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Summary of Thesis

This thesis is a study of the Tree of Battles, and of its author, Honoré Bouvet, prior of Selonnet.

Honoré Bouvet, born near Sisteron in Haute-Provence, circa 1345, joined the Benedictine community at Ile-Barbe and was appointed prior of its house in Selonnet. Bouvet studied Canon law at the University of Avignon, gaining his doctorate in Decretals in 1386. Having been employed sporadically by the Angevin government of Provence, he took service under Charles VI of France when, in 1390, he was attached to the Languedoc reform commission. He was employed as councillor and diplomat by the French court during the 1390s, especially in business connected with the papal Schism. After an unsuccessful mission to the Eastern European courts, in 1399–1401, and after an equally unsuccessful attempt to have his election to the abbacy of Ile-Barbe confirmed, Bouvet returned home to Provence. Here he was employed, between the years 1404 and 1409, as maître racional in the government of Louis II of Anjou. It seems likely that the prior’s death occurred in 1409, possibly while he was en route for the Council of Pisa.

Bouvet is remembered as a writer, not as a political figure. For Gaston Fébus, count of Foix, he wrote a history of the county of Foix in the Provençal language, probably during the 1360s. His other known works include the Tree of Battles, (written c. 1387), the Somnium Super materia scismatis, (written 1394), and the Apparicion Maistre Jehan do Meun, (of 1398). Bouvet was probably also the author of the Discourse which he delivered before the king of the Romans in 1399, and possibly of the Judicium Veritatis, a small contribution to the vast Schism literature.
The Tree of Battles was written for Charles VI of France, and was based on the legal scholarship of the Italian Post-glossators. The Italian origins of the Tree's third and fourth parts affect the relevance of this work to the French situation only slightly, and in relatively insignificant details.

The Tree's relevance to the French society of the author's own day is indicated by the fact that it shares several basic themes with contemporary literature at the French court. The principle, constantly asserted in the Tree, that soldiers must respect the rights of other classes in society and that they are responsible to the Prince, and subject to his discipline, was echoed in the works of Philippe de Nôisibres, Jean Gerson, Eustache Deschamps, Christine de Pisan, and others. Although these writers shared with Bouvet many basic assumptions concerning the rôle of the soldier in society, their works differ from the Tree in one important respect: they did not purport to be law-books. It was a great strength of the Tree of Battles that it presented ideas, already popular at the French court, in a legal form. When the Tree came to be accepted as an 'authority' on the 'law of arms', what had been a customary code, - developed in the interests of individual soldiers, - was at first infiltrated, and then largely replaced, by a law evolved in the interests of the state.

This did not happen during the author's lifetime. The ideal of the soldier as the servant, rather than the master, of the state was achieved a considerable measure of realization in the Normandy of Henry V and of the duke of Bedford, during the third and fourth decades of the fifteenth century. The pattern of English
military administration was later imitated and developed by Charles VII of France, and by his successors. The Tree of Battles was in very wide circulation during this period, especially amongst the Anglo-French military aristocracy, and we can only assume that this work encouraged and stimulated these developments.
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INTRODUCTION

and note on the orthography
of the prior's surname
Honoré Bouvet, (otherwise known as Bonet, Bonnet or Bovet),
the prior of Selonnet, was a person of some importance in the political life of Western Europe. He was born probably in a remote village of northern Provence during the 1340s, but by the time of his death, in 1409, he had come to the notice of two popes (Urban V and Clement VII); he had addressed speeches to Louis I, duke of Anjou, and to Wenceslas, king of the Romans, and had conversed with the king of Aragon and with John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster; he had been a familiar figure, and trusted councillor, at the courts of Charles VI of France and of Louis II of Anjou. The list of Bouvet's political and diplomatic activities could be, and will be, extended much further, but it is a slightly sobering fact that almost all of our information concerning these aspects of Bouvet's career are derived from his own writings. In the cases where Bouvet is mentioned by persons other than himself, his is usually one name amongst many others. Thus, the prior of Selonnet came to the notice of Clement VII in a list of petitions for benefices; to the Burgundian treasurer, because his master had received a number of gifts from a prior in Provence; and to the French royal treasurer, because he owed the prior a small pension. This small pension was, in fact, the only reward which the prior received from the French Crown after a decade of conscientious service.

Bouvet's fellow-writers at the French court may well have been kinder to the prior. The fact that Jean Gerson took great pains to copy out the prior's Somnium suggests an association between the two writers, as does Christine de Pisan's grateful acknowledgement of her debt to Bouvet in her Fais d'armes. Even
in literary circles, however, Bouvet's personal impact was relatively slight, and the only description which we have of the prior is from the pen of Christine de Pisan who pictures him in such a formalised, stylised fashion that a recent commentator has concluded that the prior must have been dead by this time.\(^1\) Bouvet was possibly too cautious an individual, probably too straightforward and practical, to attract the love or hatred of others. Bouvet's biographer must reconcile himself to the fact that his subject's personal importance to the political life and to the literary world of his own generation was unremarked, if by no means unremarkable.

Nevertheless, historians, literary scholars and lawyers over the last hundred years, or so, have studied Bouvet's literary works in considerable detail, and continue to do so. The prior's literary production, over a period of perhaps forty years, was not great in quantity by contemporary standards. His Epistolla to Gaston Fébus, his Tree of Battles and Apparicion, his Somnium and Discourse to Wenceslas, written in Provengal, in French and in Latin, possibly contain fewer words between them than one of Philippe de Mézières' books, Le Songe du Vieil Pelorin. Most of his works never achieved a wide circulation. The Epistolla has disappeared altogether, the Discourse is available in only one manuscript, and the Apparicion and Somnium manuscripts are extremely rare. The ideas expressed by Bouvet were not particularly

---

original, and his literary style has not been acclaimed. Without one particular work, entitled *L'Arbre des Batailles*, the Tree of Battles, of which we now have at least seventy-nine manuscripts and eleven printed editions, the name of Honord Bouvet might well have been completely forgotten. It will be one of the principal purposes of this present work to show how the Tree of Battles was important and relevant to the author's own society, and to generations of Frenchmen, particularly in the fifteenth century. If his reputation had been based, as it is not, on the Tree of Battles alone, a study of Honord Bouvet would have been worthwhile.

.....................

The Prior's Surname: Bonet or Bouvet?

In the introduction to his edition of *L'Arbre des Batailles* in 1883, Ernest Nys provides a very full discussion on the orthography of the prior's surname and himself settles for the name, Honord Bonet. In 1926, Ivor Arnold agreed with Nys and felt that 'la question est définitivement réglée'. The question was in fact closed until 1959 when M. Gilbert Ouy published a short article in *Romania* entitled, 'Honord Bouvet (appelé a tort Bonet) Prieur de Selonnet', in which he drew attention to the copy of a quitance, dated 8 May 1398, which is an acknowledgement for the receipt of an annual instalment of


his pension by 'Honore Bouvet, prieur de Salon'. This item appears on folio 93 of a seventeenth century 'Recueil de notices sur les présidents et conseillers du Parlement de Paris', (Bibl. nat. fr. 21145), and is accompanied by a coat of arms in which an animal of the bovine species is featured thus:

![Coat of arms]

The animal represented in this, Bouvet's coat-of-arms, may have some connection with the prior's own surname. What in modern French would be described as a 'boeuf', and in modern English as a 'bullock', might in fourteenth-century France have been called a 'bouvet' or 'bovet'. Taking into account the notorious difficulty in distinguishing the characters n, u and v in manuscripts of the later Middle Ages, Ouy concludes that the rendering of the prior's surname by the seventeenth century copyist is the correct one, and that the name 'Bouvet' has consistently been misread as 'Bonnet'. M. Ouy felt that the shortened form 'Bonet' was based on a misreading of the Latin form 'Honoratus Boveti'.

That the name of the prior of Selonnet was in some way connected with that of an ox or bullock seems to be confirmed in three Latin documents, of the 1399-1401 period, of which M. Ouy was unaware.

1. Bouvet was not, however, either a president or a councillor of the Paris parlement.

In all three of these manuscripts the name of the prior is invariably accompanied by the alias 'Carobovis'. Thus, in 10 G 1409, iv.: 'honorabilem et religiosum virum fratrem Honoratum Boveti, alias Carobovis,...'; and very much the same formula appears in 10 G 3146, i, and ii. Owing to the various meanings of the medieval Latin word 'caro', one cannot be definite over the English rendering of the alias, but the 'oxen family' seems to be the most reasonable translation of this curious patronymic. A search through the various armorials of the French nobility, moreover, reveals a considerable number of Bouvets and Bovets whose arms contain a 'boeuf' or 'taureau', though none of these families can be positively identified with the prior's own. ¹ There is, therefore, very good reason to suppose that the name of the prior of Selonnet was either Bouvet or Bovet, though H. Ouy's confidence in the former spelling does not appear to be entirely justified.

Unfortunately there is very little consistency in the spelling of the prior's surname even in contemporary documentation. Thus in the Sanglier quittance of October 1391 his name appears as 'Bo(n)g(n)et' ², while in the accounts of the Burgundian receveur of September 1390, he is called 'frère Honoré Bo(v)et'. ³

¹. E.G. Desbois & Badier, Dictionnaire de la Noblesse (Paris, 1863), vol. iii; and Morenas, Grand Armorial de France (1938), vol. ii. The latter indicates a Bouvet family from Piedmont-Lorraine with the arms, 'd'azure au boeuf passant d'or, accompagné de 3 étoiles du même', but there is evidence to show that this coat of arms was not granted until 1699, (Bibl. nat., Pièces Originales 482).


³. Archives départementales Côte d'Or (Dijon), B 1479, f.146.
In contemporary Latin documents, however, the prior's surname invariably appears as 'Bo(v)eti'. In the manuscripts of the *Tree of Battles*, most of which were produced after the author's death, the prior introduces himself either as 'Bo(v)et' or 'Bo(uv)et', but there seems to be more or less equal incidence of both styles.

On the basis of the abovementioned evidence, it has been decided to use the 'Bouvet' form throughout this work. H. Ouy's contention that the 'Bovet' form originated in the Latinized version of the prior's surname, 'Boveti', which in turn was derived from the correct 'Bouvet' form, has not yet been fully substantiated.

In a very recent work, Philippe Contamine, calls the prior of Selonnet 'Honoré Bovet', and there seems to be no very sound reason why this should not be correct. In order to avoid further confusion, however, the prior's name for the purposes of this study will be Honoré Bouvet.

Where quotations are made directly from manuscripts the ambiguous letters u and v will never be transcribed as n; but where reference is made to manuscripts in printed sources the doubtful n will be placed between brackets thus: Bo(n)et or Bo(nn)et.

---

1. E.g. in the documents from the Rhône archives mentioned above.

2. There is no reason to believe, for example, that any of those who copied the *Tree* should have been aware of the Latinized form of the author's surname, yet many of them used the short 'Bovet' style.

CHAPTER ONE

The Tree of Battles:

provenance of manuscripts and historiography
Bouvet had probably completed his *Tree of Battles* by the summer of 1387 and it is more than likely that the first copy of this work was presented to Charles VI of France at Avignon during the winter of 1389-90. Another copy had certainly been presented to the king's uncle, John, duke of Berry, by the autumn of 1394,\(^1\) and a third seems to have been in the Burgundian library at Dijon in 1405.\(^2\) Probably the oldest manuscript of the *Tree* which still exists is one which belonged to the duke of Berry, possibly in 1394, certainly in 1416.\(^3\) The only other manuscript of the *Tree* which may well have existed during the lifetime of the author was in the library of Guichard II, seigneur de Jaligny and gouvernain-maître de l'hôtel du roi, when he compiled his inventory of June 1413.\(^4\) Although we have positive evidence of only a handful of manuscripts by the time of Bouvet's death, *circa* 1420, the *Tree* may already have become a popular work—at least amongst the French aristocracy.

---


2. Georges Doutrepont, *Inventaire de la 'librairie' de Philippe la Bon, 1420* (Brussels, 1906), p. 55, suggests that the *Roument de batailles* in the 1405 inventory may well have been a manuscript of the *Tree*.

3. A very full description of this British Museum manuscript Royal 20.C.VIII is provided on pp. 374-5 of the *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections of the British Museum* (ii, 1921).

4. Le Roux de Limoy, *Inventaire des livres composant la bibliothèque des seigneurs de Jaligny, 6 juin 1413* (Paris, 1844), p. 11. Guichard II was the son of Guichard I, master of the crossbowmen, and the grandson, through his mother, of the constable, Louis de Sancerre. The entire family, (Guichard II, his brother and his two sons), was wiped out at the battle of Agincourt.
The rest of the fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries did, however, witness an extraordinary proliferation of the Tree, at first through the agency of more or less careful copyists and later by means of the early printing presses of Paris and Lyons. Of manuscript copies alone it has been possible to trace seventy-nine which are retained by libraries and archives throughout the world.\(^1\) Forty-six of these manuscripts are in France, and the remainder are scattered around Great Britain, Spain, the United States, Belgium, Italy, Switzerland, Austria and Germany. More manuscripts may well come to light. If the popularity of a work can be measured by such fortuitous survivals, the Tree of Battles was a very popular work indeed. There are only five extant manuscripts of Philippe de Mézières' *Songe du Vieil Pelerin*, and even Chartier's *Quadrilogue Investif* which, according to a recent editor, enjoyed a 'succès énorme', can be read in only about half the number of manuscripts which we have of the Tree.\(^2\)

Owing to the fact that most of the Tree manuscripts bear no indications of ownership, it is impossible to say with absolute certainty what type of person was responsible for the large number of copies. We may certainly conclude, with Coville and Coopland, that 'the book does not fall within the purview of the learned world', and that it was largely ignored by the professional jurists of the fifteenth and subsequent centuries.\(^3\) Grotius, for example, when he refers to his predecessors in the field of the 'law of war',

---

1. See Appendix I for a list of surviving manuscripts of the Tree.
makes no reference to the Tree in his list of authorities. It is not at all unlikely, however, that the lawyers and clerks of the military courts at the Table de Marbre in Paris and at the Court of Chivalry in London, were intimately acquainted with the work.

In 1455, John Mowbray, duke of Norfolk, cited the Tree as an authority in his case against Somerset, and some years later, in France, Olivier de la Marche referred to 'le jugement de l'Arbre des Batailles' in the matter of judicial combat.

Other professionals of a different sort, namely heralds and pursuivants; were not prepared to dismiss the work as a collection of idle theories written by an inexperienced clerk. Sicille, the herald of King Alphonso V of Aragon, advises the young pursuivant, in his Blason des Couleurs, to study 'ung livre intitulé l'Arbre des batailles', and to 'follow the wars', in order to learn the 'droit d'armes'. François, herald of Valenciennes, also uses the Tree as an authority on heraldry. It is most unlikely, however,


2. Norfolk's arraignment of Somerset includes the sentence, 'and also a knyght that fledd for dread of bataille shulde be beheded, soo that all these thyngs may be founden in the lawes wryten, and also yn the boke cleped L'Arbre de Bataille', Tree, ed. G. Coopland, p. 23, from Paston letters.


5. Tree, ed. Coopland, p. 35, based on British Museum Eg. 1644, f.5. François was herald of Valenciennes in 1483.
that heralds, whose business, as several contemporary antiquarians pointed out, was as much concerned with the technicalities of tournaments and coats of arms as with the business of war, were very interested in those chapters of the Tree which were not concerned with trial by combat and with heraldic devices.¹

There can be little doubt, however, that the principal 'market' for the Tree was amongst the literate aristocracy— and particularly the higher aristocracy— of France, Spain and England. This was, of course, precisely what the author had anticipated when he addressed the Tree to the 'most sovereign prince', to 'great lords', and to other 'gens seculierr'. The Tree was a simplified 'law-book', written in the vulgar tongue, for the use of laymen who were not trained in the technicalities of law. Bouvet's intention, like that of Christine de Pisan and Jean de Montreuil after him, was to 'educate' and to reform French chivalry without burdening them with an array of legal authorities 'trop prolixo et obscure a gens lais, par especial a la chevalerie de co royaume'.²

We have already remarked that, by the time of Bouvet's death, his book was in the hands of the king of France, of two of the king's uncles and of at least one of his great officers of state. Some of the finest presentation copies, (though not always the least

1. Maurice Keen, The Law of War in the Late Middle Ages (London, 1965), p. 21, quotes from Le Blason de Coulour, but feels that heralds may have used the Tree in a more general way than merely as an authority on heraldry etc. For an example of hostile criticism of heralds, see A. Langlois, "Le Dit des Héreuts" par Henri de Lacy", in Romania, vol. xliii (1914), pp. 216-25.

corrupt texts), were the property of French nobles. The Berry
manuscript of the British Museum is written on vellum, and contains
a fine illustration of the 'arbre de duel', surmounted by Lady
Fortune with her wheel and supporting on its branches the warring
nations of Christendom, from the divided papacy at the top to the
brawling commons on the ground. There is also a miniature showing
the prior of Solonnet presenting his work to a bearded duke of
Berry. Berry's brother, Philip of Burgundy, was probably the pos-
sees of the illuminated, parchment copy, bound in white leather
which was listed in one of his son's inventories of 1420. Another
Burgundian copyist, David Aubert of Houdin in Artois, made his
name in the court of Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy, by an
excellent copy of the Tree executed in 1456; 1 while in the same
year, that young and successful military commander, John II, duke
of Bourbon, had a copy made for him in Guienne. 2 Six years earlier,
Langoumon prepared a copy of the work for the 'trenchante et
puissant prince...le conte de Richemont,...consestable de France',
who was at that time laying siege to the town of Cherbourg. 3

If the Tree was used extensively by those who directed the
French offensive against the English in Normandy and Gascony during

1. Georges Doutrepont, Le littedature francaise A la cour des
2. Bibl. nat. fr., 1274 is a manuscript of the Tree on vellum
with the statement, on f. 120, 'Co livre a fait faire Jehan
de Bourbon, Conte de Clermont, lieutenant-general du roy et
gouverneur des paix et duchie de Guienne, l'an 1446. Jehan',
Johan II (1427-1488) became lieutenant of Guienne in 1451.
3. Bibl. de l'Arsenal (Paris), No. 2695. The note by the scribe,
Jehan de Langoumon, is on f. 136v. Manuscripts of the Tree
were also in the libraries of Gilbert de Chabannes at Ladic
(Ray 1493) and of Philippo de Ravenstein. See Contamine,
the fifteenth century, the hard-pressed English were no strangers to the work. John Mowbray, duke of Norfolk, as we have seen, made reference to the Tree in 1453, and one of his successors in the duchy, John Howard, took it on board his ship when, in the spring of 1481, he embarked 'to brenne the Lith and other vilages along the Scottisch see'. In the mid-1440s, John Talbot, earl of Shrewsbury, included the Tree in a book of 'romances and poems' which he presented to Queen Margaret. Nearly a century later, Henry VIII possessed a manuscript of the work in his library at Richmond Palace. The English, as far as we know, read the Tree in the original French version, but north of the border a version in the Scottish language was available after 1456. In that year Gilbert of the Haye, one-time chamberlain to Charles VII of France and a graduate of the University of St. Andrews, produced a translation for his patron, the earl of Orkney and Caithness and chancellor of Scotland. He called it the Duke of the Law of Armys or Buke of Bataillis, 'the quhilk was compilit be a notable man, Doctor in Decreis, callit Bonnet, Prioure of Sallo...'.


The _Tree_ played a similarly promiscuous part in the wars which plagued the Iberian peninsula during the fifteenth century. In 1441, for example, two men who were involved on opposite sides in the Castilian civil war, the Constable Alvaro de Luna, and Don Inigo Lopes do Mendosa, soon to become marquis of Santillana, had two, quite independent, translations made for themselves. Don Alvaro employed Diego de Valera in this task, while Don Inigo commissioned Anton de Zorita. Don Inigo, who was passionately interested in the art of war and often debated with 'his household knights and squires about the armaments necessary for defence, and those necessary for offence, about the way to hit the enemy and how one must order battles and camps...,' also possessed at least one version of the _Tree_ in French. It also seems likely that the royal library in Portugal contained a copy of the work by about 1425, and it is certain that the _Tree_ had been translated into Catalan by 1429.

Thus, within three-quarters of a century after its initial publication, the _Tree of Battles_ had been translated into at least four languages.


2. Mario Schiff, _La bibliothèque du Parquis de Santillana_ (Paris, 1905), passim. Santillana was the second son of the admiral of Castile and was largely responsible for Don Alvaro's execution in 1453. He himself died at the age of sixty, on 25 March 1498. There are several manuscripts of the Zorita translation in the Biblioteca Nacional and in the Escorial.

3. Ibid., pp. xlvii-xlviii. The description is that of Fernando de Pulgar.

4. _L'Armistitio di Jacopo de’ Medici con Le Savoie_ du Prior de Salen par Honoré Bonet, ed. Jérôme Pichon (Paris, 1945), pp. viii-ix, note 2. King Edward of Portugal's manuscript was entitled _Arreto das batalhas_, but may not have been a translation.

languages: Anglo-Scots, Castilian, Catalan and Provençal. It had become a very popular work among the aristocracy of Western Europe—though not, apparently, of Italy and Germany. Parts of the Tree had also been incorporated, with or without acknowledgement, in several treatises concerned with war and chivalry. Christine de Pisan, for example, when she was wondering how to get started on the third part of her Livre des fais d'armes et de chevalerie was visited in a dream by the 'ancient' and 'wise' prior of Selonnet who addressed words of encouragement to his 'chier amy', and invited her to pick of the fruit of his Tree of Battles. She did in fact help herself quite liberally, and the third part of the Fais d'armes is drawn almost exclusively from this particular source. A more clandestine, and much less extensive, use of the Tree was made by Christine in the composition of an earlier work, the Lavisson-Christine of 1405. In this work, 'Dame Opinion' boasts of how easily she can corrupt French chivalry from the straight and narrow path which is clearly modelled on that laid down in the Tree of Battles. Many years later, Christine is even credited with the authorship of this latter work. When discussing the justice of Edward IV's impending invasion of France, in 1475, the author of the Boke of Noblesse quotes the 'Tree of Batailles' of 'dame Christin'.

1. For Provençal translation see Bibl. nat.fr. 1277.
2. The Tree may, however, have been in the library of the dukes of Milan at Pavia on 6 June 1459. See Antoine Thomas, 'Les manuscrits français et provençaux des ducs de Milan au chateau de Pavie', in Romanic, vol. xl (1911), p. 600.
3. Bibl. nat. fr.1243, fos. 81-82. Introduction to the third part of the Fais d'armes which 'parle de droit d'armes selon les loix et droit escript'.
Bouvet's work was not slow to benefit from the invention of the printing press. The first edition of the *Tree* may have been produced by Bartholomeu Bayer in Lyons as early as 1477, but the earliest dated edition is that of 24 December 1481 of Guillaume le Roy at Lyons. In June and July 1493 two editions of the *Tree*, one of them part of a three-volume *Chroniques de France*, were produced for the Parisian stationer Antoine Vérard, and a third from the press of Jean Dupré, also of Paris. The first Vérard edition contains several illustrations from wood-cuts, but they are often completely unrelated to the text. Three more editions of the *Tree* appeared in Paris from the presses of Nichol le Noir between 1505 and 1515, and, a few years later, Olivier Arnoullot of Lyons produced the last edition before the nineteenth century.

Thus in the space of about forty years Bouvet's *Tree* was edited or reprinted on nine different occasions, though never outside Lyons and Paris. It was more than three-and-a-half centuries before a tenth edition appeared from the pen of Ernest Lye of Brussels.

3. Ibid., pp. 576-605.
While the Tree of Battles continued to enjoy a remarkable success well into the sixteenth century, knowledge about the author quickly dwindled to the meagre details which he had himself supplied in the prologue to the Tree. The Boke of Noblesse, mentioned above, showed that sometimes even these scraps of information were ignored. The spelling of the author's surname undergoes a curious transition from the Bovet or Bouvet of most of the manuscripts, to Bonnor or Bonhor in the early printed editions of the Tree. Claude le Laboureur, who had become prêvôt of the abbey of Ile-Barbe in 1629, and completed his two-volume history of the abbey in 1631, included in his work a short, but still valuable, biography of Bouvet, 'moine de l'Isle-Barbe, prieur de SalIon, docteur en decret'. Le Laboureur thought that the Tree had been written at the command of Charles V for the instruction of the dauphin, and he asserted that Bouvet had written the Judicium Veritatis (which is doubtful); but his information on Bouvet's attempt to become abbot of Ile-Barbe, based on a procuration which has since been lost, is extremely valuable. After 1681, very little work was done on Bouvet before the middle of the nineteenth century. Although George Coopland has shown that the Tree was used as an authority on heraldry as late as 1704, the abbé Papon had to admit, at the end of the century, to a near-total ignorance of 'Bonnor, prêtre et natif de SalIon' author of 'l'Arbre des Batailles, qu'il dédia au Roi Charles VII'.

As with so many other French writers of the Middle Ages, Bouvet's two works in the French language, the Tree and the Apparicion, benefited from the scholarly scrutiny of M. Paulin Paris in the early 1840s. He brought to light three manuscripts of the Tree in the French Bibliothèque du Roi, and provided a brief summary of, and an approximate date to, the work. A manuscript of the Apparicion was also given careful examination and analysis. Paris' work was admirably complemented, a few years later, by that of M. Jérôme Pichon who prepared an excellent edition of the Apparicion for the Société des Bibliophiles Français. Pichon provides in his introduction a useful and accurate framework for a biography of Bouvet which has been added to, but not substantially altered, since Pichon's day.

In 1882 Ernest Nys, lawyer and joint-secretary of the Institut de droit international, outlined Christine de Pisan's debt to the Tree in the preparation of the third book of her Livre des faits d'armes, and, in the following year, produced the only edition of the Tree since the early-sixteenth century, based on the Burgundian manuscript of 1461. Nys does not seem to have been aware of Pichon's work on Bouvet, and his painstaking study of sources for the Tree has now been largely superseded by that of Coopland. His main thesis, however, that the Tree is 'le

monument doctrinal le plus ancien (du droit international)\(^1\) has proved remarkably attractive to later scholars. The great Dutch historian, Johan Huisinga, for example, asserted that 'The influence of chivalry on the development of the law of nations nowhere appears more clearly than (in the *Tree of Battles*)\(^2\). In the 1890s Noël Valois produced in Paris a succession of works which added considerably to our understanding of Bouvet and his writings. He published four of Bouvet's letters written in Paris to friends in the south on 2 November 1394; he showed that Bouvet was the author of the *Somnia super materia acismatig*\(^3\) and that his priory of 'Salon' was in fact Salonnet in the diocese of Embrun;\(^4\) he discussed the possibility that the *Judicium Veritatis* was Bouvet's work and showed, in the light of German scholarship, that Bouvet had preached a sermon before Wenceslas, king of the Romans, in 1399.\(^5\) This sermon had been published by Hoefler in 1865,\(^6\) but the debate over its dating was not concluded until 1888.\(^7\) The work itself has been

published more recently, and with much greater accuracy, by a
Czech historian, F.M. Bartos.¹

In 1926 Ivor Arnold provided a new edition of the Apparicion
together with the first and only publication of the Somnium.²
His introduction adds little to our knowledge of the author's life
but contributes much towards a proper understanding of Bouvet's
various works in their literary and historical context. Alfred
Coville's attempt to relate Bouvet to the literary and intellectual
life at the Angevin court in Anjou and Provence, some years later,
is marred by too many speculative fancies, some of which have been
effectively challenged by Coopland.³ George Coopland himself
produced an English edition of the Tree in 1949, and, apart from
the lucid English text based on Nys' edition of 1885, has provided
us with an extremely important assessment of the Tree's historical
and literary sources and an idea of the history of, and variations
among, Tree manuscripts. Neither Coville nor Coopland are inclined
to favour the notion that the Tree 'is the earliest monument of
international law', and assign to it the more modest rôle of a
scholarly work, skilfully popularised. Bouvet's purpose, as Coville
sees it, 'parait bien avoir été d'adapter son œuvre à un milieu
plus large, plus pratique, plus contemporain que celui qu'avait

1. F.M. Bartos, Autogrf M.J. Husi (Prague, 1954). This monograph contains a facsimile of the manuscript, together with transcription of the Latin text and a translation of it into Czech.

2. L'Apparicion, ed. I. Arnold.

3. Alfred Coville, La Vie Intellectuelle dans les Domaines d'Anjou-Provence de 1290 à 1425 (Paris, 1941), chapter VI: 'Honore Bonet, Prieur de Salon, et ses œuvres'.
pu viser le pur juriste qu'était Jean de Legnano.¹

In 1959 Gilbert Guy published an article in Romania which suggested that the true name of the prior of Selonnet was Bouvet, and not Bonet, as had been accepted previously.² M. Guy has also shown that the Paris manuscript of Bouvet's Romania, (Bibl. nat. Latin 14643), was copied under the direction, and for the personal use, of Jean Gerson, late in 1394.³ Neither of these articles has yet fully penetrated the world of historical and literary scholarship.

In 1965, Maurice Keen made extensive use of the Treo in his study of the laws of war in the later Middle Ages.⁴ Whereas Ersé, Huisinga and others had looked upon the Treo as an essentially theoretical work, Keen described it as an authority for the 'law of arms' which exposed not only the legal theory of war, but also the details which regulated the conduct of individual soldiers in the field. It was, according to Raymond Kilgour's description, a 'working manual for the knight'.⁵ Philippe Contamine, in his recent study of French royal armies in the later Middle Ages, supports the idea that the Treo represents the 'formo classique' of the 'droit d'armes'. He also pointed out, however, that the

1. Ibid., p. 268.
The Tree of Battles and works of a similar nature were transforming the traditional law of arms by introducing new elements derived from Roman legal and literary sources.¹

Thanks to the work of historians and literary scholars, especially over the last one-and-a-quarter centuries, some of the more profitable lines of research on Honoré Bouvet and the Tree of Battles are clearly laid out. The biography of the prior of Selonnet itself is rudimentary and unsatisfactory, and has not been substantially altered since the middle of last century. We are provided with no details of Bouvet's life prior to 1382 when he was already middle-aged, and virtually none after 1398, though he was active for more than a decade after this date. There is a substantial amount of printed material, which relates to the life of Bouvet, but which has not yet been incorporated into any biography of the man. From this material and from manuscript sources, (especially in the archives of Lyons and Marseilles), it has been possible to prepare a more complete biography of the prior of Selonnet which forms the first part of this present work. This part will attempt to present Honoré Bouvet as an individual and as one who played a distinguished, if not altogether dramatic, part in the political life of Provence, of France and of Western Europe.

The Tree of Battles itself is available in the fine edition of Ernest Rys and in the English translation of George Coopland.

We are, thanks to the work of both of these editors, well aware of
the Tree's sources and, to a lesser extent, of its derivatives.
The work has not, however, been related to other contemporary liter-
ature, and, in particular, to the literature 'of war' produced at
and around the court of the French king, Charles VI. Although the
Tree was written specifically for this milieu, its 'alien', Italian,
sources have inhibited later commentators from relating it to the
intellectual movements at the French court. It will be shown that
there are themes common to the Italian-legal scholarship and to the
French political literature, and that the Tree of Battles served,
to some extent, as a link between them. For the purposes of this
study, the historical chapters in the first two parts of the Tree
will be dealt with summarily. A useful study of them in terms of
the history of History has been made by Coopland,¹ but such an
interpretation is not relevant here.

The various interpretations of the Tree in terms of the law
of arms, the laws of war and international law, though superficially
similar to each other, are not always in agreement. These differ-
ences are usually obscured by the absence of rigid definition of
terms. It will be shown that the Tree of Battles can be related
to such laws in a constructive manner only if a distinction is
made between a customary, 'private' law of arms, and a codified,
'public' law of war. The classification is, to a certain extent,
arbitrary in that no such obvious distinction was applied in the
Middle Ages; but without it the 'legal' nature of the Tree cannot
be properly comprehended. Without such a classification, we will

¹. Tree, ed. Coopland, pp. 36-56.
continue to be baffled by the Tree's wide theoretical perspectives and by its considerable practical limitations.
CHAPTER TWO

Honore Bouvet: biographical study

Part I: Bouvet in Provence
(c. 1345–c. 1390)
Honord Bouvet was born in Provence,\(^1\) probably some time in the early 1340s.\(^2\) Very little is known about the family, but it seems likely that it belonged to the lesser nobility of Provence and possessed its own coat of arms.\(^3\) Honord's brother, Marquis, was described in 1400 as a 'gentil-homme de Provence'.\(^4\) The family probably came from the viscounty of Valonies, and possibly from the small hamlet of Bayons which lies between Sisteron and Selonnet in the modern Department of Haute Provence.\(^5\) Honord and his family, therefore, were the subjects of Guillaume Roger, count of Beaufort, who, in turn, owed allegiance to Queen Joanna of Naples, countess of Provence. Despite the more or less constant cultural and political penetration of Provence from the kingdom of France to the north and west, the county was independent of her neighbour, and was to remain so until the last count, Charles III, bequeathed his territory to the king of France on 10 December 1481. So much of Bouvet's adult life was to be bound up with the political affairs of Provence that a brief resumé of its history over the century preceding Bouvet's birth may prove helpful.


2. There has been very little serious disagreement about the approximate date of Bouvet's birth. A very cogent argument for placing this event between the years 1340 and 1347 has been presented by Ivor Arnold in the introduction to his edition of the Apparicion, op. cit., p. 1.

3. See above, p. 4. In the document cited there Bouvet's arms appear as a 'boeuf accompagnant trois étoiles'.

4. See below, p. 73;

5. See below, p. 63. Also map of Provence, p. 44.
On the 19 August 1245 the last Aragonese count of Provence, Raimond Berenger V, died, leaving his county to his youngest daughter, Beatrice. Inevitably the competition for the hand of this wealthy and beautiful countess was fierce in the extreme, but Charles, brother of St. Louis and count of Anjou and Maine, triumphed over his rivals and married Beatrice on 31 January 1246. The count of Anjou thereby became count of Provence and a nominal vassal of the Emperor Frederick II who was also king of Naples and Sicily. Frederick II died in southern Italy on 13 December 1250 and the Crown of Sicily passed firstly to a legitimate son, Conrad, and then to an illegitimate one, Manfred. The papacy, forever deeply suspicious of the Hohenstaufen, sought a more tractable candidate for the Sicilian throne and, in June 1263, granted the kingdom of Naples and Sicily to the insatiable Charles of Anjou. St. Louis, according to Bouvet, joyfully assented to this scheme because he wished to see the Church protected, his brother a king, and the country of France rid of a great enthusiast for jousts and tournaments. 'Furthermore', continues Bouvet, 'the countess of Provence had so great a desire to be queen that she would leave her husband not a moment's peace but continually said to him "Go on, go to Lombardy"...'. Charles did in fact meet his rival Manfred before Benevento on 26 February 1266, and in the battle which ensued Manfred was killed and his army put to flight. Charles, king of Sicily and

1. For the period up to 1282 I have made extensive use of Steven Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers* (Cambridge, 1958)
count of Provence, Anjou and Maine, entered Naples, the capital city of his kingdom on 7 March following. Manfred's three bastard sons were locked up in the Castello del Parco at Nocera and never again saw the light of day. The last male heir to the Hohenstaufen claims, and the last hope of the Italian Ghibellines, the fifteen-year-old Conradin, was defeated at Tagliacozzo on 23 August 1268 and executed in Naples a few months later. Charles' ruthless treatment of Conradin became something of a cause célèbre, and Bouvet felt it necessary to justify the sentence more than a century later: 'And for this reason the good king of Naples made Conradus die by sentence, having him beheaded, for those of the king's council said that if he escaped, the war would not be finished, and that there would never be peace in the kingdom while this Conradus lived.'

After the death of Conradin, the centre of opposition moved from Bavaria to Barcelona where Manfred's son-in-law Peter III of Aragon became king in 1276. Encouraged by the Aragonese court, and particularly by the Neapolitan exile John of Procida, the Sicilians rose in rebellion against their French masters on 30 March 1282 and expelled them from the island. Five months later, Peter III of Aragon landed in Sicily and assumed the Crown which was offered to him by the rebels. Despite frequent attempts by Charles of Anjou and his successors to reverse the verdict of the Sicilian Vespers, the island passed forever out of the Angevin inheritance.

The domains of the Angevin kings after the Vespers remained more or less intact until Charles II ceded the counties of Anjou and Maine to Charles of Valois as part of a marriage settlement. When Philip VI, therefore, succeeded to the French Crown in 1328 these counties were incorporated into the royal domain. Philip's successor, John the Good, elevated the status of the county of Anjou into that of a duchy and granted it in apanage to his second son, Louis. The result of John's action was that two distinct Angevin Houses existed simultaneously: the older one in Naples represented by Charles I's great-great-granddaughter, Queen Joanna; and the newer, in Angers, represented by Louis, duke of Anjou and Maine.¹

Joanna succeeded to the Crown of Naples and to the county of Provence on 19 January 1343, at very much the same time as Bouvet was born. The turbulent life of the queen, who, in the words of St. Bridget of Sweden, lived 'more like a harlot than a queen'², the murder of her young husband, Andrew of Hungary, during the night of 18 September 1345, and the consequent Hungarian invasion of the Neapolitan kingdom, had little direct effect on Provence. Joanna's penury helped to secure Avignon for the papacy in 1348 at a price of 80,000 florins, but most of Provence enjoyed the relative stability provided by the seneschals Raymond and Foulques d'Agoult working in conjunction with frequent assemblies of the Provengal

¹. For the history of Naples during the late-14th. century see Michel de Bouard, La France et l'Italie au temps du grand schisme d'accident (Paris, 1936), and Emile Léonard, Les Angevins de Naples (Paris, 1954).

Estates. The hard-won security in Provence, constantly jeopardized by the family feuds of the Baux and Duras, was finally shattered in the early summer of 1357 by the 'Arch-priest', Arnaud de Cervole. Cervole who, in Froissart's words, had gathered together a great company of soldiers from all countries who saw that their wages could no longer be payed due to the capture of the king of France (at Poitiers) crossed over into Provence from Dauphiné in early July. The appalling consequences of the Archpriest's presence in Provence were described in a letter from Pope Innocent VI to the king of France on 12 August 1357. The Provençal peasants were reported to be destroying their grain and livestock in order to prevent them coming into the hands of the routiers, but it was only after a year of pillaging that Cervole allowed himself to be bought out by the papacy and the towns of Provence.

The lack of documentary material, and Bouvet's own silence, concerning his childhood and youth, is so complete that a biography of this period of his life must be largely hypothetical. We know that by April 1382 Bouvet was an ordained monk of the

Benedictine monastery of Ile-Barbe, near Lyons, and prior of one of its communities in northern Provence.\(^1\) His well-established position suggests that his contact with the monks of Ile-Barbe had been made many years previously. Bouvet's home village of Bayons supported a community of Ile-Barbe monks in the priory of Notre-Dame de Bayons, and it is not unlikely that Honoré received his basic education here.\(^2\) Many years later, in 1394, Bouvet described himself as a Frenchman by choice and by upbringing, and it is quite possible that after an early childhood in Bayons he made the journey up the Rhône to Lyons where he joined the abbey of Ile-Barbe either as a young scholar or as a novice. He might in this way have spent his adolescence and early manhood in the kingdom of France.

The abbey of Saint-Martin de l'Ile-Barbe was one of the richest and most ancient of the monastic foundations in the south of France.\(^3\) Followers of St. Benedict's rule had established themselves there, on an island in the river Saône a few miles to the north of Lyons, not long after the death of their founder in 543. The community had received its charter from Clovis in the seventh century, and had benefited from the special patronage of Charlemagne. The golden age of Ile-Barbe was during the 13th. and 14th. centuries when it owned sixty-seven churches in the Lyonnais, Forez and

---

1. See below, p. 36, note 1.


Beaujolais alone, and when the noble families of these provinces vied with each other to secure membership of the community for one of their sons. The monks of the abbey, had, for a long time, run a school which introduced lay-scholars as well as oblates to philosophy and theology. Thanks to the reforms of popes Clement V and Benedict XII, the trivium of grammar, rhetoric and logic was also introduced into the curriculum.¹ It was in this school perhaps, and in the rich abbey library, that Bouvot acquired that interest in history which is so evident in his later works.

Bouvot, at some stage, possibly in the early 1560s, took his monastic vows and became a full member of the Ilo-Cerbo community. Along with many of his fellow-monks, Bouvot must have been immensely gratified when Guillaume de Grizoard, abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Saint-Victor of Marseille, was elected to the papacy on 28 September 1362. Although the new pope, Urban V, was horrified by luxury and ostentation, and continued to wear his monastic habit throughout his pontificate, he was a generous patron of literature and scholarship, and the members of his own order were especially favoured.² It is possible that Honore Bouvot was already present in Avignon by 31 March 1363 when King John of France, Pierre de Lunigiana of Cyprus and Valdemar III of Denmark colonially took the cross amid scenes of tremendous festivity and pageantry.


The possibility is suggested by Bouvet's detailed knowledge of a duel which took place, a few days before, at Villencouu-les-Avignon. He was certainly in Avignon some few years later when he accompanied Urban to Rome on 30 April 1367; but what he was doing in the papal city, and what his connections with Urban V may have been, must remain, for the time being at least, a mystery.

Bouvet's presence in Avignon while still a young man indicates that his vocation was not one which involved a complete retreat from the world. 'Dismal Avignon on its horrid rock', as Petrarch described it some years earlier, '...a sink overflowing with all the gathered filth of the world', was a very far cry from the cloisters of Bayoné and of Ile-Barbe. It was probably at some time during this period that Bouvet was appointed prior of the small Ile-Barbe community at Selonnet, not far from his own birth-place in the borderlands which separated Angevin Provence from 'French' Dauphiné. Despite frequent attempts to secure a more lucrative benefice, Bouvet was to remain prior of Selonnet for the rest of his life. The duties of prior were certainly not onerous and Bouvet can hardly have spent more than a few years there in all the time that he was prior. The revenues from the priory, on the

---


2. It is possible that Bouvet arrived in Rome later, but it is certain that he was there at the same time as Urban V and Pierre de Lusignan. (Somnium, p. 76).


other hand, made him virtually independent of any other source of income and left him free to pursue his own interests. These interests, at least during this early stage in his life, seem to have been mainly literary and scholarly.

It is likely that soon after 1362 the prior of Solomnna.t wrote a history of the county of Foix in the Provencal dialect for Gaston Fébus of Foix.¹ It may in fact have been written to celebrate Gaston's victory over the count of Armagnac at the battle of Laumac on 5 December 1362. Of this chronicle only thirty-two verses of very limited historical and literary value have survived. The Foix chronicle does, however, show that Bouvet was already familiar with several works of history, notably those of Bernard Gui, and that his education in the kingdom of France had not obliterated his facility in the Provencal tongue. Even as late as 1387, Bouvet looked with exceptional favour on Gaston Fébus, and singled him out as an example of a sovereign prince 'in his land of Daern (which)...he holds by God and the Sword.'² Nevertheless, if the chronicle was designed to secure a permanent patron for its author, it does not seem to have been successful.

Some time during the following decade, the 1370s, the prior commenced his studies of Canon law at the University of Avignon. We know that by the spring of 1382 he was already a well-established figure at the University, leader and spokesman of the Provencal

¹ See appendix III.

² The Tree, ed. Coopland, p. 136.
students there, and a licenciate in Decretals. Coville maintains that studies in law at Avignon, leading towards the licence, lasted at least nine or ten years\(^1\), but it is clear that some students graduated more quickly than this. Bouvet, thanks to his income from Selonnet, may have been able to pursue his studies in a private capacity. It seems more likely, however, that he was sent there by his monastery in accordance with the regulations laid down by Benedict XII in 1356.\(^2\) That pope was determined that a certain number of Benedictine monks from each abbey, in the proportion of one in twenty, should be properly instructed in theology and canon law. To this end he laid down very detailed regulations for black monks attending courses at universities: how their pensions should be paid by the monastery, and how their discipline should be watched over by the provincial chapter of the University town. Under such a system Bouvet, as a bachelor in canon law, would have received an annual pension of thirty livres tournois towards the cost of food, clothing and the purchase of books, and would have resided in a monastic house with at least ten other students and four servants. He may have been attached to the Cluniac Collège Saint-Martial, which had been established by a bull of Clement VII in 1379, but it is more likely that he lived in a smaller and less-organized community.

Bouvet had accompanied Urban V to Rome in 1367 and had probably followed him back to Avignon in September 1370. Urban's successor Gregory XI, having announced his intention of returning to Rome in


the early years of his pontificate, finally succeeded in doing so on 17 January 1377. His death in Rome on 27 March 1378 was followed by an election in which Bartolomeo Prignani, archbishop of Bari, was chosen as the new pope. He was crowned as Pope Urban VI on 18 April. In the months which followed, the cardinals, headed by a very large French contingent, regretted their decision which they claimed had been forced upon them by the Roman mob, disavowed the election, and attempted to force Urban's resignation. Supported by Charles V of France, and forced into an extreme position by Urban's defiant attitude, a majority of the old college of cardinals, (for Urban had created a new one), met at Fondi and there elected as pope Robert of Geneva. The anti-pope, Clement VII, was forced by Urban's troops to retire to Avignon, and the Great Schism, which was to monopolize so much of Bouvet's attention during the rest of his life, had begun.

Other events, which were to have no less a bearing on Bouvet's career, were taking place at about the same time in the Neapolitan kingdom. Queen Joanna, though five times married, had failed to produce a child which survived infancy. Louis of Anjou, the eldest brother of Charles V of France, had for many years been casting covetous eyes on her rich inheritance in Provence and southern Italy. The result was that, on 29 June 1380, Joanna decided to adopt the duke of Anjou as her son and heir and to invest him with the duchy of Calabria immediately. 1 Though Honoré Bouvet did not doubt that Joanna could affiliate Louis in this way 2, Charles of Durazzo, who

---

had married Joanna's niece and was himself descended from Charles II of Anjou, felt that he had been unjustly deprived of his inheritance. Encouraged by the 'Roman' pope, Urban VI, who promised him the Crown of Naples, Charles of Durazzo defied Louis of Anjou in the summer of 1381 and invaded the kingdom of Naples. The feeble resistance of Joanna's husband, Otho of Brunswick, was swept aside on 25 August and the queen was incarcerated in the castle of Nuro where she was done to death on 27 July 1382. The speed of Durazzo's success had taken Louis somewhat by surprise but he soon obtained promises of financial support from the young Charles VI of France, and from the Avignon pope, Clement VII, for an attempt to rescue Joanna and to revive his own fortunes. Having concluded alliances with Amadeus VI of Savoy and with Bernabo Visconti of Milan, Louis prepared to cross the Alps in the early summer of 1382.

It was at this critical juncture that the prior of Selonnet first made his appearance at the Angevin court. Jean le Fèvre, chancellor of Anjou, reported that on 8 April 1382 the Provençal 'nation' at the University of Avignon came to pay its respects to the duke of Anjou, and that 'un docteur religieux de Saint Benoist, prieur de Salon' delivered a sermon before the duke based on the encouraging text: 'Lift up thine eyes round about, and behold: all these gather themselves together, and come to theo.' (Isaiah 49:18). The chancellor replied to Bouvet's discourse in the same

vein. Louis himself, busy with plans for the impending invasion of Naples, may have given only half an ear to these speeches, but it was, at any rate, a considerable honour for the prior. His position as representative of the Provençal students and his title of 'docteur', (he was in fact a licenciate), suggest that Bouvet was already a popular and influential teacher at the university. In the following month, (May 1382), possibly as a reward for the sermon, Louis of Anjou forwarded the prior's application for a richer benefice to Pope Clement VII.\(^1\) The petition was not successful.

Louis of Anjou crossed the Alps in the middle of June 1382 and concentrated his forces at Turin. As he moved his great army southward in July, the Italians were amazed at the iron discipline which he maintained. 'They move in good order', wrote Bernabo Visconti to Lodovico Gonzaga, 'paying a reasonable price for the goods which they requisition and going violence to no man; now the people everywhere look on them not as soldiers, but as compatriots'.\(^2\) After a series of forced marches Louis arrived within sight of Naples on 14 October but was fatally distracted by the delaying-tactics of Durazzo and by the skirmishing of Sir John Hawkwood, and eventually withdrew northwards at the end of December.

On 5 April 1383 Louis defeated Charles of Durazzo at Pietracatella.

---

1. N. Valois, 'Honoré Bonet, prieur de Salon', in DEC, vol. l\(\text{i}\) (1891), pp. 265-68, which includes the text of part of a Liber Supplicationum which received the papal fiat on 14 May 1382. Valois also identifies the priory as one which belonged to Selonnet, in the diocese of Embrun, rather than to Salon, in the diocese of Aries.

2. Bouard, La France et l'Italie, pp. 57-8. On the discipline in Louis' army see also Noël Valois, La France et le Grand Schisme d'Occident (Paris, 1896), vol. \(\text{i}\), pp. 42-3. Louis' death in 1384 was the direct result of his attempt to prevent the sack of Bisceglia.
and followed this up with the conquest of Tarento. A few months later he assumed the title of king of Sicily and Jerusalem. Nevertheless, the kingdom itself eluded his grasp, and, while waiting at Bari for reinforcements from France led by Enguerrand de Coucy, he died on 20 September 1384. His infant son, Louis, inherited his claims.

In Provence the adoption treaty of 1380 had not received a unanimous welcome and, though the Estates assembled at Apt on 16 April 1382 declared themselves for Louis of Anjou, the town of Aix refused to be reconciled.\(^1\) When news of Joanna's death arrived from Italy in the winter of 1382, the county of Provence broke up into civil war. Louis' cause was taken up by the sénéchal of Provence, Foulques d'Agoult, and a league of towns headed by Marseilles and Arles; while that of Charles of Durazzo was upheld by Aix, Tarascon, Toulon and Nice. Each party was supported by the bulls and anathemas of their respective popes. The situation was further complicated by the intervention of Charles VI of France in the person of his sénéchal of Beaucaire, Enguerrand d'Eudin. In the name of Louis of Anjou and of Clement VII he entered Provence from the Comtat Venaissin in February 1383 and, by the end of the year, had installed French troops in the castles of Lamanon, Mallemort, la Barben, Saint-Cannat, le Puy Sainte-Réparate, Roquefeuille and Peyrolles. The uneasy equilibrium which followed was upset by the news which arrived from Italy in October 1384 that Louis of Anjou was dead. Marie of Brittany and

\(^1\) A good and detailed history of Provence in the 1380s; and 1390's is provided by Françoise Lehoux, Jean de France, duc de Berry. Sa vie, son action politique, 1340-1416. (Paris, 1966-7), vol. ii, ch. 2 et seq.
her young son, Louis II, arrived at Avignon from Angers towards the end of April 1385, and there, a month later, Louis II was invested with the kingdom of Naples and with the county of Provence.

Louis' first priority, or rather that of his regent-mother, was to secure the Angevin position in Provence, and to this end the county had to be rid, not only of the league of Aix, but also of the Angevins' French 'allies'.

A few days after the arrival in Avignon of the dowager countess and her seven-year-old son, the prior of Selonnet reappeared at the Angevin court, again as spokesman of the Provençal students at the University. The sermon which he delivered at their court, on 2 May 1385, was based on the theme: 'Omnis lapis preciosus operimentum tuum', and it was one which he recalled with a certain amount of pride nearly ten years later. Both the regent and her chancellor, Jean le Fèvre, were from the north of France and anxious to recruit influential Provençals for their struggle with the Durazzist faction in the county. The prior of Selonnet was by this time a man of some local importance, and it is likely that his willing support of the second house of Anjou was immediately rewarded by a post in its service. The town of Sisteron, with


2. Somnium, ed. Arnold, p. 86.

3. Marie of Brittany was the daughter of Charles de Blois and her birthplace was Châtillon-sur-Marne. She had married Louis I of Anjou on 9 July 1360. Jean Le Fèvre was a Parisian and, before his appointment as Louis' chancellor in February 1380, a stranger to the south. See Coville, Vie Intellectuelle, pp. 21-25 and 95-139.
which Bouvet had doubtless been familiar in his youth, maintained an obstinate neutrality, throughout the year 1385, towards the Durazzist and Angevin factions. On 7 March 1386 the chancellor of Anjou wrote a letter to the prior of Selonnet which probably contained instructions on how he might help to secure Sisteron's recognition of Louis II.\(^1\) Bouvet left for that town from Avignon a few weeks later,\(^2\) but his mission does not seem to have been a great success. After only four days the prior returned to the papal city complaining of the 'voie malicieuse à laquelle tendent ceulz de Sisteron', but he held out a certain amount of hope for the town if a prominent burgess, Pierre Autart, could be won over to the Angevin cause.\(^3\) In fact, within three months, the town had rendered homage to Louis II and had joyfully welcomed him through its gates. The prior had been employed in the meantime as an emissary between the Angevin and papal courts.\(^4\).

At the same time as Bouvet was making his mark on the political life of Provence, he was also preparing to receive his doctorate in Canon law at the University, and his efforts were crowned with success on 23 October 1386, when Jean le Fèvre conferred on him the

---


2. Ibid., p. 263: 'Ce jour le prieur de Salon, à tout lettres de créance de Madame, parti à aler, à Sisteron et escrisoit au seigneur de Peupin, au Capitaine messire Orset, à Pierre Artauld, à Jehan BAudoyn; et aloit en intencion de les exciter que tost il venissent dovers Madame et le Roy fait leur devoir'.

3. Ibid., p. 264. R. de Laplane, *Histoire de Sisteron* (Digne, 1843), vol. i, pp. 180-1, suggests that the town merely desired its privileges to be confirmed and extended.

4. Le Fèvre, *Journal*, p. 265. He was sent to Avignon with letters for the pope on 23 April 1386, and was given ten francs in expenses.
title of Doctor of Decretals. The doctorate at Avignon was little more than a formality for those with influence and adequate financial means, yet it made a considerable difference to the recipient's standing within the University. He was ex officio of noble status, entitled to elect the primicier of the University and to sit on the governing body of the University, the Collegium doctorum utriusque juris. In 1394 the Avignon law faculty was composed of 1,143 persons, both teachers and students, of which number only twenty were doctors of either canon or civil law. Bouvet's stipend from Ile-Barbe, if indeed he was paid one, would have been raised from thirty to fifty livres tournois.

Bouvet's studies in the law faculty at Avignon had brought him into contact with the work of the Italian school of Post-glossators. Members of the school had taught at Avignon, notably Baldus de Ubaldis; while others, like John of Legnano, the professor of Civil law at Bologna, were occasional visitors to the city. Legnano continued to exercise a profound influence over Bouvet long after the former had been excluded from Avignonese society by his vigorous defence of the 'Roman' papacy. The reason for this influence was the treatise which he produced in 1360, on

1. Ibid., p. 323. Bouvet was accompanied by 'grande et belle compagnie' at this ceremony.
4. Legnano was responsible, in 1378, for an Urbanist tract entitled De Pletu Ecclesia, to which Jean le Fèvre replied in the De Planctu Bonorum of 1379. Coville, Vie Intellectuelle, p. 108.
the subject of war, reprisals and duels, and which was to form the basis of Bouvet's *Tree of Battles*. The *Tree* was probably completed in the summer of 1387 and, unlike the Foix chronicle, was written in the French language. Despite the fact that Bouvet had spent most of his adult life outside the kingdom of France and was not a subject of the French king, the *Tree* was dedicated to, and written for, the young King Charles VI of France.

The fact that the *Tree of Battles* was written in French, (and had to be translated into Provençal much later), was not in itself extraordinary. The ruling house of Provence, as Coville pointed out, had only recently transported itself from the banks of the Loire to those of the Rhône and the Durance, and it had brought with it the language and manners, if not the institutions, of the French court. Bouvet had had the good fortune to be educated in the kingdom of France without which advancement at the Angevin court of Provence might have proved more difficult. We have remarked already how the chancellor, Jean le Fèvre, came from Paris. At the time when Bouvet first made his appearance at the court of Louis I in 1382, the all-important lieutenant in the county was Raymond Bernard Flamenc who came from Cahors in Bas-Quercy. Raymond Bernard, from the year 1385 until his death in the early years of

1. Giovanni da Legnano, *De bello, de represaliis et de duello*, ed. T.E. Holland (1917). For the relationship between this work and the *Tree* see below, p. 90.

2. See below, p. 85.

3. Coville, *Vie Intellectuelle*, p. 182. Most of what follows in this paragraph comes from this particular source.
the 15th. century, was an active member of the Provençal council and held the important posts of *juge mage* and *maître vocal de Provence*. Avignon itself was an international city. The famous canonist Gilles Bellemère, who came from the diocese of Le Mans in the county of Anjou, had studied law at Bologna and was an intimate councillor of Clement VII and a familiar at the Angevin court. Jean Muret, secretary to Clement VII, was a correspondent of the French humanists Gontier Col, Nicolas de Clamanges and Jean de Montreuil, and was a particular friend of the Neapolitan, John Hoccia. Perhaps the most striking evidence of the international character of the papal city are the badly-damaged frescoes of Simone Martini and of Matteo di Giovanetto of Viterbo in the *palais des papes*. The new Tuscan art spread out from Avignon to the rest of Provence, to France, Catalonia, Bohemia and Flanders.

Yet when Bouvet prefaced his book with the words 'A la sainte couronne de France' and proceeded to show how Charles VI should act, not simply to bring unity to the Church, but also to bring peace to Provence, he deliberately turned his back on a career in the Angevin government. Queen Marie had appealed for French assistance in her struggle to suppress the league of Aix, early in 1383. The response was somewhat over-enthusiastic and, by 1385, the problem had become one of how to get the French troops

to leave. The official object of military intervention by the French Crown, in the persons of Enguerrand d'Eudin, sénéchal of Beaucaire, and John, duke of Berry, was 'que le roi fect le pais en sa main pour oster la grant division qui y est, faire cesser la guerre...', but there was more than a hint of direct French annexation. On 13 September 1385 one of the agents of the Tuscan merchant, Datini, wrote from Avignon: 'According to what people say and to what one can see and understand, Provence will fall under the government and sovereignty of the king of France'.

The attempts by the French Crown to fish in troubled waters had been welcomed neither by Marie, regent of Provence, nor by the Avignon papacy. Even though the main threat from France was over by the summer of 1387, Bouvet's remarks in his 'Dodicace must be regarded as a rejection of Angevin policy. Certainly, for nearly two decades, we do not hear of Bouvet in any official post in the Angevin administration.

When Bouvet expressed his desire to see Provence at peace he was not only referring to the war with the league of Aix. The Durazzist cause in Provence had, in fact, been on the decline ever since the death of Charles of Durazzo on 6 February 1386. Aix made

---

1. R. Brun, 'Annales Avignonaises de 1382 à 1410. Extraites des Archives de Datini', in Mémoires de l'Institut historique de Provence, xii (1935), p. 57. Brun's translation runs as follows: 'D'après ce qu'on dit, d'après ce qu'on peut comprendre et voir, la Provence tombera sous le gouvernement et la souveraineté du roi de France;...'

2. Ibid., p. 86: 'Le pape, le roi Louis et la mère paraissent mécontents de cette prétention...'. The sénéchal of Beaucaire wrote in 1385: 'Le pape et les cardinaux ne sont pas bien enclines à la partie du Roy...'. L. Douet-d'Arcq, Choix de pièces inédites relatives au règne de Charles VI (Paris, 1863), vol i, p. 67.
its submission to Louis II on 21 October 1387, and most of the other members of the league followed suit soon afterwards. The soldiers, however, who had been employed in these wars were now reorganising themselves under new leaders who were no less dangerous to the Angevin government. Falduccio di Lombardo, of the Datini business-house in Avignon, described Provence in 1389 as a 'cavern of brigands', and pointed to one Raymond de Turenne as the worst brigand of them all, 'in truth a devil incarnate'. At much the same time, as we know, Bouvet, whose family and priory were in Provence and who had attained a distinguished position in the county, decided to leave his native-land for the relative security of Paris and of French royal service. The reasons for his desire to move were complex, but the one to which he gives most prominence in a later work was the war of Raymond de Turenne. 'I am out of my own country', he wrote in 1398, 'because of the war which master Remond Rogier has waged for so long against the young king, Louis of Sicily. Because it does not please me to be in the vicinity of war, for I know not how to bear arms, and my benefice is now of little value...I wait here for God to provide a remedy against this tyrant Remon Rogier'.

This 'devil incarnate' and 'Tyrant' was Raymond, viscount of Turenne, son of the count of Beaufort and half-brother of Bouvet's own lord, Raymond de Beaufort. During the late 1360s and the 1370s Turenne had served both Louis I of Anjou and the Avignon papacy, but, by the mid-1380s, had become alienated from both parties. He

had suffered from Louis' policy of reuniting to the royal domain the lands alienated by Queen Joanna, and from Clement VII's reluctance to pay his debts. The precarious harmony which had existed up to 1386 was shattered in the spring of that year by a dispute between Raymond and Louis II over rights to the bourgade of Aureiile. Hostilities with the pope commenced almost simultaneously and, by the end of August, Clement had been forced to flee from Chateau-neuf-du-Pape to his palace at Doms. A few days later his troops were defeated in a bloody skirmish near Eyrargues. Encouraged by his easy successes and reinforced with a multitude of hitherto unemployed soldiers, Turenne embraced the cause of the dowager countess of Valentinois, Alix de Beaufort, and invaded the county of Valentinois. The communications between Avignon and the outside world were virtually severed by Raymond's captains Jehannin le Francois, Gonnin de Marmignac, Guillaume Cassien etc., based in castles like Les Baux and Roquemartine. As early as August 1386, the chancellor of Anjou reported difficulties in reaching Avignon 'pour ce que les gens Massire Raymon de Turens ancien couru jusques aux portes d'Avignon', and, by the following year, it appears that the pope was paying the viscount protection-money.

Ever since the coup d'état of the 'Marmosets' in November 1388, and the consequent improvement in relations between France and Provence, it has been widely rumoured that Charles VI was planning


a visit to the south and to his cousin, Louis II of Anjou. Bouvet may have considered, along with the Lombard businessmen in Avignon, that 'when the king of France be here, good order will be given to everything'. Certainly, throughout the Midi, there was an exaggerated, almost apocalyptic, faith in the young king of France and in his ability to inaugurate a new golden age. In fact, Charles decided at a council meeting on 18 May 1389 to visit the south, and appointed six reform commissioners to engage in preliminary enquiries. The king eventually left Paris for the south on 2 November 1389, and he assisted at the coronation of Louis II at Avignon on 1 November. It was not long before he received reports from the pope and the queen-regent concerning the wars of Raymond de Turenne which the viscount claimed to be slanderous and untrue. It does not seem unlikely that Bouvet himself was one of these 'slanderers', and that his persistent opposition to Turenne at the French court during the following decade told very heavily against the cause of the viscount. At any rate, for almost a decade after 1390, agents of the French king were active in this theatre, attempting either to appease Turenne or to destroy him. The prior of Selonnet may also have taken the opportunity of Charles VI's presence in Avignon to present him with the Tree of Battles. Certainly, his career in French royal service began a few months later, in January.


2. 'Quand le Roy fu en Avignon...le pape a feit fero informations encontre ledit Messire Remon par messire Phélibonc, lequel estoit tousjours aux despens du Pape, et quant il fesat lea dictes informations lea quelles ne sont pas vrayes ne se pour- cient prouver par nul loyal homme'. Arch. dép. de l'Isère (Grenoble), B 3771. This is a rouleau containing charges and counter-charges exchanged between French agents in the Dauphiné and Turenne, during the summer of 1390.
1390, when Charles VI appointed him to the Languedoc reform commission headed by Ferri Cassinel, archbishop of Reims, Pierre de Chevreuse and Jean d'Estouteville.¹

¹ The letters which appointed the Languedoc reform commissioners were given by Charles VI at Avignon on 28 Jan. 1390, and have been published in vol. vii of the Ordonnances des Rois de France de la Troisième Race, pp. 328–32. Bouvet is not mentioned here, but we know that Charles VI attached him to the commission from a mention in L'Apparicion, p. 65: 'Mais outre cela...ay je veu tant de choses en la commission qui fu jadis donnée a feu sire de Chevreuse es parties de Languedoc et de Guyenne, en laquelle je fus par la voulenté du roy...'.
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CHAPTER TWO
Honore Bouvet: biographical study

Part II: Bouvet in Paris
(c. 1391 - c. 1400)
Bouvet's appointment to the Languedoc reform commission in 1390 was an excellent introduction to French royal service. Pierre de Chevreuse, who obtained control of the commission after the death of Cassinel on 26 May 1390, was an old and experienced councillor of Charles V, and was generally respected for his integrity and industry. 1 'Homme sage et prudent' 2, he represented in his person the fine traditions of Charles V's administration which the Marmo-
sents were attempting to re-establish. Chevreuse continued his work in Languedoc until his death on 22 December 1393, but the prior of Selonnet can have spent little more than one year on the commission. In his own practical way, the prior busied himself with some of the minor abuses which he saw around him. He was particularly shocked by the way merchants evaded the Church's ban on usury by 'lending' merchandise at inflated prices; how the frequent use of its power of excommunication for trivial offences brought the Church into disrepute; and how tolls were illegally extracted from innocent travellers. 3

When he had finished his work on the reform commission, probably in 1391, Bouvet did not return to Provence, but took up residence in Paris. The move was prompted by a number of considerations, not

---

1. Chevreuse was the younger son of a noble Poitevin family. He was successively tresorier des aides (1362), maître d'hôtel (1368) and royal lieutenant (1378), of the French Crown. He was also chamberlain to Louis of Anjou (1380) and to Louis of Orleans (by 1387). See biography by Auguste Moutié in Mémoires et documents publiés par la Société archéologique de Rambouillet, vol. iii (1875-6), pp. 367-403.

dent, lequel en peu de temps s'y transporta et s'y porta grande-
ment bien et notablement, et en estoit le peuple très content.'

least amongst which were the insecurity of his life in the south and the prospect of further royal patronage. Two of his most important patrons had disappeared from the Provençal scene; Jean Le Fèvre died at Avignon on 11 January 1390, and Louis II departed on his ill-fated expedition to Naples on 20 July 1390. The wars of Raymond de Turenne had seriously reduced his income from Selonnet and he was doubtless anxious to secure a new source. We also know that Bouvet was immensely confident in the capacity of the French Crown to initiate and sustain the reforms which he felt to be so urgently required in Provence, in France and in Christendom as a whole, and he intended to play some part in these reforms. With those hopes in mind, the prior took up residence in the Maison de la Tournelle, in the parish of Saint Benedict just outside the town walls constructed by Philippe Augustus. The house had been the property of the famous Jean de Meun, (and it was there he had composed his part of the Roman de la Rose), but it now belonged to the Dominicans of the rue Saint-Jacques. Bouvet, very conscious of his literary associations, composed two of his major works in this house.

When the prior arrived in Paris in 1391, his reputation as a man of letters had preceded him. His history of the counts of Foix was probably not read outside the Midi, and his Judicium Veritatis, if indeed he was the author, not outside the Paris

1. We know that Bouvet was residing there when he wrote the Somnium of 1394, (see Arnold ed., p. 77) and the Aparicio of 1398, (see Arnold ed., p. 5). On the house itself, see J. Quicherat, 'Jean de Meun et sa maison à Paris', in REG, vol. xii (1880), pp. 46–52.

2. The late-14th century manuscript of the Judicium veritatis in causa aeciomatis, (Bibl.nat. Latin 1463, fos.27-53) bears no indication of authorship, but a copy of the 17th century (Bibl.nat. Latin 8975, fos.29-59) carries the marginal note: 'Honoré Bonnot, natif de Provence, religieux de l'abbaye royale de l'Ile-Barbe, auteur de cette pièce rare...' (f.29). The latter is a copy of a ms. in the Celestine library at Avignon, to which Le Laboureur also refers (op.cit., vol. ii, p. 79), but which has now disappeared. The work itself takes the form of a dream, and is strongly Clementist in flavour.
faculty of theology. The Tree of Battles, however, was already in the hands of Charles VI and of his uncle, John, duke of Berry, and was already gaining in popularity. Philip the Bold, duke of Burgundy, if he did not already possess a manuscript of the Tree, was certainly aware of the prior's existence. On 28 September 1390 Bouvet received one hundred francs from the ducal treasury in return for an odd assortment of gifts, which included a book of histories, a greyhound and a mule. Furthermore, the prior's work for Jean le Fèvre and for Pierre de Chevreuse, both of whom had been prominent in the government of Charles V, provided him with an important entrée into the world of the Hermoseta who were then in power. For someone who was, as he put it, '...d'estrange pays, petite personne et de petit affaire' Bouvet had some useful and powerful contacts.

The events of the late-1380s and early-1390s combined to make this a period of intense literary activity in the French capital. The papal schism, now into its second decade, continued to produce an enormous, and largely polemical, literature. The important new developments of this period were, however, only indirectly connected with the Schism. Firstly, there was the coup d'état

1. In the accounts of Pierre Varopel, receveur-général des finances of Philip the Bold, the following entry appears: 'A frère Honoré Bouet, prieur de Sallon en Prouvance, don a lui fait par le dit monseigneur en recompensation d'un livre de ystoires, un mulet et d'un levrier que le dit frère a donné audit monseigneur par mandement d'icellui monseigneur. Et quittance donnée le XXVIII. jour de septembre, CCCIII. et dix. C franz.' Arch. dép. de la Côte d'Or, Dijon, B 1479, f.146. This document was used by Richard Vaughan in his Philip the Bold. The formation of the Burgundian State (Cambridge Mass., 1962), p. 199-99.


3. An idea of the vastness of Schism literature can be gathered from Noël Valois, La France et le Grand Schisme d'Occident, 4 vols. (1896-1902), passim.
of the Marmota on 3 November 1388, when the twenty-year-old king had pensioned off his uncles at Rheims and declared himself of age. At a stroke the golden age of Charles V seemed to have been restored, and his trusted councillors, Piero Aycelin, Nicolas Dubosc, Olivier de Clisson, Jean de Vienna, Bureau de la Rivière, Jean la Mercier and Jean de Montaigu, brought back into the centre of affairs. Secondly, there was the prospect of an Anglo-French peace settlement, from the summer of 1388 onwards. On the French side, the failure of the invasion plans of 1386-7, combined with a complete lack of enthusiasm for the war with England on the part of the royal uncles, militated against a renewal of hostilities. On the English side, Gaunt's settlement with Castile at Bayonne on 8 July 1388 and the complete failure of Gloucester's invasion strategy of the previous month, discredited the war-policy of the Appellants, and paved the way for a peace initiative by Richard II in pursuance of the policy formulated earlier by his chancellor, Michael de la Pole. Thirdly, the advance of the Ottoman Turks into the Balkans had created a fever of excitement in the Western European courts, and the call for unity within Christendom and a crusade without, was renewed with particular urgency.1 All of these developments in the political life of France and Western Europe were to have an important effect on the literature of the period.

The advocates of reform now emerged into the open and the output of didactic literature was suddenly intensified. Philippe de Mézières, by now over sixty years old, finally emerged from the seclusion of the Celestine convent in Paris with three major works:

---

1. These themes will be developed more fully below, chapter 4.
Philippe had spent some seven years at the court of Charles V as councillor and diplomat, he had been appointed tutor to the dauphin and had developed lasting friendships with many of the royal officials, notably with Bureau de la Rivièrê. By the end of 1388, as Coopland so aptly remarks, 'Philippe had seen the young king grow up, had taken some share in his education and was clearly free to address him in bolder terms than are usual in any age between subject and sovereign. Allowing for some over-optimism, he had, perhaps, reason to persuade himself that internal reform could be achieved in France, the schism healed, lasting peace made with England, and that a united Europe under French and English leadership might march, and this time effectively, against the infidel.'

A friend of Mésières who also held nostalgic memories of service under Charles V was the court-poet Eustache Deschamps. His duties as bailli of Sens made him a reluctant exile from the palace royal, but ballads continued to pour forth from his pen.


3. The best biography of Deschamps is that of I.S. Laurie, Eustache Deschamps: his life and his contribution to the development of the rondeau, the virgâl and the ballade, unpublished Cambridge Ph.D. thesis (1962).
urging peace with England, a reformed chivalry and a crusade against the Ottoman Turks. The survey of many of these ballads show that they were addressed to the Prince as the representative of "justice et droit." The daughter of Charles V's court astrologer, and the wife of one of his secretaries, Christine de Pisan, while struggling to maintain herself and her three young children, started to write her first ballades and rondeaux after the fashion of her 'master' Eustache Deschamps. These three writers, Hésièrois, Deschamps and Pisan must have felt very much at home at the court of the Hermes and eager to welcome Bouvot into their ranks.

Their literary output does, however, pale into insignificance beside the profusion of works which emanated from the great faculty of theology of Paris University. The leading lights of the University were an astonishingly tightly-knit group: most of them came from the north and east of Paris—Gerson from Bethol, d'Ailly from Compiègne, Clamanges from the Yarne, Courteculsso from Normandy, Houvion from the House; most of them joined the College of Navarre at Paris, did a preliminary course in the faculty of Arts and then proceeded through the various stages of auditor, cursus, contentarius and baccalaureus formatus towards the licenciato in theology. It does not seem unlikely that Pierre d'Ailly, who had been through all these stages by 1381, and was rector of the college of Navarre and


chancellor of the University by 1389, was responsible for the creation of this group of intellectuals. At any rate, Nicolas de Clamanges who became rector of the University in 1393 was one of his pupils as was Jean Gerson who succeeded d'Ailly as chancellor in 1395. Other Paris theologians more or less closely associated with this group were Jacques de Nouvion, the pupil and friend of Clamanges; Jean Petit, the young Norman lawyer and theologian who was later to make his name odious by his justification of the Orleans murder of 1403; and Jean Courtecaisso, a powerful orator and vigorous advocate of reform, who was one of the strongest supporters of the Cabochien ordinance of 1413.

The main concern of the Paris theologians was with the disastrous papal schism—although their reforming interests were comprehensive. Attached to this diligent and serious group of scholars, through the person of Clamanges, was the more light-hearted and ephemeral group of French humanists led by Jean de Montreuil, Gontier Col and Clamanges himself. Montreuil, and Col were both royal secretaries, and the latter became an important professional diplomat, but their

1. A biography of d'Ailly is provided by Francis Oakley, *The Political Thought of Pierre d'Ailly* (Yale, 1964), p. 9 et seq.
4. There are many works on the French pre-Renaissance of which A. Coville, *Gontier et Pierre Col et l'Humanisme en France au temps de Charles VI* (Paris, 1934), is perhaps the most useful. See also A. Tilley, *The Dawn of the French Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1918), chapter ii.
inspiration came from a great love of classical antiquity and an admiration for Petrarch which was tempered only by their awareness of his slighting references to literacy north of the Alps ('non esse extra Italian oratores aut poetas querendos'). Although members of this group, which included Laurent de Pornierfait, Jacques de Nouvion, Nicolas de Baye, Pierre Col and Jean Piret, had many useful and thoughtful things to say about contemporary France, they are known primarily for the literary quarrels which they conducted in impeccable Ciceronian style and for the rude letters which they exchanged with Christine de Pisan in the Roman de la Rose controversy of 1399-1402.

Such then were the main groups of literary men which surrounded the royal court in Paris, whose members clamoured for the ear of the young king. Bouvet, when he arrived in Paris, had some rather tenuous connections with the court and with the Horosets, but none, as far as we know, with the University or the humanist circles. His ideas on the reform of French chivalry, culled from the legal texts of Bologna, were moderate enough to be acceptable to the royal princes, and yet sufficiently radical to win the admiration of other would-be reformers; notably of Christine de Pisan. Moreover the prior's deep concern with the damaging effects of the papal schism soon brought him into contact with Jean Gerson and the Paris theologians.

1. See above, p. 14 notes 3-4
In October 1391 Bouvet was ordered by the king and council to accompany the royal chevalier d'honneur, Pierre Sanglier, on a hurried mission to secure the homage of the new count of Armagnac, Bernard VII. Six months later the prior was an active member of the French delegation which, in the company of Charles VI, met with the duke of Lancaster at Amiens. While the peace negotiations were under way, Bouvet held a conversation with Gaunt in which he attempted to discredit the election of Urban VI. The duke replied good-humouredly that the election of Clement VII had been no loss invalid, and that a way towards a settlement of the schism, and thereafter of the war, lay in the abdication of both pontiffs. Lancaster's conciliatory attitude in his talk with the prior has led to a dramatic reinterpretation of Anglo-French diplomacy during this period by J.J.N. Palmer. Bouvet himself was now a well-established figure at the French court, and in receipt of an annual pension from the Crown.

It seems likely that Bouvet was engaged in a mission to

1. Bibl. nat. Pieces Originales, Sanglier, 29110, no. 7. Quittance of Pierre Sanglier for '...la somme de cent francs d'or pour paiement et recompensation d'un voyage que le Roy nostre dit seigneur et son conseil lui font faire hastivement en la campagnie de messire Honnoré Bongnet, docteur en decret, prieur de Salles, en pays de Gascongne dovers le conte de Armignac...'. Sanglier had been a captain in the service of Louis I of Anjou (Bibl. nat., P.O. 2626, dossier 58417) before enjoying the patronage of Charles VI.

2. Somnium, od. Arnold, pp. 91-92: '...Dux incepit Lancastrie loqui, dicens: 'Nonne tu es ille prior qui dudum Ambianis de hac materia fuisti michi loquutus? Et ego: 'Utile, domine, quando eratis cum domino meo regis Francie pro tractatu...'.

Aragon sometime between the Amiens negotiations of April 1392, and the end of 1393.  It has been suggested that his mission was somehow connected with the negotiations between Marie of Provence and John I of Aragon for a marriage between their respective children, but this seems unlikely since Bouvet had temporarily broken his ties with the Angevins. Soon after his return from Aragon, Bouvet was incapacitated by a severe illness which made him invalid for over a year and nearly brought him to the grave.

During his convalescence, in the autumn of 1394, he wrote the Somnium super materia scientiae—a work which showed that he had not lost touch with the world of the royal court and of Paris university.

In the Somnium Bouvet describes how, while lying in bed on the morning of the feast of St. Augustin, the Church appeared to him in the guise of a once-beautiful woman now gangrenous and full of worms. She points out a magnificent palace in which are housed all the kings and princes of Europe, and she instructs the prior to enter and to inform the crowned heads of Europe of her plight.

1. That Bouvet spent several months at the Aragonese court is attested by a passage in the Somnium (p. 75) in which the king of Aragon addresses the prior as follows: 'Sed nec credimus quod tu, qui dudum por multos menses nostrum palaciun frequen-
tasti, et cum regniolcis habitasti, vitam et expensas nostrorum hominum sie oblitus.' This visit could have taken place at any time between 1387 and 1393, but was probably after March 1392. See Arnold, Apparicion, p. viii.

2. N. Valois, 'Un ouvrage inédit d'Honoré Bonet', in Annuaire-

3. On 2 November 1394 Bouvet wrote to a prelate at the Avignon curia: 'Pui infirmus usque ad mortem, et duravit infirmitas anno et ultra; nec sum adhuc perfecto curatus.' Ibid., p. 216.

4. The Somnium was probably started on 28 Aug. 1394, the feast of St. Augustine, and completed before news had arrived of Benedict XIII's election in early-October. Ibid., p. 196.
The first king encountered by the prior was Charles III of Navarre who excuses himself from helping the Church by calling to mind his troubles with France and Castile; John of Portugal pleads incapacity due to the hostility of neighbouring Castile, and Robert II of Scotland because of his wars with England; John of Aragon welcomes the prior but refuses help because of his wars in the Mediterranean and at home, but the councillors of Henry of Castile promise to follow the lead of the king of France. The prior passes, without receiving any more positive assurances, through the halls of James, king of Cyprus, and of Sigismund, king of Hungary, to the hall of Louis II with whom he was familiar 'since I take my origin from his subject land'. Bouvet departs from Louis II with expressions of good-will, and arrives at the court of Richard II where the young king of England, and his uncle of Lancaster express their desire for a general council to prepare the way towards a mutual renunciation by both popes.

Approaching the richest and most exalted court, of Charles VI of France, the prior encounters John, duke of Berry, whose chapel filled with relics and ornaments sends the pilgrim into raptures. Berry is angry that Charles V's conduct at the start of the Schism is being called into question. The dukes of Burgundy, Orleans and Bourbon are met by the prior as they rise from the dinner-table, and they offer him vague expressions of sympathy. He then enters the magnificent hall of Charles VI who welcomes him and listens while Bouvet explains the fearful vision of 'Holy Church, sad and sorrowful, suffering and oppressed by misfortune'. 'No-one can console her but you', explained the prior, though it was by leading the rest of Christendom, not by force, that the French Crown was bidden to restore unity to the Church.
Much of the Somnium may have been written after the death of Clement VII on 16 September 1394, but before news had arrived of the election of his successor. Even after the election of Benedict XIII on 23 September, Bouvet continued to hope for a negotiated solution to the Schism, and he dedicated a manuscript of the Somnium to the new pope in a spirit of confidence. Of all the ways to reunite the Church which had been put forward by the Avignon papacy and by Paris University: the Via facti, whereby the Roman pope would be forced to abdicate; the Via Concilii Generalis; the Via compromissi, in which both popes would submit to arbitration; the Via Cessionis, or mutual renunciation; and the Via Reductionis, whereby Benedict's claim to the papacy should be impressed on other princes by way of discussion, the prior of Selonnet gave his approval to the latter. This course of action corresponded neither with the way that official French policy was moving, (i.e. towards the Via cessionis), nor with the thinking of Paris University which was tending towards a more radical solution. It did, however, fit in very well with the ideas of Jean Gerson who was soon to replace Pierre d'Ailly as chancellor of the University. Gerson thoroughly disapproved of the developments within the court and the University;

1. 'Beatissime pater, cortissime teneatis quod quantum sentire potui nec audire, magis rudiocres simul, in unum dives et pauper Altissimum laudaverunt de vocatione vostra ad sedes Petri in superiores sedentis, hoc verbis continuis propheta-antes quod divisa Ecclesiam unietis'. L'Apparicion, ed. Arnold, p. xxiv.

2. On the various methods which had been proposed, see the instructions given to the dukes of Berry, Burgundy, Orleans etc. before their mission to Avignon in 1395. E. Martome & U. Durand, Vetorum Scriptorum, vol. vii (Paris, 1733), pp. 438-59.
he questioned the authority of Paris University to decide such matters, and continued to support Benedict XIII long after most of his supporters had fallen by the wayside. 1

A few months after Bouvet completed the Somnium, in September 1394, Gerson decided to include it in a collection of documents concerned with the Schism which he was preparing for his own use. 2 He did much of the copying himself and exercised a strict supervision over the rest. He intended that his copy of the Somnium should serve as the model for a richly illuminated presentation copy, and himself gave instructions to the illuminator on how to paint the author 'iacens in lecto in domo Tournelle' and in the various courts of the princes whom he encountered. It does seem very likely therefore, to use the words of Gilbert Ouy, that there existed an 'étroit accord' between Gerson and Bouvet, at least during this period in the mid-1390s. Though some twenty years Bouvet's junior, Gerson was already an eminent theologian and preacher, and a familiar figure at the court of Charles VI. The prior of Solonnet, with his strange manners and accent, must have felt a little out of his depth, but he did share with Gerson his hatred of war and Schism and his enthusiasm for reform.


2. G. Ouy, 'Une maquette de manuscrit à peintures', in Mêlange d'histoire du livre et des bibliothèques offerts à Monsieur Françoi Calot (Paris, 1960), pp. 43-51. Ouy shows that the Paris ms. of the Somnium (Bibl. Nat., latin 14643, fos. 269-283) is one of a number of documents concerned with the Schism which were copied out by Gerson, or under his direction, in 1394-95.
Strangely, enough, the manuscripts of the Somnium which survive today are precisely those which were not made to last. There is Gerson's maquette mentioned above, and a very defective copy, written in haste, and sent to one of Bouvet's friends in Avignon. More beautiful and expensive copies of the work were presented to the king of France, to Pope Benedict XIII at Avignon, and to John, duke of Berry, but these have all disappeared.

On 2 November following, Bouvet sent off his chaplain from Paris with letters to friends in Avignon and with several copies of the Somnium for presentation to the pope and others. In the letters to a prelate at the papal curia and to his nephew, Bouvet describes how the king's illness has left him with little to do; but, because his livelihood in Paris was more secure than it was likely to be in Avignon, he refused for the moment to return to the south. In the letter to Catherine Adhémar de Monteil, mother of the viscount of Valernes, Bouvet describes how he had been working to secure a favourable judgement from the parlement in her case against the marquis of Beaufort. Bouvet seems to have been on terms

1. Vatican archives, Pampeluna coll., Armariun LIV, vol. 21, f°5s.73-90. On the final folio is written, in Bouvet's own hand: 'Opus male scriptum et incorrectum...'.

2. The work was dedicated to Charles VI of France, its full title being: Somnium prioris de Salloon ad regem Francie super materia scismatis. N. Faucon, La librairie des papes d'Avignon (Paris, 1887), vol. ii, p. 35, has shown that a book with the title Somnium prioris de Salloon super materia scismatis was in Benedict's library at Avignon; and J. Guiffrey, Inventaire de Jean, duc de Berry, 1401-1416, vol. i, p. 231, that Berry held a copy of the Sonne du prieur d'Assaloon sur le fait du Scieme de l'Eglise.

3. Four letters written by Bouvet from Paris on 2 Nov. 1394 have been published by Noël Valois, 'Un ouvrage inédit', pp. 216-17.
of 'respectueuse familiarité' with Catherine Adhémar, and his close association with this capable and industrious lady seems to have been maintained, for, on 27 February 1402, he dined with her in the castle of Valernes.¹ This evidence, and the fact that a Marquis Bo(n)et, probably Honord's brother, represented the vicomté of Valernes at the Estatos assembled at Sisteron on 29 August 1391,² suggests that Bouvet's family was from the viscounty. Ten years later, the accounts of the receveur of the viscounty reveal the existence of a Bo(n)et family in the small community of Bayono.³

Between November 1394 and May 1396 Bouvet's activities cannot be traced, but it seems more than likely that he was employed by the French court, during this period, as a diplomat in the complicated negotiations connected with the Schism. On 8 May 1396 'Honord Bouvet, prieur de Salon, conseiller du roy nostre sire', received 100 francs of his pension from the receveur-général, Michel de Sablon.⁴ Bouvet was not an important member of the royal

¹ 'Die xxvii fob., dòmini priores de Sallono et de Grigoriis vonerunt comatum in domo Valerne cum domina'. R.-Z Isnard, Comptes du receveur de la vicomté de Valernes 1401-1403 (Digne, 1904), p. xxiv. Isnard also provides a good short biography of Catherine Adhémar on pp. 6-8.


³ Isnard, Valernes, pp. iv, ix-xi, xxi-ii, xxv, xxvii, xxx, xxxviii, xlv & appendix. Of this family, 'Marquet' (Bouvet's brother Marquis?) was a noble of Bayono, Antoine & Jean were clerks, and Guillaume a notary.

⁴ Bibl. nat. fr. 21145. This is a 17th-century copy of a quittance, first discovered by O. Ouy, 'Honord Bouvet (appelé à tort Bonot) prieur de Solnomot', Romania, vol. lxxx (1959) pp. 255-9. The 'armes parlantes' which accompanied this quittance, and which featured an animal of the bovine species, substantiated Ouy's revised spelling of the prior's surname.
council, and it is quite likely that he was only consulted in affairs which concerned the papal Schism, but there is plenty of evidence to show that he entertained no false modesty in putting forward his opinions on this subject whenever he obtained the opportunity. His own writings show that the king asked and received his advice on several occasions. Furthermore, it is clear that the prior was responsible for the initiation and drafting of diplomatic correspondence for the king of France, 'sur le fait du Scismo de l'Eglise'. The duke of Berry had copies of several of these letters 'close', written in Latin by the 'prieur d'Asalon', and sent off in the name of the king. No more is known about them than a brief mention in Berry's inventories of 1402 and 1416.

Soon after the receipt of his pension in May, Bouvet began to write his third, and last, major work, 1'Apparicion maistre Johan de Meun, which was probably completed in September 1396. The prior describes how, one evening after dinner, he fell asleep in the garden of la Tournelle. The ghost of the illustrious former occupant, Jean de Meun, appears to the dreamer and immediately takes

---

1. 'Verum rox super sisma quesivit meam pauperom opinionem, et eam sibi dedi...', in letter to a nephew published by H. Valois, 'Un Ouvrage inedit', p. 216. In the Somnium, Charles VI is made to greet the prior in a friendly and familiar fashion, (p. 101).

2. 'Un livre en latin de plusieurs lettres closes envoiées par le Roi sur le fait du Scisme de l'Église, et de la relation du prieur d'Asalon', J. Guiffroy, Inventaire, p. 232. The formula 'Par le roy a la relation de...', attached to letters, indicated the king's absence, and that the person named, (in this case Bouvet), had been delegated the authority to initiate correspondence. See O. Morel, 'La mention "Por rogen ad relacionem ..." inscrite sur le ropli des actes royaux au XIVe siècle', in BEG, vol. lix (1899), pp. 73-80. The fact that the letters close were written in Latin suggests that they were sent abroad.

3. L'Apparicion, ed. Arnold, p.x, shows that this work was written between the beginning of July and the end of September 1396.
him to task for lying there stuffed with good food 'comme pourcel' while the world approaches catastrophe. The Church was in confusion while the Saracens were victorious, (a reference to the Nicopolis disaster of 25 September 1396); youth no longer respects age, nor the people their sovereign; great lords squander their money on fine buildings while the clergy are puffed up with false pride. Bouvet's excuses: he was a foreigner, and no-one ever listened to him, were brushed aside by the implacable Jean de Meun, but further conversation was interrupted by the arrival in the garden of a doctor, a Jew, a Saracen and a Dominican friar.

These men had good cause to conceal themselves behind the high walls of La Tournelle, for doctors were out of favour because of their failure to cure the king; the Jews had been banished from the kingdom by an ordinance of September 1394; the Saracens had just won the battle of Nicopolis; and the Dominicans were being persecuted in Paris because of the heresy of one of their number, Jean de Monson. When tackled by Meun the physician does little more than complain how certain quack doctors have brought his profession into disrepute, and the 'faux Juif' shows how Christian merchants are engaged in an usury much more extortionate than any Jew's. The main debate, however, centres round the 'coal-black' Saracen who has been sent by the Saracen princes to spy out the weaknesses of Christendom, and around the Jacobin who, after deploring the unjust persecution of his Order, undertakes a reply to the Saracen's charges.

The Arab, a learned and well-travelled nobleman, describes how the Christian people are fatally divided by the Schism, and how the French who used to be their chief support, are now decadent
and corrupt. As the captive 'monseigneur de Nevern' learned to his cost, the Saracen lives a hardy and frugal life quite unlike the French who live 'diligieusement' and do not make sufficient military use of their peasants. In addition to their military incompetence, the French do not respect their sumptuary laws, they allow too many young people into responsible positions, their administration is top-heavy and their ideals of Christian charity are quickly forgotten when it comes to ransoming prisoners in Saracen jails. The Jacobin, though reluctant to admit to such weaknesses of Christendom before the 'noir malastrau', ends up by agreeing with most of the Saracen's criticisms and even developing some of them. The wealth and corruption at the papal curia in Rome led the Church inevitably towards Schism which has now lasted so long the withdrawal of obedience, or even force, may have to be employed to bring it to a conclusion.

Of all the participants in this strange debate the Jacobin is the character who most thoroughly represents the opinions of the author himself, obsessed by the Schism: 'La matiere est un abisme', and by the decadence of French society. The prior also concludes his record of the dream with a statement of his own personal grievances against the notorious 'tirant', Raymond de Turonno.

The wars of the viscount in Provence against Louis II of Anjou and against the Avignon papacy were an almost permanent feature of that country between the spring of 1386 and the end of 1399. Bouvet complains that this unjust war between the upstart Turonno and his own liege-lord, the count of Provence, had deprived him of the revenues of the Solonnet priory and had driven him out of the land: 'par sa guerre je sus hors de mon pays'. His bitterness is understandable.
Bouvet's new militancy in his approach to the Schism is also worthy of note. In the Somium of 1394 he had advocated Gerson's ideas of caution and moderation in seeking an end to the Schism, but now he was supporting the more extreme proposals of the University. The reason for this change of heart was that, while Gerson continued to urge the dubious via reductionis, most Frenchmen had lost confidence in Benedict XIII and supported the official French withdrawal of obedience of July 1398.

In the Apparicion, Bouvet continued to look to the French Crown for a solution to the great evils of war and schism, but now it is to the important members of the King's council that the author addresses himself. Copies of the Apparicion were sent to the 'tres hault Prince', Louis of Orleans, to his wife, Valentina Visconti, and to the immensely influential marmoset, Jean de Montaigu. A slightly modified version was presented a few months later to Philip the Bold, duke of Burgundy. Bouvet explained to them that he had written this 'petite chosette' (4) 'pour le bien commun et par especial des povres gens' (1), and that it was the responsibility of those in high office to see that 'les remedes' (1) were provided. The presentation of the work both to Louis of Orleans and to Philip of Burgundy indicates very strongly that the author was not disposed to take sides in their quarrel.

1. The various dedications are published by Arnold, Apparicion, pp. 1-4. The numbers in brackets which follow refer to these pages.

2. This Burgundy version is discussed very fully by Arnold, Apparicion, pp. xxxiv-xxxix. It has come down to us in the versified form given to it by a clerk of the bishop of Arras in the early fifteenth century.
Soon after the completion of his *amoricam*, Bouvet was sent off as an ambassador of Charles VI to several eastern European courts: notably those of Wenceslas, King of the Romans, at Prague, and those of the kings of Poland and Hungary. His mission was *pro unitate saneti matris ecclesiae*, or, in other words, to secure the support of these various princes for the French policy of withdrawal of obedience from both of the schismatic popes. No record has yet come to light of Bouvet’s activities in Poland and Hungary, but we do know that he had left France by 5 October 1399 and that he was in Prague, staying in the house of a certain Peter Rethers, on 2 February 1400. It is unlikely that he arrived back in France before January 1401. The prior may not have been a stranger to the eastern European courts, for his description of the Hungarian court, in the *Somium*, looks as if it was based on personal experience. Prague itself was certainly not a popular resort for French diplomats, if we are to judge by the experiences of Eustache Deschamps. After his mission to Wenceslas in January 1397, Eustache, complained bitterly of the cold and the low standard of living in the east, where beds are shared and the vilest food is eaten out

---


2. Ibid., p. 98.

3. ‘*in civitate Prae in Boemia, in domo Petri Rethers, hospitia dormus*’ ibid., p. 98.

4. See below, p. 83.
of communal wooden dishes. Bouvet may have silently echoed Deschamps' refrain:

"Envoyez mon par tout le monde, Fours sur le pays d'Alençon,
En allant Noravo et Behaingne."

Whatever Bouvet's opinion may have been of the Bohemian capital, it would appear that the prior made a considerable impression on Prague. His pessimistic interpretation of his own age in terms of apocalyptic prophecy corresponded with similar intellectual movements in Prague, notably that of Matej of Janov whose *Regulae* appeared between 1384 and 1394. The prior's ideas on the Schism also attracted John Hus, a young arts graduate of Prague University and a candidate for ordination, and Christian of Prachatice, rector of the University and the friend and benefactor of Hus. The Czech historian, P.H. Botta, has suggested, on the basis of a manuscript in Prague University library, that Bouvet and Hus had struck up some sort of association during the 1399-1400 period. The manuscript is a copy, executed by Hus for Prachatice, of a speech which the prior of Salomot delivered before Venceslaus, king of the Romans, in 1399. In this Discourse, the prior deplores the Schism which has been the cause of so much war in Christendom and anarchy in the Church, which has set nation against nation, brother


2. Ibid., rondeau 1303.


5. F.H. Barton, *Autografi M.J. Husi* (Praguio, 1954), pp. 5-16. The manuscript which Barton publishes here, X III F 16, was first published by Hoeflor in *Fontes rerum austriacarum, Scriptores, vol. vi*, pp. 174-187; but this latter version is very inferior.
against brother, and has filled the heathen foe with malicious exultation, ('undique clamat paganitas, finis est Christianorum'). The feeble argument, (which Bouvet, incidentally, had once espoused), that it is better to await the decease of one pope or another before attempting a solution to the Schism, and that no-one may challenge the authority of a pope, 'est doctrina angeli informalis'. Now, the only feasible way towards a solution was by forcing the rival popes to abdicate by a general withdrawal of obedience from them.

The speech was probably delivered in 1399, and certainly between December 1398 and August 1400. It was the last of a long succession of such embassies despatched from the French court to Prague, and it certainly yielded no better results than its predecessors. Wenceslas remained firmly Urbanist in continent, and anyway was deposed by the Electors at the diet of Obersalmstein in August 1400. It is a strange irony that Bouvet's copyist of 1399 should have been burned at the stake in Constance on 6 July 1415, thanks largely to the efforts of Bouvet's colleague in Paris, Jean Gerson.

A few weeks after Honoré's departure for the east the abbot of Ile-Barbo, Jean de Sognoto, died, and the monks of the abbey,

1. J. Heissacker, Deutsche Reichstagakten unter Konig Ruprecht 1406-1410, vol. vi (Gotha, 1888), pp. 342-43, shows that it must have been delivered after the Diet of Brackau (Dec. 1398) and before Wenceslas' deposition (Aug. 1400). H. Vallon suggests after 14 Jan. 1399, when Navarre adhered to the French programme, La France, vol. iii, p. 287. Earlier Bouvet had written a letter to Archbishop Olbram of Prague in an attempt to enlist his support. It is published by Barto, Autour, p. 11, note 14.

under their chief prior, Jean de Diviono, began to make the necessary arrangements for the election of a successor.¹ On 5 October 1399 about thirty of the monks celebrated the traditional mass of the Holy Spirit in their abbey church, and, having prayed for divine assistance, they processed into the chapter for the election.

Hugues de Donenches, prior of Saint Romanus de Miribellus, was absent through sickness, but he agreed to be bound by the decision of the others. After the chief prior had urged the assembly to 'put aside all affections, favours and fears', and had warned that no excommunicated person should dare to vote, the election was held. A sudden and unanimous vote was made in favour of 'brother Honoré Boveti, alias Carobovia, who is doctor of canon law, prior of Cellon of our own order, a man especially prudent and discreet, with a knowledge of literature, commendable in life and character, being in holy orders and of full legal age, born in legitimate wedlock and circumspect in spiritual and temporal matters....'²

The monks then returned to the abbey church where Bouvet, represented in his absence by Guillaume Rata, was solemnly enthroned in the abbot's wooden seat.

---

¹. Charpin-Peugerolles, Pancarta, vol. ii, pp. 91-95. This is a transcription of Arch. dép. Rhone (Lyon), 10 G 5146, pièce 1.

². '...fratrem Honoratium Boveti, alias Carobovia, in decretis doctorem, priorum prioratus de Cellon nostri ordinis, virum utique providum et discretum, litterarum scientia, vita et moribus commendandum, in sacris ordinibus et etato legitima constituuntum ac de legitimo matrimonio procreatum, in spiritualibus et temporibus circumspectum,...'. Ibid., p. 94.
News of his election did not reach Bouvet until a few months later when he was already installed in Prague. There, on 2 February 1400, he decided that he could not reasonably abandon the business with which he had been entrusted and return to Ile-Barbe. Instead he appointed six proxies, four of whom were monks of the abbey, (the other two being lawyers), to oversee the abbey's affairs during the absence of its abbot-elect. They were also charged to ask 'humbly and devoutly that the lord archbishop (of Lyon), or his appointed agents, graciously confirm the election'. Bouvet may also have written, at about this time, to his brother Marquis, requesting him to give every support to the proxies in their attempt to have the election confirmed by the archbishop, Philippe de Thurey. At any rate, 'Marquis Bonhort, gentil-homme de Provence' supplied money and jewels to one of his brother's agents, François Jocerandi, prior of Saint Jean d'Ardières, to 'soutenir l'élection qui esté fait de la personne d'Honoré Bonhar, son frère, prieur de Salon et abbé de l'Isle...'.

By the time Bouvet arrived back in Lyon early in 1401 his agents had already become involved in litigation connected with the election.

1. Charpin-Feugerolles, Fancarts, vol. ii, pp. 98-100. The proxies were Jacques d'Escotay, Pierre de Gurgite, François Jocerandi and Thomas Frepperii, monks of Ile-Barbe; and the lawyers Jean Paterini and Durand Gessent.

2. Claude Le Laboureur, Les Nusures de l'Ile-Barbe, ed. E-G. & G. Guigue (Lyon, 1887), vol. i, p. 217. This particular document concerning 'Marquis Bonhort', used by Le Laboureur but now lost, clearly belongs to the year 1400 and not to 1393 as claimed by the author and by all the more recent biographers of Bouvet e.g. A. Coviello, La Vie Intellectuelle, pp. 231-32.

3. Arch. dép. Rhône (Lyon), 10 G 1409, pièce 4, 8 fos. This is a record of the archbishop of Lyon's hearing on 28 Feb. 1401 of the case of Bouvet's disputed election to the abbacy of Ile-Barbe. Expenses were claimed for the costs of previous litigation (f.2v). See Appendix 2.
Four monks of Ile-Barbe, led by the chamberlain, Stephan de Verneto, had claimed that there were several irregularities in the election of 1399, not least among which was the fact that they themselves had not been present. The case was reopened after Bouvet's arrival, in the episcopal palace at Lyon on the morning of Monday, 28 February 1401. Philippe de Thurey presided over the hearing, while his interests were represented by the procurator-general, André Marini. The chamberlain and his three companions, Guillaume de Binant, Jacques Magnini and Jean de Mont d'Or, were represented by the lawyer Aycardinus de la Rippa, while Bouvet's case was defended by François Jocerandi and Jean Paterini.

Aycardinus, on behalf of the plaintiffs, maintained that on 4 October 1399 certain factions of the Ile-Barbe monks, led by their cellarer, Jacques d'Escotay, and their commoner, Pierre de Gurgite, held two elections informally and unannounced. After the second of these elections, d'Escotay was presented as abbot-elect to the chief prior but was informed that his election had been unconstitutional. On the following day, so it was claimed, the monks proceeded to a third election in which the prior of Solonnet was elected, but, for several reasons, this election was invalid. The electors did not annul the earlier elections; there were several monks present who had been excommunicated for 'gross extortion' and were therefore disqualified from voting; Verneto and the others, who had been in the kitchen, had not been summoned to the election; Bouvet's election was neither spontaneous nor the result of divine inspiration, but 'reeked of simony' and resulted from preliminary talks on how to enrich the abbey with the revenues from the Solonnet priory; and finally the proper forms had not been observed and the archbishop had not been requested to confirm and consecrate the
election within the statutory period. The plaintiffs claimed that Bouvet’s election should be set aside and that the right to elect a new abbot, in this instance, devolved upon themselves. Marini, the archbishop’s procurator, agreed with them that Bouvet’s election had been invalid, but claimed for the archbishop the right to replace him.

A final decision in the dispute by the archbishop was postponed until the following Thursday (3 March). On this day, or very shortly afterwards, Thuroy annulled Bouvet’s election and installed his own candidate, the Savoyard nobleman, Aynard de Cordon, who was certainly not a member of the Ile-Barbe community. Cordon had endeared himself to the archbishop by intervening in a dispute between the Lyon chapter and one of his kinsmen, Guigues de Montbel. His timely intervention secured a settlement and saved the church from a dangerous freebooting soldier. Cordon remained abbot of Ile-Barbe from the spring of 1402 until

1. Ibid., f.7v. Unfortunately, no record of this second hearing survives.

2. Cordon’s name does not appear in the abovementioned document but, in a record of the oath of obedience of the abbot of Belleville to the archbishop of Lyon on 10 May 1402, Aynard de Cordon appears as abbot of Ile-Barbe (10 G 1409, pièce 5). There is plenty of evidence that he remained abbot until after January 1435. The fact that he was not a monk of the abbey when elected suggests that his appointment was due to the archbishop.

3. Montbel had attacked the property of the Lyon chapter in 1397, and Pierre de Montjeu and Aynard de Cordon had been appointed arbitrators. Their final declaration in favour of the chapter was on 19 March 1402. J. Boyesse, Les Prévôts de Fourvière (Lyon, 1908), p. 101. Montbel then turned his attention on the Comtat Venaissian where the rector, Pons de Langac, attempted to buy him out after July, 1402 (Arch. dép. Vaucluse, Avignon, C 139, f.16).
after January 1435, and Bouvet had to look elsewhere for advancement.

After his missions to the eastern European courts which had yielded such poor results, and after his failure to secure the abbacy of Ile-Barbe, Bouvet decided to return to his homeland of Provence. We hear of him dining with Catherine Adhémar in her castle at Valernos in February 1402, and, by this time he may have taken service under Louis II of Anjou, count of Provence. Many explanations for Bouvet's return to Provence have been offered.

Coopland suggests that he was unable to cope with the savage political rivalries at the French court, and Barto that he was in disgrace because of the failure of his Prague mission. It seems more likely, however, that the prior was dispirited by the meagre results of a decade of service under the French Crown, and determined to take advantage of the relative peace in Provence which followed the final defeat of Raymond de Turonno in 1399.

1. The last recorded appearance of Cordon as abbot seems to have been on 19 Jan., 1435, in a letter from Louis, duke of Savoy (Arch. dép. Rhône, 10 G 5119, fco. 11-11v.). He was succeeded soon afterwards by Claud de Sotison who had been present at Bouvet's election 35 years previously.

2. See above, p. 64.

3. Coopland, Tree, p. 20.

CHAPTER TWO

Honord Bouvet: biographical study

Part III: Bouvet in Provençal

(c. 1401 – c. 1409)
The prior's return to Provence approximately coincided with return of Louis II from Naples. Louis, supported by Charles VI and by Clement VII, had embarked for Naples on 20 July 1390. Early successes against the young Ladislas of Durazzo, culminating in the capture of Otho of Brunswick and Alberigo di Barbiano in 1391, had given way to a war of attrition in which Louis managed to hold on to Naples while Ladislas, based at Gaeta, increased his hold on the country. Louis' position had been seriously weakened by the English efforts to check further French involvement in Italy after 1390, and by his mother's withdrawal of obedience from the Avignon pope on 30 November 1398. On 10 July 1399, the people of Naples had opened their gates to the triumphant Ladislas, and, after negotiating the release of his brother, Charles of Taranto, Louis II arrived back in Provence towards the end of July.

Like Bouvet himself, Louis arrived in Provence to find the war with Raymond de Turenne virtually over. Various methods had been tried over the previous decade to rid the county of Turenne's companies. Both Clement VII and Benedict XIII had excommunicated the viscount and his men, but, as Turenne pointed out '...they try to make me leave off by excommunicating me, but they can't do it. They try to engage knights and squires to fight me by promises of pardons and indulgences, but they have no talent for the business.'

I could have more soldiers for one thousand florins than they for all the absolutions which they could grant in seven years! ¹ He had been condemned to death in absentia by Pierre d'Acigné, seneschal of Provence after being found guilty of treason, rape, adultery, sacrilege, incendiarism and banditry. ² Agents of the French Crown had attempted to appease him, and the French admiral, Jean de Vienne, acting in a private capacity, had tried to destroy him in his head-quarters at Les Baux. ³ But it was not until a concerted effort was made by the French Crown, represented by Marshal Boucicaut and the seneschal and Estates of Provence, that the danger from Turenne was finally eliminated from the county.

At the turn of the century, Provence began the slow task of reconstruction after having been 'batue et foulée de divisions et tribulacions' ⁴ for nearly two decades. Louis II and his successors, between 1400 and 1428, were forced to cut the hearth-tax from 8,669 to 4,000 hearths. ⁵ When the archbishop of Aix inspected his diocese in the early-1420s, he found that most of his churches were in a state of extreme dilapidation, that some had completely disappeared whilst others were being used as barns and stables. ⁶

---

1. This conversation which took place between Turenne and Bernard d'Armagnac early in 1391 was reported, (not without a little relish, perhaps), by Froissart and is published by Valois, Raymond de Turenne, p. 222.

2. In December 1394.

3. Jean de Vienne laid siege to Les Baux, early-July 1393. The fascinating correspondence between Vienne and Turenne (7-23 July) during the siege has been published by Terrier de Loray, Jean de Vienne, amiral de France, 1341-1596 (Paris, 1877), pp. clxx-cxci.


The village of Selonnet had not escaped the catastrophe. As late as 1400, soldiers who had formerly been in the service of Turenne at Thorames and Les Baux, invaded the Seyne valley and sacked the hamlet of Selonnet.¹ New walls and towers were erected around Selonnet in 1408,² but the drop in the number of hearths from 145 to 64 between 1319 and 1471, tells its own story.³ Unlike many of the surrounding towns and villages, Selonnet never recovered from the disasters of the late fourteenth century. We must assume that the priory shared in this decline.

Bouvet must surely have inspected his priory during his visit to Haute-Provence in the late-winter of 1402. He may even have spent some time there, supervising the work of reconstruction after the raid of 1400. By 10 April 1404, however, he was again involved in the political life of Provence, this time as councillor to Louis II of Anjou. In a document of that date, he is described as 'dilicto consiliario et fidoli nostro'.⁴ It is impossible to say at what date the prior became a councillor at the Angevin court. Louis may have remembered him from twenty years previously when

1. C. Allibert, Histoire de Seyne, de son bailliage et de sa viguerie (Barcelonnette, 1904), p. 174.
he had last been active at the court, and when the count himself had been a small boy in the tutelage of an imperious mother. At any rate, on 10 April, Bouvet was appointed to the important office of maître racional for the county of Provence.

The appointment was a signal honour to one who had been absent for so long. Bouvet now joined that small body of officials in the palais royal at Aix-en-Provence who controlled the Chambre des Comptes, and were responsible for the financial administration of the county. The Chambre at Aix had, since the beginning of the fourteenth century, become the administrative centre of the county, and, thanks to a reorganization of its archives in the mid-fourteenth century, the fonds of the Cour des Comptes is a rich source for the history of the county during this period. Thanks to these records, we are able to construct a remarkably clear picture of Bouvet's activities in the last few years of his life.

On 10 January 1405, Bouvet was present at a meeting of the council at Aix where Louis II presided in person. On 23 March following he was in Avignon and acting as lieutenant for the juge mage, the chief justice of Provence. Here he was involved in complicated negotiations between Louis II and Boucicaut, the governor of Genoa. The prior's position as deputy to the juge mage must have been very temporary for, on 28 May 1406, he had returned to Aix where, in his capacity as maître racional, he witnessed the


homage rendered by the bishop of Gap to Louis II. At the end of
the following October he was still in Aix, this time in council
with the seneschal of Provence, Pierre d'Acigné. On 1 February
1407 he was present at the episcopal palace at Toulon where Jean
de Pontoves did homage to the count of Provence for the bastide
of La Cluse. On 24 May Bouvet was back at the court of the maîtres
racionaux at Aix. In March and May of 1408 he was in council at
Aix with the seneschal, and on 11 August he was present when Nicolas
Dominici was admitted to the office of maître racionnal. His last
recorded appearance in council, on 13 November 1408, was at Aix
when the delegates from Sisteron had their municipal charter con-
firmed—an event surely laden with memories for the old prior.

It seems likely that, during most of the first decade of the
fifteenth century, Bouvet was resident in Aix whence he made
occasional visits to Avignon and Toulon as public business required.
Despite the fact that the schools of Aix were not officially a
studium generale until made such by the papal bull of Alexander V
on 9 December 1409, the town had become an important centre for
the teaching of law and theology. The prior of Solnonmay, in
addition to his official duties, have taught here.

1. Arch. dép. Bouches du Rhône, B772, fos. 6-7
2. Ibid., B9, f.138.
3. Ibid., B771, fos. 11-12v.
4. Ibid., B771, fos. 15-16.
5. Ibid., B1384, f. 26v and f. 28.
6. Ibid., B8, f. 256.
7. Ibid., B1406, f. 67.
On 22 January 1409 an act was published in the cathedral church of Aix in which ten delegates were named to represent the archdioceses of Aix, Arles and Embrun at the forthcoming council of Pisa. Honoré Bouvet, prior of Selonnet, was one of the four 'venerabiles et circumspoctos viros' who were designated to accompany Jean Fillet, bishop of Apt, Paul de Sade, bishop of Marseilles, Nicolas Sacosta, bishop of Sisteron, Bertrand Raoul, bishop of Digne, 'Aegidium Jumenis, electum Foromliensen' (?), and Jean Bonvin, abbot of Saint-Victor of Marseilles. Eight of the ten delegates arrived at Pisa on 27 March, but the prior was not among them.\(^1\) Bouvet had been intensely occupied with affairs connected with the papal schism for most of the thirty years of its history to this date, and it is highly unlikely that he would willingly have sacrificed this opportunity of playing a personal part in bringing it to an end. His non-appearance at the council suggests that serious illness or death intervened to prevent his attendance: an assumption which is strongly indicated by his advanced years (he was now a man of some sixty-five years), and by the fact that there is no record of his existence after January 1409. The council itself, attended by more than 150 French and Provençal delegates, ended by deposing Gregory XII and Benedict XIII, and electing a new pope on 26 June who took the name of Alexander V. Bouvet was probably spared from being a witness to the chaos which followed the council of Pisa.

---

1. J.D. Mansi, Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, vol. xxvi (1903), col. 1123. Bouvet is listed here as 'Honoratum Boneti, priorem de Collone'.

Our acquaintance with Bouvet over the last thirty-or-so years of his life show him to have been a tireless writer and diplomat, painfully conscious of the evils of his time and persistently advocating their reform. By 1387 he had already written a history and possibly also a Latin work on the Schism, entitled *Judicium veritatis in causa schismatis*. He had gained political experience at the Angovin court during a time of considerable crisis, and legal expertise at the law schools of Avignon. In the thirteen years which followed, he had been on no less, (and probably considerably more),\(^1\) than five diplomatic missions: to Languedoc, to Armagnac, to Aragon, Aniens and Prague. As a middle-aged gentleman, used to an easy life, he was not well suited to the rigours of diplomatic life, but he commented upon them with resignation and a wry humour. While lying on the ground with a stone for his pillow, at the court of the king of Hungary, he reported how the Church had appeared to him in a dream and had made fun of his effeminacy: 'Corto bone apparat nichi quod tu fuisti nitritus in Francia, ubi vivunt monachi delicato.'\(^2\) He had written three major works, all of which he appears to have revised and rewritten,\(^3\) and he was almost certainly the author of the discourse which he delivered before the king of the

---

1. The details which Bouvet includes in the *Somnia* when describing various European courts suggest that he had visited many of them.
3. Three ms. of the *Trés* at least, contain the historical interpolation published by Coopland, *Trés*, pp. 237-57, which seems to have been the work of Bouvet himself. In 1402 Berry’s library contained ‘Un livre en françoyas que fist le prizur d’Absalon de l’union de l’Eglise’; (Guiffroy, *Inventaire*, vol. 1, no. 978), which might well have been a French version of the *Somnia*. For the ‘Burgundian’ version of the *Anarican*, see above, p. 58 note 2.
Romans in 1399. Even when he had returned to Provence as an old man with little to show for all his pains, he did not retire to his priory in the mountains of Haute-Provence, but plunged into a new political life. If all his conscientious service to the kings of Naples and of France was forgotten, and it very quickly was, Bouvet's reputation for many generations was securely established on the Tree of Battles.
CHAPTER THREE

The Tree of Battles:

description and analysis
The Tree of Battles

It is impossible to determine with any great precision the date of composition of the Tree. It is a work 'de longue haleine', as Ivor Arnold warns us, and so probably not written all at once. It was certainly completed after Bouvet had received his doctorate on 23 October 1386 since, in the prologue, he calls himself 'docteur en decret', and almost certainly before the death of Urban VI in October of 1389. Arnold suggests, however, that because the victories of Otho of Brunswick in Naples are not mentioned, the bulk of the work was completed between the winter of 1386 and the summer of 1387.

It also seems highly probable that the Tree was produced in Avignon where the prior could have made good use of the splendid papal library.

The challenging nature of the dedication to Charles VI of Franco has already been mentioned. It is true that the prologue was probably the last part of the Tree to be written, but there can be no question but that Bouvet had the king of France in mind from the very inception of the work. In chapter 12 of the first part there is an indication that a young man is being addressed (32), and in chapter 18 of the second part he is called 'tres souverain prince' (66). Throughout the remainder of the Tree Bouvet reminds

1. In this chapter, single numerals in brackets will refer to page numbers in L'Arbre des batailles d'Hororé Bonet, ed. E. Nys (Brussels, 1883); Numerals in brackets divided by colon refer to chapter numbers in The Tree of Battles of Honoré Bonet, ed. G. Coopland (Liverpool, 1949). (p. 79) refers to the Tree prologue as published by Coopland.


3. See above, pp. 42-43.
the reader that a king is to be the beneficiary of this work, although
it may, incidentally, come into the hands of 'gens seculiers' (66,
207). It is conceivable that the prince whom Bouvot had in mind was
not Charles VI of France but the young Louis II of Anjou who had
been invested with the Crown of Sicily by Clement VII in 1385.
However, the frequent mention of the French Crown (e.g. 4:83), the
constant use of examples drawn from French experience, and the very
specific references to Charles VI in the prologue, make it highly
unlikely that Bouvet had any other prince in mind.

We have already remarked upon the probability that the prior
was seeking French royal patronage at this time, when his life and
subsistence were jeopardized by the wars of Raymond de Turenne,
and when two of his benefactors had departed the Provençal scene.
His presentation of the Tree to Charles VI, in Avignon, had, in
fact, brought Bouvet a place in the king's service, at first in
Languedoc, afterwards in Paris. We have also remarked how so many
hopes were placed in the young king of France at the time when he
declared his own majority. 'The people', as the monk of Saint-Denis
remarked, 'addressed fervent prayers to Heaven that he would pass
with virtue from adolescence to the manly age, and that all his
actions would turn to the confusion of the enemy, and to the advan-
tage and honour of the kingdom.'¹ Bouvet was certainly affected
by the general excitement which developed as the king approached
his twentieth birthday, but his attitude towards the French Crown
was given a peculiar slant by his understanding of recent prophetic
utterances. Although other writers of this period, notably Jean de

¹. Chronique des religieux de Saint-Denis, contenant le règne de
Charles VI, de 1380 à 1422, 6 vols. (Paris, 1839), vol. 1,
pp. 562-3.
Venette and Jean Froissart, were also influenced by such material,¹ it is such a feature in Bouvet's work, and particularly in the Tree, that it merits some further consideration here.

Professor Coopland has shown, in some detail, how Honoré Bouvet's interpretation of history in the first two books of the Tree was based on much earlier interpretations of the prophetic chapters in the Books of Daniel and of Revelation.² The idea, for example, of the seven ages and the four kingdoms could be traced back to the Adversus Haereses of St. Irenaeus in the second century A.D., Bouvet himself made no claims to the gift of prophecy, but he was by no means prepared to discount the claims of others. 'If I spoke further', he warned the reader of the Tree, 'I should appear to wish to treat of things yet to come, and these no being in this mortal life can know, unless they are revealed to him by the will of our Lord' (1:12). That he considered some of these privileged mortals to have existed in his own day is indicated in the Apparicion where he takes the works of 'Roche Seiche', and of other more obscure prophets, into consideration.³

The 'Roche Seiche' of Bouvet's Apparicion was none other than Jean de Roquetaillade, whose prophetic visions and violent attacks on clerical

---

¹ The Chronicle of Jean de Venette, ed. J. Birdcall & R. Newhall (New York, 1953), esp. pp. 31-2 & 61-2. Chroniques de Froissart, ed. S. Luce, vol. xii, pp. 228-9. Froissart's pessimistic observations on the state of the world in 1390 put him in mind of his 'jone temps' when there was in Avignon 'ung frere mineur, tres notable clerç, lequel s'appelloit frere Jehan de Rocetallade...'.

² Tree, ed. Coopland, pp. 41-2.

³ L'Apparicion, ed. Arnold, p. 34.
wealth earned him a succession of papal prisons during the twenty years which preceded his death in 1365.\footnote{1} Roquetaillade was not to be silenced however, and his works, the Vade Nucum in particular, circulated rapidly throughout the French kingdom. The young prior of Solonnet may have come under Jean's influence while he was in Avignon during the 1360s. When one of the prophesics of the Vade Nucum had come to pass with the papal schism of 1378, the prior had cause to reflect on some of the other statements of the deceased prophet. In addition to the Antichrist-, and the Angelic pope-, themes which were common to traditional Joachite prophecy, Roquetaillade had introduced the new element of a saintly king of France who would be elected emperor of the Romans, would rescue the Church from Schism and Antichrist, and who was destined to conquer the whole world.\footnote{2} The central rôle ascribed to the French monarchy in the cosmology of Roquetaillade and his followers, which is so reminiscent of the De recuperatione Torre Sancto of Pierre Dubois, must surely have been in Bouvet's mind when he composed the prologue to the Tree of Battles. One of the reasons for writing, he explains, is '...that many glosses made by great clerks of recent times, who consider that they understand the ancient prophesics pointing to the present great evils, claim that, by a member of the high lineage of France, healing will be given to an age which is in such travail and disease' (p. 79).

\footnote{1}{By far the best biography of Roquetaillade is that of J. Bignani-Odier, Études sur Jean de Roquetaillade (Paris, 1952). See also E.P. Jacob, Essays in Later Medieval History (Manchester, 1968), chapter ix.}

\footnote{2}{For the relationship between Roquetaillade and 'political Joachimism', see M. Reeves, The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages, A Study in Joachimism (Oxford, 1969), pp. 321-2.}
The prior's confidence in the French Crown was reinforced by his (rather selective) reading of history. His books of history informed him that, while no less than twelve emperors had been heretic and schismatic, no king of France 'has ever supported heresy or schism'. It was 'self-evident truth', not mere 'flattery' or 'adulation', which prompted Bouvet to remark that the French kingdom 'has always protected and still protects all Christendom, and maintains the Holy Church and the Faith' and whose king is 'named among all Catholic kings, the Very Christian King, and with good reason, for he has never left the right way...'. Yet it was neither prophecy nor history alone, which led the prior to consider the king of France as a possible agent for reform and reconstruction. They served, in part at least, as the rationale for even more deeply-rooted convictions. 'When any great peril comes to (any Christian kingdom)', Bouvet explained in the Tree, 'it is the pope's business to see to it and to provide a remedy' (4:110). Since the start of the Schism, however, it was the Church itself which was in need of 'remedy', and Bouvet had to look elsewhere for a solution to the 'wars and hatreds' of his age. His own lord, the king of Naples, was a young boy never likely to rule his own kingdom. Wenceslas, king of the Romans, was a degenerate and, from Bouvet's point of view, a schismatic. A solution had to be found, and the French king was the most likely person to secure it.

Eustache Deschamps asked the question, in his Lay de Plour: 'Comment ose un cler c parler / D'armes, qui n'y doit aler Et n'en a l'experience?'. and he advised Charles VI to seek the counsel of knights, rather than clerks, in such matters.¹ Bouvet had, it is true, talked with

nobles and knights in his youth (4:56 & 103) and was familiar with their practices (e.g. 4:105), but he was also a clerk who, to use his own words, 'as say no doy armes porter'.

If Bouvet had felt that, in the Tree of Battles, he was writing a manual of soldierly practice, one might have expected from him the sort of apology which Christino de Pisan wrote into the first chapter of her Faia d'armes. As we shall see, the Tree is no such manual, and it is most unlikely that the author thought of it as such. It is founded, he said, 'on the Holy Scripture, and the Decretals, and the laws, and on natural philosophy, which is none other than natural reason' (p. 79). It was an attempt, in fact, to apply the universal principles of theology, as interpreted by the Schoolmen, and of law, as interpreted by the Italian post-glossators, to the particular problems arising from war.

Bouvet, himself, was incapable of such a synthesis, trained though he was in Canon law. Coopland has shown just how extensively the vital third and fourth parts of the Tree rely on one work: the Tractatus de Bello, de Represaliis, et de Duello of John of Legnano. Legnano was a professor of Civil law at the University of Bologna and his treatise was very much the product of the situation in northern Italy in the mid-fourteenth century, and especially of the need of the Italian communes to maintain control over the condottieri in their employ. 2 Legnano's treatise, following the

---


lead of Bartolus of Sassoferrato and his school, strongly asserted the rights of the employer over the stipendiary troops based on an interpretation of the legal rights and obligations created by the contract or condotta. The contract itself was a carefully-worded document drawn up between the employer and the military captain, and, because it was the result of bargaining, varied considerably from case to case. Legnano, therefore, concentrated not on the written contract but on the rights and duties implicit in the grant and receipt of wages.

The heavy concentration on the subject of wages passed from Legnano's treatise into the Tree of Battles. The details of who was obliged to pay (4:15; 19); of who had the right to wages (4:29-32; 34, 36, 38, 42); and of when wages were to be paid (4:37), were technicalities which probably affected French practice very little. The idea, however, that soldiers who went to war for the sake of pillage were not entitled to receive wages (4:34), and that those who were paid wages had no rights over booty and prisoners captured in the war (4:14, 43), was a good deal more relevant to the French situation of the late-fourteenth century. Here, as we shall see, the question of soldiers' pay and its connection with the pillaging of innocent parties, was developing as a powerful theme in literature. This connection was not made explicitly in the Tree, but Bouvet does frequently express his concern that '...in these days all wars are directed against the poor labouring people and against their goods and chattels.' (4:102), and in the Apparicion he has the Saracon ask: 'Vivent couvoyers de pure gaiges? who answers himself with: 'J'ay veu que plus grans dommaiges /En pays plat font que 'annemis.\(^1\)

---

1. L'Apparicion, ed. Arnold, p. 36.
Just as the question of soldiers' pay was related, in Legnano's Treatise, to the state's control over its mercenaries, so, in the Tree, it is connected with the issue of military discipline. This latter subject receives extensive treatment in the Tree of Battles. Bouvet asserts that 'the chivalry of today is by no means of the valour of former times' when knights were prepared to live rough and 'did not usually dispute as to which was the best wine but drank clear water...' (4:132). The true knight, according to the Tree, is the one who loves to fight in just wars and who knows that only in just wars can his soul be saved (3:4; 4:52). His boldness is not derived from base motives of vain-glory, anger or fear of dishonour but springs from a true 'knowledge and understanding' of 'reason and justice' (3:6), and it makes him scorn death in the course of duty (3:7). The knight's loyalty to the Crown should override all obligations to any other lord (4:15, 16, 17). The knight must be loyal to his lord and obedient 'to him who is acting in place of his lord as governor of the host' (4:8). If strict justice were done, the knight who deserts his lord in time of need, who strikes one of his officers or indeed one of his own companions without cause, who disobeys the governor of the host, who flees from battle or induces or feigns sickness to avoid it, who betrays his companions or who stirs up dissension among them, —for all these reasons he should be punished with death, and all his goods be confiscated to the lord, (3:8; 4:10).

It is the duty of the lord, or of the constable who acts on his behalf, to ensure that discipline is maintained in the host. His orders must be obeyed and no movement of soldiers should take place without his orders. He must administer justice within the host and in matters arising from the contact of soldier with civilian
...as for instance, in the case of a merchant who complains of a man-at-arms (4:9). He is responsible for the allocation and distribution of booty and prisoners captured during the war which belong, not to the soldier who secures them initially, but to the lord who pays him his wages, '...for he does all that he does as a deputy of the king or of the lord in whose pay he is' (4:14, 43).

The Tree's insistence on the 'public' duties rather than the private rights of soldiers in war, especially where it related to booty and prisoners, was intended to reinforce the authority of the prince while, at the same time, reducing the desirability for plunder of the soldier in his service. The desire of Gerson, Clamanges and others for regular and adequate payment of soldiers as we shall see, was directed towards the need to reduce the soldier's dependence on plunder. The payment of wages and the surrender of booty, however, could only have alleviated the suffering of innocent bystanders in war, but they could never have eliminated it. Wars could still be waged for the acquisition of property, both movable and immovable, and rights over this property, however readjusted, would still be highly desirable. Bouvet asserts that, although the captor must hand over his booty to the 'duke of the battle', the duke should then 'share the spoils out among his men, to each according to his valour' (4:43). The incentive to plunder therefore still remained, and the only way of protecting innocent parties was by definition and enforcement of their legal immunity. Furthermore, Bouvet had so far only considered the soldier who was entitled to, if not actually in receipt of, wages. There were many, however, who, though actively engaged in the profession of arms, neither received nor expected to receive wages from any public authority. 1

1. Such, for example, was the routier captain Kérigot Marchès who, while claiming to be in the service of Richard II, neither received, nor was offered, wages by any public authority. See M. Keen, The Laws of War in the Late Middle Ages (London, 1965), pp. 97-100.
The routier, or freebooting soldier had to be eliminated, just as the immunities of non-combatants had to be safeguarded, before an equitable solution could be reached. The theoretical basis for such a solution was provided by the doctrine of the 'Just War'.

Theoretically the basis for such a solution was provided by the doctrine of the 'Just War'.

The doctrine of the just war, worked out by generations of canonists and theologians from the foundations laid by Aristotle and St. Augustine, has been the object of much scholarship over the last century, notably that of Ernest Nys, Alfred Vanderpol and Maurice Keen. Definitions of the just war were provided by Augustine himself, by Raymond of Pennafort, Hostiensis, Monaldus, John of Legnano, Baldus de Ubaldis, Cynus of Pistoia and by Thomas Aquinas. The definition provided by Bouvet, however limited in conception and muddled in execution, must be the object of our attention here. The Tree, as we have remarked, is drawn from the mainstream of contemporary legal literature and was itself the source for later works, notably for the Levison-Christine and the Fais d'armes of Christine de Pisan.

War, according to Bouvet, is in the nature of things: it has arisen on account of certain things displeasing to the human will,

2. A. Vanderpol, Le Droit de Guerre d'après les théologiens et les canonistes du moyen-âge (Paris, 1911); and La Doctrine Scolastique de droit de guerre (Paris, 1919).
3. M. Keen, Laws of War, pp. 63-81
to the end that such conflict should be turned into agreement and reason..." (1:1). Antipathies and conflicts are as natural to the human world as they are to other elements in the universe, both animate and inanimate, because 'everything is inclined by its nature to contradict its evil form' (3:2; 4:1). War is not only natural but it accords with the law of reason, as embodied in the Canon and Civil laws, and with Divine law as revealed in the Old Testament, where God is shown not only to have permitted war but also to have ordered and encouraged it, (4:1). Clearly, since war was backed by such impeccable credentials, the evils and injustices which so often attended it were not part of its nature but rather the results of misconduct and abuse. 'And if in war', Bouvet explains, 'many evil things are done, they never come from the nature of war itself but from false usage; as when a man-at-arms takes a woman and does her shame and injury, or sets fire to a church'; (4:1).

In chapter 79 of the Tree's fourth part, Bouvet divides war into three categories: the 'wars of princes', war in self-defence and the wars of reprisal, or marque, and shows in this and in other chapters, how the conditions which regulated their conduct differed in particular instances. Such wars could be waged according to justice and reason, or they might be perverted, through scant regard for such principles, into illegal acts of violence. The distinction was between just and unjust war, and the basis of this distinction, according to the Tree of Battles, was a three-fold one. The justice of a war should be measured according to the legitimacy of the objectives pursued, of the parties engaged in it, and of the manner in which it is conducted.

Clearly the use of violence in self-defence was legitimate—a serf may defend himself against the lord who wishes to kill him (4:73);
and, in like circumstances, the monk may defend himself against his abbot, the son against his father, the accused against wrongful judgement, the exile against arrest (4:73-77). If self-defence was a legitimate cause for violence, so was the defence of one's lord, one's family and one's property (4:23-4 & 64-9), but the boundaries between legitimate defence and unjust offence had to be strictly drawn and observed. The 'law allows all just defence, so long as it does not pass beyond the bounds of the offence. If a man tries to strike me with his hand and I, being as big as he, tried to strike him with a lance or an arrow, this would not be a due or proportionate defence...' (4:44, also 71). The same sort of conditions applied in the case of reprisal, where the injured party was compensated only to the extent of the initial loss or injury, and no further (4:79).

In addition to the right of the individual to make war in his own defence, the Church had the special right to initiate war against the German emperor and against the Saracens and Jews, but only where they constituted an active threat to Christian society (4:2, 6, 63).

The question of which parties were permitted to initiate and to engage in war received, in the Tree, a relatively simple and straightforward answer. 'According to written law a man cannot ordain or decide on war if he is subject to any lords, so that he who decides on war should have no sovereign' (4:82, also 4). The prince's assent was implicit in wars of self-defence, but in every other case—including that of marque and reprisal—explicit authorisation was required. The question of who was, and who was not, a sovereign prince received rather equivocal treatment from Bouvet, but he
clearly felt that the pope, the emperor and the king of France conformed to this definition (4:6, 83), even if the kings of England and of Spain were more doubtful cases (4:84). Although a sovereign prince was entitled to initiate offensive and defensive war, and although his subjects were bound to aid him in this war (4:15-7), there were certain classes of people who could not be compelled to participate. Clerks should not take up arms, asserts Bouvet, for 'the clerical estate and office is separate from all war, for the service of God to which clerks belong makes them unfit to carry the arms and harness of temporal battles' (4:97 - though this is somewhat contradicted by 4:35). Also 'separate from all war' were old people, children, women and the infirm, and these too could not be compelled to take up arms (4:70).

Most of the remaining chapters of the Tree were concerned with the thorny question of how wars should properly be conducted. Bouvet outlines the procedure whereby letters of marque should be granted by the prince to an individual (4:80-1), and how in all types of war prisoners should be ransomed at a reasonable cost (4:46-7); how safeconducts should be observed in the spirit as well as in the letter (4:57), and how deceit is to be shunned (4:49); how fighting during feast and rest days should be discouraged (4:50) and how it should be severely punished and actively prohibited during periods of truce (4:103-4). But these questions of military conduct are given summary treatment in comparison to that which is devoted to the question of immunities.

In the case of war between, for example, the kings of France and England in which the English subjects give their king aid and contenance, 'the French can make war on the English people and take their possessions and lands and all that they can seize, without
being required, in the sight of God, to return them' (4:48). It is inevitable that during such a war 'the humble and innocent' will occasionally suffer harm and loss. Furthermore, in the case of marque and reprisal, innocence of the crime offers no security against injury, 'for on this theory one person suffers loss for another, and receives damage and molestation for the deed of another...' (4:79). The possibilities, however, of a loose interpretation of the words 'aid and countenance', and of a casual attitude towards the sufferings of innocent folk in time of war, are completely excluded by Bouvet's firm and unequivocal definition of immunities.

'Ox-herds, and all husbandmen, and ploughmen with their oxen, when they are carrying on their business, and equally when they are going to it or returning from it, are secure; according to written law' (4:100), and 'neither emperor, king; duke nor count, nor any person whatsoever can excuse himself from keeping this law...’ (4:102). It is also 'a very terrible act of war' to attack a foreign student (4:86 & 90), his servants (87), his father (88) or his brother (89) who attend or visit him. It is also forbidden under any circumstance to lay violent hands on the infirm and the insane (91; 92, 95); on the very old and the very young (93-4); on ambassadors, on clerks and on pilgrims (96-99). All these categories of people are entitled by their very status to the highest and most binding safeconduct of all: namely, the 'safeguard of the Holy Father of Rome'. The infringement of such a security is a mortal sin and may be punished by excommunication (4:99).

Twenty of the last twenty-two chapters in the Tree are concerned with the details of duels and of coats of arms, and are of such a specialized nature that they need not detain us here. The fact that the question of trial by combat was considered at all is, however,
worth remarking. Combat, as Bouvet points out, is contrary to
Divine law because it 'tempts God' by requiring him to intervene;
to the Law of Nations (droit de gens), because it is contrary to
reason that the guilty 'should be absolved and he who is innocent
condemned, as may often happen in wager of battle'; to Civil law
because this law has instituted judges, courts and legal procedures
which are by-passed by combat; and to Canon law because the pope
has expressly forbidden trial by combat (4:111). Bouvet does,
however, proceed to describe the cases in which 'wager of battle'
is permissible, because, in this case 'at least, 'worldly customs
and usages' (les coustumes et usaiges du monde) take precedence
over written law (4:112). Such all-important customs which in this
case, as in that of marque and reprisal (4:79), overrule the Tree's
acknowledged foundations in written law (p. 79), should be considered
here because they point to some important conclusions about the
nature of the Tree of Battles itself.

The worldly customs and usages to which Bouvet referred in
chapter 112 of the fourth part were emphatically not the practices
and customs of ordinary soldiers. Bouvet had nothing but contempt
for such practices and certainly did not consider them to have the
force of law. When discussing the privileges of students and their
relatives, Bouvet remarks that '...this opinion is held to be true
by many of our doctors and masters, although in practice soldiers
perhaps hold the opposite' (4:88). The Tree is full of cases
in which the 'law' asserts one thing and soldiers do the reverse,
but in which the law remains unaltered and as binding as ever. The
law, for example, demands that ransoms should be reasonable but
'the soldiery of today do the opposite...' (4:47); battles should
not normally be fought on feast days but Bouvet doubts whether the
'soldiery of today' will take any heed of this law (4:50), and he allows himself similar doubts in the cases of safe-conducts (4:57) and immunities (4:102). Bouvet despised the soldiery of his own day; he felt that they were decadent (4:132), eager to find flaws and loop-holes in the law (4:58), and that their role in this world was like that of the 'devils of hell' in the other (4:54). It was clearly not their customs and usages which had the authority to overrule written law.

Towards the end of March, 1563, a duel took place before King John II of France at Villeneuve-les-Avignon between the Gascon lord, Amanieu de Pommiers, and the Frenchman, Foulque d'Archiac. The duel itself was inconclusive, and it is mentioned only in passing by the chroniclers who are mainly interested in the celebrations which accompanied John's taking of the cross.1 Bouvet may have been in Avignon at the time, and was sufficiently interested in the duel to recall the affair twenty-five years later in the Tree of Battles. There had been a dispute between Urban V, who wished to ban the duel, and King John who was determined that it should be held. 'Although the pope wished to keep the laws laid down by the Decretals, and commanded that no one, under pain of excommunication, should be present at the combat, yet the King did not refrain from having the combat carried out, and was unwilling to act to the prejudice of royal customs.' (5:1), (cousumes royaulx).2 Thus when Bouvet talks respectfully of 'worldly' customs and usages

2. The 'cousumes royaulx' in France regarding duels were defined in an ordinance of Philippe the Fair of 1306. Ordonnances des Rois de France de la 3e race, vol. 1, pp. 435-41.
he refers only to those practices which the secular authority was prepared to permit and to support. The legality of marque and reprisal is supported not because any written law allows the innocent person to suffer for his guilty colleague, but because it is a 'kind of war which princes for long have been using commonly throughout the world' (4:79).

The secular prince is, in fact, never far from the centre of the stage in the Tree of Battles. The work was written for the king of France, it emphasised the public authority of the prince as against the private rights of individuals, showed that he alone was permitted to make war and that only those customs which had secured his approval had the force of law. The soldier is entitled under normal circumstances to demand wages in return for his services, but, at the same time he must be subject at all times to the control and discipline of the prince, for 'no man should, or may, bear arms without the licence of the prince' (4:4). Furthermore, the Tree's appeal for the just and proper conduct of wars and battles was directed not towards the knight, with his sense of personal honour, but towards the king, with his sense of royal majesty. When discussing breaches of truce Bouvet remarks that it 'would strike sufficient fear to all soldiers if they knew such rules, and felt that the King was a prince who did justice severely' (4:104). When dealing with the disgraceful practice of imprisoning and ransoming old men, women and children Bouvet remarked that 'if the King found a remedy for this' God would assist him (4:94).

With these considerations in mind, it should be possible to explain why Honoré was accepted into that Parisian circle 'de nobles esprits qui, Gerson en tête, dirigeaient véritablement l'opinion
They might also help to explain the amazing popularity of the Tree among the aristocracy of fifteenth-century Europe, and to determine the accuracy with which it has been judged and described in later literature.

CHAPTER FOUR

Literature of the Hundred Years War

and of the Crusade

Part I: up to the death of Charles V, (1380)
There were very few in the fourteenth century who wrote about war and failed to notice, or chose to ignore, its evil effects. Of these few, most had restricted themselves to recording 'les oeuvres d'armes et chevaleries, vertus, bonnes meurs, belle vie et bonne fin'\(^1\) of such eminent figures as the Black Prince,\(^2\) Jean le Meingre, dit Boucicaut,\(^3\) and Louis II, duke of Bourbon. The chroniclers of chivalry, dominated throughout this century and the beginning of the next by Jean le Bel, Froissart and Monstrelet, who had set out to record 'les grans merveilles et li biau faits d'armes qui s'ont avenu par les grans guerres de France et d'Engleterre',\(^4\) necessarily presented the wars in a favourable light. They do, however, occasionally show their awareness of the nasty side to war, and Froissart expressed himself so vigorously on the subject that he has even been called a 'pacifist'.\(^5\) This literature, which reflected the ideals and values of a particular social class, and did not seek to change and reform, will not be examined in very much detail here. Nor will the official propaganda, designed to boost morale, or to allay

---

the suspicions of tax-payers, such as the letters of expeditionary commanders circulated by the English chancery. ¹ The literature which we shall be examining will, on the whole, be free of the inhibitions and restraints which the authors of chivalric chronicles and of military dispatches imposed upon themselves, and will be the result of genuinely critical observation.

Such literature, produced especially by the Hundred Years War, was confined to no single period of the fourteenth century, nor to any particular geographical area. If we are to accept Mr. Whiting’s interpretation of the Vows of the Heron, we must conclude that a bitter anti-war burlesque poem was produced in the very first years of the Anglo-French war. ² By 1346, at Alvastra in southern Sweden, St. Bridget had a vision of two fierce animals fighting over the kingdom of France, and was commanded to ‘arise...and make peace between the kings of France and England, who are like two fierce wild beasts’. ³ Nevertheless, it seems that most of the genuinely critical commentary on the war in the fourteenth century, is concentrated in two main periods: from the battle of Poitiers to the Treaty of Brétigny, (1356-60), and from the death of Charles V up


to, and beyond, the end of the century. It is, moreover, confined mainly to France and to England.

The political literature of the post-Poitiers years is almost entirely French, and was the direct product of the French defeat at Maupertuis and the capture of King John II. The exceedingly bitter, and slightly hysterical, Parisian clerk who produced the *Complainte sur la bataille de Poitiers* accuses the French knights of monstrous cowardice, arrogance and dishonesty in the face of the English enemy. 1 They are, he maintained, more prepared to strut around in 'vesture deshoneste', with golden belts around their waists and feathers in their hats, than to finish the war with England by a decisive battle. The Italian friar, Francis of Monte-Belluna, newly arrived at the Benedictine monastery of Dijon, also accused the French nobles of decadence and cowardice, but as part of a general decline in moral standards. 2 He commented on the disgrace to the France of Charles Martel, of Clovis and of Charlemagne, that a handful of barbarians have entered their territory and carried off their king. The foreign enemy (locusta), however, has only obtained such triumphs thanks to the internal disorder produced by a collapse of moral standards among all classes of French society. The 'barbarian invasion' theme was taken up by another Italian, Petrarch,

---


who watched with horror from Milan as the 'barbarian' English 'who once could (not make head) against even the vile Scots captured the wretched, undeserving French king...and then laid waste his whole kingdom with fire and sword'.¹

Some writers of this period obtained even more direct and personal experience of the 'English'. Hugues de Montgeron, prior of Braillet, was forced to flee from his home to the woods when the 'English' of Chantecoq arrived on 31 October 1358. His agonised account of the terrible winter which followed, and which he managed to scribble into his sermon-book, is a vivid and shocking one.²

Jean de Venette, theologian and head of the French Carmelite order, lamenting the 'loss by fire of the village where I was born, Venette near Compiègne', began to write his chronicle of the period in 1359.³ Like the authors of the Complaints, Venette linked the 'luxury and dissoluteness of many of the nobles and knights' with the defeat at Poitiers and the consequent catastrophe in France, when the 'nobles dooped and hated all others and took no thought for the mutual usefulness and profit of lord and man'.⁴ The bitter comments of so many of these French churchmen were no more literary or sermon conventions which were rehearsed as a matter of habit, without deep

⁴ Ibid., pp. 62-66.
conviction. We know, for example, that when Jean de la Ferté-Fresnel, who had been captured by the Navarrese soon after the battle of Poitiers, returned home to raise his ransom, he was set upon by the peasants of Lyre near Evreux who cried out, 'Here are the traitors who, out of malice, deserted the host!' If ever the literature of the fourteenth century reflected 'public opinion', it was the literature produced during this period.

It is understandable that during a period of defeat and national humiliation (for such it was considered), there is no desire expressed in any of this literature for a permanent settlement with England to avoid the horrors of further bloodshed. Venette, it is true, welcomed the Treaty of Brétigny as 'that peace so long desired', but, before it was actually concluded, the tone of his chronicle is as nationalistic and as anti-English as that of the Complainte. Reinforced by prophecies of the astrologer Jean de Kurs, of Jean de Roquetaillade, and others, these writers easily transferred the war with England into a biblical setting in which the rôles were precast. John II is represented as the Jewish patriot, Judas Maccabée, struggling to defend the temple of Jerusalem against the Syrian king, Antiochus. Edward III is described variously as the second Antiochus and the prince of locusts, as one who could barely be recognised among the brotherhood of Christians. For the


2. Venette, Edward III a 'second Antiochus', p. 96. The two Books of the Maccabees, which describe the history of the Jews in the 2nd. and 1st. century B.C., form part of the Apocrypha.

French writers of this period, military victory rather than peaceful settlement was the goal.

The aggressive anti-English theme, shorn of its rather quarrelous and self-critical undertones, was renewed in the French literature of the 1370s, when Charles V and his brother, Louis of Anjou, were directing a dramatic military recovery. Shortly after the reopening of hostilities in 1369, the lawyer and future royal councillor, Raoul de Presle, produced his *Traité de l'Ogriflamme* which describes how God and Saint-Deny would lead Charles V to victory over the English.¹ It begins, characteristically, with a reference to the 'Histoire du Livre des Machabees', and shows how Charles will be victorious over his rebellious vassal if he places his confidence in God, and in the symbols of divine assistance: 'the *Auriflamme*' and the 'unction celestielle' with which he has been anointed. A few years later, the author of *La Royale du Monde* took the king and his council to task for being 'ai bonte qu'il n'osent assaillir Angletorro...² The French Crown, he continues, has a sufficiency of human and material resources to punish the fierce English tyrants, and to make England, 'cette isole assez petite', tremble for very fear. The confident, though not uncritical, tone of the *Royale* is developed in the famous Sonce du Verric which


2. *La Royale du Monde*, Trinity Hall (Cambridge), ms.12, fos.100-143. This quotation is taken from f.108. The book would appear to have been written by a clerk, (the author is portrayed as such in the illustrations), and for Charles V, between 1371 and 1376. (Dr. J. Laidlaw, of Trinity Hall, intends to publish this work).
was completed, under the direction of Charles V himself, in 1378. Reinforced with the statements of the Bolognese jurists, Richard of Saliceto and John of Legnano, the knight in the song asserts the justice of the French war aims and the entitlement of Charles V to the conquests which he had already secured. Addressing himself to the king, the rather sycophantic 'chevalier', asserts that never since 'Rolant, Artus ne Olivier feissent plus du mestier d'armes que tu as fait faire de ton temps...'.

In England the French situation was reversed. The buoyant spirit of Laurence Hinot, whose verses recorded a succession of English victories from the early-1330s to the early-1350s, was transformed by the grim news from the expeditionary forces under Lancaster, Knowles and others during the 1370s. The 'treachery' of the Gascon lords in 1368, made the English of the Black Prince's court see deceit all around them. The herald of one of his principle captains, Sir John Chandos, reported that in 1368 there 'began falsehood and treason to govern those who ought to have loved (the Prince)'. With the Black Prince's death in 1376, and that of his father a year later, there disappeared two of the great English war-leaders. An


2. Songe du Verrier, ed. Brunet, p. 6


anonymous poem of the late-1370s portrays England as a derelict ship whose rudder (Edward III), helmsman (the Black Prince) and mast (the good commons who voted war subsidies), had all now been lost. ¹ English preachers turned the same scathing epithets on their own soldiers which had served so well for the French of a previous generation. 'Is not', asked Bishop Thomas Brinton from his pulpit at Rochester, 'the hand of English knighthood once strong and gracious, now feeble?'. ² The Dominican, and future chancellor of Cambridge University, John Bromyard, elaborated on the age-old theme of knights who are 'liouns in halle and hares in the feld'. In defence of their own country 'they are timorous, cowardly and fugitive, allowing the enemy to devastate the land, to plunder and to pillage,...'. ³ The monk, Ripon, added his voice to the chorus of criticism, and showed how the knights of his day were given over more to wantonness and to self-display than to 'the busines of wars and the endurance of labours'. ⁴

The literature produced by the first forty-or-so years of the war between Plantagenet and Valois, though not unconstructive in its content, tended to follow traditional paths. Much of the vitriol of the French Complaints and the English sermons was poured out of the old bottles which had been so amply stocked by Peter of Blois

⁴. Ibid., p. 332.
and John of Salisbury in the twelfth century, and which had been replenished by generations of preachers over the last two centuries. This may partly be due to the type of literature which has survived, the work almost entirely of churchmen who were constantly anxious to remind the military class that it was its duty to defend them. One is also conscious that this literature is the literature of crisis, the product of a situation in which military victories or disasters were recent or imminent, and in which a military solution to the conflict appeared to be genuinely possible. It tended, in consequence, to reflect very closely the ups and downs of national fortunes in the war, and to be concerned almost exclusively with the strength and weakness of knights in battle. The feature more than any other which transformed the literature of war in the last two decades of the century was the prospect of a permanent peace settlement between France and England.

The death of the French constable, Bertrand du Guosclin, on 13 July 1380, and that of Charles V some two months later, created in France the same kind of national disorientation which had accompanied the deaths of Edward III and his son in England. The myth of the golden age of Charles V had already been created by the literati of his own court: by the author of the Songe du Vergier for example. In 1377, it had also appeared in the Songe de Pestilence where a distinction was made between the period of national disaster of 1341-1362 and the era which followed, and which was characterized

by the wise administration of Charles V and the military triumphs
of Du Guesclin, 'the eagle of the west'.\textsuperscript{1} The poet, Eustache Des-
champs, was the first to associate Du Guesclin with the 'neuf preux',\textsuperscript{2}
and was convinced that the deaths of Urban V (1370), of the Emperor
Charles IV (1379) and of Charles V of France marked the end of a
golden age.\textsuperscript{3} The national obsequies, and the social upheavals
which followed them on both sides of the Channel, reinforced the
idea not only of a new epoch, but one from which no good could come.
Only gradually, and particularly after the resumption of peace
negotiations at Leulinghen in 1388, did men begin to realize that
the disappearance of a generation of war-leaders opened up the
possibility of a final peace between the boy-kings of France and
England.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Les livres du Roy Modus et de la Royne Ratio}, ed. in 2 vols.
G. Tilander (Paris, 1932), vol. ii, 'Le Songe de l'estilence',
pp. 203-10.
\item I.S. Laurie, \textit{Eustache Deschamps}, p. 48.
\item \textit{Oeuvres Completes}, ed. Saint-Hilaire, vol. i, fol. CLXV:
'Dons doivent bien pleurer les Christiens / Le pappe Urbain,
l'empeureur et le Roy / Qui en brief temps sont trempasse/
tuit troy'.
\end{enumerate}
CHAPTER FOUR

Literature of the Hundred Years' War
and of the Crusade

Part II: towards an Anglo-French peace settlement,

(c. 1386 - c. 1400)
Until late in 1387, the chances of an end to the Anglo-French war seemed to be as remote as ever. In the early-June of 1385 a Franco-Scottish army under the French admiral, Jean de Vienne, was preparing to invade England from the north, while another French army under the constable de Clisson, and the marshal de Sancerre, was planning a descent on the southern coast. In the following year, an English army under John of Gaunt was preparing with Portugal for an attack on France's ally in Castile, while an enormous French army was concentrating at Sluys for an invasion of England. In October 1386, the peace-loving English chancellor, Michael de la Pole, was impeached, and the war party, headed by Gloucester and Arundel, was brought to power. In the following month, Richard II, rejected the possibility of negotiations with France "considerez comment notre dit adversaire a assemblez grande navie pur entrer oveaque grande force de gentz notre roiaume..." 1 In the spring of 1387 an English army under Arundel arrived in Brittany, and in the early-summer yet another French invasion force under Clisson and Vienne was ready to embark from the Breton and Norman ports. Eustache Deschamps, who had taken part in many of these invasion preparations, was enthusiastic:

"Princes, passez sans point de demouree,

Vostros sera le pays d'Angleterre,

Autre fois l'a un Normant conquêtée;...


Nevertheless, by the summer of 1388, the situation had been dramatically altered.¹ Gaunt's settlement with Castile, finalized at the treaty of Bayonne on 8 July 1388, and his consequent renunciation of the Castilian Crown, removed one major obstacle to an Anglo-French peace and, at the same time, the duke's support for the war policy of the Appellants. Gloucester's ambitious plans for a three-pronged invasion of France came to grief in the early-summer of 1388, thanks to the lack of financial support from parliament. In France, the extraordinary failure of three successive invasion plans, combined with a lack of enthusiasm for the war on the part of the royal uncles who saw their interests elsewhere, prepared the way for a settlement. The period between 18 June 1389 and September 1394 was, in fact, one of uninterrupted truce, and truce, as Bouvet reminds us, signifies 'hope of peace, for during the truce ways and means of reconciling and pacifying the two sides are sought.'² A 'hope of peace' between England and France could be entertained thanks to the proposal for a Lancastrian duchy of Aquitaine held in fief of the French Crown. It was not until 1394 that this plan had to be shelved due to Gascon resistance. That 'ways and means' towards a reconciliation were actively sought during this period is indicated by the density of high-level peace negotiations during the early-1390s. Jean Juvenal des Ursins reported, some time later, that many of those meetings


² Tree, ed. Coopland, p. 190.
which took place in the north-east of Franco were accompanied by high winds and storms. At the sight of this, 'they who knew and understood the true love which bound the two parties, concluded and believed firmly that the devil of hell, enemy of peace, was responsible for the said tempests because he was angry that he had not been able to prevent the conclusion of a peace.' Clearly the devil felt, like everybody else, that the war was over.

New men appeared at the royal courts on either side of the Channel whose eloquent advocacy of peace and the crusade was eagerly attended by the young monarchs. Leo VI, dispossessed of his Armenian kingdom by the advancing Turks, arrived from Aragon at the French court in June 1384. His enthusiastic reception bears witness to the fact that even by this early date a final peace settlement was seriously contemplated. The French Crown showered him with gifts, granted him a monthly pension of 500 livres and lodged him in the magnificent 'noble maison de Saint-Cuen'; while Richard II in January 1386 also furnished him with fine presents and a substantial annual pension. Although the English taxpayers did grumble, there can be little doubt that the constant efforts of the King of Armenia to secure a settlement until his death in 1393, repayed the investment. A year or two before Leo's death, Robert le Hennot, 'the Hermit', arrived in France from the East and, from August 1392 onwards, was continually

2. On Leo VI of Armenia see L. Hirot, Tentative d'invagination, p. 436 et seq.; and Perroy, Diplomatie Correspondence, pp. 208-61.
employed as ambassador between the courts of Westminster and Paris. Leo and Robert the Hermit were only two of that constant stream of messengers, and diplomats, and would-be arbitrators who braved the rough seas of the Channel and the storms of Leulingham and Guines in order to secure the agreement which had eluded lawyers and diplomats for a century.

Disenchantment with the war at the courts of Richard II and of Charles VI soon had an effect on the literature of the period and the bellicosity of, for example, the Songe du Verger, was no longer fashionable. In one of his ballads, Deschamps, who had once been a champion of the aggressive French policy, and who was always something of a weathercock in the changing climate of French politics, had the three Estates of England and France appeal to the two kings for peace. The wars, they said, had lasted for fifty years, feeding on mutual jealousy and greed, and had caused the destruction of 'cities, castles, towns, lands and palaces'. The young kings should not allow the destruction which was permitted 'ou temps passé par voz peres'. The idea that the war with England had lasted too long, and that a new generation had arrived, represented by the young kings of France and England who were innocent of the war, began to establish a firm hold in the political literature of the late-1380s and 1390s. In Nézières' Songe du Vieil Pelerin of 1389, Queen Truth addresses some harsh words to Richard's uncles, ('les grans Sangliers Noirs'), who were

2. Oeuvres Complètes, ed. Saint-Hilaire, vol. iii, balade CCCXCVI.
preventing their king ('le blanc Faucon couronné') from concluding a treaty with his brother across the Channel, ('le gracieux jeune Cerf Volant'). The queen asks them to remember, 'and not without tears, how the judgement of my Father approaches concerning the amount of human and Christian blood which your fathers have shed without measure on the earth. ...Who can count the souls which, in the time of the Old Pilgrim, over the last fifty years, you have sent to hell...?'¹ Such sentiments were incorporated into a letter, which was drafted by Mésibres, and sent by Charles VI in May 1395 to his 'très anc et frère', King Richard.² It describes the war 'de nos prédécesseurs' which has lasted for sixty years, and has brought nothing but murder, destruction and rape. By the grace of God, it continues, the two young monarchs 'innocens do l'effusion du sang de nos subdits' have been reserved the signal honour of bringing the evil war to a fitting conclusion.

In England there was a similar call for an end to the war with Franco. As early as 1370, 'John of Bridlington' had condemned Edward III for the slaughter of innocent people in France, ('propter occasione gentis innocentis in Francia'),³ and this was to become a powerful theme in English political literature until obliterated

---

¹ Le Souce du Vieil Pelerin, ed. in 2 vols. C.W. Coopland (Cambridge, 1969), vol. 1, p. 396. 'Il vous devroit souvenir et non sans larmes, car la jugement de mon Pere approche, du sang humain et creation que vos pores sans mesure ont capando en torre...Qui pourroit nombroir les ames lesquelles au temps du Vieil Pelerin vous avons mando ou envoyo en enfir depuis l. ans,...?'

² Published by Kervyn de Lettenhove, Oeuvres de Froissart, vol. xv, pp. 388-91. Porroy, Diplomatic Correspondence, p. 251, suggests that this letter was a 'literary exorcise' on the part of Robert the Hermit or Mésibres. J. Palmer, on the other hand, in his 'The Background to Richard II's Marriage to Isabel of Franco (1396)', in EHR, vol.xliv (May 1971), p. 8 et seq., shows that it was an actual communication between the two kings, and drafted by Mésibres.

³ Wright, Political Poems, vol. 1, p. 172. This particular Latin poem, written c. 1370, is of doubtful authorship.
in the euphoria created by the victories of Henry V. In his Confessio
Amentia, the Kentish gentleman and friend both of Richard II and of
Chaucer, John Gower, allowed himself to hope 'That god his grace
wolde sende To make of thilke werre an ends, ...'. In the first
year of the reign of Henry IV, he gave this advice to the usurper:

'What kyng that wolde be the worthieste,
The more he myghteoure dedly werre cesse,
The more he schulde his worthinesse encresse.'

Unlike most of the French literature, however, the English is
tinged with an element of outright pacifism: Langland, in the
Piers Plowman, expressed his hostility to all war, and looked for-
ward to the Second Coming when peace and harmony might reign. John
Wyclif, in his Tractatus de Officio Regis, explained that wars
between Christians were contrary to Divine and Natural law, that
such wars are wasteful and are prompted by motives of avarice and
pride. His lead was followed, and taken to further extremes, by
some of the Lollard preachers: notably by Walter Brut and William
Swinderby.


2. Ibid., vol. iii, p. 483. 'Poem to King Henry IV in Praise of
   Peace'.
3. William Langland, Piers Plowman, ed. E. Salter & D. Pearsall
4. Iohannis Wyclif, Tractatus de Officio Regis, ed. A. Pollard
5. C.T. Allmand, 'The War and the Non-combatant', in The Hundred
   Years War, ed. K. Fowler (1971), pp. 175-6. On Brut and
   Swinderby, see W.W. Capes, The English Church in the 14th. and
Honore Bouvet did not, of course, adhere to the extreme positions adopted by some of his English contemporaries. Had he not asserted in the Tree of Battles that 'war is not an evil thing, but is good and virtuous'? He does not, at the same time, deny the proposition that 'if all men were wise and good it would be impossible for them to live in peace' (119), and it is difficult to believe that he did not have the Hundred Years War in mind when he wrote: 'I see all holy Christendom so burdened by wars and hatreds, robberies and dissensions, that it is hard to name one little region, be it duchy or county, that enjoys good peace' (79). Bouvet took part in the peace negotiations of the early-1390s and must surely have been excited by the prospect of a termination of this long war. In the Tree he describes how a Gascon centenarian was captured by a French knight and taken before the king of France whom he addressed in these words: "Sire...you and my lord the king of England have had many great wars together which have already lasted long, for they began when I was still very young in years. And now that I am very old they are not yet finished;..." (184). For this ancient citizen of Bordeaux, and perhaps for Bouvet himself, the war between England and France had somehow lost its way in the mists of time and had become a meaningless and burdensome irrelevancy. In the beginning, said Bouvet in his interpolation to the Tree, the king of England called himself king of France, 'and I find that because of this quarrel there was very great war between

1. Tree, ed. Coopland, p. 125. The numbers in brackets below refer to page nos. of this edition.
the two kings such that I believe it has not yet been terminated. May God by his grace give them good peace.‘ (297).

Bouvet did, therefore, have no low opinion of the value and the benefits of peace, and was interested, at the very least, in the possibility of an Anglo-French settlement. The author of the *Tree* is, however, slightly detached from the latter problem. The Gascon Burgess speaks of the war as the affair of two distant kings, and Bouvet himself is of much the same mind: ‘May God, give them good peace’. The prior had little direct experience of the Anglo-French war. Jean de Venette, Eustache Deschamps and Philippe de Mésières had all personally suffered from the war through the burning of their homes and villages by English armies. Deschamps called himself ‘Brûlé des Champs’ to commemorate the destruction of his house by Buckingham in 1380, and Venette and Mésières both commented wistfully on the state of their devastated homelands. The prior may, as a boy, have heard rumours of Lancaster’s campaigns in Gascony, Poitou and the Toulousain, and of the battles of Croy and Poitiers; as a young novice at Ile-Barbe in 1358-9 he may have come uncomfortably close to the English captain, Robert Knowles. Nevertheless, the prior’s worst experiences of war had little or no connection with the major war between England and France, and often took place precisely when that war was in its least active state. It was, for example, during the period covered by the truce of Bordeaux that one of the conservators of that truce, Arnaud de Cervole, the ‘Archpriest’, entered Provence with his company of freebooting soldiers. A few years later, the towns with which Bouvet and his family had been familiar: Embrun, Sisteron and Avignon, were transformed by new walls, ditches and pallisades, while Lyons was besieged by the ‘Tardvenus' of
'le Petit-Nechin' and of the notorious Seguin de Badofol. 1

The Tree of Battles is a good example of the limited quality of French 'pacifism' in this period. It contains descriptions of many of the horrors which were attendant on war: the destruction of property and the tyranny of the strong over the weak, but it does not condemn war in principle. Christine de Pisan exclaimed, in her Livre de Paix, 'O! quel chose est aujourd'hui au monde plus délicable que paix?', 2 but, in another work, she provided advice on how armies should be drawn up for battle and how towns may be starved into submission. 3 The author of the Songe du Vercel remarks that 'paix doit estre la chose plus désirée on ce monde', but recalls with pride Charles V's victories in Spain, in Brittany and in Guienne. 'Tu es Roy de grant victoire, tu es le Roy paisible'. 4 A reconciliation between such apparent incongruities was provided by the doctrine of the Just War, a doctrine which made very clear, theoretical, distinction between brigandage and wars waged in the correct manner and for the right reasons. It was a doctrine whose subtlety was easily smudged and distorted by the forces of nationalism. Coluccio Salutati, who, it must be remembered, was a powerful influence on Jean de Montroïl and the

3. In the Livre des Faits d'Armes et de Chevalerie of c. 1409.
French humanists, exclaimed in one of his epistles:

'Thou knowest not how sweet is the *amor patriae*: if such would be expedient for the fatherland's protection or enlargement, it would seem neither burdensome and difficult nor a crime to thrust the axe into one's father's head, to crush one's brothers, to deliver from the womb of one's wife the premature child with the sword.'

Another important limitation on French 'pacifism' of the late-fourteenth century was that, in general, it applied only in relations between Christians and specifically excluded the 'Saracen'. In fact, a very large proportion of the literature which so persistently advocated peace between England and France, described, as one of the greatest benefits of such a peace, a massive crusade against the Turk.

---

CHAPTER FOUR

Part III: the Crusade
When Charles VI's queen, Isabella of Bavaria, entered Paris for the first time in 1389 several pageants were arranged for her benefit, and one which particularly caught the attention of the ageing poet, Jean Froissart was a representation of the third crusade. Mounted on scaffolding in the middle of a street through which Isabella would pass, was a castle whose battlements were defended by Saladin and his men. Below them was the Christian army dominated by the figure of Philip Augustus who was surrounded by twelve peers of France, each magnificently arrayed in his own coat of arms. 'And when the queen of France [Isabella] had been carried forward on her litter to a position in front of the scaffolding, King Richard [the first, of England] departed from his companions and, approaching the French king, begged leave to attack the Saracens which the king granted him...'. Six years earlier such a display of crusading fervour, (let alone one in which an English king played even a subordinate part), would have been unthinkable. In fact the only 'crusade' which took

1. 'Et quand la reine de France fut amenée si avant en sa litière que devant l'escharfaut ou ses ordonnances étaiant, le Roi Richard se départit de ses compagnons et s'en vint au roi de France et demanda congé pour aller assaillir les Sarracens, et le roi lui donna...'; Froissart, Chroniques, ed. J.A. Buchon, Collection des Chroniques nationales françaises, vol. xii (Paris, 1825), p. 11. Theatrical displays of this sort, to celebrate a royal entry into a town, were altogether new developments of the 1380s according to B. Gueneo & F. Lohoux, Les entrées royales françaises de 1328 à 1515 (Paris, 1968), p. 12.

2. Though something rather similar was staged at a royal banquet in Paris a few years earlier, in 1378, 'in which the towers of Jerusalem were defended by turbaned Saracens reciting prayers in Arabic and attacked by crusaders in moving boats who fell off scaling ladders to provide comic relief...'; Anthony Luttrell, 'The Crusade in the Fourteenth Century', in Europe in the Late Middle Ages, ed. J. Hale, J. Highfield & B. Smalley (London, 1965), p. 126.
place in 1383 was that of Henry Despenser, bishop of Norwich, against the French and their allies in Flanders. Significant changes must have taken place during the six intervening years to warrant such a change of heart.

One of the most important of these factors was the advance of the Ottoman Turks into the Balkans. While the Mameluke Sultans of Egypt consolidated their hold on Syria and even managed to annex the Christian kingdom of Armenia in 1375, the Ottomans were rapidly penetrating 'Europe' from the south-east. Their sultan, Murad I (1359-89), according to French pilgrims, had sworn to 'come to France when he had finished with Austria' and to turn the altar of St. Peter's in Rome into a manger for his horse. Having reached the Bosphorus in 1338, the Turks had taken advantage of the civil war in Byzantium between John Kantakouzenos and the Emperor John V to cross the water into Thrace. Anthony Luttrell has described the crusade throughout the fourteenth century as essentially a 'defensive struggle against Islam', but the last two decades of this century were a period of particular crisis. In the two years preceding Isabella's arrival in Paris the Turks had overrun Theassalonika and Bulgaria, and, in that very year of 1389, the Christian empire of Serbia was destroyed by Bayosid I at the battle of Koscovo. When Bouvet remarked in the Tree of Battles on the 'tribulation', of 'Holy Church' as a result of the Schism, and on the wars and hatreds which burdened Christendom, it was the menace from the east which gave to these problems a unique urgency.

---

1. On the crusade during this period, see especially A. Luttrell, op. cit., and A. Atiya, The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages (London, 1936).

It was no coincidence that all the major crusades of the second half of the fourteenth century took place during the intervals of the Anglo-French war. Crusading leaders like Humbert II de Viennois, Pierre I de Luasignan and Amadeus VI of Savoy took advantage of the treaty of Brétigny, while Louis II, duke of Bourbon, Henry of Derby and Jean de Nevers profited from the relative stability of the 1390s. Leo VI of Armenia, who had been a prisoner in Cairo from 1375 until 1382, arrived at the French court in 1384, and attempted with considerable success to impress upon the kings of England and France that 'par la guerre de France et d'Engleterre, laquelle a duré tant d'ans et tant de jours, sont les Sarrasins et les Turchs enorgueilllys...'. While the main threat to England and France continued to come from the other side of the Channel, however, their kings had to ensure that national energies in terms of men and resources, were not dissipated against the Turk. Jean Petit, in his *Livre du Champ d'Or* of 1389, described how French knights were waiting with impatience for such restrictions to be lifted in order to come to grips with the 'Saracen' in Hungary, Prussia and in Barbary.

The idea that war between Christians impeded the preparation of a crusade against the 'Saracen' was neither a very profound nor


a very original one. To go back no further than the beginning of the fourteenth century, Guillaume Durant advised the pope and the French king in 1313 to suppress all internal warfare and discussion within the Christian lands before embarking on a war against the infidel.1 Burcard dedicated in 1332 his Directorium to Philip VI of France, who had taken crusading vows at Helun on 25 July 1332. He expressed 'the joy of all on hearing the news of the king's decision', and urged an end to the wars between Aragon and Sicily, Genoa and Catalonia, which had deflected their aggressive energies away from the common enemy and towards their own ruin.2 The truth upon which so much of Burcard's advice had been based was demonstrated all too soon, and with terrible clarity, when, in 1336, Philip of Valois ordered the great crusading fleet out of Marseillou and into the Normandy ports whence it could be directed against England.

The Hundred Years War began only a few months later, on 24 May 1337.

Once the war had started, it was natural that the theme of Christians ruining themselves by wars and hatreds while the infidel pursued un molested his own sinister designs, should be intensified in the literature of both sides. While the war was at its most bitter, however, in the 1350s and 1370s, national energies on both sides of the Channel were directed towards the immediate danger—and even such ardent crusaders as Mésières were engulfed.3

---

1. Atiya, The Crusade, p. 69. Durant (1297-1328) was bishop of Mende, and the work referred to here is his Informacio brevis of c.1313.

2. Ibid., p. 100.

cry for Christian solidarity, during these periods, usually came from those not directly involved in the Anglo-French war, not notably from Petrarch\(^1\) and from St. Catherine of Siena,\(^2\) and also from the papal curia, prior to the Great Schism.\(^3\) At other periods, and particularly during the final decades of the century when a quiescent period of the war coincided with an aggressive and triumphant Islam, the situation was very different. The poet, Eustacho Doschamps, who had seen plenty of active military service, composed several ballads during this period reminding the princes and nobles of Europe that they were brothers, 'un peuple et une loi', and urging them to unite 'pour conquérir de obscure Sainte Torre'.\(^4\) Philippe de Mézières was one of the most systematic exponents of the 'brotherhood of all Christians' ideal during this period.

Mézières, who had travelled through much of Europe and the Near East in various capacities as soldier, diplomat and pilgrim, had been installed in the Celestine convent of Paris since 1372.\(^5\) His duties as one of Charles V's most intimate councillors, and as tutor to the dauphin, may have prevented Philippe from devoting himself wholeheartedly to literary pursuits. The king's death

---


5. The most complete study of Mézières is that of H. Jorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, op.cit.
in 1380 made him miserable and withdrawn. From 1394, however, the Anglo-French peace negotiations seemed to be taking a more constructive turn, towards a final settlement and a jointly-organized crusade. Mésibres immediately produced two new works, the first for nearly two decades, the Pèlerinage du pauvre pèlerin and the _statit Pèlerinage du pauvre pèlerin_. He followed these with a second redaction of his _Nova Religio Passionis_ in which he urged an end to the 'sixty' years of war between England and France, a concerted effort to heal the Schism, and the assembly of a vast, international crusading army organized on the basis of Philippe's own Order of the Passion. Since Mésibres fully realized the intimate connection between an Anglo-French peace, a settlement of the papal Schism and a crusade, it is not surprising that the four 'evangelists' of his order, Jean de Blaisy, Robert le Nennot, Louis do Giec and Otto de Granson, should have busied themselves in negotiations directly connected with all three objectives. King Leo of Armenia was also a close friend of Mésibres until the former's death on the 29 November 1393. This group, led by Mésibres, effectively promoted 'the vision of reunited Christendom led by England and France against the encroaching Turk.'

1. G. Gazor, 'Un manuscrit inédit de Philippe de Mésibres, retrouvé à Besançon', in _BFC_ (1919), pp. 101-08. M. Gazor describes a letter written by Mésibres for a nephew in 1391, in which he laments the death of Charles V and describes how miserable it has made the writer.

If the crusade could secure an end to the ancient rivalry between England and France and the removal of the most destructive elements in society, many would have felt that these benefits were tangible enough to make the whole enterprise worthwhile. An end to the papal schism was sometimes an additional, more often a paramount, consideration. In his Epiphany sermon Adorabunt, delivered before the king on 6 January 1591, Gerson posed the problem as one alternatives: the necessity to reunite the Church was of a greater urgency than that for any crusade against the Moslems.¹

Most other writers of this period, however, like Lévi-ès, treated these two causes as if they were interdependent. The Norman theologian, Jean Petit, in his Complainte de l'Eglise of 1592, has Holy Mother Church, 'ferme de grant lignago' complain of being torn between rival factions while the Saracens step in to finish her off; but she concludes that '...se jo suis gueirio Jo lui meuvray tolle bataille Quo guigneray toute Turquio.'² The political adventurer and royal secretary, Pierre Salmon, presented his Demandez to Charles VI in 1409, in which the latter is made to admit his responsibility for failing to check 'le très douloureux scisme'.

This Schism, he continues, has been the cause of many 'grans tribulations, divisions, guerras, mortalités'; and has, moreover, contributed to 'les victoires que ont eu le temps durant les infidels


2. Bibl.nat.fr. 12470, fos.2 (11.97-101) and 4v. (11.269-71). In the explicit on f.5, Petit himself dates this poem 1592, but Alfred Coville, Jean Petit: la question du tyrannicide au commencement du XVIe siècle (Paris, 1932), pp. 30-32, considers 8 April 1393 to January 1394 more likely.
sur les gens de nostre dit royaume.\textsuperscript{1} Salmon was as confident as Petit that when the Schism was over 'all Turkey could be won'.

Just as the desirability of a crusade acted, and was used, as an incentive in the more tedious business of concluding a peace treaty between France and England, and an end to the Schism, so also did it serve as a remarkable catalyst in the domain of military reform. The negative benefit derived from the crusade of removing troublesome soldiers from their native land was as attractive to the men of the fourteenth century as it had been to the men of the twelfth.\textsuperscript{2} Jean Petit, described in his Livre du Champ d'Or of 1389 the arrogant knights of his day, who attack and threaten peasants, who rape women and destroy property; and he goes on to suggest how well their destructive energies might be channeled against the infidel.\textsuperscript{3} Another French theologian, Nicolás de Clamanges, faced with the grim reality of civil war in 1411, urged those French princes who could never be content with peace to turn their eyes towards the infidel in Hungary, and in Spain.\textsuperscript{4} Even Lisidoro, who certainly felt more positively about the crusade than either Petit or Clamanges, did not disregard its incidental advantage of removing from the French scene

---


2. For examples of this attitude in the twelfth century, see H. Cowdrey, 'Pope Urban II's Preaching of the First Crusade', in \textit{History} (June, 1970), p. 182.


the Companies who otherwise gorged themselves on the 'sang des pauvres gens'. 1 Mézières did, however, realize that a successful crusade demanded careful preliminary organization and planning.

The formation of a disciplined and professionally competent army was vital to the success of any major crusade. This point was stressed by Guillaume Durant in his Informacio brevis of 1313, by Ramon Lul in his Liber de fine of 1305, and by Burcard in his Directorium. 2 Most of these authors, like Mézières himself, modelled their crusading armies on those of ancient Rome, and two of them at least used Vegetius freely. Philippe de Vitry's Chapel des Fleurs de Lis of 1335, composed for King Philip's projected crusade of that year, contains whole sections drawn directly from Vegetius, the ideal 'chevalier et clerc' and master of the 'art de chevalerie'; 3 Mézières, in his Sustance de la Chevalerie de la Passion of 1368, describes how the decadent effeminate chivalry of Christendom have allowed Jerusalem to be captured and destroyed by the 'moscreans Sarrasins', and how his new Order of the Passion seeks to remedy the situation by reforming 'les cretens, et par especial les hommes d'armes'. 4 He expresses his disgust of the way innumerable 'gens d'armes et de pie' make a habit of arriving at the royal host at their own expense, without 'maistres' or 'regle', and shows how this, and other, disorders 'a coustume es grans host' might be

2. Atiya, The Crusade, p. 70 (Durant), p. 81 (Lul) and p. 100 (Burcard).
eliminated from his own Order.¹ Even in this early work it is clear that Mézières was not content merely to propose a new crusading order, but was also anxious to see the rules of his Order imitated on a wider scale, wherever there were 'gens d'armes'. His ideal was to revive chivalry on the basis of Christian principles and Roman military technique, and it is therefore hardly surprising that in later works, particularly in the Songe du Vieil Pelerin (1389) and in the Epistre lamentable (1397), many of the regulations for the Order of the Passion were explicitly recommended for the reform of French chivalry. Thus, the fifteen rules 'de la discipline de chevalerie' which the 'Chambriere Magnificence' proposes to Charles VI of France, in the Songe,² have much in common with the 'causes pour lesquelles ceste Chevalerie de la Passion Jhesu Crist est necessaire', exposed in the Sustanco.³

It should be remarked, however, that in a work of the scope and complexity of the Songe du Vieil Pelerin, a simple interpretation of Mézières' proposals for military reform in terms of their usefulness for military success against the infidel, is not always appropriate. It is clear from this work that Mézières, like Monte-Belluna before him, felt that the reform of chivalry must be a part, albeit an important one, of the general, moral, reform of Christian society. Reform at home was the necessary prerequisite for military success abroad.

1. Ibid., pp. 49 & 50.
Honoré Bouvet had shown himself an ardent advocate and a diligent worker in the cause of Church unity, and the horrors of inter-Christian strife shocked and offended him. Nevertheless, he does not seem ever to have been prepared to concede the desirability of an aggressive war against the Saracens either to promote Christian unity or to destroy the infidel. For this reason, and on the basis of a chapter in the Tree of Battles, Professor Atiya has seen fit to compare Bouvet to Gower, Langland and Wyclif in their support for 'Raymond Lull's older view of peacefully winning the Muslim- danes to the Church by means of missionary activities instead of widening the gap between them and the Christians by the use of the sword'. Bouvet's argument for peaceful co-existence, Atiya continues, 'shows a turning point in the history of the crusading propaganda'. If Bouvet had indeed sponsored such ideas his position among contemporary French men of letters would certainly have been a unique one.

Bouvet's intimate knowledge of events in and around Avignon in the spring of 1363, suggests that he was present there when the kings of France, Denmark and Cyprus took the Cross. When the euphoria of the occasion gave way, two years later, to the futile bloodbath at Alexandria, the prior's natural horror of violence may have been intensified. In the Tree of Battles, more than twenty years later, Bouvet posed the question 'By what law or on what ground can war be made against the Saracens?', and in a somewhat equivocal answer he suggested that the pope might initiate a crusade only against those infidels who persecuted Christians or usurped their lands.

2. Tree, ed. Coopland, pp. 126-8. His ideas on the subject were derived from John of Legnano's Tractatus de bello, chapter XII.
The prior felt that a crusade organized to recover the Holy Land was a legitimate and laudable objective since Jerusalem naturally belonged to Christians. Bouvet, it is true, did doubt the scriptural authorization for the forcible conversion of unbelievers, but he expressed no confidence in the alternative role of 'preestes and preachours' which so excited Ramon Lul and some of Bouvet's English contemporaries. In fact, the prior of Solonnet expresses some doubt as to the value of a baptism, however obtained, where the Saracen convert 'may remain the man of that lord to whom he was bound before baptism...'.

It cannot be said, therefore, that Bouvet was either opposed in principle to the idea of a Holy War or was particularly interested in the idea of missions to the Saracens. The contrast with the English gentleman, John Gower, who presented his *Confessio Amantis* to Henry of Lancaster in 1395, is remarkable. In this work, Gower asks the chaplain Genius to say whether it be lawful 'To passe over the grete See, To werro and sle the Sarasin', and he is given the answer:

'Some myn,
To preche and soffre for the feith,
That have I herd the gospell seith;
Not forto slee, that hie re I noght.' (11.2490-3).

Bouvet's somewhat negative attitude is partly explained by reference to some of his later works. In the *Apparition* of 1398 his Saracen spy smugly asks his French audience, 'H'estes vouz dont tous d'une loy, Entre vous et les diz Romains?', and describes how, when his

---

own people learn how Christendom is hopelessly divided by the
Schism, they will no longer be afraid, 'Car gent qui a descent on
loy Ne s'aydera par bon arroy'. ¹ He then proceeds to demonstrate
the obvious military superiority of the Saracen fighting man over
his decadent western counterpart. Bouvet's eyes, particularly after
the Nicopolis disaster of 25 September 1396, seem to have been turned,
not so much towards the recovery of the Holy Land, but against the
possibility of an Ottoman advance into Western Europe. '...Now
on all sides the heathen cries out: "The Christians are finished!
Behold the time is ripe for us,... because God has rejected them and
does not help them in battle."'.²

Bouvet may, or may not, have been seriously preoccupied by
the Ottoman menace in the Balkans. He certainly does not seem to
have been interested in the possibility either of converting them
or of mounting a military expedition against them. More, perhaps,
than any other writer of his time, Bouvet drew the lesson from
the victories of the infidel of the deficiencies and weaknesses of
his own society. Few knew better than he that the bogey of an invin-
cible Turk could force a solution to the Schism and draw the atten-
tion of men to the 'disciplines of the pristine wars of the Romans.'³

2. '...nunc undique clamat paganitas: "Finis art christianorum.
Ecce nunc tempus pro nobis existit,...quia Deus sprevit eos
et non auxiliatur eis in bello".' From Bouvet's Discourse
to Wenceslas of 1399, ed. P.M. Bartos, Autographes l'.J. Husi
CHAPTER FIVE

Criticism of Chivalry and
Proposals for Military Reform,
(c. 1380 - c. 1410)
In the previous chapter we have considered various themes in the literature of the fourteenth century which were more or less directly affected by the events of the Hundred Years War: up to 1380, mainly by the war itself; after that date, by the possibility of a final peace-settlement which would reunite Western Europe in the face of a disunited Church and of the advancing Turk. It would be misleading to suggest that such literature was entirely pragmatic, concerned exclusively with such concrete and immediate objectives as military victories, peace treaties and crusades, and hesitant to embark on wider, more theoretical, paths. Such a suggestion would hardly be fair to Monte-Belluna and to the sophisticated literary figures at the court of Charles V. Still less would it be fair to Mézières, Deschamps, Petit and others whose important contributions to the literature of military reform will be examined below. It would appear, however, that during the last two decades of the fourteenth century a new type of didactic literature concerning war emerged, which incorporated many of the more traditional elements concerning crusades and a decadent chivalry, but which supplemented them with a profound and rigorous examination of the nature and the purpose of war, and the rôle of the military class in society. The Tree of Battles, as we have remarked, was hardly at all concerned with the problems of the Anglo-French war or with the crusade; but with the newer and more reflective developments in the didactic literature of late-fourteenth century France, the Tree was very much at home.

..................
a) **Chivalry**

During the last two decades of the fourteenth century there was an unusual unanimity among the 'critics' and 'propagandists' of chivalry that chivalry itself was in decline. The complaint is voiced in so much of the literature of this period that its veracity is rarely questioned, even today. Kervyn de Lettenhove, for example, thanks to his readings in Froissart and others during the second half of the nineteenth century, compares these decades of 'décadence de la chevalerie' with those which had immediately preceded them, and which were characterised by the 'éclat de la chevalerie'.

More recently, Raymond Kilgour stated, on the basis of his readings in the works of Honoré Bouvet, that the 'institution of chivalry', by the end of the fourteenth century, was 'brilliant' but 'hollow'. Such conclusions are certainly justified by the particular sources from which they were derived, but it is hardly surprising that the interpretations of 'chivalry' in Froissart's chronicles and in Bouvet's *Tree* are quite dissimilar.

When Froissart was at Canterbury in 1395, at a time when negotiations were already under way for a marriage-alliance between the royal houses of England and France, he commented wistfully about the good times under the 'bon roi Édouard'. What has become now, he asked, of 'les grandes entreprises et les vaillans hommes, et les belles batailles et les beaux conquets'? Chivalry, in

---


the eyes of Froissart, is hardly likely to flourish in conditions of peace—even with the occasional interlude of a crusade. Such a conception of chivalry is common to many contemporary works. In a short poem entitled *Le Livre Héssire Geoffroi de Charny*, composed in the middle of the fourteenth century, the author describes how, while travelling along one day, he set himself to consider how a knight might be 'en armes parfait'.

The knightly profession, he reflects, is a rigorous one which involves lack of food and sleep. In battles, when he knows that the day is lost and can easily take to his heels, he is faced with the agonizing choice between a dishonourable flight and death or capture: '...Que feras tu? T'en yras ou demouras tu?'. The honourable path is chosen, and the knight is taken prisoner; he languishes in captivity, composing 'balades, rondiaux et chansons' to relieve his boredom; then, when his ransom is finally paid, he immediately returns 'où guerres sont'. Charny's warrior-ethos, accompanied by erotic elements from the courtly love tradition, was also basic to the *Cent Ballades*, composed by Jean le Seneschal and others towards the end of the century. Here the knight who wishes 'en honneur monter' is advised to seek out 'grans guerres' where all great renown and prowess are to be obtained.

The idea that a knight must be actively engaged in the profession of arms was also expressed in contemporary literature of a different kind to that of Froissart, Charny and le Seneschal. The *Tree of*

---


Battles forbids the knight to 'till the soil, or tend vines, or keep beasts,... otherwise he must lose knighthood and the privileges of a knight'. All knights, moreover, 'should in thought and deed be occupied only with the practice of arms, and with campaigning for the honour of their lord, and for his peace,...'. Mésièrs complained that French soldiers had become too feeble for the endurance of prolonged battles, and that the phrase 'délit de comme sont les Françoys' had almost become a proverb among other nations. Christine de Pisan, some years later, proposed a very strict regimen for the professional training of soldiers based on Roman military patterns. The fundamental difference, however, between the conception of chivalry of the 'critics', and the 'propagandists', of chivalry, was in the question of individual prowess and public duty. The knight of Froissart, Chnrny and the others is concerned primarily with the problem of how he, as an individual, may obtain the respect of his colleagues and the love of his lady, hence their obsession with the hazardous but glamorous business of wars and battles. Bouvet and Mésièrs, on the other hand, are constantly reminding the knight of his duty to 'la utilité publique' and 'au prouffit du roy et du bien commun des Françoys' and fully appreciate the need for an end to wars, at least to those between Christians.

3. Christine de Pisan, *Livre de faix d'armes*.
These different interpretations of chivalry may also be observed in attitudes to the actual conduct of knights in battle. An extreme and much-quoted example of Froissart's approach is contained in his account of the banquet which the Black Prince organized to celebrate his victory at Poitiers. The Prince treated the captive French king with every mark of respect, and urged him not to dine miserably 'because God has not granted your wishes' in the battle, but to rejoice 'for you have today won a reputation of bravery that surpasses all your other knights'. Froissart remarks approvingly that all those who attended the banquet, both English and French, prayed for King John that 'God should grant him life to continue his glorious career'.

We have noticed, however, that the authors of the Complaints were far less tolerant of honourable failures and, although the king of France was rarely criticized, a much higher value was placed on military victory. The Roman military manuals, (which are considered below in relation to military discipline), had much to tell their fourteenth-century readers on the importance of military success and how it might best be obtained. The reputations of individuals were shown to be of no significance when weighed against the raison d’État, and they recommended 'subtelties' and 'deceptions' whereby the enemy might best be discomfited. Such stratagems, which did not involve outright dishonesty, were immensely attractive to Bouvet and to Gerson. In the Tree, Bouvet advises the Prince when in battle to place his confidence in God,

but not to the extent that he fails to ambush his enemies when they are unprepared and in recreation, and to manoeuvre the enemy into a disadvantageous position in the field, with the sun in its face.1 Jean Gerson, in his Vivat Rex sermon, praised the stratagems of Frontinus and of Valerius Maximus, 'because, as Scipio Africanus said, there is no sense in undertaking battle where one does not feel so positioned as to have an advantage over one's enemies.'2 Christine de Pisan, in the early years of the fifteenth century, was to devote a large part of her book, the Livre de faç d'armes to such wiles and stratagems, and was to call it a book of 'chevalerie'.

The obligations of knights, according to the fourteenth century critics of chivalry, was not to themselves alone, nor even to their paramours and colleagues, but to the rest of society. A military defeat, however mitigated by fine feats of arms, was worse than no battle at all. This element of harsh realism pervaded the Tragicum Argumentum of Francis of Monte-Belluna after the Poitiers disaster of 1356, as it did also Mésièrs' Epistre lamentable et consolatoire after the defeat of the crusading army at Nicopolis forty years later.3 Bouvet remarks, in the Tree of Battles, that a knight may not properly be described as 'bien hardy' if his boldness

1. Tree, ed. Coopland, pp. 154-55. Bouvet also asks the question (4:56) whether, 'when a knight is taken in battle, he should receive every honour, and be feasted and kept in enjoyment and recreation because he has borne himself so well?', and answers it with an emphatic negative.

2. Harengue, ed. Boulard, p. 34. '...pource dicoit Scipion Affrican: que ce n'est point sens d'entreprendre bataille, qui ne so sent tellement ordonné qu'il n'ait l'avantage sur ses ennemis...'.

3. The Epistre lamentable et consolatoire, which was written for the duke of Burgundy, has been published by Kervyn de Lettenhove in his Oeuvres de Froissart, vol. xvi, pp. 444 to end.
is prompted only by base motives of acquiring 'the vain-glory of
this world, and its honour and commendation'. There is virtue in
baldness, he adds, only when it is tempered by 'right knowledge and
understanding', and on occasions there may even be virtue in flight
from battle when the day is clearly lost.¹

The idea that the first obligation of the knight was to the
rest of his society was not peculiar to the fourteenth century;
in fact it was older than the traditions of knight-errantry
which so strongly affected Froissart and Charny. The ideal of
soldiers fighting for their lord and people is a very primitive
one and is revealed in its classic form in the chansons de geste
of the late-eleventh and twelfth centuries.² The idea of a per-
sonal obligation to the weak and defenceless elements in society
was largely the product of the Church's efforts to 'Christianize'
the military profession during the eleventh and twelfth centuries,
when the knight was urged to take an oath that his sword 'may be
a defence of churches, widows, orphans and all their servants,...
that it may be the terror and dread of evildoers'. When the
knight's obligation was extended by the peace associations to
include all classes of society which were not entitled to bear
arms—the clergy, the peasants, the merchants etc.,—his professional
ethics were clearly laid out, and he could be criticized for
failing in these particular duties.³ The 'courtly' developments

¹. Tree, ed. Coopland, pp. 121-2.
². Richard Barber, The Knight and Chivalry (London, 1970),
chapter iii: 'The herioc age of chivalry; the "Chansons de
Geste" ', pp. 37-55.
³. See, for example, R. Bonnaud-Delamare, 'Fondement des
institutions de paix au XIe. siècle', in Hélances Louis Halphen
in the conception of chivalry, propagated by the troubadors and trouvères during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, had always been viewed with a jaundiced eye by clerical commentators of the type of Ordericus Vitalis and Geoffrey of Vigeois, and continued, in the fourteenth century, to attract condemnation. The golden age of chivalry, as described in the Tree of Battles, was not the product of the urbane and civilized courts of Provence and southern France, but rather of the time when the Spartan disciplines of knights had not been replaced by luxurious and dissolute habits; when 'knights ate beans and bacon and coarse meats; they lay hard and wore harness most of the time;...and they did not usually dispute as to which was the best wine but drank clear water, because they could endure all hardship and labour.'

At a time of national emergency, when the enemy had either invaded or was preparing to invade the kingdom, knights were liable to the accusation that they were defaulting in their obligation to defend the rest of society. This accusation is voiced with a particular stridency in France during the four years which followed the battle of Poitiers, and it can also be detected in the English literature of the 1370s when the towns of the Channel coast were suffering from repeated raids. In these situations the enemy is easily identified and the duty of the military class is clearly laid out: to confront and to defeat the enemy as quickly as possible. At other times, and particularly in France during

1. Tree, ed. Coopland, p. 213

2. In post-Poitiers France this is the main theme of the Complainte sur la bataille de Poitiers and one of Venette's complaints against French knighthood in his Chronicle (e.g. p. 66). In England of the 1370s it is taken up again in the work of John of Bridlington and in the sermons of Thomas Brinton. See above pp. 109-110.
the last two decades of the fourteenth century, the identification of the enemy with 'the English' was no longer satisfactory. This was a period of 'uneasy truce' when enemy incursions, when they took place at all, were on a small scale between frontier garrisons. The main threat to the non-military classes during this period came from their own soldiers, and French chivalry was blamed, not so much for defaulting in its obligation to defend these classes of people, but for attacking and pillaging them. Hocinières describes in the Songe du Vieil Pelerin, how at one time the 'noble et sainte chevalerie de France' protected the Church and the people 'gros et menu' from all oppression. Now, on the contrary, the knights rob and pillage the Church and the poor people of France are attacked, killed, mauled and ransomed not by their enemies alone, but, what is worse, by their own chivalry. Deschamps complained that men who call themselves 'gens d'armes' destroy their country; they grab what they can find without paying for it and violate the Church; no house or room is safe from them, and the poor people flee before the 'noble armée' crying out for justice. Bouvot himself makes one of the most outspoken of such criticisms in the Tree of Battles: '...in these days all wars are directed against the poor labouring people and against their goods and

3. Oeuvres Complètes, ed. Saint-Hilaire, vol. i, balade LXIV. Just such a complaint was made to Gaston Fébus of Foix of the French troops of Guillaume de Nailhaec and Gaucher de Passac, who were preparing in 1387 to march into Castile to combat Lancaster: "...ils ne paient chose qu'ils prendent, et tout le menu peuple s'enfuit partout ou qu'ils viennent devant eux, si comme qu'ils fussent Anglais." Froissant, Chroniques, ed. Luce, Vol. xiii, p. 174.
chattels. I do not call that war, but it seems to me to be pillage and robbery... (for it) does not follow the ordinances of worthy chivalry or of the ancient customs of noble warriors who upheld justice, the widow, the orphan and the poor.¹

The Hundred Years War had, from the very start, taken the form of a civil war and a social upheaval within the French kingdom, in addition to its international aspects as a war between two sovereigns. During the later fourteenth century it was the social and domestic problems of war, arising particularly from the contact of French soldier with French civilian, that were most in evidence and which consequently attracted a great deal of comment in contemporary literature. The writers of this period, as we have seen, felt that it was necessary to remind the knight of his implicit and explicit contract to defend the people. Many, however, realized that the mere reminder of an obligation was not sufficient to secure the protection of the defenceless, and that a coercive element was also necessary. Thus, when an English soldier attacked and robbed a French peasant, it was considered to be an unfortunate but justifiable act of war. When a French soldier did the same, however, it was deemed an act of injustice which was the ultimate responsibility of the French Crown.² It


2. It is significant, for example, that in the Tree of Battles Bouvet (reluctantly) admits the right of French soldiers to take spoil from English merchants, peasants, shepherds, 'and other such-like people', when war has been declared between the two kingdoms, (Tree, ed. Coopland, pp. 153-4). This argument for the immunity of such people from acts of war must, therefore, only apply in their full rigour to 'friendly' rather than 'enemy' civilians.
was for this reason that the word 'justice' frequently appears in the works of Mézières, Deschamps and of Bouvet cited in the previous paragraph. It was for this reason also, that of the examples of their work quoted in that paragraph, all conclude in a very similar fashion to each other. Mézières' Chambrière Magnificence advises the young king of France 'qu'il vauldroit mieulx au roy qu'il feist une saige regulee'; Deschamps concludes his ballad with the refrain:

'Princes qui d'or a teste couronnée
A ses subgiz ne doit soufrir tel bruit,...';

and Bouvetprefaces his own statements with the hope that it may 'please God to put into the hearts of Kings to command that in all wars poor labourers should be left in peace,...'.

-------------------

b) The Crown

During the fourteenth century several theories of French kingship combined to make the Crown a particularly appropriate vehicle for the reform of chivalry. From the earliest days of the Capetian monarchy the Crown had assumed the responsibility, albeit ineffectively executed, of protecting the Gallican church and the moral welfare of its subjects, and of defending the weak from enemies within and without the kingdom.1 The Church's leadership of the 'peace movement' of the eleventh century was a temporary expedient 'proe imbecilitates regis'. Armed with the texts of Roman law, and exalted by the elaborate coronation ceremony, St.

Louis in the thirteenth century declared that the 'peace and repose' of his subjects was his own peace and repose, and that his indignation would be incurred by those who chose to disturb it.¹ This ideal, that the king represented Justice and the 'chose publique', was vigorously championed in some of the literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, especially in the particular _genre_ of 'Miroirs aux Princes'.² The most famous examples of these _Miroirs_, John of Salisbury's _Policraticus_, Vincent de Beauvais' _De eruditione filiorum nobilium_, and Gilles de Rome's _De regimine principum_, though not all French in origin, had all appeared in French translations at the time of Charles V. The work of Gilles de Rome, now known as _Li Livres du Gouvernement des Rois_, inspired several similar works in the fourteenth century, notably the anonymous _Avis aux Roys_, and it may well have had an influence on the _Tree of Battles_.³ Queen Truth in Mézières' _Songe du Vieil Pelerin_ specifically recommends the 'livre du gouvernement des princes' to the 'Jeune Moyse couronne', Charles VI.⁴

The fourteenth century was rich also in mystical theories of French kingship. There was the element of prophecy to which we have already referred above, in its relation to the _Tree of Battles._⁵

---

1. Ibid., p. 1014.
2. D.A. Bell, _L'Idéal éthique de la royauté en France au moyen âge d'après quelques moralistes de ce temps_ (Genova, 1962), esp. the introduction ('Le climat pédagogique') and chapter v ('Avis aux Roys').
3. Coopland, in his introduction to the _Tree_ (p. 61), remarks, '... there are indications that Bonet was acquainted with _Li Livres du Gouvernement des Rois_.'
5. See above, p. 87.
Jean de Roquetaillade and Telesphorus of Cosenza transferred the Joachite dream of an angelic king and a world monarchy from its original German and Italian context to a French setting. These visions were in turn stimulated by the extravagant literature produced at the court of Philip IV which exalted the 'nobles et sancti reges Francorum' and sought to prove their pre-eminence over other kings. 'He that carries war', wrote one preacher in 1302, 'against the king of France, works against the whole Church, against the Catholic doctrine, against holiness and Justice, and against the Holy Land'.¹ Such statements were rarely repeated during the decades which followed Philip the Fair's death, which witnessed a collapse of the French monarchy's prestige. They were, however, revived at the court of Charles V: by the author of the Songe du Vergier, for example, who abases himself before the royal majesty, 'j'ay veu ta face comme la face de Dieu. Car, comme nous lysons es histoires des Romains, les emperourcs et les roys estoient jadis appelez dieux...'.² In his slightly more restrained manner, Raoul des Presles asserted in 1369 that 'princes are nothing less than vicars and lieutenants of God on Earth, instituted to take vengeance on sinful people and against those who offend against the common and public good.'³

A subtle but noticeable change of emphasis in the myths and legends surrounding the origins of kingship and chivalry was

---

3. Traité de l'Oriflame, fonds Duchesne 65, fos.35v.-39: '...les princes temporels ne sont autres choses que Vicaires et Lieutenans de Dieu en terre pour prendre vengeance des pechies communs ou prejudice du bien commun et publique.'
affected during the fourteenth century. Rainon Lul, in his Libre del Ordre de Cavalleria of the late-thirteenth century, and the author of the Rovalo du Fonse in the third quarter of the fourteenth century, repeat the older version of the legend. In the latter work it is explained that the word 'chevalier' is 'noble' in Latin, and that, in times past, each knight was elected by a thousand citizens who provided him with a castle and with rents to support himself.

In return, the knight publicly swore: 'Quo le paie ot les pas gardaroit, Et tout on paie il les gouvernoirit, Quo laboureux au champs coriscnt, Et touns marchans la passer maufa pourront ...

Such legends corresponded well with the Church's own attempts to create a personal obligation in the knight to the rest of society. The legend is slightly but significantly altered in the Livre des faic et bonnos renurs du sanc roy Charlon V of Christine de Pisan. Then men began to spread over the Earth, according to Christine, after they had lost their primitive innocence, they elected and established a prince to secure them from injustice and oppression. The now prince divided society according to functions, and one such 'percion de gens et le prince reservée, locquols il establil pour la campainct, garde et coffence de son corps, du nom populo, du elergiè, des femmes, des laboreurs et de son pays...'

Gerson rehearsed a very similar version of this legend of the origins of kingship in a sermon delivered before the


king and court in 1408. The nobles were no longer considered to have been elected by the people for their defence, but to have been chosen by the king for his own personal protection and for that of his people, 'pour la conservacion de (la) couronne et deffense de la chose publique'. The knight, although he still retained his obligations towards the rest of society, to protect them from violence, was now responsible to the prince as the representative of the 'chose publique'.

Thus, when soldiers ignored or forgot their duty to protect the people, it was the king's duty to correct them. The prince as Pisan pointed out in her Livre de la Paix, must govern his people 'deuement et soubs tres bonne justice, ne les scuffro estre foulez ne pillez par gens d'armes ne de personne'. Gerson, some years earlier, quoted from the Book of Proverbs: 'A king that sitteth in the throne of judgement scattereth away all evil with his eyes', and explained that it was the king's responsibility when knights turned to pillage and to tyranny, 'not because you do these wrong,...but because you suffer them to be done'. When Johnes Thoyn, a notary and clerk of the town of Bergerac, minutely inventoried the crimes and depredations of the Purigourdin nobility between the years 1379 and 1382, his hope was that one day 'le

2. Remontrances, ed. Moranville, p. 22.
3. On the notion derived from antiquity that the miles was the servant of the state, and that the knightly order was bound to protect the poor and defend the Church, see G. Duby, 'Les Origines de la Chevalerie', in Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, vol. xv (ii) (Spoleto, 1968), pp. 759-61, esp. pp. 749-50 & 753-56.
'seigneur' (the king or his seneschal of Perigord) would punish the nobles 'per bona justicia'. When the people appealed for justice against soldierly excesses in the fourteenth century, they expected the king to do something about it.

Those who felt that they represented in some way the interests of the non-military classes in society also appealed to the Crown to exercise control over its military arm. The most prolific period for literature of this sort was during the late 1380s when Charles VI had shown a certain interest in reform; but, even after his first attack of madness, neither Bouvet nor many of the other literary men at court quickly lost confidence in the Crown's institutional capacity to initiate and to sustain reform. Jean Petit, in his Livre du Champ d'Or of 1389, describes through the mouth of 'Dame Gentillesse' how French knights beat and terrorize the peasants with their swords, rape women and destroy property, and she concludes that, but for the 'souverain roy, Ou quel je ay encore esperance', she would depart the country immediately 'comme femme desesperee'. In the Songe du Vieil Pelorin of Mézières, the king is represented variously as the master of the ship of France, as Moses the lawgiver and as the sovereign physician of the realm, and all the positive forces leading towards peace, a reformed chivalry and the crusade, are attributed to him.

The Tree of Battles, though unique in other ways, was identical in this respect to the literature of the French capital.

Bouvet expressed the hope, some two years earlier than either Petit or Mézières, that 'by a member of the high lineage of France, healing will be given to an age which is in such travail and disease'.

His criticisms of chivalry, — very similar in content, as we have seen, to those of Mézières, Deschamps and Petit,—were also addressed to the French Crown. He maintains, in the Tree, that any soldier who captures and ransoms children of the enemy 'deserves the name of pillager. And if the King found a remedy for this I think that God would help him,...'; he hopes that kings would see fit to ensure that peasants are left in peace, and that soldiers be made aware that 'the king was a prince who did justice severely'.

Thus far the literature of the late-fourteenth century developed and elaborated traditional ideas about the knight's social responsibilities and the Crown's right and duty to ensure fair play. The notion that the injured party in cases of armed violence was not the victim alone, but that it also included the king, was not a development of the fourteenth century. Nevertheless, it was from this theoretical base of royal prerogative and soldierly duty that the French writers of the time of Charles VI worked out the shape of military reforms which were largely put into effect during the fifteenth century. The ideal proposed by them in the insidious conditions of the later fourteenth, and early-fifteenth centuries was that the French Crown exercise a permanent control over all soldiers withing the kingdom by means of proper and regular pay, and strict discipline.

1. Tree, ed. Coopland, p. 79.
2. Ibid., p. 185.
3. Ibid., p. 189.
4. Ibid., p. 190.
The myth that the code of chivalry originated in the Roman Republic encouraged, if encouragement were needed, the use of Roman military manuals. The collection of anecdotes organised by Valerius Maximus under appropriate headings (including 'military discipline') in his Facta et dicta memorabilia, became popular in the fourteenth century thanks to the commentary of Dionigi da Borgo San Sepolcro. Simon de Hesdin, chaplain of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem and one of Charles V's team of translators, had started a translation and commentary of this work in 1375, and there is at least one other commentary which originated in fourteenth-century France.¹ The Strategemata of Sextus Julius Frontinus was also popular. By far the most celebrated of these books, however, was the handbook of tactics compiled by Flavius Vegetius Renatus towards the end of the fourth century A.D., and entitled De rei militari.² This work was translated into French, first by the indefatigable Jean de Heun in 1284, then by Jean de Vignai during the second quarter of the fourteenth century. In 1380 yet another translation appeared, possibly the work of Eustache Deschamps. These works provided advice on most areas of military activity, but the feature of Roman armies which they described, and which most impressed the literate men of the fourteenth century, was their discipline. Jean de Montreuil advised any who


² On Vegetius translations see Jules Camus, 'Notice d'une traduction française de Végèce faite en 1380', in Romania (1896), pp. 395-400; and Paul Meyer, 'Les Anciens traducteurs de Végèce et en particulier Jean de Vignai', in Romania (1896), pp. 401-23.
wished to teach 'disciplina militari' to consult the works of Valerius Maximus and of Vegetius. Christine de Pisan goes further, and quotes Vegetius' call for a disciplined host to all captains who are entrusted with 'so great a thing as the leadership of knights, and the interest of the prince...'.

One of the first to apply the lessons of Vegetius to the conditions of France was François de Monte-Belluna, the author of the Tragicum Argumentum of 1357. In a series of rhetorical questions he asked the 'miles Gallie' what had become of the exercise of arms, and what of the art of war and military discipline; and then proceeds to quote Vegetius' dictum that no-one fears to do that which he is competent to do. Monte-Belluna felt that 'disciplina militaris' was synonymous with military efficiency, and, although his ideas did not take root in the literature of his own generation they were considerably developed in the literature of the reign of Charles VI. Christine de Pisan, in particular, employed the works of Frontinus and Vegetius extensively in her plans for a 'chevalerie bien ordonnée'. Vegetius taught that 'qui desiderat paces, praeparet bellum', and Christine vigorously stressed the importance of military training for knights, and a sound education in Roman military strategy and tactics for their leaders.


Joan Gerson and Philippe de Mézières were also very well aware of the importance of military training. Gerson felt that 'gens de chevalerie' should be prepared from early youth in the rigours of their calling, and Mézières considered that their adherence to 'les règles de la discipline de vraie chevalerie', had secured the astounding victories of Charlemagne's French Knights. They do, however, also express the vital importance of obedience in the ideal of military discipline. Gerson, in his Vivat Rex sermon of 1405, offered a very precise and strikingly modern definition of discipline: '...J'entends par discipline obéissance au prince, au capitaine, sans ce que chacun veuille ensuyvre son propre plaisir ou delict voluptueux.' An army without discipline, he continues, is like a flock without a shepherd and is doomed to destruction. Mézières proposed as the third rule 'de la discipline de chevalerie', that, wherever the royal host is encamped, the captain must expose the instruments of justice, the block and the sword, in a public place so that all may know that justice will be done to 'tous ceulx, grans, moyens et potis, qui trespasseront la loy et discipline de chevalerie et commandement du chevatains'. In other rules of discipline Mézières shows how the captain must inspect his men at frequent musters, how no pillaging must be done without the leader's express command, and how non-combatants must be protected by the captain from violent treatment by his men.

The work of Hézières shows clearly the connection which was
being drawn at this time between the Crown's responsibility for
protecting its subjects from injustice and oppression, (in this
case by soldiers), and its right to exercise a rigorous control
over the military class. The chief responsibility of royal officers
when not actively engaged in field operations was, according to
Hézières, (and according to many after him), to ensure that the
soldiers entrusted to their authority did not rob the people whom
they were paid to protect. The factor of pay was, of course,
vital to the whole scheme of military discipline, for without the
regular payment of adequate wages to soldiers they were more than
likely to help themselves. Such a likelihood was recognized as
early as the first quarter of the fifth century when St. Augustine
remarked that "...payment for soldiers has been wisely instituted
in order that they do not turn themselves into brigands to
recover their expenses".¹ Some of the most original and construc-
tive ideas for military reform put forward by writers at, and
around, the court of Charles VI, were little more than an elaborate
commentary on the words of the bishop of Hippo written nearly a
millennium before.

We have already had cause to remark that, in the fourteenth
century, it was a customary criticism of French chivalry that,
although knighthood and chivalry were instituted to defend the country

¹ Quoted by Alfred Vanderpol, La Doctrine Scolastique du droit
and the people from violence, the contrary was the case, and knights had turned upon their own people to plunder them. Jean de Venette, for example, described how the nobles after the battle of ricitiérs 'subjected and despoiled the peasants and the men of the villages. In no ways did they defend their country from its enemies'.¹ The clerk in the Songe du Vergier remarked how the soldiers, whose duty it is 'tout le pays garder et defendre de toute oppression' now do 'tout le contraire'.² Neither the author of the Complainte nor Philippe de Mésières, although they have much to say concerning the misappropriation of soldiers' wages, establish any direct connection between the non-payment of wages and the plundering of the people. Eustache Deschamps, though he complained in his Lay des Douze Estas du Monde about soldiers who have 'mainte chose robée' despite their wages, takes the subject no further.³ It was only towards the end of the century that the problem of pillaging was analysed in terms not simply of a decadent chivalry.

In 1392, Jean Gerson, soon to become chancellor of Paris University, preached a sermon before the king and his court in which he made the point that taxes which were levied for the defence of the 'chose publique' were in fact wasted on luxuries and gifts. If these subsidies, he continued, had been directed towards the war-effort then 'gens d'armes' would be content with their wages, and the 'povres gens' would not feel obliged to flee with their meagre belongings when they heard of the approach of

1. Venette, Chronicle, p. 66.


soldiers.\(^1\) By 7 November 1405, when he preached the famous sermon Vivat Rex before the royal court, his ideas on the subject had been clarified and developed. Here his fourth 'consideration' for the reform of chivalry was based on the advice given by John the Baptist to the soldiers: 'Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages.' (Luke 3:14). 'If payment is lacking', continues Gerson, 'for soldiers, they excuse themselves from paying for what they take. If they do not pay, they pillage and rob poor people most outrageously...'.\(^2\) It would be difficult to find a clearer statement of the problem.

A few years later, Christine de Pisan advised 'the good captain who wishes to maintain and conduct his war justly before God and truly towards the world' to see that 'his soldiers be so well paid that they need live off no pillage in the country of their friends...'. Christine believed that if this were done, and everything paid for under pain of death, 'all things would therefore come to a better end.'\(^3\) A few years later, in 1413, she gave the same advice to the Prince that 'ses gens d'armes soient tres bien pays afin aussi que moins aient de excusacion de fouler le pays et grever les laboureurs...'.\(^4\) At about the same time,

1. Jean Gerson, Oeuvres complètes, ed. Mgr. Gloriotx (Paris, 1960), vol. viii, p. 440: 'Les subsides qui sont levés au titre de garder la chose publique, ne seroient pas despendus en pompes et trop larges dons et autres choses que guerres ne profitent. Les gens d'armes seroient contents de leurs soldes...sans rien piller ou desrober et ne faudroit mie que les poures gens... s'enfuissent devant eulz...'.


3. Fayettes of Armes, ed. Byles, p. 44.

Nicolas de Clamanges, theologian of Paris University, took up the theme in a letter to Gerson from the abbey of Fontaine du Bosc. He complained in the traditional vein that French knighthood, created to defend the country, was now laying it waste. Realising, however, that the non-payment of soldiers' wages was the source and root of all this evil, ('ille est fons, illa est radix totius mali et iniquitiae'), Clamanges suggested that no soldier should be employed where there was no money to pay him, and that the whole machinery of payment be overhauled.¹

Such reforms were, in fact, an important element in the Cabochien reform programme of 1413. The Remonstrances presented by the University and by the town of Paris to Charles VI on 13 February 1413 attacked the corrupt trésoriers who enriched themselves and a few others at the expense of the many, and explained how 'it is an irregular thing for soldiers, when they live off the people without paying, to say that they are not paid any of their wages and therefore must live by helping themselves'.² The Cabochien Ordinance which followed, in the same year, made provision for the proper payment of soldiers in royal service and made their captains responsible for injuries to the king's subjects.

2. 'Remonstrances de l'Université et de la ville de Paris à Charles VI sur le gouvernement du royaume', ed. H. Koranville, in BEG., vol. 11 (1890), p. 11: 'Car maintenant c'est chose irrégulière à gens d'armes qu'ils vivent sur le peuple sans paier, de dire qu'ils ne sont point payés de leurs gaiges, et faut qu'ils ne vivent en bons servants.'
It is clear therefore, that the connection which St. Augustine had established between payment of soldiers and the brigandage of soldiers who needed to 'recover their expenses', had, by the end of the fourteenth century, become a powerful theme in political literature. It was considered by many to have been the vital factor in the pursuit of military discipline and in the reassertion of the ancient ideals of chivalry to protect the weak against violence and oppression. The Guidon des Guerres, (which has been attributed to the Chevalier de la Tour Landry, but seems to be the work of a later hand), summed up the question in the following manner: 'Puis que les chevaliers sont ordonnez pour la garde et deffense du bien commun, s'ils sont bien payes de leurs gaiges et ce non obstant ils vivent sur le commun, ils doivent mieulx estre appelles pillers que chevaliers...'.

The payment of soldiers, as we have remarked in a previous chapter, was a subject which received extensive treatment in the Tree of Battles. Bouvet asks, and provides answers to, such miscellaneous questions as whether a soldier who goes to war for the sake of vain glory, or for pillage, may expect to receive wages; whether absentees and invalids should receive their wages, and at what period wages should be paid. In a work of this nature, which sought rather to describe legal rights and obligations than


2. See above, pp. 91-2.
to analyse social problems, it is hardly surprising that the Tree establishes no direct casual connection between the payment of soldiers' wages and the safety of the common people from plundering. Nevertheless, the vital link between the payment of wages to soldiers and military discipline is an important feature of the Tree of Battles.

Bouvet does, it is true, describe the knight's obligation to defend his lord and his compatriots in wider terms than those which are based simply on money. A knight's professional code provides him with obligations to the rest of society, and his feudal duty with obligations to his lord. Nevertheless, the Tree makes it quite clear that the Crown's right to exercise a permanent control over men-at-arms, and their duty to submit to such discipline, was based neither on the 'code' of chivalry, nor on feudal obligation, but on the contractual relationship between payer and payee. The idea that the soldier surrendered many of his individual liberties when he accepted royal pay was to have an immense importance in the military reforms of the fifteenth century. The receipt of wages, Bouvet explained in the Tree, implies the obligation of the recipient to defend to the death the one who has paid him. For his part, the soldier, except in cases of national emergency, was not to be expected to risk life and limb for the king, —even in a just war—when he was not offered a regular wage.

1. In the Tree, ed. Coopland, p. 189, Bouvet describes 'the ordinances of worthy chivalry' which command that the knight uphold 'justice, the widow, the orphan and the poor'; and on p. 131 he enjoins knights to 'keep the oath which they have made to their lord to whom they belong'.

2. Ibid., p. 122.

3. Ibid., p. 135.
All gains of war acquired by individuals were the property of the lord 'in whose pay the soldier is', who might dispose of them as he wished; and any person who went to war for the sake of booty thereby forfeited his right to wages.¹

The grant and receipt of wages brought with them the subjection of the soldier to the prince's discipline. Bouvot was extremely hostile to the ideal of knightly virtue propagated by the 'chivalric' writers of the Froissart-Charny type. He abhorred the kind of boldness, senseless and immoderate, which decimated the Order of the Star, and described, with obvious distaste, the 'plain and notorious' fact 'that a young knight receives more praise for attacking than for waiting'.² 'A knight must be obedient to him who is acting in place of his lord as governor of the host,...'; he must carry our the orders of such officers, '...and if a knight acts contrary to such a command he must lose his head'.³ Instead of engaging in spontaneous acts of individual heroism, soldiers 'should go nowhere at all' without the licence of the military commander.⁴ Amongst the numerous capital offences of soldiers were ranged 'striking the provost of the army with intent to injure him'; disobedience to 'the governor of the host'; separating themselves from the host 'in order to show their great courage'; causing riots and dissensions within the host, and desertion.⁵ In no other work in fourteenth

1. Ibid., pp. 134-5 & 144.
2. Ibid., p. 121.
3. Ibid., p. 131.
4. Ibid., p. 131.
5. Ibid., pp. 132-3.
century France was the case for a disciplined soldiery spelled out with such remorseless vigour as in the Tree of Battles. Few books were more hostile to the ideals of the medieval knight, as embodied in the romances of chivalry, and to his traditional way of life, as embodied in the customary 'droit d'armes'.

The creation of a disciplined soldiery was, of course, only a part-solution to the problems of soldiers, and of war, which were tackled in the Tree. Bouvet was quite as much concerned with the question of who was to discipline soldiers, as with that of how they were to be disciplined. It was in the assertion of the Crown's exclusive rights over the initiation and the conduct of war, and consequently of its rights over all men actively engaged in the military profession, that the Tree made its most important contribution to the ideas of military reform current at the French court. It was this assertion which allowed Bouvet to substitute the words 'king' and 'prince' for that of 'employer', and it was this which gave to the interpretation of the 'droit d'armes' in the Tree of Battles its peculiar character.
CHAPTER SIX

The Tree of Battles and the Laws of War
Ernest Nye, in the introduction to his edition of the Tree, in 1883, describes that work as the first systematic treatise on the 'droit de la guerre'.

Maurice Keen, more than three-quarters of a century later, described the Tree and its major source, the Tractatus de Bello of John of Legnano, as 'usually the two most reliable authorities on the law of arms'.

Philippe Contamine asserted that the 'droit d'armes' appeared in its 'forme classique' in the Tree of Battles. In order to understand their meaning, (or rather their individual meanings, since none of them felt quite the same thing about the law 'or arms' or 'of war'), one must seek to establish some definition of the term 'droit d'armes'.

The use of this term in the fourteenth century by men who were directly involved in warfare, or in the chronicling of deeds of arms, provides us with a surprisingly limited conception of the 'droit d'armes'. Froissart usually employs the phrase to indicate some sort of relationship between knights in which one party is temporarily at a disadvantage with regard to the other. Thus, in Froissart's account of the siege of Limoges of 1370, three French knights surrender themselves to Lancaster, saying, 'Signeur, nous sommec vosstres et nous avons conquis: si ouvros de nous au droit d'armes'. Later, Froissart describes how the English left


the slayer of Sir John Chandos to die of his wounds, which was 'mal fait, oncques il ne vint bien de traiter nul prisonnier autrement que droit d'armes ne le requiert.' The implication here is that the 'droit d'armes' imposes some sort of obligation on one knight to behave in a 'chivalrous' fashion towards another.

That the 'law of arms' was something more positive and more formal than a simple code of gentlemanly behaviour, is suggested by the work of Geoffroi de Charny. Charny was a captain of French garrisons on the Picard and Norman frontiers when, on 6 January 1352, he was admitted to King John II's Order of the Star. This famous but short-lived Order had as its centre the Noble Maison de Saint-Ouen situated between Paris and Saint-Denis, where, on 15 August, its 500 member-knights held their assembly.

Soon after his admission to the Order, Charny drew up a list of questions to be discussed by his fellow-members. These questions, some of which are of considerable consequence, others of unimaginable triviality, were aimed at establishing definite rulings in cases concerning the 'droit d'armes' of jouets, of tournaments and of war. All 134 of Charny's Demandes are occupied with technicalities

1. Ibid., vol. viii, p. 459.
2. Useful biographies of Charny, who was knighted at the siege of Aiguillon in 1346, and died bearing the Oriflamme at Poitiers ten years later, are provided by Arthur Faiget, 'Le Livre Messire Geoffroi de Charny', in Romania, vol.xxvi (1897), pp. 394-411, and in the Dictionnaire de Biographie Francaise. Charny was also the author of Le Livre de Chevalerie, published by Lettenhove in vol. i of his Oeuvres de Froissart, pp. 463-533.
4. Geoffroi de Charny, Demandes, Bibl. nat. Houv. acq. fr. 4736. This ms. contains 34 fos. of which 26 are occupied with questions on war. I am grateful to Dr. Kenneth Fowler for making available to me his transcript of the manuscript.
of terminology and of the rights and duties of knights in the list and in the field. Most of them are casuistical and many, one suspects, were chosen more to perplex and bewilder the reader than to enlighten him. Nevertheless, the majority of Charny's Demandes conclude with the question: 'How will it be judged by the law of arms?', and therefore point to conclusions about what sort of law a soldier like Geffroi de Charny felt the droit d'armes to be.

Clearly he did not consider the law of arms to be a codified body of law as were the two great codes of 'droit d'escript': the Canon and Civil laws. If Charny concludes many of his Demandes with the question, 'How will it be judged by the law of arms?' (Qu'en sera il jugie par droit d'armes?), he frequently associates it with, or replaces it by other questions: 'What do you say about it?', (Qu'en dictes vous?), and, (even more significantly), 'How would it be judged by men-at-arms?' (Qu'en sera il jugie par gens d'arms?).

Charny's use of these phrases as if they were equivalent and interchangeable, and the fact that the Demandes are addressed to other knights, rather than to lawyers, suggest that the droit d'armes was a matter of military custom and usage. No group of men would have been more competent to rule on such questions as the eminent and experienced knights of the Order of the Star. Another important distinction between the law of arms, as seen through the eyes of Charny, and more conventional positive law, appears in the matter of incentives and sanctions. Like any other law, the law of arms was concerned with rights and duties, (albeit of a restricted social class), but the incentive to conform was not conceived in terms of punitive sanctions.

1. Examples of these questions are contained in the Demandes, op.cit., fos, 9, 17v., and 23v. respectively.
but rather as a matter of entitlement or non-entitlement to the profits of war. This applied in relations between soldiers of the same side, as in the question whether soldiers of a garrison must share booty acquired outside the walls of the castle with their fellows who remain behind; it applied in relations between soldiers and their own captains, in cases, for example, of disobedience; and it applied in cases concerning soldiers of opposite sides, usually where entitlement to ransom was at stake. Charny, is, in fact, so overwhelmingly preoccupied with questions of booty and prisoners that we may be justified in thinking, on the basis of the Demandes, that the droit d'armes was little more than 'rapacity working through well-organized legal channels.'  

From the information provided by Froissart and by Charny we might conclude that the droit d'armes was a professional code which regulated the conduct of knights, especially where this related to the acquisition and distribution of booty and prisoners.

It would also seem that this 'code' was not to be found in any book, but was founded in the everyday customs and usages of 'gens d'armes'. It was, as Keen remarks, a 'spécial law' for knights; one which made 'little distinction between the rights of public bodies and those of private persons', and which was


2. It was reported in La Geste des Nobles Francois of c. 1429, that Henry of Lancaster 'tant fut droicturier en armes et autres choses, et qui a l'introduction des nobles establit et fist le Livre des Droiz de Guerre'; but it is very unlikely that any such work existed in the 14th century, either from Lancaster's pen or any other. See H. Hayez, 'Un exemple de culture historique au XVe. sibcle; La Geste des Nobles Francois', in Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'Ecole Francaise de Rome, vol. lxxv (1965), p. 162.
'formulated and applied with a view to the protection of the rights of individual soldiers...'.

The Tree of Battles had very little to do with such a law. The rules of soldierly conduct described in the Tree were binding upon military men whether or not they were accustomed to observe them already. In fact, many of the laws embodied in this work were recognized as being contrary to contemporary soldierly practice. The 'law' for example, forbade the taking of excessive ransoms from prisoners, and especially from the common people, 'but God well knows that the soldiery of today do the opposite'; a foreign student and his relatives may not be attacked 'by law' even though, 'perhaps, soldiers will not receive this opinion very willingly'. The Tree was not a collection of knightly customs, nor was it a work which failed to make a distinction between 'private' and 'public' rights. The king's war, it maintained, 'concerns the common good of the whole kingdom, which is more important than the particular good of a barony' (4:17), and only the sovereign prince, as the representative of the 'public good' was permitted to 'order general war' (4:4). The Tree repeatedly makes a contrast between the selfish interests of individual knights, and the interests of the community as a whole, which is usually unfavourable to the former. If knights gave battle on feast days 'for the public good, they would be absolved in all men's minds from sin,...but God knows how much concern there is nowadays for the public good'. (4:50).

1. Keen, Laws of War, pp. 15 & 245.

In his introduction to the *Tree*, Nys remarked that this work is less than explicit when it dealt with questions of 'les pratiques de la guerre, et sur le butin et le rançon des prisonniers'. Bouvet did not, apparently, treat such matters 'avec toute la rigueur désirable'. Such a statement is nothing short of the truth. The vexed question of how booty is to be divided among soldiers, which occupied Charny for nearly one third of his *Demandes* on war, is concentrated into one single paragraph of the *Tree* where it is stated that all booty must be handed over to the 'duke of the battle; and the duke should share the spoils out among his men, to each according to his valour' (4:43). The *Tree*, it is true, does address itself in a more businesslike fashion to problems relating to prisoners and ransoms, but most of such material deals with immunities to imprisonment rather than the rights within such a relationship. Thus, while only four of the *Tree's* questions are directly related to matters such as the scale of ransoms and the proper treatment of prisoners, at least twenty others are concerned with the classes of people who were entitled to immunity from ransom and imprisonment. Far from devoting itself to the 'protection of the rights of individual soldiers', the *Tree* seems to have been much more concerned with protecting the rights of all other classes in society.

The content and the principles of the droit d'armes which are suggested in the questions of Geoffroi de Charny, are so radically


2. A comment on the chapter dealing with conditions of imprisonment (4:56) is revealing: 'And if a man, by his own fault, find himself in such a case [of harsh imprisonment], the peril and risk are on his own head, for he has thereby lost the privilege of law'. 
different from the 'laws of war' exposed in the Tree of Battles, that we must conclude that they were derived from different sources. The law of arms appears to have been a code of conduct which regulated the mutual relationships between knights. Its stipulations may have been derived from many different sources, but, owing to the fact that they were uncodified, they varied with the different standards, interpretations and needs of successive generations of knights. The Tree, on the other hand, seems to have had a permanent base in the 'written' law.

In the Tree, Bouvet mentions many different types of law: divine law (droit divin), the law of nations (droit des gens), canon law (droit de decret), civil law (droit civil), the Lombard law (la nouvelle loy lombarde) and the law of war (droit de guerre), but he tends to classify such laws in terms of written and unwritten law. The Lombard law was, as Bouvet noted, 'extraordinary', and did not fit in well with either classification. The distinction was essentially between the customary 'droit de guerre' and all of the other laws. When discussing, for example, the question whether legates or ambassadors were permitted to bring with them into enemy territory 'things' or 'persons' superfluous to their actual requirements, Bouvet remarked that if a soldier 'had captured this thing or that man neither the laws of war nor written law would take it from him' (4:96). All written law is occasionally indicated by the simple word 'droit' (e.g. 4:112), while the laws of war appear variously, depending on the author's approval or disapproval, as 'de bonne guerre' (4:56), 'bonnes coutumes' (4:60), 'coutumes et usaiges du monde' (4:112) or 'pratices' invented by 'lords and others' (4:79). It is clear that the Tree was drawing upon many sources in written and customary law.
The Tree was not simply a collection of materials from such sources which related to the subject of war, for the sources themselves did not always agree. In the case of duels and reprisals, a customary law contradicted all written law (4:79, 111 & 112); with regard to the captor's right over his prisoner, the 'ancient law' had been humanized by Christianity (4:46); in the case of an enemy leader who is taken prisoner, the 'civil law' and the 'decretal' disagree with regard to his treatment (4:13); if the son should resist his father, the 'law of nature' would allow what the 'civil law' condemned (4:75). The thesis, which has recently been put forward, that the laws relating to war, which drew upon Divine and Natural law, Canon, and Civil law, and the customary rules observed from old times by professional soldiers, formed a naturally coherent structure in which the laws 'were not all essentially different but supplementary to each other in particular matters',¹ seems, on the basis of the Tree, to be untenable. The Tree was a selection from such sources. In order to understand the principles and criteria of such a selection we must first examine the direct legal sources of the Tree of Battles itself.

The Tree is the direct product of those developments in legal theory which took place during the late-thirteenth, and fourteenth, centuries, and which are associated with the school of the Post-glossators.² This school, which had originated in France, had, during the fourteenth century, come to be dominated by Italian jurists:

1. Keen, Laws of War, p. 18.
notably by Bartolus of Sassoferrato, Baldus of Ubaldis and Lucas da Penna. The aim of the Post-glossators was nothing less than the creation of a new medieval civil law, the usus modernus, by combining Roman and non-Roman legal materials. Their basic principles were derived from Roman law (the Justinian texts and glosses) and from scholastic philosophy (particularly of Aquinas and Colonna), but other bodies of law—notably Canon law, and various feudal and customary laws—were not entirely discountenanced. When they turned their attention to the question of war the Italian lawyers, with their high ideals of law based on equity (jus est justitiae executivum), did not always accommodate themselves easily with the primitive and barbaric customs inherited from a tribal and feudal past. The doctrine of reprisals, for example, which allowed an innocent individual to suffer for the acts of another, and which was derived from Germanic tribal principles of collective responsibility for a crime, did not accord well with post-glossatorial principles. In fact, Lucas da Penna denounced the custom altogether, as he did also the practice of judicial combat. Other jurists, particularly those of the Bartolist school, were more realistic in their approach and attempted, not to eliminate these deeply-rooted customs, but to restrict their operation and to bring them securely under the control of the civil authority. One of the pioneers in this field was the Bolognese jurist, John of Legnano, whose Tractatus de bello, de represaliis, et de duello was completed in 1360, and became, some twenty-five years later, the basis of the Tree of Battles.

Thanks especially to their training in Roman law, and also to their familiarity with the *Summa Theologica* of Aquinas and the *De Regimine Principium* of Colonna, John of Legnano and the other 'subtle and strenuous legists of the (Italian) trecento' were often the 'faithful intellectual auxiliaries of the civil authority'. ¹ One of the most serious problems of the 'civil authority' in fourteenth-century Italy was that of controlling the mercenary soldiers in its employ; of subordinating the private interests of the condottieri to the public interests of the state. The commune of Florence, for example, had attempted with less and less success since the Biliotti commission of 1337 to impose a regular system of muster and review, and a strict interpretation of public rights in the spoils of war, on its stipendiary soldiers. ² The *usus modernus* of the Italian post-glossators would have been of no consequence if it had not attempted to relate itself to the particular problems of the society for which it was devised. The *Tractatus* of Legnano did deal with just such contemporary problems, but they were the problems of the civil authority, not those of individual soldiers who were more than sufficiently capable of securing their own interests. It is significant, perhaps, that the *Tractatus* was dedicated to Cardinal Gil Albornoz, lieutenant of the Avignon popes in Italy, and 'widely acclaimed as the leading civilian virtuoso of his generation in the management and control of mercenaries'. ³

---

2. Ibid., p. 9 et seq.
3. Ibid., p. 46.
When the Tractatus was transferred to a French setting in Bouvet's Tree of Battles some of its details might have sounded strange and alien to French ears. The regulations for the proper conduct of trial by combat, for example, which were derived from the Lombard law, had little relevance to the French customs which had been standardized in the Ordonnance of Philip IV, of 1306. Nevertheless, the problems which faced the French Crown, as the embodiment of the public good of the realm, concerning the conduct of war and the control of soldiers, were essentially similar to those of the Italian communes; and the legal theories of the Post-glossators were as relevant to France as they were to the Italian republics. The Italians were concerned with directing the aggressive energies of their condottieri against the enemies of the state rather than against its own subjects in the contado. The French Crown had similar problems, especially with its garrison troops on the frontiers of the kingdom, and the constant appeal voiced in the Tree in favour of the rights of 'friendly' non-combatants was one which provoked a wide response in France. The whole question of public interest versus private rights, which was such a dominant theme in post-glossatorial legal literature, had bedevilled the Hundred Years War from its start, and had effectively prevented a final peace-settlement during the 1360s. Such problems were eliminated in theory, if not in practice, by the assertion, which was repeatedly enunciated in the Tree, that the private interests of soldiers must never run counter to the public interests of the Crown.

2. It was difficult for Edward III to remove the occupants of castles which had been captured in his name during the war; but which had been returned to France by the treaty of Brétigny. The captains claimed compensation. See P. Chaplais, 'Some documents regarding the fulfilment and interpretation of the treaty of Brétigny', in Camden Miscellany, vol. xix (1952), pp. 12-15. For examples of this problem on the French side after Brétigny, see P-C. Timbal (et al.), La Guerre de Cent Ans vue à travers les registres du parlement, 1337-1369 (Paris, 1961), pp. 432-67.
We have remarked already that the 'law of arms' was a customary law, but that the customs and usages which were considered in the 'law of arms' to have any legal force were those which had been sanctioned by the civil authority and over which such an authority could maintain control. Just as it was true in the case of judicial combat, it was also true of marque and reprisal which, 'according to the written law...is by no means permitted' (4:79).

The right of reprisal is the right conceded to an individual by the sovereign authority to which he is subject, to pursue his right, even by force, against a foreigner or a co-citizen of that foreigner in cases in which he cannot obtain justice through the ordinary legal processes. Although the system itself was open to much abuse, and occasionally resulted in rapid and dangerous escalation of hostilities, it remained, in theory at least, strictly under the control of the prince who 'is subject to no lord' (4:82). Such a doctrine was entirely inimical to the traditional, feudal right of the noble to engage in private war wherever he considered that justice had been denied him, and it must be considered in the light of the attempts made by the civil authority to curb and eradicate the 'guerre privée'. This latter right existed in direct proportion to the lack of central authority, and was therefore most securely based in Germany and Italy. Elsewhere, the kings of England, Castile, Aragon and France had attempted, with more or less success, to place restrictions on the private war. In France, St. Louis' imposition of a 'cooling-off period', 'la Quarantaine du

1. See above, pp. 100 - 101.

2. E. Nys, Le droit de la guerre et les précurseurs de Grotius (Brussels, 1882), 'La Guerre et le Christianisme'.

Roy', gave way in 1296 to Philip the Fair's ban on all hostilities while the king himself was at war. In 1361, John II decreed that, 'nonobstant ledis privileges ou usages des nobles', all assemblies and 'chevauchides' of 'gens d'armes ou archiers' which had not been specifically authorized by the Crown or its officers, were illegal. The doctrine of reprisals, at least as it was elaborated in the Tree of Battles, fitted in very neatly with the French Crown's own attempts to monopolize the control of war.

It is not surprising that the Tree of Battles, which is founded in Roman and scholastic principles of the 'public good', should have put forward ideas for the reform of chivalry which were very similar to those which were proposed at the court of Charles VI. The Crown's claim to exclusive rights over soldiers and over acts of war, which was upheld in the Tree, ran counter to the chivalrous ideal of the 'knight-errant' whose vocation was the pursuit of just quarrels. The knights of Chrétien de Troyes' romances would have considered themselves hardly worthy of the name if their independence had been so restricted. Yet Bouvet advocated such reforms in the very name of chivalry, and showed how soldiers must accept them as the 'ordinances of worthy chivalry' (l'ordonnance de deue chevalerie) (4:102).

The interpretation of chivalry which appears in the pages of the Tree of Battles is ultimately derived—though the selective lense of the Post-glossators—from two sources; the military manuals of republican and imperial Rome, and the 'peace movement' of the tenth and eleventh-century Church. We have already had cause to remark on the manner in which these Roman war-manuals had come to be accepted as authorities for chivalry, and how the ideal of the

---

disciplined and efficient soldier which they propounded was the
one which most absorbed the literary men of the fourteenth century.
This is precisely the lesson which Bouvet drew from these sources
in the Tree of Battles, and particularly from 'the doctrine of a
doctor called Monseigneur Vegetius, in his Book of Chivalry' (4:9).
The pattern of knightly virtues, therefore, which are exposed in
the Tree, are very far removed from those of the knight-errant.
Bouvet's 'chevalier' is loyal to his lord and obedient to the
lord's deputy in the host; he is fully professional and constantly
occupied with the practice of arms; he is subject to the strict
discipline which the lord's officers exercise in the host. It
was just such a conception of knighthood and chivalry, based on
the work of Vegetius and of Bouvet himself, which formed the
essential element in a book composed by Christine de Pisan in 1409,
and which was entitled Le Livre des faits d'armes et de chivalerie.

If the Roman military manuals described a pattern of 'chivalrous'
behaviour for the individual knight within the host, the Tree also
described other requirements of chivalry which regulated the relation-
ship between the military and the non-military classes. 'I hold
firmly,' Bouvet said, 'according to ancient law, and according to
the ancient customs of good warriors, that it is an unworthy thing
to imprison either old men taking no part in the war, or women,
or innocent children.' (4:94). Again, in the context of soldiers
who attack and rob 'poor labouring people', Bouvet remarks that
'that way of warfare does not follow the ordinances of worthy
chivalry or of the ancient custom of noble warriors who upheld
justice, the widow, the orphan and the poor'. (4:102). It has
often been pointed out that such 'ordinances' and 'ancient customs'
had origins no more ancient than the councils summoned at the
instigation of the Church in southern France during the late-tenth and eleventh centuries. One of the most important objectives of the 'peace' associations which emerged from these councils was that knights who had the right to bear arms should no longer turn them against those who did not possess such a right; clerics, peasants and merchants. Even the sanctions which the peace associations could bring to bear were often insufficient to enforce either this, or the related principle of the 'truce of God'. Nevertheless the principles themselves passed into Canon law with the decree of Pope Nicholas II in 1059, whence, through a remarkable chain of revisions and repetitions, they re-appeared in the Tree of Battles.

The Tree of Battles, therefore, represents a stage in the development of legal theory relating to war. Thanks to the work of legal synthesis produced by the Italian Post-Glossators, it drew upon a multitude of sources: biblical, canonical, scholastic, Roman and customary. The selection of material from such disparate sources, which appeared in the Tree, achieved its coherence, not because the sources themselves agreed but because they had been selected according to the criteria of the 'public good'. Such a law, which embraced the entire community, had little time for the 'special laws' of particular classes in the community. The long-established customs which protected the rights of individual soldiers

and which we have chosen to distinguish by the name 'droit d'armes', was just such a special law. The new law, exposed in the Tree, which we might call the 'laws of war' did incorporate certain emasculated elements of the law of arms which related to the conduct of duels and the treatment of prisoners. There was much in the law of arms which was simply ignored in the Tree, such as the obligations entailed by brotherhood-in-arms and the details of tournaments and jousts. The basic principles of the Tree, however, were hostile to those of the law of arms. When a military commander in the third quarter of the fifteenth century repeatedly enunciated the principle that 'unbien particullier n'est pas à preferer à la chose publique',¹ the Tree of Battles had done its work, and the law of arms could look forward only to a threadbare existence.

Guillaume de Paris described in one of his verses the knight in full retreat before the lawyer:² 'La France a tout plein d'avoquats:

Les chevaliers de bons estats,
Qui France voient trestournée
Et en serveté atournée
Vident le pays et s'en vont.'

For the fourteenth century, as Huizinga remarked, the Tree of Battles was 'only a theoretical treatise... The fine rules and the generous exemptions enumerated by the good prior of Celonnet were


too rarely observed. If we look to the Tree for information concerning the actual conduct of war during the first half-century of the Hundred Years War, we are as likely to find it in the breach as much as in the observance of the Tree's regulations. We must, as the fifteenth-century herald advised his poursuivant, read the Tree of Battles, but also 'follow the wars' in order to supplement the Tree's theoretical principles with practical, day-to-day details. To regard the Tree, as many have done, as an authority for the 'law of arms' is likely to be an unfruitful exercise, unless we appreciate that the conception of war which the Tree proposes 'allait dans un sens favorable aux monarchies modernes'. The Tree did not present a codification of military practice, but a programme for reform. It became a practical treatise only when, during the fifteenth century, the kings of France and of England created national 'chivalries' out of the universal order of knighthood, and brought these knights effectively under their own control.

2. See above, p. 9.
CHAPTER SEVEN

The Tree of Battles:
its practical importance
The Tree of Battles was inspired by the conditions of fourteenth-century society in Western Europe, and it was written for an (admittedly restricted) fourteenth-century public. In this chapter we shall seek to outline some of the ways in which the Tree was relevant to the conditions of contemporary French society, and, secondly, to show when this work ceased to be an essentially 'theoretical treatise' and became a workable programme of military reform. It would be foolish to assert, on the basis of available evidence, that Bouvet's Tree was ever utilized in a systematic manner by men engaged in the practical business of reform. Nevertheless, just such a possibility is suggested by the tremendous popularity of Bouvet's work in the fifteenth century, especially amongst the higher aristocracy and military command of fifteenth-century France. The ways in which they might have used the Tree of Battles will be indicated below.

We have mentioned above how Bouvet's unhesitating avowal of the Prince's exclusive rights to make war, corresponded well with the French Crown's attempts, over a century-and-half, to eradicate the private war.1 If a prince's subject, according to the Tree, wished to avenge a wrong done to him by the subject of another, he was obliged to go through the elaborate procedure of obtaining letters of marque and reprisal. The weaknesses of such a policy, during the fourteenth century, were, as we shall see and as Bouvet himself recognized, in distinguishing between what was, and what

1. See above, pp. 175-6.
was not, a sovereign state, institution or individual. It was inconceivable, for example, that the 'podestat of Florence', 'who by chance that year may be a citizen of that town, a shoemaker, or a robemaker, with gold on his belt', should be placed on the same level as the king of France. The problem, however, was even nearer to home for the French Crown.

When discussing the subject of whether a vassal should aid his lord against the king, Bouvet remarks that: 'all I say of the King I say too, of any other who may be prince in his country, as is Monseigneur of Foix in his land of Béarn in which he is emperor, for he holds it only by God and the sword'. Quite apart from the rights and wrongs of Gaston Fébus' claim to hold Béarn 'de Dieu et l'espée', which was disputed not only by King John of France but also by Edward III of England, his case had many parallels within what was traditionally recognized as the kingdom of France. The principle, formulated by the end of the thirteenth century, that the king of France was sovereign in his kingdom with rights 'to take action, judicial or other, in any part of the kingdom in the interests of peace and justice', was effectively challenged by

2. Ibid., p. 136.
several princes of fourteenth-century France, of whom the dukes of Aquitaine, Brittany and Burgundy, and the counts of Flanders and Béarn, were the most important. For the kings of France to make full use of the rights over war which were assigned to them in the Tree of Battles, they had first to secure their exclusive position as emperors within the kingdom. The main obstacle to the legal definition of their rights was posed by the emperor, himself, and Bouvet shows at length how the French kings may legitimately claim to be free of any ties of subjection to the German emperor. In practice, however, the real threat to the king's claim to sovereignty was posed by the development of semi-autonomous principalities within the French kingdom, and the problem ultimately resolved itself into a great struggle between the forces of centralization and those of fragmentation. The French Crown, at the time of Charles VI, was in no position to engage in such a struggle; but that did not prevent the literary men at court from preparing for just such an eventuality.

If the Tree of Battles provided the 'Very Christian' kings of France with a programme for the assertion of their sovereign rights within the kingdom which corresponded with traditional ideas of the late-Capetian, and Valois, kings; it also proposed ideas for the reform of chivalry which were relevant to contemporary French conditions and acceptable at the French court. The Tree's


2. Tree, ed. Coopland, chapter LXXXIII, pp. 175-8: 'How can we maintain that the king of France is not subject to the emperor?'.

concern with the relationships between soldiers and 'civilians' of their own side, which was, as we have seen, so generally echoed in other literature of the period, was particularly opposite to the condition of France towards the end of the fourteenth century. The proposals which were put forward in the Tree for an end to soldierly excesses through a rigidly-enforced discipline, were also anticipated, to some extent, by a series of royal ordinances published in France during the decades after the battle of Poitiers.

In fourteenth-century France the heaviest concentration of fortresses, and consequently the highest density of soldiers, was in the frontier areas. Maurice Roy has found it possible to classify the areas 'ou l'on se battait vraiment' during the reign of Charles VI, which amount to three fronts which he called 'Guyenne', 'Normandie' (bordering on Brittany and the Cotentin) and 'Nord' (the Calais march).\(^1\) Christine de Pisan observed that in the time of Charles V it was necessary 'tonir continuellement gens d'armes en v. ou vi. lieux, es frontieres et par le royaume ou nasement sur mer, c'est assavoir en Guyenne tres grant host, si que dit est, en Picardie, semblablement en Bretaigne, en Languedoc, en Auvergne,...et en Normandie...'.\(^2\) The discipline of such royal garrisons, especially where it related to the local, 'friendly' population, was outlined in several royal ordinances. The Dauphin Charles, in 1357, forbade all soldiers to rob his subjects

---

of 'blefs, vins, vivros quelconques ou autres choses', and empowered Frenchmen to resist pillage 'par tous les voyes et manieres que ils pourront miculx...'.

1 This rough-and-ready justice was put on a more regular footing in Charles V's ordinance of January 1374, which made military captains responsible for 'aucune pillerie, roberie, ou aucun dommaige' perpetrated by their men on the king's subjects, and liable to be constrained to make restitution. The problem of military discipline was not, however, one which could be solved by royal mandate alone. The only way, as P.S. Lewis remarks, to prevent soldiers from acting like routiers was to bribe them 'with regular employment and pay...'.

Bouvet's insistence, in the Tree of Battles, on the importance of regular payment and fair distribution of soldiers' wages was, as we have seen, an important feature of the work. It was such recommendations which the English and French Crown, (but particularly the latter), found impossible to implement during the late-fourteenth century. The problem of paying the French field armies and the English expeditionary forces was perhaps the most easily solved, for they demanded an exceptional and 'once-and-for-all' effort on the part of taxpayers and of financial officers. Taxes were levied for the particular national emergency, or for the particular campaign, and the concentration of the army in one place facilitated mustor, review and the payment of wages. That even those armies

1. Ordonnances des rois de France de la troisième race, ed. Secousse et al., vol. iii, p. 159.
2. Ibid., vol. v., p. 660.
4. See above, p. 91.
could not rely on regular pay is indicated by the arrangements made for English armies of the 1370s to live off the country, and by the appalling damage effected by the French army awaiting embarkation at Sluys in 1386. The English were not always insulated from these problems by having their armies on foreign soil. John Bromyard commented, in one of his sermons, that English armies go off to war, not with the prayers of the people behind them, 'but with the curses of many. For they march, not at the king's expense or their own, but at the expense of Churches and the poor, whom they spoil in their path. And if they do happen to buy anything, they give nothing but tallies in payment. Christ fed five thousand on five loaves. These men do a greater miracle, for they feed ten thousand on little tallies,...'  

The fact that most of the Hundred Years War, and particularly that part of it which occupied the final two decades of the fourteenth century, was fought on wide frontiers between scattered, and sometimes isolated, garrisons, made the problem of payment even more difficult. On the French side of the frontiers, responsibility for the payment of garrison troops belonged to the two trésoriers des guerres of the northern and the southern frontiers. There was a widespread suspicion in France, originally voiced in the Compliainte sur la bataille de Poitiers, that the trésoriers were presented with fraudulent muster-rolls, and that military leaders and their retainers were enriching themselves while the 'vaillans

1. Owt, Literature and Pulpit, p. 338.
chevaliers et esquire received little of their wages. Even without such corruption and misappropriation of funds, however, it must be remarked that the cost of maintaining garrisons was often quite beyond the resources of the trésoriers. Clivier de Clisson, for example, was given specific authorization by letters of 24 March 1371, to extract ransoms from 'nos ennemis' on the frontiers of Poitou, Guienne and Brittany in anticipation of wages. Despite this arrangement, Charles VII was obliged, in 1381, to place the town and castle of Pontorson in Clisson's temporary possession, pending payment of eighty thousand gold francs in wage arrears. A similar sum of money was owed to Waloran of Luxembourg, captain of Boulogne, in 1403, for unpaid wages of the garrison.

It has been shown that the problem was no less acute on the English side of the frontiers, where permanent garrisons had been maintained from subsidies voted by an increasingly reluctant parliament. In effect, only the garrisons of the Calais march were supported from England, while those of Gascony, the Cotentin and (especially) Brittany relied heavily on taxes raised from the local parishes. The system of financing garrisons from the proceeds


3. Tiey, Finances royales, p. 408.

of these taxes, called 'raengons' or 'patis', achieved an early development in Brittany where English troops were in occupation for most of the century after Edward III's initial intervention in 1342. By the early-1350s the royal lieutenant there, Walter Bentley, was complaining that because of an insufficiency in wages the English garrisons were plundering the people and had become unresponsive to centralised control. He explained that 'les quatre villes, lesquex tous les autres fortresses et villes cee covient governor, oient esté devant cee heures grantment groves par la demore do grant nombre des soudiers, lesquex ont faits outrageouses prises et estortions en defeute de leur sages...'. In 1396, Duke John V of Brittany complained that the English garrison at Brest was selling safeconducts to ships, pilgrims and merchants, was infringing local seigneurial rights, and plundering the people. The Breton author of the poem Le Combat de Trente Bretons contre trente Anglois describes how Benaumoir 'le bon' accused the English captain, Bamborough, of treating the poor people of Brittany like cattle at the market: 'Deux et deux, trois et trois, chascun au lieu se sont tous les boeufs et vaches que len-maine au marchie.'

The Provence from which Honoré Bouvet escaped in 1350 was equally disturbed by this problem. The French troops who were introduced early in 1383 to assist in the struggle against the

3. Le Combat de trente Bretons contre trente Anglois, ed. G. Crapelet (Paris, 1827). This poem commemorates the famous 'arranged' battle which took place between Froërmol and Josselin on 27 March 1351.
league of Aix, were plundering friend and foe alike by the end of the year. The Italian merchants, employed by Francesco di Marco Datini, observed these developments with interest and described them in letters to Datini and to each other. One writes from Avignon to Pisa on December 1383: 'Things here are very calm. The men-at-arms who are in Provence are wintering in the fortresses which they have taken and attack friends and enemies for the necessities of life. At present they steal from their friends food and livestock which they never took from their enemies, and all because they lack money and cannot obtain any...'. Another writes on 21 December 1387 that no roads are safe in Provence because the soldiers who occupy the strong places are paid as wages nothing but words. ¹

The result, therefore, of the French Crown's political and financial insecurity during the late-fourteenth century, was that two proposals basic to the Tree of Battles were impossible to implement. The Crown's political weakness vis-a-vis the French princes meant that it could not maintain its claims to exclusive rights over soldiers and over acts of war, and, effectively, that any individual, (like Raymond de Turenne), who could afford to pay soldiers was entitled to use them as he wished.² The Crown's financial instability during this period meant that, even over soldiers technically in its service, the Crown could not enforce

² The Crown did, of course, continue to pursue individuals who conducted illicit war within the kingdom, especially during periods of truce, - and its action was sometimes effective; (see, for example, the case of Mérigot Marchès as described in Keen, Laws of War, pp. 97-100). Nevertheless, the large number of letters of remission during the latter part of the 14th century reveal an incapacity to cope with the problem generally.
discipline and control. This situation was dramatically altered during the course of the fifteenth century when English royal lieutenants in France, and French military officials, managed, with varying degrees of success, to make war a royal prerogative, and soldiers, servants of the Crown. This was also the period when Bouvet's Tree enjoyed its widest circulation.

'The fine rules and generous exemptions enumerated by the good prior of Selonnet' in the Tree were not applied in anything like a systematic manner until some years after the prior's death, when, in the second and third decades of the fifteenth century, the English were establishing themselves in Normandy. Their work was anticipated to a very limited extent by the French army ordinances of 1357 and of 1374, and by Richard II's Ordinance of War issued at Durham in 1385.¹ This latter commanded that all soldiers in the host be obedient to the king and to his officers; that no soldier take lodgings, or ride out of the host without the permission of royal officers; and that all soldiers be at all times subject to the jurisdiction of the constable and marshals.² Henry V's determination to protect the 'public' interest, even at the expense of 'private' rights was demonstrated early, at the battle of Agincourt on 25 October 1415, when he caused the enemy prisoners to be massacred in order to facilitate a military victory. His decision might

¹Also by the Cabochien Ordinance of 1413; see above, p. 159. It has been remarked that the Burgundian triumph of 1418 brought back to power many of the Cabochien party who had fled Paris in 1413, and that there are, in consequence, many traces of Cabochien influence in the details of Bedford's administration of Normandy. B.J.H. Rowe, 'The "Grand Conseil" under the duke of Bedford, 1422-35', in Oxford Essays in Medieval History presented to H.E. Salter (Oxford, 1934), pp. 207-34, esp. p. 207.

well have been made easier by a chapter in the *Tree of Battles* which declared that mercy is due to a prisoner 'unless there were a risk of his escaping, with the result of prolonged war, damage, or mischief'. The discipline which the English king exercised over his soldiers made him the model of classical 'chivalry'. Jean de Wavrin remarked how 'well he kept the discipline of chivalry, as did the Romans in former times', and Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini was full of admiration for this king who 'prohibited the use of feather beds, forbade the drinking of wine by his men, and cut down all the vineyards, in order to preserve the vigour of his troops'. It was only, however, at the time when Henry V and the duke of Bedford were seriously faced by the problems of an army of occupation in its relations with a subject, non-combatant population, that the *Tree*’s stipulations were most thoroughly applied.

In their respect for the immunities of 'civilians' the English had, for many years, obtained an enviable reputation. In the *Tree* Bouvet remarked that the 'English of Guienne,...although they are an evil and proud race,...do not willingly lay hands on clerks'. Bouvet's ideal that clerks who 'have no concern with the

2. Barber, *Knight and Chivalry*, p. 139.
3. R.A. Newhall, 'Discipline in an English Army of the Fifteenth Century', in *Military Historian and Economist*, vol. ii, no. 2 (April, 1917), p. 149. Newhall quotes from Piccolomini's *De viris illustribus*. As far as the cutting down of vines was concerned, quite the opposite was the case in the English-occupied territories—but for equally laudable reasons: Clause 4 of Shrewsbury's ordinance, for example, commanded that 'no man put any beast into vines, or draw up the stakes of the same vines, in order to destroy them' on pain of a fine and imprisonment. Shrewsbury's Ordinance has been published by Sir H. Nic.olas, *History of the Battle of Agincourt and of the Expedition of Henry the Fifth into France in 1415*, 2nd. ed. (London, 1832), pp. 41-44. The extract quoted is from p. 42.
business of war' should not be killed or despoiled, and that the 'poor innocent who has nothing more in mind that to eat his dry bread alongside his sheep in the fields'¹ should be left in peace, was brought several stages nearer to realization by the disciplinary ordinances of Henry V and Bedford in Normandy, and of Shrewsbury in Maine.

As early as 1418, Henry had attempted to regulate the behaviour of English garrisons and had established a system whereby appeals against soldiers might be heard before local, civilian vicomtes. His Mantes Ordinance of July 1419 prohibited all plundering of the king's subjects by soldiers, and insisted on regular payment for provisions: 'Also, that no maner man be so hardy to take fro noman gayng to the plough, harrow, or carte, hors, mare nor oxe, nor none other beste longyng to labour, within the Kynges obeissaunce...'² This policy was inherited, and considerably developed, by Bedford. His Caen Ordinance, issued on behalf of the young Henry VI in December 1423 and in the name of 'Raison et Justice', declared illegal the system of ransoming the countryside by garrisons, and insisted that 'noz loyaux subgiez' be free to live and pursue their labour without interference, 'qui est la destruction de la chose publique de notre dit pays'.³ It was also forbidden, under pain of criminal proceedings, to 'take, ransom or imprison any merchants,'

1. Ibid., p. 153.
2. The Mantes Ordinance has been published in The Black Book of of the Admiralty, ed. Twiss, vol. i, pp. 459-71. This quotation is from p. 469.
peasants or artisans, or any other, dwelling or resident in the open country...'. Many of these regulations were restated in Bedford's Ordinance on the Watch, of September 1428, which also laid down an elaborate system of deductions from soldiers' wages for offences.2

The payment of regular wages to soldiers in royal service in Normandy was, and was recognized to be, an essential feature of the system. Without it, clauses forbidding the pillaging of the king's subjects which were published in royal ordinances, were moribund. The payment of wages also enabled that distinction to be made between 'knights and men-at-arms', on the one hand, and those who 'deserve the name of pillager', on the other, which was fundamental to the conception of the Just War as it was elaborated in the Tree of Battles.3 A 'brigand' might claim to be acting in the service of the king, but, since he was on no captain's muster-roll, he might be pursued as a common felon.4 The Tree's stipulation that 'no man should, or may, bear arms without the licence of the prince', and that all who do bear arms should be subject to the control and discipline of royal officers, was incorporated into the third and fourth clauses of the Caen Ordinance. Here it was required that no soldier be permitted to live in the country 'sans adveu ou

1. Ibid., p. 204: '...Avons défendu, et défendons-, auxdissus diz et a tous autres, qu'ilz ne soient oy hardy de prendre, Raengonner ne emprisonner, quelconques marchans, laboureurs, gens de mestier, ne autres demourans ou Residens ou plat pays sur peine destre pugnys criminellement comme de force publique'.
2. This Ordinance has been published by R.A. Newhall, 'Bedford's Ordinance on the Watch of September 1428', in HHR., vol. 1 pp. 50-54.
3. Tree, ed. Coopland, p. 185.
4. See B. Rowe, 'John Duke of Bedford and the Norman "Brigands"', in EHR., vol. xlvii (1932), pp. 583-600. One of the most interesting examples presented here is that of Richard Tensables who, from his base in the fortified abbey of Savigny, levied war on the 'French' in the name of Henry VI. Bedford sent him to the block as a thief and a traitor.
Retenue de capitaine', and that all properly-engaged soldiers be concentrated into garrisons 'avecques leurs capitaines pour faire ce que par euxs leur sera commandé et ordonné.'

Perhaps most significant of all, from the point of view of the Tree of Battles, was the inclusion of clauses relating to soldierly discipline and good behaviour in captain's indentures. Ever since 1423 the indentures of captains serving in Normandy had included instructions to govern their soldiers well and to ensure that these latter did not attack and rob the people. The Tree, as we have remarked above, described the Crown's right to exercise a permanent control over men-at-arms, and their duty to submit to such control, in terms, not of feudalism, of chivalry or even of sovereignty, but in those of the contractual relationship between payer and payee. In Normandy of the 1420s, as Newhall has remarked, it was clearly recognized that disciplinary regulations promulgated by royal ordinance were not sufficient to produce results. The incorporation of these regulations into the indentures of military officers indicates that the king was using the contract as a means for providing himself with the authority necessary for controlling the army and for making it an instrument of policy rather than a mere gathering of captains and soldiers for whom war was only an opportunity for personal profit.'

4. Newhall, 'Bedford's Ordinance on the Watch', p. 38. See also his Muster and Review: a Problem of English Military Administration 1420-1440 (Harvard, 1940), p. 3, where Newhall argues that the introduction of the indenture system for raising armies in the Later Middle Ages 'gave opportunity for developments in the exercise of central authority....'
If the English military administration in Normandy had worked as well in practice as it was devised in theory, (and there is plenty of evidence to indicate that it worked remarkably well during the third and fourth decades of the century), Henry V's war would have conformed, in many ways, to the ideal pattern of the Just War as elaborated in the Tree of Battles. Although Bouvet might have condemned the conquest as one based on 'covetousness of great dominations and lordships', he would have been forced to admit that in most other respects it filled the bill. It was in this war that the Devonshire lawyer, Nicholas Upton, gained his military experience under the earls of Salisbury and of Suffolk which he put to good effect in his Libellus de officio militari. This work may well have been modelled on the Tree of Battles.

South of the Loire, in the territory which had remained loyal to the Dauphin Charles, no such decisive action was taken during this period to control the actions of gens d'armes, and the appeal for a disciplined chivalry was again taken up by men who were not in positions of great political or military responsibility. Although Christine de Pisan and Jean Gerson, from an earlier generation of political writers, remained loyal to the dauphin for some years after the Treaty of Troyes, it was now men, like Alain Chartier and

1. Tree, ed. Coopland, p. 158.
2. For a slightly less benevolent interpretation of the English occupation, see S. Luce, 'La Maine sous la domination anglaise en 1433 et 1434', in Revue des Questions Historiques, vol. xxiv (1878), p. 226-41.
3. Coopland, introduction to Tree, p. 22.
his friend Pierre de Nesson, who kept alive the literary themes which had been developed during the last decades of the fourteenth century. They complained that nobles prefer taking booty to conducting honourable war, and that they robbed the people instead of defending them. They described the virtues of justice and of peace, and showed how these might be obtained by general obedience to the Prince. They urged the importance of 'discipline de chevalerie', which consisted in a knight's proficiency in arms, obedience to royal officers and an awareness of his public responsibilities. It was not, however, until the late-1430s that their criticisms and suggestions began to find their way into the legislative enactments of the 'roi de Bourges'.

In 1438, a special legal commission was set up under Ambrose de Loré to investigate the crimes of freebooting soldiers, and in December of the same year it was enacted that each captain was entirely responsible for the men in his company, and that the prévôt of Paris should have the authority to arrest a captain in order to ensure compensation for the delinquencies of his men. The Orleans Ordinance, in November of the following year, took the matter considerably further when it asserted the principle that the king alone had the right to raise troops, and that lords who wished

---

1. E.g. in Chartier's Quadrilogue Invectif, ed. J. Droz, pp. 20-21 & 52.
3. Chartier, Le Quadrilogue Invectif, p. 54.
4. This, and most of the other information in this paragraph, is derived from E. Cosneau, Le Connétable de Richomont (Arthur de Bretagne), 1395-1458 (Paris, 1886), pp. 282-3, 298-9 & 357-71.
to garrison their castles had no right to order the movement of
troops outside the castle walls. The Crown was not yet strong enough
to enforce these legislative measures of the late-1430s in their full
rigour, but the great army reform ordinance of 1445 met with much
greater degree of success. By reviewing all captains and companies
of soldiers within the kingdom, and by discharging some of them
and employing others, French military officers effectively made
the distinction between 'gens d'armes' and 'brigands' which was
such an important feature of English-occupied Normandy. Thenceforth,
the only soldiers within the French kingdom who were licensed to
live by war were those who formed part of the royal companies,
'd'ordonnance', and who were therefore subject to the discipline
of royal captains and commissioners.

In the short term, the results of the French army reforms of
the fifteenth century were very mixed. Guillaume Cousinot was full
of praise in 1465 for Louis XI whose army was 'so well disciplined,
both in battle and on the road, and it doesn't harm anyone'; but
a year later Pierre Michault, in his Doctrinal du temps présent,
commented that soldiers who did not commit outrages were not deemed
to be 'gens d'armes de vaillance'. Nevertheless, even if the sub-
stance of reform frequently eluded the French Crown during this
period, the principle at least had been vigorously affirmed, and
generally accepted, that proper soldiers were the king's soldiers
and that proper war was the king's war.

1. This rather doubtful compliment to the soldiers of Louis XI
was cited by P. Lewis, in his Later Medieval France, p. 51.
We know that several of the military commanders, on both sides of the frontier, had copies of the *Treo of Battles* made for them during this period. Artur de Bretagne, the constable of Richemont, for example, who was the man most responsible for the French army reforms, received a copy from the hand of Langearon in August 1450.¹ The dukes of Burgundy and of Bourbon also had copies prepared for them during this period. One of their most prestigious opponents, until his death at Castillon in 1453, was John Talbot, earl of Shrewsbury, who also possessed a manuscript of the *Treo*.² Shrewsbury was also responsible for the disciplinary ordinance made 'at his sieges in Foyne and other places', which we have mentioned above.

The use, or lack of use, which these and other nobles made of Bouvet's work is difficult to assess, but an episode recounted in the *Mémoires* of Olivier de la Marche is illuminating.³ A Burgundian noble, according to La Marche, was obliged to request the pardon of Philip the Good for acts of disobedience, for, 'selon l'Arbre des Batailles, nulle chose n'est estimée bien faite contre le commandement du chef ne de ses lieutenants'. It was this emphasis on military discipline in the *Treo* which also impressed La Marche's English contemporaries.

John Mowbray, duke of Norfolk, stated in 1453 that desertion from the host before battle should be punished by decapitation, which 'thyngs

---

1. See above, p.11.

2. This is indicated by the fact that, circa 1445, he presented a manuscript which included the *Treo* to Henry VI's queen, Margaret of Anjou. See above, p.12.

may be founden in the lawes wryton, and also yn the boke cleped L'Arbre do Bataille.¹ If Bouvet had been assured of being remembered only for his part in propagating the ideal of Roman military discipline, he might have been well satisfied.
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Surviving manuscripts of the Tree of Battles

This list of manuscripts has been prepared from the catalogues of *fonds français* and of *manuscrits espagnols* in the French Bibliothèque Nationale; from the *Catalogue général* of manuscripts in French public libraries, and from the card index of the Instituto de Recherches ot d'Histoire des Textes in Paris. The list of *Tree* mss. in British repositories has been prepared from the British Museum Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal & King's Collections (1921), and its *Catalogue of Additions to B.N. Mss.* (1854-60); also from the catalogues of *Western Mss.* in the Bodleian library (1922), of Western Medieval Mss. in Edinburgh University library (1916), and of Mss. in the Lambeth Palace library. For Spanish libraries, the information contained in the *Inventario General of Mss.* in the Biblioteca Nacional (1953), and in the catalogue of Castilian Mss. in the Real Biblioteca de el Escorial (1924-29), has been supplemented by a helpful letter from Dr. Luis Vásquez de Parga of the Biblioteca Nacional. For the United States, I have used the Supplement to the Census of Medieval and Renaissance Mss. in the U.S. and Canada (1962), and the Catalogue of Pennsylvania University libraries to 1800 (1965). References to *Tree* Mss. in the Belgian Bibliothèque Royale have been communicated to me by Marguerite Debae of the Cabinet dos Manuscrits there. The *Catalogus Codicum Boromensium* (1875) has also been used.

The most complete list of *Tree* Mss. to date has been compiled by G.W. Coopland and published on pp. 217-18 of his edition of the *Tree* (1949). Coopland mentions 49 mss., but his reference numbers are not always up-to-date. Covillo's *La Vie Intellectuelle* (1941),
p. 246; Paris' *Les Manuscrits François*, vol. v (1845), and Stevenson's introduction to Gilbert of the Hayo's Prose Manuscript, vol. 1 (1901), are also helpful.
Surviving Manuscripts of the Tree of Battles

France (46 ms.)

Bibliothèque Nationale.

1. Fonds espagnol 206, (written in Catalan for Ramon de Caldes, 1429, from Provençal version e.g. 21 below).
2. français 587, (written in Spain, accompanied by section of Blason des couleurs.)
3. français 673.
4. français 674, (written for Pierre Plumetot).
5. français 1260, (before 1471).
6. français 1261, (written 1425).
7. français 1262, (text and illumination incomplete).
8. français 1263-4, (in two volumes).
9. français 1265.
10. français 1266.
11. français 1267.
12. français 1268.
13. français 1269.
14. français 1270.
15. français 1271.
16. français 1272.
17. français 1273.
18. français 1274, (written for Jean de Bourbon, 1456).
19. français 1275.
20. français 1276, (Paris, 1460).
21. français 1277, (written in Provençal).
22. français 1695.
23. français 5389.
24. français 8690.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>français, 9691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>français 17183, (illustration frontispiece in Coopland ed.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>français 17184.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>français 25020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Ms. 2695, (written 1450 for Constable Richemont).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Ms. 347.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>French departmental, municipal and university libraries. Aix 192.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Besançon 587.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Carpentras 409.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Grenoble 1006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Lille, fonds Godefroy, 130.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Rouen 995.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Rouen 1233.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Soissons 165.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Tours 957.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Troyes 917.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Britain (8 ms.).

British Museum
47. Royal 15 E VI, f. 293 et seq., (one of 'romances and poems' presented to Queen Margaret by John Talbot, c.1445).
48. Royal 20 C VIII, (Berry ms. prior to 1416; illustration on p. 49.
49. Add. 22.768, (together with Livre de l'Ordre de Chevalerie).

Other libraries.
50. Edinburgh University (Laing collection), 187.
51. Bodleian, Laud misc., 1578.
52. Lambeth Palace Library 267.
53. Abbotsford library 21, (Gilbert de La Haye's translation).
54. Private collection of G.W. Coopland.

Spain (10 ms.).
55. Escorial H II 19, (translated into Castilian by Antón de Zorita for the marquis of Santillane).
56. Escorial X III 2.
64. Barcelona University Library 12-2-14.

United States (5 ms.).
65. Pennsylvania University library Fr. 20.
66. Yale University library Ms. 230, fos. 10-116v., (written in Flanders, 1472).


68. Boston Public library Ms. 1519 fos. 1-143, (written Calais c. 1470).


Belgium (5 ms.)

70. Bibliothèque Royale 3781.


72. Bibliothèque Royale 9079, (copied in 1461 by David Aubert for Philip the Good of Burgundy; basis of Nys' edition of Arbre).


74. Bibliothèque Royale II 5939.

Other manuscripts.

75. Vatican library Reg. 899.

76. Berne Municipal library A 280 fos. 198-245.

77. Vienna National library 3309.

78. Vienna National library 2652.

79. Dresden 0 c 58, (fragment).
APPENDIX II

Record of the hearing in the case of the disputed election at the abbacy of Ile-Barbe, before Philippe de Thurey, archbishop of Lyons, 26 February 1401.

(See pp. 71-76)

Arch. dép. Rhône (Lyon), 10.C. 1409, pièce iv. Difficulties with the text are indicated by round brackets: (); marginal and interlinear insertions by square brackets: [ ]
Archivum departimentale du Rhône, (Lyon), 10 a 1409, nôbre 4.

Processus factus et habitus coram nobis Philippo de Thuroyo dei et apostolico sedis gracia archiopiscopo (sia) et condicto et super quattuor provincias galliarum primate, inter dilectum nostrum procuratorum generalium pro juro et interesse nostrio, ex una parto, et religiosos viros fratres Stephano de Vernetto, chamberium, Guillelmuu de Bimant et Jacobum Magnini monasterii Iscalo Barbaro claustrales, se dicentes contemptos, ex alio, et honorabiles et religiosus virum fratrum Honeratum Doveti, alio Cardobovia, doctorem doctorum, priorum de Cellano, se anseronem abbatio dicti monasterii clausum, et religiosos dicti monasterii inferius nominatos qui in dicta electione presentes fuisse dicunt, ex altera, super facto annulacionis et irritationis dicto electione protr infra.

Voverunt universi presentes pariter et futuri hunc presentes processum visuri lecturi et audituri (oto), anno dominii millesimo quattuorcentostimo a paschate cere gallicano sumpto, et ilio luno post dominicam qua cantatur in sancta dei ecclesia ad officium missa remisio, ultima mensia februrii; ad quam dicam, ad instantiam et roquestam dilectii procuratoris nostri generalis pro re publico nostroque et jurisdictionis nostro ecclesiasticis ac interesse adherentium et adherore volentium in hac parte cum eodem, citati orant litora et proximo coram nobis Philippo de Thuroyo, nicroationes divina

(lv.) primate / Lugdunoemio ecclesia archiopiscopo et condicto atque supra quattuor provincias galliarum primate virtute et auctoritate litorarum nostrarum et iporum exequcionis a targo decrcripto inferius incortarum: religiosi viri fratres Symonius de Abbaopini, prior maior, Jacobus d'Escotay, collorarius; Henricus de Jotison, camorarius, Eugnandus de Garda, sacrieta maior, Petrus de Vorrurus,
hemosinarius, Stephanius Alverniaci, sacrista beato Maria, Petrus de Gurgite, communierius, Guillelmus Perlay, infirmarius, Andreas de Gurgite, reflecterierius, Franciscus Jocerandi, prior sancti Johannis de Arderia, Martinus de Culo, prior sancti Andrea de Insula, Petrus de Buant, prior de Saleria, Thomas Propperii, prior sancti Pauli de Cornillion, Hugo Bergoignion, prior de Pallet, Guidus de Castro, prior claustrialis, Guidus de Fontana, Philippus de Virinco, Guido de Villa Urbana, Johannes de Bastida, Claudius de Coutisone, Stephanus Moyrodi, Stephanus Preset, Guillelmus Rata, Michael Sapientis, Jocerandus Dozise, Martinus Deufella, Johannes Vagene et Guillelmus Macielloti, claustrales monasterii Insulae Barbarae, visuri et audituri per nos archiepiscopum et commitem predictum, procedi in causa electionis abbatis Insulae Barbarae mota et (verteri) coram nobis inter dictum procuratorem nostrum pro juro et interesse quibus supra, ex una parte, et religiosos viros fratres Stephanum de Verno, chambrorium, Guillelmus de Binant, Jacobum Magnini ac Johannem de Monte Aureo se dicentes contemptos, ex alia, ac honorabilen et religiosum virum fratrem Honoratum Boveti, alias Carobovis, (2r.) decretorum doctorem, priorem / de Sellone dicto abbatie se asser- entem electum, ex altera, super petitis et requisitis per dictum fratrem Honoratum in quodam papiri rotulo per ipsum, die veneris noviter lapesa, tradito incipiente 'Dominus Honoratus Boveti, etc.' inferius inserto et alia ut foret racionis. Comparantibus in judicio coram nobis archiepiscopo et comite profato, in aula bassa domus archiepiscopalis lugubris die et anno predictio hora prime, magistro Andrea Marini, publico notario procuratoro nostro generali pro jure et interesse quibus supra dicto, de Verno suo et procuratorio nomine Guillelmi de Binant et Jacobi Magnini se dicentes contemptos ut supra, assistento secum venerabili viro
domino Aycardino de La Rippa, legum doctor, pro cinque consiliario
et advogado et adherentibus et adhororo volentibus cum eiocam in
causa electionis do qua supra fit contio admullando et irritando ad
fines inferius descriptos, ac dicto asserto eocto supranotato, ac
etiam dictis religiosis Symondo do Abbaspini Jacobo d'Escotay,
Petro do Gurgito, Andrea do Gurgito, Thomas Prepporii, Guidone do
Fontana, Guidone de Vilia Urbana, in eorum propria personis
dicantibus sustinere vollo cum dicto decimo oocto huiusmodi oelectionem
fuisco et foro canonico excepto, dicto maior prioro, [prior saneti
Andreo, sacriata saneti Martini, sacriata banto lario et inferm-
arius dicti monasterii] dicantos quod non vult co involui procurati-
bus et quod ci dictus assertus ooctus habcat buman jus sustinencat
(cavantor), quod sumus in hac parte superior pro nisitando
justitiam unicipuo. Nomen dicto fratre Francisco Jecssrandi suo
et procuratorio nomine aliorum religiosorum superius nominatorum
citatorum, fndatoribus procuratis grossatis et expeditis acelicet
uniform per Eugenio do Burgi, aliud Petru Bulliandi dolicutamento et

(2v.)
ricum per Petrun de Bellavilla/ impordali notarios publicos
inferius incortorum adiuncto pro sustinendo cum dicto domino
Honorato electionem supra dictam fuisco et foro canonico et per
nos conftmandam foro et deboire. Unda supradictus ooctus assertuo
etiam per voces et organism dicti magistri Johannis Fatarini, in
legibus licenciati, potit per nos archipiscopum et priztum
memorarum primo et anto quant ad alico in huiusmodi oelectionis
causa actus procedarius dicto rotulo supra tradito, incipitonto
'Domnus Honoratus Bozoti eto.'; pro ipsum fratrem Honorati parte
responderi et supra contentio et per ipsum fratrem Honoratum petitis
ordinari et justitiam fieri. Quo facto co effort procedere in
causa huiusmodi sumario et de plano ut fuerit racionis.
Ex adverso dictus Stephanus de Verneto suo et nominibus quibus supra, per vocem dicti domini Aycardini eius consiliarii, dixit quod quia electus petit irritari et nullus dixit primum processum agitatum coram nobis causa huiusmodi defectu ( ) et cavillacionibus asserti electi supra nominati ac suorum procuratorum, cum reverentia ( ) loquendo petit et petit ipsum fratrem Honoratum per nos in expensis contemptorum supra nominatorum condamnari et eis solui ante omnia maxime quia lice non contestata procissorunt dicte expense; et de quibus ac damnis et interesse ipsorum contemptorum protestatur contra dictum fratrem Honoratum et dictum magistrum Johannem Patarini et Franciscum Jocerandi eius procuratorum. Quibus sibi solutis paratus et promptus est iterato et de novo fondare processum et (Jr.) / dicens et deducens causas et rationem coram nobis statim et in promptu per quas dici et declarari debebimus electionem per ipsum fratrem Honorati coram nobis exhibitis et traditae nullam et nullius valoris vel momenti huic aut saltis per nos et nostram diffinitiam finalem dicit et declarari huic et fore ipso jure et facto nullam et adnullandam per nos dobere causis et rationibus inferius deducendis et declarandis, si sit opus.

Dicto aserto electo per vocem dicti magistri Johannis Patarini petit prout alias primo et ante omnia suo rotulo supra tradito per nos responderi et dicens ad expensas per partem contemptorum predictorum petitas non tenari pro eo quia totus processus retro coram nobis agitatus inter presentes superius nominatas de huiusmodi electionis causa fuit et est nullus ipso jure. Quia ut alias dicit procurator dicti fratris Honorati non habuit potestatem ad agendum neque defendendum nisi duntaxat ad presentandum decretum dicte electionis et ad petendum ipsius confirmationem duntaxat; et se reffert ad procuratorem penes curiam causae huiusmodi existentem
et sic fuit culpa et negligencia se asserentum contemptos supra nominatis qui non bene et caute inspexerunt procuratorem quare eis imputetur sicut imputari debet.

Quibus hinc et inde auditis, nos, archiepiscopus et galliarum primas, prefatus mature in hac parte procedere volentes et assertum electum supra nominatum audire ad omnia que dicere voluerit prout fuerit racionis, et ministrari justitiam unican prout tenemur ad (3v.) removendum omnia dubia et pro (vicinorum acceler) / racione huiusmodi cause respondendo dicto suo rotulo et contentis in eodem; quod quia dictus frater Honoratus desiderat et petit (quemcunque) pro- cessum et acta in eius absentia facta et agitata coram nobis per quoscunque se dicentes procuratores suos, nullus et pro nullo haberi et reputari, prout seriosius in dicto suo rotulo de quo supra fit mencio dicitur contineri; et attentis etiam consensibus et aliis permissionibus dictorum contemporum et procuratoris nostri; et quod de dictis actis fuit amota et perdita magna pars, prout nobis retulit scriba noster et aliqualiter ostendit et aliis nos monemibus; habuimus et habemus processum primum coram nobis ut supra- fervert agitatum inter partes supra nominatas pro non facto, [remanen- tibus presentatione decreti et consensus electionis et petitione confirmationis et ceteris in quibus procurator electi habebat mandatum,] expensis supra petitis, [hoc pro utraque parte reser- vanti, cui de jure debebuntur,] reservanti in fine litis causa pres- sentis, et ulterius ordinantur et permittentur quod partes pro- cedant in huiusmodi electionis causa et dicant quidquid voluerint.

Quibus sic dictis et ordinatis dictus Andreas Marinini, noster procurator pro jure et interesse quibus supra, ex una parte; Stephanus de Verneto, Guillelmus de Binant et Jacobus Magnini se
asserentis contemptos supra nominati, [ex alia], dixerunt judicialiter coram nobis ad fines eis in hac parte utiliores. Ac proposuerunt contra dictum (asserentes) electum ut supra nominatum et alios religiosos citatis supra nominatis et descriptis per organum dicti

(4r.)

domi Aycardini eorum advocati quibus quilibet / ipsorum quomlibot tantam (comictim) quam divisim, pro se et eorum adherentibus et adhovere volentibus ad eomes fines eis utiliores et neccessarios:

(Quis)-licet ad eligendum futurum pastorem ratio sit a sacrorum canonum conditoribus tradita forma que si pretereatur talis eelectio sit ipso facto nulla aut saltim per nos adnullanda et cassanda: verum-
tamen nuper die sabbati, quarta mensis octobris post prandium, hora vesperorum vol circa, anno currentis domini millesimo trecentesimo nonagesimo nono, deffuncto bene memorie reverendo patre fratre Johanne de Sugniato, quondam abbate dicti monasterii Insule Barbare, superdicti religiosi, seu eorum maior pars, unionem et tractatum inter so de eligendo abbaten in eodem monasterio altorum dominio cellerarii et communerii.

Qui alter contra alium dictorum cellerarii et communerii religiosos dicti monasterii ad habendum voces suas in electione per claustrum dicti monasterii tractaverunt et fecorunt; et tandem forma elercionis secundum juris dispositionem nominata actenta et considerata quia: campana solita pro capitulo non pulsata, missa quod de sancto spiritu ut convenit nemine celebrate, et qui vocandi erant nemine vocatis, et aliis juris-solemitatibus quo in talibus hactenus servari debent et consuerunt neque servatis nec actentis. Eo quia tractatu prius prehabito inter ipsos de parte dicti communerii in pastorem et abbaten predicti monasterii difformiter ut dicebant elegerunt; deinde quod predictum fratrem Jacobun d'Escoatay, celler-

(4r.)

arium, etiam in abbatem et pastorem dicti monasterii / ad secundam
procedendo elegerunt et voces suas in eum super hoc direxerunt ipsum quod sit electum priori maiori dicti monasterii presentando ut pro abbate ipsum cellerarium teneret.

Quibusquid electionibus per oeadem religiosos factis et non obstantibus scientes in ipsis electionibus in forma peccasse et ipsae non observasse, volentes ad aliam acelicat tortiam electionem prorumpore, duas primis electionibus non cassatis nec adnullatis, aliam electionem inter se por viam, ut dicebant, sancti Spiritus, fecerunt seu facisso dicuntur. Per quam in abbatem et pastorem dicti monasterii dicuntur elegisse predictum fratrem Honoratum, priorum de Sellion; que tamen electio fuit et est ipso jure et facto nulla, aut saltim adnullanda et irritanda quoniam ut in prima et secunda poeccarunt in forma, ex eo quia predictis electionibus primis non cassatis seu adnullatis processerunt ad dictam tertiam electionem. Item, quoniam in dicta ultima electione plures ex dictis religiosis presentibus in eadem fuerunt et erant electionis tempore maioris summa extortacionis innodati propter quod ex capite non valuit neque valet predicta tertia electio de dicto priore.

Item, multominus valuit neque valet eadem electio ex coquina qui vocandi erant in eadem non fuerunt vocati neque presentes; nam et licet hiidem religiosi Stephanus de Verno, Guillolmus de Binant et Jacobus Magmini et Johannes de / Monte Aureo ossent claustrales dicti monasterii ac de gremio et conventu atque capitulo eiusdem proque talibus haberentur et reputarentur habeanturque et reputentur, ad dictam electionem faciendam non fuerunt vocati neque presentes ut fieri debebat, sed penitus et omnino contempti; quod ius infra dictam nostram diocesim existens, de licencia tamen eorum superioris, potestaten ad hoc habentis, causa legitima precedentis.
Item et quod quae premissa cessarent que non cessant sed vera sunt adhuc, non valuit neque valet dicta electio de dicto fratre Honorato dicte abbatie ut præmittitur factam ut supra; ex eo quia in eadem quam plures tractatus intervenerunt et precesserunt ante-quam ad illam processissent religiosi prenominati tam in cappella sancti Johannis dicti monasterii quam extra; scelicit quia inter cetera tractarunt et ancesrarunt de dicto domino priore ac prelocuti fuerunt nominativi quem idem eligerent in abbatem, et ut dictum eorum monasterium et ipsorum victualia pinguiora officerentur, et ad finem quod dictus suus prioratus do Sellions qui magnorum proven-tuum et exituum existot dicto monasterio unicetur, et ut meliores potiores et grandiores distributiones obtinerentur et haberentur a pluribusque viris notabilibus tam clericis quam secularibus tunc in dicto monasterio existentibus. Non tamen de religiosis dicti monasterii dicto Insule Barbare ante ipsum electionem consilium qual-iter dictus prioratus uniri posset et valeret dicto eorum monasterio (5v.) et per quam / ad ipsum eligendum procederent exquisierunt et exinde receperunt ac sub illa spe unionis prioratus abbatie predicte et prelocutorie predicta dictum fratem Honoratum elegerunt in abbatem prout supra, alium non electuri. Item et quia in eadem plures alii et diversi tractatus symoniam recte sapientes in dicta electione intervenerunt tractando de persona ipsius fratis Honorati, et post modum dixerunt ipsum via inspirationis elegisse, quod dici non potuit, ymmo potius via dyabolica, quia tractabant de fructu ventris et sic, non valet dicta electio. Item fortiori racione eadem electio de dicto priore de Sellions ut supra facta, fuit et est nulla quia extra dictum monasterium in perlocutionibus predictis perseverantes discpectabant invicem per quam vian eligerent eundem priorem; ex eorum vocibus aliqui dixerunt quod eligerent
via inspirationis et quod erat (cautior) via et quando intrarunt capitulum [indicto capitulo existente de electione tractantes et tractatum (huiusmodi) per predictum] talem electionem habitis predictis prelocucionibus publicarunt. Item quia debut [de jure] tercia dies assignari et prefingi ad electionem futuri pastoris faciendam quo tamen non fuit assignata naque prefixa ex eo non valuit neque valet eadem electio. Item dictus prior de Sellions non potuit neque debut per religiosos dicti monasterii in abbatem et pastorem (6r.) eligi, ymo postulari debuisset / et debebat quia prioratus est dignitates cui est alligatus idem prior, igitur non valuit neque valet [electio]. Item et [non] posito et non concesso que predicta non valorent quo tamen valent et tenent, multominus valet dicta electio ex eo quia electionem suam assertam per nos confirmari non petiit infra tempus juris prefixi et statuti a canone noque consecrationem (nemino) intra dictum tempus. Itaque tempus petitionis confirmationis et consecrationis percurrit et est dicto asserto electo supra nominato lapsum, et quod si aliquod jus habuit in dicta electione si electio dici mereatur, per lapsum temporis et obmissam confirmationem et consecrationem petendam amicit. Item et quia solemnitates juris non fuerunt servate que tamen servande erant. Cui premissa enim et singula fuerunt et sunt vera notoria, et manifesta est quod de eis publica vox et fama tam in dicto monasterio quam alibi. Ex quibus premisae causis et earum qualibet, fuit ipsa electio ipso facto nulla aut per nos adnullanda, cassanda et irritanda, ac ipsa religiousi juro eodem eligendi potestate hac vice privati, ac ipsa potestas ipsa jure ad dictos contemptos esse etuisse, devolutis ut dicebat procurator contemptis aut saltim per nos et nostran finalem diffinitivam ad ipsos contemptos devolvi debebor. Nec fieri potens et conclusens procurator contemptorum superius
nominatorum pro quibus compararet idem chamberius per vocem cuius supra.

Et ex alia parte dicto Andrea Marini pro jure et interesse predictis concludendo petiti et petit dictam electionem factis de dicto fratre Honorato causis premissis et earum qualibet ad hoc sufficiente/ quas ad hunc finem infrascriptis, dixit et proposuit et hic pro insertis vult haberi, fuisset et fore nullam aut saltim per nos adnullandam fore cassandam et irritandam; religiososque citis supra nominatis qui fuisset dicuntur in dicta electione potestate eligendi hac vice privari; et vobis jus devolutum fuisset tamquam prelatum dioecesarium et superiorum in hac parte, racione abusiose premissorum, deoque pastore ydoneo et sufficiente dicte abbatis per vos providendum fore et proventi debere; non autem ad se dicentes contemptos superius nominatos fuisset devolutum neque devolui debere de juro, eo quia si forte aliquod jus extitit dictis contemptis devolutis propter peccatum eligendi forme et materie ut supra tacite et alia fuit et est vobis devolutum et eorum jus vobis remiserunt.

Quarum cum in causa huiusmodi procedi debat summarie et de plano, obmissu strepitu et figura judicii, petivit dicti generalis procurator noster pro jure et interesse premissis, et de Verneto suo et nomine supra, et quilibet eorum prout quemlibet ut supra tangit conjuncta et divisio religiosorum supra citatorum, si qui sint non competentes debite continuantes reputari ponique in continuantia et defectu; necnon per dictos competentes premissis singulariter singulis medio juramento responderi, et si quo negentur ad probandum se admici, non astringendum se ad onus superflue probationis predicta dicendo ad personas,
Procurator noster pro jure et interesse et contempi supranominati suis et nominibus quibus supra tam conjunctim quam divisim

(7r.) salvo / eis juro addixerunt, dixerunt, (correxerunt) etc. deindeque per nos et nostram diffinitivam finalem dici, pronunciari et declarari predictas electionesuisse et fore ipso facto nullas causis premisit et earum qualibet ad hoc sufficiente irritas, invalidas et inanes voluntarieque ex de facto juris solommitatibus non servatis processisse et casu quo opus fuerit eadem cimam adnullari, irritari, cassari et nullas decerni. Decernique ipsos religiosos citatos ad illas nulliter et ut supra processisse et idco potestate oligendi ulterior in eodem monasterio pastorem et prelatum saltim hac vice privari, jusque et potestatem eligendi abbatam et providendi de pastore in eadem abbatiad nos tanquam diocesarium et superiorem devolutamuisse; competississe et nobis comptere ac per nos in eodem monasterio de prelato et pastore causis sepedictis providendis fore provideri et fieri quod fuerit rationis; religiososque supra citatos casu quo correctio et punicio interveniat corrigi et puniri prout justitia suadebit.

Ex adverso, predictus frater Honoratus, religiosi citati supra competentes, et frater Franciscus Jocerandi suo et procuratorio nomine predicto, per vocem dicti magistri Johannis Atarini eorum consiliorii et Advocati petierunt eis dari per procuratorem nominatum et se dicentes contempos summariam petitionem in scriptis et diem congruan eis assignari ad respondendum aut saltim predicta in scriptis rodigi loco summarie petitionis se offerentes facere somper quod debebunt. Parte vero contemptore petens etiam copiam dictarum procurationum et rotuli ut supra pro parte dicti se assententia electi

(7v.) supra nominati tradi et sibi decerni cum (termine) / ad dicendum et impugnandum contra quidquid dicere et impugnare voluerint. Et quia
dictus frater Honoratus, per vocem reverendi in Christo patrie domini abbatis Saigniati (sic), voluit dicere et obicere contra personas contemptorum superius nominatorum et de facto ipse iniuratus fuit et contra eorum personas multa verba iniuriosa dixit (queque) ipsis voluerit, extra judicium pro dictis haberi ut dicebat de quibus protestatus fuit, dictus dominus Aycardinus contemptorum superius nominatorum consiliarius et advocatus protestatur etiam de dicendo et obiciendo contra personas ipsius fratri Honorati totiens quotiens sibi fuerit neccesse et ei videtur expedire.

Et nos, archiepiscopus et primas antedictus dicto Jacobo Magnini continuato reputato quia nullum pro ipso competeret saltim legitime fondatus, predictis hinc et inde auditis, nature procedere volentes ac summarie in hac parte iuxta canonicas sanctiones, copiam rotuli pro parte dicti fratri Honorati ut supratraditi ut procuramento supra exhibitarum contemptis supra nominatis competentibus potestibus, determinavimus fieri et expediri ordinatam tenoreque presentium ordinamus premissa in scriptis redigi loco summarie petitionis, et partibus quarum interessent tradi et fieri; ipsisque partibus supra competentibus assignavimus et tenore presentium assignamus pro hac causa coram nobis ubique nos adesse continget diem Jovis proximum hora prime iuxio fuerit foro (etc. vidus) dictis fratri Honorato et supradictis religiosis supra citatis volentibus electionem de qua agitur / sustineri ad respondendum dictae summarie verbali petitioni in scriptis redacte; et contemptis ac procuratori nostro ad dicendum et obiciendum contra supra producta, et rotulum pro parte dicti fratri Honorati ut supra traditum quidquid dicere et obicere voluerint; et ulterior ad proponendum facta defensione et exceptione propositorum utroque, atque procedendum in huiusmodi causa ut fuerit rationis.
Datum Lugdunensi, anno die hora et loco primo dictis, praesentibus venerabilibus viris dominis Bartholomeo de Bochaillia praeposito Forverii in ecclesia Lugdunensi, Guilielmo de Goironodo, Gaufrido de Thelis, canonibus ecclesie Lugdunensis predictis, Bartholomeo de Cruce camerario sancti Pauli Lugdunensis, domino Johanne de Burgo legum doctore, Petro de Aurilliaco in legibus licenciato, et pluribus aliis testibus ad hoc astantibus coram nobis. Actum ut supra. (Hugonis de Berguario).
APPENDIX III

Bouvet's verse history of the counts of Foix
Bouvet's verse history of the counts of Foix

Sometime before the death of Gaston Fébus, count of Foix, on 1 August 1391 and probably after the battle of Launac in 1362, Honoré Bouvet produced for Fébus a history of the county of Foix written partially or entirely in verse and in the Provençal dialect. This chronicle of the counts of Foix, covering a period of some three hundred years, was based on several other chronicles and histories, not least among them the Flores Chronicorum of the Dominican Inquisitor, Bernard Gui. Bouvet's history of Foix does not appear to have survived, and our knowledge of it is derived exclusively from the fact that two historians employed by Gaston IV of Foix in the middle of the fifteenth century both made use of the verses in Bouvet's history. These two historians were Michel du Vernis and Arnaud Esquerrier, both of whom were notaries employed by Gaston IV, but whose chronicles seem to have been written independently.

Michel du Vernis' Cronique des comptes de Foix et senhors de Bearn was completed in 1445, and has been published by J.A.C. Buchon in his Choix de Chroniques et Mémoires in 1875. Buchon's edition is based on a manuscript in the archives of the Basses-Pyrénées at Pau (E 392), but a seventeenth century copy of Vernis' chronicle is available in the Doat collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, (Doat, 164), and it is from this version that the verses below have been extracted. Vernis' introduction to his Cronique

1. Choix de Chroniques et Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France, ed. J.A.C. Buchon (Orlean, 1875). This volume, (the series is unnumbered), also contains Cuvelier's Du Guesclin.
2. Bibl. nat. Doat 164, fos.2v.-73v.. This copy also contains a French translation.
in the Buchon edition runs as follows:

'Per entrament et honorablo commençament dol present libro, ad eternal memoria dels contes antiguos de Foix, et per saber qui fou lo primer conte de Foix, et successivament tots los autres entre lo jorn present, nostre Miguel del Vorns n'a volgut far memoria, et tot primerament qui fou lo primer conte de Foix; car segond que recitó messen Honorat, bona prior de Sant Loor en Provença, en una epistolla sua transesa al ograci et excellent princip de bona memoria messen Gaston, nuncupat Fobus, conte de Foix, en la qual epistolla fe mencion expressi, com lo dit messen Honorat et diligentia, abia sercat et trobat las croniques antigues, et en tropes libros especiallement en un libre que s'appella Floa del Croniques et en lattin Floa cronicarum, et en un autre libre que en appella La Catalgue dols Papes et en lattin Pontificum romanorum catalogae, et en las histories proconsales, per las quals abia trobat qui fou lo primer conte de Foix, lo segond, lo terc,...l'onzo qui fou lo payro del dit conte Fobus, segond la relation deu dit messen Honorat.' (Buchon, p. 575).

The Doat version of this introduction differs from Buchon's in very few respects, but, instead of 'messen Honorat, bon prior de Sant Loor', the Doat copy reads:

'messen Honorat Bonet, prior de Sent-Lor en Provença' (f.4v.).

The author then of the 'copistolla', whom Buchon found it impossible to identify, appears to be none other than Honoré Bouvet, prior of Selommet. His specified sources, the Floa del Croniques and the Catalgau dols Papes, were probably in effect only one work, the Floa Chronicarum of Bernard Gui, various editions of which

---

1. Buchon consistently misread Vernis' name as Vorns.
were produced in the sixteen years preceding the author's death in 1331. The Flores Chronicorum was also called Catalogue pontificum romanorum (H.L.F., xxxv, p. 176),¹ and in the French translation the chronicle 'peut estre entitulé les fleurs ou ce niex vous plaist le Catalogue des Papes' (Bibl. nat., Nouv.Acq., 1409, f.1). Bouvet may, however, have used a Provençal version.²

In the years which followed the publication of Vernis' Cronique in 1445, some or all of Bouvet's verses were incorporated in histories of Foix and Bearn. A decade or so after Vernis, Arnaud Esquerrier produced a history of Foix in which the battle of Launac of 1362 was described with the help of certain verses which, though unacknowledged, appear to have originated in Bouvet's Epistola.³ Esquerrier was probably the last person to make direct use of Bouvet's manuscript. Miegaville's history of Foix, produced in the first years of the sixteenth century, borrowed Bouvet's verses from Michel du Vernis,⁴ and, in 1539, Guillaume de la Perriore borrowed Bouvet's 'Launac' verses from Esquerrier in the preparation of his Les Annales de Foix.⁵ Guillaume de Catel in his Memoires de l'histoire de Languedoc of 1633, copies Bouvet's stanzas from Miegaville,⁶ but, a few years later, Pierre de Marco, may have obtained them directly from Vernis

2. An example of the Provençal version is in Bibl. nat.fr. 24940, which was probably executed soon after Gui's death in 1331.
3. Félix Pasquier and Henri Courteault, Chroniques Romanes des Comtes de Foix composées au XVe siècle par Arnaud Esquerrier et Miegaville (Foix, 1895), pp. xi-xii.
4. Ibid., p. xxi.
in the preparation of his own Histoire de Béarn. At any rate, Marca is the first since Vernis to have mentioned the name of the Provençal poet, 'Honoret Bonet, prieur de S. Lor' and 'sa lettre escrite à Gaston Phoebus' (II. p. 503). At this time Vernis' Cronique was available only in the manuscript at Pau, but, on 4 November 1665, one of Jean de Doat's industrious band of copyists completed a fine copy of the manuscript which is now available in the French Bibliothèque Nationale.

We have seen that when Buchon published Vernis' Cronique in 1875 he was unable to identify either 'mossen Honnora' or his priory of 'sent Lor en Proensa'. M. Chabaneau seems to have been the first to identify this personage with 'Honoret Bonet, prieur de Salón', author of the Tree of Battles, when he discussed the question in Devic and Vaissette's history of Languedoc of 1885. Chabaneau's discovery was confirmed in 1894 by Henri Courteault who argued that Bouvet was only responsible for the stanzas devoted to Gaston Fébus' predecessors (i.e., up to verse 11 below), and that Vernis himself was responsible for the remainder. Courteault also criticised Buchon's uncritical and faulty text which he described as 'détectable'. In 1902, Courteault suggested how Michel du Vernes might have been tempted away from Gaston IV's dull archives by Bouvet's 'beaux récits', and suggests the delightful possibility that Jean Froissart,

2. C. Devic and J. Vaissette, Histoire Générale de Languedoc, vol. x, (Toulouse, 1885), pp. 359-60, 'Notes sur l'histoire de Languedoc'.
while in Orthez, heard these verses 'tomber des livres bavardes du complaisant chevalier Espan du Lyon'. Froissart may, unfortunately, have found them rather turgid.

That Bouvet was in fact the author of the verses inserted by Vernis into his text, is indicated on several occasions. When introducing the verse (1) concerning Bernard, first count of Foix, Vernis mentions his source: '...delqual loudit Roscen Honorat, per eternal memoria et denomination deldit prumer conto de Foix, fec lo seguien metre en quattre lignes...' (Deat, 5v). It would also appear that Bouvet's Epistolla to Gaston Fébus contained something more than the rather meagre panegyrics which Vernis quotes directly. Bouvet was, for example, Vernis' source for the information about Count Roger's translation of the relics of St. Anthony (Deat, 6v.), but this event is not recorded in any of the verses copied by Michel du Vernis. It may not, therefore, be quite fair to Bouvet to judge his Epistolla on the basis of some verses which possibly formed only a small part of his history.

Even the verses in Vernis' Cronique, however, cannot all be attributed to Bouvet's pen. The stanzas on folios 50v to 51v of the Deat manuscript which deal with the life of 'mosen Archambaud', the fourteenth count, could not, of course, have been included in Bouvet's Epistolla to the twelfth count, Gaston Fébus. Courteault, however, has suggested, presumably on the basis of Vernis' introduction, that Bouvet was not responsible for any of the stanzas which related to Fébus (i.e. 12-32 below). Michel du Vernis does not, however, suggest that Honoré had not brought his chronicle up to date, simply that his sources helped him only so far as the

eleventh count. After that, presumably, Bouvet was on his own. It seems very unlikely that Bouvet should have omitted to include any verses about his patron. Furthermore, if Vernis had written the 'Fébus' stanzas, it is difficult to comprehend why he should have confined himself to the period up to 1362, and ignored the last thirty-or-so years of Gaston's reign. Bouvet, on the other hand, might have written his Enistolla in the early-1360s, long before Fébus' death in 1391, possibly even to commemorate the latter's victory at Launac on 5 December 1362. Finally, if, as Félix Pasquier and Henri Courteault believed,¹ Arnaud Esquerrier made independent use of Bouvet's Enistolla, the verses which he included in his own Chronicle to describe the battle of Launac, some of which are identical to those in Vernis, must have been the work of Honoré Bouvet rather than Michel du Vernis. If Vernis had written them, the independence of Esquerrier's Chronicle must be called into question.

One can therefore conclude, with a fair measure of certainty, that Honoré Bouvet, while still a young man in his twenties, composed a history of the county of Foix for Gaston Fébus, count of Foix and viscount of Béarn. It was written partly or entirely in verse, and in the dialect of the author's native Provence. All thirty-two of the verses below were copied by Michel du Vernis, but were composed by Honoré Bouvet himself, and, just as they only form a part of Vernis' Chroniques, they also only constituted a fraction of Bouvet's Enistolla.

¹. See note 3 on p. 221.
Verses addressed by Honoré Bouvet to Gaston Fébus of Foix.

From Chronicle of Michel du Vernis: DOAT 164.

(5r.) 1. Sent Bernad foe qui comensec la blanque de cisteus,
Et sibien puix ainsí sera per en Foix comte novel
Car bien soy que lo temps viendra que lo comte sera mot bel.
Et de ennemicq trops aura car ben sabera gardar sos feus.

(5v.) 2. Per so me failh Rogier nomar, car lo nom siec la personne
Et a gros os rosogar car ey conquistat Carcassone
Encare crei que mon corsier poeyra dei roce a Barsalone
Courre per tout chens nul danger sy dius longue vite me donne.

3. Hom me apele Rogier de tibaut, seignour do la basse proense
Encare montare plus haut per ardiment et per valenssa
Qui Gausara cuilhir mon saut jo juri diu ot ma cresenco
Que amon ale no aura defaut per gran qui sie dessa durensa.

(6v.) 4. Rogier lo gros soy breviment dels contos de foix soy lo quart
Et sibien me he la panse grande no me trobi flac ni coart
Goerre no vouilh am mulles gens mas ben sapien per sent leonart
Que qui men fare tant ni quant que no sen pondira tart.

5. Hom me apele Rogier aubepe, et soy dels contos lo cinque
Et plata me contra sele armar qui an la loy de Sarrazine
Trop desiri lo sang venyar de Jesus lo hilh de laltisme
Car ben sure lo bon logier en la gloire do laut Regisme.
(7v.) 6. Ben saben tous vos ennemicqs que nomat soy Rogier lo grant
Et sy bouilh esser bon amicq large et franc a toute gent
Mas envoyos seran anous car lo lous fie d tal talent
Et jo lo juri por sent denis els ne conexeran lo semblant.
(9v.) 7. Bien cresi que james no foc que foix no agues embeyos
Puix que a inxi mapelan tous conte Rogier bornad lo pros
Gardon se de noeyt et de jour de mi encontrar los orgulhos
Car si diu es de mon conduit lo mettre lous orgulhos en sos.
(10v.) 8. Ami me plats gardar nous dreyts et estre seignour de ma torre
Et he desirat tropes vots que entre chrestias agues fi guerre
Touts anessen sus sarrasins ab honor de Diu et de sa mayre
Per conquistar lous dreyts de Diu et la gloria de Diu lo payre.
(11v.) 9. Hom me apele Rogier bermad et si soy bien en vertat
Et jo no soy pas tant musard que pannac la rique ciutat
No aye conquise et bearn por creixer lo meu Comtat
Enquara no quitty lautre part daquest pays chens falsetat.
(12v.) 10. Hom me apele prumer Gaston que jamais fos en mon linadge
Si he de foix cambiat lo nom per Bearn gardon son usadge
Dont paravant se garde lo Leon sus en la bacque prendre
Car ja non fara son prou si Diu me garde de dammage.
(13v.) 11. Lo monde beg fort tribolat que no presi tres carlis
Mas pregui la sancte trinitat quem doni lanime saubar
Carlo souspiri chens long sejour car bey lous enfisseus
si abansar
Et aux sarrasins themir terre desca la mair et son si pres
de nostes vesins.

(Before departing for Granada, Gaston II addresses his wife:)

12. Done adiu vous coman que io mon vau
A vous coman mon filh Gaston et tout lostau
Et si vous pregui que a Gaston mustrets bones virtuts
Et lo regoardets a lonviron et luy donets neurituts.

(His wife replies:)

13. Hossaignor greu mes la departide ay aus y pody far
Diu vous don longue vitto et vous laixi tourmar
De Gaston fare bonne garde el dare neurittut
Monstra li faro doctrine et bonne virtut.

(Gaston then speaks to his son, Gaston F6bus:)

14. Avisate mon filh arror et avant et sies bien aquisat
No ayes flac cor ny simple gant ab tous amicqs te atire
(soras ben cosselhat)
Car aspre guerre tespore dels enbeyos false et trat
Et ny ab tous amicqs not acosseilhes fort soras corrossats.

(Gaston F6bus replies:)

15. Vostre filh soy chens falha et soy lo toro Gaston
Lo cor me made en batailhe et en als renom
Jo ame forte personne et bon cors per portar armes
En Bearn Carcassone et en France contre als angles
Et soy de tres noble linadg de Foix lo antig hostal
Hoy aura ville ny parade en Espaigne ni Portogal
En Armanhac ni en Roergue ni als monts do cantal
En Gascoigne ni en Comenge io no traversi acavalh
Car soy nascut en tal planotte et fortunade costellacion
Que per toutes partes del monde de mi cora feyte mention
De mi pay no ayats doublanse ni ayats lo cor racos
En Diu ey ferme esperance que ni fara estar juyos
De nostre ennemicqs aure vengeance et tous fare estar iros
Asprement ab vies de lance tous me tere do cap en jos
Non y aura de sy haut corage que io no lous fassi
Ny malle ville ni vassaladge no lous fasse aterrar
Et si voleu are del nostre jo lous acq defendre
Fortament ab punkte de lance de haut cor lous respondre
Sy are soy en infantie tantost viendra lo temps
Que poeyre far valentie ab nostres amicqs tous ensemps
Por so vous progui lo me payre de mi no ayats esbayment
Ni vous matres cara mayre non ayats marriment,

(Gaston II then bids farewell to his people:)

16. A Diu, adiu que io men vau en Granade contre lo poble
monsacrosen
La cause de que plus lo cor me rague, Gaston es loquoau
vous coman
Veray Diu donats lo leyau gent car de ennemicqs an ira
marcat gran
Don io se que jacque et plate li faran bien boscinh et
soen.

(The people reply:)

17. Nostre bon seignou de nos no ayats doptanco
Guise vous Diu nostre seignour et nostre donc de Sarranse
(While the count is away Fôbus is scolded by his mother:)

18. Bel filh perques as tón coradge et voluntat ot en jouenesse

Regardo a col de tón linadge com son estats de gran proesse

Tu es enemiga en plamosse plus que no son lops en lous boscadges

Et sien a prima ou a la messe tosten pensen sus tous damadges.

(Fôbus replies:)

19. Madame no vous donets tristesee car io ey lo polit plomadge

Lo fou so que plats a jovennesse car atal es son usatge

Fëbus suffric trop gran otradge quand el ero on sa enfanteso

Puix fô ou tan prous et tant savi que metoc nous enemiga a outranse.

(Count Gaston dies at Granada mourned by his fellow crusaders:)

20. Benazoyt sie Diu nostre seignou / Car Foix pren oey gran honor

Car per la gent chrestiane / Per qui Diu pres carn humme

Acquest home tant hondrat / Daqueste vitta es trespassat.

(Gaston Fôbus, the new count, is in Prussia when the duchess of Normandy appeals for his assistance against the "jacomars"):)

21. Lasse sire que farem nous tous en morts et hontis

Conte de Foix io prouqi vous puix que Diu vous dassi tramis

En terre de Prussia per esser pres don bon retornats mon dous amis

Et fets vous que lo vostro secours nos gars de nostes enemiqs.
(Fébus replies:)

22. Par ma foy se ne son que vilanis no vous dobetes pas madame
Car io vous juri per mon arme que no seran tous vius
doma
Et se jo meti na lance en la ma jo prometi ala ros que
plus ame
Que seran de mort tant prochans com es del blanc carbo
la flame.

(The duchess confidently addresses the Jacques:)

(18v.)23. Fugets vilans jacques fugets car lo Comte de Foix Fébus
vous bien dessus
Qui assi vous ets alostats contre mi ala mort ets venuts
Et si tantost no fugets lous tous serets confus
Et la mort vous es prochane et del tout serets destruts.

(The count of Armagnac, preparing to give battle to Fébus
in 1362, speaks to Lady Fortune:)

(23v.)24. Dona bien ay per mon saber del pays lo gouvornement
Et ey ab mi tout mon pouder de cavalhiers et daustres gens
Jo ey Comenge ab son deber et ey la lebrego bon corrent
Dona per so adestruir Foix et toute sa gent
Car no te demandy ros plus ny sur ny argent
Mas que bien pusca complir mon talent.

(But Lady Fortune replies:)

25. Tu penses acquier fortune per barat et por tricharia
Et te penses que io sie mude et del tout ondormide
Si penses que io sie mude de justice non soy mia
Vet te assi la jornade vengudo que ta tricharia es finide.
(Meanwhile saint Voluzian appears to Fêbus in a dream:)

(24v.)26. Filhs lhevats sus car temps es que vous prengats lo gran honor
Que om no es al mon vivent am pancas prongsas maior
Tost armats vous no doubtets res anats avant encontrar lor
Car darmainhac ot de sas gens vous fare oey seignour.

(Fêbus then arouses his men and addresses them:)

(25v.)27. Jo he mon bon dreyt ainsi fermament io lo croy
Car jo he gardade per entier la pats jurade per ma fe
Hardidement aic sobre ni car io vouilh este lo prume
Ja no metre lo po arre per ducq per Conte ni per rey.

(Armagnac is defeated and, while fleeing to the woods, is captured by a German knight, 'nossen Anssa'. He begs to be set free:)

(26v.)28. Compans io te pregui que tu me octroyes soque te requeri esta vetz
Que tu no me empache la vie laxe me fugir on acquest boscq
Car se tu vos de ma monede jo te dare aur et argent tantost
Et te prometi on que jo sie que io te sorc car amic cortes.

(But Hans[?] replies:)

(27v.)29. Trop farats honte a voste linadge de fugir tant vilanement
So es nature de porc sauadage et non pas de honorable gent
Lous roynards que estan al boscadges et lous layrous que van panan
Are sie dius a mon dagnadgy ay vous arrats plus avan,
(Armagnac is taken before Gaston Fébus and plumbs for mercy.)

30. Fébus jo to tort be ho say ot a nomen pocty escondir
    Car trop gran tems ha no fine deperpotr: r a tu ontir
    Don las caytien gran peor he que brevement no fassas
    mourir
    Ho en priso car ho merit com un moschant long tems
    languir.

(Fébus replies:)

31. Fui que Diu aixi por sa merce a mi donat ni gran honor
    Vous no mourirets pas en est jorn ja nie que trop lavets
    servit
    Mas penes vous fare souffir car vos motre en atal tor
    Que rey due ni emperador no vous veyran ni jorn ni noeyt.

(28v.)32. Lan ui l tres cens sixante et dos / Lo conte de Foix
    valent et pros
    A justat an sa baronie / En desembre lo cinquo die
    Prangon batailhe campal / Armahac son onmenic mortal...
    (there then follows list of prisoners, captured after
    Foix's victory).

The last verse incorporated in Vernis' Chronicle concerns
'mosen Archambaud', Fébus' successor, and is therefore certainly
not the work of Bouvet.
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I. Manuscript Sources

a) Literary

Most of the unpublished literary sources for this work were examined in the Bibliothèque Nationale, in Paris. Twenty-eight of the seventy-nine Tree manuscripts which still exist, are in this library, as are two of the Apparicion manuscripts and one of the two manuscripts of the Somnium. These have all been consulted. The Demandes of Geoffroy de Charny to the Order of the Star are in the Bibl. nat., Nouvelles Acquisitions françaises 4736; but the transcript of Dr. Kenneth Fowler has been used. The late-fourteenth century French translation of Ramon Lul's Livre de l'Ordre de Chevalerie, used here, is that of the Bibl. nat. fonds français 1971 which has been checked against français 1973. The Traité de l'Oriflame of Raoul de Presles has been consulted in the library's fonds Duchesne 65, fos. 38-45v., (fos. 41-42 are extraneous), and Jean Petit's La Complainte de l'Eglise in fonds français 12470, fos. 1-5. Christine de Pisan's Le Livre de fais d'armes et de chevalerie is, rather surprisingly, only available, in print, in the English translation of Caxton. This version, together with the original in the fonds français 1243, has been used for this present study. The Chronique of Michel du Vernis, from which Bouvet's verses have been extracted in Appendix III, is that of the Bibl. nat. Doat collection, 164.

The only major unpublished literary source used in this work, outside the Bibl. nat., is La Regale du Monde in the Trinity Hall (Cambridge) ms. 12 fos. 100-143. This work is anonymous and undated, but there are several indications that it was written for Charles V between 1371 and 1378.
Unpublished documents referred to in this present work are almost all connected with the biography of Bouvet. Although the Archives Nationales in Paris, and a number of departmental and communal archives in the south-east of France, were visited—the richest sources for Bouvet material were the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Archives départementales of Rhône (at Lyons) and of Bouches-du-Rhône (at Marseilles).

Bibl. nat. Pièces Originales, Dossiers Bleus and fonds français produced miscellaneous details concerning Bouvet's career between 1391 and 1405.

Documents from the fonds of the Chapitre primatial Saint-Jean (10 C) at Lyons have been the exclusive source for information concerning Bouvet's election to the abbacy of Ile-Barbe and the annulment of that election, and have thrown considerable light on his journey to the eastern European courts, 1399-1401. The most significant unpublished document discovered in these archives is 10 G. 1409, pièce iv, which is published in Appendix II. 10 G 3146, pièces i & ii have been published in the Grand Pandecte of Charpin-Feugerolles but 10 G 1409, v; 10 G 3119, ii; and 10 G 3126, were also useful.

The central archives of Provence, at Marseilles, was a rich source for the biography of Bouvet in the last five years of his life.

During this period, (1404-1409), he was maître racional at the Cour des Comptes, and it is the fonds of the Cour (série B) which are most valuable. The most important document, in this respect, is the record of Bouvet's appointment to the post of maître racional, in the register B8, fos. 190v-191v, but this register and others, (B9, B771, B772, B1384 & B1406), contain a number of entries recording Bouvet's attendance at council meetings.
The records of the Chambre des Comptes of Dauphiné in the archives dép. of Isère, Grenoble, (B2607-B4660) are also a rich source, especially for military material. The rouleau B3771, relating to Raymond de Turenne, has been used.

The departmental archives of the Vaucluse at Avignon were not an important source for this study, although the liasse C49, and the registers C137-140, contain several mentions of Guigues de Montbel of whom Aymard de Cordon had rid Lyons in 1400. The Departmental archives of Basses-Alpes at Digne, and of Hautes-Alpes at Gap, were also visited; as were the communal archives of Embrun, Sisteron, Seyne and Selonnet, but they did not prove useful.

The Departmental archives of the Côte d'Or, at Dijon, yielded the document (B 149, f 146) transcribed on p. 52, (note 1).
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