

**INTERPRETING WARFARE AND KNIGHTHOOD IN LATE
MEDIEVAL FRANCE: WRITERS AND THEIR SOURCES IN THE
REIGN OF KING CHARLES VI (1380-1422)**

A Ph.D. Dissertation

by

ZEYNEP KOCABIYIKOĞLU ÇEÇEN

Department of History

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

Ankara

March 2012

To Erhan Salih

**INTERPRETING WARFARE AND KNIGHTHOOD IN LATE
MEDIEVAL FRANCE: WRITERS AND THEIR SOURCES IN THE
REIGN OF KING CHARLES VI (1380-1422)**

**Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences
of
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University**

by

ZEYNEP KOCABIYIKOĞLU ÇEÇEN

**In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in**

**THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA**

March 2012

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. Paul Latimer
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. David E. Thornton
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Assoc. Prof. Cadoc D. A. Leighton
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. Berrak Burçak
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Prof. Burçin Erol
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Erdal Erel
Director

ABSTRACT

INTERPRETING WARFARE AND KNIGHTHOOD IN LATE MEDIEVAL FRANCE: WRITERS AND THEIR SOURCES IN THE REIGN OF KING CHARLES VI (1380-1422)

Kocabıyıkoglu Çeçen, Zeynep

P.D., Department of History

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Paul Latimer

March 2012

This thesis makes an analysis of different views on warfare and knighthood focusing on the late Middle Ages, though looking back to what came before, with an argument that a ‘new view’ was held by certain authors during the reign of Charles VI in France. This coincided with a certain phase of the Hundred Years’ War where the French were very conscious of their military failures. Medieval views on warfare and knighthood are examined under two basic categories: the view promoted through the romances to a lay audience, and the view developed by ecclesiastical authors, i.e. theologians, academics and canon-lawyers meant for a highly educated audience. While thesis shows that the ‘romance view’ perseveres into the early fifteenth century, it suggests a growing vogue for a ‘new view’ that is also addressed to a lay audience, but is closer to the ‘ecclesiastical view’ in many of its approaches. The new view is nevertheless different from the latter in certain respects, including the way it uses Ancient Roman sources on warfare, though these are also used to an extent in the ‘ecclesiastical view.’ It will illustrate this new view in the works of three authors residing in France at the time: Honoré Bouvet, Philippe de Mézières and Christine de Pizan. While evaluating these authors’ ideas on warfare and knighthood from the point of view of the contemporary military situation, the thesis will also briefly address their relevance to humanism.

Keywords: Knighthood, Warfare, France, Hundred Years' War, Honoré Bouvet, Philippe de Mézières, Christine de Pizan, Roman Works, Vegetius, Valerius Maximus, Frontinus, Humanism.

ÖZET

GEÇ ORTAÇAĞ FRANSASINDA SAVAŞ VE ŞÖVALYELİK YORUMLARI: VI. CHARLES DÖNEMİNDE (1380-1422) YAZARLAR VE KAYNAKLARI

Kocabıyıkoglu Çeçen, Zeynep

Doktora, Tarih Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Asst. Prof. Paul Latimer

Mart 2012

Bu tez geç Ortaçağ dönemine odaklanarak ama daha önceki zamanlara da bir bakışla, savaş ve şövalyelik üzerine değişik görüşleri inceleyip Fransa’da VI. Charles döneminde yeni bir görüşün varlığını tartışmıştır. Bu söz konusu dönem Yüzyıl Savaşlarının Fransızların kendi askeri başarısızlıklarının çok farkında olduğu bir zamanına denk gelmektedir. Savaş ve şövalyelikle ilgili Ortaçağ görüşleri iki ana başlık altında incelenmiştir: romanslar yoluyla halk dinleyici toplulukları arasında yayılan görüş, ve dini yazarlar, yani din felsefecileri, akademisyenler ve kilise hukukçuları tarafından yüksek eğitilmiş bir dinleyici topluluğuna hitaben oluşturulan görüş. Bu tez, bir yandan ‘romans görüşü’nün onbeşinci yüzyılın ilk yarısında halen geçerliliğini koruduğunu gözler önüne sererken, yine halk topluluklarına hitap eden ‘yeni bir görüşün’ artmakta olan popülerliğini öne sürmüştür. Bu yeni görüş bir yandan ‘dini görüşe’ pek çok yaklaşımı itibariyle yakinken bir yandan da birtakım açılardan, ki buna ‘dini görüş’ tarafından da belli bir derecede kullanılmış olan savaşla ilgili yazılmış eski Roma eserlerini kullanma biçimi de dahildir, değişiktir. Tez, bu ‘yeni görüş’ü bahsedilen zamanda Fransa’da yaşamış olan şu üç yazarın eserleriyle örneklemiştir: Honoré Bouvet, Philippe de Mézières ve Christine de Pizan. Bir yandan bu yazarların savaş ve şövalyelik üzerine düşüncelerini o günün askeri olayları açısından değerlendirirken, bir yandan da hümanizmle olan ilgilerine kısaca değinmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Şövalyelik, Savaş, Fransa, Yüzyıl Savaşları, Honoré Bouvet, Philippe de Mézières, Christine de Pizan, Roma Eserleri, Vegetius, Valerius Maximus, Frontinus, Hûmanizm.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Paul Latimer whose guidance and support has been invaluable during the preparation of this dissertation. His knowledge, as well as his positive attitude has always inspired and guided me throughout my study. I would also like to thank all the committee members for the time and effort they spend on reading my thesis and for providing me with valuable suggestions.

I would also like to thank my family for their great support during the enduring process of writing this dissertation. My special thanks to my little son for cheering me up with his presence, to my husband for his understanding and love, to my sister for believing in me and for her all-time support, for my sister-in-laws for keeping my spirits up, my parents for always being there whenever I needed them, and all the members of my family for their love and support. Last but not least, I would like to thank all my friends who have always been so supportive and caring during all those years. Without any of these people, this work would not be complete.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER II: LANCELOT DO LAC: A REPRESENTATION OF THE ROMANTIC VIEW OF KNIGHTHOOD.....	49
CHAPTER III: THE INFLUENCE OF ROMANCES ON WORKS OF GUIDANCE ON CHIVALRY: TWO EXAMPLES FROM THE LATE MEDIEVAL PERIOD.....	77
CHAPTER IV: THE ECCLESIASTICAL OPINION ON WARFARE AND WARRIORS.....	111
CHAPTER V: THE REVISED IDEALS OF KNIGHTHOOD IN THE LATE MIDDLE AGES: HONORÉ BOUVET, CHRISTINE DE PIZAN, AND PHILIPPE DE MÉZIÈRES.....	144
5.1 Just Wars as a Mechanism of Divine Justice for punishing Sinners	148
5.2 Just Wars as aimed at the Common Good.....	149

5.3 Just Wars should protect the Defenceless Non-Combatants.....	150
5.4 Just Wars should be waged by Right Authority.....	154
5.5 Self-Defence as Just War.....	156
5.6 Holy War as Just War.....	156
5.7 Private Combats condemned.....	157
5.8 Points of Personal Honour not justified in Warfare: Pride and Desire for Vainglory as Sinful Motives.....	162
5.9 Love of Luxury not justified for Warriors.....	165
5.10 The Sinful will be defeated.....	170
5.11 The Roman Influence: The Idea of a Warrior in the Service of the State	173
5.12 The Admiration for Roman Military Teaching and Example.....	175
5.13 The Roman Idea of Honour.....	177
5.14 The Execution of Strategy and Discipline vis-à-vis the Role of Divine Providence in Warfare.....	179
5.15 The Focus on the Commander as the Executor of Strategy and Discipline.....	183
5.16 The Use of Strategy and Wisdom in Warfare.....	185

5.17	The Execution of Discipline among Warriors.....	191
5.18	The Payment of Wages.....	197
5.19	The Spoils of War.....	203
5.20	The Confused Concepts of the Medieval Knight, Man-at-Arms and the Roman Soldier.....	207
5.21	Conclusion.....	210
CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION.....		216
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....		237

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Maurice Keen, the famous scholar of medieval warfare and knighthood describes warfare as a permanent state of affairs of kingdoms and the lives of men. Peace he defines as the periods between wars.¹ Hence, it is not surprising to find warfare and knights as a favourite theme in medieval literature. Greek, Roman or German epic poems basically all praised valour, prowess, loyalty and largesse not in a particularly different way from their praise in the eleventh and twelfth century epics, the *chansons de geste*.² Then came the romances, which made a much more enduring and significant imprint on the image of a medieval warrior.

Romances provided the basis of a particular kind of view of knighthood and warfare that was very influential on other literature concerning knights and warfare, as much as it was on real life practices and attitudes. Much to do with the importance of cavalry and the emergence of knights as an essential aid to nobles in the protection

¹ Maurice H. Keen, *The Laws of War in the Late Middle Ages* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965), 23-24.

² Idem, *Chivalry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), 104.

of their status, these stories, dominated by the prowess and valour of their heroes and their love for a noble lady, reflected an ideal that suited the contemporary needs and aspirations in courtly circles of knights and nobility. Yet also, because they were usually written by courtly clerks, these stories often gave signs of the authors' efforts to teach their audience certain manners that aimed to civilise their conduct, as well as to enhance their consciousness of the spiritual sphere. At the end of the day, romances may not be held to represent completely a clerical view of knighthood and warfare, as these stories were written in the vernacular and for the entertainment of courtly circles and largely reflected the ideals of the individuals in those circles.

In parallel to this view taken by the romances however, another view of knighthood and warfare can be established in the writings of those whom I will call here the ecclesiastical authors.³ This view can be defined broadly as an outlook on warfare and knighthood that mainly drew on the teachings of the Church, as well as on those of the ancient philosophers, an outlook that did not aim to present an ideal of individual achievement that would please the military class, but rather to resolve martial issues in a way that looked to protect the common benefit. Of course, unlike the authors of romances who addressed a lay and often relatively uneducated audience, clerks though the authors generally were, ecclesiastical authors wrote in Latin, the language of the learned to be read by a relatively highly educated audience: students, scholars, priests, bishops, popes, kings or by the advisors who would educate and guide them.

³ In the introduction to his *Chivalry*, Maurice Keen uses a similar terminology to distinguish different influences on knighthood during the Middle Ages. He holds that the idea of chivalry was influenced by both the romances and the "ecclesiastical opinion," and shows *Ordene de chevalerie*, Ramon Llull's *Libre del ordre de cavayleria* and Geoffroi de Charny's *Livre de chevalerie* as drawing on both: Ibid., 1-17. See also, *Ramon Lull's Book of Knighthood and Chivalry & the Anonymous Ordene de chevalerie*, trans. William Caxton and Brian R. Price (Chivalry Bookshelf, 2001); Geoffroi de Charny, *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry*, trans. Elspeth Kennedy, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005) [Hereafter *Book of Chivalry*].

Both views have established themselves as influences on the idea of knighthood and warfare in the minds of medieval men. Yet, during the late Middle Ages we can discern the appearance of another view of warfare and knighthood new to vernacular literature. This ‘new’ view, drawing certain features from the ecclesiastical view, and heavily relying on Roman sources, but contradicting the romance view in several aspects, can be observed in the works of three authors residing in France during the reign of Charles VI, Honoré Bouvet, Philippe de Mézières and Christine de Pizan. The most famous works of these authors on warfare and knighthood, respectively, *Arbre des batailles*, *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, and *Livre de faits d’armes et de chevalerie*⁴ share an outlook that defies the individual heroism of the romances with a concern for the common good with an emphasis on Roman discipline and strategy, to an extent similar to the Latin works of ecclesiastical authors, though different in emphasis, language, style and audience, as they are written in the vernacular and addressed towards the knights and nobility, and not to academic or highly educated circles.

In trying to analyse the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières in respect of the fundamental features of the view of warfare and knighthood expressed in them, the personal backgrounds of the authors deserve attention, because they are noticeably different from each other.

Honoré Bouvet — or Bonet as he was called earlier⁵ — was a Benedictine monk and a canon-lawyer who has held the office of the prior of Salon in the

⁴Honoré Bouvet, *The Tree of Battles of Honoré Bonet*, trans. and intro G.W. Coopland (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1949) [Hereafter *Tree of Battles*]; Philippe de Mézières, *Songe du vieux pèlerin*, ed. Joël Blanchard (Paris : Poche, 2008) [Hereafter *Vieux pèlerin*]; Christine de Pizan, *The Book of Deeds of Arms and of Chivalry*, ed. Charity Cannon Willard, trans. Sumner Willard (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003) [Hereafter *Deeds of Arms*].

⁵ The surname of the author, now confirmed to be Bouvet was considered to be Bonet before the publication of an article by G. Ouy, “Honoré Bouvet (appelé à tort Bonet) prieur de Selonnet” *Romania* 85 (1959) : 255-59.

Southeast of France from 1382 onwards.⁶ His *Arbre des batailles*, written in 1387, was a work on the nature and laws of war that largely drew on the *Tractatus de bello, de represaliis et de duello* of Giovanni da Legnano written c.1360.⁷ Despite the fact that Bouvet's learning was limited by his knowledge of canon laws, evidenced by his preference for proofs taken from canon law instead of civil law decrees, and by an indirect knowledge of Latin classics or ancient philosophy,⁸ we might easily put his work next to those of Legnano and Bartolus Saxoferatto, for example, in communicating an 'ecclesiastical opinion' on warfare and knighthood, if it were not for the peculiar features of this book that makes it more accessible to the knights, heralds, noblemen and others in the occupation of arms than the works of the above stated authors. Writing in French, Bouvet almost reworked Legnano's *De bello*, by omitting the bulk of Legnano's references to philosophers, decretals, law codes and other authorities, and also illustrating the long and heavy discourses of Legnano with either contemporary examples or those of his own creation. The modern editor of his book maintains that Bouvet was "unusually well-informed" about contemporary wars, perhaps through his acquaintance with knights in his youth — to which he makes reference in *Arbre des batailles* — and also perhaps through his closeness to Avignon, his connections with the French royal court, and through his witnessing of the effects of war all around him, especially in Languedoc.⁹ In all, he gave a non-romantic portrayal of a knighthood that should be governed by laws that can be basically defined as protecting the common good, something that was a regular

⁶ *Tree of Battles*, 15.

⁷ Giovanni da Legnano, *Tractatus de bello, de represaliis et de duello*, ed. Thomas Erskine Holland (Washington, 1917), accessed March 9, 2012, http://www.archive.org/stream/tractatusdebello00legnuoft/tractatusdebello00legnuoft_djvu.txt [Hereafter *De bello*]. G.W. Coopland remarks that the eighty-four percent of the hundred and twelve chapters of the book that deal with the same subjects covered in Legnano's book are based on his work: *Tree of Battles*, 26.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 18, 28.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 18-19. Coopland does not find sufficient evidence to back up the claim of Coville that Bouvet was intended for a military career: *Ibid.*, 20, n. 31.

concern of ecclesiastical authors. Yet his choice of language and simplification of discourses made this view accessible to laymen. This methodology may account for the book's popularity among nobles and knights during the fifteenth century and for the inspiration it gave to (non-academic) authors in writing on the subject.¹⁰ The evidence for the book's popularity can be seen in the number of copies found in the libraries of noble homes over a wide geographical area extending from Spain and France to England and Scotland, especially during the fifteenth century. During this time translations were constantly being produced and there is even evidence that *Arbre des batailles* was actually being referred to for immediate practical use in the case of the duke of Norfolk boarding his ship with a copy of the book in 1481.¹¹ In addition to having a direct influence on Christine de Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes*, the book was also used in well-known examples of fifteenth-century works on warfare such as Nicholas Upton's *De studio militari* (written before 1446), William Worcester's *Boke of Noblesse* (addressed to King Edward IV in the late fifteenth century), and in Jean de Bueil's *Le Jouvencel* (written in 1466).¹²

Bouvet's other two works that survive today were critical pieces on politics. *Le Somnium super materia schismatis* (1394) "one of the most interesting," albeit "minor", works on the Schism and French politics¹³ and *L'Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun* (1398), a dream vision written in verse on the ills of society, knighthood, Church and administration in France.¹⁴ Although Bouvet never played a great part in

¹⁰ Ibid., 21-25.

¹¹ Keen, *Chivalry*, 141; *Tree of Battles*, 21; Wright, "The *Tree of Battles* of Honoré Bouvet and the Laws of War," in *War Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. Christopher T. Allmand (New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 1976), 12-13; Keen, *Laws of War*, 21.

¹² *The Essential Portions of Nicholas Upton's De studio militari before 1446*, trans. John Blount, ed. Francis Pierrepoint Barnard (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931); William Worcester, *The Boke of Noblesse*, ed. J. G. Nichols (London, 1860), cited in *Tree of Battles*, 22-23; and Jean de Bueil, *Le Jouvencel*, ed. C. Favre and Lecestre (Paris, 1887-89), cited in Keen, *Chivalry*, 162.

¹³ *Tree of Battles*, 16.

¹⁴ Both works can be found in *L'Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun et le Somnium super materia schismatis*, ed. Ivor Arnold (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1926) [hereafter *Apparicion*].

the politics of France, he found himself close to politically powerful people. His appointment in 1390 by the king as a member of a commission established for the restoration of Languedoc, a region that had suffered badly from war, excessive taxes and depopulation, placed him in a position of some influence in southern France at least.¹⁵ Moreover, his presence at the king's interview with the duke of Lancaster in 1392 and his appointment as the king's legate with the task of winning Emperor Wenceslas over to the French side in the Church Schism in 1399 prove that he had sufficient credit at the royal court.¹⁶ He is acknowledged as the "maitre rational de la Cour de Provence" in 1405 but there is no further mention of him in the records, even regarding his death, which may indicate that he was no longer politically active from that date on.¹⁷ Yet the fact that Pizan draws on *Arbre des batailles*, praising the author as her 'master' in *Livre des faits d'armes*, testifies to the perseverance of the impact of his work beyond his political influence.

In this dissertation, besides *Arbre des batailles*, which basically deals with the laws of warfare and knighthood, I will also be examining *L'Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun* because a quarter of the author's criticisms of the contemporary situation in this book are about knighthood, which he expresses through the mouth of an illusionary Saracen who has witnessed the defeat of the crusading army at Nicopolis. In comparison to *Arbre des batailles*, in which Bouvet addresses the same problems in the form of a disputation with occasional notes of references to the actual situation, *L'Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun* is directly critical of the contemporary state of knighthood concerning their lack of discipline, methods and morals. The Saracen often contrasts this state of decadence with a superior past, particularly that of the Romans. This work, although not the author's masterpiece,

¹⁵ *Apparicion*, vi-vii.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, vii, x, xiv; *Tree of Battles*, 16-17.

¹⁷ *Tree of Battles*, 17.

was regarded by nineteenth-century scholars as making its author worthy of attention among his contemporaries.¹⁸

Although a manuscript dating from the mid-fifteenth century describes Phillippe de Mézières as an “excellent doctor” comparable to Aristotle — the text also compares Charles VI to Alexander the Great¹⁹ — Mézières’s education was limited to the cathedral school he attended in his early youth followed by some private tutoring received from a master from the University of Paris.²⁰ Born as the younger son to a family of lesser nobility, his early education might suggest he was intended for the Church. However, Mézières sought his fortune and renown in arms from a very young age, just like other many other younger sons of similar social standing.

After he served in the retinue of several great lords of the time in various locations, his career took an upwards turn from man-at-arms to man of politics, becoming first chancellor to the king of Cyprus in 1361, councillor to the king of France in 1373, then tutor to the dauphin and a member of the future regency council established by Charles V.²¹ Although such a quick advancement in life may not be so extraordinary in the late Middle Ages, Mézières can be distinguished from other such examples by his lifelong ambition to embark on a successful crusade expedition against the infidels in the East. Having witnessed the miserable state of the Christians living under the yoke of the Saracens during an expedition he made to the East in his

¹⁸ Apparicion, xxxi.

¹⁹ This is mentioned in the introduction to *Une epistre lamentable et consolatoire, adressée en 1397 à Philippe le Hardi, duc de Bourgogne, sur la défaite de Nicopolis (1396)*, ed. Philippe Contamine and Jacques Paviot (Paris: Société de l’Histoire de France, 2008) [hereafter *Epistre lamentable*], 38.

²⁰ He might have studied and served in arms simultaneously: Contamine and Paviot remark that the young Mézières was already in the service of the king between 1350 and 1354 during which he is thought to be studying: *Ibid.*, 14, n.5.

²¹ He served under Lucchino Visconti of Milan, Andrew of Hungary, Peter of Cyprus and probably Alphonso XI of Castille, and travelled in a diverse geography as Italy, Western Anatolia, Cyprus, Spain, Jerusalem, Prussia and Norway: Nicolai Ioarga, *Philippe de Mézières et la croisade du quatorzieme siecle* (Paris: Librairie Emile Bouillon, 1896), 63-71.

early youth (1347), he spent a lifetime trying to map out an expedition to restore the Holy Land to Christians.²²

This early experience in the East, as he described it in *Contemplacio horae mortis* (1386-87) and *Oratio tragedica*, (1389-90), was significant in Mézières's life, making him question the sinfulness of fighting for personal motives as opposed to for a just cause, which he expressed as "for the common good, for the faith, for the Church, for the widows and orphans, for equity and justice."²³ While he collaborated with Peter of Cyprus in the organization of the Alexandria crusade (1365), an expedition that received the greatest support on a European scale in the fourteenth century before the Nicopolis crusade, its failure to achieve anything after the successful sack of Alexandria led Mézières to concentrate on founding and promoting a new secular Order of knighthood to realize his goals, such Orders not being uncommon during this period.²⁴ For his *Ordre de la chevalerie de la passion de Jhésu Christ*, Mézières drew up rules frequently between 1368 and 1396.²⁵ He recruited members and won supporters from among the French, the English and other European nobility during the 1380s.²⁶

²² Ibid., 70-76.

²³ Philippe de Mézières, *Contemplacio hore mortis*, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, MS. 408 and Philippe de Mézières, *Oratio tragedica*, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS. 1651, cited in *ibid.*, 65.

²⁴ Especially around the mid-fourteenth century, we can find examples of several military orders found often by princes and kings in order to establish a body of knights that will serve them in their wars. The English Order of the Garter found by Edward III was soon reciprocated by the *Ordre de l'étoile* found by Jean II of France. Marshal Bouciquaut's *Ordre de l'escu vert a la dame blanche* founded in the first decade of the fifteenth century for the purpose of helping ladies in need. However, Mézières might rather have been inspired by the Order of the Sword (*Ordre de l'épée*) founded by his friend Peter of Cyprus around that time with the same aim of restoring the Holy Land.

²⁵ Mézières penned the outlines of the organization and administration of his order respectively in 1368 and 1384 (found in the Mazarine Latin MS. 1943), in *La sustance abregie de la chevalerie* between 1389 and 1394 (found in the Ashmole MS. 813), and in *De la chevalerie de la passion de Jhesu Christ* in 1396 (found in the Arsenal MS. 2251): Philippe de Mézières, *Letter to King Richard II: A Plea made in 1395 for Peace between England and France*, ed. and trans. G.W. Coopland (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1975) [hereafter *Letter to King Richard*], xxxiii.

²⁶ Brown suggests that the Order had members and supporters from Spain, Savoy, Aragon, Gascony, Navarre, Germany, Scotland and Lombardy, including the kings Charles VI of France and Richard II of England and the poets Eustache Deschamps and Geoffrey Chaucer: Murray L. Brown, "The Order of the Passion of Jesus Christ: A Reconsideration of Eustache Deschamps's Ballade to Chaucer" *Mediaevalia* 11 (1985), 223-24.

Mézières's works, though not all directly related to this Order, often included the promotion of its ideals and aims, as well as his ideas on military conduct and reform. His *Songe du vieil pèlerin* (1389), a dream vision aimed at instructing the young Charles VI in affairs of state and warning him against the ills of bad government, such as those of the period since the death of his father, contains the author's advice on rules that should be followed by army captains, the right conduct of warfare to be pursued by the king, the establishment of peace and the project of a crusade expedition that would follow the political and military reform and the peace. It is noteworthy to find the author's emphasis on military discipline, order, strategy and the respect for the common good, which Mézières supported with examples and authorities from antiquity.²⁷ His *Oratio tragedica*, composed a little later, is described as "a mystical poem in honour of the Passion." It directly praises the knights of the Order as approaching the "saintly saints" and distinguished them even from those who are fighting just wars in defence of the oppressed and the common good.²⁸ In the *Epistre au roi Richart*, written to exhort the conclusion of a permanent peace treaty between France and England, Mézières advocates the undertaking of a joint Anglo-French crusading expedition to the Holy Land that would follow the peace, and asserts that it should be led by the *Ordre de la passion*.²⁹ Finally, in *Une Epistre lamentable et consolatoire*, written just after the disastrous defeat of the Christians by the Turks at Nicopolis, Mézières, after lamenting the defeat, elaborates his plan for a new crusade to be led by his Order. Reflecting on the defeat, he advocates rule, discipline, obedience and justice as the necessary virtues to be

²⁷ See *Vieux pèlerin*, 439-60 on the rules that should be followed by the captains; *ibid.*, 852-908 on the conduct of warfare; *ibid.*, 908-18 on crusade.

²⁸ Ioarga, *Philippe de Mézières*, 472-73.

²⁹ *Letter to King Richard*, 30-33.

followed by armies if they are to achieve victory.³⁰ In addition to these works, Mézières also penned other various works such as his *Vita Sancti Petri Thomasii* (1366),³¹ which narrates the life of Peter Thomas, a papal procurator and Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, and his collaborator in the promotion of the crusade of Alexandria, *De la présentation de la vierge Marie au temple* (c.1372)³² in which he introduced a feast of the eastern Church to the western Church, and *Le Livre de la vertu du sacrement de mariage* (1385-89)³³ where he praised married life.

Mézières was both a prominent author and an important political figure in late fourteenth-century France. His *Songe du vieil pèlerin* is often referred to as the author's masterpiece,³⁴ and saw "a considerable circulation" over the course of almost a century after its first appearance, winning its author due praise.³⁵ We have much evidence for his influence on the politics of his day. He served on diplomatic missions for the king of France and for the pope to Italy; gave counsel to Charles V regarding the English war; and possibly helped Charles VI pen his letter of peace to Richard II.³⁶ He certainly had good relations with, and certain influence on important figures at the French court and in the Church, such as Bureau de la Rivière, Nicolas Oresme, Jean de Montreuil, Pierre d'Ailly and Pierre de Luxembourg, as well as with royalty, Peter I of Cyprus, Leon of Armenia, Louis d'Orleans and with Charles V and Charles VI of France themselves. Although he retired to the convent of the Celestines in Paris in 1380, his influence on politics persevered both through his

³⁰ See *Epistre lamentable*.

³¹ Philippe de Mézières, *Vita Sancti Petri Thomae*, ed. J. Smet (Rome, 1954).

³² See W.E. Coleman, *Philippe de Mézières' Campaign for the Feast of Mary's Presentation* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981).

³³ Philippe de Mézières, *Le Livre de la vertu du sacrement de mariage*, ed. Joan B. Williamson (Washington D.C., 1993).

³⁴ While Joël Blanchard describes the book as Mézières's greatest work in *Songe du vieux pèlerin*, 8; Contamine and Paviot label it as Mézières' masterpiece in *Epistre lamentable*, 37-38 [all translations from French are mine unless otherwise indicated].

³⁵ *Epistre lamentable*, 38.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 40.

writings and his individual correspondence with these figures. The focus of his political correspondence, like his works, was the organization of a crusade. Although he never had the chance to bring his crusading ideals to life, it is argued that they comprise a part of the political plan of the Charles VI's advisors, nicknamed *Marmousets*, with whom Mézières had close relations.³⁷ It is also argued that the same political programme, including "the exaltation of the monarchy, national reconquest and crusade," was shared also by Bouvet, the poet Eustache Deschamps and the chancellor of the University of Paris, Pierre d'Ailly.³⁸

Mézières's scheme of reform and crusade, which has common features with Pierre Dubois's *De recuperatione terre sancte*, Galvano di Levanto's *Liber sancti passagii*, Fidentius de Padua's *Liber recuperationis terre sancte*, Marino Sanuto Torsello's *Liber sectorum fidelium crucis* all belonging to the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries when the loss of Acre had caused a stir to devise methods to regain it,³⁹ may have lost some of its appeal by Mézières's time for several reasons, among which were the clash of its internationalism with rising national concerns and the discouraging effect of the defeat of Nicopolis.⁴⁰ Although the idea of undertaking a joint Anglo-French crusade against the Saracens that would follow the establishment of peace between the two kingdoms was also expressed by the contemporary authors like John Gower and Eustache Deschamps for example, these

³⁷ See James Magee, "Crusading at the Court of Charles VI, 1388-1396," *French History* 12, no.4 (1998): 367-383.

³⁸ Jean-Patrice Boudet and Hélène Millet, *Eustache Deschamps en son temps* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1997), 141.

³⁹ Pierre Dubois, *De recuperatione terre sancte: Traité de politique générale*, ed. Charles V. Langlois (Paris, 1891); Charles Alfred Kohler, ed., "Traité du recouvrement de la terre sainte adressé vers l'an 1295, à Philippe le Bel par Galvano de Levanto, medecin Génois," *Revue de l'Orient Latin* 6 (1898): 343-369; Fidentius de Padua, *Liber recuperationis terrae sanctae*, ed. G. Golubovich (Quarrachi, 1913), Marino Sanuto Torsello, *Liber secretorum fidelium crucis* (Hanover, 1611), cited in *Vieux pèlerin*, 48-49; Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, 212-13.

⁴⁰ G.W. Coopland asserts that Mézières failed to accept that the disaster of Nicopolis ended all hopes of a united crusade against the Turks: *Letter to King Richard*, xiv; Also see Jeannine Quillet, "Songes et songeries dans l'art de la politique au XIVe siècle," *Etudes Philosophiques* (1975), 333.

ideas, which did not go beyond the defeat of Nicopolis, were affected by Mézières.⁴¹ Even though one might agree with Philippe Contamine that the duke of Burgundy, to whom the *Epistre lamentable* was addressed, might have received Mézières advice with a shrug,⁴² it would be unfair to discount Mézières's experience and influence in politics and arms, and the accuracy and the skilfulness of the analyses and the remedies for contemporary problems that can be found in his works.

Christine de Pizan, well-known by modern scholars as a proto-feminist author, may not have been in her own time as significant a figure as she is today. Although her works were much read into the late sixteenth century, they were almost forgotten until the late eighteenth, from which time they underwent a revived interest.⁴³ The daughter of the Venetian Thomas de Pizan, Charles V's astrologer, she was launched into a writing career by a turn of fate, as a means to make her living following the early death of her husband. Starting off as a copyist, then writing love poems, she eventually turned to more serious subjects such as politics, knighthood and the social status of women. Despite her lack of a noble title or an official position at court, Pizan had good relations with the court, writing for both the princes and princesses of royal blood, for the purpose of educating them and influencing their political actions.⁴⁴ She wrote about knighthood for the first time in

⁴¹ See Brown, "Order of the Passion of Jesus Christ," 219-244, for the influence of Mézières's Order on contemporary authors both in France and England including the poets Chaucer and Deschamps ; Kelly de Vries mentions Gower speaking of the same theme of peace and joint-crusade in "God and Defeat in Medieval Warfare: Some Preliminary Thoughts," in *Guns and Men in Medieval Europe, 1200-1500* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 94.

⁴² Phillippe Contamine presumes that the duke must have received Mézières's suggestions with "a shrug of the shoulder" in "La Consolation de la desconfiture de Hongrie de Philippe de Mézières (1396)," *Annales de Bourgogne* 68 (1997), 46 [All translations from French are mine].

⁴³ Gianni Mombello, "Quelques aspects de la pensée politique de Christine de Pizan d'après ses oeuvres publiées" in *Culture et politique en France à l'époque de l'humanisme et de la renaissance*, ed. Franco Simone (Torino: Accademia delle Scienze, 1974), 43.

⁴⁴ While Pizan was preoccupied with the education of the dauphin in her several works as aforementioned, she was equally concerned with that of his bride Marguerite de Bourgogne to whom she addressed her *Livre des trois vertus* (1405). Moreover, she twice addressed the queen in her letters *Epistre à la reine* (1405) and *Lamentacion sur les maux de guerre civile* (1410) urging her for bringing peace to France, and also addressed Mary de Berry in *Epistre de la Prison de Vie Humaine*

her *Epistre Othea*,⁴⁵ a collection of mythological examples appended with biblical glosses aimed at instructing the ideal knight on morals. She made an issue of chivalry again in her *Le Chemin de longue estude*,⁴⁶ a poem written in the genre of a dream vision, debating the identity of the ideal king who would bring justice to the world, and of the definition of true chivalry. This definition was rendered with reference again to both classical and Christian sources. Then in *Le Livre des fais et bonnes meurs du sage roy Charles V*,⁴⁷ her biography of Charles V, she drew a picture of the ideal king in the person of Charles V from the perspectives of both government and military administration, and thereby necessarily discussing chivalry. Again, she drew both on examples from pagan and Christian philosophers. In all the three works mentioned, the ideal of chivalry is defined as one that is combined with a wisdom that serves the defence of the common good. In *Le Livre de la mutacion de fortune* (c.1403) and *Le Livre de l'advison Cristine* (c.1405), historical and autobiographical works commenting on the political situation in France, she again made reference to the decline of its knighthood.⁴⁸ She explored the subject of ideal knighthood once more in detail in her *Le Livre du corps de policie*,⁴⁹ a mirror for princes inspired by John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*. In this work, Pizan discusses the functions and the

(1418) where she lamented Agincourt: Christine de Pizan, *Le Livre des trois vertus*, trans. Garay and Jeay (Paris: H. Champion, 1989); idem, "Letter to the Queen of France, Isabel of Bavaria" in *The Writings of Christine de Pizan*, ed. Charity Canon Willard (New York: Persea Books, 1990), 269-274; "Lamentation on the Woes of France" both in *The Writings of Christine de Pizan*, ed. Charity Canon Willard (New York: Persea Books, 1990), 304-309; idem, *Christine de Pizan's Epistre de la prison de vie humaine*, ed. Angus J. Kennedy (London: Grant and Cutler, 1984).

⁴⁵ Idem, *Lettre d'Othéa, déesse de prudence, à un jeune chevalier, Hector*, trans. Hélène Basso (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2008) [hereafter *Othéa*].

⁴⁶ Idem, *Le Chemin de longue étude*, ed. and trans. Andrea Tarnowski (Paris: Librairie Générale Française/Livre de Poche, 2000) [hereafter *Chemin*].

⁴⁷ Idem, *Le Livre des fais et bonnes meurs du sage roy Charles V*, in *collection complètes des mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France par Petitot et Monmerqué*, vol.1.5 (Paris: Foucault, 1824), accessed March 9, 2012, http://www.voltaire-integral.com/La%20Bibliotheque/Histoire/Pizan_Christine.html [hereafter *Charles V*].

⁴⁸ Idem, *Le Livre de la mutacion de fortune: publié d'après les manuscrits par Suzanne Solente* (Paris: A. & J. Picard, 1959); idem, *Le Livre de l'advison Cristine*, ed. Christine Reno et Liliane Dulac (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2001).

⁴⁹ Idem, *The Book of the Body Politic*, ed. Kate Langdon Forhan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) [hereafter *Body Politic*]. Also available in French in *Le Livre du corps de policie*, ed. Angus J. Kennedy (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1998).

duties of the parts of the body politic, namely princes, nobles and knights and the common people. Her teaching on knighthood emphasised learning, discipline, loyalty and wisdom, making reference mostly to the Roman authors Valerius Maximus and Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatius, whom she had earlier mentioned in *Le Chemin de longue estude* and *Le Livre de Charles V*.

Her *Livre des faits d'armes*, although perhaps less well-known among modern scholars than her proto-feminist writings,⁵⁰ is nevertheless an important work. A book of knighthood concerning war and its laws, strategy, organization and the morals of men-at-arms, this work was partly inspired by Bouvet's *Arbre des batailles*, which has occasionally caused misinterpretations concerning the identity of its author. The fact that Pizan rendered an abridged version of *Arbre des batailles* in the last two parts of the book — where she refers to Bouvet as her master — made it difficult to distinguish *Livre des faits d'armes* as an independent work.⁵¹ While an early sixteenth-century imprint of Pizan's book was entitled *Arbre des batailles et fleur de chevalerie*, the late fifteenth-century *Boke of Noblesse* mentioned *Arbre des batailles* as a work of Pizan.⁵² Yet, the content of *Livre des faits d'armes* was not limited solely to its teaching of the laws of war via Bouvet, but also included a section on strategy, organization and morality concerning warfare based on the

⁵⁰ *Livre de cité des dames* and *Livre des trois vertus* (both written in 1405) are often esteemed for their proto-feminist outlook as in these works Pizan taught women to improve their morals for a respectable status in society and defended their rights. Her earlier ballades of love such as *Epistre au Dieu d'amours* (1399), *Le Livre du débat de deux amans* (1400), *Dit de la rose* (1402) and *Le Livre du duc des vrais amans* (1403-5) also reflect her ideas on the status of women with a critical stance on courtly love: Idem, *The Book of the City of Ladies*, trans. Rosalind Brown-Grant (London: Penguin Books, 1999); idem, *Epistre au Dieu d'amours*, in *Poems of Cupid, God of Love: Christine de Pizan's Epistre au Dieu d'Amours and Dit de la rose*, Thomas Hoccleve's *The Letter of Cupid: Editions and Translations with George Sewall's The Proclamation of Cupid*, ed. Thelma S. Fenster and Mary Carpenter Erler (Leiden: Brill, 1990); Christine de Pizan, *Le Livre du débat de deux amans* in *The Love Debate Poems of Christine de Pizan*, ed. Barbara K. Altman (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998), 81-154; idem, *Le Livre du duc des vrais amans*, ed. Thelma S. Fenster (Binghamton, New York: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1995).

⁵¹ *Deeds of Arms*, 143-44(3:1) [all references in the parantheses are to book and chapter numbers]; *Tree of Battles*, 24, n. 47.

⁵² *Deeds of Arms*, 2; *Tree of Battles*, 22, n.40.

Roman sources, the *De re militari* of Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus, the *Strategemata* of Sextus Julius Frontinus, and the *Facta et dicta memorabiles* of Valerius Maximus.⁵³ This, on the other hand, caused other confusions among contemporaries, making the title of a 1488 edition of the book *L'Art de chevalerie selon Végèce*.⁵⁴ The evidence of the surviving manuscripts and imprint suggest that the book was popular, and increasingly so in the late-fifteenth century.⁵⁵ Jean de Bueil's *Le Jouvencel* (1466), a semi-autobiographical, didactic work on politics and warfare, is significant for the way it reflects how the ideas in Pizan's book got to be implemented in actual practice in the late fifteenth-century.⁵⁶

Having given a brief account of the lives and careers of the three authors, the political and military background to the works of Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan is also clearly relevant and can perhaps explain some of the important characteristics that their works have in common. Whereas romances were a product of certain developments and circumstances originating in France, the view of warfare and knighthood in accordance with the one which permeated that literature was coming to be challenged by a new one that is radically different from the romance view in many ways. The reasons for this can again be looked for in the contemporary state of France.

⁵³ Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*, ed. Michael D. Reeve (Oxford: Oxford Medieval Texts, 2004); Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Deeds and Sayings: A Thousand Tales from Ancient Rome*, trans. Henry John Walker (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2004); Sextus Julius Frontinus, *Strategemata, or Greek and Roman Anecdotes Concerning Military Policy, and the Science of War*, trans. Robert B. Scott (London: Pall-mall, 1811), accessed March 9, 2012, <http://books.google.com.tr/books?id=P-0AAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=tr#v=onepage&q&f=false>.

⁵⁴ Yet in its English translation by William Caxton in the following year, Pizan was acknowledged as the author of the book: *Deeds of Arms*, 1-2; Robert H. Lucas, "Mediaeval French Translations of the Latin Classics to 1500," *Speculum* 45, no.2 (Apr. 1970), 249.

⁵⁵ *Deeds of Arms*, 8; Charity Canon-Willard, "Christine de Pizan on the Art of Warfare," in *Christine de Pizan and the Categories of Difference*, ed. Marilyn Desmond (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 14-15.

⁵⁶ Keen, *Chivalry*, 162.

The period that encompasses the writings of the three authors under study, between the publication of Bouvet's *Arbre des batailles* in 1387 and Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes* in c.1410, coincides with a particular phase of the intermittent warfare between England and France, that later came to be known as the Hundred Years' War (1339-1453) and also with the reign of the king Charles VI (1380-1422) that is known for its unstable and weak government. The war in its initial stages had been disastrous for France with the heavy defeats at the battles of Crécy (1346) and Poitiers (1356), followed by those in Spain at Auray (1364) and Nájera (1367),⁵⁷ and also saw the death of King Jean II in captivity (1364). Even more than defeat in these open pitched battles, which was relatively rare as the war was mainly fought by *cheavuchées* or in sieges, it was the damage to civilians and the countryside caused by plundering that really made the French suffer. Despite the good performance of the French armies during the reign of Charles V, basically due to good strategy and leadership,⁵⁸ the premature death of the king once more put the French in an uncertain position regarding the end of the war. The turbulence during the years of regency (1380-1388), because of the minority of Charles V's son, led to hopes for the reign of a strong monarch in the person of Charles VI once he was to come of age, and echoes of this can be seen in contemporary literature.⁵⁹ The expectations of success from the young king were often grounded on the successful reign of his father that had turned the situation in the war in favour of the French. The king's declaration of his majority and assumption in 1388 of his own rule by establishing a

⁵⁷ The thirteen-sixties, despite the alleged truce between the two kingdoms (1360-1369) were not exactly without military conflict as the war went on in Spain, the two crowns supporting different contestants to the Spanish throne.

⁵⁸ The thirteen-seventies saw a reversal of the situation in war to the advantage of the French resulting from the successful command of the French forces under the leadership of the king's constable Bertrand du Guesclin. He refrained from fighting open battle with the English and took the towns they captured back from them one after another (Poitiers in 1372, Bergerac in 1377) and also won a crushing victory at sea against the English at La Rochelle (1372).

⁵⁹ See below.

group of advisors, later nicknamed the *Marmousets*, and the signing of a peace treaty with England at Leulinghen in 1389, must have raised the morale of the people of France and produced more literature reflecting the optimism for the achievements of the crown. Although Charles VI's bouts of mental illness, appearing early in his reign (1392), cut this period of expectation short, hopes then tended to rest on Charles VI's son, the young Louis de Guyenne. These too, unfortunately would be interrupted in 1415, which saw both the death of the dauphin and the heavy defeat of the French forces at Agincourt.

As the hopes of this particular period concerned a powerful ruler and hence a powerful army to defeat the English, it is necessary to briefly mention the state of the French armies and their organization and compare it with that of their enemy in the Hundred Years' War. While the system of recruiting troops through indenture, that is contracts made with army captains for a specific period of time, was established in England from the early stages of the Hundred Years' War, and which enabled the prolonged English campaigns on France soil,⁶⁰ in France it was only in Charles V's time that an attempt to put a similar system into effect was made. It was indeed his military reforms that were thought to be responsible for the military successes during his reign. The raising of armies through *lettres de retenue*, as they were called in France, was an attempt to establish some degree of professionalism in the army, as opposed to the troops raised by the *arrière ban*, a general call to arms to vassals of the king and their own vassals, who would often have little training or experience in arms and lack the organization to fight in large scale battles.⁶¹ Moreover, the

⁶⁰ Christopher T. Allmand, *Society at War: The Experience of England and France during the Hundred Years' War* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998), 57.

⁶¹ Although *arrière ban* was largely used at the start of the Hundred Years' War, it was abandoned for the most part, or used selectively to recruit archers and noblemen after the initial French failures in the war: Phillippe Contamine, *Guerre, état et Société à la fin du Moyen Âge: Études sur les armées des rois de France, 1337-1494*, 2 vols (Éditions de l'EHESS, 2004), 1: 37-38. Contamine declares that

indenture contracts saw that the captains maintained the order and loyalty of the troops that they paid, just as the royal payments to the captains ensured their loyalty and obedience.⁶² Hence the evolution of armies from bodies of men largely recruited from among non-professionals to fight short-term skirmishes to a combination of indentured companies composed of paid soldiers under a captain on a contractual basis would yield better skilled and better organized soldiers that could respond to the needs of large scale battles, if only they were put under central control.⁶³ Hence some kind of regulation was necessary to ensure that captains under different contracts maintained their loyalty and the discipline of their troops for military victory and for the expulsion of the English.⁶⁴

Ordinances of war promulgated in France by Jean II (1351) and Charles V (1374) and by Jean de Vienne and the Scottish captains of a Franco-Scottish army against the English in 1385, just like those in England by Richard II (1385) and Henry V (1419) were obviously striving towards that end. What was eventually aimed at in France, and possibly better regulated in the ordinances of Charles V, was to ensure that only those companies who received *lettres de retenue* from the king would be authorized to fight and receive wages under captains who were appointed by the king. In that context, all others fighting on their own account, the free companies of *routiers* and *écorcheurs* in France, who turned to marauding whenever they became unemployed, and were hence a great problem to civilian security, were

Charles V had to resort to *arrière ban* during the critical phases of the war as in 1369, 1373, 1375, 1378 and 1380: *ibid.*, 1: 139-40.

⁶² Theodor Meron, *Henry's Wars and Shakespeare's Laws: Perspectives on the Law of War in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 128-29; Allmand, *Society at War*, 48-49.

⁶³ Dennis E. Showalter, "Caste, Skill, and Training: The Evolution of Cohesion in European Armies from the Middle Ages to the Sixteenth Century" *Journal of Military History* 57, no. 3 (Jul., 1993), 412-23.

⁶⁴ Keen, "Richard II's Ordinances of War of 1385," in *Rulers and Ruled in Late Medieval England*, ed. Rowena E. Archer and Simon Walker (London: The Hambledon Press, 1995), 34-36; Housley, "Le Maréchal Boucicaut à Nicopolis," *Annales de Bourgogne* 68 (1997), 97.

outlawed.⁶⁵ Yet the hiring of foreign troops was a practice employed by Charles V all the same, when he could not find enough accomplished men of specific occupation among his own subjects.⁶⁶ While the issues of discipline or the rights of soldiers were often resolved according to the contract or, in the absence of any specific terms, to customs of war, the problem of multiple jurisdictions in the army was resolved by declaring the king's constable to be the head of jurisdiction in the army whenever he was on the site.⁶⁷ A most crucial point was the payment of wages to the king's men, which was fairly well regulated under Charles V to be reversed during the reign of his successor. Under these provisions, there was an attempt to enforce the permanence of companies, for the sake of providing troops ready to fight in the service of the king. Better central inspection of troops was also maintained within the reforms of Charles V. These reforms, although they drew on innovations that had been tried before, were more successful in their aim towards establishing a permanent army of re-conquest.⁶⁸ Yet, the misfortunes of the premature death of the king, the long period of regency and the illness of Charles VI that followed deferred the success of military reform to the reign of Charles V's grandson, Charles VII. The English armies, who had been recruited from among contracted companies for a longer time than in France, also faced the same problem of the need to put these different units under central control and discipline. The ordinances of Richard II promulgated in 1385 were aimed towards that end, and their comparison with the French ordinances under Jean de Vienne at the same time (both were prompted by a Franco-Scottish campaign against the English), renders them more comprehensive

⁶⁵ Contamine, *Guerre, état et société*, 1:140-45; Allmand, *Society at War*, 5; Meron, *Henry's Wars*, 129. The English free companies marauding in France were also banned by the English king Edward III in 1361 under the pain that they will be arrested and outlawed: Meron, *Henry's Wars*, 129; Keen, *Laws of War*, 93, n.1.

⁶⁶ Contamine, *Guerre, état et société*, 1:156.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 1:198-202.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 1:145-50; Allmand, *Society at War*, 44-49.

and focused on the problem of centralisation than their French counterpart.⁶⁹ Both Maurice Keen and Christopher Allmand attribute the successes of the English in the Hundred Years' War to the better order of their troops in comparison to the French which, in turn was also appreciated by their contemporaries.⁷⁰

We need to evaluate the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières in the light of the background of this warfare and these military developments in France and England. Bouvet's *Arbre des batailles* (1387) and Mézières's *Songe du vieil pèlerin* (1389) mark the beginning of the period of hope for the reign of Charles VI. Significantly, both works were dedicated to the young king. Bouvet explained his aim in writing *Arbre des batailles* as his wish for Charles VI to fulfil the prophecy of a French king who would heal all the tribulations of his age — which might indicate endorsement of the political programme of the *Marmousets* aimed at creating a powerful and universal monarchy⁷¹ — by learning about the things in the book.⁷² The fact that the king visited Avignon where Bouvet was residing in 1389, just two years after he had penned *Arbre des batailles* must have been a happy instance for Bouvet.⁷³ Yet, five years later, we can find evidence of a less optimist Bouvet who recognizes that the illness of the king made him incapable of all acts of government, as he laments in a letter of 1394 that his pension has not been paid.⁷⁴ Moreover, it is significant that his *Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun* (1398), in which he criticised the failings of the French society and government, was addressed to Charles VI's brother the duke of Orleans, the duke's wife and to Jean Montaigu, an illegitimate brother of the king and the duke and an advisor to the crown. Bouvet presumably

⁶⁹ Keen, "Richard II's Ordinances," 33, 47-48.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 48; Allmand, *Society at War*, 6.

⁷¹ See below n. 71.

⁷² *Tree of Battles*, 79-80.

⁷³ *Apparicion*, xxii-xxiii.

⁷⁴ Ibid., xxix.

sees these people as the most appropriate recipients to whom he could communicate his criticisms and pleas. In this book, Bouvet sets out his criticism of the military conduct and morals of French men-at-arms by reflecting on the Nicopolis crusaders who were mostly of French or Burgundinian origin. In his dedication, he suggests that by reading the book, the duke will find a remedy for the contemporary excesses and be able to put into effect a reform that will enable the French to win back the grace of God, which they had seemed to have lost in the light of the Schism in the Church and the victories of the Saracens against them.⁷⁵ Bouvet explains the reason for his dedication of the book to the duke by referring to the latter's role in providing counsel to his brother, "in helping him govern his kingdom."⁷⁶

In *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, Mézières addressed Charles VI as the *Blanc Faucon au bec et aux pattes dorés*, *Jeune Cerf volant* or *Jeune Moise couronné*, epithets possibly belonging to the political programme of the *Marmousets*.⁷⁷ In the prologue to his book, Mézières expresses the relevance of these epithets to the young king as tributes to the king's "great determination, courage, exploits" that he viewed as remarkable at such a young age.⁷⁸ In the book, which is described by James Magee as "a virtual manifesto for *Marmouset* government,"⁷⁹ Mézières severely criticises the preceding period with a hope that Charles VI would re-establish justice in France and bring back her former glory. He conveys that the book is aimed at guiding the young king so that he will not bring dishonour to the common good and the kingdom

⁷⁵ Ibid., 2.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 3.

⁷⁷ See Mézières's prologue in *Vieux pèlerin*, 91-115; The contemporary court poet Eustache Deschamps used similar epithets for the young king in his several poems which might be considered as evidence for the both authors' being both advocates of the political programme of *Marmousets*. This programme included the exaltation of the monarchy, national reconquest and crusade through certain prophecies directed at the king: Boudet and Millet, eds., *Eustache Deschamps en son temps*, 122-43.

⁷⁸ *Vieux pèlerin*, 107.

⁷⁹ Magee, "Crusading at the Court of Charles VI, 372.

of France and that he will earn glory.⁸⁰ His *Epistre au roi Richart* written in 1395 signifies the persistence of his hopes for Charles VI despite the fact that after the king's first attack of mental illness in 1392 he was practically incapacitated from ruling on his own and the power struggle between the dukes of Orleans and Burgundy dominated politics in France.⁸¹ Yet the year 1395 was marked by the hope of consummating the peace between England and France with a marriage alliance between the two crowns: Mézières's letter to Richard II of England, proposing that Richard make peace with Charles VI and together go on a crusade to Jerusalem, echoed the actual letter sent by Charles VI to the French court on the establishment of a permanent peace treaty. There is a strong possibility that Mézières assisted the French king in penning his letter.⁸² While the marriage between the two crowns may be viewed as an episode in the peaceful relations between England and France following the treaty of Leulinghen (1389) that followed the attainment by both kings of their majorities, any project of a joint-crusade to the East was soon undone by the defeat of the crusaders at Nicopolis (1396). Mézières's *Epistre lamentable et consolatoire* (1397), written a year after the defeat and a year before Bouvet's *L'Appraicion maistre Jehan de Meun*, and addressed to the duke of Burgundy, but also to all the Christian kings and princes, especially those of France, England, Bohemia and Hungary,⁸³ witnesses the author's changing tone from hope to criticism, though it still offers remedies for the situation. Besides lamenting the defeat as a disaster affecting all Christianity, Mézières offers a prescription for a successful crusade in the form of his *Ordre de la passion de Jhésu Christ*, which I have discussed above. Although the book is aimed at promoting Mézières's Order as

⁸⁰ *Vieux pèlerin*, 114-15.

⁸¹ Magee, "Crusading at the Court of Charles VI," 379-80.

⁸² *Letter to King Richard*, xxvi; *Epistre lamentable*, 40.

⁸³ *Epistre lamentable*, 97-98.

a solution for dealing with Christian defeats in the East, it also presents ideas on the reform of knighthood as a whole. The address to the duke of Burgundy is significant in that the author sees the duke as an authority that could accomplish such reform and the project of a new crusade, even though the duke's son had failed in leading the previous one (Nicopolis). While this might be suggestive of the power of the house of Burgundy in the administration of France in this particular period, when compared with Bouvet's dedication of his *L'Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun* to the duke of Orleans and his follower Jean de Montaigu, it is quite illuminating of the contest between the two factions, Orleans and Burgundy, for the control of the king that would finally culminate in the outbreak of a civil war in France (1407-1435).

Pizan's works belong to a slightly later period than those of Bouvet and Mézières, to the period when the rivalry between the dukes of Burgundy and Orleans had already intensified and to that of the war that followed, when hopes for a powerful king began to focus on the dauphin, Louis de Guyenne (d. 1415). We can observe that Pizan wrote for both of the dukes: she dedicated her *Epistre Othea* (c.1401) to the duke of Orleans; she wrote *Le Livre de Charles V* (c.1404) for the duke of Burgundy who had actually commissioned the work. Although she dedicated an earlier work, *Le Chemin de longue estude* (c.1403) to Charles VI and the princes of noble blood, at end of this poem she refers to Charles, not as the monarch to rule the world in justice, but as the judge who will decide who it will be.⁸⁴ In *Le Livre de Charles V*, she expresses her disdain for the contemporary state of France by holding up the reign of the previous monarch as a model to look up to, including his military achievements. She states that "since the time of the wise king Charles much has been

⁸⁴ *Chemin*, 39-40.

lost and nothing gained.”⁸⁵ Pizan dedicates her *Le Livre du corps de policie* (c.1407) to Charles VI and all the royal princes, but she later states that she wrote it for the benefit of the dauphin, Louis.⁸⁶ It is suggested by contemporary scholars that her *Livre des faits d’armes* was also written for the dauphin to educate him in the matter of arms.⁸⁷ Her *Livre de la paix* (1414) written in the middle of civil war in France, was particularly designed for Louis de Guyenne, expressing her hopes that he could establish a permanent peace in France.⁸⁸ As opposed to *Le Chemin de longue estude*’s ambiguity over the person who would deliver France from its current state, *Livre de la paix* conveys the author’s strong belief that Louis de Guyenne would be the one to take on the role of the just ruler.⁸⁹

Now that I have had a brief look at the lives and works of Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan and established their connection with the military and political state of France at the time, it is necessary to establish the common characteristics of their writing. The most obvious feature, as has been highlighted in the analysis of the period, is their critical stance vis-à-vis their period and their wish to provide guidance for a reform in France that included its knighthood and military organization. These authors were not alone in their criticisms, for we can find at the court of Charles VI in France a remarkable production of didactic works concerning military reform, as a part of a political programme and the establishment of peace.

⁸⁵ “... depuis le temps du sage roy Charles, moult y orent perdu et riens gaigné ...” *Charles V*, 428 [all translations from medieval French are mine unless otherwise indicated].

⁸⁶ *Body Politic*, xvi-xvii.

⁸⁷ Although Canon-Willard proposes that this must have been done at the behest of the duke of Burgundy, his father-in-law, who saw it necessary in view of the dauphin’s aversion to the occupation of arms. Green and Mews argue that, as the duke was expelled from Paris at the time, the book is “more likely to have been commissioned by one of the people then controlling Charles VI’s court”: *Deeds of Arms*, 5-6; Canon-Willard, “Christine de Pizan’s Treatise on the Art of Medieval Warfare,” in *Essays in Honor of Louis Francis Solano*, ed. Raymond J. Cormier and Urban T. Holmes (Chapel Hill: The University of Carolina Press, 1973), 184-85; Christine de Pizan, *The Book of Peace*, ed. Karen Green, Constant J. Mews, Janice Pinder, et al. (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008), 13 [hereafter *Book of Peace*]. Forhan agrees that the book was written for the dauphin but does not indicate any suggestion about by whom it was commissioned: *Body Politic*, xvi.

⁸⁸ *Book of Peace*, 6, 14.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 26.

The court poet Eustache Deschamps (1346-1406) was one of those who criticised the contemporary situation and taught reform at the same time, with an ever waning hope in the reign of Charles VI.⁹⁰ Alain Chartier (1385-1430) is another name that is associated with the criticism of the situation in France around the same period. Although his work belongs to a later period, his criticism of the state of knighthood and its effects on civilians is often found to be parallel to that in the works of Bouvet, Mézières, Deschamps and Pizan.⁹¹

A brief look to the other side of the channel may be of further assistance in illustrating that the political criticism in French literary writing, with its emphasis on military failure and directed at reform, was a contemporary result of the situation specifically in France. Although the poets John Gower and John Langland, in *Vox clamantis* and *Piers Plowman* respectively, addressed a criticism of their society including the estate of knighthood, they did not have a particular emphasis on military failures or the need for military reform, and did not go further than to echo the commonplace perspective of the moral decadence of knights.⁹² Even if we take

⁹⁰ Ivor Arnold compares the criticisms of Deschamps to those of Bouvet to find certain similarities: *Apparicion*, xv-xvi; Glynis M. Cropp evaluates Mézières, Deschamps and Pizan in the same category of critics of France teaching reform in the vernacular: Glynis M. Cropp, "The Exemplary Figure of Alexander the Great in the Works of Eustache Deschamps and Christine de Pizan," in *Contexts and Continuities: Proceedings of the IVth International Colloquium on Christine de Pizan (Glasgow 21-27 July 2000)*, published in honour of Liliane Dulac, vol. 1, ed. Angus J. Kennedy, Rosalind Brown-Grant, James C. Laidlaw et al. (Glasgow: University of Glasgow Press, 2002), 301. For Deschamps' works, the following may be consulted: *Eustache Deschamps: Selected Poems*, ed. Deborah M. Sinnreich-Levi and Ian S. Laurie, trans. David Curzon and Jeffrey Fiskin (New York: Routledge, 2003); Boudet, *Eustache Deschamps en son temps*.

⁹¹ For the comparison of criticisms of Pizan and Chartier see, Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, "Two Responses to Agincourt: Alain Chartier's *Livre des quatre dames* and Christine de Pizan's *Epistre de la prison de vie humaine*" in *Contexts and Continuities*, 75-85. Glynis M. Cropp compares Chartier to Pizan as well as to Mézières and to Deschamps in "Alexander the Great in the Works of Eustache Deschamps and Christine de Pizan," 301-302. For the works of Alain Chartier see, *Le Quadrilogue invectif*, ed. E. Droz (Geneva: Droz, 1950); and *Le Livre des quatre dames* in *Poèmes*, ed. James C. Laidlaw (Paris: Union Générale d'éditions, 1988), cited in *ibid.*, 302; Blumenfeld-Kosinski, "Two Responses to Agincourt," 75.

⁹² See for example, Derek Pearsall, *Gower and Lydgate* (Harlow: Longmans, Green & Co., 1969); "John Gower: from *Vox clamantis*," in Robert P. Miller, ed. *Chaucer: Sources and Backgrounds* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 192-206; William Langland, *The Piers the Plowman Tradition: A Critical Edition of Pierce the Ploughman's Crede*, Richard the Redeless, Mum and

Geoffrey Chaucer's *Knight's Tale* to be a criticism of knighthood, as is suggested by some scholars, it too can be read as a criticism of the decadence of chivalric morals.⁹³ Whereas we cannot disregard John Wycliff's pacifism in his criticisms of warfare and warriors, these can rather be taken as representative of an extremist view with no wider impact on the clergy or the laity for that matter. The English orthodox clerical opinion on the subject harped on the same theme of just war and the punishment of sinners.⁹⁴ What is more, in England, we cannot find books directly concerning knighthood with the same content and objectives as those of Bouvet and Pizan until around the middle of the fifteenth century. These later works, Nicholas Upton's *De studio militari* (1446) and William Worcester's *Boke of Noblesse*, addressed to Edward IV on his invasion of France (1475), noted before for drawing on the works of Bouvet and Pizan and on the Roman military model, notably belong to a period that followed English defeats by the French, and the turbulence of the dynastic struggle of the houses of Lancaster and York.

As has been remarked earlier, the criticisms of military failures made by Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan often focus on discipline, strategy and the service of the common good as their remedies. These remedies, in turn, were exemplified to a great extent from the Roman sources. Glyniss M. Cropp remarks on the use of classical sources for examples in didactic writings on warfare at the court of Charles VI by Mézières, Deschamps, Pizan and Chartier.⁹⁵ To this list of French works teaching by Roman example, Canon-Willard adds Jean de Montreuil's *A toute la chevalerie*,

Sothsegger and The Crowned King, ed. Helen Barr (London: J.M. Dent, 1993); G.G. Coulton, "Knights and Squires," in *Chaucer and his England* (London: Methuen & Co., 1908).

⁹³ The following can be consulted on the discussion of knightly criticism in Chaucer's *The Knight's Tale*: Terry Jones, *Chaucer's Knight: The Portrait of a Medieval Mercenary*, rev.ed. (London: Methuen, 1994); Peggy Knapp, "Chivalry and its Discontents," in *Chaucer and the Social Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 15-31; Stefan Erik Kristiaan Vander Elst, "Chaucer and the Crusades: A Study in Late Medieval Literary and Political Thought" (Ph.D. Diss.: Princeton University, 2006).

⁹⁴ Allmand, *Society at War*, 37-39.

⁹⁵ Cropp, "Alexander the Great in the Works of Eustache Deschamps and Christine de Pizan," 301-2.

written around the same time with Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes*.⁹⁶ In parallel to this, Maurice Keen in *Chivalry*, points out to the "great vogue ... for treatises on war and translations of classical military experts like Vegetius" in the late Middle Ages.⁹⁷ Then in *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-arms*, he mentions Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan for their criticism of warfare and knighthood especially in terms of lack of discipline in France and for their emphasis of the soldiers' service to the state influenced by Roman authors and lawyers.⁹⁸ Philippe Contamine in his *War in the Middle Ages*, agrees that in the period from the end of the thirteenth to that of the fifteenth century and beyond "didactic treatises consecrated to the art of war, military discipline and the organization of armies began to appear."⁹⁹ In his list of these treatises we can glimpse Bouvet's *Arbre des batailles* and Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes*, Jean de Bueil's *Le Jouvencel*, which has already been noted to have been drawn from the works of Bouvet and Pizan, and a few other treatises from a wide geographical span that extends from Byzantium to Italy and to Germany.¹⁰⁰ Moreover in his *Guerre, état et société*, Contamine discusses the ideas of Pizan and Mézières within the context of their parallels with contemporary military reform, and compares Bouvet's *Arbre des batailles* to Charny's *Livre de chevalerie* to point out to the former's

⁹⁶ Canon-Willard, "Christine de Pizan on the Art of Warfare," 8. For *A toute la chevalerie*, the following can be consulted: Jean de Montreuil, *Opera*, ed. N. Grévy et al, vol. 2 (Turin: Giappichelli, 1975).

⁹⁷ Keen, *Chivalry*, 219.

⁹⁸ Maurice H. Keen, *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms in the Middle Ages* (London: Hambledon Press, 1996), chaps. 1 and 11.

⁹⁹ Philippe Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, trans. Michael Jones (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Basil Blackwell, 1984), 119.

¹⁰⁰ The non-French works that are cited by Contamine are, Theodore Paleologus's *Enseignemens et ordenances pour un seigneur qui a guerres et grans gouvernemens a faire* written in the early fourteenth century and translated into French by a translator of Vegetius, Jean de Vignai in the late fourteenth century; Conrad Kyaser's *Bellisfortis* and Mariano di Jacopo Taccola's *De Machinis Libri X*, fifteenth-century works about war engines and weapons: Ibid., 119-20. For these works see, J. Bastin, "Le Traité de Théodore Paléologue dans la Traduction de Jean de Vignai" in *Etudes Romanes dédiées à Mario Roques par ses amis, collègues et élèves de France* (Paris, 1946); Conrad Kyaser, *Bellisfortis*, ed. G. Quarg, 2 vols (Düsseldorf, 1967); Mariano Taccola, *De machinis*, ed. G. Scaglia (Wiesbaden, 1971).

emphasis on military discipline and service to the prince drawn on Roman source as distinguishable from the traditional point of view.¹⁰¹

The basic and most apparent factor that made the Roman sources appealing to authors writing in favour of military reform in France must have been the dominant themes of military discipline, learning, the use of strategy and service to the prince and commonwealth found in the Roman works that seemed to provide a remedy to contemporary military shortcomings, shortcomings that were not considered as failings from the perspective of the view of warfare and warriors in the romances or in romance-influenced works on warfare and knighthood, which praised reckless exhibitions of individual military skill and the search for personal glory. It is commonly underlined by scholars that, especially during the early stages of the Hundred Years' War, the point of honour was so valued by the chivalry of France that it often resulted in defeats or losses of men which otherwise could be avoided if military decisions were led by strategical thinking and a consideration for the common benefit. The perishing of several members of the *Ordre de l'étoile* of Jean II in Brittany against the English for the reason that they were ordered not to retreat or flee at the cost of their honour, or the defeat and imprisonment of Jean II at Poitiers for the same reason can be shown as examples to such conduct.¹⁰² Canon-Willard also recognizes that lack of good leadership and the ambitions of knights to show individual prowess instead of unified action were characteristics of the late fourteenth-century French armies as witnessed during the Hundred Years' War and at the Nicopolis crusade, to which the Roman military model provided a remedy.¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ For the comparison of Bouvet's ideas with those of Charny and similar views, see *Guerre, état et société*, 1: 202-4.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 1: 190-91.

¹⁰³ Charity Canon-Willard, "Christine de Pizan on Chivalry," in *The Study of Chivalry: Resources and Approaches*, ed. Howell Chickering and Thomas H. Seiler (Western Michigan University, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications, 1988), 516-17.

As Allmand underlines in reference to Vegetius, the Roman works were “concerned with team work as opposed to heroism and individual acts which brings skill, planning and organisation as important considerations.”¹⁰⁴ N.A.R. Wright likewise asserts that the military discipline advocated in the Roman sources must have seemed particularly impressive to fourteenth-century French readers because of its apparent lack in their contemporary armies mainly for the reason that the contemporary knights idolized the model in Chrétien de Troyes’s romances.¹⁰⁵

On the other hand, it should be stated that earlier medieval warfare neither lacked considerations of military discipline and strategy, nor was characterised by the dominance of cavalry and open pitched battles. John Gillingham recently pointed to the contrary by showing that the chivalric heroes Richard I and William Marshal, often portrayed as representing reckless and impetuous acts prompted by the search for individual glory, in fact gave considerable thought to strategy and often avoided battles for the risks they involved, and that the role of infantry, i.e. artillerymen, archers, bowmen, etc in their battles was equally as important as cavalry.¹⁰⁶ Vegetius, the main source to learn Roman military teaching is also evidenced to be known and appealed to by medieval princes and knights during that time: Geoffrey Plantagenet learned how to construct an incendiary bomb in the Vegetian way from monks; Richard the Lionheart used Vegetian tactics in his warfare, and a twelfth-century bishop of Auxerre explained lessons of Vegetius to a group of knights.¹⁰⁷ Of course, this might be largely through the diffusion of John Salisbury’s use of

¹⁰⁴ Christopher T. Allmand, “The *De re militari* of Vegetius in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance,” in *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*, ed. Corinne Saunders, François le Saux and Neil Thomas (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2004), 24-25.

¹⁰⁵ Wright, “*Tree of Battles* of Honoré Bouvet,” 27-29.

¹⁰⁶ John Gillingham, “Richard I and the Science of War in the Middle Ages”; idem, “War and Chivalry in the History of William the Marshal,” both in *Richard Coeur de Lion: Kingship, Chivalry and War in the Twelfth Century* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1994).

¹⁰⁷ Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, 211; Gillingham, “Richard I and the Science of War,” 211-26; Keen, *Chivalry*, 31.

Vegetian ideas in his *Policraticus*.¹⁰⁸ The ideas of discipline and public service taught by Vegetius might have appealed to clerics at least from the ninth century both for use in the cloister and in their teaching of political morals. John of Salisbury and Aegidius Romanus made the most use of Roman authors in their mirrors for princes with an emphasis on waging warfare for the common good with military discipline and strategy. Their contemporary Vincent of Beauvais also drew almost entirely on Vegetius concerning ‘the art of war’ in his encyclopedia, *Speculum maius*.¹⁰⁹ On the other hand, although Allmand cites from an early thirteenth-century French chronicle to show that the author of the chronicle has learned his Vegetius well to reflect the use of discipline and strategy as essential in the wars of a king,¹¹⁰ we do not really have any equivalent of the works of Bouvet, Mézières or Pizan, where Roman ideas are found embedded in vernacular works aimed at teaching knights about warfare.

Allmand argues that that the military state of France during the early years of the Hundred Years’ War might have triggered the need to look back to the Roman model. The continuous defeats of the French army might have signalled that the traditional ways of fighting with noble-led troops seemed to have failed, and that the need for a Roman type of army was immediate: disciplined and led by a commander under royal authority.¹¹¹ Dennis Showalter agrees that the Hundred Years’ War brought up the urgent need for dependence on strategy and discipline in warfare on both sides. Now that large number of skilled men needed to be mobilised for longer periods than the usual feudal levy provided for, the required troops should be

¹⁰⁸ Allmand, “*De re militari* of Vegetius,” 21.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 16-18; Christopher T. Allmand, “Fifteenth-Century English Versions of Vegetius’ *De re militari*,” in *Armies, Chivalry and Warfare in Medieval Britain and France: Proceedings of the 1995 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Matthew Strickland (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1998), 33.

¹¹⁰ Allmand, “*De re militari* of Vegetius,” 20.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 25-26.

professionals that could be organized under a central command.¹¹² Kate Langdon Forhan agrees that it was the need for professionalization in the French army, and for that matter in all medieval armies, which made the Roman works appealing with their “rich store of information and *exempla* about the Roman army’s traditions, discipline, tactics and values.”¹¹³ To the appeal of the lessons of discipline and leadership found in the Roman sources for late medieval readers, Allmand adds another one: its teaching on siege warfare, which came to characterise much of the fighting during the Hundred Years’ War.¹¹⁴

Besides the requirements of the Hundred Years’ War and the shortcomings of the French knighthood, we can find more reason for bringing the Roman works concerning military teaching to the fore during this particular period. The translations of the Roman works from the late thirteenth century onwards to vernaculars may point to another factor in their increased diffusion into vernacular literature on warfare and knighthood that had previously been under the prevalent effect of the romances. The *De re militari* of Vegetius written in the fourth century AD, the best known of the Roman works on warfare entitled as “the outstanding authority in the realm of warfare” by Contamine,¹¹⁵ and “the most influential military manual in use during the Middle Ages” by G. Lester¹¹⁶ was the first to be translated into a vernacular language. Although it has been already established that the book was known to lay audiences through its ecclesiastical interpretations, mainly in John of Salisbury, Thomas Aquinas, Aegidius Romanus, and Vincent de Beauvais, with its translations into vernaculars the book became available to lay audiences and authors

¹¹² Showalter, “Cohesion in European Armies,” 407-11.

¹¹³ Kate Langdon Forhan, *The Political Theory of Christine de Pizan* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 150.

¹¹⁴ Allmand, *Society at War*, 8.

¹¹⁵ Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, 210.

¹¹⁶ G. Lester, ed. *The Earliest English Translation of Vegetius’s De Re Militari* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter—Universitätsverlag, 1988), 7.

writing on military matters, with an increasing popularity well into the sixteenth century.¹¹⁷ The first translation of Vegetius was into Anglo-Norman made in 1271, requested by Prince Edward of England, suggesting an intended immediate use as he was in the Holy Land at the time. This was followed by a French translation by Jean de Meun in 1284, which was also rendered into verse and followed by a Tuscan translation around 1286. Notwithstanding the appearance of earlier translations over a wide geographical area, the French interest seems to be rather overwhelming, as by the year 1320 two more French translations had also been produced, followed by another in 1380. In contrast to the existence of the five French translations before the end of the fourteenth century, the first English translation was only produced in 1408, possibly due to the fact that the French translations sufficed for the English ruling class who spoke French.¹¹⁸ Yet, by the end of the Middle Ages there were other four translations in English. A German translation was not made until 1475, and Portuguese, Castilian, Scottish and even Hebrew translations were produced also during the fifteenth century.¹¹⁹ Vegetius is found in ninety-six manuscripts in the fourteenth-century and a hundred and fifty in the fifteenth century, as opposed to only seventeen from the thirteenth century and twenty-one after 1500¹²⁰ (Of course the decline in the number of manuscripts after 1500 can be interpreted by the impact

¹¹⁷ Allmand, “*De re militari* of Vegetius,” 21-22; idem, “Fifteenth-Century English Versions of Vegetius,” 39. See also John of Salisbury, *Policraticus: Of the Frivolities of Courtiers and the Footprints of Philosophers*, trans. and ed. Cary J. Nederman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)[hereafter *Policraticus*]; Thomas Aquinas, *Aquinas: Political Writings*, ed. R.W. Dyson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)[hereafter *Aquinas*], Aegidius Romanus, *The Governance of Kings and Princes: John Trevisa's Middle English Translation of the De Regimine Principum of Aegidius Romanus*, ed. David C. Fowler, Charles F. Briggs and Paul G. Remley (New York: Garland Publications, 1997)[Hereafter *De regimine principum*]. The Trevisa edition of *De Regimine Principum* is used here because it was the only version of the book available to me. For Beauvais's *Speculum maius*, the following may be consulted: Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum quadruplex, sive speculum maius*, 4 vols. (Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1964-65).

¹¹⁸ John R.E. Bliese, “Rhetoric Goes to War: The Doctrine of Ancient and Medieval Military Manuals,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (Summer - Autumn, 1994), 113.

¹¹⁹ Allmand, “*De Re Militari* of Vegetius,” 21-22, idem, “Fifteenth-Century English Versions of Vegetius,” 30-35, 44; Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, 210; Bliese, “Rhetoric Goes to War,” 112.

¹²⁰ Bliese, “Rhetoric Goes to War,” 111.

of printing). Hence, Vegetius was “the leading authority on military thinking in the fifteenth century,” cited as well as read by so many people.¹²¹

Besides Vegetius’s book, two other Roman works, Frontinus’s *Strategmata*, and Valerius Maximus’s *Dicta et facta memorabiles*, both written in the first century AD, became also increasingly popular in the late Middle Ages. *Dicta et facta memorabiles*, a book of anecdotes on the deeds of the Romans in warfare, politics, social relations and other matters, drew largely on Cicero, Livy and Sallust and dealt in its second part with military and civil institutions.¹²² Although it was not cited as much as *De re militari* in the works of scholars before it was translated into vernaculars, we can find references to it in *Policraticus*, in Thomas Aquinas’s *De regimine principum* as well as in Vincent de Beauvais’s *Speculum*.¹²³ Yet it was certainly available in several manuscripts at least from the ninth century until the early fourteenth when a commentary on it was produced by an Augustinian monk at the papal court in Avignon, which in turn largely provided the basis for Simon de Hesdin’s translation about half a century later. This French translation was taken up by Hesdin in 1375 and completed by Nicolas de Gonesse in 1401.¹²⁴ Valerius’s popularity blossomed from the late fourteenth century to the sixteenth century as a source of moral teaching from Roman examples.¹²⁵ The book has some five hundred manuscripts dating from the period 1300–1500, while there are only fourteen from the thirteenth century, and a diminishing interest was noted for the sixteenth

¹²¹ Allmand, “Fifteenth-Century English Versions of Vegetius,” 45.

¹²² Barbara Drake Boehm, “Valerius Maximus in a Fourteenth-Century French Translation: An Illuminated Leaf,” *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 18 (1983), 53.

¹²³ Boehm declares that although Valerius’s book was “infrequently tapped by medieval scholars,” John of Salisbury and Vincent of Beauvais were exceptions. *Ibid.*, 55. Aquinas’s quotes from Valerius are either trivial such as concerning the ties of friendship or the discussion about the primacy of priests before laymen: *Aquinas*, 18, 31, 42.

¹²⁴ Wright, “*Tree of Battles* of Honore Bouvet”, 27-28; Canon-Willard, “Christine de Pizan on Chivalry”, 514.

¹²⁵ Boehm, “Valerius Maximus in a Fourteenth-Century French Translation,” 55-56; Gian Biagio Conte, *Latin Literature: A History*, trans. Joseph B. Solodow (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 381-82.

century.¹²⁶ An English translation of Valerius's book was even slower than that of Vegetius to come: it was translated into English for the first time in 1678, almost three centuries after its first French translation. On the other hand, a German translation is known to have been made almost at the same time as the French, in 1369.¹²⁷

Frontinus's *Strategmata*, a book on Roman war strategies, saw a translation into French in separate extracts in 1402, though it was not translated as a whole until the reign of Charles VII (c. 1439) which may suggest a link with the military reforms around that date.¹²⁸ Before that date, it can also be seen to have been cited in John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*,¹²⁹ and in Aquinas's *De regimine principum*. *Strategmata*, unlike *De re militari*, is known to have been a rare text before the late Middle Ages. Before it had been translated into French, it was more commonly known — for example in the case of Christine de Pizan who drew on heavily from it in her *Livre des faits d'armes* — through its incorporation into the first French translation of *Facta et dicta memorabiles*.¹³⁰ Another late medieval work, Antoine de la Sale's *La Salade* included numerous extracts from the book.¹³¹ In its first English translation in 1811, *Strategmata* is mentioned for still receiving praise among contemporary French commanders and for the timelessness of its advice.¹³²

¹²⁶ Conte, *Latin Literature*, 382.

¹²⁷ Valerius Maximus, in *Classical and Medieval Literature Criticism*, vol.64 (Gale Cengage, 2004), viewed at, <http://www.enotes.com/valerius-maximus-criticism/valerius-maximus>.

¹²⁸ Lucas, "French Translations of Latin Classics," 227, 238.

¹²⁹ For John of Salisbury's references to Frontinus, see *The Statesman's Book of John of Salisbury: Being the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books, and Selections from the Seventh and Eighth Books, of the Policraticus*, trans. John Dickinson (New York: Russell & Russell, 1963), accessed March 9, 2012, <http://www.constitution.org/salisbury/policrat456.htm> [Hereafter *Statesman's Book*]. The parts of Book Six which John of Salisbury drew on Frontinus has been omitted in the Nederman edition.

¹³⁰ Wright, "Tree of Battles of Honore Bouvet," 28; Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, 212; *Deeds of Arms*, 81, n; Janet Martin, "John of Salisbury as Classical Scholar," in *The World of John of Salisbury*, ed. Michael Wilks (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984), 180.

¹³¹ Antoine de la Sale, *Oeuvres complètes, vol. 1, La Salade*, ed. Fernand Desonay (Liège: Liège-Droz, 1935-41), cited in Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, 212.

¹³² Frontinus, *Strategematicon*, 2-3.

It is also necessary to point out that *Policraticus*, which transmitted the ideas of several Roman authors to medieval audiences, was also translated into French during the reign of Charles V, while another important source for the dissemination of *De re militari* during the Middle Ages, Aegidius Romanus's *De regimine principum*, saw a French translation around 1286.¹³³ The existence of the French versions of these two books possibly enhanced the recognition of the Roman military ideas during the aforementioned period that their advice was specifically valuable.

The translations of Roman sources and the works which contained their ideas apparently made them available to a larger and more varied audience. This, in view of the military needs of the period, must also have been their purpose. Jean de Vignai, the 1320 translator of Vegetius, wrote that he made the translation to inform soldiers who could not read Latin on military matters.¹³⁴ He also emphasised that it is military learning that brings victory and not mere strength or numbers.¹³⁵ Similarly, the English translator of Vegetius in 1408 also emphasised its function of teaching the knighthood so that they could win their battles.¹³⁶ We can find a similar statement of the book's usefulness in *Policraticus*, as John of Salisbury recommended Vegetius to "anyone who wishes to learn how to fight," for the author "most elegantly and diligently teaches the art of military affairs."¹³⁷ This advice accords with the evidence of the passing of Vegetian learning on to the princes and knights by monks and bishops during the twelfth century, in the absence of translations.¹³⁸

¹³³ Contamine, *Guerre, état et société*, 1:195; Joseph Canning, *A History of Medieval Political Thought, 300-1450* (London: Routledge, 1996), 133.

¹³⁴ Allmand, "De re militari of Vegetius," 22.

¹³⁵ Allmand, "Fifteenth-Century English Versions of Vegetius," 40.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 38.

¹³⁷ *Policraticus*, 124 (6:19) [all references in the parantheses are to book and chapter numbers].

¹³⁸ See above for Geoffrey Plantagenet, Richard the Lionheart, and a group of knights learning about Vegetius's ideas.

After their translation in the late Middle Ages, Vegetius and other Roman authors were more accessible to laymen who wanted to read them but who were not fully literate in Latin, i.e. many nobles, knights and other men-at-arms. Maurice Keen asserts that once they were passed on to the “secular aristocratic society” in the vernaculars, the Roman military lessons proved to be richer in material in comparison to that of the romances and other epics of knighthood.¹³⁹ Yet this does not mean that they viewed the Roman experience and knowledge as belonging to a different culture than their own tradition of knighthood. After all, Chrétien de Troyes had declared that chivalry — like all other components of civilisation — came to France from Greece and Rome, and the early romances often adapted themes from pagan antiquity into a romance setting.¹⁴⁰ In accordance with this, the translators of Vegetius often used the words knighthood or chivalry in their titles to make their content understandable to their readers. The earliest French translation of Vegetius by Jean de Meun was entitled *L’Art de chevalerie*, its verse version, *Li Abreiance de l’ordre de chevalerie*, and an English verse translation (made circa 1458) was called *Knyghthode and bataile*.¹⁴¹ Although these titles may not prove that contemporaries took Vegetius’s book to be a treatise on knighthood, it might suggest how a new perception of warfare was refracted through the terminology current at the time.¹⁴² It also raises questions about the range of the term *chevalerie* or knighthood as it is understood by contemporaries and within the view of the place of knighthood in contemporary battle formations.

¹³⁹ Keen, *Chivalry*, 112.

¹⁴⁰ Chrétien makes this declaration at the beginning of his *Cligés*: Chrétien de Troyes, *Arthurian romances*, trans. William W. Kibler and Carleton W. Carroll (London: Penguin Books, 1991), 123; Keen, *Chivalry*, 107-10.

¹⁴¹ Keen, *Laws of War*, 57, n. 4.

¹⁴² Allmand also discusses how the titles of the Vegetius translations should be interpreted in “*De re militari* of Vegetius,” 22-24.

Certainly there was a distinct body of thought and information diffusing into the views of knighthood and warfare held by the military class itself. Although the Roman books may not have been entirely new in their use for discussing military matters, as they had been in use by ecclesiastical authors before and had been made use of even by laymen to an extent, their presentation in the vernacular and as directly addressed to men-at-arms themselves was notable. In parallel with this translation of Roman sources into the vernacular was the aforementioned production of original didactic books — also in the vernacular — on knighthood and warfare making use of these Roman sources. Hence these new books written for laymen contributed to the dissemination of Roman ideas and experience. We can aptly place the works of Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan in this category.¹⁴³ In the case of *Arbre des batailles* and *Livre des faits d'armes* we can clearly talk of a transmission of ecclesiastical views that were found in their original source, Giovanni da Legnano's *De bello* — and for that matter those of Bartolus Saxoferrato which had been used by Legnano — to the lay sphere so that the academic discourses of Legnano were simplified and put in the vernacular first in *Arbre des batailles*, and then in a more condensed form in *Livre des faits d'armes*.¹⁴⁴ N.A.R. Wright comes close to pointing out a shift from romantic ideas, in a book intended for an audience of noblemen, knights and heralds, to Roman ideas which were previously covered in ecclesiastical writing when he describes Bouvet's view of knighthood in *Arbre des batailles* as a “decidedly unromantic” one, being derived, according to him, from two sources: “the military manuals of republican and imperial Rome, and ‘the peace movement’ of the

¹⁴³ Keen, *Chivalry*, 219; Cropp includes the works of Eustache Deschamps and Alain Chartier along with those of Philippe de Mézières and Christine de Pizan in this category: Cropp, “Alexander the Great in the Works of Eustache Deschamps and Christine de Pizan,” 301-2; Contamine mentions a variety of late medieval works on warfare from Bouvet's *Arbre des batailles* and Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes*, to Theodore Paleologus's, Jean de Bueil's and Robert Balsac's treatises: Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, 210-15.

¹⁴⁴ Keen, *Laws of War*, 21; Keen, *Chivalry*, 162, 111; *Deeds of Arms*, 6.

tenth- and eleventh-century church.”¹⁴⁵ While it may be the canon law that put down the regulations of the Peace movement in a universally recognized form and not the movement itself that Bouvet drew on, they were rather a part of canonical regulations, rather than the only ones that he used for reference to justify his arguments in *Arbre des batailles*. On the other hand, Pizan, like the translators of Vegetius, explains her aim in *Livre des faits d’armes* as teaching Roman military knowledge to a lay audience as she conveys that she will present her material, selected from several books, “in diligence and sense rather than with the subtlety of polished language, and also considering that experts in the art of chivalry are not usually clerks accomplished in their knowledge of language.”¹⁴⁶

Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan all refer to the source of their knowledge as Vegetius or other Roman authors at some point in their works. Bouvet in *Arbre des batailles* refers to the doctrine of “a doctor called Monseigneur Vegetius, the author of the “Book of Chivalry”, when he is talking about the strategies the army captain should follow and the order he should keep; and in *Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun* he mentions Vegetius as the “great master of arms” and refers to Valerius as simply Vegetius “the great.”¹⁴⁷

Philippe de Mézières in *Songe du vieil pèlerin* recommends that “those who would like to know in more detail and on special subjects the function of captains of the army and its aspects, should read the good book of Vegetius.”¹⁴⁸ Later in his advice for reading to Charles VI, he denounces the romances as a source of military advice, calling them “lies of Lancelot and other similar [stories]” as works “which

¹⁴⁵ Wright, “*Tree of Battles* of Honoré Bouvet,” 27.

¹⁴⁶ *Deeds of Arms*, 12.

¹⁴⁷ *Tree of Battles*, 132 (4:9); 211-12 (4: 132) [all references in the parantheses are to book and chapter numbers]; *Apparicion*, 28.

¹⁴⁸ “Celui qui voudra connaître plus en détail et sur des sujets spéciaux la fonction des capitaines de l’armée et ses aspects, qu’il lise le beau livre de Végèce, *De la chevalerie*”: *Vieux pèlerin*, 454 [all translations from French are mine unless otherwise indicated].

drive readers to imagine impossible things, [and are] foolish, [a] source of vanity and sin” and instead he recommends the “real stories of the Romans, meaning the books of Livy, Valerius Maximus, Seneca” (alongside Byzantine and Carolingian histories, Boethius, Aristotle, Aegidius Romanus, John of Salisbury, Augustine, and Eustache Deschamps).¹⁴⁹ Likewise in *Epistre lamentable* he recommends the reading of Vegetius along with Aegidius Romanus (which contains a lot of Vegetian teaching and was available in a French translation from the late thirteenth century as aforementioned) to learn about the discipline of knighthood, in which he praises the former as the useful book where one “will find the true science by which the virtue of the discipline of knighthood cannot be corrupted and consequently the prince will have victory.”¹⁵⁰ It should be noted here that the list of recommendations made by Mézières resembles the one made by the chancellor of the University of Paris, Jean Gerson, addressed to the dauphin in 1405: In that list there were Vegetius, Valerius, Frontinus and Aegidius Romanus’s *De regimine principum*, accompanied significantly, by Bouvet’s *Arbre des batailles*.¹⁵¹ Although Mézières advises that all the Latin works should be read in their original and not in translations that may contain errors,¹⁵² what he is actually doing is rendering the ideas in them in the vernacular.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 686-89. Mézières’s advice to the young king goes as follows: “Et pour cette raison il convient, cher fils, pour ta gouverne, de renoncer au plaisir de lire les ouvrages non authentiques, et principalement les livres et les récits qui sont pleins de mensonges, qui conduisent le lecteur à imaginer des choses impossibles, folles, sources de vanité et de péché, comme le récit des mensonges de Lancelot et d’autres semblables ...Et tu ne dois oublier le noble livre *Du Gouvernement des princes*, les histoires véritables des Romains, c’est-à-dire les livres de Tite-Live, Valère Maxime, Sénèque le philosophe et moraliste, la *Consolation* de Boèce, les enseignements d’Aristote, et toutes les autres histoires authentiques des païens ...”. These ideas were repeated in *ibid.*, 855-56.

¹⁵⁰ “... la trouvera la vraie science par laquelle la vertu de la discipline de chevalerie raisonnablement ne pourra estre corrompue et par consequent le prince aura victoire.” *Epistre lamentable*, 130-31 [all translations from the medieval French are mine unless otherwise indicated].

¹⁵¹ *Deeds of Arms*, 4; Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, 210-11.

¹⁵² *Vieux pèlerin*, 688.

Christine de Pizan in *Chemin de longue estude* starts her discussion about the qualities necessary in good knights with Vegetius “who speaks of the art of knighthood,” and goes on about examples and statements from Vegetius and Valerius; in *Le Livre de Charles V* she refers frequently to Vegetius to justify Charles V’s right conduct of knighthood by serving the common good and being prudent; in *Le Livre du corps de policie* she explains that she quotes Valerius very often in order to inspire desire of honour and courage by examples of virtue, and that he said that “discipline of chivalry ... was the highest honour and firm foundation of the Empire of Rome”; and in *Livre des faits d’armes* she refers to Vegetius’s book as “a notable work concerning the discipline and art of warfare possessed by the great conquerors, those who carried out through good judgement and skill in arms deeds that today would seem impossible.”¹⁵³ Pizan and Mézières apparently both feel the need to justify their praise of the Romans, a pagan people, as she goes in *Le Livre du corps de policie* to say that “the noble Romans were pagans and unbelievers, yet were so well governed that we ought to take them for an example,” just as Mézières in *Songe du vieil pèlerin* defends the idea that “the Romans have known well [to serve justice] that although they are pagans, God have consented that they rule the world for four centuries.”¹⁵⁴

Having set out Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan as representatives of a different perspective of knighthood and warfare in the late Middle Ages, it is necessary to

¹⁵³*Chemin*, 339-353[all translations from French are mine unless otherwise indicated]; *Charles V*, 336, 346; *Body Politic*, 25(1:13), 64(2:5) [all references in the parentheses are to book and chapter numbers]; *Deeds of Arms*, 26 (1:8). Although Pizan also frequently refers to Cato the Censor in *Chemin*, *Corps de policie* and *Faits d’armes*, Canon-Willard comments that she should have taken these from Vegetius’s quotes of Cato’s book, *De disciplina militari : Deeds of Arms*, 13, n. 3

¹⁵⁴*Body Politic*, 20 (1:11); *Vieux pèlerin*, 659: “... les Romains ont su bien se servir le troisième roue de chariot et jouer vaillamment sur la troisième case de leur vertue échiquier (la justice), et, bien qu’ils fussent idolâtres, Dieu consentit à ce qu’ils eussent la domination générale du monde durant quatre cents ans de suite.”

have a brief look at the scholarly works that have been produced on the late medieval approaches to knighthood and warfare as well as on the views of the three authors.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Johan Huizinga and Raymond L. Kilgour looked into the decline of chivalry in the late Middle Ages. While the ideas of the former in *The Autumn of the Middle Ages* were revolutionary for challenging the view that the age of chivalry was already gone by the late Middle Ages, both authors looked at chivalry as a concept in its high medieval form and tested its later existence by the same features as found at its zenith.¹⁵⁵ In the late twentieth century, Maurice H. Keen can be regarded as the most prominent scholar on the late medieval approaches to knighthood and warfare, with a focus particularly on France and England. In his *Chivalry* and other works, he has looked at the subject within a wider context than Huizinga and Kilgour that included the impact of Roman influences.¹⁵⁶ Christopher T. Allmand, another prominent scholar of medieval knighthood and warfare, concentrated especially on the period of the Hundred Years' War to find both English and French views on warfare and knights, and also particularly studied the reception and impact of Vegetius's *De re militari* in this period.¹⁵⁷ Philippe Contamine has contributed greatly to the study of literature and laws on warfare and knighthood in the late Middle Ages, specifically concentrating on France during the Hundred Years' War and its aftermath in his *Guerre, état et société à la fin du Moyen Âge*.¹⁵⁸ Maurice Keen in *Laws of War* and "Richard II's

¹⁵⁵ Johan Huizinga, *The Autumn of the Middle Ages* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004)[first translated into English in 1924 from the 1919 Dutch original, *Herfsttij der Middeleeuwen*]; Raymond L. Kilgour, *The Decline of Chivalry as shown in the French Literature of the Late Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1937).

¹⁵⁶ Keen, *Chivalry*; idem, *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms*; idem, "Chaucer and Chivalry Re-visited" in *Armies, Chivalry and Warfare in Medieval Britain and France*, 1-12; idem, "Chivalry, Nobility and the Man-at-Arms" in *War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages*, 32-45.

¹⁵⁷ Allmand, *Society at War*; idem, *The Hundred Years' War: England and France at War c.1300-c.1450*, rev.ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); idem, "Fifteenth-Century Versions of Vegetius"; idem, "De re militari of Vegetius."

¹⁵⁸ Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*; idem, *Guerre, État et Société*.

Ordinances of War of 1385,” and Theodore Meron in *Henry’s Wars and Shakespeare’s Laws*, have also made studies of the laws of war during the late Middle Ages, to illuminate views about knighthood and warfare in the period.¹⁵⁹ Moreover, volumes like *War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages*; *Writing War: Medieval Responses to Warfare* and *Armies, Chivalry and Warfare in Medieval Britain and France*, with their collections of articles, have provided insight into late medieval literature on warfare and knighthood, again with a specific focus on England and France. Bouvet’s and Pizan’s views on warfare and knighthood have been discussed in these volumes, in articles respectively by N.A.R. Wright and François le Saux.¹⁶⁰ Raymond L. Kilgour has also discussed the views of Bouvet and Mézières on chivalry in the last part of his *Decline of Chivalry*, and those of Bouvet alone in, “Honoré Bonet: A Fourteenth-Century Critic of Chivalry.”¹⁶¹ Charity Canon-Willard has also explored Pizan’s views on warfare and knighthood in three separate articles.¹⁶² Mézières’s views on knighthood and warfare have found specific interest from scholars mainly in view of his ideas on crusade, as explored for example by Philippe Contamine in “*La Consolation de la desconfiture de Hongrie de Philippe de Mézières*,” and Joan Williamson in “Philippe de Mézières and the Idea of Crusade.”¹⁶³

The three authors have been linked in several studies, most of the time regarding their reforming views and criticisms on warfare and knighthood. This may

¹⁵⁹ Keen, *Laws of War*; idem, “Richard II’s Ordinances of War”; Meron, *Henry’s Wars and Shakespeare’s Laws*.

¹⁶⁰ Wright, “*Tree of Battles* of Honore Bouvet”; Françoise Le Saux, “War and Knighthood in Christine de Pizan’s *Livre des faits d’armes et de chevalerie*” in *Writing War*, 93-106.

¹⁶¹ Raymond L. Kilgour, “Honoré Bonet: A Fourteenth-Century Critic of Chivalry,” *PMLA* 50, no.2 (June, 1935): 352-361.

¹⁶² Canon-Willard, “Christine de Pizan on Chivalry”; idem, “Christine de Pizan on the Art of Warfare”; idem, “Christine de Pizan’s Treatise on the Art of Medieval Warfare”.

¹⁶³ Contamine, “*Consolation de la desconfiture de Hongrie de Philippe de Mézières*”; Joan Williamson, “Philippe de Mézières and the Idea of Crusade,” in *The Military Orders: Fighting for the Faith and Caring for the Sick*, ed. Malcolm Barber (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1994), 358-364.

be traced back to Ernest Nys's article, "Honoré Bonet et Christine de Pisan."¹⁶⁴ Whereas Jean-Louis G. Picherit has looked for evidence of other similarities between the works of Mézières and Pizan in "De Philippe de Mézières à Christine de Pizan,"¹⁶⁵ the common scholarly tendency has been to look at the three authors together with a regard to their view of knighthood and warfare, and often with an emphasis on their use of Roman works.¹⁶⁶ However, although the authors have thus been grouped together with other contemporary authors, or as a trio, in the aforementioned studies of ideas and literature on late medieval warfare as well as in other works, there has been no detailed comparative study of the three as yet — perhaps excepting Nys's article on Bouvet and Pizan. This thesis aims to fill that gap by making a comparative analysis of the views of the three authors towards warfare and knighthood.

As an extended preliminary to this, in Chapters Two to Four, I propose to examine the view of knighthood and warfare that emerges from the romances, followed by some examples from the late medieval literature on knights and warfare that were heavily influenced by this view, and then turn to the ecclesiastical and academic writing on these subjects in the Middle Ages that would have such an important influence on the writings of Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan, with an emphasis on this contrasting view as it had accumulated by the late Middle Ages.

¹⁶⁴ Ernest Nys, "Honoré Bonet et Christine de Pisan," in *Revue de Droit International et de Legislation Comparée* 14 (1882): 451-472.

¹⁶⁵ Jean-Louis G. Picherit, "De Philippe de Mézières à Christine de Pizan," *Le Moyen Français* 13 (1983): 20-36.

¹⁶⁶ For example see Keen, *Laws of War*; idem, *Chivalry*; idem, "Chivalry, Nobility and Man-at-Arms," idem, *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms*; Allmand, *Society at War*; Wright, "Tree of Battles of Honoré Bouvet"; Cropp, "Alexander the Great in the Works of Eustache Deschamps and Christine de Pizan"; Contamine, "Consolation de la desconfiture de Hongrie"; idem, *War in the Middle Ages*; idem, *Guerre, état et société*; Housley, "Le Maréchal Boucicaut"; Meron, *Henry's Wars and Shakespeare's Laws*.

The most popular of the romances was the Arthurian romance originating from Chrétien de Troyes' late twelfth-century romances, this Arthurian subject matter elaborated both in verse and in prose over the following century. Although Chrétien is considered to be the father of the Arthurian romance, most of the time, he himself was repeating folk tales told by storytellers called *conteurs*.¹⁶⁷ The story of Lancelot, which first appeared in Chrétien's *Lancelot: Le Chevalier de la charette* — written at the behest of Marie de Champagne, a patron of troubadours and an advocate of courtly love — can be described as the mostly widely known story and the one most associated with the idea of Arthurian romance in the minds of modern readers. The motif of a young knight on a quest for renown through knightly deeds and inspired by love, which characterises this story, came to be popularised by the Prose *Lancelot*,¹⁶⁸ which remained a bestseller for more than three centuries,¹⁶⁹ suggesting that it was also an inspiration to other authors. Elspeth Kennedy, a scholar of Arthurian romances, has looked for evidence of the reading of romances in the writings of knight/authors and finds evidence that pertains to the Prose *Lancelot* mostly.¹⁷⁰ For these reasons, in Chapter Two, I will particularly examine *Lancelot do*

¹⁶⁷ Roger Sherman Loomis, *The Development of Arthurian Romance* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), 66.

¹⁶⁸ Elspeth Kennedy, "The Re-writing and Re-reading of aText: The Evolution of the *Prose Lancelot*" in *The Changing Face of Arthurian Romance: Essays on Arthurian Romances in Memory of Cedric E. Pickford*, ed. Alison Adams, Armel H. Diverres, Karen Stern et al. (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1986), 3.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 1; Loomis, *Development of Arthurian Romance*, 54.

¹⁷⁰ She mentions Philippe de Novare's *Les Quatre âges de l'homme*, Philippe de Beaumanoir's *Coutumes de Beauvaisis*, Ramon Llull's *Libre del ordre de cavayleria*, and Geoffroi de Charny's *Livre de chevalerie*: Elspeth Kennedy, "Geoffroi de Charny's *Livre de chevalerie* and the Knights of the Round Table" in *Medieval Knighthood V: Papers from the Sixth Strawberry Hill Conference, 1994*, ed. Stephen Church and Ruth Harvey (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1990), 221-22. For a comparison of the prose *Lancelot* with Charny, Llull, and also the anonymous *Ordene de chevalerie*, see the whole article above; and for comparisons of Novare, Beaumanoir and Llull, see *idem*, "The Knight as Reader of Arthurian Romance" in *Culture and the King: The Social Implications of the Arthurian Legend. Essays in Honor of Valerie Lagorio*, ed. Martin B. Schichtman and James P. Carley (New York: State University of New York Press, 1994), 70-90. The following may also be consulted: Philippe de Novare, *Les Quatre âges de l'homme: traité moral de Philippe de Navarre, publié pour la première fois d'après les manuscrits de Paris, Londres et de Metz*, ed. Marcel de Fréville (Paris, 1888); Philippe de Beaumanoir, *Coutumes de Beauvaisis*, ed. A. Salmon, 2 vols (Paris, 1884-5).

Lac,¹⁷¹ the non-cyclic version of the story, to find a particular view of knighthood which I will treat as representative of the ‘romance view.’

In Chapter Three, I will show that the romance view persisted into the Late Middle Ages through two famous examples of writing on knighthood and warfare written respectively in the mid-fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries: Geoffroi de Charny’s *Livre de chevalerie* written around 1350 and the anonymous *Le Livre des fais du bon messire Jehan le Maingre, dit Bouciquaut, mareschal de France et gouverneur de Jennes* [*Le Livre de Bouciquaut*]¹⁷² written in 1409. The *Livre de chevalerie*, a didactic book with the aim of teaching the proper conduct of knighthood, was written by Charny, who was a knight at the court of Charles V, and the king’s standard bearer. It is one of the most frequently cited examples of medieval books of knighthood, together with two other works of an earlier period, the anonymous *Ordene de chevalerie* (before 1250), and *Libre del ordre de cavayleria* (c.1280s)¹⁷³ by the Mallorcan knight-turned-hermit, Ramon Llull. Charny’s book shares features with both of these books, such as its account of the knighting ceremony and its attempt to reconcile spirituality with a praise of prowess and courtliness, both of which in turn can be traced back to the Prose *Lancelot*.¹⁷⁴ *Le Livre de Bouciquaut* is the biography of the French marshal Bouciquaut with a perspective that concentrates on the hero’s prowess, valour and courtliness and with an emphasis on his individual achievements. Such an approach that goes to considerable lengths to idealise its hero, following the model of a romance hero, was

¹⁷¹ I will here refer to Corin Corley, trans, *Lancelot of the Lake* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), which is based on Elspeth Kennedy, ed., *Lancelot do Lac: The Non-Cyclic Old French Prose Romance*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1980) with references also to the cyclic version of the same text in *Lancelot: Roman en prose du XIIIe siècle*, ed. A. Micha, 9 vols. (Paris and Geneva, 1979-83).

¹⁷² Denis Lalande, ed., *Le Livre des fais du bon messire Jehan le Maingre, dit Bouciquaut, mareschal de France et gouverneur de Jennes* (Paris: Librairie Droz, 1985) [Hereafter *Livre de Bouciquaut*].

¹⁷³ See Ramon Lull’s *Book of Chivalry*.

¹⁷⁴ Kennedy, “Geoffroi de Charny,” 233-37; Keen, *Chivalry*, 11.

something adopted by other examples of chivalric biographies, for example, *L'Histoire de Guillaume le Mareschal*, the early thirteenth-century biography of the famous English knight and statesman, or *Le Livre des faits de messire Jacques de Lalaing*, the biography of the fifteenth-century champion of the court of Burgundy.¹⁷⁵

After I have defined the significant features of the romance view of warfare and knighthood through *Lancelot do Lac*, and demonstrated that the influence of the romances on literature about warfare and knighthood was still intact in the late Middle Ages, as evidenced by Charny's *Livre de chevalerie* and the anonymous *Le Livre de Bouciquaut*, in Chapter Four, I will try to establish the features of what I will call the 'ecclesiastical view' of warfare and knighthood by examining the ideas of a series of ecclesiastics, theologians and canon lawyers, from the late Roman Church Father and theologian, St. Augustine of Hippo, whose ideas formed the basis of the ecclesiastical view, to Giovanni da Legnano, the fourteenth-century Italian legist whose ideas represented the accumulation of ecclesiastical ideas on warfare and knighthood as they are found in the late medieval period. I will here use his *Tractatus de bello, de represaliis et de duello*, which I earlier mentioned as a source to Bouvet's *Arbre des batailles*. Other theologians and legists whose ideas I will refer to will be St. Bernard of Clairvaux, John of Salisbury, St. Thomas Aquinas, Aegidius Romanus (Giles of Rome), Jean de Gerson, Gratian, Ramon de Penyafort and Innocent IV. John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* and two books both entitled *De regimine principum*, the first by Thomas Aquinas¹⁷⁶ and other by Aegidius Romanus, are examples of mirrors for princes, political treatises addressing princes that also

¹⁷⁵ *Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, ed. P. Meyer (Paris, 1891); Jacques de Lalaing, *Le Livre des faits de Jacques de Lalaing* in *oeuvres de G. Chastellain*, ed. K. de Lettenhove (Brussels, 1866), both cited in Keen, *Chivalry*, 20-23; 223-34.

¹⁷⁶ See Aquinas.

included advice on military matters. Aquinas' ideas on knighthood and warfare can also be found in his *Summa theologiae*,¹⁷⁷ which is a compendium of all theological teachings of the Church. Jean de Gerson's sermons are a source for his thoughts on warfare and knights,¹⁷⁸ and Bernard of Clairvaux's *De laude novae militiae*,¹⁷⁹ a eulogy on the Knights Templars communicated ideas on knighthood from the perspective of the early Cistercians. The aforementioned theologians, except for Bernard of Clairvaux, were associated with the University of Paris — in the case of John of Salisbury, with the schools that later made up the university —, although Jean Gerson, the late fourteenth and early fifteenth-century chancellor of the university, was also influenced by the thought of Bernard of Clairvaux. John of Salisbury and Aegidius Romanus were particularly important for their political thought that influenced authors in later centuries, and Thomas Aquinas is famous for elaborating on and systematising Augustine's ideas on 'just war' into a fully fledged theory of just war. Gratian's *Decretum* was the first attempt to reconcile and systematise canon law that mainly depended on papal decisions on various issues and Ramon de Penyafort's *Decretals of Gregory IX* continued this effort of reconciling the various legislation of canon-law both with itself and with other authorities such as the bible, church fathers and civil law to render a comprehensible code of canon-law. These theologians and canon lawyers, while establishing the conditions for a just war, by which they elaborated on the thought of Augustine, also tried to resolve questions about how just warfare should be conducted. Roman military ideas, especially on discipline and strategy, were also in use by the ecclesiastical authors, particularly by John of Salisbury and Aegidius Romanus, and later by Giovanni da

¹⁷⁷ See *ibid.*

¹⁷⁸ See D. Catherine Brown, *Pastor and Laity in the Theology of Jean Gerson* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

¹⁷⁹ Bernard of Clairvaux, *De laude novae militiae*, trans. David Carbon, accessed March 9, 2012, <http://faculty.smu.edu/bwheeler/chivalry/bernard.html>.

Legnano, together with his use of the codes of Roman law, study on which had developed in parallel to the canon-law from the twelfth century onwards.

In Chapter Five I will examine the works of Bouvet, Mézières, and Pizan regarding both their differences from the romance view as illustrated in *Lancelot do Lac* and the later chivalric books, Geoffroi de Charny's *Livre de chevalerie* and the anonymous *Le Livre de Bouciquaut*, and their similarities with the ecclesiastical view illustrated chiefly through the late medieval example of Giovanni da Legnano's *De bello*, but also with reference to the ideas of several other early and high medieval theologians and canonists, with an emphasis on the three authors' contribution to a new lay view of warfare and knighthood in their use of the Roman sources. This I will show despite the previous existence of Roman ideas in the works of ecclesiastical authors, establishing the works of three authors as original in several ways, the most obvious being their contribution to the diffusion to a wider public of ideas that were once limited mostly to the knowledge of the ecclesiastical world, and thus effecting a shift in ideas of warfare and knighthood in the lay sphere. Finally, in the conclusion, I will briefly discuss the ideas of the three authors as they relate to subsequent French military reform and also to humanism in France.

CHAPTER II

LANCELOT DO LAC: A REPRESENTATION OF THE ROMANTIC VIEW OF KNIGHTHOOD

The romances, with their ideal of knighthood that was at once enticing and unattainable, were increasingly popular as reading from the late twelfth century onwards, maintaining their appeal at least up to the sixteenth century. Widely read — and listened to — by nobles, gentry and merchants, it would be hard to classify romances merely as escapist literature even though the abundance of the mystical and the supernatural combined with love and chivalry in them could give such an impression.¹ On the contrary, it would not be wrong to argue that these works had an inspirational role in helping form the values and behaviour of the knightly class, and set the standards for chivalric behaviour with other factors in play such as the Germanic and Roman martial traditions, as well as Christian morals and rituals. Yet,

¹ *Lancelot of the Lake*, xvii. See also Loomis, *Development of Arthurian Romance; The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. Roberta L. Krueger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Beate Schmolke- Hasselman, *The Evolution of Arthurian Romance: The Verse Tradition from Chrétien to Froissart*, trans. Margaret and Roger Middleton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

romances cannot be thought of as immune from other influences. The feudal relations between the king and his knights and vassals, the magnificence of the great courts where tournaments and other celebrations were held, or the belief in the divine duty of knights with regard to the maintenance of order and justice in the kingdom can be cited as some of the influences that affected the storyline of the romances.² Reciprocally, the romances inspired a model of knighthood to be emulated by knights, nobles and aspirants and render a chivalric culture of international character.³ The fact that the patrons of tournaments and romances that glamorised them were the same noblemen,⁴ for example, testifies to the close-knit relationship and interaction between romances and knightly culture.

The emergence of romances can be associated with a particular phase of transformation, rather an elevation of status, regarding knighthood by the late eleventh into the twelfth centuries. This period saw the emergence of the cavalry, or horsemen as the most important warrior in the armies, which was due to contemporary developments in military technology and strategy, and the need for local lords to depend on these warriors for political power. As a sign of significance of cavalry, the word *milites* in Roman documents was often translated as denoting warriors on horseback, hence knights. It was during this time that knighthood was established as an order next to clergy and common people, distinguished from the latter and placed in almost equal importance to the former. Often described as the most honourable vocation and a noble order, knighthood came to be an extension of nobility. While it was implied that knights who had such a honourable occupation could only come from noble blood, it was often the case that becoming a knight offered the opportunity for ennoblement which made it more desirable for those who

² *Lancelot of the Lake*, xiii, xvii.

³ Keen, *Chivalry*, 18-43; Barber, *Knight and Chivalry*, 132.

⁴ Keen, *Chivalry*, 84-85, 91.

sought freedom and social advancement. Knights' association with the noble courts resulting from the nobles' dependence on them made the occupation more attractive as it also offered the opportunities of a courtly life. Such an elevation of status and re-definition of the warrior status originated in France due to developments in that particular geography but spread onto Europe — as well as to the *Outremer* — due to the international character of the society and the high mobility of French knights and clerks for that matter — facilitated by the chivalric literature best defined by the romances.⁵

Although romances relied on sources as varied as the histories of Caesar, Troy, Thebes and Alexander, as well as Celtic histories and legends, what they recounted was a version of that past as it had never existed. In spite of several features inherited from the *chansons de geste*, the French epics of a slightly earlier period that narrated heroic feats of the Carolingian kings, romances could be distinguished by their emphasis on the individuality of the knight, and particularly on love as a motivation for the knight to do honourable deeds in arms,⁶ with no particular emphasis on the “service of the state, or the *patria*, or of any corporate association.”⁷ While *chansons de geste* also reflect the aforementioned proximity of knights to nobility and to courtly life, romances incorporate the element of loyal service to a noble lady as equally important as service to a noble lord together with the theme of courtly love borrowed from troubadour poetry.⁸ The ideal created in the romances which the knights aspire to is a combination of courtliness and martial

⁵ For the development of the Order of knighthood, see for example Keen, *Chivalry*, chaps. 2 and 3.

⁶ Unlike in the *chansons de geste*, in the early romances we can find courtesy and love as knightly qualities in addition to prowess. Keen mentions the effect of the crusades, hence the discovery of the East and its riches, and its contribution in the depiction of courtly life and pleasures, and also the effect of the idea of courtly love emerging in troubadour poetry to modify the knightly life based on masculine power and relations that was found in the heroic epics of the former period: *Ibid.*, 107-10. See the whole of Keen's Chapter Four (pp. 102-24) for more on *chansons de geste*, classical romances and Arthurian romances.

⁷ Keen, *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms*, 42.

⁸ Keen, *Chivalry*, 29-33.

prowess. Courtliness meant a refinement of manners that would accompany martial skills with social ones that would guide the behaviour of knights in games and festivities at the court and in the company of the ladies who were an object of their love. Written for noble patrons for courtly reading—to begin with Chrétien de Troyes who wrote his *Lancelot* for Marie de Champagne and *Perceval* for Philippe de Flanders—⁹, romances were meant to entertain and educate knights to acquire courtly virtues at the same time. Despite the element of entertainment for their courtly audience, romances can be thought to be aimed at the education of knights also in a larger sense than that of courtly virtues as their authors were mostly clerks educated at cathedral schools who knew of works of classical literature and principles of Latin teaching. This can be evidenced by the influence of Ovid in troubadours and romances, and the use of Latin rhetoric principles in the romances.¹⁰

The most famous storyline in romance literature was without doubt the one that focused on the court of the British King Arthur and his knights, which was called “the matter of Britain” to distinguish it from romances with classical or French themes.¹¹ Arthurian romances, built on the late twelfth-century works of Chrétien de Troyes, who brought “a new development in the ideas of chivalry,”¹² were popularly available in verse and in prose over the course of the three hundred years that followed, in a wide geographical area extending from Scandinavia to the Iberian

⁹ Loomis, *Development of Arthurian Romance*, 44-45.

¹⁰ Sarah Kay, “Courts, Clerks and Courtly Love,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, 82, 87; Schmolke-Hasselman, *Evolution of Arthurian Romance*, xxxiv.

¹¹ *Lancelot of the Lake*, xvii.

¹² Barber, *Knight and Chivalry*, 106. Even if it is not uncommon to find a satire or even denigration of the ideals and characters established by the romances in certain later examples of the genre, at the end of the day not only did they use the same yardstick to challenge and topple Chrétien’s world but also their efforts were mostly directed at surpassing Chrétien: Schmolke-Hasselman, *Evolution of Arthurian Romance*, 21, 36-37. For a discussion of the challenge to Chrétien’s established characters and themes, especially concerning the character of Arthur in later romances, see *ibid.*, 61-103. For more information on the emergence and evolution of the Arthurian verse romance, see *ibid.*, 1-28.

Peninsula.¹³ The verse tradition following Chrétien de Troyes was led by Robert de Boron's trilogy composed at the beginning of the thirteenth century. This, rendered into prose as the *Lancelot-Grail* cycle composed between 1215 and 1235, is the most influential and well-known example of the verse tradition after Chrétien.¹⁴ Although verse and prose romances were produced simultaneously, the prose romances came to be more influential than those in verse, although the influence of the later verse romances was not so negligible as their relatively infrequent studies suggest.¹⁵

A significant difference in tone and outlook on events can be noted between prose and verse romances. The verse examples can be described to be bound up with the conservative concerns of its audience, reflecting their social and political problems but doing this discreetly by pretending to recount things in the past. Moreover, they have no comparable esteem for courtly love, a fundamental feature of the prose romances, or any notion of heavenly chivalry in the form of Grail quest, which is important in the *Lancelot-Grail* prose cycle. As a whole, verse romances are interesting on their own for embodying different approaches that range from serious moral teaching to satires of the Arthurian world.¹⁶

What I will be trying to show in this chapter is not a full-fledged study of the Arthurian romances — due to the long time span and the variety of works published — but a simplified outline of the most outstanding and common features that are

¹³ The genre can be represented by *Perceforest*, *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, and Jean Froissart's *Méliador* in the fourteenth, and Thomas Malory's *Morte Darthur* in the late fifteenth centuries: See also, Gilles Roussineau, ed., *Perceforest*, 2 vols. (Paris: Droz, 2007); Simon Armitage, trans., *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (Faber & Faber, 2008); Jean Froissart, *Méliador: Roman comprenant les poésies lyriques de Wenceslas de Bohême, duc de Luxemburg et de Brabant, public pour la première fois par Auguste Longnon* (Nabu Press, 2010); Sir Thomas Malory, *Le Morte Darthur: the Original Edition of William Caxton*, ed. H. Oskar Sommer (Michigan: Ann Arbor, 1997).

¹⁴ Norris J. Lacy, "The Evolution and Legacy of French Prose Romance" in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. Roberta L. Krueger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 167-70.

¹⁵ Schmolke-Hasselmann argues that the comparative lesser impact of the later verse romances might be due to their much narrower audience. Schmolke-Hasselmann, *Evolution of Arthurian Romance*, xxiii, 219-24, 228.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 11, 14, 22-23, 75, 228-29.

found in the Arthurian romances by which I will define the romance view of knighthood and warfare so that I can look for similar and different features in other works of literature concerning knighthood and warfare.

I will here illustrate these specific features of the Arthurian Romance by means of the story of *Lancelot* in the prose romance *Lancelot do Lac*, written in the early thirteenth century by an anonymous author.¹⁷ Described as one of the “most influential narratives in medieval literature,” and a best-seller while three centuries, Prose *Lancelot* develops from Chrétien de Troyes’s *Lancelot: Chevalier de la charette* and builds up it to render it in the version known to modern audiences.¹⁸ The influence of this romance on later chivalric literature has been demonstrated by Elspeth Kennedy in her examination of works of knight/authors during the Middle Ages. In her analysis of works on knighthood in a span of early thirteenth to mid-fourteenth centuries, she identifies quotations from Prose *Lancelot* in several chivalric books.¹⁹

Lancelot do Lac, the first *Lancelot* romance written in prose, represents the Arthurian prose romance in its non-cyclic form, that is before the quest of the Holy Grail in *La Queste del Saint Graal* — which in turn is developed from Chrétien’s *Perceval* — and the episode of Arthur’s death in *Mort d’Artu* were appended onto the story of the rise of Lancelot as a knight. The inclusion of the Grail legend, with the addition of the figure of Galahad as the immaculate seeker of the Grail — a Jesus-like figure — necessitated a revision of Lancelot’s past adventures in the light of this later spiritualism.²⁰ Although occasional clerical correction and innuendos for the divine nature of knighthood was neither absent from *Lancelot do Lac* by virtue of the

¹⁷ See Chapter One for the edition used.

¹⁸Schmolke-Hasselman, xxiii; Kennedy, “Evolution of *Prose Lancelot*,” 1; Loomis, *Development of Arthurian Romance*, 54.

¹⁹ See Chapter One.

²⁰ *Lancelot of the Lake*, xvi-xvii.

fact that it was possibly written by a clerk inclined to educate his audience, the author of *La Queste del Saint Graal*, possibly a Cistercian steeped in the teachings of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, gave a vision of knighthood and warfare that was at odds with the earthly representation in non-cyclic Prose *Lancelot*, or in the writings of Chrétien de Troyes for that matter. Kennedy points out how the incorporation of the Grail episode affected the interpretation of the *Lancelot* story in the cyclic version as opposed to the one in the non-cyclic one, emphasising the implications of criticism for Lancelot's adulterous relationship with Guinevere, and the foreshadowing for a superior type of heavenly knighthood contained in the cyclic version.²¹ Moreover, a brief outlook into the post-Vulgate version that followed the Vulgate *Lancelot-Grail* suggests an increasing emphasis on spirituality in the evolution of the prose Arthurian romances from the courtly worldliness of *Lancelot do Lac*.²² Elspeth Kennedy comments that such a different perspective in the cyclic versions of Prose *Lancelot* can be attributed to the effort to represent the story as a part of a greater reality.²³ Moreover several scholars have argued that the spiritual direction in *Queste* was not intended to condemn worldly knighthood but to contribute to its exaltation in which the praise of heavenly chivalry pointed out to the ultimate goal of knighthood.²⁴ Among these scholars, Keen does not find in *Queste* a comparable rejection of worldliness at the expense of the heavenly pursuits to St. Bernard's but instead thinks

²¹ Fanni Bogdanow, "An Interpretation of the Meaning and Purpose of the Vulgate *Queste del Saint Graal* in the Light of the Mystical Theology of St. Bernard" in *The Changing Face of Arthurian Romance: Essays on Arthurian Romances in Memory of Cedric E. Pickford*, ed. Alison Adams, Arnel H. Diverres, Karen Stern et al. (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1986), 23; Lacy, "Evolution of French Prose Romance," 171. Elspeth Kennedy states that as opposed to the non-cyclic version of *Lancelot*, "in the cyclic version ... the interpretation of Galehot's dreams both presents the love of Lancelot and Guinevere for the first time in the romance as destructive and sinful, and predicts the coming of a knight, pure and chaste descendant of Lancelot and destined to surpass him": Kennedy, "Evolution of Prose *Lancelot*," 3. See Kennedy's whole article for the transformation of ideas in the cyclic version of *Lancelot* and its emphasis on the spiritual.

²² Lacy, "Evolution of French Prose Romance," 173, 176.

²³ Kennedy, "Evolution of Prose *Lancelot*," 2.

²⁴ Keen, *Chivalry*, 61; Emmanuèle Baumgartner, *L'Arbre et la pain, essai sur la Queste del Saint Graal* (Paris: S.E.D.E.S., 1981), 144; J. Frappier, "Le Graal et la chevalerie," in *Autour de Graal: Publications Romanes et Françaises, CXLVII* (Genève: Droz, 1977), 116-17.

that its author was displaying different degrees of virtue in knighthood.²⁵ Moreover, Bogdanow asserts that in the next story in the cycle, *Mort d'artu*, there is no continuity of the spiritual theme, but an appreciation of worldliness, especially of courtly love, although the adulterous relationship between Lancelot and Guinevere ultimately prepares the collapse of the kingdom.²⁶ The changes in tone observed in the evolution of the story can also be attributed to the authors and trends of the day. For example, while the post-Vulgate version of the *Lancelot-Grail* cycle (composed circa 1230-1240) disposed of much of the courtly features of the Vulgate in favour of spiritual concerns almost to the extent of a remake, Thomas Malory's *Morte Darthur* in the late fifteenth century gave a restatement of characters and theme with an emphasis on "warfare and knighthood at the expense of courtly refinement and the concern for love."²⁷ While the post-Vulgate gloss of the story can be ascribed to the identity of its author, the significance of Malory's emphasis can be explained as a part of the popular military ideals of the late Middle Ages for which the evidence will be provided in this dissertation.

If we are to return to the story of *Lancelot do Lac*, which preceded all these versions of the story, and followed the themes and hints found in Chretien de Troyes' romances, it simply narrates a series of adventures, or tests for Lancelot, in his quest for identity, in which his success is often found to be intertwined with his love for Guinevere.²⁸ The primary focus of the story is the individual deeds of Lancelot as well as other knights in the story, together with the praise of valour and prowess in arms. The knightly honour that is brought by the praise of these virtues, according to

²⁵ Keen, *Chivalry*, 61.

²⁶ Ibid., 46.

²⁷ Lacy, "Evolution of French Prose Romance," 175-76, 179.

²⁸ *Lancelot of the Lake*, ix.

Kaeuper, was the “veritable currency of chivalric life” in the romances.²⁹ The means to demonstrate prowess and valour was represented by adventures, undertakings that were not so much training for the knights as they were a way in which they could reveal their inherent nobility. Lancelot explains that physical qualities are inherited and cannot be learned,³⁰ as he himself displays signs of nobility from an early age by his excellent deeds in arms. His identity as the son of a noble king is only revealed to him and to others when he has proved his prowess in arms. When Sir Gawain is astounded by his deeds at a tournament, wondering about the identity of the knight who he thinks is “certainly ... one of the best in the world,” he is informed that “he is Lancelot of the Lake, the son of King Ban of Benwick.”³¹ In order continuously to increase his honour in arms, Lancelot listens to the advice of the Lady of the Lake and seeks adventures “through all the land ... that will enable [him] to win honour and renown” making sure that “no one ever undertakes to perform a knightly deed which [he has] neglected.”³² That is the spirit of the story, and of the romance genre in general, an endless pursuit of honour and renown through whatever opportunities were available to the knight.

Although Lancelot’s pursuit of adventures and honour that would result in earning his name are not evaluated in relation to divine approval in non-cyclic Prose *Lancelot*, in the *Lancelot-Grail* cycle, the sins of knights are presented as holding back their deeds in arms and eventually hindering their quest to self-realization. Just as Lancelot cannot succeed in his quest of the Holy Grail due to his sin of adultery,

²⁹ Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 129.

³⁰ *Lancelot of the Lake*, 141.

³¹ Ibid., 201. In *Parzival*, inherited social status and morals is confirmed when the hero of the poem discovers that he is noble by birth for his “nature predisposes him to knighthood”: Barber, *Knight and Chivalry*, 115. On the other hand, whereas the presence of physical beauty and moral superiority in a knight revealed his inherited nobility, the contrary could disclose bad lineage: Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 190-91; Schmolke-Hasselmann, *Arthurian Romance*, 167.

³² *Lancelot of the Lake*, 66-67.

those knights who seek the Grail in imitation of Galahad are also doomed to fail because they were not led by spiritual motives but by their worldly desires and pride.³³ Hence, worldly desires, even the basic urge to surpass others were found to be incompatible with earning the highest honour, that is heavenly honour, in *Queste*³⁴ as opposed to *Lancelot do Lac* in which its hero randomly seeks and earns honour and renown in avenging a knight with whom he had no acquaintance before, in defence of ladies and maidens in need, and in royal tournaments and wars.

Lancelot does not distinguish between feats of arms and rushes from one to the next in order to become known as the best knight in the world. The author tells us that Lancelot becomes upset when he can perform no deeds in arms, and rejoices when he hears of an opportunity to fight a knight who has beaten one of the best knights in the world, complaining that it is such a waste to spend time without “jousting or knightly deeds.”³⁵ Hence *Lancelot do Lac* is a narrative of endless pursuits that are thought to be nothing other than tests of bravery and prowess for the hero alone. Even Lancelot’s achievement in cutting alone through the lines of the Saxons and the Irish, in a war on which the fate of the kingdom depended, is nevertheless declared as a test of his individual prowess.³⁶

There is thus a clear stress on the individual knight and his quest for honour and renown through adventures in arms, where he is expected to excel in valour and prowess. Prowess is such a virtue that it is assumed to be admired by all, men and women alike. Lancelot fights so skilfully that everybody on the battleground stops and watches him fight. Even Sir Gawain, who is known otherwise as the best knight, is astonished by his prowess, asserting that “no man, to his knowledge, could have

³³ Kennedy, “Evolution of Prose *Lancelot*,” 4-6; Bogdanow, “An Interpretation of *Queste*,” 35-45.

³⁴ Bogdanow, “An Interpretation of *Queste*,” 41.

³⁵ *Lancelot of the Lake*, 359.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 399.

done as much.”³⁷ Again, Lancelot is said to have done “such deeds of arms that all those who were with him were astonished; and those who were against him were taken aback.” His fellow knights, when they see Lancelot’s deeds of arms, follow him, as they esteem him as a man of great valour and are “ready to do deeds of prowess or to die with honour in his company.”³⁸ At the end of *Lancelot do Lac*, the clerks were called to record the deeds of prowess of Lancelot and other knights of the Round Table so that they will be passed on to the aspirants of prowess.³⁹

Admiration of prowess is so inherent to the narrative that not only knights fighting on the same side but also enemies are said to admire each other. A knight escaping from Lancelot’s wrath is astounded by his deeds as he describes him as doing the “most remarkable [things] which have ever been seen.”⁴⁰ Likewise, when the enemy knights who are holding King Arthur prisoner see Lancelot, they recognize him as “the good knight” and go on to greet him, and one of them asks Lancelot for a joust.⁴¹ This is a typical reaction to an esteemed knight, for the opportunity to fight a good knight is also a chance to increase one’s own status as a knight. Arthur, due to his admiration for the prowess and valour of Galehot, his enemy, retains him as his knight as well as his companion.⁴² Likewise, Galehot admires Lancelot as a knight so much that even though he defeats Arthur in battle he chooses to surrender himself to Arthur to honour the oath he has given to Lancelot.⁴³ When he sees Lancelot’s “remarkable deeds” on the battlefield, Galehot draws back his men, for “he would not wish to have conquered all the lands under the heavens, if

³⁷ Ibid., 275.

³⁸ Ibid., 278.

³⁹ Ibid., 413.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 282.

⁴¹ Ibid., 403.

⁴² Ibid., 412.

⁴³ Ibid., 286-95.

it meant that such a valorous men died through his fault.”⁴⁴ For him, the companionship of a knight of such great valour and prowess as Lancelot is worth giving up the chance of conquering Arthur’s kingdom.⁴⁵

As much as these examples in admiration of the prowess of the enemy defy all reason in warfare, likewise does the knights’ stubborn desire to show their own prowess at great cost, and such examples crowd the pages of the romances. Knights refuse to hear reason while they can go on fighting and earn more honour. In *Lancelot do Lac*, Lionel and Yvain try to reassure Lancelot that going against a multitude of Saxons and Irish whom they have already defeated will not be “bravery, but foolishness” as he might easily get himself killed. Lionel adds that even if he did any deed of prowess, “no one would ever know.” Yet, despite all these warnings and even though he is told that he has done as much as all the troops of the king’s army could do, Lancelot never thinks he has done enough, but only consents to stop fighting when he is reminded of his loyalty to the queen.⁴⁶ The same anecdote is told with slight variations in other Lancelot stories, pitting Lancelot’s rashness against the warnings of his fellow knights,⁴⁷ yet with a sense of applause for such bravery and eagerness to show prowess at great risk. A similar pitting of praiseworthy impetuosity against prudence can be seen in Arthur’s decision to go against Galehot, whose forces were far greater than his, whereas his men advise him to wait until his other followers arrive with their forces. Here too, despite the soundness of the advice, Arthur refuses to wait when somebody threatens his lands, and such pride is described with more than a hint of praise.⁴⁸ We can see praise of similar recklessness in *Chanson de Roland*, a famous example of *chansons de geste* dating

⁴⁴ Ibid., 283.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 290.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 401-2.

⁴⁷ Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 144.

⁴⁸ *Lancelot of the Lake*, 228.

from the mid-twelfth century. In the account of the battle of Roncevaux, Roland who risks his forces and his own death is praised, as opposed to the prudence of Oliver who advises him against taking action.⁴⁹

Fights, taken up without any consideration for prudence, are often described, though uncritically, as being moved by the feelings of anger or fury on the part of the heroes. Lancelot's assault on the Saxons and the Irish is described as that of "an angry lion which rushes among the hinds, killing to right and left, not from hunger, but to display its great pride and power."⁵⁰ Then when he was stopped from fighting them because it would have been too risky, he becomes "so angry that he was nearly beside himself."⁵¹

Descriptions of the violence of fighting are often found in hyperbolic terms to describe the extent of prowess, not in criticism but in praise of it. In *Lancelot do Lac* we can find a great many depictions of the violence of battle, such as: Lancelot "took aim at the knight and struck him right on the throat so hard that the lance-head passed through his throat." Aiming at other knights, Lancelot cuts through their arms and bodies, splitting them in two, and spills out their brains.⁵² Ladies could also be targets of violence, as when Lancelot "grasped [a woman] by her hair and said that he would send her head flying" and he does not stop until she begs for mercy.⁵³ However, these scenes of violence serve clearly to emphasise the extent of prowess displayed, as they are often accompanied by the praise of avoiding idleness and doing remarkable deeds.⁵⁴

⁴⁹ Barber, *Knight and Chivalry*, 51-52, 157.

⁵⁰ *Lancelot of the Lake*, 399.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 402-3.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 404-5

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 407.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 279, 283.

The narrative clearly has its focus on the knights and their deeds, which leaves little room for any other concern related to warfare. Despite the fact that most of Lancelot's quests are undertaken in the name of the king, for the defence of his vassals or to defeat an enemy that threatens the realm, at the end of the day what concerns the author are the individual feats of valour and prowess shown during battles. In battles fought for the king, the focus is on "knightly deeds" and who fights well, more than the outcome of the battle as a whole.⁵⁵ The narrative focuses usually on one knight, whose prowess and valour determines the battle or simply outshines all else even if the battle is lost. We can note several remarks such as "Sir Gawain fought the best of all"; Lancelot "jousted so skilfully that all other stopped jousting and fighting to watch him. He did such deeds of arms ... that no man ... could have done as much", and Lancelot is "defeating everyone by himself," and although he has never stopped fighting all day, "he is just as fierce and fresh as if he had not borne arms at all."⁵⁶ The need to praise the deeds of a hero is so continuous that when Sir Gawain cannot fight anymore due to his serious injuries, the author announces that "then Sir Yvain's deeds of prowess began."⁵⁷ Moreover, the individual hero could be so important that even when Arthur's kingdom is threatened by an army of Saxons and Irish and the king imprisoned by the enemy, the story still focuses on Lancelot's madness that keeps him from doing more remarkable deeds to save the kingdom and how he was eventually healed.⁵⁸

Love of a noble lady is presented as an important motive for knights to accomplish feats of prowess. Courtly love, as it was coined in the nineteenth century, or *fin'amor* as it is commonly referred to in medieval literature, provided Arthurian

⁵⁵ Ibid., 230-31.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 230, 275, 282.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 268.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 378-401.

romance with a specific flavour that distinguished it from the *chansons de geste* and other epics.⁵⁹ The concept of courtly love was not invented by Chrétien de Troyes or any other author of the Arthurian romances, but was already found developed in the works of troubadours, the lyric Occitan poetry of the twelfth century — to produce much controversy between the Church and troubadours —, and was also seen in the earlier romances that looked back to the antiquity, such as *Roman d'Eneas*.⁶⁰ Geoffrey of Monmouth had mentioned that it was the tradition in Britain that the love of ladies would increase the valour and prowess of knights, and in return the valiant and skilful in arms would win the love of the ladies.⁶¹ The fact that Chrétien wrote his *Lancelot* for his patron Marie de Champagne who was known for her patronage of troubadours and for her statements praising *fin'amor* may indicate that courtly love was becoming a part of the new courtly culture that connected knights and nobility before it passed onto Arthurian romances and established itself as one of its fundamental features.

In *Lancelot do Lac*, love is often represented as the primary reason for accomplishing great deeds of arms. It is repeated again and again that such deeds can only be prompted by the love of a noble lady. Lady Malohaut wonders “why [Lancelot] did such deeds of arms” and decides that they might only be due to his love of “someone of very high rank.”⁶² It is Guinevere’s request that moves Lancelot to do such deeds that “those who were with him were astonished; and those who were against him were taken aback.”⁶³ Moreover, love is justified as a serious factor

⁵⁹ Keen, *Chivalry*, 115-16.

⁶⁰ Kay, “Courts, Clerks and Courtly Love”, 84-90; Loomis, *Development of Arthurian Romance*, 52-53.

⁶¹ Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain : An Edition and Translation of De Gestis Britonum (Historia Regum Britanniae)*, trans. Neil Wright, ed. Michael D. Reeve (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 229.

⁶² *Lancelot of the Lake*, 255.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 278.

in determining the outcomes of battles, and hence the future of the kingdom. Although Guinevere declines at first to encourage Lancelot in his feats of arms, regarding herself as too busy to engage in such “challenges and fun” when the kingdom is in danger, she later gives in to the advice of Sir Gawain to let the knight fight for her, as “anyone who has a man of valour has a great deal.”⁶⁴ In accordance with this, Lancelot cannot join Arthur’s knights in battle with the Saxons except on the command of Guinevere. At the same time he cannot be stopped from fighting, except because of his love and loyalty to his lady, and then decides to stay with the king only because it is his lady’s command for him to do so.⁶⁵ His love for his lady also makes him wish to be knighted by his queen instead of by the king which should have been a great honour, too.⁶⁶ At the end of the book, — in contrast to what will happen in *Mort d’Arthur* — Lancelot’s love for Guinevere profits the king by saving his honour and land and thus is approved of even by the king, who watches Lancelot kiss the queen and her declare her love for him.⁶⁷

In *Lancelot do Lac*, amid all the praises of individual prowess and love that enhances it, there is a certain notion of piety that passes through the story. This can be evidenced by the frequent reminders that the characters belong in a Christian society, which firmly believes in God and observes Christian rituals. Arthur, despite his failure in his duty to God, is nevertheless a firm believer in the divinity as the source of his power, as he declares that he has never held land “from anyone except God.”⁶⁸ We can also find frequent expressions of piety early in the story: the characters swear oaths on holy relics, in the name of God and his saints,⁶⁹ pray to

⁶⁴ Ibid., 273, 275.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 396, 402, 409.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 58, 80.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 406, 410.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 212.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 14.

God and confess their sins,⁷⁰ and found abbeys and minsters.⁷¹ Likewise, even if the knights do not perform any act in defence of the public good of the kingdom, a treacherous knight is rebuked for not doing his duty and having broken “his oath to God and to his liege lord.”⁷² We can see this duty as directed towards God in the description of Lancelot’s dubbing to knighthood as a religious ritual that involves the knights’ praying to God through the night and hearing mass at the Church, as well as swearing an oath to the divinity.⁷³ The Lady of the Lake, a quasi-mystical figure, explains the duty of knights as a part of the divine plan, and establishes that knights are delegated the role of protectors over the weak who cannot defend themselves in order to “maintain their rights,” and the Church wholly fits this definition because She cannot defend herself by arms.⁷⁴ The Lady further asserts that the defence of the Church means the defence of its clergy, as well as of the widows and the orphans and the tithes and alms assigned to the Church. Knights upon being admitted to the Order, make an oath to God and to their king to be true to their duty, the demands of which are symbolized through their clothing and equipment.⁷⁵

In accordance with this duty, the Lady of the Lake explains that the knights should be “courteous without baseness, gracious without cruelty, compassionate towards the needy, generous and prepared to help those in need [and] a fair judge, without love or hate.”⁷⁶ As good as these qualities may sound, they are not reflected in the deeds of the characters during the narrative except in the description of Galehot, the knight who tries to conquer Arthur’s kingdom. And even he, described

⁷⁰ Ibid., 19.

⁷¹ Ibid., 23.

⁷² Ibid., 16.

⁷³ Ibid., 73-74, 56.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 52.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 53-56. The clerically tuned teaching about the establishment of knighthood can also be noted in the other Arthurian romances: Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 167, 202.

⁷⁶ *Lancelot of the Lake*, 52.

as the man “the most loved by his people ... the most noble and gracious knight in the world, and the most generous”,⁷⁷ fails to live up to these qualities, for we do not see this concern for his people even once. On the contrary, as aforementioned, he is ready to exchange a victory, presumably won for these people, for the love of Lancelot.

The Lady of the Lake finds examples of knighthood from the Scriptures and traces them down to Galahad, the aforementioned seeker of the Grail, who would be later included in the Arthurian romance cycle as Lancelot’s son, hence adjoining heavenly chivalry to the worldly. Judas Maccabaeus, David and Joseph of Arimathaea, among others from the Bible, are examples of “excellent” knights with true qualities who “maintained knighthood with honour both in the world and before the Lord God.”⁷⁸ Knights who do their duty will be rewarded by eternal salvation and those who do not will lose both God and grace on earth.⁷⁹ Hence, honour in the world depends on heavenly approval. Overall, this part of the story distinguishes itself from the rest of the narrative. Whereas here deeds of arms are to be performed to please the divinity and to earn salvation in return, elsewhere they are to demonstrate one’s valour and prowess and to increase personal honour and renown in arms.

Such a representation of a knighthood directed at heavenly salvation instead of worldly honour was later to be extended in *Queste* in the *Lancelot-Grail* cycle. Yet whereas such an approach would be an attempt to correct the characters in the story by criticising their failures in *Queste*, here the teaching is kept at arm’s length from the actual deeds of knights in the story without any criticism of their seeming

⁷⁷ Ibid., 213.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 56-57.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 55-57.

focus on worldliness.⁸⁰ It is further noteworthy how in this story Lancelot perceives the teaching of the Lady of the Lake: he declares that all “qualities of the heart” are learnt unlike the “qualities of the body” that are innate,⁸¹ and makes a gesture towards the superiority of physical qualities over moral ones in the occupation of knighthood, a comment that agrees with the true spirit of the story.

There is one attempt at criticism though, in the form of an interruption in the middle of the story. An unnamed “worthy man, full of great wisdom” comes to the court of Arthur with the warning that the king is being punished by military defeat through the hand of divinity, for he has not taken his duty to heart and has sinned. In accordance with what the Lady of the Lake had said, this man explains that Arthur is “losing all earthly honour” because he has lost favour with the divinity by his sins.⁸² His greatest sin is explained as his failure to defend the rights of the poor and powerless in his kingdom that is his duty by divine injunction.⁸³ This duty, as had been explained by the Lady of the Lake, is again said to secure heavenly honour as well as earthly honour for the king.⁸⁴ It is significant that Arthur needs to call together his bishops and archbishops so that he may confess and repent of his sins.⁸⁵ Evoking the eventual end of Arthur’s kingdom in *Mort d’artu* and the conditions that prepare it as told in *Queste*, the preaching of the wise man looks to the perception of warfare as a divine mechanism for the punishment of sins, a common theme in ecclesiastical thought.⁸⁶ While there are no indications in the overall story like in *Queste* that sins (of pride, vainglory and luxury) of Lancelot and other knights of the Round Table, for their failure to grasp the spiritual aim of their knightly quest will

⁸⁰ Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 156.

⁸¹ *Lancelot of the Lake*, 51.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 237.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 238.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 242.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 239-40.

⁸⁶ This will be discussed in Chapter Four.

eventually be defeated,⁸⁷ we can maybe find some hints that sins bring defeat. For example, Galehot's "pride in attacking Arthur, the most worthy man in the world," is prophesised as the reason for Galehot's eventual death;⁸⁸ and early in the story, Lancelot's father's seneschal is defeated in private combat against another knight for his sin of disloyalty towards his king.⁸⁹

Yet, in *Lancelot do Lac* spiritual goals, or divine duty and punishment are not pushed too far. The speech of the wise man becomes a lecture on how Arthur should properly reward his knights and nobles, poor and rich, reminding a feudal rather than divine duty.⁹⁰ Moreover, despite the reminder that God will punish sinners with defeat, Lancelot is exempt from such remarks in this story. On the contrary, he is identified as the one to save Arthur's kingdom. Even though Arthur wishes that "God grants that [he] will return to [his] land with honour," it is again up to Lancelot, as his prowess in deeds of arms is interpreted as a sign that God will save Arthur's kingdom.⁹¹ A similar remark can be found in Sir Gawain's call to Lancelot that Arthur's kingdom "will go to ruin unless God and he do something about it".⁹² Hence there is no comparable storyline in *Lancelot do Lac* to *Queste* where Lancelot is presented as unable to pursue the heavenly quest of the Grail because of sins, particularly of that pertaining to the flesh.⁹³ Interestingly, in *Lancelot do Lac*, it is not the sin of adultery committed by Lancelot and Guinevere — as it will be in *Mort d'Artu* — but the one committed by Arthur's parents' before he was born that threatens the future of his kingdom.⁹⁴

⁸⁷ See Bogdanow's article.

⁸⁸ *Lancelot of the Lake*, 237-50, 415.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 16-17.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 242-45.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 245, 250-51.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 276.

⁹³ Kennedy, "Evolution of 'Prose Lancelot'", 4-8; Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 221-22.

⁹⁴ Bogdanow, "An Interpretation of *Queste*," 46; *Lancelot of the Lake*, 237.

On the other hand, even though adulterous love is condemned as sinful in *Queste*, it is found that the attitudes of characters remain unchanged from those expressed in the Prose *Lancelot*. After it is revealed that Lancelot is no longer fit to use the name of Galahad and is divinely prevented from succeeding in the Grail conquest due to his sin of luxury that pertains to the pleasures of the flesh, Lancelot still holds that he would never have accomplished deeds or won his reputation as a knight if it were not for the love of Guinevere. Guinevere too, despite coming to terms with the sinfulness of her act, justifies her love for Lancelot in terms of the attraction of prowess, and sees there a clash of views between clerics and laymen.⁹⁵ The same may be hinted in *Lancelot do Lac* by remarks defending the relationship between love and knightly deeds. Lady Malohaut declares that, “one could not suffer shame from something one did for such a valorous man;”⁹⁶ or the Lady of the Lake defends that even if Lancelot and Guinevere are committing a sin, there is only “reason and honour” in loving “the most worthy man in the world.”⁹⁷ Hence, at the end of the day, the teaching of the clergy against sinfulness of knights is heeded but not especially agreed with.

Like adulterous love, tourneying was also an important feature of Arthurian romances — and knightly life — which received ecclesiastical censure for invoking the sins of vainglory and greed among others.⁹⁸ Tournaments, which were often used as settings of courtly love in Arthurian romances and became one of its fundamental and most colourful aspects, was established as popular martial games as well as social and courtly gatherings in France at least from the early twelfth century on.⁹⁹

⁹⁵ Kennedy, “Evolution of Prose *Lancelot*”, 4-8; Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 221-22.

⁹⁶ Lady Malohaut in defense of her own love for Lancelot: *Lancelot of the Lake*, 254.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 393.

⁹⁸ The ecclesiastical view of tournaments will be further discussed on Chapter Four.

⁹⁹ Keen, *Chivalry*, 83-91. That could even be to the extent of organizing Arthurian mock tournaments: *Ibid.*, 91-93. Although tournaments were already established as popular undertakings by the early

Moreover, they were such arenas of show of knights' prowess that they would often participate in order to catch the eye of great lords who would take them into their retinues, or to take the opportunity for more honourable expeditions like crusades which were occasionally promoted during the tournaments.¹⁰⁰

In the *Lancelot-Grail* cycle, the tournament is primarily considered as "a test of prowess" that all knights should go through, and a vavasour declares that, "no knight should avoid a tournament if he can get there in time."¹⁰¹ In accordance with this, in *Lancelot do Lac*, Lancelot's name was revealed to the Arthurian court when his prowess at a tournament astounded everyone that was watching.¹⁰² In this book, battles fought to determine the fate of Arthur's kingdom are often described through the terminology of tournaments. Thus battles become "encounters" where knights join other knights at predetermined dates and places, and pass lists, joust and avoid *mêlées*, and where ladies are present watching and admiring the knights' prowess, and encouraging them to do more.¹⁰³ The representation of battles as tournaments were to a certain in reflection of real practices, as in the thirteenth century, knights spent more days of fighting in tournaments than in battles as tournaments could address conflicts between rival lords and fought with the fierceness of actual battles; or knights or group of knights could challenge each other in jousts *à outrance* before or in place of battles (which in turn found vivid descriptions in chronicles and chivalric biographies).¹⁰⁴ At the same time, the practice of jousts between two knights preferred in *Lancelot do Lac* instead of *melées* that involve groups of

twelfth century, their depictions in the romances may have added to their splendour as often the same noble patrons who commissioned the romances were the organizers of tournaments: Ibid., 25, 83-85.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 89, 98.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 116. The quote from *Lancelot* is taken from Micha's edition of cyclic version of *Lancelot*. See Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 164.

¹⁰² *Lancelot of the Lake*, 201-3.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 396, 276-77, 373-74.

¹⁰⁴ Keen, *Chivalry*, 86; Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 175.

knights and more danger may indicate that tournaments themselves were undergoing an evolution from battle-like ferocious to ceremonious in the thirteenth century.¹⁰⁵

In *Lancelot do Lac*, courtly love is also shown to play an important part in enhancing the knights' performance in tournaments when Guinevere is asked to send word to Lancelot to fight for her. At her declining the advice saying that she does not have time for fun, she is told that this is not something to be taken lightly for Lancelot is fighting for the future of the kingdom. Accordingly, for he is fighting for the praise of Guinevere, Lancelot shows great feats of arms, defeats everyone and saves the kingdom.¹⁰⁶ Hence, in the Arthurian world of individual achievements where a knight's feats of prowess in joust can save the kingdom, it is no extraordinary thing that they will be prompted by the love of a lady.

After these tournament-like battles, celebrations often ensued. Hints of a good life that is deserved by knights after such intense pursuits of arms can be glimpsed throughout *Lancelot do Lac*. After the battle with Arthur, Galehot wears his "best robes" to meet the king and queen, in the company of the knights and ladies of the court.¹⁰⁷ Then, night after night, Galehot and Lancelot meet their lady-loves in secrecy and do "nothing but kiss and embrace" and talk "with no word of any other pleasure" than their love.¹⁰⁸ Surely, the pleasures of love, even if illicit, are accepted as proper rewards for the deeds of prowess that define the rest of the story. Neither is the magnificence of a courtly life that colours the lives of knights underemphasised. When Lancelot saves Arthur's kingdom from the Irish and the Saxons, the king holds such a magnificent court lasting seven days where he dubs Lancelot and two others

¹⁰⁵ Keen, *Chivalry*, 85-87.

¹⁰⁶ *Lancelot of the Lake*, 273-86.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 296-97.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 310-31. The quotations are from 331. The later tale of the consummation of the love between Guinevere and Lancelot is told in emphasis of the secrecy of their meeting, but without any mention of the illicitness of the affair: *Ibid.*, 378-80.

as knights of the Round Table, so that “there was not one day ... that he did not wear his crown.”¹⁰⁹ Even though such worldliness is condemned in *Queste*, like the sin of adultery, it is not genuinely understood by the characters. It is recorded in the story that very few of Arthur’s knights did actually repent and change their worldly lives in the path of Galahad.¹¹⁰

The refusals of romance characters to take in clerical teaching can be interpreted as a sign of the knightly confidence in the divine approval of their Order. Malory expresses this belief explicitly in *Morte Darthur* where Gawain refuses to do any penance for his sins for the reason that knights suffer enough pain in their adventures.¹¹¹ Even though there is no comparable statement in *Lancelot do Lac*, there is an apparent exclusion of the clergy from directing any important event.¹¹² For example, although Lancelot goes to the church before the knightly ceremony to keep vigil and to hear mass, the actual knightly ceremony is performed outside the church by the king.¹¹³ Moreover, although Lancelot, Galehot and Hector are accepted into the Order of the Round Table on a feast day, All Saints’ Day, there still is no mention of a clerk directing the ceremony except the note that clerks were called to record the “deeds of prowess of the companions of the king’s household.”¹¹⁴ Hence, the role limited to the clergy in *Lancelot do Lac* sees that their role is passive and limited to administering religious services or to appreciation of the prowess of knights by writing them down.

The view of clergy and their teachings thus explained, a few remarks can also be made about the view of knights’ duty towards their king as portrayed in

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 412.

¹¹⁰ Bogdanow, “An Interpretation of *Queste*,” 39-40.

¹¹¹ *Lancelot of the Lake*, 50.

¹¹² Ibid., 61-62.

¹¹³ Ibid., 73-74.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 413.

Lancelot do Lac. Despite the presence of the king throughout the story and his being questioned for the goodness of his rule at some point, the overall feeling is that knights do not see their duty to their king as prior to their individual pursuits. The Lady of the Lake advises Lancelot that after he is knighted he should not stay at the court of his king any longer and should go searching for adventure yet without stopping too long in one place, and Lancelot complies with it.¹¹⁵ Adventure after adventure, the personal ties he has with others still mean more to him than his duty towards the king. Although at first Lancelot fights for the king against Galehot and refuses the latter's offer to lodge with him by virtue of his loyalty towards his king,¹¹⁶ he confesses to Galehot that he values their friendship more than his loyalty to Arthur and that he would leave the latter upon Galehot's request if the commands of his lady did not retain him by his side.¹¹⁷ Likewise, he joins Arthur's knights in battle against the Saxons not due to his loyalty to the king but upon the command of Guinevere, and then he can only be stopped for the sake of his love and loyalty to his lady —only this supersedes his desire to show more prowess — and not because he is ordered by Arthur's knights to stop.¹¹⁸

Moreover, the expressions of the knights' duty to the king can be seen to be superficial next to their wish to show more prowess and earn more honour. Although Gawain calls on his knights to fight well against Galehot, so that "it will be apparent who loves the king's honour and his own," a little later the king's seneschal Kay reminds the knights that they "are all [there] to win honour and renown, and [they] shall never in all [their] lives find such a good opportunity to exercise knightly

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 66-67.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 286.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 409.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 396, 402.

valour.”¹¹⁹ Hence, it appears that the need to earn personal honour wins over the duty to save the kingdom in the knights’ minds. Aptly, in battle, even though the orders of the king were to refrain from crossing a river lest they would be defeated, “no order could keep the lively knights bachelor from crossing... and in short time there were good jousts and fierce fighting.”¹²⁰ It is interesting that, as have been noted before, the author represents these battles, which are repeatedly asserted to be fought for the honour of the king and to save his kingdom, in tournament terminology.¹²¹ The knights are told to pass the lists, engage in jousts and avoid *mêlées*, just like in tournaments, to demonstrate their prowess and valour. We tend to forget that they are supposed to be fighting for the king.¹²²

The king, on the other hand, seems to both support the individual progress of knights and to retain them in his service to save his kingdom from threats. Arthur views Lancelot’s quests for individual prowess as tests that prove his prowess and qualify him for his acceptance amongst the knights of the Round Table.¹²³ When Lancelot has gone missing, Arthur organizes the other knights to go on a quest to find him that will bring them “all the renown and honour in the world.” Yet Arthur immediately warns that not all of them should go, as the kingdom is under threat and he needs his knights “to hold court with ... magnificence.”¹²⁴ This attitude is similar to that in *Queste* when the knights go on the quest of Holy Grail: instead of encouraging them or joining in the quest he fears that their absence from the court will diminish his worldly honour.¹²⁵ The expressions of such fears might be treated as foresights into the events that will unfold subsequently and lead to the fall of

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 231, 278.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 293.

¹²¹ Ibid., 276.

¹²² Ibid., 266, 274, 275, 277, 282, 293.

¹²³ Ibid., 411.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 256.

¹²⁵ Bogdanow, “An Interpretation of *Queste*”, 34.

Arthur's kingdom in the absence of its knights.¹²⁶ Yet in *Lancelot do Lac*, the knights eventually come back at "the urgency of the king's need," when they are harangued by Sir Gawain that their own disgrace is not so much important as the disgrace and dispossession of the king.¹²⁷ Hence the knights are reminded that although their own honour is important, that of the king and his kingdom is more important and should be given precedence. Yet it is apparent from the overall praise of individual honour throughout the story that this lecture will go unheeded.

In *Lancelot do Lac*, in agreement with its reflection of the knights' preference for individual achievement over duty to the king, there is hardly a suggestion that any of the fighting had the objective of benefiting the public good or the achievement of a just peace. Indeed, peace is described as a state in which there is no fighting and that is therefore undesirable for knights. At a time when Lancelot and Galehot reside at a castle doing nothing, Lancelot complains that "it has been a long time since we saw jousting or knightly deeds, and we are wasting our times and lives."¹²⁸ Accordingly, when Galehot makes peace with Arthur, most of the knights "were upset, for they would have preferred war."¹²⁹ Although the Lady of the Lake tells Lancelot that knights were chosen from among the people to defend and protect them, there is no particular evidence that Arthur's knights are fighting for the people, except in the case of maidens and widows who frequently seek the help of Arthur's knights.¹³⁰ Sometimes of course the plights of these ladies could be the plights of the

¹²⁶ Schmolke-Hasselman finds the same attitude in the later verse romances and suggests that they express fears for the end of Arthur's kingdom: Schmolke-Hasselmann, *Arthurian Romance*, 74-75.

¹²⁷ *Lancelot of the Lake*, 265.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 359.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 296.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 77, 87, 228 for example. For the Lady of the Lake's sermon on the knights' duty to defend the people see, *ibid.*, 52.

kingdom too, for example when a vassal who seeks the aid of the king is either a widow or a maiden.¹³¹

To sum up, the most distinctive characteristic of *Lancelot do Lac* can be shown as their praise of individual prowess in continuous adventures in arms. The primacy of the concern of prowess surpasses all other concerns such as the defence of the public good and loyalty to one's king. As battles appear like tournaments and are perceived as tests of prowess, prowess also defines the attitudes and actions of all the characters in the story: knights, kings, ladies. Prowess consequently decides the outcome of battles fought for the kingdom. In such a world defined by the admiration of individual prowess, the relationship with the divinity is also understood and expressed accordingly. Explicit through the presence of an abundance of remarks on God, the divine duty of knights and the knightly ceremony in expression of that duty, there is no denial of a knightly piety. Yet the piety reflected in the book is not dictated by clerical teachings but is based on God's approval of prowess in arms. Kaeuper and Keen maintain medieval knights saw themselves in direct relationship with God in these terms, which agrees with Chrétien de Troyes's definition of the order of knighthood as "the highest order God has willed and made."¹³² Although there is no open statement of any conflict between the sinful aspects of knights' lives with clerical teaching in *Lancelot do Lac*, we can find it expressed in the *Lancelot-Grail* cycle. However, as the criticism of worldliness in the cyclic versions of the story is also found next to praises of prowess, we cannot really say that Arthurian prose romance, even with the high dose of Cistercian influence, can be interpreted as promoting spiritual goals of knighthood over the worldly ones.

¹³¹ Ibid., 77, 228.

¹³² Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 49-51; Keen, *Chivalry*, 61-63, 77.

CHAPTER III

THE INFLUENCE OF ROMANCES ON WORKS OF GUIDANCE ON CHIVALRY: TWO EXAMPLES FROM THE LATE MEDIEVAL PERIOD

Having described the particular view of warfare and knighthood that was common in medieval romances, demonstrated through the example of *Lancelot do Lac*, I would like to discuss its influence on late medieval thinking about warfare and knighthood. For this purpose I will be examining two distinguished examples of knightly literature: Geoffroi de Charny's *Livre de chevalerie*, written in the mid-fourteenth century, and the anonymous *Le Livre des fais du bon messire Jehan le Maingre, dit Bouciquaut, mareschal de France et gouverneur de Jennes* written in the early fifteenth century. I will argue that Charny and the author of *Le Livre de Bouciquaut*, like other writers of chivalric manuals and chivalrous biographies, held to a fairly unreconstructed version of the romance view as found in the *Prose Lancelot*. Together, these two books can be regarded as two representatives of "too

idealistic views”¹ on knighthood, belonging as they did to the world of lay knights where everything was thought of in terms of individual prowess and the desire to earn worldly renown, where Orders of knighthood were founded on the example of Arthur’s Round Table or Perceforest’s Free Palace, rather than on the model of the Templars.²

Geoffroi de Charny (1306-1356), described by Kauper as “the chivalric embodiment of his colourful and violent age,”³ was a French knight and the bearer of the *oriflamme*, “the sacred banner of the king of France,” who died at the Battle of Poitiers with the *oriflamme* in his hands.⁴ He seems to have been a man of some piety too, as evidenced by his foundation of a religious house and his possession of “the Shroud of Turin.”⁵ He spent his life going from one encounter to another, mostly in battles against the English. Charny’s deeds were depicted vividly by Froissart, who saw the Hundred Years’ War as a story of great deeds of arms and honour. Froissart described Charny as the “most worthy and valiant of them all.”⁶ Moreover, Charny is argued to have inspired the chivalric *Ordre de l’étoile* that was founded by Jean II. Charny wrote three works, including his *Livre de chevalerie*, which he penned at the behest of the king.⁷ The *Ordre de l’étoile*, founded around the mid-fourteenth century, was part of the fashion for chivalric orders at western courts that Keen suggests were established on “the Arthurian model.” The *Ordre de l’étoile*

¹ Keen, *Chivalry*, 5.

² Ibid., 190-91, 199.

³ *Book of Chivalry*, 1.

⁴ Ibid., 12-13.

⁵ Ibid., 28-30; Kauper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 47.

⁶ Kauper’s translation from *Oeuvres complètes de Froissart*, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove (Brussels, 1867-1877), 5:412, cited in *Book of Chivalry*, 14; See Allmand, *Society at War*, 22-23 for an excerpt that defines Froissart’s view of warfare taken from *Oeuvres de Froissart*, 5: 61-63.

⁷ *Book of Chivalry*, 12-14. The other two books were *Les Demandes pour la joute, le tournoi, et la guerre*, a set of questions on the practice of chivalry of which only the questions have survived — or it is possible that Charny only meant to pose the questions — and *Livre Charny*, which is described as “a verse work on the manner of life and the qualities demanded by chivalry”: See Michael Anthony Taylor, ed., “A Critical Edition of Geoffroy de Charny’s *Livre Charny* and *Demandes pour la joute, le tournoi et la guerre*” (Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1977), cited in *Book of Chivalry*, 15, n.35.

was rivalled by its English counterpart, the Order of the Garter.⁸ Jean II, in his letter where he endowed his Order, set out its aim as the restoration of the flower of chivalry in France and thus to bring back divine grace on the French knighthood for possible victories.⁹ Charny's manual for knights, the *Livre de chevalerie*, was presumably written as a guide for Jean II's Order and Charny's aim was to reform knighthood and bring it back to its former glory. The *Livre de chevalerie* is often compared to the *Libre del ordre de cavayleria* of Ramon Llull, due to the themes and features that the two books share.¹⁰

The emphasis of Charny's *Livre de chevalerie* is on prowess, which would win honour for knights.¹¹ Charny begins with the possible adventures in which young men-at-arms can seek honour, putting forward the motto "He who does more is of greater worth."¹² Just as Lancelot is advised not to miss any opportunity to seek adventure to win honour and renown, Charny teaches that "one should not fail in any way to put great effort into anything which might improve one's chance of winning an honourable reputation at any moment of the day or night," and advises that those at the start of their careers should especially give priority to earning their reputation in arms thus. The search for adventure is said to be so continuous that "the more [men-at-arms] achieve, the less they feel they have achieved [which] stems from the delight in striving constantly to reach greater heights" and "it always seems that there is so much left to do."¹³ Knights will never be satisfied with their performance

⁸ Keen, *Chivalry*, 190-91. See also Barber, *Knight and Chivalry*, 339-50 for the lay Orders of knighthood.

⁹ *Book of Chivalry*, 21.

¹⁰ For the similarities between these works and *Lancelot of the Lake*, see Chapters One and Two, and also Kennedy, "Geoffroi de Charny's *Livre de chevalerie*." For the similarity between both Llull and Charny and also between these two and the Prose *Lancelot*, see *ibid.*, and also Barber, *Knight and Chivalry*, Chap. 4: "Chivalric Biographies and Handbooks"; Keen, *Chivalry*, 14. Keen shows that Llull drew not only on the Prose *Lancelot*, but also on the Romance of Alexander: *Ibid.*, 10.

¹¹ *Book of Chivalry*, 22.

¹² *Ibid.*, 48.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 63- 64.

because it is the demand of “their natural nobility” that urges them to do more.¹⁴ Thus, Charny emphasises the continuous need for men-at-arms to show more prowess and valour in order to win more honour in arms. This, as he sees it, is the determinant characteristic of a life in arms and signifies the inherent nobility of knighthood. All of this agrees with what is written in the Prose *Lancelot*. In accordance with the admiration of prowess for aspirant knights seen in *Lancelot do Lac* in the previous chapter, Charny asserts that young men desirous of seeking honourable adventures in arms should hear and learn from others who have proved themselves by their remarkable feats in arms, so that they will strive to attain the same degree of prowess.¹⁵ Froissart, Charny’s contemporary, declares that he is also writing with the same objective: “to give examples to these worthies who wish to advance themselves in renown.”¹⁶

Honour to be won from feats of arms is the primary concern of Charny in the *Livre de chevalerie*. The men-at-arms’ desire for continuous achievement is not something that is prompted by their urge to do justice, or to do a public service, but by the personal delight they take in “striving constantly to reach greater heights” of honour.¹⁷ Hence Charny has a notion of the necessity of continuity in feats of arms, just like the contemporary chronicler Froissart would lament periods of peace for the reason that “the great deeds of arms would not happen for a while.”¹⁸ In accordance with this view, the honour won is measured in terms of the continuity of pursuits and not in terms of their utility to people or to the state. Fighting purely for one’s personal honour is something praiseworthy, in fact the most praiseworthy goal to be

¹⁴ Ibid., 57.

¹⁵ Ibid., 50-51;60-61. Kaueper points out the influence of both this book and the Arthurian romances in establishing the rule of the *Ordre d’étoile*, in which it was put down that the knights’ deeds of arms should be recorded so that good deeds will be honoured while vile ones defamed: Ibid., 38.

¹⁶ *Oeuvres de Froissart*, ed. Lettenhove, 11: 4, cited in Barber, *Knight and Chivalry*, 149.

¹⁷ *Book of Chivalry*, 64.

¹⁸ *Oeuvres de Froissart*, ed. Lettenhove, 11:4, cited in Barber, *Knight and Chivalry*, 148.

sought by men-at-arms, for it involves no other material or social benefits. Great lords who fight only for honour and renown deserve more praise than the poor knights who fight for status and wealth.¹⁹ Hence, men of good standing, when they start their career in arms, should be concerned primarily with earning a good reputation in arms rather than with the affairs of their estate and or of the people, for the reason that “worth and honour will always remain.”²⁰

While Charny insists that men-at-arms constantly seek honour in arms, he also produces a kind of scale of honour to be won from different kinds of deeds, as well as from deeds guided by different motives. He sees an ascending scale of honour from jousts, to tournaments and to wars.²¹ Charny’s ranking of honour, clearly set out in the book, was apparently not an extraordinary phenomenon in its day. We can find comparable scales in the late thirteenth-century *Dit dou baceller* and in the statutes of some late medieval Orders of knighthood.²² Keen, finds Charny’s ranking of honour similar not only to the one in *Dit de baceller* but also to the implications of different degrees of achievement in arms to be received respectively from worldly and heavenly knighthood in *Queste del Saint Graal*.²³ According to Charny, in order to achieve “the highest standard in deeds of arms,” knights should first try themselves in jousts, then in tournaments and then in wars that will bring “the greatest honour in arms.”²⁴ Yet, doing something is better than doing nothing, as knights who neglect to pursue real warfare for the pleasure and satisfaction of fighting in jousts or tournaments nevertheless deserve praise by the

¹⁹ *Book of Chivalry*, 58-59.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 64.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 47-50.

²² Keen, *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms*, 3, 7-8.

²³ Keen, *Chivalry*, 61.

²⁴ *Book of Chivalry*, 55-57.

grace of God, because performing well in these activities requires great effort and dedication.²⁵ At the end of the day, whoever does more is worth more.²⁶

In his discussion of the honour to be won from different pursuits of arms, there is an implicit but consistent criticism aimed at those men-at-arms who seek great deeds of arms in distant lands. Although he finds these deeds worthy of praise for the greater physical risks they involve, he does not think that they will always find as many adventures as they will find staying in one place, and what is more he says that these lands can as well be travelled as merchants or pilgrims in times of peace. A little later in the book he returns to those men who spend too much in pursuit of deeds of arms through long travel to other lands. While he approves of the motive — a quest for honour — he thinks it unnecessary and destructive to those seeking it this way, because often they will not find it and will spend too much while searching for it.²⁷ These remarks were quite possibly directed at the contemporary trend — that will shortly be demonstrated through the example of Bouciquaut — for young aspiring knights to travel to Prussia, Lithuania or Livonia, often to take part in expeditions organised by the Teutonic knights against the infidels. It is difficult to take this as a cautious stance towards crusades in general, for Charny himself is known to have taken the cross against the Turks at Smyrna.²⁸ It is clear that as much as Charny may believe that the quest for honour is the most important thing that should be on the agenda of knights, he does not really see any great profit in these Baltic package-tour crusading expeditions, and thinks that there are enough opportunities for knights anyway.

²⁵ Ibid., 47-48.

²⁶ Ibid., 51.

²⁷ Ibid., 50-5, 54.

²⁸ Ibid., 6.

On the other hand, he also considers situations when honour is not the primary motive in deeds of arms. On the issue of fighting for the love of ladies, he is positive but cautious about the honour to be won. While he finds that such men-at-arms should be honoured, he also adds that these are often “naïve men-at-arms” who need to be prompted by such a motive in order to realize the great honour that is waiting for them in deeds of arms.²⁹ Yet, further into the book, he gives a striking portrayal of what love can achieve by describing a lady who is greatly honoured when she sees her lover receiving praise from everybody for his prowess and valour at a courtly feast. He asserts that only the worthy men-at-arms deserve the love of their ladies, which in turn will encourage them to do more dangerous feats, and which consequently, will earn them more honour. Here he describes the act of loving a lady as “the right position to be in for those who desire to achieve honour,” but provides the condition that while engaging themselves in love, the knights should guard the honour of the lady as well as their own. Here he alludes to the story of Lancelot by criticising those men who would not love “Queen Guinevere” secretly as they should have done.³⁰

When Charny considers men-at-arms who are fighting for material rewards, he again decides that they should also win praise for what they achieve in arms. The men who go to fight with the Italian mercenary companies are especially praised, even though their primary consideration may be material benefits, because among these there are those who have achieved great deeds and who have been rewarded by God with great renown. Yet they will lose that praise if they stop once they have made enough profit.³¹ Yet, while those men-at-arms who aim at winning booty should nevertheless be praised for their “strenuous effort and great courage,” Charny

²⁹ Ibid., 52-53.

³⁰ Ibid., 65-67.

³¹ Ibid., 51-52.

warns that men-at-arms should rather focus on earning honour than material profit, for otherwise it will make them lose their concentration on the result of the battle and that could lead to defeat before the victory is completed. Moreover, whereas honour lasts forever, the profits of war can be lost as quickly as they are won, and in the end greed will cause one's ruin.³² Hence, it has consequences both for the army and for the men-at-arms, the first of which might be inspired by the defeat of Hannibal by the Romans when he did not rush to take Rome after the battle of Cannae, but occupied himself too much with the booty he could win, and the second possibly by the Christian teaching against greed for material goods.³³ At the end of the day, Charny's decision is that men-at-arms fight for material profit are not the most worthy, because they can do better.³⁴

All these judgements in ascertaining the scale of honour in different deeds of arms culminate in the definition of "the men-at-arms of supreme worth." These are men-at-arms who fight to win God's approval in humility, and who are comparable to the clergy in the heavenly merits of their occupation. This is in stark contrast to the description of men-at-arms who seek honour regardless in all deeds of arms and for all motives, among which the love of ladies is a praiseworthy one. Such a transformation in ideas is highly reminiscent of the *Lancelot-Grail* cycle, which starts with the worldly deeds of knights in *Lancelot* and then switches to heavenly pursuits in *Queste*. Significantly, as in the *Lancelot-Grail* cycle, both heavenly and worldly chivalry exist together, and their combination represents the ideal for Charny. He declares that if a man is granted honour in this world and salvation in the other, then there is nothing more he can ask from God. He continues by stating that such a thing is possible in the practice of arms: "One can indeed make one's personal

³² Ibid., 55.

³³ Pizan told the tale of Hannibal in *Deeds of Arms*, 75 (1:27).

³⁴ *Book of Chivalry*, 55.

career honourably and valiantly and save one's soul.”³⁵ Although this approach may be reminiscent of the promotion of crusades as enterprises that promise the rewards of worldly honour and salvation combined, Charny makes it explicit that he is not just referring to crusades here. He explains that both honours will be enjoyed by men-at-arms in all wars that are “begun in the proper manner and in due form”, which he specifies as, wars in defence of their lords, kinsmen and their own land and inheritance, as well as those in defence of maidens, widows, and orphans, the Church and Christianity.³⁶ This is a definition of just war that extends somewhat beyond the limits set by the ecclesiastical opinion — and beyond the one inserted in *Lancelot do Lac* in the sermon of the Lady of the Lake — to include possibly the most frequent contemporary need to appeal to arms: the defence of lords, kinsmen and own possessions.³⁷

Such parallel statements of worldly and heavenly goals can be seen as an attribute of lay piety that is stimulated by the knights' confidence in the divine praise of prowess and their direct relationship with God.³⁸ In Charny's book, we can also observe glimpses of this kind of piety in the author's constant references to God and in his description of the knighting ceremony as a spiritually directed one. Charny's description of the ceremony and the spiritual significance of the garments and equipments of knights, emphasising their purity in body and morals and their service of God, is reminiscent of the one in *Lancelot do Lac*, as well as the one in *Ordene de chevalerie* and Ramon Llull's *Libre del ordre de cavayleria*.³⁹ As I have shown in

³⁵ Ibid., 89. Also repeated in ibid., 96.

³⁶ Keen, *Chivalry*, 48-49; *Book of Chivalry*, 89-90.

³⁷ *Book of Chivalry*, 34-35. For the Lady of the Lake's description of the duties of the knights in *Lancelot do Lac*, see Chapter Two.

³⁸ Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 45-62. He discusses the same idea in his introduction to *Book of Chivalry*, 31-35.

³⁹ *Book of Chivalry*, 91-93. Among these, Ramon Llull's account of the ceremony tends to emphasise the knight's duty towards the crown within the scope of his duty towards God, whereas the others, including Charny, choose to focus on the knight's relationship with God alone. For the description of

the previous chapter, such an attitude towards spirituality was expressed in the *Lancelot-Grail* romances as recognition, but not full appreciation, of the role of clergy and their stance on worldly pursuits. The early thirteenth-century biography of the famous English knight William the Marshal, also confirms how knights sometimes regarded clerical teaching. William, who fought in many tournaments besides going on pilgrimage to the Holy Land and founding a religious house, refused to accept that his worldliness would deny him salvation, though he did become a Templar on his deathbed.⁴⁰

Moreover, just as the role of the clergy in *Lancelot do Lac* was restricted to performing the knighting ceremony, receiving confessions and recording the deeds of knights, hence both a sacramental and a practical role, here too Charny constantly describes the clergy to be praying, performing mass and other divine services, emphasising that they are to remain within the confines of the Church and in security, which implies a comparison with knighthood. Although Charny does not go as far as to place the clerical order beneath knighthood in the eyes of God, his slighting of the office of clergy is apparent in his comparison of the knightly service with the religious orders' service to God by praying alone in the comfort of an orderly life devoid of all other concerns. This, he asserts, "is all nothing in comparison with the suffering to be endured in the order of knighthood," which entails that knights "may have to undergo hard trials and adventures" in danger and in great discomfort.⁴¹ He repeats the same idea over and over by comparing the dangers of knightly service to the safety and comfort of the clerical one, claiming

the ceremony in *Libre del ordre de cavayleria* and *Ordene*, see Lull's *Book of Knighthood*, 63-75, 110-15. For *Lancelot do Lac*, see Chapter Two. Maurice Keen finds Charny's description of the knighting ceremony to be taken directly from *Ordene de chevalerie*: Keen, *Chivalry*, 14.

⁴⁰David Crouch, *William Marshal: Court, Career and Chivalry in the Angevin Empire, 1147-1219* (London: Longman, 1990), 51-52; Sidney Painter, *William Marshal, Knight-Errant, Baron, and Regent of England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), 285-86.

⁴¹ *Book of Chivalry*, 95.

more “integrity” for knights because of the greatness of the spiritual demands on them, besides the physical demands of their job, and because they perform their duty without any “rule or ordinance” except the love of God to guide them.⁴² Although knighthood was described as the most worthy, valiant, gracious and noble profession in *Lancelot do Lac*, or as the highest Order in Chrétien’s *Perceval*, there was no comparison made with the clergy there. Also, although Ramon Llull wrote that knights endure greater hardships than lesser men, he asserted that theirs was the most honourable office except for the priesthood.⁴³ On the other hand, Charny hints at criticism that goes even beyond his greater regard for knighthood than for the clergy, as he also asserts that there are many clergy who do not conduct themselves according to the worthiness of their office, albeit he follows this by criticising unworthy knights too.⁴⁴

Throughout the whole book Charny is confident that God will bestow his grace on knights, whether in joust, tournament or battle. He explains his confidence at the beginning of his book thus: “And because God has bestowed on them such grace as to conduct themselves well in this particular pursuit of arms (jousts)” or “They want to continue this kind of pursuit of arms (tournaments) because of the

⁴² The good knights and good men-at-arms who, in pursuit of all the benefits mentioned earlier, desire often to take up arms, it might well be considered that they should be of as great or even greater integrity than might be required of a priest, for they are in danger every day And it behooves them to seek humble devotion for the help of Our Lord in such perilous service as is required of them in the vocation of arms, for this service may not be fittingly be performed in churches, which are beautiful and strong, nor can it by its nature be carried out there nor in safe places, but such services must perforce be performed on the field and in such danger as can and should pertain to such a calling and to the performance of the service for which such men take up arms.... And through this one can know and fully understand that such a service and calling, which can well be performed according to God’s will, is very dangerous and perilous, and its practice makes greater physical and spiritual demands than those required of any of the men who are ordained to serve Our Lord in the Holy Church, for they have and ought to have their rule and ordinance and position for the conduct of both their lives and the service it is their duty to perform; but these good men-at-arms have no rule or ordinance to observe in relation to their way of life and their position except to love and fear God always and to take care not to anger Him, and to be themselves always in such a situation that they are all the time more engaged in such dangerous enterprises than any other men”: Ibid., 98-99.

⁴³ *Lancelot of the Lake*, 50, 52; *Lull’s Book of Knighthood*, 25-27, 74, 99.

⁴⁴ *Book of Chivalry*, 94, 96-97, 101-3.

success God has granted them in it” or “When God by his grace grants that such people ... perform great exploits [in wars]”.⁴⁵ Charny also sees God’s will as omnipotent in all situations in deeds of arms, as he can make lesser numbers defeat greater numbers or can make the worst organized defeat the best organized.⁴⁶ In contrast, Ramon Llull had seen Judas Maccabeus’s victory against greater numbers as resulting not directly from divine providence but from his use of prudence in battle.⁴⁷

Yet, despite all the divine support for the deeds of knights, there is one thing that knights should keep in mind: that they receive their prowess and related honours only from God and may lose them if they fail to recognize this. Hence pride and vainglory, failing to see that their prowess was granted to them by God and valuing worldly glory too much before heavenly glory, are sins that will take away all honours both in this world and the other, as in the examples of the worthy men of the past like Absalom, Solomon and Julius Caesar.⁴⁸ The teaching here is in accordance with what happened to the knights of Arthur’s court in *Queste* when they failed to recognize the spiritual ends of the quest and did not repent their pride and love of worldly honour and luxuries.

Again as in *Queste*, Charny condemns knights who enjoy the pleasures of this world too much, who are too wrapped up in their vanity to remember God, and he declares that these will soon lose the honour they have won.⁴⁹ Yet these remarks should not be taken as an absolute criticism of all worldliness in knights, such as was

⁴⁵ Ibid., 47-49.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 74.

⁴⁷ *Lull’s Book of Knighthood*, 83. This might be due to the fact that John of Salisbury’s *Policraticus* was one of Llull’s sources: Barber, *Knight and Chivalry*, 134. *Policraticus* will be examined in Chapter Four as an important representative of and contributor to the ecclesiastical view on warfare and knighthood.

⁴⁸ *Book of Chivalry*, 74, 84-88, 96.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 102-103.

clear in *Queste*.⁵⁰ We have seen how Charny justified and then praised the knights' love of ladies. In this section where he discusses love as an important aspect of the lives of honourable men-at-arms, being a great motivation for an otherwise hard and dangerous vocation, Charny also discussed other pleasures that can be enjoyed without straining the reputation and prowess in arms of knights. Under the title "the heavy responsibilities of men of rank and prowess," he argues that men-at-arms may enjoy a good meal or a drink if they find one, as long as it is in moderation, so that they will not lose their prowess and honour, and that in their pastimes they may practice "jousting, conversation, dancing, and singing in the company of ladies," instead of gambling which arouses greed and loss of honour, or they may go hunting as long as it does not distract them from their efforts to earn honour in arms.⁵¹ Thus Charny asserts that worldly pleasures should be enjoyed only in moderation and not at the expense of their prowess and the earning of honour, which is the primary concern in the book. A similar view had been previously held by Ramon Llull who claimed that hunting, jousting and tourneying could be practised as long as they contribute to the knights' prowess and do not detract from their duty.⁵² Llull also explained that the enjoyment of worldly pleasures and comforts, including material goods, is a rightful reward for knights that pertains to their divine duty in the service of people.⁵³

The accommodation of worldliness in Charny's view of knightly piety can also be observed in his praise of Judas Maccabeus of the Old Testament, who had also been shown as the ideal knight in the Lady of the Lake's sermon in *Lancelot do Lac*, exemplary for his good conduct and belief in God. It is interesting that Charny's

⁵⁰ See Chapter Two.

⁵¹ *Book of Chivalry*, 61-63.

⁵² *Lull's Book of Knighthood*, 30.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 20, 73.

description is more accentuated on worldly qualities like strength, prowess, boldness, valour and even good-looks, as opposed to qualities such as wisdom, lack of arrogance and a holy life.⁵⁴ Hence what appears to be important is not a simulation of clerical virtues, but an appreciation of those qualities befitting a good warrior, at the same time accepting that they are God-given. This is very much in line with the lay piety that is inherent in *Lancelot do Lac* and in the overall of the *Lancelot-Grail* cycle.

Although Charny tolerates a certain worldliness in his definition of piety, he is quite strict in his disavowal of another sin: the abuse of civilians in warfare. Although earlier in the book he made no criticism of men-at-arms fighting only for the sake of booty,⁵⁵ even while he saw it as a lesser kind of worthiness, he now labels those who “attack anyone, taking booty, prisoners, and other valuables ... without any justification” as “unworthy to be men-at-arms,” and “bad Christians” deserving punishment in this world and in the other.⁵⁶ The same contrast of knights that engage in harming and pillaging defenceless civilians with the duty of knights and the honour due to them was made in Ramon Llull’s *Libre del ordre de cavayleria*.⁵⁷

The criticism of pillage as an abuse of defenceless civilians is not the only part where Charny shows concern for the common good. Although his main perspective is that of men-at-arms and their earning of honour and divine praise by their prowess in arms, there are certain implications in the book that suggest that other things that pertain to a broader benefit should be considered too. While statements concerning the defence of ladies as the duty of all good men-at-arms can be treated as customary in chivalric literature as they are found in the Prose *Lancelot*

⁵⁴ *Book of Chivalry*, 88.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 55.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 96-97.

⁵⁷ *Lull’s Book of Knighthood*, 35-36.

and also in Llull,⁵⁸ we can find still other evidence. We can hear Charny's comments on those who fight without thinking and on impulse for example. Although he considers those who promptly "perform personally many feats of arms" without considering "their benefit or advantage for their friends or the harm done to their enemies ... without giving or taking advice" to be also worthy as they have achieved a lot and earned honour through their bravery, he concludes that these are not the most worthy of men-at-arms.⁵⁹ Likewise, he finds more worth in leadership that is accomplished through wisdom and knowledge. He asserts that although men-at-arms who just perform under the leadership of others are worthy, more worthy are those who both show prowess and use their wisdom in leading others. Then, the "men-at-arms of supreme worth," he says, are those who have enough wisdom to accompany their valour, but who also have faith in God so that they know that everything is endowed by Him.⁶⁰ Again, Ramon Llull can be found to make a similar point in his book by declaring the use of wisdom, reason and counsel to be more in accordance with the duty of knights than simply fighting.⁶¹

However, although the *Livre de chevalerie* was intended as a guide for Jean II's *Ordre de l'étoile*, and that Order was a part of the king's efforts of reforming his knighthood aimed at achieving success in wars against the English, in the book, or in the Order for that matter, there is a lack of emphasis on the knights' service to the king. The Order was not created to establish a body of knights who would be dedicated solely to serving the king in his wars, but it was rather intended for the king to have "beautiful noblemen ... to be reminiscent of the happy times of Arthur and of the Round Table [and] to eventually pass in front of the eyes of the ladies as

⁵⁸ *Book of Chivalry*, 53; *Lull's Book of Knighthood*, 35.

⁵⁹ *Book of Chivalry*, 81- 82.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 82-84.

⁶¹ *Lull's Book of Knighthood*, 82-83.

the model of the perfect knight.”⁶² The members of this Order, like those of several of its late medieval counterparts, were tied to their sovereign with more of a personal bond that coexisted within their notion of service to the state but lacking in the view of public benefit. Likewise, in the *Livre de chevalerie*, when Charny touches on the relationship between great lords and his men, the motives and rewards of this relationship are identified as personal ones that have no apparent relationship to service to the state or the benefit of the people. Charny asserts that great lords should strive to create knights skilled in arms who will earn great renown, and should reward their prowess, to be reciprocated by the men-at-arms’ fighting to achieve greater prowess and by their love and esteem for their lord.⁶³ This is very similar to Froissart’s prologue to his chronicles where he recommends young men who want to advance in life to seek the patronage of great lords who will train and equip them so that these men will establish their name by showing their prowess.⁶⁴

In the *Livre de chevalerie* there is only one particular section where the author deals with “the true function for which rulers were created.” In this section, which resembles in some ways the part in *Lancelot do Lac* where Arthur is preached to by a wise man with the aim of correcting Arthur’s rule, Charny teaches that, as emperors, kings and princes are divinely created for the government of the people in justice and for their defence by arms, they should put the profit of their people before their own and fight for the common good. Again, as in *Lancelot do Lac*, Charny establishes that rulers should be bold as well as just, generous and humble in their duty, so as never to let the poor suffer.⁶⁵ The duty of knights to the king may also be

⁶² L.Pannier, *La Noble maison de Saint-Ouen, la villa Clippiacum et l’ordre de l’étoile d’après les documents originaux* (Paris, 1872), 87, cited in Contamine, *Guerre, état et société*, 189.

⁶³ *Book of Chivalry*, 59.

⁶⁴ *Chroniques de Jean Froissart*, ed. Siméon Luce (Paris, 1869-99), 1, 2, line 30, 3, line 29, cited in François le Saux, “War and Knighthood in Pizan’s *Faits d’armes*,” 94-95.

⁶⁵ *Book of Chivalry*, 76-79.

hinted at in the remarks that knights who stay at home instead of going to distant lands are likely to find more adventure and earn more honour.⁶⁶ These lines might possibly be inspired by an effort to prevent men-at-arms from leaving the country when there was an imminent threat of war with the English. Charny's contemporary, Guillaume de Machaut, also expressed the same thought by articulating that "the time for crusade ... is when your kingdom is not at war."⁶⁷ All in all these remarks on kingship and hints at the need for forces at home are not adequate to conclude that Charny advocated that knights should fight particularly for the king, whereas Ramon Llull, whose work resembles Charny's in many ways, clearly maintained that the duty of the knight is to defend his lord, the king and his people.⁶⁸ Phillippe Contamine finds the wars of the king as only one of the grounds on which Charny's men-at-arms could fight, with no particular priority.⁶⁹ Richard W. Kaeuper believes this to reflect the contemporary commonplace of private wars and the tension between royal claims to manipulate the right to wage wars and those of lords and knights.⁷⁰ Such realities will shortly be discussed at greater length through the evidence of Marshal Bouciquaut's deeds of arms.

Jean II le Maingre, called Bouciquaut, like his father, Bouciquaut, Sr, also the marshal of France, launched himself on a career in arms at a very young age and served under the duke of Bourbon and became a knight. Subsequently, he entered the service of King Charles VI. Soon, he was granted the title of marshal that was an important military distinction in the French army, and was later appointed French governor of Genoa, where he served for some time until the Genoese freed themselves from French rule. He fought in several crusades against Muslims in the

⁶⁶ Ibid., 50-51.

⁶⁷ Keen, "Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms," 6.

⁶⁸ Llull's *Book of Knighthood*, 28-29, 31, 68, 75.

⁶⁹ Contamine, *Guerre, état et société*, 187.

⁷⁰ *Book of Chivalry*, 40.

Mediterranean, in Prussia and in the Balkans at Nicopolis. He died a prisoner of war in the hands of the English by whom he was captured during the battle of Agincourt. *Le Livre de Bouciquaut*, the authorship of which has remained unknown to date,⁷¹ was a biography of the Marshal written just before Bouciquaut had to leave Genoa. It was apparently aimed at venerating its hero as a paragon of chivalric ideals and also saving his reputation in the face of his failures during the Nicopolis crusade and as governor of Genoa.⁷²

The book can be compared to the equally celebrated thirteenth-century biography of William the Marshal for its praise of the personal deeds of a military hero in the service of the crown. It was labelled by both Norman Housley and Maurice Keen as a chivalrous biography, which Keen describes as “a *genre* directly influenced by romance,”⁷³ and by its editor, Denis Lalande, as a work that “tends effectively towards the romance by its general atmosphere, by the marvellous adventures of its hero, and above all by its manner of hiding the brutality and corruption of the century behind the glaze of heroism and courtesy.”⁷⁴

Deeds of prowess on the battlefield or elsewhere are also the main driving force of the narrative in *Le Livre de Bouciquaut*. Bouciquaut’s “incessant search for battlefields on which he could earn praise for his prowess” reflects the book’s focus

⁷¹ For the debate on the authorship of the book and its attribution to Christine de Pizan, see my article: Zeynep Kocabıyıkoglu Çeçen, “Two Different Views of Knighthood in the Early Fifteenth Century: *Le Livre de Bouciquaut* and the Works of Christine de Pizan,” *Journal of Military History* 76 (January 2012): 9-35; On the authorship question, see also Hélène Millet, “Qui a écrit *Le Livre des faits du bon messire Jehan le Maingre dit Bouciquaut*?,” in *Pratiques de la culture écrite en France au XV^e siècle: Actes du colloque international du C.N.R.S, Paris, 18-21 mai 1992*, ed. E. Ornato and N. Pons (Louvain-la-Neuve, Fédération Internationale des Instituts d’Études Médiévales, 1995), 135-149.

⁷² The editor, Denis Lalande points out that although its author claimed to have written the book for the glorification of knighthood in the person of Bouciquaut, his genuine intention was to clear the Marshal of some of the charges made against him, including his military conduct in the Mediterranean and at Nicopolis: *Livre de Bouciquaut*, xxv-xxix.

⁷³ Norman Housley, “One Man and his Wars: The Depiction of Warfare by Marshal Boucicaud’s Biographer,” *Journal of Medieval History* 29 (2003), 29; Keen, *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms*, 37.

⁷⁴ “... l’oeuvre tend effectivement vers le roman par son atmosphère générale, par les merveilleuses aventures de son héros et surtout par cette façon de dissimuler la brutalité et la corruption du siècle sous le vernis de l’héroïsme et de la courtoisie”: *Livre de Bouciquaut*, xxix [all translations from French or medieval French are mine unless otherwise indicated].

on individual knightly achievement, just as one can find in *Lancelot do Lac* and in Charny's book.⁷⁵ Echoing Charny's emphasis that good deeds of arms should be heard by others who can aspire to them, the author conveys the idea that Bouciquaut's deeds will serve as an example to "those who tend towards honour" so that they will "attain the good renown that is due to those who deserve it."⁷⁶ Thus Bouciquaut is presented as a paragon of the "aspiring knight" just as William the Marshal had been two centuries earlier.⁷⁷ Bouciquaut is portrayed, again like William the Marshal, as going from one deed of arms to another, which also confirms Charny's teaching that "who does more is of greater worth."⁷⁸ In the book, Bouciquaut goes on crusade, comes back and fights another knight in a joust, then organizes a tournament when he cannot find any war in which to fight, then fights for the king against the English, then goes on crusade again, and so on. This constant pursuit of deeds of prowess is prosecuted in such a determined fashion that, at a time when he takes leave of his lord, the duke of Bourbon, Bouciquaut even seeks adventure at the courts of the Ottoman Sultan and the Hungarian King.⁷⁹

In all these pursuits of arms, there is an emphasis on the praise of prowess and on the objective of increasing one's own and others' prowess and honour in arms. Some of this fits what Charny has said about great lords trying to create men of great prowess from young knights and the knights loving and honouring the lords in return. After the young Bouciquaut serves under the duke of Bourbon, his "father in

⁷⁵Housley, "One Man and his Wars," 30.

⁷⁶ "... et avec ce c'est chose couvenable que en memoire autentique soient mis les bons et leur nom auctorisié, affin que ceulx qui tendent a honneur puissent prendre exemple de bien faire, pour attaindre au loyer de bonne renommee qui est deue a ceulx qui le desservent": *Livre de Bouciquaut*, 8-9.

⁷⁷ Barber, *Knight and Chivalry*, 141.

⁷⁸ Keen comments that, William the Marshal fought so continuously in tournaments, crusades and royal wars that, "If ever a knight lived up to Geoffrey's principle of chivalrous prowess, 'he who achieves more is the more worthy', it was surely William the Marshal": Keen, *Chivalry*, 21.

⁷⁹*Livre de Bouciquaut*, 61-62: The Sultan in question is Murat I, and the Hungarian king is possibly Sigismund, who later became Holy Roman Emperor.

knighthood,”⁸⁰ the king discovers Bouciquaut’s prowess and asks him to serve among his troops, which the duke consents to for the sake of Bouciquaut’s advancement in arms.⁸¹ Bouciquaut reciprocates the duke’s support of his advancement by striving to fight under him in the Barbary Crusade.⁸² Another example of the admiration for prowess in the book can be more likened to those in *Lancelot do Lac*. Just as the love between Lancelot and Galehot develops in unlikely circumstances and prompts them to make remarkable sacrifices for each other and yearn to fight together, the “great love” between Bouciquaut and the count of Eu, prompted by the captivity of the latter in Egypt, causes Bouciquaut to stay with him voluntarily and later motivates Bouciquaut to undertake the crusade to Nicopolis.⁸³

There is an even greater motive than his love for worthy men that prompts Bouciquaut to take up arms. In accordance with the romances and Charny’s book, love of a lady is also presented as an important motive for the prowess and valour Bouciquaut showed in arms. As if reiterating from these books, the author of Bouciquaut describes love as an important inspiration for young men, giving them “the courage to undertake difficult things, which they achieve in order to increase their renown, so that they will have the grace of their ladies.”⁸⁴ Proving this statement through the “histories of the former valiant men like ... Lancelot and

⁸⁰ Housley assumes that it was the duke of Bourbon who dubbed Bouciquaut a knight, in “One Man and his Wars,” 34. Bouciquaut’s entrance into the service of the duke is narrated in *Livre de Bouciquaut*, 19.

⁸¹ Ibid., 65.

⁸² Ibid., 74. Also discussed by Housley in “One Man and his Wars,” 34. The expedition undertaken by Louis of Bourbon to Mahdia in North Africa in 1390 is often commonly referred to as the Barbary Crusade. It was a Franco-Genoese expedition which was staged for the benefit of the Genoese against their maritime rivals and which brought no profits to the French except for chivalric fame and glory and those were the reasons they came for. With all its failures in strategy and discipline and with the casualties on the French side, this expedition was a kind of a prelude to the faults in the Nicopolis crusade that incurred so much criticism, also mentioned by Housley in “One Man and his Wars,” 38.

⁸³ *Livre de Bouciquaut*, 62-63, 89. The quotations are from Housley, “One Man and his Wars,” 36.

⁸⁴ “Amours, par qui leur venoit le hardement d’entreprendre les fortes choses, les quelles pour accroistre leur renommee ilz achevoient affin que ilz eussent la grace de leurs dames ...”: Ibid., 27. This statement can be found echoed in the contemporary biography of another military hero, the Spanish Don Pero Niño: G. Díaz da Gamez, *The Unconquered Knight: A Chronicle of the Deeds of Don Pero Nino*, trans. J. Evans (London, 1928), cited in Keen, *Chivalry*, 117.

Tristan,”⁸⁵ Bouciquaut’s biographer affirms that, after the young Bouciquaut experiences love, he is filled with the desire to become more valiant, and accomplishes great deeds of knighthood to serve his lady well and receive her love.⁸⁶ Hence love of his lady is the most important reward for him to look forward to on his return from his “perilous adventures.”⁸⁷ Similar to Charny’s advice to knights, the author of Bouciquaut conveys the fact that the Marshal loves secretly and acquires honourable pastimes such as singing gracefully and composing songs, dancing, laughing and speaking with courtesy at dances and feasts, where he is admired by ladies and others for his marvellous deeds. Again, like Charny’s famous description of ladies who will feel the great honour of loving the most valiant and worthy of men-at-arms, the author describes the ladies staring at Bouciquaut in admiration and pleasure while he is performing great deeds at jousts held at the court of Charles VI in an atmosphere of great festivity.⁸⁸

Just as in Charny, the emphasis concerning the deeds in arms recounted in the book is not on public utility, but on personal honour. All Bouciquaut’s exploits are narrated as if directed towards earning honour for himself to contribute to his knightly renown, which the author justifies in the last part of the book with a quotation from the Roman author Valerius: “Every valiant man can and must lawfully wish and desire praise, honour and glory in the world.”⁸⁹ Whether Bouciquaut is fighting in a war against the Turks or against the English, in a tournament or in a joust, the pursuit of honour always comes to the fore as his

⁸⁵ “Et qu’il soit vray, qui veult lire les histoires des vaillans trespassez, assez trouvera de ce preuve, si comme on lit de Lancelot, de Tristan et de plusieurs autres que Amours fist bons et a renommee attaindre...”: *Livre de Bouciquaut*, 28-29.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 32.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 55.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 31-35.

⁸⁹ “... tout vaillant homme peut et doit loisiblement vouloir et desirer loz, honneur et gloire au monde du bien que il fait”: Ibid., 455. The author exploits this statement to justify his reason for praising the Marshal in such a book. For the whole discussion, see *ibid.*, 452-6.

primary motive. Just as he wins jousts with other knights always with great honour and praise,⁹⁰ Bouciquaut organizes a tournament for knights from all around Europe “for the great desire he had to be valiant and to acquire honour” and to “employ his fine youth in chivalrous pursuits,”⁹¹ and travels frequently to Prussia,⁹² a favourite destination of contemporary knights for the acquisition of fame by accomplishing feats of arms against the infidels, like all “good men who ... desire to travel for increasing their worth.”⁹³ Later, he joins the Nicopolis expedition because it was “an enterprise of great renown,” a most favourable opportunity for youth to seek “the honour of knighthood” and “the most honourable and God approved” path for all knights and squires to take,⁹⁴ and attacks the English to increase his and his men’s honour and renown.⁹⁵ Likewise, Bouciquaut and his men are occupied in crusading around the Mediterranean out of their desire to “increase their renown”,⁹⁶ which seems never to be satiated despite the Marshal’s advisors’ strong belief that he has earned enough honour to make him stop.⁹⁷ Accordingly, Bouciquaut’s first battle in the company of the king (in Languedoc) was the “highest, the most graceful and the most honourable enterprise that a knight has undertaken for a long time in Christianity.”⁹⁸ Hence we can say that Bouciquaut seems to have taken Charny’s

⁹⁰ Ibid., 51-55.

⁹¹ “... pour le grant desir que il avoit d’estre vaillant et d’acquies honneur, n’avoit autre soing fors de penser comment il employeroit sa belle jeunee en poursuite chevalereuse”: Ibid., 66.

⁹² At least four times according to the book: Ibid., 40-42, 74-77.

⁹³ “... si comme communement font les bons qui voyager desirent pour accroistre leur pris”: Ibid., 40.

⁹⁴ “... ce fus une emprise de grant renom”: Ibid., 88 ; “Adont lui estoit en fleur de grant jeunee, desirant suivre la voye que les bons quierent, c’est assavoir honneur de chevalerie, considerant que mieulz ne se pouoit employer que de donner ou service de Dieu sa jeunee en travaillant son corps pour l’accroissement de la foy, desira moult a aler en celle honorable besogne ...pour laquelle cause chevaliers et escuyers y estoient pou embesognez des guerres, desirerent plusieurs jeunes seigneurs du sanc royal et autres barons et nobles hommes a y aler, pour eulx tirer hors de oyseuse et emploier leur temps et leurs forces en fait de chevalerie; car bien leur sembloit, et voir estoit, qu’en plus honorable voyage et plus selon Dieu ne peussent aler”: Ibid., 89-90.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 45-46.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 222.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 232, 241, 243.

⁹⁸ “... une entreprise la plus haulte, la plus gracieuse et la plus honorable que passé a lonc temps en crestienté chevalier entreprist”: Ibid., 66.

advice and fought in all kinds of deeds in arms: jousts, tournaments, wars both at home and in distant lands, all to increase his honour. If we take note that he fought in jousts, tournaments and distant lands like Prussia more in the early years of his career and in wars of the king in France and in the Mediterranean in the later stages of it — which at some point earned him the title of Marshal — we can also find that Charny's scale of prowess was also confirmed in the life of Bouciquaut.⁹⁹

As in Charny, all these remarks about the honour that is due to knights from different deeds of arms are combined with the view that knightly honour is something won by divine Grace, and in the assurance that God approves of and praises all the deeds of arms of knights. Thus, the crusade of Nicopolis, as aforementioned, is described to be popular among knights and squires not only because it will bring them great honour and renown, but also it is the most divinely approved voyage to undertake.¹⁰⁰ Likewise, an expedition to Alexandria will give “great honour to conquerors and great profit to all Christianity,” as it is agreeable to God.¹⁰¹ In the same way, the king's war against the English in Languedoc is the most honourable enterprise to be taken by Christian knights to increase their worth and honour.¹⁰² Bouciquaut, or at least his biographer, seemingly has great confidence in the worth of the knight's occupation in the eyes of God, which makes him perceive service to God as a natural extension of his own achievements in arms.

⁹⁹ Starting one's military career at tournaments seems to be common practice among medieval knights as can be observed in the examples of the famous knights William Marshal, Jacques de Lalaing and Don Përo Nino. William Marshal was thought to be at “the high point of his chivalric career” when he was fighting at tournaments; Jacques de Lalaing was portrayed as having “distinguished himself at an early age in tournaments” and Don Pero Nino was reported to have been jousting from an early age, and later moving on to the battlegrounds after he took up a military career: Barber, *Knight and Chivalry*, 143, 145.

¹⁰⁰ *Livre de Bouciquaut*, 88-90.

¹⁰¹ “... laquelle chose, se il avenoit, seroit grant honneur aux conqueteurs et tres grant prouffit a toute crestienté”: Ibid., 345; “... car l'emprise estoit agreable a Dieu, prouffitable a crestienté, et tres honorable a qui s'i employeroit”: Ibid., 346.

¹⁰² Ibid., 66.

Like Charny, Bouciquaut's biographer also emphasises that the nature of the physical sufferings endured by men-at-arms makes their occupation especially worthy. Bouciquaut and his men, fighting now in another war against the Saracens, cannot be praised and honoured enough for the perils of their occupation and the bodily risks they are taking for the benefit of Christianity.¹⁰³ In return, their remarkable deeds of arms will receive the aid of God in whom they have hope and faith, and will help them conquer greater numbers with smaller numbers, as it did for Bouciquaut and his men.¹⁰⁴ It is noteworthy that both Charny and the author of Bouciquaut saw divine providence, and no other factor, as deciding the victories of valorous smaller numbers of men against greater numbers. On the other hand, the divine approval of prowess, expressed throughout the *Le Livre de Bouciquaut*, does not come with any claim to superiority over the clergy as was implied in Charny's *Livre de chevalerie*. This is in accordance with the conventional statement at the opening of *Le Livre de Bouciquaut* which, as in Llull's *Libre del ordre de cavayleria*, defines knighthood as one of the two pillars of society established by the divine will in order to sustain the divine and human laws in the world, and for this reason to be praised and honoured.¹⁰⁵

Other than the expressions of the divine praise of prowess in the book, there are enough remarks to point out Bouciquaut's piety. He is often portrayed wanting to "give damage to the Saracens" (*porter damage aux Sarrasins*, or often, *grever les Sarrasins*), be it in Prussia (where the enemy is also described as Saracen), the Balkans, Turkey or North Africa, without stating any particular wish to serve the

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 234-38. The author provides an anecdote from the Roman author Valerius Maximus about Romans winning against greater numbers with lesser numbers in justification of this astonishing victory against Saracens, yet he fails to add Valerius' gloss: the benefits of military discipline and learning: Ibid., 238-39.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 6-7.

Church or Christianity.¹⁰⁶ Such an attitude, as Housley comments, can be associated with the common belief among knights that “Christ was always served when infidels ... were attacked.”¹⁰⁷ Moreover, in the last part of the book, Bouciquaut, in accordance with Charny, is described as a devout Christian who constantly prays to God and seeks his help in all his deeds, who helps in the recovery and repair of places of prayer, and who practices chastity and abstains from luxury, covetousness and vanity.¹⁰⁸

However, again as in Charny’s *Livre de chevalerie*, there is a conflict between the portrayal of this sinless knight and the account of the worldly habits of Bouciquaut in the book. We have already seen how Bouciquaut fights in jousts and tournaments just for the sake of glory, which was censured as vainglory by the Church. Moreover, the Marshal seems to indulge in every kind of worldly pleasure and luxury. His aforementioned eagerness to seek the rewards of love that are described as deserved by his prowess and valiant deeds is alone contradictory to this portrayal of chastity and abstinence. The author often registers the fact that Bouciquaut went back to the royal court after expeditions to enjoy himself in the company of ladies with feasts, games and dances, which he remarks to be held increasingly at the court of Charles VI as a sign of the king’s youth, power and nobility.¹⁰⁹ He even slips in now and again that Bouciquaut forsakes discipline for pleasure during a few campaigns. We know that during one campaign he invited his men for a drink, with the purpose of motivating them, and that at Nicopolis he and his fellow crusaders were busy eating dinner when they were attacked by the

¹⁰⁶ For example, *ibid.*, 40-41, 89, 146, 217, 344, 349.

¹⁰⁷ Housley, “One Man and his Wars,” 31.

¹⁰⁸ *Livre de Bouciquaut*, 393-403. Compare with the emphasis of knights’ devoutness in *Ordene and Libre del ordre de cavayleria*, respectively in *Lull’s Book of Knighthood*, 116, 94-95.

¹⁰⁹ *Livre de Bouciquaut*, 34-35. Also in 40-41, 52-53, 82-83.

Turks.¹¹⁰ These remarks are supported by contemporary criticism of the Nicopolis crusaders' debauchery and indulgence in games and feasts. All this makes it difficult to believe in the austerity and self-discipline that made Bouciquaut ban all games in the camp and held him back from taking any recreational break, as the last part of *Le Livre de Bouciquaut* recounts.¹¹¹

Next to the recognition of worldliness in *Le Livre de Bouciquaut*, there is none of the criticism of pillage and abuse of civilians that there is in Charny's *Livre de chevalerie*. The author gives a vivid description of Bouciquaut's men plundering and killing on at least two occasions in Escandelour (now Alanya, in Turkey) and in Constantinople, in both of which they are described to be fighting in good order (*belle ordonnance*).¹¹² Even though the author states at the very beginning of the book that knights have been created by God together with the clergy so that they will "sustain and increase individual and public good"¹¹³ there is no other indication towards that direction than the oath taken by Bouciquaut for the defence of ladies, pointing to an important duty of all chivalric knights as communicated in the romances. The author praises at length how the Marshal and a group of fellow knights formed *L'Ordre de l'escu vert a la dame blanche*, a chivalric order for the defence of ladies in need. He tells how women, widows and others who are

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 238, 103.

¹¹¹ Delaville le Roulx mentions, possibly in reference to Juvenal des Ursins and the Monk of St. Denis, that at the blockade of Nicopolis "feasts, games, debauchery, celebrations of all sorts followed each other without interruption, to the detriment of discipline... precautions necessary to guard the camp were not taken at all; the spies did not fulfil their duty, the service of the scouts was non-existent": J.M.A Delaville le Roulx, *France en Orient au XIV^{ème} siècle: Expéditions du Maréchal Boucicaut*, 2 vols. (Paris: E.Thorin, 1886), 256 [my translation of Delaville le Roulx]. For the Marshal's claimed austerity and self-discipline, see *Livre de Bouciquaut*, 403-4, 433-36.

¹¹² Ibid., 139-47, 221-29.

¹¹³ The book opens with the following line, "Deux choses sont, par la volenté de Dieu, establies au monde ainsi comme .II. pillers a soustenir les ordres des loys divines et humaines qui a creature humaine donnent rigle de vivre en paix et deument soubz les termes de raison, et qui accroissent et multiplient le sens humain en congnoissance et vertu et l'ostent de ignorance, et avec ce deffendent et soustiennent et augmentent le bien propre et aussi le publique, et sanz lesquelz seroit le monde ainsi comme chose confuse et sanz nul ordre.... Yceulz .II. pillers, sanz faille, sont Chevalerie et Science qui moult bien se couviennent ensemble": Ibid., 6-7.

oppressed by powerful lords have been complaining to the king that there was no knight to help them in their struggles and how Bouciquaut could not remain indifferent to these laments. The Marshal regards this situation as a shame in a country where there is the flower of chivalry of the world and thus founds this Order.¹¹⁴ All this is recounted in a romance-like fashion reminiscent of the episodes in *Lancelot do Lac* where women in distress often came to Arthur's court to seek the aid of his knights. Yet, despite the outline of the rule of this Order, we do not see in this part of the book or in any other any proof of its accomplishing its objectives.

When we read through the accounts of Bouciquaut's battles that comprise most of the book, there seems to be not even a brief remark on good leadership or the use of wisdom comparable to the ones made by Charny. On the contrary, it is not military strategy or wisdom that receives applause, but heroic feats that might often be considered reckless. Bouciquaut and his men are so anxious to be the first to fight the Saracens at Rachowa, in order to have all the glory for themselves, that they put at risk the entire expedition.¹¹⁵ Again at Gallipoli, the Marshal declines to hear all counsel against action and risks his entire navy to save two galleys, as he views the matter from the point of view of honour.¹¹⁶ Bouciquaut resembles "mad lions" (*lyons forcenez*) fighting against twenty Saracens all by himself at Nicopolis at the risk of his life.¹¹⁷ Later, as governor of Genoa, the Marshal continuously declines to hear advice against undertaking more feats in arms, as he wants to earn more and more

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 160-71. Housley comments on the book's disregard for civilian welfare in "One Man and his Wars," 37.

¹¹⁵ *Livre de Bouciquaut*, 94-96.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 137-38.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 111-13. Although the recklessness of Bouciquaut and the crusaders did not lead to disaster at Rachowa, it did later at Nicopolis. The contemporary sources reveal the reckless manner in which Bouciquaut and his fellow crusaders declined to hear the Hungarian advice: *ibid.*, xxxvi; Housley, "One Man and his Wars," 38; Delaville le Roulx, *France en Orient*, 1: 261-62; Kelly de Vries, "The Lack of a Western Military Response to the Ottoman Invasions of Eastern Europe from Nicopolis (1396) to Mohacs (1526)," *Journal of Military History* 63 (July 1999): 540-41.

honour for himself.¹¹⁸ In all this, he has absolutely no concern for the ongoing trade between Muslims and Christians, important to the Genoese, which was a reason why he was criticised contemporaneously for his governorship.¹¹⁹ Besides Bouciquaut's not appealing to counsel in his wars, there is also no substantial benefit to arise from these fights. All through these accounts of the Marshal's wars against the infidels there is no real explanation as to why they have been undertaken and how Christianity has profited from them, except through the numbers of Saracens killed, places destroyed and personal honour won by men-at-arms.¹²⁰ Likewise, in his account of wars fought against the English, the author's emphasis is on how Bouciquaut and his men earned praise, and this completely overshadows concern for the actual results. In the account of a battle against the English in Guyenne, instead of relating the outcome, a victory for the French, the author underlines how the Marshal "carried away the honour of the day."¹²¹ Likewise, the retreat of French forces after another battle against the English can easily go unnoticed alongside all the long praises of the unmatched valour of the knights. Although the author asserts that the "valour of the good Frenchmen" is directed towards the "profit of the king of France," this statement is not confirmed by his later emphasis on the knights' immediate concern to increase their honour and renown.¹²² While the praise of valour that heeds no reasonable advice and the constant focus on individual achievement that has no view of a greater benefit in warfare, as we see in the account of the deeds

¹¹⁸ *Livre de Bouciquaut*, 222, 232, 235, 241, 243.

¹¹⁹ Housley, "One Man and his Wars," 31.

¹²⁰ The emphasis of the destruction of Saracens and not of other outcomes in the book can be found in the accounts of the Marshal's expeditions in Turkey and North Africa in *ibid.*, 225, 229, 242-43, in Prussia in *ibid.*, 40, and at Nicopolis in *ibid.*, 112-13.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 60.

¹²² "Ou temps de lors les Anglois occupoient moult le royaume de France en plusieurs lieux, c'est assavoir maintes villes et chastiaux que ilz tenoient par force, tant en Picardie comme en Guienne et autre part, combien que, Dieu merci, par la vaillance des bons Français ja en estoit le pays moult descombré, envers qu'il souloit estre, et tous jours aloit en amendant au prouffit du roy de France ...": *Ibid.*, 43. The author immediately tells how Bouciquaut and others earned personal honour from their combats with the English: *Ibid.*: 44-46.

of the Marshal, closely resembles the attitudes in *Lancelot do Lac*, in the fourth part of the *Le Livre de Bouciquaut*, which is different from the rest of the book in both style and structure, the author attempts at a justification of Bouciquaut's deeds by contradicting this particular point of view. In this part of the book, where he discusses the virtues, good morals and lifestyle of the Marshal, the author defends him as a paragon of prudence and calculation in warfare, considering the justness of the cause and the consequences in terms of the possibility of victory. The author asserts that Bouciquaut, as all men who fear to disobey God's commandments, always prays for God's help in all things, uses wisdom and counsel in his decisions by considering all conditions at length in battle and keeps his men in good order under good leadership of captains and under strict discipline.¹²³ If we disregard the contrast with the narrative of the Marshal's battles, this part resembles closely the praise of prudence and leadership in Charny's book. Moreover, the author's emphasis on the Marshal's belief in God as the source of all military success is also reminiscent of the "men-at-arms of supreme worth" who both use their wisdom and their belief in God in their affairs.

On the other hand, the outlook of Bouciquaut's author on the wars of the king is not very different from that of Charny. He is likewise indifferent between these and other deeds of arms undertaken by the Marshal, as he views them all as contributing to his personal honour. In further proof, he describes Bouciquaut's first war fought under the king as honourable in the same way as the honours that are won by knights when they are prompted by love and valour.¹²⁴ Moreover, like Charny, he seems to share Guillaume de Machaut's advice to go on crusade when the kingdom is not at war, as he describes the expedition of Nicopolis as an honourable enterprise

¹²³ Ibid., 401-5.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 66.

undertaken when knights “were little occupied with wars.”¹²⁵ Yet, in the account of Bouciquaut’s other crusading enterprises, the author makes it explicit that the Marshal was not always happy to accept this policy. While repeating that Bouciquaut needed to get permission from his king to participate in a *reise* in Prussia or in the duke of Bourbon’s crusade to Mahdia, he frankly conveys the Marshal’s disappointment whenever he was declined permission or summoned back by the king to duty at home. The author writes that the decisions of the king “weighed heavy on Bouciquaut”, but he “dared not to disobey.” Hence proposals for leave to depart France were always accompanied by the fear that he would be turned down and with displeasure if he was actually denied. Going home for the wars of the king was “the right thing” to do, but was not always the most joyful decision. When Bouciquaut was finally released from his duty, when the king changed his plans to go to war, “he (Bouciquaut) was overjoyed.” While these passages give some idea of the other side of the story to Charny’s mild disapproval of remote ventures, they also offer some confirmation of the difficulties and frustrations they could involve. We learn from the author that Bouciquaut once returned from Prussia because the winter season made it difficult to undertake any expedition against the Saracens (by which he means the pagans).¹²⁶

¹²⁵ Ibid., 88-90.

¹²⁶ “D’icelle alec ot moult grant joye Bouciquaut, car ne cuida mie que ce deust estre sanz lui; mais quant il en demanda congïe au roy, il lui vea baudement ne nullement laisser aler ne lui volt, dont moult grandement pesa a Bouciquaut; et tel desplaisir en ot que il ne se vout tenir a court pour chose que le roy lui deist. Si fist tant a toutes fins que il ot congïe d’aler de rechef en Prusse. Si parti après le congïe le plus tost que il pot, de paour que le roy ravisast et ne l’en laissast aler. Mais quant il fu par dela, il trouva que il n’y avoit point de rese pour l’iver qui n’estoit mie assez froit.... Et ainsi comme messire Bouciquaut et son frere attendoient temps et saison que la dicte rese se feist, lui vint message de par le roy, qui lui mandoit qu’il avoit en propos de faire certain voyage; si vouloit qu’il fust avecques lui, et pour ce lui mandoit expressement que, tantost et sans delay, s’en retournast vers lui. Ces nouvelles ouïes, Bouciquaut, qui desobeir n’osa, quoy que il lui en pesast, se mist au retour, si comme raison estoit ... et si comme il estoit a Brucelles, message lui vint de par le roy, qui lui mandoit que, par l’ordenance de son conseil, il avoit changïe propos; si lui remandoit qu’il feist a sa volenté de s’en revenir ou de tenir son voyage. Quant Bouciquaut ouï ce, il fu moult joyeux et s’en tourna dont il venoit”: Ibid., 74-76.

We get the sense that the author does not really have a real notion of the overriding duty of fighting for the king when he describes Bouciquaut, who was then the governor of Genoa, and his men attacking the Saracens in the Mediterranean as doing their duty, which is the defence of a country against all enemies.¹²⁷ Royal wars are easily interpreted as private combats, and royal and personal interests can easily become blurred. When Bouciquaut was ordered by the French king not to make war against Venice, he challenges the doge of Venice to private combat to save his honour, which he thinks is in danger. This gesture, aiming at no benefit but the Marshal's own, receives praise from the author.¹²⁸ Moreover, earlier in France, Bouciquaut had often challenged knights or had been challenged by them in the midst of battles with the English. He always defeats the English knights and wins the honour of the day. One of the combats is decided on when Bouciquaut was eating and drinking with some Englishmen. It was to take place between twenty Englishmen against twenty Frenchmen but then takes the form of a battle that ends up in nothing substantial but festivities in honour of Bouciquaut.¹²⁹ These jousts in the middle of wars and battles which, as I have mentioned in the previous chapter, were not extraordinary in medieval practice, also remind us of the pages of *Lancelot do Lac* with its tournament-like battles which seem to be demonstrations of the prowess of individual knights. Yet, Bouciquaut was not acting too differently from the French and English kings and princes who challenged each other to combat during the Hundred Years' War in order to settle their quarrels without battle.¹³⁰ While Bouciquaut's actions may be justified by the rarity of pitched battles that

¹²⁷ Ibid., 236.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 288-90.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 49-61.

¹³⁰ Kelly De Vries, "Hunger, Flemish Participation and the Flight of Philip VI: Contemporary Accounts of the Siege of Calais, 1346-47," in *Guns and Men in Medieval Europe, 1200-1500* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 160-64; Huizinga, *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*, 107-8.

actually saw the two armies fighting against each other during the Hundred Years War, they also give evidence of the still weak notion of fighting for the state in the late fourteenth century. The disapproving attitude of the king towards these private combats is also implied. For fear that the king and other lords of the realm would prevent a combat that was to take place between Bouciquaut and an English knight, Bouciquaut arranges that it is fought on English land.¹³¹ While these combats do not reflect an enmity between two nations at war, they do give evidence of a ‘national’ rivalry between the men-at-arms of two kingdoms, who compete for chivalric renown. When Bouciquaut decides to hold a tournament at St. Inglevert for the participation of knights from all countries, the English, who are described as striving to surpass the French in all things, are represented by the greatest number, and of course are all defeated by the French knights.¹³² The lack of a more bitter enmity between the two nations may also be attributed to the relatively peaceful period during the Hundred Years War of the book’s composition, evidenced again by the way Bouciquaut’s organization of the tournament was reciprocated by an English tournament at Smithfield. The English participated alongside with the French in the Barbary crusade and then later at Nicopolis.¹³³

To sum up, an examination of Charny’s *Livre de chevalerie* and the anonymous *Le Livre de Bouciquaut* regarding their view of knighthood and warfare gives enough evidence to argue that both works were influenced by the view disseminated through the Arthurian romances, (and in particular) the Prose *Lancelot*. The common features in all these works can broadly be identified as the following: a focus on prowess and the quest for personal honour, together with the belief that love

¹³¹ *Livre de Bouciquaut*, 54.

¹³² *Ibid.*, 70-73.

¹³³ J.J.N. Palmer, *England, France and Christendom*, 1377-99 (Chapel Hill: University of Carolina Press, 1972), 185.

for and of ladies will enhance the prowess and honour of knights, and that God as the source of all prowess will grant honour to the faithful both in this world and in the other. Yet their view of piety has a lay tenor in that it tolerates a certain worldliness as pertaining to the perilous occupation of knighthood. While the notion of service to the king and the state is largely absent from these works, there nevertheless is displayed a certain bond between knights and their king that is often expressed in terms of personal achievement and the praise of prowess. Issues such as consideration for civilians, the use of wisdom and counsel or the need to establish discipline in warfare exist in quieter tones in Charny and are almost completely absent from the book about Bouciquaut, except in the rather distinct fourth part. Mostly however, they are submerged among the aforesaid dominant themes, even while there is some heralding of a different perspective from that of the Arthurian romances. Moreover, the parallel examination of the *Livre de chevalerie* and *Le Livre de Bouciquaut* with regard to their inspiration from the Arthurian romances provides us also with a comparison of two works written more than half a century apart. Despite the time gap that separates them, they attest both to the continuity of the Arthurian tradition in shaping views of knighthood and warfare through the fourteenth and into the early fifteenth centuries, and also to the concurrence between the ideals, in Charny, and something more approaching real practice in Bouciquaut concerning warfare and knighthood during that time period. Moreover, both authors, writing in response to military failures, in the case of Charny those of the French against the English, and in the case of Bouciquaut's author those of his hero in the Mediterranean and in the Balkans,¹³⁴ refuse to accept criticisms of lack of military discipline and tactics as the source of these failures, but advocate instead the

¹³⁴ See above p.3 for the objectives of Charny, and also above p. 18 for those of Bouciquaut's author.

traditional view that is dominated by a mixture of prowess and piety.¹³⁵ This prompts a question about the relationship of the ideas of these two works regarding knighthood and warfare to their period, or at least to some ideas current in the same period, which I will discuss in Chapters Four and Five.

¹³⁵ See Kaeuper's introduction to *Livre de chevalerie* for his statements of Charny having a similar point of regarding military failures: *Livre de chevalerie*, 24-25, 41.

CHAPTER IV

THE ECCLESIASTICAL OPINION ON WARFARE AND WARRIORS

As much as romances and related chivalric books reflected an opinion on knights and warfare, there were other pieces of writing, often works concerning law or theology, that reflected an entirely different view with different emphases, which often contradicted the opinion in the earlier mentioned works. I will refer to this different view as ‘ecclesiastical opinion’ or as the ‘ecclesiastical view’. I prefer these terms to ‘clerical opinion’ or ‘Church opinion’, because it neither entirely reflects an official position broadcast by the Church, nor can it be held to apply to all works written by clerics, among which were romances, chivalric biographies and chronicles. What I will try to discuss, on the other hand, is rather an opinion that was commonly held by intellectuals who wrote on canon law or theology, making use of Biblical sources and the Church Fathers as well as the works of ancient authors. This

writing was characteristically in Latin, the language of the learned, and addressed to those who were able to read such discourse. While it is understandable that the approach to warfare and warriors would be somewhat different here from that of the romances, it should not be assumed that it was necessarily a negative one.

Ecclesiastical opinion on warfare, defined as above, looked back to a considerable extent to the writings of Augustine, the Bishop of Hippo in the Later Roman Empire, who looked at the wars of that period, through Christian and pagan sources, to arrive at a Christian theory of just war. It was on his ideas that later canonists and theologians, the most famous of them being Gratian, the twelfth-century author of the *Decretum*, the first systematic compilation of canon laws, and Thomas Aquinas, the thirteenth-century theologian and Dominican friar, built to construct an elaborate and consistent view on warfare and warriors.¹

For the purpose of looking at the ecclesiastical view around the time the three authors, Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan, were writing, I will take as my primary reference the *De bello, de represaliis, et de duello* of Giovanni da Legnano, a civil and canon lawyer of the early fourteenth-century University of Bologna. This work, written in 1360, was a treatise on the laws of warfare as well as reprisals and duels, also common forms of armed fighting besides wars during the Middle Ages. This work may be rightfully described as the most comprehensive work dedicated solely to warfare written by an ecclesiastical author, and with a considerable influence both on Legnano's contemporaries and on later generations of authors writing on warfare and knighthood. Besides being the chief source for Bouvet's *Arbre des batailles*, the work can be noted to have constituted parts of the anonymous *Somnium viridarii*, a political treatise written around the same time as *Arbre des batailles*, and the

¹ Keen, *Laws of War*, 66.

fifteenth-century works *Boke of Noblesse* and *De studio militari*, both of which have been cited in Chapter One as drawing on *Arbre des batailles*, as well as Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes*.² Legnano drew basically on the codes of canon and civil law including the *Libri feudorum*; the Bible and the Church Fathers, including Augustine viewed through the lens of the canon law; and Thomas Aquinas, Aristotle, and some Roman authors among whom was Vegetius. Here we should establish that these sources more or less represented the basis of an accumulated ecclesiastical thought on warfare and knighthood.³ While Legnano in the fourteenth century would use them as the immediate sources to draw on regarding issues on warfare, so would John of Salisbury in the twelfth or Thomas Aquinas and Aegidius of Rome in the thirteenth century. On the other hand, while all these authors contributed to an accumulated thought on warfare and knighthood, none of their ideas were ignored after their own lifetimes. Augustine himself, for one thing, was still regarded as the utmost authority on 'just war' at the time when Legnano was writing, or even much later for that matter. The authority of this accumulated opinion clearly was very important in establishing the views of ecclesiastical authors on the subject of warfare and knighthood. While I look into Legnano as the most recent and comprehensive ecclesiastical opinion on warfare and knighthood at the time Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan were writing, I will also try and compare his views with those of other theologians and canon lawyers during the Middle Ages — because they were still used independently — and also add in opinions on issues not covered by Legnano. Hence my aim is to make neither a historical analysis of ecclesiastical opinion on warfare and knighthood nor an analysis of Legnano's sources as such, but to give a basic outline of what was available to a canon lawyer or theologian, hence an

² *Tree of Battles*, 25-36, 22 Also see 26, n.55 and 22, n. 40, 42.

³ *De bello*, xxxii, 69-70, 457.

‘ecclesiastical author’, writing on warfare and knighthood during the late Middle Ages.

Legnano, having divided his work into three basic parts, which deal consecutively with wars, reprisals — which, as he defines them, are retaliations made by the injured party against the injurer, but legitimate only when authorised by a sovereign — and duels, again legitimate only in certain circumstances, uses the term “corporeal universal war” to denote “just war”, but also goes over the cases where “corporeal private wars,” i.e. reprisals and duels, may also be regarded as just.

Legnano begins with an introduction based on Augustine’s theory of how just wars are ordained by God to punish sinners on earth. Sin, which stems from the original sin, is the tendency of human nature to give in to its own desires, for which Aristotle gives the evidence of incontinent men who do not obey reason but their own appetite. They are the reason for all strife and discord on earth and thus they need to be thwarted and corrected towards good through wars, which are God’s mechanism of punishing evil and restoring justice on earth.⁴ Legnano, citing Augustine, declares that wars are God’s disciplinary instruments for punishing sinners on earth. Hence wars proceed from God and thus from divine law as they are not only permitted but also ordained by Him. The examples of punishment through divinely ordained wars are found in the Old Testament, where the sinning cities and kingdoms, Sodom, Gomorrah, Zeboim, etc, were destroyed by warfare. In accordance, wars such as those fought by the Maccabees, Joshua or Jeremiah, were shown to be commanded by God to punish evil, declared through the words in Jeremiah: “The Lord is with me as a warrior.”⁵ Augustine explained that wars in the Old Testament could not be seen as driven by cruelty or aggression, because these

⁴Ibid., 221-22.

⁵ Ibid., 224-27.

wars are divinely ordained by God to “crush the pride of man.”⁶ In a not altogether contradictory way, philosophers of antiquity — Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics, for example — had worked on the idea of associating the downfall of states with the moral decadence of their people, and this Augustine also drew on.⁷ The destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, of Troy by Greece, and of Rome by the barbarian invasions were shown as examples of this divine mechanism for the punishment of sinners.⁸ Legnano also found evidence of the destruction of sinners through warfare in his contemporary Italy, whose people “are in fever and are being subjected to trial,”⁹ comparing Bologna to Jerusalem in the Old Testament, “utterly changed and devastated ... for the innumerable offences of her inhabitants, and their mutual hatreds.”¹⁰ Like Legnano, a French theologian of the next century, Jean Gerson, views the French civil war from the same perspective as that prescribed by Augustine: a punishment from God resulting indirectly from the sins of the people.¹¹

Nevertheless, warfare should not seek to perpetuate this destructive state, but to arrive at peace by eliminating it. Legnano describes warfare as “a contention arising by reason of something discordant offered to human desire, tending to exclude the discordancy.”¹² Again, with reference to Augustine, he shows that wars, being a divine mechanism for the punishment of sinners, are directed at their correction and the achievement of peace, the universal good. Legnano repeats Augustine’s famous saying that “war is not sought that war may be practised but war is waged that peace may be sought,” emphasising the peace aimed at by war. He also

⁶Robert W. Dyson, *St. Augustine of Hippo : The Christian Transformation of Political Philosophy* (London : Continuum, 2005), 128.

⁷ Ibid., 123.

⁸ Ibid., 125; *De bello*, 227-28.

⁹ *De bello*, 228.

¹⁰ Ibid., 209.

¹¹ Brown, *Theology of Jean Gerson*, 119-20.

¹² *De bello*, 216-17.

declares, again quoting Augustine, that “wars are waged in order to bring the vanquished to the fellowship of piety and justice,” to show that just wars are not fought for the total annihilation of the enemy, but for the healing of the evil.¹³ The idea of a just war directed at peace and universal good can in turn be traced back to Plato and Cicero, whose ideas were a major influence on Augustine.¹⁴

Legnano’s discussion of just wars is supported by his definition of true fortitude, borrowed from Aristotle, which he says is aimed at the common good and not at any private gain.¹⁵ This is the emphasis of Augustine in his definition of just war. He asserted that just wars seek “common peace and safety” as opposed to unjust wars that are fought for the sake of violence and with cruelty and enmity, for vengeance, and desire for mastery, riches, praise and renown.¹⁶ Isidore of Seville, relying on Cicero, also underlined the difference between just and unjust wars by declaring that unjust wars “result from passion and not from lawful reason.”¹⁷ Aquinas, quoting Augustine declared that wars should not be fought with “greed or cruelty ..., the desire to do harm, [to take] vengeance, ... the lust to dominate” but with the aim of helping the good and securing peace.¹⁸ Accordingly, Ramon de Penyafort put down in his *Decretals* that in order for the war to be just the combatants should “be moved by a genuine desire for justice, not by hate or cupidity.”¹⁹

At the end of the day, intention in warfare distinguishes just war from the unjust: if it is waged with a view to the greater good rather than personal benefits

¹³ Ibid., 224-25.

¹⁴ Roland H. Bainton, *Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), 95-96, 37; Keen, *Laws of War*, 66.

¹⁵ *De bello*, 241.

¹⁶ Dyson, *Augustine*, 129, 117.

¹⁷ Keen, *Laws of War*, 66.

¹⁸ Dyson, *Aquinas*, 241.

¹⁹ Keen, *Laws of War*, 66-67.

and desires, then it is just war. This principle can be found applied to the use of violence in general: Jean de Gerson justifies anger only when passion is controlled by reason, that is if anger is directed towards recovering a right and doing justice and not towards inflicting damage on somebody.²⁰ Use of violence in self-defence is also justified by these criteria. Although Augustine asserted that one cannot fight even in self-defence “without passion, self-assertion and a loss of love,”²¹ Legnano held that it involves charity and love towards oneself, and thus has the right intent for war. He further discussed that fighting in self-defence cannot be forbidden by divine law as it is not forbidden by canon law, showing Gratian’s justification of it, not in spite of but in reliance on Augustine’s writings, and his emphasis on the importance of good intentions. Hence, if one is acting with humility to defend oneself, then one is justified.²² Although the very austere Bernard of Clairvaux saw self-defence as the killing of one’s soul and an evil thing,²³ self-defence clearly passed on as a lawful form of fighting in canon law, as we can also see that it is recognized by the thirteenth-century canonists, Innocent IV and Ramon de Penyafort.²⁴ Thomas Aquinas also justified war in self-defence on the grounds of right intent: he asserted that as long as the act of self-defence had the objective of a public good, or was not moved by private feelings of hatred or vengeance, it was just.²⁵ Like Legnano he dismissed interpretations of Scriptures that seemed to forbid self-defence, such as ‘avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath’, in *Romans* 12, on the grounds that the Scriptures do not condemn the act of self-defence itself, but

²⁰ Brown, *Theology of Jean Gerson*, 135, 137, 299, n.125.

²¹ Bainton, *Christian Attitudes toward War*, 97.

²² *De bello*, 279-80.

²³ *De laude novae militiae*.

²⁴ Keen, *Laws of War*, 67.

²⁵ Aquinas, 264-65, 241.

wrongful intent, vengeance in this case.²⁶ Maurice Keen explains such an extension of the definition of just war to include self-defence with the need to give the right to individuals “in a society in which large scale violence was an everyday problem.”²⁷ However, this is perhaps an explanation too far, as justifications of self-defence under certain circumstances persist to the present day in most systems of law.

Thus, the Augustinian idea of just warfare renders it a mechanism of justice that is aimed at the common good, as well as at the punishment of the evildoers. Augustine, reiterated by both Legnano (and also Aquinas), stated that “ ‘Wars are called lawful which avenge injuries,’ that is, excesses of offences, ‘so a people or a city must be made to suffer which has neglected to punish the wrong-doing of its own men.’ ”²⁸ We can follow the definition of just war as a mechanism of justice through the works of canon lawyers and theologians at least up to the age of Grotius. While Gratian’s *Decretum* and the *Decretals* of Ramon de Penyafort defined wars as a remedy for the injuries of person, right or possessions, Grotius in the seventeenth century asserted that in the absence of other mechanisms of justice, warfare was the essential mechanism for inflicting punishment on those causing injuries.²⁹

The definition of just war as a mechanism for rendering justice to the injured and oppressed could be transposed to the duty of warriors to defend them. The notion of the divine duty of knights came to be promoted in the recognition of the three orders of society and their functions during the early eleventh century. This division placed the duty for the protection of the defenceless and the Church on knights. The establishment of this duty of knighthood can be seen in parallel to the movement of

²⁶ Ibid., 265; *De bello*, 279.

²⁷ Keen, *Laws of War*, 68.

²⁸ *De bello*, 226; See also Aquinas, 240-41.

²⁹ Keen, *Laws of War*, 66-67; Michael Donelan, “Grotius and the Image of War,” *Millenium* 12 (1983), 233-35.

the Peace of God in the Church.³⁰ A movement led by bishops in the south of France, then spreading into the north, the Peace of God movement, and subsequently the perhaps less ambitious Truce of God, aimed to restrict the violence caused by the men of competing local lords, by prohibiting pillage and massacre, and primarily aimed at protecting the Church and churchmen, as well as the defenceless poor.³¹ While the movement may have resulted in some success, the following campaigns of the crusade to rally errant knights to the cause of God and to prevent pillage and robbery in the countryside shows that the security of non-combatants from the effects of warfare needed to be addressed frequently during the Middle Ages.³²

This is also evident in that it was a common theme in the writings of ecclesiastics in the twelfth century. John of Salisbury, a secretary to two archbishops of Canterbury — one being Thomas Becket — and eventually bishop of Chartres himself, was perhaps the most important political theologian of the twelfth century, especially notable for his original treatise on politics, *Policraticus*.³³ He was important in elaborating on this divine duty of knights, presenting the ceremony of dubbing to knighthood as conferring on them this divine duty, describing the way knights received their sword from the altar.³⁴ Accordingly, he set out the duties of soldiers, as he defines them, as defending against injuries to the poor and bringing peace to the country, as well as protecting the Church and the clergy. Hence those

³⁰ Keen, *Chivalry*, 28; Jean Flori, *L'Essor de la chevalerie, XI^e-XII^e siècles* (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1986), 232-33.

³¹ James Turner Johnson, "Historical Roots and Sources of the Just War Tradition in Western Culture," in *Just War and Jihad: Historical and Theoretical Perspectives on War and Peace in Western and Islamic Traditions*, ed. John Kelsay and James Turner Johnson (Greenwood Press: New York, 1991), 12-13; H.E.J. Cowdrey, "The Peace and the Truce of God in the Eleventh Century" *The Past and Present* 46 (Feb., 1970) : 42-67.

³² Keen, *Chivalry*, 48-49.

³³ Canning, *History of Medieval Political Thought*, 111.

³⁴ Flori, *Essor de la chevalerie*, 288, 331-33.

who did not obey the requirements of this divine duty could not belong to the military Order.³⁵

Several other ecclesiastical writing around the same period as John of Salisbury also remarked on this duty and often drew contrasts with the conduct of their contemporary knights: Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter the Venerable, Peter of Blois, Alain de Lille, Etienne de Fougères and others all harped on the same idea that those who turn against defenceless people by abusing them cannot belong in the Order of knighthood for that Order is given the divine duty to defend them.³⁶

Long before this elaboration on the duty of the Order of knighthood, Augustine had praised the protection of the defenceless from the violence of warfare as a Christian virtue pertaining to Christian warriors. Significantly, he made this comment with regard to the conduct of the barbarian invaders of the Roman Empire, who, unlike the Romans, spared the lives of the civilians, which according to Augustine, was due to the barbarians' Christian virtue. However, the idea of protecting the defenceless from the effects of war went back to Cicero and Plato, on whom Augustine drew, arguing that the innocent should be spared from the effects of war. Augustine also justified the protection of the innocent in warfare within the definition of just war, which should seek the punishment of the wicked but the sparing of the righteous.³⁷ Aquinas likewise finds good reason to spare civilians from the abuse of warfare, arguing that just war seeks to fight the sinners who corrupt the common good, but not the innocent who preserve and advance it.³⁸

³⁵ *Policraticus*, 116 (6:8).

³⁶ Flori, *Essor de la chevalerie*, 331-38.

³⁷ Bainton, *Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace*, 38, 41-42, 97; Dyson, *Augustine*, 125; Robert W. Dyson, *The Pilgrim City: Social and Political Ideas in the Writings of St. Augustine of Hippo* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2001), 134-35, 161-68.

³⁸ *Aquinas*, 261.

We can parallel this ecclesiastical criticism of indiscriminate warfare with the developments in canon-law that prohibited violence towards civilians. In the *Decretum*, Gratian asserted that “pilgrims, clerics, monks, women and the unarmed poor” should be protected from the violence of war. Moreover, in *De treuga et pace* promulgated by Gregory IX in the early thirteenth century, which was also included in the *Decretals* compiled by Ramon de Penyafort, apart from the churchmen (clerics, monks, friars and other religious persons) pilgrims, travellers, merchants and peasants were ordered to be immune from violence, for the reason that they have nothing to do with war by virtue of their occupation.³⁹

In accordance with the divine duty of knights was often found also criticism of their worldly behaviour, especially concerning their love of luxuries and pride. Bernard of Clairvaux, the Cistercian reformer who preached the second crusade, went to extremes in this criticism, as he condemned the worldliness of secular knighthood in contrast with his praise of the austerity of the recently constituted religious military Order of the knights of the Temple.⁴⁰ He criticises secular knights for fighting with unreasoned anger, for their desire for vainglory or worldly goods, all sinful motives that should not pertain to knights.⁴¹ John of Salisbury, although not so extreme in denouncing secular knighthood, asserted that it is commanded by God that soldiers should not serve with anger, vanity, avarice, or by their private will, but for public utility and justice.⁴² He also criticised the seeking the pleasures as most inappropriate for soldiers because it caused military vigour to decline and led to defeat.⁴³ The inappropriateness of luxury and pride to the office of knighthood can

³⁹ Meron, *Henry's Wars*, 91-92, Also see 91, n.65, 92, n.68.

⁴⁰ *De laude novae militiae*; G.R. Evans, *Bernard of Clairvaux* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 156-57; Flori, *Essor de la chevalerie*, 210.

⁴¹ *De laude novae militiae*.

⁴² *Policraticus*, 116 (6:8).

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 112-13; 122-23.

also be found in the works of other twelfth-century clerical authors, both regular and secular, such as Orderic Vitalis, William of Tyre, Peter de Blois, Henry of Huntingdon, and so on.⁴⁴ This association of these vices with lethargy and military failure was an idea that could be drawn from Augustine, who explains the military defeats of Rome with the loss of military vigour, due to the comfort and pleasures of a prolonged peace, though Augustine in turn could draw on the ideas of Plato, Aristotle and the Stoic school, and was in any case a commonplace in Roman writers.⁴⁵

The idea that the love of luxury and pride, which is not fit for knights to have, will cause military downfall could often be used to explain defeats, especially when the war itself was believed to be just. Both Bernard of Clairvaux and John of Salisbury attributed the defeat of the second crusade to the sins of the warriors, though from different perspectives. Whereas Bernard of Clairvaux saw it as a demonstration of divine wrath on secular knights, John of Salisbury viewed the sins of warriors during the second crusade, or in other contemporary wars, as undermining their discipline and vigour, though the punishment of this failing was still associated with the divine will.⁴⁶ We can also find similar explanations, for example in the chronicles of Fulcher of Chartres, Henry of Huntingdon, Roger of Wendover and Guillaume de Nangis, as well as in poetry written from the eleventh to the fourteenth century.⁴⁷

It is significant that we find similar explanations in both the French and the English chroniclers' responses to military defeats during the Hundred Years' War.

⁴⁴ Keen, *Chivalry*, 233; Flori, *Essor de la chevalerie*, 333-34.

⁴⁵ Dyson, *Augustine*, 123-25. When John of Salisbury takes on the same theme in *Policraticus*, he refers to Juvenal's *Saturae: Policraticus*, 112-13 (6:6). Also see 112, n. 15.

⁴⁶ Evans, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 169; Flori, *Essor de la chevalerie*, 285. See John of Salisbury's criticism concerning contemporary wars in *Policraticus*, Chapters, 6, 16.

⁴⁷ De Vries, "God and Defeat in Medieval Warfare," 91-96.

While the Carmelite friar Jean de Venette, the Benedictine monk Francis Beaumont and the Monk of St. Denis all relate the defeats of the French to their sins, an anonymous English chronicle found the same reason for an English defeat.⁴⁸ While these interpretations of military defeats support the idea that the sinful side will be defeated in battle, this was not exactly what Augustine had maintained. In contrast, he had argued that “victory does not always go to the just,” with the example of how the people of Cannae suffered at the hands of Hannibal, who was known for his pride and greed, and who was not defeated until later.⁴⁹ While Augustine had accepted that war might also cause the righteous to suffer along with those unrighteous who deserved it, he maintained that in turn this would strengthen the faith of the righteous and test their perseverance.⁵⁰ In the early fifteenth century, this was explained by a French abbot as follows: “According to the Holy Scripture, [God] sometimes gives victory to the good, sometimes to the wicked, not by chance or hazard, but for reasons and causes which are very good, even though they may not seem constant or intelligible to men.”⁵¹ He repeats also the much-quoted line, that can be seen also in Bernard of Clairvaux, that God, as evidenced from the battles of Maccabees, can make small numbers win against multitudes because all things in battle are willed by Him.⁵²

A most important aspect of just wars was that they be waged by a lawful authority. This lawful authority could be agreed to be the prince, as expressed by

⁴⁸ Kaeuper in the introduction to *Book of Chivalry*, 18-19; De Vries, “God and Defeat in Medieval Warfare,” 95.

⁴⁹ Dyson, *Pilgrim City*, 134, 152-54. See also St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 3:18-22. In the late Middle Ages we can find Hannibal’s sins interpreted as reasons for his downfall by the ecclesiastical author Jean de Gerson, or by the lay authors Geoffrey de Charny and Christine de Pizan. For Jean de Gerson, see Brown, *Theology of Jean Gerson*, 126-28; for Charny, see Chapter Three, and for Pizan Chapter Five of this dissertation.

⁵⁰ Dyson, *Augustine*, 125.

⁵¹ Allmand, *Society at War*, 42.

⁵² *Ibid.*; *De laudae novae militiae*. For the same argument made by Charny in *Livre de chevalerie*, see Chapter Three.

John of Salisbury where the prince is the minister of God on earth for the purpose of serving the common good and doing justice by punishing all injuries and wrongs.⁵³ Legnano declares that just warfare could only be declared by princes, whose jurisdiction surpassed all others. This statement assumed that other persons were subject to the authority of the prince for the administration of justice, while princes were subject to no one.⁵⁴ Augustine had explained that “the natural order that seeks the peace of mortal men ordains that a prince should have the authority to wage war if he thinks fit ... for the common peace and safety.”⁵⁵ Aquinas reiterated Augustine’s argument and added that “since the care of the commonwealth is entrusted to princes ... it pertains to them to use the sword of war to protect the commonwealth against enemies from without” as it is against troublemakers from within, hence describing princes as the ultimate givers of justice. He finds the evidence for divine commandments on this in *Romans* 13:4, which declares, “He beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil” and to *Psalms* 82:4 that orders princes to “deliver the poor and needy: rid them out of the hand of the wicked.”⁵⁶

The fact that wars were waged by the just authority also justified certain conduct that could seem contradictory with other aspects of the definition of just wars. The issue of the spoils of war was one of these. Whereas harming civilians was found to be contradictory to the aim of just wars and the duty of knights, taking spoils from them (at the expense of their well-being) was nevertheless justified depending on the justness of the authority who was waging the war. Augustine distinguished robbery from the right to spoils by virtue of the nature of the war: he

⁵³ *Policraticus*, 31 (4:2).

⁵⁴ *De bello*, 234.

⁵⁵ Dyson, *Augustine*, 129.

⁵⁶ *Aquinas*, 255, 240. The quotations are from 240.

contended that, although it was sinful to fight only for spoils, the despoilers were committing a crime only if the war was unjust. He asserted that it is otherwise lawful to take spoils in the wars of princes, because these wars are aimed at justice and the common good. Ambrose too, had contended that the spoils belonged to the ruler. In turn, Aquinas expressed these ideas as a part of a fully fledged opinion on the spoils of war. He drew the line between the lawfulness and unlawfulness of spoils on the grounds of the justness of the war, and also saw that, as the spoils of war belonged to the prince, they should also be distributed by him.⁵⁷

Canon lawyers, such as Gratian in the twelfth and Johannes Andreas in the early fourteenth century, also confirmed the relationship between the justness of the war and the lawfulness of spoils in Christian wars.⁵⁸ Ramon de Penyafort set out clearly that, provided that the war is just, i.e. waged by just authority, the burning of houses and villages or the taking of spoils from them was just.⁵⁹ In parallel with canon law, the study of Roman Law by civil lawyers also showed the taking of spoils in public wars to be just.⁶⁰ By turning this argument on its head, the late medieval canon and civil lawyers, Nicholas of Tudeschi and Bartholomew of Saliceto, condemned the companies of men who looted the countryside as committing the crime of robbery on the grounds that the war they were waging was not declared by a just authority.⁶¹ Bartholomew of Saliceto also declared that the spoils, which belonged to the prince, should be distributed in accordance with consideration of the common good for which the public wars were waged. Hence, no private soldier could claim spoils for himself before they were given permission by the prince or the

⁵⁷ Aquinas, 217-19.

⁵⁸ Keen, *Laws of War*, 70.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 64-65.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 70.

⁶¹ Ibid., 65, 69.

commander.⁶² In accordance with all of this, and with frequent references to the laws of Innocent III, Legnano affirms that, in a public war waged on the authority of a prince, the spoils of war belong to the prince by reason of the superiority of his jurisdiction, and in other just wars they should be presented to whomever is the superior authority. And by reason of the superiority of this jurisdiction of whoever wages the war, all things captured in war need to be approved by his authority to become the property of the captor.⁶³

While captives were also considered as spoils of war, the Christian practice regarding captives was seen to have to differ from the Roman one by virtue of Christian charity and mercy. The view that it was unchristian to enslave captives due to Christian mercy and charity was established by the canon-lawyers, Ramon de Penyafort and Johannes Andreas, possibly drawing on the opinion of Augustine.⁶⁴ After all, it was he who had praised the Christian virtue in the barbarians' humility and mercy towards the Romans who took sanctuary in the churches and asserted that their liberty was preserved, unlike the conquered people Romans took mercilessly into slavery.⁶⁵ Accordingly, Legnano asserts that even though the Roman laws declare that in public wars waged by princes, captives become slaves, according to Christian practice and modern customs people cannot be enslaved or sold.⁶⁶ He also argues that unless there is the risk of the disturbance of peace, "mercy should be shown to persons captured in a lawful war."⁶⁷ Although it is not mentioned by Legnano, the practice of taking ransom replaced the ancient custom of slavery in

⁶² Ibid., 144-45.

⁶³ *De bello*, 269.

⁶⁴ Keen, *Laws of War*, 137.

⁶⁵ Dyson, *Pilgrim City*, 165-68.

⁶⁶ *De bello*, 269-70.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 274.

response to the question of what should be done with captives in war.⁶⁸ Although the decretals forbid the taking of money from prisoners — yet not its payment by the captive to his captor⁶⁹ — ransom was considered as one of the major spoils of war.⁷⁰ Hence, we can see attempts on the part of ecclesiastics to regulate the practice of ransom. During the Hundred years war we can find letters of the Popes, Gregory IX and Innocent VI, to Edward III about moderating the amounts of ransoms to be taken from his prisoners, which attest at least to a *de facto* justification of moderate ransom in ecclesiastical opinion.⁷¹

The use of tricks in warfare, also an issue that may seem to contrast with the good intentions that should trigger the waging of wars, was also something that was justified on the basis of the justness of wars. Augustine held the position that as soon as the war's cause is just, it does not matter if the war is carried out openly or not. He gave the evidence of Joshua laying ambush to his enemies by the command of God. Aquinas agreed with Augustine, yet he argued, drawing on Ambrose, that the use of deceit against the enemy should not be contrary to agreements formerly made with the enemy.⁷² Legnano basically repeats what they are saying to establish that even if it is sinful to deceive the enemy after making certain promises, it is totally lawful to keep some things secret when there is no such promise.⁷³

Returning to the question of the just authority in the waging of wars, there can be seen a considerable effort to put the princes under the direction of the Church. Aquinas had expressed the idea that the rule of princes, in order that it should be “towards heavenly goods”, should be subject to the papacy, the Vicar of Christ, even

⁶⁸ Ibid., 137. Keen, *Laws of War*, 137.

⁶⁹ *Tree of Battles*, 152.

⁷⁰ Keen, *Laws of War*, 145.

⁷¹ Ibid., 158. Also see 158, n.6.

⁷² Aquinas, 246.

⁷³ *De bello*, 271.

though the princes have “the supreme ruling power in human affairs.”⁷⁴ Aegidius Romanus (Giles of Rome), a disciple of Aquinas, prior general of the Augustinian Order and an archbishop of Bourges, in *De ecclesiastica potestate*, emphasised that rulers have the duty to maintain good order and propriety by the “exercise [of the] judgement of blood” by virtue of the need that they assist the spiritual powers, who by the nature of their office cannot perform this work without secular aid.⁷⁵ Yet both Aquinas and Aegidius Romanus show the precepts for the governance of independent secular states in their works, Aquinas in *Summa theologiae* and *De regimine principum* and Aegidius Romanus in his *De regimine principum*, “the most influential medieval example of the mirror-of-princes *genre*.”⁷⁶

There really was no attempt to reconcile the arguments for the superiority of jurisdiction wielded by the prince with that of papal supremacy over all powers by virtue of the Pope’s being the Vicar of Christ on Earth. Keen attributes this to a compromise made by papal apologists to defend individual secular jurisdictions against those who would argue for the superiority of imperial jurisdiction.⁷⁷ Despite the fact that Legnano supports the idea of the supremacy of the Pope as well as that of the position of the emperor as “secular head, having no superior in secular matters,” he does not evoke any conflict between the idea of papal supremacy and the authority of princes to wage wars.⁷⁸ Although he makes it clear that secular powers cannot wage war against the Church, because, among several reasons, it is from where they take their authority to declare war, he does not elaborate on it to the

⁷⁴ Aquinas, 41-42.

⁷⁵ Aegidius Romanus, *De ecclesiastica potestate*, trans. Arthur P. Monahan (Lewinston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1990) [Hereafter *Ecclesiastica potestate*], 161-63.

⁷⁶ Canning, *History of Medieval Political Thought*, 133.

⁷⁷ Keen, *Laws of War*, 76.

⁷⁸ *De bello*, 231-33. He also declares that wars against the infidels should be waged by papal authority only.

point of making it contradict his earlier statements.⁷⁹ Likewise, in the thirteenth century, Pope Innocent IV declared that it only pertains to sovereign princes to wage war as they are above the law, whereas Ramon de Penyafort regarded wars as lawful when either waged on the authority of the Church or that of a sovereign prince.⁸⁰

Even though some crusade preachers, like Bernard of Clairvaux, sometimes suggested that holy war was the only kind of just war to be waged by knights, general ecclesiastical opinion seemed to agree that crusade was only one kind of just war among others. In proof, Legnano justifies fighting against the infidels only on conditions that might make any other war legitimate: to punish them in case they are oppressing the Christians or to recover the rightful possessions of Christians from them.⁸¹ In accordance with this treatment of wars against infidels, he declares that warriors will receive salvation if they are fighting in holy wars or in other just wars provided that they do not commit any sin.⁸²

This reluctance to put obstacles in the way of secular rulers' authority to wage war partly stems from the already established separation between those who pray and those who fight. Initially stated by Augustine in the form that the clergy should not engage in warfare but do the spiritual work only,⁸³ this idea would become widely acknowledged, despite the fact that fighting clergymen were not uncommon, especially until Gregory VII promoted "the idea of knighthood as an order with a Christian vocation in the church's service." The papal apologist, Bonizo of Sutri, argued, as Keen underlined, that "clerks should themselves abstain from the shedding of blood" and wrote down that " 'kings, magnates and knights, should ... be summoned to persecute schismatics and heretics and excommunicates with their

⁷⁹ Ibid., 234.

⁸⁰ Keen, *Laws of War*, 69, 67.

⁸¹ *De laude novae militiae; De bello*, 231-32.

⁸² *De bello*, 273.

⁸³ Aquinas, 244-45.

arms.’ ”⁸⁴ Despite Bernard of Clairvaux’s praise of the Templars for being girded with both of the swords, spiritual and temporal, ecclesiastical opinion was commonly for the separation of the offices of knighthood and clergy.⁸⁵

Penyafort in the *Decretals* confirmed that “clerks cannot justly engage in war”⁸⁶ and Aquinas, too, found it unfitting for them to kill, as it was at odds with their office, which is the “contemplation of divine things ... and praising God and offering prayers for the people.”⁸⁷ But, he says, it “pertains to clerics to dispose and lead other men to prosecute just wars.”⁸⁸ His disciple Aegidius Romanus, as aforesaid, also underlined the nature of the office of clerks as necessitating that they delegate such works to laymen.⁸⁹ Although Legnano establishes the authority of the Papacy over all lay governments, he nevertheless affirms with reference to Gratian and Innocent IV that clerks “may not make war in person but may do so vicarously” by means of encouraging secular persons to fight.⁹⁰ Hence, with the clear definition of these two pillars of the society as those who pray and those who fight, ecclesiastical authors pass on the idea that laymen will fight, while the clergy will direct them towards just wars.

While ecclesiastical opinion did not try to challenge the princes’ authority to wage war in respect of the existence of a superior papal power, it strongly strove to subvert private claims to be able to wage war, which were found to be backed by feudal traditions attributing to “any person who was of military status [hence a gentleman] ... the right to defy his enemies and levy war upon them.”⁹¹ This,

⁸⁴ Keen, *Chivalry*, 48.

⁸⁵ *De laude novae militiae*.

⁸⁶ Keen, *Laws of War*, 66.

⁸⁷ Aquinas, 244.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 245.

⁸⁹ *Ecclesiastica potestate*, 161-63.

⁹⁰ *De bello*, 231-32, 264.

⁹¹ Keen, *Laws of War*, 73.

understandably, was something that princes also wished to counteract. The feudal tradition obviously endangered the mechanism by which war was a means of doing public justice, by putting private interests before the common good.

Legnano asserts that just wars “may not be declared without the authority of a prince” for it would be a violation of his laws. He nevertheless criticises the fact that this is not the case in his own day as “every day wars are declared by one people against another, without asking the leave of any one.”⁹² The same statement was made by Aquinas, who confirmed that as “the care of the common good is entrusted to princes having public authority,” individuals cannot seek their own justice by killing wrongdoers instead of going to the courts of their superiors. Aquinas here relied on Augustine’s declaration that princes had the authority to wage war and the warriors were only their servants to act under their command.⁹³ John of Salisbury had also asserted that warriors should serve “in order that they may execute judgements assigned to them, according to which each attends not to his own but to ... equity and public utility” as it is willed by God and the people.⁹⁴ About a century later, Aegidius Romanus, in his *De regimine principum*, described knighthood as “ordained to defend the common profit of the city and of the kingdom” by a commission from the king or the prince. Hence, he argued, it is not proper to call knights those who do not fight for the common profit of the kingdom at the command of the prince.⁹⁵

By the same token, private combats that take place between individual knights for a variety of personal reasons came under discussion concerning their justness. Duels were discussed by Legnano after his discussion of wars and reprisals.

⁹² *De bello*, 234.

⁹³ *Aquinas*, 255-56, 240.

⁹⁴ *Policraticus*, 116 (6:8).

⁹⁵ *De regimine principum*, 396-97 (3:1) [all references in the parantheses are to book and chapter numbers].

He underlines that duels are distinguished from fights in self-defence — which also involve two men fighting — by virtue of their being deliberate on both sides. Although at the onset, duels seem to have nothing to do towards the common good, Legnano actually attempts to justify some kind of duels on this basis. He looks at three kinds of duels, those of hatred, glory and compurgation:⁹⁶ whereas he does not find anything justifiable in duels fought by hatred, for the reason that they are intended at extermination, he shows that he is more lenient towards those who fight for glory, as they serve a better end than that of extermination.⁹⁷ Legnano supports his argument in defence of duels fought for glory by reason that they “take place in a public spectacle for the pleasure and recreation of people.”⁹⁸ And here he would seem to be referring to duels in the context of tournaments and jousts, which I shall turn to shortly.

Legnano is clearly influenced by Aquinas and Augustine, who approved of glory and honour among other “extrinsic goods”, as Legnano calls them, sought in war — such as gain or pay — as they were closer to the objective of common good.⁹⁹ Aquinas laid down that “it is more tolerable ... to seek [honour] and glory than to desire riches or pursue pleasure.” In turn, his source was Augustine, who maintained that glory has some virtue about it in that it is seeking “to win the approval of good men and to avoid displeasing them.” Yet through both the Bible and ancient philosophers they also viewed seeking one’s own good as a vice that weakens the soul akin to ambition and presumption, as opposed to the virtuous act of seeking

⁹⁶ *De bello*, 331.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 335-36. The quotations are from 336.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 337.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 251.

justice, and declared that one should hope to earn heavenly glory rather than vainglory on earth.¹⁰⁰

The arguments about the objective of honour and glory in duels must have been about the justification for tournaments — which by Legnano's time were basically fought as a series of jousts — that was much discussed in this period. Tournaments had initially been condemned by Innocent II in the canons of the Council of Clermont in 1130, as well as in the canons of the Lateran councils in 1139 and 1179, for being foolish displays of strength and boldness ending in homicide and endangering the souls of men, with the sanction of denial of Christian burial. This position continued on to the *Decretals* of Gregory IX in the thirteenth century and appeared in the works of both Aquinas and Legnano.¹⁰¹ The primary reason that tournaments were condemned by ecclesiastical opinion was their nature of prompting the seven deadly sins: pride, avarice, envy, anger, lechery, gluttony, sloth. Although the papal ban was repeatedly stated and attracted a whole ecclesiastical literature pointing out the sinfulness of tournaments, it did come to be reduced to periodic bans during the thirteenth century and was finally lifted in the fourteenth century, possibly due to the impracticality of carrying it out effectively in the long-term and in such harsh terms, and also perhaps because tournaments themselves had become more stylised and less dangerous, as was mentioned in Chapter Two.¹⁰²

Legnano shows evidence of the evolution of tournaments in that direction, as he considers that, as much as duels are forbidden by all laws, the old laws (possibly

¹⁰⁰ Aquinas, 22-26. The quotations are from 23-24.

¹⁰¹ *De bello*, 340; Aquinas, 239-40.

¹⁰² Keen, *Chivalry*, 94-96; 84-87; Sidney Painter, *French Chivalry: Chivalric Ideas and Practices in Mediaeval France* (Johns Hopkins Press, 1940), 155, 47-51; Aquinas, 242, n.12. In 1316, the papal ban on tournaments was revoked in accordance with the earlier acceptance of tournaments by the local ecclesiastical authorities: Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 80. Philip the Fair of France tried to prohibit tournaments using the same criticisms used by the ecclesiastics, which basically repeated that they were vain and dangerous exercises. Yet the royal prohibition possibly stemmed from the fact that the tournaments exhausted the military energy of the men-at-arms at the expense of the wars of the king: Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, 216.

the Roman) permit bloodless fighting, as in men wrestling with their arms. Moreover, if it happens that blood is accidentally shed in a duel like this, it should be taken as unintentional.¹⁰³ This is obviously taken from Aquinas, who asserts that only martial contests that involve “slaying and looting,” are forbidden and not those that are held after the example of the ancients’ “armed practice” without bloodshed.¹⁰⁴ Hence, Augustine’s and Aquinas’s arguments that tolerated the search for honour and glory must have provided valid justifications for such a relaxation, when tournaments seemed to be such an accepted part of the aristocratic life. Legnano’s comments on duels fought for this purpose illustrate this further relaxation in the ecclesiastical attitude towards tournaments.

Duels fought as part of the processes of justice, which Legnano refers to as duels of compurgation, also find some justification in Legnano’s treatise. Yet these duels, are initially found to be strictly forbidden by all laws: by divine and canon laws because they tempt God by trying to make him work a miracle in attempting to make the weaker party win, and by the law of nations because they hinder the course of justice, as the stronger party may win even though his cause is unjust.¹⁰⁵ Legnano here is arguing against the custom of judicial combat. Keen declares that judicial combats were a part of the legal system in Europe whenever other legal processes did not suffice to deliver justice.¹⁰⁶ It is evident that duels were authorised by law when Legnano was writing as, after he condemns these combats, he recognizes nevertheless that Lombard law specifies some cases where they could be fought in the fashion of a “contentious trial in a civil or ecclesiastical court.”¹⁰⁷ Hence, he

¹⁰³ *De bello*, 240-41.

¹⁰⁴ *Aquinas*, 242. It is noted here that although Aquinas refers such an allusion to the antiquity to St. Jerome, he is actually referring to Vegetius: *ibid.*, 242, n. 13

¹⁰⁵ *De bello*, 342-43.

¹⁰⁶ Keen, *Laws of War*, 41.

¹⁰⁷ *De bello*, 346. The cases are explained in *ibid.*, 344-45.

presents a regulation of duels “as part of the processes of justice,” which means restricting them to particular instances that proceeded according to principles that followed from or imitated the practice of the courts. The matter of judicial combat will be discussed further in Chapter Five in relation to the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières.

As the ecclesiastical position on duels shows, the main argument in definition of the justness of any fighting is the good and justice rendered by it. The authority of the prince, as shown, is crucial to the establishment of this, as sovereign princes are divinely commissioned to execute justice and maintain the common good. While it is also accepted that individuals can seek justice or benefit the common good in some cases by fighting, at the end of the day the fear is that they will nevertheless be conditioned by private motives.

At the end of the day, all the arguments concerning just war concentrate on the aim of the common good, which in turn rely on Aristotle’s discussion of the true fortitude, which basically maintains the view that in order that an action should be virtuous, it should be aimed at a higher good than an individual one. True fortitude then should be something that serves the common good. Aquinas drew on Aristotle’s arguments and, like Cicero and the Stoics, extended the limits of the definition of true fortitude beyond the military.¹⁰⁸ Aegidius Romanus, an author who transmitted Aristotelian political ideas to the Middle Ages in his *De regimine principum*,¹⁰⁹ also discussed true fortitude, which he defined to be administered by wisdom and directed at the common good.¹¹⁰ What can be understood from these discussions is that

¹⁰⁸Craig Steven Titus, *Resilience and the Virtue of Fortitude: Aquinas in Dialogue with the Psychosocial Sciences* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2006), 172-75.

¹⁰⁹Canning, *History of Medieval Political Thought*, 133.

¹¹⁰*De regimine principum*, 394-99 (3: 1-2).

fortitude that is accompanied by prudence, temperance and justice, thus directed towards the common good, is virtuous.

Legnano also discusses true fortitude at length, and asserts that it is not a physical virtue but a moral one directed towards the public good, that should be accompanied with temperance towards pleasurable things and feelings, and with prudence concerning the actions in warfare. Hence he gives the portrait of a warrior who will restrain himself in pleasures and feelings that do not contribute to the goodness of the cause he is fighting, and will fight prudently according to the “dictation of reason.” In that context, he considers if it is best for warriors to attack, flee or wait, and gives the decision that they should choose the one which best fits the situation, hence which is the most prudent action to take. For example, he gives the example of attacking a thousand men with only one as not true bravery, but audacity, and asserts that it will only be applauded by the vulgar.¹¹¹

Hence, the definitions of ‘true fortitude,’ borrowed from Aristotle, can be thought to promote a certain way of behaviour in warfare, that is one of self-discipline and prudence and directed at the common good. Although these were also inherent in the definition of just war, they also overlap with the Roman virtues that are praised in Roman books concerning military warfare. Their teaching of military strategy, discipline and the aim of justice and common good in warfare matches exactly the precepts of true fortitude. Likewise, Aristotle had maintained that something is virtuous or honourable when it renders a common good. Legnano justifies the seeking of honour in acts of fortitude on the grounds that those who seek

¹¹¹ *De bello*, 244-45, 248-49, 252. The quotations are from 252.

honour “do more towards public good.”¹¹² This also agrees with the Roman emphasis on the honour to be acquired from fighting for the common good.

The Roman ideal exists side by side with the Aristotelian in Legnano, through references both to Roman classics and to codes of Roman law. His main reference for Roman military teaching is Vegetius’s *De re militari*. After he discusses the terms of just war, he passes on to how it should be conducted, for which he refers mainly to Vegetius. Here his main emphasis — as it will be in his discussion of Aristotle’s true fortitude that immediately follows this section — is the need for discipline and wisdom directed at the common good in warfare. Yet here he has a different perspective from that of the individual warrior in Aristotle. The focus is clearly on the general, who has the office to command his men with discipline and strategy towards the benefit of the emperor and the common good.¹¹³ According to this point of view, the soldiers, “since the commonwealth cherishes and supports them, ... ought to devote themselves to the public interests alone, and do their service by preparing themselves for war by the daily practice of arms; and so they ought to obey their generals, because, if they disobey their commands, even in a good cause, they are punished with death none the less.”¹¹⁴

Legnano was not the first ecclesiastical author to make use of Roman military precepts in his discussion of warfare. Although Aquinas occasionally made references to Roman authorities on issues on warfare — for example concerning the need to choose labourers for soldiers (with reference to Vegetius);¹¹⁵ or the importance of strategy in warfare (with reference to Frontinus’s *Strategmata*)¹¹⁶ — John of Salisbury and Aegidius Romanus were the most important authors in the

¹¹² Ibid., 250-51.

¹¹³ Ibid., 235-38, 253.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 236.

¹¹⁵ Aquinas, 51-52.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 246.

dissemination of Roman military teaching to medieval audiences. John of Salisbury is remarkable for his use of Roman authors in *Policraticus* at a time when medieval knowledge about their works was limited.¹¹⁷ He quotes heavily from Vegetius and Frontinus, as well as from other Roman authors, especially in the sixth book of *Policraticus*, where he deals with the “armed hand” of the republic. He praised Roman military discipline as making them conquerors of the world,¹¹⁸ and recommended the Roman military authorities, and especially Vegetius as he “most elegantly and diligently teaches the art of military affairs”, for consultation by “anyone who wishes to learn how to fight.”¹¹⁹ The main emphases concerning military issues are the need for soldiers’ discipline, training, payment and obedience to the prince in their service to the commonwealth. Discipline, according to him is associated much with abstinence from luxuries and comfort and with strict punishment after the example of the Romans.¹²⁰ In this he underlined the importance of the duty of the commander as executing discipline in the army towards the aim of protecting the common good, and the need that the commander should be accomplished in his duty.¹²¹ The soldiers, in the Roman fashion, are to be bound by an oath to the prince to serve him. His description of the oath of obedience, regarded by John of Salisbury as a part of a ceremony that bestows the privileges of the occupation upon the soldier, is interesting for containing both spiritual tones and the emphasis on the duty to the prince and the common good. This description of the oath, which would influence several works on knighthood, points out that knights are given the divine duty to defend the common good under obedience to the princes who were divinely created. Whereas we can see the echoes of this in *Lancelot do*

¹¹⁷ *Policraticus*, xx-xi.

¹¹⁸ *Statesman’s Book*, 6:14 [all references are to book and chapter numbers].

¹¹⁹ *Policraticus*, 124 (6:19).

¹²⁰ See mainly *Policraticus*, Book 6.

¹²¹ *Statesman’s Book*, 6:14-15.

Lac, Ramon Llull and in Charny, John refers it back to the Romans through the authority of Vegetius.¹²²

Yet, as much as John of Salisbury taught how military learning, discipline and strategy made the Romans the conquerors of the world, he did not abandon the underlying principle of just war — that all wars are ordained by God and thus controlled by Him — out of the discussion. While he held that those corrupted with luxury and pride will be destroyed by God's judgement on them, by reference to examples from ancient history, he also maintained that the Romans were victorious as long as they fought against luxury in the army by means of discipline.¹²³ Hence he associated the sins of warriors, as discussed above, with their lack of military discipline. Although the point about the Romans' falling into lethargy and luxury and becoming militarily ineffective can be traced back to Augustine, here John uses a reference not to Augustine, but to Juvenal, the Roman poet of the late first and second centuries. While John of Salisbury maintains that the Romans won against multitudes of enemies as long as their warriors were trained, disciplined and unyielding to luxuries, which Vegetius taught to be an important criteria in choosing men-at-arms, John of Salisbury also quotes from the Old Testament to show that God chose as His soldiers those who were not inclined towards luxury and (thus) brought victory to a small number of warriors against multitudes.¹²⁴ At the end of the day, even though he asserts the need for human skill and training for military victory,¹²⁵ he nevertheless maintains that conquests are made by the permission of God, without which there is no power to overcome enemies.¹²⁶

¹²² *Ibid.*, 114-15 (6:7).

¹²³ *Statesman's Book*, 6:14.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 110-12 (6: 2, 6).

¹²⁵ *Policraticus*, 123 (6:19).

¹²⁶ *Statesman's Book*, 6:17.

Aegidius Romanus's *De regimine principum* was also an important source in the Middle Ages for learning about Roman military writing, especially that of Vegetius, in its last part entitled "The rule of the kingdom in time of war."¹²⁷ By combining Aristotle's teaching on true fortitude with references to Vegetius, Aegidius defined chivalry as "a wise manner of deeds of battles ordained for the common profit."¹²⁸ Like John of Salisbury, he discusses issues that can be put broadly under training, discipline, and the use of wisdom, strategy and techniques in warfare, where he asserts that it pertained to kings and princes to learn about the ways to overcome the enemy, with the objective of protecting the peace and the common profit.¹²⁹ Like John of Salisbury and Legnano, he also brought up the importance of commanders in maintaining order and discipline in the army after the example of the old times, so that there will be no confusion in battle.¹³⁰ He also made the same references, already made by John of Salisbury and Aquinas, regarding men unaccustomed to luxuries making better soldiers and on small numbers of men with learning and discipline defeating multitudes, but here in far more detail and without any criticism of contemporaries.¹³¹ Again, there is more in Aegidius Romanus's *De regimine principum* than there had been in *Policraticus* on such military issues as the Romans' early military training of their children, the need to use strategems such as the building of ditches and castles in war (which was something Aquinas also mentioned in his *De regimine principum*),¹³² the need to use advice and calculation

¹²⁷ *De Regimine Principum*, xxviii.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 397 (3:1) [my translation from the Middle English translation of Trevisa].

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, Book III. For the statement on the need of kings to learn about warfare, see *ibid.*, 439 (3:23).

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 411-12 (3:10).

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 402-3 (3:5-6).

¹³² *Ibid.*, 399(3:3), 407-8 (3:8) ; Dyson, *Aquinas*, 45-52.

before going to war,¹³³ and various technical and strategical details, such as who should conduct sieges and assaults, the supply of provisions, etc.¹³⁴

Aegidius Romanus's work is essentially different from *Policraticus* in the extent of its coverage of military strategy and tactics, something that had received relatively brief remarks in *Policraticus*, in spite of John of Salisbury's extensive use of Frontinus's *Strategemata*.¹³⁵ In another way too, Aegidius's work differs. It does not include any of the commonplace criticisms of luxury and pride leading to defeat, which are found in John of Salisbury in connection with military discipline. Aegidius places great emphasis on knowledge and judgement, asserting that it is inadvisable to leave oneself to Fortune when fighting. Rather, it was necessary to think of everything.¹³⁶ Hence, this work reflects more a strictly pragmatic Roman point of view on warfare, rather than the blend of Roman and Christian thought, including the moralistic aspects of both, as in *Policraticus*.

In the light of the above discussion about Legnano's treatment of warfare and knighthood in his *De bello* and the tracing of its components back to earlier works of theology and canon law, we can infer that there was no very substantial change in ecclesiastical views about warfare from the late Roman Empire to the late fourteenth century, although there was a progressive elaboration of them and a particularly consistent picture from the mid-twelfth to the late fourteenth century. So far, we can say that the ecclesiastical view on warfare was mostly based on a Christian just war theory that goes back to Augustine, a theory that was basically built on the authority of Scriptures as well as of ancient philosophers led by Plato, Aristotle and Cicero.

¹³³ *De regimine principum*, 409-10 (3:9).

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 415-39 (3:12-23).

¹³⁵ Although John of Salisbury refers to Frontinus several times in Book Six where he talks about the armed hand of the republic, as well as in the other parts of the book, he barely mentions war plans and strategy in *Policraticus*, 124 (6:19).

¹³⁶ *De regimine principum*, 409 (3:9).

This, as has been suggested at the beginning of the chapter, is not a negative view of warfare. On the contrary, it largely deals with regulating warfare and the conduct of warriors within the limits of just wars, and dominated by concerns for the common good. While we can fit all criticisms and clerical teachings on the conduct of warfare and on warriors within the arguments about just war, they are not purely theoretical arguments, but often pointed to actual military practice as much as they could, perhaps partly at least in response to the precepts of romance view of knighthood that we examined earlier.

We can also recognize in ecclesiastical works, at least by the late-twelfth century, the routine use of Roman military ideas, in praising faithful military service to the prince in defence of the commonwealth, military learning, discipline and the use of strategy and stratagems. Roman military teaching posed no real conflict with the theology of just war. This is not surprising if we remember that the theory of just war itself was basically a Christian adaptation of Roman thought about war. Hence Roman military teaching is used to some extent independently of the theory of just war as a recommended basis for how warfare should be conducted once a just war is undertaken, though it is presented within the framework of the theory of just war so as not to distance war from its divine origins or to present it as something that is entirely dependent on human power and skills. Yet, we can hardly assume that the Romans had viewed warfare as unaffected by divine intervention either, or think of a divorce of divine providence from discussions about warfare until well into the modern period, if then.

The ecclesiastical view of warfare, developed mainly from thought about just war, is basically not a criticism of war, but a statement about the form of warfare that is divinely acceptable. While I have already noted that the romance view of warfare

also saw it in the context of the divine acceptance of war and warlike acts, this was different. While the ecclesiastical view strove to call knights to particular conduct in warfare, so as to receive the approval of God, who ordains and directs all warfare, the romance view largely maintained that God particularly approved of prowess and by His approval sanctioned all the honourable feats of knights. While the ecclesiastical view started with the notion that war was a divinely ordained mechanism for punishing sins, the romance view saw it more as an opportunity for knights to obtain praise. Ecclesiastical opinion started from the perspective of analysing the nature of war in relation God and the common good, the romance view looked at everything from the perspective of the knights themselves. Yet both aimed, in one sense, at the same thing: the legitimization and the teaching of particular types of conduct in warfare, and these somewhat influenced one another due to a flow of ideas in both directions.

CHAPTER V

THE REVISED IDEALS OF KNIGHTHOOD IN THE LATE MIDDLE AGES: HONORÉ BOUVET, CHRISTINE DE PIZAN, AND PHILIPPE DE MÉZIÈRES

While there were reciprocal influences between the medieval lay and ecclesiastical spheres concerning ideas on warfare and knighthood, an outside lay authority also affected perspectives on knighthood and warfare. As has been shown, Roman military opinion, largely based as it was perceived in the Middle Ages on Vegetius's *De re militari*, had already become a part of the ecclesiastical discussions of warfare, which otherwise had been dominated by arguments concerning 'just war' (also itself a subject of non-Christian Roman thought). These Roman ideas, however, now came to establish themselves not only in works of theology or canon law appealing to the academic reader, but also in works that can be classified as books of chivalry, which had been previously under the influence of

the romance view of knighthood to a great extent. The influence of romances in shaping the ideals of knighthood, which has been demonstrated to be still intact in late medieval French literature, came to be challenged in the late fourteenth century through an emphasis on Roman military teaching in books concerning knighthood. In this chapter, I want to discuss the existence of a new outlook on warfare and knighthood in this period, and one that was especially new for works that were ostensibly aimed at the reading of a lay audience rather than at learned academics or highly educated audiences. I shall try to delineate the common features within examples of this new outlook, and also try to analyse its distinctive and similar characteristics in relation to both the romance and ecclesiastical views. To a considerable extent this involved the transmission of ecclesiastical and academic opinion on knighthood and warfare, which in turn already and increasingly included Roman teaching on war and warriors, to the wider audience of the nobility, knights, squires etc in the vernacular and in a more simplified form. It also arguably meant that the the view of knighthood and warfare held by this wider audience began to be distanced from the effect of the romances.

For the above stated purposes, I shall examine the works of three authors resident in France writing on warfare in the particular period of the reign of Charles VI (1380-1422) — the significance of which I discussed in Chapter One: Honoré Bouvet, Christine de Pizan and Philippe de Mézières. Honoré Bouvet was a monk and a canon-lawyer who became prior of Salon in Provence and developed close relationships with the house of Anjou, Pope Clement VII in Avignon, and King Charles VI, all of which led him to work as an ambassador in efforts to end the Papal Schism. His *Arbre des batailles*, a book cited by many scholars as the authority to consult on late medieval warfare, was chiefly drawn from Legnano's *De bello, de*

represaliis et de duello, examined in the previous chapter. Christine de Pizan, Italian by descent and the daughter of the astrologist of Charles V, wrote the treatise *Livre des faits d'armes et de chevalerie*, drawing largely on Bouvet's book and the Roman authors. She became known to modern readers largely because of the proto-feminist outlook in her works, though her writings on warfare and knighthood, especially *Livre des faits d'armes*, have also received quite a lot of attention from modern and late medieval readers alike, with translations into several languages. Philippe de Mézières, the crusade enthusiast and political figure, taken to be influential at the French court as a councillor to Charles V and as tutor to the future Charles VI, is mostly known by his *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, a mirror for princes written in the style of dream-allegory and dedicated to the young Charles VI in 1389. While two of the works of these authors — Bouvet's *Arbre des batailles* and Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes* — have been cited by Philippe Contamine as examples of popular treatises on warfare in this period,¹ Phillippe de Mézières's works also deserve attention due to his influence in the political affairs of his day and his remarkable enthusiasm for crusade. The common feature of these three authors is that, in spite of the differences in their background — a canon-lawyer, a lay woman and a knight — they are all writing for a predominantly lay audience and for a specific purpose, i.e. to promote military reform in response to the particular circumstances of France in the period, as discussed in Chapter One.

By examining the works of these three authors I shall show how the Roman emphases on the common good as the aim of warfare and on the use of learning, discipline and strategy in warfare came to dominate the views of knighthood and warfare expressed in such works, while I shall also note the common features that

¹ Contamine, *War and Chivalry*, 119-216.

these authors' writings had with the ecclesiastical view, integrating the latter's discussions of just war, as well as concrete expressions contradicting the romance view. In my discussion of these specific features, I shall follow the pattern of proceeding from Bouvet's ideas to the others', as in some ways he, as a doctor of canon-law who draws extensively from Legnano's *De bello*, is an intermediary in this process. Bouvet is thus both contributing to the ecclesiastical view on warfare and knighthood and also transmitting these views to a lay audience by his choice of language and style. While Legnano, who was "constantly preoccupied with the claims of the Papacy and the exceptional position of the clergy," wrote with "a superfluity of references to the civil and canon laws,"² Bouvet often summarised the ideas contained in them and illustrated them with contemporary examples to make them understandable to those who had not necessarily received an education in law. Moreover, Pizan who drew half of her *Livre des faits d'armes* from Bouvet's *Arbre des batailles*, helped, together with Bouvet, in the transmission of "the lawyers' opinions to a wider public, and in a more popular and digestible form" and in French, "the language of knights."³ Moreover, Pizan's book can also be noted for presenting *Arbre des batailles* in a more condensed and orderly form. Clarity of meaning and orderly narration is also present in Pizan's other works, which makes them easy to read even today. Mézières's style is more ambitious and the narrative less comprehensible than in the other two authors, with his use of allegories and long sentences, especially in *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, which basically is structured on possible moves in a game of chess. Despite the complex nature of this work and others, Mézières too, is quite an orderly writer, writing according to a clear plan. In the discussion below of the authors' works for evidence of their view on warfare

² *De bello*, xxxi.

³ Keen, *Laws of War*, 21.

and knighthood, for the reason of the aforementioned parallels between the writings of Bouvet and Pizan, I will go from Bouvet's opinions to Pizan's and then to Mézières's instead of following the chronological order of the appearance of the works of Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan as I did in Chapter One.

5.1 Just Wars as a Mechanism of Divine Justice for punishing Sinners

The view of warfare, previously seen in the ecclesiastical authors, that all warfare is ordained by God to punish sinners is expressed by all these authors, together with the view that the end of this punishment is justice and peace. Bouvet's description of the relationship between wars and divine justice in *Arbre des batailles* is entirely taken from Augustine via Legnano. He asserts that just wars are instruments of God to punish sinners.⁴ He establishes that these are justified by "divine law," for they seek "nothing other than to set wrong right, and to turn dissension to peace, in accordance with the Scripture." Again like Legnano, Bouvet emphasises that God not only permits wars (meaning just wars) but also ordains them, and gives the evidence of Joshua's battles against his enemies, and the wars ordained by God against sinning cities, Sodom, Gomorrah and Zeboim. The aim of all these wars and hence of all just wars, is "to wrest peace, tranquility and reasonableness from him who refuses to acknowledge his wrongdoing."⁵

Pizan echoes Bouvet in *Livre des faits d'armes* and asserts that according to the Scriptures and divine law, "wars and battles waged for a just cause are but the proper execution of justice, to bestow where it belongs," and God is the "Lord and governor of hosts and battles." Although she does not say that just wars are "ordained", she finds proof that they are "permitted" in several examples from the

⁴*Tree of Battles*, 157-58 (4: 54).

⁵ *Ibid.*, 125 (4:1).

Scriptures. She recalls the wars of Joshua, erroneously referring to him as Jesus.⁶ Likewise, in *Le Livre de Charles V* written a little earlier, she shows that knighthood originated from the need to bring the turbulences on earth, caused by human perversities after the creation, to justice and peace.⁷

Whereas we do not find a comparable definition of just wars in Mézières's works, we can find him refer to the divine administration of battles. In *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, he not only describes victory in battle as dependent only on divine providence, but also points to the Old Testament as the source in which to find examples of the proper role of the warrior as well as of the proper nature of kingship.⁸ Moreover, he views the Anglo-French war as persevering through the generations due to the sins of both the French and the English.⁹ In accordance with this, in *Epistre Lamentable* he describes Jesus Christ as the "true patron of the host", who punishes an army by defeat when he sees them corrupted in his laws, as evidenced both by wars in the history of the world in general and in the recent history of France in particular.¹⁰

5.2 Just Wars as aimed at the Common Good

The aim of just wars, willed by God to punish sinners, should be the common good. Echoing Legnano's statement that true fortitude should be directed at the common good, and not towards some individual benefit, Bouvet in *Arbre des batailles* asserts that "what constitutes boldness in a knight" is "the will to hear reason and justice," and not any other private feeling or motive like anger or earning

⁶ *Deeds of Arms*, 14 (1:2).

⁷ *Charles V*, 328-29.

⁸ *Vieux pèlerin*, 453, 687.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 852.

¹⁰ *Epistre lamentable*, 105.

vainglory.¹¹ Although he finds that there are wars waged for sinful motives such as to increase glory, or through pride, avarice, covetousness and the desire to dominate etc — like those of Alexander, the Romans and ancient kingdoms of the past — he asserts that these are not just wars.¹² Pizan, in *Le Chemin de longue estude*, cites Augustine as declaring that “one can wage a just war against anyone he wants ... if one defends the *chose publique*,” but one is damned if one fights for domination and oppression.”¹³ Again in *Livre des faits d’armes*, she contends that wars waged for revenge or conquest — for which like Bouvet she gives the examples of the Romans and Alexander the Great — are not just.¹⁴ Likewise, Mézières in *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, asserts that “the laws of true knighthood” order that knights fight for the religion, the Church, their lord, the people, the oppressed who cannot defend themselves, and “generally for the benefit of justice ... and particularly for the common good of the kingdom of France.”¹⁵

5.3 Just Wars should protect the Defenceless Non-Combatants

As has been discussed with reference to the ecclesiastical view, the definition of just war as the defence of the common good requires that knights should not bring harm to those that they should aim to protect. Although Bouvet repeats the Augustinian idea that in warfare the good might sometimes suffer along with the evil, he nevertheless warns that those who are valiant and wise should be careful not to be hard on innocent people but only on combatants. Here he supports the

¹¹ *Tree of Battles*, 121 (3:6).

¹² *Ibid.*, 157-58 (4: 53-54).

¹³ “... que l’on peut livrer une guerre juste/à qui l’on veut; c’est à dire/ si l’on défend la chose publique ...” : *Chemin*, 349, lines 4425-4434.

¹⁴ *Deeds of Arms*, 17 (1:4).

¹⁵ “ ... les lois de la vraie chevalerie, selon lesquelles elle doit se battre en vivant justement pour la religion et l’Église, pour son seigneur et pour le peuple, pour les veuves, les pauvres et les orphelins et pour ceux qui sont opprimés et ne peuvent se défendre, globalement pour le bien de Justice ma maîtresse et particulièrement pour le bien commun du royaume de France”: *Vieux pèlerin*, 467-69.

ecclesiastical defence of the immunity of non-combatants by arguing that it is not just to oppress people who have nothing to do with the business of arms, and that such acts are not war but pillage and robbery, as they are against the common good of the people. Yet, he admits that they are common occurrences in his own day despite being both dishonourable and sinful, in that they neglect the duty of knighthood to keep justice and defend widows, orphans and the poor, and that canon law demands the immunity of these people from warfare.¹⁶ He further argues that it is not compatible with the Christian religion to kill a prisoner or make him a slave, whatever the custom in ancient times.¹⁷ Although he does not directly criticise his contemporaries here, the fact that the killing of prisoners had not been uncommon during the Hundred Years' War may suggest that Bouvet intended these remarks as criticism.¹⁸

Pizan too, in *Livre des faits d'armes*, views pillage as having nothing to do with just warfare because it constitutes oppression of the common people. Like Bouvet she laments the pillagers of her own day and reminds us and them that they will be punished. She then basically repeats what Bouvet has said in *Arbre des batailles* about the injustice and dishonour in harming people who have nothing to do with arms, especially churchmen and peasants, and laments that this injunction is not heeded in France.¹⁹ She also asserts that the enslaving or killing prisoners is unchristian, though also without any specific criticism of contemporaries.²⁰ Unlike Augustine who set the mercy and charity of the Christian barbarian invaders towards people and holy places against the cruelty of pagan Romans, Pizan in *Le Chemin de longue estude*, with reference to Valerius and Cato, praises the Romans for not

¹⁶ *Tree of Battles*, 125 (4:1), 153-54(4:48), 155 (4:50), 189 (4: 102).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 151-52 (45-47).

¹⁸ Meron, *Henry's Wars*, 170-71.

¹⁹ *Deeds of Arms*, 165-66 (3:14).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 169-70 (3:17).

touching the temples of their enemies or women captives, and for their strict punishment of pillagers.²¹ Again in *Livre des faits d'armes*, she makes a clumsy effort to demonstrate that pillage is wrong by using the example of the Gauls, who she sees here as ancestors of the French. She tells us that the Gauls had so little greed that they threw everything they captured from the Romans into a river, to the astonishment of the Romans.²² While this example does not really prove that Gauls did not pillage, it also contradicts her earlier praise of Romans in *Le chemin de longue estude*.

Philippe de Mézières, in *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, laments that the endemic practice of violence towards, and pillage of, civilians in his own times is in sharp conflict with the primary function of knighthood, which is to “comfort, unite, protect and preserve both the Church and the people.”²³ Also in *Contemplacio hore mortis* and *Oratio tragedica*, written around the same period as *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, he looks back to the wars he fought in his early youth in one of those “*grandes compagnies*” that he now accuses of the abuse of civilians and of pillage, and criticises himself for not distinguishing between “just and criminal wars.”²⁴ Moreover, like Pizan, he tends to present the Romans as a model for just conduct in warfare. Hence, the Romans are the example to the disrespectful contemporary knights for not touching women, children and temples, and for punishing those who do not respect this. He underlines this as a Roman principle both in the duties of commanders that he attributes to Vegetius, and with reference to Augustine, who

²¹ *Chemin*, 343, lines 4319-4327, 353, lines, 4479- 4502, 349, lines 4410-4415.

²² *Deeds of Arms*, 41(1:14).

²³ “Les pauvres hommes sont battus et torturés, les femmes déshonorées, les vierges forcées en public et violées, en infraction aux règles des vaillant capitaines ... Cette pitoyable et horrible tragédie ici resumée de la chevalerie française ... est bien étrangère à sa fonction première, qui est de doucement reconforter, unir, protéger et préserver à la fois l’Eglise et le peuple dont elle procède...”: *Vieux pèlerin*, 463.

²⁴ Ioarga, *Philippe de Mézières*, 65.

praised Romans for respecting civilians, which won them the domination of the world over four centuries, albeit they were pagans.²⁵ Here Mézières, like Pizan, desperate to draw on the Roman model, perhaps intentionally distorts Augustine's view of the Romans' conduct towards civilians. This, as aforementioned, possibly stemmed from his anxiety to address a contemporary problem, as both Bouvet and Pizan did. However, he voices his criticism of contemporary pillage and the abuse of civilians more than they do.

In *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, Mézières laments in several places that it is the French knights who beat and torture their own people and the captains who do not stop it. On the frontiers people have to “*garde la garde*” as “*qui peut piller pille*”, and the “*grandes compagnies*” are like leeches who suck the blood of the poor people and enrich themselves each and every day.²⁶ He returns to the same metaphor of leeches in *Epistre au roi Richart* in his famous description of a horrible garden of war where commanders and men-at-arms “suck the blood of the poor, that is to say the substance of their livelihood, by ransom, pillages, taxes, and oppression without measure.”²⁷

The English ordinances of Richard II in this period also illustrate the efforts to protect civilians from the violence of the war. It was canon law that the ordinances took as the yardstick for determining the persons who should be immune from pillage or other violent acts: churchmen, women and unarmed labourers.²⁸ Yet it was

²⁵ *Vieux pèlerin*, 357, 451, 658-59.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 463, 466, 658, 883.

²⁷ *Letter to King Richard*, 58.

²⁸ Keen, “Richard II's Ordinances,” 38.

a fact that both French and English soldiers were a scourge for the French civilians, and the Hundred Years' War even more than other wars, victimized civilians.²⁹

We can say that as much as Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières echo ecclesiastical opinion that harming the defenceless is not compatible with the aim of just war and hence the duty of knights, they also bring in the Roman example — which Augustine had tended to see as in contradiction with Christian charity and mercy — to praise the Romans for the justness of their conduct. Overall, they lament that pillaging soldiers are not worthy of their occupation and should be called robbers instead, and these complaints seem to run through the discourses of both lay and clerical authors at least from the eleventh century onwards as a criticism of chivalry that can be found also in writings of a more romantic vein, as in Charny and Llull. We can find similar remarks persisting too in both lay and ecclesiastical authors contemporary with Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, such as Eustache Deschamps, Alain Chartier, Alvaro Pelayo, Bartholomew of Saliceto and Nicholas of Tudeschi.³⁰

5.4 Just Wars should be waged by Right Authority

Notwithstanding the injunction that secular rulers cannot declare war on infidels without the licence of the Pope, or declare war against the Pope for that matter, Bouvet declares that “a person other than a prince cannot order general war” for the prince has the right to do justice.³¹ Accordingly, he defends the right of the French king to restart the war with England — and to break the treaty of Bretigny — on the grounds of this right: to protect his subjects from the pillaging of the

²⁹ Meron, *Henry's Wars*, 128-29, 123-24. Froissart's account of the Black Prince's siege of Limoges in 1370 tells of the massacre of the inhabitants of the town in spite of all their pleas; likewise it is reported that Henry V pillaged Caen and killed some townsmen: *Ibid.*, 89-91.

³⁰ Keen, *Chivalry*, 233-35; *idem*, *Laws of War*, 65, 69; Gillingham, “War and Chivalry in the History of William the Marshal,” 239-40.

³¹ *Tree of Battles*, 127 (4: 2), 129 (4: 4-5).

English.³² Pizan reiterates Bouvet in asserting that, as not just anyone can start a war to defend his own rights, the undertaking of wars belongs to sovereign princes by virtue of their right to do justice on behalf of their subjects.³³ It is significant that she includes many kinds of lords as sovereign princes in this respect, including emperors, king and dukes, as well as others who are legitimate rulers of temporal jurisdictions. This, according to Keen, could be an effort to allow the legitimacy of at least some of the many contemporary wars that were not instigated by emperors or kings, and was in accordance with the ideas of contemporary jurists like Bartholomew of Saliceto.³⁴ There was apparently a confusion regarding the identity of sovereign powers, in which lawyers and theorists often gave a decision according to their allegiance to a particular power.³⁵ Mézières also declares that it is the duty of the French king to declare war against his enemies (in this case the English) for the purpose of the defence of the crown and the common good, of the Church and the people of France that by divine authority were given to him.³⁶ Hence all wars should be waged by princes with no superior, the definition of which could vary from the emperor to dukes and even counts, which in turn reflected the messy reality of sovereignty in the late Middle Ages. It was not that the notion of a sovereign state was underdeveloped at the time, but the lack of actual sovereign power over lesser rulers, who in turn were effectively sovereign, that caused the problem.

³² Ibid., 192 (4:107).

³³ *Deeds of Arms*, 15 (1:3).

³⁴ Keen, *Laws of War*, 77.

³⁵ Charity Canon-Willard also suggests that the long list of sovereign princes can also be taken as Pizan's effort to include her patron, the duke of Burgundy, who in fact had two sovereign lords above him, among sovereign powers: *Deeds of Arms*, 15, n. 6. Mézières's definition of great lords who were given the divine duty to defend the common good is just as inclusive as Pizan's definition of the sovereign princes: *Vieux pèlerin*, 467-68. Bouvet also adjusts the definition of a sovereign power, who arguably should only point at the emperor, so that it includes the French king. He does this by declaring the latter not subject to the emperor, which was in accordance with the political theories in support of the independent monarchies of the day: *Tree of Battles*, 128-29 (4:3-4).

³⁶ *Vieux pèlerin*, 853.

5.5 Self-Defence as Just War

Bouvet does not draw on Legnano's elaborate discussion of the justification of self-defence, perhaps so as not to allow any of the private wars waged between the noble houses in his own day to be interpreted in this context. He emphasises in *Arbre des Batailles* that, except for the prince, no one can declare war even on the grounds of righting a wrong done to him, and that in such a case he had to appeal to the justice of the prince.³⁷ Yet Bouvet allows legitimate defence in cases where one is robbed or struck by another. He argues in several cases for the legitimate defence of one's own goods by war, and allows legitimate defence of relatives without penalty.³⁸ Pizan, too, does not include any argument concerning self-defence in *Livre des faits d'armes*, but only in *Epistre Othea* describes legitimate wars in cases of self-defence.³⁹

5.6 Holy War as Just War

On the other hand, Bouvet's treatment of holy war in *Arbre des batailles* is no different from Legnano's, in that he views it as not the only kind of just war, but just as a possible form of it, and also argues that not all wars concerning religion are justified. He only justifies fighting against infidels in cases where the Pope, as the representative of God on Earth, should need to punish them for their abuse of Christians or to recover the Holy Land which by right belongs to Christians.⁴⁰ Again, like Legnano, Bouvet maintains that knights may gain salvation whether they fight in holy wars or in other just wars.⁴¹ In this context, whereas the Pope has the power to

³⁷ *Tree of Battles*, 129 (4: 4).

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 149-51 (4:49), 139 (4:23), 166-67 (4:64-65).

³⁹ *Othéa*, 19-20 (3) [all references in the parantheses are to text numbers].

⁴⁰ *Tree of Battles*, 126-27 (4: 2).

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 156 (4: 52).

declare holy war, secular princes who wish to make war against infidels should be aided by the Pope after good consideration of its benefits to Christianity.⁴² Moreover, Bouvet maintains that it is the duty of kings to defend the Church against its enemies, such as infidels and heretics.⁴³

Although Pizan does not elaborate on the issue of holy war in *Livre des faits d'armes*, she describes the defence of the Church and its patrimony against all enemies, which she includes among just wars, as the duty of all Christian princes.⁴⁴ Mézières, on the other hand, tends to exalt crusade as the ultimate form of just war to be undertaken by kings, their duty before all other things, after all other secular wars have been terminated. In this case he is writing specifically about the kings of France and England. He specifies the aims of the crusade as the recapture of the Holy Land and the safeguard of oppressed Christians there, like Bouvet and Pizan, but also the exaltation of Christianity, the punishment of its enemies, the avenging of the defeat at Nicopolis and the recovery of prisoners of war (as in *Epistre lamentable*). However, he treats crusade as a secular enterprise without mentioning any interference from the Pope.⁴⁵

5.7 Private Combats condemned

The statements legitimizing the wars waged by the authority of sovereign princes were coupled with the condemnation of private combats. One of the common types of private combats, as had been defined by Legnano as duels of compurgation,

⁴² Bouvet's caution that the Papacy should approve of crusading expeditions according to their benefits to Christianity may possibly be telling of the ecclesiastical disapproval concerning the contemporary small scale expeditions taken against the infidels, as well as prophetic of the end of the coming Nicopolis crusade. Bouvet asserts that "if a king wished to make the passage with a small company it would bring blame to Christians, and there would be a great risk of oppressing our Holy Faith, rather than of increasing it": Ibid., 127(4:2).

⁴³ Ibid., 211 (4:132).

⁴⁴ *Deeds of Arms*, 16 (1:4).

⁴⁵ *Vieux pèlerin*, 906-18; *Letter to King Richard*, 30-33; *Epistre lamentable*, 163, 171, 183-195.

were judicial combats fought between individual parties to deliver justice from a quarrel. Bouvet, drawing in *Arbre des batailles* on Legnano, discusses the subject at length. Bouvet establishes that, although such combats, to which he refers as trial by battle, are forbidden by all laws, for the same reasons as Legnano (basically that they defy the judgement of God and the courts of justice), they are all the same practised by secular princes and lawfully recognized in certain cases by Lombard laws and the laws of the Emperor Frederick. Bouvet's position is that, even though fighting in such combats is divinely forbidden, if they are to be fought, it should at least be done under the authority and by the judgement of princes, and also by the advice of clerks and in a manner that would put the souls of combatants at the least possible risk.⁴⁶ Bouvet declares the view that judicial matters between knights should be decided by clerks learned in the decretals and civil laws, instead of by knights and nobles who would be inclined more towards combat than peace. His remarks, while pointing to the yet undeveloped nature of a mechanism for military justice and to the common knightly practice of resolving judicial matters by combat, conveys his preference for the adjudication of lawyers. A most important criterion in deciding the justness of private combats is whether they are fought for reasonable causes and not for frivolous reasons or with impulsive feelings. Bouvet regards appeals made with "malice, heat, fury, ... pride, ... avarice or boastfulness" as insufficient alone to make a case for trial by combat and finds arguments such as "in what country the best wine is drunk, ... the women are most beautiful, ... [are] the better soldiers", or who is "more successful in love, ... dances better, ... more effective [in combat]" are too foolish to be decided by combat. Here we can sense a personal touch from Bouvet that involves a criticism of the contemporary chivalric practices that we have best

⁴⁶ *Tree of battles*, 117-18 (3:1), 195-203 (4: 111-123), 206-7 (4: 130).

seen in the example of the Marshal Bouciquaut, who was praised by the author of his biography for his eagerness to fight his opponents in such combats. Bouvet's description of the hot-headed knights always eager to fight one another for their anxiety to earn honour in arms can be taken to be the critical counterpart to Bouciquaut and his kind.⁴⁷

In turn, Pizan, referring to judicial combat, in *Livre des faits d'armes*, basically repeats the ideas of Bouvet on trial by combat, regarding it as condemned by all laws including the divine, though she makes room for the possibility of cases where they might be fought, provided that they are done under the authority of the prince.⁴⁸ In this, like Bouvet, she refers to her preference for lawyers to regulate the matter of combat. Among the reasons she cites for private combats that were not lawful she also includes the reason of fighting for a lady, reminiscent of the effect of courtly love in knightly deeds. Moreover, she asserts that refusing such foolish wagers of combat is more honourable than accepting them, thus questioning the primacy of the quest for honour among contemporary knights.⁴⁹ Again significantly, she rejoices in the fact that all judicial combats fought for honour had been banned in France for four years at the time she is writing. This, she thinks, should establish an example to other Christian kingdoms. Nevertheless, she implies that the main concern of this royal ban was aimed at those "foolish feats of arms undertaken through youth and for no reason except for the sort of vanity of conquering each other." As evidence of Pizan's claim on the royal ban, the translator of the book gives the royal "*Lettre patente du 27 Janvier 1406*" forbidding duels and armed contests in the kingdom, yet not all judicial combats.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Ibid., 206-7 (4: 130). The quotations are from 207.

⁴⁸ The subject of judicial combat is discussed in *Deeds of Arms*, 197-215 (4:7-14).

⁴⁹ Ibid., 211-12 (4:13).

⁵⁰ Ibid., 199, 199, n. 8 (4:7).

Mézières deals with the judicial combats (*duels judiciaires*) using the same arguments as Bouvet and Pizan. He argues that they defy God by their denial of the belief that victory comes from the heavens, and establishes that they are forbidden by all laws. While he recognizes that such combats are authorised by the royal courts, he does not see this as a justification of judicial combat but an error that should be corrected. For this, he gives the example of Charles V who forbade duels to be fought in his presence. This, together with Pizan's remark on a later ban by Charles VI, attests to the continuous efforts on the part of French kings to ban combats of honour, and may also explain Marshal Bouciquaut's concern to hide from the king a combat with his Scottish adversary during the 1380s, as we have seen in Chapter Three. Hence, although Mézières finds some examples of divinely authorised judicial combats in history, he does not tolerate them as Bouvet and Pizan have done under certain conditions, except when they are fought for the reason of the defence of the religion.⁵¹ Moreover, he seems to hold the opinion that judicial matters in the army should be dealt by lawyers. In another place in the same book, he maintains, like Bouvet, that there should be one or two experts on civil and canon law to give opinion on judicial matters that might arise in the army.⁵²

Another type of private combat, this undertaken with no judicial motive at all but purely for the sake of knightly entertainment and practice, was constituted by tournaments. As Bouvet does not include any of Legnano's justification of duels fought for glory on the grounds of common benefit, Pizan also evades the topic in her *Livre des faits d'armes*. Yet, in a later work, *Livre de la paix*, she declares tournaments to be necessary training grounds for soldiers to be ready to serve the

⁵¹ *Vieux pèlerin*, 747-50.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 447-48.

king in his wars, in accordance with Vegetius's advice.⁵³ While this attitude may be viewed as in parallel with the late medieval ecclesiastical toleration of tournaments as public entertainment, the emphasis here, made also by other near-contemporaries, Eustache Deschamps and William Caxton, was on their public benefit for training soldiers to serve in the armies of the kingdom. Yet, just like Aquinas had done, Pizan, Deschamps and Caxton all looked back to antiquity to praise their games aimed at training soldiers.⁵⁴ These late medieval attitudes towards tournaments, in turn, could have been influenced by the attitude of monarchs in exhorting men-at-arms to military games at the expense of other pastimes. This was prompted by the need for trained men to serve in the king's wars, as evidenced by Charles VI's 1384 ban on games "except those with the bow or crossbow" promulgated after concluding a truce with England. We can find the parallels of this ban in England in Richard II's statute of 1389 which ordered that all the servants and labourers of the king should practice archery in their leisure and leave all other games.⁵⁵

Mézières approves of tournaments only as public spectacles that are necessary for the prestige of the kingdom. In *Songe du vieil pèlerin* he writes that they can be practised on occasions of great celebrations — as demonstrations of magnificence, especially directed towards foreigners — but that they should be practised far more moderately than they were done in his day.⁵⁶ Still in the same book, he includes jousts and tournaments among activities that would not bring any benefit or honour to the king, as opposed to proper activities such as the defence of his crown, people and the Church of France.⁵⁷ Hence both Pizan and Mézières concur that tournaments are permissible as long as they serve the common benefit of

⁵³ *Book of Peace*, 145 (3: 13) [all references in the parentheses are to book and chapter numbers].

⁵⁴ Keen, *Chivalry*, 234, 236.

⁵⁵ Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, 217.

⁵⁶ *Vieux pèlerin*, 678.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 853.

the realm, whether as military training for its soldiers or as a demonstration of its greatness. These points of view, however, are clearly distinguished from praise of tournaments and jousts as occasions to bolster individual knightly honour, as advocated in the romances and in chivalric books exemplified by Charny's *Livre de chevalerie* and *Livre de Bouciquaut*.

5.8 Points of Personal Honour not justified in Warfare: Pride and Desire for Vainglory as Sinful Motives

Hence we can say that Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières share a common stance on private combats that rejects personal honour as a primary, legitimate motive. They also communicate this view regarding armed combat in general. In *Arbre des Batailles*, Bouvet underlines that achieving personal glory does not constitute a just motive, even when the cause itself is just. He declares that if a knight is fighting for the sake of his own glory in the just cause of defending a widow, he does not deserve any rewards that might be fit for feats of arms accomplished for the benefit of others. He asserts that such glory earned in the show of personal valour and prowess is vainglory.⁵⁸ Bouvet's discussion of true fortitude, which he borrows from Legnano, can also be interpreted as pointing to the same view concerning the nature of deeds of arms to be undertaken by knights. Bouvet argues that boldness should not be triggered by the will to earn vainglory, or by pride in one's own skills and arms, or by anger, or by imitation of other knights in the army, or by the desire to earn riches, but by knowing how to act rightly to render justice.⁵⁹ This latter kind of boldness, a kind that earns divine praise he argues, is about knowing when to strike and when to

⁵⁸ *Tree of Battles*, 143-44 (4: 32).

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 121 (3:6).

wait or flee, by judging which of these acts will be the most beneficial for the army.⁶⁰ He explains through the example that, whereas it would be a mistake to flee when equal numbers of men are storming a fortress, it would be foolish to attack disciplined greater numbers with a few. He finds it lacking in virtue and sinful to act with “rashness” and “over-boldness” in battle⁶¹ and asserts that strength in battle should be accompanied with justice, temperance and wisdom so that it is directed at right ends and thus pleasing to God.⁶²

In *Epistre Othea*, Pizan also defines feats of arms aimed only at earning renown as bringing only vainglory to knights, as opposed to fighting in just causes such as self-defence or the defence of women in need. These will bring true honour and the glory of God.⁶³ She repeats several times that the *chevalier méritant* should not fight with pride but with reason and while listening to wise counsel. By examples from mythology and with references to the Church Fathers and the Scriptures, she asserts that fights undertaken with too much pride and which involve the taking of unnecessary risks are both foolish and self-destructive.⁶⁴ Hence, she declares that “force which lacks thinking is not worth anything.”⁶⁵ Accordingly, in *Livre du corps de policie*, Pizan asserts that boldness moved by “presumption and foolhardiness” and not by reason is neither honourable nor sustainable in the long-term, as it will eventually end with destruction. Like Bouvet she illustrates this with the example of one man fighting against many or a few people against a great force, or one man doing extreme things without thinking that somebody will take revenge.⁶⁶ This she

⁶⁰ Ibid., 120-21 (3:5); 133(4:11).

⁶¹ Ibid., 133 (4:11).

⁶² Ibid., 119-20 (3: 3).

⁶³ *Othéa*, 19-20 (3), 24-25 (5).

⁶⁴ Ibid., 103(68) , 117 (77), 137 (94).

⁶⁵ “La force ne vaut rien où manque la réflexion”: Ibid., 83 (52) [all translations from French are mine unless otherwise indicated].

⁶⁶ *Body Politic*, 66 (2:7).

advises with reference to Roman sources, the same way as she recounts the end of Hannibal, who takes too much pride in his strength and suffers a disastrous defeat at the hands of Romans.⁶⁷ In these stories the fates of the proud — just like that of the truly bold — are not linked to the divine will, but to Fortune and to their lack of discipline resulting from unreasonable and reckless conduct, although possibly in the belief that God did operate through Fortune, and unreasonable and reckless conduct was also sinful.

In accordance with the opinions of Bouvet and Pizan, Mézières in *Songe du vieil pèlerin* declares that, as all glory in warfare is granted by God, taking pride in one's accomplishments is sinful. The illustrations for such a sinful attitude are the English, who have defeated the French in several battles, and the French who have also won some victories against the English. He uses the battle of Roosbeeke as an example of those who erroneously took pride for themselves in glories. Hence, just as St. Bernard had accused his contemporary knights of fighting for the sake of vainglory, Mézières directed the same criticism toward his own contemporaries. The bouts of vainglory indulged in by contemporaries, he asserts, are due to their self-comparison with the knights of Arthur, Godefroy de Bouillon and Charlemagne, without really aspiring to their real deeds but rather to their representation in the romances.⁶⁸ He also teaches that the vainglory of victories should not overwhelm the decision to make peace. Those carried away with their own pride would refuse to act humbly towards their adversaries, and for this reason God will not defend their cause and will instead bring them defeat.⁶⁹ Moreover, in *Epistre lamentable*, Mézières regards pride, which makes one fight for vainglory and without reason, instead of

⁶⁷ Ibid., 34 (1:18).

⁶⁸ *Vieux pèlerin*, 358, 459. The opinion that romances are full of lies and imaginary things is repeated in *ibid.*, 686.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 854-55.

prudently for the common good, as one of the primary vices — along with desire and luxury — corrupting the armies and bringing military defeat by the hand of God, using several examples from Scriptures and history.⁷⁰ He shows that even the most virtuous of knights, the Old Testament hero Judas Maccabeus, who formerly had won victories with so few men against many by the grace of God, was not spared from the punishment of God by defeat and death on the battlefield when he gave into his pride.⁷¹ As in *Songe du vieil pèlerin* he again offers a criticism of the battles of the Hundred Years' War from the point of view of the vices of the combatants. This time he finds the pride of the French as responsible for their defeats at Crécy and Poitiers by causing Christ to take away his support from the French army.⁷² He also finds that vices, led by pride, brought about the defeat of the crusaders at Nicopolis in the same way.⁷³

5.9 Love of Luxury not justified for Warriors

Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières not only deplored pride and the pursuit of vainglory, but also the sin of luxury in men-at-arms. This, as we have observed, existed in the thought of St. Bernard and was a common source of criticism of knighthood in medieval literature, of both secular and monastic origins, at least from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries.⁷⁴ In *L'Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun*, Bouvet's criticism of contemporary knighthood is mainly based on their indulgence in luxury in clothes, eating and drinking, which in turn makes them soft and unfit for a career in arms and causes their military defeat on several battlegrounds including

⁷⁰ *Epistre lamentable*, 105-17.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 112.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 117.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 121.

⁷⁴ Keen, *Chivalry*, 233.

that of Nicopolis.⁷⁵ Bouvet refers directly to the authority of St. Bernard, who had deplored the sins in his contemporary knights, declaring that knights should not take pleasure in clothes or vanities.⁷⁶ Yet Bouvet does not say that such vices bring military defeat by the hand of God, but by virtue of their undermining military discipline. He gives a rational explanation of how luxurious habits will affect the performance of men-at-arms by illustrating the contemporary state of French knights “*qui vivés diliciesement*”⁷⁷ in contrast to the Saracens who defeated them at Nicopolis. Then he appeals to the authority of Roman authors Valerius and Vegetius in advising that instead of noblemen, who are accustomed to living in comfort and luxury, simple labourers who can endure all physical comforts will make better soldiers.⁷⁸

In *Epistre Othea*, which has the appearance of a moral guide for Christian knights, Pizan condemns the love of luxuries, especially in food and drink, and defends chastity in “*chevaliers méritants*.”⁷⁹ Then in *Livre du corps de policie* she refers to St. Anselm’s advice of “modesty of the heart, abstinence of the body, and silence of the mouth” to the youth who aspire to be warriors. Yet, just like in Bouvet’s *L’Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun*, Pizan’s discussion of abstinence from luxury in *Livre du corps de policie* does not limit itself to monastic advice, but draws on several authorities such as Aristotle, Valerius and Vegetius, as well as on German, Breton and Norman customs, in deciding that the best warriors are those unaccustomed to luxuries. Again, the conclusion is not made in terms of divine wrath

⁷⁵ *Apparicion*, 21-32, lines, 421-680.

⁷⁶ It is noted that the same citation was made by the contemporary poet, Eustache Deschamps in a poem: *Ibid.*, 25, n.1.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 21, line 421.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 27-28, lines 543-568. Bouvet refers to the same idea that mien-at-arms should be little accustomed to luxury and comfort so as not to lose military vigour in *Arbre des batailles*, 213(4:132). The same advice, as mentioned in Chapter Four, appears in both John of Salisbury’s *Policraticus* and Aegidius Romanus’s *De regimine principum* with references to Vegetius.

⁷⁹ *Othéa*, 28 (7), 46 (21), 47-48 (22), 49 (23), 87 (55).

on sinners, but on the military vigour and discipline observed in the examples of these Roman and other warriors who were militarily successful by virtue of their endurance to hardships.⁸⁰ This was in turn, an allusion to the Roman commonplace idea that luxury and comfort will undermine military vigour and bring defeat, which itself had an ascetic dimension.⁸¹ In *Le Chemin de longue estude*, which was written between *Epistre Othea* and *Livre du corps de policie*, Pizan asserts that knights have to show abstinence from the sin of luxury both in foods and drink and in the pleasures of the body, again using the example of Roman generals, with reference to both Valerius and John of Salisbury. Here she treats luxury both as a sin and as a factor undermining prowess, which consequently will lead to military defeat.⁸² She also refers to the advice of Vegetius, as she would do later in *Livre des faits d'armes*, for something that has been earlier advocated by Bouvet: that men who can better endure physical hardships are better fit for military life than those accustomed to comfort.⁸³ Again, in *Livre des faits d'armes*, she establishes by the authority of Vegetius that if there are men who are spoiled by luxuries and cannot endure the hardships of military life in an army, then that army can easily be defeated.⁸⁴ Moreover, still in the same work, she repeats what Augustine had stated that the Romans lost their military vigour and went into decline when they gave into luxury and lethargy. Yet she uses Vegetius as a reference for this.⁸⁵

In *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, Mézières deplores the sin of luxury next to other sins, pride and avarice. He regards jousts and tournaments and other courtly entertainment that would instigate courtly love as a sign of the sin of luxury. He

⁸⁰ *Body Politic*, 61 (2:2). Also in 67-69 (2:8).

⁸¹ See Chapter Four of this dissertation for the ideas of Augustine, and of Juvenal on the subject which were expressed in *Policraticus*.

⁸² *Chemin*, 345-49, lines 4354-4406.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 341-43, lines 4295-4306; *Deeds of Arms*, 36-37 (1: 11).

⁸⁴ *Deeds of Arms*, 54 (1:18).

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 27 (1:8).

names several people from history who were poisoned by this sin, including Guinevere and Lancelot.⁸⁶ Then, elsewhere in the same book, he particularly denounces the romances, which he calls the imagined follies of Lancelot and Gawain, as the sources of vanity and sin that induce their readers to “*aimer par amour*.”⁸⁷ He is quite adamant on the sinfulness of luxury, greed and pride as reasons for the decline of French knighthood, which had once been the example for all others who had feared and held them in high esteem. As aforementioned, he disparages the contemporary knights, who do not observe the rules of knighthood kept by the ancients and the courageous knights who had served Arthur, Godefroy de Bouillon and Charlemagne, yet aspired to imitate them. He complains that while the old knights of legend had been able to endure all the hardships of military life, the contemporaries could not even stand battle for two hours. While Mézières’s praise of the romance heroes seems to contradict his earlier stance on the romances, he is accusing the genre of enticing knights to luxury and vainglory rather than attacking the actual historical heroes — Arthur, Godefroy and Charlemagne — whom he probably recognizes as the last three of the *neuf preux*,⁸⁸ following the heroes of the Old Testament, Joshua, David and Judas Maccabeus and the heroes of antiquity, Hector, Alexander, and Julius Caesar. He includes abstinence from luxury in food, drink, leisure activities, clothes and possessions as an important aspect of the rules necessary for the captains of the army to obtain victories, which he says that he has largely drawn from Vegetius. Accordingly, most often the examples Mézières gives against the French love of luxuries happen to be Romans, who with their humility and modesty in life had won great victories and acquired honour, this with reference

⁸⁶ *Vieux pèlerin*, 291-309.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 686-87.

⁸⁸ ‘*Les neuf preux*’ or the ‘nine worthies’ were first described in the early fourteenth century by Jacques de Longuyon in his *Voeux du Paon* (1312): Keen, *Chivalry*, 121.

to Titus Livius and Valerius.⁸⁹ At the end of the day, he laments that there is no knighthood in ancient or Christian history comparable to the contemporary French and their luxury. In those earlier times one can only find examples of abstinence and strict military observance that had won those earlier and better knighthood's victories.⁹⁰

In *Epistre lamentable*, Mézières sets out the foundation of the Order of *Chevalerie de la passion de Jhesu Christ* as an ascetic order reminiscent of Bernard's description of the Templars, except in respect of the requirement for chastity, for the members of the Order are encouraged to marry. It was to be composed of men living "in a holy congregation and ... saintly in a commune [obeying] a written rule and without mortal sin."⁹¹ Hence the members of the Order would be examples of humility, justice and charity and abstain from all sins, including that of luxury, which had caused the end of several hosts in history, as at Nicopolis. While the presence of the sin of luxury, like other sins, is said to have caused Jesus Christ to abandon the army, he also describes luxury like other sins as undermining the order and discipline of the host, making it impossible for the commander to control his men for the common good of the host.⁹² The army at Nicopolis is illustrative of how the sin of luxury could take control of a host: Mézières states that some of the knights in the army were enjoying such a "*delicieuse vie*" that they were dressed up as if they were going to a wedding feast in London or in Paris and having great dinners comparable

⁸⁹ *Vieux pèlerin*, 445-46, 448-50, 456-60, 467.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 879.

⁹¹ "... les vaillans combatants et esleüs de Dieu en une sainte congregacion et vivre saintement en commun a la letltre regulee et sans pechié mortel comme faire se pourra par grace de Dieu singulaire": *Epistre lamentable*, 185. The extent of idealism in these ascetic goals is remarkable, as we know that the actual recruits to the Order did not fit this profile. The Marshal Bouciquaut who has been noted for enjoying the courtly life in Chapter Four, was also a member of this Order among other members recruited largely from the courts of France and England: *Vieux pèlerin*, 23.

⁹² *Epistre lamentable*, 105-21, 139, 146-49.

to those of King Xerxes of Persia.⁹³ The description of soldiers dressed as if going to a wedding was probably influenced by John of Salisbury's criticism of his own contemporary knights, which he expressed in comparison with the modest ways of the Romans.⁹⁴ Mézières's criticisms of the Nicopolis crusaders, also noted in Bouvet's *L'Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun*, were not uncommon in contemporary literature; the aforementioned chroniclers, Jean Juvenal des Ursins and the Monk of St. Denis, also blamed luxury as a reason for the defeat of the crusade, pointing out the continuous feasts, games, debauchery and celebrations going on at the camp, which undermined discipline among the knights.⁹⁵

5.10 The Sinful will be defeated

Hence what we have found in common in the writings of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières is that warriors should not fight with pride, desire for vainglory, greed or with love of luxuries in view that the sinful will be defeated. In this, while pride desire for vainglory can be described as a state of acting on one's own without regard to the wider interest, greed can be associated with the attraction of pillage in war, and love of luxury with habits that are incompatible with military life, like eating and drinking in excess, enjoying the company of women and participating in leisure activities that have nothing to do with soldiering. This is the idea of just wars as a divine mechanism for punishing sinners evolving, just as has been seen in the writings of both ecclesiastical and lay authors in Chapter Four, into the belief that the sinful will be defeated in battle, which was not a part of the original thought about

⁹³ Ibid., 224.

⁹⁴ *Statesman's Book*, 6:4.

⁹⁵ Delaville le Roulx, *France en Orient*, 1: 256.

just war, but was appended by clerics to explain defeats in wars that were themselves just in their nature.

Accordingly, Bouvet in *Arbre des batailles* asserts that God will give victory to the faithful and not to the physically strong, so he can even make someone win without striking a blow.⁹⁶ In a more detailed examination of the subject, “Who are the stronger in battle, the just or the sinners?”, Bouvet ponders on examples from ancient history of the sinful being victorious and against these sets examples from the Old Testament. While he again argues that the just are more often victorious, as God is the source of all victory, he cautiously adds, in allusion to Augustine, that even if the sinful may sometimes win and the good and the just are oppressed in battle, this should be taken again as a mechanism to test the virtue of the good or to increase their glory.⁹⁷ Pizan, as have been seen, is also quite keen on associating sinfulness with defeat in battle, especially in *Epistre Othea*, which is after all a moral guide to teach how sinful knights are defeated and the virtuous are victorious. Mézières repeats the idea of divine punishment of sinners in *Songe du Vieil pèlerin*, as he associates the failures of the French knights in their wars with their sins of pride, greed, luxury and their lack of fear of God, and in *Epistre lamentable* as he strives to prove how those sins brought military defeat to armies, finding examples from ancient pagan history, the Old Testament, French history, the Hundred Years’ War, the crusades and the Nicopolis crusade in particular.

The three authors are all concerned with contemporary military failures even if they do not always explicitly refer to them. Where they do, they are anxious to point to the reasons for these failures in terms of the sins of the warriors. The criticisms found in the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières can be seen as a

⁹⁶ *Tree of Battles*, 119-20 (3:3).

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 156-58 (4:53, 54).

refutation of the romance-type of knight, who loves glory for the sake of it and fights regardless of any other concerns, while he also enjoys the pleasures of a worldly life as a reward for his prowess. N.A.R. Wright, R.L. Kilgour, Norman Housley and Charity Canon-Willard are all agreed that the three authors held a stance that is against the particular type of knight that is promoted in the contemporary works of Charny and Bouciquaut's author, among others, and that they have an eye to the contemporary military failures in the Hundred Years' War or at Nicopolis.⁹⁸ The same faults could be seen in the actual knighthood of the day, as reflected for example in Delaville le Roulx's description of the pomp and flamboyance in the departure of the Nicopolis crusaders that was due to the love of luxury shared by the duke of Burgundy and his followers,⁹⁹ or in the criticism of the contemporary chroniclers Jean Juvenal des Ursins and the Monk of St. Denis regarding the crusaders' excessive pride in their own strength, which was responsible for their reckless actions (something that is also reflected in the biography of the Marshal Bouciquaut, though there without criticism).¹⁰⁰

Moreover, they use examples from Roman history and statements from Roman authors to prove that the sinful will be defeated. Through their use of Roman sources the writers emphasise that these sins of pride and luxury were not just liable to invoke the wrath of God, but that they undermined military performance, thus contributing to the inevitable result, defeat in battle. While the criticism of the pride and luxury of the knighthood was a commonplace in ecclesiastical works, especially in monastic writings from at least the twelfth century onwards, the extensive use of the Roman model to compare with contemporaries and show that the absence of

⁹⁸ Wright, "Tree of Battles of Honoré Bouvet," 18; Housley, "Le Maréchal Boucicaud," 97-98; Canon-Willard, "Christine de Pizan on Chivalry," 515-16; Raymond L. Kilgour, "Honoré Bonet: A Fourteenth-Century Critic of Chivalry," *PMLA* 50, no.2 (June, 1935): 352-361.

⁹⁹ Delaville le Roulx, *France en Orient*, 1: 238.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 1: 256.

these vices brings military success was not so common in the ecclesiastical tradition, though it could be found, for example in John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*,¹⁰¹ which can be compared in several of its features to the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, except for its audience and style. Even though the two concepts, the divine punishment of sins and the results of a lack of military strategy and discipline, cannot really be disentangled from each other — as was also the case in John of Salisbury — the Roman model with its emphasis on military service to the state, under discipline and good administration, and performed with strategy towards the common good, emerges as the focus of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières on these matters.

5.11 The Roman Influence: The Idea of a Warrior in the Service of the State

Roman law, passed on through the works of legists, was an important influence, as well as the Roman military books themselves, most of all Vegetius, in establishing the concept of service to the state in a military context. The emphasis on service by soldiers to the state in medieval writing about warfare and knighthood can be referred back again to John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, where Salisbury, with reference to Vegetius, describes a ceremony where the new soldiers take an oath, swearing by God to work for the prince and the common good.¹⁰² As Keen argues, the idea of chivalry as a divinely instituted Order to serve the common good was reflected in this book as much as it was in later "Books of Chivalry" drawn on Vegetius.¹⁰³ We can also see expression of this in Ramon Llull's *Libre del ordre de cavalleria*, which, possibly drawing on *Policraticus*, established the duty of a knight

¹⁰¹ See Chapter Four.

¹⁰² *Policraticus*, 115 (6:7).

¹⁰³ Keen, *Chivalry*, 5.

as that of helping his king to maintain justice by arms;¹⁰⁴ in Aegidius Romanus's *De regimine principum*, which, extensively drawing on Vegetius, described the reason for the existence of knighthood as "the defence of the common profit of the city and of the kingdom,"¹⁰⁵ or in Giovanni da Legnano's *De bello*, which, in reference to both Roman laws and Vegetius, described an oath made by soldiers to the emperor in defence of the commonwealth.¹⁰⁶

Kilgour calls Bouvet's portrayal of a knight "a soldier almost in the Roman tradition,"¹⁰⁷ and Keen affirms that Bouvet's knight is a "servant of the prince" doing "all that he does as the deputy of the king or the lord in whose pay he is."¹⁰⁸ Indeed, *Arbre des batailles* is full of suggestions in that direction: Bouvet maintains that a knight should give primacy to service of his king, which he should do at the king's command and leave any other occupation, because "the king's war concerns the common good of the whole kingdom," and that he should be paid in return for his service.¹⁰⁹ Likewise, Pizan in *Livre du corps de policie*, which was inspired by Salisbury's *Policraticus*, declares that knights are the "guardians of the prince and the people of the country [fighting] for the honour of the prince and the public good."¹¹⁰ Moreover, in *Le Chemin de longue estude* and *Le Livre de Charles V* she draws on John of Salisbury, Aegidius Romanus and Vegetius to establish that the knighthood was created by election in Rome to defend the prince, the country and the common good against its enemies, and hence knights take an oath to confirm this duty.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁴ Ramon Llull's *Book of Knighthood*, 29.

¹⁰⁵ *De regimine principum*, 396 (3:1).

¹⁰⁶ *De bello*, 235.

¹⁰⁷ Kilgour, "Honoré Bonet," 353.

¹⁰⁸ Keen, *Chivalry*, 235. Also see, *Tree of Battles*, 135 (4: 14).

¹⁰⁹ *Tree of Battles*, 137 (4: 17); 135 (4:15).

¹¹⁰ *Body Politic*, 50 (1 :29).

¹¹¹ *Chemin*, 339-41, lines 4253-4295; *Charles V*, 332, 336.

Mézières does not specifically refer to the oath taken by knights at Rome, or to any oath taken by soldiers or knights, but still stresses the knights' duty to the state in *Songe du vieil pèlerin*. His description of the duty of a French knight covers both the accustomed definition of the general duty of knights that pertains to the protecting the defenceless and maintaining justice and the "particular" service to "the common good of the kingdom of France."¹¹² Yet what immediately contrasts with this opinion, repeatedly stated in *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, is the nature of his Order of the *Passion*, his almost lifelong mission to seek and find recruits from all the kingdoms of Europe throughout the years over which he penned *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, and especially from England, which needless to say, had been at war with France for about half a century.¹¹³ Yet this should be examined in the context of his project for the establishment of peace between the two kingdoms, to be followed by a joint-crusade led by the two kings, which at the end of *Songe du vieil pèlerin* appears as the ultimate goal of the political and military reform that should be undertaken by Charles VI.¹¹⁴ Hence in Mézières's thought there is no conflict between the idea of knights' serving the state in the French king's wars against the English and their joining this international Order.

5.12 The Admiration for Roman Military Teaching and Example

It is clear that the Romans were the model the three authors had in mind for the image of the soldier in the service of the state. Accordingly, they all expressed praise for Roman authority on military matters. In *Arbre des batailles*, Bouvet refers

¹¹² *Vieux pèlerin*, 467.

¹¹³ J.J.N. Palmer describes the Order as an Anglo-French Order in *England, France and Christendom*, 190.

¹¹⁴ *Vieux pèlerin*, 906-18. The absence of conflict between Mézières's idea of service to the state and his crusading goals is also expressed by Keen in *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms*, 6.

to “a doctor called Monseigneur Vegetius, the author of the “Book of Chivalry,” whom in *L’Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun* he describes as the “great master of arms.”¹¹⁵ Pizan describes Vegetius’s book as “a notable work concerning the discipline and art of warfare possessed by the great conquerors,” and Philippe de Mézières regards him as the source from which to learn about “the good rules” or “true science” concerning knighthood in order to obtain victory.¹¹⁶ Pizan clearly expresses the idea that the Romans should be an example to contemporaries for their deeds in arms. She establishes in *Le Chemin de longue estude* that it was training, knowledge and the desire to defend the common good which made Romans the conquerors of the world.¹¹⁷ In *Livre des faits d’armes* too, she praises the greatness of the Romans’ “good judgement and skill in arms,” by which they accomplished “deeds that today would seem impossible,”¹¹⁸ and in *Livre du corps de policie* she finds their particular love of warfare and their magnificent deeds, as described by Valerius, as an encouragement to contemporaries to follow in their example of “honour ... courage ... and virtue.”¹¹⁹ Mézières conveys the same idea in *Epistre lamentable*, where he asserts that Roman works should be read to learn about the Romans’ strength of rule and discipline that brought military victory to their princes.¹²⁰ He also shows a preference for Roman teaching as opposed to other chivalric literature, as in *Songe du vieil pèlerin* where he asserts that Roman histories and works are indisputedly superior, for they recount the truth unlike “the lies of Lancelot and other similar [stories].”¹²¹ Moreover, both Pizan and Mézières admire the Romans also from the point of view of their good government and just rule, and

¹¹⁵ *Tree of Battles*, 132 (4:9); 211-12 (4:132); *Apparicion*, 28, line 564.

¹¹⁶ *Deeds of Arms*, 26 (1:8); *Vieux pèlerin*, 454; *Epistre lamentable*, 131.

¹¹⁷ *Chemin*, 351, lines 4456-4462.

¹¹⁸ *Deeds of Arms*, 26 (1:8).

¹¹⁹ *Body Politic*, 64 (2:5); 25 (1:13). The quotations are from 25 (1:13).

¹²⁰ *Epistre lamentable*, 131.

¹²¹ *Vieux pèlerin*, 688, 686.

underline the fact that they were superior in spite of their being pagans.¹²² This admiration apparently was not peculiar to the three authors, as we can find other contemporary French authors, Eustache Deschamps, Jean de Gerson and Alain Chartier, all looking back to Roman military example to compare it with their own times and to find models to imitate.¹²³

5.13 The Roman Idea of Honour

In accordance with the idea that the knight's duty was to serve the state, the notion of honour that is conveyed in the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières can be found to be quite different from that in the romances or romance-influenced literature. As we have seen previously, in the tradition of romance literature, the knight's honour was primarily associated with the renown and glory he would earn as a valiant knight that would make him desired by ladies and admired by other knights. Such an honourable life would also, it was assumed, please God. The ecclesiastical writers on the other hand, defined honour as pertaining only to fighting in just causes that were approved by God and that would serve the common good. This idea could be interpreted, as in John of Salisbury, to the benefit of wars fought for one's prince, as these were divinely ordained wars fought for the common good.¹²⁴ Hence we may probably draw the notion of honour in serving the state back to John of Salisbury, whose ideas, although quite well known in intellectual circles and inspired a good deal by Roman authors, had not had much of a direct influence on vernacular writing until the late Middle Ages.¹²⁵

¹²² *Body Politic*, 20 (1:11); *Vieux pèlerin*, 659.

¹²³ Keen, *Chivalry*, 234.

¹²⁴ *Policraticus*, 115-17 (6:7-8).

¹²⁵ The translation of *Policraticus* into French during the reign of Charles V may have been a factor in its influence on a wider audience: Contamine, *Guerre, état et société*, 1:195.

We can derive Bouvet's notion of honour from his various remarks in *Arbre des batailles*. As mentioned before, he denies that it can be acquired from fighting for the "vain-glory of this world, and its honour and commendation" or for other personal reasons,¹²⁶ or from pillaging civilians.¹²⁷ As opposed to these he defines "a good knight," as one who is "occupied only with the practice of arms ... for the honour of [his] lord."¹²⁸ Hence it can be inferred that true honour in arms could be won only by serving one's lord. In accordance with this, Pizan, in *Livre des faits d'armes*, asserts that men-at-arms would earn honour and praise as long as they brought honour and profit to their prince in his just wars.¹²⁹ In *Livre du corps de policie*, she defines true glory as something endowed by the state on its soldiers for good deeds and virtue, with reference to the Romans' example.¹³⁰ She also explains that those Roman generals who had won victories in the wars of the empire were awarded with an honour called a "triumph" and were applauded in the ceremony.¹³¹ Mézières, too, defines honour through the Roman example, recounting the tales of the generals, Scipio the African and Cato, who were crowned with true honour, which was celebrated with ceremonies, because of the conquests they had made for the profit and honour of the Romans. He underlines that these noble generals did not accomplish these great deeds for their own profit, but for that of the Romans, and adds that the Roman example should be aspired to by all Christian captains and lords.¹³² The fighting of the Roman generals, "to maintain ... the dignity of the name of Roman", instead of fighting for the vainglory of outshining others, seems to have been a repeated example in fifteenth-century heraldic collections, which in turn

¹²⁶ *Tree of Battles*, 121 (3:6).

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 153 (4:48), 189 (4:102).

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 131 (4:8).

¹²⁹ *Deeds of Arms*, 62 (1:21).

¹³⁰ *Body Politic*, 77-83 (2:14-17).

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 68-69(2:8), 51(1:29).

¹³² *Vieux pèlerin*, 456-59.

signifies that service to the state had become an established value in knightly literature by that time.¹³³

5.14 The Execution of Strategy and Discipline vis-à-vis the Role of Divine Providence in Warfare

The Roman model dictated that warfare — undertaken for the prince and for the common good of the kingdom — should be regulated by some rules, which necessitated that it should follow predetermined or improvised strategies, and that the warriors should behave according to some established codes of discipline with serious penalties for infringement, and all these should be administered by a commander who would be the deputy of the prince. Hence everything in battle depended on the performance of the warriors directed by the commander.

Thus knighthood became an art that could be learned and practised through some written rules that would guarantee the victory of the host and the prince. This tended to undermine the romances' outlook on feats of arms with their focus on personal glory. It might also be taken to undermine the idea that the virtuous would win against the sinful in all circumstances, stemming from a religious view of warfare as an instrument of God to punish sinners. However, the latter problem might be resolved somewhat by arguing that sins themselves undermined military capacity, as shown above. In Pizan's *Epistre Othea*, for example, sinful behaviour that is to be avoided by knights is contrasted with praiseworthy behaviour that is defined by prudence, wisdom, discipline, etc. In accordance with this, in *Epistre lamentable*, Mézières defines the existence of sins as a sign of the corruption of

¹³³ Keen, *Chivalry*, 235.

“rule, discipline, obedience and justice” in the army. Hence God abandons the sinful, because they do not have the virtues to win the war.

Notwithstanding the ideas discussed earlier on the hand of divine providence and how the sinful will be defeated by the virtuous in battle, there is a deliberate effort on the part of the authors to convey the message that it is not the divine will alone directly that decides the outcome of battles. Hence, hope and faith in God to give victory is not enough. Bouvet cautions in *Arbre des batailles* that, even if a king has the just cause in battle, he must not leave it only to God to decide the outcome, but should do whatever he can “by diligence, and by taking good counsel, to overcome the enemy.”¹³⁴ Pizan in *Livre du corps de policie* records that the Romans too believed in the interference of divine power in battles, citing Ovid’s, “the Gods help the bold,” and giving examples from the antiquity. Yet she maintains that this might very well have been false belief and adds that, even if true, victories won like that will not last long, if they are not accompanied by reason, temperance and discipline.¹³⁵ On the other hand, in *Livre des faits d’armes*, she elaborates in several examples from Roman history how Fortune, that is governed by God and yet is inconstant, affects the outcome of battles. The common conclusion she draws from these examples is that once Fortune is in one’s favour, it should be pursued, which means that all human effort should be spent in perpetuating the good Fortune, and likewise, in order not to face bad Fortune, one should not abandon all reasonable efforts for victory.¹³⁶

Although in *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, Mézières asserts that victory in battle “depends only on divine providence,” it is not because he rejects the necessity of

¹³⁴ *Tree of Battles*, 154-55 (4: 49).

¹³⁵ *Body Politic*, 66-67 (2:7).

¹³⁶ *Deeds of Arms*, 19-20 (1:5), 70 (1:24), 75 (1:27).

strategy or discipline in warfare, but because he condemns the contemporary use of fortune-telling regarding the outcome of battles.¹³⁷ He asserts elsewhere in the same book that hope in God should be accompanied by careful judgement of the situation, as he advises that the king should wage his wars with “judgement and without running risks ... in the hope of God’s help.”¹³⁸ Likewise, in *Epistre lamentable*, he asserts that wars should be waged with diligence, with the help of spies and other instruments of war, that actions in war should be guided by subtlety and according to what is beneficial, that one should always be on guard against the enemy and his spies, that one should take counsel and keep pacts with the enemy, and also that one should make sure that the soldiers do not occupy themselves with pillage, and that booty should be distributed fairly to them according to their valour. The ultimate source from which to learn these good practices, he recommends, is Vegetius’s *De re militari*.¹³⁹

These statements can be regarded as representing a shift of focus from an emphasis on the role of divine providence to a discussion of the role of Fortune in warfare which — though it should not be seen independent of divine will — does not signify predetermined consequences that cannot be changed by human effort, but represents opportunities that can be grasped by human ability. In accordance, John of Salisbury, the most important early transmitter of the ideas of Vegetius to a medieval audience, expresses this positive meaning of Fortune with an emphasis on human effort thus: “Whoever wishes for good Fortune is to fight by skill, not by chance.”¹⁴⁰ Aegidius Romanus, the other ecclesiastical author who also popularised the ideas of Vegetius, likewise asserted the importance of wisdom and skill when going into

¹³⁷ *Vieux pèlerin*, 453.

¹³⁸ “... c’est-à-dire défendre ton royaume avec courage, discernement, sans courir de risques et avec vertu, dans l’espérance de l’aide de Dieu ... et attaquer ainsi tes ennemis”: Ibid., 853.

¹³⁹ *Epistre lamentable*, 129-30.

¹⁴⁰ *Policraticus*, 123 (6:19).

battle, and declared that one should not hope for good Fortune without being prepared.¹⁴¹ A quasi-contemporary of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, Geoffroi de Charny, whose *Livre de chevalerie* was discussed in Chapter Three, describes the role of human effort in relation to Fortune in quite similar terms to John of Salisbury, Aegidius Romanus, and Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières. He asserts that “one should not put trust in the benefits of Fortune ... but ... be wise and ... strive at it.”¹⁴² Yet, as much as these ideas seem to establish a contrast with the view of divine providence operating in warfare, in essence they are not really rejecting it. On the contrary, they are arguing that while the divine will or Fortune, depending on what you might want to call it — or calling it both as seen in Pizan — decides the outcome of battles on the basis of human effort and not by pure chance. This, in turn, is not so different from the idea that God will choose to give defeat to those who are corrupted in morals, i.e. who are sinful as opposed to those who are not. Hence, a contemporary sermon of the abbot of Saint-Denis made in 1414, although different in its emphasis, may be found to argue the same idea in its essentials. He asserts that large armies can be defeated by smaller numbers as victories come from heaven, though “not by chance or hazard.” Yet he turns the arguments of Bouvet, Pizan, Mézières and others on their head to conclude that “Christian princes must not rely on their plans, on the size of their armies, on force, or strength, or on experience or wisdom alone, but must humble themselves before God, recognizing that they can do in battle none other than what God ordains and decides should be achieved by them ...”¹⁴³ Hence, although he does not deny that the two conditions, divine providence and human effort should exist together, his emphasis is on the decisiveness of the former rather than the latter affecting the former.

¹⁴¹ *De regimine principum*, 409 (3:9).

¹⁴² *Book of Chivalry*, 73.

¹⁴³ Allmand, *Society at War*, 41-42.

5.15 The Focus on the Commander as the Executor of Strategy and Discipline

As aforementioned, the most distinctive features of Roman military strength were discipline and strategy, which in turn, depended on human effort, and most of all, the abilities of the commander to govern that effort in a right way and towards right ends. Accordingly, Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières had their focus on the commander instead of on the individual knight. Bouvet repeated what Legnano had covered concerning the duties of the army commander, mainly with reference to Vegetius. Bouvet asserted that, as the commander is the one responsible for everything concerning the organization of troops and deciding when and how to fight, the commanders should be “wise and well-informed in the matter of combat.”¹⁴⁴ Pizan, too, highlights the importance of commanders as the administrators of warfare in the name of the king and that they should be selected from among the wisest and most experienced in arms, and should “know how to maintain, lead and equip in the best possible manner.”¹⁴⁵ In *Livre des faits d’armes*, she practically regards warfare as the business of the commanders and organizes her chapters according to how the commanders should organize and lead his troops in different situations, with reference to Vegetius and other Roman authors.¹⁴⁶ Moreover, she asserts the importance of the duty of the commanders as pertaining to the well-being of the state, the prince and the people, both in this work and in *Livre du corps de policie*.¹⁴⁷ In addition to these, in *Le Livre de Charles V*, she asserts that,

¹⁴⁴ *Tree of Battles*, 132 (4:9): Although he claims his source on the “duties commander of the army” as Vegetius, Bouvet apparently draws on Legnano here, for he covers the same issues as he does.

¹⁴⁵ *Deeds of Arms*, 23-24 (1:7).

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 37-77 (1:12-28).

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 61 (1: 21); *Body Politic*, 70-71 (2:9).

while individual commanders are put at all levels of the host to lead the men in order, a general army commander should be established by princes to act in their name in battles, due to the perils of losing the prince in battle if he were to command in person.¹⁴⁸ Mézières too emphasises the army commanders, as he establishes fifteen rules to be observed by the captains of the army in order to conquer their enemies and to maintain their status, which concerns the honour and benefit of the king, the men-at-arms and the people. He sees such an emphasis on commanders as associated with Roman experience, as he recommends the reading of Vegetius to those who would like to know more about the function of the captains of the army.¹⁴⁹

The role of the army commanders as the servants of the prince to administer discipline and strategy was hence a Roman feature. Although it can also be found asserted in John of Salisbury, Aegidius Romanus, and Giovanni da Legnano, we do not there see a comparable focus on it as is found in Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières. It can be argued that this focus was associated with the contemporary military demands. The centralisation of command in the army was seen as a remedy to the ills viewed as responsible for the military failures of the day, these ills being the lack of discipline and strategy. In this context, what was previously addressed as a criticism of pride and fighting for vainglory, with the love of luxury and the greed for pillage among men-at-arms, was now diagnosed as a sign of lack of strategy and discipline in the army.

¹⁴⁸ *Charles V*, 330-31. She repeats the perils in princes' leading battles and the need of princes to delegate this task to commanders with reference to the example of Charles V in *Deeds of Arms*, 22-23 (1: 6-7).

¹⁴⁹ *Vieux pèlerin*, 442-54.

5.16 The Use of Strategy and Wisdom in Warfare

The good commander needs to administer his wars wisely, prudently and with strategy, so that he will benefit his prince and the common good. In *Arbre des batailles*, Bouvet, like Legnano, discusses the concept of true fortitude that had been borrowed by Christian theology from Aristotle. Bouvet asserts that physical strength does not suffice alone, but to win divine praise it should be accompanied by “good counsel, and to know how to command well those who are to fight the battle.” Here he holds that boldness is not always about striking, but knowing when to do it, when it is more opportune, and that it is as important to win a battle by waiting as by attacking.¹⁵⁰ Again, as Legnano did with reference to Vegetius, Bouvet establishes that the office of the general is to know how to guide his men in battle as much as how to keep them in discipline and order. He asserts that the commander should know which men he can use according to the place and time of combat and to the state of opponents.¹⁵¹ Likewise, he declares in *L’Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun*, appealing to the authority of Cicero, that military commanders should be chosen from those who can act with reason and not by will and impulse.¹⁵²

Although this is all Bouvet covers concerning strategy, he comes back to the same issue in *Arbre des batailles* within a discussion of the use of tricks and cunning in warfare, which in turn was passed down from ecclesiastical opinion. He asks “whether it is fitting for a king or prince by deceit or subtlety to overcome another prince his enemy” and then basically repeats the ecclesiastical consensus on the issue by citing Legnano. Hence, using in support the example of Joshua from the Bible, he declares that it is permissible by divine will as long as the war is just and

¹⁵⁰ *Tree of Battles*, 119-20 (3: 3), 133 (4: 11).

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 132 (4:9).

¹⁵² *Apparicion*, 30, lines 618-624.

there is no breaking of promises involved. He also adds that the use of trickery is not only “good and fitting”, but also constitutes “sound sense and correct conduct” in warfare. His advice, that may have a hint of criticism about royal behaviour, is that the king of France must not leave it to God to decide the outcome of the battle without doing anything, but fight “by diligence, and by taking good counsel, to overcome the enemy.”¹⁵³

Like Bouvet, Pizan holds that battles can be won basically with “good sense and government”, which does not necessarily involve fighting, as in the example of the wise king Charles V.¹⁵⁴ This had been her defence of the king in *Le Livre de Charles V*, insisting that the late king was indeed a good knight. She therefore challenged the traditional definition of the knight or king fighting with a sword in his hand in front of his army with that of a wise king who gives primacy to the safety and well-being of his subjects in battle. Accordingly, she justified the king’s paying for the surrender of castles and fortresses instead of storming them, out of the fear that he might lose many of his men, and his mobilization of mercenary companies under the royal banner in order that they would not harm his subjects. Moreover, she asserts that the king makes war only when “the public utility” is under threat, but then strives to end these wars quickly by way of pacts and treaties.¹⁵⁵

Likewise, in *Livre du corps de policie* and in *Livre des faits d’armes*, she underlines that the commanders should be “wise and well-advised in their duties” and act prudently, for they are guarding the common good and the benefit of the sovereign both in war and in peace. She advises that commanders should not refuse offers of truces as long as they are honourable and profitable, so that they will not

¹⁵³ *Tree of Battles*, 154-55 (4:49). The quotations are from 155.

¹⁵⁴ *Deeds of Arms*, 22-23 (1:6).

¹⁵⁵ *Charles V*, 339, 342, 344.

only avoid further bloodshed, but also the wrath of God on those who are too proud to make peace.¹⁵⁶ Hence wisdom in warfare is a virtue that agrees with the end of the common good and thus is praised by God. These statements, while they emphasise the common good as the duty of princes and commanders in the service of the state, are at the same time drawing on the definition of just wars that should be aimed at the common good and peace.

In both *Livre des faits d'armes* and *Livre du corps de policie*, Pizan promotes strategy in warfare after the example of the Romans. In *Livre des faits d'armes*, she is as if speaking in criticism of the romance heroes and the real-life chivalric heroes who were inspired by them, though there is no direct indication of this. She cites Vegetius's advice to "fight with strategy and not at random," and not to engage in a fight if one is not likely to win, and declares that "the knight who seeks good adventure should fight ... using good judgement and not 'from the hip.'"¹⁵⁷ Her description of the commander follows these lines and often draws on Vegetius. Like Bouvet, she maintains that the commander should not make haste to attack in battle if he does not see the situation to his advantage; and should leave the battlefield prudently and with strategy if it is best to avoid battle.¹⁵⁸

In *Livre des faits d'armes* Pizan praises the use of wisdom and strategy as more necessary than the number of troops in battle,¹⁵⁹ and in *Livre du corps de policie* she reports that victories won by both strategy and strength were the most honoured in Rome.¹⁶⁰ She specifies some of the things that commanders should consider in battle, such as the state of the enemy and that of the commander's own troops; the terrain of the battlefield; the counsel of the wise and experienced men in

¹⁵⁶ *Body Politic*, 71 (2:9); *Deeds of Arms*, 58-61 (1:20). The quotations are from *Body Politic*, 71.

¹⁵⁷ *Deeds of Arms*, 27 (1:8).

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 53-56 (1:18), 58 (1:20).

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 24 (1:7).

¹⁶⁰ *Body Politic*, 51 (1:29).

the army, and the enemy's traps and spies.¹⁶¹ Although she repeats the old arguments about the justification of the use of tricks in battle with reference to Bouvet, and derives the same conclusion that they should be used before putting one's faith in God for the outcome of a battle,¹⁶² she already has many arguments in favour of subtleties in battle that she draws from the Roman sources. She teaches that, while being careful against enemy spies and traps, the commander must constantly strive to find the weaknesses of his enemies and surprise them, and must use spies in order to discover the enemy's strategies and even to "sow dissension" among them.¹⁶³ Elsewhere she repeats the advice to lay ambushes against the enemy and to beware of ambushes laid by the enemy, asserting that to be defeated by such means is more shameful than to be defeated in open battle, because it indicates a lack of proper care.¹⁶⁴ In *Livre du corps de policie*, too, she elaborates on the use of trickery in war, this time with reference to Valerius Maximus's examples of "strategems" by which the ancients conquered their enemies. She describes these examples, which in turn were possibly taken from Frontinus's *Strategmata*, as pertaining to wise and well-advised soldiers.¹⁶⁵

In *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, Mézières teaches the young Charles VI that, like his father who had been praised by Pizan for his lack of hunger for battle, he should refrain from hasty decisions to go to war without sufficient preparation and without taking good counsel, when war would affect both his people and his knighthood. Mézières asserts that a serious war is one that should be fought only if it is impossible to make peace, for the common good of the kingdom and the people, and this should be done with judgement, reflecting on the results and hearing counsel and

¹⁶¹ *Deeds of Arms*, 46-47 (1:15), 53-57 (1:18-19), 63-64 (1: 22).

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 163-64 (3:13).

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 46-47 (1:15).

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 55(1:18), 57(1:19).

¹⁶⁵ *Body Politic*, 83-89 (2:18-21).

without running risks. Opposed to this is the taking of impulsive action as in the battle of Crécy, which ended with the crushing defeat of the French and marked the beginning of the decline of the glory of the monarchy.¹⁶⁶ Again, in agreement with Pizan, Mézières advises that war should be only the last resort, when it is impossible to make peace with the enemy, and the common good needs to be defended. Then, even though one is victorious in war, peace should be made as soon as possible. This will both stop the sufferings caused by war and will please God, who will punish those too proud to make peace.¹⁶⁷

With reference to Vegetius in *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, Mézières teaches that the commander should be prudent not to expose the state of the army to the enemy and should beware of enemy spies; should use spies to gain advantage over the enemy, and should take the opinion of his counsellors, both clerks and knights, in his decisions.¹⁶⁸ He especially emphasises the use of permanent spies among the enemy in order to be informed about their situation, as part of the requirement for “diligence and prudence”, and also as an instrument to facilitate the making of a profitable peace as willed by God.¹⁶⁹ In *Epistre lamentable* too, he maintains that using spies, subtleties and ambushes, and knowing about the spies of the enemy, are parts of the “virtue of the discipline of knighthood,”¹⁷⁰ something he often describes as both willed by God and taught by the Romans.¹⁷¹ Hence Mézières, too, justifies tricks both as a part of just wars that should be aimed at peace and as a necessary feature of the wars led by commanders to the benefit of the sovereign state.

¹⁶⁶ *Vieux pèlerin*, 852-57.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 848-55.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 444-48, 453.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 881-83.

¹⁷⁰ *Epistre lamentable*, 129-30.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 105, 131.

All this emphasis on the need for military strategy that should be administered by the commander can be taken as different from the ecclesiastical authors' treatment of the subject. First of all, the discussion is not limited to the commonplace justification of trickery in warfare, or the definition of true fortitude undertaken by prudence, temperance and justice, but extends beyond it by referring to the Romans' praise of wisdom and their use of military strategies. While John of Salisbury made extensive use of Roman ideas concerning warfare in *Policraticus*, he did not have a comparable focus on the use of strategy in war or its administration by the commander. On the other hand, Aegidius Romanus was quite keen on discussing Roman military strategies and tactics, though, writing in a different time and place of course, one cannot find there the same actual or implied criticism of contemporary military affairs that Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières shared.¹⁷² These authors hinted at, or in the case of Mézières directly stated, the contemporary recklessness in the conduct of battles, setting this imprudence against prudent and planned action, with a warning against the disastrous effects of the former. Their descriptions of impulsive actions directed towards personal glory recall the deeds of the good Marshal Bouciquaut as recounted in his biography, or Charny's indifference to knights' disobedience to their captain when they go recklessly into action at the expense of overall success in battle.¹⁷³ In accordance with the ideas of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, we can find around the late fourteenth century that the actions of individual knights that disregarded the strategy of the battle for shows of heroism were prohibited under the clauses of obedience to the commander in contemporary ordinances of war and were

¹⁷² See Chapter Four.

¹⁷³ Contamine, *Guerre, état et société*, 188; Chany, *Livre de chevalerie*, 55.

rebuked by commanders in action.¹⁷⁴ Moreover, as has been previously mentioned, just as Mézières criticised the battles of the Hundred Years' War for their unplanned nature and impulsive actions, the contemporary chronicles of Jean Juvenal des Ursins and the Monk of St. Denis attacked the Nicopolis crusade for the same reasons.¹⁷⁵

5.17 The Execution of Discipline among Warriors

In order that knights should not act on their own, moved either by the desire for personal glory or for other individual reasons, Bouvet underlines the necessity of military discipline in the army and asserts that it should be supervised by the commander. He describes the commander as directing every move of the soldiers. Without the commander's licence they should not do anything, thus putting the individual soldiers completely under the commander's control. Despite the fact that Bouvet is borrowing from Legnano here, he adds his own remarks to supplement Legnano's strictly theoretical definitions based on Vegetius. As seen in Chapter Four, Legnano gives a list of the duties of the commanders, that pertained to maintaining discipline among their men, looking after their needs, administering the order of his troops and the organization of battles, just as John of Salisbury and Aegidius Romanus had underlined the importance of the duty of the commander to maintain discipline and order in the army after the example of the old times. Bouvet's contribution to the discussion of the commanders' role in administering discipline reveals contemporary conduct and the criticism of it.

Bouvet contends that the commander should prevent soldiers from being idle in castles and fortresses or being engaged in activities such as hunting that are not

¹⁷⁴Keen, "Richard II's Ordinances," 37-39; Housley tells that the duke of Bourbon rebuked Bouciquaut's brother for his disobedience and impulsiveness in search of a display of heroism in "One Man and his Wars," 38.

¹⁷⁵Housley, "One Man and his Wars," 38.

related with warfare, something that recalls the knights of the romances, who pass their time in festivities or games at court. He also mentions the need for the commander to control the consumption of food and wine, the excess of which as we have seen was an important part of the contemporary criticism of knighthood. He also asserts that the commander should see to the quarrels and conflicts between his men, and severely punish those fighting individual combats to demonstrate their boldness in the course of the battle. Moreover, he advises that it is also the duty of the commander to decide which men, footmen or knights, to use in a particular circumstance in battle, declaring that the decision depends completely on the question of its benefit on that particular day. These last two comments may be interpreted as a criticism of knights going always after their own personal interests and glory. In particular, the question as to when to use footmen rather than knights may be directed at knights who always want to go first in order to have the glory of the day to themselves, as seen in Bouciquaut's biography. He also asserts, like Legnano, that disobedience to orders, abandoning the battlefield, revealing military secrets, causing tumult or dissension among the men, are all ill-disciplined actions that should be punished severely in the Roman tradition.¹⁷⁶

In *L'Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun*, as aforementioned, Bouvet criticises the luxurious habits of the French knights, such as excessive and pleasurable eating and drinking and the love of comfort, as undermining their military discipline and causing them to fail on the battlefield. He refers to the "old laws" and to Valerius, asserting that soldiers should always be in good order and ready to serve, and that continuous practice made them masters in arms whereas lethargy did not. He even repeats the Vegetian advice also used by John of Salisbury, Thomas Aquinas and

¹⁷⁶ *Tree of Battles*, 131-32 (4: 9-10).

Aegidius Romanus, though without reference to Vegetius, that labourers, who are used to harsh conditions, for example to coarse food and drinks, and to rough beds, are the best ones to be chosen as soldiers, and adds that these should be organized under a good captain for the French to have victory in battles.¹⁷⁷

Pizan, who had asserted the importance of commanders in battle, dictates in *Le Livre de Charles V* that it is the duty of the commander to decide how to organize his men according to the requirements of the battle, and that order in battle is the most essential factor in obtaining victory. She argues that, for the defence of the common good, individual knights should be like rings of a chain assembled in such strictness that there should not be any disruption or confusion in battle that would lead to defeat.¹⁷⁸ She echoes this thought in *Livre du corps de policie* with reference to Vegetius and asserts that the occupation of arms is a science in which rules should be kept, without which there will be all confusion. She hints at a criticism of contemporaries by adding that this is something that “we know from experience.”¹⁷⁹ Moreover, she praises the Romans because they combined their love of arms with their observation of strict military discipline, which in turn both made them victorious and secured the establishment and continuity of their empire. With reference to Valerius, she asserts that “the discipline of chivalry, that is keeping the rules and order appropriate to it, was the highest honour and firm foundation of the empire of Rome.” Then she gives examples concerning the strictness of Roman discipline.¹⁸⁰ In *Livre des faits d’armes*, where she repeats that all things concerning men-at-arms are the responsibility of the commander, she states that the good commander should maintain discipline in the army. Reminiscent of Bouvet’s

¹⁷⁷ *Apparicion*, 23-24, lines 455-486, 27, lines 543-556, 32, lines 675-680.

¹⁷⁸ *Charles V*, 331, 335-36.

¹⁷⁹ *Body politic*, 70 (2:9).

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 64-65 (2:5).

comment on the commander's duty to prevent individual combats between men-at-arms, she asserts with reference to Vegetius that, although the men can exercise at their leisure in this way, nevertheless such combats should be held in check lest they result in disorder. Here, in spite of the examples of the strict punishments of the Romans she gives in *Livre du corps de policie*, she asserts that "rule and good doctrine" are more praiseworthy in maintaining discipline than mere punishment.¹⁸¹ Elsewhere she declares that commanders should also keep self-discipline and govern their men well by keeping them in order.¹⁸²

In several of Pizan's books, training and getting accustomed to the rough conditions of battle is shown to be one of the most important aspects of Roman military success.¹⁸³ In both *Livre des faits d'armes* and *Livre du corps de policie*, she praises the Romans' training of their children from an early age in arms, and contrasts it with the contemporary state of French noble youth, who are spoiled in luxuries and comfort.¹⁸⁴ Also in *Le Chemin de longue estude*, she repeats Bouvet's Roman advice that knights should not be accustomed to fine food or comfort.¹⁸⁵ Although the stages of the Roman training on which Pizan elaborates are reminiscent of Charny's stages of prowess in arms that should be taken to attain higher degrees of knightly honour, here they are taken for the sake of the training that will benefit the soldier's service to the state.¹⁸⁶ In accordance with the importance she gives to training, she repeats in various places that the Romans defeated large numbers of men with smaller numbers that were trained and disciplined in arms.¹⁸⁷ In contrast is the difficulty of keeping "men gathered from various places and nations in an army"

¹⁸¹ *Deeds of Arms*, 44-45 (1:15).

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 25(1:7).

¹⁸³ *Chemin*, 351, lines 4453-4462; *Body Politic*, 59 (2:2); *Deeds of Arms*, 26-28 (1:8).

¹⁸⁴ *Body Politic*, 59-61 (2:2); *Deeds of Arms*, 29-37 (1:9).

¹⁸⁵ *Chemin*, 347-49, lines 4400-4406.

¹⁸⁶ *Deeds of Arms*, 29-32 (1:9).

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 26-28 (1:8), 37-38 (1:12), 66 (1:23).

under discipline. This too is perhaps a criticism aimed at contemporaries, with the use of mercenary companies or crusades with troops from many nations in mind. She refers to Vegetius's disapproval of such mixed armies as being liable to lead to tumult.¹⁸⁸

Mézières sticks to the definition of discipline as an absence of sins in an army, namely luxury, pride and greed. Although the treatment of these sins has been examined earlier with reference to the ecclesiastical tradition that shaped the clerical and lay criticism of warriors, Mézières directly places them as the opposites of military discipline in both *Songe du vieil pèlerin* and *Epistre lamentable*.

Mézières's fifteen rules that should be observed by army captains, as set out in *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, can be viewed as emphasising the role of the captain as the deputy of the king, a captain who should keep discipline in his army rule as much as he rules by wisdom and strategy. He should do it by establishing justice between men-at-arms; taking musters; and making sure that all keep self-discipline by abstaining from excess food, drink, games, clothes, equipment, etc, and also that all avoid pillage. While strict military discipline and justice is presented as the primary virtue that should be copied from the Romans (despite the fact that they were pagans), luxury, pride and greed for pillage are both sinful and the enemies of discipline.¹⁸⁹ Accordingly, he gives the Roman commanders, Cato and Scipio Africanus as examples of this proper behaviour by praising their abstinence from luxury, vanity and pride.¹⁹⁰

Moreover, as the keeper of the discipline in the army, the captain should also show the utmost reverence for religion and the Church, both by spiritual and material

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 45 (1:15). 38 (1: 12), 27-28 (1:8).

¹⁸⁹ *Vieux pèlerin*, 442-54.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 456-59.

means.¹⁹¹ Accordingly, Mézières asserts that the good captain should persevere in the “religion of Jesus-Christ” as much as he perseveres in “the true discipline of knighthood.”¹⁹² Likewise, just as he believes, like St. Bernard, that Judas Maccabeus won his victory with a small number of men against many by the will of God, he also asserts that this was a victory of disciplined troops who had a common rule against those who indulged in pride and vainglory.¹⁹³ This, rather than an account of the divine punishment of sinners, becomes an interpretation of the Old Testament story from the perspective of Vegetius’s praise of discipline.

By the same token, in *Epistre lamentable*, Mézières associates the sins of pride, lust and luxury among men-at-arms with the absence of “rule, discipline, obedience and justice” in the army, and this he illustrates not only with examples from ancient history but also from the Bible and the history of France.¹⁹⁴ As in *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, he asserts that the book of Vegetius is a fundamental source, as well as Aegidius Romanus’s *De regimine principum* that draws on it, for learning “the true science” by which the discipline of knighthood cannot be corrupted, so that the prince will have victory.¹⁹⁵

The attitude to sins as causes of defeat by undermining military discipline and the Roman examples of discipline to counter this state of sins, a combination that is found in Mézières to a great extent, and also noted in Bouvet and Pizan too, as has been discussed in Chapter Four, was also advocated by John of Salisbury earlier within a context of criticism of his contemporary warriors. Hence, it is discipline which brings military victory, but it is not ascertained if this is due to the benefits of

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 442-43, 450-51.

¹⁹² “... persévérant dans la religion de Jésus-Christ, la vraie loi, la vraie discipline de la chevalerie ...”: Ibid., 446.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 858.

¹⁹⁴ *Epistre lamentable*, 105-21.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 131.

organized and coordinated behaviour as opposed to individual undertakings in warfare, or due to the belief that God will favour the armies where discipline overcomes sinfulness. Yet from Mézières's, or John of Salisbury's point of view for that matter, they may well come to the same thing. The criticism of the Nicopolis crusaders in *Epistre lamentable* offers an examination in this light: the defeat of the crusaders ensued because the absence of rule, discipline, obedience and justice in an army made God withdraw His support from the crusaders.¹⁹⁶ Hence, God's punishment is made effective through the effects of sins, that is lack of discipline bringing about defeat.

5.18 The Payment of Wages

The establishment of discipline in the army necessitated that the men-at-arms were well-looked after and paid for their labour, so that they would not attempt to flee, cause disorder in the army, or satisfy their needs by plunder. Hence the issue of payment of wages to soldiers on a regular basis so that they will serve the state with discipline came to form an important part in the discussions of warfare and knighthood that looked back in admiration to the Roman military system.

Whereas the system of raising troops by a general or regional summons to vassals of the king, or to the vassals of his vassals by virtue of their feudal duty to supply men for the king's army, was becoming outdated at the time when Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan were writing, there were still occasional levies of this kind made in France and in England, but they were far from the only means of recruiting men-at-arms. Foreign mercenary companies and indentured companies and soldiers came to be the most accustomed way of mobilising troops. Yet the payment of these troops

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 105, 108, 117-21.

in accordance with individual contracts made with the king did not quite live up to the notion of soldiers receiving wages from the ruler that was thought to exist in the Roman model.

Although Legnano touched upon the issue of the liabilities owed by lords towards those who were not their vassals, including those who had leased their service, he did not really talk about payment for knights. He only discussed the payment of wages to mercenaries, but even then he viewed it from the point of view of a legal liability and not as an instrument of keeping military discipline.¹⁹⁷ Only in his argument that soldiers should not be occupied with things other than matters of arms does the the author caution that, if they are, they will be deprived of the “privileges” of their service, which possibly includes the material benefits due to them.¹⁹⁸ The problem is that, whereas Legnano referred to a soldier in the service of the state who should not hold any other occupation than that of always keeping himself ready to fight for the common good, to accord with the realities of his time he had to consider several differing types of men-at-arms from vassals to mercenaries and other contractors.

Bouvet, like Legnano, cannot successfully make a definition of a soldier in the service of the state. This makes him limit his definition of knights, who should only be occupied with arms, to those “who are in the king’s service, or in a lord’s” by virtue of their oath.¹⁹⁹ Again he repeats via Legnano from Vegetius that these men, who should obey the orders of their commanders and be severely punished if they do not, should be looked after by the commander in return. It is the commander’s task to establish justice between them and see to it that they have enough food and drink and

¹⁹⁷ *De bello*, 259-68.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 236.

¹⁹⁹ *Tree of Battles*, 131 (4: 8).

are in good health.²⁰⁰ However, although he follows Legnano's pattern and considers that men-at-arms may fight with different motives, he tends to treat them as particular cases that deviate from the regular paid service to the lord, and even then discusses the relevance of payment to these particular cases.²⁰¹ He declares that a knight is "not obliged to take part in a war at his lord's command, however just it may be, at his own expense, but must have wages."²⁰² Hence, he argues that even vassals fighting for their lords should have wages. While this does not mean, Bouvet adds, that the king's vassals and subjects should not aid him in arms if he needs it, this must be done in a fair way where there will be no abuse of the fighting men.²⁰³ Likewise, if a knight is to help his neighbour for his defence, he should receive payment, but not in a case where he willingly wants to help a widow for the sake of his own glory.²⁰⁴ Payment is also not due to those fighting only for pillage, which he adds is a wicked thing.²⁰⁵ Wages, he declares, "are not given for the love of the persons concerned only, but also for the labour and pain incurred in earning them."²⁰⁶ Thus, he goes by the principle that men-at-arms, who take certain risks in arms, should be paid wages in return, unless they are taking the risks for their own sake or are compensating themselves in other ways. He elaborates on particular conditions how and when wages should be paid to particular persons, and he is not referring to mercenaries like Legnano, but to soldiers in the service of a lord or the king.

Pizan, too, argues that the commander, who has the duty to keep his troops in order and discipline, should also see to the needs of his men and make sure that they

²⁰⁰ *De bello*, 236; *Tree of Battles*, 131-32 (4:9).

²⁰¹ *Tree of Battles*, 135-138 (4: 15-20), 141-149(4: 26-42).

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 135 (4:15).

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 135-36 (4:15), 137(4:19) , 138 (4:20).

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 135 (4:15), 137 (4: 18).

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 143-44 (4: 32, 34).

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 146 (4:36).

do not suffer from hunger, cold, tiredness or diseases.²⁰⁷ She further describes the ritual of soldiers taking oaths to serve the prince loyally, as accompanied by their acceptance of pay. She underlines that the appropriate payment of men-at-arms for their service is an important issue to be respected by leaders in war, because it will affect the success of their battles. She explains that “nobody can expect to have good soldiers who are badly paid, because their courage will decline along with their pay.”²⁰⁸ Only after they take care of the issue of payment can the commanders “put [their] men into such action as circumstances require.” Hence, she establishes that payment ensures the quality of what is done under the discipline of the commander. In accordance with this, in *Le Livre de Charles V*, she asserts the need to pay knights with suitable wages or other rewards and revenues in return for the risks they are taking with their bodies and limbs in wars fought for the common good.²⁰⁹ She also declares, in *Livre des faits d’armes*, that inadequate payment will oblige the men-at-arms to pillage and rob. However, if the men-at-arms are paid well so that they can afford all their needs, they will not need to pillage.²¹⁰ Aptly, she praises the ancients, presumably meaning the Romans, who would never withhold pay from “poor soldiers”, which they had earned in great perils and labour, unlike her contemporary commanders who kept their men’s pay for themselves.²¹¹

Further, in *Livre des faits d’armes*, she basically recapitulates what Bouvet had declared about different cases where wages were to be paid or not. She elaborates on the issue of payment of vassals more carefully than Bouvet to come to the decision that the levy of arms is not necessary as long as the king takes taxes from his subjects. Even so, he can declare a summons to arms if he does not have any

²⁰⁷ *Deeds of Arms*, 40-41 (1: 13-14), 50-51 (1: 16), 54-55 (1: 18).

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 38-39 (1:12).

²⁰⁹ *Charles V*, 336.

²¹⁰ *Deeds of Arms*, 166 (3:14), 41(1:14).

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, 156-57 (3: 9).

other resources. On the other hand, the vassals should not fight at their own expense but for wages, unless they have a feudal obligation over generations to do so. She nevertheless passes on from the issue of vassals quickly to establish the payment of men-at-arms by lords as something that should be done on a regular basis for the contracted period of time, unless there is some fault on the part of the soldiers to break that contract.²¹² Here, she is presumably referring to indentured soldiers or similar.

Mézières, like Bouvet and Pizan, also underlines the idea that the commander, whose duties he elaborates mainly as administering discipline in the army, should provide for his men, especially the poor ones, and should not withhold anything from his men that they should have by right, and should distribute the booty according to the courage of his men in order to reward them for their valour.²¹³ He establishes regular payment of troops as profiting the wars of the king, as he declares that such troops will be ready to serve the king and waiting for his orders in discipline, unlike the disordered multitudes assembled by the *arrière ban*. Then he laments the state of the French knights who have been exhausted by having to pay for their own expenses during the long war with the English. He asserts that these knights cannot possibly be effectively disciplined, because they are not paid well. Hence, as Pizan said, nobody could expect victory from them in the absence of payment. Accordingly, Mézières advises the king that in times of both peace and war he should give his subjects what is due to them by their right of serving him. He discusses the problems related with the insufficient or non-existent pay of men-at-arms, which he finds responsible for the ongoing defeats. In this, he criticises some great nobles who enrich themselves by stealing from the wages of their men, a

²¹² Ibid., 148-159 (3:5-10).

²¹³ *Vieux pèlerin*, 446-47, 450.

criticism also hinted at by Pizan. Mézières proposes a regional system of levying taxes for wars, so that men-at-arms will be well-paid and ready to serve the king upon his orders.²¹⁴ Finally, he also finds the remedy for the disorder and disruption caused by the mercenary troops, who go off on their own and pillage the countryside, in putting them under discipline by regular payment.²¹⁵ It should be noted that such an attempt at reform had been already been taken by Charles V, a reform which, remembering that Mézières was a councillor of the king at the time, could have possibly been influenced by Mézières himself. Another such attempt reform was made by Charles VII around the middle of the fifteenth century.²¹⁶

The idea in all these insistences on regular payment of troops was that they would serve better and would not act in an undisciplined manner, as they would not flee, rebel or pillage. Pillage, as examined earlier from the point of view of morality, was an act that denied Christian charity to civilians, and that defeated the purpose of serving the common good in arms. On the other hand, it was also an act that manifested lack of discipline, which did not fit the ideal of soldiery inspired by the Roman sources. Both Pizan and Mézières suggested that when soldiers were denied their pay they were prone to pillage and this would affect the course of the battle and eventually bring about the defeat of the army.²¹⁷ The contemporaries, Jean de Gerson and the Monk of St. Denis, also touched on the same issue, Jean de Gerson showing the example of the Romans from Valerius and the monk of St. Denis criticising both the French and the English soldiers.²¹⁸ Such an emphasis on pillage and lack of

²¹⁴ Ibid., 858-71.

²¹⁵ Ibid., 883-86.

²¹⁶ Keen, *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms*, 12; Allmand, *Society at War*, 51-55.

²¹⁷ *Deeds of Arms*, 156-57 (3:9), 166 (3:14), 41(1:14); *Vieux pèlerin*, 450-51.

²¹⁸ Canon-Willard suggests that Jean de Gerson's remark in *Vivat rex* (1405) may have been an inspiration to Pizan: Canon-Willard, "Christine de Pizan on the Art of Warfare," 8, citing Jean Gerson, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Pierre Glorieux, 10 vols (Paris: Desclée, 1960-1973), 1137-85; See also Meron, *Henry's Wars*, 116-17.

discipline due to inadequate payment was apparently directed at the contemporary situation, in which soldiers who did not receive their due wages on both sides took to pillaging the French countryside to compensate themselves for their lack of payment.²¹⁹

5.19 The Spoils of War

The line that separated pillage from lawful booty was indeed thin. While not all booty was taken from combatants on the battlefield, what distinguished the taking of lawful spoils of war from pillage, in accordance with the previously discussed opinions of canon and civil lawyers, boiled down to whether the war was just and whether the soldiers were given authorisation for the act by those waging that just war.²²⁰ Bouvet, in *Arbre des batailles*, while he laments the unfairness of harming and robbing civilians, justifies the taking of spoils from civilians on the grounds of the justness of the war and the justness of the cause. He declares that, by the authority of the “masters” — of law presumably — in just wars sometimes the good plants can be harmed along with the bad, and what is more, if those civilians are helping their king in his war, then it gives just cause for looting their goods and persons.²²¹ However, he also emphasises that the spoils of war are justified only when wars are waged by legitimate authority.²²² This thought, possibly drawn largely from Legnano, repeats the ecclesiastical opinion on the spoils of war that was examined in Chapter Four. Then Bouvet recapitulates another established opinion of canon and civil lawyers that all spoils taken in just wars belong to the prince who wages the war and thus should be distributed by him. Bouvet asserts this with an

²¹⁹ Meron, *Henry's Wars*, 123-24.

²²⁰ Keen, *Laws of War*, 139-40.

²²¹ *Tree of Battles*, 153-54 (4:48).

²²² *Ibid.*, 149 (4: 43).

emphasis on payment. He declares that if “the soldier is in the king’s pay, or in that of another lord, the prisoners or other possessions acquired should be the lord’s in whose pay the soldier is.” The reason, he explains, is that the soldier is not pursuing his own war by his own means but that of the prince or the king.²²³ Bouvet declares that prisoners should also be treated the same as other spoils of war, but Christian practice replaces the ancient custom of enslaving them by the taking of ransom, which should be done in moderation.²²⁴

In *Livre des faits d’armes*, Pizan goes from lamenting pillage directly to the legitimisation of the spoils of war and discusses on what conditions it is just. She declares, like Bouvet whom she draws on, that “if a war is conducted by the command of a king or prince who has the power to declare and carry out a just war,” then the spoils of war, whether booty or prisoners, are lawful. She also adds that it should be disposed of according to the will of the prince or to his commander and according to the merits of soldiers. Yet, she also maintains that the ancient princes and commanders, meaning the Romans, meant well by this law and rewarded their warriors by not keeping anything to themselves out of the booty and distributing it all.²²⁵

While Mézières, in *Songe du vieil pèlerin*, sees pillage as an ill committed largely by the mercenary companies in France,²²⁶ he otherwise establishes that as long as it is done under the authority of commanders of the army (presumably in the just wars of their king), it is allowed. He maintains that good commanders should not keep the spoils to themselves, but share them with their men, favouring the most

²²³ Ibid., 134-35 (4: 14).

²²⁴ Ibid., 134 (4:13), 151-53 (4: 45-47).

²²⁵ *Deeds of Arms*, 166-68 (3:15-16). Also in 156-57 (3: 9).

²²⁶ *Vieux pèlerin*, 883-84.

courageous.²²⁷ Likewise in *Epistre lamentable*, he asserts that preventing pillage and distributing the booty to reward the valiant and punish the coward are important aspects of keeping discipline in the army.²²⁸ Hence just authority defines the lawful collection of spoils.

As we have seen, wages and the spoils of war receive a special emphasis in the writings of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières. The need for payment of soldiers as a measure of discipline and as an important factor in improving their performance had earlier been mentioned by John of Salisbury, though not to the same extent, and not in relation particularly to a contemporary situation as in the works of these authors. Moreover, the authors' point of view concerning the the spoils of war, despite their repetition of the canon and civil laws on the issue, may be held to differ from the ecclesiastical one. In that they do not only discuss the lawfulness of spoils of war on the grounds of just war, as was established in ecclesiastical opinion, but also see them as legitimate rights that belong to soldiers, like wages, in their service to the state. Legnano's treatment of them as legal liabilities may be closer to the authors' sense of it, though not from the knights' but the lawyer's point of view. Yet, this should not be perceived as a private right concerning individual soldiers, but one that pertains to the common benefit of the host and the state the soldiers are serving. In this context, their discussion of the spoils of war commonly testifies to an effort to put them under the control of the prince via the commander under whose authority, and for whose cause — it is emphasised — the soldiers are fighting. N.A.R. Wright compares such a point of view with that of Charny and Froissart, both of whom are known for their individualistic perspective on warfare and knighthood, in the former's *Les Demandes pour la joute, le tournoi, et la guerre* and the latter's

²²⁷ Ibid., 450.

²²⁸ *Epistre lamentable*, 130.

Chroniques. He establishes that whereas these authors looked from the point of view of the individual rights of soldiers especially where it concerned war spoils, Bouvet had a view of the protection of the common good.²²⁹

We can see arguments that undermine the individual claims to spoils of war in the remarks of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières. Bouvet tries to prove the impracticality of this, by reasoning that otherwise “every strong castle and fortified town” should belong to its capturers.²³⁰ Denying knights the right to castles and strongholds they capture, Keen points out, was also a clause included in indentured contracts drawn up in England.²³¹ On the other hand, there is also considerable caution about hindering the rights of knights to the spoils of war, just like wages, for its side effect was to undermine military vigour and discipline. Especially Pizan and Mézières constantly make remarks about the obligation of captains not to hinder the rights of their men-at-arms to the spoils of war.²³² These authors were probably trying to propose a consistent set of laws to determine the issues concerning the spoils of war under the apparent influence of Roman laws and Roman examples. Yet this was apparently done notwithstanding the difficulties that arose from comparing the Roman soldier in the paid and pensioned service of the empire with the medieval warrior, who was often not paid and fought in the service of a captain or a lord, who was not always fighting on behalf of the king.²³³ Although their writings contained the shadow of their own doubt, at the end of the day their view of the spoils of war was as consistent as possible with their idea of paid warriors fighting in the service of the prince or the king.

²²⁹ Wright, “*Tree of Battles* of Honoré de Bouvet,” 21-23.

²³⁰ *Tree of Battles*, 135 (4:14).

²³¹ Keen, *Laws of War*, 139.

²³² *Deeds of Arms*, 167 (3:15); *Vieux pèlerin*, 450.

²³³ Keen, *Laws of War*, 145-46, 154-55.

5.20 The Confused Concepts of the Medieval Knight, Man-at-Arms and the Roman Soldier

Something that also needs to be addressed concerning the interpretations of warfare and knighthood in the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières is the terminology they use to denote the soldier in the service of the state. Although the common features I have examined point to a more or less uniform type of warrior, who serves his prince, the kingdom and its people under the commander who administers military discipline and strategy in the army, they have no consistent choice of expressions to describe the warrior himself. We can find that the terms knight, man-at-arms, and soldier (*chevalier*, *gens d'armes* or *homme d'armes*, *soudoyer*) are used interchangeably with one another in the works, while the term knighthood (*chevalerie*) can be found in reference to the occupation of arms in general (as in *discipline de chevalerie*) or to all men engaged in the occupation (as in *chevalerie de France*).

There is rarely evidence for a distinction of rank or function, in the use of all these different terms that describes a warrior, although men-at-arms in its contemporary usage can be taken to mean warriors of generally lesser social status than knights. Such a difference in rank can be hinted at, for example, in *Le Livre de Charles V* in the allusion to the foundation of knighthood in Rome where *chevaliers* were chosen as the best from among a thousand *gens d'armes*,²³⁴ or in *Songe du vieux pèlerin* by the frequent references to men-at-arms as those under the command of knights. On the other hand, Mézières's use of both terms, *gens d'armes* and *chevaliers* in the same book in reference to pillagers, contends against the

²³⁴ *Charles V*, 332.

contemporary notions that only non-noble men-at-arms would be inclined towards pillage from the point of view of enriching themselves.²³⁵

There are also more confusing uses of the three terms, which may not point to any purpose of distinction or emphasis, but may simply aim at enriching the expression, or possibly even demonstrate the confusion of the authors with these terms. For example, Bouvet refers to “a soldier or a knight” in *Arbre des batailles*, while Pizan refers to “soldiers’ pay and wages for men-at-arms” in *Livre des faits d’armes* and to “knights and noble men-at-arms” in *Livre du corps de policie*.²³⁶ If we compare these uses with those of their quasi-contemporary, Geoffroi de Charny in his *Livre de chevalerie*, we can note that, he too, does not show any consistency between use of knights and men-at-arms. While he may be denoting two different categories of men by using them together in some places, he tries to stick to men-at-arms for the most part, using the term knight in some specific instances, for example in the case of a knight seen to be honoured by his lady, or with reference to the exemplary knight, Judas Maccabeus.²³⁷

Although there is an apparent tendency to use the terms *gens d’armes* and more infrequently *soudoyers* concerning the discussion of warriors serving under commanders and in return for wages (as in *Arbre des batailles* and *Livre des faits d’armes*), this is not a general rule, for the term knight is also used in the same context for example in *Arbre des batailles*, *Livre des faits d’armes*, *Livre du corps de policie*, and *Songe du vieux pèlerin*. Moreover, there are also several uses of the terms *chevalier* and *chevalerie* in reference to the Roman soldiers, as in *Arbre des batailles*, *Le Chemin de longue estude*, *Le Livre de Charles V*, *Livre du corps de*

²³⁵ This was expressed for example by Charny in his discussion of different motives in warfare. See Chapter Three.

²³⁶ *Tree of Battles*, 147 (4:39) ; *Deeds of Arms*, 153(3:8); *Body Politic*, 75 (2:13).

²³⁷ For the exclusive use of knight, see *Book of Chivalry*, 66, 88.

policie, and *Songe du vieil pèlerin*. Pizan in *Le Livre de Charles V*, justifies this use by referring to the commonplace of the Roman origins of *chevalerie* (that can also be inferred from John of Salisbury's account of the knighting ceremony in reference to Vegetius) and more doubtfully establishing the Romans' use of the term as *milites* as an equivalent of *chevalerie*.²³⁸ This great confusion on the part of Pizan reflects either the author's ignorance or her indifference regarding the distinction between the Roman soldier and the medieval knight.

Hence, what we may infer from the above examination of the terms, soldiers, knights and men-at-arms in the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, and from the comparison with Charny's *Livre de chevalerie*, is first of all the ambiguity concerning the use of these different expressions. These terms possibly did not have very clear connotations. While a detailed analysis of the usage of all these terms exceeds the scope of this study, it is interesting to note the key characteristics of their use as evidence for an interaction of different influences on the concept of the warrior in the period. The cult of knighthood still persevered, yet there were many well-armed mounted soldiers, of varying wealth and social status, who were not entitled to the name of knight, while the Roman books introduced both the idea of the archetypal Roman soldier, and a rather different kind of knight, a member of the Roman Order of Equites. Equally, while the type of soldier that is described by the Roman sources could not completely be reconciled with contemporary reality, the knight as described in traditional chivalric literature was somehow outdated. The authors were trying to work out a revised description of a warrior, modelled on the Roman soldier, while they were also revising late medieval ideals of warfare and knighthood.

²³⁸ *Charles V*, 332.

5.21 Conclusion

Honoré Bouvet, Christine de Pizan and Philippe de Mézières, three influential late medieval French authors writing on warfare and knighthood, can be understood to have a fairly common approach to warfare and knighthood. The specific traits of these three vernacular writers distance them from other contemporary vernacular books or narratives on knighthood, which appertain far more to traditional chivalric literature, influenced mainly by the romances. The contemporary works, Geoffroi de Charny's *Livre de chevalerie* and the anonymous *Livre de Bouciquaut* stand apart from the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières with their traditional emphasis on individual prowess and honour. Most fundamentally, the works of the latter three can be distinguished by their emphasis on a public purpose in warfare as opposed to the emphasis on the interests of the individual that is commonly seen in the traditional romance literature. Also, while none of these three writers — albeit one of them, Honoré Bouvet, was an ecclesiastic — was writing in the academic language of ecclesiastics, academics or legists, it is fairly clear that they were quite often reiterating ecclesiastical opinion, the basic feature of which was a view of warfare as a divine calling that should be fought for the common good and by right authority — that is the prince — to bring justice and peace, and which tended to condemn all other fighting as sinful.

Whereas we could, to a considerable extent, categorize their writings alongside that of the quasi-contemporary academic work, Giovanni da Legnano's *De Bello*, a famous work of the late medieval theory of war — which was the main source for Bouvet's *Arbre des batailles* and in turn partly for Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes* —, the fact that Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières were writing in the vernacular and without the academic references and abstract disputations of the jurists and

theologians, for a much wider audience, including princes, noblemen and knights, with the aim of regulating certain conduct in and concerning warfare that they consider wrong, necessitates that they should be treated in a different category from writers generally addressing an academic or high ecclesiastical audience.

What is also recognizable in the works of these three authors is an extensive praise of Roman military skills and power that is shown through the use of Roman examples and citations of Roman authors on military matters, as well as the promotion of a kind of warrior that would fit the Roman military system. This was not without precedent. We can find it especially in the works of John of Salisbury and Aegidius Romanus, the two chief ecclesiastical authors who had earlier transmitted Roman military ideas to medieval audiences. John of Salisbury in his *Policraticus*, especially, comes closer to Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières in that he was critical of the knighthood of his own day and used Roman examples to demonstrate an ideal that he thought should be imitated by his contemporaries. Moreover, John of Salisbury combined the Roman teaching and examples with his criticisms of the sinfulness of warriors, the latter criticisms also commonly found in other ecclesiastical authors, especially monastic, but also secular, and later also in lay writers. Thus he blended Christian and Roman thought together. Yet, these two spheres of thought did not necessarily conflict with each other, for the reason that Romans also had a view of associating the vices of combatants with military decline. Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières did not argue very differently from John of Salisbury in criticising a military downfall that stemmed from the sins or vices of combatants and the use of Roman examples and lessons to correct them. Moreover, the basic precept of the teaching concerning just war, that just wars are fought for the common good and by the authority of the prince, also agreed with the Romans praise of military

service to the state and the commonwealth. This, in turn, stemmed from the fact that Augustine, the father of the theory of just war, drew fundamentally on Roman and Greek thought to put together the essentials of his doctrine. Armed service to the state, using Roman example, can thus be found to be emphasised in John of Salisbury, just as in Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières.

The military teaching of the Romans that Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières drew on could be put under the general headings of discipline, strategy and service to the state with a view of common good. As aforementioned, while John of Salisbury greatly emphasised military discipline and service to the state — without losing the view of divine sanction on wars and warriors —, he did not give the same focus to the stratagems of war, though these in turn were discussed at length by another ecclesiastical writer, Aegidius Romanus. His *De regimine principum*, which drew chiefly on Vegetius for its teachings on warfare, had a focus on strategy and tactics, together with the emphasis on the aim of warfare as the common good and the need for military discipline and order for victory. Aegidius's work, in comparison with *Policraticus*, had a more Roman focus without the Christian criticism of the morals of warriors. Pizan had a comparable discussion of strategy and tactics with reference to Vegetius and Frontinus in the initial two parts of her *Livre des faits d'armes*.

In spite of the parallels that exist between the discussions of warfare and knighthood in the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières on the one hand and the ecclesiastical authors, especially Giovanni da Legnano, John of Salisbury and Aegidius Romanus, on the other, there are certain features in the former that set them apart from the latter. The most obvious of these, as has been argued before, is the language and style of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, intended for a different audience. Yet, other differences can also be pointed out. These can be basically associated with

their attitude towards contemporary problems and the need to resolve them. While, as has been argued, criticism of contemporary warriors was persistent in ecclesiastical authors, and particularly with a view to Roman precepts in John of Salisbury, Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières go beyond criticism to promote a reform programme that would benefit the current situation. In this they have a particular emphasis on the commanders' duty to establish discipline over their men especially through their payment of wages as parts of a central military system in which soldiers abide by rules in obedience to the state and are rewarded in return. The need to use strategy, too, receives emphasis, in a different manner from its extensive coverage in Aegidius Romanus, as it is often directed in Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières specifically at contemporary failures. Thus these three authors are doing more than constructing theoretical and theological discussions of warfare and knights, they are aimed at practical change to make that system work for the benefit of the state and the people of France, which the authors see as in peril. In that, their arguments certainly draw on a lot of contemporary practices and military reforms that had recently been attempted, the most significant of which were the reforms of Charles V. From another perspective, the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières can be seen as anticipating the French military reforms of the middle of the fifteenth century under Charles VII that would culminate in the first standing army of the realm.

Some scholars have tried to identify a challenge to medieval opinion on knighthood and warfare, including ecclesiastical and academic opinion, in the popularisation of the Roman ideas on military teaching. Maurice Keen, for example, in addition to seeing the model of the professional soldier fighting with the discipline and training of the Romans as challenging the individualism of the romance view, also sees a challenge in the Roman ideas to ecclesiastical opinion. He sees the

Roman ideas as being “only tapped in stages by the learned medieval world, and passed on in vernacular translation, once again by stages, to secular aristocratic society.” Through this, he asserts that “chivalry was thus reminded, forcefully, of the separation of the origins of its institutions from those of the priesthood, and of the original independence of its function — within the broad framework of divine providence — from the priestly one.”²³⁹

Similarly, Christopher Allmand found a great challenge in the Roman military ideas, with their promotion of skill, organization and planning, to the “fatalistic” resonance of the view of divine providence in warfare. He asserts that Vegetius’s book came to challenge the “ ‘just war’ doctrine [which] accorded victory to those whose cause God ‘approved,’ ” by its concept of Fortune “which, if seized, could only improve one’s position,” and passed on “a more optimistic view of human ability and a more positive view of why armies existed than was usually found among medieval writers.” In that, he underlined that “the notion, which will have appealed to the humanists of the period, that man could improve his lot if he acted rationally and took steps to prepare seriously for success ... was at odds with the ‘traditional,’ religious view prevalent at the time.”²⁴⁰

I oppose both of these views mainly on the basis of the arguments I have made comparing the views of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières with those of the ecclesiastical authors. I cannot agree that the familiarity with the Roman views brought an independence of knighthood from the function that had been bestowed on it by ecclesiastical teaching with a view to divine providence. First of all, as Keen also notes, Roman ideas can already be found within ecclesiastical opinion, both through the doctrine of just war itself via Augustine and others, and through Vegetius

²³⁹ Keen, *Chivalry*, 112-13.

²⁴⁰ Allmand, “*De re militari* of Vegetius,” 25.

and the other Roman authors used by ecclesiastics. Secondly, the later use of these Roman ideas in vernacular works destined for lay audiences did not differ that much from their earlier use by authors fully within the ecclesiastical tradition, in that they too viewed the Roman teachings within the framework of divine providence and not in opposition to it. Also, it would be wrong to label the earlier ecclesiastical views of divine providence in warfare as fatalistic, as Allmand does, for through their earlier borrowing from Roman ideas — and indeed their philosophical outlook — they also incorporated the human factor, albeit often in the form of vices, in the outcome of wars. By the same token, the view of Fortune cannot be distinguished as something radically different from the view of divine providence, as, in both, the human element, be it in the form of morality or simply actions, was seen to work through celestial powers to render the outcome in warfare.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Knighthood and warfare received a great many interpretations from within different spheres of literature and from different genres of literature during the Middle Ages. In this dissertation, I have tried to make generalisations about these different interpretations and put them under two main headings: the romance view and what I have called the ecclesiastical view. I have maintained that the first view corresponded to a set of features that existed in ideas on knighthood and war commonly presented to, and congenial to, a predominantly lay audience. This set of features has been illustrated here primarily through the example of a popular prose romance, *Lancelot do Lac*.

The basic features of *Lancelot do Lac* that I held to exist commonly in this kind of literature concerned with knighthood and warfare and aimed at a mostly lay audience, and which in turn influenced the attitudes and practices of the knights, noblemen, heralds, and all those associated with this social circle, can be summed up

as the admiration for military prowess and valour, and the emphasis on personal honour that is earned through them. I have underlined the focus on individual prowess in such literature that shaped all other perceptions, even that of the attitude of God to knightly pursuits. This focus exalted knightly prowess to such an extent as to claim that it would receive divine praise almost unconditionally. Even though there was an occasional effort on the part of the authors, who were themselves mostly clerks, albeit writing for a largely lay court, to teach that divine praise came also on condition of certain behaviour that accorded with Christian teachings, and even Christian asceticism, these often rather token sermons did not alter the essential concept of this particular kind of literature. In the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, Geoffroi de Charny's *Livre de chevalerie*, and the anonymous biography of the Marshal Bouciquaut, entitled *Le Livre des fais du bon messire Jehan le Maingre, dit Bouciquaut*, provide evidence for the continuing vigour of this romance view in the late Middle Ages, having many features that were in common with those pointed to in *Lancelot do Lac*.

In parallel with the ideas that are here argued to pertain to the romance view, however, there existed another stream of thought on knighthood and warfare that can be distinguished by its fundamental dependence on the views of St. Augustine on just war, though substantially elaborated on from tenth century, and especially from the twelfth century, onwards. This view, which I have labelled the ecclesiastical view, differed at a basic level in its outlook on knighthood and warfare, an outlook that was oriented towards God and the public weal rather than towards the knights themselves as was the case in the romance view. According to this ecclesiastical view, all warfare was created by God and thus administered by Him as a mechanism for the punishment of sinners. Hence knights were servants of God created for this purpose

and ordained to fight in just wars that were directed towards the common good. In contrast to the romance view, the focus of the ecclesiastical writings was not the knight himself, his deeds of prowess or honour, but the function of just warfare and the role of knights in it.

This view of knighthood and warfare came to impose certain restrictions on knights that would accord with their divine duty. Several ecclesiastical authors, such as John of Salisbury, Bernard of Clairvaux, Gratian, Ramon de Penyafort, Thomas Aquinas, Giovanni da Legnano, Bartholomew Saliceto and Jean de Gerson, all highly educated, many of them theologians or canon lawyers, drew attention to the divine requirements for the proper occupation of knights and the proper purposes of warfare, and lamented the contrasts between these requirements and actual practice. I have tried to set out the common features of this tradition of thought, mainly by referring to Legnano's *De Bello, de represaliis, et de duello*, a treatise on the law relating to warfare written in the late fourteenth century, showing how Legnano's ideas can be traced back to earlier authors and Augustine, but also by noting important points made by the other ecclesiastical authors, such as St. Bernard whose asceticism represented a particular strand in ecclesiastical criticism of the sins of warriors. Ecclesiastical thought on warfare and knighthood, however, did not restrict its concern to the criticism of lay practices, but often involved their regulation too. The proper treatment of the spoils of war and the subject of when deceit was justifiable in warfare were very frequently addressed by ecclesiastical authors over the centuries, and while Augustine as the basis for this tradition was never forgotten, additions to that basis accumulated to form an increasingly elaborate set of ideas.

The issue of military discipline, for example, came to find its way into the ecclesiastical view of warfare and knighthood, not primarily from Augustine, but

from pagan Roman works, particularly two written on the practice of warfare, Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus's *De re militari* and Sextus Julius Frontinus's *Strategemata*. The ecclesiastical authors, John of Salisbury and Aegidius Romanus, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries respectively, disseminated the ideas of these Roman writers in discussing the importance of military discipline. In the case of John of Salisbury, this is integrated into a criticism of contemporary knights and their sins.

Having explained the basic features of the romance view and having shown its persistence into the late medieval period, as exemplified by Charny's *Livre de chevalerie* and the anonymous *Livre de Bouciquaut*, and also having set out the ecclesiastical view, I go on to show how a new view comes to be presented to a vernacular, predominantly lay, audience in the late middle ages, heralded by the works of three authors residing in France during the reign of Charles VI, Honoré Bouvet, Philippe de Mézières and Christine de Pizan.

The domicile of these authors and the period in which they were writing were important factors in influencing their views. In the reign of Charles VI, the kingdom of France was basically living through a political and military crisis, which was not helped by the fact that the king was not in good mental health. The failures in the Hundred Years' War and the Nicopolis crusade made it obvious that the military system needed reform. Criticism of the military system or of knighthood was hardly new. It had often existed, as aforementioned, in clerical condemnations of the worldly practices and behaviour of knights, both in reality and as they were presented in romances, contrasting their sinfulness with their divine calling. Some of this criticism even appears, somewhat incongruously, within the romances themselves.

The view of warfare and knighthood in the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, drawing on ecclesiastical thought concerning divine providence and the divine duty of knights, and on Roman teaching concerning military discipline and strategy, came to establish itself among lay audience in contrast to the view traditionally presented to such an audience, essentially the romance view as described here. Commonly advocated in romances and romance-influenced literature, the focus on individual prowess and fighting for personal glory was challenged by a focus on the army fighting under the commander for the prince and for the common good, and true honour would be obtained by the fulfilment of this public duty. This was chiefly a Roman precept, but one which was in accordance with ecclesiastical thought on just war that also promoted the common good as the ultimate aim of just wars. Bouvet, Mézières or Pizan were not the first to assert that military service should be to the prince and for the common good — John of Salisbury and Aegidius Romanus had already promoted this concept in their respective works — but they were presenting it in a new style to a wider audience, and often with their own very contemporary concerns.

We should not however think that this new presentation of ideas on knighthood and warfare immediately swept all before it, as we can see in the examples of Charny and the anonymous author of *Livre de Bouciquaut*, contemporaries of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières. Although Charny was writing his book to guide the knights of Jean II's *Ordre de l'étoile*, who were meant to serve him loyally and obediently, and Bouciquaut was the marshal of Charles VI who served him in his wars in France and abroad, these books lacked a comparable notion of service to the state such as that promoted in the books of Bouvet, Mézières, Pizan, or for that matter earlier in John of Salisbury and Aegidius Romanus. On account of the

focus, in Charny's *Livre de chevalerie* and in *Livre de Bouciquaut*, on personal honour instead of public honour, both of these works viewed serving the king in his wars as only one of the several opportunities for knights to earn honour for themselves. Moreover, neither of these had the notion that disobeying orders was a heinous offence or that knights' freedom of action should be curtailed; nor did they see that the knights' search for personal honour might be at the expense of the common good, which should be the aim of the knight's service to his commander and prince.

In many ways Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières adopt the ecclesiastical view of warfare as a divine mechanism for punishing the sinful and for benefiting the common good through a knighthood that is divinely ordained for this duty. The criticism of the sins of warriors as not according with their divine duty, and bringing military defeat, is there, just as it was in the writings of ecclesiastical authors, famously in Bernard of Clairvaux and John of Salisbury. Yet, they all also place a special emphasis on the military discipline and strategy to be learned from the pagan Roman works, even while containing this within a view of the role of divine providence in warfare. The sins of warriors work through the lack of discipline and strategy in the army that they engender to end in military failure. In order to earn military victory, warriors need both to improve their skills in organization and warfare and also to have faith in God. This was not altogether unfamiliar to a medieval audience, as such an attitude can be drawn from John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* or taken to be implied by Aegidius Romanus's descriptions of military discipline and strategy, but in terms of audience, style and emphasis, can still be seen as a new departure.

Although, as stated above, there was a clear similarity of the ideas of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières with those of ecclesiastical authors, especially John of Salisbury, Aegidius Romanus and Giovanni da Legnano, regarding their use of Roman sources and prescriptions, we can establish certain differences. The most distinctive, of course, is the language, style and intended audience. The Latin works of the ecclesiastical view are dominated by academic disputations — perhaps with the exception of John of Salisbury — and this made the comprehension of these works by lay audiences much more limited and difficult. In Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, the use of French with illustrations from contemporary and historical examples facilitated the permeation of these ecclesiastical ideas, most importantly the Roman ideas contained within them, to an audience which included noblemen, knights, esquires, heralds, etc., who until then had been amongst the target audience of romances and other traditional knightly literature in the vernacular.

One can see the penetration of Roman ideas into works that can broadly be categorized under those advocating the romance view, here exemplified in Charny's *Livre de chevalerie* and the anonymous *Livre de Bouciquaut*. Charny's praise of knights who are good leaders and administrators and use wisdom and prudence in warfare, and Bouciquaut's author's last minute concern to craft a Roman general out of the romance hero portrayed earlier in the book, demonstrate the general interest in Roman military teachings at this particular period. Nevertheless, the works of Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan were especially important for their contribution to the dissemination of the ideas in their Roman sources, most of all, Vegetius, Frontinus and Valerius Maximus.

Moreover, Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan differed substantially from the ecclesiastical authors in their particular use of the Roman sources as presenting a

remedy to contemporary military failures. Whereas John of Salisbury, for one, was an ardent critic of his contemporary knighthood, which he contrasted unfavourably with the Roman model, the three authors above differed in that they were not only criticising, but also proposing a reform, the blueprints for which they saw in the military reforms of Charles V, whom they all admired. Although the promotion of Roman military discipline and the need to punish and banish all ill-disciplined behaviour, was also John of Salisbury's view concerning military ills of his day, the particular emphases in the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, concerning commanders, and the payment of wages to soldiers, seem to be directed towards the an intended military centralisation that would tend towards the formation of the first standing armies. Likewise, the subject of military strategy, although given a fairly full treatment by Aegidius Romanus, gained a different angle in the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, with their apparent association of contemporary military defeats with failures in strategy, a fault they also found to be encouraged by the romance type of literature.

Hence, although the components of Roman military teaching can be identified in earlier ecclesiastical writings, it might be argued that they found their incorporation into a whole doctrine of warfare and knighthood in the works of Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan. All of them defined a type of a warrior after the fashion of the Roman soldier who served the prince under his commander, who in turn administered discipline among his men through punishment and payment, and led them on to the battlefield in accordance with a military strategy that would be in the best interests of the state and the people.

This type of soldier did not exist at the time the authors were writing. Philippe Contamine comments about *Arbre des batailles* that while the ideas it drew from

canon and civil laws reflected contemporary practices; those it derived from Roman sources did not. Yet he shows that the Roman lessons, of service to the king and military discipline contained in the book came to be appreciated by the late fifteenth century, and that the book became popular in France during the course of this century, by the end of which copies of it could be found in the libraries of great noblemen.¹ N.A.R. Wright's agrees that the book became a guide to military commanders during the late fifteenth century in France and elsewhere.² Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes*, basically a compilation of *Arbre des batailles* and Vegetius and Frontinus, is also noted to be popularly read during the later fifteenth century, mentioning particularly a reader who executed the military reforms of Charles VII.³

All this evidence suggests that by the time of the military reforms of Charles VII, during the late 1430s and 1440s, the ideas, especially the Roman ones, contained in the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, came into their own and enjoyed a considerable audience. The parallels between the reforms of Charles VII and the ideas of the authors can easily be drawn. Charles VII proposed to establish a centrally controlled and permanently serving army, by initially dispensing with the use of marauding mercenary companies, by exporting them out of the country under pain of death, and putting the remainder of the military forces of the kingdom under royal control in the charge of captains.

The ills of the marauding companies to military discipline and the safety of civilians, as has been discussed in Chapter Five, represented a common problem

¹ In evidence of the book's use in the fifteenth century, he mentions the Burgundian herald Olivier de la Marche referring to it as a guide for resolving contemporary military cases: Contamine, *Guerre état et société*, 1: 202-4, 203, n.

² He mentions that both the French and the English commanders took the book with them to the battlefield and those in Spain ordered its translation in the late fifteenth century: Wright, "The *Tree of Battles* of Honoré Bouvet," 12-13.

³ Canon-Willard particularly states that one of Charles VII's advisors to help him with his reforms, Arthur de Richmont, also a close companion of the former dauphin Louis de Guyenne, was a possible reader of Pizan's *Livre des faits d'Armes*: Canon-Willard, "Christine on the Art of Warfare," 14-15.

addressed by all of these authors. All proposed good and regular payment as a remedy, and Mézières had even suggested that they be mustered under royal service, disciplined both by punishment and payment, possibly an allusion to the measures earlier attempted by Charles V.⁴ According to the reforms of Charles VII, the captains of the companies fighting under royal command would be appointed by the king and paid wages from the towns and provinces; they would choose their men from among those best in skill and equipment from all over the country, and they would be entitled to exercise strict discipline over their men. The captains themselves would also be monitored by the king and his officers in their duty to ensure that they paid their men and retained the numbers specified. Bouvet had maintained that service to the king came first and commanders should keep strict control of their men, whom, he constantly repeated, should be paid for their service. Pizan always defined commanders as deputies of the prince who would guard his troops and lead them in war, and that soldiers should be paid well in order that they be disciplined and obedient. Mézières especially warned about controlling the payment of troops to ensure military success and advocated that permanent troops should be maintained by tax levies on the provinces and towns until peace was established. The troops of Charles VII, which were to be ready and equipped to serve the king whenever they were called for duty, were called the *compagnies d'ordonnance*, which left all other companies as outlaws. If those under royal service threatened the common good, they too would face the fate of the unauthorized companies.⁵

Although the immediate effectiveness of this reform may be questionable, it may still largely be held responsible for the ensuing French victories against the English in the 1440s, which eventually gave the French victory in the Hundred

⁴ See Chapter One.

⁵ Allmand, *Society at War*, 51-57; Meron, *Henry's Wars*, 147-49; Contamine, *Guerre, état et société*, 278.

Years' War.⁶ Moreover, service to the king came to be prized as the ultimate reward of a career in arms by the late fifteenth century. A French chronicler around that period gives an account of such men following captains of *ordonnance* "in the hope of being appointed when an opportunity arose; and they sought out every means of achieving this."⁷ Likewise, Olivier de la Marche, a Burgundinian herald of the late fifteenth century, prizes service to the king as the epitome of a career in arms, earning the greatest honour to the knight, just as in the next century Castiglione saw royal service in a sovereign state as signifying the ideals of his day instead of those of chivalry.⁸ Hence, soldiers serving the king in return for pay and under the discipline of commanders appointed by the king both earned victory in the Hundred Years' War and came to be exalted in the perceptions of men in the late fifteenth century and beyond, just as Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières had proposed. Were these authors ahead of their time in their ideas on warfare and knighthood? Yes, but they were neither without inspiration in outlining their reform programme — Charles V's attempts at reform pointed the way — nor were they so original in their use of Roman ideas for their justification, a use that was prefigured in the works constituting the ecclesiastical view.

Not from literature but from experience, the most obvious influence came from the reforms of Charles V. We cannot disregard the fact that Mézières had been a counsellor to this king; or that he was associated with the advisors of his son, Charles VI, to the extent that his *Songe du vieil pèlerin* has been identified as a guide for their reform programme. Bouvet, as has been mentioned in the introduction, was

⁶ Although Allmand thinks that the account of a contemporary chronicler on the reforms was "somewhat overpainted," he nevertheless believes that the French successes that led to the expulsion of the English in the later period of the Hundred Years' War were "based upon solid military organisation": Allmand, *Society at War*, 51, 55.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 55.

⁸ Keen, *Chivalry*, 236; Eugene F. Rice, Jr. "Humanism in France," in *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, ed. Albert Rabil, Jr., vol. 2 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991), 120.

also thought to be associated with the advisors of Charles VI. Hence, he was probably acquainted with this reform programme. Pizan possibly had first-hand knowledge of Charles V's reforms through her father who was at the court during that time. Although she was very young at the time, she looked back to it with nostalgia and in praise, particularly in her *Le Livre de Charles V*, and drew examples from it for the dauphin in *Livre des faits d'armes* and *Livre de la paix*.

However, even if the authors were inspired by the reforms of Charles V in their emphasis on soldiers serving their king under commanders to keep them under discipline and pay them adequately, they were still indeed influential and innovative in trying to adapt ideas, which were previously to be found mostly in ecclesiastical writings, to the purpose of practical military reform in the footsteps of Charles V.

The portrayal of the soldier in the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières anticipates and encourages the evolution in the perceptions of knighthood that would proceed on to the late fifteenth century, gradually shaking off the perceptions both of the romantic knight who fought constantly for individual glory, and of the just warrior, who fought individually only in defence of the weak and for justice. This was increasingly replaced by the perception of the soldier fighting for pay in the service of the king in obedience to his commander for the benefit of the common good of the state and the people. The prosecution of warfare, too, was increasingly seen as a set of rules that should be learned and implemented in order to gain victory, with limits on individual human power and skill. It was no longer a demonstration of limitless prowess that could depend on divine support, or simply the punishment of God on sinners, the outcome of which could be left to divine providence alone.

While the newer perceptions of knighthood and warfare can be seen to an extent as falling within the precepts of humanism, in valuing human intellectual skill

and wisdom, and working for the benefit of the common good, can the ideas of Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan be defined as humanistic, or as the precursors of Renaissance humanist thought in France?

The traditionalists on Renaissance humanism would certainly disagree. Their prevailing opinion is that Renaissance humanism came to France in the late fifteenth century due to direct French contact with Italy during the French invasion of Italy, something which is contested by later scholars.⁹ The traditionalists argue against an earlier date for the reason that French intellectuals, even though they were not completely out of contact with Italy, or unacquainted with classical authors, were too preoccupied with their own problems concerning the prolonged war with England to nurture humanist ideas. Hence they tend to see the emergence of France as a powerful monarchy and a nation-state at the end of the fifteenth century as finally enabling humanist influences to be drawn from Italy, bringing with them a revival in its letters. Hence they see the “poor” state of French literature before the late fifteenth century as offset by the political gains of the fifteenth century, which would then provide fertile ground for the development of humanist ideas.¹⁰

Although other scholars do accept earlier humanist tendencies, they do not attach much significance to them and consider that they only blossom under the influence of Italian humanism.¹¹ Franco Simone, for example, despite suggesting that “the first glimmerings of the French Renaissance” appeared during Petrarch’s visit to Avignon in the fourteenth century, finds its influence limited to a handful of

⁹ For example, see Jean-Claude Margolin, “Humanism in France,” in *The Impact of Humanism on Western Europe*, ed. Anthony Goodman and Angus MacKay (London: Longman, 1990), 164-201.

¹⁰ Werner L. Gundersheimer, ed., *French Humanism, 1470-1600* (Glasgow: The University Press, 1969), 11-13; Henry Hornik, “Three Interpretations of the French Renaissance” in *French Humanism*, 42, 46.

¹¹ Again, Margolin is an exception to this as he shows that there were critics of Petrarch among the fourteenth-century French humanists: Margolin, “Humanism in France,” 201.

intellectuals writing at the same noble court.¹² On the other hand, Eugene F. Rice, Jr thinks that the French did not adopt the Renaissance ideas immediately after they were exposed to them by Petrarch's visit, and places the actual beginnings of the French Renaissance in the late fifteenth century. Moreover, he apparently ignores the existence of lay authors like Christine de Pizan and Philippe de Mézières, as he asserts that before the end of the fifteenth century, "French intellectuals were typically clerics, graduates of the University of Paris" and that "clerics and nobles remained content with the traditional methods and content of chivalric and theological education."¹³ Gilbert Ouy, Henry Hornik and Peter Burke, accept the existence of a few humanist scholars in France among clergymen at the top of the bureaucracy during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, agreeing on the names Nicolas Clémanges, Jean de Gerson, Pierre D'Ailly, Jean de Montreuil and the Col brothers. However, Ouy, Hornik and Burke nevertheless all attribute the sources of the humanist influence on these intellectuals to their contact and correspondence with Italian humanists.¹⁴ Christine de Pizan has been mentioned as an early French humanist mostly through her association with the aforementioned late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century French scholars and with the duke of Burgundy, who was considered to be a patron of humanist works,¹⁵ and also due to

¹²Franco Simone, *Il Rinascimento Francese* (Torino, 1961), 1-118, cited in Gundersheimer, *French Humanism*, 13.

¹³ Rice, "Humanism in France," 109.

¹⁴Gilbert Ouy, "Ambrogio Migli et les Ambitions Impériales de Louis d'Orleans," in *Culture et politique en France à l'époque de l'humanisme et de la Renaissance*, 14-21; Hornik, "Three Interpretations of the French Renaissance," 40; Peter Burke, *The European Renaissance: Centres and Peripheries* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), 53.

¹⁵ Although her husband, who was also working in the royal chancellery, may have introduced her to this circle, Pizan certainly developed her own connections with them as we can see that she was in correspondence with most of them in the "quarrel" of the Rose, a debate about Jean de Meun's *Roman de la rose*, even a decade after her husband's death: Canon-Willard, "Christine de Pizan's Treatise on the Art of Medieval Warfare," 190; Christine de Pizan, *Book of the City of Ladies*, xxvi; Burke, *European Renaissance*, 53. The same names including Pizan were mentioned as the early French humanists also by Millet in "Qui a écrit *Le Livre des fais de Bouciquaut*," 147.

the apparent influence on her of Dante's *Divina commedia* in her *Chemin de longue estude*.¹⁶

Canon-Willard links the origin of Pizan's thought concerning military reform after the example of the Romans, which Canon-Willard finds as consistent with humanist ideas — and hence the origins of the wider thought here studied together with that of Bouvet and Mézières —, to Petrarch's visit to Paris in 1361. After his visit, the father of Italian Renaissance humanism is known to have expressed in a letter his ideas on French revival by proposing the Roman military model. He drew parallels between the devastation of France and contemporary Italian cities, and regarded this as resulting from their decline from the Roman military virtues. The communication of these ideas to two Frenchmen, Pierre Bersuire, a Benedictine monk known for his translations, interpretations and collections of ancient works, and Philippe de Vitry, a composer and a secretary at the royal court — neither of whom lived to read the letters that contained these ideas — is proposed as evidence for the introduction of Roman ideas on warfare and knighthood into French intellectual thought, in other words in a similar manner to which other Italian Renaissance humanist ideas have been thought to have been disseminated in France.¹⁷

Petrarch's ideas could indeed possibly have influenced French intellectuals in the period, though it would be rather indirect in the case of Pizan — who was not even born at the time of the visit — and even in the case of Mézières, who was still in Cyprus at the time. Although it might be possible that Bouvet was present in Paris

¹⁶ Hornik, "Three Interpretations of the French Renaissance," 42; Mombello, "Pensée politique de Christine de Pizan," 50. Kenneth J. Atchity also includes Pizan's *The Book of the City of Ladies* among the Renaissance works: Kenneth J. Atchity, ed. *The Renaissance Reader* (New York: Harper Collins, 1996), 25-29.

¹⁷ Canon-Willard, "Christine de Pizan's Treatise on the Art of Medieval Warfare," 189-90. For the dissemination of the ideas of empire in France through the correspondance of French intellectuals with Italian humanists that was connected to the campaign of Louis d'Orleans' election to the imperial throne, see Ouy, "Ambitions Impériales de Louis d'Orleans," 13-42.

or in Avignon, which Petrarch had also visited earlier, it is clear that the immediate source for the ideas in *Arbre des batailles* was not Petrarch, but Giovanni da Legnano's *De bello*, written in 1360. It is however significant that Legnano, a master of both canon and civil law, was writing possibly with the same concerns that Petrarch had in mind: the devastation of Bologna by warfare. This also accorded with Bouvet's own expressed aim in *Arbre des batailles* to address the ills of the continuous state of war around him.¹⁸ Altogether, it would seem safer to regard Petrarch's influence on Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, if there at all, as marginal and indirect.¹⁹

Maurice Keen finds the emergence of humanist thought in France also as stemming from concerns with military decline, but not through Petrarch's advice. He shows that the idea of the superiority of serving the state by arms in the Roman manner gained popularity by the middle of the fifteenth century, as expressed both in literature and in real life.²⁰ He argues that the emphasis of these authors was humanist, because it valued honour won by human ability and aimed at the common good — i.e. civil honour as described by Bartolus — above an honour that is innate by lineage.²¹ Hence, their works had a tinge of the Renaissance definition of nobility

¹⁸ See Coopland's comment for Legnano in *Tree of Battles*, 25, and see Bouvet's prologue in *ibid.*, 79-80.

¹⁹ We can still assume that both Mézières and Pizan were conversant with the works of both Petrarch and Boccaccio in evidence of Picherit's notification that Mézières translated a Latin translation of Petrarch from Boccaccio's *Decameron* into French under the title *L'Histoire de Griseldis*, and that this translation was used by Pizan: Picherit, "De Philippe de Mézières à Christine de Pizan," 24-25.

²⁰ He basically mentions Jean Mielot's translation of Buonaccorso of Montemagno's *Controversia de Nobilitate*, and a document narrating a *debat d'honneur* between the chivalrous princes Hannibal, Alexander, and Scipio Africanus; the anonymous *Enseignement de la vraye noblesse*; Diego de Valera's *Espejo de verdadera nobleza*; and the fifteenth-century Burgundian herald Olivier de la Marche's statements on service to the state and nobility: A.J. Vanderjagt, ed. "Buonaccorso of Montemagno's *Controversie de noblesse*, trans. Jean Mielot" in "Qui sa vertu anoblist" (Ph.D. diss., Groningen, 1981); "*Debat d'honneur*, trans. Jean Mielot" in *ibid.*; "Diego da Valera, *Espejo de verdadera nobleza*, trans. Hue de Salves" in *ibid.*; *Enseignement de la vraye noblesse*, Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MS B 11047, cited in Keen, *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms*, 187-89; See also *idem*, *Chivalry*, 236 for reference to the comments of Olivier de la Marche on nobility and service to the state.

²¹ Keen, *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms*, 199-202; See also *idem*, *Chivalry*, 148-53.

that would value virtues such as intelligence, reason, eloquence and morals in the service of the state, as opposed to the old idea of inherited nobility that shows itself predominantly in martial prowess and valour.²² Yet, Keen also finds signs earlier than the mid-fifteenth century of the same ideas in the writings of Bouvet, Pizan, Mézières, along with other works, such as the anonymous *Songe du vergier* and the works of Alain Chartier, with their borrowings from classical history, from the writings of the Roman authors Vegetius and Valerius, and from Roman law.²³

While Keen asserts that the limitations of the sources of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, or their contemporaries, did not make them lesser humanists than later generations, Christopher Allmand would also argue that one of their sources in particular, the *De re militari* of Vegetius influenced humanism in the military thought of the late Middle Ages. As has been argued in the conclusion to Chapter Five, Allmand sees the emphasis on the human capability for rational action and serious preparation that would affect the outcome in warfare in this book — and in other Roman sources for that matter — as a challenge to the doctrine of ‘just war’, with its view of war as a mechanism for divine judgement.²⁴ Likewise, Keen correctly sees that the use of Roman sources, best exemplified by Vegetius, do influence the way the successes and failures of knighthood relate to divine providence, even though I would argue with his idea that these writings represented some kind of new separation of knighthood from the priestly function.

As I hope I have already made clear in Chapter Five, I cannot see the effect of the appeal to Roman sources in Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières in these stark terms of contrast with the ecclesiastical view. I have asserted that the authors did not only

²² Rice, “Humanism in France,” 119-20.

²³ *Le Songe du vergier*, ed. M. Schnerb-Lièvre, 2 vols. (Paris, 1982); Alain Chartier, *Le Brèviaire des nobles* in *The Poetical Works of A. Chartier*, ed. J. Laidlaw (Cambridge, 1974); idem, *Le Quadrilogue invectif*, cited in Keen, *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms*, 202-3, 192-93.

²⁴ Allmand, “*De re militari* of Vegetius,” 25.

draw on the Roman sources to praise military service to the state along with the virtues of discipline, learning, obedience, strategy and the aim of common good, but also gave divine sanction to them by seeing them as divinely praised virtues. Hence, they did not really advocate the idea that human ability and knowledge determined the outcome of battles, but that rather that they influenced the way the divine will operated in favour of those who used them well. In accordance with this point of view, they referred to both pagan and Christian sources to illustrate the same ideas. However, I would also maintain that such an interpretation and use of Roman sources should not prevent us from associating these authors with humanism.

It is highly probable that Henry Hornik would see the view of divine providence that co-exists with human abilities as ruling out a humanist view in the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, for he maintains that it would be wrong to draw humanist conclusions from any interpretation, in a period earlier than the late fifteenth century, of classical authors, on the grounds that these interpretations would not be free of religious attitudes. In illustration, he gives evidence from the difference between the medieval *Ovide moralisé* and the Renaissance translations and editions of Ovid.²⁵ On the other hand, several scholars would disagree with Hornik on several grounds. Alastair Hamilton, for example, remind that many of the early humanists were clerics who had received a scholastic education, and who were interested in the Church Fathers for their reconciliation of classical and Christian views, and that this interest was also shared by Petrarch.²⁶ Peter Burke and Dolora A. Wojciehowski also assert Petrarch's inspiration from Augustine — and from St. Bernard too in the case of Burke — while both see Petrarch's view of Fortune as essentially a traditional medieval one. Wojciehowski here defines Fortune as something that, although

²⁵ Hornik, "Three Interpretations of French Renaissance," 45.

²⁶ Alastair Hamilton, "Humanists and the Bible" in *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, ed. Jill Kraye (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 100-1.

uncontrollable, the disastrous effects of it can be escaped by freeing oneself from human desires.²⁷ This, quite significantly, is analogous to the interpretations of divine will and human effort in warfare as seen in the works of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières. Moreover, Burke, who finds a continuity of ideas between Medieval and Renaissance thought in terms of the interests of Aquinas in Aristotle and of Petrarch in classical writers, finds John of Salisbury's moral and religious interpretations of his classical sources in the twelfth century — which I have found to prefigure the thinking of Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières — as not so different from interpretations made by some fifteenth-century scholars.²⁸

Maurice Keen does seem to have a problem in describing Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, as well as what he sees as mid fifteenth-century French precursors of humanism,²⁹ as fully humanist, even if these works did emphasise human concepts such as service to the state for the common good and the use of human abilities, because of their “indiscriminate” use of “classical and scriptural or patristic” material to provide authority for statements from a respectable source, without making any distinction between the different precepts in these sources.³⁰ It is questionable, however, whether we ought to try to measure these writers against some sort of pure humanism, a problematic notion. Petrarch too could be and was criticised by later humanists. Peter Burke for example, points out to the “distance” of the later generations of humanists from the first one that followed in the footsteps of Petrarch by giving the evidence of a criticism directed at Petrarch by later humanists.³¹

²⁷ Burke, *European Renaissance*, 24-25; Dolora A. Wochieowski, *Old Masters, New Subjects: Early Modern and Poststructuralist Theories of Will* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1995), 45-55.

²⁸ Burke, *European Renaissance*, 21.

²⁹ These are the aforementioned works, *Enseignement de la vraye noblesse* and Valera's *Espejo de verdadera nobleza*.

³⁰ Keen, *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms*, 195-96.

³¹ Burke, *European Renaissance*, 26.

To conclude this discussion on the existence of humanist thought in the works of Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan, the following points can be made. If the traditionalist view of French humanism as arriving in France at the end of the fifteenth century is discarded for a broader view, humanist thought can certainly be found in Bouvet's, Pizan's and Mézières's emphasis on military service to the state for the common good and administered by human skill and knowledge. The fact that these ideas were triggered by the authors' need to cure the military ills of the day challenges the traditionalists' view that humanism in France was delayed because of the political and social disorders caused by continuous warfare, which in turn hindered the revival of letters in the kingdom. Hence, while the traditionalists viewed the Hundred Years' War as handicapping intellectual activity towards humanist ends in France, the idea of early humanist thought in the works of Bouvet, Mézières and Pizan would argue on the contrary that the war itself, by bringing forward the concern for military reform, actually encouraged in France the humanist aspect of the authors' thinking.

On the other hand, if we are to reject the existence of humanist thought in Bouvet, Pizan and Mézières, on the basis of their not being able to shake off the idea of divine providence in warfare and their indiscriminate use of Christian and pagan sources, this would also invalidate all arguments for a twelfth-century humanism, in which John of Salisbury is always seen as a major figure, if not also the humanism of Petrarch, arguably the father of Renaissance humanism. The ideas of Salisbury on military issues, as we have seen, were perhaps closest from among those of the ecclesiastical view to those of the authors here, with his use of both Christian and pagan sources to illustrate his emphasis on service to the state and military discipline. Both he and they did not see the Roman teaching on human effort to bring military victory as independent of a divine providence that punishes the sinful. Moreover,

from a broader perspective, we can question whether the Roman idea of Fortune, that is argued as asserting human effort as crucial to the outcome of wars, was entirely independent of the idea of divine intervention on the basis of virtues or vices. Last but not least, we can ask whether the idea of the intervention of divine powers in warfare ever ceases to exert influence on views of warfare, certainly in the heyday of the Italian Renaissance and even into the modern age? The answers to these questions however, are beyond the scope of this particular study.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Aegidius Romanus. *De ecclesiastica potestate*. Translated by Arthur P. Monahan. Lewinston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1990.

———. *The Governance of Kings and Princes: John Trevisa's Middle English Translation of the De regimine principum of Aegidius Romanus*. Edited by David C. Fowler, Charles F. Briggs and Paul G. Remley. New York: Garland Publications, 1997.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Aquinas: Political Writings*. Edited R.W. Dyson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Armitage, Simon, trans. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Faber & Faber, 2008.

Bernard of Clairvaux. *De laude novae militiae*. Translated by David Carbon. Accessed March 3, 2012.
<http://faculty.smu.edu/bwheeler/chivalry/bernard.html>.

Bouvet, Honoré. *L'Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun et Le Somnium super materia scismatis*. Edited by Ivor Arnold. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1926.

———. *The Tree of Battles of Honoré Bonet*. Translated by G.W. Coopland. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1949.

Charny, Geoffroi de. *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry*. Translated by Elspeth Kennedy. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

Chrétien de Troyes. *Arthurian Romances*. Translated by William W. Kibler and Carleton W. Carroll. London: Penguin, 1991.

Corley, Corin, trans. *Lancelot of the Lake*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

- Froissart, Jean. *Méliador: Roman comprenant les poésies lyriques de Wenceslas de Bohême, duc de Luxemburg et de Brabant, public pour la première fois par Auguste Longnon*. Nabu Press, 2010.
- Frontinus, Sextus Julius. *Strategematon, or Greek and Roman Anecdotes Concerning Military Policy, and the Science of War*. Translated by Robert B. Scott. London: Pall-mall, 1811. Accessed March 9, 2012. <http://books.google.com.tr/books?id=P0AAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=tr#v=onepage&q&f=false>.
- Geoffrey of Monmouth. *The History of the Kings of Britain: An Edition and Translation of De Gestis Britonum (Historia Regum Britanniae)*. Translated by Neil Wright and edited by Michael D. Reeve. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007.
- John of Salisbury. *Policraticus: Of the Frivolities of Courtiers and the Footprints of Philosophers*. Translated and edited by Cary J. Nederman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- . *The Statesman's Book of John of Salisbury: Being the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books, and Selections from the Seventh and Eighth Books, of the Policraticus*. Translated by John Dickinson. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963.
Accessed March 9, 2012,
<http://www.constitution.org/salisbury/policrat456.htm>
- Kennedy, Elspeth, ed. *Lancelot do Lac: The Non-Cyclic Old French Prose Romance* 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Langland, William. *The Piers the Plowman Tradition: A Critical Edition of Pierce the Ploughman's Crede, Richard the Redeless, Mum and Sothsegger and The Crowned King*, ed. Helen Barr. London: J.M. Dent, 1993.
- Legnano, Giovanni da. *Tractatus de bello, de represaliis et de duello*. Edited by Thomas Erskine Holland. Washington, 1917. Accessed March 9, 2012. <http://www.archive.org/stream/tractatusdebello00legnuofthttp://www.archive.org/stream/tractatusdebello00legnuoft>.
- Lalande, Denis, ed. *Le Livre des fais du bon messire Jehan le Maingre, dit Bouciquaut, mareschal de France et gouverneur de Jennes*. Paris: LibrairieDroz, 1985.
- Levi, Deborah M. Sinnreich- and Ian S. Laurie, eds. *Eustache Deschamps: Selected Poems*. Translated by David Curzon and Jeffrey Fiskin. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Llull, Ramon. *Book of Knighthood and Chivalry*. In *Ramon Lull's Book of Knighthood and Chivalry & The Anonymous Ordene de Chevalerie*. Translated by William Caxton and rendered into modern English by Brian R. Price. Chivalry Bookshelf, 2001.

- Malory, Thomas. *Le Morte Darthur: The Original Edition of William Caxton*. Edited by H. Oskar Sommer. Michigan: Ann Arbor, 1997.
- Mézieres, Phillipe de. *Le Livre de la vertu du sacrement de mariage*. Edited by Joan B. Williamson. Washington D.C., 1993.
- . *Letter to King Richard II: A Plea made in 1395 for Peace between England and France*. Edited and translated by G.W. Coopland. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1975.
- . *Songe du vieux pèlerin*. Edited by Joël Blanchard. Paris : Poche, 2008.
- . *Une Epistre lamentable et consolatoire, adressée en 1397 à Philippe le Hardi, duc de Bourgogne, sur la défaite de Nicopolis (1396)*. Edited by Philippe Contamine and Jacques Paviot. Paris: Société de l'Histoire de France, 2008.
- . *Vita Sancti Petri Thomae*, ed. J. Smet. Rome, 1954.
- Ordene de chevalerie*. In *Ramon Lull's Book of Knighthood and Chivalry & The Anonymous Ordene de chevalerie*. Translated by William Caxton and rendered into modern English by Brian R. Price. Chivalry Bookshelf, 2001.
- Pizan, Christine de. *Christine de Pizan's Epistre de la prison de vie humaine*. Edited by Angus J. Kennedy. London: Grant and Cutler, 1984.
- . *Epistre au Dieu d'amours*. In *Poems of Cupid, God of Love: Christine de Pizan's Epistre au Dieu d'amours and Dit de la rose, Thomas Hoccleve's The Letter of Cupid; Editions and Translations with George Sewell's The Proclamation of Cupid*. Edited by Thelma S. Fenster and Mary Carpenter Erler. Leiden: Brill, 1990.
- . "Lamentacion on the Woes of France." In *The Writings of Christine de Pizan*. Edited by Charity Canon Willard. New York: Persea Books, 1990, 304-309.
- . *Le Chemin de longue étude*. Edited and translated by Andrea Tarnowski. Paris: Librairie Générale Française/Livre de Poche, 2000.
- . *Le Livre de l'advison Cristine*. Edited by Christine Reno and Liliane Dulac. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2001.
- . *Le Livre de la mutacion de fortune: publié d'après les manuscrits par Suzanne Solente*. Paris: A.& J. Picard, 1959.
- . *Le Livre des fais et bonnes meurs du sage roy Charles V*. In *Collection complètes des mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France par Petitot et Monmerqué*. Vol 1.5. Paris: Foucault, 1824. Accessed March 9, 2012. http://www.voltaire-integral.com/_La%20Bibliotheque/Histoire/Pizan_Christine.html.

- . *Le Livre des trois vertus*. Translated by Garay and Jeay with an introduction by Charity Cannon-Willard and Eric Hicks. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1989.
- . *Le Livre du corps de policie*. Edited by Angus J. Kennedy. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1998.
- . *Le Livre du débat de deux amans*. In *The Love Debate Poems of Christine de Pizan*, 81-154. Edited by Barbara K. Altman. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998.
- . *Le Livre du duc des vrais amans*. Edited by Thelma S. Fenster. Binghamton, New York: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1995.
- . "Letter to the Queen of France, Isabel of Bavaria." In *The Writings of Christine de Pizan*. Edited by Charity Canon Willard. New York: Persea Books, 1990, 269-274.
- . *Lettre d'Othéa, déesse de prudence, à un jeune chevalier, Hector*. Translated by Hélène Basso. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2008.
- . *The Book of Deeds of Arms and of Chivalry*. Edited by Charity Cannon Willard and translated by Sumner Willard. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003.
- . *The Book of Peace*. Edited by Karen Green, Constant J. Mews and Janice Pinder. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Park, 2008.
- . *The Book of the Body Politic*. Edited by Kate Langdon Forhan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- . *The Book of the City of Ladies*. Translated and edited by Rosalind Brown-Grant. London: Penguin Books, 1999.
- Roussineau, Gilles, ed. *Perceforest*. 2 vols. Paris: Droz, 2007.
- Vegetius. *Epitoma rei militaris*. Edited by Michael D. Reeve. Oxford: Oxford Medieval Texts, 2004.
- Valerius Maximus. *Memorable Deeds and Sayings: A Thousand Tales from Ancient Rome*. Translated by Henry John Walker. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2004.

Secondary Sources

- Allmand, Christopher T. "Fifteenth-Century English Versions of Vegetius' *De re militari*." In *Armies, Chivalry and Warfare in Medieval Britain and France*:

- Proceedings of the 1995 Harlaxton Symposium*. Edited by Matthew Strickland. Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1998, 30-45.
- . “The *De re militari* of Vegetius in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.” In *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*. Edited by Corinne Saunders, Françoise Le Saux and Neil Thomas. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2004, 15-28.
- . *The Hundred Years’ War: England and France at War c.1300-c.1450*. Revised Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- .ed. *Society at War: The Experience of England and France during the Hundred Years’ War*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998.
- .ed. *War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages*. New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1976.
- Atchity, Kenneth J., ed. *The Renaissance Reader*. New York: Harper Collins, 1996.
- Bainton, Roland H. *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- Barber, Richard. *The Knight and Chivalry*. Revised Edition. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1995.
- Baumgartner, Emmanuèle. *L’Arbre et la pain: Essai sur la Queste del Saint Graal*. Paris: S.E.D.E.S., 1981.
- Bliese, John R. E. “Rhetoric Goes to War: The Doctrine of Ancient and Medieval Military Manuals.” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (Summer - Autumn, 1994): 105-130.
- Boehm, Barbara Drake. “Valerius Maximus in a Fourteenth-Century French Translation: An Illuminated Leaf.” *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 18 (1983): 53-63.
- Bogdanow, Fanni. “An Interpretation of the Meaning and Purpose of the Vulgate *Queste del Saint Graal* in the Light of the Mystical Theology of St. Bernard.” In *The Changing Face of Arthurian Romance: Essays on Arthurian Romances in Memory of Cedric E. Pickford*. Edited by Alison Adams, Armel H. Diverres, Karen Stern and Kenneth Varty. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1986, 23-46.
- Boudet, Jean-Patrice and Hélène Millet. *Eustache Deschamps en son temps*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1997.
- Brown, Catherine D. *Pastor and Laity in the Theology of Jean Gerson*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Brown Murray L. “The Order of the Passion of Jesus Christ: A Reconsideration of Eustache Deschamps’s Ballade to Chaucer.” *Mediaevalia* 11 (1985): 219-244.

- Burke, Peter. *The European Renaissance: Centres and Peripheries*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
- Canning, Joseph. *A History of Medieval Political Thought, 300-1450*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Coleman, W.E. *Philippe de Mézieres' Campaign for the Feast of Mary's Presentation*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981.
- Contamine, Phillippe. *Guerre, état et Société à la fin du Moyen Âge: Études sur les armées des rois de France, 1337-1494*. 2 vols. Éditions de l'EHESS, 2004.
- . "La Consolation de la desconfiture de Hongrie de Philippe de Mézières (1396)." *Annales de Bourgogne* 68 (1997): 35-48.
- . *War in the Middle Ages*. Translated by Michael Jones. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Basil Blackwell, 1984.
- Conte, Gian Biagio. *Latin Literature: A History*. Translated by Joseph B. Solodow. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Coulton, G.G. "Knights and Squires." In *Chaucer and his England*. London: Methuen & Co., 1908.
- Cowdrey, H.E.J. "The Peace and the Truce of God in the Eleventh Century." *The Past and Present* 46 (Feb., 1970): 42-67.
- Cropp, Glyniss. "The Exemplary Figure of Alexander the Great in the Works of Eustache Deschamps and Christine de Pizan." In *Contexts and Continuities: Proceedings of the IVth International Colloquium on Christine de Pizan (Glasgow 21-27 July 2000), published in honour of Liliane Dulac*. Vol.1. Edited by Angus J. Kennedy, Rosalind Brown-Grant, James C. Laidlaw and Catherine M. Müller. Glasgow: University of Glasgow Press, 2002, 301-313.
- Crouch, David. *William Marshal: Court, Career and Chivalry in the Angevin Empire, 1147-1219*. London: Longman, 1990.
- Curry, Anne and Michael Hughes, eds. *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years' War*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1994.
- Çeçen, Zeynep Kocabıyıkoglu. "Two Different Views of Knighthood in the Early Fifteenth Century: *Le Livre de Bouciquaut* and the Works of Christine de Pizan." *Journal of Military History* 76 (January 2012): 9-35.
- Delaville Le Roulx, J.M.A. *La France en Orient au XIV^{ème} siècle: Expéditions du Maréchal Boucicaud*. 2 vols. Paris: E.Thorin, 1886.
- Donelan, Michael. "Grotius and the Image of War." *Millenium* 12 (1983): 233-243.
- Dyson, Robert W. *St. Augustine of Hippo: The Christian Transformation of Political Philosophy*. London: Continuum, 2005.
- . *The Pilgrim City: Social and Political Ideas in the Writings of St. Augustine of Hippo*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2001.

- Evans, G.R. *Bernard of Clairvaux*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Flori, Jean. *L'Essor de la chevalerie, XI^e-XII^e siècles*. Genève: Librairie Droz, 1986.
- Forhan, Kate Langdon. *The Political Theory of Christine de Pizan*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.
- J. Frappier, "Le Graal et la chevalerie." In *Autour de Graal: Publications Romanes et Françaises, CXLVII*. Genève: Droz, 1977.
- Gillingham, John. *Richard Coeur de Lion: Kingship, Chivalry and War in the Twelfth Century*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1994.
- Gundersheimer, Werner L. ed. *French Humanism, 1470-1600*. Glasgow: The University Press, 1969.
- Hamilton, Alastair. "Humanists and the Bible." In *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*. Edited by Jill Kraye. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 100-117.
- Hasselmann, Beate Schmolke-. *The Evolution of Arthurian Romance: The Verse Tradition from Chrétien to Froissart*. Translated by Margaret and Roger Middleton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Hornik, Henry. "Three Interpretations of the French Renaissance." In *French Humanism, 1470-1600*. Edited by Werner L. Gundersheimer. Glasgow: The University Press, 1969, 19-47.
- Housley, Norman. "One Man and his Wars: The Depiction of Warfare by Marshal Boucicaut's Biographer." *Journal of Medieval History* 29 (2003): 27-40.
- . "Le Maréchal Boucicaut à Nicopolis." *Annales de Bourgogne* 68 (1997): 85-99.
- Huizinga, Johan. *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Ioarga, Nicolai. *Philippe de Mézières et la croisade du quatorzième siècle*. Paris: Librairie Emile Bouillon, 1896.
- Johnson, James Turner. "Historical Roots and Sources of the Just War Tradition in Western Culture." In *Just War and Jihad: Historical and Theoretical Perspectives on War and Peace in Western and Islamic Traditions*. Edited by John Kelsay and James Turner Johnson. Greenwood Press: New York, 1991, 3-30.
- Jones, Terry. *Chaucer's Knight: The Portrait of a Medieval Mercenary*. Revised Edition. London: Methuen, 1994.
- Kay, Sarah. "Courts, Clerks and Courtly Love." In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*. Edited by Roberta L. Krueger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, 81-96.

- Kauper, Richard. *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Keen, Maurice H. "Chaucer and Chivalry Re-visited. In *Armies, Chivalry and Warfare in Medieval Britain and France: Proceedings of the 1995 Harlaxton Symposium*. Edited by Matthew Strickland, Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1998, 1-12.
- . *Chivalry*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.
- . "Chivalry, Nobility and the Man-at-Arms." In *War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages*. Edited by Christopher T. Allmand. New York: Barnes & Nobles, 1976, 32-45.
- . *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms in the Middle Ages*. London: Hambledon Press, 1996.
- . "Richard II's Ordinances of War of 1385." In *Rulers and Ruled in Late Medieval England*. Edited by Rowena E. Archer and Simon Walker. London: The Hambledon Press, 1995, 33-48.
- . *The Laws of War in the Late Middle Ages*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965.
- Kennedy, Elspeth. "Geoffroi de Charny's *Livre de Chevalerie* and the Knights of the Round Table." In *Medieval Knighthood V: Papers from the Sixth Strawberry Hill Conference, 1994*. Edited by Stephen Church and Ruth Harvey. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1990, 221-242.
- . "The Knight as Reader of Arthurian Romance." In *Culture and the King: The Social Implications of the Arthurian Legend. Essays in Honor of Valerie Lagorio*. Edited by Martin B. Schichtman and James P. Carley. New York: State University of New York Press, 1994, 70-90.
- . "The Re-writing and Re-reading of a Text: The Evolution of the *Prose Lancelot*." In *The Changing Face of Arthurian Romance: Essays on Arthurian Romances in Memory of Cedric E. Pickford*. Edited by Alison Adams, Armel H. Diverres, Karen Stern and Kenneth Varty. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1986, 1-9.
- Kilgour, Raymond L. "Honoré Bonet: A Fourteenth-Century Critic of Chivalry." *PMLA* 50, no.2 (June, 1935): 352-361.
- . *The Decline of Chivalry as shown in the French Literature of the Late Middle Ages*. Cambridge, Massachusettes, 1937.
- Knapp, Peggy. "Chivalry and its Discontents." In *Chaucer and the Social Contest*, New York: Routledge, 1990, 15-31.
- Kosinski, Renate Blumenfeld-. "Two Responses to Agincourt: Alain Chartier's *Livre des quatre dames* and Christine de Pizan's *Epistre de la prison de vie humaine*." In *Contexts and Continuties: Proceedings of the IVth International Colloqium on Christine de Pizan (Glasgow 21-27 July 2000), published in honour of Liliane Dulac*. Vol.1. Edited by Angus J.

- Kennedy, Rosalind Brown-Grant, James C. Laidlaw and Catherine M. Müller. Glasgow: University of Glasgow Press, 2002, 75-85.
- Lacy, Norris J. "The Evolution and Legacy of French Prose Romance." In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, 167-182. Edited by Roberta L. Krueger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, 167-182.
- Lester, G. ed. *The Earliest English Translation of Vegetius's De re militari*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter—Universitätsverlag, 1988.
- Loomis, Roger Sherman. *The Development of Arthurian Romance*. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Lucas, Robert H. "Mediaeval French Translations of the Latin Classics to 1500." *Speculum* 45, no.2 (Apr. 1970): 225-253.
- Magee, James. "Crusading at the Court of Charles VI, 1388-1396." *French History*, 12, no. 4 (1998): 367-383.
- Margolin, Jean-Claude. "Humanism in France." In *The Impact of Humanism on Western Europe*. Edited by Anthony Goodman and Angus MacKay. London: Longman, 1990, 164-201.
- Martin, Janet. "John of Salisbury as Classical Scholar." In *The World of John of Salisbury*. Edited by Michael Wilks. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984, 179-201.
- Meron, Theodor. *Henry's Wars and Shakespeare's Laws: Perspectives on the Law of War in the Later Middle Ages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Miller, Robert P., ed. "John Gower: from *Vox clamantis*." In *Chaucer: Sources and Backgrounds*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977, 192-206.
- Millet, Hélène. "Qui a écrit *Le Livre des fais du bon messire Jehan le Maingre dit Bouciquaut*?" In *Pratiques de la culture écrite en France au XV^e siècle: actes du colloque international du C.N.R.S, Paris, 18-21 mai 1992*. Edited by E. Ornato and N. Pons. Louvain-la-Neuve, Fédération Internationale des Institutes d'Études Médiévales, 1995, 135-149.
- Mombello, Gianni. "Quelques aspects de la pensée politique de Christine de Pizan d'après ses oeuvres publiées." In *Culture et politique en France à l'époque de l'humanisme et de la Renaissance*. Edited by Franco Simone. Torino: Accademia delle Scienze, 1974, 43-153.
- Nys, Ernest. "Honoré Bonet et Christine de Pisan." In *Revue de Droit International et de Legislation Comparée* 14 (1882): 451-472.
- Ouy, Gilbert. "Ambrogio Migli et les ambitions impériales de Louis d'Orleans." In *Culture et politique en France à l'époque de l'humanisme et de la Renaissance*. Edited by Franco Simone. Torino: Accademia delle Scienze, 1974, 13-42.
- . "Honoré Bouvet (appelé à tort Bonet) prieur de Selonnet." *Romania* 85 (1959): 255-59.

- Painter, Sidney. *French Chivalry: Chivalric Ideas and Practices in Mediaeval France*. Johns Hopkins Press, 1940.
- . *William Marshal, Knight-Errant, Baron, and Regent of England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.
- Pearsall, Derek. *Gower and Lydgate*. Harlow: Longmans, Green & Co., 1969.
- Palmer, J.J.N. *England, France and Christendom, 1377-99*. Chapel Hill: University of Carolina Press, 1972.
- Picherit, Jean-Louis G. "De Philippe de Mézières à Christine de Pizan." *Le Moyen Français* 13 (1983): 20-36.
- Prestwich, Michael. *Armies and Warfare in the Middle Ages: The English Experience*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Rice, Eugene F., Jr. "Humanism in France." In *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*. Edited by Albert Rabil, Jr. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991, 109-122.
- Quillet, Jeannine. "Songes et songeries dans l'art de la politique au XIV^e siècle." *Etudes Philosophiques* (1975): 327-349.
- Saunders, Corinne, Françoise le Saux and Neil Thomas, eds. *Writing War: Medieval Responses to Warfare*. Cambridge : D.S. Brewer, 2004.
- Le Saux, François. "War and Knighthood in Christine de Pizan's *Livre des faits d'armes et de chevalerie*." In *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*. Edited by Corinne Saunders, Françoise Le Saux and Neil Thomas. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2004, 93-106.
- Showalter, Dennis E. "Caste, Skill, and Training: The Evolution of Cohesion in European Armies from the Middle Ages to the Sixteenth Century." *Journal of Military History* 57, no. 3 (Jul., 1993): 407-430.
- Titus, Craig Steven. *Resilience and the Virtue of Fortitude: Aquinas in Dialogue with the Psychosocial Sciences*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2006.
- Valerius Maximus*. In *Classical and Medieval Literature Criticism*. Vol 64. Gale Cengage, 2004. Accessed March 9, 2012, <http://www.enotes.com/valerius-maximus-criticism/valerius-maximus>.
- Vander Elst, Stefan Erik Kristiaan. "Chaucer and the Crusades: A Study in Late Medieval Literary and Political Thought." Ph. D. dissertation, Princeton University, 2006.

- Vries, Kelly De. "God and Defeat in Medieval Warfare: Some Preliminary Thoughts." In *Guns and Men in Medieval Europe, 1200-1500*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002, 87-97.
- . "Hunger, Flemish Participation and the Flight of Philip VI: Contemporary Accounts of the Siege of Calais, 1346-47." In *Guns and Men in Medieval Europe, 1200-1500*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002, 131-181.
- . "The Lack of a Western Military Response to the Ottoman Invasions of Eastern Europe from Nicopolis (1396) to Mohacs (1526)." *Journal of Military History* 63 (July 1999): 539-559.
- Wochieowski, Dolora A. *Old Masters, New Subjects: Early Modern and Poststructuralist Theories of Will*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1995.
- Willard, Charity Canon-. "Christine de Pizan on Chivalry." In *The Study of Chivalry: Resources and Approaches*. Edited by Howell Chickering and Thomas H. Seiler. Western Michigan University, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications, 1988, 511-528.
- . "Christine de Pizan on the Art of Warfare." In *Christine de Pizan and the Categories of Difference*. Edited by Marilynn Desmond. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998, 3-15.
- . "Christine de Pizan's Treatise on the Art of Medieval Warfare," in *Essays in Honor of Louis Francis Solano*. Edited by Raymond J. Cormier and Urban T. Holmes. Chapel Hill: The University of Carolina Press, 1973, 179-191.
- Williamson, Joan. "Philippe de Mézières and the Idea of Crusade." In *The Military Orders: Fighting for the Faith and Caring for the Sick*. Edited by Malcolm Barber. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1994, 358-364.
- Wright, N.A.R. "The *Tree of Battles* of Honoré de Bouvet and the Laws of War." In *War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages*. Edited by Christopher T. Allmand. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1976, 12-31.