Mathias Bezill, the Unpopular Alien?

In his tweet of 17 May 2012, David Carpenter referred to Mathias Bezill as ‘Bezill a foreign servant of Henry III and here his barn at Sherston Wilts was broken into - showing his unpopularity.’ The evidence to support this is taken from the Curia Regis rolls of the Hilary term of 1254. In this Fine of the Month, helped considerably by material from the fine rolls, we will take a fresh look at Bezill’s career, focusing in particular on the question of his alleged unpopularity as an alien in England.

There can be no doubt that Mathias was an alien. He was first noted in English governmental records in 1233 the timing of which is significant as it was during the time of the ascendancy of Peter des Roches, Bishop of Winchester and former tutor to Henry III, who, in 1232, had engineered the fall from power of Hubert de Burgh, the most powerful minister after the death of William Marshal in 1219. Roches was from Touraine, the province which is centred along the valley of the Loire, and showed no hesitation in promoting the career of his fellow Tourangeux either as new men at court or as old retainers who had suffered something of an eclipse after the reign of King John. Thus Engelard de Cigogné once one of John’s most prominent soldier courtiers, reemerged as a significant power. Amongst other men who did well were members of the Tourangeux families who had become so unpopular under John that a chapter (50) of Magna Carta had proscribed them and Engelard by name and had required the King to banish them. Typically John refused to do so but by 1232 they had died or become less important. It was on 3 January, whilst the court was at Winchcombe in Gloucestershire, that Mathias was recorded as being granted land at Gomshall in Surrey to be held by service of a quarter of a knight’s fee. That Mathias was part of the Chapter 50 Tourangeau clan is made clear by the fine of January 1239 when Aymer de Chanceaux, who belonged to one of the families named in the chapter, was pardoned a debt of seventeen pounds to the Exchequer at the instance of Mathias, his nephew. This is reinforced by the evidence from another fine, of 1250, when Mathias paid £100 for the lands and heirs of Guy de Chanceaux. A final proof of his Tourangeau origin can be found in a seal of Reynaud Besile.
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fl.1368-83, who came from Touraine and bore the same arms, argent, three torted.⁶ There is just one caveat. The family gave its name to Besselsleigh, about five miles south west of Oxford and in, around 1535, the antiquary, John Leland wrote ‘The Blessells hathe bene lords of it syns the time of Edward the First or afore’ and ‘The Blessells cam out of Province in France, and were men of activitye in feats of armes, as it apperithe in monuments in Leigh how he fought in listes with a strange knight that chalengyed him, at the whiche deade the Kynge and Quene at that tyme of England were present’.⁷ So could Mathias have come from another part of what is now France? The confusion is easily explained as Mathias was a prominent member of the circle of Eleanor of Provence serving the Queen as Marshal of her household and later as her Steward, and, as we have seen, he was in England by the beginning of 1233, well before the arrival of Eleanor.⁸ So there can be no doubt that Mathias was an alien, but was he unpopular?

Establishing a solid case for Mathias’s unpopularity hinges on five elements; his name, his difficulty in finding a woman to marry him, his relationships with his tenants and neighbours, his difficulties in Gloucestershire and finally, more broadly, as an alien at a time of rampant xenophobia.

Whilst Mathias Bezills’ descendants used the particular ‘de’,⁹ when he first appeared in England there was no suggestion that his surname was a toponym.¹⁰ There is a Bézelle in the commune of Lesaire in the département of Tarn¹¹ but it has been assumed that Bezill was derived from the verb ‘besilier’ meaning ‘to snatch or steal’,¹² hence Vincent’s description of Mathias as ‘The Plunderer’.¹³ In a 1309 document, ‘besiller’ was used to describe the mutilation of a document.¹⁴ The Oxford English Dictionary gives the origin of ‘embezzle’ as French, meaning maltreat, ravage and fraudulently destroy and stated that it was used in a pejorative sense in late Latin.¹⁵ It might seem strange that a man was prepared to accept an epithet of little credit and pass it down to his family but this practice was not unknown. For instance, in Yorkshire, thrusting families gloried in
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⁶ G. Demay, Inventaire de Sceaux de la Collection Clairambault, nos. 968-9.
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the names of Malebisse and Mauleverer meaning ‘evil beast’ and ‘evil hound’ respectively.\textsuperscript{16} Uncomplimentary English names such as ‘Halknaked’ were preserved elsewhere.\textsuperscript{17}

Nicholas Vincent has argued that Mathias had difficulty in persuading an English heiress to marry him.\textsuperscript{18} He was granted the marriages of Reginald Basset’s daughter,\textsuperscript{19} Roger de Notton’s heirs,\textsuperscript{20} Constance de Ponte Arche\textsuperscript{21} and Margery de Rivers.\textsuperscript{22} In 1246, Beatrice, widow of John de Bassingham, was excused her oath not to marry without the King’s consent providing she took Mathias as her husband.\textsuperscript{23} She seems to have married Robert of Lowick (Northants) instead,\textsuperscript{24} but, if so, she must have been quickly widowed for by 1249 she is found married to Mathias.\textsuperscript{25} The case for reluctant brides might not be as persuasive as Vincent suggested and the marriage grants might have been ways of giving Mathias financial benefits. Of the potential brides he mentioned, it is not certain that there was a Notton heiress; neither Constance nor Margery are known to have paid not to marry Mathias. Only Beatrice, who presumably did pay for a free marriage if she married Lowick first, ended up marrying Mathias. But, if Mathias had been looking for a bride since 1233, Vincent’s overall conclusion is sound. Beatrice brought him some landed interests but these seem to have come from her dower rather than from any inheritance, and as such could only be held by Mathias for her lifetime. Still the property seems quite substantial. Through her Mathias had lands at Bassingham (Lincolnshire),\textsuperscript{26} Brogborough and Odell (Bedfordshire),\textsuperscript{27} and lands in Buckinghamshire.\textsuperscript{28} The presentation in 1261 by Mathias of his nephew, John Luvel, to the living of Minsterworth (Gloucestershire)\textsuperscript{29} raises the possibility that Beatrice was born a Luvel.

As shown by an entry in the fine rolls, Mathias’s close connections with Gloucestershire and Wiltshire began in 1233 when, following the rebellion of Richard Marshal against the regime of Peter des Roches, lands were taken from those who had joined the rebellion at Wycombe with horses and arms. They were distributed to men who could be trusted by Bishop Peter and his
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closest colleagues. Mathias gained the Gloucestershire holdings of Robert Musard as well as those of Ralph Bloet in Wiltshire and Hampshire. But these gains were only temporary as was the grant of Hubert de Burgh’s manor of Westhall in Suffolk in the following year. In compensation for the loss of Westhall, which was restored to Hubert, came the life grant of Sherston (Wiltshire) in 1240, with Mathias paying £15 annually for it. Sherston was also *Terra Normanorum* but its status whilst held by Mathias is confused. The initial grant in December 1240 was for life. When Mathias was respited the scutage due for Sherston in 1241, he was said to hold it in chief and there was no reference to a life grant. A market and fair at Sherston were granted in 1241, the grant noted that Mathias held the lands for life but the market and fair were for the benefit of future holders of the manor. This suggests that Mathias was consciously trying to convert Sherston into a hereditary holding. Then, in 1247, Mathias and his heirs were granted free warren in his demesne lands at Sherston, a sign that the lands were expected to be held in perpetuity. During 1248 Mathias was recorded as holding it of the king’s gift, when the manor was valued at £36 p.a. In 1253 a further grant was made which reads like a hereditary grant, it being held as a quarter of a fee. He does not seem to have answered for any of the £15 farm at the exchequer. However, there is no trace of Sherston in Mathias’ *inquisition post mortem*. The Hundred Rolls do not contain any more evidence and in 1270/1 his son, John, was not paying a farm for it. But, in March 1280, John was confirmed as a life tenant and, in 1281, when he was challenged by the King to prove his right to the assize of bread and ale as well as a gallows at Sherston, the jury stated that he only held the manor for life.

It was at Sherston that Mathias had his barns broken into by Ralph de Hoville of Winterborne and Robert le Munt who stole his corn. In Sherston a local jury found for his opponent when Mathias
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had contested his right to common pasture but in a dispute with the abbot of Pershore over the impact that the abbot’s market at Hawkesbury had on Mathias’ market at Sherston, the local men supported Mathias. However, this might have been because they benefitted from the market.

Following the Provisions of Oxford, Hugh Bigod, the new justiciar appointed at the Barons’ insistence, began a special eyre to investigate nationwide grievances. On 30 September 1258 Mathias was before Bigod at Clarendon. As shown by a fine of May that year, he had been accused of dispossessing one Clement of Sherston of two virgates at Sherston and the jury had found against him. Mathias accused the jury of swearing a false oath and claimed that John was his villein but the jury had said he was a free tenant. A new jury confirmed the verdict of the earlier jury and Mathias was to be committed to prison. It is not clear whether he was jailed but he presumably paid a fine for his release. No sign appears in the Pipe Rolls of unpaid amercements for the case. Paul Brand believed that the committal to prison was standard practice but it is tempting to see the outcome as evidence of anti-alien feeling at that time. Would a man as well connected as Mathias have been sued, lost such a case or been imprisoned before 1258? One of the complaints of the Barons was that certain men close to the King were not touched by the ordinary procedures of justice. Thus Mathias’ potential imprisonment at this time was an indication of the ebbing of the power of alien courtiers around the king.

During 1258 Mathias brought the case that ended before Bigod. If nothing else, this case shows Mathias’ persistence and, at its worst, that he was a ruthless landlord. In Sherston, he brought an action against William le Gras and twelve others for taking goods worth 50 marks in 1268. Cases recorded in the last years of Mathias’s life indicate local difficulties elsewhere and in particular with the lands his wife held in dower. He sued Walter de Wahull (Odell) over the theft of goods at Odell by Herbert de Wahull, and Geoffrey de Stanton for the taking of goods and chattels worth £100 from Bassingham in Lincolnshire. Roger de Warbelon and six others stood accused of causing enormous damage at Paycote in Huntingdonshire.
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Wider hostility was shown to Mathias in Gloucestershire. By 1251, he was constable of Gloucester.\(^5\) 1261 saw Henry III overthrowing the Provisions of Oxford and recovering royal power. He replaced sheriffs with those he could trust and Mathias Bezill added the shrievalty of Gloucestershire to his castellany of Gloucester castle.\(^5\) There was a spectacular and violent reaction to Bezill’s appointment. The county gentry of Gloucestershire gathered together and elected one of their own men, William de Tracy, as sheriff. With a strong force, Bezill seized Tracy at a meeting of the county court and had him beaten and then dragged through the mire and imprisoned in Gloucester castle.\(^5\) Although Robert of Gloucester referred to a popular election, David Carpenter has suggested that Tracy was, in fact, a member of the entourage of the earl of Gloucester.\(^5\) The evidence that Carpenter relied on dates from 1267 but it refers back to 1265 and is about Earl Richard’s son, Gilbert. However, it does carry some weight as a 1259 patent roll entry refers to Oliver de Tracy, who was possibly William’s brother, as the nephew of the Earl Richard in 1259.\(^5\) Revenge came when violence broke out nationally in 1263. In June, the Savoyard, Bishop of Hereford, Peter d’Aigueblanche, was attacked and imprisoned and Mathias was forced to endure a savage siege of Gloucester castle. Although he was forced to surrender, the Pershore chronicler noted that he was ‘a foreigner, but a bold and brave knight’ and included an elegant tribute stating that ‘neither fear of death nor the threats of his enemies made him wish to voluntarily surrender and this was noted by his enemies as being worthy of praise’.\(^6\) But this did not stop his Wiltshire lands at Sherston being ravaged. In Robert of Gloucester’s words, ‘they took Sir Maci and into the March led him, and Sir John Giffard took all his live stock to himself, and all that he found of his, and namely at Sherston’.\(^6\) Mathias was imprisoned at Eardisley castle (Herefordshire) alongside Aigueblanche. However, by the end of the year, Mathias and the Bishop were released from captivity.\(^6\)

\(^6\) CPR, 1258-66, p.162. 
\(^5\) *CPR, 1258-66*, p.10. 
\(^6\) *Flores Historiarum*, ed. H. R. Luard, Roll Series, 95 (1890), ii, 480. That the *Flores* at this time was written at Pershore abbey is argued by David Carpenter in a forthcoming article in *English Historical Review*. 
\(^6\) *Flores Historiarum AD 1067-1264*, ed. H. R. Luard, Roll Series, xcix (1890), ii, 484.
These events show that Bezill was still perceived nationally and locally as a foreigner; Robert of Gloucester drew particular attention to the French origins of Bezill and the Pershire chronicler also referred to Bezill’s alien origin. This perception counted even though Mathias had been in England for thirty years, had been associated with Gloucester castle for twelve years, had been accepted as constable by the Barons in 1258, had held lands in Gloucstershire, was married to an Englishwoman and had children born in England.

An item in a wardrobe account of the mid 1250s may throw a new light on these events. One reading of this entry is that Bezill paid ten marks to have the sheriff of Gloucester removed. If so, why? Bezill had been constable of Gloucester since 1251. William of Lasborough, who was sheriff in April 1255, was replaced in 1257 by Henry de Penbroke. However, the List of Sheriffs also recorded Bezill as sheriff, on 10 January 1256 but there is no supporting evidence. Lasborough is in the parish of Westonbirt. Bezill held lands at Sherston, about two miles away, from 1240 and at Didmarton (Gloucstershire), also about two miles way, from before 1260. Perhaps Bezill was objecting to Lasborough as either a hindrance to his position as constable or it was a neighbour dispute or both. But if he did pay to have Lasborough removed, why was he only prepared, or expected, to pay a mere ten marks? So if Bezill had had a brush with a locally based sheriff in the 1250s, this might be a further reason for local hostility to him in the 1260s.

There must have been better relationships with some Gloucstershire men. During 1256, Mathias helped Robert de Meysey to obtain quittance of attendance at assizes, a charter of free warren and respite for five years from knighthood for his son. Even in Gloucester itself relations had not always been bad. When the Savoyard Peter de Champvent became constable, the burgesses alleged that he had kept them from using the common pasture in the Southmead as had Roger de Clifford during the time of war, but Mathias had permitted them. And Mathias must have retained some affection for the city as he funded an obit in the abbey.
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At a national level, Mathias was not always unpopular. When the storm broke around the king’s head in 1258, the Barons in their petition of that May asked that all royal castles including those adjoining harbours from which ships sail, should be committed to the custody of men born in England and that no women shall be disparaged by being married to ‘men who are not true-born Englishmen’. Whilst the Poitevin, Elias Rabayn and the Savoyard, Imbert Pugeys were replaced at Corfe castle and the Tower of London, Mathias Bezill was retained as constable of Gloucester.

It is not certain whether Mathias was at the Battle of Lewes in May 1264 but it is unlikely, as he seems instead to have been part of the royal garrison at Windsor castle. When, presumably under Montfort’s instructions, the captive king ordered him and others to come to court, they prevaricated for two months despite a series of offers of safe conduct and escort. The stand-off persisted until at least July. Although stalwart in his support for Henry III in the Barons’ War, Mathias’s rapprochement with the Montfortians was indicated when, before the battle of Evesham, he was granted at the king’s pleasure the houses at Woodhill (Wiltshire), the former property of William de Englischeville.

When the Barons’ War came to an end, opportunities for the acquisition of lands owned by real or suspected Montfortians were open to those with royalist credentials. It appears that Mathias took advantage of the post war disorder to enrich himself and this too cannot have made him popular. Some lands might have been in his hands by royal gift. He had been given the Huntingdonshire lands of Robert de Hardreull who had been killed at Evesham. The king ‘out of humanity and grace’ allowed Robert’s widow some of the lands for her support. Nicholas de Dene, who was said to have fought against the king at Northampton, went to court to reclaim his lands. When a jury of twelve knights said that he had not been a rebel, Mathias lost. Others were obtained without due process. Seven years after Mathias’s death, it was disclosed that Ralph Perot, who was
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78 CR 1264-8, pp.11, 52. The grant was authorised by both the king and the justiciar. The timing of William’s death is unknown; he was not a Montfortian who lost his lands after the Barons’ War, Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous (Chancery), i, (1916), i. Theobald de Englischeville was a Queen’s household knight who had lands in the same Devon lordship as Bezill: H.Ridgeway, ‘The Politics of the English Royal Court 1247-65 with special reference to the role of the Aliens’, Unpublished D.Phil thesis, Oxford University (1983), 412; Book of Fees, 1386.
an enemy of the king on the side of the earl of Leicester, had had his lands seized by Mathias acting as constable of Dover.  

There is one circle in which Mathias was popular and always retained his good name. This was in the royal court. Serving as her marshal and steward, he was particularly close to Queen Eleanor. Indeed, this may well explain his survival in 1258 when the queen and her party of Savoyards at the very least consented to the revolution in order to be rid of their Lusignan rivals. It was not till 1263 that the queen was marked down and Bezill and the Savoyard Bishop Aigueblanche with her. Bezill also received a continuous stream of favours from the king. From the close and patent rolls starting in 1238 until his death in 1268, he received a valuable wardship, twenty three tuns of wine, one hundred and twenty seven deer and sixty four trees, a sparrow hawk, two sows and six bream. In addition his wife was given three tuns of wine, fifteen deer and six oaks. The fine rolls disclose other gifts and concessions such as a gift of 30 marks and remittance of moneys owed for the holding of Gloucester castle and crops growing on assarts in Essex and a tun of wine.

In the last years of his life and in the aftermath of the Barons’War, Mathias was so respected that he was entrusted with the control of the gateway to England, Dover castle, as well as the keeping of its port and Sandwich by the Lord Edward.

One is drawn to the conclusion that Mathias Bezill was sometimes, but not always, unpopular. He behaved with courage and tenacity at times and with tact on others but he went too far in degrading the locally elected sheriff of Gloucestershire and seems to have been an oppressive landlord. His alien provenance gave an added dimension when people were impacted on, or upset, by his actions but, on an objective judgement, was he worse than many other men of similar rank and of English birth?
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