

The Nationality of Men-at-Arms serving in English Armies in Normandy and the *pays de conquête*, 1415-1450: A Preliminary Survey

Anne Curry
University of Reading

This article is based on a computer-assisted study of muster rolls of the armies with which Henry V and Henry VI invaded and occupied Northern France in the first half of the fifteenth century. At the time of writing, the database contains 50,000 entries derived from almost all the rolls known to survive, but is restricted to those described therein as either mounted or foot men-at-arms.¹ Men-at-arms constituted about 25% of the total number of military effectives, with archers making up the remainder. Evidence from the *contrerolles* of English garrisons in Normandy suggests that there was very little interchange of personnel between the archers and the men-at-arms. Even so, the conclusions reached in this article must be regarded as limited (in that they are specific to the men-at-arms) and tentative (in that the database and research is not yet complete). It is hoped, however, that they will provide some useful preliminary observations relating to the nationality of those serving in English royal armies in this period. The surviving documentation facilitates investigation of three aspects. First, we can identify government policy towards the service of soldiers of non-English origin, and the consequent attempts to record nationality on the muster rolls. Secondly, we can note the nationalities so recorded, and comment on the patterns of military service of foreign troops in English pay. Thirdly, we can assess contemporary concepts of nationality by studying the methods and terminologies adopted for its recording in the context of the English occupation of northern France.

Before examining the evidence of the muster rolls we must consider, albeit briefly, the systems of military administration which produced them. The English royal armies of this period are well documented. This demonstrates the tight bureaucratic control exercised over them by the financial agencies of the Lancastrian state in both England and France. For expeditionary armies the taking of a muster under Exchequer auspices was routine practice by 1415, and further musters might well be carried out during the campaign. At the return of the expeditionary army to England, muster rolls, along with other documentation such as the indenture and warrants for the issue of pay, were examined by Exchequer officials and each captain's account terminated.² Thus some musters are extant in Exchequer records, now housed in the Public Record Office, but the survival rate is not high.³ Some may have been lost or disposed of in later centuries, but it is possible that most muster rolls were deliberately destroyed within the period; once the Exchequer officials and auditors had been satisfied, there was perhaps no long-term need to keep material subsidiary to the accounts. For the same reason, perhaps, relatively few musters survive for the garrisons established in northern France between 1415 and 1420, for these came under the control of the English Exchequer, as did the garrison of Calais throughout its tenure by the English.

From 1420-21 a separate financial administration was established within the Norman and other northern French conquests. This took over responsibility from the Exchequer for the garrisons and for other military matters. As Newhall demonstrated, mustering was an essential part of the system developed by the French and Norman *chambres des comptes* whilst under English control.⁴ Garrisons and retinues were normally mustered four times a year, and musters were taken as necessary of troops detached for field service. From 1429 a quarterly *contrerolle* was also kept in each garrison, recording gains of war, absences and changes in personnel. The resulting archive remained in France after the English left in 1450. Unfortunately its subsequent, rather chequered, history means that cognate documents have been separated, and are now distributed amongst various repositories in France, England and North America without any discernable chronological or geographical rationale.⁵ Many musters and *contrerolles* have been lost but it seems that c.3,500, perhaps half the original number produced, are still extant.

Despite problems in their survival, the value of the rolls is immense. Not least, they allow us to know the names of many of

those serving in the garrisons and expeditionary armies in this period of English involvement in France. By comparison, there are a few surviving muster rolls for fourteenth-century expeditionary armies but next to none for the garrisons maintained in France. To ascertain the names of men-at-arms and archers serving in the fourteenth century, historians are largely reliant on protections enrolled in the Treaty (or French) rolls.⁶ But the number of names so retrievable is small compared with that provided by the muster rolls from 1415 to 1450. But before we wax too lyrical about the muster rolls, we must remember that they are often no more than lists of names of soldiers, distinguished only by the military rank they held, for this determined the level of pay they received. In their usual format, a heading gives details of the place, function and date of the muster, often noting the names and commission of the musterers. There follow in list form the names of the men-at-arms and then of the archers. At the foot of the document is normally a statement by the musterers to the effect that the troops have satisfactorily mustered and that they have performed their commission as musterers; their signatures or signs usually terminate the document.

It is clear, however, that such lists offer considerable potential for the study of the nationality of those serving English kings in this period. The most obvious - but by no means the easiest or least problematic - approach would be to examine the names themselves. Surnames and, to a lesser extent, forenames can be seen to reveal the geographical origins of their holder. Some surnames are, after all, topographical in nature. In others orthography might suggest specific locational links. It would be easy to assume, therefore, that someone with the surname 'de Bruxelles' hailed from Brussels, or that someone with the forename 'Rodrigo' was Spanish, or that 'van', as a characteristic of netherlandish naming systems, was sure indication of such an origin. These basic assumptions may well be true but there are many dangers in taking the name forms at face value. It was once believed that, in English surnames, topographical references or allusions offered a guide to geographical origins. The problem is that surnames were increasingly hereditary in the later middle ages. Someone bearing a topographical name in a twelfth or thirteenth century source might well have come from, or indeed still be resident in, the place with which he shared a name. But what of his descendants? If their link with the place cannot be established by other means then all that can be assumed is that they had ancestors who

perhaps once hailed from there, although often it is impossible to know when the migration took place. Nor can it be assumed that movement was merely from A to B; it may have been via C and D.

Returning to the question of the names of fifteenth-century soldiers, we might aver that surname evidence of foreign (i.e. non-English) origin is a more reliable guide than the topographical allusions in English surnames. These foreign soldiers were in a minority. The vast majority of the soldiers were English. Might it not be that musterers and clerks would be likely to record someone as 'de Brucelles' because they knew indeed that that was where he came from? This raises all kinds of questions about European naming systems, of course. In the examples cited so far, the 'de Brucelles', the 'Rodrigos' and the 'vans', foreign-ness does seem to be indicated by name. But it is the case that many foreigners had names not dissimilar to those in use in England at the time. The situation is further complicated by the fact that the muster rolls were rarely written in English. Some of the musters for expeditions are composed in Latin and the names thus Latinised. A few lists are in English; occasionally the incipits and excipits are in Latin or French but the soldiers' names are given in English. Such rolls were probably compiled by English scribes. But the vast majority of rolls, and virtually all those produced in Normandy after 1421, are in French and were compiled by French scribes, who Frenchified all names. Some Englishmen thus appear by their forenames to be French and it is difficult to identify genuine Normans or French by name evidence alone.

By themselves, therefore, names can be suggestive, but do not provide definitive proof, of the non-English origins of some of the soldiers. Other factors can be applied to give substance to assumptions based upon a study of the names. The first is the context in which non-English names appear. When several soldiers with apparently foreign names are found in the retinue of a known non-English captain then it is likely that they are indeed drawn from the same area as their captain. This is particularly obvious in the case of the Welsh. It also applies to the retinues of the handful of Gascon, French and Norman captains in English service.

In our study of the nationality of soldiers a second factor is of considerable help, although, as we shall see, it gives rise to further dilemmas. This is the fact that at certain junctures the Lancastrian administration in Northern France saw fit to make efforts to ascertain and record the nationality of those serving in garrison. As a result,

some musters provide alongside the name of the soldier an indication of his nationality. The first major initiative to record nationality seems to have been made in 1430. Up to that point there is little evidence of concern about the nationality of troops. None of the musters for expeditions between 1415 and 1450 provide details of this sort although occasionally they give place origins or associations within England for soldiers who share a common surname. Newhall discovered references to nationality in only two pre-1430 documents. The first is the muster of the garrison of Argentan taken on 9 October 1423, where Normans and Gascons are marked.⁷ The second is a warrant for the payment of Sir Lancelot de Lisle, whose retinue was to join in France with the earl of Salisbury's expeditionary army during the Orléans campaign in 1428. Here it was ordered that all of de Lisle's troops should be natives of England, save for ten French men-at-arms whom he was permitted to keep.⁸ I have discovered two further references. The muster of the garrison of Dreux, on the eastern frontier of Normandy, of 23 June 1424 seems to denote one foot man-at-arms as Gascon. The term appears to be given as 'g'scon', although this may be a misreading of an abbreviation for 'prisonnier', the hand being rather unclear.⁹ There can be no doubt, however, of the noting of six men-at-arms as Gascon in a muster of the retinue of Sir Thomas Rempston on 8 August 1428. This company, like that of de Lisle, formed part of the 1,600 strong force raised in English France to join with the earl of Salisbury's expeditionary army.¹⁰ In none of the four documents is there any explanation of why nationality was an issue of concern, but the fact that two of the documents relate to the same campaign implies that there may have been some interest at this point in restricting or at least noting the service of non-English. Yet such limited recording in a period which is fairly well-served by the survival of musters suggests that it was scarcely an issue at the forefront of the minds of commanders and administrators in Lancastrian France. Why should it have become so in 1430?

To answer this we need to consider other changes which were made to recruitment procedures in the previous year. The inclusion of a new clause in the captains' indentures of October 1429 is the first indication of concern over the eligibility of men for garrison service. A ban was explicitly placed upon the recruitment of any who held the party of the enemy or who had been received into royal obedience only recently. The fear of treason from within was the motivating factor behind the inclusion of this clause. It reveals the precarious position

in which the English found themselves following the raising of the siege of Orléans in May 1429. Joan of Arc's success at Orléans had disrupted the English advance. Her victory in battle at Patay on 18 June ended eight years of English military supremacy. A month later she enabled Charles to be crowned at Reims, thus undermining the English political position too. Much of the territory to the south and east of Paris had fallen to Charles. The English had been shown to be vulnerable. This heartened those who were opposed, whether clandestinely or openly, to English rule. At the same time it made the English more sensitive, even in Normandy, to both actual and potential resistance.¹¹ There was certainly an upsurge in treasonable activities against the English at this point. The English thought it prudent not only to take precautions but also to make a show of their strength, by both means revealing their intention to maintain and perpetuate the dual monarchy.¹² So additional troops were brought into the garrisons. The young Henry VI was installed in Rouen from May 1430 whilst arrangements were made for his coronation in Paris. The King's presence in the Norman capital forced further defensive precautions to be taken; amongst other measures, a night-time patrol of four archers was established around the walls of Rouen. In the light of the present discussion it is most significant that these archers were explicitly required to be English.¹³

The ban from October 1429 on the recruitment of those who were suspected of being pro-Dauphinist or who had only recently come into Lancastrian obedience was implicitly a restriction on garrison service by French and Normans.¹⁴ Not until March 1430, however, is a case of an explicit ban on the recruitment of non-English evidenced. On 24 March 1430 the order to muster the garrison of Meulan, then standing at 80 men and captained by Sir Richard Merbury, restricted his retinue to 'tous anglois et natifs du royaume d'Angleterre'. It additionally required the musterers to 'prendre surement en tel cas accoustume que ilz soient tous natifs dudit royaume d'Angleterre et de la retenue dudit chevalier audit lieu et non dautres garnison et retenue'.¹⁵ The inclusion of the phrase 'en tel cas accoustume' implies that this was not an unprecedented procedure, although we have no definitive evidence on how it had been operated previously. The other concern, that only those formally part of Merbury's retinue at Meulan should be accepted, acted as a further check; it prevented the service of those who were not already known to the captain and his officials - an embryonic form of security clearance - as well as helping to discourage deserters from

other garrisons moving from one place to another at will, or from receiving pay twice. This restriction on recruitment, or something very like it, is found in several other contexts over the course of the 1420s.¹⁶ As for the clause on nationality, this is the only known example at this juncture. The restriction was apparently specific to Meulan, although it is possible that it was also required of other garrisons by orders which have not survived. None of the extant musters for this quarter show any indication of concern for nationality. It is particularly unfortunate that the muster for Meulan, taken as a result of the order of 24 March, is not now extant.

We are in a better position when it comes to the next known case of concern over the nationality of those in garrison service, for here both an order to muster and the resulting muster roll survive. On 9 June 1430 the order to muster the garrison of Pontoise allowed the service of men who were not 'de la nascion dAngleterre ou du pays subgiet du Royaume dAngleterre', but it instructed the commissioners that 'ou cas que aucunes dautres nascions seroient presentez ausdictes monstres les marquez en tete'.¹⁷ This is the first known order to record the nationality of foreign troops, the latter being defined as those not of England or of its subject territories. (Although not explicitly stated in this document, these subject territories can be deduced from other evidence to be Gascony, Wales and Ireland. This point will be investigated further when the concept of nationality is discussed.) The musterers were also required to mark and inquire into any of those of the 'nascion dAngleterre' who were 'manans, habitans et tenans messuages, faisans mestiers ou marchandises audit lieu'. The muster was duly taken.¹⁸ Fifteen men-at-arms and 24 archers (out of a total garrison establishment of 45 men-at-arms and 186 archers captained by Robert, Lord Willoughby) had 'françois' placed against their names. One man-at-arms, Jean l'Alemant, was noted as *allmand*. In addition, two men-at-arms and three archers were described as 'anglais mais vivans a Pontoise', and three French archers were noted as 'mariés', most likely to local girls, because they are also said to be 'tous demourans mesnagiers en la dicte ville de Pontoise'.¹⁹

It seems that the special instructions issued to the musterers of Meulan in March and of Pontoise in June were *ad hoc*, and unique to those places.²⁰ None of the other extant orders to muster of this period contain similar arrangements.²¹ The concern with nationality and with the local connections of soldiers was apparently regionally specific. It focussed on the garrisons in this strategically significant area close to

Paris - an area where English control was vulnerable and where local opinion was perhaps more potentially hostile to English rule than it was in the heartlands of Normandy.²² It was thus essential to guard against treasonable activities. This could explain the concern to know if any soldiers at Pontoise had local connections. Such links might lay them open to persuasion or pressure from anti-English elements or could make them turn a blind eye to acts of resistance by their local friends and associates. At worst, it might encourage acts of treason within the garrison itself.²³

There were other reasons, perhaps, for concern over the nationality and local interests of troops in this key area of the *pays de conquête*. The English authorities had to make sure that troops were performing their duties in garrison properly. They may well have feared that soldiers pursuing non-military activities would experience too many distractions thus preventing their full involvement in training or in garrison activities. The same might have been feared of those soldiers who were French, particularly if they were from the vicinity of the garrisons. The Pontoise muster does not allow us to know whether they were local men or not, recording them only as *français*, although two have the surname 'le Bourguignon', one is called 'de Nevers' and another 'de Givry', both places under Burgundian control.

Muster roll evidence from the garrisons of this area in the 1430s and 40s suggests that they contained larger numbers and proportions of non-English troops than did the garrisons in Normandy. In December 1438, for instance, the garrison of Mantes had amongst its men-at-arms an *allmand*, an *espagnol*, a *portugais*, a *lombard*, 11 French and 19 Gascons.²⁴ This is a measure of English military needs in the area. From the summer of 1429 onwards strategic considerations dictated that very large garrisons be maintained in the *pays de conquête* and around Paris, larger than most, although not all, of the those in Normandy. The garrisons in this area housed what were effectively front-line troops, all the more so after 1436 when the loss of Paris transformed them into genuine frontier installations. It was frequently necessary to reinforce these garrisons temporarily by detailing troops into them from the expeditionary armies sent from England. At least 300 of the army brought over by Sir Richard Woodville in the summer of 1439 were sent to Pontoise for the last three months of their indentures (September to December).²⁵ The musters of Pontoise during October and November show the recruitment into the garrison of a number of French and Gascon men-at-arms to substitute for those

'defaillans' (lacking) from the expeditionary army.²⁶ At the same time it was permitted that 20 men of any nation could be placed in Pontoise 'pour estre cannoniers, macons, pionniers, charpentiers, artillereurs, fevres et batelliers'.²⁷ A major means of ensuring that there were enough troops in the area seems to have been to recruit soldiers who were not of English nationality. Perhaps too the area was well known to wandering mercenary soldiers as offering plenty of opportunity for employment. One might even suggest that Englishmen preferred the calmer waters of the Norman heartlands and were reluctant to serve on this frontier. Non-English troops were thus more prominent in the *pays de conquête*, but their service, whilst militarily vital, raised some concern in English minds which the recording of nationality was aimed at allaying.

Newhall interpreted the special instructions at Meulan and Pontoise as 'exploratory moves'.²⁸ He suggested that as a result of the outcome of this pilot scheme, the restrictions on recruitment were extended in September 1430 to the rest of the English-held garrisons in Normandy and the *pays de conquête*. The situation is slightly more complicated than he suggested. On 10 September 1430 commissioners were instructed to take a secret and simultaneous muster of all garrisons on 26 September.²⁹ On the issue of nationality their instructions were as follows: 'sans y recevoir toutesvoies pour ceste foiz aucun sil nest de la nation d'Angleterre yrois galois ou guiennois car ainsi fut il par nous derreneirement ordonne'.³⁰ In addition they were not to accept anyone 'soit anglois ou autres qui seroit resident es bonnes villes et y tenant mesuage et domicile a cause de merchandise ou faisant fais de mestiers ou merchandise'. The terminology of this document raises several interesting points. First, the last phrase of the clause concerning nationality implies that there had been an earlier, duchy-wide instruction before 10 September on this issue, yet no such order has been found save for those noted above for specific garrisons. A second point of interest is that the order of 10 September, as indeed that of June concerning Pontoise, had been issued from Rouen by the royal council of Henry VI and not by the Regent of France, John, duke of Bedford. During the king's presence in France the authority of Bedford, who had previously exercised control over both civilian and military matters, was effectively suspended. The order of 10 September was one of a number of 'reforms' which the royal council applied to the military sphere. Their actions testify to the perceived vulnerability

of the English position following French advances in 1429-30 and perhaps to an implicit criticism of Bedford's previous methods.

A third point of interest is that the order of 10 September on was not carried out to the letter. Its terms prohibited the service of those who were not English or from the territories subject to England. Yet the muster taken at Avranches on 26 September listed one *allmand* amongst the men-at-arms, with a Picard, a Breton and 12 Normans amongst the archers, and there is no indication that their service was disallowed.³¹ None of the other surviving muster rolls of this date record any foreigners at all, so perhaps commissioners elsewhere were more zealous in the performance of their duties than those acting at Avranches. The latter was always a large garrison by Norman standards, so perhaps foreign troops had to be tolerated here as in the *pays de conquête* in order to keep the establishment up to full strength.

It was, however, the line taken at Avranches rather than the terms of the 10 September order which became accepted English policy thenceforward. This can be seen by examining the terms of indentures for garrison captaincies issued by the royal council with effect from Michaelmas 1430.³² In some of those which survive, it was laid down that half of the men-at-arms in garrisons could be French or Norman, but all of the archers had to be English, Irish, Welsh or Gascon. Captains were also banned from recruiting in the neighbourhood of their garrison, although the exact extent of 'neighbourhood' was not defined. The indentures also introduced a ban on the recruitment of those who held lands in Normandy by royal grant. The clauses of 10 September concerning the recruitment of householders, artisans and traders were reiterated, although exceptions were made for craftsmen working in the military sphere, such as armourers, bowyers and fletchers. All of the indenture clauses reflect concerns similar to those identified in the cases of Meulan and Pontoise earlier in the year, although the whole matter was now being put on a more formal footing. The authorities were largely motivated by fears of treasonable activity in the garrisons if too many natives were recruited. The restrictions were also aimed at making the garrisons more professional and at distancing them from the population they surveilled. The ban on those with land grants was included because such grantees usually had defensive obligations arising out of their land tenure which service in garrison might prevent them from fulfilling.³³

A further point of interest about the indenture restrictions is the adoption of a different line towards men-at-arms as opposed to archers. Why was it deemed acceptable to have French or Norman men-at-arms yet not archers of these nationalities? Some tentative suggestions can be advanced. Perhaps men-at-arms, usually coming from higher in the social scale than archers, were seen as more reliable and as having a more elevated sense of honour, and thus less likely to be clandestine supporters of Charles VII. Perhaps the English authorities felt that they could not run the risk of offending their higher status Norman and French supporters by excluding them from military employment as men-at-arms. There was perhaps less of a tradition of archery amongst the Normans and French. In this context it is interesting to note that when the inhabitants of the seigneuries of Briquessart, Torigny and Saint Cler petitioned for 10 archers to defend them against the activities of brigands, they specifically requested them to be 'natifs du pais dAngleterre'.³⁴

It is difficult to see how one could prove any of these suggestions. The variations in ratios may simply reflect the relative availability of soldiers of different kinds. Thus if it was proving easy to find enough archers from England, Ireland, Wales and Gascony then it would be feasible to ban the recruitment of French and Norman archers. If the home countries could not provide enough men-at-arms, then the residue would have to be recruited locally to keep the garrisons up to required strength and to maintain what was seen as the optimum ratio of one man-at-arms to three archers. It would therefore be foolish to ban native men-at-arms completely, particularly at a time when a large garrison establishment was needed.

In this context it is interesting to note a subsequent change in the proportions of non-English allowed. In October 1434 the relevant clause in captains' indentures was amended to allow one-eighth of the entire retinue to be French. This seems to have remained the basis of English policy on the nationality of troops right to the end of the occupation. As Newhall notes, an eighth was effectively the same proportion of foreigners as permitted in the 1430 indentures, but the quota was from 1434 being applied to men-at-arms and archers indiscriminately.³⁵ The fact that French archers were now acceptable may reveal a growing shortage of archers from the home countries. It could be, of course, that the English felt themselves to be more secure in 1434 than they had done four years earlier. Certainly Charles VII's advance had not been extended much beyond that of 1430. The English

military position was now less threatened, although by no means totally secure. It seems too that the 1434 clause removed restrictions on the service of Normans (as opposed to French), thus placing them on equal footing with the English, Irish, Welsh and Gascons. This may have been part of a wider desire to exploit the military potential of the local population. Around the same time the Norman peasantry were once more permitted to carry arms and were organised into groups for the defence of the countryside.³⁶ The trust which was put in the Normans at this point proved to be ill placed, for within the next eighteen months peasant rebellion and local acts of treason had led to the loss of most of the Pays de Caux.

The indentures of 1430 did not explicitly require the recording of nationality, but in effect this was the only means by which the proportion of non-English serving in a garrison could be established. When another secret muster was ordered in March 1431, commissioners were required to record the 'nation' of the soldiers. In practice, what tended to happen here and in subsequent musters was that they recorded the nationality only of those *not* of England or of her subject territories. All of the orders concentrated on the exclusion of the French. None of them said anything about soldiers coming from further afield, but, as we shall see, the nationality of such men were also noted in the muster rolls. In theory, therefore, the policy on nationality from the end of 1430 ought to reveal in the muster rolls those soldiers who were foreign. Unfortunately the situation is not so straightforward. Regulations concerning the nationality of troops were neither universally nor consistently applied between 1430 and 1450. Moreover, there was much confusion over terminology and over other aspects of recording. Indeed it is difficult to reconstruct the implementation of policy from the surviving indentures, the orders to muster and the musters themselves. One is tempted to conclude that there may never have been one single policy for the whole of the English-held area. It may never have been intended to record nationality at every muster but rather to operate 'spot checks'. Indeed it is quite common to find one muster noting the nationality of 'foreign' troops, but that of the next quarter failing to do so, even though there was little change of personnel in between. Erratic survival of the documents makes it difficult to come to categorical conclusions, but certain observations can be advanced.

First of all, we can see that the clauses on nationality were not enforced consistently over the period from 1430 to 1450. As said, we

are at the mercy of the rate of survival of the musters themselves, and it may be this, rather than actual changes in policy, which now cloud our judgment. But, bearing this factor in mind, it is still possible to suggest certain broad chronological trends. After initial rigour in the recording of nationality during the king's visit (1430-32), interest in the matter appears to tail off. Recording seems to become rigorous again when the earl of Warwick was lieutenant general between November 1437 and April 1439. The interim council which ruled Normandy after Warwick's death until the arrival of York in 1441 seems to have maintained a high level of attention to the matter. These years witnessed a greater suspicion of foreigners, both in England and in English-held France.³⁷ In both areas this stance was largely occasioned by the defection of the duke of Burgundy from his English alliance at the end of 1435. When Paris fell to Charles VII in the following year the English found themselves increasingly on the defensive, and with little territory under their control outside Normandy. Fear of local collusion with the enemy increased. In May 1436 the Frenchman Louis Oursel was booted out of his lieutenancy at Vernon as a traitor. Two years later his compatriot, Sir Guillaume de Bourneville, was dismissed from the garrison of Pontoise. These men had served the English for some time: they are both listed amongst the French men-at-arms in the Pontoise muster roll of June 1430, which was, as we saw, one of the first to record nationality.³⁸ The frequency of recording diminishes in the time of the duke of York's lieutenancy from 1441 to 1445. The interim council which ruled Normandy between York's departure and the arrival of Edmund Beaufort in 1448 seems to have applied the rules more zealously, not only recording nationality with greater consistency but also noting defaults in equipment and residence. Their measures reflect the difficult task of maintaining garrison standards in a period of truce.

Secondly, certain regional variations in the level of recording also suggest themselves.³⁹ The controls on nationality seem to have been more frequently imposed in Upper compared with Lower Normandy, although there is no marked difference between the two areas in respect of the numbers of musters surviving. As noted earlier, the matter received particular attention in the garrisons of the *pays de conquête*, as it also seems to have done at Gournay and Neufchâtel on the north-eastern frontier. Nationality was also recorded with reasonable frequency at Rouen, a place which housed many soldiers both as garrison and in transit. In the summer of 1437, for instance, the wages

of four archers were held back by the officials of the Norman *chambre des comptes*. These archers were said to be 'norman or of other nations' and were serving in excess of the eighth of a retinue permitted to be non-English.⁴⁰ These concerns reflect English awareness of the need to hold key strategic and political centres safely, as well as showing the relative insecurity of the northern and eastern frontiers of the duchy. To this, however, we must add a further explanation. The recording of nationality was undoubtedly affected by the preferences and bureaucratic styles of local administrators, such as the commissioners who were instructed to take the musters and the clerks who wrote them out. Some seem to have been keener to record nationality than others. This personal element in the level of recording is also reflected by the use of differing forms of spelling and of diverse terminologies for the various nationalities, as will be revealed subsequently.

Thirdly, mention must be made of certain oddities. The administration of the nationality clauses was not fixed in stone. Like other aspects of medieval government there was much flexibility in its application. Exceptions could be made on an *ad hoc* basis, particular to the situation or to the individual. In the case of the four Rouen archers cited above, payment was finally allowed to the captain, John Lord Talbot. After all, the four archers had already effected their service; garrison wages were paid quarterly in arrears. Talbot may have already felt obliged to pay them out of his own pocket. Whatever the case it was not deemed politic to refuse him their wages on a permanent basis. Similarly it seems to have been difficult to dictate to foreign captains about the nationality of their troops. In December 1432, for instance, the *receveur général* Pierre Surreau, himself a Norman, was allowed to take his escort retinue of one man-at-arms and three archers 'de telle nation que lui plaira'.⁴¹ Not a single muster of the garrisons and companies serving under the Aragonese Sir Francois de Surienne indicate nationality, although the surnames of his men suggest many French, Gascon and Spanish elements present. It should also be noted that his companies followed the French practice of having one man-at-arms to every archer rather than the English ratio of one to three.⁴² These were most certainly troops which he himself had recruited and brought into English royal service. The musters of Sir Guillaume Broullart, a Frenchman who captained Dreux for the English in the 1430s only rarely indicate nationality but seem to include many French names. Even in 1431 there was no requirement for the musterers of his garrison to note nationality, and in 1435 the

additional troops under his command were permitted to be either French or English.⁴³ Broullart defected to the French in 1438 taking his garrison with him; he is subsequently found in command of Dreux for the French.⁴⁴ Where surnames suggest the service of Gascons in the retinues of captains from that area, such as Sir Bernard de Montferrant and Sir Lewis Despo, nationality is again rarely marked; this is presumably due to the fact that Gascony was considered one of the 'pays subgiet dAngleterre', and its inhabitants acceptable without restrictions. On the other hand, some musterers did consider it proper to record the presence of Gascons.

On occasion the nationality of troops serving in garrison was subject to further restrictions. In April 1436, for instance, it was ordered that exclusively English troops should be kept in La Roche Guyon, and, interestingly, in Dreux.⁴⁵ Recent French successes had rendered these places very vulnerable and all efforts had to be made to limit the possibility of their loss. The same notion no doubt lay behind the order to limit the garrison of Mantes to 'anglois, galois, irois ou gascons' in 1432.⁴⁶ In October 1434 most of the frontier garrisons in both Upper and Normandy had installed in them special mounted companies 'pour les champs'. Their principal functions were to patrol the surrounding area and to act as an immediately available force in the case of French incursions, although they also served to reinforce the garrisons themselves. It seems that their composition was generally restricted to men of English, or English-associated, origin. Garrison controllers, too, were normally required to be English.⁴⁷

Fourthly, there was much confusion and inconsistency over the matter of recording. The incipit of the muster of Gisors of August 1430 claimed that 'sont marques en cest ceux qui sont de la nation dAngleterre' but in fact it was the French who were marked.⁴⁸ Procedures can be seen to vary from one muster to the next. In one quarter a men might be described as being of a certain nationality, in the next quarter the muster might make no mention of the fact. The latter muster might even go so far as to claim that all the retinue were English! Similarly there are many men in garrison with non-English sounding names who do not have any foreign nationality ascribed to them. This was particularly true for the Welsh, where admittedly the need to record was dubious, but many of likely Norman or French origin also seem to go unmarked. On occasion, however, the musterers saw fit to include more detailed information on the issue,

such as the town or area of origin. The muster of the garrison in the palace of Rouen in December 1446 notes five archers from the Norman capital itself, implying that the ban on the recruitment of locals was no longer being adhered to, although it never seems to have been formally abolished.⁴⁹ Other Norman archers in this muster are described as being of Harfleur, Louviers, Harcourt, Rugles, and Vernon. A Norman man-at-arms is merely given the label 'du Cotentin'. There are two Frenchmen, a man-at-arms from near Chartres and an archer from Beauvais, and there is an archer from Lorraine who is also dubbed 'cannonier et arblastier (crossbowman)'. Additional occupations of soldiers are also sometimes given in musters. In this Rouen palace muster, there are archers described as *boulangier* (baker), *barbier* (barber), and *forgeur* (smith). Amongst the archers at Harfleur in 1431 are found a Norman *flechier* (arrow-maker) and five Germans, a *oisseau* (fowler or porter?), a *cousturier* (cutler or seamster?), a *tonnelier* (barrel-maker), and two *brasseurs* (brewers). In addition, one of the foot men-at arms was a German *riseur*.⁵⁰ In the case of Englishmen even the county of origin is sometimes given, but the provision of such detailed information of this kind is, sadly, infrequent. Once again we are at the mercy of the foibles of individual scribes and musters.

Fifthly, the recording of nationality was restricted to the garrisons and to the personal retinues of commanders.⁵¹ None of the musters of armies in the field indicate nationality, presumably because the danger of treason lay primarily in the towns and castles where garrisons were installed. Although the warrant to pay William Bonville, who had indentured to serve as seneschal of Gascony in December 1442, required him to have all of his 21 men-at-arms and 600 archers 'neez d'Angleterre',⁵² there is no record of nationality in the musters of expeditionary armies to northern France. That is not to say, of course, that all the members of such armies were Englishmen. Laying siege in March 1427 to Pontorson (situated on the Norman mainland just south of Mont Saint Michel), the earl of Warwick ordered the raising of 300 archers in the nearby Channel Islands.⁵³ This was aimed at boosting his numbers and at providing replacements for those in the army he had led from England in the previous year but who had subsequently deserted. Unfortunately no muster of such a force of archers survives, and a Channel Islands origin is never indicated in any of the garrison musters. During the fifteenth-century wars, protections are found for a handful of French, three Italians, two Flemings and a

Dane, although it is difficult to prove that such men were crossing to France on military service.⁵⁴ If surnames are a valid guide then the expeditionary musters do suggest the presence of some foreigners. In the muster of the expeditionary army of 1417, for instance there are two Low Germans, identified by the name element 'van', but what one is to make of the nationality of someone named Martin van Gerrards Cross or Wenneslow van Shoho (Soho?) is rather problematic!⁵⁵ It warns us once again of the dangers of taking foreign names at face value.

Despite the many inconsistencies and problems noted above, the annotations on the muster rolls for garrisons in Normandy and in the *pays de conquête* remain our best source for the study of foreign troops in English pay. What, then, are the nationalities they record? The database reveals 18 different nationalities given for men-at-arms in the muster rolls. In the most frequently found spellings (with modern equivalents provided where necessary), these are; *norman*, *francois*, *gascon*, *breton*, *bourguignon* (Burgundian), *picard*, *pictavian* (from Poitou), *hainault*, *savoyard*, *irois* (Irish), *lombard*, *espagnol* (Spanish), *portugais* (Portuguese), *allmand* (German), *dutchman* (probably also signifying German origins), *gallois* (Welsh), and *anglois* (English).⁵⁶ We shall not comment on those to whom the description of *anglois* is given for such recording was no more than an administrative aberration. The same is true for the Welsh. Surname evidence indicates that they served in large numbers yet only 38 individuals are marked as *gallois* in the muster rolls. Only at Rouen, Neufchâtel and Tancarville is such recording found.

'Norman' is most frequently found. We can identify 211 separate individuals to whom this description is given. They are found in a wide variety of garrisons in both Upper and lower Normandy, but most frequently at Gournay, Pont de l'Arche, Evreux and Rouen. They are never listed as present at Mantes or Pontoise despite the fact that these garrisons often contained many non-English. It is interesting to speculate that this was the result of a conscious policy of exclusion. It is possible, however, that the musterers at these locations did not see any need to record the presence of Normans, so that their service went unmarked. Many Normans served as foot rather than as mounted men-at-arms. Some saw long and continuous periods of service. Jean Baillart, for instance, served at Gournay for at least eight years (1438-46) under three successive captains. Michel Durant may have been in service even longer for he is found at Evreux from 1435 to 1439 and at

Vernon in 1449. The muster evidence suggests that there were still several Normans in the garrisons in the late 1440s. At least some local men, amongst them a handful of Norman knights, saw military service to the English as attractive and potentially lucrative.⁵⁷

The next most numerous are the French, with 76 individuals identified. They appear to have been equally likely to serve as foot or as mounted men-at-arms. According to the annotations in the muster rolls their service seems to have been confined to Upper Normandy and to the *pays de conquête*, most notably at Mantes. Only one muster for Lower Normandy, that of an additional troop lodged in Bayeux in 1448, notes the presence of a Frenchman, Jacquet de Brucelles, whose name provokes immediate problems.

Fifty-eight Gascons are so identified in the rolls. Again their service is mainly noted in the garrisons of Upper Normandy and *pays de conquête*, although they are also found at Essay on the southern frontier of Lower Normandy. Mantes saw particularly large groups; the muster for December 1438 notes the presence of 19 Gascons, with 16 listed in that of the following June. Only 11 names are common to both musters, implying that there was a fair degree of troop movement and that it was not difficult to find other Gascons to take the place of those who left the garrison. One of the men listed in the December 1438 muster had been marked as Gascon when serving under Sir Thomas Rempston in the Orléans campaign of 1428, one of the earliest musters to record nationality.

Only at Evreux was the appellation *breton* cited and then only for one man-at-arms, Sir Pierre de Breton. It is highly likely, however, that a study of toponymics would reveal other men with Breton names. A similar conclusion is tenable for the Burgundians where again only one definite citation is found, that of Ymbelot de Rouveray, a mounted man-at-arms in the garrison of Conches in November 1438. If his name is indication of his origins, then he came from near Arras. It may be, therefore, that other musterers preferred to use the term *picard* to describe men from this area which was largely under Burgundian domination, although it is interesting to note that the men-at-arms mustered alongside Ymbelot de Rouveray included a *picard*. On this occasion at least, the musterers felt justified in distinguishing Burgundian from *picard*. The *picard* at Conches in November 1438 is similarly described at Verneuil in July 1439. Altogether, seven *picards* are recorded in seven different garrisons. The majority of these were the frontier posts of the north and north-east,

such as Arques, Eu and Gournay, but *picards* are also found at Alençon and Vire. In the latter location, John Darcy, scarcely a name reeking of *picard* origins, is described also as 'cannonier' and marshal of the horses of the captain, Thomas, Lord Scales. A further warning on the problems of toponymics is that William le Picart, serving at Mantes in 1438 and 1439, was noted as French.

All of the men-at-arms noted as being from Hainault are found serving in the garrison of Gournay under Sir James Ormond in 1442. Three individuals can be identified, all mounted, of whom two served in two musters (March and July).⁵⁸ Similarly all of the four *savoyards* (also given as *savoysin*) are found at Gournay under the same captain. Two appear in the muster of March 1442, and two in that of July, but only one man, Jean dit Lunnoy, served on both occasions. These musters also include a small number of Normans and Gascons. It seems, therefore, that Gournay had quite a cosmopolitan garrison at this stage, or else that a close check was being kept upon the nationality of its members. The recording may simply be the result of one musterer's obsession with such matters. It is hard to believe that Gournay was the only place to contain Hainaulters and *savoyards*. Similarly, it is unlikely that the only Irish in English service were the four noted at Pontaudemer in 1445 and 1447 under Sir John Salvain, yet no other muster has been discovered which records the presence of Irish men-at-arms.⁵⁹

Six Lombards are revealed in the database, three bearing the surname 'Le Lombart'. Two further names may be toponymic - Le Breche (Brescia?) and Dasse (Assisi?). Lombards are noted only in the garrisons of Mantes, Rouen, Evreux and Tancarville. Four *espagnols* are noted: it is interesting that this general term was used instead of more specific references to Castilian, Aragonese or Navarrese origins. Three of the *espagnols* are found at Evreux. One bears the name William d'Espagne. Another, Michel Louppes, is noted as *espagnol* in the musters of the Evreux garrison of December 1438 and March 1439 but in the musters taken there during 1432, 1433 and 1435 he is described as Gascon. A man of the same name is noted as Gascon in the muster of Gisors in 1448. Two *portugais* are noted, Alphonse Dalbank at Honfleur in 1431, and Bonson at Mantes in 1438. The Poitevin, Hemeclyn Flayn, is noted at Essay in 1431.

Twelve *allmands* are noted, eight serving as foot. They are widely distributed, being found in ten garrisons stretching from Arques and Pontoise to Cherbourg and Avranches. Eight *dutchmen* are found, but

only in the rolls of Neufchâtel and Rouen, and of the personal retinue of Talbot in December 1448 which was mustered at Rouen. Six served as foot, and two were described as brothers. In the Middle English of this period both *allmand* and *dutchman* signified German origins. It may be that the first was applied to men from the imperial lands proper, and the second to those from the Low Countries who technically fell under imperial control. This may explain, perhaps, the slightly curious fact that the muster rolls do not record any soldiers of Flemish or other Low Country origins.⁶⁰ However, the term 'Dutch' as a name for the inhabitants of the Netherlands did not become common English usage until the late sixteenth century. It is also worth noting that a Laurens de Brucelles was described in a muster as *allmand* rather than *dutchman*. It may be, therefore, that the use of these different terms was merely the result of the musterers own preferences. The fact that the term *dutchman* is found only at Rouen and Neufchatel, places where there is no record of the service of *allmands*, gives further credence to this possibility. It is also feasible that the terms reflect the mother tongue of the musterers and scribes, in that Norman officials would have used *allmand* whereas English officials could have used either *allmand* or *dutchman*.

In no way do the records of nationality on the muster rolls give us a complete picture of the service of foreigners. A study of the database shows that many marked on one or more occasion as being of a particular nationality served on others without so being marked. The database will allow fuller service records to be examined but this will be a time-consuming activity even with computer assistance. As in all biographical work of the medieval period there are major problems in identifying individuals. The rolls suggest that some foreigners served alongside others of the same origins, implying that they may have moved around in groups, perhaps accompanied by archers who were also their compatriots. More research is also required on this topic, although it is worth pointing out that some foreign men-at-arms certainly seem to have been serving alone. It is difficult to say whether any served as a result of English royal alliances with foreign rulers.⁶¹ German allies had provided some troops to Henry V in 1421-2 and may have done so in the mid-1430s but connections between these arrangements and the noting of Germans in the rolls cannot be established. As we have seen, some foreigners, most notably those marked as German, were serving as military technicians, such as *cannoniers*. Allmand has already noted the presence of 'gunmaistres de

les parties d'Almaigne' in the English army in this period.⁶² We are at a great disadvantage in that the muster rolls of the retinue of the master of the ordnance in Normandy never record nationality. They most certainly contain men whose names indicate non-English origins. In 1436, for instance, a Philip de Lorin (Lorraine?) served as master artillerer, a Jacobus Dalleman as cannonier and a John de Namur as 'varlet cannonier'.⁶³ But we must beware of thinking that such expertise was the main reason foreigners were recruited or that all such specialist positions were held by them. Many non-Englishmen seem to be enrolled simply as men-at-arms or archers, and there are plenty of Englishmen who served as military technicians.

Although the musters never provide a complete picture of nationality there can be no doubt that non-English troops were in the minority. As we have seen, some nations provided only a handful. Where this was the case, these foreigners must have been quite distinctive and easily recognisable. It is interesting to note how many were recorded by a nickname.⁶⁴ A study of the recording of nationality in the rolls suggests, however, that concepts of nationality were by no means clear cut. It is clear, for instance, that the framers of the regulations intended that the nationality should be noted only in the case of those who were not English or of 'pays subgiet d'Angleterre'. Yet some musterers and their clerks clearly saw fit to note the nationality of men who fell into these unrestricted groups. At Gournay in February 1438, for instance, the appellation 'anglois ou gallois' was used, although it has not been found in any other muster.⁶⁵ On occasion men born in England were distinguished from those of the subject territories of Wales, Ireland and Gascony. This paralleled the distinctions drawn in English legal practice at this time. The Welsh and Irish were still seen as identifiably different in law, although the trend was for these distinctions to be eroded. The Welsh, for instance, were not included in the taxes on aliens in 1440-42 although the Irish were. By 1449, however, the Irish, along with those born in the English-held lands in Normandy and Gascony were deemed exempt from such taxes.⁶⁶

The position of the Gascons was problematic. The omission of any mention of Gascony (or indeed of Calais) in the Treaty of Troyes implies that these areas were not seen by Henry as part of the kingdom of France which he was now inheriting, but as the property of the kings of England by virtue of the settlement of 1360. Gascony was thus, like Ireland and Wales, still a 'pays subgiet au royaume

d'Angleterre' even after 1420. The Gascons were not seen as French, yet some commissioners saw fit to record their presence. Likewise they were foreign enough to need letters of denization should they wish to settle and hold property in England, as indeed some chose to do when the French overran Gascony in 1451-53.⁶⁷

The Gascons, Welsh and Irish were undoubtedly seen as different from other 'foreign' elements. They did not have their own 'nation'; they were men of 'pays' which were attached to England although not technically part of it. Normans were never seen in this way for Normandy was unequivocally part of France. Although Henry V intended to keep it in his own hands until he became French king, it was to be reunited with France once he (or as it happened, his son) ruled both kingdoms. Thus the 1430 moves concerning nationality did not give any special place to the Normans as opposed to the French, although those of 1434 seem to have relaxed restrictions on the recruitment of Normans. Even so, both before and after 1434 commissioners often do denote French and Normans separately.⁶⁸

There are, however, many confusions. At least three men-at-arms are said to be Norman on one occasion but French on another. Some men noted as Gascon at Mantes in December 1438 are described as French in the same garrison in June 1439.⁶⁹ At least one soldier is called Gascon in one roll and *espagnol* in another, and one of the *dutchmen* is elsewhere described as Norman. The surname 'de Brucelles' might entitle its holder to be either French or *dutch*; those called 'le Picard' might be described as French or Picard. The recording of nationality was governed by the concepts in the minds of those doing the recording. 'English' was perhaps the most nebulous term of all, for sometimes it was taken to include the Irish, Welsh and Gascons, yet sometimes commissioners saw fit to distinguish between these groups. It is difficult to interpret appellations such as that given to an archer of the Rouen palace garrison described as 'norman, filz danglois', or of a man-at-arms in Tombelaine 'repute comme anglois'.⁷⁰ The fact that many soldiers settled in Normandy, married native girls, bought or were granted property, became involved in local commerce and industry and established themselves as *bourgeois* must have clouded the question of nationality further. Did such men ever think of themselves as being anything other than English? What of their children born in the duchy who may never have seen England?⁷¹

At the end of the occupation the matter was finally settled one way or the other. Some became French ('s'est devenu français' as the texts

put it) although one wonders how long it took for them or their descendants to lose their English identity. There were several English war veterans, for instance, in the retinue of the French seneschal of Normandy, Pierre de Brezé, in July 1451.⁷² The majority of English, Irish, and Welsh must have returned home, however. We know that some Normans and Gascons came to England too, amongst them the women of those areas who had married English soldiers and administrators. At least one contemporary observer was highly suspicious of those 'men borne of this land' who had wives and children 'dwelling under the obeissance of our souverayn lordys adversaires', suspecting the latter of being 'but as spyes'.⁷³ It has often been suggested that warfare sharpened the concept of nationality. For the civilian population of England this may well be true, but for the soldiers of this period the situation was a lot less clear cut. The nature of the English occupation of Normandy, involving a conscious settlement policy, confused the issue. The muster rolls imply that the vast majority of soldiers in the armies of Henry V and VI were English; certainly neither king used as many foreign mercenaries as did Charles VI or VII. But there were some foreigners in English pay. The garrisons in the *pays de conquête* even have something of a cosmopolitan feel to them. There is some indication of the wandering soldier of fortune, and of the attractions of military service for the natives of Normandy and northern France. Perhaps in conclusion we may ponder whether Henry V's vision of ruling both England and France did not generate in part a quasi-dual nationality for those Englishmen who had long service in the wars and even for some of the inhabitants of the duchy of Normandy who had developed close links with their occupiers. Perhaps to the other problems of the expulsion of the English in 1450, therefore, we need to add that of a 'crisis' of nationality.

NOTES

¹ The compilation of this database has been made possible by a Personal Research Award from the British Academy and by a grant from the Research Endowment Fund of the University of Reading. I would like to express my gratitude to both bodies, and also to Miss Jane Medcalf, Mr Johnnie Harris and Miss Janine Iveson who had the difficult task of entering the data from my rather indecipherable notes. Thanks are also due to Dr Robert Massey for assistance in the project. The database was compiled on an Apple Macintosh system using Borland Reflex Plus. It is now being transferred to Borland Paradox 3.5 on an IBM-compatible system.

- ² There is a useful summary of the process in J.H. Wylie and W.T. Waugh, *The Reign of Henry the Fifth* (3 vols, Cambridge 1914-29), i, p.464.
- ³ The relevant rolls, all regrouped into E101 (Exchequer Accounts Various) are listed in the published *List and Index XXXV* (London 1912) pp.50-60, and in a typescript supplement thereto housed in the P(ublic) R(ecord) O(ffice).
- ⁴ R.A. Newhall, *Muster and Review. A Problem of English Military Administration 1420-1440* (Cambridge, Massachusetts 1940). See also his *The English Conquest of Normandy 1416-1424. A Study in Fifteenth Century Warfare* (Newhaven, Connecticut 1924), esp. chapter VI. Further discussion of the garrison system and expeditionary armies is to be found in my unpublished doctoral thesis, 'Military Organization in Lancastrian Normandy 1422-1450', Teesside Polytechnic/CNA, 1985.
- ⁵ See M. Nortier, 'Le sort des archives dispersées de la Chambre des Comptes', *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 123 (1965). I intend to examine the history of the archive in more detail elsewhere.
- ⁶ PRO C 76. The fourteenth-century rolls are partially calendared; protections for the early campaigns of Edward III are found in *Treaty Rolls*, vol. II (1337-39), ed. J. Ferguson (London 1972). The rolls for the reigns of Henry V and Henry VI, which also contain protections, are calendared in the *Annual Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records*, XLIV (1883) and XLVIII (1887).
- ⁷ London, B(ritish) L(ibrary) Add(itional) Ch(arter) 91, cited in Newhall, *Muster and Review*, p.116, n.263.
- ⁸ Rouen, Archives de la Seine Maritime, Fonds Danquin Supplement, Acquisition Millet, cited in Newhall, *Muster and Review*, pp.114-15.
- ⁹ Paris, B(ibliothèque) N(ationale) m(anuscrit)s fr(ançais) 26278/6.
- ¹⁰ BN ms fr 25768/291.
- ¹¹ See the comment made by the Hérault Berry, admittedly retrospectively, of Bedford's fears that there would be rebellion in Normandy in 1429 (*Chroniques du roi Charles VII, par Gilles le Bouvier, dit le Hérault Berry*, ed. H. Courteault, L. Celier and M-H. Jullien de Pommerol (Société de l'Histoire de France, Paris 1979), pp.140-41).
- ¹² On this period see C.T. Allmand, *Lancastrian Normandy, 1415-1450. The History of a Medieval Occupation* (Oxford 1983), pp.33-36, and Curry, 'Military Organization', pp.233-44.
- ¹³ BN Clairambault 157/42. An English garrison for the walls and gates of Rouen had first been established in November 1429, thus ending the arrangement established in 1425 whereby the townspeople had assumed responsibility for their defence (A. Chéruel, *Histoire de Rouen sous la domination anglaise au quinzième siècle* (Rouen 1840), vol. ii, pp.131-32).

- ¹⁴ It needs to be seen alongside attempts to prevent English landholders in the duchy disposing of their lands to other than fellow English (Allmand, *Lancastrian Normandy*, p.55).
- ¹⁵ BN ms fr 1482/79; Newhall, *Muster and Review*, p.115.
- ¹⁶ In 1423, for instance, captains were required to certify at the point of muster that their men were of their own retinue and not of anyone else's (BN ms fr 26046/36). Indentures for expeditionary service in 1425 (BL Stowe Ms 440 f.54), 1428 (J. Stevenson, *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Wars of the English in France during the reign of Henry the Sixth, King of England* (2 vols in 3, Rolls Series London 1861-64), i, pp.404-14) and 1429 (*Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England 1386-1542*, (7 vols, London 1834-37) ed. N.H. Nicolas, iii, pp.337-38) banned army commanders from recruiting men who had previously agreed to serve other captains or who were already serving in Normandy. See also B.J.H. Rowe, 'Discipline in the Norman Garrisons under Bedford, 1422-35', *English Historical Review*, 46 (1931).
- ¹⁷ BN ms fr 26053/1360, discussed in Newhall, *Muster and Review*, p.115.
- ¹⁸ BL Add Ch 11,663, discussed in Newhall, p.116.
- ¹⁹ My findings are slightly different from Newhall's, but having perused the document carefully, I am convinced that the numbers which I cite are correct. Newhall omitted to mention the presence of the *allmand*.
- ²⁰ Newhall (pp.115-16) suggests that the Pontoise order was unique, and that its unpopularity was envisaged as it anticipated punishment if the captain refused to cooperate with it. I am not convinced by his argument; the clause he cites reflects standard terminology aimed at the enforcing of the musterers' authority over the captains.
- ²¹ See, for instance, the order to muster the garrison of Pont-de-l'Arche, issued on 12 June 1430 (BN ms fr 26053/1362).
- ²² It is also significant that Pontoise, along with other garrisons in the *apanage* granted to Queen Catherine in December 1424, should have been taken back into royal hands towards the end of 1429 (Curry, 'Military Organization', p.238-39).
- ²³ As Allmand (p.198, n.4, see also p.80, n.119) points out, there is some irony in the fact that Sir Richard Merbury, captain of Meulan in March 1430, chose to defect to the French in 1449 precisely because his wife was French and he wished to retain her extensive lands. It is also interesting to note that the controller of Pontoise in June 1430, Louis Oursel, was booted out of the lieutenancy of Vernon as a traitor in May 1436 (BN ms fr 25773/1104).
- ²⁴ BN ms fr 25775/1382.
- ²⁵ Paris, Archives Nationales K 65/1/31.
- ²⁶ AN K 65/1/34 (October), 65/1/38 (November).

- ²⁷ AN K 65/1/31. These craftsmen were to be paid at the same rate as the archers.
- ²⁸ *Muster and Review*, p.116.
- ²⁹ Such a muster had been ordered by Bedford in the previous year (BN ms fr 26052/1199; Newhall, *Muster and Review*, p.113).
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, p.117 citing from BL Add Ch 11,674 (order to muster the garrison of Avranches).
- ³¹ *Ibid.* The muster is now BL Add Ch 7965.
- ³² See, for instance, that of Sir Ralph Butler for Arques (BN ms fr 26053/1399) and of Cardinal Beaufort for Honfleur (BN n(ouvelles) a(cquisitions) f(rançaises) 1482/97).
- ³³ In practice, however, such grantees did serve in garrison, although from 1437 they seem to have been entitled only to half wages. On occasion they received no pay at all, for it was said that they had lands 'dont ils pourroient soustenire leur estat' (see Curry, 'Military Organization', pp.402-403).
- ³⁴ BN ms fr 26063/3326 (November 1437).
- ³⁵ Newhall, *Muster and Review*, p.120. The men-at-arms constituted a quarter of each garrison. The 1430 indentures allowed only half of them and none of the archers to be non-English; this was the equivalent of an eighth of the retinue as a whole. For a full discussion of other changes effected by Bedford in October 1434 see Curry, 'Military Organization', pp.263-70.
- ³⁶ Newhall notes (p.81) that the *contrerolle* of the garrison of Caen records Jean de Cheux, a foot man-at-arms, as leaving in September 1434 to become one of the *cinquanteniers* of the people of the *seigneurie* of Cheux, situated about 12 km south west of Caen. An examination of the roll, BN ms fr 25771/891, shows that he was described as a Norman who was married and had a house in Caen. In the *bailliage* of Caux, however, English men-at-arms were used 'pour la conduite des gens dudit bailliage embastonne' in October 1435 (Stevenson, *Letters and Papers*, II, i, p.xlviii).
- ³⁷ R.A. Griffiths, *The Reign of Henry VI* (Tonbridge and London 1981), pp.171, 223, 551, 555.
- ³⁸ For Oursel see BN ms fr 25773/11004, and for Bourneville BN ms fr 25774/1333.
- ³⁹ It is not clear whether the restrictions were ever imposed outside the duchy and *pays de conquête*, such as in the garrisons maintained in Maine or in Paris and its environs.
- ⁴⁰ BN naf 1482/147.
- ⁴¹ BN ms fr 26056/1976.
- ⁴² A. Bossuat, *Perrinet Gressart et François de Surienne, agents d'Angleterre* (Paris 1936), p.293.

- ⁴³ BN ms fr 26054/1568, naf 8606/49.
- ⁴⁴ BN ms fr 26064/3404, 26065/3608, 32510 f.372. He seems to have been knighted at the Parisian coronation of Henry VI (BN ms fr 25769/564). Dreux technically lay outside Normandy but its garrison was normally administered with those of the duchy.
- ⁴⁵ Curry, 'Military Organization', p. 285.
- ⁴⁶ BN ms fr 26055/1813.
- ⁴⁷ BN ms fr 26057/2218 for this requirement at Caen, January 1434.
- ⁴⁸ BN ms fr 25769/517.
- ⁴⁹ BN ms fr 25777/1768.
- ⁵⁰ AN K 63/10/34, noted in part in *Muster and Review*, p.121. I have been unable to find a suitable definition of *riseur*.
- ⁵¹ Anthony Hunne, a man-at-arms in the personal retinue of the earl of Shrewsbury in December 1448 was noted as *dutchman* (BN ms fr 25778/1830).
- ⁵² PRO E404/59/119. A muster of his force, taken at 'Le Howe iuxta Plymouth' on 11 February 1443 survives in E101/695/40.
- ⁵³ BN P(èces) O(riginales) 238 Beauchamp en Angleterre 12.
- ⁵⁴ For the Italians see *DKR*, XLVIII, pp.306,307, 380, and 397, and for the French pp.241, 258, 266, 287, 288, 292, 359, 380, 381, 391, and 404. Hector Clarke of Bruges crossed with Sir Richard Whittingham, probably to Calais, in 1447 (*DKR* XLVIII, p.373), another man of Bruges went with Sir Thomas Kyriell to France in 1440 (p.331). The Dane, John Bodcii, was crossing with Bedford in 1427 (p.248). Another Dane, Hennyng van der Lankyn, was given lands in Normandy in 1419 although these were later confiscated as he went home to Denmark and did not return within the time specified (*DKR*, XLI, pp.782, 802; AN Collection Lenoir 21/307. I am grateful to Robert Massey for this reference). Links with Sir Andrew Ogard, a prominent captain of the Lancastrian occupation and also a Dane, have not been established.
- ⁵⁵ PRO E101/51/2 m.22. They seem to be serving in the company of Hartung von Clux, who also had under his command two crossbowmen (a characteristically foreign profession), John Kylledeine and William Roscoppe (Roscoff?). For the career of von Clux, who had come to England as a mercenary captain, see P. Chaplais, *English Medieval Diplomatic Practice. Part I, Documents and Interpretation* (London 1982), vol. i, p.100 n.149.
- ⁵⁶ In the section which follows, specific references are not provided but are available from me on request.
- ⁵⁷ See, for instance, the reference to a *laboureur* of the Vermandois who had enrolled in an English troop 'faute de pouvoir gagner sa vie autrement' (Stevenson, *Letters and Papers*, I, p.29).

⁵⁸ Guy de Boys, 'natif du pays de Haynau', apparently a member of Cardinal Beaufort's household, was granted lands near Falaise in September 1431 (AN Collection Lenoir 22/209. I am grateful to Robert Massey for this reference). He is not one of the men-at-arms found in the Gournay musters.

⁵⁹ One of the Irishmen at Pontaudemer, Thomas Dalton, was granted lands in Normandy in 1440 and 1444 (AN Collection Lenoir 75 f.21 and 13 f 161. I am grateful to Robert Massey for this information.) Another, William Douley, was probably of Nuas in County Kildare (*The Ormond Deeds*, ed. E. Curtis (6 vols Dublin 1912-43), iii, p. 31.

⁶⁰ A remission, however, notes that at least one 'natif du pays de Hollande' served with the English army (*Actes de la Chancellerie d'Henri VI concernant La Normandie sous la domination anglaise (1422-1435)*, ed. P. Le Cacheux (Société de l'Histoire de Normandie, Paris-Rouen 1907-8), vol. II, CXXVI, pp.248-50.

⁶¹ See J. Ferguson, *English Diplomacy 1422-1461* (Oxford 1971) for negotiations which aimed at the provision of troops, with the Spanish kingdoms (pp.39-57) and with German princes (pp.59, 63-71) .

⁶² C.T. Allmand, 'L'Artillerie de l'Armée anglaise et son organisation à l'époque de Jeanne d'Arc', *Jeanne d'Arc. Une époque, un rayonnement* (Paris 1982), p.77.

⁶³ BN naf 8603/53, AN K 64/10/6.

⁶⁴ One of the *espagnols*, for instance, was named as Brunnebeuf. French epithets include 'Brycquedar', 'le Moine Matourne', 'dit Pismis', and 'dit le Loup'.

⁶⁵ BN ms fr 25773/1171.

⁶⁶ Griffiths, *Reign of Henry VI*, p.555, and also p.168 on hostility to the Welsh and Irish in earlier decades. Griffiths also contributed a useful overview of the status of the subject territories in 'The English Realm and Dominions and the King's Subjects in the Later Middle Ages', in J.G. Rowe (ed.), *Aspects of Late Medieval Government and Society. Essays presented to J.R. Lander* (Toronto 1986).

⁶⁷ On denization see W. Holdsworth, *A History of English Law*, vol. ix, (third edition, London 1944) p.77 and also C.T. Allmand, 'A Note on Denization in Fifteenth-Century England', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 17 (1966).

⁶⁸ Further research is needed on the distinctions drawn between Normans and French, not only in the military sphere but also in terms of the administration of Lancastrian France in general. Normans who fled to England in 1449-50 found it necessary, as did Gascons, to take out letters of denization (Griffiths, *Reign of Henry VI*, p.553).

⁶⁹ BN ms fr 25775/1382, 1417.

⁷⁰ BN ms fr 25777/1768 (Rouen, 1446), 26057/2195 (in a quittance for Tombelaine, 1433).

⁷¹ In the reign of Edward III the status of subject was extended to those born abroad of English parents, so that birth overseas did not diminish rights to inheritances in England (Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, p.76).

⁷² These included Peter and Tassin Dampart, John Marbury and John Basset (BN ms fr 21495). Walter Stokeley, a member of the Falaise garrison at its loss to the French, was still resident in the town in May 1453 (AN Collection Dom Lenoir 9 f.316). See also Allmand, *Lancastrian Normandy*, p.80. The issue of those who 'stayed on' is a topic well worth further research. For references to those staying on in Gascony see R. Boutruche, *La Crise d'une société. Seigneurs et paysans du Bordelais pendant la guerre de Cent Ans* (Paris 1947, new ed. Strasbourg 1963), p.135.

⁷³ London, College of Arms, Arundel Ms XLVIII, f.324.