Sex and the soldier in Lancastrian Normandy, 1415-1450

Sex and the Soldier in Lancastrian Normandy, 1415-1450

Anne Curry,
University of Reading

When the US House Committee on Military Affairs discussed in 1941 the formulation of an Act to prohibit prostitution within a certain distance of military and naval establishments,[1] it was treading a well-worn path, for the professions of arms and of prostitution are of equal antiquity and have always been inextricably linked. Throughout history, authorities have often sought to steer a middle course, acknowledging the sexual needs of the soldier yet trying to limit, or at least control, their fulfilment by 'ladies of the night'. It would be erroneous to assume, however, a neat continuum in attitude and policy. There is much truth in the contrast drawn by Fernando Henriques between the 'open and unabashed' attitude of the medieval period to the 'specifically sexual function of the camp-follower' and the 'shamefaced' stance of more modern armies.[2] The most obvious explanation of this contrast is the spread of venereal disease, and it is not surprising to discover that the first legislation on such diseases in mid nineteenth-century England focussed on the sanitary inspection of prostitutes in military depots.[3] Change has also resulted from the increasingly self-contained nature of modern armies. In the medieval and early modern periods (if not in earlier societies too), armies were less differentiated from the population as a whole. Female camp-followers were an essential part of any army, furnishing not only sexual solace but also services such as washing, cooking and rudimentary medical care. As armies began to develop their own specialised units for such activities, so the camp-followers lost their proximity and the sexes were increasingly segregated.[4]

There is ample evidence for the presence of, and the variety of services offered by, female camp-followers in the European armies of

the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Commanders acknowledged the need for a regular, albeit regulated, supply of prostitutes for their soldiers' use.[5] There can be no doubt that early modern European armies were much boosted in size by the presence of a host of women - wives, sweethearts, prostitutes - as well as by children and male non-combatants.[6] For the medieval period the same assumption has often been made, sometimes with evidence to prove it to be true.[7] On the whole, however, documentary evidence on medieval military organisation is considerably scantier than for the early modern period, and even where it does survive, as in the case of the English army occupying Normandy and other parts of Northern France in the early fifteenth century, it is so much less informative on camp-followers. Because the documentation derives largely from the financial administration of this army, only those who received royal wages feature prominently; not surprisingly, there are no women amongst them. For the present study, which is by no means exhaustive, material on camp-followers - the focus here being on women who provided sexual solace - has been gathered from a wide variety of miscellaneous sources. None the less, we can begin to examine a topic which illustrates attitudes to both warfare and sexuality in a period of considerable interest to Anglo-French historians. Henry V's first campaign of 1415 which led to the capture of Harfleur and the victory at Agincourt was followed from 1417 by the conquest of Normandy. Despite the peace treaty drawn up at Troyes in 1420, offensive actions continued so that armies took to the field in every year up to the truce of Tours of 1444 whilst garrisons were maintained in Normandy and in the other areas of Northern France until the English were driven out in 1450. The garrison establishment varied in size between two to six thousand and almost every year saw the launch from England of an expeditionary force numbering between 400 and ten thousand.[8] In addition there were French counter-offensives and the duchy had already seen civil war before the English invasion. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the presence of soldiers was a common feature in Normandy and its environs throughout the first half of the fifteenth century.

Medieval society had a rather ambivalent attitude to prostitution.[9] Although prostitutes were regarded as low and despicable, they were seen, following the teachings of St Augustine, as a necessary evil in society, for it was preferable that men should visit prostitutes than seduce married women or virgins, or, even worse, indulge in

homosexual practices. Prostitution was therefore condoned by the church and lay authorities, although prostitutes and their clients might occasionally be brought to book. Some towns had official brothels, and there is evidence of increased intervention in the provision and regulation of prostitution by secular authorities towards the end of the fourteenth century. Indeed, Brundage has noted recently that in the later middle ages, 'efforts to reform prostitutes diminished sharply . . ., and the penalties attached to the practice of prostitution became little more than anachronisms in many places'.[10] The French appear always to have had a greater level of toleration of prostitution than the English but in neither country did outright condemnation come before the mid-sixteenth century.

Prostitution was condoned in general, but we must ask whether special rules applied to members of an army actively engaged in conflict. In this context, attitudes seem to have been confused and inconsistent. During the Crusades, chronicle references suggest that at certain junctures, often periods of military crisis, loose women were driven out of the army, to avoid displeasing God and to focus the soldiers' minds and bodies on the tasks in hand. The women soon returned, however, and comments suggest that they were more usually present than not.[11] There is no evidence of English policy towards female camp-followers in the fourteenth-century campaigns of the Hundred Years War. Although Henry V issued some disciplinary ordinances at the outset of the Harfleur campaign, these are known only through a summary in the near-contemporary *Gesta Henrici Quinti* and do not include any reference to the issue, although they banned attacks on women and made rape a capital offence, the latter being a departure from contemporary practice in criminal law in both England and France. Henry's code was based upon the disciplinary ordinances issued by Richard II in 1385, which may in their turn have been based on a now lost code of Edward III.[12]

Henry continued to regard military discipline as vital to the success of his actions in France. In July 1419, he issued at Mantes a lengthy set of ordinances which repeated the theme of female immunity and gave extra protection to women in childbirth, but which, in their most commonly cited version, did not mention camp-followers.[13] Reference to the latter comes in another set of Henry's ordinances which are included in the treatise *De Studio Militari*, written by Nicholas Upton before 1446.[14] The modern-day editor of an early sixteenth-century English translation of Upton's work suggested that

these ordinances were 'probably made by Henry V at Mantes in July, 1419', although he noted their variance from texts of the Mantes ordinances.[15] As the order and content of Upton's ordinances are completely different from the Mantes ordinances, it is more likely that they arise from another occasion, either the 1415 or 1417 campaign. They were clearly aimed at an army on the move but they also envisaged the conquest of castles and towns, which makes the latter date more likely.[16] We know from chronicle references that Henry certainly issued some disciplinary ordinances at the landing at Touques on 1 August 1417.[17] What interests us here is the last clause concerning camp-followers. This did not constitute a total ban on camp-following or on the sexual activities of soldiers, but it limited the opportunities for contact, particularly at times of military action, and also served to ban the keeping of brothels in conquered towns.

> De Meretricibus ejiciendis
>
> Precipimus insuper ut meretrices publice et communes, infra exercitum nostrum nullo modo permanere permittantur: Et specialiter in obsidionibus villarum, castrorum, vel fortaliciorum quorumcumque; set longe ab exercitu, ad minus per unam leucam, insimul collocentur. Quod eciam volumus observari in omnibus villis, castris, et fortaliciis per nos vel nostros captis, aut nobis vel nostris redditis, vel in posterum capiendis seu reddendis, seu alias nobis, vel alicui nomine nostro redditis, videlicet quod infra dictam villam, castrum, vel fortalicium permanere, aut domicilium quantumcumque parvum vel magnum fovere aliquatenus non permittantur, sub pena fracture sinistri brachii dicte meretricis, si post unam monitionem in dicto loco prohibito inveniatur publice vel occulte.[18]

By the end of 1420, Normandy had been conquered and Henry recognised as heir and regent of France. In the following year, despite his absence in England, the King gave much attention to discipline in the Norman garrisons, partly in response to local complaints about the behaviour of soldiers and partly to forestall any disciplinary repercussions following the defeat of his brother Clarence's army at Baugé. On 25 April 1421, instructions were issued at Rouen, although they probably followed royal orders sent from England, to

captains of 37 towns for the better governance of their garrisons: these included an order that no garrison soldier of whatever rank, nor their servants, should keep a woman in concubinage or, *quod deterius est*, in adultery or any other illicit union.[19] This time no punishment was detailed for the women but for the troops the penalites were harsh and were to be imposed impartially, *omni favore postposito*. Offenders were to be put in prison for at least a month or longer, as the seriousness of the case dictated. Additionally, they were to lose their wages for a month and were only to be released on payment of surety for their good behaviour.

No record has been found of further bans issued centrally and applicable to the whole of the English soldiery during the occupation. There is no mention of the matter in the disciplinary ordinances issued by the duke of Bedford in December 1423 nor in the annual indentures of garrison captains. A set of ordinances issued by the earl of Salisbury for a campaign in Maine do, however, end with a clause limiting contact with prostitutes although, as in the ordinances of Henry V given by Upton, there was no outright ban. Rather, a soldier was not allowed to have a woman to his exclusive use.[20]

> For women that usyn bordell the whiche logge in the oste. Also that no maner man have ne hold any comon woman within his loggyng upon peyn of losyng a monthes wages. And if eny man fynd or may fynd any comon woman loggyng my seid lord gyveth him to leve to take from her or theym alle the money that may be founde uppon her or theym and go to take a staff and dryve her owte of the oste and breke her arm.

These ordinances are undated but may have been issued by the earl when he spearheaded the advance into Maine between late December 1424 and Michaelmas 1426. There is, of course, a possibility that the ordinances were issued during the earl's earlier activities in Maine, in the spring of 1420 or in the early summer of 1421.[21] Other than the orders of Henry V himself, this is the only known directive of the English occupation concerning the sexual activity of soldiers in royal pay. Two further documents, however, are worth mentioning although they concern bands of ex-soldiers living off the land - the English equivalent of the French *écorcheurs* - rather than members of the English army proper. These men always posed a serious problem

because of their lawless behaviour which often soured relations between the English and the native population. It is highly likely that, when living off the land, they had camp-followers with them on a permanent basis.[22] In response to complaints by the Norman Estates in 1428,the duke of Bedford noted that large bands of such men 'ou leurs femmes et chambrières (a common word for a prostitute or concubine), varletz et chevaux' had been living off the local population and committing various thefts and acts of violence.[23] Much the same problem was reported in September 1438 to John, Lord Talbot as marshal of France and 'governeur des vicomtés d'Auge, Orbec and Pont-Audemer'.[24] Bands of ex-soldiers - this was a period of relatively little military activity - were again reported to be living off the land, keeping in their company 'plusieurs femmes dissolues leurs concubines'. Talbot banned the keeping of such women. Any women found in these companies were to be arrested, placed in the pillory and then banished out of the kingdom: their masters, meanwhile, were to suffer imprisonment and confiscation of their possessions.[25]

Such is the evidence of the policy of English military commanders to the issue of camp-following. Several important questions arise. First, why did English war leaders consider it imperative to check the sexual activities of their soldiers? Secondly, how were the orders to be enforced and how long were they intended to remain in force? Were they specific to certain campaigns and thus lifted once military circumstances changed? Thirdly, what evidence have we of camp-following and of illicit sexual contact between soldiers and women, and what can we know of the people involved?

In answer to the first question, fear of sexually-transmitted disease was apparently not the main worry of commanders. There is no real evidence for the occurrence of gonorrhea in an English army until Edward IV's short-lived French campaign of 1475, when the Brut chronicler noted 'and in that Iorney our kynge lost many a man that fylle to the lust of women and wer brent by them; and there membrys rottyd away and they dyed'.[26] Its popular appelation then as the 'French pox' is simply blatant xenophobia. Venereal disease is believed to have developed most strongly in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries and did become a matter of concern in early modern European armies.[27] Although some mid fifteenth-century leech books claimed that lustful activity with a woman was a cause of plague, there is little to suggest that this thought was uppermost in the minds of the English war leaders of the early part of the century.[28]

In the time of Henry V, concern for the health of the soldier was much less specific and applied to his psychological as well as physical well-being. Sexual activity was widely and traditionally believed to weaken the constitution and to distract the mind. This view is apparent in Nicholas Upton's *De Studio Militari*, where he includes in the duties of a captain the obligation to ensure that his men remain continent.[29] The military efficacy of a ban on sexual activity is illustrated in his work by two classical examples. In the first, drawn from Book II of Valerius Maximus's *Factorum Dictorumque memorabilium libri novem*, where the glory of Rome is seen to be founded on strict military discipline, Upton notes Scipio's expulsion of 2,000 prostitutes from the army. In the first-century original, the now-purified army, previously fearful, regains its courage and vigour and so defeats the Numantinae.[30] To Upton the message is clear: 'novit enim vir prudens quod luxuriandi voluptas effeminat et enervat voluptuosos'. Sexual activity is not only physically draining but, significantly, causes the indulger to become effeminate, and thus, like a woman, fearful and incapable of fighting. As Upton noted earlier when outlining the qualities which a knight ought to possess, 'non ergo delicati vel effeminati aut trepidi debent esse milites'.[31]

The second allusion is drawn from the *Strategemata* of Frontinus, although Upton ascribes it wrongly to Vegetius who in fact says nothing on the subject in his *De Rei Militari*, a text much consulted by military leaders in the later middle ages.[32] This tells of Alexander's self-control when faced with a beautiful virgin captive, who just happened to be betrothed to the enemy leader. To avoid temptation the king put her from his sight and subsequently returned her unsullied to her fiancé. The point is that not only did he keep his mind on the task in hand by refusing to be distracted by her beauty, but also by releasing her unviolated he won the good will of all, including the enemy. The interconnection between soldiers' sexual proclivities and the crucial issue of maintaining good relations with the civilian population is a theme to which we shall return later.

The idea that the male body was weakened by sexual activity was well-etablished in medieval minds. Albertus Magnus had explained that women lived longer than men partly because of the purifying effects on the body of menstruation but also because sexual activity took less from them than from the male.[33] Thus to keep one's men 'fighting fit' required abstinence from the pleasures of the flesh, a

notion which has not gone unnoticed by modern-day sports coaches. Besides, women were traditionally viewed as seducers. Sexual desire burned uncontrollably in them, tempting men to lust and thus necessitating subordination of the female body to one man within marriage. Women were intrinsically irrational and over-emotional: following Aquinas, it was considered that the weaker intelligence of women affected their moral behaviour and so justified their subjection.[34] When men succumbed to female temptation then their minds ceased to be on 'higher things', but were, as Upton noted, made effeminate and hence irrational: sex distracted the mind as well as weakening the body.

A further concern was the influence which women could bring to bear on their male partner. In bed this influence was at its greatest for there the man was at his most vulnerable to female wiles. Admittedly, this influence could be used for the good, as Thomas de Cobham had envisaged in his early thirteenth-century manual for confessors:

> 'Even in the bedroom in the midst of their embraces a wife should speak alluringly to her husband and if he is hard and unmerciful and an oppressor of the poor, she should invite him to be merciful, if he is a plunderer, she should denounce plundering, if he is avaricious, she should arouse generosity in him'.[35]

A wife might even bestir a vascillating knight to action, although, of course, no true knight needed his wife's admonitions. But more likely, a wife would soften and corrupt, and distract her husband from the task in hand. Even more deleterious was the influence of a mistress who did not even enjoy the legitimacy of wifely persuasions.[36] The sort of woman who plyed her trade as prostitute or camp-follower was doubtless considered an even more evil and worthless influence. This is implied by the association, in the 1428 and 1438 references, of such women with criminal behaviour.

These widely-held views on women and sex provide the backdrop for the disciplinary ordinances of the Lancastrian occupation, but their issue was occasioned principally by concern for military discipline. The soldiers' minds had to be kept on the task in hand. In addition, potential causes of rivalry had to be rooted out. As the preface to Henry V's ordinances as cited by Upton acknowledged, *effrenata*

cupiditas ('onrewly covetousness') was the mother of strife, enemy of peace and the cause of grudge and malice.[37] The disciplinary ordinances were issued to keep the *appetitus noxius* ('noysome Appetit') of men under control so that the army might be ruled and governed in good order and the commonwealth kept in prosperity. Prostitutes were to be kept away from the host and from captured castles and towns in order to minimise the chances of sexual jealousies amongst the soldiers, thus ensuring orderly conduct. This thought lay behind the banning of concubines in April 1421 and is even further apparent in Salisbury's ordinance. It is easy to see how jealousies and violence might arise amongst young, sex-starved soldiers stationed miles away from home if there were not enough women to go round. Salisbury's order thus banned the keeping of a woman for one's private use, by implication making prostitutes common property in order to avoid rivalries and disputes within the ranks. The onus for detecting those who disobeyed was placed, significantly, on fellow soldiers who had a vested interest in ensuring that the order was kept and who may have been given further rewards at the expense of the transgressor for turning informer. Likewise, Henry V's 1421 order did not preclude soldiers from visiting brothels but banned the keeping of personal concubines. A similar policy is seen in France later in the century: in 1473, Charles, duke of Burgundy limited the number of women in his army and forbade any soldier to reserve one to his personal use: eleven years later, Charles VIII of France likewise ordered that his men 'ne tiennent aucunes filles propres', but he did not ban women from following the army on foot.[38]

Contact between soldiers and prostitutes also raised wider issues about fraternisation with the native population. Although some wives and other female associates may have crossed from England once the occupation was underway, in the early years of the conquest soldiers would have been entirely reliant upon local girls. Initially, fraternisation was not encouraged. At the outset of the 1417 campaign there seems to have been a ban on marriage with local girls; although exceptions were made almost as soon as it was issued, there is relatively little evidence of intermarriage before 1422 except in the Norman capital.[39] Whatever Henry V might claim about being rightful ruler of Normandy, in the early stages of the invasion his army was operating in what was essentially enemy territory so that uncontrolled fraternisation could prove a security risk. Women were

ideal spies because their immunity from capture as prisoners of war gave them greater freedom of action: they were certainly much used in this capacity by the English later in the occupation.[40] Fear of spying may have provided another reason for restricting contact between soldiers and local prostitutes both on campaign and in newly captured places in the early years of the conquest.[41]

Women were also expected to be kept away from the theatre of war for the sake of their own safety. All of the ordinances of Henry V upheld contemporary notions of female immunity.[42] But if modern experience is anything to go by, definition of rape might vary. What a soldier saw as willing sex might be interpreted by natives as coercion and hence cause conflict between the occupier and occupied. All women, even prostitutes, are someone's daughter, sister or wife. In the troubled days of the early occupation, it is easy to see how the sexual advances and practices of the invading army might sour relations with the locals. In the 1421 orders, Henry was particularly condemnatory of adulterous relationships, which were immoral in the eyes of the church. This did not prevent, however, English soldiers becoming involved with the wives both of natives and of fellow soldiers. Restrictions on the sexual fraternisation of soldiers with women were partly instituted, as in later periods, to prevent conflict with the local community as well as within the army itself. Thus, for instance, the captain of La Ferté Frênel took seriously the complaint of a young native girl in 1425 that one of his men, an English soldier called Jenkin Regnault, wanted to abduct her by force and have his evil way with her. The captain sent his English servant to tell the soldier to leave her alone but Regnault ignored the order and began hitting the girl. He also drew his sword against the captain's servant, who responded by mortally wounding him.[43] As we shall see later, crimes of passion were both a result of and a contributory factor to tension, not only between Norman natives and English soldiers, but also amongst the soldiers themselves.

There can be no doubt that Henry V placed high store on strict military discipline. Perhaps there is even something of the prude about the man. It has been widely believed that he himself remained chaste from his accession until his marriage to Catherine de Valois in 1420, pursuing his military objectives with characteristic single-mindedness. If there is any truth in the story that the assumption of the mantle of kingship changed his character, transforming the pleasure loving, even lascivious, prince into a chaste, serious-minded

king, then perhaps we have a classic case of the over-zealous recent convert.[44] Henry certainly expected his men to match his own high standards: it is interesting to speculate that the orders against sexual activity may have been issued partly because of the King's own obsessions. To find the order against camp-followers in the ordinances of Salisbury is not surprising given that the earl had been one of Henry V's leading captains. Moreover, the earl had taken charge of affairs in Normandy after the death of the duke of Clarence at Baugé, and was thus in command when the ordinances of April 1421 were issued in the duchy.[45] It is tempting, but as yet unproven, to assign him some role in their formulation. Nicholas Upton, it must be remembered, was subsequently the earl of Salisbury's chancellor, and it is known that he had, at the earl's request, translated the ordinances of Henry V from Latin into English.[46] Although there are some differences between the orders of Salisbury and of Henry, this translation may form the basis of the Maine ordinances. A neat connection can be drawn, therefore, between the theory and practice of military discipline.

But how exactly were the various orders to be enforced? The ordinances of Henry V where the ban on camp-followers is first mentioned were openly proclaimed in the host. Additionally, every captain within the host was to receive a written copy and it was his task to ensure that his men knew and obeyed the ordinances.[47] The third clause in these ordinances obliged the soldiers to obey their immediate captains and masters, after ordering all of the host of whatever status to obey the constable and marshal, who, together with the King, exercised ultimate executive authority. Next to nothing is known on how the constable and marshal exercised disciplinary control, nor does the ordinance on harlots explicitly state with whom responsibility lay for removal or dismembering but we can assume, perhaps, that the captains were normally allowed to act on their own discretion, particularly in newly-established garrisons. It is significant that Nicholas Upton stressed the soldier's obligation to obey his captain and, as we have seen, saw it as the captain's responsibility to see that his men remained chaste.[48]

Salisbury's orders give few clues about how they were actually to be put into practice, although certain clauses reinforce the notion that the earl himself was the ultimate source of authority. The clause on common women is interesting because it encouraged soldiers to inform on their fellow men, offering them as a reward any money

found on the woman, and giving them licence to drive the woman out of the host and even to break her arm.[49] To a modern observer, it seems hard to believe that this means of detection and punishment would not increase rather than diminish rivalries and conflict within the army, but we must remember that military discipline was already vicious and authoritarian. As in later centuries there was a reliance on a 'dog eat dog' mentality to keep the lower ranks under control.

In the disciplinary ordinances, it was generally the prostitutes who were punished. Rough handling was condoned, and no doubt expected by the prostitutes themselves, although it is hard to know whether arms were regularly broken (as permitted in the Upton text at the second offence and in Salisbury's ordinances at the first), for we have no evidence of punishments being effected. Mutilation of prostitutes was not a new notion nor was it confined to the Middle Ages, but the breaking of an arm was, if actually effected, considerably harsher than punishments witnessed elsewhere in Europe in this period.[50] Presumably the idea was to render the woman less attractive and also easily identifiable, although we might question whether anything more than a severe beating was administered. After all, how does one break an arm, and, more significantly, could one survive the act and aftermath of breaking in this period of primitive or non-existent medical care?

In the Upton text, no punishment was outlined for the man. This is in line with contemporary notions that in illicit sex the woman's sin was greater than that of the man. Besides, no commander would damage his valuable manpower resource on campaign for such a minor offence as fornication. Once established in garrison, cheek by jowl with the local population, the matter might be seen rather differently. Hence, in the letters sent to the captains of 37 Norman towns in April 1421, the penalty for the keeping of concubines was at least one month's imprisonment of the male offender. He was also to lose his wages for a month and was only to be released on payment of a surety for future good behaviour. There is no mention of a penalty for the woman.[51] The onus of detection and punishment was again placed on the captains although Henry was already taking measures to ensure regular inspection of captains and their garrisons by his officials.[52] These 1421 orders mark a transitional stage between the exercise of martial law and the beginning of civilian control over the military which developed further over the 1420s. In the early campaigns, the army had been controlled entirely by ad-hoc ordinances

which consituted a form of martial law: offences could not be referred to Norman civil or ecclesiastical courts. Besides, it is not known to what degree these courts were able to operate in the early years of the English conquest. This might also be the case in Salisbury's campaigns in Maine, so that here the prostitutes were dealt with arbitrarily, suffering financial and physical damage, and the soldiers, as in the 1421 orders, lost a month's wages.[53] But once the Treaty of Troyes had been signed, Henry was under obligation to maintain French law. The 1421 orders are perhaps moving tentatively in this direction. The lack of mention of the women may imply that they could be handed over to the secular courts for punishment. The reason why there are no further military ordinances on the sexual activity of the soldiers is that the issues of fornication, adultery and bigamy reverted to the aegis of the ecclesiastical authorities.

By 1424, from whence survive the records of the *officialité* of the archbishopric of Rouen, Englishmen were being prosecuted for sexual offences in the time-honoured way. In the register for 1439-40, two Englishmen were fined for fornication and another two for adultery, as too was Pierre Baille, the receiver-general of Normandy.[54] Rape likewise reverted to the powers of the civil courts. Although captains retained considerable authority over their men, the conditions of service from Michaelmas 1423 (contained in the annually issued indentures) included an obligation that troops obey the dictates of civilian officials, the *baillis*, *vicomtes* and the *contrerolleurs* subsequently introduced into each garrison.[55] These measures had been taken in response to local complaint about the behaviour of the English garrisons in Normandy. Further protest at the Estates of 1427 led to a further enquiry and the introduction of a formal procedure whereby local people could make complaints about the soldiers to the civilian authorities. It is in connection with this enquiry that the comment about large bands of ex-soldiers 'ou leurs femmes et chambrières, varletz et chevaux' living at the expense of the local population was made.[56] Its redress was put in the hands of the civilian authorities and proper judicial process. Ex-soldiers always remained a problem, for they could not be controlled by military discipline given that they were not within the formal retinue or garrison system, nor could they easily be brought to civil justice because of their violent resistance to the imposition of authority. Talbot's order of September 1438 banning the keeping of 'pluseurs femmes dissolues leurs concubines' was an ad-hoc edict, issued with combined military and

civil authority by virtue of Talbot's offices as marshal, and 'governeur des vicomtés d'Auge, Orbec and Pont-Audemer'. It was to be proclaimed and enforced by the civilian *vicomtes*, and the designated punishments reflect this: the women were to be arrested, put in the pillory and banished - civil punishments which contrast with the mutilations ordered by Henry V and Salisbury - whilst the men were to suffer imprisonment and confiscation of possessions. In all such matters, following the indenture clauses established in 1423, the army was obliged to assist the civilian authorities in the exercise of justice. Once English soldiers were subject to the law of the land, there was no need for ad-hoc military ordinances.

We must turn finally to the evidence for actual sexual activity and contact with women. In some ways, of course, the legislation is itself proof that such contact took place. If it did not then there would be no need to restrict contact with prostitutes or to ban the keeping of concubines! But evidence is rather thin on the ground,and, unfortunately, we have little to go on for the reign of Henry V because of the use of martial law and the lack of records of civil and ecclesiastical administration in Normandy during the early years of occupation. As said previously, the archiepiscopal records for Rouen recommence in 1424 and offer much interesting material - only partially exploited here - on fornication, adultery and bigamy. A second important source are the pardons awarded for criminal misdemeanours, where justifications put forward for the exercise of mercy provide a considerable amount of circumstantial detail.[57] Mention of sexual activity is often coincidental, when a prostitute is murdered or when violence arises after soldiers have been drinking and whoring. We must also remember that confessions aimed at securing pardons are not necessarily true statements of fact and that there is much temptation to use them in a rather anecdotal fashion. These pardons, awarded under the seal of the Chancellerie, commence with the regency of John, duke of Bedford in 1422 (although some deal with incidents which occurred earlier), but cease after the English loss of Paris in 1436. Thenceforward, evidence is considerably patchier, relying on chance references in the financial, military and urban records of the duchy but little is known about the policies of towns to prostitution.

We also face difficulties in distinguishing between different kinds of sexual contact. It is not easy to separate the professional, brothel-based prostitute from the occasional, and often itinerant, independent

seller of sexual favours. For men, the occasional visit to a common whore was not the same thing as the keeping of a concubine or mistress, who might not herself be a prostitute. Moreover, marriages between English soldiers and Norman women might be preceded by sexual contact for it was still quite common for consummation to occur before the act of wedlock. The exact status of those frequently described as *fiancées* of Englishmen is thus difficult to ascertain. Rape is, of course, a major topic in its own right and thus will not be considered here, but suffice to say that the presence of English soldiers did lead to an increase in female sexual vulnerability despite frequent attempts to curb excesses.

The judicial records all have a rather disparaging tone towards prostitutes. Quite often they are portrayed as violent, both loud- and foul-mouthed and, above all, common. Cardine, *chambrière* and *concubine* of the Englishman, William Roz, but also a *femme publique de vie dissolue*, thought nothing, for instance, of shouting down the road at an erstwhile client, ' "Valee, tu (note the over-familiar tone) as eu ma compagnie et me as mauvasiement paiee: tu es un homme de neant, qui riens ne vaulz, murdrier et larron, je te feray copper les jarrez et les jambes, sanglant, paillart, et apres te feray tuer et perdre la vie", et pluseurs autres injurieuses paroles, et soy approchant de son visage'. After further words to the same effect, she grabbed hold of his clothing and spat in his face several times.[58] The terminology itself was heavily loaded with moral overtones and it is not easy for a modern commentator to understand the subtle differences between the various words applied to women who indulged in illicit sexual activity. The first ordinances talk of *meretrices* which, when translated into early sixteenth-century English, became 'common harlots'. Salisbury's orders use the expression 'common women' as well as 'women that usyn bordell'. In other sources of the period, *filles de joie*, *filles* (or *femmes*) *amoureuses*, *fillectes* and *filles de mauvaise vie* were common expressions to indicate professional prostitutes, but less precise appellations such as *chambrières* are more difficult to pin down. [59] The last term was intentionally vague, for there were many servant girls whose duties included bed-making as well as bed-sharing. Many prostitutes are referred to only by their Christian names, which are often given in pet form, thus providing a sort of professional name which was all a client would be likely to discover or would need to know.[60]

A further problem is of distinguishing activity which arose directly

out of the English occupation from that which would have occured in Normandy even without the war. Given that most of the soldiers were young and away from home there may have been additional impetus to extra-marital sex, prostitution and concubinage, but these phenomena already existed in the duchy and the documentation provides examples for both occupiers and occupied.[61] Prostitution was well-established in fifteenth-century France.[62] Of greater interest because of its relative uniqueness is English policy on the issue. Henry V certainly tried to curb sexual activity amongst his soldiers: after his death, however, there seems to have been a relaxation of controls. As the occupation continued and more Englishmen settled in the duchy, policies on the whole reverted to those found in the duchy before the English invasion.

Henry V's first orders concerned camp-followers in the strictest definition of the term. Unfortunately no evidence has been found of prostitutes following the host or of women accompanying armies in order to provide support services of any kind. This may indicate the success of the English orders or merely that chroniclers failed to record this kind of information. Whatever the case there is certainly nothing to parallel the situation in French armies of the late fifteenth century where 'filles publiques suivant l'ost' were an accepted adjunct, subject to control and even muster by the *prévôt des maréchaux*.[63] Only in the less formal and often lawless bands of demobilised English soldiers are camp-followers definitely known to have been present. Gangs of French brigands active against the English in Normandy are also known to have contained '*femmes amoureuses*'.[64]

Elsewhere in early fifteenth-century France, municipally organised prostitution was common.[65] In Paris, there were large numbers of professional and semi-professional prostitutes established in 'red-light districts' under official control.[66] As yet, no similar evidence has been discovered for Normandy although there is no reason to suppose that Norman towns, particularly the capital and the ports, were without the usual array of brothels or of prostitutes who worked independently. In Dieppe there was a *maison* or *ostel* located in or near the rue des Wez,[67] where lived the 'fillectes communes'; this was certainly frequented by English soldiers as well as by natives. In an incident of October 1428, two local seamen, ashore from a herring boat, had a drink in a tavern in the same quarter and then made to return to their ship. Passing by the shutters of the brothel, they saw one of the 'fillectes communes' called Jehanneton du Val. One of the

sailors, Laurenchon Clemence (a married man with four small children) shouted in, 'Je sens trop bone porée, scez tu ou elle est?'. Jehanneton replied 'Laurenchon, elle est ceans à ton commandement'. (Note again the familiar and perhaps suggestive tone of the conversation.) So Laurenchon decided to go in to eat, asking his friend to go and get some drink from a nearby hostelry. They were enjoying their meal with three girls to keep them company when there came a loud knocking at the door. Jehanneton ordered one of the other girls (there were at least four inmates) to open the shutters for she had guessed that their new, and apparently regular, client was an Englishman, William Quot (subsequently described as living in the house of the lieutenant of the captain of Dieppe who was his master), who would break down the shutter if it was not opened. Seeing Laurenchon there, Quot threatened to arrest him and to take him to the prison 'en la cour du Polet',[68] jibing that a married man should not be in such a place. Laurenchon was clearly embarrassed and, successfully at first, bribed Quot with beer to keep his mouth shut about finding him in the brothel. But Quot insisted on arresting Laurenchon and there ensued a scuffle in the street, during which Quot, clearly much inebriated, 's'arresta a pisser contre le paroy de la maison desdictes fillectes', and Laurenchon, equally drunk, dealt a fatal blow to Quot's head. A typical medieval night on the town, perhaps, where all the pleasures of the flesh are sought, albeit guiltily, by a married man, but here coloured by the specific context of the occupation, where the Englishman tries to humiliate the local and ends up getting his come-uppance.[69] Likewise at Cherbourg, a 'maison d'une femme publique' is brought to our attention by the rollicking which the servant of an Englishman gave to a monk he discovered therein, no doubt whilst he was also seeking to avail himself of the services offered![70]

Bathhouses (*étuves*) were also notoriously involved in the sale of sexual services. At Abbeville in 1452, for instance their owners were forbidden to allow *filles de joie* to lodge in their houses or in the *étuves* because their presence had led to 'grand vitupere et escalande de justice'. Henceforth only women aged 50 or more were to serve in the bath-houses, an order reminiscent of that in the Third Crusade where, following the expulsion of loose women, good old dames who washed and toiled for the crusaders and who were 'as good as apes for picking fleas' were allowed to remain in the camp. [71] There were certainly *étuves* in the rue de la Prison in Rouen, forty pounds worth

of whose rent the owner, Jacques Poignant, had granted to the Confrèrie of Saint-Sever to fund a daily mass. We cannot assume that this was a brothel - not all bathhouses were - but the fact that its profit was turned to pious ends is not incompatible with a sexual function.[72] Contact between soldiers and prostitutes may have taken place on a casual basis in the streets, but it also seem likely that taverns were a regular venue for soliciting and intercourse. In this context it is interesting to note how many taverns were held by English serving soldiers or veterans who had married native wives. Such places may well have been the usual recreational venues for off-duty soldiers who perhaps found their presence in native hostelries unacceptable. Pardons record several incidents suggestive of the speculation that the taverns run by ex-soldiers were also brothels. Why else should John Camartin, a Welsh soldier in the garrison of Caen, be enraged at finding his *chambrière* drinking in a tavern in the town kept by Watkin Goudeheim (Goodkin) and his wife, so enraged that he killed, as she tried to shield the girl, Goudeheim's wife, who in this scenario might even be considered the 'madame' of the brothel?[73]

Presumably there was also a degree, albeit unmeasurable, of independent prostitution, girls working from their own homes, or perhaps travelling from place to place and combining various ways of raising money to generate an income needed merely to survive. One young woman, 'laquele s'estoit mauvaisement gouvernée', journeyed all the way from Poitou, where she had left her husband. She wheedled her way into the affections of two local men, as housekeeper of one and mistress of both, and was the cause of a fatal fight between them.[74] Poverty has always been a common reason for girls to turn to prostitution. We shall see later the claim of Judetta de Montigny that she was coerced into a potentially bigamous marriage with an Englishman partly because of her poverty.[75] Many girls suffered loss of dowry when their families had to abandon lands in areas of military activity or when fathers, brothers and husbands chose exile in French-held territories. When the horrors of war were at their height, women were forced into prostitution merely to survive. During the lengthy siege of Rouen in 1418-19 chroniclers reported that girls were prepared to sacrifice their honour for a morsel of bread.[76] As elsewhere, prostitution, domestic service and petty crime were often closely connected, again partly because of the desperate instinct for survival which women were forced to possess. Thus the *chambrière* of

a soldier of the garrison of Avranches stole from her master some money and a gold ring which she then pawned, although it seems to have been the poor pawnbroker who suffered most for the soldiers beat him up to try to recover the ring.[77] Another native girl, perhaps euphemistically described as the *fiancée* of an Englishman, stole jewelry and plate from her Norman employer; she too was described as a *chambrière*.[78] Some girls may even have been pushed into fraternisation and prostitution by their parents: such seems to be the case with the daughter of Jean Ricart in Sées who lived in concubinage with several Englishmen and who, with her parents, denounced to her clients a neighbour who had made money by selling armour to the wife of a French brigand.[79]

Some English soldiers and their servants certainly kept concubines, despite the order of April 1421. William Roz, for instance, had at Pontaudemer as his *chambrière et concubine* a local lady named Cardine, who was also described as *une femme publique, de vie dissolue*, and who was certainly plying her trade with local men whilst in Roz's service, because, as we have seen, she publicly and brazenly accused a labourer of not paying her enough. Whether Roz knew about, or even encouraged, her other customers is not clear.[80] Sexual relations with servants are likely to have been common, as the use of the term *chambrière* accurately reflects. There are several English soldiers recorded as having *chambrières* but of course one can never be completely certain as to their duties.[81]

It seems likely that only those of the highest rank were accompanied in France by their wives from England, partly for the sake of the ceremonial functions which the war leaders were called upon to perform. Not that this necessarily precluded extra-marital activity in Normandy. Sir John Salvain, for instance, may have had a mistress in Rouen where he exercised his office as *bailli* even though his wife was sometimes resident in Normandy, often a few miles downstream at the castle of Tancarville.[82] Another prominent English captain, Sir Walter Fitzwalter, was even accused, amongst other crimes, of detaining a young girl called Henrie against her will and raping her.[83] The records of the *officialité* of the archbishopric of Rouen show that sexual offences were by no means restricted to the lower orders and that no particular favour was shown by the authorities in detection or punishment.[84] For the nobility, it was acceptable, perhaps even expected, that they should have mistresses. The bastards of many of the leading peers involved in the war also

served in Normandy, suffering little social stigma and acquiring offices and rewards for service much as anyone else. The illegitimate son of the earl of Salisbury, John Montagu, Bastard Salisbury, held the captaincy of Argentan, for example, in the early 1430s.[85] In fact, it may have been more common for the bastard offspring than the legitimate issue of peers to serve in the war, perhaps because of concern for family interests at home or merely because men like the earl of Salisbury had no male heirs anyway.

Even the wives of English soldiers might find themselves as the mistresses of their husband's associates, particularly when their husbands were on active service. John Painter enjoyed the *compagnie charnele* of the wife of John Rippes - her nationality is unknown - for ten years whilst her husband was serving in garrison at Cherbourg and elsewhere. (The pardon is dated March 1428, implying a relationship established early in the occupation.) Her defence was that Painter had convinced her of her husband's death, but the fact that the couple were living at Valognes, only 20 km from Cherbourg, and that Painter was prone to bragging about his conquest makes one somewhat suspicious. Whatever the case, Rippes ended up killing Painter.[86] How much wife and mistress swapping went on is hard to ascertain. In some cases, the relationship struck up between soldiers and local women was more personal and of longer duration. Some remained outside wedlock but were no less serious relationships, for some degree of responsibility was assumed for bastard offspring. Richard Tolemaire, for instance, bequeathed all his goods to his mistress, Perrette Damenches, and at her death to their bastard son, John, 'a tel temps que icellui seulement soit souffisament agiée et abille pour gagner sa vie'.[87] His compatriot, Robert Oliver, had similarly committed all his goods to his *fiancée* Guillette just in case he died during the *voyage* which he was undertaking at royal orders in August 1421.[88]

Some relationships led to legitimate marriage, others to bigamy.[89] A number of marriages contracted in the occupation were most certainly bigamous for the soldiers had wives back home: the records of *poursuites* in the *officialité* of Rouen show that at least some men were brought to book for this offence. The records for 1424-25 mention an bigamous Englishman sentenced to a day in the pillory, six weeks in prison on bread and water and then, perhaps the cruellest penalty of all, sent back to his first wife.[90] The insecurity of the times contributed to the instability and uncertainty about marriage.

The same register notes the case of Judetta de Montigny, wife of Henri de Trousseauville, who had married an Englishman, Henry Turnbull, without having definite knowledge of the death of her first husband, who was probably either in exile or serving in the French army. Extenuating circumstances brought her some sympathy: she had married Turnbull because of her great poverty - something experienced by many women deserted by their husbands in time of war - and because she had been compelled by Turnbull into wedlock 'par force et violence', again a scenario which many vulnerable native women must have found hard to resist. Priests too had little choice but to succumb to English persuasion, as the unfortunate curé of Esquimbosc discovered in 1425.[91] When asked to marry an Englishman and a woman whose names he did not know, he quite properly refused, but three sword blows from the Englishman persuaded him to change his mind: In this period of invasion and occupation the line between willing sex or marriage and coercion was thin. One also wonders how many bigamous marriages went undetected, particularly by the folks back home.

The prostitutes, concubines and fiancées were usually local girls, born in or near the towns where they operated or lived. It is difficult, however, to come to conclusions about their clients and male associates. Soldiers were often young men and studies of other French communities have suggested that it was the youth who indulged most obviously and often violently in sexual activity. Many of those known to be involved with prostitutes were not soldiers but rather the servants of soldiers, again likely to be young and uncouth. One case in the *Actes de la Chancellerie* suggests that, during the occupation, the streets of Rouen were rather unsafe to walk at night, although admittedly the night in question was the eve of the Feast of the Epiphany early in 1427. Three locals thought it necessary to escort a girl home after dinner at a friend's mothers house. On the way there, they were accosted by some revellers who broke their lantern, but they managed to reach the girl's house and waited for her to enter the building and to close her shutter, another sign of the insecurity of the times. The young men then decided that they should try to find those who had broken their lantern and, to cut a long story short, found themselves embroiled in a dispute with two English 'varlez' who goaded them with demands that they should speak English.[92]

Something of the rumbustiousness of the English soldiers can be seen in the following incidents too, which also demonstrate that

sexual jealousies and bravado could give an additional cutting edge to relations with the local population. Sometime in the early 1420s, soldiers from the garrisons of Essay, Exmes and Bernay started to victimise a lad from the parish of Mardilli near Gacé at the encouragement of a young woman, Robine la Laresse, whom they had frequented and who hated the young man in question. Why we cannot tell, but the fact that he is described as married, and that the soldiers' threats include an attempt to ravish his wife, are highly suggestive of a thwarted passion on Robine's part. Eventually the young man could take it no more and was forced to flee with his wife and children to Maine.[93] A similar scenario unfolds in 1429 when, 'pour occasion d'une femme', a twenty-four year old brewer from Le Tréport fell foul of English soldiers in the garrison of Eu. In this case, the soldiers accused him of being an Armagnac traitor, so forcing him to flee, whereupon he was captured by brigands and compelled to join them.[94] These are not the only crimes of passion of which we have record but both demonstrate an important, but often hidden, aspect of the English occupation of Normandy, that sexual jealousies had a significant role to play in civil/military relations. A native girl's, even a prostitute's, association with an Englishman may also have led to charges of collaboration from the more patriotically-minded. To round off this glimpse at the sexual side of international relations, one can add in cases where local men took their own revenge on English soldiers who had 'gang-banged' their wives.[95]

War created excellent preconditions for sexual irregularities. It threw upon the native population many young soldiers, lonely, homesick, or perhaps plain randy and pleased to be away from their responsibilities at home. Although some attempts were made initially to restrain their behaviour, as the occupation continued, contact with the native population increased as did the level of inter-marriage. Some soldiers chose, and were encouraged, to settle permanently or at least semi-permanently in Normandy. Besides, no commander could afford to keep his soldiers restless and frustrated for too long. Sex in medieval society was a surprisingly public thing and on the whole the company of prostitutes was accepted, even condoned. It can be argued that military commanders, like Henry V, who tried to restrict the sexual activity of their troops were the ones going against the grain, rather than those who visited the prostitutes. Perhaps too the English were already more prudish in these matters than the French. Later in the century the French even began to muster the camp-followers who

served the soldiers' sexual needs, whilst English kings continued to issue ordinances against harlots based on the orders of Henry V.[96] Amusingly, the same divide in national attitudes is revealed in the First World War, when British commanders tried to stamp out 'that sort of thing' and the French encouraged it by providing fully-operational brothels.[97]

NOTES

[1] Papers arising from the Hearings are cited in *A Bibliography of Prostitution*, ed., V. Bullough, B. Elcano, M. Deacon and B. Bullough, New York and London 1977, item 6485.

[2] F. Henriques, *Prostitution and Society*, vol. 2:*Prostitution in Europe and the New World*, London 1963, p.56.

[3] J.R. Walkowitz, 'The Politics of Prostitution', *Signs*, 6, part 1, 1980, 124.

[4] B.C. Hacker, 'Women and Military Institutions in Early Modern Europe: A Reconaissance', *Signs*, 6, part 4, 1981, 643-71.

[5] G. Parker, *The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road* , Cambridge 1972, pp.175-76.

[6] ibid., pp. 288-89, where statistics for the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries reveal percentages of non-combatants ranging from 8% to 53%.

[7] For crusading armies see R. Finucane, *Soldiers of the Faith: Crusaders and Moslems at War*, London 1983, pp. 75-77, and for French and Burgundian armies of the late fifteenth century, P. Contamine, *Guerre, état et société à la fin du moyen âge: Etudes sur les armées des rois de France, 1337-1494*, Paris and The Hague 1972, pp.267, 281, 451-52. See also Hacker, 347.

[8] A. E. Curry, 'Military organization in Lancastrian Normandy, 1422-50', unpublished Ph.D thesis, CNAA/Teesside Polytechnic 1985, vol. 1, pp.92, 201; vol. 2, pp.iv - vi.

[9] S. Shahar, *The Fourth Estate. A History of Women in the Middle Ages*, London and New York 1983, pp.206 - 210. L.L. Otis, 'Prostitution and Repentence in Late medieval Perpignan', in *Women of the Medieval World*, ed., J. Kirshner and S.F. Wemple, Oxford and New York 1985, p.139; J. Roussiaud, 'Prostitution, Youth and Society in the Towns of south-eastern France in the Fifteenth Century', in *Deviants and the Abandoned in French Society. Selections from Annales, Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, vol. 4, ed. R. Forster and O. Ranum, Baltimore and London 1978, pp.1-46.

[10] J.A. Brundage, *Law, Sex, and Christian Society in Medieval Europe*,

Chicago 1987, p.521.

[11] Finucane, pp.179-80.

[12] *Gesta Henrici Quinti* , ed., J. Taylor and J. S. Roskell, Oxford 1975, p. 27. See also the allusion in *Titii Livii Foro-Juliensis Vita Henrici Quinti Regis Angliae*, ed., T. Hearne, Oxford 1716, p.8. The ordinances of Richard II are printed in *The Black Book of the Admiralty*, ed., T. Twiss, 4 vols, Rolls Series, London 1871, vol. i, pp.453-58. Our knowledge of disciplinary orders issued by Edward III derives from Froissart; H. J. Hewitt, *The Organization of War under Edward III* , Manchester 1966, pp.97, 123.

[13] *Black Book of the Admiralty*, vol. i, pp. 459-72; N.H. Nicolas, *History of the Battle of Agincourt*, London 1833, Appendix VIII.

[14] Nicholas Upton, *De Studio Militari Libri Quatuor*, ed. E. Bysshe, London 1654, pp. 133-45.

[15] *The Essential Portions of Nicholas Upton's De Studio Militari, translated by John Blount, Fellow of All Souls (circa 1500)*, ed., F.P. Barnard, Oxford 1931, p.60, n.37. The editor justifies giving Blount's English version of the ordinances (pp.33-48) as well as Upton's Latin version (pp.48-58) by explaining that 'there are indications in Blount's version that he was translating from a somewhat different codex' (p.xiv, n.1). Both versions include the ordinance on prostitutes.

[16] I intend to discuss elsewhere the dating of these ordinances and the wider question of English disciplinary ordinances issued between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries.

[17] *Titii Livii Foro- Juliensis Vita Henrici Quinti*, p.33; Thomas Walsingham, *The St Alban 's Chronicle 1406-1420*, ed. V.H. Galbraith, Oxford 1937, p.111.

[18] *De Studio Militari*, p. 145. Blount's English text (pp.47-48) reads 'Of the Avoydaunce and Ridding Away of comon harlottes. Moreover we commaunde that these open and comon stompettes be suffred in no maner wyse to Abyde wyth in oure hooste, And specially At the siege of townes, castelles, And fortresses, but then they be Removed to gyther A leegghe At the leeste frome the hooste; wiche we woll be observyd Also in All townes, castells, And fortresses taken by us And our captaynes, or yelded, or to be yelded, other to us or Any in our name. That ys to saye we woll they shall not be suffered to abyde wythin the said townes, castells, or fortresses, or to mainteyne Any howseholde, small or grette, under payne or forfett of the harlottes lefft Arme yf After the fyrste monicion she be founde in the place so forbydde openly or prevely.

[19] *Foedera, Conventiones, Literae et Cuiusque Genera Acta Publica*, ed., T. Rymer, 10 vols, third edition, The Hague 1745, vol. iv, part iv, p.24. There is no mention of the issue in a previous order to the

baillis to check the oppressive actions of captains (ibid. p.4, 4 Jan. 1421). See *Thome de Elmham Vita et Gesta Henrici Quinti Anglorum Regis*, ed., T. Hearne, Oxford 1727, p.307, for Henry's increased concern for military affairs in Normandy following the receipt of news of his brother's death. Brundage (p.514) notes that legal commentators showed greater concern about concubinage in the later middle ages although he gives no examples relevant to the present discussion.

[20] British Library, Landsdowne 285 f.149. These ordinances have been erroneously ascribed to John Talbot, earl of Shrewsbury (Nicholas, Appendix VIII, pp.41-42; S. Bentley, *Excerpta Historica*, London 1833, pp.40-43; R.A. Newhall, *The English Conquest of Normandy* , Newhaven, Mass. 1924, p.222) but were rightly attributed by M. Keen, *The Laws of War in the Middle Ages* , Oxford 1965, p. 272, although the reference therein to [British Library] Cotton Julius F IV should read C IV.

[21] J.H. Wylie and W.T. Waugh, *The Reign of Henry V*, 3 vols, Cambridge 1914-29, iii, pp.216, 314. For his service in Maine from December 1424 see Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, manuscrits français 4491 f.26v, 26048/486, and 26049/587.

[22] see below p.32, n.64.

[23] R.A. Newhall, 'Bedford's ordinance on the Watch', *English Historical Review*, lii, 1935,citing Paris, A(rchives) N(ationales), KK 325B.

[24] British Library, Additional Manuscript 12,005, issued at Rouen under the seal of the marshal on 12 September 1438.

[25] The same order also limited the keeping of pages because they were seen to assisting their masters in robbing and pillaging. The pages, too, were to be arrested but were to have their ears cut off 'et autre si grievsne pugnicion quil en sera a toujours memoir et exemplaire aux autres'.

[26] *The Brut or The Chronicles of England*, ed., F.W.D. Brie, Early English Text Society original series, 2 vols, 131, 1906, and 136, 1908, ii, p.604, cited by R.S. Gottfried, *Epidemic Disease in Fifteenth Century England*, Leicester 1978, p.43. Gottfried (p.106) notes that the entry in Fabyan's Chronicle (*The New Chronicles of England and France by Robert Fabyan, named by himself the Concordance of Histories*, ed., H. Ellis, London 1811, p.653) concerning the Scottish campaign of 1462-63, where Edward IV had been forced to abandon his plans due to 'the syknesse of pockys', may be an earlier, though less explicit, reference to venereal disease in the army.

[27] Parker, p.169. The Spanish called it 'el mal galico' too.

[28] Gottfried, pp.67, 75.

[29] *De Studio Militari* , book I, cap.XVI; *Essential Portions*, pp.7 - 8.

[30] *Collection des Auteurs Latins*, ed., M. Nisard, Paris 1850, p.603.

[31] *De Studio Militari*, book I, cap.V.

[32] *Collection des Auteurs Latins*, ed., M. Nisard, Paris 1851, p.548. See *Essential Portions*, p.59, n.12.

[33] Quaestiones super De animalibus', 15, questio 8, in his *Opera Omnia*, 12, Munster 1955, p.263.

[34] S. Farmer, 'Persuasive Voices: Clerical Images of Medieval Wives', *Speculum*, 61, part 3, 1986, 520.

[35] ibid., p.517, quoting from Thomas de Cobham's *Manual for Confessors* of circa 1215.

[36] See, for instance, the explicit and implicit criticisms of the influence which Alice Perrers was deemed to wield over Edward III in the last years of his life (J. Barnie, *War in Medieval Society. Social Values and the Hundred Years War, 1337-99*, London 1974, pp.118-19).

[37] *De Studio Militari*, p.49; *Essential Portions*, pp.33-34.

[38] Contamine, p.452. Camp-followers were banned from having horses for fear that the latter would consume fodder required by the soldiers' mounts: food and fodder were often in short supply in armies on the move.

[39] *Rotuli Normanniae in Turre Londinensi asservati Johanne et Henrico Quinto Angliae Regibus*, ed., T.D. Hardy, London 1835, p.184; R. A. Massey, 'The Lancastrian Land Settlement in Normandy and Northern France, 1417-50', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Liverpool, 1987, p.199.

[40] A Frenchwoman described as 'une espye' was bringing information to the *bailli* of Evreux on a regular basis throughout the 1420s (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Clairambault 206/18). I intend to examine this topic at greater length elsewhere.

[41] A similar fear partly explains the following ban in a later set of ordinances which may have been issued for the 1475 campaign; 'Item that no woman be walking in the host sekyng prisoners and yff eny suche be founde she shalle be chastised in such manner that other shalbe abashed to come in such wyse' (British Library, Additional Manuscript 33,191).

[42] See above p.19.

[43] *Actes de la Chancellerie d'Henri VI concernant la Normandie sous la domination anglaise (1422-1435)*, ed., P. Le Cacheux, 2 vols (Société de l'histoire de Normandie), Rouen and Paris 1907-08, ii, CLXXXIII, AN JJ 174/156. The servant was pardoned for this act of justifiable

homicide.

[44] A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England II (c.1307 to the early sixteenth century*), London 1982, chapter 7, esp. pp.194-95, 218.

[45] Wylie and Waugh, iii, p.312.

[46] *Essential Portions*, p. 9. For the career of Upton and his service under Salisbury, see *Dictionary of National Biography*, ed., S. Lee, London 1909, vol. xx, pp.39-40.

[47] *De Studio Militari*, p.134; *Essential Portions*, p. 34, 49. This was also true of the 1419 ordinances (*Black Book of the Admiralty*, vol. i, p.469).

[48] *De Studio Militari*, p.32; *Essential Portions*, pp. 7-8.

[49] British Library, Lansdowne 285, ff.147-49.

[50] H. Dillard, *Daughters of the Reconquest. Women in Castilian Town Society, 1100-1300* , Cambridge 1984, pp.197-99; Brundage, p.517. See also the instruction to cut off the ears of pages in Talbot's 1438 order, above n.26.

[51] *Foedera*, vol. iv, part iv, p.24.

[52] See for instance the appointment of Sir John Ratcliffe on 5 May 1421 to carry out a tour of inspection, probably in the wake of the April orders (ibid., p.26).

[53] The text may also be read as meaning that informers could take money found not only on the person of the prostitute but also on the man who kept her.

[54] Rouen, A(rchives) D(épartmentales de la) S(eine) M(aritime), amendes de l'officialité de Rouen: poursuites, G 249-58 (1424-51). The register for 1439-40 is G 256.

[55] Curry, 'Military Organization', pp.227-28.

[56] Newhall, 'Bedford's ordinance on the watch', 52.

[57] *Actes*, passim.

[58] *Actes* , ii, CLXXXIX; AN JJ 174/233 (1428).

[59] Contamine, p.451, provides other terms used in late fifteenth-century French armies, many of which were equally derogatory: *femmes de peche, ribaudes, garses, bacelettes* and *meschines*. B. Geremek, *Les marginaux Parisiens aux XIVe et XVe siècles*, Paris 1976, p.241, gives a full acount of terminology, citing many of the appelations which we have also found in Lancastrian Normandy. See also J. Roussiaud, *Medieval Prostitution*, Oxford 1988, p.7 where further terms - *filles secrètes, cantonnières* (street walkers), *legières* and *vagabondes* - are cited, all likely terms for the independent, non-brothel based prostitute.

[60] See, for instance, some of the names of girls in the brothel at Dieppe in *Actes*, ii, CXCIV, AN JJ 174/281, and the case of Cardine cited in n.58.

[61] For two cases of Norman husbands killing their wives' lovers see *Actes*, ii, CCXL; AN JJ175/291, and ii, CCXLI; AN JJ 175/300. In *Actes*, ii, CCXXXIX*;AN JJ 175/311 is the story of a son whose father disowned him for keeping a concubine.

[62] See, for example, Rossiaud, *Medieval Prostitution*, using evidence drawn largely from Dijon.

[63] Contamine, p.451.

[64] *Actes*, i, LXXVI; AN JJ 173/67 (Feb. 1425). For other cases of women in the company of brigands (although their exact status is unclear), see ibid., CXI; AN JJ 173/298 and CXXIV; AN JJ 173/513.

[65] Rossiaud, passim. On p.10 he notes, for instance, that Amiens had at least 50 public prostitutes in 1453.

[66] Geremek, chapter VII, esp. p.242.

[67] Subsequently the rue d'Ecosse. *Plan et description de la ville de Dieppe au xive siècle dressés d'après le Coutumier ou Cueilloir recueilli pour Msr. Guillaume de Vienne, archevêque de Rouen, par Guillaume Tieuillier, prêtre de Saint-Jacques* , Dieppe 1865, p.31. See also pp.33-34 for further discussion of this quayside area based on the above survey of 1396.

[68] Presumably the ecclesiastical prison. Dieppe's lord was the archbishop of Rouen. The pillory was nearby (*Plan*, p.34).

[69] *Actes* , ii, CXCIV; AN JJ 174/281.

[70] *Actes*, i, CXIV; AN JJ 173/516 (1424).

[71] J.N.A. Thierry, *Recueil des monuments inédits de l'histoire du Tiers Etat* , 4 vols, Paris 1850-70, iv, p.259. Finucane, p.179.

[72] *Rouen au temps de Jeanne d 'Arc et pendant l 'occupation anglaise (1419 -1449)*, P. Le Cacheux, ed. (Société de l'histoire de Normandie), Rouen and Paris 1931,p.321. See also Brundage, p.527 on bathhouses and p.526 for cases of religious houses owning brothels in Seville.

[73] *Actes* , i, LXXXIV;AN JJ 173/84 (Feb. 1425). Brawls in taverns were not uncommon. Another at Avranches led to a *chambrière* being hit by an English archer (ibid., ii, CLXXXVIII; AN JJ 174/229). See also ibid., i, CLIV; AN JJ 173/565 (1426). For details of Goodkin's career, see C.T. Allmand, *Lancastrian Normandy. 1415-1450*, Oxford 1983, pp.101-102.

[74] *Actes* , ii, CCXXVII; AN JJ 175/233 (1433).

[75] See below p.37.

[76] *Chronique de Jean le Fèvre, Seigneur de Saint-Rémy*, ed., F. Morand,

2 vols (Société de l'histoire de France), Paris 1876-81, i, p.353. *A Chronicle of the Reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI (1377-1461)*, ed., J. S. Davies (Camden Society), London 1856, p.133.

[77] *Actes*, i, CVIII; AN JJ 173/253 (October 1425).

[78] ibid., i, CL; AN JJ 173/474.

[79] *Actes*, ii, CLX; AN JJ 173/587 (1426).

[80] ibid., ii, CLXXXIX, AN JJ 174/233.

[81] For examples, see *Actes*, i, CVIII; AN JJ 173/253.

[82] *Rouen au temps de Jeanne d'Arc* , pp.200-201, where an extract from the Tabellionage for 1431 shows Salvain making a suspicious payment of 20 l.t. per annum to Marion la Veuve living in the parish of Saint Ouen 'pour la bonne amour qu'il a a ladite Marion, les bons et agreables services qu'elle lui a faiz'. For his wife's residence at Tancarville see ADSM, serie E, Comté de Tancarville: comptes (uncatalogued), vol.2, f.80 (1428-29).

[83] *Actes* , ii, CLVIII**; AN JJ 174/114 (pardon dated 14 Feb. 1428).

[84] See above n.54.

[85] Curry, 'Military Organization', vol. ii, p.xliv.

[86] *Actes*, ii, CLXXXIV; AN JJ 174/157.

[87] ADSM, Tabellionage de Rouen, 18, f.345 (7 March 1422).

[88] ibid., f. 181v.

[89] I intend to discuss the question of marriages between English soldiers and native girls elsewhere.

[90] ADSM G 249.

[91] ADSM G 250, where there is a similar case concerning a priest who marries an Englishman to a local girl without the proper paper work, again because physical violence is threatened.

[92] *Actes*, ii, CLXII; AN JJ 173/290.

[93] *Actes*, i, L; AN JJ 172/594.

[94] *Actes*, ii, CCI*; AN JJ 175/27 (pardoned December 1431).

[95] For instance, *Actes*, i, XC; AN JJ 173/129.

[96] See, for instance, the regulations of Henry VII issued in 1487 and of Henry VIII in 1513 where camp-followers were expressly forbidden (*Tudor Royal Proclamations,Volume I, The Early Tudors*, ed., P.L. Hughes and J.F. Larkin, New Haven and London 1964, pp.15, 113). An undated set of ordinances, possibly issued by Edward IV in 1475, banned women entering the host in search of prisoners (British Library, Additional Manuscript 33,191). For French practices, see Contamine, pp.451-52.

[97] Walkowitz, 651, n.29.