The Reputation of the Queen and Public Opinion: The Case of Isabeau of Bavaria

Tracy Adams and Glenn Rechtschaffen

Certain medieval and early modern queens are deemed "unpopular" in classrooms, documentaries, and even histories and conference presentations. However, recent scholarship reveals the hazards of accepting negative primary source accounts uncritically as evidence of contemporary notoriety. The notion of a jealous rivalry between a calculating Anne of Beaujeu, unofficial regent of France for her brother Charles VIII from 1484-1492, and a haughty, vindictive Anne of Brittany, queen of France, can be traced to one observation by Brantôme.[1] As for Anne of Brittany's supposed bad character, Didier Le Fur has followed it back to a single comment by Commynes: after the death of Anne's three-year-old son, Commynes reports, King Charles VIII organized a festival to cheer the queen, who sat quietly with a sullen expression (she appeared "fâchée").[2] Once we recognize that Catherine de Médici owes her reputation for wickedness to Protestant pamphleteers, we need to nuance our view of her contemporary reputation. The same is true for Anne Boleyn, victim of a factional fight for power.[3]

In this essay we would like to examine modern assumptions about the reputation of Isabeau of Bavaria (1371-1435), another queen popularly imagined to have suffered the scorn of her contemporaries. Scholars have shown the charges most frequently made against this queen in histories—adultery, cupidity, neglect of her children, and political incompetence—to be without foundation.[4] Thus we will not revisit the old argument that the queen has been unfairly vilified. Rather, we are interested in the modern perception that Isabeau was unpopular among her contemporaries, which continues to be taken for granted in the most recent scholarship.[5] The old image of a frivolous spendthrift surrounded

MFF, vol. 47 no. 1, 2011: 5–30
http://ir.uiowa.edu/mff/vol47/iss1/

by a flock of scandalous ladies common in histories of the fifteenth century has been revised, replaced by that of a generally respectable queen and entourage unfairly maligned by the people, beleaguered by abusive rumors, "stigmatized as disruptive, conniving, malicious, and publicly dangerous."[6] For the modern reader, accustomed to the systematic destruction of political figures, there is nothing implausible in the idea that a woman as powerful as Isabeau would have attracted personal attacks during her lifetime. And yet, when one seeks to verify assertions like "Extremely unpopular, Isabeau allied with Duke Louis of Orléans, leading to rumors of an affair and other misconduct," one emerges with very little evidence.[7] Of the many chroniclers of her time, only one, the monk of St. Denis, the Burgundian-leaning Michel Pintoin, reports any complaints about Isabeau, and he does so only in his entry for the year 1405, when he notes on four occasions that wise men murmured that the king's brother, Duke Louis of Orleans, and the queen were mismanaging the realm.[8] (One other chronicle, that attributed to Jean Juvénal des Ursins, repeats the criticism of Louis and Isabeau found in Pintoin's. However, because this section of Juvénal des Ursins's chronicle is an abridged translation of Pintoin's, the passage cannot be taken as further evidence.[9]) The only other source that suggests that Isabeau's contemporaries did not think highly of her is an anonymous verse pamphlet known as the "Songe véritable," composed circa 1406 by a supporter of the queen's political enemy Duke Jean of Burgundy.[10]

In the first section of this essay, we argue that these two sources prove not that public opinion turned against Isabeau in 1405–1406, but only that Jean of Burgundy was planting negative propaganda about her in hopes of damaging her reputation during those years. We have discussed the sources in detail elsewhere.[11] However, we return to them here, because they offer a point of departure for reflecting more generally on the problem of female reputation in the medieval and early modern periods. We discuss this in part two, the heart of the present essay, considering whether it is possible to speak at all of a queen's reputation among the public during these times. As Isabeau's example demonstrates, the views of a single biased chronicler (or that chronicler's informant) and a political enemy cannot be taken to represent the opinion of a wide public. However, this leaves open a larger question: can any medieval

source be said to reflect public opinion? Although Habermas's notion of the public sphere has been critiqued and modified, his suggestion that medieval publics were restricted and able to form opinions only in limited senses requires attention.[12] We propose, thus, that to consider a queen's reputation, we need to historicize the concept of public opinion and study contemporary perceptions in relation to the particular modalities of discussion and expression available to given groups. In the case of Isabeau, Claude Gauvard's conclusions about public opinion in early fifteenth-century France offer a useful perspective on how the various publics of Paris received their information and, therefore, provide an optic through which to reexamine the traces of the queen's reputation scattered throughout documents of that period.[13]

In the final section of the essay we apply Gauvard's perspective to what was written about Isabeau during her own time. We hope to show that although such traces cannot be read as straightforward indications of reputation in our modern sense, when we lift them out of the narratives in which they are embedded and reinterpret them with reference to their status as a particular type of public opinion, they offer important insights about how the queen was regarded by her contemporaries. When one gathers all the evidence, the image of Isabeau that emerges most consistently across different groups is nothing like the negative one commonly assumed, but rather that of a loving mother protecting her son, the heir to the throne.

The Sources of the Queen's Negative Reputation

The two sources that suggest Isabeau to have been unpopular during her lifetime were written during the same few years, 1405-1406, a critical period in the Orleanist-Burgundian feud. The king of France, Charles VI (1368-1422), had been suffering from lengthy episodes of insanity since 1392, leaving control of the royal council to his uncle, Duke Philip of Burgundy, and his brother, Duke Louis of Orleans, when he was unable to function. When Philip died in 1404, his son and heir Jean demanded the same degree of power and control over the kingdom's finances that his father had exercised.[14] But his relationship to the king—his cousin—did not warrant the degree of power accorded his

father, brother of one king, uncle of another, and Louis and Isabeau attempted to block the new Duke of Burgundy, who occupied only the fifth place in the royal council in 1404 and 1405, in his demands for access to power and funds.[15] In response, Jean and his army marched into Paris in August, 1405, took possession of the young dauphin, and attempted, without success, to gain control of the king. Louis and the queen represented such a significant obstacle to Jean's goals that Jean had Louis assassinated in 1407.[16]

This is the historical context of the two sources adduced as proof of Isabeau's contemporary notoriety. Let's now consider the four complaints against the queen reported by chronicler Michel Pintoin. Before laying them out, it is important to note that within the larger context of chronicles recording the events of the queen's lifetime, Pintoin's reports of discontent are unique. Other chronicles, like those of Jean Froissart, Enguerrand Monstrelet, Jean Le Fèvre de Saint-Rémy, the anonymous author of the *Chronique des Cordeliers*, Pierre Cochon, Pierre Cousinot, and Jean Juvénal des Ursins, do not suggest that the queen was disliked (with the exception of Juvénal des Ursins's borrowed passage).[17] True, the Orleanist-leaning chronicle attributed to Pierre Cousinot mentions that the Duke of Burgundy spread lies about Louis and Isabeau among vagabonds and in taverns.[18] But the absence of criticism in other chronicles suggests that even if the Duke of Burgundy was circulating stories about the queen, they did not catch on beyond Pintoin. As Bernard Guenée has warned, any event described by Pintoin that is not corroborated in other sources should be handled with caution.[19]

Caution indeed. When we contextualize the four complaints that Louis and Isabeau were mismanaging funds historically, they look like opportunistic claims planted by supporters of Jean of Burgundy. In 1405, as we have seen, Louis and Isabeau prevented Jean's access to royal funds. The Royal Council, under Louis's direction, imposed taxes in 1405 to fund the war against England, giving Jean, who, like his father before him, garnered popularity in Paris by protesting against taxes, the opportunity to play the financial reformer.[20] Pintoin's first report of popular discontent emerges in tandem with his announcement that French knights were unable to protect the people from the English, who kept attacking on all sides of the kingdom. According to Pintoin,

the French blamed their general misery on the queen and the Duke of Orleans, whom they saw as the cause of their financial worries and the war: "hearts bitter, suffering nobles and commoners alike, along with the clergy, deemed detestable the intolerable yoke placed upon the people in the guise of taxes levied for the war that would not let them enjoy the beauty of peace and the luxurious repose of the world. The inhabitants put the blame upon the queen and the Duke of Orleans, who were governing ineffectively."[21] Immediately following this passage, Pintoin reports that Jean voted in the Royal Council against new taxes to support the war. Pintoin's second report of discontent features an Augustinian monk, Jacques Legrand, who scolds Isabeau and her courtiers in the spring of 1405. Once again, the root of the complaint is the war: "Venus occupies the throne in your court," he announces, presumably to Isabeau. "Certainly drunkenness and debauchery follow her, turning night into day, with continual dissolute dancing."[22] This type of insult was commonly used against ineffective soldiers who were called soldiers of Venus rather than Mars, that is, emasculated lackeys. Pintoin reports that the king asked Legrand for a repeat performance; Legrand explains to the king that during the time of Charles V, heavy taxes were imposed for the war, but at least the French won sometimes![23] Pintoin's third criticism of Isabeau begins with noble seigneurs asking that the kingdom be watched over, because, the monk asserts, the queen and Louis, by virtue of the rights they enjoyed as the nearest relatives of the king, had arrogated supreme authority to themselves whenever the king was insane and were deciding things on their own without consulting the uncles and cousins of the king or the other members of the Royal Council. Just afterwards the king scolds the queen for neglecting to caress the dauphin.[24] Finally Pintoin suggests that there were complaints that Louis and the queen refused to come to Paris to end the standoff between Louis and Jean after the latter siezed the dauphin and brought him back to Paris in an attempt to take control of the government.[25] In 1405, then, the war against the English was not going well for the French. By planting reports of complaints of mismanagement against the Duke of Orleans and the queen with Pintoin, the politically ambitious Duke of Burgundy appears to have taken advantage of the general discontent with the war to justify his attempts to seize power.

Pintoin's sympathies, entirely with the Burgundians in 1405, changed when Jean had Louis murdered in 1407 to clear the way for his own rise. In later years, Pintoin actively deplores the Duke of Burgundy's ambition, evincing amazement that the man was able to impose himself upon the French with such ease in 1418.[26] As for Pintoin's attitude towards Isabeau, after 1405, he records nothing further negative about her. When she appears again in his chronicle, in 1407, he depicts her as a bereaved mother, loudly bewailing her newborn who had survived only a few hours. This is in stark contrast with the indifferent mother of 1405 whom he describes as forgetting to caress the dauphin. But with the violent demise of the Duke of Orleans and subsequent seizure of power by Jean, the negative narrative about Isabeau lost its purpose.[27] Had the public genuinely hated her for mismanaging funds, Pintoin would have noted this in his accounts of the Cabochian revolt of 1413, when the Parisians were more vocal about royal waste than at any other time during her reign. True, the arrest of some members of Isabeau's entourage during the Cabochian revolt has been construed as evidence of her unpopularity.[28] However, this interpretation cannot be correct. Although histories have tended to focus solely upon Isabeau's entourage, advisors of both the king and the queen were arrested. As the monk Pavilly expressed it, "au Jardin du Roy et de la Reyne y avoit de tres-mauvaises herbes, et perilleuses, c'est à sçavoir quelques serviteurs et servants, qu'il falloit sarcler et oster" (there were very bad and dangerous weeds in the garden of the king and queen, that is, some followers whom it was necessary to yank out).[29] Certainly nothing suggests that the king was not well-loved despite the Cabochians' eradication of the "bad weeds" crowding the royal garden. Given that the arrests of Isabeau's advisors were part of this wider sweep that included the king's entourage, they do not lend support to the assumption that queen and her entourage were unpopular.

The second source is the anonymous poem known as the "Songe véritable," composed circa 1406. A story of the search of Commune Renommé (Common Knowledge) for whoever is spiriting away all the king's money, the poem has been treated by scholars as a savage indictment of the queen by the Parisian public. However, like Pintoin's chronicle for 1405, it appears to be a Burgundian product: two of its

main figures, Louis of Orleans and Jean de Montaigu, were killed by order of Jean.

The poem has already been used to disprove the widely held notion that a rumor of a love affair between Isabeau and Louis circulated in Paris in 1405. As R. C. Famiglietti has explained, "If, indeed, there had been even the merest suspicions of an adulterous relationship between the queen and the duke of Orleans, would not the author have used them somewhere in this poem? He was certainly close enough to the court to have heard such gossip, if it existed, for he was able to name and vilify in the 'Songe' many members of Isabeau's household."[30] We push Famiglietti's argument further, suggesting that the poem proves that Isabeau was much loved, or at least that Jean believed her to be so.

One of the poem's allegorical characters, Fortune, explains that she has planted many good things in Isabeau's garden, including "bon renommé" (good reputation). Now, however, she is threatening to destroy the queen's name in the near future. She mentions that she became angry at Isabeau one year ago, implying that her attitude towards the queen had changed abruptly: "Mon yre encontre elle torna / Si que en mains d'une année / Fu Royne mal clamée" (line 1735; My anger turned against her / So that in the space of less than a year / rumors spread about the queen). If the work was written in 1406, Fortune's sudden ire corresponds precisely to the date when Jean would have begun to spread rumors about the queen. However, most importantly for this study of Isabeau's reputation, Fortune further clarifies that she has not yet achieved the desired result: the queen's defamation. When she refers to what she has in store for the queen, Fortune uses the future tense: "Je ly feray avoir tel honte, / Et tel dommage et telle perte, / Qu'en la fin en sera deserte" (lines 1736–38; I will bring such shame to her / and such damage and loss / that in the end she will be ruined by it). Moreover, although the poem insults Charles VI's closest advisors, his brother, Louis of Orleans, his uncle, Duke Jean of Berry, and the king's *grand maître d'hôtel*, Jean de Montaigu, whom Jean had executed in 1409, Isabeau plays a lesser role in the poem. She is reprimanded for putting all of her thought into how to "prendre ce qu'elle en peut" (line 1035; get everything she can), but she is spared the long lists of crimes attributed to the other more prominent characters.

In sum, if the "Songe véritable" was written in 1406, as critics believe to have been the case, the poem confirms what we have concluded from reading Pintoin's chronicle, that in roughly 1405 Jean of Burgundy began undermining the queen and Louis of Orleans.[31] In projecting the fall of the queen into the future ("Je ly feray avoir tel honte"), the poem indicates that Fortune has not succeeded in bringing about the queen's disgrace. Far from evidence of widespread dislike, the poem is strong proof that Isabeau was well-regarded. Had she been despised, Jean of Burgundy would have felt no need to defame her.

Public Opinion and "Fama" in the Fifteenth Century

The self-interest behind the complaints recorded by Pintoin and the "Songe véritable" is easy to discern and would have been visible to contemporaries. Then, as now, bias was recognized as a problem by those seeking information about the *fama* of someone. During trials "judges wanted to know who made the *fama*: 'Does it proceed from his enemies or ill-wishers?'"[32] Moreover, the facts that reports of discontent disappear as abruptly from Pintoin's chronicle as they had appeared and that besides this chronicle, no other negative mention except the "Songe véritable" exists, suggest that although for a short period of time Isabeau's Burgundian enemies attempted to destroy her reputation, the ploy failed. Other remaining traces of her reputation, even all other examples from Pintoin's chronicle, suggest that she was positively viewed. But do we have any more cause to trust these positive traces than the negative ones? Perhaps all traces of reputation represent the views of a small and interested group. Promoting one's own reputation while damaging an enemy's before a large group of listeners was a common strategy for representing power. An example is the series of letters that Philip of Burgundy had read before the Parlement claiming that the realm was being mismanaged by Louis of Orleans.[33] Other examples include the insulting letters that Louis of Orleans and Jean of Burgundy sent about each other to various towns of the kingdom to be read in public during the course of their struggle.[34] More generally, Habermas cautions that chroniclers inevitably record stagings of power, attempts to control public opinion, rather than genuine public opinion, because no

such thing existed before the eighteenth century. Because the medieval public was "directly connected to the concrete existence of a ruler," princes represented their power "'before' the people rather than for the people."[35] During entries, royal figures displayed themselves for the public, defining through symbols the relationships between themselves and their subjects. Such public acts did not seek to circulate information among the public but to control the circulation of information. Christian Jouhaud has come to a similar conclusion on the status of the pamphlets known as the Mazarinades.[36] The public did not produce the pamphlets, but merely read them. These pamphlets, therefore, did not represent widespread opinion but aimed to create it. The public opinion of the medieval and early modern periods cannot be compared to that of today, or even that of eighteenth-century France when readers of different social levels and groups interacted, exchanging ideas. In this context, the hundreds of scurrilous pamphlets on Marie Antoinette, circulated by scores of different presses, suggest that that this queen was indeed disliked by a large and diverse public.[37] Nothing comparable exists for medieval or early modern queens.

And yet, if Habermas's notion of public opinion as the ideas produced and circulated within an independent public sphere cannot be applied to medieval France, some scholars have historicized the phenomenon, demonstrating that medieval publics did develop and circulate views and that the means by which they did so were varied. In her work on public opinion in early fifteenth-century France, Claude Gauvard concludes that the necessary condition for public opinion is "le partage d'un savoir par la parole entre les membres d'une même communauté" (the sharing of knowledge through words by members of a same community).[38] Shared knowledge, Gauvard continues, is the community's "voice," and such knowledge is "approprié, digéré, intériorisé par des individus qui sont désormais des complices parce qu'ils sont les dépositaires et les garants d'un savoir commun" (appropriated, digested, interiorized by individuals who now become complicit because they possess and guarantee common knowledge).[39] Thus she sees no need for a public sphere from which the king and/or the State is excluded for public opinion to exist. Indeed, in a reversal of Habermas's notion, she states that genuine public opinion belongs to the medieval rather than modern era: "On

peut même affirmer, de façon paradoxale," she writes, "alors que l'idée d'une communauté politique appliquée au Moyen Age fait encore sourire de nombreux historiens, que le concept d'opinion publique y est plus opérationnel que de nos jours parce que, dans cette société restée encore traditionnelle, le désir de conformité l'emporte sur le sentiment des différences" (We can even state, paradoxically, that although the idea of a political community, applied to the Middle Ages, brings a smile to the lips of historians, the concept of public opinion is more applicable then than it is today, because, in that still traditional society, the desire for conformity was more important than the feeling of differences).[40]

The fifteenth-century State shaped public opinion by means of well-placed propaganda. However, this does not mean that opinion was merely fed to the public. As Gauvard explains, the public received ideas, but it also shaped, exchanged, and returned them. She points to the royal ordinance as a material trace of the workings of public opinion in political decisions, of reciprocal engagement of the king and the people through legislation. Certainly in an ordinance, the king expresses his will and exercises his power. And yet, without the assent of the audience it addresses, the ordinance will be ineffectual. Presumably the audience has sought the remedy announced in the ordinance, alerting the king by its "clameur" to come to its aid to reestablish order. The dialogic nature of an ordinance is evident in its very form, with the king adhering to certain ritualistic patterns: the preambles to the ordinances reveal an "incantatory function."[41] Gauvard notes the "sens de l'écoute," the oral sense of the ordinance, emphasizing the visual and auditory ritual embedded within its text. Letters of remission issued by the king inscribe a similarly ritualistic dialogue between him and the community within the jurisdiction affected.

As bureaucracy developed, acquiring a large network of officers charged with collecting taxes and carrying out the king's justice, Gauvard explains, public opinion became separable from the State, often turning against it. Taxes, originally understood as gifts granted to the king to cover a circumscribed set of extraordinary expenses, became permanent during the fourteenth century, when they were needed to support the war against the English and the "état bureaucratique," judicial and financial, which grew all the more rapidly under Charles VI to guarantee the

government's continued function during his periods of mental illness.[42] Protests against taxes came to be focused on those who collected them and managed the king's interests more generally, the despised "officiers royaux." These officers became scapegoats, Gauvard writes, accused of

> violence contre les faibles, fortune trop vite amassée, et même, dans les cas extrêmes, crimes sexuels. Ces accusations ont un effet de terreur dans l'opinion publique qui voit ses valeurs culturelles bafouées. Alors, rassemblée en foule, par-delà les éléments de différenciation sociale, la communauté perturbée réclame la mort de ceux qui la dérangent.[43]
>
> [violence against the weak, fortune too quickly won, and, even, in extreme cases, sexual crimes. These accusations arouse a sort of terror in the public opinion, which sees its cultural values upset. Then assembling in a crowd that exceeds social boundaries, the angry community demands the death of those that disturb it.]

Françoise Autrand's work on royal officers under Charles VI notes the same tendency to blame these public servants for the kingdom's manifold woes. About Charles VI she writes:

> Chaque fois qu'un pressant besoin d'argent contraignait le roi à donner la parole à ses sujets, les officiers royaux étaient les premiers mis en cause. De crise en crise reviennent à leur sujet les mêmes doléances, accompagnées des mêmes vœux et suivies d'ordonnances royales identiques prescrivant les mêmes mesures et répétant souvent mot pour mot les mêmes articles: réduction du nombre des sergents, remplacement de la mise en ferme des prévôtés par leur mise en garde, obligation de résidence, enquête générale sur tous les officiers.[44]
>
> [Each time that a pressing need for money forced the king to let his subjects speak, royal officers were the first blamed. From crisis to crisis the same complaints reappear, accompanied by the same wishes and followed by identical ordinances prescribing the same

measures and often repeating the same articles word for word: reduction in the number of officers, replacement of the system of farming out *prévôtés*, obligation of residence for the officers, a general investigation of the officers.]

It is crucial to note that popular sentiment against taxes was not turned upon Charles VI, who continued to be loved by his subjects. Bernard Guenée writes that whereas Charles V had been dubbed "The Wise" by the elite, "le peuple" referred to "Charles VI le Bien-Aimé (Well Beloved)."[45] The public also spared the queen its hatred. Were the modern perceptions of Isabeau's extreme unpopularity with her contemporaries accurate, we would discover traces of an outraged community turned against her similar to what we find for the "officiers royaux." However, as we have seen, no record of such popular sentiment against the queen exists, just the few references to her negative reputation spread by Burgundians wishing her ill in 1405–1406, the years during which Jean of Burgundy made his first bid for power.

Against this short-lived propaganda, we will now consider the positive maternal images current throughout Isabeau's lifetime, images shared by chroniclers, presented by the king to his subjects in official documents read before the public, and acted out in entries. To return to the question with which we began this section—the question of why we should grant any source more credence than we grant Pintoin's four negative chronicle entries for 1405 or the "Songe véritable"—we believe that Gauvard's analysis of public documents offers an answer. Although royal ordinances and entries imposed a particular image of the queen upon the community, the community interacted positively with such images because they conformed to its shared notions of queenship, and, in accepting them, the public absorbed them, making them its own. Certainly this is not what Habermas means by public opinion. However, this maternal imagery is what the public would have heard and seen of the queen, and, absent any record of popular dissent, it seems reasonable to conclude that the Parisians' view of the queen would have come to them refracted through such imagery. If we search further than Pintoin and the "Songe véritable," all indications suggest that the queen was well loved. Within her own circle, the loyalty of her

intimates was noteworthy. In his study of her household, Yann Grandeau concludes that the stability of her personnel was "exceptional during a time of disorder, when impatient courtisans, greedy, unwilling to compromise, changed master according to the success of the factions." This, he continues, "bears witness to her virtues. Catherine de Villiers served her nearly thirty years, Amélie de Moy over twenty-five, twenty-four for Isabelle de Malicorne. Two or maybe three generations of de La Fauconnières were faithful to her."[46] Beyond this small, intimate circle, the most frequently deployed image of Isabeau is maternal. We cannot speak of Isabeau as a popular or unpopular figure in the sense we use today, when information on a public figure circulates within a wide public sphere. However, we propose that regarded through the optic provided by Gauvard's notion of medieval public opinion, Isabeau was embraced as a maternal figure offering the hope of protection against the warring dukes.

Mother of the Dauphin

On September 5, 1408, having just returned to Paris from Melun where she had retreated with her children after Jean Petit's justification of the assassination of Louis of Orleans, carried out under the order of Jean of Burgundy, Isabeau met with the Royal Council at the Louvre to determine how best to manage the aggressive Duke.[47] Pintoin writes that Jean Juvénal des Ursins, the queen's lawyer, explained before a gathering composed of the Princes of the Blood, barons, prelates, and a large multitude of respected men ("circumspectorum virorum multitudine copiosa") that the king had once more granted the queen and her son sovereign powers to care for the affairs of the kingdom during his absences. Pintoin then adds an important detail about Juvénal des Ursins's discourse. In explaining why the king had decided that Isabeau should continue as head of the royal council, Juvénal des Ursins cited as a positive example Blanche of Castile, who had earlier ruled the kingdom with her son, Saint Louis.[48] Juvénal des Ursins associates Isabeau with the most famously pious and beloved queen mother in the French imaginary.

There are two points to make about this chronicle entry. First,

its accuracy is confirmed by a long series of ordinances promulgated between 1393 and 1409, in which the king reaffirmed Isabeau's authority to perform various duties during his absences: specifically, to serve as guardian for the dauphin, mediate between the warring princes, and preside over the royal council. The very frequency with which such ordinances about the queen's position were made suggests a struggle between those who stood to lose with her increased authority, on the one hand, and, on the other, the king and the public inscribed in the ordinances, who desired peace during the king's absences. The salutation and the form of royal ordinances in general, as Gauvard has pointed out, appeal to a public whose assent was required for the realization of the ordinance, that is, without whose assent the decree would remain ineffective. The chronicle entry describing Juvénal des Ursins's discourse dramatizes the lawyer's interpellation of a wide group of subjects, requesting the support without which the king's ordinance would be useless.

Second, the emphasis upon motherhood inserted Isabeau into a genealogy of beloved queen mothers to whom the burgeoning Mariology of the twelfth century had offered a new prestige.[49] The image of Isabeau to which the public was asked to assent was that of queen mother, utterly devoted to the dauphin, working to prepare him for the position he would occupy one day. This same image informs the royal ordinances. The regency ordinance of 1393 justified Isabeau's primacy in the guardianship of the dauphin with reference to her positive maternal qualities: "the mother has a greater and more tender love for her children, and with a soft and caring heart takes care of and nourishes them more lovingly than any other person, no matter how closely related, and for this reason, she is to be preferred above all others."[50] To mention just one more of the many regency ordinances promulgated by the king and the royal council over the years, that of May 1403 assigns the queen the duty of supervising the king during his illnesses to ensure that he not be persuaded to do anything to the detriment of the kingdom. The queen, Charles explains, is the person the most apt to perform such oversight, because she is the one to whom "appartient garder le bien, prouffit de Nous & de nostre Royaume, & de noz Enfans, plus que à nul autre" (belongs the task of guarding the good belonging to us and to our kingdom, and to our children, more than to any other).[51] Wife,

queen, mother: Charles collapses Isabeau's roles, representing her as the protector of the entire kingdom.

Isabeau had herself reminded Parisians visually of her role as mother of the dauphin just days before the discourse of Juvénal des Ursins when she and the boy made their entry into Paris. The Parisians greeted her with great joy, according to the chronicler Monstrelet. He writes that Isabeau's own chariot followed behind her son, the dauphin, who was riding a white horse led by four men on foot.[52] The entry staged the hierarchy of authority that was to be maintained: the queen rode discreetly behind the dauphin, there to guide him when necessary. But, above all, in the procession she demonstrated that she required the support of the public to stave off Jean's aggression. Visibly, a young son and his mother were unprepared on their own to stand up to the powerful Duke of Burgundy. Pintoin's chronicle also makes clear that the public assented to the queen as she presented herself during entries. Followed the Peace of Auxerre in 1412, as Pintoin describes it, Louis, the dauphin, entered Paris the last week of September, accompanied by his cousins, and behind them, the Dukes of Burgundy and Bourbon. When the queen entered three days later, "[P]lebs universa reginam venerabilem iterum ingredientem suscepit et cum tanta exuberanti leticia, ut laudes sibi regias acclamarent, ac si suscepissent regem qui de adversariis regni triumphasset" (The entire people again received the entering venerable queen and acclaimed her with such exuberant joy, such royal laud, it was as if they were receiving a king returning to the realm from triumphing over enemies).[53]

Once again, we are not suggesting that the public had access to information about the queen that it circulated and used to form an opinion. Rather, what we see is the crowd interacting with an image of the queen that has been offered it, but that it accepts into its collective values as necessary to its own well-being. The crowd fervently supports the queen in her task as mother and mediator guiding the dauphin to maturity. An active collectivity of subjects rallying behind the queen is also evoked in Christine de Pizan's "Epistre a la Royne de France" of October 5, 1405, where the poet, like Juvénal des Ursins, draws on the image of Blanche of Castile. The epistle's primary purpose is to reinforce the queen's authority to mediate between the warring dukes, Louis and Jean. Several

of Charles VI's ordinances command the king's unruly male relatives to heed the truces negotiated by the queen, whom he has appointed mediator when he himself is sick. As we have noted, the fact that the order is repeated in successive ordinances indicates that the queen had difficulty in enforcing the agreements she negotiated. Christine's epistle appears just one week before still another royal ordinance ordering the dukes, on penalty of bodily harm, to submit themselves to her arbitration.[54] As a reader of the *Grandes Chroniques de France*, Christine would have been familiar with the story of Blanche of Castile and the child Louis IX harassed by the barons of the realm. The chronicle recounts how the barons did not believe that Blanche, a woman, was fit to rule a kingdom ("qu'il n'apartenoit pas à fame de tel chose faire") and plotted to seize the young king.[55] Hearing this, "la royne sa mere" asked the powerful men of Paris to come to her aid. She then sent letters throughout the kingdom asking for further support. A great army assembled at Paris to safeguard the young king from his enemies. The parallel that Christine draws between Blanche and Isabeau, both harassed by aggressive lords, is clear. Blanche takes the child Louis in her arms, and, extending him towards the quarreling barons, she demands that they look at their king and remember that he will soon reach the age of majority, at which point they will not want to have angered him earlier.[56] Christine's epistle thus invokes a collectivity of subjects dedicated to the common welfare to support the queen mother and heir against the selfishly motivated dukes.

Isabeau bore twelve children, thus she would have been pregnant during many of her appearances before the public. Already during her first major public appearance, her grand entry into Paris of August, 1389, to be crowned, she was pregnant with Isabelle, who would be born in November. Gordon Kipling suggests that the iconography of the entry associated the queen with the Virgin, the ultimate exemplum for queen mothers, creating parallels between the queen's entry into Paris and the Virgin's assumption into heaven.[57] "Just as an octave Sunday constitutes a second commemoration of a feast," he writes, "so Queen Isabella's entry could be seen as a second commemoration of the Virgin's Assumption."[58] Passing beneath the *Porte-aux-peintres*, Isabeau was crowned queen of paradise by two angels descending to lay a crown upon her head.[59] The chronicle explains that a Virgin with child was depicted above the gate

of Saint Denis. The pilgrimages that Isabeau made to Saint-Sanctin-de-Chuisnes, near Chartres, which contained a belt of the Virgin Mary, before the births of Isabelle, Jeanne, Charles, Marie, Michelle, and Jean, further guaranteed that she would have been visible as a caring mother throughout the years.[60]

That Isabeau's supporters would emphasize her maternity before the public whose consent they courted is not surprising. It is clear, however, that the image of the queen mother watching over her son enjoyed wider purchase, for it was drawn on even by a public in active rebellion. During the Cabochian revolt, Jean de Troyes, addressed the dauphin on behalf of a group of rebels described by Pintoin as 20,000 strong. Jean de Troyes scolded the young man for allowing himself to be seduced by the advice of traitors. The venerable queen, his mother, Jean admonishes, and the princes of the fleur-de-lis were deeply saddened by his behavior.[61] Even among those who would have been the most apt to criticize the royal family, Isabeau's maternity is her most salient feature, her motherly disappointment called upon to shame the dauphin.

Isabeau's maternal image was perdurable. In 1418, three years after the death of the dauphin Louis, when the dauphin Charles (later Charles VII) named himself regent of the realm, he sent out letters to the towns of France soliciting their support.[62] In these letters he refers to his mother as having been kidnapped by Jean of Burgundy from her prison in Tours, where she had been banished by the Orleanists (known after 1410, when Bernard of Armagnac assumed leadership, as the Armagnacs), who had turned against her following the death of the dauphin Louis. That Charles believed that his mother had been kidnapped is uncertain, nor is it known whether she called upon her old enemy Jean of Burgundy for deliverance or whether he called upon her to install a government against the Armagnacs. But that Charles preempts charges of maternal betrayal is significant: the queen mother was a potent symbol, and her support would work to his advantage. The image of Isabeau held hostage by the Burgundians is further deployed in pamphlets supporting Charles around the time of the Treaty of Troyes.[63] The queen had so long been recognized as the force behind the dauphin that audiences were more likely to believe that she was acting against her will

than otherwise. Deeply ingrained, the image of Isabeau as mother of the dauphin resonates even at this late stage.

Finally, in his chronicle for 1431, the Bourgeois of Paris paints a moving picture of Isabeau responding to a gesture from her grandson, the child Henry VI, as he passed by her window during his entry into Paris. She had sent her daughter Catherine off to England as the queen of Henry V. At the sight of the boy, living link to Catherine and reminder of the many sons she had born and lost before they could sit on the throne, the queen dissolved in tears.[64]

Conclusion

The suggestion that Isabeau's reputation among her contemporaries was first and foremost that of protective mother of the dauphin may seem strange, because her black legend has long insisted on her neglect of her children. Typical of this attitude, we read, "For a long time Isabeau had taken no pleasure in maternity. She enjoyed a new pregnancy only because it offered her the pretext to give herself a present, the rights to a toll road, a new abbey, a chateau surrounded by good land. The Bavarian woman loved riches."[65] And yet, quite the opposite seems to have been true. Contemporary sources attest to Isabeau's maternal solicitude. When her children were small they lived alongside her at the Hôtel Saint-Pol. They went with her when she travelled.[66] Pintoin describes her acute sorrow when she discovered at the wedding of her young son Jean that the boy was to be removed from her care and raised by the parents of his new wife in Hainaut. When the Countess of Hainaut moved to take the boy with her, Pintoin reports, an argument broke out between the women. But Isabeau could not halt Jean's departure for it formed part of the marriage agreement.[67] As we noted above, Isabeau also demonstrated her maternal love at the death of her youngest son, the premature Philip. Pintoin records the Queen's distress at this loss, which threw "her into agony" and caused her to lament "throughout the time of the delivery."[68] Loving maternity, then, seems to have been the predominant image associated with Isabeau, an image promoted by royal authority, but, as its use by different groups suggests, one that was widely accepted and circulated.

To return to the point with which we began, we believe that it is possible to coax information about how women of the past were viewed from chronicles and other sources. However, as we hope to have shown, caution is crucial in evaluating traces of a powerful woman's reputation. Any assessment of a queen's contemporary reputation requires a careful reading of its traces to discover who was circulating the story, what the motives for circulating it would have been, which public would have received it, and how that public would have received it. Not that such inquiries always reveal queens to have been more positively viewed than previously believed. At least one investigation of a queen long presumed to have been well loved has discovered that her contemporaries thought rather badly of her: John Carmi Parsons has shown that queen of England Eleanor of Castile acquired her positive reputation after her death.[69]

Stories of female reputation often had little interest for the chroniclers in charge of a society's major narratives, unless the point was to discredit for political purposes. Thus the interpretation of "rumors" is a difficult project, forcing one to rely on indirect methods, to listen for a disjointed narrative lying below the surface of the story recounted by authors with agendas. Nonetheless, in the case of Isabeau, it seems possible to write with confidence that attempts to ruin the queen's reputation have been mistaken for a negative public opinion of her, and, moreover, that the predominant image of her is recoverable. Her example demonstrates the necessity of resisting the easy lure of characterizing queens of the medieval and early modern periods as unpopular.

University of Auckland

END NOTES

1. Pierre de Bourdeille Brantôme, *Œuvres complètes de Branthôme*, ed. Prosper Mérimée and Louis La Cour de la Pijardière, 13 vols. (Paris: P. Jannet, 1858-95; Nendeln: Liechtenstein, Kraus reprint, 1977), 10:270. Brantôme's description of the Annes' relationship, which he wrote more than seventy-five years after the women's deaths, has guided understanding of it. See Philippe Tourault, *Anne de Bretagne* (Paris: Perrin, 1990), 103-4; J. H. M. Salmon, "The Regent and the Duchess: Anne de Beaujeu and

Anne de Bretagne," *History Today* 16:5 (1966): 343; Jehanne d'Orliac, *Anne de Beaujeu, Roi de France* (Paris: Plon, 1926), 109; and John S. C. Bridge, *A History of France from the Death of Louis XI*, 5 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1921-36), 1:240-41. All assume a rivalry between the women.

2. Didier Le Fur, *Anne de Bretagne* (Paris: Guénégard, 2000), 177-78. Commyne's remark was taken up and amplified by Brantôme.

3. See Robert McCune Kingdon, *Myths About the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacres* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988); and N. M. Sutherland, "Catherine de Medici: The Legend of the Wicked Italian Queen," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9 (1978): 45-56. On the factional rivalry that brought down the Boleyns see Eric Ives, *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn: "The Most Happy,"* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004), and for different interpretations of precisely what happened, see Ives, *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn*, 291-356; Greg Walker, "Rethinking the Fall of Anne Boleyn," *Historical Journal* 45 (2002): 1–29; G. W. Bernard, "The Fall of Anne Boleyn," *English Historical Review* 106 (1991): 584–610; and Retha M. Warnicke, *The Rise and Fall of Anne Boleyn: Family Politics at the Court of Henry VIII* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 163-90.

4. For rehabilitations of Isabeau see Tracy Adams, *The Life and Afterlife of Isabeau of Bavaria* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010); Rachel C. Gibbons, "Isabeau of Bavaria, Queen of France (1385-1422): The Creation of an Historical Villainess," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Series 6.6. (1996), 51-74; R. C. Famiglietti, *Royal Intrigue: Crisis at the Court of Charles VI, 1392-1420* (New York: AMS Press, 1986); Yann Grandeau's many articles, especially "Les Dames qui ont servie la reine Isabeau de Bavière," *Bulletin philologique et historique* (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1975): 129-239; "Le Dauphin Jean, duc de Touraine, fils de Charles VI (1398-1417)," *Bulletin philologique et historique* (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1971): 665-728; and "Les Enfants de Charles VI: essai sur la vie privée des princes et des princesses de la maison de France à la fin du moyen age," *Bulletin philologique et historique* (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1969): 665-728; and Heidrun Kimm, *Isabeau de Baviere, reine de France 1370-1435. Beitrag zur Geschichte einer bayerischen Herzogstochter und des französischen Königshauses* (Munich: Stadtarchiv, 1969).

5. See, for example, Larissa Taylor, *Virgin Warrior: The Life and Death of Joan of Arc* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 203; Helen Solterer, "Making Names, Breaking Lives: Women and Injurious Language at the Court of Isabeau of Bavaria and Charles VI," in *Cultural Performances in*

Medieval France, ed. Eglal Doss-Quinby, Roberta L. Krueger, and E. Jane Burns (Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: D. S. Brewer, 2007), 203-18; Eliane Viennot, *La France, les femmes et le pouvoir: l'invention de la loi salique (v-xvi siècle)* (Paris: Perrin, 2006), 361; Sharon Jansen, *Anne of France: Lessons for my Daughter* (Rochester, NY: D. S. Brewer, 2004), 82; Gibbons, "Isabeau of Bavaria," 62-63; Famiglietti, *Royal Intrigue*, 42-43; and Theodor Straub, "Isabeau de Bavière, Legende und Wirklichkeit," *Zeitschrift für Bayerische Landesgeschichte* 44 (1981): 134.

6. Solterer, "Making Names, Breaking Lives," 204.

7. Taylor, *Virgin Warrior*, 203.

8. See Michel Pintoin, *La Chronique du Religieux de Saint-Denys contenant le règne de Charles VI, de 1380-1422*, ed. and trans. Louis Bellaguet, 6 vols. (Paris, 1839-1852; repr. Paris: Editions du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques, 1994), vol. 2.

9. Jean Juvénal des Ursins, *Histoire de Charles VI, roy de France, et des choses mémorables advenues durant quarante-deux années de son règne: depuis 1380 jusqu'à 1422. Nouvelle collection des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France*, ed. Joseph-François Michaud and Jean-Joseph-François Poujoulat, 3rd series, 34 vols. (Paris: Ed. du commentaire analytique du code civil, 1836-39), ser. 1, vol. 2, 333-569. On Juvénals des Ursins's borrowings from Pintoin see P. S. Lewis, ed., *Écrits politiques de Jean de Juvenal des Ursins*, 3 vols. (Paris: Klincksieck, 1992), 1:88, and René Planchenault, "La 'Chronique de la Pucelle,'" *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes* 93 (1932): 95.

10. "Le Songe véritable," ed. Henri Moranvillé, *Mémoires de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Ile de France* 17 (1890): 217-438.

11. See Adams, *Life and Afterlife*, 113-48.

12. Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Enquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Berger (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989).

13. Claude Gauvard, "Le Roi de France et l'opinion publique à l'époque de Charles VI," *Culture et idéologie dans la genèse de l'état moderne*, Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome; 82 (Rome: Ecole Française de Rome, 1985), 353-66.

14. The feud is treated by Bertrand Schnerb, *Jean sans Peur: le prince meurtrier* (Paris: Payot, 2005) and *Les Armagnacs et les Bourguignons. La maudite guerre* (Paris: Perrin, 1988); Bernard Guenée, *Un Meurtre, une société: l'assassinat du duc d'Orléans, 23 novembre 1407* (Paris: Gallimard, 1992); Famiglietti, *Royal Intrigue*; Richard Vaughan, *John the Fearless: The Growth of Burgundian Power* (first published 1966; Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK:

Boydell Press, 2002); and Michael Nordberg, *Les Ducs et la royauté: étude sur la rivalité des ducs d'Orléans et de Bourgogne 1392-1407* (Uppsala: Svenska Bokförlaget, 1964). More generally on the problems of Charles VI's reign see Françoise Autrand, *Charles VI: la folie du roi* (Paris: Fayard, 1986).

15. In a treaty with Jean signed in 1404 Isabeau makes the royal family's view of Jean's position clear. She will defend him only as far as permitted by the family hierarchy where the interests of those more closely to related to her than Jean (that is, Louis) take precedence over Jean's. See Famiglietti, *Royal Intrigue*, 40. As for Jean's position on the Royal Council, see Pintoin, 3:230.

16. Although the most important secondary source on the incident is Léon Mirot's "L'Enlèvement du dauphin et le premier conflit entre Jean sans Peur et Louis d'Orléans (1405)," *Revue des questions historiques* 95 (1914): 329-55 and 96 (1914): 47-88 and 369-419, the article must be approached with caution because of its pro-Burgundian bias. The major chroniclers rely on Jean of Burgundy's own justification of his action. See Nordberg, *Les Ducs et la royauté*, 187-88. The chronicles must therefore be balanced with less biased sources, for example, the letter of August 25 of Olivier de Mauni to the King of Castille, which reveals that Jean of Burgundy's act was viewed as aggressive in Paris: "Et a len défendu à mondit seigneur de Bourgogne et crié partout Paris de par le Roye, qu'il n'assemble ne tiengne nulles gens d'armes pour ceste cause" (And it was forbidden Monsieur of Burgundy, and cried everywhere in Paris on behalf of the king, that he not assemble or keep any soldiers for any reason). *Choix des pièces inédites*, vol. 1, 270.

17. Jean le Fèvre de Saint-Rémy, *Chronique de Jean le Fèvre, seigneur de Saint-Rémy*, ed. François Morand, 2 vols. (Paris: Renouard, 1876-1881); *Chronique des Cordeliers*, in *La chronique d'Enguerran de Monstrelet, 1400-1444*, ed. Louis Claude Douët-d'Arcq, 6 vols. (Paris: Renouard, 1857-1862), vol. 6; *Chronique de la Pucelle ou chronique de Cousinot, suivie de la chronique Normand de P Cochon, relatives aux régnes de Charles VI et de Charles VII, restituées à leurs auteurs et publiées pour la première fois intégralement à partir de l'an 1403, d'après les manuscrits, avec notices, notes, et développements*, ed. Auguste Vallet de Viriville (Paris, 1859; New York: Elibron Classics, 2005). Nor does the rabidly pro-Burgundian Bourgeois of Paris, *Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris*, ed. Colette Beaune (Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 1990) have anything terribly negative to offer: he notes that after the queen's retirement in the 1420s, the people of Paris did not know or much care what had become of her.

18. Cousinot, *Chronique de la Pucelle ou chronique de Cousinot*, 109.

19. Bernard Guenée, *L'Opinion publique à la fin du Moyen Age d'après la 'Chronique de Charles VI' du Religieux de Saint-Denis* (Paris: Perrin, 2002), 63, 65, 90.

20. See Schnerb, *Jean sans Peur*, 169. Schnerb discusses the motivation behind the Burgundians' habit of fashioning themselves as men of the people. Gauvard explains that although Jean sans Peur gathered popular support by demanding financial reform in 1405, he quickly abandoned the discourse when pressed for fear of losing the revenue he required to carry out his political agenda. See "Les Officiers royaux et l'opinion publique en France à la fin du moyen âge," *Histoire comparée de l'administration (IVe-XVIIIe siècle)*, ed. Werner Paravicini and Karl Ferdinand Werner (Munich: Artemis Verlag, 1980), 590.

21. Cum cordis amaritudine inde cum clero nobiles et ignobiles dolentes, jugum intollerabile plebis, sub titulo subsidii guerrarum levatum, execrabile reputabant, cum sic manere non posset in pulcritudine pacis et requie temporalium opulenta. In regine et ducis Aurelianis culpam malum hoc regnicole retorquebant, qui sic regnum tepide gubernabant." Pintoin, 3 : 228 (my translation).

22. "[I]n tua curia domina Venus solium occupans, ipsi eciam obsequntur ebrietas et commessacio, que noctes vertunt in diem, continuantes choreas dissolutas." Pintoin, vol. 3, 266.

23. This can be seen in the chronicle of Thomas of Walsingham, who criticizes Richard II's inner circle for their unwillingness to engage in battle and also their refusal to heed outside advice. They "were more soldiers of Venus than of Bellona [Goddess of War], more valorous in the bedchamber than on the field of battle, and more likely to defend themselves with their tongues than their spears, for although they slept on when the trumpet sounded for deeds of war, they were always wide awake to make speeches." *The Chronica maiora of Thomas Walsingham*, 1376-1422, trans. David Preest (Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2005), 248.

24. "Auctoritatem hanc regina Francie et ipse dux Aurelianis sibi assumebant, quociens mentem regiam tenebris ignorancie obnubilari contingebat, nec inde redarguendi, cum ipsi regi propinquiores existerent." Pintoin, vol. 3, 288-90.

25. Ibid., 310-12.

26. Pintoin, vol. 6, 80.

27. Pintoin, vol. 3, 730.

28. See Solterer, "Making Names, Breaking Lives."

29. See Juvénal des Ursins, 483. We could also note that immediately before the Cabochian revolt, the university and city of Paris produced a series of *remonstrances* of the government of the realm listing complaints against the households. The king's came first; it was followed by the dauphin's, and the queen's. And yet, modern historians describe Isabeau as the target of the *remonstrances* without mentioning that her household is dealt with in exactly the same way as the king's. See Henri Moranvillé, "Remonstrances de l'Université et de la ville de Paris à Charles VI sur le gouvernement du royaume," *BEC* 51 (1890): 420-42. This is true of the Cabochian ordinance itself. The mandates dealing with the expenses of the hotel of the king are followed by "et pour les hostelz de la Royne et du daulphin." See Alfred Coville, *L'Ordonnance cabochienne* (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1891). The ordinances do not target the queen, but the royal family.

30. Famiglietti, *Royal Intrigue*, 43.

31. See "Le Songe véritable," 220-21.

32. See Thelma Fenster and Daniel Lord Smail, eds., *Fama: The Politics of Talk and Reputation in Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 2.

33. Françoise Lehoux, *Jean de France, Duc de Berri: sa vie. Son action politique (1340-1416)*, 4 vols. (Paris: Picard, 1966), vol. 2, 461n5.

34. For the edited letter of Louis of Orléans, see Louis Claude Douët-d'Arcq, *Choix de pièces inédites relatives au règne de Charles VI*, 2 vols. (Paris: Renouard, 1863), vol. 1, 273-83; for Jean's see Mirot, "L'Enlèvement du dauphin," 405-13. The subject of the circulation of rumor in the public space and whether or not this constitutes a form of public opinion has attracted substantial interest in recent decades. See Colette Beaune, "La Rumeur dans le *Journal du Bourgeois de Paris*," *La Circulation des nouvelles au moyen âge. Actes du XXIVe Congrès de la SHMES, Avignon, juin 1993*, Collection de l'École française de Rome; 190/Série histoire ancienne et medievale; 29 (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1994), 191-203; Claude Gauvard, "Rumeur et stéréotypes à la fin du moyen âge," *La Circulation des nouvelles au moyen âge*, 157-77 and "Le Roi de France et l'opinion publique à l'époque de Charles VI," and Bernard Guenée, "Les Campagnes de lettres qui ont suivi le meutre de Jean Sans Peur, duc de Bourgogne (septembre 1419-février 1420)," *Annuaire-bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de France* (1993): 45-65.

35. Jürgen Habermas, Sara Lennox, and Frank Lennox, "The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article (1964)," *New German Critique* 3 (1974): 51.

36. Christian Jouhaud, *Mazarinades: la Fronde des mots* (Paris: Aubier, 1985), 13.

37. See Terry Castle,"Marie-Antoinette Obsession," *Representations* 38 (1992): 1-38; Lynn Hunt, "The Many Bodies of Marie Antoinette: Political Pornography and the Problem of the Feminine in the French Revolution," in *Eroticism and the Body Politic*, ed. Lynn Hunt (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), 109-30; and Vivian Gruder, "The Question of Marie-Antoinette: The Queen and Public Opinion before the Revolution," *French History* 16 (2002): 269-98.

38. Gauvard, "Le Roi de France et l'opinion publique," 354.

39. Ibid.

40. Ibid., 353-54.

41. Ibid., 357.

42. Ibid., 365-66.

43. Ibid., 365.

44. Françoise Autrand, "Offices et officiers royaux en France sous Charles VI," *Revue historique* 242 (1969): 285-86.

45. Bernard Guenée, *La Folie de Charles VI, roi bien-aimé* (Paris: Perrin, 2004), 236.

46. Grandeau, "Les Dames." The loyalty of her ladies, "alors exceptionnelle, témoigne devant l'histoire de ses vertus. Catherine de Villiers la servit près de trente ans, Amélie de Moy plus de vingt cinq, et vingt quatre Isabelle de Malicorne. Deux et peut-être même trois générations de La Fauconnière lui demeurèrent fidèles" (157).

47. Pintoin, vol. 3, 766.

48."quam prudenter quamque potenter domina quondam Blancha cum parvulo filio sancta memorie Ludovico regnum Francie rexisset" (that once Blanche had prudently and powerfully ruled the kingdom of France with her small son, Louis of holy memory). Pintoin, vol 4, 93.

49. On Mariology generally see Jaroslav Pelikan, *Mary Through the Centuries: Her Place in the History of Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); Penny Schine Gold, *The Lady and the Virgin: Image, Attitude, and Experience in Twelfth-Century France* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985); and Marina Warner, *Alone of All Her Sex: The Myth and Cult of the Virgin Mary* (New York: Random House, 1976). Medieval queens often associated their maternity with that of the Virgin. See Fanny Cosandey, *La Reine de France. Symbole et pouvoir, XVe-XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Gallimard, 2000), 279; Gordon Kipling, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 289-356; and John Carmi Parsons, "The Pregnant Queen as Counsellor and the Medieval

Construction of Motherhood," in *Medieval Mothering*, ed. John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (New York: Garland Publishing, 1996), 39-61.

50. See *Les Ordonnances des rois de France de la troisième race*, ed. Denis-Francois Secousse, 21 vols. (Paris: L'Imprimerie nationale, 1723-1849), vol. 7, 530.

51. *Ordonnances*, vol. 8, 587.

52. Enguerran de Monstrelet, *La chronique d'Enguerran de Monstrelet, 1400-1444*, ed. Louis Claude Douët-d'Arcq, 6 vols. (Paris: Renouard, 1857-1862), vol. 1, 267.

53. Pintoin, vol. 4, 724.54. *Ordonnances*, vol. 12, 222-23.

55. *Les Grandes Chroniques de France*, ed. Jules Viard, 10 vols. (Paris: Champion, 1920-1953), vol. 7, 38.

56. *The Epistle of the Prison of Human Life With an Epistle to the Queen of France and Lament on the Evils of the Civil War*, ed. and trans. Josette Wisman (New York: Garland, 1984), 76.

57. Kipling, *Enter the King*, 294. See also 78-85 for a detailed description of other pageants relating Isabeau to the Virgin Mary and stressing her status as mediator.

58. Kipling, *Enter the King*, 294.

59. Ibid.

60. See Grandeau, "Les Enfants de Charles VI," 812.

61. See Pintoin, vol. 5, 18. "Inde procul dubio tristantur cum venerabili regina matre vestra omnes lilia deferentes de regio sanguine procreati, verentes ne, dum ad virilem perveneritis etatem, indignum vos faciant auctoritate sceptrigera" (For that reason, without doubt, all the princes of the blood along with the venerable queen, your mother, fear that when you have reached the age of manhood, they [evil counselors] will have caused you to be unworthy of reigning).

62. See, for example, the letter printed in C. J. H. Walravens, *Alain Chartier: études biographiques, suivies de pièces justificatives* (Amsterdam: Meulenhoff-Didier, 1971), 150.

63. See Nicole Pons, "Intellectual Patterns and Affective Reactions in the Defence of the Dauphin Charles, 1419-1422," in *War, Government and Power in Late Medieval France*, ed. Christopher Allmand (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), 58.

64. *Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris*, 307.

65. Philippe Erlanger, *Charles VII et son mystère* (Paris: Gallimard, 1945), 2.

66. See Grandeau, "Les Enfants de Charles VI," 824.

67. Pintoin, vol. 5, 393-95.

68. Ibid., 730.

69. John Carmi Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile: Queen and Society in Thirteenth-Century England* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995). In chapter 4, "Legend and Reality," (205-58), Parsons traces the evolution of her legend toward the positive.