LEABHARLANN CHOLÁISTE NA TRÍONÓIDE, BAILE ÁTHA CLIATH
Ollscoil Átha Cliath
TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY DUBLIN
The University of Dublin

Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.

Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

Thomas of Lancaster, Duke of Clarence 1388 - 1421

The Consolidation of the Lancastrian Dynasty

Trinity College Library Dublin

University of Dublin

THIS THESIS MAY BE READ ONLY

IN THE LIBRARY

Trinity College Library College Street Dublin 2 Ireland

Thomas of Lancaster, Duke of Clarence

1388 – 1421

The consolidation of the Lancastrian dynasty

Thesis submitted for the degree of Ph.D.

by

Brian Blacker

Trinity College Dublin
Department of Medieval History
November 1996

TRINITY COLLEGE
06 MAY 1997
LIBRARY DUBLIN

THESIS
4398

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ..... p. i
Declaration ..... p. ii
Summary ..... p. iii
Abbreviations ..... p. iv

Introduction ..... p. 1

Chapter 1
Thomas of Lancaster, 1388-1401: The establishment of the Lancastrian dynasty ..... p. 11

Chapter 2
Thomas of Lancaster as lieutenant of Ireland. ..... p. 33

Chapter 3
The reign of Henry IV, 1403–12 ..... p. 81

Chapter 4
The expedition to France, 1412-13 ..... p. 109

Chapter 5
The reign of Henry V. Thomas, duke of Clarence and the conquest of Normandy ..... p. 123

Chapter 6
The lands of Thomas of Lancaster, duke of Clarence ..... p. 157

Conclusion ..... p. 180
Appendix: John, the bastard of Clarence ..... p. 186
Bibliography ..... p. 189

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my thanks to all those who helped in the preparation and completion of this thesis. Firstly I would like to thank the staff of the Dept. of Medieval History at Trinity College, Dublin, for their support and encouragement throughout the past five years. My greatest academic debt is to my supervisor, Prof. Christine Meek, who first pointed me in the direction of Thomas of Lancaster, and without whom, it is safe to say, this work would not have been completed. Thanks are also due to Prof. J.F. Lydon, who has always shown tremendous enthusiasm for this work, and to Dr. Seán Duffy, who has always shown me his support. I am grateful to both Dr. Dorothy Johnston, of the University of Nottingham, and Dr. Philomena Connolly, of the National Archives in Dublin, for providing me with invaluable manuscript references.

The staff of the Library of Trinity College Dublin, the staff of the Public Record Office in London and the staff of the British Library are also due thanks for the help they have provided in finishing this work. I would like to express my gratitude to the Graduate Studies Office of Trinity College and to the Grace Lawless Lee Fund for providing the means by which I had access to the manuscript sources in London.

I would also like to thank my fellow post-graduate students in the department of Medieval History, whose help, encouragement and good humour have helped to see me through the past five years. In particular I must express my gratitude to Cormac Ó Cléirigh, Dr. Mario Sughi, Anne Kavanagh, Linzi Simpson, Dr. Annette Kehnel, David Beresford and Sharon Weadick, but especially to Bronagh Ní Chonaill for proof-reading the final draft of this work. I would also like to thank Yvonne Colucci for helping me with translations. My thanks are also due to Gareth and Susan for providing me with accommodation during my periods of research in London.

My most profound debt of gratitude is to my parents whose support over the last five years, and particularly in the final months of this work, has been above and beyond what I could have ever expected.

Declaration

I, Brian Blacker, declare that none of the material contained in this thesis has been submitted for another degree at any other institution, and that the research contained herein is entirely my own.

I hereby agree that the Library of Trinity College Dublin may lend or copy this thesis upon request.

Brian Blacker.

Brian Blacker

Summary

Thomas of Lancaster, duke of Clarence, 1388-1421

Brian Blacker

This thesis is a study of the life and career of Thomas, duke of Clarence, the second son of King Henry IV of England. The thesis has two main aims. Firstly, it will attempt to provide a reasonably coherent account of the most important events of Clarence's life. Thus, it will describe his early life and how his father's involvement in the politics of the era led to Clarence's elevation to royal blood. The main emphasis of the work is on Clarence's career of service to the crown, in particular in Ireland and in France. The impact of Clarence's activities has been too often underrated and he has been overshadowed by the achievements of his brother, Henry V. This work sheds light upon a much-neglected aspect of the history of the house of Lancaster.

The second aim of this work is to assess Clarence's career and its effect on the attempts by Henry IV, and later by Henry V, to consolidate the hold of a usurper dynasty upon the throne of England. Clarence's entire career was based in the service of the Lancastrian dynasty and he served his father and brother both at home and abroad in establishing the dynasty on a more secure footing.

Abbreviations

AC	*Annála Connacht : the Annals of Connacht, A.D. 1224 –1544.* Ed. A. M. Freeman. Dublin, 1944.
AClon	*The annals of Clonmacnoise,* ed. D. Murphy, R.S.A.I., 1896.
AFM	*Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters,* ed. J. O'Donovan, 7 vols., Dublin, 1848-51, repr. Dublin, 1990.
ALC	*The annals of Loch Cé: a chronicle of Irish affairs, 1014-1590,* ed. W.M. Hennessy, 2 vols., R.S., London, 1871.
AU	*Annála Uladh: Annals of Ulster: a chronicle of Irish affairs, 431 to 1541,* ed. W.M. Hennessy and B. MacCarthy, Dublin, 4 vols., 1887-91.
Cal. Carew	*Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts preserved in the Archiepiscopal library at Lambeth,* ed. J.S. Brewer & W. Bullen, P.R.O., London, 1867-73.
C.C.R.	*Calendar of close rolls,* London, 1927-32.
C.Ch.R.	*Calendar of charter rolls, 1341-1417,* London, 1916.
C.F.R.	Calendar of fine Rolls, London, 1911-62.
C.I.P.M.	*Calendars of inquisitions post*

	mortem and other analogous documents ..., London, 1909-88.
C.P.L.	*Calendar of entries in the papal registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland.* London & Dublin, 1893–.
C.P.R.	*Calendar of patent rolls,* London, 1903-11.
CS	*Camden Society*
CYS	*Canterbury and York Society*
DKR 41	*Forty–first report of the Deputy Keeper of the public records* (London, 1880).
DKR 42	*Forty–second report of the Deputy Keeper of the public records* (London, 1881).
DNB	*Dictionary of National Biography*
EETS	*Early English Texts Society*
EHR	*English Historical Review*
Gregory's Chronicle	'William Gregory's Chronicle of London' in *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the fifteenth Century*. ed. J. Gairdner, C.S., London, 1876.
IHS	*Irish Historical Studies*
IMC	*Irish Manuscripts Commission*
JRSAI	*Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*
Kirby, *Henry IV*	Kirby, J.L., *Henry IV of England,* London, 1970.
Marleburrough, *Chronicle*	Henry of Marlborough, Chronicle of Ireland, in

	Ancient Irish Histories, ed. Sir James Ware, Dublin, 1809.
MIA	*Miscellaneous Irish annals, (A. D. 1114-1437)*, ed. S. Ó hInnse, Dublin, 1947.
Monstrelet, *Chronique*	*Chronique d'Enguerran de Monstrelet*, ed. L. Douet d'Arcq, S.H.F., 1859-62.
Otway-Ruthven, Chief governors	Otway-Ruthven, A.J., 'The Chief Governors of Mediaeval Ireland', *Journ. R.S.A.I.*, 95, 1965.
Otway-Ruthven, *Med. Ire.*	Otway-Ruthven, A.J., *A History of Medieval Ireland*, 2nd ed., Dublin, 1980.
P.P.C.	*Proceedings and ordinances of the Privy Council of England*, ed. N.H. Nicholas, London, 1834.
Richardson & Sayles, *The Irish parl.*	Richardson, H.G., and Sayles, G.O., *The Irish Parliament in the Middle Ages*, Philadelphia, 1952.
Rot. Pat. Hib.	*Rotulorum Patentium et Clausorum Cancellarie Hibernie Calendarium*, ed. E. Tresham, Irish Record Commission, 1828.
RN	*Rotuli Normanniae*, ed. Sir T.D. Hardy, London, 1835.
RS	*Rolls Series*
Rymer, *Foedera*	Rymer, Thomas, *Foedera, conventiones, literae, et cujuscunque generis acta*

	publica, London, 1816–69.
SHF	*Société de l'Histoire de France*
Stats. Ire. John-Hen. V	*Statues and ordinances, and acts of the parliament of Ireland, king John to Henry V*, ed. H.F. Berry, Dublin, 1907.
The First English life	*The First English life of king Henry the Fifth*, ed. C.L. Kingsford, Oxford, 1911.
TRHS	*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*
Waurin, *Chronicles and ancient histories*	Waurin, Jean de, *Chronicles and ancient histories of Great Britain, now called England*, ed. W. Hardy & E.L.C.P. Hardy, R.S., London, 1887-91.
Wylie, *Henry IV*	Wylie, J.H., *A History of England under Henry IV*, 4 vols., 1884-98.
Wylie & Waugh, *Hen. V*	Wylie, J.H., and Waugh, W.T., *The Reign of Henry the fifth*, 3 vols., Cambridge, 1914-29.

Introduction.

> By his first wife Mary, daughter of the earl of Hereford, the king [Henry IV] had four sons who were illustrious among the princes of the World....The second was Thomas, duke of Clarence, who was a distinguished conqueror of all men who opposed him, and a most amiable friend of all who were connected with him whatever might be their claim to his benevolence.[1]

Thomas of Lancaster, second duke of Clarence, has recently been described as 'one of the least studied members of the house of Lancaster' and as a man whose 'career serves to illustrate the reverse side of the glory sought and temporarily attained by Henry V'.[2] There has been no modern study of Clarence since the early years of this century and the belief that he 'spent the whole of his relatively short life in the shadow of [his] elder brother'[3] would seem to be well founded. However, to his contemporaries Clarence was certainly not a marginal figure and his prominent role in his brother's French campaigns won him great acclaim. One chronicle, reporting the reaction of Henry V to Clarence's death, records that the king was grief-stricken at his brother's funeral 'and not without cause, for it was he in whom he had the greatest hope for the success of his undertaking'.[4] Why, then, has Clarence sunk into relative obscurity? Both of his younger brothers, John, duke of Bedford, and Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, have been the subjects of biographies and much other scholarship,[5] while Clarence seems to be worthy of study only in the context of his relationship with his elder brother, Henry V, or in his role as one of Henry's captains in the French campaigns which were launched in 1415.

---

1 *John Capgrave's book of the illustrious Henries*, ii, pp. 116-17.

2 Clayton, D.J., Davies, R.G., McNiven, P., ed., *Trade, devotion and governance*, p. ix.

3 ibid.

4 Jean de Waurin, *Chronicles and ancient histories*, ii, p. 338.

5 Williams, E.C., *My lord of Bedford*; Vickers, K., *Humphrey duke of Gloucester*.

It is only recently that the expedition which Clarence led to France in 1412 has received the attention which it merits,[6] while the period which he spent as lieutenant of Ireland is covered in a matter of pages, usually with the emphasis on his absenteeism and his chronic financial problems.[7]

The judgements passed by modern historians on Clarence have been harsh, and this can be attributed primarily to the manner of his death at the battle of Baugé in 1421. Clarence's defeat at Baugé has been attributed to 'his own impatience and his anxiety to win a victory which might compare to Agincourt'.[8] Another account of the battle blames the English defeat on Clarence's 'suicidal perversity' and concludes with the statement that 'except when actually giving and receiving blows, Clarence cuts an amazingly poor figure'.[9] The actions of Clarence at Baugé were 'over-bold and met with complete and disastrous failure'.[10] While the blame for the defeat at Baugé can only be laid with Clarence it seems unfair to judge the rest of his life and career on the outcome of this battle and to neglect his more positive achievements. While Clarence was certainly foolish and reckless at Baugé, it must be remembered that he had been appointed as military commander in France by Henry V. It seems most unlikely that the king would have left Clarence in charge of the army if he had had any doubts about his brother's abilities. Indeed, Clarence's previous record of service in France can only have inspired confidence in him. He played a pivotal role in the siege and capture of Caen in 1417 and his campaign during the spring of 1418 secured the approach of the English army to Rouen. As captain of the vanguard of the English army a certain degree of risk-taking was required on Clarence's part. When successful, these risks can be described as bold and imaginative and as examples of Clarence's flair as a military commander. On the other hand, when unsuccessful, as at Baugé, these risks are indicative of Clarence's recklessness and irresponsibility and show his fatal disregard for tactics and strategy in his overwhelming thirst for glory. If Henry V had been defeated at Agincourt, as he

---

6 Milner, J., 'The English enterprise in France, 1412-13', in *Trade, devotion and governance*, ed. Clayton, Davies and McNiven.

7 Otway-Ruthven, A.J., *A history of medieval Ireland*, pp. 341-6; Lydon, J.F., *The lordship of Ireland in the middle ages*, pp. 244-7; Cosgrove, A., 'The emergence of the Pale, 1399-1447', in *A new history of Ireland, ii, the middle ages*, pp. 537-8, 544.

8 *Dictionary of National Biography*, xix, p. 639.

9 Wylie, J.H., & Waugh, W.T., *The reign of Henry the fifth*, iii, p. 309.

10 Newhall, R.A., *The English conquest of Normandy*, p. 276.

so easily could have been, would he ever have been described as 'the greatest man that ever ruled England?[11] It is unlikely. However, Henry V won that battle and this fact must be taken into consideration when discussing Clarence's decisions before Baugé. The victory at Agincourt, the collapse of Normandy in the face of English armies between 1417 and 1420 and the recognition of Henry V as the heir to the French throne must have surely inculcated a sense of invincibility amongst the English captains. Up until 1421 the English had suffered no real setback in France, and this surely had an impact on Clarence. The presence of the enemy force at Baugé gave Clarence the opportunity to make up for his absence from the battle of Agincourt. To his contemporaries Clarence was a great captain, 'a knight no less renowned in the practice of war than for personal courage'[12] and a man who was renowned for his prudence and skill in arms.[13]

Thus, it is the aim of this work to assess the life and career of Clarence and to examine his role, not just in the French wars, but also as lieutenant of Ireland and in the attempts of the Lancastrian dynasty to secure its hold on the throne of England. From this account it will be possible to examine the importance of Clarence's position during the reigns of his father and his brother and to rescue him from the obscurity to which he has unfairly been consigned.

The sources used in the preparation of this work fall into two main categories, the first being the official records of government of the period and the second being contemporary, or near-contemporary, chronicles and annals. Of the records of government, both printed and manuscript sources have been used extensively. Of the printed and calendared sources particular use has been made of the Calendar of Patent Rolls and the Calendar of Close Rolls, which have been invaluable in trying to recreate the outline of Clarence's career.[14] The records of the Privy Council also contain important information, which is particularly relevant to Clarence's financial difficulties.[15] The rolls of parliament have also proved useful.[16] For his career in Ireland the most

---

11 McFarlane, K.B., *Lancastrian kings and Lollard knights*, p. 133.

12 *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, p. 33.

13 *Chronique d'Enguerran de Monstrelet*, iv, p. 24.

14 *C.P.R.; C.C.R.*

15 *P.P.C.*

16 *Rotuli Parliamentorum.*

important printed source has been the edition of the Irish patent and close rolls, and reference has also been made to the statutes of Ireland.[17] Clarence's involvement in the French campaigns of Henry V are covered in detail by the calendars of the French and Norman rolls contained in the reports of the deputy keeper of the public records. The edition of the Norman rolls for the fifth year of the reign of Henry V has also been used extensively.[18] Information relevant to Clarence's career in England, Ireland and France has been collected by Thomas Rymer and his work is cited throughout this thesis.[19] The manuscript sources have been particularly useful in developing a fuller picture of Clarence's life and career and they contain much valuable information which seems to have been previously overlooked. Some of these manuscripts have been taken from the collections preserved in the British Library, but the majority can be found in the Public Record Office in London. The bulk of these sources are taken from the Exchequer King's Remembrancer, Accounts Various (E 101), the collection of Ancient Petitions (SC 8), the collection of Writs and Warrants for Issue (E 404), as well as the Exchequer Issue Rolls (E 403) and Receipt Rolls (E 401). For Clarence's career in France, use has been made of Chancery records, especially the Norman Rolls (C 64) and the Treaty Rolls (C 76). Other manuscript sources were consulted but these contained little information of significance. These sources include the Memoranda Rolls, both King's Remembrancer (E 159) and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer (E 368), held in the Public Record Office in London. In the National Library of Ireland the collection of manuscripts compiled by Harris was potentially a rich source of information but yielded little of direct relevance to this study of Clarence.[20] Similarly, the records of the Duchy of Lancaster might also be expected to provide valuable information on the life and career of Clarence. However, the sheer bulk of Duchy of Lancaster material available precluded any attempt to investigate this source in as thorough a manner as possible. Despite the bulk of this source an examination of the Lists and Indexes published by the Public Record Office indicates that the information contained here is of little significance to this work.[21] However, for Clarence's life before 1399, use has

---

17 *Rot. Pat. Hib.; Stat. Ire. John- Hen. V.*

18 *41st. D.K.R; 42nd. D.K.R.; R.N.*

19 Rymer, *Foedera.*

20 *Collectanea rebus Hibernicis*, iv, c. 1370-1538.

21 *Lists and Indexes 14, List of the records of the Duchy of Lancaster preserved in the Public Record Office; Lists and Indexes, supplementary series, 5, pt. 1, Duchy of*

been made of the records of the Duchy of Lancaster which Wylie has included in the appendices to his monumental study of the reign of Henry IV.

The second category of sources used consists of the contemporary, or near-contemporary, chronicles and annals of English, continental and Irish origins. Of the English chronicles by far the most useful have been the various London chronicles, which seem to have paid particular attention to Clarence's life and career. Also of importance is *The First English Life of Henry V*.[22] Although a sixteenth century translation of Tito Livio's *Vita Henrici Quinti*,[23] it contains information passed on to the author by the earl of Ormond, whose ancestor, the fourth earl, was a close associate of Clarence, serving with him in France. *The First English Life* appeared in 1513, as Henry VIII planned his invasion of France, and was written to serve the same purpose as the *Vita Henrici Quinti* which had been commissioned by Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, in the mid-fifteenth century.[24] Both works were intended to justify and to glorify the involvement of Henry V in France, and therefore to justify continued English involvement there. As well as providing an almost exact translation of the Vita, *First English Life* also contains material from other sources, including the *Polichronicon*, the chronicles of Monstrelet and the stories of the earl of Ormond.[25] For this reason it has been cited throughout this work. *The Gesta Henrici Quinti* and *The Brut* have also proved particularly useful. The most important of the continental chronicles have been those of Enguerrand de Monstrelet and Jean de Waurin, although substantial duplication of material occurs in these works, particularly in relation to the reign of Henry V. Of the Irish annals the most frequently cited are the *Annals of Connacht*, the *Annals of Loch Cé* and the collection of miscellaneous annals edited by Ó hInnse.[26]

As this thesis is an attempt to evaluate the career of Clarence, it seemed sensible to adopt a chronological approach in outlining the

---

Lancaster supplementary list of records; Lists and Indexes, supplementary series, 5, pt. 2, Duchy of Lancaster, descriptive list of royal charters; Lists and Indexes, supplementary series, 5, pt. 3, Duchy of Lancaster, descripitive list of cartae miscellaneae.

22 *The First English Life of king Henry the fifth*, ed. C.L. Kingsford.

23 Livio, Tito, *Vita Henrici Quinti regis Angliae*, ed. T. Hearne.

24 Allmand, C., 'Henry V the soldier and the war in France', in *Henry V. The practice of kingship*, ed. G.L. Harriss, pp. 133-34.

25 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 432.

findings of the research. The opening chapter will provide an outline of the early years of Clarence's life and will deal with his father's involvement in the turbulent politics of the reign of Richard II, which ultimately led to his father's exile and subsequent seizure of the throne of England in 1399 as Henry IV, resulting in Clarence becoming second in the line of succession. It is possible that Clarence accompanied his father into exile and he has often been described as the favourite of Henry IV's sons. This is perhaps the origin of his later conflict with his brother Henry, prince of Wales. After the usurpation of 1399 the king appointed Clarence as steward of England. While this seems to have been only of ceremonial significance it is interesting to note that on the death of Clarence in 1421 the office was never again filled on a permanent basis. This chapter will also provide an outline of the political difficulties facing the new king and how, almost immediately after his usurpation, he began to face domestic opposition. The rebellion of Owain Glyndwr and his capture of Edmund Mortimer, which gave rise to a dynastic challenge to Henry IV, presented a threat to the new dynasty, and therefore to Clarence, which lasted until 1409. The attitude of the Percies towards the king will be examined and their rebellion later in the reign of Henry IV seems to have been purely an opportunistic attempt to indulge in kingmaking. The relationship of the new king with the commons in parliament, in particular their reluctance to make grants of parliamentary taxation to him, will also be covered in this chapter. The financial difficulties of the king had a direct bearing on the career of Clarence throughout his father's reign, in particular to the time which he spent in Ireland. The chapter will conclude in 1401, as in this year Clarence left England to take up his position as lieutenant of Ireland.

The second chapter will provide an account of the time in which Clarence served as lieutenant of Ireland. Clarence was appointed to the office in 1401 and was nominal lieutenant until 1413 and the accession of his brother as Henry V. Altogether, he spent a total of less than three years in Ireland. Arriving there in November 1401, Clarence stayed in the country for just two years, before returning to England in 1403. Between August 1408 and March 1409 he also served in Ireland in person. The financial problems faced by Clarence as lieutenant will be discussed, as the lack of financial support from England seems to have been the principal reason for his absenteeism. There were attempts made by the government in England to provide for Clarence in a realistic fashion, and this seems to have been an attempt to persuade him to

---

26 *A.C.; A.L.C.; M.I.A.*

return to Ireland. Although his salary as lieutenant was to be reduced efforts were to be made to pay him the money which was owed to him from his previous service there. His absences from Ireland provoked the hostility of his brother, the prince of Wales, and the prince was behind the suggestion made in 1409 that Clarence be replaced as lieutenant. An examination of Clarence's powers as lieutenant will also be carried out in order to distinguish between Clarence and his immediate predecessors and successors holding the office of lieutenant of Ireland. There seems to be no doubt that Clarence was able to avoid his responsibilities in Ireland because he was a prince of royal blood. Clarence's military activity in Ireland will be examined and the extent to which he, under the influence of his advisors, was engaged in operations merely to safeguard 'the four loyal counties' of the lordship of Ireland will be discussed. Within six months of his arrival in Ireland Clarence was able to secure submissions from the O'Connor Faly, the O'Byrnes, the O'Reillys and the MacMahons, all of whose territories bordered on the frontiers of the English lordship. Through these submissions Clarence was able to secure the defence of the lordship. Although the military settlement broke down quite rapidly the fault for this lies not with Clarence but in the lack of financial support from England. The presence of Clarence in Ireland showed what could be achieved if an adequate level of funding was maintained from England. The motives behind the submissions made to Clarence by the Gaelic Irish chieftains will be examined, as will the degree to which Clarence was involved in the endemic factionalism of the Gaelic Irish lordships in order to secure the borders of the English colony. While in Ireland Clarence relied very heavily on the advice of his council there, and in particular on that of his deputy, Stephen le Scrope. Scrope's experience in Ireland meant that he was responsible for the direction of the government there during Clarence's time in Ireland. The poor state of the lordship in Ireland will be examined, with emphasis on the desire of the inhabitants to be protected from the Gaelic Irish, as well as from those members of the Anglo-Irish nobility who had turned 'degenerate'. The chapter will conclude with an examination of the career of Clarence in Ireland as portrayed in the contemporary Irish annals, of both Gaelic and Anglo-Irish origin.

The third chapter will present an account of Clarence's life and career between his departure from Ireland in 1403 and the expedition which he led to France in 1412. This is the most obscure period of Clarence's adult life and he seems to have been struggling to carve out a role for himself in the attempts of his father to secure his hold on the English throne. Clarence's brief involvement in the campaigns in Wales against Glyndwr will be

discussed. The most important military activity undertaken by Clarence during this period was the raid which he led against Flanders and Normandy in the early summer of 1405, which brought Clarence to the attention of his contemporaries on the continent for the first time. This raid was noted in Venice and is the first sign of the significant role that Clarence was later to play on the international stage. The evidence that Clarence returned to France in 1407, serving as the captain of the castle of Guisnes, will also be examined. However, Clarence seems to have spent most of this period at the royal court, with the approval of his father. This leads on to the most important section of the chapter, which is a discussion of Clarence's rivalry with his brother the prince of Wales. This was greatly exacerbated by the prince's seizure of control over the royal council late in 1409 and his subsequent refusal to pay Clarence the money which was owed to him for his service in Ireland and Guisnes. The illness of Henry IV contributed greatly to the uncertainty of the political situation at this time and the significance of the king's ill-health will be discussed. Also important is the relationship between Clarence and his uncle Henry Beaufort, bishop of Winchester. Beaufort tried to block the marriage of Clarence to Margaret Beaufort, the widow of the bishop's brother, as he feared that this would put the Beaufort family lands at risk. In 1411 the king was able to reassert his control over the royal council and advanced his second son to a position of prominence. Clarence was given command of the expedition to France in 1412, which was being sent in support of the French princes who were opposed to John, duke of Burgundy, a reversal of the policy which had been followed by the prince of Wales. This seems to have re-ignited the rivalry between the king's sons resulting in the prince being forced to submit to the king and declare his loyalty to his father. The feud in the royal family seems to have been settled satisfactorily before the death of Henry IV, although the prince, as Henry V, seems to have had lingering doubts about the degree of Clarence's loyalty to him.

The fourth chapter is an examination of the expedition which Clarence led to France in 1412. This expedition is important because it laid down the diplomatic and military foundations for the later involvement in France of Henry V. Clarence's time in France greatly increased his stature and turned him into a leader of note, and this expedition has been unjustly neglected in the past. A coherent account of Clarence's activities in France at this time is included, as is a discussion of the attempts of Clarence to secure the duchy of Aquitaine. The difficulties which he encountered in relation to his French allies, which resulted in the French princes buying Clarence off, are

examined in detail. The success of this expedition added to Clarence's reputation, both in England and on the continent.

The fifth chapter begins with a discussion of Clarence's role in the suppression of the opposition movements to Henry V. Clarence helped to defeat the Lollard rising led by Sir John Oldcastle in January 1414 and also played a prominent role in the trials and executions of the leaders of the Southampton Plot during the summer of 1415. However, the bulk of this chapter deals with the role which Clarence played in the French campaigns of Henry V. Particular emphasis will be placed on his activities leading up to and during the siege of Caen in 1417. Also of great importance is the campaign which Clarence led in eastern Normandy during the spring of 1418, which paved the way for the capture of Rouen, the Norman capital. A brief account of the Agincourt campaign is included, as it was probably Clarence's absence from this battle which was responsible for the risks which he took in later campaigns and which led ultimately to his death in 1421. From late-1419 onwards diplomatic activity took precedence over military action and Clarence was one of those appointed by Henry V to negotiate a peace settlement with Philip, the new duke of Burgundy, and the French king Charles VI. Clarence was back in the field again during the summer of 1420 and helped his brother in mopping up the French garrisons in northern France which refused to accept the settlement negotiated earlier that year, which had recognised Henry V as the heir to the French throne. The attempt of Henry V to create a permanent landed English presence in France, and Clarence's part in this, will also be examined. The only way to ensure the maintenance of the English conquests in France was by attracting English settlers through the offer of lands in the conquered territories. An account of the battle of Baugé, at which Clarence was killed, is included. Sources for the battle are wide-ranging, but the reports are often contradictory and on occasion wildly implausible. The account of Baugé included here discusses the various sources for the battle and also tries to outline a coherent description of the battle. The impact of the battle on Henry V's plans in France will be assessed.

The sixth and final chapter is an examination of the landed property held by Clarence, as well as of the attempts of both his father and his brother to provide for him through other means. The aim of the chapter is twofold. Firstly there is a comparison between the manner in which Henry IV and Henry V provided for Clarence. The second aim is to examine the lands and annuities which were received by John, duke of Bedford, and Humphrey,

duke of Gloucester, in comparison with those received by Clarence. From this it is possible to assess the way in which the first two Lancastrian kings looked upon their obligations to provide for members of the royal family. This chapter will also include a discussion of Clarence's affinity and the extent to which it was based upon his landed possessions.

Throughout this discussion of the work, Thomas of Lancaster, duke of Clarence, has been referred to as Clarence. However, as he was not elevated to the rank of duke until 1412, in the early chapters of this thesis he will be referred to as Thomas of Lancaster. From 1412 onwards he will be referred to as Clarence.

Chapter 1: Thomas of Lancaster, 1388-1401. The establishment of the Lancastrian dynasty.

The exact date of birth of Thomas of Lancaster, the second son of Henry, earl of Derby, and his wife Mary de Bohun is unknown. All that we can be sure of is that Thomas was born sometime before 30 September 1388. Wylie claimed that Thomas was born in London in the autumn of 1387, suggesting 29 September as the possible date. This date is based on the payments to a midwife called Joan for the delivery of 'the young lord Thomas' in London and for payments made to her for the purchase of white cloth to cover Thomas' cradle and her bed at the castle of Kenilworth in Warwickshire. These payments are recorded in the Duchy of Lancaster accounts of Hugh Waterton covering the period from 30 September 1387 until 30 September 1388. This account also records the purchase of clothes for Thomas as well as the purchase of gowns and shoes for Thomas and his elder brother Henry. The fact that Christmas livery was bought for the nurses of Thomas and Henry, both of whom were called Joan, would possibly indicate that Thomas was born before Christmas 1387.[1] However the most commonly suggested year for the birth of Thomas of Lancaster is 1388,[2] and the fact that clothes were being bought for Thomas before 30 September 1388 might also indicate that Thomas was born in either August or September of that year. William Worcestre noted the birth of Thomas of Lancaster under the year 1388.[3] Despite the fact that Worcestre was writing in the second half of the fifteenth century, roughly seventy years after the date in question, he seems to be the only source which noted the birth of the future duke of Clarence. As Worcestre had been in the service of Sir John Fastolf, who had served with Thomas of Lancaster during his time as lieutenant of Ireland, it seems reasonable to assume that

---

1 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, pp. 157-9.

2 Kirby, J.L., *Henry IV of England*, p. 18.

3 'Wilhelmi Wyrcester Annales', in *Letters and papers illustrative of the wars of the English in France during the reign of Henry the Sixth*, ii, pt. 2, p. 754.

Worcestre would have been well informed about the life of Lancaster and that his information is reliable. Therefore, it is likely that the future Henry V was born in the autumn of 1387 and that Thomas was born in the late summer of the following year.

Henry Bolingbroke, earl of Derby, was the only legitimate son of John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, third son of Edward III, and thus a grandson of king Edward III. Bolingbroke was also descended from the royal house on his mother's side.[4] John of Gaunt was the most powerful magnate in England and he seems to have been intent on securing a suitable estate for his son. In July 1380 Gaunt bought the marriage of Mary de Bohun from the young king Richard II in exchange for the sum of 5,000 marks which was owed to Gaunt for service in the wars of Edward III. Later that year, or early in 1381, Gaunt married Mary to Henry Bolingbroke.[5] Mary de Bohun was the second daughter of Humphrey de Bohun, earl of Hereford and Essex, who had died in 1373. Her sister Eleanor was married to John of Gaunt's brother Thomas of Woodstock, the future duke of Gloucester. He had hoped to commit his wife's sister to a nunnery in order to secure the entire de Bohun inheritance. In 1384, when his wife came of age, Bolingbroke was able to take possession of her inheritance, as well as of the titles of earl of Hereford and Northampton.[6] As early as 1382 Bolingbroke, then sixteen years old, was maintaining his own household and council, leading the normal life for a member of the higher aristocracy.[7] Bolingbroke's position in society is demonstrated by the fact that he was with king Richard II, his cousin, in the Tower of London during the Peasant's Revolt of 1381.[8] However, Bolingbroke seems to have remained in the shadow of his father. It was not until Gaunt went to Spain in 1386 that Bolingbroke came into his own. From September 1385 onwards he was summoned to parliament as earl of Derby and it was this involvement in national politics that resulted in his contact with the opposition to king Richard, led by Thomas, duke of Gloucester, and Richard, earl of Arundel.

---

4 Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 14.

5 ibid., pp. 17-18.

6 ibid.

7 ibid., p. 20.

8 ibid., p. 19.

In 1387 Bolingbroke joined Gloucester, Arundel, Thomas Beauchamp, earl of Warwick and Thomas Mowbray, earl of Nottingham, in acting against the army raised by Robert de Vere, Richard II's favourite.[9] After defeating de Vere's army at the battle of Radcot Bridge the lords were left in control of the kingdom, and may possibly have deposed Richard II before eventually re-instating him as king. A precedent had been set for the events to come in 1399.[10] These five magnates effectively ruled England until the summer of 1389 when Richard II was able to re-assert his control over the government of the kingdom.[11]

The return of John of Gaunt to England in November 1389 resulted in Bolingbroke's involvement in government being greatly reduced. The opportunity now existed for Bolingbroke to indulge in activities closer to his heart. In March 1390 he distinguished himself at a tournament held outside Calais, and it was here, perhaps, that Bolingbroke first turned his mind to crusading.[12] In May 1390 Bolingbroke was at Calais waiting to depart on a crusade against the pirates of the Barbary coast. Although this plan was abandoned, later in the year he did travel to Prussia, arriving there early in August. Later in the month Bolingbroke arrived at the camp of the army of the Teutonic Knights, which was campaigning in Lithuania. After a successful campaign the army, including the English contingent, retired to Königsberg for the winter. Bolingbroke was back in England by the end of April 1391. In March 1392 he accompanied his father to France as part of the English embassy being sent to negotiate a permanent peace between the two countries. In July of that year Bolingbroke again departed for Prussia, arriving there in August. However, as there was no campaign at the time, he left Prussia, intending to travel on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. The English party travelled overland and arrived in Prague on 13 October, where Bolingbroke was entertained by Wenceslas, king of Bohemia, the brother of Anne, the English queen. From Prague the English moved on to Vienna, from where letters were sent to Venice to arrange shipping to the Holy Land. While in Vienna Bolingbroke was in contact

---

9 ibid., pp. 22-5.

10 ibid., p. 26.

11 ibid., p. 27.

12 ibid., p. 29.

with Sigismund, king of Hungary, the future emperor. Bolingbroke was in Venice by early December and from there he sailed to Rhodes. From Rhodes he travelled on to Jaffa where he disembarked. The journey to Jerusalem was made from Jaffa. On his return journey Bolingbroke stayed for a while in Cyprus before returning to Venice in March 1393. From Venice he travelled to Milan before crossing the Alps and moving on to Paris, which was reached in June 1393. On 28 June he was at Calais and he was back in London by 5 July.[13] During his trips abroad Bolingbroke's fourth son and eldest daughter were born and this shows that he can have had little impact on the early years of his children. Even after his return home his involvement in political and diplomatic affairs means that he must have remained a distant figure.

The political situation in England had deteriorated greatly during Bolingbroke's absence. The earl of Arundel made an open attack on John of Gaunt, claiming that Gaunt was manipulating the king to support his own ambitious schemes to the detriment of the good of the kingdom. Although this dispute was resolved it did not augur well for the state of England. In 1396 Bolingbroke was again in France attending the marriage of Richard II to Isabel, the daughter of Charles VI, king of France. The following year Richard II felt strong enough to take revenge on those who had curtailed his royal power in the 1380's. In July 1397 a plot was revealed to capture the king, John of Gaunt and the duke of York and to imprison them for life. The ringleader of this alleged plot was the king's uncle Thomas, duke of Gloucester. Gloucester and the earls of Arundel and Warwick were arrested. Arundel was executed for treason and the earl of Warwick was exiled to the Isle of Man. It is likely that Gloucester would have suffered the same fate as Arundel but he had died in mysterious circumstances in the custody of the earl of Nottingham at Calais.[14] Both Bolingbroke and Nottingham acted with the king against their old allies, Bolingbroke probably acting under the influence of his father. Gaunt, as steward of England, presided over the trial of Arundel. In the parliament of 1397 Bolingbroke was created duke of Hereford and Nottingham was created duke of Norfolk, possibly as a reward for having helped the king in

---

13 ibid., pp. 28-40.

14 ibid., pp. 44-5.

destroying his enemies. However, the new duke of Norfolk seems to have had doubts about the trustworthiness of the king.

In December 1397 Norfolk apparently told Bolingbroke that the king planned to deal with them in the same way as he had dealt with the other lords present at Radcot Bridge despite the fact that they had received pardons for their part in the events of 1387.[15] Norfolk also claimed that there was a plot to kill Gaunt and Bolingbroke at the parliament which was to meet in January and to destroy the house of Lancaster. This plan to destroy Lancaster was based upon revoking the restoration of Lancastrian lands to Henry, the brother of Thomas, earl of Lancaster. The Lancastrian inheritance had been seized by Edward II following the execution of earl Thomas in 1322. Five years later his lands had been restored to his brother and eventually passed to John of Gaunt and would pass to Bolingbroke on his father's death. If, as Norfolk claimed, Richard II planned to annul the act of restoration then the basis for Gaunt's power and influence within the kingdom would be lost and Bolingbroke's potential inheritance would be resumed into the hands of the crown.[16] Bolingbroke repeated this conversation to his father who then went to the king. Bolingbroke was forced to accuse Norfolk of treason before the king and he also subsequently implicated Norfolk in the death of the duke of Gloucester the previous year. The king decided that the matter would be settled by judicial combat and set 16 September 1398 as the date. When the day came Richard II halted the combat. Norfolk was banished from England for life while Bolingbroke was banished for a period of ten years. Richard's actions seemed to confirm Norfolk's story that he wished to see the destruction of the last of his enemies and that the king himself was the prime mover behind the plot against Gaunt and Bolingbroke. It has been suggested that the seizure of the Lancastrian estates was 'a long-cherished ambition' of the king's.[17] Neither duke was to have contact with the other while in exile, nor with Thomas

---

15 Given-Wilson, C., 'Richard II, Edward II, and the Lancastrian inheritance', *E.H.R.*, 109 (1994) p. 554.

16 ibid., pp. 555-6.

17 ibid., p. 561.

Arundel, the archbishop of Canterbury, who had been exiled in 1397.[18] Bolingbroke's period of exile was reduced to six years at the request of his father. He was also entitled to an annual allowance of £2,000 from his estates in England and an allowance of £500 was arranged for his eldest son Henry. Bolingbroke left London for his exile on 13 October 1398. He spent less than nine months abroad before returning to England and seizing the throne.

Bolingbroke's exile was spent in Paris. Although he had received permission from the king to stay in Calais for up to one month and despite the fact that John of Gaunt maintained a house in Calais, Bolingbroke seems to have moved on to the French capital almost immediately after arriving in France where, according to one French chronicle, 'he was counting on a warm welcome'.[19] He was received at Paris with great honour and was lodged in the Hôtel Clisson.[20] Bolingbroke was even involved in negotiations for a marriage to a daughter of the duke of Berri. However the situation changed when English ambassadors arrived in Paris. The earl of Salisbury and the bishop of Carlisle, trying to negotiate a dowry for Richard's new queen Isabel, complained of the esteem in which Bolingbroke, a man exiled for treason, was being held and this put an end to his marriage negotiations.[21] On 3 February 1399 John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, died. Before Bolingbroke had gone into exile Richard II had promised that if Gaunt should die during that time then Bolingbroke would be allowed to enjoy his inheritance. However, on 18 March the king announced that Bolingbroke's sentence was now increased to exile for life and that all the possessions of the duchy of Lancaster were forfeit to the crown. Bolingbroke now had the perfect reason to return to England. In May 1399 Richard II left England for Ireland in an attempt to restore order to the English lordship there. This gave Bolingbroke the opportunity to act. He was

---

18 Arundel had been accused of treason in the parliament of 1397 for his role in the impeachment of Michael de la Pole in 1386 and for usurping royal authority through the establishment of a commission of government with the duke of Gloucester and his allies.

19 Given-Wilson, C., *Chronicles of the revolution*, p. 105, quoting the *Chronique de Saint-Denys*.

20 Kirby, *Henry IV*, pp. 49-50.

21 Given-Wilson, *Chronicles of the revolution*, p. 105.

joined in Paris by Thomas, the archbishop of Canterbury and Thomas, the son of the executed earl of Arundel. The support of archbishop Arundel was essential to Bolingbroke's plans. The archbishop was able to add the sanction of the church to Bolingbroke's coup. At the new king's coronation Arundel anointed him with the oil which the Virgin Mary was alleged to have given to Thomas Becket. This had been lost sometime during the reign of Edward III and had not been used at the coronation of Richard II.[22] This was an attempt to give the usurper king an aura of legitimacy and sanctity. The archbishop was to remain one of the staunchest supporters of the new regime in England.[23] On 17 June Bolingbroke made a treaty of friendship with the duke of Orléans and left Paris soon afterwards.[24] The attitude of the French nobility towards Bolingbroke seems to have been quite ambiguous. They were apparently outraged by the treatment of queen Isabel by Richard's council and recognised the illegality of Richard's actions against Bolingbroke.[25] However, it was claimed that they counselled Bolingbroke not to resort to any dishonourable acts.[26] But his plans to return to England seem to have been an open secret and no attempt was made to stop him. When king he was to claim that he had been encouraged in his actions by the duke of Orléans, and retainers of both Berri and Orléans attended his coronation in October 1399.[27] The fact that Bolingbroke sealed a treaty with Orléans before he left Paris would lend credence to his claims. By early July he landed at Ravenspur in Holderness. There he was joined by Lancastrian retainers and was able to take Pontefract castle. He was soon joined by the earls of Westmorland and Northumberland, two of the most powerful magnates in England. On 27 July the duke of York, who had been appointed as lieutenant by Richard II, joined forces with Bolingbroke. At Bristol some of Richard's closest advisors were executed. England was now firmly under Bolingbroke's control. Richard II's army scattered on its return from Ireland

---

22 Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 73.

23 Aston, M., *Thomas Arundel. A study of church life in the reign of Richard II*, p. 374.

24 Given-Wilson, *Chronicles of the revolution*, p. 113.

25 ibid., p. 110.

26 ibid., p. 106.

27 Wylie, *Henry IV*, i, p. 85.

and the king retired to Conway castle in the hope of gathering his supporters and a new army. However, the end was in sight and by early August Richard II, still formally king, was a prisoner in Bolingbroke's hands.

Up until the capture of the king Bolingbroke had been receiving petitions and issuing letters in which he styled himself duke of Lancaster and steward of England. Although claiming no royal prerogatives he was certainly acting as if he was king. Now he was able to act in the king's name and a parliament was summoned to meet on 30 September 1399. The day before the parliament was to meet it was announced that Richard II had renounced the throne. An official ceremony of deposition took place and this was followed by Bolingbroke claiming the throne. This claim was deliberately vague citing right of descent and right of conquest, perhaps in an attempt to reduce any dependence on those who had helped him to the throne. Bolingbroke wished to establish the fact that he was king by right. However, this meant ignoring the claim to the throne of the infant earl of March. March was descended from Lionel, duke of Clarence, Edward III's second son, and was closer in line to the throne than Bolingbroke, descended from Edward's third son. As March was only a child his claims were easily overlooked but the new king seems to have wanted to justify March's exclusion from the line of succession. Bolingbroke tried to claim that Edmund Crouchback, Henry III's second son, from whom Bolingbroke could also claim descent, was in fact older than Edward I and that he had been passed over as king due to his physical deformity. This preposterous claim was rejected as it would have meant that there had been no legitimate king of England since the death of Henry III in 1272. The belief that Richard II had recognised the earl of March as his successor is now generally accepted as a later Yorkist fabrication.[28] In fact it is quite possible that Richard II was planning to move against the earl of March. He had been serving as lieutenant of Ireland since 1395 and was suspected of harbouring his uncle, Thomas Mortimer, there. Mortimer was wanted by the king for his part in the events of 1387. March had been summoned to the parliament of 1398 and made to swear an oath to uphold the settlement made the previous year. He had also been dismissed as lieutenant of Ireland on 27 July 1398 and was replaced by the duke of Surrey, although March had died in battle a few

---

28 Pugh, T.B., *Henry V and the Southampton Plot of 1415*, pp. 73-4.

days before this.[29] After being recognised as king Henry IV, the new king issued writs for a new parliament to meet on 6 October. The date of coronation was set for 13 October. On 4 October the new king created his second son, Thomas, steward of England.[30] Henry IV also knighted his sons in a ceremony the day before his coronation.

Despite the fact that Bolingbroke was the son of one of the country's most powerful magnates, and that he himself would one day inherit his father's lands and titles, it was never expected that he would succeed to the throne of England. This meant that little attention was paid to the birth of Bolingbroke's children and there is little evidence available to describe the early years of Thomas of Lancaster. Even the early years of his brother Henry, subsequently to become king, are relatively obscure. Apart from what have been described as 'various trifling notices of Thomas as a child'[31] in the accounts of the Duchy of Lancaster, there is no reference to Thomas of Lancaster before the year 1399. The birth of Thomas in 1388 was followed in quick succession by that of John, named after his paternal grandfather, in 1389 and then Humphrey, named for his maternal grandfather, in 1390. Mary de Bohun also gave birth to two daughters, Blanche in 1392 and Philippa in 1394, dying whilst giving birth to her second daughter.[32] We know that Thomas and his siblings spent little time in the company of their parents, especially their father. As the son of the wealthiest and most powerful magnate in England, as well as being one of the principal magnates himself, Henry Bolingbroke was far too involved in his own career to play an active role in the upbringing of his children. In any case it was not usual for the children of the leading nobility to be actively supervised by their parents. Bolingbroke himself was sent to live with his great-aunt, Lady Wake, at the age of three.[33] After the death of Mary de Bohun in 1394 the children were sent to live with their maternal

---

29 Tuck, A., *Crown and nobility, 1272-1461*, pp. 215-16.

30 Harcourt, L.W. Vernon, *His grace the steward and trial of peers*, p. 189; Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 72.

31 *D.N.B.*, xix, p. 638.

32 Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 18.

33 Orme, N., *From childhood to chivalry*, p. 45.

grandmother Joan, dowager countess of Hereford, at Bytham castle in Lincolnshire.[34]

At Bytham the four boys were under the care of a governess called Mary Hervy who may have been selected for the post by Mary de Bohun.[35] The previous year she had been described as the *magistrissa* of the young lords and she received three ells of scarlet cloth at Hertford in December 1393.[36] In the same account, covering the period from 30 June 1393 until 1 February 1394, the names Juliana and Agnes Rokster appear, these women being described as the *domicellae* of Thomas and Humphrey.[37] Mary Hervy is still described as the *magistrissa* of the young lords the following year and Agnes Rokster is described as one of their attendants.[38] The function of the mistress was to look after the royal nursery and the children of royal blood being brought into it. This practice gradually spread to some of the greater lay magnates[39] and Mary Hervy fulfilled this role for the children of the earl of Derby. Joan, the nurse of Thomas, also seems to have taken care of his brother John. Johanna Waryn, nurse to Henry, received forty shillings per annum for taking care of him, while Johanna Donnesmere received the same amount for taking care of Thomas and John.[40] In the accounts from February 1393 up to February 1394, Johanna (Joan) Waryn is still acting as nurse to Henry and a woman called Margaret is described as the nurse of his brother Humphrey.[41] The accounts of the following year record continuing payments to Johanna (Joan) Donnesmere, described as *nutrici*. At the same time William Lecham was paid 40s. as the yeoman of the chamber of the young lords.[42] When Bolingbroke became king as Henry IV he began to reward those who had looked after his children. On 9 June 1408 Mary Hervy was granted £40 for

---

34 Allmand, C., *Henry V*, p. 10; Williams, *My lord of Bedford*, p. 3.

35 Williams, *My lord of Bedford*, p. 3.

36 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, p. 163.

37 ibid., p. 165.

38 ibid., p. 171.

39 Orme, *From childhood to chivalry*, p. 13.

40 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, p. 177.

41 ibid., p. 179.

42 ibid., p. 180.

life from the issues of the counties of Oxford and Berkshire as reward for her 'good service to the king and his son the prince and his other infants'.[43] Mary Hervy was still alive during the reign of Henry V and in 1417 she was granted a tun of wine from Gascony yearly.[44] In April 1400 Henry IV appointed a commission to enquire in to the complaints of John and Marjory Bray and Henry Morys and his wife Joan, who had been the nurse of Thomas and John after their property had been attacked in Warwickshire and Leicestershire.[45] Henry V also wished to reward his own nurse. In 1415 he granted £20 per annum from the issues of the royal manor of Isleworth to Joan Waryn and this was still being paid as late as 1431.[46]

The children of Bolingbroke seem to have remained at Bytham throughout most of 1395, although from the Duchy of Lancaster accounts for this period it would appear that regular journeys to London were made, being described as trips to buy clothes for the young ladies. These trips also included one to bring the children from Bytham to London for Christmas 1395.[47] In the accounts beginning 1 October 1396 we find John and Humphrey at Kenilworth on 1 November, where the clerks of the church of St. Nicholas sing for them, while on January 1 of the following year we find minstrels on horseback entertaining the young lords at Tutbury in Staffordshire. Five days later, on the feast of the Epiphany, a minstrel called Wilkin Walkin was making 'minstralsie' in the presence of the young lords.[48] Later that year John spent some time at Framlingham in Norfolk with Margaret Marshal, the dowager countess of Norfolk.[49] In May 1397 we know that John and Humphrey were at Tutbury and expenses are also recorded for a trip taking Humphrey, Blanche and Philippa from the manor of Eaton Tregoes to London and back.[50] Between February and November

---

43 *C.P.R., 1405-8*, p. 452.

44 *C.P.R., 1416-22*, p. 123.

45 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 271.

46 *C.P.R., 1413-19*, p. 329; Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 9.

47 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, p. 172.

48 ibid., pp. 180-1; Williams, *My lord of Bedford*, p. 4.

49 Williams, *My lord of Bedford*, p. 3.

50 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, pp. 173-4.

1398 the young lords were staying at Framlingham and Kenilworth.[51] Bolingbroke had left for his exile in October 1398 although he was to be back in England in July 1399.

There is some evidence to suggest that Thomas of Lancaster accompanied his father into exile in France. Two of the London chronicles both record the return of Thomas with his father in 1399, along with Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, and Thomas, son of the earl of Arundel.[52] At the same time Bolingbroke's eldest son Henry was in Ireland with king Richard on an expedition to try and restore order to the lordship there, which was coming under increasing threat from the Gaelic Irish. Richard II seems to have been holding the young Henry as a hostage for the good behaviour of his father. It is also possible that the king was trying to groom Bolingbroke's son as a successor to the Duchy of Lancaster, assuring the crown the support of, and the control of, the largest landholding in the kingdom after the royal lands. The king knighted the young Henry in Ireland,[53] but on the king's return to England to face Bolingbroke Henry and Humphrey, son of the executed duke of Gloucester, who had also been brought to Ireland by the king, were imprisoned in Trim castle in Meath. Three of Bolingbroke's other children, Humphrey, Blanche and Philippa, were left in the care of Hugh Waterton at the manor of Eaton Tregoes during the period of their father's exile. While there, the children were to be provided with a chaplain in order to say mass for the soul of their mother.[54] Bolingbroke's other son John was at the manor of Waltham for the months of May and June 1399 until his father returned from exile.[55] The possible presence of Thomas in France during his father's exile has been interpreted

---

51 ibid., p. 175.

52 *The great chronicle of London*, ed. A.H. Thomas & I.D. Thornley, p. 50; 'William Gregory's Chronicle of London', p.101, in *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. J. Gairdner; McNiven, P., *Heresy and politics in the reign of Henry IV*, p.151; Given-Wilson, C., *Chronicles of the Revolution*, p. 35.

53 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 12.

54 Wylie, *Henry IV*, ii, p. 436.

55 ibid., iv, p. 185; Williams, *My lord of Bedford*, p. 5.

as a sign that he was the favourite of his father's four sons.[56] If this is the case it may explain the rivalry between Henry and Thomas which seems to have developed towards the end of their father's reign.

What little we know of the education of Thomas of Lancaster must also be inferred from the scattered references to him and to his brothers in the records of the Duchy of Lancaster. Up until the age of seven there were no formal studies and most male children were incapable of indulging in the exercises that led on to their more formal military training. However, from the age of seven up until fourteen the children of nobility began to study in earnest and also began their training in the arts of war. At seven most boys would pass from the care of women into the hands of a male tutor.[57] Although this is quite a general formula for the education of the male children of a noble family it is supported by evidence from the accounts of the Duchy of Lancaster. Seven books of Latin grammar, in one volume, were purchased for the young Henry in London in 1396, while a book of elementary grammar was bought for his brother John in 1398.[58] It seems most likely that similar arrangements would have been undertaken for the education of Thomas. In 1397 Blanche and Philippa were also being taught to read and two books of ABC were bought for them.[59] It is possible that Thomas was also being educated in music. Both of his parents were able to play instruments and harpstrings were bought for his brother Henry in 1397.[60] Bolingbroke himself seems to have been well educated and continued to act as patron to Geoffrey Chaucer after his accession to the throne.[61] When king he also tried to persuade Christine de Pisan to come and live in England.[62] Henry IV's youngest son Humphrey became one of

---

56 McNiven, *Heresy and politics*, p. 151.

57 Orme, *From childhood to chivalry*, pp. 6-7.

58 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, p. 172; Orme, *From childhood to chivalry*, p. 146; Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 10.

59 Orme, *From childhood to chivalry*, p. 158.

60 ibid., p. 166.

61 Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 253, Chaucer was married to the sister of Katherine Swynford, John of Gaunt's third wife and the mother of Bolingbroke's illegitimate Beaufort half-brothers.

62 ibid.

the most important literary patrons of fifteenth century England,[63] while after the fall of Caen in 1417 the only item which Henry V reserved for himself was a book in French.[64] This indicates that the education of Bolingbroke's children had been quite comprehensive.

The more active and physical side of the young lords' education also seems to coincide with the pattern outlined above. In the accounts beginning on 1 October 1396 we find that Thomas was staying in the household of Lord Audley[65] and by 1397 John was under the care of John Farwell, described as his master and governor.[66] The training of Bolingbroke's sons was already underway in 1395 when J. Walter was sent from Pleshy to Tutbury with a horse for Henry.[67] Horses were bought for John after his father's accession to the throne, when he was ten, and for Humphrey in 1402, when he was twelve.[68] It seems likely that Thomas would also have been in possession of horses by this time. Horsemanship was taught to younger members of the aristocracy from an early age and was regarded as one of the most important skills that a young aristocrat should acquire.[69] The young lords were also being trained in the use of swords. A sword was purchased for Henry in 1397 while John's sword was burnished in 1400-1.[70] At the same time they would have been taught how to hunt and how to use falcons.[71] Hunting was regarded as a prelude to more earnest military training, teaching young aristocrats skill in the use of weapons and in the control of horses.[72] All of Bolingbroke's sons displayed an interest in falconry and hawking in later life. Henry, when prince of Wales, had a French book on hunting, *The Master of the Game*, translated for him by

---

63 Labarge, M.W., *Henry V, the cautious conqueror*, p. 3.

64 *The first English life of king Henry the Fifth*, ed. C.L. Kingsford, p. 92.

65 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, p. 181.

66 Williams, *My lord of Bedford*, p. 3.

67 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, p. 181.

68 Orme, *From childhood to chivalry*, p. 181.

69 Given-Wilson, C., *English nobility in the late middle ages*, p. 3.

70 Orme, *From childhood to chivalry*, pp. 183-4.

71 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 10; Orme, *From childhood to chivalry*, p. 181.

72 Orme, *From childhood to chivalry*, p. 196.

Edward, duke of York.[73] Thomas brought three falconers with him to France in 1418,[74] and John was appointed keeper of the king's falcons by his father Henry IV in August 1402.[75]

As the sons of one of the country's leading magnates it is to be expected that Thomas and his brothers would live in quite considerable comfort and style. In the accounts covering May 1391 until May 1392 payments were recorded for the mending of two silver gilt collars which were intended for Henry and Thomas.[76] The Lancaster accounts also record the purchase of tartarin gowns for Thomas and Henry when they were only infants.[77] Not only were Thomas and his brothers provided with their own nurses and tutors, the young lords also had their own yeomen in their service. As noted above William Lecham was serving as the valet of their chamber in 1394. During the period between February 1397 and February 1398 we find expenses for the pages of the chamber of Thomas and Henry.[78] After their father's accession to the throne in 1399 the size of their retinue increased. Accounts exist from the first year of their father's reign which are described as private household accounts. These accounts provide for the support of the men of John and Thomas, these men being described as two yeomen, as well as providing for the clothes of their men. The cost for the 'arrayement' of John and Thomas at this time came to £27 and they were also assigned 15s. for 'offering and other disports'. The wages of their yeomen came to £4 and the yeomen also received 26s. 8d. for their clothes. A further £43 6s. 8d. was allowed for their 'dietts and their fruits'. This account also includes some entries for Henry including £52 4s. 10d. to cover the expenses of his yeomen, his clothing and his horses plus a further £47 13s. 4d. for his 'diet' and for that of his five men.[79] Unfortunately the

---

73 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 420.

74 Woolgar, C.M., ed., *Household accounts from medieval England*, ii, p. 653.

75 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, p. 118.

76 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, p. 161.

77 ibid., p. 158. Mary G. Houston, *Medieval costume in England and France*, p. 225, describes tartarin as a 'very fine and costly' cloth.

78 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, p. 175.

79 P.R.O., C47/3/53/14.

fragmentary nature of this document impairs its usefulness as a source for the study of the royal household at this time.

King Henry IV appointed his son Thomas of Lancaster as steward of England on 4 October 1399. As Thomas was only eleven at the time his father appointed Thomas Percy, earl of Worcester, as deputy to the steward. Percy seems to have carried out most of the functions of the steward at the coronation of Henry IV, indicating that Lancaster's appointment to the office was intended to be primarily honorific. Henry had been using the title of steward during the months of July and August 1399 up until the capture of Richard II. It seems that the only time during his father's reign that Thomas was actually required to act as steward was at the coronation in 1399. Before the coronation Thomas held a court in the White Hall at Westminster to discuss coronation claims, along with the earl of Northumberland, who had been appointed as constable of England, and the earl of Westmorland, recently created marshal of England. The steward's court of claims had been introduced at the coronation of Richard II in 1377 and was presided over by John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster and steward of England.[80] Gaunt also supervised the arrangements for the coronation of Richard II. The title of steward of England had been inherited by Gaunt as earl of Leicester being attached to the earldom by virtue of the barony of Hinckley.[81] Since 1265 the earldom of Leicester had been joined to that of Lancaster and the hereditary stewardship passed to Thomas, earl of Lancaster, in 1308 and from then on to all subsequent earls and dukes of Lancaster.[82] Now the office of steward was united with the crown and Henry IV was free to grant the office to Thomas. The court of claims was held in order to decide upon the part to be played in the coronation by the holders of, or claimants to, the hereditary offices. In 1399 there was a challenge to the right of Sir Thomas Dymock to act as the king's champions at the coronation. The decision was postponed and Dymock acted as champion, offering to engage in combat with anyone who doubted the new king's title to the throne. Despite the claim of C. L. Kingsford it is certain that Thomas

---

80 Harcourt, *His grace the steward*, p. 191.

81 Wylie, J.H., & Waugh, W.T., *The reign of Henry the fifth*, i, p. 2.

82 Maddicott, J.R., *Thomas of Lancaster, 1307-22*, pp. 76-7.

of Lancaster was never replaced as steward of England.[83] Kingsford stated, quoting the *Annales Henrici Quarti*, that Lancaster was replaced in 1401 on account of his youth by Thomas Percy. Percy was certainly appointed as steward of the royal household at this time, but there is no evidence of him ever having used the title of steward of England. Lancaster continued to use the title of steward throughout the reign of his father and is described as steward of England as late as February 1415.[84] In 1421, at the coronation of Henry V's queen, Katherine of Valois, the earl of Warwick was appointed to act as steward because Thomas was in France at the time, and this shows that Thomas retained the office up until the time of his death. After his death in 1421 the office of steward was never again granted for life, only for particular occasions[85] and the office seems to have lost most of the importance attached to it.[86]

Lancaster, along with his brothers, was also one of those knighted by the new king in a ceremony on 12 October 1399, the day before his coronation. Although his brother Henry had been knighted by Richard II in Ireland it seems that he too was knighted before his father's coronation. Soon after the coronation of Henry IV, the king began to make provision for the support of his sons. On 2 November 1399 Thomas of Lancaster was granted the valuable lordship of Burstwick in Yorkshire.[87] In January 1401 he was also granted the towns of Hackney in Middlesex and Leyton in Essex,[88] possibly in order to support him when he was in London. In February 1401 Thomas received goods which had belonged to Thomas Holand, earl of Kent, which had been seized into the king's hands after Kent's part in the unsuccessful rebellion the previous year. Lancaster was given a covered salt of silver gilt with the arms of Kent and Arundel on the top, one basin and ewer of silver, one covered cup of silver gilt and two 'quartepottes' of silver.[89] In May 1401 the mayor of London was ordered to

---

83 *D.N.B.*, xix, p. 638.

84 *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 276.

85 Harcourt, *His grace the steward*, p. 191.

86 Clarke, M.V., *Medieval representation and consent*, p. 359.

87 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 152.

88 ibid., p. 403.

89 *C.C.R., 1399-1402*, p. 320.

deliver three pieces of arras cloth to Lancaster which had belonged to John, earl of Salisbury.[90] Lancaster had also been granted the right to receive all charters, letters patent and writs in chancery without fine or fee in December 1400.[91]

Henry IV immediately faced opposition from the supporters of Richard II. Thomas of Lancaster was with his father in January 1400 when a plot was discovered to kill the king and his sons at Windsor, where they had spent Christmas, and to restore Richard II to the throne. The leaders of the plot were the earls of Rutland, Kent and Huntingdon and they were later to be joined by the earl of Salisbury. They had all been close advisors of Richard II and had suffered under the new regime. In the first parliament of the new king these men had lost the titles which had been bestowed upon them by Richard II in the parliament of 1397. Henry IV had done enough to earn the enmity of these men but not enough to ensure that they would not be a threat to him.[92] However, the plot was betrayed, possibly by the earl of Rutland,[93] and the king and his sons were able to escape to London, which had shown great support for Bolingbroke before he became king.[94] The king was able to collect an army and the conspirators fled to Cirencester. Here a mob seized the earls of Kent and Salisbury and beheaded them. The earl of Huntingdon suffered a similar fate at the hands of a mob at Pleshy in Essex. The attempt of the earls to effect the restoration of Richard II achieved nothing except to convince Henry IV that Richard would have to be killed. As long as Richard II lived the new dynasty could not be secure. Early in 1400 the body of Richard was displayed in London before his funeral in St. Paul's.[95] The rebellion of 1400 was only the beginning of the problems facing Henry IV.

In May 1400 Henry IV led an expedition to Scotland in an attempt to secure the submission of the Scottish king and to try and effect

---

90 ibid., p. 344.

91 ibid., p. 222; *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 388.

92 Butt, R., *A history of parliament: the middle ages*, p. 455.

93 Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 87.

94 Froissart, *Chronicles*, pp. 438-99.

95 ibid., p. 94.

a settlement regarding the endemic warfare along the Anglo-Scottish border. This expedition achieved nothing[96] and the king was forced to return to England on hearing news of the revolt of Owain Glyndwr in Wales. Glyndwr had been involved in a land dispute with Reginald, Lord Grey of Ruthin, which had rapidly turned into a full-scale rebellion against English rule. Grey was one of Henry IV's staunchest supporters and it was the king's support for Grey that seems to have pushed Glyndwr into rebellion.[97] A march into Wales only caused the Welsh to retreat into the mountains and the king failed to stamp out the rebellion. The revolt was to drag on until 1409 and proved a severe drain on Henry IV's financial resources. In 1402 Glyndwr captured Edmund Mortimer, the uncle of the earl of March, and this introduced a dynastic element to Glyndwr's rebellion. Mortimer married the daughter of Glyndwr and joined the rebellion. He claimed he was fighting to secure his nephew's rightful inheritance as king of England. Henry IV's problems increased even further in 1403 with the rebellion of the Percies. They also claimed to be fighting for the rights of the earl of March and in their manifesto they stated that Henry IV had sworn an oath to them at Doncaster in 1399 saying that he had no intentions of making himself king and that he had only returned to England to secure his Lancastrian inheritance. The role of the Percies in helping Henry seize the throne means that this story can be discounted. Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland, was the man who engineered the capture of Richard II at Conway.[98] In August 1399 Northumberland also accepted the office of warden of the west march towards Scotland from Henry, accepting his use of the royal prerogatives.[99] At the coronation of Henry IV the earl of Northumberland acted as constable of England while his brother Thomas, earl of Worcester, acted as steward. The real reasons for the Percy rebellion seem to be far more pragmatic. Between 1391 and 1396 the Percies were the dominant magnates on the northern border. The earl of Northumberland was warden of the east march while his son, Hotspur, was warden of the west march. In 1397 Richard II had begun to advance the position of the Neville family, who

---

96 Tuck, *Crown and nobility*, p. 226.

97 Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 106.

98 Bean, J.M.W., 'Henry IV and the Percies', *History*, 44 (1959) p. 215.

99 ibid., pp. 219-20.

were rivals of the Percies,[100] in the north in an attempt to break the stranglehold of the Percies along the border. The return of Bolingbroke in 1399 provided the Percies with the opportunity to regain their position of dominance on the border. However, from 1402 on a serious crisis arose in their relations with the king. There were problems in paying the Percies the huge sums which were due to them for their offices of wardens and in 1403 the earl of Northumberland claimed that a sum of £20,000 was owed to himself and to his son by the king.[101] The king had also refused to allow the Percies to ransom the Scottish prisoners which they had taken at the battle of Homildon Hill in 1402,[102] which, if they had been allowed to do so would have eased their financial difficulties somewhat. The fact that Hotspur was also refused leave to ransom Edmund Mortimer, his brother-in-law, can only have aggravated Percy dissatisfaction with Henry IV.[103] In March 1402 the king had appointed Ralph Neville, earl of Westmorland, as captain of Roxburgh castle, a position which, up until then, had been held by Hotspur.[104] All these factors combined to push the Percies towards rebellion. The Percy family had acted as kingmakers once and with the support of Edmund Mortimer they could act as kingmakers again. Their support for the claims of the earl of March can only be viewed as an opportunistic attempt to create a king who would be more compliant with their wishes. Hotspur and the earl of Worcester were defeated and killed at the battle of Shrewsbury in July 1403, while the earl of Northumberland was stripped of his offices. He was involved in another rebellion two years later, in alliance with archbishop Scrope of York, but this too was unsuccessful and the earl was forced to flee to Scotland and his estates were seized by the crown. Northumberland was replaced as constable of England by Henry IV's third son John.[105] John was also appointed as warden of the east march while the earl of Westmorland became warden of the west march.[106] The defeat of the

---

100 ibid., p. 214.

101 ibid., p. 222.

102 ibid., p. 225.

103 ibid.

104 ibid., p. 224.

105 Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 158.

106 Tuck, *Crown and nobility*, p. 229.

rebellion in 1405 effectively ended the challenges to the new dynasty. There seems to have been no doubt from this time on that Henry IV would eventually be succeeded as king by Henry, prince of Wales.

The principal reason for the Percy rebellion seems to have been financial. They seem to have expected preference in collecting money due to them from the exchequer.[107] However, Henry IV was to face financial problems throughout his reign and the money was just not available to pay the Percies. These financial problems were primarily due to the attitude of the commons in parliament to the new king. Henry IV was forced to 'depend on parliament for money simply to remain on the throne'.[108] The reign of Henry IV saw some of the most severe confrontations between king and parliament in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.[109] Henry's demands for money were due primarily to the steady drain on royal finances caused by the rebellion in Wales. The new king was also the father of six children. Money had to be found for the maintenance of his four sons and their households as well as for the dowries of his two daughters. Henry IV was also faced with the cost of returning Richard II's queen, Isabel, to France, along with what had already been paid of her dowry.[110] This increase in royal expenditure was combined with a decline in the wool trade, one of the mainstays of English royal finance, which resulted in a reduction in royal income.[111]

The king's need for money allowed the commons to withhold grants of taxation until reforms which they sought were implemented. Attacks were directed against the cost of Henry IV's administration, and in particular the costs of the royal household. In 1404 attacks were launched on the presence of aliens in the kingdom. Many were expelled and threats were made to the composition of the household of Henry IV's new queen, Joan of Navarre, duchess of Brittany. The queen managed to secure exemptions for many members of her household, but

---

107 Bean, 'Henry IV and the Percies', p. 224.

108 Butt, *A history of parliament*, p. 484.

109 Roger, A., 'Henry IV, the commons and taxation', *Medieval Studies*, 31 (1969) p.44.

110 ibid., pp. 56-7.

111 ibid., p. 45.

two years later forty-three aliens were expelled from England, most of whom were members of Joan's household.[112] The main struggle between the king and parliament was the use to which parliamentary taxation was being put. The commons objected to the fact that taxes were being used to run the administration of the household when the grants had been made to ensure the effective defence of the kingdom. Attacks were also made on the composition of Henry IV's royal council. This included many long-standing Lancastrian retainers who were of relatively humble origins. As a group these men were more important than the great magnates in the early councils of the reign.[113] Their presence was objected to because it was felt that they would owe far too much to the king and would not give him the impartial advice necessary for good government. From as early as 1401 the commons were requesting the king to name his council in parliament and not to change its composition until the next parliament met. A council answerable to parliament would, it was hoped, be more responsible in the administration of parliamentary taxation.[114] It was this financial weakness that caused so many problems for the king's sons. Henry, prince of Wales, was never able to secure the submission of Glyndwr in Wales due to lack of money. The complaints of John, serving on the Scottish border, echo those made by the Percies before their rebellion in 1403, while Thomas, serving as lieutenant of Ireland, saw his army disappear because the money promised from England to pay its wages was not forthcoming. Similar complaints were made by the king's half-brother John Beaufort, earl of Somerset and captain of Calais, and no money was available to defend the English possessions in Aquitaine against French attacks. Henry IV's financial problems lasted throughout his reign and were only reduced from 1409 onwards with the collapse of Glyndwr's revolt. However, the lack of money had a huge impact on the career of Thomas of Lancaster, especially during his service in Ireland.

---

112 ibid., p. 65.

113 Brown, A.L., 'The king's councillors in fifteenth century England', *T.R.H.S.*, 5th series, 19 (1969) p. 103.

114 Brown, A.L., 'The commons and the council in the reign of Henry IV', *E.H.R.*, 79 (1964) p. 3.

Chapter 2: Thomas of Lancaster as lieutenant of Ireland.

In June 1401 King Henry IV of England appointed his second son, Thomas, as lieutenant of Ireland, replacing Sir John Stanley, who had held office since December 1399.[1] Although Stanley had originally been appointed to serve as lieutenant of Ireland for three years, there was a clause in his indenture which allowed for his replacement as lieutenant, with three months notice, if the king or one of his sons was to go to Ireland. Thus on 18 May 1401 Stanley was informed that Thomas of Lancaster was to be appointed lieutenant, even though Lancaster's formal appointment did not come until 27 June 1401.[2] However, in 1401 Thomas was a mere thirteen years old and, although he had served as steward of England this was in a purely ceremonial capacity and the office of lieutenant of Ireland was a much more daunting task, with a far greater degree of responsibility. The English lordship in Ireland had been in decline since the early fourteenth century. As lieutenant, Thomas of Lancaster was expected to try and protect the existing 'land of peace' from the incursions of the Gaelic Irish while at the same time attempt to recover control of lands already lost. This was to be achieved without either the financial or military resources available to king Richard II, whose two expeditions to Ireland in the 1390's had failed to halt the decline in English authority there.

In 1399, according to a letter sent by the Irish council to the king, because there were no soldiers for the defence of Ireland and no money there in order to engage new ones, 'the land is in danger of final destruction'. This letter outlines the problems faced by the English lordship in Ireland at the end of the fourteenth century. Art MacMurrough had risen in rebellion again after the departure of Richard II, claiming he would not make peace until an annuity of 80 marks and his wife's inheritance in the barony of Norragh had been restored, as promised by Richard II in 1395. MacMurrough had gone to Munster to help the earl of Desmond in his feud with the earl of Ormond. After

---

1 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 507.

2 Otway-Ruthven, *Medieval Ireland*, p. 341.

defeating Ormond, MacMurrough and Desmond planned to return 'with all the power that they can get from the parts of Munster, to destroy the country'. In Ulster the O'Neill had also gathered a large force and was threatening war unless his son and cousins, who were being held as hostages in Dublin Castle, were released. Nothing could be done to protect the lordship because of the lack of troops and money from England. The principal Anglo-Irish magnates were involved in their own private wars, often in alliance with the Gaelic Irish, and, according to the letter, 'the English marchers are not able, nor are they willing to ride against them [the Gaelic Irish] without stronger paramount power'. Under the circumstances the only stronger paramount power was an English army. Of the English lordship in Ireland only the county of Dublin and part of the county of Kildare provided any revenue for the Irish exchequer. The incompetence of officials in Ireland and the opposition of the Anglo-Irish magnates meant that English law could not be enforced, and therefore revenue not collected, within the areas which owed allegiance, at least nominally, to the English crown.[3] The Irish council seems to have been appealing to the new king to mount a royal expedition to Ireland, or at least send an expedition under the command of a substantial and capable nobleman, in order to save the lordship from complete destruction.

However, Henry IV was in no position to launch an Irish expedition so early in his reign and appointed Sir John Stanley as lieutenant of Ireland for three years instead. It is possible that Henry IV may have regarded Stanley's appointment as a temporary measure. The clause in Stanley's indenture which allowed for his replacement by the king or one of his sons perhaps indicates that Henry IV was aware of the problems in Ireland and that he planned a royal expedition to Ireland as soon as it was possible. A similar clause was inserted in the indentures of Thomas of Lancaster.

Immediately after his accession to the throne Henry IV had begun to encounter opposition. In 1400 there was an attempt to murder the king and his four sons and to restore Richard II to the throne. Soon afterwards Owain Glyndwr was driven into rebellion in Wales while tensions were also rising on the Scottish border. There was also the threat of renewed hostilities

---

3 *A Roll of the Proceedings of the King's Council in Ireland, 1392- 1393*, ed. J. Graves, pp. 261-9.

with France over the fate of Richard's child-bride Isabella and the return of her dowry. Henry, in facing all these problems, associated his sons with him in the royal government. His eldest son Henry, created prince of Wales in the first parliament of the reign, was given the task of subduing Glyndwr, Thomas was sent to Ireland, while the king's third son John was sent to the Scottish border, becoming Warden of the East March in 1403. Not only was the king ensuring that his sons learnt practical and valuable lessons about government and warfare, he was also making sure of a royal presence in areas where his authority was in dispute. Even if they were merely the nominal heads of royal government in these areas the presence of princes of royal blood added extra weight to the authority of the men actually responsible to the king. In the absence of the king himself the presence of one of his sons was the next best thing. The policy of associating the royal princes in government had also been used by Edward III. His eldest son, Edward, the Black Prince, had been his father's deputy in Aquitaine in the 1360's, holding the title Lord of Aquitaine from 1362 on, while Lionel, duke of Clarence, had served as lieutenant of Ireland in the 1360's. Edward III's sons also served in the wars in France.[4]

Thomas of Lancaster arrived in Ireland on 13 November 1401, landing at Dalkey and reaching Dublin later that day.[5] His deputy Sir Stephen le Scrope had reached Ireland in August 1401 in order to prepare for the arrival of the new lieutenant. Up until the late fourteenth century the more common title for the chief governors of Ireland had been that of justiciar. Before the appointment of Edmund Mortimer as lieutenant in October 1379 only six other men had been appointed as chief governor with that title. These included two de Burgh earls of Ulster, appointed in 1308 and 1331, Piers Gaveston, the favourite of Edward II in 1308, Roger Mortimer in 1316, Lionel, duke of Clarence, son of king Edward III, in the 1360's and William of Windsor in 1369.[6] From 1379 onwards the title of lieutenant becomes more common. Between the appointment of Edmund Mortimer in 1379 and that of Thomas of Lancaster in 1401 a further nine men were appointed with the title of lieutenant.[7] After the

---

4 Keen, M., *England in the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 251-5.

5 *Rot. Pat. Hib.*, p. 160.

6 *Handbook of British Chronolgy*, pp. 161-64.

7 ibid.

royal expeditions of Richard II in the 1390's, the title of the chief governor was more frequently that of the king's lieutenant, with the office itself often being exercised by a deputy.[8] The title of lieutenant seems to have been used to indicate the status of the man in office. For example Sir William le Scrope was appointed justiciar for Leinster, Munster and Louth in 1395 at the same time as Roger Mortimer, earl of March and Ulster, was appointed as lieutenant for Ulster, Connacht and Meath. There is no doubt that March was the superior as all charters, letters patent and writs were to be sealed under his authority as lieutenant.[9] The title of lieutenant also seems to have been used as an inducement to encourage men to take office when service in Ireland was regarded with some distaste. However, there seems to have been no substantial difference between the powers and responsibilities of justiciars and lieutenants.[10] Perhaps the main difference between the offices of lieutenant and of justiciar was that justiciars were usually appointed without any indenture at the fixed salary of £500.[11] As the lordship was increasingly threatened during the fourteenth century this difference seems to have lessened with both justiciars and lieutenants entering office by way of indenture.[12]

Thomas of Lancaster's first indenture to serve as lieutenant of Ireland was sealed on 27 June 1401. On this date the chancellor of England, Edmund Stafford, bishop of Exeter, received authorization from the king to appoint Lancaster as lieutenant for a period of six years, beginning on Monday three weeks hence, on 18 July. The powers to be granted to Lancaster as lieutenant were set out in a series of articles delivered to the king by those men serving in the council of Lancaster and were attached to the king's letter of appointment. The king reserved to himself the power and authority to appoint to the offices of chancellor, treasurer and chief baron of the exchequer of Ireland.[13]

---

8 Wood, H., 'The Office of Chief Governor of Ireland', *P. R. I. A.*, (1923) p. 210.

9 *C.P.R., 1391-96*, p. 170.

10 Otway-Ruthven, A.J., 'The Chief Governors of Medieval Ireland', *J. R. S. A. I.*, 95 (1965) p. 228.

11 Wood, 'The Office of Chief Governor', pp. 207-9.

12 Otway-Ruthven, 'Chief Governors', p. 231.

13 P.R.O., C81/609/2649A

Lancaster was given the power to admit and to receive into the law and the king's peace all rebels and outlaws, both English and Irish, and to give and to grant to them charters of pardon and to confirm them in the king's peace by granting them letters patent under the king's seal used in Ireland. Pardons could be issued by Lancaster for treasons, homicides, robberies, felonies, murders, rapes, larcenies, trespasses, contempts, forfeitures and other rebellions, as well as to confederates and accomplices to these crimes. This power included both crimes which had previously been committed in Ireland and those which might be committed in the future. Lancaster was also empowered to receive and to keep all fines and ransoms made to the use of the king in Ireland. Lancaster also sought the power to make grants of all manner of lands and tenements, appurtenances and emoluments held by the Irish through war or rebellion or through lack of adequate defence, as well as other lands which the Irish held of old and which were currently in their possession. This excepted lands which had previously been annexed to the church. Lancaster also sought the power to make grants of all manner of lands and tenements, rents, services, knights-fees and advowsons of churches with all manner of ecclesiastical benefices and other appurtenances whatsoever, which had been forfeit to the king or to his predecessors or which would come to be forfeit to the king in the future. These lands were to be granted, with the advice and assent of the council, to suitable men within the obedience, law and allegiance of the king, either in tail, or for the term of life or for the term of lives. Lands held in Ireland by those residing in England which were destroyed and wasted by war also fell under the power of the lieutenant. These lands could be let and leased to tenants who wished to hold these lands by the payment of an annual farm to the king and his heirs, in fee simple, in tail, for life or for a term of years. However, this was only to happen after a proclamation had been made by Lancaster allowing for any English to claim the lands and if their claim was upheld then they were to have their lands in the same manner as they had previously been held. Lancaster also sought to have the power to supervise and govern all officers of the king in Ireland including those holding their office for life or otherwise, as well as their deputies. Those whom Lancaster found to be neither able nor sufficient nor profitable in their office nor duly exercising their office, with the advice and assent of his council, could be removed by Lancaster and others, more suitable, could be appointed in their place, with the exception of the chancellor, the

treasurer and the chief baron of the exchequer, which power, as noted, the king had reserved to himself. Lancaster was also entitled to move the common bench and the exchequer to places that pleased him, for the profit of the king and his people. Lancaster also received the power to grant and present to all manner of ecclesiastical benefices, both with cure and without cure, as well as to deaconries, archdeaconries, parsonages, vicarages, chapels and to chantries in cathedral churches as well as in collegiate churches, in any place within Ireland, which were currently vacant or would become vacant in the future. All benefices which were in the gift of the chancellor were excepted. Lancaster wanted the power to exercise his office fully and freely, to have the power to make grants and gifts which previous justiciars had, to do all manner of things which pertained to the office of justiciar of Ireland, to hold the country in a strong and stable manner for the king, to do everything for the profit of the king and the country and to act in all things as if he were the king in person.[14] Letters patent were also issued authorizing Lancaster to make war upon and to pacify the king's enemies and rebels, and to take any supplies necessary to sustain his household and men.[15]

Three days after the indenture was sealed the terms of payment for Lancaster were set out. For each of the six years of his term of office Lancaster was to receive 12,000 marks, for himself and for the payment of his retinue. He was to be paid 3,000 marks immediately and a further £1,000 three weeks later, when his term as lieutenant officially began. Another payment of £1,000, covering his salary for the first half year, was to be made when Lancaster and his retinue were ready to cross over to Ireland. Lancaster was then to be paid, or suitable assignments were to be made in England, at the rate of 3,000 marks at the beginning of each of the two remaining quarters of the first year and at the beginning of each quarter of the other five years. If any of the payments due to Lancaster were over a month in arrears then he was to be excused by the king from the lieutenancy and governance of Ireland. The cost of shipping Lancaster and his retinue to Ireland was to be borne by the king. All powers granted to Lancaster under the terms of his indenture were to last for the full six years, excepting only if the king or the prince of Wales were

---

14 P.R.O., C81/609/2649B

15 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 507.

to go to Ireland. In that case Lancaster was to have the office of chief justice of Ireland, still receiving the full 12,000 marks *per annum.*[16]

In March 1403 Lancaster agreed to a new indenture to serve as lieutenant of Ireland. This new indenture followed that of 1401 quite closely but some additions to the lieutenant's powers were made. Lancaster was again given full power to keep the peace and laws of Ireland as well as the power to act against any rebels or enemies of the king in Ireland. He was also to receive all profits and issues of the exchequer in Ireland due to the king, as well as control over wardships, marriages, escheats and other things pertaining to the king in Ireland. The issues and profits of Ireland were to be used for the defence of that land and any other charges arising there. Lancaster was not liable to render any account for this to the king or to any of his heirs. At the same time the right of Lancaster to appoint suitable people to any vacant ecclesiastical benefice was reiterated. He was also entitled to confirm the estates and possessions of any person, both lay and ecclesiastical, as well as liberties, both royal and otherwise. One of the major innovations of the indenture of 1403 was that Lancaster was given the authority to receive the fealties of archbishops and bishops and to confirm them in their temporalities, as well as the homage of lay tenants. Lancaster was also to appoint and to remove all officers of the crown, seemingly without restriction, and to oversee the rendering of their accounts. He was charged with ensuring that all those in the king's ward were adequately provided for, and was also given a commission to enquire about all goods forfeit to the king in Ireland.[17] The reason for these extensions in Lancaster's powers is not quite clear. One possible reason is that it was an attempt to persuade him to stay on in Ireland when there was no money available to pay him, or perhaps it was felt that he should no longer be put under restrictions on account of his age. When Lancaster was re-appointed as lieutenant in October 1404 all of the above powers were restated with the exception of the one relating to the appointment of royal officers. Now it was restricted to those 'not having estate in fee or for life'.[18]

---

16 P.R.O., E404/16/728.

17 Rymer, *Foedera*, viii, pp. 293-4.

18 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, p. 456.

On 1 March 1406 Lancaster sealed a new indenture agreeing to serve as lieutenant. The reason given for this new indenture was that Lancaster had lost his part of the previous indenture. If his part of the indenture was found he promised to return it to the office of the privy seal in order for it to be cancelled and annulled. However, this may have been merely an excuse to reduce the amount being spent on Ireland from the English exchequer. In the new indenture Lancaster was appointed as lieutenant for a period of twelve years, agreeing to serve at the reduced rate of £6,000 *per annum*. This sum was to cover Lancaster's salary as well as that of his retinue. This force was to consist of 100 men-at-arms and 200 archers, to be recruited in England. He was also entitled to raise a force from among the English of Ireland, if the necessity arose, in order to make raids[19] on the rebels there. The cost of shipping Lancaster and his men to Ireland was again to be borne by the king. Lancaster was to be paid £3,000 immediately, with the remaining £3,000 due for the first year to be paid on the quindene of St. John the Baptist [8 July]. Thereafter he was to be paid £1,500 at the beginning of each quarter of his remaining years in office. Again, if any payments were more than a month overdue then Lancaster was to be excused from the lieutenancy. If the king or the prince of Wales were to go to Ireland in person then Lancaster was to be appointed to the office of chief justice of Ireland, although he was still to receive his full salary of £6,000 *per annum*. The king also reserved the right to send Lancaster to Gascony, or elsewhere, allowing Lancaster to appoint a suitable deputy, with the king's agreement, to govern Ireland during his absence. In the case of the arrival of the king or the prince in Ireland Lancaster was to be notified at least six months in advance.[20]

Lancaster's next indenture as lieutenant of Ireland was agreed on 8 March 1408. Lancaster was to take up office on 1 May of that year and was to serve for a further three years. He was to be paid 7,000 marks *per annum*, another reduction in his salary. However, in addition to this he was to receive extra payments of £3,000 for each of his three years. These payments were intended to try and clear the sum of £9,000 which was owed to Lancaster for his previous service as lieutenant. Soon after this Lancaster actually

---

19 The word *chivachees* is used in the original.

20 P.R.O., E101/69/2/316.

returned to Ireland for the first time since 1403 and it seems likely that this promise to settle his arrears was the reason for his return. Lancaster and his men were to be shipped to Ireland at the king's expense. While no specific details are given as to the size of Lancaster's retinue it is possible that he was to serve with a force of the same size as agreed in March 1406. Neither is there any mention of Lancaster's powers in this indenture and again we must look back to the indenture of 1406 as a precedent. The main purpose of the 1408 indenture seems to have been to establish a new rate of pay for the lieutenant, but to compensate for this by trying to ensure the payment of his arrears.[21] On 4 May 1408, three days after Lancaster was to have taken up office, the treasurer of England was instructed to ensure the delivery of 400 bows and 1,000 sheaves of arrows to Lancaster, to be used for the defence of Ireland.[22]

The feature which most distinguishes the 1408 indenture from its predecessors is that in 1408 the indenture actually specified how, and from what sources, Lancaster was to be paid, rather than just stating that adequate provision would be made for him. The 7,000 marks due to Lancaster for his first year were to come in six payments. The first payment 1,500 marks was to be paid to Lancaster immediately. This payment was to come from the fifteenth and tenth lately granted to the king and orders were issued for its payment on 17 February 1408.[23] He was also given assignments for a further 2,500 marks. Of these, a payment of 1,500 marks was to come from the first part of the tenth, granted to Henry IV at the parliament of 1407, to be collected from the clergy of the province of Canterbury, which was due at Easter. The other payment of 1,000 marks was to come from the second part of the lay subsidy, granted at the same time, and due on 1 May. Lancaster was only to receive this money after the prince of Wales was able to secure the sums already assigned to him for the suppression of the Glyndwr rebellion.[24] Of the remaining 3,000 marks, another payment of 1,000 was to be collected from the next part of the clerical tenth due from the province of Canterbury. This sum was only to be paid after £500 had been given to John, the king's third son, and the earl of

---

21 P.R.O., E101/69/2/320; BL., Cotton Titus B, XI, f. x, 17.

22 P.R.O., E404/23/377.

23 P.R.O., E404/23/242.

24 P.R.O., E404/23/309.

Westmorland for the defence of the east and west marches towards Scotland. The next payment of 1,000 marks was to come from the third part of the lay subsidy, which was due at Candlemas. The final sum of 1,000 marks was to come from the subsidy, reserved to the king, on wool to be shipped from the port of Boston after Michaelmas 1408. Of the £3,000 due to Lancaster for the payment of his arrears the sum of £2,000 was to be levied in the port of Hull, 500 marks in the port of Southampton and 1,000 marks in the port of Ipswich. Orders were issued on 26 November 1408 for the payment of the sums due from the subsidy on wools.[25] The indenture also sets out the sources from which Lancaster was to be paid for the subsequent two years. For each year he was to receive £2,000 in the port of Hull, £2,000 in the port of Boston, £1,000 in the port of Ipswich, £1,000 in the port of London, 2,000 marks in the port of Southampton, £200 in the port of Chichester and £133 6s. 8d. in the port of Melcombe.

There seems to have been another agreement made between Lancaster and the king concerning his service as lieutenant of Ireland before the terms of the indenture of 1408 had expired. In March 1411 we find the king issuing warrants to the treasurer for the payment of 4,000 marks to be paid to Lancaster for his service as lieutenant. Although no evidence for a new indenture exists, Henry IV refers to the appointment of Lancaster as lieutenant being lately made with the assent of his great council.[26] The 4,000 marks were to cover Lancaster's expenses in Ireland from Michaelmas 1410 until Michaelmas 1411. The first payment was authorised on 23 March 1411 and Lancaster was to receive 2,000 marks from the wool subsidy as part payment of the agreed 4,000 marks. A warrant for payment to Lancaster issued on 13 May 1411 refers to the indenture lately made between him the king. Lancaster is to receive a further 2,000 marks, to cover his expenses for the second half of the year, again from the subsidy on wool.[27] However, even with his salary cut down to 4,000 marks *per annum*, the English exchequer still had problems meeting its obligations to Lancaster. In November 1411 Lancaster was still

---

25 P.R.O., E404/24/248.

26 P.R.O., E404/26/247.

27 P.R.O., E404/24/363.

owed £369 6s. 8d. of the 4,000 marks due to him.[28] It is not clear why Lancaster's salary suffered a further reduction at this time. It may have been due to purely economic reasons, with the English exchequer simply being unable to support Lancaster. A more likely explanation for the reduction in Lancaster's salary lies in the seizure of power, early in 1410, by Henry, prince of Wales. We know the prince was unwilling to pay either the salary or the arrears in salary of a predominantly absentee lieutenant,[29] and the new salary of 4,000 marks may have been a compromise negotiated during the course of the prince's control of the council. If so, then the king seems to have been trying to ensure that at least as much of the 4,000 marks as possible was paid to Lancaster. By the autumn of 1411 the king was firmly back in control of government and a new series of provisions for the settlement of Lancaster's arrears were undertaken. On 23 December 1411 and on 15 January 1412 Henry IV ordered payments to be made to Lancaster in order to cover part of the money due to him as lieutenant of Ireland.[30]

Lieutenants and justiciars were appointed in order to supervise the lordship of Ireland on behalf of the king and to act as his representative there. It has been stated that, to the Anglo-Irish the English king was necessary for their sense of identity and that while justiciars were 'temporary and dependent figures who could not replace the king', they at least ensured a continuous link between Ireland and the English crown.[31] As the head of the administration in Ireland it was quite natural for the justiciar or lieutenant to have the power to remove and appoint government officials. In 1360 the second earl of Ormond received a commission to enquire into the bearing and defects of royal officers, including 'sheriffs, escheators, constables, bailiffs and other officers as well as the clerks and other ministers of the exchequer and either bench' with the exceptions only of the barons of the exchequer and the justices of the benches.[32] In 1399 Sir John Stanley was given full power to remove all the king's officers and ministers found to be

---

28 P.R.O., E404/27/153.

29 *P.P.C.*, i, p. 320.

30 P.R.O., E404/27/174; E404/27/177.

31 Frame, R., *English Lordship in Ireland, 1318-1361*, pp. 8-9.

32 *C.P.R., 1358-61*, p. 411.

insufficient excepting the chancellor, the treasurer, the chief justices and the chief barons of the exchequer and those holding office for life by grant of letters patent.[33] Although Lancaster's authority over the government in Ireland was less restricted than that of other lieutenants, presumably because of his royal blood, he had been given powers traditionally granted to the chief governor and his indentures in this regard were in no way exceptional. In 1420 the fourth earl of Ormond was serving as lieutenant with the power to remove all the king's ministers in Ireland excepting only the chancellor and the treasurer.[34]

The problem of absentee holdings was one which constituted a major problem for the English government. Successive statutes were passed in both English and Irish parliaments to ensure that lands held by absentees were adequately defended. One of the first acts of Henry IV had been to confirm a statute of Richard II whereby absentees must return to Ireland and defend their property, or make adequate provision for its defence in their absence, or else they would forfeit two-thirds of the profits of their lands, rents, offices or possessions.[35] In 1398 Thomas Holland, duke of Surrey, requested that he be allowed 'to have from every one or two parishes in England a man and his wife' to settle in marcher lands wasted by war and lands left vacant by absentees.[36] The power of Lancaster to grant leases of absentees' lands was an innovation in the powers of the lieutenant, but this can also be regarded as a natural extension of these powers. This extra power can also be attributed to the fact that Lancaster was the king's son. In March 1399 Thomas Holland was also given the power to present to all benefices in Ireland within the king's gift, excepting those to which the king presented by authority of the pope, providing a direct precedent for Thomas of Lancaster's power to do likewise.[37] The legislation against absentees holding land in Ireland was an attempt 'to fill the vacuum created by the absence of personal lordship' there. However, as has been pointed out the greatest absentee of all 'was the lord of Ireland himself'.[38]

---

33 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 92.

34 *C.P.R., 1416-22*, p. 256.

35 *Stat. Ire., John-Hen. V*, pp. 501-03.

36 *Cal. Carew*, v, p. 387.

37 *C.P.R., 1396-99*, p. 501.

38 Davies, R.R., 'Lordship or colony?', in Lydon ed., *The English in medieval Ireland*, p. 146.

The other exceptional powers granted to Lancaster were the clause in his 1401 indenture granting him the power of purveyance and the power given to him in 1403 to receive the fealties of archbishops and bishops and the homage of lay tenants, which in theory should have been performed in front of the king. The grant of the power of purveyance, or coign, seems to have been recognition of the fact that successive justiciars and lieutenants had been forced to resort to this practice due to the lack of money forthcoming from England. Although Lancaster seems to have been the first lieutenant to have expressly received the right to purveyance, a precedent seems to have been set. In 1420 the fourth earl of Ormond received the same power.[39] The grant of the power to receive fealty and homage was probably due to Lancaster's blood connection to the crown and may be used as evidence that Henry IV was using his son to help secure the loyalty of the lordship for the Lancastrian dynasty. This was essential to the king as there is evidence that attempts were being made to draw Ireland into Glyndwr's rebellion. In 1401 Glyndwr had sent envoys to Ireland seeking an alliance against the English. The letters which Glyndwr sent to 'the lords of Ireland' claimed that as long as he was able to continue to wage his war against the English then the Irish would 'in the mean time have welcome peace and calm repose'. Glyndwr made much of the common enmity of the Welsh and Irish towards the English and requested the Irish to send him 'horsemen and footmen, for the succour of us and our people who now this long while are oppressed by our said foes and yours'.[40] Although nothing came of this embassy and Glyndwr's messengers were captured and executed,[41] it showed Henry IV the threat which Ireland could pose. This seems to have been a major reason behind the sending to Ireland of Thomas of Lancaster. The presence of a prince of the royal blood might do much to remind the lordship of its loyalty to the crown and, as a usurper king, Henry IV seems to have been well aware of the need to guarantee the loyalty of Ireland to the new dynasty.

---

39 *C.P.R., 1416-22*, p. 256.

40 *The Chronicle of Adam of Usk*, p. 111. A similar letter was sent to the king of Scotland, imitating the attempts of Robert Bruce to create a combined Scottish, Welsh and Irish alliance against the English during the early decades of the fourteenth century, Lydon, *The Lordship of Ireland in the middle ages*, p. 245.

41 *The Chronicle of Adam of Usk*, p. 109.

It is possible that Henry IV also regarded the Mortimer lordship in Ireland as a possible threat to his kingship, being aware of the prestige and power which the Mortimer family enjoyed in Ireland.[42] Roger Mortimer, the fourth earl of March, seems to have been primarily responsible for the breakdown of the Ricardian settlement in Ireland. It was his vigorous attempt to re-establish the Mortimer lordship in Ulster that resulted in the return of the O'Neills to open warfare. The appointment of March as lieutenant and Sir William le Scrope as justiciar in 1395 has been interpreted as an attempt by Richard II to limit the activities of the earl of March as chief governor.[43] The ambitions and interests of the earl of March in Ireland were more in tune with those of the Anglo-Irish lords there than with those of the king. Richard II seems to have been aware of this fact, as well as of the fact that the continued quiescence of O'Neill 'depended upon a sacrifice of the personal interests of the lieutenant'.[44] The O'Neill had been one of the first of the Gaelic Irish chiefs to submit to Richard II, and this seems to have been primarily in order to gain protection from the crown against the earl of March. In a letter from Niall Mór O'Neill to Richard II he requests that the king 'be shield and helmet of justice to me between my lord the earl of Ulster and me'.[45] As long as Richard II remained in Ireland then the settlement with O'Neill would remain intact.

However, from 1396 onwards the earl of March began to attempt to re-assert his authority in Ulster. In this year he launched a seemingly unprovoked attack on O'Neill in conjunction with the Anglo-Irish lords.[46] From this point on the settlement in Ulster was a dead letter and the situation there reverted to that which had existed before the arrival of Richard II.[47] It was perhaps as much for this reason as for his sheltering of his renegade uncle Thomas Mortimer that the king planned to move against March. Adam of Usk,

---

42 Lydon, *The Lordship of Ireland in the middle ages*, p. 244.

43 Johnston, D., 'The Interim years: Richard II and Ireland, 1395-99', in *England and Ireland in the later middle ages*, ed. J.F. Lydon, p. 180.

44 ibid.

45 Simms, K., "'The King's friend': O'Neill, the crown and the earldom of Ulster", in *England and Ireland in the later middle ages*, ed. J.F. Lydon, p. 217.

46 *M.I.A.*, p. 157. The annalist describes the attack on O'Neill as 'a treacherous raid'.

47 Johnston, 'The Interim years: Richard II and Ireland, 1395-99', p. 181.

a man with strong Mortimer connections, states that the king 'being ever evil-minded against him [March], for that others dared it not, thought with his own hands to slay him. And with others thereto sworn, the king did ever seek occasion to destroy him'.[48] Richard II replaced the earl of March as lieutenant of Ireland in 1398 and it was only the earl's untimely death in a skirmish in Carlow that prevented the king from moving against him. The death of the fourth earl left the Mortimer lordships in England and Ireland in the hands of his young son, who had been born in 1391. The youth of the earl of March certainly helped to establish the claim of Henry Bolingbroke to the English crown following the deposition of Richard II in 1399. Thus, in 1399 the Mortimers accepted the authority of the new king. Despite the fact that Edmund Mortimer, uncle of the earl of March, joined Glyndwr's rebellion in 1402 there does not seem to have been any real anti-Lancastrian feeling among the Mortimer lordships and it must be remembered that Edmund Mortimer was captured by Glyndwr when Mortimer was leading raids against the Welsh rebels. While these military actions were helping to defend the Mortimer lands in Wales they were also helping to secure the hold of Henry IV on England. The opposition of Edmund Mortimer to Henry IV can be interpreted as an opportunistic attempt to ease the burden of his captivity.

In the Mortimer lordships in Ireland there does not seem to have been any attempt to oppose the new king nor to promote the more legitimate claims to the throne of the earl of March. This seems to have been a pragmatic approach to the deteriorating military situation throughout the lordship.[49] In Ulster the O'Neills were in rebellion and Mortimer partisans would have been more likely to be involved in trying to defend their position in Ireland than raising a rebellion against the new king of England. The position of the Mortimer lordship in Ireland was further exacerbated in 1401. In this year Adam of Usk records raids on Ulster by 'the Lord of the Orkney Isles, to the great injury of my lord of March, who was still in wardship of the king'.[50] The Ricardian settlement in Ireland broke down because of 'the divergent interests of the English crown and the Anglo-Irish community' and it

---

48 *The Chronicle of Adam of Usk*, p. 35.

49 see above, pp. 33-4.

50 *The Chronicle of Adam of Usk*, p. 98.

was the opportunism of the Anglo-Irish magnates which 'hastened the return of Gaelic Ireland to rebellion'.[51] The new king was a man with neither the financial resources nor, seemingly, the inclination to restore the settlement effected by Richard II in Ireland. Henry IV seems to have been content to allow the Anglo-Irish to deal with Gaelic Ireland in the traditional manner. The arrival of Thomas of Lancaster in Ireland was not intended to deal with a threat to the Lancastrians from the Anglo-Irish, but instead to prevent Gaelic Irish lords from becoming involved in Glyndwr's rebellion in Wales, something that could be achieved only by vigorous miltary action, a policy which the Anglo-Irish were greatly in favour of. Thus, while there is no evidence to point to either support for or opposition to Bolingbroke's seizure of the throne amongst Mortimer adherents in Ireland, it seems likely that the new dynasty was under no threat from the Mortimers nor from any of the other Anglo-Irish magnates.

By the middle of the fourteenth century the principal function of the chief governor of Ireland was to conduct the wars against the Gaelic Irish. From this time onwards the policy of the English monarchy was to increase the territory under its control by the use of military expeditions, a policy which culminated in the two royal expeditions of Richard II. Throughout the thirteenth and the first half of the fourteenth century the normal salary of the justiciar of Ireland was the sum of £500 per annum, out of which he was expected to maintain a force of 20 men-at-arms, the justiciar himself usually being specified as the twentieth man.[52] However, by the middle of the fourteenth century the chief governor's retinue was obviously too small a force to combat the revival among the Gaelic Irish. Evidence for the size of Lancaster's original retinue is scant, but in 1406 he indented to serve in Ireland with a force of 100 men-at-arms and 200 archers.[53] As Lancaster did not return to the country until 1408 it seems unlikely that this force ever reached Ireland. However, on 18 August 1406 warrants were issued to pay Stephen le Scrope, who had agreed to act as Lancaster's deputy during the lieutenant's absence from Ireland, for a period of six months. He was to serve in Ireland with a force

---

51 Johnston, 'The Interim years: Richard II and Ireland, 1395-99', p. 191.

52 Otway-Ruthven, 'Chief Governors', p. 230.

53 Rymer, *Foedera*, viii, p. 431.

of fifty men-at-arms and 300 archers beginning on 18 September 1406.[54] Commissions had been issued on 17 August to gather ships in the ports of Chester, Liverpool and Bristol for the passage of le Scrope and his men.[55] The fact that le Scrope, as deputy, had direct access to the English exchequer is quite unusual. Normally deputies were appointed through a private arrangement with the lieutenant.[56] Perhaps this is indicative of financial problems facing the administration in Ireland and of the unwillingness of le Scrope to serve as deputy without some form of financial guarantees from the exchequer in London. As Lancaster's military commander in Ireland le Scrope would presumably also have been aware that archers could play a more effective role in the type of campaigns he was conducting in Ireland than men-at-arms. However this would have been a smaller retinue than that which served under Sir John Stanley. In October 1400 Stanley received £1,000 to pay his retinue, which was supposed to consist of ninety-nine men-at-arms and 300 archers.[57] It is possible that the force which le Scrope brought back to Ireland was to reinforce troops that he had left in Ireland the previous year.

In July 1360 the Irish council, under the earl of Ormond, sent an appeal to king Edward III asking for an army to be sent to Ireland. The council also requested that this army be financed by the English exchequer.[58] This request reached Edward at just the right time because that same year England and France had agreed to the treaty of Bretigny, resulting in a truce in the Anglo-French war and giving Edward the opportunity to try and solve some problems closer to home. The direct result of this appeal was the arrival in Ireland in September 1361 of the king's son Lionel, earl of Ulster, as lieutenant. He brought with him a force of 197 men-at-arms and 670 mounted archers.[59] Although a substantial force by Irish standards, it was small in

---

54 P.R.O., E404/21/305.

55 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p.237.

56 Matthew, E., 'The Financing of the Lordship of Ireland under Henry V and Henry VI', in *Property and Politics*, ed. A.J. Pollard, pp. 104-5.

57 P. R. O., E101/247/6; Devon, F., *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 279.

58 H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles, *Parliaments and Councils of Medieval Ireland*, pp. 19-22.

59 Connolly, P., 'The Financing of English Expeditions to Ireland, 1361-76', in J. F. Lydon, ed., *England and Ireland in the Later Middle Ages*, p. 105.

comparison to English armies employed on the continent. Even so the English exchequer faced problems in the financing of this army. When an individual retinue's period of service had expired its indenture was not renewed, so that by 1365 Lionel's army had been reduced to 160 men.[60] Lionel seems to have been quite happy to leave Ireland in 1366 in order to pursue the prospect of a marriage to Violante Visconti, niece of the ruler of Milan. Lionel was replaced by the earl of Desmond, appointed as justiciar, who was replaced in 1369 by William of Windsor, who had served under Lionel when he was lieutenant.

Windsor was appointed as lieutenant for a period of three years. Under the terms of his indenture he was expected to maintain a force of 200 men-at-arms and 300 archers in his first year in office, 120 men-at-arms and 200 archers in his second year and 80 men-at-arms and 120 archers in his third year. All of this was at a total cost to the English exchequer of £20,000,[61] the equivalent of practically ten years revenues for the Irish exchequer. Once again the English government was unable to meet its commitments in Ireland and Windsor was forced to seek subsidies from the Irish parliament. During his first three years in office Windsor called four parliaments and four great councils, seeking a subsidy on each occasion.[62] The experiences of William of Windsor showed the necessity of maintaining good relations with the Anglo-Irish magnates. According to complaints sent to Edward III, Windsor used pressure to extract subsidies from the parliament which were therefore unlawful.[63] Windsor returned to England in 1372 and was replaced by Robert Ashton. The new justiciar was to maintain two forces in Ireland. The first was to consist of men-at-arms and archers, to be financed from England, while the second was to consist of hobelars and kerns, more suited to warfare in Ireland, to be recruited in Ireland and to be financed by the Irish exchequer.[64] William of Windsor was re-appointed as lieutenant in September 1373 with instructions to maintain a force of 200 men-at-arms and 400 archers for one year, at a cost of £11,213. 6s.

---

60 ibid. p. 107.

61 ibid., p. 111.

62 Lydon, J.F., 'William of Windsor and the Irish Parliament', *E.H.R.*, 80 (1965) p. 257.

63 ibid. p. 258.

64 *C.C.R., 1374-77*, pp. 170-1.

8d,[65] but he was again removed from office in February 1376, seemingly because of the renewed opposition of the Anglo-Irish magnates.

In October 1379 Edmund Mortimer, earl of March and earl of Ulster, was appointed as lieutenant. As the most substantial landholder in Ireland March would not be dependent on the Irish parliament for subsidies in the event of the English exchequer being unable to pay his wages. His own revenues provided the lieutenant with the basis for independent action. The new lieutenant was also given full control of the profits and issues of Ireland without having to render any account at the English exchequer.[66] This does not seem to have been a successful move because in June 1383 the new lieutenant, Sir Philip Courtenay, was instructed to investigate the debts of Mortimer's household.[67] The grant of the revenues of Ireland to successive lieutenants became more common leading to the grant in March 1403 of 'all issues belonging to the king in Ireland' to Thomas of Lancaster, which was renewed in October 1404 with the condition that he use these issues for the defence of Ireland.[68]

Due to the increasingly military nature of their office justiciars were also empowered to receive rebels back into the king's peace. This had been a regular feature in the indentures of justiciars since the 1330's. William of Windsor had similar powers but with the exception of where 'a prelate, earl or baron has done any felony, treason or other delinquency for which he should lose life or limb or forfeit his lands and chattels'.[69] Sir John Stanley had been appointed as lieutenant with the power to receive and pardon rebels and to grant them letters patent of pardon.[70] The administration of Thomas of Lancaster tried to deal with English rebels by drawing them back under the influence of the English crown. In December 1403 William de Burgh, a man who had long ignored the authority of the government in Dublin, was appointed as Lancaster's sole local deputy in Connacht, a position he had

---

65 *C.P.R., 1370-74*, p. 340.

66 Richardson, H.G., & Sayles, G.O., *The Irish Parliament in the Middle Ages*, p. 158

67 *C.P.R., 1381-85*, p. 348.

68 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, pp. 212, 456.

69 *C.P.R., 1367-70*, p. 225.

70 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 92.

previously shared with John Lyverpool and William and John Mirreson.[71] William de Burgh, lord of Upper Connacht, had been in control of the town of Galway from 1400. In that year an expedition had been planned, under the command of Nicholas Kent, a burgess of the town, to recover the town and the Aran Islands, which were under the control of the O'Briens. The confirmation of de Burgh's authority in the region in 1403 was a recognition on the part of the Dublin government of its ineffectiveness in this region.[72] In effect the appointment of de Burgh served a similar purpose to the submissions taken from Gaelic Irish chieftains. When the government was in no position to enforce its jurisdiction, the only option was to abdicate governmental functions to those exercising practical authority, even those over whose activities the government exercised little or no control.[73]

The appointment of de Burgh as Lancaster's sole local deputy in Connacht may also have been due to the desire on the part of the Dublin government to protect trade along the western seaboard. The expedition of March 1400, under Nicholas Kent, was to consist of four ships recruited by John Scotte, John Rederice, William Pounde, Edward Whyte and Philip Taillour, citizens of Bristol, it being the English port which seems to have controlled most of the trade with the west of Ireland.[74] Their aim was to recapture the town of Galway and the Aran Islands because of the threat to the shipping of the king's loyal subjects. The town of Galway paid annual tribute to the O'Briens in return for keeping Galway Bay safe for shipping.[75] The importance of Galway lay in the fact that since 1380 the town had become the centre of the wine trade with Portugal and was becoming one of Ireland's main sources of wine.[76] The expedition was not being supported with government

---

71 *Rot. Pat. Hib.*, p. 177, p. 167.

72 Cosgrove, A., 'The emergence of the Pale', in *A New History of Ireland, ii, the middle ages*, p. 535.

73 ibid.

74 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 254.

75 Childs, W., & O'Neill, T., 'Overseas trade', in *A New History of Ireland, ii, the middle ages*, p. 523.

76 Down, K., 'Colonial society and economy', in *A New History of Ireland, ii, the middle ages*, p. 489.

money, but if it succeeded those involved could 'have to their own use all goods of the rebels and enemies of the king there'. Those involved guaranteed to safeguard the rights of the king, the heir of Roger Mortimer, earl of March and nominal lord of Connacht, and all other lieges of the king in the town. The mayor of Bristol was ordered to extract security of £1,000 from those involved in the expedition in case any of those in the king's allegiance were harmed.[77] The failure of this expedition seems to have increased the need to bring William de Burgh back into the royal allegiance.

However, the principal threat to the English lordship in Ireland came from the Gaelic Irish, and the main purpose of military expeditions led by the chief governors was to secure submissions from the Irish, in particular those on the borders of the land of peace. On his arrival in the summer of 1401 Stephen le Scrope, Lancaster's deputy, had immediately set about trying to secure submissions from Gaelic Irish lords. Although much more substantial English armies had been present quite recently in Ireland, le Scrope seems to have used his force to good effect. By 14 September 1401 he secured the submission of the O'Connor Falys, while that of the O'Byrnes of Wicklow followed on 8 November. In December he turned his attention to the north securing the submission of the MacMahons of Uriel on 13 December, followed on 4 February 1402 by that of the O'Reillys of Breifne.[78] All of these Irish lordships were situated on the borders of the English settlement and le Scrope was thus able to remove significant threats to the position of Thomas of Lancaster in Ireland. It has been suggested that by the early 1400's the Dublin administration was concentrating on maintaining the core settlement areas around Dublin and that it was coming to terms with its large, neighbouring, Gaelic Irish powers.[79] It is possible that what le Scrope had in mind was to ensure the stability of the lordship in Leinster, perhaps because that was the only part of the lordship that he could defend adequately and that le Scrope was in fact surrendering control of parts of the lordship because there was no way to enforce the authority of the government there.

---

77 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p.254.

78 *Rot. Pat. Hib.*, p. 165.

79 Frame, R., 'The Defence of the English Lordship, 1250-1450', in *A Military History of Ireland*, p. 91.

Le Scrope was a man who already possessed extensive experience of Ireland. He was the younger brother of William le Scrope who had been appointed justiciar of Leinster, Munster and Louth in April 1395.[80] Throughout his two year period in office William le Scrope employed his brother to act as his deputy in Ireland. William le Scrope was one of Richard II's closest advisers and was executed at Bristol in 1399 during the Lancastrian seizure of the throne. In 1400, while serving as one of the captains of Roxburgh castle, Stephen le Scrope was accused of plotting to restore Richard II to the throne by lord Grey, the other captain of the castle. He was cleared of these charges[81] and their origin may have lain in tension between the two captains rather than in any actual plotting on le Scrope's part. This seems the most likely explanation because the king allowed le Scrope to buy out Grey's share in the guard of the castle in order to make its defence more secure. In June 1402, after Roxburgh castle had been entrusted to the earl of Westmorland, Henry IV ordered that the money which le Scrope still owed to lord Grey, for his share of the custody of the castle, be paid out of the exchequer.[82] Le Scrope obviously retained the confidence of the king, travelling to Ireland in August 1401, in order to prepare for the arrival of Lancaster. In December 1401 le Scrope was officially appointed as Thomas of Lancaster's deputy, as well as his governor of the wars.[83] In September 1407 le Scrope defeated a force of Irish led by O'Carroll at Callan in county Kilkenny.[84] The following year Thomas of Lancaster led an expedition into Leinster, while later in the year he was wounded in a skirmish at Kilmainham, where he seems to have been based. After being wounded at Kilmainham, Lancaster ordered 'that all such as ought by their tenures to serve the king, should assemble at Rosse'.[85] This proclamation of royal service was the prelude to a substantial campaign against the Irish of Leinster, and the earl of Ormond was issued with safe-conducts to

---

80 *C.P.R., 1391-96*, p. 710.

81 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 401.

82 P.R.O., E404/17/764.

83 *Rot. Pat. Hib.*, p. 162.

84 *Jacobi Grace, Kilkenniensis, Annales Hiberniae*, ed. R. Butler, p. 157.

85 Marleburrough, *Chronicle*, p. 22.

serve the lieutenant 'with all his power both of horsemen and footmen'.[86] These military actions indicate that despite the submissions made to Thomas during his first year in Ireland the military situation had rapidly deteriorated during his absence. The fact that the Gaelic Irish who had submitted had done so for their own reasons, combined with the absence of a substantial military power from England, meant that little could be done to enforce the submissions.

The O'Connor Falys had been the first to submit to le Scrope in 1401. They had been involved in a long-running conflict with the Daltons of Meath and had been trying to expand their influence westward for some time. It perhaps suited their immediate purposes to submit at this time for in 1403 the Dublin government organised a retaliatory raid into Offaly and took some hostages, indicating that the O'Connor Falys had failed to keep the terms of the agreement made with le Scrope.[87] In 1404 the O'Connor Falys raided Dalton territory and burned Rathskeagh, described as Henry Dalton's town and the most flourishing town in Ireland.[88] From 1405 onwards raids by the O'Connor Falys become more common with a hosting being made in that year into Westmeath resulting in much of the country being burned.[89] Further raids are recorded in 1406, 1408, 1411, when the sheriff of Meath was captured, 1414 and 1417.[90] It is significant that in 1405 both Thomas of Lancaster and Stephen le Scrope were absent in England. The Irish annals note that in 1405 'the earl of Ormond, i.e. James Butler, died, and the Galls were very powerless after that'.[91] With the death of one of the foremost Anglo-Irish magnates, who was also acting as deputy to le Scrope, coming at the same time as the absence of the lieutenant and his deputy, the Gaelic Irish would obviously be encouraged to increase their raids on the lordship.

The indenture between Lancaster and Donal O'Byrne resulted in O'Byrne promising 'to be a faithful liege to the king and to conduct himself faithfully towards the king's people'. O'Byrne also promised not to rise

---

86 *Calendar of Ormond Deeds*, ii, no. 396, p. 285.

87 *M.I.A.*, p. 171.

88 ibid., p. 173.

89 ibid., p. 175.

90 *A.F.M.*, iv, pp. 787, 797, 807, 817, 829.

91 *M.I.A.*, p. 175.

up with enemies or rebels of the king, but to serve the king against them with his subjects. He also promised to stop taking *vadia* from the king's people for any injuries done by them against O'Byrne or his people, but instead to approach the lieutenant or the justices of the peace within one month of the event taking place. O'Byrne pledged to make amends for all injuries and damages caused by the O'Byrnes against 'any of the marchers or faithful people of the king' in time of peace in return for a reciprocal agreement from the English. If any of his men were to rise against the king, O'Byrne promised to deliver the body or head of the rebel along with a pledge of 100 marks until any trespasses shall be satisfied. He agreed not to harbour anyone coming with goods stolen from the king's people and they promised to do likewise. O'Byrne also promised to 'permit the king to enjoy all the woods, lands, meadows and pastures belonging to the New Castle of McKyngngham'.[92] New Castle Mackinegan was one of the five royal demesne manors south of the city of Dublin, all of which were regularly under attack from the Irish of Wicklow. In the 1370's the O'Byrnes had taken and burned the royal castle there.[93] The castle was one of the most important sites for the defence of the royal road from Dublin to Arklow and this made the castle an obvious target for the O'Byrnes as they attempted to push northwards towards Dublin. However this agreement also seems to have broken down very quickly. Less than six months after the submission of the O'Byrnes it is recorded that the mayor of Dublin, John Drake, led a force of the citizens from Dublin and won a victory over the Irish at Bray on 11 July 1402, killing 500 of the Irish, 'being all men of warre'.[94] It is most likely that these Irish were O'Byrnes. From 1405 the number of raids made by the O'Byrnes of Wicklow on the English settlements also increases.

The submission of the MacMahons of Uriel resulted in their acquisition of the land and lordship of Farney in county Louth, excluding the king's castle there, territory which they had long coveted. Aghi MacMahon agreed, for himself and his nation, to be a faithful liege to Henry IV and his heirs. He also promised not to rise up with any Irishmen, enemies or rebels nor

---

92 *Cal. Carew*, vi, p.481.

93 Otway-Ruthven, *Medieval Ireland*, p. 302.

94 Marleburrough, *Chronicle*, p. 18; Hand, 'The Psalter of Christ Church, Dublin', *Reportorium Novum*, 1 (1956) pp. 317-8.

to give them counsel, aid or favour, but instead to rise up against them with his subjects and with all his power. If he left his own territory he was to do so at the king's expense. In return for this Aghi received Farney, for which he was to pay a rent of £10 *per annum*.[95] However, at this point the chief of the MacMahons was Philip, Eachaidh's (Aghi) father. On Philip's death in 1403 he was succeeded by his brother Ardghal. This seems to have resulted in a breach between the two branches of the family. The *Annals of Connacht* say that in 1414 'Eochaid Mag Mathgamna, eligible prince of Oriel, was captured by Brian Mag Mathgamna'.[96] Brian MacMahon, the son of Ardghal, succeeded to the chieftaincy of the MacMahons on the death of his father in 1416.[97] The grant of Farney to the MacMahons was deeply resented by their new Anglo-Irish neighbours, who complained to the king that the MacMahons were impoverishing the county of Louth and were using the opportunity to spy on the English settlements, placing them in danger. They appealed that the MacMahons be sent out of the county.[98] This grant to the MacMahons has been described as the abandonment of the south Ulster frontier, a recognition that Dublin could do little to protect the settlements there.[99]

The submissions of the O'Reillys of Breifne may have been due to their disputes with their O'Rourke neighbours, which resulted in open warfare between the two families from 1403 on.[100] In his indenture with Lancaster, Eoghan O'Reilly, 'captain of his nation of Irishmen', acknowledged that he and his nation were lieges of the king of England. He also agreed to observe and fulfil all the conditions and covenants in the indentures made between Roger, earl of March and Ulster, and Seán O'Reilly in the 1390's, during the minority of the current earl.[101] However, it is noted in a contemporary Gaelic Irish annal that 'the son of Seaán was made king by the

---

95 *Cal. Carew*, vi, p. 479.

96 *A.C.*, p. 423.

97 *A.L.C.*, p. 147.

98 *P.P.C.*, ii, pp. 49-50; Gilbert, J.T., *History of the Viceroys of Ireland*, pp. 297-8.

99 Curtis, E., *A History of Medieval Ireland*, p. 287.

100 *A.C.*, p. 387; For the O'Reillys see C. Parker 'The O'Reillys of east Breifne', *Breifne*, 8 (1991).

101 *Cal. Carew*, vi, p. 480.

Galls' in 1401. The son of Seaán being referred to was Eoghan O'Reilly. In 1402, the same year as Eoghan sealed his indenture with Lancaster, the same annalist records that 'Maol Mórdha Ó Raighilligh was elected Ó Raighilligh and young Ó Raighilligh was banished'.[102] The Annals of Connacht state that 'Maelmorda son of Cu Chonnacht son of Gilla Isa Ruad assumed the kingship of the Muinter Mailmorda this year', citing his accession under the year 1403.[103] It seems that Lancaster, probably acting on the advice of his council, was involving himself in internal O'Reilly politics in order to try and create a client state on the borders of the English lordship. In return for his submission Eoghan was to receive English support in his attempts to succeed to the chieftaincy of the O'Reillys. Eoghan's father Seán had been succeeded by Seán's brother Giolla Iosa. However, he died within a month of becoming chief and this resulted in a power struggle between competing O'Reilly septs. As soon as it became clear that Lancaster's military power in Ireland had evaporated Eoghan O'Reilly was deposed and banished from Breifne and replaced by his relative Maol Mórdha. It was not until 1418 that Eoghan O'Reilly was able to become chief of the O'Reilly's. By 1406 the annals are recording 'great raids by the Galls on Ó Raighilligh, and they took many cows',[104] indicating that the Anglo-Irish were using other means in order to dominate the O'Reillys. The indentures made with Eoghan O'Reilly and Eachaidh MacMahon would indicate that Lancaster was trying to exploit the endemic factionalism of Gaelic Irish lordships in order to alleviate the pressure exerted by these families on the northern part of the English lordship.

The agreements made by the Irish with Thomas began to break down after the beginning of his financial problems. All the submissions received were taken within the first year of his arrival in Ireland, while he still had money to pay his troops. From the summer of 1402 we hear reports of desertions due to a lack of money for pay.[105] This meant that Thomas no longer had sufficient military force to maintain the submissions. The main problem in trying to enforce a stable settlement was the fact that the Gaelic Irish leaders

---

102 *M.I.A.*, pp. 165-9.

103 *A.C.*, p. 387.

104 *M.I.A.*, p. 179.

105 *Royal and historical letters*, i, pp. 73-76, pp. 87-89.

'felt themselves bound by their submissions only for as long as they could be enforced'.[106] Thomas of Lancaster's experiences show that without the maintenance of a large-scale army in Ireland on a permanent basis there was little hope for a long-term settlement. *The Libelle of Englyshe Polycye,* which appeared in the 1430's, says that the earl of Ormond, who had suffered similar financial problems when he had served as lieutenant, claimed that the cost of maintaining the French wars for one year, if spent on securing the English lordship in Ireland, 'myght wynne Yrelonde to a fynall conquest in one soole yere, to sett us all in reste'.[107] As Ormond seems to have been aware, the defence of the English conquests in France was regarded by the English government as a higher priority than the defence of Ireland.

The fact that the Gaelic Irish posed the most serious threat to the English lordship is not in dispute. However, the fact that the lordship was also under threat from forces outside Ireland can be seen from the measures implemented by the Dublin government in the early fifteenth century in an attempt to secure the seas around Ireland. In 1407 Janico D'Artas and the bishop of Down were authorized to treat with Donald, lord of the Isles, in an attempt to protect the north eastern part of the colony from Scottish depredations.[108] In 1400 the Scots had won a sea battle at 'Stranford' over a fleet led by the constable of Dublin castle. This area had been coming under increasing pressure since the burning of the town and castle of Carlingford in 1403.[109] In 1405 three Scottish ships were taken in the Irish sea and the merchants of Drogheda seem to have organised a raid on Scotland, where they 'tooke pledges and preyes'.[110] Later that year the men of Dublin also raided Scotland, where 'they valiantly behaved themselves' and on their return they also raided Wales 'doing much hurt to the Welchmen' and they 'brought away the shrine of St. Cubius, and placed it in the Church of the holy Trinitie in Dublin'.[111] It is perhaps in reward for the loyalty demonstrated by these

---

106 Cosgrove, 'The Emergence of the Pale', p. 545.

107 *The Libelle of Englyshe Polycye*, p. 39.

108 Cosgrove, 'Ireland beyond the Pale', in *A New History of Ireland, ii, the middle ages,* p. 575.

109 Cosgrove, 'The emergence of the Pale', p. 535.

110 Marleburrough, *Chronicle*, p. 19.

111 ibid.

military expeditions that Henry IV gave his sword to the city of Dublin in 1409.[112] However, the situation inside the lordship was still far from secure. In the summer of 1409 Janico D'Artas was forced to led a raid against the Irish in Ulster.[113] In December 1413 an expedition was launched from Waterford. The mayor, together with a force of the citizens, sailed to the harbour of Baltimore in west Cork. On Christmas night they entered the castle of the O'Driscolls and captured the chief, along with his wife and son. The reason for this raid seems to have been because the town of Waterford had been paying black rent to the O'Driscolls for many years.[114] Waterford seems to have felt particularly isolated at this time. In March 1400 the mayor and constables of the staple of Waterford were excused from having to travel to Dublin and allowed to take their oaths of office before the prior of St. Katherine's in Waterford because the journey to Dublin was regarded as too dangerous.[115]

Along with Stephen le Scrope the other principal advisors of Thomas of Lancaster, apart from the chancellor, Archbishop Cranley of Dublin, were Lawrence Merbury, the treasurer, Edmund Noon, the steward of the lieutenant's household, Anthony de Seynt Quintyn, a clerk appointed to the prebendary of Maynooth in St. Patrick's Cathedral, the Gascon squire Janico D'Artas and Edward Perers, a knight based in Ireland. Merbury had been appointed treasurer of Ireland in November 1400. In January 1401 he was acting as attorney in Ireland for the king's confessor, a friar called Robert Mascal.[116] In June 1402 he was appointed as local deputy to Lancaster in the counties of Carlow and Kildare, along with Noon, Perers and a knight called David Wogan.[117] Merbury's career did not progress smoothly, however, and in January 1405 a commission was given to Richard Rede and Thomas Cusak 'to enquire about divers extortions and oppressions and other trespasses and crimes committed against the king's liege Luke Feypowe, Barnabas Cusak and John Cusak of the county of Meath' allegedly by 'Laurence Merbury, treasurer

---

112 *Holinshed's Irish chronicle*, p. 240.

113 Marleburrough, *Chronicle*, p. 23.

114 Gilbert, *History of the viceroys*, p. 303.

115 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 248.

116 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 387, p. 406.

117 *Rot. Pat. Hib.*, p. 164.

of Ireland, and Thomas Mareword and others of Ireland in the said county'. The charges may have had something to do with the commission given to Merbury in 1403 to enquire into waste and prodigality in the government. The charges seem to have come to nothing because in July 1406 Merbury was appointed chancellor of Ireland and was granted expenses of 6s. 8d. daily 'provided that the king be not bound to make any recompense to his son Thomas, to whom he lately granted the profits of that land'.[118] Merbury continued to serve as chancellor on an intermittent basis until the 1420's, playing a prominent role in the disputes between the earl of Ormond and the Talbot faction for the control of the Irish government. In November 1399 Merbury had been granted £20 *per annum* from the customs of the port of Drogheda, a grant renewed in 1406 with the addition of a grant of £30 annually from the fee-farm of the city of Waterford. These annuities were renewed in 1411 'in consideration of his long service and poor estate'.[119] This may indicate that Merbury was not using his position to build up his own personal fortune. In March 1415 Merbury was granted the manor of Crumlin and lands in Meath by Henry V.[120]

Edmund Noon, as steward of Lancaster's household, probably returned to England with him in 1403 and does not seem to have had the opportunity to exploit his position in government. We know that he was definitely back in England by 1406.[121] In June 1402 he was appointed deputy in Carlow and Kildare, while in December of that year he was granted the custody of the lands of Walter Kerdyff during the minority of his son John Kerdyff.[122] Noon was dead sometime before September 1413, when offices which he had held in Norfolk were granted to John Rothenhale.[123] Noon had a long history of service to the royal family and as early as the 1370's he had served as an esquire of the chamber of the Black Prince.[124]

---

118 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 205.

119 *C.P.R., 1409-13*, p. 252.

120 *Rot. Pat. Hib.*, p. 206b, p. 208.

121 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, pp. 154, 200.

122 *Rot. Pat. Hib.*, p. 170.

123 *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 93.

124 Griffith, M.C., 'The council in Ireland, 1399-1452', p. 34.

Janico D'Artas first arrived in Ireland with Richard II. In November 1399 a grant of 100 marks per annum to D'Artas from the issues of the city of London made by Richard was confirmed by Henry IV, while a new grant was made of 100 marks from the fee-farm of Drogheda because D'Artas had been retained for life by the new king.[125] However, the connections between D'Artas and Henry IV go back further than Henry's accession to the throne. D'Artas had been retained by Henry's father, John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, during the 1380's. During the expedition of Henry Bolingbroke to Prussia in 1390 D'Artas was employed by Bolingbroke to carry messages from Prussia to his father in England, receiving a higher rate of pay than any other messenger except Lancaster Herald. In December 1392 D'Artas was delivering money from Gaunt to Bolingbroke, who was then in Venice.[126] D'Artas seems to have been used as one of Lancaster's advisors due to his experience in Ireland, and it was on his advice that in March 1400 the king allowed the mayor and the constables of the staple of Waterford to take their oaths before the prior of St. Katherine's in Waterford because of the dangerous nature of the journey to Dublin.[127] His influence was not confined to Ireland and in September 1400 he was appointed as provost of Bordeaux, being allowed to exercise his office by deputy. In April 1401 D'Artas was appointed as constable of Dublin castle and in July 1404 as the admiral of Ireland.[128] At this time he was appointed to treat with the Lord of the Isles, whose brother John, had recently come into possession of land in Ulster. In 1412 he was one of those charged to arrest Thomas Butler, prior of Kilmainham.[129] It also seems likely that D'Artas served in France during the reign of Henry V.

Edward Perers had held lands in Meath since the reign of Richard II. In 1381 he had been appointed as constable of Kilkenny and in 1394 he had served in the royal army in Ireland with seven men-at-arms and 43 archers.[130] The following year he was appointed as marshal of the army, later

---

125 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 74.

126 *The Earl of Derby's Expeditions in the years 1390-1 and 1392-3*, ed. L. T. Smith, p. 305,

127 see above p. 55.

128 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 446; *C.P.R., 1401-05*, p. 406.

129 *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 373.

130 *Rot. Pat. Hib.*, p. 150.

confirmed by Henry IV in January 1402.[131] In 1402 he was appointed as deputy in Carlow and Kildare with Noon and Merbury.[132] In November 1403 he was appointed as keeper of the peace in county Carlow and in October 1405 as constable of Carlow castle, with an annual fee of £20 to be collected from the lands, lordships and services of Thomas, earl of Nottingham, in the counties of Kildare, Carlow and Wexford.[133] In July 1401 'in consideration of his charges in the defence of the land' Perers was granted the custody of all lands, rents and services in the county of Kilkenny held by Roger Mortimer, earl of March, during the minority of his son Edmund.[134] In April 1404 Perers and his wife were granted £20 *per annum* from the fee-farm of the city of Dublin in recompense for the 20 marks yearly which they paid to the mayor of Dublin for holding lands in the manor of Bagotsrath, and two years later a further £20 *per annum* from the fee-farm rendered by the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem at Kilmainham for its holdings of Salmon Leap and Chapelizod.[135]

Men like these were obviously being used by the king to try and make sure that Lancaster, who had little or no experience of government or warfare, did not come to grief in Ireland. Their knowledge of conditions in Ireland accounts for their appointments as local deputies, ensuring that an experienced man would be able to take charge in the event of an emergency. For a lieutenant like Lancaster, with no power base in Ireland, their advice and support was essential. Also their presence may have been a concession to the Anglo-Irish nobility who may have been hostile to outsiders. The presence of these men in Lancaster's council has also been interpreted as an attempt to 'ensure the predominance of English ideas, or at least the absence of baronial faction, in the council'.[136] By not appointing any of the great Anglo-Irish magnates to the council Henry IV could ensure that the council was not dominated by any particular magnate, using control of the council to further his own ambitions. The active role these men played in the Irish council and the

---

131 ibid., p. 162.

132 ibid., p. 164.

133 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 87.

134 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 446.

135 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, p. 380; *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 122.

136 Griffith, 'The council in Ireland, 1399-1452', p. 28.

numerous official positions which they held meant that even during the prolonged absences of the lieutenant the government of the lordship could continue.

Despite the fact that he had only arrived in Ireland in November 1401, by November 1403 Thomas of Lancaster was back in England. This seems to have been due to the breakdown in the financing of his government. Lancaster's original indenture of June 1401 stipulated that he was to receive an annual salary of 12,000 marks. However, payments to Lancaster rapidly fell into arrears. The only money which he seems to have received in Ireland was the sum of 500 marks in December 1401.[137] A further payment of £1,200 is recorded in July of 1402.[138] Attempts made later that year to pay Lancaster seem to have failed. In August 1402 we find the archbishop of Dublin and other members of the Irish council writing to the king that 'your son is so destitute of money that he has not a penny in the world, nor can borrow a single penny, because all his jewels, and his plate, that he can spare of those which he must of necessity keep, are spent and sunk in wages', as a result of which 'his soldiers are departed from him, and the people of his household are on the point of departing'.[139] They also claim that Ireland can in no way afford to support the charges of Lancaster's household and retinue, and they ask Henry IV for the speedy remedy of the situation. It was probably as a result of this letter that in December 1402 Lancaster received assignments totalling over £6,500.[140] However, he seems to received less than £1,500 of this sum, as most of the assignments were cancelled almost immediately.[141] In February of the following year we find Lancaster himself writing to his father, saying that his soldiers were deserting and claiming 'that they could no longer serve unless they had payment of their wages' and that if nothing was done then 'great damage may accrue to me and to your said country'.[142] These letters probably account for the measures taken in June 1403 when it was decided by the king

---

137 P.R.O., E403/571 m. 15.

138 P.R.O., E403/573 m. 24.

139 *Royal and Historical Letters*, i, pp. 73-76.

140 P.R.O., E403/575 m. 8.

141 P.R.O., E401/627.

142 *Royal and Historical Letters*, i, pp. 85-89.

that 'in consideration of the danger on account of the non-payment of the money for the safe-custody' of Ireland, Lancaster should receive his salary from the customs and subsidy of the port of Kingston-on-Hull, beginning on 10 June, with only assignments made previously for the defence of Calais and its marches taking precedence. This grant also entitled Lancaster to receive his arrears of payment, which by this stage amounted to £9,156 14s. 8d., from the same source.[143] However, despite the good intentions of the king only £1,000 seems to have reached Ireland.[144] The financial situation does not seem to have improved and in November of that year Lancaster left Ireland, not to return until 1408.

Between November 1403 and March 1404 only two further assignments, one of 500 marks and one of £400, were made to Lancaster.[145] However, in June 1404 the assignment of £400 was renewed because Lancaster had not received the money.[146] In November 1404 Lancaster had still not received payment of the arrears due to him, which still amounted to over £9,000. At this time we find him writing to the king to request the payment of £4,000 of this sum from the customs and subsidy of wool in various ports. He sought £1,000 in the port of London, £1,000 in the port of Southampton, £300 in the port of Sandwich, £600 in the port of Melcombe, £400 in the port of Chichester and £700 in the port of Kingston-on-Hull, after assignments made for the king's household and the defence of Calais were covered.[147] This request was granted on 1 November 1404,[148] and this perhaps ties in with the events of October 1404, when Lancaster was re-appointed as lieutenant in Ireland for the following three years.[149] However this does not seem to have alleviated Lancaster's financial problems. On 10 February 1405 Henry IV authorised payment of £600 to Lancaster out of the subsidy of wools to be shipped from Southampton after the expenses of the royal household had been

---

143 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, p. 266.

144 P.R.O., E403/577 m. 12.

145 P.R.O., E403/578 m. 5, 22.

146 P.R.O., E403/579 m. 6.

147 P.R.O., SC8 230/11452.

148 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, p. 464.

149 ibid., p. 456.

covered. This was because Lancaster had been unable to collect assignments made to him, for that sum, the previous March.[150] Eight days later the king was forced to order the treasurer to make payment of £78 19s. to Lancaster because of 500 marks which was to be paid to Lancaster from the port of Kingston-on-Hull he had only received £254 7s. 8d.[151] In July 1406 Lancaster was granted £100 from the customs of the port of London in order to pay off some of his debts, despite the fact that the money had already been assigned for the expenses of the king's household.[152]

During his absence Ireland was governed by Stephen le Scrope as deputy. He too was absent in England between March and October of 1404, having left Ireland without appointing a deputy, and throughout this period James, third earl of Ormond, acted as justiciar by appointment of the Irish council. The Irish council only ever appointed men to the office of justiciar, never to that of lieutenant, a prerogative which was seemingly reserved for the king. Le Scrope returned to England once more in 1405, this time leaving Ormond as his deputy. Ormond had also experienced financial difficulties when acting as justiciar and in March 1404, almost immediately after his appointment by the Irish council he was forced to write to the king and English council claiming that he was 'altogether unable and insufficient' to support the charges of the office of justiciar, due to expenses which he had previously incurred in the reign of Richard II and earlier in the reign of Henry IV. Ormond pleads for 'sufficient provision for the government of your said land, and to give me my discharge therein as a deed of charity'.[153] On his death in September 1405 he was replaced by the earl of Kildare, who acted as justiciar until the return of le Scrope in 1406.

The new indenture of March 1406 between Thomas of Lancaster and the king was probably the reason for le Scrope's return. On 1 March Lancaster agreed to a new indenture to serve as lieutenant in Ireland for twelve years at a reduced salary of £6,000 per annum.[154] However this new rate

---

150 P.R.O., E404/20/146; P.R.O., E403/580 m. 9.

151 P.R.O., E404/20/165; P.R.O., E403/580 m. 8.

152 P.R.O., E404/21/287.

153 *Royal and Historical Letters*, ii, pp. 29-32.

154 E101/69/2/316.

of pay was also found to be impractical to maintain and a new indenture was agreed upon in March 1408, whereby Lancaster agreed to serve as lieutenant for three years from the following May. Perhaps the reason for this indenture, providing the opportunity to once again reduce the money being expended on Ireland, was the departure from Ireland in December 1407 of Stephen le Scrope, resulting in the appointment of the fourth earl of Ormond, who was still a minor, on 8 December as justiciar by the Irish council. Le Scrope returned to Ireland with Lancaster in August 1408, dying of the plague that September. Thomas of Lancaster returned to England in March 1409 on hearing news of a serious illness affecting his father. He left Thomas Butler, prior of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem at Kilmainham, as his deputy. Butler acted as deputy until the appointment of Sir John Stanley as lieutenant in June 1413 by the new king Henry V. The re-appointment of Stanley as lieutenant has been interpreted as an attempt by Henry V to reduce the level of Anglo-Irish expectations of financial aid from England. From the 7,000 marks promised to Lancaster in 1408 the salary of the new lieutenant was reduced to 4,000 marks for the first year of his appointment and 3,000 marks *per annum* for the remainder of his term of office. This new rate set a standard to which all subsequent Lancastrian appointments to the office of lieutenant followed quite closely.[155]

Thomas Butler was the illegitimate son of James the third, earl of Ormond, and therefore the half-brother of the fourth earl. In October 1405 Thomas of Lancaster had been given the custody of 'all castles, manors, lands, rents and possessions' of the third earl to hold during the minority of his son, as well as the right to the marriage of the fourth earl.[156] This was the beginning of a long association between Lancaster and Ormond, resulting in Ormond serving with Lancaster in France during the expedition which Lancaster led to France in 1412 and in the campaigns of Henry V. Complaints about Butler's administration reached the English court and in 1412 Butler was summoned to appear before the council in London. After he refused, a commission was sent to Ireland ordering the arrest of Butler. However, he remained as deputy until the arrival of Stanley in 1413. Thomas Butler also served in the French campaigns of Henry V. He was not the only one of

---

155 Matthew, 'The Financing of the Lordship of Ireland', p. 98.

156 *Calendar of Ormond Deeds*, ii, no. 386, pp. 277-8.

Lancaster's deputies to cause problems for the English government. In 1408 Lancaster had arrested the earl of Kildare, who had acted as deputy in 1405 and 1406, due to what were regarded as his attempts to dispute royal prerogative.[157] Wylie states that Kildare and his three sons were arrested on Lancaster's return to Ireland because of Kildare's appointment of Stephen Bray as chief justice of the king's bench.[158] Bray was appointed to the post on 11 January 1406.[159] However, his letters of appointment were revoked less than three weeks later, on 28 January, because 'the appointment of chief justice was granted to the king's son Thomas de Lancastre'.[160] It is possible that this encroachment on the powers of Lancaster as lieutenant was the cause of the dispute with Kildare. However, Lancaster's dispute was with Kildare and not Bray and in February 1407 Bray was reappointed as chief justice 'with the assent of the king's son Thomas'.[161] Lancaster had been able to assert his authority in defence of his prerogatives. Gilbert has suggested that the dispute arose from the interference, by Kildare and Adam O'Nolan, with the right claimed by the crown of appointing a prebendary to Maynooth.[162] Kildare was released from his captivity the following year on the payment of a fine of 300 marks. While perhaps Butler was appointed as deputy because of his connections with Lancaster, it should be noted that the priors of Kilmainham had a long history of serving as deputies. William de Ros acted as deputy to John Wogan in 1301 and 1302, Roger Outlaw acted as deputy on an intermittent basis between 1324 and 1341 and acted as justiciar for a five month period in 1328. John Larchet was deputy to Walter de Bermingham between 1347 and 1348. William Tany acted as justiciar briefly in 1373, while Richard White was deputy to Thomas Mortimer in 1389. William fitz Thomas, prior of Kilmainham, perhaps the son of Thomas Butler, served as justiciar by appointment of the council between April and October 1422.[163] With the Anglo-

---

157 *A.F.M.*, iv, p. 795.

158 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iii, pp. 167-9.

159 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 106.

160 ibid., p. 145.

161 ibid., p. 285.

162 Gilbert, *History of the viceroys*, p. 300.

163 *Handbook of British Chronolgy*, pp. 162-67.

Irish magnates unwilling to serve as chief governor Butler may just have appeared as the obvious candidate for the position of deputy.

Despite the lack of money available from England, Lancaster seems to have been reluctant to try and raise money in Ireland. This may have been due to the experiences of William of Windsor in the 1370's, although it is unlikely that the Irish parliament would have launched an attack on the king's son. However, unlike Lionel of Clarence or the Mortimer lieutenants, Lancaster had no Irish lands to draw revenues from in the event of the non-arrival of his wages from England. In the parliament held at Ross in December 1401 Lancaster received a subsidy in kind, consisting of 40 crannocks of wheat and 40 crannocks of oats from the county of Dublin, 120 crannocks of wheat and 120 crannocks of oats from the county of Meath, 40 crannocks of wheat and 40 crannocks of oats from the county of Louth, 20 crannocks of wheat and 20 crannocks of oats from the county of Kildare and one crannock, half of wheat and half of oats, from the county of Carlow.[164] There is no evidence of a grant or subsidy being granted by any other parliament or great council held during Lancaster's first period in office. These parliaments were held at Dublin in April 1402, at Dublin in September 1402, at Dublin in February 1403 which was adjourned to Waterford for later in the month, then adjourned again until 5 March and then finally to Kilkenny, where it began on 18 June 1403. A parliament was also held at Dublin in 1408, but the date is uncertain so Lancaster may not yet have returned to Ireland. The last parliament to be held in Lancaster's presence started on 14 January 1409 in Kilkenny.[165]

At the meeting of the Irish council held at Castledermot on 3 March 1404 the earl of Ormond was able to extract a substantial subsidy from the prelates, magnates, nobles, clergy and commons of Leinster, Meath, Louth, Waterford and Tipperary, at the rate of half a mark a ploughland, in order to finance an expedition to Ulster, with a further grant being promised within six months should the need should arise. This further subsidy was duly granted at a great council held at Castledermot in August 1404 in order to allow for the maintenance of a force of 800 foot, but at the reduced rate of ninepence per

---

164 *Rot. Pat. Hib.*, p. 161.

165 Richardson & Sayles, *The Irish Parliament*, pp. 347-9.

ploughland. Although this grant was high by contemporary standards, it was made in exceptional circumstances, with the treasury empty and both the lieutenant and his deputy in England. The grant to Ormond was also made with certain conditions attached. Ormond was to receive the money as soldier and governor of the wars and not as justiciar and he also had to promise that coign and livery would cease during his period of office. This first condition was added in order to remove any precedent about granting money to justiciars in the future. The grant also provided for the military needs of Ormond adequately, removing any need for the practice of coign.[166] Perhaps Ormond was able to extract a subsidy from the Irish parliament due to the lack of response from England to his letter of March 1404 appealing for financial support.

The only time when Lancaster seems to have been able to raise money in Ireland was when he was granted a subsidy from the parliament held at Kilkenny in January 1409, which it is noted was summoned for the purpose of granting a tallage.[167] The subsidy granted was at a lower rate than that granted to Ormond five years earlier, the rate being one shilling per ploughland with the clergy supplying two shillings and sixpence in the mark.[168] Perhaps Lancaster was right in not pushing the Irish parliament for subsidies. Sir John Talbot, lord Furnival, lieutenant from 1414, was forced to resort to the practice of coign due to lack of money, resulting in complaints to the king by the Irish council about 'divers extortions, oppressions, damages and grievances' committed by previous lieutenants, and Talbot in particular, on the lieges of Ireland.[169] However, these complaints were made in 1421 when Ormond was lieutenant and Talbot seems to have had the support of the council in Ireland during his period in office. The council claimed that it was only lack of money from England that forced Talbot's troops to resort to coign. In a letter written by the Irish council in 1419 the council wrote to Henry V requesting money to be sent to Ireland, otherwise Talbot would be forced to leave Ireland in order to return to England to sue for payment in person. The

---

166 ibid., pp. 155-6.

167 Marleburrough, *Chronicle*, p. 22.

168 Richardson & Sayles, *The Irish Parliament*, p. 156.

169 *Stat. Ire., John-Hen. V*, pp. 563-85.

letter stated that Talbot and his men only resorted to coign because they were not being paid.[170] In their letter the council describe the military successes of Talbot, and these seem to be the principal reason for their wholehearted support of him. The earl of Ormond, appointed lieutenant in 1420, was able to secure three grants, totaling 1,400 marks, during his two years in office.[171] This may be an indication of the unwillingness of the Anglo-Irish magnates to grant subsidies to men whom they regarded as outsiders rather than men they were more familiar with. It may also indicate resentment on the part of the Anglo-Irish magnates that they should be forced to subsidise the lieutenant when, in theory at least, he was sufficiently provided for by the English exchequer.

It was at this time that the practice of local communities making grants to the justiciar to arrange for the defence of their locality becomes prevalent. These subsidies were more readily granted because there was no clash of interests over where and how the money should be spent. In 1402 the commons of Kildare granted enough money to pay for 260 kerns to fight the Gaelic Irish.[172] In 1412 Thomas Butler was able to secure 300 marks from the county of Wexford and the towns of Ross and Wexford for use in military operations within the county.[173]

Lancaster's financial problems in Ireland seem to have been the main reason behind his absenteeism. The lack of money from England seems to have become critical under the Lancastrian kings. The letter from the Irish council, on behalf of Talbot, testifies that finances did not improve under Henry V. Talbot received almost all of what was promised to him as lieutenant, but delays in payment meant that he was forced to resort to the practice of coign.[174] Sir John Stanley had similar problems during his terms as lieutenant of Ireland. In December 1400 a commission from the king was sent to the chancellor, the treasurer and the council of Ireland which stated that they were to issue a proclamation that all the king's loyal subjects were to assist the lieutenant and that his debts would soon be paid. The following July, after

---

170 Ellis, *Original Letters Representative of English History*, 2nd Series, i, pp. 54-63.

171 Richardson & Sayles, *The Irish Parliament*, p. 234.

172 *Rot. Pat. Hib.*, p. 166.

173 Richardson & Sayles, *The Irish Parliament*, p. 158.

174 Matthew, 'The financing of the lordship of Ireland', p. 98.

Lancaster's appointment as lieutenant, the king ordered that no-one should molest Stanley because he could not pay his debts and that all his debts should be respited until Christmas when sums of money were due to him from the king.[175] In addition to the payment of £1,000 in October 1399, Stanley was assigned substantial amounts of money. Between December 17 1399 and May 10 1401 Stanley was paid a total of over £7,800.[176] However, all these payments seem to have been on assignment and must have been considerably in arrears because Stanley was forced to complain to the king about his financial difficulties.[177] Stanley was forced to turn to the Anglo-Irish in order to try and overcome his financial problems. In the spring of 1401 a parliament was held to deal with the state of affairs and grievances in Ireland. This is all we know about the proceedings in this parliament, although it is possible that the parliament had been called specifically to provide a subsidy for the lieutenant. In July 1400 the community of county Louth granted a local subsidy to resist O'Neill and in January 1401 the community of Dublin was assembled for a similar purpose, indicating that Stanley was in financial difficulty.[178] In June 1403 we find Stanley being paid £1,500 in return for the surrender of three tallies which had been assigned to him in an attempt to cover his expenses in Ireland.[179]

It was definitely not unusual for a lieutenant to appoint a deputy and to spend part, or even most of his time in England. Robert de Vere, earl of Oxford, later created marquis of Dublin and duke of Ireland by Richard II, spent his period of office in England leaving Ireland to be governed by his deputy Sir John Stanley. Between 1395 and 1397 the justiciar William le Scrope was represented as deputy at all times by his brother Stephen. This is an unusual case because at the same time Roger Mortimer, earl of March and Ulster, was also in Ireland serving as lieutenant. However, both de Vere and William le Scrope were close advisors of Richard II and their standing at court

---

175 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, pp. 397, 523; Otway-Ruthven, *Medieval Ireland*, p. 341.

176 P.R.O., E101/247/6.

177 Otway-Ruthven, *Medieval Ireland*, p. 341.

178 Richardson & Sayles, *The Irish Parliament*, p. 149; Otway-Ruthven, *Medieval Ireland*, pp. 340-1.

179 Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 292.

permitted their absence from Ireland. Their deputies were capable men who were able to continue the governing of Ireland during their absences. The situation under Lancaster would not have been so bad if he had made adequate provision for the government of Ireland in his absence, but this was not the case. The complaints about Butler have been noted above and in 1412 the council in England planned to consult with Lancaster's council to see if any remedy could be found for the misgovernment of the lordship.[180]

On his departure from Ireland in 1403 Lancaster was rapidly followed by his deputy, le Scrope. Despite his return to Ireland at the end of 1404, le Scrope returned to England again early in 1405, forcing the Irish council to make arrangements for the government of Ireland. The evidence would suggest that Thomas of Lancaster continued to draw on his salary as lieutenant of Ireland while in England, leaving the administration in Dublin to fend for itself. In the English parliament of 1406 the commons complained that despite the unprecedented sums being spent on Ireland 'the said land is not in any better order, safe-guard or disposition'.[181] This would seem to indicate that money was being earmarked for expenditure in Ireland, but was being used to cover the expenses of Thomas of Lancaster. This contrasts to the parliament of 1402 when the commons wished to thank prince Thomas for his good work in Ireland.[182] This seems to have led to tensions between Thomas and his elder brother, Henry, prince of Wales. In 1409 at a meeting of the Privy Council, prince Henry and his allies on the council requested the replacement of Thomas as lieutenant of Ireland by Sir John Stanley, a knight with vast experience of service in Ireland. In 1386 and 1389 Stanley had served as deputy to Robert de Vere and in August 1389 he was appointed as justiciar, remaining in office until 1391. As we have seen he also served as lieutenant from 1399 until the arrival of Thomas of Lancaster in 1401. In 1413 he replaced Lancaster as lieutenant on the accession to the throne of king Henry V. In order to recompense Lancaster for his proposed removal from office in 1409 it was suggested that Stanley pay him 2,000 marks per annum from the revenues of Ireland, while the king was to pay

---

180 *P.P.C.*, ii, p. 35.

181 *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, iii, p. 573.

182 ibid., p. 486.

him 1,000 marks *per annum*.[183] These payments were to enable Lancaster to set up and maintain his own household. The following year, when the prince of Wales was in control of the council, Thomas petitioned for the payment due to him on several bad tallies, his wages as the captain of the castle of Guisnes in the March of Calais and for the payment of £3,000 arrears due to him as the lieutenant of Ireland. In reply to the last request the council said that if Thomas would perform the articles in his indentures then the prince and the other lords of the council would do their utmost to ensure that payment was made to him.[184] Lancaster did not return to Ireland and the following year his father was able to regain control of the council, removing the pressure on Thomas to fulfil his duties as lieutenant.

The financial problems facing Thomas of Lancaster were based in the decline of Irish and English revenues in the fourteenth centuries. The revenues of the Irish exchequer had been in decline since the Bruce invasion of 1315-18. Under Edward I the average yearly income of the Irish exchequer had been in the region of £6,300, which declined during the early years of Edward II's reign to an average of about £3,000. From 1315 onwards revenues declined to roughly £2,000 *per annum*.[185] Due to the contraction of the amount of land under the direct control of the Dublin government there was a corresponding reduction in the revenues paid into the Irish exchequer. Thus the lordship of Ireland, which had previously been a source of income to the English monarchy, was in no position to subsidise the large-scale military expeditions which were a feature of English government policy from the mid-fourteenth century on. The late fourteenth century also saw the decline of revenues at the English exchequer causing problems for the payment of English-financed forces in Ireland. This was a result of the reduction in the amount of wool exported from England due to the expansion of a domestic cloth industry. Henry IV had come to the throne in 1399 promising to reduce the extravagant expenditure of his predecessor Richard II. He had also promised to live off the crown revenues and could not risk antagonising parliament by asking for subsidies due to the tenuous nature of his hold on the

---

183 *P.P.C.*, i, p. 320

184 ibid., pp. 339-41.

185 Lydon, J.F., *The Lordship of Ireland in the Middle Ages*, p. 191.

crown. The position of Thomas of Lancaster in facing financial difficulties was not, therefore, uncommon. The only unusual feature was that Lancaster was able to avoid his responsibilities in Ireland for so long.

Evidence of Thomas of Lancaster's inexperience in government and his lack of awareness as to conditions in Ireland can be seen in a letter which he wrote to the king and the council on 5 September 1402, on behalf of John Hemyngton, described as a merchant of London. The letter recounts how certain men of the town of Galway robbed Hemyngton of merchandise, gold and silver to the value of £600. Hemyngton sought the aid of the lieutenant which resulted in the letter seeking restitution for the merchant.[186] On 16 December 1402 the king issued a writ of aid to John Hemyngton which describes the case in more detail. It describes how, on 4 May 1402 Hemyngton loaded the ship *la Gracedieu* of Dartmouth, under its master William Lambell, with wine, salt and other merchandise valued at £600, which he brought to Athenry where he sold the goods to various merchants of the town. Then certain men of Galway, named as John William, John Rederice, William Athy, Thomas Lynch, Simon Shillogh as well as twelve others, bribed the master and mariners of the ship to take it, the merchandise and merchants to Galway, for the sum of 207 and a half marks. Here they attacked the ship, killed two of the merchants onboard, looted the goods and money and imprisoned the other merchants. These they proceeded to ransom and then divided the ransom money and merchandise amongst themselves. Hemyngton claimed he was lucky to have escaped with his life and the king granted him licence to seize goods to the value of £600 belonging to John William, John Rederice, William Athy and others in England and Ireland, by land or by sea, as well as the power to arrest the culprits and to bring them before the king and council.[187]

Not everything pertaining to this case was as straightforward as it might seem. In January of 1402, Hemyngton, along with another man called John Lumbard, were given licence to ship twenty quarters of salt and forty tuns of wine to the port of Heury or elsewhere in Ireland.[188]

---

186 B. L., Cotton Vesp., f xiii, 16.

187 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, pp. 186-7.

188 ibid., p. 31.

On February 21 1402 this licence was revoked because it had been sued for without the knowledge of John Lumbard and because Hemyngton intended to sell his merchandise in 'parts hostile to the king'.[189] Later that year, in July of 1402, John Rederys and John Willyam, captains of the town of Galway, William atte Thye, sovereign of the town and Thomas Lynche were commissioned to enquire into an attack on the ship *la Gracedieux* of Dartmouth in response to a petition from William Clerk of Dartmouth, the owner of the ship, and William Lambyn, the ship's master. They claimed that the ship had been attacked by Irish at Stredville,[190] but that the crew had managed to resist the attack and had captured the Irish. A ransom of £400 was paid to the crew and the Irish were then brought to Galway and delivered to the sovereign of the town for the execution of justice. However, when the ship was in Galway it was attacked again. This time the assault on the ship was successful and the ransom of £400 and merchandise to the value of £80 was stolen. Those named as having taken part in the assault included Nicholas Kent, the leader of the expedition to recapture Galway in 1400, William Meson, perhaps the same William Mirreson who was subsequently appointed as one of the justices in Connacht with William de Burgh, and ten others, one of whom was John Hemyngton.[191] Hemyngton's writ of aid was later revoked and in June of 1403 orders were issued to the mayor, sheriffs and bailiffs of Bristol to arrest Hemyngton and to bring him before the king and the council.[192] In July 1403 new orders were issued to the mayor, sheriffs and bailiffs of Bristol, Simon Shollagh, one of those accused of attacking Hemyngton in 1402, and all other sheriffs to arrest Hemyngton and to bring him before the king and the council in chancery. Hemyngton had already appeared before the king and had been ordered, under a penalty of 1,000 marks, not to leave the court but he had done so anyway.[193] The case of John Hemyngton shows the problems facing the administration in Ireland. A seemingly legitimate merchant was able to convince the lieutenant of his good intentions when some form of illegal trade with the Gaelic Irish seems to have been taking place.

---

189 ibid., p. 43.

190 Stradbally, which served as the port of Athenry.

191 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, p. 134.

192 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, pp. 244, 280.

193 ibid., p. 283.

Contemporary attitudes towards Thomas of Lancaster as lieutenant may be found in an examination of the annals. However, very little information is recorded about Lancaster in the Gaelic Irish annals, perhaps due to the fact that he spent so much time in England. *The Annals of Connacht* record the arrival of Lancaster in 1401 his return to Ireland in 1408 and the arrest of the earl of Kildare, the campaign in Leinster of that year and his return to England in 1409, citing the leprosy which afflicted Henry IV as the reason for Lancaster's departure.[194] An almost identical account is found in the *Annals of Loch Cé*.[195] The *Annals of Clonmacnoise* also mention the arrival of Lancaster in Ireland in 1400. This annal ends in 1408 and mentions the return to Ireland of Lancaster in this year, as well as the expedition into Leinster. However there is no mention of the arrest of the earl of Kildare or of Lancaster's return to England in 1409.[196] *The Annals of the Four Masters* mentions the arrival of 'the son of the king of England' in Ireland, also stating that he arrived in 1400 rather than in 1401. This account also mentions Lancaster's arrest of Kildare, the expedition into Leinster of 1408 and his departure in 1409.[197] However, the *Annals of Ulster* fail to mention Lancaster's presence in Ireland at all.[198] This total absence from the Annals of Ulster is perhaps an indication of Lancaster's lack of impact in Ulster and on the Gaelic Irish living in this region.

If we look at the career of Lancaster's predecessors and successors as chief governor and compare the coverage of their time in Ireland, as recorded in the Gaelic Irish annals, to that of Lancaster we may be in a better position to assess the impact of Lancaster in Ireland. Lancaster's immediate predecessor and successor, Sir John Stanley, receives a great deal of attention in the annals. *The Annals of Connacht*, which do not mention him before his second term of office, say that he came to Ireland in 1414 in order to destroy the Gaels of Ireland. He is described as a man who gave no protection to clerics or poets, exposing them to 'cold and beggary'. The cause of his death was reputed to have been the venom of the satires composed by the Ui Uicinn about him, after

---

194 *A.C.*, pp. 377, 401-02.

195 *A.L.C.*, ii, pp. 93, 125, 127.

196 *A. Clon.*, p. 323, 328.

197 *A.F.M.*, vol. iv, pp. 771, 795, 799.

198 *A.U.*, ed. W. M. Hennessey.

he had attacked them in Meath.[199] The coverage of Stanley in the *Annals of the Four Masters* is similar to that of the *Annals of Connacht*.[200] However, neither the *Annals of Loch Cé* nor the *Annals of Ulster* mention Stanley, perhaps due to the fact of his untimely death a mere four months after his arrival in Ireland. Stanley's successor, John Talbot, lord Furnival, was one of the most vigorous of the Lancastrian chief governors, a man who campaigned regularly against the Gaelic Irish. He is described as having 'plundered a great number of the poets of Ireland' and that he 'granted no protection to saint or shrine so long as he was in Ireland'.[201] The impact of Furnival can be assessed by the fact that for nearly every year that he was in Ireland there is an account of a military operation conducted by him.[202]

The Anglo-Irish annals are equally unforthcoming about the activities of Lancaster, giving more exposure to his deputy le Scrope. The only entry in the *Annales Hiberniae* of James Grace for the period of Lancaster's lieutenancy comes in 1407 when Lancaster was out of the country. This entry details the victory of Stephen le Scrope at Callan over O'Carroll.[203] Henry Marleburrough is equally brief in his coverage of Lancaster in Ireland. He mentions his arrival in 1401 and his departure in 1403, which comes immediately after an account of the battle of Shrewsbury, where the Percies were defeated, perhaps indicating that Lancaster was recalled to England due to the uncertainty of the political situation there.[204] He also records the return of Lancaster in 1408 and his arrest of the earl of Kildare, the skirmish at Kilmainham and the parliament which Lancaster summoned at Kilkenny in January 1409. He is recorded as having left Ireland after 13 March 1409.[205] Lancaster's subsequent death in France in 1421 is also noted.[206] The Book of Howth mentions the fact that during the time of Henry V the king's deputies in

---

199 *A.C.*, p. 423.

200 *A.F.M.*, iv, p. 819.

201 *A.C.*, p. 425.

202 ibid., pp. 425-39.

203 Grace, *Annales Hiberniae*, p. 157.

204 Marleburrough, *Chronicle*, pp. 17-18.

205 ibid., pp. 22-3.

206 ibid., p. 31.

Ireland were John Talbot, Thomas of Lancaster, Stephen le Scrope, John, duke of Bedford and James Butler.[207] The only men to serve as lieutenant of Ireland during the reign of Henry V were John Stanley, John Talbot, lord Furnival and James Butler, earl of Ormond, with Thomas Cranley, archbishop of Dublin, acting as justiciar between the death of Stanley and the arrival of Talbot.[208] The Book of Howth, under the year 1399, refers to Lancaster as the king's brother, rather than as the king's son.[209] More coverage is given to le Scrope in this chronicle. The chronicler relates the story of how the poor people of Ireland damned le Scrope for his violent extortions during the reign of Richard II. His wife, upon hearing this refused to live in his company until he swore a vow to make payment for all expenses. This done, his good opinion was restored and it is recorded how le Scrope's name was never mentioned 'without many blessings and good prayers'. This resulted in good service in le Scrope's campaigns against MacMurrough and O'Carroll.[210]

Thomas of Lancaster was certainly not a typical medieval lieutenant. Despite having the same powers as most other lieutenants of the period and despite facing the same financial problems, his position as the king's son meant that Lancaster was able to avoid the responsibilities pertaining to his office on an unprecedented scale. His absenteeism could be excused on the grounds of his youth, but his brother Henry, who was a year older than Thomas, was serving in person in Wales at the same time, while his brother John, who was a year younger than Thomas, was serving on the Scottish border. His absences could also be excused on the grounds of the financial difficulties experienced by Thomas in Ireland. However, in November 1407 we find John of Lancaster writing to the king also complaining of a lack of money to pay his troops and saying that the castles under his command were on the point of being taken and destroyed by the Scots.[211] Similar letters also exist from John Beaufort, the king's half-brother, complaining about the arrears in the pay of the garrison in Calais, of which he was captain. Lancaster was

---

207 *Cal. Carew*, v, p. 171.

208 *Handbook of British Chronology*, p. 163.

209 *Cal. Carew*, v, p. 212.

210 ibid.

211 *Royal and Historical Letters*, ii, pp. 219-224.

appointed as lieutenant of Ireland because he was the king's son and accordingly he was able to exploit his relationship with the king in order to avoid service in Ireland. Not only was he able to avoid service in Ireland but it is apparent that he continued to receive his substantial salary whilst he was in England, without having made adequate arrangements for the government of Ireland during his absence. Lancaster was able to use his position to receive privileged treatment accorded to no other chief governor of Ireland. However, this should not detract from his achievements while serving in Ireland. His presence had set a precedent for what could be accomplished in the lordship, provided the financial backing was available from England. Once it was obvious that the English exchequer could no longer afford to support Lancaster he could achieve little in Ireland, and this, rather than the desire to avoid his responsibilities, seems to have been the principal reason behind his return to England in 1403 and his failure to return to Ireland for five years.

Chapter 3: The reign of Henry IV, 1403-12.

Little is known about the activities of Thomas of Lancaster in the immediate aftermath of his departure from Ireland in November 1403. Although his name continues to appear in government records in connection with Ireland, most of these entries are merely offering protection for those going to serve in Ireland in the company of Thomas of Lancaster.[1] The confirmation of several grants of land and appointments relating to Ireland were also recorded.[2] On 1 October 1404 Lancaster was reappointed as lieutenant of Ireland and on 1 November new arrangements were instituted in order to try and secure the payment of the arrears in his salary.[3] It is not until later that month that further evidence exists relating to the movements and whereabouts of Lancaster. On 13 November 1404 king Henry IV issued orders to the sheriff of Warwick to levy a force of twenty men-at-arms and 200 archers in that county and to bring them to the prince of Wales and Lancaster at Hereford before 25 November. Similar writs were issued to the sheriffs of Worcester, Gloucester, Stafford and Wiltshire. Once collected, this force under the command of the prince of Wales and Lancaster, was to march to Cotyf (Coety) castle in Glamorgan in order to lift the siege of the castle and to relieve Alexander Berkerolles, the lord of Coety, who was trapped in the castle.[4] On 23 November two knights, Richard Arundell and Richard Redeman, were commissioned to take muster of the force going with the king's two sons for the relief of Coety.[5] Coety had been substantially remodelled and rebuilt during the fourteenth century, but due to its isolated position and situation well inland it was questionable whether the castle would be able to withstand a lengthy siege.[6] The substantial nature of the castle can be gleaned from the fact that Richard

---

1 *C.P.R, 1401-05*, pp. 308, 311, 313, 345, 350, 365, 376, 378, 382, 387, 388, 389, 406, 411, 421, 452, 459, 467.

2 ibid., pp. 377, 380, 390, 391, 401, 419, 421, 467.

3 ibid., pp. 456, 464.

4 *C.C.R., 1402-05*, pp. 478-9.

5 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, p. 475.

6 Davies, R.R., *The Revolt of Owain Glyn Dwr*, p. 14

II and his entourage had stayed there in 1394 and that in the 1390's the value of the lordship of Coety was estimated at being worth over £90 *per annum*.[7]

The revolt in Wales had been gaining ground steadily since its outbreak in 1400. In 1402 both lord Grey of Ruthin and Edmund Mortimer, the uncle of the earl of March, had been captured by Glyndwr. The vast royal expedition launched against Wales in the late summer of 1402 'achieved nothing except to prove that Wales would not be pacified by large-scale offensives and seeking after field engagements'.[8] In March 1403 prince Henry was appointed as royal lieutenant in Wales with instructions to maintain a line of garrisons along the Welsh border. These bases could be used as starting points for English expeditions against Glyndwr and also for the resupply of the English garrisons of the interior and along the coast.[9] However, the Percy revolt of 1403 and the inability of the English exchequer to maintain a sufficient level of payment to the prince combined to undermine his position in Wales severely, resulting in his withdrawal from Wales in late 1403, not to return until June 1404.[10] From the time of his return until November 1404, the prince maintained a force at Hereford and Leominster in order to protect the entrance to the Wye valley. He was now fighting a defensive war to try and protect the English border counties and to preserve the integrity of the marches.[11] As 1404 drew to a close effective English authority in Wales seems to have been largely symbolic, a situation which was unparalleled since the arrival of the Normans.[12] This decline in English power made the relief of Coety essential and the force gathered for that purpose was quite substantial. The expedition towards Coety was to be combined with an attempt to relieve the castle at Cardiff. If successful this would have greatly enhanced English power in south Wales. However, financial problems struck and it looked as if the expedition might not go ahead. In the parliament of 1404 the only money forthcoming was in the form of loans from the spiritual lords assembled there.[13] Despite the size of

---

7 ibid., pp. 14, 46.

8 R. Griffiths, 'Prince Henry and Wales, 1400-1408', in *Profit, Piety and the Professions in later medieval England*, ed. M.A. Hicks, p. 54.

9 ibid.

10 ibid., p. 55.

11 ibid., p. 56.

12 Davies, *Glyn Dwr*, p. 116.

13 Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 175.

the force, the success of the prince and Lancaster seems to have been purely temporary as a further expedition, led by Henry IV in person, was forced to march to the relief of Coety again in September 1405.[14] This campaign seems to have been the only time that Lancaster served in Wales. The fact that Lancaster would now have knowledge of light skirmishing warfare, as practised in Ireland, as well as of siege warfare experienced first-hand in Wales would be an advantage in later campaigns.

In February 1405 Lancaster seems to have been responsible for the arrest of the duke of York following an attempt to smuggle the earl of March to Wales by his guardian Lady Despenser. She was a sister of the duke of York and implicated him in the plot, a charge which he at first denied. She also accused the duke of having planned to kill the king and his sons while they had been celebrating Christmas at Eltham the previous year. York was arrested and sent to the Tower of London, but was released soon afterwards.[15] Lancaster's next appointment came later that month. On 20 February he was appointed as king's admiral with full powers,[16] replacing his uncle Thomas Beaufort, who had been appointed as admiral in 1403. The indenture between Lancaster and the king stated that Lancaster was to serve the king on the safeguard of the sea for six months beginning on 20 April 1405.[17] Initially Lancaster's force was to consist of 700 men-at-arms, of whom two were to be earls, twelve bannerets, eighty knights and the rest esquires, as well as 1,400 archers. A fleet of twenty ships, twenty barges and twenty balingers was to be made available for their transport.[18] Lancaster was ordered to constrain and to chastise those rebels or enemies that he came across,[19] indicating that Henry IV was merely reacting to a breach of the truce by the French. By 7 March the composition of Lancaster's retinue had changed. Now it was stipulated that he was to have two earls, eight bannerets and twenty-one knights with the rest of his men-at-arms being esquires, as well as the 1,400 archers, and his fleet was to consist of eighteen ships, eighteen barges and eighteen balingers.[20] Lancaster

---

14 Davies, *Glyn Dwr*, p. 117.

15 Wylie, *Henry IV*, ii, p. 43; Kirby, *Henry IV*, pp. 182-3.

16 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, p. 496.

17 P.R.O., E 101/69/2/314.

18 Rymer, *Foedera*, viii, p. 389.

19 ibid., pp. 388-9.

20 P.R.O., E 101/69/2/314.

was to be paid by the treasurers of war appointed in the parliament held at Coventry in 1404. He was to receive the first payment, covering the first month of his commission as admiral, straight-away in cash, although part of the payment was to consist of victuals. Another payment would be made after Lancaster had held the muster of his retinue at Sandwich before the king's commissioners. Lancaster would then receive payment for the second half of his commission before his fleet left for sea. If the king and his council thought it necessary and expedient, Lancaster and his troops could be transferred to the port of Southampton. If they remained there for one month before the end of the first period of their service without having put to sea, then they were to be discharged from having to serve any longer. If the enemy went to sea before or during the period of Lancaster's admiralcy then he was to attack them with all the power at his disposal. This seems to indicate that the English were expecting a French fleet to be operating in the channel and that they were responding to a French breach of the truce. The indenture also sets out the division of the profits, if any, that might come from the expedition. Half of any profit was to go to the king and the owners of the ships, while the other half was to be divided between Lancaster and his men. If any great captains were to be taken by Lancaster or by any of his men then they would remain their prisoners. The king also guaranteed to compensate Lancaster and his men if the expedition was cancelled for any reason.[21]

On 1 March 1405 Simon Blackburn was commissioned to take ships, barges and vessels to the portage of 36 tuns and over in the river Thames and from the mouth of the river as far as Southampton for the transport of Lancaster and his men. A similar commission was issued to John Elyngeham covering from the mouth of the Thames to Berwick-on-Tweed and one to Richard Kays covering from the port of Pole as far as the port of Falmouth and then to the port of Bristol.[22] Four of the vessels arrested for this voyage were the royal ships 'la Katherine de la Tour', 'le Holygost de la Tour', 'la Tour' and the royal barge 'la Godegrace de la Tour'.[23] The combined crews of these four vessels came to a total of 255 mariners. On 3 April John Pelham and Robert Berney were commissioned

---

21 ibid.

22 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, p. 512.

23 ibid.

to supervise the muster of Lancaster's men 'at Dover or Sandwich'.[24] Lancaster also seems to have tried to recruit ships himself. At this time he wrote to the mayor of Rye inviting any who had a suitable ship to join his expedition, promising all those who did a share in the prize money.[25] From March onwards ships had been gathering at Sandwich and the following month Lancaster's men had begun to assemble at Dover and Sandwich in preparation for sailing on 20 April. A combination of bad weather and a shortage of money meant that the fleet was still in port in early May.[26] On 6 May Lancaster was forced to write to the council and request more money, saying he would not be able to leave Sandwich without the payment of the wages promised for himself and his men.[27] The same day the council wrote to the king telling him that, with great difficulty they had managed to arrange payment for Lancaster and that he would be able to sail by the following Thursday at the latest.[28] However, it was not until mid-May that the orders to sail were given.[29] The immediate reason for Lancaster's expedition sailing seems to have been the French attack on the castle of Marck in the march of Calais, breaking the truce between the two countries confirmed in 1400.[30] The attack on the castle was led by Waleran, count of St. Pol. He had married Maud Courtenay, a half-sister of Richard II, and he had declared a personal war on Henry IV after his seizure of the throne. He had written to Henry IV in February 1402 vowing to extract vengeance on him as a usurper,[31] and he used this as a pretext for regular breaches of the truce. He had also led a raid on the Isle of Wight in 1403, causing much discomfort to the inhabitants there.[32] On 12 May 1405 he attacked Marck with a force of between four and five hundred archers and fifty Genoese crossbowmen.[33] The attack was unsuccessful and a sortie from Calais by the garrison there, led by Richard Aston, deputy of John Beaufort, earl of Somerset, succeeded in lifting the siege. Monstrelet seems in no doubt that

---

24 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 59.

25 *V.C.H., Sussex*, ii, p. 141.

26 Wylie, *Henry IV*, ii, pp. 100-1.

27 *P.P.C.*, i, pp. 263-4.

28 ibid., pp. 259-60.

29 Wylie, *Henry IV*, ii, pp. 100-1.

30 ibid., p. 91.

31 Monstrelet, *Chronique*, i, pp. 67-8.

32 ibid., pp. 91-2.

33 ibid., pp. 100-1.

the success in repulsing this attack prompted the dispatch of Lancaster's fleet.[34]

Lancaster's fleet sailed along the coast of Flanders, between the towns of Dunkerque and Nieuport, arriving at Sluys on 22 May 1405. In the harbour four ships, belonging to Rhenish and German merchants, were burnt and a force was landed with the intention of attacking the town. The garrison of the town consisted of French, German and Flemings, although the Flemings seem to have been reluctant defenders due to their ongoing dispute with their overlord, the duke of Burgundy. Lancaster's troops managed to burn some of the town's fortifications but the garrison of the citadel, consisting mainly of Frenchmen, managed to hold out. After five days, hearing news of the advance of the duke of Burgundy, the English withdrew to their ships leaving sixty men dead. During the attack the earl of Kent had been wounded.[35] The English then moved towards the island of Cadsand, landing another force which burnt some villages in the area. It was at this point that the English fleet encountered three Genoese carracks. During the subsequent battle one of the Genoese ships attempted to ram the ship which was carrying Lancaster. All three were captured and were sent to Winchelsea to await the return of Lancaster and the main body of the English fleet. However, at the mouth of Rye harbour one of the carracks caught fire and this resulted in all three of the ships being damaged. The chronicle of William Gregory records that the carracks were burnt through misgovernance and that much of their cargo was destroyed. Gregory also records the burning of towns in Flanders and the assault on Sluys.[36] Another London chronicle also records this expedition, noting that the earl of Kent went with Lancaster. It also describes the burning of towns in Flanders and the capture of two Genoese carracks, taken because they would not strike their sails in the name of the king of England. This chronicle

---

34 ibid., p. 107.

35 Wylie, *Henry IV*, ii, pp. 102-3; Monstrelet records the death of the earl of Pembroke, described as one of the principal English captains, during the attack on Sluys. However, the title was vacant at the time and nowhere else is the death of any prominent English nobleman recorded.

36 'William Gregory's Chronicle of London', in J. Gairdner (ed.), *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century*, C. S., 2nd series, no. 17, 1876, p. 104.

claims that the carracks caught fire while the goods onboard were being examined.[37] The fact that Genoese crossbowmen took part in the assault on the castle of Marck may have been behind the seizure of the Genoese vessels. The capture and burning of the three carracks is recorded by the Venetian chronicler Antonio Morosini. He states that three Genoese ships were in the harbour at Sluys and that two of them were burned by the English, one of them because its master, Niccolò de Moneglia, spoke in a dishonest manner, for which he was killed.[38] Morosini also notes how the king of England inflicted a great defeat on the king of France seizing merchandise found on ships in Sluys to the value of between 150-200,000 ducats.[39]

The English fleet then moved on to Normandy, losing one ship to Flemish privateers along the way. A substantial force was landed in the eastern Cotentin, burning the towns of Barfleur, La Hogue de St. Vaast, Montebourg and Pernelle. The English troops plundered the countryside for over thirty miles, burning another thirty-six villages. Lancaster seems to have avoided any further incidents and managed to return home with his fleet in early July, possibly on hearing news of the rebellion of archbishop Scrope of York and the earl of Northumberland. The expedition can be regarded as a success and resulted in the duke of Burgundy negotiating a separate commercial treaty with England due to the opposition he faced from his subjects in Flanders.[40] One of the Genoese carracks captured by Lancaster was subsequently returned to Leonard de Maryn, its owner, at the request of Gabriel, Imperialis of Genoa. On 29 January 1406 the king ordered Henry Holeway, the mayor of Southampton, to return the carrack, which was being held in Southampton, to de Maryn.[41] On 16 February 1406 Thomas Erpyngham, the constable of Dover castle and warden of the Cinque Ports, was ordered to safeguard a carrack 'lately taken at sea by the king's son Thomas his admiral', currently in the port of Winchelsea in the keeping of the mayor and bailiffs of the town.[42]

---

37 *A Chronicle of the Reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI*, ed. the Rev. John Silvester Davies, C. S., no. 64, 1856, p. 30.

38 *Chronique d'Antonio Morosini*, i, pp. 182-4.

39 ibid., pp. 186-8.

40 Wylie, *Henry IV*, ii, pp. 104-5.

41 *C.C.R., 1405-09*, p. 29.

42 ibid., p. 27.

Although Lancaster does not seem to have served at sea again, he continued to hold the title of admiral as late as 25 March 1406.[43] It was not until April 1406, with the appointments of Nicholas Blackburn and Richard Clitheroe as admirals of the northern and western fleets respectively,[44] that Lancaster was replaced.

Lancaster seems to have spent most of the summer of 1406 in the company of his father at the royal court. In July 1406 the king, the queen and the princes Henry, Thomas and Humphrey gathered at Hertford in order to escort the princess Phillipa to Lynn, from where she was leaving to marry king Eric of Denmark. The royal family moved to Barley on 21 July, then to Babraham the following day. From there they moved to Newmarket arriving at Bury St. Edmunds on 24 July. Philippa rested at Thetford while the king and queen moved through Wymondam, Norwich, Walsingham and Castle Rising, arriving at Lynn by 7 August.[45] After spending nine days at Lynn and having taken leave of his daughter,[46] King Henry proceeded on a tour of the Lancastrian estates in Lincolnshire, accompanied by his sons Thomas and Humphrey, Prince Henry having returned to Wales, and by the three Scottish earls of Fife, Douglas and Orkney, who had been captured by the Percies in 1402. Travelling via Spalding the royal party arrived at Horncastle on 20 August. The following day they moved on to Bardney Abbey. Here the royal party stayed overnight and the king heard mass the following morning and then breakfasted with Thomas and Humphrey and the Scottish earls. The king left the abbey the following day travelling to Lincoln, where he spent the 24 and 25 August, Leicester, where the royal party remained from 29 August until 6 September, arriving at St. Albans by 13 September. Two days later they were back in London and witnessed a tournament in West Smithfield where the earl of Kent and sir John Cornewaille distinguished themselves against some Scottish knights, including the earl of Mar. The king then travelled to Merton in Surrey, but was back in London in time for the resumption of Parliament, which was due to restart on 15 October.[47]

---

43 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 160.

44 *Handbook of British Chronology*, p. 140.

45 Wylie, *Henry IV*, ii, p. 448; Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 202.

46 *John Capgrave's Chronicle of England*, p. 292, ed. F. C. A. Hingeston.

47 Wylie, *Henry IV*, ii, pp. 460-1; Kirby, *Henry IV*, pp. 202-4.

It was during this session of parliament that the issue of the royal succession was raised again. The royal succession had seemingly been settled definitively in the parliament held at Westminster in 1404. Then the succession was declared to belong to the prince of Wales and his heirs and then to his three brothers and their heirs in turn.[48] On 7 June 1406, during the second session of the current parliament, the right of succession was altered. Now Henry, prince of Wales was declared to be the king's successor in the kingdoms of England and France and in the king's lordship overseas. The right of succession belonged to the prince and to his heirs male, and would then pass to his brothers and their heirs male.[49] However on 22 December 1406, just before the final session of parliament broke up, the king again changed the right of succession. The prince of Wales was once again declared to be the heir apparent, but the line of succession could pass to the heirs of his body, not specifically the heirs male, a reversion to the right of succession set out in 1404. Once again Thomas, John and Humphrey were to be next in line, and they too could be succeeded by the heirs of their bodies.[50] The reason for this change seems to have been due to the negotiations taking place with the French trying to secure a marriage between the prince of Wales and a daughter of Charles VI. The French were unhappy about the possibility of the exclusion from the line of succession of any daughters of the prince if he was unable to produce a male heir.[51] Another interpretation of the events surrounding the changes in the line of succession of 1406 is that the prince of Wales was responsible for the change of the wording from heirs male to heirs of the body. The reasons put forward for this are that the prince was unwilling to see the throne pass to his brother Thomas if he was unable to produce male heirs, or that even at this early stage the prince of Wales was planning to prosecute his great-grandfather's claim to the throne of France.[52] If the line of succession to the English throne was limited to heirs male then this would seriously diminish the authority of the English claim to the French throne, which stemmed from Edward III's mother Isabella. The parliament of 1406 had also seen the commons recommend the king's sons and others to him for the

---

48 Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 169.

49 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 192.

50 ibid., p. 298.

51 Wylie, *Henry IV*, ii, p. 463; Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 205.

52 McNiven, P., 'Legitimacy and consent: Henry IV and the Lancastrian title, 1399-1406', *Medieval Studies*, 44 (1982).

good work that they had done in securing the kingdom.[53] However, earlier in the same session of parliament on 24 May criticisms were made concerning the state of the lordship in Ireland and the amount of money being given to safeguard the country. Despite the great sums of money being spent on the defence of the lordship, at least nominally, the country was no better off than ever before. It would appear that Lancaster, although not mentioned by name, was under attack for neglecting his duties in Ireland.[54]

It was during the summer of 1406 that Thomas of Lancaster was also appointed as the captain of the castle of Guisnes in the march of Calais, replacing John Norbury, who had held that post since the start of the reign. On 19 August 1406 Henry IV wrote to the treasurer ordering that payment be made to Lancaster of the sum of 1,000 marks recently assigned to him as part payment of his arrears as lieutenant of Ireland. This money was to be paid as soon as possible to enable Lancaster to implement the agreement recently made between Lancaster and Norbury whereby Lancaster would replace Norbury as captain of the castle in return for the payment of a sum of money.[55] It seems that Lancaster was using his presence at the royal court to ensure favourable treatment for himself. The castle of Guisnes, situated some six miles outside Calais, was the most important of the fortresses which protected the approach to the town and was essential for the maintenance of English control over Calais. The march of Calais was an area where English and French forces were almost constantly at war with each other throughout the reign of Henry IV, due principally to the attitude of Waleran of St. Pol. It does not seem likely that Lancaster actually travelled to Guisnes at this time. In March 1407 Lancaster was receiving payments as captain of Guisnes. Along with payments to John Beaufort, earl of Somerset, as captain of Calais for his troops there and to the prince of Wales for the payment of troops suppressing the Glyndwr revolt, Lancaster was to receive the sum of 300 marks for the wages of the garrison of the castle.[56] In the following May, Lancaster was assigned the sum of £500, again to pay for the garrison of Guisnes. £300 of this was to come from the wool subsidy to be levied in Southampton while the remainder was to come

---

53 *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, iii, p. 577.

54 ibid., p. 573.

55 P.R.O., E404/21/306.

56 P.R.O., E404/22/285.

from that to be levied in the port of London.[57] However, this does not prove that Lancaster actually served in person at Guisnes. It seems likely that he attended the parliament at Gloucester which started in October 1407 because it was here, on 2 December 1407, on the last day of the parliament, that Lancaster was one of those appointed to treat with the French ambassadors trying to negotiate a peace settlement between the two countries.[58]

Lancaster's commission claimed that once a peace settlement was reached then it would be easier to try and end the Schism, so the peace was being negotiated for the good of all Christendom. The French were eager to renew the truce because earlier in 1407 Louis, duke of Orleans had been murdered by retainers of John, duke of Burgundy, bringing France to the brink of civil war.[59] Henry IV would be in a much stronger position at home if the truce with France was renewed and with the capture of James of Scotland the previous year, the threat to England from its northern borders also receded. The Welsh revolt had also been winding down since 1406 and the position of Henry IV on the throne was much more secure. Neither side seems to have been genuine about the search for a permanent peace and were content to renew the truce from 15 January 1408, and this truce was periodically renewed up to 1410.[60] The rest of the English delegation had been appointed the previous day and consisted of Thomas Langley, bishop of Durham, Thomas Erpyngham, Hugh Mortimer and John Catterick.[61] Lancaster's inclusion in the embassy seems to have been to add some royal dignity to the English side.[62] Also in this parliament the speaker, Thomas Chaucer, in the name of the commons, requested that the king's sons Thomas, John and Humphrey should receive titles as well as the means to sustain their positions honourably.[63] However, as with the similar requests made the previous year and in 1404 no action was taken by the king to implement this suggestion.

---

57 P.R.O., E404/22/501.

58 Rymer, *Foedera*, viii, p. 506.

59 Keen, *England in the later Middle Ages*, p. 320.

60 Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 218.

61 ibid.

62 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iii, p. 95.

63 *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, iii, p. 612.

The position of Henry IV had now improved considerably since his accession to the throne. Since March 1406 he had held James, son and heir of king Robert III of Scotland, as a prisoner and since Robert's death in April 1406 the nominal king of Scotland was held at the court of the English king. In the meantime Scotland was being ruled by the regent, Robert Stewart, duke of Albany. Albany's son, Murdoch earl of Fife, had been a prisoner in English hands since the battle of Homildon Hill in 1402.[64] Both king James and the earl of Fife could be used to threaten the position of Albany and could be used by Henry IV to try and secure a more lasting peace on his northern border. The threat of civil war in France had saved the English possessions in Calais and Gascony from French attacks in 1407 and it now looked as if concerted French action against Calais and Gascony would be impossible. The internal feuding of the French nobility, which resulted in the truce of 1407, reduced the military pressure on Henry IV and allowed him to concentrate on ending Glyndwr's rebellion in Wales. It is also possible that Lancaster returned to Ireland in 1408 to try to establish English lordship there on a stronger footing during a period of relative stability elsewhere. In Wales the Glyndwr revolt had been winding down since late-1406. The intervention of a French force in 1405 had allowed Glyndwr to march as far as Worcester, but this had achieved little and Glyndwr and his allies had been forced to retreat. From December 1406, the prince of Wales began to spend more time in London attending meetings of the royal council, indicating confidence in the failure of the rebellion.[65] With the defeat of the earl of Northumberland at the battle of Bramham Moor in January 1408, the last domestic opposition to Henry IV had been removed and it seemed as if he had finally secured the hold of the Lancastrian dynasty on the English crown. It is ironic that with the increasing stability of the later years of the reign, dissension among the royal family began to appear, and two distinct factions began to fight for control of the government.

A major contributing factor to the split in the royal family seems to have been the problem of Henry IV's health. From the summer of 1405 onwards Henry IV began to suffer from recurring attacks of severe illness.[66] These attacks occurred on a regular basis, beginning in June

---

64 Keen, *England in the later Middle Ages*, p. 320; Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 195.

65 Griffiths, 'Prince Henry and Wales', p. 56.

66 McNiven, 'The problem of Henry IV's health', p. 747.

1405 following the execution of archbishop Scrope of York. Further attacks seem to have taken place in April 1406, June 1408, December 1408, December 1412 and March 1413, which resulted in the king's death. Travelling from York to Ripon soon after the execution of archbishop Scrope Henry IV was struck down by what most contemporaries believed was leprosy. The king was incapacitated for at least a week and this was regarded as punishment from God for ignoring the archbishop's clerical privilege. Henry's symptoms, as recorded by contemporaries, included pustules which developed on his face and hands, as well as other far more incredible claims. One chronicle claimed that Henry's body had shrunk to the size of that of a twelve year old and another stated that when the king died his body was scarcely a cubit in length.[67] While these outlandish claims can certainly be discounted, the severity of the king's illness must be recognised and that general opinion believed that the king was suffering from leprosy and that he was severely disfigured by his illness.

More important than the exact nature of Henry's illness was its effect on his ability to govern. This is most obviously displayed in the attack suffered by the king in April 1406. The second session of the parliament of 1406 had been summoned to meet on 26 April but when parliament opened the king was absent. On 28 April he sent a letter to the council apologising for the delay in his arrival and stating that his doctors had forbidden him to travel. He planned to arrive by river within a matter of days. Later that day another letter was sent and warned the council of a worsening in the king's illness and to expect further delays in his arrival. It is likely that Henry did not arrive at the parliament until 4 May.[68] The parliament of 1406 saw the most sustained attack by the commons on the government of Henry IV. The principal aim of the commons in this parliament was to secure the appointment of a council to be named in parliament, and therefore accountable to parliament. This move was to limit the freedom of action of the king and not to relieve him of any burden. However, if the king was being forced to admit that he was incapable of carrying out his duties then the commons would have a weapon to use against him in their plans to seek accountable royal government. Following his attack in June 1408 it was believed that the king was actually dead. Combined with another serious attack within the space of

---

67 ibid., pp. 756-7

68 ibid., p. 760.

a year this must have raised grave doubts about Henry's ability to rule and for how much longer he would rule. In December 1408 both the prince of Wales and Thomas of Lancaster were summoned due to the king's latest bout of illness. The king remained at Greenwich until March 1409 recuperating from this attack.[69] The prince of Wales had fought his last campaign the previous summer and had managed to recapture Aberystwyth from the Welsh. In January 1409 Harlech was recaptured by Gilbert and John Talbot,[70] and this effectively marked the end of Glyndwr's rebellion. Now the prince was free to turn his attentions fully to affairs of state and the central government and although there was little real need for the prince to be in Wales, it seems likely that the main reason that the prince began attending council meetings was due to the serious and incapacitating nature of his father's illness. It was time for the prince to be associated in government in case it was necessary for him to take over. Lancaster, who had only returned to Ireland in November 1408, left there again in March 1409 on hearing news of his father's illness, because it was believed that the king was dying.[71] Lancaster never returned to Ireland leaving the government of the lordship to his deputy, Thomas Butler, prior of Kilmainham. Not only did Lancaster's absenteeism lead to conflict with his brother, the prince, but his deputy Butler failed to maintain the confidence of the government in England. In 1412, while Lancaster was in France, it was decided in the council to consult with his advisors to see if any remedy could be found for the poor state of the administration in Ireland.[72]

It seems to have been the prince of Wales' uncertainty concerning his father's well-being that led him to takeover the running of the council in late 1409, and this saw the emergence of the prince of Wales as the main political power in England for a period of two years. The Welsh rebellion had seen the emergence of the prince of Wales as a significant figure in his own right. Initially his command in Wales had been purely nominal, and he was in effect serving under Henry Percy, known as Hotspur, son of the earl of Northumberland, and later under Hotspur's uncle, Thomas Percy, earl of Worcester. However, in April 1403, the prince

---

69 ibid., p. 763.

70 Griffiths, 'Prince Henry and Wales', p. 57.

71 *A.L.C.*., ii, p. 127.

72 *P.P.C.*, ii, p. 35.

was appointed as royal lieutenant in Wales,[73] and later that year the influence of the Percies was completely removed following their unsuccessful rebellion. The prince's command in Wales had allowed him to build up a loyal following among the younger nobility. Men like the earls of Arundel and Warwick, who had served under the prince in Wales, would play a major role in government when the prince took over control of the council and served with distinction in the French wars of the next reign. In December 1406 the prince attended his first meeting of the royal council, and between January 1407 and December 1409 he attended ten out of the fifteen recorded meetings of the council.[74]

The intentions of the prince of Wales concerning government were made clear even before he became the dominant figure in the council. The moves made against his brother Thomas show that the prince would not tolerate those who shirked their responsibilities. On 18 August 1409 during a meeting of the council the prince sought to have his brother replaced as lieutenant of Ireland by John Stanley.[75] Thomas had returned to England earlier in the year and had remained ever since, continuing to draw off the exchequer for his duties in Ireland. In May 1409 Lancaster had been granted assignments in payment of his arrears, while at the same time only nominal sums were being spent on Wales and the Scottish marches.[76] The prince proposed that in return for the surrender of his office Lancaster would be paid an annuity of 3,000 marks which would enable Lancaster and his men to leave the king's household and allow him to set up his own household. This move was to be financed jointly by the king, who would pay Lancaster 1,000 marks per annum, and Stanley, who would pay Lancaster the remaining 2,000 marks out of the revenues of Ireland.[77] Those present at the meeting were the prince, Thomas Arundel, the chancellor and archbishop of Canterbury, the duke of York, the earl of Somerset and his brother Thomas Beaufort. It seems most likely that the prince put forward this proposal with the support of the Beauforts.[78] The

---

73 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 23.

74 Kirby, 'Councils and councillors of Henry IV, 1399-1413', *T.R.H.S.*, 5th series, 14, (1964) pp. 55-7.

75 *P.P.C.*, i, p. 320.

76 Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort*, p. 49.

77 *P.P.C.*, i, p. 320.

78 McNiven, 'The political crisis of 1412', p. 6.

influence of the duke of York seems to have been negligible at this stage of the reign, while Thomas Arundel was one of the king's staunchest allies and due to animosity between himself and the Beauforts is most unlikely to have acted in conjunction with them. This arrangement was dependent on the consent and agreement of both the king and Lancaster and the prince agreed to discuss the proposal with them. There seems no doubt that the prince wished to see Thomas, regarded as Henry IV's favourite son,[79] removed from court and forced to carry his own weight as his brothers were doing. Although this attempt was resisted by the king, the position of Lancaster was shown to be precarious.

The reason for the coolness between the archbishop and the Beauforts seems to have dated back to 1407. In February of that year John Beaufort requested that Henry IV confirm the patent legitimising his family issued by Richard II in 1397. This was renewed but with a new clause which specifically excluded the Beauforts from the line of succession which was inserted at the insistence of archbishop Arundel.[80] However, this would seem to indicate that some tension already existed between the archbishop and the Beauforts at this time. This may have sprung from the role played by Thomas Beaufort in the execution of archbishop Scrope in 1405 when Arundel had pleaded with the king to recognise Scrope's clerical immunity as Richard II had done in his own case in 1398. When archbishop Scrope appeared before the king Thomas Beaufort had seized Scrope's crozier, symbol of his spiritual role and his immunity stemming from that role, and brought it to the king.[81] As members of the royal family the Beauforts could naturally expect to share in the spoils of government. With the illness of the king and his inability to fulfil all the functions of government the Beauforts, and in particular the ambitious Henry Beaufort, bishop of Winchester, saw the opportunity to widen the scope of their influence in the government. Having been the some of Henry IV's most trusted allies during the years of crisis the Beauforts expected to be rewarded. However, with archbishop Arundel in control of the royal council their ambitions were being thwarted and they seem to have gradually turned towards the prince of Wales in an attempt to regain their position. The loyalty of the Beauforts to king Henry

---

79 Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort*, p. 49; McNiven, *Heresy and politics*, p. 151 and 'The political crisis of 1412', p. 6.

80 Tuck, *Crown and nobility*, p. 236; Kirby, 'Councils and councillors', p.57.

81 Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort*, p. 29.

is not in doubt, but they seem to have been frustrated by Arundel's tight grip on the council and without any substantial territorial base they were dependent on the generosity of the king. With the increasing stability from 1407 on the position of the Beauforts was no longer as secure as it might have been.[82]

The establishment of Henry Beaufort as bishop of Winchester in 1404 greatly increased his influence within the church and it seems that Arundel regarded him as a threat to his authority. Beaufort had agents at the papal court attempting to secure episcopal appointments for his supporters and this attempt on Beaufort's part to create his own faction among the episcopate, against the wishes of archbishop Arundel, would certainly have increased tension between the two men.[83] In August 1409 Beaufort was appointed as papal legate in England by the recently deposed pope, Gregory XII. The English delegation at the council of Pisa had supported the election of Alexander V and had consisted of a number of reformers closely connected with archbishop Arundel. Hence, it would appear that knowledge of the tensions existing within the English church was widespread, and that Gregory XII was trying to exploit them for his own ends.[84] Archbishop Arundel was being used by the king to look after his interests in the royal council and it was perhaps obvious to Beaufort that there was very little chance for advancement as long as the council remained under the authority of the archbishop. He was forced to look outside the council for support towards Henry, prince of Wales, whose attendance at council was becoming more regular. He was able to act as a focus for any discontent and it appears that Beaufort aligned himself with the prince, consciously looking forward to the next reign.

It was in late 1409 that the prince, in alliance with Henry Beaufort, took over the running of the council. Although the chronology of events during this period is confusing what is certain is that on 19 December 1409 the treasurer, John Tiptoft, resigned and two days later archbishop Arundel resigned as chancellor and that for the next two years the council consisted primarily of men aligned with the prince.[85] Neither the chancellor

---

82 ibid., p. 43.

83 ibid., pp. 41-2.

84 ibid., p. 47; McNiven, *Heresy and politics*, pp. 153-4.

85 Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 227; McNiven, 'The political crisis of 1412', p. 1.

nor the treasurer were replaced immediately and it was not until 6 January 1410 that Henry, lord Scrope of Masham, was appointed as treasurer. The new chancellor was Thomas Beaufort and he was not appointed until 31 January, four days after the opening of parliament. When parliament opened the king was using John Wakering, archdeacon of Canterbury and an ally of the king and the archbishop, as temporary keeper of the great seal.[86] The delay in making these two appointments can only show that attempts were being made to resist them and that no agreement could be reached as to who should fill them.[87] The fact that both of the new appointees can be linked to the prince's party suggests that the king was trying to block their appointment.[88] The appointment of Thomas Beaufort instead of his brother Henry, who had already served as chancellor, suggests that while the king had accepted his son's control of government he did not have to support it.[89] Thomas Beaufort remained in favour after the king regained control of the council in 1411 and this would suggest that his appointment was a compromise between the king and his eldest son.[90] The commons proved more than amenable to the change in control of the government and elected Thomas Chaucer, a cousin of the Beauforts, as speaker. The rise to power of the prince seems to have increased the confidence of the commons and it was in this parliament that they put forward their plan for the confiscation and distribution of the temporal wealth of the church. This, they argued, would allow the king to create fifteen new earls, 1,500 new knights, 6,200 squires and 100 almshouses as well as providing the king with an additional £20,000 each year.[91] With the rejection of this scheme by the king the commons seem to have retreated. They duly offered a grant of taxation and the prince's new council, which consisted almost entirely of his supporters, was sworn in. The new council was entirely noble and clerical, exactly what the commons had wanted for some time. As well as the two new officers and the keeper of the privy seal, John Prophet, there was the prince of Wales, Henry Beaufort as well as

---

86 McNiven, *Heresy and politics*, p. 185.

87 ibid., pp. 185-9.

88 Scrope had served with the prince in Wales during the Glyndwr rebellion.

89 McNiven, *Heresy and politics*, p. 188.

90 Beaufort was created earl of Dorset in 1412 at the same time as Thomas of Lancaster was created duke of Clarence. These were the only two ennoblements of the reign of Henry IV.

91 McNiven, *Politics and heresy*, pp. 191-4.

bishop Bubwith of Bath and Wells and bishop Langley of Durham, the earls of Westmorland and Arundel and Hugh, Lord Burnell. Of the members of the new council only bishop Langley of Durham and the earl of Westmorland could be identified with the king.[92] Within a week of the council being named in parliament they had been replaced by bishop Chichele of St. David's and Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, due to the commitments of Langley and Westmorland in the north.[93] Both of the new appointees were advocates of the prince. Coupled with the announcement of the king that certain of his advisors had refused to serve, probably meaning Archbishop Arundel, it indicates that there was no place on the new council for men whose loyalties lay with the king rather than the prince.

The prince's seizure of power and the disregard in which he seems to have held his brother Thomas may explain one of the more curious incidents of the reign of Henry IV. In June 1410 Thomas and his brother John were involved in what has been described as an affray in Eastcheap, involving their followers and other men of the court.[94] The incident quickly got out of control and the mayor and the sheriffs of London had to be called to the scene. Most contemporary chronicles attach little importance to this event[95] but, if we take this event in the context of the exclusion from power of the king and Thomas, and the failure to pay Thomas any of the money due to him, it is possible that Thomas and John were standing up for their position and that of their father and became involved in a dispute with supporters of the prince and the new council, which, given the reputation of the prince of Wales for indulging in wild behaviour,[96] is not too unbelievable. The lack of coverage given to this affair may indicate a reluctance on the part of the chroniclers to involve the name of the prince. Further disturbances in London involving Thomas

---

92 Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort*, p. 52.

93 Kirby, 'Councils and councillors', p. 58.

94 Stow, J., *A survey of London*, i, p. 217, ed. C. L. Kingsford.

95 'William Gregory's Chronicle of London', p. 106, refers to 'the hurlynge in Estechepe'. *Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London*, ed. J. G. Nichols, C. S., no. 53, 1851, p. 11, records 'the kynges sonnes beten in Chepe'. This resulted in an ordinance that inns and cookhouses should close at no later than nine o'clock, *Chronicles of London*, Kingsford (ed.), p. 268.

96 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 58.

were reported the following year. It was at this time that safe-conducts were issued to Jean de Bourbon, count of Clermont, coming to England to perform feats of arms with Thomas of Lancaster.[97] Although there is no record of Clermont actually having arrived in England, it is perhaps indicative of Lancaster's lack of involvement in the affairs of state at the time that he was able to indulge himself in tournaments.

The main aim of the new council was the restoration of royal finances but the prince demanded in parliament that adequate funds be made available to govern, otherwise the council would resign at the end of parliament. The attempt of the prince to ensure sound financial management manifested itself in a renewed attack on the position of his brother Thomas. In June 1410 when Thomas of Lancaster petitioned the council regarding his expenses as lieutenant in Ireland he was told that he would only receive payment if he actually performed the duties he was obliged to carry out there.[98] The desire on the part of the prince to remove Thomas from court would indicate that he regarded Thomas as being in a position of prestige. The presence of Thomas at court does seem to have had the tacit approval of his father. It seems likely that the marriage arranged between Thomas and Margaret Beaufort was a further attempt to provide for Lancaster.

On 16 March 1410 John Beaufort, earl of Somerset, died following a period of illness. He had served his half-brother loyally and the heavy burdens placed upon him as captain of Calais seem to have contributed to his ill-health. His brother Henry was appointed executor of his will. On 24 April 1410 his widow Margaret was granted the custody of all the earl's lands during the minority of her son, except Corfe castle,[99] which were worth approximately £1,000 *per annum*.[100] On 20 June Margaret was also granted the custody of her son, heir to the earl, until he reached the age of fifteen, with a yearly allowance of 200 marks to pay for his maintenance, although his marriage was reserved to the king.[101] On 16 August 1410 Pope John XXIII authorised the archbishop of Canterbury and Henry Beaufort, in

---

97 Rymer, *Foedera*, viii, p. 626.

98 *P.P.C.*, i, pp. 339-41.

99 *C.F.R., 1405-13*, pp. 185-6.

100 Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort*, p. 63.

101 *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 210.

answer to 'the recent petition of Thomas, son of Henry King of England, and Margaret de Holand, relict of John de Beaufort, Earl of Somerset', to issue a dispensation allowing Thomas and Margaret to marry because they were related within the prohibited degrees.[102] The transfer of Beaufort's lands and the custody of his heir to Margaret seems to have been a prelude to the marriage and was a way of providing a substantial income for Lancaster and also a means of removing him from the royal household.[103] The idea that the king arranged the marriage in order to strengthen his party and that the prince of Wales was in anyway opposed to this arrangement[104] can be discounted by the fact that the dispensation to marry was granted 'at the petition also of Henry Prince of Wales'. However, Henry Beaufort certainly objected to the marriage, viewing it as a threat to the Beaufort inheritance. As one of those authorised by the pope to issue the dispensation to marry he seems to have tried to obstruct the marriage[105] and on 10 November 1411 the pope renewed his mandate of the previous year to Antonio de Pireto, one of the papal nuncios being sent to England, to authorise the marriage of Thomas and Margaret, again citing the petition of the prince of Wales.[106] The previous day Paul de Caputgrassis, the other papal nuncio, was authorised to recruit Thomas of Lancaster and a force of men-at-arms and archers to serve in the papal campaigns in Italy against king Ladislas of Naples and the deposed pope Gregory XII, for which Lancaster would receive a full crusade indulgence.[107] With both the Armagnac and Burgundian factions in France actively seeking English military intervention, it is unlikely that this move was suggested by either the king or the prince of Wales as both men would have realised the folly of allowing military resources to be drawn out of the kingdom. However, the possibility that this was a further attempt by the prince of Wales to remove his brother from the centre of power cannot be discounted out of hand. The prince of Wales did eventually side with his uncle against his brother, possibly due to his dismissal from the council on 30 November 1411, and helped the bishop to block attempts by Thomas to acquire part of the money

---

102 *C.P.L., 1404-15*, pp. 212-13.

103 Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort*, p. 63.

104 McNiven, 'The political crisis of 1412', pp. 6-7.

105 Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort*, p. 64.

106 *C.P.L., 1404-15*, p. 249.

107 ibid., p. 170; *A chronicle of the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI*, p. 37.

left by John Beaufort.[108] As sole executor of his brother's will Beaufort was in the perfect position to obstruct Thomas. It was claimed that John Beaufort had left £20,000 and that Thomas was laying claim to half of this. An agreement was eventually reached whereby Beaufort retained control of the money and agreed to pay the sum of 200 marks for the maintenance of John Beaufort's children in Lancaster's household.[109]

The council was now firmly in the hands of the prince and Henry Beaufort. Prince Henry was trying to secure his prerogatives believing, perhaps, that the new dynasty was not secure enough to have an invalid on the throne. The king's illness does seem to have become more serious and from April 1411, he never moved further from London than Windsor or Canterbury. It was reported that by the spring of 1412 the king could neither walk nor ride unaided.[110] It was this which seems to have inspired the prince into trying to force his father's abdication. One chronicle notes that 'it was accorded between the prince, King Harry's son, and Harry Bishop of Winchester, and many other lords of this land that certain of them should speak to the king and entreat him to resign the crown to the said Prince Harry his son, because he was so greatly vexed and smyte with the sickness of leprosy'.[111] This attack on the royal prerogative is most often linked with the parliament of November 1411. It also coincides with the arrest of six knights connected to the prince of Wales' household, one of whom was Roger Leche, the steward of the prince's household, on 23 October 1411 and their confinement in the Tower of London.[112] On 30 November, soon after the opening of parliament, the prince and his council were thanked for their services and dismissed.[113] In the parliament of November 1411 the king warned Thomas Chaucer, again elected speaker, that he would tolerate no manner of novelty and that he wished to enjoy the royal prerogatives as his predecessors had.[114] The commons felt so intimidated by this turn of events that they offered an oath of their loyalty to the king. The king was also able to annul an act of restraint passed in the

---

108 Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort*, pp. 64-5.

109 ibid.

110 McNiven, 'The problem of Henry IV's health', p. 765.

111 *A chronicle of the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI*, p. 37.

112 McFarlane, *Lancastrian kings and Lollard knights*, p. 108; Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 238.

113 McNiven, 'The political crisis of 1412', p. 1.

114 *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, iii, p. 647-8.

previous parliament. The new council appointed in this parliament saw the return of archbishop Arundel as chancellor and the removal of all those obviously associated with the prince from the council. John Pelham, a knight of the chamber and an old retainer of John of Gaunt's who had previously served as one of the treasurers of war, was appointed as treasurer.[115] The only men left from the previous council were bishops Langley and Bubwith, the earl of Westmorland and John Prophet, the keeper of the privy seal.[116] Although relations between the king and the council had remained outwardly cordial throughout this period, it seems the king resented the usurpation of his powers and the decisive moment came late in the summer of 1411 when the prince of Wales contradicted his father in the critical field of foreign policy.

A situation of near civil war had developed in France during 1410 between John, duke of Burgundy, and the faction of princes loyal to Charles, duke of Orleans, led by his father-in-law Bernard, count of Armagnac.[117] Both sides seemed anxious for English support, the most likely reward for which would be the recognition of English authority over all lands ceded to the English crown under the Treaty of Brétigny, which had been ratified in 1360 but never implemented. These lands included a much enlarged duchy of Aquitaine, with the addition of Poitou, Quercy, Limousin and the Agenais, as well as territory in Ponthieu, Montreuil and Guisnes in Picardy, which would greatly strengthen the English hold on Calais.[118] In 1411 king Henry had announced his intention of leading an army to France in order to protect the English possessions around Calais. This plan was abandoned, due to the king's poor health, and instead an English force, consisting of 800 men-at-arms and 2,000 archers, was sent to France to aid the duke of Burgundy.[119] This was led by the earl of Arundel, one of prince Henry's closest associates, and seems to have been sent without the knowledge of the king. In return for this aid Burgundy proposed a marriage between his daughter Anne and the prince of Wales.[120] Burgundy's

---

115 Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort*, p. 32.

116 Kirby, 'Councils and councillors', pp. 59, 65.

117 Keen, *England in the later Middle Ages*, p. 320.

118 ibid., p. 140.

119 Tuck, *Crown and nobility*, p. 237.

120 Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 236; Keen, *England in the later Middle Ages*, p. 321; Anne of Burgundy subsequently married Henry IV's third son, John, in 1420.

Armagnac opponents claimed that he also planned to surrender to English control the towns of Gravelines, Dunkerque, Sluys and Dixmude in Flanders, although this seems to have been propaganda in order to stir up popular feeling against the duke.[121] Arundel's force played an important role in the Burgundian victory at St. Cloud, which paved the way for Burgundy's triumphal entry into Paris in October 1411, accompanied by the English.[122] It was this success which may have inspired the suggestion that king Henry resign the crown to the prince and which in turn inspired the king to reassert his authority over government.

After their decisive defeat in 1411 the Armagnac princes entered into negotiations with the English king, at the same time as he was continuing to hold discussions with the Burgundians.[123] In May 1412 the Armagnac ambassadors, representing Jean, duke of Berri, Charles, duke of Orleans, Jean, duke of Bourbon, Jean count of Alençon and Bernard, count of Armagnac, reached an agreement with Henry IV, which resulted in the Treaty of Bourges. Under this treaty Henry IV agreed to send a force of 1,000 men-at-arms and 3,000 archers to France to aid the Armagnacs against the duke of Burgundy and not to enter into any alliance with him, a complete reversal of the policy pursued by the prince of Wales during the previous year. The French princes agreed to pay the wages of this expedition. In return the Armagnacs agreed to help the king of England and all his heirs and successors in his quarrels and to recognise all English claims in Aquitaine, which had been agreed in the Treaty of Brétigny, as well as to help Henry IV to enforce these claims with all their power and the support of their allies. All the property held by the French princes in Aquitaine was to be held of the king of England as the true duke of Aquitaine. The duke of Berri was to continue to hold the county of Poitou during his lifetime as a fief of the English crown and on his death the county was to revert to the crown. As security he was to surrender the castles of Lusignan, Poitiers and Niort to Henry IV and a similar arrangement was in place for the county of Angoulême held by the duke of Orleans. He was to surrender control of Châteauneuf-sur-Charente as security. He was also to continue to hold the county of Périgord, but only if he recognised that he held it from Henry IV. Bernard of Armagnac was to hold four castellanies at Rouergue in

---

121 Vaughan, *John the Fearless*, p. 92.

122 Keen, *England in the later Middle Ages*, p. 321.

123 Tuck, *Crown and nobility*, pp. 238-9.

perpetuity.[124] As well as this a further twenty important towns and castles in Aquitaine held by the Armagnacs were to be ceded to English control and the princes were bound to help the king to conquer those which were not in their power. The princes offered their children, relatives, allies and subjects to Henry IV in order to arrange marriages for them.[125] The treaty was ratified in Westminster on 18 May 1412 and two days later Henry IV's four sons all swore an oath to uphold it.[126] However, the prince of Wales was still involved in attempts to negotiate a marriage with Anne of Burgundy. He wrote to the duke of Burgundy on 30 May saying that he still hoped to conclude a marriage alliance but that his father the king felt that the offer of the Armagnac princes was far too good to be turned down. The earl of Arundel also wrote to Burgundy promising not to show any favour to his Armagnac opponents.[127] Already the scene was being set for another change in English policy towards France. On 16 May Henry IV wrote to the advocates, burgomasters and assessors of the towns of Ghent, Bruges and Ypres explaining how he intended to recover his rights in Aquitaine. He asked them not to help the duke of Burgundy who was trying to block English attempts to recover what was rightfully theirs. Henry stressed the importance of the trade agreement recently agreed with Flanders and promised that it would in no way be compromised by his actions against Burgundy.[128]

The English expedition to France left in August 1412 under the command of Thomas of Lancaster, who had been created duke of Clarence and earl of Aumale on 9 July.[129] He was to be accompanied by Thomas Beaufort, created earl of Dorset on 5 July,[130] and Edward, duke of York. There was no place on the expedition for the prince of Wales. On 11 July Clarence was appointed as the king's lieutenant in Aquitaine[131] which has been interpreted as a deliberate snub to the prince of Wales, who had

---

124 Vale, *English Gascony*, pp. 60-1.

125 Waurin, *Chronicles and ancient histories*, ii, pp. 162-5; Vaughan, *John the Fearless*, pp. 94-5.

126 Rymer, *Foedera*, viii, p. 743.

127 ibid., p. 239.

128 *Royal and Historical Letters*, ii, pp. 314-17.

129 *C.Ch.R., 1341-1417*, p. 447; Rymer, *Foedera*, viii, p. 757.

130 *C.Ch.R., 1341-1417*, p. 447.

131 Rymer, *Foedera*, viii, p. 757.

been created duke of Aquitaine during the first parliament of the reign.[132] However, as the main aim of Clarence's expedition was the restoration of English royal authority in the duchy, it seems that the king was merely investing Clarence with the power and authority necessary to carry out that task. Clarence, under the king's name and with his authority, was to receive back into the grace and peace of the king parts of the duchy of Guienne which had long been outside his power. He was also empowered to receive homages and fealties in the name of the king.[133] It would seem natural for the man responsible for restoring royal authority in Aquitaine to have royal power there, as he had when he served as lieutenant of Ireland.

The exclusion of the prince of Wales from power and the reversal of his French policy resulted in his retreat from London to his estates in the midlands. This seems to have led the king or his advisors to believe that the prince planned to obstruct the expedition to Aquitaine and to try and reinstate himself in government by usurping the crown.[134] The prince set out his position in an open letter from Coventry on 17 June 1412. He claimed that the king had agreed that he should accompany the expedition to Aquitaine. However, the prince felt that the number of men which he was allowed to bring with him was too few to either do him honour or to provide adequate security for him. The king had then agreed to allow the prince to confer with his friends to see if there was any way in which the size of the prince's retinue could be increased, for the security and honour of the prince and for the good of the realm. When the prince reached Coventry he became aware of rumours that he planned to collect an army and to seize the throne. The prince declared all these rumours to be false, saying that he felt only love and obedience towards his father and that he would fight to recover Aquitaine and all other rights pertaining to the crown. Those slandering the prince merely wanted to disrupt the line of succession. The prince sent the letter throughout the country and he arrived in London on 30 June at the head of a substantial body of men.[135] It seems unlikely that the prince planned any form of military takeover. A royal council was meeting prior to the departure of Clarence's expedition and all

---

132 McNiven, 'The political crisis of 1412', p. 15.

133 Rymer, *Foedera*, viii, pp. 758-60.

134 Kingsford (ed.), *The first English life of Henry V*, p. 11.

135 Galbraith (ed.), *The St. Albans chronicle*, pp. 64-7; McFarlane, *Lancastrian kings and Lollard knights*, pp. 109-10; McNiven, 'The political crisis of 1412', pp. 7-15.

those attending had brought substantial retinues. The presence of a royal army nearby was another deterrent.[136] The prince seems to have been using a show of force to remind his father of his support and that he could not be ignored. He called for the punishment of his slanderers, which McFarlane has described as 'virtually a request for the trial of Archbishop Arundel and the king's second son Thomas, of whom the prince was jealous'.[137] The king agreed that those who were involved should be punished but that this should take place during the next parliament when the judgement of their peers might be passed. The expedition left under Clarence, no parliament was called and once again the prince withdrew from London. The exclusion of the prince from this expedition has raised speculation that a conspiracy involving archbishop Arundel, Pelham, the treasurer, Clarence, the duke of York and Thomas Beaufort was responsible.[138] By September the prince was back in London at the head of another vast assembly of retainers. Now he was trying to clear his name after rumours had been spread about him embezzling money from the wages of the Calais garrison during his time as captain of the town. After a dramatic reconciliation with his father the prince was cleared of these charges following an audit of his accounts and the king ordered letters to be written exonerating his son.[139] There were no further attacks on the prince for the rest of Henry IV's reign.

It does seem likely that this period saw an attack on his brother Thomas by the prince of Wales. Hardyng records how the king discharged the prince of Wales from his council and advanced Thomas in his place, 'for whiche the Prynce and he [Thomas] fell at distaunce'.[140] There is no evidence to indicate that Thomas attended any meetings of the royal council,[141] although this passage may refer to informal meetings prior to the departure of the expedition to help the Armagnacs. In the later version of his chronicle, admittedly written for a Yorkist king, Hardyng implies that a more serious breach had occurred in the ranks of the royal family. He now claims that the king supported Thomas against the machinations of the prince and that both 'helde the felde' against him until the prince submitted

---

136 McNiven, 'The political crisis of 1412', p. 13.

137 McFarlane, *Lancastrian kings and Lollard knights*, p. 110.

138 Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort*, p. 60.

139 *P.P.C.*, ii, pp. 34-5.

140 Kingsford, *The first English life*, p. xxiii.

141 McNiven, 'The political crisis of 1412', p. 1.

to the king's grace.[142] This account emphasises the role of the prince in the breach and certainly implies some form of military stand-off. Harriss believes that the prince's march on London was merely a political demonstration and not an insurrection.[143] An account exists recording how Henry IV, on his deathbed, tells the prince of Wales how he fears that there may be discord between the prince and his brother Clarence, and that the kingdom may be at risk. The king believed that Clarence might try to usurp the throne from his brother.[144] The prince swore that he would love and honour his brothers above all men as long as they were true, faithful and obedient to him. If they should conspire against him he would execute justice upon them just as he would do to the lowest in the kingdom.[145] This answer satisfied the king and relations between Clarence and Henry V seem to have remained good throughout the next reign, despite Clarence's replacement as lieutenant of Ireland by John Stanley in 1413. Clarence was to provide his brother with good service in France, and while Henry V may have had some initial misgivings about his brother, Clarence dedicated himself to an attempt to fulfil his brother's ambitions.

---

142 Kingsford, *The first English life*, p. xxiii.

143 Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort*, p. 60.

144 Kingsford, *The first English life*, p. 14.

145 ibid.

Chapter 4: The expedition to France, 1412-13.

The political developments of the early summer of 1412 do not seem to have made any impact on the preparations for the departure of the expedition to help the Armagnac princes. As early as 11 May 1412, even before the Anglo-Armagnac treaty had been concluded, orders for shipping to be collected went out. Thomas Beaufort, acting as admiral of England, was ordered to provide for the shipping of men-at-arms and archers, going in the company of the king's son Thomas, to Guienne in order to recover the king's heritage there. A sum of two hundred marks was provided for the wages of the masters and mariners of the ships arrested in various ports, which were then to assemble at Southampton.[1] Just over two weeks later, on 26 May, Geoffrey Pampyng of Great Yarmouth was ordered to take forty mariners and the ship 'la Gracedieu' and serve the king's son Thomas going abroad in the service of the king.[2] It has been stated that the shipping arrangements show that the appointment of Lancaster as commander of the expedition had already been decided upon, almost a month before he actually sealed his indenture.[3] On 22 July 1412 the sum of £2,533 6s. 8d. was authorised for the payment of the wages of the masters and the mariners of the fleet assembled at Southampton. Provision was also made for the costs and expenses which they had incurred whilst waiting at Southampton for the order to sail.[4] The fleet was to be capable of carrying all the men-at-arms and archers as well as 8,000 horses.

Thomas of Lancaster sealed his indenture as commander of the French expedition on 8 June 1412.[5] Under the terms of the indenture he was obliged to bring 1,000 men-at-arms and 3,000 archers to France in order to serve the Armagnac princes, at their expense, for a

---

1 P.R.O., E 404/27/394.

2 *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 373.

3 McNiven, 'The political crisis of 1412', p. 9.

4 P.R.O., E 404/27/433.

5 P.R.O., E 101/69/2/340.

period of three months. Of this force Lancaster was to be personally responsible for the provision of 500 men-at-arms and 1,500 archers. Three earls, eight barons or bannerets and twenty-eight knights were to be included in the number of men-at-arms, with the rest to be made up of esquires. The earls, barons and knights were to receive the accustomed wages pertaining to their estate, while the esquires were to receive 18d. per day. The archers were to be paid at a rate of 9d. per day. These were the traditional rates of pay associated with campaigns in Aquitaine.[6] Lancaster's troops were to be assembled at Southampton not later than 6 July 1412 in order to hold their muster there. This date was to mark the beginning of a two month period during which Lancaster and his men were to be paid by the English king. This was to last until their arrival in Blois where they were to rendezvous with their French allies. The cost of the English troops would then become the responsibility of the French princes. If for any reason the expedition was to be cancelled by the king then Lancaster and his men would be obliged to remain in the king's service until the period of two months had elapsed, being liable to serve the king on land or at sea. Lancaster was to receive an immediate payment of £1,565 with another payment of a similar sum after the muster of his retinue had taken place. The remainder of the amount due to Lancaster and his men was to be made up of suitable assignments, which the king promised would be neither revoked nor repealed.[7] The day after Lancaster had sealed his indenture the king set out which revenues the assignments were to be made on.[8] The assignments were made on the half lay tenth and fifteenth due to the king in November 1412. £300 was to be collected in Suffolk, £400 in the county of Cambridge, £300 in the county of Hertford, £600 in Hampshire, £500 in Wiltshire and £171 4s. 8d. in Oxfordshire. However, on 10 June Henry IV authorised the treasurer to make immediate payment of the second sum of £1,565, which Lancaster was not due to receive until July.[9] One possible reason for this is that the cost of mounting the expedition was far exceeding what had initially been projected. A further 4,000 marks from £10,400 left

---

6 J. D. Milner, 'The English enterprise in France, 1412-13', in *Trade, devotion and governance*, eds. D. J. Clayton, R. G. Davies and P. McNiven, p. 81.

7 P.R.O., E 101/69/2/340.

8 P.R.O., E 404/27/414.

9 P.R.O., E 404/27/417.

unassigned from the half tenth and fifteenth had to be allocated for the cost of Lancaster's shipping. The original estimate for the cost of the shipping had been put at 3,000 marks, but this figure had risen to 7,000 marks by July 1412.[10] Special measures were implemented to meet the spiralling costs of the expedition. The king and his council looked to the bishops to provide money for the increasing cost. On 9 July it was decided that letters would be sent requesting money. The bishop of Lincoln was asked for 1,000 marks, the bishop of Norwich for £600, the bishop of Ely for £200, the bishop of Salisbury for 500 marks, the bishop of Worcester for 200 marks, the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield for £200, the prior of St. John of Jerusalem in England for 500 marks and the bishop of London for 500 marks. Several others agreed to lend money on surety for its repayment. The archbishop of Canterbury lent 1,000 marks, the bishop of Bath and Wells 400 marks, John Prophet, the keeper of the privy seal £200, master John Bathe £100, the city of Norwich 400 marks, the city of Canterbury 100 marks, master Thomas Polton 100 marks, the masters and clerks of the chancery 1,000 marks, the bishop of Exeter £200, the Florentine community in London 500 marks and the Venetian community in London £200.[11] The English bishops did not just provide financial support for the expedition. On 14 August the archbishop of Canterbury issued letters to the bishop of London to be forwarded to the other bishops of the province. The letters contained a mandate for processions and prayers to be held for 'the good estate of the realm and for the expedition of the duke of Clarence to recover Aquitaine'. An indulgence of forty days was to be granted to all those taking part.[12] These letters reached Philip Repingdon, bishop of Lincoln, on 26 August and Robert Hallum, bishop of Salisbury, on 1 September.[13] By 9 September Repingdon wrote to Arundel stating that his request had been carried out in his diocese. Henry IV had gained spiritual support for his son's expedition and this would indicate that the expedition of 1412 was being viewed with a great deal of importance by the king.

The remainder of the expeditionary force was to be provided by the other two principal commanders, Edward, duke of York

---

10 *P.P.C.*, ii, pp. 121-2.

11 ibid., pp. 31-2.

12 *The register of Philip Repingdon*, ed. M. Archer, pp. 270-2.

13 *The register of Robert Hallum, bishop of Salisbury*, ed. J.M. Horn, no. 1012, p. 151.

and Thomas Beaufort. Lancaster was to have the power of king's lieutenant during the voyage to France and the subsequent campaign and all those who were to accompany him to France were to offer him their absolute obedience. The duke of York was to provide contingents of 260 men-at-arms and 800 archers while Thomas Beaufort agreed to serve with 240 men-at-arms and 700 archers.[14] The three earls who accompanied Clarence in his retinue were James Butler, earl of Ormond, Richard de Vere, earl of Oxford and Thomas Montague, earl of Salisbury.[15] Sir John Cornewaille, married to Henry IV's sister Elizabeth, also went on the expedition bringing a retinue of ninety men-at-arms and 270 archers.[16] The inclusion of 8,000 horses for an expedition of 4,000 men indicates that the bulk, if not all, of the English force was to be mounted, presaging the highly mobile armies raised for the French wars by Henry V in the next reign. One curious fact concerning Lancaster's indenture is that it makes no mention at all of the duke of Burgundy and only mentions the Treaty of Bourges in passing. As far as the indenture of June 1412 is concerned Lancaster is going to France to recover the king's rights in his duchy of Guienne and the only function of the French princes is to help him achieve this. On 11 July Henry IV ordered John Pelham, John Berkeley, John Popham and John Oudeby to supervise the muster of Clarence's men-at-arms and archers.[17] It seems that the financial problems delayed the sailing of the expedition and it did not leave England until August 1412, landing at La Hogue de St. Vaast in Normandy on 10 August.[18] At the same time as Clarence landed in Normandy another English force, under the earl of Warwick, was sent to Picardy and was able to capture the fortress of Balinghen between Ardres and Calais. This further strengthened the hold of the English on Calais.[19]

The political situation in France had altered dramatically between 18 May and Clarence's arrival off the Norman coast.

---

14 Rymer, *Foedera*, viii, pp. 749-50.

15 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, p. 73; Jacob, *The fifteenth century*, p. 114; Tuck, *Crown and nobility*, p. 240.

16 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, p. 74.

17 Rymer, *Foedera*, viii, pp. 757-8.

18 Lehoux, *Jean de France, Duc de Berri. Sa vie. Son action politique, 1340-1416*, iii, p. 281; Tuck, *Crown and nobility*, p. 240.

19 Monstrelet, *Chronique*, ii, pp. 259-60.

The French king, Charles VI, had begun military action against the Armagnac princes in early May 1412. After collecting the *oriflamme* at the abbey of St. Denis the king and the dauphin had rejoined the duke of Burgundy at Corbeil and marched against the Armagnacs, reaching the territory of the duke of Berri on 29 May. By 11 June the royal army was besieging Berri in Bourges.[20] A settlement was reached between the two parties and Charles VI ordered the Armagnac princes to repudiate their alliance with the English. On 21 July he wrote to the princes stating that all alliances made with 'some of our said blood and lineage, and also with our adversary of England, his children, and others holding to their party' to be null and void and that the princes should send communications to their allies stating this as soon as possible.[21] The following day the dukes wrote to Henry IV and his children renouncing their alliance and freeing the English king from any obligations to them, citing the loyalty which they owed to their sovereign lord as the reason why.[22] These letters did not arrive in England in time to prevent Clarence sailing and the first he seems to have heard of the change in attitude of the Armagnacs was after his arrival in France.[23] What effect this had on Clarence's immediate plans is unclear because he carried on as if nothing untoward had happened. Soon after his landing Clarence had been joined by the count of Alençon and Arthur, count of Richemont, the brother of the duke of Brittany. They had refused to disown their English allies and used the landing as an opportunity to capture some fortresses in the area of Argentan being held by royal troops. They joined Clarence with a force of some 1,500 men-at-arms as well as bringing much needed supplies.[24] The English army was also reinforced by 600 Gascons, who had been employed as mercenaries at Bourges.[25] This is some indication of the depth of Gascon loyalty to the English crown. Clarence arrived at Coutances on 17 August and here he restored to

---

20 Lehoux, *Jean de France*, iii, pp. 268-9.

21 *Royal and historical letters*, ii, pp. 322-5.

22 ibid.

23 Clarence captured three of the heralds charged with carrying the letters of the French princes to England.

24 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, p. 77.

25 Waurin, *Chronicles and ancient histories*, i, pp. 159-60; Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, p. 77.

Alençon a number of places which had been seized by royalists.[26] Clarence and his troops ravaged the Cotentin and Normandy before moving into Maine. His intention seems to have been to carry on with the plan which had been agreed with the Armagnacs the previous May and continue on to Bourges, where he was due to join his erstwhile allies. The English force captured Châteauneuf, St. Rémy and Bellême[27] and by 6 September Clarence was in the outskirts of Blois from where, on 16 September, he wrote a letter in reply to that of the duke of Berri and his allies.[28]

Writing from the plain before Blois, Clarence recounted how three men, claiming to be the heralds of the princes, had come into his presence with letters which he thought were addressed to him. Clarence then claimed that he could not believe that these letters could be issued with the consent of such princes. He claimed that an 'earthly man could not revoke or make null and void that which so solemnly, and by so sufficiently weighty powers on both sides has been bound, sworn to and consented to, and fully agreed upon'. Clarence, because he had bound himself to do so, had arrived at Blois to fulfil the English obligations agreed in the Treaty of Bourges and demanded that the Armagnac princes do likewise. Concerning the duke of Burgundy, Clarence claimed that the English had stopped to treat with him because of the alliance with the Armagnacs. If this had not been the case it was likely that they would have concluded an alliance with Burgundy instead.[29]

Clarence then began a campaign of destruction against the lands of the duke of Orléans. On 19 September the English captured the town of Meung and crossed the Loire. This was followed by crossing the Sologne and moving through the valley of the Indre, burning the town and abbey of Beaulieu and plundering Buzançais in the duchy of Berri.[30] The immediate French reaction to the news of the English landing had been to agree to the peace of Auxerre on 22 August 1412. This effected a reconciliation between the duke of Burgundy and his Armagnac

---

26 Lehoux, *Jean de France*, iii, p. 281.

27 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, p. 80; Keen, *England in the later Middle Ages*, p. 321.

28 Lehoux, *Jean de France*, iii, p. 281.

29 *Royal and historical letters*, ii, pp. 328-32.

30 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, pp. 80-1; Jacob, *The fifteenth century*, p. 114.

opponents,[31] which resulted in a further renunciation of any alliance with the English. Then military preparations were undertaken in order to drive the English army from France. The Armagnac and Burgundian princes received an order to assemble at Chartres by 8 October in order to resist the English. On 18 September the duke of Burgundy called on his knights in Flanders and Artois to come to his service during the campaign which was being launched against the English.[32] However, the princes, in particular the duke of Berri, preferred to negotiate with Clarence, fearing for the damage that would result from a full-scale campaign across their lands. Berri was also facing serious financial embarrassment. At the beginning of October he had managed to raise only eight companies of men-at-arms, totalling a mere 650 men.[33] The decision was taken to negotiate and on 4 October the duke of Burgundy had suspended the mobilisation of his forces.[34] On 13 October envoys were dispatched from Bois-de-Vincennes, where the princes had been staying with Charles VI, to Clarence in order to discuss the terms for an English evacuation of the French kingdom.[35] The problem for the French princes does not seem to have been whether the English army would leave, of which they seem to have had no doubt, but how much it would cost them before the English did leave.

The English leaders had decided that the army would not leave France for anything less than the sum of 150,000 *écus*.[36] Negotiations between the two parties dragged on until 14 November, with the main obstacle to a settlement being the route which Clarence and the English army would take on their departure from France. Clarence had already been paid the sum of 2,200 *écus* in return for an undertaking not to cross Poitou. However, he changed his mind and moved deeper into French territory, and by mid-November the English vanguard was at Blanc.[37] This seems to have inspired the French princes to try and reach a solution and on 14 November an agreement was reached between Clarence

---

31 Lehoux, *Jean de France*, iii, p. 277; Tuck, *Crown and nobility*, p. 240.

32 Lehoux, *Jean de France*, iii, p. 282.

33 ibid., p. 284.

34 ibid., p. 283.

35 ibid., p. 285.

36 ibid.

37 ibid., p. 286.

and the Armagnac princes at Buzançais. The main point of the Treaty of Buzançais was the payment of an indemnity of 150,000 *écus* to the English. 100,000 *écus* were to paid on 30 November and the remainder was due on Christmas day. As security seven hostages were to be handed over to the English, including the count of Angoulême, the youngest brother of the duke of Orléans. In return the English commanders promised that the money would not be used to finance military action against either the French king or the Armagnac princes themselves. The English army was to be evacuated from French territory by 1 January. A truce was to be observed between all concerned parties during this time. Before the end of the year a conference was to be held in Picardy to try and work out a more permanent peace settlement between the two kingdoms.[38] The financial problems of some of the French princes meant that it was not certain that they would be able to meet their obligations. Accordingly a new arrangement was quickly reached with Clarence and his men. This called for the immediate payment of 75,000 *écus* with further payments that would eventually total 210,000 *écus*. Security for these future payments was to be provided by the seven hostages. Further security was offered in the form of treasures from the duke of Berri's chapel at Bourges. Of the English commanders Sir John Cornewaille claimed a total of 21,375 *écus*, which seems to have been paid in total by 26 November. The duke of York claimed 40,000 *écus*, of which he was paid 5,430. He was also given a large gold cross, valued at 40,000 *écus*, as security. Clarence sought payment of the sum of 120,000 *écus*, of which he received 40,000. He was given a crucifix valued at 15,000 *écus* as well as a smaller cross with emeralds inlaid. Clarence also received a gold cross from the chapel at Bourges valued at 30,000 *écus*, which also served as a reliquary, containing one of the nails used during the crucifixion.[39] When all subsequent payments were made the seven hostages would be returned at Châteauneuf.[40] The agreement reached at Buzançais allowed for some of the English army to return home via Brittany or Calais and Charles VI

---

38 ibid., pp. 285-87.

39 Wylie, *Henry IV*, iv, pp. 81-4; Jacob, *The fifteenth century*, p. 115.

40 Clarence was never paid all of the money which he claimed and on his death he was still owed 64,790 écus. As a result the count of Angoulême spent thirty years as a hostage in England.

issued safe-conducts for those who wished to do so.[41] However, the bulk of the army remained and Clarence began to lead it south with the intention of establishing winter quarters at Bordeaux and by mid-December the entire English army had reached Guienne. On his way south Clarence promised to return the following spring, this time as a conqueror.[42] As France was once again on the brink of civil war the situation must have looked very profitable to Clarence.

Clarence arrived at Bordeaux on 11 December 1412 where he and his retinue established themselves in the archbishop's palace.[43] The receiver-general reported that he was very badly treated by the English troops staying there.[44] Immediately after his arrival in Bordeaux Clarence became very active militarily. His army laid siege to Talmont and reduced all the fortresses within sixty miles of the city with the exception of Marmande. His army seems to have been particularly ill-disciplined and looted the property of loyalists and rebels alike, even causing some damage to the suburbs of Bordeaux.[45] Despite receiving some of the payments due from the Armagnacs Clarence found himself desperately short of money and was forced to try and raise funds from the inhabitants of Guienne. Clarence assembled the three estates of Bordeaux and the Bordelais. He claimed that he had come to protect the land and sought to raise a general imposition on the duchy for the defence, protection and safe-guard of the land. Despite their initial protestations they agreed to a tax. This was to consist of a tax of 12d. in the pound on all manner of merchandise being sold in the duchy, excepting only corn and fresh meat and fish. A tax of 20d. on each tun of wine being sold was also levied. This tax was to start on 15 April 1413 and to last for one year.[46] This levy was confirmed by Henry V on 13 July 1413 and it was also extended to cover Bayonne, Dax, Landes and St. Sever.[47] Supplies were also being sent out from England. As early as October 1412 preparations were being made for the shipment of equipment

---

41 Lehoux, *Jean de France*, iii, p. 287.

42 ibid., p. 289.

43 Vale, *English Gascony*, p. 62.

44 ibid., p. 63.

45 Wylie & Waugh, *The reign of Henry V*, i, p. 116.

46 Rymer, *Foedera*, ix, pp. 32-3.

47 ibid, pp. 33-4.

to Clarence in Aquitaine. 500 bows, with one gross of bowstrings for every twelve bows, and 3,000 sheaves of arrows were to be purchased and delivered to William Alyngton, one of Clarence's attornies, for shipment to Aquitaine.[48] On 15 of that month payments were made to Nicholas Frost, bowyer, Stephen Sedar, fletcher, Ralph the stringer and others for 500 bows, 1,700 sheaves of arrows and forty gross of bowstrings which were to be shipped to Aquitaine for the use of Clarence.[49] The shipment of military supplies to Clarence is indicative of the extent of his campaigning in the duchy. In April 1413 William Pee, master of the ship 'la Katerine of Baioun', was ordered to ship 100 quarters of oats to Aquitaine for the use of Clarence.[50]

Clarence also began to act upon his powers as king's lieutenant in the duchy. On 17 December he issued a summons to Bernard, count of Armagnac, to come and perform the homage which Bernard owed to Henry IV before 31 December 1412. In his appointment as lieutenant Clarence had been given the power to receive all fealties and homages due to the king. Clarence promised to observe all the rights and privileges which had been granted to Armagnac by previous dukes of Guienne. In return Armagnac was to perform homage for the four castellanies of Rouergue which he was to hold by the terms of the Treaty of Bourges.[51] The following year, on 14 February 1413, Clarence sealed an alliance with Armagnac and Charles, lord of Albret, another of the Armagnac princes responsible for the Treaty of Bourges. Armagnac had already agreed a treaty of friendship with Clarence the previous year,[52] but this new agreement altered the terms of alliance of the previous year. Both Armagnac and Albret were to be compensated for any damage inflicted on their property by the English and were to be confirmed in all their liberties and franchises. They were to perform homage to Henry IV, or to his lieutenants, for these territories, but only as the duke of Guienne and the two French lords recognised the sovereignty of Charles VI over the duchy and reserved a right of appeal to the French king. The right of Henry IV to hold Guienne in

---

48 P.R.O., E 404/28/98.

49 Devon, *Issues of the exchequer*, p. 318.

50 *C.C.R., 1413-19*, p. 11.

51 Vale, *English Gascony*, p. 63.

52 Lehoux, *Jean de France*, p. 295.

full sovereignty, as agreed the previous year, seems to have been passed over.[53] If either of the two princes were to come under French attack then Henry IV was obliged to help them with all the power available in the duchy, and if this was insufficient then he was to send a force of 1,000 men-at-arms and 3,000 archers under a commander of royal blood. The English also agreed to pay for 500 men-at-arms under Armagnac and 200 under Albret to reinforce the garrisons of their principal fortresses. If the two lords lost more than three-quarters of their lands to France then they would perform liege homage to Henry IV once they had been compensated for that loss. If they lost any less than this then simple homage would be performed for any lands which they received in compensation.[54] The two French princes were to perform their homage by 29 September 1413 at the latest. This alliance seems to have been primarily directed against Jean, count of Foix. He was an adherent of the duke of Burgundy and had been appointed as captain-general in Languedoc and Guienne in February 1412. His principal objective was to take into the king's hands all of the lordships in this area, then being held by Bernard of Armagnac.[55] Wylie records an English force of 500 men-at-arms and 200 archers being sent to aid Armagnac and Albret against the count of Foix, which resulted in the capture of the castle of Biron.[56]

It was while wintering in Bordeaux that Clarence found himself with the opportunity of becoming involved in Spanish affairs. King Martin I of Aragon had died in 1410, without leaving any heir. A Castilian nobleman, Don Ferdinand d'Antequera, was elected as king by the agreement known as the compromise of Caspe in the summer of 1412. However James, count of Urgel, refused to be bound by this decision, believing that he had the stronger claim to the throne and he was supported by certain sections of the Aragonese nobility. He began to recruit an army to help him depose Ferdinand and to make himself king instead. He had gone to France to recruit a force of 2,000 French cavalry and on his way back to Spain tried to interest Clarence in his venture. Clarence was quickly won

---

53 Vale, *English Gascony*, pp. 63-5

54 ibid., pp. 65-6

55 The houses of Armagnac and Foix had long been in dispute over the title to the *comté* of Bigorre. See Vale, *English Gascony*.

56 Wylie & Waugh, *Henry V*, i, pp. 128-9.

over and promised to come to Spain with an army of 1,000 men-at-arms and 3,000 archers if his father approved. If Henry IV refused to let him go in person then he promised to send 500 men-at-arms and 3,000 archers to James by midsummer's day 1413. In return Urgel promised Clarence his sister's hand in marriage and to make him king of Naples.[57] This attempt by Clarence to revive the Spanish schemes of his grandfather, John of Gaunt, came to naught and he returned to England soon afterwards on hearing news of his father's death. It is possible that some of the English at Bordeaux did go to help Urgel[58] and a force of Gascons did travel to Spain.[59] It is unclear if Henry IV would have supported any attempt to place Urgel on the Aragonese throne. His half-sister Catherine had been married to king Henry III of Castile in 1388. He had died in 1406 and Catherine was now acting as regent for her son, Henry IV's nephew, king John II. Until quite recently Ferdinand d'Antequera had been one of Catherine's principal advisors. Henry IV had only recently renewed a truce for one year with Castile[60] and it is unlikely that he would wish to see his diplomatic efforts fall apart by allowing his son to antagonise one of the most powerful men in Castile and the recognised king of Aragon. As things stood the Spanish kingdoms were losing interest in becoming embroiled in the Anglo-French wars and were beginning to turn their attention more and more towards creating Mediterranean empires for themselves.[61] If, however, they were provoked by an English attack on Aragon the substantial naval resources of two Spanish kingdoms might very well be turned against England in support of France.

On his return to England in April 1413 Clarence left the duchy in the hands of the duke of York and Thomas Beaufort, earl of Dorset. On 22 July Dorset was appointed as the king's lieutenant in Guienne for a period of six months, to serve there with a retinue of 240 men-at-arms

---

57 ibid, pp. 88-9, as Clarence had married Margaret Beaufort in July 1412 the reliability of this account can be viewed as being doubtful.

58 R. Altamira, 'Spain, 1412-1516', p. 482, in *Cambridge Medieval History*, viii.

59 Wylie & Waugh, *Henry V*, i, pp. 88-9, state that a force of 700 Gascons went to help Urgel. His rebellion was defeated by the end of 1413.

60 *Royal and historical letters*, ii, pp. 326-7.

61 Ferguson, *English diplomacy*, p. 37..

and 1,200 archers.[62] Since the departure of Clarence, Dorset had been campaigning vigorously in the region. In June 1413 he had captured the town and castle of Soubise and had inflicted a defeat upon a force which had been sent from Paris by the Burgundians under the command of Jacques de Heilly. The political situation in France soon changed again, following the capture of Paris by the Armagnacs in May 1413. Charles of Albret was appointed constable of France and the duke of Berri as royal lieutenant in Guienne. Burgundy was left in the political wilderness. Armagnac and Albret were no longer under threat and it follows that they no longer felt the need to co-operate with the English in Guienne. The efforts by Clarence to forge an alliance with Armagnac and Albret, far from being naive, were in fact credible attempts to ensure that the English still had allies in France. Following his father's policy of recovering an expanded duchy of Guienne it made sound political and military sense to try and recruit these allies from among the French princes whose territories bordered on the duchy. Following the Armagnac takeover military operations in Guienne began to be wound down. All campaigns in the duchy were covered by a truce which was to run for one year from 2 February 1414. Dorset returned to England before the summer of that year.

Clarence does not seem to have been informed about his father's death until early April 1413, and on hearing the news he immediately arrested eight ships in Bordeaux belonging to some English merchants and sailed for England on 6 April. On the voyage home the English fleet encountered two Prussian ships off the coast of Brittany who were carrying wine from La Rochelle. The Prussian ships were captured and brought into Southampton and Poole.[63] The English merchants later laid claim to these vessels as compensation for the disruption to their commercial activities. However, the fact that supplies were being sent to Clarence in Aquitaine as late as 18 April 1413 indicates that those in England were unaware of his intentions to return. On 7 April letters patent were issued at Bordeaux in the name of Henry IV and shows that at this stage news of the king's death had not yet filtered through to Guienne.[64] Clarence missed the coronation of his brother on 9 April and his duties as

---

62 Wylie & Waugh, *Henry V*, i, p. 120.

63 ibid., i, p. 119.

64 Milner, 'The English enterprise', p. 90.

steward of England were carried out by Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick.[65] Clarence was certainly back in England by 14 July 1413 when he was granted an annuity of 2,000 marks *per annum* by Henry V.[66]

While the expedition of 1412 did not achieve all that it might have, it was certainly not a disaster. Clarence had shown that the factionalism of the French nobility provided England with an opportunity to intervene in France. The fact that Clarence had been able to march from Normandy to Bordeaux, reminiscent of the great *chevauchées* of the fourteenth century, showed that if intervention was to take place in force then the French would not really be in a position to resist. It seems likely that had he lived longer Henry IV would certainly have become more involved in trying to exploit the political situation in France for his own ends.[67] Despite the dearth of coverage afforded this campaign in the contemporary English chronicles,[68] valuable political and military lessons had been learned, lessons which Henry V was to put to good use during his campaigns. Clarence's presence in France also allowed him to explore opportunities for advancement on the continent. His support for James of Urgel shows his thirst for military adventure and puts the attempt by the pope to recruit Clarence as captain of the papal armies in a new light. Perhaps this venture was suggested by Clarence himself, frustrated at his exclusion from power during his brother's control of the council. The failure of the Armagnac princes to intimidate Clarence also shows an increase in his stature. He was now a figure to be reckoned with and perhaps he felt that now he had proven himself. The generosity of Henry V to his brother on his return to England is perhaps an indication that the new king felt that something worthwhile had been achieved.

---

65 Wylie & Waugh, *Henry V*, i, p. 2.

66 *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 94.

67 Curry, A., *The Hundred Years War*, p. 94.

68 Milner, ' The English enterprise', pp. 82-3.

Chapter 5: The reign of Henry V. Thomas, duke of Clarence and the conquest of Normandy.

The most sustained period of activity in the life of Clarence came during the reign of his brother. As the eldest of Henry V's three brothers it was natural for Clarence to play an important role during the wars in France, which began in 1415. His previous experience in France, having led a raid on Normandy in 1405 and commanded the expedition to France in 1412, meant that Clarence could contribute valuable advice to his brother. In April 1415, well before the English army left for France, Clarence was one of those summoned to attend a meal given by Henry V with the intention of seeking the advice of those who would serve as his captains during the king's forthcoming campaigns to 'Harfleu [sic] and Normandy'.[1] The presence of Clarence on the expedition to France meant that the king had to appoint his brother John, recently created duke of Bedford and earl of Richmond, as lieutenant of England. It has been suggested that this was because the king wished to keep his brother Clarence close to him because he was not 'a man to be relied upon' and that his previous record of service to the crown 'did not inspire trust'.[2] However, despite any doubts the new king may have harboured about the ability and intentions of his brother at this stage of the reign Clarence had certainly proven his loyalty to the new king.

Clarence may have been involved in the suppression of the Lollard rebellion led by John Oldcastle in January 1414. Oldcastle had been one of Henry V's closest companions and advisors during the Welsh campaigns of the previous reign and his rebellion was due to his conviction for heresy. He had been sitting with the lords in parliament since 1410 by right of his title Lord Cobham, acquired through his marriage. In 1411 he had taken part in the earl of Arundel's expedition to France in aid of the Burgundians. His Lollard tendencies seem to have been widely known and he had been in contact with the Hussites of Bohemia in 1410. However it was not until Lollard tracts belonging to Oldcastle were found in London that

---

1 Devon, *Issues of the exchequer*, p. 340.

2 Allmand, *Henry V*, pp. 336-7.

action was taken against him. In September 1413 he was imprisoned in the Tower of London but managed to escape the following month. Whilst in hiding Oldcastle hatched a plot to kill the king and his brothers, a plan that was remarkably similar to that of the earls loyal to Richard II in 1400. The Lollards planned to seize the royal family which had gathered to celebrate Christmas and the new year at the royal manor of Eltham. The plot was betrayed to the king and the Lollard force was easily dispersed. Oldcastle escaped, remaining at large until November 1417. At his trial Oldcastle said that he would not recognise any of those present as his judge, claiming that the only man who could judge him was Richard II, who he claimed was in Scotland.[3] This attack on the legitimacy of the Lancastrian dynasty, eighteen years after the seizure of the throne, added a new dimension to what had been a rising by heretics. On hearing news of the rebellion the king assembled a force under Clarence and sent it 'against those scelerate and misbeleeuinge rebellions, whome almost without resistance he vanquished, and tooke part of them, and put the remnant to flight'.[4] The threats to his family and to his own life may have inspired a deeper sense of loyalty in Clarence to the kingship of his brother than he, in fact, had previously felt.

Clarence's role in dealing with those involved with the Southampton Plot of 1415 may also have done much to foster in Clarence a heightened sense of loyalty to Henry V. It has been said that the Southampton Plot once again emphasised the precarious nature of the Lancastrian hold on the throne. Henry V had yet to prove himself in France and the time may have seemed ripe to remove the usurper dynasty once and for all and to place Edmund Mortimer, earl of March on the throne. The main conspirators were Richard, earl of Cambridge, brother of the duke of York, Henry, lord Scrope of Masham and Sir Thomas Grey of Heton. The king was informed of the plot by the earl of March himself who, it has been claimed, was an unwilling member of the conspiracy. However, as Pugh has shown,[5] these men were not only the main conspirators but seem to have been the only conspirators. The Southampton Plot was far from being a

---

3 For a more complete account of Oldcastle and the Lollard revolt see Allmand, *Henry V*, pp. 294-303.

4 *The first English life*, p. 23.

5 T. B. Pugh, 'The Southampton Plot of 1415', in *Kings and nobles in the later Middle Ages*, ed. R. A. Griffiths & J. Sherborne; T. B. Pugh, *Henry V and the Southampton Plot of 1415*.

manifestation of baronial dissatisfaction with the new king. Rather, it was a small group of men with close ties to each other nursing personal grievances against Henry V. Indeed, many of the contemporary chronicles believed that those involved in the plot were inspired by French bribes rather than by any dynastic considerations. The author of the *Gesta Henrici Quinti* states that Scrope was involved in the plot because he had been corrupted by 'the stench of French promises or bribes'.[6] While the French almost certainly had nothing to do with the plot it is important to note contemporary opinions, indicating that people did not believe that Henry V faced any internal opposition. Adam of Usk also attributes the plot to French involvement.[7] Another chronicler states that by the second year of Henry's reign all dissensions within the king's dominions had been put down[8] and there seems to be no hint in any contemporary source that the right of Henry V to the throne of England was in doubt.

The main aim of the plot was for Cambridge and March to travel to March's Welsh estates and to raise a rebellion there. Murdoch, earl of Fife, the son of the duke of Albany, regent of Scotland, was to be taken from the custody of Henry V and exchanged for Henry Percy, son and heir of the earl of Northumberland, as well as the Pseudo-Richard II, who had been sheltering in Scotland. This was to be combined with a Scottish invasion of northern England,[9] possibly in the expectation of a rising by Percy loyalists. The plot had little chance of success. The Pseudo-Richard had died earlier in the reign and the duke of Albany seems to have been willing to go along with Cambridge only in the hope of freeing his son who had been an English prisoner for twelve years. There was little hope of Henry Percy throwing his lot in with the conspirators. He had everything to gain by making his peace with the new king and could reasonably look forward to recovering his inheritance.[10] Without the help of Percy or Albany the plot looked doomed to failure.

Richard, earl of Cambridge, the man behind the plot was the younger brother of the duke of York. As the landless youngest brother of

---

6 *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, ed. and trans. F. Taylor & J. S. Roskell, p. 19.

7 *The Chronicle of Adam of Usk*, p. 177.

8 *The first English life*, pp. 23-4.

9 Pugh, 'The Southampton Plot', pp 71-2.

10 ibid., pp. 64-6

York his prospects were poor. As godson of Richard II he had been in a position to exploit his connection with the crown. The seizure of the throne in 1399 had destroyed his political prospects.[11] In 1408 he had married Anne Mortimer, the older sister of the earl of March. Cambridge was forced to rely on the generosity of his brother. In May 1414 he was created earl of Cambridge, but was given no lands to go with this title. He was not even given the customary £20 annuity from the issues of the county of Cambridge.[12] His next wife, Maud Clifford, sister of John, Lord Clifford, failed to bring any material benefit to Cambridge. However, it did bring him into contact with the Percy family,[13] which, combined with his lack of endowment, may have heightened his sense of grievance against the house of Lancaster.[14]

Edmund, earl of March, until recently a minor in the keeping of the king, also had financial motives for plotting rebellion. The previous year he had been forced to pay a fine of 10,000 marks in return for permission to marry Anne Stafford, sister of Humphrey, earl of Stafford. This was twice the yearly income of Mortimer's estates in Wales. While the payment of a fine of this nature was traditional for those in the king's custody who wished to choose their own spouse, it failed to take into consideration the devastation which had been wrought in Mortimer's lands in Wales during the course of Glyndwr's rebellion in the previous reign. There was no realistic way for Mortimer to pay this fine and on his death in 1425 he was still in debt.[15] He was more than willing to become involved in a scheme that would remove the Lancastrians from the throne. Sir Thomas Grey of Heton seems to have played quite a small part in the conspiracy. His son was married to the daughter of the earl of Cambridge[16] and this seems to have been the main reason for his involvement in the plot. Grey also faced severe financial problems and had been outlawed twice during the previous reign for bankruptcy.[17] Grey's connections to the Percy family may also have

---

11 ibid., p. 66.

12 ibid., pp. 73-5.

13 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 76.

14 Pugh, 'The Southampton Plot', p. 76.

15 ibid., pp. 78-9.

16 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 74.

17 Pugh, *Henry V and the Southampton Plot*, p. 103.

pushed him towards Cambridge.[18]

Henry, Lord Scrope of Masham, was the conspirator with the most to lose from the rebellion. He was a trusted advisor of Henry and had served on his council as treasurer in 1410 and 1411. He seems to have tried to dissuade the others from going ahead with the plot when he heard of Cambridge's plans to link up with the survivors of the Lollard rebellion of the previous year.[19] Scrope was the third husband of Joan Holand, dowager duchess of York, Cambridge's stepmother. Henry Scrope had also served with Cambridge as part of the escort which brought Henry IV's daughter Philippa to Denmark in 1406. More importantly perhaps, Scrope was the nephew of archbishop Scrope of York, who had been executed by Henry IV in 1405 and this does seem to have been partially responsible for his participation in the plot.[20] The reason why Scrope did not report the conspiracy, and pre-empt the confession of the earl of March when he began to suffer doubts seems to have been due to the fact that the earl owed Scrope a substantial sum of money, money which Scrope would never recover if March was executed for treason.[21]

The earl of March confessed his involvement in the conspiracy to Henry V on 31 July 1415 at Portchester castle near Portsmouth. The main conspirators were arrested immediately and placed in custody in Southampton castle. The king ordered their trial to commence as soon as possible. Both Cambridge and Grey confessed to their role in the plot but Scrope denied the charges. He claimed that he had only feigned interest in Cambridge's plan in order to find out more about it with the intention of warning the king. As a peer of the realm he demanded to be tried by his peers. Grey was condemned and executed on 2 August while judgement on Cambridge and Scrope was reserved until the lords could be assembled. On 5 August a new court was convened, presided over by the duke of Clarence. Twenty peers of the realm had been collected to hear the case against Cambridge and Scrope. The decision was unanimous and both men were executed later that day. Scrope's head was sent to York for public display and that of Grey was sent to Newcastle. The head and body of Cambridge were

---

18 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 74.

19 Pugh, 'The Southampton Plot', p. 83.

20 ibid., pp. 81-2.

21 ibid., p. 84.

buried together in Southampton. Two days after the execution of the conspirators, on 7 August, the earl of March was pardoned for all of his treasons and other offences.[22] In the parliament held later that year the sentences were confirmed as being good and lawful.

On 5 August the king had appointed his brother as his lieutenant and vice-regent in order to hear the cases and to carry out the necessary judgement on the conspirators.[23] The later fifteenth century development of the Lord High Steward's court was based on the proceedings of August 1415. However, no precedent should have been drawn from the events of 1415 as during the trials Clarence was not acting in his capacity as steward, and it was a mere coincidence that Clarence held the office of steward when he was acting as viceregent.[24] In fact, Clarence presided over no trials as steward during either the reign of his father or that of his brother.[25]

The seizure of the crown by Henry IV in 1399 had 'involved dynastic change and therefore dynastic insecurity'.[26] While this was certainly true for the first part of the reign of Henry IV, by 1405 he faced no serious domestic opposition. He had successfully managed to pass on the crown to his son and Oldcastle's Lollard rebellion and the Southampton Plot are not indicators of serious unrest in England and neither presented any challenge to the Lancastrian hold on the throne of England.The commonly accepted belief that the conspirators at Southampton plotted to murder the king and his brothers has now been shown to be untrue.[27] The charge that there was a plan to murder the royal family 'was devised and invented as a logical conclusion that could be drawn from the recital of offences set down in the indictment', that is the plan to raise a rebellion against the king.[28] None of the conspirators confessed to this plan. The Southampton plot can

---

22 Pugh, *Henry V and the Southampton Plot*, p. 82.

23 Rymer, *Foedera*, ix, p. 300.

24 L. W. Vernon Harcourt, *His Grace the Steward and trial of peers*, p. 380.

25 ibid., p. 378.

26 J. Gillingham, 'Crisis or continuity? The structure of royal authority in England, 1369-1422', in *Das Spätmittelalterliche Königtum im Europäischen Vergleich*, ed. R. Schneider, p. 59.

27 Pugh, ' Henry V and the Southampton Plot', p. 67.

28 ibid.

be interpreted as giving some credence to the report of master John Fusoris, one of the French ambassadors in 1415 that dissension existed within England and that part of the English population would have preferred the earl of March, or even the duke of Clarence, to be their king. Fusoris believed that Henry V looked more suited to being a priest than a king and that his brother Clarence had a far more regal bearing.[29] However, Fusoris was probably basing his report purely on what he had heard of the Southampton Plot, rather than on any genuine evidence of opposition to Henry V.

Despite this attempt to depose the king, preparations for the expedition to France continued. Since his accession to the throne in 1413 Henry V had been engaged in diplomatic efforts to pave the way for further English involvement on the continent. He continued to negotiate with the duke of Burgundy as well as with his Armagnac rivals. He was also seeking the hand of Katherine of Valois, daughter of Charles VI, in marriage. The king also made attempts to revive the alliances fostered by Edward III with some of the imperial princes whose territory bordered on France. Henry's sister Blanche, who had died in 1409, had been married to Louis, count palatine of the Rhine in 1402. Her dowry had not been paid in full at the time of her death[30] and Henry V was able to use the prospect of a full settlement of English debts to Louis as a means of attracting support. Henry also began to pay money fiefs to some of the Rhenish bishops in order to put pressure on the duke of Burgundy and make him aware of the vulnerability of his eastern borders. Henry V had begun to negotiate with Aragon soon after his coronation.[31] He sought an alliance with Aragon, to be sealed by his marriage to Mary of Aragon, early in 1415, when war with France was already inevitable.[32] An alliance with Aragon would have had the effect of balancing the traditional Franco-Castilian alliance with its overwhelming naval superiority. Attempts were also made to strengthen the Portuguese alliance with England. However, the attentions of the Spanish kingdoms were directed elsewhere at this time. Henry IV's sister Philippa had married the king of Portugal in 1389. In 1404 the earl of Arundel had married the illegitimate daughter of the Portuguese king, which had further

---

29 Wylie & Waugh, *Henry V*, i, pp. 506-7.

30 Tuck, 'Henry IV and Europe', p. 117. Blanche's dowry was not paid in full until 1446.

31 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 67.

32 ibid., p. 74.

strengthened ties between England and its closest Iberian ally. It was widely believed that the Portuguese fleet being assembled by John I, at the same time as Henry V's preparations for war continued, was intended to support the English effort in France.[33] Despite his continued negotiations with France Henry V seems to have been convinced that he was going to have to fight for the fulfilment of his claims. Clarence does not seem to have played any significant role in any of these negotiations and it is possible that Henry V felt that Clarence's own diplomatic preferences might manifest themselves. It is possible that Clarence was serving at Guines at some point in 1414. On 17 June the protection recently granted to Thomas Corbet going in the company of Clarence, acting as captain of Guines, on the safe-keeping of the castle was revoked.[34] Protections for others going in the service of Clarence were being granted in December 1414.[35] Some further evidence pointing to lingering discord between the king and Clarence can be found in the fact that no bequests were made to Clarence in Henry V's first will, drawn up just before the expedition sailed, although he was appointed as one of its supervisors.[36] It is possible that Clarence was not mentioned in his brother's will due to the fact that he was the heir apparent, and if Henry V died in France then Clarence would inherit the kingdom.

Clarence sealed an indenture to serve in the campaign of 1415 with a retinue of 240 men-at-arms and 720 mounted archers, one of the most substantial retinues in an army that totalled somewhere in the region of 10,500 men.[37] His retinue was to consist of himself, one earl, two bannerets, fourteen knights and 222 esquires, as well as his archers. Henry Beaufort, earl of Somerset, the son of Clarence's wife Margaret Beaufort, served as the earl in the retinue.[38] Henry V's military intentions can be deduced from the high degree of mobility expected from Clarence's men. He was to bring fifty of his own horses with him, Beaufort was to bring twenty-four, each banneret seven, each knight six and each of the esquires four. All

---

33 *Chronique d'Antonio Morosini*, ii, p. 21. In fact the Portuguese fleet was being gathered in order to attack the town of Cueta in Morocco.

34 *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 194.

35 ibid., p. 276.

36 Wylie & Waugh, *Henry V*, i, pp. 541-3.

37 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 210.

38 P.R.O., E 101/45/4, this provides the complete muster roll for Clarence's retinue for the 1415 expedition.

the archers were also to have their own horse. Even as late as April 1415 Henry V seems to have been contemplating a campaign in Guienne. Clarence agreed to serve with his retinue for a period of one year, either in the duchy of Guienne or in the kingdom of France. Clarence was to be paid 13s. 4d. per day, Beaufort was to receive 6s. 8d., the two bannerets were each to be paid 4s., and each of the knights 2s. per day. If the campaign was to be fought in Guienne then each esquire would be paid forty marks for the entire year and each of the archers would be paid twenty marks. If the campaign was to be fought in France, however, then each esquire and archer was to be paid 12d. and 6d. per day respectively. Despite this clause the obvious initial target of the expedition was Normandy. Henry V may have contemplated something like the expedition led by Clarence in 1412 with Guienne being the final destination and from where the army would be in a position to strike at France more readily the following year. The cost of shipping Clarence's men, horses and supplies to France was to be borne by the king. Clarence would also receive a regard of one hundred marks per quarter for every thirty men-at-arms in his retinue.[39] On 20 July 1415 the king appointed Richard Redeman and John Straunge to supervise the muster of Clarence's retinue at Southampton.[40] Just over a week earlier, on 12 July, Henry V had authorised Richard Courtenay, bishop of Norwich, treasurer of the king's chamber, to give a crown, called 'la corowne Henry', to Clarence as security for the payment of the wages due to him and his men. If the king was unable to redeem the crown by 1 January 1416 then Clarence was entitled to dispose of it in order to provide for the wages of his retinue.[41] The crown was then divided amongst Clarence's captains and some pieces remained unredeemed until the eighth and ninth years of the reign of Henry VI.[42]

The English fleet, consisting of somewhere in the region of 1,500 vessels, left Southampton on 11 August 1415 and appeared off the coast of Normandy two days later. The army disembarked at Chef de Caux, not far from the town of Harfleur, situated at the mouth of the river Seine. Harfleur was described as 'the key of the sea of all Normandie'.[43] Without

---

39 P.R.O., E 404/31/155.

40 Rymer, *Foedera*, ix, p. 287.

41 ibid., pp. 284-5; *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 350.

42 Nicolas, Sir H., *History of the battle of Agincourt*, app. p. 15.

43 *The first English life*, p. 35.

first establishing a firm base on the coast, the English could never hope to complete their conquest successfully. By 17 August the army and all its equipment had been landed.[44] Clarence, 'chieftaine of the King's first ward',[45] then advanced on the town awaiting the arrival of the king. The king positioned his headquarters on the side of a hill overlooking the town. He then dispatched his brother Clarence, with the earl of Salisbury, to blockade the eastern side of the town, an action which the author of the *Gesta Henrici Quinti* believed was the result of a pre-arranged plan.[46] However, if so the king failed to act quickly enough. On 18 August the Sire de Gaucorte had managed to enter Harfleur from the eastern side of the town with 300 lances.[47] Access remained freely available to the French until Clarence was sent to invest that side of the town as well. At first Clarence and his men were forced to travel up the valley of the river Lézarde for nine or ten miles before they could effect a crossing. This was due to the fact that the defenders of Harfleur had destroyed all the bridges over the river and had dammed the flow of the Lézarde, causing it to flood most of the meadows right up to the ditches surrounding the town.[48] This greatly hampered English action during the siege, as it meant that the heavy equipment could not be brought into effective range. At long-range the effect of the English artillery was more psychological than real. Clarence and his men also managed to intercept a French column advancing from Rouen with supplies for Harfleur. Guns, powder, crossbows, quarrels and catapults were all captured.[49] However the crossing was successful and Clarence and his men, as well as some of the artillery,[50] were in position the following morning. Clarence and his men were also involved in a successful engagement with some of the defenders of the town, forcing them to retreat back into Harfleur.[51] The *Gesta Henrici Quinti* records how Clarence and his

---

44 *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, p. 27.

45 *The first English life*, p. 34.

46 *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, p. 33.

47 ibid.

48 ibid., pp. 33-5.

49 ibid. p. 35, *The first English life*, p. 37, records how the English were able to intercept supplies being sent to Harfleur from Rouen by sea.

50 Wylie & Waugh, *Henry V*, ii, p. 36, name four of the guns as 'the London', 'the Messanger', 'the King's Daughter' and 'Her Maidens'.

51 *The first English life*, p. 34.

men first arrived before Harfleur. On Monday 19 August 'at dawn in clear sunlight, he made his appearance over the crest of the hill facing the town on that side, not without causing real fear and dread among the besieged'.[52] He was able to place his headquarters near a chapel on a hill called Mont Cabert which overlooked the town from the north-east. A bridge of boats was built to ensure communications between the two groups of the army.

The siege began with an artillery bombardment which lasted for several days. However the defenders were able to repair most of the breaches made by working under cover of darkness.[53] Clarence ordered his men to begin a mine, hoping to be able to gain an advantage over the defenders of the town by undermining the walls. However, the fact that the mine had to be started in open country meant that the French knew what was happening and were able to dig their own countermines. After suffering losses due to the constant fighting in the mine, Henry V ordered that it should be abandoned. Conflict continued in the mine on a regular basis, and the mine 'that was begun for the sodaine invasion of the Towne was changed into the exercise of knightlie acts'.[54] According to the *Gesta* Henry V had given orders for the mine to be started in the hope of striking fear into the hearts of the defenders of Harfleur. This would cause the defenders to surrender and Henry would be able 'to save human blood from being shed'.[55] At the same time the king brought some of his ships up to Harfleur in order to make his blockade of the town more complete. Clarence ordered his men to build a trench up to the fosse surrounding Harfleur which resulted in his being able to seize the eastern portion of the moat. Clarence also ordered a ditch to be dug between his men and the town. The earth removed from the ditch was then used to build a defensive rampart which the English fortified with stakes and tree-trunks. After one month, on the morning of 18 September, the garrison of Harfleur sought to negotiate with their besiegers. The Sire de Gaucorte, Lord d'Estoutville and the other lords of the town sent out heralds of arms to the duke of Clarence requesting a meeting with the king or those whom he should appoint in order to discuss a truce.[56] In the end the commanders of the town offered to surrender if no

---

52 *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, p. 35.

53 ibid., p. 37.

54 *The first English life*, p. 38.

55 *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, p. 41.

56 *The great chronicle of London*, ed. A. H. Thomas & I. D. Thornley, p. 92; *Gregory's*

relief had arrived from Rouen by 22 September. The French were unable to raise a force to lift the siege and Harfleur duly surrendered on the appointed day. The surrender of the town was fortuitous for Henry V, as the English army was in no position for an extended siege. The salt-marshes surrounding Harfleur have been described as 'pestilential death-traps',[57] and the level of English casualties from dysentery was high. The author of the *Gesta* believed that more of the English army had died from the disease than from the attacks on the town.[58] Those who died from the disease during the course of the siege included the earl of Stafford, the bishop of Norwich and Lord Beaumont.[59] After the siege was over up to 5,000 members of the army, including the duke of Clarence, the earls of March and Arundel and the earl marshal, had to be transported back to England due to their illness. On his march to Calais after the siege was over Henry V had somewhere in the region of 6,000 combatants with him, scarcely sixty per cent of the force that had left England. The king left Harfleur after fifteen days, intending to return home to England via Calais. He had left Thomas Beaufort, earl of Dorset, as captain of Harfleur with a garrison of roughly 1,500 men as well as some of the artillery.[60] The rest of the siege equipment was shipped back to England with Clarence and those unfit to continue the campaign. As a consequence of his illness Clarence missed the English march to Calais, which culminated in the battle of Agincourt.

Much of the population of Harfleur was expelled from the town and Henry V planned to turn it into a second Calais. As one London chronicle puts it Henry's plan was to 'stuffe the toun with English peple'.[61] The *Gesta* records how the French, 'by the true judgement of God were proved sojourners where they had thought themselves inhabitants'.[62] However, Henry V did provide those he had expelled with an escort in order to protect them from the more unscrupulous elements of his army. Soon after the town had fallen Henry V started to make grants of property within Harfleur to Englishmen. Three hundred of the town's more prominent

---

chronicle, p. 109.

57 Wylie & Waugh, *Henry V*, ii, p. 41.

58 *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, p. 59

59 *The first English life*, p. 42.

60 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 81.

61 *A chronicle of the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and HenryVI*, p. 40.

62 *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, p. 55.

defenders and inhabitants were taken prisoner. They were set at liberty in order to make arrangements for their ransoms on a promise to surrender themselves at Calais by 11 November.

After leaving Harfleur Henry V planned to take the remnants of the English army to Calais. The French, aware of Henry's plans, had gathered a large army and were determined to give battle and prevent the English force from reaching Calais. At the battle of Agincourt on 25 October the English force inflicted a crushing defeat on the vastly superior French army. During the course of the battle the cream of the French army was either killed or captured. The French dead included the duke of Alençon, the duke of Bar, the duke of Brabant, the count of Nevers, both of whom were brothers of the duke of Burgundy, and Charles d'Albret, the constable of France, the man who had advised against engaging the English in battle. His plan had been to let Henry V march to Calais and return to England while the French army concentrated on recapturing Harfleur. The defeat at Agincourt meant that, for the time being, the English hold on Harfleur was secure. The prisoners taken by the English included the duke of Orléans, the duke of Bourbon, as well as the counts of Vendôme, Richemont and Eu.[63] On the English side casualties were very light, the duke of York and the earl of Suffolk being the only men of rank to die. The response of the English people to the victory at Agincourt was overwhelming and extra money was soon forthcoming in order to finance new campaigns. The commons in the parliament of November 1415 granted the king the wool subsidy and tunnage and poundage for the rest of his life, an unprecedented grant.[64] This ensured that Henry V would be able to return to France to continue his conquests. It was the absence of Clarence from this battle which is said to account for much of his recklessness in later campaigns. Before the battle of Baugé in 1421, during which Clarence died, he reputedly told Gilbert Umfraville that because he had missed the victory at Agincourt he needed to prove himself and to win glory and honour.[65] The king was back in England by mid-November 1415. On 1 December Clarence, who seems to have recovered from the illness contracted at Harfleur, and all the other members of the royal family attended the vigils for the duke of York, who had died at

---

63 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 96.

64 Butt, *A history of parliament*, p. 491.

65 Wylie & Waugh, *Henry V*, iii, p. 302.

Agincourt.[66]

It is likely that the military success of Henry V in France during 1415 was the spur for the emperor Sigismund to try and negotiate a peace between England and France.[67] Henry V had been in personal contact with the emperor Sigismund since at least 1411. In July 1414 he had appointed ambassadors to treat for an alliance between England and the empire.[68] Sigismund had been critical of English involvement in France in 1412, believing that it was wrong for the English to be involved on both sides in a civil war. He had written to Henry IV saying that the English presence there would only intensify the conflict.[69] By this time the emperor's main interest was in promoting the Council of Constance, which had opened in November 1414. The principal aim of the council was to end the schism within the church. The emperor believed strongly in church reform and he believed that the council could only be successful if England and France were at peace.[70] It was for this reason that he offered to try and negotiate a peace between the two countries in 1415. Henry V was more than willing to allow Sigismund to intervene. However, he was not looking for the emperor to broker a peace between England and France but instead he wanted to win the emperor over to the English cause. It was for this reason that Henry had had copies of the Treaty of Bourges, Henry IV's agreement with the Armagnac princes, sent to Sigismund and the Council of Constance before his expedition to France in the summer of 1415.[71] Henry V tried to claim the moral high ground and justified his military action by citing the intransigency of the French in not restoring territories which they had promised to the English three years previously.

Sigismund arrived in Paris on 1 March 1416. The emperor antagonised his hosts with his demands for hospitality and the French came to believe that the emperor already favoured the English cause. The French belief that Sigismund was already sympathetic to the English

---

66 ibid., ii, p. 269.

67 Crowder, C.M.D., 'Henry V, Sigismund, and the Council of Constance, a re-examination', *Historical Studies*, 4 (1963), p. 102.

68 ibid., p. 69.

69 Tuck, *Crown and nobility*, p. 239.

70 ibid., p. 252.

71 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 99.

may have been true as one of the emperor's chief allies among the electoral princes was Louis of Bavaria, Henry V's brother-in-law.[72] Louis was later to serve in France with Henry at the siege of Melun during the summer of 1420.[73] He left Paris in late April, after spending less than two months there, and his negotiations with the French seem to have achieved very little. Travelling to Calais the emperor crossed to Dover and he landed in England in early May.[74] On his arrival in England Sigismund, 'the most Christian and superillustrious prince',[75] was greeted by the Henry V's youngest brother Humphrey, duke of Gloucester. According to one source Humphrey waded into the water with his sword drawn and threatened to deny Sigismund a landing in England if he planned to exercise imperial authority there. Only on receiving assurances from the emperor did Humphrey allow him to land.[76] Sigismund then proceeded to Canterbury where he was welcomed by archbishop Chichele. From there he travelled to Rochester where he met John, duke of Bedford, and then the imperial party moved on to Dartford. Here Sigismund was greeted by the duke of Clarence who was accompanied by the earls of March and Huntingdon, lords Grey of Ruthin, Poynings and Abergavenny and by Sir John Cornewaille.[77] From Dartford the company moved on to Blackheath, where the citizens of London welcomed the emperor, and finally to London where the king was waiting. Sigismund was to remain in England for over four months.[78]

Almost immediately after the arrival of Sigismund in England Henry V began to cultivate an Anglo-Imperial alliance. On 24 May Sigismund was admitted as a knight into the Order of the Garter. At the end of May William, count of Holland, Zeeland and Hainault arrived in England. He was the brother-in-law of John, duke of Burgundy, as well as the father-in-law of John, duke of Touraine, who would become dauphin six months later. William was also a Knight of the Garter and seems to have been openly sympathetic to England. It seems likely that Henry hoped to use Sigismund and William to put pressure on John of Burgundy to form an

---

72 Crowder, 'Henry V, Sigismund, and the council of Constance', p. 99.

73 *Memoires de Pierre de Fenin*, pp. 135-6.

74 Allmand, *Henry V*, pp. 104-05.

75 *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, p. 127.

76 *The first English life*, p. 67.

77 *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, p. 131.

78 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 105.

alliance with England. At the same time Henry V renewed the money-fief which Edward III had paid to the archbishop of Cologne. At this time the archbishop of Bourges arrived in England in order to negotiate a truce with England. However, these negotiations were merely an attempt to prevent an English expedition being sent to France to lift the French blockade of Harfleur and to provide the French princes with the opportunity to recapture the town. The blockade of Harfleur was being strengthened and it appeared as if an assault on the town was imminent. Henry V was forced to muster a fleet under the command of John, duke of Bedford, to try and relieve the town. Bedford was involved in a ferocious naval battle with the French and Genoese fleets besieging the town. Bedford himself was wounded but managed to break the French blockade.[79] On hearing news of the victory Henry was joined by Sigismund at a thanksgiving service in Canterbury cathedral. Sigismund seems to have already been won over and on the same day as Bedford's victory at sea he had sealed a treaty of perpetual friendship with Henry V. Under the terms of this alliance Sigismund promised to be a friend and ally to Henry V and his successors as kings of England and to help Henry to resist all attacks made upon him, unless it was launched by the pope. Merchants from both countries were to have free access in each other's territories. Both men also promised not to harbour traitors against each other and never to go to war with each other. Most importantly they agreed to help each other recover their rights in France.[80] Soon after this Henry V left England to travel to Calais. Little is known about the activities of Clarence at this time and he does not seem to have been involved in the negotiations with Sigismund. However, on 4 September 1416 the king appointed Clarence as keeper of the kingdom and the king's lieutenant there during his absence.[81] This appointment only lasted for one month as by mid-October the king was back in England. Henry had been accompanied on this trip to France by Humphrey, duke of Gloucester. During the discussions which were held with the duke of Burgundy, Gloucester acted as a hostage for the security of Burgundy and his retinue.[82]

---

79 Many chronicles state that Clarence was actually in command of the English fleet but it is certain that he remained in England and that Bedford was the fleet's commander.

80 Wylie & Waugh, *Henry V*, iii, p. 19.

81 *C.P.R., 1416-22*, p. 48.

82 *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, p. 161.

At the end of the negotiations with Burgundy it seemed as if little had been achieved. The *Gesta* records how Henry and Sigismund had little confidence in the hope of peace between England and France 'unless it were to be achieved by the edge of the sword'. The emperor had been completely won over by Henry V and he 'gloried in the exploits of our king no less than he abominated the machinations and trickery of the French'.[83] On his return to England Henry was present at parliament. Henry Beaufort announced in his opening speech that as there was no way of proceeding by diplomatic means therefore war was the only option. The commons made a huge grant of two tenths and fifteenths to the king and this generosity allowed preparations to get under way for the launching of a new expedition to France the following year.[84]

As early as January and February 1417 orders were issued for the seizure of ships of over twenty tons for the king's forthcoming expedition to France.[85] In June of that year Henry V dispatched a naval force under the earl of Huntingdon against the Genoese squadron operating in the English Channel. Huntingdon captured four of the Genoese carracks as well as the French admiral.[86] English control of the Channel was now ensured and Henry's fleet could cross to France unmolested. Clarence's retinue in this expedition was slightly smaller than that which he had brought to France with him two years previously. In 1417 Clarence's retinue was recorded as consisting of 240 men-at-arms and 620 archers.[87] However, there is no official record of the size of the retinue at this time and these figures cannot be relied on as being completely accurate. The retinue with which he was serving in France in 1418 consisted of only sixty men-at-arms and 180 archers.[88] This is probably indicative of an increasing desire to serve in France on the part of men of lesser importance, who now served as captains of their own smaller retinues instead of in the retinues of the greater lords.

The duke of Clarence was to play a very active role in the forthcoming campaigns and he was able to win great distinction through his

---

83 ibid., p. 175.

84 Butt, *A history of parliament*, p. 491.

85 Allmand, *Henry V*, pp. 112-3.

86 R. A. Newhall, *The English conquest of Normandy*, p. 55.

87 *The first English life*, p. 79.

88 Rymer, *Foedera*, ix, p. 545.

military activities. The English fleet landed at Touques on 1 August 1417. As soon as the English force had disembarked Henry V began to attack the castle of Touques and was able to capture it the same day. The castle, with all its dependent lordships, was given to the duke of Clarence.[89] He was also appointed constable of the king's host with the power to punish all those members of the army who contravened the ordinances laid down by the king for discipline amongst his troops during the forthcoming campaign.[90] Immediately after the fall of Touques Clarence was sent to reconnoitre the valley of the river Touques as far as Pont l'Evêque and Lisieux. French troops coming from Paris or Rouen would have to travel by these points in order to reach the English army. By 4 August Clarence and his men had entered and occupied the town of Lisieux and they then moved eastwards on the Paris road as far as Bernay. This town, which was undefended, was also occupied by Clarence's troops. He then retraced his steps to rejoin the rest of the English army which was moving to the west, in the direction of Caen.[91] Clarence was then sent with a force of 1,000 cavalry to Caen in order to prevent the defenders of the town from firing the suburbs on the approach of the English army. Clarence appeared before the town on 14 August. He managed to take the garrison by surprise and was able to capture the suburbs intact. Some fires had been lit but the English troops were able to extinguish them successfully. Clarence then established his headquarters in the abbey of the Trinity just outside the town.

Soon after his arrival at Caen Clarence was approached by a monk of the abbey of St. Stephen. He sought Clarence's help in trying to save the abbey, which was also situated in the suburbs of the town, from being destroyed by the French. He told Clarence that the abbey had been founded by William the Conqueror and was where he had been buried. As a descendant of William, Clarence was honour bound to try and save the abbey from destruction.[92] Work had already been started on undermining the towers of the abbey, which overlooked the town, in order to prevent them falling into the hands of the English. Clarence acted swiftly and was able to capture the abbey and the French troops there. One of the French defenders was executed for trying to remove the bars on the windows of the

---

89 *The great chronicle of London*, p. 96.

90 *R.N.*, pp. 316-17.

91 Newhall,*The English conquest of Normandy*, p. 57.

92 Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*, ii, p. 323.

abbey's church, which was regarded as being sacrilegious. While this story may be true, the principal reason for its dissemination was to provide further moral justification for the English invasion of France. It was God's will that Henry V was successful because he was acting in the interests of peace and justice. His rightful possessions in France were being kept from him 'against God and all justice by the violence of the French'.[93] His military actions were designed to 'promote the honour of God, the extension of the Church, the deliverance of his country, and the peace and tranquillity of kingdoms, and especially (because they were more closely connected and associated) the peace and tranquillity of the two kingdoms of England and France'.[94]

The town was completely invested within four days. The siege of Caen was the first real opportunity for Clarence to display his military ability. The speed with which he was able to establish his troops in the town and to prevent the suburbs being burnt greatly enhanced the likelihood of a successful outcome to the siege. The fact of keeping the suburbs intact meant that when the rest of the English army arrived at Caen they were able to take up positions directly below the walls of the town. English possession of the suburbs would also allow for better quarters for the bulk of the army.[95] The capture of the two abbeys just outside the walls of Caen meant that the English artillery was able to operate at close range and the initial English bombardments did substantial damage to the walls of the town. In fact the shock caused by the English artillery being fired from the vicinity of the abbey resulted in all the windows of the abbey being blown out.[96] The abbey of St. Stephen was so secure that Henry V used it as his headquarters throughout the siege. Henry V planned an early end to the siege, hoping to set an example to other French garrisons in the area. Troops were immediately sent out to pacify the surrounding countryside in order to secure supplies for the besieging army. The actual assault on the town was launched on 4 September, just over two weeks after the siege had commenced. After a period of bombardment by the English artillery, which did serious damage to the walls of the town, the attack began.

---

93 *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, p. 17.

94 ibid., p. 3.

95 *The first English life*, p. 84.

96 ibid., p. 86.

Before the attack began Henry V called on the town to surrender in order to prevent innocent blood being shed. When the town refused, a two-pronged assault was launched. Clarence led his men from the river side of the town while Henry attacked simultaneously from the town's western side. Clarence's assault was by far the more successful of the two. He managed to capture a section of the walls forcing the defenders to abandon them on his side of the town. Clarence was reputedly one of the first men to scale the walls, giving the cry 'a Clarence! a Clarence! a saint George!'.[97] The first English life gives a graphic description of Clarence and his men fighting through the town in order to meet the king's company on the other side. Up to 2,000 inhabitants of the town were butchered and 'there was no Frenchman spared save priests, that were unarmed, and women and children'.[98] Clarence then managed to capture the bridge which crossed the river which divided the town. In this part of the town Clarence 'made greate occision and murther of Frenchmen'.[99] After the town had been subdued Clarence was able to launch an attack, from inside the town, on the walls where his brother and his men were still fighting. With Clarence's help the king was able to secure his entry into Caen. He went straight to the church of St. Peter in order to thank God for his victory.[100] Clarence, on hearing news of the arrival outside the town of another French force, gathered his company and took up positions outside the town in case the French attacked. However, it was a false alarm.[101] Caen castle continued to hold out but it was eventually forced to surrender five days later.[102]

As recognition of the pivotal role played by Clarence in securing the surrender of Caen the king ordered all the booty from the town to be collected and put into one house. Then 'when the doore was fast locked, the Kinge gave the key and all the substance in that house to the Duke of Clarence, because by him the Towne was first entred and gotten, and

---

97 *A chronicle of the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and HenryVI*, p. 45; *The Brut* records this as being the rallying cry for Clarence's troops during the assault on Caen.

98 *The first English life*, p. 90.

99 ibid.

100 ibid., p. 91.

101 ibid.

102 Newhall, *The English conquest of Normandy*, p. 60.

to himselfe the Kinge reserued nothinge except a goodly French Booke'.[103] Clarence then proceeded to distribute all of his gains amongst his men 'whereby he maruelouslie obtayned theire favour and love'.[104] The bloodshed and slaughter at Caen does contrast somewhat with the modern portrait of Henry V as being the ideal and devout christian prince. However, what happened at Caen was within the normal rules laid down for medieval warfare. Henry had called on the town to surrender and if a town fell by assault after refusing the summons to surrender then the inhabitants could expect no quarter or mercy. It was not only the actual garrison that would suffer after a town was taken by assault but all of its able bodied inhabitants as well, and 'in a city taken by storm almost any licence was condoned by the law'.[105] As Henry claimed to be the rightful duke of Normandy then the population of Caen were also to be regarded as rebels. As such the lives and goods of the inhabitants were forfeit to Henry V for 'the contumacious disregard' which they showed to his summons to surrender.[106] Caen was to serve as an example of what would happen if Henry V was forced to fight for what belonged to him. However, the English king seems to have acted with a great deal of restraint in dealing with the population of Caen compared to what might have been expected.[107] After Caen had fallen Henry appointed Clarence as captain of the town, and possibly of Bayeux as well.[108] On 11 September Clarence wrote to the mayor of London to announce the news of the fall of Caen. He said that many places had already surrendered and that soon the aims of the king would be accomplished. He stressed the need for English settlers to come to Normandy.[109] Without the presence of Englishmen to take advantage of the conquest it was unlikely that Normandy could have been held.

While the siege of Caen was going on English troops were operating elsewhere in Normandy. Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, had been sent to secure the surrender of Bayeux, roughly twenty miles north-west of Caen. On 8 September, after Caen had fallen, he was able to issue safe-

---

103 *The first English life*, p. 92.

104 ibid.

105 Keen, M.H., *The laws of war in the late middle ages*, p. 121.

106 ibid., p. 123.

107 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 117.

108 *A chronicle of the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and HenryVI*, p. 45.

109 Wylie & Waugh, *Henry V*, iii, p. 62.

conducts to the garrison of Bayeux and the town surrendered the following day.[110] At the same time John, duke of Burgundy, was sweeping all before him in his advance on Paris. He had delayed his march on the capital in the hope that the Armagnac forces defending the city and its approaches would be drawn off to cope with the English invasion. His actions prevented the French government from mounting any effort to save Caen[111] and the Burgundian threat to Paris was obviously regarded as being the more serious. This meant that Henry V was able to begin the siege of Falaise late in the winter of 1417. The town did not fall until the middle of February 1418. However, the southern frontier of Normandy had already been secured by a truce with Anjou, Brittany and Maine.[112] English troops had also managed to capture the towns of Alençon, Mortagne and Bellême, creating a string of English-held strongholds to the south of Falaise, isolating the town from any possible relief force.

The English army appeared before Falaise on 1 December. No attempt was made to storm the town and Henry V managed to bombard the town into submission. On 20 December the town agreed to surrender if it had not been relieved by 2 January 1418. As no relief was forthcoming the town surrendered on the appointed day.[113] However, the castle continued to hold out. After bombarding the castle for a further month its captain, Oliver de Mauny, desired to negotiate a surrender and the king appointed Clarence to negotiate the terms of the surrender. It was agreed by the defenders that if the castle was not relieved by 16 February by the king of France, the dauphin or the count of Armagnac then the garrison would surrender by midday on that date. Again there was no chance of relief and the castle was forced to surrender. All of the garrison were to leave their horses and armour in the castle and they were also to repair any damage sustained by the castle during the course of the siege at their own expense. All English prisoners being held in the castle were to be handed over on the surrender of the castle. All the supplies and artillery in the castle were also to be left behind. None of the garrison were to take up arms against England until the castle was fully repaired. Eight hostages were to be handed over from amongst the notables

---

110 Newhall, *The English conquest of Normandy*, p. 60; 'William Gregory's chronicle of London', p. 115, mistakenly credits Clarence with the capture of Bayeux.

111 Newhall, *The English conquest of Normandy*, p. 68.

112 ibid., p. 76; Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 119.

113 *The great chronicle of London*, p. 99.

of the garrison to ensure the terms of the treaty were kept. When the repair of the castle was completed the garrison was to be free to go, except one Geffrey de Chasteaulx. All the personal effects of the garrison could be taken with them except, as noted above, their horses and armour.[114]

At some point after the fall of Falaise Clarence may have returned to England. In March 1418 preparations were underway to ship Clarence, Thomas Beaufort, promoted from earl of Dorset to duke of Exeter, Edward Holland, Henry FitzHugh, Gilbert Umfraville and a force of 2,000 men to France. All these men had agreed to serve there for the next year and they arrived in France sometime in May 1418.[115] Clarence's return to England may have been to recruit reinforcements for his retinue. However, it is possible that troops were being raised in Clarence's name in England and that he himself did not return home at all. Gregory's chronicle records Clarence staying in France after the fall of Falaise. Clarence took part of the army with him on a campaign to subdue the valleys of the rivers Touques and Risle to the east of Falaise towards Rouen, and Gregory records that he 'gate many townys and castellys and stronge abbeys'.[116] On 21 March Clarence had also received a mandate from the king to pardon all rebels who wished to enter the king's allegiance before 3 April.[117] On 4 April he received a new mandate to receive all those who wished to swear allegiance to Henry V and to restore them to their property.[118] These commissions to Clarence would indicate that he remained in France after the fall of Falaise. Viceregal authority over the marches and frontiers of Auge towards Rouen had been conferred on Clarence on 24 February 1418,[119] and the campaign launched in the spring of 1418 was to prepare the way for the siege of Rouen, the capital of Normandy. On 6 March the town of Courtonne agreed to surrender to Clarence. John Cornewaille, Ralph Cromwell and William Bowes were commissioned by Clarence to receive the surrender of Courtonne in his name. The captain of Courtonne, Jean Bienfait, agreed to hand the castle over on 7 March. The captain, the garrison and all inside the castle agreed to

---

114 *R.N.*, pp. 308-12.

115 Allmand, *Henry V*, pp. 119-20.

116 'Gregory's chronicle', p. 121.

117 'Norman Rolls 6 Henry V, pt. 1' in appendix 1 to *The forty-first report of the deputy keeper of the public records*, p. 708.

118 ibid., p. 709.

119 *R.N.*, p. 254.

submit to the grace of the king of England. None of the goods or food which were inside the castle were to be taken away or destroyed by the garrison. None of the weapons of artillery in the castle were to be removed or destroyed. All of the English prisoners, or those holding to the English party, were to be handed over to those appointed to receive the surrender of the castle. One knight and five other 'gentilz homes' of the garrison were to be handed over as hostages until the castle was surrendered. Those who wished to enter the king's grace were to be allowed to maintain their possessions, while letters of safe-conduct were to be issued to those who wished to leave.[120] The reason why Clarence did not accept the surrender in person seems to have been because of the speed at which his campaign was progressing. Following the surrender of Courtonne the surrender of the town and castle of Chambrois followed two days later, and this cleared the valley of the Touques of French garrisons. The form of the agreement worked out between John Cornewaille, Ralph Cromwell and John Heron, acting for Clarence, and the garrison of Chambrois closely followed that of the surrender of Courtonne.[121] The fortress of Harcourt, in the valley of the Risle, also agreed to surrender on 9 March,[122] and two days later the garrison of the castle of Rivière de Thibouville agreed to surrender within two days.[123] At Harcourt Clarence was able to capture a vast amount of booty and, as at Caen, 'whatsoeuer golde, or ritches, silver, pretious stones, or rich apparrell, and all other things' which Clarence had taken in Harcourt were given to him by the king 'in recompense of his labours and manhoode'.[124] The speed with which all these places fell to Clarence shows the extent of the French unwillingness to engage in combat. The fall of Caen and Falaise seems to have demoralised the French garrisons and, with no sign of a royal army being raised to defend Normandy from the English, most of the towns and fortresses surrendered without putting up any kind of resistance. By 4 April all of Auge, Orbec and Pontaudemer had been captured. Only the abbey of Bec was left between the English army and Rouen. After sustaining a siege throughout April it too surrendered on 4 May.[125] On 16 July Clarence was

---

120 ibid., pp. 303-06.

121 Rymer, *Foedera*, ix, p. 552

122 P.R.O., C64/9 m. 29.

123 *R.N.*, pp. 292-4.

124 *The first English life*, p. 107.

125 P.R.O., C64/9 m. 26.

commissioned to receive the fealty of any of the inhabitants of Louviers and Pont de l'Arche, which was being besieged by the English, who wished to come into the obedience of Henry V.[126] Louviers had surrendered on 23 June and Pont de l'Arche on 20 July, thanks to a river crossing effected by Clarence.[127] A bridge of boats was then built across the Seine to ensure communications between the two parts of the army. The capture of these towns meant that the English now controlled the territory to the west and south of Rouen. With the fall of Pont de l'Arche the English had managed to secure a point at which to cross the Seine and would also be able to disrupt traffic on the river Seine between Paris and Rouen. It was at this time that Clarence was approached by pope Martin V, who wished to use Clarence to help arrange a peace settlement between England and France. The pope requested Clarence to do all that he could to help the papal legates which Martin was sending to France. This is a sign of the reputation which Clarence enjoyed among the international community.

By 26 September 1417 Clarence was already receiving grants of land in Normandy. On this date we find Thomas, earl of Salisbury being granted the lordship of Auvilliers, excepting the lordship of Auge, which had already been granted to the duke of Clarence.[128] On 27 February 1418 Clarence was granted the *vicomtés* of Orbec, Pontauton and Pontaudemer.[129] The fact that five months had passed between these grants is indicative of the fact that the king was unwilling to make grants of land on a large scale until the conquest was completed. As the legitimate duke of Normandy, Henry V was obliged to safeguard the rights of his subjects. Those who had fled in the face of the English invasion had to be enticed back to Normandy. It was only those men who absolutely refused to accept the position of Henry V whose lands were to be granted to Englishmen.[130] Clarence was one of the few men to be granted land in Normandy who was entitled to exercise high justice in his new property[131] and Henry V seems to have been anxious to hold this in his own hands as often as possible. This is connected to the status of men that Henry wanted to attract to settle in

---

126 P.R.O., C64/9 m. 17; 'Norman Rolls 6 Henry V', *41st. D.K.R.*, p. 695.

127 Newhall, *The English conquest of Normandy*, pp. 100, 104.

128 *R.N.*, p. 157.

129 ibid., pp 317-18.

130 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 200.

131 Wylie & Waugh, *Henry V*, iii, p. 74.

Normandy. Those from the smaller landholding classes seem to have been more attractive to the king as they would be more likely to establish permanent roots in France. The greater nobility would still be tied down by their responsibilities in England and would be reluctant to settle down full-time in France.

The siege of Rouen, the capital of Normandy, began at the end of July 1418. The capture of Rouen would greatly strengthen the hold of Henry V over Normandy. The city was the administrative and financial centre of the duchy, with its own mint. The city was also the seat of the archbishop whose province covered the six other sees in Normandy.[132] Rouen was under the command of the Burgundian captain Guy de Bouteiller and the population held out hopes that the duke of Burgundy would be able to raise an army and lift the English siege. Burgundy, however, had neither the men nor the money to march against the English and was still involved in fighting with the dauphin and the Armagnac lords.[133] The capture of the town of Caudebec by the earl of Warwick on 9 September opened the river Seine to English ships and this allowed Henry V to bring supplies and siege equipment directly up the river to Rouen. Clarence was lodged in the abbey of St. Gervase, before the Porte Causse. Beside Clarence was the earl of Ormond, who had served with Clarence during the expedition of 1412. In July 1418 Ormond's half-brother, Thomas Butler, prior of Kilmainham, had arrived in Normandy with a force of 200 horsemen and 300 foot. Butler had served as Clarence's deputy as lieutenant of Ireland between 1409 and 1413. Butler and his lightly armed and highly mobile Irish were given the job of protecting the flanks of the besieging army from French attack.[134] They attracted much unfavourable comment from contemporary chroniclers for their wild behaviour[135] and eventually Henry V was forced to write to Butler ordering his men to obey the ordinances laid down for the discipline of the army.[136] It was during the siege of Rouen that Henry, earl of Somerset, died. He was succeeded by his brother John, who was to arrive in France, along with his mother and other brothers, during

---

132 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 122.

133 Newhall, *The English conquest of Normandy*, p. 116.

134 *The Brut*, ii, p. 398, the author's impression of the Irish was that they were good warriors and proud men of arms.

135 Monstrelet, *Chroniques*, iii, pp. 284-5.

136 'Norman Rolls 6 Henry V', *41st. D.K.R.*, p. 720.

November 1419.[137]

The siege of Rouen was by far the most prolonged of the campaigns in Normandy to date. The plan of Henry V seems to have been to starve the city into submission and not to risk a frontal assault. It was not until January 1419 that the city decided to surrender. Rouen surrendered on 19 January and the duke of Exeter was the first to enter the city in order to take possession of the castle in the name of Henry V. The following day the king himself made his entrance into his new city.[138] After the fall of Rouen Henry V was now able to concentrate on eliminating the last centres of French resistance in Normandy. Almost immediately after the fall of the city Clarence received a commission from the king to receive the surrender of all castles and towns that wished to submit to Henry V.[139] On 18 February he was given the power to garrison all the castles which were to be surrendered.[140] On 22 January letters of safe-conduct had been issued to the lords of Torsy, Nesle and Suane coming to Clarence to surrender their castles,[141] and this secured Rouen to the north-east as far as Dieppe.[142] These submissions seem to have been voluntary and are further evidence as to the extent of the French collapse in Normandy, which Clarence had done much to effect.

By late-January Clarence was back in the field leading a force up the valley of the Seine. On 3 February he was able to secure the surrender of Gaillon and Vernon, while two days later the town of Mantes surrendered on Clarence's approach. On 23 February the garrison of Neaufle, south-east of Rouen and one of the outposts of Gisors, surrendered to Clarence.[143] This increasing military pressure seems to have convinced the French to negotiate and on 25 April 1419 Clarence was one of those appointed by Henry V to treat with Burgundian ambassadors concerning a truce. A meeting between the English representitives and the Burgundians

---

137 Woolgar, *Household accounts*, ii, p. 651; Ward, J.C., 'The English noblewoman and her family' in *'The fragility of her sex'?*, ed. Meek & Simms, p. 124.

138 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 126.

139 'Norman Rolls 6 Henry V', *41st D.K.R.*, p. 724.

140 ibid., p. 728.

141 ibid., p. 707.

142 Newhall, *The English conquest of Normandy*, p. 125.

143 Rymer, *Foedera*, ix, p. 696.

was set for 15 May, although this was later postponed until the end of the month. On 7 May Sir Walter Hungerford and Sir Gilbert Umfraville were appointed to negotiate for a marriage between Henry and Katherine, daughter of Charles VI. At the same time Hungerford and Lord FitzHugh were appointed to try and negotiate a final peace settlement between the two countries. The initial negotiations failed to produce any arrangement. The duke of Burgundy then failed to appear for the second round of talks which had been scheduled for early July. On 11 July Burgundy was reconciled to the dauphin and they began to make preparations for a joint campaign against the English. Henry V had no choice but to go back to war. On 29 July, after a daring night assault, an English force under Gaston de Foix and the earl of Huntingdon, managed to capture the town of Pontoise. The English were now within striking distance of Paris. Sometime before 10 August Clarence arrived at Saint-Denis-en-France and requested to be allowed to perform his devotions at the abbey there. His request was turned down because he had not secured the permission of the king of France to do so. Clarence left, saying he would return at a time when he would not have to ask for permission. On 10 August Clarence appeared before the walls of the city and got to within a few hundred yards of the porte Saint-Martin. Clarence and his men then spent the night in the villages around Saint-Denis[144] before withdrawing to Pontoise the following day.[145] On 17 August Clarence was appointed as captain of Pontoise with the power to receive homage from those who wished to swear fealty to the king.[146] Preparations seem to have been underway for military operations which would isolate Paris. However, political developments now combined with the military superiority of the English to help Henry V achieve his aims. On 10 September the duke of Burgundy was assassinated by supporters of the dauphin during a meeting to discuss joint action against Henry V. The opportunity now existed for the English king to claim not just Aquitaine and Normandy but all of the kingdom of France. On 27 September Henry announced to the French court that he would only be satisfied with the throne of France. With the new duke of Burgundy, Philip, unwilling to co-operate with the dauphin, Henry

---

144 Thompson, G., 'Monseigneur Saint Denis, his abbey, and his town under the English occupation, 1420-36', p. 15, in *Power, culture and religion in France*, ed. Allmand.

145 *Journal de Clement de Fauquembergue*, i, p. 312.

146 'Norman Rolls, 7 Hen. 5', *41st. D.K.R.*, p. 792.

V now seemed to be the dominant power, both politically and militarily, in France. However, the English were not yet strong enough to risk an assault on Paris. As Henry was under no military pressure from the French he was able to concentrate on Normandy. All English military activity was now confined to securing the frontiers of the duchy. The appearance of Clarence before the walls of Paris had demonstrated the English freedom of action due to their undoubted military superiority. Henry V could now look to diplomatic means of securing his goals. By the end of October agreement had been reached with Philip of Burgundy. On 24 December 1419 a general truce was proclaimed between the kingdoms of France and England. The final agreement was ratified on 20 May 1420 in the cathedral at Troyes. On 2 June Henry was married to Katherine of Valois. Under the terms of the treaty of Troyes Henry V was now recognised as the heir to the kingdom of France. The dauphin Charles was disinherited and Henry was to act as regent of France during the lifetime of his father-in-law. It seemed as if Henry had been able to achieve what the English monarchy had been striving for since king Edward III had first laid claim to the throne of France in the fourteenth century.

On 1 December 1420 Henry V and Charles VI, accompanied by Philip of Burgundy, Clarence and John, duke of Bedford entered Paris. The following day queen Isabelle of France, Katherine, the new queen of England, and Margaret Beaufort, duchess of Clarence, also entered the city. On December 27 Henry and Katherine left Paris for Rouen. From there they travelled to England, arriving at Dover on 2 February 1421. On his departure from Paris Henry had appointed Clarence as captain of the city, although it is possible that Clarence had held that post since July 1420.[147] His uncle, the duke of Exeter, was associated with him in governing Paris. At the same time the earl of Huntingdon was appointed as captain of Bois de Vincennes and the earl of Kent as captain of Melun.[148] On 10 January the duke of Exeter was given the command of the English garrisons in Paris during the absence of the duke of Clarence.[149] Eight days later the king

---

147 Thompson, G.L., *Paris and its people under English rule*, p. 90.

148 *A Parisian Journal*, p. 156., notes along with Clarence's appointment, the appointment of 'two other earls who did Paris very little good'.

149 'Norman Rolls, 8 Henry V, pt. 3' in appendix to *The forty-second report of the deputy keeper of the public records*, p. 407.

appointed Clarence as the commander of the English army in Normandy.[150] Clarence received no title to go with this appointment. In effect, he was being invested with the military authority of the king during his absence in England. Clarence was given the power to summon all the English in France and all of the population of the territory which had been conquered by Henry V and to use them in military operations against those who refused to accept the king as the heir to the French throne.

Early in the spring of 1421 Clarence led an expedition through Beauce as far south as the borders of the forest of Orléans. This expedition was undertaken at the request of the inhabitants of Chartres, but it had no real objective other than as a show of force and Clarence soon returned to Normandy. Later he mustered some 4,000 men at Bernay, in preparation for another expedition, this time through Anjou as far as the town of Angers. The French were soon aware of his plans and began to make arrangements to meet the English army in the field. In March 1421 Clarence began to move south. He crossed the river Huisne at Pont-de-Gennes and crossed the Loire at Luché, taking the surrenders of many garrisons along the way. Finding Angers more strongly defended than he had expected, and not being in a position to mount a long siege, Clarence withdrew to the village of Beaufort-en-Vallée. From here he sent out foraging parties to gather supplies from the local countryside. The English seem to have been unaware of the presence nearby of the dauphinist force, which planned to cut off the English line of retreat into Normandy. This force, consisting mainly of Scots under the command of the earls of Buchan and Wigtown, had stationed itself at the village of Baugé to the north of Clarence's base at Beaufort. On Saturday 21 March a party of Clarence's foragers captured some Scottish scouts. It seems that the Scots had planned to attack Clarence's force on the Monday, after having observed the Easter vigils at Baugé. On hearing news of the proximity of the Scottish army Clarence quickly gathered a small force in order to attack. The majority of his troops were still out gathering supplies and Clarence only seems to have been able to muster about 1,500 men. He left the earl of Salisbury at Beaufort in order to round up the rest of his men and to bring them up as support. Clarence had no archers with him except those of his own bodyguard and the bulk of his troops consisted of men-at-arms. On the ride to Baugé Clarence's force became scattered, which seriously lessened the impact of their initial charge against the Scottish.

---

150 P.R.O., C64/15 m. 17 dors.

Clarence and his cavalry arrived at Baugé on Easter Sunday. The journey to Baugé was carried out at a very rapid pace and this accounts for the lack of cohesion among the English troops. Scottish scouts managed to sound the alarm on the arrival of Clarence at Baugé, but the Scottish army does seem to have been taken by surprise. The earl of Buchan was able to send a small force of men, under Robert Stewart, to try and prevent the English crossing a bridge into Baugé. The bridge was very narrow and Clarence and his men were forced to dismount in order to fight their way across. This gave Buchan a chance to co-ordinate the rest of his troops. If Clarence had not been delayed in crossing the bridge his initial charge might have succeeded in scattering the Scots before they had had a chance to organise themselves. After fighting his way across the bridge Clarence was then forced to cross the Altrée, a smaller stream to the west. Here he was met by French troops under Jean de la Croix. They retreated in the face of the English advance and Clarence led his men up the slope of a hill in pursuit. The earl of Buchan and the rest of the Scottish army then appeared at the top of the hill and charged against the English. Clarence, wearing a golden coronet on his helmet, was easily identifiable and was one of the first to die on the English side. Nearly all of the 1,500 men with Clarence were either killed or captured. Those who died included Lords Roos and Tancarville as well as Sir Gilbert Umfraville. The earls of Huntingdon and Somerset, Lord FitzWalter and Thomas Beaufort, the earl of Somerset's brother, were all captured. Of those who accompanied Clarence to Baugé only two hundred managed to escape. These survivors managed to rejoin the rest of the English army being brought up to join the battle by the earl of Salisbury. They arrived at Baugé the following day and were able to disperse the Scottish troops left there. The bulk of the Scottish army had already left in order to seek out the English archers and to block their escape to Normandy. Clarence's body was recovered from the battlefield by his illegitimate son John, and was subsequently transported back to England for burial. Salisbury was able to elude the Scottish army and led the remnants of the English force back to Normandy via Le Mans. According to one source 'they raged into the suburbs of Le Mans, burning houses and slaughtering women and children, old men and young men, without mercy'. Adam of Usk recorded the great slaughter inflicted upon the English at Baugé, but that 'this slaughter the earl of Salisbury, who was appointed to ward the land

along with his comrades, has cruelly avenged with fire and sword, and is still avenging it'.[151] The English chronicles try to lessen the blow inflicted at Baugé by quoting the large numbers of French and Scottish dead, although the Scottish casualties do seem to have been very light. Henry V, on hearing news of his brother's death, immediately began preparations to return to France.

The idea put forward by Walter Bower, author of the *Scotichronicon*, that a date on which the battle would take place had already been arranged between Clarence and Buchan can be discounted. Bower claims that Clarence attacked the Scottish force in order to surprise them.[152] However, if Clarence was already aware of the location and size of the Scottish army it does not seem very likely that he would have gone to attack them without first waiting for his archers to regroup. That idea that the Franco-Scottish army was able to ambush Clarence can also be dismissed.[153] The confusion and surprise amongst the Scots which greeted the arrival of Clarence at Baugé is well documented. The fact that Clarence had allowed his cavalry to get strung out along the road from Beaufort to Baugé meant that the effect of this surprise was neutralised. The initial English charge was quickly broken by the Scots and when the remnants of Clarence's cavalry arrived they were easily swamped by the far larger Scottish force. The blame for the English disaster at Baugé can only lie with Clarence. His impetous behaviour and his overwhelming desire for glory resulted in the only English defeat of any significance in France during the reign of Henry V. The advice of men like Salisbury and Sir Gilbert Umfraville, who recommended that Clarence wait for the return of the English archers, was overruled. Clarence is even reported to have left his archers behind deliberately in order to increase the glory which would result from his victory.[154]

Soon after his death orders were issued for the resumption into the hands of the crown of Clarence's lands in Normandy. On 30 April 1421 the *baillis* of Rouen, Caux, Caen, Contentin, Gisors, Mantes, Evreux and Alençon were ordered to take into the king's hands the lands of

---

151 *The Chronicle of Adam of Usk*, p. 189.

152 Bower, *Scotichronicon*, viii, p. 119; *Parisian Journal*, p. 158, also states that a day on which the battle was to take place had already been decided.

153 *Parisian Journal*, p. 159.

154 *Chroniques du roi Charles VII*, p. 100.

Thomas, duke of Clarence, John, Lord Roos, John Grey of Heton and Gilbert Umfraville in their *bailliages*.[155] On 20 August 1421 the *vicomtés* of Orbec, Auge, Pont-Auton and Pontaudemer, which had all been held by Clarence, were taken into the king's hands.[156] Henry V also began to make preparations for the funeral of his brother. On 19 July Simon Prencost, a wax-chandler of London, was paid £85 for 'une herse' for the duke of Clarence, to be made in the cathedral at Canterbury.[157] The following day Hugh Spencer, captain of Lillebonne, and Peter Lound were ordered to arrest ships in order to transport the body of the duke of Clarence back to England. Margaret Beaufort, duchess of Clarence, and her family and servants were to accompany the body back to England.[158] Clarence had specifically asked to be buried in Canterbury, at the foot of his father's tomb.[159] Clarence was subsequently reburied in the cathedral at Canterbury with his wife and her first husband. Soon after the battle of Baugé it was suggested that Thomas Beaufort, son of Margaret, duchess of Clarence, captured in the battle, should be exchanged for the count of Angoulême, who was still a prisoner in England, and was now in the hands of the duchess.[160] A similar arrangement was again proposed in 1430,[161] but nothing seems to have come from either plan and Thomas Beaufort remained in French captivity.

The defeat inflicted on the English army at Baugé was certainly not militarily irreversible. What was more important was the fact that Clarence, due to his 'suicidal perversity', had shown that English armies were not invincible. Those who had accepted the Treaty of Troyes because there had seemed to be no alternative could now look to the dauphin as the saviour of France. In May 1421 the duke of Brittany renounced his alliance with the English and agreed to support the dauphin.[162] While Baugé can in no way be described as the beginning of the end of English power in France, combined with the death of Henry V the following year and the political in-

---

155 Rymer, *Foedera*, x, p. 95.

156 'Norman Rolls, 9 Henry V' in appendix to *The forty-second report of the deputy keeper of the public records*, p. 408.

157 Rymer, *Foedera*, x, p. 145.

158 ibid., p. 146.

159 Rymer, *Foedera*, ix, p. 462.

160 McLeod, E., *Charles of Orléans, prince and poet*, p. 156.

161 ibid., pp. 178-9.

162 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 162.

fighting which ensued in England for control of the minority council of Henry VI, it certainly marked the beginning of the revival of the fortunes of France. However, by June 1421 Henry V was back in France and the conquest continued. By 4 July Henry was at Paris and preparations began for a campaign against the garrisons loyal to the dauphin to the south of the city. Within a month Henry had managed to capture Dreaux and was able to advance through Chartres as far as the Loire.[163] At the beginning of October Henry began the siege of Meaux.[164] This siege was to last until the following May and seems to have done much to break the health of the king. On 31 August 1422 Henry V died, leaving a nine-month old son as his heir. With the costs of the war becoming increasingly unpopular in England and without a dynamic leader to guarantee spectacular military victories, the English war effort began to find itself bogged down. It was the death of Henry V that put an end to any hopes of a permanent English conquest in France. Neither John, duke of Bedford, nor Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, shared the imagination and ability which had fired their brother. However, Henry V did leave his son as king of England and France. Henry VI was crowned king of France in Paris in 1430, and this was due to the work which had been done by Henry V in securing his conquests. It is unlikely if he would have been able to achieve as much if it had not been for the help and support of his brother Clarence. Although Clarence's image has been tarnished by the manner of his death he seems to have played the single-most important role in the conquest of Normandy, after Henry V himself. In helping to secure France for Henry V Clarence also helped to secure the throne of England for Henry VI. The wars in France had made Henry V one of the most popular English monarchs of the middle ages and because of this no-one would dispute the title of the infant Henry VI to the throne of England.

---

163 ibid., p. 163.

164 ibid., p. 164.

Chapter 6: The lands of Thomas of Lancaster, duke of Clarence.

On his accession to the throne of England in 1399 Henry IV became the greatest royal landowner the country had seen since the reign of William the Conqueror.[1] However, by 1404 only his eldest son Henry, prince of Wales, had received lands and titles commensurate with his rank.[2] He had been created prince of Wales, duke of Cornwall and earl of Chester on 15 October 1399, two days after his father's coronation. The following day he was also created duke of Aquitaine and on 10 November he received the title of duke of Lancaster.[3] In the parliament of 1404 Henry IV claimed that his resources were exhausted and that he did not have the means to provide for other members of his family.[4] If the declaration of the new king was to be believed then the situation was similar to that which existed during the reign of Edward III. Edward III had also endowed his eldest son with the bulk of the property available to him, leaving little for the support of his younger sons.[5] Edward III was forced to rely on marriage to wealthy heiresses or on cash annuities in order to support the men he raised to the nobility during his reign,[6] and he followed the same policy in the endowment of his sons. Edward's second son Lionel of Antwerp was married to Elizabeth de Burgh, daughter of the earl of Ulster. This secured the extensive lands of the honour of Clare for Lionel, as well as the earldom of Ulster, which included vast amounts of territory in Ulster and Connacht. Lionel's title of duke of Clarence was derived from his possession of the Clare inheritance.[7] In 1359 Edward's third son John of Gaunt, father of Henry IV, was married to Blanche, one of the heiresses of Henry de Grosmont, duke of Lancaster. Lancaster's estates were worth in the region of £8,500 *per annum* and Gaunt could look forward to inheriting half of this

---

1 Wolffe, B.P., *The royal demesne in English history*, p. 76.

2 ibid., p. 77.

3 Allmand, *Henry V*, pp. 16-17.

4 Wolffe, *The royal demesne*, p. 77.

5 Waugh, S.L., *England in the reign of Edward III*, p. 123.

6 Ormrod, W.M., *The reign of Edward III*, p. 58.

7 Given-Wilson, *The English nobility*, p. 42.

through his marriage. In 1362 Blanche's sister Maud died and this meant that the entire Lancastrian inheritance came to Gaunt.[8] That same year both Lionel and Gaunt were created dukes, Lionel as duke of Clarence and Gaunt as duke of Lancaster. At the same time Edmund of Langley, Edward III's fourth son was created earl of Cambridge.[9] Langley was endowed with one third of the lands of John de Warenne, earl of Surrey.[10] This endowment was insufficient to support Langley and when he was created duke of York in 1385 he was also granted an annuity of £1,000 at the exchequer.[11] Edward III's youngest son, Thomas of Woodstock, had married Eleanor de Bohun in 1374. He had tried to commit his wife's sister to a nunnery in order to secure the entire inheritance for himself.[12] When Woodstock was created earl of Buckingham by Richard II in 1377, he was also awarded an annuity of £1,000.[13] Both Woodstock and Langley were compensated for their lack of endowment in 1377 when they were granted offices and property which had formerly been held by Lord Latimer and Richard Lyons, taken into the king's hands after their impeachment during the Good Parliament.[14]

Henry IV's claim that his financial resources were exhausted led to a demand from the commons in the parliament of 1404 for an act of resumption to be passed, covering all lands and annuities granted by the crown since 1366.[15] This demand was based on a belief that the reign of Edward III had been a period of great abundance and in the eyes of the commons this must have been because Edward III had far more substantial landed resources at his disposal.[16] The commons proposed to bring back into royal hands all of the crown lands which had been granted out by the crown since 1366. It was planned to put these lands at the disposal of the exchequer so that they provide a regular and substantial contribution to the royal income.[17] Henry IV was forced to come to terms with the demands of

---

8 ibid., p. 43.

9 Ormrod, *The reign of Edward III*, p. 116.

10 ibid., p. 58.

11 Given-Wilson, *The English nobility*, p. 44.

12 see above, p. 12.

13 Given-Wilson, *The English nobility*, p. 46.

14 Ormrod, *The reign of Edward III*, p. 119.

15 Wolffe, *The royal demesne*, p. 77.

16 Wolffe, 'Acts of resumption in Lancastrian parliaments, 1399-1456', p. 588.

17 ibid.

the commons. His financial situation was so bad that earlier in 1404 he had been forced to suspend the payment of annuities granted at the exchequer.[18] The king agreed in principal that an act of resumption was necessary, but he claimed that the information needed to implement the act was not available. He therefore proposed to set up a commission of inquiry to look into the extent of the crown lands in 1366.[19] In the meantime all those holding annuities, fees or wages from the crown were to surrender one year's income, covering the period from Easter 1404 until Easter 1405. This also applied to those holding lands from the crown. However, this was only to apply to annuities and lands which had been granted by Richard II and Henry IV himself.[20] All those holding crown lands were to bring their patents to the council for inspection. The amount of exemptions to this act granted by the king meant that in effect it achieved nothing.[21] In the parliament of 1406 when the king was once again seeking financial aid from the commons they renewed their demands for an act of resumption. This time they turned to the council for help. The council was to investigate the true value of all the crown lands not in the hands of the king. These lands could then be relet by the council at their true value. No further grants of crown lands were to be made until parliament met again.[22] Despite these measures the commons still refused to supply the king with money and a grant was only forthcoming after threats of violence from the king.[23] Some success had been achieved by the commons because Henry IV never again allowed the royal lands to become a source of controversy and between 1404 and 1437 there was very little alienation of royal lands outside the royal family.[24] Henry V was able to swamp any potential criticism of his financial management in the 'surge of patriotic fervour which followed his conquest of France'.[25]

It is then, no surprise to find that the king's younger sons survived on piecemeal grants made throughout their father's reign.

---

18 ibid., p. 589.

19 ibid.

20 ibid., p. 590.

21 ibid., pp. 590-1.

22 ibid., p. 592.

23 ibid.

24 Wolffe, *The royal demesne*, p. 87.

25 Wolffe, *The crown lands*, p. 25.

Henry IV was simply in no position to endow his sons with substantial grants of land. This was despite the fact that on several occasions in parliament the commons requested the king to do so. In 1404 Henry was asked to honour his sons Henry and Thomas suitably, the commons seeking the promotion of Thomas to the rank of duke, or duke and earl. The commons also requested the king to increase the landed possessions of John and Humphrey, as well as to reward Edward, duke of York, John Beaufort, earl of Somerset, and Somerset's brother Thomas.[26] The request that the king should promote his sons was ignored and in 1407 the commons again asked for an increase in the estates of the king's sons and that they should be preferred for advancement before all others.[27] Thomas was not created duke of Clarence and earl of Aumale until 1412, while John and Humphrey had to wait until the reign of their brother before receiving titles. Henry IV may have been reluctant to create titles for his sons without adequate landed resources to go with them for fear of the comparisons to those men advanced to the nobility by Richard II, the so-called *duketti*.[28] The complaints made by the commons to Henry IV concerning the lands and status of his sons are reminiscent of those made by the commons of the Good Parliament in 1376 when they complained that neither Edmund of Langley nor Thomas of Woodstock had been provided with lands or incomes appropriate to their princely status.[29] The fact that Henry IV used his sons in positions which, in theory at least, meant that they were in the receipt of substantial salaries may have been intended to act as a substitute for landed endowment. The marriage of Thomas of Lancaster to Margaret Beaufort, widow of John Beaufort, earl of Somerset, may have been an attempt to revive the policy of Edward III in providing for his sons through advantageous marriages.

The first grant of land to Thomas of Lancaster was made on 2 November 1399, less than a month after the coronation of his father as Henry IV. This grant consisted of the manor and lordship of Burstwick, the castle and manor of Skipsea and the patronage of Meaux (Melsa) abbey, all situated in the east riding of Yorkshire, along with the manor of Barrow and the patronage of Thornton abbey in Lincolnshire. Also included were

---

26 *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, iii, p. 547.

27 ibid., p. 612.

28 Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 176.

29 Ormrod, *The reign of Edward III*, p. 59.

all the manors, lands, rents, services, franchises, liberties and possessions in the towns of Preston, Burtonpidsea, Bondburstwick, Skeckling, Lelley Dyke, Paull, Keyingham, Skeffling, Easington, Kilnsea, Withernsea and Cleton.[30] All these towns were situated in Holderness wapentake in the east riding of Yorkshire and had been part of the Aumale fee, which had passed into the hands of the crown in the late thirteenth century. Throughout the fourteenth century these lands had been held either by members of the royal family or else by people high in the royal favour. These included Piers Gaveston, favourite of Edward II, Isabella, queen of Edward II, William de la Pole, one of Edward III's chief financiers, Edward III's daughter Isabella, Anne, queen of Richard II, Richard II's uncle Thomas, duke of Gloucester and Edward, earl of Rutland, who had held the lands up until 1399.[31] The pattern is continued with the grant of these lands to Thomas of Lancaster.

This list of the previous holders shows that the property in question was regarded by the crown as being of some importance as only those in especially favoured positions held these lands, and Holderness has been described as being the richest lordship in England.[32] Burstwick had also been the most important part of the chamber estate of Edward II. This was a reservation by the king of some fifty units of land to the king to be administered directly by the king's chamber. The chamber estate had been set up in 1322, but on Edward's deposition in 1327 Queen Isabella appropriated these lands for her own use. From 1333 on Edward III made some attempt at re-establishing the chamber estate but this was unsuccessful.[33]

The value of the manor of Burstwick and its associated villages at the end of the fourteenth century was at least £600 *per annum*. In 1395 we find Thomas, duke of Gloucester, being granted the manor to the value of £600 in order to support his rank of duke, the £600 to be deducted from a grant of £1,000 a year at the exchequer which Gloucester had been granted by Richard II for the same purpose.[34] What exact income Thomas of Lancaster was able to derive from Burstwick is uncertain. Although the

---

30 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 152.

31 *V.C.H., Yorkshire East Riding*, v, p. 10.

32 Pugh, *Henry V and the Southampton plot*, p. 91.

33 Wolffe, *The crown lands, 1451-1536*, p. 23.

34 *C.P.R., 1391-6*, pp. 575-6.

manor was crown property in 1399, it does not appear in Lancaster's inquisition *post mortem*, because in 1407 Lancaster received royal licence to enfeoff a group of notables with the manor of Burstwick. These included two of the king's half-brothers, Henry Beaufort, bishop of Winchester, and Sir Thomas Beaufort, as well as Sir John Stanley, steward of the king's household.[35] The reason for this transaction is unclear, and it is possible that it was in some way connected to Lancaster's debts. We know that he received Burstwick back at some point but he again let the property pass out of his hands, this time to a group of men closely connected to him. These included William Bowes, Ralph Cromwell, John Colville, and William Alyngton. They received the property some time after 1412. They demised Burstwick and its associated properties to six other men in February 1423, 'for the payment of the debts of the said late duke' [Clarence].[36] It is probable that the arrangement of 1407 was to serve a similar purpose. It is very unlikely that the value of Burstwick would have fallen between 1395 and 1399 and it is even possible that Lancaster may actually have been receiving more than £600 from his new property. In Gloucester's grant of 1395 the income he was to receive from Burstwick was specifically limited to £600 and there is no clear evidence to suggest that this was the total value of the manor. We know that Lancaster was still holding Burstwick at the time of his death in 1421 because in the inquisition *post mortem* of John, Lord de Roos, held in that year, we find de Roos holding a parcel of the manor of Rosse by knight service of the earl of Aumale, as of his manor of Burstwick.[37] Roos had died at the battle of Baugé with Lancaster, who was by then duke of Clarence. When Lancaster was created duke of Clarence in 1412 he was also created earl of Aumale, perhaps because he was already holding lands which had been part of the old Aumale fee. In August 1403 the collectors of the tenth and fifteenth in the east riding of Yorkshire currently being levied were ordered to pay £260 to Peter de Bukton, the steward of the manor of Burstwick, for the use of Thomas of Lancaster.[38] This would indicate that as early as 1403 Lancaster was in financial difficulties.

There is evidence to suggest that Clarence was closely

---

35 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 363.

36 *Catalogue of Ancient Deeds*, iv, no. A6967, p. 105.

37 *Inquisitions post mortem relating to Yorkshire*, p. 177.

38 *C.C.R., 1402-05*, p. 103.

connected to his lands in Yorkshire. On 14 January 1407, at Lancaster's request, the lands and possessions of the abbey in Holderness were exempt from the clerical tenths being levied in the archdiocese of York due to the fact that the lands had been flooded by the North Sea.[39] It was presumably Lancaster's possession of the manor of Burstwick that resulted in his appointment to various commissions of the peace in Yorkshire's east riding. Between March 1400 and November 1416 Lancaster was appointed to thirteen commissions in the east riding and one in the west riding.[40] However, in March 1413 he is recorded as being a member of a commission for the peace in the east riding when in fact he was in Aquitaine and had been since the previous summer. It is therefore uncertain whether Lancaster actually served on all of these commissions. An examination of the muster role for the retinue which Clarence brought to France in 1415 also indicates close links to his lands in the north.[41] One of Clarence's captains is Sir John Colvyle. It is possible that he is the same John Colville who was the grandson and heir of another John Colville who held lands in Yorkshire.[42] In 1412 letters of protection were issued to Sir John Colvyle in the retinue which Clarence brought with him to France in that year.[43] Colvyle was later appointed one of the executors of Clarence's will in 1417.[44] However, there are other names which can be linked more closely with the lands which Clarence held in Yorkshire. Also serving as one of Clarence's captains at the time was Sir John Godard. Godard was the nephew and one of the heirs of Peter de Mauley, who held the castle and manor of Bransholme and the advowson of the manor of Sutton of Clarence, of his manor of Burstwick.[45] Robert Sayntquntayn was serving in Clarence's retinue as one of his men-at-arms. The Seintquentyn family had long connections with Holderness holding land there from the mid-twelfth century.[46] As late as 1408 the heirs of Herbert de St. Quyntyn were holding

---

39 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 284.

40 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 566; *C.P.R., 1401-05*, p. 521; *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 499; *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 486; *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 426; *C.P.R., 1416-22*, p. 462.

41 P.R.O., E101/45/4.

42 *C.I.P.M., 1413-18*, no. 370, pp. 113-14.

43 Rymer, *Foedera*, viii, p. 752.

44 ibid., ix, 462.

45 *C.I.P.M., 1413-18*, no. 468, pp. 146-7.

46 *Early Yorkshire Families*, pp. 79-80.

land in Holderness,[47] and it is also possible that Robert Sayntquntayn was a relative of Anthony de Seynt Quintyn, who had served with Clarence in Ireland. However, this seems to be the only evidence to connect Clarence's retinue to his lands.

For the other men listed in the muster roll of 1415, a much more obvious reason exists for their presence in Clarence's retinue. Most of these men had already been retained by king Henry IV, and in some cases by John of Gaunt before him. It seems that Clarence's retinue consisted predominantly of men with backgounds of service to the House of Lancaster. Among others of Clarence's captains were Sir John Daubridgecourt and Sir Edward Burnell. Daubridgecourt had served in Ireland with Clarence, accompanying him on his second trip in 1408.[48] However, in the 1390's he was already being retained by both Gaunt and the future Henry IV.[49] Burnell was the son and heir of Lord Burnell, and he had been retained by Gaunt some time before 1397.[50]

Sir William Bowes, another captain, was in receipt of an annuity of £20 from Henry IV as early as 1400.[51] Bowes served with distinction throughout the French campaigns and was one of the men appointed by Clarence to receive the surrenders of Courtonne,[52] Harcourt and Bec Hellouin in Normandy.[53] William Cromwell, serving with seven men-at-arms and fourteen archers, was also in receipt of an annuity from Henry IV.[54] Ralph Cromwell also served in 1415 and was also appointed by Clarence to receive surrenders during later campaigns. Henry Noon, who had served in Ireland and was the brother of Edmund Noon, at one time the steward of Clarence's household, was paid forty marks by the king so he would not be retained by anyone else.[55] Two men who appear quite regularly in connection with Clarence are John Kyghley and his brother

---

47 *Inquisitions post mortem relating to Yorkshire*, p. 71.

48 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 456.

49 Walker, S., *The Lancastrian affinity*, p. 37.

50 ibid., pp. 203-04.

51 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 366.

52 *R.N.*, pp. 303-06.

53 P.R.O., C64/9 m. 29, 26.

54 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, 195.

55 *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 162.

Gilbert. Although neither served with Clarence in 1415, they both spent time in Ireland as well as serving on the expedition to France of 1412.[56] John Kyghley, the king's esquire, was being paid an annuity in 1399, and a W. Kyghley served with Bolingbroke in Lithuania in the 1390's. It is possible that they were in some way connected with the William Kyghley serving with Clarence in 1415. Even those with close connections to Holderness are not immune to the Lancastrian connection. John of Gaunt retained Sir Thomas Colvile of Yorkshire in the fourteenth century,[57] while Elizabeth, the daughter of Herbert de Seint Quentyn, was married to Sir John Marmion, one of Gaunt's closest advisors.[58] It seems clear that Clarence's retinue and affinity was only superficially based on his lands in Yorkshire. We know that in the 1390's John of Gaunt retained men already being employed by his son,[59] and it is possible that Henry IV was following a similar policy as regards Clarence.

After Burstwick, the next grant of lands to Thomas of Lancaster does not come for over a year. In January 1401 Thomas was granted the towns of Hackney in Middlesex and Leyton in Essex,[60] towns whose main economic function was to supply the city of London. These towns had previously been assigned to Thomas Arundel when he was bishop of Ely and chancellor of England. A grant of 1387 states that the towns were given to Arundel for the purpose of providing maintenance for the bishop whilst executing his office of chancellor because there were no lordships or towns belonging to his bishopric near the city of London.[61] This grant was renewed in 1389 after Arundel had been translated to the archbishopric of York. Again it was stated that this was because he had no lordships or towns near London and he needed lodgings for his household and horses.[62] This seems to have been the reason for the grant of these towns to Lancaster. In the petition to the king requesting this grant it was specified that none of the king's officers should be allowed to take supplies

---

56 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 392; Rymer, *Foedera*, viii, p. 752.

57 Walker, *The Lancastrian affinity*, p. 32.

58 ibid., p. 113.

59 ibid., p. 37.

60 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 403.

61 *C.P.R., 1385-89*, p. 282.

62 *C.P.R., 1388-92*, p. 30.

from the town.[63] The grant of Hackney and Leyton to Thomas of Lancaster in 1401, for the livery of himself and his household, was presumably due to the fact that the only lands held by Lancaster were in Yorkshire and Lincolnshire. It is not until October 1405 that any new grants were made to Lancaster. At this time Thomas was granted the keeping of all castles, manors, lands, rents and possessions in England and Ireland of James Butler, earl of Ormond, during the minority of the earl's son James.[64] These lands were in Lancaster's hands until August 1411.

In April 1406 Lancaster was granted an inn and eight shops in the parish of St. Mary Somerset in Queenhithe ward in the city of London to the value of £12 yearly.[65] The inn, called Northampton's Inn, and the houses had been the property of Thomas Mowbray, earl of Norfolk, who had been executed in 1405 for his part in the rebellion of Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland.[66] The actual financial value of this grant is not as important as the fact that Lancaster now had property within the city. The following month Lancaster was also granted £100 yearly from the issues of the manor of Petworth in the county of Sussex.[67] This is the last grant made to Lancaster until 1409, possibly due to his absence from the kingdom. In 1407 he was in France serving as the captain of the castle of Guines in the march of Calais and the following year he returned to Ireland to resume his duties as lieutenant of Ireland, where he stayed until early 1409. Lancaster seems to have remained in debt throughout the first half of his father's reign. On 20 December 1407 a group of Genoese merchants were given licence to ship wools, hides and wool-fells from the port of Southampton and to take the sum of £600 from the customs of Southampton. This was because Lancaster owed them £600 which he had borrowed to cover his expenses for Christmas. Lancaster surrendered tallies amounting to £600 and this sum was to be deducted from the money which he was owed by the king.[68]

---

63 P.R.O., SC8/230/12395.

64 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 88.

65 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 167.

66 The inn had been in Mowbray's possession since 1384, Robertson, D.W., *Chaucer's London*, p. 44, London, 1968.

67 ibid., p. 178.

68 ibid., pp. 385, 386.

In June 1409 Lancaster was given the custody of all the lands of William de Skipwyth during the minority of his son, not exceeding the value of 100 marks yearly along with the marriage of the son and heir.[69] The following August Lancaster requested and was given the custody of the lands of Richard Seymour during the minority of his daughter and heiress, Alice.[70] When the custody of these lands was transferred to John Norbury in July 1412, they were valued at £216. 16s. 8d. yearly.[71] In September 1410 Thomas of Lancaster received a grant of the custody of the castle and lordship of Portchester situated on the coast of Hampshire near Southampton.[72] This was the last grant made to Lancaster until 1412, possibly due to the control of the council by Henry, prince of Wales.

In February 1412 the king granted Lancaster the reversion of the castle and lordships of Hawarden and Mohaute, in the counties of Flint and Cheshire, to the value of 400 marks, which Elizabeth Montague, widow of the earl of Salisbury, then held.[73] Later that year Thomas was created duke of Clarence and earl of Aumale in preparation for his leading an English expedition to France. The creation of Lancaster as duke of Clarence is also reminiscent of the policies pursued by Edward III. Edward created Lionel as duke of Clarence and Gaunt duke of Lancaster primarily because they played important roles on the international stage.[74] The promotion of Clarence seems to have been arranged to give him equal status with his French allies. In July 1412, soon after their marriage, Thomas and his wife Margaret were granted the keeping of all castles and two thirds of all lordships, manors, lands, rents, annuities and possessions of John Beaufort in the king's hands, the other third being held by Margaret in dower, as well as the marriage of Henry, John Beaufort's son and heir.[75] As a duke of the royal blood, Thomas could naturally expect an increase in his property holdings. This was the last grant made to any of the king's three younger sons for the rest of his reign.

---

69 *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 92.

70 P.R.O., SC8/332/15731; *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 101.

71 *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 410.

72 ibid., p. 215.

73 *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 407.

74 Given-Wilson, *The English nobility*, p. 46.

75 *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 422.

In his grants to his three brothers Henry V showed himself to be aware of the shortcomings in the gifts made by his father. Almost immediately Henry V set about enhancing the honour and prestige of his brothers. In July of 1413 Thomas and his wife Margaret were awarded 2,000 marks *per annum* to be paid at the exchequer.[76] In October of that year they were granted a further annuity of 500 marks to be collected from the customs of the port of London.[77] This was part of the annuity which had been paid to John Beaufort, earl of Somerset, two-thirds of which had been awarded to Thomas and Margaret in 1412. Thomas and Margaret were also allowed to receive the annuity of £500 which John Beaufort had been awarded at the exchequer.[78] Henry V seems to have been less concerned with the idea of providing for his brothers with grants of land than through other means. Throughout Henry's reign very few outright grants of land were made to his brothers. Thomas received only four properties directly from his brother. The first of these seems to have been an extension to a grant which had actually been made to Thomas and Margaret by Henry IV in 1412. This was the grant of the castle, town and lordship of Hawarden in Cheshire, along with the castle, town and lordship of Mold and Mohautsdale in north Wales. The letters patent granting this property to Thomas had been surrendered by him as invalid and the new grant included Mold, which had not been mentioned in the original. When Thomas had been awarded the reversion of these properties in 1412, they had been valued at 400 marks yearly. In April 1415 the value had been extended to £400 *per annum*.[79] In May 1415 Thomas was also granted the castle, manor and lordship of Somerton in Lincolnshire, valued at £25, while in July he received the manor of Bukby in Northamptonshire.[80] In July 1417 Thomas asked for and was awarded a grant of the lands, rents, services and goods of Nicholas Stokes, who had been condemned as a traitor.[81] The only other grants made to Thomas before his death in 1421 were the custody of the lands of Roger Gyffard in 1415 and the keeping of the lands of Bertram Monbouchier in 1418 during the minorities of their

---

76 *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 94.

77 *C.C.R., 1413-19*, p. 34.

78 Devon, *Issues of the exchequer*, p. 342.

79 *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 306.

80 ibid., p. 327.

81 P.R.O., SC8/39/1934; *C.P.R., 1416-22*, p. 113.

heirs.[82] In July 1416, in answer to a petition from his brother, Henry V awarded the keeping of all the possessions in England and Wales which had belonged to Maurice Russell.[83]

The apparent lack of a substantial independent power base for Clarence is quite significant. Unlike his brother, the prince of Wales, Clarence never seems to have been able to build up an affinity of his own based upon his landed estates or to create a network of allies among the aristocracy. Perhaps the most obvious reason for this was the haphazard nature of grants of land to Clarence. For the first ten years of his father's reign the only substantial lordship to come into Clarence's possession was that of Burstwick. The grants to Clarence of Hackney and Leyton in 1401 and of Mowbray's property in London in 1406 seem to have been intended to provide him with the means to support himself when in London rather than to expand his landed resources in any real sense. This situation continued during the reign of Henry V and at this time Clarence's main source of income came from royal annuities rather than from his landed estates. For this reason alone Clarence was seemingly unable to build up an independent affinity of his own and continued to rely on long-standing Lancastrian and royal retainers to provide the bulk of his retinue. Another possible reason for Clarence's lack of an independent base is the political role which Clarence played in England. He seems to have been used by his father to reinforce the authority of the usurper dynasty in areas of possible threat, in Ireland and later in Aquitaine. In these cases the bulk of Clarence's retinue seems to have been provided by the king from among the ranks of royal knights and esquires. Henry IV regularly issued summonses to the royal retainers in order to provide him with military service and 'well over half of Henry's knights were regularly employed by the king in warfare of one sort or another'.[84] Clarence seems to have accepted this role and, being unable to recruit his own affinity, seems to have relied on the royal retainers provided by his father. These men seem to have remained in Clarence's service after the death of his father and continued to serve in Clarence's retinue well into the reign of Henry V.

After the death of Thomas in 1421 Henry V issued

---

82 *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 321; *C.P.R., 1416-22*, p. 101.

83 P.R.O., SC8/230/11461; *C.P.R., 1416-22*, p. 32.

84 Given-Wilson, C., *The Royal household and the king's affinity*, p. 234.

orders to the escheators in four counties to take into the king's hands all lands which had been held by Clarence in those counties of the king in chief. These orders were issued to the escheators of Yorkshire, Lincolnshire and Middlesex on 5 June 1421 and to the escheator in Shropshire, also covering the adjacent march of Wales, on 24 October.[85] Only three of the escheators seem to have returned their findings and there is no report in Clarence's inquisition from the escheator in Yorkshire.[86] The returns of the escheators indicate that Clarence held very little property of the king at the time of his death. The inquisition in Shropshire was held on 22 January 1422. The only lands which he held there were the castle, town and lordship of Monte Alto (Mold) and Mohautsdale with their members and appurtenances in north Wales and the marches. This property was held of the king by knight service and was valued at £75 10s. *per annum*. The bulk of this came from the farm of the bailiff, which was worth £56. The inquisition in Middlesex was held on 12 December 1421. All that Clarence held was an annuity of £40, granted to him on 9 July 1411. Of this Ralph Rochefort was to receive forty marks. Rochefort had previously held the manor of Somerton in Lincolnshire which had been granted to Clarence in 1415. Rochefort had previously been in receipt of an annual grant of £40 from the farm of the county of Lincoln provided that he maintain the upkeep of the castle at Somerton.[87] When Clarence was granted Somerton the king promised to pay Rochefort forty marks out of Clarence's annuity at the exchequer in compensation for Rochefort's surrender of the castle.[88] The castle, manor and lordship of Somerton were the only properties which the escheator in Lincolnshire reported Clarence as holding of the king. This was given an annual value of £34 4s. 4d.[89] Margaret Beaufort was allowed livery of a third part of the lordship of Somerton after the death of her husband, extended at £8 4s., as well as a third part of the lordship of Mold and Mohautsdale, with an annual value of £25 3s. 4d. Margaret was also to receive the sum of £448. 17s. and 9d. *per annum* at the exchequer.[90] In

---

85 *C.F.R., 1413-22*, pp. 378-9.

86 P.R.O., C 138/61.

87 *C.P.R., 1409-13*, p. 137; Rochefort had served in Henry IV's campaigns in Lithuania in the 1390's, Kirby, *Henry IV*, p. 35.

88 *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 327.

89 P.R.O., C 138/61.

90 *C.C.R., 1422-29*, p. 13.

February 1423 Margaret Beaufort and others were pardoned after paying a fine of 1,000 marks. This was due to the fact that the men to whom Lancaster had enfeoffed the lordship of Burstwick in 1407 had released the property back to him without royal licence and that Lancaster had subsequently granted Burstwick, also without royal licence, to a further ten knights and esquires.[91] Burstwick seems to have found its way back into Clarence's hands before his death and Margaret Beaufort seems to have been allowed to retain some of the property.[92] It seems that at the time of his death the bulk of Clarence's income came from his annuities. His annual income from all his lands seems to have been less than £300, while at the same time he was receiving three annuities, one of 2,000 marks and two of £500.[93]

Despite the size of his annuities Clarence was clearly in serious financial trouble when he died. In the will which he made in 1417 all the profits and revenues of his lands, the money which he was still owed by the French princes from 1412, the money, which he was owed by the king and any profits which might accrue from his custody of Henry, earl of Somerset, and Thomas, son and heir of Maurice Russell, were to be dedicated to the payment of his debts. After his debts had been paid, Margaret Beaufort was to enjoy the possession of his lands for the term of her life. If Clarence was to die without a male heir then his lands were to pass to Henry, earl of Somerset, and the heirs male of his body. Somerset was also to receive the profits and revenues of his lands two years before he came of age so he would be better able to maintain his estate. The executors of the will were also to distribute £2,000 among Clarence's servants and retainers.[94]

An examination of the grants of land made to Thomas' brothers John and Humphrey reveals a similar pattern of endowment existing for all of Henry IV's younger sons. In December 1399 we find John receiving the castle, lordship and town of St. Briavels in Gloucestershire along with the Forest of Dean.[95] In common with the manor of Burstwick,

---

91 *C.P.R., 1422-29*, pp. 59-60.

92 Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort*, p. 105.

93 ibid.

94 Rymer, Foedera, ix, p. 462.

95 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 159.

granted to Thomas, this was also property which had been held by Thomas, duke of Gloucester. At the time of the grant to Gloucester this property had been valued at £80 per year.[96] This initial grant does not compare to the £600 Thomas of Lancaster could expect from Burstwick, but in February 1400 we find John being granted the manor, town and lordship of Ware in Hertfordshire, valued at £120 yearly.[97] In March of the same year John was granted £60 from the farm which Constance, widow of Thomas, lord Despenser, was bound to render to the exchequer for the custody of lands during the minority of Despenser's heir.[98] In March of 1401 John received a grant of the manor of Swallowfield in Berkshire which had passed into the hands of the crown on the death of William de Arundel.[99] Swallowfield, like Burstwick, was another of the properties which had been in the hands of Edward III's daughter Isabella.[100] In the following three years John was to receive a further seven grants of lands with a combined total value of over £700, although one group of properties, worth in the region of £250 per year, had already been granted out by the king when it was granted to John and it is unsure what income John was able to derive from this property.[101]

John was also granted the reversion of the lands of Ivo fitz Waryn and the reversion of the lands held by Philippa, widow of Robert de Vere, Richard II's favourite.[102] The lands of Philippa were situated in the northern counties of Yorkshire, Lancashire and Westmoreland. The grant of this reversion was possibly made in order to ensure that John had some form of income to rely upon while serving as warden of the East March towards Scotland. This is also the probable reason for the grant to John in 1404 of the lands in Cumberland which had been forfeited by Henry Percy, son of the earl of Northumberland, after his rebellion in 1403.[103] These two grants are comparable to that made to Thomas of Lancaster in 1405 of the custody of the lands of the earl of Ormond. As warden of the East March John suffered from the same problems as Thomas did as lieutenant of

---

96 *C.P.R., 1388-92*, p. 406.

97 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 195.

98 ibid., p. 247.

99 ibid., p. 456.

100 Wolffe, *The royal demesne*, p. 243.

101 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, pp. 170, 226, 266, 333, 374, 387, 392.

102 ibid., pp. 226, 484.

103 ibid., p. 392.

Ireland in trying to ensure that the payment of his wages was kept up to date.

In 1405 John of Lancaster was granted all the lands of Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland 'within the realm' after Percy had fled England following his abortive rebellion in 1405.[104] Soon afterwards John was also granted the lands of Thomas, lord Bardolf, in Essex which were forfeit for his part in the rebellion of 1405.[105] Three years later, in January of 1408, 'in consideration of his having kept the castles at his own cost after the forfeiture of the earl of Northumberland' John was given the castle and constableship of the town of Jedburgh as well as the towns of Jedburgh, Bonjeward and Hassendean by the service of one goshawk yearly. This was accompanied by a grant of 500 marks from the customs of the town of Berwick-on-Tweed as well as the keeping of the castle at Berwick with a salary of 100 marks per year in time of peace, or £200 per year in times of war. John was to hold the grant from the customs until the king could provide land to the value of 500 marks.[106]

In 1410 the king granted to John all the lands and possessions of Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland, and his son Henry Percy in the king's hands.[107] When the Percy lands were restored to Henry Percy's son in 1415 John was awarded an annuity of 3,000 marks, to be paid until lands of an equivalent value became available.[108] This was the last grant of land to John during the reign of Henry IV, apart from the grant of a tower at Westminster to John 'for occupation by himself and his council'.[109]

In May 1414 John was created duke of Bedford and earl of Kendal with an annuity of £40 to maintain himself as duke and £20 to maintain himself as earl to be collected from the issues of the county of Bedford.[110] However, within six months John was also created earl of Richmond with a grant of the reversion of the castle, county, honour and

---

104 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 40.

105 ibid., p. 41.

106 ibid., p. 388.

107 *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 212.

108 *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 370.

109 *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 265.

110 *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 187.

lordship of Richmond to the value of £2,000 yearly with suitable compensation to be made to John if the value of this property fell short of that sum.[111] Apart from the reversion of the honour of Richmond the only other territorial grants made to John were the custody of the lands of Henry Vavasour in 1415, the custody of the lands of Brian de Stapulton in 1417, and the custody of the lands of Baldwin Straunge in 1419.[112]

In August 1404 John was awarded the fine of 200 marks due to the king on the escape of fourteen convicted clerks from the prison of the bishop of London.[113] John was also given the fine due on the escape of John Rose, William fitz Robert and Henry Corby from the gaol of Okeham castle in 1410.[114] The 100 mark fine paid by Ivo de Wells for pardon of his part in the Percy rebellion of 1405 also passed to John.[115] In 1404 John was one of the three keepers appointed for the priory of Okebourne, rendering nothing for its custody during John's lifetime.[116]

The initial grant of land to Humphrey of Lancaster, although still substantially less than that made to his brother Thomas, was in excess of that made to John. In December 1399 Humphrey was granted the manors of Cookham and Bray, in Berkshire, and the manor of Milltown and the hundreds of Milltown and Merden in the county of Kent.[117] These manors had been valued at £60, £70 and £133 6s. 8d. per year respectively in 1385.[118] However, probably because Humphrey was only eight years old at the time of his father's accession to the throne, we find no new grants to Humphrey until 1401 when he received the manor of Dartington in the county of Devon, valued at £100 yearly.[119] This had been forfeit by John, earl of Huntingdon, for his part in the attempted rebellion of the previous year. In 1402 Humphrey received the reversion of the manor of Hadleigh in Essex, then held by Edward, earl of Rutland, and the grant of three other

---

111 ibid., p. 259.

112 *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 359; *C.P.R., 1416-22*, pp. 331, 181.

113 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, p. 409.

114 *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 211.

115 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 99.

116 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, p. 466.

117 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 143.

118 *C.P.R., 1381-85*, p. 126.

119 *C.P.R., 1399-1401*, p. 439.

manors in Essex for which he was to render £60 yearly at the exchequer.[120] These three manors in Essex were subsequently taken from Humphrey and given back to Rutland, now duke of York, because his father had previously been granted the reversion of the manors and he had a claim that took precedence over that of Humphrey.[121] In 1403 Humphrey received the manor of Wratting in Suffolk to the value of 20 marks as well as the rent of £120 which Walter Hungerford paid to the exchequer for the manor of Marlborough, along with the reversion of the said manor.[122] The following year he was given the town of Islington for the lodging of his men, servants and horses while he was at Westminster.[123] Later this year Humphrey received the grant of the castle of Colchester, the hundred of Tendring and the fee-farm of the town of Colchester.[124]

These were the last direct grants to Humphrey during the reign of Henry IV. However, Humphrey was granted the reversion of the manor of Holywell in Lincolnshire in 1406.[125] He was also awarded the custody of the lands of William Beaumont during the minority of William's son, Thomas, in 1406 although the custody of these lands was transferred to John Cornwall in 1410.[126] In 1409 Humphrey was awarded the custody of the lands which had been held by Bernard Myssenden during the minority of Bernard's heir.[127] In January 1410 he was also granted the reversion of the manor and forest of Feckenham and in March of that year he was granted the keeping of the forest and park of Clarendon and the forests of Grovele, Melchet and Bukholt which had come into the hands of the king on the death of John Beaufort, earl of Somerset.[128]

In 1410 Humphrey was appointed keeper of the alien priory of Tykeford, along with Thomas Langley, bishop of Durham, who

---

120 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, pp. 121,160.

121 *C.P.R., 1408-13*, pp. 150-1.

122 *C.P.R., 1401-05*, pp. 256, 320.

123 ibid., p. 373.

124 ibid., p. 468.

125 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 191.

126 ibid., p. 268; *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 166.

127 *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 102.

128 ibid., pp. 164, 170.

had been appointed keeper of Okebourne with John in 1404.[129] Humphrey also received a grant of 2,000 marks in 1407 in order to help pay the 5,000 marks which he was to pay for the reversion of the lands of Matthew Gourney.[130] Two years previously Humphrey had been pardoned the £60 which he was to render at the exchequer for the possession of three manors in Essex.[131] In December 1408 he received all the goods of John Young to the value of £70 on account of Young's suicide.[132]

In November 1413 Humphrey was awarded two annuities of 500 marks each, one to be paid by the exchequer and the other to be paid from the issues of the principality of Wales and the issues of the duchy of Cornwall. These were to be paid until lands to the value of 1,000 marks became available.[133] In May of the following year Humphrey was created duke of Gloucester and earl of Pembroke.[134] In November 1415 Humphrey was created constable of Dover castle and warden of the Cinque Ports. These offices carried with them a salary of £300.[135] These new grants do not seem to have really improved Humphrey's financial situation. In July 1418 Humphrey was licensed to enfeoff Thomas, bishop of Durham, and six other men with all the property which he held of the king. The arrangement was to last until this group had raised the money for which Humphrey was then indebted to them from their custody of these properties.[136]

Humphrey seems to have been the only one of Henry's brothers who received substantial endowments of land during this reign. In 1413 he received a grant of the lordships of Pembroke, Tenbeigh and Kilgaren in Wales.[137] In December 1414 he received the lands which had been held by Joan Wydecombe in Gloucestershire to the value of forty

---

129 ibid., p. 303.

130 *C.P.R., 1405-08*, p. 297.

131 ibid., p. 105.

132 *C.P.R., 1408-13*, p. 40.

133 *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 146.

134 ibid., p. 187.

135 ibid., p. 374.

136 *C.P.R., 1416-22*, p. 129.

137 *C.P.R., 1413-16*, p. 170.

marks.[138] In December 1415 Humphrey was awarded the reversion of the lordship of the Isle of Wight and the castle of Carisbrooke.[139] In the same month Humphrey received a grant of the manor of Bristol in Gloucestershire.[140] The following year he was awarded the lordship of Lanstephen in Wales in the king's hands due to the forfeiture of Henry Gwyn, who was killed at the battle of Agincourt fighting on the French side.[141] As we have seen Humphrey was not able to profit from these grants due to the huge scale of his debts.

John and Thomas Beaufort, although sons of John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, received remarkably little land from their father. As Gaunt's only legitimate son almost all of the Lancastrian inheritance passed to Henry IV. John Beaufort received only nine manors from his father, along with £1,000 in cash.[142] These manors were in Somerset and had been bought by John of Gaunt from the earl of Salisbury. They had an annual income in the region of £300 and this is probably where John derived his title of earl of Somerset.[143] John also held eleven manors by a grant of Richard II from 1397 onwards.[144] John Beaufort seems to have suffered from the same afflictions as his nephews in that there was never enough land available. The principal grants of lands to John Beaufort were in Wales. In 1400 he was granted the lands forfeit by Owain Glyndwr in north and south Wales to the value of 300 marks yearly.[145] The following year more forfeit land in Wales was granted to Beaufort, although he was to take no more than 200 marks *per annum* from these lands, any surplus going to the exchequer.[146] It is extremely unlikely however, that Beaufort would have been able to enjoy much revenue from these lands, situated as they were in areas ravaged by warfare. Beaufort's main source of income was from an annuity of £1,000 *per annum* at the exchequer, which was granted to him and his direct heirs in 1404. This annuity was to be paid

---

138 ibid., p. 274.

139 ibid., p. 387.

140 ibid., p. 397.

141 ibid., p. 395.

142 Elder, A.J., 'A study of the Beauforts and their estates, 1399-1450', pp. 57-8.

143 Given-Wilson, *The English nobility*, p. 51.

144 Elder, 'A study of the Beauforts', p. 75.

145 ibid., p. 59.

146 ibid., p. 60.

until lands of an equivalent value became available.[147] Henry IV also used his brothers as members of the aristocracy whom he could trust. In 1400 Beaufort was appointed as constable of the castle of Wallingford, a position which carried a wage of £40 yearly.[148] John also served as captain of Calais from 1401 until his death in 1410 for which he would have received a substantial wage, Calais being one of the largest permanent garrisons maintained by late medieval kings. Although it is likely that John Beaufort had as much trouble as anyone else in collecting wages and annuities during the reign of Henry IV, it seems that the bulk of John's income came from royal sources and that his landed possessions were of lesser importance.

Thomas Beaufort seems to have relied on the king's generosity even more so than his brother. The manors he inherited from his father were valued at no more than £17 yearly.[149] Subsequent grants made by Henry IV brought Thomas Beaufort lands valued at £66 per year, and Henry also renewed the annuity of 100 marks *per annum* which Richard II had granted to Thomas to stay with him as king's knight.[150] In 1402 Thomas was awarded the custody of the lands of Baldwin de Friville during the minority of his heir. This was valued at 120 marks yearly and was still held by Thomas in 1410.[151] Thomas Beaufort was granted the town of Stratford Langthorne in Essex in order to provide lodging for himself, his men, servants and horses when in London.[152] This was when Thomas was serving as chancellor of England, a position he held for two years and for which he received a wage of 800 marks *per annum*.[153] It was not until 1416 and his promotion to duke of Exeter that Thomas received substantial rewards. In that year Henry V granted Thomas £1,000 per year at the exchequer in order to maintain himself as duke, until lands to that value became available.[154] This generosity towards his uncle shows that Henry V clearly felt that members of the royal family should be adequately provided

---

147 ibid., p. 61.

148 ibid.

149 ibid., p. 69.

150 ibid., p. 71.

151 ibid., p. 73.

152 ibid., p. 76.

153 ibid.

154 ibid., p. 72.

for. It also shows that even more so than the king's brothers Thomas Beaufort relied on grants at the exchequer to maintain himself. It was not until the middle of the fifteenth century that the Beaufort family began to accumulate landed wealth and at this stage they were still very much dependent on the favour of the crown.[155]

Henry V was obviously aware of the frustrations which his brothers suffered due to their lack of endowment. He needed the support of his brothers to govern England during his absences from the kingdom, and to help command his armies in France. All three of Henry V's brothers, as well as his uncle Thomas Beaufort, played key roles in his French campaigns. This meant that, due to the almost continual presence in France of two of Henry's brothers throughout his reign, lands were to play a role of secondary importance in the attempts of Henry V to provide for his family. In his first parliament Henry enacted legislation which reduced the amount of annuities being paid by the crown. This legislation, combined with the lands which he reunited with the crown on his accession allowed Henry V an increase in revenue of roughly £10,000 *per annum* over that enjoyed by his father.[156] This was used to create new annuities in order to provide for his brothers. The huge amounts of taxation granted to Henry after his initial successes in France also meant that the payment of his brothers' annuities took place more regularly than had been the case during the reign of Henry IV. This contrast between the two reigns does not show that Henry IV was excessively mean in providing for his sons, but merely that he was incapable of providing for them adequately. Henry V, in a better financial position than his father, was therefore able to provide for his brothers in the manner which Henry IV would have hoped to do. Henry V realised that the only way to provide for the royal family was through wages and annuities for the basic reason that adequate landed resources were not available.

---

155 Given-Wilson, *The English nobility*, p. 52.

156 Allmand, *Henry V*, p. 387.

Conclusion.

Born in 1388, by the time of his premature death in 1421, Thomas of Lancaster, second duke of Clarence had had a career of service to the crown which spanned twenty years. During the course of those years Clarence served in Ireland, Wales, Aquitaine and Normandy, as well as commanding a fleet in the English Channel during the summer of 1405. When Clarence was born there can have been little expectation that he would have a significant role to play on a national, let alone an international scale. His father, Henry Bolingbroke, was active in the politics of the reign of Richard II, but only really achieving prominence during the absences from the kingdom of his own father, John of Gaunt. While his father lived, Bolingbroke could not hope to wield any significant power in England. Even for the son of the greatest magnate in the country and a cousin of the king there was no clearly defined role in society. The great Lancastrian inheritance had not yet passed to Bolingbroke, and his eldest son Henry would inherit it on his death. It was Bolingbroke's ill-fated intervention in the English political arena that led to his exile in 1398 and to the dramatic change in the role which Clarence was destined to play in English society. Bolingbroke's return from exile in 1399 and his seizure of the throne resulted in Clarence being elevated from the second son of a great magnate to being second in the line of succession to the throne.

As a prince of the royal blood Clarence now had a clearly defined role to play in society. He was a tool to be used by his father in securing the hold of the new dynasty on the throne of England. In the government of the kingdom his role was far more important than that which had been played by his father during the previous reign. No matter what should happen in the course of his father's reign Clarence would always have to be near the centre of events. The attempts made to depose Henry IV would have meant the end for his family and Clarence's life was in danger on more than one occasion. In 1401 he was sent to Ireland holding the position of lieutenant there. The activities of Clarence in Ireland have always been greatly neglected. Although admittedly acting under the influence of his council, Clarence managed to secure the borders of the English lordship within six months of his arrival in Ireland. The submissions taken from the O'Connor Faly, the O'Byrnes, the O'Reillys and the MacMahons meant that the most

vulnerable points of the lordship had been secured. Clarence's presence in the lordship with an English army meant that the administration there was in a position to deal forcefully with the Gaelic Irish lordships that had been raiding the frontiers of the colony. Their submissions to Clarence meant that the lordship went from being under threat to being in a position to expand its influence beyond the four loyal shires. Even in areas where Clarence could have had no realistic ambitions of exercising practical authority, those outside the law were brought back into the king's allegiance. The authority of the Dublin administration was being expanded into areas that had long since fallen out of its control. At a time when overtures were being made to Irish chiefs by Owain Glyndwr the presence of a member of the royal family in Ireland was essential.

The collapse of the settlements effected by Clarence within a year of his return to England can be interpreted as a sign of their essentially transient nature. However, if the money had been forthcoming from England to maintain Clarence's army then surely these settlements would not have collapsed so suddenly. The blame for this can not be laid with Clarence but only with the financial crisis being experienced by his father. Ireland, as it soon became clear, was no threat to the new dynasty but Glyndwr's rebellion in Wales certainly was, and from 1402 onwards the Welsh, in alliance with Edmund Mortimer, were espousing the rights of the earl of March to the throne. With the Percy rebellion of 1403, which also had links to Glyndwr, the presence of Clarence in Ireland was irrelevant. However, his time in Ireland had shown what could be achieved to stabilise the situation if only the money was available. The demand for English troops and money to be sent to Ireland would continue throughout the fifteenth century. While Henry IV may have had good intentions towards Ireland it soon became clear that the lordship was regarded as being of marginal importance. Even the far more serious problem of stamping out the rebellion of Glyndwr in Wales was hampered by the new king's insolvency. With there being little chance of improving the situation in Ireland, Clarence was allowed to return home after spending only two years there. Yet despite this apparent failure in Ireland the policies practised by him there soon became the norm. Sir John Talbot, Lord Furnival, was also able to exploit the divisions amongst the Gaelic Irish to great effect. His vigorous campaigning in Ireland was extremely successful and the Gaelic Irish who submitted to him were promptly enlisted to serve him in the next campaign and his involvement in Gaelic Irish politics seems to have taken its cue from

Clarence. The combination of political activity and military intervention worked, it was just the finances that had let Clarence down.

Clarence's forte was in the military field. His expedition to Wales in 1404 in the company of his brother Henry gave Clarence his first taste of siege warfare. Although Clarence's preference was for the bold frontal attack, the expedition to Wales taught him lessons that he was to use during the later Norman campaigns of the reign of his brother. Again, the raid which Clarence led on Normandy in 1405 can be viewed as a rehearsal for the invasion and conquest of Normandy planned by Henry V, and many valuable lessons were learnt from it. This raid was important in a broader context as well. In England it showed that Henry IV was making a serious effort to prevent the raids of the French on the south coast of England, while at the same time it sent a message to the French princes that Henry IV was able to, and willing to, intervene in France. It was a policy that the English king was to follow towards the end of his reign when civil war broke out in France. For Clarence this raid was important in that it brought him international recognition for the first time. As the raid was a success it can only have boosted Clarence's prestige and reputation in England.

Clarence returned to Ireland in the summer of 1408, but he was to spend less than nine months there before being recalled due to the serious illness afflicting his father. It was due to the ill-health of Henry IV that the prince of Wales was able to seize control of the royal council between 1410 and 1411, and in effect of the royal government. This greatly diminished the role which Clarence had played in the affairs of state and embittered the relationship between him and his brother. Until his father was able to re-assert his authority Clarence had no official role to play. The prince even suggested removing his brother from his position as lieutenant of Ireland and creating a pension for him in order to remove him from the royal household. However, Henry IV regained control of the government in late-1411, and his reassertion of his authority paved the way for the finest moment of Clarence's career to date.

The expedition to France in 1412 turned Clarence into a figure of stature. His dealings with the French princes show that he refused to be intimidated, particularly evident in his extracting a high price from the French before withdrawing to Aquitaine. His army intact, Clarence was now in a position to do what he had gone to France for, restoring English royal

authority in Guienne. The respect which Clarence earned in 1412 can be gauged from the proposed alliance to James of Urgel and by the treaty of friendship which he sealed with Bernard, count of Armagnac and Charles d'Albret. The support of Clarence was seen as a valuable commodity. The events of 1412 had also shown the essential disunity of France, and this too was to be put to good effect during the reign of Henry V. The expedition to France went ahead despite the feud in the royal family. However, a reconciliation was effected between the king and the prince of Wales during the autumn of 1412, after Clarence had already left for France. It was the absence of Clarence from the kingdom at this time that was responsible for the lingering doubts which the prince seems to have harboured about his brother after his accession to the throne as Henry V.

Clarence soon had the opportunity to prove his loyalty in the eyes of his brother. The Lollard rising of 1414 was directed, not just at the new king, but at the members of his family as well. Clarence was involved in the suppression of the Lollard rising as well as of the Southampton Plot of the following year. Neither of these conspiracies had much chance of success but the role of Clarence in the events of 1414-15 can only have reassured the new king about the loyalty of his brother.

It was this renewed confidence in Clarence that led to him playing such an active role in the wars in France. Henry V had already recognised the expertise which Clarence could bring to his French campaigns. Clarence had led raids on the coast of France in 1405 and most recently had commanded the successful expedition there in 1412. Clarence was one of those invited to a meal at which Henry V discussed his plans for the forthcoming invasion of France. He missed the Agincourt campaign after being invalided home after the siege of Harfleur but he served continuously in France between 1417 and his death in 1421. It was his absence from Agincourt that was ultimately responsible for his death as in his quest for a military victory that would compare to Agincourt he took risks that were unnecessary. However, the manner of his death cannot detract from the ability and talent for military leadership which he showed in the campaigns up to 1421. The seizure of the suburbs of Caen in 1417 guaranteed a successful outcome to the English siege. The bravery which he displayed during the actual assault on the town was recognised by his brother and all the booty from Caen was given to Clarence. He then proceeded to distribute it amongst his men and Clarence certainly seems to have enjoyed the respect of his troops. During the spring of 1418 a

string of fortresses surrendered to Clarence and he was also active at the siege of Rouen in 1418. The reputation of Clarence grew immensely during these years and, along with Thomas Beaufort, duke of Exeter, he was the chief military commander of Henry V in France. The trust and confidence which the king placed in Clarence can be seen in his appointment as one of those negotiating a final peace settlement with France in 1419. It is most unlikely that the king would have appointed Clarence his military commander in Normandy in 1421 if he had harboured any doubts about the ability of his brother. There was no reason to expect that Clarence's final campaign would end in the disaster at Baugé. His competence as a military commander had been proved many times at this stage of the war. While the responsibility for the defeat at Baugé can only lie with Clarence we must remember that the English had yet to lose a battle in France and that Clarence's career had thrived on the taking of risks. His exploits at Caen and his march to Paris in 1419 clearly demonstrate this. We know that Clarence was unaware of the presence of the Scottish force at Baugé. We also know that the Scottish were definitely planning to attack Clarence on his return to Normandy. Might it not be the case that the information which Clarence received as to the size and disposition of the Scottish force from his prisoners was false, perhaps deliberately so, and that Clarence did not feel the need to wait for his archers to regroup?

The time is right for a re-assessment of the role of Clarence in the events of the first two decades of the fifteenth century. Clarence was by no means the negligible character that he has since become. While his brothers survived the reign of Henry V to play active parts in the government of England under their nephew, Henry VI, neither the duke of Bedford nor the duke of Gloucester display the flair for campaigning which is evident in Clarence. The caution of Bedford in France gave the dauphin the opportunity to regroup and counter-attack, while the bizarre entanglement of Gloucester in the Low Countries in the early 1420's did much to damage the Anglo-Burgundian alliance, which was the lynch-pin of English success in France. Gloucester's status as the elder statesman of England in the 1440's appears to have come about by default as much as through any real talent or ability of his own. The role of Clarence in defending the new dynasty under his father and his brother has been far too often overlooked. His achievements in Ireland are often dismissed due to their collapse soon afterwards, but that was not the fault of Clarence. The political uncertainty of the early part of the reign of Henry IV meant that Ireland was not a priority of the English government and once this became obvious there was little point to Clarence's presence there.

The expedition of 1412 showed what Clarence could achieve and this fact was recognised by Henry V. Perhaps more respect should be shown to the judgements of Henry V, as he obviously felt that Clarence was suited to holding high office and his confidence in his brother was absolute. If, as Waurin wrote, Clarence was the man in whom Henry V had most confidence in for the successful completion of the wars in France, then surely his neglect by modern scholars has been totally unwarranted and that his contribution to ensuring the consolidation of the Lancastrian dynasty has been, for far too long, unjustly underestimated.

Appendix: John, the bastard of Clarence.

Although Thomas, duke of Clarence, had no children by his marriage to Margaret Beaufort he did father one illegitimate son, John, commonly known as the bastard of Clarence. The name of John's mother is unknown, as is the date and whereabouts of his birth. Evidence is lacking for his early years but he was old enough to serve with his father during the French campaigns of the reign of Henry V. No mention of John is made in the muster roll of the retinue which the duke of Clarence brought to France for the campaign of 1415.[1] However, it is known that he was with his father at the battle of Baugé in 1421. A grant of July 1428 from king Henry VI to 'John, the bastard of Clarence, the king's knight, and his near kinsman' cites the rescue by John of 'the corpse of the earl [sic] of Clarence' after the battle of Baugé.[2] It is possible that John was knighted by Clarence before the battle,[3] although it is also recorded that John had already been knighted by his father during his ride to Paris during August 1420.[4] This knighting ceremony is mentioned as having taken place during the reign of Henry VI, the month of August is specifically mentioned, and Clarence certainly spent time outside Paris in early August 1420.

John continued to serve in France after the death of his father. In 1429 John, duke of Bedford, his uncle, who was acting as regent in France, sent John of Clarence to besiege the castle of Torsy, in the Caux region of Normandy, which had initially surrendered to the duke of Clarence ten years earlier. John of Clarence was able to secure the surrender of this castle after a siege which lasted six months. The reason for the French occupation of the castle seems to have been the result of members of the garrison changing allegiance, not an uncommon phenomenon at this stage of the war. This was because in May of 1429 the English had been forced to raise the siege of Orleans, an event which inspired fresh confidence amongst the supporters of

---

1 P.R.O., E404/45/4.

2 *C.P.R., 1422-29*, p. 489.

3 Wylie & Waugh, *Henry V*, iii, p. 300.

4 William Worcestre, *Itineraries*, p. 361.

the dauphin. This also resulted in many of those who had accepted the English occupation of Normandy declaring their allegiance to the dauphin after his coronation as Charles VII in July 1429.

The Caux region also seems to have been one of the most volatile areas of the English conquests in France, probably due to its border position, and in 1435 this area erupted in full scale rebellion. Part of the terms of the surrender of the castle of Torsy in 1429 was that some of the more notable French defenders were to be allowed to leave the castle, taking part of their goods with them. However, others, 'to the number of twelve or thirteen, who had formerly held the party of the English, and had even assisted the French to conquer the said fortress' were to remain behind at the mercy of the besieging force. These men were subsequently executed by John of Clarence before the castle was destroyed.[5]

In November 1429 John of Clarence indented to serve in France for a further six month period with a retinue of fifty men-at-arms and seven hundred archers, quite a sizeable force to be under the command of a knight.[6] Two days later Clarence, described as 'our dear and loyal knight John Bastard of Clarence' seems to have been granted £100 by king Henry VI as a reward for his services in France.[7] This gift to Clarence may also have been intended to help alleviate what appears to have been his chronic shortage of money. The grant to Clarence of July 1428 mentioned above gave him the manors of Esker, Newcastle of Lyons, Crumlin and Tassagard (Saggart), the four royal manors in the county of Dublin. However, these manors had already been granted to others by James Butler, earl of Ormond, when he was justiciar of Ireland in 1426 and 1427. The manor of Crumlin had been granted to James Cornewalsh in December 1426 for a period of eight years, while the manors of Esker, Newcastle and Tassagard had been granted to Richard Fitz Eustas in July 1427, also for a period of eight years. In 1429, in return for surrendering the letters patent awarding him the manors, John of Clarence was granted £80 a year from the issues of the manors of Esker, Newcastle and Tassagard and £20 a year from the manor of Crumlin. Clarence was also awarded custody of these manors on the completion of the terms of Fitz Eustas and Cornewalsh.[8] However, these

---

5 Jean de Waurin, *Chronicles and ancient histories*, iii, p. 212.

6 P.R.O., E404/46/146; *C.P.R., 1429-36*, p. 41.

7 P.R.O., E404/46/151.

8 *C.P.R., 1422-29*, p. 453.

manors were situated in the southern part of county Dublin which was subjected to frequent raids by the Irish living in the Wicklow mountains. As a result, manorial revenues would often be severely depleted and John seems to have had some difficulty in collecting the money due to him. This area suffered greatly during the fourteenth century from the raids of the O'Tooles and the O'Byrnes. It has also been noted that 'during the fifteenth century the royal manors were greatly neglected, and at the beginning of the sixteenth century the king's lands were stated to be of all the others the worst and most wasted'.[9] In 1431 John was forced to seek relief from king Henry VI due to his poor estate. John claimed that he had little to maintain himself except £118 *per annum* which he received from the king. But this money came from 'the parties of Irland of the wiche he is often and many tymes ilpaied'. Therefore he requested the king to send him to France, or elsewhere, in order to serve the king in whatever capacity that the king saw fit.[10] Although the exact date of this letter is uncertain, in July 1431, perhaps in response to his request, we find Clarence being appointed as constable of Dublin castle, with all the fees and profits relating to that office. Clarence was not obliged to serve in person and it was stated that he was entitled to discharge his duties by deputy. This appointment was made even though Clarence was entitled to £100 a year from the royal manors.[11] It is uncertain whether John of Clarence ever took up residence in Ireland, and it is likely that he remained in France. In 1430 he was granted the property and possessions of Jacques Perdriel in Paris.[12]

The grant of lands and offices to John of Clarence may indicate that he was of Irish origins and given the fact that his father was lieutenant of Ireland this is quite possible. The fact that John was knighted in either 1420 or 1421, and that he seems to have been playing an active role in the campaigns of his father would indicate that he was born during or soon after his father's first trip to Ireland, between 1401-03. Although Clarence was only fifteen when he left Ireland in 1403, it is worth remembering that the first child of Clarence's own father, Henry IV, was born in 1382, when Henry was sixteen and his wife Mary was twelve. After 1431 John of Clarence disappears from view and nothing is known of his subsequent life and career.

---

9 Ball, F. Elrington, *History of the County of Dublin*, iii, p. 113.

10 P.R.O., SC 8/96/4753.

11 *C.P.R., 1429-36*, p. 122.

12 Thompson, *Paris and its people under English rule*, p. 143.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

MANUSCRIPT SOURCES:

Public Record Office, London:

C 47, Chancery, Miscellanea

C 64, Norman Rolls.

C 76, Chancery, Treaty Rolls.

C 81, Chancery, Warrants for the Great Seal.

C 138, Chancery, Inquisitions Post Mortem, Henry V.

E 101, Exchequer, King's Remembrancer, Accounts Various.

E 159, Memoranda Rolls, King's Remembrancer.

E 358, Memoranda Rolls, Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer.

E 401, Exchequer of Receipt, Receipt Rolls.

E 403, Exchequer of Receipt, Issue Rolls.

E 404, Exchequer of Receipt, Warrants for Issues.

SC 8, Ancient Petitions.

British Library:

Cotton Vespasian

Cotton Titus B

National Library of Ireland:

Collectanea de rebus Hibernicus, complied by Walter Harris, iv, c. 1370-1538.

PRINTED SOURCES:

Annála Connacht: the Annals of Connacht, A. D. 1224-1544, ed. A.M. Freeman, Dublin, 1944.

Annála Uladh: Annals of Ulster: a chronicle of Irish affairs, 431 to 1541, ed. W.M. Hennessy and B. MacCarthy, Dublin, 4 vols., 1887-91.

'Annales Ricardi Secundi et Henrici Quarti', J. de Trokelowe et Henrici de Blandforde, *Chronica et Annales*, ed. H.T. Riley, R.S., London, 1866.

The annals of Clonmacnoise, ed. D. Murphy, R.S.A.I., 1896.

Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters, ed. J. O'Donovan, 7 vols., Dublin, 1848-51, repr. Dublin, 1990.

The annals of Loch Cé: a chronicle of Irish affairs, 1014-1590, ed. W.M. Hennessy, 2 vols., R.S., London, 1871.

Bower, Walter, *Scotichronicon*, viii, ed. D.E.R. Watt, Aberdeen, 1987.
Brut, or the chronicles of England, ed. F.W.D. Brie, E.E.T.S., London, 1908.

Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts preserved in the Archiepiscopal library at Lambeth, 1515-74, ed. J.S. Brewer & W. Bullen, P.R.O., London, 1867-73,
Calendar of charter rolls, 1341-1417, London, 1916.
Calendar of close rolls, 1272-1509, 47 vols., London, 1892-1963.
Calendar of fine Rolls, 1272-1509, 22 vols., London, 1911-62.
Calendar of Inquisitions post mortem and other analogous documents, London, 1904-.
Calendar of Ormond deeds, 6 vols., ed. E. Curtis, I.M.C., Dublin, 1922-43,
Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal letters, London, 1893- .
Calendar of patent rolls, 1232-1509, 53 vols., London, 1891-1971.
Calendar of signet letters of Henry IV and Henry V, ed. J.L. Kirby, London, 1978.
Capgrave, John, *Chronicle of England*, ed. F.C. Hingeston, R.S., London, 1858.
The book of the illustrious Henries, ed. and trans. F.C. Hingeston, R.S., London, 1858.
Catalogue of ancient deeds, iv, London, 1902.
Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London, ed. J.G. Nichols, C.S., London, 1851.
Chronicles of London, ed. C.L. Kingsford, Oxford, 1905.
The Chronicle of Adam of Usk, ed. and trans. E.M. Thompson, London, 1904, repr., 1990.
Chronique d'Antonio Morosini. Extraits relatifs à l'histoire de France, ed. G. Lefèvre-Pontalis & L. Dorez, S.H.F., Paris, 1899.
Chronique de Jean le Févre, ed. F. Morand, 2 vols., S.H.F., Paris, 1876-81.
Chronique d'Enguerran de Monstrelet, ed. L. Douet d'Arcq, S.H.F., 1859-62.
Chroniques de Perceval de Cagny, ed. H. Moranvillé, S.H.F., Paris, 1902.
Chroniques de roi Charles VII par Gilles le Bouvier, dit le Heraut Berry, ed. H. Courteault, L. Celier & M. -H. Jullien de Pommerol, S.H.F., Paris, 1979.

Ducatus Lancastriae Calendarium Inquisitionum post mortem, vol. 1, London, 1823.

The Earl of Derby's Expeditions in the years 1390-1 and 1392-3, ed. L.T. Smith, C.S., 1894.

Early Yorkshire families, ed. Sir C. Clay & D.E. Greenway, Yorkshire Archaelogical Society, 135 (1973).

English chronicle of the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V, and Henry VI, written before the year 1471, ed. J.S. Davies, C.S., London, 1856.

First English life of king Henry the Fifth, ed. C.L. Kingsford, Oxford, 1911.

Froissart, Jean, *Chronicles*, ed. & trans. G. Brereton, 2nd. ed. London, 1979.

Gesta Henrici Quinti. The deeds of Henry the Fifth, ed. and trans. F. Taylor & J.S. Roskell, Oxford, 1975.

Grace, Jacobus, *Annales Hiberniae*, ed. and trans. R. Butler, Dublin, 1842.

Great chronicle of London, ed. and trans. A.H. Thomas & I.D. Thornley, London, 1938.

Hayward, John, *The life and raigne of king Henrie IIII*, ed. J.J. Manning, C.S., London, 1992.

Henry of Marlborough, 'Chronicle of Ireland', trans. J. Ware, in *Ancient Irish Histories*, Dublin, 1809.

Historical collections of a citizen of London in the fifteenth century, ed. J. Gairdner, C.S., London, 1876.

Holinshed's Irish chronicle, ed. L. Miller & E. Power, Dublin, 1979.

Inquisitions post mortem relating to Yorkshire of the reigns of Henry IV and Henry V, ed. W.P. Baildon & J.W. Clay, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 59 (1918).

Issues of the Exchequer from king Henry III to king Henry VI, ed. F. Devon, London, 1837.

Journal de Clement de Fauquembergue, greffier du Parlement de Paris, 1417-35, ed. A. Tuetey, S.H.F., Paris, 1903-15.

Letters and papers illustrative of the wars of the English in France during the reign of Henry the Sixth king of England, ed. J. Stevenson, R.S., London, 1864.
The Libelle of Englyshe polycye, ed. Sir G. Warner, Oxford, 1926.
Livio, Tito, *Vita Henrici Quinti regis Angliae*, ed. T. Hearne, Oxford, 1716.

Memoires de Pierre de Fenin, ed. Mlle. Dupont, S.H.F., Paris, 1837.
Memorials of Henry the fifth, king of England, ed. C.A. Cole, R.S., London, 1858.
Miscellaneous Irish annals, (A. D. 1114-1437), ed. S. Ó hInnse, Dublin, 1947.

Original letters illustrative of English history, ed. H. Ellis, 1st series, i, London, 1825, 2nd series, London, 1827.

Parisian Journal, 1405-49, ed. and trans. J. Shirley, Oxford, 1968.
Proceedings and ordinances of the Privy Council of England, ed. N.H. Nicholas, London, 1834.

Register of bishop Philip Repingdon, 1405-19, ed. M. Archer, Lincoln Record Society, 57 (1963).
Register of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1414-43, ed. E.F. Jacob, C.&Y.S., 4 vols., 42, 45-7 (1938-47).
Register of Robert Hallum, bishop of Salisbury, 1407-17, ed. J.M. Horn, C.&Y.S., 72 (1982).
Reports of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, 41, London, 1880; 42, London, 1881.
H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles, ed., *Parliaments and Councils of Medieval Ireland*, I.M.C., Dublin, 1947.
Rotuli Normanniae, ed. Sir T.D. Hardy, London, 1835.
Rymer, Thomas, *Foedera, conventiones, literae, et cujuscunque generis acta publica*, London, 1816-69.
A roll of the proceedings of the king's council in Ireland, 1392-3, ed. J. Graves, R.S., London, 1877.
Rotuli Parliamentorum, London, 1767-77.
Rotulorum Patentium et Clausorum Cancellarie Hibernie Calendarium, ed. E. Tresham, Irish Record Commission, 1828.

Royal and historical letters during the reign of Henry the Fourth, ed. F.C. Hingeston, R.S., 2 vols., London, 1860-65.

St. Albans chronicle, 1406-20, ed. V.H. Galbraith, Oxford, 1937.
Statutes and ordinances, and acts of the parliament of Ireland, king John to Henry V, ed. H.F. Berry, Dublin, 1907.
Stow, John, *A survey of London*, ed. C.L. Kingsford, London, 1908, reprinted 1971.

Walsingham, Thomas, *Historia Anglicana*, ed. H.T. Riley, R.S., London, 1864.
Waurin, Jean de, *Chronicles and ancient histories of Great Britain, now called England*, 3 vols., ed. W. Hardy & E.L.C.P. Hardy, R.S., London, 1887-91.
Woolgar, C.M., ed., *Household accounts from medieval England*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1992-3.

REFERENCE WORKS:

Allison, K.J., *A History of the county of York, East Riding*, vol. 5, Oxford, 1964.

Baker, J. H. *Manual of Law French*. 2nd. ed., Aldershot, 1990.

Cheney, C.R., *Handbook of dates for students of English history*, London, 1978.
Colker, M., *Trinity College Library Dublin: Descriptive catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts*, 2 vols., Aldershot, 1991.

The Dictionary of National Biography, eds. Sir L. Stephen & Sir S. Lee, repr. Oxford, 1959-60.

Graves, E.B., *A Bibliography of English history to 1485*, Oxford, 1975.
Guth, D.J., *Late-medieval England, 1377-1485*, Cambridge, 1976.

Handbook of British Chronolgy, 3rd edition, ed. E.B. Fryde, D.E. Greenway, S. Porter and I. Roy, London, 1986.

Hardy, Sir T.D., *Descriptive catalogue of materials relating to the history of Great Britain and Ireland to the end of the reign of Henry VII*, 3 vols., R.S., London, 1862-71.

Latham, R.E., *Revised Medieval Latin word-list from British and Irish sources*. Reprint, London, 1980.

Lists and Indexes 14, List of the records of the Duchy of Lancaster preserved in the Public Record Office, London, 1901.

Lists and Indexes, supplementary series, 5, pt. 1, Duchy of Lancaster supplementary list of records, London, 1964.

Lists and Indexes, supplementary series, 5, pt. 2, Duchy of Lancaster, descriptive list of royal charters, London, 1964.

Lists and Indexes, supplementary series, 5, pt. 3, Duchy of Lancaster, descripitive list of cartae miscellaneae, London, 1964.

Page, W., ed., *A History of the county of Sussex*, vol. 2, London, 1907.

Strayer, J.R., ed., *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*. 13 vols., New York, 1982–9.

SECONDARY WORKS:

Allmand, C.T., 'The Lancastrian land settlement in Normandy, 1417-50', *Econ.H.R.*, 21, 1968.

Lancastrian Normandy, 1415-1450. The history of a medieval occupation, Oxford, 1983.

'Henry V the soldier and the war in France', in *Henry V. The practice of kingship*, ed. G.L. Harriss, Oxford, 1985.

The Hundred Years War: England and France at War, c.1300-c.1450, Cambridge, 1988.

(ed.) *Power, culture and religion in France*, Woodbridge, 1989.

Henry V, London, 1992.

Altamira, R., 'Spain, 1412-1516', in *Cambridge Medieval History*, viii, Cambridge, 1936.

Armstrong, C.A.J., 'Inauguration ceremonies of the Yorkist kings and their title to the throne', *T.R.H.S.*, 4th. series, 30 (1948).

Aston, M., *Thomas Arundel. A study of church life in the reign of Richard*

II, Oxford, 1967.

Ball, F. Elrington, *The Judges in Ireland*, 2 vols., London, 1926.

Bean, J.M.W., *The estates of the Percy family*, 1958.

'Henry IV and the Percies', *History*, 44 (1959).

Brown, A.L., 'The Commons and the council in the reign of Henry IV', *E.H.R.*, 79 (1964).

'The king's councillors in fifteenth-century England', *T.R.H.S.*, 5th. series, 19 (1969).

'The reign of Henry IV', in *Fifteenth Century England*, ed. S.B. Chrimes, C.D. Ross and R.A. Griffiths, Manchester, 1972.

Butt, R., *A history of parliament: the middle ages*, London, 1989.

Clarke, M.V., *Medieval representation and consent. A study of early parliaments in England and Ireland, with special reference to the 'Modus Tenendi Parliamentum'*, London, 1936.

Clayton, D.J., Davies, R.G. and McNiven, P., ed.,*Trade, devotion and governance*, Stroud, 1994.

Connolly, P., 'The Financing of English Expeditions to Ireland, 1361-76', in *England and Ireland in the later middle ages*, ed. J.F. Lydon, Dublin, 1981.

Cosgrove, A. (ed.), *Medieval Ireland, 1169-1534: A New History of Ireland*, ii, Oxford, 1987.

Crowder, C.M.D., 'Henry V, Sigismund, and the Council of Constance, a re-examination', *Historical Studies*, ed. G.A. Hayes-McCoy, 4 (1963).

Curry, A.E., 'The first English standing army? Military organisation in Lancastrian Normandy, 1420-1450', in *Patronage, pedigree and power in later medieval England*, ed. C. Ross, Gloucester, 1979.

The Hundred Years War, London, 1993.

Curtis, E., *A history of medieval Ireland*, London, 1938.

Davies, R.R., 'Lordship or colony?' in *The English in medieval Ireland*, ed. J.F. Lydon, Dublin, 1984.

The Age of Conquest, Wales 1063-1415, Oxford, 1991.

The Revolt of Owain Glyn Dwr, Oxford, 1995.

Ferguson, J., *English diplomacy, 1422-1461*, Oxford, 1972.

Ford, C.J., 'Piracy or policy: the crisis in the Channel, 1400-03, *T.R.H.S.*, 5th. series, 29 (1979).

Fowler, K., *The Age of Plantagenet and Valois. The struggle for supremacy, 1328-1498*, 1967.

(ed.), *The Hundred Years War*, London, 1971.

Frame, R., *The English lordship of Ireland, 1318-61*, Oxford, 1982.

'War and peace in the medieval lordship of Ireland', in *The English in medieval Ireland*, ed. J.F. Lydon, Dublin, 1984.

'The Defence of the English Lordship, 1250-1450', in *A Military History of Ireland*, ed. T. Bartlett & K. Jeffery, Cambridge, 1996.

Gilbert, Sir J. T., *History of the Viceroys of Ireland*, Dublin, 1865.

Gillingham, J., 'Crisis or continuity? The structure of royal authority in England, 1369-1422', in *Das spätmittelalterliche königtum im Europäischen vergleich*, ed. R. Scheinder, 1987.

Given-Wilson, C., *The royal household and the king's affinity. Service, politics and finance in England, 1360-1413*, London, 1986.

The English nobility in the late Middle Ages. The fifteenth century political community, 1987.

'Richard II, Edward II, and the Lancastrian inheritance', *E.H.R.*, 109 (1994).

Goodman, A., *John of Gaunt. The exercise of princely power in fourteenth century Europe*, London, 1992.

Gransden, A., *Historical writing in England, ii: c. 1307 to the early sixteenth century*, London, 1982.

Griffith, M.C., 'The Talbot-Ormond Struggle for Control of the Anglo-Irish Government, 1414-47', *I.H.S.*, II (1941).

Griffiths, W.R.M., 'Prince Henry and Wales, 1400-1408', in *Profit, piety and the professions in later medieval England*, ed. M. A. Hicks, Gloucester, 1990.

Harcourt, L.W. Vernon, *His Grace the Steward and trial of peers*, London, 1907.

Harriss, G.L., (ed.),*Henry V. The practice of kingship*, Oxford, 1985.

Cardinal Beaufort. A study of Lancastrian ascendancy and decline, Oxford, 1988.

Heath, P., *Church and realm, 1272-1461*, London, 1988.

Jacob, E.F., *Henry V and the invasion of France*, London, 1947.
The Fifteenth Century, 1399-1485, Oxford, 1961.
Johnston, D., 'The interim years: Richard II and Ireland, 1395-99', in *England and Ireland in the later Middle Ages*, ed. J.F. Lydon, Dublin, 1981.
'Chief governors and treasurers of Ireland in the reign of Richard II', in *Colony and frontier in Medieval Ireland*, ed. T. Barry, R. Frame and K. Simms, London, 1995.

Keen, M., *The laws of war in the late Middle Ages*, London, 1965.
England in the Later Middle Ages, London, 1973.
Kirby, J.L., 'Councils and councillors of Henry IV, 1399-1413', *T.R.H.S.*, 5th. series, 14 (1964).
Henry IV of England, London, 1970.

Labarge, M.W., *Henry V. The cautious conqueror*, London, 1975.
Gascony, England's first colony, 1204-1453, London, 1980.
Lapsley, G.T., 'The parliamentary title of Henry IV', *E.H.R.*, 49 (1934).
'Richard II's last parliament', *E.H.R.*, 53 (1938).
Lehoux, F., *Jean de France, duc de Berri. Sa vie. Son action politique, 1340-1416*, 4 vols., Paris, 1968.
Lydon, J.F., 'Richard II's Expeditions to Ireland', *J.R.S.A.I.*, 93 (1963).
'William of Windsor and the Irish Parliament', *E.H.R.*, 80 (1965).
The Lordship of Ireland in the Middle Ages, Dublin, 1972.
Ireland in the later Middle Ages, Dublin, 1973.
(ed.) *England and Ireland in the later Middle Ages*, Dublin, 1981.
(ed.) *The English in medieval Ireland*, Dublin, 1984.

McFarlane, K.B., *Lancastrian Kings and Lollard Knights*, Oxford, 1972.
The Nobility of Later Medieval England, Oxford, 1973.
England in the fifteenth century, London, 1981.
McKenna, J.W., 'The myth of parliamentary sovereignity in late-medieval England', *E.H.R.*, 94 (1979).
McLeod, E., *Charles of Orléans, prince and poet*, London, 1969.
McNiven, P., 'Prince Henry and the political crisis of 1412', *History*, 65 (1980).

'Legitimacy and consent: Henry IV and the Lancastrian title, 1399-1406', *Medieval Studies*, 44 (1982).

'The problem of Henry IV's health, 1405-1413', *E.H.R.*, 100 (1985).

Heresy and politics in the reign of Henry IV. The burning of John Badby, Woodbridge, 1987.

Maddicott, J.R., *Thomas of Lancaster, 1307-22: a study in the reign of Edward II*, Oxford, 1970.

Massey, R.A., 'The land settlement in Lancastrian Normandy', in *Property and politics: essays in later medieval English history*, ed. A.J. Pollard, Gloucester, 1984.

Matthew, E., 'The Financing of the Lordship of Ireland under Henry V and Henry VI', in *Property and Politics: essays in later medieval English history*, ed. A.J. Pollard, Gloucester, 1984.

Milner, J.D., 'The English enterprise in France, 1412-13', in *Trade, devotion and governance*, ed. D.J. Clayton, R.G. Davies and P. McNiven, Stroud, 1994.

Morgan, P., 'Henry IV and the shadow of Richard II', in *Crown, government and people in the fifteenth century*, ed. R.E. Archer, Stroud, 1995.

Neville, C.J., 'Keeping the peace on the northern marches in the later middle ages', *E.H.R.*, 109 (1994).

Newhall, R.A., 'The war finances of Henry V and the duke of Bedford', *E.H.R.*, 36 (1921).

The English conquest of Normandy, 1416-1424. A study in fifteenth century warfare, Yale, 1924.

Nicolas, Sir H., *History of the battle of Agincourt*, London, 1832 (repr. 1970).

Nicholls, K., *Gaelic and Gaelicised Ireland in the Middle Ages*, Dublin, 1972.

Orme, N., *From childhood to chivalry. The education of the English king's and aristocracy, 1066-1530*, London, 1984.

Ormrod, W.M., *The Reign of Edward III: crown and political society in England, 1327-77*, London, 1990.

Otway-Ruthven, A.J., 'The Chief Governors of Mediaeval Ireland', *J.R.S.A.I.*, 95 (1965).

A History of Medieval Ireland, 2nd ed., Dublin, 1980.

Parker, C., 'The O'Reillys of east Breifne', *Breifne*, 8 (1991).

Perroy, E., *The Hundred Years War*, London, 1951.
Power, E., and Postan, M.M. ed., *Studies in English trade in the fifteenth century*, London, 1933.
T. B. Pugh, 'The Southampton Plot of 1415', in *Kings and nobles in the later Middle Ages*, ed. R.A. Griffiths & J. Sherborne, Gloucester, 1986.
Henry V and the Southampton plot of 1415, Southampton Record Series, 30 (1988).

Richardson, H.G., and Sayles, G.O., *The Irish Parliament in the Middle Ages*, Philadelphia, 1952.
Richmond, C.F., 'The keeping of the seas during the Hundred Years War: 1422-1440', *History*, 49 (1964).
'English naval power in the fifteenth century', *History*, 52 (1967).
Robertson, D.W., *Chaucer's London*, London, 1968.
Rogers, A., 'Henry IV, the commons and taxation', *Medieval Studies*, 31 (1969).
Rowe, B.J.H., 'Discipline in the Norman garrison under the duke of Bedford', *E.H.R.*, 46 (1931).

Simms, K., "'The King's friend': O Neill, the crown and the earldom of Ulster", in *England and Ireland in the later middle ages*, ed. J.F. Lydon, Dublin, 1981.
From Kings to Warlords: The Changing Political Structure of Gaelic Ireland in the Later Middle Ages, Woodbridge, 1987.

Thompson, G.L., 'Monseigneur Saint Denis, his abbey, and his town, under the English occupation, 1420-36', in *Power, culture and religion in France*, ed. C. Allmand, Woodbridge, 1989.
Paris and its people under English rule. The Anglo-Burgundian regime, 1420-36, Oxford, 1991.
Tout, T.F., *Chapters in the administrative history of Medieval England*, 6 vols., Manchester, 1920-33.
Tuck, A., *Richard II and the English Nobility*, London, 1973.
Crown and Nobility, 1272-1461, London, 1985.
'Henry IV and Europe: a dynasty's search for recognition', in *The McFarlane legacy. Studies in late Medieval politics and society*, ed. R. H.

Britnell & A. J. Pollard, , 1995.

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.
Vaughan, R., *John the Fearless*, London, 1966.
Philip the Good, London, 1970.
Vickers, K.H., *Humphrey, duke of Gloucester*, London, 1907.

Walker, S., *The Lancastrian affinity, 1361-99*, Oxford, 1990.
Ward, J.C., 'The English noblewoman and her family in the later Middle Ages', in *'The fragility of her sex'?*, ed. C.E. Meek & K. Simms, Dublin, 1996.
Waugh, S.L., *England in the reign of Edward III*, Cambridge, 1991.
Wilkinson, B., 'The deposition of Richard II and the accession of Henry IV', *E.H.R.*, 54 (1939).
Williams, E.C., *My Lord of Bedford, 1389-1435*, London, 1963.
Wolffe, B.P., 'Acts of resumption in the Lancastrian parliaments, 1399-1456', *E.H.R.*,73 (1958).
The crown lands, 1451-1536, London, 1970.
The Royal demesne in English history, London, 1971.
Wood, H., 'The office of chief governor of Ireland, 1172-1509', *P.R.I.A.*, 36 (1923).
Wylie, J.H., *A History of England under Henry IV*, 4 vols., 1884-98.
Wylie, J.H., and Waugh, W.T., *The Reign of Henry the fifth*, 3 vols., Cambridge, 1914-29.

UNPUBLISHED THESES:

Connolly, P., 'Lionel of Clarence and Ireland, 1361-66', Ph.D., University of Dublin, 1978.
Elder, A.J., 'A study of the Beauforts and their estates, 1399-1450', Ph.D., Bryn Mawr College, 1964.
Frame, R.F., 'The Dublin government and Gaelic Ireland, 1272-1361', Ph.D., University of Dublin, 1971.
Griffith, M.C., 'The council in Ireland, 1399-1452', B. Litt., Oxford, 1935.
Johnston, D.B., 'Richard II and Ireland, 1395-99', Ph.D., University of Dublin, 1977.

Matthew, E.A.E., 'The governing of the Lancastrian lordship of Ireland in the time of James Butler, fourth earl of Ormond, c. 1420-52', Ph.D., University of Durham, 1994.