THE CAPTIVITY OF A ROYAL WITCH:

By A. R. MYERS, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.,
LECTURER IN MEDIEVAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL.

In the long line of the Queens of England, Joan of Navarre, the Queen of Henry IV, is, in most respects, not of outstanding note. In one way, however, she is unique; she is the only Queen of England to be imprisoned for treason by means of witchcraft. Yet few Queens have had less reason to be discontented with their lot, and few have been less malevolent than she. Contemporary chroniclers record with unquestioning confidence the charges of sorcery and necromancy brought against her; to the modern historian the explanation of this strange episode is not so simple as that. The evidence of two household accounts, one of which is printed below, the other to be printed later, for a considerable portion of Joan's imprisonment, does not provide by any means a master-key to the problem; but it helps a good deal towards a solution.

The story of Queen Joan's reputed sorcery has often been told before; but it may be well to recall the main facts. Joan, or Joanna, of Navarre, Duchess of Brittany from 1386 to 1399, became in 1403 the second wife, and the Queen, of Henry IV, King of England. The new Queen was received with great pomp, and a dowry of 10,000 marks (£6,666 13s. 4d.) per annum was bestowed on her. The royal favour thus shown to her continued throughout the reign of Henry IV; and not only was she on good terms with the King, but her relations with all her

step-sons and step-daughters appear to have been friendly throughout her husband’s lifetime.\(^1\) After his death she seems to have continued for several years on very amicable terms with King Henry V; but in 1419 there came a sudden change. On the 27th September, 1419, the royal council\(^2\) made an order depriving her of her dowry and all her other revenues and possessions;\(^3\) and four days later she was arrested and taken from her own\(^4\) manor-house of Havering-atte-Bower in Essex to the royal manor-house of Rotherhithe, in Surrey.\(^5\) The reason, so it was stated in parliament, was that her confessor, John Randolf, a Franciscan friar of Shrewsbury,\(^6\) had accused her “of compassing the death and destruction of our lord the king in the most treasonable and horrible manner that could be devised”.\(^7\) Contemporary chroniclers said more bluntly that she had tried “by sorcery and necromancy for to have destroyed the king”.\(^8\) Two members of her household, Roger

\(^1\) There seems to be no evidence in support of the suggestion of Benjamin Williams, on p. xix of the Introduction to his edition of Thomas Elmham’s *Henrici Quinti Angliae Regis Gesta* (London, 1850), that in 1411 Joan had used her influence with the King to the detriment of Henry, Prince of Wales. It would, on the other hand, be wrong to suppose, as Miss Agnes Strickland did, in her *Lives of the Queens of England* (2nd edition, London, 1852), ii. 83-84, that in the latter years of Henry IV “such confidential feelings subsisted between young Henry and Joanna, that he employed her influence for the purpose of obtaining the king’s consent to the marriage of the young earl of March, at that time ward to the prince”. The two extracts from the Issue Rolls which she quotes in support of this statement are merely records of the sums paid by the Prince for the transfer to himself of the feudal right of marriage over the Earl of March from Queen Joan, to whom it had been granted in February, 1408 (C.P.R., 1405-8, p. 408). The transaction was therefore quite an ordinary one.

\(^2\) The King had set sail for France in July, 1417, leaving his brother, the Duke of Bedford, and a council to govern the country in his absence, and did not return until February, 1421. He and Joan must still have been on good terms when he left England, for a truce with the Duke of Brittany, which Henry made on the 16th November, 1417, was expressly stated to have been due to the appeals of Queen Joan (T. Rymer, *Foedera*, London, 1729, ix. 511).

\(^3\) Rot. Parl., iv. 118b.

\(^4\) Granted to her for life on the 9th September, 1403 (C.P.R., 1401-5, p. 259).

\(^5\) Exchequer Accounts 406 30 (to be printed later), f. 2a; *The Brut*, ed. F. W. D. Brie (E.E.T.S., 1906), ii. 444.


\(^7\) Rot. Parl., iv. 118b.

Colles, also of Shrewsbury, and Peronell Brocart, were implicated in the affair, as was John Randolf himself. Indeed, the latter was said to have been the tempter who had caused the Queen to resort to witchcraft. He was seized in Guernsey, and taken to Normandy; later, he was sent back to England and shut up in the Tower of London. There he met his death in 1429 as the result of a brawl with a mad priest.

His royal mistress enjoyed a happier fate. She was, it is true, kept a prisoner for nearly three years, and all her servants and property were taken away from her. But during his last illness, Henry V regretted his treatment of his step-mother, and ordered the restoration of her freedom and her property. Moreover, her imprisonment was not by any means a burdensome one. Other attendants were appointed to replace those who had been removed, and for the first few months of her captivity she was given the variety of a certain amount of travel; during that period she was lodged at Rotherhithe, Dartford, Rochester, and possibly other places besides. This frequent change of residence was, however, probably made to suit the convenience of the government; for during the last two years of her imprisonment she appears to have been at Leeds Castle, in Kent, the whole of the time.

A much more important and unequivocal indication of the way in which she was treated is the standard of living which she was allowed. It is here that valuable evidence is afforded by two account-books of her household during a large part of her captivity. The first (to be printed later), now in the custody of the Public Record Office, records the accounts from the 1st

1 Rot. Parl., iv. 118b.
2 First to Cherbourg, thence to the King at Mantes; from there to Château Gaillard, and eventually to the Tower (Devon, Issues, p. 365; Brut, ii. 423).
5 Ibid., 248b.
6 Galbraith, op. cit., p. 123; Exch. Accts. 406/30. From the 1st October to the 15th December, 1419, she was mainly at Rotherhithe; and from the 15th December, 1419, to the 8th March, 1420, at Pevensey, in the custody of John Pelham. Thenceforward she was at Leeds.
7 John Rylands Library, Latin MS. 238 (printed below); Phillipps MS. 3788 (see below, p. 266, note 3, and p. 268, note 1.)
October, 1419, to the 15th December, 1419, and the second (printed below), now in the John Rylands Library, provides, in its present state, the accounts for the period 17th March, 1420, to the 7th March, 1421. For the last year and a half of her imprisonment there are, at present, no accounts available; but these two accounts cover between them a long enough period to give a fair idea of how she was treated during most of her captivity.

The first account shows that during the first three months of her imprisonment, Joan was living in great comfort. Her commissariat expenditure averaged during these eleven weeks £37 16s. 7d. a week; and since each day's expenses include an item of between twelve and sixteen shillings for the stable,
it looks as though she was permitted to ride out a good deal. The leniency with which she was treated is even more apparent from an inspection of the list of gifts and rewards, and the expenses for wardrobe and chamber. To allow the Queen at least nineteen grooms and seven pages to wait on her would have been a curious policy if it had been really believed and proved that she had been practising witchcraft in a dangerous manner. Still more remarkable would it have been to permit her so many clothes for herself and her servants, especially as these clothes were not inexpensive garments of homespun. The materials for them included minever and other choice furs, tartarin (a rich silk stuff), silk laces, cords, and thread, sindon and Flanders linen (both fine linen fabrics), and cloth of various kinds which were all of such a price that they must have been of very good quality. And it was not only in the matter of clothes that Queen Joan was suffered to gratify her desires. Other purchases for her included chains, rosary, and girdle, all of gold; an ewer, a buckle and pendant, and table-knives, of silver-gilt; and a candlestick of silver. She bought a wide variety of medicines, often of an expensive kind, doubtless prescribed by the Portuguese physician of Henry IV, Pedro de Alcobaça, who had been appointed to attend her. This was not all; other luxuries included the repair of a harp, the laying-in of a stock of aqua vitae, and the purchase of a birdcage for her 'jay'. If she was allowed to retain her books, she must have had at least one or two very fine books to look at. Altogether, apart from the

1 She also had a silver-gilt clock, which was repaired during this period.


3 Probably a popinjay, or parrot. In July, 1418, she had sent a 'papegeay' as a present to her daughter-in-law, the Duchess of Brittany (Rymer, Foedera, ix. 603).

4 One of the most sumptuous MSS. in the John Rylands Library is a mid-thirteenth century Psalter (Latin MS. 22). On folio 2r of this MS. are the words 'Royne Jahanne,' which Delisle pronounced to be undoubtedly the signature of Queen Joan (M. R. James, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Latin MSS. in the John Rylands Library at Manchester, Manchester, 1921, i. 67). There is some evidence that a fine fifteenth-century Book of Hours, now in the Philadelphia Free Library, belonged to Queen Joan (E. Wolf, A Descriptive Catalogue of the John Frederick Lewis Collection of European MSS. in the Free Library of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, 1937, p. 115).
stigma of a charge of witchcraft, and the inconveniences inherent in imprisonment, however light, Joan must have been leading a very pleasant life during this period.

The second account-book (Rylands Latin MS. 238) shows that by March, 1420, this luxurious régime had been reduced to a less expensive standard of living which continued throughout the following twelve months. The former average commissariat expenditure of £37 16s. 7d. a week had now been reduced to £11 17s. 9d., and the provision for the stable had disappeared altogether. No purchases are recorded for the wardrobe and chamber, and the 'dona' had shrunk to very small proportions—£6 10s. for a period of nearly fifty-one weeks as against £5 18s. 7d. for just under eleven.

Some of this apparently greater frugality is, however, deceptive. A fragment of a Great Wardrobe book, now in the Public Record Office (Exch. Accts. 407/4, f. 12a), a transcript of which is printed below, shows that Queen Joan was still treated in such a generous manner that she was able to bestow gifts liberally on her numerous servants, both men and women. The absence of any allowances for the stable does not necessarily mean that she was no longer permitted to ride out at all; she may have been allowed to use the horses and the carriage (if any) of her governor. She was able to buy considerable quantities of wine, of various kinds—Gascon, Rochelle, and Rhenish; and her menu was good enough for her to entertain from time to time some distinguished visitors, whose standards in gastronomy were high. The Archbishop of Canterbury came once to dinner, on the 1st April, and the Duke of Gloucester twice to supper, on the 14th April, 1420, and the 10th February, 1421. The Bishop of Winchester, one of the richest Englishmen of his day, spent a short week-end at Leeds Castle in August, 1420, from Friday, the 9th, until Sunday, the 11th.¹ Lord Camoys

¹ Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, and Henry Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester, each came again at least once during the following twelve months, when she was still at Leeds. In the margins of Queen Joan's household account-book for the year 8-9 Henry V it is recorded that on the 12th June, 1421, the Duke of Gloucester dined and departed after dinner, and on the 2nd July the Bishop of Winchester dined with her (Messrs. Sotheby, Wilkinson, and Hodge, Catalogue of Manuscripts of the late Sir Thomas Phillipps, Bart., 1896, p. 111).
seems to have come for a much longer stay; apparently he arrived on Friday, the 12th April, and did not leave until nine months later, on Friday, the 31st January. Even this departure was not a final one; five days afterwards he returned, on the Wednesday afternoon, for a comparatively brief visit of eight days.\(^1\)

The standard of comfort which Joan enjoyed during the first three months of her captivity continued, then, but little reduced during 1420 and the early months of 1421. It did not end or fall thereafter; on the contrary, for the rest of her imprisonment it seems to have risen again. The account-book for the Queen's household from 1421-1422, described above,\(^3\) is not now available; but Miss Agnes Strickland was able to inspect it, and her quotations from it are some indication of the luxuries which Joan obtained during this period. The cost of the Gascon, Rochelle, and Rhenish wines which were bought for her amounted this year to £56 0s. 4d.; and "There are charges for seven yards of black cloth, for a gown for the queen at the feast of Easter, at 7s. 8d. per yard, and for making a gown for her, 1s. 6d.; for one cape of black, for black silk loops, and for 400 clasps (possibly hooks and eyes); for 7½ yards of black cloth, at 7s. per yard, for the queen's person; for making a cape for the queen, for black satin, and for grey squirrel fur, 23s. 4d.; for fur for a collar and mantle for the queen, 20s.; for 1 oz. of black thread, 1s. 6d.; 3 dozen shoes at 6d. per pair. . . . To two serjeants-at-law to plead for the queen's gold, 6s. 8d. To Nicholas, minstrel, a gift of the queen, 6s. 8d. . . . one pot of green ginger, 9s. 6d.;

\(^1\) His visits are particularly interesting in view of the fact that the late Mr. T. A. Archer gave the date of his death as the 28th March, 1420, in the article on Thomas de Camoys, in the Dictionary of National Biography. He made Lord Camoys a ghost at the time he was paying these visits to Leeds Castle by misquoting Dugdale's correct statement of the date of Lord Camoys' death, 28th March, 9 Henry V, as 1422, and then refuting it in favour of 1420. That Lord Camoys died in 1421 is clear from the Inquisitiones post mortem 9 Henry V, no. 29, and 1 Henry VI, no. 70 (Calendarium Inquisitionum Post Mortem, vol. iv, Record Commission, 1828, pp. 58, 78). For an explanation of previous errors regarding this date, see G. E. Cokayne, The Complete Peerage, revised by the Hon. Vicary Gibbs, vol. ii (London, 1912), p. 508, note (e).

\(^3\) P. 266, note 3.
In the matter of food, fodder, and fuel the Queen received increased privileges. On the 16th November, 1421, the royal council issued a "commission during pleasure to Thomas Lilbourne, clerk, Peter Thorpe, Richard Capell, John Warene, William Doget, and Walus Wales, to take wheat, barley, beans, peas, oats, wine, ale, cows, calves, sheep, lambs, pigs, little pigs, capons, hens, poults, geese, ducks, pheasants, partridges, conneys, salt and fresh fish and other victuals, and hay, litter, coals, firewood, rushes, and other necessaries for the household of the King's mother, Joan, queen of England, and carriage for the same." This grant was not merely a device on the part of the government to abuse the right of purveyance in order...
to save a corresponding financial grant from the Exchequer. Not only were large sums granted from time to time in 1421 and 1422—for example, £106 13s. 4d. on the 15th July, 1422, to buy horses for her ‘chaise,’ but the total amount allowed was greater. For the board and maintenance of Joan herself, Thomas Lilbourne, the clerk of her household, drew some £1,300 from the Exchequer from Henry’s last departure to France in June, 1421, to his death on the 31st August, 1422, an average of just over £19 5s. a week. The total expenditure for the Queen’s household from the 17th March, 1420, to the 7th March, 1421, was only £666 0s. 0½d., which averages out at just over £13 1s. a week.

The impression one gets from these household accounts is that a degree of consideration unusual in the case of a person charged with treason by means of witchcraft was shown towards Joan throughout her imprisonment; and this is in harmony with the other facts known of her captivity. There is no suggestion anywhere that she was ever tried for her reputed witchcraft, or even that any further investigations were made after the first alarm in September and October, 1419; and from the letter which Henry V issued during his last illness, ordering the restoration of her freedom and her dowry, it is plain that he regretted by that time the action taken against her in 1419.

For the rest of her life no stigma nor disadvantage seems to

---

1 J. H. Wylie and W. T. Waugh, *The Reign of Henry the Fifth*, vol. iii (Cambridge, 1929), p. 394, note 6, citing the Issue Roll 10 Henry V, 15th July, 1422. (I greatly regret that owing to the war many classes of documents, including the Receipt and Issue Rolls, are inaccessible, and it has therefore been impossible for me to consult them.) This grant for the purchase of horses must have been a result of Henry V’s order for her release, made on 13th July: “... And be cause we suppose she wol son remoeve from the plas where she is nowe, that ye ordeine hir also Horses for ij Chares. . . .” (Rot. Parl., iv. 248b.)

2 Wylie and Waugh, op. cit., p. 400.

3 If Waugh meant by “the board and maintenance of Joan herself,” the receipts for the commissariat alone, the contrast would be still greater. For a true comparison the total amount of receipts for the year 7-8 Henry V should, of course, have been given, and not the total expenditure; but, as explained above (p. 266, note 2), the record of all receipts is missing from this MS.

4 Rot. Parl., iv. 248b. “... We doubtynge lest hit shulde be a charge unto oure conscience, for to occupie forth lenger the said Douair in this wise, the whiche charge we be avised no longer to ber in our conscience. . . .”
have remained upon her on account of the accusations against her in 1419, although she seems never to have been formally acquitted of those charges. She had a little difficulty in recovering her dower, in spite of Henry V's command; but that was merely because so much of it had been granted away to other persons,¹ and she was eventually compensated fully by other royal grants for these unobtainable revenues formerly part of her dowry.² Henceforward, she led a very easy and peaceful existence. Her grandson, Gilles de Bretagne, became a great friend of Henry VI during his stay in England from 1432 to 1434; it is likely that in consequence Joan was viewed with favour by the young King, who certainly treated her with respect and consideration. He gave her, for example, a valuable New Year's gift in 1437, consisting of a tablet of gold, garnished with four balas-rubies, eight pearls, and in the midst a great sapphire.³ When she died in the July of the same year at Havering-atte-Bower,⁴ he saw to it that she was buried with all honour by the side of her second husband, in St. Thomas à Becket's chapel behind the high altar of Canterbury Cathedral.⁵

These are remarkable facts in view of the gravity of the charge on which she was imprisoned in 1419. The case against Eleanor Cobham, Duchess of Gloucester, in 1441, began in a very similar way—the arrest and examination on a charge of sorcery of a clerk in her household (Roger Bolingbroke), who then accused his mistress of plotting against the King's life; but there the similarity ends. Eleanor was not only brought

¹ Rot. Parl., iv. 248b-249a.
⁵ On the 11th August she was given a State funeral to which the King summoned the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of Norwich and Rochester, the Prior of Christchurch, Canterbury, the Abbots of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, Battle, Faversham, and the Prior of Rochester, and the Duke and Duchess of Gloucester, the Earls and Countesses of Huntingdon, Northumberland, and Oxford, and Lords Fanhope and Poyning (Nicolas, Proceedings, v. 56).
speedily to trial, but convicted of treasonable sorcery, and condemned to perform in the fullest publicity a humiliating penance. Not only that, but she was imprisoned for life, with an allowance for her maintenance far smaller than that which the captive Joanna had enjoyed. And her reputed fellow-criminals did not escape with mere imprisonment, as Friar Randolph had done. Roger Bolingbroke was executed with the full rigours of a traitor’s death; and Margery Jourdemain, the Witch of Eye, with whom the Duchess confessed to having dealings, was burnt at the stake. Thomas Southwell, another cleric implicated in the affair, escaped the fate of Bolingbroke only by a timely and merciful death in prison. Evidently, high rank was not necessarily any protection against a charge of sorcery, for either the chief prisoner or the humbler folk implicated in the affair; for in 1441 Eleanor Cobham was the first lady in the land. The leniency of the treatment which Queen Joan received, and her eventual restoration to complete favour, are convincing signs that the charge of sorcery against her cannot have been taken very seriously by the government. Why, then, was she arrested and kept a prisoner for nearly three years?

At the outset, the charges against her may very well have been widely believed. At the time of her arrest there were so many rumours of attempts on the King’s life by witchcraft that on the 25th September, 1419, Archbishop Chichele issued

---

1 Eleanor was sent first to Chester, then to Kenilworth (October, 1443), and eventually (July, 1446) to the Isle of Man, a far less pleasant place to that generation than the South-East of England, where Queen Joan had been imprisoned (Henry Ellis, *Original Letters illustrative of English History*, 2nd Series, London, 1827, i. 107; Rymer, *Foedera*, xi. 45; Nicolas, *Proceedings*, vi. 51). According to a writ of the 15th May, 1444 (Devon, *Issues*, pp. 447-448), Eleanor received for daily support 100 marks yearly, and was allowed twelve persons in attendance, whose total wages per annum amounted to £115 11s. 8d. These two sums together amount to only £182 5s.

a letter to all his bishops, stating that the King had ordered prayers to be said for his protection, especially against the supernatural machinations of necromancers who were reported to have been working of late for his destruction. Shortly afterwards, on the 8th and 9th November, Convocation had before it a chaplain named Richard Walker, who was accused and found guilty of practising sorcery in the diocese of Worcester. To minds already feverish with rumours of witchcraft, it would seem not at all impossible that even a Queen-mother previously on good terms with the King might have plotted against his life by the use of witchcraft (particularly if they remembered the evil reputation for sorcery of her father, Charles the Bad, King of Navarre). This would appear the more likely if, as some have thought, she or her attendants had been corresponding too freely with her son, the Duke of Brittany. Certainly, the commons had presented in parliament in 1415 a petition, which the King had accepted, praying for the expulsion of all Bretons, both within the Queen's household and without, from the realm, as a statute of 7 Henry IV had ordered, on the grounds that these Bretons made it their aim to find out the secrets of the realm, and reveal them to their compatriots, "que sount les greindres enmeyes de vostre Roialme", and also to carry money and jewels out of the country, to the prejudice of the King and the damage of the whole land. There was a long-standing enmity between the seamen of England and Brittany and this was liable to kindle periodical outbursts of national resentment against Queen Joan and her Breton children, servants, and connexions, from 1404 (only a year after her marriage to Henry IV), until at least 1426.

These are sufficient reasons to account for the Queen's arrest; they are inadequate to explain why she was not released

---

1 Concilia MagnaeBritanniae, ed. D. Wilkins (London, 1737), iii. 392-393, 'superstitios necromanticonun operationibus'.
2 Conc., iii. 393-394.
5 Rot. Parl., iv. 79b.  
6 Ibid., iii. 527b-528a; iv. 79b, 306b.
by the summer of 1420, when there had been enough time to investigate and disprove the charges of sorcery and necromancy, and the Treaty of Troyes had for a while allayed Anglo-Breton enmity. There are firm grounds for supposing that the compelling motive for keeping her a prisoner two years more was a financial one, a motive which may, indeed, have weighed with the government in making her arrest. From the renewal of the war with France in 1415, parliaments had voted supplies with unusual generosity; but by 1420 the drain on the exchequer was becoming formidable,¹ and the government may have feared the outbreak of popular murmurings, of which Adam of Usk speaks in 1421,² if the burden of taxation were increased any further at that moment. To deprive Queen Joan of her dowry of 10,000 marks a year would be an important addition to the resources of a badly insolvent government, whose regular income amounted at this time to only just under £56,000 a year.³ Joan's dowry had always been a heavy burden on the royal finances, which in the Lancastrian period were in a state of chronic deficit. By July, 1404, little more than a year after

³ Many attempts have been made, notably by the late Sir J. H. Ramsay, to compute the total annual revenue and expenditure of the mediaeval English kings; but Mr. Anthony Steel has pointed out very clearly the numerous pitfalls in the path of anyone rash enough to try. (See his article quoted above, note 1; also " English Government Finance, 1377-1413," in E.H.R., vol. li (1936), pp. 29-51, 577-597, and "The Receipt of the Exchequer, 1413-1432," in the Cambridge Historical Journal, vol. vi, No. 1 (1938), pp. 33-54.) But fortunately there is no need to essay such a hazardous course here, for in May, 1421, the Treasurer of England presented to the King's Council a statement on the deplorable condition of the royal finances. According to this, over £52,000 of the total income of nearly £56,000 was already assigned to the defence of England, Calais, Ireland, and the March of Scotland, and various salaries, wages, and pensions, leaving only £3,500 to pay for a wide variety of charges, ranging from the royal household, royal embassies, artillery, and other munitions of war, to the building of a new tower at Portsmouth, the wages of the clerk of the King's ships, and the custody of the King's lions. Besides these, there were a number of old debts and arrears for which the Treasurer could not even attempt to make any provision (Nicolas, Proceedings, ii. 312-315).
her marriage to Henry IV, her dowry had fallen into arrears, to the extent of nearly £5,000; and this seems to have been not the last time that her dowry was not paid up to date. For the year March, 1420, to March, 1421, Joan’s board and maintenance cost the government only about £700; and even during the year following, when the allowance was on a more generous scale, the government had to find only just over £1,000 for her keep. A net addition to the exchequer of nearly £6,000 must have been a godsend to the exchequer, which from 1420 onwards had to find considerable sums towards Queen Catherine’s dowry of 10,000 marks. The exchequer must have viewed with great regret the restoration in full of Queen Joan’s dowry in 1423.

If financial considerations were a more powerful motive for keeping Joan in captivity for three years than a continued belief in her guiltiness, it would explain the absence of any trial or formal investigation. If a trial should acquit her as guiltless, there would no longer be any justification for the continuance of her imprisonment and the retention of her property. If, on the other hand, it should result in a condemnation, she would have borne henceforth the stigma of being officially pronounced a witch, and might have had to perform a penance as humiliating as that which Eleanor Cobham later had to undergo. Henry would wish to spare her both of these. If, however, no trial were held, all these difficulties would be avoided, and the original charges against her would be a sufficient pretext for keeping her in captivity—a very lenient and comfortable captivity—while the government made use of her dowry. Several times during this century English statesmen would turn to account for political purposes accusations of sorcery, which many people genuinely believed; the charges against St. Joan in 1431, against Eleanor Cobham, Duchess of Gloucester, ten years later, against the

---

1 C.P.R., 1401-1405, pp. 402, 405; Rot. Parl., iii. 532b, 533a.
2 Vide ibid., 577a, 634b, 658b; C.P.R., 1413-1416, p. 341.
3 Supra, p. 271.
4 As agreed by the Treaty of Troyes, the 9th April, 1420 (Rymer, Foedera ix. 878).
Duke of Clarence in 1477 are cases in point. Such a device seems the most likely solution of the mystery of Queen Joan’s imprisonment, three years long, as a royal witch.

JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY LATIN MS. 238. Account-book of the household (in the form of a diary) of Joan of Navarre (widow of Henry IV) at Leeds Castle (Kent) from Sunday, the 17th of March, 1420, to Friday, the 7th of March, 1421.1

Vellum, ff. 28. 370 × 263 mm. 1420-1421.

f. 1a Die Dominica xvij die Marcij apud Ledys. Dispensaria ijs iiijd, Butilleria xs ix ob, Garderoba vijs viijd ob, Coquina xixs iiijd ob, Pulletria xvjx, Scutillera iiijd, Salsaria ijd ob, Aula xjd, Vadia vs iiijd.8 Summa xlvjx iiijd.

Die Lune xvij die Marcij ibidem. Dispensaria xxd ob, Butilleria viijx xd ob, Garderoba iijs iiijd, Coquina xs ix ob, Pulletria xiiijd ob, Scutillera jd ob, Salsaria ijd, Aula et camera ix ob, Vadia iiijs xjd ob, Summa xxxixs viijd ob.

Die Martis xix die Marcij ibidem. Dispensaria ijs iiijd, Butilleria viijx vd, Garderoba iijs ob, Coquina xixs vd ob, Pulletria xiiiijd, Scutillera iijijd ob, Salsaria ijd ob, Aula et camera xjd ob, Vadia vs xjd.

Summa xxxiiijds xd ob.

Die Mercurij xx die Marcij ibidem. Dispensaria xviijd, Butilleria vijs xd, Garderoba iiijs ijd ob, Coquina xjs vijd ob, Pulletria xvjd ob, Scutillera iijd ob, Salsaria ijd ob, Aula xjd, Vadia iiiijs xjd ob. Summa xxxijx xjd ob.

Die Jouis xxj die Marcij ibidem. Dispensaria ijs iijd, Butilleria xs iijd ob, Garderoba vs viijd ob, Coquina xiiijd iijd, Pulletria xiiiijd, Scutillera iijd ob, Salsaria iijd, Aula etc. xjd, Vadia iiiijds xob. Summa xxxixs.

Die Veneris xxij die Marcijibidem. Dispensaria xvijd, Butilleria vijs iijijd ob, Garderoba vs viijd ob, Coquina ijs xd, Pulletria xjd, Scutillera iijd, Salsaria iijd, Aula xijijd ob, Vadia iijjis viijd ob. Summa xxxjs viijd.

1 I wish to express my warm thanks to Dr. Guppy for permitting me to transcribe this MS., and to Dr. Frank Taylor, Keeper of the Western MSS. in the John Rylands Library, for the valuable assistance which he has generously given in the editing of this document and the writing of the accompanying article.

8 These offices are those of the steward, the buttery, the wardrobe, the kitchen, the poultry, the scullery, the sacry, the hall, and the wages respectively.

Die Sabbati xxiij die Marcij ibidem. Dispensaria xvijd, Butilleria vijs viijd ob, Garderoba iiijs viijd ob, Coquina vijs xjd, Pulletria viijd ob, Scutilleria vd, Salsaria ijd, Aula xd ob, Vadia iiijs iiijd.

Probatur. Summa istius septimana—xijij iiijs vijd ob.

ff. 1b to 24b inclusive are identical with f. 1a in form. To each week of commissariat expenditure is allocated one side of a folio. The expenses of the above nine domestic offices are recorded day by day, with the day's total in the right-hand margin, and the week's total at the bottom of the folio. Under the week's total is noted, every four weeks, the total expenditure of the preceding lunar month; both weekly and monthly totals are usually prefaced by the auditor's note of approval, 'probatur'. The following is a list of these weekly and monthly totals:

| Week beginning March 24th | £11 12 1 |
| Total for the first month | £42 6 1½ |
| Week beginning March 31st | £13 10 9 |
| " " April 7th | £13 17 0½ |
| " " " 14th | £15 5 7 |
| " " " 21st | £11 8 4½ |
| Total for the second month | £54 1 9 |
| Week beginning April 28th | £10 7 4 |
| " " May 5th. | £10 11 7 |
| " " " 12th | £10 4 1½ |
| " " " 19th | £10 17 7 |
| Total for the third month | £42 0 7½ |
| Week beginning May 26th | £12 4 11 |
| " " June 2nd | £11 17 2 |
| " " " 23rd | £11 2 6½ |
| " " " 30th | £9 19 6 |
| " " July 7th | £10 17 5½ |
| " " " 14th | £12 5 1 |
| Total for the fifth month | £44 4 7 |
| Week beginning July 21st | £11 5 9 |
| " " " 28th | £11 11 4½ |

1 Cf. note 2 on page 266. The accounts for the two days, Friday and Saturday, 8th and 9th March, and the week commencing 10th March, must have been on the same sheet of parchment as the accounts for the weeks commencing 9th and 16th June. The March accounts would occupy the recto and verso of the first folio; the two latter accounts would be on the recto and verso of the eighth folio. The accounts for these three weeks (10th-16th March, 9th-15th, 16th-22nd June) and two days (8th and 9th March) were therefore written on the outermost sheet of the first quire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week beginning</th>
<th>Day(s)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Visits of Important People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 4th</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10 19 0½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>£11 15 0½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£45 11 2½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18th</td>
<td></td>
<td>£9 9 13 10½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25th</td>
<td>£9 17 3½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 1st</td>
<td>£10 5 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>£10 11 10½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£40 8 9½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15th</td>
<td></td>
<td>£11 11 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>£12 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29th</td>
<td>£12 19 11½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 6th</td>
<td>£12 3 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£48 17 3½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 13th</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10 14 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20th</td>
<td>£10 9 3½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27th</td>
<td>£11 8 7½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 3rd</td>
<td>£10 7 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£43 0 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10th</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10 8 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17th</td>
<td>£10 14 4½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24th</td>
<td>£11 3 4½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 1st</td>
<td>£10 19 11½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£43 6 6½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 8th</td>
<td></td>
<td>£11 1 2½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15th</td>
<td>£11 3 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>£20 10 7½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29th</td>
<td>£18 6 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£61 1 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 5th</td>
<td></td>
<td>£16 0 11½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>£11 17 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>£11 15 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26th</td>
<td>£12 14 4½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£52 8 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>£14 1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>£11 2 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16th</td>
<td>£8 16 4½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>£8 7 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£42 7 11½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the left-hand margin are noted, against the appropriate day, the visits of important people. These entries are as follows:
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f. 2a [Monday, April 1st]. Isto die venit Erchepiscopus Cantuariensis cum priuatis famularibus suis ad prandium, et recessit eodem die post prandium.

f. 2b [Friday, April 12th]. Isto die venit Dominus Camoyse post prandium.

f. 3a [Sunday, April 14th]. Isto die venit Dux Gloucestrie cum priuatis famularibus suis post prandium, et recessit eodem die post cenam.

f. 10a [Friday, August 9th]. Isto die venit Episcopus Wyntoniensis cum priuatis famularibus suis post prandium.

f. 10b [Sunday, August 11th]. Isto die recessit Episcopus Wyntoniensis cum priuatis famularibus suis post prandium.

f. 22b [Friday, January 31st]. Isto die recessit Dominus Camoyse post prandium.

f. 23a [Wednesday, February 5th]. Isto die venit Dominus Camoyse ad prandium.

f. 23b [Monday, February 10th]. Isto die venit Dux Gloucestrie post prandium et recessit eodem die post cenam.

f. 23b [Thursday, February 13th]. Isto die recessit Dominus Camoyse post prandium.

Note is also made in the left-hand margin, against the appropriate day, of the principal feasts of the year. The feasts recorded are those of Easter Sunday (April 7th this year, A.D. 1420), Whitsunday (26th May), All Hallows, Christmas Day, the Circumcision, Epiphany, and the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Each day the residence of the Queen is stated, and from this it appears that throughout the whole period covered by this account she remained at Leeds Castle, in Kent.

f. 25a Die Dominica secundo die Marcij apud Ledys. Dispensaria ijs xjd ob, Butilleria viijs vjd ob, Garderoba iijs, Coquina ixs vjd ob, Pulleria xjd, Scutillaria vjd, Salsaria vjd, Aula ijs ijd, Vadia iijs ijd.

Summa xxxijhs vjd ob.

Die Lune tercio die Marcij ibidem. Dispensaria xxijd, Butilleria vjs vjd, Garderoba ijs vjd ob, Coquina vijs iiijd, Pulletria viijd, Scutillaria iiijd ob, Salsaria iiijd ob, Aula xxjd ob, Vadia vs. Summa xxxvijd iiijd.


Die Mercurij quinto die Marcij ibidem. Dispensaria vs ijd, Butilleria vjs vjd ob, Garderoba iiis viijd, Coquina ixs ijd ob, Pulletria xvd ob, Scutillaria iiijd ob, Salsaria iiijd ob, Aula xxjd, Vadia iijs iiijd. Summa xxxijs vjd ob.
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Die Veneris septimo die Marcij a° viij°. Dispensaria xxijd, Butilleria vjs iijd ob, Garderoba iiijs jd ob, Coquina vijs viijd ob, Pulletria viijd, Scutilleria iijd ob, Salsaria iijd ob, Aula xxd ob, Vadia vs. Summa xxvijs xjd.

Probatur. Summa istius septimane———ixli ijs viijd. ixli ijs viijd.
Probatur. Summa totalis xiiij mensium et
vj dierum
Dcxviijli vijs viijd.

Oblaciones.


Probatur. Summa istius pagina———lxvjjs viijd. ltxvjs viijd

Necessaria.

Thome Lilbourne, clerico expensarum hospiciij Domine Johanne Regine, pro vadiis suis extra curiam prosequendo penes Concilium Domini Regis et alibi pro diuersis negocis hospicium eiusdem Domine Regine tangentibus expediendis, per lxxij dies ad ijs per diem, viij li vis [per quod tempus non cepit vadia diurna infra hospiciij Regine].

Diuersis clericis scribentibus hunc computum ac alia necessaria et memoranda eundem computum tangentia, de regardis eisdem factis, xls. In precio xxxvj

1 Inserted in the original above the line, with a caret mark.
2 See K.R. Memoranda Roll, 3 Henry VI, Mich., m. 11 (Brevia directa Baronibus).
sextariorum [et] dimidij picherij vini Vasconiensis, Rochelliensis et Reniensis expeditorum in oillagio\(^1\) et corisona,\(^2\) xiiij doliom xlij sextariorum [et] dimidij picherij vini Vasconiensis, Rochelliensis et Reniensis per pincernam Regine recepti de empece inter viij diem Marcij anno domini Regis nunc septimo et septimum diem Marcij proximo sequenti anno domini eiusdem Regis anni predicti, dolia per medium ad vii li et sextaria ad ijs iiijd, iijli iijjs iijd ob. Pro bermanagio,\(^3\) cariagio,\(^4\) shoutagio \(5\) batillagio,\(^6\) cranagio,\(^7\) frectagio,\(^8\) rimagio,\(^9\) grindagio,\(^10\) celeragio,\(^11\) couperagio,\(^12\) vadio pincerne\(^13\) ac aliis custagis\(^14\) factis circa vinum domine Regine infra tempus huius compoti, iijis viijd ob.

Probatur. Summa istius Pagine—xvjli vs. xvi vs (sic)

---

\(1\) ullage, the amount of wine or liquor by which a cask or bottle fell short of being quite full, or the quantity required to make good the loss by leakage or absorption.

\(2\) leakage. See The Black Book of the Admiralty, ed. Twiss (Rolls Series, No. 55), i. 100 and 101, n. 2, and The Oak Book of Southampton, ed. P. Studer (Southampton Record Soc.), ii. 71, n. 28.

\(3\) fees for wine-porterage.

\(4\) carrying-service, or toll on carts.

\(5\) toll for the use of a shout or barge.

\(6\) fee for boat-hire. See T. Wright, Dictionary of Obsolete and Provincial English, i. 175. Batelle = boat or barge.

\(7\) In the Oak Book of Southampton, ed. P. Studer, the English form ‘cranage’, means ‘duty paid for the use of the town crane’. Cranage is the fee for hoisting.

\(8\) freightage.

\(9\) stowage, fare. See The Black Book of the Admiralty, pp. 25, n. 2, pp. 112, 113, n. 3; and The Oak Book of Southampton, ed. P. Studer, ii. 86, n. 12 (where the spellings ‘rymage’, ‘remage,’ and ‘remmaige’ occur), and p. 87, n. 19.

\(10\) ‘gindage’ or ‘gyndage’, meaning ‘hoisting’, ‘hoisting-money’. See The Oak Book of Southampton, ed. P. Studer, ii. 70 and 78, notes 15 and 22 (where ‘gunyn-’, ‘guym-’, ‘guin-dage’ are cited. If grindage is an error, it could easily be a misreading of the last of these forms). In the text (ibid., p. 70), ‘gin-’ and ‘gyndage’ occur.

\(11\) cellarage, fee for storing in a cellar.

\(12\) fees for cooper’s work. A ‘cooper’ can mean ‘one engaged in the trade of sampling and bottling wine’.

\(13\) butler’s wages.

\(14\) costagia, costs, expenses.

\(15\) grooms of the chamber.

\(16\) pages of the chamber.
Regine, ac aliis officialibus hospiciij, cuilibet eorum xx, de regardis eisdem factis de dono dicte Regine per idem tempus, xxs.

Probatur. Summa istius Pagine—vijli xs. vjli xs.

f. 27, a and b is quite blank.

f. 28a

*Prestita et remanencia.*

In precio diuersorum victualium remanentium in diuersis officinis hospiciij Domine Johanne Regine post septimum diem Marcij anno domini nostri Regis Henrici quinti octauo, de quibus Thomas Lilbourne, clericus expensarum dicti hospiciij, onerabitur in compoto suo proximo sequenti, videlicet, in precio ij quarteriorum iiiij bussellorum frumenti remanentis in officina pistrine 3 et paneetrie post dictum septimum diem Marcij, quarteria per medium ad vs et busselli ad vij ob, xijli xijd. In precio ij doliorum vini Vasconiensis, doliun ad vjli et sextaria ad ijs iiiijd, remanentis in officina butillerie post dictum septimum diem Marcij, xijli.


Probatur. Summa istius Pagine—xxijli xjs ijd ob. xijli xjd ob.

Summa totalis expensarum huius libri,

coniuncta cum prestita et remanentia.}

Dclxvijli ob.

f. 28b

Probatur. Summa totalis expensarum huius libri, cum prestita et remanentia.}

Dclxvijli ob.

Et sic habet superplusagium—lxvijli iijs iiiijd ob. xlviijli xiijs vjd ob.

1 bakehouse. 2 ale. 3 ? carriage.

4 The office of the spicery received wax, napery, linen, cloth, canvas, and spicery from the royal great wardrobe, and distributed them to the various household offices. The chandlery formed part of the office of the spicery.