lacking neither in intelligence nor resources, Philip Augustus remained anxious and ready to fight. Warlike preparations, the strengthening of fortifications, underhand negotiations, attempts to seduce their opponent’s barons, and finally the circumstances which favoured the formation of the two systems of antagonistic alliances in the West, all led to a general war. In fact, it was on the point of breaking out and was to have extremely important consequences. Empire and Papacy were to take part in this decisive conflict; France, England, and even Germany were to be involved and the course of their political history modified by it.

Philip Augustus and John Lackland sought allies everywhere. Philip made agreements with the lords of the newly annexed districts, negotiated with the discontented barons of England or Gascony and the Welsh prince, Llewelyn ap Joverth while John maintained communications with Normandy and Poitou. Both sent ambassadors to the neighbouring countries on the frontiers of the Empire and even as far as Holland and Thuringia; the support they found there was far from reliable; the recantations of Henry I, Duke of Brabant, were typical. The decision which the two most powerful counts of North France, of Boulogne, and Flanders, took was more important.

Renaud de Dammartin belonged to a family of loyal châtelains of the Île de France; he had married the heiress to the County of Boulogne and had fiefs reaching to the frontiers of Brittany. Philip Augustus appreciated his understanding and ability and tried to strengthen his wavering loyalty by satisfying his ambition. Either as the result of wounded vanity or, perhaps, because he thought Philip too weak to stand against the alliance of John and Otto of Brunswick, in 1211 Renaud entered into negotiations with the King of England and the Emperor. A sentence of the Court of France declared him a traitor and deprived him of his fiefs. He fled into exile On 3rd May, 1212, he did homage to John and, henceforward, he was to be the inspirer and organizer of the coalition against the King of France.

Philip Augustus believed that he could rely on the Flemish alliance. Jeanne, the daughter and heiress of the late Count

---

1 See particularly, CXXI, iv, 2nd part, bk. x.
2 CXLIII, and the supporting documents; CXXI, iv, bk. ix and x.
Baldwin IX, came to Paris to marry Ferrand, the son of
the King of Portugal and a relation of Blanche of Castile
(January, 1212). The Flemings, since the departure of their
Count for the Crusade, had submitted to the protection of
the King of France but the commercial classes, which had
the strongest reasons for keeping on good terms with John,
remained hostile, and it was necessary to take hostages in
the towns; the nobilities accepted the pensions offered for
lack of higher bids. The new count, a stranger in the country
who was badly received, needed external support. Philip
Augustus made the mistake of alienating him by taking away
the two towns of Saint Omer and Aire. Ferrand was naturally
loyal but his suzerain had done him wrong and refused any
compensation. King John turned to his financial weapons
to win over the count's advisers.\(^1\)

In Germany, pounds sterling could work wonders. Otto
of Brunswick, relieved of his rival Philip of Swabia (died by
assassination in 1208), remained firmly attached to a lucrative
alliance and became a disturbing enemy for France. He had
quarrelled with the Pope, however, by reviving the policy
of the Staufen and showing his ambition to reduce Italy.
The Pope found himself forced to support against him "the
child of Apulia", Frederick II, the son of Henry VI, and
to allow the formation of an alliance between the young
leader of the Ghibelline party and Philip Augustus. On
19th November, 1212, Louis of France met Frederick at
Vaucouleurs and they entered into mutual engagements. A
certain number of German princes, convinced by the specious
arguments of Philip Augustus, elected Frederick as king on
5th December. By the end of this critical year, two systems
of alliances had been established in Western Europe.\(^2\)

Innocent III had no objects but the interests of the Church
and the triumph of Christ. He would have wished to make
peace between the Christian princes but the complexity of the
questions involved led him to adopt a contradictory policy
and a dangerous route. Previously, he had tried to maintain
the Angevin Empire and put a check to the conquests of
Philip Augustus. The abominable persecution of the English
Church, carried on by John, had forced him to depose the

\(^1\) CDXIV, chap. i and ii; CCCX; CCXLIV, 314 ff.; CCXI, iv, 2nd part,
bk. x.

\(^2\) CCXI, bk. x; CCCXXXIV, i, 195 ff.; DXVII, 31–2.
King of England in the same way as he had deposed Otto. Philip Augustus was the only prince to whom he could appeal to reduce John. In January, 1218, the sentence of deposition was promulgated in France by the Holy See and the King of France and his subjects were instructed to take away John’s crown for the remission of their sins. Louis VIII, who had married one of John’s nieces, was to replace him on the English throne. Philip Augustus allowed himself to become a pawn for the Pope and assembled an army and a fleet. The legate, Pandulph, however, had been given instructions on the conditions under which John would receive pardon; he travelled to England and gained his submission. John consented to become the liege man of the Pope and Philip Augustus, on pain of excommunication, had to abandon the expedition he was preparing on the prompting of the Holy See.¹

By this tortuous manoeuvre, Innocent III had freed the English Church but he had unleashed war. Philip found himself threatened by an Anglo-Flemish-German coalition. Ferrand had refused host service for the expedition to England and now received John’s emissaries. The King of France set out to ravage Flanders. In 1214 after losing a lot of time, the allies attacked him on both sides at once. John Lackland, himself, conducted the campaign in the West; taken with panic at the arrival of Louis of France he departed without giving battle (La Roche au Moine, 2nd July). In the North, the Germans with their emperor, the troops of the counts of Flanders and Boulogne, and an English detachment had met at Valenciennes to march on Paris. A decisive battle was fought in the marshy plain between Bouvines and Tournai. Tactical dispositions based on common sense were made by Guerin, the Bishop of Senlis, whose sound judgment and intelligent activity were marked in every sphere of politics. But the battles of those days were not a matter of science; there was a series of hand to hand encounters, of furious charges by heavily armed knights who tried to unhorse each other. Victory was won by sporting enthusiasm, personal bravery, endurance, and loyalty to the leaders. Philip Augustus though lacking a numerous army had a magnificent band of knights with him whose loyalty was assured. He fought

¹ *DXVII*, 30–8; *CCXI*, bk. xi. See Bk. Four, Chap. I below of this volume.
bravely himself and all but perished. His enemies did not work together very well; the feudal spirit weakened any coalition before it was put to the test. The Duke of Brabant who seems to have been bought by the King of France gave the first signal of disorder among the allies. The flight of the Emperor Otto and the capture of the other leaders made it irretrievable (27th July, 1214).¹

The Capetian dynasty had never known such a triumph in battle. Bouvines simultaneously guaranteed its hegemony in France and the West.² In Germany the Guelf party gave up the fight and Frederick II entered on his imperial career. He remained in general friendly with the Capetians. Flanders, whose count was to remain a prisoner in the Louvre until 1227, passed under the strict surveillance of Philip Augustus.³

IV

LAST CONFLICTS. TREATY OF PARIS

John returned to England crippled and less than a year later the barons dictated to him their conditions (Great Charter, 15th June, 1215). To get rid of a man who was incapable of keeping a promise it was necessary to turn to a foreigner and once more Louis of France received the offer of the English crown. But this time, Innocent III supported John who was a liege of the Holy See. Philip Augustus was distrustful of the fickleness of the English barons and the ability of the Roman Curia. He left his son to depart on his own and to assume full responsibility for the war. Louis was well received by the majority of the barons and bishops and the people of London, he confirmed the Charter and expected some great success to achieve his consecration as King of England. But he was excommunicated, as were all his supporters, and his forces were inadequate. The tyranny of the Plantagenets was forgotten by the English when they learned of the disappearance of John Lackland who had

¹ CCXI, bk. xi and xii; CDXLVI, 174–196; DXVII, 40–51; DCXII, 151.
² See the description of the victory festivals in LVII, bk. xii; CCXIII.
³ CCLIII, 137 ff.; CCXI, iv, 2nd part, 491 ff.
died of indigestion on 19th October, 1216. The new Pope, Honorius III, intervened warmly in favour of John's young son, Henry III, and Louis of France found himself being gradually deserted and had to give up his ambitions (Peace of Lambeth, 11th September, 1217). The war he had carried on and the ravages of John's mercenaries had at least ruined England and made her impotent. Philip Augustus was able to finish his busy life in peace, holding the prisoners of Bouvines in gaol, strengthening his fortifications, and keeping a watch on his nobility.¹

He bequeathed to his son a crown with considerable prestige, an orderly kingdom, and a war treasury. Louis VIII (1223–6) had a cold and determined character, energetic and ambitious. Well supported by the remarkable woman he had married, he would undoubtedly have had a brilliant reign but he died prematurely after some fruitful expeditions in Poitou and the South. Blanche of Castile and Saint Louis preserved the conquests of Philip Augustus and Louis VIII. On two occasions, in 1230 and 1242, Henry III had dreams of conquest; but the two expeditions failed miserably.²

Henry III still possessed Guienne but he was no longer the vassal of the King of France for the sentence of 1202 had broken the feudal tie between Capetian and Plantagenets. Saint Louis and he, however, had married sisters. Attracted towards peace by family sympathies, his Christian sentiments, and, above all, by his dislike for any intrigue that was of doubtful character, Saint Louis proposed a compromise and the recognition of accomplished facts to his brother-in-law. Henry III, who had become very unpopular in England, finally yielded on the eve of a rising even more serious than that of 1215. The baronial party wanted an end to the conflict with France. The peace, concluded on 28th May, 1258, was published in Paris, 4th December, 1259. Henry III gave up Normandy, Maine Anjou, Touraine, and Poitou, and again became the liege of the King of France for the fiefs he retained.³

¹ DXVII, 1st part, chap. iii–ix. Subsequently, I have published an important text. XLII, and, in DXV, taken up again the question of the justification of Louis's claim to the English Crown. Cf. CCXI, iv, 2nd part, bk. xiii.
² See pp. 299–303.
³ CCXVII ; CLXXIX, p. v ff.
IV. DESCENDANTS OF LOUIS VI AND LOUIS VII

Alliances with royal and seigniorial dynasties. Capetian Ecclesiastical dignitaries.

LOUIS VI = Adelaide de Maurienne

Philippe (1116-1131).

LOUIS VII (1120-1180) = Henry (ob. 1175) Archbp. of Rheims.

Robert I (ob. 1188) Count of Dreux

Philippe (ob. 1161) Dean of St. Martin of Tours.

Pierre I (ob. 1183?) Lord of Courtenay by marriage with Isabella Courtenay

Constance = (1) in 1140 Eustace Count of Boulogne;
(2) in 1154 Raymond V, Count of Toulouse.

Robert II Count of Dreux.

Henry Bishop of Orleans.

Philippe Bishop of Beauvais.

Alix = Raoul I de Coucy.

Isabella = Hugh de Broyles.

Pierre II de Courtenay, Count of Nevers by marriage with Agnes Countess of Nevers.

(1) in 1137

ELEANOR OF AQUITAINE (divorced 1152)

= Henry I Count of Champagne in 1164.

Alix = Thibaud V Count of Blois in 1164.

MARJORITE Adelaide betrothed to HENRY THE RICHARD YOUNGER CŒUR DE LION son of Henry II = William III Plantagenet; Count of Ponthieu (2) in 1186 in 1195.

BELA III King of Hungary.

(3) in 1189

ADELA OF CHAMPAGNE

PHILIPPE (1 in 1180)

ALEXIS Emperor of Byzantium
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V. DESCENDANTS OF PHILIP AUGUSTUS, LOUIS VIII, AND SAINT LOUIS


Philippe Augustus =

(1) in 1180
ISABELLA OF HAINAULT
ISAMBOUR OF DENMARK
Divorce not recognized by the Pope. No children.

(2) in 1193

(3) in 1196
AGNES DE MERAN
children legitimized by Innocent III

Morganatic union with "a maiden of Arras"

Pierre Charlot
Bishop of Noyon.

Philippe Hurepel
Count of Boulogne by marriage with the heiress to Arthur.

Marie betrothed to Arthur.

LOUIS VIII = BLANCHE OF CASTILE
12 children: the following survived adolescence

LOUIS IX = MARGUERITE OF PROVENCE
12 children: the following survived adolescence

Robert Count of Artois by appanage.

Alphose Count of Poitiers by appanage and Count of Toulouse by marriage with the daughter of Raymond VII.

Isabella. Charles Count of Anjou by appanage Count of Provence by marriage with Beatrice of Provence and King of Sicily.

PHILIPPE III
The Bold

Jean Tristan Pierre Robert = Isabella = Blanche = Marguerite

Common ancestor of the last Capetians and the Valois.

Count of Champagne and King of Navarre. Founder of the Bourbon dynasty.

Agnès = Robert II
Duke of Burgundy.

[p. 229]
To those who deprecated the treaty, Louis said, "He was not my man and he has entered my homage." Like the popes of the period, he saw in homage the guarantee of political and moral order. The first Hundred Years' War (1152–1259) finished thus in an act of loyalty by the standards of Feudalism. It laid the seeds for the second which was to be more incessant and more disastrous. In practice, the Treaty of Paris was not the clear and definitive agreement which the King of France would undoubtedly have liked. The situation of Aquitaine was so involved that the editor of the treaty had been forced to make allusions, exceptions, and reservations which, immediately after the death of Saint Louis, gave rise to incessant conflicts. Louis IX was activated by a love of peace and order; but his memory could not bind, in a later age, those agents of the King of France, the Parlement of Paris and local officials, to a renunciation of suzerainty or to see it abused nor the King of England to be a willing vassal. In feudal principles, Saint Louis believed he had found the means of assuring Christian peace. Philip Augustus had sought in it only a method of unlocking the vice which was cramping the Capetian monarchy and a justification for his conquests; it was he and not Saint Louis who established the tradition which statesmen of the ancien régime have consistently followed.

1 See Joinville (LXVIII), §§ 65, 678–9.
BOOK THREE

THE APOGEE OF THE FEUDAL MONARCHY IN FRANCE AND THE ARISTOCRATIC REACTION IN ENGLAND
CHAPTER I

THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE CAPEHIAN MONARCHY FROM
THE CONQUEST OF NORMANDY TO THE DEATH OF
ST. LOUIS

I

RESIDENCES AND HOMES OF THE KING. THE HOUSEHOLD

THE disinheritance of John Lackland marked a date of
extreme importance in the history of the French
monarchy the prestige and resources of which were suddenly
doubled. The conquest of Normandy, in particular, had
been of considerable importance. The royal demesne there
was extensive and wealthy; the country was well administered,
accustomed to obey, and furnished with a judicial and
administrative bureaucracy, the traditions of which gradually
penetrated Capetian methods of government. Henceforward,
sheltered from the threat of an English invasion and adequately
provided with money, the monarchy was able for seventy
years to develop its machinery, regularly and without sudden
changes, with the help of a personnel drawn from the ancient
demesne not to speak of the traces of the influence of southern
lawyers which can be found, at least, at the centre. The
Capetian power was strengthening itself without emerging
from its traditional setting, the feudal framework. It is
a period which has a unity of its own, in which the essential
traits can be distinguished which differentiate the medieval
from the modern monarchy.

The traditional simplicity of the dynasty showed itself
without any considerable modification in the daily life of
Philip Augustus, Louis VIII, and Louis IX. ¹ It was from
Paris, "a historic town whose fame and glory has spread
throughout the world,"² that royal acts were, as far as possible,
issued from which we can surmise that it was the king's normal
residence at this period. But Philip Augustus, particularly

¹ ODXXXVI, 192–3; OLXX, chap. vi.
² LXXXIV, 330.
towards the end of his life, made frequent stays in the forest districts where he had the opportunity to hunt, at St. Germain-en-Laye in particular, at Compiègne, or at Melun. He liked the Vexin and the neighbouring parts of Normandy, Mantes, Gisors, Anet, Pacy, Pont-de-l'Arche. Louis VIII had a preference for St. Germain, Louis IX for Vincennes. They adopted their predecessor's habits and, even in time of peace, frequently changed their quarters for two reasons: first, the right of hospitality, which they exercised particularly at the expense of the Church, allowed them to effect considerable economies on the maintenance of themselves and their followers; secondly, they wished to see things for themselves and be seen. It was not without some gain in prestige that Saint Louis, during the later years of his life, made several journeys through Normandy, visiting the poor, talking to the nobles, lay and ecclesiastical, and being formally received in every abbey from the Vexin to Mont Saint Michel.

The king travelled with his full household or, at least, some part of it. It was an ancient institution of which, however, we have no details before the reign of Saint Louis. The household, in the narrowest domestic sense of the term, consisted of six departments—the pantry, the butlery, the fruiterie, the stable, and the chamber. The department of the king (ministerium) which was in constant contact with the royal person and, alone, had a political importance was the chamber where clothes and valuables were kept; the chamberlains gradually became people of primary importance. The offices of the chamber were situated in the Palais de la Cité and the Louvre. In the tower of the Louvre was the household chest where the king had under his control a treasury of precious metals and coined money. The chamber was also responsible for the archives which, from the end of Saint Louis's reign onwards, were preserved in an annexe of the Sainte Chapelle. Gautier of Nemours, a chamberlain, and the Bishop Guérin had been the principal archivists of Philip Augustus. They had established what was known, at a later date, as the Trésor des Chartes which included original

1 DXVII, 330.
2 XXXI, p. ciii ff.; Itinerary of Louis VIII in DXVII, 428 ff.; LXXVII, 408 ff.
3 DXVII, pp. lvi-lxi.
4 DXVII, 374, 387 ff.; CCCXCI, 323 ff.
dispatches and registers. It consisted of the charters which seem to have had the greatest financial and administrative interest. The register which Saint Louis took with him on the Crusade as a ready source of information was of this character. It is possible to-day for us to turn the leaves of this volume which Saint Louis handled.

II

The Court

The most important servants of the household had originally been the seneschal, the constable, the butler, and the chamberlain. In a decree of 1224, they are still called ministeriales of the king’s household. They had become separated from their domestic duties and, like the Chancellor, developed into major officials of the Crown.

At the same time, the marshals, formerly in charge of the stables under the direction of the constable, had been raised to command of the army. These offices, by their historical development, were the concrete proof that the king’s court, the centre of government, was nothing but an enlarged household, entertaining numerous guests permanent or in transit. Philip Augustus, from mistrust, suppressed the office of seneschal (1191), and left vacant that of chancellor (1185–1223). The latter was only restored for a short period (1223–7) for the benefit of the Bishop Guérin but the three other great offices were held in the thirteenth century by men who played an important part, such as the constables Dreux de Mello, Mathieu de Montmorency, Raoul de Nesle, the butlers Robert de Courtenay and Henry de Sully, the chamberlain Barthélemy de Roye, etc. Guérin (ob. 1227) and Barthélemy de Roye (ob. 1237 ?) were the principal advisers of the Crown until the time of their death. The great officials were the trusted ministers of the Crown without any very exact specialization of functions. For instance, the constable is not yet in charge of the army. Most of them belonged to the middle nobility of the royal demesne; Guérin was of humble birth. The secondary offices were

2 XXXI, intro., p. lxvi ff.; DCLXXX 38 ff.; CCXII, iv, 2nd part, 444, 588, etc.; DXVII, 584 ff.; CXXXVI, 583 ff.; DXI, 155 ff., 509 ff.
still very largely monopolized by certain families such as the Clermonts who succeeded one another as marshals, the La Chapelles, the Tristans, and the Villebeons who were chamberlains. The principle of hereditary office, though constantly watched and restricted, still found expression in these able and devoted servants. Besides them, there were numerous petty nobles and “royal knights” who lived at Court and from whom were drawn diplomats, judges, counsellors, and bailiffs; in this class fell the counts of Dreux, Sancerre, Saint Pol, the Beaumonts, Coucy, Beaujeu, Archambaud de Bourbon, the lawyer Pierre de Fontaines, Simon de Nesle who was Saint Louis’s “lieutenant” in France during the king’s last crusade, and the famous Sire de Joinville.¹

The clerical element which had previously been preponderant still held an important place in the personnel of the Curia. In every branch we find clerici domini Regis. The people who probably did most, apart from the kings themselves, to impress on monarchical policy of the period its conservative and moderate character were the great churchmen who appear so often among the king’s following: Pierre de Corbeil, Archbishop of Sens, who was, next to Bishop Guérin and Aimard, the commander of the Templars, one of the advisers who had most weight with Philip Augustus; the Archbishop of Rouen, Eudo Rigaud; the Bishop of Paris, William d’Auvergne; Guy Foulquoi (the future Pope Clement IV), Bishop of Le Puy. The Archbishop of Bourges and three bishops formed a sort of Council of Regency during the crusade in Egypt and Mathieu de Vendôme, Abbot of St. Denis, was the king’s lieutenant, together with the Sire du Nesle, when Louis set out for Tunis.²

In spite of the liberty to elect their superiors which the three kings left to the chapters and convents, it is highly probable that some of these prelates owed their clerical dignities to the political administrative services they had rendered. The fact is indisputable in the case of Guérin. The Franciscan Eudo Rigaud had been the friend and

¹ DCLXXI, CCCIII, 187 ff.; DCLXXX, CCXI, DXVII, passim; CLXX, 52 ff.; CCCXCVI, 46 ff.
² Will and codicil of 1270; LXXII, iv, n. 5638, 5730, 5734; CCXI, iv, 2nd part, 591; CCL, 61 ff.; CCLXIV, 312–13; CCXLIII, 40–1; CLXXII, 57 ff.; CLXIX, p. lvii; DOLI, chap. ix.
adviser of Louis IX before being promoted to the see of Rouen. The alliance of Crown and Church, in spite of mutual dissatisfaction and controversies, was so close that the ecclesiastical electors had no objection to such candidates on principle. Further, Louis IX was so scrupulous on such matters that he was, we believe, the first Capetian to ask the Pope to give formal authorization to the royal clerks not to reside in the benefits in the king’s gift which had been given to them as appointments.

This question of the remuneration of officials was still solved and was for a long time yet to be solved in the old way in the majority of cases. Many of them were lodged and fed at the expense of the household. Those who distinguished themselves were given a living if they were clerks, or, if they were laymen, a money fief for which they did homage or an annual rent levied on some provostship or on the chest of the chamber.¹ The system of wages, however, was already established.²

As in the past, the Court was expanded from time to time, and great meetings were arranged with the same functions and the same purely consultative character as of old. As previously they remained very irregular and very variable in the number and qualifications of those taking part. It would appear that during the reign of Saint Louis they became less frequent in France than in England where the king made frequent demands for money. The institution remained, however, far from moribund. The officials, the royal clerks and knights, and the permanent residents at the Court witnessed the arrival, on these occasions, of prelates, great lords, and even burgesses, all summoned to discharge their duty of giving counsel and all sitting down together.

It was particularly in view of the necessity of taking political decisions of major importance demanding a meeting of the barons that the largest assemblies were brought together; for example, in 1205, at Chinon, the barons were consulted by Philip Augustus on the unjust claims of the Pope; they pledged him to resistance and promised their support; in

¹ XXXI (numerous examples); CXXXVI, 88–94.
² LXXXI, ii. lxix (1266), xcii (1296), etc.; CCCXCVIII, 320, n. 4; CXLVIII, 94–5.
1213, at Soissons, and in 1216, at Melun, a decision was taken for an expedition to England; during the three years of Louis VIII's reign, many political gatherings were held; there were at least ten at which the war with England and the Albigensian Crusade came up for discussion.\(^1\) In the reign of Saint Louis, in 1235, we see forty-one great lords and councilors "and other barons and knights", in conclave with the king at St. Denis and drawing up a protest against the actions of the clergy which was sent to the Pope; other great meetings were held about the matrimonial alliances which affected the dynasty or to decide to end by arbitration the quarrel between the House of Dampierre and the House of Avesnes or on the occasion of the peace with England and the homage to Louis IX rendered by Henry III, etc.\(^2\)

Other "concilia" were concerned with legislation and administration. This was the character of the assembly at Villeneuve le Roi (1209) which accepted an ordinance concerning the division of fiefs\(^3\) or those which Louis VIII held to reach agreement with his barons on the position of Jews in the kingdom, to fix his rights over certain land, to make a definite enactment on a claim against host service, to issue ordinances against the heretical and excommunicated subjects of the South.\(^4\) "By common council of the barons" a new ordinance on the Jews was published in 1230.\(^5\) But when he was concerned with financial problems, he turned most readily to the burgesses. Louis IX consulted them on many occasions on questions of currency: we have the name of three burgesses of Paris, three of Provins, two of Orléans, two of Sens, and two of Laon who took part, in this way, in the preparation of the ordinance of 1263.\(^6\)

The chief business of the Court, throughout this period, was still to give judgment and in its plenary sessions it retained this right even after its judicial session, the Court in Parliament, has been organized. In the first place, the king in person was the chief justiciar. He could cast into

\(^1\) Index Concil. Philippi Augusti, nn. 70, 79, 85, in CCCLII, 90 ff.; Ass. du règne de Louis VIII, nn. 3, 6, 8, 12, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, in DXVII, 442 ff.

\(^2\) LXXII, ii, n. 2404, 2335–2353, 2387–8, 3408–9; iii, n. 4192, 4506, etc.

\(^3\) CCCLII, n. 72.

\(^4\) DXVII, n. 2, 3, 9, 14, 22, 24, etc.

\(^5\) LXXII, n. 3085.

\(^6\) LXXXVII, i, 98–4.
prison without any form of trial, he could condemn to death or he could pardon.1 The sentences which Louis IX, in session under the oak of Vincennes, executed or had executed straightway by his personal advisers were neither legendary nor exceptional.2 Finally, the king alone had power “to be judge and party to his own quarrel and those of others”,3 but he delegated his powers of justice to whom he would.

Controversies which were somewhat complicated were frequently cut short by arbitration, sanctioned by a royal charter, or by mutual agreement reached in the presence of the king.4 In cases of litigation, it might be the whole Court, reinforced with prelates and barons, whom the king invited to pronounce judgment or it might be a limited number of lawyers who knew what was already beginning to be called “the custom of the kingdom of France”.5 It is not always easy, during the first half of the thirteenth century, to distinguish in the document between the two latter categories more so as they merge into each other by insensible gradations. Clearly, however, the king expected to consult his barons on a case which concerned the great feudal houses like that of the succession in Champagne (1216) and, with even greater reason, when he was concerned with a political verdict of condemnation. By way of example, since we are fortunate enough to possess the authentic text, we will quote here the sentence pronounced in June, 1230, “on the field, before Ancenis,” on Pierre Mauciere who was count of rather regent of Brittany pending his son’s majority.

We would have you know that, in the presence of our most beloved lord Louis, famous King of France, we have unanimously adjudged that Pierre, sometime Count of Brittany, because of the crimes he has committed against our lord the king which have in very large part been proved to us all has forfeited at the bar of justice his position in Brittany. All who by reason of that position have rendered him loyalty or homage are completely quit and absolved from that loyalty and that homage and are not bound to obey him or do anything for him on account of that position.

1 See the case of Enguerran de Coucy below. Remission granted by Philip Augustus: XXXI, n. 1987.
3 XVI, §§ 84. Cf. however, LXXII, iv, n. 3115.
4 DCLXX, 90; DXVII, 355–5; LXXII, ii, nn. 2747, 2873, 2947, 2977, etc.
5 Connoctus Regni Franciae (XXXI, n. 1456). Cf. Guiliemo, in R.E.C., 1899, p. 54, n. 5. Some texts of judgments will be found in II, LXXI, CIV.
The deed is sealed with thirty seals, belonging to the Archbishop of Sens, the bishops of Chartres and Paris, the counts of Flanders, Champagne, Nevers, Blois, Chartres, and counts, viscounts, and lords who are known to us as supporters of Blanche of Castile and Louis IX and officials of the Crown. It is further indicated that “other barons and knights have taken part in the judgment”.

In certain cases we find mention, at this period, of the famous “Peers of France”, whose early history has stimulated such a flow of ink. In the Middle Ages, it was a principle of law that the nobility (and even the burgesses and, in certain countries, the villains) should be judged by their peers. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, we can see, from an authentic text, that an important vassal of the King of France, the Count of Flanders, could already claim judgment by his peers. But it was only when the Capetian monarchy had become a force to be respected, in the course of the thirteenth century, that the great lords of the kingdom, being justiciable before the Curia Regis in practice as well as in law, began to demand their rights, and in 1216, for the first time, we have, in a text, a sentence in which six peers of the realm are named: the peers of the realm, “namely, the Archbishop of Rheims, the bishops of Langres, Chalons-sur-Marne, Beauvais, and Noyon, and the Duke of Burgundy,” judge the case of Erard de Brienne and the Countess of Champagne. Moreover they judged it together with “many other bishops and barons”. It was enough that the court should include “peers”. We possess other official documents dating from the end of the reign of Philip Augustus, from the reign of Louis VIII and Saint Louis in which peers of the realm appear but none of them mention a “court of peers”, nor even “twelve peers”. The list of twelve peers (Archbishop Duke of Rheims, bishop dukes of Laon and Langres, bishop counts of Beauvais, Chalons-sur-Marne, and Noyon, dukes of Normandy, Aquitaine, Burgundy, counts of Flanders,

1 LXXII, ii, n. 2056.
2 See the analysis of texts in DOLXIV, iii, 301 ff.; OCII, i, 646 ff.; DOLXX, 77–88; OCXXXIX, 84–6; OCXXXVII, OCXLIII, OCXIX, OCXIV, OCCLXVI, 205 ff. On a recent work of M. de Valon, see B.E.C., 1932, pp. 153–7.
3 OCCLXXIX, 237–8.
4 OCXII, 7.
5 LXXI, n. xix.
Champagne, Toulouse) given by the English chronicler Matthew de Paris is a very old list which since the annexation of Normandy and the County of Toulouse to the royal demesne represents a tradition in part at least obsolete. The genuine texts relative to the period that we are considering now almost all fall between the years 1216 and 1287 and for the most part concern the relations between the Crown and the County of Flanders. They bear witness to the fact that the magnates saw some guarantee in judgment by their peers and that the king was seeking to limit his concessions. Since Bouvines Flanders had been under his yoke and that was the fief in which, of all the great fiefs, the custom of judgment by peers was most vital. The Countess of Flanders claimed its benefits for fear of the king's servants. In 1224, obviously at her prompting, the peers present demanded that the four great officers of the Crown should not sit with the eleven "peers of France" in judgment on an appeal brought against her by one of her vassals and they were dismissed. In the same way, the king claimed to be able to make a distinction in cases where the ordinary jurisdiction is insufficient; in 1259 in a case about the ward of a church, he could not agree with the Archbishop of Rheims "to have his peers". However, he did not give the peers any predominance among his advisers on matters of government. In vain did supporters of the aristocracy like the poet Hue de la Ferté press the idea and it was in vain that the English and Germans claimed to recognize a political prerogative in the peers of France. In short, the peerage has existed in the French kingdom since the thirteenth century but its ambitions were stillborn.

These represent the varying aspects of the political and judicial assemblies held between 1202 and 1270. They deserve the more careful attention of scholarship; they are clearly the embryo of the future States General. It would be equally possible to find the origin of the local and provincial assemblies of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, in gatherings like those of the knights of the French Vexin who,

1 LXXX, v, 606-7.
2 On the peers in the north of the kingdom see CCCXXV, 79 ff. and notes.
3 LXXII, ii, n. 1831, 2583-4.
4 LXXI, n. xxi. Cf. DXVII, 349.
5 LXXI, n., xxxii, xxxii bis.
6 LXXXVIII, 191-2; LXXX, v, 281, 482-3, 606; LXXII, ii, n. 3380.
in 1235, took an ordinance on feudal relief in their province into the presence of the bailiff, or of the nobles of Maine and Anjou who met for the same object in 1246 under the presidency of the king himself, or the commissions of jurors which the ordinance of 1254 recommended bailiffs and seneschals to establish to advise on the export of foodstuffs.

But the monarchical administration based on specialization, the development of special competence and bureaucracy was growing and from it the new order in France was to arise.

III

Masters and Councillors

During the reigns of Philip Augustus, Louis VIII, and Saint Louis, the word "Consilium" was applied to all kinds of meetings of the Court and the Consiliarii Regis were men more concerned with justice than policy. We cannot yet see a separate council. As a result, the commission of lawyers and accountants emerges particularly at the end of the period. Their traditions were established and their methods of work improved.

Scholarship tends to place at an even later date the birth of a Parlement of Paris distinct from the Curia Regis. During the thirteenth century, the term "parlement" meaning "discussion" remained a vague word frequently referring to general sessions of the Court. Applied to justice, it signified a special session of the Curia during which consideration was given to some previously prepared business. There was no Parlement, there were parlements which might be judiciary sessions three or four times a year and outside these sessions the Court was competent to give judgment. This remained so even under the sons of Philip the Bel. Nevertheless, from the reign of Saint Louis, the improvements of the judicial machinery of the monarchy, which was already noticeable in the time of Philip Augustus and even under

---

1 **LXXII**, ii, n. 2392, 3521. See also n. 2706, 3588; **XXX**, n. 425-6.
2 See the interesting texts of 1234, in CV, n. 299, and of 1264 in **XXXIX**, ii, 269.
3 **DLXVI**, 187 ff.
4 **DCLII**, 74 ff.; **DCLIII**, 60 ff.
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Louis VII, became most marked and many innovations appear. Accumulations of business was one of the principal reasons for the changes. The number of cases of first instance and on appeal was so great that the establishment of a permanent judicial personnel, excluding unqualified elements, became more and more essential. Under Saint Louis, some thirty people formed this personnel. Already they were called "Councillors" or "Masters"; one of them presided and pronounced the sentence: they sat at sessions known as "parlements" with other people whom there had been some reason to summon. For example, on 24th February, 1258, the Prior of Saint-Martin-des-Champs appeared before "the councillors of the King of France holding Parlement": there were three professional magistrates, Geoffrey de la Chapelle, king's knight, who presided, Master Étienne de Montfort, Dean of Saint Aignan d'Orléans, and Master Eudo de Lorris, Dean of Angers; three royal clerks qualified as "masters"; the three bailiffs of Caen, Étampes, and Orléans (the bailiffs were often lawyers and rendered service in Court); the two Provosts of Paris who were concerned in the case; and, finally, the Archbishop of Bourges and the two bishops of Paris and Évreux summoned because a churchman was involved. The case was heard in Paris "in domo regis", undoubtedly in the chamber of pleas, of which Joinville tells us, in the Palais de la Cité. The itinerant character of the commissions of royal judges was disappearing more and more: many reasons combined to make their settlement in Paris inevitable. It was impossible for the vast number of plaintiffs to follow the king's progress: on the other hand, under the influence of Norman methods, a written procedure was making rapid advances and the habit of preserving decrees on rolls and "registering" the most important of them began to grow up. Henceforward, a record office and a permanent situation were essential. This was the first step in the establishment of the Parlement of Paris. At present, it is still only one aspect of the Curia Regis but already the royal judges form a corps in almost permanent session in Paris, there are archives and registers in which are entered

1 COCXXVII; CXLI, 67. It would not be out of place to instance a decree of 1228 which is characteristic of the previous period: X, 235–8.
2 LXXI, n. xxiv.
3 LXVIII, § 679.
the decisions which will form the basis for "precedent".¹ The term "Chambre des Comptes" does not appear before the beginning of the fourteenth century. Nevertheless, the organization of the Curia Regis in session to receive the accounts submitted by the bailiffs and to prepare their estimates in advance is certainly more ancient than the judicial session "in parliament". It appears already in a considerably advanced stage in the oldest account which the general destruction of financial documents of the period has left us—the General Account of 1202-3.² Thanks to the model provided by the financial administration of the Duchy of Normandy, there was a gradual improvement. The classification of receipts and expenses became clearer and more precise during the reign of Saint Louis³; but the reforms of the finances and the Treasury did not take place till the reigns of Philip the Fair and his sons. Throughout the period we are studying, the main features of the administration remained the same. The Treasury was in the Temple at Paris and remained there till 1295. The Templars were bankers to the king and the princes of the royal family. It was in the Temple that the money paid in by provosts and bailiffs was deposited. The household chest at the Louvre received the sums necessary for meeting the expenses of the household services and its curator had to justify his expenditure before the Treasurer of the Temple. These people, however, merely rendered simple accounts. The real financial agents of the monarchy were the bailiffs and provosts and the members of the Curia who directed and controlled them. When the Court was concerned with financial questions, it adopted the title "Curia in compotis domini Regis"; it met three times a year at the Temple to supervise receipts and expenditure with the help of the accounts of the bailiwicks and the estimates prepared by the specialists.⁴

This Curia Regis in which was embodied the nucleus of

¹ LXXXV, preface, p. lxxiv ff.; noted by Grun in II, i, p. 1 ff.; XXXII, 305; CVII, 256-7, 267 ff.; CXXXIV; LXXXI, p. vi ff.
² Preserved by Brussel who has edited it in CXL, ii, p. cxxxix ff. Cf., CXXXV.
³ Documents published by De Wailly and Delisle in H.F., xxi, 226 ff., and xxii, 505 ff.
⁴ CXL; CLXXXV, n. i-ii.
all the great departments of state, had a high reputation for integrity. "From the King of France, or his Court," wrote the Bishop of Cahors in 1246, "comes nothing but what is just and equitable, lawful, and honest." The barons recognized in the Court a royal power; in 1245 the new Countess of Flanders speaks of permission given her by the Court since the king is too ill for anyone to speak to him on business. She says, "He has granted us through his Court..." It was the Court, also, which governed when the king was absent and it was by commissions issuing from it that the demesne was administered.

IV

THE DEMESNE AND LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

Since 1202 the demesne had been increased by the ducal demesne of Normandy which included about forty "cities" (centres of dioceses) or châtelleries; the demesne of the counts of Anjou with Angers, Tours, and le Mans; the demesne of the dukes of Aquitaine in Poitou and Saintonge with Poitiers and Saintes and, finally, by fiefs which had been confiscated from rebellious vassals, such as the County of Boulogne and Auvergne, or which had fallen to the king through lack of an heir or by negotiation, such as Eastern Vermandois with Saint Quentin, the counties of Valois, Clermont-en-Beauvaisis, Beaumont-sur-Oise, Alençon, the lordships of Nogent and Issoudun. If we add to these acquisitions those dating from the beginning of the reign, we shall appreciate that Philip Augustus had increased by four times the royal demesne which was extended from the neighbourhood of Saint Omer as far as Saintonge. Louis VIII completed the annexation of Poitou and acquired the châtellanes of Saint Riquier and Doullens, the County of Perche, and, following the Crusade in the heretical districts

1 LXXII, ii, n. 3549.
2 LXXXII, ii, n. 3228.
3 On the demesne and the appanages: ODXXVIII, lectures vii–ix; OCXI, iv, 2nd part, 595–6; DXVII, 358–363; CXCI; XXII, ii, intro.; LXXV: Du Cange on the word appanage.
4 See p. 154 above.
of which we shall have to speak, the Seneschalship of Beauaire and Carcassonne seized from the Count of Toulouse. In the reign of Louis IX, the County of Maçon was acquired but most important was the conclusion of a series of treaties which simplified and clarified the relations of the king, his barons and the neighbouring kings: in 1229 treaty with the Count of Toulouse who, except for his capital and the Toulousain which he retained, yielded to the King of France his demesnes and his rights of suzerainty; in 1234 treaty with the Count of Brittany who handed over to the king the important fortified posts of Saint James of Beuvron and Bellême; in 1258-9 treaties with the King of Aragon who retained nothing in France but the suzerainty of Montpellier and with the King of England.¹

It is true that in the time of Saint Louis the demesne had been seriously reduced by the custom, introduced by Louis VIII, of establishing important appanages for the younger sons of the king; by his will, he bequeathed Artois to his second son, Anjou and Maine to the third, Poitou and Auvergne to the fourth. If the holder of the appanage died without a direct heir his possessions returned to the Crown. Many of the predecessors of Louis VIII had enfeoffed their young sons in lordships. It was customary, in those areas where baronies were indivisible, for the elder son to give the younger a “means of life” apanamentum. It was not a “part of the inheritance” as Robert of Artois wrongly claimed.² In this way Louis VIII had alienated at least a third of his demesne “to prevent the growth of discord” among his sons. That is easily identifiable as a result of the ascendency undoubtedly exercised over him by his wife, Blanche of Castile. For a mother, even for a mother of her character, the desire to endow her children adequately and prevent jealousy could easily triumph over considerations of policy. Louis IX carried out his father’s wishes but he only conferred very modest appanages on his own younger sons. Nevertheless, a dangerous precedent had been created;

¹ See p. 237 above.
² LXXII, ii, n. 2569; Robert of Artois declares that his brother, in accordance with the will of their father, has conferred Artois upon him pro parte hereditatis. Cf. the judgment of 1284 against Charles of Anjou, who claimed the heritage of Alphonse of Poitiers: Regio fratres portionem certam bonorum patris... non possunt petere sed primogenitus quantum vult et quando vult eis conferi (XXXII, n. 387).
the history of France in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was to show that the princely dynasties of the blood royal were as much a menace to the monarchy and unity as the others. In the thirteenth century, thanks to the firm stand of Louis IX and some lucky chances the dismemberment of the demesne between the king and his brothers was not serious. The tremendous appanage of Alphonse of Poitiers, to which was added the inheritance of his father-in-law the Count of Toulouse, was prudently administered and the way was prepared for assimilation to the royal demesne in regions which were not readily absorbable.

The administration of the royal demesne did not undergo any essential changes. The bailiffs retained their character of delegates of the Curia and they were not the only delegates of the Curia sent into the provinces. Some of its members took their seats on the Exchequer of Normandy; others were commissioned to receive submissions, oaths of loyalty, and guarantees, to arbitrate and hold administrative or judicial inquiries: the procedure of the inquest showed considerable development and provided the agents of the king with an opportunity, even outside of the demesne, to appear the defenders of truth, law, and the peace. The great inquests which Saint Louis set on foot, of which we shall speak again, have a special character but they are only the ideal form, the theoretical manifestation of a procedure which was one of the vehicles of monarchical progress.¹

The bailiffs² were more permanent delegates than the others but, particularly during the first third of the thirteenth century, the institution retained its original character of a delegation sometimes individual and sometimes collective; even during the reign of Louis VIII and the Regency of Blanche of Castile, the bailiffs frequently formed commissions; there were two or three to hold judicial sessions and the bailiwicks were of varying extent but all were known as bailiffs. They were responsible for justice and administration, they received the revenues but they often returned to resume their place at Court. Subsequently, the bailiwick became

² CDLXLV, pref. 15–385; CDLXVII, 545 ff.; 587 ff.; DXVII, 368 ff.; CDXXXIX, 195 ff.; DCLXXIII, 5 ff.; CDXXXVI, 145 ff.; CDLXXXI, chap. i.
a fixed district which had a local name and was administered by only one bailiff: for example, the bailiwicks of Vermandois reached this stage between 1234 and 1236. In the South after 1226 royal seneschalships were being created. The seneschals were bailiffs who, owing to their isolation, were more independent of the Curia. The bailiffs and seneschals were important people sometimes given, in documents, the title of "bailiff in chief", or "lieutenant of the king". They administered, primarily, the lands belonging to the king and those over which he had rights, particularly the rights of higher justice; already, however, their activities were spreading beyond the demesne and they interfered as much as they could in the life of the neighbouring lordships or free towns.

There still remained seneschalships of a feudal character. William des Roches had been recognized by Philip Augustus as Seneschal in Anjou, Maine, and Touraine, and the Viscount of Thouars as Seneschal in Poitou and Aquitaine. Under this title they did liege homage and handled part of the revenues. The real administration was in the hands of inferior seneschals or bailiffs. Philip Augustus had not intended to make anything but a temporary concession to the great lords whom there could be no question of transforming into officials. He hoped through them to gain a mastery over a local nobility which was far from reliable. The seneschalship of Anjou, after the death of William des Roches, passed to his brother-in-law and then to his daughter. Aimery of Thouars proved disloyal and lost the seneschalship of Poitou. The duties of the grand seneschal of Normandy which, in this case, had been more than nominal, had been suppressed by Philip Augustus.

V

THE KING'S REVENUES

One of the most important functions of the bailiffs and seneschals was to provide the king with money.

The revenues of the Crown had been considerably increased

---

1 *Ballivi capitales*: XXX, n. 251; LXXII, ii, nn. 2022, 2025.
2 *CDXLVII*, 550 ff.
3 *DXVII*, 308–9; *CCXI*, iv, 1st part, 208–9; *LXXII*, ii, n. 1915, iii, n. 3828.
4 *CLI X*, 10.
since the conquests of Philip Augustus. It was not only that they took on a new character and regular public taxation was levied but the demesne had been extended as we have already seen and the king, now able to command some respect, was not only able to impose his will on towns and churches but to draw every possible advantage from feudal custom and his position as supreme suzerain.

The receipts from the provostships in the account of 1202 amount to £81,782 Parisian but by the middle of the thirteenth century they are in the neighbourhood of £50,000 Parisian.\(^1\) Many of the revenues, however, particularly those of the forests and fishponds, were not received by the provosts and appear in the accounts under a different heading. In the General Account for Candlemas, 1227, which is devoted to the last of the three terms of the year 1226–7, each of the great forests brings in about £800. In 1202 the total product of the forests had been £7,080.\(^2\) There had been a considerable geographical extension in the collection of certain dues formerly limited to the royal demesne or neighbouring ecclesiastical lordships. The expleta, that is the products of justice, the fines, were a case in point. In the account of 1202 they amounted to £5,810.\(^3\) The dues of the Chancery\(^4\) and the tax on franchises provide further examples: in 1225 the Canons of Orléans promised the king that they would pay him £200 if he would enfranchise their serfs of Étampes.

The old right of hospitality allowed the king, as in the past, to travel through the kingdom without any great expense. During the progress made by Louis VIII in 1223 it brought in £1,815 and, under this right, the Archbishop and people of Rheims paid the considerable expenses of the consecration.\(^5\) But more and more it became fixed or even transformed itself into an annual tax of, for instance, £100.\(^6\)

Apart from the dues which we have just enumerated, taxes and voluntary gifts imposed on individuals because

---

\(^1\) CDXXXVI, 49; GLXXXVI, 50–60.
\(^2\) DXVII, document in proof, n. 18; CDXXXVI, 55–6.
\(^3\) CDXXXVI, 57–8.
\(^4\) GLXXXVI, 378–9.
\(^5\) OUI, i, chap. xxxviii; LII, 397 ff.
\(^6\) XXXI, n. 1896; DXVII, 378; LXXII, iii, 3690, 4168, 4537, etc.
of their position or on communities, lay and ecclesiastical, became more and more productive. The former have a seigniorial or feudal character; the latter can be explained only by the prerogative of monarchy. Foreigners (aliens, Jews, Lombards) were only tolerated as long as they could be exploited. Aliens settled on the royal demesne and even on certain Church lands paid the king a special tax. Philip Augustus, after showing himself brutally fanatical towards the Jews, adopted the policy of muleting them regularly and their life was peaceful and prosperous in the royal demesne during the last years of his reign. Loans at interest or "usury" were tolerated. Louis VIII and IX showed themselves much more harsh; the one undoubtedly stimulated by greed and the influence of the barons, the other by hatred of the Jews. Louis VIII in agreement with twenty-four lords, lay and ecclesiastical, decided that debts belonging to Jews should not bear interest and should be repaid within three years to the lord of the lender. It is probable that the lenders rarely saw their money again. The "Summa Judaeorum" amounting to £8,682 Parisian which appears in the incomplete account for 1227 undoubtedly came from the levy, imposed by the king, on Jewish debts. This ordinance and the similar ordinances of Saint Louis were not enforced so far as the suppression of loans at interest was concerned but, henceforward, the royal agents treated the Jews of the demesne in a completely arbitrary manner and pillaged them shamelessly. In a royal mandate of 1246 to the seneschal of Carcassonne it is cynically said, "take as much as you can from those of our Jews who are in prison for we want control of their resources, quia volumus habere de suo." The Lombard bankers were installed in Paris after 1224; each of them paid the king £2 10s. a year; they practised usury, like the Jews, and were not treated much better.  

The economic development which the population gained from several prosperous years of peace did not only lighten the incidence of taxes on industry and commerce. The towns


2 DXV, i, 29–30; DXVII, 417–18; ordinance of 1299, in LXXXVII, i, 96.
of the demesne and many episcopal towns were squeezed, particularly at the end of Saint Louis's reign. They were not only asked for aids on the four traditional occasions; they were arbitrarily required to make presents or loans which were not always repaid. The king's exactions, particularly the rights of regale and relief which were received on the death of a prelate or baron, grew as his control extended to the remotest parts of the kingdom. In 1202–3, the regales brought Philip Augustus £4,956 Parisian; Rheims alone provided £2,829 although it was vacant only four months. The king had good reason to delay for a long time the "leave to elect." A certain number of bishops secured the suppression of the regale by paying an indemnity or an annual rent. The "relief" of the fief brought in considerable profits by this date in accordance with the extension of the royal authority. In 1212, Theobald, Count of Blois, a vassal of the Countess of Champagne paid £4,000 Parisian to the countess and £5,000 to the king; in 1219, the widow of the Count of Eu paid 15,000 marks of silver; in 1289, Henry de Sully, whom the Countess of Dreux was to marry as her second husband paid £4,000 Parisian as a redemption for the County of Dreux; the same year, the new viscount of Châtellerault paid £1,500 Tournois; the relief of the County of Ponthieu provided Saint Louis with £5,000 Parisian.

Finally all subjects lay and ecclesiastical were subject willy nilly to aids. They contained the germs of the modern system of public taxation. Philip the Fair invented nothing, he merely developed an established procedure. The tax in lieu of military service—"aid of host," "host tallage"—which was probably introduced by Philip Augustus, was paid by all those people or communities who did not wish to do personal service. They were rarely nobles but they included, in particular, abbeyes, communes, the provostships of the demesne and the bishops; for instance, in 1226, the Bishop of Soissons paid £120 to avoid accompanying the king.

---

1 COXI, Actual document, n. 47; COXCI, 242–3. See below.
2 COXCI, 63–4.
3 See below, Chap. II, § III.
4 See the ordinances of Louis IX: LXXIV, 55, 58.
6 LXXII, n. 2761, 2777.
7 CV, n. 423–4.
8 CL, 20 ff.; COXCI, 59–60.
on his expedition against the heretics.1 Finally, the feudal aids which had been so rare and so badly collected in the twelfth century were increasing not without rousing some protest. Saint Louis had levied twice for the Crusade, once for the marriage of his eldest daughter, once for the knighting of his eldest son, and even once for the extension of fief, in 1259, when the promises of subsidies made to Henry III obliged him to levy "the aid for the King of England's peace."2 The aids for the Crusade were particularly heavy. In 1248, Beauvais paid £1,750 to this, Compiègne and Senlis £1,250, and Soissons, a second account, £1,000.3 The Church paid the aid in the form of a tenth or a twentieth of their annual revenue when the defence of the faith was concerned, i.e. for the crusades against the Moslems or the Albigensian heretics or for the conquest of Sicily by Charles of Anjou. The king demanded a tenth which the Pope granted and the clergy paid not on their personal property but on the revenues of their ecclesiastical possessions. For example, in 1227, the Archbishop of Sens undertook on behalf of his province to give £1,500 a year for four years for the Albigensian business.4 Recalcitrants were punished with excommunication and distraint. Further the taxes levied on the authority of the Pope had an international character. The money might come from England, Spain, or the Empire and might be used to support a certain prince or knight who had taken the Cross as much as the King of France. It was in France, however, that the charges were greatest and it was primarily the king who benefited from the tenths and twentieths levied during the period. The Capetian monarchy had made some progress since the time when Philip Augustus had been forced abjectly to renounce the Saladin tithe.5

Monetary history, like the history of the aids, allows us to measure the progress of the royal power. Its fluctuations show equally the spirit which inspired a particular king and his advisers. In the twelfth century, currency was weak, unstable, and scanty.6 Philip Augustus and Louis VIII

1 DXVII, 379.
2 CVII, 48–57; CCXVII, 64–5; DXXIX, 308 ff.
3 CLXXXVIII, 169.
4 LXXII, ii, n. 1930, 1949; XXV, 314.
5 CXV, 56, 88, etc.; CLXXII, 169 ff.; CCXLVII, 581–3.
6 On the debasement of the coinage under the early Capetians see CC XVIII, COLVII.
commenced a reorganization of the currency by making the
system of Tours coinage general in all the newly annexed
territories while the Paris coinage was retained in the ancient
demesne. The pound Tournais was worth four-fifths of the
Parisian pound. Louis VIII fixed the customs of the Parisian
mints and for the future there was a true Capetian coinage,
but there were even better things to come. Every lord,
including the king, had the right to fix the currency of the
coins he struck and to vary at will its relation to the pounds,
shillings, and pence which comprised the money of accountant.
On the other hand, he was trying to lower the value of the
coins. It was essential that the king should abandon these
vagaries, that the royal money should be stable and the best
in France, that he should not make excessive profits out of
the minting, and that the relations between the coins and
the money of account and between gold and silver coinage
should not be arbitrarily altered. This was the work of
Saint Louis. He re-established the prestige of a good coinage.
The value of gold pieces in his reign was $\frac{3}{100}$ fine and of the
silver ones $\frac{3}{4}$ fine. The gold crown of the Tournais coinage
(about fifty-eight of these coins made up a gold mark)
weighed a little more than 4 grammes and was worth twelve
shillings and a half of the Tournais money of account. The
tournais silver penny, at the rate of fifty-eight to a mark
of silver, was worth one shilling Tournais. Innumerable
silver and gold coins were set in circulation. This coinage of
Saint Louis was accepted so confidently that it was possible
without rousing any undue anger to restrict the currency of
seigniorial monies in its favour. He provided that the royal
money should be current throughout the realm and forbade
the use of any other in districts where there was no seigniorial
mint. As for claiming the sole right of striking coinage,
or authorizing its issue, he had too much respect for the rights
of his barons to entertain any such project. His officials
who did not always obey his orders, frequently claimed to
restrict somewhat unduly the currency of seigniorial coinage
but the following generation was to see the introduction of
many serious abuses and at that period there would be re-
gretful memories of the time of the good money of Saint Louis.\(^1\)

\[^1\] \textit{OCL}, vol. x, 187-8; \textit{XXX}, n. 350; \textit{OCLIX}, 328 ff.; \textit{DLXVIII}, pp. lxxvii-
\textit{LXXXI}; \textit{DXVII}, p. 381; \textit{DLII}, 79-84; \textit{CXXXIV}, ii, 147 ff., 225 ff.
Historians of the Capetian monarchy have forgotten to mention among its resources ransoms and the spoils of war. It was a source of such considerable profits that it gave rise to treaties. Thus when Louis VIII assisted the Countess of Flanders against her revolted subjects he was careful to reserve for himself half of ransoms, spoils captured in towns taken by assault, and sums paid on surrender. The Crown sought to gain some benefit from its wars for they cost it very dear.

VI

The Expenditure. Financial Balance of the Period

The bailiffs and provosts, after meeting on the spot local expenses such as the wages of the royal agents, rents, pious gifts, the upkeep of castles, bridges, roads, etc., carried to Paris a surplus which, with the addition of some other receipts, was sufficient for the expenses of the household and the religious or political administration in time of peace. The daily style of living of the household, the wages in money or kind of the civil and military personnel of the Court, the gifts, alms, and festivals still retained a character of patriarchal moderation. Louis IX, in his youth, was not an enemy of finery, he said to his friends, "You should dress yourself properly and cleanly and your wives will love you the better," but he deprecated untoward luxury and, at the end of his life, dressed himself as a priest. Philip Augustus and his closest descendants had not the same extravagant ideas which later made it necessary for the Valois to create new resources for themselves. Their only luxury was building but it was not devoted to palaces at that period. Philip Augustus was haunted to the end of his life by the fear of a revival of English power and he built many strong castles and fortified Paris and his chief towns. Military architecture reached

1 DXVIII, 382-397; CDXXXVI, 73 ff.
2 CDXXXVI, 89-128; DCLXVII, pp. lxxviii-lxxii; CDXLVII, 584 ff.
3 The expenses of the household are, nevertheless, very difficult to evaluate (CDXXXVI, 131-3).
4 LXVIII, §§ 25, 36, 94, 228.
5 CDXXXVI, 117; LVII, 387, line 408 ff.; CDXLVI, 248-9.