

Anne CURRY

**Personal links and the nature of the English war retinue:  
a case study of John Mowbray,  
earl marshal, and the campaign of 1415**

The armies which crossed from England to France during the Hundred Years War were normally made up of a number of different retinues. This was already the case in the early stages of the war, but, with the king usually present in person, the duration and conditions of service were essentially at royal discretion, and the use of indentures was largely restricted to garrison service. In the second phase of the war (1369-96), however, with neither Edward III nor Richard II campaigning in person, those serving on the expeditions entered into indentures with the crown to supply troops. This indenture, or contract, system persisted throughout the fifteenth-century phase of the war, even when the king was present. Anyone, from prince to esquire, might indent to provide a company of a certain size and composition for military service of a specific duration. We shall call this individual a "captain" although this is a later historian's convenience. Indentures merely note the fact that the individual was, in Latin, "retentum", in French, "retenu" or, in English, "withholden", to provide service on the campaign in question with a specified number of men. This number could be anything from a handful to several thousand. Intended composition was expressed in terms of military rank (i.e. men-at-arms and archers) as well as social position (i.e. dukes, earls, barons, bannerets, knights bachelor).

On the face of it, the system seems straightforward enough, and is easily traced in the surviving royal Exchequer records in The National Archives.<sup>1</sup> The indentures were grouped together in the nineteenth century into the artificial class, The National Archives E101 Exchequer Accounts Various. As soon as the captain had indented, he was paid part of the wages to which he and his company were entitled for their anticipated service. This payment in advance

---

1. For further discussion of the operation of the indenture system in the fifteenth-century phase of the war see A. Curry, "English Armies in the Fifteenth Century", in *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War*, A. Curry and M. Hughes ed., Woodbridge, 1994, p. 41-8.

was no doubt intended as an aid to recruitment of his company. Pay rates varied according to the rank of the troops. The amount of pay received at the point of indenting also varied according to the intended duration of the campaign and the proposed location. For six-month campaigns it was usually half of the total pay due, for twelve-month campaigns, a quarter. For service in Gascony, pay was calculated at a yearly rate at 40 marks for each man-at-arms, and 20 marks for an archer. For service in France, pay was calculated per day, with men at-arms (in some musters of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century called "armigeri" or esquires) at 1s, with archers (sometimes listed as "valetti" or yeomen) at 6d. In addition, for service in France, an additional "regard" was payable to men-at-arms, calculated at 100 marks per quarter for every 30 men. In both theatres, dukes were entitled to 13s 4d per day, earls 6s 8d, barons and bannerets 4s and knights bachelor 2s. These men of title mustered in military terms as men-at-arms and thus were also included in the calculation of the regard.

Once the indenture was sealed in the Chancery, payment was ordered by a means of a Warrant for Issue sent to the Exchequer from which money would be disbursed to the captain. These Warrants for Issue are to be found in The National Archives E404, and are extremely useful when the indentures themselves do not survive since they give a summary of the terms of the indenture. The disbursement of the first instalment of pay is also recorded on the Issue Rolls of the Exchequer, The National Archives E403, where the payment of any subsequent instalments is also noted. It was customary for the second instalment of pay to be given to the captain when he made his muster at the port of embarkation, the date and location of which was commonly specified in the indenture terms. In all cases it was the captain's responsibility to issue pay to his men. Exchequer officials checked the size and composition of the troops which the captain had brought along to the point of embarkation in order to ensure that his pay entitlement had been fulfilled. This was done by taking musters. Where the resulting muster rolls survive, they offer most valuable information, providing names of soldiers grouped by retinue, listed in such a way as to distinguish the different ranks. The muster rolls have also been artificially grouped into The National Archives E101. After the campaign, captains were obliged to return accounts to the Exchequer showing what money they had received in advance, what service their men had provided, and whether any war gains had been made from which the crown was due a share. This enabled a final calculation of whether the crown owed the captain more pay or a refund was due to the crown for service not fulfilled. The particulars of these accounts are to be found in The National Archives E101, with enrolled versions on the Foreign Accounts, The National Archives E364.<sup>2</sup>

By means of such sources it is possible to reconstruct the size and composition of expeditionary armies.<sup>2</sup> But there remain certain puzzling questions, not

2. There is a useful survey for the late fourteenth-century campaigns, in J. Sherborne, "Indentured Retinues and English Expeditions to France, 1369-80", *English Historical Review*, 79 (1964).

least concerning recruitment of the troops for which indenture had been entered into. How was it decided what the size of a captain's company should be? Did indenting captains offer a figure based on knowledge of how many they knew they could recruit or was a figure allocated to them by the crown? How did a captain recruit the troops? This last question is perhaps the most perplexing. A whole raft of answers can be suggested. Some troops may already have been bound to the captain, perhaps by private indenture for peace and war, or by employment in the household or on the estate. Others may have been tenants, or neighbours, family or friends. Existing links were thus central to recruitment. When the indenture demanded a very large number of men, the captain might enter into "sub indentures" with other men who promised to bring along a certain number of troops, recruited from their own associates as well as perhaps from professional soldiery.<sup>3</sup> In such a scenario, the captain's retinue would be made up of a number of smaller groups.

Although the Exchequer materials provide us with much valuable material on numbers and names, they are not in themselves enough to elucidate the fundamental issue of personal links in the recruitment of troops. What is needed are private archives—estate and household records—which can give us a deeper insight into the processes at work and help us to identify the men who appear on muster lists. We are extremely lucky to have both kinds of sources for the service of John Mowbray, earl marshal, on the expedition which Henry V led into France in 1415. There is an almost complete set of Exchequer materials for the earl, as we shall discover.<sup>4</sup> But, more significantly for present purposes, we also have the account of his receiver-general, Robert Southwell, from the feast of Michaelmas 2 Henry V (i.e. 29 September 1414) to the eve of the same feast in the following year (28 September 1415). Southwell's account thus covers the crucial period of recruitment and preparation for the expedition in the early summer of 1415.

Captains were indenting with the crown for service on the campaign from 29 April onwards. The terms of their indentures kept open the possibility of service in either Gascony or France, but ordered troops to assemble for muster on 1 July. Mustering duly occurred in various locations around Southampton Water in early July, but embarkation was delayed by the discovery of a plot against the king, known as "the Southampton plot". The army left England on 11 August. Siege was promptly laid to Harfleur which surrendered on 22 September. Earl John's wife, Katherine Neville, who was daughter to the earl of Westmorland by Joan Beaufort, gave birth to a son, John, on 12 September 1415 whilst his father was at the siege. Exchequer records show that Henry V

3. For examples in the 1415 campaign for the earl of Salisbury and the earl of Dorset see The National Archives E101/69/7, no. 508, and nos. 488-505 respectively, and the discussion in A. Curry, *The Battle of Agincourt: Sources and Interpretations*, Woodbridge, 2000, p. 418.

4. For a general discussion of the Exchequer materials and payment arrangements for the campaign of 1415 see Curry, *Battle of Agincourt*, p. 408-34.

began his march towards Calais on 6 or 8 October, and that Earl John was invalided home along with some of his retinue on 5 October as a result of dysentery contracted at Harfleur.

Earl John (b. 1392) was in his early twenties at this point, having received his first summons to parliament as earl marshal in March 1413 shortly after Henry V's accession. Although Thomas, his elder brother and predecessor as earl, had been executed for involvement in conspiracy against Henry IV in 1405, there had been no act of attainder against him. Thus John had livery of his lands as earl of Nottingham and earl marshal in November 1413, although it was not until 1425 that he was restored to the dukedom of Norfolk when a dispute with the earl of Warwick over precedence had been settled in his favour by parliament. Although invalided home in 1415, he served on several later expeditions to France until his death in 1432. The Mowbray line continued for two further generations in the male line until 1476. The daughter of the last Mowbray earl, Anne, was married to Richard of York, younger son of Edward IV, who thereby became earl of Nottingham and duke of Norfolk. But at her death in 1481, the estates of the Mowbrays were divided between the Berkeleys and the Howards. These families were descended from two sisters of our Earl John, Isabel, who had married as her second husband James, lord Berkeley (d. 1463), and Margaret, who had married Sir Robert Howard. Richard III granted the Nottingham inheritance to the Berkeleys and the Norfolk inheritance to the Howards.<sup>5</sup>

Since the account roll of Earl John's receiver-general related to the Nottingham inheritance, it came into the possession of the Berkeleys and is still to be found at Berkeley castle. Although access to the archives at the castle is limited, the roll is accessible on microfilm at the Gloucestershire Record Office.<sup>6</sup> It has been consulted by other historians, not least K. B. Macfarlane who, in his work on the later medieval nobility, cited the income side of the account to reveal the financial difficulties experienced by Earl John at this stage of his life. "In order to raise money to equip his retinue for France in 1415 he had to borrow 1,000 marks from the earl of Arundel and to have resort to a practice which had become increasingly common later in the century: claiming prosperous townsmen as runaway villeins and extracting money for them for their blackmail manumission"<sup>7</sup>. Rowena Archer also drew on the receiver-general's account in her doctoral thesis on the Mowbrays, noting that it offers "a fascinating insight into the efforts required by the nobility serving Henry V in France."<sup>8</sup> Dr Archer's work provides a fuller analysis of the people and places

5. *The Complete Peerage*, ed. G.E. Cokayne, revised H. Doubleday *et al.*, 12 vols (London, 1910-59), vol. II, p. 132-3; vol. IX, p. 605-6, 610.

6. Gloucestershire Record Office, microfilm 12.

7. K.B. Macfarlane, *The Nobility of Later Medieval England*, Oxford, 1973, p. 221.

8. The account is discussed in R.E. Archer, «The Mowbrays: earls of Nottingham and dukes of Norfolk to 1432», unpublished PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 1984, chapter 5.



mentioned in the roll. This present discussion confines itself to what the roll suggests on how the earl assembled his company for military service in 1415. This is achieved by linking the information in the account to the relevant materials in the Exchequer records, with the aim of revealing the operation of Exchequer procedures at a personal level.

Let us first examine the Exchequer records. On 29 April the earl indented to serve the king on the intended campaign. The crown's half of the indenture does not survive but that of the earl does, being returned to the Exchequer in 1423 with the particulars of account as part of the final accounting process.<sup>9</sup> The basic terms of the indenture are also given on the Warrant for Issue sent to the Exchequer on the same day that the indenture was sealed.<sup>10</sup> The period of service was to be for one year. Earl John agreed to serve in his own person as earl along with four knights bachelor, 45 men-at-arms and 150 archers, a total company size of 200. Comparison with other retinues in 1415 suggests that this size was standard for a man of comital rank. On 6 June he received the first instalment of pay, £433 8s 4d, as noted on the special Issue Roll drawn up for the campaign.<sup>11</sup> This payment reflects the fact that the higher Gascon rates were used to calculate the first instalment. The payment is also noted in the particulars of account drawn up and returned to the Exchequer in 1423 by the earl's attorney, John Fishlake.<sup>12</sup> The particulars also show that the earl received a second instalment of pay on 6 July of £290 8s 6d, this time using the rates for service in France, implying that the king had changed his mind on the intended theatre of war. A total of £723 16s 10d had been paid to the earl in cash. The particulars of account also show that jewels worth £723 16s 10d had been delivered to the earl in June as security for the pay due for the second quarter, this being a distinctive characteristic of the 1415 campaign where the king wished to retain his men for a lengthy period of service but had only a limited amount of ready cash at his disposal to pay wages in advance.

The particulars of account give useful information on the fate of the men of the earl's retinue. They reveal that the earl was invalided home from the siege of Harfleur on 5 October with 12 men-at-arms and 45 archers, "diversis langoribus vexatis". The total pay due for the period of service of this group (8 July-5 October) was calculated as £187 6s 2d. All were noted as being shipped home from Harfleur to Portsmouth with their equipment and victuals in a ship called the «Nicholas de Hull», transport costs being given as £26 13s 4d. The particulars also note that three men-at-arms and one archer died at the siege, their

9. The National Archives E101/47/38.

10. The National Archives E404/31/170.

11. The National Archives E101/45/5 m. 4d.

12. The National Archives E101/47/37. The account was settled in May 1423 as a result of the earl's petition that arrears due for the campaign of 1415 should be paid to him (*Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England 1386-1542*, ed. H. Nicolas, 7 vols, London, 1834-37, III, p. 101-2). That his petition met with success may be related to his willingness to serve on the campaign of 1423.

pay cost being calculated as £15 18s 6d. None of the earl's retinue were put into the garrison of Harfleur. The remaining four knights, 30 men-at-arms and 104 archers, 138 men in total, continued on the campaign and saw service at the battle of Agincourt, returning to England in November. Their pay costs, totalling £630, were calculated from 8 July to 23 November. They had taken no gains of war. The particulars which were drawn up and presented to the Exchequer in 1423 therefore calculate the pay entitlement of the earl's troops at £1061 19s 9d. As he had received £723 16s 10d before the campaign started, he was still owed £338 2s 10d, which was now paid. The jewels which had been received as security for the second quarter's pay were noted as already returned to Thomas Chitterne, previously keeper of the king's jewels.

The particulars of account also give the costs of shipping back to England the horses of the earl's company at the end of the campaign at a total cost of £50 6s 0d. These show that 24 of the earl's horses remained with his retinue in France even after he himself had been invalided home. These horses were shipped back from Calais to Dover in mid-November, along with 4 knights and their 24 horses, 30 men-at-arms and their 168 horses, and 104 archers with 149 horses—a total of 138 men and 345 horses. The particulars state that the horses shipped back to England were the property of the soldiers returning at that point "*et sociorum suorum infirmariorum*."<sup>13</sup> Note the use of the term "*socius*" (comrade, associate) in this military context, not least as it is a term also used in the relevant sections of the receiver-general's account.

What evidence do the Exchequer records provide of the names of those serving under him? There is no surviving muster of his company as it prepared for embarkation in early July, but we have two lists relating to the campaign. The first is a list of those invalided home with the earl. This is found in a white leather bag with several other rolls concerning men of different retinues returning to England as a result of sickness.<sup>14</sup> It lists the earl, Sir Nicholas Colfox, 15 men-at-arms and 47 archers, with one deletion. At the end it calculates 17 "*gentilez*" and 47 "*valetz*". The list includes John Everard and William West of the earl's chapel, Robert Moreys and John Spore *trompettes*, and Cornwall herald. There is an identical copy of the list on paper in a poor hand which was submitted to the Exchequer in 1423 along with the particulars of account.<sup>15</sup> Yet the particulars of account consider those invalided home as being the earl, 12 men-at-arms and 45 archers. The lists therefore add in a further six men. Perhaps these were not in royal pay but were the earl's servants, whose inclusion in the lists of those invalided home was part of Henry V's efforts to avoid desertion after the siege.

13. *The Revised Medieval Latin Word List*, R. Latham ed., 1965, notes that "*societas*" was used for a company of soldiers in 1415, with the word also being used to describe the Great Companies (of mercenaries) as well as the knights of the Garter.

14. The National Archives E101/44/30 m. 8.

15. The National Archives E101/47/38. There is also a shorter list in E101/44/30 which names only the earl, Colfox and one other esquire.

A second list is provided in British Library Harleian MS 782, printed by Harris Nicolas.<sup>16</sup> This names five knights (Sir Thomas Rokeby, Sir Thomas Lindley, Sir John Hoton, Sir John Green and Sir John Heveningham) and 33 men-at-arms. None of these occur on the first list mentioned above. This second list also notes that there were 80 archers, but does not provide their names. This gives a total of 118 men. The list is in the form of a copy made by Ralph Broke who was York herald from 1593 to 1625. My researches have shown that the list is derived from the so-called "Agincourt roll" drawn up by royal officials after the campaign of 1415 in order to inform the Exchequer's accounting process. It was intended to name those who were present at the battle and who thus were entitled to pay for the whole period of the campaign. The original does not seem to survive but there are several later copies.<sup>17</sup> As will be seen from the numbers given above, there is some variation from the figures provided in the earl's particulars of account for those who had served on the whole campaign, namely four knights, 30 men at arms and 104 archers—138 men in total.

How does this Exchequer information relate to the account of the earl's receiver-general? First, we can see on the income side of the account the monies for troops which the earl was paid by the Exchequer at the point of indenting and subsequently. Under the heading *Denarii recepti ad scaccarium regis*, there is listed the receipt of £723 16s 10d from the treasurer of England in two instalments, by indentures for payment dated 15 May (£433 8s 4d) and 1 July (£290 8s 6d). The dates are interesting as they are at variance with those in the Issue Rolls of 6 June and 6 July. The actual payments, it seems, were made on the earlier dates but entered on the Issue Rolls later. The Exchequer officials chose to enter all the wage payments on the Issue Roll under 6 June and 6 July for administrative convenience. Also noted in the same section of the receiver-general's account are the jewels worth £723 16s 10d which were given in pledge for the wages of the second quarter by indenture with the keeper of the jewels, Richard Courtenay, bishop of Norwich, dated 13 June. In a later section of the account dealing with the cost of messengers, a payment is made to the clerk of the bishop of Norwich "pro scriptura indenturi de jocalibus".

The *Recepte forinsece* section of the account, as Macfarlane observed, notes a loan of 1,000 marks made to Earl John by Thomas, earl of Arundel, "pro viagio domini in obsequio Regis versus partes Normannie", plus smaller loans for the same purpose from the prior and monks of Thetford (£33 6s 8d), and the rector of church of Southfield (£6 13s 4d). On 21 June a payment of 100s is received from John Randolf, *nativus*, and one of the same amount from Ralph Willy, *nativus*, plus, on 22 July a loan of £13 6s 8d from John Reynold. The receiver-general's account thus reveals how the earl raised additional funds, no

16. H. Nicolas, *History of the Battle of Agincourt*, third edition, London, 1833, reprinted 1971, p. 337-8.

17. Curry, *Battle of Agincourt*, p. 407-8

doubt to cover the costs of the preparations for the expedition, and perhaps also to enable him to pay his troops wages for the second quarter, for which he had received no money from the crown but only jewels in security of future payment.

Here it is worth remembering that the earl had received livery of his lands, and hence their resources and revenues, only two years earlier on reaching the age of 21. His youth and lack of earlier military experience (he does not seem to have served in the Welsh wars of the first decade of the century) might also explain why he did not already have the necessary war gear and why he needed to spend so much on equipping and apparelling himself for the campaign as befitted the marshal of England (in which capacity, incidentally, he played a key role in the trial of the conspirators involved the Southampton plot). His receiver-general's account shows considerable expenditure on armour and other personal accoutrements. These included a costly "cote armour" and a "trappur" for his horse, both woven with his arms as earl marshal. A mainsail for his ship and a number of other flags painted with his arms were also purchased at this point. Also acquired was a pavilion (tent) for his stable. An old pavilion was also repaired to use as his "garderobe", and a new iron seat for a latrine was also purchased as well as a bed, mattress, and equipment for his chapel. A number of medications were also provided, although the "electura" against the flux cannot have proved effective in protecting the earl from dysentery at the siege of Harfleur given that he was invalided home.

The account of his receiver-general also indicates the provision of a large quantity of food and drink for use during the campaign. Some of this came from his own estates, some was purchased. Much was gathered at his seat at Bosham and transported first to Portsmouth before being taken across the Channel. Further victuals were sent during the siege. The quantities are such that they were clearly not simply for personal consumption but also for the men of his household. The account also reveals that military items were purchased for use by his company. These included a supply of bowstrings and 100 bundles of arrows as well as chests within which to store and transport them whose descriptions match well the chests full of bows found on the "Mary Rose". He also purchased 48 "pavises" (large wooden shields). As he had indented to serve with 45 men-at-arms and four knights it is surely significant that the number of "pavises" is almost enough to provide one each.

Coming now to the crux of the matter, we find in the section of the account headed *vadia guerre* details of payments made "for the first quarter commencing 1 June" to those who were to serve the earl in the expedition. This takes the form of a list of 80 names followed by the numbers of troops each man had agreed to bring. The first entry is for Sir Thomas Rokeby who was paid for his own service for one quarter at 2s per day, that of one man-at-arms at 12d per day and of 9 archers at 6d per day with a «regard» of 44s 5d due to himself and the man-at-arms. The total payment made to Rokeby was £38 11s 4d. The pay rates used

are as the crown paid out for service in France. It is not certain at what date the earl's receiver-general issued the wages to Rokeby and others but the wording in the *vadia guerre* section implies that the wages were paid in one instalment. A later reference in the "messenger" section of the account indicates that the earl sent a messenger from London to the home of Thomas Rokeby in Yorkshire with wages for the first quarter "and to provide that the said Thomas would be with the earl at Bosham on 1 July 1415". But alas, there is no date for this message, save that it must be placed before 1 July. It does indicate, however, that the initial service commencement on 1 June had been changed. If the earl's receiver-general issued wages in one instalment, it might imply that the earl was having to meet the costs at least at first partially out of his own pocket, for he did not receive the second instalment of wages for the first quarter's service until his muster in early July. Rokeby had certainly committed himself to serving with the earl by 28 July for on that day letters of protection were issued by the Chancery for Rokeby's benefit.<sup>18</sup>

After Rokeby, the next entry is for Sir Nicholas Colfox who was paid for his own service as well as that of two men-at-arms and seven archers. The terms used in the entries concerning Rokeby and Colfox are "armiger" for man-at-arms and "Sagittarius" for archer. There follow six men, including two esquires, Perceval Lyndley and John Hotham, who were to serve as men-at-arms and to bring along a small company of men-at-arms and archers. The term "socius" is used for man-at-arms in all six entries and "Sagittarius" for archer. Lyndley's company is the largest with 6 "socii" (including himself) and 15 archers. Hotham has two "socii" plus himself, as well as eight archers. The remaining four men have the following companies of men-at-arms and archers (with their own service being included within the figure for men-at-arms): Edward Wever, 3+7; William Ledes, 4+9; Robert Home 2+6; Thomas Ask 2+5.

There follow the names of 26 men who are serving in person as men-at-arms, but who bring along only archers. Eleven bring two archers, 15 three archers. Then we have Nottingham herald and Cornwall herald, each paid at 12*d* per day without regard, and each accompanied by an archer. The fact that they did not receive the customary regard may imply that they were not intended to be involved in active service. The researches of Andrew Ayton have suggested that the regard had been introduced from the 1370s to replace the previous system of compensation for loss of horses ("restauro equorum") whilst in royal service<sup>19</sup>. After the heralds comes John Spurr with two of his minstrels who do not receive regard but are paid at 12*d* per day.

The next entry is particularly interesting. It notes Thomas Trumpet who previously was in the company of Henry, lord Scrope ("manente cum domino

18. The National Archives C76/98 m. 10.

19. A. Ayton, *Knights and Warhorses. Military Service and the English Aristocracy under Edward III*, Woodbridge, 1994, p. 115-7.



Le Scrop"). He is not paid at a daily rate but at £10 per annum "tempore guerre" and is also given "bouche de court" (i.e. board and lodging at the earl's household). He is paid from some point in August; the scribe has left blank a space to fill in the precise day. Scrope had been arrested on 31 July and, after trial on 5 August before the earl marshal and other peers, was sentenced to immediate execution. Scrope had indented with the crown for military service on 29 April to serve in his own person with three knights, 26 men-at-arms and 90 archers.<sup>20</sup> Some of those who were due to serve in his company did cross with the expedition. The "Agincourt roll" gives the names of six men-at-arms and the number of 14 archers of Scrope's retinue, one version of the roll adding that these men served in the company of Sir Roland Lenthale.<sup>21</sup> In Trumpet's case, however, he had transferred to the service of the Earl marshal. His surname might suggest that he was indeed a "trompette" used for sounding various military instructions as well as for acting as messenger.<sup>22</sup> The list of those invalided home with the earl in early October included two "trompettes", John Spore (Spurr) and Robert Moreys.<sup>23</sup> We have already noted Spurr's entry in the receiver-general's account immediately before that of Trumpet. Moreys is listed later in the *vadia guerre* in receipt of pay as an archer. After the entry for Trumpet there follows John Pyntre who is described as "valettus" which we should here translate as archer. He is followed by a further 41 names. Although these are not given the appellation "valettus" they receive the same rate of pay (6d per day) as Pyntre and we can assume therefore that they were to serve as archers.

Taking the list in the *vadia guerre* as a whole, we can see that four names were subsequently deleted. Three were archers, with the following explanation being provided: "quia non in servicio domini ultra mare", implying that these men had been expected to go on the campaign but had not done so. It was noted that the last of the three archers, Thomas Durant de Barewe, was to be paid by the hands of John Reynolds. The last entry in the *vadia guerre* section is for William Petistre and is also deleted. He was intended to serve in his own person with three archers and had received an advance of his wages by the hands of John Lancaster. His deletion is marked "causa predicta", signalling that he also failed to serve on the campaign.

The salient feature which is revealed by the *vadia guerre* section is that the retinue for which the earl had indented with the crown was raised by him not as one group but in "sub-companies". Eight of these sub-companies, namely those led by the two knights, the esquire and five others, contained multiples

20. The National Archives E01/69/4/384 (indenture), E404/31/168 (warrant for issue). For first payment see E101/45/5 m. 3.

21. Nicholas, *History of the Battle of Agincourt*, p. 344.

22. For other notices of "trompettes" in the English garrisons in Normandy in the period 1417-50 see A. Curry, "Isolated or Integrated? The English Soldier in Lancastrian Normandy", in *Courts and Regions in Medieval Europe*, S. Rees Jones, R. Marks and A. J. Minnis ed., 2000, p. 200.

23. The National Archives E101/47/38.

of both men-at arms and archers. These contributed 25 men-at-arms and 66 archers in all, almost half of the number for which the earl had indented with the king. A further 26 sub-companies comprised a single man-at-arms serving with a small group of archers, providing a further 26 men-at-arms and 77 archers. Finally, there were 41 men serving alone as archers. In addition, there were two heralds paid as men-at-arms and bringing 2 archers, as well as a named minstrel accompanied by two of his "socii", all paid as men-at-arms.

The overall total of payments in the *vadia guerre* section (including deletions) thus covers in all 56 men-at-arms (including two knights) and 186 archers—a grand total of 242 men, excluding the earl himself and Thomas Trumpet whose rank is not given. As we saw, the earl had indented with the king to serve in person with four knights and 45 men at arms (i.e. 50 men-at-arms in total) plus 150 archers—a total of 200 men. His receiver-general's account thus reveals that he had recruited six more men-at-arms and 36 more archers than the number he had agreed to provide. If we take account of deletions, we have 55 men-at-arms and 180 archers. If we also discount the heralds and minstrels and their parties on the grounds that they may not have been intended to fight, we have 50 men-at-arms and 178 archers. Even so, the earl had raised more men than required. The account shows that he had paid out in wages £832 3s 11d, but had only received from the crown £723 16s 10d. the costs of his over-recruitment had no doubt to be met from his own pocket.

Although the earl had recruited too many archers, he had, on the evidence of the *vadia guerre* section, failed to raise the number of knights for which he had indented, which had been set at four. Sir Nicholas Colfox was invalided home with the earl. Sir Thomas Rokeby was present at the battle, his name being found on the "Agincourt roll". As we saw, the latter also names four other knights: Sir Thomas Lyndley, Sir John Hoton, Sir John Geney, Sir John Heveningham. Three of these—Lyndley<sup>24</sup>, Hoton (Hotham) and Heveningham—are mentioned on the *vadia guerre* list but not as knights. Geney is not named in the *vadia guerre* list but may have been a man-at-arms within one of the "sub-companies". Assuming that the Agincourt roll is not mistaken in its listings of knights, we can suggest that Lyndley, Hoton and Heveningham had been knighted during the campaign. They do not, however, feature in a list of those knighted at the crossing of the Somme which is found in a manuscript chronicle in the College of Arms<sup>25</sup>, and no further references to knightings have so far been discovered.

The *vadia guerre* list provides us with the names of 37 men-at-arms (including two heralds and one minstrel) and of 41 archers, plus the name of Thomas Trumpet. We can compare the names of the men-at-arms with those in

24. We should not be too concerned at the different personal name—Perceval in the *vadia guerre* and Thomas in the "Agincourt roll." The latter was not always accurately transcribed by the Tudor heralds.

25. Curry, *Battle of Agincourt*, p. 86, from College of Arms MS 9, folio XXXII.

the list of men invalided home and in the Agincourt roll.<sup>26</sup> Eight of the 15 men-at-arms invalided home with the earl in early October also feature by name in the *vadia guerre* section. These include Cornwall herald, and William Bachiler, who is described elsewhere in the account as one of the earl's "armiger domini". John Spurr, the minstrel, was also invalided home, along with Robert Moreys, another minstrel, who is listed amongst the household fee recipients and was probably one of Spurr's two "socii" in the *vadia guerre* section. Also returning home were John Everard and William West of the earl's chapel. As for a comparison with the Agincourt roll, 16 names of men-at-arms therein, including the four putative "new knights" noted earlier, are also in receipt of the earl's wages in the *vadia guerre* section. For a further 10 men-at-arms listed in the *vadia guerre*, however, we have no absolute proof of service on the campaign since they do not occur in either the list of those invalided home or the list of those at the battle. This may suggest some reorganisation of retinues during the campaign, much as Henry, lord Scrope's retinue had been distributed to the command of others.

An interesting exercise is to see whether the names in the *vadia guerre* list occur elsewhere in the receiver-general's account for this might provide us with an insight into how the earl had gone about recruiting his company. There are indeed many interesting findings. For instance, Nicholas Ledewych, serving as a man-at-arms and bringing three archers, was the lord's steward. Richard Dull, who served with two archers, was the master of the earl's horses. John Spurr, who served as minstrel, was also in receipt of an annual fee as "trumpet alias minstre." Perceval Lyndley, serving with a further 5 men-at-arms and 15 archers and likely knighted during the campaign, is seen organising shipping for the earl for the campaign which may imply he had a role in the household. Thomas Lyons, serving as a man-at-arms with two archers, clearly had some function in provisioning, for he is found several times buying food and drink for the campaign and for regular use. He is also paid expenses for riding from Bosham to Midhurst to speak to Sir John Barre about a mandate which concerned the campaign. It is interesting to speculate, given the relative shortfall in knights, that the earl was trying to recruit Sir John to his company, but that he failed to do so. William Bachiler, John Basset, Roger Radcliffe, Thomas Strangeways and Nicholas Dawne, all with the same sized retinue as Ledewych, were noted elsewhere in the account as "armigeri domini" in receipt of annuities from the earl.

Seven of the archers were in receipt of fees in the earl's employ, Robert Grey and John Ferroure as yeomen of the chamber, Richard Fynch as baker, and Nicholas Armourer. Although the latter has no function given in the list of "fees of the household" information elsewhere in the account shows him as the point of delivery for armour supplies, and the maker of a crest for a bascinet as well as a vantail for another of the earl's bascinets. He was thus no doubt the

26. The names of the archers have yet to be analysed. The fact that they were omitted from the later copies of the Agincourt roll is frustrating as it prevents a complete picture emerging.

earl's armourer. John Fyshelake (Fishlake) was in receipt of a fee as clerk. As noted earlier, he presented the earl's final account to the Exchequer in 1423. Thomas Noreys serving as an archer received his annual fee as minstrel. In the messenger section of the account we see a letter taken to him in Knaresborough "ad capiendum herbagium domini apud Suthampton", implying that his duties within the earl's household stretched beyond minstrelsy. A further archer, John Pyntre, received a fee as "valettus robarum domini". It was he who arranged provision of the new bed for the campaign. He features several times within the *draperia* section of the account in purchasing materials. For instance, he provides a scarlet cap in February 1415 when the earl was ill.<sup>27</sup> Thomas Walter, also serving as archer, was the lord's "avenarius" (havenar), responsible for gathering supplies around Brember in June and July.

It is possible that there were others of the earl's household present on the campaign, such as his "barbitonsor" (barber), Thomas Fenys. Their names are not in the *vadia guerre* but they may have served within one of the sub companies. Some of the surnames within the list, such as that of the archer, Richard de Butre, may also indicate a household connection. There are several other occupational names such as Ferrou, Webster, Saddler in the *vadia guerre* section. From evidence elsewhere in the account, the earl also had within him on the campaign 14 Welshmen whose function is unclear, as well as several sumptermen and carters. We know from the list of those invalided home that William West and John Everard, his chaplains, were also present on campaign. But it is interesting to note also men associated with the earl who do *not* go on the campaign. These include financial officials such as the chamberlain of Bosham, Richard Spencer, and his predecessor William Nonyngton, the treasurer of the household, Richard Downham, and the receiver-general himself, Robert Southwell. As noted earlier, however, Nicholas Ledewych, the steward of household, was to be found amongst the men-at-arms.

In conclusion, therefore, we have strong indications, thanks to the information in the receiver-general's account, that the earl's household was a central source of troops for him in 1415. Such men were expected not only to fight with him but also assist in the organisation of his war effort by arranging food supplies, buying armour and other equipment and so on. This situation was no doubt commonplace for other participants in the campaign of 1415. It is well represented in the surviving muster evidence for the troops serving in the retinue of Thomas, duke of Clarence<sup>28</sup> and for the royal household.<sup>29</sup> It is also replicated in the army with which Henry VI crossed in 1430.<sup>30</sup> These royal-led

27. Red woollen flannel material was commonly used in periods of sickness.

28. The National Archives E101/44/30 for a list of the sick returning with Clarence which reveals some members of his household.

29. The National Archives E101/45/18, cited in Curry, *Battle of Agincourt*, p. 421.

30. A. Curry, "The 'Coronation Expedition' and Henry VI's Court in France, 1430-32", in *The Lancastrian Court*, J. Stratford ed., Stamford, 2003, p. 30-54.

campaigns were very special initiatives in France, involving as they did major efforts to recruit as many men as possible. It is not surprising that under such circumstances, men would look to their own households in order to provide the core of their troops. A further point can be made about the household at war. It was no doubt convenient for the earl to be able to draw on royal wages to pay his own household men for their service. Even though, as we saw, he had to meet some costs out of his own pocket, the vast majority of the wage costs of his troops were borne by the crown. Thus his household operated partly at royal expense during the campaign.

The evidence of the *vadia guerre* section shows that members of the earl's household were expected to bring along their own sub-companies, the sizes of which were determined by the status of the man involved. Thus, as we have seen, the earl's "armiger domini" were expected to and were able to bring along both men-at-arms and archers. Lesser men, such as the earl's baker, came along simply in their own right as archers. Historians have tended to see personal links in retinues as operating only between the captain and his men. But the evidence of "sub-companies" suggests that links also operated within the retinue. Those who brought along other men-at-arms and archers must often have had existing links. No doubt they drew on their own servants and also on relatives and friends. The list of those invalided home with the earl includes amongst the men-at-arms a John Ledes and a Thomas Ledes. Neither name appears in the *vadia guerre* list, but the name of William Ledes does. He was to provide three men-at-arms (or "socii") as well as himself and nine archers. It is tempting to suggest that both John and Thomas were two of the men-at-arms which their relative produced for the retinue of the earl. Yet it is also possible that his relatives were also his servants, for this was by no means uncommon in this period. Family links were important at all levels. In the 1417 campaign, the earl marshal recruited his brother-in-law, Sir Henry Ferrers, to his service.<sup>31</sup> In addition, at least fifteen of the men-at-arms who had served in the earl's retinue in 1415 served again in his company in the expedition of 1417.<sup>32</sup> These included Sir John Geney and Sir Perceval Lyndley, although on this later occasion Sir Thomas Rokeby indented directly with the king to bring along his own company.<sup>33</sup>

Thanks to the survival of the receiver-general's account, we have been able to flesh out the barebones of the Exchequer materials for the 1415 campaign and to gain at least an initial insight into the actualities of recruitment of the military retinue. There is no doubt that more could be done to identify men in the earl's retinue, not least by considering tenurial and neighbourhood links. It would also be interesting to take the story forward in time. The earl served

31. On this occasion the earl marshal indented to serve with 100 men-at-arms and 300 archers: The National Archives E101/70/2/576 for his indenture.

32. The National Archives E101/51/2 m. 27.

33. The National Archives E101/70/601.



again with large companies in the campaigns of 1417, 1423 and 1430 in addition to captaining the garrison of Pontoise between January 1421 and June 1422. Whilst we have Exchequer records for these periods of service, we do not have any further receiver-general's accounts on which to draw. This is a pity, for it would have been instructive to see whether there was a move away from reliance on the household and on pre-existing connections as the war with France continued. It would also be possible to look at the surviving muster roll evidence for later expeditions and for the garrisons which were established in Normandy to see whether men who were in Earl John's retinue in 1415 served under other captains later. My researches into the personnel of the garrisons has suggested that soldiers soon developed links with places and continued to serve in the same location even when their initial captain moved on.<sup>34</sup> The researches of Anne Marshall also demonstrated how men entered into new associations by virtue of military service in the same companies and garrisons.<sup>35</sup> Thus whilst war consolidated existing links and personal ties, it also served to develop new ones, affecting no doubt the composition of households, the nature of friendships and the complexity of relationships in general. The war retinue of the fifteenth century must therefore be seen as a dynamic entity, although one which sometimes had an existing household at its heart, much as had been the case in earlier centuries.

---

34. A. Curry, "Military Organization in Lancastrian Normandy, 1422-1450", unpublished PhD thesis, CNAA, Teesside Polytechnic, 1985, vol. 2, appendix XIB.

35. A.E. Marshall, "The Role of English War Captains in England and Normandy, 1436-61", unpublished MA thesis, University of Wales, 1975. For a brief case study of two soldiers with intertwining careers, namely Andrew Trollope and Osbern Mundeford, see A. Curry, *Essential Histories: The Hundred Years War* (Botley, 2002), p. 71-2.

## Résumé

Anne CURRY

### **Personal links and the nature of the English war retinue: a case study of John Mowbray, earl marshal, and the campaign of 1415**

Au cours de la phase de la guerre de Cent Ans qui correspond au x<sup>v</sup>e siècle, les armées anglaises furent levées par le moyen de contrats passés entre la Couronne et des hommes qui se chargeaient de pourvoir un certain nombre de soldats pour une période précise de service. Ce système est bien documenté dans les archives de la série de l'Échiquier aujourd'hui conservée aux National Archives/Public Record Office. Ces sources nous fournissent une grande richesse d'informations au sujet de l'importance numérique et de l'organisation des armées, et elles nous donnent aussi des listes de noms de soldats en service effectif. Toutefois, elles ne nous permettent pas de savoir comment les capitaines recrutaient leurs troupes. John Mowbray, comte maréchal, avait l'intention de servir dans la campagne de 1415 avec 200 hommes. Dans son cas, nous disposons non seulement de la documentation de l'Échiquier mais aussi du compte du receveur général pour la période allant de septembre 1414 au mois de septembre de l'année suivante. Ce document contient de nombreuses informations sur les préparatifs de campagne du comte et nous permet de voir comment celui-ci recruta ses troupes. La principale conclusion que nous pouvons tirer de cette étude est que les officiers et les membres de son hôtel formaient le cœur de sa retenue de guerre au cours de cette campagne.