of the knightly class as a whole?”²¹. He is convinced if we talk about crisis during the 13th century it was “a crisis less of a class than of some individuals within it”²².

Economic and social mobility is important in further Coss’s researches. On base Warwickshire, he rejected the idea of “decline” through the variability of the knightly class between 1180 and Barons’ Wars and symptomatic between growth and decline knight’s number and landowner, because that’s was normal in feudal societies²³. Coss confirmed Carpenter’s hypothesis about non-linearity and specificity determine the knightly estate in the late 12th - early 13th century. According to his calculations, in the documents of the Royal Council 1222-1231, only 31 of the 97 knights were warriors with minor property interests in the county. Between 1200-1214 years there were 18 of the 41 knight²⁴. How to convinced P. Coss, they were mostly lesser knights which went to courts for earnings money and increasing the status²⁵. The focus of his attention is the courts as an institution with a distinct knightly interests.

British historian Richard Barber (born 1941) in his article “When is a knight not a knight” (1994) focused on plurality knightly identity²⁶. He sees draws a clear line between the civil rank of knight and a knight as soldier²⁷. Moreover, R. Barber accentuated the military definition: “*By the end of 12th century, the distinction between knights and mounted warrior is well-established...On the Battlefield, they well indistinguishable from*

¹⁸ Peter Coss. *Sir Geoffrey de Langley and the crisis of the knightly class in Thirteenth century England. Landlords, Peasants and Politics in Medieval England*. Ed. by T. H. Aston. (Cambridge : University Press, 1987), 189.

¹⁹ David A. Carpenter. Was their a crisis of the knightly class in the thirteenth century?, 723.

²⁰ Ibidem, 723.

²¹ Ibidem, 721.

²² Ibidem, 751.

²³ Peter Coss. *Lordship, Knighthood and Locality: A Study in English Society, c.1180-1280*. (Cambridge : University Press, 1991), 304.

²⁴ Peter Coss. *The Knight in Medieval England 1000-1400*. (Stroud: Sutton Pub Ltd., 1993), 38-43.

²⁵ Peter Coss. *The Origins of the English Gentry*. (Cambridge: University Press, 2003), 88.

²⁶ Richard Barber. When is a knight not a knight. *Medieval Knighthood V: Papers from the Sixth Strawberry Hill Conference 1994*. Ed. S. Church, and R. Harvey. (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1994), 7.

²⁷ Ibidem, 9.

knights, and yet they were not knights: rank and function are treated as being quite distinct"²⁸.

Historians 1980-90-ies had interested in examine the status of knights. Researcher Kathryn Faulkner focused on a key period in the transformation of the knights – the late 12th - early 13th century, within which you should find answers to most questions regarding the “decline” of the knights, because the number of knights has sharply decreased from 6000 to 5000. She explained it the four reasons: the growth of administrative functions with generations of young sons who “refused” from knight’s title; the change in the relationship of lords to its knight-service; the poor economic situation in the country; peculiar nature of knight’s existence demanded changes²⁹. Kathryn Faulkner to divides on administrative and military knight, though many, who combined both roles. A characteristic feature is the fact that the military knights often left their country during military campaigns, but the administrative knights must remain, at this time, the number of civil knights in the country much more than warrior knights³⁰.

Researcher Jeremy Quick in the article “The Number and Distribution of Knights in Thirteenth-Century England” explains the broad spectra of the English knightly class. In his opinion, knights in the early of 13th century were variously supported, and had different components, including the base – as a warrior profession with an emphasis on service, but the status provided by wealth and connections³¹. The historian raised the rational questions of how many knights were at the beginning of the 13th century? When and why so many “knights” were thrown overboard knights-warriors? Jeremy Quick agreed with the Denholm-Young’s³² calculations in what was about 1250-1500 knights in any period between 1266-1322 years. At 1200-1272 he on the basis of the analysis of documents 27 counties counted 1539 knights, who included or participated in the Grand Assize 1256³³. He concluded the number of knights that participated in local government was around 1000-2000 at any one time. Historian Quick called counting conventions: undoubtedly, this number excludes barons, landless knights, and those knights who successfully avoided service by Grant Assize; hard to believe that these knights at any time had more than 2000³⁴.

Researcher Anna Polden analyzed knightly class Buckinghamshire. She noted the impact of relationships in the county on the development

²⁸ Ibidem, 13.

²⁹ Kathryn Faulkner. The Transformation of Knighthood in Early Thirteenth-Century England. *The English Historical Review*. Vol. 111, № 440. (Feb. 1996), 1–23.

³⁰ Ibidem, 20–23.

³¹ Jonathan Quick. The Number and Distribution of Knights in Thirteenth-Century England: The Evidence of the Grand Assize Lists. *Thirteenth-Century England I. Proceeding of The Newcastle upon Tyne Conference, 1985*. P. Coss and S. D. Lloyd. (Woodbridge : The Boydell Press, 1986), 114–124.

³² Noël Denholm-Young. Feudal Society in Thirteenth Century, 83–85.

³³ Jonathan Quick. The Number and Distribution of Knights in Thirteenth-Century England, 119.

³⁴ Ibidem, 119.

of knightly status: the role of family, the marriages important of “young sons”³⁵. Its main merit lies in drawing attention to everyday mercantile life in the growth knight’s prestige.

Historian N. Saul argued knighthood transformation in the 13th century, that period was rather peaceful and that knight’s inactivity paradoxically played a special role in the history of chivalry in England³⁶. According to his calculations, the beginning of the 13th century it was about 3600-4000 persons of knightly title, maximum – given the old “knightly quotas”– 5000, but after 70-80 years, they became 1250. The researcher proposed to identify these processes not as decline, but as a transformation³⁷. According to Saul, this is due to the fragmentation of knights’ fees for the purchase and sale of land that “ate” the knights from inside.

In the British historiography of the late 20th – early 21st centuries began discussions on the issue of reducing the number of knights as a military force in the context of feudal service to the king. Saul N. supported the view that many potential knights did not have received knights title through a series of major political and economic changes in a short period of time³⁸. Peter Coss examined the reaction writ of Henry III, 1224, 1234 and 1241 years, what included distraint men who had sufficient income to become knights, but still had not done it. The researcher indicates on the Royal worry after 1241, when for the long time distraint was extended to men who did not hold their fees directly from king³⁹. Historian David Crouch raised an interesting issue, how many men avoided a distraint, respectively, and the knight’s title with service⁴⁰. He first changes the discourse in a new direction, arguing that in fact the crown was worried about the number of civilian, not military knights. If there were not enough knights for war there were use squires who was equipped adequately as knight⁴¹. As proof, with 1294 all manor’s owners worth over J 40 had to serve, but not become a knights. David Crouch opens a new view in which the reasons refused to become a knight was the absence sufficient benefits⁴². This concept is opposed to N. Denholm-Young’s view. In this paradigm, increasing the knight’s status is not enough to attract to the knighthood more men. In our opinion, not heredity knighthood and “undermining” vertical vassal relations makes knights 13-century phenomenon.

Deserves attention the idea of selective knight’s crisis in the 13th

³⁵ Anne Polden. A Crisis of the Knightly Class? Inheritance and Office among the Gentry of the Thirteenth-Century Buckinghamshire. *Regionalism and Revision: The Crown and Its Provinces in England 1250–1650*. Ed. by P. Fleming, A. Gross and J.R. Lander. (London: The Hambledon Press, 1998), 29–31.

³⁶ Nigel Saul. *For Honour and Fame: Chivalry in England, 1066–1500*. (London: The Bodley Head, 2011), 60.

³⁷ Ibidem, 63.

³⁸ Nigel Saul. *For Honour and Fame: Chivalry in England*, 63.

³⁹ Peter Coss. *Lordship, Knighthood and Locality*, 241–244.

⁴⁰ Dennis Crouch. *The Image of Aristocracy: in Britain, 1000–1300*. (London: Routledge, 1992), 110.

⁴¹ Ibidem, 111.

⁴² Ibidem, 111.

century from historian Michael Prestwich. He counting knights which took part in grand assize proceeding in Shropshire in 1221 and 1256, the number fell from 41 to 17. The same in Warwickshire in 1221 and 1261, the number was reduced from 47 to 29. Conventionally, these trends were common to all counties. Medievalist concluded overall fall from 4000 in 1220-s to perhaps 2000 by the middle of the century⁴³. Some factor of counting knights at the start of 14th century impacted by 935 individual summonses to knightly men, who possessing at least 40 pounds of land, sent out in 1301 for Scottish campaign. As noted M. Prestwich, it is not known how it was drawn up, however, obviously it was the most active military knights⁴⁴. No doubt that key change in decline knightly number were in the first half of the 13th century during rapidly increasing population and wealth of large landowners, guesses Prestwich. On his opinion, all evidence is not sufficient to demonstrate that the knights was a ‘class’ – everything was individually for knightly families, that’s why the use idea of knightly crisis is debatable: the range of wealth variation was so great that they cannot be considered in the cohesive class; someone could be so rich as the lesser barons, the other to possessed the manors in several counties, else more to had no more than one manor at all⁴⁵. A large-scale study of Oxfordshire showed that there was not impoverishment of the knights as a whole. Evidence of many historians about the mass land sale of poor knights is not convincing through a minor character, at the same time, those lands primarily passed to other knights⁴⁶.

The transformation of the knighthood can be considered complete only with adding their political role. Despite the dominance in English historiography “political history” during the 20th century, knights for a long time was not examined as a political force. Yet, significant attention in the historiography at the second half of the 20th century given to the Household knights and their modifications from the time of King John (1199-1216).

With the 1960-ies started the “politicization” of the knightly class in historical thought. Cambridge Professor James Holt (1922-2014) believed that the rebellious barons and King John fought for the favor of the knights. He was convinced, when the Earl rises, his knights mostly join him; when the Earl remained loyal to the king, their behavior becomes less predictable, but when the knights acting autonomously – they show a trend in the direction of the rebels⁴⁷. Thus, knights were free to choose your path, and that the baron’s influence may be limited circumstances. Holt convinces, the knights influenced policy, because without them nothing would have happened⁴⁸. During the reign of King John, knight’s status

⁴³ Michael Prestwich. *Plantagenet England 1225–1360*. (Oxford University Press, 2005), 391.

⁴⁴ Ibidem, 391.

⁴⁵ Ibidem, 394.

⁴⁶ Ibidem, 395.

⁴⁷ James Clarke Holt. *The Northerners: A Study in the Reign of King John*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), 37–60.

⁴⁸ James Clarke Holt. *Magna Carta*. (Cambridge : University Press, 1992), 292.

has acquired a different meaning: “the political independence which men of knightly status showed in the time of John became the basis of further beneficent and bureaucratic activities”⁴⁹. This idea deserves a lot of attention through the biographical analysis of many individual knights. With the opinion of Holt can agree and conclude that knight’s choice, not duty and loyalty, often became values. For example, the chronicler Ralph of Coggeshall wrote that after the capture of London in 1215 sixth earls and barons remained loyal to the king, but all their knights sided with the rebellious barons⁵⁰.

Researcher Kathryn Faulkner in the article “The knights in the Magna Carta Civil War” (1999) proves the political influence of the knights in 1215-1217. She focuses on the important issues: “*Did they follow the lead of their lords or did they act independently? Were the knights a separate ‘party’ or interest group with their own agenda?*”⁵¹. Historian K. Faulkner highlights the influence of the administrative knights of four counties on South-East. According to the lists of reversi recorded in the close rolls, 78 administrative men carried out service as knights in those counties in 1199–1230 can be identified as rebels⁵². Article opens the integration of the knights in their local space, where they were tied up administrative and judicial cases, and their campaign against King John can be explained by the increase of their own ambitions⁵³. For Faulkner “Magna Carta” (1215) was not clean baron’s document, because some clauses were beneficial to both – knights and magnates, but in practice it was a mirage. Faulkner substantiated by the fact that the knights were the holders of many lands from different lords, so his vassalage was diverse⁵⁴. She confirmed Holt’s hypothesis, events in 1215-1217 gave knights a political consciousness and gave carte blanche in the regulation of a local authority in its own interests.

Historian P. Coss insists that “*thirteenth-century knights had their own grievances against the crown, both personal and collective and that collective grievances beyond baronial ranks surfaced in Magna Carta*”⁵⁵. The researcher criticize the attribution of political consciousness as a property of the whole knightly class. Coss thinks the image of the knight is appropriate in view of the political inequality which was developed in England in ‘1200-1300s’ with a focus on the two civil wars (1215, 1258-1259) with the knights’ challenges in Parliament and the development of

⁴⁹ James Clarke Holt. *The Northerners*, 55.

⁵⁰ Radulphi de Coggeshall. *Chronicon Anglicanum*. Ed. by J. Stevenson. (London: Longman etc., 1875), 171.

⁵¹ Kathryn Faulkner. The knights in the Magna Carta Civil War. *Thirteenth century England VIII: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 1999*. Ed. by M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame. (Woodbridge : Boydell Press, 2001), 1.

⁵² Ibidem, 1-2.

⁵³ Ibidem, 6.

⁵⁴ Ibidem, 3.

⁵⁵ Peter Coss. How did Thirteenth-Century Counter Royal Authority? *Thirteenth Century England XV. Authority and Resistance in the Age of Magna Carta: Proceeding of the Aberystwyth and Lampeter Conference, 2003*. Ed. by J. Burton, Ph. Schofield and B. Wieler. (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2015), 3.

self-government in the counties. For his view, if Simon de Montfort or Edward I (1272-1307) tried to win, it was necessary to join the knight's support⁵⁶.

A specialist in the history of parliamentarism in Medieval England John Maddicott assumes, than knight's representation at Parliament in the middle of the 13th century responded the needs of the time⁵⁷. The historian argues that the continuity and preconditions for these processes are quite long, and assume the appearance of a political component as result events of the first quarter of the 13th century is not necessary, as well as its complete formation, because it is a long process. John Maddicott sees the foundation of the knights' politicization from the reign of Henry II through participation in the Great Councils, where the knights serving as officials and judges in the local structure could provide accurate information about businesses in their counties for coordinate the taxes and can easily to replace each other. The researcher believes that the Parliament of Henry III, was adapted to the old system, and the emergence of the knights as a political class, we can establish only with 1258-1265⁵⁸. The growth of knight's status forced the crown to give preference to the knights, and not the vassals-landowners to challenge in Parliament, although in the middle of the 12th century it was much difficult to find the difference between these two groups, concludes Meddicott⁵⁹. The political interests 'new' knights were instituted in the mid-thirteenth century increasing the prestige of the title and expanded the hierarchy horizons inside a class.

Historian Reginald Treharne noticed the knights' influence in the period of reform and rebellion 1258-1267 with emphasis on the formation of a new class⁶⁰. In his understanding, the knights were little cohesive and wealthy class of people who were confident in the safety and respected among surrounding; experts in local authorities, they knew the strengths and weaknesses at the system⁶¹. The Medievalist P. Coss, in his book "The Origins of the English Gentry " (2003) revealed the function of the knights in new ways. So, knights in the grand jury and the local administration were intermediaries from the counties. The appointment received a limited number of knights, who enjoyed the confidence of the counties. The transformation of the knights peaked in the mid-thirteenth century, strengthened and determinable elite mentality⁶². Researcher P. Coss is a adherent non-political vision of the knights as a class. It did

⁵⁶ Peter Coss. Sir Geoffrey de Langley and the Crisis of the Knightly Class in Thirteenth-Century England. *Past and Present*. № 68. (Aug. 1975), 29.

⁵⁷ John Robert Maddicott. An Infinite Multitude of Nobles: Quality, Quantity and Politics in the Pre-Reform Parliaments of Henry I. *Thirteenth Century England VIII: Proceeding of the Durham Conference, 1997*. Ed. by M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame. (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1999), 37.

⁵⁸ Ibidem, 39.

⁵⁹ Ibidem, 43.

⁶⁰ Reginald Francis Treharne. The Knights in the Period of Reform and Rebellion: A Critical Phase in the Rise of New Class. *Bulletin of the Institute of History Research*. Vol. 21. (1946), 1-12.

⁶¹ Ibidem, 10.

⁶² Peter Coss. The Origins of the English Gentry, 12.

not support the idea that the widespread and spontaneous participation to promote reforms of the 13th century made cohesive knightly class, and their participation in judicial and administrative activities was more variegated than it shows Treharne⁶³.

Medieval researchers P. Coss and N. Saul investigated the separation of the individual lines in knightly “class” – gentry. For P. Coss, we are talking about the transformation lesser nobles of knightly origin in gentry. The knights subsequently became a later form of the higher gentry⁶⁴. The historian drew attention to the study of the social and economic climate and came to the conclusion: The biggest social phenomenon, that gentry arose through the high cost of chivalry⁶⁵. Saul N. noticed that this process is more appropriate from the end of 13th century, when the phenomenon became more widespread and a lot of knights were going by the gentry, the so-called ‘elite landowners in the local area’⁶⁶.

On the Carpenter’s opinion, the economic position of the knightly class were reflected in the social scale. You should first pay attention to the definition of “knightly class” or “gentry”, the owner of one or more manors. In the 13th and 14th centuries barons, knights and esquires, who held no military rank was called “gentry”. David Carpenter considers it inappropriate to combine the knights into a one category: “*The class cannot be confined to those who were technically knights – that is, had been girded with the sword of knighthood – since this was a group of rapidly diminishing size which lacked any real unity*”⁶⁷. According to Carpenter, in the early 13th century almost all lords-landowners were knights, but after 100 years, the chivalry became narrowly limited to those who had 2-3 or more estates. The researcher focuses attention on the knight’s universalism in the 13th century – they busy in a local administration as a coroner, forest official, sheriff or undersheriff⁶⁸. Big part of local power was concentrated in knights hands, considering the military, judicial and political activities. The scientific achievement of D. Carpenter is in expanded the plurality of knights issues where artificial knightly ‘class’ covers a wide social and material spectra.

The military aspect of the classic chivalry remains relevant in the historiography. Considerable attention is paid to the effect of ‘scutage’ on the change quantity and status of knight. You should pay attention to the trend of ‘payoff’ from the service and development of the household knights with their responsibilities and capabilities. Historian Brian Fee-ney researched scutages in the reign of John for example on East Anglian. According to his vision: “*Military obligation, the original basis for scutage, had been a bone of contention between a king and major tenets-in-chief be-*

⁶³ Ibidem, 13.

⁶⁴ Ibidem, 45.

⁶⁵ Ibidem, 27–28.

⁶⁶ Nigel Saul. *For Honour and Fame: Chivalry in England, 1066–1500*, 70.

⁶⁷ David A. Carpenter. *The Reign of Henry III*. (London and Rio Grande :The Hambledon Press, 1996), 350.

⁶⁸ Ibidem, 351.

fore the date monetary inflation was identified by modern historians”⁶⁹. Changes were necessary to cope with the protection of the boundaries in the great Angevin Empire, which required military service above 40 days with a compact fixed power, and not large feudal army⁷⁰. The Author of *Dialogus de Scaccario* give a confident definition of scutage: “*It happens sometimes when the realm is threatened or attacked by enemies, that the king decrees that a certain sum, usually one mark or a pound, shall be paid from each knight’s fees, and from this source are derived the soldiers’ wages. For the king prefers to expose foreign mercenaries rather than his own knights to the fortunes of war*”⁷¹. Historian Brian Feneey explains, or felt threatened by the knights of the mainland of England during the attack south-eastern border of Normandy, let alone Poitou? Was it for the English knight’s equally serve in Ireland or Aquitaine⁷²? In this plane should seek the origins of mercenary troops and the overflow feudal duties of the knights in the contract service. Inflation, decline of knightly quotas, the temptation to pay scutage and the need campaigns for more than 40 days to protect the borders, weakened position of military knights’ status in practice.

Specialist of “military history” Christopher Gravett sees in the 13th century. the beginning some ‘flexibility’ of feudal relations. According to Gravett: “*By the late of 13th century there was a rapid turnover of membership of retinues, men serving a several lords on each campaign, and personal loyalty was*”⁷³. We mean knights-mercenaries, who began to become the norm, because about 80% of landed knights in the 13th century paid off from the knightly service using scutage⁷⁴. In this context, these mercenaries with knightly rank had reduced the feudal combination with the creation of horizontal networks of loyalty with a small predisposition to the traditional honor.

Historians have been extensively studied of the Royal army, where the leading place was occupied by knights. David Crouch notes that in the 13th century we have more correct record about active knights in the Royal army – 300-400 knights, that’s all that could count kings John and Henry III in their campaigns. King Edward I (1272-1307) not had more, but at the expense of other horsemen (sergeants and esquires) it was possible to increase the number of cavalry in his army to 1000⁷⁵.

Professor at the University of East Anglia Stephen Churh convinced the number of household knights of the king is fundamental in assess-

⁶⁹ Brian Feneey. *The Effects of King John’s Scutages on East Anglian Subjects. Reading Medieval Studies: East Anglian and Other Studies Presented to Barbara*. Vol. XI. (Graduate Centre for Medieval Studies University of Reading, 1985), 51.

⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, 51.

⁷¹ *English Historical Documents*. Vol. II: 1042–1189. Ed. by D.C. Douglas & S. W. Greenaway. (London : Eyre Methuen/OUP, 1981), 559.

⁷² Brian Feneey. *The Effects of King John’s Scutages on East Anglian Subjects*, 52.

⁷³ *Ibidem*, 14.

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*, 9.

⁷⁵ Dennis Crouch. *The Image of Aristocracy: in Britain, 1000–1300*, 110.

ing the military strength of the royal armies⁷⁶. As noted by S. Church, the household knights can for a long time to held positions in the royal service. Not all of knights who accompanied him in the campaign, many of the knights have served in local and king's administration. They often carried out key management and financial functions during the campaigns of king John. From the 13th century spreaded knights who never fought 'de facto', however, belonged to the household knights. Moreover, this knights had the opportunity for career growth: in the some lists person was as warrior, in others already had not⁷⁷. David Carpenter analyzed the career of Godfrey of Crowcombe, who was a knight at court of John and Henry III. The researcher described Godfrey's evolution from diplomat and warrior to steward of the household under Henry III⁷⁸. Historian Kenneth Lightfoot exploring the knights of young king Henry III said that the family of royal knights played an integral role in the governance of England, occupying the posts of sheriffs, administrators of the castles, as ambassadors and prisoner's guards⁷⁹.

Researcher John Morris in the beginning of the 20th century for the first time emphasized the importance of the household knights of Edward I⁸⁰. Professor University of Manchester Thomas Tout in the 1920s based on Morris's thoughts, elaborated further on the versatility of the knight's duties⁸¹. Historian Michael Prestwich debating Edwardian courtyard wrote: the knights were used as diplomats, counselors, and leaders⁸². Having studied household knights of Edward I, historian Ruth Ingamells called Norman Darcy a typical Edward I's knight. She describes it this way: "*Darcy received fees and robes as a banneret of the household during 1280s. He served in the second Welsh war (1282-3) with the retinue of 5 squires and one knight... In 1290, Darcy went to France as a messenger to the cardinal legats. In the following year, Norman accompanied the king to Scotland. The castle of Sterling was entrusted to him while Edward decided between the different claimants to the Scottish throne*"⁸³. However, knight's main function still was to fight in the royal wars. She noted that king Edward I mobilize the household knights on parliamentary activity

⁷⁶ Stephen D. Church. The Knight of the Household of King John: A Question of Number. *Thirteenth Century England IV: Proceeding of the Newcastle Upon Tyne Conference, 1991*. Ed. by P. R. Coss and S. D. Lloyd. (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1992), 151.

⁷⁷ Ibidem, 155

⁷⁸ David A. Carpenter. The Career of Godfrey of Crowcombe: Household Knight of King John and Steward of King Henry III. *War, Government and Aristocracy in the British Isles, c. 1150-1500: Essays in Honour of Michael Prestwich*. Ed. by Chris Given-Wilson, Ann Kettle and Len Scales. (Woodbridge : The Boydell Press, 2008), 29.

⁷⁹ Ibidem, 26.

⁸⁰ Jennifer E. Morris. *The Welsh Wars of Edward I*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901), 84.

⁸¹ Thomas Frederick Tout. *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England: the Wardrobe, the Chamber and the Small Seals*. Vol. 2. (Manchester University Press, 1920), 135.

⁸² Michael Prestwich. *Edward I*. (London: Methuen, 1988), 154.

⁸³ Ruth Ingamells. The Political Role of the Household Knights of Edward I. *Thirteenth Century England V: Proceeding of the Newcastle Upon Tyne Conference, 1993*. Ed. by P. R. Coss and S. D. Lloyd. (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1995), 29–30.

despite resistance of the opposition. In the Edward I's days 52 knights-bannerets received individual writs of summons to parliament, representing royal interests⁸⁴. Of change the knightly status also showed that by the end of 13th century compulsory part of the knight was a blazon⁸⁵. In our opinion, this means that the shires knights had not huge political weight in contrast of household knights. Knights of the end of 13th century had the phenomenon of the middle ages – universality, which gave the opportunity to strengthen the prestige and status of titled persons.

Historian M. Prestwich revealed the specificity of knightly estate: “*He was someone who had been through a formal process of being knighted... Knighthood of England was not hereditary, but there was an expectation than the son of a knight would himself take up knighthood*”⁸⁶. He noticed a paradox: it was difficult to distinguish between administration and military knight. Prestwich for example, called John Storon, who at the beginning of the 14th century was a man of war and weapons, but never used it in practice, and was all the time engaged on the business of royal justice. The knights were leading members of the county courts. They regularly participated in courts as juries and criminal investigations. The researcher accented the important knightly role in the establishment of law and order. According to him, the knighthood was not merely a question of economic status, because they were part of a special world⁸⁷. In our opinion, such tendencies were not precedential, despite the long existence of the principle, when eldest son had priority in the inheritance, but it became more popular through pressure economic difficulties, for which the young knights looking for success in public service or the army spraying that conditional unity which existed in the 12th century.

At the reign of Edward I, knights monopolized key positions in local governance. So, lecturer at University of Hull Richard Gorski on the basis of archival materials showed that in 1300-1309 in England was appointed 139 sheriffs of counties, of which 65 were knights, 37 future knights⁸⁸. Without a doubt, in addition to the political role, knights have to become politicians in the sense of leadership and management.

The question of knight's status ceased to be on the margins in the historiography only at the end of the 20th century. This issue is in dire need of generalization, and colligation of knowledge for the formation of a holistic view about knightly impact at Empire development. Persons with a knightly rank of the 13th century were divided into military and administration man with different status in society and power. During ‘century’ knights transformed and evolved due to the rapid social and economic peripeteias, along with the increasing demand for knights in authorities structures. They have become stronger than predecessors through “the

⁸⁴ Ibidem, 30.

⁸⁵ Nigel Saul. *For Honour and Fame: Chivalry in England, 1066–1500*, 67.

⁸⁶ Michael Prestwich. *Plantagenet England 1225–1360*. (Oxford University Press, 2005), 389.

⁸⁷ Ibidem, 389.

⁸⁸ Richard Gorski. *The Fourteenth-Century Sheriff: English Local Administration in the Late Middle Age*. (Woodbridge : The Boydell Press, 2003), 87.

loss of the weak and poor persons”. Knights can be considered only in the context of groups, not class, because still the open question of cohesion in historiography. Interaction of knights and their status in the 13th century flows into the mainstream of usualness, to a greater extent, “demilitarizing” existence.

**Роман КШАНОВСЬКИЙ.
ДИСКУСІЙНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ ЕВОЛЮЦІЇ ЛИЦАРСТВА
В АНГЛІЇ XIII СТОЛІТТЯ.**

У статті проаналізовано неоднозначні процеси еволюції лицарського стану в Англії XIII століття з погляду новітньої історіографії. Дослідження має на меті розширити історичний дискурс про місце лицарів в соціальній ієрархії. Акцент був зроблений на ідеях істориків XX- початку XXI століття щодо нових процесів диференціації лицарів у військових і цивільних сенсах. Автор тексту опираючись на авторитетних британських істориків намагається визначити множину інтересів лицарства та початок демілітаризації їхнього життя. Стаття презентує концепції різних шкіл історіописання стосовно розвитку лицарів під поглядом викликів часу.

Ключові слова: лицарство, еволюція, Англія XIII століття, дискусійні проблеми.