Aristocratic Involvement in Charles VI's Royal Progress in Languedoc, 1389–1390

Royal and princely progresses (and in particular their formal entries to individual cities) in the late medieval and early modern period have typically been studied as encounters between the ruler and the urban elite. From the ruler's perspective, these occasions helped consolidate their legitimacy, promote political stability, and pursue specific objectives, both at their power base in their capital and in the provinces where their direct authority was more sporadic.[1] Municipal councils and other urban institutions, meanwhile, had the opportunity to display both their loyalty and their own claims to power, alongside more practical considerations of securing concessions and privileges through these moments of direct access to the prince or king.[2] Logistically, this historiographical orientation has translated into a focus on the ruler and their retinue on the move, with all the expenditures and coordination that entailed, and on the towns' efforts to receive the entourage in due style.[3] And if there is ongoing debate over the extent to which these ceremonial encounters should be viewed as spaces for genuine political dialogue, as exercises in consensus-building, or as vehicles for the imposition of royal authority, this discourse itself has drawn new attention to the role of urban elites in the development of the premodern state.[4]

I propose introducing a new dimension to these power dynamics by considering the rural aristocracy as separate players in this ritualized political process. This is not to say that the landed and urban elites were wholly distinct social groups: far from it. Recent work has broken down the longstanding dichotomy between burghers in the towns and nobility in the countryside, showing that portions of the nobility were in fact highly integrated with urban life.[5] Conversely, especially in areas where the urbanization of the nobility has been longer acknowledged, scholars have pointed towards the tendency for great urban families to invest in

rural estates and society.[6] Progresses, however, often doubled as means of obtaining the homages and oaths of fealty from the fiefholding tenants of the prince or king, an exchange that put landownership and seigneurial authority front and centre and so represented a performance of power that was quite distinct from the urban concerns.[7] However, the aristocracy (along with, more broadly, the rural populace at large) have appeared only tangentially in studies of royal itinerance, if at all.[8] This exclusion stems from a dichotomy in the historical narrative: collaborations between urban centres and the monarchy are read as modernizing trends, steering away from the older model of feudal relationships.[9] Reincorporating rural aristocratic participation and seigneurial power into the political functions of the progress challenges this teleological approach to the evolving relationship between local powers and the wider polity.

I will examine the relevance of aristocratic participation to our understanding of the social and political significance of progresses through a case study of the voyage of King Charles VI of France (r. 1380–1422) to the region of Languedoc in the south in 1389. This tour marked the advent of Charles' majority and aimed at restoring the king's good government to a region long abused by unscrupulous lieutenants and their officers. In addition to making grand entries, hearing petitions, and reforming his administration in the area, Charles received the homages of over four hundred fiefholders, from powerful counts to minor lords. Summoned in advance by royal mandate, these aristocratic tenants appeared publicly before the king at every major stage of his progress to perform the requisite ceremony, and to present an official record of their lands and privileges to the royal administration, in exchange for which they received letters confirming them in their possession. This exceptionally well-documented interaction, however, has been overlooked in previous accounts of the progress.[10]

I will first consider the structural parallels between royal entries and homages as political encounters to demonstrate the relevance of aristocratic participation in this context. The act of

homage underpinned the function of royal visits as both inaugural ceremonies and political programmes, and so offers new scope for understanding the reciprocity of such hierarchical interactions. I will then turn from the royal perspective to that of the landed elite by considering the logistics underlying their interactions with the king as a measure of their agency in this process. A spatial analysis of who met the king, where, and why, suggest that rather than being the passive recipients of the royal presence, the homagers were active participants in the display of authority. Finally, the social significance of the encounter between the king and his fiefholders is thrown into sharper relief by comparison with the patterns of engagement following his departure from the region. Although not all fiefholders performed their homage in person, their greater prioritization of a personal interaction with the king himself suggests how the occasion served as a marker of distinction. Recalibrating the dynamics of the progress in this way offers new perspectives on the cooperation between royal and seigneurial power at the end of the Middle Ages.

The royal visit to Languedoc was no small undertaking. From 1 September 1389 to 23 February 1390, Charles VI progressed from Paris to Toulouse and back, with numerous stops along the Loire valley on the way south, and the Saône and Seine on the return.[11] He reached Avignon on 31 October and Toulouse on 29 November, where he spent more than a month before turning for home on 7 January, departing Avignon in early February.[12] This path brought him through three of the major seneschalsies, Toulouse, Carcassonne, and Beaucaire.[13] His entourage comprised several members of the royal family as well as the king's council and representatives of the administration, including bookkeepers of the *Chambre des comptes*, effectively shifting the centre of power and government to follow Charles ('and when will the king return from Languedoc? He has stayed there too long', lamented the poet Eustache Deschamps on behalf of the Parisians left behind).[14] The scale of this voyage reflected its double significance as at once

an inauguration and a renewal of royal governance. Each of these two aspects situate this case study in relation to specific traditions surrounding the royal progress and its historiographical study, and so underscore the several reasons why the collection of homages should be considered integral to this process. I will highlight first the main points of contact between the urban and aristocratic ceremonials, before showing how Charles' aims for the progress relied on (re)establishing a rapport with the landed elite.

In the first instance, historians have tended to distinguish entries performed at the beginning of a reign from those made periodically thereafter.[15] The inaugural character of a ruler's first visit might have more or less actual constitutional force, depending on each polity's political traditions, but it always represented the public acceptance of the ruler's authority by their subjects, in exchange for which they expected to receive the confirmation or extension of their privileges.[16] This dynamic was usually marked by the swearing of oaths, either reciprocally or unilaterally – and that ritual shows a direct filiation between the civic entry and the seigneurial homage.[17] Homages were likewise due at the accession of a new prince, and served to confirm the political relationship between the tenants, who recognized their dependence, and the prince, who recognized their rights. It is not a coincidence that the regular tours of homage undertaken in the late Middle Ages collected the oaths of towns (and villages) indiscriminately with those of their fiefholders.[18] Nor should we forget that other groups, and especially the clergy and nobility, were represented alongside the towns during entry ceremonies.[19] The main difference between the two contexts was that entries dealt primarily in collectives, while aristocratic homages privileged the individual power-holder; together, these complementary practices were instrumental in establishing a new reign.

At the same time, the recurring significance of inaugural progresses and entries could give way to more targeted aims. Whether at the start of a reign or later, such events sought to alleviate

(or stifle) political anxieties, restore relationships, and capitalize on good will, through the ritualization of the ruler's authority and good governance. For instance, King Henry V (r. 1413–22) returned from a long sojourn on the mainland to raise money and garner support for his French policies by his progress through England in 1421, an event which showcased the king as a pious and just ruler committed to defending his realm.[20] In 1368 and 1384, Duke Jean IV of Brittany (r. 1365–99) used entries into Saint-Malo to restore ducal authority in a town which had ambitions of becoming an independent commune; in Ghent in 1467, a similarly tense entry by Duke Charles the Bold of Burgundy (r. 1467–77) instead provoked further revolts.[21] Homages, for all that they were expected to be routine events in the life cycles of lordships, were liable to be caught up in such loaded moments as representing a return to normalcy and the reaffirmation of the structures of power.

The 1389 progress offers a concrete example of how the homages underpinned Charles' dual mission of establishing his rulership and fostering regional stability. While Charles had been crowned in 1380 at the age of twelve, his personal assumption of rule on 3 November 1388 marked a new start. There was, moreover, a custom of royal visits to Languedoc specifically, which were supposed to familiarize the king with the territories and people he ruled and gain their respect, and so were often undertaken at the start of a reign.[22] In this context, the homages of the king's aristocratic tenants were necessary to fulfil these several goals. Accordingly, despite their near-invisibility in most scholarly accounts of Charles' visit, were the best-documented aspect of the entire event.[23]

I have examined the extant sources elsewhere, but their salient characteristics may be summarized here.[24] The key documents are the letters of homage issued by the royal administration to certify that homage had been duly performed, and the declarations known as *dénombrements* produced by the tenants to list all the lands, rights, and revenues for which they

had done homage. The register Archives nationales, P 1143, was produced during the royal progress to summarize and account for the letter of homage and *dénombrement* of each tenant (or group of tenants) who appeared before the king. Its 421 brief entries, representing some 391 homages, were grouped by seneschalsy and, within each section, in a loose chronological order; the register thus outlined a rough approximation of the royal journey itself.[25] Meanwhile, Archives nationales, P 591, recorded 101 letters of homage from the seneschalsy of Carcassonne and transcribed the full *dénombrement* for each (unfortunately, corresponding registers for the other major seneschalsies have since been lost). In addition, it included a separate section for eighty-three oaths of fealty performed to the king's representative there in the two months following Charles' departure, along with their respective *dénombrements*.[26]

Together, these registers attest the administration's serious efforts to systematically record the king's encounter with his tenants. The ceremony prolonged the recognition of the new king's authority beyond the moment of the civic entry, extending it not just across the entirety of his progress, but also into the permanent record.[27] Meeting each tenant also allowed Charles to become acquainted, however superficially, with those who exercised significant power in the region. More specifically, my analysis of these fiefholders as a group has shown that the homagers of the seneschalsies of Toulouse and Carcassonne broadly tended towards a higher social rank and degree of seigneurial authority (and in particular, rights of high and low justice) than royal tenants who were not expected to swear their oaths to the king in person.[28] And while a number of the king's tenants (or their near relatives) were directly involved in the royal government or the king's political circles in the late fourteenth century, most of those who owed homage in 1389 derived their status simply from the lands they held.[29] These lords' essential contributions to the maintenance of local political order, made personal interaction with them an essential step in establishing Charles' control in the region, while the accompanying

dénombrements gave the royal administration a better grasp of how power was distributed in the king's domains.[30] At the same time, such aims could be equally accomplished had the homagers come to Paris.[31] By associating the homages instead with his progress through Languedoc, the process assumed a more collaborative dimension, centring the local political structures – rural as well as urban – and so building the type of rapport which was supposed to serve a ruler well in the years to come.

In addition to these general considerations, the 1389 progress responded to a particular moment of political transformation.[32] The declaration of Charles' majority transformed the royal council, bringing to the fore a group of reformers, the so-called Marmousets, at the expense of the royal dukes, Charles' uncles, who had held the reins of power since 1380.[33] Under the Marmousets' influence, the king and his council quickly embarked on an ambitious program of reform both within the royal household and administration, and across the kingdom at large.[34] The situation in Languedoc was of particular concern. It had been more than twenty-five years since a king of France had last set foot in his southern domains, and years of abuses by royal lieutenants and their officers had exacerbated grievances over taxation and warfare in the region.[35] On 18 May 1389, in response to the 'outcry (*clameur*) of our people', Charles renewed his pledges of redress: he nominated three official reformers (*réformateurs*) for the region and announced his intention to personally visit the three seneschalsies of Languedoc.[36] The restoration of order in the kingdom meant tackling Languedoc's financial, administrative, and military situation, and historians have drawn attention to these various aspects in turn, highlighting particular accomplishments such as the removal and/or execution of corrupt officials, the negotiation of peace between the counts of Armagnac and Foix, and the establishment of a longer-term reform commission at the king's departure.[37]

The collection of homages was, however, just as integral to Charles' agenda of reform and restoration. Jean Cabaret d'Orville, in his *Chronique du bon duc Loys de Bourbon* (1429), drew precisely this connection, including the barons and lords of Languedoc in the king's procession into Toulouse; he then claimed that Charles called for his tenants, from the great to the lesser, to be received by him in homage, while also promising to do right by those who had been wronged.[38] It was particularly important to re-establish these ties in the aftermath of the Tuchin revolt from 1381 to 1384 against the imposition of heavy royal taxes and the incursions of mercenaries. Vincent Challet has demonstrated the ambiguous position of the local seigneurial elite during these troubles, as they were aligned with the Tuchins for the purposes of defending their territory against banditry, but also took part in the royal suppression of the rebels (or risked punishment for opposition to the king).[39] The repercussions of these events were still in play in 1389, as Charles absolved 'the nobles of the seneschalsy of Beaucaire and Nîmes' for their actions against pardoned rebels in December.[40] The dynamics of reconciliation were also enacted through the homage ritual. For example, Phillipe de Bré, 'the most illustrious of the nobles who rallied to the Tuchinat', had been executed in 1383 and his possessions confiscated.[41] But in 1389, his wife Jacqueline de Bruyères did homage for herself and her son and heir, Philippe de Bré the younger, an act that secured her control over the lands that had featured at the heart of her late husband's preparations for the revolt while emphasizing to the king the continuity of their lineage.[42] Similarly, Pierre Boyer, who had waged the legal battles of local communities against royal financial impositions while encouraging their more active self-defence during the revolt, was not only among those who did homage in 1389, but was appointed regent for the seneschal of Carcassonne (and so collected the oaths of fealty owed to the king in early 1390).[43] The acts of homage served to prominently mark the restoration of the social order through the reaffirmation of both royal and aristocratic power.

Moreover, even the act of registering the homages and *dénombrements* was considered part and parcel of getting the smooth operation of the royal administration back on track.[44] According to the royal letters copied alongside the *dénombrements*, Charles VI's arrangements for their collection had their roots in his father's early reign.[45] On 21 November 1371, Charles V (r. 1364–80) had reminded his financial officers of his order that all the fiefs held directly from the king be accurately compiled in each administrative district of his kingdom.[46] Owing, as he said, to the negligence of his regional officials, this had not been accomplished, so he ordered that it be made publicly known that anyone who held anything of him in fief should provide their *dénombrement* explaining the fief(s), their location, and any fiefs held from them in turn. These declarations were to be 'registered in a certain book' by each of his representatives. Anyone who had not done so by Easter was to have their lands and revenues confiscated (as was usual in such cases). The partial success of these orders was reflected in Bibliothèque municipale de Toulouse, MS 641, a seventeenth-century inventory of feudal documents in the seneschalsy archives that included 184 entries from 1371; the copyist, however, noted with some displeasure that these *dénombrements* were 'imperfect', being very brief and without much specifying seigneurial rents and obligations.[47]

It was therefore left to Charles VI to renew the project. He wrote (with similar reprimands of bureaucratic laxity) to the seneschal of Carcassonne and Béziers – and, we must assume, to the other southern seneschals as well – on 22 August 1388. His orders mirrored his father's, requesting the publication of his orders across the seneschalsy for the collection of 'the true and complete *dénombrements* in which are explained the fief or fiefs, the place or castellany where they are, which things they contain and of what value, according to each portion', along with those of their own tenants.[48] He set a deadline of half a year after the announcement was made in each locality (with, we must assume, similar penalties for non-compliance), although this

deadline was renegotiated when this process became caught up with Charles' plans for a voyage to the south.[49] The incorporation of this older reform project into the measures taken to stabilize the government in 1389 expands the focus of these measures beyond the royal administration, hitherto the centre of scholarly attention. While bureaucratic abuses were the primary target of popular outcry, from the royal perspective the restoration of order also required the clarification and reaffirmation of local seigneurial power.

Considering the progress as both an inauguration and a restoration of royal authority, the integration of the homages into the 1389 narrative is a natural extension of the political concerns already embedded in entries as urban interactions. Nor should the civic context be privileged over the seigneurial. In fact, understanding the king's interactions with the rural elite offers a new angle on the key issue of reciprocity and collaboration running through the historiography. For all that the king had personally returned to Languedoc, Charles' actions set the stage for his inevitable return to Paris. As such, the confirmation of aristocratic power through the performance of homage was not just an essential component of Charles' display of authority, but also its counterpart, reinforcing local power structures to ensure the ongoing political stability of the region.

This interpretation, however, must contend with the fact that homage was a legal obligation, not a voluntary one. Challet has questioned whether the public displays of royal entries could constitute a political dialogue if the participants did not have the option to decline to take part.[50] In this vein, Michael Hicks argues from his examination of late medieval English homages that royal tenants found it 'an inconvenient, even pointless, bureaucratic routine', undertaken only under duress.[51] And while scholars periodically offer new evidence for the long-lasting political weight of the homage process, from ritual to record, the benefits appear to accrue to the ruler alone.[52] We should not, however, overplay the royal angle in such interactions. By challenging

the top-down narrative of participation in the homage ritual to make room for the active engagement on the part of the fiefholders, we can reconsider the political function of the personal contact between the king and his tenants on this occasion. The homagers' agency was part of what made the ceremony more than an affirmation of royal authority and implicated their own structural power. The remainder of this article will therefore turn to the question of the participation of the local landed elites in the homage process as a reflection of the perceived importance of this personal encounter.

Recovering deliberate action from something as impersonal as administrative records can be more readily approached as a question of trends than of individuals. I use a spatial analysis of the homagers' interactions with the king achieved through digital mapping to trace the varied responses of landed elites to this political event. While the question of urban spaces and their role in individual entries have proliferated, similar perspectives of location and movement offer a means of expanding the royal–urban framework of the royal progress into the hinterlands of Languedoc.[53] On this basis, the lack of a clear 'right' way to integrate the homages into the progress shows the agency of local fiefholders in their engagement with this important socio-political occasion. Not only did Charles' tenants have a choice as to where and when to perform homage, this decision was influenced by social as well as practical considerations, reflecting the dynamism involved in an encounter between local and royal power structures.

Geographic considerations have always influenced the interpretation of Charles' journey, as previous historiography has highlighted certain phases of the king's travels in accordance with its particular preoccupations.[54] The *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, in its brief description of the homages received by Charles VI, points to Montpellier and Toulouse as the cities of greatest significance.[55] What actually unfolded was rather more complicated (Figure 1). Toulouse was, uncontestably, at the centre of events, as Charles' time there was marked by a continuous stream

of homages that amounted to some 300 in total across the five-and-a-half weeks of his stay. He received about a tenth as many at Carcassonne and at Montpellier, half that number in turn at Béziers, and a trailing handful at Nîmes, Narbonne, Avignon, Beaucaire, and Mazères. Their distribution also reflects differences in the king's outward and return journeys not necessarily visible in his itinerary alone (Figure 2). Charles took twenty-three days to go from Avignon to Toulouse and the same time returning, but received around 55% more homages when passing back through Carcassonne, Béziers, Montpellier, and the other towns, than he had on his way to Toulouse.[56] Perhaps this (relatively) last-minute press is what caused one of the royal clerks to describe Charles' departure as 'hastif': if not literally speedier, it was certainly made busier by this second, albeit smaller, wave of homages following the main event at Toulouse.[57]

The royal perspective is, however, relatively simple compared to that of the fiefholders who came from across the five seneschalsies to meet him. Since most tenants held more than one piece of land, I have identified the primary property associated with each performance of homage to clarify the distribution of landed power and seigneurial presence across the landscape.[58] I established a core dataset comprising instances where the tenant was identified as the lord or lady of a specific place; which specified the location of their residence; or where their surname corresponded to a property in their homage or *dénombrement*. Often, more than one of these criteria was fulfilled simultaneously, suggesting a certain congruity between these characteristics. A second 'extended' category then gathered instances where a habitable building such as a house, manor, or castle was mentioned without any specification of residence; where the property was designated as a barony without the attribution of the title directly to the individual; or where the wife's surname matched one of the properties (which evidently came from her inheritance). Such cases cannot be confidently associated with personal seats of power in the same way as the first group, but designate the most probable sites within the limitations

of the data. Finally, a third 'supplemental' category accounted for all remaining instances where a precise location could be established with some certainty, but where no reliable information or correlation was available.[59] Forty homages from the 1389–90 journey could not be localized because they contained no specific information or because the indicators were insufficient to identify the properties involved (generally when the medieval toponym has either vanished or is too common).[60] The three datasets established in this way contained 136, 90, and 114 entries, respectively, for a total of 340 reference points in all.

These identifications can be used to represent the approximate 'home base' of the individuals and groups who came to do homage to Charles as he traversed Languedoc, allowing a rough assessment of their dispersal from the route taken by the king. Each point was plotted at the level of the present-day *commune,* allowing a linear measurement to the city in which the homage was performed (Figure 3).[61] This approach necessarily leaves aside the issue of the urban nobility discussed in the introduction. A certain number of families would have been city dwellers who had invested in rural estates, and so were probably already on-site at Charles' advent. Such cases would not significantly impact the cumulative picture, however, given the size of the dataset and the concentration of such estates near the city of residence. Moreover, all three datasets followed similar trends in geographical spread, save for the few dates represented only by the extended and supplemental sets. Given the lack of distortion introduced by the less robust material, I have based my analysis on the complete set of available data so as to obtain the fullest possible coverage of the proceedings. On this basis, we can model the practical and social considerations that shaped the encounter between the king and the landed elites.

To begin with the practicalities, we can quickly gain a sense of scale for the enterprise of coming to do homage during the royal progress. On average, the principal fiefs identified here lay about a day's journey from the city where their tenants performed homage. In concrete

terms, the mean linear distance from fief to city was 52 kilometres, with a median of 39 kilometres. A full day of travel represented approximately 50 kilometres, so even taking into account the additional margin of real distance to cover, half these fiefs or more lay within this radius from their respective destinations.[62] To break this distribution down further, of 255 homages performed at Toulouse for which corresponding locations have been identified, 57% lay within 50 kilometres of the city; an additional 27% within 100 kilometres; 13% within 150 kilometres; and a small handful, 3%, more than 150 kilometres away.[63] The two longest trips in the entire sample, however, went to cities at the eastern edges of the region, with the viscount of Bruniquel coming to Beaucaire, 240 kilometres away, and the lord of Ornézan crossing 266 kilometres to Montpellier. These were, however, exceptional; most of those who came were close enough that their journeys could be made relatively swiftly.[64]

These parameters are useful points of reference because the king himself was also on the move. Of the eighty-eight-day period in which Charles received these homages, thirty-nine were spent in Toulouse, while the remaining forty-nine were distributed among the eight other key towns of the voyage. The course of the royal progress (which necessarily shortened some distances while leaving other parts of the seneschalsy unvisited) and the relative rapidity with which the lords might be able to appear at a given location are the two 'fixed' factors for understanding why events unfolded as they did. Against this backdrop, we can more accurately gauge the significance of the collective patterns and individual trajectories observed over the course of this trip.

Tracing the homages chronologically, a story begins to emerge. The initial collection of homages at the king's halts between Avignon and Narbonne (including Montpellier) was unsystematic and limited. It was only at Carcassonne, on 26 and 27 November, that more homagers began to appear, drawn from the surrounding countryside. The average distance prior

to this point, for homages dating between 6 and 24 November, comes to 84 kilometres (median: 65 kilometres), significantly above the overall mean for the trip (Figure 4). Daily patterns varied widely, however: 144 kilometres for the first, lone homage at Avignon, 240 kilometres for that at Beaucaire, 104 kilometres at Montpellier on 17 November and 122 kilometres at Béziers on the twentieth – interspersed by days where the average distance was only 7, 12, or 14 kilometres.[65] Those who appeared thus seem either to have been clustered already near these cities, or unusually proactive in coming long distances to meet the royal cortège early. In the latter group, it is worth noting that some of the more significant names among the homagers were here represented, including the lord of Peyre and the viscounts of Lautrec, Bruniquel, and Uzès.[66] By contrast, on the way back, the mean and median distances for this same stretch fell to 58 and 34 kilometres, respectively, even while the number of attendees increased considerably (Figure 2). In addition, Montpellier also drew a greater number of tenants from the mountainous reaches of the seneschalsy of Beaucaire than had appeared on the initial visit, even though Charles' stopover was a day shorter this time. Catching the king before he departed the region may have been simpler than anticipating his arrival.

In between, the long stay at Toulouse stands out partly by the sheer number of attendees, which was disproportionate even in comparison to the duration of Charles' presence. About three-quarters of the homages took place there, even though Toulouse occupied fewer than half the days of the entire trip. The fact that the king became a stationary target may have encouraged this turnout, but several other factors also determined what was practical. The majority of these homagers (roughly 80%) lived in the seneschalsy of Toulouse, which is reflected in their preponderance over the other seneschalsies in the registers of this voyage. At the same time, the causality in a sense flows the other way: it made sense to concentrate the reception of homage at Toulouse, the foremost city of the region (and perhaps the one best equipped to host the royal

entourage for so long). Indeed, the royal itinerary as a whole reflected the population densities of Languedoc, and the seneschalsy of Toulouse had a higher concentration of inhabitants than either Carcassonne or Beaucaire.[67] Portions of the latter two seneschalsies reached into the Massif Central, which were more sparsely populated and so would have had fewer powerful families holding lands from the king.[68] Furthermore, the hilly terrain may have hindered not only travel, but the circulation of the royal ordinance and/or news of the king's passage in these areas, compounding any tendencies towards under-representation caused by the king's rate of travel on his way to and from Toulouse (and particularly east of Montpellier).[69] Accordingly, few homagers appeared from the northern 'arm' of the seneschalsy of Carcassonne or the upper reaches of Beaucaire. The geographic spread represented in Figure 3 aligns with the overall demographic and topographical patterns of the area. There was also a modest tendency for tenants' distance of travel to increase over the course of Charles' stay at Toulouse: that is, the homagers came from further and further away, pulling the average up by about 20 kilometres as December wore on. The few tenants from Bigorre, in the southwestern corner of the seneschalsy, arrived only in the last few days of the month and into the start of January.[70]

However, the patterns of homages cannot be reduced only to practical considerations, although the evidence for their social implications is necessarily indirect and must be attacked from several different angles to build a cumulative picture. In the first instance, of the tenants whose locations can be mapped, about one-third did *not* perform homage at the stop on the royal progress which was physically closest to them. Of these, half would have been nearest to Carcassonne, but went instead to Toulouse, which was likewise the most common destination for homagers coming from other cities. The others encountered the king en route either earlier or later than they might otherwise have done. In aggregate, the decision to bypass a closer city

tended to double the distance travelled, to an average mean of 97 kilometres. These variations therefore meant a considerable investment of time and effort on the homagers' part.

The extent to which the choice of destination was individualized appears especially clearly in instances of co-lordship (where one lordship was shared among multiple lords), or where several homages were owed for property in the same area, for not all the tenants necessarily gave their homage together. In some instances, half or more of the co-lords opted for the nearest city, such as those from Villegailhenc, two of whom performed homage at Carcassonne on 27 November while one did so at Toulouse on 20 December.[71] But in several cases, such as Conas, Roujan, and Rustiques, the majority of homagers went to Toulouse, with only one from each group of three to five staying closer to home.[72] Meanwhile, none of the homagers from Montirat met the king at Carcassonne despite it being less than 10 kilometres away; rather, three performed homage at Toulouse on 13 December and one went all the way to Montpellier on 21 January.[73] The four who went to Toulouse from Roujan made up part of a larger contingent from the eastern reaches of the seneschalsy of Carcassonne that all performed homage at Toulouse on 24 December, suggesting perhaps a degree of local networking underlying some of these longer trips. However, there was by no means a clear trend for even co-lords to travel together, going by the dates of their homages: of fourteen homages performed at Toulouse for the lordship of Gardouch, five were performed singly, six in pairs, and one as a trio, all spread between the very first and very last day which Charles received homages there.[74] This example, by far the most fragmented lordship represented here, encapsulates the broader trends seen across the co-lords in this sample. Individual agency was thus a clear factor in deciding when and where to perform homage, but certain choices may have come with different social implications.

This consideration was especially true for the inhabitants of the seneschalsy of Carcassonne, deciding between performing homage on (or at least near) their home turf, and doing so at the

epicentre of the royal progress at Toulouse. Of the three seneschalsies on the king's route, they were the most likely to travel more than a day away, with an average journey of 71 kilometres (versus an average of 41 kilometres for both Toulouse and Beaucaire).[75] Conversely, only five fiefholders whose holdings were closest to Toulouse decided to go elsewhere. But while homage could only be performed once, a number of the homagers from Carcassonne in fact travelled to *both* cities in the course of these events, as we can see from the two-part handling of their *dénombrements* compared to their homages.[76] A slight majority of the homages for fiefs in Carcassonne (recorded in P 591) took place at Toulouse, for which the corresponding *dénombrements* were about twice as likely to processed by the seneschalsy court of Carcassonne rather than that of Toulouse.[77] Of those received at Carcassonne, two trends predominated: either the *dénombrement* was acknowledged within a week of the homage, usually beforehand; or it was only registered several weeks or even months afterwards. The former case suggests a scenario in which the fiefholders stopped at Carcassonne on their way to or from Toulouse, which made sense given that most of them held lands to the south or east of Carcassonne, placing the city on the main road to Toulouse (though not all who must have passed through Carcassonne produced a *dénombrement* there). The minority of homagers whose *dénombrements* were only received considerably afterwards were more dispersed in origin, and may have made a second, separate trip to hand in their *dénombrements*: perhaps they did not have the document prepared when they went to Toulouse, preventing them from handing it in on-the-spot. In either case, these dynamics demonstrate that there was no apparent difficulty in getting to Carcassonne, but Toulouse was the preferred destination for their homage, rather than awaiting Charles nearer to home.

More complicated is the reverse pattern, where more than a quarter of the tenants in P 591 who did homage at Carcassonne in November or January had a *dénombrement* registered at

Toulouse in December. In raw numbers there are only six such instances on record, but some of the thirty or so *dénombrements* dated to December and early January in P 1143 for homages outside of Toulouse may have reflected a similar situation.[78] The example of Raymond Aban suggests such a peregrination: following his homage on 27 November, his *dénombrement* was recorded at Carcassonne on 29 November and at Toulouse on 6 December.[79] Although 27 November was the day before King Charles left Carcassonne for Toulouse, it is unclear that he necessarily travelled at the same time as the king given the registration of his *dénombrement* two days later (though this did not necessarily require the tenant's presence by that point); but in other instances we may more firmly suspect a deliberate coordination. For instance, Pierre Boyer, who did homage when the king reached Carcassonne and was made regent of the seneschalsy after 1 January, may well have accompanied Charles in December.[80] Several members of the prestigious Bruyères family appear to have followed a similar pattern.[81] It is thus probable that the number of people who came to Toulouse at the time of the royal visit was higher than that indicated by the homages alone, and that the obligation to perform homage took place in a context of broader contact between the king and the landed elites. Taken together, these two trends point to different strategies for navigating the relative appeal of localized versus centralized homage, rather than an unambiguous preference for one or the other.

In at least certain instances, the choice may have taken on a socio-political dimension. As discussed earlier, Pierre Boyer and Jacqueline de Bruyères had been involved with the disturbances of the Tuchin revolt, and Charles would soon install Pierre as his temporary representative in the seneschalsy of Carcassonne. Similarly, among the prominent lords who encountered Charles early in his journey, Philippe, viscount of Lautrec, and Roger de Comminges, viscount of Bruniquel, produced *dénombrements* during the period of Charles' stay at Toulouse, which suggests that they accompanied him en route (especially as their homes

lay in that direction anyhow). The prestige of joining the royal entourage for its progress may have appealed, especially given the opportunities it presented to take part in the royal entries. At the other end of Charles' voyage, two long-distance travellers did homage at Montpellier on 22 January who both held lordships west of Toulouse; however, they did homage at this point only for rents of 200 *livres tournois* to be drawn on the incomes of that city.[82] Each was identified as a royal chamberlain (*chambellain du roy*), which may explain their presence at his side even at this distance from their homes. It is even possible that they might have received this rent in recognition of their service on this voyage.[83] By contrast, other prominent lords seem to have approached more slowly. Jean, count of Astarac, did homage on the first possible day after Charles' arrival in Toulouse (4 December), while Jourdain, count of L'Isle (both Gers) did so on the last (2 January).[84] This meant that Jean was among the large crowd who opened the homage proceedings at Toulouse, while fewer homages were performed alongside Jourdain. Meanwhile, both their *dénombrements* were processed in early January, heightening the difference in their approaches as Jean may have effectively come to court for the duration while Jourdain perhaps put in only a late appearance. There were thus different strategies for incorporating the homage ritual into the royal progress.

While such cases stand out from the bulk of more 'ordinary' members of the local landed elite, the broader patterns of homage reflect fiefholders' dynamic participation in the royal progress across the board. Their engagement did not boil down to any single set of priorities, but instead reflected a balance of options. Pragmatism was certainly one of these, as the royal itinerary and fiefholders' attendance reflected in many cases the path of least resistance given local topographic and demographic realities. Some of these trends may have aligned with Charles' own preferences if, for example, he encouraged the concentration of homages at Toulouse so as not to encumber his travels or to create a grander impression. However, the

choice was made independently by each tenant, indicating their receptivity to the social and political significance of their performance of homage during the royal progress. It was, after all, as much an occasion for them to see and be seen as it was for King Charles, in a way that homage at distant Paris was not – though tensions remained between performing homage within their immediate social (and geographical) milieu, or making for the large gathering at Toulouse which drew together fiefholders from across the region.[85] In between the cities themselves, joining the royal progress was a means of resolving these conflicting scenarios, while making for the king en route could mark social distinction in its own way. Although it remains impossible to directly assess concrete motivations across such a group, the spectrum of specific outcomes makes it clear that for many of the landed elite, the performance of homage here was an opportunity rather than a simple imposition from above, much as it was for the urban elites who also played their part in the royal progress.

What made the occasion so special was, of course, the king's personal presence in a region from which he had long been absent. But whereas the personal dimensions of rulership are often framed in terms of the benefit to the ruler – the legitimation and affirmation of their authority, the maintenance of their political relationships, and so on – interacting with the king also served to frame the power of the other party. After all, access to the king was selective, and increasingly ceremonialized from the later Middle Ages to reflect the king's sovereign dignity.[86] The act of homage in 1389 was thus a ritual of familiarity, given by the tenant in person and showcasing their direct tie to the king. As such, it was also a ritual that selected among the royal tenants, rather than being equally available to (or even demanded of) all of them. Certain patterns of attendance surrounding Charles' voyage suggest that this personal encounter with the king was valued accordingly as mark of distinction among the landed elite.

In the first instance, the performance of homage distinguished a principal tenant from among the various legal claimants of a given fief. The vast majority of homages were undertaken by a single individual, but they could act on behalf of or alongside a dependent, such as a sibling, spouse, incapacitated parent, or child or other minor; or to be represented by a third party unconnected by such ties.[87] The most common case was that married women were often represented by their husbands, reflecting the assumption that a wife's lands were held in common with her husband. It is therefore necessary to break down the dynamics of representation by gender (Table 1). The first column of Table 1(a) shows the proportion of lay women and men, respectively, who had someone else perform homage in their name; the total count given below indicates the raw number of all tenants. It shows that nearly a third of the eighty women tenants did not perform the ceremony themselves, but were instead represented by someone else, as were a small proportion of the (more numerous) men. Accordingly, the gender composition of the actual homage ceremonies, shown in the second column, was skewed slightly more masculine than the overall gender ratios of those who had stakes in these fiefs.[88] Homage thus remained a personal obligation for the tenants insofar as those who performed these ceremonies had authority over the fief(s) concerned, but the ritual aspect preferred a single, central focal point for the subsidiary interests involved. In singling out the most systemically significant (i.e. adult and/or male) representative for this role, the royal encounter reaffirmed the expected patterns of the transmission of power in landed society.

At the same time, all participants of age were usually considered part of the ceremony performed in their name: a brother might do homage 'as much in his name as in the name of his sisters' or a husband 'in the name of himself and his wife'.[89] And there was some flexibility in how this authority was attributed, and even in who personally performed homage. For instance, some husbands did not include themselves in the properties for which they did homage in their

wives' names, and one appears to have done homage alongside his wife.[90] Moreover, several married women performed homage and presented their *dénombrements* without any indications that their husbands were dead, and in at least one instance a clear suggestion that he was not.[91] In rare instances a husband might omit to mention his wife (or at least the scribe neglect to copy the information).[92] There was again room for the agency of individual tenants in appearing before the king, creating different depictions of the internal distributions of power within each fief.[93] It would be interesting to know how many of the people who did not perform their own homage were still present as witnesses to these ceremonies.

But the dynamics of representation changed sharply when the king himself was no longer present, as can be seen through comparison with the oaths of fealty performed to Pierre Boyer as Charles' representative in Carcassonne following his departure. Table 1(b) attests not only a sharp rise in the proportion of representation across both women and men, but also a substantial shift in the nature of that representation. Twenty-five oaths were performed by third-party procurators, delegated to perform this specific task but without legal authority over the fief(s)/tenant(s) in question, as was the case with a husband or guardian. The same procurator might act successively for several different tenants; usually, these were university-trained professionals who already lived in Carcassonne, such as *maître* Bernard de Serège, jurist, or *maître* Lambert de Villar, royal notary, who was also a tenant in his own right and swore fealty accordingly.[94] Other procurators could be conveniently chosen among one's neighbours or family, especially if they were already heading that way to give their own fealty.[95] Across the board, nearly four of ten tenants did not personally swear the oath of fealty, an increase entirely attributable to the popularity of procuration: while 13% were represented by spouses or guardians, a figure entirely in line with those for the homage groups, 26% (or two-thirds of all absentees) elected to send a procurator. The presentation of the *dénombrement* could be

similarly outsourced, to the same procurator or another, even if the tenant had appeared in person before the king.[96] In short, for ceremonies where the king was not himself present, the tenants were also less likely to appear themselves.

Fundamentally, of course, homagers were obligated to show up in person, while there was no such requirement for the oath of fealty, and so the mere fact of attendance does not speak to the significance of the encounter from the tenants' perspective. At the same time, it is difficult to ascertain directly how much power the royal government actually had to enforce the performance of homage and its attendant obligations. On one hand, the efforts made by Bertrande de Cougnans, lady of Tournebouix, and by an individual referred to as Stont, to obtain their letters of homage after the *Chambre des comptes* lost or mishandled their copies indicate that the royal officials were at least potentially able to confiscate the fiefs of recalcitrant tenants.[97] On the other hand, the royal government's renewal of the orders for the collection of *dénombrements* and their late collection suggests some laxity of enforcement on the administration's part prior to this point, as perhaps do the two dozen individuals for whom P 1143 recorded no *dénombrement* following their homage.[98] And while three elderly women observed the legal forms enough to request respite of homage on the basis of their age, an unknown number of tenants may simply not have turned up and so left no trace in our records.[99] On balance, it seems fair to conclude that legal repercussions must be considered among the factors for the performance of homage, but that they do not tell the whole story. Indeed, while Hicks cites the frequency of respites of homage as evidence for seigneurial reluctance to engage with this aspect of royal authority, the paucity of such letters in this corpus suggests that Charles' voyage at least made for a good opportunity to get the obligation out of the way, and at best presented an attractive occasion to take part in this socially and politically significant encounter, as seen in the patterns of homage observed above.

In fact, even during Charles' voyage a small number of tenants arrived to perform an oath of fealty rather than homage, even though these were not supposed to be performed directly to the king, but rather to the seneschal of the area in question.[100] Perhaps this was why the royal administrators sought verification in at least one instance that homage was not owed on top of fealty: effectively, those who had only fealty to perform should not have been there.[101] Yet they came anyway: thirteen to Toulouse, of whom eight clustered together on 28 December, and five on 16 January in Narbonne.[102] Furthermore, four of those who came to Toulouse could have been closer to Carcassonne.[103] And the *dénombrements* of those who did homage at Narbonne had all been produced in December, including two at Toulouse and one at Carcassonne.[104] These patterns are consistent with those observed among the homagers proper, but these individuals were not required (or indeed, meant) to meet the king in person: rather, they *chose* to do so. Ritual contact with the king was thus in itself desirable as it was associated with an elite among the landed elite and offered a powerful confirmation of seigneurial authority, performed before an audience of those who really mattered in the area.

This participant-centred reading of the royal progress, accounting for the perspective of the local landed elites, transforms the 1389 voyage into a mutual opportunity, one that reinforced the decentralization of power as an integral part of the reassertion of royal authority. Justine Firnhaber-Baker has shown that from the mid-fourteenth century, 'the [French] crown fostered the development of ideas about licence and delegation' that enabled seigneurial autonomy within a royal paradigm.[105] The present case study has argued that this process of delegation was two-sided, depending on the proactive engagement of the royal tenants rather than simply bestowed (or imposed) from above. This dynamic offers an important corrective to the long-standing tendency to underplay the political involvement of minor lords and landed elites in this period.[106] By rethinking the performance of homage as a dialogue as well as an obligation – the

two not being mutually exclusive – we gain a clearer picture of individual political agency within this segment of the aristocracy alongside the group's systematic position as a local counterpart to royal authority.

The political awareness suggested by the varied responses to Charles VI's progress and its homages has implications for the wider processes of state-building in the later Middle Ages. John Watts has observed that there was 'a general relationship…between periods of royal weakness and the strengthening of lordship, but the one is not the simple or exclusive cause of the other'.[107] The role of the fiefholders during Charles' progress show how the latter could play a deliberate part in the remedy of the former. If the crown took advantage of the ties of homage to distribute rather than to consolidate authority as part of the restoration of royal government, the landed elites reaffirmed their own position through proximity to the king (even while remaining at home). It is this reciprocal relationship that really made the homages make sense among the other aspects of Charles' political programme on tour, and made the rural aristocracy participants alongside the towns in the construction of shared governance.[108] And so, even though most of these local aristocrats were not regular political players on the level of the realm as a whole, their conscious socio-political positioning at the regional level means they must be accounted for alongside other institutional aspects in the development of late medieval government.

[1] Given the breadth of literature on this theme, I here highlight only certain representative works. For France, the focus has been especially on Paris and its ties with the coronation, counterbalanced by trends in the provinces: R. E. Giesey, 'Inaugural aspects of French royal ceremonials', in *Coronations: Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual*, ed. János M. Bak (Berkeley, 1990), pp. 35–45, at pp. 40–1; L. M. Bryant, *The King and the City in the Parisian*

Royal Entry Ceremony: Politics, Ritual, and Art in the Renaissance (Geneva, 1986), esp. chapter 4; N. Murphy, 'Royal entries in 15th-century France: Louis XI's northern progress of 1463–64', in *Visible Exports/Imports: New Research on Medieval and Renaissance European Art and Culture*, ed. E. J. Anderson, J. Farquhar, and J. Richards (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2012), pp. 260–76, at p. 261; see also the commentary and sources collections in Bernard Guenée and Françoise Lehoux, *Les Entrées royales françaises de 1328 à 1515* (Paris, 1968); D. Rivaud, G. Duhil, and R. Rech, eds., *Entrées épiscopales, royales et princières dans les villes du Centre-Ouest de la France XIVe–XVIe siècles* (Geneva, 2013). In England, the progresses of the Tudor monarchy have drawn special attention, but for the earlier political role of such events, see K. Bourassa, 'The royal entries of Henry VI in a London civic manuscript', *Journal of Medieval History* xlii (2016), 479–93; N. Coulet, 'Les Entrées royales en Angleterre. Deux exemples: les entrées de Richard II en 1392 et de Henri V en 1451', *Memini* i (1997), 3–20; J. Doig, 'Propaganda and truth: Henry V's royal progress in 1421', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* lv (1996), 167–79; E. Cavell, 'Henry VII, the North of England, and the first provincial progress of 1486', *Northern History* xxxix (2002), 187–207. Ducal entries in the highly urbanized Low Countries have occasioned perhaps the most debate, with their political impact weighed against their relative familiarity: J.-M. Cauchies, 'La Signification politique des entrées princières dans les Pays-Bas: Maximilien d'Autriche et Philippe le Beau', in *À la cour de Bourgogne: le duc, son entourage, son train*, ed. J.-M. Cauchies (Turnhout, 1998), pp. 137–54, at pp. 140–2; W. Hüsken, 'Royal entries in Flanders (1356–1515)', in *Women at the Burgundian Court: Presence and Influence*, ed. D. Eichberger, A.-M. Legaré, and W. Husken (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 37–42; Nadia Mosselmans, 'Les Villes face au prince: l'importance réelle de la cérémonie d'entrée solennelle sous le règne de Philippe le Bon', in *Villes et campagnes au Moyen Âge: mélanges Georges Despy*, ed. J.-M. Duvosquel and A. Dierkens (Liège, 1991), pp. 533–8, at p.

547; É. Lecuppre-Desjardin, *La Ville des cérémonies: essai sur la communication politique dans les anciens Pays-Bas bourguignons* (Turnhout, 2004), pp. 136–41.

[2] For an especially incisive recent analysis, see the work of N. Murphy, *Ceremonial Entries, Municipal Liberties and the Negotiation of Power in Valois France, 1328–1589* (Brill, 2016); and N. Murphy, 'The court on the move: ceremonial entries, gift-giving and access to the monarch in France, c.1440–c.1570', in *The Key to Power? The Culture of Access in Princely Courts, 1400–1750,* ed. D. Raeymaekers and S. Derks (Leiden, 2016), pp. 40–64.

[3] For the former, see F. Autrand, 'L'Allée du roi dans les pays de Languedoc, 1271–1390', in *La Circulation des nouvelles au Moyen Âge* (Paris and Rome, 1994), pp. 85–97, and on a smaller scale, C. de Mérindol, 'Le Prince et son cortège: la théâtralisation des signes du pouvoir à la fin du Moyen Âge', in *Les Princes et le pouvoir au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1993), pp. 303–23, at pp. 304–10. On the practical aspects of preparing these ceremonial productions, see in particular G. Kipling, 'The design and construction of royal entries in the late Middle Ages', *Medieval English Theatre* xxxii (2010), 26–61; N. Coulet, 'Les Entrées solennelles en Provence au XIVe siècle: aperçus nouveaux sur les entrées royales françaises au bas Moyen Age', *Ethnologie française* vii (1977), 63–82, at pp. 63–4; C. de Mérindol, 'Théatre et politique à la fin du Moyen Âge: les entrées royales et autres cérémonies mises au point et nouveaux aperçus', in *Théatre et spectacles hier et aujourd'hui: Moyen Âge et Renaissance* (Paris, 1991), pp. 179–212, at pp. 200–3; M. Hébert, 'Les Entrées solennelles au Moyen Âge: un bref bilan', in 'Des entrées solennelles de l'Ancien Régime et des rituels imaginaires', ed. M.-F. Wagner and M. Vadean, *Cahier du GRES [Groupe de recherche sur les entrées solennelles]* iii (2008), pp. 7–26, at pp. 20–1; T. Lévy, 'La Fête imprévue: entrées royales et solennelles à Lyon (1460–1530)', *Questes: revue pluridisciplinaire d'études médiévales* xxxi (2015), 33–44, at pp. 35–9; and D. Rivaud, 'Panorama des accueils solennels dans les villes du Centre-Ouest à la fin du

Moyen Âge et au début des temps modernes', in Rivaud, Duhil, and Rech, *Entrées épiscopales, royales et princières*, pp. 23–58, at pp. 25–30.

[4] F. Alazard and P.-A. Mellet, 'De la propagande à l'obéissance, du dialogue à la domination: les enjeux de pouvoir dans les entrées solennelles', in Rivaud, Duhil, and Rech, *Entrées épiscopales, royales et princières*, pp. 9–22, at pp. 11–7; Murphy, 'Royal Entries', 271.

[5] F. Buylaert, 'Lordship, urbanization and social change in late medieval Flanders', *Past & Present* ccxxvii (2015), 31–75, esp. at pp. 34, 48–9, 66–74; Thierry Dutour, 'Les Nobles et la ville dans l'espace francophone (XIIe–XVIe siècles), ou pourquoi poser un problème résolu depuis trois cents ans', in 'Villes nouvelles et grands ensembles II', *Histoire urbaine* xx (2007), 153–70; Dutour, 'Problème', and see the other essays in that volume.

[6] Buylaert, 'Social Change', p. 32; G. Castelnuovo, 'Bons nobles, mauvais nobles, nobles marchands? Réflexions autour des noblesses italiennes en milieu communal (XIIe–début XVIe siècle)', *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes* xiii (2006), 85–103, at p. 92; P. Wolff, 'Une famille, du XIIIe au XVIe siècle: les Ysalguier de Toulouse', *Mélanges d'histoire sociale* i (1942), 35–58, at pp. 43, 45.

[7] Cf. D. Vaillancourt and M.-F. Wagner, 'Repenser le champ politique du solennel: entrée royale et pouvoir (première partie)', *Bulletin d'histoire politique* xii (2004), 161–73, at pp. 168–9.

[8] E.g. Murphy, *Ceremonial Entries*, p. 33; L. Dauphant, *Le Royaume des quatre rivières: l'éspace politique français (1380–1515)* (Seyssel, 2012), pp. 292–302, esp. 300–1; É. Lalou, 'Voir et être vu: le voyage royal ou un art de gouvernement parathéâtral. L'exmple de Philippe le Bel', in *Formes teatrals de la tradició medieval* (Barcelona, 1996), pp. 119–24, at p. 123. Cf. for the early modern period, L. Briggs, 'Presenting the most Christian king: Charles IX's performance of Catholic ritual in the royal tour of France (1564–1566)', *French History* xxxii

(2018), 2–24, at pp. 5–6, 15; M. Wintroub, *A Savage Mirror: Power, Identity, and Knowledge in Early Modern France* (Stanford, 2006), p. 7. An important exception is J. Boutier, A. Dewerpe, and D. Nordman, *Un tour de France royal: le voyage de Charles IX (1564–1566)* (Paris, 1984), which discusses the incorporation of the nobility on pp. 253–60.

[9] Alazard and Mellet, 'Enjeux de pouvoir', pp. 15–6.

[10] As these are among the earliest homage records for Languedoc, we do not know the extent to which previous royal progresses may have featured similar encounters, though it would have been in keeping with contemporary practice to do so. A closer cross-checking of the homages and related records in series P of the Archives nationales with known royal itineraries (on which, see the recent work of the project 'L'itinérance curiale, du Moyen Âge à l'époque moderne', led by B. Bove, C. zum Kolk, and L. Costa) could yield further insights into the subsequent performance of homage beyond Paris. By the mid-sixteenth century, progresses such as that of Charles IX do not appear to have been used as occasions for homage, though they ultimately effected the same political aim of establishing ties of loyalty with the individual members of the provincial aristocracy: Boutier, Dewerpe, and Nordman, *Tour de France*, pp. 255, 260 (I here differ from the authors in suggesting this parallel, rather than the contrast they deduced from an abstracted, administrative interpretation of the 1389 homage process).

[11] E. Petit, 'Séjours de Charles VI', *Bulletin historique et philologique du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques* (1894), pp. 405–492, at pp. 445–6, gives a detailed itinerary. Dates in this article from September–December should be understood as 1389, and from January–May as 1390, unless otherwise specified. Documents from Béziers used a Christmas dating rather than the Easter style of the other records: A. R. Friedlander, 'The Administration of the Seneschalsy of Carcassonne: Personnel and Structure of Royal Provincial Government in France, 1226–1320' (PhD diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1982), p. ix.

[12] The surviving household accounts give total expenditures for each month from July to December 1389: L. Douët-d'Arcq, ed., *Comptes de l'hôtel des rois de France aux XIVe et XVe siècles* (Paris, 1865), pp. 247–50; cf. M. Rey, *Le Domaine du roi et les finances extraordinaires sous Charles VI, 1388–1413* (Paris, 1965), p. 278; Autrand, 'L'Allée du roi', p. 92.

[13] É. Pélaquier, ed., *Atlas historique de la province de Languedoc* (Montpellier, 2009), p. 16.

[14] 'Et quant sera le roy au retourner / De Languedoc? Trop y fait grant demeure': E. Deschamps, *Œuvres complètes de Eustache Deschamps*, ed. Le Marquis de Queux de Saint-Hilaire (Paris, 1878–1903), v. 122–3; Autrand, 'L'Allée du roi', p. 89; Dauphant, *Royaume*, p. 293.

[15] Mosselmans, 'Villes', pp. 533–4, 540–1, 546–7; L. M. Bryant, 'The medieval entry ceremony at Paris', in Bak, *Coronations*, pp. 88–113, at p. 91; Hébert, 'Entrées solennelles', p. 16.

[16] Giesey, 'Inaugural aspects', pp. 35–6; Bryant, 'Ceremony at Paris', p. 100.

[17] Murphy, *Ceremonial Entries*, p. 51, 99, 182; Vaillancourt and Wagner, 'Repenser', p. 163; Mosselmans, 'Villes', p. 541; P. J. Arnade, 'Secular charisma, sacred power: rites of rebellion in the Ghent entry of 1467', *Handelingen der Maatschappij voor Geschiedenis en Oudheidkunde te Gent* xlv (1992), 69–94, at pp. 73–4; W. Blockmans, 'Le Dialogue imaginaire entre princes et sujets: les joyeuses entrées en Brabant en 1494 et en 1496', in Cauchies, *À la cour de Bourgogne*, pp. 155–70, at p. 157; Cauchies, 'Signification', p. 141; J. D. Hurlbut, 'The duke's first entry: Burgundian inauguration and gift', in *Moving Subjects: Processional Performance in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. K. Ashley and W. Hüsken (Amsterdam, 2001), pp. 155–86, at pp. 157–8.

[18] E.g. B. Andenmatten, 'Geste de soumission, formalité bureaucratique ou rituel curial? L'Hommage vassalique dans l'État princier savoyard du bas Moyen Âge', in 'Les Gestes à la cour', *Micrologus* 30 (2022); P. Tucoo-Chala, *Le Livre des hommages de Gaston Fébus (1343–1391)* (Saragossa, 1976), pp. 14–29; J.-P. Trabut-Cussac, *Le Livre des hommages d'Aquitaine: réstitution du second livre noir de la connétable de Bordeaux* (Bordeaux, 1959), pp. iii, xxvii–xxxv. Outside the royal domain, homage was owed only to the local lord or prince from who the lands were held, rather than to the king, so these records are generally found outside the central archives. Curiously, however, a few of the 1389 *dénombrements* included lands held from other lords: AN, P 591, e.g. nos. 36 (from the lord of Couffoulens [Aude, Carcassonne]), 43 (the lord of Rabouillet [Pyrénées-Orientales, Prades]), 138 (the lord of Pezens [Aude, Carcassonne]), 178 (the lord of Saissac [Aude, Carcassonne]).

[19] G. Kipling, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy, and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph* (Oxford, 1998), p. 39; Hurlbut, 'First entry', p. 166; M. Jones, 'The rituals and significance of ducal civic entries in late medieval Brittany', *Journal of Medieval History* xxix (2003), 287–314, at p. 297.

[20] Doig, 'Propaganda', pp. 167–8, 171–2.

[21] Jones, 'Ducal entries', pp. 294–5; Arnade, 'Rites of rebellion', esp. p. 78.

[22] This tradition had, however, been neglected since the mid century owing to the political preoccupations of Charles V's reign. Autrand, 'L'Allée du roi', pp. 85–6, 93–4, following J. Froissart, *Œuvres de Froissart: Chroniques*, ed. J.-B.-M.-C. Kervyn de Lettenhove (Brussels, 1867–7), xiv. 30–1, associates this responsibility with Charles VI's declaration of majority, a shift away from her earlier dismissal (F. Autrand, *Charles VI: la folie du roi* (Paris, 1986), p. 242) of the king's newfound legal independence as a factor in this undertaking; this revision

seems clearly justified in light of the timescale on which the journey was planned. Cf. Dauphant, *Royaume*, p. 277.

[23] C. Devic and J.-J. Vaissete, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, new ed. (Toulouse, 1872–1904), ix. 940, 944 (hereafter cited as *HGL*), mention the homages of 'the principal nobility' at Montpellier and Toulouse, but offer no comment aside from identifying a few of the counts, viscounts, and barons – far from representative of most homages, and not indicative of the full scope of the event. The problem seems to have been partly one of sources: Auguste Molinier (1851–1904), who revised the medieval volumes of the series, was apparently aware of only one register of homage, and he regarded it as being of 'but little interest': *HGL*, ix. 940n4. He also thought, incorrectly, that the *aveux* it recorded had been received only after the king's departure. The brevity of this authoritative account along with its dismissive treatment of the available records may have thrown subsequent scholars off the track. See *HGL*, x. note 31, for a comparison of the chronicle sources of these events.

[24] [Article forthcoming.]

[25] The number of homages reflects my best assessment as to which entries represent true duplicates and which were cases of homonymy. The Beaucaire section began on 13 November, Carcassonne on 23 November, and Toulouse on 4 December. Sections for 'several seneschalsies' and for Bigorre (more usually considered part of the seneschalsy of Toulouse until the later fifteenth century), which were also concentrated on the month of December, followed the Toulouse section. There are a few anomalies in this overall structure, such as a false start on the Toulouse section crossed out amidst the records from Carcassonne, and the insertion of the short section for Quercy in the middle of the Toulouse records even though one of these lords was among the first to perform homage (12 November).

[26] Fealty entailed an oath sworn on religious objects; while all tenants swore oaths of fealty for their fiefs, not all swore homage on top of it.

[27] The details of these ceremonies were not recorded, though there is no reason to think they varied from the usual practices of joined hands, the exchange of a kiss, and certain standard pledges. We have a few indications of the king's accommodations in some of the towns he visited (cf. V. Challet, 'Un espace public sans spatialité: le dialogue politique entre le roi et ses sujets languedociens', in *L'Éspace public au Moyen Âge: débats autour de Jürgen Habermas*, ed. P. Boucheron and N. Offenstadt (Paris, 2011), pp. 337–52, at p. 342), which may also be where the homages took place. According to Froissart, Charles lodged in 'son hostel royal' at Villeneuve-lès-Avignon (in the Fort Saint-André: Autrand, 'L'Allée du roi', p. 90). At Montpellier, the *Petit Thalamus* chronicle put him in the Salle-l'Évêque, the palace of the bishops of Maguelone (on the street of the same name). In Béziers, he used the 'palais' not far from the cathedral of Béziers, while his retinue wound up scattered across the city; Jacme Mascaro, squire of the consulate of Béziers, spoke more specifically of 'son hostal, que es costa lo portal d'en Grindas' in the vicinity of the Église de la Madeleine (see S., 'La Porte de Grindes et le palais du roi', *Bulletin de la Société archéologique, scientifique et littéraire de Béziers (Hérault)* viii (1874), pp. 35–58). For his lengthy stay in Toulouse, he resided in the Château Narbonnais, where he received the homage of the count of Foix (an event at which Froissart was present); by analogy, we may assume he likewise used the castle at Carcassonne. See Froissart, *Chroniques*, xiv. 33, 60, 71, 74, 77; C. Barbier, 'Le *Libre de Memorias* de Jacme Mascaro', *Revue des langues romanes* xxxiv (1890), pp. 36–100, 515–564, at p. 94 (cf. 93); R. Carrasco et al., eds., 'Édition critique numérique du manuscrit AA9 des Archives municipales de Montpellier dit Le Petit Thalamus', version of 19 February 2021, http://thalamus.huma-num.fr/annales-occitanes/annee-1389.html, entry for the year 1389.

[28] [Article forthcoming.]

[29] AN, Paris, P 591, no. 49, 72; AN, Paris, P 1143, fos 37, 114v, 116v; G. Dupont-Ferrier, *Gallia regia, ou, état des officiers royaux, des bailliages et des sénéchaussées de 1328 à 1515* (Paris, 1942–61), i. nos 5028, 5070 (hereafter cited as *GR*). See also *GR*, i. no. 5029 (AN, P 1143, fo. 20), no. 5248 (AN, P 591, no. 130), no. 5285 (AN, P 591, no. 34), no. 5476 (AN, P 591, no. 85), no. 5487 (AN, P 1143, fo. 125; Bibliothèque municipale, Toulouse, MS 634, fo. 108), and perhaps no. 4906 (AN, P 591, no. 6).

[30] Cf. J. Firnhaber-Baker, *Violence and the State in Languedoc, 1250–1400* (Cambridge, 2014), e.g. pp. 7, 10, 12.

[31] Such homages in Paris were, however, not to the homager's advantage, as they entailed the expense of the journey and were routinely handled by the chancellor or his subordinates rather than giving access to the king himself: Henri Jassemin, *La Chambre des comptes de Paris au XVe siècle* (Paris, 1933), p. 236. Urban representatives could face similar obligations to come to Paris for homage: Murphy, *Ceremonial Entries*, pp. 35, 64.

[32] Languedoc's distance from Paris and perceived foreignness left it open to abusive royal officials and so the king's inaugural visits were routinely bound up with the need for redress: Autrand, 'L'Allée du roi', p. 86; Dauphant, *Royaume*, pp. 202–3, 212–5, 300.

[33] J. B. Henneman, *Olivier de Clisson and Political Society in France under Charles V and Charles VI* (Philadelphia, 1996), chapter 8; J. Sumption, *The Hundred Years War*, iii. *Divided Houses* (London, 2009), pp. 665–70.

[34] E. J. Laurière et al., eds., *Ordonnances des roys de France de la troisième race* (Paris, 1723–1849), vii. 236–43 (1 March 1389), 256–64 (3 April 1389), 768–70 (28 February 1389); cf. Henneman, *Clisson*, pp. 135–6; Rey, *Domaine*, pp. 102–3.

[35] Autrand, 'L'Allée du roi', p. 87n5; F. Lehoux, *Jean de France, duc de Berri: sa vie, son action politique (1340–1416)* (Paris, 1966–8), ii. esp. 250–6.

[36] *HGL*, x. no. 712. Charles attributed his visit to the imminent possibility of an invasion, but as the truce of Leulinghem exactly one month later established a three-year peace between England and France beginning in August, the other aims of the royal visit could take priority: Sumption, *Divided Houses*, p. 675; Lehoux, *Jean de Berri*, ii. 246–7.

[37] Rey, *Domaine*, pp. 122–4, 221–3; Lehoux, *Jean de Berri*, ii. 254–60; Autrand, *Charles VI*, pp. 249–54; Dauphant, *Royaume*, p. 300; Sumption, *Divided Houses*, chapter 14, esp. p. 713–7.

[38] C. d' Orville, *La Chronique du bon duc Loys de Bourbon*, ed. M.-A. Chazaud (Paris, 1876), p. 217; on d'Orville's eyewitness source, see Olivier Mattéoni, 'Portrait du prince idéal et idéologie nobiliaire dans "La Chronique du bon duc Loys de Bourbon" (1429)', *Studi francesi* xxxix (1995), pp. 1–23, at p. 4–9.

[39] V. Challet, 'Un mouvement anti-seigneurial? Seigneurs et paysans dans la révolte des Tuchins', in *Haro sur le seigneur! Les luttes anti-seigneuriales dans l'Europe médiévale et moderne*, ed. G. Brunel and S. Brunet (Toulouse, 2009), pp. 19–32.

[40] *HGL*, x. no. 720; Challet, 'Espace public', pp. 346–51. Charles also pardoned one of his homagers, Raimonnet de Péreilles, for his failure to appear for royal service following a property dispute with two other homagers: AN, JJ 137, no. 83 (cf. AN, P 1143, fos. 61, 84, 112v). The homager Giraud Beral (AN, P 1143, fo. 111v) received remission from the fallout of his role in supressing the Tuchinat in January 1393: *HGL*, x. no. 744.

[41] V. Challet, 'Peuple et élites: stratégies sociales et manipulations politiques dans les révoltes paysannes (France, XIVe–XVe siècle)', in *Revolte und Sozialstatus von der Spätantike*

bis zur Frühen Neuzeit, ed. P. Depreux (Munich, 2008), pp. 213–28, at p. 220–1; R. C. Famiglietti, *Audouin Chauveron, prévôt de Paris (1381–1389)* (Providence, 2015), ii. 308.

[42] AN, P 591, no. 4; AN, P 1143, fos 12v, 16v. Jacqueline had in fact already performed homage for her lands, without Philippe, on 26 January 1387 in Paris, underscoring the deliberateness of this second ceremony.

[43] AN, P 591, nos 22, 70; Challet, 'Peuple et élites', pp. 221–3. For the interaction between Boyer's actions in the Tuchinat and his seigneurial holdings, see *HGL*, x. no. 726.

[44] Cf. C. Marion, 'Les Aveux et dénombrements du Vendômois: réalités et représentations (1311–1550)', *Annales de Bretagne et des pays de l'Ouest* cx (2003), pp. 55–76, at p. 57–8.

[45] These letters survive only in the rare standalone public instruments produced by the seneschalsy of Carcassonne: Archives départementales de l'Aude, Carcassonne, 8 J 4; Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, MS nouvelles acquisitions latines 2090, no. 240; Archives départementales de l'Aude, Carcassonne, 2 J 1016/2, doc. 6.

[46] Cf. Laurière et al., *Ordonnances*, v. 432–3.

[47] Bibliothèque municipale, Toulouse, MS 641, fo. 46.

[48] 'Les vrays et entiers denomemens esquels soit exprime le fief ou fiefs, le lieu ou chastelanie ou ils sont, que les choses ils contiennent, de queles valeurs et par singuleres parties'.

[49] Raymond de Châteaupour stated that he had received the mandate on 2 June 1389, meaning his *dénombrement* on 16 December had just overshot the six-month window, but fell within a few days of his homage (21 December), as did the vast majority of the other *dénombrements* here: AN, P 591, no. 28. Typically, *dénombrements* were due within the forty days following the homage: A. Giraud, 'Des aveux féodaux et des déclarations censuelles', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* v (1859), pp. 397–407, at p. 400. While most of

the 1389 tenants respected this deadline, fully 15% of the *dénombrements* in P 1143 were processed by the seneschalsy courts *prior* to the performance of homage, without any apparent consequences.

[50] Challet, 'Espace public', p. 338.

[51] M. Hicks, 'What was personal about personal monarchy in the 15th century?', in *The Image and Perception of Monarchy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. S. McGlynn and E. Woodacre (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2014), pp. 8–22, at pp. 17–8.

[52] A rare exception is M.-T. Caron, 'La fidélité dans la noblesse bourguignonne à la fin du Moyen Âge', in *L'État et les aristocraties, XIIe–XVIIe siècle: France, Angleterre, Écosse*, ed. P. Contamine (Paris, 1989), pp. 103–27, who argues that the Burgundian nobility continued to take homage seriously as a meaningful political tie. For the more centralizing perspectives, see J. Brejon de Lavergnée, 'La Permanence de la suzeraineté royale à travers les actes d'hommages conservés à la Chambre des Comptes de Paris aux XIVe et XVe siècles pour les pays de Languedoc', in *La 'France anglaise' au Moyen Âge: colloque des historiens médiévistes français et britanniques* (Paris, 1988), pp. 259–67, at pp. 263, 266–7; J. Morsel, 'Quand enregistrer, c'est créer: la transformation des registres féodaux des évêques de Wurtzbourg aux XIVe et XVe siècles', in *L'Art médiéval du registre: chancelleries royales et princières*, ed. O. Guyotjeannin (Paris, 2018), pp. 377–420; Andenmatten, 'L'Hommage vassalique'; cf. J.-F. Nieus, 'Formes et fonctions des documents de gestion féodaux du XIIe au XIVe siècle', in *Décrire, inventorier, enregistrer entre Seine et Rhin au Moyen Âge: formes, fonctions et usages des écrits de gestion*, ed. X. Hermand, J.-F. Nieus, and É. Renard (Paris, 2012), pp. 121–61, at p. 152.

[53] Among others, see É. Konigson, *L'Espace théâtral médiéval* (Paris, 1975), esp. pp. 195–204; É. Lecuppre-Desjardin, 'Parcours festifs et enjeux de pouvoirs dans les villes des anciens

Pays-Bas bourguignons au XVe siècle', *Histoire urbaine* ix (2004), 29–45; K. Overlaet, 'The "joyous entry" of Archduke Maximilian into Antwerp (13 January 1478): an analysis of a "most elegant and dignified" dialogue', *Journal of Medieval History* xliv (2018), 231–49.

[54] Lehoux, *Jean de Berri*, p. 257, identified Béziers (where the royal administrator Jean de Bétisac had operated), Toulouse (where he was executed, and where the king stayed longest), Mazères (where Charles met with Gaston Fébus), and Avignon (where he met pope Clement VII), as the most important stages of the journey. Guenée and Lehoux, *Entrées*, pp. 13–4, concentrated on the royal entries at Lyons, Montpellier, and Béziers. Note that Charles mentioned his 'Joyeux Advenement' at Toulouse in a charter from December 1389, and there is no reason to suppose he would not have entered Carcassonne in a similar manner: Laurière et al., *Ordonnances*, vii. 327; cf. Froissart, *Chroniques*, xiv. 71.

[55] *HGL*, ix. 940, 944.

[56] The king's location on 16 January was not specified in Petit's itinerary, which was based primarily on the *trésor des chartes*, the accounts of the king's household, and the records of the *parlement* and the Châtelet: Petit, 'Séjours', p. 4. I have identified it as Narbonne based on the proximity of the tenants who appeared then.

[57] AN, P 1143, fo. 50v.

[58] This approach also helps address the unevenness of the information available for the different seneschalsies of Languedoc: full *dénombrements* for Carcassonne, summaries plus fragments for much of Toulouse, and summaries alone for Beaucaire, Quercy, and Rouergue. See the discussion of AN, P 1143 and AN, P 591 above; these have been supplemented by BmT, MS 634, a seventeenth-century inventory of the lost *dénombrements* from Toulouse.

[59] In many of these cases, the letter of homage or summary of the *dénombrement* gave only one toponym; among several properties, I have selected that mentioned first to reflect the

patterns seen in the first two categories. In ambiguous cases, I have selected the property nearest the city where the homage was performed, so as not to overestimate the logistical hurdles. Five entries whose lands spanned two or three seneschalsies were excluded as it was not possible to apply this method effectively.

[60] Identifications were made using A. Sabarthès, *Dictionnaire topographique du département de l'Aude* (Paris, 1912); E. Thomas, *Dictionnaire topographique du département de l'Hérault* (Paris, 1865); F. R. Hamlin, *Toponymie de l'Hérault: Dictionnaire topographique et etymologique* (Montpellier, 2000); and É. Connac, *Dictionnaire topographique du département de la Haute-Garonne*, 1882 (unpublished). In addition, six ecclesiastical homages have been omitted from this study of lay landownership.

[61] Measuring as the crow flies, rather than overland, gives the minimum possible distance between locations, avoiding the difficulties in matching modern roads to medieval ones and the availability of multiple possible routes between two locations. However, comparison with the shortest walking routes of all journeys over 50 kilometres revealed a median increase of only 13% over the linear distance (minimum: 1%, maximum: 32%), or 12 kilometres on a median journey of 94 kilometres. Since in practical terms this represented a relatively small increase, the ballpark figures of the linear route can be used to give a uniform assessment across the dataset.

[62] M. N. Boyer, 'A day's journey in mediaeval France', *Speculum* xxvi (1951), pp. 597–608, at p. 606. This also appears to correspond roughly with the king's rate of travel; for instance, it took him two days to go between Carcassonne and Toulouse: Petit, 'Séjours', p. 445.

[63] Due to rounding, the total percentage is 99%.

[64] Though not, perhaps, so spur-of-the-moment as those already within the cities: Mascaro reported that the king's arrival at Saint-Thibéry (some 21 kilometres distant) was the signal for the leaders of Béziers to assemble to meet him (Barbier, 'Mascaro', p. 94). Bruniquel: Tarn-et-Garonne, Montauban; Ornézan: Gers, Mirande.

[65] Respectively, Montpellier on 19 November, Nîmes on 13 November, and Montpellier on 20 November.

[66] Peyre: Lozère, Mende. AN, P 1143, fo. 7v, 8, 52, 60. Curiously, however, Auzias d'Uzès did not perform homage at Nîmes, the city which lay closest to his lordship, but at Béziers some days later, a pattern which I shall analyse further below.

[67] N. J. G. Pounds and C. C. Roome, 'Population density in 15th century France and the Low Countries', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* lxi (1971), pp. 116–130, at pp. 125, 128, and cf. the population density map of Languedoc in 1789 in Pélaquier, *Atlas de Languedoc*, p. 43.

[68] For comparable cases where reduced populations corresponded to fewer (but sometimes larger) lordships, see e.g. C. Pailhès, 'Le Groupe aristocratique en comté de Foix, XIe–XIIIe siècles', in *Les Voies de l'hérésie: le groupe aristocratique en Languedoc, XIe–XIIIe siècles*, ii. *Structures et comportements* (Carcassonne, 2001), pp. 121–77, at pp. 130–40; A. Le Moyne de La Borderie, *Essai sur la géographie féodale de la Bretagne* (Rennes, 1889), p. 28; J. van der Meulen, 'Seigneurial governance and the state in late medieval Guelders (14th–16th century)', *Continuity & Change* xxxvi (2021), pp. 33–59, at pp. 42–3.

[69] We have no direct evidence for how news of the king's advent circulated among the tenants during the progress (though cf. note 49 for the initial promulgation of the royal mandate), whether by royal messenger, public announcement, or agents of the tenants

themselves. The royal accounts mention only 7 messengers for the November–December period, so there must have been localized networks as well: Autrand, 'L'Allée du roi', p. 93.

[70] AN, P 1143, fo. 110v, 132.

[71] AN, P 1143, fos 19v, 23v, 34. Villegailhenc: Aude, Carcassonne.

[72] AN, P 1143, fos 21, 37, 38v (Conas: Hérault, Béziers, Pézenas), 23v, 24v, 38, 126v (Roujan: Hérault, Béziers), 12v, 21v, 22 (Rustiques: Aude, Carcassonne); AN, P 591, no. 154 (Roujan), 55 (Rustiques).

[73] AN, P 1143, fos 16v, 20v, 22, 41. Montirat: Aude, Carcassonne.

[74] AN, P 1143, fos 53, 57v, 59v, 67v, 78v, 88v, 92, 94, 105, 105v, 106v, 107, 112v, 115v. Gardouch: Haute-Garonne, Toulouse.

[75] Median distances were 75 kilometres (Carcassonne), 36 kilometres (Toulouse), and 13 kilometres (Beaucaire).

[76] The *dénombrements* offer slightly problematic evidence in this regard because P 1143 place-dates very few of its documents. P 591 does, allowing for a partial glimpse into this stage of affairs, with several caveats. One-third of the homages in P 591 give a different date for the *dénombrement* than that in P 1143, probably because multiple copies of a *dénombrement* may have been prepared for different authorities, and because of the time lapse between the original composition of the *dénombrement* and its ratification by the administration. Accordingly, it is not always clear that the date and place of the records in P 591 actually correspond to the physical presence of the individual in question. Nevertheless, while the *dénombrement* cannot help us trace most individual journeys, the dates in P 591 offer a *terminus ante quem* for the tenant's visit to the local authorities.

[77] Other options attested in P 591, albeit less frequently, were the royal courts established at Béziers or at Gignac, and the *Rectorie* of Montpellier, though these were primarily the recourse of those who lived towards the eastern edge of the seneschalsy.

[78] AN, P 591, makes it clear that the work of the seneschal's court continued into December, so dates are not an automatic proxy for location; but the likelihood of correlation is increased by being recorded in P 1143, under the auspices of the royal accountants.

[79] AN, P 591, no. 11; AN, P 1143, fo. 14v. It is conceivable that a copy was transmitted to the representatives of the *Chambre des comptes* at Carcassonne, and that they acknowledged it only after settling in at Toulouse (this would be to assume that the 'lettre de l'adveu' was then their own work rather than the document transmitted by the tenant) but such an explanation cannot answer the instances where the *dénombrement* recorded in P 1143 preceded the homage.

[80] See *GR*, i. 539, on the deposition of the previous seneschal.

[81] AN, P 591, nos 3, 4. Both Jacqueline and Bernard de Bruyères performed homage, the latter also on behalf of his sisters Jeanne and Raymonde; it is not possible to verify from these sources whether the latter two would themselves have attended at any point.

[82] AN, P 1143, fo. 116v.

[83] The *dénombrements* are not fully clear on this point, for they specify that the rent 'naguere lui avoit este donne par le roy', where *naguere* usually means 'recently' but could also mean 'once, formerly'. However, that a timeframe was mentioned at all makes the former usage more likely.

[84] AN, P 1143, fos 53v, 124v.

[85] Cf. Caron, 'La fidélité', p. 108.

[86] L. Dauphant, '"Si grant charté a Paris…par defaulté du roy": governmental practice and the customary geography of the absence and presence of the king in France (1364–1525)', in

Absentee Authority across Medieval Europe, ed. F. Lachaud and M. Penman (Woodbridge, 2017), pp. 153–170, at p. 159.

[87] I do not distinguish those acting solely on behalf of another from those with a joint interest, since the distinction is not always clear in this corpus and was often nebulous in practice.

[88] The total count of individuals who performed homage is slightly higher than the number of homages performed, as sometimes two people performed homage jointly.

[89] 'Tant en son nom comme ou nom de…ses seurs', AN, P 591, no. 3; 'ou nom de lui et de sa femme', no. 55. The name of these individuals was sometimes specified, sometimes not (especially in the case of wives). There was some variability with underaged wards whether the tutor acted just in their own name as guardian, or in the name of the wards themselves – the former was more common when the tutor also had their own legal claim to some or all of the fiefs in question.

[90] AN, P 1143, fo. 73; AN, P 591, nos 23, 117, 118, 142, 145, 157.

[91] AN, P 1143, fo. 50v; AN, P 591, nos 9, 71–3, 96, 145.

[92] E.g. AN, P 591, nos 19, 50; AN, P 1143, fo. 126; BmT, MS 641, fo. 60.

[93] On the concentration of participants and the diffusion of authority, see E. Graham-Goering, *Princely Power in Late Medieval France: Jeanne de Penthièvre and the War for Brittany* (Cambridge, 2020), pp. 154–5.

[94] AN, P 591, nos 104, 131, 137, 139 (with mention of the letters of procuration), 143, 145, 166.

[95] AN, P 591, nos 112, 122, 123, 127, 154, 162, 164.

[96] AN, P 591, e.g. nos 24, 73, 157, 169.

[97] AN, P 1143, fo. 50v.

[98] I have attempted to exclude duplicate entries where one was completed by the inclusion of the *dénombrement*, and those where a *dénombrement* is attested by other registers (which is of course impossible for the entries from the seneschalsy of Beaucaire). This shaky bookkeeping demonstrates that this record is not always a reliable guide to the full extent of the paperwork processed. For the slow collection of *dénombrements* over the 1380s, see AN, P 591, nos 246, 247, 248, 298, 295.

[99] Paule and Esclarmonde Cauderonne claimed to be more than eighty years and sixty years old, respectively: AN, P 591, fo. 54. Sibylle de Miremont was said to be over sixty, and appointed procurators for the homage instead: AN, P 1143, fo. 56; BmT, MS 634, fo. 89.

[100] Many of the homagers had already performed their fealty to the seneschal in the years leading up to Charles' voyage: BmT, MS 641, fos 74v–88. Others did so only afterwards, e.g. AN, P 1143, fo. 40.

[101] AN, P 591, fo. 20bis.

[102] A few churchmen also fell into this category: AN, P 1143, fos 123v, 127v, 132.

[103] AN, P 1143, fos 26v, 73v, 101, 101v.

[104] AN, P 591, nos 73, 83, 92; the other two are attested only in AN, P 1143 and so lack a place-date.

[105] Firnhaber-Baker, *Violence*, p. 178.

[106] Cf. the calls for further study by B. Guenée, preface to *La France à la fin du Moyen Age: la société politique*, by Peter S. Lewis, trans. Claude Yelnick (Paris, 1977), pp. 9–19, at pp. 18–9; and J.-P. Genet, 'Political Society and the Late Medieval State', in *New Approaches to the History of Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. T. Dahlerup and P. Ingesman (Copenhagen, 2009), pp. 11–36, at p. 19. Even Philippe Contamine, one of the authorities on late medieval French nobility, frames the issue of political society as between the king and the

greater magnates: P. Contamine, ‘Le Concept de société politique dans la France de la fin du Moyen Âge: définition, portée et limite’, in *Axes et méthodes de l’histoire politique*, ed. S. Berstein and P. Milza (Paris, 1998), pp. 261–71, esp. at pp. 263, 266.

[107] J. Watts, *The Making of Polities: Europe, 1300–1500* (Cambridge, 2009), p. 94.

[108] Bryant, *The King and the City*, pp. 206–7.