

THE HOLY ROMAN EMPEROR IN THE TOILS OF THE FRENCH PROTOCOL: THE VISIT OF CHARLES IV TO FRANCE

JANA FANTYSOVÁ-MATĚJKOVÁ
UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
CZECH REPUBLIC

Date of reception: 6th of September, 2010

Final date of acceptance: 15th of February, 2011

ABSTRACT

This study analyses the chapters on the journey of the emperor Charles IV to Paris (1377-1378), which are part of the *Grandes Chroniques de France*. It follows the critical insights offered by Heinz Thomas, Françoise Autrand and Anne D. Hedeman, putting forward specific objectives of this source. The approach regarding these chapters as a “protocol fiction” and a highly political document emphasizing the grandeur of France against the Holy roman Empire, makes possible to distinguish the perspective of the Emperor from that of the French Court, to reconstruct Charles's attitude to some specific events (i.e. his entry to Paris, festivities of the Epiphany, oaths of allegiance) and to establish a more equilibrated image of the Emperor's visit to France.¹

KEY WORDS

Emperor Charles IV, Charles V King of France, Court of Paris, “Grandes Chroniques de France”, Journey, Court Protocol, 1377-1378.

CAPITALIA VERBA

Carolus IV Imperator, Carolus V Rex Francorum, Regia Parisiorum, “Magnae Historiae Francorum”, Peregrinatio, Regiae Protocollum, MCCCLXXVII-MCCCLXXVIII.

1. This contribution was researched as part of the *Scholarly Plan of MSM 0021620827 “Czech lands in the Middle of Europe in the Past and Today”* program, implemented at the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy at Charles University in Prague. Used abbreviations: BnF, Bibliothèque Nationale de France.

The visit of Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV to France in 1377 and 1378 has been the subject of frequent research in French, German, Czech and other historiographies. The studies always involve new analyses of the corresponding chapters of the *Grandes Chroniques de France* of Charles V also known as the Chronicles of the Reigns of John II and Charles V (*Chronique des règnes de Jean II et Charles V*). They serve as the principal source of data for this event.² Though it sounds unusual, the chroniclers of Emperor Charles IV neglected to report on this event. Thus, only the official French version of the Emperor's visit, as well as several other brief descriptions and notes, are available at present. Although the narration of the *Grandes Chroniques* follows the Emperor's figure, its principal and real subject is France. Based on the current sources available, the following text delves into the possibility of describing the visit from the Holy Roman Emperor's point of view. This paper likewise focuses on several real-life situations, which have not been thus far considered or explained in a satisfactory manner.

The present analysis is inspired by interpretation alternatives sourced in the texts of Anne Hedeman, Françoise Autrand and Heinz Thomas concerning the *Grandes Chroniques*.³ Their observations indicate that a detailed depiction of the Emperor's visit to France is not what it seems to be; i.e. an exhaustive delineation how the Emperor's visit to Paris actually proceeded. They doubt the course of the event as reported in the *Grandes Chroniques*. The interpretation issue of the *Grandes Chroniques* resides in their pragmatics and subjectivity. However, both the Paris court and its guests had had their own ideas of how the Emperor's stay should proceed, as implied by the confrontation concerning the Christmas celebration held in accordance with the imperial traditions as depicted in the *Grandes Chroniques*. Emperor Charles IV had to withdraw his intention to celebrate Christmas in Paris and instead organized a Christmas ceremony in Cambrai on the territory of the Holy Roman Empire.⁴ For in France, *rex imperator in regno suo* —the king was Emperor within its own kingdom. He was the only one entitled to demonstrate his sovereignty in public such as certain liturgical ceremonies, the riding of a white horse, the pealing of bells, etc.⁵ Yet the French and imperial conceptions of the ceremonies collided during the crucial moments of the Emperor's visit and it is these moments of conflict and rivalry which are worth paying more attention to.

2. *Chronique des règnes de Jean II et de Charles V*, ed. Roland Delachenal. Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1910-1920: II, 193-277.

3. Hedman, Anne Dawson. "Valois legitimacy: Editorial changes in Charles Vs *Grandes Chroniques de France*", *Art Bulletin* 66 (1984): 97-117; Autrand, Françoise. "Mémoire et cérémonial: la visite de l'empereur Charles IV à Paris en 1378 d'après les 'Grandes Chroniques de France' et Christine de Pizan", *Une femme de Lettres au Moyen Age. Etudes autour de Christine de Pizan*, Liliane Dulac, Bernard Ribémont, eds. Orleans: Paradigme, 1995: 91-103; Autrand, Françoise. *Charles V*. Paris: Fayard, 1994: 779-805; Heinz, Thomas. "Ein Zeitgenössisches Memorandum zum Staatsbesuch Kaiser Karls IV in Paris", *Zwischen Saar und Mosel: Festschrift für Hans-Walter Herrmann zum 65 Geburtstag*, Wolfgang Haubrichs, Wolfgang Laufer, Reinhard Schneider, eds. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag, 1995: XXIV, 99-119.

4. *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 197-198.

5. *Chronique des règnes...*: 199-200; Autrand, Françoise. *Charles V...*: 787.



1. The *Grandes Chroniques* of Charles V: Their nature and objectives

Commissioned by Charles V, the *Chronicles of the Reigns of John II and Charles V* is the official chronicle of the Kingdom of France. They were not a separate work, but preserved either as a constituent of the *Grandes Chroniques* or as a continuation of a popular French chronicle by Guillaume de Nangis (+ 1300), chronicler and monk of Saint-Denis.⁶ Similar to the first *Grandes Chroniques* written by the monk Primat and based on the request of King Louis IX, their continuation (initiated by Charles V) testified to the legitimacy of the current royal dynasty, i.e. in particular, to the succession of the Valois Dynasty. Moreover, they were meant to emphasize the grandeur of France over England and the Holy Roman Empire.⁷ The oldest and best preserved version of the *Chronicles of the Reigns of John II and Charles V* can be found in a manuscript of the *Grandes Chroniques*⁸ which Charles V ordered to be set up in the 1370s. The Delachenal edition was based on this manuscript as well. This generously illuminated manuscript (originally two-volumes) contains the amended chronicles of Saint-Denis followed by the *Chronicles of the Reigns of John II and Charles V* covering from approximately 1350 to 1379. The manuscript was bound for the first time in 1377 (narrating until 1375).⁹ As proved by Anne Hedeman's codicological analysis which focused on replenishing miniatures into the text, the revision of the narration proceeded even after the manuscript's completion. The revision substituted four sets of illustrated texts for pages containing new text and illustrations, with the primary goal of the amendments being the legitimization of the Valois succession. As Anne Hedeman reminds us, the editor of Charles V's codex suppressed texts that detracted from this goal, while introducing texts and illustrations that also furthered it. (The amendments concerned the life of Philip of Valois, a depiction of the king of England's homage to the king of France, Charles of Navarre's conspiracy, etc.). Through this editing, the *Grandes Chroniques* became a unique expression of Charles V's political and dynastic concerns.¹⁰

All editing was controlled by the kingdom of France through lawyers (legists). The chronicle might have been controlled by Pierre d'Orgemont, the legist and loyal clerk whose career was linked with Parliament and who became the Chancellor of France in 1373.¹¹ The objectives followed by the revision of the chronicle of Saint-

6. The *Nangis French Chronicle* was originally written as the royal tomb guide for the Basilica of Saint-Denis. However, further parts describing the period from 1285-1384 were also compiled (*Chronique française amplifiée de Guillaume de Nangis*). Guyot-Bachy, Isabelle; Moeglin, Jean-Marie. "Comment ont été continuées les Grandes Chroniques de France dans la première moitié du XIV^e siècle", *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes*, 163 (2005): 385-433.

7. Tyl-Labory, Gilette. "Chroniques de France (Grandes)". *Dictionnaire des Lettres françaises. Le Moyen Age*, Paris: A. Fayard, 1992: col. 296-298.

8. BnF, ms. fr., n° 2813.

9. *Chronique des règnes...*: III, 11.

10. Hedeman, Anne Dawson. "Valois legitimacy: Editorial changes in Charles V's *Grandes Chroniques*...": 97-99, 109. Guyot-Bachy, Isabelle; Moeglin, Jean-Marie. "Comment ont été continuées les Grandes Chroniques de France...": 385-386.

11. *Chronique des règnes...*: III, 12-15.



Denis can also be observed in the *Chronicles of the Reigns of John II and Charles V*: e.g. given the relations to the Holy Roman Empire, the chronicle completely omitted any homage rendered by the Dauphin Charles to the Emperor at the Imperial Diet in Metz on December 25, 1356, on the grounds of possessing the title of Dauphin of Vienne.¹² The possibility that this omission was inadvertent can be excluded. In analyzing the *Grandes Chroniques*, any incorrect knowledge, mistakes or other false information can generally be ruled out. Everything included was conscientiously considered and if the chronicle's version differed from the actual course of events, this variation was intended for a certain purpose.

2. Protocol and reality

The chronicle's two principal objectives also coalesce in the chapters devoted to the Emperor's visit: one of them was to legitimize the Valois Dynasty in terms of the king of England, i.e. to defend and fix the official French version of the past; the other objective was to establish the protocol and pattern of future relations with the Emperor and the Empire.

The manuscript history of the chapters dealing with the Emperor's visit is unique: Firstly, it is impossible to ascertain for certain that they were written by the same author who wrote the rest of the *Chronicles of the Reign of John II and Charles V*. From our perspective, the author's actual identity is not so important since the official supervision of the kingdom minimized the potential personal aspect of the authorship.¹³ There are two versions of the narrative – the full and the abridged one. The full version of the visit exists only in the continuation of the *Chronicle of Guillaume de Nangis* (12 manuscripts), the only exception being the aforementioned issue of the *Grandes Chroniques* of Charles V¹⁴. The abridged version, which can be found in the manuscripts of the *Grandes Chroniques*, with the exception of Charles V's manuscript of the chronicle, describes events up until the ceremonial Three Wise Men lunch (January 6, 1378). Nevertheless, it does not cover the theater *entremets* dealing with Godfrey of Bouillon's conquering of Jerusalem as presented at the close of the ceremonial lunch. Moreover, some other real-life facts depicting the Emperor's visit were summarized in a separate paragraph. This abridged version describes the welcome ceremonies on the Emperor's journey from Cambrai to Paris, as well as the reception and behaviour of both the Emperor and the king of

12. *Chronique des règnes...: I, 91: Le lundy, quint jour dudit mois de decembre, parti le dit monseigneur le duc de Normandie de Paris pour aler à Mès par devers monseigneur Charles de Boesme, empereur de Romme, oncle du dit monseigneur le duc, pour parler à luy et avoir son conseil, tant sur le gouvernement du royaume de France et de la prise dy Roy, son pere, comme de pluseurs autres choses ...*

13. The chronicle is a unique presentation of Charles V's political and dynastic thinking within the period before his reign. During Charles V's reign, the chronicle merely summarizes important events in a dry manner and lists documents *in extenso*. Tyl-Labory, Gilette. "Chroniques de France...": col. 296-298.

14. BnF, ms. fr., n° 2813.



France. It also indicates the seating plans during banquets, describes the interiors of buildings, the arrangement of valuable items, decorations, etc. This information inspired later courtly protocols in the centuries that followed. Thus, the abridged version found its own individual path beyond the chronicle to eventually become a separate document.¹⁵ As stated by Françoise Autrand, the full version of Charles IV's journey to France, meant to function as the French ceremony (*cérémonial français*), was issued by Théodore Godefroi in 1614.¹⁶

The relation between the chapters on Charles' visit and courtly protocol is one of the keys to interpreting this source. No protocol for the Emperor's visit existed in 1377. It had to be developed especially for this occasion. Françoise Autrand has focused her investigations on the wider context of Charles V's reign. She researched the self-confidence of the kingdom of France and the expectations of the king of France during Charles' visit. Both the confidence of the kingdom, as well as the king's expectations strongly influenced the newly prepared protocol. "There was no single detail omitted during the entertainment and protocol events. All actions were intentional and deliberate to set a certain image of France and the Crown."¹⁷ According to F. Autrand, the *Grandes Chroniques* "fixed the protocol for future."¹⁸ This meant that the group of clerks who prepared the Emperor's visit and the group of people who compiled the official chronicle had to be nearly identical.¹⁹ Presumably, the chronicle derived information from some preparatory documents or protocol papers developed for the purpose of the Emperor's visit.

Heinz Thomas, the German historiographer, edited the entire document *Memoire comment l'empereur entra a Paris – On the Emperor's Arrival into Paris* – which describes the first three days of the Emperor's stay in Paris (covering his departure from Saint-

15. One of the separate short versions from the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, n° 5128, was edited by: Tille, Václav. „Francouzský rukopis o cestě císaře Karla IV. Do Francie v letech 1377-1378“. *Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk*, 14 (1899): 1-16 (Translation: Tille, Václav. "French Manuscript on the Visit of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV to France in 1377-1378". *Bulletin of the Czech Royal Society of Scholars*, 14 (1899): 1-16 ; *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 239, note 3; it was also researched by Jaroslav Hrubant: Hrubant, Jaroslav. „Pařížské rukopisy o cestě Karla IV. Do Francie a Paříže (1377-1378)“. *Časopis musea Království českého*, 87 (1913): 362-365 (Translation: Hrubant, Jaroslav. "Paris Manuscripts on the Visit of Charles IV. to France and Paris (1377-1378)". *Journal of the Museum of the Kingdom of Bohemia*, 87 (1913): 362-365, here page 365, who came to the following conclusion, "Both manuscripts look like occasional papers: the writers who were quite close to both the royal court and the clerical circles did not intend to write a history. Rather, they copied the present part of the *Chronicle of Saint-Denis* in accord with the instructions of a highly positioned person who were later interested in the pomp and beauty linked with Charles IV's visit to France and in the details on the courtly welcome ceremony held to honor foreign monarch."

16. Autrand, Françoise. "Mémoire et cérémonial...": 92, 101; Autrand, Françoise. *Charles V...*: 780.

17. The ceremony was organized by the Bureau de la Rivière who discussed with the Emperor himself the necessity of holding a Christmas liturgy in Cambrai and the arrival of the Emperor in Paris (*Chronique des règnes...*: 208). Schwedler, Gerald. "Prinzipien der Ordnung königlicher Prozessionen im späten Mittelalter", *Prozessionen, Wallfahrten, Aufmärsche. Bewegung zwischen Religion und Politik in Europa und Asien seit dem Mittelalter*, Jörg Gengnagel, Monika Thiel-Horstmann, Gerald Schwedler, eds. Cologne-Weimar-Vienna: Böhlau, 2008: 122-142, here page 127.

18. Autrand, Françoise. "Mémoire et cérémonial...": 91-103; Autrand, Françoise. *Charles V...*: 787, 793.

19. Heinz, Thomas. "Ein Zeitgenössisches Memorandum...": 99 (doc n° 2); *Unbezweifelbar ist, dass der Verfasser dieses Teils der Chronik über nicht jedermann verfügbare Unterlagen des Protokolls verfügt haben muss.*



Denis on January 4, 1378 to the Three Kings' lunch on January 6). This document differs significantly from the *Grandes Chroniques*. At approximately the same time as H. Thomas, Martina Lechová issued the second manuscript version of the same text. According to H. Thomas, the issue of the originality of one of the copies (either A or B) is more a subject of choice than of a scientific assessment.²⁰ In his study, H. Thomas compared content differences in narration on the Emperor's arrival in Paris on January 4 in the *Grandes Chroniques* and in the *Memoire*. He defines the *Grandes Chroniques'* narrative as "protocol fiction": even if French protocol was not followed, the chronicle still recorded an "ideal" version of the preparatory documents and not the genuine events.²¹ Gerald Schreiber supports Thomas' proposition by referring to narration points which indicate that the chronicler worked on the basis of preparatory documents. The real-life course of events appears as a compromise of the negotiations between the French and Imperial parties. The Emperor's concessions, both in protocol and in politics, were probably compensated by France's concessions. However, the *Grandes Chroniques* do not address this topic, thus preventing concessions from becoming the new precedent.

3. The private and the political

The *Grandes Chroniques* feature an official political document. Likewise, private and personal matters of the French princes — nephews of the Emperor, who adamantly supported Charles V and his brothers throughout the hard times between 1356 and 1359— are reduced. According to F. Autrand, the role of the king's brothers and brothers-in-law during Charles' visit was purely a "decorative" one.²² The chronicle does not provide personal and private information on French participation. It focuses on ceremonial acts of courtoisie and political requirements, which were satisfied by the Emperor. On the contrary, the Emperor is depicted in a highly personal manner. His principal objective was to meet the royal family and consign his son Wenceslas IV to them for safekeeping.²³ The Emperor's relations towards the French royal family were, in fact, primarily defined from the emotional point of view. Thus as a person, Charles IV was observed very closely. The *Grandes Chroniques* do not indicate at all that the Emperor might have proposed any non-private and political requirements. The official aspects of the Emperor's reception in France (including

20. Heinz, Thomas. "Ein Zeitgenössisches Memorandum...": 115-119; Lechová, Martina. „Zpráva o návštěvě Paříže Karlem IV. roku 1378“. *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity*, C 43 (1996): 49-59 (Translation: Lechová, Martina. "The Report on Charles IV's visit to Paris in 1378". *Anthology of the Brno University's Philosophical Faculty. Studia minora Facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Brunensis*, C 43 (1996): 49-59. This edition contains mistakes.

21. Stefan Weiss observes the protocol and its variations during the Emperor's visit to Avignon. Weiss, Stefan. *Die Versorgung des päpstlichen Hofes in Avignon mit Lebensmitteln 1316 (1316-1378). Studien zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte eines mittelalterlichen Hofes*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2002: 236-237, 240-241.

22. Autrand, François. *Charles V...*: 800.

23. *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 198-199.



a lack of Christmas liturgy, pealing of bells, royal entry processions and riding a black horse, instead of a white one) are strangely mixed with extremely private information on the Emperor. The text continuously comments on the Emperor's health status, emotional relations (towards the French king and monarchs buried at Saint-Denis), and even the Emperor's tears during his meeting with Isabelle of Valois. In this sense, the text appears out of balance. The Emperor's visit indeed featured several momentous political acts such as the ceding of power over the Kingdom of Arles to the Dauphin Charles, an utterance of unambiguous support for France within the Anglo-French conflict, as well as a promise of alliance and loyalty pledged by the Holy Roman King Wenceslas IV into the hands of Charles V. However the *Grandes Chroniques* do not indicate any obliging action on the side of the French which might have been considered a *quid pro quo*. The helpfulness of the House of Luxembourg towards the French Crown looks like it was quite unlikely in forthcoming. Would the sentimental Emperor really sell the Kingdom of Arles for a ceremonial lunch?²⁴

Undoubtedly, personal and private emotions were present among the French participants as well. In addition, displacement of this information from the chronicles probably caused certain interpretation difficulties solved by the historiographers. H. Thomas calls attention to the fact that, according to the *Memoire*, the French king's brothers and brothers-in-law, the dukes Philip the Bold, John of Berry, Louis of Bourbon, and Robert of Bar, arrived in Saint-Denis on the morning of January 4, when the Emperor was present. The *Grandes Chroniques* cover only the preceding official reception, the Duke of Bourbon's welcoming the Emperor in Compiègne on December 31²⁵, the king's brothers, Philip and John, setting off for Senlis on January 1 and the Duke of Bar's welcoming the Emperor on January 2 in Louvres.²⁶ This reception of the Emperor was most likely based on personal relations. Louis of Bourbon, the son of Isabelle of Valois (herself the sister-by-blood of the Emperor's first wife Blanka and a friend of the Emperor's sister Bonne) was the closest person to the Emperor. Louis visited the Emperor's court several times during the unsettling period of 1357-1359.²⁷ The Emperor knew Philip the Bold and John of Berry, the sons of his sister, to a lesser extent: in 1356, he met John in Metz and in 1365, both brothers greeted him during his journey to Avignon and Arles. The least personal in terms of relations was the Emperor's acquaintanceship with Robert of Bar, his vassal of the margraviate of Pont-à-Mousson and the husband of Mary of Valois, the Emperor's niece.

The *Grandes Chroniques* do not depict any events after the reception ceremonies. They record a dinner organized in Compiègne by Louis of Bourbon. As Charles IV did

24. German chronicler Dietrich von Nienheim (Compare with Heinz, Thomas. "Ein Zeitgenössisches Memorandum...": 114) was outraged that Charles IV sold the Kingdom of Arles for a ceremonial lunch.

25. *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 202.

26. *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 204.

27. See: Fantysová-Matějková, Jana. "Un duc de Bourbon à la cour de l'empereur Charles IV. Note sur les relations franco-impériales (1357-1359)", *Universitas scholarium. Mélanges offerts à Jacques Verger par ses anciens étudiants*, Cédric Giraud, Martin Morard, eds. Genève: Droz 2011: 583-595.



not feel well, it was only the Emperor's son Wenceslas and the Emperor's company who attended the dinner. Thus Louis stayed there until at least the following day. We may wonder whether Philip of Burgundy, John of Berry and Robert of Bar also had to partake in similarly organized ceremonial dinners. Most likely, they needed to however once again, the *Grandes Chroniques* did not consider it necessary to write about these events. According to the accounting records, Philip the Bold had a sword lavishly decorated with gems for his cousin Wenceslas IV.²⁸ Charles IV had received a similarly precious sword from the Dauphin Charles at the Imperial Diet in Metz. The parallel is quite obvious, though we have no information under what circumstances the swords were given to the Luxembourg sovereigns.

The *Grandes Chroniques* mention the presence of the king's brothers (apparently of his brothers-in-law, as well) in Saint-Denis on January 3 and add the information that the princes set off for Paris that same day.²⁹ The following day on January 4, the bourgeois of Paris arrived in Saint-Denis to welcome the Emperor and later to lead the Emperor's procession to Paris. According to the *Memoire*, the four aforementioned princes and other patricians set off for the journey to follow the bourgeois. However, they returned to Paris when the Emperor had left Saint-Denis.³⁰ They then departed from Paris again to welcome the Emperor and become a part of the king's instead of royal procession. Apparently, the king's brothers escorted the Emperor throughout the entire event, i.e. from the moment they met him for the first time. However, the procession became too large once Robert of Bar was received in Louvres. Thus, the procession could not be accommodated in Saint-Denis and had to return to Paris. The princes came back to Saint-Denis to keep the Emperor company the next day. Most likely, they stayed with him in the Basilica of Saint-Denis where the Emperor honored the relics and tombs of kings of France. Any personal aspects of the behavior of the king's brothers were not observed within the *Grandes Chroniques*, since only the purely ceremonial acts were described.

28. The sword for Wenceslas IV was manufactured by the Parisian goldsmith Jehannin de Saint Laurent. See: *Inventaires mobiliers et extraits des comptes des ducs de Bourgogne de la Maison de Valois (1363-1477)*, ed. Pierre H. Prost. Paris: E. Leroux, 1913: II: 15-16 (doc. no 96-97); 20 (doc. no 117); 28 (doc. no 162); Quicke, Fritz. *Les Pays-Bas à la veille de la période bourguignonne, 1356-1384; contribution à l'histoire politique et diplomatique de l'Europe occidentale dans la seconde moitié du XIV^e siècle*. Brussels: Éditions universitaires, 1947: 289.

29. *Chronique des règnes...* : II, 203, 206: *Et apres ce qu'il fu reporté en sa chambre, les diz freres du Roy, et aucuns des prelas qui estoient demourez, pristrent congîe de li et devindrent devers le Roy à Paris ...*

30. *Item a ycelui jour au matin yssirent de la ville de Paris de deux mile a XXIIC bourgeois de Paris tous vestus d'un parement.[...] Item cheuaucoient par deuant eulx bien de cent a VLXX sergens vestu d'une autre liuree non pareille d'icelle et cheuachierent en belle ordenance et honneste et estoit noble chose a veoir. Et en ycelle ordenance chevauchierent jusques pres de Saint Denis a l'encontre du dit empereur et illeuc seruïrent en belle ordonnance. Et apres eux se partirent (de Paris pour venir encontre l'empereur) le duc de Bourgoigne, le duc de Berri, le duc de Bourbon, le duc de Bar, et plusieurs autres barons, de quoi ie ne fais pas mencion, et auoient chascun baron vestu de belles lieureez et honueste. Item quant l'empereur parti de Saint Denis les dis barons retournerent a Paris deuers le roy et les dis bourgeois s'enuindrent cheuaucaunt deuant l'empereur en belle ordenance et vindrent en ycelle ordenance iusques a La Chapelle. Et si tost qu'il orent passe La Chapelle et qu'il porent prendre les champz il se mirent en ordenance en maniere de bataille tout du lonc du chemin bien et par bonne ordenance. L'empereur descendi a La Chapelle de la dicte litiere et monta sur I destrier noir. Et les princes qui estoient retourne deuers le roy a Paris retournerent tantost deuers l'empereur, et le roy les sieuy tantost apres et li vint au deuant entre La Chapelle et Paris.*



4. Imperial or French?

The King's representatives, Bureau de la Riviere and Colard de Tanques, arrived in Saint-Denis to meet the Emperor and discuss his ceremonial entry into Paris. They also gave him the king's gift —two horses. Among other items, the *Grandes Chroniques* explain that according to imperial traditions, the emperors arrive in their imperial cities riding a white horse. The Emperor, however, cannot enter Paris riding a white horse as he is not the sovereign ruler there. The white horse is designated for the king of France alone. Thus, the Emperor must ride a black horse, a *destrier morel*³¹, which was given to him by the king of France in Saint-Denis. In fact, he received two horses, i.e. he could choose between a *bel coursier* and a *bel destrier*. The *bel destrier* was harnessed in the French royal colors. The Emperor promised to enter Paris riding the given horse. And so he did.³² The chronicle does not depict whether the horse was re-harnessed in imperial colors. It is significant that the colors of the French processions were described in great detail,³³ while there is no information given on the colors of the imperial visit.

We do not have much information on the imperial tradition of entering imperial cities while riding white horses, excluding the occasions when this tradition was not respected. Thus, the Emperor Charles IV did not enter Avignon (May 23, 1365) riding a white horse, in spite of the fact that the Pope had sent him a white *destrier* for this purpose:

*Dominus tamen papa album dextrarium magnum sericeo panno splendide coopertum et auro contextum aquila et imperialibus armis signatum sibi transmisit, quem ante se deduci fecit, sed in suo proprio dextrario versus Auinionensem civitatem processit*³⁴.

In Paris, the Emperor not only received a dark horse, but even one which was clothed in French colors. However, we do not know any details. In Avignon, the Emperor did not ride the white horse to honor the Pope who repaid the Emperor via other variations to the protocol.³⁵

On the other hand, the *Grandes Chroniques* are the only source, which does mention Charles V as riding a white horse. The *Memoire* talks only about the Emperor as riding a black wartime horse. There is no information on colors and the French king's white horse is not even mentioned there. In other words, everything was quite normal and thus there was no need to record such an event.

31. *Chronique des règnes...* : II, 210-211.

32. *Chronique des règnes...* : II, 208, 210.

33. Autrand, Françoise. "Mémoire et cérémonial...": 94.

34. "Though the Pope sent a large, white steed covered with glittering silken fabric interlaced with gold, decorated by an eagle and sporting the imperial symbols, he let this horse walk in front of him and rode his own horse (*suo proprio dextrario*) towards Avignon" ("Johannis Neplachonis, abbatis Opatovicensis, Chronicon", *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum*, Josef Jireček, Josef Emler, Ferdinand Tadra, eds. Prague: Printing of František Palacký, Grégr a Ferd. Dattel, 1882: III, 443-484 specially page 483).

35. Weiss, Stefan. *Die Versorgung...*: 236-237, 240-241.



Thanks to the *Memoire*, we can presume that Charles' arrival in Paris on the *destrier morel* was a symbol of his own choosing. From La Chapelle, where the Emperor changed from a sedan to a horse and where the burghers of Paris organized in a ceremonial procession (*belle ordonnance*) changed into a battle formation (*il se mirent en ordenance en maniere de bataille*). This symbolic army was approaching Paris as an ally and, at the same time, as a potential security and protection factor. The Emperor rode the wartime horse (*destrier*) and used the burghers battle formation as a vanguard. They were followed by the Emperor's escort and part of the welcome delegation from Cambrai, i.e. Enguerrand of Coucy, John of Sarrebrücken and Simon of Braine (in total, approximately 150-200 riders) who had escorted the Emperor since his entrance to the Kingdom as reported in the *Grandes Chroniques*.³⁶ These riders were not only the French feudal tenants, but also Imperial ones. Thus, they accompanied the Emperor on his French journey and could partially be considered as forming the Emperor's company.

It is impossible to precisely define the size of the Emperor's company. According to the *Grandes Chroniques*, more than fifty of the most important members of the Emperor's company listened to the King of France's speech in the *salle d'apparat* in the Louvre.³⁷ We know the names of fourteen persons: Wenceslas IV, Wenceslas of Bohemia, Duke of Luxembourg and Brabant, Albert, Duke and Elector of Saxony, Heinrich Sorebom, Bishop of Warmia (Braunsberg) and three Silesian dukes—Wenceslas of Opava (Troppau), Henry of Brzeg and Boleslaw of Legnica, the hofmeister Peter of Vartenberg, the landgrave John of Leuchtenberg, the chamber master Těma of Koldice, the chancellor Nicholas of Riesenburg, the marshal of the Kingdom of Bohemia Hynek of Lipá and Rataje, and finally two Bohemian courtiers, Hašek of Zvířetice and Albrecht of Sternberg.³⁸ However, the Holy Roman King Wenceslas himself had his own company of forty horsemen³⁹ and the Elector of Saxony and the Duke of Brabant were most probably escorted by similar retinues.⁴⁰ The company of a prince attending the Emperor's court usually consisted of forty to fifty horsemen.⁴¹ Three Silesian dukes might have had slightly smaller companies. In all likelihood, there were not less than 200 horsemen escorting the Emperor.⁴²

36. *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 218.

37. *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 249-250.

38. Kavka, František. *Vláda Karla IV za jeho císařství 1355-1378*. Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1993: II, 211. (Translation: Kavka, František. *The Reign of Charles IV during his Empire 1355-1378*. Praha: Univerzita Karlova, 1993: II, 211.

39. *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 194.

40. The Duke of Brabant was escorted by forty-two barons and knights dressed in his colors on his way to Reims for Charles V's coronation (1364). Martens, Mina. "L'Administration du domaine ducal en Brabant au Moyen Age (1250-1406)". *Mémoires de l'Académie royale de Belgique, classe des Lettres*, 48/3 (1954) : 180-181, note 8.

41. According to Froissart, Albert of Bavaria arrived in Aachen with fifty horsemen in 1372 to visit the Emperor. *Œuvres de Froissart. Chroniques*, eds. Joseph-Bruno-Marie-Constantin Kervyn de Lettenhove, Jean Froissart. Brussels: V. Devaux, 1867-1879: XIII, 25.

42. The welcoming processions of French dukes, earls and bishops consisted of about 300 horses in Cambrai, 300 horses in Compiègne, and 500 horses in Senlis.



The entire Emperor's company, consisting of the group of French tenants with the vanguard of Parisian burghers, approached the King of France in the battle formation. As the Anglo-French war was again rekindled in autumn 1377, the Emperor's symbolic war alliance was not considered unsuitable. However, the picture of France as protected by the Imperial eagle's pinions was not the one favored by French legists. The relationship of the two Charleses was always a dual one —both personal and political. The Emperor dominated this relationship in that he, as the uncle, protected and supported his nephew, while the nephew honored his uncle and asked him for advice. However, such relations were not to be demonstrated in the official protocol or in the formal relationship of France to the Empire. These dual aspects of the relationship were always sensitively addressed in the official rules and instructions describing how the monarch should write lettres close:

Quando vero littere clause fiunt non subditis sciendum est quo Rex nulli se subscribit nisi pape. Interdum tamen se subscribit isti imperatori hodierno quia ejus est avunculus, filius scilicet sororis imperatoris. Et ideo aucunes fois il lui rescript de sa main ou par autre bien privéement. Et tunc il se met desoubz hic dicendo: le Roy de France vostre nepveu ... Et istud ut nunc dixi non habet locum nisi isti imperatori propter familiaritatem quam simul ipse et rex habent propter genus et sanguinem etc... Et de ordinacione rex scribit imperatori sicut ceteris regibus ut super dictum est.⁴³

These exceptions are accepted solely on the basis of a close blood-relationship between the Emperor and the King of France. This extraordinary relationship can be demonstrated, for example, during the entrance into Paris, however, it could not be fixed as a precedent for future emperors and kings of France, as they might not be relatives.

On the other hand, if the Emperor announced his journey to France by letters written in his own handwriting (we cannot know if the letters were signed or not), he was emphasizing the more private rather than the political nature of his visit. If the visit grew into an official and political event, we should thank both the *Grandes Chroniques* and Christine de Pizan for such a shift. Christine had accented certain concrete aspects of the visit which were to the King of France's benefit and which contributed to the myth of Charles the Wise (*roi sage*).⁴⁴ Consequently, it can be

43. "When the sealed letters are written to persons other than tenants (of the King of France), it is necessary to know that the King does not grant his signature on any of these letters, except the ones addressed to the Pope. As the case may be, the King – as a son of the Emperor's sister – signs the letters to the present Emperor who is his uncle. Thus, the King writes to the Emperor privately in his own hand or through somebody else. If this is the case, the following must be stated at the bottom of the letter: 'The King of France, your Nephew'... Such signature is only added in the case the present Emperor, due to the family relationship between the Emperor and the King regarding their origins, blood relations, etc. According to this rule, the King writes letters to the Emperor and to other monarchs as stated above (Autrand, Françoise. "Mémoire et cérémonial...": 100 according to BnF, ms. fr. 18 674, fol. 18-28).

44. Kintzinger, Martin. "Das inszenierte Imperium. Kaiser Karl IV. und König Karl V. von Frankreich", *Die Goldene Bulle Kaiser Karls IV. Politik-Wahrnehmung-Rezeption. Berichte und Abhandlungen, Sonderbände 12*, Ulrike Hohensee, ed. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2009: I, 299-326, specially page 302.



derived from the narrations that the Emperor's visit had an enormous political and promotional impact on the Kingdom of France.

5. Joint entrance to Paris: Conflict of the ceremonies?

Both monarchs met and greeted each other between La Chapelle, from where the Emperor set off for his journey on a wartime horse in a war formation, and Windmill. Discrepancies between the *Grandes Chroniques* and the *Memoire* as far as the formation of the joint procession of the Emperor and the King of France have already been discussed by several scholars.⁴⁵ According to the *Grandes Chroniques*, the Emperor, monarchs and dukes approached Paris in ranks of threes.⁴⁶ The first trio was headed by the King of France on a tall white horse, while the Emperor and the Holy Roman King accompanied him on the left and right sides on smaller, dark wartime horses. They were followed by the trio comprising Wenceslas of Bohemia, Duke of Luxembourg and Brabant in the middle and Philip the Bold and John of Berry on his sides and other horsemen followed. They were to keep the formation from the meeting point all the way to Paris and further along the Grande Rue (nowadays, Saint Denis Street).⁴⁷ Gerald Schwelder has noted the Emperor's disagreement with the formation in the *Grandes Chroniques*: the King of France “positioned the Emperor on his right even though the Emperor tried to make an excuse several times and did not want to follow the King's instruction.”⁴⁸ Apparently, Charles IV did not wish to ride on the King's right within the trio as the most honored place was in the middle and this was occupied by the King of France. Most likely, the Emperor wished to be in the middle of the trio, i.e. on the King's left. In compliance with the *Grandes Chroniques*, the King of France asked the Emperor to go on the right side despite the Emperor's protests. However, they maintained the ranks of threes; in other words, they kept the formation the Emperor did not wish to form! The *Memoire* does not address the issue of the right and left sides, but instead describes a different formation—in ranks of twos. From the moment they first met, the Emperor and the King of France rode side by side. As soon as they went through the Paris town gate, their horses were bridled. First a pair was formed by the Emperor and King of France and this was followed by Wenceslas IV and his uncle, Duke Wenceslas.⁴⁹

45. František Šmahel for the last time, *Cesta Karla IV. Do Francie. 1377-1378*. Prague: Argo, 2006: 266-268. (Translation: Šmahel, František. *The Journey of Charles IV to France. 1377-1378*. Prague: Argo, 2006: 266-268).

46. Heinz, Thomas. “Ein Zeitgenössisches Memorandum...”: 106-108.

47. *Chronique des règnes...* : II, 220-221.

48. *Chronique des règnes...* : II, 217: *le fist mettre à destre de lui, combien que l'Empereur s'en excusast tres longuement et ne vouloit faire*; Schwedler, Gerald. “Prinzipien der Ordnung...”: 127.

49. ... *et, quant il orent salue l'un l'autre, il prinrent a cheuauchier, l'un empres l'autre, et ainsi entrerent a Paris, et quant il vinrent a la porte monseigneur Charles de Poitiers et messire Buriau de la Riuiere se mirent tout a pie et menerent l'empereur par le frain jusques au palais; messire Adam de Galonguet et messire Guillaume des Bourdes amenerent le roi en ce parti et par deuant estoit monseigneur de Coucy et plusieurs autres cheualiers qui faisoient*



H. Thomas has addressed these inconsistencies in ranks of threes and twos. He observes that the ranks of threes were those designated by protocol, while the ranks of twos were formed for practical reasons: the roads were quite narrow and the ranks of threes were too risky considering the amount of people in the streets; the horses might get frightened and were thus bridled. Nevertheless, the Emperor and the King of France rode side by side since they first encountered one another somewhere between La Chapelle and Windmill as observed in the *Memoire*. Obviously, the Parisian court knew how many horsemen could ride next to each other along the Grande Rue. If three horses could not ride side by side along this street, why were more feasible guidelines not established in the protocol? Most likely, the *Memoire* depicts a negotiated compromise: Charles IV did not ride in the middle of the trio on the King's right as he probably wished to do so originally.⁵⁰ He may actually have ridden on the right of his nephew, the King of France, as stated in the *Grandes Chroniques*, however in ranks of twos, as indicated in the *Memoire*. The French party had bowed to the Emperor in his petit moment of glory; however, in the official chronicle, the protocol version of the French court was recorded.⁵¹ Such discussions as to the right and left sides and the ranks of threes or twos might have even had an affect on the arrival of the Holy Roman King Wenceslas IV in Reims twenty years later. King of France Charles VI was on his right and King of Navarre Charles III on his left.⁵²

The issue of formation of the joint procession is not the only discrepancy between the *Grandes Chroniques* and the *Memoire*. There were several confusing details, for example the monarchs' taking off of their hats when meeting one another (according to the *Grandes Chroniques*, the Emperor was the first one to take off his *aumuche* and according to the *Memoire*, it was the King of France who first took off his *chapel*⁵³). The procession of the King of France is likewise depicted inconsistently. The *Grandes Chroniques* indicate that four princes led the procession behind the King, yet according to the *Memoire*, the King followed the procession. The aforementioned details indicate that the princes were returning from Saint Denis and had to join the procession in front of the King's suite.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, the *Grandes Chroniques* depict the ideally stipulated order.

The bridling of the Emperor's and the King's horses after their arrival in Paris was not only for practical reasons, the procedure in and of itself constituted part of the official ceremony. The *Memoire* even stipulates the names of the four men honored

vuidier les gens hors de la voie, et l'auoit ainsi le roy ordene affin que on veist plus plainement l'empereur. Apres l'empereur et le roy de France cheuaichoient le roy de Behaigne, le duc de Brabant, tout les freres du roy de France et pluseurs autres princes et barons ...

50. Heinz, Thomas. "Ein Zeitgenossisches Memorandum...": 110.

51. A corresponding miniature (BnF, ms. fr. 2813, fol. 470v) carries traces of having been repaired. It depicts three monarchs side by side, but differently than stated in the *Grandes Chroniques*. Charles V is placed in the middle, Wenceslas in on his right and the Holy Roman Emperor is on his left.

52. Schwedler, Gerald. "Prinzipen der Ordnung...": 131.

53. *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 217.

54. Šmahel, František. *Cesta Karla IV...*: 266.



to bridle the horses. The Emperor wished these tasks to be arranged by the French party. Similarly, in Arles, the Emperor's horse was bridled by the Duke of Oranges and the Earl of Valencia —the local Arles princes. It was considered a privilege to bridle the Emperor's horse. Such a privilege was given to the Emperor's stepbrother Wenceslas Duke of Luxembourg and Brabant in 1354.

6. The *Memoire*: Its nature and power

We have repeatedly set the *Grandes Chroniques* face to face with the *Memoire*, the document recording the first three days of the visit from January 4-6. The *Memoire*, in particular, focuses on lists and enumerations. Simultaneously, it records the order of the processions, the banquet menus on January 5 and 6 including the seating plans, i.e. any and all information which would have been difficult to memorize given that there were similar events organized, one after another. The document looks as if it were written by somebody who was present during the events and who was familiar with the movement of separate groups of people (the Emperor's suite, four princes, the King of France). Apparently, the course of the events was depicted to inspire further potential court protocols.

Moreover, the *Memoire* and the *Grandes Chroniques* do not fully match in their descriptions of ceremonial banquets. According to the *Grandes Chroniques*, the banquet was held at dinnertime on January 4, the day of the Emperor's arrival. However, this banquet was not depicted by the *Memoire*'s author, despite the fact that the other data listed is particularly thorough. The banquet was not even mentioned by the *Chronique des quatre premiers Valois* which emphasized the banquets held during the two following days.⁵⁵ Similarly, minor discrepancies can be found with regard to the presence or absence of particular guests. According to the *Grandes Chroniques*, Wenceslas IV was absent from the lunch on Tuesday January 5 while the *Memoire* observes that Wenceslas, Duke of Luxembourg and Brabant, was not present. Most likely, some noble members of the Emperor's suite accompanied the ill Charles IV who took his meal in his private room; the Duke of Saxony then joined the Emperor on Monday night, while the Duke of Brabant Wenceslas and the King Wenceslas IV joined the Emperor on Tuesday. The Three Kings' lunch is the only event which is depicted identically by both sources, given that this lunch was of paramount importance and nobody could be absent⁵⁶.

We can merely conjecture who saw to the origin of the *Memoire*. This document is available in two versions in the Archives départementales du Nord in Lille, the archive of the counts of Flanders. With regard to this fact and considering the type

55. *Chronique des quatre premiers Valois (1327- 1393)*, ed. Siméon Luce. Paris: V. J. Renouard, 1862: 264: *Cellui jour estoit la vegille de la Typhanie. Moulz tint riche hostel pour ce jour le roy de France. Et l'andemain tint le roy court plainière à son palais et moult honoura l'empereur et son fils et tous les haulz hommes de sa compaignie.*

56. See the table in: Fantysová-Matějková, Jana. *Wenceslas de Bohême, un prince aux carrefours de l'Europe (1337-1383)*. Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2013: 498-501.



of handwriting, H. Thomas has suggested ascribing the authorship to the Count of Flanders Louis of Male (1330-1384) or to his son-in-law and later heir, Philip the Bold (the Duke of Burgundy) —the younger brother of Charles V, the King of France. Louis of Male did not partake in the Emperor's visit to Paris, which seems to have been an ample reason for him to record this visit. Yet why would the Duke, who avoided the Emperor intentionally, have been interested in processions and seating-chart details, as well as in the descriptions of menus which he did not even taste? He was likewise interested in the performance of Godfrey of Bouillon's conquer of Jerusalem which was then described in the end of the *Memoire*. Moreover, his engagement in the event is very unclear. On the contrary, Philip the Bold was responsible for substantial tasks and, undoubtedly, he was well informed on protocol and "historiography" activities at the French court. Philip the Bold obtained a copy of the *Grandes Chroniques* and ordered the *Livre des Fais et Bonnes Meurs du Sage Roy Charles V* by Christine de Pizan, in which the author merely copied the extended version of the Emperor's visit.⁵⁷

Attempting to identify the *Memoire*'s author, many other attributes have to be considered. Firstly, it is a French text, thus, it was definitively originated at the francophone court. Unlike the *Grandes Chroniques*, which consider the Emperor's suite as a German one, the *Memoire*'s author distinguishes between the noblemen from Bohemia and those from Germany. Unlike the *Grandes Chroniques*, it titles Wenceslas IV as the King of Bohemia and not the Holy Roman King. Nevertheless, this approach is not a purposeful avoidance at titling the king as the Holy Roman King, as Martina Lechová has noted. Apparently, there were long negotiations with the Curia Romana to approve Wenceslas IV as the Holy Roman King.⁵⁸ Wenceslas was usually referred to as "the King of Bohemia" in Brabant because of Bohemian kings' succession rights to the Duchy of Brabant, Limburg and Luxembourg.⁵⁹ The succession of Brabant-Limbourg also was of great importance for Louis of Flanders and Philip the Bold, who both claimed these countries as the inheritance of their wives, Margaret of Brabant and her daughter Margaret of Male.

However, the discrepancies between the *Memoire* versus the *Grandes Chroniques* regarding the titling of Bohemian noblemen and the King of Bohemia could also be considered in a completely different manner. Obviously, the members of the Parisian court knew that Wenceslas IV was the King of Bohemia and they were familiar with the Bohemian noblemen of the Emperor's suite. Yet the Bohemian title is missing in the chronicle, since it could not be utilized politically. Among other objectives,

57. de Winter, Patrick M. *La Bibliothèque de Philippe le Hardi, duc de Bourgogne (1364-1404). Etude sur les manuscrits à peintures d'une collection princière à l'époque du 'style gothique international'*. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1985: 43; de Pizan, Christine. *Le Livre des Fais et Bonnes Meurs du Sage Roy Charles V*, ed. Suzanne Solente. Paris: H. Champion, 1940: II, 89-132.

58. Lechová, Martina. „Zpráva o návštěvě Paříže...“: 50.

59. On December 31, 1377, the city of Leuven sent a messenger to Paris to address Duke Wenceslas, asking him to negotiate tax exemptions for Leuven merchants operating in Paris with Charles V. Accounting records suggest that the Duke was in Paris with the Emperor and the King of Bohemia. Quicke, Fritz. *Les Pays-Bas à la veille de la période bourguignonne...*: 288 and note 37.



the chronicle was meant to strengthen the position of France towards the Empire. Thus, Wenceslas IV's pledge of loyalty as the King of Bohemia does not have the same weight as the pledge of the Holy Roman King, the future Emperor. Though, it was not a feudal vow or homage, the miniature illustrating Wenceslas' pledge is quite appalling in comparison with other pictures of homage in manuscripts of the *Grandes Chroniques* (BnF, ms. fr. 2813, fol. 290, 357 r and v). For example, the homage of King of England Eduard towards the King of France, Philip VI, was emphasized in the *Grandes Chroniques*. Apparently, Eduard was on one of his knees; however, his head was only half of a head (fol. 357r) or a full head (fol. 357v) lower than that of the King of France.⁶⁰ On the other hand, the head of Wenceslas IV, who definitely did not render tribute, is below the King's chest and although he is not kneeling, it indeed looks like he is about to soon fall to his knees (fol. 478r). It was hard to imagine an any more imperative demonstration of Wenceslas IV's pledge. This is also gestured by the long forefinger of Charles V's six-fingered left hand, indicating that the pledge was made based on the will of Wenceslas IV's father. Yet what did Wenceslas actually promise on January 11, 1378?

According to the full (original) version, he promised to the King of France that "before all princes of the world, he would love and serve both him and his children until the end of his days; the King has expressed his thanks and is grateful."⁶¹ A short and later re-written version (of the manuscripts of the *Grandes Chroniques* with the exception of Charles V's manuscript) uses much stronger expressions. Love, which demonstrates the private nature of the promise, is replaced by obedience. Purportedly, Wenceslas promised to the King of France that "his entire life long, he would obey and serve him and his children above all others."⁶² No space was left to express the King of France's gratitude in the short version. The *Grandes Chroniques* of Charles V contains narrative covering up until spring 1379, i.e. they were worked on even after the death of Charles IV (November 29, 1378) and during the time of the schism, thus aiming to remove responsibility from the King of France for the dissension of Christendom. Apparently, the miniature also illustrates the obedience of the Holy Roman King towards the King of France. At the same time, it proves that if the Roman King had met his obligations and obeyed the King of France, there would have been no need for dual papacy. The absence of a Bohemian element in the *Grandes Chroniques* reflects the decided political intentions. Consequently, any data not supporting the aforementioned intentions had to be eliminated.

60. An illustration of Henry III rendering homage to Saint Louis, as well as two illustrations of Edward III's homage to Philip VI, were added to the manuscript at the same time (third phase) when the events from autumn 1375 to spring 1379 were being compiled and illustrated. Hedeman, Dawson, Anne. "Valois legitimacy: Editorial changes in Charles vs *Grandes Chroniques*...": 98. Thus, they originated at the same period as Wenceslas "semi-homage".

61. *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 264-265: *...que il l'ameroit et serviroit, tant comme il vivroit, devant tous les princes du monde, et les enfans du Roy aussi ; de quoy le Roy le mercia et sot bon gré.*

62. *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 239, note 3: *...que tous les jours que il vivroit lui seroit obeissant et le serviroit et obeiroit devant tous et contre tous et contre tous ceulx qui porroient vivre et morir, et les enfans du Roy pareillement.*



Conversely, the *Memoire* does not reflect any of France's political ambitions. Moreover, it almost ignores them (ruling out the white horse). Considering the Duke of Burgundy as a possible owner of the *Memoire*, the following question must be asked: was Philip the Bold independent enough of French opinions in 1378 to have the document intended for him be without any comments on the results of French ambitions? This is quite unlikely for Christine de Pizan who appropriated, confirmed and supported Charles V's version of the *Grandes Chroniques*. We do not have to take into consideration the location of the original in Lille, even though the transfer of the document to Lille cannot be substantiated. With regard to the close relations between the Flanders, Hainaut-Holland and Brabant-Luxembourg courts and also considering further territorial developments within the Netherlands region (which was gradually unified as a result of Philip the Bold's and Margaret of Male's offspring), the removal of such a document from one residence to another cannot be ruled out. Hypothetically, the Hainaut-Holland regent —Albert of Bavaria— and the Emperor's step-brother Wenceslas of Bohemia —the Duke of Luxembourg and Brabant— might be suggested as the authors of this document.

Moreover, the *Memoire* stipulates the native country of Henry of Brieg (Brzeg) who is titled in the *Grandes Chroniques* as Duke Henry. The Duke was a relative of Margaret of Liegnitz and Brieg, wife of Albert of Bavaria and mother of the Queen of Bohemia —Joanna of Bavaria. Undoubtedly, the Dutch princes were familiar with this information and they had sufficient reasons to list the Duke's full name. However, Albert of Bavaria did not partake in Charles' journey. Only his bailiff, the sire de Houdaing, was present there. On the contrary, Wenceslas of Bohemia, the Duke of Luxembourg and Brabant, set off for the journey as allies of the Empire and France at the highest possible level. At the minimum, one herald of Brabant named *Heurerch*, travelled to Paris in his suite.⁶³ The Duke of Brabant accompanied his sixteen-year-old nephew Wenceslas IV on the visit to France and introduced him to his cousins, the brothers of the King and Queen of France and other important representatives of the French court. Simultaneously, he probably arranged fluent communication among all, since the Emperor's suite did not speak French.⁶⁴ The thirty-nine-year-old Duke Wenceslas might easily have needed to take responsibility for organizing similar meetings of the Empire and France in the future and, thus, he was highly interested in the details of the welcome ceremony. Apparently, the Duke was expected to actively partake in imperial policy, as Charles IV felt old and unwell. The Duke was expected to attend Wenceslas IV's coronation in Rome.⁶⁵ Thus, it cannot be ruled out that Duke Wenceslas, Charles IV's step-brother, who

63. Delisle, Léopold. *Mandements et actes divers de Charles V (1364-1380) recueillis dans les Collections de la Bibliothèque nationale*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1874: 788 (doc. no 1588).

64. *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 255-256.

65. *Regesta Imperii*, eds. Johann Friedrich Böhmner, Alfons Huber. Innsbruck: Wagner, 1877: VIII; with a supplement dating from 1889, reprint Hildesheim, 1968. *Deutsche Reichstagsakten. Deutsche Reichstagsakten unter König Wenzel. Erste Abtheilung 1376 bis 1387*, Julius Weizsäcker, ed. Munich: Literarisch-Artistische Anstalt, 1868: 138, note 1; *Regesta Imperii...*: VIII: 522 (doc. no 151).



had attended all the essential events, himself ordered the *Memoire* to be compiled so that all the substantial information could be recorded.

7. Three in one: Struggle for liturgy

The *Memoire* does not note the further course of the Emperor's visit to France, concluding its narration with the Three Kings' lunch and the performance of Godfrey of Bouillon's conquer of Jerusalem. However, certain details of the Emperor's visit as described in the *Grandes Chroniques* are strange enough to raise many questions on their own. As mentioned above, Charles IV wished to celebrate Christmas using imperial traditions. The French party did not allow him to do this. Apparently, everybody remembered the Christmas celebration in Metz (1356), held in the presence of Dauphin Charles, his brother John and other French participants. During the Christmas service, the Emperor read the seventh lesson of the Book of Hours, dressed in an imperial gown holding a drawn sword. Such a supreme presentation of the imperial majesty took place this time in Cambrai, as it was inadmissible on French territory.⁶⁶ The Epiphany ceremony was featured as the paramount event of the Emperor's visit to France. An extraordinary liturgy was offered in the Sainte Chapelle and it was hence depicted both in the *Grandes Chroniques* and in the *Livre des Fais et Bonnes Meurs du Sage Roy Charles V*:

When it came to the offerings, the King prepared three: gold, frankincense and myrrh to offer up for himself and for the Emperor, as is common. When the King asked the Emperor if he was going to make an offering, the Emperor apologized saying that he could neither walk nor kneel or even hold anything due to gout and wished the King to perform the offering himself. The King's offering proceeded in the following way: three knights (his chamberlains) held up three beautiful, gilded and enameled goblets. There was gold in the first one, frankincense in the second and the myrrh in the third. All three of them walked in line in front of the King, one after another, maintaining the proper offering procedure. The King followed them. The knights then knelt and the King knelt as well in front of the Archbishop. The first offering was gold; the knight holding the gold handed it to the King who offered it up and kissed the Archbishop's hand. The second offering of incense was handed by the second knight to the first one. The first knight handed the incense to the King who offered it up, kissing the Archbishop's hand. The third offering of myrrh was handed by the third knight to the second one, the second knight handed it to the first one and the first knight handed it to the King who, in turn, offered it up and kissed the Archbishop's hand. Thus, the King concluded his offering in a religious and honest manner. No sermon was held during the aforementioned service, as it was too late...⁶⁷.

66. *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 197-198.

67. *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 233-234.



It seems too appropriate to celebrate the Three Kings' ceremony on the occasion of the meeting of the three monarchs: the Emperor, the King of France and the Bohemian and Holy Roman King. Nevertheless, it was discovered that Wenceslas IV was ruled out, since Charles V prepared only one pair of each of the three offerings, i.e. for himself and for the Emperor. Thus, the ceremony was not of "Three Kings" importance, but of a bilateral Imperial-French one. The Holy Roman and Bohemian King was not at all taken into consideration and the chronicle did not provide any explanation of this. The Emperor was immediately ruled out: his illness limited him to the extent he could not make any offerings because of his physical sufferings. The possibility of replacing him by his oldest son and heir was not considered at all (similarly, the Duke of Luxembourg replaced the Bohemian King at the Christmas banquet in Metz in 1356). The King of France makes the offerings alone, playing the roles of Melchior, Balthazar and Caspar in turn. Françoise Autrand is probably right talking about a kind of liturgy *revanche*. As an eighteen-year-old man, Charles V had to watch the Emperor's Christmas ceremony in Metz. And on the other hand, the Emperor is powerless from his illness and watches the King of France play a triple royal role.⁶⁸ Undoubtedly, these active and passive roles in the liturgy were one of the aspects of this liturgical revenge.

The meaning of the entire ceremony was likely of enormous significance. The Three Kings' relic belonged to the imperial relics administered by the Archbishop of Cologne who was, in turn, authorized to crown the Holy Roman King in Aachen. Frederick Barbarossa had found the relic in Milan and in 1164, donated it to the Archbishop of Cologne who then transported the relic to Cologne. The translation of the relic was subsequently linked with the canonization of Charles the Great and was meant to emphasize the Emperor's right to direct his relationship with God (not intermediated by the Pope). It is widely known that Charles IV followed up on Barbarossa's heritage and promoted the cult of Charles the Great. (Charles V, his nephew, followed the ideological heritage of Charles the Great as well.⁶⁹) The Three Kings' cult spread to the Duchy of Brabant. The Duke of Brabant, John I, together with his ally, the Archbishop of Cologne, attributed the victory in the Brabant-Luxembourg Battle of Worringen (1288) to the help of the Three Kings. In this battle, all the adult men from the Luxembourg Dynasty died. The Worringen rivals reconciled via the marriage of Henry of Luxembourg and Margaret of Brabant, the grandparents of Charles IV and grand-grandparents of the King of France, Charles V. In 1308, Henry VII was elected the Holy Roman King with significant French support. He was crowned on January 6, 1309 in Aachen and two years later in 1311, the iron Lombard crown was placed on his head during the Three Kings' ceremony in Milan. Forty-four years after his grandfather's coronation in Milan, Charles IV was crowned the King of Lombardy on Epiphany. Similarly, the King of France, Philip IV the Fair (1286), and potentially Philip V (1317) as well were crowned in Reims on Three Kings' Day. Apparently, the participants of the Parisian Three Kings'

68. Autrand, Françoise. "Mémoire et cérémonial...": 96-97.

69. Kintzinger, Martin. "Das inszenierte Imperium...": 300-301.



liturgy in 1378 were familiar with such nuances associated with coronations and the Epiphany ceremony, in general, was a good opportunity to continue the age-old struggle of the imperial and French royal majesty.

Within the context of the Three Kings' ceremonies associated with the coronation, it is quite obvious that the well-developed imperial cult and its random application in France established two parallel traditions. Neither of them could overtake nor subjugate the other. The liturgical message of the King of France was parallel to *rex imperator in regno suo* wherein an equal and independent status of France and its King was manifested. It was ingenious to maneuver Charles IV into such a situation where he himself had to acknowledge that he could not be Emperor in France. Most likely, his health problems were not the main issue; instead his primary concern was the Archbishop of Reims' mission. The Archbishop of Cologne and other imperial prelates were present at both the Epiphany ceremony and the coronation. However, Charles IV was not accompanied by anybody of similar status; the Bishop of Braunsberg could not partake, given his low hierarchical position. The Emperor could make the offering, kneel down and kiss the hand of the Archbishop of Reims. However, the first of the French *pairs* was not the right person either. Charles IV had the choice of celebrating the Epiphany ceremony by kneeling down at the feet of the French prelate and then kissing his hand. However, this would have been absolutely unprecedented and potentially misused in the future. Thus, Charles IV decided to watch the ceremony passively and this is also the reason why Wenceslas IV did not represent him during the ceremony. Inevitably, Charles IV must have felt that he was not the Emperor in France. He used his illness as an excuse and this became a two-edged sword. Thus, the *Grandes Chroniques* imply that if Charles IV had not been unwell, he would have conducted the ceremony in the same manner as Charles V had done so.

F. Autrand suggests that the tradition of offerings at the Epiphany celebration was not a regular one and that most likely, it was performed solely for this opportunity. Potentially, such a tradition was not at all present at the French court before 1378.⁷⁰ Moreover, the Epiphany ceremony was one of the most important celebrations in 1352 to honor the ephemeral Knightly Order of the Star (*Ordre de l'Etoile*), which was established by the King of France, John the Good, the father of Charles V. It is quite unlikely that this ritual would have had something in common with the Three Kings' paraliturgy conducted by Charles V. However, certain analogies between the 1378 Epiphany ceremonial lunch, including the performance of Godfrey of Bouillon's conquer of Jerusalem, and the banquet of the Knights of the Star on January 6, 1352, can be noted. Both ceremonies mutually alluded to each other to a certain extent (e.g. the Star of Bethlehem points to the Holy Land which is to be liberated by crusades). Both Three Kings'

70. Autrand, Françoise. "Mémoire et cérémonial...": 96-97.



banquets (fol. 394r and fol. 473v) are depicted in the manuscript BN ms. fr. 2813 and such cannot be a coincidence.⁷¹

8. The Dauphin on the table: Struggle for sovereignty

It is noteworthy to trace the *Grandes Chroniques'* observation of the assignment of the Kingdom of Arles's powers and authorities to the nine-year-old son of Charles V, the Dauphin Charles. The minor Dauphin was made an adult by the document of January 5, 1378; this was a common and advisable step within the context of the Emperor's policy towards the French princes who were holding imperial fiefs.⁷² The documents of January 7 consign the imperial vicariates in Dauphiné and in the Kingdom of Arles to the Dauphin for life (not lineally).⁷³ Potential reasons for these concessions by Charles IV have already been researched. Thus, we will only attempt to address a single issue: the obligatory homage or vow of the young Dauphin towards the Emperor with respect to the possession of Dauphiné. Naturally, the medieval monarch did not grant authority or fiefs to somebody who did not render homage. However, the *Grandes Chroniques* never recorded the Dauphin's homage towards the Emperor. This holding back of information is noticeable and leads to insufficient reciprocity of mutual respect and possible concessions between the Empire and France. Likewise, the *Grandes Chroniques* do not report on any homage paid in Metz or in Paris. The French crown craved full sovereignty over the Kingdom of Arles, thus stressing feudal dependency on the Emperor was not in the interest of the chronicle. The French legists attempted to restrict the terms of the Emperor's sovereignty in France. Charles IV was not allowed to carry out his Christmas ceremonies in France: the bells did not peal, no processions were held, he had to ride a black horse and people were denied any right to partake in entertaining events on the occasion of the monarchs' meeting. In this context, the ceremony demonstrating the Emperor's sovereignty *par excellence*, i.e. the Dauphin's ceremonial homage, obviously generated many troubles. In spite of the purposeful silence of the *Grandes Chroniques* on this account, the homage indeed must have taken place. Otherwise, the Dauphin would not have gotten the imperial vicariates. Yet the question remains—during which part of the visit was the homage rendered?

At Christmas in Metz (1365), the Dauphin Charles rendered homage to the Emperor in the afternoon, after religious services and a ceremonial lunch.⁷⁴ The

71. Concerning the Order of the Star: Pannier, Léopold. *La Noble-Maison de Saint-Ouen. La villa Clippiacum et l'ordre de l'Etoile d'après les documents originaux*. Paris: A. Franck, 1872; d'Arcy, Jonathan. *The Knights of the Crown. The Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe 1325-1520*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987: 167-210.

72. *Regesta Imperii...*: VIII: 490 (doc. n° 5858).

73. *Regesta Imperii...*: docs. n° 5861 and 5862.

74. The information used in this study concerning the Metz Imperial Diet comes from Hergemöller, Bernd-Ulrich. "Der Abschluss der Goldenen Bulle zu Metz 1356/1357". *Studia Luxemburgensia, Studien zu*



homage in Paris might have proceeded similarly during the most important visting day, i.e. Three Kings' day. Therefore, we can rely on the data stipulated in the principal documents: the Dauphin was proclaimed an adult the day before the homage was rendered (January 5) so that the ceremony of homage would be legal. A day after the homage (January 7), he was given the vicariates in Dauphiné and in the Kingdom of Burgundy. Such careful arrangements were made so that there would be no assumptions that the documents had been issued on January 6, i.e. before the homage ceremony. The relationship between the Dauphin Charles and Charles IV was thus depicted by the chronicles very cautiously. When the Emperor officially met the Dauphin, Charles IV did his best, "he asked to be lifted from his chair, took off his hat, embraced and kissed him," while "the Dauphin bowed down without genuflecting."⁷⁵ Surely, the situation was intentionally in opposition to the perscribed homage requiring genuflection, the removal of a tenant's hat and the stretching of the tenant's hands forward to be taken by the sovereign. Thus, a very curious formulation is described at the place where we would expect the homage to be rendered after the Three Kings' lunch: "After it was completed, the Dauphin was brought and placed on a table, two feet in front of the Emperor and the King⁷⁶, and was held by the Duke of Bourbon."⁷⁷ The chronicles do not observe why and how long the Dauphin stood on the table or what he did there. Thus, we may assume that some information is missing at this point. Most likely, this is the event which we are seeking.

The homage ceremony was probably modified as it was not undertaken on the territory of the sovereign and needed to be made by a nine-year-old child. The permanently reported immobility of the Emperor might have been another reason for some of the adjustments. It is unusual that the ceremony was to be carried out on a table. Incidentally, any ceremonies performed on a table two feet apart from the Emperor and the King are quite peculiar. However, the Dauphin was a nine-year-old child who could kneel on a table and comfortably kiss his sovereign from a distance of sixty centimeters. Moreover, the sovereign did not need to bend down or lean over. The homage could also be seen by many more people than if it had taken place on the floor. Despite the peculiar situation, the Dauphin's feudal obligations had to be fulfilled. Likewise, the *Grandes Chroniques* do not note any homage rendered in Metz in 1356 nor in Paris in 1378. The empowerment of the Dauphin by Charles IV is described retrospectively after the Emperor's departure. The matters are introduced by the phrase, *il n'est pas a oublier*, i.e. it must not be forgotten. The circumstances of empowering the Dauphin are not described at all.

den Luxemburgern und ihrer Zeit, 3 (1989): 123-232.

75. *Chronique de Jean II et Charles V...*: II, 235.

76. The king is not specified here, however, is should be the King of France based on the context. If we insist of the fact that the Dauphin made the homage at this moment and that the *Grandes Chroniques* are quite vague, we may suggest that the Dauphin appeared before Charles IV and Wenceslas IV and made the homage towards the both monarchs simultaneously.

77. *Chronique de Jean II et Charles V...*: II, 243: *...et fu apporté le dalphin sus la table, en estant à deux piez entre et devant l'Empereur et le Roy, et le tenoit le duc de Bourbon.*



Naturally, the legally valid designation had to take place during the Emperor's stay. Ultimately, the last chapter comes back to the topic and suggests that the Emperor's chancellor Nicolas of Riesenbourg later brought the documents to the Dauphin. Obviously, these documents solely testify to the designation, but do not establish it. Nevertheless, the illumination does not depict the designation—the legally binding public act which should have been testified. Instead, only Nicolas of Riesenbourg is shown as he brings the documents to the Dauphin. This is the only illustration of the Emperor's visit depicting the young Dauphin (fol. 480r).

9. To throw away or to give: The contest for the better banquet

In conclusion, we quote a unique and original narration of Charles IV's visit to Paris by Jaique Dex, the chronicler of Metz.⁷⁸

L'an mil IIIc LXXVII allait Charle l'empereur a St. Mors des Fousces en pellerinage, et a Parix li fist le roy de France, fil de sa suer, grant honnour et furent fais dons a lui de bien LX millez francz et de plus. Et ne savoit parsonne pourquoi il y alloit for que en pellerinaige de St. Mort. Le dit roy de France donnait le dit empereur a digner tres grandement et tant de pairez de met que ce fuit merveille, ... et quant on deservoit, on raluoit tout.

Puez donnait le dit empereur a digner le dit roy de France de II pairez de met, c'est assavoit le premier une grant piece de boeuf et ung chappont boillis au navel et une joutte au baucon. Le second met chappons et pourcillons rostis sen sause et gellee. Le tier met lachefrites, poierez et neuxes.

In 1377, Emperor Charles set off for the pilgrimage to St. Maur des Fosses. In Paris, he was honored by the King of France, the son of his sister and was given gifts amounting to approximately 60,000 francs or even more. And nobody knew why the Emperor went there except for the pilgrimage to Saint Maur. The said King of France provided the Emperor with such a wide choice of courses that it was surprising...and when the tables were cleaned off, everything remaining was thrown away.

Afterwards, the Emperor arranged a four course lunch for the King of France. The first course consisted of large portions of beef, boiled capons with turnip and a juicy roast meat with bacon. The second course included roasted capons and piglets without any sauce and jelly. The third course consisted of desserts, pears and nuts.

78. *Die Metzger Chronik des Jaique Dex (Jacques d'Esch) über die Kaiser und Könige aus dem Luxemburger Hause*, ed. Georg Wolfram. Metz: G. Scriba, 1906: 313.



Et tout quant que on estoit desor tauble tant de vin comme de viande on n'en raluoit riens, mais tout gitzte on pot a l'ausmonne et tout donnei pour Dieu aprez dignei. Se fuit pluz prisier que le disney du roy pourtant c'on ne raluoit rien. Et disoit le dit empereur qu'il donnoit grossement a disner selonq la coustume d'Allemaigne, combien que le disney de Fransoys estoit trop pluz coustangeable.

Et au despartir qu'ilz firent l'un de l'autre, le dit empereur demandait ung don audit roy de France que li volxit promettre qu'il n'entreprenroit riens ne ne soufferoit de riens laissier entreprendre contre son fil Wainchelat de venir a l'empeire aprez son decept. Lequeil roy li ottriait et le tint. Et se fut la cause pourquoy le dit empereur s'en allait a St. Mor de Parix.

When the tables were cleaned, no wine and meat was thrown away, but instead was put into charity vessels and given to God. Thus the Emperor's lunch was valued more than the lunch of the King as nothing was thrown away. The said Emperor said that his German style lunch was bigger [as it fed more people], even though the French lunch was more costly.

At the departure, when the monarchs were saying farewell, the said Emperor asked the King of France for a gift. He asked the King to promise him that he would not take or allow any action against his son Wenceslas when he succeeded to the throne after the Emperor's death. And the King promised this and kept his promise. This was the reason the said Emperor went to the Parisian Saint Maur.

Dex' stories are often anecdotal, yet informative while emphasizing the intelligence of the Luxembourg monarchs. They might have returned from France through Metz without even spending a night there. Thus, the Metz people could have had some information. The sum of money determined by Dex as the sum of gifts to the Emperor and his suite was most likely not far from the truth.⁷⁹ At the same time, Dex agreed with the *Grandes Chroniques* on the Emperor's journey to Saint Maur les Fosses. The *Grandes Chroniques* quote Emperor Charles IV several times. He announced the following to the French delegation in Cambrai:

Though he is planning to set off for the pilgrimage to the monastery of Saint Maur, he is still coming to visit the King, the Queen and their children and he wishes to meet them more than any other persons in the world. When he meets the King, he will talk to him and when he commends his son to him (the King of Romans), who came along to be entirely at the King's disposal, he will say that he will accept death at any time when God sees fit to call him, as this would be fulfilling one of his greatest wishes⁸⁰.

79. Šmahel, František. *Cesta Karla IV...*: 362-363, lists the total costs of the French Crown for the reception of the Emperor at 55.888 francs. The gifts made up only a part of this. Other items must also be included, for example, the clip for the Duke of Luxembourg and Brabant costing 900 francs, (Delisle, Léopold. *Mandements et actes divers de Charles V...*: 796-797 (no 1605)), or the unquantified items as books (e. g. two Books of Hours for the Emperor as reported in the *Grandes Chroniques*). Several gifts financed from other sources may also be included.

80. *Chronique des règnes...*: II, 198.



Indeed, Wenceslas' visit was understood as the introduction of the future emperor. Negotiations on the papal approval and the Holy Roman coronation were being thoroughly prepared in this time.⁸¹

We can hardly speculate if the Emperor arranged a German style banquet in Paris as suggested by Dex, as no other sources can neither confirm nor disprove this information. The *Grandes Chroniques* would not be interested in any such information. To defend the German style banquet, it should be stated that banquets based on the guest's national tradition, i.e. *pro modo patriae*, were a part of the papal court's protocol. According to the *Chronicle of John of Reading*, Emperor Charles IV was honored similarly in 1365.⁸² However, the information that Charles V promised to support Wenceslas IV when he ascended the imperial throne after his father's death and that he indeed kept this promise should be taken very seriously. Undoubtedly, such a promise from the King of France constituted a counterweight to Wenceslas IV's promise of life-long love and service.

10. Conclusion

This analysis of some portions of the Emperor's journey to France demonstrates that the *Grandes Chroniques* chapters covering the Emperor's visit were entirely driven by political and protocol objectives. Research suggests that in spite of the size and detail, the text's focus is a selective and limited one. Some facts are reduced, since they are not considered significant (relations between the Emperor and his nephews), while others are considered even undesirable (the Dauphin's homage, the pledge of Charles V to Wenceslas IV). Finally, some aspects, such as the pomp and self-presentation of the Emperor (the colors of his procession entering Paris, the German-style banquet) would have distracted the reader's attention from France and its King. Undesirable elements and disputes between the French and Imperial parties to be obliterated were described in quite a typical manner. During these moments of confrontations, the courtesy, thoughtfulness and kindness of the French party towards the Emperor was always emphasized. Instead of learning about the Emperor's manner of entering Paris, we receive information on borrowed sedans and on bestowed horses. The entry ceremony peculiarly focuses on the Emperor's diseased legs (the King of France was afraid to touch the Emperor's legs when riding side by side on his horse). Likewise, the dispute on the procession as organized in ranks of twos or threes is overshadowed by the issue of a more honorable acceptance of homage. Oddities continued in that before the Three Kings' service took place, the Emperor was kindly offered holy water and the gospels earlier than the King of France were offered the same. And when we expect the Dauphin's homage, it is suggested that a different procedure is carried out due to the Emperor's disease. Is it

81. Kavka, František. *Vláda Karla IV...: II*, 206-212.

82. Weiss, Stefan. *Die Versorgung...: 237-230*.



solely a coincidence that the kindness and courtesy of the French host is emphasized at the moments of potential protocol and political disputes? There is every likelihood that it is not a coincidence, but in actuality a strategy. Yet it is hard to determine whether this is a characteristic feature of the text or if this indeed managed to genuinely influence the Emperor's visit.

Undoubtedly, the French hosts utilized whatever means possible, including a detailed report in the official chronicle, to take political and promotional advantage of the Emperor's visit. Nevertheless, Charles IV was a master of propaganda as well. Although he made a large error in not ordering the visit to be described similarly, he also utilized any and all means to promote the Empire and himself. Charles IV's visit was a hard-earned compromise in many ways. Given the limited sources, we are not able to develop a complete description of the Emperor's visit; however by analyzing certain passages, we can outline a "shadow version" of the *Grandes Chroniques*. The Emperor arrived with a representative suite, actively discussed the course of ceremonies, entered Paris in a manner which he deemed adequate and eventually refused to participate in the Three Kings' liturgy which would damage his majesty's honor. The Dauphin Charles (VI) had to render homage for the Dauphiné of Vienne. The King of France, Charles V, promised the Emperor that he would not allow any actions to be taken against Wenceslas IV when he ascended the throne after his father's death. Henceforth, the tradition of good personal and political relations between the Roman Empire and France, as well as the Luxembourg and Valois Dynasties, was passed on to the new generation during this Parisian visit. Apparently, the strong determination to maintain this constant European policy was later confirmed, even during the time of dual papacy, which brought both "states" into odds against each other⁸³.

83. Fantysová-Matějková, Jana. *Wenceslas de Bohême...*: 513-552.

