

THE LANCASTRIAN LAND SETTLEMENT IN NORMANDY AND
NORTHERN FRANCE, 1417-1450

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements
of the University of Liverpool for the degree of
Doctor in Philosophy by Robert Andrew Massey

January 1987

THE LANCASTRIAN LAND SETTLEMENT IN NORMANDY AND

NORTHERN FRANCE, 1417-1450

Robert Andrew Massey

Abstract of Thesis

It is now recognized that Henry V's second expedition to France in 1417 was different in aim and method from previous royal campaigns of the late Middle Ages. The intention was not merely to conquer and occupy but to settle. This thesis examines the accompanying large-scale confiscation of Norman and French properties, both rural and urban, and their subsequent redistribution to Lancastrian land settlers of all ranks as a reward for past services and an incentive to future commitment. It aims to provide answers to the questions of the identity of settlers, their number and distribution, length of estate tenure, the nature of landed revenues and the likely value of holdings to their owners.

Chapter One examines the initial allocation of lands by Henry V in the context of the piecemeal conquest of Normandy, and provides a case study of settlement in the Vexin Normand. The second chapter looks at Bedford's policy during the years of Anglo-Burgundian territorial expansion. Particular emphasis is put first on the impact of the battle of Verneuil, and secondly on the distribution of patronage to members of the Bedford household. Chapter Three considers the period after 1435 and argues for the persistence of an active settlement in spite of the serious economic problems then evident. The following chapter examines the English presence in towns across the period of study.

Consideration is then given to the way in which both the central authorities and landholders themselves managed the properties in their charge and, briefly, to actions at law taken to pursue and defend individual interests. Finally, an attempt is made to assess the nature and quantity of landed income accruing to beneficiaries of differing ranks. Appendices provide further information on the chronology and location of grants and on the distribution of rewards by successive lieutenants-general to members of their own households.

Copious use is made of manuscript sources available in Paris and Normandy to suggest that the settlement was of a size and of a duration sufficient to constitute a revolution in land ownership. The consequences for the diplomatic and political history of the period 1417-50, on both sides of the sea, were correspondingly far-reaching.

CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| List of Tables and Map | iii |
| List of Appendices | iv |
| Acknowledgments | v |
| Abbreviations | vi |
| Introduction | viii |
| | |
| <u>CHAPTER ONE</u> <u>THE LAND SETTLEMENT 1417-22</u> | 1 |
| (i) Introduction | 1 |
| (ii) The Land Settlement 1417-22 | 5 |
| (iii) The Vexin Normand: A Case Study | 34 |
| (iv) The Distribution of Settlers | 53 |
| | |
| <u>CHAPTER TWO</u> <u>THE LAND SETTLEMENT 1422-35</u> | 67 |
| (i) Continuity and Change 1422-4 | 67 |
| (ii) The Impact of the Battle of Verneuil | 83 |
| (iii) Bedford and his Household | 94 |
| (iv) The Land Settlement 1424-35 | 111 |
| | |
| <u>CHAPTER THREE</u> <u>THE LAND SETTLEMENT 1435-50</u> | 125 |
| (i) The Military and Diplomatic Setting | 125 |
| (ii) Economic and Social Problems | 143 |
| (iii) The Land Settlement 1435-50 | 158 |

| | | <u>Page</u> |
|----------------------|--|-------------|
| <u>CHAPTER FOUR</u> | <u>THE URBAN SETTLEMENT 1417-50</u> | 179 |
| (i) | Settlement by Henry V 1417-22 | 179 |
| (ii) | Settlement 1422-36 | 202 |
| (iii) | Rouen and the Norman Towns 1436-50 | 215 |
| <u>CHAPTER FIVE</u> | <u>THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAND SETTLEMENT</u> | 236 |
| (i) | The Granting of Rural Lands | 236 |
| (ii) | The Granting of Urban Properties | 258 |
| (iii) | The Royal Demesne | 261 |
| (iv) | Administration and Financial Management | 269 |
| <u>CHAPTER SIX</u> | <u>LITIGATION AND LAND TENURE</u> | 296 |
| <u>CHAPTER SEVEN</u> | <u>THE LANDED REVENUES OF SETTLERS</u> | 320 |
| (i) | Introduction | 320 |
| (ii) | Estate Management | 324 |
| (iii) | The Nature of Revenues | 333 |
| (iv) | Two Major Landholders | 352 |
| (v) | Settlers of Middle Rank | 360 |
| <u>CONCLUSION</u> | | 371 |
| <u>APPENDICES</u> | | 373 |
| <u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u> | | 430 |

LIST OF TABLES AND MAP

| <u>Tables</u> | | <u>Page</u> |
|---------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | Land Value Related to Military Service, 1417-22 | 248 |
| 2 | Property Value Related to Guard Duty at Harfleur, 1417-22 | 259 |
| 3 | Income at Prez | 336 |
| 4 | Combined Income and Expenditure at Prez and La Carneille | 337 |
| 5 | The Value of Tancarville, 1428-31 | 339 |
| 6 | Expenditure at Tancarville | 342 |
| 7 | The Value of Lillebonne, 1429-30 | 344 |
| | | |
| <u>Map</u> | | |
| 1 | Identified Lands in the Vexin Normand Granted to Settlers, 1417-22 | 36 |

LIST OF APPENDICES

| | | <u>Page</u> |
|------|---|-------------|
| I | The Distribution of Lands to Settlers, 1417-22 | 373 |
| II | Settlers Granted Identified Lands in the Vexin Normand, 1417-22 | 377 |
| III | Household Men of Henry V Granted French Lands and Houses, 1417-22 | 382 |
| IV | The Distribution of Land to Settlers, 1422-35 | 390 |
| V | Household Men of Bedford Granted French Lands, 1422-35 | 399 |
| VI | The Distribution of Lands to Settlers, 1435-50 | 407 |
| VII | Household Men of York Granted French Lands, May 1436 - April 1437 | 415 |
| VIII | Household Men of Warwick Granted French Lands, November 1437 - April 1439 | 417 |
| IX | Household Men and the Affinity of York Granted French Lands, July 1440 - September 1445 | 419 |
| X | The Distribution of Urban Properties to Settlers, 1417-22 | 422 |
| XI | Settlers Granted Burgess Status at Caen | 426 |
| XII | Settlers Granted Burgess Status at Rouen, Honfleur and Cherbourg | 428 |

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My first debt is to the institutions which have provided financial support for my research. The University of Liverpool, the Department of Education and Science, the Institute of Historical Research and the University of Exeter have been generous sponsors of work done in this country and especially in Paris and Normandy. If space precludes the appropriate acknowledgment of the national and local record offices and libraries which have given me access and welcome, I must thank the staff of the Sydney Jones Library at the University of Liverpool for much help and, not least, a comfortable carrel.

To my friends, Dr. Anne Curry, Dr. Michael K. Jones and Dr. Guy Thompson I owe the inestimable benefits of discussion with and inspiration from fellow-workers. Miss Elizabeth Danbury gave me early training in palaeography, for which I thank her. To my supervisor, Dr. Christopher Allmand, I owe my greatest debt of gratitude for unfailing encouragement and support over a long period. This thesis is dedicated to the memory of my father and mother.

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| AN | Archives Nationales, Paris |
| <u>B.E.C.</u> | <u>Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes</u> |
| Bib. Mun. | Bibliothèque Municipale |
| <u>B.I.H.R.</u> | <u>Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research</u> |
| <u>B.J.R.L.</u> | <u>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</u> |
| BL | British Library, London |
| Add. Ch. | Additional Charter |
| Add. Ms. | Additional Manuscript |
| BN | Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris |
| Bréquigny | 'Rôles normands et français ... tirées des archives de Londres par Bréquigny ...', <u>M.S.A.N.</u> , xxiii (1858) |
| <u>B.S.A.N.</u> | <u>Bulletin de la société des antiquaires de Normandie</u> |
| <u>C.C.R.</u> | <u>Calendar of Close Rolls</u> |
| <u>C.P.R.</u> | <u>Calendar of Patent Rolls</u> |
| Calvados | Archives Départementales du Calvados, Caen |
| <u>D.K.R.</u> | <u>Annual Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records</u> |
| <u>D.N.B.</u> | <u>Dictionary of National Biography</u> |
| E.E.T.S. | Early English Text Society |
| <u>E.H.R.</u> | <u>English Historical Review</u> |
| <u>Econ. H.R.</u> | <u>Economic History Review</u> |
| Eure | Archives Départementales de l'Eure, Evreux |
| <u>Foedera</u> | <u>Foedera, Conventiones, Literae ...</u> , ed. T. Rymer (third edn., 10 vols., The Hague, 1739-45) |
| <u>G.E.C.</u> | <u>Complete Peerage of England ...</u> , ed. G.E. Cockayne et al. (12 vols., London, 1910-59) |
| Hardy | <u>Rotuli Normanniae in Turri Londinensi asservati ...</u> , ed. T.D. Hardy (Record Commission, London, 1835) |
| Lenoir | Archives Nationales, Paris, Collection Dom Lenoir |

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Manche | Archives Départementales de la Manche, St.-Lô |
| <u>M.S.A.N.</u> | <u>Mémoires de la société des antiquaires de Normandie</u> |
| Ms. fr. | Manuscrit français |
| n. acq. fr. | nouvelle acquisition française |
| Orne | Archives Départementales de l'Orne, Alençon |
| PO | Pièce originale |
| <u>P.P.C.</u> | <u>Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England, 1386-1542</u> , ed. N.H. Nicolas (7 vols., London, 1834-7) |
| PRO | Public Record Office, London |
| R.S. | Rolls Series |
| <u>Rot. Parl.</u> | <u>Rotuli Parliamentorum</u> |
| S.A.T.F. | Société des anciens textes français |
| S.H.F. | Société de l'histoire de France |
| S.H.N. | Société de l'histoire de Normandie |
| S.H.P. | Société de l'histoire de Paris |
| Seine-Mme | Archives Départementales de la Seine-Maritime, Rouen |
| <u>T.R. Hist. S.</u> | <u>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</u> |
| Wylie and Waugh | J.H. Wylie and W.T. Waugh, <u>The Reign of Henry the Fifth</u> (3 vols., Cambridge, 1914-29) |
| <u>l.p.</u> | <u>livre(s) parisis</u> |
| <u>s.p.</u> | <u>sou(s) parisis</u> |
| <u>d.p.</u> | <u>denier(s) parisis</u> |
| <u>l.t.</u> | <u>livre(s) tournois</u> |
| <u>s.t.</u> | <u>sou(s) tournois</u> |
| <u>d.t.</u> | <u>denier(s) tournois</u> |

INTRODUCTION

The acquisition, management and retention of land were matters central to medieval life. Few historians would dispute the intrinsic value of landed property as a source of subsistence, livelihood or wealth in a predominantly agrarian society. It is now fully appreciated, too, that the ownership of land conferred status and privilege upon its holders. Power and patronage were as surely the benefits which it bore as impotence and vulnerability were the burdens of the untenured. Of the manifold attractions of the possession of property in the later Middle Ages, two which are emphasised in this thesis are the permanence of land as a resource by comparison with more transient personal gains, and the opportunities it presented for integration into a local community and the subsequent development of personal and professional ties and obligations.

The ownership of land generated written records, and the starting-point for this thesis has been the letters of grant issued to individual settlers in the name of Henry V and Henry VI. Particular sources are identified and discussed in each chapter, but in general terms the most valuable evidence for the distribution of properties comes from the Norman Rolls of Henry V in the Public Record Office, the registers of the Trésor des Chartes in the Archives Nationales for the years 1422-35, and the Collection Lenoir for the period after 1435, also in the Archives Nationales. Extracts from the Norman Rolls have been published on several occasions, notably by Carte in 1743 and by Vautier

in 1828, and the official Calendars were made available in the 1880s, but each of these sources has limitations in the form of brevity and the inaccurate transcription of place names and personal names.¹

Carte made efforts to record the rank and provenance of settlers but not the value or date of grants; the Calendar entries provide details of feudal tributes but not of land values or military obligation.²

For this reason the original sources have been consulted, and whenever possible the supporting reference given is to Bréquigny, the most complete and reliable of the copyists.

Aside from grants, abundant sources have been examined relevant to the tenure and transmission of land. The single most important collection for the whole period is that of Dom Lenoir, containing delays for the performance of services owed and detailed informations of the estates of individual landholders. This information was derived largely from the records of the chambre des comptes in Paris, largely dispersed after the dramatic fire of 1737 into public and private collections, the most valuable for present purposes being Série P at the Archives Nationales and the Additional Charters at the British Library. At a local level, great benefit has been derived from reading the registers of the Tabellionage at Caen and especially Rouen, and it

1. Catalogue des rolles gascons, normans et françois, conservés dans les archives de la Tour de Londres, ed. T. Carte (2 vols., London, 1743); C. Vautier (ed.), Extrait du registre des dons, confiscations, maintenues et autres actes faits dans le duché de Normandie pendant les années 1418, 1419, et 1420, par Henri V, Roi d'Angleterre (Paris, 1828).
2. D.K.R., xli, xlii, passim. In the same volume are published Charma's transcriptions of a manuscript in the Collection Clairambault, itself probably copied from the original Rolls, and the much fuller extracts taken at first hand by Bréquigny (A. Charma, 'Partie des dons faits par Henry V, roi d'Angleterre, lorsqu'il se fut rendu maître de la Normandie', M.S.A.N., 3^e série, xxiii (1858); idem, Bréquigny, passim.

has been the Norman Archives Départementales which have yielded fruitful sources on litigation and arbitration, and also estate accounts for the assessment of the nature and quantity of landed income.

It would be possible to write at some length of likely precedents for the Lancastrian settlement in northern France. The first to spring to mind would be the Norman conquest of England, and parallels can also be drawn with the Norman occupation of Ireland, and the Edwardian colonisations of Wales and, to a lesser extent, of Scotland.¹ Common to each were the dispossession of native landholders and the introduction of colonists, both individuals and families, as a land-owning caste enjoying favourable terms of tenure. Important as these precedents were, particularly the subjection of Wales of which Prince Henry had direct personal experience at a later date, none could provide a model for what was attempted in northern France.

It has been argued that the 'new imperialism' brought to late thirteenth-century Wales embraced racial resettlement and the imposition of alien systems of land tenure and law.² One hallmark of the colonisation of Ireland was the speculative grant to the great captain conditional upon his conquest of the territory concerned.³ Such were not practices characteristic of the Lancastrian régime in France. The choice of terms such as 'settler' and 'settlement' in this thesis stems

-
1. K.B. McFarlane, The Nobility of Later Medieval England (Oxford, 1973), p. 35; J. Otway-Ruthven, 'Knight Service in Ireland', Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, lxxxix (1959), 1-15; R.R. Davies, Lordship and Society in the March of Wales, 1282-1400 (Oxford, 1978).
 2. R.R. Davies, 'Colonial Wales', Past and Present, 65 (1974), 14.
 3. A.J. Otway-Ruthven, A History of Medieval Ireland (second edn., London, 1980), pp. 61-4.

not from a naïve approach to the harsh realities of warfare and the sequestration of properties but from an attempt to understand the intentions and actions of the Lancastrians as they are reflected in the manuscript sources. These sources have largely dictated the approach taken to each chapter and to the work as a whole: the aim has been to balance against the pronouncements of government and the progression of successful petitions for land the practicalities of the tenure of estates and houses in the localities.

This work attempts to make a contribution to the literature assessing the impact of war on late medieval society. The occupation of northern France demanded the participation of all ranks and many occupations, and attention is given to the lowest classes of grantees, to members of households and families who made new homes for themselves, and to individual settlers whose careers were bound up closely with the possession of land. How many settlers were there? Adding the numbers drawn up in Appendices I, IV, VI and X produces a total of 1,253 known, identified grantees of rural and urban property for the period 1417-50. Given that one man might well receive several grants at different dates, an allowance of 20% for grants to existing beneficiaries would leave just over 1,000 land settlers. To this figure must be added those recognised in other sources as landholders for whom no letters of grant are known. It is suggested that a multiplier of three, and perhaps as high as five, would not be unrealistic in estimating the total number of land settlers.

In terms of chronology, attention is given to the period from Henry V's second expedition to France in 1417 until the expulsion of most English settlers and soldiers in 1450, crossing a dividing line variously drawn at Orléans in 1429, at Arras in 1435 or at Paris in 1436.

The preferred choice here of 1435 reflects the significance for the land settlement of Bedford's death. The chosen area of study is that of Normandy and northern France. The special position of the duchy of Normandy which was upheld by the English for legal and political reasons could at the same time be ignored for the purposes of requesting and allocating available lands. To this end, due tribute is paid to the cartographers of the Institut Géographique National whose maps have proved invaluable in plotting the distribution of the settlement across this large area. Place names have been modernised as far as possible.

The inspiration for this thesis stems largely from a pioneering article published by Dr. C.T. Allmand in 1968 on the land settlement, since further explored in context in his 1983 monograph, Lancastrian Normandy.¹ No apology is made for frequent reference to both works. Much has also been gained from the publication of legal suits of English interest taken from the daunting registers of the Paris Parlement.² Not the least of the values of these works is that they champion people as well as institutions. This thesis similarly aims to pursue individual careers, a task made difficult by the strange mutations to which English surnames were prone in the hands of French secretaries and notaries. The other main point of reference has been Dr. Anne Curry's work on the Lancastrian armies in the field and in garrisons,

-
1. C.T. Allmand, 'The Lancastrian Land Settlement in Normandy, 1417-50', Econ. H.R., second series, xxi (1968), 461-79; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy 1415-1450. The History of a Medieval Occupation (Oxford, 1983).
 2. C.T. Allmand and C.A.J. Armstrong (eds.), English Suits before the Parlement of Paris 1420-1436, Camden fourth series, xxvi (Royal Historical Society, London, 1982).

and her discussion of service by obligation in particular.¹ Otherwise, the responsibility for what follows is entirely my own.²

Reference is made to both the livre tournois and the livre parisis. One livre parisis was always worth 25 sous tournois. The franc was a coin, but was used as an alternative name for the livre tournois; the écu was a gold coin worth slightly less than the livre tournois. The salut d'or was probably worth 30 sous tournois. The pound sterling is thought to have been worth nine livres tournois towards the end of the period but a ratio of 1:6 may be a more realistic figure for the 1420s.³

-
1. A. Curry, 'Military Organization in Lancastrian Normandy, 1422-1450' (unpublished C.N.A.A. Ph.D. thesis, 2 vols., 1985).
 2. R.A. Massey, 'The Land Settlement in Lancastrian Normandy', Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History, ed. A.J. Pollard (Gloucester and New York, 1984), pp. 76-96.
 3. P. Spufford (ed.), Handbook of Medieval Exchange (Royal Historical Society, London, 1986); Lenoir 28/27; AN, JJ 172 no. 265; 174 no. 184.

CHAPTER ONE

THE LAND SETTLEMENT 1417-22

(i) Introduction

Late in July 1417, the great army which had assembled on the south coast of England set sail for France. Just as the embarkation of such a force must have taken several days at least, so too must the landing close to Touques. Chronicle and manuscript sources agreed, however, that Henry V's second expedition to France officially 'began' on 1 August 1417.¹ Contemporaries soon became aware of the significance of the date to the invading king and his supporters: it marked the beginning of a planned and systematic attempt to conquer a land and a people who, it was claimed, were the rightful subjects of the English crown. It is probable that the intention was to capture Normandy as Monstrelet recorded,² a duchy with which England shared many common interests and past associations, and a considerable prize in itself. The invasion marked the expression of a territorial claim to an English inheritance in France, a claim which had been asserted in a series of diplomatic exchanges from the time of Henry V's accession but which had consistently accorded a central

-
1. The 'Ordinances of Henry V on the Maintenance of the Conquest' referred to 'ladite conquete qui commança à la descente à Touques' (BL, Add. Ms. 21411 f. 9).
 2. La Chronique d'Enguerran de Monstrelet, ed. L. Douët d'Arcq (6 vols., S.H.F., Paris, 1857-62), iii, 188.

position to Normandy. At the heart of the English case lay an insistence that it was only upon the terms of the treaty of Brétigny of 1360 that a lasting agreement could be negotiated.¹ Secondly, the resort to arms marked the revival of a parallel English claim to the French crown which dated from Edward III's resumption of the title in 1369 after its abandonment at Brétigny..

The point to note about these two elements of the English position is that they were based on history:² there was no great originality to Henry's argument, which had been asserted and denied over several generations and which must have been widely familiar. What was new was the skilful use to which the thesis was put in order to justify a large-scale invasion of northern France. The sources leave no doubt as to the widespread dissemination of English propaganda based upon the transcription and collation of documents relating to, among other matters, the claim to the French crown. These documents, comprising copies of treaties made by Henry IV and papers from the early years of his son's reign,³ were brought together in the 'libri recordorum' to which the Gesta Henrici Quinti refers on several occasions.⁴ With the pronouncements made in each Parliament of the reign, they comprised the essence of an 'official' English position to be communicated at home and abroad. Within two weeks of

-
1. E.F. Jacob, Henry V and the Invasion of France (London, 1947), pp. 16-17.
 2. See A. Gransden, Historical Writing in England, ii, c.1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century (London, 1982), pp. [197-200].
 3. Ibid., p. [203] n. 67. Material collected also related to the English claim to Aquitaine.
 4. Gesta Henrici Quinti. The Deeds of Henry the Fifth, ed. and trans. F. Taylor and J.S. Roskell (Oxford, 1975), pp. xxxix-xliii, 14, 18, 56.

the landing at Touques, Henry had written to Charles VI requesting the restoration of the crown and the kingdom of France.¹ Two years later, privy-seal letters were sent simultaneously to Louis III, duke of Bavaria, and to Charles I, duke of Lorraine, explaining the reasons for the resumption of the war.²

There was a consistency in the Lancastrian argument which meant that the justification for the renewal of hostilities in 1417 could be recalled and reiterated from the public declarations which had preceded Henry V's first expedition to France two years previously. Then, the king had spoken to the mayor and leading citizens of London of his intention to reconquer lands rightly belonging to the crown, which had long been 'by enormous wrong withheld'.³ During both expeditions, the city's letter-books disclosed an intention to keep London, and therefore the country, informed by means of newsletters both of progress in war and of particular requirements in the form of manpower and military supplies.⁴

It is the chronicle literature, however, which best conveys the essence of what Henry was trying to achieve. The popular and patriotic Brut, for example, related that the king's title and right

1. English Medieval Diplomatic Practice. Part I, Documents and Interpretation, ed. P. Chaplais (2 vols., London, 1982), i, 37-9; Foedera, Conventiones, Literae ..., ed. T. Rymer (10 vols., The Hague, 1739-45), IV, iii, 12.
2. English Medieval Diplomatic Practice, ii, 456-7.
3. Memorials of London and London Life in the XIIIth, XIVth, and XVth Centuries 1276-1419, ed. H.T. Riley (London, 1868), pp. 603-5.
4. Ibid., pp. 619-20, 664-6; Collection générale des documents français qui se trouvent en Angleterre, ed. J. Delpit (Paris, 1847), pp. 216-31. The letter-books were used by J.L. Kirby, 'Henry V and the City of London', History Today, xxvi (1976), 223-31.

to Normandy and other territories had been wrongfully withheld, since his ancestors had held them before him, 'be trewe titill of conquest, and rizt heritage.'¹ During the negotiations for the surrender of Rouen, the same source reported the king's stern reply to the inhabitants: 'it is myn owne londe'.² Above all, it was the Gesta which set out the English position in forthright tones. A legitimate territorial claim had been unjustly denied against natural law and God's will; in doing so the French had proved themselves to be an obdurate and rebellious people. Efforts to secure a perpetual peace had failed in the face of stubbornness and duplicitas and so, reluctantly, Henry V was forced to resort to arms to recover Normandy, which belonged to him by right dating from the time of William the Conqueror.³

There is no doubt that the English king believed in the justice of this view.⁴ 'He had convinced himself by his reading of history and by the archives of his foreign department that his case was overwhelming.'⁵ What is more, he must have convinced many others that war, with all that it might entail in terms of personal loss and communal sacrifice, was the only means of proving that case in the eyes of God and his people. It was a considerable achievement to spread this conviction widely. It was again a great achievement to

-
1. The Brut or The Chronicles of England, ed. F.W.D. Brie (2 vols., E.E.T.S., London, 1906-8), ii, 374.
 2. Ibid., 411.
 3. Gesta, pp. 14-18, 34-6.
 4. C.T. Allmand, 'Henry V the Soldier, and the War in France', Henry V. The Practice of Kingship, ed. G.L. Harriss (Oxford, 1985), pp. 117-35.
 5. Jacob, Henry V, p. 66.

transform this belief into the summoning and marshalling of a large army, variously estimated at 10-12,000 men,¹ regardless of how many of them shared the king's motivation. Their landing in Normandy put into effect a claim first, to the land itself, and secondly, to the people living on it. The intention of the subsequent confiscation and distribution of properties was that these two elements, land and people, should be brought together to form the bedrock of a permanent settlement upon which the wider aspirations and hopes of the English crown could be built.

(ii) The Land Settlement 1417-22

The first known land grant of the second expedition was made on 25 September 1417, when Thomas Montague earl of Salisbury was given the castle and lordship of Auvillars, situated in the pays d'Auge between Caen and Lisieux.² The following day, he was commissioned to receive all in Auvillars and nearby wishing to swear allegiance to the king, excluding those from the adjacent lordship of Auge.³ Salisbury had taken the surrender of Auvillars on 14 August from its captain, Richard de Tournebu, whose lands were included in the grant.⁴ Thus within two months of landing on French soil Salisbury, already an

-
1. Ibid., p. 125.
 2. Rotuli Normanniae in Turri Londinensi asservati, Johanne et Henrico Quinto Angliae Regibus, ed. T.D. Hardy (Record Commission, London, 1835), pp. 283-4.
 3. Ibid., pp. 157-8. It is possible that Auge had already been awarded to the duke of Clarence, but the official letters of grant were dated 27 February 1418 (Les Croniques de Normendie (1223-1453), ed. A. Hellot (Rouen, 1881), p. 33; see below, p. 18.
 4. Hardy, pp. 146-7, 285-6.

established and trusted military commander, was rewarded with estates in return for the exercise of local responsibilities. The royal biographer, Titus Livius, thought this of sufficient merit to record as follows:

'Itaque tunc primus strenuus [iste comes] qui hoc in conquestu terris a regia liberalitate donatus est.'¹

Although grants were few in number during the first six months of the English occupation, that to Salisbury reveals features which epitomised the emergent land settlement of Henry V. First, a baron was given lands which he himself had brought into the English obedience, with the implied recognition of past good services and of compensation for personal expenses hitherto incurred. From the very outset, the settlement acted as a concomitant to the military conquest of Normandy, and the immediate redistribution of a recognised lordship and caput to its conqueror marked the first stage in this process of piecemeal distribution. Secondly, the grant encompassed a personal transfer of property from the hands of a defeated captain to those of a victor: de Tournebu was punished as a 'rebelle et désobéissant' by an initial loss of lands and, probably, a subsequent confiscation.² Thirdly, it was at once made clear to Salisbury as the beneficiary of the land, income and title of the lordship of Auvillars that certain responsibilities were to be exercised as a quid pro quo. These took the form of the homage and feudal tribute to the

1. Titii Livii Foro-Julienensis Vita Henrici Quinti, ed. T. Hearne (Oxford, 1716), p. 34; The First English Life of King Henry the Fifth, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1911), p. 83.
2. Salisbury later came into possession of Grimbosq and La Motte-de-Cesny near Tournebu in the vicomté of Falaise, which he held as a life-grant. (AN, JJ 175 no. 149).

crown expected of all landholders, but also involved a more general commitment to the conquest and pacification of a local area as a representative of the king.

From its very earliest stages, the Henrician settlement balanced defence and attack, reward and incentive, personal gain and public responsibility. If the prime need was to defend what had been won, the next was to extend the amount of territory within the English obedience. On 7 October 1417 Henry Lord FitzHugh and John Neville were authorised to capture towns and castles, receive allegiances from Norman subjects and issue safe-conducts.¹ Their powers were confirmed on 16 October² and significantly extended on 24 October to take account of the capture of Alençon and the extension southwards of the frontier of the occupation.³ Like Salisbury, FitzHugh was engaged both in conquest and its consolidation, and he was similarly rewarded, receiving the castles and lordships of L'Aigle and Chambois on 8 November together with lands at Tuboeuf and those of the comte and comtesse de Penthièvre.⁴ A valued royal servant and administrator,⁵

1. Hardy, pp. 174-5.

2. Ibid., p. 181.

3. Their commission gives one of the first signs that the occupation was intended to extend beyond Normandy to include towns and castles in France, 'regnum nostrum' (ibid., p. 189).

4. Ibid., p. 280.

5. A royal chamberlain of Henry V from 1413 (C.P.R., 1413-16, p. 9) and Treasurer of the Exchequer from late in 1416, FitzHugh had been present at the siege of Harfleur and at Agincourt (A.C. Reeves, Lancastrian Englishmen (Washington, 1981), pp. 65-138. From 1420 his retinue was based at Falaise (BL. Add. Ch. 80), where he was captain until 1422 (BN, Ms. fr. 20643 no. 5517; D.K.R., xlii, 438, 447). His son William also saw service in France (G.E.C., v, 426-9), and in 1447 was given licence to succeed to L'Aigle and other lands held by his father and 'unjustly detained' since (D.K.R., xlvi, 373).

it was above all as a soldier that FitzHugh was given the lands of Jean de Tilly, the knight who had yielded the castle of Chambois, and L'Aigle itself, whose surrender he had accepted on 13 October.¹

The pattern of distribution of confiscated French fiefs closely followed the movements of the advancing English armies. The capture of the town and then the castle of Caen in September 1417 put into the king's hands the administrative capital of lower Normandy.² It was from there that Salisbury's letters of grant were issued. The thrust of the advance was then directed against Argentan and Alençon, where grants were made to FitzHugh and Sir John Grey,³ and the first phase of the occupation ended when the great castle at Falaise surrendered on 16 February 1418.⁴ Its capture effectively secured the eastern frontier of the conquest as it then stood against possible attack from that direction, and Newhall was surely right to regard this as a turning-point in military terms.⁵

This success also gave an important stimulus to the land settlement. As Appendix I reveals, grants were very few in number during the first six months of the occupation, with only six settlers rewarded

-
1. For Tilly at Chambois see Hardy, p. 177, and for the surrender of L'Aigle, ibid., pp. 306-7.
 2. J.H. Wylie and W.T. Waugh, The Reign of Henry the Fifth (3 vols., Cambridge, 1914-29), iii, 59-62; Hardy, pp. 287-9.
 3. Grey was given the castle and lordship of Tilly-sur-Seulles west of Caen, together with hospices in Bayeux and Caen (Hardy, pp. 281-2).
 4. Wylie and Waugh, iii, 69-72.
 5. R.A. Newhall, The English Conquest of Normandy, 1416-1424. A Study in Fifteenth-Century Warfare (New Haven, 1924), pp. 80, 92.

before February 1418.¹ Between 1 and 15 February six more men were given lands, with a further ten grantees known between 16-28 February, almost doubling the number of recipients within two weeks. This acceleration in the number of grants may be attributable in part to the administrative procedure which governed their issue: it was not uncommon to find letters patent bunched together on certain days and weeks. But the successful investment of Falaise must have inspired confidence and engendered a feeling of greater security, which in turn led to an increase in demand for French land, now freely available. For the first time, it was apparent that the king's bold claim to Normandy might be realised.

Plotting the distribution of grants made during this early period on the map, it becomes clear that there was little that was random or haphazard about the redistribution of Norman fiefs. Appendix I shows that the majority of lands given to Englishmen lay within the bailliage of Caen, which is not surprising given the presence of the king and the armies there. It is possible to distinguish, however, what may be termed frontier grants, which at the time of their award marked the effective boundary of the military conquest. Clustered together in the vicomtés of Caen and Bayeux, two such frontier grants were those of the fortalice and lordship of Colombières, given to Richard Drayton, esquire, on 12 February 1418,² and the lordship of Asnières-en-Bessin given to Thomas Appulton, esquire, four days later.³

-
1. See also R.A. Newhall, 'Henry V's Policy of Conciliation in Normandy, 1417-1422', Anniversary Essays in Mediaeval History by Students of Charles Homer Haskins, ed. C.H. Taylor (Boston, 1929), p. 215.
 2. Hardy, pp. 247-8.
 3. Ibid., pp. 315-6.

There was nothing in the terms of these grants, their obligations or their values, to otherwise set them apart. They were distinguished only by their location, in this case well to the west of Bayeux. It was to become one of the constants of the land settlement that certain settlers chose for themselves estates at the very edge of the area within the military control of their king.

Frontier grants created an outer buffer of strategic fiefs in English hands, behind which a more concentrated settlement could develop. In effect, they created a defensive ring which encircled Bayeux and Caen. Bayeux was surrounded by the fiefs of Asnières-en-Bessin, Colombières, Tilly-sur-Seulles¹ and Sommervieu.² If grants made in the vicomté of Caen are traced on the map, the result is a protective ring stretching from Varaville³ in the north-east, through Auvillars and La Poterie⁴ to the east, from Cesny-aux-Vignes-Ouézy⁵ and Billy⁶ through to Urville and Les Fontaines⁷ to the south of Caen. Addition of the lordships of Saint-Vaast⁸ and Tracy-Bocage⁹ forms,

1. See above, p. 8.
2. Sommervieu, east of Bayeux, was given to Henry Tilleman, esquire (Hardy, pp. 266-7; Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, pp. 308-9).
3. Hardy, p. 249, granted to Walter Intebergh.
4. Ibid., pp. 275-6, to William Bradwardine.
5. Ibid., pp. 276-7, to John Halys.
6. Ibid., p. 262, to John Sutton.
7. Both fiefs were granted to Robert Shottesbroke (ibid., p. 244).
8. Above, n. 4.
9. Bréquigny no. 466. This is a rare example of a grant from other than the king. The original letters issued by Humphrey duke of Gloucester on 28 February 1418 were confirmed by the crown in April 1419 and extended to include more land (PRO, C.64/11 m.52); the whole transaction was ratified and extended still further on 1 July 1421 (ibid., C.64/16 m.31; Bréquigny no. 1002).

very roughly, a large semi-circle of grants around Caen and Bayeux.

It will not pay to read too much into this pattern of landed distribution. It is not suggested that it was in any way a policy to allocate land in strict geometric patterns, or to apportion to an individual settler a defined place within a concentric circle of outposts designed to defend Caen or Bayeux against attack from any direction. Rather, these fiefs stood as marker-posts, delimiting the extent of the occupation as it pushed outwards from its early strongholds into lower Normandy. At a local level, each will have acted as a base for the defence and consolidation of what had been won so far, acting at best as a supplement to rather than a replacement for the garrison and field armies being mobilised at the same time. Frontier grants established a firm English presence in the Norman countryside: the redistribution of confiscated lordships took the occupation into new areas which armies may only have passed through on their way from one siege to another. The evidence of these grants does suggest, however, a coherence and strategy to the land settlement from an early date. French lands were awarded carefully and cautiously, and their allocation formed an essential element of Henry V's military policy.

What were the obligations incumbent upon these early settlers? From the outset, all grantees were expected to pay homage to their lord, namely the king, of whom all possessions were held. They were also subject to the provision of a feudal tribute at a time and place that were clearly specified: Sir Richard Strother was to render a pair of gilt spurs at Caen castle on the feast of St. John the Baptist;¹ William Ayleston, esquire, was to present a lance at

1. Hardy, pp. 277-8; Lenoir 3/130, 326.

Bayeux castle on the feast of St. Peter ad Vincula.¹ For the most part, the obligations owed at this stage were defensive in nature, with settlers required to defend either Caen or Bayeux (according to which was closer to their lands) with their followers arrayed for war, whenever such service was deemed necessary. Richard Strother therefore undertook to guard the town and castle of Caen, and Ayleston to defend Bayeux. As we shall see, it was not long before this essentially passive contribution to the defence of Normandy was transformed into a more active obligation of military service in return for land tenure.

The advance of the English armies into the Cotentin peninsula began on the very day of the capture of Falaise castle, and the operations spearheaded by Gloucester and Huntingdon were so successful that by mid-April 1418 virtually the whole of lower Normandy was under English control.² The amount of land available for redistribution suddenly increased as a consequence, and an occupation which now embraced the rich bocage lands of the Cotentin could take on a bolder and more confident aspect. On 13 March 1418 the castles and lordships of Hambye and Bricquebec were granted to William de la Pole earl of Suffolk in tail male to the value of 3,500 écus per year with all liberties and franchises, reserving high and supreme justice to the king.³ In return, Suffolk was to perform homage and to present

-
1. Hardy, p. 265. It is interesting to note that this feast-day fell on 1 August, the 'official' date of the English landing in 1417, but this was only one of several saints' days commemorated.
 2. Wylie and Waugh, iii, 72-3.
 3. Hardy, pp. 319-20. He also received a hospice with a separate garden in Caen. On 6 May 1419 the grant was confirmed, and all the arrears of the lordships were added to it (PRO, C.64/11 m.55; Bréquigny no. 535). This latter entry is misleadingly calendared as an original grant (D.K.R., xli, 775).

an annual tribute of a shield of the arms of St. George at Cherbourg on that saint's day. Most important of all, he was obliged to provide six men-at-arms and twelve archers to ride with the royal armies, 'durante presenti guerra'.¹

This grant marked the expansion of the land settlement across the river Vire, hard on the heels of the field armies and occasionally ahead of them. Hambye had surrendered to Sir John Robessart only three days before Suffolk's award, and Bricquebec was probably still in French hands.² Suffolk was the first beneficiary of the redistribution of a series of strategic Cotentin lordships to men of the highest rank. The castle and lordship of Chanteloup south-west of Coutances were given to Sir John Harpenden on 26 March, to an estimated value of 800 écus per year, with the proviso that he kept there a force of men sufficient to defend both the castle tower and the surrounding areas against enemy invasions.³ La Haye-du-Puits stood at an important road junction and formed a link in the chain of communication running northwards from La Haye to Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte, Valognes and Cherbourg, westwards to Carentan and southwards to Coutances. The barony was granted to John Cheyne, esquire, on 1 April 1418, with a defensive obligation identical to that expected at Chanteloup.⁴

Another to benefit from the conquest of the Cotentin was John

-
1. See Curry, 'Military Organization', pp. 395-6 on this difficult term.
 2. Bréquigny no. 84. Bricquebec may not have fallen until late March (Newhall, English Conquest, p. 93, n. 4).
 3. PRO, C.64/9 m.38; Bréquigny no. 79; see below, p. 16.
 4. PRO, C.64/9 m.33; Bréquigny no. 88.

Beauchamp of Powick, Worcestershire. It was surely not by coincidence that he was granted the castle of Beauchamps, together with the castle and lordship of Mesnil-Garnier, both confiscated from Frenchmen declared to be rebels.¹ William Rothelane, esquire, received the estates of Olivier and Jacques Folygny adjacent to Beauchamps.² The significance of these grants becomes clear on the map: the three lordships stood in line, marking the southern limit of the occupation of the peninsula as it then stood, and protecting captured territories against attack from Brittany or from the south-west. The grant of Bricqueville-sur-Mer to John earl of Huntingdon concludes this subgroup of awards to men actively committed to the conquest.³

It can be seen that these were awards of great potential to their holders. The grant to Suffolk was the most valuable of the new acquisitions at an estimated 3,500 écus, whilst Cheyne's barony was thought to be worth 1,500 écus and Beauchamp's lordships 1,500 francs. No value was specified for the earl of Huntingdon's grant, but it was probably of similar standing to that of Suffolk. Emphasis must be placed here on the fact that grants were made to a certain value, according to an estimate of their potential worth to their new owners; this helps to explain the use of round figures and different units of currency. In the first place, then, the values attached to this important series of grants were estimates of the possible revenues

-
1. The former owners were Ralph de Beauchamp and Olivier de Mauny, knights, 'qui quidem ... contra nos rebelles existunt, ut dicitur' (PRO C.64/9 m.12; Bréquigny no. 92). See also below, pp. 27-8.
 2. PRO, C.64/9 m.39; Bréquigny no. 94; Lenoir misread the value of this grant at 800 l.t. instead of 800 francs (Lenoir 3/152; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 52-3).
 3. PRO, C.64/9 m.40; Bréquigny no. 99. It also included a messuage in Caen on the rue Froide.

which might accrue to lands of high prestige from the array of seigneurial rights and privileges attached to them. Secondly, these values were in turn a reflection of the rank and social status of the recipients of the lands in question.¹

From an early date, the land settlement was able to make available rewards to match the demands and expectations of men of the highest military and social position. Those members of the English baronage and nobility who figured prominently as leaders of campaigns, such as Huntingdon and Suffolk, were given French estates commensurate with their personal status and which acknowledged, in the terms of the letters of grant, their good services to the crown. Taking Huntingdon as one example, he had been in the vanguard of the king's armies more than once, at Touques itself early in August 1417, and at the sieges of Caen and Villers-Bocage;² by a commission dated 10 March 1418 he was empowered to bring into the English obedience a number of enemy strongholds in the region of Coutances.³ Huntingdon carried out his duties with conspicuous success, and Bricqueville-sur-Mer was almost certainly amongst the gains for the crown made at this time.⁴ It was more than fitting that the lordship should be given to him as a reward for service on the king's second expedition, and the grant must also have acted as an acknowledgement of the not inconsiderable support he had given to Henry V on land and at sea

-
1. Beauchamp and Rothelane were esquires, but Beauchamp was later knighted, and summoned to Parliament in 1447 (G.E.C., ii, 46-7; BL, Add. Ch. 86).
 2. Wylie and Waugh, iii, 54, 58, 63-4; Hardy, pp. 286-7.
 3. Ibid., pp. 382-3.
 4. Newhall, English Conquest, pp. 93-4.

since 1415.¹

The obligations required of settlers holding lands of high nominal value were of corresponding importance. The ownership of a strategic castle or lordship commonly involved a requirement to provide soldiers for its defence, at the landholder's expense, and with this provision of a permanent force able to safeguard a fortress and its surrounding area can be traced a movement away from a largely passive defensive obligation towards a more active contribution to the security of the English occupation. Beauchamp and Cheyne, for example, were in effect charged with a local responsibility for defence as delegates of the crown, the implication being that their individual landed revenues should be partly employed in this duty, thus freeing the king's armies for operations elsewhere.² Neglect of this obligation could be punished by forfeiture. Whether by accident or design Sir John Harpenden allowed Chanteloup to fall into enemy hands, and in September 1420 this and other lordships passed to John Lord Grey.³ The grant to Suffolk took the process one stage

1. Present at the siege of Harfleur and at Agincourt (G.E.C., v, 205), Huntingdon was a leader of the force which relieved Harfleur by sea in August 1416 (Newhall, English Conquest, pp. 26-7, 31-3), and defeated a Franco-Genoese fleet in the same area on 29 June 1417 (ibid., pp. 54-5).
2. The number of men required was left to the landholder's discretion. This clause commonly ran as follows: 'Proviso semper quod sufficiens stuffura soldariorum in castro predicto ad illud et patriam adjacentem contra hostiles invasiones et incursus tempore eminenti muniendum et defendendum semper habeatur' (PRO, C.64/9 m.33; Bréquigny no. 88).
3. PRO, C.64/14 m.17; Bréquigny no. 858. Harpenden was pardoned in March 1422 (D.K.R., xlii, 440). He was possibly of Devon origin and a man whose father had served in France with Sir John Chandos (L. Tardif, 'Les Seigneurs et les capitaines du château de Chanteloup pendant l'occupation anglaise, 1418-49', Le Pays de Granville, ix (1913), 261).

further, and this is the earliest known example of a feature soon to be a common requirement of all grantees, namely the provision of a specified number of men-at-arms and archers for the royal armies. Land tenure was regarded by the crown as much a matter of public responsibility as of private gain, and each beneficiary was expected to contribute to the royal host according to the value of the estates in his possession.

The redistribution of major Cotentin lordships should not obscure the fact that properties were available elsewhere in lower Normandy during March and April 1418. Military success provided rich pickings in the peninsula for men of the highest social standing, but in their wake and also in other bailliages it was men of the rank of esquire who comprised the majority of grantees. Overall, the number of grants was not large at this time, but it was men such as Thomas Haweton, esquire, given the lordship of Campigny south-west of Bayeux to the value of 400 écus per year, who had much to gain from the acquisition of confiscated estates.¹ In return for the defence of the castle or town of Bayeux in person or by proxy, and the presentation of an annual tribute of a falcon, Haweton could enjoy the benefit of hereditary tenure. Almost all grants made by Henry V took this form, and possession in tailmale must have acted as an attraction to putative settlers keen to ensure that male heirs should also benefit from the royal favour.²

-
1. Hardy, pp. 261-2. Haweton did not enjoy his estates without trouble. They were restored to him on 8 April 1422 after a recent confiscation by the crown (PRO, C.64/17 m.23d; Bréquigny no. 1107).
 2. Cf. C.L. Kingsford, Henry V. The Typical Mediaeval Hero (London, 1901), pp. 226-7.

As the English armies moved eastwards across the rivers Touques and Risle, with all that such crossings implied for the strategy and psychology of the opposing forces, it was again the great captains who took the spoils of land. Foremost among them was the duke of Clarence, who had led the fierce assault on Caen castle.¹ A London chronicle tradition ascribed to Clarence the grant of the castle of Touques and its dependent lordships, but there is no known evidence from within Normandy to support this supposed award.² By a commission of 24 February 1418 he was put in command of forces 'in marcheis tam fronteriis patrie Dauge versus Roen'.³ Three days later the governance of the vicomtés of Auge, Orbec and Pont-Audemer was conferred on him for life,⁴ and he was simultaneously awarded those three vicomtés, together with that of Pont-Authou, again for life.⁵ In its opening clause this apanage grant expressly acknowledged Clarence's labours and the expenses he had hitherto incurred, and although no indication was given of the revenues which it might produce, there is no doubt that the extensive seigneurial rights which accompanied these demesne holdings were expected to prove lucrative to the king's brother.

-
1. The St. Albans Chronicle, 1406-1420, ed. V.H. Galbraith (Oxford 1937), pp. 111-114. Clarence was granted a manor in the town on 15 February 1418 (Hardy, p. 249).
 2. The Great Chronicle of London, ed. A.H. Thomas and I.D. Thornley (London, 1938), p. 96; Chronicles of London, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1905), p. 71.
 3. Hardy, p. 254.
 4. Ibid., pp. 259-60. High and supreme justice were reserved to the crown.
 5. Ibid., pp. 317-9. There is a reference in the Norman Rolls to a grant of Auge to Clarence and his heirs before 26 September 1417 (ibid., p. 157; Wylie and Waugh, iii, 54 n. 10). No letters of grant survive and contemporaries referred invariably to the subsequent life-grant (see above, p. 5).

With few exceptions, the most notable being the homage of noble tenants and the customary services due from them, Clarence was to enjoy jurisdictional and feudal privileges commonly reserved to the crown, including the right to grant to office.¹ Income was due from a multiplicity of sources and 'viceregal authority' was exercised over a considerable territory.² It may be suggested that this award properly lies within a tradition of apanage grants by Valois kings to members of the royal family,³ a tradition taken over and developed by the Lancastrians to balance the expectations and needs of principal captains against available resources and an intention to settle rather than merely to occupy.

As long-established, strategic Norman lordships were brought into possession, so Henry V allocated them to men who had already proved their loyalty and commitment. The most notable absentee from the list of early beneficiaries was the duke of Gloucester, and there seems to be no obvious reason why he did not claim for himself lands and titles, particularly given the munificence shown to Clarence.⁴ Gloucester was only granted an annuity of 500 marks in tail male by Henry V until he received lands of equal value, but these were not French lands.⁵ Other commanders did very well for themselves.

-
1. The crown reserved the right to appoint the bailli of Rouen and the maître des eaux et forêts.
 2. Newhall, English Conquest, p. 98.
 3. See A. Longnon, La Formation de l'unité française (Paris, 1922), pp. 127-8 for grants by Louis VIII in 1225.
 4. Gloucester held land during Bedford's Regency and subsequently, but he stands as an example of an absentee landlord rather than a settler.
 5. On 23 November 1436 Gloucester petitioned successfully for the islands of Jersey and Guernsey as Bedford had held them in lieu

Robert Lord Willoughby received the castle of Beaumesnil and the lordship of Moulin-Chapelle together with their appurtenances on 24 May 1418,¹ some four days after the capture of Evreux.² On 1 June Salisbury received his second major block of lands, comprising the prestigious barony of Le Neubourg and the lordships of Combon to the south and La Rivière-Thibouville on the river Risle, as well as all lands held by Louis de Thibouville which had not been included in the award to Clarence.³

Adjacent territories were thus apportioned to those responsible for their submission to the crown of England. Furthermore, Norman seigneuries were given in recognition of past, as well as present services. Willoughby and Salisbury had been companions-in-arms on the important Clarence expedition of 1412 and at Agincourt.⁴ To their number can be added Thomas Beaufort duke of Exeter, given the comté of Harcourt and the lordships of Quatremare and Routot on 1 July 1418.⁵ It was upon this uncle that Henry V had conferred the captaincy of

of his previous annuity (PRO, E.28/58/19; P.P.C., v, 5; K.H. Vickers, Humphrey Duke of Gloucester. A Biography (London, 1907), p. 248).

1. PRO, C.64/9 m.17; D.K.R., xli, 695. This grant in tail male to the value of 1,600 écus owed a provision of three men-at-arms and seven archers for the royal army.
2. Bréquigny no. 164.
3. PRO, C.64/9 m.13; Bréquigny no. 186 omits the seven men-at-arms and sixteen archers to be provided for the royal army from revenues estimated at some 4,000 écus per year. Le Neubourg was among the richest of the Norman baronies (A. Plaisse, La Baronnie du Neubourg. Essai d'histoire agraire, économique et sociale (Paris, 1961), pp. 303-5.
4. For Willoughby see G.E.C., xii, part ii, 663-6, and for Salisbury ibid., xi, 393-5.
5. PRO, C.64/10 mm. 35-34; Bréquigny no. 205.

Harfleur after its capture.¹ A third element in the king's reasoning was common to all these grants: an expectation of future service both within the locality and elsewhere. This is particularly apparent in assessing Exeter's grant, coming only a week after the capture of Louviers and bearing very much the character of a frontier grant in an area which was to remain among the most difficult to control and defend.

Harcourt was a comté, and its ownership conferred a much-prized comital status enjoyed by an élite throughout the occupation. In terms of territory, the grant comprised a great expanse of land between the rivers Risle and Seine, and included the first known grant in upper Normandy, namely the lordship of Lillebonne. Since that castle did not surrender to the English until 31 January 1419,² this constitutes one of few known instances of the land settlement outpacing the field armies. Lillebonne evidently formed part of the patrimony of Jean de Harcourt, and certainly Exeter was to enjoy his new estates under the same conditions as their previous owner. The terms of the grant reveal the sheer size of the territories involved, and underline the problems which the Anglo-Norman chancery faced in trying to define them:

'dedimus et concessimus eidem duci comitatum de Harecourt in quantum se extendit, tam in feodis nobilibus quam in membris, cum pertinenciis et dependenciis suis quibuscumque una cum omnibus aliis terris, feodis, redditibus et dominiis que tenere solebat Johannes, comes de Harcourt, ex parte australi aque de Sayne'.³

-
1. Gesta, p. 54; Brut, ii, 377.
 2. Bréquigny no. 277.
 3. Above, p. 20.

Knowing precisely the extent and nature of lands available for redistribution, and the identity and allegiance of their former owner or owners, were difficulties which beset the administration of the settlement from the outset. During the months which followed the capture of Falaise, various royal commanders were empowered to receive oaths of allegiance sworn to Henry V and to pardon rebels regardless of past offences.¹ Such moves, which included the use of the semonce des nobles, formed part of a broader attempt to induce absentees to return to their vacant holdings, and to identify those who, for whatever reason, did not swear allegiance and take up their properties as formerly.² As a Norman chronicler noted,³ it was these men who stood to lose their lands for defiance of the numerous royal proclamations issued to encourage residence and submission and to discourage migration and resistance. Notable among these measures was that of 12 April 1418, by which all those holding property to an annual value of 60 l.t. or below were to continue to enjoy it on condition of their proving residence and allegiance before 1 June following.⁴ It is interesting to observe this particular concern for the lesser Norman landholder. According to the preamble to the proclamation it was the complaints of poor subjects which had helped to inspire the issue of this general safe-conduct, and it was certainly at this level of

-
1. PRO, C.64/9 m.40d; D.K.R., xli, 708 for such authority granted to Gloucester, Clarence and Huntingdon; ibid., C.64/9 m.31; D.K.R., xli, 687 to Sir John Tiptoft.
 2. Dr. Curry suggests that allocation on a large scale could not have taken place before the first English semonce on 16 March 1418, which ties in well with the above chronology (Curry, 'Military Organization', p. 380).
 3. Croniques de Normendie, p. 33.
 4. PRO, C.64/9 m.28d; Foedera, IV, iii, 47; Newhall, 'Henry V's Policy', p. 213.

society that the greatest dislocation, enforced migration and personal hardship occurred. These were the people most at risk from the invading armies and least able to pay a large sum for their bullettes, and a special effort was made to include their persons and properties within an overall settlement.

Between June 1418 and January 1419 Appendix I reveals that only ten men were rewarded, and no ready explanation can be offered for this decline in numbers. Newhall suggested that the quantity of confiscations already made would act 'as an example to the Normans and a promise for the English until the campaign against Rouen was finished'.¹ There is little evidence to support the view that the early land settlement was intended to be punitive and directed against the interests of the Norman population at large; indeed, repeated efforts were made to encourage a return to lands and estates and to uphold the continuity of their tenure. Nor is it likely that grants were discouraged or withheld until a projected siege was brought to an end. In the case of Rouen, such success was by no means a foregone conclusion. The paucity of grants made during the second half of 1418 probably owed more to Henry V's attitude to his conquered subjects on the one hand, and to practical problems of administration on the other. By viewing awards to Englishmen within the broader context of the settlement of the native population, the adoption of local legal and customary practices and the maintenance of existing institutions of government, it can be argued that the notions of punishment and 'increased severity' were applicable only to individual 'rebels' known to have broken oaths of fealty. There remained a substantial majority

1. Ibid., p. 215.

of Norman landholders whose allegiance and intentions were uncertain, and it was to these men and women that were addressed conciliatory measures which sought to confirm the rights of existing owners to their possessions and to uphold, as far as the conditions of war might allow, the tenurial status quo. With regard to the administration of the settlement, it may be suggested that the absence of known grants to Englishmen between 12 July and 22 November 1418 owed much to the king's absence from Caen and the institutions of government there, and to the pressing business of conducting an intricate siege operation¹ which left him inaccessible for the hearing of petitions for grants or the receipt of homages from those who had sworn allegiance.

The surrender of Rouen on 19 January 1419 had a considerable impact on the land settlement. The English were firmly established in upper Normandy and looked likely to stay, and such was the speed of the advance that by the end of February almost the whole duchy was in their hands.² This made it more difficult for Normans to reject the claims made by and on behalf of Henry V or to hold a neutral position; to do so was to put at risk estates, properties and livelihoods. It is notable that during the first half of 1419 great efforts were made to discover who owned what lands, whether they had paid homage to the king, and the extent and value of those lands. In upper Normandy on 9 February orders were issued to seize all estates for which homage had not been performed by laymen or churchmen and to collect their revenues, 'et convertir en notre proffit come [sic] notre propre

-
1. For a detailed account see L. Puiseux, Siège et prise de Rouen par les Anglais (1418-1419) (Caen, 1867).
 2. Wylie and Waugh, iii, 176.

demaine'.¹ The following month John Popham, John Ashton and Roland Leyntal were commissioned as baillis of Caen, the Cotentin and Alençon respectively to ascertain the names of those who had not performed homage and, most importantly, to discover what lands they held, of whom, by what services and to what value.² Subsequently on 6 June 1419 the Norman baillis were ordered to seize all lands whether within or without the English obedience whose owners could not show letters patent from the king authenticating tenure.³

It is clear, then, that much more was becoming known to the conquerors of Rouen about the ownership and tenure of Norman land. It was now possible to distinguish loyal subjects from absentees and from rebels, and to identify estates available for redistribution and those to be retained by the crown. Renewed attempts were made to entice men to offer their oath of allegiance, 'non obstant quelle offence ou mesprison qu'ilz aient faite envers [nous] seurement';⁴ orders were reissued to baillis and captains, and deadlines for submission were extended.⁵ The closely-related concerns of landholding and personal loyalty were becoming matters for the written record, and by amalgamating information collected at a local level by royal delegates with that already known to the chambre des comptes the English administration was

-
1. PRO, C.64/10 m.32d; printed with errors by Bréquigny no. 297.
 2. PRO, C.64/10 m.15d; D.K.R., xli, 759.
 3. PRO, C.64/11 m.40d; Bréquigny no. 599.
 4. PRO, C.64/10 m.27d; D.K.R., xli, 754.
 5. Authority to receive homages and to grant letters of safe conduct was part of a commander's responsibilities. See PRO, C.64/9 m.1; D.K.R.; xli, 708 for Salisbury and PRO, C.64/11 m.24; D.K.R., xli, 795 for Suffolk and Ashton.

better able to protect its new subjects and, of course, its own interests.

Such is the background against which the peak of grant-issuing in the spring of 1419 should be seen. It was not that Henry V adopted a harsher attitude to the recalcitrant and disloyal after the capture of Rouen, but rather that the government of the occupation was put on a sounder footing, one based on the possession of documentary evidence of the right to hold land. At the same time, the door was left open for those Normans who wished to enter the English obedience, or to return to it,¹ and, as we shall see, restitutions of land were made to those unjustly dispossessed even before the sealing of the treaty of Troyes. This dual approach gave to the nascent occupation and settlement flexibility in the light of changing military circumstances: on the one hand military objectives were pursued and more land and people were brought under Henry V's control and scrutiny; on the other, negotiations for peace were supported, traditional customs and practices respected and army discipline upheld.

Newhall was justified in describing the great increase in the number of grants of land to immigrants as a revolution in property-holding.² Appendix I reveals four known settlers rewarded in February 1419, eleven in March, an astonishing 136 in April, and fifty in May. During March and April the king treated for peace with representatives of both Armagnac and Burgundian parties, while simultaneously dispatching armies to besiege La Roche-Guyon and

1. Croniques de Normendie, p. 47.

2. Newhall, 'Henry V's Policy', p. 220.

Château-Gaillard.¹ His presence in the Seine valley during April and May 1419 emphasises the close ties which bound the land settlement to the military advance: the dynamism of the one was contingent upon the success of the other. The flood of grants made during these two months also resulted from the drought of the preceding period, for it may well be that a build-up of petitions was cleared at the same time as new ones were heard. Certainly the king was accessible both to soldiers and non-combatants keen to gain from his most recent exploits.

Who were the beneficiaries of this revolution? In the first instance, it is noticeable that men of knightly rank did well out of the advance of the occupation into the pays de Caux and the Seine valley. This was the impression given by the Norman Chronicler:

'Et furent plusieurs terres données, et de plus grandes, par especial aux seigneurs d'Engleterre qui [le] avoient servi, et les autres menues terres à ces gens et à ceulx qui [le] favorisoient en pais conquérant.'²

The evidence certainly supports the view that, as during the conquest of the Cotentin peninsula, the most extensive and valuable of the estates available for redistribution were apportioned to the major garrison and field captains. Sir John Fastolf received the castles and lordships of Le Bec-Créspin, Criquetot-l'Esneval and Gonneville-la-Mallet, together with the castle and seigneurie of Orcher east of Harfleur;³ Sir Christopher Curwen the castle and lordship of Cany;⁴

1. Newhall, English Conquest, p. 131.

2. Croniques de Normandie, p. 55.

3. PRO, C.64/10 m.13; Bréquigny no. 262; Lenoir 3/286.

4. PRO, C.64/10 m.16; Bréquigny no. 275; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 55 n. 15.

Sir John Grey the strategic comté of Tancarville with its appurtenances, 'in quantum se extendit';¹ all these grants were made between 15-31 January 1419. Add to these names those of other knights subsequently rewarded, most notably Sir Gilbert Umfraville with Amfreville-sur-Iton, the ancient seat of his family, and it emerges that the richest pickings of confiscated French lands were again at the disposal of the great soldiers before all others.²

The significance for the land settlement of the capture of Rouen and of upper Normandy did not lie, however, in the continued marks of favour shown to a minority. It rested rather in the confiscation and reallocation of lands to men of middle rank, often described as 'armiger' or 'escuier' in the Norman Rolls. By far the largest number of grantees were those of quite humble status who received, in the chronicler's terms, 'les menues terres'. Military success brought into the land settlement in large number the royal official, the household servant and the garrison soldier, among others, and it was men of such position who were at the heart of a long-term occupation which it was the king's policy from the outset to encourage and foster. To take only two examples, Henry Brombeley, chief jailer at Caen, was

-
1. PRO, C.64/10 m.41; Bréquigny no. 280; G.A.A. de La Roque, Histoire généalogique de la maison de Harcourt (4 vols., Paris, 1662), iv, 1473-4. The grant was confirmed and augmented on 29 March 1419 to include all moveable goods, chattels, and arrears owed since 1 August 1417 (PRO, C.64/11 m.70; Bréquigny no. 1261).
 2. PRO, C.64/10 m.28; D.K.R., xli, 733. Umfraville's life is described by T.F. Tout in D.N.B., lviii, 24-5. Confusion has arisen over which of nine possible locations was 'the cradle of his race' (idem); it was almost certainly Amfreville-sur-Iton south-west of Louviers (cf. e.g. W.P. Hedley, Northumberland Families (2 vols., Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1968-70), i, 208, 214).

given lands within that bailliage in April 1419;¹ William Marshall, 'armiger noster', received the lordship of Acquigny south of Louviers to the reputed value of 800 écus per year.²

The obligation of military service incumbent upon grantees was, by this date, an active one. A specified number of men-at-arms and archers were to be provided for the royal armies according to the reported value of the lands in question. Thus Sir John Grey was to equip fifteen men-at-arms and thirty archers from the revenues of Tancarville, Fastolf five men-at-arms and ten archers from his lordships in the Caux, and William Marshall two men-at-arms and four archers from his fiefs. To judge by the number of grants made early in 1419, this requirement did not act as a disincentive to English settlers of lesser means, nor did it discourage grants in lower Normandy at a time when the main sphere of diplomatic and military activity lay along the Seine valley. It is one thing to refer to the theory of feudal quotas, however, and quite another to discern their operation. Whether innovatory or a revived custom, whether put into practice or, as seems likely, ignored, quotas were acknowledged by grantees and must have served some useful purpose.³

The numbers of recorded grants never again reached those of April and May 1419. Thereafter, it is more typical to find a few men receiving lands each month by letters clustered around one or two dates. The influence of diplomatic negotiations on the pace and direction of

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.61; Bréquigny no. 403. For his letters of appointment dated 30 September 1417 see Hardy, p. 159.
 2. PRO, C.64/10 m.16; Bréquigny no. 304, dated 16 February 1419.
 3. Newhall, English Conquest, p. 212; Curry, 'Military Organization', pp. 394-5, 447-9.

the land settlement is difficult to detect, but it may be that Henry V's discussions with the Dauphinist and Burgundian camps had a moderating influence upon the quantity of grants issued. Caution was certainly the watchword: only four beneficiaries are known from the king's sojourn at Pontoise after its capture late in July, and only two from that at Gisors in late September and early October 1419.¹ It is significant, too, that by this date restitutions were being made to men whose lands had been unlawfully distributed. On 10 September the Frenchman Roger Suhart was restored to that portion of his lands not already granted to a compatriot, the former having returned to the royal obedience,² and Englishmen were by no means exempt from these transactions. By letters patent dated 26 February 1420 Sir John Claxton was ordered to restore lands in the bailliages of Caen and Alençon to the rightful heir of Jean de Coursy, late seigneur of Coursy, lands which Claxton had been granted by Henry V in April 1418.³

By the time of the sealing of the treaty of Troyes on 21 May 1420, the principles which that treaty enshrined regarding the landed settlement were already in practice.⁴ All who swore fealty to Henry V were to enjoy the peaceful possession of their lands. This was precisely the tenor of a royal mandate issued late in September 1419 to the baillis of Gisors, Caux, Evreux, Mantes and the captain of Pontoise.⁵ The need to restore lands to supporters of Burgundy and others unjustly

1. D.K.R., xli, 792-3, 799.

2. PRO, C.64/10 m. 39; C.64/11 m.23; Bréquigny nos. 104, 655.

3. BL, Add. Ch. 355; PRO, C.64/9 m.36; Bréquigny no. 122.

4. E. Cosneau, Les Grands traités de la guerre de Cent Ans (Paris, 1889), esp. nos. 13-14, 18-19.

5. PRO, C.64/11 m.21d; Bréquigny no. 670.

deprived of their patrimonies was also recognized at Troyes. The treaty does not seem to have exerted a direct influence on the nature or terms of land grants, but it is possible that the paucity of known awards during 1420 bore at least indirectly upon the emphasis on legality and justice which it enshrined.

That scarcity must also have owed something to the intricate siege directed by the king against Melun between July and November 1420. Clearly royal preoccupation in the management of the war can only act as a partial explanation for the shortage of known awards, whether during the investments of Rouen or Melun, and other factors clearly played their part: the availability of land not reserved to the crown; demand from existing or potential settlers; the possibility of purchase within the land market; favourable or unfavourable economic prospects locally. Yet it will not do to deny Henry V's role in the distributive process. During his absence from Normandy between January and June 1421 no new grants were made. Two were recorded on 16 January,¹ one was confirmed on the 18th at Rouen,² and there was an important redistribution from Boutiller to Hungerford in May.³ The next known beneficiary was Richard earl of Worcester, given certain of the lands of the late Sir Gilbert Umfraville on 1 August 1421 by the king with his army near Dreux.⁴

1. PRO, C.64/15 m.27; Bréquigny no. 916 to John Bourghop; *ibid.*, C.64/14 m.4; D.K.R., xlii, 386 to Clement Overton.

2. PRO, C.64/15 m.19; Bréquigny no. 923.

3. Below, p. 39.

4. PRO, C.64/16 m.30; Bréquigny no. 1008; BL, Add. Ch. 11473. The Calendar entry mistakenly identifies the grantee as the earl of Rochester (D.K.R., xlii, 414).

During the last year of the Henrician settlement, recorded grants were few. The occupation seems to have undergone a measure of consolidation, by which the estates of deceased settlers were re-distributed both to existing landholders and to those not previously rewarded. Sir Gilbert Umfraville's remaining lands were given to Sir Robert Brewes, his son Robert and heirs male, an unusually precise designation; Brewes held no land in France at this time.¹ Henry Noon, an esquire later knighted, was a prominent commander granted lands in July 1419 to a combined value of 2,000 écus per year.² By 1 December 1421 Noon was dead.³ His Vexin fiefs were released from the king's possession and given to Sir Reginald Grey,⁴ and shortly afterwards the castle and lordship of Condé-sur-Noireau were granted to a man already holding French property, Sir William Breton.⁵

From an early date, lands which had escheated to the crown in the absence of a male heir were granted afresh to men of similar rank. It made every sense to do this, and it must be emphasised that military and strategic considerations were uppermost in the king's mind at this time. In the aftermath of the defeat at Baugé on 22 March 1421 the

-
1. PRO, C.64/16 m.27; Bréquigny no. 1013, dated 16 August 1421. By 1435 the lordships of Amfreville-sur-Iton and Bacquepuis had passed to the younger Robert Brewes after informations had been carried out (Lenoir 8/395-6).
 2. PRO, C.64/11 m.29; Bréquigny no. 620. Noon was listed among five 'leaders of some prominence' by Newhall, English Conquest, pp. 206-7 n. 87.
 3. He was still alive on 13 July 1421 when granted the moveable goods of the rebel Guy de Pittres (PRO, C.64/16 m.29; Bréquigny no. 1274).
 4. PRO, C.64/16 m.18; Bréquigny no. 1059.
 5. PRO, C.64/16 m.16; Bréquigny no. 1066. Breton was captain of Caen and owned houses there (D.K.R., xli, 809; xlii, 380, 416).

priority was the defence of what had already been won, and if English knights could be persuaded to take over the landed responsibilities of their colleagues killed, captured or deceased, then continuity of tenure again became a realistic possibility to the mutual advantage of successive recipients and the crown.

The nature and the number of grants made during the period from June 1421 until August 1422 indicate a time of difficulty for the settlement. Such new territories as were brought into the English obedience south of Normandy and in the Seine valley were not made available in quantity, although it was still possible for an individual commander to do well for himself. On the very day that the surrender of the garrison at Dreux was taken, 20 August 1421, Gilbert Halsall was given the castle and lordship of Tillières confiscated from the captured Jean le Baveux, a rebel executed for renouncing an oath of allegiance to Henry V.¹ For the most part, however, opportunities to acquire possessions either on the frontiers of the occupation and in new areas, or within the existing bounds, were few. It was probably easier to improve the terms of a grant already held than to obtain more land. In October 1421 Thomas Hadfeld petitioned successfully to collect the revenues of his lordship at Méautis near St.-Lô which were in excess of the 400 écus originally authorised.² On condition of having his former letters cancelled at the Norman chancery, Hadfeld was allowed up to 600 écus per year, though he now had to provide one man-at-arms and four archers for the royal armies instead of one man-at-arms and

-
1. PRO, C.64/16 m.27; Bréquigny no. 1019; Wylie and Waugh, iii, 327.
 2. See PRO, C.64/11 m.56; Bréquigny no. 555 for the original grant on 10 May 1419, and PRO, C.64/16 m.22; Bréquigny no. 1044 for its improvement; also below, pp. 60-1.

three archers.

It would certainly be misleading to think that the sudden death of Henry V brought to an end an era of vigorous activity in the distribution of French lands to Englishmen. Prior to the treaty of Troyes there had been signs that the large-scale share-out of confiscated fiefs and estates begun in the spring of 1419 would not be continued, let alone repeated. The diplomatic and legal climates were no longer conducive to actions which in any way threatened to undermine the validity of the English position enshrined by the 'paix finale'. The military conquest proceeded piecemeal, with armies engaged in the necessary but slow process of siege warfare. The land settlement could not help but reflect the difficulties faced by Henry V between 1420 and 1422 just as it had mirrored the successes of previous years. A case study of a well-populated area will illuminate both aspects, and shed light on the practical implications of royal policy for settlers themselves, their attitudes to land tenure and their relations with each other.

(iii) The Vexin Normand: A Case Study

The Vexin Normand enjoyed the reputation of a prosperous agricultural area, a 'bon pays' well-suited to arable farming and grain crops which promised good returns to those prepared to work its soil.¹ At the same time, the Vexin was by tradition a frontier area, a battleground between dukes of Normandy and kings of France since the

1. G. Du Moulin, Histoire générale de Normandie (Rouen, 1631), p. 3: 'c'est un bon pays, qui a des terres labourables à souhait'; Histoire de la Normandie, ed. M. de Bouard (Toulouse, 1970), pp. 301-2.

late eleventh century.¹ The resulting legacy of castles and forts provided ready-made defensive positions for the new invaders. Conquest by the English between February and October 1419² was accompanied by a share-out of lands which made of the Vexin Normand the most densely settled region of the occupation. Appendix II and Map One attempt to quantify and depict this settlement. Who benefited? The careers in France of some men and indeed their families can be traced in detail, while others remain elusive.

Such was the variety of status, occupation and service within the area that it may be taken as representative of Henry V's occupation: the Vexin can be considered as a microcosm of an Anglo-Norman society at war and as a fair reflection of attitudes to property holding and military and civilian service evident elsewhere within the occupied territories.

Given that men of knightly rank consistently procured for themselves the better estates to fall into English hands, it is not surprising to find them prominent among the Vexin settlers. Sir John Baskerville was given a valuable award of lands in at least three bailliages, worth up to 1,600 écus per year, and including properties

-
1. F.M. Powicke, The Loss of Normandy. Studies in the History of the Angevin Empire (Manchester, 1913), pp. 264-83; J. Le Patourel, The Norman Empire (Oxford, 1976), pp. 82-4; J.A. Green, 'Lords of the Norman Vexin', War and Government in the Middle Ages. Essays in Honour of J.O. Prestwich, ed. J. Gillingham and J.C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984), pp. 47-61.
 2. A.-M. Bouly de Lesdain, 'Le Vexin français sous la domination anglaise (1419-1449)', École Nationale des Chartes: Positions des Thèses, lxxxix (1937), 157-65; Lesdain, 'Le Vexin français sous la domination anglaise (1419-1449). Répercussions économiques de l'invasion', Mémoires de la société historique et archéologique de Pontoise, du Val d'Oise et du Vexin, lxxii (1969), 55-69.

in the three villages of Morgny, Lilly and probably Fleury-le-Château within the bailliage of Gisors.¹ Since he was required to present an annual tribute of a head of a lance to the king at Cherbourg, a town which he and his followers were to guard as required, it might be thought that the focus of this grant lay upon the Cotentin.

Baskerville had more than a passing connection with the Caux, however. After the 1415 expedition he remained in Harfleur as a member of its garrison² and was appointed captain of Arques in 1420.³ He may have been active in the Caux prior to this appointment, for in December 1419 he nominated a procureur to take possession and collect the revenues of his lordships in Caen and the Cotentin.⁴

It was by no means unusual for individual landholdings to be widely dispersed in this way. Reference has already been made to Sir Henry Noon's possessions and their division after his death, from which it emerges that the Vexin estates held the greater potential revenue of 1,200 écus to Grey compared to 800 écus to Breton.⁵ Lands were acquired as and when they became available in the Vexin as elsewhere in Normandy, for men of knightly status and above were essentially itinerant. Their responsibilities were manifold: as captains of garrison and field forces, for example John Lord Roos, appointed captain at nearby Château-Gaillard in December 1419;⁶ as leaders of

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.64; Bréquigny no. 465.
 2. J.H. Wylie, 'Notes on the Agincourt Roll', T.R. Hist. S., third series, v (1911), 112.
 3. D.K.R., xlii, 379.
 4. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1419-20, f. 59v.
 5. Above, p: 32.
 6. D.K.R., xli, 808. Roos held lands in the Caux rather than in the Vexin.

retinues and members of households themselves, for example Henry Noon as master of the horse to the king;¹ not least as landholders obliged to defend their estates and to provide men for the royal host.

As individuals these men were well able to profit from the misfortunes of others, including companions-in-arms. Indeed, the Vexin settlement provides evidence of settlers stepping into dead men's shoes, which was to prove a useful means of acquiring land throughout the occupation. Holdings confiscated from Marie de Fécamp and granted to Hugh Whitlond in April 1419² were in turn given to John Wenlock, esquire, in August 1421 on Whitlond's death without heirs male.³ There were differences in the estimated value of each grant and in the services owed for its enjoyment, but there is no doubt that the property concerned was the same on each occasion. One suspects that this method of acquisition was adopted in particular by men who, for whatever reason, did not participate in the initial conquest but arrived in France subsequently. For them, it provided a ready-made entry to the land settlement, and to the crown it ensured continuity of tenure and the maintenance of defensive obligations locally.

Openings were certainly available to the determined and to the fortunate. The greatest of those rewarded by Henry V with Vexin estates was the ubiquitous figure of Sir Walter Hungerford, steward of the royal household and a veteran of the campaigns of 1415 and

-
1. E.H. de L. Fagan, 'Some Aspects of the King's Household in the Reign of Henry V, 1413-22', (unpublished University of London M.A. thesis, 1935), p. 44.
 2. PRO, C.64/11 m.51; Bréquigny no. 453.
 3. PRO, C.64/16 m.28; Bréquigny no. 1015; Massey, 'Land Settlement', p. 80.

1416.¹ Although scarcely of the strategic or financial importance of the barony of Le Hommet in the Cotentin, whose title he often used, or of lands received later in the same year in the Caux,² Hungerford's grant of 13 January 1421 reveals an opportunist at work. The letters patent by which Jean de Chartres had held Tourny were surrendered to the Norman chancery; Hungerford, probably in the right place at the right time, pressed his claim and acquired Tourny and the lordship of Baudemont.³

It is the men of high social and professional status who most readily catch the eye, but what emerges strongly from this Vexin case study is the role played by those drawn from the middle ranks of society in the occupation locally. In terms of number, it was grantees drawn from this very broad category who derived the greatest benefit from the confiscation and reallocation of lands during the period of the Henrician settlement, and it has been suggested that these middling men formed the backbone of the English occupation of northern France for much of its duration.⁴ An example is provided by Richard Wydeville, the first known Vexin beneficiary. On 1 February 1419 he was granted the lordship of Dangu south-west of Gisors, together with lands in the bailliages of Rouen and the Caux.⁵ Three

-
1. J.S. Roskell, 'Three Wiltshire Speakers', Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine, lvi (1956), 301-41; Roskell, The Commons and their Speakers in English Parliaments, 1376-1523 (Manchester, 1965), pp. 357-8.
 2. PRO, C.64/16 m.31; Bréquigny no. 994. On 19 May 1421 Hungerford received lands including Breauté, Néville, Sainte-Colombe and Villequier formerly held by John Boutiller.
 3. PRO, C.64/14 m.2; Bréquigny no. 911.
 4. Massey, 'Land Settlement', passim.
 5. PRO, C.64/10 m.12; Bréquigny no. 281. The grant included Préaux north-east of Rouen and Nauville, probably Noville near Arques.

months later the terms of the grant were improved to include the moveable goods and chattels and the arrears attached to those lands.¹ Although no value was specified to the award, the obligation to provide five men-at-arms and ten archers for the king's armies leaves no doubt that it was of high potential to its recipient. When to this clue are added the details of his career, Wydeville appears as a man enjoying patronage and favour. His land grants were soon followed by appointment as bailli of Gisors and later of Chaumont,² and then as seneschal of Normandy, treasurer-general of the duchy and maître-général of the waters and forests of Maine.³

Richard Wydeville's advancement may be attributed in part to consistent patronage by the Lancastrian family, but it is possible to overstate the importance of such connections.⁴ Within the setting of the war in France what mattered was that the opportunity existed for an ambitious or acquisitive man to serve the crown and to reap the rewards fitting to his status, and one of the best ways to achieve this was to hold both lands and office within a single area. It was certainly convenient, and it made sense to acquire property close to the town or

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.53; Bréquigny no. 534. This confirmation is recorded in the Calendar entry as a separate grant (D.K.R., xli, 776).
 2. D.K.R., xli, 806; xlii, 345.
 3. Ibid., xlii, 398. Although thought to be a knight on appointment as seneschal on 18 January 1421 (Newhall, English Conquest, pp. 217 n. 130, 246; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 93, 205), the letters of appointment describe him as 'armigeri nostri' (Bréquigny no. 924). As treasurer-general he appears as an esquire, and there is no record of his being knighted (BN, Ms. fr. 25767 no. 6).
 4. Wydeville probably saw service as a young man with Henry earl of Derby, and in 1409 received a small grant of tenements in Calais. He was a retainer of Thomas of Lancaster in 1411 and an esquire of the body of Henry V (G.E.C., xi, 17-19; D.N.B., lxii, 414; C.P.R., 1408-13, p. 43).

garrison at the heart of one's daily life. But there was more to the matter than convenience. The close relationship between the tenure of land and of office suggests that settlers were willing and able to build up influence and respect within a locality either for the intrinsic benefits which this might bring or as a power-base for ambitions elsewhere. The crown, in its turn, gained the services of individuals with a two-fold commitment to its cause. In the case of Wydeville, his abilities and energies must have meant that he spent little time in the Vexin after 1419, yet he retained strong local attachments. In May 1423 he was given further lands in the bailliages of Gisors and Senlis,¹ lands which passed together with Dangu into the possession of his son and heir.²

Mobility was a sine qua non of both conquest and subsequent settlement, and ironically this threatened to undermine the personal attachment of landholder to land which was otherwise encouraged. Although hard evidence on this point is lacking, it appears that few settlers were actually resident in their newly-acquired estates for any length of time. Rather were they living nearby and serving in garrisons or as office-holders in towns, able to visit their holdings and oversee their management, but always liable to be called away for duties elsewhere, as was Richard Wydeville. William Bucton, esquire, was given three Vexin fiefs and two in the Caux in April 1419, for which he owed guard duty at Rouen as required.³ Two years later

1. AN, JJ 172 no. 278.

2. By November 1436 the younger Richard Wydeville (who was knighted) was described as seigneur of Préaux and Dangu and other lands granted to him by his father (Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1436-7, sub 2 November 1436).

3. PRO, C.64/11 m.74; Bréquigny no. 414.

Bucton was named captain of Beaumont-sur-Oise.¹ In theory the distance was not so great as to prevent at least occasional visitations, but in practice Bucton became an absentee landowner. Two months after his appointment the lordship of Mussegros was farmed to five Frenchmen of that hamlet, including its manor and all rents due to the lord in kind or otherwise.²

If captains and royal officials were often required to extend their geographical horizons, the same was not always true of the mounted and foot lances who made up the garrison forces. A number of Vexin landholders are known to have been soldiers, the most numerous beneficiaries of Henry V's settlement in the area. Of some, like Robert Smart, little is known: an unspecified grant of lands in 1419 to the value of 100 francs in the bailliage of Gisors can be pinpointed to Aubigny,³ and Smart was serving as a foot lance at Château-Gaillard under Sir Thomas Beaumont, probably in 1421.⁴ Others provide more convincing evidence of a close relationship between military service and land tenure over a number of years. Richard Abraham, esquire, was one of two men charged with taking possession of Tancarville early

-
1. D.K.R., xlii, 410. An undated petition to the chancellor alleged that Bucton had wrongfully seized prisoners captured by John Craven and Simon Irby at Agincourt, and put them to ransom (Select Cases in Chancery A.D. 1364 to 1471, ed. W.P. Baildon (Selden Society, London, 1896), p. 110).
 2. Seine-Mme, Tabellionage de Rouen 1421-2, fos. 136v - 137.
 3. PRO, C.64/11 m.49; Bréquigny no. 448. It is interesting to note from an information of May 1451 that Aubigny returned to its original owners, the Boisset, after the reconquest (Lenoir 14/82).
 4. BN, Ms. fr. 25766 no. 667. I am indebted to Dr. Anne Curry for this reference. A Robert Smart was listed in the Vernon garrison in 1435 and 1437 (ibid., 25772 no. 1020; 25773 no. 1199).

in 1419,¹ and shortly afterwards he was given lands to the value of 400 écus per year which had at their centre the lordship of Saint Martin, confiscated from the rebel Étienne de Saint Martin.² Abraham was captain of Étrépagny by 1424,³ literally within sight of his original lordship, and by 1434 he had accumulated further holdings in the surrounding countryside which made an impressive list in the notarial register.⁴ Grants by Henry V and by Bedford made of this soldier a small-scale landholder in the Vexin Normand, giving an immediate interest in property and the Lancastrian cause in France.

Thomas Tyringham was another who can be identified as a man-at-arms and landowner over a long period. He was granted several delays for services due for lands held since April 1419, including one as late as 1445, although these and other lands in the bailliage of Gisors had been reported in September 1443 as being of no value because of the war.⁵ Roger Ingerland was to assist in the defence of Vernon, the nearest garrison town to his lordship of Aveny, whenever such service

-
1. D.K.R., xli, 751.
 2. PRO, C.64/11 m.53; Bréquigny no. 433. He is recorded in the Norman Rolls as 'Aburgham'.
 3. Gallia Regia ou état des officiers royaux des bailliages et des sénéchausées de 1328 à 1515, ed. G. Dupont-Ferrier, (7 vols., Paris, 1942-66), iii, 401.
 4. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1434-5, fos. 371-371v. Abraham had employed a French receiver, Simon le Carretier, on his Vexin estates.
 5. Lenoir 27/281; 4/239. An entry in the notarial register at Rouen records Tyringham selling his lands to William Rothwell and John Straighton, subject to the approval of the king and 'son conseil' (Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1431-2, sub 5 January 1432). Either the sale was approved and delays were subsequently issued to Tyringham in error, or, as is quite likely, the transaction did not take place.

was required;¹ he was still in nominal possession of this and other land when accorded a delay in 1438.²

Further examples could be quoted to illustrate the willingness of soldiers to put down roots in French soil and their ability to build up within a particular area a means of support and advancement. This evidence from the Vexin Normand points to the ownership of land as promoting stability within the volatile circumstances of war. Just as individual holdings were diminished by sales or, more commonly, were augmented by purchase and by grant, some of which, as in the case of Richard Abraham, have left no trace in the official record, so the careers of particular settlers waxed and waned over several decades. Ingerland was a mounted lance at Vernon in 1423 and again in 1437, and had served as its lieutenant in 1436;³ by 1442 he was of knightly rank and lieutenant of the garrison at Essay.⁴ Tyringham was listed among the foot lances at Château-Gaillard in 1421;⁵ in 1445 either he or his heir and namesake was described as a serviteur in the royal household.⁶

It is all very well to argue that, for some of the beneficiaries of the Henrician settlement at least, their careers developed from a commitment to and a familiarity with a particular area, but what

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.76; Bréquigny no. 376.
 2. Lenoir 4/369.
 3. BN, Ms. fr. 25767 no. 42; 25773 nos. 1089, 1199; 25774 no. 1244. I am grateful to Dr. Anne Curry for these references.
 4. Ibid., n. acq. fr. 8606 no. 81.
 5. Ibid., Ms. fr. 25766 no. 667.
 6. Lenoir 27/281.

exactly did the tenure of land entail? What might a typical Vexin settler receive that he was subsequently so keen to retain? The bare bones of one such grant are known, that to Thomas Tyringham of lands in the bailliage of Gisors, worth up to 500 écus a year, formerly held by the rebel Jean du Pré.¹ Little more would be known of the property in question were it not for the aveu which the new owner rendered to the chambre des comptes on 22 June 1419, some two and a half months after the grant.² Included were an hôtel 'pour demourer' and rents at Andely; a manor with 68 acres and a masure with 36 acres at Guiseniers; the fief and manor of Doux Mesnil, held of the seigneur of Tancarville and owning the right to present to its church; properties at Noyers-sur-Andelle and Vézillon and rent at Vernon.

Certain of Tyringham's properties, therefore, lay quite close to Château-Gaillard, probably his garrison at the time of the grant, but others were located at some distance, towards Étrépagny to the east and Vernon to the south. Notable, too, was the variety of forms which the anticipated revenues of the land took. The customary practice 'en temps passé' was to put out land to farm for rents in cash and kind: the manor at Guiseniers owed seven 'muys de blé' a year; five acres at Vézillon owed sixteen francs in rent; other income came from poultry, eggs, vineyards near Vernon and from forest rights. Given the geographical spread of the holdings and the multiform nature of their revenues, neither of which was unusual in the Vexin or elsewhere, the employment of a receiver by Richard Abraham, and of a French procureur by Tyringham, becomes understandable.³ The aveu also

1. PRO, C.64/11 m.49; Bréquigny no. 370.

2. AN, P 307 (A) no. 294; Lenoir 52/261-2.

3. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1419-20, f. 60v.

suggests that from a plethora of small rents and seigneurial rights, such as cutting wood every seventh or ninth year, there would derive an income more in the manner of a long-term investment at a variable rate of interest than a high-yield account offering a rapid return. Thomas Tyringham held on to these lands for at least thirteen and perhaps over twenty years, by which time neither he nor the crown could expect any revenue at all because of war damage.¹

Not all the grantees rewarded in the Vexin during the months following the capture of Rouen were either willing or able to experience the lasting benefits or responsibilities of land tenure. William Bigood was given property in April 1419,² but was dead by the beginning of October when James Lynde took it over on slightly different terms.³ In his turn neither Lynde nor his fellow-countryman Walter Aslake, a man of Norfolk origin, long enjoyed the fruits of their possessions.⁴ It was alleged that both had failed to perform services due to Henry V and Bedford, and in particular the armed services which their respective grants had specified,⁵ with the result that in May 1423 their lands were given to another Vexin landholder, Richard Wydeville, now described as a conseiller of Bedford.⁶

-
1. Lenoir 4/279, 239.
 2. PRO, C.64/11 m.67; Bréquigny no. 422.
 3. PRO, C.64/11 m.16; Bréquigny no. 672.
 4. Aslake's grant of St. Clair-sur-Epte south-west of Gisors was a valuable one, worth up to 500 l.p. a year (PRO, C.64/11 m.51; D.K.R., xli, 778).
 5. Lynde was to defend Gisors and provide one man-at-arms and two archers for the royal armies; Aslake to protect St. Clair itself and provide one man-at-arms and three archers for the host.
 6. AN, JJ 172 no. 278. Included in Wydeville's grant were the lands of another Vexin landholder, William Askwith, who had died

This rapid turnover of land indicates that demand was high, and here we are observing only the 'official' land market, without including private transactions. There was no shortage of people willing to put forward claims to property formerly in French or English hands although some, like Aslake, were condemned for attempting to hold it while absent.¹ The military obligations concomitant with land tenure were not to be undertaken lightly, particularly in a frontier area, and their non-observance was punishable by forfeiture. Where lands could be kept in settlers' hands, they passed from one to another with the sanction of the chancery: brisk demand meant that little official encouragement was needed to ensure a reasonable continuity of tenure. It will be instructive to examine one such instance which carries forward into Bedford's Regency.

On 12 April 1419 Robert Wyntrynham received lands at Mesnil-Verclives and elsewhere in the bailliage of Gisors held by Guillaume de Gaillarbosc dit Percheval.² Two days later Thomas Wyntrynham was granted the lands of Cordelier de Villers, one of the rebel family of that name.³ Robert Wyntrynham, probably the brother of Thomas, put out his own lands to farm to the Frenchman, and those same properties reverted to the king on Robert's death without heirs male in 1424. They were subsequently granted to the royal secretary Ralph Parker, and during the ensuing dispute over arrears it was claimed by Percheval

without male heir. Wydeville's petition was upheld the following year (ibid., JJ 172 no. 421; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 55).

1. See D.K.R., xliv, 638 for letters of protection as one of the royal retinue.
2. PRO, C.64/11 m.68; Bréquigny no. 383.
3. PRO, C.64/11 m.67; D.K.R., xli, 770.

that the lands in question had been worthless since 1424 because of the war.¹ In the meantime, Thomas Wyntrynham enjoyed chequered fortunes following his original Vexin grant. His good services to the king and Bedford were rewarded in March 1423 with lands, to be held at royal pleasure, formerly in the possession of Jean de Villers and his brothers and sisters, and since granted to the late Thomas Merston.² In 1430, describing himself as 'seigneur de Hennezis', Wyntrynham purchased an hôtel at Andely from Sir William Bishopston, but in the following year he was captured at Château-Gaillard and ransomed for 800 saluts d'or.³ In 1432 he was again captured, and could not afford to purchase his release without selling lands granted to him by Henry V and Bedford. Two French proctors were duly appointed to farm, sell or exchange Wyntrynham's lands for whatever price they could obtain: the remedy was seemingly a success, in the short term at least, for Thomas Hunt, esquire, bought all the holdings for 700 saluts, which was more than the ransom demand of 600 saluts.⁴

From this tangled web of information several strands may be drawn. In the first place, two men who were almost certainly members of the same family were given lands close to each other in the Vexin, surely not by coincidence. The association of landed possessions with ties of family must have served to inculcate a sense of stability

-
1. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1440-1, sub 19 January 1441.
 2. Lenoir 21/245-6. Merston's Vexin lands included Hennezis, Bourg-Beaudoin, Forêt-la-Folie and Noyers (PRO, C.64/11 m.79; Bréquigny no. 386).
 3. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1430-1, f. 107v; 1432-3, sub 1 January 1433 for details of his capture and land sales.
 4. Ibid., 1434-5, f. 77v. As late as 1444 the two men were reportedly in dispute about these lands before the cour du conseil (BN, PO 3052 no. 4).

and of regional identity, an identity which Thomas Wyntrynham seems to have acknowledged by accumulating the estates of a French family, the Villers, in three bailliages. Moreover, there were mutual advantages of support and contact evident within the occupation: notably, it was Thomas's 'parens et amis' who obtained the permission necessary before lands in English hands could be sold. Secondly, land was viewed as a flexible resource by both settlers and natives. It could be farmed, sold or purchased quickly (within the limitations laid down by royal ordonnances) according to individual fortune and need. Wyntrynham bought property when money was to hand, and sold when in straitened circumstances. He enjoyed the title of a Vexin lordship and the status which went with it. As long as land retained a market value, which presumably it must have done for Hunt to have bought, it could be translated into ready cash.¹ Thirdly, continuity of tenure between settlers is again apparent from the above evidence. Thomas Wyntrynham was a soldier of long standing, serving as a foot lance at Château-Gaillard between 1437-8 and within the Vexin and other territories prior to then.² Lastly, the hazards of war could be offset in some measure by the use of land as security against mischance. In 1419 the Vexin Normand was a frontier province and its vulnerability to attack thereafter put settlers and their holdings at risk, yet the dangers did not prevent a lasting occupation. The sense of permanence and stability which Henry V had attempted to instil into the Vexin

-
1. Hunt was contrôleur of the royal recepte in Normandy. John Bromley and Richard Clerc were also potential purchasers.
 2. BN, Ms. fr. 26053 no. 783; 25775 no. 1374. In February 1429 he was commanding a mobile force instructed 'pour tenir en seurté les chemins par terre d'entre Rouen, Gisors et Dangu' (ibid., 25768 no. 348). Wyntrynham and Tyryngam jointly mustered Bishopston's retinue at Château-Gaillard in 1427 (AN, K 62/38/8).

settlement had not been unsuccessful.

Not that the processes of confiscation and subsequent distribution always went as smoothly as the king might have wished. Mistakes were inevitably made. Within nine days the lordship of Tosny on the opposite bank of the Seine to Les Andelys was given first to Henry Warryn, and then to John Eston, in similar terms.¹ It was Eston who secured the better title to the property, although his rival did not allow his own claim to be forgotten.² Nor might the grantees themselves have always lived up to the expectations which senior Lancastrians had of them. It is difficult to see how William Belle, for example, variously described as a brewer, taverner and carrier of wines, could have managed his two awards except in absentia;³ his operational base seems to have been at Harfleur, where he also held property.⁴ Nor should one forget that land was conquered by act of war and by men not always ready to share the patience of a Tyringham or Wyntryngam. The attitude of Edward Russell was frankly mercenary. Together with a French companion-in-arms he made a quick cash profit from the seizure of property in the Caux, 'prinse et mise en [leur]

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.47; Bréquigny no. 425, dated 19 April 1419; PRO, C.64/11 m.65; Bréquigny no. 482, dated 28 April 1419.
 2. On 1 December 1445 Warryn obtained an exemplification of his grant in 1419, probably to the intended benefit of his son and heir, Edmund (D.K.R., xlviiii, 370).
 3. Belle's lands included unspecified properties in the bailliages of Rouen, Caux and Gisors (PRO, C.64/11 m.56; C.64/13 m.28; Bréquigny nos. 420, 798. See also D.K.R., xlii, 331; xliv, 570; Calendar of Letter-Books preserved among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall. Letter-Book I c.1400-1422, ed. R.R. Sharpe (London, 1909), p. 234.
 4. PRO, C.64/12 m.3; Bréquigny no. 747.

main comme en fait de guerre',¹ and between 1423-4 he contested in the Paris Parlement his right to hold lands granted by the king as 'terres franches', quit of all rent charges.² The core of Russell's estates lay to the east of the river Epte in the Vexin Français,³ but for the purposes of the land settlement the traditional boundary of Normandy was overlooked. Grants were readily made on either side of the river, and Russell numbered Englishmen among his neighbours.

One or two final points emerge from this case study. Land settlers knew each other, and put that knowledge to good advantage. This becomes clear when we look beyond the linear progression of grants to the muster rolls and notarial records. Many of these men were soldiers of one rank or another; some were mobile and others not; all bore a common interest in the occupation and protection of a frontier area. Fortunes and misfortunes were shared, to some extent. As captain at Château-Gaillard, Sir William Bishopston counted Thomas Wyntrynham and John Eston among his mounted lances.⁴ When Eston died

-
1. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1418-19, fos. 237v-238, 240v. Russell received 50 l.t. as his share of the farm of Sotteville-sur-Mer, between St. Valéry-en-Caux and Dieppe, which it was claimed was not yet within the royal obedience. It is possible that Russell and Jean Noel, 'natif de Harfleur soy disant soudoier du Roy', were brothers-in-arms (K.B. McFarlane, 'A Business-Partnership in War and Administration, 1421-1445', E.H.R., lxxviii (1963), 290-310; M.H. Keen, 'Brotherhood in Arms', History, xlvii (1962), 1-17.
 2. Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, no. I, pp. 21-7, 303.
 3. From letters of protection issued in September 1419 (D.K.R., xli, 799) the following fiefs have been identified: Buhy, Copierres, Montreuil-sur-Epte, La Chapelle-en-Vexin and Hassicourt (? Alaincourt). The disputed land of 'Margny' was probably Magny-en-Vexin, close to the above fiefs.
 4. BN, Ms. fr. 25768 nos. 252, 443. In 1431 Bishopston was pardoned for allegedly surrendering Château-Gaillard without siege (Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, p. 220 n. 2).

it was Bishopston who took over Thony-sur-Seine and when Bishopston was imprisoned for negligently allowing Gaillard to be captured it was to Wyntryngham that he sold property to raise money.¹

It is by no means clear at present whether settlers in the Vexin and indeed elsewhere in Normandy had established ties of connection within England, or whether such ties, informal and formal, developed during service in France. The evidence considered above suggests that the association of land tenure and military service in a particular area of the occupation must have strengthened any existing ties and, more significantly, facilitated the formation of new bonds. The occupation made necessary mutual dealings and, not least, initial contact with Frenchmen as proctors, estate officials and rivals at law. In a settlement of higher density than that experienced in other bailliages, men were thrown together as newcomers replacing those deemed to be absent or in rebellion. Quantifying grants made in the Vexin Normand between 1 February 1419 and 31 August 1422, some twenty-seven settlers received a total of forty-seven fiefs for which a specific location can be found. The total rises to forty-six men if all grants which included lands within the bailliage of Gisors are added together. It has been suggested that the presence of the main field armies, the subsequent establishment of local garrisons and the accessibility of the king all contributed to the relative popularity of the region among individual landholders.² Equally of interest, however, are the careers, connections and attitudes to property of

1. AN, JJ 174 no. 116; JJ 175 no. 16, printed in P. Le Cacheux (ed.), Actes de la chancellerie d'Henri VI concernant la Normandie sous la domination anglaise (1422-1435) (2 vols., S.H.N., Rouen and Paris, 1907-8), ii, 157-60.

2. Massey, 'Land Settlement', p. 80.

these settlers once arrived: their individual biographies have much to reveal, but where they may be considered collectively there is perhaps even more to be learnt about a society at war and at peace.

(iv) The Distribution of Settlers

By August 1422 English settlers were present in every bailliage of Normandy. As we have seen, some of their number spilled across the ancient frontier marked by the river Epte and moved into the Vexin Français and the area which became known as the pays de conquête. From the outset, the customary boundaries of Normandy and its division into bailliages and vicomtés were adopted by the royal administration, and the management of the land settlement followed this established local pattern. There were, however, no fixed lines of settlement: Norman seigneuries and holdings accumulated by grant, inheritance or purchase were in many cases taken over in toto, regardless of bailliage or vicomté. The location of an award was of course important to an individual beneficiary, but one suspects that personal preferences were sometimes sacrificed in the rush to acquire almost any land available.

A review of the geographical distribution of the Henrician settlement will, therefore, reflect particular gains and the circumstances which obtained within a given area to make them possible, as well as the crown's concern to uphold and develop the security of the occupation as a whole. Central to both was the relationship between land tenure and local military service. This was nowhere more evident than in areas adjacent to enemy territories, such as the Vexin Normand and Vexin Français. Known grants in the bailliages of Mantes and Senlis were few, but when, for example, William Montquin's award of properties

and revenues within the châtellenie of Pontoise on 17 August 1419 is related to his appointment as prévôt of Pontoise one day later, it can be seen that local obligation could take several, mutually related forms.¹ To be given lands south-west of Mantes in April 1419 was foolhardy at first sight, yet the dangers to life and livelihood were presumably thought worthwhile.² If the risks were greater than elsewhere then so might be the returns, while to the authorities frontier grants which enhanced and consolidated the activities of the garrison and field armies were to be welcomed.

Within the neighbouring bailliage of Rouen tenure was more secure, though with fewer encastellated sites or strategic fiefs than in either the Caux or the Vexin there were perhaps not as many rich prizes to tempt the great and the good. It was common to hold property both within Rouen itself and in the surrounding countryside, as did John Wyse, esquire, 'de comitatu Cornubie', and it was quite usual for grants to comprise land in this bailliage and at least one other.³ The potentially valuable lordship of Sainte-Beuve-en-Rivière, north-east of Neufchâtel, was held together with other lands in the bailliages of Rouen and the Caux by Sir Roger Fenys,⁴ at least for a time,⁵ while the lordship of Préaux constituted the other portion of

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.19; D.K.R., xli, 799; xlii, 327.
 2. Flacourt and Arnouville-lès-Mantes were granted to James Reede to the value of 300 l.p. (PRO, C.64/11 m.68; D.K.R., xli, 770).
 3. PRO, C.64/11 m.64; Bréquigny no. 468.
 4. PRO, C.64/11 m.50; Bréquigny no. 359. Fenys served as bailli of the Caux from 1418-20 and held captaincies at Longueville and Piercourt near Neufchâtel (Gallia regia, ii, 11; D.K.R., xli, 730; xlii, 369).
 5. In December 1421 Fenys farmed out his lands to the Kentishman William Buley (? Burley) for the annual sum of 500 l.t. (Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1421-2, fos. 262-262v).

Richard Wydeville's grant of Dangu in the Vexin.¹ The Seine valley became quite well settled, accessible from a number of points within the occupied territories to office-holders and soldiers, such as the long-serving contrôleur at Château-Gaillard, Richard Nynnys.²

Within the Caux, by contrast, a number of castles and seigneuries of strategic importance were brought into settler possession. None was more valuable in this regard than the comté of Eu, whose castle on the north-eastern frontier of the occupation was to be manned with soldiers at the expense of its new owner, Sir William Bourgchier.³ To the south-east of Eu, the comté of Aumale was to be held under very similar conditions for the defence of the caput and the provision of ten men-at-arms and twenty archers for the royal armies.⁴ In addition to land frontiers, ports were well protected: the lordships of Pontrancart and Bracquemont lay a few miles inland of Dieppe;⁵ those of Bléville⁶ and l'Orcher,⁷ among others, effectively ringed Harfleur

1. See above, pp. 39-40.
2. Canteleu and lands in the surrounding bailliages were thought to be worth up to 400 écus a year (PRO, C.64/11 m.42; Bréquigny no. 558). Nynnys held this office from 1427 until 1443 (Gallia regia, iii, 414).
3. PRO, C.64/11 mm. 4, 33; Bréquigny no. 608; L.S. Woodger, 'Henry Bourgchier, Earl of Essex, and his Family (1408-1483)' (unpublished University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1974), pp. 7-8. In April 1420 Bourgchier sent a long and detailed aveu listing his holdings and rights at Eu to the chambre des comptes (AN, P 284² no. 47).
4. G.E.C., i, 503-4. Aumale was granted to Richard Beauchamp earl of Warwick on 19 May 1419.
5. PRO, C.64/11 m.50; Bréquigny no. 467.
6. Granted to John Bourghop in January 1421 (PRO, C.64/15 m.27; Bréquigny no. 916).
7. One of the Caux lordships granted to Sir John Fastolf on 15 January 1419 (PRO, C.64/10 m.13; Bréquigny no. 262).

and contributed to the defence of a Seine estuary overlooked by châteaux at Villequier¹ and Tancarville.² The strategic value of these Caux properties to the crown, and their likely financial worth to those who held them, were such that they passed quickly from settler to settler following a death. Thus Sir Philip Leech's holdings between Arques and Dieppe were taken over by Ralph Butler.³ One would not wish to convey the impression, though, that the settlement in the Caux was dominated by these prestigious awards. As Appendix I shows, this region was consistently among the most popular in which to hold lands, and the area to the south of St. Valéry-en-Caux was particularly favoured. Further east, around Neufchâtel, the settlement was noticeably thinner. To the north, one small gift demands attention: a personal grant by Henry V to Agincourt, King at Arms, of lands worth up to 20 francs at royal pleasure.⁴

In the two bailliages of Evreux and Alençon which together constituted much of the southern frontier of the occupied territories, it is surprising to find a relatively low density of colonists. To the east, in the pays d'Ouche, grants were few, and to the north of

-
1. To John Boutiller (PRO, C.64/10 m.12; Bréquigny no. 299). This and other lordships in several bailliages passed to Sir Walter Hungerford in May 1421 (PRO, C.64/16 m.31; Bréquigny no. 994) and to Sir John Robessart in September 1432 (AN, JJ 175 no. 158), a good example of continuity of tenure.
 2. To Sir John Grey (see above, p. 28).
 3. Leech was a Derbyshire knight who served as captain of Arques (S.M. Wright, The Derbyshire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century (Chesterfield, 1983), p. 152; PRO, C.64/14 m.5; D.K.R., xlii, 386; xli, 730).
 4. PRO, C.64/10 m.15; Bréquigny no. 1244; N.H. Nicolas, History of the Battle of Agincourt and of the Expedition of Henry the Fifth into France in 1415, (third edn., London, 1833), p. 175. Letters patent were issued to the herald 'per breve de privato sigillo' (see below, Chapter Five).

that area the apanage award to Clarence of the vicomtés of Auge, Orbec, Pont-Authou and Pont-Audemer all but excluded other would-be settlers. When taken together with the allocation of Harcourt to the duke of Exeter, *Le Neubourg to Salisbury and Beaumesnil to Robert Lord Willoughby*, it can be seen that major donations within a given area militated against the proliferation of smaller awards to lesser men. Two grants already referred to and centred upon Tillières and Amfreville-sur-Iton point to the practice of conferring strategic lordships upon trusted men.¹ That of the seigneurie of Mesnil-sur-l'Estrée and château of Motel, both situated across the river Avre from Dreux, provides a splendid example of a frontier grant to a less well-known man, Robert Bucton, esquire.² Other settlers took up opportunities in areas of the bailliage more secure or more convenient to their work, including Henry Vernay's cluster of fiefs to the north and west of Bernay,³ and unspecified lands given to Roger Waltham, a maître in the chambre des comptes, to the value of 300 l.t.⁴

In the bailliage of Alençon, although grants had been made since the early months of the conquest, they remained thinly spread in 1422. To the west some lay towards Mortain and owed guard duty at Domfront or St.-Lô, namely those received by Henry Broun and Robert Trewman;⁵

-
1. Above, pp. 28, 33.
 2. PRO, C.64/11 m.64; Bréquigny no. 481; probably Bucton rather than Button, as D.K.R., xli, 772.
 3. PRO, C.64/16 mm. 29-28; Bréquigny no. 1011. They included Boissy-le-Chastel, St. Mards-de-Blacarville and La Houssaye. In June 1426 it was attested that Vernay, lieutenant at Harcourt for the duke of Exeter, was still in possession of St. Mards (Lenoir 14/183).
 3. PRO, C.64/14 m.15; Bréquigny no. 881. The Calendar entries confusingly translate 'camera compotorum' as the Exchequer (D.K.R., xli, 775; xlii, 323).
 4. PRO, C.64/11 mm. 66, 39; Bréquigny nos. 484, 581.

to the east others lay towards Mortagne-au-Perche, including the lordship of Hauterive a few miles north-east of Alençon, given to Walter Hampton, esquire.¹ As in the bailliage of Mantes and other border areas it is doubtful whether such grants could always be realised, given the endemic warfare to which these places were prone. It will not pay to be too sceptical, however, even where only isolated holdings changed hands. Hauterive merited a petition by Hampton in 1428 to the effect that Bedford had sequestered it as part of his 'demaine d'Alençon', and the plaintiff duly received compensation elsewhere.² Lands further south, too, were sought after and remained in English possession. Four important fiefs in Maine, including that of Sillé-le-Guillaume, were given to Sir Robert Brent at the same time as his appointment as captain of Fresnay-le-Vicomte, an indication that an army was active in that direction in the months prior to Baugé.³

Certain areas attracted a particular kind of settler. The land settlement was altogether too diverse in character to allow this judgement to stand without qualification, but there remains at least a grain of truth in it. The bailliage of Caen, by a short head the most popular settlement location under Henry V, attracted the royal official, tradesman and soldier of middle rank in large numbers. There seems to

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.68; Bréquigny no. 384.
 2. AN, JJ 174 no. 118. Hauterive bore an estimated annual value of 800 écus, and Hampton's new lands (once held by Edward Makwilliam) in the prévôté of Paris, bailliage of Mantes and surrounding areas were worth up to 400 l.p.
 3. PRO, C.64/14 m.4; Bréquigny nos. 910, 914. The entry on the Norman Roll is almost illegible. Brent was described by Newhall as a 'petty lord of the marches' (Newhall, English Conquest, p. 219).

have been no single, favoured area within the bailliage, and Englishmen rewarded between 1419 and 1422 reinforced the presence of those already well-established on their estates. John Fairfield, esquire, lieutenant of Vire, held lands in the Cotentin and at Hamars south-west of Caen;¹ Henry Brombeley, jailer of the town, was given lands and a house there;² a man from the north-west of England, Henry Worseley, held office as constable of the castle and was twice rewarded with lands.³ An area that was relatively secure from enemy attack, agriculturally prosperous and close to an administrative and military centre of great renown could not fail to attract grantees in the first place. It is apparent that for many the attraction lasted. Fairfield requested a delay for Hamars in 1425,⁴ while Worseley's properties were the subject of an information in 1427, following his death, to the intended advantage of his French wife Marguerite and son John.⁵

The settlement in the Cotentin peninsula, once almost exclusively the preserve of the great captains, was soon opened up to those men of middling rank who permeated the occupation. Strategic sites of high potential value at St.-Sauveur-le-Vicomte, Néhou and Auvers were allocated to that long-standing supporter of the Lancastrians, Sir John

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.66; Bréquigny no. 417; BN, Ms. fr. 26043 no. 5589.
 2. Hardy, p. 159; D.K.R., xli, 773; xlii, 364.
 3. PRO, C.64/11 m.61; C.64/16 m.14; Bréquigny nos. 348, 1077; Gallia regia, i, 534.
 4. AN, P 1135 f. lviii^{vo}.
 5. Lenoir 9/55-6. For further evidence of careerism and land tenure in and close to Caen see Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, Chapter IV.

Robessart¹ and at Moyon south of St.-Lô to John de la Pole, brother of the earl of Suffolk and a soldier in his own right.² The western seaboard of the peninsula was more lightly settled than the central and eastern districts, where garrisons were concentrated and good communications gave ready access to the neighbouring bailliage of Caen. The core of a small grant to John Heyno comprised the fief of Vierville-sur-Mer to the north-west of Bayeux, and also included land at Saint-Vaast-la-Hougue, right on the coast east of Cherbourg.³ The isolated nature of St.-Vaast might suggest that Heyno would have paid little attention to it, but other Englishmen holding land in both bailliages or indeed in the Cotentin alone are now known to have made local commitments sufficient to embrace members of their families and to last as long as the occupation itself.⁴ That commitment often began with a grant by Henry V. Reference has already been made to the success of one recipient, Thomas Hadfeld, in improving his terms of tenure.⁵ The pattern was repeated in 1432 when Hadfeld's possession of two other collections of estates, some held for life and others at royal pleasure, was upgraded to that in fee tail to take account of his

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.80; Bréquigny no. 340. Soldiers were to be retained at St.-Sauveur to defend the castle and adjacent lands against incursions. See also L. Delisle, Histoire du château et des sires de Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte (Valognes, 1867), p. 252.
 2. PRO, C.64/11 m.53; Bréquigny no. 373. Listed as a mounted lance at either Coutances or St.-Lô in 1423, John acted as lieutenant at Avranches for his brother before being captured later that year (BN, Ms. fr. 25767 no. 1; Newhall, English Conquest, pp. 300-301).
 3. PRO, C.64/11 m.66; Bréquigny no. 366. Heyno, a member of the Bayeux garrison, was pardoned for a murder at nearby Lingèvres committed in 1421 (Le Cacheux, Actes de la chancellerie, i, 101-2).
 4. Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 64-6.
 5. See above, p. 33.

forthcoming marriage to Marie de Saint-Germain.¹ Such examples of long-term settlement are by no means unusual, particularly in the bailliages of Caen and the Cotentin: they testify to the ability of property there to provide some degree of livelihood for a settler and his dependents, and to the willingness of both individuals and families to establish themselves in an area that was relatively secure and, perhaps, recognisably similar in landscape and climate to that which they had known in England.²

The king's intention to reward men for past services to him cannot be doubted. How and when members of the 1415 expedition were so favoured requires assessment. Sir Harris Nicolas drew attention to a handful of rewards conferred in recognition of presence at Agincourt, which included several land grants in England and Wales and two minor awards in France to Fastolf and Agincourt, King at Arms.³ Although the published lists of men serving on the first expedition and present at Agincourt are incomplete and unreliable,⁴ it is evident that a reasonable number of these same soldiers later came to enjoy the benefits of the reallocation of French estates. Among them were the captains Sir Roland Leyntal, Sir John Grey and Lewis Robessart, esquire,⁵ and the lances James Fenys, Degory Gamel, Thomas Tyringham and Gerard

-
1. AN, JJ 175 no. 258. The grant was confirmed in 1436 after a prise had been taken (Lenoir 26/205).
 2. Dr. Curry has found this an area of many small garrisons (Curry, 'Military Organization', p. 204 and Appendix VI).
 3. Nicolas, History of the Battle of Agincourt, p. 175.
 4. Ibid., pp. 166-9; Wylie, 'Notes on the Agincourt Roll', 123-4.
 5. Ibid., 132 and Lenoir 3/400; Hardy, pp. 281-2; D.K.R., xli, 733, 769.

Huyn.¹ Letters of grant did not specifically refer to presence on the great day of battle, unlike those issued after Verneuil in 1424, and some men prominent in the 1415 and later campaigns such as Edmund earl of March, are not known as grantees.² Nevertheless, those who had been with the king in 1415 were unlikely to let him forget it, and the dozens of names common to lists of indentures for that year and to lists of land settlers after 1417 indicate that the king did not fail to remember his companions-in-arms. This phenomenon of delayed rewards suggests that there was a greater continuity of interest and involvement between the two campaigns than Professor Powicke has allowed.³

What kind of man benefited from the Henrician settlement, and where did he come from? Further work is needed on the social and geographical origins of settlers during this and indeed later periods. It has been suggested that the north-west of England provided a significant proportion of the soldiers and some notable commanders for Henry V's campaigns, partly as a consequence of a tradition of foreign military service which was by that time well developed.⁴ The Norman

-
1. Ibid., xli, 742; xli, 780; xlii, 366, 402; above, pp. 45-46; D.K.R., xli, 793.
 2. March held high office, including that of lieutenant of the marches of Normandy and other lands in the royal possession, without himself receiving land (BL, Add. Ch. 342; D.K.R., xli, 690).
 3. M.R. Powicke, 'Lancastrian Captains', Essays in Medieval History presented to Bertie Wilkinson, ed. T.A. Sandquist and M.R. Powicke (Toronto, 1969), pp. 371-82.
 4. M.J. Bennett, Community, Class and Careerism. Cheshire and Lancashire Society in the Age of 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight' (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 162-91; P.J. Morgan, 'Military Service in Late Medieval Cheshire, 1277-1403' (unpublished University of London Ph.D. thesis, 1983), pp. 165-70.

Rolls include a number of commissions to array the archers of Cheshire and Lancashire both in garrisons and in specified retinues.¹

Lancashire and Cheshire men certainly featured among those receiving landed rewards for their past and most recent support in war.² It is likely that every English county produced participants in this first wave of settlement, although in the absence of anything more than scattered references to a county or town of origin within the terms of letters patent little more can be said. The provenance of an individual can most readily be detected where that person was a member of a known retinue or household, and the royal household in particular merits a brief word.

In the absence of a complete list of members of Henry V's household, and given the turnover in its personnel during the years of the occupation, a percentage of men rewarded with French lands cannot be calculated accurately. Nevertheless, if we accept a recent estimate of some two hundred members in total,³ and consider that thirty-eight of them are known as grantees as shown in Appendix III, then the figure comes to nineteen per cent. This figure should be regarded as a minimum, since not all property transactions were recorded on the Norman Rolls. This very rough indication of the extent of royal patronage suggests a moderate and modest provision for household officers. Land grants were, however, only one of several means of reward. Pensions and corrodies in England were distributed to royal

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.31d; C.64/14 m.29d; D.K.R., xlii, 322, 389.
 2. Bennett, Community, Class and Careerism, pp. 180-1.
 3. J. Catto, 'The King's Servants', Henry V. The Practice of Kingship, ed. G.L. Harriss (Oxford, 1985), p. 84.

servants,¹ and ecclesiastical positions within Normandy were readily available.² Beneficiaries were, for the most part, those who travelled and worked with the king in France rather than those who remained in England, although itinerance blurred the distinction. What is quickly evident from a glance at the accompanying Appendix is that position was no bar to rewards. Servants of the royal larder were included,³ as was the royal page, Edward Lye,⁴ while among the more illustrious names were the squire and carver, Sir William Porter,⁵ and the controller of the household, Sir Robert Babthorpe.⁶ Doubts may legitimately be expressed about how far these grants were realised, but frequent absence or non-residence should not be taken to imply that these were paper awards or short-lived gains. To take only one example, the yeoman of the larder, John Wycheford, given lands in the Caux in April 1419, contested with the archbishop of Rouen the right to present to a parish

-
1. William Gloucester and Thomas Gentill, both clerks of the Chapel Royal, were respectively granted a corrody in the convent of Coventry and a pension from the revenues of the convent of Barking (D.K.R., xli, 699; xlii, 314).
 2. John Kyngnan, clerk of the Chapel Royal, replaced Thomas Gentill as chaplain of St. Eustace de Argences in the diocese of Bayeux (ibid., xli, 731; xlii, 336).
 3. James Tournour and Nicholas Neuton were jointly granted a manor near Caen (PRO, C.64/9 m.24; Bréquigny no. 202).
 4. PRO, C.64/12 m.32; D.K.R., xlii, 340.
 5. Porter's two grants during 1418 centred on the bailliages of Caen and Evreux, and in particular upon Rugles, of which he was captain (PRO, C.64/9 m.41; Bréquigny no. 74; Hardy, pp. 192-3; Lenoir 3/406). Porter returned to England with the body of Henry V, and in his absence his former French receveur left the lordship of Aunoy, taking estate papers and registers with him (ibid., 22/37).
 6. D.K.R., xli, 783; Fagan 'Some Aspects of the King's Household', p. 186. Babthorpe was present at Agincourt and the siege of Rouen and was an executor of Henry V's 1421 will (Wylie, 'Notes on the Agincourt Roll', passim; P. Strong and F. Strong, 'The Last Will and Codicils of Henry V', E.H.R., xcvi (1981), 79-102).

church within only a few months, and in 1430 was reported to have performed homage for these same lands.¹

Membership of a great household or retinue during a period of successful warfare was not a key which unlocked a treasure-chest of offices, titles and lands. The evidence for Henry V's occupation does suggest, however, that such an attachment brought men to the head of the queue and helped to ensure that they were rewarded early with such benefits as were available. It also brought together under one banner men of widely differing provenance and background who were then scattered across Normandy and the pays de conquête with new, local duties and responsibilities. William Porter was evidently a prominent landowner from Rutland; Babthorpe a Yorkshireman with connections in the Midlands; the Vexin landholder Sir John Baskerville came from Herefordshire and the squire of the chamber John Cheyne, later knighted, was probably of Buckinghamshire origin.² The origins and careers of these and others like them will be illuminated by studies of county gentry now in progress which will have to take into account, at the very least, the role of royal patronage and the development of cross-Channel interests which transcended local English horizons.

These, then, were among the more perceptible links in the chains of patronage developing between England and Normandy under Henry V. These chains were reinforced and even replaced by bonds forged within a locality such as the Vexin Normand as a result of favoured and loyal

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.39; Bréquigny no. 430; Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1419-20, f. 14v; AN, P 1140 f. 189.
 2. Fagan, 'Some Aspects of the King's Household', pp. 78, 82-3; Wylie, 'Notes on the Agincourt Roll', 112-4; D.K.R., xliv, 561.

service. In almost every case, one is aware of that multitude of ties which bound lesser men to their superiors, such as Walter Intebergh, a Clarence retainer given office, houses and land in several locations,¹ or James Hoget, a royal esquire for whom a charge of outlawry published at Middlesex was annulled by virtue of his presence with the king in Normandy.² One is aware, too, that such relationships as existed could be fluid and temporary, expedient or disappointing to both sides. Service and reward did not always live up to expectations, and in the latter case the land settlement was not conducive to those who anticipated a quick return for past or present duties performed. If this was true of the favoured minority, then it was all the more evident to the majority who enjoyed little or no advantage, or to whom the granting of French property was unrelated to existing connections. Ultimately, the settlement came back to a king whose audacious claim to the land and people of Normandy in 1417 had all but been realised by 1422.

-
1. PRO, C.64/8 m.12; Hardy, p. 249; D.K.R., xlii, 350, 403, 410; xliv, 560.
 2. D.K.R., xli, 743; C.C.R., 1419-22, p. 100.

CHAPTER TWO

THE LAND SETTLEMENT 1422-35

(i) Continuity and Change 1422-4

The deaths within two months of Henry V and Charles VI left no clear answer to the question of who was to take charge in France in the name of the infant Henry VI, and on what terms. Whether Philip duke of Burgundy stood down willingly or only under pressure from Bedford and the need to uphold the treaty of Troyes is a moot point.¹ What is certain is that Bedford's case proved the stronger, and that he advanced quickly from the position of 'gouverneur de Normendie'² to that of Regent in France for his nephew. The interregnum effectively ended at an important meeting of the Paris Parlement on 19 November 1422.³ The chancellor proclaimed to the assembled conseillers that the Regent

'avoit entencion et bonne volenté d'emploier corps,
amis et chevance pour le bien de ce royaume et pour

-
1. Monstrelet, Chronique, iv, 119-20; C.A.J. Armstrong, 'La Double monarchie France - Angleterre et la maison de Bourgogne (1420-35). Le déclin d'une alliance', Annales de Bourgogne, xxxvii (1965), 81-112. For a recent summary of events and commentary on evidence see R.A. Griffiths, The Reign of King Henry VI. The Exercise of Royal Authority, 1422-1461 (London, 1981), pp. 16-19.
 2. BN, n. acq. fr. 1482 nos. 13, 17, dated 29 September and 1 October 1422.
 3. Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, p. 4.

maintenir les subgiez d'icellui en bonne justice,
en bonne paix et tranquillité'.¹

The theme which emerges strongly from this session of the court is that of continuity, of the maintenance of the status quo ante and the preservation of existing institutions and practices. No greater compliment to the achievements of Henry V could be paid by the Parlement and the Regent than this recognition of the legality and validity of the Lancastrian authority in France. Within the chancellor's address, however, there were two indications that the Parlement and the subjects of 'l'union des deux couronnes' would need to face up to the legacy of the immediate past. In the first place, it was explicitly stated that the duchy of Normandy was to be reunited to the French crown.² Secondly, and of greater significance in the long term, there was implicit recognition that the principles of justice and peace could extend only to those living within the Anglo-Burgundian obedience. The irony of the 'paix finale' was that it bound those who swore to it to further war against the Dauphin, his supporters and all who rejected the authority of the Lancastrian Parlement.³ The treaty committed Henry V

'à mettre en nostre obéissance toutes et chascunes
citez, villes, chastiaulx, lieux, pays et personnes

-
1. Journal de Clément de Fauquembergue, greffier du Parlement de Paris, 1417-1435, ed. A. Tuetey, (3 vols., S.H.F., Paris, 1903-15), ii, 74.
 2. Idem.
 3. Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 20-22; M.H. Keen, 'Diplomacy', Henry V. The Practice of Kingship, ed. G.L. Harriss (Oxford, 1985), pp. 181-99. The treaty has been characterised by Dr. Harriss as 'a half-way stage ... the blueprint for a different order, not one that had been achieved.' (Harriss, 'Conclusion', ibid., p. 205).

dedens nostre royaume désobéissans à nous et rebelles.'¹

The assembly which met two and a half years after the sealing of the treaty was well aware that much remained to be done if the Plantagenet and Valois crowns were ever to be united. Bedford's Regency could not therefore rely for its justification on the illustrious deeds of Henry V. There was a brief 'honeymoon period' during which authority was asserted and expressions of unity were forthcoming, but from the outset elements of change brought home to its supporters the need of the new régime to prove itself in its own terms.

The first question which this settlement raises concerns the authority by which Bedford governed in France. Prior to 1431 no written record describes the nature and limits of the Regent's personal competence, which at first sight seems surprising when compared, for example, to contemporary appointments of royal lieutenants in Ireland.² The provision of James Butler earl of Ormond as king's lieutenant in 1420 was made under rather restrictive terms which included the right to receive Englishmen and Irishmen deemed to have been 'rebels', and to grant confiscated lands by advice of the council of Ireland.³ Sir John Sutton's appointment in March 1428 gave him a freer hand:

'Also to grant to deserving persons, in fee or for term of life or years, lands acquired in war

-
1. Cosneau, Grands traités, p. 106, no. 12.
 2. C.P.R., 1413-16, pp. 53-4, 164; E. Matthew, 'The Financing of the Lordship of Ireland under Henry V and Henry VI', Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History, ed. A.J. Pollard (Gloucester and New York, 1984), pp. 97-115; R. Frame, English Lordship in Ireland 1318-1361 (Oxford, 1982), pp. 109-111, 120-1; A.J. Otway-Ruthven, A History of Medieval Ireland (second edn., London, 1980), pp. 144-51.
 3. C.P.R., 1416-22, p. 256.

by the king's enemies, for lack of defence, and recovered from the said enemies again, and also confiscated lands of rebels, for a reasonable farm or yearly rent by advice of the said council. Provided always that the said John do not meddle with the king's lands and demesnes which were subject to his grandfather, or father'.¹

There are similarities between this Irish commission and the exercise of Bedford's de facto authority in France. Land grants were to be made by the advice of a council, and demesne lands were specifically excluded from the regular process of distribution. In France land grants were enacted by letters patent issued in the king's name, with the Grand Conseil occasionally acting in an advisory capacity, both in perpetuity and for term of life. In practice, however, it is the differences between the French and the Irish situations which prove more enlightening than the similarities. If Bedford was careful to act in the name of Henry VI, there can be little doubt that he acted as a king in the matter of the disbursal of landed patronage, traditionally among the most valued of the royal prerogatives. By far the majority of grants were issued on the advice of Bedford alone, for the Regent acted as the mainspring of the civil administration of the occupied territories. As we shall see, during his absences from France in 1425-7 and 1433-4 the management of those territories was put into the hands of the chancellor and the Grand Conseil. Two items were carefully excluded from their delegated authority: gifts of money, and gifts of land.²

The absence of a written commission is not therefore unusual,

-
1. Ibid., 1422-9, pp. 475-6; ibid., 1429-36, p. 105 for Sir Thomas Stanley's appointment in January 1431 with similar powers regarding land.
 2. Below, pp. 119-21.

for Bedford claimed the Regency of France as a birthright as the elder of the late king's brothers. The claim was strengthened by his personal success in war and by an experience of government that had made familiar the institutions of Paris, Rouen and England. In England it was the King's Council which was collectively responsible for the management of the material resources of the crown,¹ and in France the Grand Conseil performed a similar role. In practice, both bodies were subject to influence and direction and, in the case of the Conseil, it has been argued that power was concentrated in the hands of individuals according to their office rather than in the conseillers as a body.² In effect, Bedford assumed quasi-regal powers, and there is little doubt that the responsibility for the overall direction of what may be termed a policy of land settlement rested with him.

Support for this interpretation of Bedford's position may be found, paradoxically, in the terms of a grant issued by the Grand Conseil some eighteen months later. On 21 June 1424 the first apanage grant of the Regency was made, that of the duchy of Anjou and comté of Maine to Bedford himself.³ In two valuable preambles of unusual length, we are given some indication of the social, economic and political context in which the land settlement operated. These letters patent were signed by the duke of Burgundy, the bishops of Thérouanne and Beauvais, the abbot of Mont-Saint-Michel, the seigneur

-
1. Griffiths, Reign of Henry VI, pp. 83-106.
 2. B.J.H. Rowe, 'The Grand Conseil under the Duke of Bedford, 1422-35', Oxford Essays in Medieval History presented to H.E. Salter, ed. F.M. Powicke (Oxford, 1934), pp. 220-22.
 3. AN, JJ 172 no. 518; JJ 173 no. 315. It is not clear why two differently worded copies of this grant were entered in the registers. The terms of the grant itself are essentially the same, as are the witness lists and the signature of the secretary, Jean de Rinel.

of Saligny and other leading bishops and laymen charged with upholding the treaty of Troyes. Their presence bore testimony to the close relationship which existed between the confiscation and redistribution of land and what may be thought of as the broader policy and attitude of the Grand Conseil towards the war. Reference was made to the 'povreté du commun peuple' and to the difficulties of continuing the war; moreover, some seigneurs were reportedly holding a neutral position and waiting for one side to demonstrate an advantage over the other.¹

It was the allegiance of these wavering or uncommitted seigneurs that the Grand Conseil hoped to attract, using land as both incentive and reward to men whose passive acceptance of the Anglo-Burgundian régime might, it was hoped, be turned into an active participation in their cause:

'pour leur donner et distribuer terres et seigneuries que tiennent et occupent lesdis ennemis dont ils seront constituez noz hommes et vassaulx, la guerre pourra prendre briefve fin et fructueuse conclusion'.

The architect of this ambitious plan was to be Bedford. The grant in register JJ 172 recorded that he held of the king no French lands or lordships at that date, implying that this was both an untypical and an unsatisfactory state of affairs for one of such position. The grant in register JJ 173 stressed his royal lineage and the desire to further encourage his efforts to the benefit of king and kingdom. Furthermore, the former grant expressly stated that land tenure would make Bedford a vassal of the crown:

1. Idem, cited by Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 29.

'Et afin que par le moien des terres et seigneuries éstans en notre dit Royaume il soit fait et constitué notre vassal'.

It may well be that the Conseil had misgivings about the nature and extent of a Regent's authority. By means of both a generous personal award and a responsibility to distribute to others lands then in 'enemy' hands, its members were in effect underpinning the sovereignty of the crown in all matters relating to the tenure of such a valuable resource. It is important to observe that the apanage was to be held in the manner by which previous dukes of Anjou and counts of Maine held it of 'noz prédécesseurs Roys de France en temps passéz'.

Bedford probably chose Anjou and Maine for himself. The grant comprised, in addition to the towns, castles and lordships of the duchy and comté, a panoply of feudal rights and privileges, including the confiscations and forfeitures normally reserved to the crown. The potential value of such a provision in a frontier area was indeed high. It would be wrong, however, to think that the Regent dictated his own terms. Land grants demanded something in return, and in this instance instead of an obligation to provide men to defend strategic positions or for the royal armies, the grantee was expected to conquer the territory in question. This was something more than issuing letters for lands not yet within the English obedience, as Henry V had occasionally done.¹ The Grand Conseil were marrying together Bedford's desire to bear title and hold estates commensurate with his position to their own declared intention to win support for their cause and to push the war to a conclusion. An obligation to conquer donated lands was not a general requirement at any time during the English

1. See above, pp. 21-2.

occupation,¹ but here it was perhaps mutually advantageous to all parties swearing to the treaty of Troyes that Bedford's personal ambitions should be co-joined to the likely future direction of the war effort.

What, then, were the connections between the land settlement and attempts to reinforce and extend Anglo-Burgundian authority during the years 1422-4? In the military and diplomatic spheres, it was only practical that Bedford should work within the guidelines laid down so successfully by his brother. The initial campaigns of the Regency were directed towards the repulsion of a bold raid upon lower Normandy, the security of the north-eastern frontier of the duchy and control of the vulnerable Seine valley, concerns crushingly familiar to Henry V. The investment of Le Crotoy, begun in June 1423, had apparently been planned by the late king.² Another legacy was the accord with the duke of Brittany, confirmed by the sealing of the treaty of Amiens in 1423. This yielded Breton recognition of the treaty of Troyes, no mean consideration in relation to the geography of the land settlement, however much one doubts the motives of the signatories.³ It was certainly Newhall's view that Bedford's personal policy was not properly formulated until May or June 1424.⁴

It is possible to overstate the case for continuity of attitudes and actions between the two Lancastrians. By mid-1424 Bedford had

-
1. Cf. B.J.H. Rowe, 'John, Duke of Bedford, as Regent of France (1422-1435): his Policy and Administration in the North' (unpublished University of Oxford B.Litt. thesis, 1927), p. 57.
 2. Newhall, English Conquest, pp. 297-9.
 3. Armstrong, 'La Double monarchie', 84-5.
 4. Newhall, English Conquest, pp. 314-5.

surely proved himself as a commander and strategist in his own right. With decisions to be taken urgently to try to wrest the initiative from the Dauphinists, there was no question of resting on past glories, of failing to explore the potential inherent within the alliance of English and Burgundian forces. The execution of the siege of Le Crotoy, for example, was a triumph for Bedford.¹ The victory gained under the leadership of Salisbury and Willoughby against a Franco-Scottish force near Cravant in July 1423 has been somewhat overshadowed by that of Verneuil a year later, but in its own terms such a success achieved deep in Champagne says much about the vigour with which war on several fronts was being pursued, and might indicate the direction of future operations.² To agree with Professor Vaughan's interpretation of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance as one which owed more to the personalities of the respective parties than to any 'systematic policies' is to take rather a narrow view of a relationship too important to both sides to be left to the whim or ambition of individual princes.³

Into this broader framework should be fitted the land settlement of the early Regency: the one did not exist in isolation from the other. Evidence for the settlement during the period 1422-35 comes mainly from two sources. First, the registers of the Chancellerie de France contain the official record of transactions involving the

-
1. Fauquembergue, Journal, ii, 122-3; Griffiths, Reign of Henry VI, pp. 185, 210.
 2. Jean de Waurin, Recueil des croniques et anchiennes istoires de la Grant Bretagne, a present nomme Engleterre, 1399-1422, 1422-31, ed. W. and E.L.C.P. Hardy (5 vols., R.S., London, 1864-91), ii, 61-9; Fauquembergue, Journal, ii, 104-5. News of the victory was greeted with processions in Paris.
 3. R. Vaughan, Philip the Good. The Apogee of Burgundy (London, 1970), p. 6.

crown, including letters of remission and pardons, and donations to French and English alike.¹ The Chancellerie registered both grants to recipients who requested that a permanent record be kept, and those of which the crown itself wanted a note for future reference.² The eminent archivist and historian Paul Le Cacheux warned that the registers of the Trésor des Chartes might not tell the whole story,³ and his suspicion was confirmed by the discovery of a wealth of material stemming from the chambre des comptes. This second major source, first recognized by Le Pesant and since brought to wider attention as the Collection Lenoir, adds incalculably to our knowledge of the occupation of Normandy in general.⁴ In particular, of the fifty Englishmen receiving lands between 14 October 1422, the date of the first known grant of the Regency, and 16 August 1424, the eve of the battle of Verneuil, Lenoir supplies twenty-nine names and the Chancellerie twenty-one; of the latter Lenoir has copies of seven. Put another way, the Collection Lenoir does more than fill in gaps in the record: it is the only source for over half the known settlers in this shorter period and indeed, very roughly, for the duration of the Regency. In the absence of accessible sources, some authorities once argued that Bedford abandoned the settlement policy of Henry V, but

1. AN, JJ 172-5.

2. O. Morel, La Grande chancellerie royale et l'expédition des lettres royaux (1328-1400) (Paris, 1900), pp. 322-33.

3. Le Cacheux, Actes de la chancellerie, i, x: 'Il est difficile de savoir si toutes les lettres de donation d'Henri VI ont été insérées dans les registres de la Chancellerie; mais on peut affirmer hardiment que le plus grand nombre d'entre elles y a pris place'.

4. M. Le Pesant, 'Les Manuscrits de Dom Lenoir sur l'histoire de Normandie', B.S.A.N., 1 (1946-8), 125-51; C.T. Allmand, 'The Collection of Dom Lenoir and the English Occupation of Normandy in the Fifteenth Century', Archives, vi (1964), 202-10.

nothing could be further from the truth.¹

One striking feature of the settlement during 1423 and early 1424 was the number of Frenchmen who benefited from it. Some were conseillers or followers of the duke of Burgundy, such as André de Vallins, conseiller,² and Hugues Le Coq, prévôt des marchands in Paris.³ Others had evidently come into the Anglo-Burgundian obéissance recently, such as Louis Martel,⁴ or alternatively were compensated for losses and damages suffered during enemy occupation of their lordships, for example Regnier Pot, seigneur de la Roche, given extensive estates at Gamaches in the bailliage of Amiens.⁵

These and similar grants suggest that the promises and aspirations of the new régime were far from worthless. Within the land settlement a strand of thought common to the treaty of Troyes, to Bedford's address to the Paris Parlement and to the apanage grant of Anjou and Maine can be drawn out: that good justice and peace might best be achieved by co-operation, conciliation and the judicious distribution of landed patronage to those deprived or deserving of it. Donations made on the advice of Bedford acted as enticements and honours to Frenchmen already loyal and especially to those who might become so, and could only serve to make the military and diplomatic objectives of

-
1. S.B. Chrimes, 'John, First Duke of Bedford. His Work and Policy in England, 1389-1435' (unpublished University of London M.A. thesis, 1929), p. 94; A.R. Myers, "'A Vous Entier". John of Lancaster, duke of Bedford, 1389-1435', History Today, x (1960), 463.
 2. AN, JJ 172 no. 237.
 3. Ibid., no. 377. Le Coq was a conseiller in the Paris Parlement (Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, pp. 270-1).
 4. AN, JJ 172 no. 292.
 5. Ibid., no. 247.

the new order that much easier to attain. The restoration and redistribution of estates to at least the more prominent supporters of the Anglo-Burgundian cause at national and local levels provides persuasive evidence of an attempt to put into practice promises made both in public declarations and in the terms of private grants to individuals.

Letters patent also reveal the intentions of the donor and the potential rewards available to a donee, and the decision on the advice of Bedford to assign the comté of Dreux to the earl of Suffolk on 27 July 1424 provides a good example of the two elements at work:

'pour consideracion des grans et notables services que nous a faiz et fait un chacun jour notre amé et féal cousin ... à la Recouvrance, garde et deffense de noz Royaume et seigneurie de France pour lesquelz il a exposé et expose Incessamment ses personne et chevance tant en fait de guerre comme autrement. Et pour autres bonnes causes et Raisons justes et honorables'.¹

One would not wish to take such language at face value, but when due allowance has been made for the use of a common form in these letters and, for instance, even in a small grant to the earl of Salisbury in July 1424, there remains firm evidence that individual service matched the aspirations of the Anglo-Burgundian government.² Suffolk had indeed been active at a series of sieges during 1423 under Salisbury's command.³ As a result of this campaign the frontier of the occupation had been extended southwards from Normandy; the grant of Dreux came

1. Ibid., no. 571.

2. The grant comprised a rent of 100 l.t. on the fief of La Vallée near Lillebonne (ibid., no. 578).

3. Suffolk was present at the siege of Cravant and then successively at Montaiguillon, Coussy, and La Roche-Guyon (Waurin, Recueil des croniques, iii, 62, 70).

shortly after the castle of Ivry had agreed to surrender.¹ The acquisition of a comté which comprised lands in the bailliages of Mantes, Evreux and Chartres was, therefore, a direct reward for Suffolk's having brought this very area under control. There could be no obligation upon him to conquer his new estates because he had already done so. He had exposed himself and his fortune in war, and in return was to enjoy estate revenues to whatever their current or future value might be, in addition to the prestige of a title which he bore proudly.²

That commanders of field armies could expect to be rewarded by Bedford as they had been by Henry V seems likely, and such an expectation was not disappointed. This consistency of approach is best shown by an examination of the honours bestowed upon and accumulated by Sir John Fastolf between 1423 and 1425, but there were others whose activities demonstrate the relationship between land tenure and . . . military service in this period.³ Sir John de Montgomery was given estates in Maine at Ambrières-les-Vallées north-west of Mayenne and at Saint-Aubin-Fosse-Louvain south-west of Domfront on 14 June 1423.⁴ Montgomery was captain of Domfront in 1420 and again between 1427-8,⁵ and with Fastolf and Thomas Lord Scales was committed to the conquest

1. Newhall, English Conquest, pp. 313-4.
2. See for example its use in a grant of the lordships of Chanteloup and Créances in April 1427, property once in the possession of Sir John Harpenden (AN, JJ 173 no. 634).
3. For Fastolf see below, pp. 99-101, 355-9.
4. AN, JJ 172 no. 265; Le Cacheux, Actes de la chancellerie, ii, 319. In April 1428 Montgomery received permission to sell these estates to Scales (AN, JJ 174 no. 184).
5. D.K.R., xlii, 380; AN, K.62/38 no. 2. He was described as bailli of Alençon and captain of Domfront and Argentan in September 1423 (Seine-Mme, Tabellionage de Rouen 1422-3, f. 273).

of Maine and the attempted conquest of Anjou following the battle of Verneuil.¹ It was by means of awards to great captains such as Suffolk, Montgomery and Fastolf that the bounds of the settlement slowly advanced from the limits reached in August 1422 in response to successes won against the Dauphinists.

Within Normandy and the pays de conquête, land remained freely available to those prepared to perform the customary services and to pay the usual charges for its tenure. The grant to the long-serving Nicholas Burdett, an esquire of Warwickshire origin, 'et ses hoirs masles en ligne directe' was typical in that it balanced against these duties potential revenues of 1,000 écus d'or from the fiefs of Bonnebosq and Manneville-la-Pipard near Pont-l'Évêque, and other lands in the bailliages of Rouen and the Caux.² Some men first came into the possession of French land during this period. Walter Charlton, esquire, was given lands in the bailliages of Rouen, Caen and the Cotentin;³ from an information in the Collection Lenoir the major fief of the grant can be pinpointed to Manneville-la-Raoult west of Pont-Audemer.⁴ A retainer of Sir Walter Hungerford,⁵ Charlton had served in the 1415 and 1417 expeditions to France and his grant, in fee tail to the value of 800 l.t., is commensurate with those accorded

1. See below, p. 100.
2. AN, JJ 172 no. 191; Le Cacheux, Actes de la chancellerie, ii, 313; Chronique du Mont-Saint-Michel (1343-1468), ed. S. Luce (2 vols., S.A.T.F., Paris, 1879-83), i, 120-1, 149-50; D.K.R., xliv, 633. Burdett was knighted by September 1424.
3. AN, JJ 172 no. 457, dated 27 December 1423. An earlier copy is dated 10 October 1422 and gives a value of 500 l.t. (Lenoir 3/170).
4. Ibid., 14/181-2.
5. J.L. Kirby, 'The Hungerford Family in the Later Middle Ages' (unpublished University of London M.A. thesis, 1939), p. 33.

to men of similar rank by Henry V.

Whether such grants issued between 1422 and 1424 could long be enjoyed was a different matter. Charlton died at Verneuil, having scarcely had time to take possession of his new properties.¹ Another beneficiary, John Handford, found himself enmeshed in a protracted suit against Jean de Gaucourt over the 'fruiz, prouffis et revenuez' of the lordship of Maisons-sur-Seine close to Paris; even the date of the grant was disputed.² Legal proceedings also threatened to bar the entry of the conseiller of Bedford and Vexin landholder, Richard Wydeville, to lands awarded in May 1423, until a confirmation of the original grant was obtained a year later.³

Nevertheless, there is much within the settlement to suggest a healthy demand both from existing grantees and new settlers for fiefs confiscated from French men and women. Threats to land tenure from law or from war, if considered at all, were secondary to a desire to own property close to the centre of individual service in the military or civilian administration. To this rule of thumb there were of course exceptions, but it is a theme as common to the early settlement

-
1. Waurin, Recueil des croniques, iii, 116. The wardship of Charlton's lands was administered by a French procureur on behalf of his widow and their three young children (BL, Add. Ch. 14366).
 2. Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, no. III, pp. 44-74, 295-6. Nothing is known of an alleged grant in October 1422 (ibid., p. 55 n. 45), but the Collection Lenoir contains one at the king's pleasure to the value of 500 l.p. dated 10 March 1423 (Lenoir 13/121) which supports Handford's claim to a grant prior to that of 26 September 1424 (Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, p. 48 n. 20).
 3. AN, JJ 172 nos. 278, 421; Le Cacheux, Actes de la chancellerie, ii, 316-7, 324; above pp. 39-41. The suit against James Lynde and Walter Aslake before the bailli of Gisors was successful, but Wydeville feared that the procureur du roi would declare the grant to be of no value.

of Bedford as to that practised by his predecessor. Richard Merbury's appointment as captain of Gisors from 1 January 1423 was followed by a grant of lands in that town and bailliage the following September.¹ From these foundations and by virtue of a propitious marriage to Katherine de Fontenay, Merbury built a career as a trusted soldier and administrator in an area which became his home.² Within this pattern of continuity of purpose and achievement between successive administrations, there can be detected elements of change sufficient to point to the view that Bedford had his own firm opinions about the nature and direction of the settlement. The considerable patronage and power at his disposal had to be exercised in the context of an Anglo-Burgundian alliance which demanded of its adherents a loyalty and commitment which was as much a precondition of tenure to the Regent himself as to the smallest grantee. The sources suggest a widespread confidence that the illustrious deeds of Henry V represented a beginning rather than an end, and that in return for the demands of service in war made of them, individual landholders could acquire revenue and title and, above all, opportunity for advancement.

The settlement was pushing out from the boundaries of Normandy in new directions, and there were signs that its beneficiaries were changing. First, the number of men willing or able to receive grants for life or at the king's pleasure increased significantly. This may in part be a reflection of our sources, in that life-grants sometimes made by Henry V were not officially enrolled whereas those issued by

-
1. Gallia regia, iii, 403-4; AN, JJ 172 no. 362; Le Cacheux, Actes de la chancellerie, ii, 319-20.
 2. For example, during the 1440s Merbury served as bailli of Gisors and captain of Gisors and Vernon (Gallia regia, iii, 367, 403-5, 412; Lenoir 4/199; BL, Add. Ch. 1218; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 80).

Bedford are known to us from the chambre des comptes records. Appendix IV shows that grants for life and in fee tail were made after 1422 in almost identical numbers. Life-grants may also be interpreted as an attempt to attract more settlers, perhaps men of lesser means, to estates generally of lower value and less strategic importance. Secondly, the number of grants made to known members of Bedford's household and retinue from October 1422 is sufficient to warrant separate treatment. Paradoxically, as more land became available for redistribution and more people were being brought into the settlement, it appears that good patronage and connection were becoming increasingly necessary to obtain, retain and enjoy that land to the full.

(ii) The Impact of the Battle of Verneuil

Verneuil had a considerable bearing on the settlement. Fought on 17 August 1424, the battle had far-reaching consequences which justify its selection as a decisive point in this survey of Bedford's policy and practice. In the first place, large numbers of Frenchmen were slain on the field, and the chronicle sources show beyond doubt that the nobility of France suffered heavy losses.¹ Not least among the consequences of the slaughter of Agincourt had been that Englishmen arriving in France in the earliest years of the occupation had taken over the estates of nobles who had perished in 1415 leaving widows and minors. Much the same happened after Verneuil. On the eve of battle,

1. Brut, ii, 566-7; J. Stevenson (ed.), 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, R.S., London, 1861-4), II, ii, 394-5. Jean de Waurin ended his eyewitness account of the battle with a long list of the noblemen killed or taken prisoner (Waurin, Recueil des croniques, iii, 116-8).

wisely as it turned out, a number of soldiers on the Franco-Scottish side reportedly put their affairs in order and arranged to dispose of property.¹ The English may well have done the same, although no evidence has been found. By this date, too, the baillis and the central administration would have known the names of many who had refused to pledge adherence to the treaty of Troyes or had fled. To their names were added those of Frenchmen who had formerly sworn obedience, and then joined the Armagnac cause: Verneuil was an acid test of personal loyalty. The penalties for oath-breaking were especially harsh, and some paid with their lives. Others lost their estates:

'comme de leurs terres et autres biens meubles
 quy furent prins et confisquies et mis realement
 en la main du roy d'Angleterre pour aplicquier
 a son demaine, ou baillier en recompence a
 aulcuns qui lauroient mery par leur loyaulte et
 bon service'.²

The battle was a turning point in the land settlement for two main reasons. First, it paved the way for the advance of the occupation into Maine and then Anjou, and the extension of its frontier at some points as far south as the river Loire. The indenture drawn up between Bedford and Fastolf on 27 November 1424 reflected English optimism and bears comparison with Fastolf's commission some ten months earlier.³ Sir John was to take eighty mounted men-at-arms and 240 archers,

-
1. J. Augis, 'La bataille de Verneuil (jeudi 17 août 1424) vue de Châteaudun', Bulletin trimestriel de la société dunoise, xvi (1933), 118.
 2. Waurin, Recueil des croniques, iii, 120-1.
 3. See below, p. 100.

'pour employer a la conquete du dit pais et conte du Maine et des marches denviron ... et partout aillieurs en ceste royaume de France ou le dit monseigneur le regent le vouldra ordonner'.¹

It is not surprising that the great captains who had assembled at Verneuil already held, in many cases, substantial interests in French land, or were soon to acquire such interests. From a list of forty-three leading Englishmen reputedly present at the battle, some thirty-five were known property owners; of the twenty-eight knights, twenty-one held lands.²

The true significance of this crushing military success, however, was that men of all ranks were brought into the land settlement for the first time, as the totals for early 1425 in Appendix IV would suggest. Following the fall of Rouen in January 1419 many Englishmen of lesser position had been granted estates and properties to enjoy, but after August 1424 there was a further broadening of the social base of the settlement. We have good evidence that those present at the battle came to expect a direct reward in land for their services to the Anglo-Burgundian cause. Into this setting came the petition of Jean de Matheu in 1430, who claimed to have been present at a series of sieges and battles which he listed, including Verneuil:

'à l'occasion desquelx services il a grandement fraié et despendu du sien sans ce que il en ait esté aucunement remuneré, ja soit ce que ceulx

-
1. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, i, 45; C.T. Allmand (ed.), Society at War. The Experience of England and France during the Hundred Years War (Edinburgh, 1973), pp. 58-60.
 2. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, 394.

qui furent à ladite bataille de Vernueil aient
eu don de terres'.¹

A sense of expectation of reward, and of disappointment when that expectation was not fulfilled, marks an advance in any appreciation of contemporary attitudes to the land settlement. Burgundians and 'loyal' Normans present at the battle were similarly rewarded for their services, including Guillaume Poisson, Bedford's procureur in the Cotentin.² Patronage was available and was widely known to be available, and the Anglo-Burgundian administration would be judged by both nationalities in terms of a distribution of that patronage sufficient to satisfy at least some of the many and sometimes conflicting claims upon it.

Among the documents collected by William Worcester on the government of Normandy and the conquered provinces was a declaration worth quoting in support of this argument:

'Gentes Anglice nationis, tam nobiles, domini, milites, et plebes habuerunt ex dono prefati domini Regentis Ducis de Bedford, pro eorum bono gestu et strenuitate in bello de Vernelle in Perche ... dominia, maneria, terras, et tenementa in dicto comitatu de Mayne assignata et concessa in feodo'.³

The Collection Lenoir enables us to focus on the 'plebes' given lands,

-
1. Lenoir 22/155, cited by Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 468. The Burgundian Matheu convinced the assembled notables at the Anglo-French Grand Conseil of his loyalty and the justice of his cause.
 2. Lenoir 21/351.
 3. Lambeth MS 506 f. 22r, printed in Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [550-1]; K.B. McFarlane, 'William Worcester: A Preliminary Survey', Studies presented to Sir Hilary Jenkinson, ed. J. Conway Davies (Oxford, 1957) pp. 196-221 esp. p. 216.

usually as life-grants, as this same text relates, 'secundum statum, gradum, et merita gentis Anglorum strenue in prenominate bello de Vernelle in Perche gerentem'. The opening clause of a grant often referred to the recipient's good services in the king's wars, but what distinguished many letters patent issued after Verneuil was their specific reference to attendance on the great day. It seems that everyone, from foot soldier to magnate, was keen to have his participation put on the official record. To be counted among those present was itself held to be a testimonial to valour and good character, and it has recently been shown that litigants before the Paris Parlement, Richard Handford and William Zeman among them, were eager to draw public attention to their attendance and subsequent reward.¹

Some thirty-two Englishmen described as archers were given French lands after August 1424. That there were more is certain.² Since they make only fleeting appearances in the records, little can often be gleaned about the lives and careers of these men outside their service in one or several garrisons. One who is better known is Thomas Kyreby, granted a small fief in the vicomté of Orbec two months after the battle.³ Saint-Jean-de-Livet, south of Lisieux, was the first of three small awards to Kyreby, who had married a French woman. A telling clue as to the thinking which lay behind such grants was given: 'et affin que luy qui s'est marié en Normendie ait mieulx de quoi avoir la vie, éstat et sustentacion de luy sa femme et enfans'. That he and his family settled in the area was suggested by a grant of a rent and

-
1. Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, pp. 18-19, 78, 135, 272.
 2. In May 1434 the archer John Bromblay was granted a delay for land at Mollay Bacon near Caen for which no letters of grant are known (Lenoir 22/345).
 3. AN, P 1905¹ no. 4786; Lenoir 21/281.

lands in the vicomtés of Auge and Orbec in 1425¹ and confirmed by an information presented in April 1434 showing that Kyreby had bought Saint-Jean and other properties, with the right of reversion, and furthermore the purchase was in perpetuity whereas his previous grants had been for life or at the king's pleasure.²

From the sources it thus appears that archers were no less willing than other social groups to put down roots, support their families and earn their livelihoods on foreign soil. John Regnault, given lands in the bailliage of Rouen in May 1425, was accorded a delay for those lands in July 1434;³ John Preston, given a life-grant near Caudebec in the same month, sought a delay in September 1434.⁴ A close relationship between garrison service and the settlement is certain to underlie this evidence for the long-term tenure of estates. It is reasonable to suppose that soldiers returning to their garrisons took up lands nearby, since not the least of the effects of Verneuil was a renewed confidence in the strength of the English armies and in the permanence of an occupation based on land. Family settlement reflected this feeling of security. The archer John Pouleferd and his son Robert were granted lands to the value of forty l.t. per year to be shared equally between them.⁵ Hoskin and Jenkin Wortyght

-
1. His second grant on 24 June 1425 was of a rent on lands in the bailliages of Rouen and Caen and vicomté of Falaise; the third came on 22 October following (ibid., 21/281-2).
 2. Ibid., 21/287-8. For details of the purchase see Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 472, where the buyer is wrongly identified as John Kyrby.
 3. Lenoir 21/389; 22/349.
 4. Lenoir 21/383; 26/183.
 5. Ibid., 21/341-2, dated 23 February 1425. These lands lay east and south-east of Pont-Audemer in the parishes of Campigny and Hauville.

received rebel lands in the bailliages of Caen and Alençon to the same value, 'et ce par indivis à égalle portion'.¹

The common ownership of lands was also evident among larger groups. Seven archers, probably from the same garrison, were collectively given lands formerly held by no less than thirty-one 'rebels' and their wives in the Cotentin, to the value of 140 l.t. per year, namely twenty livres each.² This figure of twenty livres occurs so often that it can be taken as a norm. All the archers mentioned above received lands to this value; each of Thomas Kyreby's three awards was to this specific amount.³ There was nothing random about the distribution of landed benefits after Verneuil, given the declared aim to make grants according to the relative status and merits of their recipients. When Matthew Jouen, esquire, and Hugh Jouen and John Osaystre, archers, were granted lands in the Caux to the value of 100 l.t. it was specified that the esquire should receive sixty livres and the archers twenty livres each.⁴ Social division could transcend the family link between the two Jouens.

Ties of family were mutually advantageous, but familial connection represents only one form of association linking people together within Lancastrian France. That certain archers were granted properties close to their garrison suggests at the very least a good working

-
1. Ibid., 21/369. A valuable comparison can be made with the Gough family, which had members fighting on both sides of the conflict (R.G. Little, The Parlement of Poitiers. War, Government and Politics in France 1418-1436 (London and New Jersey, 1984), pp. 173-4).
 2. Lenoir 21/265.
 3. See above, p. 87. An addition to his third grant added lands in the vicomté of Orbec worth six l.t.
 4. Lenoir 21/345, 6 March 1425.

relationship with their captain in the securing of the grant in the first place and in the subsequent collection of its revenues. In turning a blind eye to residence outside the garrison, contrary to instructions, in the distribution of gains of war should there be any,¹ and in promotions from archer to foot lance to mounted lance, local influence or patronage could be keenly felt. Moreover, since it has been shown that the Verneuil campaign drew on troops from almost all the Norman garrisons,² the consequent land allocations would necessarily embrace most of the duchy and would extend connections, whether old or newly-formed, into the localities as never before.

The distribution of landed income therefore gave the common soldier a direct role in the occupation. Men of the rank of esquire had enjoyed the fruits of conquest from its outset. During the early years of the Regency this disparate group continued to form the backbone of the long-term settlement. The sum of sixty l.t. was the equivalent norm for the squirearchy. Of the fifty-three esquires known to have received rewards specifically for their presence at Verneuil, thirty-four took lands to this value. The correlation between land ownership and garrison service is easier to detect within the sources for these men. John Nessefield was a member of the prominent Yorkshire family which settled in Normandy.³ His grant referred to membership of the Vire garrison, which was precisely where his new estates were situated.⁴ For the esquire, no less than the

1. P. Contamine, 'Rançons et butins dans la Normandie anglaise (1424-1444)', Actes du 101^e congrès national des sociétés savantes (Paris, 1978), 241-70.

2. Curry, 'Military Organization', pp. 218-9 and Appendix X.

3. Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 64-5.

4. Lenoir 21/357, 16 March 1425.

archer, it made sound sense to hold lands close to a garrison base. Thanks to Lenoir's comprehensive transcription a further example is afforded by the grant to John Bedford, esquire, of land at Limeux in 1425;¹ he was certainly serving at nearby Conches under its captain Henry Standish in the early 1430s.² Finally, Richard Talbot, connétable of the garrison at Touques, received property to the value of sixty l.t. in the bailliages of Rouen and Caen.³ Talbot made his home in this part of Normandy, as did a number of fellow-countrymen, holding lands in the pays d'Auge and near Pont-l'Évêque conveniently situated for his garrison.⁴

For certain of these men, the title of esquire befitted their rank as mounted men-at-arms within the English armies. This was true of John Bedford, and another mounted lance whose career has been traced recently was James Dryland.⁵ It was the intention of the Bedford administration to encourage these men to settle and to satisfy their mutual as well as their individual needs. In 1425 a block grant to five men, all probably mounted lances, partitioned an assortment of fiefs in the Cotentin and the bailliage of Caen.⁶ It seems

-
1. Having copied the recto, Lenoir turned over the manuscript and noted: 'Au dos est écrit en écriture du temps: joh de Bedeford Esc pour la terre de Limeux.' (Lenoir 21/395).
 2. Bib. Mun. Rouen, Fonds Martainville 1039 no. 98. No year is given on this muster roll but Standish was captain of Conches from 1431 (BN, Ms. fr. 25770 no. 650).
 3. Lenoir 21/331.
 4. In 1429 he was a landholder at La Mote near Pont-l'Évêque, and in Auge (ibid., 17/294).
 5. Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 94-5. Dryland's fief of Campigny lay close to Bayeux, where his later career was based (Lenoir 21/267, 349).
 6. Ibid., 21/339, 18 February 1425. The total value of the lands in question was 300 l.t., to be divided equally between the five men.

to have suited certain groups of both archers and esquires to hold lands in common association without necessarily harming individual interests. One such man, Thomas Chisenal, was granted a delay as late as 1439 for the fief of Savigny east of Coutances which had originally formed part of this communal award.¹

Military commitment and responsibility went hand-in-hand with the post-Verneuil grants. As captains, and lieutenants for captains, the esquires exercised a dual function, as the career of William Wolston illustrates. He acted as lieutenant at Regnéville and in the same capacity for the busy Walter Hungerford at Cherbourg between 1426 and 1432.² An early settler in that port,³ Wolston acquired another house and garden there in 1425 and accumulated fiefs scattered across the Cotentin peninsula as a consequence of long service within this region.⁴ By 1432 he was under pressure to leave office, for reasons not known,⁵ and he died in service to York at Fécamp in October 1436, leaving a widow and eight children. One son in turn succeeded to property at Cherbourg which he sold just before the city surrendered in August 1450, at which time another son was captured and ransomed.⁶ The Wolstons can therefore be added to the list of settler

1. Ibid., 3/132; 5/55; 4/319.

2. Gallia regia, ii, 293, 295.

3. Wolston held an hôtel by virtue of a grant by Hungerford (Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1419-20, f. 540v).

4. Lenoir 21/315. His holdings included the following: Ver, Corbigny, Lingreville and Boisroger in the vicomté of Coutances; Ravenoville in the vicomté of Carentan; Saint-Germain-le Gaillard, Fresville and Goberville in the vicomté of Valognes, and a fief near Caen (AN, P 267² no. 2730; ibid., P 1140 fos. 229-229v; Lenoir 9/9).

5. Gallia regia, ii, 293.

6. Annuaire du département de la Manche. Rapport de l'archiviste, ed. F. Dubosc (St.-Lô, 1877), p. 278.

families to whom the Cotentin was home over several generations.¹

Careers and connections can more readily be followed among men of middle rank. Rewards for veterans of Verneuil such as Wolston could vary from estates estimated at 300 l.t.² to a modest house in Vire at fifteen l.t.,³ and where grants were made at variance with the standard figure then particular circumstances can sometimes be seen to have applied to the transaction. When Hamon Belknap was awarded lands in the bailliage of Rouen worth up to 300 l.t. the grant was made,

'tant où fait de son office comme en ses guerres de France, et pour le recompenser des pertes et dommages qu'il a eus à l'occasion de la journée de Verneuil, où il a été en personne en la compagnie de notre très cher et très amé oncle Jehan Regent notre Royaume de France duc de Bedford'.⁴

Landed patronage could thus act as compensation for individual losses in battle, thereby replacing moveable goods with an immoveable asset. As a further demonstration of the flexibility of the resource at Bedford's disposal, Belknap's ability to combine public duty and private service as a councillor to Bedford must have helped to secure this grant in tail male, one of few such awards issued in the aftermath of Verneuil.⁵

-
1. Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 64-9.
 2. Given to John Browe, esquire (Lenoir 24/25-6).
 3. Ibid., 3/338; 21/333, to John Haulden.
 4. Ibid., 21/271, 29 August 1424.
 5. Belknap was appointed treasurer and governor-general of the finances of France and Normandy on 2 January 1423 (ibid., 21/237). One year later he was given lands in the bailliages of Caen, Cotentin and Alençon and in June 1424 in those of Evreux and Alençon, both grants made in fee tail (AN, JJ 172 nos. 545, 577).

To conclude this analysis of the impact of military success upon the settlement, brief mention may be made of two men. John Faucq petitioned for a confirmation of a grant made to him by Henry V and its extension to include estates which he had not previously known about. He was successful because of his good services in the king's wars and especially at Verneuil, where he had been knighted.¹ John Basset, esquire, had his modest grant entered into the registers of the Chancellerie as a grant in tail male, where it was distinguished from an earlier award by Henry V.² For Faucq and Basset, as for Hamon Belknap, presence at Verneuil earned more than confiscated estates. Being in the right place at the right time brought a confirmation of existing privileges, opportunities for advancement and a degree of security for the future.

(iii) Bedford and his Household

Recent studies have done much to illustrate the extent and nature of patronage in later medieval English society, and the success or failure of its exercise.³ A great deal is becoming known about the formation, development and duration of ties binding men one to another

-
1. Ibid., no. 583, dated 30 August 1424.
 2. Basset's original grant of the lands of Adam Louvel on 5 July 1419 (PRO, C.64/11 m.36; Bréquigny no. 627) was supplemented by the lands of Adam's brother, Robin, worth a further 30 l.t. (AN, JJ 172 no. 630). The value of and source for this award are wrongly given in Le Cacheux, Actes de la chancellerie, ii, 327. In 1427 this latter grant passed to Thomas Maisterson on Basset's death (AN, JJ 174 no. 41).
 3. C.D. Ross, Richard III (London, 1981), esp. pp. 153-69; Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England, ed. C.D. Ross (Gloucester and Totawa, 1979); Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England, ed. R.A. Griffiths (Gloucester and Atlantic Highlands, 1981); Property and Politics, ed. Pollard, passim.

both in war and at peace, at national and local level.¹ A study of a major household in Lancastrian France in effect embraces these four elements: occupied territory was never wholly at peace, and the demands of personal mobility and itinerance worked against a natural tendency to accumulate land and office in a particular locality. Bedford's household was probably the largest and most prominent of the entire occupation, although it commands attention for reasons other than of sheer size. Its members included some of the most successful self-made men of the fifteenth century. If Verneuil was the battle not to have missed, Bedford's was the service not to be refused. The relationship of such connection to grants of office and especially of land was not, however, untypical of that exercised by Henry V or by York, Warwick and the Beauforts later.

The natural starting point for this assessment is the Regent himself. Devoted service over many years to the king and to the Anglo-Burgundian cause have earned Bedford a good press,² not to mention at times an adulatory one. Nevertheless, it should not be thought that this tireless labour went unrewarded, for however undervalued he might have thought his career to have been in England, to fellow-settlers and contemporary Frenchmen Bedford was the embodiment of worldly success. The inventory of Bedford's landed possessions

-
1. A.J. Pollard, John Talbot and the War in France, 1427-1453 (London and New Jersey, 1983), ch. 5; S. Walker, 'Profit and Loss in the Hundred Years War: the Subcontracts of Sir John Strother, 1374', B.I.H.R., lviii (1985), 100-106; D. Clayton, 'Peace Bonds and the Maintenance of Law and Order in Late Medieval England: the Example of Cheshire', ibid., 133-48.
 2. R. Huard, 'La Régence du duc de Bedford à Paris, de 1422 à 1435', Positions des thèses de l'École des Chartes, liii (1902), 43-55; Chrimes, 'John, First Duke of Bedford', passim; Myers, '"A Vous Entier"', 460-8; E. Carleton Williams, My Lord of Bedford 1389-1435 (London, 1963), passim.

makes impressive reading, for, in McFarlane's phrase, he did not stint himself, but what is also remarkable is the manner of their acquisition.¹ In addition to the grant of Anjou and Maine his properties included the Salisbury lordships of Le Neubourg, Combon and La Rivière-Thibouville awarded in July 1430;² through Anne of Burgundy Bedford claimed Auvers and the comté of Harcourt before receiving them as an outright grant;³ the extensive Tancarville estates were held in wardship for Henry Grey;⁴ the pays de conquête and the dignity of the duke of Alençon were claimed as of right.⁵ A personal chambre des comptes at Mantes was necessary to manage these holdings.⁶ In effect Bedford made substantial claims to the title and income of lands which had escheated to the crown by death, forfeiture and the non-performance of services owed.

Every available means was therefore used to amass in piecemeal manner many of the richest and most prestigious estates in northern France.⁷ We now know, too, that Bedford adeptly acquired multiple

-
1. Lambeth MS 506 fos. 23r-24r, printed in Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [553-5]; K.B. McFarlane, The Nobility of Later Medieval England (Oxford, 1973), p. 35.
 2. Lenoir 22/163.
 3. B.A.P. du Haut Jussé, 'Anne de Bourgogne et le testament de Bedford, 1429', B.E.C., x (1934), 306; Lenoir 22/49 for the grant of Harcourt and the estates of the duke of Exeter to Anne in 1427; ibid., 22/163 to Bedford.
 4. P.P.C., iii, 177-8.
 5. Rowe, 'John, Duke of Bedford', pp. 36-7; BN, Ms. fr. 26050 nos. 822, 823; above, p. 58.
 6. BN, n. acq. fr. 7931 f. 196v; Lenoir 2/185.
 7. Sir John Robessart had the better claim to Auvers (near Carentan) by grant of Henry V, but had not dared to claim possession against Exeter and Bedford (PRO, E.28/57; Lenoir 5/69).

properties on a fitting scale in Paris,¹ and indeed in Norman towns, and by his death held no less than seven principal captaincies.² First of all, it is important to judge the Regent by the standards of his contemporaries of both nationalities who would surely have expected nothing else of a man in whom so much authority was evidently vested than the enjoyment of territories befitting his near-kingly status. Secondly, the lands chosen suggest in themselves a concern to legitimise this accumulation by reference to history. Miss Rowe has described Anjou and Maine as 'the ancient cradle of [his] race',³ and Harcourt and Dreux were certainly comtés of long standing. The seizure of a choice array of possessions and titles, not mere spoils of war, was arguably carried out with one eye on the past as well as on the future. It is significant that William Worcester's introduction to his collections on Normandy and northern France made reference to the revenues of 'the demaynes and of other particuler countes belongyng by yefte in the [Regentes] owne hand as his propre Enheritaunce', words reminiscent of Henry V's own claims to Normandy and France.⁴ Thirdly, money was needed to support a lifestyle which can only have been sumptuous and to maintain a household great in number and high in quality. Finally, demesne lands were held in trust for the young king and could not be disposed of lightly: Alençon, Anjou and Maine

-
1. G.L. Thompson, 'The Anglo-Burgundian Régime in Paris, 1420-1436' (unpublished University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1984), pp. 225-9.
 2. Curry, 'Military Organization', p. 355.
 3. Rowe, 'John, Duke of Bedford', p. 40; see also BN, Ms. fr. 26059 no. 2450 and G.B. de La Clergerie, Histoire des pays et comté du Perche et duché d'Alençon (Paris, 1620), p. 319.
 4. Lambeth MS 506, f. 4v.

were held on royal approval.¹

Such, very briefly, may have been among the reasons for the accretion of a great personal estate. A thin dividing line separated the necessary garnering of landed wealth and power in the common interest from the acquisition of prestigious estates and titles for private gain. If Bedford's motives have been rather generously interpreted by some authorities,² it will not do to impugn his actions by portraying him as the stock type of over-mighty subject. No known contemporary source disparaged or challenged the Regent as the single greatest landholder of Lancastrian France.

Criticism of the extent of Bedford's patronage of his household may be impliedly inferred, however, from the complaint voiced in April 1430 by the king's servants of a 'lack of fertheryng'.³ It may even be that some of those who were so eager to proclaim their presence at Verneuil did so in the belief or knowledge that landed reward would otherwise be difficult to obtain without some form of Bedford connection. Certainly the list of members of his 'hospicis et Retinencia' reads like a roll-call of the most prominent names in the military and civil government.⁴ It is impossible to be precise as to the number of

-
1. Such was the outcome of deliberations by the King's Council in April 1430 (P.P.C., iv, 37).
 2. Rowe, 'John, Duke of Bedford', pp. 38-9; Williams, My Lord of Bedford, p. 127.
 3. P.P.C., iv, 38.
 4. Lambeth MS 506, fos. 8r-10v. The names of Sir John Dedham and Sir William Burton were omitted from the list of eighty-three men printed by Stevenson (Letters and Papers, II, ii, 433-7). A much shorter list was transcribed by Dugdale (Bodleian Library, MS Dugdale 10, fos. 65-65v), and see also College of Arms MS L.15, fos. 144-5.

household members, given the rapid turnover in personnel and the difficulty in distinguishing the household from the affinity from the military or riding household. The eighty-five names listed in receipt of fees, wages and pensions in 1435 include some household men but not others. Taking this figure as a minimum, and the military household of 400 men as a maximum, it would be reasonable to suppose a household size of around 200, more or less the same as that of Henry V.¹

Appendix V lists seventy-one landholders known to be members of Bedford's household at the time of their grants. Again, individual cases might arguably be excluded or included according to these criteria, but the conclusion will hold: a significant proportion of the Bedford household, perhaps 35%, held French lands, a much higher figure than for Henry V's household. Some 22% of those given land during the Regency were Bedford men.

The careers of the knightly class in Lancastrian France rested upon the foundations of appointment to high office, the leadership of field armies and, in most cases, the possession of appropriate properties. Household service was not a sine qua non, but deservedly the most celebrated example of what could be achieved in very little time where such service could be exploited to the full is that of Sir John Fastolf.² His existing tenure of the estates of the seigneur de l'Orcher was improved in March 1423 to include all the Orcher lands and those of other named rebels in eight bailliages, including that of Alençon.³ Following his recovery of Passy-en-Valois from the

-
1. Above, p. 63.
 2. K.B. McFarlane, 'The Investment of Sir John Fastolf's Profits of War', T.R. Hist. S., fifth series, vii (1957), 91-116.
 3. Lenoir 3/316-7. Lands which had reverted to the crown by death, forfeiture, disobedience, escheat and lack of heirs passed to Sir John in fee tail; their value is not recorded.

Dauphinists,¹ Fastolf received the châtellenie of Breuteuil north-east of Beauvais from Bedford in recognition of his great services and the expenses he had incurred at war; it was to be held in tail male and to whatever value the lands were, had been or might be in future.² It was rather on the southern frontier of the occupation that Fastolf's main interests came to lie, however, following appointment as captain of Alençon and of Fresnay-le-Vicomte³ and notably as lieutenant to the Regent for a broad area stretching westwards from Pont-de-l'Arche to Caen and southwards to the bailliage of Alençon and into Maine.⁴ By the time of the battle of Verneuil at which he reputedly earned his fortune in ransoms, Fastolf was already well-established as grand maître d'hôtel of Bedford's household, a landholder in his own right and an office-holder who felt it to be within his authority to make a grant of property to William Chambers and his heirs on 1 December 1423.⁵ Together with Scales and Montgomery, Fastolf was commissioned to lead the advance into Maine in August 1424.⁶ On 1 October the

-
1. The consequences of the surrender of Passy and its commander, Guillaume Remon, have been examined by C.A.J. Armstrong, 'Sir John Fastolf and the Law of Arms', War, Literature, and Politics in the Late Middle Ages, ed. C.T. Allmand (Liverpool, 1976), pp. 46-56.
 2. AN, JJ 172 no. 345, dated 8 July 1423.
 3. AN, K.62/11 no. 7; M. de la Jonquière, 'Les Anglais dans le duché d'Alençon. Sir John Falstaff 1423', Bulletin de la société historique et archéologique de l'Orne, xii (1893), 9.
 4. BN, Ms. fr. 26047 no. 200. Authority was given 'pour recevoir toutes manières de plaintes, jouguir et faire jouguir et corriger tous malfaisans et atemptans, garder tenir et faire executer les ordonnances du Roy'.
 5. On 25 March 1425 Thomas, son and heir of the late William Chambers, sold to Robert Stafford, esquire, his right to the property for twenty saluts d'or and one salut for wine (Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1424-5, f. 272).
 6. R. Planchenault, 'La Conquête du Maine par les Anglais. La campagne de 1424-5', Revue historique et archéologique du Maine,

surrender of the castle of Sillé-le-Guillaume was taken,¹ and with its barony passed into Sir John's possession, probably shortly afterwards.

It would be possible to continue at length this account of Fastolf's career, but enough has been said to demonstrate that conquered territories were immediately put at the disposal of their victor in much the same manner as practised by Henry V. Such was the confidence and vigour of the occupation during the years 1423-5, however, that it was possible as never before to build up power within a given area, especially a border area. Fastolf was avowedly in his element as a frontiersman, winning land for his king but claiming some for himself, holding high office and serving his master and patron but choosing to make a liberal interpretation of the powers vested in him when it suited his needs.² Much of this behaviour was not untypical: Fastolf was the archetypal soldier-landholder in the mould of Clarence, Salisbury and Talbot.³ What is unusual is the speed of Fastolf's rise from the position of an esquire in 1415, in which the patronage of Bedford was instrumental. By virtue of this connection and by hard campaigning, the war could compensate for a lack of high birth by conferring estates and honours sufficient to put an esquire on a par with all but a handful of the greater indigenous and settler landholders.

v (1925), 3-31. Their commission is printed from BL, Arundel Ms. 26 as pièce justificative no. I.

1. Ibid., pièce justificative no. II.
2. Pierre Surreau was instructed to examine the muster rolls and accounts of Alençon and Fresnay. Fastolf had complained of delays, and excused himself with the need to be present at the siege of Le Mans (BN, Ms. fr. 26048 no. 432; also Orne, A 416).
3. A similar pattern can be observed on the frontiers of Spain (A. MacKay, Spain in the Middle Ages. From Frontier to Empire 1000-1500 (London, 1977), pp. 39-40).

Knights service and land tenure in the Bedford household followed no common pattern. For all that mutual association and campaign service with a great lord drew men together, such were their individual duties and responsibilities that a personal attachment to the household, and to French lands acquired before or during that service, was sometimes only nominal. Alongside the land-hungry Fastolf must be put Sir John Popham and Sir Ralph Butler, two Bedford chamberlains who did not figure prominently in the settlement. Popham's small-scale landholdings dated from 1418 and 1420, and the only known addition to them was of the Hôtel de Thorigny in Paris in 1429.¹ As an administrator, diplomat and occasional commander, Popham was a highly-trusted lieutenant of the Regent with every opportunity to avail himself of French estates to complement his holdings in Hampshire, Wiltshire and elsewhere.² That he did not do so may have been due in part to a lack of desire to take up land; against this must be set his petition of May 1436 requesting that his tenure of the lordships of Torigni-sur-Vire and Planquery be converted from fee tail to fee simple.³ A more cogent consideration was that Popham was essentially a man on the move, and his prolonged absences from France

-
1. PRO, C.64/9 m.31; C.64/13 m.14; D.K.R., xli, 686, xlii, 367; AN, JJ 174 no. 291. Popham temporarily occupied the Hôtel de Clisson before Bedford took it over (H. Sauval, Histoire et recherches des antiquités de la ville de Paris (3 vols., Paris, 1724), iii, 302).
 2. His career has been studied from English sources by J.S. Roskell, 'Sir John Popham, knight-banneret, of Charford', Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society, xxi, part i (1958), 38-52. See also Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, pp. 301-2 and, for his burial monument, J. Stow, A Survey of London, ed. C.L. Kingsford (2 vols., Oxford, 1908), ii, 33-4.
 3. PRO, E.28/57, unnumbered; P.P.C., iv, 337-9. The petition was granted on the Council's advice, and Popham was allowed a delay for these lands in 1438 (Lenoir 4/373).

on official business prevented the accumulation of a substantial landed inheritance there, even had he wished to obtain one. As an absentee landholder Popham attempted to make secure what he already held and to earn a meagre income by putting out to farm properties in and around Caen in August 1436, but high office and favour could not compensate for an unwillingness or inability to make a long-term personal commitment to the war.¹ Ralph Butler was another to be well rewarded with offices, in particular a wide-ranging authority for the governorship of the comté of Eu and the protection of the north-eastern frontier of the occupation.² Effective as Butler was at Le Crotoy, Arques and with the duke of Burgundy on campaign in Picardy, however, there was no attempt to amass frontier estates in the Fastolf style;³ his interests lay in England, and in the absence of other than two or three years' campaigning at the beginning of the Regency, no additions were made to existing modest holdings.⁴

The contrast within the Bedford household between absentee lords, whether that absence was voluntary or otherwise, and those who were either regularly in attendance upon the Regent or at least present on French soil is sufficient to bear emphasis. It was not an absolute test, certainly, but Fastolf was not unusual as a man who drew the benefits of consistent domestic and military service to the extent that

-
1. Calvados, 7E 89 f.89v; P.P.C., iv, 340-3.
 2. Lenoir 3/248.
 3. Gallia regia, ii, 11, 62; Newhall, English Conquest, p. 289.
 4. Butler took over the Caux lands of Sir Philip Leech (PRO, C.64/14 m.5; D.K.R., xlii, 386; above, p. 56). In 1435 he was appointed chief butler of England, and took the title of Lord Sudeley in 1441 (A. Marshall, 'The Role of English War Captains in England and Normandy, 1436-1461' (unpublished University of Wales M.A. thesis, 1975), p. 43; Griffiths, Reign of Henry VI, p. 353).

relatively humble origins could be left well behind. The Dane Sir Andrew Ogard was another who did very well for himself in this way.¹ A long career in public service was rewarded by the issue of letters of denization and the subsequent purchase of Rye House and manors on which building works were lavished, to the attention of William Worcester.² The foundations of this palpable success were laid in France, for Ogard's rise was coterminous with the period of the Regency, and the steady accumulation of confiscated estates there was the most important method by which his personal wealth and position were built up. As an esquire he received the lordship of Blangy-le-Château in October 1422,³ and he astutely acquired more lands following the deaths of two celebrated soldiers at Orléans. Salisbury's former lordship of Auvillars lay conveniently close to Blangy, while Le Merlerault in the bailliage of Alençon had been among William Glasdale's possessions.⁴ Further grants in October 1434 and January 1435 brought Ogard landed interests in the bailliages of Caen, Rouen and the Caux, tenures which were confirmed in February 1435.⁵

That Ogard was a landholder on the Fastolf scale was confirmed by reference to a maximum figure of 1,500 l.t. for the reversionary

1. Massey, 'Land Settlement', p. 88.
2. Rot. Parl., iv, 439-40; C.P.R., 1429-36, p. 288; William Worcester, Itineraries, ed. J.H. Harvey (Oxford, 1969), pp. 47-9; Itineraria Symonis Simeonis et Willelmi de Worcestre, ed. J. Nasmith (Cambridge, 1728), pp. 86-8.
3. Lenoir 3/220.
4. AN, JJ 174 no. 27; Lenoir 13/129. Glasdale's lordship of Gacé passed to Sir Thomas Rempston (Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [623]).
5. BL, Add. Ch. 120; AN, JJ 175 nos. 330, 331. These lordships included those of Merville north-east of Caen, and Desneval, Pavilly and Hugleville in the Caux north-west of Rouen.

interests he took up, which is comparable to Fastolf's limit of 1,560 saluts d'or.¹ In terms of high office held, however, Ogard was no match for his peer: Norman captaincies at Touques, Vire and Argentan were unremarkable.² Sir Andrew's authority must have lain within the Bedford household itself as second chamberlain and an intimate member of the personal staff.³ The happy knack of being in the right place at the right time saw him knighted, probably at Verneuil, able to pick up lordships reverting to the crown by death or forfeiture and to secure their ownership, and to transfer his interests to England before the occupation faced its most serious difficulties. To this cosmopolitan man French land may have been no more than a means to an end, though the efforts he made to acquire and retain it suggest strongly that it was valued as a resource in its own right as well as a springboard to higher things.

That estates should be made freely available to those of high rank within the Bedford household and to those eager to advance their positions outside it is not surprising, but Appendix V demonstrates that patronage also extended in no small measure to the lesser officials and servants upon whom the Regent daily depended. Of great interest is the case of John Barton, granted the lordship of Ausebosc in the Caux at the king's pleasure to the value of 300 l.t. while described only as a serviteur.⁴ That was in December 1422, and by

-
1. Armstrong, 'Sir John Fastolf', p. 46. William Worcester estimated the annual value of Ogard's captaincies and lands at £1,000 sterling (Itineraries, ed. Harvey, p. 49).
 2. Gallia regia, i, 532-3; Calvados, Fonds Danquin no. 1547; BN, Ms. fr. 25769 no. 533.
 3. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, 434.
 4. Lenoir 21/237.

the following April he was treasurer of Bedford's household, before receiving lands in the bailliages of Caen and the Cotentin in November 1423.¹ There followed a further acquisition of property in the prévôté of Paris, and by 1429 he was maître d'hôtel.² Barton was almost certainly the same Cheshireman and cleric who studied at Paris and compiled the Donait François in about 1415. This was a text designed to encourage the study and practice of spoken French, among children in particular, for use abroad.³ John Barton's career thus neatly combines household service and land tenure, administrative ability and linguistic skills, in true humanist fashion. His personal standing was such that he was both an executor and beneficiary of Bedford's first will.⁴

Another to hold office as maître d'hôtel was Sir William Bishopston, although only briefly in 1425. Of Warwickshire origin, he already held a valuable life-grant and was later rewarded with the lordship of Tosny-sur-Seine, close to his captaincy at Château-Gaillard.⁵ As maître d'hôtel Bishopston petitioned successfully in April 1425 for the lordship of Anneville which had been under an arrêt.⁶ A retainer

-
1. BN, PO 207 no. 2; AN, JJ 172 no. 539; Le Cacheux, Actes de la chancellerie, ii, 320; Lenoir 8/375.
 2. AN, JJ 173 no. 149; Lenoir 17/413.
 3. N. Orme, English Schools in the Middle Ages (London, 1973), p. 74; Orme, From Childhood to Chivalry. The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy 1066-1530 (London and New York, 1984), p. 126; The Register of Thomas Langley, Bishop of Durham, 1406-1437, ed. R.L. Storey (6 vols., Surtees Society, 1956-70), i, 155; iii, 48-50.
 4. Haut Jussé, 'Anne de Bourgogne', 286, 322-3.
 5. Lenoir 3/170; AN, JJ 174 no. 116; Gallia regia, iii, 398.
 6. Lenoir 21/377.

of the earl of Warwick, and with Talbot connections, Bishopston's career in France underwent chequered fortunes through which personal service and modest gains in land may have provided some degree of stability.¹ That Bedford was attended by able men is beyond question, whether they stayed for long or short periods, and there was a particular recognition of those who controlled the purse-strings of the household. John Stanlawe, esquire, was a maître d'hôtel who received a little property in the Caux and later became a name familiar to students of the period in his capacity as treasurer-general of Normandy.² On the expenditure side of the account, Thomas Scarlet brought experience as clerk of the markets for the household of Henry V to his position of contrôleur of expenses to Bedford.³ Scarlet's status and influence are indicated first by a grant to the value of 600 écus in March 1423 and secondly by letters patent issued in England in December 1425 conferring lands in the prévôté of Paris and bailliage of Senlis worth up to 300 l.t.⁴ Another member of the financial staff was William Milles, 'serviteur et clerc de la chambre des comptes de l'ostel', who benefited from a small life-grant in 1427 and later went on to greater office and reward.⁵

-
1. M.C. Carpenter, 'Political Society in Warwickshire, 1401-72' (unpublished University of Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1976), p. 50, Appendices 5, 41; Pollard, John Talbot, p. 97; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 190.
 2. Stanlawe was given fiefs in the Caux worth 20 l.p. per year (AN, JJ 174 no. 315). In June 1434 he desisted in a claim to certain houses in Dieppe held by royal grant 'à sa vie', in favour of Tassin Eude, bourgeois of Dieppe (Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1434, fos. 78v-79). Later that year he acquired more property in Dieppe (AN, JJ 175 no. 320).
 3. Hardy, p. 156; D.K.R., xlii, 318, 329.
 4. Lenoir 14/213 (the grant included the wardship of the minor son of John Clifton, esquire); AN, JJ 173 no. 402.
 5. Lenoir 22/79; see below, p. 210.

The disbursal of French lands to those of his civilian administration brought numerous advantages to Bedford. Revenues accruing from fiefs were the individual responsibility of grantees and may have reduced the considerable expense of maintaining a large household by substituting landed income in cash and kind for more direct and immediate monetary reward in the form of wages and pensions. At a time when hard currency was in short supply, this might be a serious consideration. In essence, this practice within the household was a microcosm of the overall attempt by the Lancastrian authorities to reduce or replace some of the continuous demands on crown capital which war imposed. It may have been the intention that the Bedford household should pay for itself in the same way as the occupation as a whole, and the redistribution of confiscated properties was a fundamental means to this end. At the very least, rewards to known officials can only have encouraged service over a number of years and perhaps helped to keep in check the corruption and embezzlement to which any large household was prone.

In the employment of Bedford were a host of officials and servants whose daily responsibilities were recognised alongside those of their more senior fellow-retainers. To judge from the value of their landed incomes and any other information known about them, some were highly-respected individuals. John Major was Bedford's doctor,¹ given lands in the bailliage of Caen in January 1425.² Five years later Major gave up these and other lordships, the whole passing to the

-
1. C.H. Talbot and E.A. Hammond, The Medical Practitioners of Medieval England. A Biographical Register (London, 1965), pp. 165-6; A.B. Emden, A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500 (3 vols., Oxford, 1957-9), ii, 1205.
 2. Lenoir 21/307. The lands had once belonged to Hennyng Vanderlankyn, who had gone home to Denmark and not returned.

royal physician, John Somerset, to the value of 577 l.t.¹ More typically the Regent's barber John Houitte held a single lordship at the king's pleasure,² while Thomas Giffart, esquire, chief purveyor of oats to the household, took up lands in the Seine valley which had reverted to the crown on the death of a former English holder.³ The two 'varlets de chambre' Thomas Chastellain and Stephen Flexmar were recompensed at almost the same date.⁴ Special mention must also be made of the celebrated musician John Pyamour, rewarded in 1427 or 1428,⁵ who shared with his fellow-composer John Dunstable the material as well as the artistic patronage of a great prince.

Some household men were specifically rewarded for their good services at Verneuil, including the porter William Kabou and the valet John Bernard,⁶ and it is likely that other grants made late in 1424 and during 1425 were in fact an acknowledgement of presence on the day. John de Saint-Lo was almost certainly in attendance as the Regent's

-
1. Included were the former Estouteville lordships of La Remuée and Rolleville north and east of Montivilliers (Lenoir 8/379, 9/110-111). Somerset was a new arrival in France (P.P.C., iv, 30).
 2. Lenoir 21/267.
 3. AN, JJ 173 no. 648. William Eland had been given these lands on 30 April 1419 (PRO, C.64/11 m.53; D.K.R., xli, 776).
 4. Lenoir 3/316. Chastellain's tenure proved short-lived. Having falsely represented to Bedford that Pierre de Baucherville was dead, when in fact he had sworn to the treaty of Troyes, the lands were restored in August 1424 (ibid., 21/295).
 5. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1427-8, f. 407v; N. Wilkins, 'Music and Poetry at Court: England and France in the Late Middle Ages', English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages, ed. V.J. Scattergood and J.W. Sherborne (London, 1983), pp. 200-202. Dunstable's tenure of Croisy and other lands is the subject of research by Mr. Andrew Wathey, whose assistance I gratefully acknowledge.
 6. Lenoir 21/297, 299.

'huissier d'armes'.¹ Shortly after a grant to him in April 1427 he seems to have joined the king's household and to have achieved prominence both in Gascony and the west of England.² Saint-Lo took up the seigneurie of Lingèvres south of Bayeux, an area in which the enjoyment of an income of up to 200 l.t. might reasonably be expected. Below him, the blanket term of 'serviteur' was applied equally to John Bridon and John Grene, for example, in the terms of their life-grants: the former in the bailliage of Alençon worth 25 l.t., the latter in the bailliage of Evreux estimated at 120 l.t.³

Taken together, the elements of land value, location, means of tenure and description of position or status within letters of grant allow at least a rudimentary assessment of social standing within a major fifteenth-century household. At the top stood the patron himself, who seems to have shared his brother's belief that land formed the essential part of an inheritance and was his to do with as he pleased. During this most successful phase of the occupation Bedford distributed to the knights and senior men within his household estates commensurate with personal status; on his financial staff he looked with particular favour; the lesser servants and officials were far from forgotten. It must be emphasised, however, that the Bedford household did not function as a strict hierarchy, with a carefully graded structure in the form of a pyramid or ladder; It was (so to speak) a community within a community, where the talented John Barton

-
1. AN, JJ 173 no. 644; Le Cacheux, Actes de la chancellerie, ii, 348. He may also have been given lands in the vicomté of Coutances, shortly before Verneuil (G. de La Morandière, Histoire de la maison d'Estouteville en Normandie (Paris, 1903), p. 274).
 2. Griffiths, Reign of Henry VI, pp. 233, 332-3, 362-3, 479; Lenoir 8/359, 10/15.
 3. Ibid., 22/7-8, 21/273.

could stay for a number of years and William Bishopston could quickly move on. It was a means of access to other major households, including that of the king, and a stepping stone to higher office. To a Fastolf or an Ogard its potential was almost limitless. Land grants promoted social advancement and blurred the distinctions of the household's cursus honorum; they encouraged personal mobility whilst recognising public service and responsibility. Bedford's generosity to his own men acknowledged their loyalty to him while at the same time committing them to a common cause to be maintained and defended.

(iv) The Land Settlement 1424-35

It would be difficult to pick out a single theme which might be held to characterise the settlement of 1424-35. Indeed it could be argued that the period possessed no intrinsic unity, and a good case can certainly be made for its termination rather in April 1436 with the ending of Anglo-Burgundian authority in Paris, than at the over-worked turning-point of 1435 and the sealing of the treaty of Arras.¹ From the point of view of the land settlement, however, the unity of the period from August 1424 to September 1435 can be found simply in Bedford's life; these years saw the full exercise of the authority to issue grants, the effects of a challenge to that authority and the consequences for would-be donees of the Regent's absence from France. Existing beneficiaries found their new acquisitions on the frontiers rapidly overwhelmed or put at risk, but in the heartland of the settlement the decade saw many able to enjoy their holdings in spite of

1. J.G. Dickinson, The Congress of Arras, 1435. A Study in Medieval Diplomacy (Oxford, 1955), passim; Thompson, 'Anglo-Burgundian Régime', pp. 357-83.

threats to their tenure and livelihoods.

Although the broad outline of the military and political fortunes of the opposing parties during these years is sufficiently well known to make a lengthy commentary unnecessary,¹ and although individual campaigns have been thoroughly investigated by French historians,² the nature and extent of the Maine land settlement in particular remains little known. The evidence is simply not of a quantity or quality to permit bold assertions. What can be said is that individual beneficiaries held land in the comté in the same form as elsewhere, for example John Mortemer, esquire, given lordships in Maine and within Normandy on 1 February 1428,³ and that such grants commonly bore a territorial association with the bailliage of Alençon, as they had done under Henry V. It is frustrating to know so little, given the prominence that the Maine settlement was later to assume.

With this extension of the frontiers of the occupation the principal soldiers were among the first and the most heavily rewarded with prime seigneuries. Of the twenty 'nobles' listed as joining Salisbury and Scales on the expedition to Anjou in 1425, eighteen held lands or were soon to do so.⁴ Salisbury himself, by this time a major

-
1. J. Favier, La Guerre de Cent Ans (Paris, 1980); M.G.A. Vale, Charles VII (London, 1974), pp. 33-44, 70-5; Pollard, John Talbot, Ch. 2.
 2. R. Charles, 'L'Invasion anglaise dans le Maine de 1417 à 1428', Revue historique et archéologique du Maine, xxv (1889), 62-103, 167-219, 305-27; L. Froger, 'La Paroisse de Pirmil pendant l'invasion anglaise, 1425-1435', ibid., xli (1897), 281-95; A. Bouton, Le Maine. Histoire économique et sociale, XIV^e, XV^e et XVI^e siècles (Le Mans, 1970), pp. 55-6.
 3. AN, JJ 174 no. 125.
 4. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, 411-2. The exceptions were Richard Whederton and Sir de Ferires Chamboys.

owner, took up the castle and lordship of Courville-sur-Eure west of Chartres on 22 November 1425 and five days later received a rent on an existing property at Loigny, in the Beauce.¹ In April 1427 lands in the prévôté of Paris were awarded to the earl to whatever value they might be.² One year later Richard Beauchamp earl of Warwick was awarded first Laval, in the west of Maine,³ and then a major estate within the comté of Poitou, a remarkable location well to the south of the existing occupation.⁴

In addition to lands, captaincies and appointments to office were shared out as prizes for successful campaigning. Following the surrender of Le Mans early in August 1425 Fastolf was made lieutenant for its captain the earl of Suffolk;⁵ other captains included John Popham at Sainte-Suzanne, William Oldhall at Montsûr and John de Montgomery at Mayenne.⁶ Warwick's major acquisition befitted his senior status as captain and lieutenant-general for the wars in Normandy, Anjou, Maine and the Breton marches.⁷

What role did prestigious land grants to the great and the good play during the years of confident expansion prior to the reverse at

1. AN, JJ 173 nos. 293, 299.
2. Ibid., no. 645.
3. Ibid., JJ 174 no. 192.
4. Ibid., no. 200, dated 18 March 1428. (?) Châtellerault was the seat of a vicomté and together with the comté of Aumale had once belonged to the Harcourt family (La Roque, Histoire de Harcourt, i, 56).
5. Planchenault, 'Conquête du Maine', 18.
6. Ibid., 20-1; R. Triger, 'Sainte-Suzanne au XIV^e et XV^e siècles', Revue historique et archéologique du Maine, lxi (1907), 55-78.
7. Waurin, Recueil des croniques, iii, 232; Griffiths, Reign of Henry VI, p. 211.

Orléans? In the first place, we are considering what had become by this date an accepted means of relating the pursuit of individual gain and status in war to the need to extend by force of arms the amount of territory within the Anglo-Burgundian jurisdiction. Secondly, property held as a frontier grant was an acknowledged risk to its owner, liable to damage, confiscation or a shortage of manpower necessary to make its tenure viable. It was therefore customary to take up vulnerable lordships as a supplement to existing estates within the comparatively trouble-free bailliages of Normandy, and this was as much the normal practice of newcomers as of existing settlers. Thus shortly after John Lord Talbot began his celebrated career in France early in 1427 he acquired some modest holdings in the vicomtés of Auge and Pont-Audemer¹ and estates in the bailliages of Rouen and the Caux confiscated from Robert Stafford.² Whether Talbot ever derived any benefit from his lands at Amboise, very much within the war zone, is open to question,³ but as a fall-back he may have had greater hopes of Sir Reginald Grey's former estates at Heuqueville, Pont-Saint-Pierre and elsewhere in the bailliages of Gisors, Rouen and the Caux.⁴

In the third place, it must be stressed that these risks should be set against the potential gains of land tenure at the frontier, which must have been sufficient to attract and retain the services of the likes of Fastolf and Talbot. Moreover, the conditions of and restrictions upon frontier grants were conspicuous by their absence:

-
1. Pollard, John Talbot, p. 12; Lenoir 22/89 dated 23 September 1427, a life-grant worth 80 l.t. per year.
 2. AN, JJ 174 no. 108. For the repercussions see Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, no. XIX, pp. 220-30.
 3. AN, JJ 174 no. 112.
 4. Ibid., no. 150. For Grey's ownership see above, pp. 32, 37.

there were no demands for quotas or quasi-feudal services, and beyond the performance of the customary rights and obligations of tenants-in-chief there was a freedom to manage and derive revenues which implicitly recognised the impracticality for a great captain of residence in person. Such, it is true, were the terms of tenure familiar to many grantees under Bedford but nowhere were they more relevant than in a military setting which demanded immediate mobility on the part of a captain and his retinue.

In the years preceding the Orléans campaign, when the potential of the conquest may have seemed unlimited, the great commanders led a reorientation of English landed interests southwards from Normandy into the area between Paris and Chartres, and south again towards the Loire. A glance at Appendix IV bears out this point. Existing Norman landholders were galvanized into augmenting their holdings with grants in the bailliages of Mantes, Evreux, Chartres, Senlis and Gaillardon in the case of Walter Hampton, esquire, and those of Troyes, Sens and the comté of Joigny in the case of Sir John Handford.¹ The Orléans campaign promised new opportunities for Richard Waller, bailli of Evreux, for example, given lands at Montpipeau on the north-western outskirts of the city on 15 September 1428. Their potential worth was 600 l.p.² Within Normandy it should be made clear that the process of redistribution continued, to the benefit of Thomas Hunt,

1. AN, JJ 174 nos. 118, 197. The countryside and towns of the area of Senlis evidently benefited from the relative stability of the English occupation (J. Flammermont, 'Histoire de Senlis pendant la seconde partie de la guerre de Cent Ans (1405-1441)', Mémoires de la société de l'histoire de Paris et de l'Île de France, v (1878), 229-39.

2. AN, JJ 174 no. 23.

esquire, given lands centred upon the vicomté of Harcourt,¹ and of the earl of Suffolk, recipient of lordships at Chanteloup and Créances in that area of the lower Cotentin with which he was already well familiar.² Whether by virtue of better availability of land, or of richer land, however, the Chancellerie registers record the names of a number of knights and esquires who were drawn towards what seemed likely to be the new centres of military activity. They were not usually to be found in the vanguard as landholders but commonly preferred, as did Thomas Barneby, the relative safety of the bailliage of Chartres, for instance.³

The impact of the period from late in 1428 to the arrival of Henry VI in France in April 1430, when the Lancastrians suffered the loss on all fronts of much that they had gained, made itself plainly felt on the quantity and distribution of land grants. The confidence and dynamism which had hitherto been the hallmarks of Bedford's settlement policy were destroyed by defeat in the field and the ensuing loss of diplomatic and political initiative. The records summarised in Appendix IV cannot be taken as an accurate month-by-month reflection of these events, but the general trend is clear. Between mid-October

-
1. Ibid., JJ 173 no. 636. Letters patent were issued at Leicester on 12 March 1426 during Bedford's attendance at the Parliament there.
 2. Ibid., no. 634.
 3. Ibid., JJ 174 no. 182. Barneby (or Burneby) was probably the same man who served as chamberlain of North Wales from 1406 to 1414 (R.A. Griffiths, 'The Glyn Dŵr Rebellion in North Wales through the Eyes of an Englishman', Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies, xxii (1967), 151-68). Together with John Ypres, Barneby held the valuable wardship of Tilly and other lands in the bailliages of Caen and Alençon during the minority of Henry Grey of Heton (Lenoir 10/179-80, 22/77; BL, Add. Ch. 11865). Barneby and the royal secretary William Browning were further rewarded in June 1436 (Lenoir 5/67).

1428 and March 1429 only one grant is known; from May 1429 until April 1430 they are scarce. Beneficiaries were also restricted by force of circumstance to locations within Normandy and the pays de conquête, which meant that Thomas Gerard's award of properties in fee tail to the value of 1,000 l.t. in September 1429 largely comprised a number of villages and hamlets close to Meaux and Melun.¹ The bailliage of Rouen became the most popular location for Regency settlers.

Some of the causes of the decline in the issue of grants can be pinpointed. Military defeat pushed back the boundaries of the occupation as surely as success had advanced them, and frontier grants were now impractical. Less tangibly, one may detect the first real signs of a reluctance on the part of Englishmen to take up the opportunities available to them. Closely related to this point were the measures taken after August 1429 to enforce residence within the territories under English obedience and insisting upon personal service to the king before all other.² The revival of such obligations within the changed climate affecting all who supported the Anglo-Burgundian cause may well have rendered land tenure less attractive to potential grantees.

Central to this discussion is the question of the jurisdiction necessary to apportion territory. By a division of powers in October 1429 it was Burgundy who took over the government of Paris and a number of bailliages outside Normandy, with Bedford retaining personal

1. AN, JJ 174 no. 334.

2. P.P.C., iv, 349-51. William Forsted agreed for himself and his heirs male 'qu'ilz feront Résidence personele es terres et pays de notre obéissance de France, qu'ilz seront tenuz de nous servir pardevant tout autres et ne se pourront obligier à service d'autrui sans l'exprès congé de nous' (AN, JJ 175 no. 23). See below, Chapter Five.

authority in the duchy.¹ Furthermore, the meeting of the King's Council at Canterbury on 16 April 1430 decided that the title and office of Regent should cease on Henry VI's landing in France, and that is what happened.² The authority to distribute the royal inheritance was vested in the joint Anglo-French council, and grants of both land and office were made 'sur l'avis du grand conseil'.³ It would be wrong, however, to suggest that the Conseil put into practice a 'policy of liberal grants' contrary to that previously exercised by Bedford.⁴ The Regent's munificence has already been demonstrated, and Appendix IV does not disclose conciliar generosity. It was only during November 1430 and especially in the first half of January 1432, immediately before the royal departure, that there was a conscious attempt to implement the Council order that 'benefices, offices and other thynges belongyng to the Kynges yfte and disposicion' should be made available to royal servants and to those who had served the king's father and grandfather.⁵ Eighteen grants issued first at Rouen and then at Dieppe early in January leave no doubt that loyalty and past service stood in the highest favour. John Solers and the Welshman Matthew Gough were stalwarts of Henry V's campaigns;⁶ Henry Haston proudly claimed twenty-four years' service as a royal quartermaster;⁷ William Pecke, clerk of the groceries, complained that his

1. AN, X^{1a} 8605 fos. 14-14v; Armstrong, 'La Double monarchie', 91.

2. P.P.C., iv, 37-9.

3. AN, JJ 175 nos. 59-69; BN Ms. fr. 26053 nos. 1443, 1469.

4. Rowe, 'John, Duke of Bedford', p. 92; Rowe, 'Grand Conseil', p. 225.

5. P.P.C., iv, 38.

6. AN, JJ 175 no. 64; ibid., nos. 92, 295.

7. Ibid., no. 80.

former lands had been donated or sold without permission:¹ all were duly rewarded.

This was a concerted effort, one might think, to rebut charges of 'lack of fertheryng' by favouring long service to the crown and by putting a premium on that most valued quality in war, namely experience. Indeed, by September 1430² land grants contained a proviso that their recipients should not previously have been rewarded, presumably a measure designed to attract first-time grantees, to encourage a more equitable distribution and to ensure that veterans were not forgotten. These measures certainly imply criticism on both sides of the sea of Bedford's settlement policy in general and the advancement of his personal household and retinue in particular. It is difficult to regard a hurried distribution of largesse to a handful of old soldiers and senior servants, however, as anything other than a parting gesture by councillors aimed at the appeasement of complaints and the stemming of petitions. It showed a greater awareness of public opinion in England than of the practical problems then facing the occupation at all levels in northern France. The attempted introduction of new faces into the settlement corresponded to changes in army personnel in 1430,³ but the effect in this case would have been to replace one favoured minority with another. The Council were trying to implement a package of reforms to settlement policy and practice which, unlike the simultaneous and more comprehensive changes in military recruitment and administration analysed by Dr. Curry,⁴ proved either unworkable or

1. Ibid., no. 150.

2. BN, Ms. fr. 26053 no. 1403.

3. Curry, 'Military Organization', pp. 358-60.

4. Ibid., pp. 246-54.

unenforceable. As if in recognition of this, the commission of Regency issued in October 1431, which was otherwise characterised by vagueness, stated explicitly that land grants were to be Bedford's personal preserve.¹

There was no large-scale redistribution of confiscated French estates during the period from February 1432 until September 1435. In the aftermath of the Council's intervention the settlement assumed a conservative character. First, any intention to restrict or exclude awards to Bedford's household staff was undermined by the continued patronage of individual servants.² Secondly, we have evidence of improvements to and confirmations of existing grants. John Colman had been given lands in the Caux to the value of 150 l.t. approximately six years previously, according to his petition of 1432.³ Since the chambre des comptes had thought the lands worth 250 l.t., which they were not, and since the chambre had discovered additional holdings worth 100 l.t., Bedford agreed to their amalgamation. In the same year Roger Amiger, esquire, petitioned for the improvement of the tenure of a life-grant in recognition of loyal service in war against the enemy. Letters were duly issued authorising tenure in tail male, notwithstanding a previous award to Amiger for presence at Verneuil.⁴ Thirdly, current landholders of proven fidelity continued to enjoy favour rather than the new men who had arrived in the expeditions of 1428, 1430 or 1432. The terms of land grants commonly made exceptions

-
1. AN, X^{1a} 8605 f. 20v.
 2. Above, pp. 99-111.
 3. AN, JJ 175 no. 117. In fact Colman held these lands by 14 June 1425 when granted a delay for their dénombrement, and they were probably granted earlier that year (Lenoir 21/389).
 4. AN, JJ 175 no. 134.

to the rule against multiple tenure. Richard Merbury's acquisition of Cotentin lordships on 23 March 1433 recognised both personal service since the landing at Touques on 1 August 1417 and the specific obligation to guard Meulan and its strategic bridge.¹ Most significant of all, the award stood as recompense for lands in the vicomté of Auge and Orbec reclaimed to the royal demesne.

Put bluntly, the crown was short of ready money. Merbury was owed 'de certaines grans sommes de deniers' which had to be offset against future landed revenue. There is no doubt that a bullion shortage and financial pressures, occasioned by a war demanding greater provision of money from reduced resources, were becoming readily apparent by 1433. Whether grants declined in number or value as a consequence is unlikely. The effect of Bedford's absence from May 1433 to July 1434 is more certain: the supply of land grants was cut off.² During the Regent's previous visit to England from December 1425 until March 1427 the same had occurred, as Appendix IV clearly shows. At that time the commission held by the able chancellor Louis de Luxembourg had specifically excluded alienations of money or lands.³ This provision was repeated in May 1433, 'reservez seulement les dons de terres d'autrui et de finance et toute alienacion de notre demaine'.⁴

-
1. The lordships of Grippon, Dangy and Saint-Malo-de-la-Lande near Coutances were worth up to 700 l.t. to Merbury, Katherine de Fontenay his wife, and their heirs male (ibid., no. 231).
 2. An exception was the grant to the Bedford serviteur, John Kennynges, made at London on 3 November 1433 (ibid., no. 308).
 3. AN, X^{1a} 8603 fos. 90-90v, printed by C.T. Allmand, 'The Relations between the English Government, the Higher Clergy, and the Papacy in Normandy, 1417-1450' (unpublished University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1963), Appendix no. 10; also ibid., pp. 149-61.
 4. AN, X^{1a} 8605 fos. 23v-24.

On Bedford's return the land settlement resumed something of its earlier character during the second half of 1434. Talbot's vigorous campaign in the Oise valley which included the recapture of Creil earned him the comté of Clermont nearby, and the title and dignity of comte.¹ In a preamble which bore comparison with those of apanage grants made in previous years, Talbot's award was placed within the tradition of those to men who had risked their lives in the royal cause,

'pour la recouvrance et conservacion de noz couronne et seigneurie de France, pour la deffense desqueles Il a tousjours honnorablement exposé sa personne et sa chevance et esté prisonnier longuement de noz ennemis et adversaires'.²

If the military situation demanded recovery, conservation and defence then Talbot, at least, was pulling his weight. He deserved both the means to maintain his 'état' and further encouragement. Similarly there was recognition in the grant of the duchy of Touraine of the earl of Arundel's campaign leadership.³ Express permission was given to Arundel to bear the title and insignia of duke, and this elevation in status was to be supported by an additional award made on the same day of lands and lordships to a value of 2,000 l.t.⁴

-
1. Pollard, John Talbot, pp. 19-20.
 2. AN, JJ 175 no. 318, dated 24 August 1434.
 3. 'afin de lui donner plus grant courage de continuer en noz services et que par ce les autres à son exemple soient plus enclins de nous servir en noz affaires.' (ibid., no. 365). Arundel held successive regional commands in addition to captaincies at the town of Rouen, Vernon and Verneuil. Appointed lieutenant of the area between the Seine and the Loire in 1433, he was active and successful in Maine and Anjou early in 1434 (Gallia regia, iii, 409, 412; G.E.C., i, 247-8; Bodleian Library, MSS ch. foreign, no. 301).
 4. AN, JJ 175 no. 366.

There was thus a revival late in 1434 of the practice of allocating prestigious estates and titles to the more prominent commanders. Even within the terms of the grants themselves, however, there was some recognition of the great difficulties confronting everyone with an interest in the preservation of an occupation based on land. Arundel's award to a specified maximum value merely disguised the debts he was almost certainly owed, in the manner of Fastolf, Ogard and Merbury, for past military service. Arundel was involved, too, in the crushing of the peasant uprising around Caen in the spring of 1435, itself a manifestation of the malaise of brigandage and of the economic hardship which had implications for land values and tenure throughout the duchy.¹ The ever-present dangers of a war fought almost on home ground put Talbot's new lands at risk from the moment of their donation, and denied Arundel opportunity to take effective possession before his death in June 1435.²

It would perhaps be natural to conclude an account of the Regency settlement on a pessimistic note. The problems confronting settlers and potential settlers on every front were formidable. At one level these were harsh realities faced by all accommodated within the Lancastrian occupation: the breakdown of the alliance with Burgundy; the rebellion in the Caux which threatened the security of Rouen; the constant ebb and flow of the frontiers of that territory which the English might regard as their own. At another, one may identify

-
1. A. Gasté, Les Insurrections populaires en Basse-Normandie au XV^e siècle pendant l'occupation anglaise, et la question d'Olivier Basselin (Caen, 1889); L. Puiseux 'Des Insurrections populaires en Normandie pendant l'occupation anglaise au XV^e siècle', M.S.A.N., 2^e série, ix (1851), 138-59.
 2. For the reactions of both sides to the 'mesadventure' of Gerberoy and Arundel's death, see Waurin, Recueil des croniques, iv, 65-6.

concern about the use and misuse of patronage and favour, and some evidence of a divorce in understanding between parties representing the opinions and concerns of non-participants in the war and those who were actively and regularly engaged in it.

To concentrate unduly on difficulties actual or imagined, however, would be to undervalue a substantial achievement for which Bedford must surely take responsibility. However mindful of his own landed interests he may have been, and however partisan to his own men, to Bedford belongs the credit for overseeing a policy of distributing lands to men of all ranks and in considerable numbers. Furthermore, the subsequent alienations and redistributions of estates, and confirmations and improvements of grants, required executive as well as administrative approval. Whether Bedford succeeded in his own terms cannot be known. But the evidence in Series P at the Archives Nationales of the issue of life-grants in 1435,¹ and of Alice Chaucer's request to improve her tenure to that in fee tail,² suggests both a confidence in past attainments and also expectations which would outlive the Regency.

1. AN, P 1905² nos. 6047, 6063, 6065, 6069.

2. Ibid., no. 6051.

CHAPTER THREETHE LAND SETTLEMENT 1435-50(i) The Military and Diplomatic Setting

This chapter attempts to do much the same as its two predecessors, but in a slightly different way. The concern to identify the number, type and distribution of settlers remains, as does the particular focus on household grantees. Attention is given in two separate sections, however, to the military and especially the diplomatic context to the land settlement, and to the economic and social problems which beset it; the three sections are obviously intended to relate one to another. The justification for this approach is that the evidence is of a volume and quality to demand that space be given to considerations which were, after all, hardly peripheral to our theme. The land settlement featured overtly in post-1435 negotiations, and indirectly some light is shed on the occupation in Maine to compensate for our ignorance of its establishment. Documentary evidence allows assessment of the decline in land values and incomes, and of the security and discipline of the occupation, problems of a scale and severity not previously experienced. Recognition of the existence and resilience of the 1435-50 settlement within this broader setting will contribute to a greater understanding of what is the least-known period of the occupation.

Paris fell in April 1436, and much of the ground lost during that

year was located in the pays de conquête, including Corbeil, the Bois de Vincennes, Pontoise and Saint-Germain-en-Laye.¹ This exposed the south-eastern flank of Normandy to French advance, and for the second time in six months Rouen came under threat. The peasant rising in the pays de Caux late in 1435 had surprised the English by its ferocity and had aroused real fears for the security of Rouen.² Then in May 1436 a French army was halted in its intention of marching on the city only by news of a counter-attack in upper Normandy, and by the timely arrival of reinforcements.³ Further north came the success of the force specially commissioned under Gloucester to relieve Calais, but this was a victory which may have meant more to Englishmen at home than to those in France.⁴ For it was only the inspired campaign leadership of Talbot as Marshal of France which prevented French consolidation of recent gains, capturing Pontoise in 1437 and clearing enemy forces from the Vexin Français and Vexin Normand.⁵ He it was who invested Tancarville and then relieved the siege of Le Crotoy late in 1437.⁶ Talbot and Sir Thomas Kyriel were active in the Caux during 1438, winning back fortresses in the north of the bailliage, but Dieppe held firm and it

-
1. Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris, 1405-1449, ed. A. Tuetey (S.H.P., Paris, 1881), pp. 310-11.
 2. BN, Ms. fr. 26060 no. 2726; S. Deck, La Ville d'Eu. Son histoire, ses institutions (1151-1475) (Paris, 1924), pp. 51-2, n. 10.
 3. Monstrelet, Chronique, v, 281-2.
 4. Ibid., v, 235-60; Griffiths, Reign of Henry VI, pp. 200-205; F. Lennel, Histoire de Calais, ii, Calais sous la domination anglaise (Calais, 1910), p. 148.
 5. Bourgeois de Paris, p. 329; Pollard, John Talbot, p. 48.
 6. Monstrelet, Chronique, v, 308-16; A. Hugué, 'Aspects de la guerre de Cent Ans en Picardie maritime 1400-1450', Mémoires de la société des antiquaires de Picardie, xlvi (1941), 276-7.

was not until October 1440 that Harfleur was recaptured.¹ It was harder still to disguise difficulties experienced beyond the Norman frontiers, for example the fall of Meaux, despite the combined efforts of Talbot and Somerset to relieve the town.²

It is tempting to consider the period 1435-41 with its litany of military reverses and desperate attempts to stave off attacks deep into the heartland of the occupied territories as symptomatic of a crisis of leadership following Bedford's death. The case is hard to refute. The appointment of Richard duke of York as lieutenant-general and governor of France and Normandy in May 1436 could hardly seem more inappropriate in view of his executive and administrative inexperience at the highest levels of government, failings shared by John Beaufort duke of Somerset, who for good measure could add a lack of recent military command to his shortcomings.³ Taken together with the stop-gap appointment of the earl of Warwick in 1439, and the interminable delay between Warwick's death and York's actual arrival to commence a second term, it can be seen that a lack of continuous and effective leadership reduced the war effort to piecemeal campaigning and denied to the occupation the overall direction and consistency in policy which had formerly been the norm. When York had still not arrived in June 1441 the Grand Conseil at Rouen wrote to Henry VI in despairing terms:

-
1. Monstrelet, Chronique, v, 340-1,418-24; T. Basin, Histoire de Charles VII, ed. and trans. C. Samaran (2 vols., Paris, 1933-44), i, 251-3.
 2. Its captain, Sir William Chamberlain, was made the scapegoat for the loss and imprisoned (Monstrelet, Chronique, v, 387-90).
 3. M.K. Jones, 'John Beaufort, Duke of Somerset, and the French Expedition of 1443', Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England, ed. R.A. Griffiths (Gloucester and Atlantic Highlands, 1981), pp. 79-102.

'nous ne savons doresnavant adviser maniere de plus povoir entretenir vostre peuple, ne conduire les affaires de ceste vostre seigneurie, que nous voyons habandonnee, comme la neif gettee en la mer de divers vens, sanz recteur, sans conduyseur, sanz gouvernail, sans trep, sans voyle, flottant, chancellant, et vaguant entre les undes tempestueuses, plaines de tourment daspre fortune et de toute adversite, loing de port de salut et de secours humain.'¹

It may be suggested, however, that the ship of state was not in such dire need of a helmsman as this evocative appeal would have its audience believe. An absence of direct personal leadership between 1425-7 and 1433-4 had not caused the Regency of Bedford to flounder, any more than the minority of Henry VI had left England without a firm hand on the tiller, and it could be held that after 1435 Lancastrian France suffered an excess rather than a shortage of such direction. The political and administrative infrastructure, embodied by the chambre des comptes and the Grand Conseil itself, was sufficiently well established to manage the routine tasks of government and to nullify all but the most serious consequences of an absence of decision-making, and when it did come, the leadership was perhaps of a kind unsuited to the changed conditions which obtained after the events of 1429 and 1435-6. The opportunities for swift advance and personal glory would henceforward be scarce: the war was essentially to become one of containment, consolidation and collective security, to which men who were first and foremost soldiers and campaign leaders were unfitted in the 1440s. The danger in attributing many of the failings of the Lancastrian cause after 1435 to those nominally in charge of it is that not only is too much left to ride on the historical reputation of, for example, Richard duke of York, but also that our perspective may become that of England,

1. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [605-6].

and Westminster in particular, rather than that of Normandy, its soldiers and settlers.¹

The English military effort of the early 1440s was concerned with holding on to existing possessions and checking attacks as and when they occurred. That the land settlement was as relevant to this policy as it had ever been is illustrated by the appointment of Henry Lord Bourghier to the captaincies of Le Crotoy and Neufchâtel in 1441.² His authority on the Picard frontier was increased to resemble that of a marcher lord, and tenure of the nearby comté of Eu provided every incentive to his defence of a locality. By contrast, the tragedy of Somerset's disastrous expedition of 1443 lay in its failure to recognise this new military reality, and the role of land within it. The bargaining between the duke and the king prior to departure reveals a cynical and detached attitude to French territory, in this case estates formerly held by the duke of Alençon, which was to be bartered for in the manner of an old-style spoil of war.³ Such an attitude did not augur well.

On the diplomatic front the main interest of the period lay in the Anglo-French negotiations held at Oye near Calais in 1439.⁴ The

-
1. P. Johnson, 'The Political Career of Richard, Duke of York, to 1456' (unpublished University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1981), pp. 60-4; V.J. Gorman, 'The Public Career of Richard, Duke of York. A Case Study of the Nobility of the Fifteenth Century' (unpublished Catholic University of America Ph.D. thesis, 1981), pp. 40-2.
 2. Woodger, 'Henry Bourghier', pp. 18-22.
 3. PRO, C.47/26/28; Jones, 'John Beaufort', 90-1.
 4. C.T. Allmand (ed.), 'Documents relating to the Anglo-French Negotiations of 1439', Camden Miscellany, fourth series, xxiv (Royal Historical Society, London, 1972), pp. 79-149; Allmand, 'The Anglo-French Negotiations, 1439', B.I.H.R., xl (1967), 1-33.

legitimacy of the landed settlement rested upon the English claim to the French crown enshrined in the treaty of Troyes. The consistent rejection of that claim by the Valois and the equally consistent avowal of it by some Lancastrians meant that no breakthrough could be achieved on this fundamental principle.¹ Instead, after weeks of stalemate, the French raised an issue hardly of less significance to English settlers, namely that of the restoration of all clergy and laymen of whatever status to those benefices and lands which they had previously abandoned.² Neither side was under any illusions as to the legal, military and technical problems which restitution on a large scale would create, but since these proposals opened up one of the few potentially fruitful areas remaining to the assembled representatives, they were carefully explored.³

Three themes may be identified. First, could the principle of restitution be conceded? Clearly it could, for the principle was nowhere explicitly denied and an English memorandum drawn up to consider the peace proposals implicitly agreed to this measure.⁴ Secondly, was such a proposal tenable in practice? In general terms the English thought not, both because of the scale of the problem, involving some seven comtés and an estimated 4,000 noble fiefs within Normandy alone as well as towns and other strongpoints, and because of the political and military consequences of restoring a largely hostile population to lands

-
1. See the anonymous French protocol in Allmand, 'Documents', no. 13 pp. 116-7; also Allmand, 'Anglo-French Negotiations', 10.
 2. Allmand, 'Documents', no. 14 p. 126; P.P.C., v, 367-8.
 3. For the legal and social implications of resettlement during this period see C.T. Allmand, 'The Aftermath of War in Fifteenth-Century France', History, lxi (1976), 344-57.
 4. Allmand, 'Documents', no. 20 esp. pp. 143-5.

which had once been renounced. More specifically, however, the English were indeed prepared to discuss certain options with a view to restricting French restitutions within Normandy itself. Thus a number of comtés might be restored to their seigneurs if not already taken into the king's possession; their vassals, too, might return; more important still, there might be a general restoration of all who had fled the English obedience and of their direct heirs if the original owners were dead.

This in turn raised the third theme, that of compensation in the event of a comprehensive rehabilitation. On the French side, a general restitution was favoured to all who held lands prior to the English occupation, excluding those who had sworn allegiance and then fled,¹ with compensation to be agreed between individual landholders where the properties in question had been granted to a third party.² To the English there was concern lest the costs of large-scale compensation should devolve upon the crown: the king might pay a quarter or at most a third of such sums but the remainder was to be raised from the revenues of all Valois lands, and by the imposition of a clerical tenth.³

Leaving to one side the practical problems involved, it can be seen that the two closely-related issues of restitution and compensation

-
1. 'Those who had taken the oath and later rebelled were traitors pure and simple.' (S.H. Cuttler, The Law of Treason and Treason Trials in Later Medieval France (Cambridge, 1981), p. 42).
 2. Allmand, 'Documents', no. 18 pp. 133-4. As a general principle, 'fauldra adviser maniere de trouver comment seront faictes lesdictes reconpensacions, tant dung coste que daultre'. Another suggestion was that those restored should be paid half the revenues of their former lands by the last owners.
 3. Ibid., no. 20 p. 145.

warranted the most serious consideration at the Oye conference. There was also recognition within the proposals that genuine progress towards an overall peace could be achieved, for flexibility was, so to speak, built-in to the English position: Royal instructions to the embassy returning to Calais on 9 September 1439 made the point clearly:

'[The king] wold put hym effectuely in hys devoir to entreate hys said soubgetz wythin suche tyme as may be accorded that for reasonable recompense or othrewyse contente the wold be agreed to departe fro thaire saide possessyons, the whiche thyng doone [the kyng] wol of hys grace for the universal welthe and good of peas that the saide possessyons be delyvered tho them that occupied the saide possessions bi fore the werres'.¹

These two issues therefore evinced a moderate and conciliatory approach, notwithstanding the political sensitivity of the prospect of an officially-sanctioned dispossession and restitution. Yet the divisions which obtained within the English camp at Oye and within the King's Council rendered the spirit of compromise null and void. The lay envoys to the conference included landholders with revenue, title and status to preserve. Humphrey earl of Stafford was comte of Perche; Walter Lord Hungerford baron of Hommet and seigneur of Breauté and Varengebec; Henry Lord Bourghier comte of Eu. Sir John Popham and Sir John Sutton were more modest landowners, and even Archbishop Kemp had once held an hôtel in Paris.² Without wishing to overstate a case for individual advantage, these men were well able to represent those with interests in northern France stretching back in some cases for twenty

1. P.P.C., v, 390.

2. Above, Chapters One and Two; PRO, C.64/11 m.79; Bréquigny no. 1257 for Sutton; H. Sauval, Histoire et recherches des antiquités de la ville de Paris (3 vols., Paris, 1724), iii, 279 for the life-grant of the Hôtel Neuf to Kemp.

years, to whom a peace settlement was anathema. This viewpoint is manifest in the memorandum attached to the instructions to be delivered to Cardinal Beaufort.¹ It is clear from the seventh objection to the French proposals that the person or persons responsible for the rejection had some knowledge of the Lancastrian land settlement, the grant-issuing process and, importantly, of its relationship to the broader question of willingness to perform present and future royal service:²

'and shuld go ayeinst his owne and ayeinst his faders forsaide lettres patentz and seal, and undo unmake and begger many man, namely suche as han spended her daies yn the said conquest and yn the service of the kyng and of his fader and have nozt elles to lyve by but that they holde of the saide landys, and shuld also withdrawe the hertes and the courages of hem and others fro him and fro his service and cause hem not to wille to doo service in tyme comyng.'

The sovereign issue of Henry VI's claim to the French crown, forcibly upheld by Gloucester, was the main stumbling-block to the attempt to achieve a permanent settlement. It can be argued that the land settlement proved scarcely less troublesome because its very success militated against progress in negotiations which made necessary the abandonment of revenue and title. Reverses in the field between 1435-9, the acknowledged deterioration in land values, the problem of garrison lawlessness, the fact that some were neglecting their estates and others - such as Fastolf - were selling out: none of these factors held sway against a powerful current of opinion which upheld the de iure and de facto claim of the English to northern France, its lands and its people. To men imbued with a spirit of justice by Henry V who felt accustomed and even impelled to pursue a legal right by force of arms if

1. P.P.C., v, 391-5; Allmand, 'Anglo-French Negotiations', 28.

2. P.P.C., v, 393.

necessary, the proposals under discussion were a betrayal of everything that they and their king had fought for. For it should be stressed that in 1439 there was nothing inevitable about an eventual French reconquest of the occupied territories, a time when the English hold on Normandy was more or less intact, the land settlement remained secure and the issuing of grants, although scarce in that year as Appendix VI shows, was still an active process. The voices raised in loud protest against the spirit and the nature of the 1439 negotiations should not then be seen as reflecting individual self-interest in the pursuit of war and the gains, in landed revenues or otherwise, which might be accrued therefrom. They spoke for a wider body of opinion which saw the dispossession of landowners and the stripping of livelihoods as contrary to divine justice and legal right.

Between 1443 and the renewed outbreak of hostilities in March 1448 the interests of landholders lay in the hands of diplomats rather than soldiers. During the negotiations at Tours in 1444 the issue which had so dominated proceedings at Arras and at Oye, namely the English claim to the French crown, was circumvented in the interest of securing a general truce and the royal marriage. Suffolk's concern was to secure the full sovereignty of Normandy and Gascony, but the truce of Tours did acknowledge the status quo by allowing settlers to enjoy their possessions as formerly held.¹ The sources are not forthcoming about the position of Anjou and Maine in the discussions or in those of the following year. It seems likely that the question of their return to Margaret of Anjou's father was at least discussed, even if such a possibility was rejected by Suffolk, as he later held.

1. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, I, 131-5.

It has been suggested that the request for Normandy alone was itself a recognition of English military weakness,¹ and the absence of discussion about Anjou and Maine may indicate that their fate was under serious consideration in 1444 though in private, secret negotiations.² By the time of Charles VII's demand for the cession of Maine in November 1445, the idea was probably fixed in the minds of Henry and his queen that such a move would contribute to a lasting peace. Henry VI perhaps believed that to agree to the yielding of Maine would be to strengthen the English hold on Normandy rather than to weaken it, and it may also have been the intention to render stable the frontier between the two areas by alliance and truce. There is no mistaking the king's personal responsibility for giving up Maine, and to read his letter to Charles VII is to read of Henry's desire to please the French king himself, 'en tout ce qui [nous] seroit honnorablement possible et licite'; Queen Margaret, whose requests for such a move had evidently been frequent; duke René, close in blood and also desirous of a 'paix principale'.³ The king's conduct was a personal act of faith, an expression of belief in the French suggestion of July 1445 that a lasting peace might best be achieved at the highest level in direct discussion by the rulers themselves. While arrangements for a meeting were in progress the agreement to the demand expressed by duke René through Charles VII would show the willingness of one member of the Anglo-French ruling family to please other members of that family to their mutual

-
1. L.E. James, 'The Career and Political Influence of William de la Pole, 1st Duke of Suffolk, 1437-1450' (unpublished University of Oxford M. Litt. thesis, 1979), p. 71.
 2. See Stevenson, Letters and Papers, I, 171-7. Discussions had already been held about the lordships of Quatremare, Le Neubourg, Acquigny and others, and further negotiations were anticipated.
 3. Ibid., II, ii, [639-42], esp. [640].

benefit.

The difficulty was that many Englishmen on both sides of the sea saw neither the problem nor its solution in the same light. For some, for whom Sir John Fastolf had spoken in 1435 and whose views remained influential, the idea of peace at all was to be rejected,¹ while others must have been dismayed and angered by the king's credulity and lack of political acumen. In historical terms, the cession countermanded the Grand Conseil's grant of Maine in 1424 to Bedford, whom Fastolf had served, and the subsequent conquest and occupation of the comté and of Anjou, with all its strategic and military implications for territorial gain south of the Loire and the protection of the southern flank of Normandy. It nullified Edmund Beaufort's appointment as governor in 1438 and his life-grant of the comté as recently as 1442. In legal terms, it has recently been pointed out that yielding Maine was an admission of the lack of validity of the English claim to the comté and indeed all the occupied territories.² It destroyed the juridical base upon which rested the claims of English settlers lawfully to hold lands.

To the diplomat, the direct intervention of the king swept aside the issue of compensation to dispossessed landholders in the event of a general restitution of displaced Frenchmen, an issue which as we have seen played a prominent part in the 1439 negotiations. To the soldier, territory which had been quickly won and required prolonged stout defence, was now lost not by battle or siege but by royal will. English

-
1. M.G.A. Vale, 'Sir John Fastolf's "Report" of 1435: A New Interpretation Reconsidered', Nottingham Medieval Studies, xvii (1973), 78-84.
 2. James, 'William de la Pole', pp. 150, 152-4 emphasises this important point.

forces were to retreat and the frontier was to recede into Normandy.¹ For the landowner who was, in many cases, facing economic difficulties which were reducing the value and revenues of his estates, the prospect of the king giving away that most precious commodity for so little in return must have appeared beyond comprehension. In fact, the number of landholders who stood to lose from the secession of Maine was not large, so far as is known, but this was not the issue at stake. What mattered was that part of the patrimony won, defended and managed during the Regency should be so readily conceded. In 1446 when the English tenure of Normandy and lands beyond the duchy was under threat but was still very much a reality, this may have appeared as the thin end of a wedge that would drive the English from northern France in a way that was neither honourable nor lawful.

Charles VII was able to use the personal promise of Henry VI as an essential precondition to negotiations for a wider peace, which in turn bound Henry to specify firm dates and promises.² On 28 July 1447 Matthew Gough and Fulk Eyton were appointed royal commissioners to receive the towns and fortresses of Maine from Edmund Beaufort and to hand them over to Charles VII. The fact that they were issued with secret instructions and could call on the help of soldiers if necessary indicates that overt hostility was already anticipated in the execution of this unpopular task.³ Six weeks later, the king appointed Nicholas Molyneux, Osbert Mundford and Thomas Direhille as commissioners with a

-
1. An indictment of Suffolk described Maine as 'the keye of well faire of all the kynge's obeisaunces' (Historical Manuscripts Commission, iii (1872), 280).
 2. B.P. Wolffe, Henry VI (London, 1981), pp. 191-2.
 3. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [696-702]. The royal intention was entrusted, probably orally, to Garter King of Arms.

wide-ranging authority to treat with their French opposites in the matter of compensation for the dispossessed.¹

From the tortuous proceedings which led to the withdrawal from Le Mans and Maine in 1448, three pertinent questions may be put. First, how relevant were the vested interests of the appointed commissioners to the nature of the events which followed? Although neither Gough nor Eyton were known to hold land within Maine itself, Gough in particular had acquired numerous Norman properties and bore several prestigious titles; he was a proven, renowned captain who had held the lieutenancy of Le Mans among other posts.² Eyton was the long-serving captain of Caudebec, given a small grant of lands in 1446.³ Both men had Talbot connections.⁴ Both had earned a reputation in French circles as tough, not to say harsh soldiers for whom the prospect of a needless surrender must have been a sharp test of loyalty. They acted with such reluctance and unwillingness to come to an agreement with the representatives of Charles VII that they incurred the anger of the two kings for their deceptions and delays.⁵ The three men appointed to negotiate compensation were again not known as Maine settlers, but Direhille held land in the nearby bailliage of Alençon, of which he was vicomte,⁶ and Mundford held office as bailli of Maine

1. Ibid., [666-9].

2. BL, Add. Ch. 17237; Gallia regia, i, 518-9.

3. Lenoir 28/11; below, p. 174.

4. Gough's mother had been Talbot's nurse (William Worcestre, Itineraries, ed. Harvey, p. 351), and Eyton was a Talbot retainer (Pollard, John Talbot, p. 79).

5. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [692-6]; II, i, 361-8.

6. He was given two small grants in October 1438 and March 1442 (BL, Add. Ch. 12040; Lenoir 27/127).

and captain of Fresnay-le-Vicomte.¹ The two other men involved in the negotiations seem to have represented the interests of English seigneurs: Richard Frogenhall was chamberlain of Edmund Beaufort's household and captain of Essay and Harcourt;² Nicholas Molyneux was receiver-general of York's estates as well as holding land and office in his own right within Maine and Normandy.³

Those charged with carrying out the king's will were thus experienced men with local knowledge and the respect of their peers. If they themselves did not stand to lose lands, titles and revenues within Maine, this hardly made them any less reluctant to yield territory from which their king, their fellow-settlers and in some cases their patrons and employers drew direct benefit. The grievances made known in 1452 by the inhabitants of the comté must have been known to these officials in 1447-8. There is no mistaking the feeling of abandonment evident in the loss of lands, possessions and livelihoods in Maine.⁴ Perhaps it was felt that in deception and delay lay the best hope for securing a change of policy, or that at least the situation might somehow turn to advantage. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the royal commissioners knew all too well what was being lost, that they sympathised with their companions in that loss, and that they were aware of the pressure which a French-controlled Maine would place on their interests in Normandy.

-
1. Griffiths, Reign of Henry VI, pp. 500-501.
 2. Jones, 'Beaufort Family', pp. 327-8, 332.
 3. McFarlane, 'Business-Partnership', 299-300; Lenoir 5/3, 26/371, 27/27.
 4. Lambeth MS 506 fos. 55r-56v, printed in Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [598-603]. A marginal addition referred to the 'mauvais et désloyal conseil' given to the king.

The second question concerns compensation for loss of lands in Maine. The principle had been agreed during the negotiations in London in 1447 and it was by letters patent of 27 July that year that the undertaking to appoint commissioners to the task was made.¹ In practice, there was perhaps a fear that only the earl of Dorset would receive suitable provision, in return for his agreement to the cession, and this fear was justified. In discussions held at Le Mans on 1 November 1447 the French commissioners asserted that Dorset's compensation had been agreed during their July meeting with the King's Council in London, and that further provision could be discussed after the comté had been handed over. The response of a group of English proctors present, with Fastolf's procureur Jean Abernay prominent amongst them, was vigorous. They demanded compensation in advance and on the same basis as that enjoyed by Dorset.² Nothing more was heard until the agreement of 30 December 1447 upon which the eventual withdrawal was based. It was there settled, in the most general terms, that lands could be enjoyed until compensation was agreed between the representatives of both sides, unless independent arrangements were made between parties which would then be ratified.³

Although no strictly contemporary evidence has survived, sources from a slightly later date strongly suggest that a majority of Englishmen were dispossessed and received little or nothing from those charged with such provision. Even treating with due caution the post hoc evidence of the 1452 petition to Henry VI,⁴ Fastolf's complaints in

1. Ibid., [642-3].

2. Ibid., [681-5], [687-90].

3. Ibid., [712-3].

4. Above, p. 139.

1455¹ and the allegations made against Somerset by York in the early 1450s², the consensus was that the Maine settlers had suffered a raw deal and that at least part of the blame lay with Somerset's administration. By the time that Charles VII's patience finally ran out, and final arrangements for the surrender were made on 11 March 1448, it was clear that compensation would have to come from revenues assigned to the English.³

What, then, were the wider implications of the cession of Maine? In the first place, the king's well-intentioned gesture towards a lasting peace had rebounded on him. The political and diplomatic initiative had passed to Charles VII to an extent that the protagonists were no longer negotiating from a position of rough equality, and the issue of compensation for English landholders provides a benchmark for the decline of Lancastrian influence. The reconquest of the comté by the newly-reformed French armies⁴ boosted the morale and unity of the enemy and demoralized and polarized English opinion on both sides of the sea. Indeed, it marked the culmination of the divide which had slowly emerged between the perception of the war and the land settlement held by the king and his Council in London and the realities of the occupation viewed from Normandy. The legal right of English settlers to their French lands was seriously undermined by the failure to discuss the claim of Henry VI to the French crown after 1439, and the

-
1. The Paston Letters, ed. J. Gairdner (3 vols., London, 1896), i, 359-60.
 2. Ibid., i, cxix-cxxiii.
 3. Foedera, V, i, 188-9.
 4. P. Contamine, Guerre, état, et société à la fin du moyen âge. Études sur les armées des rois de France, 1337-1494 (Paris and The Hague, 1972), pp. 367-72.

willingness of the king to sacrifice the de facto possession of estates in Maine with scant regard for the historical and legal justification for their possession did not bode well for future negotiations. Furthermore, it was seen that the Lancastrian leadership represented and protected a minority of landholders of a status and authority sufficient to make their demands for compensation heard, while the majority were left to defend their livelihoods as best they could.

The fate of those of both nationalities who had long fought in the Lancastrian cause was one of the issues raised by Sir John Fastolf in his recommendations of 1449,¹ and this has rightly been seen as reflecting much more than the grumblings of a disaffected seigneur at the loss of his own estates and revenues without compensation.² The gravity of the surrender of Maine for all settlers was brought home by the sheer speed of the French advances after the formal declaration of war on 31 July 1449. English landholders became casualties of war, finally protected neither by the diplomacy nor by the field armies which had tried during the previous fifteen years to secure their place on French soil. The resulting sense of anger and helplessness had henceforward to be expressed on an English stage:

'the kyne's lyvelode and enheritaunce ys goone
and his obeisaunce anentished, and his liege menne
have lost her lond, and are become beggers.'³

-
1. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [726].
 2. Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 478-9.
 3. Historical Manuscripts Commission, iii, 280.

(ii) Economic and Social Problems

There can be no doubt that the economic and social conditions which faced all inhabitants of northern France from around 1435 were among the hardest of the century. The nature and chronology of this recession, at its deepest in the late 1430s, are now beginning to be understood.¹ This short section cannot hope to give a comprehensive account of the harvest failures, famine, plague and quite simply the bad weather which afflicted local populations to a greater or lesser degree. Instead it attempts to consider how and why such difficulties mattered to both existing land settlers and those coming into the settlement for the first time. It is very difficult to draw from the records figures with which to support these remarks, but it is hoped that by concentrating on population shortage and also on the relationship of the recession to diplomacy and especially the military occupation, some indication may be given of the changed conditions affecting the post 1435 settlement.

Not least among the reasons prompting the successive rounds of negotiations between the opposing parties discussed in the preceding pages was a recognition that war had caused or contributed to the hardship widely experienced in the late 1430s. The agreement reached in December 1438 between Edmund Beaufort, captain-general and governor of Anjou and Maine, and rival French claimants to those territories, made specific reference to the need to repopulate parishes whose people had fled because of war, famine and other

1. H. Neveux, 'Déclin et reprise: la fluctuation biséculaire 1330-1560', Histoire de la France rurale, ed. G. Duby and A. Wallon (4 vols., Paris, 1975-6), ii, 41-87; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 163-70.

reasons.¹ It was acknowledged in Maine and elsewhere that both sides stood to lose: starvation and extortion paid little respect to political allegiance. The English memorandum of mid-1439 already referred to gave as the first reason for accepting French terms the costs of the war in financial and human terms:

'pour ce que son peuple en Normendie est tant las, foudre, opprime, appovri et diminue, tant a loccasion des longues et aspres guerres, comme de grans famines, mortalite et absence des habitans du pais, tellement que a paine est demoure la moitie du peuple en iceluy pays'.²

The cumulative effects of these adversities therefore contributed to the pressure for peace or truce at both local and national levels, and it will be noted that the above examples come from the very years when the crisis was at its worst.

To some extent this picture is a familiar one, painted in its most vivid colours in Thomas Basin's celebrated portrayal of his homeland:

'Aussi arriva-t-il, au bout de peu de temps, que cette terre jadis glorieuse, riche d'hommes et de biens, tourna à l'abandon complet et prit l'aspect d'un désert, tous ces champs immenses restant vides et sans culture'.³

Treating Basin's testimony with all due caution, it can nevertheless be corroborated from the records as an overview of what was happening.

1. A. Joubert, 'Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire de la guerre de Cent Ans dans le Maine de 1424 à 1452', Revue historique et archéologique du Maine, xxvi (1889), 271.
2. Allmand, 'Documents', no. 20 p. 140.
3. Basin, Histoire de Charles VII, i, 223; J.-L. Goglin, 'Thomas Basin, témoin de la misère normande', Annales de Normandie, xxx (1980), 91-101.

There is no doubting the geographical extent of a disaster which obtained between the Seine and the Somme, between the Oise and the ocean, as Basin put it. More recently, Guy Bois has estimated that in Normandy as a whole seigneurial rents fell by as much as two-thirds or three-quarters between the early fourteenth and the mid-fifteenth centuries.¹ Also, the material drawn from the chambre des comptes by Lenoir includes delays for the performance of aveux and dénombrements in quantities almost too large to handle: they can be numbered in the thousands rather than the hundreds.

Everywhere land was held under conditions that were difficult and at times dangerous, and the normal and regular patterns of its management had sometimes to be put in abeyance or drastically modified as a result. Two examples well illustrate this point. The revenues of the crown from demesne lands were reduced or disappeared altogether. In April 1439 the lieutenant of the bailli of Gisors reported that since the rebellion in the pays de Caux in 1435 there had been no ordinary or extraordinary jurisdiction in the châtellenie of Lyons, and there still was none, which meant that no amendes or exploits had been levied.² Only two of the fermes of the royal demesne had yielded revenue, the others being vacant and worthless because people had fled as a result of the war. A lack of people meant that no one was available to bid for lands put to farm, nor could anyone be found to proclaim offers in the customary way. It is often difficult to distinguish one from another the consequences of war, depopulation and

1. G. Bois, 'Noblesse et crise des revenus seigneuriaux en France aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles: Essai d'interprétation', La Noblesse au moyen âge XI^e-XV^e siècles. Essais à la mémoire de Robert Boutruche, ed. P. Contamine (Paris, 1976), p. 220.

2. Lenoir 16/373.

brigandage, or even to separate cause from effect, since officials reporting to the chambre des comptes were more concerned to state what had happened than to ask why or in what order events had taken place.

Secondly, when the vicomte of Falaise made a declaration of the worthless rents within his jurisdiction between the terms of St. Michel 1437 and Easter 1438 it included the sum of 52 l. 4s. t. formerly farmed from the demesne in the parish of Bienville-en-Auge by John Convayn, esquire. Convayn obtained a royal remission of rent in 1438 and 1439,¹

'pour ce que ladite terre est presque à non valloir pour le fait des guerres, brigans, larrons et mortalités qui ont esté et encore sont en pays, et aussi pour l'abondance des eaux yssues des marests de Trouart sur les terres'.

Flooding and drainage problems were perhaps more genuine grievances than difficulties arising from the war or brigandage in this relatively secure and stable area. One might also suspect that the attribution of blame to all-embracing causes such as high mortality rates or the activities of robbers and brigands would serve as a mask and a protection against the demands of the Rouen authorities for rents and services. There were undoubtedly instances of abuse of the system of land tenure, for settlers eager to shield holdings and revenues against the various threats to them were quite capable of putting their own livelihoods before the needs of the crown. Yet it would be wrong to undervalue evidence which can tell us much in detail about the nature and extent of the difficulties shared by all owners of land in this period. English settlers were only one among a number of groups or

1. Ibid., 17/383-4.

institutions affected by adverse circumstances,¹ and the tenor of their complaints and petitions is certainly echoed elsewhere, for example in the treasurer's accounts for the archbishopric of Rouen between 1439 and 1440.²

An analysis of the period 1435-50 forms a key section of the study by Guy Bois of the economy and demography of eastern Normandy.³ Turning first to population, Bois takes as a reference point the relationship between the feux de monn age of 1314 and 1347, and the episcopal survey of heads of households compiled c.1240 and continued by Eudes Rigaud.⁴ This relationship can be quantified to give a very rough guide to rural population trends over a long period, though it is for the vicomte of Rouen that continuous evidence has best survived. Setting an index figure for rural population at 100 in 1314, he argues for a crisis caused by plague and depopulation between 1374-80, subsequent recovery to 1413 and then another period of disaster between 1415 and 1450, with the index figure falling to around 25-30 between

1. The abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Corneilles in the diocese of Lisieux petitioned in December 1438 that he could not present the aveux and d nombrement for his temporalities because of the war, brigandage and other reasons (BN, Ms. fr. 26065 no. 3659). The bishop of Lisieux himself could not assess his lands because of 'le p ril et dangier des chemins' (26066 no. 3995).
2. Seine-Mme, G41, Compte du tr sorier 1439-40, f. 141v. The receipts of the vicarerie of Pontoise for this year were so low that they were used to pay the vicar's outgoings, leaving nothing for the Rouen treasury.
3. G. Bois, Crise du f odalisme.  conomie rurale et d mographie en Normandie orientale du d but du XIV^e si cle au milieu du XVI^e si cle (second edn., Paris, 1981), translated as The Crisis of Feudalism (Cambridge and Paris, 1984). The thesis is assessed by E. Le Roy Ladurie, 'En Haute-Normandie: Malthus ou Marx?', Annales:  conomies, Soci t s, Civilisations, xxxiii (1978), 115-24.
4. Bois, Crise, pp. 50-1 and tables 1 and 2.

1452-8.¹ The nadir came between 1436 and 1441-2 when that half of the population remaining after the 1415-22 devastation was further reduced by around a third: 'trois hommes environ vivent là où en demeuraient dix.'²

These figures are open to question. Within the vicomté of Rouen the comparison of the parish roles du monnéage of 1452-8 and the thirteenth-century household survey lacks, by the author's admission, a statistical corrective, and it is difficult to believe that the parish enquiries conducted throughout Normandy in the 1460s bore exactly the same terms of reference and used the same definitions as those of 1240. An index figure set at a time of population growth also exaggerates the extent of subsequent decline: in absolute terms the loss appears great but in relative terms it is less pronounced. For the years 1415-52 there is a shortage of comparative evidence. First, the argument that population fell by around a half between 1415 and 1422 is unsubstantiated and rests only on evidence for the vicomté of Rouen, giving an index figure of 34 for 1422-5 compared to 65 in 1413. This statistic gives little indication of mortality levels within eastern Normandy. Secondly, migration is given such short shrift in the Bois thesis that populations seemingly appear from nowhere between 1422 and 1434-5 as quickly as they had previously disappeared; again it is unfortunate that evidence from the Rouen vicomté alone survives to yield a figure of 43 in 1434.³ Thirdly, the crisis years between 1436 and 1441-2 are treated briefly without indication of how

1. Ibid., p. 58 and tables 10 and 11. The figures are: 1314 100; 1347 97; 1357 c.70; 1374-80 43-8; 1413 65; 1452-8 25-30.

2. Ibid., p. 62.

3. Ibid., pp. 62-3 and tables 12 and 13.

population fell to one-third of an unspecified former level.¹ What then may have happened between 1441-2 and 1452-8 is passed over. In sum, the Bois conclusions for the English occupation indicate only likely population trends.

The analysis of the economic difficulties of the period 1435-50, however, rests upon a firmer base. Using the accounts of the archbishopric of Rouen to construct a case study of the five parishes of Aliermont, Bois concludes that marginal lands were abandoned and villages temporarily deserted.² Although there is again a lack of records for the actual years of crisis, this is an important assessment of the response of tenants to economic dislocation and of the reluctant acceptance by landlords of a diminution of revenues and of their share of them. These observations probably apply to other areas of Normandy and to the domanial lands scattered widely within the duchy.

On a broader scale Bois labels the period 1436-50 'Hiroshima en Normandie', and identifies an acute phase of crisis between 1435 and 1439 followed by a period of chronic decline until 1450. It must be said that the application of an inappropriate historical label serves only to detract from the argument presented, but the use of chronicle accounts in conjunction with a series of wheat prices at the Rouen halles creates a convincing picture of the intensity of the crisis in the pays de Caux.³ It should be remembered that the peasant rising

1. In the vicomté of Bayeux population fell in the period 1434-46, although larger parishes grew, but there was no catastrophe on the scale suggested for eastern Normandy (D. Angers, 'La Vicomté de Bayeux au bas moyen-âge. Esquisse d'histoire démographique (1389-1500)', Francia, vii (1979), 141-72).

2. Bois, Crise, pp. 135-6.

3. Ibid., pp. 299-304.

there was on a scale and of a ferocity not found elsewhere in northern France, and without diminishing the significance of the revolt, nowhere else within the English obedience with the exception of the Bessin close to Caen had suffered to a comparable degree. Indeed, any general statements about the extent of the economic difficulties of these years need to be tempered with the qualification that much depended on the local picture. The areas worst affected often produced most documentation, and the chambre des comptes was reasonably well-informed about those English settlers with estates close to Rouen whose revenues were not being assessed.¹

The Vexin Normand was another area ill-affected by a combination of factors difficult to separate one from another. A declaration was made in 1445 by the vicomte of Gisors of those lands taken into the king's hands because homage had not been performed or the local aveux not rendered.² The list included a number of lordships originally granted by Henry V which were now worthless, including Noyon-sur-Andelle given to John Pessmershe, and the fief of Mannéville belonging to Richard Curson. Notwithstanding the truce of Tours it was reported that the countryside remained depopulated and its lands uncultivated. The lands of Sir John Baskerville and Sir Richard Wydeville had for a long time been 'inutiles et à non valloir'.

For those Vexin landholders of middle rank who had formed the backbone of Henry V's settlement, this collapse in revenues must have

-
1. BN, Ms. fr. 26062 no. 3158, a list of fiefs in the vicomtés of Pont-Authou and Pont-Audemer held by Sir John Salvain, William Browning and others owing fines for their lack of aveux and dénombrements in April 1437.
 2. Lenoir 4/239, a similar declaration for September 1443. For the later statement see BN, Ms. fr. 26074 no. 5372.

been hard to bear since Richard Abraham, Robert Smart and Richard Nynnys were, as we have seen, settlers of over twenty years' standing whose livelihoods were closely bound up with income from land.¹ The relationship between these men and patterns of military service was also changing. For the most part, this change may be ascribed to absenteeism and more pressing demands on manpower due to the lack of field armies, but it may also be the case that the land settlement had lost many of its attractions in parts of Normandy and was no longer an incentive sufficient to tie a man to an area of local interest. A loosening of the bond linking the soldier or office-holder to those landed estates granted to him can be considered only tentatively at this stage, but it may be possible to substantiate this idea with further research. Certainly, those stalwarts of the garrison at Château-Gaillard, Richard Nynnys and Thomas Wyntrynham, were still serving there in December 1441, but not thereafter; by 1445 Nynnys still held his Vexin lands although they were of no value, but Wyntrynham had had the good sense to sell his properties to another Englishman.

The most celebrated example of a man cutting his losses remains Sir John Fastolf,² but the decline in landed revenues which may have precipitated Fastolf's action depended more upon the geographical distribution of estates than on the status of their holder. Walter Lord Hungerford petitioned for a delay for the assessment of his revenues in 1438 because some of his lands lay within enemy territory,³ a circumstance which afflicted many lesser landholders, but the fact that

1. Above, pp. 42-5, 55.

2. Fastolf's French lands merit a separate study.

3. BN, PO 1550 no. 4.

Hungerford had accumulated scattered lordships in every Norman bailliage made him better able to withstand the loss or decline of one or two. Fastolf, it has been pointed out,¹ had acquired lands in areas hard-hit by the fortunes of war and the economy, namely Maine and the Caux, but great as the decline in their value was, it remained a relative decline if his French estates are viewed in their entirety. In absolute terms, the greatest losses were suffered by those with properties concentrated in only one or two areas, lands which were expected to support a wife and dependants as well as their owner. It was the Walter Smiths and William Wolstons of Lancastrian Normandy who were most at risk after 1436, rather than the better-known Fastolfs.²

It may be useful to draw a distinction between the general underlying trends which rendered the tenure of land an uneconomic, difficult and sometimes dangerous proposition, and the specific instances of violence towards the local population which were directly attributable to a military occupation. Within the former category, it is noticeable that the effects of rural depopulation were still being felt many years after the initial crisis. In 1446 the vicomte of Caudebec was instructed to remit to the inhabitants of the bailliage of the Caux any rents owed for their héritages, and to reduce by half their rents for the next four years, because it was known that the combined effects of rebellion, the war, famine and population shortage had left the countryside devastated and uninhabited.³ Over ten years after the

-
1. Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 473; McFarlane, 'Investment', 105-7.
 2. Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 474; above, Chapter Two.
 3. Lenoir 4/187, a vivid description drawn from the reports of local officials.

peasant revolt in the Caux, repeated campaigning had seemingly prevented the repopulation and economic recovery of an area which had always been well-peopled with English settlers.

In eastern Normandy, Bois has shown that seigneurial revenues fell by around 50% between 1400-15 and 1450-60, a decline which affected all landholders, ecclesiastical and lay, great and small.¹ He argues that the sheer scale of depopulation and the high mortality level precluded recovery in the 1440s.² The evidence for the bailliage of the Caux and for parts of those of Rouen and Evreux supports this view. It may well be the case, however, that the seigneurial revenues of the western bailliages suffered a less dramatic decline and that the peasantry of Caen and the Cotentin had less occasion to abandon their holdings, which in turn would have made recovery during the 1440s a more practical proposition.

Brigandage was another problem faced by settler and native alike. The motivation of brigand activity, its organization and extent have been the subject of debate.³ For our purpose, and noting that brigands were primarily of local, rural origin,⁴ it is surprising that their impact upon the land settlement was not greater. To those who would attribute political or nationalist inspiration to brigand behaviour, one would say that there is no evidence that their actions were more frequently or more seriously directed against English landholders or

1. Bois, Crise, pp. 200-1, 230-1.

2. Ibid., pp. 304-7.

3. Judiciously reviewed by Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 230-7; also N.A.R. Wright, "'Pillagers' and 'Brigands' in the Hundred Years War", Journal of Medieval History, ix (1983), 15-24.

4. R. Jouet, La Résistance à l'occupation anglaise en Basse-Normandie (1418-1450) (Caen, 1969), pp. 79-83.

their French tenants. We might expect to find examples of attacks specifically directed against the properties and moveable goods of the large numbers of Englishmen living in lower Normandy, but they are not to be found. Brigand activity also seems to have diminished during the years 1436-50 by comparison with the Regency, contrary to what might have been expected.¹ Examples certainly exist of delays being granted for the performance of services to the crown which cite brigandage as the particular cause of difficulty, but they are not plentiful. The general fear for the security of the countryside and the safety of road travel for routine business may have been more relevant to the daily lives of landowners than direct threats to their interests.

More serious to the settler was the loss of the protective march to the south and east of Normandy. The successful French campaign of 1441-2 which had seen the capture of Louviers, Evreux, Conches and Beaufort had grim consequences for those holding lands between the towns, chief among whom was Edmund Beaufort, who had held the comté of Harcourt since 1435. In a report made by the lieutenant of Richard Froghall, bailli of Harcourt for Beaufort, it emerged that the destruction wrought by the advance and by the assembly of a large English force at Elbeuf under Talbot, Scales and Fauconberg had reduced by over half the value of the prévôté and coutume of Elbeuf.² In addition to the incursions of the enemy, the settlement faced the problem of the violence and indiscipline of the very men charged with

-
1. Although in each of the areas of lower Normandy surveyed by Jouet sources are fewer after 1436 (Jouet, Résistance, pp. 104-5, 121-3, 140-2, 151-4).
 2. Lenoir 9/224; Jones, 'Beaufort Family', pp. 332-3. The English troops who spent nine or ten days at Elbeuf 'y firent ... moult de maux et de destructions'.

its defence. The persistence of such incidents, again acknowledged in contemporary peace negotiations, suggests that certain captains were taking advantage of laxities in the military administration to commit abuses without fear of punishment. In April 1440 an attempt was made to round up some of John Beaufort's men, newly arrived in Normandy, who were living off the land close to Bayeux.¹ By May 1447 complaints in the Estates of Normandy had reached such a pitch that previous ordonnances relating to military discipline were reissued to the baillis.²

The cumulative effect of robberies, forced requisitions of provisions and other crimes against non-combatants was to drive people away, not only from the immediate scene of trouble but also out of the English obedience altogether.³ The early and efficient attempts of Henry V and Bedford to use both military and civilian channels to keep the soldiery in check had to some extent prevented this happening, but non-combatants were helpless without the constant protection which was not available in the 1440s. Soldiers were reportedly seizing the houses of the bourgeois and churchmen of the bonnes villes without payment, living there and stealing utensils; these were misdeeds which flagrantly breached the spirit and the law of the Lancastrian urban settlement. In the countryside, too, a shortage of hard currency meant that troops had to be paid from local sources: in the case of Sir Richard Merbury at Vernon from the revenues of the town and

1. BN, Ms. fr. 26067 no. 4026; Allmand, 'Documents', no. 20 p. 141.

2. Orne, A416; BN, Ms. fr. 27076 no. 5740.

3. Cf. N.A.R. Wright, 'French Peasants in the Hundred Years War', History Today, xxxiii (1983), 38-42.

châtellenie of Vernon and the lordship of Tourny;¹ in that of Sir William Peyto from the appatis, bullettes and gains of war collected at Creil-sur-Oise, in addition to the domanial revenues which Talbot and other captains had been entitled to.²

In such circumstances, with soldiers being forced to earn their living from lands close to their garrison, the very lands that they and their fellow-countrymen might hold or might reasonably expect to hold by royal grant, it would appear that the military occupation of Normandy was becoming incompatible with the land settlement. The mutual dependence which had once characterised this relationship was undermined by conflicting needs. Soldiers required housing, provisions and wages, and if official sources could not supply them it was natural to take what was locally at hand. Landholders needed a stable population and the protection of garrison forces, neither of which could be relied on.³ For the numerous men-at-arms and archers who held Norman fiefs the conflict was probably resolved by immediate short-term needs. If lands could no longer support a livelihood or if military service was demanded elsewhere, then lands were abandoned.

Whether by accident or design the abandonment of estates was a constant of the 1440s. Officially-approved leave of absence was obtained by William Browning in 1444 which left him free to attend to his affairs in England for a year without prejudice to his landed

1. Lenoir 4/199.

2. BN, Ms. fr. 26066 no. 3921, an indenture dated 31 December 1439.

3. In October 1436 some Normans and Englishmen of the Essay garrison reported that since the demolition of the fortress of Bonmoulins, the inhabitants of the châtellenies of Essay and Bonmoulins had all left for fear of the king's enemies (ibid., 26061 no. 2949).

interests.¹ More serious were the absences for political reasons of the senior commanders and councillors, including Hungerford and York.² These departures were demoralizing and unsettling to the men left behind, and suggested a mercenary attitude to landed estates and a lack of commitment to their maintenance. York had been advised in 1440 that absentee captains were acting against the public good,³ and although his removal to England and thence to Ireland was not of his own making, he still derived benefit from Normandy as an absentee landlord. Other involuntary absentees were men captured in war, such as Sir Thomas Rempston and Robert Chery, esquire, though they were not numerous.⁴ By far the greatest number of people separated from their lands were those, including the Welshman Guibon ap Thomas, who were summoned to serve in the royal host as the need arose and as their own abilities dictated. He held land in Maine and in the bailliage of Alençon while serving as lieutenant for Talbot at Tancarville, so there was no possibility of a visit to his estates without great difficulty.⁵ With greater demands being made of existing manpower the administrative and defensive requirements of the land settlement took second place to the military needs of the crown.

1. Lenoir 27/209.

2. BN, PO 1550 no. 6; E.M. Burney, 'The English Rule in Normandy, 1435-1450' (unpublished University of Oxford B. Litt. thesis, 1957), pp. 254-7.

3. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [590-1].

4. See BN, PO 2431 nos. 4, 5 for Rempston and Lenoir 4/181-2 for Chery.

5. BN, PO 81 nos. 2-4.

(iii) The Land Settlement 1435-50

From what has been said in the previous pages it is reasonable to suggest that the later land settlement assumed, by necessity, a different character from its predecessors. In place of the buoyant, all-embracing qualities manifest in happier times for the immigrants, the settlement assumed a conservative and circumspect nature in the face of the diverse difficulties outlined above. Even allowing for the considerable variations in tenorial fortunes between and within localities, it can be seen that the very different evidence of Basin and Bois points irrefutably towards severe problems for existing and potential settlers. Taking a broader view, the pattern within one part of the general historical literature has been to view the military and diplomatic reversals of 1435 and 1436 as disastrous to the Lancastrian cause in France, marking the beginning of a slow but relentless decline in political authority.¹ The lure of hindsight has proved irresistible, resulting in a rapid chase through the events of the final decade or so of the occupation until the English were inevitably beaten out or trapped.

The consideration of the settlement which follows forms part of an argument that all was far from lost in the 1430s, and that within the context of a defensible duchy of Normandy the balance of power was such that gains made during the past twenty years could be realistically protected. The point cannot be pushed too far, since nothing was

1. See e.g. A.R. Myers, England in the Late Middle Ages (eighth edn., London, 1971), p. 125; H. Talbot, The English Achilles. An Account of the Life and Campaigns of John Talbot, 1st Earl of Shrewsbury (1383-1453) (London, 1981), *passim*; E. Bourassin, La France anglaise, 1415-1453 (Paris, 1981), *passim*; J.R. Lander, Government and Community. England 1450-1509 (London, 1980), pp. 179-80, 184-5.

certain in war and few could have seen the future as rosy. But even in this harsher climate the expectation was that the status quo could be maintained, and if this would not benefit profit-seekers of any kind it might still be to the advantage of those who had secured or sought a livelihood in France. Change was not necessarily synonymous with decline, and to land settlers faced by new pressures from diplomacy and war one reaction was to take the longer view, to adapt and to consolidate. Not all were able or willing to do so, but those who remained were surely no less hard-headed, or no more short-sighted, than those who left.

It was the view of Miss Burney that land of all kinds was less in demand after 1435 and that supply was reduced accordingly.¹ Evidence from the Collection Lenoir which was unknown to Burney gives a different view, as Dr. Allmand has shown,² and the addition of this invaluable chambre des comptes material has allowed a revision of the former position. One further corrective needs to be applied. The impression may have been given that grants of land were more numerous after 1436 than under Bedford, which is not the case.³ What we see is an active period of grant-making in 1436 and 1437 which provides an increase in numbers relative to Bedford's final years, before a more stable pattern emerges with comparatively few grants awarded in each year until 1449. Unfortunately there is a lacuna in the Chancellerie records for the last year or so of the English occupation of Paris, and the few details which survive come from across the Channel, most notably the grant made

-
1. Burney, 'English Rule in Normandy', pp. 224, 235.
 2. Allmand, 'Collection of Dom Lenoir', 205-6.
 3. Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 63; Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 465-6.

at Westminster to Edmund Beaufort of the comté of Harcourt on 23 December 1435.¹ The next grant known was dated at Honfleur on 8 June 1436 when John Cherwyn, esquire, was given lands in the bailliages of Rouen and the Caux and elsewhere in Normandy to the value of 300 saluts d'or.²

The number of known grants made in each month is recorded by Appendix VI which may be compared with equivalent Appendices for the reign of Henry V and for the Regency. Overall, grants were fewer in number than for the two earlier periods, although it should be remembered that this information derives from a source which, invaluable as it is, is not a first-hand, official record of land transactions. Lenoir's concern was to gather material for a projected history of Normandy, and he was selective from a mass of documents available. Nor is it likely that all the surviving chambre des comptes material came within his gaze. This may help to explain why so few grants in Maine were recorded, and one similarly suspects that Mantes and the pays de conquête were under-represented as falling beyond the pale of Lenoir's interests.

It is clear that grants of land were more plentiful after 1435 than Appendix VI can demonstrate. A glimpse of what is missing is provided by two folios of an incomplete register of monies collected in 1445, listing some eight Englishmen given rents of land for life or in perpetuity, mostly between February and April.³ Each paid one-tenth of his annual revenue to the collector, the exception being Edmund Mulso,

-
1. Lenoir 75/5; Jones, 'Beaufort Family', pp. 287-8, 317-9. He did not take possession until January 1437.
 2. Lenoir 5/63.
 3. BN, Ms. fr. 26074 nos. 5373, 5374.

esquire, who paid only 25 l.t. on his anticipated revenue of 500 l.t. The locations of these holdings were not specified, although internal evidence suggests the bailliage of the Caux as their most likely siting, and Mulso held the captaincy of Neufchâtel and Lincourt at this date.¹ The fact that nine additional grants were made to eight men in less than a year in only one bailliage indicates that the totals for the Caux may need to be trebled. It may be suggested, tentatively, that many of the figures in Appendix VI need at least to be doubled if all those given rents on specified properties are to be included.

The figures as they stand show the years 1436 and 1437 as the peak period for the distribution of lands, with the months of June and July 1436 being particularly important. 1438, too, saw a respectable number of grants, before the totals fell away between 1439 and 1443. A recovery in 1444 and 1445 was then followed by further decline until May 1447, after which only one grant is known. If the quantity of land grants for each year is put alongside our discussion of contemporary economic conditions, there is a strong correlation between them. The healthy demand of the early years fell away sharply in 1439, when only four awards have been found, before numbers picked up again in the mid 1440s. In terms of their distribution the largest number of grants again fell within the bailliage of Rouen, with the three bailliages of lower Normandy also popular, while areas within or bordering the pays de conquête often formed one part of a grant concentrated elsewhere.

The gap of eight months between September 1445 and May 1446, when no grants are known, and their subsequent paucity, again raises suspicions about the quantity of surviving evidence as a proportion of

1. BN, PO 2080 nos. 10, 12.

the total which existed. While it is unsatisfactory to argue ex silentio, there was no reason why land grants could not be made in modest number well into the late 1440s. The outcry which greeted the surrender of Maine does not suggest that the settlement there or elsewhere was a thing of the past, or even that it was moribund. The last known land grant of the occupation was issued at Caen on 11 December 1449, no less.¹ John Bray received lands in the bailliages of Rouen, Caen and the Cotentin for life to the value of 80 l.t. This startling evidence of the resilience of the settlement, not to mention the optimism of at least one beneficiary, suggests that the confiscation and redistribution of land continued almost literally to the last possible minute.

Although the total area of land within the English obedience was much reduced after 1436, this was partly offset by the return to the royal demesne of Bedford's considerable holdings and of the lands held in dower by Queen Catherine, who died in 1437. The Paris Parlement held that Bedford's territories fell within French jurisdiction and should be forfeit for treason,² but they returned to Henry VI's demesne for later reallocation.³ Similarly Catherine's estates were put back into the king's hands, thereby releasing a large amount of land in the bailliage of Gisors held since 1424 for the crown's use.⁴

-
1. BL, Add. Ms. 27443 no. 104. This grant, which puzzled Gairdner (Paston Letters, ed. Gairdner, i, 96), is found with other contemporary French material in the volumes housing the Paston correspondence.
 2. M.H. Keen, The Laws of War in the Late Middle Ages (London, 1965), pp. 91-2 citing AN, X^{1a} 4799 f. 222.
 3. BN, n. acq. fr. 7628 fos. 119-21 concerns the appointment of Michiel Tostain to exercise royal jurisdiction for La Haye-du-Puits and other Cotentin lordships escheated to the crown on Bedford's death.
 4. Lenoir 5/41.

Quite how valuable this demesne land might be is a question that has legitimately been put,¹ and in terms of quarterly and annual revenue paid into the Rouen chambre the answer is sometimes only a little or nothing at all.² For all the difficulties and hardships involved in its tenure, however, land was too precious a resource to be judged purely in financial terms. It was not given up lightly nor was it distributed carelessly, whether inside or outside the demesne. On 29 August 1437 William Awmoney was given a small grant in the prévôté of Chaumont to the value of 30 l.t., for life only.³ Two weeks later the chambre des comptes requested of the local royal officials a comprehensive assiette, listing not only the revenues of the lands in question but also their location, means of tenure, services owed and monies belonging to others.⁴ Even life-grants of little financial value were viewed by donor and recipient with respect in a litigious age, and the Rouen chambre was a jealous guardian of the crown's rights regardless of the vagaries of war which might affect incoming revenues in the short term.

How important were the appointments of a succession of governors of Normandy and the English dominions in France to the direction and distribution of the land settlement? York's commission on 1 May 1436 included the power to grant lands to a maximum value of 1,000 saluts

-
1. Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 471-2.
 2. 'Rentes et demaines' due in the châtellenie of Vernon for the Easter term of 1446 were not paid because of the war (BL, Add. Ch. 11073).
 3. Lenoir 26/257.
 4. BN, Ms. fr. 26063 no. 3283. Awmoney was to enjoy his revenues while the assiette was in progress provided that the lands were not of the royal demesne, and that he held no previous grant by York's advice.

d'or for life or in tail male,¹ a reasonable figure allowing him to sanction the majority of normal grants but excluding those of major political or strategic significance, which were presumably to remain within the ambit of the King's Council. Of the forty-eight known grantees in the period May 1436-April 1437, some eight were at that date in York's service and are listed in Appendix VII. This figure is based on strict criteria relating personal service to land grants, and should be regarded as a minimum. Arguably it could be increased by including grants to leading figures who were then members of the York circle, or were soon to become so, such as William Lord Fauconberg² and Talbot.³ We may note, too, that at least one grant was issued on York's advice after his commission had technically expired.⁴

The modest distribution of patronage to members of York's household during his first term, for all its small scale, embodied several of the means by which he built a following in France.⁵ The valet de chambre, Robert Martin,⁶ had held the same position under Bedford, following a path taken by a number of the conseillers and senior men of the Regent's household including William Oldhall, himself a grantee

-
1. BN, Ms. fr. 5330 f. 137, printed by Johnson, 'Richard, Duke of York', Appendix B.
 2. The lordship of Rugles, formerly held by Sir William Porter, was worth up to 1,000 saluts d'or, the maximum permitted value (Lenoir 5/93). Fauconberg was a leader of York's 1436 expedition.
 3. Granted an hôtel in Honfleur at an unspecified date in 1436 (Lenoir 26/187).
 4. BL, Add. Ch. 11950, a grant to John Younger on 28 May 1437.
 5. See Griffiths, Reign of Henry VI, pp. 669-72.
 6. Lenoir 5/23, 27/35; below, Appendix V.

in both February and September 1437.¹ York also had his own followers, including his feoffee Richard Dixon,² and attracted others with long service to the Lancastrians behind them, notably Henry Welton.³

There is evidence both within and without the York household that new men were being attracted to the land settlement. This was essential: new blood had to be found if an occupation based on the possession and retention of property was to survive and prosper. Robert Emond, for example, was given a number of fiefs in lower Normandy, worth up to 250 l.t. under the usual conditions applicable at this time.⁴ He was to reside within the English obedience in France or Normandy, and pay one-tenth of his annual income towards the construction of the royal palace at Rouen. The evidence of delays for the performance of services indicates that newcomers did settle and become absorbed into a well-established system of land acquisition and ownership.⁵ Alongside this can be put examples of two points already well familiar. Military service continued to be rewarded, as demonstrated by the grant in June 1436 to Thomas Packington, a foot lance at Pont-de-l'Arche in 1434 and contrôleur of the Honfleur garrison

-
1. BL, Add. Ch. 128; Lenoir 4/401. The barony of Roncheville was again worth up to 1,000 saluts.
 2. Ibid., 22/45-6; Griffiths, Reign of Henry VI, p. 701.
 3. Welton, if we are dealing with the same man, was a grantee under Henry V and was rewarded in January 1425 for services at Verneuil (PRO, C.64/9 m.34; Bréquigny no. 137; Lenoir 21/343). Having taken over some of the lands of Walter Lord FitzWalter, Welton was reportedly in Talbot's service by 1445 (Lenoir 13/163).
 4. Ibid., 3/350.
 5. Emond obtained some houses in Caen from William Morice which were reclaimed by Richard Patry after Emond's death and the English expulsion (ibid., 75/161-2 dated 20 July 1450).

by 1438.¹ Administrators were also likely to prosper. A small life-grant to William Wymyngton may be compared to a more valuable joint award to Thomas Barneby and William Browning,² for Wymyngton and Barneby had first been given property by Henry V. Browning was a royal secretary and notary, Wymyngton an auditor in the chambre des comptes.

Warwick's commission on 16 July 1437 trusted him with the same grant-making authority as York.³ Between November 1437 and April 1439 some twenty-five settlers received lands, of whom five were known Beauchamp men, listed in Appendix VIII. Forming part of the innermost of the concentric circles by which Dr. Carpenter has described the Warwick affinity⁴ these household officials, usually esquires, included William Tempest, given a potentially valuable award scattered across the Norman bailliages,⁵ and William Forsted, whose grant in May 1438 was soon followed by appointment as royal maître des ordonnances.⁶ Another to catch the eye is the long-serving Richard Curson, a settler who held a multitude of offices and who saw service to Talbot and the

-
1. Lenoir 5/79; Eure, II F 4069; BL, Add. Ch. 6922. He also held lands in the bailliage of Caen according to delays issued in 1439 and 1444 (Lenoir 4/311, 211). Two other Packingtons are known, a William in the Bayeux garrison in 1443 (AN, K.67/12/2) and a Nicholas given lands in the same vicomté in 1444 (Lenoir 27/307).
 2. Ibid., 5/5, 67.
 3. Foedera, V, i, 42.
 4. M.C. Carpenter, 'The Beauchamp Affinity: A Study of Bastard Feudalism at Work', E.H.R., xcvi (1980), 515-6.
 5. Lenoir 4/369, a grant worth up to 400 l.t.
 6. Ibid., 4/367; 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), pp. 79-80, 83.

crown as well as Warwick.¹ In their turn these men comprised a small part of the Warwick connection known to have spent time in France, which included William Mountford, Sir William Peyto and John Nanfan, esquire.²

The commission headed by Louis de Luxembourg was given no authority to dispose of confiscations or make alienations from the royal demesne, a position of powerlessness familiar to Luxembourg from the days of the Regency.³ That these were personal responsibilities is shown by John Beaufort's commission with the limited authority to issue grants to a maximum value of 500 l.t., to be ratified by the Grand Conseil within three months.⁴ The single known grant to a member of his household, the usher Thomas Vaughan, is not representative of the extent of the patronage exercised by Beaufort, who was actively making awards in 1440.⁵ At the same time Beaufort himself received the apanage of Saint-Sauveur-Lendelin from the royal demesne to the value of 3,000 saluts d'or, to be held in tail male or until lands of a similar value

-
1. Lenoir 4/351; Marshall, 'English War Captains', pp. 27-30; Pollard, John Talbot, pp. 80-1; Carpenter, 'Political Society', p. 127. Curson was described as a squire of the body in 1446 when given lands in the bailliages of Rouen and Gisors (Lenoir 4/169). In 1455 it was reported that he and his wife, Isabel Godart, had rented a property at Rouen for twenty-three years (75/223).
 2. Mountford is well-documented in Carpenter, 'Political Society', e.g. pp. 44, 50, 70 and Appendices 92, 103, and Carpenter, 'Beauchamp Affinity', passim. Peyto was a life-annuitant of Warwick, with later connections to Talbot and Edmund Beaufort (Carpenter, 'Political Society', pp. 50, 71-2, 79; Pollard, John Talbot, pp. 80-1). Neither is known to have held French land, unlike John Nanfan (below, pp. 174, 176-7).
 3. BL, Add. Ms. 11542 f. 79; Burney, 'English Rule in Normandy', pp. 130-1.
 4. BL, Add. Ms. 11542 fos. 81-2.
 5. Lenoir 26/485; Jones, 'Beaufort Family', pp. 126, 296-7 for other examples.

be assigned.¹ As well as acknowledging his long imprisonment, the preamble emphasised Somerset's lineage and the need to 'maintenir son état', a theme consistent with apanage grants of previous decades. In spite of this consistency of intentions, however, Somerset's letters recognised the difficulty in the 1440s of finding the means to fulfil them. Following a petition in 1443 he was allowed to hold St.-Sauveur without prisee or valuation, in the manner of the duke of Orléans, since the stated annual value was not being reached.²

The reappointment of York as lieutenant-general and governor in France on 2 July 1440 for a term of more than five years brought with it an authority comparable to that of Bedford as Regent rather than to the restricted civil powers exercised by successive governors since 1436.³ In particular, the right to grant lands 'jusques a telle valeur ou Estimacion que bon luy semblera' was a significant concession. Whether a necessary enticement to induce York to serve or, as Professor Griffiths has suggested, one of a number of powers carefully extracted from the king, the commission gave him a free rein to employ confiscations to attract and build up a following with grants for life or to the donee and his legitimate male heirs.

The very limited information which we have as to the direct relationship between personal household service to York and resulting land grants would produce only a short and unrepresentative assessment of the second lieutenancy. This being the case, Appendix IX attempts

-
1. Lenoir 26/441; AN, P 1934⁴ fos. 2v-3; see esp. Jones, 'Beaufort Family', pp. 289-90.
 2. PRO, E.28/73/85.
 3. Foedera, V, i, 85.

to list known members of the York affinity given lands between 1441-5, some seventeen in total. Other names can probably be added and further information will doubtless emerge.¹ Nevertheless, several points already stand out clearly. York made good use of his relative freedom to issue grants without financial or other restrictions. One beneficiary was Sir William Oldhall, whose new lordship of La Ferté-Frênel was worth up to 1,000 l.t.² As the most important member of York's civilian administration, with responsibilities which included that as governor-general of his French estates,³ Oldhall's multiple grants of land and office demonstrate that personal service in the greatest contemporary English household could be well rewarded in the 1440s, as it had been in the 1420s. Continuity with the Bedford era, epitomised by the careers of Oldhall and Talbot and by what were now the standard methods of attraction and reward, needs to be balanced against changes evident in the nature of the patronage disbursed by York and the king. Talbot's terms of tenure of his existing estates were improved,⁴ while Oldhall received a pension worth some 2,000 saluts d'or in October 1444.⁵

-
1. Other lists of the York household are in Johnson, 'Richard, Duke of York', Appendix H and in J.T. Rosenthal, 'The Estates and Finances of Richard, Duke of York (1411-60)', Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History, ii, ed. W. Bowsky (Nebraska, 1965), 179-82.
 2. Lenoir 4/193. This and other lands had previously belonged to Sir John Grey.
 3. BL, Add. Ch. 6970; see also Marshall, 'English War Captains', pp. 56-61.
 4. There was to be no limit on his landed income, no valuation was necessary, and payment towards the construction of the palace at Rouen was remitted for a once-only fee of 100 saluts (Lenoir 27/211-2).
 5. BL, Add. Ch. 147.

York could not rely on the great names of the past alone, and new and lesser men duly benefited. Arriving in France for the first time in 1441, Edmund Mulso was rewarded the following year and in 1445;¹ further down the household scale Robert, son and heir of the Welshman Griffith Don, took up service with York along with his father's lands.² That personal servants earned landed opportunities echoes the wide-ranging Bedford household settlement but, as far as is known, York did not distribute grants to his followers in similar numbers to Bedford. Set alongside Warwick and the two Beauforts, York seems to have made greater efforts to distribute largesse to existing settlers and new men. In the changed economic conditions of the 1440s, however, with land less readily available and, perhaps, less in demand, there could be no return to the generous hand-outs of the Regency. Moreover, it is probable that the restriction dating from the later Regency of Bedford on multiple awards to one individual remained in force, and would be upheld by the chambre des comptes as a check on the favouring of a minority. It should be emphasised that a number of men prominent in York's household and administration in the 1440s, John Clay, William Minors and Sir Walter Devereux among them, are not known to have received lands from him.³

Among the largest single beneficiaries of this second term of office were York and his son; The grant of the comtés of Evreux and Beaumont-le-Roger and the vicomtés of Orbec, Conches and Breteuil was

-
1. Lenoir 4/249; BN, Ms. fr. 26074 no. 5373; Marshall, 'English War Captains', pp. 61-5.
 2. Lenoir 4/191.
 3. For Clay and Minors see Pollard, John Talbot, pp. 79-81; for Devereux see Griffiths, Reign of Henry VI, pp. 671-2.

on paper an award worthy of the duke's position.¹ These lands had once belonged to the duke of Clarence in part, and had since been carefully guarded by the crown to prevent their diminution.² In 1444 as in 1418 they formed part of the frontier of the occupation, but the emphasis now was very much on their defence and careful management. As John Beaufort had also found, even major owners could not expect the revenues reaching their coffers to match the theoretical value of holdings. York gained for himself the profits of the gabelles, quatrièmes, tailles and other monies, as well as confiscations normally forfeit to the crown, but how were his garrison wages then to be paid? The king's officers managed to secure half the revenues of the tailles and octrois for this purpose, but the dispute indicates how revenues were being squeezed and privileges bartered.³ The point is also relevant to the grant to York's son, Edmund earl of Rutland, of the lordship of Saint-Sauveur-Lendelin on 31 May 1444. Anticipated annual revenues of 3,000 saluts d'or were again not realised, and it was necessary to concede income from church patronnages and from wardships customarily reserved to the crown.⁴

Outside the York circle lands were redistributed within all the Norman bailliages, and sometimes in Maine, in numbers that were modest

-
1. The grant was made by 4 December 1444 (Lenoir 4/207). See also H. de Frondeville, 'La Vicomté d'Orbec pendant l'occupation anglaise (1417-1449)' and 'Le Compte de Jean le Muet, vicomte d'Orbec, pour la saint-Michel, 1444', Études Lexoviennes, iv (1936), 1-328.
 2. BL, Add. Ch. 11950. The vicomte of Auge was instructed to ensure that none of the Clarence lands was included in John Younger's grant in 1437.
 3. Lenoir 27/463.
 4. AN, P 1934⁴ fos. 3-5v.

yet persistent. Life-grants and awards in tail male were issued in roughly equal proportions by York, and indeed during the post-1435 period generally, and while exceptions certainly exist it would seem that grants for life were commonly of less value. That to Henry Bray of properties in the bailliage of Rouen was typical in that it was worth only 20 l.t. a year,¹ the same value as the lordship of St. Anastase in the bailliage of Alençon held by John Stain.² Such grants cannot be written off as worthless even in 1444. Stain found that his lordship might produce more than was thought, and asked to farm the surplus of up to 16 l.t. on paying a higher rent to the crown.³ The sums may be small, but the extra revenue probably made all the difference in the world to individual livelihood. Nor had the settlement lost the flexibility which had previously characterised it. In September 1444 two settlers took over the lands of three deceased Englishmen in at least five bailliages, and in January of the same year two esquires, Edmund Goldington and John Winslow, were jointly awarded for their lives property held by listed rebels in perpetuity.⁴

In a draft indenture drawn up in March 1443,⁵ John Beaufort obtained the significant concession of the right to dispose of territory which he could win from the enemy,

'and applique hem to hymself and his herres or yeve hem to what other persones that hym lust and to her herres masles'.

1. Lenoir 27/343.

2. AN, Q¹ 880; Lenoir 27/291.

3. Ibid., 27/447.

4. Ibid., 27/355, 303-4.

5. PRO, E.101/71/4/916; Jones, 'John Beaufort', 91.

The crown was therefore prepared to sacrifice potential demesne revenues to be won in the 1443 expedition and to entrust in Beaufort quite considerable rights of disposal. That the expedition realised none of the hopes held of it does not detract from the view that magnate service in this later period was being won at some cost to domanial income. As captain-general and governor of Maine from March 1438, Edmund Beaufort was allowed to make small grants from reversions to the demesne, and Dr. Jones has shown that he did so, to the household serviteur John Maydston among others.¹

There is no reason to believe that Edmund Beaufort abused this authority, and the terms of his major award of the comté of Maine on 19 July 1442 explicitly recognised long service in the governance of Anjou and Maine without adding restrictions to it.² In some ways the responsible distribution of landed patronage at a local level by either Dorset or Somerset was not undesirable, and the presence of an overseer to hear complaints and protect crown interests on the frontier was an attractive proposition. The problem was that a magnate such as Edmund Beaufort was essentially itinerant, and more important was faced by a conflict of interests between the needs of his own affinity for a valued commodity upon which individual livelihood as well as allegiance could well depend, and an awareness that excessive favouring of his own men might prompt further charges of a lack of opportunity for advancement, as had happened in the late 1420s. Moreover, the creation of a parallel system of grant-making was sure to create administrative

1. Jones, 'Beaufort Family', pp. 99-102.

2. BN, n. acq. fr. 3642 no. 804; see Jones, 'Beaufort Family', pp. 291-2, 334-7 for discussion of this important grant.

problems, and we know that it did,¹ and would compromise the ability of a future lieutenant-general to direct a single, undivided policy in the Bedford manner. Independent authority undermined the carefully delimited powers of successive governors of Lancastrian Normandy to distribute land to a certain value, and York's probable consternation at Somerset's 1443 commission may have reflected a concern at the civil authority extracted from the king as well as a justifiable nervousness about the military implications of the appointment.

York's commission as lieutenant-general technically expired at the end of September 1445, although it has been suggested that he remained in office in November 1446,² and he was succeeded on 24 December 1446 by Edmund Beaufort, who did not take over in France until March 1448. In the interim, Appendix VI shows that grants were issued during 1446 and the first half of the following year, some for life and some in tail male and mostly for rents of small value. Dom Lenoir does not tell us much about the authority by which letters were issued, but at least one grant, that to Fulk Eyton on 25 July 1446, referred specifically to the council for the government of France and Normandy in York's absence.³ It seems likely that this council had a

-
1. The intention was that grants should be confirmed by the king and registered in the chambre des comptes. John Nanfan, esquire, confessed that he had not so proceeded and renounced his claim in favour of another settler (Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1439-40, sub 28 August 1439).
 2. Professor Griffiths has not distinguished York in his official capacity from York as a private landlord. The reference (Griffiths, Reign of Henry VI, pp. 505-6 n. 132) to BN, Ms. fr. 7629 f. 297 (wrongly given as 7692) can be supplemented by others dated 13 July 1447 and 11 September 1448, all concerned with the management and defence of York's French lands (BN, n. acq. fr. 1482 nos. 186, 189).
 3. Lenoir 28/11.

limited right to deal with reversions, as in this instance, and confiscations, as part of its routine business. Formal matters required letters patent direct from the king, and it was thus that a grant from the royal demesne was made to Andrew Trollope in May 1447,¹ and John Salvain and his wife were given special dispensation to dispose of their properties.²

Almost nothing is known of land grants by Edmund Beaufort during the last two years of the English occupation. The last-gasp award to John Bray in December 1449 was made on Beaufort's advice,³ and it may well be that others were issued alongside the delays for the performance of services which bear dates well into 1449.⁴ By this date, however, settlers were more concerned to salvage something from the wreckage of Lancastrian France, and since compensation was a lifeline only for the privileged, the majority were left to sink or swim as best they could. Some went with the tide, and it is now recognised that a number of settlers opted to stay behind, 'demourer et estre bon Franchois' in the chronicler's phrase.⁵ Charles VII had made express provision for this eventuality in the terms agreed for the surrender of Maine, and a clause to this effect was commonly inserted into the appointements agreed for

-
1. Ibid., 28/157; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 71. Trollope later served under Somerset as captain at Calais, and perished at Towton in 1461 on the Lancastrian side (Marshall, 'English War Captains', pp. 189-92; Griffiths, Reign of Henry VI, pp. 822, 874).
 2. Lenoir 28/147.
 3. Above, p. 162.
 4. Lenoir 28/197, 199, dated July 1449.
 5. Chronique de Mathieu d'Escouchy, ed. G. du Fresne de Beaucourt (3 vols., S.H.F., Paris, 1863-4), i, 210. Settlers known to have remained in France are listed by Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 80.

the surrender of Norman towns.¹ The majority fled and were dispossessed, losing lands, revenues and titles in the manner in which they had been won, by force of arms.

Links forged over several decades and generations were not suddenly broken. A few settlers clung on to letters of grant and estate documents,² while others left behind them pious bequests, tangible evidence of participation in an Anglo-French society. Margaret, daughter and part-heir of Sir Walter Cotford and his wife Alice, sold the héritages, rents and possessions held by herself and her sister in Caen to Jean Nicholas. The Frenchman promised to say a requiem mass every week for a year in memory of Alice.³

The argument advanced in this chapter has been that the settlement after Bedford's death was of a scale and a vitality which was all the more remarkable given the difficult military, diplomatic and economic conditions in which it operated. None could deny that the reduced amount of land available, and its lower potential worth as reflected in the small sums of rent accorded to grantees, made tenure unattractive in the short term, and some new and sometimes desperate measures had at times to be adopted in order sufficiently to entice and reward men in the royal service. Demesne revenues were sacrificed to this end, and in the cases of John Nanfan, esquire, and Thomas Lord Scales, among others, assignments were made of annual sums to be

-
1. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [613], [715].
 2. Manuscripts relating to the Curwen lordship of Cany may have found their way to Cumberland in this way (Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 55. n. 15).
 3. Calvados, Tabellionnage de Caen 7E 91, f. 121v, dated 12 January 1450.

collected from reversions.¹ Household service remained among the surest routes to individual advancement, and one would emphasise here the fluidity of such connections. Members of households other than those mentioned are known to have held lands, including retainers of the dukes of Gloucester and Stafford,² and settlers can be detected moving between the great and the royal households.³ Within this pattern of continuity and change, settlers remained to the bitter end. This view can be set beside that of Dr. Curry, who argues that a reluctance to serve or a manpower shortage were far less instrumental in the loss of Lancastrian Normandy than confused objectives and sheer disorganization.⁴

The flight from Normandy afforded a sorry spectacle, as Fastolf had predicted it would,⁵ and one account described the scene in Cheapside in August 1450 as former soldiers and settlers passed through laden with armour, bedding and household goods.⁶ In Somerset, indulgences were granted to those giving goods to two men reduced to

-
1. Nanfan claimed war expenses of 9,000 saluts and a ransom of 15,000 saluts, and was granted one-tenth of this sum, 1,600 saluts, from the revenues of confiscations and reversions (Lenoir 26/321-2). Scales held a similar right to the value of 2,000 saluts (26/389).
 2. Ibid., 4/277, a delay to John Skelton; 26/211, a delay to Thomas Scudamore.
 3. The Warwick servant William Tempest had joined Gloucester's household by June 1440 (ibid., 4/277), and Curson and Nanfan both served the king (5/73; 27/167; above, pp. 166-7).
 4. Curry, 'Military Organization', pp. 109, 311-24.
 5. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [726]; Wolffe, Henry VI, pp. 211-2.
 6. Six Town Chronicles of England, ed. R. Flenley (Oxford, 1911), p. 134.

poverty after long service in the king's wars.¹ The most striking testimony to the successful integration of Englishmen into Norman communities is provided by petitions to the crown in the 1450s, often for provision against the 1455 Act of Resumption. Robert Broke claimed household service to Henry V and Henry VI over thirty-six years or more,² while William Eryngton, esquire, sought favour for twenty years' service,³

'and in recompence of ye grete lostes yt he suffred as well in his lyfelode as in godes meovables in the losyng of youre Duchie of Normandy'.

The sense of anger and disillusionment felt at the cession of Maine was amplified at the loss of Normandy, which supported still more livelihoods in the form of offices and lands.⁴ Henry V had surely hoped to marry together lands and people in a lasting settlement, and had the perpetuation of that belief by his successors not been so well achieved, the abrupt abandonment of material possessions and livelihoods might have been easier to bear.

-
1. The Register of Thomas Bekynton, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1443-1465, ed. H.C. Maxwell-Lyte and M.C.B. Dawes (2 vols., Somerset Record Society, 1934-5), i, 155.
 2. PRO, S.C.8/28/1372. Other relevant petitions survive in this series.
 3. Ibid., S.C.8/28/1374A. See Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 76-8 for discussion of the important question of livelihood.
 4. Matthew Gough's response was violent. He stole money and sacred objects from the Cathedral chapter at Bayeux and threatened to set on fire the town's suburbs (F. Neveux, 'Les Marginaux et le clergé dans la ville et le diocèse de Bayeux au XIV^e et XV^e siècles', Marginalité, déviance, pauvreté en France XIV^e-XIX^e siècles (Caen, 1981), p. 36).

CHAPTER FOUR

THE URBAN SETTLEMENT 1417-50

(i) Settlement by Henry V 1417-22

The only caveat which need preface these pages is to reiterate a point made above about the division of rural and urban properties. Such a separation is convenient but perhaps unrealistic, both in terms of initial grants and their subsequent tenure. It is worth stressing that there were overlaps in personnel between the two, and common expectations and attitudes evident throughout the period. Yet it would be unwise to deny that the towns of Normandy offered a distinctive experience to settlers, and this chapter aims to assess what attracted and kept within them both the soldiers and non-combatants revealed in the sources to be residents rather than visitors.

The principal evidence for the first section is that of the Norman Rolls, to which the Calendars do not do justice. There remains scope for a study in greater detail than space allows here of the quantity, nature, distribution and value of the properties allocated by Henry V. The second section concentrates on the settlement at Rouen, using the remarkably rich and voluminous Tabellionnage registers for which there is no precise English equivalent, and the third section again uses notarial records to stress the extent of settler integration locally.¹

1. A. Barabé, Recherches historiques sur le tabellionnage royal, principalement en Normandie (Rouen, 1863), pp. 132-5.

Rouen has been chosen as a point of comparison and contrast to recent work by Dr. Allmand on Caen.¹ Throughout, the emphasis lies on the assimilation of two nationalities: the term 'community' is in danger of overuse, but comes closest to describing the personal, family and tenurial bonds linking societies one to another over several decades and generations in Norman towns.

The context of the initial urban settlement is that of the terms of surrender negotiated between victor and defeated, terms which themselves depended upon the means of capture. As the inhabitants of Caen knew only too well, a different fate under the law of arms awaited a town taken by assault from one agreeing a surrender.² Those who survived the storming and its aftermath were offered a simple choice of swearing allegiance or leaving, causing some French historians to write of wholesale expulsions and the desire to establish at Caen an English colony on the model of Calais.³ Such was neither the intention nor the consequence. Some left and others stayed, and against the migration of the native population should be put the installation of a permanent garrison and, significantly, the arrival of civilians and non-combatants whose numbers it was hoped to increase. The duke of Clarence wrote accordingly to the City of London that,

'ne n'est nécessité par dessa du chose du monde,
fors que de gentz pur peuplier et garder les dictes
villes et forteresses'.⁴

-
1. Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, Chapter IV.
 2. Keen, Laws of War, pp. 119-23; St. Albans Chronicle, ed. Galbraith, pp. 111-114.
 3. Notably L. Puiseux, 'Prise de Caen par les Anglais en 1417', M.S.A.N., 3^e série, xxii (1856), 459.
 4. Delpit, Collection générale, pp. 220-1.

The appointement was, however, only the first stage in an administrative procedure which became more complex as additional territories were brought into obedience. Oaths of allegiance were sworn and then recorded, letters of safe conduct were issued and registered as a further step towards the separation of those townspeople sworn as subjects of the English king from those declared to be absent or in rebellion. This was still far from sufficient. It then became essential to determine the possession of urban properties in the same way as it became necessary for the baillis and vicomtes to establish the ownership, value and method of tenure of rural fiefs and lordships. For grants of town properties, as those of rural lands, began within weeks of the landing at Touques on 1 August 1417, and from the outset it was vital that the details of these transactions were recorded for future reference. Moreover, the king himself began to take an interest in certain properties and in particular districts of towns for purposes which were not always revealed. On 12 April 1418 a mandate was widely published that all persons holding property worth 60 l.t. or less and swearing fealty to Henry V should enjoy their tenure as they had prior to the English landing, making the exception of those holding property in Caen and excluding the houses, lands and rents of the tower and faubourgs of Falaise, 'que nous Retenons à nous pour en faire nostre plaisir'.¹

The examples of Caen, Bayeux and Falaise show in broad terms how conquered towns began to be assimilated into an intended settlement, which was something rather different. The royal administration moved from general and non-specific confirmations of past privileges towards

1. PRO, C.64/9 m.28d; Foedera, IV, iii, 47. Instructions were to be proclaimed in both French and English.

a more precise definition of individual obligations and responsibilities and then towards a direct involvement in the government and management of towns, and in particular those centres of strategic importance whose defence was a prime consideration. The reservation of certain areas and of selected properties suggests that an appreciation of the value of demesne holdings and of their potential future uses was as much a feature of the Henrician urban settlement as it was of its rural counterpart. The apportioning of property to the royal demesne, following the negotiation of the terms of surrender of Norman towns, forms the backcloth to the distribution of urban properties to settlers and sworn, loyal subjects, a process which began slowly but which gathered momentum with the advance of the English armies.

The conquest of lower Normandy was marked by a cautious allocation of town properties. Just as the rural settlement bore the hallmarks of a careful and planned distribution of lands based upon the defensive requirements of the invading armies, so the early settlement in towns was designed to meet the exigencies of a takeover of civic government and administration. Robert Spellowe, appointed bailli of Harfleur on 16 September 1417, was granted a house there the following day,¹ and received further grants of lands in April 1419² and of properties in February 1420³ within or close to the town. His was the first town grant to be made on the 1417 expedition, and as Appendix X shows, there were few others within the first nine months of the English landing. There were several reasons for this.

-
1. Hardy, pp. 164-5.
 2. PRO, C.64/11 m.36; D.K.R., xli, 788.
 3. PRO, C.64/12 m.22; D.K.R., xlii, 345.

First, the attempt by Clarence to attract colonists to Caen was not successful. We have no evidence of settlers arriving in France for this specific purpose, and indeed no evidence that there was an intention to build up an exclusively English settlement there or elsewhere within Normandy after 1417. Since there was no influx of settlers, grants could at first be made only to members of the 1417 expedition, either soldiers or non-combatants. Soldiers were urgently needed for the field armies and to form garrisons in towns as they were captured, and they were not as yet permitted to take up residence in towns themselves.

This left the non-combatants. They can be divided for convenience according to recorded occupation. Sir Robert Babthorpe and Sir John Rochevale were respectively controller and treasurer of the royal hospices, and each received a house in Caen on the same day.¹ John Hethe and Richard Sturgeon, royal clerks, were each awarded a house in Caen on or next to the town bridge in the parish of St. Pierre conveniently close to their place of employment at the royal chancery within the castle walls.² Housed nearby was the chambre des comptes, presided over by Sir John Tiptoft³ and employing William FitzHarry among its ushers,⁴ and both were given property in Caen. As well as the administrators working in the town that was for a time the centre of English government in Normandy, Caen housed members of the royal household including James Tournour and Nicholas Neuton, servants of the

1. Hardy, p. 269, dated 12 February 1418.

2. Ibid., pp. 260-1.

3. Ibid., pp. 205-6; Wylie and Waugh, iii, 248-50. Tiptoft was granted a manor on 21 March 1418 (PRO, C.64/9 m.33; D.K.R., xli, 685).

4. PRO, C.64/9 m.25; D.K.R., xli, 689.

royal larder,¹ and it was to there that commanders of the rank of Clarence² and the earl of Warwick³ went to conduct their official business, for which they required a residence befitting their status and position.

Caen was very much the focus of the allocation of urban properties, and it was the town's function as a port and distributive centre which attracted another group worthy of consideration. Merchants were quick to seize the opportunities presented by successful warfare. Richard Torre, victualler, Philip Maidstone, merchant and victualler, and Thomas Bonneville, merchant, all received houses in May 1418, by which time much of lower Normandy was under English control.⁴ Between May and July a number of their fellow-traders became property owners in Harfleur, still very much a fortress within hostile territory. Maidstone and Bonneville were again beneficiaries of a redistribution of properties which included a number of houses which must have been readily identifiable to contemporaries.⁵ The house 'ubi Delphinus habetur insignum' was given to William Barrys, and other properties bore the colourful signs of a horn, a cock and a red rose.⁶ A few settlers were granted houses elsewhere in the bailliage of Caen, including William Aylestone who accepted a house at Bayeux to complement his existing landholdings at Sully and Vaucelles to the west of the town.⁷

-
1. PRO, C.64/9 m.24; Bréquigny no. 202; see below, Appendix III.
 2. Hardy, p. 249.
 3. PRO, C.64/9 m.40; Bréquigny no. 78.
 4. PRO, C.64/9 mm.32, 26, 30; Bréquigny nos. 160, 178, 177.
 5. PRO, C.64/9 mm.23, 28; Bréquigny nos. 187, 172.
 6. PRO, C.64/9 mm.5, 23, 22; D.K.R., xli, 691.
 7. Hardy, p. 265; PRO, C.64/9 m.8; Bréquigny no. 234.

The intentions of these initial grants were to reward the non-combatants accompanying the 1417 expedition who had been appointed to official positions within the government and administration, and to attract to Normandy civilians who would make a positive contribution to the maintenance of the conquest as it progressed. A further benefit of civilian residence was that the requirement common to their grants to perform the guet or guard duty by night would add, it was hoped to some considerable degree, to the security of the town. Soldiers, on the other hand, could not be spared from the field armies. Even after the fall of Rouen when grants of lands to men-at-arms were plentiful, there was no corresponding upsurge in the granting of town properties.

Appendix X reveals the paucity of grants issued during the first eleven months of 1419, with Harfleur the most popular location and one grant made at Caudebec.¹ The fall of Rouen occasioned only three known grants in the city including one to Sir Walter Beauchamp, appointed bailli of Rouen on 19 January 1419 and given a valuable house suited to his position later that month.² If the city itself did not open its doors to settlers, yet its capture and the subjection of the Caux may perhaps have triggered the increase in the number of grants made at Harfleur, which began suddenly on 15 December 1419. From that date until the second half of 1421 grants of houses at Harfleur were made in considerable number, and constitute the major proportion of all grants issued until the death of Henry V.

-
1. The house distinguished by the sign of a sword was given to William FitzHarry on 4 May 1419 (PRO, C.64/11 m.60; Bréquigny no. 835).
 2. PRO, C.64/10 m.39; D.K.R., xli, 724-5. This house on the rue Grand Pont was worth up to 20 l.t. per year.

For the cause of the increase there is need to go back to 21 March 1419 when Sir Hugh Luterell, lieutenant of Harfleur,¹ was empowered to grant,

'domos et terram vacuam infra villam predictam
quibuscumque ligeis regni nostri Anglie qui villam
inhabitare voluerint pro se et heredibus suis
imperpetuum'.²

It is clear, however, that in the four months following the issue of this authority little use was made of it, and that the attempt to attract settlers to the town was a failure. In response, the king wrote directly to Luterell, Thomas Barneby and Simon Fleet, respectively treasurer and controller of the town to renew, extend and render more precise that authority.³ Between the initial authorisation and the issue of more detailed instructions Luterell was appointed seneschal of Normandy,⁴ and this authority together with a greater familiarity with the administration and layout of the town raised the tempo of settlement. The Public Record Office preserves a list of quarterly sums paid by thirty-five settlers into the town accounts for the rent of Harfleur properties.⁵ Some were soldiers, one a tailor, and one came from Winchelsea; they rented properties for periods between one and four years and undertook to perform night watch and to maintain their possessions.

Taking only one name from the register, the London mercer John

-
1. Appointed 20 June 1417 (PRO, C.76/109 m.14; D.K.R., xliv, 597).
 2. PRO, C.64/11 m.81; D.K.R., xli, 762.
 3. PRO, C.64/11 m.23d; Bréquigny no. 640, dated 26 July 1419.
 4. Newhall, English Conquest, p. 244.
 5. PRO, E.101/48/7, fos. 1-5v.

Otterbourne, given two tenements in December 1419, and another in 1421 as well as a ruined house, it is clear that multiple occupancy was common.¹ Allocations proceeded apace from December 1419, despite the problem of damage to domestic buildings which had persisted since the 1415 siege,² to the benefit of another holding several properties, Thomas Fekenham,³ appointed controller of the royal salt garner at Harfleur the previous month. Taking a house enabled him to settle, to augment his holdings and take up another appointment locally.⁴ The tenure of property was also a source of income, and this may be considered the main motive underlying settlers' willingness to take up a house or, as happened in many cases, an assortment of houses, tenements and vacant plots. Rents on town properties were carefully assessed and recorded, and even vacant plots were allocated some revenue; the tenement granted to William Bell in the rue des Billettes in Harfleur owed 13s. 4d. per year and two nights' watch and guard duty, and his vacant land on the rue Colyn Sery owed 12d. rent and half a night's watch.⁵ It was income from rent which attracted immigrants to Norman towns in large numbers: houses were rented or leased to other Englishmen or Normans by those who held multiple grants of properties, and by the itinerants whose official duties prevented their permanent residence

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.3; C.64/15 m.30; Bréquigny nos. 704, 902.
 2. Gesta, p. 38; Foedera, IV, ii, 152 for instructions to the mason, John Colchester, to take lath-layers and tilers to Harfleur to repair its walls, houses and buildings.
 3. PRO, C.64/11 m.3; C.64/16 m.3; Bréquigny nos. 704, 1068.
 4. D.K.R., xlii, 330. By 1 September 1422 he was vicomte of Montivilliers (Lenoir 3/324).
 5. PRO, C.64/12 m.3; Bréquigny no. 747. Alternatively, each tenement and plot granted could be assessed as one unit (PRO, C.64/12 m.13; Bréquigny nos. 764, 747).

in one location.¹

Contemporary chronicles reported widely Henry V's intention to 'stuff' Harfleur with Englishmen in 1415.² It was published that free habitation was available in perpetuity in the town to those who would go and settle there.³ On the French side it was held that a foreign enclave was to be established and that documents, charters and letters of privilege were publicly burned to mark the beginning of a new order.⁴ In practice such ordinances may have been honoured more in the breach than the observance. It was one thing to forbid hereditary tenure by natives but quite another to prevent their acquisition of any rights or interests in property. Nor was housing free: the crown demanded rents, guard duty and in some cases the erection of new buildings or the maintenance of existing ones. If Harfleur began its new life as an English garrison or fortress it did not continue it on those strict terms but developed its existing strengths as a Norman town, and was none the less successful in attracting settlers.

The ownership of urban properties held clear attractions for

-
1. William Alington and Simon Fleet travelled extensively in royal service and with Luterell and Barneby enjoyed Harfleur properties (PRO, C.64/12 m.18; C.64/13 m.28; Bréquigny nos. 738, 813).
 2. Brut, ii, 377; Chronicon Adae de Usk A.D. 1377-1421, ed. and trans. E.M. Thompson (second edn., London, 1904), p. 126; Elmham, Vita et Gesta, p. 366.
 3. Calendar of Letter - Book I, ed. Sharpe, p. 159; Wylie and Waugh, ii, 60-1.
 4. E. Dumont and A. Leger, Histoire de la ville d'Harfleur (Le Havre, 1868), p. 19; F. Blanchet, 'Harfleur du début de la guerre de Cent Ans à la fondation du Havre', École Nationale des Chartes: Positions des thèses (1929), 40.

craftsmen, traders and office-holders. Residence in Harfleur or Caen was safer than in the plat pays; lives and possessions were protected by walls, defences and garrison from the ravages of armies or brigands. Rents were comparatively easy to collect and were less susceptible to the fluctuations of harvest and climate which characterised certain rural fiefs. Town life was a shared, collective experience, conducive to the establishment of business contacts and personal friendships within and between nationalities which could and did prove valuable and lasting.

To some, towns meant opportunities for social advancement, and property ownership was certainly one means of access to both the wider commercial life of a town and to its government. These prospects may not have been so readily available within the more rigid guild and political structures of certain English towns of the early fifteenth century. At Bristol, for example, land was described as 'almost the only practicable form of investment', but it was not an investment open to all. The men who were purchasing property, including the celebrated William Canynge the younger with fourteen shops and at least seventeen tenements, belonged to that élite of merchants from whom the city's mayors were chosen.¹ It is difficult to assess whether a more open commercial and political structure acted as an incentive to disaffected Englishmen to settle in French towns, or whether their involvement in civic life at Rouen and elsewhere was more a collective reaction to beneficial circumstances. What can be said is that the urban environment was certainly favourable to those intent on bettering themselves by supplying the demands of town and garrison for food, drink and

1. E.M. Carus-Wilson, 'The Overseas Trade of Bristol in the Fifteenth Century', Medieval Merchant Venturers. Collected Studies (London, 1954), p. 79.

munitions, for example. The London mercer John Barbour, John Edward, a mariner from Barnstaple and John Croke, barber, had a common interest in the varied resources which Harfleur could offer, and as townsmen themselves would again become part of an urban culture which, although French, would not be unfamiliar to them.¹

To these opportune conditions for settlement must be added the greater security which the capture of Rouen and the Caux had brought to upper Normandy, and the fact that both Caen and Harfleur were safely distant from the military operations of 1420 in the Seine valley. By far the largest number of grants between 15 December 1419 and April 1420 were of properties in Harfleur, where a sizeable English community became established. At Caen awards were scarce until 10 April 1420 when thirty-three men were rewarded on the same day, but in both towns numbers of grants were much thinner between April 1420 and January 1421. Those issued elsewhere, notably in the ports of Normandy, suggest that the urban settlement was becoming more widespread. On 4 January 1420 Thomas Arblaster was given lands and goods in Dieppe which had been forfeit to the crown, worth up to sixty francs per year and owing 4d. in rent and the performance of the guet in the town.² Cherbourg became the home of a merchant community during 1420 which included the vintner John Litolton, the victualler Richard Boutler and the merchant Thomas Hywey.³ In addition Thomas Roley, a soldier of the garrison,

1. PRO, C.64/12 m.48; C.64/11 m.4; C.64/13 m.29; Bréquigny nos. 705, 704, 789.
2. PRO, C.64/12 m.49; D.K.R., xlii, 334. He was a former captain of Dieppe by 1422 (Gallia regia, ii, 67).
3. PRO, C.64/12 m.13; C.64/14 m.20; Bréquigny nos. 771, 886. Hywey was given a house on the rue du Château and a garden nearby, 'una cum quodam vacuo humo in humfreystrete', which he was obliged to build on before Michaelmas following.

was granted a house there¹ in open contravention of a mandate forbidding garrison soldiers from taking up quarters in towns.²

One of the intriguing questions to be asked of the urban settlement concerns its relationship with garrison service. For Harfleur at least it is possible to show this connection at work. The muster roll of its captain, Sir Ralph Cromwell, dated 9 June 1421, records the names of forty men-at-arms and 120 archers.³ Among the men-at-arms were the following:- William Bell, John Lymbury, Robert Stokes, Ralph Trenewith, Henry Kilkenny, William Somercotes, Henry Ledbetter, William Fynbarowe, Thomas Brailes and John Yonge. All were given houses in Harfleur by Henry V. Somercotes, for example, was rewarded on three occasions with houses, ruined tenements and vacant plots, all of which were assessed for the rent and guet which they owed. Yonge was to repair his houses within fourteen months of the date of the grant, and none was to sell property to any but Englishmen without special licence.⁴ Harfleur was first and foremost a military settlement and the craftsmen, traders and office-holders who chose to live there with these men-at-arms owed their livelihoods directly to the garrison forces. To the soldier rents and property, even in poor condition, meant revenue, potential revenue and opportunity: military success had earned not the traditional spoils of war but a source of living and a potential investment in the future of Lancastrian France.

-
1. PRO, C.64/12 m.13; D.K.R., xlii, 350.
 2. Issued on 27 August 1419 (PRO, C.64/11 m.25d; Bréquigny no. 648).
 3. PRO, E.101/50/9.
 4. E.g. PRO, C.64/11 mm.23, 4; C.64/15 m.11; Bréquigny nos. 657, 704, 965.

It will be shown that some of the men named above grasped the rewards offered by a long-term settlement, and were to be found living in Harfleur and other towns much later.

The size and nature of the English presence locally varied according to the other functions of the particular town. At Caen, office-holders seem to have formed the largest single group known to hold property, whether in civilian or military service.¹ Harfleur was home to a good number of craftsmen such as John Clerk 'cementarius' and the mason Thomas Kentbury,² whilst both towns had encouraged merchant residence from an early date. Along with soldiers these four groups formed the largest elements within an urban settlement well established by the end of 1420, and there were no great changes to this social structure during the lifetime of Henry V. January 1421 brought a fresh burst of grant-making at Caen and Harfleur, the numbers for this one month being greater than those for the rest of the year.

It was not uncommon for grantees to acquire holdings in both towns, as did the merchant Philip Maidstone who added a house at Harfleur to his property at Caen,³ but local responsibilities tended to cause a concentration of activities in one area alone. Thomas Haidon was the receveur des quatrièmes for the vicomté of Caen, outside the town, when granted two tenements in Harfleur in January 1420.⁴ Further

-
1. Sir William Breton, captain and bailli of Caen, received several grants of houses there (PRO, C.64/11 m.2; C.64/14 m.16; C.64/16 m.32; Bréquigny nos. 705, 863, 999).
 2. PRO, C.64/12 m.9 dated 16 February 1420 not 16 March as D.K.R., xlii, 351.
 3. PRO, C.64/14 m.9; Bréquigny no. 902.
 4. PRO, E.101/187/14 f. 11; C.64/12 m.35; Bréquigny no. 738.

grants in April 1420 and January 1421 to himself and his wife Katherine were located in Caen,¹ where he was subsequently appointed louvétier and sergeant and where he seems to have settled.² Haidon may well have rented out his houses in Harfleur as an additional source of income to supplement the wages of his various offices. Settlers could be versatile and mobile, making the most of the prospects which towns presented as sources of regular income, earning their livings with the assistance of a share-out of urban properties designed to be attractive to a wide range of social and occupational groups.³

This income could come directly from rents for houses not in frequent use by the grantee, or indirectly as property held at a low rent from the crown and owing the performance of certain duties, property which might elsewhere prove expensive if it were obtainable at all. Furthermore if, as seems likely, individual settlers were able to exercise some freedom in the choice of holdings which they wished to be allocated to them, the careful selection of a favourable location for the performance of a particular trade or craft could prove highly beneficial. It was surely not by coincidence that the barber Roger Mot was granted the house of Guillaume du Mount, barber, and of Maître Ralph, a cordwainer of Harfleur.⁴ A house standing empty because a French craftsman previously resident had left voluntarily,

-
1. PRO, C.64/13 mm.15-14; C.64/15 m.20; Bréquigny nos. 809, 902.
 2. D.K.R., xlii, 409, 429. In 1430 he was discharged from office as élu at Caen because he could not do the job while acting as garrison contrôleur there (BL, Add. Ch. 6846).
 3. Haidon's widow, Katherine Bourlay, was living in Caen in 1437 when she farmed to John Stratton, esquire, an hôtel or manor with a court and garden for 20 l.t. and a once-only payment of 100 l.t. (Calvados, Tabellionnage d'Argences 7E 5 (1), f. 69).
 4. PRO, C.64/12 m.23; D.K.R., xlii, 344.

had been expelled or killed, might be taken over by a settler with like skills and with similar requirements in terms of location and proximity to a busy thoroughfare, wharves, or a good water supply. A bowyer, such as William Crouchon,¹ had much to gain from living close to other bowyers in a property which would at the same time allow him to live and to make and display his products for sale.

A strong suggestion of participation in retail trade is provided by the grant to Stephen Miller of three houses and 'unam shopam' in Caen on 22 November 1421. The shop was located 'ex opposito Turris Pontis Sancti Petri juxta finem murorum', a prime location reflected by the high rent of 4 l. 10s. t. compared to one house owing 30s. and the remaining two houses 10s. each.² Merchants, too, tended to favour only those areas of towns fitted either to the direct pursuit of individual trades or to the status which they had acquired through their skills. Those not bound by considerations of local or international commerce could afford to be more selective about property location, but administrators and those in royal service did favour certain streets and parishes at the expense of others. In Caen, the parish of St. Pierre was a consistently popular location, housing William FitzHarry, Sir William Breton and the Cheshireman Henry Worseley, constable of Caen Castle in 1419.³ It seems reasonable to expect that the grander houses of a town would be reserved for the enjoyment of the leading commanders and senior figures of government,

1. PRO, C.64/14 m.4; Bréquigny no. 917.

2. PRO, C.64/16 m.20; Bréquigny no. 1056.

3. Worseley held property in the parish of St. Pierre and on the rue Exmoisine in the parish of St. Jean, another area popular with settlers (PRO, C.64/13 m.16; Bréquigny no. 809; also above, p. 59).

as was very much the case in Paris, and the high rent of 13s. 4d. for the main property in Harfleur granted to the duke of Exeter would certainly suggest this.¹

The number of settlers receiving grants of houses during the second half of 1421 declined after the peak month of January of that year, but the near-monopoly which Harfleur and Caen had enjoyed was broken by the emergence of a small settlement at Honfleur.² This came about as a direct consequence of a royal commission of August 1421 to William Alington and Simon Fleet to treat with those wishing to obtain houses in the town, the terms of which commission bore a close resemblance to those issued to Alington, Fleet, Luterell and Barneby to effect the same policy at Harfleur in July 1419.³ At Honfleur, although the delay between the issue of instructions and their implementation was not as long as that experienced at Harfleur, there was still a gap of two months between the date of the commission and the first known grant, to Alington himself, and the distribution of property to other settlers.⁴ The small number of grants made at Honfleur between August 1421 and August 1422 suggests a policy of integration into the existing population rather than an attempt to implant there an exclusively English colony.

-
1. PRO, C.64/13 m.16; D.K.R., xlii, 366.
 2. For the geography of the town see C. Bréard, Vieilles rues et vieilles maisons de Honfleur du XV^e siècle à nos jours (Honfleur, 1900).
 3. PRO, C.64/16 m.27d; Bréquigny no. 1026.
 4. On 16 October 1421 Robert Lynford was given a tenement which overlooked the town walls (PRO, C.64/16 m.22; Bréquigny no. 1043). In 1435 he opened a tavern (Bréard, Vieilles rues, pp. 136-40).

The choice of Honfleur must have been dictated by military and naval considerations. Its position at the mouth of the Seine estuary opposite Harfleur and its port function made a permanent English presence in the town highly desirable. The essential context of Henry V's encouragement of the Honfleur settlement is that of his grasp of naval strategy and an appreciation of the need to defend the Channel and its seaports.¹ The properties granted in the town owed the performance of the guet and could only be sold to other Englishmen; frequent references to the walls and gates of the town serve to emphasise this concern with security and defence.² Little is known of the professions of the men settling in Honfleur, apart from Henry Worseley whose main duties lay in Caen, and John Hodeswell, a chaplain, but further research may well establish a link between settlers and the town garrison.

At Caen, the prime beneficiaries of the final months of the Henrician settlement were again administrators and office-holders. Among them may be noted John Clifford, esquire, granted a house in July 1422,³ by which time he was already serving as a clerk at the chambre des comptes.⁴ In January 1424 Clifford was awarded a life-grant of lands in the vicomté of Falaise and elsewhere, but he was not to enjoy them for long, having died by January 1425.⁵ Also in royal service was Henry Lord FitzHugh, a chamberlain already noted as a

-
1. C.F. Richmond, 'The War at Sea', The Hundred Years War, ed. K.A. Fowler (London, 1971), pp. 114-5.
 2. E.g. PRO, C.64/16 mm.7, 14; Bréquigny nos. 1082, 1071.
 3. PRO, C.64/17 m.8; Bréquigny no. 1139.
 4. PRO, E.101/187/15/21.
 5. Lenoir 3/344, 21/303.

landholder.¹ The house granted to him in 1422 had previously belonged to Sir Hugh Stafford, deceased, an example of property remaining in English hands in accordance with Lancastrian policy.²

It has been noted above that only three grants of houses were made at Rouen following the capture of the city, and between May 1419 and August 1422 no further grants there were recorded on the Norman Rolls. This indicates that such grants were listed elsewhere, either in the registers of the Grand Conseil, which have not survived, or within the archives of the financial administration at Rouen taken over by Henry V, later incorporated into the chambre des comptes there and partly destroyed by fire in 1737.³ This problem of missing evidence is mitigated by the survival of a near-complete series of registers of the Tabellionage at Rouen for the period 1418-1444; from these registers a wealth of detail can be drawn for the years 1419-22 to build up a good picture of municipal life during the occupation.

It is clear that Rouen attracted settlers in numbers which at least matched and probably exceeded those at Caen. Its advantages were considerable. In terms of population and size Rouen was second only to Paris within northern France; its lively and bustling trade along the Seine to Paris and to England dating from at least the twelfth century tempted merchants;⁴ as a distributive centre for a large hinterland, an administrative capital and the seat of an

1. Above, p. 7.

2. PRO, C.64/16 m.15; Bréquigny no. 1073.

3. M. Nortier, 'Le Sort des archives dispersées de la chambre des comptes de Paris', B.E.C., cxxiii (1965), 463-4, 471-2.

4. L. Musset, 'Rouen au temps des Francs et sous les ducs', Histoire de Rouen, ed. M. Mollat (Toulouse, 1979), pp. 60-64.

archbishopric Rouen had a magnetic attraction for immigrants of many vocations. No sooner had the city fallen than builders, carpenters and plasterers were in demand to begin work on the royal palace to be constructed on a reserved area overlooking the river, using stone from quarries which had also been expressly set aside at Caen and Falaise.¹

By 1420 merchants were making an impression on the commercial life of the city. Thomas Bonneville, already holding property by royal grant in Caen and Harfleur, rented a house in the parish of St. Martin from Robin Alorge 'bourgeois de Rouen', while the London merchant Thomas Markby took over from a fellow-countryman the right to claim a specific revenue from vessels travelling along the Seine.² Looked at from the French side, there were certain advantages to coming to terms with the invaders which Robin Alorge was keen to exploit as a party to the first recorded property transaction in Rouen involving an Englishman, namely the rent of the 'hostel de destain' to Simon Clismere in October 1419.³ Integration into the commercial life of Rouen was rapid, and accorded well with the king's desire to foster a long-term urban settlement in northern France. The Londoner Thomas le Clerc was living in the parish of St. Maclou in May 1421 when he owed the receveur of the royal demesne 42 l.t. 'pour le louage de ix éschoppes' belonging to the king in the rue des Tailleurs which he had rented the previous Easter for three years.⁴ Such a commitment by le Clerc, almost certainly a

1. C.P.R., 1416-22, p. 421; Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1418-19, fos. 227v-229v.

2. Ibid., 1419-20, fos. 148, 327v.

3. Ibid., fos. 3-3v. This property had once belonged to another member of the Alorge family and, like the house rented by Bonneville, was situated in the parish of St. Martin.

4. The rent was originally assessed at 126 l.t. but was adjusted in December 1420 (ibid., 1421-2, fos. 79-79v).

merchant and perhaps a mercer, bore testimony to the extent to which individual traders were prepared to pledge themselves to the English cause and helps to reveal the consequences of military success both for mercantile activity and what may surely be thought of as business confidence.

The richness and diversity of the Tabellionnage registers allow illumination of those aspects of urban life common to the settlement in northern France but for which evidence elsewhere has not survived. The theme of intermarriage, for instance, is important to an understanding of the tenure of urban property, particularly after 1422 when the number of settlers marrying French women was sufficient to leave a firm mark in the notarial records. Before that date the example of John Convers, granted permission to marry and given the house of his father-in-law in Caen, is one of very few cases of intermarriage, with concomitant ties of property, which can be discovered outside Rouen.¹ Within that city there can be found more and more detailed examples of this phenomenon. William Hereford and his wife Guillemotte, widow of a Rouen citizen, were busy in 1421 selling off properties and rents which Guillemotte held as the héritage of her father. One rent was sold to her sister and brother-in-law, who already held the other share of the héritage.²

Similarly the relationship between garrison service and property ownership can be shown to be significant using evidence from Rouen for the period up to 1422 which helps to put other scattered references into context. For at Rouen, as at Cherbourg and Harfleur, soldiers were

1. Hardy, p. 184.

2. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1421-2, fos. 176, 214, 186.

openly taking up properties outside the garrison. Roger Rowen, 'escuier de la garnison de Rouen', rented a house 'en laquelle pend l'enseigne du heaume' with a garden and trees from Robert Berkeroft, an English landholder in the Caux, but Berkeroft retained a room above the hearth and a stable for four horses for his own profit when he chose to come to the hôtel.¹ The rent of 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ gold nobles per year would thus provide Berkeroft with a useful supplement to his landed revenues without depriving him of accommodation in Rouen whenever he required it. Resourceful settlers who had accumulated more property than they themselves could either manage or find occasion to live in used rents as a regular supplement to garrison and landed income. Thomas Bonneville had property interests in three towns which were bases for his trading activities, and in 1422 sold the title to a house in Caen to William Cliff, a soldier of Salisbury's company, for 200 écus d'or.²

Soldiers, merchants and office-holders were keen to exploit the opportunities offered by the warfare of Henry V within northern French towns. Capital sums were invested in urban property with an expectation of a good return, and houses acquired by gift, purchase, or marriage were themselves sold, rented out and leased. French historians have argued for discrimination solely on the grounds of nationality as the principle which underlay the attempt to establish English colonies at Cherbourg, Harfleur and Honfleur: mass expulsions were followed by large-scale expropriations of property itself in a

-
1. This house, with its sign of a helm, was located in the parish of St. Laurens (ibid., f. 290).
 2. Ibid., f. 377. The house and garden had been awarded to Bonneville only fifteen months previously.

state of ruin.¹ This is not an accurate assessment either of English aims or actions. Only at Harfleur in 1415 had there been an initial effort, Calais-style, to create an exclusively English presence. At Caen, Cherbourg, Honfleur and elsewhere in Normandy there was no such intention. Rather it was hoped to integrate settlers into urban populations which had sworn fealty to Henry V, for it was surely the acid-test of loyalty that determined residence or exile rather than nationality itself.

The transition from the role of conquered town to that of settled town seems to have been quickly achieved in spite of the problems of population migration, economic dislocation and physical damage to buildings. The disregard with which the few ordinances aimed at a separation of soldier from townsman were treated reveals the inherent difficulty of maintaining an exclusively alien presence in occupied territory. From the outset a common element of settlers and natives were prepared to work towards a modus vivendi by means of property transactions, commercial activity and intermarriages. At Rouen in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries merchants, some of whom had been engaged in commerce with England, had invested their capital in urban properties.² Their English counterparts of the early fifteenth century can be placed within a tradition of acquiring property as a base for their trading activities and for profit in the longer term.

-
1. C. de Robillard de Beurepaire, 'La Normandie pendant l'occupation anglaise', B.S.A.N., xxvii (1909), 99-102; S. Luce, 'Philippe le Cat: Un Complot contre les Anglais à Cherbourg à l'époque de la mission de Jeanne d'Arc', La France pendant la guerre de Cent Ans. Épisodes historiques et vie privée aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles (2 vols., Paris, 1890-3), i, 296.
 2. S. Deck, 'Les Marchands de Rouen sous les ducs', Annales de Normandie, vi (1956), 252-3.

(ii) Settlement 1422-36

Little has been said so far about English settlement in the greatest urban centre of northern France, namely Paris. Confiscations and grants in the city have now been studied in detail by Dr. Thompson, and to the student of the Lancastrian presence in Norman towns points of comparison stand out clearly.¹ First, the tight control of the administration of confiscations evident in Paris was characteristic of Henry V's intention to prevent indiscriminate awards elsewhere: the allocation of property was to be the responsibility of experts with local knowledge and the power to settle disputes. Secondly, the paucity of English grantees under Henry V and even under the more generous Bedford régime is in marked contrast to the substantial presence at Rouen in particular. Whether a consequence of the generally slight English infiltration into Paris, an unwillingness to take up property whose rents were falling, or of a policy decision to restrict the granting of former Armagnac possessions, the effect was that settlers were numbered in the tens rather than the hundreds.

Thirdly, the properties themselves were of a status, size and value equivalent to the hôtels appropriated elsewhere by men of influence and authority. In Paris as in Rouen, Bedford and his senior councillors took for themselves five star accommodation to the benefit of their itinerant families and households. This was natural enough, given that those rewarded largely formed the élite of the Regency administration, including prominent land settlers such as Suffolk, Hungerford and Robert Lord Willoughby. Fourthly, convenience of

1. What follows owes much to Thompson, 'Anglo-Burgundian Régime', Chapter V.

location was a criterion important to the choice of Paris property as it was at Caen and Rouen: the preferred situations in the area south of Les Halles, in the centre of the Grève area and less commonly close to the Bastille were those appropriate to the conduct of both household and public business in the military and especially the civilian spheres. In sum, the small size of the English presence in Paris and its narrow social and occupational bases were untypical of the urban settlement as a whole, and in turn raise questions about Lancastrian intentions there, but in other respects there was much that was similar. Perhaps the greatest difference lay in attitudes, for Dr. Thompson argues that in the capital arrogance and self-interest lay never far below the surface of the English mentality,¹ whereas in Normandy such thoughts certainly persisted but were balanced by genuine attempts to contribute to and participate in an urban culture which blurred the distinction of occupiers and occupied.

At Rouen there was essentially a continuity in the nature of the settlement under Bedford.² The same Robert Berkeroft and his French wife who had previously put to farm a house in the city did so again in 1426.³ The London barber Robert Regnart also held a share in this hôtel which they sold to Thierry du Bosc.⁴ There was certainly no shortage of available property within the city at this time, just as there was no lack of land in the surrounding bailliage. Settlers farmed out lands locally for revenue while engaged elsewhere, such as

-
1. Ibid., pp. 338-9, 356.
 2. Cf. R. Herval, Histoire de Rouen (2 vols., Rouen, 1947-9), i, 180.
 3. Seine-Mme, Tabellionage de Rouen 1425-6, fos. 167-167v.
 4. Ibid., 1422-3, f. 39.

the busy John Handford.¹

Others established and maintained links with religious orders, including Robert Chery, esquire, seigneur of Acqueville south of Caen and a man who was to become a landholder of long standing. He granted the Carmelites a rent of 60s. per year on his lordship and other goods and possessions.² The Scot, John Watson, and his French wife rented a house in the parish of St. Maclou from the prior and convent of the Hôtel-Dieu de la Magdalene for six l.t. per year.³ At Rouen, Caen and Cherbourg, and also at St.-Lô there is good evidence for the involvement of the religious communities in the urban settlement either as landlords in their own right, as beneficiaries of Lancastrian patronage or as the recipients of smaller gifts and bequests. In addition to the two examples cited above, it is known that William Stidement of York had acquired properties from the Cathedral chapter at Rouen and owed rent to the Collège des Clementins, and that at Lisieux Sir Nicholas Burdett had put to farm property owing a rent in cash and kind to the bishop there.⁴ The Abbaye de Notre Dame du Voeu at Cherbourg was actively engaged in transactions with settlers as a landlord of houses within the town and of fiefs in the Cotentin peninsula, and Richard Hayton, esquire, was among those renting property in Cherbourg in 1435.⁵

-
1. Ibid., f. 299v. Handford farmed land at Quevillon and St. Pierre-de-Manneville for a pair of gilt spurs, five s.t. and a pair of dice, all to be paid to him at his hôtel or a pot of wine to be paid by default. See also A. Chéruef, Histoire de Rouen sous la domination anglaise au quinzième siècle (Rouen, 1840), pp. 9-10.
 2. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1422-3, f. 123v.
 3. Ibid., 1424-5, f. 163v.
 4. Ibid., 1433-4, fos. 100v-101, 124-124v; cf. Chéruef, Histoire de Rouen, p. 75.
 5. Inventaire sommaire des archives départementales antérieures à 1790. Série H (St.-Lô, 1942), H 2472.

Inevitably, these dealings brought their share of disputes. The case of Richard Bristow, 'portier de la porte de fer du chastel de Chierbourg' is a particularly interesting one.¹ In 1430 Bristow gave his chambermaid Jehenette Gosselin some property, sheep and cattle at Octeville close to Cherbourg to support herself and their children. When she in turn granted the property to Colin Abaquesne four years later, the Frenchman had to hand it back to the Abbaye at Cherbourg: Bristow had died without heirs male and his advancement of Jehenette was 'contre la coustume de Normandie'; moreover her husband was still alive at the time of her service to Bristow. Settlers were prepared to break with local custom when it suited them to do so and to adapt their holdings in town and suburbs to their own uses. The fact that their landlords were men of the cloth does not seem to have made much difference. John Stanlawe came into conflict with a chaplain of the chapel of St. Romain within the Cathedral at Rouen for building on a garden which he had rented for a year. Stanlawe promised to knock down the building at the end of the year, or else the chaplain could do so.²

For the most part, the relations between the English government and the ecclesiastical authorities within the towns of northern France were as cordial as the demands of war would allow.³ On the one hand, the properties of the church of Notre Dame at St.-Lô were annexed to the royal demesne as a source of revenue and for subsequent

1. Ibid., H 3157.

2. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1430-1, f. 9.

3. For Rouen see Allmand, 'Relations', pp. 31-2.

redistribution.¹ On the other, Bedford had a special regard for the Celestines and Carmelites in Paris and Rouen, helping the Carmelites in particular by commuting rents which they owed in Rouen and helping to build a new priory. This patronage earned for Bedford and his wife a daily mass which made express mention of them as 'fundatoribus nostris'.² The Regent gave land to the Béguines to replace the convent destroyed to build the royal palace and left copes and chasubles to the Cathedral at Rouen. The earl of Salisbury had also left money for the fabric of the building and for a chalice.³

Residence in French towns over a number of years brought to settlers a growing awareness of and familiarity with the institutions of civic government. A growing involvement in the temporal and spiritual affairs of ecclesiastical bodies points to a high level of integration into an urban community, and there can be no better witness to this than the election of English échevins at Caen in 1431 and 1434.⁴ There were no comparable elections at Rouen or elsewhere, and Thomas Halliday was one of only five settlers known to have been accorded the title of 'bourgeois de Rouen'.⁵ It is not known why the large and cosmopolitan English presence at Rouen produced so few bourgeois;

-
1. E. Lepingard, 'Les Effets à Saint-Lô de la conquête de la Normandie par les Anglais, 1418-1437', Notices, mémoires et documents publiés par la société d'agriculture, d'archéologie et d'histoire naturelle du département de la Manche, ix (1890), 164-8.
 2. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1427-8, fos. 311-2; C. de Robillard de Beaurepaire, 'Fondations pieuses du duc de Bedford à Rouen', B.E.C., xxxiv (1873), 345-6; Seine-Mme, G 2126, fos. 11, 60-1, 77-8.
 3. Ibid., G 2124, f. 137, dated 14 November 1426.
 4. Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 100.
 5. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1434-5, f. 82.

perhaps the tabellion was less assiduous than his colleagues at Caen in recording personal status. The man who sold Halliday a tenement and property in 1434, the ubiquitous John Salvain, bailli of Rouen, was able to keep two procureurs in his employ to safeguard his considerable assets in land and property and to reward one of them, Henry Lancaster, with a rent on Salvain's possessions in the city upon the conclusion of a legal dispute to which they were parties.¹

There was a constant official presence in the city, comprising men who played a dual role in the civil and military organization and who lived in Rouen when their duties demanded it. In 1433 Sir John Handford was living in 'l'ostel où pend l'ensaigne de la cuillier à pot' in the parish of St. Pierre le Portier, at a time when he was captain of the bridge at Rouen.² He was evidently on good terms with his neighbour, Jean le Marinier dit Malanoy, to whom he rented an easement, garden and trees in that year, having rented to him a vacant plot close by in 1430.³ The integration of the two communities by intermarriage was also a constant of the period 1422-36, although occasionally marriages contracted in haste were punished by fine or even annulment.⁴

-
1. Ibid., 1430-1, fos. 226v-227, 273. The other procureur, William Clerc, esquire, farmed out property in Rouen to two Frenchmen in 1431 (ibid., f. 277v). For Lancaster see Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, pp. 72, 283.
 2. Ibid., p. 295; Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1433-4, f. 169.
 3. Ibid., 1430-1, f. 108v. The vacant plot was adjacent to Handford's hôtel, and le Marinier was to put up no building which might hinder the Englishman's access to his own property.
 4. Judeta de Montigny was fined for 'marrying' Henry Turnbull without being sure of her first husband's death (Seine-Mme, G 249). Robert Chery was fined for attempting to wed a Frenchwoman already betrothed, and the 'marriage' was annulled (ibid., G 250).

The duke of Bedford, twice married in France, did not confine his property dealings to the patronage of the religious orders. In 1430 and again in 1431 Bedford bought up property and land adjacent to his own, and by means of three separate transactions in 1433 greatly extended his tenure of the buildings and gardens surrounding the hôtel of Joyeux Repos,¹ granted to him by Henry V.² The background to these purchases is essentially that of Bedford's hand-over of the government of Paris and then of the occupied provinces of France to the duke of Burgundy. The Regent's subsequent withdrawal to Rouen late in 1429 and residence there throughout 1430 was perhaps a sign of his own desire to separate and delineate the functions of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance by concentrating English resources upon Normandy and its capital. In purely personal terms, Bedford probably found his hôtel and its gardens amenable and better suited to his health than his residences in Paris.

Within this broad picture of continuity and integration there can be detected changes also apparent within the rural settlement. Following the victory at Verneuil in 1424 English archers began to take up Rouen properties. One such was John Magnitourne, who sold to his fellow archer John Coutin and his wife a house and garden in the parish of St. Jean-sur-Renelle for 30 l.t. and 20s. for wine. Four years later in 1430, Magnitourne was given land in the Caux by another Englishman in order to support his wife's daughter through a previous marriage.³ Military success probably attracted a good number of lesser

1. Ibid., Tabellionage de Rouen 1430-1, fos. 105-105v; 1431-2, f. 2v; 1432-3, sub 26 February and 21 March 1433; 1433-4, f. 257.

2. Williams, My Lord of Bedford, p. 185.

3. Seine-Mme, Tabellionage de Rouen 1425-6, f. 223v; 1430-1, f. 60.

craftsmen and tradesmen to the towns of northern France, men who lacked the means to purchase property or have their transactions registered by the local tabellion. The poor tended to congregate in the populous eastern parishes of Rouen,¹ especially the parish of St. Maclou, home of at least one recorded 'factor arcuum'.² There was probably a substantial population of indigent and itinerant living in the poorer districts of the Norman capital, comprising unskilled workmen, mariners and non-combatants, deserters from field and garrison armies and the inevitable casualties of war, the wounded and those who had lost all means of support. To them Rouen offered asylum and, perhaps, the chance to return home on a merchant vessel.

One group about whom more is known, as previous chapters have indicated, were household servants. The presence of Bedford and of Henry VI in Rouen meant that the city rivalled Paris as the political, administrative and social centre of the English occupation. Yet there are not as many recorded examples of household officials buying or selling houses within Rouen as one might have expected. There was probably no shortage of official accommodation for them within the city, perhaps in the château in the north-west, close to the seat of the bailliage. Bedford, too, may have housed attendants and officials at his enlarged hôtel of Joyeux Repos. This brings to mind the comments of the butcher, William Zeman, who pleaded before the Parlement of Paris that he had not received a summons to appear,

-
1. M. Mollat, 'Une Expansion différée par la guerre (1382 - environ 1475)', Histoire de Rouen, ed. Mollat, p. 137.
 2. John Disint (?) paid a fine during the year 1437-8 (Seine-Mne, G 158, f. 13).

'car il demouroit en l'ostel de monseigneur le regent ou il n'a point esté adjorné; et fault que eulx serviteurs de telz seigneurs changent souvent logiz'.¹

There were also signs that the rural settlement held more positive attractions to Thomas Watson, a valet de chambre and to Roger FitzJohn and Robert Brinford, clerks of the Regent's chapel.² Nevertheless town properties did provide accommodation and a source of revenue to some household and royal officials. Sir William Milles, already a small landowner, bought a house in Rouen in the parish of St. Laurens from William Wardel who was acting for his brother Richard, himself a servant of Bedford's chamberlain Andrew Ogard.³ Milles was both a member of Bedford's household and an auditor at the chambre des comptes; he was described as such the following year when he bought properties at Harfleur from Thomas Pain, himself a 'cousin' of the late John Young, a former servant in Bedford's artillery.⁴

The example of Milles reveals something of the complexity of social ties and connections which were the result of an unbroken period of English residence in northern France. This constituted an amalgam of ties of family, the common bonds of household service and of property transactions in different towns and in the countryside. Rouen in particular attracted men of every social rank and of a variety of occupations. The period 1424-32 saw new arrivals including archers,

-
1. Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits no. XXI, p. 273.
 2. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1431-2, fos. 95v-96; 1432-3, sub 23 March 1433.
 3. Ibid., 1433-4, f. 161.
 4. Milles bought 'un tenement contenant pluseurs éstages et édifices' on the rue Notre Dame, suggesting status and prosperity (Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1434-5, f. 12v).

household servants and civilians working within the administration, who boosted the number of settlers already living in the ducal capital.¹ The coming of these men, together with the largely unrecorded artisans, lesser tradesmen and the conjunctural poor,² augmented an occupation which had already become less conspicuous as an 'alien' preserve. Property transactions and commercial dealings, intermarriages and ties of kinship, and a degree of involvement with local churches and the monastic orders helped to soften the harsh edges of a foreign occupation of Rouen.

The urban settlement elsewhere in northern France is not well documented for the period of the Regency, but there are certainly indications that the assimilation of settlers into local communities was by no means restricted to Rouen and Caen. Bedford himself was busily buying property at Harfleur in 1427, although his intentions in doing so are by no means clear.³ The vendors were Englishmen, one of whom, William Minors, esquire, saw long service as captain of the town. Another Harfleur resident of long standing was John Boure, who bought a house and a vacant plot from William Ludlow which was reportedly not subject to performance of the guet; the house was conveniently located next to another house granted to Boure in 1419.⁴ The English community in Harfleur, although probably smaller in number at the end of the Regency than at its beginning, was none the less resilient and

-
1. Cf. Mollat, Histoire de Rouen, ed. Mollat, p. 132.
 2. The term describes those able to earn a living most of the time but forced into mendacity when disaster struck (P. Benedict, Rouen during the Wars of Religion (Cambridge, 1981), p. 10).
 3. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1427-8, fos. 109v, 153.
 4. Ibid., 1430-1, fos. 349v-350; PRO, C.64/12 m.47; Bréquigny no. 705.

resourceful. Not only were some of those granted property by Henry V still living there during the second half of this period but at least one man, John Dawson, esquire, felt sufficiently attached to the town to grant a vacant plot to a church for the upkeep of its fabric,

'et afin que ledit escuier, ses père, mère, parens, amis et bienfaiteurs soient et demeurent es bienfais, prières et oroisins qui sont et seront faiz'.¹

At Harfleur, as at Caen and Paris, settlers were living next door to one another, but preferred residence within certain streets and quartiers should not be seen as indicative of aloofness or exclusivity. Rather, proximity of residence served to extend existing social bonds between settlers and was more likely to encourage than discourage a sense of corporate belonging to a Norman town. Ties of kinship meant that favourable deals could be negotiated between related parties. Robert Fulman, esquire, bought an hôtel and a tenement at Honfleur from his cousin William FitzHenry in 1431, 'en augmentation et accroissement des biens et Revenues de son dit cousin', and to maintain his 'état', with the proviso that if Fulman were to die without heirs male the houses and lands concerned should revert to FitzHenry and his heirs.² Fulman was described as a serviteur of the earl of Arundel in 1434 when granted lands in the bailliages of Rouen and Caen, and had already acquired property in Honfleur in 1430.³ Inheritance was the simplest way of ensuring that properties remained in English possession, though the trade in town houses was probably as

1. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1431-2, f. 15v.

2. Ibid., 1430-1, fos. 200v-201.

3. Ibid., f. 71; AN, JJ 175 no. 324.

brisk as that in rural fiefs. Thomas Chambers succeeded to houses and héritages in and around Fresnay-le-Vicomte as son and heir of William Chambers, but sold them to Robert Stafford, a captain with responsibilities on the southern frontier of Normandy.¹

Beyond the mainstream one is afforded glimpses of a 'fringe' settlement in the many towns of northern France which were hosts to an English garrison. An archer of the Avranches garrison, William Gould, lived outside the town walls, 'ou il faisoit et avoit acoustume de faire ou faire faire taverne de vin et autres marchandises', while at Ellecourt near Aumale John Wakefield and his French wife Beatrix de Beauchamp were engaged in the same hazardous profession.² These and other examples are known to us by means of petitions for pardons presented as a consequence of attacks upon life and property in hostels and taverns. Settlers were sufficiently enterprising to set up their stalls to serve the needs of the garrison, moving outside the town walls when necessary to avoid the levying of the quatrième and other taxes on beverages. In the pursuit of what they themselves regarded as their livelihood, such people were prepared to risk the violence which was, in any case, never far from their daily lives as soldiers, in order to exploit the opportunities of the town either for individual profit or to support wives and families. The degree to which such activities were condoned must have depended, to a large degree, on the goodwill or otherwise of the garrison captain or his lieutenant, which in turn raises the question of the diversity and subtlety of the many forms of patronage available

-
1. The legality of the grant to William by Sir John Fastolf must therefore have been accepted (above, pp. 100-101; Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1424-5, f. 272).
 2. AN, JJ 174 no. 229; JJ 175 no. 310; Le Cacheux, Actes de la chancellerie, ii, 109-14, 282-4.

to a garrison commander. The first responsibility of a captain, however, was the defence of the town in his charge. It was when William Gould was away from his hostel on military service at St. James de Beuvron that a group of Englishmen broke in and committed outrages, a sure reminder of the vicissitudes of war.

Finally, the relationship between the tenure of property and local office-holding was as consistent in the more isolated towns as it was in larger centres. John Chamberlain, esquire, was put in possession of lands stretching across four bailliages in 1432, including an hôtel at Bernay ideally situated for the post of vicomte of Orbec which he held later that year and probably at the time of his grant.¹ Four years later Chamberlain was again rewarded, this time with lands formerly held by Jacques Advise who had reportedly rejoined the enemy, and a house at Lisieux 'appellé la Blanche Maison', once held by another Frenchman who had died in territory outside the king's obedience.²

The character of the Lancastrian settlement in smaller towns differed from that of the larger centres. It was more functional, more directly dependent on the size and stability of a local garrison whose members might or might not choose to move into the town, and it certainly lacked the prospects for profit-making from multiple tenures that were available elsewhere. That said, its beneficiaries were, by paucity of numbers, all the more prominent within the local community. As Englishmen and as representatives of the Lancastrian government, such men may have had to call upon a wider range of administrative abilities

1. AN, JJ 175 no. 61. He held office by June 1432 (Gallia regia, iii, 328).

2. Lenoir 5/75.

than their counterparts in Rouen and Caen, including a thorough knowledge of the French language,¹ in order to carry out successfully instructions received from or by means of their bailli, and also in attempting to solve the multitude of local disputes thrown up by warfare and occupation. The 'fringe' settlement, too, had its role to play in the Regency government of northern France.

(iii) Rouen and the Norman Towns 1436-50

An analysis of the urban settlement during the years 1436-50 must take into account two related problems. First, a change in the major sources: on the debit side we lose the fruitful Tabellionage records at Rouen after 1445, and for our purposes the registers of the Trésor des Chartes following the fall of Paris in April 1436; on the credit side we gain the Tabellionage registers at Caen from that year. Secondly, it must be borne in mind that this was a period of great difficulty for many towns irrespective of their size. Facing an increasing burden of taxation to pay for their defence and to finance specific campaigns, towns were hit hard by the general economic depression particularly of the late 1430s outlined in the previous chapter. Moreover, the slow but steady advance of the French armies eroded the buffer zone which had for so long protected Normandy. This brought towns within the range of the more adventurous enemy commanders and made capture, with help from those within their walls, a very real possibility. It is against a background of insecurity and hardship that the continuing English presence in towns must be seen.

1. Seine-Mme, Tabellionage de Routot 1422-3, sub 9 June 1423 for a garrison soldier at Caudebec proficient in French.

It would be wrong, however, to sketch too darkly the period as a whole. Caen, Cherbourg and Rouen all survived threatened capture between 1432-6 and retained a settler presence without interruption until the reconquest. The economic crisis common to all towns was arguably a short-term phenomenon, and the truce of Tours and its renewals at least did not discourage, and may have encouraged, a return to normal commercial activity.¹ In sum, the sources reveal the lasting presence of resilient and adaptable settlers within French towns, some of whom stayed to the bitter end in the manner of their counterparts holding rural properties.

What were the attractions of towns? Opportunities for advancement within them during this period were perhaps less readily available. The official redistribution of property was carried out on a much smaller scale than during the years of initial settlement and later expansion, and the possibility of attachment to a personal household had probably declined. As a source of profit in the form of rents, only Paris provides statistical data from which we can, very cautiously, generalise for urban rents in Normandy.² From their lowest point between 1438 and 1440, the average rent rose slowly at first and then steeply between 1444-6, a rise which continued to 1450 and beyond our period. The average nominal rent of 1450-5 was, however, only one sixth of the peak rent of 1420-2, and less than a quarter of that of 1426-8. It seems unlikely that the typical settler can have

-
1. A point accepted for Rouen but not for Caen: Mollat, Histoire de Rouen, ed. Mollat, p. 141; R. Jouet, 'La Ville "Anglaise" et la réadaptation au royaume', Histoire de Caen, ed. G. Désert (Toulouse, 1981), p. 111.
 2. E. Le Roy Ladurie and P. Couperie, 'Le Mouvement des loyers parisiens de la fin du moyen âge au XVIII^e siècle!', Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations (1970), 1012-3, 1020.

anticipated a sizeable net profit from his holdings.

The safety which towns offered was certainly a more cogent consideration than it had once been, at a time when the authorities were hard-pressed to control the growth in numbers of deserters and brigands in the countryside. The greatest single attraction of towns, however, was the prospect within them of employment in royal or public service. After 1436 the need for loyal and committed servants of the Lancastrian cause was greater than ever, either in the central administration at Rouen and Caen or, more probably, in the Norman bailliages. To secure and carry out such an appointment as a captain, lieutenant, notary or clerk, residence within a town would be essential. When the chambre des comptes moved to Rouen in 1436, its personnel was quickly established.¹ On 11 July William Gente was appointed greffier with the wages of a notary and William Wymyngton, an original member of the chambre des comptes at Caen, was appointed clerk on the same day.² Richard Spurstowe was made an usher later that month, and William Milles moved from Paris to serve as an auditor and later as maître.³

Administrators thus secured a respected position, one which must have earned them high status among their peers of both nationalities, and at a level of remuneration which promised more than a bare livelihood. There were other benefits, too. Early in 1437 Wymyngton, Milles and two French clerks were awarded 200 l.t.⁴ in annual rent as

1. Lenoir 26/243.

2. Ibid., 44/419, 423.

3. Milles was a 'conseiller et maître' by 1442 (Seine-Mme, Fonds Danquin, Carton 10, unnumbered; above, p. 210).

4. Lenoir 5/13.

a supplement to their salaries. Such an award from the domanial revenues was not commonly made. Like Milles, Wymyngton lived in Rouen and held office for a number of years; he had reportedly been rendered homeless and had lost his possessions during the rising in the Caux in 1435, but in 1447 received the compensation of a once-only payment of 300 saluts d'or.¹ In spite of the many problems which the Lancastrian administration faced after the events of 1435-6 there were still chances to advance in public service, and while such possibilities were now confined geographically to a more compact area of authority, their concentration remained heaviest in towns.

Turning first to Caen, it has already been noted that office-holders were the main beneficiaries of the initial redistribution of confiscated properties, and although the removal of the chambre des comptes and the later concentration of governmental resources upon Rouen might be thought to have reduced the prospects for administrators in Caen, there was no exodus. On the contrary, the English presence in the town remained remarkably stable. William Wymyngton went away to work in Rouen but Hammonet, perhaps a son, was involved in litigation at Caen in 1442.² The sources reveal a flourishing English community at Caen during the period 1436-50 which has recently been the subject of detailed research.³ Such was the degree of English integration into civic life and consciousness there that the use of the term 'occupation' for these years may be a misnomer. At every level there were associations between Normans and English. As well as securing

-
1. Ibid., 4/167; Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1439-40, sub 20 January 1440.
 2. Calvados, Tabellionnage de Caen 7E 90, f. 23.
 3. Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, Chapter IV.

election to positions of responsibility, settlers were keen to acquire burgess status as 'bourgeois de Caen'. Twenty men were so described in the Tabellionnage registers, and are listed in Appendix XI, much the highest total known for any town. Commercial dealings with the inhabitants of Caen and its hinterland remain largely unknown, as does the nature and extent of cross-Channel trade. At a local level it is likely that trade was brisker than the sources, by their nature, can reveal, and that taverners and innkeepers were active outside the walls if not inside. The importance of social ties is best illustrated by the continued occurrence of intermarriage. When Ralph Marston married Jehanette, daughter of Jean Tirel, it brought him into a family which included a niece, Robine, and her husband Richard Joye.¹ Finally, there was again a concern for spiritual welfare which brought settlers into regular contact with the churches and monasteries. At the time of the French advance into Normandy, for example, John Marchwell, esquire, gave to the charité Saint Jacques a small rent with its title deeds in order that he and his wife might be included in their prayers and masses.²

Property tenure in Caen was one of the most important catalysts of social integration. Its study focuses attention upon those forces uniting the political and commercial, social and cultural functions briefly referred to above. As one example of this, William Sanders, a bourgeois of the popular parish of St. Pierre, bought some rents and héritages from Robert le Bourg and his wife Collette in October 1436. The following year he allowed Pierre de Bryeul to collect half the

1. Calvados, Tabellionnage de Caen 7E 90, fos. 53v-54.

2. Ibid., 7E 91, f. 123, dated 14 February 1450.

revenues and profits of his royal grants.¹ It might be thought that Sanders was losing interest in property and land, for in 1442 he sold to Thomas Norton, another bourgeois living in the parish of St. Jean, his house and garden on the Grande Rue. Within a year Sanders reclaimed the property by paying back the instalment already paid by Norton, as well as costs, as their original agreement had allowed. More successful was Norton's association with the abbey and convent of St.-Étienne-de-Fontenay near Caen, from whom he leased a garden for 30 s.t. in 1437.²

In an active property market settlers were thus buying, selling and renting houses in Caen to and from each other as they had always done, but by means of their advantageous integration into the urban community, which such dealings themselves encouraged, they came increasingly into contact with the indigenous population and their institutions. The value of the Tabellionage registers at Caen is that they help to reach an understanding of the function of property as a source of livelihood at a time when the general economic climate and the search for peace made the pursuit of the more traditional profits of war impractical. Ralph Marston granted his niece holdings north of Caen,

'pour ce que Il ne veoit pas son prouffit à plus tenir lesdis héritages à la charge de ladicte Rente et aultres charges et deniers'.³

Mixed marriages brought Englishmen into the urban settlement if they had not already been encompassed by it. Ties of kinship and of residence

1. Ibid., 7E 89, fos. 114, 166v.

2. Ibid., 7E 90, fos. 35, 107v; 7E 89, f. 243.

3. Above, p. 219.

helped to generate a concern for the welfare of the town and its population, as well as a more particular interest in defending individual property rights against encroachment.¹ To the office-holders and soldiers who constituted the major element of the English presence, the ownership of houses in Caen provided a potential, if modest, supplementary income.

The reconquest of Caen saw the properties which had brought in that income either sold or given away by those who left: those possessions which came to John Goodkin by inheritance from his mother were sold for 30 l.t. and 30s. for wine; an hôtel owned by John Heward at Vaucelles was given to his brother-in-law.² Only one man is known to have stayed behind after the reconquest, and only a few Frenchmen may have accompanied the English as they left.³ This evidence does not do justice to the slow evolution of a homogenous Anglo-Norman community at Caen, in which the tenure of property played a key part, and which made the recapture of the town in 1450 that much harder to bear. With houses and holdings confiscated, there disappeared past achievement, present status and future opportunity at one and the same time.

It may well be that geographical mobility between the Norman towns and seaports was a greater aid to social mobility than has been

-
1. Sir Richard Harrington, bailli of Caen, reached agreement with a Norman priest following a dispute about a building erected next to Harrington's hôtel (Calvados, Tabellionnage de Caen 7E 90, fos. 81-81v).
 2. Hellot, Croniques de Normandie, p. 162; Calvados, Tabellionnage de Caen 7E 91, fos. 128, 128v.
 3. Ibid., fos. 128v, 203; 7E 92, f. 190v for Thomas Bourton and his wife, Jehanne de Rosel; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 80; Jouet, Histoire de Caen, ed. Désert, p. 106.

appreciated, at every level of society. There were certainly strong links between Caen and Rouen, and not only between their administrative institutions and personnel. In January 1437 the fletcher Maurice Massey, then living in Rouen, was granted a house near the rue Exmoisine in Caen for twenty nobles d'or.¹ It is not known whether Massey went to live in the house or if he rented it out while residing in Rouen. The vendor was William Hilforton who had himself come into the property through his wife Jehanne, to whom he authorised the sale; this was common practice at Rouen and, as has been shown, at Caen, for there are many examples of settlers acquiring properties as grants or rents by means of marriage treaties.² It was a particular advantage if, as with Richard Bic, the marriage was to the daughter of a 'bourgeois de Rouen', who would always be a property holder.³

The terms of these family agreements were probably more favourable to the spouses than similar commercial deals. There was usually sufficient scope within the clauses of property transactions to allow for considerable leeway in arrangements agreed. At Rouen this latitude is shown by terms allowing the purchase of rents sold at ten years' purchase. Thus Thomas Bridon authorised his wife Alison to sell to the royal secretary Jean de Rinel, a resident of the same parish of St. Amand, 6 l.t. of rent per year for 60 l.t. For the 'amour naturelle' of the parties the vendors could buy back the rent within four years on paying the said sum and arrears pro rata.⁴ The sale was

-
1. Seine-Mme, Tabellionage de Rouen 1436-7, sub 26 January 1437.
 2. Ibid., 1440-1, sub 28 September 1441, 16 January 1442; 1442-3, sub 2 June 1443.
 3. Ibid., 1440-1, sub 14 October 1440.
 4. Ibid., 1436-7, sub 4 July 1436.

made by Bridon and his wife 'pour leurs cler et évident prouffit'. The phrase appeared again in a similar sale by Sir John Salvain and his wife Eleanor of 100 l.t. rent at ten years' purchase to Pierre Roque, which could be bought back within six years.¹

This evidence can be read in two ways. Either the sales were made in the pursuit of profit in the form of an immediate payment of a lump sum rather than as a regular income which might decline, on terms favourable to the vendors. Or such sales were made on conditions suitable to both parties, who were probably well acquainted, and this was reflected in both the sums of money involved and the length of time allowed for possible repurchase. The latter view is perhaps nearer the mark. Salvain and Roque did become parties to a dispute which went to the cour du conseil but agreement was quickly reached. The value of the yearly rent was reduced to 80 l.t., and since 700 l.t. had already been paid, Roque was to forgo the remaining 100 l.t. owed by Salvain for spices and gunpowder.² Since Salvain had already seen long service as bailli of Rouen, and Roque was in the business of supplying provisions and armaments, neither man was a stranger to commercial transactions of this kind, and Salvain was one of the most active participants in the land and property markets during the English occupation.³

As well as being the seat of the bailli, Rouen served after 1436

-
1. Ibid., 1439-40, sub 14 April 1439.
 2. The dispute was settled within eight months of its arising, testimony to the efficacy of the cour du conseil (ibid., sub 12 December 1439; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 143-51).
 3. For a sale of lands to Edmund Beaufort see Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1439-40, sub 19 September 1439.

as the administrative, legal and financial capital of the English occupation, housing in particular the chambre des comptes, the cour du conseil, the Grand Conseil and the Échiquier de Normandie. This concentration of institutions of government had a bearing on the settlement locally. It has been seen that the arrival of the chambre des comptes in 1436 stimulated purchases by its officials, one of whom was Nicholas Molyneux, a maître and a royal councillor. In July 1440 he bought a house, garden and buildings in the parish of St. Sauveur, and the following year acquired substantial properties, namely 'ung tenement de maisons contenant plusieurs étages, édifices, jardins et le fons de la terre' in the parish of St. Pierre l'Onoré.¹ With William Wymyngton living on the rue des Béguines close to the royal palace and William Milles in the parish of St. Laurens, it is clear that residence in the west of the city was favoured by the senior personnel of the chambre, who would thus enjoy properties befitting their status close to their place of work.

Two royal secretaries were living in less grand accommodation in the parish of St. Godard. In 1440 Ralph Parker bought a house there and in 1443 John Profoot did the same, their purchases each costing twenty-four saluts d'or.² Profoot and Molyneux served in the household of the duke of York with Molyneux, whose career has been the subject of a celebrated study,³ preceding Profoot in the office of receiver-general of the estates of York and his son.⁴ If Rouen was to become the home

1. Ibid., sub 1 July 1440; 1440-1, sub 13 January 1441.

2. Ibid., 1439-40, sub 28 July 1440; 1442-3, sub 21 June 1443.

3. McFarlane, 'Business-Partnership', passim.

4. Molyneux was appointed on 18 October 1446 and Profoot had taken over by 9 June 1447 (BL, Add. Ch. 12308, 8027).

of an increasing number of civilian office-holders after 1436, there was still no corresponding growth in the number of household men buying or renting houses in the city. Another royal secretary to join York's household was William Browning, but like John Boure, valet de chambre, and Richard Boer, serviteur domestique, he was known to hold rural fiefs but no property in Rouen itself.¹ The pattern established under the duke of Bedford was continued.

Itinerant household officials were probably provided with accommodation in the château at Rouen and in corresponding buildings in other towns as they followed their master. The advantage of the rural settlement to them was that the chance to achieve a net profit - along with the risk of substantial losses, as William Wymyngton discovered - was perhaps greater, while personal residence on the lands in question was not necessary. Browning appointed as procureur a Norman, with whom he had recently been in dispute about barrels of cider, to act on his behalf and receive all that was due from the land.² Richard Boer agreed with William London to share the 'fruis et prouffis' of their lands in the bailliage of the Caux despite the fact that London was currently living in Caen and that their shares were of unequal value. The general absence of members of the great households of York, Warwick, Talbot and the earl of Dorset from the urban settlement in Rouen can therefore be explained partly by the demands placed upon their personal mobility, and by the positive attractions of a rural settlement which might still promise status and income at a time

-
1. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1436-7, sub 5 June, 12 June 1437.
 2. Browning and Robert de la Mare, a priest, had reportedly been in 'grant et sumptueux procès' (ibid., 1440-1, sub 2 November 1441).

when the economic crisis had passed its peak and the slow process of recovery had begun. It is significant that in 1440 Edmund Beaufort chose to buy a large manor house with dovecotes and fountains in the parish of St. Gervais to the west of Rouen, rather than an hôtel within the city walls.¹

Though urban settlement at Rouen responded to and reflected changes in the government of Lancastrian France after 1436, the cosmopolitan character of the city still meant that it had most to offer in the way of opportunities for self-advancement. Some were clearly more successful than others. In 1448 Stephen Drop, an archer of the Rouen garrison, claimed that he had served in the king's wars and sieges since the time of the landing at Touques without receiving any grants of land to supplement his wages.² Drop was concerned about livelihood, specifically the support of his wife and seven children, but his attempt to augment his income was thwarted. A quarter of his soldier's wages were deducted, 'de ce que l'en dit ledit suppliant : estre barbier'. His losses were restored on petition out of consideration for his 'état', with no mention made of any general restriction on such activities which had been contravened. It is likely, therefore, that the fine had been imposed for absence or for failure to seek approval for his venture than for commercial activity per se.

One would certainly expect that the five Englishmen described as 'bourgeois de Rouen', listed in Appendix XII, were engaged in

-
1. The price was 400 saluts d'or and the vendor, Robert Jolivet abbot of Mont-Saint-Michel, was to retain a key to come and go as he pleased (ibid., 1439-40, sub 10 May 1440).
 2. Seine-Mme, Fonds Danquin, Carton 9, Liasse D.

business dealings. Little is known of their lives or how they came to earn their designation, but two had seen long service in France. Ralph Trenewith was awarded lands in 1419 and houses in Harfleur in 1420, where he was a man-at-arms;¹ Thomas Halliday received Cotentin lands in 1432 and held office as vicomte of Pont-Authou and Pont-Audemer.² The precise preconditions for obtaining burgess status at Rouen, Caen and elsewhere are not known, but typically included: legitimate birth or honourable status; registration, swearing and the payment of a fine; residence for a year and a day; the possession of property.³ Burgess status afforded urban privileges and exemptions, but it must be stressed that its true value lay in the status and prestige which the title of bourgeois conferred on its owners. Settlers who had progressed to what Professor Chevalier has termed 'une condition définie par un genre de vie' were no longer arrivistes.⁴ They were known professional men, respecting and respected by the community of which they had become a part.

The tenure of Rouen property by purchase, sale or rent was a valued means of assimilation into one or more parishes. The hôtel bought in 1440 by Nicholas Molyneux from an 'advocat et conseiller en court laye' was sold in 1443 to the Rouen merchant Pierre Moreau, almost

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.54; C.64/14 m.24; Bréquigny nos. 583, 860.
 2. AN, JJ 175 no. 102; BL, Add. Ch. 12182; Seine-Mme, Tabellionage de Rouen 1439-40, sub 30 March 1440.
 3. Le Coustumier de la vicomté de Dieppe par Guillaume Tieullier, ed. E. Coppinger (Dieppe, 1884), pp. 19-20; A. de Calonne, Histoire de la ville d'Amiens (3 vols., Amiens, 1899-1906), i, 303.
 3. B. Chevalier, Tours, ville royale (1356-1520). Origine et développement d'une capitale à la fin du moyen âge (Louvain and Paris, 1975), p. 183.

certainly earning Molyneux a handsome profit in the process.¹ John Barton, esquire, rented his hôtel on the rue aux Tonneliers to two Normans with the proviso that they maintain it in good condition.² Finally, the case of Thomas Crendon selling a house and garden in the parish of St. Patrice to a canon of Rouen Cathedral³ is one of few illustrations of a direct relationship in the tenure of property between the English and the members of the Cathedral chapter. It is known that settlers were in common association with the established church and the religious orders, both on an individual basis and as beneficiaries of patronage as institutions. The temporal welfare of the one aided the spiritual welfare of the other. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the Cathedral chapter had bought up a large number of rents in all the city parishes which brought in a modest annual income,⁴ and an account of rents due to them in 1438 shows that English settlers formed part of this flourishing tradition.⁵

In conclusion, a few words need to be said about presence in the smaller towns of northern France after 1436. We are by no means bereft of evidence for this 'fringe' settlement. John Rocheford and his French wife were living at Neufchâtel in 1436⁶ and three years later

-
1. Seine-Mme, Tabellionage de Rouen 1442-3, sub 8 August 1443. Molyneux seems to have paid only 100 s.t. for the décret, the order passed by a court for the sale of seized property. He sold the property for 410 l.t. and 10 l.t. for wine.
 2. Idem.
 3. Ibid., sub 14 May 1442.
 4. A. Sadourny, 'Les Rentes à Rouen au XIII^e siècle', Annales de Normandie, xxi (1971), 99-108.
 5. Seine-Mme, G 3017 (no foliation).
 6. Ibid., Tabellionage de Rouen 1436-7, sub 17 June 1436.

Thomas Porter, esquire, was a party to litigation there which ended up at the cour du conseil. His opponent was the widow Jehanne de Maubuisson, who claimed that by the coutume of Neufchâtel,

'chacun peult en son testament ou aultrement donner ses héritages assises en la ville et bourgage dudit Neufchastel à tel personne qu'il lui plaist.'¹

Porter accepted her right to the properties and agreement was reached. Settlers were clearly at a disadvantage in their ignorance of local custom unless they engaged the services of a procureur, but it must be emphasised that this unfamiliarity with tenurial and hereditary practices was no great disincentive in itself to urban settlement. In fact, Thomas Porter remained in possession of the disputed héritages within the town, which he then farmed out to his opponent for the yearly rent of a silver mark.

Intermarriage was advantageous in smaller towns in several ways. John Rocheford came into rural property through his wife Guillemette, and within the closely-knit environment of a garrison town the combination of kinship and ties of property assured such a couple of a prominent position within the local community. While John James was being held prisoner at Louviers his wife Collette arranged the sale of a house, court and garden in Vernon to Sir Richard Merbury for 100 l.t. and 30s. for wine.² Collette probably inherited the property as daughter and part-heir of Pierre Sebire and knew that her husband would ratify the sale; in the meantime 100 l.t. helped towards his ransom. Merbury, on his part, received a substantial property for a rent of

1. Ibid., 1439-40, sub 14 May 1439.

2. Collette made the sale 'pour son cler et évident prouffit' to release her husband (ibid., 1442-3, sub 17 November 1442).

36 s.p. in a town of which he was captain and where he had duties as bailli of Gisors. Similar was the example of the wife of William Robinson, then living at Honfleur, who acted as procureuse for her husband by selling a property in Rouen which had once belonged to her first husband, this time to a Frenchman.¹ Not the least of the attractions of French women and widows to Englishmen was the property which they already held or might soon inherit. The income which an urban holding yielded in the form of rent or a lump sum for a sale could provide a valuable supplement to the regular wages of a soldier or public servant, and when ties of family were added to those of property they rendered assimilation locally even more desirable.

Integration of this kind can be detected at the port of Honfleur. Consider William Belaclef, 'bourgeois de Honnefleu' and Henry Spicer, 'marchant et bourgeois dudit lieu de Honnefleu', the only two Englishmen known to have been accorded the title. Residence in the town over a long period was instrumental in their achievement of this elevated status. Belaclef had been awarded four tenements and two vacant plots by Henry V in 1422, and in 1438 he rented the mill at Honfleur for nine years at 6 l. per year, pledging to change the millstones to those of Brie.² Henry Spicer had been granted a tenement in October 1421³ but had moved on to better accommodation by 1437, when he entertained at his hôtel François de Surienne, on his way to England, for eight days.⁴ It had been the aim of Henry V and Bedford to encourage and

1. Ibid., 1443-4, sub 28 January 1444.

2. PRO, C.64/17 m.9; Bréquigny no. 1145; Lenoir 26/321.

3. PRO, C.64/16 m.21; Bréquigny no. 1048.

4. BN, Ms. fr. 26062 no. 3186. Spicer was paid 51 l.t. for expenses. A Henry Spicer was listed as an archer at Honfleur in 1423, a foot lance in 1431 and a lance in 1438 (25767 no. 30; AN, K.63/13/36; Seine-Mme, Fonds Danquin, Carton 22).

promote a long-term commitment to the settlement in town and countryside, and these examples testify to both the success of Lancastrian policy in smaller towns and to the resourcefulness of settlers in securing their livings. At Verneuil, William Champenay rented a vacant plot - where a mill had stood some thirty-five years previously - for no less than ten years, 'par y faisant faire un moulin à bled'.¹ The lesser men of the urban settlement boasted an enterprise and a commitment sometimes lacking in those of more senior position.

What of the English presence at Harfleur? Between November 1435 and November 1440 the town was in French hands, but within a year of its recapture immigrants were again resident. In July 1441 John Chicheley sold to John Clampart, then living in London, the same tenements and properties granted to him by Henry V in February 1421.² There is further evidence of a remarkable continuity of settlement between the original colonisation of Harfleur and its later settlement. Henry Kilkenny was already living in Harfleur in 1443 when he bought a house there from a fellow-countryman,³ and since a man of that name had been granted a house in Harfleur in 1420,⁴ it is evident that this was either the same man or a son. Similarly, it was not until 1444 that William Woodcock, then 'demourant au chastel de Caen', sold the very properties in Harfleur granted to him twenty-two years previously,⁵ the buyer being the fletcher Maurice Massey who had by this time moved

-
1. Lenoir 26/203.
 2. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1440-1, sub 6 July 1441; PRO, C.64/15 mm.16-15; Bréquigny no. 965.
 3. Calvados, Tabellionnage de Caen 7E 90, f. 140.
 4. Above, pp. 191-2; PRO, C.64/12 m.9; Bréquigny no. 747.
 5. Idem; Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1443-4, f. 180.

from Rouen.¹ A resident of more recent date was the former captain of the town, William Minors: he was contrôleur de l'hôtel of the duke of York when he purchased a house, tenement and garden from Thomas Harpefield in 1441.²

The first point that needs to be made is that an English presence was quickly restored to Harfleur after its recapture. Moreover, the port attracted men from other Norman towns and in one case from England who were seemingly keen to take up new opportunities and responsibilities. Most important of all, a proportion of those involved in the sale and purchase of Harfleur properties had connections with the town dating from the time of the establishment of the English colony there. The vitality of the new community which grew up in Harfleur during the 1440s suggests that accepted opinion on this subject is in need of revision.³ The experiment of building up an exclusively English colony in the town failed through a lack of numbers and the impracticality of establishing a second Calais without the volume of trade necessary for its survival; the idea may well have been moribund by the time of the town's fall in 1435. With its recapture, however, the English enjoyed some success in bringing back within its walls both original colonists and new men at a time when the worst of the economic crisis had passed and the peasant rising in the Caux, which must have driven people into Harfleur for safety, had been quelled.

The importance attributed to the maintenance and expansion of a presence at Harfleur is manifest from the issue of new ordinances

1. Above, p. 222.

2. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1441-2, sub 30 November 1441.

3. Summarised in Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 464.

granting privileges in 1444.¹ Much was made of the need for that security which a substantial settlement would bring to a town, 'quidem quasi clavis Ducatus nostri Normannie existit', and of the ruined state of many houses and buildings. Accordingly, the town was granted commercial privileges and its inhabitants were to be exempt from customs and other duties. Responsibility for government and defence was to lie with a mayor and burgesses elected from the English townsmen. In 1446 Thomas Everingham, esquire, who had been acting as lieutenant in the town for Talbot, was chosen in order that,

'il y ait en icelle certaine notable personne, chevalier ou escuier, qui par lui soit commis à l'office de Maire, ainsi que ceulx de sa ville de Bordeaux ont acoustumé d'avoir'.²

The choice of Bordeaux as a precedent reveals that Harfleur was regarded in a special light in England. The aim was, as in 1415, to attract men of the rank of burgess from England and within northern France to take up ruined properties and perform defensive duties in return for trading privileges. As has been shown, progress towards that goal should not be underestimated, and the choice of Everingham as mayor was a good one.³ The final loss of Harfleur on 1 January 1450 was neither the consequence of a long period of decline nor of a failure to appreciate the significance of the urban settlement to the war effort.⁴

At Cherbourg and Caen, the last recorded acts of the occupation

-
1. Lenoir 27/201-4; L. Puiseux, L'Émigration normande et la colonisation anglaise en Normandie et XV^e siècle (Caen and Paris, 1866), p. 82.
 2. Lenoir 27/397.
 3. Pollard, John Talbot, p. 77.
 4. Cf. Puiseux, L'Émigration normande, pp. 79-83.

were sales of property to Normans and Norman institutions. In an orderly withdrawal from Cherbourg its captain, Thomas Gower, gave back land outside the town to the Abbaye de Notre Dame du Voeu in return for prayers and masses and two yearly obits in memory of himself and his friends.¹ Within the town he sold 'un hostel neuf' to Jean le Teissier on the day after the formal capitulation; le Teissier took care to have his acquisition confirmed by the king the following year to include another hôtel once held by William Wolston.² Gower had served as lieutenant or captain at Cherbourg since 1439,³ while there were three known members of the Wolston family in the town at various times.⁴ When information of this kind is considered alongside similar evidence for Honfleur and Harfleur it will be seen that settlers in the Norman seaports, though perhaps few in number at the end of the occupation, were nevertheless bound by the same close ties of kinship and of property tenure as their counterparts in Rouen and Caen.

This commitment helped them to become part of the political and economic, social and cultural life of their local communities. For an Englishman to be described, as was William Sterzalier, as 'bourgeois de Chierebourg'⁵ implies that, at a local level, Normans were prepared to push aside the barriers of nationality in recognition of the individual merits and social status of one who had become, for many purposes, one of their own. This chapter has made use of urban notarial registers

-
1. Inventaire sommaire ... Série H, H 2467, 2653.
 2. Annuaire de la Manche, ed. Dubosc, pp. 278-9.
 3. Gallia regia, ii, 294, 272.
 4. Above, pp. 92-3.
 5. Inventaire sommaire ... Série H, H 3211, 3227.

because they provide another perspective to that of the linear progression of grants listed on the Norman Rolls. Much has been said about integration and assimilation, themes which the Tabellionnage sources emphasise by their very nature. But it should not be thought that exaggeration has occurred. Corroborative evidence especially from Rouen attests to the continued vitality of English interests there at a late date. As a postscript to the incidence of settlers remaining on French soil after swearing allegiance to Charles VII we may add the case of the merchant, Robert Quilingolbed, a name to conjure with, who left Rouen and requested permission to live in Paris with his wife and children. Permission was duly granted, and he took his household along the Seine by boat.¹ Other merchants, too, went to live in Paris in 1450.² They were the successors to and beneficiaries of the Henrician settlement of a previous generation.

1. AN, Z¹H 10 f. 20.

2. Ibid., f. 20v.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAND SETTLEMENT

Previous chapters have attempted to demonstrate the scale and distribution of the land settlement in Lancastrian France. How was this settlement administered? What demands did an occupation based on land place upon government both in France and in England, and how well were such demands met? It is proposed to examine this subject thematically under four main headings. The first will study the process of issuing grants and the means by which men came into the possession of rural lands. Secondly, brief reference will be made to grants of urban property and the means by which settlers took up residence in the Norman towns. Thirdly, consideration will be given to the role of the demesne lands and to changes of attitude to their management during the course of the occupation. Finally, an examination will be made of the measures adopted to administer lands once granted, and of the tenurial obligations incumbent upon their owners.

(i) The Granting of Rural Lands

Our major source of information for grants of land under Henry V, the Norman Patent Rolls, belongs to that great series of Chancery enrolments which date from the reign of John. The use of a separate category of records to encompass a variety of official business, from letters of safe conduct to exemplifications of charters to presentations

to benefices also kept apart the routine business of administration in France from that in England. This separation was achieved with the minimum of disturbance to the existing institutions of Norman government: the Treasury and the chambre des comptes remained in Caen, the Échiquier and the Grand Conseil in Rouen.¹

Important to the development of Rouen as the effective capital of the Lancastrian occupation was the establishment of the Norman chancery under the chancellor, John Kemp. Chancery personnel included privy-seal clerks detached from the Privy-Seal Office at Westminster. John Offorde and John Hethe both saw service abroad,² Hethe being granted a house in the parish of St. Pierre, Caen, in February 1418. The value of the house, worth up to forty sous per year, and its location on the town bridge linking the parish to the castle and offices of government there, suggest that a large and well-sited property had been chosen to accommodate the busy practice of the privy-seal clerks and their servants. This corresponds well to what is known of similar provision in England.³ Nearby lived Richard Sturgeon, clerk of the crown in chancery, granted a manor next to the church of St. Pierre and close to the town bridge in the same month.⁴ The division of the Privy-Seal Office into two sections, with the higher status accorded to the Norman seal, placed at the king's

-
1. Wylie and Waugh, iii, 242-4.
 2. C.C.R., 1419-22, p. 72; H.C. Maxwell-Lyte, Historical Notes on the Use of the Great Seal of England (London, 1926), p. 33.
 3. A.L. Brown, 'The Privy Seal Clerks in the Early Fifteenth Century', The Study of Medieval Records. Essays in Honour of Kathleen Major, ed. D.A. Bullough and R.L. Storey (Oxford, 1971), pp. 265-6.
 4. PRO, C.64/8 m.11; Hardy, pp. 260-1.

disposal a body able to formulate royal instructions, to issue letters duly authenticated and to issue warrants to move the great seal.¹ In addition, Henry V made good use of the signet seal for the authentication of letters to the chancellor in England and for the issue of newsletters to the Londoners reporting his progress.² The itinerant nature of the Signet Office and its proximity to the royal household may help to explain the absence, with one exception, of successive secretaries and their clerks from the list of known grantees.

The exception was the royal secretary John Stopyndon, awarded tenements in Harfleur in January 1420.³ Stopyndon's main interests and responsibilities lay in Rouen, however, for on 17 January 1421 he was appointed keeper of the Norman Rolls and keeper of the Hanaper of the Norman chancery, and six months later he was collated to a prebend in Rouen cathedral.⁴ The office of keeper was a responsible job because the Norman Rolls were the chief repository of information for all appointments to office and land transactions which in any way concerned the crown. They served the function of Patent Rolls in France, as their full title reveals, and were to be compiled and corrected to the same standards as those of the English chancery. Their custodian performed his duties well: the Rolls are neat and mostly legible, and Stopyndon was appointed keeper of the Hanaper in England in 1426 and

-
1. Brown, 'Privy Seal Clerks', pp. 261-2, 265; Maxwell-Lyte, Great Seal, p. 45; C.C.R., 1413-19, p. 496.
 2. J. Otway-Ruthven, The King's Secretary and the Signet Office in the XV Century (Cambridge, 1939), p. 40; Calendar of Signet Letters of Henry IV and Henry V (1399-1422), ed. J.L. Kirby (London, 1978), pp. 2-5.
 3. PRO, C.64/12 m.35; Bréquigny no. 738.
 4. D.K.R., xlii, 405, 415; Allmand, 'Relations', pp. 35, 118.

then keeper of the rolls and books of the royal chancery in 1438, by letters which referred to his good services to three Lancastrian kings in France, Normandy and England.¹ Offorde, Hethe and Stopyndon were adept in securing the annuities, benefices and offices which earned for them a livelihood in the absence of regular wages, and it has been pointed out that their proximity to the court made it more likely that some of the endless petitions which they directed towards the king would be heard with favour.²

Petitions were the normal means by which all ranks of society sought royal grace. Grants of lands and offices, wardships, annuities, pardons and privileges, all were secured in this way according to both English and French practice.³ The usual procedure was for petitions to be authenticated and passed to the keeper of the Privy Seal where they were copied as a warrant to the chancellor for issue under the great seal. Alternatively an authorised petition could be passed directly to the chancellor under the signet seal, until the Council reforms of 1444 prevented the circumvention of the Privy-Seal Office.⁴ Before that date, the criteria which determined whether a bill went directly to the chancellor or to the privy seal and thence to the

-
1. Otway-Ruthven, King's Secretary, p. 172; C.P.R., 1436-41, p. 245.
 2. Brown, 'Privy Seal Clerks', pp. 267-8. For a petition of the 'poevre cleric' John Hethe see Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions from All Souls MS. 182, ed. M.D. Legge (Anglo-Norman Text Society, iii, Oxford, 1941), p. 1).
 3. Kirby, Calendar of Signet Letters, pp. 8-9; G.R. Elton, England 1200-1640 (London, 1969), pp. 41-2; Christine de Pisan, The Treasure of the City of Ladies, ed. and trans. S. Lawson (London, 1985), p. 60; G. Tessier, Diplomatique royale française (Paris, 1962), pp. 269-72.
 4. Maxwell-Lyte, Great Seal, pp. 53-4, 90.

chancellor are uncertain.¹ The various means by which the great seal was moved were indicated by the endorsement of the letter and subsequent enrolment with the appropriate note of warranty.

In broad terms, this familiar and trusted system was that adopted by the government of Henry V in France. It is difficult to be more precise, because the extant evidence comprises the end result of the grant-making process in the form of letters of donation and their enrolments, while the preceding stages of petition, signet letter and privy-seal warrant do not seem to have survived. Much may have been destroyed in the fire of 1619 in which the privy-seal archive was largely lost.²

What do the enrolments reveal of the way in which grants were issued? First, a handful of grants bore the note of warranty 'per breve de privato sigillo', indicating that the chancellor had received his instructions by writ of privy seal. As far as can be determined, there is nothing to distinguish these grants from the majority bearing the endorsement 'per ipsum regem'. Chronologically no pattern can be seen: a cluster of grants went through the Privy-Seal Office in March and April 1419, but others bearing the same date and place of issue did not.³ There was nothing distinctive about the location of the lands in question, their means of tenure or value, the provisions attached to the grants or the status of their recipients. What is clear is that two methods of issuing letters of grant were in use simultaneously.

1. Ibid., p. 82; A.L. Brown, 'The Authorization of Letters under the Great Seal', B.I.H.R., xxxvii (1964), 125-46.

2. Ibid., 126, 136.

3. Compare grants to Sir John Robessart and John Seynlowe (PRO, C.64/11 mm.80, 67; Bréquigny nos. 340, 342).

In both cases, petitions were addressed to the king and their success was dependent upon his favour; all that was different was their subsequent journey to the chancellor. During the reign of Henry IV it has been argued that an approved petition was literally handed by the king to the chancellor or his clerk for later issue, and there is no reason to think that the practice in Normandy under his son was substantially different.¹

It seems likely that a petitioner would have to be present in person in order to advance a claim to particular lands. A number of the Vexin landholders, for example, took advantage of the king's residence at Vernon in April and May 1419 to secure grants nearby, and it was common for lands to be allocated close to the place where letters patent were issued. Some men must therefore have faced long journeys to the royal household to make their claims heard, for the king never returned to lower Normandy after it had been conquered. Sir John Baskerville made a personal appearance before the chancery in January 1421 in order to secure an exemplification of lands given to him in April 1419. The Norman Rolls were duly consulted and the letters patent recording the original grant read out, before Baskerville swore an oath to their veracity.² The Rolls themselves were probably compiled from the drafts of actual letters issued, and enrolled some time after letters had been forwarded to the Hanaper for collection by the applicant. This again was standard English practice.³

-
1. Brown, 'Authorization of Letters', 141-2, 145.
 2. PRO, C.64/15 m.15; Bréquigny no. 942.
 3. B. Wilkinson, The Chancery under Edward III (Manchester, 1929), pp. 54-5; Maxwell-Lyte, Great Seal, pp. 360-3.

Errors and omissions there certainly were. Some grants were not enrolled, either because drafts were lost or because recipients were unwilling to pay to have their title deeds put on the official record. One suspects that the latter were relatively few in number and that most grants which were not enrolled had been inadvertently passed over. Land won by conquest needed as secure a title as it was possible to obtain, and in the event of loss of personal papers, the chancery would provide the only certain proof of tenure. One of the most important transactions not to appear on the Rolls was the grant to the earl of Warwick of the comté of Aumale on 19 May 1419.¹ It is unusual to find a major grant omitted from the record, and there is no way of quantifying lesser grants which were similarly excluded. Mistakes in chancery procedure could take several forms, including the granting of the same lands to two different people within a short space of time and the duplication of entries.² Where letters were entered on to the Roll more than once, the original entry was to be cancelled, and examples of this practice can be seen in the first Norman Roll.³ Corrections in a different hand can also be seen. A cryptic note to William Bradwardine's award of the lordship of St.-Vaast in February 1418 revealed that the lands had been restored to their former owner.⁴

Grants of land during the period 1417-22 were most commonly authorised by a direct warrant from king to chancellor. This applied

-
1. G.E.C., i, 503-4.
 2. Above, p. 50.
 3. Hardy, pp. 228, 250, 253-5.
 4. Ibid., pp. 275-6.

both to small grants of little value and to awards of comtés to the senior figures of the Lancastrian government. This was contrary to established procedure, whereby the more important letters issuing grants and annuities were directed to the Privy-Seal Office for consideration by the keeper and members of the Council while lesser business went directly to the chancellor's office.¹ Sources for the settlement give a firm impression that it was in the person of the king that responsibility for the reallocation of conquered estates rested. During his absence from Normandy between January and June 1421 grants were not made. In his presence, they bore the stamp of a man with clear aims in mind.

No two grants carried exactly the same wording but many letters and enrolments possessed a common form derived from standard models. Sir Christopher Curwen's award of Cany and Canyell represents a good example of this form.² First came a salutation clause which identified the recipient and his rank and made some reference to good services in the past which it was hoped would be continued. Next came details of the lands in question, their status, location and former owner or owners, and the reason for their availability for redistribution. Then a 'habendum et tenendum' clause defined the tenure of the grantee, the estimated value of the lands, and the tribute to be presented on a specified occasion, with due homage. The next two clauses listed the rights to be retained by the crown and then the services owed by the recipient, often in the form of a given number of men-at-arms and archers for the royal armies provided at the grantee's cost. In

1. Kirby, Calendar of Signet Letters, p. 9.

2. PRO, C.64/10 m.16; Bréquigny no. 275; see also Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 55.

addition, the holder of a castle or fortification was expected to furnish men for the defence of the caput and its surrounds. Finally, the dating clause recorded the time and place of issue of the letters patent.

The salutation clause may in itself yield clues for our purpose. The identification of a 'miles' or an 'armiger' serves as a basic reference point denoting individual status at a particular date. The provenance of a recipient is always a valuable item of information on such as John Wyse, 'de comitatu Cornubie', as is occupation or household attachment, in the case of the minstrel, Richard Geffrey.¹ It is also at this point that due tribute could be made to men whose services were considered especially worthy of royal acknowledgment. Salisbury's grant of the comté of Perche in April 1419 rewarded his inquiries into the rights and privileges of the crown within Normandy and Perche, 'volentes que provide prout regie convenit dignitati'.² Henry V's concern to reward his leading commanders with territories befitting their rank could find expression in terms which transcended the formal language of the chancery clerks.

The description of the lands themselves was often summary, but does allow several observations. Most important, from the use of terms such as comté, lordship, and fief a rough correlation may be seen between the status of lands and their recipient. Salisbury's comté and Curwen's castles and lordships were clearly reasonable requests by men of baronial and knightly rank. Estates were often taken over en bloc, and the crown had no immediate way of knowing

1. PRO, C.64/11 m.64; C.64/9 m.40; Bréquigny nos. 468, 75.

2. PRO, C.64/11 mm. 63-2; D.K.R., xli, 772.

whether the evidence presented in petitions was true or false. In the early stages of the occupation it was all but impossible to distinguish rebels, from absentees, from those genuinely away from their holdings; in Curwen's case, the duke of Bavaria was a rebel, 'ut dicitur', and therefore was guilty until proven innocent. Similarly, the extent and value of lands claimed could not be known until a proper survey had been carried out, which accounts for the vagueness of those clauses in the largest of all grants such as that of Perche, 'in quantum in omnibus se extendit'. Most grants did, however, specify a value and a rider, 'si valorem illum non excedant'. Land grants bore a nominal value at first, but it will be seen below that there was concern lest the stated value of confiscated lands be exceeded, after a survey or dénombrément had been carried out, to the detriment of the crown.

In almost all cases grants were issued by Henry V in tail male, the estate passing to the eldest male heir to the exclusion of the female line. Hereditary tenure was a means of attracting settlers with the promise of lineal male descent, and the supply of new blood to the settlement, whether in the form of the fabled younger sons excluded by primogeniture or others who were disadvantaged or ambitious, was essential. Tenure in tail male accorded well with the contemporary trend away from estates held in fee tail, whereby lack of male issue caused a daughter to inherit and the estate to pass out of the family possession in the event of her marriage, a theme much illuminated by K.B. McFarlane.¹ The failure of the male line meant that the estate reverted to the donor, in this case the crown. It may well be that our main source does not accurately reflect the balance between grants

1. McFarlane, Nobility, pp. 272-8.

in tail male on the one hand and life-grants and those at pleasure on the other, but the quantity and the distribution of Henrician grants suggests that the king was successful in achieving his own balance between the longer-term interests of donor and donees.

Military service was required as tangible proof of commitment to the royal cause.¹ This requirement took three basic forms. Where lands were taken over which did not have a specified caput but comprised a number of fiefs formerly held by one or several Frenchmen, their tenure made necessary the provision of soldiers for the royal armies.² Where a caput was known or fiefs were specifically identified there was usually a provision to defend the nearest town or fortified settlement whenever such service was demanded, in addition to the supply of soldiers.³ Finally, grants of castles, fortresses and named lordships were often accompanied by an obligation to provide for the local defence of the stronghold, as in Curwen's case, with men equipped and paid at the settler's expense. This was usually a supplement to the other two requirements.

Land held in return for military service was, by definition, feudal property.⁴ To what extent, then, was the land settlement of Henry V and his successors a feudal settlement?⁵ Looked at from the

-
1. The question of service by obligation is discussed in detail by Dr. Anne Curry in her thesis, and I am indebted to her for information and guidance.
 2. See e.g. PRO, C.64/11 m.73; Bréquigny no. 346, a grant to John Skelton of lands in the bailliages of Caen and the Cotentin.
 3. William Merlin owed service at Caudebec for the lordship of Valliquerville west of Yvetot (PRO, C.64/11 m.75; Bréquigny no. 377).
 4. J.S. Critchley, Feudalism (London, 1978), p. 11.
 5. Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 463-4.

English side and from the terms of enrolled grants between 1417 and 1422 in particular it would appear that a conscious attempt was made to revive ancient feudal practice in demands for quotas, personal military service, homage and fealty and tributes. Professor Contamine has argued that this motley collection of feudal services meant little in terms of military organization at this date,¹ but this was not necessarily the case as regards land. For one thing Henry V was surely not the man to persist with anachronistic or useless forms. In either case, the important point is that a view which credits Henry V either with the revival of former practices or the introduction of a pragmatic 'neo-feudalism' runs the risk of underestimating the extent and the depth of continuing, traditional habits of land tenure. There was nothing new in vassals offering symbols of lordship to seigneurs in the form of tributes of flowers, spurs or lances; in knight service in varying length owed by tenants; in swearing oaths and listing possessions in an aveux et dénombrement.² The Lancastrians adapted and made full use of these means throughout the occupation and although one might consider that they contributed to the longevity of an archaic system another view would have it that the adoption of tried and trusted tenorial practices was practical, familiar at all levels and in accordance with the conservative ethos of land management and possession.

-
1. Contamine, Guerre, état et société, pp. 46-9, 218-22.
 2. Bib. Mun. Rouen, Tiroir 410 no. 1; J. Boussard, 'L'Enquête de 1172 sur les services de chevalier en Normandie', Recueil de travaux offert à M. Clovis Brunel (2 vols., Paris, 1955), i, 193-208; AN, P 129^B f. 92; P 274² no. 6356; P 1923³ no. 4680. See also Curry, 'Military Organization', pp. 371-8, where emphasis is put on the use of Valois precedents for public military service and for land grants.

A respect for local observances and past customs should be borne in mind even when examining a quantifiable relationship such as that between the estimated maximum value of granted lands and the number of soldiers to be provided for the royal host. The totals for soldiers in Table 1 were those most often specified in letters of grant, but not every grant worth up to 600 écus, for example, required four archers; sometimes two and sometimes three were needed. Nevertheless, the table permits three points to be made.¹ First, it was upon the estimated value of lands that the requirement for military service was based.

Table 1. Land Value Related to Military Service,
1417-22.

| Land value in <u>écus</u> | Men-at-arms | Archers |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------|
| 0- 49 | - | - |
| 50-199 | - | 1 |
| 200-299 | 1 | 1 |
| 300-399 | 1 | 2 |
| 400-499 | 1 | 3 |
| 500-699 | 1 | 4 |
| 700 | 1 | 5 |
| 800 | 2 | 5 |
| 1000 | 2 | 5 |
| 1100 | 3 | 6 |
| 1200 | 3 | 8 |
| 1600 | 4 | 8 |
| 2000 | 5 | 10 |
| 4000 | 7 | 16 |
| 5000 | 10 | 20 |

1. The écu was worth slightly less than the livre tournois. A similar table can be constructed for grants in l.t.

Landed income was, in effect, intended to finance field armies in the defence of what had been won and in carrying the war to the enemy. Anticipated revenues would therefore support men-at-arms and archers, usually in the ratio of 1:2, the normal French ratio, at the expense of the incoming settler.¹ Second, the table suggests that both the Norman chancery and settlers understood a basic formula which equated income and service to each other. This sheds light on the official policy of matching grants to the status of the grantee whenever possible. No lowly esquire could afford to equip or maintain the retinue demanded of a large lordship or comté, while the common soldier was virtually excluded from holding any land which required more than the defence of the local town. Third, the crown's concern to obtain swift and accurate valuations of lands once granted stemmed partly from its need to invoke its ancient right to military service, in due proportion. Services owed were to be performed in order that the conquest might become as self-sufficient as possible in terms of manpower.

Rights reserved to the crown may be briefly mentioned. The power to exercise high justice was rarely given away since it conferred upon its holder both individual autonomy and a judicial authority which included the right to execute tenants.² This sovereign right was accorded to Salisbury in Perche for example, but was otherwise among the most jealously-guarded of the crown's privileges throughout the occupation. A further exemption was the reservation of the quarries near Caen and Falaise whose stone was to be used for the construction

-
1. Curry, 'Military Organization', pp. 94, 395.
 2. Keen, Laws of War, pp. 78-9; J.R. Sweeney, 'High Justice in Fifteenth-Century Normandy: the Prosecution of Sandrin Bourel', Journal of Medieval History, x (1984), 295-313.

of the royal palace at Rouen - this clause first appeared in grants made after the city's capture. One universal proviso was that a grant which duplicated another was invalid, as were those which inadvertently included demesne lands, unless express exemption was made.

It was argued in Chapter One that the hand of Henry V did much to shape the substance and the form of the early settlement. It is worth reiterating that almost all letters of grant were issued in his name, and those that were not required subsequent royal ratification. Such was the practice regarding grants issued by Gloucester and Clarence.¹ It is possible that other senior Lancastrians profited from this nominal devolution of authority, but the impact of their allocations on the overall settlement cannot have been great. The context was rather that of the local settlement management for which named commanders and captains were given responsibility. Clarence was certainly able to issue grants within his apanage holdings, and employed the faithful Walter Intebergh as chief seneschal in his vicomtés.²

The administrative procedure governing the actual allocation of Norman lands underwent no major changes between 1422 and 1449, the date of the last known grant. As we have seen, Bedford kept as tight a grip on the disbursal of confiscated estates as his brother had done.³ In April 1425 instructions were issued to forbid the chancellor, the treasurer-general and the chambre des comptes from authenticating letters of grant not passed by Bedford or the Grand Conseil and

-
1. Above, p. 10; PRO, C.64/15 m.19; Bréquigny no. 923.
 2. Lenoir 3/336-7.
 3. Above, pp. 69-71.

signed by approved notaries.¹ The first move of an intending grantee was to address a supplication to Bedford, the standard means by which grants of land and pardons for criminal offences were sought. It acted, too, as a vehicle for airing grievances for which remedy was sought. Thomas Kirkeby had his title deeds stolen by brigands and was then cheated by a clerk whom he employed to redraft them. When he took the letters to Paris to be sealed they were found to be false, causing Kirkeby to be imprisoned in the Conciergerie until his case came to the Regent's attention.² Presenting one's suit could be a complicated business to the likes of John Faucq and Sir John Handford. Faucq wanted the extension of a grant made to him by Henry V to include lands which he had not known about at the time, as well as recognition of the knighthood conferred at Verneuil.³ Handford was permitted to hold Maisons-sur-Seine and other confiscated estates as their former owners had held them, 'c'est assavoir de celles qui sont a vie a vie, et des autres a tousjours mais perpetuelment et hereditablement'.⁴ The advantages of grant registration were well worth the fee payable since an official record afforded insurance against the loss of deeds and against the ever-likely threat of litigation and counter-claim, as Handford was well able to appreciate.

There were two main differences between the grants issued by Bedford and those made by his brother. The clause denoting a specific

-
1. Ordonnances des rois de France de la troisième race (22 vols., Paris, 1723-1849), xiii, 84.
 2. AN, JJ 172 no. 492. Kirkeby was restored only to those lands not already confiscated.
 3. Ibid., JJ 172 no. 583.
 4. Ibid., JJ 172 no. 641; Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, p. 45.

military obligation no longer appeared and was replaced by a general stipulation to perform customary services and pay usual duties. The emphasis of the Chancellerie grants lay not on the personal services owed by individual recipients but on the status and value of the fiefs in question. This apparent discontinuity reflects a more realistic interpretation of the way in which military service might be performed. The principle that such service was owed remained unchanged, for all that was new was the formula used to record grants.

English and French petitions alike were merged in the Chancellerie registers after the Norman Rolls ceased to be kept, which meant that awards to settlers, recorded in the hand of French secretaries, were made and enjoyed under the same conditions as their French counterparts. This is a point worth emphasising. A study of the grants made by Charles VI after 1419 reveals a good deal of similarity in the tenure of both rural and urban properties to the terms imposed on English grantees. Pierre de Luxembourg was awarded lands to hold in perpetuity, forfeit by the rebellion of the seigneur d'Argillières, lands worth up to 2,000 l.t. according to an estimate of their value some fifteen years previously. The king was entitled to any revenues exceeding that sum, and in the event of the failure of the male line the lands were to revert to the royal demesne.¹ These were conditions commonly applied to Frenchmen loyal to the treaty of Troyes and to Lancastrian settlers alike. One is therefore struck by the continuity in the pattern of land tenure between letters issued in the name of Charles VI and those made in that of Henry VI.

Further support to this view comes from attempts to estimate the

1. AN, JJ 172 no. 129.

value of estates named in these letters. The question of the precise meaning of such clauses has recently been raised.¹ From the evidence of grants to Frenchmen in the first instance, it may be seen that references to estimated income some fifteen years prior to the date of the grant were intended to convey some idea of potential revenue before the conflict of Burgundy and Orléans had divided the country.² In other words, grants made between 1422 and 1424 contained a clause, inaccurate in its chronology, which nevertheless consciously recalled 'le temps de paix' when the value and income of many estates was at a peak. Settlers who took over these same estates saw their grants bear the identical formula, although by the spring of 1423 a more specific clause was in use: 'En Regart à ce qu'ilz valoient ou povoient valoir l'an mil iiii^c et dix'.³ The reference to 1410 commonly made in letters of grant was not to a large-scale land valuation of that year.⁴ It was a popular representation of a time 'before the present divisions' to which opposing parties aspired to return, and provides another telling example of the continuity of tenurial and customary practice between Valois and Lancastrian régimes.

The second feature to distinguish Bedford's grants concerned estate possession, namely the greater use of life-grants and those at pleasure. This was no overnight conversion from previous policy but rather a recognition that a more complex tenurial pattern was

-
1. Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 70-1.
 2. Grants to Pierre de Marigny and Philippe de Morvilliers are good examples (AN, JJ 172 nos. 67, 95). See also Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, p. 11 n. 66 for similar references.
 3. AN, JJ 172 nos. 265, 441.
 4. Cf. C. de Robillard de Beaurepaire, 'La Normandie pendant l'occupation anglaise', B.S.A.N., xxvii (1909), 105-6.

necessary to embrace new grantees of lesser means rewarded after Verneuil, for example. The evolution of the settlement meant that such a pattern was in any case likely to form, as the theoretical provisions contained within letters patent were met by the practical reality of succession at a time of war. Tenurial terms under the Regency and after 1435 were never so strict as to prevent the accommodation of individual interests. In 1431 the veteran settler William Ayleston, then aged around eighty and with no male heirs, disposed of his lands to two Englishmen.¹ At a later date Sir John Salvain and his wife were similarly without heirs and were given free licence to alienate property jointly or separately to any of their lineage.²

There was a continued insistence that grants should not comprise demesne lands, for it should be remembered that Bedford and the Grand Conseil bore a responsibility akin to that of the King's Council to preserve the royal inheritance. In September 1427 it was reported by the royal procureur général that the lordship of La Roche-Tesson constituted part of the demesne. Instructions for its confiscation were therefore issued regardless of Walter Lord FitzWalter's claim to hold the land by grant of Henry V, 'ce qui ne peut avoir esté fait que par inadvertence'.³ High justice remained a crown privilege and men of senior status received major holdings to whatever value they had once been, were now, or might be in future.⁴ Life-grants also reflected a

1. Lenoir 22/201; above, pp. 11-12.

2. Lenoir 28/147.

3. Ibid., 22/69.

4. AN, JJ 173 nos. 648, 657.

measure of continuity in the policy of the two brothers, for the Ordinances of Henry V on the Maintenance of the Conquest required that grants for life could only be alienated for life and should return to the crown on the death of their holder.¹ These ordinances were themselves reissued on 16 August 1430, indicating that they remained valid in law.

Elements of change in the grant-making process point to the increasing difficulties faced by the settlement. In particular, the provision within the terms of the treaty of Troyes that Burgundians and loyal Frenchmen returning to their estates should be compensated for losses suffered by means of grants was not merely a token inclusion. Restitutions to the dispossessed had begun even before the signing of the treaty, and Bedford was prepared to compensate Roger de Breauté² and to restore to his rightful estates Jacques Painei, a member of one of the oldest Norman families.³ Although the Chancellerie registers do not contain many restitutions or grants of compensation, the evidence is sufficient to suggest that the onus of implementing the treaty lay with Bedford and that he was not afraid to carry out the task. Roger de Breauté's Norman lands were probably in the hands of an Englishman who held them by hereditary tenure, necessitating partial compensation with lands in Brie, whereas Painei was restored to his lordship of Courbépine near Bernay and to other lands in the bailliages of Rouen and Evreux granted for life to John Harbottle, usher of the royal chamber, in October 1423. Here we come to the nub of the

1. BL, Add. Ms. 21411 f. 9v.

2. AN, JJ 173 no. 748.

3. Ibid., JJ 173 no. 154; Lenoir 21/403.

matter: grants for life or at pleasure were reversible, grants in tail male were not. This must have had a crucial bearing on the hearing of petitions. Where doubt existed about ownership, where lawsuits were pending, where it was thought that an absentee or rebel might return, a life-grant was a safer option. Most important, the uncommon instances of life-grants being upgraded to allow hereditary tenure (although permissible after 1430) does suggest that French lands held for life were to be taken over by their new owners in the same way; conversely, those once held in tail male were to be enjoyed on the same terms.¹

Relevant to this point was the issue of instructions regarding the management of the settlement and their subsequent implementation in the terms of letters issued. The Chancellerie was quick to respond to new orders, whether emanating from England, Normandy or from the two councils which merged during Henry VI's stay in France. As a direct result of a Council ordinance of November 1431 designed to raise revenue for the repayment of a royal loan, a clause was inserted into some grants from January 1432 requiring that the first year's revenue of newly-ceded estates be collected by appointed royal officers, 'en acquiet de certains emprunts'.² When money was needed the Chancellerie had to move quickly to satisfy its masters. As we have seen, it was also from around 1430 that existing settlers had to make out a case for receiving further donations.³

The restrictive practices imposed by the King's Council were duly

-
1. AN, JJ 173 nos. 293, 718.
 2. This tax applied only to lands within Normandy (ibid., JJ 175 nos. 60-2, 150).
 3. Above, pp. 119-21.

absorbed but, it appears, largely forgotten in their absence. The grant-making procedures of the later occupation differed little from established practice, in spite of the changing powers held by successive lieutenants-general to issue awards. Tenure in tail male¹ and for life may be found in roughly equal proportions, and the chief concerns of the crown were first, that owners resided within the English obedience and secondly, that they paid one-tenth of their landed income towards the construction of the royal palace at Rouen.² This levy of one-tenth was intended as a once-only payment applicable both to grants already made (although how this was to operate in practice was not stated) and to new grants in tail male. Life-grants were eligible for a once-only payment of one-twentieth of their annual revenue.³ Money was clearly in short supply, especially for expenditure on large capital projects which did not directly contribute to the war effort. One may well imagine that this was an unpopular levy at a time when landed income was in decline and when the potential value of lands on paper was likely to bear little resemblance to its real worth. Frenchmen were to pay as well as Englishmen.⁴ The man appointed to collect the monies was the loyal secretary Ralph Parker, who was to be paid 200 l.t. a year to oversee both income and expenditure on the work of fortifying the royal palace.⁵ Concern remained to the very end lest grants include demesne lands, a condition of Scales's award of landed revenues to the

-
1. Sir William Porter had held lordships in tail male but on his death without heirs male the lands passed to Lord Fauconberg to hold in the same way (Lenoir 5/93).
 2. BL, Add. Ch. 11950.
 3. Lenoir 5/69.
 4. Ibid., 26/199, 3/350.
 5. Ibid., 26/207.

value of 2,000 saluts d'or.¹ Unless a specific exemption was granted allowing for the allocation of the king's patrimony, as eventually occurred with John Beaufort's acquisition of St.-Sauveur-Lendelin, the crown's pressing need for its estate revenues made such exceptions unusual.²

(ii) The Granting of Urban Properties

It is important to distinguish between two forms of tenure which existed concurrently throughout the urban occupation. A proportion of all grants, perhaps one quarter, took the form of grants in tail male; almost all bore the note of warranty 'per ipsum regem'. Apart from a handful of life-grants in the early months, however, a large majority of the awards made by Henry V were in fact rents, which made no provision for heirs and no reference to the length of tenure to be enjoyed. These rents commonly owed the service of watch and guard duty at night as well as an annual money rent: William Moreton owed 3s. 4d. and half of one night's duty; Robert Bayeston owed 20d. and one night's duty.³ Only rarely were other restrictions imposed. By contrast, settlers desirous of actually owning property had to satisfy a host of conditions. The property must not have been granted previously, and no part of it might in future be alienated to any but Englishmen without special licence.⁴ Repairs had to be carried out

1. Ibid., 26/389.

2. Jones, 'Beaufort Family', pp. 289-90.

3. PRO, C.64/14 m.8; Bréquigny no. 902.

4. PRO, C.64/11 m.4; Bréquigny no. 704.

within a set time, often fourteen months or two years,¹ and sometimes a house was to be built on vacant land within eighteen months.²

Finally, a new owner was to pay a money rent and perform the customary guard duty in person or by proxy.

Was there a correlation between the value of the property granted and the performance of the guet, a relationship which equates to that of military service for the tenure of fiefs? At Harfleur Table 2 reveals that there was a very rough correlation between the two, and that it made no difference whether houses were held as rents or entailed grants.

Table 2. Property Value Related to Guard Duty at Harfleur, 1417-22

| Annual rent in sous and deniers tournois | Number of nights' <u>guet</u> owing |
|---|--|
| 6 <u>d</u> . | $\frac{1}{4}$ |
| 12 <u>d</u> . | $\frac{1}{4}$ |
| 20 <u>d</u> . | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 3 <u>s</u> . | 1 |
| 3 <u>s</u> . 4 <u>d</u> . | 1 |
| 5 <u>s</u> . | 1 |
| 6 <u>s</u> . 8 <u>d</u> . | 1 |
| 10 <u>s</u> . | 1 or 2 |
| 13 <u>s</u> . 4 <u>d</u> . | 2 |
| 20 <u>s</u> . | 3 |

-
1. The longer period was common to grants in Caen (PRO, C.64/16 mm.37, 23; Bréquigny nos. 980, 1031).
 2. PRO, C.64/12 m.10; Bréquigny no. 775.

The two benchmark figures are those of 3s. 4d. and 6s. 8d., both owing one night's duty.¹ In some cases, the distinction between them seems to have lain in the location and probable size of the property concerned, while in others the state of repair was all-important, the frequent description of 'ruine' halving the rent and guet owed.² The pattern at Harfleur is a varied one, a testimony to the damage incurred in the siege of the town and the proliferation of ruined buildings and vacant ground, and to the tenurial negotiations between the tenants and the royal commissioners which allowed a measure of latitude in the terms by which grants were held.

At Caen, on the other hand, both rents and grants of property usually owed one night's guard duty regardless of rent payable. Thomas Russell's house on the Grande Rue owed 6 l.t. and that of Thomas Appulton on the rue de Franc 20 s.t. Both owed one night of guet.³ Where two houses were owned the duty was doubled.⁴ Honfleur properties also owed one night's service and rents which matched the standard figures at Harfleur.⁵ Duties necessary in return for the right to hold or own property therefore varied according to local customary practice and conditions. Settlers were liable to the watch and ward as a consequence of concern for the security of captured towns, but the service was itself derived from an essential obligation of burgage

-
1. PRO, C.64/12 mm.9-8; Bréquigny nos. 772, 775.
 2. In February 1420 Hugh Luterell was given one Harfleur tenement owing 6s. 8d. and one night's watch and guard duty, and another in a ruined state owing 3s. 4d. and half a night's duty (PRO, C.64/12 m.25; Bréquigny no. 747).
 3. PRO, C.64/13 m.14; C.64/14 m.15; Bréquigny nos. 809, 879.
 4. PRO, C.64/14 m.19; Bréquigny no. 884.
 5. PRO, C.64/16 mm.27, 22; Bréquigny nos. 1024, 1043.

tenure which had long obtained on both sides of the sea.¹ As a specific requirement for property held, or as a general provision to be called upon in times of danger, a communal responsibility, the guet does correspond to the military service incumbent upon those holding rural fiefs.

(iii) The Royal Demesne

Having considered the manner in which lands and houses were apportioned, it remains to examine their subsequent administration. First, something must be said about those territories which were not normally parcelled out to incoming settlers but remained in crown hands as demesne lands. The task of producing an account of the extent and value of the Lancastrian demesne in France is an impossible one, owing to the loss of some of the chambre des comptes records.² Enough evidence has survived, however, to enable a comparison to be drawn with the position in England, where it has been argued that the royal demesne did not exist as a separate entity until the early fifteenth century and that no attempt was made to collect its revenues systematically.³

It has been noted above that Henry V had, from an early date, approved grants on condition that they did not comprise properties reserved to the royal use. This clause remained valid, but was in some cases supplemented by a general proviso that any lands to be

-
1. J. Tait, The Medieval English Borough. Studies on its Origins and Constitutional History (Manchester and New York, 1936), pp. 108-112.
 2. Nortier, 'Le Sort des archives dispersées', 463-4.
 3. B.P. Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History (London, 1971), pp. 34-7, 69.

allocated did not include 'aliqua parcella ... de dominio regum Francie aut ducatus nostri Normannie'.¹ This statement first appeared in letters issued in the middle of 1419, a time when the king was ordering his baillis and commissioners to take inventories of landholders who had not performed due homage for their possessions. As the conquest advanced into upper Normandy there was concern that all land be held by letters patent of the crown, and in June 1419 the order was given that all lordships and manors without due title should be taken into possession by the baillis without delay.² The message to Norman and Englishman was self-explanatory: unless a written record existed to the contrary, all landed possessions and revenues within the Lancastrian obedience belonged to the crown as part of the demesne. The English presence on French soil was, after all, justified by Henry V's claim to the territory and subjects of Normandy as his rightful inheritance, and all those of either nationality enjoying privileges of whatever kind did so at his behest. A strong element of legal right permeated this insistence on the position of the king as feudal lord, of whom all land was held by the performance of the appropriate duties. The penalty for non-observance or for the breaking of the oath binding man to lord was dispossession and the confiscation of estates and moveable goods.

Allied to this claim was of course a financial motive, and an awareness that the costs of prolonged warfare made it essential that the war should, as far as was possible, pay for itself. The theory was

-
1. Both clauses applied to Richard earl of Worcester's acquisition of the Umfraville lands in August 1421 (PRO, C.64/16 m.30; Bréquigny no. 1008), whereas the original grant referred only to reserved properties at Falaise and Caen (PRO, C.64/10 m.28; D.K.R., xli, 733).
 2. PRO, C.64/11 m.40d; Bréquigny no. 599.

that the burden upon the king's subjects in England would be reduced or removed by exploiting conquered possessions to maximum effect. Dr. Wolffe has argued that the English demesne lands were not expected to make a direct contribution to the war effort in the manner of parliamentary taxation, indirect taxation or loans, but were instead intended to support members of the royal family and to provide irregular assistance with government expenses.¹ Did this then apply to the conquered demesne lands of France?

On the whole, this assertion is valid only until around the year 1430. Until that date, the revenues of the royal demesne were at best an adjunct to the aides granted by the estates of Normandy and to the sums raised in England for immediate use in the war effort.² The accounts of Pierre Surreau as receiver-general of Normandy for the years 1423-4 and 1428-9 reveal that the revenues from the mints, customs and gains of war were not high, and the vicomtes whose duty it was to collect the income from confiscations and wardships, from forest rights, profits of justice and of seals were experiencing increasing difficulties in administering the domanial revenues and were themselves more and more reluctant to travel to Paris and later to Rouen to present their accounts.³ It was Newhall's view that domanial revenues declined sharply between 1419 and 1424, and while accepting this, it should be

-
1. Wolffe, Royal Demesne, pp. 49-51, 65-6.
 2. B.J.H. Rowe, 'The Estates of Normandy under the Duke of Bedford, 1422-1435', E.H.R., xlvii (1931), 551-78; H.L. Ratcliffe, 'The Military Expenditure of the English Crown 1422-1435' (unpublished University of Oxford M.Litt. thesis, 1979), pp. 184-7.
 3. BN, Ms. fr. 4485, 4488, passim; Burney, 'English Rule in Normandy', pp. 75-6; A. Plaisse, La Baronnie du Neubourg. Essai d'histoire agraire, économique et sociale (Paris, 1961), pp. 309-10.

pointed out that alienations from the demesne itself were unlikely to have been a major cause.¹ As we have seen, Henry V made grants only on the express condition that no part of his patrimony be included, and in November 1424 Bedford issued a revocation of all demesne grants which had been made inadvertently by himself or his predecessor.²

The problem here is partly one of definition. On the one hand, the domanial revenues embraced the incidents of tenure referred to which were administered by the vicomtes in accounts to the chambre des comptes. On the other, the Lancastrians took steps to preserve those sovereign territories of diverse quality and value which had fallen into their hands, as it were, whose extent and value cannot now be known.

In the broadest sense, all lands granted to settlers or restored to Normans formed part of the demesne, and their distribution did deprive the crown of potential revenue. In particular, the allocation of comtés to Willoughby, Hungerford and Salisbury among others served to direct considerable revenues into private hands for the purpose of political expediency. Yet we can hardly accuse the king of profligacy, of putting the needs of a richly-rewarded baronial and knightly class before those of the crown and the war. Every effort was made to protect actual known revenues which had traditionally accrued. The majority of the great lordships and estates which were given away, by contrast, were those upon which the king had no direct legal claim and whose revenues were, at the time of grant, unrealised paper revenues.

There can be little doubt that domanial income was in decline well before the difficulties later to beset all landholders were in

1. Newhall, English Conquest, p. 166.

2. Seine-Mme, Fonds Danquin, Carton 11 no. 221.

evidence. Queen Catherine was assigned a number of important seigneuries by the Grand Conseil in December 1424 in accordance with the stipulation of the treaty of Troyes, lands which had once belonged to Blanche of Navarre, widow of Philip VI. The lands were thought to be worth some 12,000 francs, leaving 10,500 francs to find from other lands nearby; in the meantime she was assigned the local aides until a full valuation could be taken.¹ There was a recognised difficulty in finding real revenues to match those existing on paper, and the practice of assigning sums owed on income due to the crown was an insidious one. During 1432 some of these lands fell into enemy hands, and on the death of the queen they returned to the demesne.²

It was during the early 1430s that the demesne and accretions to it began to be heavily exploited as a source of ready capital. In November 1431 the Grand Conseil bluntly stated that the aids and subsidies raised in Normandy, the domanial revenues there and the 'très grosses finances' from England were insufficient to meet the costs of defending French possessions. The crown had been forced to borrow up to 15,000 nobles d'or, and certain members of the Grand Conseil and the treasurers-general were authorised to raise the repayment by selling lands which had come into their hands by confiscation and other means since 29 July 1430 and until such time as the king might cross the Somme to return to England.³ Noble lands were to be sold only to Englishmen but non-noble lands might be sold to any loyal subject; all sales might

-
1. Lenoir 2/179-82; Chaplais, English Medieval Diplomatic Practice, ii, 659.
 2. BL, Add. Ch. 118; Lenoir 5/41.
 3. Ibid., 21/282-6, 22/217; Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 468.

be for life, in tail male or to all heirs. Englishmen already holding lands by royal grant were allowed to sell them only to their fellow-countrymen, while Frenchmen might sell to any living in the king's obedience.

It is not known whether this attempt to raise money was successful, but sales were certainly made by the appointed men, who were known under several titles including the 'commissaires nommés sur les vendicions d'héritages et ampliations de dons'. Thomas Kyreby purchased the fief of St.-Jean-de-Livet from them in April 1434 for 200 l. 10s. 1d. t., for example.¹ Within a year the practice of assigning lands to a certain value as a means of repaying debts had embraced at least one major landholder, Sir John Fastolf.² Fastolf and others who were licensed to seek recompense from among the reversions to the royal demesne were therefore in direct competition with the crown for revenues. In the search for income the public good was sacrificed to private gain and personal loyalty. One would not wish to make too much of this, for Fastolf had himself benefited from confiscations and forfeitures to the crown by a grant in December 1423,³ but ten years later there was evident a sense of desperation, and a sheer necessity to promise payment from anticipated revenue rather than to deliver lands already acquired.

It is during the early 1430s that references multiply to the commissioners for the augmentation of the demesne, a body of men already in existence who had the power to issue grants themselves where revenue

1. Lenoir 21/287-8.

2. Ibid., 26/219.

3. BN, PO 1101 Fastolf no. 2.

might accrue to the royal benefit,¹ and the right to examine the accounts of the vicomtes and receveurs whose job it was to receive and administer demesne revenues. Their duties were many. The commissioners were charged with augmenting income in cash and in kind from the leasing of land, forest usages, mills, manorial dues and tolls payable for trading within towns.² The selling of newly-acquired confiscations and forfeitures became their responsibility, as did changes in the terms of tenure of lands already held, for example from a grant at pleasure to a life-grant. Theirs, too, was the task of levying a tax on the first year's revenue of any grant made within a specified period, for the express purpose of paying back the royal loan. Their commission ran from 17 November 1430 until 1 May 1434, during which time they enjoyed a wide authority to make sales, which were subsequently confirmed in the king's name, provided that local customs were respected and that at least four of their number were in agreement.³ Their commission was probably extended, for John Stanlaw was so employed at Caen in August 1435 when excused the performance of his duty.⁴

The years 1429-32 saw the expression of a growing concern at the course of the land settlement. The King's Council were clearly not happy about its administration, and in particular about the financial management of the demesne lands.⁵ The insistence on residence on

-
1. BL, Add. Ch. 3758.
 2. A comparable attempt was made in the bailliage of Rouen between 1261-6 (J.R. Strayer (ed.), The Royal Domain in the Bailliage of Rouen (revised edn., London, 1976).
 3. Lenoir 21/286-7.
 4. BL, Add. Ch. 3763; Burney, 'English Rule in Normandy', p. 77.
 5. Rowe, 'Grand Conseil', 223-8.

French soil by settlers, the reissue of Henry V's Ordinances and the appearance of restrictive clauses in the terms of new grants made during this period, as well as the money-raising schemes described above, constitutes a package of measures designed to augment the revenues derived from French lands and to reduce the demands of the war upon English money and manpower. The occupation needed to become more self-sufficient, and it may well be that the royal councillors felt themselves better able to achieve this than Bedford. If so, this may alter our perspective of the suspension of the Regency in April 1430. As much as a personal attack on his authority in France, it may have stemmed from a utilitarian view of the settlement, a view based upon financial and economic considerations which emphasised the importance of domanial revenues and cash rents.¹ After all, the Council did carry out their threat made at Canterbury in that month to appropriate and return to the demesne some of Bedford's own landed revenues in Alençon and the pays de conquête.² There could be no more personal way of driving home their message than to deprive the king's uncle of a portion of his landed income.

The royal demesne came to be regarded as a reservoir of patronage, as the privileged and protected status which it had formerly enjoyed was challenged by a growing demand for revenues both for the war and for the honouring of private commitments. The outflow was greatest just at the time when the supply of lands was at its lowest. The commissioners for forfeitures and confiscations had the unenviable job of trying to balance supply and demand; they were responsible to the

1. Cf. Rowe, 'John, Duke of Bedford', pp. 90-3.

2. P.P.C., iv, 37; Lenoir 22/189.

treasurer-general for putting crown lands to the best use.¹ Increasingly, this came to mean farming out lands and wardships to the highest bidder for an annual income, a practice which worked well when bidders were in competition locally. Where, as happened so often after 1436, a sole bidder came forward, only a nominal rent could be demanded. It was not uncommon for no one to tender for lands offered by the vicomtes at public criées on three successive Sundays or market days.

Lest we consider that the demesne fell readily a victim to the forces of supply and demand, however, a historical perspective remained alive, tempering encroachments and abuses.. The procureur du roi opposed a grant in the Cotentin in 1439 on the grounds that some forty years previously the lands had been put to farm by Charles VI:

'la possession ... étoit de si long temps
qu'elle devoit par Raison estre dicte et
reputée ancien demaine'.²

The royal demesne was thus augmented and preserved, by fair means and foul, by local and central staff treading a narrow line between the pressing need for a ready cash income and a longer view which emphasised the right of Henry VI to the patrimony of his Valois predecessors.

(iv) Administration and Financial Management

The immediate need of Henry V on campaign was to exercise authority quickly and efficiently in response to particular

1. See BN, PO 1101 Fastolf no. 2 for their role in 1423 and BN, n. acq. fr. 21135 no. 106 for the use of commissioners by Charles VII to put to farm lands confiscated from the English after 1450.

2. AN, P 1914² no. 28178.

circumstances. To that end, he made use of two interchangeable forms, the commission and the mandate. The commission empowered one or several individuals to receive those wishing to swear fealty, to issue safe-conducts and to take the surrender of captured towns and strongholds.¹ The mandate was often addressed to a single or several baillis bearing instructions to be carried out and information to be disseminated by public proclamation. It was by use of the mandate to all baillis that efforts were made to ascertain the extent and tenure of lands held on 1 August 1417, the date of the landing at Touques.²

A third instrument was employed for what might be termed declarations of policy, the ordinance. It is proposed to examine first a collection of statements entitled 'The Ordinances of Henry V on the Maintenance of the Conquest', and then what became known to contemporaries as 'l'ordonnance de Moronval'. No firm date can be ascribed to the Ordinances of Henry V, for they survive only as copies made later.³ They were also known as 'les lois du feu Roy d'Angleterre', and clearly made an impression on contemporary legal memory.⁴ On 16 August 1430, one month after his arrival in Rouen, Henry VI confirmed and reissued the Ordinances of his father, presumably acting by the advice of the Council, although no mention was made of this.⁵ Copies were then made into the registers of the chambre des comptes and those of the Conseil du Roi at Rouen.⁶

-
1. E.g. PRO, C.64/8 m.12, C.64/9 m.40d; D.K.R., xli, 708, 795.
 2. PRO, C.64/17 m.15d; D.K.R., xlii, 450.
 3. Newhall, 'Henry V's Policy', p. 220 n. 77 suggests May or June 1421.
 4. BN, n. acq. fr. 7931 f. 391.
 5. BL, Add. Ms. 21411 fos. 9-10v; BN, Ms. fr. 5964 fos. 205v-209v.
 6. Ibid., n. acq. fr. 7627 fos. 264-266v.

First, all grants were to be held up to their stated value. If they exceeded it the king had the right to dispose of the surplus in the case of grants issued 'usque ad talem sommam' or of the entire revenue of grants made with the proviso 'si sommam talem non excedant'. In practice the early grants most often indicated the worth of land with the phrase 'ad valorem quater viginti scutorum per annum',¹ for example, but from around the end of March 1419 the clause 'si valorem illum non excedant' was frequently written immediately after the stated value of the lands in question.² This may have been a tightening-up of the regulations governing the reallocation of estates, and it has been noted above that after the capture of Rouen the spring and summer months of 1419 saw a series of mandates and commissions designed to distinguish those who had performed homage for their lands from those who had not.³ Armed with this knowledge, the intention was perhaps to encourage a greater precision in the specification of the value and extent of lands requested and to discourage attempts to secure lands ill-suited to the status of their owner and owing insufficient services to the crown. One such duty was the prisée which, when ordered to be taken, owed the revenue of one year out of ten according to customary practice.⁴

The Ordinances emphasised the changed circumstances which applied to French landholders. No lawsuit could be heard without the possession of letters patent from the Norman chancery recording the

1. PRO, C.64/9 m.7; Bréquigny no. 243.

2. PRO, C.64/11 m.67; Bréquigny no. 341.

3. PRO, C.64/10 m.15d; D.K.R., xli, 759; above, pp. 24-6.

4. Below, pp. ²86-8.

ownership of lands held on the key date of 1 August 1417.¹ Challenges to grants which relied on old titles were no longer valid, and new grants were to be quit of arrears but not of any hereditary rents owed. The problem of husbands and sons known to be in rebellion was summarily treated: the wives of rebel husbands were to keep any heritages not granted but lost their entitlement to a 'douaine'; the sons succeeded to their allotted portion but other lands held were forfeit to the crown. Another new measure was the suppression of the courts of the baillis for the hearing of tenurial disputes, for the cour du conseil at Rouen was to be the 'court souveraine' under the presidency of the chancellor, who was to know of all royal grants.² Cases which had lapsed or been interrupted by the war could be heard afresh. Two further orders stated that life-grants were to revert to the king on the death of their holder, and could only be granted to another for life, and that lordships granted with all appurtenances were adjudged to include the lands of any sub-tenants in rebellion.

The Ordinances of Henry V illustrate well the workings of the settlement in practice. They were not a theoretical statement of intent but a no-nonsense, practical guide designed to answer some of the questions which the revolution in Norman land ownership had thrown up. Estate tenure was rarely a straightforward business, and each statement seemed to pronounce upon a particular problem with a view both to clarifying the legal position of landowners at the time and to preventing abuses and disputes in the future. The king was certainly eager to ensure that there was no erosion of royal privileges, or of

1. PRO, C.64/11 m.40d; C.64/16 mm.35d, 32d; D.K.R., xlii, 321, 428, 429; Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, pp. 155-60.

2. See Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 143-51.

royal income, and throughout there runs an emphasis on customary practice, either that of the duchy or the localities within it. At the same time, new and unfamiliar measures were introduced which reflected the harsh reality of military occupation. The crown was having a larger say in the distribution of lands and in their government, and a degree of centralisation is evident in the insistence that disputes be heard at Rouen. The picture which emerges from the Ordinances is one of the new mixing with the old. There was neither a rigid imposition of a system of land tenure alien to Normandy, nor a simple takeover of existing practices and institutions where they did not suit the aims of Henry V as we may assess them.

The Moronval Ordinance can be more briefly considered. At Baugé on 22 March 1421 a number of English knights and esquires were killed, and on 3 April all baillis were ordered to return to crown possession the lands of Clarence, John Lord Roos, Sir John Grey of Heton, Sir Gilbert Umfraville and their peers without delay.¹ On 23 August 1421 at Moronval east of Dreux, which was under siege at the time, were issued formal letters patent reuniting the vicomtés of Auge, Orbec, Pont-Authou and Pont-Audemer to the royal demesne.² These were the most important of the territories acquired by Clarence in February 1418, and their reincorporation was designed to prevent the splitting-up of a prestigious and valuable collection of lordships, castles and fortalices which had been brought together under the jurisdiction of the bailli of Rouen, even though the vicomté of Orbec had come within the authority of the bailli of Evreux 'de grant ancienneté'.³ As

1. PRO, C.64/16 m.37d; Bréquigny no. 981.

2. PRO, C.64/16 m.21; Bréquigny no. 1020.

3. Lenoir 26/267.

demesne lands granted for life only they returned with the implication that they should be preserved as part of the royal patrimony. The impressive witness list testified to the gravity of the transaction: the dukes of Gloucester and of Exeter; Thomas earl of Salisbury and Richard earl^{of} Warwick; the chancellor of Normandy and the chamberlain and seneschal of the king's household.

That the resumption of the Clarence lands was of wider import than might at first appear is shown by later references to 'l'ordonnance de Morenval', as it became known. It was confirmed and reissued in September 1430 with instructions that it be widely observed and publicised, and a copy was sent to the Paris Parlement and registered there in the following month.¹ In 1433 the vicomte of Pont-Audemer challenged the right of Sir John Salvain to a fief in the parish of Vannecrocq, claiming that it should have returned to the king by the Ordonnance.² Five years later, William Browning and Thomas Barneby requested from the chambre des comptes permission to retain a lordship in the vicomté of Auge granted to them in 1436.³ The lordship had been among those confiscated by the rebellion of Jean de Trihan, and the two Englishmen were to enjoy its revenues until it was decided whether or not the land was to revert to the demesne as land held in Clarence's lifetime. It was not until 1442 that the Clarence lands were made available to those wishing to hold them at farm, when economic necessity prompted the issue of letters patent to that effect

1. AN, J 211 no. 48.

2. Eure, E 959. Salvain responded that the fief was not held of the king but was dependent on another fief held by himself. The treasurer of Normandy ordered that an information be carried out.

3. Lenoir 26/215.

by the king at Windsor.¹ Until that date, the Ordonnance had earned due recognition and had become fixed in legal memory as a measure which all but prohibited the ownership of land within four vicomtés.² The king's officials were bound to contest any claim which, knowingly or unknowingly, sought to undermine the hereditary right of the crown to territories which had been formally classified as being of its possession.

After 1422 ordinances were issued less frequently within Normandy, and the Regency saw the increasing involvement of the King's Council in England in the administration of the settlement. The Council minutes show that the governance of the French dominions was under regular discussion, given the authority of the councillors to appoint to office and to apportion revenues and privileges where they saw fit.³ The Council received letters and heard petitions and responded accordingly in the king's name, for example in acknowledging the representations made by the inhabitants of Paris, Rouen and other Norman towns.⁴ The councillors were thus acting within their right to remedy abuses made known to them on either side of the sea when they issued a proclamation on 3 August 1429: all knights, esquires and others holding French lands were to return there and perform services owing within a month, on pain of forfeiture.⁵ Absenteeism meant that personal military service had

1. Ibid., 27/141.

2. Ibid., 22/141-2.

3. See P.P.C., iii, 177-8 for Bedford's grant of the wardship and marriage right of the Tancarville estates during the minority of Henry Grey.

4. Ibid., iv, 10-11.

5. Ibid., iii, 349-51; C.C.R., 1422-9, pp. 449-50; Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 464.

been avoided, requiring a greater number of soldiers to be sent from England to compensate for those who had abandoned their obligations.

This order together with the clause inserted into new grants requiring 'résidence personnelle' certainly took effect, but perhaps only against the most blatant and persistent offenders.¹ On the one hand, a Council proclamation addressed to all sheriffs would be the only way to tackle the problem of absentee landholding from the English side, and the provision that deputies could be sent to perform services owing at the grantees' expense suggests that a realistic appraisal of the burdens of personal obligation had been made. On the other, absenteeism was a problem severe enough to warrant the attention of the Council, but only some two years after the same proclamation had been issued within Normandy.² Bedford seems to have enjoyed some authority to issue mandates and to make proclamations, with the advice of the Grand Conseil, but they probably did not have the immediacy or impact of the reforms implemented by Henry V. The impression remains that the Council in England were belatedly and ineffectually attempting to remedy abuses in the day-to-day running of the war and the settlement from which they were themselves remote.

If one proclamation seems to provide little support for such a position then the management of the settlement during the years 1430-2, already referred to, provides a further argument in its favour. In short, the restrictions placed upon grantees benefiting from the

-
1. Edmund Beaufort's absentee tenure of Mortain was the subject of serious complaint in 1433, and further action was avoided only by his promise to return there shortly (Lenoir 22/307; Jones, 'Beaufort Family', p. 283).
 2. BN, Ms. fr. 26050 no. 797.

distribution of patronage by the Grand Conseil made land tenure for the first time an unattractive and burdensome proposition. The intervention of the King's Council in the grant-making process served to upset the balance which Bedford had sought to achieve between the need to encourage settlers to take up available opportunities even in less favourable circumstances and a concern that specified duties and services be performed in return. Settlement administration was made more difficult by interruptions and changes in tenorial practices, and it appears that after Henry VI had attained his majority the institutions responsible for that administration had absorbed English land settlers into a tried and trusted Valois system, and were able to continue their work without too much interference.

One further instance of legislation from England worthy of attention came on 19 October 1439 with the publication of the Windsor Ordinance.¹ It was reported that some of those requesting grants of the king's lieutenants, on finding that the lands in question lay within enemy territory or were of little value, were either leaving their letters of grant in the Chancellerie instead of having them verified in the chambre des comptes or were having them signed by a royal secretary or notary without being sealed. The delay between the issue and registration of letters patent was now limited to a maximum of three months, and secretaries and notaries were forbidden to sign such letters. Some were trying to circumvent the standard procedure by securing cheaper, unofficial title deeds which were not authentic. Once again, the impression is of a weakness which might better have been remedied on the spot and before its effects upon fiefs which were

1. BL, Add. Ms. 11542 fos. 93-93v; Burney, 'English Rule in Normandy', p. 236.

neglected and ownerless had become too serious. The dichotomy which developed in the settlement during and following the Regency was that between the issuing of lands, either without restriction or to a certain value, and their subsequent management. The former lay in the hands of individual governors, the latter under the auspices of a miscellany of institutions on both sides of the sea whose interests were not always compatible and whose ad hoc measures did little to attack the underlying problems faced by landholders from the late 1420s until the end of the occupation.

We have seen, then, that letters of grant were issued by the Chancellerie, the name generally given to the king's writing office during the Lancastrian occupation. It may be useful to distinguish the Norman chancery of Henry V and that continued at Rouen after 1436 from the Grande Chancellerie, the long-established French royal office in Paris where grants of land and property to settlers were registered in the same way as charters of purely French concern. The Chancellerie was little-disturbed by the English presence in terms of its personnel and methods, and its secretaries continued to issue the sought-after letters sealed with green wax on silk threads which were the hallmark of grants in perpetuity.¹ As in England, the chancellor had sole authority to move the great seal, but the Windsor Ordinance reveals that the expense and probable delay caused grantees to obtain other signatures which gave a semblance of legality to their letters patent. The chancellor had authority to delay a grant if he thought that the lands in question were of the demesne, but had little power after his seal had been applied.²

1. Morel, Grande chancellerie, pp. 122, 192.

2. BN, PO 2714 no. 4.

Following the progress of a typical grant, the chancellor sent a copy to the treasurer and governor-general of finances. Little is known of the duties of this office, held successively by William Alington and Richard Wydeville, but a distinction was clearly drawn between the treasurer in Normandy and his equivalent in Paris: the two offices existed simultaneously,¹ lending support to the view that Normandy retained a degree of financial independence after the treaty of Troyes.² The Paris Trésor had traditionally comprised two departments, one to collect ordinary demesne revenue and one concerned with extraordinary finance, but from 1420 until 1443 the two offices were united.³ Within Normandy the trésoriers were probably attached to the Rouen Échiquier, with the power to authorise grants and a particular responsibility to safeguard the demesne lands and to oversee the collection of their income, a duty involving travel and personal inspections of accounts. John Stanlaw saw long service in this capacity, as did the former prévôt of Paris, Simon Morhier.⁴

The second institution to receive a copy of a grant was the chambre des comptes, like the Chancellerie a body of long standing, the royal accounting office which exercised a pervasive influence upon the land settlement.⁵ The function of the maîtres and auditeurs of the

-
1. Letters concerned with lands outside Normandy were directed to the treasurer in Paris alone (AN, JJ 175 nos. 23, 24); those with lands within the duchy went to Paris and to Normandy (ibid., nos. 367, 368).
 2. Rowe, 'Grand Conseil', pp. 214-6; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 127-30.
 3. F. Lot and R. Fawtier, Histoire des institutions françaises au moyen âge, ii, Institutions royales (Paris, 1958), 245-7.
 4. Lenoir 26/217.
 5. Lot and Fawtier, Histoire, ii, 240-44.

chambre des comptes was to put into practice the executive actions of the king or his representatives made known to it by means of the Chancellerie. They therefore registered land grants and used a Latin clause recording that letters had been signed, sealed and dated.¹ A mandate was then issued to the relevant baillis and vicomtes to put into effect the grant and to put its holder into seisin and possession. Then the chambre had to ensure that the terms of grants were adhered to, and it was to there that were sent notifications of the oaths of fealty and acts of homage performed, the aveux and dénombrements, the informations and requests for delays that constitute a large part of its surviving evidence. It was here, too, that the accounts of the baillis and vicomtes of those territories within the English possession were sent. In short, the chambre has been described as 'le factotum de la royauté ... le seul corps de l'État constitué, organisé, permanent.'²

The first requirement of a landholder was that he should perform an act of homage and swear an oath of fealty to the king as his lord. The two acts were commonly recorded in a single phrase noting that the 'foi et hommage' had been performed, but each was distinct and held its own symbolic importance. In addition, it has been noted above that grantees during the period 1417-22 were expected to present an object such as a horn, a bow and a sheath of arrows, or a pair of gilt spurs on a recognised feast or holy day at a specified castle. This was the third stage of entry into vassalage, the investiture, by which a tribute or redevance was presented to symbolise the transfer of property

1. AN, P 1905² no. 6069.

2. Lot and Fawtier, Histoire, ii, 242.

in conformity with traditional custom.¹ This took the form of a public ceremony or ritual, which explains the specification of a particular date and place on grant entries. The items presented were almost always related to fighting or hunting, or else held a nominal value, in the case of flowers and spices. The entire ceremony, it has been argued, was perceived as reinforcing the internal coherence of a male-dominated kinship system.² The oath of fealty was required of settlers throughout the occupation either in person or by proxy.³ It was a solemn oath of loyalty both to the king and, after 1420, to the treaty of Troyes.⁴ The act of homage was essentially an act of submission by a vassal offering service, to a lord offering protection.⁵ It seems that the performance of this duty to the Regent in person was demanded of at least some landholders,⁶ probably those holding noble lands, but the baillis normally received homages for non-noble lands and then reported their performance to the chambre des comptes.⁷

Tenants of the Lancastrian crown were thus bound by obligations which conformed to a classic feudal pattern. This was especially

-
1. J. Le Goff, 'The Symbolic Ritual of Vassalage', Time, Work and Culture in the Middle Ages, trans. A. Goldhammer (Chicago and London, 1980), pp. 244-6.
 2. Ibid., pp. 248-50, 254-61.
 3. AN, P 1135 f. 56.
 4. In November 1425 Robert Strefford swore his oath to the bailli of Gisors according to Norman custom, and swore also to uphold 'le traictié de la paix finale' (ibid., f. 50v).
 5. Le Goff, 'Symbolic Ritual', pp. 240-3, 250-3; N. Brussel, Nouvel examen de l'usage général des fiefs en France pendant le XI le XII le XIII et le XIV^e siècle (2 vols., Paris, 1727), i, 18-19.
 6. E.g. Robert Lord Willoughby (Lenoir 22/7).
 7. BN, PO 1049 Elinghen no. 2.

marked in the settlement of Henry V, when the full panoply of ceremony and ritual was invoked in order to impress upon participants and observers alike a sense of unity and order, a common spirit which bound together knights and esquires as the holders of land won by war. Landholders were probably as aware of the dangers of isolation as other groups faced by the perils of war, and common association was to their mutual advantage.¹ The act of investiture had little to do with building-up a royal arsenal, nor can it have appeared outdated in the context of a hard-fought occupation, at the heart of which lay lands held to the demesne or apportioned to the king's subjects.

The presentation of a tribute recognised the fact that none held land outright but that all land was held of a lord, in this case the king, in return for a service. The tribute was a familiar feature of English land tenure, appearing for example in *final concords* conveying land from one party to another.² It was also commonly found within homages recorded in Anjou and Maine between 1387 and 1439.³ Even when this third element of vassalage had ceased to be a tenurial obligation, the performance of the foi et hommage remained a serious business. It was owed to the bailli throughout the occupation and from there duly reported to the chambre des comptes, and we know that settlers lost their lands for its non-observance. At a time when loyalties could lie in several directions at once the crown needed to know its friends

-
1. 'Il faut s'ûnir pour ne pas disparaître' (M.-T. Caron, La Société en France à la fin du moyen âge (Paris, 1977)), pp. 54-5.
 2. Feet of Fines for Essex, i, ed. R.E.G. Kirk (Colchester, 1910), 5; Final Concords of the County of Lincoln A.D. 1244-1272, ii, ed. C.W. Foster (Horncastle, 1920), lxviii-lxix.
 3. M. Reynaud, 'Le Service féodal en Anjou et Maine à la fin du moyen âge', Cahiers d'histoire, xvi (1971), 130-1.

from its enemies, and for both nationalities the tenure of land was a sure test of fidelity.

The second obligation incumbent upon settlers was the production of an aveu et dénombrement. This was the natural sequel to the performance of homage and fealty, and once again two customs which were separate, strictly speaking, became merged as a single term.¹ The dénombrement was an enumeration of the composition of lands awarded, their identity and location, rights and privileges, dependancies, and rents and services owing to the crown or others.² Its provision was a standard French practice, and once written down and sealed, the dénombrement was presented to the chambre des comptes with the aveu or avowal of the vassal to his lord that this was a true declaration. The dénombrement could then be registered. The two acts were required every time a death, sale or exchange took place, and the penalty for non-performance was forfeiture of the estates in question. Essentially a part of the same network of fidelity and allegiance as the foi et hommage, the aveu et dénombrement was also a vital source of information to the chambre des comptes on the monies and services owing to the crown and the extent of any demesne holdings, and on the seigneurial rights which had accrued by precedent in any given lordship.

Some examples of the aveu et dénombrement have survived.³ They

-
1. D. Houard, Dictionnaire analytique, historique, étymologique, critique et interprétatif de la coutume de Normandie (4 vols., Rouen, 1780-82), i, 127, 468.
 2. Examples are printed by Caron, La Société en France, pp. 65-7; R. Lacour, Le Gouvernement de l'apanage de Jean, duc de Berry 1360-1416 (Paris, 1934), pièce justificative no. 3.
 3. AN, P 294⁴ no. 3097 by Willoughby; P 277² no. 168 by Handford; P 285² no. 427 by Clement Overton; see also BN, Collection Dupuy 247 fos. 23-23v.

are written in engaging style, in the first person, and reveal something of the way in which land tenure was viewed. Both Willoughby and Handford ended their accounts with apologies for the fact that their declarations were incomplete: Willoughby could not recover his 'mémoriaux ou registres des terres et revenus', while Handford reported that Marie d'Yvetot had retained the 'Rouilles, chartres et éscriptures' which rightly belonged to him. William Bourgchier furnished a long list of his manors and sub-tenants, but had to delay the submission of details of the value of his estates because of the war and his brief tenure. Missing papers notwithstanding, Handford was able to detail first of all his fiefs, of which La Rivière-Bourdet formed 'le corps'; then came his seigneurial rights to revenue from the mill, dovecotes and forests, and the right to exercise low justice according to Norman custom; next were listed his sub-tenants and their holdings; finally came other personal rights including the presentation to the chapel at La Rivière-Bourdet and, unusually, the 'droit de seigneur', unless commuted for a payment in cash or kind.

The aveux et dénombremens reveal the concern of landholders to benefit from newly-granted estates in the manner of their former owners. Frequent references to the customary practice of Normandy, to the value of individual fiefs 'en temps de bonne paix' and to written records of ownership and income emphasise the intended continuity of the Lancastrian settlement and a concern to adhere to traditional tenurial forms. This may serve to warn us against taking a view of settlers as mercenaries, as land-grabbers eager to exploit their war gains at the expense of the indigenous population. There was rather a desire to increase income to the levels of the pre-war years, if possible, and to exercise the legitimate rights of lordship to which

they were entitled. The chambre des comptes acted as the overseer of the royal prerogatives within the Norman lordships, and the aveu would not fail to omit the rent and military service owed by the landholder.

From the outset, the chambre had the right to instruct the baillis to seize lands for which the aveu et dénombrement had not been performed. In the later years of the occupation such instances multiplied, and in July 1439 letters patent were issued to all land owners demanding that this service be carried out within three months on pain of forfeiture.¹ This punishment was avoided by obtaining a delay, a written notification that services owed would be performed within a specified time. A delay was obtained by sending a petition or supplication to the royal representative, who would then issue the appropriate letters addressed to the chambre des comptes, the treasurer-general and the baillis and vicomtes under whose jurisdiction the lands fell. This meant that the supplicant had briefly to list fiefs held of the crown in his petition. Some petitions from the early years of the settlement were a little vague in this respect,² but they were later subject to more precise wording. The survival of delays in their thousands testifies to their role in the day-to-day management of the land settlement.³ In February 1421 Thomas Beaufort was accorded a delay until the feast of John the Baptist for the production of a 'visum et dinumeracionem terrarum',⁴ but later the time allowed was

1. BL, Add. Ch. 354.

2. Lenoir 10/105, 109.

3. They are most numerous in the Collection Lenoir and the Pièces Originales.

4. AN, PP 135 p. 232.

almost always a year from the date of issue of the notification.¹

There was a third requirement of English and French landholders alike, in which the royal accounting office was heavily employed. This was the production of a written prisee or valuation of lands held. The distinction between it and the aveu et dénombrement is not always clear-cut but nevertheless it can be made. Although the dénombrement could sometimes record an estimate of the value of lands as happened in the case of Willoughby, its concern was above all to detail their extent and means of tenure; an assessment of their real, annual value to an owner was not the same thing, and the chambre des comptes was usually precise in distinguishing the two. A number of references make clear the fact that the prisee was concerned, first and foremost, with land values. In 1437 Guibon ap Thomas requested a delay for lands in the bailliage of Alençon and in Maine, because 'Il soit tenu faire faire la prisee et Informacion de la valeur des dictes terres et seigneuries'.² Sir John Handford was later allowed to enjoy estates granted to him in 1426 to the value of 400 l.t., since it appeared from their prisee that they did not exceed their stated value.³

Delays for the performance of the prisee were as common as those for the aveu et dénombrement, and the range of excuses offered as wide or wider, from frequently-occurring references to service in the king's war, to the petitioner's absence in England on official business or in France in the personal service of the lieutenant-general, to detention

1. Lenoir 26/217, 367; BN, PO 1550 nos. 6-9.

2. Ibid., PO 81 no. 2.

3. Lenoir 4/227.

as an enemy prisoner.¹ In most cases a delay of only six months was offered for the production of the prisée, and where general delays were issued covering all services owed to the crown this shorter period often stood out clearly.² A man seeking a delay was bound to specify the lands on which duties were owing: it was not sufficient to request a cover-all provision for lands held.³ We must remember that a prisée was in part a tax on landed income, and delays for its performance were at least in some cases a means of tax avoidance. Once granted, the king would order the chambre des comptes and the relevant local officials to respect the delay in the usual way, but delays for the prisée were often subject to two special provisions.

First, there was a general stipulation that the beneficiary would continue to pay the usual charges and perform the accustomed duties for his lands. More important, the king reserved the right to make any presentations to benefices which fell vacant before the prisée had been delivered, and to take into the royal wardship any minors whose former guardians had died.⁴ In addition there was sometimes a condition that a delay should be valid in spite of previous letters of sufferance which the petitioner may have held. The prisée was essentially a compromise between the crown and the grantee. Once made, or if its performance was excused,⁵ the landholder might enjoy the revenues of his possessions to their fullest extent. The disadvantage was that

1. Ibid., 4/359, 215; 5/1; 4/171-2, for the prisoner John Melton.

2. Ibid., 4/163, 169.

3. Ibid., 10/143.

4. E.g. BN, PO 572 no. 1; PO 1363 no. 17.

5. It was not required of major awards issued to whatever value lands were or might be (Lenoir 4/179, 22/87).

the chambre des comptes then had an exact record of those revenues and the services due to the king and others. In the absence of this valuation the landholder forfeited both the right to make presentations, itself a valued privilege, and an income derived from them which could be substantial. In reserving presentations and wardships to its own use and profit, the crown was maintaining an avenue of royal patronage and augmenting the domanial revenues at one and the same time.

In its turn, the prisee must be distinguished from the information: the former might be a part of the wider-ranging information, but the two terms were not used interchangeably. In January 1437 delays were accorded both to Peter Chatreton, esquire, and Sir John Fastolf for the information and prisee of particular lands,¹ and it is clear from the terms ordering the information to be carried out that the valuation constituted only one element of a larger whole.² The information could be performed either at the instigation of the chambre des comptes or at the request of the landholder: it was an irregular, not a regular instrument of estate management. The chambre was naturally keen to secure an independent assessment of at least a proportion of the lands within its financial ambit, and local officials could be instructed to carry out a comprehensive review of the location, value and means of tenure of given lands, their seigneurial rights and obligations. Such an assessment was no small undertaking, involving the summoning of local clerics, nobles and respectable bourgeois before the vicomte or his lieutenant to give sworn testimony, but whether or not an owner knew that his possessions were under scrutiny, the

1. Ibid., 5/63, 67.

2. Eure, E 236, instructions for an information of the lands of Sir Thomas Greffin.

vicomtes were under strict instructions not to disclose the valuation arrived at.¹

There was a degree of secrecy attached to some, but not all, informations requested by the royal accountants, who were eager to ensure that lands did not exceed the value contained in letters of grant. It was for this reason that an information might be ordered after a landowner had furnished his own declaration of his holdings and their worth. Where the bailli reported that, in the case of John Savage, esquire, landed income did not exceed a maximum of 600 l.t. per year, the owner was allowed to enjoy those estates for which the prisee had been performed and paid.² Sometimes it was necessary to employ two lieutenants within one bailliage or in adjoining bailliages;³ in all cases, evidence was collated centrally and a decision taken. Occasionally an information was carried out so poorly that a fresh attempt had to be made.⁴ In most cases, however, it was found that lands did not exceed their stated value and no further action was necessary.

Not all informations were conducted in a clandestine manner. Public participation was the key to their success and accuracy, and this may be seen to good effect in the attempts to establish the age of a minor in order to release him from the royal wardship. In the case

-
1. In 1430 the vicomte of Valognes was told to 'informer secretement' of the value of lands (Lenoir 8/361).
 2. Ibid., 8/369.
 3. Ibid., 8/383.
 4. The information on the possessions of Richard, son and heir of Sir Thomas Hadfeld, was described as 'insuffisante et défectueuse' (ibid., 10/21).

of Richard Afford, esquire, the task was relatively simple. He had been baptised at Caen castle in the presence of the earl of Warwick and his wife in June 1427, it was reported, which meant that he was just over twenty years old.¹ The precise determination of age was seldom so simple,² but it was the essential preliminary to the possession of estates held in wardship. The aim of the Lancastrian authorities was to encourage the succession of sons to their fathers' fiefs, but the burden of proof of maturity lay with the intended recipient, who had to request an information and pay a fee.

It is this second category of informations, those requested by a relative, widow or servant of a deceased man which provides such valuable evidence of the importance of land tenure to the livelihood of English settlers and their families. It is from the details of the administration of wardships and from attempts to establish what lands were held in royal custody and what they were worth that a picture may be drawn of the mutual co-operation which underpinned long-term residence in France. Events ran as follows. A request was made to the chambre des comptes by John, brother of the late Thomas Burgh; by Margaret, widow of Henry Worseley.³ The information was carried out in the normal way, and the wardship was then awarded to the highest bidder once the value of the lands had been established.

-
1. Ibid., 9/302; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 99. The witness list included a number of men who settled in or close to Caen and who may have been present at this notable occasion. Afford was put out of the king's wardship in 1447 (Lenoir 74/193).
 2. In 1448 John, son and heir of Nicholas Basset, was adjudged to be of sufficient age after eight witnesses had testified to his maturity (BN, PO 210 no. 2).
 3. Lenoir 8/379, 9/55-6.

The first stage of mutual support came with the securing of the information and the second with the adjudgment of the wardship. The wardship of the children of Nicholas Bradkyrk 'dit Lespicier', for example, had originally fallen to Colin le Fevre for 54 l.t. a year, an indication of the potential value of guardianship. One month later, however, Nicholas Molyneux persuaded le Fevre to transfer the wardship to Bradkyrk's widow, on condition that the same sum was paid to the recepte of Bayeux.¹ Although Molyneux and le Fevre were seemingly well-acquainted, it was thought more fitting that a mother should be responsible for the welfare of her minor children.

From the viewpoint of the chambre des comptes, the information employed the services of an existing body of royal officials to furnish much of the evidence which it needed for the administration of the settlement. Just as newly-granted lands could be surveyed in this way, so the information assessed estates which, as settlers knew, reverted to the crown on the death of their holder without heirs male. The need to establish the value, location and obligations of such lands, and those held by the king as trustee during the minority of their heirs, was met by this all-embracing survey in which no rent was too small and no payment in cash or kind was too insignificant to merit inclusion. The value of the information lay in its comprehensive character and above all in its independence: both the royal accountants and the friends and relatives of a deceased settler could be reasonably sure that the vicomtes and other officials would fairly report their findings and testimony heard. In practice, the prisée performed by a landholder was perhaps liable to under-represent the value of estates

1. Ibid., 18/136. For Bradkyrk's career in Caen see Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 90-1.

held,¹ whereas the information, as its name suggests, was an instrument providing evidence upon which decisions could then be taken and upon which interested parties could rely.

The practice of farming lands to the highest bidder, a last point to consider, was in existence well before the final months of the occupation, for example in the vicomté of Rouen in 1446-7 and in the bailliage of Alençon in the years 1435-7.² The vicomte typically empowered one or several sergeants to take possession of listed fiefs whose titles had lapsed. The sergeant was then summoned to appear at the assizes before the procureur du roi, where he presented his written list of seizures for the relevant quarters of the year. He then reported that 'il avoit fait les criées de ces fiefs' on three successive market-days, for example at Alençon. If anyone wanted to farm any of the listed fiefs or tenements they were to come before the vicomte or his lieutenant. In this instance, as often happened in areas badly affected by the war, no one offered a bid. As a last resort, an effort was made to recover the lands for the direct use of the crown, but here the threat of brigandage and the king's enemies prevented this.

The farming of confiscated lands often appears as a desperate attempt to secure revenue, however little, for the demesne. Given the failure of public proclamations to attract bidders, the direct exploitation of lands which might follow was an unsatisfactory means of

-
1. Although not always. A prisee by Thomas Chisenal found that his lands exceeded the specified maximum of 300 l.t., and the surplus of 36 l.t. was given to Walter Smith (Lenoir 26/253).
 2. Ibid., 13/189; Orne, A 417, A 422.

estate administration when the need of the chambre des comptes was for rents in cash. The direct management of estates was almost certainly unprofitable following the economic stresses of the years 1436-40 and would have ranked very low in any theoretical table of chosen methods of land tenure. The piecemeal farming of estates forfeit to the demesne for short periods, typically a quarter of a year or several years, was hardly more satisfactory, but at least it might produce cash revenues for the vicomte to total up.¹ Seen in this light, the large number of delays issued by the chambre des comptes becomes more readily understandable. Bad as conditions were after 1436, it was in the maintenance of tenants of either nationality that the best hope lay of securing a meaningful return from the hundreds of grants which had been issued in previous years.

This chapter has attempted to show that those charged with the administration and financial management of the settlement adopted a variety of methods to suit their purpose. Principally, there was a striking continuity evident both in the procedures of issuing grants and in their subsequent supervision between the reigns of Charles VI and Henry VI. Lancastrian innovations designed to alleviate and remedy the problems of declining personal and domanial incomes, absenteeism, and a growing reluctance or inability to observe tenurial obligations were less successful in terms of their observance and consistent application. Settlement administration was always a compromise between theory and practice, the desirable and the possible, and in the end its success or failure both in the eyes of grantor and grantee came down to the individuals and institutions concerned with

1. The same was true of other landholders (Plaisse, Baronnie du Neubourg, pp. 71-3).

its operation.

The impression gained from the sources is that the governing bodies coped well with the interruptions which inevitably disrupted their activities, and in particular with the shortages first of information about land ownership and value and secondly of hard cash in the form of rents and fees. In terms of individuals it appears that long service was the norm both within the chambre des comptes and at a local level, and the Lancastrians can have had few complaints about the loyalty and commitment of those responsible for the day-to-day management of their extensive, fluctuating possessions.

It may well be that the hierarchical, feudal structure taken over and invigorated by Henry V was moribund by the later decades of the occupation. In terms of military organization, Dr. Curry argues that the main characteristics of feudal service were no longer adequate in terms of manpower or finance in the light of changing expectations of regular provision.¹ The land settlement, too, saw a loosening of the tie binding man to fief or town property in response to demands for personal and geographical mobility, a regular income to support wives and dependants, or self-advancement in public or private service. Rarely, however, does one find instances of the traditional or new restrictions which applied to landownership serving to discourage or terminate tenure, except in cases of more obvious abuse. Flexibility and a willingness to bend according to personal circumstance were traits of the settlement throughout its duration. At the same time the land settlement was by its very nature less willing and able to change its fundamental character and direction in the light of reforms

1. Curry, 'Military Organization', pp. 452-4.

and new directions, in the military sphere or elsewhere. Tenurial practices were rooted in custom, and change was to be resisted. It did not matter so much that traditional procedures were feudal or anachronistic in appearance so long as they worked, more or less well, and allowed the free enjoyment of income in return for known, familiar obligations. M. Reynaud has found a not dissimilar system in operation in Anjou and Maine to have been 'utile et exigé'.¹ In Normandy the longevity of the settlement was due at least in part to the proven reliability of practices and procedures which drew their strength from the past, preserved in documents and the collective memory.

1. Reynaud, 'Service féodal', 159.

CHAPTER SIXLITIGATION AND LAND TENURE

The first part of this short chapter is concerned with the application of justice to landholders, whose legal rights cannot be separated from the Lancastrian claim to the French throne. The broader context is that of the treaty of Troyes, by which the dual monarch was charged with defending, appeasing and governing the kingdom, 'selon l'exigence de justice et équité'.¹ Within this setting, one perspective is provided by the recent publication of some twenty-one suits of English interest heard before the Parlement of Paris, of which some twelve concern lands in the hands of settlers.² The suits reveal much about the interplay of the theory and practice of occupation, and stand as a basic point of reference for what follows. For the most part, however, attention will be directed towards the pursuit of claims through a network of local and regional courts, examining the substance of disputes, parties to them and the operation of the legal system as it impinged on settlers' lives. Not least, something will be said about arbitration and negotiation by and on behalf of landholders. The result should be to complement work on the Lancastrian Parlement, to throw light on the themes of continuity and change and of settler attitudes to property raised in the previous

1. Cosneau, Grands traités, p. 105.

2. Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, passim.

chapter and to assess the role of disputes in an age described as one of intense litigiousness.¹

Those attracted by the prospect of landed acquisition in France were in many cases representatives of those ranks of society for whom engagement in legal disputes was a regular and unremarkable part of their lives. Indeed, such was the frequency with which the gentry became involved in suits, whether real or fictitious, and such was the length of the resulting actions, that litigation over land became the norm rather than the exception. It was almost a routine accompaniment to the accumulation of manors and titles.² A glance at the feet of fines for Essex during the period of the occupation, for instance, discloses the names of a host of men familiar as French landholders who were at the same time actively in dispute with each other and with others over lands and rents: *Sir Lewis Robessart, Sir John Montgomery, Sir John Harpenden, Lewis John, John Tyrell and William Burley*, all esquires, among others.³ Given this climate of litigation, Henry V had ordered the suspension of the assizes before his departure on the second expedition, in order that those accompanying him should be in no danger of losing properties in their absence. The delays which this prompted, however, caused the Commons to petition for remedy in the Parliament which began on 2 May 1421. Henceforward letters of protection were to include the assize of novel disseisin in their stated terms, and while

-
1. F.R.H. du Boulay, *An Age of Ambition. English Society in the Late Middle Ages* (London, 1970), p. 137.
 2. A. Harding, *A Social History of English Law* (London, 1966), pp. 245-7; Wright, *Derbyshire Gentry*, Chapter 9; N. Saul, *Knights and Esquires: The Gloucestershire Gentry in the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 194-204.
 3. *Feet of Fines for Essex*, iv, ed. P.H. Reaney and M. Fitch (Colchester, 1964), 1-47.

the ordinary assizes were to be held in the usual way, their judgments were not to be prejudicial to those abiding in the royal service in France.¹

In theory, men undertaking service abroad enjoyed at least a limited protection against assize judgments of debt, default or outlawry in their absence, on condition that such service could be authenticated, and in practice the interests of defendants were upheld in the face of claims made against them.² In the case of senior commanders travelling to France special consideration might be shown: in the event of the death of the duke of Exeter or any other lord in France, the wardship and marriage right of his heir would be granted to his wife or executor, while Talbot secured a respite for the performance of homage by himself or any of his retinue until the end of their term of service, a benefit applicable to any lands held in Wales, Ireland or England.³ For the majority, it was the responsibility of their captain to secure letters of protection from the Privy-Seal Office which would safeguard the landed possessions of the men travelling under their charge.⁴

Once established in France, with land acquired by royal grant and other interests accumulating, it was soon evident that anyone intending

-
1. Rot. Parl., iv, 147; Statutes of the Realm, ed. A. Luders et al. (11 vols., Record Commission, London, 1810-28), ii, 205. The ordinance was to remain in force until a Parliament was summoned on the king's return to England.
 2. The 1421 statute was cited in the defence of John earl Marshal and Richard earl of Worcester against a claim by Sir Roland Leyntal and his wife to tenements in Shropshire (C.C.R., 1419-22, p. 188). For other orders protecting the interests of men in France see ibid., pp. 102, 437, and Rot. Parl., iv, 72-3.
 3. P.P.C., iii, 38; iv, 197-8.
 4. Brown, 'Authorization of Letters', 130-1.

to exploit the revenues of fiefs which might be widely scattered, and at the same time to hold office or to serve in a field army, would sooner or later fall down in the observance of one or more of his obligations. The problem was circumvented in several ways, notably by the appointment of a deputy or lieutenant to a particular office, especially that of a garrison captaincy, by the employment of existing estate personnel, to be considered in the next chapter, and by the use of a procureur or estate administrator. That most celebrated procureur, Nicholas Molyneux, served Fastolf and York successively,¹ but it has rightly been pointed out that social status was no bar to the employment of a proctor.² John Prentis, chaplain of the royal chapel, made Walter Cotford his procureur in January 1421; William Dalyngrype, esquire, seigneur of Hacqueville in the Vexin, appointed a Frenchman in the same month;³ John Strelley employed a member of the English community in Caen, Thomas Kyrton, who in turn worked in the same capacity for others.⁴ It was quite normal to appoint a member of one's family to the post,⁵ and not at all unknown for Frenchmen to serve in this capacity.⁶

What mattered was that a procureur should be trustworthy and act responsibly in the defence of his employer's interests. His duties

-
1. McFarlane, 'Business-Partnership', 299-300.
 2. Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 470-471.
 3. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1419-20, fos. 535-535v.
 4. Calvados, Tabellionnage de Caen 7E 89, fos. 125v-126v.
 5. In January 1421 John Bourghop appointed his son Thomas (Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1419-20, f. 536).
 6. Thomas Tyringham appointed Denet Danneville, and Edward Russell appointed Guillaume le Villain (ibid., fos. 60v, 86).

were many, and could vary according to the size and distribution of estates. For convenience they may be divided into two categories. First, as an estate administrator he might be empowered to ensure that granted lands were taken into his master's possession; to farm land for rents in cash and kind; to issue quittances; to appoint local seneschals and receivers, and generally to manage the holdings within his charge on behalf of their owner.¹ Secondly, the procureur acted as the legal representative of his employer with a responsibility to plead, defend and reply in all cases brought by or against the landholder in the church and secular courts of northern France. In the case of one such as John Strelley, it was doubtless useful to engage Thomas Kyrton to manage his 'querelles, négoce et besoingnes', but for the likes of Talbot it was more a question of necessity to employ a knowledgeable legal agent, in this instance with extensive powers of land management which excluded only the right to make sales.² The two functions exercised by the procureur were compatible and interchangeable and, from the point of view of the landholder, their concentration in the hands of one man removed the burden of the day-to-day business of estate government.³ The position of the procureur was, however, an equivocal one. The prospect of paid employment, promotion and, perhaps, of the fringe benefits which such a post might attract had to be weighed against the hazards of service in the financial and

-
1. In 1447 Margaret, daughter and heiress of the Welshman David Benest, appointed her stepfather William Herdson, a settler, procureur for the English and Welsh properties of her father (Clwyd Record Office, Nerquis Hall MSS D/N H/1212). I owe this reference to the kindness of Miss Elizabeth Danbury.
 2. BN, Ms. fr. 26052 no. 1162; Pollard, John Talbot, p. 98. Thomas Clerc was a member of the personal retinue.
 3. Lacour, Gouvernement de l'apanage, pp. 217-20.

legal administration of settlers eager to acquire land and to maximise its revenues. The protracted lawsuit between Fastolf and his receiver-general in Alençon and Maine alerts us to the dangers attendant upon service to an ambitious and acquisitive land owner.¹

Beyond the estates and urban properties in his charge, the attention of the procureur was first directed towards the lower courts of Normandy. Little is known of their proceedings, and evidence that cases were heard locally has survived mainly in the form of references made in cases heard before the higher courts. It seems that a two-tier structure was in existence, comprising the plaids of the vicomtes where minor civil cases were dealt with, and the assises of the baillis where were heard the more important civil and criminal cases and appeals from the lower courts.² The judicial function of the baillis had always been significant, from the time of its use to bring the great seigneurs of northern France under the authority of the central monarchy.³ It was exercised by the holding of assises in the presence of 'sagès' who would advise on local customary practice.⁴ In the bailliage of the Caux, for example, assises were held regularly at Caudebec, Neufchâtel, Arques, Cany and Montivilliers to hear cases brought on appeal from the courts of the vicomtes.⁵ When faced by the disruption

-
1. Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, no. XX, pp. 231-68, esp. p. 244.
 2. F. Goineau, Gisors, la ville et le bailliage jusqu'à la fin du XV^e siècle (Pontoise, 1937), pp. 193-200; R. Besnier, La Coutume de Normandie. Histoire externe (Paris, 1935), pp. 72-5.
 3. Lot and Fawtier, Histoire, ii, 144-7, 153.
 4. W.L. de Gruchy (ed.), L'Ancienne coutume de Normandie (Jersey, 1881), pp. 212-4.
 5. A. Hellot, Essai sur les baillis de Caux de 1204 à 1789, avec documents inédits à l'appui (Paris, 1895), pp. xxi-xxvii; Rowe, 'John, Duke of Bedford', pp. 240, 266.

of war, the courts moved to the nearest convenient location and the legal process continued as normal.¹

Historians of Norman institutions have traditionally taken the view that the English occupation had little impact on the judicial organization and custom of the duchy.² It is indeed clear that many established procedures continued unchanged and that changes in the personnel and nationality of legal officers are more evident in the sources than institutional reform and innovation. Yet it would surely be wrong to underestimate the importance of those changes which were made to a legal system faced with a revolution in land ownership. In spite of the fragmentary nature of the surviving evidence and the questions which remain, it does appear that the changed circumstances which applied after 1417 made modifications necessary and that both Henry V and Bedford had views on the form that projected improvements should take. The revival of the Échiquier at Rouen,³ the jurisdiction claimed by the Grand Conseil there against the Paris Parlement,⁴ the attempts to render the English soldiery subject to the control of the civilian arm,⁵ all suggest that at the very least old institutions were being put to new uses and that legal principles were slowly becoming established which were themselves a recognition of the problems arising

-
1. A. Goujon, Histoire de Bernay (Evreux, 1875), p. 185; D.K.R., xli, 682.
 2. P. Le Cacheux, 'L'Organisation judiciaire en Normandie pendant l'occupation anglaise (1419-1449)', Revue historique de droit français et étranger, 4^e série, xv (1936), 812-3; Besnier, Coutume de Normandie, pp. 84-6.
 3. Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 130.
 4. Rowe, 'Grand Conseil', passim.
 5. Rowe, 'Discipline in the Norman Garrisons under Bedford, 1422-35', E.H.R., xlvi (1931), 194-208.

from prolonged warfare. Most important of all, the 'slow evolution' of the cour du conseil at Rouen to hear, among other business, cases related to the land settlement in direct challenge to the judicial pre-eminence of the Échiquier and the Parlement, may be seen as a sign of the inability or the unwillingness of existing bodies to cope with the new demands placed upon them. The recent evaluation of the role of the cour du conseil and its emergence at the centre of the stage must finally push a long-standing thesis into the wings.¹

The best way to examine the operation of the legal system as it affected land settlers will be in the context of disputes and attempts to secure their resolution. The number of cases known and the variety of their subject matter defy neat categorization, but it is possible to identify common themes and problems which consistently brought landholders to litigation. The first of these to be considered arose from the imperfections of the administrative procedures which governed the issue of letters of grant. It has previously been noted that errors and duplications in chancery practice were inevitable, given the number and the spread of the territories available for redistribution and the willingness of petitioners to apply for them. The result was that rival claimants to the same lands, rents and héritages went to court to contest their respective titles. Suits referring to this problem were a constant of the occupation, although it was during the 1420s that their number reached a peak in the aftermath of the Henrician settlement.

In October 1424 John Green and John Newton, both esquires,

1. See the discussion by Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, Chapter V, esp. p. 150.

reached agreement over lands in the bailliage of Alençon which Green claimed by letters of 12 April 1419 and which Newton defended with letters issued sixteen days later.¹ Although it would appear from the original letters that Newton's was the stronger case, the parties agreed that Green should have the lands on paying his opponent 200 nobles d'or in two instalments, 'par charité'.² In 1435 Green's title to these and other lands in the bailliage of Evreux was judged to be satisfactory by the chambre des comptes, which had requested an information in each area, so the decision of this settler to resort to law had been vindicated.³ Success in this and other cases was largely dependent upon the timing of the grants in question: if proof could be produced that a grant predated that to an opponent, then a case was immeasurably the stronger. William Merlin renounced his own grant in favour of an earlier one to Robert Mallefield; Robert Sewell desisted in his claim against Thomas Berenger;⁴ the royal secretary Ralph Parker was not allowed to take possession of an hôtel in Paris near the Porte Barbette because the officers of the chambre des comptes had consulted their registers and found a donation of the property some eight months beforehand.⁵

Even the hour of the day could prove decisive. John Breuse based his claim to the héritages and possessions of the late Marguerite de Calleville on a grant made by Warwick on 27 September 1438. He was opposed by John Nanfan, esquire, who in his eagerness to secure landed

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 mm.39, 44; Bréquigny nos. 395, 477.
 2. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1424-5, fos. 108v.-109.
 3. Lenoir 8/399.
 4. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1424-5, f. 151; 1427-8, fos. 109v-110.
 5. BN, n. acq. fr. 7627 fos. 416-418.

revenues to the value of 1,600 saluts d'or, as he had the right to do by virtue of letters of July 1437, had arrived at the chambre des comptes in Rouen on the same day as his rival but at the earlier hour of 9 a.m.¹ The case did not only concern the establishment of prior title, being also a question of the value and status of the fiefs under contention, but it also illustrates the importance to settlers of registering a claim to property which had come into crown possession at the earliest possible opportunity. All letters of grant contained a provision for their annulment in the event of an earlier award of the same lands being discovered, and the conseil du roi was, in effect, upholding that stipulation.

The second and related problem is that of the nature and extent of the lands encompassed by a grant. Much of the difficulty here lay with petitioners who had no clear idea of and in some cases no interest in their rights or obligations as landholders, nor of the boundaries within which such responsibilities were to be exercised. John Robessart and Davy Howel disputed ownership of certain lordships in the Cotentin, the one by virtue of a grant of the barony of Néhou, the other by that of a royal grant of all the lands of the Baron des Biars.² It was by no means unusual for settlers to find that individual titles granted to them were, in fact, part of a wider tenorial network which might involve dependency, as Robessart was to claim in this case, and would require co-operation if they were to be enjoyed. A similar case was that between Sir William Bucton and Hugh Spencer, esquire. The

-
1. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1442-3, sub 13 May 1442. The parties agreed to divide up the de Calleville properties and their profits and charges.
 2. Ibid., 1419-20, fos. 147v-148.

matter at issue was whether certain land belonged to the former as a 'fief noble' owing homage to the king, or to the latter as a dependency of other lands.¹

Land grants brought men into dispute with institutions as well as with each other. The same Hugh Spencer was forced to acknowledge that the abbot of Fécamp had long enjoyed possession of the donjon of Fécamp and other lands to which he had laid claim,² but Talbot was more reluctant to concede to the religious community of St. Ouen, Rouen, their case for the exercise of certain forest rights which fell beyond his jurisdiction.³ A knowledge of local custom and tenurial practice was a sound defence against the arbitrary issue of grants from Rouen. The widow Jehanne de Symon based her successful action before the conseil du roi on the coutume of Neufchâtel which allowed a testator to confer his property on whomsoever he chose, a point which Thomas Porter recognised in the course of his own inquiries into local usage.⁴

It is evident from these and other cases that the ownership of lands and titles on paper was one thing, but their physical possession and enjoyment could be quite another. It could take an appearance before the local assises to clarify one's legal position, in the case of Talbot's procureur, or a suit might be followed from the court of

-
1. Ibid., 1427-8, fos. 404-404v. Spencer conceded to Bucton's prior title and costs were shared.
 2. Spencer's fiefs were found to lie outside the abbot's jurisdiction (ibid., 1424-5, fos. 457-457v).
 3. The parties decided that an agreement between the abbey and Sir Reginald Grey, the former owner of some of Talbot's lands, should remain in force, but Talbot would be free to pursue its annulment on his return to Normandy (ibid., 1434-5, fos. 96-96v).
 4. Ibid., 1439-40, sub 14 May 1439.

the lieutenant of the bailli of Rouen to the Échiquier and finally to the cour du conseil before a decision was reached, as Thomas Porter found. The Échiquier des Causes, the highest Norman law court, had been recognised in the early fourteenth century as possessing legal jurisdiction within the duchy, and its surviving registers reveal that disputes concerning the nature and extent of granted lands were heard there. Sir Christopher Curwen disputed with Sir John Montgomery and the procureur du roi a rent due on his lordship of Cany. Curwen at first argued that the rent was due not from the justice of Maulévrier but from the market at Cauville, but his French procureur conceded the case at the Échiquier and promised to pay both rent and arrears.¹ In most instances, however, the suits described above had at issue an interpretation of the terms of a royal grant, and the Échiquier was not sanctioned to hear such cases. By the Ordinances of Henry V which were confirmed and reissued in August 1430, it was to the cour du conseil under the chancellor that settlers were to go to seek judgment.² In November 1424 Simon Chamber's doléance or complaint against Richard Merbury was annulled,

'Et pour ce qu'il étoit débat en principal de don royal, la congnoissance de la cause fu renvoyé par devant les gens du conseil du roy à Rouen'.³

These cases heard and resolved within the duchy complement those

-
1. Seine-Mme, Échiquier 1424, f. 66.
 2. Above, pp. 270-3; . Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, p. 48 n. 21.
 3. Seine-Mme, Échiquier 1424, f. 32. A similar clause was quoted in a dispute over a rent in kind attached to a canonry and prebend at Gournay, held by John Pulmond (Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1430-1, fos. 86-86v).

disputes concerning tenurial obligation brought before the Paris Parlement. The suits involving Edward Russell and William Zeman had the payment of rent-charges at their heart, as did the much longer and more complex cases brought against Sir John Handford and Thomas Dring.¹ The major difference between suits heard within Normandy and those which came before the Parlement was that the latter, by virtue of the expertise and often the prolixity of those pleading on behalf of each party, tended to raise issues whose gravity far outweighed the original substance of the case. In essence, Russell claimed to hold his lands, 'franchement et a lui appartenir franchises et quictez de toutes charges et rentes'; Handford that his grant was 'franche et quite'; Dring that 'il ne soit obligié ne tenu en riens' towards his opponent.

The first duty of the courts was to decide the legality or otherwise of the arguments used against land settlers by Frenchmen, French institutions and fellow-settlers. Their verdicts tended to favour plaintiffs and to support the tenets of traditional tenurial practice and local custom against the unfamiliar and sometimes ingenious arguments adopted by or on behalf of English defendants. This in turn raises the question of whether settler litigants genuinely believed in submissions advanced by and on behalf of themselves or whether they adopted expedient lines of attack or defence which were thought best suited to their own ends.² On the one hand, we must make allowance for the sheer complexity of a settlement which embraced the confiscation of lands belonging to one, alongside the confirmation of tenure to another, alongside the issue of recognized fiefs and lordships to a third, to the

1. Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, nos. I, XXI, III, XIV.

2. Ibid., pp. 16-17.

confusion of grantees and their tenants. The settlement introduced landholders and in some cases their procureurs to an unfamiliar and variable pattern of land tenure. On the other, lawsuits show up many of the unattractive characteristics of settlers: an acquisitive tendency; a readiness to ignore payments or obligations; a habit of disregarding either clauses within royal ordinances or local customary practices if they could not be employed to legal and financial advantage. Above all there may be detected an equation between law and private interest which saw the one put to the service of the other, leaving little room for abstract notions of justice and equity.¹

An assessment based on the Parlement suits alone may produce too harsh a verdict on land settlers. The arguments evinced on their behalf were at times so ingenuous, at times so evasive, that they exaggerate the divisions between opposing parties. The evidence from the assises and the cour du conseil suggests that arguments could be renounced and entrenched positions conceded on discovery of a recognisably stronger claim or title. Litigation should be seen to have included the pre-trial matters of pleadings and the discovery of documents, which identified and delineated interests in land otherwise unknown or uncertain, and which reduced to a minimum the contentious business brought before the court. In many instances, at every stage before trial conciliation and arbitration were attempted in order to avoid the formality and the finality of a judgment which might confer security of tenure on the victor but leave no provision for the defeated party.²

-
1. C. Carpenter, 'Law, Justice and Landowners in Late Medieval England', Law and History Review, i (1983), 225.
 2. E. Powell, 'Arbitration and the Law in England in the Late Middle Ages', T.R. Hist. S., fifth series, xxxiii (1983), 57.

A third category of disputes, overlapping with those already discussed, concerned opposition to grants of land and property made either before or after a landholder had taken 'la saisine et possession' of his holdings. The Tabellionnage registers reveal that it was not uncommon for the title of a grantee to be opposed by rival claims to its enjoyment. William Chambers was faced by an attempt to 'empescher' his grant of the hôtel de Paradis in Caen by Jean Denis dit Lieusif, and John Marbury, esquire, by Adam de la Roe and his wife after Marbury had taken possession of certain lands on which he held a life-rent.¹ Nor was it only Frenchmen living in the locality of a grant who contested settlers' rights. John Durant, a Caen resident, found himself in dispute with Richard Spencer over revenues and héritages once held by a deceased Norman.² The parties agreed before the cour du conseil that for the duration of the proceedings they would share the revenues of the lands in question, which had been sequestered into the king's hands, until a verdict could be reached.³ The right to succeed to inherited possessions was again an area fraught with difficulty for courts, particularly where a claimant held the right to take forfeitures and reversions to a specified value which would ordinarily have fallen to the crown, as in Fastolf's case. In proceedings whose duration and complexity merited comparison to his Parlement suit against Thomas Overton,⁴ Fastolf and his able procureur Nicholas Molyneux eventually secured recognition of their claim to Pirou, near Coutances,

-
1. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1424-5, fos. 283-283v, 296-296v.
 2. AN, JJ 174 no. 109; BN, Ms. fr. 26069 no. 4602.
 3. Calvados, Tabellionnage de Caen 7E 89, fos. 425-425v.
 4. Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, no. XX, pp. 231-68.

by virtue of the assignment of annual revenues to the value of 1,560 saluts d'or, in the face of three rival claims to the lordship.¹

A related area of litigation concerned not Frenchmen who had died but those who had, reputedly, joined the ranks of the enemy in rebellion against their sworn allegiance to the dual monarchy. Of the penalty, there was no doubt: 'traitors' had long been subject to forfeiture of their estates.² Complications arose, however, as a consequence of petitions to take over land confiscated in this way. The cour du conseil heard that John Sweten, esquire, had given it to be understood that two Frenchmen had participated in the rising near Caen in 1435, an allegation denied by opponents who were able to produce written evidence attesting to their loyalty.³ The courts almost invariably upheld the provision contained in the treaty of Troyes that Frenchmen who had remained in the Anglo-Burgundian obedience should be restored to their holdings,⁴ and it is interesting to observe that legal theory was put into practice even at some years' remove and in the face of strong title. Settlers including Thomas Maisteron in 1424 and Degory Gamel in 1427 saw their titles to land cancelled by letters granting restitution to Frenchmen who had been mistakenly dispossessed as absentees or rebels.⁵ Gamel's original grant dated from May 1419 and

-
1. The suit lasted at least seven years, and Molyneux was left to secure its resolution in negotiations with Robert de Fréville, in the absence of his master in England (Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1436-7, sub 13 September 1436; 1442-3, sub 3 July 1443).
 2. Cuttler, Law of Treason, p. 39.
 3. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1439-40, sub 21 July 1439.
 4. Cosneau, Grands traités, p. 109.
 5. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1424-5, fos. 93v-94; 1427-8, fos. 63-63v.

had been confirmed as recently as 1426.¹

The Parlement, too, heard suits arising from contested claims, which in turn gave rise to issues of wider import. In the occupied towns both the earl of Suffolk in Paris and John Chepstowe in Caen pressed for the expedition of their respective grants of houses against the protestations of elderly occupants.² In the countryside the earl of Salisbury was twice confronted by powerful opponents in his attempts to take seisin and possession of lands which lay far beyond the boundaries of the duchy of Normandy, but in neither case was he able to achieve a solution before his death.³ Of special interest are claims made by John Huytin and Richard Handford to the lands of men who had 'tenu parti contraire au roy', arguments met by responses designed to demonstrate the continued fidelity of existing landholders even in the trying circumstances of siege and imprisonment.⁴ The Parlement found these suits among the hardest to judge, and the court did complain of a lack of information with which to investigate claim and counter-claim.

When inquiries were undertaken, either by a commissioned enquête or, in the lower courts, by use of the information, the resulting evidence could work as much to the advantage of settlers as to their disadvantage. Certainly the impression conveyed by the local sources is that litigation was often the consequence of settlers' ignorance of the inherited titles, prior claims and fealty and allegiance of the

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.47; Bréquigny no. 519. The lands were estimated to be worth up to 500 écus, no small sum to renounce.
 2. Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, nos. V, XIII.
 3. Ibid., nos. IX, XI.
 4. Ibid., nos. IV, X.

former owners of the lands which they were keen to acquire. A malevolent intention to annex estates in contravention of the treaty of Troyes is not often discernible, and if the burden of proof of ownership lay with Frenchmen desiring to return to their former holdings then the production of written evidence in court was usually sufficient to ensure their success. In so far as we may judge the spirit of the agreements reached in the settlement of suits, they suggest hard bargaining but fairness in the arrangement of compensation for legal costs incurred,¹ and rather an attitude of resignation than one of rancour at the loss of landed revenue and status. Land won by conquest was not readily conceded, and long actions were fought in its defence, but verdicts reached by the cour du conseil and the Parlement were as final and binding on land settlers as on other disputants regardless of nationality.

Brief mention may be made of some other contentious matters relevant to the land settlement. Church presentations are now recognised as being among the most valuable and valued benefits of land tenure in terms of financial advantage and the patronage which they bestowed to their holder.² Successive archbishops of Rouen stoutly defended their rights as they saw them against attempted presentations by the English. In October 1419 John Wycheford's appointment to a church within lands recently granted to him in the Caux was rejected,

-
1. John Sweten received thirty saluts towards his costs in 1439 (above, p. 311), and in another suit, twenty sous for costs and forty saluts as a gift from his opponent, Nicholas Bradkyrk (Calvados, Tabellionnage de Caen 7E 90, fos. 198v-199).
 2. R.W. Dunning, 'Patronage and Promotion in the Late-Medieval Church', Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England, ed. R.A. Griffiths (Gloucester and Atlantic Highlands, 1981), pp. 167-80; Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, p. 209.

but the selection of another candidate was then agreed without prejudice to the rights of either party.¹ A similar agreement was reached over Roger Ingerland's intended presentation to a Vexin church, resisted on behalf of Louis de Luxembourg in July 1436 by the authority 'de son plain droit à cause de sa seigneurie et dignité archiépiscopal'.² Luxembourg complained the following year that he was ill-informed of cases proceeding in the various Norman courts, and may have felt that his temporal interests were being ignored or undermined.³

In fact, disputes concerning presentations which were heard within Normandy were generally settled by a compromise between the landholder and either the see of Rouen or the crown, which saw a vacancy filled without prejudice to the legal title of either party.⁴ The right to exercise ecclesiastical patronage was rather a question for the higher courts, and the Parlement in particular, and formed the essence or 'le principal' of two suits which saw the crown and English landholders taking opposite sides. Could a settler enforce the privilege within his acquired territories?⁵ Did the crown retain this right unless express mention was made of its conferment when confiscated lands were redistributed?⁶ In spite of settlers' appeals to tenurial memory and

-
1. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1419-20, f. 14v; below, Appendix III.
 2. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1436-7, sub 11 July 1436.
 3. Ibid., G 1134. In April 1437 the crown ordered the chambre des comptes and the baillis to allow the archbishop to pursue cases without hindrance, and to enjoy the revenues of his temporalities.
 4. Ibid., G 1638.
 5. Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, no. XV, pp. 192-200, esp. p. 197.
 6. Ibid., no. XVIII, pp. 209-19.

to the continued enjoyment of existing benefits outlined in their aveux et dénombremens, at least one important decision went in favour of the royal cause.¹ The prevailing legal climate upheld the right of the central authorities, lay and ecclesiastical, to make clerical presentations against the claims even of more notable land owners to accommodate the practice within their local jurisdiction.

That other valuable prize to land owners, the wardship of minors, also attracted its share of actions at law. In one case which proceeded from the assises of the bailli of Caen to the cour du conseil Henry Bourgchier, count of Eu and once himself a royal ward, lost the right to the wardship of Charles de Hermanville and his lands which Bourgchier had claimed by a grant of Henry V to his father.² The custody of the Hermanville estates had been the subject of protracted litigation from the time of their original award to Sir William Bourgchier in 1418. The family were clearly unwilling to yield their title to holdings which had, in the past, produced considerable sums into the hands of their appointed procureur.³ Two suits before the Parlement which have already been mentioned, involving Richard Handford and the earl of Salisbury, testify to the importance of the guardianship of minors as a source of revenue to individual landholders. The other element to be borne in mind here is the crown's interest in securing for

-
1. Ibid., p. 219. See also Seine-Mme, Échiquier 1423, f. 27, where it was argued that a presentation did not belong to a landholder as a property right but followed its 'dévolution', the traditional privilege of appointment.
 2. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1440-1, sub 5 February 1442; Woodger, 'Henry Bourgchier', pp. 8-9.
 3. As procureur, the merchant John Deville brought back some 420 crowns from the Hermanville estates to Anne countess of Stafford (ibid., pp. 13-14).

its own benefit wardships made available through the delays sought by land owners for the performance of their prisées.

Litigation could prove to be an expensive and exhaustive business. Settlers were aware that to pursue their claims beyond a certain point, for example on appeal from the assises to the Échiquier, was to risk further expense which success might not justify. There came a point, as Hamonnet Wymyngton found, when it was better to cut one's losses, 'pour ce qu'il ne veoit pas son prouffit à plus précéder ne poursuivre sadicte loy apparente', and to desist.¹

The employment of a procureur was probably not cheap but was certainly essential, although on at least one known occasion a newly-appointed proctor proved at first to be more a hindrance than a help.² It was known that by the time a suit was presented to a higher court for judgment its costs might well exceed the profits of the lands in contention,³ so it made good sense to reach an agreement privately or at the assises to prevent this. To take just one example, both John Sutton and John Benart had been granted certain lands in the bailliages of Rouen, Caen and the Cotentin and faced the prospect of a long and expensive suit to resolve title. Instead, they agreed that William Sutton, son and heir of John, should enjoy the lands; in the meantime, neither would lay claim to the lands of the other and they would help each other to obtain the necessary letters patent when the time arose.⁴

-
1. Calvados, Tabellionnage de Caen 7E 90, f. 23; Allmand, 'Aftermath of War', 350-351.
 2. John Durant obtained an empêchement on behalf of his employer in ignorance of a previous agreement (Calvados, Tabellionnage de Caen 7E 89, f. 421).
 3. Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, p. 142.
 4. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1434-5, fos. 131-131v.

Other such agreements are known. Even after a case had been heard and a verdict reached, it has been noted that settlements were made to defray and sometimes to share the expenses of the unsuccessful and to temper the ill-effects of lost title and income. Taken together this may indicate that some landholders, at least, would take pains to avoid the law courts if possible and, if not, to mitigate the impact of a loss of livelihood upon their fellows. The local evidence suggests that we should certainly be wary of regarding a minority of aggressive English litigants as representative of that much larger number of settlers who had recourse to law. Suits were hard-fought, sometimes over many years and sometimes to the detriment of the widows, minors and lesser men who could ill afford to lose their livings.¹

Yet there are signs, too, that landholders recognized the value of independent arbiters and of the involvement of the wider community of which they were members in the settlement of disputes, to the advantage of the next generation of settlers.² Nor is there a lack of evidence for settlers co-operating with the indigenous population in the resolution of tenurial problems. The records of the decisions reached by the Norman courts as recorded in the notarial registers reveal the shades of grey which lay between the black and white of claim and counter-claim. Legal proceedings were not always instituted with the aim of securing outright victory over an opponent, even when the highly prized commodity of land was at stake. Arguments which commonly

1. Harding, Social History, pp. 121-3.

2. Thomas Elyngham acted on the advice of friends, relations and neighbours in selling a house in Caen to Stephen Miller (Calvados, Tabellionnage de Caen 7E 89, fos. 523v-524). See also I. Rowney, 'Arbitration in Gentry Disputes of the Later Middle Ages', History, lxxvii (1982), 369.

arose through ignorance of landed title and as a result of errors in the procedure for issuing grants could readily be settled in court without malice and in a spirit of compromise.

One must emphasise, too, that the Tabellionnage records reveal that arbitration and litigation were inter-dependent rather than mutually exclusive. It was much quicker and cheaper to settle a problem before trial and to have an agreement as to title and the costs of the parties written up by the tabellion. There were other advantages. All could emerge with honour intact, having avoided the resort to arms and the forcible possession of property, and while costs, arrears of revenue and other provisions could be negotiated to leave something to both plaintiff and defendant. Court judgments, by contrast, could eventually end a dispute without establishing peace between the parties, and as a general rule costs were awarded against the loser.¹ Moreover, arbitration catered for disputes which fell outside local customary practice and the existing legislation of, for example, Henry V's Ordinances, and responded to the particular problems arising at a local level from an occupation which lasted for three decades.

Such were among the attractions which may have caused even that renowned warrior, Matthew Gough, to avoid the 'grant rigueur de procès'.² A further consequence which should be stressed is that arbitration created new social ties and reinforced those existing: between the parties themselves, their procureurs, arbiters appointed,

-
1. S.D. White, 'The Settlement of Disputes by Compromise in Eleventh-Century Western France', American Journal of Legal History, xxii (1978), 296-301.
 2. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1443-4, sub 7 November 1444.

and friends and relatives offering advice and support.¹ The pressure to reach a compromise and then to observe it was that much greater. Agreements commonly recorded the pledge by each party to the other of moveable goods, as in Gough's case, but it was in the interests of all concerned that such a sanction should not be resorted to.

There was of course nothing new about arbitration in later medieval France, and settlers adapted to it by necessity.² It has been observed that the pattern of jurisdictional conflicts and of efforts made to achieve their resolution followed French rather than English lines,³ a conclusion which accords well with the continuity of practice in the administration of the settlement between Valois and Lancastrians argued for in the previous chapter. It may seem paradoxical to suggest that litigation and arbitration could encourage rather than hinder integration and mutual association between settlers and natives, but such must have been regularly the case. Litigants were not divided by nationality but by suit, and were brought together on the same terms.

1. White, 'Settlement of Disputes', 301, 307-8.

2. J. Fourgous, L'Arbitrage dans le droit français aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles (Paris and Toulouse, 1906), p. 22; J. Rogozinski, Power, Caste and Law. Social Conflict in Fourteenth-Century Montpellier (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), p. xii.

3. Cuttler, Law of Treason, p. 82.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE LANDED REVENUES OF SETTLERS

(i) Introduction

Discussion of the landed revenues accruing to Lancastrian settlers forms part of a larger consideration of the profitability or otherwise of the Hundred Years' War both to individuals and to the nation as a whole. Professor Postan argued that the effects of the war in financial and economic terms were largely negative; that the few real gains or profits were channelled towards the purchase of land in England; that the existing hierarchical social order was little disturbed but responded to changes already taking place.¹ K.B. McFarlane weighed expenditure in the form of direct and indirect taxation against the many sources of war income and concluded that the balance favoured the national economy and the personal fortunes of the English nobility.² The third protagonist in the debate, Dr. Bridbury, forcefully rejected 'the arbitrament of the balance sheet', questioned the value and feasibility of any attempt to calculate the overall costs of war, and viewed its profits in terms of immediate benefit to fighting men

-
1. M.M. Postan, 'Some Social Consequences of the Hundred Years War', Econ. H.R., xii (1942), 1-12; Postan, 'The Costs of the Hundred Years' War', Past and Present, 27 (1964), 34-53.
 2. K.B. McFarlane, 'War, the Economy and Social Change. England and the Hundred Years' War', ibid., 22 (1962), 3-15; McFarlane, Nobility, pp. 19-40.

engaged in their normal social activity.¹

There is a danger that within this debate and in any consensus which may finally emerge from it the original question of the value of French lands to their English owners may be obscured or forgotten altogether. It is useful, therefore, to examine current knowledge of this single problem. Naturally enough it forms only a small part of the analyses of Postan and Bridbury. The former acknowledged the existence of a few large and profitable fiefs but doubted that a majority would yield real and consistent gains; the latter suggested that contemporaries understood full well that landed profits were readily available, as were the other traditional spoils of war, according to individual fortune and access to royal patronage.² To McFarlane we owe the first appreciation of the potential value of the long term possession of conquered estates, which were not mere 'empty titles', to great captains and commanders. Conclusions expressed in lecture form were later substantiated in a celebrated case study of the administration and landed income of Fastolf's French holdings which is likely to remain the best documented and most lucid account of the gains and losses experienced by landholders in these years.³

Subsequent research into this difficult problem has come from two directions. First, studies of the estates and income of those members of the English baronage and nobility active in the war have, in almost

-
1. A.R. Bridbury, 'The Hundred Years' War: Costs and Profits', Trade, Government, and Economy in Pre-Industrial England. Essays presented to F.J. Fisher, ed. D.C. Coleman and A.H. John (London, 1976), pp. 80-95.
 2. Postan, 'Costs', 47; Bridbury, 'Hundred Years' War', pp. 91-3.
 3. McFarlane, Nobility, pp. 35-6, 40; McFarlane, 'Investment', 91-116.

every case, stressed the view that French lands were unlikely to produce a clear and consistent profit to their owners. It might be expected, for example, that the comté of Perche held by Humphrey duke of Buckingham and that of Eu held by Henry Bourgchier would yield surpluses at least comparable to those enjoyed by Fastolf on his more scattered estates. According to their respective historians, such was not the case.¹ Of all the English war captains it might be thought that Talbot would do well for himself, but again it has been argued that any landed profit accrued, as opposed to income, was at best modest.² Neither a substantial landowner of the rank of the duke of York,³ nor that well-favoured and influential councillor, the earl of Suffolk, are thought to have derived great benefit from their French holdings, although it should be noted that for Suffolk this has been an argument ex silentio.⁴ One receiver's account has been found for Suffolk's comté of Dreux, and others may exist.⁵ It is likely, too, that further materials relevant to foreign landed income await examination in English record collections, but unlikely that they will substantially change the picture described above.

-
1. C. Rawcliffe, The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521 (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 109, 114-5; Woodger, 'Henry Bourgchier', pp. 8, 13-14. It is not correct to state that in 1447-8 Buckingham drew about 800 marks in income from his French lands (J.L. Bolton, The Medieval English Economy 1150-1500 (London and Totowa, 1980), pp. 222-3). The valor referred to their anticipated income in time of peace.
 2. Pollard, John Talbot, pp. 106-7, 120.
 3. J.M.W. Bean, 'The Financial Position of Richard, Duke of York', War and Government in the Middle Ages. Essays in Honour of J.O. Prestwich, ed. J. Gillingham and J.C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984), p. 190; Johnson, 'Richard, Duke of York', pp. 32-3.
 4. James, 'William de la Pole', p. 45.
 5. AN, 300 AP1 Fonds de Dreux, 255.

The second, and more promising direction lies towards the French sources. The pioneering work of Dr. Allmand has both opened up the debate on the profitability of conquered estates and drawn attention to the function of landed income as a means of livelihood or subsistence to the non-noble majority of settlers. It is now argued that profits on the Fastolf scale were the exception rather than the rule, that the incidence of war and economic difficulties had grave effects upon the revenues of many, and that to equate landed revenue with the traditional spoils of war, booty and ransoms, is to misunderstand the aims and achievement of the Lancastrian occupation.¹ A recent examination of awards to members of the Beaufort family, furthermore, has stressed that the theory and practice of grant-making were not the same thing at all. Grants could be difficult to realise, their titles open to dispute and their nominal values might bear little relation to actual yields.²

It is not the purpose of this chapter to quarrel with the new orthodoxy. Indeed, evidence introduced here and in previous chapters does much to support the 'pessimistic' thesis of Professor Postan. It is rather the intention to raise several questions suggested by the sources themselves. How were French estates managed? What was the nature of the revenues, in cash and especially kind, which produced the totals essential to our assessment of landed worth? What exactly were the economic difficulties experienced by landowners, and what were their reactions to them? The absence of a good run of estate accounts by which income and expenditure over a reasonable period of time might

-
1. Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 472-9; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 69-80.
 2. Jones, 'Beaufort Family', pp. 287-92.

be assessed is regrettable. Nevertheless, there is much of value in the informations submitted to the chambre des comptes and in receivers' accounts which have been found for certain estates. Together they may provide new insights and contribute towards the revised and more complex picture of settlement which is emerging.

(ii) Estate Management

Reference has been made in the previous chapter to the role of the procureur as the legal representative of the landholder, and it was this same official who bore an overall responsibility for the financial management of the lands in his charge. Thus Thomas Clerc was commissioned to put to farm properties for rents in cash or kind in perpetuity, for life or for a term of years, and to guard and govern the Talbot lands and their appurtenances.¹ This official was sometimes called a procureur and sometimes a receveur in this context. Since it was clearly impractical to incorporate the management of French estates into that of English holdings, the two were kept separate for administrative purposes. That is not to say that English estate accounts of the period made no mention of French landed income; they sometimes did, but these tended to be incidental, passing references to potential revenue and to the men appointed to collect it. The nominal value of Perche to the duke of Buckingham was briefly recorded in a valor, and the administration of Henry Bourghier's French estates was conducted by his mother, Anne countess of Stafford, by means of her receiver, John Deville.² Such references might reflect upon the efficiency of

1. BN, Ms. fr. 26052 no. 1162.

2. Rawcliffe, The Staffords, p. 109 n. 16 citing Longleat MS 6410 m.21; Woodger, 'Henry Bourghier', pp. 9, 13-14.

baronial financial affairs at the centre, and also acknowledged that the day-to-day running of lands held overseas was a separate matter, to be dealt with on the spot by the receiver and his staff.

There was considerable variation in estate management practice. As in England, the greater landowners seem to have devised their own arrangements to suit individual needs, according to experience, or by trial and error.¹ For it must be remembered that while the establishment of a separate receivership in France may have been natural to the likes of York or Talbot already in possession of considerable domestic holdings, the same was not true of those ambitious but newly-established landowners, such as Fastolf, who in the early years of the occupation lacked the tenurial tradition and knowledge of customary practice common to the higher nobility. Inexperience in land management could prove costly in the context of war, and may perhaps have contributed to Fastolf's protracted dispute with his receiver-general, Thomas Overton, but for the most part incoming settlers seem to have found that standard French procedure was little different from that familiar or at least known to them already.²

At the highest level the management by settlers of their French holdings became quite sophisticated. This is shown by a glance at the estate administration of the greatest English landholder of his time, the duke of Bedford. The establishment of an accounting office at Mantes in January 1425 marked the separation of Bedford's territorial interests from those of his fellow settlers. By the Regent's

-
1. C.D. Ross and T.B. Pugh, 'Materials for the Study of Baronial Incomes in Fifteenth-Century England', Econ. H.R., second series, vi (1953), 185-94.
 2. Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, no XX, pp. 231-68.

instruction his chambre des comptes was to bring together all registers, books and papers concerning his holdings,

'afin que les gens et officiers ... en ladite chambre puissent avoir claire connoissance de l'état et gouvernement des terres et pays'.¹

Uniquely, Bedford maintained this personal office as a body attached to, yet at the same time separate from, his personal household. Attached, in that revenues accrued by the chambre were passed to Bedford's treasurer and were used to offset household expenses;² separate, because Bedford employed a number of receivers to cover his scattered estates and made them responsible to a treasurer and receiver-general but kept their business apart from that of his routine household affairs. As Miss Rowe pointed out, this meant that Bedford's Maine revenues could be used to pay the garrisons there, or the income from the former Orléans lands could be paid into the Norman accounts.³ Maine itself was administered separately from Normandy, with its own chancellor and governor, and a brief statement of the receipts of the comté, but not of expenses, survives for the year 1433-4.⁴

A valor of the Bedford estates for the same year reveals that for accounting purposes landed income came under the heading of one of three comtés, those of Maine, Harcourt and Dreux.⁵ Separate accounts were drawn up for each lordship or combination of lordships by a

-
1. Lenoir 2/185.
 2. BN, Ms. fr. 4488 f. 28.
 3. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [553]; Rowe, 'John, Duke of Bedford', p. 38.
 4. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [549-50].
 5. Ibid., [553-5].

receiver or vicomte, such as Guillaume du Hamel at Lillebonne, and then collated. In addition, procureurs were employed to put out properties to farm and to safeguard their masters' interests.¹ This complicated administrative structure merits comparison with that evolved to manage the finances of Jean duc de Berry on the apanage lands granted to him in 1361.² As the Berry financial organization imitated that of the Hôtel du Roi, so Bedford's corresponded to that of the Lancastrian government with some overlap, too, in the personnel employed by the official and private accounting offices.³

Bedford stood apart from other magnates by virtue of the quantity and diversity of his landed possessions in northern France. Other major landholders of similar status adopted a less impressive but familiar system based upon local receivers and an overall receiver-general or treasurer directly accountable for income and expenditure. Such was, in large measure, the procedure used by York, Fastolf and Edmund Beaufort. Both York and Fastolf employed Nicholas Molyneux as their receiver-general,⁴ and York also appointed his councillor William Oldhall governor-general of his French estates shortly after an important grant in February 1445.⁵ Similarly, Edmund Beaufort employed Frenchmen as his receiver-general and treasurer and established a central treasury and council at Rouen to which the revenues of his

-
1. Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage d'Elbeuf, sub 7 July 1433.
 2. Lacour, Gouvernement de l'apanage, pp. 227-69.
 3. Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 92-3.
 4. BL, Add. Ch. 12308; McFarlane, 'Business-Partnership', 299-300.
 5. BN, n. acq. fr. 1482 no. 186.

scattered holdings were brought.¹ As we have seen, a majority appointed one man to be their receiver and legal representative, and in some cases it is clear that incoming settlers employed the services of existing estate personnel with the local knowledge and experience which could only prove beneficial to new owners.²

How important was effective estate management to the landed income which settlers might anticipate? Unfortunately it is not possible to support the remarks which follow with hard figures, but it may be instructive to compare the following evidence with that for fifteenth-century England.³ The receiver's manifold duties left ample room for efficiency and enterprise on the one hand, and maladministration and corruption on the other. Almost every aspect of land management came within his ambit, from the seizure of the lands of defaulting tenants to the farming of properties and the issue of acquittances; all monies paid and received were to be recorded and accounted for on a quarterly basis in annual accounts. The receiver-general bore additional responsibilities such as the receipt of royal aides and the collection of the profits of the seal and signet office, in Molyneux's case,⁴ and the distribution of soldiers' wages and the

-
1. Jones, 'Beaufort Family', p. 323.
 2. P. Charbonnier, Une Autre France. La Seigneurie rurale en Basse Auvergne du XIV^e au XVI^e siècle (2 vols., Clermont-Ferrand, 1980), i, 563-4.
 3. A.J. Pollard, 'Estate Management in the Later Middle Ages: the Talbots and Whitchurch, 1383-1525', Econ. H.R., second series, xxv (1972), 553-66; Rawcliffe, The Staffords, pp. 46-9. Estate and household management constituted the second of three considerations necessary to the 'good governaunce' of a prince (Four English Political Tracts of the Later Middle Ages, ed. J. - P. Genet, Camden fourth series, xviii (Royal Historical Society, London, 1977), pp. 183-8).
 4. BN, Ms. fr. 26075 nos. 5560, 5568; AN, KK 324, f. 212v.

issue of safe-conducts in that of Thomas Overton. That conflicts between lord and official could arise was therefore not surprising. In November 1426 Sir William Porter had to petition for a delay for the valuation of his lands because his receiver in the vicomté of Evreux had deserted, taking with him essential papers and registers.¹ More serious was the aggravated dispute between Fastolf and his receiver-general in Maine in which Fastolf levelled grave charges of embezzlement, inefficiency and interference against the hapless Overton, offences which it was claimed could warrant imprisonment: 'Et est l'usage tout notoire en Normendie que les seigneurs peuvent emprisonner leurs receveurs'.²

The receiver's lot was not a happy one, often caught between the desire of a landlord to extract the maximum from his landed possessions and an array of problems at a local level which could hinder such intentions. In the setting of war and an armed occupation the value of a good receiver must have been high, and the rewards heaped upon Nicholas Molyneux by successive patrons surely testify to the esteem in which he was held. The position required literacy, a financial and legal training and probably a sound knowledge of the French language. Estate management was only one of several fields which demanded these skills in Lancastrian France. There was competition between public and private interests for the best administrators, who were able to combine careers in both areas to personal advantage. During the early years of the occupation in particular, land owners may have thought there were rich pickings to be gained from well-managed estates which

1. Ibid., K.62/25 no. 31.

2. Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, p. 237.

could be administered in their absence on campaign or in England, and the fact that such profits seldom materialised and that the authorities sought to outlaw absentee tenure must have occasioned a sense of disillusionment.¹ In later years the real value of competent land management lay in an ability to adjust to the changed circumstances of falling revenues and declining land values by the abandonment of direct exploitation and fixed rents in favour of farming out properties. The careful husbandry of existing resources was the key to the maintenance of livelihood which was so essential to the majority of lesser landholders. Throughout the period of the occupation it seems that the value of good estate management was higher than it has been estimated in England. To both greater and lesser landholders the differential between efficient and merely average administration was probably greater than the 10% or so of potential yields considered likely on the Talbot estates in Shropshire.²

Evidence from two main sources establishes the nature of landed income. Estate accounts recorded income under two headings. The 'domaine fieffé' comprised the terres nobles, lands which owed only an administrative or often a military service and homage to the king, and the terres roturières which owed rents in cash and/or kind. Under the heading of the domaine fieffé came lands given to tenants to hold with hereditary tenure on the payment of a fixed rent. To the 'domaine non fieffé' belonged lands granted for a specified period, either a set number of years or for the life of the holder.³ Following these two

1. Below, pp. 334-5.

2. Pollard, 'Estate Management', 561-3.

3. C.A.A. de Manneville, De l'état des terres et des personnes dans la paroisse d'Amblainville (Vexin Français) du XII^e au XV^e siècle (Beauvais, 1890), pp. 13-16; Plaisse, Baronnie du Neubourg, pp. 33-4, 71-3.

major categories came an assortment of privileges, rights and feudal incidents which yielded revenues: profits from the seal and writing office; fines levied at the assises and for forest offences; income from property put to farm; income from wardships and church presentations; from the reliefs et treizièmes; sums raised by the sale of wood and from the use of seigneurial mills. Under the heading of expenditure were listed the wages of estate staff, monies spent on building and repairs to property, writing materials used by the receiver, often recorded as the 'dépence commune', and a total figure for decayed or remitted rents.¹

Secondly, the dénombrements sent to the chambre des comptes make it possible to break down these headings still further. William Bourgchier was able to furnish only a general statement of the extent and nature of his holdings at Eu, pleading brevity of tenure and involvement in the war, but even this cursory declaration provides insights into the exercise of comital lordship.² In the first place, the comté comprised the appartenances, namely what were described as 'les primordiales consistances de la seigneurie',³ its population, lands, rents and customs, and the appendances, everything subsequently attached to the lordship. Among the most important seigneurial revenues were those derived from the exercise of justice, in this instance high, medium and low justice, and from presentations to at least thirteen churches and chapels. In addition to the revenues in cash and kind produced by lands, mills, fisheries and dovecotes,

1. de Frondeville, 'Vicomt  d'Orbec', 122-5.

2. AN, P 284² no. 47, dated 13 April 1420.

3. Brussel, Nouvel examen, i, 17.

Bourgchier could anticipate income from the forest of Eu and the two ports in the comté, Le Tréport and Criel-sur-Mer, and the wardships, reliefs and other customary dues from an array of dependent baronies which were carefully listed.

Putting Bourgchier's award alongside those to Thomas Tyringham, discussed in the first chapter, and Henry Worseley, discussed below, raises more points of similarity than of difference. Apart from the obvious contrasts of scale, of the enjoyment of unlimited revenues and additional judicial privileges, all settlers were faced by the need to identify and manage a bewildering array of incomes in cash and kind from rural and urban properties. Manors, fiefs, mills, fishponds, forest rights, church presentations, all dispersed across a wide area in some cases: such was the stuff of land tenure. Standing back from the local interests and responsibilities common to all landholders, however, it is clear that the major lordships and comtés were more than the sum of many small parts. The castles, towns, baronies and vicomtés which they embraced contributed to a sense of autonomy and independence to which lesser land owners could not aspire. Careful estate management conferred social and political advantages as well as financial gain, contributing to that respect for lord and lordship upon which the tenurial hierarchy depended. Military commanders were expected to lead in civilian matters, too, and by example to demonstrate that respect for past observances and practices which others were to follow. The idea perhaps was that the identity of the seigneur should change, but little else. At Le Neubourg it appears that the burghal and other revenues accruing to the earl of Salisbury were collected much as before, however slight, and the dénombrements suggest that lesser landholders and those acting for them were assiduous in listing

and gathering in what was due.¹

(iii) The Nature of Revenues

The landed revenues of settlers in France can be assessed from two main sources. Some estate accounts have been found which, although patchy or incomplete in form, do give valuable evidence of the income and expenditure of landholders of the noble and baronial classes. Secondly, the informations provide a detailed and independent inventory of revenues accruing to both knights and esquires.

Settler estate accounts for the reign of Henry V are rare, and the earliest known reference to them concerns that portion of the Estouteville estates² granted to Sir Gilbert Umfraville on 1 February 1419.³ A register containing at least two annual accounts of these lands was used by La Morandière at the turn of the century, but it is now probably buried within the unclassified Fonds de Valmont at Rouen and has not been located.⁴ The first and earliest of these Umfraville accounts was drawn up by his receiver, Bernard Dutronq, for the year commencing 23 March 1419.⁵ The estates were not tightly-grouped but

-
1. Plaisse, Baronnie du Neubourg, pp. 322-4.
 2. Interestingly, Robert d'Estouteville was rewarded after the battle of Hastings with lands in the Scottish marches, a region in which an Umfraville companion-in-arms fought and later settled (G. de La Morandière, Histoire de la maison d'Estouteville en Normandie (Paris, 1903), pp. 19-20, 270-1; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 122, 242).
 3. PRO, C.64/10 m.28; C.64/11 m.69; D.K.R., xli, 733; Bréquigny no. 1261.
 4. Seine-Mme, 19 H Fonds de Valmont.
 5. La Morandière, Histoire, pp. 271-3.

were scattered across three bailliages, with their heaviest concentration in the heartlands of the Caux in the areas south-east of Fécamp and south-west of Dieppe. The recent passage of armies left its mark on certain parishes within the Umfraville lordship: some were able to pay their feudal dues but others yielded nothing owing to a shortage of manpower. This was very much the substance of the account for 1420, where the receiver reported an acute labour shortage at Valmont and four nearby parishes while three others, close to those worst-affected, were seemingly well-peopled.¹ Umfraville wasted no time in seeking relief, and his petition to the crown in May 1419 listed a series of charges due to the king, and certain Frenchmen who were absent or in rebellion,

'attendu que icelles seigneuries, manoirs et terres sont à present de petite valeur pour occasion des guerres et mortalités qui ont esté ou pais, en son très grant dommage'.²

The charges were duly remitted with their arrears, but Sir Gilbert continued to request delays for delivery of a dénombrément to the chambre des comptes.³

We should be wary, however, of interpreting the evidence of these fragmentary accounts in too gloomy a fashion. In the first place, the incidence of depopulation and war damage was highly localised and could vary from year to year: in 1419 Valmont was seemingly little affected; in 1420 the parish contained only fifteen men. Secondly, Umfraville was probably surprised and disappointed to find that revenues were low

1. Ibid., pp. 282-3.

2. PRO, C.64/11 m.43d; Bréquigny no. 593; Lenoir 3/294.

3. PRO, C.64/11 m.40d; C.64/12 m.49; D.K.R., xlii, 320, 334.

and people to work the terres labourables scarce, and it was in his own interest in a petition to apply particular evidence to the general condition of his estates. The rent-charges with which he was burdened testify, by their very size, to the former prosperity of these lands, as does the provision in the original grant that Sir Gilbert supply twelve men-at-arms and twenty-four archers for the royal armies as well as soldiers to defend each of his castles. Thirdly, the 1419 account reveals evidence both of repair work at Valmont castle and elsewhere, which seems to suggest repair after a period of neglect rather than routine maintenance, and signs of commercial activity. Umfraville bought cloth and taffeta from Rouen merchants and sold the wool of some 800 sheep kept at Valmont. These brief references to trade are all the more welcome given their scarcity in other estate records, and serve as a reminder that an active, resident landowner was not always reliant solely upon the traditional domanial revenues which form the bulk of the surviving material for the study of individual income.

Further west, the accounts of the duke of Exeter's estates at La Carneille and Prez to the west and south-west of Falaise, the latter partly shown in Table 3, reveal a pattern which is not dissimilar.¹ The impact of war on landed revenue can be noticed at La Carneille under the heading of domaine non fieffé, where in 1421 and 1422 four sergenteries could not be put to farm for fear of brigands and the king's enemies, and even in the account ending at Easter 1426 only one sergenterie produced an income.² There was a mill, too, which was

1. These lordships formed part of the comté of Harcourt granted to Exeter on 1 July 1418 (PRO, C.64/10 mm.35-4; Bréquigny no. 205). The source for Tables 3 and 4 is Calvados, E 252, 253.

2. Ibid., E 252 fos. 1, 5v; E 253 f. 6.

Table 3. Income at Prez

| <u>Michaelmas 1422 - Easter 1423</u> | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | <u>l.</u> | <u>s.</u> | <u>d.</u> |
| <u>Domaine fieffé</u> | 14 | 19 | 8 |
| Uncollected rents | - | - | - |
| <u>Domaine fieffé, capons, deniers</u> | - | 50 | - |
| Poultry | 4 | 7 | 2 |
| Mill | - | - | - |
| <u>Corvées</u> | - | 11 | 8 |
| | 22 | 8 | 6 |
| | | | |
| <u>Michaelmas 1426 - Easter 1427</u> | | | |
| <u>Domaine fieffé</u> | 14 | 19 | 8 |
| Uncollected rents | - | - | - |
| <u>Domaine fieffé, capons, deniers</u> | - | 40 | 8 |
| Poultry | - | 65 | 11 |
| Mill | - | 25 | - |
| <u>Corvées</u> | - | 11 | 8 |
| | 22 | 2 | 11 |

reportedly worthless because none dared to work it. The last man to do so, John Adam, had joined the brigands at the end of his term of office.¹ Yet the overriding impression gained is one of stability. Fixed, hereditary rents meant that income from the domaine fieffé and the corvées remained little changed from year to year, and although payments in kind could fluctuate it is not uncommon to find the same figures appearing in the accounts for successive years. Supplementing this core of domanial income were the irregular sums produced by lands

1. Ibid., E 253 fos. 4v, 9.

put to farm, mills and fines levied by the vicomte, and it was these revenues which were most vulnerable to the ill-effects of war on the local population and economy, particularly in a frontier area at some distance from the nearest garrison.

Table 4. Combined Income and Expenditure at Prez and La Carneille

| <u>Income</u> | <u>l.</u> | <u>s.</u> | <u>d.</u> |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| 1421-2 | 24 | 19 | 10 |
| 1422-3 | 39 | 17 | 11 |
| 1423-4 | 39 | 12 | 11 |
| | <u>104</u> | <u>10</u> | <u>8</u> |
| <u>Expenditure</u> 1421-4 | 32 | 10 | - |
| <u>Balance</u> | <u>72</u> | <u>-</u> | <u>8</u> |
| | | | |
| <u>1424-5</u> | | | |
| <u>Income</u> | 60 | 7 | 6 |
| <u>Expenditure</u> | 10 | 6 | 8 |
| <u>Balance</u> | <u>50</u> | <u>-</u> | <u>10</u> |
| | | | |
| <u>1425-6</u> | | | |
| <u>Income</u> | 50 | 14 | 3 |
| <u>Expenditure</u> | 10 | 6 | 8 |
| <u>Balance</u> | <u>40</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>7</u> |

Table 4 makes two interesting points about these fiefs. First, their combined income doubled between 1421 and 1425. Secondly, expenses remained static, leaving a healthy balance. Expenses on these smallholdings were light, comprising the wages of the receiver and accommodation for him at Falaise and a sum for alms. The increase in net revenue must therefore be attributed to the feudal incidents and

irregular monies which became more conspicuous and significant. By 1426 the mill was in use, fines were more lucrative, the profits of the seal yielded a small sum after previously producing nothing, land was being put to farm. The nature of this increase in revenue shows just how the military successes of the early years of the Regency and the southward extension of the southern frontier of the occupation could increase landed income in Normandy. Looked at another way, even in an area that escaped lightly from the worst of the war seigneurial revenues could be halved in the short term. The key to their revival lay in repopulation and greater security.

The decade of the 1420s was, in general terms, the most favourable of the occupation for Lancastrian settlers. It was during these years that income from land and tenurial privileges exceeded expenditure to produce a favourable balance in all cases that are known. Land to the south and south-west of Caen held by Salisbury yielded revenues totalling 314 l.t. and with expenses of 188 l.t. the receiver owed a balance of 126 livres.¹ At Le Neubourg John Willeton's account for the year 1428-9 showed an income of 1,702 l.t. for the barony and expenditure of 1,025 l.t., leaving a balance of 677 livres.² One does not have to look far beyond these figures, however, to realise that this was no golden age of land tenure. Even in good years lands put to farm contributed nothing because English soldiers living off the land at Le Neubourg had seized them and, on the other side of the account, the need to provide and pay for soldiers to defend the barony's castles helps to explain the heavy outgoings incumbent upon

1. Ibid., E 385.

2. Eure, E 3939 f. 111v.

larger estates.¹ It is as well to remember that the informations conducted even in this period of relative prosperity rarely recorded that seigneurial revenues exceeded the limit specified in letters of grant. To a large extent, it was the difference between potential and actual receipts which explains the shortfall.

The estate accounts of the lordship of Tancarville, held in wardship for Henry Grey of Heton by Sir John Salvain, enable more to be said about both income and expenditure.² Table 5 refers to receipts at Tancarville for the years 1428-9 and 1430-1, the years for which the most complete records have survived. The domaine fieffé

Table 5. The Value of Tancarville, 1428-31

| | <u>1428-9</u> | | | <u>1430-1</u> | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-----------|
| | <u>l.</u> | <u>s.</u> | <u>d.</u> | <u>l.</u> | <u>s.</u> | <u>d.</u> |
| <u>Domaine fieffé</u> | 1,767 | - | 3 | 1,769 | 4 | 9½ |
| <u>Domaine non fieffé</u> | 1,223 | 17 | 3 | 1,217 | 8 | 7 |
| <u>Rented income</u> | 2,990 | 17 | 6 | 2,986 | 13 | 4½ |
| Decayed rents | 1,203 | 9 | 8½ | 1,151 | 18 | 11 |
| <u>Net income</u> | 1,787 | 7 | 9½ | 1,834 | 14 | 5½ |
| Leases, fines, sales | 55 | - | 3 | | | |
| <u>Gross value</u> | 1,842 | 8 | ½ | | | |
| Estate charges | 560 | - | 6½ | | | |
| <u>Estimated clear value</u> | 1,282 | 7 | 6 | | | |

-
1. Ibid., f. 38; Plaisse, Baronnie du Neubourg, pp. 315-6.
 2. Seine-Mne, série 1 E, Comté de Tancarville (unclassified). Accounts exist for 1426-7 (incomplete); 1428-9; 1430-1 (incomplete); 1433-4 (incomplete).

recorded the fixed rents anticipated first in cash and then in kind, with very similar figures recorded for each year, whereas lands put to farm for varying periods and the divers charges and perquisites were subject to annual variation, as noticed above.¹ It will be remembered that listed receipts were those anticipated, not those actually collected. To calculate the actual rented income it is necessary to deduct the decayed rents recorded on the expense side of the account in order to arrive at a net value for income from rents and farms.² Table 5 reveals a net income at Tancarville of 1,787 l. for the year 1428-9 and 1,835 l. for 1430-1. To the first figure can be added revenues from leases, court perquisites and sales to arrive at a gross value for the lordship.

Perhaps the most striking observation to be made about the Table is that the potential landed income of this estate was almost half as large again as the actual, net income at Grey's disposal. Put another way, this lord could expect to realise only some 60% of the revenue of Tancarville on paper. The lordship comprised a number of fiefs situated between Harfleur and Lillebonne near the mouth of the Seine, an area of strategic importance which was well-garrisoned by the English, but not since 1419 had it seen active campaigning. In the absence of an estate account for the early 1420s it is not possible to detect signs of an economic recovery within the first half of the decade, as witnessed on Exeter's estates outside Falaise, but account evidence suggests that both anticipated landed income and actual, net

-
1. The first three categories only of domaine non fieffé have been included as rented income.
 2. Ross and Pugh, 'Materials', 185, 193; J.M.W. Bean, The Estates of the Percy Family, 1416-1537 (Oxford, 1958), p. 16; The Grey of Ruthin Valor, ed. R.I. Jack (Sydney, 1965), p. 10.

income remained fairly stable and were if anything rising slightly between 1426 and 1434. It is unlikely, therefore, that Grey's 'missing' income can be attributed to a serious overall decline of land values, although there were doubtless a number of local exceptions to this view.

Nor do the accounts refer to war damage, brigandage or destruction effected by the nearby garrisons, although all probably took their share of Tancarville revenues. The crux of the matter lay rather with the decayed rents, which included both lands which were untenanted and decreases in rent since the original rental had been compiled. They were so numerous as to indicate a serious population shortage, which also helps to explain the generally low level of fines and sales within the lordship. The managers of the Grey estate at Tancarville were faced by a lack of manpower and an absence of tenants and farmers willing to take from the lord the abundance of land which lay in his hands. There were one or two Englishmen who did so,¹ but the number of decayed rents testifies to the abandonment of lands by tenants who had left or had not performed services owing. Those who remained, for example the inhabitants of La Cerlangue and St.-Jean-des-Essars, were incapable of paying existing rent-charges, which were duly reduced to the sum of 10 s. per acre at a total cost in 1428-9 of some 924 l. 6s. 2d.² These were by far the largest of the remissions accorded on the estate and comprise the larger part of the 'deniers rendues et non receuz'. Nevertheless, in almost all fiefs remissions and reductions were made. This was the price which had to be paid by a

1. John Fiere farmed lands at Épretot for 40 s. per year; Robert Stokes, esquire, held a life-rent worth £10 sterling at Tancarville (Seine-Mme, Comté de Tancarville, 1426-7, 1433-4).

2. Ibid., 1428-9.

lord keen to retain such of his tenantry as remained. A shortage of manpower, and the limited ability of tenants to meet the higher assessments of rent which had once obtained do much to explain the shortfall between potential and actual income experienced by Grey at Tancarville and that felt by other settlers elsewhere in Lancastrian France.¹

The discharge side of the Tancarville accounts is recorded by Table 6.² Payments included the wages of the estate managers at 334 l.t., of which 200 l.t. to John Garner as captain and bailli

Table 6. Expenditure at Tancarville

| | <u>1428-9</u> | | | <u>1430-1</u> | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-----------|
| | <u>l.</u> | <u>s.</u> | <u>d.</u> | <u>l.</u> | <u>s.</u> | <u>d.</u> |
| Fiefs, alms, rents | 39 | 5 | - | 16 | 12 | - |
| Tithes | 56 | 1 | 8½ | 58 | 4 | 9 |
| Wages | 334 | - | - | 344 | - | - |
| Sums to <u>vicomtes</u> | 90 | 7 | 6 | | | |
| Payments to trustee | 212 | - | - | | | |
| Other payments | 482 | 10 | - | | | |
| Repairs, building works | 74 | 6 | 9 | 180 | 4 | 5 |
| Travel expenses | 7 | 12 | 6 | | | |
| Decayed rents | 1,203 | 9 | 8½ | 1,151 | 18 | 11 |
| <u>Dépence commune</u> | 48 | 14 | 7 | | | |
| Total Expenditure | 2,548 | 7 | 9 | 3,137 | 15 | 4½ |
| Total Receipts | <u>3,186</u> | <u>19</u> | <u>6½</u> | <u>3,201</u> | <u>8</u> | <u>7</u> |
| Receiver's <u>debet</u> | 638 | 11 | 9½ | 63 | 13 | 2½ |

1. R.H. Hilton, A Medieval Society. The West Midlands at the End of the Thirteenth Century (London, 1966), p. 23.

2. Drawn from Seine-Mme, Comté de Tancarville, 1428-9, 1430-1.

formed the largest part, and liveries to John Salvain as trustee of the lordship for Grey. In both years repairs were carried out at Tancarville castle and money was also spent on mills, and in particular on replacing worn mill-stones. In 1430-1 the sum of 180 l. set aside for building and repairs was added to the receiver's debet to form a total of 243 l. 17s. 7d. paid by the receiver to the captain and bailli. The larger sum recorded in the 1428-9 account comprised some 460 l. paid to John Garner for a purpose at present unclear but which may have been military, and 184 l. paid to him as bailli of which 6 livres had been carried forward from the previous account.

The conclusions to be drawn from this body of account evidence are, by necessity, tentative. No amount of juggling with figures will produce a balance of profit and loss from accounts not designed for that purpose. These are personal, not public documents, drawn up to assess the liability of an independent receiver for income and expenditure within a set period.¹ There is much that remains unknown of the financial management of lands by settlers.² The most that can be done is to take the gross value of the estate and to deduct from it the necessary charges incurred in the form of alms, wages, repairs and sundry expenses to arrive at an estimated clear value of 1,282 l. 7s. 6d.³ Expressed in sterling Tancarville was worth some £213 to Grey. This was no large sum to draw from what was a considerable French estate.

-
1. R.R. Davies, 'Baronial Accounts, Incomes and Arrears in the Later Middle Ages', Econ. H.R., second series, xxi (1968), 212-13.
 2. For example, attempts to calculate the clear value of individual manors; the process of audit; the pursuit of arrears (cf. Grey of Ruthin Valor, ed. Jack, pp. 17-27).
 3. Decayed rents and liveries of money have not been deducted from the gross value as estate charges in Table 6.

It represents the clear value of a small English lordship or a collection of manors held within a single county. If such a figure can be taken as a reliable indicator, it suggests that landed income might produce modest sums in the form of liveries to the lord and his estate officials, and would allow an individual receiver to balance his books at the end of a term of office.

It is instructive to compare the Tancarville evidence with that of Lillebonne, the adjacent comté held by Bedford, for which a few receivers' accounts have survived, that of 1429-30 being the most complete.¹ What emerges most clearly from a comparison of Table 7 with Table 5 is that although total income in the form of rents was

Table 7. The Value of Lillebonne, 1429-30

| | <u>Easter</u> | | | <u>Michaelmas</u> | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|
| | <u>l.</u> | <u>s.</u> | <u>d.</u> | <u>l.</u> | <u>s.</u> | <u>d.</u> |
| <u>Domaine fieffé</u> | 989 | 12 | 9 | 1,032 | 7 | 10 |
| <u>Domaine non fieffé</u> | 244 | 6 | - | 308 | 1 | 6 |
| <u>Rented income</u> | 1,233 | 18 | 9 | 1,340 | 9 | 4 |
| Decayed rents | 152 | 14 | 2½ | 111 | - | 9½ |
| <u>Net income</u> | 1,081 | 4 | 6½ | 1,229 | 8 | 6½ |
| Leases, fines, sales | 91 | 2 | 3 | 217 | 3 | 9½ |
| <u>Gross value</u> | 1,172 | 6 | 9½ | 1,446 | 12 | 4 |
| | 1,446 | 12 | 4 | | | |
| <u>Total annual value</u> | 2,618 | 19 | 1½ | | | |
| Estate charges | 970 | 6 | 10 | | | |
| <u>Estimated clear value</u> | 1,648 | 12 | 3½ | | | |

1. Seine-Mne, série 1 E, Comté de Lillebonne (unclassified), 1429-30.

lower at Lillebonne the relative absence of decayed rents there meant that net income and gross value were higher. Despite the fact, too, that estate charges were higher, largely attributable to Hugh Spencer's annual wage of 500 l.t. as captain of Lillebonne, the estimated clear value of the Bedford lordship was again above that of Grey, at 1,648 l.t. or £274 sterling.

There is no doubt that the two comtés witnessed the similar handicaps of lack of manpower and a reluctance to take to farm properties in seigneurial hands. The difference between them lay in the scale of the problem and in the attempts to resolve it. First, the châtellenies which comprised the comté of Lillebonne seem to have escaped the acute population shortage which afflicted Tancarville. Incidents of lands not farmed 'pour faultes dommes' were certainly recorded in many areas, but the amounts of uncollected revenue were almost always smaller than at Tancarville. The impression given by the account is that people did not abandon their lands to the west and east of Lillebonne in large numbers. Whether their decision was influenced by the presence of the castle garrison or by local economic conditions is impossible to say. Bedford also benefited from the good estate management of his vicomte and receveur, Guillaume du Hamel, particularly in the matter of farming out property in order that as much land as possible could be put to productive use. The sums involved were not large, some 12 l. on one fief for the Christmas quarter and 16 l. for the Easter, but their assiduous collection made all the difference when the totals were added up at the end of the year - a difference that was certainly higher than the 10% or so thought likely on equivalent English estates.¹

1. Above, pp. 328-30.

The key to seigneurial income lay with land put to farm. As in fifteenth-century England,¹ little was derived from direct cultivation of the demesne and every effort was made to lease out land to tenants, mostly Frenchmen, but in a few cases Englishmen as well. In its traditional form, the tenure en fief provided the tenant with the security of perpetual tenure and the lord with the certainty of a fixed rent.² In the context of war, however, the fieffe was often unsatisfactory: a declining landed income and rural depopulation did little to encourage productive land use when obligations were binding on both parties. The bail à ferme, already in operation at the time of the Lancastrian occupation, was the more flexible and potentially the more lucrative alternative. It offered the lord a chance to make regular adjustments to rents according to the local condition of the land market, while the tenant was free to negotiate a realistic money rent to be paid for a set number of years.

This point should not be over-stated, for practice varied greatly within Normandy and no single model can be proposed to explain changes in the nature of landed income. At Lillebonne and Le Neubourg it was the domaine fieffé which made much the larger contribution; at Tancarville the domaine non fieffé was almost as important. The bail à ferme became more popular but did not replace the customary fieffe as the mainstay of seigneurial revenue. Tenants seem to have negotiated concessions in their fixed rents in acknowledgment of their economic difficulties, and only then to have taken to farm lands in the lord's hands at a low cash rent. Such was the practice at Le Neubourg, where

-
1. Bean, Estates of the Percy Family, pp. 13-15; Bolton, Medieval English Economy, pp. 219-20.
 2. Bois, Crise, pp. 218-20.

it has been estimated that remissions and decayed rents which comprised 3% of total income in 1405 exceeded 66% of the total in 1444-5.¹

There is a danger that statistics and figures may distort any view of what landholders were trying to achieve, and by what means. There is no denying the validity of the evidence for Le Neubourg so carefully analysed by M. Plaisse and all the more valuable because it derives from a continuous series of estate accounts. Seigneurial revenues were in decline, the fieffes were less productive, land values stagnated.² Much of this was true elsewhere in Normandy and land settlers suffered as much as anyone else, as the evidence considered above has shown. Nor would one wish to quarrel with the overall reduction in income established by Guy Bois in eastern Normandy.³ To judge this evidence purely in economic terms, however, is to take too narrow a view of the role of land during the Lancastrian occupation. To write of 'le marasme économique' or a 'crise des revenus de la seigneurie' is to paint black a picture that was shaded with grey. Were land owners faced by ruin? Did they abandon their worthless estates, refuse to acquire more, or sell out completely? Most of the evidence is to the contrary.

First, it is now accepted that local economic conditions varied greatly within and between seigneuries to an extent which renders difficult any consensus for the occupied territories.⁴ Secondly, effective land management could mitigate the effects of a crisis in

-
1. Plaisse, Baronnie du Neubourg, p. 325.
 2. Ibid., pp. 321-34.
 3. Bois, Crise, pp. 230-2.
 4. E.g. Charbonnier, Une Autre France, i, 488-9.

landed income by negotiating concessions to tenants and encouraging a shift to short-term leasing of demesne lands. Thirdly, the tenure of land was, by its very nature, an expensive business: it had to be defended by paid soldiers; run by a waged staff (of nine men at Lillebonne); maintained and equipped with major items for tenants' use. Fourthly, and most important of all, the most valuable commodity within the economy features only incidentally in any study which concentrates upon receivers' accounts, and this was the tenants themselves. If tenants in sufficient number could be cajoled or forced to remain on their holdings and to accept English lordship, the prospect of riding out a storm caused by external influences was much improved. Even more than the lord, the livelihood of his tenants was directly bound up with the processes of sowing and cultivation, harvest and storage, rearing and slaughter, and it surely mattered little to them whether their activities were listed with receptes or dépences on a distant account.

It mattered to the Lancastrian land settler, but not in the way that is commonly envisaged. The search for profit was not his motivating force. Rather, there was a desire to preserve a steady flow of income into the seigneurial coffers, to be balanced by a moderate outflow: the one or the other would rise and fall in an individual year but they would even themselves out in the course of a receivership to the owner's net advantage. Such was the only realistic aim of land tenure. Outright profit gained from a ransom, the holding of several offices or the sale of booty might be invested in land, but that commodity was not intrinsically profitable and could seldom by itself generate capital sufficient for further purchase. The modest gains of Grey and Bedford and their peers do much to support the view

of Professor Davies that the aims of landlords were essentially conservative and were directed towards the maintenance of the tenurial status quo.¹ It may well be that those who had arrived on French soil expecting to make a quick profit from the ownership and sale of land were disappointed by the quantity of available revenue. This raises another important point. Seigneurial income in Normandy largely comprised revenues in kind, a fact of relevance particularly to the 1430s and 1440s. Landowners would then have found, as did Guillaume de Murol in the Auvergne, that ready cash was in very short supply.²

There were few signs anywhere within Lancastrian France of the domestic building work which one might expect to find if landed profits had been the norm, rather than the exception. Money was spent on the upkeep of castles and on the repair and maintenance of demesne buildings, work costing some 212 l. 3s. 10d. at Lillebonne and occupying some twelve folios of the 1429-30 account.³ Evidence of new private building by settlers is rare, however, and can seldom have been financed from landed revenues alone. Edmund Beaufort's ambitious plan for a manor house at Elbeuf required an estimated 6,000 l.t. to be spent on its construction, far in excess of the income of his comté of Harcourt and other estates.⁴ Major work for private rather than public benefit might realistically be funded from a diversity of sources accessible to a man of high position of which a regular income from land would be one,

1. Davies, 'Baronial Accounts', 228.

2. Charbonnier, Une Autre France, i, 709-13, 744-51.

3. Seine-Mme, Comté de Lillebonne, 1429-30.

4. L. Régnier, 'Devis pour la construction d'une maison forte à Elbeuf-sur-Seine pendant l'occupation anglaise du quinzième siècle', Mélanges de la société de l'histoire de Normandie, vi (1906), 333-50; Jones, 'Beaufort Family', pp. 325-7.

but by itself it was insufficient for large-scale capital projects.

Were French landed revenues employed, in that case, to pay for the imposing manor houses built in England in the mid-fifteenth century? The question is an important one: 'On the number of war profiteers and on the scale of their gains the interpretation of a whole phase of English social history may depend.'¹ William Worcester certainly felt that wealth accumulated in the French wars was invested in the domestic architecture of England. Among the more prominent works described by him were those of William Oldhall at Hunsdon, Andrew Ogard at Rye House, Ralph Lord Cromwell at Tattershall and South Wingfield and the earl of Warwick, who built extensively on his estates and at Warwick itself.² Of these men Cromwell held no French land and Warwick held the comté of Aumale whose value is not known but which must have been reduced by the French occupation of the town between 1429 and 1430. Oldhall and Ogard belong in a different category.³ As perhaps the greatest beneficiary of the settlement after 1436, Oldhall had every opportunity to channel a proportion of his gains into the construction of the Hertfordshire manor house described by Worcester. So too did Ogard, who reportedly held French lands and offices worth around £1,000 sterling, almost the purchase price of Rye.

It is probable that Oldhall and Ogard belong with Fastolf (to be considered below) in that select group of men for whom the ownership of French lands was sufficiently profitable to encourage these conspicuous

-
1. McFarlane, Nobility, p. 23; D. Hay, 'The Division of the Spoils of War in Fourteenth-Century England', T.R. Hist. S., fifth series, iv (1954), 91-109.
 2. Itineraries, ed. Harvey, pp. 49-51, 73, 219-21.
 3. Above, pp. 104-5, 169.

displays of material success which so impressed witnesses. It needs to be made clear, however, that such projects were not paid for out of French lands alone. The profits of pensions and multiple office-holding tend to be under-estimated in considerations of personal wealth, although Worcester accorded them due prominence by listing Fastolf's appointments and by specifying that Ogard's income came from land, 'cum diuersis officiis castrorum'.¹ It is often difficult to separate the gains of war one from another, but the attempt is necessary.

From Leland's terse descriptions of the relatively new buildings encountered on his travels in the 1530s, it is evident that few owed their origins, in whole or in part, to surplus income gained from French land. Their builders were often minor landholders in France, and sometimes men who held nothing at all. Indeed Leland makes it quite clear that they earned their fame and fortune from spoils of war in the traditional form, especially ransoms and plunder.² Ralph Boteller, 'a famous man of warr', partly built Sudeley castle from spoils gained abroad, it was reported, including a ransom;³ Sir William Bowes was apparently in service to Bedford for seventeen years where he 'waxid riche' before returning to Durham to build from scratch a manor house;⁴ McFarlane also cited from Leland the examples of Sir Roland

-
1. Itineraries, ed. Harvey, pp. 48, 353-5. It was not the lordships alone that were worth £1,000 sterling (cf. McFarlane, Nobility, p. 36).
 2. For the continued availability of ransom profits see Allmand and Armstrong, English Suits, no. XVII, pp. 205-8.
 3. The Itinerary of John Leland, ed. L. Toulmin Smith (5 vols., London, 1906-10), ii, 56.
 4. Ibid., ii, 9. Bowes held no French land, and does not appear on Worcester's list of Bedford's household (Lambeth MS 506 fos. 8r-10v).

Leyntal and Sir Walter Hungerford as direct beneficiaries of the profits of ransoms.¹ The profits of land tenure per se were not mentioned, and although they were almost certainly incorporated into the generic term of 'spoliis Gallorum', Leland's eye-witness testimony emphasised the immediate benefits of the windfall profits derived from ransoms and booty. Leland's evidence commands respect for distinguishing reports at second hand from his own sources. From it, we see that the great builders were captains and men-at-war first and Lancastrian land settlers second. For all but a small minority, it was French gold and French prisoners that paid for new English houses and castles.²

(iv) Two Major Landholders

A consideration of the landed revenues enjoyed by settlers must include men exceptional both in terms of the quantity and the quality of the lands in their possession. The means by which the Regent Bedford and Sir John Fastolf acquired at least some of their French estates has already been discussed;³ here the concern is with their income alone. A product of Bedford's land management was one of only two known valors to survive listing an entire French estate.⁴ This took the form of a summary statement of the income of each lordship for the year ending at Michaelmas 1434, brought together to provide a ready

-
1. McFarlane, Nobility, pp. 23, 128.
 2. Ogard brought back from France a chest of gold worth about 7,000 marks (Itineraries, ed. Harvey, p. 49).
 3. Above, pp. 95-101.
 4. Lambeth MS 506 fos. 23r-24r; Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [553-5].

means of calculating overall income and expenditure. This valor recorded gross yields rather than actual income; in other words we are dealing here with a statement of potential receipts in round figures.¹

In the first place, there were no entries for Bedford's major holding, the comté of Maine, since it had been ordered that the receipts for that year be assigned to pay the wages of the four main garrisons there. Since relatively little is known of the occupation of Maine it is unfortunate that no guide remains to its potential value to Bedford. The profits of the seal and signet office, however, were estimated at 27,000 l.t. Then were recorded the revenues of the comté of Harcourt which included the lordships acquired by Bedford on Salisbury's death: Le Neubourg, Combon, Brucourt and La Rivière-Thibouville, the whole yielding 7,153 l.t. The comté of Dreux was less valuable at only 300 l.t., but the Cotentin lordships of Hambye and La Haye-du-Puits were of higher worth, 1,700 and 600 l.t. respectively. The remainder of the recepte comprised the profits of captaincies and levies of the guet at Caen and Alençon to produce a grand total of 12,773 l.t.² On the debit side the valor included pensions and annuities to Bedford's councillors and household officials, from his personal chancellor and treasurer to the specialists in artillery, called 'cannoner' or 'Gonner', in his pay at Rouen and in Maine.³ Then came the wages of the captains employed in the defence

1. Davies, 'Baronial Accounts', 216-8.

2. The estimated income of Bedford's lands in Normandy and the pays de conquête for the year 1428-9 was 12,000 l.t. (BN, Ms. fr. 4488 f. 28).

3. Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, ii, [555-9].

of his lordships, the receiver's expenses and sums spent on building and repair work. Total expenditure of 13,418 l. 1s. 8d. left a deficit of some 645 l.

Two points may be made concerning this valuable inventory of the Bedford estate. There is good reason to think that it gives a fair impression of gross income.¹ The lordships of Le Neubourg, Combon and Brucourt were thought to produce an income of 840 livres and Lillebonne some 1,520 livres, reasonable estimates which together with the Cotentin valuations suggest that Pierre Baille's total would not have been far wide of the mark. At this date, the Regent had been deprived of the revenues of the duke of Alençon which, together with the receipts of Maine, would have further augmented his income. Bedford's lands were concentrated in eastern Normandy but he drew revenues from a wide area within the occupied territories. His estate comprised the largest single bloc of French lands to be held by a settler, and the list of his lordships reads as a roll-call of the patrimony of some of the greatest families of northern France.

The expenses charged on this receipt help to explain why the accumulation of such an estate was necessary. As much as a desire for landed title and status, or sheer acquisitiveness, Bedford needed to garner as much revenue as possible to pay for the army of councillors, representatives in the Paris Parlement and the Châtelet, secretaries and soldiers attendant upon his office. The comté of Maine was held by right of conquest and had to be defended at his personal cost, as did the Norman lordships, and the essential feature of a seigneurial income

1. The exception was the estimated income of 27,000 l.t. from the profits of the seal and signet office in Maine. In 1433-4 there was a deficit of 1,148 livres (AN, KK 324. fos. 206v, 217v).

was that it was independent of crown assistance. This perhaps proved to be a disadvantage where land was held in such quantity. The distinction between men employed in private service and those paid from the public purse was a fine one, and Bedford's financial responsibilities extended to the likes of Fastolf, as governor of Anjou and Maine, and the Bristol resident, John Temple, 'carpentario principali ordinationis artilleriae', who may be thought of as representatives of both camps. The need to acquire potentially profitable lordships as and when they became available can be better understood in the context of the charges incumbent upon Bedford both as the king's representative and a magnate in his own right. A seemingly impressive landed income was probably barely sufficient to maintain baronial status in France, and the maintenance of personal status, as has been consistently shown, was an aim shared by many settlers of lesser rank and distinction.

The second private valor to survive concerns the lands of Sir John Fastolf.¹ It was compiled in 1459 by William Worcester, 'sub compendio extra compota et registra dicti militis in anno que ipse obiit', and recorded the values of English and French manors held in the year ending at Michaelmas 1445. There is no need to repeat here the analysis by McFarlane of Fastolf's revenues, but there remain several features of the valor relevant to our theme.² First, the figures themselves. From a landed income of £593 was deducted £200 for the 'lost' Caux revenues; adding the £8 of actual Caux income produces

1. Magdalen College, Oxford, Fastolf Paper no. 69 [hereafter FP 69]. I am grateful to Dr. G.L. Harriss for permission to consult the Fastolf Papers.

2. McFarlane, 'Investment', passim.

McFarlane's clear annual value of £401. Adding to the income figure the yield of one lordship and three messuages sold at ten years' purchase gives a total annual income of £678 sterling.¹ As in Bedford's case, there is every reason to believe that these sums are a reasonably accurate reflection of Fastolf's income from French land.

It should be pointed out, however, that the valor does not record all the lands which came into Fastolf's possession. By virtue of a grant of confiscated lands to the annual value of 1,560 saluts d'or in January 1433,² Fastolf petitioned successfully on several occasions for estates which did not appear in the record for 1444-5. He was keen to acquire land in the bailliages of Caen and the Cotentin,³ the region least affected by the incidence of war and revolt which had so harmed his income elsewhere, but some of these gains passed through his hands very quickly. The lordships of Ste.-Mère-Église, Fontenay and St. Marcouf were granted to Fastolf in August 1436 and were probably sold soon afterwards.⁴ We can be more certain about the lordship of Ussy north-west of Falaise awarded at the same time. It was sold only three months later at twelve years' purchase.⁵ In December 1433 Fastolf had been granted permission to sell his estates to any Englishman, on paying their reversions to the crown,⁶ and it is clear that he

1. FP 69, mm.6-8; McFarlane, 'Investment', 106.

2. AN, JJ 175 no. 203; Armstrong, 'Sir John Fastolf', 46-56.

3. In April 1435 Fastolf's procureur, Jean Blondel, was put into possession of a number of fiefs situated between Caen and St.-Lô (Lenoir 50/492).

4. Ibid., 75/11.

5. Calvados, Tabellionnage de Caen 7E 89, fos. 117v-118; Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 475.

6. AN, JJ 175 no. 287.

did so, and profitably. Worcester's brief list of sales does not reveal the extent to which lands were accumulated and then rapidly sold between 1433 and 1439, the date of Fastolf's return to England.

In the matter of sales Sir John played the land market with exceptional skill. Having obtained official permission to dispose of holdings, the only known Englishman to do so, he obtained twelve and later ten times the annual value of lordships and manors which included those which had long formed part of his landed interest in France, as well as more recent acquisitions. It would be wrong, however, to portray this substantial landholder as a disillusioned or bitter figure eager to sell out at the expense of credulous purchasers who lacked his foresight. Only a few of Fastolf's properties were sold and in at least one instance it was seemingly the buyer who was the instigator of the deal.¹ It may be also that two of the purchasers, Oliver Badersby and William Fortin, were connected to Fastolf by service. For all the latter's shrewdness, this would not suggest that the terms agreed weighed heavily in favour of one party.² Any 'sell out' was small in scale and sanctioned by the authorities, and although serving as a salutary reminder that land could produce a ready cash income if required, the real interest of Fastolf's tenurial practice lies in the fact that he held on to scattered holdings of little individual value for such a long time.

1. Calvados, *Tabellionnage de Caen* 7E 89, fos. 116v-117.

2. *Idem*. The sale to Badersby noted good service to the king and to Fastolf. A William Fortin was appointed receiver of the vicomté of Alençon in 1421 and a man of the same name held land in 1443 in the bailliages of Caen, Alençon and the Cotentin formerly held by a member of the Bedford and York households, Robert Martin (D.K.R., xlii, 425; BL, Add. Ch. 14479; Bodleian Library, MSS ch. foreign, nos. 309, 330).

These holdings may be examined in four geographical groupings. The first and potentially the most lucrative were lands outside Normandy, namely the barony of Sillé-le-Guillaume and the lordship of La Suze-sur-Sarthe. Although their value was much reduced owing to a position at the southern frontier of the occupation, these lands, together with the castle and lordship of Condé-sur-Noireau, provided the core of Sir John's landed income in France.¹ Also prominent in Worcester's valor were estates held in the Caux and in particular the barony of Aurichier and lordship of Le Bec-Créspein whose value was greatly diminished by the peasant rising and later French occupation of the area.² Little is known of the displacement of landholders in the Caux, once a popular area of settlement, but the scale of Fastolf's losses suggests that those not fortunate enough to own land elsewhere were badly affected. The third grouping comprised a collection of small fiefs to the west of the Seine in and close to the pays d'Auge, and the fourth was a scattering of estates in lower Normandy to the south and west of Caen.

It was by no means unusual to derive an income from an amalgam of the large, such as Sillé-le-Guillaume, worth 1,000 marks 'in tempore pacis', and the small, such as the fief of Quez, near Caen, worth 13s. 4d. What mattered as much as the size and status of landed possessions in the 1430s and 1440s was their location and actual value. The castle and barony of Auffay south of Dieppe yielded less than the fief of La Champagne in the vicomté of Carentan.³ It may well be that

-
1. FP 69, m.7. Sillé-le-Guillaume and La Suze-sur-Sarthe together yielded 200 marks and Condé-sur-Noireau 76 l. 13s. 4d.
 2. Idem; McFarlane, 'Investment', 105-7; Allmand, 'Lancastrian Land Settlement', 473.
 3. FP 69 mm.7-8. The figures were 6 l. 13s. 4d. and 10 l. respectively.

Fastolf grasped the importance of this earlier than most. Whether he did so or not, it is clear that the pattern of his landed acquisitions was transformed in the early 1430s. The prestigious and potentially lucrative lordships with their expensive military obligations were forsaken in favour of small, individual manors and fiefs in less troubled areas.¹ Like Bedford, Fastolf had been given lands expressly to provide income to maintain status and rank, and the valor indicates that grants had been made to him specifically to support military and civilian positions and to reward service. Even after the Regent's death Fastolf needed a landed income to pay for a household and outgoings which must have been considerable. A large number of smallholdings carefully chosen from crown confiscations for their location might serve that purpose reasonably well in the absence of the revenues of large estates. In answer to the question of what Fastolf was trying to achieve with the income of his French estates, one is led to the conclusion that it was less a matter of outright profit than of the maintenance of a certain level of revenue appropriate to a senior figure in public and private office. It would have been possible to sell out completely in 1436 and to abandon all interest in Lancastrian France. That Fastolf did not do so is surely significant. There remained resources sufficient to compensate at least in part for losses already suffered, and in land lay the potential for future prosperity regardless of how unlikely this may have seemed in the short term.

1. Dr. Smith emphasises the care with which purchases were made in England (A. Smith, 'Litigation and Politics: Sir John Fastolf's Defence of his English Property', Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History, ed. A.J. Pollard (Gloucester and New York, 1984), pp. 59-61).

(v) Settlers of Middle Rank

It remains to consider in more detail the landed income of settlers of middling rank. For it was men such as Thomas Tyringham, mentioned above, serving as garrison soldiers and office-holders in the Lancastrian territories, who formed a majority of land owners during the entire period of the English occupation. In so far as it is possible to identify a 'typical' landholder, the choice would devolve upon a member of the gentry rather than the aristocracy, and it is fortunate that by use of the informations the landed income of several of their number can be assessed. It is desirable to choose settlers whose careers covered different decades to illustrate the general and particular means by which letters of grant were translated into the livelihood of a man and often his family.

Henry Worseley was one of many esquires rewarded by Henry V after the capture of Rouen, and he received a second grant of lands in February 1422.¹ In addition, he was given property at Caen and then at Honfleur.² Beyond a few facts, little is known of Worseley: his origins lay in the north-west of England and perhaps in Lancashire, and he saw service as constable of Caen castle in 1419.³ It is an information compiled shortly after July 1427 which brings him to life as a settler.⁴ Lands located in an area between Vire and Caen

-
1. PRO, C.64/11 m.61; C.64/16 m.14; Bréquigny nos. 348, 1077.
 2. D.K.R., xlii, 366, 418.
 3. Bennett, Community, Class and Careerism, p. 180; above, p. 59. An Edmund Worseley was given Cotentin lands in May 1419 (PRO, C.64/11 m.56; Bréquigny no. 545).
 4. Lenoir 9/55-6. The information was carried out at the request of his widow, Marguerite, in order to establish the properties to remain in royal wardship during the minority of their son, John.

comprised the fief of Montchauvet which was held at farm from Bedford for 69 sous per year; the fief noble of La Gallonière; a vavasory at La Ferrière yielded an income in cash rents, in poultry of several kinds, and in grain of different types and measures; at Montchauvet to cash rents of 25 l.t. per year were added eighteen setiers of corn, three capons and 140 chickens to produce a total of 68 l.t. in annual revenue. From this were deducted the fee-farm and a fixed charge on the fief of ten livres inherited as a ransom payment from the former owner, Bernard d'Anfernet. There was no church presentation here or at La Gallonière, and a mill was unproductive because of the war. Worseley did benefit, however, from the small sums produced by the reliefs and treizièmes, and the vavasory which he held of the bishop of Bayeux. He could feed his pigs in the forest and take wood for heating without charge.

It will be evident that Henry Worseley's small-scale land holdings were not going to make him a rich man. Their mixed revenues were sufficient for three purposes: to support himself and his family, to pay a seneschal and other officers to manage the properties, and to meet the charges upon them. The right to appoint to the churches within his authority would have been of financial benefit to Worseley, and its absence is unusual.¹ More typical was the decline in income from the mill, again a potentially profitable seigneurial right which could not always be realised. It is noticeable that within this information, one of the earliest known, there were otherwise few signs that the income from either demesne lands or those put to farm had

1. In February 1429 the wardship of John was awarded to Margaret, but advowsons were reserved to the crown (BL, Egerton Charter 156).

greatly declined from levels reached in time of peace or in 1410, the two most commonly cited points of comparison. As an early settler with lands in a favourable location, Worseley enjoyed a small but stable income with few of the problems soon to beset his companions-in-arms.

In a slightly later period and in a different part of Normandy, the information compiled on behalf of John Somerset is of interest for the light it sheds on the nature and extent of the difficulties facing landholders.¹ Somerset was a well-educated and talented man who benefited greatly from Lancastrian patronage as a member of the household, a royal tutor and physician, and it was natural that French land should constitute one reward for his services.² It should be clear that Somerset represents that body of Englishmen who were itinerant and seldom long resident in one place. He was a landowner but not a land settler, at home at court and in Rouen rather than on holdings at La Remuée and Rolleville to the east and north of Harfleur. It is unlikely that he ever visited his estates, and he cannot have expected to draw a large profit from them as an absentee landlord. The survey of their income was largely based upon data for the year 1410, and both a reduced revenue and the erosion of privileges during the intervening twenty years rendered the assessed value of the lands, some 577 livres, a purely nominal figure. Their former prosperity was well attested. A church presentation was worth 100-120 livres per year; the prerogative of high, medium and low justice was exercised, with a sergeant and a

1. Lenoir 9/110-111. No date is given, but the information was probably taken shortly after Somerset's grant in October 1430 (ibid., 8/379).

2. Griffiths, Reign of Henry VI, pp. 54-5, 190-1, 332.

tabellion to record its findings; one tenant had taken to farm some forty-two acres for 34 l. 14s. In the meantime the king had annexed the right to high justice, the same tenant paid only 14 l. 14s., and the value of the presentation was not reported.

At Rolleville the familiar problem of a shortage of manpower was in evidence, and there are signs that such seigneurial rights as had existed had been relaxed:

'en ladite seigneurie ... n'a hostel, prés, bois, terres labourables ou non labourables, patronages d'église, ne aucunes franchises, si non que les hommes de ladite terre sont frans de coutumes et acquis en tous passages, foires et marchés'.¹

This familiar tale can be found elsewhere in informations taken during the 1430s. It will be sufficient to mention two tenants who jointly farmed property near Vire in these years, Robert Hauldain, esquire, and maître Guillaume Paien, a student at the University of Paris.² They had worked hard to repair a mill which had been out of action for ten years, but it yielded only five or six livres.³ Worse still, a number of Englishmen who had taken over properties from sub-tenants who had fled did not themselves wish to pay rent. It was not surprising that nobody else was willing to take over the fiefferme at its former price.

The story which emerges from the informations considered so far is one of a rentier economy producing a modest income in cash and kind

1. Lenoir 9/111.
2. Ibid., 10/385-6.
3. Mills, often in a state of disrepair, feature often in contemporary estate accounts and informations (see P.A. Rahtz, 'Medieval Milling', Medieval Industry, ed. D.W. Crossley (Council for British Archaeology Research Report no. 40, London, 1981), pp. 1-15).

for English owners both resident and non-resident. Expenditure was for the most part relatively light, consisting largely of small rents owed to local religious communities and charges payable to lords of whom fiefs were held in dependency. It could be increased according to the number of estate officials employed: to the seneschal and procureur known in one case were added a receiver, an advocate and a sergeant in another. A further variable was money spent on building and repair work which, while less extensive than that undertaken on the great estates, constituted an important item in relative terms. The balance which remained formed part of a livelihood, whether quite a small part, as one suspects in the case of the well-remunerated John Somerset, or a larger element of individual and family fortunes as the example of Henry Worsley makes clear. The significance of French landed income to men of middle rank must have varied greatly, acting as the sole source of revenue to some and a mere bonus to others, with points between the two extremes. Common to many was a desire to retain landed possessions during the absence of an owner or following the death of a grantee. The absentee Somerset requested delays in 1438 and 1444 for the performance of services due on his lands, once part of the Estouteville inheritance, and an hôtel in Rouen, although continually occupied in the king's service in England.¹

Two points will relate the position of these men to that of the nobility considered above. First, a concern for profit was not uppermost in the minds of a majority of gentry settlers. They shared with their more illustrious compatriots and, interestingly, with their English counterparts, certain common sources of income derived largely from a

1. Lenoir 4/345; 27/347.

multitude of small rents and from basic agricultural produce, without sharing some of the heavier expenses incumbent upon the greater lords for the defence of their property.¹ Whether resident or non-resident, this revenue would contribute to the maintenance of individual status and might help to improve it. Such was a chief aim of land grants. This in turn raises a second theme, that of the wider function of land tenure in gentry society. On financial grounds alone the informations disclose that some settlers would have been justified in selling out in the 1430s and 1440s when it was apparent that revenues ran far below the levels known to the previous generation of occupants. That sales were not frequent cannot solely be a consequence of a depressed land market or an absence of purchasers. A general reluctance to dispose of holdings rather testifies to the role of land as a binding force within a society at war, bringing together landholder, family, tenants and estate staff and fostering tenurial stability and continuity.

Informations expressed concern that the inheritance of minors should be preserved, for example, and it was local men of both nationalities who were summoned in order that an accurate record of the nature and extent of landed possessions be obtained. Tenurial memory was long and worked as much in favour of landholders as against them, preserving traditional rights as well as resisting encroachments. Landed revenue, which derived essentially from a myriad of such rights, cannot be divorced from the society which produced it. From the labours of the one came the maintenance of the other, and livelihoods were mutually dependent. This accorded a particular status and responsibility to the land settler above and beyond purely financial

1. C.C. Dyer, 'A Small Landowner in the Fifteenth Century', Midland History, i (1972), 1-14.

considerations. To some, the possession of French land was undoubtedly a means to an end or at best a supplement to income from office or land held elsewhere. Yet the great number of requests for extra time to perform services due for its tenure and the picture of local society working in co-operation which emerges from the informations suggests that to many the ownership of land meant much more than the balance of an account. This was as true, and perhaps truer, to gentry society as it was to the nobility and baronage.

The example of Thomas Greffin illustrates well these points. Given lands in 1423 as an esquire,¹ he ended his life a knight, and in an information compiled in June 1440 on behalf of his French wife Jehanne de Rogerville, son John and daughter Jehanne, there survives a highly detailed source for landed income and its importance to a settler family.² It relates to lands within the vicomté of Pont-de-l'Arche which, like his possessions elsewhere, had been subject to damage by war and popular disturbance which had reduced their total value from an estimated figure of 300 crowns.³ What was their current value? This is difficult to judge because several witnesses were relating known sources of income and their value 'en temps de paix'. Nevertheless, the vicomte was charged with rendering an assessment of revenue and expenditure to the chambre des comptes, and in the absence of a receiver's account the information must stand as an approximation of the contemporary worth of three fiefs, Ecrosville to the west and

-
1. AN, JJ 172 no. 520; Le Cacheux, Actes de la chancellerie, ii, 315.
 2. AN, P 26² nos. 103^{ter} - 130^{dix}. Greffin died in April 1440 and the wardship of his children was awarded to Talbot as highest bidder (Lenoir 27/23).
 3. Eure, E 236; Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, pp. 72-3.

Bois to the north-east of Louviers and Pîtres at the junction of the Andelle and the Seine. Together they yielded some 183 livres and bore charges of 89 livres, leaving a balance of 94 livres sufficient for the vicomte to recommend that the wardship of the properties be put to farm.

On the income side, any thought that the figures quoted bore no contemporary relevance may be dispelled by reference to reduced rents and damaged buildings, with mills again featuring prominently, and, in one instance, a mention of Sir Richard Wydeville as a sub-tenant. Greffin's estates were vulnerable both to the brigandage rife in this densely-forested area and to successful French attacks on Louviers in 1429 and again in 1440, but this document is not a catalogue of worthless rents and absentee tenants. Rather, the concern was to arrive at an assessment of potential income, to the benefit of the minors and the crown. The information did indeed establish that the diverse sources of revenue would be sufficient to provide for the children and to profit the crown in future:

'Item audit manoir appartient xliiii acres de terre labourable aux champs qui communes années souloient estre baillées en temps de paix à x s.t. chacun acre. Pour ce cy par an xxi l. x s.'

Expenditure, too, was calculated according to what might be paid in coming years for the upkeep of estate buildings, for example.

Landed revenue was here regarded in the long term by tenants looking back to a time of former prosperity and forward to a return to normality. In the meantime, land provided this settler family with enough to live on if not much more. The story of the Greffins is of a man who rose in rank and married a Frenchwoman, whose name suggests that she came from that area near Harfleur where Thomas held land.

The two children were of similar age, John certainly being born at Rogerville in June 1428,¹ and on the death of their mother soon after that of their father the inheritance passed to them. It is known that John Greffin remained in France and was given land in his own right in August 1442.² French estate revenue played an essential role in this model of family settlement. Although never large and much depleted by virtue of the unfavourable location of its sources, this income was sufficient to encourage residence over two generations by a family which may truly be described as Anglo-Norman. Provision during the minority of thirty livres for the boy and twenty for the girl was thought ample, 'en regart à l'état et noble ligne desdiz soubzaagés'. The maintenance of status was as important to families as to individuals.

As new evidence is brought to bear on the question of the landed income of settlers an overall judgment is made all the more difficult. On the one hand, the attempt to support assertions with detailed figures recording revenue and expenditure runs the risk of presenting a static rather than a dynamic image of revenues subject to considerable fluctuation within a short period. On the other, it is essential to make the best use of the receiver's accounts and informations which do survive and, to some extent, to take what they are saying at face value. Within these terms much of the evidence presented above favours the 'pessimistic' view of Postan that only a handful of great landholders could anticipate drawing a substantial profit from French land. Their names, however, are not those one might expect to find at the head of a table of profit-makers. Talbot, York, Warwick, Suffolk, Bourghier

1. AN, P 26² no. 130^{bis}.

2. Lenoir 4/243. He was granted a delay for these lands in 1444 (4/223).

were not of their number. Neither long service nor high position were any guarantee of an income concomitant with that of equivalent English estates.

The real beneficiaries were rather a minority who dispensed or benefited from a high level of patronage over a long period. Bedford, Fastolf, Oldhall and Ogard were the princes of the land settlement, men who eagerly acquired property as it became available on the open market and who used its income to pay for private building and self-aggrandisement. The possession of territories scattered across a wide area of northern France was one of the main prerequisites of conspicuous gain, as was efficient land management, although an element of good fortune shielded some from those same hazards of war which harmed others.

In addition, this chapter has attempted to consider the importance of land tenure to the many as opposed to the few. Within this framework it may fairly be stated that the terms laid down in the debate between Postan and McFarlane are no longer adequate to meet the new questions which are being put and the answers tentatively proposed. In a synthesis now emerging it is argued that outright gain was not the aim of a majority of those petitioning for land won by conquest. If some early settlers desired this they were soon to be disillusioned, and common to this first generation of landholders, to the new blood which arrived in the 1430s, and to the second generation of owners was a hard-headed realism which acknowledged that land held across the sea was no more a golden opportunity for wealth and advancement than that held at home.

As Dr. Allmand has stated, much of the documentary evidence

emphasises the inherent difficulties of land tenure.¹ Yet the informations in particular stress continuity of ownership and a level of income sufficient to support individuals and families. The sheer resilience of land settlers merits greater consideration than has been allowed: sales were few; delays were abundant; remissions to local tenants of rents and services frequent. However severe the crisis of revenues which afflicted all those dependent upon land during the period 1435-40, men of modest means were able to survive and to look to the future for an upturn in their individual and collective fortunes. By itself, the examination of figures of incomings and outgoings will not suffice to explain the persistence of the English occupation.

1. Allmand, Lancastrian Normandy, p. 75.

CONCLUSION

The expulsion of most English settlers and soldiers from Normandy in 1449 and 1450 by no means marked the end of the story. The fate of many of those who returned, particularly the gentry and lesser men on whom this study has concentrated, awaits discovery: did they go back to their counties and towns of origin; were old connections revived or new ones taken up? The social and geographical origins of settlers remain largely unknown and it can only be in the pursuit of individual and especially of collective biographical details, using sources from both sides of the Channel in conjunction, that answers to these questions will emerge.

The focus of the previous pages, however, has been on those for whom the long-term commitment to the Lancastrian cause was accompanied by the tenure of land as a reward for and inducement to public and private service. To such men there was often little to return to. Their own lives and those of their families, retainers, companions-in-arms, employees and tenants had become so inextricably bound up with the theory and practice of the occupation that dispossession had consequences more serious than a loss of estates. The theory which underlay the resort to arms by Henry V had rested, in part, on the principles of justice and right applied to French land and its people. The practice had seen genuine efforts on the part of those responsible for shaping and administering the policy of settlement, and Henry and Bedford in particular, to uphold and apply those principles to all, regardless of

nationality, subject to sworn allegiance.

In other respects the divide between theory and practice was greater than early supporters of the war would have liked, and it grew wider as occupation turned into settlement. The colonisation of towns gave way to integration and mutual dealings; the promise of valuable estates and titles was broken by harsh economic conditions and ill-fortune in the choice of location; any intention to freely enjoy properties on new terms was met by the weight of customary law and the practical need to compromise with neighbours and suitors. The most successful settlers were those who early abandoned unrealistic expectations and made as their strength the local ties which land tenure engendered: some, at least, became part of Anglo-Norman communities which they and their successors supported and extended until forced to leave.

If the English part of such communities is now coming to be better understood, the French contribution remains obscure. It is essential that work be done on the expropriated, the dispossessed, those excluded from the Lancastrian settlement. Some lands were restored to former holders of individual and family interests locally but others probably went to new men, loyal servants of Charles VII who petitioned for advancement. The wheel of fortune span again in favour of those seeking restoration to ancient estates and of the ambitious and land-hungry, as it had once done for Lancastrian settlers. This work has attempted to assess a revolution in land ownership. It was not the first and not the last, and it was the land alone which remained largely unaffected.

APPENDIX ITHE DISTRIBUTION OF LANDS TO SETTLERS, 1417-22Notes

1. Figures are compiled from the Norman Rolls.
2. All grants were issued in tail male unless indicated. In March 1419 one grant was made at royal pleasure and another on the life of the donor, Clarence (PRO, C.64/10 m.15; C.64/15 m.19; Bréquigny nos. 1244, 923).
3. Entries are compiled according to the specific fief(s) or bailliage(s) recorded, if known.
4. Improvements to and confirmations of grants, and restorations and wardships, are not included.
5. For months not included, no grants are known.

| Month | Settlers | Life | Alençon | Caen | Caux | Cotentin | Evreux | Gisors | Mantes | Rouen | Maine | Senlis | Not known |
|-------------------|-----------|------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|--------|--------|----------|-------|--------|-----------|
| <u>1417</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sep. | 1 | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov. | 3 | | 8 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Dec. | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| <u>1417 TOTAL</u> | <u>5</u> | | <u>8</u> | <u>3</u> | | | | | | | | | <u>1</u> |
| <u>1418</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 1 | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Feb. | 16 | | | 18 | | 3 | 1 | | | 2 | | | 2 |
| Mar. | 15 | | | 7 | | 5 | | | | | | | 7 |
| Apr. | 15 | | 2 | 9 | | 5 | | | | | | | 5 |
| May | 14 | | 3 | 8 | | 2 | 4 | | | | | | 5 |
| Jun. | 6 | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 4 | | | | | | 2 |
| Jul. | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | | 3 | | | | | | |
| Nov. | 1 | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Dec. | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| <u>1418 TOTAL</u> | <u>71</u> | | <u>6</u> | <u>49</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>17</u> | <u>12</u> | | | <u>2</u> | | | <u>21</u> |
| <u>1419</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 5 | | | 1 | 8 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | |
| Feb. | 4 | | | | 6 | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | |

| Month | Settlers | Life | Alençon | Caen | Caux | Cotentin | Evreux | Gisors | Mantes | Rouen | Maine | Senlis | Not known |
|---------------------|------------|------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| <u>1419 (Cont.)</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mar. | 11 | | 4 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | | 3 |
| Apr. | 136 | | 16 | 32 | 35 | 33 | 24 | 48 | 10 | 24 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| May | 50 | | 8 | 7 | 22 | 16 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 7 | | | |
| Jun. | 9 | | | 3 | 6 | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | | | |
| Jul. | 13 | | 2 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 3 | | | | | |
| Aug. | 4 | | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Sep. | 3 | | | 2 | | 3 | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Oct. | 6 | | 2 | 4 | | 2 | | 1 | | | | | |
| <u>1419 TOTAL</u> | <u>241</u> | | <u>29</u> | <u>59</u> | <u>84</u> | <u>71</u> | <u>36</u> | <u>61</u> | <u>16</u> | <u>40</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>8</u> |
| <u>1420</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 2 | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| Feb. | 3 | | | 1 | | 3 | | | | | | | |
| Mar. | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| Apr. | 4 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| May | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | | 1 | | | |
| Sep. | 2 | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | |
| Oct. | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Nov. | 2 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | | | | | |
| <u>1420 TOTAL</u> | <u>18</u> | | <u>2</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>10</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>4</u> | | <u>3</u> | | | |

| Month | Settlers | Life | Alençon | Caen | Caux | Cotentin | Evreux | Gisors | Mantes | Rouen | Maine | Senlis | Not known |
|--------------|----------|------|---------|------|------|----------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-----------|
| <u>1421</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 4 | | | | 4 | | | 1 | | | 4 | | 1 |
| May | 1 | | | | 6 | | | | | | | | |
| Aug. | 7 | | | | 2 | | 7 | 1 | | 6 | | | 1 |
| Oct. | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | | | | | |
| Dec. | 4 | | | | | 2 | | 3 | | | | 1 | |
| 1421 TOTAL | 18 | | 1 | 1 | 12 | 4 | 7 | 5 | | 6 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| <u>1422</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Feb. | 2 | 1 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mar. | 2 | 1 | | | 3 | | | | | | | | |
| Jun. | 1 | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | |
| 1422 TOTAL | 5 | 2 | | 2 | 3 | 2 | | | | | | | |
| GRAND TOTALS | 358 | 2 | 46 | 118 | 106 | 104 | 56 | 70 | 16 | 51 | 6 | 4 | 33 |

APPENDIX II

SETTLERS GRANTED IDENTIFIED LANDS IN THE

VEXIN NORMAND, 1417-22

Notes

1. Manuscript source is PRO Norman Rolls (C.64) unless otherwise stated.

| | Name | Date of Grant | Location | Reference |
|----|----------------------|---------------|--|--|
| 1. | Richard Abraham | 19 Apr. 1419 | Doudeauville-en-Vexin St. Martin | C.64/11 m.53; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 776 |
| 2. | William Askwith | 18 Apr. 1419 | Bois de l'Aunette Trie-Château | C.64/11 m.74; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 766 |
| 3. | Walter Aslake | 12 Apr. 1419 | St. Clair-sur-Epte | C.64/11 m.51; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 778 |
| 4. | Sir John Baskerville | 27 Apr. 1419 | (?) Fleury-le-Château Lilly Morgny | C.64/11 m.64; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 772 |
| 5. | John Brese | 9 Apr. 1419 | Fontenay (?) Sancourt | C.64/11 m.76; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 765 |
| 6. | John Bridesale | 8 Mar. 1420 | Gisancourt | C.64/12 m.13; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 349 |
| 7. | William Bucton | 18 Apr. 1419 | Gamaches-en-Vexin Marcouville Mussegros | C.64/11 m.74; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 766 |
| 8. | Thomas Chetewode | 12 Apr. 1419 | Chaumont-en-Vexin | C.64/11 m.67; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 770 |
| 9. | John Eston | 28 Apr. 1419 | Bernières-sur-Seine Tosny (see H. Warryn) (?) Villers-sur-le-Roule | C.64/11 m.65; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 772; <u>Lenoir 52/357</u> |

| | Name | Date of Grant | Location | Reference |
|-----|-----------------------|---------------|---|--|
| 10. | Sir Reginald Grey | 1 Dec. 1421 | Heuqueville Pont-Saint-Pierre (see H. Noon) | C.64/16 m.18; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 419 |
| 11. | Sir Walter Hungerford | 13 Jan. 1421 | Baudemont Tourny | C.64/14 m.2; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 387 |
| 12. | Roger Ingerland | 11 Apr. 1419 | Aveny | C.64/11 m.76; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 765 |
| 13. | Robert Lyn | 22 Apr. 1419 | Saussay-la-Campagne (see J. Stocle) | C.64/11 m.68; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 770 |
| 14. | Thomas Merston | 12 Apr. 1419 | Bourg-Beaudouin Forêt-la-Folie Hennezis (?) Noyers | C.64/11 m.49; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 779 |
| 15. | John Mortemer | 10 Apr. 1419 | Courcelles-lès-Gisors | C.64/11 m.75; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 765 |
| 16. | Henry Noon | 1 Jul. 1419 | Heuqueville Pont-Saint-Pierre (see Sir R. Grey) | C.64/11 m.29; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 792 |
| 17. | Richard Nynnys | 11 May 1419 | Amfreville-sous-les-Monts | C.64/11 m.42; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 783 |

| | Name | Date of Grant | Location | Reference |
|-----|-------------------|---------------|---|---|
| 18. | John Pessemersshe | 28 Apr. 1419 | Cressenville Grainville Hacqueville Ménesqueville Radepont | C.64/9 m.64; D.K.R., xli, 772 AN, P 307 (A) no. 295 |
| 19. | William Sepront | 12 Apr. 1419 | Farceaux | C.64/11 m.73; D.K.R., xli, 766 |
| 20. | Robert Smart | 22 Apr. 1419 | Aubigny | C.64/11 m.49; D.K.R., xli, 779; Lenoir 14/81 |
| 21. | John Stocle | 19 Apr. 1419 | Saussay-la-Campagne (see R. Lyn) | C.64/11 m.39; D.K.R., xli, 786 |
| 22. | Thomas Tyringham | 9 Apr. 1419 | La Bucaille Doux Mesnil Guiseniers (?) Noyers-sur-Andelle Pressagny-l'Orgueilleux Vézillon | C.64/11 m.49; D.K.R., xli, 779; Lenoir 52/261-2 |
| 23. | John Waller | 9 May 1419 | Radeval | C.64/11 m.56; D.K.R., xli, 774 |
| 24. | Henry Warryn | 19 Apr. 1419 | Tosny (see J. Eston) | C.64/11 m.47; D.K.R., xli, 780 |

| | Name | Date of Grant | Location | Reference |
|-----|--------------------|---------------|------------------|---|
| 25. | Richard Wydeville | 1 Feb. 1419 | Dangu | C.64/10 m.12; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 745 |
| 26. | Robert Wyntryngham | 12 Apr. 1419 | Mesnil-Verclives | C.64/11 m.68; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 770 |
| 27. | Thomas Wyntryngham | 14 Apr. 1419 | (?) Villers | C.64/11 m.67; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 770 |

APPENDIX III

HOUSEHOLD MEN OF HENRY V GRANTED FRENCH LANDS
AND HOUSES, 1417-22

Notes

1. b. - bailliage(s)
2. Manuscript source is PRO Norman Rolls (C.64) unless otherwise stated.
3. Household information drawn chiefly from Wylie and Waugh; Nicolas, History of the Battle of Agincourt; Fagan, 'Some Aspects of the King's Household'.

| Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Nature of Grant | Reference |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Sir Robert Babthorpe | Controller of the household | 12 Feb. 1418 | House and garden in Caen | Hardy, p. 269 |
| 2. Sir Walter Beauchamp | Treasurer of the household | 24 May 1419 | House in Rouen | C.64/11 m.43; D.K.R., xli, 783 |
| 3. John Boutiller | Keeper of the king's jewels | 31 Jan. 1419 | House in Rouen | C.64/10 m.39; D.K.R., xli, 724 |
| 4. William Bradwardine | Royal surgeon | 21 Mar. 1419 | Lands b. Caux | C.64/11 m.45; D.K.R., xli, 782 |
| 5. John Bromley | Yeoman of the crown | 14 Feb. 1419 | Lands b. Caux, Rouen | C.64/10 m.12; D.K.R., xli, 745 |
| 6. John Cheyne | Squire of the body | 12 Apr. 1419 | House near Rouen | C.64/12 m.1; D.K.R., xlii, 354 |
| | | 6 Feb. 1418 | Lands b. Caen | Hardy, p. 250 |
| | | 18 Apr. 1418 | House in Bayeux | C.64/9 m.39; D.K.R., xli, 680 |
| | | 1 Apr. 1418 | La Haye-du-Puits, b. Cotentin | C.64/9 m.33; D.K.R., xli, 685 |
| | | 26 Feb. 1420 | La Roche Tesson, b. Cotentin | C.64/12 m.13; D.K.R., xlii, 349 |
| | | 2 Oct. 1420 | Houses in Harfleur | C.64/14 m.16; D.K.R., xlii, 380 |

| Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Nature of Grant | Reference |
|------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| 7. William FitzHarry | Usher of the chamber | 1 Nov. 1417 10 May 1418 12 Apr. 1419 4 May 1419 | Lands b. Alençon House in Caen Lands b. Caux Hospice in Caudebec | Hardy, p. 277 C.64/9 m.25; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 689 C.64/11 m.69; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 769 C.64/11 m.60; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 774 |
| 8. Henry Lord FitzHugh | King's chamberlain | 8 Nov. 1417 | Lands b. Alençon | Hardy, p. 280 |
| 9. Simon Fleet | Keeper of the privy wardrobe; Receiver of the chamber | 16 Jan. 1422 3 Jan. 1420 | House in Caen Houses in Harfleur | C.64/16 m.15; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 421 C.64/12 m.18; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 347 |
| 10. Richard Geoffrey | Minstrel | 8 Apr. 1421 23 Mar. 1418 | House in Harfleur Lands b. Caen | C.64/14 m.40; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 410 C.64/9 m.40; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 679 |
| 11. Sir John Grey | Knight of the household | 24 Nov. 1417 31 Jan. 1419 | Lands b. Caen Tancarville and lands b. Rouen, Caux | Hardy, pp. 281-2 C.64/10 m.41; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 723 |

| | Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Nature of Grant | Reference |
|-----|-----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 11. | Sir John Grey | Knight of the household | 20 Jan. 1420 | Wardship lands b. Rouen | C.64/12 m.2; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 354 |
| | | | 9 Mar. 1420 | House in Harfleur | C.64/12 m.4; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 352 |
| | | | 1 Nov. 1420 | House in Caen | C.64/14 m.4; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 386 |
| 12. | John Hannam | Servant; Clerk of the poultry | 12 Apr. 1419 | Lands b. Caen, Rouen | C.64/11 m.47; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 780 |
| 13. | James Hoget | Squire | 20 Mar. 1419 | Lands b. Caen | C.64/10 m.16; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 743 |
| 14. | John Holland | Squire | 15 Dec. 1419 | Houses in Harfleur | C.64/12 m.47; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 335 |
| | | | 26 Feb. 1420 | House in Harfleur | C.64/12 m.17; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 347 |
| | | | 8 Apr. 1421 | House in Harfleur | C.64/16 m.40; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 410 |
| 15. | Sir Walter Hungerford | Steward of the Household | 20 Dec. 1418 | Honmet, b. Cotentin | C.64/9 m.2; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 706 |
| | | | 16 Mar. 1419 | Lands b. Cotentin | C.64/11 m.28; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 792 |

| | Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Nature of Grant | Reference |
|-----|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 15. | Sir Walter Hungerford | Steward of the Household | 13 Jan. 1421 | Lands b. Gisors | C.64/14 m.2; D.K.R., xlii, 387 |
| 16. | John Hurlbatte | Servant | 19 May 1421 | Lands b. Caux, Rouen | C.64/16 m.31; D.K.R., xlii, 413 |
| 17. | Sir Roland Leyntal | Knight of the household | 2 Apr. 1418 | Lands b. Caen (with R. Manfeld) | C.64/10 m.26; D.K.R., xli, 735 |
| 18. | Peter Logge | Servant | 4 May 1419 | Lands b. Caux (with R. Manfeld) | C.64/11 m.44; D.K.R., xli, 783 |
| 19. | Edward Lye | Page | 12 Apr. 1419 | Argouges, b. Cotentin | Lenoir 3/400 |
| 20. | Thomas Lynford | Yeoman of the stables | 7 Apr. 1418 | Lands b. Caen | C.64/9 m.39; D.K.R., xli, 680 |
| 21. | William Malbone | Yeoman of the crown | 11 Apr. 1419 | Lands b. Caen | C.64/12 m.32; D.K.R., xlii, 340 |
| | | | 6 Apr. 1418 | House and land, b. Caen | C.64/9 m.39; D.K.R., xli, 680 |
| | | | 7 Apr. 1419 | Lands b. Caen | C.64/11 m.76; D.K.R., xli, 765 |
| | | | 26 Apr. 1419 | Lands b. Caux, Rouen | C.64/11 m.52; D.K.R., xli, 777 |

| Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Nature of Grant | Reference |
|-------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|--|
| 22. Robert Manfeld | Servant | 2 Apr. 1418) 4 May 1419) | See J. Hurlbatte | |
| 23. William Marshall | Squire | 16 Feb. 1419 | Lands b. Rouen, Gisors | C.64/10 m.16; D.K.R., xli, 743 |
| 24. William Myners | Yeoman usher; Squire of the chamber | 28 Apr. 1418 | Lands b. Caen | C.64/10 m.29; D.K.R., xli, 732 |
| 25. Nicholas Neuton | Servant of the larder | 18 Jun. 1418 | Manor near Caen (with J. Turnour) | C.64/9 m.24; D.K.R., xli, 690 |
| 26. Henry Noon | Master of the horse | 1 Jul. 1419 | Condé-sur-Noireau, b. Cotentin, and Vexin lands | C.64/11 m.29; D.K.R., xli, 792 |
| 27. Sir William Porter | Carver; Squire of the chamber | 22 Mar. 1418 | Lands b. Caen | C.64/9 m.41; D.K.R., xli, 679 |
| 28. Sir Lewis Robessart | Squire of the body | 6 May 1418 14 Feb. 1418 | Rugles and lands b. Evreux Lands and houses, b. Cotentin, Caen | Lenoir 3/406 Hardy, p. 255 |
| 29. Sir John Rothenale | Treasurer of the household; Keeper of the wardrobe | 19 Jan. 1419 12 Feb. 1418 | Lands b. Caux, Caen, Rouen House in Caen | C.64/10 m.28; D.K.R., xli, 733 Hardy, p. 269 |

| | Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Nature of Grant | Reference |
|-----|------------------------|---|---------------|--|--|
| 30. | William Rothwell | Servant of the poultry | 12 Apr. 1419 | Lands b. Cotentin | C.64/11 m.47; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 780 |
| 31. | William Somercotes | Yeoman of the robes; Yeoman of the crown | 14 Dec. 1421 | Lands b. Cotentin | C.64/16 m.15; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 421 |
| | | | 13 Sep. 1419 | House in Harfleur | C.64/11 m.23; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 795 |
| | | | 27 Feb. 1421 | Houses in Harfleur | C.64/15 m.11; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 403 |
| | | | 2 Jun. 1421 | Houses in Harfleur | C.64/16 m.32; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xlii, 413 |
| 32. | John Styward | Squire of the body | 8 Mar. 1418 | Lands b. Caen | Hardy, pp. 279-80 |
| 33. | Sir John Tiptoft | King's knight | 21 Mar. 1418 | Manor in Caen | C.64/9 m.33; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 685 |
| 34. | James Tournour | Servant of the larder | 18 Jun. 1418 | Manor near Caen (shared with Nicholas Neuton) | C.64/9 m.24; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 690 |
| 35. | Sir Gilbert Umfraville | Knight of the household | 1 Feb. 1419 | Amfreville-sur-Iton and lands b. Evreux, Rouen | C.64/10 m.28; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 733 |
| 36. | John Warde | Yeoman of the chamber | 15 Dec. 1419 | House in Harfleur | C.64/11 m.4; <u>D.K.R.</u> , xli, 808 |

| | Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Nature of Grant | Reference |
|-----|-------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 37. | John Wycheford | Yeoman of the larder | 19 Apr. 1419 | Lands b. Caux | C.64/11 m.39; D.K.R., xli, 786 |
| 38. | Richard Wydeville | Esquire of the body | 1 Feb. 1419 | Lands b. Rouen, Gisors | C.64/10 m.12; D.K.R., xli, 745 |

APPENDIX IVTHE DISTRIBUTION OF LANDS TO SETTLERS, 1422-35Notes

1. Figures are compiled from AN, JJ 172-5 and Collection Lenoir.
2. Entries are compiled according to the specific fief(s) or bailliage(s) recorded, if known.
3. Improvements to and confirmations of grants, and restorations and wardships, are not included.
4. For months not included, no grants are known.

| Month | Sett- lers | Tail- Male | Life | Royal Plea- sure | Not known | Alençon | Caen | Caux | Cotentin | Evreux | Gisors | Mantes | Rouen | Amiens | Beauvoisis | Chartres | Chaumont | Maine | Meaux | Melun | Paris | Sens | Troyes | Unknown |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|------------------------|--------------|---------|------|------|----------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|------------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|---------|
| <u>1422</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Oct. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dec. | 7 | 1 | 2 | 4 | | | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 8 | 2 | 2 | 4 | | | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>1423</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 3 | 1 | | 2 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| Feb. | 2 | 2 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mar. | 7 | 4 | | 3 | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| Apr. | 5 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| May | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Jun. | 6 | 5 | 1 | | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | |
| Jul. | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Sep. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Oct. | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov. | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dec. | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1423 TOTAL | 29 | 15 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 13 | 2 | | | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | | | 3 |

| Month | Sett- lers | Tail Male | Life | Royal Plea- sure | Not known | Alençon | Caen | Caux | Cotentin | Evreux | Gisors | Mantes | Rouen | Amiens | Beauvoisis | Chartres | Chaumont | Maine | Meaux | Melun | Paris | Senlis | Sens | Troyes | Unknown |
|---------------|---------------|--------------|------|------------------------|--------------|---------|------|------|----------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|------------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|--------|---------|
| <u>1424</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 3 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Apr. | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jun. | 3 | 3 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Jul. | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Aug. | 7 | 4 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | | | | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sep. | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 2 | | | 3 | | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| Oct. | 4 | | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | | 2 | 2 | | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov. | 3 | 1 | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dec. | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1424 TOTAL | 36 | 18 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 7 | | 2 | 16 | | 3 | | | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | | | |
| <u>1425</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 33 | | 32 | | 1 | 6 | 15 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 1 | | 9 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Feb. | 17 | | 17 | | | | 5 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mar. | 16 | | 16 | | | | 3 | 4 | 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Apr. | 10 | | 10 | | | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| May | 7 | 1 | 6 | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |

| Month | Settlers | Tail Male | Life | Royal Pleasure | Not known | Alengon | Caen | Caux | Cotentin | Evreux | Gisors | Mantes | Rouen | Amiens | Beauvoisis | Chartres | Chaumont | Maine | Meaux | Melun | Paris | Senlis | Sens | Troyes | Unknown |
|---------------|----------|-----------|------|----------------|-----------|---------|------|------|----------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|------------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|--------|---------|
| 1425 Cont. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jun. | 8 | 1 | 7 | | | | 5 | | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Aug. | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Oct. | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov. | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Dec. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| 1425 TOTAL | 96 | 5 | 89 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 35 | 11 | 28 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 22 | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | | | |
| 1426 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mar. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aug. | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1426 TOTAL | 2 | 2 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1427 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Apr. | 6 | 6 | | | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | |
| May | 7 | 2 | 5 | | | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Jul. | 7 | 5 | 2 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | |

| Month | Sett- lers | Tail Male | Life | Royal Plea- sure | Not known | Alençon | Caen | Caux | Cotentin | Evreux | Gisors | Mantes | Roen | Amiens | Beauvoisis | Chartres | Chaumont | Maine | Meaux | Melun | Paris | Senlis | Sens | Troyes | Unknown |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------|------|------------------------|--------------|---------|------|------|----------|--------|--------|--------|------|--------|------------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|--------|---------|
| <u>1427</u> Cont. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aug. | 2 | 2 | | | | | 2 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sep. | 3 | | 3 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov. | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1427 TOTAL | 26 | 15 | 11 | | | 1 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 8 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 6 | | | | |
| <u>1428</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Feb. | 4 | 4 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| Mar. | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 2 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |
| Apr. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jun. | 2 | 2 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Jul. | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Aug. | 3 | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Oct. | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1428 TOTAL | 17 | 15 | 2 | | | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | | | 4 | | 1 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |

| Month | Sett- lers | Tail Male | Life | Royal Plea- sure | Not known | Alençon | Caen | Caux | Cotentin | Evreux | Gisors | Mantes | Rouen | Amiens | Beauvoisis | Chartres | Chaumont | Maine | Meaux | Melun | Paris | Senlis | Sens | Troyes | Unknown |
|---------------|---------------|--------------|------|------------------------|--------------|---------|------|------|----------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|------------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|--------|---------|
| <u>1429</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mar. | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aug. | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sep. | 2 | | 2 | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| Oct. | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov. | 4 | 1 | 3 | | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dec. | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1429 TOTAL | 12 | 3 | 8 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| <u>1430</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 3 | | 3 | | | | 1 | 3 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mar. | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Apr. | 3 | | 3 | | | | 1 | 2 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jul. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sep. | 4 | 4 | | | | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Oct. | 4 | 4 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov. | 11 | 11 | | | | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | | 6 | | | | | | | 1 | | 2 | | | 1 |

| Month | Sett- lers | Tail- Male | Life | Royal Plea- sure | Not known | Alençon | Caen | Caux | Cotentin | Evreux | Gisors | Mantes | Rouen | Amiens | Beauvoisis | Chartres | Chaumont | Maine | Meaux | Melun | Paris | Senlis | Sens | Troyes | Unknown |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------|------|------------------------|--------------|---------|------|------|----------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|------------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|--------|---------|
| <u>1434</u> Cont. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov. | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dec. | 2 | 2 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1434 TOTAL | 9 | 7 | 2 | | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | | | 5 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| <u>1435</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Feb. | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| May | 3 | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sep. | 2 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 8 | 3 | 4 | | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GRAND TOTAL | 317 | 146 | 145 | 19 | 7 | 34 | 104 | 72 | 77 | 51 | 26 | 13 | 115 | 10 | 3 | 12 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 19 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 8 |

APPENDIX VHOUSEHOLD MEN OF BEDFORD GRANTED FRENCH LANDS,1422-35Notes

1. Manuscript source is Collection Lenoir (e.g. 17/413) or AN JJ 172-5 (e.g. 174 no. 43).
2. Grants of urban property are not included.

| | Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Bailliage(s) | Reference |
|-----|------------------------|--|---------------|--|----------------------------|
| 1. | John Andrieu | Servant | 19 Jul. 1427 | Rent, <u>prévôté Paris</u> | 174 no. 43 |
| 2. | Roger Appilleton | Clerk of the chapel | By Jun. 1427 | Rent, Paris | N. acq. fr. 7627 f. 361 |
| 3. | John Barton | Servant; Treasurer; <u>Maître d'hôtel</u> | 18 Dec. 1422 | Ausebosc, Caux | 17/413; 21/237 |
| | | | 1 Nov. 1423 | Caen, Cotentin | 172 no. 539 |
| | | | 28 May 1425 | <u>Prévôté Paris</u> | 173 no. 149 |
| 4. | Hamon Belknap | <u>Conseiller</u> | 10 Jan. 1424 | Caen, Cotentin, Alençon | 172 no. 545 |
| | | | 1 Jun. 1424 | Evreux, Alençon | 172 no. 577 |
| | | | 29 Aug. 1424 | Rouen | 21/271 |
| 5. | John Bernard | Valet | 7 Dec. 1424 | Caen, Cotentin | 21/299 |
| 6. | Sir William Bishopston | <u>Maître d'hôtel</u> | 27 Apr. 1425 | Anneville, Rouen | 21/377 |
| 7. | John Blakeman | Servant | 28 Feb. 1435 | Caux | 24/63 |
| 8. | John de Blaton | Servant | 8 Mar. 1432 | Caen, Cotentin, Alençon | 22/279 |
| 9. | Sir Thomas Blunt | Chamberlain | 16 Jan. 1428 | Meaux, Gisors, Soissons, Crépy-en-Valois, <u>prévôté Paris</u> | 174 no. 97 |
| 10. | John Bourer | Servant | 4 Apr. 1423 | Rouen | 21/243 |

| | Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Bailliage(s) | Reference |
|-----|----------------------|---|-----------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 11. | John Bradshaw | Servant | 15 Jan. 1425 | Rouen, Caen | 21/227 |
| 12. | John Bridon | Servant | 14 Jan. 1425 | Alençon | 22/7-8 |
| 13. | William Bruges | Valet; Servant | 23 Nov. 1429 | Rouen, Caux, Caen, Evreux, Gisors | 22/151 |
| 14. | Thomas Chastellain | Valet | 17 Dec. 1422 | Rouen, Evreux | 3/316 |
| 15. | Sir Thomas Chetewode | Servant | 7 Jun. 1428 | <u>Prévôté Paris</u> | 174 no. 162 |
| 16. | John Colman | Servant | By 14 Jun. 1425 | Caux | 21/389 |
| 17. | Thomas Copeland | Valet | By 1 May 1434 | Rouen | Tab. de Rouen 1434-5, f. 34 |
| 18. | William Cotismore | Servant and Butler | 9 Mar. 1432 | <u>Prévôté Paris,</u> <u>Meaux, Senlis</u> | 175 nos. 70, 81 |
| 19. | Robert Dalby | Servant | 4 Jan. 1425 | Rouen, Caux | 21/303 |
| 20. | Thomas Dampport | Squire | 25 Jan. 1433 | Caen, Cotentin | 175 no. 178 |
| 21. | Sir John Fastolf | Conseiller; <u>Grand</u> <u>Maître d'hôtel</u> | Mar. 1423 | Rouen, Caux, Alençon, Amiens, Evreux, Gisors, Caen, Cotentin | 3/316-7 |
| | | | 8 Jul. 1423 | Breteuil; Amiens, Senlis | 172 no. 345 |
| | | | 2 Jan. 1433 | Caen, Cotentin, Rouen | 75/11 |
| | | | 26 Feb. 1435 | Caen, Cotentin, Rouen | 22/375 |

| | Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Bailliage(s) | Reference |
|-----|--------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|---|------------------------|
| 22. | Stephen Flexmar | Valet | 14 Dec. 1422 | Caux | 3/316 |
| 23. | Thomas Giffart | Chief purveyor oats | 26 Apr. 1427 | Mantes, Gisors, <u>prévôté Paris</u> | 173 no. 648 |
| 24. | George Grene | Valet | By Oct. 1429 | Caen | 10/181 |
| 25. | John Grene | Servant | 10 Sep. 1424 | Evreux | 21/273 |
| 26. | John Guilledon | Servant | 6 Jun. 1428 | Caen | 174 no. 183 |
| 27. | Thomas Hadfeld | Servant; Standard bearer | 29 May 1432 | Rouen, Caux, Gisors, Caen, Cotentin | 175 no. 258 |
| 28. | Sir John Handford | Servant; Sergeant of the bakery | 10 Mar. 1423 | Maisons-sur-Seine; Rouen, Mantes, <u>prévôté Paris</u> | 13/121; 172 no. 641 |
| 29. | John Harap | Servant | 15 Jun. 1424 | Rouen, Cotentin | 174 no. 103 |
| 30. | Nicholas de Harlay | Squire of the stables | 22 Jul. 1428 | Troyes, Senlis | 174 no. 197 |
| 31. | Alexander Heron | Servant | 12 Nov. 1429 | Evreux, Rouen | 22/123 |
| 32. | Thomas Hopkin | Valet | 23 Jul. 1427 | Caen, Cotentin | 173 no. 718 |
| 33. | John Houitte | Barber | 24 Apr. 1423 | Cotentin | 21/243 |
| | | | 8 Mar. 1430 | Evreux, Caen | 22/139 |
| | | | 12 Apr. 1424 | Rouen | 21/267 |

| | Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Bailliage(s) | Reference |
|-----|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| 34. | Reginald Jullien | Servant | 13 Jul. 1427 | Rouen, Caux | 22/63 |
| 35. | William Kabou | Porter | 3 Nov. 1424 | Caux | 21/297 |
| 36. | Robert Kay | Clerk of the signet | 28 May 1435 | Caen, Cotentin | 22/393 |
| 37. | John Kennynge | Servant | 3 Nov. 1433 | Rouen, Caux, Gisors, Amiens, Senlis | 175 no. 308 |
| 38. | Thomas Maisterson | Chamberlain | 9 Aug. 1427 | Caux | 174 no. 41 |
| 39. | John Major | Physician | 29 Jul. 1428 | Rouen, Gisors | 174 no. 305 |
| 40. | John Marshall | Servant | 28 Jan. 1425 | Caen | 21/307 |
| 41. | John Martin | Usher; Valet | By 19 Jul. 1423 | Rouen, Gisors, Caux | 21/255 |
| 42. | Robert Martin | Valet | 10 May 1427 | Caen | 22/51 |
| 43. | William Mayo | Servant | 7 Nov. 1429 | Caen, Cotentin | 22/131 |
| 44. | Richard Merbury | Servant | 10 Oct. 1429 | Caen, Cotentin | 22/135 |
| | | | 6 Aug. 1424 | Rouen | 21/271 |
| | | | Feb. 1423 | Rouen | 14/179 |
| | | | Sep. 1423 | Gisors | 172 no. 362 |
| | | | 18 Jul. 1424 | Mantes, <u>prévôté Paris</u> | 173 no. 65 |

| | Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Bailliage(s) | Reference |
|-----|------------------------|--|----------------|--|------------------|
| 44. | Richard Merbury | Servant | 15 Jun. 1425 | Meaux, Senlis, <u>prévôté Paris</u> | 173 no. 173 |
| 45. | William Merlin | Servant | 23 Mar. 1433 | Cotentin | 175 no. 231 |
| 46. | William Milles | Servant and clerk of <u>the chambre des comptes</u> | 23 Sep. 1424 | Rouen, Caen | 21/367 |
| 47. | Sir John de Montgomery | <u>Conseiller</u> | 2 Sep. 1427 | Rouen, Caux | 22/79 |
| 48. | Thomas de Montgomery | Servant | 14 Jun. 1423 | Maine | 172 no. 265 |
| 49. | John Mortemer | Servant | By 7 Jun. 1434 | Maine | 22/343 |
| 50. | John Nedeler | Valet | 8 Apr. 1427 | Caen, Cotentin | 173 no. 630 |
| 51. | Sir Andrew Ogard | Chamberlain | 15 Apr. 1427 | Maine, Alençon | 173 no. 643 |
| | | | 27 Aug. 1427 | Rouen, Caux | 174 no. 13 |
| | | | 21 Jan. 1435 | Caen | 22/375 |
| | | | 7 Aug. 1428 | Rouen, Caux | 8/397-8 |
| | | | 14 Oct. 1422 | Rouen | 3/220 |
| | | | 10 Jan. 1429 | Caen | 174 no. 27 |
| | | | 14 Oct. 1434 | Rouen, Caux | BL, Add. Ch. 120 |
| | | | 12 Jan. 1435 | Caen | 175 no. 330 |

| | Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Bailliage(s) | Reference |
|-----|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 52. | Robert Piers | Servant | 11 Aug. 1425 | Rouen, Evreux | 21/399 |
| 53. | William Polx | Servant | 14 May 1427 | Rouen, Caux | 22/53 |
| 54. | John Pyamour | Clerk of the chapel | By 21 Sep. 1428 | Caen, Cotentin | Tab. de Rouen 1427-8, f. 407v. |
| 55. | Sir Thomas Rempston | Chamberlain | 2 Nov. 1429 | Caen, Alençon | 22/215 |
| 56. | James Ripalda | Servant | 19 Jan. 1425 | Caen | 21/359 |
| 57. | John de Saint-Lo | Usher | 15 Apr. 1427 | Caen | 173 no. 644 |
| 58. | Robert Saltmarsh | Usher | 23 Aug. 1428 | Caen, Alençon | 22/103 |
| 59. | Sir John Salvain | <u>Conseiller</u> | 9 Mar. 1423 | Rouen | 172 no. 526 |
| | | | 3 Apr. 1423 | Rouen | 22/163 |
| | | | 10 May 1427 | Rouen | 8/393 |
| | | | 15 Aug. 1433 | Caen, Cotentin, Alençon | 22/313 |
| 60. | Thomas Scarlet | Controller household expenditure | 22 Mar. 1423 | Caen, Cotentin | 14/213 |
| | | | 20 Dec. 1425 | Senlis, <u>prévôté Paris</u> | 173 no. 402 |
| 61. | Thomas Seballe | Servant | 22 Sep. 1424 | Evreux | 21/275 |

| | Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Bailliage(s) | Reference |
|-----|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| 62. | John Sherle | Servant | 1 Nov. 1423 | Caux | Ms. fr. 26046 no. 165 |
| 63. | John Stanlawe | <u>Maître d'hôtel</u> | 6 Mar. 1429 | Caux | 174 no. 315 |
| 64. | John Stany | Servant | 7 Dec. 1434 | Caux | 175 no. 320 |
| 65. | John Strelley | Valet | 4 Jan. 1425 | Caen, Cotentin | 21/355 |
| | | | 13 Jan. 1425 | Caen, Cotentin | 22/15 |
| | | | 29 Apr. 1425 | Caen, Cotentin | 21/379 |
| 66. | William Wake | Servant | By 21 Jan. 1435 | Alençon | 22/373 |
| 67. | Walter Maloys | Servant | 25 Apr. 1432 | Caen, Alençon | 22/287 |
| 68. | Richard Wardell | Valet | 20 Apr. 1430 | Caux, Amiens | 22/145 |
| 69. | Thomas Ware | Servant | 7 Apr. 1430 | Caux | 22/119 |
| 70. | Thomas Watson | Valet | 16 Dec. 1432 | Evreux | 24/73 |
| 71. | Richard Wydeville | <u>Conseiller</u> | 2 May 1423 | Gisors, Senlis | 172 no. 278 |

APPENDIX VITHE DISTRIBUTION OF LANDS TO SETTLERS, 1435-50Notes

1. Figures are compiled primarily from the Collection Lenoir.
2. Entries are compiled according to the specific fief(s) or bailliage(s) recorded, if known.
3. Improvements to and confirmations of grants, and restorations and wardships, are not included.
4. For months not included, no grants are known.

| Month | Settlers | Tail Male | Life | Unknown | Alençon | Caen | Caux | Cotentin | Evreux | Gisors | Mantes | Roquen | Amiens | Maine | Meulan | Senlis |
|---------------|----------|-----------|------|---------|---------|------|------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| <u>1435</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dec. | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | |
| TOTAL | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | |
| <u>1436</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jun. | 11 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 2 | | 10 | | | | |
| Jul. | 15 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 9 | | | 1 | |
| Aug. | 3 | 3 | | | | 2 | | 3 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Sep. | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Nov. | 3 | 2 | 1 | | 2 | 3 | | 3 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| 1436 TOTAL | 33 | 24 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 21 | | | 1 | |
| <u>1437</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 4 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | |
| Feb. | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | | |
| Mar. | 3 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | |
| Apr. | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | | | 3 | | | | |
| May | 6 | 3 | 3 | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | |
| Jun. | 5 | 2 | 3 | | | | 3 | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | | |

| Month | Settlers | Tail Male | Life | Unknown | Alençon | Caen | Caux | Cotentin | Evreux | Gisors | Mantes | Rouen | Amiens | Maine | Meulan | Senlis |
|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|------|---------|---------|------|------|----------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| <u>1437</u> <u>Cont.</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jul. | 9 | 3 | 6 | | 5 | 3 | 4 | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Aug. | 6 | 1 | 5 | | | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | | 4 | | 1 | | |
| Sep. | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Nov. | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>1437</u> <u>TOTAL</u> | 42 | 15 | 26 | 1 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 3 | 6 | 5 | | 18 | | 3 | | |
| <u>1438</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Feb. | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Mar. | 3 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| Apr. | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| May | 4 | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 3 | | | | |
| Jun. | 2 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| Jul. | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Aug. | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | |
| Sep. | 4 | 2 | 2 | | | | 2 | | | 1 | | 4 | 1 | | | 1 |
| Oct. | 3 | 3 | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Nov. | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| <u>1438</u> <u>TOTAL</u> | 23 | 14 | 9 | | 8 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 16 | 2 | | 1 | 1 |

| Month | Settlers | Tail Male | Life | Unknown | Alençon | Caen | Caux | Cotentin | Evreux | Gisors | Mantes | Rouen | Amiens | Maine | Meulan | Senlis |
|---------------|----------|-----------|------|---------|---------|------|------|----------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| <u>1439</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mar. | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Apr. | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Sep. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Dec. | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| 1439 TOTAL | 4 | 4 | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | 2 | | |
| <u>1440</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| May | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Jun. | 3 | 2 | 1 | | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | | | | |
| Aug. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| Sep. | 6 | 3 | 3 | | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | | | | |
| 1440 TOTAL | 13 | 8 | 5 | | 5 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 6 | | 1 | | |
| <u>1441</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| May | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | |
| Aug. | 2 | 2 | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov. | 2 | 2 | | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| 1441 TOTAL | 5 | 5 | | | | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | | | | |

| Month | Settlers | Tail Male | Life | Unknown | Alençon | Caen | Caux | Cotentin | Evreux | Gisors | Mantes | Rouen | Amiens | Maine | Meulan | Senlis |
|---------------|----------|-----------|------|---------|---------|------|------|----------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| <u>1442</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | 2 | | | | |
| Mar. | 3 | | 3 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Apr. | 3 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | | | | | | 3 | | | | |
| May | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Jul. | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Aug. | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Oct. | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov. | 4 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 1442 TOTAL | 16 | 5 | 11 | | 4 | 6 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 | | 2 | | |
| <u>1443</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mar. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Apr. | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| Aug. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Sep. | 3 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | |
| Oct. | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| 1443 TOTAL | 7 | 5 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | | 6 | | | | |

| Month | Settlers | Tail Male | Life | Unknown | Alengon | Caen | Caux | Cotentin | Evreux | Gisors | Mantes | Rouen | Amiens | Maine | Meulan | Senlis |
|---------------|----------|-----------|------|---------|---------|------|------|----------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| <u>1445</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Feb. | 2 | | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| Mar. | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Apr. | 5 | 3 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| May | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Jul. | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aug. | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sep. | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1445 TOTAL | 16 | 6 | 10 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | | |
| <u>1446</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| May | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Jun. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Jul. | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Aug. | 3 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | |
| Sep. | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Dec. | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| 1446 TOTAL | 9 | 4 | 5 | | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | | | | 5 | | | | |

APPENDIX VII

HOUSEHOLD MEN OF YORK GRANTED FRENCH

LANDS, MAY 1436 - APRIL 1437

Notes

1. b. - bailliage(s)
2. All references are to Collection Lenoir unless stated.

| | Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Nature of Grant | Reference |
|----|--------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1. | John Buyturley | Servant | By 11 Dec. 1436 | Lands b. Maine | 26/209 |
| 2. | Howel Davy | Servant | 22 Jun. 1436 | Lands b. Alençon | 3/356 |
| 3. | Richard Dixon | Usher of the chamber | 13 Apr. 1437 | Lands b. Rouen | 22/45-6; 4/411 |
| 4. | Griffith Don | <u>Familier domestique</u> | 16 Jun. 1436 | Lands b. Rouen, Caux, Caen, Cotentin, Evreux, Gisors, Alençon | 5/89 |
| 5. | Thomas de Elleston | Servant | 27 Jul. 1436 | Lands b. Rouen, Gisors, Evreux, Mantes, Meulan | 4/407; BN, Ms. fr. 26062 no. 3133 |
| 6. | Robert Martin | Valet | 9 Jul. 1436 | Lands b. Caen, Cotentin | 5/23 |
| 7. | John Rousse1 | Usher of the chamber | 14 Jun. 1436 | Lands b. Rouen, Caux, Evreux | 5/71 |
| 8. | Henry Welton | Servant | 2 Aug. 1436 | Re-issue of grant, b. Rouen, Caen, Evreux | 5/75-6; 26/209 |

APPENDIX VIII

HOUSEHOLD MEN OF WARWICK GRANTED FRENCH LANDS,

NOVEMBER 1437 - APRIL 1439

Notes

1. b. - bailliage(s)
2. All references are to Collection Lenoir.

| | Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Nature of Grant | Reference |
|----|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|---|---------------|
| 1. | John Clayfield | Servant | 9 Sep. 1438 | Lands b. Rouen, Caen, Cotentin, Caux, Evreux, Alençon, Gisors | 4/345; 26/373 |
| 2. | John Collier | Servant | By 28 May 1439 | Lands b. Rouen, Caen, Cotentin, Evreux, Alençon | 26/373 |
| 3. | Richard Curson | Retainer | 26 Aug. 1438 | Lands b. Rouen, Evreux, Caen, Alençon | 4/351 |
| 4. | William Forsted | Servant | 2 May 1438 | Lands b. Caen, Cotentin | 4/367 |
| 5. | William Tempest | Servant | 9 Apr. 1438 | Lands b. Caen, Caux, Rouen, Evreux, Cotentin, Gisors, Alençon | 4/369 |

APPENDIX IX

HOUSEHOLD MEN AND THE AFFINITY OF YORK GRANTED

FRENCH LANDS, JULY 1440 - SEPTEMBER 1445

Notes

1. b. - bailliage(s)
2. All references are to Collection Lenoir unless otherwise stated.

| Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Nature of Grant | Reference |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|---|----------------------------|
| 1. William Browning | Treasurer | 15 Jan. 1442 | Improved tenure lands b. Rouen, Caux, Caen, Cotentin, Alençon | 75/21 |
| 2. Henry Cook | Yeoman of the Kitchen | 26 Feb. 1445 | Life-grant, location unknown | BN, Ms. fr. 26073 no. 5374 |
| 3. Griffith Don | <u>Familiier domestique</u> | 5 Aug. 1443 | Property in Lisieux; lands b. Rouen | 27/267; 5/9 |
| 4. Robert Don | Servant | By 4 Nov. 1445 | Lands b. Evreux | 4/191 |
| 5. William Donett | Servant | 2 Apr. 1442 | Lands b. Rouen, Caux | 4/247 |
| 6. Leonard Hastings | Servant | 16 Nov. 1442 | Lands b. Caen, Cotentin | 27/209 |
| 7. John Hubard | Servant | By 14 May 1445 | Lands b. Rouen, Caux, Caen, Cotentin, Alençon, Gisors | 4/197; 28/87 |
| 8. Robert Kay | Clerk and Servant | 24 Mar. 1442 | Lands b. Rouen, Caux, Caen, Alençon | BL, Add. Ch. 14498; 27/155 |
| 9. James Lansac | Servant | By 28 Jan. 1443 | Lands b. Rouen, Caux | 28/163 |
| 10. John Leche | Servant | 19 Apr. 1442 | Lands b. Rouen | 27/145 |
| 11. John Lucas | Servant | By 26 Sep. 1444 | Lands b. Caen, Cotentin Alençon | 27/353 |

| | Name | Household Position | Date of Grant | Nature of Grant | Reference |
|-----|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|
| 12. | Edmund Mulso | Esquire | 22 Mar. 1442 | Lands b. Caen, Rouen, Caux, Cotentin, Evreux, Gisors, Mantes | 4/249 |
| | | | 1 Apr. 1445 | Life-grant, location unknown | BN, Ms. fr. 26074 no. 5373 |
| 13. | Sir William Oldhall | Chamberlain | 20 Jul. 1444 | Lands b. Rouen, Caen, Cotentin, Alençon, (with J. Robessart) | 4/215 |
| | | | 27 Sep. 1444 | Profits of the lands of the abbey of Mont-Saint-Michel (with J. Salvain) | 27/361-2 |
| | | | 13 Jul. 1445 | La Ferté-Frênel, b. Alençon | 4/193 |
| 14. | Sir John Salvain | Councillor | 27 Sep. 1444 | See W. Oldhall | |
| | | | 18 Jan. 1445 | Farm of lands, b. Rouen | 4/201, 207 |
| 15. | Thomas Lord Scales | Councillor | 7 May 1442 | Lands b. Rouen, Caen, Alençon | 27/137 |
| 16. | John Lord Talbot | Annuitant | 21 May 1442 | Improved tenure of all lands held | 27/211-2 |
| 17. | William Whitlock | Servant | By 15 Jun. 1444 | Lands b. Rouen, Caux, Caen, Cotentin, Evreux, Gisors, Alençon | 27/309 |

APPENDIX X

THE DISTRIBUTION OF URBAN PROPERTIES TO
SETTLERS, 1417-22

Notes

1. Figures are compiled from the Norman Rolls.
2. Each house, tenement and vacant plot has been counted separately. 'Tenements' have been counted as two properties. Gardens have not been included.
3. For months not included, no grants are known.

| Month | Settlers | Harfleur | Cherbourg | Caen | Honfleur | Rouen | Argentan | Bayeux | Dieppe | Caudebec |
|---------------|----------|----------|-----------|------|----------|-------|----------|--------|--------|----------|
| <u>1419</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Feb. | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Mar. | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | |
| Apr. | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| May | 4 | 5 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Sep. | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Oct. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Dec. | 24 | 41 | | 1 | | | | | | |
| 1419 TOTAL | 34 | 54 | | 1 | | 3 | | | | 1 |
| <u>1420</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. | 11 | 30 | | 1 | | | | | 1 | |
| Feb. | 42 | 101 | | | | | | | | |
| Mar. | 55 | 118 | 5 | | | | | | | |
| Apr. | 37 | 6 | | 43 | | | | | | |
| May | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Aug. | 3 | 1 | | 2 | | | | | | |
| Sep. | 8 | 15 | | 3 | | | | | | |
| Oct. | 5 | 3 | | 3 | | | | | | |
| Nov. | 9 | 11 | 1 | 5 | | | | | | |
| Dec. | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 1420 TOTAL | 172 | 286 | 6 | 58 | | | | | 1 | |

APPENDIX XISETTLERS GRANTED BURGESS STATUS AT CAENNotes

1. All references are to Calvados, Tabellionage de Caen unless stated.

| | Name | Date | Reference |
|-----|-------------------|------|--|
| 1. | Simon Bonnet | 1445 | 7E 90 f. 232v |
| 2. | Nicholas Bradkyrk | 1435 | 7E 89 f. 454 |
| 3. | John Broun | 1444 | 7E 90 f. 171v |
| 4. | John Convers | 1436 | 7E 89 f. 68v |
| 5. | Stephen Cornwall | 1438 | 7E 89 f. 366v |
| 6. | John Dracot | 1445 | 7E 90 f. 213 |
| 7. | Thomas Hale | 1438 | 7E 89 f. 366v |
| 8. | John Hayden | 1437 | 7E 89 f. 448v |
| 9. | John Hebert | 1439 | 7E 89 f. 520v |
| 10. | William Johnson | 1438 | 7E 89 f. 366v |
| 11. | Stephen Miller | 1439 | 7E 89 f. 523v |
| 12. | John Milcent | 1436 | 7E 89 f. 124 |
| 13. | William Nepur | 1441 | Tabellionnage de Rouen 1440-1, <u>sub</u> 30 August 1441 |
| 14. | Peter Newman | 1437 | 7E 89 f. 153 |
| 15. | Thomas Norton | 1437 | 7E 89 f. 198v |
| 16. | Henry Pencras | 1443 | 7E 90 f. 85 |
| 17. | Peter Regnart | 1439 | 7E 89 f. 532 |
| 18. | William Sanders | 1436 | 7E 89 f. 114 |
| 19. | Richard Spencer | 1437 | 7E 89 f. 277v |
| 20. | John Sturgeon | 1443 | 7E 90 f. 129 |

APPENDIX XII

SETTLERS GRANTED BURGESS STATUS AT

ROUEN, HONFLEUR AND CHERBOURG

| Name | Date | Reference |
|-----------------------|------|---|
| <u>ROUEN</u> | | |
| 1. Thomas Bridon | 1449 | Bib. Mun. Rouen, A7 f. 39 |
| 2. John Doncaster | 1443 | Seine-Mme, Tabellionnage de Rouen 1442-3, <u>sub</u> 16 Aug. 1443 |
| 3. Thomas Halliday | 1434 | <u>Ibid.</u> , 1434-5, f. 82 |
| 4. John Pascal | 1443 | <u>Ibid.</u> , 1442-3, <u>sub</u> 14 Mar. 1443 |
| 5. Ralph Trenewith | 1443 | <u>Idem.</u> |
| <u>HONFLEUR</u> | | |
| 1. William Belaclef | 1438 | Lenoir 26/321 |
| 2. Henry Spicer | 1437 | BN, Ms. fr. 26062 no. 3186 |
| <u>CHERBOURG</u> | | |
| 1. William Sterzalier | 1443 | <u>Inventaire sommaire ...</u> <u>Série H, H 3227</u> |

BIBLIOGRAPHYA. MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

Within a collection, sources of particular value to this study have been identified.

Archives Nationales, Paris

| | |
|--|--|
| Série J | Trésor des Chartes |
| Série JJ JJ 171 - JJ 175 | Registres du Trésor des Chartes |
| Série K K 59 - K 68 | Monuments historiques, cartons des rois |
| Série KK | Monuments historiques, comptes |
| Série P P 267-308 P 1905-1923 | Chambre des comptes et comptabilité Hommages, aveux et dénombremments Titres domaniaux |
| Série PP | Anciens inventaires de la chambre des comptes |
| Série Q ¹ | Titres domaniaux |
| Série X X ^{1a} 64-68 X ^{1a} 4793-4797 X ^{1a} 8603-8605 | Parlement de Paris Jugés, lettres et arrêts Registres des plaidoiries, 'matinées' Lettres patentes et ordonnances |
| Série Y | Châtelet de Paris |
| Série Z ^{1h} | Bureau de la ville de Paris |
| Série AP 300 AP1 | Archives personnelles et familiales Archives de la maison de France (branche d'Orléans). Fonds de Dreux |

Collection Dom Lenoir (Salle des microfilms 104 Mi)

Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

Manuscrits français
26042-26080

Quittances et pièces diverses

Manuscrits latins

Nouvelles acquisitions françaises
7625-7632)
7930-7936)

Portefeuilles de Fontanieu

Nouvelles acquisitions latines

Pièces originales

Collection Bréquigny

Collection Clairambault

Collection Dupuy

Collection du Vexin

Archives Départementales de la Seine-Maritime, Rouen

Série B
1423, 1424, 1426, 1448, 1453

Échiquier de Normandie

Série E
Registres 1418-1445

Tabellionage de Rouen

1E

Comté de Lillebonne, comptes
(non classés)

Comté de Tancarville, comptes
(non classés)

2E

Tabellionnages et notariats
Elbeuf
Routot

5E

Corporation d'arts et métiers

Série G

Archives ecclésiastiques,
cathédrale de Rouen

G 501-505

Comptes de Dieppe

14 H

Abbaye de St. Ouen, Rouen

18 H

Fonds du Valasse (non classé)

19 H Fonds de Valmont (non classé)
 Fonds Danquin Cartons 1-24
 Archives Communales d'Harfleur
 Série AA

Archives Départementales du Calvados, Caen

| | |
|---------------|--------------------------|
| Série D | Université de Caen |
| Série E | Titres féodaux |
| 7E | Tabellionnages |
| 7E 5 (1) | Tabellionnage d'Argences |
| 7E 89 - 7E 92 | Tabellionnage de Caen |
| Série F | Fonds Divers |
| F 1250-1649 | Fonds Danquin |

Archives Départementales de l'Eure, Evreux

Série E
 Sous-série II F Fonds Danquin

Archives Départementales de la Manche, St.-Lô

Séries A, E, H
 Manuscripts largely destroyed. Catalogues and Inventaire Sommaire
 consulted.

Archives Départementales de l'Orne, Alençon

Série A Domaine royale
 A 410-422

Bibliothèque Municipale, Rouen

| | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Série A | Delibérations du conseil. Registres |
| Série U | Registres de vidimus de chartes |
| Série XX | Comptes de la ville |
| Collection Leber | |
| Collection Montbret | |
| Fonds Martainville | |
| Registres de la ville Y 29 | |
| Tiroirs | |

Bibliothèque Municipale d'Evreux

Archives Municipales d'Evreux

| | |
|----------|----------------------------------|
| Série AA | Actes constitutifs et politiques |
| Série BB | Administration communale |
| Série CC | Comptabilité |

Bibliothèque Municipale de Mantes-la-Jolie

Archives Communales de Mantes

| | |
|----------|-----------------------------|
| Série BB | Delibérations de la commune |
| Série CC | Comptes de la commune |

Archives Municipales d'Angers

| | |
|----------|------------------------|
| Série CC | Impôts et comptabilité |
|----------|------------------------|

Archives Communales de Tours

| | |
|----------|----------------------------------|
| Série BB | Registres de délibérations |
| Série CC | Registres de comptes municipaux |
| Série EE | Affaires militaires et maritimes |

Musée des Beaux-Arts, Caen

Collection Mancel

British Library, London

Additional Charters

Additional Manuscripts

Egerton Charters

Harleian Manuscripts

Public Record Office, London

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| C.47 | Chancery, Miscellanea |
| C.64 | Chancery, Norman Rolls |
| C.64/8 - C.64/17 | Norman Rolls |
| C.76 | Chancery, Treaty Rolls |
| C.76/106 - C.76/144 | Treaty Rolls |
| E.28 | Exchequer, Treasury of Receipt, Council and Privy Seal |
| E.101 | Exchequer, Accounts Various |
| E.364 | Exchequer, Foreign Accounts |
| E.403 | Exchequer, Issue Rolls |
| E.404 | Exchequer, Warrants for Issue |
| S.C.8 | Special Collections, Ancient Petitions |

Bodleian Library, Oxford

MS Ashmole 826
MS Carte 176
MSS Dugdale 2, 10

MSS Charters Foreign

Magdalen College Library, Oxford

Fastolf Papers

College of Arms, London

MS L15
MS M16
MS M19

Lambeth Palace Library, London

Lambeth MS 506

B. PRINTED SOURCES

Allmand, C.T. (ed.), Society at War. The Experience of England and France during the Hundred Years War (Edinburgh, 1973).

Allmand, (ed.), 'Documents relating to the Anglo-French Negotiations of 1439', Camden Miscellany, fourth series, xxiv (Royal Historical Society, London, 1972).

Allmand, and Armstrong, C.A.J. (eds.), English Suits before the Parlement of Paris 1420-1436, Camden fourth series, xxvi (Royal Historical Society, London, 1982).

Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions from All Souls MS. 182, ed. M.D. Legge (Anglo-Norman Text Society, iii, Oxford, 1941).

Annuaire du département de la Manche. Rapport de l'archiviste, ed. F. Dubosc (St.-Lô, 1877).

Annual Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, xli, xlii, xliv, xlvi (London, 1880, 1881, 1883, 1887).

Anquetil, E. (ed.), Le Cartulaire ou livre rouge de l'évêché de Bayeux (2 vols., Bayeux, 1908-11).

Basin, T., Histoire de Charles VII, ed. and trans. C. Samaran (2 vols., Paris, 1933, 1944).

Beaucousin, A. (ed.), Registre des fiefs et arrière - fiefs du bailliage de Caux en 1503 (S.H.N., Rouen, 1891).

Boke of Noblesse Addressed to King Edward the Fourth on his Invasion of France in 1475, ed. J.G. Nichols (Roxburghe Club, London, 1860).

Bourdote de Richebourg, C.A., Nouveau coutumier général, ou corps des coutumes générales et particulières de France, iii (Paris, 1724).

Bréard, C., Cartulaires de Saint-Ymer-en-Auge et de Bricquebec (S.H.N., Rouen and Paris, 1908).

Brut, The, or The Chronicles of England, ed. F.W.D. Brie (2 vols., E.E.T.S., London, 1906-8).

Calendar of Letter-Books preserved among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall. Letter-Book I c.1400-1422, ed. R.R. Sharpe (London, 1909).

Calendar of Signet Letters of Henry IV and Henry V (1399-1422), ed. J.L. Kirby (London, 1978).

Calendar of the Close Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office, 1413-1454 (London, 1929-47).

Calendar of the Patent Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office, 1408-1452 (London, 1909).

Catalogue des rolles gascons, normans, et françois, conservés dans les archives de la Tour de Londres, ed. T. Carte (2 vols., London, 1743).

Charma, A., 'Partie des dons faits par Henri V; roi d'Angleterre, lorsqu'il se fut rendu maître de la Normandie', M.S.A.N., 3^e série, xxiii (1858).

Chronicle of John Hardyng, ed. H. Ellis (London, 1812).

Chronicles of London, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1905).

Chronicon Adae de Usk A.D. 1377-1421, ed. and trans. E.M. Thompson (second edn., London, 1904).

Chronique de la Pucelle ou Chronique de Cousinot, ed. M. Vallet de Viriville (Paris, 1859).

Chronique de Mathieu d'Escouchy, ed. G. du Fresne de Beaucourt (3 vols., S.H.F., Paris, 1863-4).

Chronique d'Enguerran de Monstrelet, La, ed. L. Douët d'Arcq (6 vols., S.H.F., Paris, 1857-62).

Chronique du Mont-Saint Michel (1343-1468), ed. S. Luce (2 vols., S.A.T.F., Paris, 1879-83).

Chronique latine inédite de Jean Chartier (1422-1450), ed. C. Samaran (Paris, 1928).

Chronique normande de Pierre Cochon, ed. C. de Robillard de Beaurepaire (Rouen, 1870).

Chroniques du roi Charles VII par Gilles le Bouvier, dit le Héraut Berry, ed. H. Courteault, L. Célier and M.-H. Jullien de Pommerol (S.H.F., Paris, 1979).

Collection générale des documents français qui se trouvent en Angleterre, ed. J. Delpit (Paris, 1847).

Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, ed. G.E. Cockayne et al. (12 vols., London, 1910-59).

Cosneau, E., Les Grands traités de la guerre de Cent Ans (Paris, 1889).

Le Coustumier de la vicomté de Dieppe par Guillaume Tieullier, ed. E. Coppinger (Dieppe, 1884).

Croniques de Normendie (1223-1453), Les, ed. A. Hellot (Rouen, 1881).

Denifle, H.S., La Désolation des églises, monastères et hôpitaux en France pendant la guerre de Cent Ans (2 vols., Paris, 1897-9).

Dillon, V. and Hope, W.H. St. John (eds.), Pageant of the Birth, Life and Death of Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick, K.G., 1389-1439 (London, 1914).

- English Medieval Diplomatic Practice. Part I, Documents and Interpretation, ed. P. Chaplais (2 vols., London, 1982).
- Feet of Fines for Essex, i, ed. R.E.G. Kirk (Colchester, 1910).
- Feet of Fines for Essex, iv, ed. P.H. Reaney and M. Fitch (Colchester, 1964).
- Final Concords of the County of Lincoln A.D. 1244-1272, ii, ed. C.W. Foster (Horncastle, 1920).
- First English Life of King Henry the Fifth, The, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1911).
- Foedera, Conventiones, Literae et cuiuscunque generis acta publica, ed. T. Rymer (third edn., 10 vols., The Hague, 1739-45).
- Four English Political Tracts of the Later Middle Ages, ed. J.-P. Genet, Camden fourth series, xviii (Royal Historical Society, London, 1977).
- Gesta Henrici Quinti. The Deeds of Henry the Fifth, ed. and trans. F. Taylor and J.S. Roskell (Oxford, 1975).
- Great Chronicle of London, The, ed. A.H. Thomas and I.D. Thornley (London, 1938).
- Grey of Ruthin Valor, The, ed. R.I. Jack (Sydney, 1965).
- Gruchy, W.L. de (ed.), L'Ancienne coutume de Normandie (Jersey, 1881).
- Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century, ed. J. Gairdner, Camden new series, xvii (London, 1876).
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, Third Report (London, 1872).
- Hunger, V. (ed.), Quelques actes normandes des XIV^e, XV^e et XVI^e siècles, (3 vols., Paris, 1909-11).
- Inventaire sommaire des archives départementales antérieures à 1790. Série H (St.-Lô, 1942).
- Itineraria Symonis Simeonis et Willelmi de Worcestre, ed. J. Nasmith (Cambridge, 1728).
- Itinerary of John Leland, The, ed. L. Toulmin Smith (5 vols., London, 1906-10).
- Journal de Clément de Fauquembergue, greffier du Parlement de Paris, 1417-1435, ed. A. Tuetey (3 vols., S.H.F., Paris, 1903-15).
- Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris, 1405-1449, ed. A. Tuetey (S.H.P., Paris, 1881).
- Le Cacheux, P. (ed.), Actes de la chancellerie d'Henri VI concernant la Normandie sous la domination anglaise (1422-1435) (2 vols., S.H.N., Rouen and Paris, 1907-8).

Le Cacheux, (ed.), Rouen au temps de Jeanne d'Arc et pendant l'occupation anglaise (1419-1449) (S.H.N., Rouen and Paris, 1931).

Legris, A. (ed.), Le Livre rouge d'Eu 1151-1454 (S.H.N., Rouen and Paris, 1911).

Liber Regie Capelle, a Manuscript in the Biblioteca Publica, Evora, ed. W. Ullmann (Henry Bradshaw Society, xcii, London, 1961).

Longnon, A. (ed.), Paris pendant la domination anglaise (1420-1436). Documents extraits des registres de la chancellerie de France (Paris, 1878).

Mémoires de Pierre de Fenin (1407-1427), ed. Mlle Dupont (S.H.F., Paris, 1837).

Memorials of London and London Life in the XIIIth, XIVth, and XVth Centuries 1276-1419, ed. H.T. Riley (London, 1868).

Ordonnances des rois de France de la troisième race (22 vols., Paris, 1723-1849).

Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century, ed. N. Davis (2 vols., Oxford, 1971-6).

Paston Letters, The, 1422-1509 A.D., ed. J. Gairdner (3 vols., London, 1896).

Pisan, C. de, The Treasure of the City of Ladies; ed. and trans. S. Lawson (London, 1985).

Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England, 1386-1542, ed. N.H. Nicolas (7 vols., London, 1834-7).

Register of Thomas Bekynton, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1443-1465, The, ed. H.C. Maxwell-Lyte and M.C.B. Dawes (2 vols., Somerset Record Society, 1934-5).

Register of Thomas Langley, Bishop of Durham, 1406-1437, The, ed. R.L. Storey (6 vols., Surtees Society, 1956-70).

'Rôles normands et français et autres pièces tirées des archives de Londres par Bréquigny en 1764, 1765 et 1766', ed. L. Puiseux, M.S.A.N., 3^e série, xxiii (1858).

Rotuli Normanniae in Turri Londinensi asservati, Johanne et Henrico Quinto Angliae Regibus, ed. T.D. Hardy (Record Commission, London, 1835).

Rotuli Parliamentorum; ut et petitiones et placita in parlamento (6 vols., London, 1767-77).

St. Albans Chronicle, 1406-1420, The, ed. V.H. Galbraith (Oxford, 1937).

Saige, V.G. (ed.), Cartulaire de la seigneurie de Fontenay le Marmion (Monaco, 1895).

Sauval, H., Histoire et recherches des antiquités de la ville de Paris (3 vols., Paris, 1724).

Select Cases in Chancery A.D. 1364 to 1471, ed. W.P. Baildon (Selden Society, London, 1896).

Select Cases in the Court of King's Bench under Richard II, Henry IV and Henry V, vii, ed. G.O. Sayles (Selden Society, London, 1971).

Serres, L.L. Borelli de, Recherches sur divers services publics du XIII^e au XVII^e siècle (3 vols., Paris, 1895-1909).

Six Town Chronicles of England, ed. R. Flenley (Oxford, 1911).

Statutes of the Realm, ed. A. Luders et al. (11 vols., Record Commission, London, 1810-28).

Stevenson, J. (ed.), 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, R.S., London, 1861-4).

Stow, J., A Survey of London, ed. C.L. Kingsford (2 vols., Oxford, 1908).

Strayer, J.R. (ed.), The Royal Domain in the Bailliage of Rouen (revised edn., London, 1976).

Tardif, E.J. (ed.), Coutumiers de Normandie. Textes critiques publiés avec notes et éclaircissements (Rouen, 1881).

Thomae de Elmham, Vita et Gesta Henrici Quinti, ed. T. Hearne (Oxford, 1727).

Titi Livii Foro-Julienensis Vita Henrici Quinti, ed. T. Hearne (Oxford, 1716).

Un Sire de Gouberville: gentilhomme campagnard au Cotentin de 1553 à 1562, ed. A. Tollemer (Rouen and Paris, 1892).

Upton, N., De Studio Militari, ed. F.P. Barnard (Oxford, 1931).

Vautier, C. (ed.), Extrait du registre des dons, confiscations, maintenues et autres actes faits dans le duché de Normandie pendant les années 1418, 1419, et 1420, par Henri V, Roi d'Angleterre (Paris, 1828).

Waurin, J. de, Recueil des croniques et anchiennes istoires de la Grant Bretagne, a present nomme Engleterre, 1399-1422, 1422-1431, ed. W. and E.L.C.P. Hardy (5 vols., R.S., London, 1864-91).

Worcestre, W., Itineraries, ed. J.H. Harvey (Oxford, 1969).

Ypodigma Neustriae a Thoma Walsingham, ed. H.T. Riley (R.S., London, 1876).

C. SECONDARY SOURCES

Allmand, C.T., Lancastrian Normandy, 1415-1450. The History of a Medieval Occupation (Oxford, 1983).

Allmand, 'The Collection of Dom Lenoir and the English Occupation of Normandy in the Fifteenth Century', Archives, vi (1964).

Allmand, 'War and Profit in the Late Middle Ages', History Today, xv (1965).

Allmand, 'Some Effects of the Last Phase of the Hundred Years' War upon the Maintenance of Clergy', Studies in Church History, iii, ed. G.J. Cuming (Leiden, 1966).

Allmand, 'The Anglo-French Negotiations, 1439', B.I.H.R., xl (1967).

Allmand, 'The Lancastrian Land Settlement in Normandy, 1417-50', Econ. H.R., second series, xxi (1968).

Allmand, 'La Normandie devant l'opinion anglaise à la fin de la guerre de Cent Ans', B.E.C., cxxviii (1970).

Allmand, 'The War and the Non-Combatant', The Hundred Years War, ed. K.A. Fowler (London, 1971).

Allmand, 'The Aftermath of War in Fifteenth-Century France', History, lxi (1976).

Allmand, 'Local Reaction to the French Reconquest of Normandy: the Case of Rouen', The Crown and Local Communities in England and France in the Fifteenth Century, ed. J.R.L. Highfield and R. Jeffs (Gloucester, 1981).

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).

Allmand, 'Henry V the Soldier, and the War in France', Henry V. The Practice of Kingship, ed. G.L. Harriss (Oxford, 1985).

Alsop, J.D., 'A Late Medieval Guide to Land Purchase', Agricultural History, lvii (1983).

Angers, D., La Vicomté de Bayeux au bas moyen-âge. Esquisse d'histoire démographique (1389-1500), Francia, vii (1979).

Angers, 'Mobilité de la population et pauvreté dans une vicomté normande de la fin du moyen-âge', Journal of Medieval History, v (1979).

Anquetil, E., 'Girot Davy de Bayeux. Épisode de l'occupation anglaise au XV^e siècle', B.S.A.N., xxii (1900-1901).

Archives Nationales, Les. État général des fonds, i, L'Ancien régime, ed. E. Taillemite (Paris, 1978).

Armstrong, C.A.J., England, France and Burgundy in the Fifteenth Century (London, 1983).

Armstrong, 'La Double monarchie France-Angleterre et la maison de Bourgogne (1420-1435). Le déclin d'une alliance', Annales de Bourgogne, xxxvii (1965).

Armstrong, 'Sir John Fastolf and the Law of Arms', War, Literature, and Politics in the Late Middle Ages, ed. C.T. Allmand (Liverpool, 1976).

Augis, J., 'La Bataille de Verneuil (jeudi 17 août 1424) vue de Châteaudun', Bulletin trimestriel de la société dunoise, xvi (1933).

Autrand, F., Pouvoir et société en France (XIV^e-XV^e siècles) (Paris, 1974).

Autrand, 'L'Image de la noblesse en France à la fin du moyen âge. Tradition et nouveauté', Comptes rendus de l'académie des inscriptions et belles lettres (1979).

Barabé, A., Recherches historiques sur le tabellionage royal, principalement en Normandie (Rouen, 1863).

Bates, D., Normandy before 1066 (London and New York, 1982).

Baulant, M., 'Le Prix des grains à Paris de 1431 à 1788', Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations, xxiii (1968).

Bean, J.M.W., The Estates of the Percy Family, 1416-1537 (Oxford, 1958).

Bean, 'The Financial Position of Richard, Duke of York', War and Government in the Middle Ages. Essays in Honour of J.O. Prestwich, ed. J. Gillingham and J.C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984).

Beaucousin, A., Histoire de la principauté d'Yvetot. Ses rois, ses seigneurs (Rouen and Yvetot, 1884).

Beaurepaire, C. de Robillard de, Notes et documents concernant l'état des campagnes de la Haute Normandie dans les derniers temps du moyen âge (Evreux, 1865).

Beaurepaire, 'Fondations pieuses du duc de Bedford à Rouen', B.E.C., xxxiv (1873).

Beaurepaire, 'La Normandie pendant l'occupation anglaise', B.S.A.N., xxvii (1909).

Benedict, P., Rouen during the Wars of Religion (Cambridge, 1981).

Bennett, M.J., Community, Class and Careerism. Cheshire and Lancashire Society in the Age of 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight' (Cambridge, 1983).

Besnier, R., La Coutume de Normandie. Histoire externe (Paris, 1935).

Bézar, Y., La Vie rurale dans le sud de la région parisienne de 1450 à 1560 (Paris, 1929).

Billot, C., 'L'Assimilation des étrangers dans le royaume de France aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles', Revue Historique, 548 (1983).

Biscaro, G., 'Il banco Filippo Borromei e compagni di Londra 1436-1439', Archivio Storico Lombardo, 4th series, xix (1913).

Blanchet, F., 'Harfleur du début de la guerre de Cent Ans à la fondation du Havre', Positions des thèses de l'École des Chartes (1929).

Bloch, M., Seigneurie française et manoir anglais (second edn., Paris, 1967).

Bois, G., Crise du féodalisme. Économie rurale et démographie en Normandie orientale du début du XIV^e siècle au milieu du XVI^e siècle (second edn., Paris, 1981), translated as The Crisis of Feudalism (Cambridge and Paris, 1984).

Bois, 'Noblesse et crise des revenus seigneuriaux en France aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles: Essai d'interprétation', La Noblesse au moyen âge XI^e-XV^e siècles. Essais à la mémoire de Robert Boutruche, ed. P. Contamine (Paris, 1976).

Bolton, J.L., The Medieval English Economy 1150-1500 (London and Totowa, 1980).

Borély, A.E., Histoire de la ville du Havre (5 vols., Le Havre, 1880-5).

Bossuat, A., 'Le Rétablissement de la paix sociale sous le règne de Charles VII', Le Moyen Age, lx (1954).

Bossuat, 'Une Famille parisienne pendant l'occupation anglaise au XV^e siècle', Bulletin de la société de l'histoire de Paris et de l'Île de France, lxxxvii-lxxxviii (1960-1).

Bossuat, 'Le Parlement de Paris pendant l'occupation anglaise', Revue Historique, 229 (1963).

Bouard, M. de (ed.), Histoire de la Normandie (Toulouse, 1970).

Boudin, M., 'Du laboureur aisé au gentilhomme campagnard: les Perrote de Cailon de Bretteville l'Orgueilleuse (1380-1480)', Annales de Normandie, xiii (1963).

Bouly de Lesdain, A.-M. (née Tattegrain), 'Le Vexin français sous la domination anglaise (1419-1449)', Positions des thèses de l'École des Chartes, lxxxix (1937).

Bouly de Lesdain, 'Le Vexin français sous la domination anglaise (1419-1449). Répercussions économiques de l'invasion', Mémoires de la société historique et archéologique de Pontoise, du Val d'Oise et du Vexin, lxii (1969).

- Bourassin, E., La France anglaise, 1415-1453. Chronique d'une occupation (Paris, 1981).
- Boussard, J., 'L'Enquête de 1172 sur les services de chevalier en Normandie', Recueil de travaux offert à M. Clovis Brunel (2 vols., Paris, 1955).
- Bouton, A., Le Maine. Histoire économique et sociale, XIV^e, XV^e et XVI^e siècles (Le Mans, 1970).
- Bréard, C., Vieilles rues et vieilles maisons de Honfleur du XV^e siècle à nos jours (Honfleur, 1900).
- Bridbury, A.R., 'The Hundred Years' War: Costs and Profits', Trade, Government, and Economy in Pre-Industrial England. Essays presented to F.J. Fisher, ed. D.C. Coleman and A.H. John (London, 1976).
- Brown, A.L., 'The Authorization of Letters under the Great Seal', B.I.H.R., xxxvii (1964).
- Brown, 'The Privy Seal Clerks in the Early Fifteenth Century', The Study of Medieval Records. Essays in Honour of Kathleen Major, ed. D.A. Bullough and R.L. Storey (Oxford, 1971).
- Bruel, A., Répertoire numérique des archives de la chambre des comptes de Paris. Série P (Paris, 1896).
- Brussel, N., Nouvel examen de l'usage général des fiefs en France pendant le XI le XII le XIII et le XIV^e siècle (2 vols., Paris, 1727).
- Calonne, A. de, La Vie municipale au XV^e siècle dans le nord de la France (Paris, 1880).
- Calonne, Histoire de la ville d'Amiens (3 vols., Amiens, 1899-1906).
- Carabie, R., 'La Constitution d'une fortune immobilière en Normandie pendant la guerre de Cent Ans', Revue historique de droit français et étranger, 4^e série, xxvii (1949).
- Carel, P., Étude sur la commune de Caen (Caen, 1888).
- Caron, M.-T., La Société en France à la fin du moyen âge (Paris, 1977).
- Carpenter, M.C., 'The Beauchamp Affinity: A Study of Bastard Feudalism at Work', E.H.R., xcv (1980).
- Carpenter, C., 'Law, Justice and Landowners in Late Medieval England', Law and History Review, i (1983).
- Carr, A.D., 'Welshmen and the Hundred Years War', Welsh History Review, iv (1968-9).
- Carus-Wilson, E.M., Medieval Merchant Venturers. Collected Studies (London, 1954).

Catto, J., 'The King's Servants', Henry V. The Practice of Kingship, ed. G.L. Harriss (Oxford, 1985).

Cazelles, R., Paris de la fin du règne de Philippe Auguste à la mort de Charles V, 1223-1380 (Paris, 1972).

Charbonnier, P., Une Autre France. La Seigneurie rurale en Basse Auvergne du XIV^e au XVI^e siècle (2 vols., Clermont-Ferrand, 1980).

Charles, R., 'L'Invasion anglaise dans le Maine de 1417 à 1428', Revue historique et archéologique du Maine, xxv (1889).

Chéruef, A., Histoire de Rouen sous la domination anglaise au quinzième siècle (Rouen, 1840).

Chéruef, Histoire de Rouen pendant l'époque communale 1150-1382 (2 vols., Rouen, 1843-4).

Chevalier, B., Tours, ville royale (1356-1520). Origine et développement d'une capitale à la fin du moyen âge (Louvain and Paris, 1975).

Chirol, P., Un Siècle de vandalisme. Rouen disparu (Rouen and Paris, 1929).

Clayton, D., 'Peace Bonds and the Maintenance of Law and Order in Late Medieval England: the Example of Cheshire', B.I.H.R., lviii (1985).

Clough, C.H. (ed.), Profession, Vocation, and Culture in Later Medieval England. Essays Dedicated to the Memory of A.R. Myers, ed. C.H. Clough (Liverpool, 1982).

Contamine, P., Guerre, état, et société à la fin du moyen âge. Études sur les armées des rois de France, 1337-1494 (Paris and The Hague, 1972).

Contamine, La Guerre au moyen âge (Paris, 1980), translated as War in the Middle Ages by M.C.E. Jones (Oxford, 1984).

Contamine, La France au XIV^e et XV^e siècles. Hommes, mentalités, guerre et paix (London, 1981).

Contamine, 'Rançons et butins dans la Normandie anglaise (1424-1444)', Actes du 101^e congrès national des sociétés savantes (Paris, 1978).

Cooper, J.P., 'Patterns of Inheritance and Settlement by Great Landowners from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries', Family and Inheritance. Rural Society in Western Europe 1200-1800, ed. J. Goody, J. Thirsk and E.P. Thompson (Cambridge, 1976).

Critchley, J.S., Feudalism (London, 1978).

Curry, A.E., 'The First English Standing Army? Military Organisation in Lancastrian Normandy, 1420-1450', Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England, ed. C.D. Ross (Gloucester and Totowa, 1979).

Curry, 'L'Éffet de la libération sur l'armée anglaise: les problèmes de l'organisation militaire en Normandie de 1429 à 1435', Jeanne d'Arc. Une époque, un rayonnement (Paris, 1982).

Cursente, B., Les Castelnaux de la Gascogne médiévale. Gascogne gersoise (Bordeaux, 1980).

Cuttler, S.H., The Law of Treason and Treason Trials in Later Medieval France (Cambridge, 1981).

Davies, R.R., Lordship and Society in the March of Wales 1282-1400 (Oxford, 1978).

Davies, 'Baronial Accounts, Incomes and Arrears in the Later Middle Ages', Econ. H.R., second series, xxi (1968).

Davies, 'Colonial Wales', Past and Present, 65 (1974).

Deck, S., La Ville d'Eu. Son histoire, ses institutions (1151-1475) (Paris, 1924).

Deck, 'Les Marchands de Rouen sous les ducs', Annales de Normandie, vi (1956).

Décultot, G., Au Pays de Caux. La Seigneurie du Bec-Crespin en Normandie; le château du Bec; St. Martin du Bec; Notre Dame du Bec; notes historiques (Fécamp, 1970).

Delisle, L., Histoire du château et des sires de Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte (Valognes, 1867).

Delsalle, L.R., Rouen et les Rouennais au temps de Jeanne d'Arc 1400-1470 (Rouen, 1982).

Denquin, M., Calais sous la domination anglaise 1347-1558 (Calais, 1939).

Dickinson, J.G., The Congress of Arras, 1435. A Study in Medieval Diplomacy (Oxford, 1955).

Dictionary of National Biography, ed. L. Stephen and S. Lee (63 vols., London, 1885-1900).

Dictionnaire national des communes de France (twentieth edn., Paris, 1977).

Doucet, R., 'Livre tournois et livre sterling pendant l'occupation anglaise sous Charles VI et Charles VII', Revue numismatique, 4^e série, xxix (1926).

Drouet, A., 'La Domination anglaise à Cherbourg (1418-1450)', Revue d'études normandes, ii (1907-8).

Du Boulay, F.R.H., An Age of Ambition. English Society in the Late Middle Ages (London, 1970).

Du Boulay, 'Who were farming the English demesnes at the end of the Middle Ages?', Econ. H.R., second series, xvii (1964).

Dubuc, A., 'Le Tabellionage rouennais durant l'occupation anglaise (1418-1445)', Bulletin philologique et historique (jusqu'à 1610), année 1967 (Paris, 1969).

Duby, G., Hommes et structures du moyen âge. Recueil d'articles (Paris, 1973).

Dumont, E. and Leger, A., Histoire de la ville d'Harfleur (Le Havre, 1868).

Du Moulin, G., Histoire générale de Normandie (Rouen, 1631).

Dunning, R.W., 'Patronage and Promotion in the Late-Medieval Church', Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England, ed. R.A. Griffiths (Gloucester and Atlantic Highlands, 1981).

Dupont, A., 'La Sergenterie royale et noble de Carentan, Saint-Lô et Le Hommet', Notices, mémoires et documents publiés par la société d'archéologie et d'histoire naturelle du département de la Manche, lxi (1953).

Dupont, 'Pour ou contre le roi d'Angleterre (1426)', B.S.A.N., liv (1957-8).

Durrieu, P., Le Terrier de Marcoussis ou la vie dans ses domaines ruraux d'un grand seigneur français à la fin du XV^e siècle (Paris, 1926).

Dyer, C.C., 'A Small Landowner in the Fifteenth Century', Midland History, i (1972).

Elton, G.R., England 1200-1640 (London, 1969).

Emden, A.B., A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500 (3 vols., Oxford, 1957-9).

Estancelin, L., Histoire des comtes d'Eu (Dieppe and Paris, 1828).

Fallue, L., Histoire politique et religieuse de l'église métropolitaine et du diocèse de Rouen (4 vols., Rouen, 1850-1).

Favier, J., Nouvelle histoire de Paris. Paris au XV^e siècle, 1380-1500 (Paris, 1974).

Favier, La Guerre de Cent Ans (Paris, 1980).

Favier, (ed.), La France médiévale (Paris, 1983).

Fierville, C., 'Histoire généalogique de la maison et de la baronnie de Tournebu', M.S.A.N., 3^e série, xxvi (1869).

Finó, J.-F., Forteresses de la France médiévale. Construction, attaque, défense (third edn., Paris, 1977).

Flammermont, J., 'Histoire de Senlis pendant la seconde partie de la guerre de Cent Ans (1405-1441)', Mémoires de la société de l'histoire de Paris et de l'Île de France, v (1878).

Fontaine de Resbecq, F. de, 'La Basse Normandie, Valognes, pendant la seconde période de la guerre de Cent Ans. Les quatre sièges, les révoltes', Mémoires de la société archéologique, artistique, littéraire et scientifique de l'arrondissement de Valognes, viii (1906).

Fourgous, J., L'Arbitrage dans le droit français aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles (Paris and Toulouse, 1906).

Fournier, G., Le Château dans la France médiévale. Essai de sociologie monumentale (Paris, 1978).

Fourquin, G., Les Campagnes de la région parisienne à la fin du moyen âge (Paris, 1964).

Fowler, K.A. (ed.), The Hundred Years War (London, 1971).

Fowler, The Age of Plantagenet and Valois. The Struggle for Supremacy, 1328-1498 (second edn., London, 1980).

Frame, R., English Lordship in Ireland 1318-1361 (Oxford, 1982).

Froger, L., 'La Paroisse de Pirmil pendant l'invasion anglaise, 1425-1435', Revue historique et archéologique du Maine, xli (1897).

Frondeville, H. de, 'La Vicomté d'Orbec pendant l'occupation anglaise (1417-1449)' and 'Le Compte de Jean le Muet, vicomte d'Orbec, pour la saint-Michel, 1444', Études Lexoviennes, iv (1936).

Gallia Regia, ou état des officiers royaux des bailliages et des sénéchausées de 1328 à 1515, ed. G. Dupont-Ferrier (7 vols., Paris, 1942-66).

Gasté, A., Les Insurrections populaires en Basse-Normandie au XV^e siècle pendant l'occupation anglaise, et la question d'Olivier Basselin (Caen, 1889).

Généstal, R., La Tenure en bourgage. Étude sur la propriété foncière dans les villes normandes (Paris, 1900).

Gillingham, J., The Wars of the Roses. Peace and Conflict in Fifteenth-Century England (London, 1981).

Gillingham, 'Richard I and the Science of War in the Middle Ages', War and Government in the Middle Ages. Essays in Honour of J.O. Prestwich, ed. J. Gillingham and J.C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984).

Goglin, J.-L., 'Thomas Basin, témoin de la misère normande', Annales de Normandie, xxx (1980).

Goineau, F., Gisors, la ville et le bailliage jusqu'à la fin du XV^e siècle (Pontoise, 1937).

- Goodman, A., 'Responses to Requests in Yorkshire for Military Service under Henry V', Northern History, xvii (1981).
- Goujon, A., Histoire de Bernay (Evreux, 1875).
- Gransden, A., Historical Writing in England, ii, c.1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century (London, 1982).
- Green, J.A., 'Lords of the Norman Vexin', War and Government in the Middle Ages. Essays in Honour of J.O. Prestwich, ed. J. Gillingham and J.C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984).
- Griffiths, R.A., The Reign of King Henry VI. The Exercise of Royal Authority, 1422-1461 (London, 1981).
- Griffiths, 'The Glyn Dŵr Rebellion in North Wales through the Eyes of an Englishman', Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies, xxii (1967).
- Guenée, B., L'Occident aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles. Les États (Paris, 1971), translated as States and Rulers in Later Medieval Europe by J. Vale (Oxford, 1985).
- Hale, J., 'War and Public Opinion in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries', Past and Present, 22 (1962).
- Harding, A., A Social History of English Law (London, 1966).
- Harvey, P.D.A. (ed.), The Peasant Land Market in Medieval England (Oxford, 1984).
- Haskins, C.H., Norman Institutions (New York, 1918).
- Haskins, 'Knight-Service in Normandy in the Eleventh Century', E.H.R., xxii (1907).
- Haut-Jussé, B.A.P. du, 'Anne de Bourgogne et le testament de Bedford, 1429', B.E.C., xcv (1934).
- Hay, D., 'The Division of the Spoils of War in Fourteenth-Century England', T.R. Hist. S., fifth series, iv (1954).
- Hedley, W.P., Northumberland Families (2 vols., Newcastle, 1968-70).
- Hellot, A., Essai sur les baillis de Caux de 1204 à 1789, avec documents inédits à l'appui (Paris, 1895).
- Henneman, J.B., 'Nobility, Privilege and Fiscal Politics in Late Medieval France', French Historical Studies, xiii (1983).
- Herval, R., Histoire de Rouen (2 vols., Rouen, 1947-9).
- Hewitt, H.J., The Organization of War under Edward III, 1338-62 (Manchester and New York, 1966).
- Hillairet, J., Dictionnaire historique des rues de Paris (third edn., 2 vols., Paris, 1966).

- Hilton, R.H., A Medieval Society. The West Midlands at the End of the Thirteenth Century (London, 1966).
- Hilton, and Le Goff, J., 'Féodalité and Seigneurie in France and England', Britain and France: Ten Centuries, ed. D.Johnson, F. Crouzet and F. Bédarida (Folkestone, 1980).
- Holdsworth, W.S., An Historical Introduction to the Land Law (Oxford, 1927).
- Holmes, G.A., The Estates of the Higher Nobility in Fourteenth-Century England (Cambridge, 1957).
- Holt, J.C., 'Politics and Property in Early Medieval England', Past and Present, 57 (1972).
- Houard, D., Dictionnaire analytique, historique, étymologique, critique et interprétatif de la coutûme de Normandie (4 vols., Rouen, 1780-82).
- Huard, R., 'La Régence du duc de Bedford à Paris, de 1422 à 1435', Positions des thèses de l'École des Chartes, liii (1902).
- Huguet, A., 'Aspects de la guerre de Cent Ans en Picardie maritime 1400-1450', Mémoires de la société des antiquaires de Picardie, xlviii, 1 (Amiens, 1941, 1944).
- Hunger, V., 'Le Siège et la prise de Vire par Charles VII en 1450', Annales de Normandie, xxi (1971).
- Inventaire sommaire des archives ecclésiastiques de la Seine-Inférieure. Série G, ed. C. de Robillard de Beaurepaire (7 vols., Paris, 1868-1905).
- Jacob, E.F., Henry V and the Invasion of France (London, 1947).
- Jacob, The Fifteenth Century, 1399-1485 (Oxford, 1961).
- Jassemin, H., 'La Chambre des comptes et la gestion des deniers publics au XV^e siècle', B.E.C., xciii (1932).
- Johnston, C.E., 'Sir William Oldhall', E.H.R., xxv (1910).
- Jones, A., 'Land and People at Leighton Buzzard in the Later Fifteenth Century', Econ. H.R., second series, xxv (1972).
- Jones, M.K., 'John Beaufort, Duke of Somerset, and the French Expedition of 1443', Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England, ed. R.A. Griffiths. (Gloucester and Atlantic Highlands, 1981).
- Jonquière, M. de la, 'Les Anglais dans le duché d'Alençon. Sir John Falstaff 1423', Bulletin de la société. historique et archéologique de l'Orne, xii (1893).
- Joubert, A., Les Invasions anglaises en Anjou aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles (Angers, 1872).

Joubert, 'Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire de la guerre de Cent Ans dans le Maine de 1424 à 1452', Revue historique et archéologique du Maine, xxvi (1889).

Jouet, R., La Résistance à l'occupation anglaise en Basse-Normandie (1418-1450) (Caen, 1969).

Jouet, Et la Normandie devint française (Paris, 1983).

Jouet, 'La Ville "anglaise" et la réadaptation au royaume', Histoire de Caen, ed. G. Désert (Toulouse, 1981).

Keen, L., 'The Umfravilles, the Castle and the Barony of Prudhoe, Northumberland', Anglo-Norman Studies V. Proceedings of the Battle Conference 1982, ed. R. Allen Brown (Woodbridge and Totowa, 1983).

Keen, M.H., The Laws of War in the Late Middle Ages (London, 1965).

Keen, Chivalry (New Haven and London, 1984).

Keen, 'Brotherhood in Arms', History, xlvii (1962).

Keen, 'Diplomacy', Henry V. The Practice of Kingship, ed. G.L. Harriss (Oxford, 1985).

Kingsford, C.L., Henry V. The Typical Mediaeval Hero (London, 1901).

Kingsford, English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century (Oxford, 1913).

Kirby, J.L., 'Henry V and the City of London', History Today, xxvi (1976).

Krynén, J., Idéal du prince et pouvoir royal en France à la fin du moyen âge. Étude de la littérature politique du temps (Paris, 1981).

La Clergerie, G.B. de la, Histoire des pays et comté du Perche et duché d'Alençon (Paris, 1620).

Lacour, R., Le Gouvernement de l'apanage de Jean, duc de Berry 1360-1416 (Paris, 1934).

Ladurie, E. Le Roy, 'En Haute-Normandie: Malthus ou Marx?', Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations, xxiii (1978).

Ladurie, and Couperie, P., 'Le Mouvement des loyers parisiens de la fin du moyen âge au XVIII^e siècle', Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations, xxv (1970).

Ladurie, and Goy, J., Tithe and Agrarian History from the Fourteenth to the Nineteenth Centuries. An Essay in Comparative History (Cambridge and Paris, 1982).

La Morandière, G. de, Histoire de la maison d'Estouteville en Normandie (Paris, 1903).

Lander, J.R., Conflict and Stability in Fifteenth-Century England (third edn., London, 1977).

Lander, Government and Community. England 1450-1509 (London, 1980).

La Roque, G.A.A. de, Histoire généalogique de la maison de Harcourt (4 vols., Paris, 1662).

Le Cacheux, P., 'Une Famille normande pendant la guerre de Cent Ans: les Painel', B.S.A.N., xlii (1934).

Le Cacheux, 'L'Organisation judiciaire en Normandie pendant l'occupation anglaise (1419-1449)', Revue historique de droit français et étranger, 4^e série, xv (1936).

Le Foyer, J., 'Réduction contractuelle de rentes seigneuriales pour cause de dommages de guerre en 1424', Revue historique de droit français et étranger, 4^e série, xxvii (1949).

Le Goff, J., 'The Symbolic Ritual of Vassalage', Time, Work and Culture in the Middle Ages, trans. A. Goldhammer (Chicago and London, 1980).

Legras, H., Le Bourgage de Caen. Tenure à cens et tenure à rente (XI^e-XV^e siècles) (Paris, 1911).

Lemarignier, J.-F., La France médiévale: institutions et société (Paris, 1970).

Lennel, F., Histoire de Calais, ii, Calais sous la domination anglaise (Calais, 1910).

Léonard, E.-G., Histoire de la Normandie (fourth edn., Paris, 1972).

Le Patourel, J., The Norman Empire (Oxford, 1976).

Le Patourel, 'L'Occupation anglaise de Calais au XIV^e siècle', Revue du Nord, xxxiii (1951).

Le Pesant, M., 'Les Manuscrits de Dom Lenoir sur l'histoire de Normandie', B.S.A.N., 1 (1946-8).

Le Pesant, 'Répertoire des informations analysées par Dom Lenoir', Cahiers Léopold Delisle, xvi (1967), xviii (1969).

Lepingard, E., 'Les Effets à Saint-Lô de la conquête de la Normandie par les Anglais, 1418-1437', Notices, mémoires et documents publiés par la société d'agriculture, d'archéologie et d'histoire naturelle du département de la Manche, ix (1890).

Lepingard, 'La Baronnie du Hommet: son origine, ses seigneurs', Notices, mémoires et documents de la société d'archéologie et d'histoire naturelle de la Manche, xvii (1899).

Lesquier, J., 'L'Administration et les finances de Lisieux de 1423 à 1448', Études Lexoviennes, ii (1919).

- Lewis, P.S., Later Medieval France. The Polity (London, 1968).
- Lewis, (ed.), The Recovery of France in the Fifteenth Century (London, 1971).
- Lewis, 'Sir John Fastolf's Lawsuit over Titchwell 1448-55', Historical Journal, i (1958).
- Lewis, 'Decayed and Non-Feudalism in Later Medieval France', B.I.H.R., xxxvii (1964).
- Little, R.G., The Parlement of Poitiers. War, Government and Politics in France 1418-1436 (London and New Jersey, 1984).
- Longnon, A., La Formation de l'unité française (Paris, 1922).
- Lot, F. and Fawtier, R., Histoire des institutions françaises au moyen âge, ii, Institutions royales (Paris, 1958).
- Luce, S., 'Philippe le Cat: un complot contre les Anglais à Cherbourg à l'époque de la mission de Jeanne d'Arc', La France pendant la guerre de Cent Ans. Épisodes historiques et vie privée aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles (2 vols., Paris, 1890-3).
- Lyon, B.D., From Fief to Indenture. The Transition from Feudal to Non-Feudal Contract in Western Europe (Cambridge, Mass., 1957).
- McCulloch, D. and Jones, E.D., 'Lancastrian Politics, the French War, and the Rise of the Popular Element', Speculum, lviii (1983).
- McFarlane, K.B., Lancastrian Kings and Lollard Knights (Oxford, 1972).
- McFarlane, The Nobility of Later Medieval England (Oxford, 1973).
- McFarlane, 'Bastard Feudalism', B.I.H.R., xx (1945).
- McFarlane, 'The Investment of Sir John Fastolf's Profits of War', T.R. Hist. S., fifth series, vii (1957).
- McFarlane, 'William Worcester: a Preliminary Survey', Studies presented to Sir Hilary Jenkinson, ed. J. Conway Davies (London, 1957).
- McFarlane, 'War, the Economy and Social Change. England and the Hundred Years War', Past and Present, 22 (1962).
- McFarlane, 'A Business-Partnership in War and Administration, 1421-1445', E.H.R., lxxviii (1963).
- Mackay, A., Spain in the Middle Ages. From Frontier to Empire 1000-1500 (London, 1977).
- Manneville, C.A.A. de, De l'état des terres et des personnes dans la paroisse d'Amblainville (Vexin Français) du XII^e au XV^e siècle (Beauvais, 1890).

- Massey, R.A., 'The Land Settlement in Lancastrian Normandy', Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History, ed. A.J. Pollard (Gloucester and New York, 1984).
- Masson d'Autume, M. de, Cherbourg pendant la guerre de Cent Ans de 1354 à 1450 (Cherbourg, 1948).
- Matthew, D., The Norman Monasteries and their English Possessions (Oxford, 1962).
- Matthew, E., 'The Financing of the Lordship of Ireland under Henry V and Henry VI', Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History, ed. A.J. Pollard (Gloucester and New York, 1984).
- Maxwell-Lyte, H.C., Historical Notes on the Use of the Great Seal of England (London, 1926).
- Meyer, E., Histoire de la ville de Vernon et de son ancien châtelainie (2 vols., Les Andelys, 1874-6).
- Mirot, L., Manuel de géographie historique de la France (second edn., 2 vols., Paris, 1947-50).
- Mollat, G., 'Le Droit de patronage en Normandie du XI^e au XV^e siècle', Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, xxxiii (1937), xxxiv (1938).
- Mollat, M., Le Commerce maritime normand à la fin du moyen âge. Étude d'histoire économique et sociale (Paris, 1952).
- Mollat, Genèse médiévale de la France moderne. XIV^e-XV^e siècle (Paris, 1977).
- Mollat, 'Une Expansion différée par la guerre (1382 - environ 1475)', Histoire de Rouen, ed. M. Mollat (Toulouse, 1979).
- Morel, O., La Grande chancellerie royale et l'expédition des lettres royaux (1328-1400) (Paris, 1900).
- Musset, L., 'Y eut-il une réaction seigneuriale dans le nord du Cotentin sous l'occupation anglaise?', Annales de Normandie, xiii (1963).
- Musset, 'Rouen au temps des Francs et sous les ducs', Histoire de Rouen, ed. M. Mollat (Toulouse, 1979).
- Myers, A.R., England in the Late Middle Ages (eighth edn., London, 1971).
- Myers, Crown, Household and Parliament in Fifteenth Century England, ed. C.H. Clough (London and Ronceverte, 1985).
- Myers, '"A Vous Entier". John of Lancaster, duke of Bedford, 1389-1435', History Today, x (1960).
- Neveux, F., 'Les Marginaux et le clergé dans la ville et le diocèse de Bayeux au XIV^e et XV^e siècles', Marginalité, déviance, pauvreté en France XIV^e-XIX^e siècles (Caen, 1981).

- Neveux, H., 'Déclin et reprise: la fluctuation biséculaire 1330-1560!', Histoire de la France rurale, ed. G. Duby and A. Wallon (4 vols., Paris, 1975-6).
- Newhall, R.A., The English Conquest of Normandy, 1416-1424. A Study in Fifteenth-Century Warfare (New Haven, 1924).
- Newhall, Muster and Review. A Problem of English Military Administration, 1420-1440 (Cambridge, Mass., 1940).
- Newhall, 'Henry V's Policy of Conciliation in Normandy, 1417-1422', Anniversary Essays in Mediaeval History by Students of Charles Homer Haskins, ed. C.H. Taylor (Boston and New York, 1929).
- Nicolas, N.H., History of the Battle of Agincourt and of the Expedition of Henry the Fifth into France in 1415 (third edn., London, 1833).
- Nortier, M., 'Recherches sur l'étendue, les subdivisions et la population des vicomtés de Caen et de Falaise au XIV^e siècle', B.S.A.N., liv (1957-8).
- Nortier, 'Le Sort des archives dispersées de la chambre des comptes de Paris', B.E.C., cxxiii (1965).
- Odolant-Desnos, P.-J., Mémoires historiques sur la ville d'Alençon et sur ses seigneurs (2 vols., Alençon, 1787).
- Orme, N.I., English Schools in the Middle Ages (London, 1973).
- Orme, From Childhood to Chivalry. The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy 1066-1530 (London and New York, 1984).
- Otway-Ruthven, J., The King's Secretary and the Signet Office in the XV Century (Cambridge, 1939).
- Otway-Ruthven, A.J., A History of Medieval Ireland (second edn., London, 1980).
- Otway-Ruthven, 'Knight Service in Ireland', Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, lxxxix (1959).
- Périaux, N., Dictionnaire indicateur et historique des rues et places de Rouen. Revue de ses monuments et de ses établissements publics (Rouen, 1870).
- Perroy, E., The Hundred Years War, trans. W.B. Wells (London, 1951).
- Perroy, 'Feudalism or Principalities in Fifteenth Century France', B.I.H.R., xx (1943-5).
- Plaisse, A., La Baronnie du Neubourg. Essai d'histoire agraire, économique et sociale (Paris, 1961).

- Planchenault, R., 'La Conquête du Maine par les Anglais. La campagne de 1424-1425', Revue historique et archéologique du Maine, 2^e série, v (1925).
- Planchenault, 'La Conquête du Maine par les Anglais. Les campagnes de Richemont (1425-1427)', Revue historique et archéologique du Maine, 2^e série, xiii (1933).
- Planchenault, 'La Conquête du Maine par les Anglais. La lutte des partisans (1427-1429)', Revue historique et archéologique du Maine, 2^e série, xvii (1937), xviii (1938).
- Pollard, A.J., John Talbot and the War in France, 1427-1453 (London and New Jersey, 1983).
- Pollard, 'Estate Management in the Later Middle Ages: the Talbots and Whitchurch, 1383-1525', Econ. H.R., second series, xxv (1972).
- Postan, M.M., 'The Fifteenth Century', Econ. H.R., ix (1939).
- Postan, 'Some Social Consequences of the Hundred Years War', Econ. H.R., xii (1942).
- Postan, 'The Costs of the Hundred Years War', Past and Present, 27, (1964).
- Powell, E., 'Arbitration and the Law in England in the Late Middle Ages', T.R. Hist. S., fifth series, xxxiii (1983).
- Powicke, F.M., The Loss of Normandy. Studies in the History of the Angevin Empire (Manchester, 1913).
- Powicke, M.R., 'Lancastrian Captains', Essays in Medieval History presented to Bertie Wilkinson, ed. T.A. Sandquist and M.R. Powicke (Toronto, 1969).
- Prestwich, J.O., 'Anglo-Norman Feudalism and the Problem of Continuity', Past and Present, 26 (1963).
- Puiseux, L., L'Émigration normande et la colonisation anglaise en Normandie au XV^e siècle (Caen and Paris, 1866).
- Puiseux, Siège et prise de Rouen par les Anglais (1418-1419) (Caen, 1867).
- Puiseux, 'Des Insurrections populaires en Normandie pendant l'occupation anglaise au XV^e siècle', M.S.A.N., 2^e série, ix (1851).
- Puiseux, 'Prise de Caen par les Anglais en 1417', M.S.A.N., 3^e série, xxii (1856).
- Quenedey, R., L'Habitation rouennaise. Étude d'histoire, de géographie et d'archéologie urbaines (Rouen, 1926).
- Rahtz, P.A., 'Medieval Milling', Medieval Industry, ed. D.W. Crossley (Council for British Archaeology Research Report no. 40, London, 1981).

- Rawcliffe, C., The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521 (Cambridge, 1978).
- Reeves, A.C., Lancastrian Englishmen (Washington, 1981).
- Régnier, L., 'Devis pour la construction d'une maison forte à Elbeuf-sur-Seine pendant l'occupation anglaise du quinzième siècle', Mélanges de la société de l'histoire de Normandie, vi (1906).
- Reynaud, M., 'Le Service féodal en Anjou et Maine à la fin du moyen âge', Cahiers d'histoire, xvi (1971).
- Reynolds, S., Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900-1300 (Oxford, 1984).
- Richmond, C.F., John Hopton. A Fifteenth Century Suffolk Gentleman (Cambridge, 1981).
- Richmond, 'The War at Sea', The Hundred Years War, ed. K.A. Fowler (London, 1971).
- Robert, P., 'L'Armée et les institutions militaires en Normandie sous la régence de Bedford, 1422-35', Positions des thèses de l'École des Chartes (1939).
- Rogozinski, J., Power, Caste and Law. Social Conflict in Fourteenth-Century Montpellier (Cambridge, Mass., 1982).
- Rosenthal, J.T., 'Fifteenth-Century Baronial Incomes and Richard, duke of York', B.I.H.R., xxxvii (1964).
- Rosenthal, 'The Estates and Finances of Richard, Duke of York (1411-60)', Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History, ii, ed. W.M. Bowsky (Nebraska, 1965).
- Roskell, J.S., The Commons and their Speakers in English Parliaments, 1376-1523 (Manchester, 1965).
- Roskell, 'Three Wiltshire Speakers', Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine, lvi (1956).
- Roskell, 'Sir John Popham, knight-banneret, of Charford', Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society, xxi, part i (1958).
- Roskell, 'William Allington of Horseheath, Speaker in the Parliament of 1429-30', Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, lii (1959).
- Roskell, 'Sir William Oldhall, Speaker in the Parliament of 1450-51', Nottingham Medieval Studies, v (1961).
- Ross, C.D., Richard III (London, 1981).
- Ross, The Estates and Finances of Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, Dugdale Society Occasional Papers, no. 12 (1956).

Ross, and Pugh, T.B., 'Materials for the Study of Baronial Incomes in Fifteenth-Century England', Econ. H.R., second series, vi (1953).

Rowe, B.J.H., 'Discipline in the Norman Garrisons under Bedford, 1422-35', E.H.R., xlvi (1931).

Rowe, 'The Estates of Normandy under the Duke of Bedford, 1422-1435', E.H.R., xlvi (1931).

Rowe, 'The Grand Conseil under the Duke of Bedford, 1422-35', Oxford Essays in Medieval History presented to H.E. Salter, ed. F.M. Powicke (Oxford, 1934).

Rowney, I., 'Arbitration in Gentry Disputes of the Later Middle Ages', History, lxvii (1982).

Sadourny, A., 'Les Rentes à Rouen au XIII^e siècle', Annales de Normandie, xxi (1971).

Salch, C.-L., Dictionnaire des châteaux et des fortifications du moyen âge en France (Strasbourg, 1979).

Saul, N., Knights and Esquires: The Gloucestershire Gentry in the Fourteenth Century (Oxford, 1981).

See, H., Les Classes rurales et le régime domanial en France au moyen âge (Paris, 1901).

Smith, A., 'Litigation and Politics: Sir John Fastolf's Defence of his English Property', Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History, ed. A.J. Pollard (Gloucester and New York, 1984).

Spufford, P. (ed.), Handbook of Medieval Exchange (Royal Historical Society, London, 1986).

Strayer, J.R., The Administration of Normandy under Saint Louis (Cambridge, Mass., 1932).

Strong, P. and Strong, F., 'The Last Will and Codicils of Henry V', E.H.R., xcvi (1981).

Sweeney, J.R., 'High Justice in Fifteenth-Century Normandy: the Prosecution of Sandrin Bourel', Journal of Medieval History, x (1984).

Tait, J., The Medieval English Borough. Studies on its Origins and Constitutional History (Manchester and New York, 1936).

Talbot, C.H. and Hammond, E.A., The Medical Practitioners of Medieval England. A Biographical Register (London, 1965).

Talbot, H., The English Achilles. An Account of the Life and Campaigns of John Talbot, 1st Earl of Shrewsbury (1383-1453) (London, 1981).

Tardif, L., 'Les Seigneurs et les capitaines du château de Chanteloup pendant l'occupation anglaise, 1418-49', Le Pays de Granville, ix (1913).

- Tessier, G., Diplomatique royale française (Paris, 1962).
- Touchard, H., Le Commerce maritime breton à la fin du moyen âge (Paris, 1967).
- Triger, R., 'Sainte-Suzanne aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles', Revue historique et archéologique du Maine, lxi (1907).
- Vale, M.G.A., English Gascony, 1399-1453. A Study of War, Government and Politics during the Later Stages of the Hundred Years' War (Oxford, 1970).
- Vale, Charles VII (London, 1974).
- Vale, War and Chivalry. Warfare and Aristocratic Culture in England, France and Burgundy at the End of the Middle Ages (London, 1981).
- Vale, 'Sir John Fastolf's "Report" of 1435: A New Interpretation Reconsidered', Nottingham Medieval Studies, xvii (1973).
- Vaughan, R., Philip the Good. The Apogee of Burgundy (London, 1970).
- Veyrat, M., Essai chronologique et biographique sur les baillis de Rouen (de 1171 à 1790) (Rouen, 1953).
- Vickers, K.H., Humphrey Duke of Gloucester. A Biography (London, 1907).
- Walker, S., 'Profit and Loss in the Hundred Years War: the Subcontracts of Sir John Strother, 1374', B.I.H.R., lviii (1985).
- Waugh, W.T., 'The Administration of Normandy, 1420-1422', Essays in Medieval History presented to T.F. Tout, ed. A.G. Little and F.M. Powicke (Manchester, 1925).
- White, S.D., 'The Settlement of Disputes by Compromise in Eleventh-Century Western France', American Journal of Legal History, xxii (1978).
- Wilkins, N., 'Music and Poetry at Court: England and France in the Late Middle Ages', English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages, ed. V.J. Scattergood and J.W. Sherborne (London, 1983).
- Wilkinson, B., The Chancery under Edward III (Manchester, 1929).
- Williams, E. Carleton, My Lord of Bedford 1389-1435 (London, 1963).
- Wolffe, B.P., The Royal Demesne in English History. The Crown Estate in the Governance of the Realm from the Conquest to 1509 (London, 1971).
- Wolffe, Henry VI (London, 1981).
- Wright, N.A.R., 'French Peasants in the Hundred Years War', History Today, xxxiii (1983).
- Wright, '"Pillagers" and "brigands" in the Hundred Years War', Journal of Medieval History, ix (1983).

Wright, S.M., The Derbyshire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century (Chesterfield, 1983).

Wylie, J.H., 'Notes on the Agincourt Roll', T.R. Hist. S., third series, v (1911).

Wylie, and Waugh, W.T., The Reign of Henry the Fifth (3 vols., Cambridge, 1914-29).

Yver, J., 'Notes sur la justice seigneuriale en Normandie au XIII^e siècle', Revue historique de droit français et étranger, xxxvii (1959).

D. THESES

Allmand, C.T., 'The Relations between the English Government, the Higher Clergy, and the Papacy in Normandy, 1417-1450' (unpublished University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1963).

Barron, C.M., 'The Government of London and its Relations with the Crown, 1400-1450' (unpublished University of London Ph.D. thesis, 1970).

Bennett, M.J., 'Late Medieval Society in North-West England: Cheshire and Lancashire, 1375-1425' (University of Lancaster Ph.D. thesis, 1975).

Burney, E.M., 'The English Rule in Normandy, 1435-1450' (unpublished University of Oxford B.Litt. thesis, 1957).

Carpenter, M.C., 'Political Society in Warwickshire, c.1401-1472' (unpublished University of Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1976).

Chrimes, S.B., 'John, First Duke of Bedford. His Work and Policy in England, 1389-1435' (unpublished University of London M.A. thesis, 1929).

Coulson, C.L.H., 'Seigneurial Fortresses in France in Relation to Public Policy c.864 - c.1483' (unpublished University of London Ph.D. thesis, 2 vols., 1972).

Curry, A.E., 'Military Organization in Lancastrian Normandy 1422-1450' (unpublished C.N.A.A. Ph.D. thesis, 2 vols., 1985).

Fagan, E.H. de L., 'Some Aspects of the King's Household in the Reign of Henry V, 1413-22' (unpublished University of London M.A. thesis, 1935).

Gorman, V.J., 'The Public Career of Richard, Duke of York. A Case Study of the Nobility of the Fifteenth Century' (unpublished Catholic University of America Ph.D. thesis, 1981).

James, L.E., 'The Career and Political Influence of William de la Pole, 1st Duke of Suffolk, 1437-1450' (unpublished University of Oxford M.Litt. thesis, 1979).

Johnson, P., 'The Political Career of Richard, Duke of York, to 1456' (unpublished University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1981).

Jones, M.K., 'The Beaufort Family and the War in France, 1421-1450' (unpublished University of Bristol Ph.D. thesis, 1982).

Kirby, J.L., 'The Hungerford Family in the Later Middle Ages' (unpublished University of London M.A. thesis, 1939).

Marshall, A., 'The Role of English War Captains in England and Normandy, 1436-1461' (unpublished University of Wales M.A. thesis, 1975).

Morgan, P.J., 'Military Service in Late Medieval Cheshire, 1277-1403' (unpublished University of London Ph.D. thesis, 1983).

Pollard, A.J., 'The Family of Talbot, Lords Talbot and Earls of Shrewsbury in the Fifteenth Century' (unpublished University of Bristol Ph.D. thesis, 2 vols., 1968).

Ratcliffe, H.L., 'The Military Expenditure of the English Crown 1422-1435' (unpublished University of Oxford M.Litt. thesis, 1979).

Rowe, B.J.H., 'John, Duke of Bedford, as Regent of France (1422-1435): his Policy and Administration in the North' (unpublished University of Oxford B.Litt. thesis, 1927).

Thompson, G.L., 'The Anglo-Burgundian Régime in Paris, 1420-1436' (unpublished University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1984).

Woodger, L.S., 'Henry Bourgchier, Earl of Essex, and his Family (1408-1483)' (unpublished University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1974).