

All the count's men

The War of William V of Holland against the Bishop of Utrecht (1355-1356)

Ivo de Nooijer
9307435
BA Thesis
30 June 2014

Introduction

The fall of 1355 witnessed a renewal of the war between Count William V of Hainaut, Holland and Zeeland, and John, the Bishop of Utrecht. By the end of the following June peace was once again restored. The peace ended another round in the seemingly endless conflict between the counts and the bishops. It would not be the last. But what sets this episode apart is the type and scope of records which have been handed down. Not just the count's war accounts, kept by the clerk and comital council member Dirk Tienen, but also a muster roll of the count's forces. In addition, several contemporary accounts from Holland have survived.

Especially the muster roll deserves attention. It is part of a bundle of records related to the war, and includes the peace treaty between the count and the bishop. But more importantly, it contains a list of retinues (the muster roll as such), draft letters detailing debts to various lords, and a list of letters of *restor* issued by the marshal. Although a man-at-arms was required to appear at a muster with proper mounts, losing one gave rise to claim for compensation from the lord he fought for, a practice called *restor*.¹

Unfortunately the lists also have their limitations, which may explain why they never received historians' full attention. They appear to be drafts, and notes which were simply bound together. Although some of the letters include dates, the muster roll as such does not. In addition, the retinues are not listed in a consistent manner.

Nevertheless, the muster roll and the accounts jointly, offer a glimpse of some of the military practices in mid-fourteenth century Holland. The composition of the forces, their origin, their terms of service, references to arms and armament, allow the modern reader to assess the count's objectives. Although the enemy was a traditional antagonist, the documents highlight a network of friends and vassals who fought on the count's behalf. Many of whom share more than a noble or military background. In addition, the backdrop of strife and internal conflict in Holland and Zeeland, which had been settled only a few years earlier, provides an insight into the count's strategic objectives.

Apart from its intrinsic value, this snapshot enables a comparison between the count's practices and those of the duke of Brabant. Warfare in medieval Brabant during the second half of the fourteenth century has been the subject of a recent study by Sergio Boffa.² His work paints a vivid picture of the practices in this key principality of the Low Countries on the eve of Burgundian domination. A fate Brabant shared with Hainaut, Holland and Zeeland. As did Flanders, but other than Flanders, Brabant did not have the civic culture for which Flanders is well known. Flanders' rich historiographical tradition is of limited use as the differences, which impacted also its military practices, set it apart from the surrounding principalities.³

Count William V's practices have led Huub Jansen and Peter Hoppenbrouwers to conclude he preferred soldiers and English archers.⁴ The preference for English archers and soldiers suggests that his forces were organized in the English manner, a tantalizing question, explicitly raised by Antheun Janse.⁵ Determining what forces William V mustered and where they were from will go a long way towards answering it.

As will be argued below, the count's force which marched on Utrecht was entirely mounted. The men originated mostly from outside his domains. A key group is formed by nobles from houses with domains along the lower reaches of the rivers Rhine, Meuse, Lek and Waal (hereafter: the river lands). These rivers formed the borders between Holland, Brabant, Utrecht and Guelders. But also

¹ Sergio Boffa, *Warfare in Medieval Brabant; 1356-1406* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2004), p. 183.

² Boffa, *Warfare*.

³ *ibidem*, p. 232.

⁴ Huub P. H. Jansen and Peter C. M. Hoppenbrouwers, "Heervaart in Holland," in *Low Countries Historical Review* 94, no.1 (1979): p. 5.

⁵ Antheun Janse, *Grenzen aan de macht; de Friese oorlogen van de graven van Holland omstreeks 1400* (Den Haag: Smits, 1993), p. 275, note 166.

men with domains higher up the Rhine or Meuse, with similar riverine interests, played a key role. Why did these men serve and under what conditions? Were they mercenaries, or not? The nature of the operations, linked to the composition of the count's forces, will be used to clarify the type of operation and the aims it supposed to achieve. But before that may be done, the events, which led to William encamping before Utrecht in May and June 1356, must be described.

The road to Utrecht in 1356

Utrecht - the perpetual enemy

From the 11th century onward Holland's population increased. Land was reclaimed from the peat grounds, which formed a large part of the great estuary of Rhine, Scheldt, and Meuse. This process impacted the balance of power and changed the land and waterways of the estuary. It was the root cause of the many conflicts between the counts and the bishop of Utrecht. The former, expanding their domain towards Utrecht at the expense of the old diocese, had large tracts of land enclosed by dikes and brought into cultivation. Not only the steadily increasing population, but also the effects of dykes and polders on the course of the many rivers and waterways became a continued source of friction. In addition, the urbanization of the Low Countries, starting in Flanders in the 11th century, brought an increase in trade. The many rivers became a major source of income for whoever controlled them. Utrecht became the focal point of the counts' ambitions during the fourteenth century.⁶

The bishop of Utrecht had since Carolingian times been the central dignitary of the Empire in the northern Low Countries. Nevertheless, the diocese kept losing ground to various counts of Holland. The bishops were unable to put a stop to the land hunger of the various counts, but the counts could not knock Utrecht out. The bishops remained in control of some of the key river tolls and Utrecht remained one of the major cities in the region. The counts tried, and frequently succeeded at getting bishops elected who offered little resistance to the encroachment, either because they were family members of the major noble houses, or they were simply unable to cope with the various civic and religious factions which divided the city. However, this was not always the case.

One bishop who was able to, albeit temporarily, buck this trend, was John of Arkel. Until 1342, he seemed no different than many of his predecessors. Elected bishop in 1340 and a son from one of the major houses which held lands between Brabant and Holland, he nevertheless turned out to be a bulwark for Utrecht's interests. Helped in no small way by the civil war in Holland, and the willingness of the civic leaders of Utrecht, he halted the alienation of the lands around the major rivers.⁷

He achieved this notwithstanding the intervention and clear cut ambition from the neighboring principalities, Holland and Guelders. Both Count William IV and his father divided the diocese by treaty with the duke of Guelders. In 1331 and 1342 the two cut up Utrecht in spheres of influence. William III also supported the conquest of territory in the Nedersticht, the area around the city of Utrecht proper. His son ended open hostilities but actively sought to influence the local politics, including the election of Bishop John. He succeeded, as his preferred candidate was elected, but it is unlikely he foresaw the eventual consequence of his choice.⁸

And even when the counts were not openly engaged against the bishop, local conflicts were plentiful and often linked to the count's business. When in 1333 a conflict between a village in Utrecht and their lord, William of Duvenvoorde, escalated, and the city of Utrecht retaliated (by burning two villages), he called up troops from Holland, Guelders and Cleve to strike back. As Duvenvoorde was also the count's vassal, who at this time contemplated war against Brabant, the count put a stop to the affair.⁹

⁶ Antheun Janse, *Ridderschap in Holland; Potret van een adellijke elite in de late Middeleeuwen*, 2nd ed. (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2009), p. 294.

⁷ Ronald P. de Graaf, *Oorlog om Holland; 1000-1375* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 1996), pp. 109-12.

⁸ Hans M. Brokken, "Het ontstaan van de Hoekse en Kabeljauwse twisten" (PhD diss. Leiden University, diss., 1981), p. 15.

⁹ Peter C. M. Hoppenbrouwers, "Ridders en hun ruiters. Het krijgsbedrijf in Holland en Brabant gedurende de veertiende eeuw," in *Bourgondië voorbij, de Nederlanden 1250-1650; Middeleeuwse studies en bronnen 123*, ed. Mario Damen and Louis Sicking (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2010), p. 340.

Although Bishop John had already shown disconcerting signs of independence, it took until 1344 before Count William IV felt obliged to act. William IV's overseas activities had reduced his grip on the developments in Utrecht and Friesland. When he returned, he immediately started to strengthen his position. He welcomed the lord of Abcoude as his vassal. Although Sweder of Abcoude was the bishop's man, he had come in conflict with him. In addition, the holdings of another lord from Utrecht, the lord of the key castle of Ysselstein, were assessed to ascertain his reliability as an ally. Nevertheless the count left for Prussia at the end of the year, leaving further preparations in the hands of his men.¹⁰

The immediate cause of William IV's subsequent attack on Utrecht in 1345 was the exile of some of his allies, a patrician family from the city. Count William IV responded by mounting a full-fledged expedition against Utrecht.¹¹ Notwithstanding the lengthy preparations, the attack came as a surprise. From 8 June until 23 July 1345 William besieged the city. A truce was agreed upon, William's exiled allies were again admitted and four-hundred burghers had to beg his forgiveness. However, this, and the minor territorial expansion at Utrecht's expense, hardly seemed worth the costs associated with the expedition.¹² In any event, it freed William to focus on Friesland, the other part of his domain where he believed matters needed to be set straight.

The count landed near Staveren in Friesland in September 1345. Part of his forces, which he commanded in person, was overwhelmed and the count was killed. The remainder decided to retreat. His death brought a swift and ignominious end to the affair.¹³ After William IV's untimely demise, Bishop John saw a renewed opportunity to reassert his power. Everyone who had assisted count William IV during the siege was to submit to his authority, including the lords of Abcoude and Montfoort. A number refused, and the bishop mounted several attacks, with little effect.¹⁴

The death of William in 1345 made his four sisters potential claimants. The eldest, Margret, was married to the Holy Roman Emperor Louis IV, of the house Wittelsbach, the second daughter, Philippa, was married to the English king Edward III, the third to the duke of Jülich and the fourth was still unmarried. The eldest had strong claims due to the birth order, custom in Hainaut (but not in Holland and Zeeland), and the fact that her husband was Holy Roman Emperor. Nevertheless, Edward III did not concede. The stage was set for a conflict which could span England and the Holy Roman Empire. The fact that the not insignificant duke of Jülich was the weakest of the three, speaks volumes in this case.¹⁵

An untimely death -the succession of William IV

Early 1346 Margret received the counties of Hainaut, Holland and Zeeland from her husband the Emperor, as rightful heiress. In response King Edward III opened negotiations with the duke of Jülich and threatened with invasion.¹⁶ Margret's reception as countess in Zeeland proved troublesome. Some of the powerful nobles appeared to support Edward III. She tried to take charge, but to no avail. She fared better in Holland. The cities and towns accepted her, albeit with little enthusiasm.¹⁷ Similarly, many nobles accepted Margret only passively, although very few appear to have actively resisted. However, she proceeded to favor those who supported her. Whether cause or effect, the privileges granted to these very few, members of the comital council and (extended) family, strongly

¹⁰ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," pp. 16-17.

¹¹ De Graaf, *Oorlog*, p. 117.

¹² Brokken, "Het ontstaan," p. 18.

¹³ Janse, *Grenzen*, p. 56.

¹⁴ De Graaf, *Oorlog*, p. 117.

¹⁵ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," pp. 21-22.

¹⁶ *ibidem*, pp. 26-27.

¹⁷ *ibidem*, pp. 30-31.

affected the relationships between the various noble families and were a seedbed for the subsequent civil strife.¹⁸

The confusion and chaos after William IV's death, also granted Bishop John an opportunity he did not wish to pass up. In early 1346 he again exiled the patricians who's earlier exile had led to the intervention from Holland. In addition he went over to the offensive and attacked the region around Eemnes, a town taken by the Hollanders in 1339. A region they had since started, menacingly, calling East-Holland. The bishop also attacked Ysselstein, held for the count of Holland. An uprising by over four-hundred supporters of the exiled burghers in October ended badly for the exiles. It enabled the bishop to consolidate his position in the city. In addition, he tried to placate powerful nobles such as the lords of Vianen and Culemborg.¹⁹

Meanwhile, Countess Margret could do little. In July 1346 she announced a one sided truce with Utrecht. She was unable to fill the power vacuum created by William IV's death. Given her vulnerable position; she wanted to suspend hostilities without offering peace. The opportunity offered by her weakness was apparent to others as well. Edward III sent a representative to the bishop to investigate the opportunities of an alliance but none was concluded.²⁰ The bishop never accepted the truce and the parties remained at war. However, he did not undertake major military activities. Both sides continued to harass each other. The Hollanders strengthened their eastern frontier and continued with forming the administrative region East-Holland.²¹

After William IV's death, many in Hainaut, Holland and Zeeland had feared, and continued to fear that the three counties would be divided among his four sisters. To demonstrate his resolve to avoid such a division, the Emperor appointed his son, William, as stadtholder.²² In the course of 1347 William strengthens his hold over his mother's domains and stabilized the situation in Friesland mid 1348 by accepting an (unfavorable) truce.²³ By then, renewed war with Utrecht and the death of Emperor Louis IV in October 1347, affected the situation in Holland.

The conflict between the electors of the Holy Roman Empire ensuing the Emperor's death, led the house Wittelsbach to approach Edward III for help. However their opponent, King Karl IV, used the duke of Jülich to approach Edward as well. Edward still hoped for a divided inheritance and started marriage negotiations to wed his daughter to Karl IV. In addition, he transferred the staple for English wool to Middelburg, Zeeland.²⁴ He probably intended to woo the locals, who depended on the trade with Flanders and England. The position of the dowager Empress Margret, and her son appeared more vulnerable than ever.

During the summer of 1348 the bishop's forces raided Amstelland and Woerden and recaptured Eemnes. William responded early August by assembling an army and marching toward Utrecht. He challenged the bishop to do battle within three days between Ysselstein and the town of Jutfaas. When Bishop John failed to accept the challenge, William burned down the town.²⁵ In November 1348 the count and the duke of Guelders agreed a treaty of mutual support and protection. In accordance with precedence, they agreed to divide Utrecht between them, apparently in response to the actions of the bishop against one of his vassals.²⁶

In early 1349 Margret proposed to abdicate in Holland and Zeeland, for which she wanted to receive a significant compensation, which William and the estates did not wish to pay. Her decision to abdicate was prompted by Wittelsbach *hauspolitik*. The family was embroiled in a power

¹⁸ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," p. 35

¹⁹ De Graaf, *Oorlog*, p. 119.

²⁰ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," p. 38.

²¹ *ibidem*, p. 72.

²² *ibidem*, pp. 52-53.

²³ *ibidem*, pp. 61-71.

²⁴ *ibidem*, pp. 89-90.

²⁵ *ibidem*, p. 76.

²⁶ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," p. 78 and Isaac A. Nijhoff, ed., *Gedenkwaardigheden uit de Geschiedenis van Gelderland, door onuitgegeven oorkonden opgehelder en bevestigd*, tome 2 (Arnhem: Nijhoff, 1833), p. 36-38.

struggle.²⁷ However, in May 1349 Louis IV's sons reached an agreement with Karl IV and settled their inheritance among themselves. This stabilized the situation. In addition Edward III moved the wool staple from Middelburg, although he kept an interested eye on Zeeland.²⁸

During the course of 1349 the war against Utrecht became grittier and harder. No holds were left barred; the count attacked the bishop's worldly and spiritual position. Nevertheless, in the end it was the bishop who came out on top.²⁹ Meanwhile, Margret's abdication proposal led to a polarization among the nobles and cities of Holland and Zeeland. Although some cities, such as Dordrecht, welcomed William as count in 1349, he was not supported by a majority. His decision to claim the comital rights increased the polarization. The ambivalent attitude many people held, is underscored by the fact that it took violent action by his supporters to ensure his rise to power in 1350.³⁰

Cods and Hooks – civil war

In May 1350 a group of nobles from Holland set out to make William count in his own right, count William V. Their charter, also known as the Cod charter, formed the basis of the faction which later became known as the Cods (*Kabeljauwen*).³¹ After the death of a Cod in Delft in August, tensions rose and those nobles who opposed the Cods, drafted their own charter in support of Margret. This charter, dated 5 September 1350, formed the basis of the faction later known as Hooks (*Hoeken*).³² Matters became heated when in February 1351 a group of nobles from Holland, led by Gerard of Herlaar, brought William V from Hainaut to Holland.³³

The conflict which erupted centered around opposing views on two questions. Firstly, the issue was whether to follow the estranged Margret or choose her son, the usurper? Although William was a usurper, he had a valid claim and was present and actively governing. Secondly, was it acceptable that the inheritance of William IV would be used to further the Wittelsbachs *hauspolitik* or was it better to accept increased control by nobles and cities over government?³⁴

In the course of 1351 William V consolidated his position in Holland; he strengthened his defenses and eliminated Hook strongholds. He subsequently went over to the offensive. He not only defeated his mother's forces, but also took Zeeland. By October he controlled both Holland and Zeeland.³⁵ During the short campaign to take the various strongholds, William V used English mercenaries and Westphalian troops, led by Gerard of Herlaar.³⁶ An English naval contingent arrived in Zeeland in support of Margret in early June, but it was defeated on the Meuse early the next month.³⁷

King Edward III intervened on Margret's behalf because she had changed tack in 1351. She sought his help to effectuate her claims. This about-face by his mother was probably a key factor for William to support, or at least encourage, the Cods. However, Edward's help did not come cheap and he and Margret never agreed on the price she had to pay. Edward most likely considered this to be an opportunity to further his own aims as he instructed his men to become involved in governing the counties to be reclaimed on Margret's behalf.³⁸

²⁷ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," pp. 90-93.

²⁸ *ibidem*, pp. 101 and 106.

²⁹ *ibidem*, p. 80.

³⁰ *ibidem*, pp. 95-98.

³¹ *ibidem*, p. 108.

³² *ibidem*, p. 118.

³³ *ibidem*, p. 129.

³⁴ *ibidem*, p. 120.

³⁵ *ibidem*, p. 144.

³⁶ *ibidem*, p. 151.

³⁷ *ibidem*, pp. 158-160.

³⁸ *ibidem*, pp. 124-125.

To hedge his bets, and most likely in the aftermath of the failed intervention, William V was brought into the English sphere of influence by arranging a marriage. Early 1352 he married Maud, the daughter of Henry of Grosmont, Duke of Lancaster. It was Edward's intention to broker a peace treaty between mother and son, and to reduce the negative effect of his earlier military support of Margret.³⁹ In 1353 the duke of Lancaster was sent to negotiate a treaty of friendship, after William V refused an earlier proposal for an offensive and defensive alliance with Edward.⁴⁰ Although nothing comes of these activities, they are indicative of Edward's interest in William V's affairs.

In light of the erosion of her position, Margret became more inclined to settle. During the second half of 1354 she and her son negotiated a settlement. William received the lordship over Holland, Zeeland and Friesland and became stadtholder in Hainaut. The financial compensation, payable to Margret, remained significant. The cities from Holland remained ambivalent, given the sums involved, and never explicitly supported the arrangement. Nevertheless, peace was concluded early January 1355.⁴¹ Almost five years of wars and conflicts had sapped much of the strength from Holland. The fact that Bishop John was unable to take more advantage of this sorry state of affairs, was not for lack of trying.

During the years since the last war, the powerful lords of Utrecht, the lords of Culemborg, Vianen, Woudenberg, Sterkenburg, and Lichtenberg and the dean Uterlo, had tried to strengthen their position at the expense of the bishop. They held important appointments in the diocese and the bishop had pledged castles to them to secure loans, his loans. They, in turn, used these castles to mount raids and obstruct trade, much to the frustration of both the bishop and the city of Utrecht.⁴²

This conflict had also stimulated the bishop to seek peace with Holland. In May 1351 William V concluded a peace treaty with Utrecht as he wished to stabilize his eastern border. In addition he used this treaty as a propaganda victory in his effort to win Zeeland. However, in the balance of things, the peace was most favorable to Utrecht. The count lost the gains made during the preceding decades. However, the bishop did agree to withhold support for the Hooks.⁴³

Nevertheless, during the summer of 1352, Margret and the bishop also concluded a peace treaty. One which was almost identical to the one her son had concluded, except that the bishop now granted the Hooks freedom of movement and agreed not to arrest or hinder them. For obvious reasons William V saw this as a breach of his treaty with the bishop and considered himself no longer bound by it.⁴⁴

By then, the bishop had dealt with his troublesome lords. In 1352 the city and the bishop joined forces to force the magnates to relinquish the castles and their appointments. At least three of them did not comply. Bishop John, once again, called to arms. After considerable effort, and at great expense, he subdued the rebellious lords. The siege of Woudenberg took seventeen weeks, but when it fell, the viscount of Montfoort capitulated, although he was not the one being besieged. It took a further year to capture the stronghold at Ter Eem. However, in the end the bishop appeared to have prevailed. He reigned in the lords and reestablished control over his domains.⁴⁵ However, the situation in Utrecht and various incidents between Holland and Utrecht after 1352, led to renewal of the conflict in 1355.⁴⁶

³⁹ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," p. 173.

⁴⁰ *ibidem*, pp. 174-176.

⁴¹ *ibidem*, pp. 177-179.

⁴² De Graaf, *Oorlog*, p. 120.

⁴³ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," pp. 152-153.

⁴⁴ *ibidem*, pp. 166-167.

⁴⁵ De Graaf, *Oorlog*, pp. 120-121.

⁴⁶ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," pp. 167-168.

William V returns to Utrecht

William V prepared his offensive against the bishop well. The accounts of the war show that almost every conceivable source of revenue was used to collect the necessary funds. There are entries for payment from cities, bailiwicks, and monasteries. The receiver lists income from taxes, redemptions by commoners for military service (*rhiemgeld*), succession taxes, judicial fines, issuance of new rights, sale of comital domains. Other preparations included reaching out to the bishop's half brother, lord John of Arkel, a powerful noble with extensive holdings along the lower Lek and Waal, to make sure he would "sit still" in a war with Utrecht.⁴⁷ William V also had the trade with Utrecht watched in Flanders.⁴⁸

On Sunday 1 November 1355 William instructed his steward in South Holland to send smiths to castle Nesse, which was promptly done. Shortly afterwards, the steward also sent, per instruction, 232 pounds of iron, a hat smith, coal, thirty eight pieces of steel to the same castle. In addition, a full smithy is sent. Although this was to be returned, the steward noted that it was destroyed and had to be replaced.⁴⁹

Notwithstanding the bishop's effort to subdue his vassal, or consequently, many lords sided against him. The vassals who did are, unsurprisingly, the usual suspects. The most prominent ones were the lords of Ysselstein, Culemborg, Vianen, and Herlaar, but various others are listed as well.⁵⁰ In early November William V sails up river on the Lek and disembarks his forces near Wijk bij Duurstee. The lords who had declared for William V instructed their supporters in Utrecht not to fight with the bishop against the count.⁵¹

Both sides raided and plundered. In November 1355 William V raided the bishop's lands for eight days. During this raid William fought a skirmish at Kothen.⁵² The bishop was powerless to intervene, according to the chronicler, because his vassals who had sided with William V prevented him to march out. Simultaneously the lord of Egmond attacked the bishop's lands at Bunschoten.⁵³ The bishop did not leave the raids unanswered, and on 25 January 1356 (n.st.) he attacked Weesp and Muiden, which were burned, forcing the defenders to swim across the moat.⁵⁴ Weesp was lost, but one of the bishop's stone throwers was captured.⁵⁵ On 14 March 1356 (n.st.) the count's forces attacked the town of Soest. In response the bishop's troops from Amersfoort attacked the enemy column, the resulting skirmish costing both commanders their life.⁵⁶

The chronicler of Utrecht referred to foreign lords who helped William V. The lords "Van der Dicke" and "Van der Sleiden" are mentioned by name. Both were captured at Montfoort, together with forty of their men. They got lost while trying to reach the city of Oudewater. They were held, for the bishop, at the castle of Montfoort. However, the viscount of Montfoort, who was also the bishop's marshal, declared himself neutral in April 1356 and let the prisoners go. A little later he became a vassal of the count.⁵⁷ The affair was typical of the complex relationships entertained by many of the major nobles.

⁴⁷ Accounts of Dirk van Tienen regarding the war against Utrecht 135-1357, November 1359, archive "Graven van Holland," catalog reference number 3.01.01, inventory number 436, The Hague: Nationaal Archief, p. 6-13.

⁴⁸ De Graaf, *Oorlog*, p. 121.

⁴⁹ Accounts of Herman Vink, Steward of south Holland, October 1354 - October 1356, November 1356, archive "Graven van Holland," catalog reference number 3.01.01, inventory number 1617, The Hague: Nationaal Archief, fol. 48v.

⁵⁰ Johannes de Beke, *Croniken van den Stichte van Utrecht ende van Hollant*, ed. H. Burch (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982), p. 203.

⁵¹ De Graaf, *Oorlog*, pp. 138-139.

⁵² Janse, *Ridderschap*, p. 324.

⁵³ De Beke, *Croniken*, pp. 203-204.

⁵⁴ *ibidem*, p. 204.

⁵⁵ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 28.

⁵⁶ De Beke, *Croniken*, p. 205.

⁵⁷ *ibidem*, pp. 203-204.

It was clearly not a premeditated plan. On 17 January 1356 (n.st.) the count instructed the steward to pay the lord of Ysselstein an amount of money to ransom the prisoners.⁵⁸ Apparently, this did not have the intended result as on 8 March 1356 (n.st.), count William V ordered the storming of the castle of Montfoort.⁵⁹ Whether the storming took place or not, is not clear. However, the accounts suggest that some repairs were in order, especially as the viscount now held the castle for William V. On 15 June 1356, while before Utrecht, the count ordered his steward to send two large shipments of lime to Montfoort.⁶⁰ The costs incurred by the viscount of Montfoort for the upkeep of his prisoners were not paid by William. Eventually a settlement was reached, but not with the count, although he received a copy. It set off toll exemptions against payment of the outstanding amounts, incurred by the viscount for the (named) Dicke and Sleiden. But it took until April 1359 (n. st.) to settle the account.⁶¹

Count William V landed around 12 May 1356 near Utrecht, and attacked castle Nyenvelt. After a siege of seven weeks, using four stone throwers and other siege engines, the castle fell. It was subsequently burned down, according to the chronicler without the count's approval.⁶² William encamped on the Hoge Woerd before Utrecht, on the other side of the river. Whether or not as a result of the destruction of Nyenvelt, the bishop and the count came to terms. On 30 June 1356 William called a *dagvaart* on the Hoge Woerd, before Utrecht, on account of the conclusion of a peace treaty. The charter was witnessed by two council members of the council of Holland, Dirk of Brederode and John, Lord of Egmond, one of the councils from Zeeland (Floris of Borsele) and four cities, Dordrecht, Delft, Haarlem and Leiden.⁶³ The nobles from Utrecht who sided with the count would have seized goods restored to them, some received reparations to castles. It included the, by now familiar, Ysselstein, Culemborg, viscount of Montfoort, and Vianen.⁶⁴ On 19 June 1356, the duke of Guelders and the bishop also concluded a two year truce.⁶⁵

The war did not cause major changes between Holland, Guelders and Utrecht. However, the bishop paid a political price. The city council became a permanent partner in the affairs of state. Some things had changed.⁶⁶ As a result of the war, the financial arrangements between Margret and William V had remained unexecuted. As the cities of Holland remained mute, and the war with Utrecht diverted the count's means, there was simply no money. Although peace was restored on 30 June, Margret had died a week earlier.⁶⁷ William did not enjoy the fruits of his labors. When he returned from a trip to England in July 1357, he showed signs of mental illness. He was considered unfit to rule and was locked-up in Les Quesnoy, his castle in Hainaut.⁶⁸ His younger brother Albrecht took over, first as warden and subsequently as count.

⁵⁸ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 1617, fol. 43r.

⁵⁹ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 24.

⁶⁰ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 1617, fol. 49r, see De Graaf, *Oorlog*, p. 140 for a different reading of the accounts, he believes the shipments were intended for the repair of castle Nyenvelt, the accounts explicitly refer to Montfoort.

⁶¹ Frans van Mieris, ed., *Groot Charterboek der Graaven van Holland van Zeeland en Heeren van Vriesland*, tome 2 (Leiden: Van der Eyk, 1754), pp. 835-36.

⁶² De Beke, *Croniken*, p. 205.

⁶³ Walter Prevenier and Johannes G. Smit, eds., *Bronnen voor de geschiedenis der dagvaarten van de Staten en steden van holland voor 1544; deel I en II: 1276-1433*, ed. (Den Haag: Instituut voor Nederlandse Geschiedenis, 1991), p. 86.

⁶⁴ Muster roll Count Willem V, 1356, archive "Graven van Holland," catalog reference number 3.01.01, inventory number 219, The Hague: Nationaal Archief, fol. 31r.

⁶⁵ Nijhoff, *Gelderland*, p. 86.

⁶⁶ De Graaf, *Oorlog*, p. 122.

⁶⁷ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," p. 180

⁶⁸ *ibidem*, p. 186-187.

William's Forces

The muster roll

The muster roll is part of an item described in the archive's inventory as "charters by the Empress Margret and Duke William, concerning Holland, Zeeland and Utrecht." The item is a bound volume consisting of sixty five paper folios. The volume contains thirty seven charters, numbered with pencil in modern Arabic numerals. The one but final charter is the treaty of 30 June 1356, the first charter in the third tom of the Charter book by Van Mieris.⁶⁹ The last charter concerns payments to a steward for costs he incurred in the course of the war. Presumably it was Van Mieris who numbered the charters.

Apart from the later numbering, these last two charters were given the contemporary heading "Utrecht". They are followed by a one page (extract?) from the war's account.⁷⁰ The muster roll (folio thirty-four recto up to and including folio fifty verso) is the longest section of the bundle. It provides a list of retinues. Most retinues are identified at the top of the folio by the leader's name. The section is followed by summaries of marshal's letters, grouped by retinue as well. This fills the folios fifty-one recto through fifty-seven recto. The following section, titled "wages", is merely two folios long, fifty-eight verso and fifty-nine recto. It contains letters setting out the consolidated debts of the count to various major lords, in exchange for providing troops. The final section, from folios sixty recto until sixty-two recto, lists various nobles from Holland who received a "letter", without specification as to what message it contained. The lists do not match with any of the retinues in the roll.

The folios are numbered with distinctly late medieval Arabic numerals. Folio thirty four is missing. There are no traces of it being cut or torn out, suggesting the numbering was added before the folios were bound. In addition, not all folios have been used; twelve have remained empty but form an integral part of the bundle. This suggests that the numbering was added before the folios were used or that the bundle was considered to be one notebook like document. Spilled ink in combination with an erroneous stroke suggests that (at least some of) the folios are in their original order, as the accidental line continuous on the next folio.⁷¹

However, the handwriting appears to be from more than one author. The wording of the various texts which identify to the author or (more likely) instructor, refer to Dirk Tienen⁷² and Jan of Bueren.⁷³ The layout of the folios is inconsistent; some folios contain one column, others two. The handwriting between the two columns is sometimes wildly different. And even if similar, the type of information provided about the retinues varies. The majority provides names and number of horses. Some are neatly itemized lists identifying men, horses and equipment. Other, however, are extremely short or lump groups of horsemen together in tens or more. Especially the retinues with men from more distant lands seem to have received less attention or the author had more trouble writing their names down.

Apart from the writing, the wording and the abbreviations for horses and armor (or men-at-arms) vary. The muster roll as such does not describe the horses, however the letters do, albeit succinctly. In all cases the animal's color is listed but not much else. There is no reference to separate lists or description. The valuation of the deceased horse appears to be based on the former owner's word or honor, as can be deduced from the letter's wording. Interestingly, different ink was used to write names above the individual summaries of some of the marshal's letters. Although they may

⁶⁹ Frans van Mieris, ed., *Groot Charterboek der Graaven van Holland van Zeeland en Heeren van Vriesland*, tome 3 (Leiden: Van der Eyk, 1755), p. 1.

⁷⁰ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 33v.

⁷¹ *ibidem*, fols. 45v and 46r.

⁷² *ibidem*, fol. 33v.

⁷³ *ibidem*, fols. 54r-59r.

have been intended as decoration, the fact that they are of poor quality writing and each appears to be different than the other, suggests that these were added by, or on behalf of, the addressees.⁷⁴

Horsemen

The muster roll lists thirty six retinues, two of which are broken down in smaller troops. The retinues are identified by the name of their leader and specify in each case the number of horses. In some cases the number of men is listed, in most cases at least the most important members are named. All retinues appear to be mounted, although there are references to foot soldiers, these are in the accounts of the war and not the muster roll.

The cavalry troop, or *rotte*, formed the basic unit and had a banner and a war cry. It was both an administrative unit and a fighting unit. It is equivalent to the French *conroi*, or *montre*. It was usually based on connections of vassalage or blood and almost always had a common geographical origin, led by a noble from the most prominent family. Their existence allowed princes to rapidly mobilize veteran units.⁷⁵ In Holland, a number of important nobles and experienced leaders were called *baenrots*. Although the word is related to knight banneret, it originally referred to leaders of a troop, their seniority and power makes them more akin to barons. However at this time the title still had a strong military overtone.⁷⁶

The names provided in the muster roll enable in many cases the identification of the leaders and, by references to towns or castles, the origin of the retinue. For example, the troop led by William of Elmpt, of thirty six horses, has twenty two named men-at-arms. The knight William of Elmpt came from the town with the same name, near Roermond on the Meuse.⁷⁷ Seven other men have names which refer to a location within a fifteen kilometer radius, i.e. Wassenberg, Breimpt (currently Brempt), Herkenbuich (Herkenbosch), Rurenmunde (Roermond), Swalmen, Vlodorp (Vlodrop).⁷⁸

Lord Rost of Wijlre offers another interesting example.⁷⁹ He commanded nine troops, in total close to three-hundred horses, making his one of the biggest retinues of the campaign. Relatively few members of his force are named, but the ones who are suggest they were mostly from Jülich. They had names such as Baugheym (currently Geilenkirchen), Garzwilre (Garzweiler), Hugelhoven (currently Bergheim), Kinswilre (Kinsweiler), Minsbach: (Munsbach), Schimper (castle Schimper, Limburg), Susterzeyl (Süsterseel), Vlattin (Vlatten), Vorsbach (currently Oberforstbach), and Wijswilre (Weisweiler)⁸⁰ Similarly, the twenty two horse troop of the Lord of Roysin, a town in Hainaut, suggests a common geographic origin. Of the eight men who do not carry the lord's name, four names refer to nearby locations. There is a companion named Blarignies and *panchiers* hailing from Haveluy, Marchines-a-pont (Marchienne-au-Pont), and Rogny.⁸¹

In Brabant the strength of a *rotte* was counted in terms of glaive or *panchier*, in French, or *pansier*, in Middle-Dutch. In Brabant, the former consisted of one man-at-arms with two good horses; the latter was a man-at-arms with a single horse. Each combatant had to be equipped with two swords and a set of armor. This suggests that the glaive was the equivalent of the French lance. In a glaive of three or more horses, the man-at-arms was seconded by an armed horseman, a *pansier*, or mounted archer.⁸²

⁷⁴ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 51r.

⁷⁵ Boffa, *Warfare*, p. 198.

⁷⁶ Boffa, *Warfare*, p. 129 and Janse, *Ridderschap*, pp. 84-86.

⁷⁷ Johanna Maria van Winter, *Ministrialiteit en ridderschap in Gelre en Zutphen* (Groningen: Wolters, 1962), p. 270.

⁷⁸ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 38r.

⁷⁹ *ibidem*, fols. 40v-41r.

⁸⁰ see for a different opinion Brokken, he believed Rost was a Bavarian noble, Brokken, "Het ontstaan," p. 318.

⁸¹ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols. 44r-44v.

⁸² Boffa, *Warfare*, p. 197.

The term *pansier* appears to be most frequently used to refer to the man in the muster roll as well, as the number of listed horses would be disproportionate to the number of men.⁸³ In its French form it is explicitly the heading of a group of named combatants listed as part of a retinue from Hainaut.⁸⁴ In Brabant in 1356 a glaive received one écu, a *pansier* received half that amount.⁸⁵ This appears to have been the case in 1356 in Holland as well. Ghereijt of Drienen received payment for horsemen and foot men. For the horsemen, a total of thirty seven horses, he received one old écu a day for three horses.⁸⁶ This supports the conclusion that the reference to a *pansier* in the muster roll is in many cases the man and not the cuirass as such. However, there are also references to *pansier* and *harnasch* as a reference to armor as such.⁸⁷ A use also found in other sources, for example a specification of the military obligations of the town of Wieringen from 1397 which referred to both as equipment.⁸⁸

Although a more detailed breakdown of the muster roll is provided in annex 1, the overall conclusion is that the largest contingent came from Guelders, a little over 40%. It was followed by the men from Holland, who accounted for close to 20% of the force. The duchy of Jülich supplied nearly 10%. About 8% appears to come from Brabant, almost 10% if Limburg is included. Luxemburg provided 6%, practically all of the Sleiden force. Hainaut, Cleves, and Berg provided about 1-2% percent each. The origin of the remaining retinues cannot be determined with sufficient certainty. These numbers should be treated with care, as many nobles held fief from several overlords, as will be discussed below. Nevertheless, it appears that Guelders, especially men with riverside domains, provided the brunt of the forces.

Overall the muster roll lists 2,941 horses. The largest contingent is referred to as Hoorne, 302 horses in total.⁸⁹ Hoorne was one of the most important noble houses in the northern Low Countries, with large holdings in the river lands. Although no first name is given in the rolls, the accounts refer to *jonkheer* Loef of Hoorne.⁹⁰ Around 1360, he had the castle Loevenstein built, which still dominates the strategic confluence of the rivers Meuse and Waal.

A significant part of the retinue of the marshal, Dirk of Brederode, is identified as being from outside the lands, but their origin is not clear. According to the roll he commanded 276 horses.⁹¹ He was a Hook and one of the most powerful nobles of Holland. He was pardoned in 1354, rejoined the comital council in February 1356, was the marshal of the count's forces during the war, and became *baenrots* some time later.⁹²

A similar force is commanded by the earlier mentioned Rost of Wylre, as detailed above, his force came from Jülich, with one small troop from Luxemburg.⁹³ His career spanned at least two decades as he, and the earlier mentioned Lord John of Sleiden, was witness to the call to arms by the duchess of Jülich in December 1371 against her sister, the countess of Cleves.⁹⁴

The 234 horse retinue led by the Lord of Cranendonc⁹⁵ can be traced to Brabant. Cranendonc was a leading house from Brabant, several of its members sat on the ducal council.⁹⁶

⁸³ for example NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols. 36r and 36v.

⁸⁴ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 44r.

⁸⁵ Boffa, *Warfare*, p. 218.

⁸⁶ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 25.

⁸⁷ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 35v.

⁸⁸ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 200, fol. 7v, quoted in Jansen, "Heervvaart," p. 10.

⁸⁹ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols. 48v-49r.

⁹⁰ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 40.

⁹¹ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 47r-47v

⁹² Brokken, "Het ontstaan," pp. 1170-72.

⁹³ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols. 40v-41r

⁹⁴ "Regesten," *Gemeente Roermond*, <http://www.roermond.nl/4/Gemeentearchief/Zoeken-in-de-bestanden-van-het-gemeentearchief/Regesten.html>, regesten II nr. 1067.

⁹⁵ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 35r.

⁹⁶ Boffa, *Warfare*, p. 92.

The lord of Zevenbergen, serving with 198 horses⁹⁷, was most likely Gerard, a Cod and early supporter of William V with domains in the river lands on the border of Holland and Brabant.⁹⁸

There are two retinues referred to as led by Herlaar. The first led by the lord of Herlaar, the second by Arnt of Herlaar, with 68 and 175 horses respectively.⁹⁹ The former is John, lord of Herlaar and Ameide, who had domains on the south bank of the river Lek near Vianen. The latter was lord of the castle Ammersoyen, another riverside castle between Brabant and Guelders. John and Arnt were the younger brothers of Gerard, the leader of the raid which had brought William V from Hainaut to Holland in 1350.¹⁰⁰ In addition, Arnt was a witness to the *lantfriede* of Guelders and Cleves of 1359.¹⁰¹

The lord of Rede had domains in the south of Holland (Grote Waard, Bommelerwaard, Land of Heusden) his 170 horse retinue originated from that region and possibly contained men from Zeeland and north western Brabant.¹⁰² As the Hook Herbaren, lord of Rede, had died in exile before June 1354, it is probably a relative but it is not clear who inherited his titles and lands.¹⁰³

The lord of Vorne was Walraven of Borne, later lord of Valkenburg (or Fauquemont).¹⁰⁴ He became the enemy of the duke of Brabant during the war over those domains, which he received as imperial fief in 1356. This was probably after his exploits for William V, as he is not referred to as lord of Valkenburg. His domains occupied strategic locations. The lands of Borne were on the Meuse and Valkenburg dominated the trade route between Aachen and Brabant.¹⁰⁵ He is already listed as one of the witnesses to the treaty between William V and the duke of Guelders of 3 November 1348.¹⁰⁶ His force of 165 horses is a testament to his power, even before the expansion of his domains.¹⁰⁷

Van der Sleiden, was John, lord of Schleiden, from Luxemburg. His son joint the expedition of William's successor to Friesland in 1396.¹⁰⁸ Although captured, with forty horsemen according to the chronicles¹⁰⁹, the roll indicates his retinue consisted of 165 horses.¹¹⁰ That this unfortunate incident was not the end of his involvement is indicated by the fact that he was paid before Utrecht in June 1356, as was his fellow prisoner the Lord Van der Dicke. In addition, they both received compensation for their losses as prisoners, and reimbursement for costs incurred during their trip home.¹¹¹

The retinue of Wouter of Ysenderen consisted of 132 horses.¹¹² He was the son of William of Ysenderen, a witness to the *lantfriede* of Guelders and Cleves of 1359.¹¹³ Wouter also was a vassal of the duke of Guelders.¹¹⁴ The total contribution of the listed nobles comes to 73.5% of the overall force.

Assessing the combat effectiveness remains difficult on the basis of the muster roll. Some of these men were already in the count's service in 1355, for example the captured Schleiden and Dicke. Others, such as the marshal were certainly present before Utrecht and most likely since the start of the war. Of others a specific term of service is mentioned. John of Kessel was paid for serving

⁹⁷ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 39r.

⁹⁸ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," p. 159 and Prevenier, *Dagvaarten*, p. 253.

⁹⁹ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols.38v and 50r.

¹⁰⁰ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," pp. 1205-1206.

¹⁰¹ Nijhoff, *Gelderland*, p. 109.

¹⁰² NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 36v.

¹⁰³ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," p. 1244.

¹⁰⁴ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 30.

¹⁰⁵ Boffa, *Warfare*, pp. 13-15.

¹⁰⁶ Nijhoff, *Gelderland*, p. 38.

¹⁰⁷ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 49v.

¹⁰⁸ Janse, *Grenzen*, p. 385.

¹⁰⁹ De Beke, *Croniken*, p. 203.

¹¹⁰ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols. 38v and 42r.

¹¹¹ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, pp. 23 and 30.

¹¹² NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols. 45r, 45v.

¹¹³ Nijhoff, *Gelderland*, p. 109.

¹¹⁴ *ibidem*, p. 20.

one month, with ten men-at-arms, as identified in the accounts.¹¹⁵ The muster roll refers to fifteen named men and forty five horses¹¹⁶, the payment of one old écu per man, suggests that the ten men paid were equal to ten glaives or thirty horses. The discrepancy indicates men left earlier, or a separate payment was made for others. In any event, neither document appears to be complete.

The earlier mentioned Lord of Rogny stayed a lot shorter, most of his men only nineteen days, and a few three days less.¹¹⁷ Unfortunately most entries in the accounts only provide the date of the letter by which wages were payable, not the duration of their service or the number of men. In any event, the muster roll does appear to represent the majority of the count's forces. However, nobles such as Langherak, Merwede, and Steenre, a total of sixty-one horses, are mentioned in the accounts of the war, but not listed in the muster roll. The fact that the last two explicitly receive wages for garrison duty may explain the reason for their absence from the roll.¹¹⁸ However, Merwede was also present at the siege of Nyenvelt.¹¹⁹

Surprisingly, none of the retainers appear to originate from Zeeland. Floris of Borsele is named as a witness to the peace treaty, but he is not identified in the rolls or the accounts of the war as one of the commanders. Apart from John Zuurmont, no nobles from Zeeland appear to be present, and Zuurmont is only mentioned as a council member. The majority of the twenty members of the comital council from Holland was present, while of the seven council members from Zeeland only the two earlier mentioned were. Zuurmont was hardly a local noble. He was a bastard son of William III who had received holdings in Zeeland.¹²⁰

Footmen

The muster roll proper does not contain any references to footmen. A short summary of payments does, as do various entries in the accounts of the war. Almost all are bowmen. In addition, the marshal paid for a large number of bows and arrows in England, for which he was compensated after the war.¹²¹ The accounts mention a total of 139 bowmen. They are part of eleven sections, most of which are twelve men strong. Most are referred to as coming from a city, Delft (forty-seven men), Rotterdam, Leiden (twelve each) or The Hague (a mere four).¹²² A further twenty-eight are referred to as Englishmen, some of whom are also listed in the summary.¹²³

Intriguingly, one section of English bowmen was accompanied by a man called Thomas of Bullincbroek.¹²⁴ This appears to be a phonetic reference to Bolinbroke, one of the main castles of the Lancastrian estate. As Henry of Grosmont, Duke of Lancaster, was William V's father-in-law it is plausible that the Thomas in question was in some way related to him. Especially since this Thomas is the only Englishman identified by name. A Thomas of Lancaster is mentioned in a petition to the curia at Avignon, made in 1354. In it a Thomas of Lancaster, illegitimate son of Thomas, Earl of Lancaster (Grosmont's brother), is identified as a chamberlain of the king and veteran of an attack on Sens.¹²⁵

¹¹⁵ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 23.

¹¹⁶ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 37r.

¹¹⁷ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols. 44r-44v.

¹¹⁸ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 23 and p. 25.

¹¹⁹ Janse, *Ridderschap*, p. 325.

¹²⁰ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," pp. 303 and 1257 and NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 41.

¹²¹ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 13.

¹²² *ibidem*, pp. 24, 27-28, and 31.

¹²³ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 33r.

¹²⁴ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 33v and NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 28.

¹²⁵ William Henry Bliss, ed., *Calendar of entries in the Papal registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland, Petitions to the Pope*, London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1896, p. 262.

The bowmen appear to have been primarily employed in garrisons, at least during the phase before May 1356 (n. st.). Thomas of Bullincbroek received wages for his time at Naarden.¹²⁶ Jacob of Rotterdam led a group of twelve bowmen who were paid for staying at the same place for ten weeks and at Weesp for two months. Similarly, the twelve bowmen led by John Heddinc were paid for four months and two weeks. Other bowmen were paid wages for service over periods of four months, nine weeks, and five months.¹²⁷ Long stretches which do not match the various chevauchées the count undertook. It also appears that restocking the garrison at Nesse and Woerden is the reason why pikes and bows were sent there.¹²⁸

A clear exception to this are the sixteen bowmen employed during the siege of Nyenvelt.¹²⁹ Apart of this reference, the force besieging the castle and encamped before Utrecht must have contained a sizeable contingent of bowmen, as can be deduced from the amount of arrows acquired for William V. In March 1356 (n.st.) he ordered arrows, twenty four écu worth, approximately 2700.¹³⁰ Eight days before Pentecost (4 June 1356) the steward of south Holland sent a further 1800 arrows to the count, by then encamped on the Hoge Woerd.¹³¹

Although pikes are mentioned, only one section of twelve pike men is identified as such in the accounts.¹³² The count did not appear to have used forces provided by the cities from Holland or Zeeland; at least none are listed in the account or the muster roll.¹³³ Interestingly thirteen citizens of Amsterdam are fined for not appearing on the Hoge Woerd.¹³⁴ As a number of cities did witness the peace, it may have been the citizens' absence during those proceedings which led to the fine.

Footmen clearly played a role, but one which appears to have been limited to garrison duty. With the obvious exception of bowmen, who were present in the various garrisons and also during the siege of Nyenvelt, and presumably therefore formed part of the force which encamped before Utrecht between May and June 1356.

Artillery and other specialists

Middle fourteenth century, artillery served only to attack or defend city walls or fortresses. Boffa refers to the use of guns (*donrebussen*) in Leuven in 1356, both regular and big guns are reported, and from 1360 onwards these weapons are part of the regular city arsenals in Brabant.¹³⁵ Similar references can be found in the accounts of the war. The count paid Nijs of Rotterdam for arrows and fifty *donrebussen*.¹³⁶ The city of Dordrecht loaned the count siege engines (stone throwers), costs incurred for moving them and the stones were reimbursed by the steward of south Holland on 4 June 1356.¹³⁷ The earlier mentioned attack by the bishop on Weesp in January 1356 (n. st.) included stone throwers. The above mentioned sixteen archers at Nyenvelt protected a mole, a siege engine.¹³⁸

William V issued a letter on 9 March 1356 (n.st.), payable by the steward of south Holland, to John den Goeden, for *donrebussen*.¹³⁹ A gunner named "Big Claes", referred to as "the one who used

¹²⁶ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 28.

¹²⁷ *ibidem*, p. 27.

¹²⁸ *ibidem*, p. 24.

¹²⁹ *ibidem*, p. 31.

¹³⁰ *ibidem*, p. 24.

¹³¹ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 1617, fol. 49v.

¹³² NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 27.

¹³³ a conclusion shared by Brokken, Brokken, "Het ontstaan," p. 284, see for a different conclusion Jansen, "Heervaart," p. 15.

¹³⁴ Jansen, "Heervaart," p. 15.

¹³⁵ Boffa, Warfare, pp. 156-57.

¹³⁶ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 31.

¹³⁷ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 1617, fol. 49v.

¹³⁸ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 31.

¹³⁹ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 1617, fol. 42v.

to shoot with the *donrebussen*“, is also mentioned in the sources.¹⁴⁰ The Count's clerk reimbursed the marshal and John of Langheraek for a total sum of forty gold moutons for the fabrication of *donrebussen*.¹⁴¹ Interestingly, this is the only reference to the then relatively new French golden coin, minted since 1355. It suggests these *donrebussen* were made in France, Flanders or Brabant.

The accounts of the war lists various letters received from craftsmen (sword smith, helmet maker, fletcher, and a mason) for payments to be made to them.¹⁴² This apart from the mentioned smiths, smithy, coal, iron and other equipment sent to Nesse in November 1355.¹⁴³ That these men were kept busy maintaining the counts forces is illustrated by the purchase of 1,000 horseshoes, and 20,000 nails on 18 May 1356 (n.st.) for delivery to the marshal.¹⁴⁴ The only specialists who are mentioned in the muster roll are a piper and a drummer.¹⁴⁵

William V's artillery appears to have been used for the operations after May 1356. The purchase of munitions and weapons suggests that it was the march on Utrecht for which the arrows were stockpiled. The references to the stone throwers and the mole are all in relation to the attack of fortified towns or castles.

¹⁴⁰ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 27.

¹⁴¹ *ibidem*, p. 20.

¹⁴² NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, pp. 22 and 28.

¹⁴³ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 1617, fol. 48v.

¹⁴⁴ *ibidem*, fol. 43r.

¹⁴⁵ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 49r.

War aims

Medieval strategy

Battles were infrequent as it usually required the willingness to give battle on both sides and, as they were high stake endeavors, that was an infrequent occurrence. In many cases, battle was a risk worth taking for a ruler with much to lose in the short run, either because he did not have the financial resources to engage in a prolonged conflict or he did not have the moral resources. For example a ruler with a weak(er) claim to his throne was challenged. However, battles, if won, could bring quick and decisive gains.¹⁴⁶ As contemporary rules recognized this tendency, they tried to find conditions favorable to winning such an encounter.

Ideally, a battle would be fought tactically defensively, i.e. a battle in which the enemy was forced to do the attacking on the battlefield itself. Even if the battle was sought by the forces on the strategic offensive, i.e. the invaders, they tried to remain on the defensive on the battlefield itself. Key benefits of the tactical defensive are that the defender will usually choose the battlefield and that the enemy will be forced to advance. Consequently, it will become disordered, reducing its combat effectiveness. Advancing will exhaust soldiers and disrupt a formation, both by creating openings and compression. The former may create opportunities to break into the advancing enemy formation and the latter may lead to losses without combat, as, in the worst case scenario, troops are crushed. But in any event, they will have insufficient room to effectively wield their weapons, which significantly reduces their combat effectiveness.¹⁴⁷

As the enemy could be expected to be aware of the risks, the invaders had to provoke the enemy to give battle. Apart from an enemy who wildly underestimated the enemy force, a commander had a number of strategies to achieve his aim, for example by insulting the enemy, demonstrating his impotence to protect his lands, or infringing his sense of honor. A more down to earth approach, with which it could be combined, was to provoke a response by besieging an important city or castle; or by causing sufficient damage to the enemy to make taking the risk of battle worthwhile.¹⁴⁸

A challenge by the invader should be delivered in a fitting manner; it should be clear enough, known to the enemy and the public at large. It might be insulting or might be courteous, in any event it should help to either override the defenders good sense or force his hand. But above all, it should make clear the invader was willing to accept battle, and not deliver it. That questionable honor befell the enemy.¹⁴⁹

For these reasons the principal forms of military operations in the fourteenth century were the chevauchée, the guerre de courses, and the raid. The raid required a small and mobile group, which could be collected unbeknown to the enemy, to surprise a town or castle or plunder an area. A guerre de courses can be characterized as a form of war consisting of many raids, intended to destabilize the enemy politically, plunder domains, reduce the countryside, and possibly win bargaining chips in the form of town or castles. The chevauchée sought to achieve the same war aims as the guerre de courses, but on a grander scale. By forming a large host, which ravaged the countryside, the invader achieved the aims set out above, and challenged the local prince to defend his lands.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁶ Clifford J. Rogers, "The Vegetian 'Science of Warfare' in the Middle Ages," in *Essays on Medieval Military History, Strategy, Military Revolutions and the Hundred Years War*, ed. C.J. Rogers (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2010), p. 18-19.

¹⁴⁷ Clifford J. Rogers, "The offensive/defensive in medieval strategy," in *Essays on Medieval Military History, Strategy, Military Revolutions and the Hundred Years War*, ed. C.J. Rogers (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2010), pp. 159-61.

¹⁴⁸ Rogers, "Offensive/defensive," pp. 162-167.

¹⁴⁹ *ibidem*, p. 163.

¹⁵⁰ Boffa, *Warfare*, p. 57.

Chevauchées were executed with mounted forces; however they consisted of few nobles and even fewer knights. The duke of Brabant, for example, contracted a force of 868 men, all mounted, of which only sixty-three were knights, 402 were esquires and 403 were commoners. The indentures specify the troops and their status. However the size of each of the contingents is markedly different, the largest are provided by the Viscount of Limburg and the lord of Cuyk, hundred-and- two and hundred respectively.¹⁵¹

William V's war aims

To enable an assessment of William V's aims in his war, the context and contents of the muster roll needs to be clarified. For example, if the muster roll lists a collection of garrisons across his domains, the conclusions would be different from those drawn here. Although the general scope of events and their chronology is known¹⁵², understanding the size and type of force, helps to understand the count's aims.

William V appears to have organized a chevauchée to Utrecht in May and June 1356. The collection of documents of which the muster roll as such forms part, was most likely made during or shortly after its conclusion. The folios are numbered with late medieval Arabic numerals, suggesting they were bundled at a date contemporary with the event. They contain notes from both the comital council member Dirk Tienen¹⁵³, who also kept the accounts and the count's squire, John of Bueren.¹⁵⁴ These men were both present before Utrecht with the count. The documents include the full text of the peace treaty. It contains the drafts of the marshal's letters detailing debts and *restor*, written by Bueren. These letters would be written at the end of the campaign. Moreover the drafts which do contain dates are all of the period May up to and including July 1356. Men who are mentioned in the accounts but not in the rolls are in most cases mentioned as being paid for garrison duty. Nevertheless, there are at least two arguments which do not support this conclusion, the men who besieged Nyenvelt, near Utrecht, are not mentioned in the rolls and the documents could merely have been combined during the course of 1356 or some time later.

As the accounts demonstrate that there was a limited amount of foot men involved, and also the chronicle neither mentions large formations of foot, nor operations suggesting the existence thereof, the muster roll is probably highly representative of the force collected by the count. Which is underscored by the fact that, although a summons was sent for aid to many nobles in Holland¹⁵⁵, hundred men-at-arms provided by Hoorne were sent back, with the count's consent. The note in the muster roll mentions that forty carthorses were not sent away.¹⁵⁶ It is likely that the count's vassal were asked for financial aid, comparable with the situation in Brabant at the time.¹⁵⁷

The counts of Holland from the House Wittelsbach tended to call general mobilization (*heervaart*), for technical operations, especially sieges.¹⁵⁸ After 1358 general mobilizations by the counts become, again, a frequent occurrence. William V did not use these summons to call up forces for his wars.¹⁵⁹ The absence of such a mobilization supports the conclusion that this was a chevauchée.

This is furthermore supported by the fact that the troops which took part were experienced and battle hardened. The lords of Jülich and Guelders built towers and strongholds along the rivers, the arteries of trade and commerce between the Rhineland and Holland. They extracted tariffs and

¹⁵¹ Hoppenbrouwers pp. 336-337.

¹⁵² De Beke, *Croniken*, pp. 203-05.

¹⁵³ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 33r.

¹⁵⁴ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols. 54r-59r and NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 1617, fol. 43r.

¹⁵⁵ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols. 60r-62r.

¹⁵⁶ *ibidem*, fol. 49r.

¹⁵⁷ Boffa, *Warfare*, p. 206.

¹⁵⁸ Hoppenbrouwers, "Ridders," pp. 327-328.

¹⁵⁹ Jansen, "Heervaart," p. 26.

tolls from the passing ships. The duke of Jülich and the duke of Guelders profited from their actions and supported them; these robber barons were respectable lords and council members.¹⁶⁰ In Guelders during these years a feud between two powerful noble houses, Hekeren and Bronckhorst, divided the land. Because the young duke and his disenfranchised brother Edward chose sides, a state of internecine war existed.¹⁶¹

In the middle of the fourteenth century troops from Jülich and Guelders fought both for and against the duke of Brabant as well. Many were knights and nobles, and were vassals of the duke of Jülich or Guelders respectively. They were members of the community of arms and were valued for their prowess and combat experience. Experience they had gained during near endless conflicts and while extorting, and robbing merchants which crossed their lands. They were robber barons, but should not be called mercenaries as such.¹⁶²

Compared with the situation in Brabant, William V collected an impressive force for his march on Utrecht. The army raised by the duke of Brabant during the war of succession in 1356-57 is estimated to have been between 3000 and 3500 men. The forces, which were collected for the large chevauchée against Jülich in 1371, may have totaled up to 5000 combatants. These were large armies, and unusual.¹⁶³ They do give further strength to the argument that William V's expedition against Utrecht should be qualified as a chevauchée.

This was, as one can expect, a well known type of operation, which Bishop John also employed. For example, just before the war he rode out in a show of force to convince unwilling vassals to remain loyal. Later that same year, he responded to a raid by the Lord of Meervelt, in the bishopric of Münster with a force said to have been over 2000 troops on horseback. He burned down the raider's castle, watermill and surrounding lands and made peace.¹⁶⁴

William V's chevauchée in 1356 also has much in common with later chevauchées. Albrecht, William V's brother and successor supports the Count of Flanders against the rebellious town of Ghent in 1381. In July Albrecht sent an estimated 450 troops, led by the lord of Brederode. The force also includes high ranking nobles such as William of Gommegnies, from Hainaut. The forces remained at the Count of Flanders disposal for about eleven days. Albrecht also supported the duke of Brabant by sending a mounted force in his support in 1382. The summons went out to a specific list of nobles from Holland. The lords who were called, were explicitly requested not to bring more troops than requested, troops supplied over the quota were sent back. For those troops which did participate, a fixed compensation was negotiated, both as wages and as reimbursement for expenses.¹⁶⁵

The conclusion must be that count William V's operation in May and June 1356 should be qualified as a chevauchée. There are no sources which indicate William attempted to besiege Utrecht, although the materials were present to execute a siege of castle Nyenvelt, the absence of a general mobilization and the force composition, i.e. mounted troops, suggest he did not contemplate a siege of the city itself.¹⁶⁶ The chevauchée may have been intended to shore up his position in his own lands. His challenge to the bishop, encamping before Utrecht with impunity, will have demonstrated his strength. Although the chronicle claims William V did not want Nyenvelt destroyed, its destruction, in plain sight from Utrecht, would have conveyed the message which the count wanted to send. Similarly, the letter he sent during his campaign of 1348, challenging the bishop to appear within three days at a field near the border, could have served a similar purpose.

¹⁶⁰ Fritz Quicke, *Les Pays-Bas a la veille de la période Bourguignonne (1356-1384)*, (Brussels: Editions Universitaires Les Presses de Belgique, 1947), p. 180.

¹⁶¹ Quicke, *Les Pays-Bas*, 60.

¹⁶² Boffa, *Warfare*, p. 154.

¹⁶³ *ibidem*, p. 225.

¹⁶⁴ De Beke, *Croniken*, pp. 202-203.

¹⁶⁵ Hoppenbrouwers, "Ridders," pp. 331-333.

¹⁶⁶ see for a different conclusion De Graaf, *Oorlog*, p. 140.

Terms of Service

In what manner did William V obtain the services of such a diverse group of men-at-arms? Given that the majority came from outside his lands and, it may be presumed, that many were chosen for their experience. Were they mercenaries? Following Garlan, Boffa distinguishes between those who serve first and foremost for gain and those who serve because they belong to a political community. He identifies foreign lords who served at the pleasure of the duke of Brabant, but were treated identical to the local lords with regard to obligations and conditions of service. In addition, whether or not a person was foreign was based not on birth or language but whether he was linked, socially or politically, to the group. Consequently, geographical origin is less relevant than the terms of service to distinguish the soldier from the mercenary.

Fief rents and indentures, frequently used by the kings of England and the dukes of Burgundy for example, could create a bundle of obligations for a nobleman with various liege lords. This, and the shared culture, both when bearing arms and when not, made a vassal who received fief rents members of the same community. Although many received wages, and were therefore by definition soldiers, they should not be considered mercenaries. The true mercenaries, still according to Boffa, are those who serve for pay and are not part of this community. In Brabant mercenaries were mostly the archers and foot soldiers.¹⁶⁷

The fief rent, a sum of money regularly paid by the lord to his vassal in exchange for the feudal obligations, here mostly military support, was very popular in the thirteenth and fourteenth century, especially in the Low Countries.¹⁶⁸ Fief rents should not be equated with an indenture, the fief rent would be paid whether the holder was called up or not. It was also often not enough to cover the costs of such military support; consequently the holder would receive wages if called up. Fief rents were not used to pay mercenaries. They were a way to create a bond between two men beyond a mere contract.¹⁶⁹

The fief rent appears to have been one of the main instruments with which William V created the community upon which he drew to summon his forces for the war against Utrecht in 1355-56. For example, the lords of Cuyk, and Valkenburg held fief rents from most lords of the Low Countries, the Rhineland and the kings of England and France.¹⁷⁰ However, not just magnates were part of this community.

John, lord of Kessel, led a forty five horse retinue of which Matthias of Kessel is a member. Both are also mentioned in the *restor* letters.¹⁷¹ Matthias received a toll on the river Meuse as a fief from the duke of Guelders in 1356.¹⁷² Matthijs also was a vassal of the lord of Hoorne and Altena, a brother of the earlier mentioned Loef of Hoorne. He witnessed his lord granting a fief rent in 1345, payable from another river toll.¹⁷³ The lords of Hoorne themselves were magnates who's domains included extensive holdings in territories disputed between the count of Holland and duke of Brabant, such as the lands of Heusden and Altena.¹⁷⁴

The earlier mentioned lord John of Schleiden received a fief rent from William V on 17 May 1357.¹⁷⁵ The accounts mention payment of the income from a fief rent to Rost of Binsvelt.¹⁷⁶ He is

¹⁶⁷ Boffa, *Warfare*, pp. 152-153.

¹⁶⁸ *ibidem*, p. 210.

¹⁶⁹ *ibidem*, p. 213.

¹⁷⁰ *ibidem*, p. 211.

¹⁷¹ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols. 37r and 51v.

¹⁷² Tollen en licenten langs de Maas - Kessel, archive 'Gemene Maashandelaars,' catalog reference number 115, inventory numbers 558 and 559, Dordrecht: Regionaal Archief.

¹⁷³ Jura et (ac) Privilegia Civitatis Ruraemundensis, 1244-1794, archive 'Oud Archief Roermond', catalog reference number 1001, inventory number 345, Roermond: Gemeente Archief, pp. 68-69.

¹⁷⁴ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," p. 426.

¹⁷⁵ Van Mieris, *Charterboek*, tome 3, p. 21.

¹⁷⁶ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 1617, fol. 46r.

mentioned on the muster roll with a troop of thirty horses.¹⁷⁷ Another example is Sweder of Abcoude, he was a vassal of the count of Hainaut, Holland and Zeeland and the duke of Brabant.¹⁷⁸ He and his brother William of Abcoude, lord after Sweder's death, were called typical exponents of the military customs of the river land nobles. With domains bordering Utrecht, Guelders, Holland and Brabant, they were active in conflicts in all four lands during the course of the two decades before Albrecht's expedition to Leuven in 1382. William of Abcoude's behavior is commonly associated with that of *condottieri*.¹⁷⁹

A further indication of the nature of this relationship between lord and vassal, even if it was based on fief rents, is suggested by the list of men who did homage to count William III in 1333.¹⁸⁰ Of this list of twenty-six vassals four share their name with retinue leaders on the muster roll: Broechusen, Reden, Mierlaer, Vorne (Valkenburg).¹⁸¹ The contribution of Conrad, the son of John of Schleiden, in 1396 has already been mentioned. Another name which reoccurs is Blankenheim, also listed as a member of the Schleiden retinue.¹⁸²

According to Boffa, payment of wages resolved some of the issues concerning the conflicting vassalages and enabled the recruitment of the desired troops. Troops were therefore not necessarily the (in)direct vassals of the prince they followed. Nonetheless, in Brabant the important lords led a significant part of the forces in the duke of Brabant's army which fought at Baesweiler in 1371. They provided nearly a quarter of the men-at-arms, and were accompanied by a large train. They represented, however, a small fraction of the duke's vassals, and the duke did not raise his army by a levy from his direct vassals. And even these important lords, were probably not called up on grounds of their vassalage.¹⁸³

This appears to match the facts of William V's war in 1355-56 as well. Most men received wages, such as the lords of Amstel and Cronenburch.¹⁸⁴ The majority is listed as being paid by the count on the Hoge Woerd before Utrecht, including Hoorne, Heukelom, Hessen, Ysenderen, Broechusen, Kessel, Herlaar (lord of Ammersoyen), Vorne (Valkenburg), Cranendonc, and leaders of several smaller retinues.¹⁸⁵ Dirk of Brederode is not listed as having received wages.

The lords of Herlaar and of Culemborg were also a *baenrots* of William V in 1356, out a total of eight *baenrotsen* at the time.¹⁸⁶ Even before the marshal Dirk lord of Brederode was awarded the same honor. This indicates that these men were in no way lesser men. The lords of Culemborg, Heukekelom, Montfoort, Langerak, Merwede, Vianen and Ysselstein were also council members in the council of Holland. As was Dirk of Brederode.¹⁸⁷ Rost of Wijlre also served as an occasional council member on William V's committal council.¹⁸⁸ It underscores the point that these men were treated as trusted vassals.

That this war is no exception is shown by the actions of count Albrecht. In 1382 he rode out to support the duke of Brabant. Key forces were supplied by the magnates from Holland (including

¹⁷⁷ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 41v.

¹⁷⁸ Boffa, *Warfare*, p. 152.

¹⁷⁹ Hoppenbrouwers, "Ridders," p. 335.

¹⁸⁰ J.W.J. Burgers, "The registers of the Counts of Holland in the Hainaut period, 1299-1345," *Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW)*, charter DE 076, http://resources.huygens.knaw.nl/registershollandsegrafelijkheid/oorkonde/DE_076.

¹⁸¹ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols. 35v, 36v, 39r, and 49v.

¹⁸² NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 38v.

¹⁸³ Boffa, *Warfare*, p. 209.

¹⁸⁴ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 26.

¹⁸⁵ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols. 58v, 59r and NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, pp. 29, and 30.

¹⁸⁶ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," pp. 208-209.

¹⁸⁷ *ibidem*, p. 303

¹⁸⁸ *ibidem*, p. 318.

Brederode). But large contingents also came from the river lands of Holland and Utrecht, including the lords of Abcoude, Vianen, Heukelom and Asperen, and the viscount of Montfoort.¹⁸⁹

The same applied to the duke of Brabant. The force he collected in 1371 before the battle of Baesweiler, consisted of nobles from various counties, including Brederode and William of Abcoude. Where the latter appears to have recruited mostly men from his domains, the former led a composite force of international origins.¹⁹⁰ This is surprisingly similar to the reference made in the muster roll, as the only retinue which is explicitly referred to as of mixed origins, is Brederode's.¹⁹¹

A noteworthy form of lordly compensation was the toll exemption. Apart from the income from tolls used for example for fief rents, vassals could be rewarded with exemptions, as demonstrated by the Kessel example above. Count William also rewarded various men with toll exemptions.¹⁹² The income of the Count collected for the war against Utrecht lists the receipt of a sum, paid by lord Rost of Wijlre, to ship his cloister wines free of tolls. As this was part of the account of the war, but granted after it had ended, it appears to be a reward for past services.¹⁹³ Gijsbrecht of Vianen fought during the campaign of 1355, in exchange for which the city of Vianen was granted toll exemption.¹⁹⁴ John of Culemborg also supported William V, for which the citizens of Culemborg were rewarded with an exemption from Zeeland and Holland's tolls.¹⁹⁵ Neither the lord of Vianen nor the lord of Culemborg is listed as having received wages.

Apart from wages, income from fief rents, or toll exemptions, William V's men-at-arms received compensation for the loss of warhorses. Their importance during the war is indicated by their number and their prominence in both the muster roll and the accounts.¹⁹⁶ According to Boffa at the muster the quality of the mount would also be estimated.¹⁹⁷ However, most letters state that the value is based on the former owner's word.¹⁹⁸ None of the contingents in the roll proper include a description of the horse, suggesting the estimate was made after the horse's death. The risk of over valuation was apparently weighed by the clerk.

Although the letters granted by the marshal listed the value, the accounts show that the settlement actually paid was often less. For example, Philips of Polen received eighty old écu, twenty less than he claimed, and set out in the letter of *restor*.¹⁹⁹ Similarly, the troop of Dicke also received *restor*, apart from the mentioned costs. Yet, they all received considerably less than claimed. In most cases the men were cut back between five and ten old écu. In one case twenty old écu less. This amount was clearly not a relative penalty, as the cheaper horses around twenty old écu were reassessed no different than the expensive ones, up to eighty old écu.²⁰⁰

Overall William V seems to have used a mixture of fief rents, wages and toll exemptions to pay his mounted troops. There are no indications that he used letters of indenture, although the practice was known in the Low Countries by this time.²⁰¹ The fact that the right to *restor* takes such a prominent place in the rolls and in the accounts supports this assumption. Its disappearance is

¹⁸⁹ Hoppenbrouwers, "Ridders," p. 334.

¹⁹⁰ Hoppenbrouwers, "Ridders," pp. 337-338.

¹⁹¹ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 47r.

¹⁹² NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 29.

¹⁹³ *ibidem*, p. 14.

¹⁹⁴ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," p. 1249.

¹⁹⁵ *ibidem*, p. 1178.

¹⁹⁶ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, pp. 32-38 and NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols. 51r-57r.

¹⁹⁷ Boffa, *Warfare*, p. 177.

¹⁹⁸ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 51r.

¹⁹⁹ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 32, cf. NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 52v.

²⁰⁰ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fols. 52v-53r, and NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 436, p. 33-34.

²⁰¹ Boffa, *Warfare*, p. 217.

associated with the increased use of indentures.²⁰² The count appears to have used the multitude of links and relationships which existed amongst the members of this community of men-at-arms. The only troops which appear to have served just for wages are the foot men, mostly archers. The various units are mentioned in the accounts only because they received wages, as described above. As in Brabant, they are the only ones which qualify as mercenaries.

²⁰² Boffa, *Warfare*, p. 216.

Conclusion

William V collected a large number of mounted troops, close to 3000 horses, which rode out to Utrecht in a chevauchée in May and June of 1356. The conflict, which started in November the year before, was until then characterized by raids and counter raids. Count William commanded various forces, especially garrisons to the west and north of Utrecht. The support of the lords from the river lands allowed him to practically surround the city. Although the size of the various garrisons is unknown, the references in the sources and the overall size of the mounted force, which was, by contemporary standards, a large force, suggest that foot men played a very limited role.

A high percentage of the men-at-arms came from the duchies of Guelders and Jülich, more than the county Holland proper provided. Especially if one considers that the contribution of some of the major lords of the river lands, e.g. Culemborg and Vianen, is not even part of the roll, the contribution from the river lands must have been very high. It is also interesting that such a high percentage of the retinues come from the upstream Meuse area near Roermond, the region of Guelders called *Overkwartier*. It underscores the point that the river lands were “an attractive place for ambitious nobles.”²⁰³

However, men from all neighboring principalities took part, members of what has been called the community of men-at-arms. They served the count and were a member of this community through a myriad of links and relationships, traditional fiefdoms but also fief-rents. They also received wages, with the noteworthy exception of Brederode, a by then more modern practice.

It may be presumed that most were veterans, well suited for, what appears to have been William V’s plan, a show of force, a challenge to the bishop. It was carried out by a chevauchée through the bishop’s lands. And it seems to have worked. It put a stop to the near continuous state of war which had reigned between the count and the bishop since 1345. And the point the count made, proved to be sufficiently clear to ensure peace (or at least avoid open hostilities) for almost two decades.

The main beneficiaries to the conflicts outcome may have been the various lords from the river lands. Their toll exemptions and the curtailed power of the bishop will have profited them most of all. The military exploits of some, and not just from Jülich, suggests that they profited from war in any event, be it wages or plunder. But clearly the toll exemptions had value as well, if not for themselves then at least for their subjects. The fact that even Rost of Wijlre acquired such an exemption, suggests that many had vested interests in trade, above and beyond the money they extracted in tolls. Trade was the linchpin; typically, in 1373, renewal of hostilities was again related to a threat to trade.²⁰⁴

William V is likely to have benefited mostly from the moral rewards. He had demonstrated the bishop’s inability to either defeat him or stop him from despoiling his lands. He had shown his commitment to his allies and strengthened his hold over the river lands. His loss in 1348 had been avenged and the bishop’s ambition had been cut to size. William will have benefited from the increased control of the lords in the river lands, but most of them appear to have been rather independent minded. Until the advent of the Burgundians, the river lands remained the seedbed for conflicts in the Low Countries, and their lords remained a powerful force in the border lands between Holland, Brabant, Utrecht and Guelders.

Although William V clearly preferred soldiers (i.e. troops served for wages) for the war against Utrecht, his suggested preference for English archers is not evident. Given the communalities in composition, character, type of operations and size, it appears far more likely that William V’s force was comparable to those Duke Wencelas fielded during the second half of the fourteenth century. Boffa calls these classical cavalry heavy forces, with a relatively small number of archers. In addition, William V’s use of fief rents, opposed to indentures also suggests a limited English influence. He appears to have been firmly rooted in the military traditions of his time.

²⁰³ Janse, *Ridderschap*, p. 236.

²⁰⁴ De Graaf, *Oorlog*, p. 141.

Annex 1: List of retinues*

Leader	no. of horses	Origin	References
Adsillen	15	???	???
Ballen, Johan of	13	Berg?	?presumably from Berg
Barmen, Henric of,	24	Guelders	?Heinrich of Barmen, knight, related to the knight with the same name who ransomed the city of Erkelens and other places in 1403. ²⁰⁵
Bastaert, John the	9	Holland?	?John de Bastaard, bastard son of count William III, William IV's uncle. ²⁰⁶
Bellinchove, John Lord of	86	Guelders	John, Lord of Bellinghoven, from Erkelens, along the Meuse river. ²⁰⁷ Also listed as vassal of the duke of Cleves. ²⁰⁸
Binsvelt, Lord Rost of	36	Jülich	Rost von Binsfelt, retinue from Binsfelt and Disternich, friend of Johan von Schleiden ²⁰⁹
Brederode, Dirk Lord of	276	Holland	Dirk, Lord of Brederode was a magnate from Holland, although he sided with Margret in 1350 and was considered one of the leaders of the Hooks, he was granted amnesty on 8 December 1354, early 1356 he was again part of the comital council. ²¹⁰
Broechuysen, John Lord of	90	Guelders	Johan, Lord of Broekhuizen, near the Meuse ²¹¹ , his brother William was lord of Wickrade. ²¹² The latter was a member of the Riede retinue.
Cranendonc, Lord of	234	Brabant	Lord of Cranendonc major noble from the area around Den Bosch; first named in the invitation to do homage to the count of Flanders during the Brabant wars of succession war, August 1356. ²¹³
Dicke, Coenraad of the	44	Guelders	Coenraed, Lord of the Dicke, castle near Zutphen, Guelders, he witnessed the <i>lantfriede</i> of Guelders and Cleve of 1359. ²¹⁴
Drien, Gherijt of	37	???	???
Elmpt, William of	36	Jülich	William of Elmpt, knight, from Elmpt on the Meuse, <i>drost</i> of Montfoort ²¹⁵ , member of the household of the count of Loon (1361) and witness to a treaty on behalf of the duke of Jülich (1375) ²¹⁶ . He became leaseholder of the dean and chapter of Xanten in 1363. ²¹⁷
Ghimmenich, John	8	Jülich	knight, he stood surety for a payment of a loan by William III to the steward of Aachen. ²¹⁸
Ghomghijs, John of	20	Hainaut	knight, Gommegnies, Hainaut. ²¹⁹

²⁰⁵ "Regesten," *Gemeente Roermond*, <http://www.roermond.nl/4/Gemeentearchief/Zoeken-in-de-bestanden-van-het-gemeentearchief/Regesten.html>, regesten II nr. 1509.

²⁰⁶ Janse, *Ridderschap*, p. 175 and 340.

²⁰⁷ Hoppenbrouwes 2010 p. 343.

²⁰⁸ Winter, *Ministrialiteit*, p. 266.

²⁰⁹ Van Mieris, *Charterboek*, tome 3, p. 21.

²¹⁰ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," pp. 1171-1172.

²¹¹ Winter, *Ministrialiteit*, table II no 13.

²¹² Nijhoff, *Gelderland*, 109 and Winter, *Ministrialiteit*, table II no. 13.

²¹³ J.F. Willems, ed., *De Brabantsche Yeesten of Rymkronyk van Braband*, tome 2 (Brussel: M. Hayez, 1843), p. 507.

²¹⁴ Nijhoff, *Gelderland*, pp. 41, 109.

²¹⁵ Winter, *Ministrialiteit*, table A II no. 22.

²¹⁶ "Regesten," *Gemeente Roermond*, <http://www.roermond.nl/4/Gemeentearchief/Zoeken-in-de-bestanden-van-het-gemeentearchief/Regesten.html>, regesten II nr. 962 and 1108.

²¹⁷ "Regesten," *Gemeente Roermond*, <http://www.roermond.nl/4/Gemeentearchief/Zoeken-in-de-bestanden-van-het-gemeentearchief/Regesten.html>, regesten IV nr. 328.

²¹⁸ Burgers, "The register", charter BR 021,

http://resources.huygens.knaw.nl/registershollandsegrafelijkheid/oorkonde/BR_021.

²¹⁹ Janse, *Grenzen*, p. 393.

Hessen, Didderic of	32	Cleves	Didderic of Hessen, knight witnessed the <i>lantfriede</i> of Guelders and Cleve of 1359. ²²⁰ He may have been the same who witnessed, as a squire, a charter by the count of Cleves in 1322. ²²¹
Harlair, John Lord of	68**	Guelders	John, Lord of Herlaer and Ameide. ²²²
Harlair, Arnt	175	Guelders	Arnt of Herlaer, knight, lord of Ammersoyen, witnessed the <i>lantfriede</i> of Guelders and Cleve of 1359. ²²³
Hoclem, John Lord of	61	Holland	John, Lord of Heukelom was scion of a cadet branch of the house of Arkel, during the war against Utrecht in 1355 and 1356 he was member of the comital council on several occasions. ²²⁴
Kessel, John of	45	Guelders	John of Kessel, knight, domains on the Meuse ²²⁵ , witness to the marriage agreement between the duke of Guelders and the daughter of Albrecht in 1368. ²²⁶
Hoerne, <i>jonkheer</i> of	302	Guelders	Dirk Loef of Hoerne, son of the Lord of Hoerne, domains on the Meuse river. ²²⁷ Dirk is the builder of castle Loevenstein and witness to a settlement imposed by Albrecht upon Dordrecht. ²²⁸
Mirlaer***	30	Guelders	?Jacob, lord of Myerlaer and Milendonk, witnesses to the <i>lantfriede</i> of Guelders and Cleve of 1359, as was Johan of Mierlaer, member of the Vorne retinue. ²²⁹
Knepken, Henric of	10	???	???
[Mirach/Mijrach]	15	???	???
Ortwijch	37	???	???
Porze, Sander of	22	Berg/Guelders?	?Sander of Porze (Berg?), knight, names refer to places in the lands between Meuse and Rhine.
Riede, Lord of	170	Holland	?Herbaren, Lord of Riede, heir of the Hook with the same name who died just before the outbreak of war. ²³⁰²³¹
Roisin, Lord of	22****	Hainaut	Lord of Roisin, who also accompanied Albrecht to England in 1364. ²³²
Rost, Lord of Wilre	276	Jülich	Rost, Lord of Wijlre. ²³³
Scayle	19	???	knight.
Sleyden, Lord of	165	Luxemburg	Johan, Lord von Schleiden ²³⁴
Sleyden, Lord of (2)	none	Luxemburg	These thirty six men are listed without a reference to horses, this may be the list of men held at Montfoort, the number roughly corresponds to the number provided by the chronicle, i.e. forty. ²³⁵
Steyghenberg, John of	12	???	???
Stummelen, Roelof of	30	???	knight.
Vorne, Walraven	165	Guelders	Walraven, Lord of Borne, later Lord of Valkenburg (Fauquemont)

²²⁰ Nijhoff, *Gelderland*, p. 110 and Winter, *Ministrialiteit*, p. 108.

²²¹ "Regesten," *Gemeente Roermond*, <http://www.roermond.nl/4/Gemeentearchief/Zoeken-in-de-bestanden-van-het-gemeentearchief/Regesten.html>, regesten II nr. 675.

²²² Brokken, "Het ontstaan," pp. 1205-1206.

²²³ Nijhoff, *Gelderland*, p. 109.

²²⁴ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," p. 1207.

²²⁵ Winter, *Ministrialiteit*, 273.

²²⁶ Nijhoff 1833 p. 233.

²²⁷ Winter, *Ministrialiteit*, p 346.

²²⁸ Van Mieris, *Charterboek*, tome 3, 218.

²²⁹ Nijhoff, *Gelderland*, p. 109.

²³⁰ Brokken, "Het ontstaan," p. 1244.

²³¹ Van Mieris, *Charterboek*, tome 3, p. 352.

²³² *ibidem*, p. 170.

²³³ "Regesten," *Gemeente Roermond*, <http://www.roermond.nl/4/Gemeentearchief/Zoeken-in-de-bestanden-van-het-gemeentearchief/Regesten.html>, regesten II nr. 1067.

²³⁴ Janse, *Grenzen*, p. 385.

²³⁵ De Beke, *Croniken*, p. 203.

Lord of,			witnessed the treaty between William and the duke of Guelders of 3 November 1348. ²³⁶ He was present when Albrecht entered another treaty with the duke of Guelders eleven years later. ²³⁷
Vossem, Sander	27	Guelders	Sander of Vossem, knight, witnessed the <i>lantfriede</i> of Guelders and Cleve of 1359. ²³⁸ Councilmember of the duke of Guelders in 1380. ²³⁹ Also mentioned as a vassal of the count of Cleves. ²⁴⁰
Ysenderen, Wouter of	132	Guelders	Wouter of Ysendoren witnessed the <i>lantfriede</i> of Guelders and Cleve of 1359 ²⁴¹ , Wouter was a vassal of the duke of Guelders. ²⁴²
Zevenbergen, Claes <i>jonkheer</i> of	198	Holland	?Claes of Zevenbergen, son of Gerard of Strijen Lord of Zevenbergen. ²⁴³

* Men listed as "lord [name]" have been listed as knights, as this title was used for knights during the fourteenth century, opposed to the title "lord of [name]" which indicates a lordship.²⁴⁴

** Twenty one horses served for only fifteen days.

** May have not led in person, his brother Johan was member of the retinue of Walraven of Vorne.²⁴⁵

**** Sixteen horses served for only nineteen days.

²³⁶ Nijhoff, *Gelderland*, p. 38.

²³⁷ Van Mieris, *Charterboek*, tome 3, p. 86.

²³⁸ Nijhoff, *Gelderland*, p. 109.

²³⁹ "Regesten," *Gemeente Roermond*, <http://www.roermond.nl/4/Gemeentearchief/Zoeken-in-de-bestanden-van-het-gemeentearchief/Regesten.html>, regesten IV nr. 420.

²⁴⁰ Winters 1962 p.279.

²⁴¹ Nijhoff, *Gelderland*, p. 109.

²⁴² *ibidem*, p. 20.

²⁴³ Van Mieris, *Charterboek*, tome 3, p. 490.

²⁴⁴ Janse, *Ridderschap*, p. 83.

²⁴⁵ NL-HaNA, Graven van Holland, 3.01.01, inv.nr. 219, fol. 49v and "Regesten," *Gemeente Roermond*, <http://www.roermond.nl/4/Gemeentearchief/Zoeken-in-de-bestanden-van-het-gemeentearchief/Regesten.html>, regesten IV nr. 320.

Bibliography and sources

Primary sources

- Accounts of Dirk van Tienen regarding the war against Utrecht 135-1357, November 1359, archive "Graven van Holland," catalog reference number 3.01.01, inventory number 219, The Hague: Nationaal Archief, 1-42.
- Accounts of Herman Vink, Steward of south Holland, October 1354 - October 1356, November 1356, archive "Graven van Holland," catalog reference number 3.01.01, inventory number 1617, The Hague: Nationaal Archief, fols. 40r-55r.
- Beke, Johannes de. *Croniken van den Stichte van Utrecht ende van Hollant*, edited by H. Burch. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982.
- Bliss, William Henry, ed. *Calendar of entries in the Papal registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland, Petitions to the Pope*. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1896.
- Burgers, J. W. J. "The registers of the Counts of Holland in the Hainaut period, 1299-1345." *Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW)*.
http://resources.huygens.knaw.nl/registershollandsegrafelijkheid/index_html_en.
- Jura et (ac) Privilegia Civitatis Ruraemundensis, 1244-1794, archive "Oud Archief Roermond," catalog reference number 1001, inventory number 345, Roermond: Gemeente Archief.
- Mieris, Frans van, ed. *Groot Charterboek der Graaven van Holland van Zeeland en Heeren van Vriesland*, tome 2. Leiden: Van der Eyk, 1754.
- Mieris, Frans van, ed. *Groot Charterboek der Graaven van Holland van Zeeland en Heeren van Vriesland*, tome 3. Leiden: Van der Eyk, 1755.
- Muster roll Count William V, 1356, archive "Graven van Holland," catalog reference number 3.01.01, inventory number 219, The Hague: Nationaal Archief, fols. 31r-61r.
- Nijhoff, Isaac A., ed. *Gedenkwaardigheden uit de Geschiedenis van Gelderland, door onuitgegeven oorkonden opgehelder en bevestigd*, tome 2. Arnhem: Nijhoff, 1833.
- Prevenier, Walter, and Johannes G. Smit, eds. *Bronnen voor de geschiedenis der dagvaarten van de Staten en steden van holland voor 1544; deel I en II: 1276-1433*. Den Haag: Instituut voor Nederlandse Geschiedenis, 1991.
- "Regesten," *Gemeente Roermond*, <http://www.roermond.nl/4/Gemeentearchief/Zoeken-in-de-bestanden-van-het-gemeentearchief/Regesten.html>
- Tollen en licenten langs de Maas - Kessel, archive "Gemene Maashandelaars," catalog reference number 115, inventory numbers 558 and 559, Dordrecht: Regionaal Archief.
- Williams, J. F. editor. *De Brabantsche Yeesten of Rymkronyk van Braband*, tome 2. Brussel: M. Hayez, 1843.

Secondary sources

- Boffa, Sergio. *Warfare in Medieval Brabant; 1356-1406*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2004.
- Brokken Hans M. "Het ontstaan van de Hoekse en Kabeljauwse twisten." PhD diss., Leiden University, 1981.
- De Graaf, Ronald P. *Oorlog om Holland; 1000-1375*. Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 1996.
- Hoppenbrouwers, Peter C.M. "Ridders en hun ruiters. Het krijgsbedrijf in Holland en Brabant gedurende de veertiende eeuw." In *Bourgondië voorbij, de Nederlanden 1250-1650; Middeleeuwse studies en bronnen 123*, edited by Mario Damen and Louis Sicking, 327-349. Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2010.
- Janse, Antheun. *Grenzen aan de macht; de Friese oorlogen van de graven van Holland omstreeks 1400*. Den Haag: Smits, 1993.
- Janse, Antheun. *Ridderschap in Holland; Potret van een adellijke elite in de late Middeleeuwen*, 2nd ed. Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2009.
- Jansen, Huub P.H., and Peter C.M. Hoppenbrouwers. "Heervaart in Holland." *Low Countries Historical Review* 94, no.1 (1979): 1-26.
- Quicke, Fritz. *Les Pays-Bas a la veille de la période Bourguignonne (1356-1384)*. Brussels: Editions Universitaires Les Presses de Belgique, 1947.
- Rogers, Clifford J. "The offensive/defensive in medieval strategy." In *Essays on Medieval Military History, Strategy, Military Revolutions and the Hundred Years War*, edited by Clifford J. Rogers, 158-171. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2010.
- Rogers, Clifford J. "The Vegetian 'Science of Warfare' in the Middle Ages." In *Essays on Medieval Military History, Strategy, Military Revolutions and the Hundred Years War* edited by Clifford J. Rogers, 1-19. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2010.
- Winter, Johanna Maria van. *Ministrialiteit en ridderschap in Gelre en Zutphen*. Groningen: Wolters, 1962.