

Contents

<i>List of Maps</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	x
<i>Note on Money</i>	xii
<i>Genealogy</i>	xiii
Introduction	1
1 Ruling the French in the Late Middle Ages	7
Rex Christianissimus	8
Church and State	19
Rex Francorum	25
Regnum Franciae	35
2 Rural France, c. 1300–c. 1500	53
Demographic Change	54
Peasant Status	59
Peasant Fortunes	64
Rural Revolt	70
A Crisis of Seigneurial Revenues?	76
Landowners – Old and New	84
The Church and Religion	88
3 Royal France, c. 1328–c. 1380	95
Philip VI (1328–50)	96
John II (1350–64)	108
Charles V (1364–80)	121

4	Royal France, c. 1380–c. 1461	132
	Charles VI (1380–1422)	132
	Charles VII (1422–61)	147
5	Municipal France, c. 1300–c. 1500	171
	Population	172
	Functions	177
	The Church and Religion	182
	Government	185
	Governors and Governed	191
	Urban Revolt	196
	Extra Muros: Towns in the Kingdom	200
	Epilogue	211
	<i>Notes</i>	216
	<i>Guide to Further Reading</i>	225
	<i>Index</i>	230

Chapter 1: Ruling the French in the Late Middle Ages

Kings naturally sought to stand above all other forms of public authority in their realm, and in doing so the monarchy succeeded in establishing itself as a focal point of loyalty and identity among its subjects. In earlier centuries, churchmen such as Abbot Suger of Saint Denis (1081–1151) had played a key role in promoting the king’s primacy by means of a ‘royal religion’ which claimed heavenly protection of the ruling line, and a special standing manifested, among other things, in the coronation ritual. Churchmen continued to have a close relationship with royal authority in the late Middle Ages as we shall see, despite the once-prevalent view that our period witnessed the birth of a ‘lay spirit’ and a declining role for the church in public life.

But reigning supreme was one thing, governing another. To give effect to royal authority, the monarchy had gradually developed administrative structures and a bureaucracy to attend to key matters such as justice and war. At first that administration was part of the king’s household, but by the thirteenth century its various components were separating themselves out. How effective such an administration could be in communicating and enacting the will of the king depended on a number of things: not just the extent and nature of its own development, of course, but the diverse legal, linguistic, geographical and historical circumstances which prevailed across the kingdom.

With these points in mind, this chapter considers some of the key ideas which lay behind royal authority in late medieval France (**‘Rex Christianissimus’** and **‘Church and State’**), the means by which that authority was exercised (**‘Rex Francorum’**), and the nature of the kingdom where that authority held sway (**‘Regnum Franciae’**).

Rex Christianissimus

Of all the things a king of France could claim to be in the late Middle Ages, including lord, suzerain and sovereign, the title which truly set him apart from other rulers and magnified his powers within the realm was that of *Rex Christianissimus*, 'Most Christian King'. Lordship remained vital to the expression of a king's authority in France as elsewhere in Christendom, but even in its exalted form of suzerainty it retained a contractual quality. Lordship was renewed upon each succession, and undertakings were given on either side of the relationship when homage was performed. Notions of sovereignty which had re-emerged in France and England in the thirteenth century offered the prospect of unqualified obedience to the ruler, and it became increasingly difficult to contest the view, ultimately derived from Roman Law, that the French king was 'Emperor in his kingdom'. But even when it was understood as a gift from God, sovereignty, like lordship, was of this world not the next. By contrast, the legitimacy and authority of the Most Christian King were located between Heaven and Earth. When expressed in the royal pardon, as we see from the work of Claude Gauvard, the king's 'Special Grace' miraculously restored order to the world and contributed to the salvation of his people.

Components

The many elements that had become entangled in the central idea of 'Most Christian King' are usefully summarised by Étienne de Conty, a learned monk and judge in an ecclesiastical court who wrote in northern France in 1400. His views command our attention because he was not part of the inner royal circle of his day; indeed, as Philippe Contamine observes in his work on the author, it was on the king's orders in 1392 that he was passed over in the succession to the post of abbot at Corbie. Étienne tells us that of the five kings crowned and anointed in the west (those of France, England, Sicily, Scotland and Jerusalem), only the French king's divine right to rule came directly from God; it was not mediated by the papacy, which took tributes from the kings of Sicily and Jerusalem and homage from the king of England (a reference to England's status as a papal fief created in John's time). Of Christendom's 17 realms, the most richly endowed was that entrusted to the Most Christian King, 'the greatest, the most powerful, the most noble, the holiest and the most judicious' of all rulers.

Justifying each of these claims in turn, Étienne de Conty dwelled longest on the holiness of the Most Christian King. His coronation was superior because it entailed the use of a holy oil brought from Heaven by an angel for the coronation of Clovis, the first Christian king of France, by St Remi, archbishop of Reims. The Most Christian King could heal the scrofulous by his touch. The royal emblem of the lilies was another miraculous gift to Clovis after his victory at the Battle of Tolbiac (usually dated 496) and conversion to Christianity. In the subsequent history of Most Christian Kings, their special standing was exemplified by the refuge they had offered to popes and their defence of Holy Church against heretics within Christendom.

Étienne de Conty's views reflect a conception of sacerdotal kingship which was widely held and deeply layered by his lifetime. A tradition of royalist chronicle writing in the monastery of Saint-Denis dating back to the twelfth century was a rich source of such material. It was in this abbey that the royal war flag (*oriflamme*) and other insignia of kingship were kept from the twelfth century on. That the king was *Rex Dei gratia* was a fundamental tenet stretching back even further, to Carolingian times. The tale of the miraculous Holy oil used in Clovis's coronation was first recounted by Hincmar of Reims in the ninth century. By the late thirteenth century, as Joseph Strayer has shown, the link between France as a Holy Land, the French as a Chosen People and the Most Christian King could be found in a variety of texts, such as the sermons of the Dominican Guillaume de Sauqueville or the treatises of the jurist Pierre Dubois. Colette Beaune has demonstrated in her work on French royal ideology that the story of the lilies was a more recent development, one that gradually emerged in the course of the fourteenth century under the influence of monks at the Praemonstratensian abbey of Joyenval, and which attained wider circulation at the court of Charles V. Of all his attributes, however, it was probably the 'King's touch' which most tangibly demonstrated his sacred powers in the eyes of contemporaries. More than a century before Étienne was writing, as Marc Bloch established in his study of the thaumaturgical powers of kings, the sick were coming from regions as distant as Brittany, the Bordelais, Toulouse, Montpellier, Provence, Savoy and Lorraine to be healed.

At a time when the legitimacy of public authority was understood as a function of its antiquity as well as its sanctity, there were other ways in which Étienne de Conty could have chosen to emphasise the standing of the kingdom and its ruler within Christendom. Many French monastic chronicles contained versions of the story, first recounted in the seventh century by the chronicler Fredegar, of how Francio and

his followers had fled from Troy and founded the Kingdom of France. The matter of Troy had gradually become linked to the later crusading exploits of Franks in the east and acquired a slightly less heathen character, with the result that it had emerged as an additional (rather than an alternative) vision of the kingdom's distant past. But the Trojan legend had its drawbacks too, notably the fact that other peoples had their own version of the story. The anonymous author of the *Débat des hérauts d'armes de France et d'Angleterre* (c. 1450) knew better than to adduce Trojan descent as grounds for French superiority over the English, because he was aware that Britain took its name from Brutus, descendant of the Trojan Aeneas, who had first conquered the isle of Albion from a race of giants.¹ By contrast, there was no need to debate whether there was more than one Most Christian King. Linked to the idea of France as a Holy Land and the French as a Chosen People, the concept demonstrated unequivocally the independence and the superiority of the ruler and the realm.

The evolution of an idea

Although its many strands were clearly very old, the idea of the 'Most Christian King' was a late medieval success in France, its propagation mainly the work of French churchmen. The title was originally accorded by popes to any monarch whose support was welcome or sought. In the course of Philip IV's struggles with Pope Boniface VIII over appointments, jurisdiction and taxation within the French church (1296–1302), it was royal apologists who began to use the title to justify the king's resistance to papal intrusion. In a sermon of the Dominican preacher Renaud d'Albignac (1302), a French audience was told that in his dispute with the papacy, 'what the king does, he does for the salvation of your souls.' The pope, by contrast, was a sinner (according to Guillaume Nogaret, one of the king's closest advisers and a leading protagonist in the disputes): Boniface VIII attacked 'the Gallic nation, a nation which is notoriously the most Christian.'²

The spread of the notion of Most Christian King in the first half of the fourteenth century is apparent in works such as the *Chronique des Quatre Premiers Valois*, but the strongest expressions of the idea emerged later, towards the end of the papacy's first residence at Avignon (1309–77) and during the Great Schism which followed (1378–1417). Even before the Schism began, Nicolas Oresme, highly respected theologian at the University of Paris and royal secretary, was

arguing that it was the duty of the King of France – ‘the most catholic and true son and champion of Holy Church and the most excellent of all the princes on earth’ – to call for a council of the church to address the perceived abuses of the Avignon papacy.³ In 1391, as solutions to the Schism were sought, the chancellor of the University of Paris, Jean Gerson, urged the Most Christian King to use his spiritual standing to help end the division of the church between Rome and Avignon. First conflict with the papacy, now division within the church itself greatly contributed to the moral authority of the Most Christian King.

Once the Schism was over, the French church passed a little further from papal control by its adoption of reform decrees of the conciliar movement under the terms of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438). The notion of Most Christian King was more relevant than ever. Supporters of the Pragmatic could present the sanction as the natural culmination of centuries of royal protection of the church and of the faith generally, and of monarchs’ personal devotion and generosity to both. Later in the fifteenth century, Pope Paul II made the title the standard formula of address to the King of France in papal correspondence.

The Most Christian King and his subjects

Although the title of *Rex Christianissimus* gave the king a certain moral authority in Christendom, it is the impact of the ideology within the boundaries of the kingdom which interests us here. Jacques Krynen argues that the concept effectively abolished

any idea of a contract or constituent pact which might exist between the monarch and his people, an idea so characteristic of the medieval west, and which in other states . . . encouraged during the same period a veritable constitutionalism.⁴

To grasp the point, we need to note that the king’s subjects – in common with many in the West – were commonly understood as belonging to different orders of society (also expressed as ranks or estates), or as different members of the same organic body (the nobles as the hands, the labourers and merchants the feet and so forth). Each estate or limb ideally performed its appointed task beneath a king whose primacy was divinely ordained, thereby assuring social harmony. The idea that the limbs of the body politic or the different ranks of society should ever control the head was, to use a

contemporary term, ‘unnatural’. St Thomas Aquinas had taught in the thirteenth century that God gave power to the people who then invested it in a monarch, and this was a notion which excited intellectual debate in other parts of Europe, such as Aragon. But in France, the debate was passed over more or less awkwardly by commentators in our period: the emphasis was firmly placed instead on notions of political authority which were, in their nature, ‘descending’ (from God) rather than ‘ascending’ (from the people). No wonder Krynen considers the concept of Most Christian King as the key to the emergence of another idea, rule ‘by absolute power’. Precisely this last phrase can already be found in at least one source from the very end of our period.⁵

In some key respects, of course, we should not exaggerate the impact of the concept of Most Christian King. Among other things, it was an idea which placed weighty restraints upon a ruler. The Most Christian King, quite as much as his subjects, had a divinely appointed role to fulfil, one he was personally bound to respect by his faith. The Picard nobleman Philippe de Mézières – ardent publicist of crusading, and for a while an intimate counsellor and tutor of Charles VI – thought that the sole purpose of the royal dignity was the good of the king’s subjects. Hence the following text from the prayer book of Charles V, recorded by Jean de La Grange, bishop of Amiens, another tutor of royal children:

I protest I am unworthy of having received such an honour from you as to have become and been ordained king and leader of your Most Christian kingdom, and to have been entrusted with justice and government for its people. That is why I pray that you might give me sense, understanding and knowledge, so that I might conduct myself wisely and justly enough to attain your grace, love, goodwill and paradise . . .⁶

As Lydwine Scordia has argued, the ‘superchristianization of the temporal power’ embodied in the notion of Most Christian King could even hamper rulers as they went about their business.⁷ How, for instance, could a Christ-like king justify raising taxes upon his subjects for the purpose of carrying out his own divinely ordained obligation to defend them? Many naturally concluded that the Most Christian King should meet this expense himself: hence the longevity of the notion that the king should ‘live of his own’, a major obstacle to the growth of a fiscal state. While there may have been little sense of a ‘constituent pact’ between the Most Christian King and his people,

it was nonetheless expected that the ruler's responsibilities towards his subjects would be foremost in his mind – not least because his own salvation depended on it. Unjust wars and illegal claims to territory were among the other matters which gave late medieval kings pause for thought in their conversations with holy men and women, in confession, or in their daily prayers.

Nor was the practical reform of government alien to the towering construct of Most Christian King. On the contrary, reform was a moral imperative for all Christians and for the church. The archetypal *Rex Christianissimus* Louis IX set the tone for all of his successors when he promulgated the first of several reforming royal *ordonnances* upon his return from crusade in 1254. This act sent the *enquêteurs* – many of them mendicant friars and secular clerics, living embodiments, in Joseph Strayer's phrase, of the 'conscience of the king' – out into the realm on a more regular basis than before to reform abuses of government. Philip IV followed his grandfather's lead in March 1303 with a reforming *ordonnance* – the so-called 'great statute' – which sought to address the more common complaints of laymen and the church against his officials. Raymond Cazelles (in his work on reform of royal government) finds that the terms of the act were confirmed no fewer than 24 times in the remainder of the fourteenth century, notably in the crises periods of 1315–19 and 1355–7, although calls for reform appear to have tailed off in the fifteenth century as we shall see.

Whatever the aims and outcomes of reforming initiatives, their very existence comforted the belief that if the Most Christian King erred, he did so, not because of any personal failings, still less some inherent flaw in his divinely ordained office, but because he had been misled by evil counsel or was badly served. It follows that to challenge the Most Christian King directly must have struck contemporaries as a radical step to take. Anger, drink or madness led many royal subjects to make verbal attacks upon individual kings of France in the late Middle Ages, as Jacqueline Hoareau-Dodinou's work on letters of remission has recently shown in detail. But it was one thing to blurt out that Louis XI needed just a single horse to transport his council, quite another to reject the prevailing monarchical form of government altogether. And in pardoning the intemperate utterances of his subjects by letters of remission, the Most Christian King simply underlined the heaven-sent power to pardon. 'The state was founded more on forgiveness than on anger.'⁸

But how was one to deal with a Most Christian King whose government proved impervious to calls for reform, or whose conscience pricked him but little? The opposite of the *Rex Christianissimus* was

the tyrant. As Peter Lewis has shown, this was not a charge which many intellectuals were willing to bandy about lightly in late medieval France. It is interesting to note that the theme of tyranny figured less and less in the writings of French commentators from the early fifteenth century onwards, around much the same time that the theme of a general reform of royal government was also beginning to dissipate. Worn down by the wars and political divisions of our period which are recounted in later pages, it seems that the king's subjects were gradually reconciling themselves to the need for strong kingship embodied in the notion of a *Rex Christianissimus*. Despite its limitations, the notion of Most Christian King was the core element of French political culture in the late Middle Ages.

Most Christian King and the royal blood

Yet it should not be thought that the notion of *Rex Christianissimus* placed monarchs beyond reach of all the challenges they might have to face. The king's primacy came from above rather than below, but it was also established over time by the holiness of the royal line. The point was made with some force in a widely disseminated defence of monarchical authority, the *Songe du Vergier* (1378). As Marion Schnerb and others have argued, this text was probably written on Charles V's command by Évrart de Trémaugon, formerly teacher of canon law at Paris and dean of Chartres cathedral. In it we learn that 'the sanctity of this blessed line' was proven 'first, by the deeds and miracles of My Lord Saint Charlemagne, of My Lord Saint Louis, king of France,⁹ Saint Louis of Marseille,¹⁰ saint Charles of Blois, formerly duke of Brittany,¹¹ and of several other saints.'¹² More than anywhere else, as André Vauchez has shown in his study of late medieval sainthood, the French royal familial community took a lead in promoting saints from among its own ranks. One can readily understand why, given the aura which saintly ancestors cast upon the royal line.

But the holiness of the line and its importance as a foundation for the notion of *Rex Christianissimus* were potentially problematic. Sainly predecessors set examples which were not easy to live up to. The charge of falling short when compared to one's Most Christian ancestors was laid before Philip IV by Pope Boniface VIII in 1302, before Charles VII by the princes who assembled at Nevers in 1442, and before the same king by those who objected to his refusals to revoke the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. The accusation was more than a calculated insult. Around the ruler were men of the royal

blood who might be considered better representatives of the holy line. Members of the royal familial community certainly considered themselves a group apart in political society on account of the blood which flowed in their veins. In 1415, Jean, Duke of Berry, uncle of Charles VI, reportedly told a deputation of leading Parisians that

you should not intervene in the affairs of my lord the king or of we who are of the royal blood, for we can be angry with one another when we want to, and we will make peace when it suits us.¹³

Duke Charles the Bold of Burgundy was not a popular man in the France of Louis XI, but nonetheless it was stated at the Estates-general of the realm in 1468 that because ‘[the duke] was of the royal line, . . . it was possible the crown could devolve upon him’.¹⁴ Late in the reign of Charles VII, the perfectly loyal Norman priest Robert Blondel, tutor to the future duke of Brittany, François II (1458–88), warned the king that his kingdom (above all others) had been created ‘by divine ordinance, not by human agency’; should it please God, He might ‘transfer the government of it from anyone who is unsuitable to another who is more useful.’¹⁵

It is no accident that the strongest challenges to ruling kings in our period came from those who had the greatest claim, after the king, to be agents of the divine: his closest male relatives. The necessary relationship between holy bloodline and Most Christian King opened up the tiniest possibility of a ‘pluralism of power’ in late medieval France, even here, in the holiest of holies, the king’s divine right to rule.

But in practice it could be asserted confidently that primacy within the blessed royal familial community still lay with the Lord’s anointed. Christine de Pizan, one of the most successful authors of the period, daughter of Charles V’s astrologer and widow of a royal secretary, thought the hierarchy could be understood arboreally. The princes of the blood were the sturdy branches of the royal tree, but the king himself was no appendage: he was the very root, his sons the fruit.¹⁶ That Robert Blondel’s fears were never realised suggests the processes by which one became Most Christian King had come to seem reasonably robust to the people that mattered.

The processes in question were initiated when one emerged as rightful heir from the blessed line – no longer by election (although that principle might still be invoked), but by dint of being the eldest male. The act of burying one’s predecessor marked the official inception of a reign from the later thirteenth century on, when the *oriflamme* fell over the coffin and then rose again to the words ‘Long

live the King'. The mystery of the *sacre* (holy sanction of a king's coronation) saw the monarch anointed and receive communion in both kinds like a priest, before being crowned with the 12 peers of the realm or those chosen to represent them in attendance, characteristically divided into leading prelates and princes. It was on this occasion that the king swore the two coronation oaths, one to defend the church, the other to preserve peace, justice and orthodoxy in the kingdom. The coronation did not make the king, but it strengthened his power by associating it with God and the clergy, as Richard Jackson has noted in his study of the ceremony. So unnatural was the prospect of regicide to Frenchmen by the end of our period that however close some might have come to it, as Peter Lewis has demonstrated, the monstrous crime was imagined as a defining characteristic of English history, not of French.

In short, the Most Christian King was clearly superior. And yet equally clearly, the notion of a holy line incorporating a wider royal familial community cannot be neglected. Proximity by blood to the Most Christian King afforded the best means of obtaining access to his person, his council, the offices in his gift, the powers exercised under his authority, and the monies raised in his name. The greater the proximity to the king, the greater the expectations his relative might harbour. No wonder (as Jean-Philippe Genet observes) that 'this [royal] blood flows without fail . . . through the living tissue of the events of the closing centuries of the Middle Ages'.¹⁷ When we come to our account of events in late medieval France, this point will become abundantly clear.

Most Christian King and other forms of public authority

Beyond the confines of the royal familial community, the notion of Most Christian King had the capacity to absorb, shape, override or undermine other visions of how public authority was exercised within the Kingdom of France. The king was not alone in offering protection, providing justice, granting liberties or taking levies, and so it was desirable to him that his legitimacy and primacy should be apparent and respected. Because a 'plurality of powers' existed in late medieval France, a plurality of ideologies existed too. But the sublime concept of Most Christian stood head and shoulders above the rest. The point may be demonstrated by a discussion of the two most significant forms of public authority other than the king, namely the leading princes of the realm and the municipalities.

Over the centuries, most princely dynasties of the realm had become related in one way or another to the royal line. It follows that to be the king's 'Fair Cousin' or his 'Good Uncle' was an important determinant of one's importance and power. To distance oneself from the Most Christian King by means of a distinct princely ideology was not an obvious course of action to take, at least for the majority. Some princes did have separate illustrious titles. René, Duke of Anjou (1434–80) inherited the title of king of Jerusalem, and vaunted it through the media of his seals and stained glass windows he gave to churches in his lands, as Christian de Mérimondol has shown in his work on symbols of princely power. But René was also a cousin of Charles VI and brother-in-law of Charles VII, a prince of the blood and a vassal of the crown in France – an important but subordinate figure in the realm. The *éclat* of extra-regnal titles simply added lustre to the French royal line of which René was part, with the result that what might seem a competing ideology was in reality a complementary one. There could be many kings, but only one Most Christian King. In ideological matters, plurality here did not affect the one.

A similar logic affects how English rulers approached the question of royal ideology in a French kingdom which all of them, from 1340 onwards, claimed the right to rule. Most kings of England were more or less distantly related to their counterparts in France. (Hence, as Malcolm Vale observes in his study of the origins of the Hundred Years' War, Edward III's adoption from a young age of two fleur-de-lys in his seal.) It would have been misguided for Edward or his successors to project an ideology of kingship which was alien to established French practices. While some attempt was made to develop a distinctive face for the so-called 'dual monarchy' under Henry VI in the early 1430s, as John McKenna argued, it is possible to overstate its importance. For most of his time as regent in France from 1422 onwards, John Duke of Bedford, Henry VI's uncle, adhered closely to a French royal style of rule. Hence his willingness to bring out the *oriflamme* in times of crisis, or his devotion to St Denis, 'protector of all of France', discussed by Guy Thompson. It was only sensible to act like the king of France if one wanted to be taken as such.

But some princes clearly did wish to distinguish their dominion from that of the king, and had all the ideological trappings to match. The last two Valois dukes of Burgundy, Philip the Good (1419–67) and Charles the Bold (1467–77), are sometimes discussed in this connection, although in reality it was not until very late in our period that the umbilical cord between France and Burgundy was broken – a point we will return to in a later chapter. The Montfortist dukes

of Brittany are a more striking and clear-cut case of a princely dynasty which distanced itself from French crown. The relative independence of Brittany which fuelled these ideological initiatives resulted from the duchy's geographical location within a wider Atlantic world, and the fact that the dynasty owed its position to military success rather than royal gift. From Jean IV's time onwards (1364–99), as Michael Jones has shown, the dukes claimed a number of regalian rights. Evidence for the crowning of Breton dukes emerges in 1401, although the practice was almost certainly older. By 1417, the dukes were styling themselves rulers 'by the grace of God', and by 1455, ducal servants were sometimes referred to in internal documents as 'royal officers belonging to the sovereign' (by which the duke, and not the king of France, was meant).¹⁸ One Breton author even claimed the only difference between the coronations of Breton dukes and French kings was the unction used in the latter case.

That princes should imagine their authority in terms that consciously imitated royal authority was not a new development, as Geoffrey Kolziol has argued in his work on Capetian political culture. But in contrast to earlier centuries, French kings – now Most Christian Kings – were far less willing than their predecessors to permit even pale imitations of their authority. The few princes who affirmed they ruled by the grace of God in late medieval France generally found their supposed rights contested, such as Jean IV, Count of Armagnac (1418–50), who was forced to drop his claims by Charles VII's administration. Moreover, the gulf between princely and royal ideologies had widened significantly compared to Capetian times. Efforts were made to project the antiquity and sanctity of Breton ducal power into an imagined past by chroniclers linked to the dynasty, as Jean-Christophe Cassard and Jean Kerhervé have demonstrated. But the chronicles in question were comparatively few in number, late in redaction and less significant in terms of their reception than the French royal chronicles written at Saint Denis. As Bernard Guenée has shown, the French royal *Grandes Chroniques de France* from the monastery of Saint Denis were copied and owned across the northern half of the realm, including Brittany itself. Kings might have been irritated by Breton pretensions, as Louis XI was by the François II's adoption of the symbol of a crown with flowerets on ducal seals and banners and by his use of the title *Dei gratia*. But a duke by the grace of God was not a king *Dei gratia*, let alone a Most Christian King. And for all the ideological trappings of Breton ducal power, it remained possible, at the end of our period, to describe oneself as both a Good Breton and a Good Frenchman.¹⁹

Unlike the dukes of Brittany, and indeed unlike cities in some other parts of Europe (notably Italy), French municipal authorities did not seek to acquire a distinct ideology of power. This was not because towns were weak and insignificant (far from it, as we shall see). But the main characteristic of municipal ideologies is that they were either compatible with, or simply part of, the monarchy's. The term *bonne ville* which was used to define towns as political entities in late medieval France helps explain why municipal ideology was so oriented towards the crown. As Albert Rigaudière and others have shown, towns were considered 'good' because they were loyal to the king. Charters and privileges which defined towns as corporations were issued by the monarch. Understandably, urban origin legends tended to imagine glorious pasts which town and crown shared, preferably from as early a time as possible. At Reims, as Pierre Desportes has shown in his work on that city, the municipality's earliest privileges were attributed to Saint Remi, baptiser of Clovis, reputedly the first Christian king of France (a spiritual link that was natural for a city that hosted the king's coronation). Elsewhere, municipal ideology tended to emphasise antiquity rather than sanctity. At Chartres, as Claudine Billot notes, the author of that town's *Vieille Chronique* (1389) aligned the municipality with the Trojan legends of monarchy. Most authors (following the twelfth-century historian Rigord) considered Paris a Trojan foundation too. Perhaps it was just a southern sense of humour that led the Provençal Honoré Bouvet, in his wide-ranging treatise entitled *The Tree of Battles*, to claim the capital had been founded at the scandalously late date of 499 AD, by Saracens.

'The French monarchy retained a veritable monopoly over ideological processes of legitimation, against which no ideological production from a particular locality or social group could impose itself, other than at a purely local level.'²⁰ Princely ideology tended to imitate the royal, while municipal ideology tended to sublimate itself within it. The state relied on more than ideas: it also relied on its ability to raise money and men, or to provide justice. But ideas were of capital importance, and the notion of Most Christian King was supreme among them.

Church and State

But what of the clergy? It is apparent from what has gone before that secular power was imbued with the spiritual power in late medieval

France. Few historians would now agree with Joseph Strayer that the 'secular sovereign state' rose at the expense of the church, that a 'laicization of society' had occurred in the thirteenth century and the church had consequently become 'a private society with no public powers or duties.'²¹ Most historians would now accept instead Jean-Louis Gazzaniga's observation that 'the state did not impose itself over the church, it imposed itself by means of the church' (albeit in ways which differed significantly from earlier periods of French history).²² The relationship between church and state may be considered in human, material and spiritual terms.

Churchmen in the service of the state

Few French churchmen spent all or even most of their time in the service of the Most Christian King, but some clearly did. Kings of France and leading princes of the realm had a growing power to influence appointments to canonries and other ecclesiastical offices. As a result, the post of canon was a popular one among clerical princely servants. As Elizabeth Lalou has shown, 273 of 1884 officers who are known to have served Philip IV (14.5 per cent) held the post of canon in a cathedral or collegiate chapter.

It might seem that the state acquired servants on the cheap when it succeeded in placing men in the church, and that the spiritual duties of the cleric were compromised by his service of the state. As Louis XI ironically remarked of Jean V Héberge, bishop of Évreux, in 1475, 'he is a right devil of a bishop, because although it may not always be so, at present he is fully occupied by my affairs.'²³ Such was not necessarily the attitude of the clergy. Canon law taught that it was the duty of the church to assist those who held the secular power. To judge from the snapshot of the bishops of the realm presented by Vincent Tabbagh for the year 1438, nearly one-fifth must have believed that serving the ruler was entirely in keeping with their calling, for that is how they were occupying themselves.

Clerics no longer enjoyed a near monopoly of governmental positions as they had in smaller royal or princely administrations of earlier times, but they were still present in significant numbers, despite (and in some areas, because of) growing specialisation. The *Chambre des comptes* which emerged from the king's court early in the fourteenth century with responsibility for audits, records and appeals relating to crown revenues was, until well into the reign of Charles VII, a bastion of clerics in government (as Jean-François Lassalmonie's study of

royal finances shows). It probably helped that clerics were far more likely than nobles and lawyers to have experience of administering large estates. Another body which began to emerge from the king's court at the start of our period, the *Parlement*, was divided on principle of parity between clerical and lay members. As Françoise Autrand has demonstrated, that principle was largely respected from 1350 to 1450. Clerics were less well represented in the king's council (judging from Pierre-Roger Gausin's work on that body in the reigns of Charles VII and Louis XI), but among their number were some of the longest-serving and most regular attenders. Robert de Rouvres, bishop of Séz and later of Maguelone, sat for 30 years on Charles VII's council and was deputy keeper of the royal seal.

Resources of the church in the service of the state

The material resources of the Most Christian King were also greatly increased through his relationship with the church. Clerical tenths (levies of one-tenth of clerical income) were granted to French kings by popes long before our period began, ostensibly for a specific holy enterprise such as the crusade, but increasingly for a wider range of purposes too. These levies were a regular occurrence in the decades leading up to c. 1350, then again after c. 1420. Prior to the fiscal changes of the mid-fourteenth century, clerical tenths were in fact the single largest source of income after receipts from the main administrative units of *bailliages* and *sénéchaussées* across the realm, and in the 1320s alone they amounted to between 15 per cent and 30 per cent of treasury revenues.

In principle, the clergy enjoyed exemptions from the direct taxes which the crown began to raise with greater success from the second half of the fourteenth century on, but the widening fiscal net captured clerical income in many other ways. Indirect taxes affected clerics and ecclesiastical institutions, and kings permitted municipalities to demand contributions from local clergy towards the spiralling costs of defence. French kings also enjoyed a number of older rights over the property and income of the church, such as the right to levy a fine upon fiefs which were acquired by the church (the *amortissement*), or the role of guardian, with its attendant profits, over vacant bishoprics and monasteries (the *régale*).

In the long term, finally, ecclesiastical models and structures shaped the development of royal taxes directly in our period. The diocese formed the basis of many of the *élections* or administrative

districts for the raising of taxes from the middle of the fourteenth century on. The parish became the basic unit for the apportionment of the direct tax burden of the state, a natural development given that it performed a similar function for a significant number of revenue sources for the church (including the tithe or payments for sacraments), and was used for administrative purposes by local lords (to announce dates for the holding of seigneurial tribunals and so forth). From 1355, the local parish priest advised on the selection of a panel of three or four worthy men who would visit heads of household, in principle in the priest's company, to establish how much taxation should be paid. Increasingly, the local worthies chosen were churchwardens already entrusted with collecting revenues for the upkeep of the church building, the focal point of the community.

Here we see that the work of the king's government had become the concern of another form of public authority, the church in its base unit of the parish. The capacity of the 'royal state' to develop depended on its ability to mobilise the support, resources and skills of other powers in society. While the point is made here with reference to the church, later we will extend the observation to other groups, notably the military classes and municipalities.

Church, state and nation

Last but not least, the authority of the Most Christian King was bound up with and advanced by the spiritual concerns of the church. When men of the church spoke to their flock, they did so in a language that emphasised hierarchy, order and obedience, all of which were necessary, since the Fall, to help attain salvation. When the Norman preacher Guillaume Pepin sought to explain the nature of God to his audience in the later fifteenth century, earthly comparisons were adduced:

We see in all the heavens that one is supreme, who is called the first mover, just as among the seven planets only one has primacy. In addition, we see that in politics there is only one supreme monarch, who gives all the orders, and this is the most perfect form of rule. We find the same in the church, in which one pope rules alone. And from all these examples we can conclude that God is one.²⁴

In the language of the mass, the conflation of kingship and the divine reinforced the themes of love and obedience which the audience was

incited to offer unhesitatingly to the highest authorities, on earth as in Heaven. Jean Gerson's instructions to clerics are suggestive here:

When the bells ring for mass you should think that it is a message from the King telling of the news of the King's arrival, and you should run to Our Lord as is fitting . . . When mass begins, you should know and think that the King is entering the door and you should go to welcome Him, and you should greet Him and say: welcome, My Fine Lord, and you should think how nobly He comes among you, and you should glory in His great beauty, in how great He is, how gracious, how glorious, how wise, how powerful, how graceful, how forgiving . . .²⁵

Preachers did sometimes speak directly about political matters in late medieval France, as the southern Franciscan Olivier Maillard did in 1470 when he railed against royal taxes. But outright condemnation of public authorities risked provoking social unrest: it was exceptional and rarely went unpunished. At Châlons in Champagne, the town council obliged all clergy

to counsel and exhort by preaching and in other manners . . . that everyone shall be good and true to our sovereign lord the king and to the good town of Châlons, to the honour and profit of the said king and his kingdom, and the public weal of the kingdom, and to My lord the duke of Burgundy.²⁶

More commonly, then, the sermon sought to reinforce authority. Parish priests were less and less inclined to preach to their flock during mass, but the king still featured in this daily event by mentions of him in prayers. Instructions of the bishop of Autun to the priests of his diocese in the fifteenth century included the order to have daily

prayers for the pope and the Holy Roman church; for all of the church, its unity and peace; for the kingdom and the king; and for the duke of Burgundy and Brabant.²⁷

The sequence of the prayers is significant, as was the order of the public authorities mentioned in the earlier example by the town council of Châlons. Although Autun and, at the time, Châlons lay within the dominions of the duke of Burgundy, Burgundians' prayers still placed the king above the duke. That was the right order of the world from the church's perspective, a perspective which necessarily accorded

primacy to the Most Christian King and a secondary place to the princes of the realm.

Religious processions became a notable feature of late medieval spirituality in France as elsewhere, and they too brought the king and the wider royal familial community to the forefront of people's minds. At Abbeville in 1414, the population was called to process (among other things) for 'the reverence of God, and to beseech and pray that He might grant health and a good life to our lord the king, to our lord of Guyenne [Louis, Charles VI's eldest surviving son, d. 1415] and all those of their blood and lineage.'²⁸ Processions were primarily located in urban milieux, but could also draw in rural populations from miles around. Divine intervention was sought by processants to alleviate a wide range of ills, including plague, famine or hazardous weather conditions. They were also increasingly held in the hope of bringing victory to the king or ending political crises in his realm. As Bernard Guenée has shown in his study of public opinion during the reign of Charles VI, more than one-quarter of over 100 recorded processions in Paris during that period sought peace in the conflict between the princes of the realm. In circumstances such as these, 'politics does not seem to "use" religion, [politics] still seems to be completely immersed within it.'²⁹ The remark is equally valid for public events surrounding proclamations of peace. As Nicolas Offenstadt has recently demonstrated, the various elements incorporated within the publication of peace treaties located the event in a deeply spiritual context: the prolonged ringing of church bells was accompanied by cries of 'Noel' (recalling the feast of the Nativity), and by the lighting of bonfires (associated with the Feast of St John). Unified celebrations and noise-making warded off evil, in this case the evil of war, and opened a new era of divinely ordained, miraculous peace.

That the Most Christian King could occupy a particular place within the spiritual lives of his subjects seems clear. That standing might be reinforced in other ways during our period. A traveller in the diocese of Poitiers in our period could chance upon the chapel of Our Lady of the Recovery, built around 1370 to commemorate Charles V's reconquest, or that of Our Lady of Grace, erected as a memorial of Charles VII's suppression of a princely revolt known as the Praguerie (discussed later in this book). Among the saints most commonly mentioned in vernacular prayers in French Books of Hours are figures closely associated with the kingdom and its ruling dynasty, such as Saint Denis and Saint Michel. In prayers to these saints (whose importance was underlined by Colette Beaune in her

work on royal ideology), the kingdom and one's own salvation and safety might be mentioned in the same breath:

O Lord Saint Denis, who from false credence,
 Converted to God the kingdom of France,
 In faith, in charity, in firm assurance
 Maintain my heart, and keep me from mischance.³⁰

If, as Bernard Guenée suggested long ago, the state created the nation in late medieval France, then it is clear, as his own work on processions has subsequently shown, that the church and the Christian faith played a large part in that process.

Rex Francorum

Ruling the French in the late Middle Ages clearly involved more than ideologies and drawing upon the human, material, spiritual and institutional strengths of the church. According to one fourteenth-century source,

the government of the kingdom of France resides in five things, in council and government relating to: war; justice; the expenditure of his household; in . . . matters relating to the *Domaine*; and the remission of misdeeds, crimes and misdemeanours.³¹

As Françoise Autrand notes, each of these areas was primarily the concern of a central body, although considerable overlap existed between them. The widest range of competence lay with the *Conseil* at the centre, which could intervene in virtually any area of government. The *Trésorerie des guerres* disbursed monies for the king's armies. Administering the king's justice was the primary concern of the *Parlement* in Paris, and later also of its regional counterparts at Poitiers (1418–36), Toulouse (1443–1790), Grenoble (1453–1790) and Bordeaux (1456–1790). The *Chambre des comptes* and the *Chambre du Trésor* were mainly occupied with the finances of the king's household and *domaine*, while royal correspondence (including documentation for remissions) was the concern of the king's notaries in the *chancellerie*. Together with the royal household and the wider court which assembled around the king's person, and his servants in the localities grouped around the post of *bailli/sénéchal*, this was the core of royal government.

Capetian origins, Valois development

Naturally, the origins of a good many of these organisations and offices can be traced before our period begins. The establishment of *baillis* and *sénéchaux* (equivalent offices in northern and southern parts of the realm) occurred at an early stage, during the reign of Philip II (1180–1223). The office was originally established to oversee the older and more numerous *prévôts*, who continued to provide a first level of royal justice in the locality. *Baillis/sénéchaux* had wide-ranging competence in justice, peace and finance in the region, much like English sheriffs. Gradually, many of their roles devolved upon specialised officers as their work became more complex and demanding in the later Capetian period. The most important of these specialists were financial receivers (reporting directly to the *Chambre des comptes* in Paris from 1305), lawyers (*Juges-mages* in the south, lieutenants, advocates and proctors elsewhere) and captains (established with a military role from 1317 in some of the *bonnes villes*).

To an older generation of historians which considered institutional developments to be of paramount importance in political history, it seemed that the thirteenth century witnessed an apogee in French government. Many of the major organs of the state emerged in that time. The *Parlement* developed from the king's court during the thirteenth century (its earliest independent records date to 1254), and the *Chambre des comptes* was just beginning to do so, acquiring its own locale in 1303–4 and a clearer definition of its role by royal *ordonnance* in 1320.

In reality, of course, a great many governmental developments occurred after 1328, some of which were of immense importance. Take the issue of how kings funded their wars, the very first item on the list mentioned above. Between the war treasurers who disbursed monies to the king's armies and the parish notables who, at the opposite end of the scale, apportioned taxation in the locality, a range of new offices and procedures evolved over the course of the second half of the fourteenth century. At the root of these developments was the office of *élu*. The *élus* were usually townsmen, less often clerics and nobles, originally 'chosen' (hence their name) by representative assemblies in the localities during the 1340s and 1350s to collect subsidies from the king's subjects. The *élus* were not, strictly speaking, royal officers in their first incarnation, but became so as the crown gradually absorbed the post during the first two or three decades of its existence. (In passing, we note once again how the royal state could simply be an extension of other forms of public authority.) The *élus*

ultimately answered to a new post which emerged at the centre, the *général des finances*, whose task it was to audit and redirect the monies which had been raised to the war treasurers. Such was the weight of business generated by tax-raising in the localities that a body eventually emerged around the *généraux des finances* known as the *Cour des aides*. This was a court of appeal for cases already heard by the *élus* in matters such as exemptions, fraud, non-payment and the like. Sustained activity in the locality was therefore generating significant administrative change at the centre in late medieval France. The fiscal product of these procedures eventually dwarfed the resources of thirteenth-century kings, as we shall see later.

Limits of government

Despite the development of an apparatus for raising taxation and other late medieval developments in government, we should not be tempted simply to replace the notion of a Capetian Valois apogee in governmental matters with a Valois one. In reality, the reach of government remained limited in our period.

Royal government was a relatively small world in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Setting aside the king's court and adding together the personnel of the *Parlement*, the *Chancellerie*, *Chambre des comptes* and the *Chambre du Trésor*, the masters of the mint and the other main services, Françoise Autrand calculates that there were no more than 200 men at the royal centre during the reign of Charles VI. That figure remained fairly stable to the end of our period. The number of personnel at the *Parlement* in Paris, the largest central body save the royal court, did not grow significantly between 1360 and 1515 (although provincial *parlements* did emerge as we have seen). As Robert-Henri Bautier showed, Philip VI's reign witnessed considerable expansion in the personnel of the chancery; thereafter, there was relative stagnation until the second half of the fifteenth century. Even in the locality where change was perhaps most evident, we would do well not to exaggerate the presence of royal officers. The number of *baillis-sénéchaux* virtually tripled in our period, and with the creation of each new *bailliage* or *sénéchaussée* came an increase in the number of specialists and auxiliaries in their service. But the total number of *baillis/sénéchaux* was never much more than 100. Gustave Dupont-Ferrier thought that the *élus*, usually between one and three of them operating in administrative units known as *élections*, could be counted in the low hundreds across the realm. Reviewing

studies of royal administration just after our period ends, David Potter notes that royal officers amounted to just over 4000 executive office-holders, rising to perhaps double that figure later in the sixteenth century. But even then, the number of royal office-holders and their dependents was around one-sixth of the size of that same group in the France of Louis XIV. Encounters between the king's men and the king's subjects were clearly increasing in our period, and were helping form attitudes towards the royal state, for good and for ill. But the number of such encounters, and the impact they might have had, remained necessarily limited.

Historians would now commonly point to a second limitation of government, what Robert Fawtier called 'administrative ignorance and distraction' in late medieval France. In the *Chambre des comptes* under Charles VII, as Henri Jassemin showed in his study of that body, the masters could not be sure if the regional receivers who answered to them were alive and in office, or indeed what their names were, for registers of nominations were not kept. The 1328 parish and hearth survey which the masters collated for the royal *domaine* was an impressive achievement, but Ferdinand Lot has shown that the surviving copies contain numerous errors, such as the underestimation of the number of parishes in Anjou by a factor of nearly 12. A manual made for the *Chambre*, first studied by Philippe Contamine, contains the imaginative claim that the kingdom was composed of 1,700,000 church bell towers (i.e. parishes). This is an entirely fabricated figure which probably appealed because of its sheer size, and because the number 17 generally had positive associations in Christian symbolism.

Given such evidence, it may well be true (as Fawtier argued in another article) that fourteenth-century kings would have found it impossible to imagine what their kingdom looked like – indeed, no map of France is known to have existed before 1472. The royal administration could, if it needed to, get a letter to the southern reaches of the kingdom in less than a week under Philip VI, and by the close of our period a relay system was established to permit news to travel from Tours to Bordeaux in a day under the best conditions. Officers of the *Parlement* in Paris had some understanding of the geographical extent of their jurisdiction, summoning plaintiffs and officers to hear cases and appeals from the *bailliages* and *sénéchaussées* in a clear order (as Françoise Autrand has shown). At the local level, the king's administrators usually knew the limits of their jurisdiction, to within a few hundred metres in the case of the *bailliage* of Senlis, studied by Bernard Guenée. But clear evidence of the limitations of administration at the centre cannot be ignored. However few external restrictions were placed upon the Most Christian King

by the ideologues, royal power, when expressed through the imperfect mechanism of an administration, was far less impressive in reality than it was in theory.

It should be noted (although it rarely is) that the same point is true of princely government. For those who consider the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as a new age of principalities in French history, a theme first articulated by Édouard Perroy and developed by John Le Patourel, the emergence of princely administrations was a serious threat to royal authority. But if the organs of princely government were modelled on those of the crown – indeed, were sometimes run by the very same men – we are entitled to doubt their ability to impose their master's will any more effectively. Princely administrations had smaller territories to govern than their royal counterparts, but they were smaller themselves too. (The *Parlement* established by Charles the Bold for all his territories in 1473 was modelled on that of Paris, but with a core of around 30 it was roughly one-third the size of its royal equivalent – without counting the personnel of the new regional *parlements* mentioned above.) The mere existence of the royal administration was a further problem for its princely counterparts. Appeals against outcomes in local courts could be directed to the *Parlement*, and a growing number of crimes (*cas royaux*: royal cases, such as coining) were reserved for the king's justice alone. It is important not to exaggerate tensions between royal and princely administration of justice, but the hierarchical relationship between the two levels of jurisdiction was clear. In few cases could it really be said that the king's administration was 'virtually excluded' from the lands held by leading royal vassals or apanned princes in our period.³²

Rather than construct an account of late medieval French history around the principalities as separate administrative entities, it is helpful to think of the princes as important elements in that 'plurality of powers' whose interplay governed the political events discussed in later chapters of this book. More broadly, the limits of governmental powers discussed here show that the state in late medieval France could not easily impose itself. In the words of Bernard Guenée, 'the state was only able to develop because it was accepted and even desired.'³³

The importance of office-holding

So historians no longer consider the administrative achievements of the thirteenth century as a highpoint of governmental efficiency, and

are wary of exaggerating the reach of royal (if not yet princely) government in the two centuries that followed. But in one key respect ‘the creation of royal corps of officials and the *parlements* [did] constitute the political dynamic of that period.’³⁴

The small governing elites mentioned above tended to solidify and perpetuate themselves from the early fourteenth century on, and a great deal of power became concentrated in their hands. By the close of the fifteenth century, a fluctuating oligarchy of a dozen or so men, the so-called masters of the kingdom of Charles VIII’s reign, was said to be able to dominate royal government.³⁵ As Mikhaël Harsgor (who coined this term) acknowledges, governing oligarchies were a feature of earlier times too; and we might add that they existed as much within the localities as they did at the centre. Between these many powers the political life of the kingdom was made. The key to their emergence and influence was the acquisition and retention of office.

Royal office was very often acquired by soliciting it directly from the king. Werner Paravicini (in the context of a comparative history of governmental institutions) illustrates the phenomenon perfectly with the example of how the post of *élu* for the city of Reims was acquired from a newly crowned Louis XI (1461). The king was approached no fewer than three times (once out on the road between Reims and Château-Thierry, later in the royal gardens at Les Tourelles, then finally within his chambers around eight in the evening at the Bastille) to agree to give the post to a particular supplicant. The practice of impetration was not, of course, a free-for-all. Gaining access to the ruler meant acquiring supporters like the king’s chamberlain, equerry or even barber, all of whom were important men because they were close to the prince. But the press of petitioners around a king generated confusion and could lead to the nomination of more than one man to a single office, thereby contributing to the ‘ignorances and distractions’ of government discussed above. Once again, the sublime concept of royal power present in the notion of ‘Most Christian King’ seems very far removed from the reality of the daily business of governance.

For the most important posts in government, election (rather than royal nomination) was preferred by reformers and was increasingly becoming the norm. At first ‘election’ entailed the selection of a candidate, not by poll, but by the deliberations of a suitable body of men deemed able to judge his qualities. Elections by poll began to take place under Charles V. Other trends were gradually developing which would be less popular with reformers. Venality (in the sense of the public sale of office) became more common in the early

sixteenth century, but from the beginning of our period the private sale of office between individuals was sanctioned by the royal administration in lowly posts such as that of royal sergeant. Private sales began to spread up the hierarchy of royal office towards the end of the fourteenth century, affecting important local posts such as *bailli*, procurator and royal advocate. The purchase of office might be regarded as an investment, the office itself a property to be passed on by practices such as resignation of office *in favorem* (whereby the officer resigned in favour of a named successor). Hereditability of office was not yet widespread, but it too was beginning to emerge by the second half of the fifteenth century.

Once office was obtained, its bearers tended to bind themselves together in different ways, as a group and as factions within the group. Marriage alliances were one means of achieving this end, with the result that governmental bodies might come to resemble extended family networks. Among the personnel of the *Parlement* of Paris from 1345 to 1417, a group studied in great detail by Françoise Autrand, a gradually increasing proportion of officers were related to one another: just under one-third had at least one relative among their colleagues at the start of that period, but nearly three-quarters were in that same position by the end. Another marked trend was the rise of men on the coat tails of a great lord or royal servant to whom they were already tied by bonds of lordship and regional association. Raymond Cazelles has demonstrated how, in the household of Philip VI, vassals and near neighbours of the powerful Burgundian *bouteiller* of France, Mile de Noyers, acquired a good number of key posts, including master of the household, master of petitions to the king's household, master of the royal stable and master of the queen's household. These figures in turn had the possibility of introducing men (and women, in the queen's household) of their connection into royal service. Further down the scale, royal service might acquire a familial air as a result of generations of marriages: the Thibault family at Senlis, for instance, whose members and relatives included a considerable number of royal advocates and procurators in the *bailliage* during the fifteenth century.

The process of election by one's peers and the bonds that grew between the families could produce a certain *esprit de corps* among royal servants. The crown might strengthen this sense of incorporation by extending the royal safeguard to its officers while carrying out their duties, and by the second half of the fourteenth century the idea was emerging in the *Parlement* that to attack a man entrusted with the king's business was an act of treason. The special status of the

king's man might be identified visually to the population in a number of ways: in his costume, in royal banners placed over his house by the *bailli* as a sign of the king's protection, or in the place he was accorded in the rituals of monarchy. Members of the *Parlement* processed through Paris in their robes of vermillion (for laymen) or violet (for clerics) lined with ermine on a range of occasions, notably in royal funerals during which their unchanged attire served as a reminder that although one king was dead, royal justice was eternal. But emerging notions of public service and an *esprit de corps* did not change the fact that office was sought because it could bring considerable benefits to the occupant, his family and friends. Here we begin to touch on the key dynamic of political life as it evolved in late medieval France.

Patrons, brokers and clients

If one wanted something done – the level of a tax negotiated, a privilege restored, the outcome of a case influenced – it helped considerably to know the right people in the right places. Office-holding encouraged informal mechanisms of brokerage which are difficult to follow in the historical record, but which clearly enhanced the importance of the king's administration to other forms of public authority in the realm.

The most important of the governmental organs where brokerage prevailed was the royal court, far larger numerically than all the other services combined. Although Elizabeth Lalou has succeeded in recovering something of the history of the royal household which lay at the core of the wider court for the early part of our period, important sources that would have permitted direct observation of networks of influence and favour at that level were lost to fire in the eighteenth century. But evidence of clientage at court and its impact does begin to emerge indirectly, in the writings of a new wave of court critics. Literary figures in the *chancellerie* (notably the royal secretaries Jean de Montreuil and, after him, Alain Chartier) were among the earliest figures in this phase of renewed court criticism which emerged in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. For such writers, the court seemed to be dominated by greedy petitioners whose demands for office, gifts and pensions inevitably drove up taxes. The king's men in the *Chambre des comptes* were just as bad as the courtiers, to judge from the comments of Nicholas de Baye, scribe of the *Parlement* in the early fifteenth century. Observing their interventions in the

Parlement on behalf of family and friends, Baye was reminded of the Parable of the Unjust Steward (Luke 16: 1–9).³⁶ Down in the *bailliages*, as Bernard Guenée demonstrated, plaintiffs sometimes claimed that their adversaries were unbeatable in court because they were related to the *bailli*'s lieutenant or the king's procurator or his advocate. At the centre of these multiple networks of influence and favour, peopled by patrons, clients and brokers, was the king – a figure whose authority was their lifeblood, but whose ability to get things done was often constricted by their actions. A few examples will help illustrate these points in a more tangible way.

Municipalities needed brokers at the centre whom they could count upon to achieve their ends. Acquiring powerful friends usually required the distribution of gifts, and in the case of towns it is possible to follow the process because municipal administrations made and preserved records (whereas many other elements of political society, especially nobles and noble networks, did not). Pierre Desportes finds that an entire rubric of Reims's accounts was given over to *courtoisies*, such as the 48 garlands of roses offered to the masters of the *chambre des comptes* in 1340 (a gift the latter had themselves specified), or the 1,000 local pears and 3 dozen cheeses presented to the wife of the president of the *Parlement* in Paris in 1353. Some municipalities retained a team of fixers and legal experts in the capital to look after the town's affairs. One member of such a team was the jurist Jacques Bachelier, procurator for the city of Tournai. Bachelier's letters back to the magistrates were read aloud before an assembly in the town, and included the name of the usher who let him into the room where Charles VI received him, 'lying on his bed'.³⁷ The use of intermediaries at court was another way of exercising influence. One such was Hélié de Papassol, notary, whose journal recording the money he distributed to servants and relatives of the great royal officers on behalf of the authorities of Périgueux in 1337 was studied by Arlette Higounet-Nadal. Such fixers were important to the king's counsellors too, for through them they received a proportion of the rewards of office. As Bernard Chevalier has noted in his work on relations between the king's council and the towns of the realm, royal advisers even worked out zones of influence across the realm so as to avoid conflicts of interest between them.

Great princes relied on the services of men in the higher echelons of royal government quite as much as municipalities. During the prolonged period of Charles VI's mental illness discussed below, the leading princes of the realm sought to establish control over the substantial tax revenues of the crown (as Maurice Rey has shown in his

study of the royal *domaine* under that king). The most effective way to achieve influence was through the appointment of specialists who could be relied upon to achieve favourable outcomes for the prince. Gradually, the royal financial administration was peopled with experts who were princely clients. Jean, Duke of Berry was one of the first princes off the mark, placing his friend, Gonthier Col, royal secretary and celebrated humanist, among the *généraux des finances* who managed income from taxation. Two years later, Berry managed to place another of his men in high financial office, this time Martin Gouge, a canon from Bourges who was also his own treasurer. Soon the duke of Berry was followed by his nephew, Louis of Orléans, who obtained posts for the Master of his own household, Guillaume de Laire and several other Orleanist servants. By the second half of 1404 the Orleanist stranglehold over the king's finances which these men achieved for their master was such that the new duke of Burgundy, John the Fearless, found that his revenues from the crown were rapidly drying up. The consequences of increasing Orleanist control over key offices were dire, as we shall see later.

For now, the example illustrates how the development of a corps of royal officers at the centre could constitute the most important 'political dynamic' of the period – not because of the size and efficiency of central institutions, but because of informal mechanisms of power distribution which developed around individuals serving within such bodies. Hence historians' gradual abandonment over the past generation of the study of 'institutions' per se, and their greater interest in the men who held office in the main organs of royal government, usually studied using prosopographical methods.

Ruling the French was a more complex business in 1500 than it had been in 1300, involving more men in general and more specialists in particular, all of them serving across a greater number of organs of government. But growth was uneven, more evident in the locality than it was at the centre in our period, where (with the exception of the court) the number of royal servants remained relatively small. Princes had a role to play in ruling the French, but they too formed part of a wider network of influence and favour which centred upon the king, and which extended outwards from the small but disproportionately powerful royal centre through many patrons, brokers and clients to men and bodies with greater purchase in the locality: to barons and noble affinities, merchants and municipalities and bishops and other clerics. The kingdom over which these powers were exercised may now be considered in greater detail.

Regnum Franciae

As late as the thirteenth century the kingdom was still referred to as *Francia*, a term that appeared in the early Middle Ages and could mean where the Franks lived generally, or a particular centre of Frankish power, the Parisian region. The use of the term *Regnum Franciae*, Kingdom of France, is first recorded in 1205, and by the start of our period it had become the norm in documents issued by the royal *chancellerie*. In the course of the thirteenth century the king himself became *Rex Franciae*, 'King of France', rather than *Rex francorum*, 'King of the Franks'.

The first detailed description of the kingdom was written by Gilles Le Bouvier, usually known by his official title of Berry herald, in the context of his *Livre de la description des pays* (Book of the description of lands, c. 1450). There we learn that the realm extended from Sluis in Flanders in the north to Saint-Jean-Pied-de-Port in the Pyrenees in the south; from Lyon in the east to Finistère in Brittany in the west. It was 'closed' by natural boundaries on all sides save the east, where Le Bouvier described a looser frontier of four rivers: the Rhône, the Saône and the Meuse, thence one day's journey to the Escaut in the Cambrésis, and down that great river to the Channel. These were effectively the frontiers created by the Treaty of Verdun in 843 to fashion the West Frankish kingdom of Charles the Bald from the Carolingian Empire.

There were other boundaries which Le Bouvier might have mentioned, but only one of them entered his account – that attributed to Gaul, incorporating lands now in the Empire, but 'which used to belong to the Kingdom of France, and where they speak French coarsely'. These lands included some which were closely connected to the kingdom in our period: the county of Burgundy, purchased in 1295 but tied to the duchy of Burgundy thereafter; the counties of Valentinois and Diois, held from the crown from 1316; the Dauphiné, purchased in 1349 on the condition it would always be held by the heir to the French throne; and the county of Provence, ruled by Angevins from 1384, and absorbed into the kingdom in 1486. In all, 18 duchies, 94 cities and 10 archbishoprics made up this 'Kingdom of France, the most pleasant, most gracious and best proportioned of all the others'.³⁸

In this last remark, we touch upon a key characteristic of all descriptions of the kingdom viewed from the political centre, its essential unity. Gilles Le Bouvier saw the realm as a harmonious whole, with an

equal balance of summer and winter months and a losange shape, neither square nor long. Even the wine-producing regions of the kingdom were handily placed near those which did not have vines. A similar tone pervades the anonymous *Débat des hérauts de France et d'Angleterre*, which stated that it was the very absence of harmony in England's geography – too few rivers, an intemperate climate – which made it inferior to France. Although recent victory over the English had surely contributed to the vision of the Kingdom of France which these military men shared, the view from the royal centre was always likely to be a unitary one. Already in the reign of Philip II, royal advisers were imagining the kingdom as a single 'vast lordship' under the monarch.³⁹

The reality, of course, was far more complex. The diversity which characterised the Kingdom of France can be illustrated by a discussion of law, language and geography, and by a brief overview of how the king's authority had extended across the realm by the start of our period.

Law

In the practice of law, the diversity of the kingdom seems most obvious in the differences between a northern half where customary law prevailed, and a southern half where written Roman law had made a strong reappearance in the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The line between the two ran southwards from (and including) the Lyonnais, Forez, parts of Auvergne and La Marche, southern Saintonge into most of the Bordelais and, above all, Languedoc. When the Dauphiné and the county of Provence were joined to the kingdom, Roman law increased its presence still further.

It would be misleading to lay too much emphasis on a north–south legal divide in the kingdom. Customary law did continue to operate in the south long after the influence of Justinian's Digest re-emerged there, and indeed in some areas, the co-existence of the two could cause considerable confusion. At the end of our period, as Robin Harris shows in his study of Valois Guyenne, it was possible for a royal proctor to refuse the introduction of new evidence in a case on the grounds that customary law forbade it, only to be flatly contradicted by an advocate who told him written law had always applied in that region, not customary. Roman law meanwhile had spread north from an early stage and was studied there, not least at Orléans. In the course of the later Middle Ages, the jurist learned in Roman law

became a feature of municipal and royal government in the north quite as much as the south, and the notary recorded the transactions and arrangements of every day life in both halves of the realm. Finally, customary law was being set down in writing in the north in the period c. 1250–1400, rather than simply retained in the memories of lay judges and transmitted orally. The development tended to further reduce contrasts between different forms of law, as Roman and even Canon law influences shaped the process of redaction. Customals were set down during this time for Vermandois, Picardy, Beauvaisis, Normandy, Brittany, Anjou, Touraine and Poitou, often by royal practitioners of law who were acting, not in response to any known central initiative, but out of an apparent desire to make it easier for judges and plaintiffs to dispense and obtain good justice.

Despite signs of growing uniformity and some common characteristics north and south, diversity was still the main feature of legal practice across the realm. Between northern customary practices there existed considerable differences on points of law, so much so that in his *Coutumes du Beauvaisis* at the close of the thirteenth century, local *bailli* Philippe de Beaumanoir observed that ‘customs are so diverse that one will not find two castellanies in the whole Kingdom of France which follow the same custom in all cases’.⁴⁰ A century later the Norman jurist Jacques d’Ableiges thought much the same: ‘there are even local customs which exist in one small enclave among several others, [different] from the surrounding *pays*, and where the custom, which is totally contradictory to this small place, has no authority.’⁴¹ In the south too, Roman law practices could be considerably modified from one jurisdiction to another by charters, privileges and statutes which had accreted over time, effectively giving each community its own law in fundamental matters such as the upkeep of highways. Northern customals accepted some aspects of Roman law but not others. As Paul Ourliac and Jean-Louis Gazzaniga note in their joint work, Roman law pertaining to property held in mortgage was not followed in Brittany and Anjou, but that relating to the guardianship of minors was.

And then there was the separate question of how the law, whatever its form, was applied (or indeed not applied) by judges in the very many jurisdictions that existed across the realm. If a plaintiff were unhappy with the decision of a seigneurial or municipal court, he could appeal, albeit at a cost, to a higher jurisdiction. If the case went (at even greater cost in money and time) to the *Parlement*, it came before legists who were increasingly interested in ‘using such appeals in order to abrogate local customs that did not fit [their] own ideas of

jurisprudence'.⁴² This last point suggests that if enough appeals had wound up at the *Parlement* in Paris, greater uniformity would eventually have emerged. But the *Parlement* seems to have been quite happy to accept the kingdom's diversity (for example, in the separation of some of its business into cases from Languedoil and Languedoc), as indeed were those fifteenth-century kings who created regional *parlements*, in which local practitioners mingled with men from Paris. In any case, we may doubt whether the volume of business passing through the *Parlement* was ever such that it could effect wholesale change from the top down. As Romain Telliez notes in his study of royal officers before the king's justice in the fourteenth century, cases from regions badly affected by war are few and far between in the judicial registers of the crown – and needless to say, there were many such regions in that troubled period.

The king himself might decide to take steps to increase uniformity of practice, if only because of the number of complaints he received from plaintiffs weary of having to prove which custom they should be judged by. But this only happened very late in our period. Charles VII issued an *ordonnance* at Montils-lès-Tours in 1454 instructing that 'the usages, styles and customs of each *pays* be written down, in accordance with the customals and the people of each *pays*'.⁴³ The resulting customals were to be brought before the *Parlement* of Paris or the king's great council for approval. Such was the resistance of local practitioners of law that very little was actually achieved, but redactions did take place in Touraine, Anjou and Burgundy. A quarter of a century later, in an initiative studied by René Gandhilon, Louis XI had the ambitious idea of amalgamating all the customals into one 'new custom' applicable across the realm. In the end, Louis's death put paid to the scheme. It was not until the middle of the sixteenth century that the *Parlement* of Paris finally completed its review of the redaction of customals ordered by Charles VII in 1454. In law, diversity ruled.

Language

Law touched most people's lives at certain points, but language was something they used everyday, certainly in oral form and (for a much smaller proportion of the population, although how small is impossible to tell) in writing. Although diversity remains the overwhelming characteristic here too, there were at least two broader trends in the written language during the late Middle Ages which should be

mentioned: the spread of French in governmental matters, and its usage to express ideas which had hitherto been the preserve of Latin.

The shift from Latin to French as the language of government was a slow and uneven process, but important steps were taken in that direction during our period. Change was apparent earliest in locality and region rather than at the centre, with French becoming the language used in the administration of the *bailliages* of the north and in the *prévôté* of Paris already in the later thirteenth century, as Louis Carolus-Barré demonstrated. The reasons behind the development are suggested in Philippe de Beaumanoir's observation that lay plaintiffs found themselves at a disadvantage in courts where proceedings were conducted in a technical Latin. The same reasoning doubtless lay behind the adoption of French in administrative documents among certain northern and eastern municipalities in the thirteenth century, considerably earlier than the crown's use of the vernacular, particularly those where an emerging literary culture can also be discerned. Latin remained the main language used in the *Parlement* throughout our period, although already in the fourteenth century its members were advised to use a simple Latin close to French. From the second half of the fourteenth century onwards, French came to predominate in letters issued by the *chancellerie* to a wide range of individuals and corporations. In turn, it seems, the weight of administrative usage gradually began to exercise a normative effect upon the vernacular, as Serge Lusignan has argued, resulting in the emergence of a 'king's French' relatively devoid of the traits of regional written forms as early as the first half of the fourteenth century in some northern *bailliages*.

The crown would eventually try to impose the use of French in government by means of the *ordonnance* of Villers-Cotterêts (1539), but the halting acceptance of this measure in the south serves as a reminder of the limitations of central government's purchase – or even ambitions – in the area of linguistic change. While readers of Occitan could probably understand the king's French and vice versa, the illuminating eyewitness account of how, in 1443, the Dauphin Louis and his secretary failed to comprehend a letter handed to them by an envoy from the municipality of Millau suggests this was not necessarily the case (although as Auguste Brun reminds us, the Dauphin's clear irritation at receiving such a letter, and the fact that the municipality subsequently used a secretary who could write in French for its dealings with the crown, should also be mentioned). As Philippe Martel notes in his study of language in the south, Latin remained the primary language of written communication between

royal government and urban communities into the fifteenth century. Regional forms of Occitan figured strongly in the greatly increased bureaucracy of municipalities, such as town council minutes and correspondence between southern municipalities. The example of Montferrand discussed by Tony Lodge, where Jean, Duke of Berry replaced a recalcitrant municipal administration with his own men in 1390, effecting in the process a sudden switch from Occitan to the king's French in the town's records, is interesting because it is exceptional.

In the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the vernacular developed considerably as a literary language, further enhancing the performative capacity of the written word. Lodge estimates that around 23 per cent of the vocabulary of modern French was first coined in our period, a notable proportion given that literacy levels in the late Middle Ages almost certainly did not match those of a more populous France in later centuries. The lexical creativity of the period and its contribution to a more uniform written vernacular may be explained in a number of ways, but perhaps above all by the growing number of learned northerners who were prepared to use French prose as a medium of communication. The trend had emerged first in the thirteenth century in the writing of history, as chronicle writing moved from its monastic and latinate background into aristocratic households (a phenomenon illuminated by the work of Gabrielle Spiegel). The translation and impact of classical histories, sometimes in compilation such as *Li Faits des Romains*, is one example of the growing creativity of the vernacular in that earlier period. Through history-writing the vernacular was coming to be seen as a language capable and worthy of mediating authoritative texts. The trend was not much enhanced by religious beliefs in the late Middle Ages, for clerics encouraged devotion over knowledge among layfolk, as Geneviève Hasenohr has shown. Some theologians, like Jean Gerson, did not even want the laity reading the Bible directly, although Guyart des Moulins rendered it partially with glosses in 1295, and Raoul de Presles produced a translation for Charles V in 1377. But in law, as we have seen, customals were being written in the vernacular in the fourteenth century; and under Charles V, political thinkers began to express their complex ideas in French. Nicolas Oresme's translation of Aristotle's *Ethics* even provided a glossary of the many unfamiliar terms and neologisms he had coined (including such fundamental concepts as *aristocratie*, *monarchie*, *oligarchie* and *définition*). Albert Menut estimates that this writer alone enriched the French language with more than 1000 words which he used for the first time.

Factionalism and troubles from Charles VI's reign onwards saw the growth of a polemical literature in the vernacular in treatise and verse forms. Public exchanges between poets in the service of competing figures in the French polity sharpened an awareness of the art of rhetoric and its application to the vernacular. The writing of French verse and prose came to be seen as appropriate pastimes for authority figures, as Duke René of Anjou (1434–80) (author of *Le livre du coeur d'amour épris*) and Duke Charles of Orléans (1407–65), a celebrated poet, demonstrated in their different ways. The spread of a more uniform literary French, less marked by regional traits and enhanced by neologisms, was resulting from these late medieval developments, and this is the language which the printing press would later adopt and spread. Presses existed as early as 1470 in Paris, but their influence is mostly a later story which can be followed in the work of Peter Rickard, among others.

It is important not to exaggerate the impact of literary developments upon linguistic change. Diversity was apparent here too, not least between north and south. Occitan was the language of town chronicles at Millau, Cahors and Montpellier, and texts originally written in Latin and French were translated into Occitan in our period, including a Latin encyclopaedia for Gaston III Phoebus, Count of Foix (1343–91) and the *Doctrinal de Sapience*, written by an anonymous Cluniac monk in the fourteenth century. Occitan grammars continued to appear in the late Middle Ages, such as the *Lays d'Amor*. While some famous southerners wrote in northern literary French, such as Honoré Bouvet and Gaston Pheobus himself, author of a successful treatise on the art of hunting, they were exceptional.

A second obvious limitation to note is that access to literary French affected but a small part of the population in the north itself. There have been optimistic evaluations of the extent of literacy among the rural and urban populations of Picardy, Champagne and Burgundy in our period, but the mention of schoolmasters established at the initiative of local church, municipality or lord sheds little light on what literacy actually meant in such instances. What we can say for certain is that book production was still dominated by Latin, and that book ownership was uncommon due to the costs involved. The evidence of surviving datable manuscripts studied by Carla Bozzolo and Ezio Ornato indicates that vernacular works amounted to between 20 per cent and 30 per cent of books made in France in our period. Twenty per cent of surviving wills from Tournai mention books, compared to just 3 per cent of those which still exist for St Omer.

The greater spread of literacy from the sixteenth century permitted norms of writing to have some impact upon the spoken language, but diversity was even more profound in the field of speech during our period than it was in written forms. Flemish, Breton and Basque (in that order) were spoken by relatively few, while English domination in large parts of France had little discernible impact upon linguistic norms, save perhaps in terms of abuse (*dogue*) and domination (*milord*). English residents had to learn to speak French, and did so with more or less success (less in the case of the English travellers in France recounted in the *Fabliau des deux Anglois et l'anel*, whose linguistic incompetence resulted, not in a meal of lamb, but of donkey flesh). But even setting aside these obvious areas of diversity in speech, subjects of the French king spoke in ways that could seem utterly different to their compatriots, ranging from ugly to humorous to incomprehensible.

One story may be suggestive here. It comes from a letter of remission studied by Jacques Monfrin for a fight which broke out between two workmen who were mimicking each other's accents in a Paris street in 1388. One of the workers was Parisian, Jean de Chastillon, the other Picard, Thomas Castel. Between northern speakers there was clearly a measure of mutual comprehensibility. The geographical mobility of the period was contributing to an increasing number of encounters between different language groups. Small-group language speakers like the Picard in Paris tend to assimilate more easily to the large group they move among, in the long-term contributing to greater uniformity, but that process was clearly not far advanced in this case. The fact that it was the Parisian who first mimicked his interlocutor suggests he thought his accent superior to the Picard's, a sentiment with which some contemporaries (and not just Parisians) would certainly have concurred.

Paris was still a vibrant capital in 1388, but the upheavals of Charles VII's reign would see a shift of the political centre of Valois France to the Loire (where, perhaps not coincidentally, the best French was subsequently deemed to be spoken). It is far from certain that the capital retained the same power to effect linguistic change two generations after the date of our story. Moreover, periods of upheaval could lead, not only to geographical mobility typified by the Picard in Paris, Thomas Castel, but also to a closing of ranks and a strengthening of rural communities. Denser social networks slowed the pace of linguistic change. Castel was a skilled male, a social type more likely than most to migrate in search of work and settle away from the family network. Female migration into cities seems to have been less common, at least judging by data cited in a later chapter. The finding

has significant linguistic ramifications given that language acquisition was shaped in important ways within the domestic environment, and through maternal influence. The story of Thomas Castel and Jean de Chastillon therefore does not easily lend itself to a straightforward picture of growing uniformity of speech in France in our period. No wonder it was still possible for later writers to complain about France's linguistic diversity, as Christiane Marchello-Nizia notes in her history of the French language: Racine, for example, who wrote to his friend La Fontaine that once he had passed Lyon in his travels, he was in as much need of an interpreter as a Muscovite would be in Paris.

In such circumstances bilingualism, at least among certain groups, was desirable. Historians have sometimes assumed bilingualism was widespread among the elites of late medieval France, but the assumption may be misplaced. Jacques Rossiaud has shown that notable townsmen of Lyon did tend to know French but their bilingualism was superficial. Examples cited by Auguste Brun in his study of the spread of French in the south of France reveal that some people were clearly comfortable dealing with complex transactions in both French and Occitan. But others were less at ease with the northern tongue, such as the counsellor of Count Jean IV of Armagnac, a future bishop of Montauban, who claimed to his English interlocutors that he found it easier to negotiate with them in Latin rather than French. Nor was speaking French popular with all regional elites, such as the bishop of Viviers who demanded in his will in 1303 that his heirs should speak Occitan, not French. All of these examples raise complex and interesting questions, but they tend to demonstrate that bilingualism among elites should not be taken for granted. And below the elite, of course, there were many for whom French was difficult or impossible to follow. Dauphiné bishops instructed their priests, in French, to conduct key parts of the ceremony of exorcism in *romans* so that their flock knew for sure the task had been performed.

Arguably, of course, it did not matter to the king which language his subjects spoke, so long as his authority was recognised within the *Regnum Franciae*. Nor did speaking differently from the king mean that his subjects were necessarily any less loyal. But the linguistic diversity of the kingdom did pose practical problems, and encouraged reliance upon narrow social groups with the requisite skills.

Geography

Few would argue that the kingdom's linguistic diversity promoted unity in the late Middle Ages, but there were once scholars who

thought that France's geography did precisely that, such as the great nineteenth-century historian Jules Michelet, or Paul Vidal de La Blache, an historical geographer of a later generation. The geography of the kingdom is more likely to be seen today as one more reason why France should not exist.

Then as now, the land mass of France contained four distinct fluvial basins which led in quite distinct directions: the Seine linking Burgundy, Paris and ultimately Normandy; the Loire draining the waters of a wide region through Anjou and the *pays de Rays*; the Garonne, stretching from the western edge of Languedoc to the Atlantic beyond Bordeaux; and the Rhône-Saône corridor which royal France straddled only occasionally. Together these basins account for over half of the surface of the territory of modern France, more so in the case of the late medieval kingdom. In Berry Herald's description the major navigable rivers figure prominently, creating natural links between towns situated along their length. He does not consider the corollary of his statement: at a time when the easiest means of communication was by water, France's main river systems also created divisions within the land mass of the kingdom.

Where rivers meet the sea there lies a coastal France which is different again, as Marc Russon's recent study of the 'warrior coasts' reminds us. The vast western and northern shoreline faced a sea which Berry Herald (thinking like a typical man of the geographical and political centre) believed led only to the land of the mythical Prester John. In reality, of course, those seas led to other maritime communities, not least across the Channel (a stretch of water that was still known in the fifteenth century as the English sea). England was also at the end of the wine route from Gascony up the western seaboard, past Brittany and the Channel Islands (which remained in English possession after the loss of Normandy in 1204). Along this maritime flank (as Michel Mollat has shown in his study of Atlantic France), people used English and Celtic words for certain navigational terms, borrowings from Dutch for aspects of ship construction, and Spanish and Portuguese loanwords for juridical features of seafaring. These linguistic realities are symptomatic of the fact that in Western France, the 'preoccupations, interests, adventures and vital terrain would virtually never be those of the capital and the great landmass of the French interior'. As a result 'the seaward periphery was a ready focus for dissidence.'⁴⁴ By contrast, the Mediterranean seaboard in our period was short and far removed from the political centres of the north. Lucien Musset's belief that it was the Mediterranean façade above all which made France is certainly applicable

to Roman Gaul and some other periods of French history, but is of limited relevance to the late Middle Ages.

Looking inwards from the western seaboard with Maurice Le Lannou (in his study of the physical geography of France), we find that the terrain rarely exceeds 200 m in height in a line from Bayonne on the Bay of Biscay to Rethel on the edge of the Ardennes. To the East of that line lay more hilly or mountainous terrain, where forestation was denser. But even the lower landscapes of the west gradually changed in complexion away from the sea. A rolling west marked by open fields and, increasingly, hedgerows, gave way to vaster plains with narrow fields in the north and east. This was the richer land which had encouraged the Carolingians to form a capital there, as Edward Fox notes in his historical geography of France. Continental France looked to a landlocked capital rather than to the sea, especially in eastern regions such as Burgundy. Paris itself looked for sustenance – in grain, livestock and wine – through river networks which led north, east and south. In certain basic respects the capital looked everywhere but west.

The contrasts between east and west are further apparent in terms of habitation. Large towns and cities were a feature of eastern France, especially the north-eastern corner on the edge of Flanders and into Artois (where cities such as Tournai, Amiens, Lille and Arras were to be found), and the south-eastern corner in Languedoc, where Montpellier, Narbonne and Toulouse were prominent. Atlantic France, by comparison, knew only limited urban development. Charters for urban communities were a late development here. Bordeaux and La Rochelle were by far the largest ports on the coast. Inland, with the exception of the corridor of Loire towns and Poitiers, western France was markedly more rural than the north east and south east.

Whereas language and law tend to emphasise differences between the northern and the southern halves of the kingdom, geography therefore highlights contrasts between maritime and continental France. The result is an impression of even greater diversity. France lay at the westernmost tip of the central landmass of the European continent, and concentrated within its boundaries was all the diversity of that vast area. According to Bernard de Rosier (1400–75), a southern bishop trained in law, the kingdom contained different languages and peoples, but it was united by its adhesion to a single church and, above all, by the government of a line of ‘Most Christian Kings’ assisted by ‘the heavenly angels of the Lord’.⁴⁵ As we shall see in our closing section, the king’s authority over the geographical kingdom in 1300 could not be described in such terms.

The Kingdom in 1300

As a lord, the king directly ruled those lands which, along with a great variety of rights, constituted his *domaine*. These lands and rights were scattered across the geographical kingdom and are not easily represented on a map, but they had grown in number and scale from the closing decades of the twelfth century onwards. It was during this time that the core of royal possessions around Paris and Orléans was extended by the acquisition of Artois and the Amienois to the north, and then spectacularly by the collapse of two extensive princely empires of earlier times. The great increase in the size of the royal *domaine* massively augmented the financial resources of the Capetians, bringing as it did more payments of dues, tolls and other levies from the populations which lived under the king's direct lordship.

The first princely empire to fall was that of the Plantagenet counts of Anjou, when King John lost Normandy, Anjou, Maine, Touraine and Saintonge to Philip II (1204–6). The Angevin empire that once straddled the Channel and extended down the western seaboard of France was now reduced essentially to its northernmost and southernmost elements, respectively the kingdom of England and the duchy of Aquitaine or Guyenne. The formerly Angevin territories extended the French *domaine* enormously, leading the chronicler Rigord to dub Philip II 'Augustus'. By the terms of the Treaty of Paris in 1259, John's son Henry III accepted the losses that had been suffered, and agreed that he and his heirs would perform homage for the lands they still held in the Kingdom of France.

Guyenne, like all the great fiefs, did not form part of the *domaine*, but it did belong to the kingdom and was held of the king by his vassal the duke. Although the king had limited financial rights in the great fiefs, his justice was sovereign there. By the late thirteenth century, the Plantagenet administration in Guyenne had devised several expedients for limiting the number and impact of appeals from the duchy to the king's *Parlement* in Paris, but they could never be eradicated completely. The powerful idea that 'the king is emperor in his kingdom,' articulated among others by Roman lawyers such as Jean de Blanot and Jacques de Révigny in the second half of the thirteenth century, was finding practical expression in the exercise of royal sovereignty over Guyenne.

The king's authority over his vassals outside the *domaine* naturally depended a great deal on the number of contentious issues and the *rapport de force* between them. Relations between the dukes of

Guyenne/kings of England and the rulers of France were inevitably the most fraught in these respects. Emerging notions of sovereignty on both sides of the Channel aggravated other tensions, such as growing hostility towards the Plantagenets among some elements of the French royal familial community, or the Franco-Scottish alliance of 1296. Twice the duchy of Guyenne was declared confiscate by its French suzerain and war ensued, first in 1294 when Edward I was deemed to have failed in his duties as a vassal, then again in 1324, over a dispute concerning the royal enclave of Saint-Sardos.

Plantagenet awareness of the vulnerability of Aquitaine increased as a result of these conflicts, leading successive dukes to seek alliances elsewhere in the realm or on its periphery. Alliances were at first made with rulers in the Low Countries and down the eastern flank of the kingdom, as Henry Lucas's work on the Low Countries and the Hundred Years' War showed in great detail. Henry III, Count of Bar (1291–1302) was one eastern lord prepared to consider an alliance with Edward I, a decision which resulted in him having to perform homage to the French crown for his lands on the left bank of the Meuse in 1301, thereafter known as the *Barrois mouvant*. It was the naturally dissident western seaboard of the realm, and not the landlocked east oriented towards the capital, which eventually provided the most willing allies of the Plantagenets in their struggles with French kings.

But for now, marriage alliances were contracted to bring the king/duke and his French royal overlord more firmly together. The second wife of Edward I (1272–1307) was Philip IV's sister, Margaret. Edward's son by his first marriage, Edward II (1307–27), took Philip IV's daughter Isabelle as his bride. When Edward III (1327–77), the grandson of a French king, married Philippa of Hainaut, herself the niece of King Philip VI, in 1327, he thus had even better Capetian credentials than his wife. The gradual entangling of the Capetian and Plantagenet royal lines could help settle differences, but in the long term they created further potential for trouble, not least the fact that Edward III, under the right circumstances, might have a claim to the throne of France.

As for the other leading vassals of the French king, the *rappport de force* on the eve of our period was more obviously in the crown's favour. In the county of Flanders, Philip IV was able to rely on support from the governing classes of some Flemish cities (especially Ghent) against the threat of an Anglo-Flemish alliance. For a time, the establishment of direct royal rule in the county seemed a distinct possibility, particularly when French forces occupied Flanders in 1297

and 1300. Popular revolt and a resounding defeat for the French in 1302 at Kortrijk (Courtrai) prevented this outcome, but Philip IV was still able to impose a demanding peace in 1305, and in 1312 the towns of Lille, Douai, Orchies and Béthune were made over to the king by Count Robert (1305–22).

In Brittany, meanwhile, royal influence was such on the eve of our period that it looked as though the county might wind up sharing the fate of its neighbours, Normandy and Anjou, by being absorbed within the Kingdom of France. In 1297, Brittany was raised to the status of a duchy (a standing which some Breton rulers had felt entitled to since the tenth century), and Jean II (1286–1305) was made a peer of the realm. At no point was a sense of the autonomous rights of the dukes of Brittany ever lost, and indeed Jean III (1312–41) sought confirmation of Breton privileges in 1314–15 from the French crown. Nonetheless, the *Parlement* in Paris became the court of appeal for cases from its Breton counterpart, much as had happened in Gascony two generations earlier.

Last but not least, the dukes of Burgundy were among the most reliable of leading royal vassals, attending the king's court and providing spouses for the royal line. Robert II (1272–1306) was a trusted member of the royal familial community, serving as lieutenant in Languedoc and governor of the county of Burgundy after its purchase in 1295. Ducal loyalty did not prevent royal penetration into the duchy by means of agreements with lesser lords and the protection of church lands, but as Jean Richard's work on the history of Burgundy demonstrates, royal gains were limited. For their part, the dukes of Burgundy acquired a measure of influence over French kings which was not given to many of their contemporaries among the princes of France, and influence over a king was potentially a firmer basis for power than extensive territorial possessions. In his work on French political society in the early fourteenth century, Raymond Cazelles has noted that 'men of the east' were an established feature of Capetian government some time before they became trusted servants of the Valois kings, such as the chancellor Gui Baudet and the president of the *Parlement* Pierre de Chalon under the sons of Philip IV. In contrast to the west, where Guyenne was a frequent source of concern, kings of France could look to the east with greater confidence. Ancient geopolitical realities – a dissident west and an east which looked to Paris – thus manifested themselves in France around 1300.

The second princely empire to collapse to the monarchy's benefit in the thirteenth century had been in the south, that of the Raymondine counts of Toulouse. The process began with the invasion

of Languedoc by northern crusaders in 1209 and was effectively settled by the treaty of Paris (1229), but it was not until 1271 that these lands were wholly absorbed into the royal *domaine*. By the end of the thirteenth century, the spread of royal government was extensive. The demise of the leading princely houses during the region's absorption into the kingdom removed a potential for conflict that was present elsewhere in the kingdom. The large towns of Languedoc, which once looked as though they might acquire liberties and powers to compare with their counterparts in Italy, now accepted the rule of a powerful but usually distant king whose support could be useful to them. As Paul Dognon emphasised in his study of the political institutions of Languedoc, this mutually beneficial relationship made the region one of the most consistently loyal in the kingdom – despite the legal and linguistic differences which separated it from the North.

The absorption of Languedoc into the kingdom was facilitated when this region was attached by marriage to the lands of Alphonse of Poitiers, brother of Louis IX. Several such grants were made in the thirteenth century by French kings to their younger brothers or sons to provide a living, and they were known as apanages (from the Latin *appanare*, to provide for). The apanage was perhaps the most tangible manifestation of the role and rights of the royal familial community in the government of the realm which we discussed above, and could help enforce royal authority. In Alphonse's case, his defeat of rebellion in Poitou and the administrative measures he took in Languedoc created a strong presence in the south, and served to remind restive local lords, notably the counts of Foix and Armagnac, of the growing reach of the crown. Lands granted in apanage were held in return for homage, and it came to be expected that the apanage would revert to the crown in the absence of a direct heir. Within the apanages kings retained ultimate jurisdiction, but in other respects – such as raising revenue – the apanagist enjoyed a fair measure of autonomy. By the start of the fourteenth century just a few lands were still held as apanages, notably Anjou, Maine, Bourbon, Artois and the county of Clermont. Further important grants would be made under John II with far greater consequences, as we shall see.

To the east, finally, the royal *domaine* was extended by the acquisition of the counties of Champagne and Brie, a vast complex of lands extending from the outskirts of Paris towards the Empire. The process began with the marriage of Philip IV to the heiress, Jeanne of Navarre, in 1284, but was not finally secure until the crown had succeeded in fending off competing claims in 1328. Along with

homages received for Bar and Valentinois-Diois and the purchase of the Dauphiné, the acquisition of Champagne contributed to a period of marked expansion towards the Empire on the eve of our period. Royal rights were extended in other ways too, such as the agreements struck with the archbishop of Lyon and the bishops of Cahors, Mende, Le Puy and Viviers early in the fourteenth century, whereby the king came to share jurisdiction and revenues in substantial parts of the Cahorsin, Gévaudan, Velay, Vivarais and the Lyonnais. This last region included the great southern city itself.

Elsewhere in the east, the protection extended to leading churchmen by the Most Christian King of France soon translated into greater power over their temporal affairs. In the north, the large city of Tournai and the extensive Tournaisis were reunited to the crown in an agreement between Philip V and the bishop in 1320. Combined with purchases, confiscations and escheats (land which passed to the crown by default of an heir), these smaller acquisitions were a valuable means of extending royal power within the realm under the last Capetians. The trend was undoubtedly facilitated in the east by dynastic weakness in the Empire, although Capetian attempts to secure election to the German crown itself (in 1272, 1308 and 1324) met with little success, and the rumour that the Emperor had allowed the King of France to extend his lands to the Rhine (1299) turned out to have no substance.

The extent of royal authority under the last Capetians and the fate of princely empires of earlier centuries might suggest that an apogee had been attained around 1300. Such a conclusion would be no more convincing than the belief that 1300 marked a highpoint in the development of royal government. Recent Capetian expansion into the east and south of the kingdom had certainly bolstered the monarchy, and would remain important in the fourteenth century as we shall see. But along the northern and western shores, where Capetian expansion was a little older, the crown's difficulties had grown significantly. The conflicts in Flanders and Guyenne from the 1290s demonstrated that whatever the extent of the lands under their rule, kings were never very far from the limits of their resources. Even gradual amelioration would require significant development of the governmental structures the last Capetians had inherited. Such change came about in response to the events faced by the dynasty that posterity has called the Valois kings of France, the subject of chapters three and four below.

We have seen in this chapter that the notion of 'Most Christian King' was a powerful ideology in late medieval France, one which built on older notions of sacerdotal kingship, and prefigured the belief that 'absolute power' resided in the figure of the monarch. The Most Christian King had clear responsibilities, but he also stood head and shoulders above other forms of public authority, notably the great fief-holders and 'good towns'. Through the late medieval phenomena of mass processions and peace celebrations, the monarchy became a focus for loyalty and identity among a wider section of the population than ever before, particularly in an urban context. Only the princes of the blood came close to the king's authority. The king was clearly different from his closest male relatives, but their rights and expectations could not be neglected, as we shall see in later chapters.

If the legitimacy and authority of the Most Christian King were well established, the means at his disposal to govern the kingdom lagged some way behind. Royal government remained (numerically at least) a small thing, and any attempt to explain the development of French history in our period based on the growth of royal 'institutions' (or, for that matter, their princely equivalents) soon runs up against the fact that the purview of administrators at all levels was limited.

This does not mean, of course, that the organs of royal government were unimportant. On the contrary, office-holders were at the centre of informal networks of 'power distribution' which led outwards to a highly pluralistic political society made up of princes and lesser nobles, townsmen and churchmen of varying descriptions.⁴⁶ Such networks determined political action and placed the king's authority at the centre of French political culture. Although a king might wind up trapped in the web of brokerage which was spun around him by patrons and clients, it also gave him the means to draw in the many powers in political society whose support, skills and resources he needed to govern. As in earlier times, 'the success of familiar collaboration with the right people was the secret of French government'.⁴⁷

That some unity, however loose, was afforded by the governing ideology and political culture of the kingdom was important, for otherwise that political space was characterised by enormous diversity arising from legal, linguistic, geographical and historical circumstances. Historians commonly point out the differences between north and south, especially in terms of law and language, and that emphasis is surely justified. But from the king's perspective, how people spoke or were judged in Languedoc was ultimately less important

than the fact that it became a remarkably loyal region. Indeed, perhaps the most important geographical contrasts from the king's perspective in 1300 lay between West and East. Dispersed along the seaboard were populations with maritime horizons and a tradition of dissidence. This was the region where the crown's most powerful and troublesome vassals held their lands. In the East, by contrast, there were fewer great lords of note and a larger number of urban communities which had yet to find a strong political role in the kingdom. The greatest vassal in the East was a loyal supporter of the crown, his men a reliable source of royal servants at the highest level under the last Capetians.

Differences between east and west, the role of the royal familial community and the importance of relations between the king and the plurality of powers within his realm will feature strongly in subsequent chapters. But for now we turn to rural France, where as many as nine in ten inhabitants of the kingdom lived. As Alain Chartier put it in his *Quadriologue invectif*, a lament on France's dire circumstances at the end of Charles VI's reign, 'the people are indeed a notable member of the kingdom, without whom the nobles and the clergy cannot govern, nor maintain themselves and their standing.'⁴⁸

Index

- Abbeville, 24, 202
 absenteeism, clerical, 90
 ‘absolute power’, 12
 Abzac family, 164
 Adam, 73
 Aeneas, 10
 Agenais, 117, 127
 Agincourt, battle of, 134, 144, 206, 214
 Agnès of Navarre, 122
 Aiguillon, 104
 Aire-sur-La-Lys, 181, 187
 Aix-en-Provence, 172
 Alain Chartier, 32, 51, 149
 Albi, 184, 193
 Albion, 10
 Albret, lords of
 see also Arnaud-Amanieu, lord of
 Albret; Charles II, Duke of
 Lorraine
 Alençon, 198
 Count of, *see* Charles, Count of
 Alençon
 County of, 98
 Dukes of, *see* Jean I; Jean II
 Alès, 195
 allod, 99
 Alphonse, Count of Poitiers, 49
 Amienois, 46, 195
 Amiens, 45, 172, 184, 190, 194, 197,
 198, 202
 bishop of, 12
amortissement, 21
 Ancenis, 212
 André de Ribes, 158
 Angers, 67, 173, 194, 198
 bishop of, 86
 ‘Angevin Empire’, 105
 Angoulême, County of, 110, 149
 see also Jean of Orléans
 Angoumois, 104, 117
 Anjou, County of, 46, 48, 108, 117
 Anjou, Duchy of, 28, 37–8, 44, 55, 58–9,
 61, 66, 77, 82, 98, 119, 145–6, 152,
 155, 160, 214
 Anjou, Dukes of, *see* Louis I; Louis II;
 Louis III; René
 Anjou, House of, 35, 149, 156
Annales School, the, 4
 Anne of Burgundy, 166
 Anonymous Parisian Journal, The, 135
 Antoine Mondiat, 67
 apanage, 49, 119, 127, 130, 138, 206, 212
appatis, 68–9, 120
 Aquitaine, 105, 117
 principality of, 117, 125
 see also William
 Aragon, Kingdom of, 12, 174
 Archambaud V, Count of Périgord,
 205–6
 Archambaud VI, Count of Périgord,
 205–6
 Archambaud de Grailly, Count of
 Foix, 136
 Archibald IV, Earl of Douglas, 153, 156
 Ardennes, 45
 Aristotle, 40
 Arles, 172
 Armagnac-Burgundian conflict, 72, 133,
 135, 137, 142, 161, 197

- Armagnac, Counts of, 49, 59, 174
see also Bernard VII; Jean I; Jean II;
 Jean III; Jean IV, Jean V
- Arnaud-Amanieu, lord of Albret, 125
- Arnaud de Cervolles (aka 'The
 Archpriest'), 123
- Arras, 45, 113, 135, 146, 172, 176, 191,
 197–9, 202
 Treaty of (1435), 148–51, 159, 165, 167
- Arthur of Richemont, 156–9, 162–3
- Artois, County of, 45–6, 71, 99, 138, 144
- assemblies (urban), 33, 188–9, 208–9
- assemblies (village), 70, 94
- Atlantic Ocean, The, 18, 44–5, 89, 117
- Auray, battle of, 122
- Aurillac, 182, 202–3
- Autun, 127
 diocese of, 23
- Auvergne, Duchy of, 36, 56, 58, 60, 62,
 68–70, 80, 82–3, 87, 119–20, 127,
 136
- Auxerre, 135
- Avignon, 10–11, 89, 159, 176, 182–3
- Avranches, 109
- bailli-sénéchal*, office of, 4, 21, 25, 27–8,
 31, 33, 37, 39, 72, 129, 162–3, 204,
 206, 208–10, 215
- Baltic, The, 167
- banlieue*, 200
- Bapaume, 176
- Bar, County of, *see* Henry III
- Bar, Duchy of, *see* René
- Bari, 138
- Barrois mouvant*, 47
- Bar-sur-Seine, 54–5, 86
- Barthélemy Bonis, 180
- Bascot de Mauléon, The, 69
- Bastille, 30
- Baugé, battle of, 148, 153
- Bavaria, House, of, 139
- Bay of Biscay, The, 45
- Bayonne, 45
- Beaujolais, 71
- Beauvais, bishop of, 151
- Beauvaisis, 37, 73, 195
- Bécon, 77
- Belleville (sur Saône), 197
- Bernard VII, Count of Armagnac, 134,
 142, 145
- Bernard de Rosier, 45
- Berry, Duchy of, 148
see also Jean
- Berry Herald, *see* Gilles Le Bouvier
- Bertrand du Guesclin, 103, 121, 123,
 126, 128
- Besançon, 182
- Béthune, 48
- Beynac family, 164
- Béziers, 197, 204
- Bible, The, 40
- Bicêtre, 85, 135
- Bigorre, County of, 54, 58–60, 78, 85,
 117, 122, 158
- Bohemia, Kingdom of, 161
- Boniface VIII, Pope, 10, 14
- Bonnac, 72
bonnes villes, 19
- books, 24, 41
- Bordeaux, 9, 28, 44–5, 64, 66, 173, 179,
 190–200, 203, 209
- Bordelais, 36, 54, 56, 59–60
- Boucicaut, *see* Jean II le Meingre
- Boulogne, 173, 202
- Bourbon, Dukes of, *see* Charles I; Jean I;
 Jean II; Louis II; Pierre I
- Bourbonnais, 54–5, 59, 63, 76, 78, 80
- Bourdeille family, 164
- Bourges, 34, 145, 154, 173, 177, 180,
 197–8
 'Kingdom of', 148
- Bournonville family, 83
- Brabant, Duchy of, 23, 102, 139, 165, 168
- Bressuire, 178
- Brétigny, Treaty of, 56, 117–19, 120, 125,
 128, 144, 151, 159
- bridges, 91
- Brienne family, 100
see also Raoul
- Brignais, battle of, 120
- Brittany, County of, 48
- Brittany, Duchy of, 9, 18, 35, 37–8, 44, 55,
 58–9, 69, 72, 102–3, 112, 121–3, 127,
 136, 163–4, 173–4, 206, 210,
 212, 214
- Brittany, Dukes of, 2, 18–19, 23
see also Arthur of Richemont; François
 I; François II; Jean II; Jean III;
 Jean IV; Jean V; Pierre II
- Brive (-la-Gaillarde), 187, 202

- Bruges, 167, 179, 181
 Brussels, 196
 Brutus, 10
 Buchan, Earl of, *see* John Stewart
 Bulgnéville, battle of, 167
 Bureau brothers, 151
 Bureau de La Rivière, 128, 132
 Burgundy, County of, 35, 38, 48, 55
 Burgundy, Duchy of, 35, 41, 45, 83, 86,
 120–1, 138, 159, 175, 183
 Burgundy, Dukes of, 2, 17, 48, 55
 see also Charles the Bold; John the
 Fearless; Odo IV; Philip of
 Rouvres; Philip the Bold; Philip
 the Good; Robert II
 Burgundy, projected kingdom of, 214
 Buron, 66
 butchers, 66, 143, 196
- Caen, 104, 173–4, 199
 Cahors, 41, 182
 bishop of, 50, 84
 diocese of, 56
 Cahorsin, 51
 Calais, 101, 104–5, 117, 126, 134, 136,
 148, 150
 Cambrésis, 35, 57, 84
 canon law, 20, 37, 85
 Capetian dynasty, 1, 18, 25, 27, 46–8, 50,
 60, 94, 97, 99
 captains (royal), 26, 208, 210, 215
 Carcassonne, 105, 174, 197
 Carentan, 182
 Carmelites, 91, 129
 Carolingian dynasty, 1, 9, 35, 45
 cartularies, 4, 85
cas royaux, 29
 Cassel, battle of, 100
 Castile, Kingdom of, 123, 125
 castles, 75, 81, 83
 Castres, 174
 Catherine of France, 165
 Caylus, 175
ceus and censiers, 4, 58, 60–2, 77, 80, 82
 Cerdagne, 212
 ‘cessante causa’ (political maxim), 106
 Châlons (en Champagne), 23, 165, 172,
 187, 203
 Chalon (sur Saône), 174, 176, 179–80
- Chambre des comptes* (royal or princely),
 20, 25–8, 32–3, 98, 107, 145, 206
 Champagne, County of, 41, 49, 60, 67,
 92, 109, 120, 148–9, 172, 213
champart, 61
chancellerie (royal), 25, 27, 32, 35, 39
 Channel, The, 35, 44
 Channel Islands, The, 44, 46
 charitable assistance, 91, 184
 see also confraternities
 Charlemagne, Holy Roman Emperor,
 14, 148
 Charles I, Count of Armagnac, 214
 Charles I, Duke of Bourbon, 159–1
 Charles II, Duke of Lorraine, 157
 Charles II, lord of Albret, 160
 Charles IV, Count of Le Maine, 160, 162
 Charles IV, King of France, 96, 98, 104
 Charles V, Count of Le Maine, 213
 Charles V, King of France, 5, 9, 12, 14–15,
 24, 30, 40, 91, 110, 113–17, 121, 132,
 135, 147, 156, 168, 188, 197
 Charles VI, King of France, 5, 12, 15, 17,
 24, 27, 33, 41, 127–8, 132, 154, 204,
 206–7
 Charles VII, King of France, 14–15,
 17–18, 20–1, 38, 42, 121, 133–4,
 145–6, 180, 188, 201, 207, 210
 Charles VIII, King of France, 30, 138, 214
 Charles, Count of Alençon, 98
 Charles de Salers, 80
 Charles, Duke of Orléans, 41, 134,
 143–4, 149, 167
 Charles of Artois, Count of Pézenas, 111
 Charles of Blois, 14, 103, 112, 122, 206
 Charles of France, 212–13, 215
 Charles of Spain, 110
 Charles of Valois, 96, 133
 Charles the Bad, King of Navarre, 73–5,
 97, 109–10, 113, 115–16, 120–1,
 123–4, 130, 133, 141, 197
 Charles the Bald, King of West
 Frankia, 35
 Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, 15,
 17, 29, 151, 165, 207, 210, 214
 charters, 19, 45, 59, 101
 Chartres, 14, 19, 135, 180, 194, 198
 County of, 98
 Château-Thierry, 30
 Châtelet, The, 176, 203

- Châtellerault, 184
 Châtillonnais, 67
 Cherbourg, 101
chevauchée, 126
 children, 55, 91, 175
 Chinon, 154, 157
 Chosen people, French as a, 9–10
 Christine de Pizan, 15, 129, 149
 chronicles, 40–1
 Breton, 18
 royal, 9, 18, 99
Chronique des Quatre Premiers Valois, 10, 109
 churches, 22, 28, 69, 81, 91
 church wardens, 69, 91
 Ciompi, The, 196
 Cistercians, 85
 Clarence, Duke of, *see* Thomas of Lancaster
 Clement VII, Avignon Pope, 206
 Clermont, 188
 Clermont, County of, 49
clos des galées, 125
 cloth production, 66, 177
 Clovis, King of France, 9, 19, 135
 Cluny, monastic order of, 41
 Cocherel, battle of, 121
 coinage, 29, 61, 64, 77, 82, 85, 99, 114, 153, 202, 204
 Comminges, County of, 59
 Compiègne, 75
 Edict of, 157
 Comtat Venaissin, 159
 Conflans, treaty of, 212–13
 confraternities, 92, 183, 195
 see also Saint James
 Constantinople, 167, 168
coq de village, 67, 76, 88
 Corbie, monastery of, 8
 coronation (royal), 9, 15, 19, 129, 139, 148
 ducal, 18
 Cotentin, 109
 Coulommiers, 176
 council (municipal), 23, 190, 209
 council (royal), 21, 25, 33, 38, 127–8, 162, 165, 210
cour des aides, 27
 Courtrai (Kortrijk), battle of, 48
 court (royal), 20–1, 26–7, 32–4, 128, 168
 Coutances, 182
Coutumes du Beauvaisis, *see* Philippe de Beaumanoir
 Cravant, battle of, 148, 153
 Crécy, battle of, 98, 102, 104–5, 112–13, 130, 134, 171, 186
 Creil, 150
 crime, 71
 see also treason
 crusade, 10, 12–13, 21, 49, 99, 106, 123–4, 139, 167
 Albigensian, 120, 186
 customals, 37–8, 63
 customary law, 36–7, 155
 Cuvelier, 103
 Dauphiné, 35–6, 43, 93, 155, 161, 174, 184
 David Bruce, 101
 Dax, 178
Débats des hérauts d'armes de France et d'Angleterre, 10, 36
Dei Gratia (political maxim), 9, 18, 162
 Denis Gillier, 206
dénombrements de fief, 4
dérogance, 79, 82
 Dieppe, 150
 Dijon, 172, 176–7, 190, 192, 194, 198, 207
 Diois, County of, 35
 disease, 56
Doctrinal de Sapience, Le, 41
domaine (royal), 1, 25, 28, 34, 46, 49, 106, 118–19, 127, 132, 138, 158, 160, 214
 Dombes, 55
 Dominicans, 9, 13, 184
 Domrémy, 157
 Douai, 48, 65
 Douglas, Earl of, *see* Archibald IV
 Doullens, 202
droit de banvin, 62
droit de gîte, 62
droit de guet, 62, 83
 see also watch, the
droit de regale, 21
 'Dual monarchy', 17, 166
écorcheurs, 159
 education, *see* schooling; university
 Edward I, King of England, 47
 Edward II, King of England, 47, 97

- Edward III, King of England, 2, 17, 96–7, 99, 103–6, 109–11, 117–18, 121, 127, 166
- Edward IV, King of England, 213
- Edward Balliol, 99
- Edward, the Black Prince, 111–13, 117, 125, 174
- election
of kings, 15, 99
of municipal officers, 190, 209
of royal officers, 30
- élus/elections*, 21, 26–7, 30, 108, 118, 155, 207
- England, kingdom of, 54–6, 59, 61–2, 71, 75, 82, 84, 97, 100, 113, 123–5, 136, 140, 172, 191, 192
- Kings of, 8, *see also* Edward I; Edward II; Edward III; Edward IV; Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VI; John II; Richard II
- Enguerran de Monstrelet, 143
- Enrique of Trastámara, 123, 125
- entry ceremonies, 4, 207
- Erasmus, 93
- Escaut (Scheldt), River, 35
- estates, 5–6, 75, 96, 107–8, 124, 130, 169, 189, 202, 204
of Auvergne, 107, 155
of Brittany, 204
of Burgundy, 107, 155, 204
-general, 15, 107–8, 154, 204, 212, 214
of Guyenne, 155
of the Landes, 156
of Languedoc, 107, 113, 125, 137, 154, 156, 204
of Languedoil, 107, 113, 121, 137, 154, 204
of Normandy, 107, 155, 204
of Poitou, 154
of Provence, 155, 204
of Touraine, 154
- Étienne Boileau, 195
- Étienne de Conty, 8, 9
- Étienne le Bis, 83
- Étienne Le Bourrelie, 196
- Étienne Marcel, 115, 116, 203
- Eu, 190
County of, 98, 109, 110
see also Jean of Artois
- Eustace Deschamps, 129
- Évangiles des Quenouilles*, 92
- 'evident necessity' (political maxim), 107, 118, 136
- Évrat de Trémaugon, 14, 129
- Évreux
bishop of, 20
County of, 97, 109
- exorcism, 43
- Fabliau des Deux Anglois et l'Anel*, 42
- fairs, 179–80
- famine, 24, 54–5, 173
- Figeac, 202
- Finistère, 35
- Flanders, County of, 35, 45, 47, 86, 100, 102, 105, 138, 140, 144, 172, 175, 180, 187, 194, 200–1, 203
see also Charles the Bold; Guy of Dampierre; John the Fearless; Louis of Male; Louis of Nevers; Philip the Bold; Philip the Good; Robert of Béthune
- fleur de lys*, *see* Lilies
- Florence, 196
- Foix, Counts of, 49, 174
see also Archambaud de Grailly; Gaston III; Gaston IV; Jean I; Mathieu de Castelbon
- Fontainebleu, 91
- Forez, 36, 56, 71, 73, 88, 123, 191
- Francia*, 35
- Francio, 9
- Franciscans, 23, 184
- François I, Duke of Brittany, 163, 167
- François II, Duke of Brittany, 15, 18, 210, 212, 214
- François de Monte-Belluna, 118
- franc-archers*, 151
- Fredegar, 9
- Frederick III, Holy Roman Emperor, 214
- Frederick of Habsburg, 97
- freebooters, *see* *routiers*
- French Revolution, The, 85
- funerals, 183, 190
royal, 15, 32, 128
- gabelle du sel*, 107
- Galants de la Feuillée*, 72
- Garges, 67
- Garonne, River, 44

- Gascony, 2, 44, 88, 93, 97, 99–101, 104–5, 163, 184
- Gaston III, 'Phoebus', Count of Foix, 41, 83, 104, 111, 119–20, 122, 126, 136
- Gaston IV, Count of Foix, 163
- Gâtine (Poitou), 80
- Gaul, 35, 45
- généraux des finances*, 27, 34, 124, 142
- Geneva, 179
- Geoffroi de Charny, 112
- George Chastelain, 147, 164
- Georges de La Trémoille, 158–9, 161
- Georges d'Orbec, 82
- Gévaudan, 50
- Ghent, 47, 100, 139, 167, 178, 181, 196
- Gien, League of, 134, 143
- Gilles de Laval, lord of Rays, 157
- Gilles Le Bouvier, 35, 44, 178
- Gilles of Brittany, 163
- Godefroy of Harcourt, 102, 104, 109, 110
- Gonthier Col, 34
- Gourdon, 202
- governors (royal), 215
- Grandes chroniques de France*, 18
- Guelders, Duchy of, 139
- Guérande, 206
- Treaty of (1365), 122
- Treaty of (1381), 136
- Gui Baudet, 48, 98
- guilds, 195
- Guillaume de Cuyssel, 191
- Guillaume de Laire, 34
- Guillaume de Machaut, 110
- Guillaume de Muroi, 82
- Guillaume de Sauqueville, 9
- Guillaume Hugonet, 151
- Guillaume Nogaret, 10
- Guillaume Pepin, 22
- Guillebert de Mets, 173
- Guines, County of, 98, 117
- Treaty of, 117
- Guyart des Moulins, 40
- Guyenne, Duchy of, 36, 46–8, 136, 151, 163–4, 167–8, 201–3
- Guyenne, Duke of, *see* Louis
- Guy of Dampierre, Count of Flanders, 100
- Hadonville, 64
- Hainaut, County of, 57, 98, 139, 165
- Hanseatic League, towns of, 167
- Harcourt family, 98, 100
- see also* Godefroy; Jacques; Jean IV; Jean V
- Havelle*, The, 197, 199
- Harfleur, 150
- Hélie de Papassol, 33
- Henri de Poitiers, 208
- Henri III, Count of Bar, 47
- Henry III, King of England, 46
- Henry IV, King of England, 142, 144
- Henry V, King of England, 134, 144–6, 148, 158, 174
- Henry VI, King of England, 17, 146, 148, 151
- Henry of Grosmont, 104, 111
- heresy, 9, 93, 99, 149
- Hincmar of Reims, 9
- Holland, County of, 139, 165
- Holy land, France as a, 9–10
- Holy oil, 9
- Holy Roman Empire, 49–50, 53, 62, 97, 139–40, 165, 212, 214
- see also* Frederick III; Sigismund
- Honoré Bouvet, 19, 41
- Hospitallers, 85
- household (royal), 25, 31–2, 99, 150
- Hugues Capet, 127
- Hugues de Pommard, 98
- Hugues Jean, 88
- Hugues Jossard, 88
- Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, 116
- Hungary, Kingdom of, 123
- Hurepoix, 74
- Île-de-France, 76, 87, 183
- industrial crops, 66–7
- Isabeau of Bavaria, 145
- Isabelle of France, 47
- Isabelle of Hainaut, 100
- Italy, 56, 172, 194
- Jacob van Artevelde, 100, 102, 139
- Jacquerie, The, 70, 71–5, 94, 115
- Jacques Bachelier, 33
- Jacques Coeur, 162, 180
- Jacques d'Ableiges, 37
- Jacques d'Armagnac, 213
- Jacques de Révigny, 46
- Jacques d'Harcourt, 152

- James II, King of Scotland, 157
 Jean I, Count of Armagnac, 104, 111, 116, 119, 122, 125–6
 Jean I, Count of Foix, 158, 159
 Jean I, Duke of Alençon, 143–4
 Jean I, Duke of Bourbon, 144, 149
 Jean II, Count of Armagnac, 122, 126
 Jean II de Melun, 105, 110, 120
 Jean II, Duke of Alençon, 144, 150, 157–8, 160–2, 167, 212
 Jean II, Duke of Bourbon, 212
 Jean II, Duke of Brittany, 48
 Jean II le Meingre, 206
 Jean III, Count of Armagnac, 136
 Jean III, Duke of Brittany, 48, 60, 97, 103
 Jean IV, Count of Armagnac, 18, 158, 160, 162
 Jean IV, Duke of Brittany, 18, 103, 122–3, 127, 136, 206
 Jean IV of Harcourt, 101–2
 Jean V, Count of Armagnac, 43, 163, 213–14
 Jean V, Duke of Brittany, 152, 156, 158, 160, 167, 206
 Jean V of Harcourt, 111
 Jean V Héberge, 20
 Jean, Count of Dunois, 157, 161, 163
 Jean de Blanot, 46
 Jean de Chastillon, 42–3
 Jean de La Fontaine, 43
 Jean de La Grange, 12
 Jean de Montaigu, 143
 Jean de Montreuil, 32
 Jean des Freux, 180
 Jean de Venette, 91
 Jean, Duke of Berry, 15, 34, 40, 85, 116, 119, 127, 129, 134, 137, 144, 206
 Jean, Duke of Calabria, 214
 Jean Froissart, 69, 103, 125
 Jean Gerson, 11, 23, 40, 92
 Jean Golein, 129
 Jean Jossard, 81, 88
 Jean Juvenal des Ursins, 151, 203
 Jean Le Bel, 101
 Jean Le Mercier, 132–3, 141
 Jeanne of Bourbon, 127
 Jeanne of Burgundy, 98, 112
 Jeanne of France, 110
 Jeanne of Navarre, 49, 97
 Jeanne of Penthièvre, 103
 Jean of Artois, Count of Eu, 111
 Jean of Montfort, 122
 Jean of Orléans, 149
 Jean Petit, 143
 Jean Racine, 43
 Jehan Le Petit, 71
 Jerusalem, kings of, 8, 17
 Joan of Arc, 92, 148–9, 157
 Joanna, Queen of Naples and Sicily, 138
 John II, King of France, 49, 99, 101, 104, 106, 124, 128, 133, 146, 153–4, 199, 203–4, 210
 John XXII, Pope, 182
 John, Duke of Bedford, 17, 146, 148, 157, 165
 John, Duke of Touraine, 135, 144–5
 John, Earl of Talbot, 73
 John Fortescue, Sir, 53, 67
 John, King of England, 8, 46
 John the Fearless, Duke of Burgundy, 34, 133, 142, 144–5, 165
 John Stewart, 153
 Jossard family, *see* Hugues, Jean
 Joyenval, monastery of, 9
Juge-mage, 26
 justice (municipal), 189
 justice (royal), 32, 37, 83, 181
 justice (seigneurial), 22, 29, 37, 62, 77, 83, 86
 Justinian, Emperor, 36
 Kerabrahan, 78
 labour legislation, 64
 La Ferté, 173
 Laigle, 110
 La Marche, County of, 36
 Lancaster, house of, 169, 213
 Langres, 188
 language, 38–44, 182
 Languedoc, 36, 38, 44–5, 48–9, 116, 120, 122, 124, 126–7, 135, 148, 155, 159, 177, 186, 195, 207
see also estates
 Languedoil, 38, 124
see also estates
 Laon, 172, 197, 203
 bishop of, *see* Robert Le Coq
 La Rochelle, 45, 153, 173, 179, 197, 208
 sea battle of, 125

- Launac, battle of, 119, 122
 Laval, County of, 67, 157, 173
 Lavaur, 197
 League of the Public Weal, 212
 leagues of 1314–15, 60, 198
 Le Maine, County of, 55, 98, 108, 117,
 148–9, 157, 173, 213–14
 see also Charles
 Le Mans, 176
 Le Neubourg, barony of, 66
 Le Perche, County of, 157
 Le Puy, 175, 181, 190, 194, 197, 209
 bishop of, 50
 Black Virgin of, 181
Le Quadrilogue investif, *see* Alain Chartier
 Les Tourelles, 30
 letters of remission, 13, 25, 42, 71, 74,
 90, 208
 Leulinghem, 136
 Lewis of Bavaria, 97
Lays d'Amor, 41
 Liège, 167
Li Faits des Romains, 40
 life rents, 187
 Lilies (royal emblem), 9, 17
 Lille, 45, 48, 172, 179, 181, 193, 200–1
 Limburg, Duchy of, 139
 Limoges, 117, 174
 Limousin, 61, 66, 79, 81–2, 87, 127, 149,
 159, 175
 Limoux, 197
 Lisieux, 194
 literacy, 41–2
 livestock, 65–6
Livre de la Description des Pays, *see* Gilles
 Le Bouvier
Livre des Bouillons, 190
Livre des métiers, 195
Livres de raison, 175
 Lodève, 195
 Loire, River, 42, 44–5, 98, 148, 153, 164,
 173, 179–80
 Lomagne, viscounty of, 163
 London, 117, 121
 treaties of (1358, 1359), 117
 treaty of (1474), 213
 Lorraine, Duchy of, 9, 162
 see also Charles
 Louis I, Duke of Anjou, 119, 124–8, 138
 Louis II, Duke of Bourbon, 119, 127
 Louis III, Duke of Anjou, 150
 Louis VIII, King of France, 101
 Louis IX, King of France, 13–14, 60,
 99, 189
 Louis X, King of France, 97, 109
 Louis XI, King of France, 13, 15, 20–1,
 30, 38–9, 161, 168, 173, 185, 196,
 198, 203–4, 207, 210, 214
 Louis XII, King of France, 140
 Louis XIV, King of France, 28
 Louis, Duke of Guyenne, 24, 136, 143
 Louis, Duke of Orléans, 34, 127, 133–4,
 138, 140, 142–3, 145, 206
 Louis of Anjou, 14
 Louis of Luxembourg, Count of Saint
 Pol, 213
 Louis of Male, Count of Flanders, 102,
 138, 139
 Louis of Nevers, Count of Flanders, 97,
 100, 102
 Luberon, 93
 Lusignan, 158
 Luxembourg, Duchy of, 141, 165
 Luzers brothers, 72
 Lyon, 35, 43, 120, 148, 172, 179–80, 184,
 191–2, 196–9, 208–9
 diocese of, 50, 90
 rebeyne of, 196
 Lyonnais, 36, 50, 54, 60, 65, 71, 76,
 87, 127

 Maconnais, 73, 123
 Maguelone, bishop of, 2
 Maillezaïs, bishop of, 105
maillotins, revolt of the, 197
 Malestroit family, 103
 Mantes, 109, 150
 Marck, 70
 Marc Vilain, 193
 Margaret of Anjou, 151
 Margaret of France, 47
 Margaret of Male, 138
 Margaret of Scotland, 157
 Margaret of York, 213
 Marmousets, 128, 132–4, 136, 138,
 140–1, 147
 Marne, River, 73
 Marseille, 172
 Marsilius of Padua, 2

- Martel, 202
 Martin Gouge, 34
 Mary of Burgundy, 214
 Mathieu de Castelbon, Count of
 Foix, 136
 Mauron, battle of, 112
 Maximilian of Austria, 214
 Meaux, 150, 159
 bishop of, *see* Philippe de Vitry
 Mechelen, 214
 Mediterranean Sea, 44
 Mello, 73–4
 Melun family, 111
 see also Jean II
 Menaud de Villiers, 120
 Mende, bishop of, 50
 ‘men of the east’, 48, 98, 102, 105, 108–9,
 111–12, 128, 130, 135, 138–9, 142–4,
 146, 150, 157, 164–8
 ‘men of the west’, 98, 100, 101–5, 108–9,
 114–15, 121, 123, 126, 128–30, 132,
 134–5, 138, 141, 143–6, 148, 150,
 152, 156–7, 160–4
 Mestré, 77
 Metz, 64, 162, 182
 Meuse, River, 35, 47
 Michel Pintoin, 72, 146, 189
 migration, 42, 56, 58, 61, 71, 175–6, 183
 Milan, Duchy of, 140
 Mile de Noyers, 31, 98, 102, 112
 Millau, 39, 41, 174
 mints (royal), 27, 153, 166
 Molesmes, monastery of, 86
 Montauban, 43, 178, 180
 Montbrison, 178, 197
 Montereau, 133, 176
 Montferrand, 40, 162, 191, 196
 Montfort, County of, 103
 Montiel, battle of, 125
 Montils-lès-Tours, 38
 Monthéry, battle of, 212
 Montpellier, 9, 41, 45, 89, 121, 124, 173,
 197, 199–200, 204
 Montpensier, County of, 72
 Montpezat, 175
 Montreuil, 117
 Mont-Saint-Michel, 148, 181
 Mortain, County of, 109
 mortmain, 85
 Moulins, 209
 Najera, battle of, 125
 Nancy, 162
 battle of, 214
 Nantes, 173, 181
 Narbonne, 45, 67, 173
 Nativity, Feast of, 24
 Navarre, house of, *see* Agnès, Jeanne,
 Philip
 Navarre, Kingdom of, 122
 Navarre, King of, *see* Charles the Bad
 Nemours, Duchy of, 213
 Nevers, 14, 161, 165
 County of, 138
 Nicolas de Baye, 32
 Nicolas, Duke of Calabria, 214
 Nicolas Oresme, 10, 40, 114, 129
 Nicopolis, battle of, 139, 141
 Nîmes, 194–5, 197, 204
 Nivernais, 128
 Nogaro, 88
 Normandy, Duchy of, 37, 44, 48, 54,
 59–60, 64, 70, 72–3, 76–7, 83, 92, 98,
 101, 104, 108, 119–20, 127, 134, 144,
 149–52, 163–5, 174, 197, 201–2, 210,
 212, 215
 notaries and notarial records, 4, 33, 37,
 60, 63, 66, 79, 88, 175, 180, 191
 see also wills
 Notre-Dame, chapter of (Paris), 70, 85
 Noyon, 197

 Odo IV, Duke of Burgundy, 97–8, 109,
 111–12
 Oise, River, 73
 Olivier V of Clisson, 103, 122, 126, 128,
 132–4, 136, 138
 Olivier Maillard, 23
 Orbec, *see* Georges
 Orchies, 48
 Order of Saint Michael, 215
 Order of the Garter, 112
 Order of the Golden Fleece, 167
 Order of ‘the Star’, 112
ordonnances, 13, 26, 38–9, 114, 116, 118,
 120, 129, 147, 160, 178
 army of the, 148, 151–2, 162, 169
oriflamme, 9, 15, 17, 167
 origin legends, 19
 Orléans, 1, 46, 148, 173, 176, 182,
 197, 201

- Orléans, Dukes of, *see* Charles; Louis;
Philip
 bastard of, *see* Jean, Count of Dunois
Orly, 70
Orthez, 69
Orvault, 91, 181
Our Lady of Grace (Poitou), 24
Our Lady of the Recovery (Poitou), 24
- papacy, 8–11, 23, 56, 120, 183
paper, 67
Parable of the Unjust Steward, 33
Paris, 1, 15, 19, 39, 42, 44–6, 49, 56, 58,
 61, 64, 67, 72, 76, 87, 115–17, 133–5,
 139, 141, 143–5, 149–50, 165, 173–4,
 176, 179, 181–2, 192, 196–8, 201–4,
 210, 212
 bishop of, 84
 Saint Antoine gate of, 202
 Treaty of (1229), 48
 Treaty of (1259), 46, 99–100, 105
 see also university
parishes, 22, 26, 28, 43, 67–9, 74, 81, 85,
 88–93, 151, 181–2, 209
parish records, 70, 91
Parlement–of Paris, 20, 25–9, 31–3, 37–9,
 48, 80, 117, 145, 180, 191, 196, 205,
 213
 of Bordeaux, 25
 of Grenoble, 25
 of Mechelen, 29
 of Poitiers, 25, 156, 208
 of Toulouse, 25, 156
Paston family, The, 84
Pau, 177
Paul II, Pope, 11
pays de Caux, 70, 72, 152
pays de Rays, 44
peace proclamations, 24
Pedro I of Castile, 125
peers of the realm, 16, 48
Penthièvre family, 153
 see also Jeanne
Perceval de Cagny, 150
Périgord, 104, 117, 127, 164, 205–6
Périgueux, 33, 194, 205–6
Perpignan, 198
Perrinet Gressart, 159
Phelippot Martin, 190
Philip II ‘Augustus’, King of France, 26,
 36, 46, 124
Philip III, King of France, 207
Philip IV, King of France, 10, 13–14, 20,
 47–9, 61, 96, 106, 129, 189, 193
Philip V, King of France, 50
Philip VI, King of France, 2, 27–8, 30, 47,
 113, 124, 128, 130, 135, 147,
 187–8, 210
Philip, Count of Évreux, 97
Philip, Duke of Orléans, 119
Philip of Navarre, 111, 119
Philip of Rouvres, 112, 119, 121
Philippa of Hainaut, 47
Philippe de Beaumanoir, 37, 39, 192, 200
Philippe de Commines, 213
Philippe de Mézières, 12, 129
Philippe de Vitry, 114
Philippe Martin, 207
Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, 119,
 127–9, 133, 138–9, 140–2, 157, 165
Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, 17,
 92, 134, 145, 149, 164–5, 210
Philip van Artevelde, 139
Picardy, 37, 41–2, 58, 135, 195
Picquigny, 213
Pierre I, Duke of Bourbon, 97
Pierre II, Duke of Brittany, 163
Pierre, Cardinal of Foix, 159
Pierre Cochon, 102
Pierre de Brézé, 162–3, 173, 210
Pierre de Chalon, 48
Pierre de Fenin, 146
Pierre de Nesson, 72, 149
Pierre Dubois, 9
pilgrimage, 181
plague, 24, 55–6, 77, 108, 173–4
Poitiers, 45, 154, 158, 161, 173, 176, 178,
 182, 199, 206
 battle of (Maupertuis), 112–13, 130,
 186
 diocese of, 24
Poitou, County of, 37, 49, 98, 127–8, 148,
 158, 164
 seneschal of, 117
Pognac, viscounts of, 73
Ponthieu, County of, 104, 117, 195
Pontoise, 135, 150, 198
Pragmatic Sanction (of Bourges), The,
 11, 14

- Praguerie, The, 24, 161, 165
 preaching, 22–3, 184
 Prester John, 44
prévôt des marchands, see Étienne Marcel
prévôt (royal), 26, 39, 195, 208–9
 prices, 61, 65–7, 74
 priests, 23, 43, 73, 88–92, 182–3
 ‘princely states’, 2, 214
 printing, 41
 processions, 24–5, 32, 92, 181, 183, 189,
 201, 209
 protection money, see *appatis*
 Provence, County of, 9, 35–6, 70, 138,
 172, 184, 214
 Pyrenees, The, 35, 158, 163
- Quercy, 57, 59–60, 62, 86, 117, 127, 175
Quod omnes tangit (political maxim), 188
- Raoul I of Brienne, 98, 101
 Raoul II of Brienne, 104, 109–10
 Raoul de Caours, 103
 Raoul de Presles, 40
 Raoul Le Bouvier, 150
 reform, episcopal, 90
 reform of royal government, 13–14, 30,
 114–16, 137, 141, 143, 147, 161–2,
 212
 regency, 95, 99, 113, 129, 134, 146, 148
 see also John, Duke of Bedford
 registers of ordinations, 89
 Regnault de Chartres, 149
 Reims, 19, 30, 33, 139, 148–9, 172, 176,
 182, 192–3, 197–8, 200, 203, 209,
 213
Religieux de Saint Denis, see Michel Pintoin
 Renaud d’Albignac, 10
 René, Duke of Anjou and Bar, 17, 41,
 157, 160–3, 167, 214
 Rennes, 173, 175, 191, 204
 representative assemblies, see estates
 Rest, 68
 Rethel, County of, 45, 138
 Rhine, River, 50
 Rhône, River, 35, 44, 120
 Richard II, King of England, 142
 Richmond, Earl of, see Arthur of
 Richemont
 Rigord, 19, 46
 roads, 37, 57, 91, 179
- Robert II, Duke of Burgundy, 48
 Robert Blondel, 15
 Robert de Rouvres, 21
 Robert le Coq, 115
 Robert of Artois, 97, 100–1, 111
 Robert of Béthune, Count of
 Flanders, 48
 Robert of Corbie, 114
 Rodrigo de Villandrando, 73, 80, 159–60
 Roger Mortimer, 97
 Rolin de Macon, 191
 Roman law, 1, 36–7, 46, 53, 60
 Rome, 11
 Roosebeke, battle, 139
 Rouen, 65, 110, 113, 125, 135, 145, 173,
 179, 183, 197, 199, 203, 210
 Rouergue, 117, 127
 Roussillon, 59, 212
routiers, 72, 123–4, 130
 royal touch, 9
- sacraments, 22–3, 183
 Saint-Antonin, 175
 Saint Denis, 17, 24–5
 Saint-Denis, monastery of, 9, 18, 66,
 84–5, 87, 99
 town of, 176
 Saint-Émilion, 177
 Saint-Flour, 73, 193, 203, 207–9
 Saint-Germain-des-Prés, monastery of, 84
 Saint James, confraternity of, 181
 Saint-Jean-d’Angély, 190
 Saint-Jean-Pied-de-Port, 35
 Saint John, Feast of, 24
 Saint John of Angers, hospital of, 56
 Saint-Just, chapter of (Lyon), 86
 Saint-Leu-d’Esserent, 73
 Saint-Maixent, 161
 Saint-Malo, 206
 Saint-Médard, parish of Dijon, 192
 Saint Michael, 24
 Saint-Omer, 41
 Saintonge, 36, 126–7, 164
 Saint Pol, see Louis of Luxembourg
 Saint Remi, 9, 19, 65
 Saint-Sardos, War of, 47, 97
 Saint Thomas Aquinas, 12
 Salers family, 80
 Sallèles, 67
 Saône, River, 35, 44

- Sarlat, 202
- Savoy, Duchy of, 9
- Schism, The Great, 10–11, 136
- schooling, 41, 91, 184
- Scotland, kingdom of, 8, 47, 56, 99, 101, 105, 153
see also David Bruce, Edward Balliol, James II
- scrofula, *see* royal touch
- seals, 17–18, 21
- Séze, bishop of, 21
- Seguin de Badefol, 120
- Seine, River, 44, 139, 179, 192
- Séné, 78
- sénéchal/sénéchaussées*, *see* *bailli-sénéchal*
- Senlis, *bailliage* of, 28, 31
- Sens, 188
- serfs, 59–60
- sharecroppers, 63–4, 66–8, 78, 80, 88
- Sicily, kingdom of, 8, 138, 150, 160
see also Joanna
- sieurries*, 78
- Sigismund, Holy Roman Emperor, 167
- Simon Caboche, 143, 147, 196
- Sluis, 35
 sea battle of, 101–3, 130
- Soissons, 172, 197
- Solers, 91
- Sologne, 55, 60, 87
- Somme towns, The, 150, 208, 210, 213
- Songe du Verger*, *Le*, 14, 129
- Souigny, 76
- sovereignty, 1, 8, 46, 48–9, 105, 117–18, 125, 203, 206
- statutes, diocesan, 90, 91
- Strasbourg, 89
- Suger, Abbot of Saint-Denis, 7
- Surville-en-Auge, 92
- Symmonet Thomassin, 91
- synods, diocesan, 90
- Tancarville, Count of, *see* Jean II de Melun
- Tarascon (Provence), 194
- Tarn, River, 69
- taxation
 municipal, 174, 186–7, 192–3, 196–7, 200, 208–9, 214
 papal, 10, 21, 120
 royal, 12, 21–3, 26, 32–3, 57, 67–9, 79, 83, 93, 96, 106–7, 113, 118, 120, 124–6, 130, 133, 135, 137–8, 141–3, 147, 151, 153, 155, 160–1, 164, 187, 198, 204, 209
- tax registers, 56, 172, 176–7, 198
- tenants, 60–3
- terriers*, 82
- theatre, 181, 184
- ‘The king is emperor in his kingdom’ (political maxim), 8, 46
- ‘The king should live of his own’ (political maxim), 12, 106
- ‘The strong should carry the weak’ (political maxim), 192
- Thibault family, 31
- Thomas Castel, 42–3
- Thomas Du Marest, 182
- Thomas of Lancaster, 153
- Thurie, 69
- tithes, 22, 62, 89
- Tolbiac, battle of, 9
- Toulousain, 63, 67
- Toulouse, 9, 45, 92, 173–5, 182–3, 197, 200, 204
 archbishop of, *see* Bernard de Rosier
 bishop of, *see* Louis of Anjou
 county of, 48
- Touraine, Duchy of, 37–8, 117, 146, 153
see also John
- Tournai, 33, 41, 45, 50, 102, 148, 166, 172, 178, 181, 191, 193, 196–7, 206–7
- Tourmaisais, 50
- Tours, 28, 154, 173, 178–80, 196, 201, 204
 bishop of, 14
 truce of, 151, 162–3
- town accounts, 4, 33, 191, 204
- town correspondence, 40
- town council minutes, 4, 40, 70, 191, 200, 203–4
- trades, 45, 177–80, 195, 203
- Tragicum argumentum de miserabili statu regni Francie*, 118
- treason, 31, 102–3, 109, 111, 162
- Tree of Battles*, *The*, *see* Honoré Bouvet
- Tréguier, 206
- Trésorerie*, 25–7, 145
- Troyes, 145, 172, 186, 188, 208–9
- Treaty of, 134, 146, 165

- Troy, matter of, 9, 19
 Trystram de Fontaines, 190
 Tuchinat, The, 70–3
 Turlupins, 93
 tyranny, 14
- University, 182, 184
 of Bordeaux, 184
 of Cahors, 184
 of Orléans, 36, 182
 of Paris, 10–11, 14, 92, 114, 143, 182, 203
 of Poitiers, 184
 of Toulouse, 65
 Ussel, 191
- Valenciennes, 197
 Valentina Visconti, 140
 Valentinois, County of, 35
 Valois, County of, 58, 95
 Vannetais, 78
 Vaux-de-Cernay, monastery of, 85
 Velay, 50, 71, 123
 venality, 30
 Verdun, bishop of, 85
 Verdunois, 79, 87
 Verdun, Treaty of, 35
 Vermandois, 37
 Verneuil, battle of, 148, 153, 156
 Vexin, 73
Vieille Chronique (of Chartres), 19
 villages, 61, 83, 94
 Villefranche-sur-Saône, 197
- Villers-Cotterêts, 39
 visitations (episcopal), 89–90
 Vivarais, 50
 Viviers, bishop of, 43, 50
Vow of the Heron, The, 101
- wages, 64, 186
 War of the Public Weal, 174
 see also League
 Wars of Religion, 2
 watch, the (*guet*), 201–2
 wells, 91
 William Felton, 117
 William the Great, Duke of Aquitaine, 105
 William of Juliers, Duke of Guelders, 139
 William of Ockham, 2
 wills, 4, 41, 43, 88, 176, 182
 wine, 36, 44, 64–6, 179, 187
 women
 and the civic watch, 201
 and claims to the throne, 96
 and language, 43
 and migration, 42, 176
 and revolt, 71
 and wages, 65
- Yolande of Anjou, 163
 Yolande of Aragon, 156
 York, house of, 169, 213
 Ypres, 178
- Zeeland, County of, 139, 165