

RANSOM.¹

By VISCOUNT DILLON, F.S.A.

Amongst the many words rarely used nowadays except in a religious sense we may take the word Ransom. In *Cruden's Concordance* the expression is explained as "satisfaction made or price paid for the redeeming of a captive or for procuring a pardon for some notorious offender."² Of the first part of this definition we happily seldom have to think in these days of civilised warfare, of the latter part we are constantly reminded by our preachers. The first definition of course does occasionally occur to us when we have to do with brigands, in Greece or Sicily, but the actual redemption from captivity by payment of money has ceased for many years among really civilised peoples. How long it has ceased is however rather difficult to determine, and I propose to put together a few notes as to the custom when it did prevail in Europe.

The subject of ransom or the redemption of his body by a prisoner is one which apparently has not met with special attention from writers on military customs and etiquette. Yet it must have been an ancient custom and an important feature in all wars until its disuse. Of late years one has been accustomed to associate it with a certain political programme which, however, has, we may hope, been long discarded by the individual who put it forth, and again in the cases of brigandage in Italy, Greece and such countries the custom has not quite died out, as some of our friends till recently living must have been painfully aware.

But my purpose in this paper is to collect some notices of ransom which are met with in the Middle Ages when it was an acknowledged practice and often the occasion for the display of generosity and chivalry in its

¹ Read at the meeting of the Institute on 4th May, 1904.

² Samuel is made to use the word in

a bad sense and the Revised Version gives as an alternative, the objectionable word bribe.

best sense, on the part of the fortunate conqueror. Perhaps these slender notes may form a nucleus round which others may construct a substantial memoir.

The ransoming of the king or superior lord was a subject specially provided for by the feudal tenures on which vassals of the crown and others held their lands. In the case of Richard I. a tax of twenty shillings on every knight's fee was imposed, and the clergy and laity in general were called on for a quarter of their yearly incomes. The ransom was eventually fixed at 100,000 marks of pure silver of Cologne standard, this to the Imperial court, and in addition 50,000 to the Emperor and the Duke of Austria. For payment of these last sixty hostages were to be given, but the 50,000 marks were to be remitted if Richard carried out certain conditions, such as the restoration to freedom of Isaac of Cyprus and the marriage of Richard's niece, Eleanor of Brittany, with the Duke of Austria's son. The money was paid, and by February, 1194, Richard was free to return to England and frustrate his brother's plans.

In 1345 orders were sent by the king to the Seneschal of Gascony to furnish information concerning the custom of exposing the bodies of murdered persons and the exaction by the bailiffs of a ransom for their burial. (Rymer.)

In 1345 Edward III. ordered that all ransoms under £500 should belong to the captor, but higher ransoms were to be yielded to the king for a reasonable consideration.

Evidently some people endeavoured to defraud the king of his rights in regard to ransoms, for it was found that after the battle of Neville's Cross in 1346 many individuals took ransom from their prisoners and then let them go. This practice was forbidden on pain of death by orders of 20th November and 13th December that year. (Rymer.)

David Bruce of Scotland only regained his liberty in 1357, having been captured at Neville's Cross 1346, on payment within ten years by himself or his heirs of 500,000 nobles, and good security in the shape of twenty hostages were given for the payment of this sum. As a matter of fact David, after eleven years' captivity, got

free in 1357, the Scottish nation agreeing to pay 100,000 marks in yearly sums of 10,000 each Midsummer's Day. A truce was agreed on during the repayment of the whole sum.

At the battle of Nogent sur Seine in 1359, Sir Eustace d'Ambreticourt was captured and had to pay 22,000 French livres for his ransom.

John of France's ransom was fixed by the Treaty of Bretigni at 3,000,000 crowns of gold, of which 600,000 were to be paid before he left Calais, and the remainder by 400,000 a year. Galeazzo Visconti, the brother-in-law of Lionel, Duke of Clarence, gave 600,000 florins of gold in consideration of John's 3rd daughter Isabella marrying his son John Galeazzo. This, however, was not enough to clear off the ransom, so hostages were given for the balance, and by the 25th October, 1360, John was able to leave Calais. When, however, in 1363, the Duke of Anjou, John's son, and one of the chief hostages, escaped from Calais, his father returned to England in January, 1364, where he remained till April of that year, when he died at the Savoy Palace. Five years later, when the war was renewed, Charles V. declared the Treaty of Bretigni annulled.

According to an ordinance made by Richard II. in 1386 for the government of the army (Harl. MS., 1309), any prisoner taken by a soldier should be brought to the captor's captain, who, if the prisoner be of high rank, will take him to the King or Constable or Marshal. The original captor to be rewarded, and his captain to receive one-third of the ransom, the King getting one-ninth part. In case the captor left his prisoner to follow in the pursuit of the enemy and another man came up and retook the prisoner, then the two captors should share the ransom, the second captor giving security to the first for his share.

Amongst other provisions it was also ordained that if a man threaten or kill another in order to get the ransom of a prisoner made by him, the man so doing shall forfeit horse and armour and remain in arrest till agreement made.

Every man was to pay one-third of his winnings to his lord and master whether he be on wages or no. No

one was to let his prisoner go out of the army to fetch his ransom without leave of the King, Constable or Chief of the Battáill. Any one taking a prisoner was to "take his faith" and his headpiece or right gauntlet, as a token of the captive, or else he was to leave the prisoner in the keeping of some of his men.

In the ordinances of Henry the Vth for the army it was ordered that every man should pay to his captain, lord, or master one-third of the ransom obtained for any prisoner the man might make, and no man was allowed to ransom or sell his prisoner without special leave of his captain under penalty of arrest and loss of all the ransom. Children under the age of fourteen were not to be taken unless they were those of a lord, a worshipful gentleman, or a captain, in which case it seems that capture might be made and ransom obtained.

In an indenture for military service between King Henry V. and William Swinburne, Esquire, in 1421, all prisoners taken by him, save any kings, princes, or sons of kings, especially Charles calling himself Dauphin, were to be the Esquire's property. Great captains of the blood royal and chiefs and lieutenants holding authority under the Dauphin were also excepted, as were any of those who had slain and murdered or were in any way accessories by word or deed to the death of the late Duke of Burgundy. All these excepted persons were to be the property of the King, who would give the captors reasonable compensation. But the King was to have one-third of the profits of the "gaignes de guerre" of the said esquire, as well as "la tierce des tierces," that is one-ninth part of all "gaignes de guerres," whether of prisoners or booty, captured by the esquire's men.

Ransom was sometimes paid for the corpse of a fighter, as in 1382, when the Lord d'Enghien was killed by the Flemings, the Earl of Flanders could only get his body from Ghent on paying 1,000 francs. (Froissart II.)

Again in 1418, when at the siege of Rouen, Laghen Bastard d'Ally, who guarded the Caux gate, was invited by Jehan le Blancq, captain of Harfleur, to break three lances, at the first encounter the Englishman was thrust through and fell from his horse, on which he was dragged within the gates and died soon after. The Bastard was grieved

at this, but received 400 nobles from the dead man's friends for the body. Monstrelet, in telling this, says that the Bastard was much honoured by the townspeople for this act.

In close connection with the subject of ransom is the matter of prisoners, and we have some interesting points arising in this respect. When Chandos was mortally wounded at the bridge of Lussac by the Bretons the French, who had attacked the English, suddenly saw the Poitevin knights approaching. These, though Frenchmen, the Bretons and their companions knew to be their enemies, and they accordingly gave the English whom they had captured their freedom on condition of their remaining to save them from their French enemies. When the Poitevins arrived on the spot the Bretons and French announced that they were prisoners already, this the English confirmed. So the English remained as the victors and carried off their prisoners and got their ransoms. In the Life of Bayard, referred to elsewhere, we have another case of somewhat similar nature, but the "Chevalier sans peur et sans reproche" seems not to have been above what was a bit of sharp practice.

The Chevalier Bayard when captured at Milan was released by Ludovic Sforza without ransom and even had his horse and arms returned to him. Later on, at the Battle of the Spurs in 1513, Bayard, when his companions surrendered, looked about for a suitable person to whom he might surrender. Seeing an English knight who on account of the heat had dismounted and taken off his helmet and was not busying himself with taking prisoners, Bayard rushed at him and put his sword to his throat. The Englishman, surprised, said, "I surrender; who are you?" "I," said the Chevalier, "am the Captain Bayard and surrender to you, but be good enough to take me away lest the English kill us." To this the English knight agreed, and indeed they had to defend themselves on approaching the English camp. For four or five days the Englishman entertained Bayard, who at last told his host that he was getting bored and would like to return to his king. "How?" said the Englishman, "we have not settled yet as to your ransom." "My ransom," said Bayard, "but it is your ransom, for you are my prisoner,

and I only surrendered to you to save my life, and I shall escape somehow and you will then have to fight me." The Englishman was much surprised and said he would consult the other captains. Meanwhile the Emperor Maximilian sent for Bayard and jestingly reminded him that in the old days it was said that Bayard never ran away; to which the Chevalier answered, "If I had run away I should not be here now." Henry VIII. also talked with him, and when the question of capture was referred to the two sovereigns they decided that if Bayard would abstain from bearing arms for six weeks he might go free.

The ransom of prisoners was sometimes collected by means of sermons and exhortations of parish priests, as in the case of Pierre de Essars and some of his companions in 1402 as noted by Juvenal des Ursius.

Ransoms were not always wholly in cash, as we see in the will of the Regent Bedford in 1435 when he bequeaths to the church in which he should be buried (that of the blessed Mary of Rouen) a cross of silver-gilt which he had in the ransom of John Alcurons.

Wills sometimes mention ransom, as in the case of Eleanor, Countess of Arundel, who in 1455 bequeaths "all the wool at my manor of Haytesbury to the value of £100 towards the ransom of Sir Robert Hungerford, knight, Lord Molins, now a prisoner in France, provided he be released during his life and that neither he nor his father Lord Hungerford disturb the executors of this my will."

Froissart tells us at the Battle of Auray in 1364 it was determined beforehand not to give quarter or to take ransom on either side, for both the French and the Bretons wanted the war to be brought to a conclusion and neither of the commanders, Charles of Blois nor Montfort, were to be admitted to the usual custom.

He says, "après cette déconfiture de Pont à Volain et le Sire de Cliçon emmenèrent la plus grand partie de leurs prisonniers en leurs compagnie en la cité de Paris. Là les y tinrent-ils tout aises sans danger, et les recurent sur leur foi courtoisement, sans autre contrainte. Ils ne les mirent point en prison, en fer, ni en ceps ainsi que les Allemands font leurs prisonniers quand ils les tiennent,

pour attirer plus grand finance. Maudits soient-ils ! ce sont gens sans pitié et sans honneur et aussi on n'en devoit nul prendre à merci. Les François firent bonne compagnie à leurs prisonniers et les rançonnerent courtoisement sans eux trop gréver ni presser."

But in spite of what Froissart says it must be remembered that Oliver de Clisson, Constable of France, who died 1407, was sometimes called "The Butcher," for he seldom took ransom when fighting against the English.

When John of Gaunt took Mont Paon in 1371 he was asked to accept the four Breton knights who had defended it in a courteous manner upon certain terms of ransom as he would wish should be done to any of his own party should they happen to be so unfortunate. This Lancaster did.

At Rochelle a Poitevin knight, Sir James de Surgières, addressed his captor so eloquently that he gave him his liberty for 300 francs down.

Though the combatants might come to terms as to ransom, on some occasions we find that the arrangements did not meet with the approval of a third party who had to be reckoned with. Thus at the battle of Montauban in August, 1366, Sir Perducas, Sir Robert Cheney, Sir John Combes and others divided the booty and arranged for the ransom of the prisoners, who then went to their homes, having pledged their faith to their captors and arranged to bring their ransoms on a given date to Bordeaux. Notwithstanding this, Pope Urban V. who hated the free companies, forbade the prisoners to pay, and absolved them from all their engagements.

Permission to obtain freedom by ransom was not always accorded. When the Bègue de Villaines and Marshal Andrehen by politic speeches to the Black Prince did obtain leave to ransom themselves, the permission to do so was refused to Bertrand du Guesclin, who had to wait some time for the favour.

When Bertrand was taken prisoner at the battle of Najera in 1367, Peter the Cruel offered the Black Prince Bertrand's weight in gold as du Guesclin had much helped his brother Henry. The Prince, however, refused to give him up on any terms. When the Prince was

reminded later on, that he had refused to let Bertrand be ransomed, he sent for him and told him to fix his own price, but said if he would swear never to bear arms again against him or his father Edward he should go free, and moreover receive 10,000 francs. Bertrand would not agree to this, so he fixed his ransom at 60,000 doubles of gold. The Prince thought it too much, but Bertrand would not abate anything. The Princess sent for him at Bordeaux and after supper said, "I will pay myself 10,000 francs of your ransom." Bertrand gallantly replied, "I thought I was the ugliest knight alive, but I see I am handsome since the ladies love me so." The famous Chandos also offered to lend him 10,000 francs, as did Sir Hugh Calverly. Bertrand soon after paid the ransom of several of his companions of the fatal day of Najera. Duke John of Anjou gave him 30,000 francs towards his own ransom, and the French king added 100,000 francs. When Bertrand went to his wife he expected to find 100,000 francs that they had deposited in the Abbey of St. Michael just before his starting for Spain. However, to Bertrand's joy he found that his lady had spent it all in ransoming some of his companions. Bertrand then went back to Bordeaux, where the French king's money arrived, and after the reduction promised by the Princess of Wales the full sum was paid and Bertrand was free to fight again.

It is worth noting that before the ransom was paid Bertrand spent some time with the Duke of Anjou, then besieging Tarrascon, and though, according to custom, Bertrand not having relieved himself of his obligation "*armer ne se povait*," yet we are told he attended to the engines which night and day threw into the town.

Du Guesclin was not mindful in 1370 of the favours he had received in 1369. At Bressure, where Bertrand defeated the English and many prisoners were taken, there was a violent disturbance about the distribution of them, on which, by the advice of the Comte de Perche, the Marshal d'Andrehen and the Sire de Clisson, Bertrand ordered all the prisoners to be killed without ransom, at least so says the *Chronique de Sire Bertrand du Guesclin*.

Ransoms were sometimes reduced for services rendered.

When Edward III. heard that the French king had beheaded Olliver de Clisson, who had been given up to him by the Earl of Salisbury, he was very angry and determined in retaliation to execute Sir Herve de Léon, his prisoner. The Earl of Derby, however, dissuaded him, so he sent for de Léon and, remarking that as one of the richest knights in Brittany his ransom would be some 30,000 or 40,000 crowns, he offered to let him off for 10,000 crowns if he would go to the French king and tell him that in consequence of his action the truce would at once cease. This renewal of hostilities would not, however, affect the Feast of St. George, as all knights attending would have passports for fifteen days. Sir Hervé was to pay his 10,000 crowns at Bruges within five days of crossing to France. The unfortunate knight was shipwrecked and lost much property and his own health, but he delivered the message.

Sir Walter Manny asked a great knight of Normandy what he would pay for his ransom. On being told 30,000 crowns, Sir Walter offered to forego the sum if the knight would obtain for him and twenty others a passport from the Duke of Normandy to enable them to ride to Calais, not stopping in any town more than one night. If the knight failed he was to return to Aiguillon and remain prisoner. The passport was obtained and all went well till at Orleans Manny and his friends were arrested and then taken to Paris and put in prison. The French king announced that he was going to execute him, so the Duke told him he would never serve him while Manny was detained. At last the king relented and set Manny free, making much of him and giving him presents, which, however, were only provisionally accepted, and afterwards were at the instance of Edward III. returned to the French king. However, that monarch refused to receive them and gave them to Manny's cousin, Mausac, who had carried them to the court.

Froissart tells us how Louis de Bourbon, one of the hostages for the execution of the Treaty of Bretigny, was asked by Edward III. to go to see Urban V. and get him to grant the vacant bishopric of Winchester to William of Wykeham, Edward's chaplain. The French king advised Bourbon to go to Avignon, where the Pope was;

to see him and obtain from him the disposal of the bishopric. Having done this, Bourbon returned to England and made his terms with Edward, obtaining his liberty for 20,000 francs and William of Wykeham getting the bishopric. It seems that other French lords also obtained their liberty at the same time, but Peter d'Alençon paid 30,000 francs for his.

Sometimes the matter of ransom appears as a balancing of accounts, as when in 1369 Sir Nicholas Lovaine, who had had on a former occasion to pay a ransom of 10,000 francs to Sir Hugh de Chastillon, Master of the Crossbones, made a prisoner of his former captor and only let him go on a ransom of 20,000 francs.

When Messire Perducas was taken prisoner by the Duke of Anjou, who owed him some 150,000 francs, his ransom was fixed at that sum and 50 francs a day for expenses during the time he was prisoner. Sir Thomas Felton who was captured at Bergera, 1377, by Sir William de Lignac, had later on to pay 30,000 francs as ransom, to pay which he in August, 1380, by permission of Richard II., gave up a like sum due to him for the ransom of William des Bordes, captured at Cherbourg, July, 1378.

The French term for admitting a prisoner to ransom is "Mettre à finance," and it seems a very good expression of the businesslike terms on which some ransoms were conducted.

Notwithstanding the ideas of chivalry which were supposed to prevail in the Middle Ages, we find cases of ladies being the objects of ransom on many occasion. Thus, in 1359 Robert Scott, an Englishman, at Vely, took the town of Roussy and allowed the Count to ransom himself, his wife and daughters for 12,000 gold florins.

In 1370 the Duke of Bourbon's mother, who had been taken by the Earls of Cambridge and Pembroke, was exchanged for Sir Simon Burley. In 1377, when seven Scotsmen captured Berwick Castle in the night, they killed the governor, Sir Robert Boynton, but liberated his lady for 2,000 marks.

It is pleasant to read that when James, King of Majorca, was taken by Henry of Castille, his wife, Joan

of Naples, ransomed him for 100,000 francs. He was her third husband.

Besides the allotment to the king and the immediate commanders of portions of ransoms, we find that in May, 1404, a commission was issued to William Wroth, Sheriff of Dorset, and four others, to levy on those persons who took prisoners at the late victory over the French at Portland one-tenth of their ransoms for distribution among those who took no prisoners. Soon after this date there was an order to the Bailiffs and other officers at Weymouth, Dartmouth and Falmouth to prevent all persons sending their French prisoners out of the kingdom. (Rymer.)

Fordun tells the curious way in which Archibald Douglas escaped after the battle of Poitiers, when his rich armour made him appear to be a great prize. Sir William Ramsay, however, enabled him to get away by pretending that he was a servant who had stolen his master's armour, and, having treated him as such, ransomed him for 40s., and sent him off to look for his master's body, thus assisting him to get away.

After this battle, according to Froissart, the French found the English and Gascons most courteous, for many of the prisoners were at once released on promise of bringing their ransoms to Bordeaux by the next Christmas, nor were these ransoms sufficiently heavy to prevent the prisoners following their profession or arms or advancing their fortunes. The Castellan of Amposta got off with a payment of 10,000 francs. The Black Prince was only able to take the French king with him after distributing 100,000 florins among the Gascon Barons.

The ransom of prisoners was at times the subject of a gift, as when, in 1347, Edward III. gave the lands and goods of his prisoners taken at St. Jean d'Angely, who had fled and so forfeited them, to Henry, Earl of Lancaster.

In 1405 Henry IV. granted to his queen, Joan, his share of the ransom of the prisoners taken by Sir John Cornwallis. (Rymer.) Edward III. at Calais gave Eustace de Ribeaumont his freedom without ransom.

The purchase of prisoners from their captors is often

mentioned. Froissart tells us that after the Battle of Poitiers the Black Prince purchased from the Barons, knights and esquires of Saxony the ransoms of the greater part of the French earls who were there, and paid ready money for them. The Castellan of Amposa paid 10,000 francs for his ransom and all his people were set at liberty at moderate terms. The Black Prince paid 25,000 crowns for James, Duke de Bourbon, Count of Ponthien, to his captor the Captal du Buch.¹

The Captal, when he was taken prisoner at Soubise in 1372, was sold for 12,000 livres to the French king, Charles V., by his captor Peter d'Andvilliers.

The transfer of a prisoner was not always a subject of complaint on the part of the individual so transferred, and indeed might be an advantage. Jehan de Grailly, Captal du Buch, in an original document of . . . mentions that having been taken prisoner by Roland Bodin at the Battle of Cocherel, 1364, he had been handed over to the king of France, whose prisoner he became. The king ordered his residence to be at Meaux, but with leave to go outside to a distance of half a league, but never to be absent from his quarters at night, or, as he expresses it "entre deux soleils." Later on he was allowed to go to England, on condition that he returned to Meaux by St. Michael's day. On the Captal's return to France the French king at his request changed the place of abode to Paris, where he was to consider the enceinte of the Bastilles of St. Denis as his prison. He was further to swear, on condition of these favourable terms, that he would hold no communication with the King of Navarre, or any other rebels, on pain of being considered perjured, wicked and disloyal, and having his arms reversed, and he himself prosecuted in the courts.

The Captal eventually freed himself by handing over to the king some of his castles as his ransom.

The Earl of Pembroke, who had been captured by the Spaniards at Rochelle in 1372, was ransomed for 120,000 francs, which the Lombards of Bruges agreed to pay on his arrival in good health at that town. However, he caught a fever, and died at Arras, so that the Constable lost the ransom. He, however, for three years had a

¹ A warrant for this sum was made in 1361. Rymer.

lawsuit with the Lombards for the money, which they refused to pay; eventually the Constable gave up his claim to the King of France for 50,000 francs.

About the same time Sir Guiscard d'Angle obtained his ransom thus :

The Lord de Roze, a prisoner in England, had an only daughter, a great heiress. His friends agreed with Sir Oliver de Manny, a nephew of Bertrand du Guesclin, that if he would get the freedom of de Roze he might marry the heiress.

Manny wrote to ask Edward III. which knight he would give in exchange for Roze and the king named d'Angle. The marriage took place and de Roze married a daughter of the Lord de Ville.

The young Count de St. Pol who was taken at Licques, near Calais, by a Guelderland esquire, in 1374, who that evening sold him for 10,000 francs to his Lord de Commignies. This seigneur brought him over to England, and gave him to the king, who gave him 20,000 francs for his prisoner. The king was glad to get him, as he hoped to exchange him for the Captal de Buch, then and till his death a prisoner at Paris. The young Count St. Pol seems to have had a good time in England, for in 1379 we find him about to marry Maud, the daughter of the widow of the Black Prince. His ransom was fixed at 120,000 francs, 60,000 of which would be reckoned off on his marriage, though the convention in Rymer does not mention this rebate. The marriage took place and the Count and his bride went back to the Continent, but not to France, the French king having been prejudiced against him, probably with good reason.

When Oliver du Guesclin was taken prisoner, near Cherbourg, by John Coq, in 1378, he was told his ransom would be 10,000 francs, but Froissart says Sir John Arundel had all the profit. He it seems was Governor of Southampton. and had merely gone over to Cherbourg to amuse himself, taking with him his squire, John Coq, to show him the town. Oliver was still a prisoner in 1380 Sep. when a safe conduct was granted to those who came over to pay his ransom.

Henry V., when on his way from Barfleur to Agincourt in 1415, had to leave two gentlemen of his army very ill

at Boves. They were given to the captain of the fortress, who was to receive a horse for each as ransom.

The Count de Penthieme, captured by the Marquis de Bade in 1420, had to pay 30,000 gold crowns for his ransom.

Sir Thomas Kiriell, an Englishman, who commanded a company in 1432, made many prisoners, and even carried off women, whom he kept in close confinement till they ransomed themselves, and some of these even had children born while in prison.

La Hire treacherously captured Lord d'Auffemont in 1434 and made him pay 14,000 saluts d'or and a horse worth 20 tuns of wine, and this in spite of the French king's intercession.

In 1515 Thomas Cressy, a grocer of London, had a license to ask alms in England for paying his ransom of 250 crowns, having been taken prisoner while on the king's service, and sold to one, Barnard of Boulogne, for £20.

In the same year amongst monies received by the treasurer of Tournay is 13s. 4*d.*, for the third of thirds of a booty taken by Geo. Hassall; also 40s. for the third of thirds of a prisoner taken by Mr. Vaughan.

In 1544 a proclamation was made by the Lord Lieutenant of the king's army, that "he has commanded these two soldiers taken prisoners by the Frenchmen and now returned for their ransoms to be hanged for leaving the camp without his license or that of their captains."

Sainte Palaye quotes Montluc as saying in 1555 that he was going to capture Marc Antoine, a rich young Roman, and to take from him as ransom 80,000 crowns, which was one year's income of the youth. Montluc intended, he says, to give one-half of this sum to M. de la Motte and his officers and men. Montluc boasts of his moderation in the matter of ransoms, and says none of his prisoners were ever dissatisfied with his treatment. Indeed, he adds, "it is unworthy to skin them when they are honourable men of war." However, Montluc did not get his man or his ransom. De Thon says that a half of their appointments was the usual ransom of officers.

Robert, Marshal de la Mark, son of Marshal Fleuranges, having been captured at Hesdin, was imprisoned most

closely at Flerys. His wife, the daughter of the Duchess of Valentinois, Diane de Poitiers, with her daughter, engaged themselves for the payment of his ransom, which was 100,000 crowns in case of his death, agreeing to remain prisoners until it was paid. The prisoner died, it is said, from poison a few days after this agreement, but the ransom had to be paid.

According to the memoirs of Maréchal de Vielleville, written by his secretary, Vincent Carloix, when in 1527 the Prince of Melphi was taken prisoner at the assault of his town by the Maréchal, to whom he was given by Lautrec, Vielleville persuaded his prisoner to become a Frenchman, thus losing a ransom of 60,000 ducats, at which price the Prince, who was very rich, appraised himself.

The fall of Calais and Guines in 1558 supply some interesting details of ransoms. According to Arthur Lord Grey's life of his father, William Lord Grey, that fine soldier on the fall of Guines was given by the Duke de Guise to Marshal Strozzi, and from him sold to Monsieur de Randon, who gave him to his brother, the Count de Rochefoucault, with whom he remained until he was redeemed for 20,000 crowns. While still a prisoner he was allowed by the French king, Henry II., to come over to England, "upon his faith to him," to attend the coronation of Mary, on which occasion he claimed to be master of the queen's hawks and to have the robe or vesture worn on that day by the queen. Five or six weeks later he yielded himself prisoner again, and so continued well nigh a year later. For the payment of his ransom he was obliged to sell his castle of Wilton-upon-Wye. This seems clear enough, and the son should have known the facts of the case, yet in the memoirs of Gaspard de Saulx, Maréchal de Tavannes, written by his son Jean, we are told that M. de Guise, knowing that Tavannes had done best in that conquest, gave Lord Grey to him, and that he sent him to Dijon and got 10,000 crowns from him, writing to Mme. de Tavannes: "Renard endormy n'a la gorge emplumée."

Of other officers taken at Guines, Sir Henry Palmer, given to Mons. Sipiers, died in his hands, so no ransom was obtained, and Lewis Dyves, who was given to

Cresakres or Crevecœur, paid 1,500 crowns for his ransom.

In 1582 an Italian, Jaco Mannucei, petitions Walsingham for a warrant to John Pine to keep in safe custody one Lucio Roseo, a Roman, but a Spanish prisoner, taken in Ireland and liable for his ransom to Sir William Wynter.

In 1584, Daniel Rogers, who had been sent abroad on state business, and had been captured, refers to a ransom of £200, which had been paid to one of Walsingham's officers by the Bishop of London for his release.

In 1594, Sir Thos. Shirley reports that he has paid £600 for the ransom of John Molle, his under treasurer, who was drawing pay at 13s. 4*d.* a day, and had been taken in Brittany.

The next year ten of the best English prisoners or £10,000 was offered as a ransom for the traitor Wm. Randall, whom the English had captured.

In 1599 there was a warrant to pay to H. Basse, citizen of London and assignee of Otewell Smith, £300 (from monies received for forfeited goods) for the ransom of the said Smith now prisoner in Dunkirk.

After the defeat of the Spanish Armada we find several of the high officers of the Spaniards in the charge and keeping of some of the English commanders. Mr. Richard Drake had three, including Don Pedro de Valdez, Sir Walter Raleigh had five and the friends of some of the English prisoners in Spain and the Low countries were anxious to obtain Spaniards to be exchanged for these English. Anyhow, it appears that Elizabeth allowed the Spaniards to be released at a ransom of one month's pay.¹ This rate was certainly moderate and more reasonable than the sums paid in the fourteenth century. In 1589 we are told of a passport being granted to a confidential agent of the Duke of Parma, who was to come over and pay these ransoms.

Francis Mendoza, Admiral of Arragon, who was taken prisoner at Nieuport in 1600, had been subsequently released on parole, his ransom being fixed at nearly 100,000 Flemish crowns. This was, however, waived by

¹ Valdes, writing to Walsingham, mentions that the Council would release 390 of his men at 10 ducats each.

the States, with consent of the Nassau family, on condition that the admiral should effect the exchange of all Dutch prisoners held by the Spaniards in any part of the world.

Henry Cary, later Lord Falkland, was captured at Brock Castle by Don Luis de Velasco in 1605, but being a volunteer was not allowed to ransom himself at the fixed sum. He was exchanged later on for a Spanish officer.

When the Earl of Ormonde was treacherously seized in Ireland, 1600, he was, after some months, ransomed for £3,000, and twelve hostages, sons of the chief gentlemen in the country, were given for the due payment of the money.

But ransom was not much in use in Ireland in those days, as we see in Carew's account of the Battle of Kinsale in 1601, when he says: "There were some of the Irish taken prisoners that offered great ransomes, but presently upon their bringing to the Campe they were hanged."

In the Civil War ransom is mentioned. Henry Verney, who was taken by the Parliamentary army in 1644, got free for £60, and after the burning of Hillesden House, Tom Verney asks Ralph for money to make up his ransom.

In the *Laws and Ordinances of Warre for Cromwell's Army*, in Sec. ix., is: "No officer or souldier shall ransome or conceal a prisoner."

Mr. W. E. Hall has remarked that when the European nations, under the influence of Christianity, desisted from reducing their prisoners to slavery, there remained the idea of making what profit they could out of their prisoners, and this was to be got by the ransom they would pay to avoid indefinite captivity. While the armies were composed of feudal levies or of free bands this custom was only modified by the circumstance that prisoners of great importance were claimed by the commander, as we find was the practice of Edward III. The sums payable varied at first, according to circumstances, but in time became fixed, according to a scale. But in time, when the forces became armies of the king, he, on the ground of paying for the war, claimed the right of disposing of prisoners as he might choose.

According to Albericus Gentilis the rate of ransom for prisoners of superior rank was a year's income, while

Grotius quotes three months' or one month's pay as the rate for those of inferior rank.

In the seventeenth century the idea of the sovereign having the disposal of the prisoners became international, and at the beginning or early in the war the chiefs of either side settled on a rate for ransom. This again became alternate with the system of exchange, and in time almost entirely disappeared in favour of the latter arrangement. As a rule, officers of equal rank were exchanged and the soldiers man for man. Mr. Hall mentions the question arising in 1777 of the Americans demanding an equality in health and efficiency in the exchange of prisoners. The alternative systems are noted in 1673, and 1780 is given as the latest instance of there being any system other than exchange.

In 1810 we had some 43,774 French prisoners, besides 2,700 of other nationalities, while France had 11,458 English prisoners, besides 500 civil detenus and 38,355 Spaniards. This made a balance in favour of France. The French claimed that for every three French two Spaniards and one English should be exchanged, but the English held that English as against French should be exchanged, as the Spaniards were not equal in value to English. At last the English, in order to recover the detenus, agreed to a general exchange, the exchange to begin with the English. Napoleon rejected this idea and the whole plan came to naught.

The Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1748, was the last occasion on which hostages were given to secure the performance of any agreement other than a Military convention.