

THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE: THE GIFT-GIVING
OBJECTIVES OF DUKE PHILIP THE BOLD OF BURGUNDY

CAROL M. CHATTAWAY

Thesis submitted for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of History,
University College London
2004



UMI Number: U591666

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U591666

Published by ProQuest LLC 2013. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

DECLARATION

THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE; THE GIFT-GIVING OBJECTIVES
OF DUKE PHILIP THE BOLD OF BURGUNDY

CAROL M. CHATTAWAY

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
the Department of History, University College London, 2004

I hereby declare that the work presented in this thesis is
my own, and has not been undertaken as part of a wider
investigation, or with any other researcher.

CAROL M. CHATTAWAY

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE: THE GIFT-GIVING OBJECTIVES OF DUKE PHILIP THE BOLD OF BURGUNDY

This thesis explores the policy objectives underlying the gift of this Order, to sixty men, on January 1 1403. Drawing primarily on Philip's household accounts, it undertakes complementary iconographical and prosopographical analyses (of the Order insignia's nature, form, materials, design and motto; and of distinguishing common features in recipients' careers, strengths, relationships with Philip, and activities in 1402-3), refined by reference to his policy concerns around the occasion of its bestowal, rigorously to test seven hypotheses. Three, posited by earlier historians, that the Order was purely decorative; a courtly conceit; or crusade-related, are shown no longer to be tenable. A further three, suggested by contemporary practice, that it was a military chivalric order; a livery badge; or a military alliance, prove to offer insufficient explanation. The evidence from the analyses points strongly to the final hypothesis, that the Order was a specific policy alliance, designed in fashionable form, to obscure its politically sensitive purpose. This was to create an unconventional, but significant, core military force, with an overriding commitment to Philip, loyally to support any action, including civil war, he deemed necessary to protect his dynasty's overall power by securing its control, and even inheritance, of the French Crown. This conclusion revises Philip's role in history, showing that rather than planning an independent Burgundian state, he initiated a co-ordinated propaganda campaign, of slogan, badge, and supporting literature, to legitimise and popularise his plans to control France. The analytical approach adopted also offers insights into the significance of decorative, material gift-giving; the identification of networks and their members; the meaning of Christine de Pisan's earlier political writings; and the origins of the Order of the Golden Fleece.

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has evolved over a number of years. Throughout, I have been fortunate in the patient support and encouragement of my supervisors, David Morgan and David d'Avray, and in the helpfulness of the staff of the Departmental Archives of the Côte d'Or, and of the Bibliothèque Municipale, in Dijon. Thanks are also due to colleagues in the Centre Européen d'Etudes Bourguignonnes, and particularly Prof. Marc Boone, for opportunities to participate in wide-ranging discussions around my topic; to Drs. Sally Dormer, Jenny Stratford, and Simona Slanicka, for helpful background discussions; and to Prof. Michael Jones for access to his personal card index.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface and Acknowledgements

Pages

Map	7
Introduction: Objectives and Purpose of Study	8- 18
Chapter 1. Method and Approach	19- 44
Chapter 2. The Nature, Form and Materials of the Order of the Golden Tree	45- 68
Chapter 3. The Iconography of the Order	69- 96
Chapter 4. The Meaning of the Motto ' <i>en loyaute</i> '	97-123
Chapter 5. The Recipients of the Order	124- 169
Chapter 6. The Occasion of the Gift of the Order	170- 201
Conclusions	202- 216
Conventions and Abbreviations adopted in Annexes and Appendices	217- 219
Annexes	
1. Ducal Authorisation for New Year Gifts 1403 (Transcript of the main text describing the Order and identifying its recipients)	220- 233
1a. Other Manuscript References to the Order (Transcripts of all relevant passages)	234- 235
2. General Distribution of Duke Philip's New Year Gifts around 1403 (Comparative table of recipients, numbers and costs of his gifts, drawn from authorisations and accounts for 1398, 1402 and 1403, to show the extent to which the Order departed from his custom at New Year)	236 - 239
Glossary	240 - 243

	Pages
Appendices	
Analysis of Appendices	244 -245
R1. Recipients: Biographical Notes R1-1 to R1-60	246-363
R2. Recipients: Hierarchy	364-368
R3. Recipients: Gifts of Material Objects - Precious (excluding 1403)	369-379
R4. Recipients: Gifts of Material Objects - Other (excluding 1403)	380-387
R5. Recipients: Financial Gifts and Rewards (excluding 1403)	388-408
R6. Recipients: Material Gifts and Financial Rewards 1403	409-416
R7. Recipients: Chivalry	417-422
R8. Recipients: Livery	423-427
R9. Recipients: Loyalty	428-434
R10. Recipients: Activities 1402-4	435-439
R11. Recipients: Military Worth	440-451
Bibliography	452-471

BURGUNDY AND SURROUNDING TERRITORIES¹

1. This map is taken from Mackay, A. and Ditchburn, D., Atlas of Medieval Europe, p.163, with additions. Although for a later period, it serves to show the relative location of the main areas mentioned in the thesis

INTRODUCTION: OBJECTIVES AND PURPOSE OF STUDY

This thesis is designed to explore, against the pattern of his giving of material objects more generally, the purposes and policy objectives underlying the gift of a particularly elaborate clasp, today called the Order of the Golden Tree, by Duke Philip the Bold, to sixty men on January 1 1403. The purpose of this is to illuminate Philip's role in Burgundian and French history.

Historians differ as to the precise nature and significance of that role, but generally agree that, as the first of the Valois Dukes of Burgundy, and as an influential French prince, Philip was a major figure in the history of both. He had succeeded to the Duchy of Burgundy after the death of its last Capetian Duke and, by the date of the Order, had held that duchy for forty years; had, in addition, been Count of Flanders, Artois, Nevers, Rethel and the Franche-Comté for nearly twenty years; held a number of other significant lordships; was effectively co-ruler of the Duchy of Brabant, the succession to which he was negotiating for his second son; and had arranged profitable marriages for his children, designed to increase and consolidate the family's landholdings. These territories not only represented a substantial dynastic power base but, stretching in a broken arc from the ^{north} west coast around the northern and eastern boundaries of France, were strategically important in protecting the latter from attack from neighbouring states. As the son, brother and, by 1403, uncle of successive Valois kings and doyen of its peers, he held a pre-eminent position within France. His territorial strength was bolstered by his wealth. In addition to the significant revenues acquired through his marriage in 1369 to Margaret, only legitimate child of the then Count of Flanders, and the richest heiress in western Europe, he used his position in France to secure substantial sums from the Crown. Unlike some of his relatives, this pre-eminent social and financial position was matched by his

abilities. As a teenager, he had acquired an early reputation for outstanding valour and loyalty, defending his father on the battlefield, and as he grew older, reinforced this by developing one for reliable, considered, and even disinterested support of the Crown as a policy maker, administrator and military leader.

Maintaining this pre-eminence had, however, required a constant vigilance and effort which underlay all his policies. The need for positive action was particularly evident by the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth centuries. In France, from 1392 onwards, the repeated periods of incapacity suffered by his nephew, King Charles VI, while providing opportunities for Philip to increase his power and influence as a senior member of the Council which governed France during the king's so-called 'absences', also faced him with growing opposition from the king's younger brother, the Duke of Orleans. Orleans' ambitions represented a particularly serious threat to Philip's control in France, but also affected his plans for the expansion of his own territories. At the same period, he needed to settle the eventual distribution of those territories between, and smooth transition to, his three sons after his and his wife's deaths, to avoid any arguments that might weaken or reduce his dynasty's hold and make it vulnerable to attack. Philip must have been concerned that this partition would inevitably leave his eldest son John, his successor as Duke of Burgundy, in a comparatively weak position, particularly within France. Not only would John's personal territorial holding be smaller than his father's, but he would lack the latter's closeness to the French crown, his seniority, his reputation and experience, and would thus (even with his brothers' support) be less able effectively to limit his cousin Orleans' ambitions to increase his personal landholdings at the expense of Burgundy and to secure overall control in France. This study therefore considers what the gift of the Order of the Golden Tree reveals about the policy means Philip

adopted to ward off or destroy this threat.

The extent, nature and purposes of the gifts of cash, revenues, lands, positions and general patronage which Duke Philip, like many of his contemporaries, made both regularly and occasionally, have been explored elsewhere¹. It is increasingly recognised that such gifts were not random, but were designed to secure political objectives. Opinion differs, however, both as to Philip's immediate objectives in such gift-giving and as to any overriding or ultimate purpose he might have had in mind. Philip created and bolstered various networks of people, obliged to him by different forms of gift-giving, in France, in his own territories, and in territories which he hoped to inherit or planned to acquire². Some historians see his primary purpose in doing this as to protect his position as a leading, and loyal, prince of the royal blood, in

1. For Duke Philip's financial gifts see, for instance, Rauzier, J., Finances et gestion d'une principauté au xiv^e siècle, (hereafter Finances) pp.477-500, for the period 1364-1384; Mollat, M., 'Recherches sur les finances des ducs Valois de Bourgogne', in Revue Historique, (1958) tome CCXIX, pp. 285-321, especially pp.302 and 309; Pocquet du Haut-Jussé, B., 'Les pensionnaires fieffés des ducs de Bourgogne 1352-1419', in Mémoires de la Société pour l'histoire du droit et des institutions des anciens pays bourguignons, (hereafter MSHDB) 8, (1942-3) pp.127-50; Vaughan, R., Philip the Bold, pp.234-5; Hemptinne, T. de, 'Princes et courtisans', pp.32-3, Caron, M-T., 'Réseaux nobiliaires', pp.263-7, and especially Prevenier, W., 'Les réseaux en action', pp.294-308, all in Le prince et le peuple, ed. Prevenier, W.; and Marchal-Verdoodt, M., Table des noms de personnes et de lieux mentionnés dans les plus anciens comptes de la recette générale de Philippe le Hardi duc de Bourgogne, (hereafter 'M-V') generally
2. For political uses of networks created by gift-giving see, for instance, internal social and administrative control, and territorial expansion in Armstrong, C.A.J., 'Had the Burgundian Government a Policy for the Nobility', pp.213-216, and diplomatic

pursuit of the French crown's policies. Others see it as designed more to support a policy of purely self and dynastic interest; and yet others as a means of developing a distinctive Burgundian polity, separate (and perhaps, ultimately, independent) from France³.

Duke Philip was also, in the view of chroniclers and on the evidence of his household accounts, an extravagant giver of valuable, manufactured objects, even by the relatively lavish standards of his Western European princely contemporaries⁴. For the most part, however,

2. (cont'd) negotiations and alliances, territorial expansion and security in his 'La politique matrimoniale des ducs de Bourgogne de la maison de Valois', pp.237-342, both in his England, France and Burgundy in the Fifteenth Century. For ducal tapping into the wider gift-giving networks, which the Dukes encouraged in their territories, between townsmen and people of influence within their Court, and which created a stabilising interdependency, with the added advantage of helping to defray the Dukes' costs in paying their servants, see Derville, A., 'Pots-de-vin, cadeaux, racket, patronage', in Revue du Nord, LVI (1974), p.363, and Boone, M., 'Dons et pots-de-vin, aspects de la sociabilité urbaine au bas moyen âge. Le cas Gantois pendant la période bourguignonne', Revue du Nord, LXX (1988), pp.231-247. Those exercising influence did so on receipt of regular gifts, favours, services and sometimes cash from their clients. Philip's gift-giving to the same administrators allowed him to tap into these networks. For the gift-giving networks to which Order recipients belonged, see Chapter 5
3. For a summary of historians' perceptions of Philip's ultimate policy aims, see Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.237-240
4. For material gifts generally see, for instance, Rauzier, Finances, pp.404-423; Van Nieuwenhuysen, A., Les Finances du Duc de Bourgogne Philippe le Hardi, (hereafter Finances) pp.391-5; Prost, Inventaires et Extraits des Comptes des Ducs de Bourgogne de la Maison de Valois, (hereafter 'Prost'); and Ewert, U.C. and Hirschbiegel, J., 'Gabe und Gegengabe', in Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial-und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, (2000), Heft 1, pp.5-37. In

historians have treated this material gift-giving, if at all, as of little political significance. Apart from some recognition of Philip's conventional use of such presents to lubricate diplomatic, and particularly marriage, negotiations, his material gift-giving is dismissed as the ephemeral and unplanned behaviour typical of a profligate prince, ruled by a passion for personal luxury and for a concrete display of wealth, and therefore power, to maintain his status as one of the international arbiters of his age⁵.

Given the purposefulness of Philip's other gift-giving, it seems intrinsically unlikely that his material gift-giving was purposeless profligacy. This is particularly so as studies suggest that he was in general an astute politician, and one who planned his expenditure carefully to meet priority needs in the light of expected revenues. He seems, for instance, to have stayed as far as possible within the limits of his demesne revenues, supplemented by additional taxes only for unexpected or exceptional expenditure (like the ransom of his eldest son and senior household after their capture at Nicopolis in 1396, by Sultan Bayazid, whilst on a crusading venture), and then only when he could not cover the costs from resources extracted from the French crown⁶.

4. (cont'd) the 1390s, for instance, Philip's expenditure on material gifts at New Year alone accounted for some 15% of his demesne revenues. See Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.228 for an estimate of demesne revenues as approximately 183,000 francs in 1395; and David, H., Philippe le Hardi, Duc de Bourgogne et co-régent de France de 1392 à 1404: le train somptuaire d'un grand Valois, (hereafter Train Somptuaire) pp.58 and 64 for an estimate of expenditure on New Year gifts in the 1390s as 20-25,000 francs a year
5. This is the general thesis advanced by David, Train Somptuaire
6. See Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.73-8 for covering the costs of the aftermath of Nicopolis, and pp.226-236 for Philip's finances more generally, especially pp.230-1 for his financial

It is unlikely that such a man would spend wantonly or wastefully on material gifts, particularly when other aspects of his financial policy are taken into account. Philip's forward financial planning was supported by prudent and detailed attention to the management of his resources, including material ones. In addition to the centralization and reform of the financial administration of his territories, he used extended credit to obtain interest-free loans from those who supplied him with manufactured goods⁷. He used reserves of manufactured goods, such as personal plate and jewellery, to provide coin, or pledges against coin, to ease temporary cash flow problems. He also supervised closely their refurbishment, so as to minimise the loss in value which had previously occurred when elements of the precious materials used had disappeared into the pockets of those responsible for organising or completing their reworking⁸.

It is also unlikely that Philip's expenditure on material gifts, any more than that on other gifts, was motivated simply by a desire to obey either the widespread general convention of generosity on the part of rulers in the middle ages, or the more specific conventions related to many public ceremonies and festivities⁹. The evidence of

6. (cont'd) exploitation of the French Crown

7. For reforms, see Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.116-119, and Van Nieuwenhuysen, Finances, pp.501-14. Philip delayed paying bills to merchants for up to six years. Prost, vol.2, item 3385 suggests that his suppliers knew this and occasionally demanded prompt payment in gold.

8. Ibid., vol.2, items 593-721 list the plate Philip sent in 1382 to be melted down to pay the troops used in putting down revolt in Flanders (which he was about to inherit) until such time as he could recoup the monies from the French Crown; and Item 1388 for ordinances for the control of his argenterie issued in 1388.

9. On the concept of generosity, particularly in accordance with the chivalric outlook, and its influence on thought and behaviour in

his accounts suggests something more than a passive response to such conventions. While working broadly within long-established conventions, perhaps so as not to arouse suspicion or antagonism, he was clearly manipulating them for specific purposes¹⁰.

If Duke Philip's material gift-giving was deliberate, planned, and not purely conventional, it is important to discover what objectives underlay it, and whether they were distinct from or supplementary to those governing his other gift-giving. This study seeks to address these questions, and to use the answers to clarify previous assessments of his objectives and thence to draw firmer conclusions about his ultimate political purpose.

9.(cont'd) this period, see Huizinga, J., The Waning of the Middle Ages, pp.67-77. For examples in contemporary writings, see Gace de la Buigne, Le Roman des Deduis, p.149 (written for Philip's guidance by his tutor); and Solente's edition of Christine de Pisan's Le Livre des fais et bonnes meurs du sage roy Charles V, (hereafter Solente, Charles V), vol.1, part 1, section xxviii, pp.79-82 - a laudatory text written at Philip's request about his brother. The records of Philip's expenditure note approvingly his generous treatment of both his guests and his hosts - see Prost, vol.2, item 2716. For the conventions of ceremonies, see Heers, J., Fêtes, Jeux et Joutes dans les Sociétés d'Occident à la fin du moyen-âge, especially pp. 13-43, and Chapter 6 below

10. Philip's normally regular annual expenditure on New Year gifts, for instance, fell sharply in 1369 to permit him to spend 7500 francs on diplomatically essential wedding gifts on the occasion of his marriage to the richest heiress in Western Europe, Margaret of Mâle, thus securing the promise of substantial future revenues when she inherited Flanders on the death of her father, Louis. See Prost, vol.1, items 972-1017 for the wedding gifts. Virtually no New Year gifts are recorded for this year. Balancing the different elements of material gift expenditure according to his current priorities clearly counted more with Philip than continuing to display the level of generosity at New Year which had come to be expected of him as Duke of Burgundy.

To explore these issues, this study posits that some idea of what the objectives of Philip's material gift-giving might have been can be gleaned from an analysis of the nature, materials and design of his material gifts, of the occasions on which they were given, and of the recipients and their relationships to him, particularly where he departed from established practice or convention¹¹. It focusses this analysis on one particular material gift Philip gave - that of the Order of the Golden Tree - because this offers the best, and in some respects a unique, opportunity for pursuing the hypothesis. Philip's household accounts provide an unusually detailed description of this gift, in terms both of its general nature and design, and of the variations in the materials and costs of the versions given to each of the recipients¹². It was the only time in forty years that Philip gave out something he called an Order, and this in itself offers hints as to the purpose of the gift¹³. The design of the Order's insignia is also unusually complex for a clasp¹⁴. It is made up of a number of different elements which, when taken together, make it possible to interpret the iconography of the design more accurately than that of the simpler motifs he normally gave, which had a wide range of possible meanings for his contemporaries¹⁵. This was the only occasion on which Philip gave the same, complex design to more than a handful of people, and yet he obviously selected its

11. A justification of this premise is given in Chapter 1

12. See Annex 1 and Appendix R2

13. For a discussion of contemporary usage of the term 'order' compared, for instance, with 'devise', and of the significance of Philip's use of it on this occasion, see Chapter 2

14. For a detailed description of the Order design, see Annexes 1 and 1a.

15. The general approach taken in the thesis to the interpretation of the iconography of the design is discussed in Chapter 1; the interpretation of the different elements of the visual design in Chapter 3; and of the motto in Chapter 4

recipients from among the larger groups to which he normally made gifts¹⁶. This, together with the information provided about the recipients of the Order, both on the occasion of the gift and elsewhere in Philip's accounts, and about the variations in the value of the Order insignia they received, make it possible to establish recipients' relationships to Philip; the extent to which the gift of the Order differed from Philip's usual patterns of material and other gift-giving to them; and thus whether it established a new or distinctive network of support for him¹⁷. Taken with what we can glean about his policy preoccupations and recipients' activities around the occasion and timing of the gift, it is then feasible to gauge Philip's specific objectives in giving this particular material gift, to a selected group of men, on this one occasion.

To arrive at these specific objectives, the study assesses the evidence available for interpreting each of the contributory aspects of the Order of the Golden Tree and its giving, referred to above. The complexity of these aspects, combined with the broad range of the evidence reviewed, gives rise to a range of possible, but apparently conflicting, interpretations. It would be dangerous, on the basis of a review of any one aspect alone, to conclude which interpretation Philip most likely

16. For recipients of other types of gifts, and of material gifts other than the Order, from Philip see Annex 2 and Appendices R3-R6 and R8; and for a discussion of the degree and nature of Philip's selectivity of Order recipients from among his other gift-based networks, see Chapter 5

17. For information about the Order recipients, and their known relationships to Philip, see Appendix R1; for the variations in the value of the Order insignia received, Annex 1 and Appendix R2; and for the interpretation of this material and conclusions about the nature and purpose of the network created by the Order, Chapters 5 and 6

intended, both because each review offers different outcomes, and because the aspects are all interrelated and should not be considered in isolation. Philip may also have intended the Order's interpretation to be ambiguous, sending different messages to different audiences. To make so complex an analysis manageable, the review of evidence for each aspect is therefore structured against a set of seven pre-determined hypotheses¹⁸. This makes it possible, as the study proceeds, to assess the relative weight of evidence for each hypothesis; progressively to downplay or discard any hypothesis for which the evidence is sparse, weak, or contradictory; and thus to build up a balanced conclusion as to which hypothesis, or combination of hypotheses, offers the most convincing interpretation of Philip's objectives in making the gift of the Order.

Considering how these objectives relate to those underlying both Philip's general material gift-giving and his other types of gift-giving, the study concludes that the gift of the Order had specific, distinct policy objectives which were too secret, sensitive, or potentially dangerous to be secured through the conventional, publicly recognised, and often overlapping, gift-based networks commonly maintained by Philip and his contemporaries.

The outcomes of the analysis suggest that Philip's objectives in giving the Order were concerned with the creation and public marking out of an élite network of powerful military men, selected mainly from his conventional, gift-based ones, and visibly committed, as allies, to securing, at all costs and against all opponents, for him and his heirs, a specific policy objective by means which the ducal family had chosen, or found itself forced, to pursue. They further suggest that it would have been generally apparent to his

18. The seven hypotheses and the reasons for selecting them are set out in Chapter 1

contemporaries, from the devices and slogan incorporated into the Order insignia, that this objective was concerned with maintaining his and his family's position, particularly in relation to the French Crown, in response to any threat to it from the Duke of Orleans, or possibly even by a pre-emptive strike against that rival. Order recipients, however, would have recognised the objective underlying its gift as to enhance and render that position unchallengeable, both immediately in 1403 and in the longer term.

The study concludes by assessing the impact of these objectives on the conventional views of Philip and his overall policies, and thus of his role in Burgundian and French history. It suggests that he was motivated primarily by self and dynastic protection and aggrandisement, which he was prepared to pursue by innovative and, if necessary, extreme means and that, far from trying to establish a Burgundian polity independent from France, he may even have contemplated the succession of his own dynasty to the throne of that country.

CHAPTER 1: METHOD AND APPROACH

This study posits that the objectives of Duke Philip's material gift-giving can be deduced from a hitherto unexplored combination of analyses of the material nature and design of the gift of the Order of the Golden Tree, of the occasion of its giving, and of his relationship to its recipients, set against predetermined hypotheses¹. Before turning to these analyses, this chapter briefly defines the term 'material gift'; justifies the approaches adopted and the sources used; and sets out the hypotheses and the reasons for their selection. Orthographical and other conventions adopted throughout the study are shown in footnotes to this chapter or in the list preceding the annexes and appendices².

Definitions

For the purposes of this study, the term 'gift' is used for something, offered to one or more identified recipients, which is specified in the primary sources as such, or was given on a specified occasion or for a specified reason, other than as part of a formal contract³. Gifts in this sense are usually irregular and at the whim of the giver, although they may be awarded

1. See Introduction, nn.11 and 18
2. In the Chapters, quotations from primary texts are italicized and in inverted commas. They generally retain the orthography and punctuation of the original, or of the edited version referred to, except where this might cause confusion. Titles, names and individual words referred to frequently are standardised; where appropriate, modernised; and modern English equivalents used if exact. Unfamiliar terms are defined in the Glossary. In the footnotes, the first reference to a source is given in full (apart from the date and place of publication, which are in the Bibliography). Subsequent source references are abbreviated as indicated. Conventions and abbreviations used in the Annexes and Appendices are listed together in the introductory sheet
3. Of the terms for gifts in the primary sources, the unambiguous

against a background of certain conventions which were widely recognised by contemporaries⁴. They therefore exclude pensions, wages and board, lodging and other expenses and necessities for individuals or their servants, directly related to a position in the ducal family, household or administration; and grants of land, money, prerogatives or general patronage made in exchange for an oath of fealty to the Duke⁵. The term 'material gift' is used to mean an object of this sort, or money

- 3.(cont'd) '*cadeau*' is rare at this period - see Prost, vol.2, item 3111; '*étrennes*' is used only for New Year gifts; and '*don*' in the ducal accounts commonly describes sums of money given out by Duke Philip which, although for good service or for items (like clothes and horses) often covered by a contract of service, resulted from a separate, voluntary ducal decision, on a particular occasion, or for a specific reason. See Rauzier, Finances, p.498, for a table showing the different types of '*don*' accorded by Philip 1368-1383. Even '*dons*' provided so that the recipient might present himself '*plus honnestement*' or '*plus honorablement*' either '*dans son état*' or '*en son service*' - that is, as more befitting the recipient's rank and status, in the Duke's service - were usually given '*de grace especial*', and on one occasion only, and were therefore additional to the Duke's contractual obligation. See, for instance, Archives Départementales de la Côte-d'Or, (hereafter ADCO), B1519, f.149
4. Some reward activity, particularly that termed '*gratiffia*', was probably tipping, for instance to those presenting gifts on behalf of their masters. See Rauzier, Finances, pp.497-500. Although tips were conventional and expected, a material one was neither automatic, nor of a fixed nature or value.
5. Pensions, whether for life or reviewed annually at the Duke's pleasure, were usually awarded for a specific reason, rather than as automatic components of contracts of service, and in that sense could be gifts. By the late fourteenth century, however, they had become more commonplace and, where associated with a ducal chamberlain, for instance, might be regarded as part of the increasingly standardised financial returns made to regular household officers

given to acquire such an object. These are usually inanimate, manufactured, luxury goods, such as fine dress or furnishing textiles (in the piece or made up), armour, books, gold and silver plate, jewellery, ornaments and other items of adornment for individuals or their property⁶. Where it is not clear whether an object is a gift or a contractual reward, it has been included as the former if there is no strong evidence to the contrary⁷.

6. Material gifts are often not termed such in the primary sources. The act of giving them may be termed '*presenter*' or '*donner*'. '*Presenter*' carried the sense of something offered personally to the recipient by the Duke or his representative - see Prost, vol. 2, item 2764. Cash rewards of this type to someone of more junior rank were standardised, and the equivalent of a tip - see Ibid., vol. 2, items 3205 and 3207, and n.4 above. Material ones were not standardised and are therefore included as gifts. '*Donner*' meant 'hand over' or 'make available', and could refer to gifts, commercial transactions, or contractual rewards. Commercial transactions can usually be identified because the exchange is specified; contractual items because they are often referred to as '*livree*' - something 'delivered' or provided automatically and regularly. Objects not so specified, given on an individual, occasional basis, particularly at marriage, baptism or New Year, can safely be assumed to be gifts.
7. Where the nature of the transaction is uncertain (as with clothes, wine or horses, which could be contractual or a one-off gift; or plate, or cash to buy it, as part of '*etrennes*'), it is included as a gift if in the same part of an account, of the same nature, or on the same occasion as a specified gift, or if there is nothing in the surrounding text to suggest to the contrary. (Clerks did not always repeat the term '*don*' for every recipient - see Prost, vol.2, item 3206. Contractual rewards are included in Appendices as they can indicate the status of the recipient and the nature of his formal relationship with the Duke, facilitating judgements as to whether any material gifts befitted his place in the hierarchy or indicated a more or less privileged relationship with the Duke. See Appendices R5 and R6.

Approaches

It is clear that, from earliest times, gifts were neither free nor motiveless, but carried attached 'strings', however dimly these might be perceived by either giver or recipient. They could be used to seal or guarantee contracts or formal relationships, the purposes of which were clear and specific, but the powerful could also use them more generally as a form of social cement, to create broad, reciprocal obligations or dependancy; to reinforce and display power and position in a hierarchy; to appease enemies; and to recompense, reward or secure friends⁸. Sometimes, therefore, reference to a gift might be the only remaining evidence of the existence either of informal obligations between giver and recipient, or of a secret arrangement with specific purposes⁹. Where there is evidence of a substantial and unusual gift, such as the Order of the Golden Tree, the purpose of which was not recorded by the giver or his contemporaries and remains unclear, it is therefore worth exploring the nature of the relationship marked by it, and whether it was intended merely to strengthen existing ties or to create new or

8. See, especially for the earlier period, Mauss, M., The Gift, particularly pp.3-4, 13-14, 41-2, and 68-83. Mauss shows that gifts were reciprocal. While reciprocity in kind, by means of an object of comparable value, might be expected from a peer, it could not be from people of a lesser rank, among whom gift-giving by the powerful therefore created obligations of service and dependancy. For a summary of the nature and uses of gift-giving in the medieval period, see Davis, N.Z., The Gift, pp.3-16,27,37
9. Reference to a gift to a person not otherwise mentioned in the ducal accounts, and of no known relationship to the Duke, his family or household, means that he must nevertheless have met or been recommended to the Duke, and suggests that he may have been in a position to offer service to him, either directly or through a patron who was a ducal client. See, for example, Appendix R1-17. The accounts sometimes indicate that the Duke did not wish the reasons for his gift-giving specified, or that the reward was for a secret mission.

specific obligations and, if the latter, to discover their nature¹⁰.

If the Order of the Golden Tree was intended to strengthen existing social ties and obligations or to reinforce Duke Philip's power, one would expect its recipients either to coincide with the circles of those to whom he gave conventional gifts, or to extend them to people with whom he had a relationship he considered insufficiently binding or public. If, however, the Order recipients appear rather, on this one occasion, to have been selected carefully from these or other groups, then it is likely that the Duke intended it to create some distinct network, with a common relationship to him, and bound by a new or different obligation, dedicated to the same purpose. Where the same gift is made only to a very few recipients, isolating accurately the common elements of their relationships with the giver is difficult. The fact that the Order of the Golden Tree was the only material gift Duke Philip gave, in the course of forty years' rule, to a large group of named recipients provides an unparalleled opportunity to clarify his purpose in giving it. The study therefore seeks to identify the sixty named recipients of the Order and the nature of their relationships with the Duke, and compares them with those who were obligated to him through known, conventional relationships, particularly those marked by gifts. Where the Order recipients appear to have been selected from these groups, it seeks to establish some idea of the purpose of the Order by identifying any shared characteristics which distinguished its recipients from their peers and would have justified the Duke seeking,

10. The Order insignia are listed among the Duke's New Year gifts - see Annex 1, but there is no explanation in the authorisation or in any of the references to the Order in the accounts, as to what it meant or why it was given only to a selected group of *etrennes'* recipients. There appear to be no other contemporary references to the Order.

rewarding, or publicising their support in this way¹¹.

In addition to any such general shared characteristics, some clearer idea of the Duke's purpose in giving the Order might be obtained from an analysis of the state of its recipients' gift-based relationships with him around the time of its award. Gifts, particularly material gifts, were at this period, normally strictly hierarchical, reflecting in their value and distinctiveness not only the rank and status of the giver, but those of the recipients¹². Departures from this norm, such as a particularly valuable gift to a low-ranking recipient, therefore signal something about the state of the relationship between giver and recipient around the time of the gift. The study therefore reviews apparent anomalies, either in the value of the Order insignia, or in the nature, value and frequency of other gifts from Philip to its recipients in 1402-3, compared to their actions, and particularly to their level of support for the Duke in his main policy concerns in this period, to help identify his reasons for giving the Order to them¹³.

These analyses suggest a number of broad purposes for the Order. The study attempts to narrow these down by analysing the form and nature of the Order itself. Not only could a material gift literally make visible an otherwise unknown relationship, but its form could be symbolic of that relationship¹⁴. Further, in the case of a gift which took the form of a decorated object, the

11. See Chapter 5 on Recipients

12. See n.7 above, and Appendix R2

13. See Appendix R10. Dates in this study are given new-style, except where quoted in a passage transcribed from the original, when the new-style, if different, is given in parenthesis

14. At the most basic, a clod of earth might be handed over to symbolise a gift of land to a vassal. Rings often symbolised close dependancy or affiliation as, by the fourteenth century, the

elements of the decoration could relate to the giver, the recipient, or the obligations involved, and thus assist in identifying them and the purpose of the gift¹⁵. The more complex and unusual the decoration, the more likely it is that it is not arbitrary, and that the purposes of the gift can be divined¹⁶. The design of the insignia of the Order of the Golden Tree, as the most elaborate and distinctive of those on any material gift which Philip gave to a group, offers the best opportunity for such an iconographical analysis.

The late fourteenth century was, however, an age which delighted in ambiguity, and Duke Philip might have selected a design for the Order insignia which was open to more than one interpretation, particularly if his purpose

- 14.(cont'd) could chain belts and collars, with their connotations of servitude. See Lightbown, R., Mediaeval European Jewellery, p.237. Philip usually gave a *hanap* and *aiguierre* when he stood godfather, doubtless reflecting the symbolism and ritual of the ceremony of Christian baptism
15. The materials used for the gift and its decoration, apart from their intrinsic value, rarity or popularity, could be symbolic. See, for instance, Les Lapidaires français du moyen âge, ed. Pannier, L., p.85, for a translation of Marbodius, of which Philip had a copy, about the properties of sapphires. Colours were commonly associated with particular virtues or properties. See, for example, Cooper, J.C., An Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Traditional Symbols, p.40, for those linked to blue. Colours could also reflect those used by the giver or recipient on a particular occasion, or as part either of a family coat-of-arms or of a personal device, as could representations of human, plant, or animal forms. The latter could also relate to the qualities or characteristics with which they were associated in widely known mediaeval texts, such as the bestiaries.
16. A simple, common decorative element might have no particular significance or, in an age which delighted in visual and literary allegory, several different, even conflicting, connotations. An eagle could, for instance, be linked to the Holy Roman Empire,

in giving it was politically sensitive or even dangerous¹⁷. Where precisely the same, uniquely decorated gift is given to a sizeable, but carefully selected group of recipients on a single, identified, public occasion, the nature and timing of that occasion may well have been chosen by the giver to reflect the purpose of the gift, or have been dictated by it¹⁸. Apart from a couple of replacements, Philip gave out all the insignia of the Order of the Golden Tree on New Year's Day, 1403. The study therefore tries to refine further Philip's purpose in giving the Order by considering the possible significance both of that feast day, in the light of contemporary custom, and of the year, in the light of his activities and policy concerns during 1402-3, the

16.(cont'd) St. John the Evangelist, or Duke Philip - see Prost, vol.

I, item 1009 for a belt he gave with this device. The meaning of two common elements together could vary according to context. An eagle with a lion, the two most commonly found heraldic charges, featured in a lectern dating from 1387 in the Charterhouse of Champmol, near Dijon, which Philip had built as a dynastic mausoleum to rival that of the French kings at the Abbey of St. Denis in Paris. Christian de Mérimod interpreted them as Visconti emblems, signifying Philip's support for the marriage of Valentina Visconti with his nephew, the Duke of Orleans, which he was negotiating at that date. See his 'Claus Sluter et le double programme décoratif de la Chartreuse de Champmol', in Actes des Journées Internationales Claus Sluter, p.167. Their use on a lectern suggests, however, that they were meant rather to represent the Evangelists Mark and John, and that the serpent dragon they were holding in their claws was not that of the Visconti arms but the traditional symbol of evil being overcome by the Christian gospel.

17. See Huizinga, The Waning of the Middle Ages, Chapter XV

18. See n.16 above. At New Year 1403, neither interpretation is likely to fit the Order, on which a lion and an eagle also feature. New Year gifts did not necessarily have any Christian associations (despite the Church's efforts to make it a Christian feast-day), and Duke Phiip was at odds with Orleans. Gifts

turbulent and culminating period of his rule¹⁹.

The study thus focusses on Duke Philip's gift of the insignia of what is termed an Order, in the form of the same, elaborately decorated *fermail*, to sixty identified men on New Year's day, 1403, against the background of his extensive, more general material gift-giving, because of the exceptional opportunity this rich combination of analyses offers for teasing out and illuminating his policy purposes at what proved to be almost the end of his rule, and thereby clarifying, and possibly reinterpreting, his overall aims; the extent to which they presaged those of his successors as Duke of Burgundy; and his role in Burgundian and French history.

Sources

A rich body of primary source material for the expenditure of the Valois Dukes of Burgundy survives which has informed understanding of the cultural and political history not only of that state, but of the period in Europe generally²⁰. For Philip, the first Duke, such material survives for almost every year of his rule²¹. Much of this has not appeared in print, and offers further opportunities for exploitation and interpretation beyond

18.(cont'd) could be given to mark a specific occasion, such as a birth or marriage in the ducal family, or the achievement of an outcome to negotiations, such as a treaty. See, for example, Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp. 68-72 and 74-5

19. Gifts were traditionally given at New Year to family and close associates to secure or reward loyalty.

20. See Vaughan, R., 1965 inaugural lecture, The Valois Dukes of Burgundy: sources of information, pp.11 and seq.

21. The series of registers ADCO B1413-B1518 includes receivers-general, 'trésorier' and 'argenterie' accounts itemising Philip's ducal expenditure for most years, apart from 1397, though those from the earlier years are less informative.

that already undertaken²². One such opportunity is the theme of this thesis - the exploration of his material gift-giving, and in particular of the Order of the Golden Tree, as a means of clarifying his political objectives.

Although no example or illustration of the insignia of the Order of the Golden Tree survives, there are several detailed descriptions of its form and decoration, and of the variations in cost and materials of the versions given to each of the sixty recipients, in the contemporary financial accounts and authorisations covering Duke Philip's expenditure²³. Similar sources provide information about his material gift-giving more generally²⁴. They are not, however, comprehensive. Although the donor and the costs are usually given, not all material gifts or their recipients are separately or clearly identified; the degree of detailed description of the object varies; and the occasion is not always specified²⁵. Nor can the occasion necessarily be divined from the date recorded, since that may be for when the

22. The registers (n.21 above) and most of the other original material (n.29 below) are in the Departmental Archives in Dijon. Selected sections are available on microfilm in the National Archives in Paris, and in later transcriptions in the Collection de Bourgogne in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. The most significant provision of the registers in print is in Prost, but this again is selective, and only up to 1399. Interpretative work on his material gift-giving has focussed mainly on it as an expression of his artistic patronage, see for example David, H., Philippe le hardi, duc de Bourgogne et co-régent de France de 1392 à 1404: le train somptuaire d'un grand Valois, (hereafter Train Somptuaire)

23. See Annexes 1 and 1a

24. See n.21 above

25. See, for example, unnamed household in Annex 2; differences in gift descriptions in Appendix R3, nn.5, 12 and 52, and in noting of occasions in nn.27 and 30

gift was commissioned, billed, paid for (anything up to six years later), despatched, presented or, in some cases, acknowledged - it being rare to find all six for one object²⁶. Indeed, some gifts appear to have left no record at all, and others to have been deliberately hidden²⁷. Without the occasion of a material gift, it can be difficult to ascertain even the Duke's overt purpose in offering it, since the latter is rarely recorded in the accounts²⁸. The information provided by the main series of ducal accounts is therefore supplemented by reference to other contemporary sources offering insights into Order recipients and their relationships with the Duke and each other; into the nature and purpose of the Duke's gift-giving, particularly to them; and into the occasions of such gift-giving, particularly in the context of his policy concerns at the time²⁹. While the latter may have

26. See, for example, Annex 1 for an authorisation signed in March to pay a bill for goods delivered in December of the previous year, and presumably ordered some months before that

27. See n.9 above. Presents for Philip's eldest son John are not recorded for 1376 or 1378-84

28. There are instances of gifts offered '*pour s'attacher*' to the Duke, but otherwise it is the occasion which is noted

29. Within the ducal household accounts, the study, annexes and appendices focus on identified gifts to Order recipients throughout Duke Philip's reign, and more generally on relevant occasions (such as those where he had previously used elements of the Order decoration, or where many of its recipients were present). Where possible, the study follows ducal gift-giving to Order recipients through into the early years of Duke John's rule. In addition to the main registers, (see n.21 above) reference is made to:-

- local receivers' accounts for the costs of gifts billed against them; and daily accounts for information about messengers sent to recipients
- ducal authorisations for gift payments, and quittances from recipients for receipt of such payments, for details of positions, titles, relationships to the Duke, dates of service

been edited to reflect the interests of their commissioners or writers, the information gleaned from the ducal accounts about gifts, costs and recipients can generally be assumed to be accurate, as far as it goes, and that about the reasons for the gift-giving to reflect the Duke's wishes³⁰.

Even with the general insights into the Duke's overt purposes in material gift-giving offered by this additional material, it is difficult to determine what, if any, covert or specific purposes might have underlain it, and in particular the gift of the Order. Attempting to

29.(cont'd) and reasons for the gift, not recorded in the main accounts - see liasses ADCO B341-B397, and for a particular example, Appendix R5, nn.36 and 37

- quittances with intact seals for confirming the identity of a recipient with a common name, and his possible relationship with other recipients - see Pièces Scellées taken from the above liasses
- *dénombrements*, for identifying recipients, their territories, and any territorial links with the Duke or each other - see ADCO B10513-10559
- *montres* and *revues* of troops, mustered to serve under the Duke on particular military campaigns, for dates of service to the Duke and possible links with other recipients, including the areas from which they came, and the companies served in - see ADCO B11746-11786 and, for example, Appendix R5, n.19 and the notes to Appendix R11
- wills and inventories for details of objects and occasionally notes of a gift and its donor
- accounts of other members of the French royal family, or of Order recipients, for information about gifts or recipients
- edited contemporary sources about royal appointments, legitimisations, and Philip's movements, for information about Order recipients and their careers
- contemporary writers for insight into the actions of the Duke and Order recipients, and contemporary opinions of them

30. Apart from different clerks' variations in spellings and titles,

discover these by interpreting the meaning of the nature, form, materials and decoration of the Order raises, however, a number of problems.

In a less literate age, where visual images were used widely to convey both general and specific information, in many and varied contexts, secular and religious, any single element or symbol could have had a number of different associations, both for the viewer and for whoever commissioned the image³¹. Associations with people or powers, which would have been familiar to both Philip and the Order recipients in 1403 are not difficult to identify from other contemporary and public visual sources, such as heraldic and other family or personal devices used to decorate clothing, possessions, buildings and tombs. Even such apparently simple associations, however, could vary according to the location, occasion or timing of the use of the image, and the function of the object it decorated and, to be accurately interpreted, need therefore to be set in these contexts³². Further, the meaning of a complex image is not necessarily the sum of its constituent parts, but could vary significantly according to the combination³³. Where there is no clear

30.(cont'd) particularly with unfamiliar names, the account entries were carefully checked and corrected before presentation at the end of the period covered. Many of the entries were copied from ducal authorisations, the wording of which, while mainly standard and conventional, was amended only on the Duke's instructions

31. See n.16 above. Those who made and decorated unusual objects at this period for a patron worked to his instructions, rather than mass producing 'on spec', or imposing their own interpretation

32. Coats of arms varied for a woman after marriage, or for men succeeding to a title or adopting an unrelated predecessor's arms. Personal devices were adopted only for short periods and frequently changed. Colours worn by a lord's retainers could vary according to his whim, the time of the year, the occasion, the rank or job of the wearers, or fashion.

33. See n.16 above

association with a particular person or power, other possible broad associations with the individual elements of an image can be suggested by written sources, available at the time, such as the popular encyclopaedias and similar didactic texts with whose ideas Philip and the Order recipients would have been familiar³⁴. To determine which, if any, of these associations Philip might have had in mind on the particular occasion of the gift of the Order, it is helpful to look at the meaning of any metaphorical uses of similar images in other literature of the period, which can be argued to reflect his beliefs and attitudes at that time.

Philip's broad attitudes and ideas were no doubt informed by the many books he owned, or at least by those which he himself had bought or had translated, or which had been discussed at the French court, and with which he could therefore be assumed to have been familiar³⁵. He left

34. Philip ordered in 1401 a copy of the French translation of the well known encyclopaedia, Bartholomew the Englishman's On the Properties of Things, commissioned by his brother, King Charles V, in 1372. See Winter, P.M. de, La Bibliothèque de Philippe le Hardi, (hereafter Bibliothèque) pp.195-6. The fact that a symbol is not recorded as used on his clothes, buildings, standards or seals does not necessarily mean that it carried no message of relationship to the Duke. Nor does its use on one occasion prove that it carried the same meaning on all occasions.

35. Philip and his wife came from literate, bibliophile families. The inventory of their library after his death records over 200 volumes, including 100 or so secular ones, of which 26 clearly belonged to him, and a further 78 to his wife, but many of these were inherited, or unsolicited presents, or valued primarily for their binding or illustrations. See de Winter, Bibliothèque, pp.36-46. For an example of books he ordered, see n.34 above; for works discussed at Court, see the open Letter to Richard II (edited by Coopland, G.W) written, at Charles VI's request, by Philip de Mézières, whom Duke Philip patronised, to further the peace talks in which the Duke was involved

nothing himself in writing, of a public or a private nature, however, to suggest what specific views led him to choose the particular combination of elements in the Order³⁶. The study therefore draws for this purpose on texts which were either created for, and commissioned directly from the author by him, or which were likely closely to reflect his views³⁷.

The sole text which we can be sure Duke Philip commissioned directly from the author, as a new creation, because she tells us so, is the panegyric of his dead elder brother, Charles V of France³⁸. This book was ordered from Christine de Pisan in 1403, not long after the Order was issued and, although it was completed only after the Duke's death, it seems clear that he gave her, in front of witnesses, detailed instructions about both the texts and the people she was to consult, in order to produce the book he wanted³⁹. Christine was in no position to deviate from these if she was to secure the

36. Most material from the Duke is conventionally worded. Little survives which can be attributed directly to him, apart from some letters to his wife and one to the Paris Parlement. See letters and commissions in Ordonnances de Philippe le Hardi, de Marguerite de Male et de Jean sans Peur 1381-1419, (hereafter Ordonnances) II, ed. Van Nieuwenhuysen, A.; and Douët d'Arcq, L., Choix de Pièces Inédites relatives au règne de Charles VI, (hereafter Pièces Inédites) LXXXXIX

37. Philip de Mézières' Epistre Lamentable, in Lettenhove, K. de, Chroniques de Froissart, vol.16, pp.444-523, written to Philip, is unlikely to reflect any expressed wish by the Duke to crusade

38. See Le Livre des Faits et Bonnes Moeurs du Roi Charles V le Sage, ed. Hicks, E. and Moreau, T., (hereafter Charles V), pp.41-43. Philip summoned Christine to him at the Louvre to explain what sort of book he wanted.

39. Christine says she presented her book, La Mutacion de Fortune, to Duke Philip on January 1 'en cet an de grâce 1403' and was called 'peu après' to see him. She could have meant 1403 or 1404, as elsewhere she uses the contemporary convention of dating the year

payment she needed for the finished work from Philip's son and successor, John⁴⁰. While it may be going too far to suggest that Christine was simply ghost-writing the book for Philip, he clearly chose her deliberately as a suitable proponent of his views, not only about his brother as a model ruler, but about future government, political life, and policies in France more generally⁴¹. It is unlikely, in the circumstances, that she would have

39.(cont'd) from Easter, referring to Duke Philip's death in April 1404 as '*en cette fin de l'année 1403*'. See Hicks and Moreau, Charles V, pp.42-3 and 109. Given the reference to a payment to her by the Duke in ADCO B1532, f.256, in the accounts for March 1402 n.s to September 1403, in an authorisation dated 11 March 1403 n.s, 1403 seems more likely. Christine finished the first part of Charles V, on 28th April, 1404, the day after Philip's death - Ibid., pp.108-110. She says the Duke saw her in the presence of his son, Anthony (Appendix R1-60), Jean de Chalon (App.R1-12) and Taupinet de Chantemerle (App.R1-14), all of whom received the Order. A passage in her Livre de la Paix suggests the Duke had given her texts, and in Charles V she indicates that she questioned people like Jean de Montagu (App.R1-42), - Ibid., pp.21-3 and n.41. Although the text falls into the traditional category of Mirrors of Princes, of which Philip owned several examples, her Charles V is not purely a compilation of existing texts

40. There is no record of any advance payment for the book. Not until February 20, 1406 is a payment to her of 100 écus recorded, for two books she had presented to Duke John, one of which had been commissioned by Duke Philip - see ADCO B1543, f.107. A widow since 1389, and without a regular income, Christine was reliant on patronage, and both payment for texts presented and future support depended on pleasing the patron. She had approached Duke Philip after failing to obtain a position for her son with the Duke of Orleans. See also Dulac, L., 'Authority in the Prose Treatises of Christine de Pisan: The Writer's Discourse and the Prince's Word', in Brabant, M., Politics, Gender and Genre, pp.129, and 131-5

41. Philip initiated the idea of the book, rather than responding to

adopted any views that contradicted Philip's, or included anything which could undermine his objectives, and more than likely that the significant elements were proposed by him⁴². Her repeated use in this book of the image of the tree - the central component of the Order design - particularly so soon after the issue of the Order, is therefore much more likely to have been dictated by Philip than to have been a literary device which she created or adopted from the background texts he provided for her use⁴³. The meanings and uses of the tree image in this

- 41.(cont'd) one from Christine (see nn.38 and 39 above), and must have considered the examples of the genre he owned inadequate or inappropriate for his purpose. He was accustomed to retaining people he could trust to present his views publicly, so commissioning a book to do so would not have been out of character. Although brought up at the French court, and known to many of those referred to in the book, Christine was not an obvious choice of author in 1403. She was a poetess, and producer of charming ballads, with little experience of serious, prose writing, although she was clearly ambitious to prove herself a literary force, as her involvement in the heavyweight public debate on the Roman de la Rose shows. See Vigier, A.de S., Christine de Pizan, pp.268-70 for a dated list of her works, and pp.173-183 for the debate. She was the more likely to do exactly what Philip wanted. Philip may also have considered that her work would be more acceptable to its assumed audience (his grandson-in-law and heir to the French throne), because she had a reputation for amusing the court and was, as a past client of Orleans, not obviously partisan -Hicks and Moreau, Charles V,p.16
42. Although the image of a genealogical tree was familiar in the Middle Ages, there is no evidence that Christine took the extended metaphor of the tree that she used in Charles V from any existing text - Ibid. pp.22-3. The timing and careful structuring of the book suggests that Christine must have prepared and planned it all out before writing, and may even have cleared this with Duke Philip before his death.
43. For instances of the use of tree symbolism see, for instance, Solente, Charles V, vol.1, pp.135, 161, and 176-7

book are therefore likely to reflect the interpretation which Philip intended to be put upon its use in the Order insignia.

These meanings are, however, broad and open to a number of different interpretations. Fortunately, Christine used the image not just of a tree, but precisely of the Golden Tree, in her book LaVision-Christine, and this time, very unusually, provided in a preface a detailed and unambiguous gloss to explain what the image was meant to convey⁴⁴. Although this book is often termed an autobiography, it is in fact a political treatise, which Christine must have designed for a powerful patron⁴⁵.

No-one else has commented on the relevance of this preface to the Order, perhaps because it post-dates it. The book is normally dated to late 1405, and the explanatory preface, which Christine Reno believes to be in Christine's own hand, while difficult to date precisely, seems to come from around the same period, or perhaps 1406⁴⁶. At this date, Christine was writing for Philip's

44. See Towner, M.L., LaVision-Christine. For a transcription of the Preface, see Reno, C., 'The Preface to LaVision-Christine in ex-Phillips 128', in Richards, E.J., Reinterpreting Christine de Pisan

45. See, for example, Rosalind Brown-Grant, 'L'Avision Christine: Autobiographical Narrative or Mirror for the Prince', in Brabant, Politics, Gender and Genre, p.95. While there is an autobiographical section in LaVision, the 'vision' is, in fact, about the government of France. While more recent critiques of Christine's work stress her development as an independent political theorist, Christine could not have relied solely on her growing reputation to secure adequate remuneration for LaVision, and must have written it to appeal to a patron, or even at his behest. See, for example, Zimmerman, M., 'Vox Femina, Vox Politica', in Brabant, Politics, Gender and Genre, pp.115-6

46. For dating LaVision, see Willard, C., Christine de Pisan, her life and works, p.155, and Towner, LaVision-Christine, p.8; for the Preface, Reno, 'The Preface to LaVision-Christine', p.226, n.14

son, John⁴⁷. Since her books reveal a gradual development of the tree allegory from Philip's original commission of Charles V to LaVision-Christine, and the Golden Tree clearly still meant something to the Burgundian Dukes, as John commissioned a collar of Golden Trees alternating with his personal device of the *rabot* in the summer of 1406, it is not unreasonable to assume that the interpretation Christine offered in the preface to this book was a Burgundian one, and in line with Philip's original intentions⁴⁸.

Hypotheses

Even though Christine's gloss helps clarify the sort of resonances Duke Philip intended contemporaries to pick up from the use of the Golden Tree in the design of the Order's insignia, interpreting the iconography of the whole design would not necessarily reveal his purpose in giving it, particularly if that purpose was sufficiently politically sensitive for him to design it to be read differently by Order recipients and by those who saw them wearing it. The outcomes of the iconographic analyses are therefore set against those of the analyses of Philip's relationships with Order recipients and of his policy concerns, over the period in which the Order was given, to identify his purposes. To conclude which of these purposes Duke Philip was most likely to have been pursuing, the outcomes of the analyses are, throughout the study, weighed against seven plausible hypotheses. These are not arbitrary, but stem from an initial review of relevant scholarly material and of the primary sources.

Decorative

The first hypothesis, put forward by historians and editors of some of the primary sources, who viewed the

47. See n.40 above for 1406, and payments to her from Duke John in 1407 in ADCO B1534, f.74v

48. For Duke John's collar, see ADCO B1554, f.113v

Order as no different from any other expression of Duke Philip's generous gift-giving, is that its purpose was purely decorative⁴⁹. Philip often gave wearable gifts in popular, precious materials, decorated in the latest fashion, with varying degrees of elaborateness, to his family and close associates, particularly at New Year, and the Order is considered to be one of these⁵⁰.

Chivalric Conceits

The next three hypotheses, drawn from earlier historians of the period, are that the Order was some form of chivalric conceit. The period has been seen as one when the concept of chivalry which had appeared to characterise the ruling classes in Western Europe in the literature of the twelfth century, was either reaching its culmination, or had been consciously revived, particularly in Burgundy⁵¹. One of the main characteristics of chivalric behaviour was deemed to be 'largesse' or generosity towards followers in the form of rewards and gifts, intended to display the magnanimity, power and splendour expected of a worthy ruler⁵². There are three particular aspects of the chivalric ideal with which orders were associated at this period, and which might therefore explain the purpose of Philip's Order. Although these had elements in common, for convenience this study explores each as a separate hypothesis.

Courtly Chivalric Order

The second hypothesis is that Philip's Order was intended as a purely courtly conceit. The code of chivalry promoted at court a refined, elaborate and formal code of

49. See, for instance, Peincedé, J-B., Inventaire de la chambre des comptes de Bourgogne, (hereafter P.), vol.22, p.340, who lists it among the gifts given on Philip's return from Brittany, as does David, Train Somptuaire..., p.177

50. See the lists of New Year gifts Ibid., pp.56-64

51. See, for instance, Huizinga, The Waning of the Middle Ages, Ch.IV

52. See, for instance, Starobinski, J., Largesse, particularly p.23

conduct, particularly respectful towards ladies, and enshrining the sort of precepts of courtly love found in earlier medieval romances (such as those of Chrétien de Troyes, which appear to have been popular with Duke Philip's wife)⁵³. Contemporary orders and brotherhoods existed, or were envisaged, in France and Burgundy at this time to promote and celebrate this, so the Order of the Golden Tree could well have been one of this type⁵⁴.

Military Chivalric Order

The third hypothesis is that it was chivalric, but military in nature. The importance of the old chivalric ideals of military prowess, mutual support, and loyalty by knights and squires to their lords and to the ruler had been revived and given fresh impetus in France in the light of that country's humiliating defeats in the Hundred Years' War, which its populace put down to the disappearance of these ideals among French nobles. Some saw this revival also as a reaction against the increasing use of mercenary forces and the reliance on payment rather than liege homage to secure military service⁵⁵. Again, there were a number of contemporary orders designed to laud military virtues or promote military reform and, as Philip had been affected personally both by French military failures and disloyalty, and by the demands of mercenaries, he might well have developed the Order of the Golden Tree as a specifically Burgundian version of such orders⁵⁶.

53. For books belonging to Philip and his wife, see n.35 above

54. See, for instance, the *Puy d'Amour* and *Cour Amoureuse*, in Bozzolo, C. and Loyau, H., La Cour Amoureuse, dite de Charles VI, (hereafter C.A.), vol.1, pp.1-6, and 35-45; and the Order of the Rose and that of *Ecu Vert à la Dame Blanche*, in McLeod, E., The Order of the Rose, including pp.73-6

55. See Boulton, A.J.D.de, The Knights of the Crown, pp.1, 10-11, and 167-210

56. For example, his father, King John's Order of the Knights of Our Lady of the Noble House, usually known as the Company of the Star, and Philip de Mézières' *Chevalerie de la Passion*

Crusading Chivalric Order

The fourth hypothesis is that Philip's Order was a crusading one. A commitment to go on crusade often, explicitly or implicitly, formed part of the chivalric ideal and was included in the objectives of contemporary chivalric orders⁵⁷. This explanation finds support among those who recall that Philip had himself taken an unfulfilled crusade vow; or who consider that he wished to avenge the humiliating defeat at Nicopolis in 1396 of the crusade led by his son, John, which he had promoted and financed; or that he wished to commemorate those relatives and close associates who had taken part in that crusade, many of whom had died as a result; or who regard his Order as a precursor of his grandson's Order of the Golden Fleece, of which crusading was one of the avowed objectives⁵⁸.

Livery Badge

The fifth hypothesis is that Philip intended the Order as some form of livery badge. The term livery is used here in the modern sense of a widespread distribution, on a given occasion, across different ranks, of material gifts in the same colours (particularly the giver's colours), or with the same decorative device in textile or metal, to be worn on clothes or harness, and related iconographically

57. See, for instance, the Order of the Collar, set up by Amadeus, the Green Count of Savoy, *Ibid.*, p.250

58. For the idea of the Order as a crusading one, see David, Train Somptuaire, p. 151; for his crusading vow, Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.61; for revenging or commemorating Nicopolis, Schnerb, B., 'Le contingent franco-bourguignon à la Croisade de Nicopolis', in Nicopolis, 1396-1996, (hereafter 'Nicopolis') pp.72-4; Appendix R7; for Peter I of Cyprus' honorary order for those returning from crusade, Boulton, Knights of the Crown, pp.241-2; for a link to the Order of the Golden Fleece, Pastoureau, M., 'La toison d'or, sa légende, ses symboles, son influence sur l'histoire littéraire', in Van den Bergen-Pantens, C., L'Ordre de la Toison d'Or, (hereafter VBP), p.101

to the giver or the occasion. (*Livrée*, in contemporary Burgundian usage, was a broader term referring simply to any distribution of clothes or textiles to an individual. This might form part, in effect, of the terms of service of some members of the household or of ducal officers, and might be given regularly on fixed dates during the year, or ad hoc. Its colour or decoration, if common to a number of people, was related to their rank or office, and colours given in a single *livrée* distribution could therefore vary considerably, and were not necessarily related iconographically to the giver)⁵⁹. At this period, some princes gave out livery badges in the narrower, modern sense, to mark some shared relationship, such as membership of their household or of a wider client group which supported them or their cause. If the Order recipients prove to have belonged to such a group, as most historians assume, Philip might have intended it as a livery badge⁶⁰. Since he only rarely provided livery in the modern sense at his court, however, it is arguable that if he did so on this occasion it was for a special reason, rather than simply to indicate both to friends and potential foes, at a time of increasingly partisan divisions between him and his rival and nephew, the Duke of Orleans, the extent of his power, the level of loyal support upon which he could definitely call, and the advisability of maintaining or transferring allegiance to him.

59. In 1393, for instance, a single livery to people in the households of the Duke, Duchess, and their eldest son included clothes for different groups in red and dark green; bright green and white; violet and white; grey, light blue and white; and several other combinations of these colours. See ADCO B1500, ff.132v-134v

60. For instance, King Richard II of England's badge of the white hart, and tournament badges issued to supporters. See Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, p.199. David, Train Somptuaire, p.151 characterises Order recipients as family and courtiers

The term 'order' is usually used to describe a network of people, also marked out by the wearing of a common decorative device, but bound by a vow to narrower, specified objectives⁶¹. This strengthens the likelihood that Philip gave his Order to mark out those on whom he could rely for support for some particular policy, or in particular circumstances. His grandson's court commentator, Olivier de la Marche, however, was later to dismiss many so-called orders of this period as not worthy of the name because they were ephemeral, lacking statutes specifying any objectives, rules, regular meetings, or means of maintaining adherence to these. In his view, those which merely shared a device were not true orders, and amounted, in effect, to little more than a livery badge. By implication, he included the Order of the Golden Tree among these⁶².

The absence of statutes does not, however, necessarily mean that the Order of the Golden Tree had no specific purpose. The preparation or publication of formal regulations might have been cut short by Philip's unexpected death; or the Duke might have wished to keep its purpose secret; or to retain some room for manoeuvre to permit him to pursue specific objectives differently as circumstances changed; or his purpose might have been short-term⁶³. Two new hypotheses, concerned with more specific objectives for the Order, are therefore posited.

Military Alliance

The sixth hypothesis is that Philip intended the Order as

61. See Boulton, Knights of the Crown, pp.xvii-xxi

62. See Ibid. pp.xvi-xvii, referring to *Epistre pour tenir et celebrer la noble feste du Thoison d'Or*, published in Beaune,H., and Arbaumont,J.de, in Mémoires d'Olivier de la Marche, IV, pp.158-189. De La Marche does not mention the Order of the Golden Tree as a 'proper' Order

63. There is no evidence of any statutes for the Order of the Garter until some years after its inception. Philip died in 1404

the outward sign of a military alliance, or contract on the lines of ones which Lewis found were being developed in France at this period, and with which Philip must have been familiar⁶⁴. While they did not usually take the form of an order, Philip was familiar with the idea of giving a badge to signify one. In Philip de Mézières' Le Songe du Vieil Pelerin, dating from about 1389, it is explained that a great lord might offer a royal officer a life pension to keep him in with the king, but might add "*Mais quoy je veuil que tu soies mon frere especial et mon alie et te donne ma devise, et que tu me faces serement d'estres avecques moy en tout et par tout, contre tous ceulx du royaume, voire excepte monseigneur le roy; et que mon bien et mon honneur tu garderas et me feras savoir tout ce qui me pourra touchier, ou bien ou mal, par les lectres secretes ou par loyal messaige, ou par un tel signet*". In France as in England by this period, princes seem increasingly to have found the broad 'feudal' agreement inadequate (not least because of the conflicting loyalties of their clients, who might hold lands from several different lords), and thus to have engaged in a variety of formal contracts, either for life or for a specific period, or purpose⁶⁵. Since Philip could already call upon some existing military support networks of this kind, such as household and other administrative officers with specifically military duties and responsibilities, who were bound by oath and paid to fight, provide and lead troops and defend fortifications for him, the purpose of any additional military alliance would have been to supplement those networks. Duke Philip needed, for

64. See Lewis, P., Later Medieval France, pp.200-1. Such contracts as Philip made for securing military support do not relate to recipients of the Order

65. See Lewis, P., 'Of Breton Alliance and Other Matters', (quoting from Coopland, G.W., (ed.), Le Songe du Vieil Pelerin, vol.2, pp.350-5) and 'Decayed and Non-Feudalism in Later Medieval France', both in his Essays in Later Medieval French History, pp. 44-68, and p.69 for the quotation. The underlining is mine.

instance, to secure loyal military support in newly acquired territories; in those falling under his control; and in sensitive border areas. There were also household officers who, for significant periods, might be off-duty; served other princes as well as Philip; or, as was not infrequently the case, had not received their expected or contracted rewards. For such people, the gift of an expensive jewel such as the Order might therefore have been intended as a sign or reminder of their obligations; as an inducement to give priority to their obligations to Philip; or as compensation to keep them loyal to him⁶⁶.

Specific Policy Alliance

Since Philip had other means at his disposal to secure such aims, the seventh and final hypothesis is that any military alliance marked by the Order of the Golden Tree was intended rather to secure support for a specific policy which exceeded or even contradicted the obligations imposed by the conventional money fee, *fief-rente*, general alliance or oath of office; was too sensitive or controversial to be made public; or was a defensive fall-back, to be called into play only if Philip was seriously threatened. Such an approach would have befitted a prince who had developed from an impetuous youth into a rich, powerful but cautious ruler who, through a flexible combination of forward planning and opportunism, had sought to extend his territories and secure the future of the dynasty he had founded.

The seven hypotheses set out above provide a convenient structure for summarising the outcomes of the analyses contained in each of the main chapters of the study, and facilitate the development by the final chapter of conclusions as to Duke Philip's most likely purpose in giving the Order of the Golden Tree to sixty recipients on January 1, 1403, thus permitting a re-assessment of his overall policies and role.

66. For military obligations, see Chapter 5

CHAPTER 2: NATURE, FORM AND MATERIALS OF THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE

The nature and form of a gift could be symbolic of the relationship between its giver and the recipient, and the materials used could be associated at this period with particular virtues or properties¹. This Chapter is therefore designed to contribute towards the refinement of the hypotheses posited for the objectives of Duke Philip's material gift-giving by analysing the material nature of the insignia of the so-called Order of the Golden Tree. It attempts to establish the precise nature, form and shape of these insignia; the number given; the materials of which they were made; and their value, rarity, novelty and fashionability. It assesses the significance of this information in determining, in comparison with his material gift-giving more generally, the intended nature of the so-called Order and the most likely hypothesis for Philip's purpose in giving it.

There is no surviving example of the insignia. There is mention, however, in the Ducal accounts of a number of material objects, the descriptions of which are sufficiently detailed to indicate that they were of the same nature, shape, form and basic materials; were distinguishable from all other examples of the Duke's material gift-giving; and thus formed a single, unique group².

In all these descriptions, each insignia is specified initially as being of '*l'ordre de monditseigneur*', and in subsequent references in the same section as being of '*dudit ordre*'; is termed a '*fermail*' (that is, some kind of clasp); and is described as containing a tree made of gold, set between an eagle and a lion, both fashioned in

1. See Chapter 1, nn.14 and 15

2. For the descriptions, see Annexes 1 and 1a

white enamel³. A later reference, to what appears to have been the Duke's own insignia, suggests additionally that under the animals' feet was a crescent-shaped sapphire; and around them a '*rouliau*' with letters in rouge cler enamel, spelling out the words '*en loyaute*'⁴. The reference to '*rouliau*' is confirmed a few folios later in a reference to the Duke paying for repairs to the insignia he had given to his second son, Anthony⁵. Although one might, from its absence in the main insignia descriptions, argue that this '*rouliau*' was an elaboration restricted to the Duke's own insignia and that of his second son, it is

3. The main description, in Annex 1, relates to the insignia offered to John of Nevers, Duke Philip's eldest son. It is drawn from the section on the acquisition of gold and silver *joyaux* in ADCO B1532, ff.254-255v, in the account of the Receiver-General, Jean Chousat, for 22/3/1402-30/9/1403(n.s), and from the virtually identical ADCO B338, the Ducal authorisation, dated 20/3/1403(n.s), for payment for the items to the merchants who had provided them. The meaning and significance of the terms '*ordre*' and '*fermail*' are discussed later in this Chapter
4. See Annex 1a, taken from ADCO B1538, f. 161, the account of the Receiver-General, Jean Chousat, for 1/10/1403-16/6/1404(n.s). Although the Order is not mentioned in terms, the similarity of the *fermail* descriptions and the associated dates suggest that this one was made either at the same time as the main group in Annex 1, or as a prototype for them. This *fermail* must have been made for Duke Philip himself because it is in the round-up account, recording the settling of outstanding bills incurred by him up to the day of his burial at Champmol; appears in a section covering work ordered for himself and his family from his personal goldsmith and valet de chambre, Hermann Ruissel; is nowhere mentioned as having been intended for or given to anyone else; and we know from Annex 1 that he had one
5. See n.4 above, *Ibid.*, f.165v. Although this does not specify the colours of the enamels applied to the animals, and implies that the *rouliau* may have been in two sections, it is clearly a reference to an Order insignia

inconceivable that Philip would have given that second son a more elaborate insignia than those he gave to his eldest son and main heir, John, or to his politically important and high ranking relative and ward, the Duke of Brittany⁶. If the absence of a reference to a '*rouliau*' in the description of John's insignia, which headed the main list of insignia, was an oversight, then it is likely that this applied to all the other insignia descriptions too, particularly since the '*rouliau*' contained, in effect, a motto - an integral element and too important to be omitted from any of the insignia. The sapphire crescent also had potential significance and probably formed part of all the insignia⁷. Individual insignia seem therefore to have been distinguished only by the number, type and quality of any additional jewels which adorned them - a necessary distinction at this period to indicate the relative rank of the recipient and his closeness to the Duke⁸.

While historians have generally treated as a single, composite group either all the objects listed as ducal New Year gifts in 1403, or all those termed '*fermail*', I would argue rather that a careful reading of the manuscript references shows that certain of these *fermaux* were carefully, and repeatedly distinguished from the rest as belonging to '*l'ordre*' of Duke Philip⁹. The fact that they were interspersed with other *fermaux* not so distinguished, reflects only the clerks' usual practice of listing gifts, when ordered or distributed, by the rank

6. See Annex 1 and n.3 above

7. See nn. 44-46 below, and Chapter 3 on Iconography

8. See Annex 1 and Chapter 5 on Recipients

9. See Chapter 1, n.46; Annex 1; P., vol.22, p.340, which lists some of the Order recipients simply as recipients of New Year gifts on the Duke's return from Brittany; and David, *Train Somptuaire*, pp.150-152, which identifies Order recipients separately, but includes among them women and other recipients of *fermaux* at New Year 1403

and importance of the recipient and their closeness to the Duke, and hence broadly by the value of the gift. If all the *fermaux* listed had belonged to the Duke's 'ordre', there would almost certainly have been some heading or introductory note to that effect¹⁰. Only those *fermaux* described as being of the Duke's 'ordre' are therefore included in this analysis¹¹.

On this basis, there appear only to have been sixty-four such *fermaux* given out to sixty recipients, including Duke Philip himself¹². The reasons underlying the presentation of two insignia, at different times, to four of the recipients are explored further in the Chapter on Recipients. They appear, however, primarily to be related to changes in the status of the recipients, rather than to a desire to present a larger number of insignia or to increase the size of the 'ordre'. The significance of an 'ordre' numbering sixty members is explored in the same Chapter.

But was this use of the term 'ordre' meant to indicate something distinct in nature and therefore of particular significance about the insignia and the group of people to which they were given? Again, contrary to other historians, I would argue that it was. This is the first and only time in the forty odd years of the Duke's rule that there is any reference in his accounts to something which he distributed being called his 'ordre'. The repeated use of the term in relation to one particular set

10. See Annex 1. Expenditure authorisations for special occasions, such as New Year or a marriage, are limited to that and indicate the occasion, see for example ADCO B338 for New Year, and B301 for Rethel's marriage

11. The one exception is the first of the two *fermaux* given to the Duke of Brittany, which appears in Annex 1 immediately after the introductory and detailed reference to Nevers' Order insignia and is described as '*pareil*' to that

12. See Annexes 1 and 1a, and n.9 above

of items suggests that it was deliberate. If the term had been intended to be no more, for instance, than a fashionable alternative to others he used to describe symbols marking his ownership, his patronage, his association with the household or a wider affinity, or representing his power, his territories and his family, then one would expect the terms to be used interchangeably. In fact, they are not. Different types of symbol seem always to be distinguished, in his accounts, by different terms.

The most common symbol Philip used was his coat of arms, which is always termed such in the accounts. This symbol was used mostly to mark his possessions or power generally. The term is rarely used in relation to a *fermail* bearing his arms, and then for one given to individual representatives, rather than to a wider group¹³.

Some of his other marking symbols were termed a '*devise*' (which, for Philip, meant some symbol or device, other than arms, devised by or personally associated with the user)¹⁴. It is not entirely clear whether Philip had a regular device or whether, like his nephew Charles VI, and other contemporary princes, he changed it at whim or to suit a particular occasion¹⁵. The fact that we are rarely told in the accounts what Philip's device was

13. See for example, Prost, vol.1, item 2351, and vol.2, item 1212, for armorial badges for his minstrels; and Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, p.198, for badges for his heralds in 1375

14. See Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.198-201; Prost, vol.2, item 1239 for pennons '*de la devise de monditseigneur*', and item 3294 for '*plusieurs devises*' for Nevers; and David, Train Somptuaire, p.20, for '*certaine devise*' to go to Brittany

15. See for example, Prost, vol.2, item 2501 for Charles VI's three devices for 1388, which Philip honoured, and vol.2, items 1239, 1437, 1699 and 1744 for unspecified ones in different colours for Philip



suggests, however, that he had at least one standard one, which was well-known and unchanging. Hints in the accounts indicate further that this was a 'P' (for his own name) together with an 'M', or a marguerite (to represent his wife, Margaret)¹⁶. There is no indication that Philip adopted any whimsical or pastoral personal device of the type fashionable among younger princes, such as the strawberry used by his second son, Anthony¹⁷. While Philip seems, on occasion, to have marked out parts of his household or affinity with his standard device, there is no evidence of him distributing this (or, indeed, any other so termed) as a *fermail* in bulk¹⁸.

Lightbown considers that, at this period, the terms 'order' and 'device' could be used interchangeably. I would argue from the evidence of his accounts, however, that Philip and his clerks did not do so, and that, by introducing the term '*ordre*' at this point, Philip intended it to mark out something which was different in nature from any of the existing networks or forms of association he might previously have marked or created by the distribution of a device, whether or not it constituted a formal brotherhood of the type which the term 'order' came later to represent¹⁹. I therefore refer

16. See for example, ADCO B1532, f.264v, and B1538, f.204

17. See for example, ADCO B1538, f.245v

18. See for example, white cloth motifs of '*la devise de la livree des paiges*', ADCO B1532, f.286

19. See Chapter 1, especially nn.61-63. Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, p.260. There is a single use of the term '*devise*' in relation to an Order insignia. The record of the repairs to Rethel's insignia (Annex 1a) refers to it as '*l'esmail de la devise de monditseigneur*', but the word used on its own in the same accounts appears not to refer to the Order. For instance, references to Philip giving clasps with his '*devise*' to his chamberlain, the Seigneur de la Rochefoucaut and to the Vidame of Amiens are recorded on the same folio as that to what is specified as the second Order insignia to Pierre de La

throughout to the Duke's '*ordre*' as his Order.

The form of the insignia was a *fermail*. This could mean anything which closed, joined or fastened things, such as a hook, buckle, clasp, centrepiece in a crown, or an ornamental brooch²⁰. In the case of Philip's own Order *fermail*, it appears to have joined the ends of, or hung down as a pendant from, a great collar²¹. At this period, in France and Burgundy, collars were of precious metal, or metal mounted on a textile band, sometimes jewelled or enamelled, with some kind of front fastening, from which a pendant might hang, and were a relatively new fashion. There is no mention, however, of an accompanying collar in any of the other descriptions of the Order insignia. Nor is there any record of Philip giving out collars to Order recipients. Indeed, apart from a few, elaborate and expensive ones presented occasionally to close, high-ranking relatives or, even more rarely, to a very favoured courtier, he did not give out collars generally, and each of those given appears to have been one of a kind, with no common form, materials or design, and no resemblance to

19.(cont'd) Tremoille - Annex 1a and ADCO B1532, f.271; and references to the Duke buying two more clasps with his '*devise*' in February 1404, which he gave to Messires Bonnebant and Christofle de Lichtenstein, and to him acquiring a similar one from Regnier Pot in May 1403 to give to the Seigneur de Hunanbyle, come just before that to the specified second Order insignia to François de Grignaux - ADCO B1538, ff.165 and 166v. As '*esmail*' usually meant an enamelled plaque or badge, and '*de la devise de*' was sometimes used to mean anything which the Duke had planned or created, it may be that the description of Rethel's existing Order insignia made it unnecessary to make a specific reference at that point to the Order.

20. See Glossary, and for examples in this period, Gay, V., Glossaire Archéologique du moyen âge et de la renaissance, Bk.1, pp.702-4

21. See n.4 above

that Philip wore with his Order insignia²². Contrary to Lightbown, therefore, I contend that, for the purposes of assessing the significance of the form of the insignia, it comprised a *fermail*, not a collar and *fermail*, and was thus some form of ornamental clasp, brooch or badge²³.

The form of a *fermail* might suggest a wish on Philip's part to draw the recipient closer to him, or to express a close relationship, but he appears not to have associated this form of gift with any one particular type of relationship, purpose or occasion²⁴. It was a common present at this period²⁵. Many of the Order recipients had received other *fermaux* from the Duke, on one or more occasions, including at marriage, during visits to or from him, at tournaments and, most commonly, at New Year²⁶. By the beginning of the fifteenth century, however, Philip seems increasingly to have favoured diamonds, rather than *fermaux*, as gifts for his general household at New Year²⁷.

22. See Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.238-240, and Plates 40, 91 and 91a. Philip and his wife had a number, but it was only in the 1390s that he began to offer them as gifts to his family. The only Order recipients, who were not close relatives, to whom Philip gave a collar were de Croy in 1399, Pierre de La Tremoille in 1401/2, and Le Voyer in 1402 - see Appendix R3, nn. 17, 34 and 41

23. See *Ibid.*, p.260, which suggests that the insignia was a brooch for ladies and a collar and pendant for men. The possible significance of the iconography of the collar Philip wore with his insignia is discussed in Chapter 3, in relation to the interpretation he might have wished some of his contemporaries to put on the purpose of the Order and his involvement in it.

24. See Appendices R3 and R6; and Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.137, 143-4, 157 and 160-164

25. See n.24 above and Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.74-5 and 160-164

26. See Appendices R3 and R6

27. See Annexes 1 and 2

The gift of a *fermail* at New Year 1403 would therefore have marked the recipients out as particularly favoured or esteemed.

Fermaux at this period could take a wide variety of shapes²⁸. That of the Order insignia is not recorded, but the components of the design seem to have been free-standing, as was the fashion²⁹. In this, it resembles the sort of openwork badges, with figures and a scroll or legend, usually only surviving in unadorned base metal, worn by pilgrims to indicate a belief in the powers of the saint whose shrine had been visited, or at tournaments to indicate adherence to a competitor³⁰. The disposition of the elements, however, resembles that of a heraldic achievement, with a central charge (the tree), supporters on either side (the lion and the eagle), and a motto underneath. Heraldic charges were, however, usually mounted on a solid background³¹. For the elements of an achievement to have been free-standing in a brooch, they would probably have been linked together, perhaps with the motto at the bottom and the *rouliaux* forming the rest of an outer band, within which the main figures were enclosed³². Few such complex *fermaux* are known, probably because they were more fragile than simpler or single figure ones³³. The insignia must also have been quite large to accommodate all the elements³⁴. The shape and

28. See Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.136-187 and Plates 19-57

29. Ibid., Figures 70-73 and 82

30. Ibid., pp.188-196 and Figures 94,100 and 101; Bruna,D., Enseignes de pèlerinage et enseignes profanes, pp.173,180,301,312,324,341

31. See Fearn, J., Discovering Heraldry, pp.12, and 20-41; and Pastoureau, M., Traité d'héraldique, Plates 1 and 2, and p.266

32. See for example, Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, Figures 70, 71, 82 and, in a cheap badge, 102

33. This fragility is born out by the references to repairs of Order insignia in Annex 1a

34. Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.136-7 instances ones

form of the insignia were thus unusual in such materials, and clearly chosen to attract attention; to convey some sort of message about adherence to a person or cause; and to mark out or honour the recipients.

These messages would have been reinforced by the costliness of the insignia and of the materials used. All appear to have been fashioned in gold, ranging from the simplest for 24 squires (of which only 23 are named) at 30 francs each; through 16 specified as without additional jewels at 50 francs each; 3 with a 'balay' and six pearls at 112½ francs each; 6 with a balay, a sapphire and three pearls at 150 francs each; another 3 at this price - one with a balay and nine pearls, another with a balay and two large pearls, and the third with a balay, a sapphire and three pearls; one at 225 francs with unspecified stones; one at 247½ francs with a balay and five pearls; 2 at 250 francs each - one with a sapphire, a balay and three pearls, and the other with unspecified jewels, but probably similar; one at 300 francs with unspecified stones; 3 at 337½ francs each, all with distinctive jewels - one with two large balays and a large, remarkably shaped pearl, another with a square cut balay, a sapphire and three pearls, and the third with two balays and a large pearl; one at 400 francs with two large balays, a large sapphire and four large pearls; one at 405 francs, with a large, cabochon balay and six pearls; 2 at 600 francs with a large balay, a large sapphire and three large pearls; up to the Duke's own insignia, which appears to have cost around the same figure, and to have been decorated with a number of large jewels, including three fine rubies. Excluding his own insignia (which was partly fashioned from recycled jewellery), this amounted to an expenditure by the Duke of some 7,500 francs - a significant proportion of his total expenditure on New Year gifts and related expenses in 1403 of some 28,000 francs. The latter total is in line with what he spent on New Year

34.(cont'd) of 15cms. or even 19cms. in diameter

gifts in the later years of his rule, which would suggest that, rather than adding the Order and its recipients to his normal list of New Year gift recipients, Philip marked some of them out by deliberately selecting them to receive it³⁵.

In general, and particularly for the more junior ranking recipients, the insignia were costlier than the presents

35. See Annexes 1 and 1a, and the Glossary for gemstones and coinage.

It is not entirely clear whether the Duke himself had one Order insignia or two - one being worn with a specially designed collar. The reference in Annex 1 to the one '*que monditseigneur porte de sondit ordre*' could imply there was another. If two, that ordered from his personal goldsmith in September 1402 might have been a prototype for the main group of insignia, whose order date is unknown, but must have been in the autumn of 1402, since they could not have been bought 'over the counter' as some gifts were. The existence of two Ducal insignia could also explain the reference in Annex 1 to Philip returning the one he wore to the merchants from whom the rest were bought. The cost of his insignia is not clear, but it is inconceivable that he would have ordered, or worn, a less valuable, finely-fashioned or ostentatious one than those given to the highest-ranking recipients. The difference between a minimum of 600 francs (the most expensive insignia distributed) and the 135 francs due to the Paris merchants simply for the gold in, and fashioning of, the insignia he returned might quite neatly be bridged by the 345 francs due to Hermann Ruissel for having made the collar and clasp, together with the 36 francs for the foils set under the gems and the value of the two Ducal rings he refashioned into them. It could be that the Parisian merchants were acting as commissioning agents for Philip and that, Ruissel having insufficient gold to make up Philip's insignia, they advanced him some from their own stock (a not uncommon practice), or defrayed part of the cost in advance (a form of credit popular with Philip, who might not repay for months or even years). Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.234, estimates Philip's spend on New Year gifts from 1395 to have been about 25,000 francs a year

Philip gave at New Year 1403 to men of comparable rank³⁶. The gold used was an expensive commodity, and regarded as the most precious of materials, suitable for the most senior or valued people, and rarely, if ever, used for a bulk commission of identical and expensive items like the Order³⁷. To his contemporaries, Philip's use of gold in the insignia would have borne visible and unmistakable witness to his wealth, power, royal status, and generosity, as well as to the favoured standing of the recipients.

The white enamel used for the lion and eagle suggests that they were probably enamelled in *rond bosse*, a relatively new and difficult technique, which gave a fashionably naturalistic, three dimensional form to the figures in *joyaux* and jewellery at this period³⁸. While Philip had given the occasional *fermail* with such enamelling, on special occasions, to a high-ranking individual, since the 1380s, this was the first time he had used it for a group of identical *fermaux* across a range of ranks³⁹.

Like *rond bosse*, the *rouge cler* enamel used for the letters of the motto could only be executed on gold, and was therefore used only for the most valued gifts, intended for display. It was a difficult technique, particularly for such detailed work⁴⁰. Instances of Philip using it other than for articles for his own use or for gifts for the most senior members of his family are rare, and if it was used on all the insignia, it would

36. See Annex 1, especially *fermaux* given to named squires of important lords, and a few individuals whom the Duke obviously wished to honour but not to include in his Order

37. Only small gold items, like plain rings, were purchased in bulk, see Prost, vol.2, item 722.

38. See Glossary; Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.146,160-4

39. Ibid., pp. 161; and ADCO B338 for New Year 1393

40. See Glossary; Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.35, 46

have been most striking, not least because of its fragility, and marked the Order insignia out as of considerable importance⁴¹.

The sapphires, balays and pearls which decorated the insignia of the more senior recipients were popular at this period in Burgundy, not only for their value, but for the colour combination of blue, rose and white⁴². Gems that were larger than average, cut, or naturally unusually shaped, being more valuable and sought after, featured on the insignia of favoured recipients. Philip's own insignia reflected both his tastes and his position as leader of the Order. The brilliance of its gems had been intensified by underlying foils. He was particularly fond of rubies, which were rarer and more expensive than balays, and they could have carried associations with him and with Flanders, as he owned the so-called Count's ruby, which had been passed down to each succeeding Count of Flanders⁴³. Rubies also carried associations with rulers and royalty, as did sapphires⁴⁴. Sapphires were also considered to protect against harm, particularly poison, and were strongly associated with loyalty⁴⁵. The use of a crescent shaped sapphire would have drawn particular attention to the stone and its properties. Sapphires are one of the hardest gemstones after diamonds, and are not found naturally in a crescent shape. References to sapphires of this shape are rare in Philip's accounts, and it must have been specially cut, with some difficulty⁴⁶. If Philip's insignia included such a stone, it would have been noteworthy: if all the insignia did, they would have

41. Ibid., pp.161 and 324; and for repairs, my Annex 1a

42. See Glossary, and Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, p.11

43. For the Count's ruby, Ibid., p.33, and for foils, pp.21-2

44. See Baisier, L., The Lapidaire Chrétien, its composition, its influences, its sources, pp.115-6; Pannier, L., Les Lapidaires Français du Moyen Age, pp.39-41, 84-6, 115-7

45. See Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.11 and 96-8

46. Sapphires were faceted or cut into simple ovals Ibid., pp.13-14

been truly remarkable in the eyes of contemporaries.

It is clear, therefore that, from what we know of the nature, form and materials of the Order insignia, they were specially ordered, from Parisian merchants, to a specific, unique design, and that, both individually and especially as a group, they would have created a stunning display of the Duke's wealth and power, surpassing even his usual munificence at New Year⁴⁷. They were obviously intended to be worn prominently on recipients' clothing and, despite their potential fragility, would have been both more durable than an embroidered or applied design and more versatile, which suggests that they were intended to be worn on more than one occasion, and even regularly⁴⁸. They would have marked out the recipients as particularly favoured, and as linked to each other and to the Duke in some significant respect. Considering the hypotheses advanced, what clues then can we find in the nature, form and materials of the Order insignia as to the nature of that link and the Duke's purpose in creating it?

Decorative

Kovacs described orders as a 'decorum indispensable' for fashionable contemporary princes, and there is no doubt but that the insignia of Philip's Order, even the least

46.(cont'd) For hardness, see the table in Steingraber, E., Antique Jewellery, which shows that on a scale of 10, the sapphire and the ruby score 9, after the hardest - the diamond- at 10. For Philip's accounts, see ADCO B338 for New Year 1397, which refers to '*un beau saphir en maniere de croissant*' given to St. Pol (R1-50)

47. See n.35 above; and Annex 1. For smaller or less important commissions, the Duke used his household goldsmith or local craftsmen; bought from friends, household and family; or passed on from his own coffers either objects he had put aside or his own goods

48. It is clear from the reference to repairs in Annex 1a that Rethel's insignia must have been worn more than once

expensive versions, would have met this need in a highly decorative way⁴⁹. The nature of the object, its design, materials and colours, were in the latest French and Burgundian court fashion, as was the Duke's accompanying collar. The Duke could just have taken this regular New Year opportunity for largesse and munificence both to ensure that his courtiers were appropriately dressed to reflect his and his court's wealth and pre-eminent status, and to display his power by satisfying his desire to be up-to-date, and at the same time, not just competing with, but surpassing, the comparable attempts of his younger contemporaries and rivals⁵⁰. The, for Philip, unique nature of the object, together with the elaborateness and complexity of its form and design, and the value, noteworthiness and careful selection of the materials used all suggest, however, that Philip had, in addition, some more specific purpose in mind.

Chivalric Conceit

The term 'order' was used at this period to describe a variety of types of network with chivalric associations, some short-term and fanciful, others with more serious, long-term purposes. As there are no surviving regulations for Philip's Order, which might have clarified its purpose, it may be helpful to compare its nature, form and materials with those of contemporary networks, termed 'orders', of which he was a member or with which he would have been familiar.

Courtly Chivalric Order

European princes and nobles at this period devised courtly orders, based on some chivalric conceit, and designed to evoke the popular precepts of idealistic love and refined,

49. See Kovacs, E., L'Ordre du Camail des Ducs d'Orléans, p.225

50. For the orders of contemporaries, see nn.52 and 53 below; and Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, p.291 for Orleans' insignia of the Camail

respectful behaviour towards ladies⁵¹. Some contemporary associations of this nature, like the Cour Amoureuse, or Court of Love of Philip's nephew, Charles VI, which had been established at Epiphany, 1401, at the instigation of Philip himself, and of which he was a senior member, were not called orders, although they had regulations stipulating their purpose, membership and meetings, and lasted for some considerable period. The members of the Cour Amoureuse were enjoined to use an appropriate symbol of its purpose on occasion, but there is no record of any formal insignia or *fermail*⁵². Other associations of this type which were termed orders, but have no extant regulations, like the Order of the Rose, said to have been instituted by the Duke of Orleans at a party he held on St. Valentine's Day 1402, may have had some representative symbol for wear by members, but this was not necessarily a *fermail*, and would almost certainly have been of a simpler design and in less spectacular materials than the Order of the Golden Tree⁵³. While the nature of Philip's creation might therefore suggest that he intended it as a romantic, courtly conceit, its form and materials, while sometimes found in jewellery associated with love, are not exclusively or particularly so⁵⁴. They seem also excessively elaborate and costly if his purpose was simply

51. See Chapter 1

52. See C.A., Bk.1, pp.39, 44 and 45. Members were to place a garland of periwinkle around their shields at meetings

53. The Order of the Rose was said by Christine de Pisan in the description in her *Dit de la Rose* to have had regulations, and she also says that roses were given to those present at its inauguration, and that gold and silver ones could be given to members in lands where roses do not grow - see McLeod, The Order of the Rose, pp.75-6.

54. There are instances of elaborate *fermaux*, more like the Order insignia in style, but with a courtly love theme, but these were individual gifts, not bulk ones - see, for instance Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, p.165 and Figure 82

a form of one-upmanship to trump similar creations by his political rivals, like Orleans. Unless there is strong evidence that the iconography of his Order insignia, its motto, membership, or the occasion of its giving are relevant to a courtly order, it would seem unlikely that this was Philip's purpose in giving it⁵⁵.

Military Chivalric Order

Some associations called orders at this period, while including the defence of women among their obligations, were concerned with a wider chivalric concept, seeking to promote knightly virtue, including mutual support, good works and services to God. Their names, such as the Order of La Dame Blanche à l'Escu Vert, founded by the French Marshal, Boucicaut, or the Order of l'Ecu Vert, founded by Duke Louis of Bourbon, Charles VI's maternal uncle, suggest that their members may have worn some insignia, possibly in the form of an enamelled badge or *fermail*⁵⁶. Philip would certainly have been familiar with these⁵⁷.

He would also have been familiar with associations, called orders, which were primarily concerned with the more military aspects of the chivalric ideal. Indeed, he was a member of the Order of the Knights of Our Lady of the Noble House, more usually known as the Company of the

55. Orleans' own insignia of his Order was flashy and expensive, but other versions seem to have been less so - Ibid., p.291. See succeeding Chapters for reviews of such evidence

56. For Boucicaut's order, see McLeod, The Order of the Rose, p.73. He founded this, with 12 other men, to protect noble ladies while their menfolk were abroad fighting. For Bourbon's order, see Boulton, The Knights of the Crown, pp.271-4. This had a golden shield with a motto on it as a badge

57. Boucicaut's order was founded in April 1399, Bourbon's in 1367, although Boulton thinks the latter may not have survived long and been abandoned in favour of a gold belt with a different motto 'esperance', which seemed to have been converted into a pseudo-order by 1379

Star, which his father, King John II, had established in 1351/2 to reform French knighthood after its disastrous defeat by the English at Crécy in 1346⁵⁸. The Company's ordinances and contemporary accounts suggest that members of this order wore the symbol of the star, both on formal occasions in the form of a large brooch, prominently on the front of the hood, or on the shoulder of the mantle which formed part of its specified ceremonial habit, and also as a ring all the time. It also featured on the Company's standard. Like Philip's insignia, the materials varied according to a member's rank, and some were jewelled, but it seems that most members had to provide their own⁵⁹.

The nature and form of Philip's Order insignia would therefore not be inappropriate for a military order of some kind. Since one of the military virtues which the Company of the Star was particularly concerned to promote was that of loyalty, Philip's use of the sapphire in his Order insignia, in view of its associations, would strengthen this case. It is not, however, conclusive, and further supporting evidence would be needed before selecting the creation of a military order as Philip's main purpose in distributing his Order.

Crusading Chivalric Order

The lack of any reference to a standard with the insignia device or to a habit for Philip's Order - two common symbols of corporate identity for orders and fraternities of the period - might suggest that it was intended to be ephemeral in nature, rather than a formal military order. It could just as well mean that Philip's purpose was to encourage the fulfilment of some military objective by members, such as crusade, individually rather than as a group, or to commemorate or honour individual achievement of this type, in a way which would reflect well on his

58. See Boulton, The Knights of the Crown, pp.167-210

59. Ibid., pp.179-181 and 201-6

honour and standing as the patron. Contemporary orders of this type existed, such as the Cypriot Order of the Sword which, although founded to prosecute a particular crusade, seems by the 1380s to have become primarily honorary, with no formal obligations⁶⁰.

This Cypriot order's insignia was a sword, entwined or traversed by a scroll on which was inscribed a motto, in the form of a brooch pinned on the breast of a surcoat or of a pendant from a collar with similar symbols. The materials used for the sword insignia were silver and gold with enamel and, in at least one instance, an engraved sapphire. This use of a sapphire in both Philip's and the Cypriot order is perhaps coincidental, but it is interesting, given the associations of the sapphire with loyalty, that the motto of both these orders referred to loyalty⁶¹.

The possible significance, for interpreting Philip's Order as a crusading one, of the iconography of the crescent - the shape of the sapphire used in his insignia - is discussed in the next Chapter. In material terms, however, it is likely that Philip used a crescent sapphire because it was unusual and costly, rather than for any association of the shape with Islam, and thus a crusading venture, since his earlier uses of similar stones had no obvious connection with crusading⁶².

Although, again, the nature, form and materials of the insignia of the Order of the Golden Tree would not have been inappropriate for a crusading order, and particularly

60. Ibid., pp.241-8. It is thought that those so honoured gave a loose, and probably empty, undertaking to protect Cyprus if it was attacked by infidels

61. Ibid., pp.247-8; and Chapter 4 on the meaning of 'en loyauté', the motto of the Order of the Golden Tree

62. See Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, p.161; and ADCO B338 for New Year 1397

a commemorative one, additional evidence is required before we can conclude that this was Philip's purpose in founding it.

In summary, therefore, the nature, form, and materials of the insignia of Philip's Order would not have been inappropriate for some form of chivalric conceit, especially one with a military or commemorative crusading theme, rather than a romantic one. From these elements alone, however, it is difficult to establish whether it was purely a conceit, or had a more serious and lasting intent. The latter seems more likely. The lack of the increasingly popular collar, apart from Philip's own, does not necessarily indicate that his Order was intended to be ephemeral, since it was not at this period an essential element of formal order insignia. Nor, as we have seen, does the absence of other elements associated with formal orders, such as regulations, ceremonies, standards or habits, all of which Philip might have introduced had he lived. The use of the *fermail* (rather than the more ephemeral cloth badge); the value and striking nature of the materials used; and the (for him) large number of the insignia distributed all suggest that Philip intended them to mark the existence or creation of a group with a particular, common purpose and one which would last beyond the occasion of its giving.

Livery Badge

One such purpose might have included allegiance and loyalty to Philip. The form and shape of Philip's Order insignia would not have been inappropriate for the sort of livery badge which some princes used to signify such allegiance at this period. Brooches or clasps with a distinctive device, sometimes jewelled, were worn in hats or on shoulders for this purpose, and were graduated in value to fit the rank of the recipient. The single use, in Philip's accounts, of the term '*esmail*' to describe one of his Order insignia could also support this hypothesis, as it was used to describe the enamel plaques with the

Duke's arms which were affixed to possessions or gifts to indicate ownership or patronage and, very occasionally, to describe the badges worn by his minstrels⁶³.

The shape of the insignia could have been round, shield-shaped, or even free-standing on a base, all of which are found as badges in the period⁶⁴. The use of the sapphire, with its associations of loyalty, would also have been appropriate for a livery badge, particularly one given out on January 1, the traditional day for reaffirming loyalty to a lord. The materials seem, for the most part, however, to have been more expensive than those generally used for livery badges, except for those given to the most favoured and high-ranking followers.

If Philip intended the Order insignia as a livery badge, however, it must have had some peculiar significance for him. He rarely gave out any form of livery in the modern sense of that word, and when he did distribute something on a particular occasion to his household or train to signify publicly that they supported him, it was generally in the form of an embroidered or cloth motif sewn onto their clothes, which was of simple design, or of something similarly simple on their horse harness⁶⁵. It was rare for Philip to give out *fermaux* bearing a device and he had never given them, or indeed any other *fermail* with a common design, out in bulk. The only bulk gifts he is recorded as giving to household were undecorated, such as diamonds or plain gold rings⁶⁶. The much more expensive

63. See for example, Prost, vol.1, items 663 and 2351, and vol.2, item 1212. Herald's, minstrel's, and often livery badges carried the lord's arms. See also Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.196-9

64. Ibid., p.196, and n.30 above

65. See n.18 above, and material '*broder a sa devise*' for Rethel's wedding, ADCO B1532, f.290v.

66. See n.37 above. Gold rings could signify allegiance, but without some device or motto, the identity of their patron would be

and lasting jewelled gold *fermaux* of the Order must therefore have been intended exceptionally to distinguish the recipients, the purpose and the occasion of their giving.

Elaborate and costly livery badges, particularly with a prince's personal device, rather than his arms, were sometimes given in small numbers to family or honoured visitors, or in gratitude for some service⁶⁷. Unless the analyses of the iconography, occasion and recipients of the insignia of Philip's Order suggest that they all fell into one of these categories, however, it seems likely that he intended it as something of more significance than a general badge of allegiance or recognition. Whilst he may not have intended it to be a formally constituted order, like the Garter, it does seem to have been designed to secure or mark support from a particular group for a particular purpose.

Military Alliance

That particular purpose could have been a military alliance. As we have seen, the idea of giving a livery badge as an outward sign of a military support network was known to Philip⁶⁸. There is no evidence that that he had ever himself given out a badge for this purpose, or indeed that he engaged in contracts of alliance with more than a few, select supporters. It is possible, however, that some perceived failure of his existing military support networks, or some particularly severe threat to his power, led him to develop a larger, more closely focussed military alliance, and to mark or advertise its existence by the distribution of a visible and distinctive *fermail*.

Apart from the use of the sapphire, there is nothing in the form or materials of the Order insignia to suggest

66.(cont'd) unclear to contemporaries

67. Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.198, 272, and 273

68. See Chapter 1

that any such alliance was particularly military in nature. Terming it an Order would, however, for Philip, suggest that he was implying that the recipients formed a select group, smaller than the wider household or affinity groupings to which livery badges were given at this time, but larger and with a more limited or specific purpose than those formed by general contracts of military alliance.

Specific Policy Alliance

The analysis of the significance of the form, nature and materials of Philip's Order suggests that, contrary to previous assumptions, none of the six general hypotheses advanced thus far is sufficient fully to explain his purpose in distributing insignia of this kind. The uniqueness, in Philip's giving, of the nature of the insignia; of the use of an identical form for such a large group; and the value and distinctiveness of the materials all suggest that Philip had in mind a more particular, or specific, purpose for the select group or network of allies marked out by its receipt.

Interim Conclusion

Although, as indicated in the Introduction, it is dangerous to draw firm conclusions on the basis of an analysis of only one aspect of a material gift, that of the form, nature and materials of the Order of the Golden Tree does strongly suggest that it was not intended to be purely decorative, or a courtly, romantic gesture. It further suggests that, although the form, nature and materials would not have been inappropriate, albeit somewhat excessive, for a chivalrous military or crusading order, a livery badge, or a military alliance, neither would it, on this evidence, have been entirely appropriate, unless in some exceptional circumstance and for some specific purpose, which required particular loyalty to be outstandingly and publicly displayed.

Further to check these conclusions; narrow down the

hypotheses; and determine whether, and if so what, particular circumstance or purpose gave rise to Philip's Order, it is necessary to consider the iconography of the decoration and motto of its insignia; the nature of the recipients and their relationship to Philip; and Philip's policy concerns around the occasion of its giving. These are explored in the following Chapters.

CHAPTER 3: THE ICONOGRAPHY OF THE ORDER

The images and the colours used in the decoration of a material gift could carry, for sender, recipient, and observer, associations with people - past, present or legendary; with powers; with ceremonies; and with causes, beliefs and attitudes. We know that, on occasion, Duke Philip used such decorative images on material gifts to send specific messages to the recipients¹. This Chapter is therefore designed to contribute further towards the refinement of the hypotheses posited for the objectives of his material gift-giving by analysing the possible meanings of the visual symbols used in the decoration of the insignia of the Order of the Golden Tree, taking particular account of those already suggested in Chapter 2 by the analysis of the nature, form and materials of the Order.

The insignia of the Order has been described in Chapter 2. To recap, its visual symbols included a golden tree, a white lion and a white eagle, and a blue crescent associated, only in the Duke's case, with a golden sun². Duke Philip used numerous different motifs, in the forty odd years of his rule, to decorate his material gifts and belongings, drawn from a wide range of sources and styles, only a few of which are found in the Order design. Although there are separate references in his accounts to objects with each of the individual elements of this design, and occasionally to a combination of some of them, Philip had never used the design of the Order as a whole before nor, so far as I can discover, did he or his successors ever use it again, so it was not traditional

1. When trying to secure the release of his son, John, after Nicopolis, Philip sent the captor, Sultan Bajazet, a tapestry of Alexander the Great, whom Bajazet believed to be his ancestor. See David, Train Somptuaire, pp.38-9, and Atiya, A.S., The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages, p.458
2. See Chapter 2, nn.3-6, and 24; and nn.8-10 below

for him or his family³. Nor does it appear to have been borrowed from any other family. This uniqueness of the overall design and the selection and combination of its components are unlikely to have been random, and suggest that Philip intended the design to convey some particular meaning to recipients.

Any single, visual symbol used in the decoration of a material gift could, at this period, carry a number of different, and even contradictory, associations, depending in part on the colour adopted and the context of the gift-giving⁴. Previous uses of the same coloured symbols by the Duke, his family or his territories might help to narrow the range of likely associations, but establishing which of these, if any, the giver had in mind on a particular occasion can still be difficult⁵. The combination of symbols used in a complex decorative image, like that of the Order, can however facilitate its interpretation as some of the associations, if they do not fit with all the components, can be eliminated⁶. This can still leave several possible meanings for the combination which may, in any case, amount to more than just a sum of those of its component parts. If there is no other instance of the particular combination of symbols in material form for comparison, then evidence of metaphorical uses of the symbols in literature with which

3. Apart from his and his wider family's arms and personal devices, Philip used motifs from nature, like cranes, panthers and blackberries; from legend, like griffons; from religion, like violets; from leisure, like falcons and hunting dogs; and from romance, like roses and doves - see, for examples, n.65 below. For his use of the Order symbols, see nn.19-25 below
4. See Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.158-9 and 165-6; Gage, J., Colour and Culture, pp.79-91; and n.6 below
5. See, for instance, nn.12 and 25 below
6. See Chapter 1, nn.16 and 18, for instance, for Christian de Mérindol's interpretation of the lion, eagle and serpent dragon on a lectern, dating from 1387, at Philip's Charterhouse of

Philip was clearly associated, and which might reflect his attitudes and beliefs around the time he planned and distributed the Order, could clarify the meaning he wished it to convey⁷.

The meaning of a symbol could also be affected by its size and position relative to the other components of a design. This Chapter therefore looks at the meanings Philip might have associated with the golden tree - the central, and probably largest, element of the Order insignia's design - especially in the light of his earlier uses of it, and of its use in literary works he knew or commissioned in or after the autumn of 1402 and the beginning of 1403⁸. It explores how these meanings fit with, and might be affected by, its combination with the white eagle and the white lion, which appear to have been roughly the same size as each other, but smaller than the tree and, placed on either side of it, formed supporting elements of the design; with the blue crescent symbol of the sapphire below these; and with the design's general colours of gold, white and blue⁹. It also assesses the possible implications, for the meaning of the Order design, of the gold, double-sided sun motif of the collar

6.(cont'd) Champmol, as Visconti emblems, signifying Philip's support of that house and of the Duke of Orleans, whose marriage to Valentina Visconti he was negotiating at that time. Given the object and its location, it is much more likely to refer to the victory of the Christian Gospel over evil. In 1403, the lion and the eagle on the Order would be most unlikely to signify support by Philip for Orleans, as by this date they were in conflict

7. See Chapter 1

8. See for instance, Stahl, H., 'Eve's Reach: A Note on Dramatic Elements in the Hildesheim Doors', and Parker, E.C., 'The Gift of the Cross in the New Minster *Liber Vitae*', both in Sears, E. and Thomas, T.K., Reading Medieval Images, pp.164-5 and 177, respectively

9. See Annexes 1 and 1a. The sizes of these elements are not specified, but the resemblance of the eagle and lion to heraldic

which Philip ordered to accompany his own Order insignia¹⁰.

The tree, as a symbol, had a wealth of different meanings in the Middle Ages¹¹. The instance of its use in a decorative device, on an object associated with Philip, which is closest to that of the design of the Order, is on a 'pectorail' or pectoral recorded in the inventory of his goods made in May 1404, just after his death¹². This has a central tree, probably golden, together with a white 'liopart' (used synonymously with lion at this period) and a white eagle¹³. Since a pectorail is usually found on robes worn by the clergy, and the item appears in the section of the inventory devoted to goods in the Duke's chapel, the meaning of its decoration is likely to be associated with the Christian religion. In this context, the tree could be interpreted as the Tree of Life, the Tree of Jesse, the Cross on which Christ was crucified, or Christ himself¹⁴. As gold was regarded as the purest metal, and incorruptible, and its colour represented the light of the sun, and therefore divine radiance, it could

9.(cont'd) supporters suggests the disposition of the symbols proposed

10. See Annex 1a

11. Pastoureau, M., has devoted a whole book to this subject - see L'arbre: histoire naturelle et symbolique de l'arbre, du bois et du fruit au Moyen Age, (hereafter L'Arbre)

12. See Glossary; and ADCO B301, f. viii^v.

13. The pectoral is specified as made of gold, and no other colour is given for the tree

14. The tree could symbolise Christ, either by reference to the wooden cross on which he was crucified, or to the Tree of Life in the Garden of Eden, with its fruits of good and evil, which he tasted in becoming mortal. See, for instance, Schiller, G., The Iconography of Christian Art, vol.2, pp.12,131-6, 153 and 158. The crown on the tree in this case would signify the power of God delegated to a representative, who might be a king or, more likely, Christ - see Dilasser, M., The Symbols of the Church, p.9

carry associations with Heaven¹⁵. A golden tree could then reinforce the association with Christ, and the lion and the eagle could represent the Evangelists St. Mark and St. John or, more particularly, since they and the tree featured in this instance above a serpent, the Gospels and Christianity defeating evil or falsehood, in the form of the devil¹⁶. The white of the lion and the eagle could then be taken to symbolise purity¹⁷. Even without the serpent, a similar design for the Order would be appropriate for any broadly Christian message Philip wished to send with it, but it is difficult to be more specific. There is nothing in the inventory or elsewhere to indicate whether Philip designed, gave, or was otherwise directly associated with the *pectorail*; when or how it came into his possession; or whether it was worn at any particular ceremonies or occasions¹⁸.

The *pectorail* is the only decorative instance of a tree combined with other elements of the Order design. If we look for a use of a golden tree by itself on a gift or belonging more directly associated with Duke Philip or his family, we find a few which might corroborate assertions that it was a family device¹⁹. A reliquary which the Duke presented to Our Lady of Boulogne sur Mer in 1402 was decorated with a gilded tree, hung with badges bearing his

15. See Pleij, H., Colors Demonic and Divine, p.78

16. See n.6 above

17. See Pastoureau, M., Figures et Couleurs, p.40

18. It could have been inherited, or part of one of the 'chapelles', or sets of furnishings, which Philip ordered for his chapels. In this instance, the details sometimes given in the inventory about the source of the object are not included

19. See, for instance, David, Le train somptuaire, p.74; La France et les arts en 1400, p.122; Jugie, S., 'Philippe le Hardi à Dijon', Les arts sous Charles VI, p.77; and Kovacs, E., L'Age d'Or de l'Orfèvrerie Parisienne, (hereafter Orfèvrerie Parisienne) pp.86-9, and 124

arms²⁰. The Duke frequently marked gifts to the Church with his arms, to indicate their source, but the tree was not necessarily part of such a reference, and could have been simply a decorative support; or one with chivalric associations; or, as it was supported by angels, another Christian reference²¹. Secular associations of the tree with, and probably as a support for, family devices are found in early 1404, when Philip's pages had clothes embroidered with an oak tree, from which hung Ps and Ms (Philip's device); and in 1406, when his son, Duke John, had a collar of gold trees and *rouleaux* refashioned, and another collar made with golden trees and his device, the *rabot*²². The only clear reference to a golden tree as a device, rather than a support, is to Philip sporting golden trees (and his son John silver ones) at the May jousts held by King Charles VI at St. Denis in 1389²³. Contemporary Burgundian and royal sources disagree, however, as to whether this was Duke Philip's device, or the King's²⁴. The uses noted could imply therefore that the golden tree was a symbol associated at the time with the Valois royal family generally, or specifically with

20. ADCO B1538, f.154

21. See, for instance, Prost, vol.1, 2636 and vol.2, 1271 for marking his gifts; and the use of a tree as a support for shields in Pas d'Armes in Anglo, S., The Great Tournament Roll of Westminster, p.133; Barker, J. and Barber, R., Tournaments, p.2; and n.70 below

22. For 1404, see ADCO B1538, f.204; for 1406, B1554, ff.113v, and 118-118v. For 'rabot', see Glossary

23. See ADCO B1476, ff.33 and 34v

24. Philip's accounts describe devices of gold or silver trees, according to rank, on green for the Duke, his son John, and their *parement* on this occasion, but nowhere state that this was the King's device, as they usually do - see n.23 above, and Prost, vol.2, items 465 and 1454 for Philip wearing the King's livery. The semi-official royal history of the Chronique du Religieux de Saint Denis, ed. Bellaguet, M.L., vol.1, pp.591-7, describes 22 jousting knights as wearing unspecified King's emblems on green

its Burgundian branch, although it does not appear, at that time, to have been a traditional, personal or heraldic device of either²⁵.

Philip's other uses of the white lion and eagle motifs do little to clarify this point. The one instance of them being used together, on something owned by Philip, is ambiguous²⁶. There, they are combined with a fleur de lys, which might suggest a royal association, borne out by the common, contemporary interpretation of the lion and the eagle as kings of the animals and birds respectively, and Autrand's suggestion that white was at this time a royal colour. I could, however, find no instance of them being used together, as supporters for either the King's or the Duke's arms, or in any other context which would distinguish between a general royal use and one appropriate specifically to Philip²⁷.

Used individually, a lion was the symbol of several of Philip's territories and, in literature, of Philip himself and, later, of his son, but not in white, or the heraldic equivalent, argent²⁸. He does use a white or silver eagle on his belongings and gifts but, again, although

25. King Charles VI had a number of devices, both permanent, like the flying stag, and the fleur de lys of the royal arms, and changing, annual ones like the tiger. Philip's wife, the Duchess Margaret, quite often used sheep (possibly as a reference to the source of her territory's wealth), and daisies (*marguerites* in French, and thus a reference to her name). The oak was also the device of Amadeus VIII, Count of Savoy, Philip's son-in-law, see Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, p.71

26. ADCO B301, f.xvi

27. The lion and the eagle were described as kings of their species in bestiaries, and in the encyclopaedia of Bartholomew the Englishman, of which Philip had a copy, see De Winter, Bibliothèque, p.195-7. See Autrand, F., Charles VI, pp.217-9

28. See Flanders (black) and Brabant (gold). For literature, see Kovacs, Orfèvrerie Parisienne, p.89, quoting from Deschamps and

there are instances of it being associated with his motto and with his arms, this does not prove some historians' contention that it and the lion were Burgundian devices²⁹. They could have been specifically associated with him, but would also have been equally appropriate symbols for any royal prince³⁰.

Similarly, although there are several references to Philip and his family sporting a crescent on clothes or jewellery, there is little evidence that it was a family device, apart from one instance of a *balay* in this shape used with Philip's initial³¹. Given the associations of the crescent at this period with the Virgin Mary, or with the ancient Greek, virgin goddess, Diana, and noting the known occasions of Philip's use of this symbol, he seems more likely to have associated it with marriage³².

28. (cont'd) Jean Petit. For white as the heraldic equivalent of argent see Pastoureau, Traité d'héraldique, pp.100-101
29. For instance, on a belt for him, ADCO B1430, f.30v, and on one for a Flemish noble, with silver lions, f.161; with his motto, on clothes B1430, f.33, and on a '*chambre*' B1476, ff.32v-33; with his device on a saddle B1517, f.196; with his French arms on an early seal, ADCO B359. See also Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, p.325; Beaune, C., 'Costume et pouvoir en France à la fin du Moyen Age', Revue des Sciences Humaines, LV, p.144 (hereafter 'Costume et pouvoir'); and Kovacs, Orfèvrerie Parisienne, p.89
30. Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.69, 179-181, 265, and 325
31. Gold, on a brooch, ADCO B1430, f.104; white, and gold and white, on jousting harness, at the Dijon jousts, B1476, ff.22v, 26-26v, and 34v; with his initial, on a collar, B1495, f.61v
32. Speake, J., The Dent Dictionary of Symbols in Christian Art, p.33, gives the crescent moon as a symbol of the Virgin Mary as Queen of Heaven, from the reference in the Book of Revelations, 12:i, to a woman clothed with the sun and the moon under her feet. Gibson, C., Signs and Symbols, pp.38 and 42, notes that Istanbul, having adopted the crescent of Diana in 339 B.C. to mark

The crescents Philip used were gold or, more usually, white in colour, rather than blue, but the one instance of him linking a blue crescent, in the form of a sapphire, with any of the design elements of the Order insignia might appear to confirm the association with marriage. It comes in a *fermail* which he seems to have had made about the time of the marriage of one of his daughters, although it is not clear that it was intended for this occasion or, indeed, what he did with it³³. In that instance, the crescent was linked with a golden sun, the motif on the collar Philip alone wore with the Order. The sun, or sunray, motif was certainly associated with Philip. He had used it for room hangings for his palaces, in association with the arms of his territories, and with his motto on a scroll borne by an eagle³⁴. The sun was, however, also one of King Charles VI's devices, so Philip's use of it only on the collar associated with his own Order insignia as much as being intended to personalise that insignia, could equally have been meant to indicate his dedication of the Order to the King, or to link the Order through him with the royal family generally³⁵.

32.(cont'd) its gratitude to a bright moon that had saved it from attack, kept it as a symbol of the Virgin when it became Christian in 330 B.C. Philip wore crescents at the jousts in Paris in 1389 to mark the marriage of the Duke of Orleans, and at the 1390 Dijon jousts to mark the marriage of his daughter, Bonne - see n.31 above and Prost, vol.2, items 3438, 3439 and 3506

33. ADCO B1471, f.3, in 1388, at the time of the marriage of his daughter to the Duke of Austria. The Duke put it '*par devers lui*' - a common phrase in the accounts, which meant that he did not have an immediate purpose in mind for it

34. ADCO B1476, ff.32v-33

35. For references to uses of the sun as a device by Charles V and Charles VI, see Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, p.167; Beaune, 'Costume et pouvoir', p.144; Autrand, Charles VI, p.239; and David, Train somptuaire, p.151

If Philip had intended to distribute an Order dedicated simply to the support of the royal family, or of the King, or of himself or his territories, however, he would surely have chosen a simpler design, with elements directly and closely associated with the chosen purpose. The nature of the Order design suggests that he had in mind a more complex message. The combination of what appear, from the analysis thus far, to be ambiguous visual elements in the Order suggests that we might divine that message by seeking some other association, perhaps with a more specific, literary or metaphorical use of the design elements, with which Philip and the recipients were familiar.

David took the Golden Tree to represent the Tree of Life³⁶. Beaune links this into a secular context, arguing that it was a popular symbol for the kingdom of France, and was used in a political context at this period, reinforcing the contemporary French view of France as the centre of the earth, and as a second Holy Land, both of which were associated in legend with the Tree of Life³⁷. These are possible interpretations, but do little to clarify the overall message of the Order.

There were at the time a number of other common examples of tree symbolism, where it was used to illustrate moral or physical relationships; or to express some characteristic of the living organism, such as strength and vigour, protection and shelter, fruitfulness, or continuity; to present those characteristics as magical or other-worldly, and thus of peculiar and unassailable power; or to recall to mind an individual associated with a particular tree, or type of tree³⁸. Genealogical trees,

36. David, Le Train Somptuaire, p.151

37. Beaune, C., The Birth of an Ideology, pp.297-8

38. See Tree of Vices and Virtues and Tree of Consanguinity, Pastoureau, L'arbre, p.113; Tree of Delusion, and magic trees continually in bloom or in fruit, Guerreau-Jalabert, A., Index des

derived from the biblical Tree of Jesse, and reflecting the tree's characteristics of continuity and strength, were also widely used at this period, among the nobility, and particularly princes, to trace their descent as far back as possible, even into legendary pre-history; to connect themselves to the most eminent, popular, and revered people known; and thus to establish or confirm their pre-eminence or legitimacy³⁹. These resonances made the tree an appropriate symbol for a dynasty and, given the legendary associations of Charlemagne and St. Louis with trees, for the French royal dynasty in particular⁴⁰.

If, however, the tree symbolised the French royal dynasty, presumably in the shape of the Valois family then ruling France, what precisely was Philip's Order trying to say about it? Some clue might be found, as explained in Chapter 1, in the panegyric commissioned personally by Philip from Christine de Pisan about his dead brother,

38.(cont'd) motifs narratifs dans les Romans arthuriens français en vers, p.40; Charles VI as tree of balm, in Philip de Mézières' Songe du vieil pelerin, ed.Coopland, G.W.; and trees of justice under which Charlemagne and Louis IX were believed to have given judgements, as had one of Duke Philip's recent predecessors, Eudes IV of Burgundy, Petit, E., Les arbres de justice, pp.3,5 and 6, and Lépine, F., 'Le pas d'armes de l'arbre de Charlemagne à Marsannay', in his Fastes de Bourgogne, pp.17-18

39. The Tree of Jesse traced the line of descent from Jesse to Christ. For this and the uses of genealogical trees, see Pastoureau, L'arbre, pp.41-55, and Raynaud, C., Images et Pouvoirs au Moyen Age, pp.240 and 253

40. See n.38 above. Also Beaune, C., 'L'utililisation politique du mythe des origines troyennes en France à la fin du moyen âge', in Lectures médiévales de Virgile, pp.331-5; Gervais, Speculum Morale Regium, ff.5v-6v, quoted by Krynen, J., Idéal du Prince et Pouvoir Royal, p.256. The tree of Charlemagne at Marsannay, a village only a few miles from Dijon, survived until 1848, and must have been known to Philip, as it was sufficiently well-known

King Charles V of France, in late 1403⁴¹. Historians have generally ignored the possible relevance for the Order of the use of the tree image in this book, possibly because it was not characterised specifically as a golden tree, or because the book was finished after Philip's death⁴². I would argue, however, that neither of these points invalidates the conclusions I draw from the book's use of the tree image.

This image is used early on in the book, in the section completed before Philip's death, both as an analogy for human development and as an expression of divine order⁴³. Since in the descriptions of the Order insignia there are no references to an 'arbre sec', or leafless or dead tree, and Philip's personal Order insignia at least was studded with rubies, it is reasonable to assume that the Order tree was meant to be in leaf, and perhaps even flowered or fruited⁴⁴. If the former it might, judging by Christine's use of the allegory, have represented vigorous growth, and thus the young Dauphin (Charles V's grandson and Philip's great-nephew) for whose instruction the book was

40.(cont'd) in 1443 for his grandson to attend an international Pas d'Armes organised round it, see De Marcenay à Marsannay-la-côte, and Beaune, H. and Arbaumont, J. de's edition of Mémoires d'Olivier de la Marche, book 1, p.290 and fol.

41. Christine de Pisan, Le livre des faits et bonnes moeurs du roi Charles V le sage. See Chapter 1.

42. Book 1 was finished on 28 April, 1404, as Christine tells us. The whole work was finished by the end of November 1404, see Hicks and Moreau, Charles V, pp.34 and 108

43. Ibid., pp.59-61, and n.42 above

44. For 'arbre sec', a common tree symbol at this period, see Van der Velden, H., 'Petrus Christus's Our Lady of the Dry Tree', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol.60, pp. 89-110, on which votive offerings were hung; for Philip's insignia, Annexes 1 and 1a; and for Philip's insignia; and n.43 above for Christine's reference to flowered and fruited trees

ostensibly written; or his father, King Charles VI, or his uncle, the Duke of Orleans, both of whom were considered adolescent in character⁴⁵.

If the latter it could, from the text, as a more mature tree, have represented King Charles V himself, who had died in 1380 aged 44, and whose maturity the book put forward as a pattern for his grandson⁴⁶. It could also have represented Philip who, at 60 when the book was ordered, could well have been advancing his claims as a living, mature, sage and experienced guide and counsellor to the Dauphin, as he had been to the young Charles VI, to counteract the undesirable influences, both moral and political, of his rival for power, Orleans⁴⁷.

In the second book of Christine's panegyric on Charles V, however, the tree symbol is widened to represent Charles V; his extended family; the French royal dynasty and its legitimacy; and even all those involved in governing and protecting France⁴⁸. The tree thus becomes a symbol of legitimate rule, both in the sense of the dynasty with the best claim to rule France, and in the sense of just rulers who fulfill their proper functions of protecting their people and the kingdom, and of governing well by preserving internal order and securing justice, rather than abusing their powers in their own interests or in those of a small minority of unworthy favourites⁴⁹.

The tree is here also used as a symbol of unity, at least among the ruling classes. Christine identifies as essential, particularly for the continued prosperity of France, the support of so many in government *'tous d'une même parenté et lignage, loyaux et obéissants à un seul*

45. See Hicks and Moreau, Charles V, p.16

46. Ibid., pp.15-16 of the Introduction, and p.108

47. Ibid., pp.15 and 109-110

48. Ibid., pp.127-150

49. For example, Ibid., pp.309-310

*chef*⁵⁰. That unity appears for Christine to be based not so much on the shared objective of supporting the public good, as on the close ties binding those in power to the single trunk of the tree (the king or dynasty) and therefore to his objective, and proper function, of protecting the people. The stress is thus on the importance of those ties and the networks they create, whether based on family, or on loyalty and obedience⁵¹. The Order could thus have been a concrete expression of such a political idea; and its wearing a similar expression of the network of recipients who supported it.

Although Philip was dead by the time these later sections of Christine's book on Charles V were finished, there are earlier instances of the use of the tree image to represent aspects of the political ideas outlined above, both in well-known and local traditions, and in books which Philip owned, with all of which he was certainly familiar⁵². The ideas also accord with what is known, or can be surmised, about his own public political agenda, (and to some extent that of his son and successor, John) and would have informed the instructions he gave Christine about writing the book on Charles V - instructions to which she would, as we have seen, most certainly have adhered, in order to secure payment for the finished work from John⁵³.

The tree image in Christine's book on Charles V is not,

50. Ibid., p.150

51. Ibid., generally, and Chapters 5 and 6 on Recipients and Occasions for the relevance of these views to the political situation

52. See nn. 38, 40 and 42 above. Philip de Mézières repeated the allegory of the tree of balm in his open letter to Richard II of England, urging him to make peace between France and England, and focussing on the role of the king as a guarantor of peace for his country - see de Mézières, Letter to Richard II, pp.80-82

53. See Chapter 1, particularly nn.40,41 and 45

however, associated with any of the other decorative elements of the Order, and considering their possible meanings in combination with it does not help to clarify whether Philip intended the Order to support a particular aspect of the political ideas embodied in that image of the tree⁵⁴. Nor, as we have seen, is it clear what he meant by making the Order tree golden⁵⁵. It is strange, therefore, that no-one else has picked up, in relation to the Order, the one, specific, broadly contemporary, and unusually unambiguous, allegorical reference to a golden tree in Burgundian inspired literature, contained in Christine's LaVision-Christine, and the separate, explanatory Preface to it⁵⁶. As I have argued in Chapter 1, although these works post-date Philip's death, their ideas were clearly not only inspired by him, but reflected a contemporary Burgundian viewpoint⁵⁷. Her interpretation of the golden tree allegory in LaVision would not have been out of line with Philip's original views⁵⁸.

In the Preface to LaVision Christine stated that the Golden Tree represented the Trojan royal dynasty before the fall of Troy - the gold being a symbol of their wealth and of their nobility. Uprooted by the Greeks in their sack of Troy, several of its branches were transported by different members of the Trojan royal family to various countries, where they grew into noble dynasties⁵⁹. In the case of France, this was effected initially by Francio, a supposed son of Hector and grandson of King Priam of Troy, and who seems to have been invented some time in the eighth century, providing the French kings with a more senior line of descent from common Trojan ancestors than their English rivals, who were descended only from a

54. See nn.43-53 above

55. See nn.15, 23 and 24 above

56. See Chapter 1, particularly n.44

57. See Chapter 1, particularly nn.45 and 47

58. See Chapter 1, particularly n.48

59. See Reno, 'Preface to La Vision-Christine', p.215

nephew of Priam, called Brut⁶⁰.

The idea that Philip was referring back to the Trojan ancestry of the French Crown is further supported by the attribution of the lion as an armorial bearing to the Trojans, particularly in twelfth- and thirteenth-century versions of the Roman de Troie⁶¹. Fourteenth-century heraldic treatises also recounted that, before the lion, the Trojans had used the eagle as an emblem, as a sign that they were descended from Dardanus, son of Jupiter (thus usefully extending their lineage back even further and more prestigiously)⁶².

In such a context, the Golden Tree of the Order could also have been intended to represent the 'Golden Age', that period before the loss of innocence (a state symbolised by the colour white) and the introduction of jealous strife and disunity, which was believed to have existed under the old gods, who had given the Golden Tree to Troy in the first place⁶³. Both Deschamps, another contemporary poet, and Christine de Pisan had portrayed Charles V as a reviver of this Golden Age, so Philip could have intended the Order to harness support for the reinstatement of the policies and practices which had gained his brother that reputation; or for those living, legitimate Valois descendants of the Trojan royal house (which would include himself, as well as Charles VI) who could restore France

60. See Bossuat, A., 'Les Origines Troyennes', in Annales de Normandie, vol. 8, pp.187-197

61. Van den Bergen-Pantens, C., 'Traditions généalogiques et héraldiques à la cour de Bourgogne', Revue Française d'Héraldique et de Sigillographie, vol.60-61, pp. 83-97. The lion is shown as the blazon of the Trojan Hector in contemporary tapestries of the Nine Worthies -see one from Paris, around 1385, in New York, Young, B., A Walk through the Cloisters, pp.58-61

62. See n.61 above. Tracing ancestors to old gods was fashionable, and could hardly be bettered in terms of forbears

63. Reno, 'Preface to La Vision-Christine', pp.215 and 219

once again to that Golden Age and secure harmony, unity and order⁶⁴.

Clarifying further Philip's objectives for the Order (in terms, for instance, of any particular policy of Charles V, or aspect of the Golden Age he wished to restore, or descendant he wished to promote) must depend on the effect upon the above interpretations of the inclusion in its design of the phrase '*en loyauté*'; of the type of people who received it and their relationships to the Duke; and of the Duke's primary policy concerns around the occasion of its giving. These are explored in the following Chapters. The light thrown by the analysis in this Chapter of the likely meanings of the combined elements of the visual design of the insignia does, however, permit at this stage some further narrowing down of the hypotheses suggested for Philip's objectives in distributing the Order.

Decorative

The tree, in a wide variety of forms, was a common and popular decorative device at the time, both generally and among Philip and his family. It fitted in with the love of pastoral themes, evident particularly in his wife's belongings; with a taste for the exotic, which some historians regarded as a legacy of his son John's imprisonment in the near East, but which was fairly widespread as a result of both crusading and commercial contacts; with a fascination with fantastic or legendary forms, particularly in jewellery; and with the rather whimsical use of plant forms as personal devices, particularly by the younger, more fashionable members of the French Court, including his two elder sons⁶⁵. The

64. Ibid., and Deschamps' '*La Fiction du Lion*', in Jones, T., Who Murdered Chaucer?, pp.332-3 and nn.34 and 39

65. For pastoral, see in the 1405 inventory of the Duchess' goods, items with sheep grazing under trees, ADCO B301; a '*chambre*' with date and orange trees and doves, given to the Duke of Orleans in

lion and the eagle were also common decorative devices, as were the sun and the crescent moon⁶⁶.

When Philip combined two or more main decorative devices in jewellery, however, he seems not to have made a purely random selection of elements, but usually to have created a recognisable scene or allusion⁶⁷. It seems much more likely therefore that he devised so complex and carefully arranged a combination of visual symbols as that of the Order insignia with a deliberate allusion in mind, rather than simply as an elaborate decorative motif. This reinforces even more strongly the conclusion of the last Chapter, based on the analysis of the nature, shape and form of the Order, that it was not just a decorative gift. It is reasonable, therefore, at this stage, to rule this hypothesis out as a sufficient explanation of Philip's purpose.

Courtly Chivalric Order

The device of a tree, and later specifically of a golden tree, was used sometimes by the Burgundian Dukes in connection with the popular chivalric pastime for knights and squires of practising their combat skills, competing against each other or invited opponents, in a public

65.(cont'd) 1388, ADCO B1471,f.46; and tapestry with shepherds and shepherdesses given to Berry, Prost, vol.2, item 2508; for exotic, saracen and camel brooches, Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.164 and 168; for legendary and fantasy, ones with sirens and unicorns, Ibid., p.162; and tapestries of Guy of Burgundy, and of a king turned into a fairy, Prost, vol.2,item 1716; for plant forms as personal devices, the raspberry worn by Anthony, and the hop worn by John, Prost, vol.2, 1732, and David, H., Philippe le Hardi, duc de Bourgogne, protecteur des Arts, (hereafter Protecteur des arts) pp.8 and 19

66. See Lightbown, Mediaeval European Jewellery, pp.68, 70-71, 126-7, 161-7, 179-183

67. A swan or a bear alone was not necessarily significant; together they were the device of Philip's brother, the Duke of Berry

arena, in a 'pas d'armes'⁶⁸. The Dukes arranged these pas to mark important celebrations, such as those accompanying dynastic marriages, and selected for them some legendary or fantastic theme, with a suitably chivalric purpose, such as the rescue of a mystical damsel in distress, for the participants to pursue. The ducal herald, who officiated on such occasions, was even called 'Golden Tree', at least during the pas of that name in 1468⁶⁹.

This possible connection of the Golden Tree with chivalric conceits is borne out by Philip's use of it as a device at the jousts held by King Charles VI at St. Denis in May 1389⁷⁰. The occasion of these jousts was the knighting of Philip's nephews, the sons of the late Duke of Anjou, and the king was said by contemporaries to have designed these celebrations carefully to revive the full pageantry of creating a knight, central to the concept of chivalry, to promote a renewed interest in, and reinstatement of the old-fashioned ideals of chivalry, which had become tarnished⁷¹.

It would be possible, therefore, to read Philip's re-use of the Golden Tree motif, particularly in connection with an Order, a concept used frequently in a chivalric context, as an example of what historians have variously

68. See, for instance, the Pas of the Tree of Charlemagne in 1443, and the Pas of the Golden Tree, 1468. For the use of trees in Pas, see Jourdan, J-P., 'Le Thème du pas dans le royaume de France à la fin du Moyen Age', Annales de Bourgogne, 1990, t.62, pp.117-126. Some considered heralds to be of Trojan origin, see Boudreau, C., 'Une groupe social en quête d'identité: les hérauts d'armes et le mythe des origines troyennes à la fin du Moyen Age', pp.2-5 (unpublished work in progress)

69. See Mémoires d'Olivier de la Marche, ed. Beaune and d'Arbaumont, vol.3, pp. 109-123

70. See nn.23 and 24 above

71. See Autrand, Charles VI, Chapter 12

regarded as a genuine reflowering of the chivalric ethos, or as the final and degenerate gasp of a bankrupt philosophy and lifestyle⁷². Philip certainly appears publicly to have embraced fully the chivalric ethos, but whether he did so simply to indulge a love of pomp and pageantry, or with a more serious, underlying, political intent, of the kind Autrand ascribes to Charles VI and his advisors, is a question that can be better addressed when the nature of the recipients of the Order and of the occasion on which it was given have been analysed⁷³. Although some of the elements of the Order design were used, coincidentally, on the occasion of jousts, they had no particular chivalric connotations⁷⁴. This would suggest that, however he chose to present it publicly, Philip had something more than empty pageantry in mind, and that a purely courtly chivalric purpose for the Order can at this stage be ruled out.

Military Chivalric Order

The May 1389 jousts were, however, held not only in celebration of knighthood, the primary purpose of which was deemed to be the military protection of the people and of the country, but in honour of the former Constable of France, Bertrand du Guesclin. Charles VI and his advisors deemed him worthy at this point, some nine years after his death, of overt royal recognition as an acclaimed military leader of international reputation and, no doubt, as the ideal personification of all that the king expected his knights to achieve as soldiers⁷⁵.

72. See Huizinga, The Waning of the Middle Ages, Chapters IV and XV

73. Philip was an enthusiastic jouster; founded a literary Court of Love; and supported Christine de Pisan in her public battle in 1401-2 against what she perceived to be the unchivalric attitude to women in the Roman de la Rose, see Blumenfield-Kosinski, R., The Selected Writings of Christine de Pisan, p.42 and Brabant, Politics, Gender and Genre, pp.131-2

74. See n. 32 above

75. Autrand, Charles VI, pp.225-7

The Golden Tree could, therefore, have been a reference back to the military ideals of knighthood, and the Order designed to promote these among its recipients. Its combination with a lion and an eagle would have been appropriate in this context, as both were associated by contemporaries with the desirable military characteristics of strength, courage and leadership⁷⁶. The eagle also featured in du Guesclin's coat of arms, and was associated with him in contemporary stories about his life⁷⁷. The other elements of the Order design were sometimes used coincidentally with jousts but, as we have seen, seem to have been more closely related to the occasion of the celebration than to the concept of jousts as military training⁷⁸.

The design of the Order of the Golden Tree would thus have been appropriate for some chivalric brotherhood with a military membership or objective, but it is not possible to be sure that this was Philip's sole or prime aim in giving it, without considering the command posts and experience of the recipients, and any military concerns he might have had around the time of its distribution.

Crusading Chivalric Order

As we have seen, a tree combined with a lion and an eagle featured on a *pectorail* owned by Philip⁷⁹. The association of this design with a religious context might suggest that the Order design was appropriate for a crusading brotherhood, the prime purpose of which was usually to rescue Christian peoples, territories, and holy places from infidel or heretic, and to restore the

76. See Payne, A., Medieval Beasts, pp.19 and 61-3

77. An eagle represented du Guesclin in a dream he was supposed to have had, recorded in a contemporary poem eulogising his life, see La Chanson de Bertrand du Guesclin de Cuvelier, ed. Faucon, J-C., vol.1, pp.368-9

78. See nn. 32 and 33 above

79. See n.12 above

primacy of the word of God. This interpretation could be supported by the association of the crescent moon, the sun, and the colours blue and white with the Virgin Mary at this time. Since she sometimes featured on crusade banners, symbols associated with her would not have been inappropriate for a crusading order⁸⁰.

There are also other potential connections between the design elements of the Order and crusade. As already noted, the tree, and particularly the Golden Tree, carried associations with Charlemagne and St. Louis, both of whom were renowned as crusaders⁸¹. Some historians, searching for the roots of Philip's grandson's Order of the Golden Fleece, and particularly its crusading aspect, have also attempted to connect the Golden Tree with the tree of Zeus in Colchis from which, according to legend, Jason took the Fleece, by way of a collar of golden trees and *rabots* which Philip's son John is thought to have issued as an order in 1406⁸². This connection does not, however, bear closer scrutiny. There is documentary evidence, possibly confirmed by a visual record, that John had such an order⁸³. There is no indication, however, that he

80. For the crescent moon and sun as Marian symbols, see n.32 above; for blue and white, see Pastoureau, M., Blue, pp.49-55; for the Virgin on Burgundian crusade banners, see Magee, J., 'Le temps de la croisade bourguignonne: l'expédition de Nicopolis', in Nicopolis 1396-1996, p.57

81. See nn.38 and 40 above. Philip had tapestries of the Nine Worthies, which included them; owned books about them; and gave jewelled statuettes of St. Louis to his brothers - see Prost, vol.2, item 2755; de Winter, Bibliothèque, p.194; and David, Protecteur des Arts, pp.57-8

82. See n. 22 above; Calmette, J., The Golden Age of Burgundy, p.60; and Pastoureau, 'La toison d'or, sa légende, ses symboles, son influence sur l'histoire littéraire', V.B.P., Toison d'Or, p.101

83. ADCO B1554, f.113v. The dedication miniature in John's Livre des Merveilles depicts him wearing a collar with *rabots* alternating with something which Tourneur identifies as trees, although this

intended it to promote crusading⁸⁴. There is also nothing to suggest that the tree in Colchis was golden⁸⁵.

Similarly, despite suggestions to the contrary, the Tree of Life, which David thought the Golden Tree might have represented, was not purely an eastern motif, and does not appear to have had any associations with crusade. The crescent was not at this time a symbol of Islam or of the Turks, nor is there any clear evidence that it featured as a heraldic charge on the coats of arms of crusaders, or families descended from crusaders⁸⁶. Its use in the badge of a crusading Order dates from several decades later, and cannot therefore be called in evidence⁸⁷.

Again, although it is possible to make out a reasonable case for interpreting the iconology of the Order design as crusade related, the evidence is not sufficiently compelling to conclude that this was Philip's intention, without considering whether the recipients had been or were likely to be crusaders, and whether there is any evidence that Philip was planning a crusade around 1403.

Livery Badge

If the Order of the Golden Tree was intended as a livery badge, one would expect its design to relate clearly to Philip, his territories or his aspirations. As we have seen, there is no clear evidence of a tree being used to

83.(cont'd) is not clear. See Tourneur, V., 'Les origines de l'Ordre de la Toison d'Or et la symbolique des insignes de celui-ci', pp. 300-323, and Avril, F. and Raynaud, C., Les Manuscrits à peinture en France 1340-1520, pp. 16 and 19

84. The vague contention that, having sworn vengeance for his humiliation after Nicopolis, John intended to lead another crusade, is further weakened by the capture in July 1402 by Timur, and subsequent death in 1403 of his persecutor, Bajazet.

85. See, for example, Frazer, J.G., The Golden Bough, p.382

86. See n.32 above

87. The Order of the Crescent dates from 1448

symbolise Philip or his territories⁸⁸. It does not feature on his arms, his seals, or the coins that he issued; and its use on his belongings and clothes is ambiguous. It is just conceivable that it was intended as a rebus, a popular device at the time, signifying his Burgundian inheritance from the Capetian line, but there is no evidence for this⁸⁹. If it was, the white lion might have represented jointly those of his territories which featured this animal, in different colours, on their arms, although this sort of approach appears unparalleled. The eagle might then have stood for his imperial territories, but this seems unlikely, in view of its colour and form⁹⁰. It would also be strange, in such an interpretation, for the tree to be the main element of the design, unless further analysis suggests that there was a reason for Philip to focus in 1403 on the Dukedom of Burgundy alone among his territories.

If, on the other hand, the tree represented, as we have seen, some policy aspiration of Philip's in relation to the king, to France, or to French government generally, then one might expect the lion and the eagle to represent either some related aspect of that aspiration, or Philip as a supporter of it. Some case could be made out for either interpretation but, as we have seen, both are somewhat strained⁹¹.

The other elements of the design do not clearly resolve

88. See nn. 19-25 above

89. Le chêne rouvre, king of the forest, might have symbolised a dynasty or its head, see Pastoureau, L'Arbre, p.17. It gave rise to many place names in France, one of which - Rouvre in Burgundy - had been the birth place of Philip's immediate, Capetian, predecessor as Duke. Its use might have symbolised his legitimacy as Duke of Burgundy, and thus as doyen of French peers

90. The imperial eagle was usually double-headed and black or golden

91. See nn.27-31 and 90 above

this. The sun could be associated with both Philip and the king⁹². As for the colours, while blue was one of the armorial colours of both Philip and the king, and both red and white were seen as royal colours and would therefore have been appropriate for either man, blue and red together could possibly be taken as a reference to Philip and his territory⁹³. The crescent, however, as we have seen, and particularly for Philip, seems to have been associated less with a person, territory, or aspiration (such as crusading), than with a particular occasion⁹⁴.

Given the above, and the complexity of the design, it seems most unlikely that the Golden Tree was distributed as a regular or permanent livery badge, like Richard II's white hart. Since Philip did not have a standard livery, but gave out liveries of clothing, the colours and designs of which varied according to the rank of the recipients and to the occasion, it is however possible that the Golden Tree was intended as some special badge, uniquely designed for the occasion on which it was distributed. This hypothesis needs to be tested further against the Order recipients, to see whether Philip regularly gave them livery; and against the occasion of its giving, to see whether the Order design fits with whatever was being celebrated or promoted at that point.

Military Alliance

As we have seen, the design of the Order could be interpreted as appropriate for a group of people selected by Philip on military grounds, either to promote the old military ideals of chivalry or to go on crusade. It was not usual, however, to create an alliance for such

92. See nn. 34 and 35 above

93. Philip's arms linked those of France 'd'azur semé de fleur de lis d'or à la bordure comonnée d'argent et de gueules', with those of Bourgogne ancien (that is, of the Capetian Dukes) 'bandé d'or et d'azur à la bordure de gueules'

94. See n.32 above

purposes. If the design of the Order is taken rather to relate to Philip or his territories, then he might have given such a token to men committed to him and his territorial interests. Since he would have expected such commitment from his household and vassals, however, it seems unlikely that he would have created a separate military alliance, and marked its members out by the distribution of so complex a token, unless that alliance had a special purpose, distinct from that of the general bonds of loyalty. Determining whether such a purpose might have been military in nature depends on analyses of the bonds already existing between Philip and the Order recipients; of the degree to which he could depend on their absolute, unquestioning loyalty; of the military skills and experience they possessed and of the military powers or strongholds they commanded; and of any policy concerns or objectives Philip had, around 1403, for which he might have required special or unusual military support.

Specific Policy Alliance

If, however, the design of the Order is interpreted as relating to some aspiration of Philip's, then he might have distributed it to those he had engaged to support him in that aspiration. Again, it seems unlikely that he would have needed to create a separate or special alliance in support of the general aspirations for him, as a French prince, suggested by the Order design, such as promoting Valois legitimacy; defending France against her enemies; securing unity, peace, justice and order in France; or even returning that country to a golden age⁹⁵. This suggests that the policy in question was an aspect of the general aspiration which not all his vassals would have supported; or which would have involved them in conflicting loyalties; or which was dangerous.

95. See nn.61-64

Interim Conclusion

This analysis of the iconography of the visual symbols decorating the insignia of the Order of the Golden Tree confirms the interim conclusion of Chapter 2 that Philip intended the Order neither as a purely decorative, nor a courtly, romantic gesture. It further confirms that while, like its nature and materials, the decoration of the insignia would not have been considered inappropriate by contemporaries for a chivalrous military or crusading order, a livery badge, or a military alliance, the combination of symbols used suggests that Philip's purpose was related to a specific policy and a particular occasion or exceptional set of circumstances. It suggests in addition that this policy purpose may have been so dangerous, controversial, or even, to some contemporaries, treasonable, that Philip designed it to be read by non-recipients as a mark of one of the innocent and conventional groupings, mentioned above, for which its design was appropriate.

The more contentious policy purpose might relate more particularly to the advancement of his own branch of the Valois dynasty, and thus to the protection of its territories, power and influence, inside or outside France, against any threat, whatever its source, which was uppermost in Philip's mind around the occasion of the Order's giving. It might then relate, for instance, to the arrangements for the succession to his territories, and those he expected to acquire, which he and his wife had just clarified, agreed with his children, and had confirmed, but which might have given rise to dispute; to the defence of the French crown's, or more particularly his own, interests in Brittany against England; to the defence of his control of the king, of government in France, and of the royal finances against the deprivations of royal servants or other royal princes, particularly his rival, Orleans; or to the marriages he was trying to arrange for his grandchildren with the children of the king, and thus to his dynasty's continued pre-eminent

position in France, or even to its succession to the French throne⁹⁶.

Determining which, if any, of these might have been the object of a specific policy alliance established by the Order depends on analyses of the location of recipients' territorial interests and power; of their loyalties to others besides Philip; of the dangers to his power, and that of his heirs, in France, Brittany, and his own territories, which Philip faced or perceived around 1403; and of the stability and security of the royal succession in France at that date, all of which are explored in the following Chapters⁹⁷.

96. See n.95 above

97. See Chapters 4, 5 and 6 on Loyalty, Recipients and Occasions, and the Appendices.

CHAPTER 4: THE MEANING OF THE MOTTO 'EN LOYAUTE'

As we have seen, it is important to consider the design of the insignia of the Order of the Golden Tree as a whole, if we are correctly to interpret its meaning and Duke Philip's purpose in giving it. Since the description of the Order insignia clearly includes a scroll bearing the words '*en loyaute*', this Chapter is designed to contribute further towards the refinement of the hypotheses posited by the thesis, by exploring the effect of this phrase on the conclusions drawn thus far¹. It considers why the Duke included words in the insignia design at all; why he selected '*en loyaute*'; and what he, Order recipients and onlookers might have understood the meaning of this phrase to be, particularly within the context of the overall design, and taking account of the outcomes of the analyses of the form, materials, and visual symbolism of the Order insignia in Chapters 2 and 3.

Duke Philip did not give as gifts *fermaux* carrying or including words, let alone the same words to a large group². That he did so on this occasion suggests that he considered the nature and visual design of the Order insignia on their own inadequate to convey his meaning and wished to reinforce, clarify (or even, for certain audiences, to obfuscate) the message delivered by these elements³. Since the most obvious translation of '*loyaute*' is 'loyalty', the phrase '*en loyaute*' could, for example, be seen as reinforcing the use of a sapphire in the insignia to suggest that Philip was seeking, marking, or offering loyalty⁴. At first sight, however, this does

1. See Annex 1a and Chapter 1

2. Philip's accounts refer to his belongings being marked with his '*devise*'. In letters, this is usually P and M, or his '*mot*', given as '*Y me tarde*'. See Prost, vol. 1, item 892, p.151, n.4, and vol.2, item 3394; and David, Train Somptuaire, p.24

3. See Chapter 3, Interim Conclusion

4. See Larousse Dictionnaire de l'ancien français, p. 370, and

nothing to clarify to or from whom, for what purpose, or in what way.

To achieve such clarification, we need to gauge with whom, and with what circumstances, events and procedures, Philip and his contemporaries might have associated this phrase. Words and phrases might, because of usage, carry different meanings or resonances, according to the context in which they were found. Those found as battle cries, personal mottoes or slogans might, for instance, be associated in common parlance, in legend, or in contemporary literature with a particular individual, family or group: and those found as stock terms in public pronouncements and documents, or in familiar procedures, rites or ceremonies, might be associated with particular occasions, activities, or relationships⁵.

- 4.(cont'd) Dictionnaire du moyen français, p.387. For a contemporary usage in this sense see, in King Charles VI's letters agreeing to the marriages between his children and Duke Philip's grandchildren "*ayans en nostre memoire et continuelle consideracion la loyaute et grant et vraie amour en quoy nostre chier et tres ame oncle, Phelippe, duc de Bourgogne, a de tous temps persevere envers nous...*", Ordonnances II, pp.618-20. For sapphires and loyalty, see Chapter 2, nn.44-46
5. For associations with individuals and families in armorials and literary texts, see Pastoureau, Traité d'héraldique, pp.215-8; for allusions to events in a family's history, Friar, S., Heraldry, pp.148 and 178; Wenzler, C., L'héraldique, p.44, for an individual's political beliefs; and Fox-Davies, A.C., The Wordsworth Complete Guide to Heraldry, pp.448-50, for aspirations or attitudes. Important documents, like Philip's emancipation of his sons and arrangements for succession to his territories, might be read aloud before witnesses, see ADCO B P.S 484. Recipients would also be familiar with the most common liturgies, such as for baptism and marriage; with ceremonies using standard forms, such as knighting and swearing oaths of allegiance of fealty; and with the wording of any treaties or agreements to which they were party.

Philip sometimes cited outstanding loyalty, either on a particular occasion or long-term, as a reason for awarding an annual pension or a single cash gift⁶. It might be argued that the Order was no more than an alternative, material gift, designed to mark or reward past loyalty of this kind⁷. As few Order recipients are recorded as having demonstrated this degree of loyalty, and a handful had even been disloyal, it is more likely that Philip used the Order to secure or offer future loyalty⁸.

If we consider for whom the Order was designed to engage loyalty, we have seen that the visual design of the insignia could suggest the Valois, as the true descendants of the Trojan Francio and the legitimate rulers of France, and thus either King Charles VI of France or Philip and his descendants. If Philip selected the phrase '*en loyauté*' to clarify this point, one would expect it to be associated clearly with him or with the King. This is not, however, the case.

Both the King and Duke Philip would, in the light of contemporary thought and practice, have expected loyalty as a matter of course from relatives, particularly close ones; on the basis of oaths, from household members, military and administrative officers, and vassals; and on the basis of formal agreements, from allies⁹. To judge by the citations for Duke Philip's rewards, both generally

6. Awards of cash or kind were handed over on the basis of a written authorisation from the Duke, which might specify the reason for them. Since receipt had to be acknowledged, the recipient would be aware if his loyalty had been recognised. See ADCO B 1532, f.227, and Appendix R9, particularly n.8.
7. See ADCO B1454, ff.27-30v, 75v, and 80v-93v, and Chapter 1, nn.3,5 and 7
8. See Chapter 5 and Appendix R9
9. For a discussion of the bases for the relationships between Duke Philip and Order recipients, see Chapter 5. Guinée, B., in Une Meut^re, une société, (hereafter Meut^re) p.33, refers to the

and to Order recipients, loyalty was, despite this, and particularly long-term loyalty, was a relatively rare commodity¹⁰. Philip must have deemed it unwise to rely on such expectations, and perhaps devised the Order to reinforce them. Since some recipients owed loyalty as directly to the King as they did to Philip, and many of the remaining, identifiable recipients owed it to the King indirectly through Philip, himself acknowledged as a loyal supporter of the King, it is still not clear whether Philip was confirming his own loyalty to the King, together with that of the recipients, or whether he was seeking loyalty only to himself, perhaps in some circumstance or for some purpose in which his interests might conflict with the King's¹¹.

'*Loyaute*', or words and phrases resembling or including

9.(cont'd)particular duty of loyalty which the King's relatives owe him in return for the privileges of their rank, and on p.67, sums up the duty of loyalty to the king in this period as "la loyauté que doivent au roi ses parents, ses vassaux, ses serviteurs, tous ses sujets, et qui assure la solidité de l'État...est un nouveau pilier sur lequel repose une policie bien ordonné". In LaVision Christine, the source of the Golden Tree allegory which I argued in Chapter 1 reflected Philip's views, there are frequent references to the importance of loyalty in securing a stable and peaceful state, illustrated by the good times which existed under Charles V, when there were "loyaulx subgiez", (Towner, pp.75 and 83), and the troubles of civil war later, when France was forced to watch "yre et contens naistre..iusques au point d'armes de guerre...entre ses propres enfans legittimes et de loyaulx peres", (p.85). The author complains about the damage resulting from disloyalty (pp.94-5), and notes the particular displeasure with which God views "desloyaulte entre les freres, parens et amis et entre prochains" (p.103).

10. See Chapters 1 and 5, and Appendix R9. ADCO B1461, ff. 27,98, 105,108v and 111-112 note rewards given for outstanding loyalty at the battle of Roosebecke.

11. See ADCO B295, and n.4 above

it, was not uncommon as a family battle cry or personal motto in Europe in the Middle Ages, but none of the instances of such use appear to relate to the Order recipients, to the King or to Philip¹². '*En loyauté*' does not relate in any way to what is recorded as Philip's personal motto, nor does it appear to have been used by the Duke or his family before 1403, apart from a single, rather doubtful, report of his Duchess once marking the collars of her hounds with it¹³. This seems likely,

12. See examples of family cries and mottoes in Chassant, A. and Tausin, H., Dictionnaire des devises historiques et héraldiques, vol.1, pp.184, 256, 297-8 and 520. Opinion varies as to the origins, distinctions and development of war cries, mottoes and slogans, but it is generally agreed that in France, by the end of the fourteenth century, nobles might have individual, personal mottoes, distinct from any personal or family warcries, and which might be used alone or, later, form part of a personal, often transient, informal badge. Like supporters and helms, it seems only rarely to have been recorded as part of the coat of arms at this stage. If it was, it was generally included on a scroll under the heraldic blazon. See, for instance, Pastoureau, Traité d'héraldique, pp.215-8; Friar, Heraldry, pp.148 and 178; Wenzler, L'héraldique, p.44; Le blason d'Harcourt et Durivault, pp.122-3; Brault, J.G., Early Blazon, pp.183-4; Fearn, Discovering Heraldry, pp.43 and 52-3; Fox-Davies, Wordsworth Complete Guide to Heraldry, pp.448-452; and Woodcock, T. and Robinson, J.M., The Oxford Guide to Heraldry, pp.15, 20 and 111-4
13. Philip's motto is variously given as "*Y me tarde*" or "*Moult me tarde*", the origins and meaning of which are not clear, but appear not to relate to loyalty. His warcry was "*Montjoye Saint André*" or "*Montjoye au noble duc*". See n.2 above; David, Protecteur des Arts, p.7; Pastoureau, Traité d'héraldique, p.216; Le Blason d'Harcourt et Durivault, p.213; and Chassant and Tausin, Dictionnaire des devises historiques et héraldiques, Supplement to vol.1, p.321. There are references to Philip using an unspecified motto, but there is no reason to think that these related to anything other than his usual one. See Prost, vol.1, item 678, for clothes with "*roliaux du mot de Monseigneur*"

however, to have been more in the nature of a comment on the nature of the animals, or what was expected of them, than a use of a family or personal motto to mark a possession, or to indicate the originator of a gift¹⁴. The only contemporary of Philip who used the word loyalty in a personal motto appears to have been Valentina Visconti¹⁵. Although the sister-in-law and favourite of King Charles VI, she was the wife of Philip's main rival for power, Orleans, so it is most unlikely he selected the phrase to indicate loyalty to the King, and even less likely that he was offering support to Valentina herself¹⁶.

Philip's son, Duke John the Fearless, and his supporters, did later use '*loyaute*' as a slogan for the Burgundian party, in contrast to the Armagnacs, who stressed rather obedience¹⁷. The lack of any record of its use by Philip

- 13.(cont'd)For the dog collars, see David, Protecteur des Arts, p.21. for 1378. I could find nothing in the accounts for that year, or in the 1405 inventory of the dead Duchess' goods, see ADCO B301.
14. The nature of the marking Philip used is not always clear in his accounts. "*Devise*" could mean any design of the Duke's devising (see Chapter 2, nn.14-19), and may have included his motto on occasion, but I have used only unambiguous references to his '*mot*'. He occasionally used his motto or initials to mark those of his belongings intended for public display -see n.2 above, Prost, vol.1, items 675 and 1554, and vol.2, items 1492 and 1850. Other possessions and, particularly, gifts were more usually marked with his coat of arms - see Prost, vol.1, items 1471, 1850, and 2628 for possessions, and item 2000 and p.378, n.6, and vol.2, items 766, 1639 and 3132 for gifts.
15. Guenée, Meut̄re, p.146, gives it as "*Loyaute passe tout*" in 1400
16. Autrand, Charles VI, pp.310-11, 321-3, 353 and 356, notes Charles' pleasure in her company, even when 'absent', but the persistent rumours of her using sorcery on him, and even of an attempt to poison the Dauphin, led to her leaving Paris in 1396, returning only after her husband's death in 1407. See also Verdon, J., Isabeau de Bavière, p.129
17. Guenée, Meut̄re, p.67

as a slogan does not mean that he did not regard it as part of his policies¹⁸. Political rallying cries were arguably less necessary before Duke John's murder of the Duke of Orleans in 1407 intensified the conflict between the two parties and forced those related to both to take or change sides and to advertise their choice.

While Duke John introduced new personal devices, like the 'rabort', to symbolise his policies, particularly in the significantly changed political climate after his father's death, he traded on the latter's reputation and position where he could. It may be, therefore, that he developed 'loyaute' as a slogan because it invoked a quality that had been closely associated with Philip, and with popular or political support for him.

There was, for instance, a rather distant, but widely recognised, association between Philip and the concept of 'loyaute', dating from as far back as 1356. Philip had been publicly lauded at that date for his youthful, but unwavering support of his father, King John II, on the battlefield of Poitiers against the English, in contrast to the perceived disloyalty of many French lords and even of his older brothers¹⁹. It was said that the Dukedom of

18. There is no reference to it, for instance, in Philip's letter to the French Parlement in October 1401, defending his actions, or in the references in his accounts to him summoning armed men to support him in Paris against Orleans in December of that year. See Douet d'Arcq, Pieces Inédites, vol.1, LXXXXIX, p.212; Nordberg, M., Les Ducs et la Royauté, pp.65-6; and ADCO B1532, f.263

19. In Lettenhove, K.de's edition of the Oeuvres, vol.5, 2nd redaction, pp.443-8, Froissart records the departure of King John's other sons from the battlefield, leaving "*messires Phelippes ses mainnes fils a le bataille*", commenting that "*se la quarte partie de ses gens l'eussent ressamble, la journee este pour yaus (lui)..Toutefois li duch, li conte...qui demorent se acquitterent a leur pooir bien et loyaument, et se combatirent tant quil furent tout mort ou pris*". Philip was among the latter

Burgundy was Philip's reward from his father for this conspicuous and valued display of loyalty²⁰. Even though, as Duke of Burgundy and later Count of Flanders, Philip strongly pursued his own dynastic and territorial interests, he ensured that his actions were perceived as being in loyal support of France and its Kings. After his father's death, he visibly supported his brother, King Charles V, and then his nephew, Charles VI, in retaining loyalty to the French Crown - riding, for instance, at the head of a Crown financed army with the latter to secure victory over the Flemish rebels in 1382²¹. Both had recognised this loyalty and rewarded it²². Including 'en

19.(cont'd) (see p.458). Autrand, F., Jean le Bon, p.373, drawing on a contemporary text, quotes the view that the French knights were guilty of disloyalty, even treason, while reserving the greatest admiration for the valour and steadfastness of Philip

20. In awarding the Dukedom of Burgundy to Philip, King John referred to the significant advantage of having loyal and brave vassals, and recalled "*les services excellens et digne de louange de nostre tres chier Philippe...qui s'exposa de plein gre a la mort avec nous...durant la bataille de Poitiers...Voulant donc..par une recompense perpetuelle...*", (ADCO B294, transcribed in Barante,P.de, Histoire des ducs de Bourgogne, vol.1,pp.103-11)

21. Philip's accounts make frequent reference in 1383-4 to his rewards to men for their loyalty to the King in this battle, against the disloyal Flemish. See ADCO B1461, f.27, for a life pension of 1000 livres p.a. to one of his senior chamberlains, Jean de Mornay, "*pour consideracion des grans notables loyaux et agreeables services...et par especial en la derniere chevauchee que le Roy a fait ou pays de Flandres et la jour de la bataille de Rosebeth...contre les flamens rebelles..et pur..reconoistre les diz services afin que lui et ses autres serviteurs feussent plus enclins chascun endroit soy de lui bien et loyaument servir et faire leur devoir envers monditseigneur*"

22. Philip received regular pensions and financial gifts from the French crown, often justified as rewards for services to it or compensation for losses sustained in its service, including 220,000 francs for his expenses in taking over and defending

loyaute' in his Order insignia could therefore suggest that Philip designed it to secure loyalty to France and to its Valois King.

This interpretation is reinforced by another possible association of loyalty within the Order design. We have seen that Philip had worn the device of a Golden Tree at the lavish ceremonies celebrated by King Charles VI in 1389 in honour of the former Constable, Du Guesclin, with whom the lion and the eagle of the design could also be associated²³. The contemporary poem eulogising Du Guesclin's life stressed his overriding and unshakeable loyalty to the French Crown, despite the opposition of the Breton Duke, his overlord, and the seductive offers of the English. This example of loyalty, even when it meant fighting against fellow Bretons and former associates, would not have been lost on Philip's contemporaries, even a dozen or so years after the commemoration, and particularly not on the young Duke of Brittany and the other Breton recipients of the Order²⁴.

Philip's use of '*en loyaute'*' could, therefore, be interpreted within the Order design as securing his and recipients' loyalty to France or to the French Crown. The associations discussed so far are, however, insufficient to be sure that the object of that loyalty was the King of France in 1403, Charles VI. In view of Philip's use of the word around this date, he could have meant to France, by maintaining a truce with Orleans (rather than endangering it through civil war) or alternatively, protecting the legitimate Valois line of succession to Charles VI (including Philip's own grandchildren) against

22.(cont') Flanders in 1384-6. See Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.230

23. See Chronique du Religieux de Saint Denis, ed. Bellaguet, vol. 1, p.585; ADCO B1476, ff.34-5; and Chapter 3, nn.77 and 78

24. See La Chanson de Bertran du Guesclin de Cuvelier, ed. Faucon, vol.1, pp.368-9

any potential usurpers, like Orleans²⁵. Given the uncertain political climate at the end of 1402 (when Philip must have commissioned the Order insignia), it cannot have been entirely clear to which individual or group such loyalty was due at any given moment²⁶. Philip could have been advancing his own claims, as an outstanding example of proven worth and unimpeachable loyalty.

While it is quite possible that Philip deliberately used an Order design that could be variously, and innocently, interpreted by the King; by Philip's rivals for power; and by other, powerful and senior members of the French Court to whom the gift of the Order might be reported, it seems less likely that he would have left the Order recipients similarly vague as to the object and purpose of the loyalty this gift was designed to secure. The idea of giving an unquestioning undertaking to fulfil some unspecified future request, which subsequently turned out to be dangerous or to conflict with broader loyalties, was a familiar topos in the courtly literature popular at the time²⁷. In reality, however, general or open-ended

25. In January 1402, Philip and Orleans agreed publicly to remain "*loyaulx amis ensamble*" for the good of the King and the kingdom - see Douet d'Arcq, Pièces Inédites, vol.1, CI, pp.220-6. The Burgundian chronicler, Monstrelet, later recorded Philip as having, on his death bed in 1404, made his sons promise to remain loyal all their lives to King Charles of France, his children, crown and kingdom - see La Chronique d'Engerrand de Monstrelet, ed. Douet d'Arcq, L., vol.1, p.88. At around this time Philip was negotiating for his grandchildren to marry the King's children, including the heir to the throne.

26. See Chapter 6 on Occasions

27. For the concept of the rash boon, see Lancelot's promise to the Demoiselle of Escalot in the thirteenth century La Mort le Roi Artu, ed. Frappier, J., pp.10-11. Although there is no record of Philip owning this book, his wife owned a number of volumes of

undertakings of this sort in conventional understandings and contracts seem to have been qualified or delimited²⁸. Unless it can be shown that Philip explained his meaning to recipients, or that the gift of the Order itself, or the relationship it marked, unequivocally committed recipients to unquestioning obedience to him, as its donor, one would expect him to have selected for the Order design words which they would interpret as he intended.

There is no evidence that Philip explained the meaning of the Order to recipients. There is no record or indication in his accounts of any written explanation, such as an accompanying letter or statutes for the Order, or of any nearby occasions at which all Order recipients were in Philip's presence²⁹. Is there, then, any evidence that Order recipients would have interpreted the use of '*en loyaute*' in its insignia as committing them either to absolute obedience to any future command of Philip's or, in the light of the interim conclusion of Chapter 3, to a particular objective, or in particular circumstances? To determine this, it is helpful to look at various contexts, particularly ones familiar to recipients, in which the word '*loyaute*' was used at this time, and the different meanings attributed to it in those contexts.

- 27.(cont'd) Arthurian legends, including ones on Lancelot - see de Winter, Bibliothèque, p.45. Copies of this text were available in France in Philip's time, see Frappier, pp.xxx-xxxi
28. See a 1384 treaty of alliance between Philip, his brother John of Berry and John de Montfort, Duke of Brittany, in support of Charles VI and each other, against everyone except the King, and Philip's brother the King of Sicily, in which each also promises not to engage in other alliances without the agreement of the other two - Douet d'Arcq, Pièces Inédites, vol.1, XXVII, pp.51-2
29. See Chapter 5 on Recipients. Not all were present at the New Year festivities in 1403; there is no record of an inaugural mass, feast or meeting for the Order; or of messengers being sent with common letters to recipients at this time

'Loyaute' seems often to have had the sense of 'foi', that is fidelity or keeping faith³⁰. Both Philip and King Charles VI used it in this sense, in formal Ordinances, as something owed, as a duty, because of a person's rank, position or relationship. This duty was widely understood as part of a notional contract between rulers and ruled³¹. Such a duty seems to have included obedience but, again, the precise form it might have taken and person to whom it might have been owed in the confused circumstances of 1402-3 would have been too unclear for Philip to have used 'loyaute' in the Order insignia in this general sense³².

A more specific duty of keeping faith might be owed on the basis of a public oath, such as that of fealty to a lord but, as we shall see in the Chapter on Recipients, landholdings spread across different territories, and the custom of holding pensions simultaneously from different lords, could mean potentially conflicting loyalties³³. If such conflict could arise, the oath might indicate exceptions to the duty of fidelity and support arising from it³⁴. Similarly, oaths of office were usually

30. Guenée regards 'foy' and 'loyaute' as interchangeable and their bracketting together as rhetorical reinforcement - see Meufre, pp.33 and 67, and nn.6 and 7 above

31. *Ibid.*, pp.33 and 67, quoting from contemporary texts

32. *Ibid.*, p.44, for a royal order requiring Philip and others to be "loyaulx subges" in April 1403, in order to remind them of the need to obey the King, despite his illness; and Ordonnances, vol.2, 554, where "la bonne obeissance" is bracketted with "loyal portement"

33. See Ordonnances, vol.II, 373 and 536 for the loyalty owed to Philip as lord, and on the basis of a public oath; and n.37 below

34. See ADCO B1521,f.60, for a squire of the Duchess of Brabant who, in 1394, received 1000 francs from Philip "affin quil soit plus obligees et tenu envers (Philip) de le servir", became his liegeman and that of his heirs who would be Dukes of Brabant and Limbourg, and promised him "foy et loyaulte de servir contre tous except contre le dit duc de Brabant", and never to bear arms

specific to a position and its duties. Such oaths would not have committed the vassal or office holder to unquestioning obedience outside their terms. The fact that Philip selected Order recipients from among members of groups who had sworn an oath to him in different contexts suggests that he felt such oaths did not guarantee their loyalty to some specific purpose for the Order³⁵.

Both King Charles VI and Philip used the term '*loyaute*' formally to mean trustworthiness, and applied it to men whose support and obedience they could thus rely upon. Used conventionally at the beginning of new appointments to royal or ducal posts, of delegations of power, or of commissions, the phrase '*confians a plain de voz sens, loiaultez et bonnes diligences*' could be interpreted either to mean that the men were selected for the work because they had been generally obedient to the patron and could be trusted to continue to be so, or that the patron was confident that they would carry out the task properly, honestly, scrupulously, and to the best of their ability³⁶. The word is used in the latter sense in, for instance, '*...dont ceulz qui en auront l'administration seront tenus d'en rendre bon compte et loyal par devant nos commis...*', or '*...de bonne foi loialement a faire poursuivre et pourcacher senz delay la delivrance et desaret d'eulz et de leursdiz biens...*'³⁷. Similarly, the Duke ordered the payment of expenses claims to be

34.(cont'd)against Philip and his heirs, or to allow any one for any reason to damage Philip's fortresses or territories, except his Duchess.

35. See Chapter 5 on Recipients

36. See, for instance, Ordonnances, vol.2, 662, for a letter from Charles VI in 1403 conferring the necessary powers on Philip to negotiate an Anglo-Flemish commercial truce in the advent of a recommencement of hostilities between France and England; and vol.2, 470 and 472 for commissions by Philip

37. Ibid., vol.2, 539 from 1399, and 584 from 1401

made to some of his most trusted officers, even though they could not produce the necessary chitty, and without requiring them to swear as to the accuracy of the claim, because they had confirmed what they had spent '*en sa loyaute*'³⁸.

Although these examples might imply that '*loyaute*' could be used to mean longterm trustworthiness, beyond that required by any particular oath, they are used in the context of a specific commission or occasion. This lack of unambiguous examples, likely to be familiar to all Order recipients, of the use of '*loyaute*' to mean unquestioning general obedience confirms that Philip did not use it in the Order insignia for this purpose. He must therefore have had some more specific meaning in mind, which would have been clear to recipients without further explanation.

Apart from the meanings discussed above, another frequent, and important sense in which Philip used '*loyaute*' and '*loial*' was to mean legal, lawful or legitimate³⁹. This meaning would have been familiar to recipients because the phrase '*loial marriage*' was used, for instance, in marriage contracts and succession documents, in relation to children born of Church approved, properly conducted and faithful unions, who were therefore entitled to succeed to their parents' titles and territories⁴⁰.

38. See for example ADCO B1475, ff.17, 21v,80-82v, and 87v; B1441, f.50; B1499, f.45; B1534, f.52-52v; and B1538, f.64

39. See Plancher, U., Histoire générale et particulière de Bourgogne, (hereafter Plancher), vol.III, Preuves LXV, for "*loyaux cousts et frais*" in a 1378 transfer of lands to the Duke; and in ADCO B P.S.484, a 1402 transcript of the emancipation of Philip's sons and the partition of his lands, for arrangements being acceptable because "*justement et loialment faites*"

40. See Plancher, vol.III, Preuves CLVI, in the 1392 marriage treaty for Anthony, a reference to "*loyal marriage*" in the succession conditions; and in Preuves CLXXXV, in a gifting of lands to

Philip himself had used '*loial*' in this sense repeatedly, not long before he issued the Order, in a series of inheritance documents, settling the future division of his and his wife's territories between their three sons⁴¹.

The Order could therefore have been seeking support either for the most legitimate feudal superior, to whom a duty of loyalty was owed, or for his or her legitimate successors in the event of some particular circumstances, such as the superior's death or permanent incapacity, especially if the line of succession was in any way in doubt. To identify this, we need to look around 1402-3 at the circumstances in which Philip used, or was connected with the term '*loyaute*', and which would have been sufficiently well known to recipients not to require explanation. This produces three possible purposes for the Order which are given in outline here, but will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6 on Occasions.

The first is a commitment to the succession arrangements within Philip's own territories, between his three sons, referred to above⁴². These had had to be changed significantly, and Philip had deemed it necessary to secure his sons' formal agreement and the acquiescence of his sons-in-law to avoid any discord between them, after his and his wife's deaths, which might damage the strength of the Burgundian hegemony he had spent most of his life engineering⁴³. He might well have thought it equally

40.(cont'd) Philip by John of Berry, to "*enfants procreez de son corps en loyal marriage*". Also in ADCO B P.S.484 (see n.39 above) to "*enfants de son corps masles ou femalles nez en loyal marriage*", in arrangements for succession in the event of Anthony dying before Philip and his wife

41. See nn.39 and 40 above on ADCO B P.S.484

42. Ibid., and Plancher, vol.III, Preuves CCI and CCII

43. Ibid., and Plancher, vol.III, Preuves CC "*afin que, apres le decez (of Philip and his wife) aucun debast ou discort ne puissent ou doive naistre entre yceulx enfans a cause desdits*

prudent to secure the commitment of the other Order recipients to these arrangements, particularly those concerned with the defence of his more troublesome territories where the succession might be disputed, or of the more peripheral ones, which might be vulnerable to attack from rivals if there were to be any internal dissension or confusion after his death⁴⁴.

The second, in view of Philip's oath, some three months after the distribution of the Order insignia, to be a loyal subject of King Charles VI, is a commitment similarly by recipients to obey the King or, in his 'absences', the legitimate regents⁴⁵. They would have understood that to mean support for the arrangements approved by the King, giving Philip a significant place in the regency council, against any attempts by Orleans to take control of the council or even to usurp the Crown⁴⁶.

The third, in view of the marriage agreements being negotiated around this time between the King's children, and particularly his heir the Dauphin, and Philip's grandchildren, might have had several levels of meaning⁴⁷. The simplest would have been a commitment by recipients to secure the achievement of these marriages, and thus the continuation of Burgundian influence at Court, against the opposition of Orleans, who saw them as endangering his influence over the Crown, and the links he had been trying to reinforce with his own family⁴⁸. Also understood in

43. (*cont'd*) *partages*"; and in Preuves CCI, "*pour entretenir nosdits enfans aprez nostre trespas en bonne paix amour, union et concorde*", and "*attendu que les Habitans de nosdits Pays et de ceulx Nous peuvent advenir, desirent avoir (avecques) eulx leur Seigneur continuellement pour les garder et deffendre*"

44. See Chapter 5 on Recipients

45. See Guenée, *Meuŕre*, p.44

46. See Nordberg, *Les Ducs et La Royauté*, pp.70-1

47. See ADCO B295, P.S.250-253, and Plancher, vol.III, Preuves, CCXIV

48. See Autrand, *Charles VI*, pp.394-5

this would almost certainly have been a commitment to obey and support the King's legitimate successor, who would then have been either married to a Burgundian or the offspring of such a marriage⁴⁹. There is also a possibility that the Order implied a commitment to securing a Burgundian succession to the French crown, whatever the circumstances. If, as must have seemed likely at that time, Charles VI died (or became completely incapable of ruling) without a legitimate male heir, the still developing French royal succession laws could have been interpreted to suggest that the Crown should be offered to someone in legitimate line of descent from Philip, or under his control⁵⁰.

This analysis of Philip's reasons for including the phrase '*en loyauté*' on the Order insignia, taken with his use of the sapphire so strongly associated with it, suggests that this virtue was crucial to his purpose, and beyond that normally required. This confirms the interim conclusion of Chapter 3 that Philip designed it in relation to a specific policy and a particular occasion or set of exceptional circumstances, and that that the policy was sufficiently controversial for him deliberately to make the design and motto ambiguous. The analysis further suggests that the policy was to do with securing not just loyalty generally, for Philip or the Crown, but a legitimate succession. The implications of these findings for my seven hypotheses are given below.

Decorative

The findings of this analysis confirm even more strongly the interim conclusions of Chapters 2 and 3 that the Order was not purely decorative. I can find no evidence of Philip using words, or even letters, purely decoratively on belongings or gifts. All specified instances relate to

49. See Chapter 6 on Occasions, and nn.45 and 46 above

50. See Chapter 6 on Occasions

him or his family as owner, giver or recipient⁵¹. It seems unlikely that Philip would have departed from these norms, particularly with the use of so resonant a phrase, when the insignia design alone, without the addition of any words, would have been striking and unusual enough if he had wished simply to impress by the nature of the decoration of his gift.

Courtly Chivalric Order

Nor does the analysis suggest any strong reason for rejecting the interim conclusions of Chapters 2 and 3 that the Order was not designed to be a courtly, romantic one. Although it was not unusual for jewellery or badges associated with love to include an appropriate inscription, I could find no instance of ones using the word loyalty⁵². The concept of true or faithful love was expressed in other terms⁵³.

Both real and literary contemporary orders devoted to courtly love, like the Cour Amoureuse founded by King Charles VI and Duke Philip, and the Order of the Rose

51. See n.2 above. There are instances of the family using a range of letters and symbols, not all of which appear to relate to them, to mark sheets, but this seems to have been to distinguish the individual items, perhaps for laundering purposes - see Prost, vol.2, pp.332-5. Saracen script was used decoratively, but had no meaning, reflecting a taste for the exotic - see David, Train Somptuaire, p.39. The King's use of 'Esperance' on a gift to Philip in 1387 could have related to the motto of his uncle, the Duke of Bourbon, adopted in 1366 and remaining in use until the sixteenth century. See Prost, vol.2, item 1719, and Boulton, Knights of the Crown, p.272,n.5

52. See Lightbown, Medieval European Jewellery, pp.100,154,185 and 529-30, and Bruna, Enseignes de Pèlerinage et Enseignes Profanes, pp.299-302

53. For example, '*saunz departier*' (never to part) - see Lightbown, Medieval European Jewellery, pp.100 and 185

described by Christine de Pisan in her Dit de la Rose as having been established by Orleans, used 'loyalty' as their motto or central precept⁵⁴. There is no evidence, however, that the word appeared on any article of display associated with such Orders⁵⁵.

While a motto such as '*en loyauté*' would, therefore, have been appropriate at that period for an order designed to celebrate or promote the courtly, amorous aspects of the chivalric ethos, this is insufficient to counter previous conclusions, or make a strong case for this hypothesis.

Military Chivalric Order

By contrast, the use of '*en loyauté*' could improve the case for the Order to have been designed to promote the specifically military aspects of the chivalric ethos. The virtue of loyalty, particularly to the ruler in war, was fundamental to this ethos, and featured strongly in texts on the subject which were well-known and available around this time, such as Raymond Lull's The Book of the Order of Chivalry, and Geoffroi de Charny's Book of Chivalry, and was still current when Christine de Pisan wrote her Book of Deeds of Arms and Chivalry a few years after Duke Philip's death⁵⁶.

A number of royal and princely orders of the period were founded to encourage this - the most relevant example

54. See Appendix 7, n.1 and the equivalent section in Chapter 5 on Recipients. See also the statutes in C.A., Book 1, pp.35-45; and McLeod, The Order of the Rose, pp.75-6

55. See n.54 above, particularly C.A., Book 1, p.36, lines 51-3, and p. 44, lines 380-385; and McLeod, The Order of the Rose, p.76. For military orders, see the buckle, inscribed '*pour loyauté maintenir*', the motto of the Cypriot Order of the Sword, in Lightbown, Medieval European Jewellery, p.333

56. For Lull, a late thirteenth century text, translated into French and widely known in Philip's time, see Le Livre de l'Ordre de Chevalrie, ed. Tredaniel, G., p.18-19; for Charny, King John's

being the so-called Company of the Star, founded by Philip's father, King John II, in 1351/2 to remedy the military failure and perceived disloyalty of the French knighthood in battle against the English, and whose members (including Philip) were required to swear that they would never flee in battle⁵⁷. There is no evidence, however, that this Company had a motto, and no record of any inscription on its badge, habits or banner, other than that of a member's name around the ring he wore bearing the device of the Company⁵⁸.

Mottoes were included in the badges of some contemporary chivalric orders of this type, like the English Order of the Garter and the Sicilian Company of the Knot, although they do not seem to have been designed clearly to reflect the purposes of the order⁵⁹. There is no reason, however, why Duke Philip should not have chosen to do so. Thus the hypothesis that the Order of the Golden Tree was intended to promote loyal military support to King Charles VI, to Philip, or to their legitimate successors, which the other elements of the insignia's design do not rule out, is strengthened by the use of '*en loyaute*' as its motto⁶⁰.

56.(cont'd) standard bearer and an initial member of his Company of the Star, for whom the book was probably written, see The Book of Chivalry, ed. Kaeuper, R.W. and Kennedy, E., pp.3,14-15, 24-7 and 59 of the introduction, and pp.119 and 149 in the text; and n.88 in Chapter 5 on Recipients. For Christine, see Book of Deeds of Arms and Chivalry, ed. Willard, C., pp.1-7 of the introduction, and pp.49, 53, and 148-153 of the text

57. For the Company of the Star, see Chapter 1, n.56, Chapter 5, nn.85 and 86; and Boulton, Knights of the Crown, pp.167-210, particularly 172, 181 and 196

58. Ibid., pp.201-8

59. '*Hony soyt qui mal y pense*' on the Garter, founded in the late 1340s and copied by the Star, and '*Se Dieux plaist*' on the Knot, founded in 1352/3 and based on the Star, see Ibid., pp.153 and 223, and Collins, H.E.L., The Order of the Garter, pp.6-14

60. Honoré Bouvet's Tree of Battles, a well-known, late fourteenth

Crusading Chivalric Order

There is some evidence from the analysis of the motto to support the hypothesis that Duke Philip's Order was designed in support of crusading but, taken with the outcomes of the analyses of the form, materials and visual design of the insignia, it does not provide a compelling case.

This aspect of chivalry is dealt with in contemporary French texts, such as Philippe de Mézières' Le Songe du Vieil Pelerin, written in 1388-9 as advice to the young King Charles VI on how best to reform the government of France, and advocating crusade not, as in the past, as an adventurous "outlet for the energies of western chivalry, but as a disciplined and sustained campaign", designed to secure permanent Christian settlements in the Holy Land⁶¹. In this book, Philippe de Mézières advocated the creation of an order - that of the Passion - which he had already sought, without much success, to realise specifically for this purpose⁶². Duke Philip was certainly well aware of the proposal, which its author had rehearsed to the French and English courts in his Letter to King Richard II,

60.(cont'd) century, theoretical treatise of which both Charles VI and Duke Philip appear to have had copies, stressed that a knight's loyalty to the Crown should override all obligation to any other lord, and that he must be obedient to the man acting in place of the King as leader of the army, advocating this as part of an "*ordonnance de deue chevalerie*" which knights should accept. See Wright, N.A.R., 'The Tree of Battles of Honoré Bouvet and the Laws of War', in War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages, ed. Allmand, C., pp.12-31, and particularly pp.18 and 28

61. See Coupland, G.W., in the introduction to his edition of Le Songe du Vieil Pelerin, particularly Book 1, p.75

62. Ibid., Book II, in the nn.to pp.66-8. See also references to other mss. by de Mézières on the same subject 1368-96 in Coupland's edition of The Letter to Richard II, p.xxxiii

written in 1395, and directed again to Duke Philip in his Epistre Lamentable of 1397, after the resounding defeat of the flower of French and Burgundian chivalry at the battle of Nicopolis in 1396 on a crusade supported by the Duke and nominally led by his eldest son⁶³.

While de Mézières regarded the true loyalty of French and English chivalry to the Crowns of these countries as lying in support for their kings' promotion of peace in order to pursue crusade (rather than continuing, in the name of honour, to advocate war between them), there is no evidence that loyalty was the motto, or featured on the device, of his proposed Order of the Passion, or, contrary to Kovacs' assertion, that the Duke took up his ideas⁶⁴.

Loyalty was the motto of a contemporary crusading order - that of the Cypriot Order of the Sword - and featured, as part of its device, on badges and on the buckle of the girdle worn by members, on a banderole looped around the blade of an unsheathed sword⁶⁵. This order is said to have been founded in 1347 by Pierre de Lusignan and maintained by him when he succeeded his father as King of Cyprus in 1359⁶⁶. He apparently established it to help him launch a crusade, possibly on the advice of de Mézières, who had arrived in Cyprus not long before, becoming a firm friend of the young prince and his Chancellor when Pierre re-established the order after his father's death. It was possibly the failure of Pierre's crusade in 1365, and the unprincipled behaviour of his knights, which led de Mézières, a member of the Order of the Sword, to conceive of a more disciplined Order of the

63. The Letter to Richard II, pp. xxxiii and xxxiv

64. Ibid., p. 61-2 and 136; the 'Epistre Lamentable' to Philip, in Lettenhove, K. de's Chroniques de Froissart, tome XVI, pp. 490-514; Kovacs, Orfèvrerie Parisienne, p. 85; and my Chapter 5, n. 91

65. See n. 55 above, and Boulton, Knights of the Crown, pp. 246-7

66. Ibid., pp. 241-2

Passion. Pierre's order seems to have survived until 1489 but, from 1396 at least, only as an honorary order for pilgrims returning from Jerusalem, rather than one actively promoting crusade⁶⁷.

Duke Philip knew of Pierre's order, so there is a case for arguing that he chose the motto '*en loyaute*' for a crusading order, designed either to replace Pierre's in promoting active crusading, or to honour countrymen returning from crusade, such as that led by his son in 1396. Loyalty in such a context could have meant adhering to the vow taken by crusaders before setting out (particularly as Philip had himself an unfulfilled vow of this kind, and his son had sworn to revenge the 1396 defeat); or continuing to support his son, as the former leader of a crusade, or the other members of the Order⁶⁸.

None of these purposes appears to be controversial, however, or to require any ambiguity of design in the insignia. The analyses thus far, taken with the familiar, contemporary use of loyalty as a crusading order's motto, offer reasonable, but by no means incontrovertible, grounds for supposing that Duke Philip's Order was related to crusading. To prove such a hypothesis would require further supporting evidence about Philip's policy concerns, or some occasion or circumstance, around the time his Order was distributed, which might have made a crusading order necessary; and about the crusading involvement of its recipients. These are explored in Chapters 5 and 6.

Livery Badge

The use of '*en loyaute*' on the Order's insignia does not rule out the possibility that it was purely a livery badge, but makes it unlikely. Such badges could include mottoes, or mottoes could be used on their own as

67. Ibid., pp.242-8

68. Ibid., p.246

badges⁶⁹. Since livery badges were often given out at New Year, as an indication of loyalty, the use of the phrase on them would appear superfluous, unless it had a particular association with the giver. As we have seen, however, it was not Philip's usual motto, nor is there any evidence that he had used it on the metal badges he gave to his minstrels, or on the devices sometimes embroidered on the clothes worn by his household⁷⁰.

Princes at this period did not, however, necessarily use only one badge at a time, or retain the same one over a period. If they did settle on one, it usually had a clear, immediately recognisable link with them, their family, their deeds or their aspirations⁷¹. The fact that Duke Philip chose so different, detailed and specific a design and motto for his Order insignia suggests that he wished to draw attention to their particular associations with him and his policies in 1402-3. This in turn confirms the interim conclusions of Chapters 2 and 3 that the Order insignia was not just a simple livery badge, but some special one, intended to indicate or secure adherence by a particular group, to a particular policy, and in particular circumstances.

Military Alliance

Similarly, while the use of '*en loyauté*' would not have been inappropriate for an insignia designed to denote a general military alliance between the Duke and its recipients, it does not prove it. It does, however, confirm earlier conclusions that any such alliance would be likely to have had some specific purpose.

69. See Fearn, Discovering Heraldry, pp.52-3 and 66; Spencer, B., Pilgrim Souvenirs and Secular Badges, pp.311,313 and 319; and Lightbown, Medieval European Jewellery, pp.196-201, particularly p.200

70. See Prost, vol.1, item 2351, and vol.2, item 3475

71. See Lightbown, Medieval European Jewellery, pp.196-201

Loyalty was certainly included as a central element in contemporary contracts for military alliance⁷². Nor would marking such an alliance by the gift of a *fermail* with a device or motto have been out of keeping with behaviour in the period⁷³. Highlighting that loyalty on an insignia would, however, suggest that the donor sought something more than the usual alliance, and required support either of an absolute, unconditional nature, or for some exceptional purpose. The term does not, of itself however, limit that support to assistance through armed combat. Wearing such a badge could indicate membership of a group of any kind which espoused common aims, including military ones but, except with livery badges, those aims were usually laid down in some form⁷⁴. It was also not uncommon for princes to wear each other's badges as an outward sign of friendship and trust, without there necessarily being any accompanying formal contract of alliance. In such instances, however, the numbers were usually small and the nature of the friendship unspecified⁷⁵.

While the relatively large size of the group receiving the Order insignia would suggest that, if it was not a livery badge, it marked some kind of alliance between members, the lack of any surviving agreement, or evidence that it existed, could be argued to make a specifically military alliance somewhat less likely, unless the phrase was being used in the sense, discussed above, of a formal oath or agreement being unnecessary because of the trustworthiness

72. See Lewis, 'Of Breton Alliances and Other matters', in his Essays in Late Medieval French History, pp.69-90; and ADCO B1461, ff.29v-30 and 35; B1503, ff.33v-34v; B1521, f.60; and B1532, f.190v

73. See Chapter 1, and Chapter 2, n.68

74. For medieval religious orders of knighthood and princely orders, their aims and statutes, see Boulton, Knights of the Crown

75. For late fourteenth and early fifteenth examples from Aragon and Burgundy, see Lightbown, Medieval European Jewellery, pp. 200-1

and commitment of the individual (or unwise because of the purpose to which it was to be put)⁷⁶.

The analysis thus confirms earlier conclusions that the Order marked some exceptional form of alliance, offering unconditional support for a specific purpose. Determining whether that support was military in nature, what its purpose was, or in what circumstances it was to be used can only be divined by analyses of the nature of any particular military worth or value of recipients, and of the circumstances requiring military intervention by, or on behalf of, the Duke around the time of the Order's distribution. These are pursued in the following Chapters.

Specific Policy Alliance

This analysis of the motto of the Order insignia confirms the interim conclusions of those of its form, materials and visual design that it marked out a particular, selected group of people Duke Philip had either engaged, or wanted to engage, in some special, unique support relationship which had a more specific purpose, and required a degree of loyalty to the Crown, to him, or to his legitimate successors, over and above that to be expected from any other support networks, which he already had or could conventionally have developed. The choice of the motto '*en loyaute*' does not, however, resolve the questions of for whose benefit Philip created such a specific policy alliance; what the nature of the precise policy was; and whether that policy was to be pursued primarily through military means.

Interim Conclusion

Philip's use of the motto '*en loyaute*' thus confirms the outcomes of earlier analyses in rejecting even more strongly the hypothesis that his Order was purely decorative. While it does not completely rule out the

76. See n.38 above

hypotheses that he intended the Order as some form of courtly or crusading one, it makes it more likely that these might have provided a widely acceptable, public cover for his real purposes. Whether he deliberately designed the Order with this in mind should become clearer in Chapter 6 if the occasion could have warranted such an interpretation by contemporaries.

The analyses thus far confirm that Philip intended the Order to distinguish its recipients from those that benefitted from his material and other gift-giving generally. They further suggest that, while he may have intended it to have some of the characteristics of a livery badge or military alliance, the objectives fell outside the terms of general allegiance or of formal military alliance, or were too controversial or dangerous for the Duke to express unambiguously. This would suggest that Philip used the Order to mark a joint commitment on behalf of its recipients to some policy objective, the achievement of which he could foresee might require a degree of loyalty to some specific purpose which exceeded that he could hope to command from either of these. The following Chapters seek to clarify the nature of that commitment and of the outcome it was designed to achieve.

CHAPTER 5: THE RECIPIENTS OF THE ORDER

If Philip selected from among the general recipients of his material gift-giving and largesse a particular group to receive the Order, then identifying what members of that group had in common, and what distinguished them from the rest, might resolve some of the ambiguities identified in the interim conclusions drawn in preceding Chapters. This Chapter therefore examines the evidence for Philip's deliberate selection of the recipients, and then adopts a limited prosopographical approach, based on Appendices R2-R11, which collate for the Order recipients information relevant to the hypotheses; and on Appendix R1, which provides biographical notes sufficient to identify these men and set the information about them in context¹.

It is necessary first clearly to distinguish the recipients of the Order of the Golden Tree from other recipients of Duke Philip's gifts, particularly *fermaux*, at New Year 1403 (see Annexes 1 and 1a)². This produces a group of sixty men, including the Duke himself³.

Deliberate Selection

It is clear that this group was selected deliberately by Duke Philip to receive the Order. Although the rest of his New Year 1403 gift list is not dissimilar, in terms of the type of gifts and the range of recipients, to those in previous years, the Order recipients double the total number of gifts to named recipients from between forty and fifty to one hundred and six in 1403.

1. The list of Order recipients is derived from the ducal authorisation for New Year 1403 gifts and from household accounts for the period - see note 2 below
2. Historians have generally failed to do this. See Chapter 2, especially nn.3,4,9 and 19. In Annex 1 the underlining of the references to the Order is mine, to distinguish its recipients.
3. See Chapter 2, n.12

Naming these recipients put them on a par with his family, peers and most senior lords and household members who were usually the only ones to be so named in the accounts as, similarly, did giving them a distinctive present, and a highly visible dress accessory, rather than the ubiquitous diamonds he distributed widely to unnamed household and visitors in the later years of his rule⁴.

Philip must have selected those he wished to upgrade in this way. Although he increased the number of gifts to named people in 1403, compared to earlier years, by about the number receiving the Order, he reduced the number of diamonds given to unnamed household at the same time by more than a hundred⁵. Nor were the Order clasps necessarily more expensive than the diamonds he gave, so it was not that Philip wanted to honour or reward the Order recipients by spending more lavishly on them.

As we have seen, the authorisation and household accounts for the 1403 New Year gifts make a point of distinguishing the Order insignia both from other New Year gifts and from other clasps, even within a particular section, by specifying each time that the named recipient is to receive a clasp of the Duke's Order. This is unique in Philip's accounts. Recipients' gifts, and particularly clasps, were usually distinguished, if at all, only by a description of the materials used, or their cost, or occasionally of a simple motif⁶.

The Order was not simply an automatic, or haphazardly awarded, alternative New Year gift. As far as records show, thirty-five out of the sixty Order recipients were

4. See Annex 2

5. See Annexes 1 and 2

6. See Chapter 2, n.3; Annex 1; and Prost, vol.2, item 722, for one with a sheep in 1382, and item 1611 for two with a white *levrier* in 1387.

not regular recipients of New Year gifts from Philip⁷. For some, this is the only reference to them anywhere in the ducal accounts, which suggests a particular reason to include them on this occasion. For others, it was the only occasion on which they received a specified New Year gift from him, although they featured in the accounts for other reasons. Yet others received both the Order and a conventional New Year gift in 1403. There are also family, and royal and ducal household members to whom Philip habitually gave New Year gifts, but who did not receive the Order, whether or not they received a New Year gift in 1403⁸.

There is no evidence that Philip's giving of the Order was simply reciprocal. It was customary for princes to exchange New Year gifts with overlords, family and senior household, but if we look at knights and squires, from amongst whom the Order recipients were selected, we find that although some who had presented gifts to Philip at New Year 1403 received the Order, others did not; and there is no evidence that all recipients of the Order had given him a gift⁹.

Nor can the recipients be explained solely in terms of the Duke's customary courtesy, for example to his hosts, to

7. See Annex 2 and Appendix R3. Comparisons are hindered by Philip giving, in some years, several hundred diamonds to members of the household and visitors, none of whom are named - see ADCO B1538, f.218. Even if some Order recipients received diamonds in other years, the gift of the Order and their naming in the 1403 account would mark them out as particularly favoured in that year.
8. See Annexes 1 and 2
9. See Annexes 1 and 2, and Appendix R2-6. Gifts to the Duke are rarely noted in the accounts, but there are references to gratuities to those who presented gifts on behalf of their masters. Absence of such a reference does not, however, necessarily mean that Philip's gift was not reciprocated.

visitors to his or the King's court, or to participants at festivities. Although his lists of New Year gifts do change slightly from year to year to reflect this, and it might explain the New Year 1403 gifts to a number of Bretons in the Order, who very probably accompanied their Duke on his visit to Paris with Philip at this time, there is no evidence that other Order recipients, who feature only in 1403, had deserved his courtesy in such ways¹⁰.

It is not even clear that the recipients were all in the Duke's presence on New Year's day 1403. Some, like his sons, the Counts of Nevers and Rethel, and the Duke of Brittany, clearly were. Others, like Waleran of Luxembourg, du Four and de Vergy, were almost certainly occupied elsewhere, although there is no record of the Order being sent to them that would confirm this¹¹.

10. See Annex 2. Ambassadors are generally named as such, as are jousting, and there are references in the household accounts to the Duke visiting or being visited by named people.
11. Rethel, Nevers, the Duke of Brittany and his brothers, Richmond and Gilles, were all at Corbueil at New Year -see Petit, E., Itinéraires de Philippe le Hardi et Jean sans Peur, ducs de Bourgogne, 1363-1419, (hereafter Itinéraires), pp.331 and 332. For those otherwise occupied, see Appendix R10. For the significance of the use of the term 'donne', see Chapter 1, n.6. Its use instead of 'envoia' in Annex 1 does not necessarily signify that the Duke presented his gift personally or that the recipient was present. Payment to a messenger to take the Duke's gift to a recipient, implying that the latter was not present, is sometimes recorded, but not always. Conversely, a record of a reciprocal gift being presented to the Duke by a messenger would normally suggest that the giver was not in the Duke's presence, but there are exceptions. The gifts of the Duke of Brittany and of Rethel were presented in 1403, although they were clearly present. In the latter case, this might have been because he left his father before Christmas for the birth of his first child, and may have been unsure whether he would return in time for New Year. This uncertainty may also explain why several

Finally, if we look at the hierarchy of the recipients of the Order, in terms of cost, materials and elaborateness of the insignia they received, the rankings are more clearly defined and distinguished than with any other material gifts the Duke gave. Taking all these factors together, it is reasonable to conclude that Duke Philip did deliberately select people to receive the Order. The next step is to determine why he did so¹².

As suggested at the beginning of this chapter, to do this it is helpful to identify, in the context of the hypotheses advanced, what the selected recipients of the Order had in common and what distinguished them from others Philip favoured with gifts, particularly at New Year 1403.

Distinguishing Characteristics of the Order Recipients

As there were sixty recipients of the Order it is useful, while reviewing their characteristics, to consider whether this represented the total number of people who had the combination of common characteristics Philip needed for the purposes of the Order; or whether it had some significance which led him to select the sixty from a larger group with the same characteristics. Philip was sixty at the time of the Order's inception, but if he intended it to mark his age, one might have expected him to distribute it on his birthday, January 17. The number of members in an Order seems sometimes to have related to its purpose, as particular numbers, or combinations of numbers, were regarded as significant by numerologists at the time. As with visual iconography, however, a wide variety of interpretations were offered for the same figure. Those for sixty, drawn from the usual medieval

11.(cont'd) messengers were paid separately to present New Year gifts to Rethel from the Duke, the Duchess, and Nevers -see Annex 1

12. See Annexes 1, 2 and Appendix R1. In general, the relative cost of a gift reflected broadly the recipient's place in the social hierarchy, but took account also of his closeness to the Duke.

sources of the cosmological science of creation, Biblical exegesis, astrology or the occult, while not appearing to have any immediate or obvious relevance to Philip's Order, may prove to have some to the type or purpose of the group designated by the Order¹³.

Identifying the recipients clearly shows that, contrary to the mistaken interpretation of the texts by other historians, they included no women, although the Duchess, her daughters and daughters-in-law, and other noble ladies did receive gifts from Philip at New Year 1403¹⁴. Nor did the recipients include any religious men, even senior ones like Philip's Chancellor, the Bishop of Arras, who received a regular pension, appropriate clothes, and gifts in 1403¹⁵.

13. See, for instance, the original 24 (twice the number of followers like Christ's disciples and the legendary peers of France) in each of the sections of the Order of the Garter; and the 15 (joys of the Virgin) in the Order of the Collar, dedicated to the Virgin -Boulton, The Knights of the Crown, pp.127 and 261.

Almost every number could be given significance at this period. Both 6 and 10 were particularly noted, both for their numerical form, and for their links with Biblical references, like the 6 days of Creation and the 10 Commandments. Milton was later to use 60 to represent the fulfilment of the Law, as the decalogue multiplied by the perfect number, 6. 10 could also refer to the number of angelic or demonic orders. In the Bible, 60 was the number of animals sacrificed to dedicate an altar or, in the parable of the sower, one of the multiples produced by those who heard the word, understood it and therefore caused it to have some effect and to spread. See Butler, C., Number Symbolism, pp.xi, 2, 8, and 133; Hopper, V.E., La Symbolique Médiévale des Nombres, pp.50 and 77; Chydenius, J., The Theory of Medieval Symbolism, pp. 6, 10 and 14; Cruden's Concordance, p.605; and the Holy Bible, Numbers 7:88 and St. Matthew 13:8, 23).

14. See note 2 above, and Annexes 1 and 2

15. See ADCO B1532 - f.81 for his pension, f. 153v for a *don* as Chancellor, and f.154 for his '*robes de livree*' at All Saints.

All the recipients were therefore laymen. They appear all to have been of noble birth¹⁶. Certainly, the Order included none of the men of lower social position mentioned in the accounts, either from outside Philip's household (such as tradesmen and purveyors of goods), or in it (such as clerks, administrators, and doctors). Even close and trusted associates of the Duke from lower ranks, like the merchant and courtier Dino Rapondi, were not included in the Order, although a number received gifts from Philip at New Year 1403¹⁷.

Being a nobleman alone did not secure inclusion in the Order. The sixty represented less than two per cent of the number of noble families in Philip's territories, and a tiny proportion of those in areas where he exercised some influence, like France and Brittany. Even compared to those who received New Year gifts from the Duke at this period, there were at least another forty-eight named noblemen, over and above the recipients of the Order¹⁸.

16. Of the 60, there are 3 whom I have been unable clearly to identify - Chiney (17), de La Tour (32), and de Triart (51) but from their names the last 2 seem likely to have been of noble birth, and the categories of Order insignia they received were either specified as being for squires, or were given to both knights and high-ranking squires -see Appendices R1 and R2
17. Secretaries like Jean Gand; administrators like the Queen's treasurer; household servants like Antoine Forest, the keeper of the Duke's jewels; and merchants like Michaut de Laillier all received gifts at New Year 1403 but were not in the Order.
18. It is difficult to gain a precise figure for the number of noble families in Philip's territories in 1403. In the Duchy alone, M-T Caron estimates that in the late 14th century there were some 620 noble families, of which 280 were of longstanding lineage -see her La Noblesse dans le Duché de Bourgogne 1315-1477, p.142 and Ch.VIII, Table 1. In the late 15th century, she calculates that there were some 319 squires and 97 knights holding fiefs in the Duchy -Ibid., p.405. In the late 15th century, the lay nobility in the Low Countries was thought to

Nor did the holding of a particular rank within the nobility secure inclusion in the Order. The King of France was not included: Duke Philip, as a son of the King of France, and doyen of the peers of France, was the most senior ranking noble in his Order. Recipients were drawn from across the ranks of the nobility - Dukes, Marquises, Counts, Barons, Lords and those with no known titles - but in no instance were all holders of a particular rank, who received gifts from the Duke, included in the Order¹⁹.

Although Philip therefore seems to have selected men of above a certain rank and social standing for the Order, other, additional factors must have led him to pick only sixty of those with such standing. Men of the same rank generally received gifts of similar value from the Duke but, although he retained this hierarchically related approach to some extent with the Order, by carefully grading the costs of its insignia broadly to match a recipient's rank, there were notable exceptions. One such

18.(cont'd)form about one per cent of the total population of 2½ million. Allowing an average of 5 in a family, this would have meant some 5,000 noble families. This figure, however, included nobles from territories not under Burgundian control in 1403, and excluded those from the Duchy and County of Burgundy, Nevers, and Rethel -see Prevenier, W. and Blockmans, W., The Burgundian Netherlands, Table 4, p.392. Adjusting for this would suggest a total of at least 3,500 noble families in the territories under Philip's control in 1403. The number of nobles in France is just as difficult to estimate accurately. P. Contamine in his La Noblesse au Royaume de France, pp.48-57, suggests that there were between 70,000 noble households in 1300 and 40,000 in the late 15th century in France as a whole, and in Brittany in 1434. there were 3 counts, 9 great lords, 18 bannerets and 4,700 lesser nobles. For nobles not in the Order receiving NY gifts, see Annexes 1 and 2.

19. See Annex 2. For example, the Dukes of Berry and Bourbon were not in the Order; nor the Marquis of Mora; the Counts of Clermont, La Marche and Namur; nor barons like de Labret

was the gift of a jewelled Order insignia worth 225 francs to Pierre de La Tremoille (Appendix R1-37), a squire with a minor lordship, compared to unjewelled insignia worth 50 francs given to other squires of similar rank. This type and value of insignia put Pierre above Jean de Vergy (R1-52), a senior Burgundian lord who was hereditary Seneschal and Marshal of Burgundy and Governor of the County of Burgundy, and almost on a par with the Count of Joigny (R1-29)²⁰. Clearly there were other characteristics, besides his rank or place in the social hierarchy, which led Philip to select a nobleman for the Order.

In so far as their ages in 1403 can be estimated, the recipients were drawn from men who had reached their majority and were therefore legally independent of guardians. Only three - the Duke of Brittany (Appendix R1-57), the younger Philip (R1-59), and possibly Jean de Chalon (R1-12) were minors, but Duke Philip was regent to the first, and father to the second, so could control them and their resources. Apart from these three, a further three were in their sixties, and of the Duke's generation - the Duke himself, Chambly (R1-13), and Rambures (R1-48); and one, Lonroy (R1-40) was allegedly in his eighties (although this seems very unlikely in the light of his recorded later career). The fact that the majority of recipients also appear to have been mature men, of fighting age; that the minors and a number of the men in their late teens and early twenties, like Edward of Bar (R1-2), Anthony, Count of Rethel (R1-60), and George de La Tremoille (R1-33) were relatives or from powerful families with whom he had influence; and that there was not an even spread across different generations suggests that age was not in itself a significant feature in Philip's choice of Order recipient. What mattered was their relationship to him, and what they could contribute in his support²¹.

20. See Appendices R2, and R1-29, 37 and 52

21. Judging, where dates of birth are unknown, from their careers,

One possibility is that receipt of the Order marked out a group with some existing relationship with Philip, on which he would normally rely for support. We have already seen that material gifts, particularly those, like the Order, of a common device, to be worn on clothes, to a number of people on a given occasion, could indicate the existence of various networks of people, linked to Duke Philip in different ways and for different purposes; and that the symbol of a tree would have been appropriate for a network²².

The most usual, and easily recognisable network was that of kinship, whether by blood or marriage. Apart from his three sons (Appendices R1-58, 59, and 60), only four other recipients of the Order were closely related to him (together, about one tenth of the Order) - his nephew, Edward of Bar (R1-2); his brother-in-law, Robert of Flanders (R1-22); St. Pol, the father of his daughter-in-law (R1-50), and the Duke of Brittany (R1-57), the husband of his niece. If, however, we compare this with close male family members to whom he habitually gave gifts, particularly at New Year, it is clear that close kinship, even when combined with elevated rank, did not secure receipt of the Order. Omitted were, for example, his brother, the Duke of Berry; his brother-in-law, the Duke of Bourbon; and his nephews, King Charles VI of France, the King of Sicily, the Duke of Orleans, Pierre of

21. (cont'd) of those not mentioned in the paragraph, Gavre (R1-25) was probably in his 60s; at least 6 were in their 50s - Croy(20), du Four(24), La Rocherousse(31), Pierre de La Tremoille(37), Montagu(42), and Vergy(52); at least 7 were in their 40s - d'Aunay(1), Blondel(5), du Bois(6), Chauffour(16), Pot(47), St. Pol(50) and Vienne(53); some 8 were in their 30s - Basoches(3), Boves(7), Brimeu(9), Courcelles(18), Craon(19), Jaucourt(28), Joigny(29) and Nevers(58); and 4 were in their late teens or twenties - Chantemerle(14) and Guillaume, Guyot and Jean de La Tremoille(33-36)

22. See Chapter 2, nn.24-26, and 63-66; and Chapter 3, nn.50 and 51

Navarre, and the Counts of Namur and Clermont²³.

At least another twelve recipients of the Order were more distantly related to the Duke, but for seven of these - the five de La Tremoilles (R1-33 to 37), Pot (R1-47) and Craon (R1-19) - their selection was probably due as much to their or their fathers' close friendship with, and support of, the Duke and Duchess, as to their degree of kinship. Through these twelve, a further seven might have claimed a very tenuous kinship with the Duke, but this was unlikely to have been the sole cause of their selection, as there were many others with similar degrees of relationship to him whom Philip did not choose²⁴. In one case at least, however, the man selected was the most senior representative of his family from whom Philip could hope to secure support in 1403 (Jean de Chalon, the younger son of the Prince of Orange (R1-12)). Since it seems unlikely that there was no-one from whom Philip could hope to gain support in any of the other families to which he was distantly related; and he had not selected all his close kin, there must have been other common distinguishing features besides kinship underlying his selection of Order recipients.

There is no evidence that the remaining thirty-three recipients of the Order were kin to Philip, so he must have looked beyond this network. Another group of people Duke Philip rewarded with gifts, and upon whom he might have depended for support, was his spiritual kin. Philip, his wife and his eldest son stood godparent most years to at least one child, to whom, or to whose parents, they

23. See Annex 2 and Appendix R1

24. The other distantly related recipients were Chalon (R1-12), Chambly(13), La Rochherousse(31), La Viesville(38), and possibly Vorne (54). The seven tenuously connected were d'Aunoy(1), du Bois(6), Croy(20), Joigny(29), Neufchatel(45), Vergy(52) and Vienne(53).

presented baptismal gifts. These were normally valuable material objects, such as plate, which served as a visible and long-lasting reminder to the godchild and his kin of the potential benefits of ducal patronage, and of the need for continuing support to the Duke to retain such benefits²⁵. Of some forty-eight ducal godchildren in the period 1362-1403, for whom gifts are recorded, twenty-seven were of noble birth (or their fathers were subsequently ennobled), but no more than twenty-three of these were men²⁶. None of these appear, however, to have been in the Order²⁷.

25. The ducal family stood godparent to two or three babies in most years. Their most common gift to a godchild or its parents was a *hanap* or *gobelet*, together with a ewer, which would be displayed on the receiving family's cup board. See Appendix R3.

Particularly favoured spiritual kin might be given jewelry (R3, n. 17). Even non-noble godchildren might receive plate, though worth commensurately less, according to their ranks. Lucot Labouquet, a Dijon bourgeois and fruitier to the Duchess received 37½ francs for plate from her when Nevers stood godfather to his son in 1387 (Prost, vol.2, item 1757). Occasionally only money was given, as to the wife of Josset Munier, the Duke's armourer, when the Duke stood godfather to their son in 1374 (Ibid., vol.1, item 2077). The ducal family's patronage continued after birth, with money for the godchild's education (Ibid., vol.2, item 132 in 1378), and gifts like furs (Ibid., vol.2, item 2685 in 1388)

26. The list of godchildren is drawn from references to baptismal gifts recorded in Prost up to 1390, and in the household accounts for the later period. The rank or household position of the father is usually noted, but not always the sex, and rarely the name of the child. The daughter of Blanchet, a ducal secretary who was later ennobled, was given a baptismal gift in 1370

27. See n.26 above. Among the 27, there were 7 ducal godchildren with the same family name as members of the Order, at least 4 of whom were boys -Haverskerke (Fontaine) baptised in 1376, Courcelles in 1385, Blondel in 1387, and Chantemerle in 1388. (Children of Jean de Vienne, a relative of R1-53, in 1376, of Guillaume 1 de La Tremoille in 1377, and of Guy VI de La

Some Order recipients did have an indirect spiritual relationship with the ducal family. The Duke and Duchess stood godparent to the children of three of the recipients of the Order, and a further twelve, or possibly thirteen, Order recipients were related to godchildren of the Duke, or were godchildren of the Duke's relatives²⁸. Since about half of these spiritual kin recipients were also related by blood or marriage to the Duke, it would appear that spiritual kinship was not a very significant common feature among recipients of the Order²⁹. It may, however, have served to identify a few possible additional supporters for the Order's objectives among important nobles who were not family, such as Jean de Montagu (Appendix R1-42), the powerful *Grand Maître d'Hôtel* of King Charles VI³⁰.

A more significant common characteristic of recipients was membership of the most sizeable network of people Philip rewarded, not only in cash, but also by material gifts, and particularly by distributions of clothes or textiles

27.(cont'd) Tremoille in 1390 also had ducal godparents). With the possible exception of Haverskerke, the dates would make the godsons younger than the Order recipients. Godchildren often, but not always, took the name of the godparent, so it seems unlikely that Anthoine de Haverskerke, Seigneur de Fontaine (R1-23) was a ducal godchild, though he (and the others) may have been closely related to ducal godchildren.

28. The Duke and Duchess stood godparent to the children of du Bois(R1-6), Croy (20) and de Poix(46). In addition to the 5 de La Tremoille recipients(33-37), Pot(47), and the 4 mentioned in n.27 above, Bar(2), Montagu(42) and La Viesville(38) were related to godkin of the Duke or were godchildren of his relatives.

29. Only Blondel(R1-5), Chantemerle(14), Fontaine(23), Montagu(42) and Poix(46) seem to have had no blood or marriage relationship to the ducal family, although that relationship was sometimes tenuous - see n.24 above. It is also possible, given his Christian name, that Jaucourt(28) was a godson of the Duke.

30. See Appendix R1-42, particularly n.2

for them, that is his household and those of his children. Over seventy per cent of the Order recipients (thirty-six out of the fifty-two members of the Order who were not in, or very closely related to, the ducal family) served Duke Philip as household members. It is difficult to establish how many noblemen were, even nominally, members of those households, either over a period, or at a given date, and thus to assess what proportion of them these thirty-six formed³¹. Judging by estimates of the average number of men in the household ranks normally held by nobles, and by the numbers of unnamed household members who received gifts from Philip, particularly at New Year 1403, however, it appears that the Order was given to between one quarter

31. For the 36, see Appendix R2. The Duke's household could be said to include all those who received some form of financial reward in his direct service, whether as secretaries or other administrative officers; as personal servants such as valets de chambre and chamberlains; as day to day organisers, like the maitres d'hôtel; as écuyers, pages, or menials in the permanent services of the court such as the paneterie, écurie, échançonnerie, and cuisine; as huntsmen, falconers, and their staff; as heralds; or as entertainers. It is difficult to assess the numbers in the household at any one date as some titles were purely honorific; many of the officers served for only part of a year, on a rota system; and numbers could vary with the importance of the occasion. Vaughan estimates that Philip's household numbered between 250 and 350 in the mid 1380s -see Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.189-190. Of these, however, only a proportion were noblemen. There are no comprehensive lists of household personnel by rank and function, but references in the accounts suggest that nobles served only as chamberlains, as écuyers in the permanent services, or occasionally as maitres d'hôtel, although the latter could be non-noble. Although in the earlier part of Philip's rule, records of payments in the household accounts identify only 20-30 such postholders, estimates of his grandson, Philip the Good's household in the 1420s suggest that some 40% could have been noble -see Rauzier, Finances, pp.427, 433-4, 442,483-4, and 488-9.

and one third of noblemen in the household³². Their selection could not have been determined solely by some form of distant family or spiritual kinship to Philip, since about a third (thirteen out of the thirty-six) do not appear to have been related to him in these ways³³.

Selection might rather have been determined by the degree of commitment Philip could expect from his household. One would assume that this would vary according to their seniority, and therefore closeness to him, and to the length, frequency and regularity of their service; and that the extent of Philip's gift-giving to them, over and above their terms of service, would reflect that³⁴.

32. The household accounts for New Year 1403 suggest that, at that date, the household numbered at least 200 who were worthy of receiving New year gifts -see Annex 2 (183 unnamed plus at least 15 of those named). Since Philip is unlikely to have given diamonds to any but the most favoured and senior of his non-noble household, some 100-140 could have been noble (i.e. 40% of the 250-350 in n.31). Even if some of these were women, only a minority of noblemen in the household were Order recipients
33. The 13 were Boves(R1-7), Brimeu(9), Bo Calonne(10), Chauffour(16), Courcelles(18), Desquees(21), du Four(24), Grignaux(26), Lonroy(40), Monchy(41), Montigny(44), Rambures(48) and Renforcat(49). De Calonne(11) and Zevemberghe(55), who may have been in Philip's household, were not related to him either.
34. Household members sometimes received life pensions, or more usually annual ones, awarded at the Duke's discretion; wages or salary (*gages*), bed and board for themselves, their horses and servants while at court; and allowances (also termed *gages*) for these when absent ^{from} the court on ducal business. They might also receive distributions of clothes, or materials for them, at regular intervals or on special occasions; and both contractual and occasional *dons*, or money gifts. See Chapter 1, n.3; and Rauzier, Finances, pp.425-500. Although there are for this period no surviving lists of terms and conditions of service for different household ranks or individual agreements setting them out, a reasonable idea of what household members must have

Philip selected from his household, however, both some of the relatively junior and irregular members, like Bo Calonne (Appendix R1-10) and Girart Desquees (R1-21) who had, before 1403, warranted only rarely small sums for additional expenses or as gifts; and others, like Pierre de La Tremoille (R1-37) and Regnier Pot (R1-47) from among senior, regular members of the household, who had been consistently and commensurately rewarded as such. This suggests that Philip concluded that securing these men's support in 1403 was important because of some additional common characteristics they shared, and would require more than their normal levels of reward; or that it was inadvisable for some reason to rely on household membership to support the objectives of the Order³⁵.

As between thirteen and fifteen recipients of the Order did not belong to the networks so far considered, did they belong to some other potential support network into which Philip could tap, such as the household of a powerful relative or ally? Five Order recipients were in the King's household, but this does not appear to have represented an additional network for Philip. Three of the five - d'Aunay (Appendix R1-1), Chambly (R1-13) and Pierre de La Tremoille (R1-37) - were also in Philip's household; a fourth, Jean de Montagu (R1-42), was spiritually related to Philip; and the last, the Count of Joigny (R1-29), was distantly related, through other

34.(cont'd) expected or been promised can be gleaned from the ducal household accounts and from the authorisations they presented for payment - see Appendices R4, R5, and R6. Rewards were normally related to the recipients' rank and seniority. Significant variations from this norm would indicate that the Duke had been exceptionally pleased by the recipient's service and commitment, or saw the need to reinforce it. See Chapter 1, nn.7 and 12

35. See Appendices R3, R4 and R5. Pot was, in effect, part of the de La Tremoille family, favourites of the Duke and Duchess (see Appendices R1-33 to 37). Bo Calonne and Desquees were both *écuyer de l'écurie* to Philip

Order members, to Philip, and had been brought up by one of Philip's strong supporters.

One sixth of the Order recipients, including Duke John V, Philip's ward, were Breton. Of the nine in addition to Duke John, two were members of Philip's household, but five were members of the household of either Duke John or his mother - networks into which Philip had already tapped by gift-giving when visiting Brittany in 1402³⁶. As Philip had just become regent of Brittany, and had brought the young Duke and some of his household back to the Burgundian court, it could be that he regarded these households as, in effect, an extension of his own, and applied similar criteria in selecting members of it for the Order³⁷. The two remaining Bretons, Bellière (R1-4) and La Muce (R1-30) did serve the de Montfort Dukes of Brittany, but as I can find no evidence that they were in a ducal household around 1403, they must have shared some other characteristic that made them important to securing Philip's objectives.

I can find no evidence that the remaining nine recipients of the Order were in the household of any other of the close relatives or allies to whom Philip might have looked for support, or in whose territories he was forging

36. The Bretons were Belliere(R1-4), Raymonnet(8), Chateaugiron(15), Gavre(25), Grignaux(26), La Muce(30), La Rocherousse(31), Le Voyer(39), Montauban, and Duke John(57). (26) and (31) were in Philip's household; (8), (15), (25), (39) and (43) were in those of the Duke or Duchess of Brittany.

37. Only de Gavre(R1-25), and through him, very distantly, Montauban(43) were related both to the Breton Duke and to Philip. There is no clear evidence that they or the other 3 in n.36 above (except possibly Chateaugiron -see Appendix R10, n.11), accompanied Duke John and Philip back to Burgundy in 1402-3, but some senior Breton lords would probably have remained in Brittany to help secure Philip's position there.

links³⁸. Since at least twenty-five, and possibly thirty-three members of the Order were related to others in the Order besides the Duke and his family, it is possible that some of these nine, like La Muce (R1-30), were included because of such a relationship. It suggests also that some, like Chiney (Appendix R1-17), whom I have been unable to identify, might have been related to an Order member. These links between Order members may, however, have been purely incidental, since noble families were often closely interrelated.

It may be that the nine were in a looser, potential support network of people to whom the Duke occasionally gave gifts, or who formed part of his entourage on certain occasions, which might be termed his court³⁹. One way to

38. For instance Brabant, to which Philip was manoeuvring his son, Rethel's, succession; Savoy, where he was in effect regent for the Count, his son-in-law; or even the courts of his other married children in Bavaria and Austria. Zevemberghe(R1-55) could possibly have been at the Bavarian or Brabantine court, in view of his family history.
39. In addition to de Calonne(R1-11) and Zevemberghe(55), for whom there is no clear evidence of membership of Philip's household, those whose relationship with Philip is so far uncertain are Basoches(3), Belliere(4), Chiney(17), Hangest(27), La Muce(30), La Tour(32), and Triart(51). There is no agreement as to the definition of court, or the distinction between court and household -see Vale, M., The Princely Court, pp.15-16. I have used household to mean those who held a named household position, for which they were formally recompensed; and court to include not only the household, but relations and clients of members of the household, ambassadors and other visitors. Courtiers might present gifts to and receive them from Philip. It is impossible to tell from the accounts whether any Order recipients fell into this group, but it seems unlikely that they were ambassadors or significant visitors, as these were often identified as such in the accounts (see Annex 2).

check this is to look at those who wore Philip's livery on particular occasions, since the wearing of his livery implied some relationship with him, and with other livery wearers, in a network.

As explained in Chapter 1, I use the term 'livery' here in the modern sense of a widespread distribution on a given occasion, across different ranks, of clothes in the same colours, particularly the giver's colours, or with the same device, or of a badge related iconographically to the giver (rather than in the contemporary Burgundian sense of any distribution of clothes or textiles to an individual)⁴⁰. The fact that some Order recipients had received such a general distribution thus does no more than confirm that they were members of the ducal household or were ducal officers, and might provide a clue as to their rank, if unknown⁴¹.

As we have seen, livery in the narrower sense was rarely provided at Philip's court, and seems to have been reserved for special occasions, when the Duke wished to make a significant visual statement about the extent of his power and authority by dressing all those accompanying him in the same colours, whatever their rank (although the hierarchical distinctions were preserved by providing the same colours in richer, more expensive textiles for the higher ranks). Philip would therefore have included in such a livery distribution people who, if not part of one of the networks described above, he wished to have perceived publicly as within his sphere of influence and, actually or potentially, within a broader network, on which he could call for support, if the need arose.

The two clearest instances of Duke Philip providing a livery in the modern sense are for those accompanying him as part of King Charles VI's train in 1396, when Charles'

40. See Chapter 1, especially n.59

41. See, for instance, Appendix R4, nn. 18, 41, 48 and 57

daughter Isabelle married Richard II of England; and for the wedding of his son Anthony in 1402 to the daughter of Waleran of Luxembourg (see Appendix R8). A comparison of recipients of these liveries and of the Order confirms that Philip selected the latter from a wider group of noblemen on whose support he might have been able to draw. (Of one hundred recipients of the 1396 livery, for instance, only a possible four out of the thirty-six with titles, and a possible twelve out of the further twenty-five who were probably of noble birth, were in the Order)⁴². The comparison might also suggest that Girart de Calonne (Appendix R1-11) (one of the eight to ten members of the Order, for whom a certain relationship to Philip has not so far been identified) could have been the Jean Calonne who wore the Duke's livery in 1402, or a more senior member of that man's family. It also lends weight to the possibility that another reason for including Baron Herve de Châteaugiron (R1-15), besides his possible membership of the household of the Duchess of Brittany, was that he was a more senior representative of a powerful Breton family than Thibaut de Châteaugiron, a squire in Philip's household given the 1402 livery. If so, this might suggest that Philip gave the Order to relations of those in his normal networks, where they had something more to offer in support of its objectives. This, in turn, might explain the inclusion of Jean de Hangest (R1-

42. ADCO B341 lists some 100 men, including 36 with titles, of whom 2 - *Messire Jehan de Vergy* and *Messire Edouart de Bar* were in the Order, and a further 2 - *Monsgnr. de Rambure* and *Monsgnr. de Saint George* probably were. Of some 25 who were probably of noble birth and possibly squires, 3 were certainly in the Order - *Pierre de La Tremoille*, *Sauvage des Boves*, and *Rocherousse*, and a further 9 - *Philipot de Jeucourt*, *Courcelles*, *le bastart de Flandres*, *Chantemelle*, *Raillart*, *Blondel*, *Anthoine de Font'*, *Fouquet*, and *Jehan du Boys* possibly were. In addition there were some 14 men noted only by a Christian or nickname, 2 *Bailllis*, and another 27 or so, who included goldsmiths, merchants, clerks, treasurers and others who worked for Philip, none of whom were in the Order.

27), whose relationship to Philip is as yet unidentified, but who was one of a number of nobles in this family who had served Philip, and the most senior of those whose loyalty in 1403 was not committed elsewhere. These factors do not, however, explain the inclusion of the remaining six to eight members of the Order.

Further comparison between the list of those given livery in 1402, less than a year before the Order was distributed and, like the Order, comprising only knights and squires, unsurprisingly shows a marked correlation (see Appendix R8). The differences between the two lists suggest, however, that Philip gave a livery only to those members of his household or of a wider entourage who were present on, or involved in, a particular occasion⁴³. There is also evidence that the colours of the clothes, and the nature of the devices Philip distributed on important occasions were related not, as one might have expected, to him, but to the occasion⁴⁴. The records for the only other occasion on which a device, in part resembling the Order, was used by Philip do not provide detail about those who wore it, but do suggest that they were all part of the Duke's party on that occasion⁴⁵. The remaining

43. See ADCO B301, P.S.390. Of those in the Order, but not receiving the 1402 livery, a significant proportion were Bretons, who had no involvement in Anthony's wedding and Philip's related policies. Others who were similarly not directly involved in 1402, and probably did not attend the wedding, and therefore did not receive the livery, were Montagu(R1-42), not a member of Philip's household; du Four(24), who was normally preoccupied with his duties in the County of Burgundy; and men like d'Aunay(1) and Chambly(13) who might have been preoccupied with their duties as chamberlains to the King, and not have left Paris

44. The green and white of the livery worn at Anthony's wedding in 1402 were not Burgundian colours, and seem to have been related more to concepts of youth and spring, and therefore, possibly, love and marriage. For the crescents, see Chapter 3, nn.32 and 80

45. See Chapter 3, nn.23 and 24 for Philip's use of the Golden Tree

six to eight members of the Order may therefore have been part of the Duke's entourage only for the occasion of the giving of the Order. What that occasion was, and thus the reason for their inclusion, is examined in the next Chapter.

Some explanation of their inclusion might, however, be arrived at by identifying some other common characteristics, besides membership of one of the Duke's support networks, which these noblemen shared with the others in the Order, and which might also serve to explain the selection of those others from among the noblemen more generally in these networks. Little is known about three of these - Chiney (R1-17), La Tour (R1-32), and Triart (R1-51) - except that, like all members of the Order, they were knights or squires. ^{Three} of the others - Basoches (R1-3), Bellière (R1-4) and La Muce (R1-30), and at least forty-five of the other fifty-four knights and squires Philip selected for the Order had significant military worth, as leaders of sizeable military forces; as holders of important military posts; or as experienced and effective fighters, serving Duke Philip, his sons, Duke John V of Brittany's father, or the French Crown on numerous campaigns (see Appendix R11). Vorne (R1-54) may also have formed part of this group, as he was a pensioner of the Duke's in a strategically sensitive area. This is not to say that noblemen in Duke Philip's household who received diamonds rather than the Order at New Year 1403 were of no military worth, but if Philip had need of troops to assist him, they would have formed a household company under the leadership of one of the senior household knights who was in the Order⁴⁶.

46. See Annex 2 and Appendix R1-9; n.32 above; and P., vol.26, p.305 (ADCO B11788) for a muster of household troops for Duke John the Fearless in 1417. The fact that some of those receiving the 1402 livery, but not the Order, were not military men reinforces the hypothesis that military worth was a characteristic of those selected for the Order. The remaining recipient, Zevemberghe

Philip did not, however, select for the Order all the forty-seven leaders of French military society, as defined by Henneman, who were active in 1403, or even the twenty-one of them who were not beholden or committed to his rival, the Duke of Orleans. Only two of these leaders were in the Order -Waleran of Luxembourg (Appendix R1-50) and Guy XII de Laval, Sire de Gavre (R1-25). A further dozen in the Order may, however, have been chosen because they were related either to leaders who were no longer in active service, or to those who were committed to Orleans⁴⁷.

If Philip was not selecting for the Order all the leaders of French military society who might have supported him, perhaps he was looking for men who could offer forms of military support or experience particularly relevant to its objectives. If that objective was to launch a crusade, only eight of the Order recipients, apart from

46.(cont'd)(55), may have been from a relative's household, or have controlled significant forces (see n.38 above)

47. See Henneman, J.B., Olivier de Clisson and Political Society in France under Charles V and Charles VI, (hereafter Clisson) App.1, pp.211-221 and nn. His list represents leading French commanders over the period 1360-1415, excluding foreigners and royal princes, based on the military office they held (including bailiff or seneschal in a militarily sensitive district) or the number of years they served, and who had at least 5 others serving under them. He classes as Orleanist those who supported or received payments from Orleans, or whose family did, in the period 1389-1407. Rambures(R1-48) either was, or was related to, the commander listed; the 5 La Tremoille (33-37) and Pot(47) were related to commanders Guy and Guillaume de La Tremoille, both of whom were dead by 1403, and by marriage to Charles d'Albret, considered to be Orleanist; Chantemerle(14), Montauban(43), Vienne((53), and probably one or both of the Calonne (10 and 11), were related to commanders of the same names who were either dead or no longer active by 1403; and Hangest(27) was related to two commanders of the same name, one inactive and one Orleanist.

the Duke and his son, had definitely been involved in a crusade, and of these, only two might be termed crusading veterans, with experience of crusades in different locations⁴⁸. Even if relatives of men with crusading experience are included, the number linked with crusading rises only to twenty-five - less than half the Order recipients, and no higher a proportion than would be normal among men of their age, rank and military experience in Burgundy at that period⁴⁹. If the purpose of the Order was rather to commemorate Nicopolis, one would expect to find included those Burgundians who had been connected to that campaign, or if dead their families, but only eighteen recipients fell into this category, out of some seventy named noblemen who, by the Duke's order, accompanied John to Nicopolis⁵⁰.

If he was not looking for a particular form of military experience, such as crusading, perhaps Philip was looking beyond potential supporters among the leaders of French

48. See Appendix R7. There is clear evidence of involvement in crusade - mainly that to Nicopolis- by recipients, rather than their relatives, only in the cases of R1-4,5,34,37,47,50,52 and 53. Pierre de La Tremoille(37) and Pot(47) might be regarded as veterans.

49. See Appendix R7. Magee, 'Le temps de la croisade bourguignonne' in Nicopolis 1396-1996, pp.50-52, gives examples of Burgundians financed by Philip to go on crusade in Prussia. It seems to have been common for younger sons of noble families to gain military experience in this way, particularly during truces in the Hundred Years' War.

50. See, for instance, Atiya, A.S., The Crusade of Nicopolis, (hereafter Atiya) pp.43-4 for the German contingents; and his Appendix VI, pp.144-8, and Schnerb, B., 'Nicopolis', pp.72-4, for the French and Burgundians; and my Appendix R7. Those from the Duke's territories or court, who fought at Nicopolis, but whose families were not in the Order, include de Cadzand, de Chartres, de Chaseron and particularly de Courtiambles, who was still at Philip's court in 1403.

military society to those with important military responsibilities, whose oaths of office would have created a specific obligation of military support to him, over and above any general duty of military service arising from tenure of lands in his territories or general household duties. Around 1402-3, at least seven of the Order recipients were *écuyer de l'écurie* to Philip, a post with particular military duties and responsibilities in the household, and for which they might have taken a special oath⁵¹. Since many in his household served for only part of a calendar year, on a rota basis, the Duke might have decided to give the Order, as a visible reminder of this obligation, to those who were not actively on duty on January 1 1403, or who might not be when he needed them, particularly if he envisaged calling on them more than once over a period of time⁵².

Looking at posts with wider military responsibilities to Philip, it is noticeable that the Constable of France, the main military councillor of the King and the chief of his army in his absence, was not included in the Order, despite the importance of his role at this period, particularly during King Charles VI's periods of

51. See Appendix R2. Olivier de la Marche, in his description in about 1473, allegedly based on those of the previous 100 years, of the household of Duke Philip's grandson, Duke Philip the Good, says '*l'esculier d'escuyrie doit avoir trois proprietes...puissant de corps, saige, mixte, vaillant et hardy... Vaillant et hardy parceque en armes il doit avoir l'estandart du prince en gouvernement, qui est enseigne qui toujours est portee et veue, et que chascun suit, et ou chascun tient regle et ou chascun se rallye....Mixte (juste) parceque ...il se mesle de toutes les pompes at les parures qui se font pour le prince, d'armer et attinter (parer)...soit pour la guerre, pour le tournoye ou pour la joute'* -see Beaune, H. and Arbaumont, J.d', Mémoires d'Olivier de la Marche, vol.IV, pp.59-61). The 7 were R1-9, 10, 11, 16, 21, 22 and 44. 7 and 18 may also have served in this capacity.

52. See Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.188-90

incapacity. During such periods, the Constable's oath to the King would have bound him not only to Philip but to the rest of the Council. The fact that Philip did not try to engage him in a more direct relationship may have been due to the Constableness being in flux; but could also suggest either that Philip's objectives were more to do with his own interests than with those of France as a whole; or that he judged the Constable unlikely or unable to support them⁵³.

The Marshal of Burgundy, Jean de Vergy (Appendix R1-52) would have taken a formal oath of office to Philip, over and above his nominal obligations as hereditary seneschal of Burgundy, for the military administration of the Duke's demesne⁵⁴. At this period, his post as Marshal, no longer hereditary but selected by the Duke from among the most powerful local families to be his personal lieutenant and foremost military leader, was becoming recognised as a

53. The post of Constable of France was, in January 1403, in transition. Louis de Sancerre, Constable since 1397, and neutral between Burgundy and Orleans, but a personal friend of Clisson, died in February 1403. He was succeeded, apparently after some dispute among the Council, by Charles d'Albret, son of Marguerite de Bourbon, sister of King Charles V's wife Jeanne, and thus a first cousin of Charles VI. D'Albret had married Marie de Sully, the widow of Guy V de La Tremoille (see Appendices R1-33 to 37) in January 1400 -see Anselme de Sainte-Marie, le père, Histoire généalogique et chronologique de la maison royale de France, (hereafter P.A.) vol.VI, pp.204-5. Henneman put Charles d'Albret in the Orleanist camp, his son Charles later marrying Anne, daughter of Bernard VII d'Armagnac and Bonne of Berry, although Philip had apparently considered it worthwhile cultivating him, along with Jean de Montagu, in the summer of 1402, when he was trying to prevent Clisson becoming regent of Brittany -Henneman, Clisson, pp.184, 195, 213 and 269, n. 52; and P.A., vol.VI, p.205

54. See Appendix R1-52. Office holders, particularly the Marshal, were required to take a formal oath to the Duke on appointment - see Schnerb, B., L'Honneur de la Maréchaussée, pp.68-95

prestigious and powerful one, and the principal ducal military officer. He had a highly visible role at public ceremonies and feasts as the representative of the Duke's military power and, more importantly, was crucial to any ducal military activity, offensive or defensive, having responsibility for ensuring that the Duke's feoffees met their military responsibilities; for raising, mustering and reviewing the Duke's troops; for securing that they were adequately armed, mounted, and provisioned; for obtaining equipment for them and overseeing discipline among them; and for deploying them effectively. He was also responsible for inspecting fortresses and appointing their captains. He could deputise for the Duke in receiving homage, and conducting diplomatic missions, and even act as Governor in his absence⁵⁵.

The Marshal already had a visible badge of his military office and of his general loyalty to the Duke in the form of his baton, presented to him when he took his oath of office⁵⁶. The presentation to him of the Order could suggest that the Duke needed to secure the adherence of his Marshal, his foremost military support, to particular objectives, beyond or contrary to those to which his oath bound him.

In addition to being Marshal of Burgundy, Jean de Vergy was Governor of the County of Burgundy and, like other Governors of Philip's territories, would have had formal obligations in respect of the military organisation of those areas, particularly in Philip's absence. The oath of the other serving Governor at this period, Guillaume de Champlenis of Nevers, was apparently sufficient, since he was not included in the Order (although the son of the previous one, Philippe de Jaucourt, was)⁵⁷. This suggests

55. Ibid., pp.100-153

56. Ibid., p.95

57. There was no Governor in the Duchy, or in Flanders and Artois at this period. Jean de Vergy was Governor of the County of

that it was either the combination of militarily important posts that made Jean de Vergy's inclusion in the Order essential; or perhaps that the geographical location of the military position held was also a factor in Philip's selection for the Order. There might, for instance, have been a greater need for military security in the fractious, border County of Burgundy, and in the isolated Champagne lands (of which Jean de Courcelles (R1-18) was Governor in 1399) than in Philip's other territories.

Baillis like Erart du Four (Appendix R1-24) had a wide range of functions, including responsibility for assembling and conducting the troops raised in their area. The fact that du Four, the only serving *Bailli* selected for the Order, held the post in Amont, crucial in governing and controlling the County of Burgundy, again suggests that Philip was particularly concerned about the military security of that County⁵⁸. This might also explain why he selected for the Order a number of Captains, charged with supporting the *Bailli* in military matters, and overseeing the defence of fortified towns, important for the defence and control of the surrounding area, and of Castellans of similarly important towns. Du Four was, for instance, also Castellan of Gray in the County, and Chauffour (R1-16) was Captain of Vesoul, the capital of du Four's *bailliage*.

Of the eight serving Captains and Castellans in the Order (and a further seventeen who had held or were to hold such posts), those from outside Philip's territories in 1403 (see Appendix R11) held positions in Brittany; on his

57.(cont'd) Burgundy. The role of the Governor, Jean d'Immersele, in Limburg after 1396, when Philip took over, is less clear. See Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.100, 114-5 and 126-7

58. By 1403, the Duchy of Burgundy was divided into 6 bailiwicks; the County into 2; Nevers, Rethel and Donzy each formed a single one; Flanders was divided into 16 (called castellanies); and Artois into 12 -see Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp. 122-3, and 136

borders; or in areas important for reaching or controlling Paris - particularly La Bellière (4) and Montauban (43) at Dinan; Chantemerle (14) at Gisors^{in the Vexin} on the Normandy and Ile de borders; Poix (46) at Pont-Audemer, Normandy, at the mouth of the Seine; d'Aunay (1) at Meaux on the Marne, just east of Paris; Chambly(13) at Viviers-en-Brie on the Champagne border, en route to Paris; Montagu (42) at the Bastille in Paris; and Craon (19) soon to be Captain of St. Quentin, on the borders of Picardy and Champagne⁵⁹.

It would seem that, in the case of these officers, Philip judged their oath of office, even when taken directly to him, insufficient to guarantee their support for the objectives of the Order. While it might be tempting to assume that this was for a simple reason, such as Philip's not infrequent failure to pay the annual pension, daily gages or expenses associated with such posts on time, in full, or at all, he usually kept people in play on such occasions by a liberal use of exceptional gifts or marks of favour, but never by identical material gifts to so many, or by anything resembling a badge⁶⁰. As with the Marshal, the gift of the Order in this form suggests that its objectives were beyond, or contrary to, those to which their oaths of military office bound them, or that Philip was attempting to counter an unusually serious military threat to his power bases, particularly those on the borders of, or between, his territories.

For the thirty militarily significant men in the Order not obligated in 1403 to Philip by an oath of office, one

59. Some Captains and Castellans in the Order from areas outside Philip's territories, like d'Aunay (R1-1), de Chambly (13) and de Chantemerle (14) were also royal servants, and may have been selected for that as well as for the positioning of their posts

60. See, for example, Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.235-6; Schnerb, L'Honneur de la Maréchaussée, pp.176-178 and 191--2; and Appendix R6, particularly n.70

might be even more inclined to expect them to have been party to some form of military contract or alliance. There is, however, relatively little written evidence of Philip developing this sort of contract in his territories, or of securing military support by means of a contract or alliance with people outside his territories or in ones he had newly acquired, and none of it relates to members of the Order⁶¹. Such contracts as do exist for Order recipients are for their retention as ducal chamberlains and councillors, giving the terms of remuneration they could expect, but make no reference to military duties⁶².

If these thirty had no specific military obligation to Philip in 1403, was there something about their position which led Philip to select them from among the many militarily experienced men in or near his territories? To maintain his power, he needed the support of the main families in his territories, who helped raise armed companies for his campaigns and who shared with him lucrative sources of revenue, like the saltpans at Salins. This would explain the inclusion in the thirty of Chalon (Appendix R1-12), Croy (R1-20), Joigny (1-29), and the de La Tremoilles (R1-33 to 37)⁶³. Some of the thirty came from territories that both traditionally furnished fighting men, and were on Philip's borders or were otherwise strategically sensitive, like six of the twelve recipients known to have lands in Artois and Picardy; two of the ten known to be from Brittany; and two of the nine recipients with lands in the County of Burgundy⁶⁴.

61. See Lewis, Later Medieval France, pp. 200-1

62. See ADCO B1438, f.22 for Guy and Guillaume de La Tremoille's recompense as chamberlains in 1373

63. For main families, see Appendices R1-12, 29, 33-7 and 52; for leaders of companies, R1-9, 20 and 52; and for families taking revenues from the Saltpans, R1-12

64. For those controlling important border territories, see in particular Appendices R1-2, 28 and 52. For those of the 30 in

Another was one of the five Order recipients from Philip's isolated Champagne lands, and at least one was from Luxembourg, which Orleans had just secured⁶⁵. Only one of the thirty - du Bois (R1-6) - appears to have held lands only in the Burgundian heartlands of Flanders and the Duchy, out of five recipients in total known to have some lands in Flanders and eight in the Duchy⁶⁶.

All this suggests that, in selecting for the Order, Philip was concerned to include not only those influential military men from his networks whom he needed for their general military experience, the posts they held, and the numbers of men they could be relied upon to muster, but those from territories he controlled which were strategically vulnerable to attack from any wishing to undermine his power. The County of Burgundy, for instance, provided a buffer against potentially hostile states like the Empire, Milan, Savoy or Lorraine. Brittany was important in both the Anglo-French and Burgundian-Armagnac conflicts. The inclusion of Edward of Bar, heir to a territory on Philip's borders (see Appendix R1-2), of Vorne (R1-54) in Luxembourg, and the number of recipients from Normandy, Picardy and the Ile-de-France suggests that he could have been concerned to protect his borders against other French princes; to deny them power

64. (cont'd) Artois and Picardy, see R1-20, 27, 38, 40, 41 and 48 (the others in the Order were 5, 9, 11, 23, 46 and 50); for those of the 30 in Brittany, 1-19 and 31 (the others were 4, 8, 15, 25, 26, 30, 39 and 43); and for those in the 30 from the County of Burgundy, 1-45 and 47 (the others were 12, 24, and 33-7)

65. For the one of the 30 in Champagne, see Appendix R1-1 (the others were 16, 18, 28 and 44); and for Luxembourg, R1-54 (and possibly 17)

66. For those with lands in Flanders, see Appendices R1-2, 6, 22, 40 and 49; and for those in the Duchy, R1-29, 33-7, 52 and 53. For some recipients, land holdings are unknown; for others, the record may be incomplete; and others held lands in different parts of Philip's territories or outside them.

in neutral areas or ones he was seeking to control; to secure the routes between his northern and southern territories; or to secure his routes to Paris, the fount of his financial power and of his influence over the King of France⁶⁷. The following Chapter on 'Occasions' should help to identify whether any of these considerations were of particular concern to Philip in the period around 1403.

No characteristic, or combination of characteristics, considered thus far entirely explains why Philip selected only the Order recipients from among those in his networks of similar rank, military experience and territorial position, whose support he needed. We have already noted that, in some instances, he had selected the most senior member of an important family whose loyalty was not committed elsewhere⁶⁸. This, and the fact that he chose loyalty as the motto of the Order would suggest that, not only did he particularly need recipients' loyalty, but that for some reason, he could not be sure of it, either generally or for the objectives of the Order. If so, one might expect to find included those whose loyalty was beyond question or who had shown an exceptional degree of loyalty to him and to his house, which it was important for him to mark and retain; those whose loyalty was questionable or divided and needed to be secured; or those whose characteristics were so important it was worth

67. See Appendix R1. For example, Joigny (29) on the Yonne is a gateway to the Duchy on the northwest; and Champlitte (Vergy, 52) is on its northern borders with Champagne. See also d'Aunay (1) with territories in the Ile de France, Paris and particularly Senlis, a stronghold northeast of Paris on Philip's route to his northern capital, Lille; Boves (7) on the Norman borders of the Ile de France; Chambly (13) at Beauvais, northwest of Paris; Chateaugiron (15) on the ^{Mayenne/Anjou} /Breton border; Craon (19) on the Brittany/Anjou borders; Pot (47) between the western borders of Burgundy and Poitiers; and Rambures (48) on the borders of Picardy and Normandy

68. See Chalon and Hangest, Appendices R1-12 and 27

trying to wean them from other loyalties⁶⁹.

Although there is evidence that at least half those in the Order had remained loyal to Philip, only five of those in his household had exhibited a degree of loyalty sufficient to be remarked upon expressly in Philip's records⁷⁰. A further five, outside his immediate family, but from important families, were referred to in terms usually reserved for a trusted associate or relative, or at least someone Philip hoped would prove so⁷¹. For these people, the Order may have been a visible expression of Philip's gratitude for their past loyalty and a tangible incentive to continue in his camp, whatever his future objectives.

There were a few men in the Order whose loyalty, or that of their immediate family, to Philip had been or was in serious doubt. These included Chalon (Appendix R1-12) and

69. See Appendix R9, and Chapter 4, especially n.10

70. See Appendix R9 for references in, for instance, citations for gifts or pensions, to loyalty or loyal services, for du Bois, a chamberlain (6), Courcelles, an écuyer pannetier (18), Pierre de La Tremoille, a chamberlain (37), Montigny, an écuyer de l'écurie (44) and Pot, a chamberlain (47) Although these references take a standard form, '*longs et loials services*' and '*services fait longuement et loyalment*', they are not common. The normal citation refers simply to '*bons services*'.

71. See Appendix R9 and n.70 above. The more ubiquitous '*ame et feal*' usually referred to a relative or close associate, like Brimeu, an écuyer de l'écurie who was close to the ducal family (Appendix R1-9), La Rocherousse, a chamberlain, squire of the King's body and possibly distantly related to the ducal family (31), Monchy, a chamberlain (41), Neufchatel, a chamberlain from an important family related to the Capetian Dukes of Burgundy (45), and Vergy, chamberlain, Marshal, Governor of the County of Burgundy and from a similarly important family related to the Capetian Dukes (52). (Pot, a very close and trusted supporter (47) warranted this epithet as well).

Neufchatel (R1-45). It would appear from the small number, however, that Philip took the opportunity of the Order to make a gesture to these families, or to attract the unattached, rather than designing it specifically to secure loyalty from dissidents or declared enemies. There is no evidence that any of the members of the Order had at this stage shown clear signs of defecting to Orleans, although Vorne (R1-54) might have been under pressure to do so. Nor is there any evidence of Philip using the Order to try to 'turn' known Orleanists.

A number of recipients could well have had divided loyalties. His close kin were, for instance, at least as closely related to Philip's nephews, the French King and the Duke of Orleans. This might suggest that those kin who were omitted from the Order were not prepared to commit themselves to Philip or his objectives, and that he selected only those that he could rely upon for support. He may have considered it worthwhile, for instance, including Edward of Bar because he had treated him on a par with his own sons, and might therefore have expected the same degree of commitment from him⁷².

Spiritual kinship also could not necessarily be relied upon because it linked families with conflicting loyalties and individuals might therefore not give unequivocal support, particularly to any new or specific objective which had not existed at the time a godparent's patronage had been sought or offered⁷³. The Order might have been

72. At this period, kin like the Dukes of Berry and Bourbon tried to mediate between Philip and the Duke of Orleans, but Edward of Bar was in the Burgundian camp -see Appendix R1-2

73. Edward of Bar was Philip's nephew and a cousin of Orleans, but was also the surviving brother of Philip of Bar, godfather to Duke Philip's youngest son see Appendix R1-2 and Prost, vol.2, item 3312. John of Berry was godfather to Duke Philip's son John, as well as his uncle -Ibid., vol.1, item 1371. Guillaume d'Orgemont, at the time Philip's *échanson*, to whose son both

designed to ensure such support.

The fact that some recipients apparently received two insignia might also suggest that Philip felt a particular need to secure or mark their loyalty, despite his close relationships with them. A closer look at these men reveals that while, in at least two instances, the second insignia was considerably more expensive than the first, this increase was occasioned more by a change in the status of the recipient than by a fear of disloyalty. It is inconceivable, for instance, that the loyalty of Pierre de La Tremoille (Appendix R1-37), a long-standing, close and trusted friend, relative and servant of the Duke, was in question. It may be that his first insignia, appropriate for his rank of squire, did not adequately reflect this closeness, or that the marriage the Duke had recently arranged for him improved his social standing. François de Grignaux (R1-26), though not as longstanding a servant, may similarly have warranted a richer insignia because of his recently arranged marriage, and possibly also because he had become a knight. The need to secure Breton loyalties may also have played a part with him. (The reasons for the presentation of second, less valuable, insignia to Philip's nephew, the Duke of Brittany, and to his second son Rethel, are less clear. It is possible that, as they appear together towards the end of the main list of insignia in the section on New Year gifts, rather than (as in the cases of R1-37 and R1-26) as additional annotations later in the same account or in a later account, it was a clerical error, or that the cheaper was intended for the Duke of Brittany's

73.(cont'd)Philip and the Duke of Bourbon stood godfather in 1388, had a brother who was chancellor to the Duke of Orleans -Ibid., vol.2, items 2539 and 2664 and p.304, note 4. Bureau de la Rivière, whose wife stood godmother to Philip's son Charles in 1373 (although he died in 1374), and to whose son Philip stood godfather in 1381, was later a Marmouset and consequently at odds with Philip -Ibid., vols. 1, item 1385, and 2, item 565

younger brother (see Annexes 1 and 1a)).

It would appear that Philip might have used the Order in part as a form of damage limitation. As we have seen, he selected members of powerful families, some of whose relatives were Orleanists, as in the case of Jean de Vitteaux (Appendix R1-12); or men like Jean de Montagu (R1-42), who had either not declared their hands or were trying to mediate between the factions. Montagu, like Galois d'Aunay (R1-1), de Chambly (R1-13) and de Chantemerle (R1-14), also had influence over the King and were related to powerful men in the French Court and Parlement. Such men would have been helpful in the constant jostling with Orleans for access to royal revenues and power.

The common characteristics revealed by the above review of the sixty noblemen Philip so clearly selected especially to receive the Order permit a further refinement of the hypotheses advanced for his purpose in giving it.

Decorative

The review reinforces the interim conclusions of earlier Chapters in ruling out the idea that the Order was purely decorative. Receipt of one of the variety of simple motifs on *fermaux* which Philip habitually gave out in any given year, or on any particular occasion, might have been the result of a random selection by the Duke from what was fashionable, readily available, or even appropriate to recipients' interests or tastes: selective receipt of one of a large set of insignia with the same complex design and motto, ordered in advance, must have been more than just a matter of pleasing decoration⁷⁴.

74. See Annex 1. Only 5 of the 84 went to women, leaving 20 given to men in addition to the Order. Of these, some went to men not of a suitable rank for the Order, like the keeper of Philip's jewels, Forest; some to relatives who might not have supported Philip against Orleans, like Bourbon's son, Count of Clermont,

Courtly Chivalric Order

Although the majority of identified Order recipients might have been regarded broadly as courtiers, their characteristics strongly confirm that the Order was not intended purely as a courtly one. Order recipients did not include the high-ranking ladies, administrators, bourgeois or clerics involved in brotherhoods dedicated to producing courtly poetry celebrating love, like the Puy d'Amour or the Court of Love. A number of close family members and senior courtiers, of the type often included in courtly orders, and who frequently received gifts from Philip, were also absent from his Order⁷⁵.

Nor does the fact that about half the recipients of the Order were either members of the Court of Love, or had close relatives in it, signify that the two had been conceived for similar reasons or to achieve similar ends⁷⁶. It was not unusual for men to hold office under both the King and one of his uncles, so there was an overlap of personnel around Charles VI and Duke Philip, particularly because the latter spent so much time at court in Paris, looking after his interests⁷⁷. It is more

74.(cont'd)and the Constable, Labret; and at least one to a favourite courtier who was a political hot potato and exile, Antoine de Craon's father Pierre (Appendix R1-19); but some went to men who had received the Order, like Philip's son John and Pierre de La Tremoille; and at least one to a longstanding household member of appropriate rank and background, Jacques de Cortiambles, who was not in the Order.

75. See Annex 1. The Court of Love included secretaries and literary men like Gontier Col; bishops like Louis de La Tremoille; merchants like Nicolas Rolin; administrators like Guillaume de Dormans and the Paillarts; and family members like the Dukes of Berry, Bourbon and Bavaria, the Count of Clermont, and Pierre of Navarre.

76. See Appendix R7

77. See Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.15 and 39. From 1380, Philip

significant that, despite a mere two year difference between the establishment of the Court of Love and of Philip's Order, half the members of the latter were not members of the former. This cannot have been due simply to their absence from the royal court in 1401, because at no point in its history did they become members of the Court of Love. In the case of some members of the Order, it might be explained by them being primarily occupied with the Duke's affairs in his own territories, and infrequent visitors to Paris⁷⁸. Others, however, such as senior members of Philip's household, would almost certainly have been frequently in Paris with him, and might therefore have warranted membership of it⁷⁹.

The differences in membership, and in the characteristics of members of the Court of Love and the Order, suggest that Philip established the latter for different or additional purposes⁸⁰. While it might be argued that he designed it as a more specifically Burgundian alternative, this is unlikely. In its early days, at least, the Court of Love had a wide territorial coverage and included partisans of both Duke Philip and the Duke of Orleans, and some not clearly attached to either⁸¹. Philip might have developed something more specifically Burgundian in tone as the tensions between him and Orleans grew, or in

77.(cont'd)spent about half the year in France, and from around 1393-4, 8 months or more on average. For overlaps, see for instance Appendices R1-13, 37, 48 and 50.

78. See, for instance, du Four (Appendix R1-24)

79. See, for instance, Appendices R1-6, 12, 16 and 26

80. If the institutions had similar objectives, and if, as Enid McLeod thought, the Court of Love was principally a Burgundian foundation, it would make it all the more surprising that there was not more overlap between the memberships. She based this, however, on an article by Piaget, rather than on the more extensive study by Bozzolo and Loyau which I have used -see her The Order of the Rose, pp.74 and 172, n.1; and my n.81 below

81. See C.A., vol.1, p.4

response to the latter's Order of the Rose - said to have been instituted on St. Valentine's Day 1402⁸². (The membership of that Order is unknown but, given the circumstances of its birth, it was probably strongly Orleanist in tone). Yet the Court of Love had members who consistently supported Philip, but were not in his Order, and reputedly Orleanist members who were in his Order⁸³. All this suggests that Philip's Order was not designed as a Burgundian rival to the Court of Love or the Order of the Rose, and confirms that, while its membership might have passed for that of a fashionable chivalric order to contemporaries, its real objectives were different.

Military Chivalric Order

Since the nature of the Order's membership of knights and squires was more like that of chivalric orders like Boucicaut's La Dame Blanche à l'Escu Vert, or Duke Louis of Bourbon's l'Ecu d'Or, concerned with promoting knightly virtue (and, indeed, there were members of the same families in them); and since most of the identified recipients of Philip's Order were men of military importance, it is more likely that contemporaries would have thought Philip designed it to resuscitate the more military aspects of the chivalric ideal⁸⁴. A closer look at the membership, however, rules out most of the general objectives of orders of this type. Philip chose only sixty men, selecting a few from each rank of knighthood,

82. For the Order of the Rose etc., see McLeod, The Order of the Rose, particularly pp.73-76

83. Among 'Burgundians' in the Court of Love, but not in the Order, were Gilles de Bretagne, the Duke of Brittany's brother (C.A. vol.1,no.16); Jacques de Châtillon, seigneur de Dampierre (vol.1, no.29); Jacques de Courtiambles (vol.1, no.311); and Henry de La Tour (vol.2, no.500). Among the 'Orleanists' in the Court of Love who were in Philip's Order, were Charles de Chambly (vol.1, no.97) and Thibaut de Chantemerle (vol.1, no.256)

84. Boulton, The Knights of the Crown, p.273; and Appendix R2 for the Lord of Chantemerle and, possibly, the Lord of La Tour

rather than the planned five hundred in his father's Company of the Star, (which had been intended to include most or all of the barons and knights banneret in France, and a significant proportion of the knights bachelor), suggesting that he was not instituting a general reform of knighthood in his territories⁸⁵.

Similarly, as a reforming Order, the Company of the Star was meant to include the most worthy in the kingdom, who were '*sans deffaulte de repreouche*'⁸⁶. While there is no reason to believe that those selected by Philip did not meet such a standard, there were other men of standing and good reputation who were not included in the Order. King John had selected nine junior members of the royal family, including Philip himself; most of his senior household knights; and a high proportion of his titled baronage. Philip, by contrast, as we have seen, included only a few of his closest family, ignoring many of royal blood; a selection of his household; a smaller proportion of the baronage in his own territories (let alone in those where he had influence); and only a few of the most experienced military men of the period⁸⁷.

Even if Philip had been attempting a reform of knighthood by selecting a few 'model' men from each rank, including squires as future knights, one would have expected him to select men like Geoffrey de Charny or Philip de Mézières, or members of the latter's order⁸⁸. While Philip's Order included some very young squires, whom he might have wished to train in the full virtues of knighthood, there

85. Ibid., particularly pp.190-193

86. Quoted Ibid. p.191

87. Ibid. pp. 191-3; Appendices R1 and R2; and nn.s 23, 31-3, and 47 above. Even excluding the known Orleanists from Henneman's list, there are men on it from Philip's territories who were not in his Order, like Colart d'Isque and Georges de la Paume

88. Charny was the author of a prose treatise on chivalry on which the Statutes of the Order of the Star were based, and an

is no evidence that they were the most outstanding, and others of similar age and background were left out. While the membership confirms that Philip had some military purpose for his Order, it was clearly not to promote general military reform, or to provide models of military behaviour, whether as a successor to, improvement upon, or Burgundian version of, the Company of the Star⁸⁹.

The particular characteristics which distinguished those Philip selected as Order recipients from among the militarily important noblemen in his support networks generally, taken together with the motto of the Order do, however, suggest that he was using it to promote the specific, military, chivalric virtue of loyalty, in order to protect or bolster his power and position. It is not clear, however, whether this was a general measure, or designed to counter a specific threat or advance a particular use of his power. The fact that there were powerful families in France, Burgundy and Brittany with similar characteristics, whose loyalty Philip would have found useful, who do not appear to have been irretrievably committed to Orleans, but who were not invited to provide a representative for the Order, confirms that Philip designed the Order to provide military support to counter a specific, armed threat, or to advance by force a particular cause, rather than as a general measure⁹⁰. The

88.(cont'd)acknowledged model of knighthood; de Mézières was the instigator of the Chevalrie de la Passion, with similar objectives, and had already approached the Duke. The latter and the Golden Tree had no members in common. See Ibid., pp.185-6; Kervyn de Lettenhove, Oeuvres de Froissart, vol.1, 111, pp.463-533; Kaeuper and Kennedy, The Book of Chivalry of Geffroi de Charny, pp. 1, 14-15, 19-23 and 48-61; and Appendix R7, n.3

89. The Company of the Star does not seem to have survived King John's death, except possibly as an honorific appointment during the reign (1364-80) of Philip's brother, Charles V

90. For example, the Montagus in Burgundy; the Rohan in Brittany; and the Sancerres in France -see Henneman, Clisson, pp.213-220

nature of that threat or cause is explored in the next Chapter by considering what uses of armed force Philip was considering in and around 1403.

Crusading Chivalric Order

As we have seen, there is little in the characteristics of the recipients of Philip's Order to support the idea that that cause was an immediate crusade. While the absence of many from outside his territories or areas of influence might be explained if he had designed it to commit recipients to providing resources to a future, primarily Burgundian, crusading project (to which his unexpected death some sixteen months later could have put paid); lending support loyally until such a project could be realised; and remaining loyal to the Duke and his successors, protecting their territories while they were on crusade, it is surprising in that case that there is so little correlation between its members and those of Philip's grandson's Order of the Golden Fleece (or, indeed, of de Mézières' Chevalerie de La Passion, which Kovacs considered to be its model)⁹¹. It is, of course, possible that part of this lack of correlation is due to so many families dying out in the intervening period because of the high death toll at the battle of Agincourt in 1415, or to the wider political objectives of the Golden Fleece, which led Philip the Good to offer membership to people in his much expanded Burgundian hegemony, and to a few foreign princes⁹². This review of

91. Many members were too old or too young for an immediate crusade. Philip and John, Duke of Lancaster had felt unable to lead the 1396 crusade when in their fifties; some minors did do battle (like Philip at 14 at Poitiers) but his son, Philip, in the Order, was not even in his teens in 1403. Kovacs, L'Orfèvrerie Parisienne, p.85, saw the Golden Tree as an intermediary stage (by means of its alleged foundation charter, for which she gives no reference, and I know of no evidence) between de Mézières' ideas and the Golden Fleece

92. See Appendix R7, and especially n.2

recipients thus does nothing to strengthen the case for the crusading hypothesis.

The number of Order recipients does not particularly suggest that it was chivalric in nature. There appears to be no precedent for sixty members in legendary or earlier chivalric orders⁹³. In sum, therefore, while the review of characteristics suggests that Philip might have wished to present his Order as a chivalric one, it was clearly not a conceit, but a practical tool, and was designed to secure some specific objective requiring loyal military support from those on whom he depended in more vulnerable areas to maintain his power. That objective might have been related to the protection of Ducal power bases during a prolonged period of absence by the Duke or his successors, such as might have occurred on crusade, but none of the analyses thus far provide sufficient or incontrovertible evidence for this to counter the conclusion that Philip had some other objective in mind.

Livery Badge

Examination of the characteristics of Order members, their relationships with the Duke, and his use of livery in the modern sense shows that the Order was not simply a household livery badge and that, while he drew on existing support networks (as identified by their members' receipt of material gifts including livery), he clearly found none of them, individually or in combination, entirely suitable

93. The number of knights of the Round Table was, for instance, variously given as 50, 150 or 250, see Hopper, La Symbolique Médiévale des Nombres, p.144; of the Argonauts, as 45, 50 or 54, see Lemprière's Classical Dictionary, p.79; and of the Franc Palais, 300, see Boulton, Knights of the Crown, p.23. Preceding monarchical Orders, where numbers are known, ranged from 15 to 500, some for symbolic reasons, some for practical reasons, and some apparently arbitrary, but none selected 60, Ibid. p.459

for the purposes of the Order. This confirms that those purposes were specific, involving something more than general loyalty to and support for Philip, and suggests that he designed the Order as a form of livery badge for a special network of men he wanted to parade with him, as a show of military strength, in support of those specific purposes, on an occasion for which the iconography of the badge was appropriate.

Military Alliance

The review of recipients clearly confirms that the Order had some military purpose, but that the existing obligations, through oaths of office for posts with particular military responsibilities, were clearly insufficient for the specific purposes of the Order. This, and the lack of any other forms of military agreement between the Duke and the Order recipients, taken together with the ambiguity of the iconography of the Order insignia, strongly support the idea that Philip's objectives would have breached the normal wording of contemporary contracts, which excluded from attack the King, the direct liege lord, and sometimes other members of the royal family, and required support for military action likely to be deemed beyond or contrary to the oaths of office or the contracts, and too dangerous to be expressed publicly and explicitly in writing⁹⁴. It is possible that Philip sought such support not to combat an immediate threat, but to deal with a situation which he envisaged might arise without warning or after his death, and for which he wanted his family to have immediate and certain recourse to military aid for themselves or their inheritances, whatever the source of that threat, and even if they were unable formally to request it.

94. See examples given in Lewis, 'Decayed and Non-Feudalism in Later Medieval France', in his Essays in Later Medieval French History, particularly in the appendix, pp.62-3

Specific Policy Alliance

The review of recipients thus strongly confirms the interim conclusions of the analyses in earlier Chapters that the Duke distributed the Order insignia to the selected sixty recipients as a form of special livery badge, to signal the creation of a military alliance for some specific policy objective, which required an overriding, loyal commitment from recipients, because it was actually or potentially hostile to a person or cause to which they might otherwise have been committed. The attempts to identify common associations among recipients or with Philip have not, however, revealed precisely what that objective might be, other than that it concerned the protection or enhancement of his or his family's territorial influence and power.

Interim Conclusion

From this review of Order recipients' characteristics it seems that Philip selected sixty noblemen of some military importance, whom he needed because they controlled territory, manpower, or access to other resources which would leave him vulnerable if they were lost to his influence; that he chose from among such people those he could be sure of, or the most influential of those he judged he could attract to his cause; and that the sixty represented the maximum number he could find with this combination of characteristics.

The review also strongly suggests that the person or people for whom the Order sought loyal support was not Charles VI, but Duke Philip and his family. It remains unclear, however, whether this support was for Philip as Duke of Burgundy, or as a (or even the primary) protector of and representative for the French royal family or, indeed, the French crown. The inclusion of the significant Breton contingent, and the possible iconographic references to their countryman, Du Guesclin, and his legendary loyalty, might suggest the latter.

This review, taken with the outcomes of earlier analyses, makes it possible now to reject completely the hypothesis that the Order was purely decorative. We can also rule out the hypotheses that it had a purely chivalric purpose (whether courtly, military or crusading), or that it was intended as a simple livery badge. Any resemblance the Order may have born to these seems likely either to have been coincidental or, more probably, to have been a deliberate cover to mask its true purpose.

It makes clear that the nature of the Order was primarily military, but confirms that, since Philip felt it necessary to give it to even the closest and most loyal of his supporters, its objective required a commitment to a specific policy beyond the normal parameters of the support expected even from a military alliance, let alone from kinship, vassalage, official or household service, or conventional gift-giving; and was even hostile to a person or cause to which recipients or their families might otherwise have been committed.

To determine more clearly what that objective might be, it is necessary to look at the problems which had, or might have, involved military action, of such a dangerous and contentious type, and particularly in the territories where the Order recipients were important; which had involved conflict with a rival or enemy of Philip; and with which the Duke and other members of the Order had been concerned, in the period around the Order's distribution. These issues are explored in the next Chapter.

CHAPTER 6: THE OCCASION OF THE GIFT OF THE ORDER

The occasion on which a gift was made was generally related to the donor's ostensible purpose in giving it, and is therefore useful for this thesis to identify. Even on a conventional gift-giving occasion such as baptism, however, there might be other, less apparent, purposes which are also worth exploring¹. That Duke Philip regarded the occasions of his giving as important is evident from the frequency with which they are noted in his accounts². As we have seen, the occasion of a gift could also affect significantly the interpretation of any decorative device it bore, and thus any assessment of the donor's purpose in giving it³. The analyses thus far suggest that the Order of the Golden Tree was designed for a special occasion and purpose. This Chapter therefore explores, drawing on the interim conclusions of previous Chapters, the precise occasion of the Order's giving; what was special about it; and what light this might shed on Philip's purpose.

There were clear conventions at this period about the occasions on which it was appropriate to offer a gift, which might be more or less generously interpreted, according to the wealth or whim of the donor⁴. The

1. For ducal godparenting, see Chapter 5, nn.25-28 and 73. This system had the advantage of extending the circle of blood kin by these spiritual kin, and strengthening the bonds of loyalty and clientage with them. Its power can be seen, for instance, in Philip's surprisingly kindly dealings with the Marmouset, Jean de Montagu, godson of Philip's father, and therefore spiritual kin to Philip; and in Orleans' propaganda use of the fact that the renowned Du Guesclin was his godfather. See, for instance, Bossy, J., Christianity in the West, p.15; Appendix R1-42; and Appendix R3, nn.1, 12 and 49
2. See Chapter 1, n.25 and Appendix R3
3. See Chapter 3, nn.4, 5 and 6
4. Philip's household accounts note approvingly, for instance, his

purpose of a gift was sometimes linked to a particular day in every year, such as a quarter day, New Year's Day, or May Day, which marked recognised stages of the passing of the calendar or financial year⁵. It could also be linked to the annual commemoration of some event or person, such as a birthday, a Saint's day, a battle, or the foundation of an order⁶. Some gifts were linked to a one-off occasion in a particular year, such as a coronation, a marriage, a tournament, a contract, diplomatic negotiations, or a visit⁷. If a gift appears not to be related to such occasions, or is in some way unusual for a regular gift-giving occasion, then it is worth looking at the giver's policy concerns around the time of its giving to determine what led him to give that particular gift on that particular occasion.

This Chapter therefore examines whether the date on which Philip appears to have given virtually all the insignia of the Order of the Golden Tree - January 1 1403 - might have been linked with any noteworthy or special occasion, other than the conventional exchange of gifts associated at this

- 4.(cont'd) particularly generous treatment of both guests and hosts - see Prost, vol.2, item 2716
5. See Appendix R3 for New Year; Appendix R4, n.52, for furs at Christmas; Appendix R5, nn.133 and 134, for pensions paid in regular instalments at fixed dates of the year; and ADCO B1532, ff. 153v-55 and 176, for livery robes at Easter and All Saints' Day
6. See, for example, gifts to Charles V on his birthday, Prost, vol.1, items 649 and 2403; and to Jean de Berry on his Saint's Day, Ibid., vol.2, item 2738
7. See, for example, gifts to Charles VI on his coronation, Ibid., vol.2, items 466 and 539; Appendix R3 generally for marriage, n.30 for a joust, and nn.35 and 66 for visits; David, Train somptuaire..., pp.27-34 for treaty negotiations with the English, pp.38-9 for ransom negotiations with Bajazet, and pp.43-4 for negotiations over inheriting Brabant

period, in princely European courts, with New Year's Day⁸. Since the Order is, for Philip, unique as a New Year gift, it also explores which of his policy concerns in the period leading up to his ordering of the Order insignia in the autumn of 1402 might have led him to plan such a gesture for New Year 1403, taking account both of significant events in the preceding months, and those which he must have anticipated or feared would occur later in 1403⁹.

Given the conclusions thus far about the form, nature and materials of the insignia, it is reasonable to assume that it related to some major policy concern¹⁰. From the analyses in the preceding Chapters, it is possible to narrow the possibilities down to something which concerned succession - that is the legitimacy and continuation of either the French royal dynasty or the Burgundian one, and possibly to a marriage as part of that; which would secure a return to a peaceful, ordered Golden Age, possibly as epitomised by the reign of Philip's brother, Charles V of France; and which necessitated support by the sixty Order recipients, of a military nature, but beyond or contrary to that required or expected from any conventional duties

8. See Appendix R3. Most of Philip's household accounts have a list of what he spent on New Year gifts, mainly within the section on the acquisition of gold, silver and jewelled objects, see for example, ADCO B 1532, ff.253v-258. These were often the subject of separate authorisations for payment to merchants, see ADCO B338 and Annex 1/
9. Philip's policies were planned well ahead, although he could adapt them where circumstances demanded. He switched the marriage plans for his eldest daughter, for instance, to secure the match he wanted for his eldest son, John - see Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.83-4. The insignia must have been ordered by the autumn of 1402, so he clearly foresaw a need for them then/
10. See Chapter 2 on the exceptional cost and elaborate nature of the insignia

of loyalty they owed to the Duke, and for a contentious or dangerous purpose, possibly involving combatting a threat of force against him or his power base, most probably on the borders of France or Burgundy, or in disputed or vulnerable areas. This Chapter therefore focusses on those of Philip's policies which could be linked to such matters, and on any significant events relating to them, in 1402-3.

As we have seen, it appears from the ducal accounts that the Order insignia were intended as *étrennes*, to be given out on January 1 1403 rather than, as some historians have suggested, a gift occasioned only by Philip's return, in December 1402, from a visit to Brittany, and thus a continuation of the largesse he had distributed there to further his policy aims¹¹. As *étrennes* were conventional gifts, regularly distributed every year on January 1, some idea of Philip's purpose might be gleaned from contemporary assumptions about them unless, of course, he was using a conventional gift-giving occasion to mask a dangerous or controversial purpose.

The nature and origin of *étrennes* is not entirely clear. The word derives from the Latin *strena* which is thought to mean a good omen¹². It was used by the Romans to describe an exchange of gifts, with symbolic importance, particularly on the Kalends of January, to bring fortune in the coming year. From quite early on, the gifts were gilded to increase their value. It became the custom in Rome to give such gifts to the Emperor and to patrons, who were expected to reciprocate, as a sign of mutual interest and support. Despite the different dates adopted in mediaeval Europe for the beginning of the year, a similar custom of gift-giving, as part of the celebrations on January 1, survived. This was regardless of the

11. See Annex 1; and P., vol.22, p.340

12. See Daremberg, C. and Saglio, M.E., Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines, vol.IV, p.1530

Christian Church's misgivings as to its pagan origins and associations with the disreputable celebrations of Saturnalia; and despite its attempts either to substitute nearby dates such as Christmas or Epiphany as the occasion of the giving, or to refocus the celebrations of January 1 on to that day's feast of the Circumcision of Christ¹³.

As we have seen, while it is clear that Philip regularly exchanged valuable material gifts on January 1, it is difficult to tell who initiated such exchanges, and it appears that not all his gifts on this day were reciprocated, at least in kind¹⁴. Judging from practice in other contemporary courts, it is likely that, in the latter case, Philip expected such gifts to be reciprocated instead by unspecified, but loyal service¹⁵. Since the Order was not a response to an actual or anticipated material gift that New Year from all the recipients, giving it as an *étrenne* would suggest that Philip intended it either to reward or to secure some service¹⁶. The fact that he specially selected the recipients to receive the Order, rather than the more conventional *étrennes* he gave to others on that date, would further suggest that, in

13. See Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, p.965

14. See Annex 2, and Chapter 5, n.9

15. The practice of giving gifts to secure support was commonplace at this period. See, for instance, Bossy, Christianity in the West, p.15, on giving gifts to secure influential godparents, and their long-term favour, for a child; Derville, 'Pots de vin', p.363, on the system of gift-giving by towns to people of influence in the ducal household or administration, which the Valois Dukes countenanced and probably encouraged to create a stabilising interdependency; Vale, The Princely Court, pp.93-4, on the practice of princely gift-giving within the household to distinguish, socially and functionally, between its members, and between it and the households of other lords; Saul, N., Richard II, p. 337, on that king's use of gifts to secure support

16. See Annexes 1 and 2; Appendix ~~OSR2-R6~~, and n.14 above

their case, that service was special or unusual¹⁷. That 1403 was the only year in which he chose to distribute such, for him, unconventional *étrennes* implies that the nature of that special service was related to January 1 1403, or to a period around that date.

I can find no event of significance for Philip recorded for or expected on January 1 1403. If, however, Philip were using this conventional gift-giving occasion to mask the true nature of the special reciprocal service, that service might have been related rather to an event anticipated for a nearby date, particularly if the precise date of that event was unknown at the time the Order insignia were ordered.

Given this and the policy concerns on which this Chapter focusses, the event might have been related to the occasions early in 1403 of the birthday of the Dauphin, or the expected births of another son to Charles VI and an heir to Philip's son, Anthony, and thus to succession issues. Indeed, as we shall see, Philip had a number of policy concerns related to both royal and Burgundian succession issues which focussed on events anticipated for early 1403¹⁸.

It is clear that in 1402-3 Philip was much concerned with his own dynastic succession, in terms of the arrangements for the division between his sons, after his death, not only of the territories which he and his wife ruled, but of those which he expected to fall to them¹⁹. It is

17. See Annex 2; and Chapter 5, particularly n.7

18. The Dauphin, Louis, was born on January 22 1397; Charles VI's son, Charles, was born on February 22 1403, and Anthony's son, John, on January 11 that year

19. There is no reason to think that Philip feared imminent death in 1402-3, but he was in his sixties in an era when war and pestilence made this a good age; two of his elder brothers, Charles V and the Duke of Anjou, had already died; and he seems

significant that he took the trouble, in August 1402, to secure an enormous vidimus, by a royal official, of all the documents (dating from late 1401 and earlier in 1402) relating to these arrangements, and confirming their acceptance, as legitimate and binding, by all parties concerned, including the King²⁰. That he was worried about the legality of these succession arrangements is further confirmed by the inclusion in the vidimus of documents by which he formally emancipated his three sons (unusually including even the third, Philip, who was still a minor) - a necessary legal step to securing their binding and unchallengeable agreement to the arrangements²¹.

19.(cont'd) to have succumbed fairly quickly to the fever which killed him on 27 April 1404, which Christine de Pisan put down to the Flemish climate - see Hicks and Moreau, Charles V, p.109

20. See ADCO B P.S 484; and Plancher, Histoire de Bourgogne, vol.III, Preuves CC, CCI, CCII, CCV and CCVI

21. See n. 20 above, particularly Preuves CCVI. The young Philip was 11 at the time and, unlike John, did not have his own household. To succeed to property, a child had to be emancipated, and this normally meant being at least 14 and living separately from his parents, see Arabeyre, P., 'L'Emancipation en Bourgogne à la fin du moyen âge', MSHDB, 51, pp. 7-12, quoting Article 371 of the *Coutumes de Bourgogne*. In the Duchy, their married status might have been deemed to emancipate John and Anthony, but this was not the case in the County of Burgundy, and other territories which observed Roman Law, see Pieri, G., 'Les particularités de la puissance paternelle dans la Duché de Bourgogne, de la rédaction officielle de la coutume à la fin de l'ancien régime', MSHDB, 26, p.58. In principle, emancipation could not, in any case, be a tacit affair. It required the father formally to emancipate his son in front of judicial witnesses of an appropriate level; the son to accept the same; and the whole procedure to be recorded. This was necessary for the child to accept, hold and enjoy any property rights, that is to enjoy "*puissance plaine general et liberal d'ester en jugement pour eulx et contre eulx en demandeurs et en deffendeurs, de acquerir, acheter, transigier,*

The ostensible reasons for confirming these succession arrangements in 1402, as set out in the documents, were to avoid discord between his sons and confusion in his territories after his death²². Both of these might have left his carefully acquired and nurtured dynastic heritage vulnerable to outside attack, and thus fragmentation or reduction. The possible occasion of such discord and confusion, whilst not referred to in the documents, seems to have been the need to change the existing succession arrangements, set out in a 1393 document governing the proposed marriage of his second son, Anthony, to the daughter of Waleran of Luxembourg, Count of St. Pol, on the occasion of the actual marriage in February 1402²³. The possible birth of an heir to that marriage, which would have been evident by mid 1402, would have reinforced that need. It is usually assumed that the changes were necessary in order to secure the agreement of the Estates of Brabant to a scion of the Burgundian ducal family inheriting the Dukedom of Brabant. That agreement was dependent on assurances that Brabant would remain independent and not be swallowed up in the Burgundian hegemony²⁴.

21.(cont'd)*transporter, vendre, aliener par toutes manieres, de faire testamens, codicilles, alienacions, procuracions, donnacions et toutes manieres de contraulx, convenances quelconques, de demander et obtenir leurs droiz et querelles quelx qu'ilz soient, et generalement de faire, procurer et exercer tout aultres choses que pere familiers et homes estanz en sa plainiere puissance et fuers de toute puissance paternel ou advouerie de pere puet et doit faire" - see Arabeyre, pp.23-5, quoting from ADCO B11286, ff.33-33v*

22. See Plancher, Histoire de Bourgogne, vol.III, Preuves CCI, pp.clxxxxix-cc

23. See Ibid. Preuves CLVI

24. See, for instance, Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.99-102

In fact, a comparison of the terms of the two agreements suggests additional, underlying reasons. In 1393, the arrangements provided for Brabant to be held alone: in 1402, it could be held, in certain circumstances, not only with some of the smaller Burgundian lands, but even with Flanders and Artois. Under no circumstances, however, could it be held with the Duchy or County of Burgundy²⁵. It appears from the texts that Philip negotiated this change because, by 1402, he felt it necessary to make provision for the disposition of the additional territory he had gained; for his youngest son, Philip (who in 1393 had been very young, and less certain to survive his parents); for the close control of lands or property rights subject to dispute, particularly with sons-in-law, some Order recipients, or others affected by the succession arrangements; and for the protection of more recently acquired or promised lands, particularly where they bordered on those of his rivals²⁶.

To avoid his dynasty losing any ground meant Philip had to make all these provisions, whilst securing that the

25. See the different distributions of territories envisaged throughout the text given in Plancher, Histoire de Bourgogne, vol.III, Preuves, CCI, according to which of Philip's sons survived and had children

26. Apart from the promise of Limburg and Brabant, Philip had gained Rethel after 1393 (promised in 1393, but not formally given until 1402). The young Philip was born in 1389. The 1402 arrangements are much concerned with the disposition of Montréal, a territory on the borders of the County of Burgundy disputed at the time with Philip's son-in-law, the Count of Savoy; with Chastel-Guyon and Salins, which had formerly belonged to Jean de Chalon; with his Champagne lands, which were somewhat isolated, and vulnerable to attack from Orleans who had also acquired lands in that area; and with Etampes, Gien and Dourdan, which he expected to acquire from his brother, John of Berry, and which would have rounded out his lands (particularly Gien, which would have formed an extension of Nevers towards Orleans and Paris)

minimum conditions of the Estates of Brabant were met, in any circumstances which might pertain, after Philip and his wife's deaths, when the Duchess of Brabant died; and that they continued to be met, whatever the vagaries of fortune, in terms of the deaths, with or without heirs, of his potential inheritors. The resulting proposed arrangements, which in some cases meant changing the terms of longstanding, formally agreed, marriage treaties, and compensating those involved in such treaties accordingly, had to be formally accepted by those affected, so that they were not immediately challenged, either on Philip's death, or at any other point where a shift in the provisions was called for. This acceptance, and indeed the succession provisions generally, had to be publicly recorded in front of witnesses and formally approved by all concerned, including the King, because the rules governing succession at this period were fluid and varied from one territory to another²⁷. There were conflicting rules even within a territory²⁸. Merely indicating one's

27. In some areas, like Flanders and Brabant, women could succeed: in others, such as the Kingdom of France, they could not. Custom also varied as to whether succession could pass through women. Both in France and in Burgundy, the rules of succession, where there was no acceptable child to inherit directly, were fluid at this period, although attempts were made to clarify them - generally to legitimise a de facto succession. In France, for instance, the Salic Law, preventing succession through a woman, appears to have been introduced to avoid succession through royal princesses whose behaviour made the legitimacy of their offspring questionable, and was used retrospectively to justify the exclusion of Edward III of England from the French throne in favour of Philip of Valois, when the direct Capetian line came to an end. In Burgundy, King John II may have expressly removed the inconvenient *nec ascendere* rule from the Duchy's customs to assist his assumption of power there - see nn.29 and 30 below.

28. In Burgundy it had not been clear whether a grandson took precedence over his uncle, or even his great-uncle, if his father died before his grandfather. The *ancien coutume* ruled that the

wishes in a will, for instance, as Philip must have known only too well, was insufficient to secure them, particularly if there was a relative or feudal superior who chose to challenge or interfere²⁹.

The membership of the Order, and events in late 1402, could suggest that Philip might have been trying to avert one of a number of problems related to this succession agreement. It is conceivable that he feared some attempt to undo his family's succession to Burgundy, and particularly to the County of Burgundy, either from surviving, disappointed claimants, or by disaffected relatives of the nobles who had fought against it³⁰.

28.(cont'd) son inherited before the brother, but the brother before the grandson. The *coutume urbaine* and *coutume ducale urbanisée*, however, followed the rule of *nec ascendere* that succession could pass only down, or horizontally (that is, to someone of the same generation), not up.

29. In 1348, Duke Eudes IV of Burgundy appeared to follow the *ancien coutume*, by indicating in his will that, his only son being dead, any hypothetical legitimate sons he might have should take precedence over that son's son, Philip of Rouvre, but that the latter should take precedence over any daughters Eudes might have, and over any of Eudes' surviving sisters. If Philip died without heir, however, Eudes' third sister Jeanne, (King John II's mother), was to succeed. He ignored his second sister, Margaret, grandmother of Charles of Navarre, because she had died before him, even though Charles was about to come of age. The *nec ascendere* rule would, however, have meant that, on Philip of Rouvre's death, his same generation cousin Charles of Navarre, not John II (Philip the Bold's father) would have been next in line as Duke of Burgundy.

30. The childless Philip of Rouvre, in his 1361 will, specified that inheritance should be according to the custom of the country, which could have meant either. For the Duchy, Article 27 of a late fourteenth century compilation of general customs expressly removed the *nec ascendere* provision, legitimising John II's authority there. *Nec ascendere* remained in force, however, in the

It seems more likely, however, that he might have been trying to forestall attempts, from princes holding or controlling territories bordering on his, to take advantage of any confusion about succession to take over all or part of his territory. The two most obvious threats were from Savoy, where several Order members had been engaged in late 1402 in countering his son-in-law's incursions in to the County of Burgundy and particularly Montréal; and from the Duke of Orleans, who made use of his influence over his brother, the King, to secure for himself lands in disputed or uncertain succession, and who for some years had been pursuing a policy of expansion and encirclement at Philip's expense, particularly threatening his eastern borders, culminating in his acquisition in late 1402 of Luxembourg, extending along the eastern frontier of Rethel and close to Brabant and Limburg, which Philip had thought safely under his own control³¹. This

30.(cont'd) County of Burgundy, leading to a potential challenge to John's authority from Jean de Bourgogne, a same generation cousin of Philip of Rouvre and last male heir of the eldest branch of the Chalons family, who were descendants of earlier Burgundian Dukes. This appears to have failed because of his lack of importance, rather for any legal reason. The County preferred succession to ascend to Margaret of France, a slightly closer blood relative of Philip of Rouvre, but from an older generation, probably because she was a powerful, royal figure. See Champeaux, E., 'La succession de Bourgogne à la mort de Philippe de Rouvres', MSHDB, 1-3, fasc.3, pp.5-50. The Chalon (Appendix R1-12) fought against Duke Philip's attempt to take the County from Margaret of France. The Dukes of Bar (R1-2) also had some claims to the County.

31. See Appendix R10, particularly nn.14 and 35, for Montréal, which had been annexed to the ducal domain only in late 1402, and Savoy. See also Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.166, for Montréal, and pp.102-104, for Philip's gradual acquisition of rights in Luxembourg, culminating in his taking over its administration and protection in 1401, only to see Orleans buy its possession in August 1402. Orleans had already sought to give his territories

would explain the inclusion in the Order not only of a number of important lords in his eastern territories, and in Luxembourg, but also of the heir to the Duchy of Bar, a territory which both helped to secure access between Philip's separate northern and southern blocks of territory, and protected Rethel, an isolated Burgundian territory whose disposition was the subject of detailed and frequent reference in Philip's succession arrangements³².

A fear of Orleans gaining control of additional lands at his family's expense, and thus reducing its future revenues, security and influence, would also explain the inclusion of so many Bretons, including their Duke, in the Order³³. Philip had, in late 1402, thwarted Orleans' longstanding ambitions to control Brittany by securing the guardianship of this young Duke and bringing him back to Burgundy, and needed both to reward the Breton lords who had supported him, and maintain their loyalty to the arrangement³⁴.

31.(cont'd) some unity by, for instance, buying lordships in Champagne, threatening Philip's lands there; and buying the inheritance to Coucy, with its strategically important fortress on the borders of the Vermandois and the Laonnais - see Schnerb, B., Les Armagnacs et les Bourguignons, pp.47-8

32. See Appendix R1-2, and n.30 above. Bar also bordered both on Luxembourg (see n.31 above), and on Lorraine, where Philip had been engaged militarily and politically in 1402/3 -see Appendices R6, n.69, and R10, n.13. For Rethel, see nn.25 and 26 above

33. See Chapter 5, n.36

34. Philip's influence in Brittany went back to his mediation on behalf of the young Duke's father, John IV, who was a close relative of his wife, and their mutual support for Pierre de Craon in his feud with Orleans' client Olivier de Clisson. Both Philip and Orleans had sought support among the Breton nobility, and, when John IV died in 1399, leaving his son as a minor, under the tutelage of his mother, who had then married Henry IV of England, proposing to take the boy to England with her, both had

It is possible, however, that it was not so much the Burgundian as the French royal succession that led Philip to found the Order. Guenée, in his La folie de Charles VI Roi Bien-Aimé, spells out in detail the severe quandry to which King Charles VI's worsening mental condition and consequent incapacity to govern gave rise in France after 1392. There were both theoretical justifications and actual precedents for deposing, replacing, or governing on behalf of a ruler who was unable to carry out his functions effectively, but French traditions and circumstances at the time made it impossible to depose Charles VI, however protracted his periods of incapacity, and however impossible they proved to cure; and left increasingly open to argument who should best govern for him³⁵.

Guenée judges that this situation came to a head in 1404,

34.(cont'd) sought the regency of Brittany. See Appendices R1-19 and R10; and Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.52-3

35. See Guenée, B., La folie de Charles VI Roi Bien-Aimé, (hereafter La folie de Charles VI), particularly pp. 211-236. It was regarded as legitimate to resist a tyrant or incompetent ruler, and there were precedents for their removal on the Pope's authority reported in the well-known Vincent de Beauvais' *Speculum historiale* and in the *Grandes Chroniques de France*. These were reinforced generally by Pope Innocent IV's judgements (reflected in the Decretals published in 1298 under Boniface VIII, and glossed further in the fourteenth century). The authority of the Pope was, however, in question during the Schism. The traditional alternative, in the case of temporary incapacity (including a minority) was for regents to be appointed. In 1392, with the King's only brother still young and inexperienced, and his Queen unfamiliar with France, its language and its customs, there was little question but that his uncles would take up again the reins of power they had enjoyed during his minority up to 1388. The older, more ambitious and more independent Orleans grew, the more he saw himself as the natural replacement for the King.

after Philip's death had, in effect, removed the brakes on Orleans' ambitions in this direction³⁶. I would argue rather that by 1403 Philip already had cause to be sufficiently concerned about these ambitions, and their implications for his family's power, both in the immediate future and in the longer term, to build up a strong defence against them, in the form of the Order.

The importance for Philip's plans for the maintenance, and even growth, of Burgundian power through its smooth and undisputed transference, in totality, to his designated heirs, of securing control for himself (and thus denying it to Orleans) of the royal finances, and of appointments and lands in the gift of the Crown, had led to a see-saw struggle between two, particularly during the King's periodic inability to rule, which had caused Philip about a year before to raise and bring to Paris a substantial body of armed men to support his cause³⁷. The apparent success of this display of military force; the continuation and escalation of the struggle with Orleans; the real possibility of the latter overturning the gains Philip had secured, and his attempted resort to matching force might all well have persuaded Philip that he would need not just a show of, but probably actual, force before

36. Philip's heir, John, lacked the closeness of blood, the experience, finances, and reputation which had supported Philip's role in governing for Charles VI, and had enabled him effectively to check Orleans

37. Orleans managed to secure places for his clients in the royal administration, culminating in a group of senior posts in the summer and autumn of 1401, while Philip was out of Paris, which led to an armed confrontation. Again, while Philip was away in April 1402, Orleans had himself made souverain-gouverneur des aides, thus controlling the levying of exceptional taxes, and used this to raise one in the May. Philip took such exception to this that he too was appointed souverain-gouverneur des aides. See Schnerb, Les Armagnacs et les Bourguignons, pp.51-54, and for the armed confrontation, Appendix R10, n.3.

long³⁸. The Order permitted him to create a highly visible core of military men from his territories and allies, which he could call upon from wherever he was, quickly in an emergency, and who were sufficiently obliged to him to obey even if that involved something excluded from, or beyond, the normal provisions of military contracts and oaths of office³⁹. In this context, the Order could be seen as Philip warning Orleans to stop meddling with his, his family's and his successors' plans and policies, so as to preserve the status quo; or as an implied threat as to how far he was prepared to go, and an exercise in brinkmanship.

There were two aspects of this struggle for control of the Crown which engaged Philip's particular attention throughout 1402-3, and which might well have persuaded him that the need for a further show of force was imminent. The first, given the uncertainty about the arrangements in the event of the King's death or permanent inability to govern, and thus in the minority of the then, very young, royal heir, his brother, or the son whose birth was hoped for in early 1403, was Philip's attempts to prevent Orleans acting as sole regent. These culminated in the Ordinances of April 1403, which provided that, in the event of the death of the King, his eldest son should succeed, whatever his age and, rather than being subject to Orleans' regency, should exercise his power with the help of the King's Council, which included Philip (and would, after his death, include his heir). This Council was also to officiate during Charles VI's 'absences'⁴⁰.

38. See n.37 above. In the confusion, it seemed that Orleans would secure any regency, and the truce negotiated between the rivals by their relatives was fragile

39. See Chapters 4 and 5

40. See Schnerb, Les Armagnacs et les Bourguignons, pp.54-5. Charles VI had been suffering from periods of madness since 1392. Of his sons, a Charles had been born and died in 1386; another Charles died at eight in 1401; Louis, the Dauphin, was to be six in

The second was Philip's attempts to ensure that, when Charles VI was finally replaced, whatever the circumstances, his legitimate heir would be married to, or the child of, a Burgundian. His original ploy, arranged in 1394, was for John's daughter to marry the then Dauphin, Charles. When the latter's death in 1401 put paid to this Philip sought, with the Queen's help, to renew the arrangement with the new Dauphin, to the exclusion of Orleans' daughter and, in case of another untimely royal death, to secure Burgundian marriages for all the unattached royal children⁴¹. Since these arrangements required the King's formal agreement, the latter's repeated 'absences' during 1401-3, and Orleans' unsurprising opposition, meant that it was May 1403 before Philip succeeded in clinching them⁴².

Philip must have been aware that, without these marriages, his successors would lack the close links and substantial influence which he had enjoyed as son, brother and uncle to successive French Kings. To be an in-law, not only of King Charles VI but, if he were to die or become

40.(cont'd) January 1403; and Jean was four.

41. Philip had arranged in 1394 to marry John's daughter Margaret to the then Dauphin, Charles. On the latter's death on 11 January 1401, he negotiated to marry her, rather than Orleans' daughter, to the new Dauphin, Louis. In addition, he arranged for John's only son Philip to marry Michelle, the eldest available daughter of the King (the eldest, Isabelle, had married Richard II of England; the next, Jeanne, had married Duke John V of Brittany; and the third, Marie, was a nun); the King's second surviving son was to marry another of John's daughters, and his recently born third son was to marry Philip's granddaughter Jacqueline (by his eldest daughter Margaret). (Charles, a later son, who eventually became King, married an Anjou cousin; Catherine, born in 1401, married Henry V of England; and the widowed Isabelle later married Orleans' son). See Vaughan, Pilip the Bold, pp.90-92

42. For a chronology of Charles VI's periods of incapacity, see Guenéé, La folie de Charles VI, pp.294-6

permanently incapacitated, of the next King and several of his siblings, and thus possibly a grandparent of any subsequent King, would go a long way to counter Orleans' influence as an uncle or great-uncle of any King, particularly if that King succeeded as a minor, and would make it reasonable for not just Philip but his successors to secure a major role in any regency arrangements.

If, as contemporary rumour suggested, and John, Philip's son, was later to allege in justification of his assassination of Orleans, Orleans was planning not just to control, or assume any regency of, but to succeed himself to the French Crown, Philip might well have feared a coup which his careful planning and negotiation would be insufficient to forestall. He would then have had all the more reason to create a core of leaders of a fighting force loyal enough to him to combat Orleans, even if the latter had assumed the crown. Given the poor health record of Charles VI's male heirs, and Orleans' growing power, Philip might in the autumn of 1402 have had cause to fear that that coup would take place in early 1403, before the birth of another potential royal heir, or before the marriage negotiations could be finalised, or before Orleans' role as regent could be undermined⁴³.

The likelihood of Philip fearing such a coup is strengthened by the real possibility that Orleans was at this time in the process of asking the Pope to depose Charles VI, and release the latter's vassals from their oaths of loyalty, because of the King's incapacity. This

43. See Autrand, Charles VI, pp.322-3, for rumours in 1395 and 1397 that Orleans' wife had tried to kill the Dauphin, and two years later that Orleans himself had caused the King's madness; Petit's justification of John's killing of Orleans, that the latter had "projeta, par convoitises, sortilèges et machinations, de détruire la personne du roi notre sire et ses enfants...", quoted in Schnerb, Les Armagnacs et les Bourguignons, p.82; and nn. 40 and 41 above

has generally been dismissed as a charge trumped up by John the Fearless as part of his justification for killing Orleans. Guenée, however, makes a plausible case for it, tracing Orleans' constant support for Benedict XIII, culminating in him securing the restoration of French obedience to this Pope on 28 May 1403, and the favours he sought in return, including dispensations for his children to marry their first cousins, Charles VI's children⁴⁴. Philip was certainly aware of, and strongly resisted, Orleans' attempts in 1401 to secure a dispensation for his newborn daughter to marry the Dauphin Louis, which would effectively have negated his own plans for a Burgundian marriage for Louis.

To help determine whether it was Burgundian or French royal succession policy concerns which led Philip to create the Order, and whether he intended it as a purely defensive move, or had some more specific outcome in mind, it is useful at this point to review the possible meanings of the design of the Order insignia in the light of the occasion of its giving, and against the hypotheses originally advanced.

While we know that Philip distributed the Order on January 1 1403, as *étrennes*, the precise nature of this occasion is less clear. It seems likely that such gifts were, for the most part, exchanged openly at court and, even where they were not, would have been seen or known about there⁴⁵. There is no record of any separate ceremony for

44. See Guenée, La folie de Charles VI, pp.227-231. In 1401, Orleans tried unsuccessfully to obtain a dispensation for his new-born daughter Marie to marry the Dauphin Louis, contrary to Philip's plans. In 1403-4, he sought one for his eldest son Charles to wed the widowed Isabelle, and achieved this marriage in 1406.

45. The whole point of such presents were that they, and what they represented, were widely known and appreciated, as an indication of the giver's power. There are references to them being presented, see Annex 1

the presentation of the Order insignia and, although some recipients were not in Philip's presence that day, the fact that they must have been sent their insignia would have been publicly known⁴⁶. This inclusion within the normal arrangements for *étrennes* suggests that, while Philip wanted to draw attention to the Order as a powerful support group, there was something about the particular purpose of the Order he preferred to conceal or obfuscate. This would in turn suggest that Philip intended the Order motifs of the Golden Tree, the lion and the eagle to refer to the French royal succession, since there would be no reason for him to hide or downplay the creation of a group to support the legitimate, authorised and recognised plans for succession to his own territories⁴⁷. Indeed, if the distribution of the Order insignia had been intended simply to warn Orleans off any attempt to frustrate the Burgundian succession plans, Philip would surely have advertised that as clearly as possible.

That the Order related to the French royal succession is made more likely by Philip's association, at least initially, of his own insignia with a collar with the sun, the emblem of Charles VI and the royal family⁴⁸. If, as seems likely, the Order distribution took place in Paris, Philip's wearing of this emblem, together with the Order's motto of *en loyauté*, would probably have been taken by courtiers present to imply his and his Order's support for the King and his children⁴⁹. The exclusion from the Order

46. Some, like Jean de Vergy, were almost certainly not with Philip on January 1 1403, see Appendix R10, n.34

47. See Chapter 3

48. See Chapter 3

49. According to Petit's *Itinéraires*, pp.331-2, Philip and the Breton princes spent from 10 - 27 December 1402 at the Hôtel de Nesles in Paris, seeing various members of the family and royal councillors, and from 28 December 1402 - 4 January 1403 at his Hôtel in Corbeil, in the Paris area. There is no mention of the King at either, probably because he was ill, and generally kept

of the King, any of his direct heirs, and the other potential regents could then have been understood, at that particular moment, as a courteous or pragmatic move to avoid forcing any of them to choose between such equally close relatives as him and Orleans, should the latter attempt a coup. Outside the court, and among his own partisans, however, these same elements could have been taken rather to refer to Philip and his heirs as the most legitimate regents for, or even successors to, the French King, should the occasion arise.

The exploration thus far of the significance of the occasion of the distribution of the Order seems therefore to support the conclusions that Philip's purpose in giving it was to form a recognised military support group for a particular defensive, or possibly even offensive purpose; that he chose 1403 because he judged that the situation throughout 1402 was developing in such a way that either he would need to call upon that support group to pursue that purpose in 1403, or that he needed to prepare it for his sons' use, should he himself die; and that he chose January 1 so as to hide the full extent of that purpose. In the light of this, we can review the significance of the occasion of the Order's giving for the hypotheses advanced.

Decorative

While New Year was at this period the occasion of decorative material gift-giving by princes, including Philip, the Order insignia were unusual for him as *étrennes* in their elaborateness and in the selection of the recipients to receive them, rather than the more usual simple diamonds. If Philip had wished merely to extend the range of the more elaborate gifts, of the type he usually gave to his immediate family on this occasion, he could have ordered various items decorated with a range of

49.(cont'd) out of sight at these times, see Guenée, La folie de Charles VI, pp. 37 and 294

popular motifs, as he did, for instance, at family weddings⁵⁰. To choose one, complicated and unusual device suggests that the decoration was intended to convey some message beyond the normal one of reciprocal obligation at New Year. Similarly, even if he had decided that events in 1402 dictated the giving of more elaborate gifts than usual to certain people at New Year 1403 to secure, retain or reinforce that obligation, it would have been enough to add to his usual list or increase the value of the gifts above what he had given any recipients before, or above the norm for their rank and position⁵¹. Nor can the choice of 1403 alone as the date of such gift-giving be explained by any trend in Philip's material gift-giving either generally, or specifically at New Year, or as a response to any trend in that of his rivals. All this serves to confirm the conclusion of earlier Chapters that the Order insignia were not intended to be purely decorative.

Courtly Chivalric Order

The occasion of the giving of the Order also confirms the conclusion that it was not intended purely as a courtly chivalric one, and effectively rules out the idea that it might have been designed to appear like one. Those concerned with courtly love were usually founded on a day associated popularly with romance, such as St. Valentine's

50. See Prost, vol. I, items 972-1017, particularly 975-6, 982-3, 989, 992, and 1007-13 for his own wedding; Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 268 and fol., and ADCO B 301 PS 385, for his daughter Katherine's wedding; and ADCO B1471, ff. 3-4 and 23-4, for the double wedding of his son and daughter at Cambrai.

51. Even in the Order, he increased the value of the insignia given to Pierre de La Tremoille and François de Gringnaux above their usual level and that appropriate for their rank, see Chapter 5; and he put items aside '*pour faire sa volonte*' - probably for unexpected eventualities

Day, or May 1⁵². Philip had already helped establish such an order, so there would seem to have been no need for him to found another, even in response to that which Christine de Pisan suggested Orleans might recently have established, and particularly not at such a time of year⁵³.

Other courtly orders were founded on a momentous occasion, such as a coronation or a marriage. Although a number of marriages were celebrated at the Burgundian court in 1402-3, including those of some Order recipients, none was significant enough to warrant the foundation of an order, and there is no record of any on January 1 1403⁵⁴. Nor did Philip's Order mark his own birthday, the Dauphin's or, so far as I can discover, that of any member of the Order⁵⁵. It is just conceivable that, given his policy concerns at the time, it was intended to mark the birth of a male heir to his son, Anthony, in view of the importance of that birth for securing for his family the eventual inheritance of Brabant. Given the lavishness of the baptismal arrangements Philip made when this child was born, however, it would have been odd to anticipate the birth by a distribution on January 1⁵⁶. The same would

52. See, for example, Chapter 2, n.53. (One exception was the Order of the Golden Shield, founded by the Duke of Bourbon on January 1, 1367, see Boulton, Knights of the Crown, pp.272-3)

53. See Chapter 5, nn.82-83

54. The Order of the Band and the Company of the Knot were founded at coronations, and the Company of the Black Swan at a marriage, see Boulton, The Knights of the Crown, pp.52-3, 211, and 250. Among those married in 1402-3 were Philip's son Anthony, Pierre de La Tremoille and François de Gringnaux, see n.51 above, and Appendix R3

55. Philip's birthday was January 17, St. Anthony's day

56. See ADCO B301 PS 397; and Caron, M-T., 'Décor d'une naissance princière à la cour de Bourgogne en 1403', 'Voyages en histoire': Mélanges offerts à Paul Gerbod, pp.143-151

apply to the birth of a child to the King, if the Order had been intended to celebrate that⁵⁷. Since neither the sex nor the safe delivery and survival of either unborn child could be assured, it is very unlikely that Philip would have distributed an Order in advance if it was intended solely as a courtly order to honour one of them.

Military Chivalric Order

While the analyses of Order recipients suggest that its purpose might well have had a strong military aspect, general military orders were often set up on the feast day of a military saint, like St. Michael or St. George⁵⁸.

There are, however, no military connotations either to the Feast of the Circumcision of Christ on January 1, or to any other festival or occasion on that day which might suggest that Philip was setting up a military order. Nor, as was the case with some such orders, was the date obviously associated with a need to avenge a defeat, commemorate a victory, or re-establish an existing order⁵⁹. As explained above, the occasion of its giving in 1403, after the events of 1402 does, however, suggest that the purpose of Philip's Order might have been to prepare for, or to forestall, a future armed conflict in France by advertising the existence of a personal military support group. Such a group would not normally have been termed an order, but it is possible that Philip used the term to indicate publicly that his group was not just a loose or temporary military alliance, but resembled more the larger, longer term, closer knit, carefully regimented

57. See n.18 above

58. See Boulton, Knights of the Crown, pp.124 and 275 for the Order of the Garter on St. George's day, and the Order of the Ermine on St. Michael's day

59. Ibid., pp.275-6 for the Order of the Ermine, commemorating the Duke of Brittany's victory at the battle of Auray. January 1 does not, for instance, echo the date of the defeat at Nicopolis, or the inauguration of the Company of the Star

and organised, and purposeful nature of a formal military order, and of its members' overriding loyalty to that purpose and to its founder. The occasion of the Order's giving would suggest, therefore, that while Philip did not intend to create a chivalric military order, in the usual sense of those terms, he did expect it to have, and to be seen publicly to have, many of the characteristics associated at the time with such an order.

Crusading Chivalric Order

The occasion also effectively rules out any idea that the Order was a crusading one. Crusade orders could be founded at the outset of a crusade, or on a major Christian feast day, often associated with the Virgin⁶⁰. One might have expected Philip to choose a more major one than the Circumcision, or one more closely related to the design of the crusade banners he had used for the 1396 crusade⁶¹. Nor does the date of January 1 suggest that the Order was a commemorative one, or in fulfilment of any long-held crusading vow by Philip, or in revenge for the Nicopolis defeat⁶².

There was also no good reason why Philip should have launched a crusading order in 1403, and a strong case for him not having done so. He continued to offer occasional support to individuals who wished to gain crusading experience with the Teutonic Knights, but had no reason to encourage a wholly Burgundian, or Burgundian led crusade⁶³. The 1396 enemy, Bajazet, was dead, and his

60. Ibid., pp.261-2 for the Order of the Collar; and pp.243-5 for the Order of the Sword

61. The Nicopolis banners carried a Virgin, see Schnerb, Les Armagnacs et les Bourguignons, p.35

62. Philip's original crusading vow, if he made one, was not made on January 1, nor did any significant element of the Nicopolis campaign take place on that date

63. See Appendix R7

conqueror, Timur, was making peaceful overtures to the West⁶⁴. Philip had satisfied Burgundian honour by taking over control of the 1396 crusade, and had gained prestige, despite the disastrous outcome. It would have been foolish to risk sullyng that by another humiliating defeat. He had, in any case, not finished paying off the debts incurred on that occasion, particularly for ransoming his son and senior companions, and needed his revenues to support policies nearer home. Nor was the time opportune in terms of international relations. It had been the conclusion of a long truce between France and England which had enabled the 1396 crusade to take place, and relations between the two had by 1403 been soured again by the deposition of Charles VI's son-in-law, Richard II; the ignominious return of Charles' widowed daughter and the undignified wrangle over the return of her dowry; the marriage of Richard's usurper, Henry IV to the widowed Duchess of Brittany, and the consequent threat of renewed English, and thus possibly hostile, control of her young son and his strategically important duchy; and the personal and very public animosity expressed against Henry by Orleans⁶⁵.

Despite some possible iconographic associations with crusade in the Order's design, therefore, the last thing likely to have been on Philip's mind was the creation of any sort of crusading order on January 1 1403.

Livery Badge

Although, as we have seen, Philip had never distributed livery badges in large numbers or with any regular device, other than his arms, and had distributed clothes widely in

64. See Paviot, J., Les Ducs de Bourgogne, la croisade et l'Orient, pp.49-57; and Atiya, Nicopolis, p. 120

65. Richard II was deposed in 1399 and died in 1400; Isabelle returned to France in the September of that year; Henry married in February 1402; and Orleans issued a personal challenge to Henry in August 1402

the same colours for all ranks only on a few special occasions, and then not in standard colours or ones particularly associated with him, he did regularly distribute clothes to his household, in colours appropriate to their rank, position, and the time of year⁶⁶. The dates for these distributions varied, but one date he used was certainly January 1⁶⁷. If Philip had decided to issue a livery in the modern sense of the word, January 1 would not have been an inappropriate date to do so but, in the light of his past practice, there must have been something special about that particular date in that particular year to make him select it.

January 1 was, at the time, associated with expressions and confirmations of loyalty between men and their lords⁶⁸. Elsewhere in Europe, princes gave out material gifts, often marked with their device, on this date, to give concrete expression to these bonds of loyalty⁶⁹. Given the motto of Philip's Order insignia - *en loyauté* - it is feasible that he had decided to follow fashion and introduce a livery badge for the first time on January 1, but this still leaves the questions of why he did not do so before 1403, why only in 1403, and why the particular design, not clearly associated with his family or territories?

Apart from January 1, livery badges were issued on particular occasions when the giver needed to advertise his power and the support he could muster. One such occasion was at military competitions and displays like tournaments and, indeed, it was at a *pas d'armes* that one of Philip's successors was to use the device of the Golden

66. See Chapters 1, n.59; 2, n.65; and 3

67. See ADCO B1500, ff.116, 130v and 131 (as against *livrée* at Easter, ff. 130v and 131, and unspecified dates, f.129)

68. See Chapter 4, n.70

69. See Saul, Richard II, pp.263-9

Tree⁷⁰. There is no record of a tournament involving Philip on or near January 1 1403, but these spectacles were often used to celebrate a major event, such as a wedding (as was the *pas d'armes* referred to above), and it was in relation to family weddings that Philip had both used elements of the design of his Order insignia and distributed them as part of a special livery for the occasion⁷¹. If Philip distributed the Order as a form of livery badge, the design and the date could then suggest that he was promoting the marriages he was at the time trying to conclude between his grandchildren and the King's children - a reminder to the King, after any 'absence', to honour his word.

In the past, however, Philip had issued special clothes with elements of the Order design to the household generally. The fact that he issued the Order on January 1 1403 only to some selected members of the household, and also to others outside the household, all of whom had strong military associations, suggests a possible precursor of the practice followed by his son and by Orleans of issuing livery and livery badges as a sign of the partisanship of their followers, and of adopting slogans to summarise and promote their causes⁷². This strengthens the idea, broached above, that Philip intended the Order as a warning and threat of the lengths to which he was prepared to go in 1403, including open warfare, to secure his policies and position, particularly against Orleans.

If this was the case, it sheds an interesting new light on the view generally held by historians that the conflict

70. For Charles the Bold's Pas de l'Arbre d'Or, on the occasion of his wedding in 1468, see Beaune and d'Arbaumont, Mémoires d'Olivier de la Marche, vol.3, pp.101-201; and vol.4, pp.116-144

71. See Chapter 3, nn. 32 and 95

72. See n.71 above; and Guenée, Une meutre, une société, p.67

between the Burgundians and the Orleanists did not become serious until after Philip's death⁷³. It suggests that Philip was already in 1402-3 contemplating the real possibility of military confrontation with Orleans; had developed the core of a force ready to follow him in this, whatever the consequences and their other allegiances; was aware enough of the power and usefulness of partisan badges and slogans to experiment with them in the Order insignia; and saw them as a means, not just of rallying his supporters to his policies, but of persuading people more generally that he had the interests of the realm at heart in reintroducing, under his sage control, Charles V's 'golden age', which the dangerously volatile Orleans could never hope to do. This would make him more innovatory than usually assumed; lay the responsibility for escalating the conflict at his door, rather than his son's or Orleans'; and suggest that John was only following his father's lead⁷⁴.

John does not, however, appear to have continued the Order after Philip's death. He used the main element of its design only once and not, apparently, as a livery badge, and he adopted a quite different regular personal and livery badge⁷⁵. This would suggest that, if Philip did intend the Order as a livery badge, it was for a policy and purpose, either related solely to 1403, or which was later superceded or changed.

Military Alliance

This review confirms that, while the Order might have been designed to share some of the characteristics of a military alliance, it involved commitments which exceeded the normal alliances of this kind.

The occasion of its presentation confirms that it was a

73. See, for instance, *Ibid.*, pp.145 and 267

74. See, for instance, Nordberg, Les Duces et la Royauté, pp.1-2

75. See Chapter 3, n.22

special alliance, designed for a particular purpose. New Year, as a time to confirm loyalty, might have been considered an appropriate date to conclude a military alliance, but such evidence as we have suggests that there was no fixed or favourite date. The timing was pragmatic, according to the instigator's need⁷⁶. If the Order was intended as a military alliance, Philip must have had particular military concerns around 1402-1403 to warrant it.

Of the policy concerns Philip had in this period which either had led, or might be expected to lead, to military action, arguably no individual one was sufficiently serious to warrant him resorting to something beyond the troops he could raise by existing and conventional means⁷⁷. This suggests that he created the Order to combat either a combination of such concerns which he judged might come together in or after 1403, or some overriding concern which he feared his normal forces would be insufficient or inappropriate to cope with. The first of these might have arisen in the event of his death, if his succession had not been secured. There is no reason, however, to think that Philip considered his death imminent in 1402-3, but he might have viewed a longer term, forward looking, military alliance as a final step in completing the actions he had been taking in 1401-3 to secure his succession. In that case, one would have expected a defensive military alliance of those involved in securing that succession to have sufficed, given the clear and legally binding arrangements he had just confirmed⁷⁸. That the Order was wider suggests that it was created to combat the second possibility. That might, for instance, have been a move by Orleans not only to continue his undermining of Philip's succession plans, but to secure control in France, either as regent or as King.

76. See Chapter 5, n.94

77. See Chapter 5

78. See nn.19-32 above

In that event, which Philip must have feared was imminent in 1402-3, although he obviously could not foresee its precise timing, his normal military support would have been insufficient to combat the concerted attack on him on several fronts which Orleans would then have been well-placed to make. To establish a defensive military alliance of conventional form would not, however, have sufficed either, as such alliances normally excluded the King⁷⁹.

The nature of the military threats facing Philip in 1402 and likely to combine in 1403 therefore suggest that he intended the Order as a form of military alliance, but that the nature of those threats meant he had to create something larger, more flexible, and more open-ended or ambiguous than the contemporary norm for such alliances.

Specific Policy Alliance

Given the nature of the policy-related occasions Philip could have expected in 1403, it might initially seem unlikely that he intended the Order as an offensive military alliance, designed to promote or push through a particular event. Most of his plans, as we have seen, appear defensive, concerned with stopping anyone, and particularly Orleans, from frustrating his policies. Where he had a positive policy relating to events in 1403, such as securing the royal marriages for his grandchildren, planning in advance to use concerted military force for this seems excessive.

If Philip intended the Order as a defensive military alliance against the action he feared Orleans might take in 1403, it is perhaps surprising that he did not make his intentions clearer and thus warn Orleans off, avoiding open warfare. There are two possible explanations for the ambiguity. One is that Philip thought it unwise to reveal that he was prepared to go as far as what would (had

79. See n.76 above

Orleans seized the throne) have amounted to civil war. The other is that he planned a pre-emptive strike if any of his major plans, like the marriages, were threatened, before Orleans could take matters further. It is even possible that that strike could have involved seizing the regency for himself and substituting his grandchildren or great-grandchildren as heirs to the French throne if, as must have seemed quite possible, during 1403 Charles VI lost his sons, failed to have another, and became (or was deemed by the Pope) incapable of rule.

Conclusion

Of the hypotheses advanced for Philip's distribution of the Order of the Golden Tree on January 1, 1403, the explorations so far clearly rule out that it was intended either as a decorative gift, of no particular significance; or as some form of purely chivalric conceit. They suggest however that, while the Order cannot properly be termed purely a chivalric military order, a livery badge, or a military alliance, Philip may have intended it to be seen publicly to have some of their characteristics. His most likely purpose seems, from the analyses, to have been to establish a, for the time, unique potential military force of allies, overridingly loyal to him and his successors, whatever the circumstances, to support a specific policy against Orleans. The nature of that policy was certainly defensive, but may even have been offensive.

CONCLUSIONS

This thesis set out to explore, against the pattern of his giving of material objects more generally, the purposes and policy objectives underlying Duke Philip the Bold's gift of the Order of the Golden Tree to sixty men on January 1 1403, and thus to illuminate his role in Burgundian and French history.

It posited that some idea of Philip's objectives could be gleaned from a series of complementary analyses of different aspects of this gift. These were its nature, materials and design; the iconography of its decoration; the meaning of its motto; the occasion on which it was given; and its recipients and Philip's relationships with them, particularly his pattern of material and other gift-giving to them, both generally and on occasions similar to the Order's giving.

To ensure that Philip's most likely objectives were identified, the thesis adopted a rigorous and painstaking approach to the possible interpretations arising from these analyses. For each of the aspects of the Order studied, the contemporary evidence available for analysis is diverse, ranging from that relating to the normal practices of Philip and his contemporaries, to material from such literature as might have informed or dictated his choices for that aspect. An analysis of the material relating to any one aspect, viewed in isolation, could give rise to a range of different, apparently equally valid, but often conflicting conclusions. These conclusions, in turn, might be found to contradict those arising from the analyses of any or all of the other aspects, or might be altered by them, as new factors were taken into account. Rather than arbitrarily selecting or rejecting conclusions from any one analysis to pursue, the thesis therefore progressively reviewed and reassessed them in the light of each subsequent analysis. To give some shape to this process, the study focussed on seven,

predetermined hypotheses, advanced by historians or suggested by related practices among contemporary Western European rulers. It has measured the outcomes of the analyses of each aspect in turn against these seven, in order gradually to build up a balanced conclusion as to which of them offered the most convincing overall interpretation of Philip's objectives in making the gift of the Order.

This approach has clearly revealed the dangers of relying on an analysis of only one aspect of gift-giving. Any gift-giving in the Middle Ages, because of its reciprocal nature, and the rigidly hierarchical structure of court society, needs to be set in the context of the relationship between the giver and the recipient; the normal pattern of gift-giving between them; and, if there is an abnormality or if the pattern varies, the occasion of that abnormality or variation. The study shows that the benefits of this comprehensive, contextualising approach to the analysis of gift-giving are particularly marked in relation to a decorated, material gift like Philip's Order, where an analysis of the decoration, taken in isolation, has in the past produced misleading results, particularly where the different elements of such a complex decorative scheme have been interpreted separately rather than, as the thesis posits to be necessary, in the context of the overall design.

This approach enables the study clearly to dismiss three commonly advanced hypotheses for Philip's giving of the Order. These are that it was purely decorative, an instance of his alleged profligacy, and of no particular significance; that it was purely a fashionable, courtly, chivalric conceit, with no political purpose; and that it was intended to promote crusading and, as such, was a precursor to the later Burgundian Order of the Golden Fleece.

The method of analysis adopted is thus shown to be useful,

in a negative sense, for dismissing previous, apparently reasonable, assumptions based on less comprehensive analyses. On the positive side, it helps to clarify Philip's broad purpose in giving out the Order insignia, in terms of the sort of resonances that a gift of that nature, on January 1, would have had for the recipients and, more widely, for contemporaries in France and Burgundy. For the latter, it could have been seen as fitting with any one, or a combination, of three of the remaining four hypotheses considered. These are that it was a form of livery badge, an ephemeral personal or family device; that it was a military chivalric order, with no specific, strategic purpose; and that it was a military alliance, of the type developing more widely elsewhere at this period. This potential ambiguity does not represent a failure of the method. On the contrary, I would contend that it is to be expected. People at this period delighted in conundrums and veiled meanings, so Philip could well have designed the insignia deliberately to offer several different meanings. This is all the more likely if, as I conclude, he had in mind a particular policy meaning which was politically sensitive, contentious and dangerous, and could be achieved only through a specific alliance, designed for that purpose.

The analyses suggest that Philip could, for instance, have intended the Order to have some of the characteristics of a livery badge, such as the public marking out of a group of especially loyal adherents, who would support him above and against all others, so as to advertise or warn opponents about the strength and nature of the support he could call upon. Elements of the nature, form, design and iconography of the Order would not be inconsistent with this, although it would have been a much more elaborate one than was customary at the time. This would have been a new departure for Philip, who had never distributed livery, in the sense normally attached to that term. The review of Philip's personal and family badges and practices in this area proves, however, that he did not

intend it as a general livery for his household or entourage, as it was restricted to a select group, and its design was unique to the occasion, suggesting that the support it represented was not just for Philip, but specifically for the policy indicated by the iconography of the Order insignia.

Similarly, the analyses suggest that Philip may have wanted to convey that his Order had something of the organisation, discipline, and purpose of a military order, or of the special, exclusive, almost contractual nature of a military alliance. Elements of the iconography of the Order insignia and its motto would not have been inappropriate for either; and the analyses of the positions, expertise and landholdings of the recipients suggest strongly that they were selected for their potential military contributions. It seems unlikely, however, that it was intended purely as either. The military aspects of Philip's policy concerns around the occasion of the giving of the Order are insufficient to explain the, for him, unique nature of the gift. Whilst he was at the time, and must have expected to be in the near future, involved in military activity in and around his territories and territorial spheres of influence, the normal forces available to him should have been sufficient to tackle this, without recourse to a new and different form of military network of the type offered by the Order. That he felt the need to create such a network of allies suggests that he intended to commit Order recipients to some purpose beyond, or normally excluded from, conventional military alliances and orders, and therefore to some specific policy.

The outcomes of the analyses of all the aspects of the Order, taken together, therefore support the final hypothesis that Philip's purpose in giving it was to develop an unique type of network specifically to achieve a particular policy. The fact that he chose to create such a network, together with the unusual nature of the

insignia and the apparently deliberate ambiguity of its iconography, suggest that either he did not wish to reveal that policy fully, or indeed at all, to potential enemies, or that it encompassed several options so as to be flexible enough for him to vary its interpretation and adapt as circumstances demanded.

The visual iconography of all the decorative elements of the Order insignia, taken together, suggests that the policy was related to succession arrangements, and possibly within these to marriage plans. Given his preoccupations at the time of the Order, these could have concerned his own territories or, more likely, the French Crown. Given this, the Order's motto could have carried the obvious meaning of loyalty, either to the King or to Philip, but is more likely to have carried the equally common contemporary meaning of legitimacy, particularly in relation to rightful succession. The military nature of the alliance created by the Order; the strategic importance of recipients' lands or positions, particularly in border or troublesome areas; and the inclusion of some whose loyalty he had reason to doubt, all suggest that Philip feared some serious, imminent threat to him or his position. The failure to include in the alliance the King, other male members of the royal family equally closely related to both Philip and Orleans, or (apart from Jean de Montagu whom I contend was at this time neutral) any committed Orleanists suggests that he expected that threat to come from Orleans.

The analyses suggest that Philip could have created the Order either as a defensive or as an offensive alliance against Orleans. The former would certainly have been necessary in case Orleans continued his undermining of Philip's power by trying to break up the carefully nurtured Burgundian hegemony, particularly at Philip's death. In the light of Philip's immediate concerns in late 1402-3 about his family's proposed marriages into the royal family, and particularly to the royal heir, and

about the arrangements for the regency or succession in France should the King die, become permanently incapacitated, or even be formally deposed by the Pope, it was more likely in case Orleans moved to seize the regency, or even the Crown itself. The Golden Tree, as a symbol of just rulers fulfilling their proper function; of dynastic, and particularly Valois, legitimacy; of unity; and of harking back to a golden age would neatly have encompassed many of Philip's arguments for resisting an arbitrary take-over bid by an overbearing and untrustworthy prince who sought to act alone, without benefit of advice from his family or the Council. There are even grounds to suggest that Philip contemplated not just a reactive policy, but a proactive one, intending to make a pre-emptive strike against Orleans in order to render unchallengeable his and his family's permanent control, or even inheritance of the French Crown and its resources, through his family's marriages with the royal heirs, all of whom were still in their minority.

Whether offensive or defensive in purpose, the Order would have sent a very clear and visible warning to Orleans to rein in his ambitions and modify his behaviour. The ostentatious and unusual nature, form and materials of its insignia; the peculiar form of the network its giving created, with its overtones of the discipline of a military order, the purposefulness and exclusivity of a military alliance, and the close allegiance of wearers of a livery badge; and the military significance of the members, would all have announced to Orleans (and, indeed, to anyone else contemplating thwarting Philip), the strength of the forces he could call upon and the lengths to which he was prepared to go, including resorting to open force, and even to civil war.

It would have been possible also, given the continuing attempts of their relatives to heal the breach between Philip and Orleans, and the wording of the oath they were persuaded to take, a few months after the giving of the

Order, to preserve the peace and remain loyal to the King, for contemporaries to interpret the design of the Order insignia and its motto as supporting this rapprochement, and through it a return to the unity, peace and order which France could enjoy only under a competent, legitimate king, and harking back to the halcyon days of Charles V or of another, older, mythical golden age. Since Orleans and his supporters were not included in the Order, however, it is more likely that Philip, while appearing publicly to express a willingness to 'make-up', was delivering a clear warning that if Orleans refused to make peace; or showed signs of breaking the peace by continuing his activities against Philip, threatening Philip's role in securing orderly government, or threatening the legitimate succession, Philip was ready and willing to take extreme measures to protect that peace.

The ambiguities, in such circumstances, were a useful, even essential, measure for Philip to avoid revealing his total game plan; to leave his options open; to put himself in the right both publicly and with those in the royal family and the court who were trying to secure the rapprochement; and to avoid both the embarrassment for them which would have arisen from an open military move against a mutual relative like Orleans, and to prevent any action from them to limit his options, which such a move might have provoked.

Apart from disproving several longstanding assumptions made previously about Philip's Order, these conclusions suggest that some revision is necessary of current ideas about Philip's policies and objectives, particularly towards the end of his life.

Even if Philip intended the Order only to secure the arrangements he had made for the succession to his territories after his and his wife's deaths, the nature of those arrangements gives no support to the idea that he

was trying to create a separate, independent Burgundian state. They provide rather for a long-term separation between different elements of those territories, and particularly between the Duchies of Burgundy and Brabant. The Order suggests that Philip wished to protect the succession against filching, or invasion, by other land and power hungry lords like Orleans, and to protect the family's holdings by securing control over bordering, or interlying territories, or those not allied to a major bloc. The attempt to create a cohesive land bloc was common to other contemporary princes, like Orleans, and was more likely to have been motivated by a desire to simplify that bloc's administration and protection, and to deny territory to rivals (for both financial and strategic reasons), rather than any intention to set up independent states.

In addition, Philip was far too aware of the financial benefits offered by his control of Crown revenues to want to give them up. His policies in 1402-3, including the Order, should be read as an attempt both to retain this control and to secure it for his successors at a similar level. Indeed, far from creating a territory independent of France, the Order suggests that Philip was contemplating, and even actively planning, to do this through a Burgundian succession to the French throne. While he was too loyal to Charles VI, and too prudent, to do this while Charles reigned, he was clearly prepared to achieve it at any cost as an alternative to Orleans succeeding.

In terms of the conflict between the Orleanist and Burgundian parties, the Order suggests that this was already marked in 1402-3, and that Philip himself was not just prepared to escalate that conflict into open warfare, and even civil war, but had deliberately developed the core of a dedicated military force, over and above that available to him through conventional means, which was ready to back him in this as soon as he deemed it

necessary to call on it. While there is no evidence that he would have contemplated murdering Orleans, the Order suggests that he would have taken extreme measures had he found himself in a similar position to that faced by his son in the years leading up to 1407. This, and his adoption of, in effect, a slogan, in the form of the Order's motto, which is a development more usually associated with increasing partisanship, under his son, suggest that the factional conflict was considerably more advanced and serious under Philip than has hitherto been supposed.

The creation of the Order also suggests that, far from being a dinosaur, left behind by developments and wedded to outdated concepts of chivalry, or a slavish imitator of the fashions of his son's generation, Philip was a clever and inventive pragmatist. He used the cover of the ubiquitous and fashionable chivalric order; the increasingly popular idea of livery as a sign of allegiance; and the traditional exchange of New Year gifts, to create a unique alliance as a support network. Unlike most princely orders of the time, Philip's seems to have had particular policy objectives and to have been created to address particular threats, rather than as an honorific adjunct to a ruler's prestige.

The design of the Order indicates that, in addition to promoting his cause through public letters, Philip recognised the political value of a slogan and of a badge or livery associating him with a popular cause. Charles V had been a well-regarded king, and the Order, as an apparently straightforward appeal for loyalty to his legitimate successors, would have found support at many levels in French society, avoiding as it did any awkward issues about the precise motivation or tactics of its proponent. The implied slur, on any who opposed Philip, of seeking to undermine the legitimate succession was a clever move, playing both on people's overriding concerns about legitimacy (particularly in view of the recent

deposition and suspicious death of their king's royal ally and relative by marriage, Richard II, in the neighbouring country of England), and on the rumours already rife about Orleans' intentions, thus lifting their argument above the level of petty princely rivalry.

For the significant Breton contingent among the Order recipients, including their Duke, and perhaps more widely, both the iconography of its design and the motto would have created strong, supporting resonances with the generally revered Breton military hero and Charles V's Constable, Du Guesclin, whose loyalty to the French Crown was, even at that period, legendary. In January 1403, a year before the young Duke came of age and did formal homage to the King for his territory, his inclusion in the Order could have been seen as an interim, but welcome, assurance of support for the French Crown. This would have been especially welcome from one whose father had for long used the support of its then main enemy, England, to weaken French control over Brittany, and whose mother had just married the usurping king of that country, and had narrowly been prevented by Philip from taking the Duke into the English sphere of influence. It was also another clever move to undermine Orleans, both by abrogating to Philip some of the cachet which Orleans had enjoyed through his close association with Du Guesclin, and by making clear that Brittany, its forces and territory were, at least in 1403, firmly in the Burgundian sphere of influence when it came to weighing up the relative power of the two princely factions.

The references in the Order design to the Trojan antecedents of the French monarchy and to the preceding golden age, reintroduced by Charles V, would have been understood amongst courtiers, many of whom would have been broadly familiar with the writings of Christine de Pisan, and with the Trojan legends. Given the use at the time of legendary genealogy to legitimise rulers, whether internally, or in support of claims to other territories

or to international dominance, however, and the enduring appeal, throughout the Middle Ages, of the Trojan stories, their general resonance with legitimate succession and the restoration of the 'good old days' would probably have been more widely recognised.

Precisely what more the Order recipients understood they were being obligated to do by the gift is debatable. There is no evidence of Philip explaining to them, but it would have been uncharacteristic for him to leave something so important to chance. While leaving the meaning deliberately ambiguous for general consumption would have been prudent, to do so for Order recipients could have limited his options or the number of recipients he could rely on for the most extreme one. They must have all recognised that the Order was important, exceptional, marked them out, and reflected in some way the relationship Philip had, or hoped to have with them, judging by the upgraded versions of the insignia which some of them managed to extract from him. They must also have realised that Philip was committing, or trying to commit, them to unquestioning support for him, his family, his position, his territories and his policies. Since many of them had spent time at court, were involved in his policies, had fought on his side, and must have been aware of his rivalry with Orleans (even if they had not been part of the force he had already called up once to face out his rival), they undoubtedly realised they might be called upon to support the Duke in the field against Orleans (and, in Montagu's case, to promote his interests, particularly over the royal marriages). Among recipients who were not his sworn vassals or officers, or had mixed allegiances, this sort of obligation might alone have been enough to explain Philip's gift, and the Order's references to legitimate royal succession would have been ample justification for accepting it. Once publicly committed to him and his policies, Philip may have judged them to be hooked, making it more difficult for them to back out if he had to pursue the most extreme option.

Recipients who were already committed to him probably judged their selection for the Order to obligate them, in any case, to something significantly out of the ordinary.

It is possible that Philip intended the commission he gave, at about the time of the distribution of the Order, to Christine de Pisan to write a panegyric of his brother, Charles V, stressing the virtues of both the man and his reign, as a further step in a planned propaganda battle against Orleans. The book's stress on order, unity and legitimate rule; on Charles V as a suitable royal rôle model (by implication as opposed to Orleans); and on Philip as in a similar mould and with similar objectives; its extensive use of the tree symbolism; and John's support for the completion of the book after Philip's death, all support the idea that Philip intended it as a subtle but effective piece of Burgundian propaganda, with a similar message to the Order, delivered by an authoress whom he could rely on to follow his instructions, but who would have appeared, particularly at court, to be an unthreatening and unbiased observer. Christine's rapid follow-up in La-Vision Christine of the use of the Golden Tree metaphor, which she then took the very unusual step of making publicly explicit in a separate preface, must also have been supported by John, and have reflected a Burgundian (and essentially Philip's original) viewpoint. Taken with John's personal use of the symbol of the Golden Tree at around the same time, this suggests that the Order and the books formed part of an extended and deliberate propaganda campaign, perhaps necessitated by a desire to render more explicit the Order's message.

The need to make it more explicit may have been occasioned by Philip's death and changes in the circumstances which generated the Order originally. Whatever their original understanding of Philip's objectives for the Order, some recipients would if necessary, to judge by their actions after Philip's death, have been prepared to take their support as far as an open civil war. The question of

whether they would have supported a Burgundian king did not arise, as Charles VI had neither died nor been deposed; his heirs had not died; and Orleans had not made an overt bid for the Crown. John was unable to take on his father's mantle, and Orleans therefore obviously felt free either to ignore the Order's warning, or to risk forcing his cousin's hand. These changes may well explain why the Order does not appear to have survived Philip's death; why none of its insignia survived; why its main design component of the Golden Tree was used only rarely by Philip's successors; and why some of the Order recipients left the Burgundian camp.

Taking all this together, it must now be clear that, contrary to earlier historians' assessments, it was Philip, not his son John, who initiated and set the course of the Burgundian party's policy in relation to Orleans and to the Crown. It was Philip who recognised the power and usefulness of partisan badges; who devised the party's slogan; who commissioned persuasive public propaganda (of a much more subtle kind than his son's), not just to support and justify his cause among those whose opinions counted, but to put himself in a morally untouchable position; and who decided to cloak his own interests as being in the interests of the realm as a whole. It is unfortunate that John lacked the political acumen to use his father's innovations as the latter had intended.

Although John continued to use 'loyalty', like the Order's motto, as a slogan, he was not the son of a King of France, and could not play on this direct connection to the legitimate royal succession, as his father had, or on his father's legendary reputation for loyalty to the Crown. He preferred to use his personal device of the plane in the propaganda battle, to indicate that he intended to level the excrescences of Orleans' device of the knotted staff, thus signifying that he would reform the misgovernment for which that Duke and his supporters were held responsible. There is only one record of him

using the emblem of the Golden Tree - on a collar, alternating with planes. This could be taken to signify a change over the first few years after his father's death from presenting policies as a reform looking back to the golden age of Charles V, appropriate for his father's generation, to one designed more directly to confront Orleans and his methods of government. This, the more obviously selfish struggle for power between rival Dukes of the same generation, and John's relative weakness in terms of both personal and financial standing with the King no doubt persuaded some Order recipients that it was not only less morally justifiable to support John, but that he was a less safe bet than his father, and that they would be wiser either to hedge their bets until it was clear who emerged as victor, or negotiate a more profitable alliance with Orleans.

The only obvious connection between Charles the Bold's use of the Golden Tree and his great-grandfather's appears to be the occasion of a significant dynastic marriage, although in Charles' case the marriage was not into the French royal family, but into that of his royal English ally against France. The conceit around which his Pas of the Golden Tree was developed concerned a conventional, courtly, chivalric theme, appropriate for a marriage, of fighting for a lady, in this case the Lady of the Hidden Isle, a fairy-tale, other-worldly figure. Although there appears to be nothing, either in the letter from the Lady allegedly requesting the Pas, which de La Marche records in detail, or in the original story from which it was taken, to link the story or the occasion with Troy, the Golden Tree which featured centrally in the scenario and in the physical setting for the Pas could have been read not just as a conventional Tree of Honour on which to hang combattants' shields, but as either referring to Charles' distant royal ancestors, and thus his equal (or even superior) standing in relation to the then holders of the French Crown, justifying his royal marriage; or as a recognition of the equally strongly asserted Trojan

ancestry of his English bride. Their alliance might then have been seen as heralding a return for Burgundy to the mythical golden age.

In the light of these later Burgundian uses, Philip's gift of the Order of the Golden Tree on January 1 1403 should be seen as a clever, appropriate, practical, potentially powerful and timely tactic, innovatively developed in particular circumstances, to harness unusual and unchallengeable military support, dedicated to him, against any move by Orleans seriously to undermine good order in France, as represented by Burgundian control of the French Crown, and particularly to avert or confront any attempt by Orleans to take over that Crown and subvert the legitimate succession, even if Philip had to resort to civil war or to his family, through his planned marriages, taking over the Crown itself to achieve it. As an alliance designed for particular policies in particular circumstances, the Order did not last as policies and circumstances changed significantly, but was sufficiently important for resonances of its purpose and meaning to be found among Philip's Valois successors as Dukes of Burgundy.

CONVENTIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED IN ANNEXES AND APPENDICES

CONVENTIONS

In transcribing material from primary sources:-

- the orthography and punctuation of the original are generally retained, except where potentially ambiguous, in which case they are modernised (for example, an accent added to a past participle to distinguish it from a present tense)
- the standard abbreviations for titles, names, materials, processes, weights and currencies are generally expanded, except as indicated below, or where the meaning is clear
- dates are left old style. Where new style would be different, it is given in parenthesis
- the lay out is either replicated, or the beginning of a line is indicated by a forward oblique stroke
- underlinings are mine

In tabular appendices, notes are grouped at the end

DEFINITIONS

For modern definitions of selected, less familiar terms, see the Glossary

ABBREVIATIONS

Superscript abbreviations

c	- hundred
e (weight)	- esterlin (goldsmith's weight, equivalent to a twentieth of an <u>once</u>)
e (date)	- ième (xx ^e = vingtième)
m (number, cost)	- times 1000
m (weight)	- marc (goldsmith's weight, equivalent to 8 onces)
o (weight)	- once (one twelfth of a livre weight)
xx	- times 20

ABBREVIATIONS

Other abbreviations

(...?)	- uncertainty (through damage to the parchment or illegibility)
bro.	- brother
c (figures)	- 100
c (documents)	- côte = reference classification mark
Capt.	- captain
chamb.	- chambellan = chamberlain
chlr.	- chevalier = knight
cllr.	- conseiller = councillor
d.	- denier (one twelfth of a sou) - coinage (as in d.p. = Paris coinage)
Dk.	- Duke
Dss.	- Duchess
Emp.	- Emperor
esc.	- esquier/ecuyer = écuyer = squire
esc.d'ecur.	- esquier descurie = écuyer d'écurie = esquire of the stable/of the Horse
esc.panet.	- esquier panetier = écuyer panetier = esquire of the pantry
esc.tranch.	- esquier tranchant = écuyer tranchant = esquire tranchant/carver
esch.	- eschanson = échanson = cup-bearer
fr./frs.	- franc/francs (20 sous)
g.e.	- grace especial
Gr.Mdh	- Grand Maître d'hôtel (see mdh. below)
JF	- John, Count of Nevers, son of PB, and later Duke John the Fearless
Kg.	- King (where unspecified, King Charles VI of France)
l. (figures)	- 50
l. (cost)	- livre (unit of account, equivalent to 20 sous or 240 deniers in Tours coinage)
l. (documents)	- liasse = folder
M.	- Monsieur
m	- 1000

ABBREVIATIONS

Mdh.	- Maistre dotel = Maître d'hôtel = master of the Household/butler
Mlle.	- Mademoiselle
Mme.	- Madame
Monsgnr.	- Monseigneur
(n.s.)	- new style (of dating)
N.Y.	- New Year
ob. (cost)	- obole (copper coin worth half a denier tournois)
ob. (weight)	- obole (12 grains, or half a scrupule)
(o.s.)	- old style (of dating)
p.	- paris/parisis (coinage struck in Paris)
p.a.	- per annum
PG	- Duke Philip the Good, grandson of PB, and son of JF
PB	- Duke Philip the Bold
P.S.	- pièce scellée (document stored separately from the rest in a folder, to preserve the attached seal)
Prem.Chamb.	- Premier chambellan = First chamberlain
Rethel	- Anthony, Count of Rethel, son of PB, and later Duke of Brabant
s	- sols/sous
Sgnr.	- Seigneur
t./tourn.	- tournois (of coinage struck in Tours)
v	- 5
x	- 10

DUCAL AUTHORISATION FOR NEW YEAR GIFTS 1403¹

/Ce sont les parties des joyaux d'or, vaisselle d'or et d'argent, et argent comptant que Francois de Passan, marchand genevois / demourant à Paris, Guillaume Sanguin et Michaut de Laillier, marchans et bourgeois de Paris ont baillies et delivrées pour monseigneur / le Duc de Bourgoigne, Conte de Flandres, d'Artois et de Bourgoigne pour le fait des estrainnes du jour de l'an mil iiii^c et deux darrain passé (1403 (n.s.))

/ Premièrement pour un ymaige d'or d'une Sainte Katherine qui fut présentée de par monditseigneur au Roy, garnie de cinq / balays, trois saphirs et trente une grosse perles, pesans l'or xiii ^m v esterlins, et l'entablement d'argent / doré ix ^m v ^o ii ^e ob.? pour tout	ii ^m v ^c fr.
/ Item pour un tableau d'or qui fut présenté à la Royne garni de onze balais et trente neuf perles pesant / environ v ^m d'or	viii ^c xxxiiifr.demi
/ Item pour un ymaige d'or de Saint Jehan Evangliste garni de pierrerie ou sont viii ^m d'or et en la tableau environ vii ^m d'argent doré donné à monseigneur de Berry ²	xiiii ^c fr.
/ Item pour un autre ymaige d'or de Saint Estienne donné à monseigneur d'Orliens, garni de pierrerie ouquel / a environ viii ^m d'or et en l'entablement environ vii ^m d'argent doré	xiii ^c lfr.
/ Item pour douze tasses en façon de hanaps d'or donnez a madame de Bourgoigne pesans xxix ^m xvi ^e à lxxv fr. / le marc, valent	ii ^m ciiii ^{xx} iifr. xs. tourn.

1. ADCO B338. Parchment roll.

2. 'perdus' written in left hand margin against this item.

ANNEX 1

/ Item pour un fermail d'or <u>de l'ordre de monditseigneur</u> fait de l'arbre d'or et une aigle et ung lyon esmailliez / de blanc, garni d'un gros balay, d'un gros saphir et trois grosses perles donné à monseigneur de Nevers	vi ^c fr.
/ Item pour un autre fermail <u>pareil</u> donné à monseigneur de Bretagne	vi ^c fr.
/ Item pour un autre fermail <u>dudit ordre</u> garni de deux gros balais, un gros saphir et quatre grosses perles / pour monseigneur de Rethel	iiii ^c fr.
/ Item pour un autre fermail <u>dudit ordre</u> garny d'un balay, un saphir et trois perles donné à Philippe monseigneur	clfr.
/ Item pour un autre fermail d'or garni d'un ruby et cinq grosses perles donné à madame de Nevers	iiii ^c l fr.
/ Item pour un autre fermail d'or garni d'un saphir quarré ou milieu un balay dessus et cinq perles / entour donné à madame de Savoye	ii ^c xfr.
/ Item pour un autre fermail d'or garny de quatre balays et trois perles donné à mademoiselle de Rethel	ix ^{xx} xifr. vs.t.
/ Item pour un autre fermail <u>dicellui ordre</u> garni de deux balais et une grosse perle donné à monseigneur le marquis	iii ^c xxxviifr. demi
/ Item pour un autre fermail <u>dudit ordre</u> garni d'un balay quarré, un saphir et trois perles donné à monsieur / de Saint Pol	iii ^c xxxviifr. demi
/ Item pour un tableau d'or garni de pierrerie donné à madame d'Orliens	iii ^c iiii ^{xx} xiiifr. xvs.t.

ANNEX 1

/ Item pour un autre tableau d'or garni de pierrerie donné à monseigneur de Bourbon	iii ^c iiii ^{xx} xiiifr. xvs. tourn.
/ Item pour un hanap d'or pesans ii ^m viii ^e ob. d'or à lxxv fr. le marc donné à monseigneur le conte de Richemont ³	vii ^{xx} xiiifr. vis. xd. ob.t.
/ Item pour un autre hanap d'or pesant ii ^m v ^e oudit pris le marc donné à messire Gilles, son frère ⁴	vii ^{xx} xiiifr. xviis. ix.d.t.
/ Item pour un dyamant que madame de Nevers a donné à monseigneur le dit jour de l'an	lxviifr. xs.t.
/ Item pour un autre dyamant qu'elle a donné à madame de Bourgoigne	lxviifr. xs.t.
/ Item pour un autre dyament qu'elle donna à monseigneur de Nevers	lxviifr. xs.t.
/ Item pour un autre dyamant plat que monseigneur de Rethel a donné à mademoiselle de Rethel	lxviifr. xs.t.
/ Item pour un autre dyament que icelle mademoiselle a donné à monditseigneur de Rethel	lxviifr. xs.t.
/ Item pour un fermail d'or garni d'un saphir, trois balays et six perles donné à madame la Dalphine / fille de monseigneur de Nevers	clfr.
/ Item pour deux poz d'argent dorez pesans xx ^m i ^o x ^e à x frans le marc donnés aux petits enffens de monseigneur de / Nevers, estans en Bourgoigne	ii ^c ifr. xviis. vid.t.

3. Price corrected in the left margin to vii^{xx}xiiifr. xixs. viiid.

4. Price corrected in the left margin to vii^{xx}xiiifr. vis. xd.ob.t.

ANNEX 1

/ Item pour un autre fermail <u>de ladite</u> <u>ordre garni d'un saphir, un balay et</u> trois perles donné au Conte de / Joingny	ii ^C lfr.
/ Item pour un fermail d'or <u>dicelle ordre</u> garni de deux gros balais et une grosse perle longue comme voute / donné au grant maistre d'ostel du Roy	iii ^C xxxviifr. demi
/ Item pour un fermail d'or garni de deux balais et cinq perles donné à monseigneur de Clermont	viii ^{XX} viiiifr. xvs.t.
/ Item pour un autre fermail d'or garny de deux balais et cinq perles donné à messire Pierre de Navarre	ix ^{XX} xifr. vs.t.
/ Item pour un autre fermail d'or garni de deux balais et cinq perles donné à monseigneur de Labret	ix ^{XX} ifr.
/ Item pour un autre fermail d'or garni d'un balay quarré, trois dyamans et trois perles donné au frère de / la Royne	viii ^{XX} viiiifr. xvs.t.
/ Item pour douze hanaps et deux aiguieres d'argent dorez pesans ensemble quarante quatre mars cinq esterlins / à xfr. le marc donné à monseigneur l'evesque d'Arras, Chancelier de monditseigneur	iiii ^C xlfr. vis. iiid.t.
/ Item pour un fermail <u>de la dite ordre</u> donné à monseigneur de Saint George	ii ^C lfr.
/ Item pour un autre fermail <u>dicelle ordre</u> garni d'un balay et deux grosses perles donné à mareschal de Bourgoigne	clfr.
/ Item pour <u>six autres fermails dicelle ordre</u> garnis chascun d'un balay, un saphir et trois perles donné à / monseigneur de Croy,	

ANNEX 1

monseigneur de Rambures, Montauban, le Sire
de Lonroy, messire Herve de Chasteaugiron
et / le Sire de Gavre, à clfr. la piece vailent ix^Cfr.

/ Item pour un autre fermail dicelle ordre
garni de neuf perles et un balay donné à
messire Regnier Pot clfr.

/ Item pour trois autres fermailz de la dite
ordre garni chascun d'un balay et six perles
en deux tronches donné à / messire Guillaume
de la Tremoille, le Seigneur du Bois et messire
Jehan le Voyer, du pris chascun de cent escus,
pour ce iii^Cxxxviifr.
demi

/ Item pour seize fermailx dicelle ordre
sens pierrerie donné au Galois d'Aunay,
messire Charles de Chambly, / messire
Anthoine de Craon, le Sire de la Muce,
messire Jehan de Triart, messire Jehan
de Basoches, le Viconte de / Belliere,
messire Rogne de Pois, messire Erart du Four,
messire George Chiney, Jehan de Neufchastel,
Jehan de Chalon / Pierre de la Tremoille,
Renforcat, George de la Tremoille et
Francois de Grignaux, à lfr. la piece
valent viii^Cfr.

/ Item pour vint quatre fermeillez dicelle
ordre pour escuiers donnez à Pierre de la
Roicherousse, Guiot de la Tremoille, /
Jehan de la Tremoille, Charles de la Tour,
Anthoines de Fontaines, Girart Caloire,
Bocalonne (or Botalomie?), Fouquet de
Montigny, / Girart Desquees, Raillart de
Chauffour, Philippe de Jaucourt, Sauvaige
des Boves, Courcelles, Raymonnet de /
Bretaigne, Guillaume Blondel, Tappinet de
Chantemelle, Jehan de la Viesville,
Girart de Zevemberghe, Roubert / de

Flandres, David de Brimeu, Jehan de Hangest, Arnoul de Vorne, le Sire de Moucy (Moncy) aconvenances à / xxxfr. la piece valent	vii ^C xxfr.
/ Item pour un fermail d'or donné au Seigneur de Fere garni de deux balays et cinq perles	vii ^{XX} fr. xiis. vid.t.
/ Item à Pierre de la Tremoille pour ses estrainnes acoustumées en vi ^m demi d'or pour faire un hanap d'or, le mars / au pris de lxxvfr. valent	iiii ^C iiii ^{XX} vii fr. de p.
/ Item pour un fermail d'or garni de deux balais et cinq perles que monditseigneur donna à madame de Marcoussis, / qui fut royne la nuyt des Roys audit Marcoussis	ii ^C iifr. demi
/ Item pour un fermail d'or garni d'un ruby et six perles donné à messire Guillaume de l'Eyre	cxiiifr. demi
/ Item pour un autre fermail d'or garni d'un ruby, un saphir et cinq perles donné à messire Jaques de Cortiambles	lxviifr. demi
/ Item pour un autre fermail d'or garni de deux balais et cinq perles donné à messire Pierre de Craon	viii ^{XX} viiiifr. xvs.t.
/ Item pour un autre fermail d'or garny d'un balay, un saphir et cinq perles donné au Seigneur de Mangny	lvifr. vs.t.
/ Item pour un autre fermail d'or garni de trois balais et un saphir donné à messire Jehan de Boffremont	lxxviiiifr. xvs.t.
/ Item pour un autre fermail d'or garni d'un saphir, trois balais et trois perles donné à un escuier du Conte / de	

ANNEX 1

Wirthembergh nommé le bailli d'Auxois lvifr. vs.t.
 / Item pour un autre fermail d'or garni d'un
 saphir, un balay et huit perles donné à
 l'escuier tranchant du / Duc de Bretagne xxxiiifr. xvs.t.
 / Item pour un autre fermail d'or garni
 d'un balay et six perles donné à Piquet vi^{xx}fr.
 / Item pour un autre fermail d'or garni
 d'un balay, trois saphirs et trois perles
 donné Aymonnet Regnier / tresorier de la Royne cxiifr.
 demi
 / Item pour un hanap et une esguiere
 d'argent pesans v^m d'argent dorez à xfr.
 le marc donné à Christienne, qui / a donné
 à monditseigneur un livre lfr.
 / Item pour un fermail d'or de la dite ordre
 garni de grosse pierrerie que monditseigneur a
 bailli aux diz marchans pesans / i^m ii^o v^e, et
 est le fermail que monditseigneur porte de
son dit ordre pour lequel est deu aux diz
 marchans pour or et facon vi^{xx}xvifr.
 / Item pour un hanap et une aiguere d'argent
 dorez pesans vi^m i^o viii^e à xfr. le marc
 donné à Guillaume de Zeyne⁵ lxifr. xvs.
 viid.ob.t.
 / Item pour un fermail d'or garni d'un
 ruby, trois dyamans et trois perles
 donné à monseigneur de Nevers iiiiclfr.
 / Item pour un autre fermail dudit ordre
 garni d'un gros balais cabochon et de
 six perles donné à monseigneur de Bretagne iiiicvfr.
 / Item pour un autre fermail d'or dudit
ordre garni d'un balay sur le ront et de
 cinq perles donné à monseigneur de / Rethel iicxlvifr.
 demi
 / Item pour un hanap d'or poinsonné

5. Corrected in left margin to lxifr. xvs.iob.

ANNEX 1

pesans ii ^m vi ^o v ^e à lxxvfr. le marc donné à monditseigneur de Rethel et fut / baillie en garde a Anthoine Forest ⁶	ii ^C viiiifr. xis. xd.t.
/ Item pour un autre hanap d'or pesans iiii ^m i ^e à lxxvfr. le marc donné au grant maistre d'ostel du Roy / par avant <u>la dite ordre</u>	iii ^C fr.ixs. iiid.t.
/ Item pour un fermail d'or garni d'un balay et six perles donné à Pierre de la Tremoille	ii ^C xxvfr.
/ Item pour deux fermeilles d'or garni chascun d'un balay et six perles et baillies à monditseigneur pour en faire / son plaisir	ii ^C xxvfr.
/ Item pour un fermail d'or garni d'un balay percie, trois saphirs et six perles donné à Anthoine Forests	cxiiifr. demi
/ Item pour un autre fermail d'or garni d'un ruby quarré, un diamant et cinq perles donné à Jehan Gande	cxiiifr. demi
/ Parties de plusieurs dyamans baillies à monditseigneur pour donner le dit jour de l'an à plusieurs seigneurs, chevaliers et escuiers / tant de son hostel comme autrement	
/ Premièrement pour quatre dyamans à pointe de douze escus la piece	liiiiifr.
/ Item pour autres sept dyamens à pointe de huit escus la piece	lxiiiifr.
/ Item pour six autres dyamens de vint cinq escus la piece	viii ^{XX} viiiifr. xvs.t.
/ Item pour autres sept dyamens à pointe de onze escus la piece	iiii ^{XX} vifr. xiis, vid.t.

6. Another sum given in left margin, but crossed out

ANNEX 1

/ Item pour quatre dyamens à pointe, c'est assavoir l'un de iiii^{xx} escus, l'autre de iiii^{xx} escus et les autres deux chascun de / lii escus, donnés à quatre chambellans dou Roy	iii^cviiiifr. vs.t.
/ Item pour trois dyamens, l'un de trente cinq escus et les autres deux chascun de trente escus	cvifr. xviis. vid.t.
/ Item pour quatre autres dyamens de trente cinq escus la piece	vii^{xx}xviifr. demi
/ Item pour trois diamans à pointe, l'un de cinquante escus et les autres deux chascun de soixante escus	ix^{xx}xifr. vs.t.
/ Item pour autres six diamens, c'est assavoir quatre à pointe, un quarré et à losange, quarante deux escus chascun	ii^ciiii^{xx}iiifr. demi
/ Item pour neuf autres dyamens de onze escus la piece	cxifr. viis. vid.t.
/Item pour trois autres dyamens, l'un de cent escus donné au Connestable, et les autres deux chascun de soixante dix escus	ii^clxxifr.
/ Item pour deux gros dyamens, l'un de huit vins escus donné à monseigneur de Rethel, l'autre de sept vins escus donné / à madame de Labret	iii^cxxxviifr. demi
/ Item pour un autre dyament plat que monditseigneur avoit retenu et le donna à celle qui fut royne la nuyt des Roys / à Marcoussis	lxxviiiifr. xvs.t.
/ Item pour un dyament donné à la fille Billy	xxxiiiifr. xvs.t.

ANNEX 1

/ Item pour six diamens de huit escus la piece	liiiifr.
/ Item pour sept dyamens de douze escus la piece	iiii ^{XX} xiiiifr. xs.t.
/ Item pour trois dyamens de quinze escus la piece	lfr. xiis. vid.t.
/ Item pour autres trois dyamens quarrez de cinquante frans la piece	clfr.
/ Item pour douze autres dyamens de dix escus la piece	vi ^{XX} xvfr.
/ Item pour huit dyamens de dix escus la piece	iiii ^{XX} xfr.
/ Item pour trois autres dyamens de trente escus la piece	cifr. vs.t.
/ Item pour dix autres dyamens petis plas de six escus la piece	lxviifr. demi
/ Item pour cinq autres dyamens de trente frans la piece	clfr.
/ Item pour huit dyamens de trente frans chascun	ii ^C xlfr.
/ Item pour six autres dyamens de vint cinq frans la piece	clfr.
/ Item pour huit autres dyamens plas de trente escus la piece	ii ^C lxxfr.
/Item pour douze dyamans de huit escus la piece	cviiiifr.
/ Item pour six dyamans plas de vint cinq frans la piece ⁷	clfr.
/ Item pour sept dyamans quarrez de vint escus la piece	vii ^{XX} xviifr. demi
/ Item pour six dyamans plas de douze escus la piece	iiii ^{XX} ifr.
/ Item pour sept dyamans à pointe de vint frans la piece	vii ^{XX} xfr.

7. Corrected sum in the left margin crossed out

ANNEX 1

/ Item pour huit dyamans de douze escus la piece	cviiffr.
/ Item pour quatre diamans de vint cinq frans la piece	cfr.
/ Item pour un autre dyament plat envoyé de par monditseigneur à la femme dudit Michaut de Laillier en recompense d'un ruby que ledit Michaut avoit donné à monditseigneur	lxviiffr. demi
/ Item pour deux dyamans donné par monditseigneur, c'est assavoir l'un à messire Guichart de Saint Seigne et l'autre à Pierre / de la Lande, ses maistres d'ostelz aux dites estrainnes, au pris de trente escus la piece valent	lxviiffr. demi
/ Item pour un benoitier cothidien que monditseigneur a fait faire pour sa chappelle ou lieu du sien qui avoit / este naigueres emblé à son passer darrenement par Angiers, pesans vii ^m au pris de douze frans le marc	iiii ^{xx} iiiffr.
/ Argent comptant delivré à ceulx qui ont presenté estrainnes le dit jour de l'an à monditseigneur /	
/ Premierement au message du Roy	iiii ^{xx} xfr.
/ A celui de la Royne	xxiiffr. demi
/ A celui de monseigneur de Berry	cxiiiffr. demi
/ A celui de monseigneur d'Orliens	xxxiiiffr. xvs.t.
/ A celui de madame d'Orliens i dyament de	xxxfr.
/ A celui de monseigneur de Bretaigne	xiffr. vs.t.
/ A celui de madame de Bourgoigne	lxviiffr. demi
/ A celui de monseigneur de Nevers	xiffr. vs.t.
/ A celui de monseigneur de Bourbon	xiffr. vs.t.
/ A celui de monseigneur de St. Pol	xiffr. vs.t.
/ A celui de monseigneur le Chancellier	xxiiffr. demi
/ A celui de Dyne	xiffr. vs.t.

ANNEX 1

/ A celui de Montbertant	xifr. vs.t.
/ A celui de Jaques Rapponde	vifr. xvs.t.
/ A celui de Joceran	xifr. vs.t.
/ A celui de Chousat	xifr. vs.t.
/ A celui de Pierre de la Tremoille	xxiifr. demi
/ A celui du Besgue de Villaines pour un dyament	xxiifr. demi
/ A celui de madame de Nevers	xifr. vs.t.
/ A celui de monseigneur de Saint George	vifr. xvs.t.
/ A celui de monseigneur de la Rochefoucaut	xifr. vs.t.
/ A celui de monseigneur le marquis	viifr. demi
/ A Jehan Ferry pour avoir porté à (R..on?) en Auvergne à monseigneur de Berry les estrainnes de monditseigneur	xxifr.
/ A Anthoine Forests pour envoyer les estrainnes de monditseigneur à madame	xifr. vs.t.
/ Au bastard de Rimenville pour aler devers monseigneur d'Orliens à Coucy	ixifr.
/ A Hannequin le chevaucheur pour porter hastivement de Paris à Rouvre les estrainnes que monditseigneur / envoia aux petis enffens de monseigneur de Nevers	ixifr.
/ Autres dons à ceulx qui ont presenté estrainnes à monseigneur de Rethel à eulx fais par monditseigneur	
/ Premierement à Jehan d'Ippre pour lui avoir presenté les estrainnes de madame	xifr.vs.t.
/ A Pierre Eschelote pour lui avoir presenté les estrainnes de par mademoiselle de Rethel	vifr.xvs.t.
/ A Pierre pour lui avoir presenté les estrainnes de par monseigneur de Nevers	vifr.xvs.t.
/ A celui qui lui presenta les estrainnes du Roy	xifr.vs.t.

/ Somme toute des parties dessusdites

contenues en ce / present rolle
 xxviii^mxlviiii frans xiis. viiid.
 ob. tourn.

/ Phelippe, fils de Roy de France, Duc de Bourgoigne, Conte de Flandres, d'Artois et de Bourgoigne Palatin, Seigneur de Salins et de Malines / à noz amez et feaulx conseilliers, tresoriers et gouverneurs generalx de noz finances, Pierre de Monbertant et Joceran Frepier, salut et / dileccion. Nous voulons et vous mandons que par notre amé Jehan Chousat, commis à recevoir toutes nos dites finances, ou autre de noz / receveurs particuliers, vous faites payer, bailler et delivrer à noz bien amez Francois de Passan, marchant genevois, demourant à Paris, / Guillaume Sanguin et Michaut de Laillier, marchans et bourgeois de Paris, la somme de vint huit mille quarante huit frans, douze sols, huit / deniers, maille tourn., en quoy nous leur sommes tenus pour les parties des joyaux, vaisselle d'or et d'argent, et argent comptant / quilz nous ont vendues, baillies et delivrées pour le fait des estrainnes que faites avons au jour de l'an, premier jour de / janvier darrain passé, comme plus aplain est contenu en ce present rolle cy dessus escript. Et par rapportant avec ces presentes / le dit rolle et quittance sur ce desdiz marchans seulement, nous voulons la dite somme de xxviii^mxlviiii fr. xiis. viiid. ob. tourn. estre / allouée es comptes et rabatue de la recepte du paiant, sans aucun contredit ou difficulté, par noz amez et feaulx gens de / nos comptes qu'il appertendra, non obstant que autrement n'appere desdites parties que par le dit role et ces presentes seulement / et quelxconques ordonnances, mandemens ou deffens à ce contraires. Donné à Paris, le onzieme jour de mars l'an de grace / mil quatre cens et deux (1403 (n.s.))

/ Par monseigneur le Duc

(On the reverse of the roll)

/ Pierre de Montbertant et Joceran Frepier, conseillers,
tresoriers et gouverneurs generaulx des finances de
monseigneur le Duc de Bourgoigne, / Conte de Flandres,
d'Artois et de Bourgoigne, Jehan Chousat commis à recevoir
contes lesdicts finances a accomplissez le (....?) au blanc
de ces presents par la maniere que notreditseigneur le
mand par icell escript, le xx^e jour de mars, l'an mil
iiii^c et deux (1403 (n.s.))

OTHER MSS. REFERENCES TO THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE

ADCO B1532, f.271

Et pour la vente d'un autre fermail d'or de l'ordre duditseigneur, garny de pierrerie donné semblablement par monditseigneur à Pierre de la Tremoille en oultre un autre fermail de la dit ordre qu'icellui monseigneur lui donna aux estrainnes au premier jour de janvier l'an mil iiii^c et deux ii^cxxv francs (1403 (n.s.))
(Ordered 4 April 1403)

ADCO B1538, f.161

Item pour avoir fait et forgé un grant colier d'or lequel est fait en maniere d'un grant double soleil garny icellui colier de front d'un grant fermail fait en maniere de deux bestres un aigle et un lyon esmaillé de blanc et entre les deux bestres a un habre d'or garni de iii fins rubis et aux piez diceulx bestres a un saphir en maniere de cressant et autour diceulx bestres a un rouliou ouvré a lettres esmaillées de rouge cler qui font en loyauté pesant tout ensemble iii^m vi^o x^e dont il chiet a rabattre pour le poix de la pierrerie pris de deux viels anneaux xviii^e ainsi demeure rabatu la pierrerie et l'or desdis anneaulx iii^m v^o xii^e et pour le dechiet (...?) qui (...?) pour once monte une once ix^eob. pour le tout iii^m vii^o i^e d'or fin et a lxviiiifr. vs.t. le marc valent ii^c xliiiiifr. xviis. xid.t. Et pour le facon dudit colier iiii^{xx}fr. pour tout iii^c xliiiiifr. xviis. xid.t. Item pour la feuille que vermeille que bleuee qui a este mise dessoulx tout les pierreries et tout les ouvraiges cy devant derlan' pour ce xxxvifr.

(Authorised at Melun 15 September 1402)

ADCO B1538, f.165v

...pour avoir fait faire a ses despenses et de son or a une fois l'arbre et l'aigle d'or de l'esmail de la devise de monditseigneur qui furent perdus lequel il donna a

monseigneur le conte de Rethel; pour avoir a une autre fois fait semblablement refait le lyon d'or dudit esmail qui est aussi perdu et resmailli tout ledit esmail et pour avoir pareillement refait les deux rouliaux d'or dudit esmail qui furent perdus resmailli lors de nouvel icellui esmail avoir fait resmailli a une autre fois l'un diceulx rouliaux

(letters patent dated Paris, 31 October 1403)

ADCO B1538, f.166

...à Guillaume Sanguin auquel estoit deu par monditseigneur iii^c francs d'or pour la vente d'un fermail d'or de l'ordre de monditseigneur garny de pierrerie lequel icelluiseigneur donna a Messire Francois de Gringnault chevalier et son chambellan sicomme il appert plus a plain par les lettres patentes duditseigneur....

(dated Paris 23 February 1404 (n.s.))

ANNEX 2

GENERAL DISTRIBUTION OF DUKE PHILIP'S NEW YEAR GIFTS
AROUND 1403¹

NAME	1398	1402	1403
King Charles VI	x ²	x	*x ³
Queen Isabeau	x	*x	*x
Dauphin	x		
Amiens, Vidame de		x	0
Armagnac, Count of	x		
Arragon, ambassador of King of		x	
Arras, Bishop of ⁴	x	*x	*x
Auxois, Bailli d'			x
Bar, Edward of		*x	*0
Bavaria, Louis of ⁵			x
Berry, Duke of	x	*x	*x
Berry, Chamb. of		x(d) ⁷	
Billy, fille			x(d)
Blondel, Jean		x	
Boffrement, Jean de			x
Boucicaut, Marshal	x		
Bourbon, Duke of	x	*x	*x
Bours, Witart de ⁶	x		
(his opponent) ⁶	x		
Brittany, Duke of			*0
Gilles ⁸			x
Brittany, esc.tranch. of			x
Brittany, Raymonnet de		x	0
Burgundy, Duke of	x		0
Burgundy, Duchess of	x	*x	*x
Bonne ⁹	x		
Philippe ¹⁰	x	x	0
Burgundy, Marshal of ¹¹		x	0
Clermont, Count of			x
Constantinople, Emp. of		*x	
Constantinople, Emp.'s bro.		x	

ANNEX 2

NAME	1398	1402	1403
Courtiambles, Jacques de		*	x
Craon, Pierre de			x
Croy, M. de		x	0
England, King of	x		
Fere, Sgnr. de		*	x
Flanders, Robert of		x	0
Forest, Antoine		x	x
France, Admiral of	x		
France, Constable of	x	x	x(d)
Fribourg, Count of		x	
Gand, Jehan			x
Grignaux, François de		x	0
Joigny, Count of		x	0
Labret, Monsgnr. de	x	*x	x
Labret, Mme de ¹²	x	x(d)	x(d)
Labret, Charles de	x		
La Lande, Pierre de			x(d)
La Marche, Count of	x		
La Marche, Mme de		*x(d)	
La Rochefoucaut, M. de		x	*
La Tremouille, Pierrex		*x	*xx0
L'Eyre, Guillaume de			x
Lourroy, M. de		x	0
Mangny, Sgnr. de			x
Montbertant, Pierre de		*x	*
Montagu/Gr.Mdh.	x	x	x0
Montagu, Mme de ¹³			xx(d)
Mora, Marquis de	x		
Namur, Count of		*x	
Namur, Jean de		x	
Nantoullet, M. de		x(d)	
Navarre, King of	x		
Navarre, Pierre of	x	x	x
Nevers, Count of	x	*x	*x0
Nevers, Countess of	x	x	*x

ANNEX 2

NAME	1398	1402	1403
Nevers' children (1)	x	x	x
(2) Dauphine	x	x(d) ¹⁴	x
Piquet			x
Pisan, Christine de			x
Orleans, Duke of	x	*x	*x
Orleans, Duchess of			x
Rambures, M. de		x	0
Rethel, Count of	x	x	xx(d)0
Rethel, Countess of ¹⁵	x	x	x
Richemont, Count of			x
Rieux, Mareshal de	x		
Rohan, Charles de	x		
Saint George, M. de		*x	*0
Saint Pol, Waleran de		*x	*0
Saint Seigne, Guichart de			x(d)
Savoy, Countess of	x	x	x
Sicily, King of		*x	
Spain, ambassador of King of		x	
Treasurer of Queen			x
Zeyne, Guillaume de			x
Unnamed Household		302(d)	183(d)
Other Order			41
Total number of gifts to named people ¹⁶³⁷		48	106
Total cost ¹⁷	24,200frs.	24,200frs.	27,300frs.
Cost of Order			7,497½frs. ¹⁸

1. Taken from ducal authorisations in liasse ADCO B338; 0 = Order
2. The number of x indicates the number of gifts received
3. * indicates a gift given to the Duke
4. Duke Philip's Chancellor
5. Queen Isabeau's brother

ANNEX 2

6. For a joust on New Year's day
7. (d) indicates the gift of a diamond, rather than a piece of jewellery or plate
8. Duke of Brittany's younger brother
9. Duke Philip's daughter, dead by 1402
10. Duke Philip's youngest son
11. Guillaume de Vienne
12. Shown before her marriage as Mme de Sully
13. Because the Duke had been entertained at Montagu's palace at Marcoussis
14. Nevers' eldest daughter, Marguerite
15. Shown before her marriage in 1402 as Mlle de Saint Pol
16. Some received more than one gift at New Year
17. Excluding gratuities to those presenting gifts
18. Excluding the cost of the Duke's own insignia

GLOSSARY¹

- ACCROISSEMENT - literally, 'augmentation'. Used for a gift to assist with arranging a marriage
- AIGUIERRE - Ewer for wine or water
- ARBRE SEC - symbol of a dead or lifeless tree, on which votive offerings might be hung
- ARGENT - Silver; in heraldic terms, white
- ARGENTERIE - Wardrobe; section of the Ducal household concerned with oversight of its textiles, furnishings, and precious objects. There are separate accounts from an argentier for some years of Philip's reign
- BAILLI - A paid official, with judicial, administrative and military functions, including responsibility for assembling and conducting the troops raised in his area
- BAILLIR - Give; hand over
- BALAY - Balas ruby - a red spinel, paler in tone than the true ruby, the name coming from the Arab word for Badakhshan, in N.E Afghanistan where they were found
- BALDEQUIN - Type of silk
- CABOCHON - Round or oval jewel, with the top polished to a curved surface
- CHAMBRE - Set of furnishings for a bedchamber
- CHAPELLE - Set of vestments and furnishings for a chapel
- DAMAS - Type of silk (not necessarily modern 'damask')
- DENOMBREMENT - Record of a division of land and property (for example, between members of a family)
- DEVISE - For Philip, a symbol or device, other than a coat of arms, devised by or associated with him or, more generally, a design or plan
- DON - A sum of money given by the Duke, as a reward for good service or to acquire necessary items, but on a particular occasion, or for a specific reason, rather than as part of a contract

1. Includes only recurrent, unfamiliar or ambiguous terms. For ranks and positions generally, see the list of Abbreviations

GLOSSARY

- DONNER - Give (not necessarily personally); hand over;
make available
- EMBLE - Stolen
- ENTABLEMENT - Base (for a statue)
- ENVOIER - Send (for a gift, implies the recipient was not present)
- ESCU - Ecu - Shield; or gold coin, featuring a shield (in Annex 1, 240 écus were equivalent to 270 francs)
- ESTAMOIS - Large vessel for liquid, usually with a lid and two handles
- ESMAIL - Email - enamel; a badge or plaque, on a metal object, often indicating an association with the owner or giver
- ESTAT - Etat - Estate; social condition
- ESTRAINNES - Etrennes - New Year gifts
- FAIT D'ARMES - Feat of arms - formal combat between a small number of champions - an 'exhibition match'
- FERMAIL - Anything which closed, joined or fastened things, such as a hook, buckle, clasp, centrepiece in a crown, or ornamental brooch
- FIEF-RENTE - Provision of a fief for the support of a member of a lord's household
- FEUILLE - Foil - thin sheet of metal used under jewels, particularly rubies and sapphires, to reflect light and thus enhance their colour.
- GAGES - Regular, contractual payment; allowances
- GOBELET - High beaker
- GRACE ESPECIAL - As a particular favour; not part of a contractual arrangement
- GRATAFIA - Bestow a reward; tip
- GRUYER - Paid, demesne official in charge a forest
- GUEULES - Red, in heraldic terms
- HACH(I)E - Engraved (of metal decoration)
- HANAP - Broad, shallow drinking bowl, sometimes with a foot, often with a matching, unattached lid.
- HONNESTEMENT/HONORABLEMENT - Appropriately for station in life (in relation to clothes, horses, etc.)

GLOSSARY

- HOUPELANDE - Fashionable, expensive, sleeved overgarment, very full. Could be knee, calf or full length
- IMAIGE - Statuette
- JOYAUX - Precious objects of wrought plate
- LEVRIER - Greyhound
- LIVREE - In Burgundy, clothes or dress material given out regularly, or on a special occasion, in colours and qualities appropriate to the occasion and to the rank of the wearer, rather than related to the giver
- LOSANGE - Diamond shape (used for a woman's blazon)
- LOYAUTE - Loyalty, legitimacy, legality
- MAILLE - Copper coin, worth half a denier; obole; something worthless; coinage
- MARGUERITE - Margaret; daisy; pearl
- MONTRE - Muster of troops
- NECESSITES - Whatever was necessary to maintain an appropriate estate or appearance, particularly in the Duke's employ
- PAR DEVERS LUI - Kept on one side; no immediate purpose in mind
- PAREMENT - Elaborate dress in a parade or on a grand occasion; entourage wearing such dress
- PAS D'ARMES - Place defended by a knight against all-comers in a combat, arranged according to a literary scenario; a celebratory event of this kind
- PATERNOSTER - Beads used in repeating prayers a required number of times, worn hanging from a girdle, or around neck, waist, or arm - as gifts in valuable and highly decorative materials. Developed into the modern rosary
- PECTORAL - Square or lozenge shaped object, in embroidered cloth or enamelled and jewelled metal, worn at chest level, usually on an ecclesiastical vestment, but occasionally on secular garb
- PIERRERIE - Generic term for jewels, usually small, less expensive, and not noteworthy
- PLAT - Table cut (of jewels)
- POINCONNE - Pounced (of metal decoration)

GLOSSARY

POT(Z) - Container for liquid

QUARRE - Oblong or square (of jewels); with a number, facet

QUEUE - Measure of wine

RABOT - Plane (device of John the Fearless), said to have been adopted to counter Orleans' device of the knotted staff; now seen as symbolising John's desire to remove the injustices of the latter's administration

ROUND BOSSE - Difficult technique on gold, in which the whole figure is coated in opaque, often white, enamel. Designed to give a naturalistic, three-dimensional form to people, flora and fauna depicted in jewellery or joyaux (as opposed to the older, compartmented forms of cloisonné or champlevé enamelling, where the enamel was flat and put into shallow cells formed, respectively, by wire walls, or scooping out the surface)

ROUGE CLER - Difficult baisse-taille enamelling technique where the gold ground is sunk by chasing and engraving, and then coated by translucent red enamel, creating delicate plays of light and patterning

ROULIAU - Phylactery; open scroll

RUBI - Ruby - deep red form of the mineral corundum. Relatively rare in the period, the hardest and best coming from Sri Lanka.

SAPHIR - Sapphire - blue form of the mineral corundum. At this period, the most prized were sky blue, mainly from Sri Lanka. The hardest gemstone after diamonds. Considered as suitable for kings; as protective against poison and illness; and as promoting peace, loyalty and chastity

TABEAU - Plaque; tablet

TASSE - Small drinking bowl or beaker

TRONCHE - Cluster (of jewel setting)

VIDIMUS - Authenticated copy, of earlier, legally binding agreements

ANALYSIS OF APPENDICES

The following Appendices on the Recipients of the Order of the Golden Tree underpin, inform and justify the methods adopted and the arguments set out in this Thesis. A brief explanation of the purpose of each is given below.

The Appendices are drawn primarily from a detailed analysis of the Duke's unpublished accounts. They establish for each man the nature of his relationships with, and normal patterns of reward from the Duke in order to identify what distinguished this group of men, and the occasion, sufficiently to warrant so unique a gift, and thus to determine the Duke's objectives in giving it.

- R1. Recipients: Biographical Notes R1-1 to R1-60
Summary of background, career, and connections to the Duke, to identify each man and any network to which he belonged, as context to Appendices R2-R11
- R2. Recipients: Hierarchy
Table showing for each man his rank, title, position, and value of Order insignia received, to identify distinguishing characteristics;
facilitate comparison with non-recipients of similar type; and identify departures from the Duke's normal pattern of hierarchically related gift values
- R3. Recipients: Gifts of Material Objects - Precious (excluding 1403)
Table by occasion, date, value and nature, to establish whether the Order fell into any pattern of Ducal gifts, of a nature similar to the Order, to that person
- R4. Recipients: Gifts of Material Objects - Other (excluding 1403)
Table of textiles, horses, wine, and other 'necessities', by date and value, given to each, to establish whether recipients were part of the Duke's circle, and more normally rewarded in this manner
- R5. Recipients: Financial Gifts and Rewards

(excluding 1403)

Table of regular and occasional financial rewards given to each, by date and value, to establish whether and when he was in the Duke's service, and if more normally rewarded other than by precious gifts

R6. Recipients: Material Gifts and Financial Rewards
1403

Table of all forms of gift and reward given to each in 1403, by nature and value, to establish relationships with the Duke in the year the Order was given

R7. Recipients: Chivalry

Table of involvement of each in chivalric orders and in crusading activities, to assess the likelihood of the Order of the Golden Tree having similar objectives

R8. Recipients: Livery

Table for each man to indicate whether he had been included in one of the Duke's rare general material distributions across all ranks, in the same colours or with the same device, and on the same occasion, to see if the Order was an example of such special livery (in contrast to the normal issue of clothes, differentiated by rank and in arbitrary colours, explored in Appendix R4)

R9. Recipients: Loyalty

Table for each of loyalty shown or noted, to establish if the Order was to reward or promote this, and its effectiveness in this respect for Philip and his successors

R10. Recipients: Activities 1402-4

Table to identify possible political or military objectives for the Order from events around its giving in which each recipient was involved

R11. Recipients: Military Worth

Table for each of military positions and activities, to test the hypothesis that the Order was some form of military alliance

APPENDIX R1: RECIPIENTS OF THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE -
BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

1. AUNAY, LE GALOIS D' (Annay/Aunoy also found)

'Le Galois' was an epithet applied to several successive generations of the d'Aunoy family at this period¹. The dates of the references in Duke Philip's household accounts suggest that the most likely of these as candidate for recipient of the Order is Robert d'Aunay, Seigneur d'Orville and de Villeron. He was born sometime after 1361, and died in 1414². It is difficult to be certain before his father's death in 1392, to which of them reference is being made in archival material, but references to 'le Galois' in such material relating to Burgundian ducal service from 1388 can be taken as being to Robert³. For the purposes of this study, I have also included such references from 1382⁴.

Robert d'Aunay came from a family loyal to the Kings of France, serving them in both military and Household capacities. His father, Philip, had served King John II of France, particularly at the battle of Poitiers in 1356; by 1361 was a knight, serving the Duke of Normandy, later King Charles V, as maître d'hôtel. He fought under Marshal Boucicaut against the English in 1367 and 1368; and by 1388 had moved to Charles VI's service, as his maître d'hôtel⁵.

The family had houses in Paris, near the royal palace of the Louvre, and near Senlis; lands in the Ile-de-France and in Champagne; and was well-connected. At Robert's marriage in 1380 to an heiress, Mahaut de Sampy, Duke Philip gave 1000 francs to buy her land; and Robert's son, Charles (1389-1415) married in 1403 Jacqueline, the daughter of Philibert de Paillart, president of the Parlement of Paris, and Jeanne de Dormans⁶. Robert's name is often found in the accounts paired with that of his

cousin, Charles de Chambly (Appendix R1-13), another recipient of the Order in the King's service, and through him was distantly related to the Duke and to a number of other recipients of the Order.

Robert had a distinguished military career, being noted as one of the most outstanding of Duke Philip's soldiers at the battle of Roosebeke in 1382⁷. He served as chamberlain to both King Charles VI and Duke Philip, accompanying them on important occasions⁸.

After Duke Philip's death, he continued in the service of King Charles VI, as did his son Charles. There is no evidence that he served or supported Duke John the Fearless directly, but he is generally recorded as party to decisions in Council which were not hostile to him⁹. Some members of the family, however, continued to serve Duke John¹⁰.

1. Unlike titles, which generally passed on only on death, abdication or transfer by the holder, epithets seem, confusingly, sometimes to have been held concurrently by two generations. P.A., vol.VIII, pp.880-1 records le Galois as a knight in 1368, but this must be Robert's father -see note 2 below
2. Dictionnaire de Biographie Française, (hereafter D.B.F.) vol.4, col.645 says Robert was born before the mid fourteenth century, but his father, Philip, married his mother, Anne or Agnes de Villiers, in 1361 -see La Chesnaye-DesBois, F.A. de, Dictionnaire de la Noblesse, (hereafter C-D.) vol.2, col.53, and P.A., vol. VIII, p.883
3. The ducal accounts for 1389, in relation to his marriage to Mahaut de Sampy, refer to him in 1388 as '*le Galois Daunoy chevalier*' -see ADCO B1475, f.64, and P., vol.22, p.185. A quittance for September 1402 refers to him as '*Robert Daunoy, dit le Galois*' -see ADCO B354, P.S.1701
4. There are frequent references to le Galois d'Aunay as a knight and chamberlain of Duke Philip from the mid 1380s, one of which

APPENDIX R1-1

refers to his '*longs services*' -see ADCO B352 for 1384. A Galois d'Aunay was also paid by the Duke for accompanying him to Flanders in an authorisation dated October 1382 -see ADCO B1460, f.106. Robert's father featured more in royal than in ducal accounts, so these are likely to refer to Robert.

5. P.A., vol.VIII, p.883. King John and Duke Philip were captured by the English at Poitiers, but many others of the French nobility were considered to have acquitted themselves shamefully at the battle, so Duke Philip would have appreciated Philip d'Aunay's unusual loyalty and bravery.
6. ADCO B1465, f.64 records the Duke's mandement of 3rd August 1386 for a payment of 500 francs towards this 1000 francs '*en accroissement de son mariage.....pour employer en achat de heritaiges pour elle*'. ADCO B1461, f.130v, records a ducal gift to masons working on the house at Senlis
7. Plancher, vol. III, p.567
8. Such as the marriage of Charles VI's daughter, Isabelle, to Richard II in 1396, see DBF., vol.4, col.645
- 9.& 10. See App. R9, n.4

2. MONSEIGNEUR LE MARQUIS: (Marquis du Pont also found)

The only Marquis referred to consistently in the ducal accounts was the Marquis du Pont who, in 1403, was Edward of Bar, the son of Duke Philip's sister, Marie, and Robert, Duke of Bar. He was born after 1372, and died at Agincourt in 1415. He succeeded his elder brothers, Henry and Philip, as Marquis after the second had died at Nicopolis in 1396, and the first on the return journey from there in 1398. He became Duke of Bar in 1411, on the death of his father¹.

His brother Philip had been Duke Philip's godson, and a great favourite, generously treated, provided with the same clothes as the Duke's sons, and featuring repeatedly in the Ducal accounts from 1383². It seems that Edward was intended in some way to fill his brother's place at the Duke's court and in his affections, as references to him in the accounts start after his brother's death³. This nurturing, although apparently effective in the short term, was less so in the longer term. Initially after the Duke's death, Edward tried to keep a foot in both camps and was on friendly terms with both John the Fearless and his royal cousins. In December 1409 he promised, as John's vassal, to support him against the King and his eldest son, and received wine from him, as 'his very dear lord and cousin' up to 1412. He had, however, joined the Armagnac party by 1413⁴.

The family was very well connected. Apart from the link to the French royal family, and to the Duke's family, one of Edward's sisters, Yolande, had married in 1380 John of Aragon, Duke of Girona, later King of Aragon, and their daughter, another Yolande, was to marry Louis II, Duke of Anjou, and King of Sicily. Another sister, Marie, had been married by contract in 1384 to William of Flanders, Count of Namur, a prominent member of Duke Philip's court,

holding important territories in Flanders, including the strategically important port of Ecluse. Marie had, however, died in 1387, and William was not a member of the Order. A third sister, Bonne, had married Waleran of Luxembourg (Appendix R1-50), another member of the Order, in 1400⁵.

Edward's family held the strategically important territory of Bar, on the borders of (and owing allegiance to) both France and the Empire, and on Duke Philip's route to his Northern territories. It had also inherited lands in Flanders from Edward's grandmother, Yolande of Flanders, including Cassel, several ports, and the town of Lille. The Duke therefore needed to secure the best possible relations with it.

Apart from Waleran, Edward was closely related to four other members of the Order - Duke Philip, and his sons John, Philip and Anthony (see Appendices R1-56, 58 and 60); more distantly to others of the Duke's relations in the Order; and possibly to two other members⁶. The cost and richness of his Order clasp, second only to those of his senior relations, reflects his rank, honoured position, and value to Duke Philip⁷.

1. ADCO B1532, f.153v refers to '*Messire Edouart de Bar, Marquis du Pont et nepMeu de monditseigneur*' , and f.81v clearly refers to the same man as '*Monseigneur le Marquis*' in 1403. His brother, Philip, was born in 1372. See P.A., vol.V, p.513, and DBF., vol.5, col.116.
2. See, for instance, Prost, vol.2, items 1052, 1194, 1352, 1609, 2807, 3107, 3115, 3331 and 3377 for New Year gifts 1383-1390; P., vol.23, p.243 for three quittances in 1391 for 3000 francs from the Duke to Philip; and ADCO B1521, f.51 for a gift of clothes similar to those for the Duke's sons, John and Anthony.
3. See, for instance, ADCO B380 for a quittance of 1398 for a pension of 3000 francs for Edward from Duke Philip.

APPENDIX R1-2

4. He was allied to Orleans in 1404, and did homage to him for 6000 livres pension a year, and in 1405 was involved in trying to spirit the Dauphin away from Paris with Montagu and Orleans' servants. In 1407 he and Orleans agreed to share the sovereignty of Metz, and later both entered a treaty of alliance with Edward's father against the Duke of Lorraine, who had supported Orleans in 1405, but was allied to Duke John in 1408. After Orleans' murder, he attended his funeral with Saint Pol. See Vaughan, R., John the Fearless, pp.31 and 69; Jarry, E., La vie politique de Louis de France, (hereafter, Louis de France), pp.313 and 352; and Autrand, Charles VI, pp.352 and 404. ADCO B1560 records him as going to Paris to support Duke John in 1409, and P., vol.1, p.636 gives a letter of alliance between him and John dated December 1409, but the DBF., vol.5, col.116, notes that from 1413, when he was arrested by the Cabochiens and imprisoned, to be released with the Dauphin's help, he had joined the Armagnacs. For the rest of his life, he was at the French royal court.
5. P.A., vol.II, pp.752-5, and vol.V, pp.512-4.
6. The Dukes of Bar were distantly related, through a common ancestor Thierry II, Count of Bar, to the families of Salm (see Appendix R1-54) and Chiny (Appendix R1-17) - see Le Gentil, A., 'Les poissons dans l'héraldique médiévale', Moyen Age, 32, pp.52-3
7. Marie de Coucy, widow of Edward's elder brother Henry, had sold part of Coucy to Orleans in 1400 - see Abbott, P.D., Provinces, Pays and Seigneuries of France, (hereafter France), p.55

3. BASOCHES, MESSIRE JEHAN DE

Most likely Jean de Basoches, Seigneur of Basoches and of Vauserée and, until 1398, Vidame of Châlons¹. (Although the de Beauvoir family were seigneurs of Basoches, life-long servants of the Counts of Flanders and of the Dukes of Burgundy, and related to Philippe de Jaucourt, also in the Order (see Appendix R1-28), I can find no reference to a Jean in this period)².

Jean was well-connected, having married before 1388 Beatrix de Roye, daughter of Mathieu de Roye, called Le Flament, who had been Master of the Crossbowmen of France, an important and prestigious royal military command. Her brothers served the French king - a half brother, Jean, as councillor and chamberlain, fighting in Normandy and on crusade, including Nicopolis, where he died³.

There is a reference in 1387 to a Jean de Bazoiches, who was a squire serving the Chatelain of Desiré in Nevers⁴. Otherwise, the receipt of the Order appears to be the sole reference in the ducal accounts to anyone of this name. He was not listed in ADCO B338 with the squires, so might have been a knight.

There is no evidence that he served the Burgundian cause after Duke Philip's death, and it is more likely that he was an Orleanist⁵.

1. P.A., vol.VIII, p.12. He sold the Vidamé to Louis of Orleans for 1900 livres tournois, see Jarry, Louis de France, p.105
2. P.A., vol.VII, pp. 1-4
3. P.A., vol.VIII, pp.10-12. She died in 1388
4. P., vol.24, p.660, (ADCO B11840) referring to a quittance from him.
5. see n.1 above

4. BELLIERE, LE VICONTE DE

Most likely Jean Ragueneel, Vicomte de Dinan, Sire de la Bellière, and Seigneur of Chastel-Oger. Several generations shared the same name, and there is confusion in the books about their dates. One served John de Montfort, Duke John IV of Brittany, faithfully throughout the 1380s and 1390s, but is recorded as having died in 1401, which suggests that the Order was given to his son, also Jean, who was recorded as in the Council of Duke John V of Brittany in 1405, and as his chamberlain in 1413. He appears to have died at Agincourt in 1415¹.

Jean came from one of the principal Breton families, related to the Rohans, and to Chateaugiron (Appendix R1-15), and holding important territories. Through the Ragueneels, he was related to the legendary Constable of France, Bertrand du Guesclin, who had married Thiphaine de Ragueneel, Vicomtesse de la Bellière (possibly Jean's aunt). A Jeanne de Ragueneel (probably his sister) married after 1398 Charles de Dinan, Seigneur of Montafilant, who had served the French king since 1369, and accompanied the young Duke John V of Brittany to pay homage to King Charles VI in January 1404 when he reached his majority².

Jean was associated with other Breton recipients of the Order who had supported the de Montfort Dukes of Brittany. In 1387, he, (or more likely his father) had headed the garrison supporting Duke John IV at St. Malo with Montauban and Chateaugiron, also in the Order (Appendices R1-43 and R1-15); and he was listed with the Sire de la Muce, also in the Order (Appendix R1-30), as one of the 24 barons at the Parlement of Brittany in 1386³.

Other than the receipt of the Order, there are no references to him in Duke Philip's accounts. From his

APPENDIX R1-4

listing in the Order, it seems likely he was a knight. There is no evidence that he supported the Burgundian cause after Duke Philip's death.

1. Prof.Jones' private index gives a reference to the death of a Jean Raguenele in BNfr. 11531, p.347; to a Jean Raguenele in the Duke of Brittany's Council in June 1405 in AIV, IF 1997, f.21r; and to Phillips MS 18465, recording the Viscount of Dinan as as ducal chamberlain and as Captain of Dinan. Michel Pastoureau, in L'Ermine et le sinople, p.234, records one Jean Raguenele as having signed the Treaty of Guérande^e campaigned with Du Guesclin; and dying at Agincourt.
2. P.A., vol.VIII, pp.579-80; and Abbott, France, pp.255-6
3. La Borderie, Histoire, vol.IV, pp.51, 101, and 115

5. BLONDEL, GUILLAUME

Having started in the Count of Flanders' service, Guillaume Blondel was in Duke Philip's service from at least 1383, when he was recorded as a squire¹. By 1389 he had been promoted to échanton to the Duke; by 1398 he was also chamberlain to Anthony, the Duke's second son, and had risen to be the latter's premier chambellan by 1403-4². He stayed in Anthony's service, being recorded as councillor and chamberlain to him in 1405-6 and chamberlain in 1407-8³. He followed Anthony in supporting John the Fearless, at least in 1405-6, when he was recorded as part of Duke John's forces in Paris⁴.

He was sent frequently on missions by Duke Philip, particularly to family members, like the Duchess of Brabant; to Duke Albert of Bavaria; to Avignon; to get help to ransom John after Nicopolis; and several times to the Duke of Brittany in the early 1390s⁵.

It is difficult to trace his family. Blondel was a common name, and he could have been from Normandy or Artois⁶. A Jean Blondel was an even more trusted negotiator and servant of Duke Philip at the same period, but there is no evidence that they were related⁷. I could find no clear relationship to any other recipients of the Order, but Guillaume is, of course, mentioned in the accounts in tandem with other recipients drawn from the Duke's household, and from powerful Burgundian families, such as the much favoured Pierre de La Trémoille (see Appendix R1-37)⁸.

He was clearly able to acquit himself well in military terms, when necessary, but his career seems to have been primarily as one of the ducal family's most trusted and loyal household members⁹.

APPENDIX R1-5

1. See Prost, vol.2, item 3348. There are references in the accounts simply to 'Blondel', which could refer either to Jean or to Guillaume. ADCO B1461, f.92, however, clearly refers to a Guillaume Blondel, squire, in 1383-4
2. See ADCO B1475, ff.19v, 20 and 23, referring to him as squire and échançon for 1389; ADCO B356, a certification dated September 1398, qualifies him as a chamberlain of Anthony; ADCO B394 contains another dated 1402, and ADCO B354 two more dated 1403, qualifying him as premier chambellan of Anthony.
3. See ADCO B1543, f.131, for 1405-6, and ADCO B1554, f.96v, for 1407-8.
4. See ADCO B1543, f.131
5. For Brabant and Bavaria, see P., vol.22, p.154 for 1384, and p.183 for 1388, and ADCO B1475, f.19v for 1389; for Avignon see ADCO B1495, f.25v, for 1392-3; for a trip to Duke Albert of Bavaria and the Count of Ostrevant in 1398 to seek help with John's ransom see P., vol.22, p.306; and for the trips to the Duke of Brittany, see P., vol.22, p.238, for 1392; ADCO B1500, f.40v, for 1393-4; and ADCO B1501, ff.20v and 89v, for 1394.
6. See C-D., vol. 3, pp.351 and 354
7. See, for instance, ADCO B11752, which lists both in a muster in 1387 for the war to help the Duchess of Brabant
8. See the muster in note 7 above, and also ADCO B1538, f.233 for a mounted messenger sent to him and Pierre in Brussels
9. ADCO B1554, f.96v, records authorisation in May 1406 for a don to Guillaume of 200 gold escus, for *'les plus grans et notables services quil fist a feu monseigneur le duc....a son vivant, fait audit monseigneur de Brabant et monditseigneur de jour en jour et espyre que dancore face'*.

6. BOIS, LE SEIGNEUR DU

Although 'du Bois' is a fairly common name and title in this period, his certifications as chamberlain make clear that this is Jean, Seigneur du Bois, d'Annequin and de Vermeille. From the dates and the title, he was Jean II, born after 1362¹.

He was a knight from an important and very well-connected military family with lands in Duke Philip's northern territories. His father, Jean, was Seigneur du Bois, des Querdes and de Vermeille, and Baron d'Esne. His mother, Jeanne de Lens, Dame d'Annequin, came from a family which had married into that of the Dampierre Counts of Flanders in the early fourteenth century; and which had provided in the mid fourteenth century a Constable of France, married to wives with substantial property and connections in Flanders and the County of Burgundy; and also a Master of the Crossbowmen of France and Governor of Lisle, Douai and Orchies, who had been chamberlain to King John II, and had served King Charles V in Flanders, Normandy and Burgundy, sometimes with Du Guesclin². Jean II's son Philip was Duke Philip's godson, and married into the powerful Burgundian family of de La Trémoille, several of whose members were recipients of the Order (Appendices R1-33 to 37). His step-sister married Rogue de Pois (Appendix R1-46), and his daughters married into other Flemish and Burgundian noble families³. Duke Philip's representative at Philip's christening was Antoine de Fontaines, also a recipient of the Order (Appendix R1-23)⁴.

It is not clear when Jean II joined Duke Philip's service. He was his chamberlain by 1397, and by 1398 was chamberlain also to the Duke's second son, Anthony, with whom he seems to have remained⁵. He was also chamberlain to the Duke's eldest son, John, Count of Nevers, and in 1405 was serving him (by then Duke of Burgundy) in arms in

APPENDIX R1-6

France⁶. He apparently stayed loyal to Duke John, as he is recorded as his councillor, chamberlain, and Captain of the important fortress of l'Ecluse in 1413⁷.

Apart from their service to the ducal family, there is a possible link between the families of Blondel (Appendix R1-5) and du Bois, as Blondel's father had been bailli of Lens, which belonged to Jean's mother's family⁸.

1. His parents were married in 1362. See P.A., vol.VI, p.173
2. For his mother's family, including Robert de Fiennes, the Constable, and her brother Baudouin, Master of Crossbowmen, see P.A., vol.VI, p.169 and vol.VIII, p.30. His father may also have been squire to Duke Philip when he was Duke of Touraine - see ADCO B1416, ff.60v and 63v.
3. For Jean II's children, see P.A., vol.VI, p.173
4. For his son's christening, see ADCO B1521, f.64v.
5. ADCO B1532, f.227 refers in 1403 to his long service. P., vol.23, p.341 (ADCO B354) contains a certification by Jean, Seigneur du Bois, chevalier and chamberlain to Duke Philip, dated 1397; ones dated 1399, 1401 and 1403 by Jean, Seigneur du Bois d'Annequin as chamberlain of Anthony; and a certification dated 10 March 1397(-O.S.) and a quittance dated 1400 qualifying him as chamberlain both to Duke Philip and to Anthony. See also ADCO B1532, f.227.
6. P., vol. 24, p.320 (ADCO B354) contains two certifications and two quittances, dated 1400 and 1403, by Jean, Seigneur du Bois and d'Annequin as chamberlain to both Duke Philip and the Count of Nevers. For a quittance recording his service to Duke John in France in 1405, see App. R11, n.15. ADCO B1543, f.131v. notes him as councillor and chamberlain to Anthony (by then Duke of Limbourg) in 1405; ADCO B1554, f.81v. as Duke John's chamberlain in 1407-8.
7. For a reference to him as chamberlain of Duke John and Captain of Ecluse in 1413, see App. R11, n.16
8. Pierre Blondel had been Bailli of Lens before he died in 1386 - see Prost, vol.I, p.239, n.2

7. BOVES, SAUVAIGE DES

Guillaume, called Sauvaige, des Boves came from the Vexin français, and was in Duke Philip's service as a squire at least from 1392, when he was qualified as a panetier¹. In the same year, he was also called an écuyer tranchant, and was still qualified as such in 1394 and 1398². He stayed in Burgundian service, as an écuyer d'écurie to Duke John in 1406-9³. It is not, however, clear whether he stayed in the latter's service until his death at Agincourt in 1415, during which period he served the Duke of Guyenne and was Captain of the Chateau of St. Germain-en-Laye⁴.

His family also served Duke Philip. Messire Jean des Boves was a squire serving as a carver in 1383-4; as a butler before 1390; and by the latter date was a knight and chamberlain to the Duke, and sufficiently important to warrant 3000 francs as a gift on the occasion of the marriage which the Duke arranged for him in 1392. He was still receiving part of this gift in 1396⁵.

Guillaume married Jeanne de Fontenay, probably in or around 1395, when he received 2000 francs from the Duke in '*accroissement*' of this marriage⁶. In 1398, he sold half the castle and lordship of St. Liebaut, and its associated rights, which his wife had inherited from her father, Nicolas, to Jean de Courcelles, an écuyer panetier of Duke Philip, and another recipient of the Order (see Appendix R1-18)⁷.

1. See C.A., vol.2, no.471. P., vol.26, p.55 (ADCO B11736) qualifies him as panetier in a Ducal authorisation of July 1392 for payment to help household officers accompany him to Brittany.
2. ADCO B377, dated 1392, refers to him as '*Guillaume des Boves, dit Sauvaige, son escuier tranchant*'
3. ADCO B1543, f.125, refers to a jewelled rabot (Duke John's device) given to him at New Year 1406 (n.s.). P., vol.24, p.236

APPENDIX R1-7

(ADCO B353) includes a quittance from him as écuyer de l'écurie dated 1409

4. C.A., vol.2, no.471; Gallia Regia, vol.IV, p.399
5. Their relationship is indicated by their seals. Guillaume's was a band of 5 lozenges with en chef a shield with 2 lions -see P., vol.24, p.236; Jean's was the same, but without the shield see P., vol.23, p.204). See ADCO B1461, f.92v for a reference to Jean as écuyer tranchant in 1383-4; and ADCO B1503, f.82v for his marriage gift
6. See ADCO B1503, f.92v
7. See P., vol.25, p.116 for a vidimus of the sale, and P., vol.24, p.105, for a certification of 1398 by Jean de Courcelles, Seigneur de St. Liebaut, which refers to the acquisition from Guillaume.

8. BRETAGNE, RAYMONNET DE

The only information available about Raymonnet is that he was a squire of the Duchess of Brittany from at least 1400 to 1403, and may have accompanied her to England on her marriage to Henry IV, but appears to have returned to Brittany after 1406¹.

We can surmise that, since squires in ducal households were usually of good family, Raymonnet was not called 'de Bretagne' because he originated from the area but had no family name. In the Burgundian accounts, the use of a ducal territory as a name could indicate a bastard of someone in the ducal family, but there is no evidence that the de Montfort Duke John IV of Brittany had a bastard of this name, and his widow was unlikely to have favoured one from the opposing house of Blois².

Michael Jones indicates that the Breton members of the Duchess of Brittany's household in England in 1406 were of little political importance, but Raymonnet must have been a firm favourite and close to her in 1402 as, in addition to the Order, he received from Duke Philip a present, on the latter's visit to Brittany in the autumn of that year, which was worth more than the Duke's gifts to Breton nobles on the same occasion³.

1. He is termed squire in the references to the Order, and in ADCO B1532, f.255v; and squire to the Duchess of Brittany in ADCO B1532, f.252v. In January 1400 he presented a gift from that Duchess to Duke Philip, and took an expensive one back to her from the Duke, for which he was unusually handsomely rewarded -see App. R3, n.10. There is a Remonet listed as one of the Duchess of Brittany's household in England in 1406 in Rotuli Parliamentorum III pp.571-2, and a Remonet was among 11 Bretons ordered by Parliament to return to France, as a means of reducing the size of her household in P.R.O., P 50 1/1/43 and 1/3/19.

APPENDIX R1-8

2. Low ranking members of a household, such as messengers, might use their country or place of origin in place of a surname. Robert de Flandres, bastard son of Duchess Margaret of Burgundy's father, Louis de Mâle, also in the Order (see App. R1-22) is an example of a bastard doing so.
3. See Jones, M., 'Entre la France et l'Angleterre: Jeanne de Navarre, Duchesse de Bretagne et Reine d'Angleterre (1368-1437)', in Autour de Marguerite d'Ecosse: Reines, princesses et dames du XVe siècle; Actes du colloque de Thouars (23 and 24 Mai 1997), p.62. For the gift, see ADCO B1532, ff.250v-253v

9. BRIMEU, DAVID DE

There are two men of this name in 1403 who might have received the Order¹. The first, Seigneur de Marigny, like the Order recipient, was a squire in 1403; by 1415 was chamberlain to Charles VI and to the Duke of Guyenne; and died in 1488². The second, his cousin, Seigneur of Humbercourt, was a squire in 1386, and a knight in 1403³. Both held lands in Duke Philip's territories and were connected to other of the recipients' families, but the most likely candidate is the second, Seigneur of Humbercourt. He was an écuyer de l'écurie of Duke Philip in 1401, a great favourite of Duke John, and his chamberlain in 1407 and 1413, staying loyal to the Burgundian cause, at least until 1421⁴.

David de Brimeu, Seigneur of Humbercourt was a Picard, with lands in the Somme area, who is found grouped with soldiers from Flanders and Artois. He was a trusted man, with a record of military endeavour, featuring in a number of musters, with other members of the ducal household, some of whom were recipients of the Order. He held a number of posts under Duke John, including at the French royal court, where he was chamberlain and maître d'hotel to the Duke of Guyenne in 1412⁵. He was also mentioned particularly with two other recipients of the Order - in 1408, reviewing troops with the Marshal of Burgundy, Jean de Vergy (Appendix R1-52), and later sharing expenses for lifting the siege of Liège with the Sire du Croy (Appendix R1-11)⁶.

1. See C.A., vol.1, no.60-1 for the Seigneur of Marigny, and no.292 for the Seigneur of Humbercourt. (There are also references to a Seigneur de Brimeu from the de Poix family in Burgundian service around this time, but although the Seigneur de Brimeu was David until about 1392, at the time of the Order he would have been Louis de Poix, who died in 1415. See P.A., vol.VII, p.822).

APPENDIX R1-9

The references to David de Brimeu receiving the Order, and livery at Rethel's wedding in 1402 (see App. R8), do not give a title, perhaps because the recipient did not have one at the time.

P.A., vol.VIII refers on p.275 to a Jeanne, Dame de Humbercourt marrying a Guillaume de Brimeu, Seigneur of Ligny-sur-Canche, apparently in the late fourteenth century, and on p.656 to a David de Brimeu, Seigneur of Humbercourt (their son?) who married a Marie de Mailly sometime after 1415. It is difficult to distinguish these men in Duke Philip's accounts. Later, Messire David de Brimeu, knight, appears in the Burgundian accounts in 1405 -ADCO B1554, f.70; repeatedly in 1407 - e.g. ADCO B1554, ff.221v, 224 and 226v, qualified in the latter as '*notre ame et feal chevalier et chambellan*'; and continues until 1417 -see P., vol.26, p.305. He is qualified as Seigneur of Humbercourt in 1408, 1409, and 1413, the last two also as ducal chamberlain -ADCO B357 and B355, and in 1421 -ADCO B310, when he was associated with a demand for justice from Duke John the Fearless' widow against her husband's alleged murderer.

2. See C.A., vol.1, no.60
3. See C.A., vol.1, no.292. Although the recipient of the Order was qualified as a squire, he could have been knighted later in 1403.
4. See n.1 above; App.R9, especially n.12; and C.A., vol.1, no.292, where he is noted as a councillor, chamberlain and maître d'hotel of Duke Philip the Good.
5. See App. R11, particularly nns.20, 21 and 22; and n. 3 above
6. For Vergy, see ADCO B1554, f.226v; for Croy, see P., vol.22, p.372

10. BOC(C)ALONNE/ CALONNE, BO

Little is known of this recipient. There is a reference in 1397 to a Bocalonne in Duke Philip's service, and in 1405 to a Boccalonne, qualified as Duke John's écuyer de l'écurie¹. Given the remains of the latter's seal, it seems likely that he is the person referred to elsewhere in the records as Bo, Bon, Boy or Boyt Calonne, qualified as Duke Philip's écuyer de l'écurie in 1398-9 and 1402, and in Duke John's in 1405 and 1408².

A number of his relatives were in Burgundian service, one possibly a recipient of the Order³. References to him are generally in a military context, and he appears to have continued to serve the Burgundian cause, supporting Duke John in 1405, 1408, 1409, and 1410⁴.

1. See P., vol.24, p.7 (ADCO B11938), and App. R5, n.25 for 1397; and P., vol.23, p664 (ADCO B370), and App. R5, n.26 for 1405
2. Bocalonne's seal on the 1405 quittance in n.1 above is very similar to that on a certification by Boyt de Calonne, écuyer de l'écurie of Duke Philip - see ADCO B1517, ff.137 and 140, for 1398-9, and P., vol.23, p.391 (ADCO B370) for 1402, and on an undated certification by Bon de Calonne
3. Jean de Calonne (see App. R1-11 on Girart de Calonne) had a similar seal as did Baudouin -see P., vol. 24, pp.22 and 205
4. See App. R4, n.12; App. R5, n.26; and App. R11, nns. 21, 24, 26, 27 and 28. ADCO B1543, f.103, refers to him fighting for Duke John in 1405. P., vol. 24, p.474 includes Boy Calonne in a quittance dated 1408 from Jean de Calonne for the wages of his company of armed men to serve Duke John; and P., vol. 23, p.296 gives a quittance dated 1410 from Boyt Calonne, squire, for his wages and those of another squire and 7 archers in his company serving Duke John in Paris.

11. CALOIRE/CALON(N)E, GIRART (DE)

There is an apparent discrepancy between the version of this squire's name given in the two extant texts, which may be due to nothing more than the script or a copying error. Although there are no other references to either version in Duke Philip's accounts, 'Calonne' seems the more likely, as several people of this name do feature in the Burgundian accounts, which suggests that he may have been a member of a family which served the Duke¹.

The name appears both with and without the 'de', when it is obviously the same person. If, as sometimes happened, an alternative was used to the baptismal name, he might have been Jean (de) Calonne, an écuyer de l'écurie of Duke Philip in 1402, who went to Brittany with him; was captured by the English; and in 1408 both fought with Duke John against Liège, being sufficiently trustworthy to be left in charge of the hostages, and was also with Duke John in Paris².

The other candidate is a Girart who, by 1410, was Seigneur de Calonne, and a knight bachelor, fighting with Duke John against the League. He came from the area of Artois and Picardy, and was fighting at this time alongside other members of the Order, including Jean de Croy (Appendix R1-20), David de Brimeu (Appendix R1-9) and Pierre de la Rocherousse (Appendix R1-31). There are, however, no references to him in the accounts before this date³.

In view of the uncertainties, information on both candidates is given in the following appendices.

1. 'Girart Caloire' in ADCO B338; 'Girart Calonne' in ADCO B1532, f.255v. Apart from Bo Calonne (App. R1-10), there are references to a Wautelet de Calonne, écuyer panetier, in 1391, 1392, 1395 and 1400; to Hennequin and Jean le jeune Calonne

APPENDIX R1-11

(along with Jean, écuyer) in 1408; to a Baudouin de Calonne, écuyer, also in 1408, and to a Wautier de Calonne, Bailiff of Courtrai in 1416-7 -see Vaughan, John the Fearless, p.132, and probably from a noble Flemish family. From the surviving seals, it appears that at least Bo, Jean, Jean le jeune and Baudouin were related.

2. Alternative names were sometimes used, for instance, to distinguish two people of the same Christian name in a family. See P., vol.24, p.22 (ADCO B374) for a quittance dated 1402 from 'Jean Calonne, écuyer de l'écurie' of the Duke, for 15 francs to clothe himself for a trip to Brittany which the Duke intended to make; and p.175 (ADCO B370) for another from the same year, and with the same seal, from a 'Jean de Calonne' for gages for serving 'au pays d'outre-meuse'. ADCO B1554, f.83 records a payment of 200 escus d'or in September 1405 to help pay his ransom to the English; f.92 records 40 escus d'or, authorised in June 1408, as reimbursement of the cost of men-at-arms and archers he had taken to Rethel at Duke John's command in June of that year; and f.100v records a payment of 60 escus for conducting hostages from Liège, authorised in the December. P., vol.26, p.104 (ADCO B11772) notes, in a list certificated by David de Brimeu (App. R1-9) of the men-at-arms serving Duke John in Paris in November and December 1408 and January 1409 a 'Jean Calonne' -see App. R11, n.21.
3. P., vol.22, p.435 (ADCO B1560) includes a 'Girard, Seigneur de Calonne', together with 2 squires and 7 archers, among the knights bachelor from Artois and Picardy, fighting with Duke John against the League in September and October 1410, and there is a quittance from September 1410 for their gaiges from 'Guerart de Calonne' -see App. R11, n.27.

12. CHALON, JEAN DE

There were in 1403 a number of members called John in the powerful Burgundian family of Chalon, which had included Counts of Burgundy, and at this time included Counts of Auxerre and Tonnerre, Barons of Arlay and Princes of Orange. The two most likely candidates as recipients of the Order are Jean, Baron d'Arlay and Prince of Orange, who features frequently in the accounts of Duke John, and his younger son, Jean, Seigneur de Vitteaux and de l'Isle-sous-Montréal, who was a squire and chamberlain to Duke Philip in 1401-3¹.

The placing of the recipient in the Order hierarchy does not make clear whether he was a knight or a squire, but references in the same account as the Order qualify Jean de Chalon as a squire, chamberlain, sometimes as councillor, and sometimes as '*noble homme*'². Given the political and military importance of the Prince of Orange, and the fact that he held this title and that of Baron d'Arlay by 1403, it is unlikely that he would have been listed without them or that he would have been given a relatively low value Order insignia³.

The more likely candidate is therefore Jean, Seigneur de Vitteaux, who was probably born in the early 1390s, and would have been quite young in 1403⁴. He was later to marry into another important Burgundian family, the de La Trémoille, several of whose members were recipients of the Order (see Appendices R1-33 to 37), and died after 1461⁵. He was clearly fairly close to Duke Philip in 1403-4, and seems to have needed considerable assistance to maintain the level of turnout expected from someone of his rank in the household⁶. He was one of the squires (along with Chantemerle, another recipient of the Order - see Appendix R1-14) that Christine de Pisan records as having conducted her to Duke Philip in the Louvre to be given his

commission to write a book on King Charles V⁷. He seems to have moved to the service of Duke Philip's third son, Philip, sometime after the Duke's death⁸.

His family was one of the most important in the Duchy and County of Burgundy, related to both the Capetian and the Valois Dukes, and to a number of other recipients of the Order⁹. While some members, like his grandfather and great-uncle, had been faithful to the Dukes, others had been (and were to continue to be) at odds with them. Their widespread territories on the Duke's borders with Savoy and the Empire, and in the turbulent County of Burgundy, as well as their hold on part of the lucrative saltpans at Salins, made it necessary for the Dukes to keep as many of the family faithful to him as possible. Since relationships with the Auxerre and Tonnerre branches and with the Prince of Orange and his eldest son Louis were strained at the time, Jean de Vitteaux was the best available¹⁰.

1. For the Prince of Orange see, for example, ADCO B1554, f.227 '*Messire Jehan de Chalon Sire d'Arlay et Prince d'Orange*' in 1407-8. For Jean de Vitteaux, see Solente, Charles V, p.8 n.1. There is also a third possibility, Jean de Chalon, Seigneur de Ligny-le-Chastel, and brother of Louis II de Chalon, Count of Tonnerre, who died at Agincourt - see P.A., vol.VIII, p.420. He was, however, a knight by 1401, and generally qualified as Messire -see C.A., vol.2, no.390. He was later an Orleanist -see P., vol.25, pp.1-3 (ADCO B1010) for a memorandum of 1452 setting out the history of Louis de Chalon.
2. See ADCO B1532, ff.155v and 158 '*escuier et chambellan*'; f.162 '*conseiller et chambellan*'; f.216 '*noble homme...conseiller et chambellan*'. For the group, see Annex 1. Galois d'Aunoy was a knight; Pierre de la Rocherousse and François de Gringnaux were squires.
3. He became Sire d'Arlay after the death of his uncle, Hugues II de Chalon, in about 1390; and succeeded his father-in-law, Raymond

APPENDIX R1-12

- de Baux, as Prince of Orange on the latter's death in 1393 - see P.A., vol.VIII, pp.409 and 422. He is qualified as both in 2 quittances, dated 1398 - see P., vol.25, p.60 (ADCO B309)
4. His elder brother, Louis, was born in 1389 - see Nouvelle Biographie Générale, (hereafter N.B.G.) vol.37-38, col.728
 5. He married Jeanne de La Trémoille in 1424. For both dates, see Solente, Charles V, p.8 n.1
 6. See App. R6, n.15
 7. Solente, Charles V, p.8
 8. ADCO B1538, f.258 refers to him as '*jadis chambellan de feu monditseigneur*' in the account authorised by Duke John of expenditure incurred up to his father's death. A letter of 1411 from Philip, by then Count of Nevers and Rethel, refers to a Jean de Chalon as one of his councillors - see P., vol.2, p.43
 9. The first Jean de Chalon, in the twelfth century, had founded several dynasties, including the Counts of Burgundy, the Counts of Auxerre and Tonnerre, and the Sires d'Arlay. Jean II d'Arlay had, in the late thirteenth century, married the daughter of the Capetian Duke Hugues IV of Burgundy and in 1306 became Governor of the County of Burgundy for the French King. Jean III, after revolting against the Capetian Duke Eudes IV in 1330, and joining the English side, had finally joined the French side and fought under Duke Philip's father in the 1350s. Jean de Vitteaux's great uncle, Hugues II d'Arlay, was a crusader; had fought against the English; had been associated with Duke Philip in the 1380s; and was married to Marguerite de Mello, widow of Maurice, Sire de Craon (see App. R1-19), and related to Duchess Margaret. Jean's grandfather, Louis, was married to a de Vienne, as was his sister, Alix (see App. R1-53).
 10. His uncle, Henry, had died at Nicopolis under the Burgundian banner. His father, the Prince of Orange, had had a more mixed relationship with the Dukes. In the early 1390s, he had killed one of Duke Philip's officers and had been imprisoned by the Duke. An impressive list of Burgundian lords, many from families members of whom received the Order, and related to him, pleaded for him to be re-established and stood bail for him, including Henry de Chalon, Seigneur d'Argeuil, Jean, Jacques and Guillaume

APPENDIX R1-12

de Vergy, Jacques and Jean de Vienne, and Jean de Ste. Croix. The Duke relented in part in 1392 and freed him, because he was a relation and because of the '*bons et loyaux*' services of his predecessor for the Duke, although the Prince still had to build a chapel at the murder spot, pay fines, and suffer the confiscation of lands which were not returned to him until 1406 by Duke John - see P., vol.1, pp.803-5. Duke John was better disposed to the Prince, who supported him, recognising in a letter that he had been continuously by his side from mid August 1403 until after the Liège campaign, which he had put under his command -see P., vol.1, p.807. Perhaps Duke John recognised the need to keep him on his side. In returning the confiscated lands and rents, he took into account '*pluseurs grans et notables services que notre dit cousin nous a fais en maintes manieres, fait de jour en jour et esperons que encores face ou temps avenir et afin quil soit tousiours plus astraint at enclin a nous servir*'. He also made the Prince Lieutenant-General of the County and Duchy of Burgundy, and in 1415 sold him several lordships to help pay the costs of a campaign against the English. The Prince's eldest son, Louis, had been in dispute with Duke Philip about the inheritance of his wife, Jeanne de Montbéliard. The Counts of Auxerre and Tonnerre had poor relationships with the Dukes. John IV had been a supporter of Charles de Blois and had had to sell Auxerre to King Charles V to help pay off his ransom after he was captured at Charles' defeat at Auray. His grandson, Louis II, who was Count of Tonnerre in 1403 (and brother of Jean de Ligny-le-Chastel) enraged Duke John's wife by abducting one of her ladies, who was also related to her, and repudiating his existing wife. The Duke and Duchess took action against him, and he joined the Orleanist party with his younger brothers, Jean and Hugues. By 1411, Duke John had confiscated all their lands in the Duchy and County of Burgundy because they had taken up arms against him, and had given them to his son, later Philip the Good.

13. CHAMBLY, MESSIRE CHARLES DE

Charles de Chambly, Seigneur of Livry and of Houdancourt, came from a well-established noble Beauvais family, which had served the kings of France at least from the time of St. Louis¹. His maternal grandfather, Renaud de Trie, had been Marshal of France, and his father had died fighting the English at Crécy in 1346, when Charles was very young². (He was therefore of Duke Philip's generation). Knighted in 1370, he fought for Charles V, Charles VI and Duke Philip in the 1370s and 1380s, dying in 1413³.

He was chamberlain to both Charles VI and Duke Philip by at least 1382, and was clearly both senior and trusted, as he was one of the knights bachelor who escorted Charles VI's wife, Isabeau of Bavaria, on her entry to Paris in 1389, and was designated to serve that king's daughter, Isabelle, when she left Calais to marry Richard II of England in 1396⁴.

He was related to recipients of the Order, particularly Galois d'Aunay (Appendix R1-1) with whom his name is often coupled in Duke Philip's accounts, and they shared joint tutelage in 1411 of some young cousins⁵. Through his mother, he was also distantly related to the Vergy family (Appendix R1-52); and through his father distantly to the Dukes of Burgundy, the Counts of Chalon (Appendix R1-12) and of those of Joigny (Appendix R1-29), and the Vergy and Vienne (Appendices R1-52 and R1-53) families⁶.

His primary loyalty, despite a family connection with a chamberlain of the King of Navarre, seems to have been to the King of France, and he had no strong connections to the Burgundian or Orleanist factions. The author of the 'Songe Veritable' considered him so knowledgeable about the king's life that he sought his collaboration for the work in 1406. There is no reference to him in the ducal

accounts after Duke Philip's death. By 1411 he was one of the King's Council and, in that capacity party to decisions both advantaging and disadvantaging the Orleanists⁷.

1. DBF, vol.8, cols. 250-252. (C.A., vol.1, no.97 says he was also Seigneur of Wiermes in the Val d'Oise, but this may be a confusion with another branch of the family)
2. His father, Philippe de Chambly, married Jeanne de Trie in 1345 -see P.A., vol.VI, p.665; and died in 1346 -see DBF, vol.8, cols. 250-252. Charles was not emancipated until 1354.
3. See DBF and C.A. references in note 1 above
4. Ibid., and ADCO B1461, f.102. His family was wealthy enough to have owned a Book of Hours of a quality that led Duke Philip in 1381 to request it from Charles VI for his wife -see Winter, Bibliothèque, p.58
5. See P.A., vol.II, p.118; and, for example, App. R3, n.3, and App. R4, n.1
6. See P.A., vol.VI, pp.532 and 670; vol.I, pp. 89 and 546; vol.VIII, pp. 812 and 806
7. His cousin, Philippe de Trie, was Chamberlain of the King of Navarre, and stood bail for another relative with Charles in 1386 -see P.A., vol.VI, p.666. For his loyalties see DBF as above, and App. R9, n.17 (although Bozzolo in C.A., vol.1, no.97, calls him an Orleanist).

14. CHANTEMELLE, TAPPINET DE

Thibaut, usually called Taupinet, de Chantemelle or Chantemerle, was an écuyer tranchant of Duke Philip in 1403, and had been so since 1398. He was the son of Taupin de Chantemerle, a knight, Duke Philip's chamberlain, and councillor and chamberlain of the French king, and his maître d'hotel in 1382, a man who was one of the leaders of French military society¹. At his father's death, Taupinet succeeded him as Captain of Gisors in 1400, and was Seigneur of La Consit, of Chantemerle, and of Flavacourt, holding lands in the Île de France². Like his father and grandfather, he was a trusted member of the King's household, serving him initially as échanton, and afterwards as councillor and chamberlain, becoming Treasurer of France in 1408³. He died in November 1415⁴.

He must have been quite close to Duke Philip in 1403-4 as he was one of the squires who conducted Christine de Pisan to him in the Louvre, along with Jean de Chalon, another recipient of the Order (Appendix R1-12)⁵. Either he, or a younger brother, was godson to the Duke, and the baptism in 1388 warranted an unusually generous gift from the Duke. He was also possibly related to another recipient, Jean de Montagu (Appendix R1-42), the King's powerful grand maître d'hotel⁶. Others of the same name included a family which served the Burgundian Dukes faithfully in the fifteenth century, and a Bishop of Rennes who was a friend and councillor of Duke John IV of Brittany, and remained chancellor during the minority of Duke John V of Brittany (Appendix R1-57)⁷.

Taupinet's father had served Duke Philip in 1388, but received payments from the Duke of Orleans in 1390-94 and served him as an ambassador in the 1390s, dying in this service in 1400⁸. Taupinet himself is said to have joined the Orleanists after Duke Philip's death, but to have

returned to the Burgundian fold in 1412. Certainly he was not acting unfavourably to Duke John in 1411⁹.

1. See Dictionnaire de Biographie Nationale, (hereafter DBN) vol.8, col.392; ADCO B1532, f.209 where he is qualified as écuyer tranchant; and ADCO B1521, f.53 which records him in Duke Philip's service in October 1398
2. See C.A., vol.1, no.256
3. See DBN and C.A. references above. Either he or his father accompanied Charles VI's daughter Isabelle to meet her future husband, Richard II, in 1396 -see Appendix R8, n.9
4. See DBN above
5. See Solente, Charles V, p.8
6. See App. R3, n.12 for the baptismal gift. Bozzolo in C.A., vol.1, no.256, suggests that Taupinet's mother was the daughter, or otherwise related to, Jean de Montagu
7. See DBN, vol.8, cols. 391 and 392. See also references to Philibert de Chantemerle, écuyer tranchant to Duke Philip and his son, Anthony -see ADCO B1538, ff.128 and 143v; and later to Duke John and his son Philip, Count of Charolais, in 1407-8 -see ADCO B1554, ff. 83, 106v, and 128
8. See DBN as above, and Henneman, Clisson, p.215. Jarry, Louis de France, pp.443-5 has several references to Taupin serving Orleans
9. See C.A. as above and App. R9, n.18

15. CHASTEaugIRON, MESSIRE HERVE DE

In 1403, Hervé de Châteaugiron was lord of Châteaugiron, having inherited the barony in 1380-1 after the death of his father, Patry I¹. He himself died in 1404, being succeeded by his son, Patry II, who died a few years later².

The barony was an ancient and powerful Breton one, centred near Rennes, with lands on the borders of Normandy³. The family held the hereditary post of Premier and Grand Chamberlain of Brittany, and served the Breton dukes and their families in various capacities⁴. They were related to a number of other important Breton families, including the Viscounts of Rohan, and the Ragueneil (R1-4)⁵. Hervé's rank and importance are reflected in the value of his Order insignia, which is one of the most expensive after those of Duke Philip's family.

There is no record of Hervé in the Burgundian accounts other than in 1402 and 1403⁶. A Thibaut de Chasteaugiron was a squire and chamberlain to Duke Philip during at least 1402-04, and was probably related to Hervé. This man seems to have been well regarded, but not to have stayed in the Burgundian ducal household after Duke Philip's death⁷. There is no evidence of Hervé's direct successors supporting the Burgundian Dukes. They followed Duke John V of Brittany, and supported Charles VI's queen, Isabeau, broadly on the Orleanist side (see Appendix R1-57).

1. The date of Patry I's death is variously given as 1380 and 1381. Pastoureau in L'Hermine et le Sinople, p.223, says 1381, and notes that Hervé died in 1404. C-D., p.377, notes letters patent dated April 1404 by which Duke John V confirmed and renewed those of his late father, according the position and rights of the Premier and Grand Chamberlainship, to Patry.
2. Pastoureau, p.223 notes that Patry II died between 1407 and 1412

APPENDIX R1-15

3. C-D., p.377
4. DBN, vol.8, cols. 715-6. The senior branch of the family took the name Châteaugiron-Malestroit, after marrying into the latter family in 1347. Patry I founded the younger branch. La Borderie, in his Histoire, book IV, notes that Patry I fought for Duke John IV in 1379 -p.54; held and fortified Dinan for him in the 1380s -p.109, n.3; and went to fetch Joan of Navarre as a third wife for the Duke in 1386. In the early fifteenth century, Patry II's successor, Armel, headed a body of Bretons who went with Duke John V in 1408 to support Queen Isabeau after the murder of the Duke of Orleans -p.155, and was his chamberlain in 1409 -p.158, and then Grand Chamberlain (presumably after Patry II's death), but was apparently dead by 1416, when a description of Duke John V's household refers to him as 'late' -p.294.
5. Patry I married Louise, daughter of Jean I, Vicomte de Rohan -see P.A., vol.IV, p.55. The Châteaugiron and Ragueneil were of common descent, and also had marriage connections - see Abbott, France, pp.255-6, and 278
6. There are references to Hervé and other members of the family receiving presents on Duke Philip's visit to Brittany in 1402, and in 1404, including Armel and Duke John V'S chamberlain Aline -see Apps. R3, n.13; R4, n.19; and R6, n.24
7. See ADCO B1532, f.209 and ADCO B1538, ff.216, 221 and 258. Thibaut was a family name (DBN., vol.8, col.766 refers to a Thibaut de Châteaugiron-Malestroit who became Bishop of Tréguier in 1378 and died in 1408). It was not unusual for younger sons of the Breton nobility to seek their fortunes outside the Duchy in this period.

16. CHAUFFOUR, RAILLART DE

Guillaume de Chauffour (variously written Chausour and Chansour), called Raillart, was born well before 1366 and had been an écuyer de l'écurie to Duke Philip from at least 1385¹. He was therefore of Duke Philip's generation. He came from a family which, for the most part, had served the Burgundian Dukes faithfully². He was Seigneur of Cusey, Maraz and Villiers sur Suize³. He had married Agnes de Duilly, who was dead by 1392, and from her had lands in Champagne. He may have died in 1415⁴.

He had a history of military service to the Duke, having been Captain of Montjustin from 1391 and, from at least 1393-4, was Captain of Vesoul, a military stronghold in the County of Burgundy, and the seat of the important bailliage of Amont, and of the local receiver of finances⁵. There are records of him presenting gifts to Duke Philip on occasion⁶.

He may have been related to the family of the Count of Joigny, another recipient of the Order (Appendix R1-29). He had dealt with rebels with Duke Philip (R1-24), and was well known to a number of senior Burgundian nobles⁷.

I can find no reference to him in the ducal household after Duke Philip's death, but he continued as Captain of Vesoul until 1415, and his sons actively served the Dukes until at least 1417-18⁸.

1. ADCO B1532, f.274v refers to '*Guillaume de Chausour, dit Raillart, escuier d'escurie*'. There is a reference in a ducal letter of 1366 to the late Messire Jean de Chauffour, knight -P., vol.2, p.419; in 1367 to a Jean de Chauffour, son of the late Messire Jean de Chauffour -P., vol.27, p.147; and in 1378 to Raillard, brother of Jean de Chauffour and squire -P., vol.2, p.840. Raillart also featured in a muster in 1367 -P., vol.24,

APPENDIX R1-16

- p.715. There is a quittance from August 1385 from Guillaume de Chauffour, autrement dit Raillart, écuyer de l'écurie -P., vol.23, p.236
2. There is a quittance from his father dated 1374 -see P., vol.23, p.339, and one in 1418 from his son Henry as écuyer de l'écurie and Captain of Vesoul, the latter referring to him as being in post from July 1415 -P., vol. 23, p.260. ADCO B1416, ff.47v-49 refer, however, to his father and a son being arrested and their goods confiscated by the Duke in 1363-4, possibly for fighting against him. His father was dead by April 1366, possibly at the hands of the Duke's officers, as there is a reference in 1367 to him swearing not to pursue the matter, nor to seek damages from the Governor of Burgundy -P., vol. 2, p.419 and P., vol.27, p.147. By 1367, Raillart was fighting for the Duke (see n.1)
 3. See Beaune, H. and Arbaumont, J.d'. ,La Noblesse aux Etats de Bourgogne, (hereafter B.d'A.,) p.155. A quittance from 1397 refers to him as Seigneur de Maraz en Mormant -P., vol.23, p.146
 4. P., vol.25, p.338 refers to his wife's death and to lands belonging to her brother, Perrin, who had been banished, and whose lands had been confiscated and given to her and Raillart before her death. His son Henry was instituted Captain of Vesoul in 1415, which might suggest Raillart was dead by then.
 5. P., vol.23, p.214 notes that the captaincy of Montjustin was given to him in August 1391. By 1399 it had passed to his nephew, Jean de Noyers -P., vol.24, p.93. For Vesoul, see App. R5, n.35, App. R11, n.34, and La Haute-Saône: Dictionnaire des Communes, VI, pp. 92-110
 6. See ADCO B1495, f.98
 7. His brother Jean was a squire of Jacques de Vergy, Seigneur d'Autrey in 1378 -ADCO B260, f.223; and a land settlement concerning him and his brothers Jean and Garnier in 1377 was witnessed by Guillaume and Guy de La Trémouille -P., vol.17, p.385. He worked with du Four in 1400 -ADCO B1521, f.61
 8. See n.2 above. Raillart was Captain of Vesoul in 1404, but qualified simply as squire, without reference to a household position -P., vol.23, p.715. See also App. R9, n.20

17. CHINEY, MESSIRE GEORGE DE

Apart from his receipt of the Order in 1403, I can find no reference to this man in the Burgundian accounts, in contemporary chronicles, or in standard prosopographical works. A man of similar name was écuyer de l'écurie to Philip's eldest son John in 1403, but the value of George's Order insignia would suggest that he was either a more senior relative, held lands in a strategic area, or was related to one of the families in the Order¹. This might suggest either a relative of the Counts of Joigny (Appendix R1-29), or of the Counts of Chiny^{2,3}.

1. ADCO B1532, f.158v, refers to John's squire Ginot de Chigney, who hunted with him in 1402.
2. Jeanne de Noyers, the step-sister of the Count of Joigny's grandfather, had been Dame de Chigny and of lands in Champagne, for which she did homage to the Duke of Lorraine, and had inherited the Montcornet lands, but had died without heirs in 1394, leading to disputes with the descendants of her father's two other wives about inheritance -see P., vol. 244, pp.90-93 for an early fifteenth century memorandum about the Noyers inheritances.
3. In 1372, after the death without heirs of Margaret (wife of the Duke of Lorraine and daughter of Louis de Los, Count of Chiny, a relative of the Dukes of Bar (App.R1-2) and of the Lords of Fauquemont (R1-54)) the County of Chiny passed to Wenceslas, Duke of Luxembourg, who mortgaged it in 1388 to Jost of Moravia who, in August 1402, sold it with Luxembourg to Louis of Orleans. This was a setback for Duke Philip who had, since 1388, been seeking to extend his influence over this sensitive frontier region, signing a mutual defence and security treaty with Jost, and with the Duke of Bar, a relative and vassal, for the neighbouring territories of Bar, Luxembourg and Rethel. In December 1401, Jost had placed Luxembourg under Philip's protection. Even after the sale, Philip kept in touch with Jost, sending an embassy to him in September 1402.

18. COURCELLES

The use of a surname on its own in this way suggests someone who was well-known to the clerks keeping the accounts, and unlikely to be confused with anyone else of the same name. Although the name is not that uncommon, the most likely candidate in Burgundian circles is Jean de Courcelles, écuyer panetier to Duke Philip from at least 1391, and possibly in his service before that in 1386 and 1387, and as échanson in 1389 - a post he appears to have held again in 1402¹. He also held a number of administrative posts under Duke Philip. He was Receiver for Isles, in Champagne in 1398, and Gruyer for the ducal lands in Champagne from 1398 until at least 1402. He was also Duke Philip's Governor for Beaufort, Soublenne and Harzicourt in 1399². After the Duke's death, he stayed in Burgundian service, being qualified as écuyer de l'écurie in 1406 and 1407. He is said to have been a councillor and chamberlain to the King from 1402³.

He came from a Champagne family, and was Seigneur de Courcelles and Saint-Liébault. It is possible that he also held lands in Charollais⁴. He married Marie or Marguerite de Fontenay in 1395, and shared the inheritance from his father-in-law with his brother-in-law, Sauvaige des Boves (Appendix R1-7) in 1398⁵.

Judging from their seals, Jean was related to Jean IV, Sire de Bueil and, amongst other places, Courcelles, who was a knight, and councillor and chamberlain to both the King and to Duke Philip's brother, the Duke of Anjou, and later Master of the prestigious and important Company of Crossbowmen, which took him on most of Charles VI's campaigns until his death in 1415. He had served under Duke Philip in 1386, on his return from Naples after Anjou's death, but he and his sons by the daughter of the Count of Clermont seem to have been associated more with

the royal than the Burgundian court. The Order recipient's relationship to this man, as well as as his own position in Duke Philip's rather isolated lands in Champagne, would have made him a useful man to cultivate⁶.

1. See ADCO B1501, f.37v, for a qualification as an écuyer panetier in 1391. Judging by the seal, the same man was a valet servant of Duke Philip in 1386 and 1387, and his échançon in 1402 -see P., vol.23, pp.424 and 394, and vol. 24, p.243. Without a seal it is difficult to be certain that this is the same Jean de Courcelles who was an échançon in 1389 -see ADCO B1476, f.14v
2. See P., vol.24, p.105 for a certification qualifying him as écuyer panetier, seigneur of Saint Liébault and Receiver for Isles; and P., vol.23, p.501 for one from a lieutenant, qualifying him as Seigneur de Courcelles and Gruyer of Champagne in 1402, and P., vol.24, p.104 for two similar certifications dating from 1398. See also App. R5, no.36
3. ADCO B1543, ff.98v-99, records a gift of 100 escus to a Jehan de Courcelles, écuyer de l'écurie in May 1406 for his services and to help him to accompany the Sire de Saint George and his army to Picardy against the English. See also App. R3, n.9. ADCO B1554, f.68v records a gift to him for services in November 1407, and f.84v lists him among household members who received gifts in the October of that year to dress and arm themselves to go to the assistance of Duke John's brother, the Duke of Brabant. He may have been councillor and chamberlain to Duke John in 1418, but later references in C.A., vol.1, no.144, suggesting that he transferred to the household of the young king Henry VI and his uncle, the Duke of Bedford, before dying sometime before 1440, are highly unlikely, given his age
4. See C.A., vol.1, no.144. P., vol.12, p.472 records a dénombrement in 1388 of a Jean de Courcelles of lands he held in Charollais
5. See C.A. vol.1, no.144, and P., vol.24, p.105
6. See P.A., vol.VII, pp.848-9, and vol.VIII, pp.62-3

19. CRAON, MESSIRE ANTHOINE DE

Anthoine de Craon, after 1404 called 'Beauverger', was born around 1369, and died at Agincourt in 1415¹. His powerful family, with lands on the borders of Brittany and Anjou, had long served the French kings and their family². He had served the Duke of Orleans as a squire in 1389 and 1390 but, as a knight, he was a chamberlain of Duke Philip continuously from at least 1397, and transferred after his death to the service of Duke John, to whom he seems to have been close, not only in age and family ties, but as a trusted supporter who was commensurately rewarded for his loyalty³.

He was linked to the Burgundian ducal family through the Duchess⁴. He was connected also to a number of the most important families in receipt of the Order, such as the Chalon, Croy, Laval, Rochefort, Longroy, Montagu, and de La Trémoille (see Appendices R1-12, 1-20, 1-25, 1-30, 1-40, 1-42, and 1-33 to 37)⁵.

His father, Pierre, had been very close to the Duchess and her family, and she supported him in his feud with Olivier de Clisson, but he had been banished and was abroad in disgrace at the time the Order was given out, although he received a New Year gift from Duke Philip in 1404. Anthoine had gone with his father to England in 1399, but had obviously returned by 1400⁶. Pierre and Anthoine were also both close to Duke John IV of Brittany, to whom they were related (see Appendix R1-57 for his son, John V)⁷.

Anthoine seems to have prided himself on his military prowess, fighting in at least two formal jousts against English knights, and offered Duke John of Burgundy continued military support. He also served him as councillor, chamberlain and negotiator, furthering the Duke's business in Paris with the Duke of Berry. After

the murder of the Duke of Orleans, he served in the royal household, and held major office at the French court while Duke John was in the ascendancy there⁸.

1. See Broussillon, B.de, La Maison de Craon, (hereafter Broussillon) II, pp.242-6
2. See P.A., vol.VIII, pp.567-572 and 623; and DBF., vol.9, cols. 1165-70
3. He was styled as 'cousin'; received large sums with warm commendations for his services; and sometimes wore the same clothes as Duke John -see Apps. R4, nn.31 and 32; R5, nn.38 to 41; and R11, n.39; and P., vol.24, p.8 for the reference to him as chamberlain
4. He was the grandson of William II de Craon, who had married Margaret of Flanders, a cousin of the Duchess, and was to marry in 1405 Jeanne d'Hondschoote, the daughter of a bastard daughter of Louis Count of Flanders, taking over wardship of her son by her first marriage, who was later to marry into the de La Trémoille family. See Broussillon, II, pp.242-6, 358 and 360
5. See nn.2 and 4 above. To Chalon through Marguerite de Mello, who had married both his great-uncle and a Chalon -see ADCO B11698; to Croy through the marriage of a first cousin, Marguerite; to Longroy through the marriage of her brother Jean; to Montagu through the marriage of another first cousin called Jean; and to the de La Trémoille and Laval through the marriage of his great-uncle to Marie de Mello, their daughter having married Guy XI de Laval and then Louis de Sully, giving birth to Marie de Sully who married Guy VI de la Trémoille
6. Pierre had accused Louis of Namur in 1378 of saying that the Duchess' father had an English heart and had offered him single combat. His disagreements with Clisson went back at least to the early 1380s, even before Clisson, a favourite of the Duke of Orleans, revealed to the Duke that Pierre had told the Duchess of Orleans about her husband's indiscretions. Forced to leave Paris, he fled to Brittany to the protection of Duke John IV, and returned there after his attempt on Clisson's life. He eventually fled to England, doing homage to the English King in

APPENDIX R1-19

1399. His French lands were confiscated and given to Orleans
-see DBF., vol.9, cols.1165-70. See also App. R3, n.4, and ADCO
B1517, f.161v.

7. His grandmother was a cousin of Duke John IV of Britⁱtany's wife
8. See App. R11, especially nn.36 and 39. He was councillor to the
King and Duke John the Fearless, and captain of the latter's
guard of archers in 1410. He was Grand Panetier of France 1411-
13 and Governor of Soisson in 1413 -see C-D, vol.6, pp.442-6; and
C.A., vol.1, no.98

20. CROY, MONSEIGNEUR DE

Jean de Croy, Seigneur de Renty, came from an ancient Picard family with lands in the Somme and Pas de Calais areas, which had served the French kings from the thirteenth century¹. He seems to have been of Duke Philip's generation, as he was serving as a knight against the English in Normandy in the mid 1370s². He served Duke Philip as chamberlain from at least 1397, and as councillor, and transferred after the Duke's death to Duke John, whom he served faithfully until his death at Agincourt in 1415³.

The Duke stood godparent to a son and the Duchess to a daughter of his, the presents on these occasions going to his wife, Marguerite de Craon, probably because of the family relationship between the Craons and the Duchess of Burgundy⁴. Through his wife, whom he married in 1384, Jean was related to the same recipients of the Order as his wife's first cousin, Anthoine de Craon (Appendix R1-19). It is possible that he was related to David de Brimeu (Appendix 1-9), with whom he appears on muster rolls, and his name is also bracketted in the accounts with the Seigneur de Rambures (Appendix R1-48)⁵.

Although his property had apparently fallen into disrepair, the value of his Order insignia suggests either that he was regarded as senior in rank and influence to, for instance, Anthoine de Craon, or that his proven military worth made him a particularly valuable ally⁶. Duke John made him Governor of Artois in 1405, and Captain of Crotoy in 1411. His family continued in Burgundian service, his son Anthoine serving Duke John and becoming a favourite of Duke Philip's grandson, Duke Philip the Good⁷.

1. See DBF, vol.9, cols.1296-7; and P.A., vol.V, pp.636-7, and

APPENDIX R1-20

vol.VIII, p.565

2. See DBF above. He served in Lower Normandy in 1376 and 1377; in 1378 under Bureau de la Rivière against the English and Navarrese. He also distinguished himself at Roosebecke.
3. See DBF above. There is a reference to money owed him as chamberlain from 1397 -see ADCO B1538, f.293, and a quittance from him for a pension of 500 francs for 1397 -see P., vol.24, p.148. See also App. R6, n.29. P., vol.24, p.440 refers to him in 1405 as chamberlain of the King and Duke John. See also App. R11, especially nn.41 and 43
4. See Apps. R1-19, and R3, n.17
5. His mother, Isabeau de Renty, was the daughter of a Marie de Brimeu -see P.A., vol. V, p.636. See, for instance, ADCO B1554, f.228 for a muster with David de Brimeu, and P., vol.26, pp. 39-43 for one with Rambures; and App. R5, n.43 for a reference to them both in the accounts
6. In 1397 he was authorised to rebuild Renty, which had been ruined for some 60 years -see P.A., vol.VIII, p.565. For his military worth, see App. R11. He was also used on secret business -ADCO B354, P.S.1627
7. See DBF and P.A., references above.

21. DESQUEES, GIRART

Girart Desquees (variously written Des Quay, Descais, and Desket, all with the same seal, although he styled himself Des Esquers), was écuyer de l'écurie to Duke Philip from at least 1398 to 1403, but possibly from much earlier¹.

He seems to have been a Norman, and by 1410 was an écuyer de corps of the king, and his Bailli for Caen, where he stayed until 1413. Later he was still in Caen as an officer of the bailliage of Caen, being Vicomte of Falaise in 1422-5 and again in 1429-30².

He was possibly related to another household officer, not in the Order, and linked to La Tour (Appendix R1-32)³.

I can find no evidence of him serving the Burgundian Dukes in a military or household capacity after Duke Philip's death. The gap in his service in Caen might suggest that he had gained his initial appointment through their influence, but it appears that his primary loyalty was to the king after 1404.

1. See P., vol.24, p. 540 for certifications where he styled himself Des Esquers. For other versions of his name see, for instance, P., vol.23, pp.239 and 352, and vol 24, pp.187, 118, and 369. For his dates of service see App. R5, n.48 (1398); and P., vol. 23, p.352 (1399), p.239 (1400) and vol.24, p.118 (1403). ADCO B1430, f.62 refers to a squire called Girart de Quay serving the King and the Duke under Girart de la Tour, Sire de Mombelot (who was also in Philip's household) in 1368
2. See Gallia Regia, vol.1, pp.452 and 498
3. ADCO B1532, ff.187v-188 record in 1402-3 a squire called Henry Desquay, who was échanson to Duke Philip

22. FLANDRES, ROBERT DE

Robert de Flandres, Seigneur d'Everdinghe and de Vlamertinghe, was a bastard son of Louis de Mâle, Count of Flanders, and thus an illegitimate half-brother of the Duchess of Burgundy. He was at the Burgundian court, although not apparently in formal service to the Duke, at least from 1396, when the Duchess bought a relatively inexpensive gilded and covered goblet from him to give as a present at a baptism. He was écuyer de l'écurie to Duke Philip from at least 1400. He was serving Duke John in that capacity in 1406, when he was entrusted with a secret trip to Hainault, and by 1409 he was a knight, leading a small company in support of Duke John in Paris, and was chamberlain to both him and Duke Philip the Good. He married Anastasia d'Oultre, Vicomtesse d'Ypres, but had no children. He died in 1434¹. Through his half-sister he shared Duke Philip's relationships with other recipients of the Order (Appendix R1-56).

1. See P.A., vol.II, p.740-1. There are earlier references to clothes and armour being provided for one or more unnamed bastards of Flanders in the accounts, but it is not clear whether or when Robert was included. See ADCO B1502, f.51 for the goblet, costing some 23 francs , which was given to the wife of the bailli of Dijon, to whose son the Duchess had arranged for her second son, Anthony, to stand godparent. For the first reference to him as écuyer de l'écurie see P., vol.24, p.252. For the trip, see ADCO B1543, f.173v, and for him as a knight see P., vol.22, p.438.

23. FONTAINES, ANTHOINE DE

Anthoine de Havesquerque (or Haveskerke), Seigneur de Fontaine and de Flétrin in the Pas de Calais, was a squire and échanson of Duke Philip, at least from 1396¹. At the time of the Order, he was his chamberlain². After Duke Philip's death, he continued in the service of the Burgundian dukes, at least until 1419, by which time he was a knight, councillor and chamberlain of Duke Philip the Good, and sufficiently senior and important to be receiving the English ambassadors to France. In the following year, he was a chevalier d'honneur and maître d'hôtel of the Duchess of Burgundy³.

Although a few of his relatives served the Duke of Orleans, both sides of his family mainly served Duke Philip, particularly his maternal grandfather, who was a close and trusted officer⁴. Amongst the Order recipients, he may have been close to the Seigneur du Bois (Appendix R1-6), as he stood in for the Duke at the baptism of du Bois' son, and personally presented the Duke's gift, as godfather, to the child⁵.

It seems likely that he was one of the younger generation of Order recipients, as there is no record of him in the Burgundian accounts before 1396, and he married at about the same time as the Duke's second son, Anthony⁶. He features frequently in musters called by Duke John, and seems to have served him loyally, particularly in a military capacity⁷.

1. There were several de Fontaines families at this period. There is, however, a quittance dated 4 January 1397(n.s.), but referring to ducal letters dated November 1396 from an '*Antoine de Havesquerque, dit de Fontaines, escuier et eschanson...*' -see P., vol.24, p.422

2. See ADCO B1532, f.195v

APPENDIX R1-23

3. The reference to 1419 comes in P., vol.22, pp.608-9, and qualifies him as Seigneur de Fontaines and de Flétrin, knight, councillor and chamberlain. For 1420, see C.A., vol.2, no.353
4. It is suggested that he was the bastard son of one of two men called Pierre, who were Seigneurs de Rasse, one of whom was chamberlain to the king and the Duke of Orleans -see C.A., vol.1, no.126. Although their arms are similar to his, and they were probably related to him, he is most unlikely to have been son to either. There is no reference in the accounts to him being a bastard, and no record of his legitimisation. In any case, the quittance referred to in n.1 above mentions that the then late Jean de Mornay was his maternal grandfather. This man was a high ranking and long-standing member of Duke Philip's household, whose daughter married a Jean de Haveskerke -see P.A., vol.VI, p.280. In the Reprises de Fief for Artois and Flanders at Hesdin in 1361 there is a reference to a '*Messire Jehan de Haverkerque chevalier Sire de Fontaines et de Flechin fie lige pour la terre de Flichin tenu du Chatel d'Aire*', so Anthoine must have been his son -see P.,vol.28, p.108
5. In the Reprises de Fief (see n.4 above) there is a reference to his father in 1361 as Captain of Vaul. His mother's half-brother, the Sire de la Motte, served the king in the 1360s. Another of her relatives served the Duke of Orleans -see P.A., vol. VI, p.280; for du Bois, see ADCO B1521, f.64v, and App. R1-6,n.4
6. See ADCO B1532, f.271
7. See Apps. R5, particularly n.54, and R11

24. FOUR, MESSIRE ERART DU

Erart (sometimes referred to as Gace or Girart) du Four was a knight, and chamberlain of the Duke from at least 1397; Chatelain of Gray from 1396; and from 1397 to 1418 Bailli in Amont, a crucial post for governing and controlling the County of Burgundy. In 1390, and again in 1418, he was Chatelain of La Mote de Bar-sur-Aube, on the borders of the bailliages of Chaumont and Foyes, and in 1409 he was Seneschal of Auvergne¹. He became a chamberlain of Duke John and stayed in his household until at least 1415, by which date he was Seigneur de Colombier la Fosse and d'Arsenville². He also had, through his wife, interests in lands in Champagne³.

He was clearly an experienced and trusted military organiser, ambassador and negotiator. He was fighting for Burgundy by 1386, continuing to do so until at least 1417, and undertaking missions for Duke Philip by 1396⁴. Philip used him to deal with problems in the County of Burgundy or on its borders. There are frequent references in 1402 and 1403 to him dealing with military incursions from Savoy and Lorraine, under the Marshal of Burgundy, Jean de Vergy, a recipient of the Order (Appendix R1-52)⁵.

He was said to have been about fifty in 1405, so was more of Duke Philip's generation than Duke John's⁶.

1. He is not qualified as chamberlain until a quittance dated 1397 -see P., vol.24, p.372. For the posts in Gray and Amont, see Apps. R5, nn.56 and 57, and R11, n.48; for La Mote de Bar-sur-Aube, see Gallia Regia, vol.2, pp.169 and 170; for Auvergne, see P., vol.22, pp. 409-410
2. See P., vol. 23, p. 651 for a quittance from 1415, qualifying him as councillor and chamberlain of Duke John and Seigneur of Colombier la Fosse. One for 1412 qualifies him as Seigneur d'Arsenville, see P., vol.24, p.200.

APPENDIX R1-24

3. There is a reference in the accounts for Villemor and Iles in Champagne in 1396 to a dispute about lands held in Champagne held by the daughters of his wife by her first husband -see P., vol.17, p.506
4. See App. R11, n.49. For references to him being sent on embassy to the King of Aragon in 1397, see P., vol.22, p.297; to the Count of Wittemberg in 1401, see P., vol.22, p.347; and to the Dukes of Savoy and Bourbon in 1409, see the Auvergne reference in n.1 above.
5. See App. R10, nn.14, 15, and 16. There are also references to him being sent in 1411 to ensure that the fortifications in the County were in a suitable condition to withstand attack -see P., vol.2, p.231; and to being sent by Duke John's wife early in 1417 to deal with armed men from Bar, Lorraine and Germany who had occupied Luxeuil
6. P., vol.25, p.61 records a deposition by him in 1405 about the dowries of noble ladies in the County which gives his approximate age.

25. GAVRE, SIRE DE

The Sire de Gavre in 1403 was Guy XII de Laval, Seigneur of Vitré and Gavre in Flanders, an experienced knight, one of the leaders of French military society, and one of the leading Breton nobles¹. He was concerned to maintain the independence of Brittany. His father had supported Charles of Blois, the French candidate, and died fighting for him in 1347. Guy had also supported Charles until the latter's death in 1364; had co-operated with the French Duke of Anjou during his lieutenancy in Brittany after Duke John IV's exile; and fought with Du Guesclin in Normandy on the French side in the period 1373-9, marrying the latter's widow in 1384. He had, however, been reconciled with the de Montfort Duke John IV when he was formally recognised as the legitimate heir to the Duchy, serving him as councillor until his exile. Annoyed by the French attempt to confiscate the Duchy, he was one of those who invited Duke John to return, and was instrumental in securing the reconciliation between him and Charles V in 1380, and negotiating the treaty of Guérande which recognised John IV as Duke (which efforts were appreciated by Charles VI). Thereafter, he served John IV and John V loyally until his own death in 1412².

Guy must have been regarded in 1402-3 as the most senior and influential of his family as, although Duke Philip gave gifts to other members of it on his visit to Brittany in 1402, he singled Guy out to receive the Order³. Guy was related to Duke John V, and to other Breton recipients of the Order, such as Craon (Appendix R1-19), Rochefort (Appendix R1-30) and Montauban (Appendix R1-43)⁴. Through them, he was related to the Duchess of Burgundy and to the families of other recipients of the Order including, more directly, the de La Trémoille (Appendices R1-33 to 37)⁵. He was, however, also related to the Penthièvre heirs of Charles of Blois, and to

Olivier IV de Clisson, and therefore potentially to the Duke of Orleans, from whom he had received monies, which made it advisable for Duke Philip to secure and maintain his support⁶.

Although Duke Philip won Guy's support for his regency, after his death Guy is likely, as a loyal supporter of Duke John V, to have followed that Duke in opposing John the Fearless when the latter's policy towards the de Montfort Dukes changed⁷.

1. For Guy XII, see P.A., vol.3, pp. 628-30 (termed Guy XI), and Henneman, Clisson, p.217.
2. See Henneman, Clisson, pp.93-4, 100, 110, and 217; Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.58; and P.A., vol.3, p. 629, which notes that Charles VI secured a dispensation for him from Pope Clement VII to marry his relative, Jeanne de Laval, du Guesclin's widow.
3. To the Sire de Laval a fermail worth 120 escus, and to Messire Guy de Laval one worth 100 escus -see ADCO B1532, ff.251, 251v.
4. His father was the brother-in-law of Duke John III of Brittany. His brother (who died in 1348) had married Isabeau de Craon, and his daughter Anne married Jean de Montfort in January 1404
5. His widowed sister-in-law, Isabeau de Craon, had remarried and her daughter Marie married Guy VI de La Trémoille, father of Georges. One cousin married Marie de Craon, and another married Jeanne de Montauban, sister of Olivier IV de Montauban
6. His first wife was the step-sister of Olivier IV de Clisson; and his sister was Olivier's first wife. He was related both through his mother, and through his first marriage, to Charles of Blois, and his niece, Clisson's daughter Marguerite, had married Charles' heir, Jean de Penthievre (who died in January 1404).
7. Henneman, Clisson,p.217 notes him as Orleanist

26. GRIGNAUX, FRANÇOIS DE

François, Sire de Grignaux was in Duke Philip's household from at least 1399 and was qualified as a chamberlain in the period 1401-4. He is sometimes referred to as a squire, and was included among a mixed group of knights and squires in the list of Order recipients but, by December 1403, was a knight. This change in status might in part explain why, a few months later, he received a second Order insignia¹. At 300 francs, six times more expensive than the first, however, and putting him almost on a par with Edward of Bar (Appendix 1-2), and well above recipients like the Marshal of Burgundy (Appendix 1-52) and Regnier Pot (Appendix 1-47), there must have been an additional reason. It is possible that the Duke needed, during 1403-4, to secure his loyalty². Other gifts to him from Duke Philip, including an unusually expensive one when he was with the Duke in Brittany in 1402, indicate that he was already regarded as important before he received the first Order insignia. Plancher implies that this was because he was one of the Breton lords whose approval Philip was seeking to his regency of Brittany³. In 1403, he received a surprising eight thousand francs to assist with his marriage, suggesting that the Duke had arranged it with a particularly rich or influential heiress, or one related to the ducal family, to remedy the impoverished state in which many Breton nobles found themselves; to further secure his loyalty; or possibly to use the marriage to undermine Orleanist support⁴.

Although I can find no direct reference to which side he supported after Duke Philip's death, in an account for 1407-8 there is a reference to Duke John giving a diamond to François' wife on their wedding day, which suggests he was still worth cultivating at this date. On the other hand, Duke John had him imprisoned and brought before him in Paris in 1409. The reason for this is not clear, and

does not necessarily signify that he had been fighting against him⁵. Earlier that year, qualified as a chamberlain of the king, he became Captain of the castle of Talmont-sur-Gironde, and briefly in 1414, Governor of La Rochelle, in the same area. The latter appointment was made in the presence of the Duke of Orleans⁶.

1. For references to him in the household, see App. R4, nn. 36, 37 and 38. For squire and chamberlain, see ADCO B1538, f.118; for knight and chamberlain, see P.S.1728 for December 1403, and ADCO B1538, f.166 for February 1404. For the Order, see App. R2, and ADCO B1532, f.255 (Annex 1) for the first insignia, and ADCO B1538, f.166 (Annex 1a) for the second
2. If he was François de Taleran, Seigneur de Chalais and de Grignols (or Grignaux), he married the daughter of Pierre de Breban, a notable knight, chamberlain of the King, his lieutenant-general in Champagne (and later Admiral of France) and Marie de Namur, a relative of Duke Philip's wife -see P.A., vol. VIII, pp.814-5 and 579. Chalais was under Orleans and Breban appears to have been an Orleanist - see Abbott, France, p.460
3. A jewelled fermail, worth 300 escus, three times more than one to given to the Sire de Chateaugiron -see ADCO B1532, f.253 (Annex 1). See also Plancher, vol.III, p.186
4. See ADCO B1538, f.142v. Antoine de Craon received only 3000 francs at the same time for his marriage
5. See ADCO B1554, f.119v for the diamond, and P., vol.24, p.264 for the arrest for '*certaines causes*'.
6. See Gallia Regia, vol.V, pp.301-2, and 352. He was relieved of his post as Governor in the October and replaced by Tanguy du Chastel, the Duke of Guyenne's marshal. No reason is given.

27. HANGEST, JEAN DE

There are several possible candidates of this name. The two best documented, Jean, Seigneur de Hangest and d'Avesncourt and his relative Jean de Hangest, Seigneur d'Huqueville, were both Picards but, although known to Duke Philip, are unlikely to have been the recipient. By 1403, both were established knights, senior figures at the royal court, and already held their titles, whereas the recipient was a squire, is given no title in the accounts, and received an insignia of too low a value for such men. They are also said to have been Orleanists¹. A more likely recipient is another relative, the grandson of Jean I de Hangest, Seigneur de Genlis, de Magny, de Fontaines and d'Huqueville. This Jean was also a Picard, who became Seigneur de Genlis in 1406 or 1407, fought with Duke John against Liège in 1408, was Captain of Chauny in the Vermandois in 1411, a chamberlain of the king, and died in 1421². It is not clear whether he was in Duke Philip's household, although it appears that Jean, Seigneur de Hangest was in the 1390s, and a knight called Jean de Hangest was chamberlain to Philip in 1397³. It may be that the recipient replaced the latter, perhaps carrying on a family attachment, as quite often happened, but did not stay long.

There are no other clear references to him in the Burgundian accounts, although his more illustrious relatives certainly exchanged gifts with Duke Philip in the 1380s and 1390s, and one was helped by Duke John in 1405. The Dukes appeared to value the services of this family. Duke Philip was concerned to secure the services of one brother of Jean Seigneur de Hangest, Robert, in 1385, and another, Ferry, fought with Duke John in 1405⁴. Perhaps Duke Philip chose a more junior scion of the family, but with prospects, to receive the Order because more senior members were already committed elsewhere.

APPENDIX R1-27

1. For Jean, Seigneur de Hangest, see P.A., vols. VI, p.740 and VIII, p.64; C.A., vol.1, no,95; C-D., vol.10, col.259; and Henneman, Clisson, p.216. He was a knight, councillor and chamberlain of the king; had seen military service from 1368 onwards, fighting with duke Philip in 1377, 1380 and 1382. From 1407, he was Master of the Company of Crossbowmen, dying at Agincourt. For Jean de Hangest, Seigneur d'Huqueville, see P.A., vols, VI, p.737, and VIII, p.63; C.A., vol.1, no.96; C-D., vol.10, col.237; and Henneman, Clisson, p.216. He was also a knight, councillor and chamberlain of the king; saw active military service from 1387; and was Master of the Company of Crossbowmen from December 1403-1407.
2. See P.A., vol.VI, p.745, and C.A., vol.1, no.218. Jean's father, Matthieu, was Jean I's third son, and it seems likely that John inherited the title after his death, and that of his childless uncle Jean in around 1406.
3. See App. R5, n.60 for a gift in 1392 to Jean Seigneur de Hangest, knight and chamberlain of Duke Philip; P., vol.2, p.350, for a quittance from a Jean de Hangest, knight and chamberlain in 1397; and App.R3, n.24 for a fermail given in 1399 to Messire Jean de Hangest, chamberlain of the the king and Duke Philip
4. See Apps. R3, nn.24 and 25; R4, n.40; and R5, nn.59, 60 and 61. For a tip to a valet who presented a horse to Duke Philip from Jean, Sire de Hangest in 1392, see ADCO B1495, f.90v. For a gift to Robert de Hangest in 1384/5 after he had fought for the Duke with 6 other knights bachelor and 12 squires, '*pour se l'attacher de plus en plus*', see Apps. R4, n.39, and R11, n.52. For a quittance of 1405 to Ferry de Hangest, esquire, fighting with 2 knights bachelor, 14 squires and 12 archers in Picardy and Flanders against the English with Duke John, see P., vol.24, p.441. He was fighting alongside Bo Calonne (App.R1-10) and the Sire of Lonroy (R1-40). Ferry was also Bailli of Vermandois in 1399-1407/8 and of Amiens in 1407 and 1410 -see Gallia Regia, vols.I, p.60 and VI, p.121

28. JAUCOURT, PHILIPPE DE

Philippe, sometimes called Philippot, de Jaucourt was the son of Philippe de Jaucourt, Sire de Villarnoul, and Governor of Nevers 1384-91. His father was an important support to Duke Philip, fighting constantly for him, carrying his standard, and also acting as his councillor and maître d'hôtel, and going on embassies for him. The Duke had relied on him to fortify and defend Nevers after he acquired it in 1384. He had also been prominent on Louis of Bourbon's crusade¹. The family held lands in Champagne, and had served the Count of Flanders². Philippe served Duke Philip continuously as squire and échanson from at least 1387 to 1403, and was retained as councillor and chamberlain by Duke John in 1405. He is said to have died, unmarried, in 1408³.

It would appear that Philippe stayed loyal to Duke John until his death, and his relatives continued to stay loyal and close to both Duke John and Duke Philip the Good, and to their supporters⁴.

1. See Rauzier, Finances, pp.40, 42, 43, 448, 642, 649 and 650; Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.61 and 157; and C-D., vol.11. His father is said to have died by 1392, and this is borne out by a reference in a dénombrement of 1391/2 to the late mesire Philippe de Jaucourt -see P., vol.8, p.58. Philippe is called Philippot before his father's death -see, for example, ADCO B1486, ff.7 and 11, referring to 1390 and 1391
2. See P.A., vol.VII, p.3. The references here seem to confuse him and his father, as the latter was certainly dead by 1392 (see n.1 above, and a reference to his sons Philippe and Guyot collecting his unpaid wages in 1401 in P., vol.24, p.139). His stepmother, Isabel de Beauvoir, was from another family of loyal servants to Duke Philippe -see App. R1-3, n.2
3. See P., vol.23, p.469, for a quittance from Philippot as écuyer and échanson in 1387. See P.A., vol.VII, p.3 for his retention

APPENDIX R1-28

by Duke John as councillor and chamberlain, and his death.

4. His brother, Guy, was councillor and chamberlain to the Dukes, distinguished himself in military service, and was governor of Nevers and Rethel for them. Guy's son, Philibert, was a close councillor of Duke Philip the Good, and married Agnes, the daughter of Pierre de La Trémoille (App. R1-37) in 1438 -see C-D., vol.11

29. JOIGNY, LE CONTE DE

The Count of Joigny in 1403 was Louis de Noyers, Seigneur d'Antigny-le-Chatel, near Beaune, a councillor and chamberlain of the king, who succeeded his brother Jean as Count in his mid to late twenties, on the latter's death at the Bal Ardent in 1392¹. The important Burgundian family of Noyers was also one of the leading ones in Champagne, and had long served the kings of France². Louis' uncle and guardian during his minority, Jean de Noyers, Seigneur de Rimancourt, served the Burgundian Dukes. While there is no indication that Louis was a member of their households, he did warmly support them against the Duke of Orleans and the Armagnacs, backing Duke Philip in Paris in 1402, and Duke John, both in 1405 and subsequently in his quarrel with the Count of Tonnerre. He died in 1415, leaving the County to pass to the de La Trémoille family through his sister Marguerite who, in 1409, married Guy de La Trémoille, Seigneur d'Uchon (Appendix R1-35)³.

Louis' family was very well-connected, particularly to the most important families in the Duchy and County of Burgundy, many of whom included recipients of the Order, such as the Chalon (Appendix R1-12), the de La Trémoille (R1-33 to 37) and the Vienne (R1-53) and also to Charles de Chambly (Appendix R1-13)⁴.

1. See P.A., vol.VI, p.653, and P., vol.2, p.300 for a dénombrement dated 26 June 1402 by Louis de Noyers, Comte de Joigny and Seigneur d'Antigny, for the lands of Antigny. Louis and his brother were minors at the time of their father Miles' death in 1376.
2. In 1404, Louis received confirmation of his title as doyen of the seven comtes pairs of Champagne -see Petit, E., Les sires de Noyers, p.213. His father had helped defend Paris in 1364; fought at Auray; again in 1369 and 1373 under Duke Philip; and

APPENDIX R1-29

in 1375 and 1376 in Normandy and Brittany. His grandfather, Jean, hereditary Grand Bouteiller of Burgundy, had been Governor of Burgundy in 1355, and had fought for both King John II and Charles V, and his greatgrandfather, Miles X, had been porte-oriflamme and Marshal of France in the mid fourteenth century - see Petit, Les Sires de Noyers.

3. For Jean de Noyers, see C.A., vol.1, no.139. See P.A., vol.VI, p.653 and Petit, Les Sires de Noyers, p.214-5
4. His greatgrandfather Miles married three times. Louis was descended from the third marriage. A cousin by the second marriage had, as her second husband, married Guillaume de Vienne (see P., vol.24, pp.90-93 for a memorandum, dating from the first quarter of the fifteenth century, before Louis' death, on the Noyers family). The Marshal's descendants had links to the families of the Dukes of Brittany and of Lorraine, and to the Count of Saint Pol -see Petit, Les Sires de Noyers, p.192. Louis was a neighbour of the Chalon, and related to them through the the de La Trémoille family, into which both he and Louis de Chalon married -see above, and App. R1-12, n.10

30. LA MUCE, SIRE DE

In 1403, the Sire de La Muce, an ancient noble Breton house, was either Guy de Rochefort, Sire d'Assérac, who had inherited the title through his wife Jeanne de La Muce, or his heir Jean, Sire de Rieux and de Rochefort¹.

Although originally a supporter of Charles de Bois, Guy de Rochefort had become a loyal supporter of the Montfort Duke of Brittany, John IV, possibly serving him as councillor from 1364, and certainly during the period 1379-1385, and fighting in the French army in the period 1369-1379². Jean de Rochefort was one of the ambassadors sent by Duke John IV to make peace with Charles VI in 1384, and was Marshal of France³. The family were connected to some of the most important Breton families, including several in the Order, such as the Craon (Appendix R1-19), Laval (Appendix R1-25), and Montauban (Appendix R1-43)⁴.

1. For Guy de Rochefort, see Pocquet du Haut-Jussé, B-A., Les Papes et les Ducs de Bretagne, pp.351, 370 and 381-3, for the period 1364-1373. Jones, M., Ducal Brittany, p.58, has references to him also in the period up to 1385. By 1396, however, the Sire de La Muce is referred to as Jean -see ALA G155, 5.4.96, taken from Prof. M. Jones' card index. P.A., vol.VI, p.765, says the eldest daughter and heiress of the Sire de Rochefort (he says Guillaume, but it must be Guy) married in 1374 Jean II, Sire de Rieux and de Rochefort, who succeeded to her titles, dying in 1417.
2. See Jones, Ducal Brittany, pp.39, nn.1 and 5, and 58
3. See P.A., vol. VI, pp.765-6
4. An ancestor of Guy de Rochefort had married into the Laval family -P.A., vol.III, p.627. Jean's son, born in 1377, married Beatrix de Montauban. Pocquet du Haut-Jussé, Les Papes et les Ducs de Bretagne, p.370, notes that in 1371 Guy de Rochefort, Olivier de Clisson, the Craon and the Laval, were related to Sire de Rais

31. LA RO_CHEROUSSE, PIERRE DE

Pierre de La Rocherousse, Seigneur de Pocé and de Rivarennnes, was a Breton who had been fighting for the French crown from the 1370s. He was squire and chamberlain to Duke Philip from at least 1383/4, and his councillor from at least 1390, serving continuously. Occasionally he is qualified as échançon¹. In 1403, he was also serving as a squire of the King's body, a position he still held in 1408 and 1411². He remained in Duke John's service until at least 1410, fighting for him until at least 1409, after 1405 as a knight³. He was dead by 1415⁴.

Despite his long service to the Duke, he seems not to have been firmly in the Burgundian camp, at least in 1402-4, which may have led the Duke to include him in the Order to secure his loyalty. Possibly for a similar reason in 1407, he was one of the chamberlains exempted from the general retrenchment of pensions and gages by Duke John⁵. He may have been distantly related to the French royal family, and through his wife to the Duchess of Burgundy and to royal servants⁶.

1. Prof. Jones' personal index has references to him fighting with Du Guesclin in the 1370s, and as one of 15-20 Bretons receiving a pension from Charles V at this time. For 1383, see ADCO B1461, f.103v; for councillor, ADCO B1495, f.43v; as échançon, ADCO B1538, f.133v; as Seigneur de Pocé by 1394, P., vol.28, p.34 (he was commissioned by the Duke to review the men at arms ordered by the King to accompany the Duke as his bodyguard on the trip to Brittany); and as Seigneur de Rivarennnes by 1397, see P., vol.23, p.124
2. For 1403, see ADCO B1532, f.83; for 1408, Gallia Regia, vol.II, p.75; for 1411, a reference from Prof. Jones, BN Moreau 1162, f.531
3. See App.R11. As knight, P., vol.29, p.588 for a muster of his

APPENDIX R1-31

- company; for 1410, P., vol.23, p.256; retained as knight and chamberlain ADCO B1554, f.54
4. P.A., vol.V, p.10 refers to his wife as a widow in 1415
 5. Gallia Regia, vol.I, p.517 notes that he was nominated by Orleans (whom the King had empowered to do this in 1402) as Captain of Bayeux, but that Charles VI rescinded this in March 1404 because there was no record of the gift Pierre had made to Orleans. The latter nominated his own chamberlain to the post in January 1404, which was confirmed in the May. See also Apps. R5, n7 and R9, n.4
 6. His seal included 3 fleur de lys, the royal coat of arms, see P., vol.23, p.245. His wife, Marie de Sainte Maure, was the granddaughter of Marie de Flandres, see P.A., vol.V, p.10. Her sister Marguerite married in 1386 Guillaume d'Orgemont, son of the Chancellor of France, to whom Duke Philip had also been close, and her brother Hector was a chamberlain of the King in 1409-12

32. LA TOUR, CHARLES DE

Although La Tour was a common enough name at this period, apart from the Order, I can find no reference to a Charles in the Duke of Burgundy's accounts or in the chronicles or standard prosopographical works. From the list of recipients, Charles was a squire but not apparently in the Duke's household or related to him so, given the other recipients in the same category, likely to have been a young or junior scion of a family holding lands in Duke Philip's territories, perhaps on a troubled border, or at another court, perhaps of one of Philip's in-laws.

In the 1350s and 1360s there are references to a Girard de La Tour, Sire de Montbelot and de Mont Saint Jean, a knight serving at least occasionally in Philip's household, and in arms on the borders of Burgundy. A relative of his, Jean, was alive in 1422¹. There could have been a Sire de Montbelot or some relative called Charles in between. In the 1420s and 1430s there was also a Henri de La Tour, Seigneur de Pierrefort, near Toul, and Captain of Sainte-Manehould and Bailli of Vitry, in the Marne area, who was an écuyer de l'écurie to Duke Philip's grandson, Duke Philip the Good². Nearer 1403, there are references to a Jean de La Tour, who had lands in the County of Burgundy, in the 1380s and 1390s. A man of the same name was fighting for Burgundy in 1367, and was Seigneur of Balaon in January 1404³. A Messire Guillaume de La Tour appears to have been part of the Duke's household, or that of the Duke of Austria, in 1387-8. Less likely, but possible if Duke Philip was trying to secure support from members of a family committed, or likely, to support his rival the Duke of Orleans, there was a Bernard de La Tour, Bishop and Duke of Langres, a councillor of Charles VI, said to have been a Marmouset, who acted as ambassador for Charles VI to Duke John IV of Brittany in the 1380s and 1390s, and would have been known

APPENDIX R1-32

to Duke Philip. He died in 1394, leaving his nephew Guy, who was still alive in 1408, as his heir, but could have had other relatives⁴.

1. See P., vol.23, p.647 for two quittances dated 1358; vol.9, pp. 29-31 for a dénombrement of his lands in 1365; and vol.2, p.61 for letters referring to him, along with a number of other knights and squires, who were called before the Duke's council in 1366. ADCO B1430, f.62, refers to him as a knight bachelor, fighting alongside the King and the Duke in 1368, and again on f.95, alongside the Duke in Champagne, as a member of his household. It appears from the former that Montbelot was some two days ride from Dijon. A man of the same name was related to the Vergy (App.R1-52) -see Abbott, France, p.208. Jean de La Tour, Sire de Montbelot is referred to in a Burgundian register of legal cases in 1422 -see P., vol.25, p.714
2. See C.A., vol.2, no. 500, and Gallia Regia, vol.6, p.177. He is said to have come from the Ardennes family of Chambley. He was Bailli in 1424-6, and Captain in 1418, 1432 and 1433. He was qualified as an écuyer banneret in 1426, and still alive in 1435
3. See P., vol.23, p.169 for a reference to Jean de La Tour de Quingey in 1381/2, lands still held by the de La Tour in 1399 see P., vol.25, p.72. See P., vol.24, p.712 for a muster under Henri de Vienne in 1367; and P., vol. 8, pp.111-112 for a dénombrement of Balaon which includes a Jean de La Tour
4. For Guillaume, see ADCO B1471, ff. 22v-23v, where he received cloth from the Duchess, along with others from the ducal household and that of the Duke of Austria, for the latter's wedding to Philip's daughter. For Bernard, see Henneman, Clisson, pp.126, 148 and 165, and P.A., vol.II, pp.216-7. Bernard was the fifth son of Bertrand II, Seigneur de La Tour in Auvergne

33.,34.,35.,36.,37. LA TREMOILLE, GEORGE, GUILLAUME,
GUYOT, JEAN AND PIERRE DE

These men were the brother and sons of two of Duke Philip's closest allies and supporters, Guy and Guillaume de La Trémoille, both of whom had died as a result of the 1396 Nicopolis campaign, leaving minors to succeed them. Guy in particular was a firm favourite of the Duke, and was accorded the unusual honour of being buried near him and in the mausoleum which Philip had built for the Dukes of Burgundy at Champmol¹. The family had a long history of service to the French crown, and both Guy and Guillaume had been councillors and chamberlains to Charles VI, and among the leaders of French military society in the second half of the fourteenth century. They had also served in the ducal household as chamberlains, Guy as hereditary first and great chamberlain, and had fought under the Duke and on crusade. Both had been handsomely and regularly rewarded by Duke Philip for their service and loyalty².

The family was a very old one, originally from Poitou, and had widespread lands, both inside and outside the duchy and county of Burgundy. It was related by marriage to both the royal and the ducal family, and also to a number of families in receipt of the Order, such as the Craon (Appendix R1-19) and Pot (R1-47)³. The family generally stayed loyal to the Burgundian Dukes, and for several generations married into other loyal families, descendants of recipients of the Order⁴. In view of its widespread landholdings, it is possible that some other recipients of the Order, if not their vassals, were their clients or close neighbours⁵.

1. Guy VI was Sire de La Trémoille, de Sully, de Craon, and de Jonvelle, Comte de Guines, Baron de Dracy, de Sainte-Hermine, and de Mareuil, Seigneur de Courcelles, de Conflans, de Sainte-Honorine, de Montigny, de Chateauguillaume, de Maillebrun, de

APPENDICES R1-33,34,35,36,37

- Saint Loup, and de Beaumont en Vaux - see Sainte-Marthe, P.de, Histoire Généalogique de la maison de la Tremoille, (hereafter Sainte-Marthe), p.104. Guillaume I was Seigneur d'Huchon, d'Espoisse, de Bourbon-Lancy and d'Antigny -see P.A., vol.IV, p. 179. For the mausoleum, see Morand, K., Claus Sluter, p.93. Guillaume died on the battlefield, Guy on the return journey, and his body was brought back to be interred at Champmol.
2. Their father, Guy V, was Grand Pannetier to John II -see Sainte-Marthe, p.100. For Guy VI's posts, see Sainte-Marthe, p.104; for pensions, La Trémoille, L. de, Livre de Comptes de Guy de la Trémoille et Marie de Sully, (hereafter Livre des comptes) pp.13-14; for his military record for 17 years between 1364 and 1395, and Guillaume's 9 years between 1369 and 1394, see Henneman, Clisson, p.220. Guy carried the Oriflamme for Charles VI against the Flemish - Sainte-Marthe, p.10, and Guillaume was knighted at Roosebecke - P.A., vol.IV, p.179. Both were Marshal of Burgundy, and both went on the Duke of Bourbon's crusade. Apart from their pensions as Marshal (for instance, ADCO B1502, f.42v), they were given lands like Jonvelle and Courcelles, gifts of money (8000 francs to Guillaume on his marriage, ADCO B1461, f.48v) and material goods (plate at New Year, ADCO B1500, f.65). Both were executors of Duke Philip's will.
 3. Guy VI married Marie de Sully, who was related to the Duchess and had been married to the Duke of Berry's son -see Sainte-Marthe, pp.117 and 122-3. Guillaume married Marie de Mello and his daughter Marguerite was the god-daughter of the Duchess -ADCO B1474, f.36v. Marie de Sully was the daughter of Isabeau de Craon -Sainte-Marthe p.50-51. Their mother remarried in 1350 the father of Renier Pot, Ibid., p.100.
 4. Later, one of Guy's daughters married a Chalon, Louis de Tonnerre (see App. R1-12), and another married a Vergy (see App.R1-52). Guillaume's son Guy married the daughter of the Count of Joigny and inherited Joigny (see App. R1-29).
 5. The Duke gave them lands and castles for instance, Courcelles (App.R1-18) and Montigny (App. R1-44)

33. LA TREMOILLE, GEORGE DE

George de La Trémoille, Seigneur de La Trémoille, Comte de Guines, de Boulogne and d'Auvergne, Baron de Sully, and Seigneur de Craon, de Sainte-Hermine, and de Jonvelle, eldest surviving son and heir to Guy VI, was born in 1385 and died in 1446¹. He was brought up at the Burgundian court, and was a squire in 1403, although not apparently formally in the household. By 1405-6, however, he was squire and chamberlain to Duke John, becoming his first chamberlain in 1407-8 and, having been on good terms with him in 1409, was his chamberlain again in 1410 and 1417. Relations with the Duke were not always cordial, as when the latter seized George's county of Boulogne by force in 1416².

After this, he supported the king rather than the Dukes of Burgundy. He married the widow of Duke Philip's elder brother, John of Berry, in 1416. Like his father, he held important posts at the French court, becoming chamberlain to both Charles VI and to his son Louis, the Duke of Guyenne, who was also Duke John's son-in-law, and then Great Chamberlain of France and Sovereign Master and Reformer General of the Waters and Forests in 1413, and later a favourite of Charles VII, his first minister in 1427-35 and his Lieutenant General in Burgundy in 1429. He also held military posts, being nominated by Duke John as Captain of Cherbourg, but replaced in 1413 by an Orleanist sympathiser. He was Captain of Compiègne in 1429, although he never went there, and of Chateau-Thierry in 1431-3³.

1. La Trémoille, Livre des comptes, pp.85-6, says 1382, but most books give 1385 -see Gallia Regia, vol.2, p.270, and as there are references to him as still in the wardship of his mother in 1397 and 1398, -see P., vol.23, pp.129 and 656, the 1385 date seems more likely. See also P.A., vol.IV, p.164.

APPENDIX R1-33

2. He received gifts from the Duke in 1400 and 1401, when he was at court with his mother -see Apps. R3, n.27 and R4, n.44. For squire and chamberlain, see ADCO B1543, f.52v, and for first chamberlain, ADCO B1554, f.96v. (His father had bought this post in 1383 -see Sainte-Marthe, p.103). A don to him in 1409 refers to him as '*cousin*' -see P., vol.8, p.114. For 1416, see Vaughan, Valois Burgundy, p.130
3. For his marriage to John of Berry's son Charles' widow, see P.A., vol.IV, p.164. He was possibly hedging his bets earlier. There is a reference in letters from Duke Philip's sons, John and Anthony, around 1400, to his '*conduite dissimulee*' -see P., vol.1, p.112, and his mother had married Charles d'Albret, the French Constable that year. For his career, see P.A., vol.IV, p.164; Gallia Regia, vols.2, p.270, 5, p.418, and 6, p.199; La Trémoille, Livre des comptes, pp.123, 127, 130 and 137; C.A., vol.1, no.123; Autrand, Charles VI, p.487; C-D., vol.16, p.190.

34. LA TREMOILLE, MESSIRE GUILLAUME DE

Guillaume II de La Trémoille, Seigneur d'Uchon, was the eldest son of Guillaume I de La Trémoille and Marie de Mello. He was born after 1375, and went into Duke Philip's service at a fairly early age, as there are references to him as a squire and échançon in 1388/9, and as écuyer tranchant in 1393. By 1400, he was a knight and chamberlain to the Duke. He already had military experience, having fought at Nicopolis in 1396, served in Guyenne in 1398, and gone on crusade to Prussia soon after. He had also accompanied the Duke to Brittany in 1397. He was chamberlain to Duke John after Philip's death, and Marshal of Burgundy at least from then¹. He died, unmarried, possibly by 1404, and certainly by 1408, because his younger brother Guy (Appendix R1-35) is referred to as Seigneur d'Huchon then².

The value of his Order insignia, on a par with the experienced Jean du Bois, a relative (Appendix R1-7) and above those of the rest of his family until his uncle, Pierre (Appendix R1-37), was awarded a second one, reflects his position as the most experienced of the younger generation of the family and the one offering the greatest potential support.

1. His parents were married in 1375 -see ADCO B1454, f.79v for their marriage gift from the Duke. For échançon, see ADCO B1475, f.15v and B1500, f.68v; for écuyer tranchant, ADCO B1500, ff.2v and 73; for knight, chamberlain and Prussia, ADCO B1517, f.112v; for Nicopolis, ADCO B1517, f.143; for Guyenne, P.A., vol.IV, p.179; for Brittany, P., vol.22, p.274; for under Duke John, ADCO B1538, f.139
2. A 1404 dénombrement refers to Guiot and Jean, his younger brothers, as Seigneurs de la baronie de Bourbon-Lancy et d'Uchon, and in a letter of 8/7/1408 Guiot qualifies himself Seigneur d'Uchon et de Bourbon-Lancy -see P., vol.11, pp.144 and 229

35. LA TREMOILLE, GUYOT DE

Guyot de La Trémoille was the third son of Guillaume I. He became baron d'Uchon on the death of his brother Guillaume II (Appendix R1-34) and Baron de Bourbon-Lancy, Seigneur d'Antigny and other territories and, after his marriage to Marguerite de Noyers, Count of Joigny (Appendix R1-29)¹. He was écuyer tranchant to Duke Philip from at least 1399, and by 1403 was squire and échanson. He became chamberlain to Duke John in 1405, and was still supporting him in 1407-8². He does not seem to have stayed in the ducal household, as there is no mention of any post in a dénombrement of 1423/4 after his wife's death³. He was given territories by Charles VI in 1421, as a recompense for his services, but in 1423 went to the assistance of Duke John's widow. He died before 1438⁴.

1. See P.A., vol.IV, p.176. Guillaume I's second son, Philippe, Seigneur de Montréal, had died childless at Nicopolis . Guyot married Marguerite, the daughter of Miles II Count of Joigny, before 1409 (see App.R1-29)
2. See ADCO B1517, f.157v; B1532, f.206v; B1543, f.12v; and B1554, ff.84-84v
3. See P., vol.2, p.301, and P., vol.7, p.106-7
4. See P.A., vol.IV, p.176

36. LA TREMOILLE, JEAN DE

Jean could either have been the third son of Guy, and Seigneur de Jonvelle, or the fourth son of Guillaume I, and Seigneur d'Uchon and de Bourbon-Lancy with his brother Guyot (Appendix R1-35) until his death in September 1408 at a battle near Tongres, helping Duke John to re-establish John of Bavaria as Bishop of Liège against the rebellious townspeople¹. Guyot and Jean are often bracketted together and sometimes referred to as brothers in the accounts, which suggests that the Order recipient was the Seigneur d'Uchon². Jean was écuyer échanson to Duke Philip from at least 1400, and is variously referred to as écuyer tranchant and échanson in 1403. Like his brothers, he stayed in Duke John's service, but in the same capacity as under Duke Philip, and was still supporting him until his death in 1408³.

(If he was the Seigneur de Jonvelle, he became a knight in 1409, and served both Duke John and his son Duke Philip the Good as échanson, first chamberlain, and first maître d'hôtel, and was a member of the latter's Order of the Golden Fleece. He married in 1424 Jacqueline d'Amboise, the daughter of Jeanne de Craon. He was strongly loyal to the Dukes, fighting for Duke John in 1414, and demanding justice from the king after Duke John's murder. He also stayed close to his relative, another loyal supporter, Renier Pot (Appendix R1-47). He was dead by 1450.)⁴

1. For the Seigneur d'Uchon, see P.A., vol.IV, p.179; for the Seigneur de Jonvelle, P.A., vol.IV, p.163
2. See P., vol.24, p.117 for a quittance of 1403 by Guyot and Jean '*freres enfans et heritiers de feu messire Guillaume de la Tremoille*' The Seigneur de Jonvelle had two brothers called Guy, but the first, Guy VI's eldest son, died young in 1390, and the second was younger than Jean, and is therefore unlikely to have received greater rewards. Jean was also a minor in 1398 -see P.,

APPENDIX R1-36

vol.23, p.653, so unlikely to have been in the Duke's service in 1399.

3. See ADCO B1517, f.138v; B1532, ff.8 and 161v; B1543, f.12v; and B1554, ff.84-84v
4. See P.A., vol.IV, p.163, and C.A., vol.2, no.391; P., vol.23, p.426 for a quittance from Jean, Sire de Jonvelle in 1418 as councillor and first chamberlain with a pension of 500 francs p.a.; vol.1, p.615 for the complaint on Duke John's death; vol.2, p.301, and vol.7, p.105, referring to him as premier chambellan and grand maître d'hôtel in 1419; and vol.5, p.58 as premier chambellan in 1420. He was probably closer to Pot, because it was his father, Guy VI, who had become guardian to Pot in 1381 when the latter's father died. See P., vol.2, p.90 for a letter from Philip the Good in 1450 referring to Jacqueline as the widow of Jean.

37. LA TREMOILLE, PIERRE DE

Pierre de La Trémoille, Seigneur de Dours, was born in 1347, the younger brother of Guy VI, Guillaume I and Philippe, and thus the uncle of George, Guillaume, Guyot and Jean (Appendices R1-33, 34, 35, and 36). After the failure of Duke Philip to get him appointed as Bishop of Chalons in 1374, he received modest gifts from the Duke, but does not seem to have held a position at the Burgundian court until about 1378, when he was receiving a pension as a squire and échanson¹. He was a chamberlain by at least 1383-4, Seigneur de Dours by 1397, and by 1403, although still a squire, was a councillor to the Duke and his most senior chamberlain, and also a chamberlain to the king. He remained as squire, councillor and chamberlain to Duke John, and actively in his service until at least 1407-8, when he was knighted fighting for him at the siege of Liège. He was still alive in 1426².

He had some military experience, going to Prussia in 1377-8 and 1391-2, and to Brabant in 1387, and had gone on the ill-fated Nicopolis campaign with his brothers³. Duke Philip used him on diplomatic missions from at least 1393, and his loyalty, trustworthiness and closeness to the Duke, particularly after the death of his brothers, are reflected in the richness, frequency and even humourousness of the rewards he received from him, particularly for the marriage which the Duke arranged for him just before the wedding of the Duke's second son, Anthony (Appendix R1-60)⁴.

Despite being only a squire, and not territorially powerful, it is still strange therefore that the first Order insignia he received was relatively inexpensive, and had to be supplemented by a much more expensive one, putting him above the Marshal of Burgundy (Appendix R1-52)

and almost on a par with the Count of Joigny (Appendix R1-29). Perhaps Pierre reminded the Duke of what he owed to the family and his position in it, or his marriage raised his status after the Duke had initially ordered the insignia⁵. He remained loyal to the Dukes, his children marrying into other loyal families⁶.

1. See Rauzier, Finances, pp.433, 489 and 490; Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.163; and ADCO B1454, f.28v.
2. See ADCO B1461, f.72; B1532, ff.152 and 185; B1538, f.238 (putting him at the top of the list of chamberlains); and B1554, f.3v. See also C.A., vol.1, no.124. P.A., vol.IV, p.181 says he bought Dours in 1413, but he is qualified Seigneur de Dours in a quittance dated 1397 -see P., vol.23, p.13, and received money from the Duke to repair his castle there in 1393 -see ADCO B1500, f.68
3. See Apps. R4, n.51, R5, n.93, and Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.61
4. Ibid. pp.62 and 219; and Apps. R3, nn. 28-37, and R5, nn.94 and 96. He slept on a palliasse in the Duke's chamber -see ADCO B1532, f.347. The genealogies do not suggest he was married before 1401-2, despite his age, although there is a reference to the Duke giving his wife a present in 1393 -see ADCO B1500, f.111 but this may be an error for his brother Philippe.
5. His family connections had helped before, securing him a pardon from Charles V in 1374 for killing a Paris butcher -see La Tremoille, Livre des Comptes, p.151. His wife was Dame d'Engoutsen and de Hubessen
6. One daughter, Agnes, married a Philippe de Jaucourt, seigneur de Villarnoul (App. R1-28); another, Jacqueline, married as a second husband a bastard of Waleran de Luxembourg (App. R1-50); and a granddaughter married the son of Jean du Bois (App. R1-6)

38. LA VIESVILLE, JEAN DE

A squire called Jean de La Viesville or Viefville, from a noble Picard family, was fighting for Duke Philip in 1387 and 1398, and was either in the Duke's household or that of the Count of Saint-Pol (Appendix R1-50) by early 1402. By 1403, he was écuyer tranchant to the Duke, and by 1408 he was a knight and chamberlain to Duke John, Captain of his personal guard, and fighting against the English. The fact that he and his brother were ransomed so quickly by the Duke suggests that the latter valued his services and that of his family¹.

He had a brother, Porrus, who was écuyer and échançon to the Duke in 1402 and, like Jean, was fighting the English in 1408². From his arms, he was related to Pierre, Seigneur de La Viesville and de Nédon, and Vicomte d'Aire in the Pas de Calais. Pierre had served Duke Philip in 1387 and, although a chamberlain of the Duke of Orleans from at least 1392 to 1396, and actively in his service, was sufficiently well thought of by Duke Philip for the latter to stand godfather to his son in 1399. By 1406, he was retained as councillor and chamberlain to Duke John, and a trusted knight in 1407, being sent to the king in 1408 to try and make peace between the Duke and the Duke of Orleans. He was still with Duke John in 1409 and 1413. He was also a chamberlain of the king, and had military experience, not only against Genoa in 1395 and 1409 and at Nicopolis, but also as Captain-General of Artois and Picardy. He died in 1421 at the battle of Saint-Riquier³. Several others in this family served both the royal family and the Dukes of Burgundy (including what must be a different Jean)⁴. Through the family, Jean was related to Duke Philip, and possibly to other recipients of the Order⁵.

1. See App. R11, n.14. See ADCO B1532, f.218 for 1402, where

APPENDIX R1-38

it is not clear whose squire he is, and his brother Porrus is qualified '*noble homme*', squire and échanton. Jean's wife received a gift -see App. R3, n.39- at the wedding of Duke Philip's son Anthony to the daughter of the Count of Saint Pol in early 1402, so they may have come to the Burgundian court for this and stayed. For écuyer tranchant, see ADCO B1538, f.124v; for 1408, see ADCO B1554, f.97v

2. See n.1 above. Duke John helped ransom both brothers in 1408
3. See C.A., vol.1, no.162. For 1387, see P., vol.23, p.430; for his son's baptism, App. R3, n.38; for 1407, ADCO B1554, f.53; for peacemaking, P., vol.22, p.395; for 1409, P., vol.23, p.337. He was qualified '*ame et feal*' in 1408 -see ADCO B1554, f.224
4. Jean de La Viesville, called Gauvin, Seigneur de Mametz and de Tiremonde in the Pas de Calais, must have been younger. He was écuyer tranchant to Duke John in 1418, then écuyer échanton to Duke Philip the Good, but not a knight, councillor and chamberlain to the latter until 1421. was Chatelain of Nieppe in 1418, and of Courtrai up to 1425, and Bailli d'Aire in 1425/6 and 1428 -see C.A., vol.2, no.333. His brother, Maillet, was also a councillor and chamberlain of Duke Philip the Good, and Captain of Aire, Lens and Gravelines -see C.A., vol.2, no.334. Their father, Sohier, was fighting for the Duke in 1390 -see App. R11, n.67. A relative Jacques, called Coppin, Seigneur de Norrent in the Pas de Calais, was écuyer échanton to Duke Philip the Bold in 1402-4 -see ADCO B1532, f.163, and B1538, f.126v. In 1412, he was a councillor of both Duke John and the king, but had to leave Paris, returning with the former in 1418. He was a knight by 1423, and a councillor and chamberlain to Philip the Good, a position he still held in 1425, despite his wife having been suspected of poisoning the Duchess in 1423. He was Captain of Argilly and Bailli of Dijon in 1422-3 -see C.A., vol.1, no.39, and P., vol.23, p.605. Le Maigre de La Viesville fought for Duke John in 1410 -see P., vol.23, p.514
5. Jean was a relative of Duke Philip's godson (see n.3 above). Pierre de La Viesville married the niece of Jean de Monchy (App. R1-41). Later, the granddaughter of a Jean de La Viesville married Jean de Hangest, seigneur de Genlis (App. R1-27)

39. LE VOYER, MESSIRE JEAN

Jean Le Voier, Seigneur de La Clarté, de Coesmes and du Plessis, was in 1403 a knight and chamberlain to Duke John V of Brittany¹. His family served the de Montfort Dukes of Brittany from at least 1364, and Jean was serving them from 1380 when, as a squire, his lands in Anjou and Maine were taken by Charles V. In 1381, he ratified the Treaty of Guérande as a ducal supporter, and from 1382-3 was qualified as a knight². From the same date he received a pension from the Duke John IV. He stayed in his service throughout the 1380s and 1390s, becoming chamberlain to him by at least 1393, and continued in John V's service³. The date of his death is uncertain, but seems most likely to have been between 1408 and 1412⁴. He would no doubt have followed Duke John V in supporting the Queen rather than the Burgundian Dukes⁵.

He married at Christmas 1391 Marguerite Beaufort, widow of the Vicomte de Polignac, and through this was related to a number of important families in France, including the Vicomte de Turenne and Jean Le Meingre, called Boucicaut⁶. The value of the Order insignia he received, on a par with two other powerful, well-connected and experienced lords - the Seigneur du Bois (Appendix R1-6) and Guillaume de La Trémoille (Appendix R1-34), suggests that his support was particularly valuable.

1. See ADCO B1532, f.275
2. La Borderie, A. le Moine de, Histoire de Bretagne, (hereafter Histoire) vol.IV, p.6, refers to a Guion Le Voier in John de Montfort's army in 1364, after the battle of Aurai.
References provided by Prof. M. Jones - for 1380, AN JJ117, f.16, no.24; and for 1382-3, B.N.fr.11531,p.317. For Guérande, see Pastoureau, L'Hermine et le sinople, p.243
3. References from Prof. Jones for 1384, ALA E211/7; and for 1387-9 and 1390-2, B.N.fr. 11531, pp.327 and 331. For chamberlain, see

Pastoureau, (as n.1 above)

4. Ibid., indicates he died in 1402-4, but *Blanchard* has a reference, in his Lettres de John V, no.984, to him at the Breton court in 1408, and one to his assassination, in B.N.fr.22319, f.139, dated 1412
5. A Perrin Le Voyer is recorded as fighting for Duke John of Burgundy in 1417, but he may not have been a relation -see P., vol.26, p.216
6. See P.A., vol.VI, p.318. Marguerite was the youngest daughter and sister of Comtes de Beaufort and Vicomtes de Turenne, and her brother's daughter married Boucicaut. The daughter of a Jean Le Voier married a Laval -see P.A., vol.VII, p.500.

40. LONROY, LE SIRE DE

Jacques, Seigneur de Longroy, was chamberlain to Philip in 1403. He is said to have been born in the 1320s, from a Ponthieu family. A knight, he was fighting for Duke Philip by 1384, and was a senior and trusted chamberlain to him by 1398, going on secret trips for him. He was termed one of Philip's principal officers in 1399, when his wages were withheld to help pay for the ransom of Philip's son John after Nicopolis. He remained a chamberlain to Duke John until at least 1408-9, when he was fighting for him¹. He was also chamberlain to the king, and his councillor in 1410. At that date he was lieutenant to the Captain-general of West Flanders, and in 1414 held the same position in Picardy. He was also Captain of Ardres, and died at Agincourt in 1415².

He came from a well-connected family which had served the French royal family; of which at least one other member served the Burgundian dukes; and which was possibly related to other recipients of the Order³. The fact that his daughter received a gift on her wedding day almost on a par with that given to the daughter of Philip's favourite, Guy VI de La Trémoille, on a similar occasion, suggests that he and his family were close to the Duke. The value of his Order insignia, on a par with those of the Seigneur de Croy (Appendix R1-20), Renier Pot (Appendix R1-47), and three of the most important Breton barons - Chateaugiron (Appendix R1-15), Gavre (Appendix R1-25) and Montauban (Appendix R1-43) - suggests that his services and support were valuable⁴. He does not appear to have turned against Duke John, being mentioned twice in 1411 among a group, including Order recipients such as Chambly (Appendix R1-13), Craon (Appendix R1-19) and Rambures (Appendix R1-48) who were on the king's council and supporting Burgundy⁵.

APPENDIX R1-40

1. See ADCO B1532, f.82. P.A., vol. VI, p.677 says Jacques, Seigneur de Longroy was a minor in 1325. This seems unlikely in the light of his later career, but the recipient appears not to have been this man's son, as in C.A., vol.1, no.107, his father's name is said to have been Robert. See P., vol.26, p.31 for a 1384 muster; vol.23, p. 394 for a 1398 quittance for his handsome annual pension; and vol.28, p.4 for 1399; ADCO B1538, ff.87 and 87v for secret trips; ADCO B1554, f.109v for a New Year gift in 1408; and ADCO B354 for a trip on the Duke's behalf to his brother in 1409
2. See C.A., as note 1 above
3. His mother was related to Mathieu de Trie, marshal of France, who died in 1344, and had served the Queen. Either Jacques or a daughter must have married into the Craon family (see App. R1-19) because a Jeanne de Craon was Dame de Longroy in 1441 when she married Jean de Soissons, seigneur de Poix -see P.A., vol.VI, pp.677 and 719. There are references to a Jean de Lonroy with Jacques in musters in 1398 and 1405 -see App. R11
4. See App.R6, n.54
5. See App. R1-13, n.7, and P., vol.1, p.669

41. MONC(H)Y/MOUCY, LE SIRE DE

The most likely candidate in 1403 was Jean II, Sire de Monchy in the Pas de Calais and de Planques, from a Picard family, although the recipient is qualified as a squire, while Jean II was a knight. He served in Picardy, Artois and Flanders in the mid 1380s. By 1397, he was a chamberlain of Duke Philip, continuing to serve Duke John in that capacity and as councillor in 1407, and serving him in arms in the period 1407-9. He was retained by the royal family in 1411, serving as chamberlain and councillor, and was Captain of Falaise at the same date. He was part of a royal council in 1411 with other recipients of the Order, such as Chambly (Appendix R1-13), Craon (Appendix R1-19), Lonroy (Appendix R1-40) and Rambures (Appendix R1-48) which was supportive of Duke John. He was still alive in 1419, but not clearly in the Burgundian camp¹. His sons were loyal to Burgundy². He was indirectly related to La Viesville, a recipient of the Order (Appendix R1-38)³.

1. See C.A., vol.1, no.171 and P., vol.24, p.23 where he is qualified as knight and chamberlain. In 1410 he is named Jean, Seigneur de Monchy in a quittance, see ADCO B354. See P., vol.24, p.107 for a quittance as knight, councillor and chamberlain in 1407, and vol.26, pp.91 and 101 for his service in arms 1407-9. Jean II's heir was his eldest son Pierre. He did have a son called Jean, but he never became Sire de Monchy, dying at 28 in Turkey -see C-D., vol.13, p.928
2. See P.A., vol.VII, p.555. His son Pierre became Governor of St. Omer, and a younger son, Edmond, served the Dukes of Burgundy
3. See C.A., reference in n.1 above. He was the brother-in-law of Pierre de La Viesville (App. R1-38)

42. LE GRAND MAÎTRE D'HÔTEL DU ROI

The holder of this position in 1403 was Jean II de Montagu, a knight, councillor and chambellan to the king, Vidame of Laon, Seigneur de Montagu, de Marcoussis and de Bois-Malesherbes, one of the Marmousets, and Grand Maître from 1401. Born in 1349/50 of a very old, noble family, once powerful in Burgundy, which had risen rapidly in the fourteenth century in the service of the kings of France, Jean was in 1403 still, because of his position and connections, a force to be reckoned with, despite the contretemps in 1392 when he had fled Paris as the Dukes of Berry and Burgundy took over the government of France¹. Duke Philip's attitude to him seems not to have been as hostile as some chroniclers suggest. This might have been because they were related spiritually, a link which the Duke took seriously; or because the Duke, ever the pragmatist, gauged that he could not undermine or overcome Jean's influence, particularly with the king; or because he recognised that he was a potentially dangerous enemy, because of his connections, and thought there was a possibility that he could be kept neutral or even won over as an ally against Orleans, and one who could actively further the Duke's policies, including the marriages of his family to the king's children². After Duke Philip's death, despite his help in securing financial support for the widowed Duchess, and the marriage of Jean's children to favourites of Duke John, the latter seems to have become gradually more hostile to him, and in 1409 secured his execution³.

In addition to his connections to the royal family, to the Dukes of Bourbon and of Berry, and to Dukes Philip and John of Burgundy, Jean de Montagu was connected to the families of other Order recipients such as David de Brimeu (Appendix R1-9), Antoine de Craon (Appendix R1-19) and George de La Trémoille (Appendix R1-33)⁴. The nature of

APPENDIX R1-42

the gifts Duke Philip and Duke John presented to Jean, and the value of the Order insignia he received, on a par with the Duke's in-law, Saint-Pol (Appendix R1-50), and second only to those given to the ducal family, reflect his influence with the king and the value the Duke put on gaining his support⁵.

1. See P., vol.23, p.13 for a quittance from Jean in May 1403 where he qualifies himself as vidame de Lannois and souverain maître d'hôtel du roi; also Merlet, L., 'Biographie de Jean de Montagu, grand maître de France', in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes, 1852, No.13, 3rd series, vol.3, pp.248-295 (hereafter Merlet). Most historians describe his family as bourgeois, but Merlet argues that it was of noble descent. Jean's grandfather had been secretary, and his father chamberlain and councillor to Charles V, and the latter married the noble daughter of Charles VI's grand échanson, herself a great favourite of Charles V. One brother, Gérard, was chancellor to the Duke of Berry, Bishop of Poitiers and then of Paris; the other, Jean, was Bishop of Chartres, then Chancellor of France and Archbishop of Sens. Jean became a secretary to Charles V and then to Charles VI, to whom he was particularly close, the only secretary to fight by his side at the battle of Roosebecke in 1383. In 1388, he married the niece of the Cardinal of Amiens and first minister of Charles V, and inherited her father's lands, adding to those he was steadily acquiring by sale and gift. When Charles VI took over the reins of power, he became superintendent of finance. He was close to the king at all the public celebrations of 1389. He fled Paris when the Dukes took over in 1392, but was back in 1393 as secretary to the king. By 1397 he was his chamberlain, and by 1398 a knight banneret and Captain, then Governor, of the Bastille. Throughout this period he continued to receive rich rewards and gifts from the king, and to increase his wealth and lands. In October 1401 he became grand maître d'hôtel. By 1403-4 he was in favour, as is evident from Duke Philip's gifts to him -see Apps. R3, R4, and R6
2. Merlet, p.257 quotes Froissart's reported conversation between

APPENDIX R1-42

Duke Philip and his brother, John of Berry threatening retaliation against the Marmousets, but Philip's father was godfather to Jean, and his nephew Charles VI to Jean's son Charles in 1398, making them doubly connected as spiritual kin. So popular was Jean's mother with Charles V that he was even rumoured to have been that king's illegitimate son, and therefore a nephew of the Duke, but Merlet discounts this. The N.B.G., vol.35-36, cols.72-73, says that Jean became close to the Duke of Orleans, and took his side against Philip, but from the gifts the latter gave him, Philip appears not to have regarded him as a confirmed partisan of Orleans -see Apps. R3, R4, R6, and R10, particularly n.25

3. See n.4 below for marriages, and Vaughan, John the Fearless, p.29 for a royal grant of all aides in Artois to the Duchess. It seems that Duke John, already irritated by Jean's influence over the king, became particularly resentful when in 1405 Jean, at Orleans' behest, took the Dauphin and his wife (Duke John's daughter) away from Paris to escape him. Jean acted as mediator, at the request of Bourbon and Berry, between the warring dukes but Duke John seems to have regarded him as an Orleanist. Orleans certainly rewarded him after a reconciliation had been negotiated -see App. R11, n.74. Jean appears to have been confident that his connections would protect him against Duke John, but after the murder of Orleans he was too easy a target for the Duke, who used Jean's ostentatiously luxurious public celebration of his brother's consecration as Bishop of Paris in 1409 to raise the populace against him, and have him arrested, tried and executed
4. Bonne-Elisabeth married Jean VI du Moulin, Comte de Rouci and de Braine in 1398; Jacqueline married George de Craon, Seigneur de Saint-Maure and de Montbazou and échanton of France in 1399. Marie married David de Brimeu, Seigneur de Humbercourt in 1409, and Louise was affianced to Jean de Melun, Seigneur d'Antoing, both men being favourites of Duke John. In the same year, his son Charles married Catherine, the daughter of Charles d'Albret, Constable of France and of royal blood, who had married in 1400/1 Marie de Sully, widow of Guy VI de La Trémoille
5. See Annex 1; and nn.1 and 2 above

43. MONTAUBAN, MONSEIGNEUR DE

Guillaume, Sire de Montauban, de Landal, and de Romilly and de Marigny in Normandy, was head of one of the principal Breton families, and one which served the French crown, except when it tried to undermine the independence of Brittany - Guillaume at one point being Chancellor to Charles VI's queen, Isabel of Bavaria¹. Guillaume served Duke John IV of Brittany from at least 1386, and by 1397 was on his council. He swore fealty to Duke John V for Dinan in 1402, 1413 and 1418, and continued to serve him, accompanying him to do homage to Charles VI for the duchy when he reached his majority in 1404, and acting as his ambassador to England and France in 1420. He died in 1432².

Duke Philip won his support for his regency of Brittany, but as a supporter of John V, Guillaume presumably followed him in supporting the Queen after Duke Philip's death. One of the family seems, however, to have been close to Philip's wife, and at least one of his siblings served Duke John, and another from the family fought for him³. Guillaume was related or close to a number of the Breton recipients of the Order, such as Belliere (Appendix R1-4), Chateaugiron (Appendix R1-15), Craon (Appendix R1-19), Laval (Appendix R1-25) and Rochefort (Appendix R1-30) as well as to a number of other powerful families and the Marshal of France⁴.

1. Guillaume's father Olivier, a companion of du Guesclin, and active commander of Charles V's army, had been councillor and chamberlain of Charles V and Marshal of Brittany, but he was part of the league which in 1379 invited Duke John IV back after the king had annexed Brittany, was his councillor in 1379-85, and then fought alongside Chateaugiron with John IV against France in 1379 and 1380, headed an embassy to Richard II to seek an alliance for the Duke in 1380, and headed a ducal garrison in St.

Malo when it was attacked by Clisson's men in 1387 -see La Borderie, Histoire, vol.IV, pp.50, 54, 58, and 96-101, and Jones, Ducal Brittany, p.58. One brother, Bertrand, was councillor and chamberlain to the Dauphin, Louis of Guienne, and another was by 1415 his premier échanson. His sister Marie was demoiselle d'honneur to the Queen by the same date -see P.A., vol.IV, p.79. For him as chancellor, see N.B.G., vol.35-36, col.113

2. See references from Prof. M. Jones - for 1386, BN fr. 32510, f.294; for 1397, BN fr.2708, f.65; for Dinan, ALA E136/2, 136/3 and 136/4; and for ambassador, BN fr. 8267, f.78. For 1404, see P.A., vol.IV, p.80
3. See Henneman, Clisson, p.305,n.51.
There is a reference in Canat de Chizy, M., Marguerite de Flandres, duchesse de Bourgogne, sa vie intime et l'état de sa maison, p.130 to a 'petit Montauban' marrying a lady of the Duchess, Marie de Saint-Ligier, in 1385 before the king and at the Duchess' expense, with a handsome present. Guillaume's brother Bertrand (see n.1 above) is also qualified as chamberlain to Duke John in 1411, when the latter sent him to John V with news about his negotiations with the king and queen -see P., vol.22, p.340. A Thevenin de Montauban was fighting with Duke John in Paris in 1410 -see P., vol.26, p.112
4. Guillaume married before 1383 Marguerite de Loheac, daughter of Beatrix de Craon -P.A., vol.IV, p.79. Their only daughter married Jean III, Vicomte de Donges, Sire de Rieux and de Rochefort, Marshal of France in 1417 in succession to his father, Jean II, Marshal of France and Brittany, who had fought at Roosebecke and supported Clisson -see P.A., vol. VI, pp. 762-6. As his second wife, Guillaume married in 1414 Bonne Visconti.

44. MONTIGNY, FOUQUET DE

Fouquet de Montigny was a longstanding, loyal and trusted servant of Duke Philip. In 1403, he was écuyer de l'écurie, a post he had held since at least 1395, and Captain of Juilly-le-Chatel. He had been in the Duke's service since at least 1385/6, as a squire and valet servant d'écuelles en salle. By 1388/9 he had become écuyer panetier, and by 1394 échanson¹. He fought for the Duke on several occasions. Apart from the trips his post required to buy horses, from at least 1400 the Duke used him on missions, including some recorded as secret. He seems to have been responsible for a guard of uniformed archers which, from May 1402, the Duke ordered from Arras to accompany him wherever he went in France². He continued as écuyer de l'écurie to Duke John at least until 1405/6, and was still fighting for him in 1414³.

There were lords of Montigny in several areas, including Ostrevant and Champagne. It is possible that Fouquet belonged to the family of one of these. There was a Foulques from the Champagne family in 1420, whose son served Duke Philip the Good as a councillor. If part of the Ostrevant family, he could have come to court after the marriage of Philip's daughter to the Count⁴. There were also others of the same name who served the Dukes, but from their seals they were not closely related to Fouquet⁵.

1. For 1385/6, see ADCO B1462, f.88v; for 1388/9, B1475, f.67; for 1394, B1501, f.38v; for 1395, P., vol.24, p.421; and for 1403, P., vol.23, p.501
2. See App. R11 for his military experience. For horse dealing, ADCO B1517, ff.149, 151, 153v and 155v; and for a secret mission to Guienne ADCO B1521, f.80v, which was paid in February 1401. For the uniformed archers, see Apps. R6, n.59 and R8, n.19
3. See ADCO B1543, f.113v

APPENDIX R1-44

4. See n.5, and C-D., vol.14, pp.329-30
5. A knight, Messire Guy de Montigny, was Bailli d'Autun for the Duke in 1366 -P., vol.1, p.408. In 1363-5, a Guillaume de Montigny, squire, was Captain de La Perriere and of the castle at Rouvre -P., vols.22, p.44 and 24, p.164, and was present at the release of a prisoner in the County of Burgundy in 1372 -P., vol.2, p.823. In 1368, a Bouchut de Montigny, a knight bachelor, brought two other knights and ten squires to fight alongside the King and Duke Philip, without having been summoned - see ADCO B1430, f.61. In 1396, a Rasse de Montigny was maître d'hôtel to the Count and Countess of Ostrevant -P., vol.24, p.195, and in 1366 and 1405 (presumably two different) Jean de Montigny were fighting for the Dukes -P., vol.26, pp.13 and 67. There are several references in the 1380s to a Jean, Seigneur de Montigny in Ostrevant and de Noyers, who had married a Dame Cecile de Noyers before 1370 -P., vol.26, pp.13 and 67

45. NEUFCHASTEL, JEHAN DE

Jean de Neufchatel was a squire, councillor and chamberlain in 1403. Seigneur de Montagu from at least 1401, de Fontenay en Vosges (for which he did homage to the Duke of Lorraine), d'Amance, de Quingey from 1410, and de Choy from 1412, he was the younger son of Thibaut VI, Sire de Neufchatel and Marguerite de Bourgogne, Comtesse de Montagu, and from one of the most important and powerful families of the County of Burgundy¹. He does not seem to have been in Duke Philip's household for long, but was sufficiently important and close to Duke John to have witnessed in 1404 the latter's letters confirming the privileges of Dijon. By 1405-6 he was a chamberlain to Duke John, and fought for him from 1406, and as a squire banneret from 1408. By 1410, he was a knight, and a councillor and chamberlain to the Duke; by 1411, Captain General of the County and Duchy of Burgundy, and qualified as '*noble seigneur*'; Gardien of the County in 1414; and Captain General and Governor of Burgundy in 1415-18. In 1418, Duke John made him Grand Bouteiller of France, and Jean was with the Duke when he was murdered at Montereau². Jean was a member of Duke Philip the Good's Order of the Golden Fleece and still alive in 1433, but dead by 1435³.

Jean's family included the direct descendants of Philip's predecessor, and first husband of his wife, the last Capetian Duke of Burgundy. It was also related to those of other recipients of the Order, such as the Luxembourg (Appendix R1-50), and closely interrelated with the Chalon (Appendix R1-12), and because of its landholdings, was closely involved with Chauffour (Appendix R1-16) and du Four (Appendix R1-24)⁴.

Although older generations of his family had not always been loyal to Duke Philip, or his predecessors, and had

therefore been at odds with the families of some Order recipients who had supported Philip, such as the La Trémoille (Appendices R1-33 to R1-37), Duke John took care to secure and retain Jean's support, and succeeding generations of the family stayed loyal to the Burgundian Dukes⁵.

1. See ADCO B1532, f.152v, and P.A., vol.VIII, p.576. For Montagu, see P., vol.25, p.223; for Quingey and Choy, see P., vol.25, pp.32-3 for a transcript of the letters recording the gifts, and n.4 below. His older brother, Thibaut VII, died at Nicopolis. The family shared revenues from the profitable salt pans at Salins with the Dukes and a number of other powerful County and Duchy families. Jean's nephew, Thibaut VIII, Sire de Neufchatel, held land in the County, including the fortress of Vesoul of which Chauffour was Captain (App. R1-16), and lands in Amont, of which du Four (App. R1-24) was Bailli, -see P., vol.2, p.755.
2. Apart from the Order, the only reference to him in Duke Philip's accounts is in July 1403, where he is not qualified as a member of the household, but seems to have occasioned Duke Philip some expense in sending Jean de Chalon to deal with a difficulty he had got into -see ADCO B1538, f.258. For 1404, see P., vol.2, p.591; for fighting, see App. R11; for squire banneret, App. R5, n.118; for 1411, see letters from Duke John, P., vol.2, p.589; for 'noble seigneur', ADCO B1563, ff.70 and 72, and for positions, Gallia Regia, vol.VI, pp.117-8.
3. P., vol.23, p.473 notes letters patent from Duke Philip the Good, dated December 1433, on Jean's departure to go on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, to pay Thibaut, Jean's bastard son, a life rent on the salt pans at Salins, which had been given to Jean for life on the death of his wife, who had had it as a marriage settlement from her first husband. P.A., vol.VIII, p.576 says that he made a will in 1433, and died soon after. Certainly, P., vol.23, p.252 gives a certification from a Jean de Neufchatel, qualified as Governor and Captain General of Burgundy, but also as Comte de Fribourg and de Neufchatel, so probably Jean's nephew, Thibaut VII's son Jean
4. The sole heirs in direct line of Philip de Rouvre were the

Seigneurs of Montagu and Somberton, see Pot, J., Histoire de Regnier Pot, conseiller des ducs de Bourgogne, 1362?-1432, (hereafter Histoire) p.1. Duke John referred to him as cousin - P., vol.25, pp.32-3; his grandfather, Thibaut V, had married Jeanne de Chalon, daughter of Alix de Bourgogne and Jean de Chalon, Comte d'Auxerre; Jean's father Thibaut VI had married Marguerite de Bourgogne; and Jean married Marie de Ghistelle, widow of Jean de Chalon, Seigneur de Chatelbellin, who had died at Nicopolis -see P., vol.23, p.473. His brother married the daughter of Marie de Luxembourg. When trouble broke out between Duke John and Louis de Chalon, Comte de Tonnerre (see App.R1-12), Jean sided with the Duke and in 1412 was given Choy, which the Duke had confiscated from Louis

5. An earlier Jean, uncle of the Order recipient, had been, together with Hugues de Chalon, one of the lords of the County of Burgundy who, in 1363, when Duke Philip was invested as Count by the Emperor, despite the territory having passed to Marguerite d'Artois on Philip of Rouvres' death, revolted against Philip, raising not only the County, but threatening the Duchy. In 1365, Jean, an implacable enemy of the Duke, and pensioner of Edward III of England, was captured by Guy and Guillaume de La Trémoille who, in effect, sold him to Duke Philip for 8,000 livres, and he remained in prison until his death in 1369 -see Rauzier, Finances, pp.6, 7, 447, 631, 656-7; and P., vol.24, pp.101, 425. Thibaut VIII, Jean's nephew, was Grand Maître d'Hôtel to the King in 1418-19, an ambassador for the King and both Duke John and Duke Philip the Good, and a member of the Order of the Golden Fleece, and Jean's bastard, Thibaut, was a knight and chamberlain of Philip the Good in 1433 -see n.3 above and P.A., vol.VIII, pp.347-9

46. POIS, MESSIRE ROGUE DE

Tyrel, called Rogue, de Pois (or Poix), Seigneur d'Ignaucourt in the Somme area, was a knight in 1386, and a chamberlain of Duke Philip by 1401. He continued in this position under Duke John¹. He fought for Duke John in 1405, and again in 1407-11, by which time he was a knight bachelor. He was Captain of Pont-Audemer, and died at Agincourt².

He must have been well regarded by Duke John, because the latter stood godfather to one of his sons in 1406, giving him his name³. He was closely related to at least one senior recipient of the Order, Jean du Bois (Appendix R1-6)⁴.

1. See C.A., vol.1, no.178; P.A., vol.VIII, p.823. For 1401, see quittances P., vol.23, p.670 and P., vol.24, p.338; for chamberlain of Duke John, see a quittance of 1410 P., vol.23, p.303
2. See C.A., and P.A., as above. For 1405, P., vol.26, p.75 as knight bachelor + 1 squire in September and October; for 1407 + 12 squires, P., vol.22, p.381; for 1408, P., vol.22, p.398; for 1409 + 1 squire, P., vol.22, p.435; and for 1410, P., vol.23, p.617
3. See App. R3, n.49
4. His step-sister, Caterine, married Jean du Bois -see P.A., vol.VI, p.173

47. POT, MESSIRE REGNIER DE

Renier Pot, Seigneur de La Prugne and de La Roche-Nolay, was from a Poitevin family, and the much younger step-brother of Guy VI and Guillaume I de La Trémoille, who were entering Duke Philip's service just as Renier was born in 1362. He was, in effect, one of the de La Trémoille family, and shared in its close relationship with the Duke and its resultant good fortune¹. He was one of Duke Philip's closest, longest-standing, and most loyal servants, and continued to serve the Dukes until his death in 1432².

He commenced in the ducal household as a squire and échançon in 1381 when Guy VI, his guardian, brought him to court. By 1383, he was a knight and Duke Philip's chamberlain, and in 1384 was fighting alongside Boucicaut in Flanders³. By 1386, he was also chamberlain to the king. After a period 1389-91 fighting with the Order of Teutonic Knights in Prussia, he returned to France⁴. He was taken prisoner at Nicopolis, after fighting bravely, and conducted the negotiations for the ransom of Philip's son John of Nevers in 1397-8⁵. Although he appears to have been briefly in the Duke of Orleans' service, going to Hungary for him, in 1394, and his second wife, whom he married in 1392, was one of the Duchess of Orleans' ladies until 1408, and he also served the king, he was primarily in Duke Philip's service, being qualified as his chamberlain throughout the 1380s and 1390s, and additionally as his councillor from 1399/1400, and was richly rewarded for his pains. Probably by 1399, and certainly by 1404, he was also chamberlain to John of Nevers⁶.

He was equally close to John as Duke, holding the same positions in his household, acting as ambassador and negotiator for him, helping to arrange a peace between

John and the king in 1410 and, with Craon (Appendix R1-19) and Croy (Appendix R1-20), was one of the Burgundians on the king's council in the same year. He received many tokens of the Duke's esteem⁷. He continued in the service of Duke Philip the Good, demanding justice for Duke John's murder, and taking part in the marriage negotiations for the Duke and his family. He was one of the first to be made a member of Philip the Good's Order of the Golden Fleece⁸.

He built up landholdings in Burgundy through purchase and gifts, making him the neighbour of other important Burgundian families in receipt of Philip the Bold's Order, such as the Chalon (Appendix R1-12)⁹. Through his de La Trémoille relatives, he was connected not only to the ducal family, but to those of a number of other Order recipients, such as the Craon (Appendix R1-19). It was probably these connections, rather than his rank, his military experience, or his negotiating skills, which led to him receiving a distinct Order insignia, and one of the same value as a number of more senior Breton and Burgundian lords.

1. His mother was the widow of Guy V de La Trémoille, who died in 1350. His father, Guillaume III Pot, became guardian to Guy V's children - Guy VI, born 1343, Guillaume I, born 1345, and Pierre, born 1347 (App. R1-37). When Guillaume Pot died in 1381, Guy VI became guardian to Renier. After Guy VI's death, and on the remarriage of his wife to Charles d'Albret, Renier and Pierre became guardians to Guy's children, including George de La Trémoille (App. R1-33). See Pot, Histoire, pp.13-18, and 84. When Louis de Chalon repudiated his de La Trémoille wife, Renier successfully pressed Duke John for vengeance -Ibid., pp.98-101, and App. R1-12
2. Guy de La Trémoille (App. R1-35) and Jean de La Trémoille, Seigneur de Jonvelle (App. R1-36) were executors to his will, made in 1426 - Ibid., p.259

APPENDIX R1-47

3. For squire and échançon, see *Ibid.*, p.15; for knight and chamberlain, and fighting with Boucicaut, *Ibid.*, p.21 and ADCO B1461, f.90v
4. For chamberlain to the King, and for the Teutonic Knights, see *Ibid.*, pp.25 and 32
5. *Ibid.*, pp.101
6. *Ibid.*, p.38. For service in the 1380s, Apps. R4 and 5; and for 1385 P., vol.23, p.461; for 1386, P., vol.23, p.425; for 1388, P., vol.24, p.155. For the 1390s, Apps. R3, 4, and 5; and for 1392, P., vol.24, p.4; and for 1395, ADCO B1498, f.36v. For councillor and chamberlain, App. R5, n.123 (although Pot, Histoire, p.82 implies that it was later). He was still in the king's service in 1398, as a vidimus of letters from the Emperor Sigismund about a gift to John of Nevers for his ransom and those of the Comte de La Marche, Jean de Hangest and Renier Pot refers to him as chambrier of the king -see P., vol.2, p.393. For chamberlain to the John of Nevers, see App. R5, nn.132 and 135
7. For councillor and chamberlain to Duke John, King's Council, and negotiations, ADCO B1543, f.59 and Pot, Histoire, pp.93, 109-10, 115 and 137. For tokens of esteem, see n.1 above - the Duke confiscated Louis of Chalon's property (also because he was an Orleanist) ; the Duke paid off Renier's Nicopolis ransom in 1405/6; and recompensed Renier's wife when she left the Duchess of Orleans' household in 1408, see *Ibid.*, pp.101 and 118, and generally Apps. R3, 4, and 5
8. For service to Philip the Good, see Pot, Histoire, pp. 218-279. He was still chamberlain in 1420, 1427 and 1429, see P., vols. 22, p.630, and 2, pp.531 and 500
9. He bought Thorey in 1399; Marie de Sully, Guy VI's widow, gave him Courcelles in 1400; he bought La Roche-Nolay in 1403, with Duke Philip's permission, from Louis of Savoy; and was given Vielchatel in Auxois for life in 1408 as recompense for his work in securing the marriage of Duke John's brother, Anthony Duke of Brabant, to Elizabeth of Görlitz, see P., vols.1, p.750 and 7, p.633, and Pot, Histoire, p.84

48. RAMBURES, MONSEIGNEUR DE

Both Andrieu I, and his son David, de Rambures in the Somme area, were knights and chamberlains of both the king and Duke Philip in this period, and actively in the latter's service, but it is Andrieu who is termed Seigneur de Rambures in 1403¹.

Andrieu came from a Ponthieu family of military renown and in the service of the royal family. His father, Jean II, had been Governor of Arras in 1338, and his brothers were both soldiers. He was serving in the French armies from 1364, throughout the 1370s, 1380s and 1390s, and was Captain of Boulogne in 1382 and later of Gravelines in the 1380s and 1390s, and was one of the leaders of French military society². He was chamberlain to Duke Philip from at least 1397³.

His successors carried on in the family tradition. His son, David, was in the king's household from 1388 as a squire, serving in the French armies from the 1380s and renown for his courage. He was chamberlain to Duke Philip from at least 1394, and was serving Duke John in that capacity in 1406. He went to help Boucicaut in Genoa in 1409 and by 1410 was chamberlain to the Duke of Guyenne, Master of the Company of Crossbowmen in 1411, and retained by the Dauphin in 1412. He died shortly after Agincourt⁴. Of Andrieu's grandsons, Jean, Hugues and Philippe died at Agincourt with their father, while Andrieu II was fighting for Duke John in 1417, later serving King Charles VII⁵.

The family appears to have been close to two other recipients of the Order, Jean de Croy (Appendix R1-20) with whose name Andrieu's is often coupled, and Saint. Pol (Appendix R1-50) alongside whom David fought⁶.

1. See ADCO B1532, f.82. David is not generally referred to as

APPENDIX R1-48

Seigneur de Rambures until 1406 - see ADCO B1543, f.105. Andrieu died and David was taken prisoner at the siege of Mercq, near Calais, in 1405. See P.A., vol.VIII, pp. 65-7

2. P.A., vol.VIII, pp.65-6, and P., vol.24, p.508 for references to Andrieu as Captain of Gravelines in 1397 and 1398. See also Henneman, Clisson, p.219
3. See ADCO B1538, f.293 for monies paid to him dating back to June 1397, and App. R5, n.143 for a pension '*de nouvel retenu*' from 1398-9
4. P.A., as above; for 1394, App. R5, n.144; and 1406, see n.1 above
5. P.A., as above
6. For Croy see, for instance, NY presents in 1400 -App. R3, n.16; payments in 1399/1400, ADCO B1519, ff.17 and 28; comparable levels of pension, ADCO B1519, ff.61 and 66; and of repayments, App. R5, n.43; and musters held together P., vol.26, p.41. For David and Saint Pol, see P., vol.26, p.39

49. RENFORCAT

Shown elsewhere as Renforcat Dagor/ Dagont/ de Gant (Ghent), in 1402 and 1403 this man was a squire and chamberlain to Duke Philip. Despite services rendered and a value to the Duke which had just won him a sizeable annual pension and glowing commendation, his name is inserted in the list of Order recipients, apparently as an afterthought, which suggests that he had either not been long at the ducal court, or not at that rank¹. He was later there on at least one occasion as a knight, probably in 1410². Apart from the handful of references in Duke Philip's accounts, there are no real indications of his family, his connections to the Duke or to other Order recipients, or his longer-term loyalty³. It is just possible that he came to court with Montauban (Appendix R1-43), as he warranted a gift of silk at about the same time as velvet was presented to the latter⁴. The value of his Order insignia suggests that he held lands or a position of importance to the Duke.

1. See ADCO B1532, f. 83v for his pension and references to him under both names, and f.255 for the insertion. P., vol.24, p.103 gives a quittance from him as squire and chamberlain in 1402.
2. There is an undated quittance for him, qualified as a knight, P., vol.23, p.337, and one for 1410 in ADCO B361
3. A Jean de Gand was married to the daughter of the bastard son of the same brother of the Count of Flanders who was married to the Dame de Fauquemont -see App. R1-54, n.2. A squire, Sohler de Gand, Seigneur de Tasnay, married a bastard sister of the Duchess in the 1390s -see P.A., vol.II, p.741; and had connections to the Vergy - see P., vol.27, p.279. A Perceval de Gand was Seigneur de La Tourete and Bailli of Troyes in 1327, and a man of the same name held the same post in 1372-3, dying in 1376 -Gallia Regia, vols.IV, pp.91-2 and VI, pp.61 and 63. Without seals it is difficult to know if they were related to Renforcat.
4. For the silk, see App. R6, n.66

50. SAINT POL, MONSEIGNEUR DE

Waleran de Luxembourg, Comte de Ligny and de Saint Pol, Seigneur de Fiennes and de Bohain, was born in 1357 and died in 1415. He was one of the leaders of French military society in the period, one of Duke Philip's most important vassals in Artois, and also one of his closest associates¹. He was a man of considerable influence and position in France, with powerful connections there and in territories which bordered on the Duke's and were of interest to him². His first marriage, to the half-sister of Richard II of England, initially caused his loyalty to the French crown to be called into question. His second, in 1400, to Bonne, sister of Edward de Bar (Appendix R1-2) and niece to Duke Philip, led to him being termed the Duke's nephew. In 1402, after negotiations which had commenced in 1384, and in line with a marriage treaty arranged in 1393, his daughter married Philip's second son Antoine and he thus shared the Duke's relationships with other recipients of the Order³.

The size of his annual pension and the value, not only of his Order insignia, but of other gifts from the Duke, reflect the significance of his landholdings and potential claims, and the importance the Duke attached to the extensive military services he had rendered and to securing and maintaining his support. Duke John attached similar importance to his support, and rewarded him accordingly⁴. Despite the doubts about his loyalty, he always supported the French crown, and protected Charles VI, but in the struggles between Burgundy and the Armagnacs, remained strongly supportive of the former until his death⁵.

1. See P.A., vol.VIII, p.564, and Henneman, Clisson, p.217. There are many references to letters between him and the Duke e.g ADCO B1461, f.146 (1383), and B1500, ff.86v, 167v (1392, 1393)

2. He was Grand Maître and Souverain Réformateur des Eaux et des Forêts de France in 1402, Grand Bouteiller and Governor of Paris for Duke John in 1410. By 1411, he was Constable of France, and in 1414, Governor of the Duchy of Luxembourg for his son-in-law, by then Duke of Brabant -see CA., vol.1, no.9. He had been close to the Duke of Orleans at one time and, although no friend of Clisson and the Marmousets, was angered by Clisson's arrest in 1387 -see Autrand, Charles VI, p.369, and Henneman, Clisson, pp.105 and 123. His father, Guy, had died in 1371 at the battle of Baëswiler, defending Wenceslas, Duke of Luxembourg and Brabant against Guillaume de Juliers, and was highly regarded in these territories, so the marriage of Saint Pol's daughter to Antoine may have helped in securing the agreement of the Estates of Brabant to the latter's succession to these territories, to which Saint Pol himself also had some claim -see Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.90 and 101, and P.A., vol.III, p.723
3. He married first at about the time of Charles VI's coronation, and was accused of treason -Autrand, Charles VI, p.224. He is termed nephew in 1400, ADCO B1519, f.154. The negotiations for his daughter's marriage commenced with Antoine's birth. For this and the treaty, see Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.89-90. By 1390, Antoine was sending gifts to Jeanne, -ADCO B1481, f.4, and Philip was referring to her as his daughter -ADCO B1486, f.3v
4. For his pension of 8000 francs, one of the highest Philip gave, see App. R5, n.148
5. His family had in the 1350s supported Charles the Bad against Philip's father, so the dangers of losing his support would have been clear -see Henneman, Clisson, p.15. Apart from his family's marriages into the French royal family, he shared with the king in 1400 a squire who married the sister of one of Philip's chamberlains -ADCO B1519, f.156. He went to protect Charles VI after Orleans' murder; attended the latter's funeral as a member of the royal family; and, although with Duke John after the murder, stayed in the royal Council when the Duke was refused entry to it. He held Paris for Duke John against the Armagnacs in 1411, and lost his position as Constable when they gained power in 1413 -Autrand, Charles VI, pp.352-5, 444 and 502

51. TRIART, MESSIRE JEHAN DE

Like George de Chiney (Appendix R1-17), this recipient is a mystery in that, apart from the receipt of the Order, I can find no reference to him, or to anyone with a name resembling his, in the Burgundian accounts, in contemporary chronicles or in standard prosopographical works. Like Chiney, his place in the Order hierarchy would suggest that he held a fairly important position in the royal or another ducal household, or lands in a strategic area, or was related to one of the families in the Order.

52. MARESCHAL DE BOURGOGNE

The Marshal of Burgundy in 1403 was Jean III de Vergy, called 'le Grand', Seigneur de Fouvans in the Côte d'Or, and de Champlitte and Port-sur-Saône in the Saône et Loire, who was also hereditary seneschal of Burgundy, and Governor of the County of Burgundy from 1386 to 1409. He was probably born in the 1340s, and died in 1419, trying to defend Duke John against his murderers at Montereau¹. He came from one of the oldest and most powerful Burgundian families, and was related not only to the Capetian Dukes, and thus indirectly to Duke Philip, but to the families of several other powerful recipients of the Order, the Chalon (Appendix R1-12), Charles de Chambly (Appendix R1-13), the Craon (Appendix R1-19), the Neufchatel (Appendix R1-45), and the Vienne (R1-53)². Through his first wife, he was also related to the Counts of Flanders and Dukes of Lorraine, and on her behalf successfully claimed lands in an enclave between Lorraine, Bar and Champagne against the House of Bar (Appendix R1-2)³. His duties also sometimes brought him into conflict with families of Order recipients, like the Chalon. The significance of his landholdings brought him into potential conflict with the Duke on occasion, but matters seem to have been amicably resolved. They did, however, mean that he did homage to others besides the Duke⁴.

A knight at least by 1397, he fought consistently for Duke Philip from at least 1365, against the Companies in the Duchy, against the English, in Flanders as one of the most outstanding at Roosebecke, and in all the major campaigns for both Duke Philip and Duke John until his death⁵. He was chamberlain to Duke Philip from at least 1395, and his councillor from 1399, often entrusted with travelling on ducal business, sometimes secret, by both the Duke, and Duchess on his behalf when he was away from Burgundy⁶. He remained loyal to the Dukes, protecting them to the last.

APPENDIX R1-52

1. See P.A., vol.VII, p.34, and Autrand, Charles VI, p.574. His father died in 1353, and Jean III had two younger brothers. He is termed Marshal in ADCO B1532, f.99, the account for 1402-3. See also Vaughan, John the Fearless, pp.9 and 152
2. See P.A., as above, and C-D., vol. 19, p.616. The Duke called him cousin -see, for instance ADCO B1500, f.147. His mother, his second wife, and the second wife of his son Antoine were all Vienne. His first wife was a Chalon, the daughter of Jean, Seigneur d'Arlay and Marguerite de Mello, and through the latter he was related to the Craon. His brother Jacques, Seigneur d'Autrey, married the widow of Louis de Neufchatel. His brother Guillaume was Archbishop of Besançon, and a Cardinal by 1391.
3. See De Winter, pp.203-5. His second wife, Jeanne, was the widow of Edouard Dampierre de Saint-Dizier, the last of his line, who died in 1401. Her claims to the Dampierre lands were opposed by the Dukes of Bar, but Jean succeeded with Duke Philip's help in realising them.
4. When the Prince of Orange, Jean de Chalon, killed a ducal sergeant, it was Vergy who seized two of his castles -see App. R1-12, n.10, and Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.166. His family shared in the revenues of the salt pans at Salins -P., vol.23, p.265. In 1391 there was a dispute over whether La Rochelle in the County of Burgundy was a fief of Vergy or of the Duke -P., vol.2, pp.296, 381, 829. He received 300 francs of rent on lands in Mâcon from Amadeus of Savoy in 1398, for which he did homage to the Dukes of Savoy -P., vol.2, p.92. He was present in Paris in 1378 when the Countess of Flanders, Artois and the County of Burgundy did homage to the Emperor for her lands in the County of Burgundy which Duke Philip and his wife inherited -P., vol.2, p.586.
5. See App. R11
6. Plancher, vol.III, Notes VI says he was a chamberlain in 1369 at Duke Philip's wedding, but he is not qualified as such in later accounts, see ADCO B1503, ff.13v and 22 for November 1395. For councillor, see ADCO B1517, f.60v for June 1399. For travelling, see App. R5, nn.156 and 158, and ADCO B1503, ff.41-5 for the Duchess; and App. R6, n.69 on secret matters for the Duke

53. SAINT GEORGE, MONSEIGNEUR DE

The Seigneur de Saint George, in the Côte d'Or, in 1403 was a de Vienne, most likely Guillaume III, called 'le Sage', and Seigneur also of Sainte Croix in the Saône et Loire¹. He must have been born before 1362, and died in 1434². He came from a very old and powerful Burgundian family, which held lands and positions in both France and Burgundy, particularly the County, and was related to recipients of the Order like Charles de Chambly (Appendix R1-13) and the Count of Joigny (Appendix R1-29), and to a number of other powerful families, some members of whom received the Order, including the Chalon (Appendix R1-12) and Vergy (Appendix R1-52)³.

Either he, or his half-brother Guillaume II, distinguished himself at the battle of Roosebecke, and was assigned by Duke Philip to advise his son John on the Nicopolis expedition⁴. By 1403 he was a knight, and councillor and chamberlain to Duke Philip. He retained these positions under Duke John, and also held ones at the French court, having been Grand Chambellan to the Dauphin from 1408, and by 1419, when he was imprisoned after Duke John's murder at Montereau, councillor and chamberlain to the King. He remained loyal to the Burgundian Dukes, being party to the complaint laid by Duke John's widow in 1420, and one of Duke Philip the Good's inner council in 1425⁵.

The value of his Order insignia and the placing of his name in the first group of recipients after the direct family of the Duke reflect the importance of his position, and that of his family, and the Duke's need to retain his support.

1. ADCO B1519, f.3 refers to a Guillaume de Vienne as Seigneur de Saint George in 1400. In 1403, a Guillaume de Vienne is qualified as Seigneur de Saint George and de Sainte Croix. Hugues VI de

APPENDIX R1-53

Vienne, Seigneur de Saint George and de Sainte Croix had a son by his first wife called Guillaume (P.A., vol.VII, p.799 says Guillaume II, but he also terms Hugues VI's father Guillaume II), who inherited from his childless elder brother, Hugues VII, in 1392. Guillaume's own marriage to the niece of Pope Clement VII was also childless, but it is not clear when he died. Hugues VI de Vienne had another son, called Guillaume III, by his second marriage to the daughter of Marguerite de Noyers -Ibid., vol. VII, p.800, who then became Seigneur de Saint George.

2. Hugues VI died in 1362 -Ibid., vol.VII, pp.799 and 800
3. See n.1 above. A relative, Jean de Vienne, Seigneur de Rollans, had been Admiral of France until his death at Nicopolis, and had been regularly rewarded by Duke Philip -see Ibid., vol.VII, p.808, and, for instance, at New Year 1395, ADCO B1503, f.129. Hugues VII had married Alix de Thoire-Villars, the widow of Philip of Savoy, son of the Count of Piedmont, who received a diamond when she attended the christening of Duke Philip's son Louis -Prost, vol.I, item 3184 and p.326, n.2. Guillaume III's son Jean served Duke John. His daughter Jeanne was the second wife of Jean III de Vergy. Guillaume III married Louise, the daughter of Amé III, Count of Geneva, and as his second wife in July 1400, Marie, Dauphine of Auvergne, granddaughter of the Duke of Bourbon, who brought him lands in Champagne. Their son, Guillaume IV married the daughter of Jean de Chalon, Prince of Orange. The family, including Guillaume III, took rents from the saltpans at Salins
4. See App. R11, and Atiya, pp.144 and 147, which also notes others of the Vienne family at Nicopolis.
5. See CA., vol.1, no.295. For chambellan and councillor of Duke Philip, see ADCO B1532, f.82v; of Duke John, B1554, f.16; of the Dauphin, Gallia Regia, vol.III, p.480; for 1420, P.,vol.i, p.615 He was a leading lay member of Duke John's embassy to the Council of Constance in 1415, see Vaughan, John the Fearless, p.137

54. VORNE/BORNE, ARNOUL DE

There is no other reference in the ducal accounts to a squire of this name, which suggests that he was not a regular member of the household or visitor to the ducal court. There are references in the accounts and other texts to a number of people with similar names¹. Of these, perhaps the most likely candidates for the Order are the Seigneurs de Borne, in Limbourg, whose goodwill Duke Philip, his father-in-law, and possibly his eldest son, John, were obviously anxious to purchase, and some of whom appear to have been related to the ducal family and to others in the Order². As the Seigneur de Borne in 1403 appears not to have received the annual pension accorded to his predecessors, it may be that the Order was an alternative sweetener to secure his support, particularly as some of his lands had just passed to the Duke of Orleans³.

1. In 1385, a squire, Perrin de Vorne, was said to be Seigneur of part of Vorne in a Dijon notary's register; and there are references in 1412 musters to Guillaume and Girart Borne, and a Guillaume de Verne. There were also two de la Verne families in Burgundy.
2. ADCO B1461, f.27, records Duke Philip's award in 1383, when he became Count of Flanders, of a life pension of 300 francs a year, in return for *hommage*, to a knight, Regnault de Falemont (elsewhere Fauquemont), Seigneur de Borne, both for the '*amour et singuliere affection*' the Duke had for him, and '*pour accroissance*' of a pension he had had from Philip's father-in-law and predecessor as Count of Flanders, Louis de Mâle. This was confirmed in 1395 -see ADCO B1503, f.34. By August 1400 Regnault was dead, and his sister Philippine's son Jean had succeeded to the lordships of Borne and Sittard (and also to the County of Salm in Luxembourg). Philip was forced to sell a significant amount of his plate to pay pension arrears of 1,950 francs due to Jean as Regnault's heir. Jean is referred to as the Duke's

APPENDIX R1-54

cousin, and was apparently already in receipt of a pension from Philip as Count of Salm -see ADCO B1519, ff.51-51v and 103-105. This had been granted by Louis de Mâle in 1378, and was to be confirmed by Duke John in 1406-7 - see ADCO B1538, f.71v. In June 1400, the Sire de Borne is said to be the son of the Count of Salm -see ADCO B1519, f.51, but according to Loutsch, J-C., Armorial du pays de Luxembourg, (hereafter Loutsch) p.698, Jean, who had succeeded his brother Simon as Count in 1397, had sold the seigneuries of Borne and Sittard in 1400. The buyer is not recorded, but it could have been Arnoul. P.A., vol.II, p.733 suggests that Fauquemont had, in the mid fourteenth century, been the subject of dispute between the Count of Flanders and his brother's widow, the Dame de Fauquemont. It may be that the pension was part of the compromise they agreed. P.A., vol. VII, p.35 notes the marriage by contract in March 1403 of Count Jean of Salm to Guillemette de Vergy, granddaughter of Jean de Vergy (App. R1-52); and P.A., vol.III, p.724 the earlier marriage of his elder brother to Marie, sister of Waleran de Saint Pol (App. R1-50).

3. See n.2 above. ADCO B1471, ff.10-10v, records an expensive gift to a '*seigneur de bornes en alemaigne*', late in 1387, along with others to the Duke of Bavaria and his household, and to Brabant lords which, if he was the same man, suggests he was playing some part in Philip's political, and possibly marriage or succession, strategies. Similarly, ADCO B1495, f.98 records Philip sending a mounted messenger to Limbourg, to the Seigneur de Borne, in late 1392. Orleans bought Luxembourg in 1402

55. ZEVENBERGHE, GIRART DE

This could be Girart de Strienen or Strinen, who was Seigneur de Zevenberghen in Holland in 1410. He was serving the Count of Hainault by 1405, and was later a councillor of Jacqueline of Hainault (Duke Philip's granddaughter, born in 1401). His brother, Arnoul de Zevenberghen, was a councillor of Duke John of Brabant, and both were cousins of the Emperor Sigismund¹. There are no clear references to this squire in the Burgundian accounts, although a squire called Girart de Zannersberghe was chamberlain to Duke Philip in 1402².

The family was an important one in Holland. A Seigneur de Zevenberghen signed the letters guaranteeing the double marriage of Duke Philip's son John and daughter Margaret to William, Count of Ostrevant, and his sister Margaret, the children of Albert of Bavaria, Regent of Hainault, Holland and Zeeland, at Cambrai in 1385³. Girart de Strienen gave up Zevenberghen to Duke Philip the Good of Burgundy in 1426 and, after 10 years in prison, finally did homage to him in 1436⁴. In the late fifteenth century, a Corneille, Seigneur de Zevenberghen, was a member of Duke Philip's Order of the Golden Fleece⁵.

1. See CA., vol.2, no.308

2. See P., vol.24, p.6 for a quittance. The clerks obviously had difficulty with non-French names, but this is the only broadly similar sounding one

3. See Plancher, vol.III, Preuves LXXXVIII. The childless Duchess Joan of Brabant (the Duchess of Burgundy's aunt) was in favour of this marriage and Brabant was mentioned as part of John's inheritance in the marriage treaty, implying Albert's support of Burgundian succession in Brabant which, by 1402, Duke Philip hoped would pass to his second son Antony, because the Estates of Brabant wanted to avoid Brabant being subsumed into the Burgundian hegemony when John inherited. See Vaughan, Philip the

Bold, pp.86-88

4. See n.1
5. See Paviot, J., 'Le recrutement des chevaliers de l'ordre de la Toison d'or, 1430-1505', in V.B.P, Toison d'or, pp.75-79.
Corneille was from the Glyme or Berghe family, lords of Bergen-op-Zoom, and was lord of Grevenbroek and Zevenbergen. His brother Henry was Chancellor of the Order 1493-1502, and another brother, Jean, lord of Bergen-op-Zoom, was also a member.

56. MONDITSEIGNEUR

Duke Philip, nick-named the Bold, first Valois Duke of Burgundy was born in January 1342, the fourth son of King John II of France. He is said to have earned his nickname on the battlefield at Poitiers, in 1356, defending his father against the English. Having in 1360 made him Duke of Touraine, a relatively small and poor territory, his father engineered an exchange for the much larger and richer Dukedom of Burgundy in 1363, after the death of the last Capetian Duke, Philip of Rouvres, in 1361. Philip's appointment to Burgundy, which was confirmed after King John's death in 1364 by Philip's eldest brother, King Charles V, helped secure his marriage in 1369 to Margaret of Male, Philip of Rouvres' widow and, as daughter of the Count of Flanders, the richest heiress in Western Europe. This marriage helped retain the economically and strategically important County of Flanders in the French sphere of influence¹.

After the death of Margaret's grandmother, Margaret of Artois, in 1382, and of her father in 1384, Philip became the ruler also of the Counties of Flanders, Burgundy, Artois, Nevers and Rethel, and of Mechelin and Salins. In 1382, Charles VI ceded to him a group of castellanies in Champagne, and he inherited further lands there in 1384. In 1387, he arranged to retain Lille, Douai and Orchies, which had been ceded to Flanders by Charles V at the time of Philip's marriage, on the understanding that Philip would return them to France when he became Count of Flanders. He secured joint rulership of the Duchy of Limbourg in 1387, and full ownership in 1396, and in 1390 he made a secret arrangement with his aunt, the Duchess Joan of Brabant, for that Duchy to pass after her death to him and his wife and their heirs. In 1388, his brother the Duke of Berry gave him the County of Etampes, Gien and Dourdan, which had belonged to their dead brother the Duke

of Anjou. In 1390, he bought the County of Charolais; in 1393 he became virtual ruler of Savoy during Amadeus VIII's minority; and in 1401-2 he obtained control briefly of the Duchy of Luxembourg².

Of Philip and Margaret's seven surviving children, six were married off advantageously to secure alliances with neighbouring rulers; to protect or extend territory, position and power; or to deny them to rivals; or to secure peace. John (Appendix R1-58) was married in 1385 to Margaret of Bavaria; Margaret, also in 1385, to William Count of Hainault and Holland, Margaret of Bavaria's brother; Catherine in 1387 to Duke Leopold IV of Austria; Mary in 1393 to Amadeus VIII of Savoy; Anthony (Appendix R1-60) in 1402 to Jeanne, daughter of the Count of Saint Pol (Appendix R1-50), and in 1409 to Elizabeth of Görlitz; and Philip (Appendix R1-59) to Isabel de Coucy and later to Bonne of Artois³.

Duke Philip planned to marry his grandchildren equally advantageously, mostly back into the French royal house, to reinforce his influence, and that of his successors, with the French crown. For the May 1403 betrothal of his son John's children, see Appendix R1-58. At the same time, Jacqueline, daughter of Margaret and William of Bavaria, was betrothed to Charles VI's son Charles, although she eventually married another of his sons, John, Duke of Touraine⁴.

During the minority and subsequent mental incapacity of his nephew, Charles VI, Philip together with the King's other uncles, virtually controlled France and its revenues. His power, influence and wealth led to increasing rivalry with the King's brother Louis, Duke of Orleans, which almost resulted in open warfare in late 1401 and continued up to, and beyond, Philip's death at the end of April 1404⁵.

Apart from the relationships mentioned above, Duke Philip was closely related by blood or marriage to a number of other recipients of his Order, including Duke John V of Brittany (Appendix R1-57), Edward of Bar (Appendix R1-2) and Robert of Flanders (Appendix R1-22), and less closely to Jean du Bois (Appendix R1-4), Jean de Chalon (Appendix R1-12), Charles de Chambly (Appendix R1-13), Anthoine de Craon (Appendix R1-19), Jean de Croy (Appendix R1-20), the Count of Joigny (Appendix R1-29), the de La Trémoilles (Appendices R1-33, 34, 35, 36, and 37), Jean de Neufchastel (Appendix R1-45), Renier Pot (Appendix R1-47), the Count of Saint Pol (Appendix R1-50) and Jean de Vergy (Appendix R1-52).

1. See Vaughan, Valois Burgundy. pp.14-15
2. Ibid., pp.15-18; Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.2 and 93-95, and for Luxembourg, pp.102-4; and Appendix 2.
3. Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.81-92. Bonne, born in 1379, died unmarried in 1398, and several children did not survive infancy
4. Ibid., pp.81-92
5. Ibid., pp.39-58

57. BRETAGNE, MONSEIGNEUR DE

Pierre de Montfort, called John V, Duke of Brittany, was born in December 1389¹. He married in 1396 Jeanne, the daughter of King Charles VI of France. He succeeded as Duke after his father, Duke John IV de Montfort's death in 1399. Duke Philip became his guardian and regent of Brittany in late 1402, just before his mother, Joan of Navarre, left to formalise her marriage to King Henry IV of England, taking her daughters Blanche and Marguerite with her. John and his brothers Arthur and Gilles were taken by Philip to Paris and thence to Burgundy until he came of age on December 1403. He then rendered homage to Charles VI for Brittany in January 1404 and returned to his duchy².

It is difficult to gauge John's later position in relation to Burgundy. After Duke Philip's death, he appeared to move closer to the Armagnac party, marrying his sister Blanche in 1407 to Jean, the eldest son of Bernard, Count of Armagnac, its leader³. In 1408, his mother-in-law, Queen Isabeau of France sought his help, having fled from Paris after the murder of her brother-in-law, the Duke of Orleans by Duke John the Fearless, and he brought her back to Paris and then, after John the Fearless' triumphant return to Paris after his victory at Othée, escorted her to Tours. Relations between him and John the Fearless were not helped by the latter marrying his daughter Isabeau to Olivier de Blois, the ^{grand}son of Charles de Blois, and son of Jean de Bretagne ^{comte de Penthièvre} and of Margot, Olivier de Clisson's daughter, and thus a potential enemy and rival of the de Montfort Dukes. His apparent rapprochement with England in 1409; his alleged mistreatment of his wife; and his continued hostility to the Clisson family upset the Queen of France and John the Fearless, nearly leading the latter to invade Brittany. Peace between the Dukes was restored by 1410 and, although he was a member of the League of Gien

against John the Fearless, he did not actively fight against him, although his brother Arthur did. Although seemingly prepared to fight against his half brother, Henry V in 1415, he managed to avoid being present at Agincourt. He helped mediate a settlement between John the Fearless and the Dauphin in 1418, and supported the latter until his implication in the murder of John the Fearless, after which he deserted him. Like his father, he was a pragmatist, concerned to protect the independence of Brittany and his position in it. For these reasons, he did not prevent John the Fearless' son, Duke Philip the Good, and the Queen negotiating the Treaty of Troyes with England by which Henry V's son was to rule France in place of the Dauphin⁴.

1. He was the first son of John IV de Montfort and Joan, daughter of King Charles II (the Bad) of Navarre and Jeanne de France, a granddaughter of King John II of France, and thus descended from both the Capetian and Valois Kings of France. See Knowlson, G.A., Jean V, duc de Bretagne et l'Angleterre, (hereafter Jean V) pp.23-24
2. Ibid., pp.39-45. His youngest brother, Richard, who became Count of Etampes and married Marguerite of Orleans, stayed in Brittany. Of his other brothers, Arthur became Constable of France and, in 1457, Duke of Brittany; Gilles died in 1412. His sister Marie had already married a Valois prince, Jean, Duke of Alençon, in 1396. See La Borderie, Histoire, pp.133-8
3. John also married another sister, Marguerite in 1407 to Alain, son and heir of Count Alain de Rohan and Béatrice de Clisson, the sister of Olivier, in an effort to detach him from the latter, his father's bitter enemy.
4. See La Borderie, Histoire, pp.155-161; Knowlson, Jean V, pp.94-125; and Vaughan, John the Fearless, pp.265 and 267

58. NEVERS, MONSEIGNEUR DE

John, eldest son of Duke Philip the Bold, was born in 1371. His godfather was Philip's elder brother, John Duke of Berry. He became Count of Nevers in 1384 and married Margaret of Bavaria in 1385. Like his father, he used his children's marriages to further his policies. Margaret was betrothed in 1394 to Charles, the Dauphin of France, who died in 1401, and then in May 1403 to his brother Louis, the then Dauphin, whom she married in 1404. Philip was betrothed also in 1403 to Michelle, the daughter of Charles VI, whom he married in 1404. Marie or Catherine was to be betrothed in 1403 to John, Duke of Touraine, another son of Charles VI. In fact, Marie married in 1406 Adolf IV, Duke of Cleves, and John of Touraine in the same year married Jacqueline of Bavaria, Duke John's niece. A marriage was arranged for Catherine in 1408 to Philip, son of Duke Louis of Orleans, as part of the peace treaty of Chartres between the Burgundians and the Armagnacs, and then in 1410 to Louis III, Duke of Anjou and King of Sicily, son of Duke Philip's elder brother, but came to nothing. Isabeau married in 1406 Olivier de Blois¹. John shared his father's relationships to the recipients of the Order (Appendix R1-56).

John had limited military and administrative experience during his father's lifetime. In 1385, he was briefly his father's Lieutenant in Burgundy; in 1388 he accompanied him on the Guelders campaign; and in 1396 he nominally led the ill-fated crusade defeated at Nicopolis. When in 1398 he returned from the imprisonment which had followed, his household was finally separate, although he still received no income from Nevers, and the ducal accounts continued to include clothes for him and his household².

John succeeded his father as Duke of Burgundy and Count of Charolais in 1404, and as Count of Flanders, Artois and

Burgundy after the death of his mother in 1405. His rivalry with his cousin, Duke Louis of Orleans, for power in France and control over the incapacitated Charles VI and the Dauphin developed rapidly after his father's death, and in 1405 John and his brother assembled an army, marched on Paris to protest at Orleans' mismanagement, and brought the Dauphin back to Paris, away from the Queen and Orleans. Orleans' influence continued, however, to grow and, in November 1407, John had him killed, arguing that it was for the protection of the King and the good of France. His success against the Liège rebels in 1408 helped him gain control of the Dauphin and dominate the Council from 1409-10. By 1410, sporadic civil war had broken out between the Burgundians and the Armagnacs, who supported Orleans' successors, but truces were arranged, and John continued more or less in control until the Cabochien revolt in 1413, after which there was a reaction in favour of the Armagnacs. The loss of his brothers, both of whom died in the English invasion in 1415 and the French defeat at Agincourt, and the death of the Dauphin, his son-in-law, at the end of that year, undermined his power, and this was reduced still further when the new Dauphin, John of Touraine, died in 1417, along with Duke John's brother-in-law and close ally, Duke William of Bavaria. The civil war continued, and John set up an alternative government at Tours with the Queen, while the Dauphin, a second Charles, remained in Paris with the Armagnacs. In 1418, John took Paris, but the Dauphin escaped and, despite a settlement between them, the latter was implicated in John's murder in 1419 at Montereau, leaving John's son, Philip to succeed as Duke of Burgundy and avenge his father's death³.

1. See Vaughan, John the Fearless, pp. 245-8, and App. R1-57
2. See for example Apps. R3, 4 and 5
3. See Vaughan, John the Fearless and Valois Burgundy; and Autrand, Charles VI

59. PHILIPPE MONSEIGNEUR

Philip, the third and youngest surviving son of Duke Philip the Bold, was born in 1389 and became Count of Nevers in 1405, and of Rethel after Anthony (Appendix R1-60) had become Duke of Brabant¹. His godfather was Philip of Bar, brother of Edward (Appendix R1-2). He married Isabel de Coucy and then Bonne of Artois. The latter survived him and became the second wife of his nephew, Duke Philip the Good, in 1424². He shared his father's relationships with recipients of the Order (Appendix R1-56).

Throughout his life he supported his brothers John (Appendix R1-58) and Anthony, though not always very effectively³. He died at Agincourt in 1415. He was succeeded as Count of Nevers by his son Charles and then, from 1464, by his second son John.

1. In the Order, this title could have referred to Philippe, the eldest son of John of Nevers (App. R1-58) born in 1396, but is more likely to have meant Duke Philip's third son. He became Count of Nevers after his father's death, when John became Duke of Burgundy.
2. Isabel de Coucy was the daughter of Enguerrand VII (1340-1397) and Isabelle, daughter of the Duke of Lorraine. Enguerrand was related to the Dukes of Austria and the Counts of Savoy; through his first wife Isabelle, daughter of Edward III, to the English royal family and to John IV de Montfort, Duke of Brittany; and through his daughter Marie (by Isabelle of England) to Edward of Bar (she married his elder brother Henry). He came from a distinguished noble family with extensive lands in Picardy, and was one of the foremost military men of his age, an experienced diplomat and royal servant, who had been on the Bourbon crusade and that in 1396 to Hungary, which he had joined at the request of Duke Philip to guide John of Nevers, and died after being captured at Nicopolis. He had served both the Duke of Anjou and

APPENDIX R1-59

the Duke of Orleans, but Duke Philip obviously regarded him as important to cultivate, offering as his usual courtesy gifts to a hostess a diamond ring to his wife and a jewelled brooch to Isabelle, then a baby, when he stayed at Enguerrand's castle in 1389, and offering the Constablership of France to him after Olivier de Clisson's downfall in 1392. See Tuchman, B.W., A Distant Mirror, pp.5, 220-1, 247, 248, 351, 358, 421, 423, 443, 501, 546, 564 and 571. Bonne of Artois was the daughter of Philippe d'Eu, a Valois prince, and Marie daughter of John Duke of Berry, Philip's uncle. Marie later married John, later Duke, of Bourbon in 1400.

3. He went to help Anthony against Guelders in in 1407, and invaded Tonnerre for John the Fearless in in 1411 against Louis de Chalon, but surrendered to Armagnac forces in 1414 -see Vaughan, John the Fearless, pp.52, 196, and 240

60. RETHEL, MONSEIGNEUR DE

Anthony, the second son of Duke Philip the Bold, was born in 1384 and became Count of Rethel in 1393. He married Jeanne de Saint Pol, daughter of the Count (Appendix R1-50) in 1402. He became Duke of Brabant and Limbourg in 1406, on his great aunt Joan's death. After Jeanne's death in 1407, he married Elizabeth of Görlitz, the heiress of Luxembourg, and became Duke of Luxembourg in 1412. He died at Agincourt in 1415, and was succeeded first by John, who in 1418 married his cousin Jacqueline of Bavaria and became Count of Hainault, Holland and Zeeland, and then in 1427 by his second son, Philip, who died in 1430. He shared his father's relationships with the recipients of the Order (Appendix R1-56).

He was present at the private meeting in the Louvre at which Duke Philip the Bold commissioned Christine de Pizan to write a panegyric for his dead brother, Charles V, which made great use of the image of the golden tree¹. He supported his brother John throughout his life, both militarily and as a negotiator and intercessor, and in return received help in protecting Brabant².

1. See Solente, Charles V, p.8
2. He formally allied with John, Amadeus VIII of Savoy, the Queen and Duke William of Bavaria in 1405. John helped him against the Duke of Guelders in 1407, and they both fought successfully at Liège in 1408. He negotiated in 1407-8 on John's behalf after the latter's murder of the Duke of Orleans, and in 1414 to help him secure the peace of Arras with Charles VI. He joined John in 1411 to oppose the Armagnac military advances. See Vaughan, John the Fearless, pp.32, 52, 62, 68, 90 and 196. There were occasions when the conflicting commercial interests of Malines in Flanders and Antwerp in Brabant led to disagreements between the brothers, but these were mediated by Saint Pol in 1413, and did not undermine their general support for one another -Ibid.p.157.

APPENDIX R2

RECIPIENTS OF THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE: HIERARCHY¹

NAME ²	RANK	TITLE	POSITION	ORDER VALUE
1. Aunay, d'	Chlr.	Seigneur	Chamb.	50frs. (1 of 16)
		d'Orville	Kg & PB	unjewelled
2. Bar, de	Chlr.	Marquis	Nephew PB	337½frs. (unique)
		du Pont	Cousin Kg	jewelled
3. Basoches, de	Chlr.?	Messire	Vidame of	50frs. (1 of 16)
			Châlons	unjewelled
4. Belliere, de	Chlr.?	Vicomte	Capt. of	50frs. (1 of 16)
			Dinan	unjewelled
5. Blondel	Esc.		Prem.Chamb.	30frs. (1 of 24)
			of Rethel	plain
6. Bois, du	Chlr.	Seigneur	Chamb. PB,	112½frs. (1 of 3)
			JF & Rethel	jewelled
7. Boves, des	Esc.		Esc. tranch.	30frs. (1 of 24)
			of PB	plain
8. Bretagne, de	Esc.		Esc. of Dss.	30frs. (1 of 24)
			of Brittany	plain
9. Brimeu, de	Esc.	(later	Esc. d'ecur.	30frs. (1 of 24)
		Seigneur	of PB	plain
		d'Humbercourt)		
10. Calonne (Bo)	Esc.		Esc. d'ecur.	30frs. (1 of 24)
			of PB	plain
11. Calonne, de	Esc.	(later	(Esc.	30frs. (1 of 24)
		Seigneur)	d'ecur. PB)	plain
12. Chalon, de	Esc.	(later	Chamb. PB	50frs. (1 of 16)
		Seigneur		unjewelled
		de Vitteaux)		
13. Chambly,	Chlr.	Messire	Chamb. Kg.	50frs. (1 of 16)
			& PB	unjewelled
14. Chante-merle, de	Esc.	Seigneur	Esc. tranch.	30frs. (1 of 24)
			of PB	plain
15. Chateau- giron, de	Chlr.?	Baron	Cllr. &	150frs. (1 of 6)
			?Prem.Chamb.	jewelled
			Dss. Brittany	

APPENDIX R2

NAME	RANK	TITLE	POSITION	ORDER VALUE
16. Chauffour de	Esc.	Seigneur	Esc. de Cusey d'ecur. PB	30frs. (1 of 24) plain
17. Chiney	Chlr.?	Messire		50frs. (1 of 16) unjewelled
18. Courcelles	Esc.	Seigneur	Esc. panet. of PB	30frs. (1 of 24) plain
19. Craon, de	Chlr.	Messire	Chamb. PB	50frs. (1 of 16) unjewelled
20. Croy, de	Chlr.	Monsgnr.	Chamb. PB	150frs. (1 of 6) jewelled
21. Desquees	Esc.		Esc. d'ecur. PB	30frs. (1 of 24) plain
22. Flandres, de	Esc.	Bastard	Esc. d'ecur. PB	30frs. (1 of 24) plain
23. Fontaines de	Esc.	Seigneur	Chamb. PB	30frs. (1 of 24) plain
24. Four, du	Chlr.	Messire	Chamb. PB & JF	50frs. (1 of 16) unjewelled
25. Gavre, de	Chlr.	Sire	Cllr. of Dss. of Brittany	150frs. (1 of 6) jewelled
26. Grignaux, de	Esc./ Chlr.		Chamb. PB Messire	50frs. (1 of 16) unjewelled 300frs. (2nd.) jewelled
27. Hangest, de	Esc.	(later Seigneur de Genlis)		30frs. (1 of 24) plain
28. Jaucourt, de	Esc.	(Sire de Esch. Villarnoul)	PB	30frs. (1 of 24) plain
29. Joigny, de	Chlr.?	Comte	Chamb. of Kg.	250frs. (1 of 2) jewelled
30. La Muce, de	Chlr.	Sire		50frs. (1 of 16) unjewelled

APPENDIX R2

NAME	RANK	TITLE	POSITION	ORDER VALUE
31.La Roche-Esc. rousse,de			Chamb.PB & JF	30frs. (1 of 24) plain
32.La Tour, Esc. de				30frs. (1 of 24) plain
33.,34.,35.,36.,37.		La Tremoille		
33.George de	Esc.	(Seigneur)	(later Chamb.JF)	50frs. (1 of 16) unjewelled
34.Guillaume de	Chlr.	Messire	Chamb. of PB & JF	112½frs.(1 of 3) jewelled
35.Guyot de	Esc.		Esch.PB Chamb.JF	30frs. (1 of 24) plain
36.Jean de	Esc.		Esch.PB & JF	30frs. (1 of 24) plain
37.Pierre de	Esc.	Seigneur de Dours	Chamb.King & PB	50frs. (1 of 16) unjewelled 225frs.(2nd.) jewelled
38.La Viesville, de	Esc.		Esc.tranch. of PB	30frs. (1 of 24) plain
39.Le Voyer de	Chlr.	Messire	Chamb.Dk. of Brittany	112½frs.(1 of 3) jewelled
40.Lonroy, de	Chlr.	Sire	Chamb.PB	150frs.(1 of 6) jewelled
41.Monchy, de	Esc.	Sire	Chamb.PB	30frs.(1 of 24) plain
42.Montagu, de	Chlr.	Vidame de Laon	Grand.Mdh. of King	337½frs.(unique) jewelled
43.Montauban de	Chlr.?	Monsgnr.	Cllr.Dk.of Brittany	150frs.(1 of 6) jewelled
44.Montigny, de	Esc.		Esc.d'ecur. of PB	30frs.(1 of 24) plain
45.Neuf- chatel,de	Esc.	Sgnr.de Montagu	Chamb. of PB & JF	50frs.(1 of 16) unjewelled

NAME	RANK	TITLE	POSITION	ORDER VALUE
46.Poix,de	Chlr.	Messire	Chamb.PB and JF	50frs.(1 of 16) unjewelled
47.Pot	Chlr.	Messire	Chamb.PB and JF	150frs.(unique) jewelled
48.Rambures, de	Chlr.	Monsgnr.	Chamb.PB & Kg.	150frs.(1 of 6) jewelled
49.Renforcat	Esc.		Chamb.PB	50frs.(1 of 16) unjewelled
50.Saint Pol	Chlr.	Monsgnr.	Nephew PB Cousin Kg.	337½frs.(unique) jewelled
51.Triart, de	Chlr.?	Messire		50frs. (1 of 16) unjewelled
52.Vergy,de	Chlr.	Marshal	Chamb.PB & JF	150frs. (unique) jewelled
53.Vienne, de	Chlr.	Monsgnr.	Chamb.PB JF & PG	250frs. (unique) jewelled
54.Vorne,de	Esc.			30frs. (1 of 24) plain
55.Zeven- berghe,de	Esc.		?Chamb.PB	30frs. (1 of 24) plain
56.,57.,58.,59.,60.		Ducal Family		
56.Bourgogne, de	Chlr.	Monsgnr.	Duke of Burgundy	Fermail + Collar 516frs+(unique) ³
57.Bretaigne, de		Monsgnr.	Ward of PB Dk.Brittany	600frs. (1 of 2) jewelled 405frs. (2nd.) jewelled
58.Nevers, de	Chlr.	Monsgnr. Comte	Son of PB later Dk. Burgundy	600frs. (1 of 2) jewelled
59.Philippe		Monsgnr.	Son of PB	150frs. (unique) jewelled
60.Rethel, de		Monsgnr. Comte	Son of PB later Dk. Brabant	400frs. (unique) jewelled 247½frs. (2nd.) jewelled

APPENDIX R2

1. Taken from ADCO B338 and additions - see Annexes 1 and 1a
2. As given in ADCO B338, put into alphabetical order
3. A single total for the cost of Duke Philip's Order insignia is not given in the accounts. The gold for the collar and its making cost nearly 345 francs; that for the fermail, 135 francs; and the enamelling 36 francs - a total of 516 francs, but that excluded the cost of the jewels and gold which the Duke provided himself from two old rings. See Chapter 2, n.35

APPENDIX R3

RECIPIENTS OF THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE: GIFTS
MATERIAL OBJECTS - PRECIOUS (excluding 1403)

NAME	OBJECT	VALUE	OCCASION			
			NY	MAR.	TSF	OTHER ¹
1. Aunay, d'	Fermail	170 frs.		1386 ²	-	-
	Diamond	45 frs.	1400 ³			
2. Bar, de	*Hanap & Aiguierre, Fermaillet	368+ frs.	1399	-	-	
	*Hanap	120 frs.	1400			
	*Hanap	223+frs.	1402			
	Fermail	292½ frs.	1404			
	Diamond	120 escus	1404 ⁴			
	(Plate	18 marcs				1401) ⁵
3. Basoches de, -	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Belliere de, -	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Blondel	(Plate	194+ frs.	-		1387) ⁶	
	Cross & Paternoster	40 livres		1389 ⁶		
	(Vaisselle	20 frs.				
	Gobelet	60frs.	1402 ⁶			
	Gobelet	33 frs.				1405 ⁷
6. Bois, du	Plate	100 frs.	-	-	1400 ⁸ -	
	Gobelet	33 frs.				1405 ⁷
7. Boves, des	Rabot	10frs.	1406 ⁹ -		-	-
8. Bretagne, de	6 Tasses Hanap & aiguierre	42frs.	-	-	-	1400 ¹⁰
		54+frs.	1402 ¹⁰			
9. Brimeu de, -	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. Calonne (Bo)	-	-	-	-	-	-
11. Calonne, de	-	-	-	-	-	-
12. Chalon, de	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. Chambly de	Diamond	45 frs.	1400 ³	-	-	-

APPENDIX R3

NAME	OBJECT	VALUE	OCCASION			
			NY	MAR.	TSF	OTHER
14.Chante- merle,de	Tasses Hanaps & aiguierre	107 frs.	1402 ¹¹ -		1388) ¹²	-
15.Chateau- giron,de	(Hanap	50 frs.	-	-	-	1402) ¹³
16.Chauffour de	-	-	-	-	-	-
17.Chiney	-	-	-	-	-	-
18.Courcelles	Rabot	10frs.	1406 ⁹	-	-	-
19.Craon,de	(Tasses & aiguierre (*Hanap (Diamond	183 frs. 150 frs. 120 escus	1400) ¹⁴ 1401) ¹⁵ 1404) ⁴	-	-	-
20.Croy,de	Pot & 4 hanaps Hanap & aiguierre (6 tasses &2 quartes) Plate Collar 6 cups & hanap	62+ frs. 225 frs.	1400 ¹⁶ 1401 ¹⁶		1402) ¹⁷	-
21.Desquees	-	-	-	-	-	-
22.Flandres, de	Fermail	40frs.	1402 ¹⁸ -		-	-
23.Fontaines de	(4 hanaps, pot & aiguierre) Diamond	94 frs.	-		1376 ¹⁹	
24.Four,du	-	-	-	-	1402/3 ²⁰	-
25.Gavre,de	Fermail	120escus	-	-	-	1402 ²¹
26.Grignaux, de	Fermail Plate Fermail	300escus 225frs. 300frs.	- 1402 ²²	-	-	1402 ²² 1404 ²³

APPENDIX R3

NAME	OBJECT	VALUE	OCCASION			
			NY	MAR.	TSF	OTHER
38.La	(Plate)	125frs.			1399 ³⁸	
	ViesvilleFermaillet	50frs.		1402 ³⁹		
	de (Tasses)		1408 ⁴⁰			
39.Le Voyer	*Fermail	140frs.	-	-	-	1402 ⁴¹
	Collar	300 escus				1402 ⁴¹
40.Lonroy,de	Vaisselle	60frs.	1402 ⁴²	-	-	
41.Monchy,de-		-	-	-	-	
42.Montagu,	Livery	100frs.		-	-	1389 ⁴³
	de fermail					
	Diamond ring	50frs.	1391 ⁴³			
	Fermail	130frs.	1395 ⁴⁴			
	Gobelet	144frs.	1395 ⁴⁴			
	Coupe	322½frs.	1397 ⁴⁴			
	Hanap	300+frs.	1402 ⁴⁴			
	Hanap	300frs.	1404 ⁴⁵			
	Hanap	191frs.	1406 ⁴⁶			
	Hanap	307½frs.				1406 ⁴⁶
43.Montauban	Fermail	200frs.	-	-	-	1402 ⁴⁷
	de					
44.Montigny,-		-	-	-	-	-
45.Neuf-	Hanap &	66frs.	1406 ⁴⁸	-	-	-
	chatel,de	aiguierre				
46.Poix,de	Hanap &	50frs.	-	-	1406 ⁴⁹	-
	aiguierre					
47.Pot	2 hanaps,	162frs.		1392 ⁵⁰	-	
	gobelet,&					
	3 aiguierras					
	Quarte,	148frs.		1392 ⁵¹		
	hanap &					
	aiguierre					
	6 hanaps &	277frs.		1392 ⁵²		
	aiguierre					
	*Fermail	200frs.	1394 ⁵³			
	*Hanap		1395 ⁵⁴			
	Ring	120escus				1400 ⁵⁵

APPENDIX R3

NAME	OBJECT	VALUE	OCCASION			
			NY	MAR.	TSF	OTHER
47.Pot	Plate	225frs.	1400 ⁵⁶			
(cont'd)	Diamond	112½frs.	1404 ⁵⁷			
	Rabot ring	17frs.	1406 ⁹			
48.Rambures	2 hanaps &		1400 ¹⁶	-	-	
de	1 pot					
	Hanap &	56frs.	1401 ¹⁶			
	aiguierre					
	(Diamond)	67½frs.	1401 ⁵⁸			
	(Diamond)	60escus				1402 ⁵⁹
	Plate	60frs.	1402 ⁵⁹			
49.Renforcat		-	-	-	-	-
50.Saint Pol	Ring	130frs.	1393 ⁶⁰	-	-	
	Collar	529frs.	1400 ⁶⁰			
	Collar	1800frs.				1399 ⁶¹
	2 Estamois	537frs.	1400 ⁶⁰			
	*Hanap	219frs.	1401 ⁶⁰			
	Hanap	224+frs.	1402 ⁶⁰			
	Fermail	300escus				1402 ⁶²
	*Fermail	225frs.	1404 ⁶⁰			
51.Triart, de-		-	-	-	-	-
52.Vergy, de	Hanap	160frs.	1402 ⁶³	-	-	
53.Vienne,	Fermail	292½frs.	1400 ⁶⁴	-	-	
de	Tasses	200frs.				1402 ⁶⁴
	2 flacons	140+frs.	1402 ⁶⁴			
54.Vorne, de -		-	-	-	-	-
55.Zevenberghe, de-		-	-	-	-	-
56.,57.,58.,59.,60. Ducal Family						
56.Bourgogne						
de ⁶⁵						
57.Bretaigne	Fermail	1000escus				1402 ⁶⁶
de	Fermail	500escus				1402 ⁶⁶
	Potel de	99escus				1402 ⁶⁶
	gobelles &					
	6 tasses					

APPENDIX R3

NAME	OBJECT	VALUE	OCCASION			
			NY	MAR.	TSF	OTHER
57. Bretagne	Ring	60 escus				1402 ⁶⁶
	de (cont'd) 3 fermail	x2220 frs.				1404 ⁶⁶
	Fermail	675 frs.	1404			
58. Nevers	Collar	1000 frs.	1398			
	de *Gobelet	700 frs.	1402			
	Fermail	800 escus				1402 ⁶⁷
	Fermail	700 frs.	1404			
59. Philippe	Collar	(700 frs.)	1398			
	Hanap	148+ frs.	1402			
	Fermail	180 frs.	1404			
60. Rethel	Collar	(700 frs.)	1398			
	de Hanap	340½ frs.	1402			
	Fermail	600 frs.	1404			
	Fermail	67½ frs.	1404			

1. Gifts of gold, silver, silver gilt, precious and semi-precious stones, divided into:-

- NY = New Year gift; * indicates that there is a record of the gift being reciprocated;
- MAR. = gift given to the recipient or his wife on marriage
- TSF = *tenir sur font* - gift to a recipient's child by Duke Philip, his wife, or sons, when they stood godparent at its baptism
- Other = gift given on other specified occasions

Items in brackets relate to recipients' relatives

2. A gold fermail with a cherubin, see Prost, vol.2, items 1433 and 1463
3. ADCO B1519, f.197
4. Gold hanap and aiguerre - ADCO B1517, f.163v, and f.163 for his to Duke Philip; gold fermaillet - B1519, f.195v; covered gold hanap - B338; jewelled fermail - B1538, f.217v, and diamond for him and others, -f.218. His brother, Philippe, received expensive jewels annually at New Year from 1384 - see, for example, Prost, vol.2, items 1194, 1352, 1609, 2507, 3107, and 3377

APPENDIX R3

5. Silver gilt plate, given to 6 knights accompanying him -ADCO B1538, f.164v
6. Silver gilt plate given at the baptism of the son of Jehan (possibly a brother?). Pierre de La Trémoille stood in for the Duke on this occasion. Jewelled cross and gold paternoster given to his wife, Prost, vol.2, items 1646 and 3348. 1402 6 marcs weight of silver gilt plate given to Jehan -ADCO B338
7. Large silver gilt covered gobelet given as a reward for going armed to serve John the Fearless in Paris, -ADCO B1543, ff.131 and 131v
8. Silver gilt plate -ADCO B1521, f.64v, given at his son Philippe's baptism, on behalf of Duke Philip, by Antoine de Fontaines (App. R1-23)
9. A jewelled version of John the Fearless' device, given by Duke John as a NY gift to his household, see ADCO B1543, f.125
10. 6 silver cups given to him when he brought a falcon from the Duchess of Brittany to Duke Philip, and took back a NY gift of a jewelled, gold tableau of the Baptism of Christ worth 267 francs -ADCO B1517, ff.172v-173 for her; silver gilt plate -B338
11. 6 Silver cups, see ADCO B1538, f.165. The letters patent were dated 29th January 1402 (n.s.), so probably a NY gift
12. 6 silver gilt hanaps, decorated with 'esmaux' and a decorated silver gilt aiguierre, which Duke Philip had bought himself from Henriët Orlant for the baptism of the son of Taupin de Chantemerle (the Order recipient's father), chamberlain to the King and Duke Philip - see ADCO B1471, f.9v.
13. Covered, gilded hanap to Armel de Chateaugiron during Duke Philip's visit to Brittany, see ADCO B1532, f.263v
14. 6 gilded cups and an aiguierre for Antoine's father, Pierre - see B1517, f.164
15. See ADCO B1519, f.198 for the hanap to Pierre de Craon; f.197v records a gift of 22 francs to the person who presented a NY gift from Pierre to Duke Philip
16. 1400 - ADCO B1517, f.164; silver gilt plate 1401 - ADCO B1519, f.196
17. Silver gilt plate given to a son of Jean de Croy on the day of his marriage; 6 marcs weight of silver gilt plate to Jean (value

APPENDIX R3

- obliterated, but likely to be the same as to Rambures, see n.59)
- ADCO B338. Gold, bejewelled collar given to Jean's wife at the baptism of their child, to whom Duke Philip stood godfather -ADCO B 1517, f.161v; and decorated silver cups and a covered, silver gilt hanap to her at the baptism of their daughter, to whom the Duchess of Burgundy stood godmother, -ADCO B1543, f126
18. Gold, jewelled -ADCO B338
 19. Silver plate given to a son of Jean de Haverskerke and Marguerite de Mornay, (and therefore a brother or uncle of the Order recipient) to whom Duke Philip stood godfather, see Prost, vol.I, item 2645
 20. A diamond given on the day of his marriage, see ADCO B1532, f.271. (See also App. R6, n.31, date unclear)
 21. A gold, bejewelled fermail given during the Duke's visit to Brittany, see ADCO B1532, f.251
 22. As n.21 above, see ADCO B1532, f.253; NY silver -B338
 23. The second insignia of the Order, see ADCO B1538, f.166
 24. Bought from Pierre de La Trémoille to be given to Messire Jehan de Hangest, chamberlain of the King and Duke Philip, sent by the King to bring the latter back to court, see ADCO B1517, f.169
 25. To Monseigneur de Hangest's daughter on her marriage, see ADCO B1517, f.172. To Monseigneur de Hangest, see ADCO B1519, f.196v
 26. Gold, jewelled -ADCO B338
 27. Jewelled fermail when at the Burgundian court with his mother, see ADCO B1519, f.192v
 28. A gold jewelled ring, and also a ring with a tiny diamond given '*par esbatement*', see ADCO B1481, ff.9v and 21v
 29. A gold jewelled fermail, worth less than those to Guy (350 francs) and Guillaume (300 francs), his brothers, see ADCO B1500, f.102v. A NY gift from him to the Duke is recorded on f.88
 30. A small one, presented at Boulogne in July, possibly after a joust, as one was presented to a German knight at the same time, see ADCO B1500, f.104v
 31. 500 francs to buy '*vaisselle*' ADCO B1503, f.85v
 32. A gold jewelled fermail, see ADCO B1503, f.124v
 33. For 1398, ADCO B338; for 1400, B1517, f.163v (more than those given to the Duke's nephews, the King of Sicily (323 francs) or

APPENDIX R3

- Edward of Bar (369 francs)); for 1401, B1519, f.196, (more than those given to the Chancellor (356 francs) or to the Duke of Bourbon (228½ francs)), and for his gift to the Duke, f.197v
34. 600 écus d'or to buy plate on the day after his marriage and as a NY gift from all the ducal family, and a gold jewelled collar and pearl covered 'chapel' to his wife that day, see ADCO B1532, ff.152v, 259, and 259v. Gold hanap -B338
 35. Jewelled, presented in Brittany, along with one presented to the Duchess of Brittany and other lords, but less expensive than that to François de Grignaux, see ADCO B1532, f.253
 36. July 1402, no reason given, see ADCO B1532, f.266
 37. Gold plate, see ADCO B1538, f.217v; jewelled fermaillet, f.218; and Pierre's to the Duke, f.219
 38. Silver gilt plate, presented by Jean Blondel, Duke Philip's chamberlain, who stood in for the Duke at the baptism of Philippe, the son of the Sire de La Viesville, to whom the Duke stood godfather, see ADCO B1517, f.156
 39. To his wife, one of 16 given to ladies by the Duke at the wedding of his son Anthony to Saint Pol's daughter. She is named separately, see ADCO B1532, f.258
 40. NY 1408 gift to the Seigneur de La Viesville, chevalier, see ADCO B1554, f.93
 41. Jewelled fermail and collar in Brittany, see ADCO B1532, ff.252, and 253v; for his to the Duke, see App. R4, n.55
 42. 6 marcs weight of silver plate -ADCO B338
 43. Gold fermail with a flying stag, the King's device, given when Montagu, the King's secretary, left the celebrations held at Dijon for the King's first visit there in 1389, see ADCO B1476, f.9v and App.R4, n.57. Diamond ring for 'Montagu', so possibly not the Order recipient, see ADCO B1481, f.9v
 44. ADCO B1503, ff.124v for a jewelled fermail to Jean de Montagu, conseiller du Roi, along with gifts to the royal family and their senior officers; and f.126v for a silver gilt goblet to his mother 'recently', dated January 1395, so possibly a NY gift. ADCO B338 for an enamelled, large silver gilt covered coupe with 500 escus; and for a gold covered hanap
 45. A gold, covered hanap to Monseigneur le Grand Maître d'Hôtel du

APPENDIX R3

- Roi, along with gifts to the royal family and senior ducal household, see ADCO B1538, f.217v
46. See ADCO B1554, ff.132 for a gold, poinçonné hanap to Monseigneur le Grand Maître d'Hôtel du Roi at NY; and f.135v for a large, gold, covered hanap, similarly decorated, when he left Paris to go to Guienne with the Duke of Orleans (ordered October 1406)
 47. Jewelled, given in Brittany, see ADCO B1532, f.253
 48. Silver gilt, poinçonné, -ADCO B1543, f.132v
 49. Silver gilt, given to his wife on the baptism of one of their sons, to whom Duke John stood godfather, see ADCO B1543, f.135v
 50. All in silver gilt, hachés and poinçonnés, the goblet covered, given by John of Nevers, his wife and sister to the wife of Renier the day after his wedding in the Bois de Vincennes, December 1392, -ADCO B1495, f.55v
 51. Silver gilt, the hanap covered, given by the Duke to Renier's wife, as in n.50, -ADCO B1495, f.59v
 52. All in silver gilt, the hanaps large and gilded inside and out, the aiguierre hachée, from the Duchess to Renier's wife, as in nn. 50 and 51, -ADCO B1495, f.59v
 53. Jewelled, -ADCO B1500, f.102v; his to the Duke, f.88v
 54. Gold, -ADCO B1503, f.129; his to the Duke, -ADCO B1501, f.43v
 55. A ring with 3 diamonds to his wife when she was with the Countess of Nevers at the Burgundian court, at Easter, -ADCO B1519, f.183.
 56. Money as gold dishes, -ADCO B1519, f.197v
 57. Diamond, -ADCO B1538, f.218
 58. To David, -ADCO B1519, f.197
 59. To David in Brittany, -ADCO B1532, f.251v; to Monseigneur de, 6 marcs weight of silver gilt plate -B338
 60. 1393, diamond, -ADCO B1495, f.56; 1400 a large gold collar with marguerites with pearls in their centres and a jewelled cosse hanging from it, -B1517, f.163, and silver gilt vases, f.172; 1401 gold, jewelled, -B1519, f.195v, and his to the Duke f.197; 1404, gold, jewelled, -B1538, f.217v, and his to the Duke f.219. Gold covered hanap -B338
 61. Gold, jewelled, given on 12 April 1399 (o.s.) for good services over a long period and in recompense for going with 300 lances to Guelders for the Duke, -ADCO B1517, f.165

APPENDIX R3

62. Gold, jewelled, on the Brittany trip, -ADCO B1532, f.252v
63. Gold, -ADCO B338
64. Jewelled, -ADCO B1517, f.162; silver gilt flagons -B338; 12 silver gilt cups '*pareillement quil avoit fait aux autres seigneurs qui avoient estre en armes devers monditseigneur a paris...es mois de decembre et janvier 1401*' -ADCO B1532, f.263
65. Since the appendix is about Duke Philip's gifts to others, this entry is blank
66. On Philip's visit to Brittany, fermail -ADCO B1532, f.250v; f.251 from Philip for Rethel to give; and for potel and diamond ring. 3 fermaux for him and his 2 brothers when they went back to Brittany, -B1538, ff.203-293v; and NY, f.217
67. When in Brittany with Philip, -ADCO B1532, f.251v; NY -B338, and -B1538, f.217. Philip gave TSF presents only to his godchildren and marriage gifts to his son or daughter-in-law and their train, although he made sumptuous provision for the baptismal and wedding ceremonies.
68. ADCO B338 for two collars for Philippe and Anthony. It is not clear whether the cost was for both, or each
69. ADCO B338 and B1538, f.217. See also n.67 above
70. ADCO B338 and B1538, f.217v. See also n.67 above

APPENDIX R4

RECIPIENTS OF THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE: GIFTS
 MATERIAL OBJECTS - OTHER (excluding 1403)

NAME	CLOTHES & MATERIALS FOR	HORSES	OTHER
1. Aunay, d'	-	-	Wine ¹ ; House ² 1383/4
2. Bar, de	1500frs. 1400 ³	-	Wine 1409, 1410 1411 ⁴
3. Basoches, de-	-	-	-
4. Belliere, de-	-	-	-
5. Blondel	-	1399-1400 ⁵	-
6. Bois, du	Furs 1401 ⁶	1404 120frs. ⁷	-
7. Boves, des	Satin 38frs. 1393 ⁹ Furs 1401 ⁶	1392 90frs., 1394 50frs., 1395 80frs. ¹⁰	Wine 1399 ⁸ Falcon 1399 ⁸
8. Bretagne de	(Satin 1404?) ¹¹	-	-
9. Brimeu, de	-	-	-
10. Calonne, Bo	-	60frs. 1407 ¹²	-
11. Calonne, de	Clothes 15frs. 1401 ¹³	-	-
12. Chalon, de	2 satins 50frs. 1402 ¹⁵	1404 ¹⁴	-
13. Chambly, de	-	130frs. 1384 ¹⁶	Wine 1383/4 ¹
14. Chante- merle, de	Silk 20frs. 1402; Robes 1407 ¹⁸	100frs, 1398 ¹⁷	-
15. Chateau- giron	(Houppelande 1404) ¹⁹	-	-
16. Chauffour de	Cloth 40frs 1399 ²¹ Furs 140frs. 1400 ²²	120frs. 1385 ²⁰	-
17. Chiney	-	-	-
18. Courcelles	(Satin 16frs. 1389) ²⁴	80frs. 1395 ²³ 100frs. 1399 ²⁵	-

APPENDIX R4

NAME	CLOTHES & MATERIALS FOR	HORSES	OTHER
18. Courcelles (cont'd)	(Baldequin 25frs. 1389) ²⁴ Satin 36frs. 1390 ²⁶ Satin 28frs. 1391 ²⁷ Cote d'acier 50frs.1392 ²⁸ Velvet 36frs. 1395 ²⁹ Furs 1401 ⁶		
19. Craon, de	Dancing clothes 1402 ³¹ Clothes 1407 ³²	80frs.1399 ³⁰	-
20. Croy, de	Fur 64frs. ³³	-	-
21. Desquees	-	-	-
22. Flandres de	Robes 100escus 1400 ³⁴	-	100escus 1400 ³⁴
23. Fontaines, de	-	100frs.1400 ³⁵	-
24. Four, du	-	-	-
25. Gavre, de	-	-	-
26. Grignaux, de	Furs 1399 ³⁶ Damas 48frs. 1400 ³⁷ Furs 1400 ³⁸	-	-
27. Hangest, de	(Damas 1385) ³⁹	-	(Wine 1399) ⁴⁰
28. Jaucourt, de	Satin 1391 ⁴¹	-	-
29. Joigny, de	Silk 25/12/1402 ⁴² Damas houppelande ⁴²	-	-
30. La Muce, de	-	-	-
31. La Roche- rousse, de	Robes 1407 ¹⁸	46frs.1407 ⁴³	-
32. La Tour, de	-	-	-

APPENDIX R4

NAME	CLOTHES & MATERIAL FOR	HORSES	OTHER
33. La Tremoille			
George de	-	100frs.1400 ⁴⁴	
34. Guillaume	Camelot	-	-
de	15frs.1392-4 ⁴⁵		
35. Guyot de	-	45frs.1399 ⁴⁶	-
		100frs.1400 ⁴⁶	
36. Jean de	-	-	-
37. Pierre de	Satin 18frs.	-	
	Mantel 40frs.		
	1383 ⁴⁷		
	Velvet 27½frs.		
	Houppelande		
	36frs. 1388 ⁴⁸		
	Satin 72frs.		
	1390/1 ⁴⁹		
	Satin 24frs.1393 ⁵⁰		Wine 1392 ⁵¹
	Furs, Satin 54frs.		Wine 1400 ⁵¹
	1395 ⁵⁰		*(Chambre
	Furs 1401 ²⁹		1400) ⁵³
	Furs 1402 ⁵²		
38. La	Silk 1402 ⁵⁴	-	-
Viesville, de			
39. Le Voyer	Silk 1402 ⁵⁵	-	-
40. Lonroy, de	-	70escus	-
		NY 1408 ⁵⁶	
41. Monchy, de	-	-	-
42. Montagu, de	Satin 36frs.	*(To the Duke	Wine
	1389? ⁵⁷	1397) ⁵⁸	1399 ⁵⁹
43. Montauban de-		-	-
44. Montigny, de	Damas 48frs.	60frs.1393,	-
	1400 ³⁷	1394 ⁶⁰	
45. Neuf-	-	1405-6 ⁶¹	-
chatel, de			
46. Poix, de	-	-	-

APPENDIX R4

NAME	CLOTHES & MATERIALS FOR	HORSES	OTHER
47.Pot	Satin 15frs 1384 ⁶²	200frs.1383 ⁶³ 100frs.1384 ⁶⁴	Wine 1399 ⁶⁵
48.Rambures, de-		(70escus 1402) ⁶⁶ -	
49.Renforcat	-	-	-
50.Saint Pol	Furs for houppelande 1403-4 ⁶⁹	-	*Falcon 1383 ⁶⁷ Wine 1399, 1400 ⁶⁸
51.Triart, de	-	-	-
52.Vergy, de	-	-	*1379 ⁷⁰
53.Vienne, de	-	*1406 ⁷¹	-
54.Vorne, de	-	-	-
55.Zevenberghe, de-		-	-
56.,57.,58.,59.,60. Ducal Family			
56.Bourgogne			
de ⁷²			
57.Bretaigne	Houppelande		
de	1402 ⁷³		
58.Nevers, de ⁷²			
59.Philippe ⁷²			
60.Rethel, de ⁷²			

1. ADCO B1461, f.111v
2. ADCO B1461, f.130v records a gift of wine from Duke Philip to the masons building d'Aunay's house
3. Edward, and Duke Philip's sons, John and Anthony, were given 1500 francs between them '*de grace especial....pour eulx abiller et avoir leur autres necessites*'. See ADCO B1519, f.131v and, similarly, ADCO B1521, f.51 for 1401
4. '*Edouart de Bar, aysne filz de Bar, marquis du Pont*' for receipt of wine from his '*treschier seigneur et cousin*' the Duke of Burgundy. See ADCO B339
5. See ADCO B1517, f.149v

APPENDIX R4

6. 240 martin furs for a gown, along with similar gifts to Jean de Courcelles and Pierre de La Trémouille, -ADCO B1519, f.224v
7. ADCO B1538, f.122v
8. 1 queue of Beaune, along with other Household officers and worthies, -ADCO B1517, f.159v; a falcon, along with ducal family members and senior lords, -ADCO B1519, f.245v
9. 2 pieces of black satin, one lined, along with other members of the Household, -ADCO B1500, f.120v
10. ADCO B1495, f.38v; B1501, f.36; and B1503, f.92v
11. To a squire of the Duchess of Brittany, -ADCO B1538, f.201
12. ADCO B1554, f.83, and for his services
13. P., vol.24, p.22 (ADCO B374) for Jean
14. ADCO B1538, f.152
15. In Brittany, -ADCO B1538, f.203
16. ADCO B1461, f.125v
17. ADCO B1521, f.53
18. P., vol.24, p.21 (ADCO B354) for a quittance for Taupinet de Chantemerle and François de Grignaux to have silk for clothes for Rethel's wedding; ADCO B1554, f.128 for gowns '*de la livree des chambellans*' for 'Chantemelle' and La Rocherousse in 1407
19. In cloth of gold, to Messire Aline de Chateaugiron, chamberlain of the Duke of Brittany, who was almost certainly with the latter at the Burgundian court
20. For a war horse, P., vol. 23, p.236 (ADCO B369)
21. ADCO B1517, f.175
22. Martin furs for a long houppebande, -ADCO B1517, f.187
23. ADCO B1501, f.49v, '*Pour estre mieux monter et plus honnestement en son service*'
24. ADCO B1476, f.14v records a black satin and a baldequin as given to the Duke's échanson, Jean de Courcelles - possibly not the recipient but a relative - see App. R1-18, n.1
25. As a don, for services, and to have '*un cheval pour soy monter*'
- 26.,27. See ADCO B1481, f.13v, and B1486, f.18v. Similar lengths were given to other Household members
28. See ADCO B1495, f.75, '*pour soy armer en sa compagnie*', along with similar armour for other members of the Household
29. Similar lengths of black velvet or silk were given to some

APPENDIX R4

Household members in October 1395, see ADCO B1503, f.139v

30. The Duke bought the horse for Antoine '*lors qu'il doit partir pour aler en Engleterre et en Yrlande avec Messire Pierre de Craon son pere ou service dudit Roy d'Angleterre*'
31. P., vol.26, p.59 (ADCO B294). John of Nevers ordered a dancing costume identical to his own for Antoine
32. ADCO B1554, ff.126v, 130v, and 131v for identical clothes for Antoine and Duke John
33. 31 northern grey squirrel pelts for a gown, -ADCO B1517, f.192v
34. For services, and '*comme pour avoir des robes et autres choses a lui necessaires ou service duditseigneur*', -ADCO B1521, f.49v
35. ADCO B1521, f58v
36. ADCO B1519, f.223v, 2 beaver fur '*manteaulx*' in January 1399
37. Ibid., f.205 for 2 lengths of damas, along with Fouquet de Montigny (App. R1-44), possibly for the marriage of Duke John's daughter to the Dauphin
38. Ibid., f.229, December 1400
39. To Robert de Hangest, '*pour reconnoitre les services.....et se l'attacher de plus en plus*', -Prost, vol.2, item 1209
40. To the Sire de Hangest, along with other courtiers, -ADCO B1517, f.160, see n.8 above
41. Red satin with three others, December 1391 -ADCO B1486, f.18v
42. 3 lengths of silk for Christmas Eve and Christmas Day, -ADCO B1532, f.277v; *houppelande*, f.297
43. ADCO B1554, f.75 for good services and to buy a horse to be mounted in the Duke's service
44. Bought by the Duke from one of his officers to give to George when he was present at court, -ADCO B1519, f.171v
45. Along with cloth bought for the ducal family between August 1392 and February 1394, -ADCO B1500, f.119
46. ADCO B1517, f.157v to replace one which had died in the Duke's service, and ADCO B1519, f.165, as a don, g.e., and to have a horse '*a soy monter ou service..*' of the Duke
47. ADCO B1461, f.72 for satin, and f.109v for money for a mantel
48. ADCO B1476, f.13 for velvet, and f.15 for satin for a *houppelande*, along with several of the Duke's household, on the occasion of the King's visit to the Duke at Conflans

APPENDIX R4

49. ADCO B1486, f.16 for 2 lengths of red satin
50. A length of black satin, -ADCO B1500, f.120; 1½ lengths of red satin ADCO B1503, f.139, and furs f.146v
51. ADCO B1503, f.121v for wine to take with him to Prussia (see also App. R5, n.93); ADCO B1517, f.158 for 3 queues at the end of January 1400. The Chancellors of France and Burgundy warranted 4 queues each, other senior officers only 2
52. Sable furs for a Christmas gown -ADCO B1532, f.290v
53. ADCO B1519, f.235, and f.237 for a chambre Pierre gave the Duke
54. ADCO B1532, f.218 for 2 lengths for a gown and to be more '*honestement*' in the Duke's service
55. ADCO B1532, f.275 for a length of silk to his squire who had presented a horse to Duke Philip on his behalf
56. ADCO B1554, f.109v to the Duke's chamberlain, the Sire de Loncroy, chevalier
57. ADCO B1476, f.15 given to '*Montagu*', along with other members of the Duke's household, to make a houppelande on the occasion of the King's first visit to Dijon in 1389 (see App. R3, n.43)
58. Gratuities given to the servants who brought 2 war horses from '*Montagu*, councillor of the King', probably as a NY gift to the Duke, -ADCO B1519, f.187
59. 4 queues of Beaune in May to '*Messire Jehan de Montagu*, chevalier, vidame de Lannoys', with various senior churchmen, nobles and officers, -ADCO B1517, f.159v, see nn.8 and 40 above
60. 1393 don for good services and to have a horse '*a soy monter*' as écuyer panetier, -ADCO B1500, f.72; 1394 -ADCO B1501, f.38v, as écuyer échanson
61. ADCO B1543, f.116v for a horse bought by Duke John for him, qualified as cousin, along with the Duke's two brothers and another cousin, the Count of Clermont, the Duke of Bourbon's son
62. ADCO B1461, f.72, a piece of black satin in May 1384, along with textiles given to lords and household, but Pot is not qualified as a member
63. An unusually expensive bay war horse bought by Philip from Pierre de La Trémoille to give to Pot, his chamberlain, '*pour sa monteure en son service*', quit November 1383
64. As chamberlain, for good services, and in hopes that he would so

APPENDIX R4

- continue in future, and to buy a horse '*pour sa monteure*' in March 1384, -ADCO B1461, ff.125v-126
65. 1 queue of Beaune, -ADCO B1517, f.160; and nn.8, 40 and 59 above
66. David, see ADCO B361
67. ADCO B1461, f.96, along with other royal and ducal courtiers and lords. B1501, f.67 for venison and a falcon sent by Saint Pol to the Duke in 1394
68. 1399 ADCO B1517, f.lv and f.159v, the latter 8 queues, with des Boves and Pot receiving 1 each, and the Seigneur de Hangest 2; 1400, 6 queues (compared to 20 to the Duke of Orleans and 10 to the Duke of Bourbon) -ADCO B1521, f.63v
69. ADCO B1538, f.206 - the Duke had lost the houppeleande to him gambling
70. 6 hounds sent as a gift to the Duke by Jean, -ADCO B1454, f.85
71. A horse presented by Saint George to the Count of Charolais, Duke John's eldest son, later Duke Philip the Good, -ADCO B1543, f.173
72. I have not provided entries for the Duke and his family. Duke Philip regularly provided clothes for his own use, that of the Duchess, their children and grandchildren, and their households. The accounts do not always specify what was provided for each individual or its cost. Clothes for special occasions, such as an embroidered damas and a houppeleande embroidered with branches of raspberries (Rethel's device) for Rethel in 1402, probably for his wedding -ADCO B1532, ff.290 and 306v, are noted. Similarly, the family made use of the horses, hunting birds and dogs of the Duke. Such things were sent as presents between rulers (see App. R3, n.10) or to members of the family by courtiers and clients (see n.71 above), but appear not to have been exchanged between family members, unless they had left home.
73. A furred houppeleande of crimson silk, given to him on Christmas Day, along with similar ones to his brothers, when they would have been with Duke Philip at Court, -ADCO B1532, f.297

APPENDIX R5

RECIPIENTS OF THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE: FINANCIAL
GIFTS AND REWARDS (excluding 1403)

NAME	PENSION/ GAGES ¹	DONS/ GRATIFICATIONS ²	OTHER ³
1. Aunay d'	150 livres.pa 1387-99 Capt. Meaux ⁴ (Exemption 1407 Jean d'Aunoy) ⁷	100frs. 1383 500frs. 1384 1000frs. 1386 200frs. 1389 300frs. 1401-2 ⁸	Unspecified 1383-5,1387, 1402 ⁵ Expenses 1402 ⁶
2. Bar,de	3000frs.pa 1398, 1399, 1400 1404 ⁹	-	1500frs. 1400 Necessities ¹⁰ 200frs.1404 Unspecified ¹¹
3. Basoches de-		-	-
4. Belliere de-		-	-
5. Blondel	Daily gages 1389,1399 ¹² 500frs. 1404 ¹⁴ gages 3frs. ¹⁴	200frs. 1390, 1392 ¹³ 400frs. 1393, 1395 ¹³ 500frs.+107½frs ¹⁴ 200frs. 1406 ¹⁵	-
6. Bois,du	Gages 1401 ¹⁶ Military service 1405 ¹⁹	300frs. 1400 ¹⁷ 120frs. 1404 ¹⁸ 400frs. 1405 ²⁰	-
7. Boves,des	-	2-300frs.1395, 1399, 1407 ²¹ 2000frs.1395 ²²	-
8. Bretagne,de	-	-	-
9. Brimeu,de	-	100escus 1405 ²³	100escus Ransom 1405 ²³
10.Calonne	Military service 1401, 1408,1410 ²⁵	-	Expenses 1397 ²⁴

APPENDIX R5

NAME	PENSION/ GAGES	DONS/ GRATIFICATIONS	OTHER
10.	Calonne (cont'd)		200frs.Ransom 1405 ²⁶
11.	Calonne, Military de service 1402, 1408,1410 ²⁷	-	Ransom 1405 ²⁷
12.	Chalon,de -	-	-
13.	Chambly,de -	100frs.1383 ²⁸	1402 ⁶
14.	Chante- Gages 1399- merle,de 1400 ²⁹ 1400-1 ³⁰	200frs.1399, -	
15.	Chateau- (Gages?1404) ³¹ giron,de	(65frs.1404) ³²	-
16.	ChauffourGages 60frs.pa de Capt. Vesoul 1393-4,1399 ³⁵	500frs.1395 ³³	Rents 1396 ³⁴ 150frs. unspecified 1400 ³⁵
17.	Chiney -	-	-
18.	CourcellesGages 1399 Gov.in Beaufort ³⁶	500frs. 1391, 100frs. 1392, 200frs. April and Sept.1395, Marriage 1397, 300frs.1398, 1400, 1402 ³⁷	-
19.	Craon,de 300frs.pa a volente 1405, 1407 ³⁸ Exemption 1407 ⁷ 400frs.pa 1409, 1411 ⁴⁰	2000frs.1398,9 200escus 1399 200frs.1400(x2) 1000frs. 1407 135frs. 1408 ⁴¹	3,000frs.1402/4 Unspecified, 50escus Expenses 1408 ³⁹
20.	Croy,de 500frs.pa 1399, 1400,1401,1404 1404 onwards a volente ⁴⁴	1000frs.1398 ⁴²	1000frs. Repayment? 1397 ⁴³

APPENDIX R5

NAME	PENSION/ GAGES	DONS/ GRATIFICATIONS	OTHER
Croy, de (cont'd)	1060escus 1406 Pension and gages ⁴⁵ Exemption 1407 ⁷ 3000frs.1408 in place of gages, expenses, and as gift for services ⁴⁷		172frs.Expenses 1398 ⁴⁶ 2000frs.1405 Unspecified ⁴⁷
21.Desquees	-	200frs. 1398 ⁴⁸	-
22.Flandres, de	-	100frs. 1404 ⁴⁹ 30escus 1404 ⁵⁰	40escus Expense 1406 ⁵¹
23.Fontaines de	Gages 1400-1 ⁵² Military service 1410 ⁵⁴	150escus 1397 ⁵³	-
24.Four, du	Gages 1398,1402 ⁵⁵ - Gages 1399,1412 ⁵⁶ Gages 1400 ⁵⁷		150frs. unspecified 1400 ³³
25.Gavre, de	-	-	-
26.Grignaux de	-	100frs,300frs 1402 ⁵⁸	100frs. unspecified 1402 ⁵⁸
27.Hangest, de	-	(60frs.1383) ⁵⁹ (200frs.1392) ⁶⁰	(500frs. Ransom 1402) ⁶¹
28.Jaucourt de	Gages 1398/9 ⁶²	200escus 1399 ⁶³ 600frs.1400 ⁶³	-
29.Joigny, de	-	-	-
30.La Muce, de	-	-	-
31.La Roche- rousse, de	300frs. à volente, 1393 1395,1397-9, 1402,1404,1408 ⁶⁵ 51 livres gages 1398 ⁶⁷ 82frs.gages ⁶⁹ Exemption 1407 ⁷	100frs.1383, 200frs.1385, 300frs.1388 ⁶⁴ 300frs.1390, 1000frs.1392, 200frs.1394 ⁶⁸ 82frs.1403/4 ⁶⁹ 50frs.1403/4 ⁷⁰	600frs.+700frs. 1392, 800frs. 1393 Unspecified ⁶⁶ 100frs.+96frs. Expenses 1406 ⁷¹ 60frs.1408,120frs.1409-10 ⁷²

APPENDIX R5

NAME	PENSION/ GAGES	DONS/ GRATIFICATIONS	OTHER
32. La Tour, de-		-	-
33. La Tremoille George de -		300frs.1408 ⁷³	1100frs. Revenues 1406 ⁷⁴ 500frs. Expenses 1409 ⁷⁵
34. Guillaume Gages de	30frs. 1400 ⁷⁶	100frs.1388/9 200frs.1393 300frs.1394,5 500frs.1404 ⁷⁸ 500frs.1399 ⁸⁰ 100escus 1399 ⁸¹ 500frs.1399/ 1400 ⁸² 50frs.1400 ⁸³	60,20,58frs. unspecified 1392,3,4 ⁷⁷ 30frs.Expenses 1393 ⁷⁹ Prussian Crusade ⁸⁰ Pilgrimages ⁸¹ Nicopolis expenses ⁸²
35. Guyot de Gages	100frs. 1402,1406 ⁸⁴	40frs.1407 ⁸⁴	Brabant expenses ⁸⁴
36. Jean de Gages	100frs. 1402,1406 ⁸⁵	50,100frs. 1400 ⁸⁶ 100frs.1406 ⁸⁷ 40frs.1407 ⁸⁴	Brabant expenses ⁸⁴
37. Pierre de Pension	200livres p.a. 1378 on ⁸⁸	200livres 1377/8 ⁸⁹ 200frs.1383 ⁹⁰ 300frs.1383/4 ⁹⁰ 250frs.1383/4 ⁸² 300frs.1389 ⁹² 3000frs.1392 ⁹³	Prussian crusade ⁸⁹
Gages 1388/9 ⁹²			4000frs.1389 ⁹² 3000+1000frs. Prussian crusade ⁹³
Gages 1393/4 ⁹⁴		1000frs.1393/4 ⁹⁴	1000frs.Castle repair ⁹⁴

APPENDIX R5

NAME	PENSION/ GAGES	DONS/ GRATIFICATIONS	OTHER
La Tremoille Pierre de (cont'd)	500frs.1398 ⁹¹	500frs.NY, 1400 1393,1395 ⁹⁵ 500frs.NY 1400 1500frs.1400 500frs.NY 1401 ⁹⁸ 10,000frs. 1402 ⁹⁹ 2,000escus 1402 ⁹⁹	3000frs. Expenses Prussian trip 1394 ⁹⁶ 110frs.Expenses 1399, 1000frs.1400 ⁹⁷ 10,000frs. Marriage ⁹⁹ 2,000escus House ⁹⁹
	Gages 270frs. 1404 ¹⁰⁰ 500frs.1407 ⁹¹	500frs.NY 1402,1404 ¹⁰⁰	
38.La Viesville de 1407 on) ¹⁰²	(500frs.p.a 1407 on) ¹⁰²	(100frs.1402) ¹⁰¹	200escus Ransom 1408 ¹⁰³
39.Le Voyer -		-	-
40.Lonroy de	500frs.1398,9 1400,02,04 ¹⁰⁴ Gages 22½frs. 1399,1405 ¹⁰⁶	-	45frs.1404 ¹⁰⁵
41.Monchy, de	Gages 1407 ¹⁰⁷		
42.Montagu, de-		-	-
43.Montauban, de-		-	-
44.Montigny -		60frs.1388/9 ¹⁰⁸ 200frs.1392 1400 ¹⁰⁹ 100frs.1399 200frs.1402 ¹¹⁰	200frs.1392 ¹⁰⁹ 20frs.Expenses 1393 ¹¹¹ 67½frs. Expense 1401 ¹¹² 25frs.Military expense 1405 ¹¹³

APPENDIX R5

NAME	PENSION/ GAGES	DONS/ GRATIFICATIONS	OTHER
45. Neuf- chatel, de	Gages 1405, 1406 ¹¹⁴ Gages 195frs. 1406 ¹¹⁵ Military gages 810frs. 1408 ¹¹⁸	195frs. 1406 ¹¹⁵ 121frs., 500frs. 1408 ¹¹⁷	140frs. Military expense 1406 ¹¹⁶
46. Poix, de	Military gages 1405, 1410 ¹¹⁹	100frs. 1410 ¹²⁰	20escus, Expense 1401 ¹²¹
47. Pot	500frs. p. a 1399-1404 ¹³³ 500frs. p. a 1402?, 1404 ¹³⁴	60frs. 1383 ¹²² 50frs., 3000 livres Marriage 1384 ¹²⁴ 300frs. 1388 ¹²⁵ 4,000frs. Marriage 1392 ¹²⁶ 300frs., 400frs. 500frs. 1393 ¹²⁷ 80frs. 1399 ¹³² 400frs. NY 1404 ¹³⁵ 1,000frs. 1404 ¹³⁵ 400frs., 350frs. 1405 ¹³⁷ 500frs. 1406 ¹³⁹ 500frs. NY 1408 ¹⁴² 1,200frs. 1408 ¹⁴²	100frs. Maladie 1385 ¹²³ 300frs. Expenses ¹²⁵ 1,000frs. 1392 ¹²⁶ 200frs., 900frs. Unspecified 1393 ¹²⁸ 1,000frs., 1,500frs. Unspecified 1394 ¹²⁹ 1,125frs. Expense 1395 ¹³⁰ 1,000frs. Unspecified 1400 ¹³¹ 240frs., 750frs. Expenses 1407/8 ¹⁴¹ 1,200frs. Expenses ¹⁴²
	105frs. 1404 ¹³⁶ 5frs. per day 1406 ¹³⁸ 500frs. gages 1408 ¹⁴⁰		

APPENDIX R5

NAME	PENSION/ GAGES	DONS/ GRATIFICATIONS	OTHER
48. Rambures de	500frs.pa 1398 on ¹⁴³ (242½frs.pa à vie)1402 on) ¹⁴⁵	(500frs. 1394) ¹⁴⁴	1000frs.1397 Repayment ⁴³ (1000frs.1406 Ransom) ¹⁴⁶
49. Renforcat	Gages 1402 ¹⁴⁷	45frs.1410 ¹⁴⁷	-
50. Saint Pol	18000frs.pa 1398-1406 ¹⁴⁸ 4000frs. 1406-8 ¹⁵² Exemption 1407 ⁷ Pension 1411/12 ¹⁵³	4000frs 1399-1400 ¹⁵⁰ 3000frs.1402 ¹⁵¹	247½frs., 1000frs.1399- 1400 ¹⁴⁹
51. Triart, de-		-	-
52. Vergy, de	90frs.gages 1369 ¹⁵⁴ 200frs.gages Capt. Faucogney 1394 on ¹⁵⁵ 1000frs.gages 1399 ¹⁵⁹ 390frs.gages 1406-7 ¹⁶¹ 750+476+2407½frs. Military gages 1407-8 ¹⁶¹ 650+650frs. Levy 1411 ¹⁶² 342frs. 1411 Military gages ¹⁶²		65frs.Expenses 1393 ¹⁵⁶ 500frs.+400frs. Unspecified 1395 ¹⁵⁷ 159frs.1398, 400frs.1399 Expenses ¹⁵⁸ 700+500+500frs. Expense 1406 ¹⁶⁰ 400+350frs.1408 Unspecified ¹⁶⁰
53. Vienne de	400+400frs. Pension?1400 ¹⁶³ 200frs.p.m. Gages or pension 1407 ¹⁶⁴ 1403-4,pension 1404 ¹⁶⁴	500frs.NY 1406 ¹⁶⁴ 3000frs. 1407 ¹⁶⁴	600frs.1399 Unspecified ¹⁶³ Expenses 1399 ¹⁶³

APPENDIX R5

NAME	PENSION/ GAGES	DONS/ GRATIFICATIONS	OTHER
53.Vienne de (cont'd)	800frs.pension 1406-7, 1458frs. pension 1407 ¹⁶⁴ Exemption 1407 ⁷ 1125frs.pension 1408, 1218frs. Military gages 1408 ¹⁶⁴ 3000 livres pension 1411 ¹⁶⁴		
54.Vorne,de	300frs.pension 1383 on ¹⁶⁵	-	-
55.Zevenberghe,de-		-	-
56.,57.,58.,59.,60 Ducal Family			
56.Bourgogne de	36,000frs.p.a.	175,000frs.p.a. ¹⁶⁶ 50,000frs. 1402 ¹⁶⁶	50,000frs.1402 Expenses ¹⁶⁶ 4,000escus NY 1404 ¹⁶⁶
57.Bretaigne- de		-	-
58.Nevers de	2frs.p.d.1389 ¹⁶⁷ 25,000frs.p.a. 1399 ¹⁶⁷		
59.Philippe ¹⁶⁸			
60.Rethel, de ¹⁶⁸			

1. These include payments made on an agreed, public basis, for which there were sometimes letters patent. Where not otherwise specified, annual payments shown are pensions. Where known, these are specified as 'a vie' (life), or 'a volente' (at the Duke's pleasure, annually for as long as he renewed it). Gages

APPENDIX R5

were usually shown as paid on a daily basis, either for trips away from court or for military service. Occasionally they are shown for a position such as Governor of a territory or Captain of a castle. See Chapter 1, n.5

2. Although some such payments occur regularly, 'dons', have a separate heading and section in the accounts from pensions and gages and, although conventionally expected, could be withheld or varied as the Duke pleased. Those termed '*de grace especial*' were one-off, and this fact is sometimes spelt out. 'Gratafie' often meant tipping, but could be very similar to 'don'. See Chapter 1, nn.3 and 4.
3. These include gift payments for other specified reasons; and those the purpose of which is unspecified in the extant texts.
4. Quoted in C.A., vol.1, p.109. See also P.A., vol.VIII, p.881
5. Quittances from Galois d'Aunoy for sums received from the Duke. Reasons unspecified, but possibly for expenses incurred. See ADCO B352, P.S. 1386, 1394, 1396, 1399, 1404, and 1406; ADCO B353, l.10, c.133 for 1387; and ADCO B354, l 24, c 130 for 1402.
6. ADCO B1532, f.366 for payments to him for expenses incurred on a trip to Brittany with Duke Philip, dated April 1403, but probably referring to 1402
7. His brother, Jean, was one of the favoured officers of Duke John the Fearless who were exempted from the general reduction or cancellation of pensions and gages in 1407. See P., vol.22, p.368. This was not unusual. Duke John limited or stopped wages and pensions frequently, usually following them by partial exemptions and relaxatiions -see Vaughan, John the Fearless, pp.115-16
8. ADCO B1461, f.100 for good services in 1383; ADCO B1475, f.62 for a voyage to Germany with the king and Duke Philip, and f.64 in relation to his marriage -see App. R1-1, n.6; P., vol.23, p.487, (ADCO B352) for long service; and a quittance dated 12 January 1400(o.s.), 'ge' for '*bons et agreables services*', -ADCO B354
9. See P., vol.24, p.533 (ADCO B380) for a quittance (1398); in the accounts, ADCO B1517, f.54 (1399); ADCO B1519, f.65v (1400); and ADCO B1538, f.63 (1404)

APPENDIX R5

10. ADCO B1519, f.131v records a sum comparable to that given to the Duke's sons, John and Anthony, for clothes and necessities.
See App. R4, n.3
11. ADCO B1538, f.129, in the section headed payments and restitution of loans.
12. ADCO B1475, ff.19v, 20 and 23, for trips away from the court and B1517, f.80
13. ADCO B1503, f.89 for services
14. ADCO B1538, f.26 for gages and don; f.189v 107½ francs for good services; and f.196v for him as premier chamberlain sent with Pierre de La Trémouille to the Duchess of Brabant
15. See App. R1-5, n.9
16. ADCO B1521, f.12v
17. P., vol.24, p.220 (ADCO B354) for good services, and '*de servir encore plus honorablement*'
18. ADCO B1538, f.122v, g.e. and for a horse - see App. R4, n.7
19. ADCO B1521, f.12v, and P., vol.24, p.184 (ADCO B11738) for a quittance for him, 17 knights bachelor, 185 squires, 155 archers and 22 crossbowmen in his company in Duke John's service
20. ADCO B 1554, f.81v, in consideration of his services, and in recompense for his expenses in the Duke's service in arms on the trip Duke John made to Paris
21. P., vol.24, p.239 for a quittance for 200 francs in 1392, and p.215 for one for 300 escus in 1402; ADCO B1501, f.36 for 200 francs for services and '*plus honnestement il se puisse gouverner en son estat*' in 1395; ADCO B1503, f.91v, for 200 francs in 1395 for his costs on a trip to Brittany with the Duke; ADCO B1517, f.116v for 300 francs in 1399; and ADCO B1554, ff.69v and 71v, for two of 200 francs in 1407-8
22. ADCO B1503, f.92v for good services and '*pour accroissement de son mariage*'
23. ADCO B1554, f.70 records a gift of 100 escus for good service and to help him pay a ransom to the English
24. P., vol.24, p.7 (ADCO B11938)
25. P., vol.24, pp.430 and 474, for 1401 and 1408, and vol.23, p.296 (ADCO B11739) for him, another squire and 7 archers in 1410
26. P., vol.23, p.644 (ADCO B370)

APPENDIX R5

27. For Jean in 1402 see P., vol.24, p.175 (ADCO B370); in 1408, ADCO B 1554, f.92, and f.100v for 1410; ADCO B1554, f.83 for his ransom in 1405
28. See ADCO B1461, f.102, for good services, along with d'Aunay (note 7 above)
29. See ADCO B1519, f.99, for the remainder of his gages, and ADCO B1521, f.37 for January 1399 (n.s.)
30. ADCO B1519, f.149 records a gift '*de grace especial*', for good services, to help with the expenses of his father's death, and '*afin aussi que plus honnestement il puist servir de son dit office*' on 6/2/1401 (n.s.); and f.163v one to him and his father, Messire Thibaut, the King's chamberlain, for their good services
31. Gages and expenses to Thibaut de Chateaugiron for continual service in Duke Philip's household from 20 March to 18 May, ADCO B1538, f.216
32. Again to Thibaut, ADCO B1538, f.221v
33. See ADCO B1503, f.92v, and P., vol.23, p.142 (ADCO B369) for good services and '*pour accroissement de son mariage*'
34. P., vol.25, p.526 (ADCO B369) notes letters patent recording the gift of the grange of Pons, near Vesoul, to him, and confirming it in 1398
35. See ADCO B1498, f.18. The 150 francs paid to him and Erart du Four were possibly for dealing with problems in Besançon, see ADCO B1521, f.61
36. P., vol.24, p.686 (ADCO B374) gives a quittance for him as governor of Beaufort, Soublenne and Harzicourt for the Duke App. R1-18, n.3
37. 1391, one-off and g.e., for good services and to help him buy back his lands of Courcelles, which had been pledged for 1500 francs, ADCO B1501, f.37v; 1392, for services and '*mieux avoir ses necessites*' ADCO B1495, f.45; 1395, for long and loyal services in his post '*mesmement ou voiage que monditseigneur fait dernièrement en Bretagne et affin quil ait de quoy plus honnestement tenir son estat*', ADCO B1503, f.86v, and g.e. for his services and '*affin quil se puisse plus honorablement gouverner en son service*', f.87; 1398, for good services, ADCO

APPENDIX R5

- B1521, ff.59 and 108v; 1400, as for 1392, ADCO B1517, f.139v.
P., vol.24, p.7 (ADCO B386) records a quittance for a don given
for good service and for his marriage; 1402, ADCO B1532, f.163v
38. Pension awarded to him, styled as cousin, councillor, chevalier
and chamberlain, in a letter dated 19 December, 1405, retaining
him as his councillor, to help underwrite the expenses he had
and might incur in Duke John's service, and '*afin quil soit plus
astraint de servir monditseigneur*', see ADCO B1543, f.68v, and
B1554, f.53 for the 1407 payment, referring to the same letter
39. ADCO B354 for an authorisation dated 1402, paid in 1404.
Expenses incurred on Duke John's business in Paris and to the
Duke of Berry, ADCO B1554, f.98v
40. P., vol.24, p.31 for 1409, and vol.23, p.129 (both ADCO B355)
for 1411
41. 1398 and 1399, see Broussillon, vol.2, p.261, items 1319 and
1322; 1399, for services and '*avoir plus honorablement son estat
ou service*', ADCO B1519, f.125; 1400, for good service and
to assist with expenses incurred in a joust between 7 French and
7 English knights in Guelders, and later '*pour plus
honorablement et honnestement estre ou service duditseigneur*',
ADCO B1519, f.128; 1407, for '*bons, notables et agreables
services et pour lui aidier a maintenir plus honorablement son
estat ou service duditseigneur*', ADCO B1554, f.95v; 1408, for
good and noteworthy services and other related matters
(unspecified), ADCO B1554, f.192v
42. For good services, P., vol.24, p.276 (ADCO B354)
43. Shown in 1404 as due to Croy and to Rambures, dating from 22
June 1397, for no specified reason, but probably a repayment of
expenditure incurred, ADCO B1538, f.293
44. 1399 ADCO B1517, f.47v; 1401 B1519, f.61; and 1404 B1538, ff.62v
and 63v; 1400 P., vol.22, p.326; ADCO B1543, f.67v for letters
dated 1 November 1404, retaining '*Messire Jehan Seigneur de
Crouy et de Renty, chevalier, conseiller et chambellan*' as his
councillor and to meet the expenses involved
45. 1 and 5 May, ADCO B1543, ff.34v, 42v, and 47
46. For expenses in bringing men to Paris to stay there with the
Duke, ADCO B1521, f.26

APPENDIX R5

47. For 1405, see ADCO B354, possibly a pension, because it specifies that he had not been paid since the death of Duke Philip. For 1408, ADCO B1554, f.85, considering the '*grans notables et agreeables services fait, fais jour en jour*' and in recompense '*de ce quil a este en la compagnie et service duditseigneur par lespace de deux ans et demi ou environ et fais plusieurs voyages pour yceli seigneur bien accompagnie de gens darmes...sans avoir prins de monditseigneur aucuns gages ou livree pour lui ne ses gens*'
48. For good services, see ADCO B1517, f.136v
49. ADCO B1538, f.142, unspecified
50. ADCO B1538, f.17, unspecified
51. To '*Robert bastart de flandres escuier desturie de monditseigneur...pour aler au pays de Henault accompagnie de certain nombre de gens darm pour faire et acomplir aucuns choses secretes que monditseigneur lui avait enchargie*', ADCO B1543, f.173v
52. Remainder, as eschanson, ADCO B1519, ff.93v and 101v
53. P., vol.24, p.24 (ADCO B367)
54. P., vol.23, p.251 (ADCO B11739) for himself, with a knight bachelor, 23 squires and 13 archers
55. To go to Montréal, ADCO B1538, f.80
56. As bailli d'Amont, P., vol.23, p.267 (ADCO B347), vol.24, p.59 (ADCO B347) and p.200 (B348)
57. As chastellain of Gray P., vol.24, p.277 (ADCO B347)
58. 100 francs for clothes to accompany the Duke to Nantes, and 300 francs g.e., ADCO B1532, ff.162v and 189v. As squire and chamberlain, P., vol.23, p.394
59. Jean, Sire de Hangest, P., vol.29, p.611
60. Jean, Seigneur de Hangest, chamberlain of the Duke, P., vol.23, p.24
61. As n.60 above, but as chamberlain of the King ADCO B1543, f.100v
62. For the remainder of his gages for 1398/9, 138½ livres, ADCO B1521, f.31v
63. ADCO B1517, f.107 for good services, and B1521, ff.47 and 108 for good services and '*pour avoir plus honnorablement son estat ou service duditseigneur*'. Paid after Duke Philip's death

APPENDIX R5

64. For good services, 1383 ADCO B1461, f.103v; for accompanying the Duke to Boulogne 1385, P., vol.23, p.486; good services 1388, ADCO B1475, f.65
65. 1393, ADCO B1500, f.36v; 1395, B1501, f.17v; 1397 and 1398, P., vol.24, pp.148 and 356; 1402, ADCO B1532, f.9; 1404, B1538, f.64v; 1408, B1554, f.54
66. 1392, possibly pension, both dated 13 October 1392, ADCO B1495, ff.3v and 6v; 1393, B1500, f.14v
67. Gages at the end of June 1398, ADCO B1521, f.31
68. For '*tres notables*' good services December 1390 and May 1392, ADCO B1495, f.43v to Pierre, qualified as councillor; 1394 for good services and in recompense for the expense of a trip to Flanders for the Duke to visit the fortresses there, B1500, f.68
69. Don, g.e., because he had served 82 days without gages, ADCO B1538, f.99v
70. As échançon, ADCO B1538, f.133v
71. ADCO B1543, ff.100-101 for good services and serving in Paris and against the English; f.105 for good services and necessities; ff.110v-111 to help clothe him to accompany the Duke in arms to Picardy
72. 1408, departing for Brittany, ADCO B1554, f.91v; 1409-10, B361
73. ADCO B1554, f.96v for '*grans notables et agreeables service que continuelment il lui a fais...*'
74. Revenues from Jonvelle belonging to George which had been kept by the Ducal family ADCO B1543, f.52v
75. To help with the expense of a fait d'armes, see App. R11, n.63
76. ADCO B1519, f.98v
77. ADCO B1495, f.8; B1500, ff.2v and 14
78. ADCO B1475, f.75v; B1500, f.68v; B1501, f.36v; and B1538, f.139 - all for good services
79. ADCO B1500, f.73v for accompanying the Duke to Paris
80. ADCO B1517, f.112
81. Ibid., f.131
82. Ibid., f.143
83. Ibid., f.140 for good services and '*pour mieux avoir ses necessites*'
84. ADCO B1554, ff.84-84v, don to assist with clothing and arming to

APPENDIX R5

- support the Duke of Brabant, Duke John's brother
85. ADCO B1534, f.48, and B1543, f.12v for 24 francs in January and November 1406
 86. ADCO B1517, f.138v 50 francs for services and to '*mieux avoir ses necessités*' in January, and ADCO B1519, f.124v 100 francs for services and '*pour lui vestir et avoir plus honorablement son estat ou service...*' in October
 87. ADCO B1543, f.12v
 88. A volonté, see Rauzier, Finances, pp.433, and ADCO B1454, f.28v
 89. See Rauzier, Finances, pp.489-90
 90. For good services, ADCO B1461, ff.105v, and for services carried out longuement et loyalement, f.126v
 91. Ibid., f.119v for 1383/4, for good services and in recompense for his pension having been stopped; 1398, a pension à volonté which his brother, Guy, used to have, P., vol.23, p.656; 1407, ADCO B1554, f.3v
 92. Gages of 4 francs a day (higher than most) to go to the King in Paris, ADCO B1475, f.21; 300 francs for good services in February 1389, f.65; and 400 francs for good services and to buy the castle of Villeterre '*pour accroistre sa chauce*' f.65
 93. For good services and to cover the expenses of this crusade which he had undertaken '*que tant pour lonnour de monditseigneur que pour autrement faire son devoir*', ADCO B1495, ff.43-43v; 1000 francs for bringing 3 horses back for the Duke - a ridiculous sum, even for good horses, which must have included a gift, ADCO B301
 94. Gages of 5 francs a day for his missions, on the Duke's behalf, to Holland to talk to Duke Albert about his son, the Count of Ostrevant, see ADCO B1500, f.40; for good services and to repair his castle of Dours in order to receive the King, the Duke and their retinue there, f.68. See also f.91v for 200 francs in 1393 for 2 trips to Duke Albert, and 240 francs in 1394 for a trip to the Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights
 95. ADCO B1503, f.85v for 1393 for what is described as his usual gift after NY, and f.86 for the same in 1395
 96. Expenses for a trip for the Duke to the Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights between May and December 1394, ADCO B1503, f.86

APPENDIX R5

97. For trips to Paris to raise troops from the Dukes of Berry and Orleans and others for the war in Brabant, ADCO B1517, f.70v, and 1000 francs unspecified, in January 1400
98. ADCO B1519, f.164v, with the Duke's treasurer, for good services and '*afin quilz feussent plus tenus de y diligement continuer et eussent aussi mieulx de quoy mieulx maintenir leur estat en son service*'
99. ADCO B1532, f.152 for good services, his marriage, and to maintain his position, and separately for his services and to have a house in Arras
100. 6 francs a day (compared to 3 francs for Guillaume Blondel, Rethel's premier chambellan) for a trip to the Duchess of Brabant ADCO B1538, f.196v
101. For his brother, Porrus, for good services, and to be '*plus honorablement en son service*' ADCO B1532, f.218
102. For Messire Pierre de La Viesville, knight, councillor, and chamberlain ADCO B1554, f.53; retained as councillor and chamberlain with a pension à volenté, mentioning long services to Duke Philip and his wife, ADCO B354
103. For Messire Jean, knight and chamberlain of the Duke, and his brother Porrus to assist with their ransom from the English, by whom they had been captured ADCO B1554, f.97v
104. 1398 P., vol.23, p.294; 1399 ADCO B1517, f.54v; 1400 P., vol.24, p.254 and ADCO B1519, f.65v; 1402 ADCO B1532, f.82; and B1538, f.63v for 1404
105. To go to the King from the Duke at Hal, on secret matters, ADCO B1538, ff.87 and 87v
106. ADCO B1517, f.79 for 1399; P., vol.24, p.204 for 1405. See also P., vol.24, p.434 for wages for him. a knight bachelor, 5 squires and an archer in his company
107. P., vol.24, p.437 a quittance for his gages as a knight banneret with 2 knights bachelor and 5 squires in 1407; ADCO B354 for gages of 3 francs a day as councillor and chamberlain in 1409, travelling for the Duke
108. ADCO B1475, f.67
109. 1392 ADCO B1500, f.72 for good services and to buy land; 1400 ADCO B1519, f.140 for services '*longuement et loyalement fait*'

APPENDIX R5

as écuyer de l'écurie

110. 1399 ADCO B1519, f.163, and 1402 B1532, f.153, for good service
111. ADCO B1500, f.73 to defray expenses in Paris with the Duke
112. ADCO B1521, f.80v for trips to Guienne for the Duke for '*aucuns besongnes que monditseigneur ne veult aucunement est declare*'
113. ADCO B1543, f.113v for good services and cover his expenses for staying in Paris, at the Duke's command, with 4 squires, to serve the Duke in the army '*pour le bien du roi et de son royaume*'
114. ADCO B1543, ff.92,92v gages for October -December 1405, and January and February 1406
115. ADCO B1543, f.27v, don and gages in February 1406
116. ADCO B1543, f.100, for good services and for his expenses in Duke John's army in Paris in 1406
117. ADCO B1554, f.12 (just after Easter) and f.72 (just before Easter), for continued good service and '*autres causes et considerations a ce mouvans*'
118. ADCO B1554, f.227v, for him, qualified as squire banneret, + 1 knight banneret, 4 knights bachelor, and 85 squires, fighting with the Duke against Liège in September and October 1408
119. 1405 for 22 days in the household without gages, ADCO B354; 1410, for the army in Paris, P., vol.23, p.617
120. Reason unspecified, P., vol.23, p.355
121. '*Pour le faire partir de Paris et l'aider a payer ce qu'il avoit despense*', P., vol.23, p.670
122. As chamberlain, g.e. '*pour soy vestir et avoir ses menues necessites au service duditseigneur*', quittance December 1383, ADCO B1461, f.109
123. '*Pour laider en sa maladie*', P., vol.23, p.461
124. 50 francs, with a comparable sum to Boucicaut, March 1384, ADCO B1461, f.120v, possibly for fighting in Flanders; 3000 livres '*en augmentation de son mariage*', Pot, Histoire, p.21,
125. For good services and '*par especial ou voyaige en alemaigne et aussy des frais et missions oudit voyaige*', quit November 1388, ADCO B1475, f.62
126. Good services, and for '*pour faire oudit regnier un honneur avancement et accroissement de son mariage*', November 1392, ADCO B1500, f.65

APPENDIX R5

127. ADCO B1495, f.41 for good services and to help with his great expenses in ducal service; B1500, f.65 for good services
128. Possibly a pension or revenues awarded, ADCO B1495, ff.4v, 7v, and 9
129. ADCO B1500, ff.10v and 14
130. For the expenses of a year's trip to Hungary for the Duke in 1394, mandated December 1394 and quit February 1395, ADCO B1503, ff.82v-83
131. ADCO B1517, f.36v, February 1400
132. As councillor and chamberlain, ADCO B1517, f.112v, g.e., for '*bons et agreables services fait, fais jour en jour et espere quil face tant a monditseigneur comme au conte de nevers*' , June 1399
133. Pension paid in 2 instalments a year, several paid together ADCO B1538, f.64
134. Pension as councillor and chamberlain, paid for the period 22 March 1402 to 3 September 1403 ADCO B1532, f.82; and for 1404 B1538, f.4v
135. Ibid., f.119 for New Year, and 120v to '*soy maintenir plus honnorablement* (inserted '*et avoir son estat*) *en service dudit seigneur*'. In the latter he is qualified as chamberlain to the Count of Nevers
136. ADCO B1538, f.196v, 5 francs a day for a 21 day trip between 1 and 21 April on the Duke's business to the King, the Queen, the Dukes of Berry and Orleans and others for '*grosses besoignes touchant grandement leditseigneur*', (see nn.14 and 92 for Pierre de La Trémoille on 6 francs and Blondel on 3 francs for similar trips)
137. ADCO B1538, ff.263v and 264
138. ADCO B1543, ff.75v-76v, and 93v-94, for journeys for the Duke in March, May, June, July, September and October to those in n.127 and also to the royal finance men and the Count of Clermont
139. ADCO B1543, f.110v for good services in September
140. ADCO B1554, f.2 for '*gages comme autrement*'
141. Ibid., ff.4 and 10 for trips to the King of the Romans and of Bohemia to arrange the marriage of his niece to Duke John's brother Anthony, Duke of Brabant
142. Ibid., f.91 '*pour avoir et acheter de la vaisselle*' for New

APPENDIX R5

Year; ff.96-96v for '*grans notables et agreeables services qui lui a fais longuement et loyalmment et en recompense de plusieurs grans frais missions et despens execifs quil a eulx et soustenus en maintes et diverses manieres ou voyaige que nagueres il a fait par ordonance*' of the Duke '*es parties de behaigne pour certaines et grosses besoignes et affaires touchans icelluiseigneur*'. This goes on to explain that he had to pay out of his own pocket for jewels he presented in the Duke's name and for his '*honneur*' to various knights and squires of the King and Queen of Bohemia and also for the large number of people he needed in his entourage for the security of his person; and f.164 for gages at 5 francs a day for 200 days between 3 November 1407 and 21 May 1408 on this trip.

143. '*de nouvel retenu*' by the Duke as his chamberlain to be paid in 2 instalments commencing with the feast of St. John (June 24) 1398, ADCO B1517, f54; for 1399, B1519, f.66; 1401, P., vol.22, p.326; 1403 P., vol.24, p.358
144. David, for good services, qualified as knight and chamberlain of the King and the Duke, ADCO B1503, f.81v
145. David, given à vie from 30 January 1402, ADCO B1538, f.61v
146. David, qualified as Seigneur de Rambures, for good services to and to pay for his ransom to the English, January 1406 ADCO B1543, f.105
147. Gaiges, ADCO B1532, f.83v, don B361
148. ADCO B1517, f.53v, starting from March 1398. B1519, ff.65v for 1400 and 154v referring to him having been '*retenu pour estre avec lui et son hotel a la pension de 8000 francs par an*' and arrears fo 1399; B1532, f.81 for 1401-2; B1538, f.63 for 1403-4. In 1406, 2 great gold dishes decorated with the male and female worthies, which had belonged to Duke Philip, was converted to pay his pension, ADCO B1543, f.56.
149. ADCO B1519, f.69v for a voyage for the Duke on secret business to Paris, to the King, and to the Duke of Orleans to raise men-at-arms to accompany him to Guelders at the Duke's command, and f.126 for the 1000 francs which he was given because he had agreed to his territories contributing to the special aide raised to offset the cost of John the Fearless' ransom

APPENDIX R5

150. ADCO B1519, f.154 referring to the underpayment for 1399 (see n.148 above) and also to his '*bons, notables et agreeables services*', and in consideration of the significant expenses incurred in the Duke's service
151. ADCO B1532, f.152 for his expenses in going to Brittany with the Duke
152. 1406/7, ADCO B1543, f.70v '*retenu de son grant conseil aux gages ou pension de 4000 francs par an.....pour le servir et accompagner toutefois que mestiers seroit et quil plairoit..*'; 1407/8 ADCO B1554, f.51, quoting letters of January 1406
153. P., vol.23, p.285 for a quittance from 1411/12 for his pension
154. 2 quittances for 45 francs each for him, another knight, 2 squires and 10 horses at 3 francs a day from 4 June 1369 when he with a number of other lords was ordered by Duke Philip to come to Paris and then accompany him to his wedding in Flanders, ADCO B1430, f.147v
155. Annual, starting from January 1394, ADCO B1498, f.18. Qualified as Seneschal of Burgundy and Governor of the County of Burgundy
156. For him and his men for 13 days during which he affirmed '*en sa loyaute*' that he had travelled at the Duke's command to the Duke of Austria
157. Possibly pension? Dated November 1395, ADCO B1503, ff.13v and 22
158. To buy back plate he had pawned to pay his expenses over and above his normal gages of 5 francs a day on a trip to Savoy for the Duke in 1399, and to pay his exceptional expenses, ADCO B1517, ff.60v and 136v
159. ADCO B1519, f.84 for a journey from Paris to Hungary, Greece and Turkey to Bajazet to secure the release of Duke Philip's son John
160. ADCO B1543, ff.27,28v and 53v for trips on ducal business in 1406; B1554, ff.12v and 13v unspecified for 1408
161. ADCO B1543, f.165 5 francs a day for travelling for the Duke in Flanders November 1406-January 1407; f.213v for him and 100 lances to help the Duke of Brabant; for him, his son, 2 other knights bachelor, and 20 squires February 1408; f.226v for visiting troops assembled for Liège, September and October 1408; and f.227 for him, and his large company in the same period

APPENDIX R5

162. ADCO B1563, f.12v because he had not levied the monies he was entitled to as marshal on the number of men at arms he had mustered to fight in August 1411; and f.78v similarly in September 1411; f.85v for him and his company 1411/12
163. To Monseigneur de Saint George, unspecified but possibly pension, ADCO B1517, f.2 for 1399; B1519, f.84 for going in 1399 to Arras to the King of the Romans on secret business from the Duke; and ff.2v-3, in June and July 1400, suggesting a pension
164. ADCO B1538, ff.64-64v for Guillaume de Vienne, qualified Seigneur de Saint George and de Sainte Croix, to have when he travelled to the Duke, his son John, or in their company, for 80 days in October and November 1403 and February and March 1404 (see also App. R6, no.72); B1543, f.111 for money to buy 2 dozen silver escuelles and plas as a NY gift; B1554, f.163v for 1406-7; f.12 for 1407; f.16 for 1408; quittance for 1411, P., vol.23, p.105; B1554, f.68v for good services and in recompense for travelling for the Duke without reimbursement; B1554, f.227v for him and his company to help the Bishop of Liège
165. Pension as Sire de Borne, originally from Louis de Mâle; confirmed by Duke Philip in 1383; continued at least until 1400; and probably into Duke John's reign -see App. R1-54, n.2
166. The entries for Duke Philip are for examples of financial support from the King, to provide a comparison. His approximate annual pension, estimated for 1395; and royal gifts 1400-1403, see Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.228 and 230. 1402, for good services and to help with his expenses in Brittany, ADCO B1538, f.23v and 1404 NY f.34v
167. Allowances from Duke Philip, Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.67, and 234
168. All expenses and needs provided by the Duke

APPENDIX R6

RECIPIENTS OF THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE: MATERIAL GIFTS
AND FINANCIAL REWARDS 1403¹

NAME	MATERIAL GIFT* ²		FINANCIAL REWARD ³	
	Precious	Other	Pension/ Gages	Other
1. Aunay, d'				Expenses ⁴
2. Bar, de	Jewelled fermail* 292frs. ⁸	Furs 500frs. ⁵ Silk 67½frs. ⁶	3000frs. p.a ⁶	1000escus don ⁷ 200frs. ⁹
3. Basoches, de -	-	-	-	-
4. Belliere, de -	-	-	-	-
5. Blondel -	-	100escus horse ¹⁰ 600frs. house ¹¹	-	-
6. Bois, du -	-	100frs. horse ¹²	-	200frs. don ¹³
7. Boves, des -	-	-	-	-
8. Bretagne, de	Silver plate- 300escus ¹⁴	-	-	-
9. Brimeu, de -	-	-	-	-
10. Calonne, Bo -	-	-	-	-
11. Calonne, de -	-	-	-	-
12. Chalon, de -	-	Silk 100frs. ¹⁵	-	100frs. ¹⁵ 100frs., 300frs., 200frs., all dons ¹⁶ 27frs. expenses ¹⁷
13. Chambly, de -	-	-	-	200escus Expenses ¹⁸
14. Chante- merle, de	-	Horse 120frs. ²⁰	-	100escus ¹⁹

APPENDIX R6

NAME	MATERIAL GIFT		FINANCIAL REWARD	
	Precious	Other	Pension/ Gages	Other
15. Chateau- giron, de	Jewelled fermail 100escus ²² (Jewelled fermail 160frs.) ²⁴	-	-	(100frs. don) ²¹ (45frs. don) ²³
16. Chauffour, de-		Silks ²⁵	-	100frs. don ²⁶
17. Chiney	-	-	-	-
18. Courcelles	-	-	-	-
19. Craon, de	-	-	-	200frs. ²⁷ Marriage 3000frs. ²⁸
20. Croy, de	-	-	500frs.pa ²⁹ -	
21. Desquees	-	-	-	-
22. Flandres, de	-	-	-	100escus don ³⁰
23. Fontaines de	Diamond ³¹	-	-	200frs. ³²
24. Four, du	-	-	125frs. gages & expenses 45frs.& 79 frs. gages ³⁴	300frs. don ³³
25. Gavre, de	Jewelled fermail 200escus ³⁵			
26. Grignaux, de	-	Silk 50frs ³⁶ -		200escus NY ³⁷ 72½frs. Expenses ³⁸ 8,000frs. Marriage ³⁹
27. Hangest, de	-	-	-	-

APPENDIX R6

NAME	MATERIAL GIFT		FINANCIAL REWARD	
	Precious	Other	Pension/ Gages	Other
28. Jaucourt, de -	-	-	-	600frs. don ⁴⁰
29. Joigny, de -	-	-	-	-
30. La Muce, de -	-	-	-	-
31. La Roche-rousse -	-	-	300frs. pension ⁴¹	500frs. don ⁴¹
32. La Tour, de -	-	-	-	-
33. La Tremoille Georges de -	-	-	-	-
34. Guillaume de-	-	Fur Houppelande 200escus ⁴³	-	400frs. don ⁴²
35. Guyot de -	-	-	Gages 100frs. ⁴⁴	200frs. don ⁴⁵
36. Jean de -	-	Horse 100escus ⁴⁶	Gages 100frs ⁴⁴	100escus Necessites ⁴⁷
37. Pierre de	*Hanap NY 487½frs. ⁴⁸ Fermail 225frs. ⁵¹ Fermail 225frs. ⁵¹	-	220frs. Gages ⁴⁹	500frs. don ⁵⁰
38. La Viesville- de	-	-	-	100escus ⁵² (300frs.) ⁵³
39. Le Voyer -	-	-	-	-
40. Loncroy, de	(Diamond Wedding 150frs.) ⁵⁴	-	-	-
41. Monchy, de -	-	-	-	-
42. Montagu, de	Hanap 300frs. ⁵⁵ Fermail 202½frs. ⁵⁷	Wine ⁵⁶	-	-

APPENDIX R6

NAME	MATERIAL GIFT		FINANCIAL REWARD	
	Precious	Other	Pension/ Gages	Other
43. Montauban, de-		Horse ⁵⁸ Velvet ⁵⁸	-	-
44. Montigny, de	Plate 80frs. Marriage ⁶⁰	Robe de livree ⁵⁹	-	2,000escus Marriage ⁶⁰ 300frs.don ⁶¹
45. Neufchatel, de-	-	-	-	1000frs. ⁶²
46. Poix, de	-	-	-	200frs. ⁶³
47. Pot	-	Silk 100frs. ⁶	500frs. pension ⁶⁴	500frs.don NY & 2 horses ⁵⁸ 2,000frs. Expenses ⁶⁵
48. Rambures	-	-	-	-
49. Renforcat	-	Silk 110frs. ⁶⁶	-	-
50. Saint Pol	* ⁶⁸	-	8000frs. ⁶⁷	
51. Triart, de	-	-	-	-
52. Vergy, de	-	-	-	300escus Expenses ⁶⁹ 2000escus(2250frs.) Gages and expenses ⁷⁰
53. Vienne, de	*? ⁷¹	-	500frs. Gages or pension ⁷²	-
54. Vorne, de	-	-	-	-
55. Zevenberghe, de-		-	-	-
56., 57., 58., 59., 60. Ducal Family				
56. Bourgogne, de			100,000frs.	Pension etc 176,800frs.Expenses ⁷³
57. Bretagne, de				
58. Nevers, de				
59. Philippe		(5000frs.) ⁷⁴		
60. Rethel, de			1200frs. ⁷⁵	100,000frs ⁷³

APPENDIX R6

1. Except where otherwise specified, notes in this Appendix are drawn from ADCO B1532.
2. * indicates people from whom Duke Philip had received a New Year gift in 1403
3. Coverage as in Appendix R5
4. f.366 for payments to him in recompense for expenses incurred on a journey to Brittany with the Duke, dated April 1403 -see App. R5, n.6
5. f.153v for martres to fur a robe
6. f.81v. ADCO B1538, f.294 records 67½ francs given for silk, but taken out of his pension, and similarly for Renier Pot
7. f.204, g.e.,
8. f.217v for gift to him; f.257v for his to the Duke
9. f.129
10. f.155v for the horse
11. f.229 for the house
12. f.194v g.e., *'avoir ung cheval a se monter et estre plus honnestement en son service'*
13. f.227, in consideration of his good services, carried out *'longuement et loyalement'* from day to day and in the future
14. Among a list of gifts authorised in late November 1402, apparently given out by the Duke in Brittany
15. f.158, g.e., 100 francs for good services, as well as to have *'draps de soie pour lui vestir et estre plus honnestement en service duditseigneur'*
16. 100 francs, g.e., f.155v; 300 francs, f.162, for good services, and *'pour lui aidier a avoir ses necessites pour plus honnestement maintenir son estat en service duditseigneur'*; 200 francs, f.216, for good services and *'pour mieux et plus honorablement avoir et sustenir son estat en service duditseigneur'*
17. ADCO B1538, f.258, as expenses for going in arms with Jean de Neufchastel, given in July 1403
18. f.366, with d'Aunay, and for the same reason (see note 4 above)

APPENDIX R6

19. f.209
20. f.241
21. f.209, for Thibaut, squire and chamberlain, to '*plus honorablement maintenir son estat en son service*'
22. f.253,
23. ADCO B1538, f.258, to Thibaut, '*jadis chambellan de feu monditseigneur*' to buy armour and arms to accompany the Count of Saint Pol to England
24. f.253 to Aline, the Duke of Brittany's chamberlain
25. f.274v, for a '*grant houppelande*', in order to be '*plus honnestement au service duditseigneur*'
26. f.230v, g.e., for good services
27. f.208v, reason unspecified
28. ADCO B1538, f.142v, '*pour le bien et accroissement de son mariage*'
29. f.81, listed among the first group of pensions, after the Duchess, the ducal family and the Chancellor of Burgundy
30. f.157v
31. f.271, on the day of his marriage
32. f.195v, g.e., '*pour aidier avoir ses necessites ou service monditseigneur*'
33. ADCO B1538, f.125, in consideration of his services in the capture of Montréal; in his daily office; and in travelling for the Duke to sort out the Monreal problem
34. ADCO B1538, ff.79-80v, 3 francs a day away from court, in addition to his gages; 45 francs to go with the Marshal of Burgundy to Lorraine; and 79 francs to go to Montréal
35. f.265v, a gold, jewelled fermail, end of January 1403
36. ADCO B1538, f.294, when he left the Duke to go to England with St. Pol
37. f.209, for NY
38. ADCO B1538, f.118, g.e., expenses incurred in Nevers' company in Burgundy in September
39. ADCO B1538, f.142v, '*en announcement de son mariage*'. Authorised August 1402, paid 1403 -quittances, P., vol.24, p.118
40. f.206, for '*peines et travaux*' in the Duke's service and otherwise

APPENDIX R6

41. Pension, ADCO B1532, f.83 as squire of the body to the King and chamberlain to the Duke, and B1538, f.3 for 1403, backdated. ADCO B1532, f.191 for the don, which he had to request again because he had lost the authorisation
42. f.206v, g.e.
43. f.198, to buy martres for a houppelande to be '*plus honorablement au service duditseigneur*'
44. f.8 and ADCO B1534, f.2v
45. f.206v, as a don and to have his 'necessités' in the Duke's service
46. f.161v, to '*plus honnestement maintenir son estat*'
47. f.203, for 'necessités'
48. f.255v, and f.257v for Pierre's to the Duke
49. ADCO B1538, f.85, 5 francs a day for going to Artois in August
50. f.185, g.e.
51. f.256, and ADCO B1538, f.203v for a gold fermail '*a la devise duditseigneur*' in August
52. ADCO B1538, f.124v. Authorisation lost; original reason not specified
53. ADCO B1538, f.126v, for Coppin to assist with losses arising from a house which had been accidentally burnt
54. ADCO B1538, ff.167v and 289v, given to his daughter on her wedding day, and bracketted with a slightly more valuable diamond (200 francs) given similarly to the daughter of the late Guy VI, seigneur de La Trémoille
55. f.256, gold, specified as having been given before the Order, but not clear whether in late 1402 or immediately before -see Annex 1
56. P., vol.23, p.13, Quittance for 5 queues of Beaune received from the concierge of the Duke's palace at Conflans from Jean de Montagu, knight and vidame of Laon, and souverain maître d'hôtel
57. f.255v, a jewelled fermail to his wife (la dame de Marcoussis) on Twelfth Night, which the Duke spent at Marcoussis
58. 1 of 2 horses bought by the Duke from Renier Pot and given in 1402 or 1403 to Montauban, f.213v. The payment to Pot was partly for good services, partly for New Year, and partly for the 2 horses, the other of which the Duke kept. ADCO B1538

APPENDIX R6

- f.169v for 2 lengths of moiré velvet given in March 1403 to the Seigneur de Montauban
59. f.289, for a '*robe pareille de la livree diceulx archiers*' the said 19 named archers having been given, at the end of January, '*robes de livree pour estre plus honnestement au service de mds*'
 60. ADCO B1538, f.127 for a don '*pour lavenement de son mariage*' and f.164v for silver given on his wedding day
 61. ADCO B1534, f.48v, reason unspecified, but probably NY
 62. g.e. f.152v
 63. For going to Brittany and loss of a horse, f.161v
 64. See App. R5, n.134
 65. f.230v, a final payment to help with the expenses of a long trip to Hungary and Bohemia for the Duke.
 66. ADCO B1538, f.169v for 2 lengths of silk given at approximately the same time, and mentioned alongside in the accounts, as the velvet given to Montauban, see n.58 above
 67. Quittance for his pension, P., vol.24, p.359
 68. His to the Duke, ADCO B1532, f.257v
 69. ADCO B1538, f.86v for a trip to Lorraine for the Duke in January and February on secret matters
 70. ADCO B1538, f.109 for 2000 escus which Duke Philip had given him in letters dated January 1403 for the armed force he raised to take Montréal for the Duke, and for other, unspecified reasons, of which he had in 1406 received only 1000 francs, with 1250 francs still to be paid
 71. ADCO B1532, f.257v for a NY gift to Duke Philip (unspecified)
 72. At 200 francs a month, see App. R5, n.164
 73. 100,000 francs from the King for Philip and Rethel's pension and unspecified expenses October 1402 to September 1403, '*une fois, grace especial*', ADCO B1538, f.23v. Expenses from the King of 3000 francs for secret things he had ordered the Duke to do, and 4000 for secret matters touching his person, B1538, f.33; 30,000 + 18,000 for defences at Ecluse, B1538, ff.34-34v and 36; 120,000 unspecified, B1538, f.35v; and 1800 for war in the County of Montfort, ADCO B1538, f.32v
 74. Clothes for the Duchess and her children, ADCO B1538, f.62
 75. Pension, ADCO B1538, f.62

APPENDIX R7

RECIPIENTS OF THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE: CHIVALRY

NAME	ORDER ¹	CRUSADE ²
1. Aunay, d'	CA, vol.1, no.103	
2. Bar, de	CA, vol.1, no.s 38,50 & 51, 'Conservateur'	(Barbary 1390) ³ (Chevalerie de la Passion) ³ (Nicopolis 1396) ³
3. Basoches, de -		(Nicopolis 1396) ⁴
4. Belliere, de -		Jerusalem, 1391 ⁵
5. Blondel -		Nicopolis 1396 ⁶
6. Bois, du -		-
7. Boves, des	CA, vol.2, no.471	-
8. Bretagne, de -		-
9. Brimeu, de	CA, vol.1, no.292	Golden Fleece ⁷
10. Calonne, Bo -		-
11. Calonne, de -		-
12. Chalon, de -		-
13. Chambly, de	CA, vol.1, no.97	-
14. Chantemerle de	CA, vol.1, no.256	-
15. Chateaugiron, de-		-
16. Chauffour, de-		(Barbary, 1390) ⁸
17. Chiney -		-
18. Courcelles	CA, vol.1, no.144	-
19. Craon, de	CA, vol.1, no.98	(Chevalerie de la Passion) Nicopolis 1396) ⁹
20. Croy, de	CA, vol.1, no.184	(Golden Fleece) ¹⁰
21. Desquees -		-
22. Flandres, de	CA, vol.2, no.302	(Nicopolis 1396) ¹¹
23. Fontaines, de	CA, vol.2, no.353	-
24. Four, du -		-
25. Gavre, de -		-
26. Grignaux, de -		-

APPENDIX R7

NAME	ORDER	CRUSADE
27. Hangest, de	CA, vol.1, no.218	(Prussia 1379, 1391 Barbary 1390 Nicopolis) ¹²
28. Jaucourt, de	-	(Barbary 1390) ¹³
29. Joigny, de	(CA, vol.1, no.139) ¹⁴	-
30. La Muce, de	-	-
31. La Rocherousse, de-	-	-
32. La Tour, de	(CA, vol.2, no.500) ¹⁵ (La Tremoille)	- (Outre Mer 1366 Prussia 1379, Barbary 1390, Nicopolis 1396, Golden Fleece) ¹⁶
33. George de	CA, vol.1, no.123	(see n.16)
34. Guillaume de-	-	(see n.16) Nicopolis 1396 ¹⁷
35. Guyot de	-	(see n.16)
36. Jean de	-	(see n.16)
37. Pierre de	CA, vol.2, no.124	Prussia 1377/8/9, 1391/2 & 1394 ¹⁸ Nicopolis 1396 ¹⁹
38. La Viesville	(CA, vol.1, no.39 de CA, vol.1, no.162 CA, vol.2 no.333 CA, vol.2, no.334) ²¹	(Nicopolis 1396) ²⁰
39. Le Voyer	-	-
40. Lonroy, de	CA, vol.1, no.107	-
41. Monchy, de	CA, vol.1, no.171	(Turkey) ²²
42. Montagu, de	-	-
43. Montauban, de-	-	-
44. Montigny, de	-	(Nicopolis 1396) ²³
45. Neufchatel	(CA, vol.1, no.260) ²⁴ de	(Nicopolis 1396) Golden Fleece ²⁵
46. Poix, de	CA, vol.1, no.178	-

APPENDIX R7

NAME	ORDER	CRUSADE
47. Pot	CA, vol. 2, no. 367	Prussia 1389-91 Nicopolis 1396 Golden Fleece ²⁶
48. Rambures, de	(CA, vol. 1, no. 100) ²⁷	-
49. Renforcat	-	-
50. Saint Pol	CA, vol. 1, no. 9	Nicopolis 1396 (Golden Fleece) ²⁸
51. Triart, de	-	-
52. Vergy, de	CA, vol. 1, no. 271	Nicopolis 1396 ²⁹ (Golden Fleece) ²⁹
53. Vienne, de	CA, vol. 1, no. 295	Nicopolis 1396 ³⁰ Golden Fleece ³⁰
54. Vorne, de	-	-
55. Zevenberghe, de	(CA, vol. 2, no. 308) ³¹	(Golden Fleece) ³¹
56., 57., 58., 59., 60. Ducal Family		
56. Bourgogne, de	Order of the Star ³² CA, vol. 1, no. 2 ³² Premier Conservateur	Oath 1363 ³³ Prussia ³³ Nicopolis 1396 ³³
57. Bretagne, de	(CA, vol. 1, no. 16) ³⁴	-
58. Nevers, de	CA, vol. 1, no. 7	Nicopolis 1396 ³⁵
59. Philippe	(CA, vol. 1, no. 21) ³⁶	(Golden Fleece) ³⁶
60. Rethel, de	CA, vol. 1, no. 19	-

1. Membership of any courtly or military chivalric order, where known. References to membership of the Cour Amoureuse, taken from Bozzolo and Loyau, La Cour Amoureuse, dite de Charles VI, are given as 'CA', with the volume and entry number.

2. Evidence of any service on a crusade, membership of a specifically crusading order, or assistance with a crusade or its aftermath.

- 'Nicopolis' refers to involvement with the 1396 crusade to Hungary against the Turks, headed nominally by Duke Philip's eldest son, John. References drawn from the Duke's Ordonnance

APPENDIX R7

recording those who were to go with his son, taken from Atiya, The Crusade of Nicopolis, 'Atiya', with page number.

- 'Prussia' indicates references from the ducal accounts to gifts on return from crusading with the Teutonic Knights in Prussia

- 'Other' indicates references from the ducal accounts to gifts on return from unspecified crusades

- 'Golden Fleece' indicates membership of the Order of the Golden Fleece, a chivalric order established by Duke Philip the Good of Burgundy in 1430, ostensibly for the defence of Christianity, although its main purpose was probably the unification of the disparate Burgundian territories, and the promotion of loyalty to the Dukes. Although some non-Burgundian princes were included in the membership of 24, the majority came from the nobility of the Duke's territories, initially from the two Burgundies, Flanders, Artois and Picardy. In view of its long life, only membership in the first few years is noted. See Richard, J., 'La Toison d'or comparée aux autres ordres chevaleresques du moyen âge', p.20, and 'Le rôle politique de l'ordre sous Philippe le Bon et Charles le Téméraire', pp.67-70; and Paviot, 'L'Ordre de la Toison d'or et la Croisade', pp.71-4, and 'Le recrutement des chevaliers de la Toison d'or', pp.75-9, all in V.B.P., Toison d'or

- References to family members are shown in brackets

3. Of Edward's elder brothers, Philip went on the Barbary crusade, and Henry and Philip died at, or on return from, Nicopolis. See Schnerb, 'Nicopolis', pp.59-74, especially pp.72-4; and Atiya, p.144. Henry was named as one of the protectors of the Chevalerie de la Passion, a crusading order, which Philip de Mézières was trying to develop to re-establish the true ideals of Christian knighthood, and to draw England and France away from the Hundred Years' War. See, for example, Jorga, N., Philippe de Mézières et la croisade au XIve siècle, pp.13, 70-74, 480, 490-7, and particularly p.491 for the reference to Henry. Edward's pension was kept back by Duke Philip in 1399, to help pay for his son John's ransom, see P., vol.28, p.4 (ADCO B11876)
4. His brother-in-law, Jean - see App. R1-3, n.3
5. Reference in Arch. de l'Orient Latin i (1881), pp.539-46, taken

APPENDIX R7

from Prof. M. Jones' personal card index

6. Sent to get assistance with raising John's ransom -see App. R1-5
7. David and Jacques de Brimeu
8. His brother, Garnier, was killed on this crusade. See P., vol.8, pp.40-41
9. See note 3 above, particularly Jorga, p.491, and also Broussillon, vol.II, p.258, item 1297. Antoine's father, Pierre de Craon, had promised money around 1395 to this Order. A George de Craon went to Nicopolis, see Atiya, p.146
10. His sons, Antoine and Jean
11. Atiya, p.145, says that Robert's elder brothers, Victor, Raoul, Regnaut, and Louis le Haze, were at Nicopolis, the last dying there. P.A., vol.II, pp.740-1, however, names them as Louis le Haze, Louis le Frison, and Jean sans Terre, and says they all died there, noting Victor as a younger brother who survived. Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.66 agrees, but adds Renault as present and a survivor. Victor was certainly around in 1402-3 -see ADCO B1532, f.190, and fighting for Duke John in 1409 -P., vol.22, p.438
12. Jean, Seigneur de Hangest went to Prussia with Boucicaut -see Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.61, and was captured at Nicopolis -see P.A., vol.VIII, p.64. For other references, see Schnerb, 'Nicopolis', p.73
13. His father went on this crusade -Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.61
14. His uncle, and guardian Jean de Noyers, Seigneur de Rimancourt, a knight and chamberlain of the King and the Duke of Burgundy
15. See App. R1-32, n.2.
16. Guillaume I went to Outre Mer -Schnerb, 'Nicopolis', p.73; both Guy VI and Guillaume I to Prussia and Barbary -Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.61 and 65; and both died at or as a result of Nicopolis (App. R1-33, 34, 35, 36, 37). Jean, Seigneur de Jonvelle, the third son of Guy VI (App. R1-36) was in the Golden Fleece
17. See gift on return, ADCO B1517, f.143, and App. R5, n.82
18. See App. R4, n.51; App. R5, nn. 89 and 93; and Schnerb, 'Nicopolis', p.73
19. See App. R1-37

APPENDIX R7

20. See App. R1-38
21. Vol.1, no.39 was Jacques; vol.1, no.162, Pierre; vol.2, no.333, Gauvain; and vol.2, no.334, Maillet -App. R1-38
22. His son Jean died in Turkey -see App. R1-41, n.1
23. See Atiya, p.145 for a 'Sire de Montigny', possibly a relative
24. His nephew, Thibaut VIII
25. His older brother, Thibaut VII, died at Nicopolis. Both Jean and his nephew were members of the Golden Fleece
26. See App. R1-47
27. David
28. Permitted a levy from his subjects to help pay John's ransom after Nicopolis, see App. R5, n.149. A bastard of his and several younger members of his family were members of the Golden Fleece
29. His brother and son fought at Nicopolis. He helped to arrange John of Nevers' ransom in 1396-7, see App. R5, n.159. His son, Antoine, was a member of the Golden Fleece
30. See Atiya, p.144. He was the first member of the Golden Fleece
31. CA included a Jean, but the editors could find only Girart, see App. R1-55, nn.1 and 5
32. Philip belonged to the Order of the Star, founded by his father, and was knighted when he received it. See Chapter 1, n.56, and Chapter 5, nn.85-87; Autrand, Jean le Bon, pp.206-16; and Boulton, Knights of the Crown, pp. 167-210. See n.1 above for the Cour Amoureuse, in which Philip, as co-founder, held one of the top positions.
33. Philip took the crusading oath with his father in 1363, but never fulfilled it personally. He supported Burgundians crusading with the Teutonic Knights; helped finance the 1396 crusade, nominally led by his son; and put together a large ransom to secure his release. See Autrand, Charles VI, p.469; and Chapter 6, under 'Crusading Chivalric Order'
34. His younger brother Gilles, born 1394, died 1412
35. He nominally led the Nicopolis campaign
36. Not Duke Philip's son, but the son of Duke John, who later became Duke Philip the Good, and founded the Order of the Golden Fleece, see n.2 above

APPENDIX R8

RECIPIENTS OF THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE: LIVERY¹

NAME	RETHEL'S WEDDING 1402 ²	KING'S LIVERY 1396 ³	OTHER
1. Aunay, d'	(Jehan) ⁴	-	-
2. Bar, de		x +2 Chlrs.	(Jousting 1389, 1390; Queen's entry 1389) ⁵
3. Basoches, de	-	-	-
4. Belliere, de	-	-	-
5. Blondel	x	(Blondel?) ⁶	Mourning ⁷
6. Bois, du	x	(Jehan du Boys) ⁸	Mourning ⁷
7. Boves, des	x	x	-
8. Bretagne, de	-	-	-
9. Brimeu, de	x	-	-
10. Calonne, Bo	-	-	-
11. Calonne, de	Jehan ⁸	-	-
12. Chalon, de	-	-	-
13. Chambly, de	-	-	-
14. Chantemerle de	x	(Chantemelle) ⁹	-
15. Chateau- giron, de	(Chateau- giron) ¹⁰	-	-
16. Chauffour, de	x	(Raillart) ¹¹	
17. Chiney	-	-	-
18. Courcelles	x	(Courcelles) ¹²	-
19. Craon, de	-	-	Mourning ⁷
20. Croy, de	-	-	-
21. Desquees	-	-	-
22. Flandres, de	x	(Batard de Flandres) ¹³	Mourning ⁷
23. Fontaines, de	x	(Anthoine de Font....) ¹⁴	-
24. Four, du	-	-	-

APPENDIX R8

NAME	1402	1396	OTHER
25. Gavre, de	-	-	-
26. Grignaux, de	x	-	-
27. Hangest, de	-	-	-
28. Jaucourt, de	-	x	-
29. Joigny, de	? ¹⁵	-	-
30. La Muce, de	-	-	-
31. La Roche-rousse, de	(x) ¹⁶	x	-
32. La Tour, de	-	-	-
33. La Tremoille George de	-	-	-
34. Guillaume dex	-	-	-
35. Guyot de	x	-	Mourning ⁷
36. Jean de	x	-	-
37. Pierre de	x	x	Mourning ⁷
38. La Viesvillex de	(x) ¹⁷	-	-
39. Le Voyer	-	-	-
40. Lonroy, de	x	-	-
41. Monchy, de	x	-	-
42. Montagu, de	-	-	Livery badge ¹⁸
43. Montauban, de-	-	-	-
44. Montigny, de	x	Fouquet	Archer livery ¹⁹
45. Neufchatel, de-	-	-	-
46. Poix, de	x	-	-
47. Pot	-	-	Negotiation ²⁰ Livery badge? ²¹ (Livery collars) ²²
48. Rambures, de	x (x) ²³	x	-
49. Renforcat	-	-	-
50. Saint Pol	-	-	-
51. Triart, de	-	-	-
52. Vergy, de	-	x	-
53. Vienne, de	x	x	-

APPENDIX R8

NAME	1402	1396	OTHER
54. Vorne, de	-	-	-
55. Zevenberghe, de-		-	-
56., 57., 58., 59., 60. Ducal Family			
56. Bourgogne, de	x	x?	1389/90 ⁵
57. Bretagne, de	-	-	-
58. Nevers, de	x	-	1389/90 ⁵ Mourning? ²⁴
59. Philippe	x	-	Mourning? ²⁴
60. Rethel, de	x ²⁵		Mourning? ²⁴

1. Livery in the modern sense of a distribution of clothes, or fabric for clothes, at the same time, in identical form and colours, to a large group of people for a particular occasion - see Chapter 1. 'x' indicates that the person concerned received the livery; names in parentheses are those given in the texts, where there is doubt about the identification.
2. This refers to the provision of green and white clothes, in velvet for knights, and in silk for squires, for the wedding of Duke Philip's second son, Anthony, to the daughter of the Count of Saint Pol in April 1402. References are drawn from ADCO B1532, ff.272-273, and from ADCO B301, P.S.390, which lists the cloth ordered in 1402 from 2 Paris merchants, '*pour faire robes de livree pour monditseigneur et pour les autres seigneurs, chevaliers et escuiers a qui monditseigneur les a donne a la feste des noces de monseigneur de Rethel son fils...*', together with the names of those receiving it, which numbered 100 in total. See also Plancher, vol. III, Notes XXIV
3. This refers to the provision of clothes for those in Duke Philip's company attending King Charles VI at his meeting with Richard II in 1396 for the marriage between the latter and the former's daughter, Isabelle. References are drawn from ADCO B341, an order for payment dated January 1397, which lists those '*qui ont este vestus de la livree que le roy a faite ou voyage de l'assamble de lui et du roy d'Engleterre lesquelles personnes*

APPENDIX R8

ont este avec monseigneur le duc de bourgoigne ou dit voyage'.

4. Galois' brother
5. February 1389, green velvet jousting costumes for Duke Philip, his son John, and Edward's brother, Philip of Bar, and green shields for 40 knights and 25 squires who paraded with them, see Prost, vol.2, items 3279 and 3310; August 1389, matching clothes for Duke Philip's son John, Philip of Bar, 26 knights and 26 squires, with gold suns as one device, for the first entry of Charles VI's queen, Isabelle, into Paris, and the marriage of Charles' brother, Louis, to Valentina Visconti, see Prost, vol.2, items 3253 and 3254; 1390, red and white jousting costumes, with a white crescent device, for Duke Philip, his son John, his son-in-law the Count of Ostrevant, and his nephew Philip of Bar, for the king's visit to Dijon, see Prost, vol.2, items 3433 and 3438, referred to in item 3462 as a 'livree'
6. Just 'Blondel', so could have been Guillaume or Jean
7. Mourning clothes for Duke Philip's funeral. See ADCO B1538, f.238, which lists some 26 household members who received lined robes and chapperons , including M. du Bois and Guillaume Blondel as chamberlains of Anthony, Count of Rethel
8. Possibly du Bois, but no title given
9. No Christian name given, so could be his father
10. No Christian name or title given, so could have been Thibaut, not the Order recipient
11. No surname or title given, but likely to be de Chauffour, as the name was unusual in the ducal accounts
12. No Christian name or title, so could be another family member
13. Not specified as Robert. At this date it could have been one of his elder brothers
14. Name incomplete, but likely to be the Order recipient
15. Petit, Les Sires de Noyers, p.214, says that he was present and wore the livery, but he is not listed among those whose clothes Duke Philip provided
16. A Gieffroy de La Rocherousse, probably a relation, see ADCO B1532, f.273
17. Both Jean and Coppin -see App. R1-38, n.4
18. See App. R3, n.43

APPENDIX R8

19. See App. R6, n.59. See also ADCO B1532, ff.346v and 351 for payments the Duke made in May and September 1402 to 16 archers he ordered to come from Arras to accompany him wherever he went in France
20. He was one of 25 princes and lords to whom Duke Philip sent a black outfit with some common devise for the reception of the English embassy at his Hôtel d'Artois, in Paris, to discuss the marriage of his great niece, Isabelle, the daughter of Charles VI, and Richard II -see Pot, *Histoire*, p.42, and P., vol.22, p.262
21. 19 May 1403, Duke Philip bought for 200 francs from Renier '*ung fermail dor a la devise dicellui seigneur*', and gave it to a visiting lord. The form of the devise is not specified. ADCO B1538, f.166v
22. In October 1405 Duke John bought from him a collar with his devise for 99 francs and gave it to Messire Philippe de Harcourt; and in March 1406 bought a similar silver and gold collar for 90 francs and gave it to Messire Christophe de Lichtenstein, a knight and chamberlain of the king. ADCO B1543, ff.126 and 128v. It is not clear whether these and the fermail in n.21 had previously belonged to Pierre, or whether, as the Dukes' chamberlain, he had acquired them for them.
23. Both Andrieu and David, ADCO B1532, f.272
24. It seems unlikely that Philip's 3 sons would not have worn mourning at their father's funeral
25. ADCO B1532, f.286 '*drap blanc dont on a fait la devise de la livree des pages, palefreniers et varlets de monditseigneur et ceulx dudit Anthoine monsieur*' - possibly for Rethel's wedding

APPENDIX R9

RECIPIENTS OF THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE: LOYALTY¹

NAME	REMARKED ²	CONTINUED AFTER 1404 ³
1. Aunay, de		Neutral? Primarily to Kg(Jean to Burgundy) ⁴
2. Bar, de		Burgundy to 1413; then Armagnac ⁵
3. Basoches, de		No evidence
4. Belliere, de		No evidence; probably to Duke of Brittany ⁶
5. Blondel		Burgundy at least to 1407-8 ⁷
6. Bois, du	<i>'loial service'</i> 1403 ⁸	Burgundy at least to 1413 ⁹
7. Boves, des		Burgundy at least to 1409 ¹⁰
8. Bretagne, de		No evidence; probably to Queen of England ¹¹
9. Brimeu, de	<i>'ame et feal'</i> 1408 ¹²	Strongly to Burgundy, at least to 1421 ¹³
10. Calonne, Bo		Burgundy at least to 1410 ¹⁴
11. Calonne, de		Burgundy at least to 1408 or 1410 ¹⁵
12. Chalon, de		Burgundy?(Father strongly so) ¹⁶
13. Chambly, de		Neutral? Primarily to King ¹⁷
14. Chantemerle, de		Orleanist? Primarily to King; returned to Burgundy 1412? ¹⁸
15. Chateaugiron, de		Dead (Sons probably to Dk of Brittany) ¹⁹
16. Chauffour, de		No evidence (Sons to Burgundy to 1418) ¹⁹
17. Chiney		No evidence

APPENDIX R9

NAME	REMARKED	CONTINUED AFTER 1404
18. Courcelles	<i>'longs et loials services'</i> 1395 ²¹	Burgundy at least to 1407, and possibly to 1410 or 1418 ²²
19. Craon, de		Burgundy to his death in 1415 ²³
20. Croy, de		Burgundy to his death in 1415 (Sons continued) ²⁴
21. Desquees		Primarily to King? ²⁵
22. Flandres, de		Burgundy, until death in 1434? ²⁶
23. Fontaines, de		Burgundy at least to 1417 ²⁷
24. Four, du		Burgundy at least to 1417 ²⁸
25. Gavre, de		Probably to Duke of Brittany ²⁹
26. Grignaux, de		Uncertain ³⁰
27. Hangest, de		Uncertain ³¹
28. Jaucourt, de		Family to Burgundy ³²
29. Joigny, de		Burgundy ³³
30. La Muce, de		Probably to Duke of Brittany ³⁴
31. La Roche-rousse, de	<i>'ame et feal'</i> ³⁵	Burgundy to death? ³⁶
32. La Tour, de		No evidence
33. La Tremoille	George de (<i>'services fait longuement et loyalment'</i>) ³⁷	Initially to Burgundy later to King ³⁸
34. Guillaume de		Burgundy to death
35. Guyot de		Burgundy to 1407-8 perhaps later ³⁹
36. Jean de		Burgundy to death

NAME	REMARKED	CONTINUED AFTER 1404
37. La Tremoille	<i>'services fait Pierre de longuement et loyalment'</i> ⁴⁰	Burgundy
38. La Viesville, de		Burgundy to 1408; family later ⁴¹
39. Le Voyer		Probably to Duke of Brittany ⁴²
40. Lonroy, de		Burgundy to death ⁴³
41. Monchy, de	<i>'ame et feal'</i> ⁴⁴	Burgundy to 1409 ⁴⁴
42. Montagu, de		Primarily to King? Seen as Orleanist ⁴⁵
43. Montauban, de		Probably to Duke of Brittany; some family to Burgundy ⁴⁶
44. Montigny, de	<i>'services fait longuement et loyalment'</i> ⁴⁷	Burgundy to at least 1414
45. Neufchatel, de	<i>'ame et feal'</i> ⁴⁸	To Burgundy
46. Poix, de		Burgundy to death
47. Pot	<i>'services fait longuement et loyalment' 'ame et feal'</i> ⁴⁹	Burgundy to death 1432
48. Rambures, de		Burgundy and King to death ^{43,50}
49. Renforcat		No evidence
50. Saint Pol		Burgundy to death
51. Triart, de		No evidence
52. Vergy, de	<i>'ame et feal cousin'</i> ⁵¹	Burgundy to death
53. Vienne, de		Burgundy
54. Vorne, de		No evidence
55. Zevenberghe, de		No evidence
56., 58., 59., 60.	Ducal Family	All to Burgundy
57. Bretagne, de		Brittany and Queen ⁵²

APPENDIX R9

1. This appendix notes evidence about Order recipients' loyalty to the Burgundian ^{Dukes} before and after its distribution
2. This notes archival references, in terms, to the recipient's loyalty
3. This notes instances of loyalty, where known, to Duke Philip's son, John the Fearless, both before and after his involvement in the murder of his cousin, the Duke of Orleans, in 1407; to his grandson, Philip the Good, after Duke John's murder in 1418; and to Duke Philip's other sons, Anthony and Philip, who supported John the Fearless. The Breton recipients who were supporters of Duke John V of Brittany are assumed, unless there is evidence to the contrary, to have followed him in supporting the Queen of France and, eventually, the Armagnac cause.
4. See Appendix R1-1. DBF., vol.4, col.645 notes that he was part of the Great Council of the Crown from 1406, which in 1411 authorised John the Fearless to pursue the League, and that he was with the King and Duke John in 1412 at the siege of Bourges, held by the Armagnacs. A Jean d'Aunay, probably his brother, served Duke John as maître d'hôtel in 1401, 1407, 1408, 1409 and, along with the most loyal and valued servants, including La Rocherousse, was exempted from Duke John's general withholding of pensions and gages in 1407. See ADCO B383; B1554, f.46; P.A., vol.VIII, p.883; and App. R5, n.7
5. See Appendix R1-2, particularly n.4
6. See Appendix R1-4. As he was certainly chamberlain to Duke John V of Brittany in 1413, shortly before his death in 1415, it seems likely he would have followed that Duke, rather than Duke Philip, and there is no evidence of further links between him and the Burgundian court after Duke Philip's death
7. See Appendix R1-5, particularly nn. 3 and 4. He served Anthony, later Duke of Brabant, Duke John's brother, and followed him in supporting the Burgundian cause, at least in 1405, and probably for as long as he remained in Anthony's service
8. See ADCO B1532, f.227, where his loyal service is specifically mentioned in the justification for a don of 200 francs.
9. See Appendix R1-6, particularly nn. 5,6 and 7
10. See Appendix R1-7, particularly nn. 3 and 4.

APPENDIX R9

11. See Appendix R1-8, particularly n.1. It is not clear whether he did in fact return to Brittany after going to England with the Duchess of Brittany when she became Queen of England, but there is no evidence that he served the Burgundians.
12. See ADCO B1554, f.216v and 226v
13. See Appendix R1-9, particularly nn.4, 5 and 6, and Appendix R11, nn. 21 and 23
14. See Appendix R1-10, note 4, and Appendix R11, n.21
15. Both possible candidates supported Duke John, see Appendix R1-11, nn. 2 and 3, and App. R11, nn.21, 25 and 27
16. Although I could find little direct evidence in the archives, it seems likely that de Chalon would have supported the later Burgundian Dukes, as his father did, and as he was married into the de La Trémoille family, which strongly supported the Dukes. See Appendix R1-12, nn. 5, 8 and 10
17. See Appendix R1-13, and n.7. By 1411, he was one of the King's Council, and party to the King's commission to Antoine de Craon and David de Rambures to take arms against the Duke of Orleans, but was also part of the commission established to review the confiscations of Armagnac partisans' lands. See P., vol.1, pp.669 and 671 (ADCO B11893)
18. Although his father had served the Duke of Orleans, this was before the antagonism between Duke Philip and Orleans became marked, and it is not clear how strongly Taupinet supported Orleans after Duke Philip's death. Members of his family remained staunchly Burgundian, and it appears that Taupinet's loyalty was primarily to the king, and that initially he took no clear side. By September 1411, he was part of a Council held by the Duke of Guyenne (which also included the Count of Saint Pol, the Seigneur of St. George, Antoine de Craon, Charles de Chambly and the Galois d'Aunay from the Order), which agreed a letter from the King ordering Duke John to command men-at-arms against hostile troops in the Vermandois. See P., vol.1, p.669 (ADCO B11879). See also Appendix R1-14, nn. 8 and 9
19. The Order recipient died around the same time as Duke Philip. His successors were loyal to the Dukes of Brittany, and probably followed him in supporting the Queen and then Orleans. See

APPENDIX R9

Appendix R1-15, n.4

20. Although I can find no evidence of him actively supporting the Dukes after 1404, he was Captain of Vesoul until 1415, so must have been loyal to them. See Appendix R1-16. His son Henry's long service to Duke John, and many journeys in arms, are referred to in a quittance of 1418 for 600 francs -P., vol.23, p.339, and his other son, Jean, was serving the Duke as as écuyer de l'écurie in 1417 -P., vol.23, p.437
21. See ADCO B1503,f.86v, and Appendix R5, n.36
22. See Appendices R1-18, n.3 and R11, n.21
23. Antoine's career was closely tied to that of Duke John. See Appendix R1-19, nn.3 and 8. He was exempted from the general retrenchment in pensions and gages in 1407, see n.4 above.
24. Another strong supporter. See Appendix R1-20, nn. 3 and 7. He was exempted from the general retrenchment in pensions and gages in 1407, see n.4 above
25. There is no clear record of support for the Burgundians after Duke Philip's death, and he seems to have moved into the King's service. See Appendix R1-21
26. Remained loyal to Burgundy after the death of Duke Philip, and of his half-sister, Philip's wife, serving both John the Fearless and Philip the Good. Died in 1434. See Appendix R1-22
27. See Appendix R1-23
28. See Appendix R1-24
29. See Appendix R1-25
30. See Appendix R1-26
31. See Appendix R1-27
32. See Appendix R1-28, especially n.4
33. See Appendix R1-29
34. See Appendix R1-30. Without evidence, it seems likely he would have followed the Duke of Brittany's line
35. See ADCO B353, 1.72, c.67 for 1390, and 1.72, c.62 for 1392 in authorisations for gifts
36. Exempted from the general retrenchment of pension and gages, see Appendix R1-31 and n.4 above
37. In Duke Philip's gift of Jonvelle to George's father, Guy VI, there is reference to Guy's '*grans continuels bons et agreables*

APPENDIX R9

*services que nostre bien ame et feal chevalier et chambellan
Messire Guy de la Tremoille nous a fait longuement et loyalment
sans cesser..* Plancher, vol.III, Preuves LX

38. See Appendix R1-33
39. See Appendix R1-35
40. Mentioned in the award of a pension to him in 1378 -ADCO B1454, f.28v, and in a don in 1383-4 -ADCO B1461, f.126v
41. See Appendix R1-38
42. See Appendix R1-39
43. See Appendix R1-40, and particularly the retention of his wages to help pay for John the Fearless' ransom - something the Duke would have risked only with a loyal officer
44. See Appendix R1-41 and ADCO B354 in an authorisation dated 1409
45. See Appendix R1-42. Christine de Pisan, in her book on Charles V, written at Duke Philip's behest, refers to him as loyal to the King -see Solente, Charles V, p.179. Henneman, Clisson, p.184, says he was seen as an Orleanist when appointed Grand Maître d'Hôtel in 1401; and Autrand, Charles VI, p.431, opines that when, in 1408, he was one of those who signed the decision to annul the letters of grace which had been given to Duke John after his murder of Orleans, he was part of the 'old team' - that is, partisans of Orleans or members of the government of Charles V
46. See Appendix R1-43
47. See ADCO B1519, f.140 for 1400
48. See Appendix R1-45 and ADCO B1058, in a letter referring to Jean in July 1403
49. See Appendix R5, n.142 and ADCO B353, l.72, c.76 in a gift authorisation of 1391/2
50. See Appendix R1-48 and n.44 above
51. ADCO B1554, f.218v, by Duke John in February 1408
52. See Appendix R1-57

APPENDIX R10

 RECIPIENTS OF THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE: ACTIVITIES
 1402-1404¹

NAME	BRITTANY ²	PARIS ³	OTHER ⁴
1. Aunay, d'	x ⁵	-	-
2. Bar, de	-	-	-
3. Basoches, de	-	-	-
4. Belliere, de	? ⁶	-	-
5. Blondel	-	-	-
6. Bois, du	-	-	-
7. Boves, des	-	-	-
8. Bretagne, de	x ⁷	-	-
9. Brimeu, de	-	-	-
10. Calonne, Bo	-	-	-
11. Calonne, de	? ⁸	-	-
12. Chalon, de	x ⁹	-	(Savoy) ¹⁰
13. Chambly, de	x ⁵	-	-
14. Chantemerle, de-		-	-
15. Chateau- giron, de	x ¹¹	-	-
16. Chauffour, de	-	-	-
17. Chiney	-	-	-
18. Courcelles	-	-	-
19. Craon, de	-	-	-
20. Croy, de	-	-	-
21. Desquees	-	-	-
22. Flandres, de	x ¹²	(Victor)	-
23. Fontaines, de	-	-	-
24. Four, du	-	x ¹⁶	Lorraine ¹³ ; Savoy ¹⁴ ; Milan ¹⁵
25. Gavre, de	x ¹⁷	-	-
26. Grignaux, de	x ¹⁸	-	England ¹⁹
27. Hangest, de	-	-	-
28. Jaucourt, de	-	-	-
29. Joigny, de	x ²⁰	x ¹⁶	-
30. La Muce, de	x ²¹	-	-

APPENDIX R10

NAME	BRITTANY	PARIS	OTHER
31. La Rocherousse de-		-	x ¹⁶
32. La Tour, de	-	-	-
33. La Tremoille			
George de	-	-	-
34. Guillaume de	-	-	-
35. Guyot de	-	-	-
36. Jean de	-	-	-
37. Pierre de	x ²²	x ²³	-
38. La Viesville, de-		-	-
39. Le Voyer	x ²⁴	-	-
40. Lonroy, de	-	-	-
41. Monchy, de	-	-	-
42. Montagu, de	x ²⁵	-	-
43. Montauban, de	x ²⁶	-	-
44. Montigny, de	x ²⁷	-	-
45. Neufchatel, de-		x ¹⁶	Savoy ²⁸
46. Poix, de	x ²⁹	-	-
47. Pot	x ³⁰	-	Hungary ³⁰
48. Rambures, de	(x) ³¹	(x) ¹⁶	-
49. Renforcat	-	x ¹⁶	-
50. Saint Pol	x ³²	-	England ¹⁹
51. Triart, de	-	-	-
52. Vergy, de	? ³³	x ¹⁶	Lorraine ^{13, 34} Savoy ¹⁴ Montréal ³⁵
53. Vienne, de	-	x ³⁶	-
54. Vorne, de	-	-	-
55. Zevenberghe, de-		-	-
56., 57., 58., 59., 60. Ducal Family			
56. Bourgogne, de	x	x	x
57. Bretagne, de	x	-	-
58. Nevers, de	x	x	-
59. Philippe	-	-	-
60. Rethel, de	x	x	-

APPENDIX R10

1. This Appendix explores the known activities of the recipients of the Order in the period around its giving, to see whether Duke Philip had a particular reason to reward them or to secure their support. Involvement is marked with an 'x'
2. This refers primarily to the Duke's visit to Brittany in the autumn of 1402, immediately prior to the gift of the Order
3. This refers to the Duke's summoning of armed men to Paris in 1401/2 to support him against a mercenary force under the Duke of Orleans which was threatening the city
4. Since the recipients were military men, particular note is made of involvement in armed incidents and border disputes in the period
5. See ADCO B1532, f.366, for recompense for his expenses in accompanying Duke Philip to Brittany
6. Likely to have met Duke Philip during his Brittany trip
7. See ADCO B1532, f.252v, for a present to him on the Brittany trip
8. One of the possible recipients was with the Duke in Brittany. See Appendix R1-11, n.2
9. See ADCO B1538, f.203, for a gift of clothes to him in Brittany
10. See Plancher, vol.III, p.191
11. See ADCO B1532, f.253, for presents from Duke Philip while he was visiting Brittany in 1402, and when he brought John V back to France and then Burgundy in 1403-4
12. P., vol.24, p.22 (ADCO B370) gives a quittance for 15 francs from Robert *'a lui donner pour l'habiller au voyage de Bretagne ou le duc entend aler'*
13. See ADCO B1538, ff.80 and 80v, for evidence of him accompanying the Marshal of Burgundy against the Duke of Lorraine in July 1402
14. See ADCO B1538, f.80, for a trip to Montréal to combat the incursions of Savoy
15. See ADCO B1538, f.79v for a trip made sometime before October 1403, on Duke Philip's behalf, to the Duke of Milan, on which he reported back to the Duke while he was in Normandy. He then accompanied Philip's son John from Rouen to see the Dauphin and then on to the Duchess of Burgundy at Douai, before returning to Philip's capital of Dijon
16. See Petit, Les Sires de Noyers, p.214, and Plancher,

APPENDIX R10

- vol.III, Notes XXIII, pp.572-3
17. See ADCO B1532, f.251 for a present to him in Brittany. The gift in late January 1403 might suggest that he returned to Burgundy with Duke Philip and Duke John V of Brittany -see Appendix R6, n.35
 18. See ADCO B1532, f.253 for a present to him when he was with Duke Philip in Brittany
 19. With Waleran of Luxembourg -see Appendix R6, n.36
 20. He received a present from Duke Philip at Christmas 1402, see ADCO B1532, f.277v. See also Petit, Itinéraires, p.330
 21. There is no other reference to him in the Duke of Burgundy's accounts but, as he was a supporter of the de Montfort Dukes, it seems likely that Duke Philip would have met in Brittany in 1402
 22. With Duke Philip in Brittany -see ADCO B1532, f.253; and App. R3, n.35
 23. See n.20 above and ADCO B339, l.74 for jewels distributed by Duke Philip to those he ordered to come to him in Paris, certificated by Pierre
 24. See Appendix R3, n.41
 25. In 1402, the Orleanists had tried to get Clisson appointed as regent in Brittany, a move which Duke Philip needed to stop to prevent his rival getting control of that Duchy. Some historians think his entertainment of a number of Marmousets and Orleanists, including Montagu, in the May, was designed to combat this, Henneman, Clisson, p.195, thinks it more likely that Philip was trying to regain control of the financial administration of France, (which he succeeded in doing in the summer) by appealing to the frugal policies of the Marmousets against Orleans' acquisitiveness. Given his position, however, Montagu must at least have been party to Charles VI's decision in September 1402 to send Philip to arrange Breton affairs
 26. Received a gift from Duke Philip in Brittany -see App. R3, n.47
 27. Probably with Duke Philip in Brittany, because the Duke ordered him to give a horse worth 100 écus to a Breton knight in 1402 -see P., vol.23, p.548
 28. Plancher, vol.III, pp.191 and fol.
 29. See ADCO B1532, f.161v for a don for going with the Duke to

APPENDIX R10

Brittany.

30. He went on a trip to Hungary for Duke Philip, before following him to Brittany, and was then sent back to Paris in October to report on the Duke's success in securing the wardship of Duke John V and control of the Duchy, Pot, Histoire, p.82, and Appendix R6, n.64
31. See Appendix R3, n.59 for a present to David in Brittany and in 1402
32. See App. R5, n.151 for a don covering his expenses in accompanying the Duke to Brittany, and App. R3, n.62 for a jewelled fermail received on the trip
33. The Duke gave a diamond worth 30 escus to one of Vergy's squires in Brittany, which suggests Vergy might have been with him there, ADCO B1532, f.252
34. See also App. R6, n.69 for a secret trip in January and February 1403
35. See also App. R6, n.70
36. See App. R3, n.64

APPENDIX R11

RECIPIENTS OF THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN TREE: MILITARY WORTH

NAME	POSITION ¹	CAMPAIGNS	MUSTERS	OTHER ²
1. Aunay, de	Gov. & Capt. Flanders Meaux ³	1382-3; Roosebecke 1383 ⁵ Germany 1388 ⁶	-	(Brittany 1381) ⁴
2. Bar, de	-	Brabant 1398 ⁷	1398 ⁷	Paris 1409 ⁸ Paris 1410 ⁹
3. Basoches, de	Desiré? 1387 ¹⁰	-	(Burgundy - 1359?) ¹¹	-
4. Belliere, de	Capt. Dinan 1413 ¹²	-	-	(Brittany 1380s) ¹³
5. Blondel	-	Brabant 1387 ¹⁴	Brabant 1387 ¹⁴	Paris 1405 ¹⁵
6. Bois, du	Capt. l'Ecluse 1412-13 ¹⁶	-	-	Paris 1405 ¹⁵ 1412-13 ¹⁶
7. Boves, des	Capt. Saint Germain en Laye 1415	-	(Brabant 1387) ¹⁴ Brittany 1394 ¹⁸	Brittany 1392? ¹⁷
8. Bretagne, de	-	-	-	-
9. Brimeu, de	Capt. Beauquesne 1410, 1415-6, Louvre 1415, Liège Crotoy 1415, 1408 ²² Bailli d'Amiens 1410, 15-16, 18 ²³	English 1405 ¹⁹	Arras 1405 ²⁰ Paris 1405, 1410, 1413, 1417 ²¹ Liège 1408 ²²	JF 1407/8, 1408/9, 1409/10, 1410, 1413 ²¹
10. Calonne, Bo	-	Luxembourg 1401 ²⁴	Paris 1410 ²¹	JF 1407/8, 1408/9, 1409 -10 ²¹

APPENDIX R11

NAME	POSITION	CAMPAIGNS	MUSTERS	OTHER
11. Calonne, de	-	English 1405 ²⁶ (Liege 1408) ²⁸	-	JF 1408 ²⁵ 1408/9 ²¹ 1410 ²⁷
12. Chalon, de	-	(Roosebecke - 1383) ⁵ (Liège 1408) ²²	-	(JF 1405, 1407/8, 1409/10) ²¹
13. Chambly, de	Capt. Viviers- en-Brie 1392 ³⁰	Picardy 1377 & Normandy 1378 ²⁹ Flanders 1382-3; Roosebecke 1383 ⁵ Normandy 1388 ³¹ Germany 1388 ⁶	-	-
14. Chantemerle de	Capt. Gisors 1400-15 ³²	-	(Brittany - 1394) ¹⁸	-
15. Chateaugiron, de-		-	-	-
16. Chauffour, de	Capt. Vesoul 1393-1415 ³⁴	Brabant 1387 ¹⁴	(Dijon 1367) ³³	(JF 1405) ¹⁵ 1410 ²¹
17. Chiney	-	-	-	-
18. Courcelles	Gov. in Beaufort 1399 ³⁵	Brabant 1387 ¹⁴	Beauvais 1417 ²¹	-
19. Craon, de	Capt. St. Quentin 1406, 1420 ³⁷	Liège 1408 ¹⁹	Brabant 1398 ⁷ Paris 1405 ³⁸	Guelders 1400 ³⁶ JF 1405 ¹⁵

APPENDIX R11

NAME	POSITION	CAMPAIGNS	MUSTERS	OTHER
Craon, de (cont 'd)				JF 1408, 1409/10, 141313 ²¹ Fd'A 1409 ³⁹
20. Croy, de	Gov. Artois 1405 ⁴¹	Normandy 1376/74 ² Navarre 1378 ⁴² Roosebecke 1383 ⁵ Brabant 1398 ⁷ Liège 1406, 1408 ^{22, 44}	Arras 1405 ²⁰ Paris 1408/9, 1410, 1411 ²¹	Paris 1398 ⁴⁰ JF 1405 ⁴³ 1411, 1413 ²¹
21. Desquees	-	-	-	-
22. Flandres, de	-	-	-	JF 1409- 10 ^{21, 45}
23. Fontaines, de	(Capt. Vaul) ⁴⁶	-	Arras 1405 ²⁰ Paris 1410 ⁴⁷ 1417 ²¹	JF 1405 ¹⁵ 1407-8, 1410 ²¹
24. Four, du	Chatelain Gray 1397-1415 ⁴⁹		Lille 1386 ⁴⁸ Beauvais 1417 ²¹	Franche Comté 1402-4 ⁵⁰
25. Gavre, de	-	-	-	-
26. Grignaux, de	Capt. Talmont sur Gironde 1409 Gov. La Rochelle 1414 ⁵¹	-	-	-
27. Hangest, de	Capt. Chauny- 1411 ⁵²		(Lille 1384/5) ⁵³	(Flanders 1405) ⁵⁴

APPENDIX R11

NAME	POSITION	CAMPAIGNS	MUSTERS	OTHER
28. Jaucourt, de	(Standard bearer 1373-83 Gov. Nevers 1384-91) ⁵⁶	(Lorraine 1377 Normandy 1378 Nevers 1387) ⁵⁷	Brabant 1387 ¹⁴ Brittany 1394 ¹⁸	Brittany 1397 ⁵⁵
29. Joigny, de	-	-	(Beauvais 1417) ⁵⁸	Paris 1405 ¹⁵
30. La Muce, de	-	-	-	-
31. La Roche-rousse, de	Capt. Bayeux 1402/3, Chatelain Longueville 1408 ⁶⁰	v. English 1406 ⁵⁹	Brabant 1387 ¹⁴ Brittany 1394 ¹⁸	JF 1405-6, 1408 ²¹
32. La Tour, de	-	-	-	-
33. La Tremoille George de	Capt. Cherbourg 1413 ⁶¹	(Roosebecke- 1383) ^{5, 62} (Brabant 1387) ¹⁴		Fd'A 1409 ⁶³
34. Guillaume de	-	Guienne 1398 ⁶⁴	Brittany 1394 ¹⁸	-
35. Guyot de	-	-	-	JF 1405 ¹⁵ Brabant 1407 ⁶³
36. Jean de	-	-	(1414) ⁶⁶	Brabant 1407 ⁶⁵
37. Pierre de	-	-	Brabant 1387 ¹⁴	JF 1407-8 ²¹
38. La Viesville de	(Capt. Gen. - Artois & Picardy 1415 Capt. of Castles) ⁶⁸	-	Brabant 1387 ¹⁴ (Tournai 1390) ⁶⁷ Brabant	JF 1407-8 ²¹ (1410) ²¹

APPENDIX R11

NAME	POSITION	CAMPAIGNS	MUSTERS	OTHER
La Viesville, de (cont'd)			1398 ⁷ (Beauvais 1417) ²¹	
39. Le Voyer	-	-	-	v. England 1386 ⁶⁹
40. Lonroy, de	Capt. Ardres- Lieut. West Flanders 1410 Lieut. Picardy 1414 ⁷⁰		Lille 1384 ⁷¹ Brabant 1398 ⁷ 1405 ⁷²	-
41. Monchy, de	Capt. - Falaise 1411 ⁷³		-	JF 1407-8, 1408-9 ²¹
42. Montagu, de	Capt. Gov. - Bastille 1398	Roosebecke- 1383 ⁵		Bar/ Lorraine 1406 ⁷⁴
43. Montauban, de	Held Dinan (Roosebecke 1402 ⁷⁷	1383) ⁷⁵		(JF 1410) ⁷⁶
44. Montigny, de	Capt. Juilly - le Chatel 1403 ⁷⁸		Brittany 1394 ¹⁸ Paris 1410 ⁴⁷ Chatillon- sur-Seine 1414 ⁸⁰	JF 1405, 10, 1414 ⁷⁹
45. Neufchatel, de	Gov. Cty of Burgundy 1411-14, Marshal of Duchy 1413, Gov. 1416, Capt. Gen. Rheims & Chalon 1417 ⁸²	Liège 1408 ²²		JF 1405-6, 1410, 1413 ²¹
46. Poix, de	Gov. Pont- Audemer		Paris 1405 ²¹	JF 1405, 1407-8, 1409, 1410 ²¹

APPENDIX R11

NAME	POSITION	CAMPAIGNS	MUSTERS	OTHER
47. Pot	Chatelain St-Romain 1408, Gov. Dauphiné 1409-11 ⁸³	Flanders 1384	Paris 1417 ²¹	-
48. Rambures, de	Capt. Boulogne 1382, Gravelines 1387-98 ⁸⁴	v. English 1364, Normandy 1367, 1378, Picardy 1380-1 ⁸⁴ Roosebecke 1383 ⁵	(Beauvais (1405) ⁸⁴ 1417) ²¹	
49. Renforcat	-	-	-	-
50. Saint Pol	Capt. Creil, Chatelain Lille ⁸⁷ Constable France, Capt. Paris 1411 ⁸⁷	Guelders 1388 ⁸⁶ Brabant 1398 ⁸⁶	Brabant 1398 ⁷ Paris 1405 ²¹	JF 1410 ^{21, 85}
51. Triart, de	-	-	-	-
52. Vergy, de	Capt. Faucogney 1393 on, Marshal Burgundy, Hereditary Seneschal ⁸⁹	v. Comps. 1368 ⁸⁸ Picardy 1377 ²⁹ Normandy 1378 ²⁹ Roosebecke 1383 ⁵	Burgundy 1365, 67 ⁸⁸ Tonnerre 1407 ⁹⁰ Liège 1408 ²²	JF 1407-8, 1409-10, 1413 ²¹ 1418 ⁸⁹
53. Vienne, de	Gov. Picardy Languedoc ⁹²	Roosebecke 1383 ⁵ Picardy 1406 ^{35, 91}	Liège 1408 ²² Paris 1409 ²¹	JF 1405, 1410 ²¹
54. Vorne, de	-	-	-	-
55. Zevenberghe, de-	-	-	-	-

APPENDIX R11

NAME	POSITION	CAMPAIGNS	MUSTERS	OTHER
56.,57.,58.,59.,60. Ducal Family				
56.Bourgogne,de	Lieut-Gen.			1356 - 1404 ⁹³
	Burgundy	1363		
	Royal Lieut.			
	Lyon,Champagne	1366		
	Picardy	1369		
	Normandy	1378		
	Capt.Gen.France	1380 ⁹⁴		
57.Bretaigne,de	-	-	-	-
58.Nevers,de	Lieut.Burgundy		Guelders	1404-19 ⁹⁵
	1385 ⁹⁵		1388 ⁹⁵	
59.Philippe				1407,1411 1414 ⁹⁶
60.Rethel,de				1404-1415 ⁹⁷

1. Date and military post given where known.
2. This includes 'Fd'A' = fait d'armes, and instances of supporting Duke Philip or Duke John the Fearless ('JF') in arms
3. See App. R5, n.4
4. Jousts in Brittany, possibly his father, see C.A., vol.1, no.103
5. ADCO B1460, f.106 and B1461, f.112v, for payments by the Duke to people who accompanied him to fight against the Flemish rebels and Plancher, vol.III, Notes XIII for gifts to those who conducted themselves outstandingly in the battle
6. ADCO B1475, ff.62-62v, for payments of 200 francs each for the expense of accompanying the King and Duke Philip to Germany in 1388
7. See P., vol.26, p.39 (ADCO B11753) for a muster under his command to go to help the Duchess of Brabant
8. P., vol.22, p.433 for a list of those going to Paris with Duke John
9. Plancher, vol.III, Notes XXXIII for those accompanying Duke John and the King against the League in September and October 1410
10. See App. R1-3, n.4

APPENDIX R11

11. Hugues and Guillaume de Basoich feature in a muster in 1359 to protect frontiers, but these may be from the de Beauvois family, not that of the recipient. See P., vol.26, pp.507 and 539
12. From Prof. M. Jones' card index, quoting Phillips MS 18465, p.33
13. See App. R1-4 for his father's support of the Duke of Brittany
14. ADCO B11752 (P., vol.24, p.724) muster and review of troops in 1387 for the war in Brabant. See also Plancher, vol.III, Notes XIX
15. See App. R1-5, n.; App. R3, n.7; and ADCO B11761 (P., vol.26, p.81) for September musters; and ADCO B11766 (P., vol.26, p.70) for a review in October in Paris of the company of the Seigneur du Bois. See also Plancher, vol.III, Notes XXVIII; and P., vol.24, p.184 (ADCO B11738) for a quittance by du Bois for his gages and those of 17 knights bachelor, 185 squires, 155 archers and 22 crossbowmen of his company in the army under Duke John to fight for the 'good of the king' (App. R5, n.19)
16. ADCO B11780 (P., vol.26, p.152) for 1412 and 1413 reviews of Jean, Seigneur du Bois d'Annequin, qualified as Captain of l'Ecluse
17. P., vol.26, p.37 (ADCO B11736) for a mandement of Duke Philip, dated 23 July 1392 for sums given to Household officers '*pour se disposer a l'accompagner en Bretagne*'
18. ADCO B11753 (P., vol.26, p.615) for musters of July and October 1394
19. ADCO B1554, f.70 refers to financial assistance, authorised in 1405, to help him pay a ransom to the English
20. P., vol.26, pp.61-3 (ADCO B11756) for a muster in August 1405 under de Croy
21. ADCO B1554, ff.216, 216v, referring to people who were continually with Duke John in arms in June 1407, on a trip from Arras to Amiens to confer with the Duke of Berry, his uncle on the opposing side, and f.221v for periods in arms in February and March 1408. P., vol.26, pp.91-5 (ADCO B11770) for a revue under de Vergy in 1407-8, and P., vol.24, p.472 (ADCO B357) for a quittance for de Brimeu raising and bringing armed men to Paris for Duke John. P., vol.26, pp.101-9 (ADCO B11772) and vol.24,

APPENDIX R11

p.472 (ADCO B357) for certificates by de Brimeu of those serving Duke John in arms in Paris in 1408-9, and for musters received by de Brimeu in late 1409-1410 of people supporting Duke John in Paris, together with P., vol.22, p.434. Plancher, vol.III, Notes XXXIII for those supporting Duke John against the League in 1410. P., vol.23, p.676 (ADCO B355) notes de Brimeu as commissioned in 1413 to receive the musters of men-at-arms who supported Duke John in Paris, and P., vol.22, p.449 lists some of them. P., vol.26, p.305 (ADCO B11788) for those of Duke John's officers mustered at Beauvais by the Duke's order on 31 August 1417

22. ADCO B1554, f.226v, refers to him reviewing troops, and f.228 to payment for himself, another knight bachelor, 43 squires, and 72 archers on this campaign, and Plancher, vol.III, Notes XXIX records those fighting with Duke John against the men of Liège in September 1408. ADCO B1554, f.99 records him as fighting under de Croy, and P., vol.22, p.386 records him as going to Liège.
23. See C.A., vol.1, no.292, and Gallia Regia, vol.1, pp.60 and 104
24. See P., vol.24, p.430 (ADCO B370) for Luxembourg 1401
25. ADCO B1554, f.92 for Jean
26. ADCO B1554, f.83 for Jean
27. P., vol.26, p.115 (ADCO B11775) for a quittance for Guerart, Seigneur de Calonne, a knight bachelor, with squires and archers, fighting against the League
28. ADCO B1554, f.100v for Jean conducting hostages back from Liege
29. Plancher, vol.III, Notes IX, and P., vol. 22, pp.110 and 113
30. C.A.,vol.1, no.97
31. Plancher, vol.III, Notes X
32. His father was also Captain 1372-40. C.A., vol.1, no.256, Gallia Regia, vol.3, pp.402-403
33. P., vol.24, p.715 (ADCO B11747)
34. He was being paid as Captain of Vesoul in 1393-4 -see App. R5, n.35. His son Henry replaced him in 1415 -see P., vol.23, p.260 (ADCO B11834)
35. See Apps. R5, n.36, and R1-18, n.3
36. ADCO B1519, f.128 records Duke Philip assisting with his costs

APPENDIX R11

- in participating in a fait d'armes, as one of 7 French knights against 7 English ones
37. See Broussillon, vol.2, p.265, item 1344; Gallia Regia, vol.VI, p.170
 38. See Broussillon, vol.2, p.264, item 1338
 39. One of 3 French knights fighting 3 English ones at Lille, see P., vol.22, p.420
 40. ADCO B1521, f.26
 41. ADCO B1554, ff.213-213v, for 1705½ francs paid in 1408 to Jean de Croy, as Governor of Artois, for the wages and expenses of 120 men-at-arms raised from Artois to support Duke John against the Duke of Orleans in September and October 1405
 42. See DBF., vol.9, cols.1296-7
 43. P., vol.26, p.621 (ADCO B11754) for a company under him raised for the defence of Flanders, Artois, Picardy and Nevers in May 1405
 44. ADCO B1554, f.228, for a payment of 472½ francs for fighting against the men of Liège in September and October 1408, with 4 knights bachelor, 33 squires and 35 archers
 45. P., vol.22, p.438, with a knight, 13 squires and 1 archer
 46. P., vol.28, p.108 (ADCO B401) indicates that his father, or grandfather, was Captain of Vaul, so the post could have been hereditary. See App. R1-23, nn. 4 and 5
 47. 1410 in Paris, P., vol.24, p.279 (ADCO B11775) with 12 squires in his company; and P., vol.23, p.251 (ADCO B11739) for a quittance for gages for him, 1 knight bachelor, 23 squires and 13 archers to serve the king under Duke John
 48. P., vol.24, p.272 (ADCO B11828) and p.277 (ADCO B347) for 2 quittances of 1397 and 1398, and one for 1400, qualifying him as this from 1397. P., vol.23, p.651 (ADCO B348) still qualifies him as this in 1415
 49. See vol.III, pp.190-2; and P., vol.2, pp.42-3 (ADCO B11875)
 50. Plancher, vol.III, Notes XVII
 51. Gallia Regia, vol.V, pp.301-2, 352
 52. C.A., vol.1, no.218; Gallia Regia, vol.VI, p.163
 53. P., vol.26, p.29 and App. R1-27, n.4
 54. App. R1-27, n.4

APPENDIX R11

55. P., vol.22, p.274
56. His father, see P., vol.24, p.360; ADCO B1461, f.128v; and Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.61
57. His father, see Rauzier, Finances, pp.649,650; and Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.157
58. See n.21 above. By this time Louis was dead, so this must be his de La Trémoille heir
59. ADCO B1543, ff.100v-101
60. See Appendix R1-31, n.5 and Gallia Regia, vol.II,p.75 for 1408
61. See App. R1-33
62. Both his father and his uncle fought with distinction, see App. R1-33
63. Against an Englishman in Lille, see P.,vol.22, p.412
64. See App. R1-34
65. Dons to assist with going to support Duke John's brother, Anthony, Duke of Brabant - 40 francs to Guyot, 25 to Jean - see ADCO B1554, ff.84-84v
66. See P., vol.26, p.185 for a Jean de La Trémoille who must have been the Sire de Jonvelle
67. Sohier - see P., vol.26, p.614
68. See App. R1-38
69. With Breton forces against England - reference from Prof. M. Jones (BN fr.32510, f.286v)
70. C.A., vol.1, no.107
71. P., vol.26, p.31
72. P., vol.26, p.67 for musters of 16 September and 18 October of the men at arms under him, including Jean
73. See App. R1-41
74. See Merlet, p.267. The Duke of Orleans gave him control over the troops sent to help Robert, Duke of Bar, against the Duke of Lorraine, allegedly as a reward for securing a reconciliation with Duke John in 1405
- 75.,76.,77. See App. R1-43, nn.1, 3 and 4
78. App. R1-44, n.2
79. For 1405, see ADCO B1543, f.113v
80. P., vol.26, pp.171-2 for a muster under Jean de Vergy in May 1414

APPENDIX R11

81. ADCO B1543, f.100
82. Gallia Regia, vol.VI, pp.117-8; P.A., vol.VIII, p.576; and App. R1-45
83. For chatelain, see Pot, Histoire, p.118 (in recompense for his wife leaving the household of the Duchess of Orleans, see App. R1-47, n.7); Governor while Duke John was in control of the Dauphin, see *Ibid.*, p.130, and for 1411 ADCO B1563, ff.12, 24v and 75v
84. See Appendix R1-48
85. P., vol.23, pp.77 and 219 for 2 quittances from knights serving under Saint Pol '*pour servir le duc en larmee que fait le roi en la ville de Paris et a lenviron*'
86. Guelders, Vaughan, Philip the Bold, p.103; Brabant, P., vol.24, p.510 for a quittance from a ducal chamberlain serving under Saint Pol against the Duke of Guelders. See also App. R5, n.149
87. Creil, Gallia Regia, vol.V, p.422, before 1413; Lille, P., vol.2, p.420 in his daughter's marriage treaty, and P.A., vol.VIII, p.564; Captain of Paris, Autrand, Charles VI, p.444; Constable, CA., vol.1, no.9
88. 1365 at Semur en Auxois, P., vol.24, p.716; 1367, P., vol.23, p.706; 1368, Rauzier, Finances, p.642
89. See App. R1-52. He was still Captain of Faucogney in 1414 -P., vol.23, p.289
90. See App. R5, n.162
91. ADCO B1543, f.99 and App. R1-18 for a reference to Courcelles going to Picardy in 1406 with Saint George to fight the English
92. CA., vol.1, no.295, Gallia Regia, vol.III, p.480
93. Fought in or oversaw all major campaigns from the battle of Poitiers in 1356 until his death
94. See Vaughan, Philip the Bold, pp.3,12, 40 and 152
95. See Appendix R1-58
96. See Appendix R1-59
97. See Appendix R1-60

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

- Abbott, France - Abbott, P.D., Provinces, Pays and Seigneuries of France, (Canberra, 1981)
- ADCO - Archives Départementales de la Côte-d'Or, Dijon
- AIV - Archives Départementales d'Ille-et-Vilaine, Rennes
- ALA - Archives Départementales de la Loire-Atlantique, Nantes
- AN - Archives Nationales, Paris
- Atiya - Atiya, A.S., The Crusade of Nicopolis, (London, 1934)
- Bd'A - Beaune, H. and Arbaumont, J. de, La Noblesse aux Etats de Bourgogne de 1350 à 1789, (Dijon, 1864)
- Beaune, 'Costume et Pouvoir' - Beaune, C., 'Costume et pouvoir en France à la fin du Moyen Age: les devises royales, vers 1400', Revue des Sciences Humaines, LV, (1981), pp. 125-46
- BN - Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris
- Brabant, Politics, Gender and Genre - Brabant, M., Politics, Gender and Genre: the political thought of Christine de Pizan, (Oxford, 1992)
- Broussillon - Broussillon, B. de, La Maison de Craon 1050-1450, 2 vols., (Paris, 1893)
- C.A. - Bozzolo, C. and Loyau, H., La Cour Amoureuse, dite de Charles VI, 2 vols., (Paris, 1982)
- C-D - Aubert La Chesnaye-Desbois, F.A., Dictionnaire de la Noblesse, (3rd. edition, Paris, 1893)

- David, Train Somptuaire - David, H., Philippe le hardi, duc de Bourgogne et co-régent de France de 1392 à 1404: le train somptuaire d'un grand Valois, (Dijon, 1947)
- David, Protecteur des Arts - David, H., Philippe le hardi, duc de Bourgogne, protecteur des arts, (Dijon, 1947)
- D.B.F. - Dictionnaire de Biographie Française, (Paris, 1933 on)
- D.B.N. - Dictionnaire de Biographie Nationale
- Douet d'Arcq, Pièces Inédites - Douet d'Arcq, L., Choix de pièces Pièces inédites relatives au règne de Charles VI, 2 vols., (Paris, 1863-4)
- Gallia Regia - Dupont-Ferrier, G., Gallia Regia ou état des officiers royaux des bailliages et des sénéchaussées de 1328 à 1515, (Paris, 1942)
- Guenée, Meutre - Guenée, B., Une meutre, une société, (Paris, 1992)
- Guenée, La Folie de Charles VI - Guenée, B., La folie de Charles VI, Roi Bien-Aimé, (Paris, 2004)
- Henneman, Clisson - Henneman, J. B., Olivier de Clisson and Political Society under Charles V and Charles VI, (Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1996)
- Hicks and Moreau, Charles V - Hicks, E. and Moreau, T., Le Livre des Faits et Bonnes Moeurs du roi Charles V, (modern French translation, Paris, 1997)
- Jarry, Louis de France - Jarry, E., La vie politique de Louis de France, duc d'Orléans, (Geneva, 1976, reprint of Paris, Orleans, 1889)
- Kovacs, Orfèvrerie Parisienne - Kovacs, E., L'Age d'Or de l'Orfèvrerie Parisienne au temps des princes de Valois,

(Dijon, 2004)

Knowlson, Jean V - Knowlson, G.A., Jean V, duc de Bretagne et l'Angleterre, (Cambridge, 1964)

La Borderie, Histoire - La Borderie, A. le Moyne de, Histoire de Bretagne, (Rennes, 1896-1899, reprinted Mayenne, 1975)

La Trémoille, Livre des Comptes - La Trémoille, L. de, Livre des Comptes 1395-1406 de Guy de La Trémoille et Marie de Sully, (Nantes, 1887)

Merlet - Merlet, L., 'Biographie de Jean de Montagu, grand maître de France', in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes, 1852, No. 13, 3rd series, vol.3, pp.248-295

M.S.H.D.B - Mémoires de la Société pour l'histoire du droit et des institutions des anciens pays bourguignons

M-V. - Marchal-Verdoodt, M., Table des noms de personnes et de lieux mentionnés dans les plus anciens comptes de la recette générale de Philippe le Hardi, duc de Bourgogne (1383-1389), (Brussels, 1971)

N.B.G. - Nouvelle Biographie Générale, (Paris, 1853)

Ordonnances - Ordonnances de Philippe le Hardi, de Marguerite de Male et de Jean sans Peur: vol.1, 1381-1393, ed. Bautier, J. and Van Nieuwenhuysen, A., (Brussels, 1965), vol.2, 1394-1405, ed. Van Nieuwenhuysen, A., (Brussels, 1974)

P. - Peincedé, J-B, Inventaire de la chambre des comptes de Bourgogne, (Dijon, 1895)

P.A. - Père Anselme de Sainte-Marie, Histoire généalogique et chronologique de la maison royale de France, (Paris, 1726-33)

- Pastoureau, L'Arbre - Pastoureau, M., L'Arbre: histoire naturelle et symbolique de l'arbre, du bois et du fruit au Moyen Age, (Paris, 1993)
- Petit, Itinéraires - Petit, E., Itinéraires de Philippe le Hardi et de Jean sans Peur, ducs de Bourgogne, (Paris, 1888)
- Plancher - Plancher, U., Histoire générale et particulière de Bourgogne, (Dijon, 1739-81)
- Pot, Histoire - Pot, J., Histoire de Regnier Pot, conseiller des ducs de Bourgogne 1362?-1432, (Paris, 1929)
- Prevenier, Le prince et le peuple - Prevenier, W., Le prince et le peuple: la société du temps des Ducs de Bourgogne, (Anvers, 1998)
- P.R.O. - Public Record Office, London
- Prost - Prost, B. and H., Inventaires mobiliers et extraits des comptes des ducs de Bourgogne de la maison de Valois, 2 vols, (Paris, 1902 and 1913)
- Rauzier, Finances - Rauzier, J., Finances et gestion d'un principauté au xiv^e siècle: le duché de Bourgogne de Philippe le Hardi (1364-1384), (Paris, 1996)
- R.N.H.B - Revue nobiliaire, héraldique et biographique
- Sainte-Marthe - Sainte-Marthe, P. de, Histoire généalogique de la maison de la Trémoille, (Paris, 1668)
- Schnerb, 'Nicopolis' - Schnerb, B., 'Le contingent franco-bourguignon à la croisade de Nicopolis', in Nicopolis, 1396-1996, ed. Paviot, J, and Chauney-Bouillet, M., (Dijon, 1997, reprinted from Annales de Bourgogne, tome 68, 1996, fasc.3)

Solente, Charles V - Pisan, Christine de, Le livre des
fais et bonnes meurs du sage roi Charles V, ed.

Solente, S., 2 vols. (Paris, 1936)

VBP, Toison d'Or - Van den Bergen-Pantens, C., ed. L'Ordre
de la Toison d'Or de Philippe le Bon à Philippe le Beau
(1430-1505): idéal ou reflet d'une société?, (Brussels,
1996)

Van Nieuwenhuysen, Finances - Van Nieuwenhuysen, A., Les
Finances du Duc de Bourgogne Philippe le Hardi (1384-
1404): Economie et Politique, (Brussels, 1984)

Winter, Bibliothèque - Winter, P.M. de, La bibliothèque de
Philippe le Hardi, (Paris, 1985)

(a) Unpublished Primary Sources

Archives Départementales de la Côte-d'Or, (Dijon) Série B

Liasses: in particular

B256-65 - Limites du Duché

B290-310 - Contrats et Testaments

especially liasses 296, 301, 303 and 306

B312-340 - Dépense de l'hôtel des Ducs

especially liasses 338 and 339

B341-397 - Quittances par offices

especially liasses 341, 352, 353, 354,

361 and 367

Pièces scellées: (drawn from the above liasses)

Régistres:

B1413-1563 - Comptes généraux des duché et comté

(trésorier, argentier, and receveur

générale des finances)

especially 1413, 1416, 1417, 1423, 1424,
1430, 1438, 1441, 1454, 1460, 1461,
1471, 1474, 1481, 1486, 1495, 1498,
1500, 1501, 1502, 1503, 1517, 1519,
1521, 1528, 1532, 1534, 1538, 1543,
1547, 1554, 1563

B10513-10559-Dénombrements, especially

10513, 10515, 10538, 10548, 10552,
10557, 10558 and 10559

B11746-11786-Montres et Révues, especially

11746, 11747, 11751, 11753, 11754,
11756-11759, 11761, 11766, 11767, 11770,
11772, 11774, 11775, 11779, 11780 and
11786

Peincedé, J-B, Inventaire de la chambre des comptes de

Bourgogne, 36 manuscript volumes, from the late
eighteenth century, containing transcripts and
summaries of documents at that time in the
departmental archives, together with indexes of
personal and place names (some later printed, see
Abbreviations)

Paris, Archives Nationales, Microfilm, Bobines 62 MI 3-10,
(ADCO B1466 to B1543)

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Collection de
Bourgogne

(b) Published Primary Sources

- Armorial du Pays de Luxembourg, ed. Loutsch, J-C.,
(Luxembourg, 1974)
- Bartholomaeus Anglicus, Le Livre des propriétés des choses, ed. and transl. Bernard Ribémont, (Paris, 1999)
- Bouvet, H., The Tree of Battles, ed. Coopland, G.W.,
(Liverpool, 1949)
- La Chanson de Bertran du Guesclin de Cuvelier, ed. Faucon, J-C., (Toulouse, 1990)
- Charny, Geoffroi de, Le Livre de Chevalerie, in Kervyn de Lettenhove, ed., Chroniques de Froissart, (1873)t.1, pt. 2, pp. 463-533
- Charny, Geoffroi de, The Book of Chivalry of: text, context and translation, ed. Kaeuper, R.W. and Kennedy, E., (Philadelphia, 1996)
- Chronique des quatre premiers Valois 1327-1393, ed. Luce, S., (Paris, 1862, reprinted New York, 1965)
- Chronique du Religieux de Saint Denis, ed. Bellaguet, M., (Paris, 1839)
- Le Débat des Hérauts d'Armes, ed. Pannier, L. and Meyer, P., (Paris, 1877)
- Froissart, J., Oeuvres, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, 26 vols., (Brussels, 1866-77)
- Gace de la Buigne, Le roman des deduis, ed. Blomquist, A., Studia romanica Holmiensia, iii, (Karlshamn, 1951)
- Illustrations from the Life of Bertrand Duguesclin by Jean Cuvelier, ed. Thompson, H.Y., (London, 1909)

- Le Mort le Roi Artu, ed. Frappier, J., (Geneva, Paris, 1964)
- Les Lapidaires français du moyen âge, ed. Pannier, L., (Geneva, 1973)
- Lorris, G.de and Meun, J.de, Le Roman de la Rose, (Paris, 1992)
- Lulle, Raymond, Le Livre de l'Ordre de la Chevalerie, ed. Tredaniel, G., (Paris, 1990)
- Mémoires d'Olivier de la Marche, ed. Beaune, H. and Arbaumont, J. d', (Paris, 1888), vol.IV
- Mézières, P. de, Letter to Richard II, ed. Coopland, G.W., (Liverpool, 1975)
- Mézières, P. de, Le Songe du vieil Pelerin, ed. Coopland, G.W., 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1969)
- Mézières, P. de, Epistre Lamentable, in Kervyn de Lettenhove, ed., Chroniques de Froissart, vol. 16, pp.444-523
- Monstrelet, Enguerrand de, Chronique 1400-1444, publ. Douet-d'Arcq, L., Tome I, (Paris, 1857)
- Pizan, Christine de, LaVision Christine, ed. Sister Mary Towner, (Washington, 1932)
- Pizan, Christine de, Book of Deeds of Arms and Chivalry, ed. Willard, C.C., (Pennsylvania, 1999)
- Pizan, Christine de, Selected Writings, ed. Blumenfeld-Kosinski, R., (London, 1997)
- Pizan, Christine de, Autobiography of a Medieval Woman, translated Vigier, A.de S., (London, 1996)
- Poirier, M. le, Le Court D'Amours, ed. Scully, T., (Ontario, 1976)

(c) Secondary Sources

- Allmand, C., War, Literature and Politics of the Late Middle Ages, (Liverpool, 1976)
- Anglo, S., The Great Tournament Roll of Westminster, A Collotype Reproduction of the Manuscript, (Oxford, 1968)
- Arabeyre, P., 'L'émancipation en Bourgogne à la fin du moyen âge', MSDHB, 51, (1994), pp.7-36
- Arbaumont, J. d', 'Les anoblis de Bourgogne; periode ducale (1361-1477)', RNHB, (n.s.)ii (1866), pp. 151-65
- Armstrong, C.A.J., England, France and Burgundy in the Fifteenth Century, (London, 1983)
- Armstrong, C.A.J., 'Had the Burgundian Government a Policy for the Nobility', in England, France and Burgundy in the Fifteenth Century, pp.213-236
- Armstrong, C.A.J., 'La politique matrimoniale des ducs de Bourgogne de la maison de Valois', in England, France and Burgundy in the Fifteenth Century, pp.237-342
- Atiya, A.S., The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages, (London, 1938)
- Autrand, F., Jean le Bon, (Paris, 1985)
- Autrand, F., Charles V, (Paris, 1994)
- Autrand, F., Charles VI, (Paris, 1986)
- Avout, J.d', La querelle des Armagnacs et des Bourguignons, (Paris, 1943)
- Avril, F. and Raynaud, C., Les Manuscrits à peinture en France 1340-1520, (Paris, 1995)
- Baisier, L., The Lapidaire Chrétien, its composition, its

- influences, its sources, (Washington, 1936)
- Barante, P. de, Histoire des ducs de Bourgogne de la maison de Valois, ed. Gachard, L.P., 2 vols., (Brussels, 1838)
- Barker, J. and Barber, R., The Tournament, (Woodbridge, 1989)
- Beaune, C., The Birth of an Ideology: myths and symbols of Nation in late-medieval France, (Oxford, 1991)
- Beaune, C., 'L'utilisation politique du mythe des origines troyennes en France à la fin du moyen âge', in Lectures médiévales de Virgile, (Coll. de l'Ecole Française de Rome, 1985), pp. 331-355
- Beaune, H., 'Etat des officiers de Philippe le Hardi duc de Bourgogne', RNHB, (n.s.), i, (1865), pp.49-56
- Boone, M., 'Dons et pots-de-vin, aspects de la sociabilité urbaine au bas moyen âge. Le cas Gantois pendant la période bourguignonne', Revue du Nord, LXX, (1988) pp.231-247
- Bossuat, R., 'Les origines troyennes', Annales de Normandie, VIII, (1958), pp.187-197
- Bossy, J., Christianity in the West, (Oxford and New York, 1985)
- Boucker, A., 'Liens sacrés ou protection profane: les filleuls de Philippe le Hardi', Historiens et géographes, 341, (Oct. 1993), pp.219-225
- Boudreau, C., 'Une groupe social en quête d'identité: les hérauts d'armes et le mythe des origines troyennes à la fin du Moyen Age', (Unpublished work in progress by Saguenay Herald, Ottawa, Canada)

- Boulton, d'A.J.D., The Knights of the Crown, (Suffolk, 1987)
- Brault, G.J., Early Blazon, (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1997)
- Brown-Grant, R., 'L'Avison Christine: Autobiographical Narrative or Mirror for the Prince?', in Brabant, M., Politics, Gender and Gendre, pp.95-111
- Bruna, D., Enseignes de pèlerinage et enseignes profanes, (Paris, 1996)
- Butler, C., Number Symbolism, (London, 1970)
- Calmette, J., Les Grands Ducs de Bourgogne, (Paris, 1949)
- Calmette, J., The Golden Age of Burgundy, (London, 1962)
- Canat de Chizy, M., Marguerite de Flandre, duchesse de Bourgogne, sa vie intime et l'etat de sa maison, (Paris, 1860)
- Caron, M-T., La Noblesse dans la Duché de Bourgogne 1315-1477, (Lille, 1987)
- Caron, M-T., 'Réseaux nobiliaires', in Le prince et le peuple, ed. Prevenier, W., (Anvers, 1998), pp.258-267
- Caron, M-T., 'Décor d'une naissance princière à la cour de Bourgogne en 1403', 'Voyages en histoire': Mélanges offerts à Paul Gerbod, (Besançon, 1995)
- Champeaux, E., 'La Succession de Bourgogne à la mort de Philippe de Rouvres', MSHDB, I-III, (1932-6), pp.5-50
- Chassant, A. and Tausin, H., Dictionnaire des devises historiques et héraldiques, (Paris, 1878)
- Chattaway, C.M., 'Looking a medieval gift horse in the mouth. The role of the giving of gift objects in the definition and maintenance of the power networks of Philip the Bold', Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende

- de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden, 114, (1999) afl.1, pp.1-15
- Chattaway, C.M., 'The Heroes of Philip the Bold', Publication du Centre Européen d'Etudes Bourguignonnes (XIVe-XVIe s.), 41, (2001) pp.27-37
- Chydenius, J., The theory of medieval symbolism, (Helsingfors, 1960)
- Collins, H.E.L., The Order of the Garter 1348-1461, (Oxford, 2000)
- Contamine, P., La noblesse au royaume de France, (Paris, 1997)
- Cooper, J.C., An Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Traditional Symbols, (London, 1978)
- Cross, F.L. and Livingstone, E.A., The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, (Oxford, 1993)
- Cruden's Complete Concordance to the Bible, (Cambridge, 1992)
- Daremberg, C., and Saglio, M.E., Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines, vol. 4, (Paris, 1877)
- Davis, N.Z., The Gift, (Oxford, 2000)
- De Marcenay à Marsannay-la-Côte, (Association 'La Confrérie des Gourmets de Marsannay-la-Côte', 1988)
- Dent Dictionary of Symbols in Christian Art, Speake, J., (London, 1994)
- Derville, A., 'Pots-de-vin, cadeaux, racket, patronage: essai sur les mécanismes de décision dans l'état bourgignon', Revue du Nord, 56, (1974) pp.341-364
- Dilasser, M., The Symbols of the Church, (Minnesota, 1999)

Dossier de l'art: Les Arts sous Charles VI, 107, (Dijon, 2003)

Dulac, L., 'Authority in the Prose Treatises of Christine de Pizan: The Writer's Discourse and the Prince's Word', in Brabant, Politics, Gender and Gendre, pp.129-140

Ewert, U.C. and Hirschbiegel, J., 'Gabe und Gegengabe', in Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial-und-Wirtschaftsgeschichte, 87 (2000), Heft 1, pp.5-37

Fearn, J., Discovering Heraldry, (Shire Publications, Bucks., 1992)

Fox-Davies, A.C., Wordsworth Complete Guide to Heraldry, (Herts., 1996)

Frazer, J.G., The Golden Bough, (London, 1960)

Fremaux, H., 'Anoblissements et légitimations donnés par les rois de France en vertu de leurs droits de suzeraineté royale, en Flandre, Artois et Tournaisis, depuis 1315 jusqu'en 1525', Bulletin de la Commission Historique du Département du Nord, XXVIII, (1911), pp. 117-54

Friar, S., Heraldry, (Stroud, Gloucs., 1996)

Gage, J., Colour and Culture, (London, 1997 edition)

Gay, V., Glossaire archéologique du moyen âge et de la renaissance, 2 vols., (Paris, 1887 and 1928)

Gibson, C., Signs and Symbols, (London, 1996)

Guerreau-Jalabert, A., Index des Motifs narratifs dans les romans arthuriens français en vers, (Geneva, 1992)

- Haucourt, G. de and Durivault, G., Le Blason, (Vendome, 1992)
- Heers, J., Fêtes, Jeux et Joutes dans les sociétés d'occident à la fin du moyen-âge, (Paris, 1982)
- Hemptinne, T. de, 'Princes et courtisans', in Le prince et le peuple, ed. Prevenier, W., (Anvers, 1998), pp.14-33
- Hopper, V.F., La symbolique médiévale des nombres, (Paris, 1995)
- Huizinga, J., The Waning of the Middle Ages, (New York, 1954)
- Jones, M., Ducal Brittany, (Oxford, 1970)
- Jones, M., 'Entre la France et l'Angleterre: Jeanne de Navarre, Duchesse de Bretagne et Reine d'Angleterre (1368-1437)', in Autour de Marguerite d'Ecosse: Reines, princesses et dames du XVe siècle; Actes du colloque de Thouars (23 and 24Mai 1997), (Paris, 1999)
- Jones, T., Who Murdered Chaucer?, (London, 2003)
- Jorga, N., Philippe de Mézières et la Croisade, (Paris, 1896)
- Jourdan, J-P., 'Le Thème du pas dans le royaume de France à la fin du Moyen Age', Annales de Bourgogne, (1990), t.62, pp.117-126
- Jugies, S., 'Philippe le Hardi à Dijon', Les Arts sous Charles VI, Dossier de l'Art, 107, (Dijon, 2003), pp.72-7
- Jussen, B., 'Le parrainage à la fin du moyen âge', Annales, Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations, 47,

- (1992), pp.467-502
- Kovacs, E., 'L'Ordre du Camail des Ducs d'Orléans', Acta Hist. Art. Hung., t.27, (1981), pp.225-231
- Krynen, J., Idéal du prince et pouvoir royale en France à la fin du Moyen Age (1380-1440). Etude de la littérature du temps, (Paris, 1981)
- La France et les Arts en 1400, (Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 2004)
- La Haute-Saône: Dictionnaire des Communes VI, (Vesoul, 1974)
- Larousse Dictionnaire du Moyen Français: La Renaissance, ed. Greimas, A.J. and Keane, T.M., (Paris, 1992)
- Larousse Dictionnaire de l'Ancien Français, ed. Greimas, A.J., (Paris, 1987)
- Le Gentil, A., 'Les poissons dans l'héraldique médiévale', Moyen Age, 32, (January/February, 2003)
- Lemaire, C., 'La toison d'or, sa légende, ses symboles, son influence sur l'histoire littéraire', in VBP., Toison d'Or, pp.84-90
- Lemprière's Classical Dictionary, (London, 1984)
- Lépine, F., 'Le pas d'armes de l'arbre de Charlemagne à Marsannay', in his Fastes de Bourgogne, (Dijon, 1882)
- Lewis, P.S., Later Medieval France. The Polity, (London and New York, 1968)
- Lewis, P.S., Essays in Later Medieval French History, (London, 1985)
- Lewis, P.S., 'Decayed and non-feudalism in later medieval France', in Essays in Later Medieval French History, pp.41-68

- Lewis, P.S., 'Of Breton alliances and other matters', ed. Allmand, C., War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages, (Liverpool, 1976) pp.122-143; and also in Lewis, P.S., Essays in Later Medieval French History, pp.69-90
- Lightbown, R., Medieval European Jewellery, (London, 1992)
- Lightbown, R., Secular Goldsmith's Work in Medieval France (London, 1978)
- Lynch, J.H., Godparents and Kinship in Early Medieval Europe, (Princeton, 1986)
- Mackay, A., Atlas of Medieval Europe, (London and New York, 1997)
- Magee, J., 'Le temps de la croisade bourguignonne', in Nicopolis 1396-1996, (Dijon, 1997), pp.49-58
- Mauss, M., The Gift, (London, 1993)
- McLeod, E., The Order of the Rose, (London, 1976)
- Merindol, C. de, 'Claus Sluter et le double programme décoratif de la chartreuse de Champmol', in Actes des Journées Internationales Claus Sluter, (Dijon, 1990) pp.165-173
- Mollat, M., 'Recherches sur les finances des ducs Valois de Bourgogne', in Revue Historique, (1958) tome CCXIX, pp.285-321
- Morand, K., Claus Sluter, (London, 1991)
- Nordberg, M., Les Ducs et la royauté. Etudes sur la rivalité des ducs d'Orléans et de Bourgogne 1392-1407 (Uppsala, 1964)
- Parker, E.C., 'The Gift of the Cross in the New Minster *Liber Vitae*', Sears and Thomas, Reading Medieval

- Images, pp.177-186
- Pastoureau, M., Traité d'Héraldique, (3rd ed., Paris, 1997)
- Pastoureau, M., Blue, (Princeton and Oxford, 2001)
- Pastoureau, M., 'La toison d'or, sa légende, ses symboles, son influence sur l'histoire littéraire', VBP., Toison d'Or, pp.99-106
- Pastoureau, M., L'Hermine et le sinople, (Paris, 1982)
- Pastoureau, M., Figures et Couleurs, (Paris, 1986)
- Paviot, J., 'L'Ordre de la Toison d'or et la croisade', and 'Le recrutement des chevaliers de l'ordre de la Toison d'or 1430-1505', in VBP., Toison d'or, pp.71-4 and 75-9
- Paviot, J. and Chauney-Bouillot, M., Nicopolis 1396-1996, (Dijon, 1997)
- Paviot, J., Les Ducs de Bourgogne, la Croisade et l'Orient, (Paris, 2003)
- Payne, A., Medieval Beasts, (London, 1990)
- Petit, E., Les Sires de Noyers, (Auxerre, 1874)
- Petit, E., Les Arbres de Justice, (Auxerre, 1898, extrait du Bulletin de la Société des Sciences del'Yonne, Suppl. au tome L, 1897)
- Pieri, G., 'Les particularités de la puissance paternelle dans la Duché de Bourgogne, de la rédaction officielle de la coutume à la fin de l'ancien régime', MSHDB, 26, (1965) pp.51-90
- Pinches, R. and Wood, A., A European Armorial, (London, 1971)
- Pleij, H., Colors Demonic and Divine, (New York,

- Chichester, 2004)
- Pocquet du Haut Jussé, B.A., 'Deux féodaux: Bourgogne et Bretagne, 1363-1491', Revue des cours et conférences, xxxv(2), (1933-4), pp. 481-93 and 595-612
Reprinted separately, (Paris, 1935)
- 'Les pensionnaires fieffés des ducs de Bourgogne de 1352 à 1419', MSHDB, viii, (1942), pp.127-50
- Pocquet du Haut-Jussè, B-A., Les Papes et les Ducs de Bretagne, (Paris, 1928)
- Prevenier, W., and Blockmans, W., The Burgundian Netherlands, (Cambridge, 1986)
- Prevenier, W., Le Prince et le Peuple: la société du temps des Ducs de Bourgogne, (Anvers, 1998)
- Prevenier, W., 'Les réseaux en action', in Le prince et le peuple, (Anvers, 1998), pp.294-319
- Raynaud, C., Images et Pouvoirs au Moyen Age, (Paris, 1993)
- Reno, C., 'The Preface to LaVision-Christine in ex-Phillips 128', in Richards, E.J., Reinterpreting Christine de Pizan, pp.207-227
- Richard, J., 'La toison d'or comparée aux autres ordres chevaleresques du moyen âge', and 'Le rôle politique de l'ordre sous Philippe le Bon et Charles le Téméraire', VBP., Toison d'Or, pp.17-20 and 67-70
- Richards, E.J., ed., Reinterpreting Christine de Pizan, (Athens Georgia, and London, 1992)
- Saul, N., Richard II, (London, 1997)
- Schiller, G., The Iconography of Christian Art, vols. 1 and 2, (London, 1971, 1972)

- Schnerb, B., L'honneur de la maréchaussée, Burgundica III,
(Brepols, 2000)
- Schnerb, B., Les Armagnacs et les Bourguignons: la maudite
guerre, (Paris, 2001)
- Sears, E. and Thomas, T.K., Reading Medieval Images,
(Univ. of Michigan, 2002)
- Sirjean, G., Encyclopédie Généalogique des Maisons
Souverains du Monde, (Paris, 1966)
- Spencer, B., Pilgrim Souvenirs and Badges, (London, 1998)
- Stahl, H., 'Eve's Reach: A note on Dramatic Elements in
the Hildesheim Doors', in Sears and Thomas, Reading
Medieval Images, pp.163-175
- Starobinski, J., Largesse, (Chicago, 1997)
- Steingraber, E., Antique Jewellery, (London, 1957)
- Thomassy, R., Essai sur les écrits politiques de Christine
de Pisan, (Paris, 1838)
- Tourneur, V., 'Les origines de l'Ordre de la Toison d'Or
et la symbolique des insignes de celui-ci', Académie
Royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la Classe des
Lettres, 5e série, t.42, (1956), pp.300-323
- Tuchmann, B., A Distant Mirror: The Calamitous 14th
Century, (New York, 1978)
- Vale, M.G.A., The Princely Court, (Oxford, 2001)
- Van Beuningen, H.J.E. and Koldewey, A.M., Heilig en
Profaan: 1000 laat-middeleeuwse insignes, (Rotterdam
Papers VIII, Netherlands, 1993)
- Van den Bergen-Pantens, C., 'Traditions généalogiques et
héraldiques troyennes à la cour de Bourgogne', Revue
Française d'Héraldique et de Sigillographie, vol.60-61,

- (1990-1991), pp.83-97
- Van der Velden, H., 'Petrus Christus' Our Lady of the Dry Tree', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 60, (1997)
- Vaughan, R., Philip the Bold. The Formation of the Burgundian State, (London, 1962)
- Vaughan, R., John the Fearless, (London, 1966)
- Vaughan, R., The Valois Dukes of Burgundy: sources of information, Inaugural lecture given at University of Hull, 13 October, 1965, (Hull, 1965)
- Vaughan, R., Valois Burgundy, (London, 1975)
- Veenstra, J., Magic and Divination at the Courts of Burgundy and France, (Leiden, 1998)
- Verdon, J., Isabeau de Baviere, (Paris, 1981)
- Vincent, C., Les confréries médiévales dans le royaume de France, (Paris, 1994)
- Wagner, A.R., Heralds and Heraldry in the Middle Ages, (Oxford, 1960)
- Wenzler, C., L'héraldique, (Rennes, 1997)
- Willard, C.C., Christine de Pizan: Her Life and Work, (New York, 1984)
- Woodcock, T. and Robinson, J.M., The Oxford Guide to Heraldry, (Oxford, 1990)
- Wright, N.A.R., 'The Tree of Battles of Honoré Bouvet and the Laws of War', ed. Allmand, C., War, Literature and Politics in the late Middle Ages, pp.12-31
- Young, B., A Walk through the Cloisters, (New York, 1988)
- Zimmerman, M., 'Vox Femina, Vox Politica', in Brabant, Politics, Gender and Genre, pp.113-127

