

## CHAPTER FIFTEEN

WALTER DE PESHALE  
Thirteenth in Ancestry

*Section 1, Walter de Peshale—Section 2, Ralph de Peshale.*

### SECTION 1.

13. WALTER DE PESHALE. Son of Walter de Peshale, Chapter 14, Section 1, married ———. Children:—
1. \*12. ADAM DE PESHALE, Chapter 16, Section 1.
  2. Thomas le Golden, Chapter 16, Section 3.
  3. Richard de Peshale, Chapter 16, Section 5.
  4. Robert de Peshale, Chapter 16, Section 4.

The family history in this generation is very interesting. Stephen, uncle of Dr. Walter de Peshale, had three children: Robert, who died without heirs of his body; Walter, who was a priest, and therefore he died unmarried; and Eleanor who married John de Swinnerton, and thereby they became the ancestors of all the living Swinnertons. Ralph, brother of Dr. Walter de Peshale, probably died in the wars, at least there is no record of his having any male heirs.

Going back to the original John de Lumley, de Peshale; the descendants of his oldest son Robert never did call themselves de Peshale, they were de Swinnerton and de Suggenhull. He was the ancestor of the above John de Swinnerton who married Eleanor de Peshale. The descendants of Ralph, the son of John de Lumley de Peshale, went away from Staffordshire and Shropshire, and not long after this time there were no descendants of his male line who called themselves de Peshale. Even in the absence of a complete genealogy we can safely assert that, allowing that there were descendants of Ralph, they had long since ceased to be any who called themselves by the name of Peshale; as a fact they seem to have called them Pexall and Pascall. As to John de Peshale, son of this same John de Lumley de Peshale, his line became extinct in the next succeeding generation to this. Therefore Dr. Walter de Peshale occupies a peculiar position in our family history in that so far as our present knowledge goes he is not only our ancestor but he is the genearch or common-ancestor of all the living Peshales.

All the lines of ancestry of those who today call themselves Peshale, of every spelling, excepting Pexall and Pascall, which are of the line of Ralph, son of John de Lumley de Peshale, trace their ancestry to Dr. Walter de Peshale. He resided in Shropshire, and as his sons a few years later married and removed to Staffordshire, it appeared to the Staffordshire historians and genealogists as though these four men of undoubted rank, of the highest family connections, and of large estate, had come down out of the clouds full grown and heavenly endowed. Fortunately some of the public records, as we shall see, state positively that they were sons of Walter de Peshale. But unfortunately the local genealogists, without in-

vestigating Shropshire records, attempted to guess who was the father and ancestor of these sons of Dr. Walter de Peshale. From this has arisen considerable confusion, the history of which will be stated more fully and the records concerning the same marshaled in the next chapter. The important facts to be remembered at this time are that Dr. Walter de Peshale is the descendant of William de Peshale, son of John de Lumley de Peshale, and that although he and his descendants during all this time were owners of part of the Manor of Peshale in Staffordshire, nevertheless they resided in Shropshire, where they were at first tenants of Pantulf, and later his descendants were tenants of Arundel and Audley. Dr. Walter de Peshale was tenant of Fitz Alan of Arundel, to whom, as we have seen, he and his ancestors were related by blood and marriage. The history of our ancestor of this generation is very interesting.

The reign of Henry III. forms an interesting chapter in English history. For fifty-six years he sat upon the throne of England, beginning as a mere child, he had advanced to old age at the close of his reign. The history of his time represents all of Shakespeare's seven different stages of life, consequently it tells of the wilfulness of this king's youth and the self consequence of his early manhood. It was his misfortune at nearly all times to move contrary to the wishes of his people, hence the records are filled with pages recording the king's quarrels with his subjects. In those days the kings enjoyed the privilege of unrestrained spending of the public moneys and as the desires of the ruler were greater than the annual income he was constantly requiring additions to the royal revenue. This gave the leaders of the barons an opportunity to dicker, not only for additional rights to be vested in the king's subjects, but for constitutional guarantees against the encroachments of the royal master upon the property and lives of his people. The king's promises were not kept so the National Council in 1242 presented to him a long list of exactions to which they had submitted out of their good will to assist him but from which no good had arisen. The king resented this and tried to let the kingdom run itself, so no permanent ministers were appointed by him. The king nominated a clerk or judge from time to time to despatch formal business and every important transaction for which he himself was not personally competent was left to be settled at haphazard. As a result his reign was a time when the court and other records do not yield much if any genealogical information. However there is an entry in the Shropshire records which relates to our ancestor. [The Early Plantagenet Kings, by William Stubbs, page 181.]

John de Pichford had an interest in the Manor of Golden, and in 1255, he being a minor, it was in the custody of Master Walter de Peshal, and Ralph Fitz Nicholas to whom the king had given the wardship of this heir, who was later a tenant in Cepe in Albrighton and Little Brite. This appears to have been the Bishops Manor, as later it seems to have been transferred to Thomas de Peshale, son of Dr. Walter, who thereupon began to call himself Thomas le Gulden. This record also discloses that the Peshales were still inhabitants of Shropshire. [Eyttons Antiquities of Shropshire, vol. 6, page 101.]

It also appeared that two generations of the name had followed the profession of medicine. The science of medicine had its earliest development among the Greeks whose learning spread to all parts of the civilized world. Later there

came a time of wars and changes of dynasties and nations, so that at about the time of the Conquest of England the ancient learning was forgotten.

In consequence of the general decay of learning in the western parts of the world, the Greek writers became totally forgotten, because nobody could read the language; and the Arabians, though mostly copiers from them, enjoyed all the reputation that was due to the Greeks. The Arabian physic was introduced into Europe very early, with the most extravagant applause: and not only this, but other branches of their learning, came into repute in the west; insomuch that in the eleventh century the studies of natural philosophy and the liberal arts were called the Studies of the Saracens. This was owing partly to the crusades undertaken against them by the European princes; and partly to the settlement of the Moors in Spain, and the intercourse they and other Arabians had with the Italians. For, long before the time of the crusades, probably in the middle of the seventh century, there were Hebrew, Arabic, and Latin professors of physic settled at Salernum: which place soon grew into such credit that Charles the Great thought proper to found a college there in the year 802; the only one at that time in Europe. Constantine the African flourished here towards the latter end of the eleventh century. He was a native of Carthage; but being informed of an attempt against his life, made his escape into Apulia, where he was recommended to Robert Guiscard, who made him his secretary. He was reputed to be very well versed in the Greek, as well as in the eastern tongues; and seems to have been the first who introduced either the Greek or Arabian physic into Italy. His works, however, contain nothing that is new, or material; though he was then counted a very learned man, and for that age no doubt was so. [The American Encyclopedia, published by Thomas Dobson at the Stone House, Phila. 1798.]

The great seat of learning in England down to the Conquest was the old Northumbrian monasteries, and the intercourse between them and Apulia was direct and intimate, hence no doubt Doctor Walter de Peshale was well learned in the art of medicine. It is remarkable that this Robert Guiscard who so signally served our ancestor Werlac should also introduce and foster the science of medicine, in which later our ancestor Dr. Walter de Peshale, who was the descendant of Werlac, should be educated and in which he excelled. Doctor Walter de Peshale accompanied the king in his wars.

Through the writs of protection, issued to those who applied for them while employed in the King's service, we are enabled to obtain a record of the King's Staffordshire and Shropshire tenants in capite who fought in the various wars of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and this serves to also indicate the subfeudatories who served in the retinue of their chief. When Henry III. invaded Brittany in 1230 such writs were issued to the following Staffordshire tenants:—Ralph Basset of Drayton, Ralph Basset of Weldon, William de Aldithele (Audley), Henry de Aldithele, William de Duston, Hervey de Stafford, Adam Mauveisin, Nicholas de Verdun, John Fitz Philip, William Basset, Roger de Somery, Hugh de Oddingesele, Geoffrey de St. Maur and Ralph de Peshale brother of Dr. Walter de Peshale. The Peshales in Shropshire, as we have seen, were tenants, Stephen of the Audleys, as successors of the Pantulfs, and Doctor Walter of the Arundels, and Doctor Walter de Peshale must certainly have gone to war with his overlord.

[Victoria History of the County of Stafford, by William Page, London 1908 & Hist. Col. of Staff. vol. 8, part 2, page 5.]

The great crisis of Henry's reign came when clergy and laity found a leader against his misgovernment in Simon de Montfort, and in the barons' wars that ensued Staffordshire and Shropshire were almost wholly against the king. Not more than three of the principal tenants of the county were on his side: Philip Marmion, the last of the male line of that family, whose daughter Jane married Sir Alexander de Freville, James de Audley and Roger de Somery, and in Shropshire the Arundels; while of the lesser tenants, only William Bagot of the Hyde, Adam de Brimton, William Wyther, and Hugh de Okeover adhered to the king. Against him were Robert de Ferrers, Hugh de Despenser the Justiciary of England, Ralph Basset of Drayton, Henry de Verdun, William de Handsacre, John Fitz Philip, Geoffrey de Gresley, John de Audley, Roger Bagot of Brinton, John de Swinnerton, Richard de Bromley, William de Rideware, Giles de Erdington, and many more. [Victoria History of Staffordshire, by William Page, London 1908.]

It was at this time that our family reached such eminence by the favoring of the king that in the next generation it attained knightly rank which it retained for more than four centuries. An interesting fact of the continued relationship of the de Peshales with the Fitz Alans, Lords of Arundel is shown by Sir John de Peshale, grandson of Dr. Walter de Peshale, witnessing deeds of the Arundels in 1313 and 1318. [Eytons Antiquities of Shropshire, vol. 7, page 296, and vol. 11, page 19.]

At first the barons in rebellion appeared to be without a leader, but gradually the earl of Leicester became the spokesman for the recalcitrant nobility. The anger of the king against the barons had gradually concentrated on Simon de Montfort, whom he rightly looked upon as their leader. The following anecdote recounts the first occasion on which he showed this feeling openly. [Readings in English History page 221. by E. P. Cheyney.]

The fears and anxieties of the barons were increased by the coming of the month of July, with its pestilence-bearing Lion and scorching Dog Star, whose deadly barking usually disturbs the atmosphere. More than all else were they alarmed at the fickleness and incrutable duplicity of the king, which they discovered from a certain ominous speech. One day he had left his palace at Westminster and gone down the Thames in a boat to take his dinner out of doors, when the sky clouded over and a thunderstorm came on, attended with lightning and heavy rain. Now the king feared a storm of this kind more than any other, so he directed them to land him at once; and the boat was opposite the stately palace of the bishop of Durham, where the earl of Leicester was then staying. On hearing of his arrival the earl goes gladly to meet him, and greeting him with respect, as was proper, says by way of consolation: What is it that you fear? The storm is now passed. To this the king, not in jest but seriously, answered, with a severe look, The thunder and lightning I fear beyond measure, but, by the head of God, I fear thee more than all the thunder and lightning in the world. The earl gently replied, My lord, it is unjust and incredible that you should fear me, your firm friend, who am ever faithful to you and yours, and to the kingdom

of England; it is your enemies, your destroyers and false flatterers, that you ought to fear. Every one suspected that these astounding words broke from the king because the earl of Leicester manfully and boldly persevered in carrying out the Provisions, under which they were to compel the king and all their opponents to assent to the plans, and utterly banish his brothers who were corrupting the whole kingdom. [Readings in English History, by Edward P. Cheyney, page 221.]

From a mere argument between the king and his would-be advisors, the controversy gradually grew into a state of civil warfare which finally culminated in a pitched battle between the barons and the adherents of the king at Lewes. It appears that the barons had sent mediators of peace to the king, offering to pay thirty thousand pounds for the loss inflicted upon the kingdom by them, saving in all things the Provisions of Oxford. When those who had thus been sent had returned, they announced that the adverse party was anticipating a war to the end. So, assured of war, the next morning before sunrise the army of the barons went out of the village of Flexing, where a great part of them had spent the night; which village was distant from the town of Lewes about six miles. When they had approached the town of Lewes, at a place scarcely two miles distant from the town, Simon de Montfort with his men ascended the hill, and, placing his wagon in the midst of his baggage and packs, he stationed his standard thereon, arranging many of his armed men about it in a circle. He himself with his army held the wings and awaited the outcome of the affair. In this wagon he had placed four citizens of London, who had conspired for his betrayal, a little while before, when he was spending the night in Southwark. He did this for a precaution. [Readings in English History, by Edward P. Cheyney, page 221. *Ibid.*, page 222-224.]

In the morning the army of the barons suddenly attacked the followers of the king, who had gone forth to seek food and forage, and killed many of them.

The king, thus assured of the arrival of the barons, advanced immediately with his men, displaying his standards. The royal standard preceded him, bearing the fatal sign which they call The Dragon. His army was divided into three parts. The first line was in charge of Edward, the eldest son of the king, with William de Velence, earl of Pembroke, and John de Warrene, earl of Surrey and Sussex. The second was in charge of the king of Germany, with his son Henry. The third, King Henry himself commanded. The army of the barons was divided into four lines; the first under Henry de Montfort, with the earl of Hereford; the second under Gilbert de Clare, with John Fitzjohn and William de Munchensy; in the third were the Londoners and Nicholas de Segrave; the fourth, Earl Simon himself commanded, with Thomas de Pelvestone.

Edward with his line rushed upon the enemy with such force that he forced them to retreat; many were drowned,—it is reported about sixty; then the Londoners were put to flight. Edward, thirsting for their blood on account of the insult formerly offered to his mother, followed them a distance of four miles and inflicted severe loss; but the strength of the royal army was much lessened by his absence. In the meantime many powerful men in the royal army, seeing the standard of the earl on the hill, and thinking that he was there, hastened thither and fell suddenly upon the Londoners, not knowing that they were on their side.

The Earl of Leicester and Gilbert de Clare rested nowhere, but struck down, overthrew, and sent to death many, straining every nerve to capture the king alive. Very many fell on the king's side. John, Earl of Warenne, William de Valence, and Guy de Lusignan, all brothers of the king, Hugh Bigot, and about three hundred mailed knights, perceiving the ferocity of the barons, turned their backs. The king of Germany, Richard, Robert Bruce, and John Comyn, who had led the Scots thither, were all captured. Even King Henry himself, his horse having been killed under him, surrendered himself to Earl Simon de Montfort and was presently shut up in the priory under guard. [Readings in English History by Edward P. Cheyney, page 222-224.]

Many barons of Scotland were killed on that day, and many of the foot soldiers who had come with them were slain also. Besides, there were captured Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford, John son of Alan, Earl of Arundel, William Bardolf, Robert de Tateshale, Roger de Someri, Henry Percy, Philip Basset. On the king's side there fell the justiciars, William de Wilton, and Fulk, son of Warenne, the one by the sword, the other by drowning. On the side of the barons Ralph Hering and Baro and William Blunders, standard bearers of the earl, were killed. About five thousand are said to have fallen on each side.

From which it appears that John, son of Alan, Earl of Arundel, was among those who adhered to the king, and Dr. Walter de Peshale followed his overlord the Earl of Arundel into the army of the king. It is impossible to say on which side the male members of the family of Stephen de Peshale fought in this battle. The families of the Audleys and Bagots were divided, it may be the same experience came to the de Peshale family. Doctor Walter de Peshale served with his king, and this accounts for the favors bestowed upon this branch of the Peshale family by the king's son who became King Edward I.

This Edward, in the meantime, with his soldiers, returned from the slaughter of the Londoners, not knowing what had happened to his father; and, going around the town, he came to the camp at Lewes, and not finding his father there entered the priory of Lewes, where he both found his father and realized the situation. The baron assaulted the fort, but when those within manfully defended themselves they withdrew. When the courage of the camp soldiers became known, Edward was greatly excited; he wished to collect his men again and offer battle. When this was known the barons sent mediators declaring that they wished to treat finally concerning peace. [Readings in English History, by Edward P. Cheyney, page 224-225.]

On the next day the Preaching Brothers and the Minorites, or Franciscans, went back and forth between the parties and accomplished this much, that on the sixth day following Edward and Henry were to give themselves up to Earl Simon for their fathers, the kings of England and Germany, for the sake of peace and quiet. There should then be a deliberate discussion as to what provisions and statutes ought to be established for the good of the kingdom, and which ought to be abolished. The captives were to be returned without ransom. On the following Sabbath the king gave authority to all who had followed him to return to their estates. During the year, five months and two weeks of this war, many were shaken with the severity of it. When any one wished to defend his

castle, he laid waste everything belonging to his neighbor, devastated the fields, and drove away the cattle, for defense of his castle; nor did the churches and cemeteries escape. The homes of the poor peasants, even to the straw of their beds, were torn up and taken. And although the earl had given command that under penalty of death no one should presume to enter a holy church or cemetery for plunder, nor should any one inflict violence upon religious men or their servants, he accomplished nothing by his carefulness. For neither bishops nor abbots, nor any religious men, could go from town to town without being plundered by thieves. [Readings in English History, by Edward P. Cheyney, page 224-225.]

Immediately after the battle of Lewes, Earl Simon de Montfort, acting in the name of Henry, appointed for the first time a *Custos pacis* in every county in England, who appears to have superseded the sheriff and wielded almost despotic power, the *custos* for Staffordshire-Shropshire being Ralph Basset of Drayton, who at the battle of Evesham fell fighting against the king with Hugh le Despenser, Richard Trussel of Kibblestone, and William de Bermingham, all of whom were enemies to the king. The Staffords were closely related to the Montforts, as Ralf Toesni, the Standard-bearer at the conquest, was married to Isabella Montfort, and all the Northumbrians at Stone Priory and Edgmond were more or less closely related to Montfort. But this was a time when the nation divided without regard to blood or feudal relationship, hence we see brother against brother and vassal against his overlord. [The Victoria History of the County of Stafford, by William Page, London 1908.]

## SECTION 2.

RALPH DE PESHALE, son of Walter. Staffordshire 14 Henry III. (1230). In the fourteenth year of his reign A.D. 1230, Henry III assembled a large army at Portsmouth for the invasion of France, passed over into Brittany and landed at St. Malo on the 5th of May. He was there joined by the Duke of Brittany and many Briton nobles and marched through Anjou and Picton and Gascony. Whilst in Gascony he received the homage of the Gascon nobility and returned to England in October without having achieved anything of note or at all commensurate with his preparations and expenditures. [Staffordshire Historical Collection, vol. 8, part — page 2.]

The patent roll of 14 Henry III. (1230) contains several letters of protection for those who had set out as *partes transmarinas*, dated Portsmouth, 20 April. Amongst them the following.—Ralph Basset of Drayton, William de Aldithele (cum Herrico de Aldithele) (Audley), William Dusten, Adam Manvesin (cum R. Hasset de Drayton), John Fitz Philip, Roger de Somery, Geoffrey de St. Maur, Ralph Basset of Welledon, Henry de Aldithele (Audley), William Basset, Hugh de Addingisele, and Ralph de Pesehale. Here we have an interesting record of the Bassets, Audleys, and Peshales, all going to the wars together.