

MICROLOGUS LIBRARY

127

Micrologus Library

Editor: Agostino Paravicini Bagliani

ADVISORY BOARD

Bernard Andenmatten (*Lausanne*), Jean-Patrice Boudet (*Orléans*), Charles Burnett (*London*), Jacques Chiffolleau (*Avignon*), Chiara Crisciani (*Milano*), Ruedi Imbach (*Corsier*), Danielle Jacquart (*Paris*), Michael McVaugh (*Chapel Hill, NC, USA*), Cecilia Panti (*Roma Tor Vergata*), Michel Pastoureau (*Paris*), Michela Pereira (*SISMEL*), Francesco Santi (*SISMEL, Bologna*), Jean-Yves Tilliette (*Genève*), Baudouin Van den Abeele (*Bruxelles-Louvain-la-Neuve*), Iolanda Ventura (*Bologna*), Oleg Voskoboynikov (*Moskva*), Nicolas Weill-Parot (*Paris*), Jean Wirth (*Maisons-Laffitte*)

Naturalisation of Power (1250-1600): Unravelling the Strategies of Legitimation

Edited by

Éloïse Adde and Jonathan Dumont



FIRENZE

SISMEL - EDIZIONI DEL GALLUZZO ~ 2025

Published as part of the FWF project I 4076 *GREMLIA: Grey Eminences in Action. Personal Structures of Informal Decision-Making at Late Medieval Courts* (dir. Andreas Zajic), at the Institut für Mittelalterforschung of the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Vienna, Austria) and the project *LUXDYNAST: Europe and the House of Luxembourg. Governance, Delegation and Participation between Region and Empire (1308-1437)* (dir. Éloïse Adde and Michel Margue) and with the support of the Fonds national de la recherche du Luxembourg, the Université du Luxembourg and its Institut d'histoire. The Fondation pour la protection du patrimoine culturel, historique et artisanal (Lausanne, Switzerland) has generously supported this project and made it possible. Our thanks go to them.



IHIST.

SISMEL · EDIZIONI DEL GALLUZZO
via Montebello, 7 · I-50123 Firenze
phone +39.055.237.45.37 · galluzzo@sismel.it · order@sismel.it
www.sismel.it · www.mirabileweb.it



ISSN: 2465-3276
ISBN: 978-88-9290-363-0 · e-ISBN: 978-88-9290-364-7
© 2025 – SISMEL · Edizioni del Galluzzo

Layout: Giorgio Grillo

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VII *Acknowledgments*

IX *Abbreviations*

- 3 Éloïse Adde – Jonathan Dumont, *Nature, Legitimacy and Power. A preliminary Approach*

THINKING NATURE IN THE SOCIAL WORLD

- 23 Maaïke van der Lugt, *Naturalising the Law - Legalising Nature. The Role of Medical Analogies and Arguments in Medieval Discussions about Consanguinity, Incest and Kin Marriage*
- 51 Julien Le Mauff, *Political Naturalism and Communitarian Values. The corpus reipublicae and its Meaning in the Twelfth Century*
- 73 Antoine Destemberg, *Création divine et naturalisation de l'ordre social aux XIII^e-XV^e siècles. L'exégèse visuelle et textuelle de la Genèse dans les Bibles moralisées*
- 95 Nicole Hochner, *Incommensurability and the Kinetic Nature of Society*
- 115 Lucie Jollivet, *La légitimation du pouvoir en période de crise. Le cercle de Nicolas de Clamanges et les prémices de la notion de 'mérite', 1380-1430*

LEGITIMATION OF THE DYNASTIC RULER

- 137 Christiane Raynaud, *Nature, naturalité et politique. Discours visuels et culture de gouvernement de Charles V à Charles VI*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 157 Valeria Caldarella-Allaire, *Un signum extra naturam. La syphilis comme expression de légitimité et d'illégitimité du pouvoir dans la première modernité*
- 177 Jonathan Dumont, *Naturalisation in Response to a Civil War in the Sixteenth Century Low Countries*
- 203 Daniel Luger, «*Sumus igitur... nostro naturali domino obligati*». Zur 'natürlichen Herrschaft' in Böhmen, Österreich und Ungarn um die Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts

EMANCIPATION AND THE SHAPING OF THE POLITICAL SOCIETY

- 225 Gilles Lecuppre, *Anything but Natural? Princely Husbands in the Low Countries (13th-15th c.). Acceptation or Distrust?*
- 237 Wim Blockmans, *Legitimizing Rulers in Europe and the Low Countries*
- 267 Éloïse Adde, *The 'Natural Lord', Naturalness, and the Nation: Naturalising the State in the Czech Lands in the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*
- 289 Fanny Giraudier, *Les Conseillers naturels du roi. Légitimation et revendication du pouvoir des Grands sous la régence de Marie de Médicis*
- 309 Éloïse Adde - Jonathan Dumont, *Conclusions*

ILLUSTRATIONS

- 319 *Index of Persons and Place Names*, by Karsten Schuil

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This collective volume is the result of two joint conferences organised at the Université du Luxembourg (Grand Duchy of Luxembourg) in 2019 and at the Austrian Academy of Sciences (Vienna, Austria) in 2020.

The research that gave rise to this volume was carried out in the context of two research projects: the *LUXDYNAST: Europe and the House of Luxembourg. Governance, Delegation and Participation between Region and Empire (1308-1437)* (dir. Éloïse Adde and Michel Margue), hosted at the University of Luxembourg, and the FWF project I 4076 *GREMIA: Grey Eminences in Action: Personal Structures of Informal Decision-Making at Late Medieval Courts* (dir. Andreas Zajic), hosted at the Austrian Academy of Sciences.

This volume could not have been published without the support of the Fonds national de la recherche du Luxembourg, the Université du Luxembourg and its Institut d'histoire, the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften (ÖAW) and its Institut für Mittelalterforschung (IMAFO), and the Fondation pour la protection du patrimoine culturel, historique et artisanal (Lausanne, Switzerland).

We would like to thank Agostino Paravicini Bagliani for his kind reception of our volume in the Micrologus Library series and for his precious editorial advice.

We would also like to thank all the friends and colleagues who have indirectly contributed to this adventure through the discussions, exchanges and conversations we have had with them, in particular Michael Depreter, Élodie Desjardin, Klaus Oschema and Andreas Zajic.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AGR: Archives Générales du Royaume (Brussels)
BM: Bibliothèque municipale
BnF: Bibliothèque nationale de France (Paris)
BL: British Library (London)
BodL: Bodleian Library (Oxford)
KBR: Bibliothèque royale de Belgique/Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België (Brussels)
HHStA: Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (Vienna)
ÖNB: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (Vienna)
PL: *Patrologie latine*
RBM: *Regesta diplomatica nec non epistolaria Bohemiae et Moraviae*

EMANCIPATION AND THE SHAPING
OF THE POLITICAL SOCIETY

SISMEL - EDIZIONI DEL GALLUZZO

Gilles Lecuppre

ANYTHING BUT NATURAL?
PRINCELY HUSBANDS IN THE LOW COUNTRIES
(13th–15th C.).
ACCEPTATION OR DISTRUST?

Whereas the neighbouring monarchies, the German Empire and the kingdom of France, progressively adopted constitutions that clearly excluded women from power, the pre-Burgundian Low Countries not only enabled and permitted female succession but demanded it. Thus, Henry I, Duke of Brabant, managed to get it in 1204 from Philip of Swabia, King of the Romans, in exchange for his support in the struggle against Otto IV for the throne¹.

In the next pages I will focus on three principalities: the duchy of Brabant, and the two counties of Flanders and Hainaut². From the beginning of the thirteenth century to the final

1. On both protagonists, see A. Wauters, Art. «Henri I^{er}», in *Biographie nationale de Belgique*, Brussels, Académie royale de Belgique, 1887, IX, 105–23; P. Csendes, *Philipp von Schwaben: ein Staufer im Kampf um die Macht*, Darmstadt, Primus Verlag, 2003. More precisely on the *jus brabantinum*, see T. Weller, «Dynastische Politik unter Philipp von Schwaben», in *Philipp von Schwaben: Beiträge der internationaler Tagung anlässlich seiner 800. Todestages*, Wien, 29. bis 30. Mai 2008, eds A. Rzhacek – R. Spreitzer, Vienna, Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2010, 193–214.

2. General overviews: *Histoire du Brabant du duché à nos jours*, eds R. Van Uytven – Cl. Bruneel – A.M. Koldeweij, Zwolle, Waanders, 2004; P. Avonds, «Brabant en Limburg 1100–1403», in *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden*, ed. D. P. Block, Haarlem, Fibula-Van Dishoeck, 1982, II, 452–82; M. Vandermaesen, «Vlaanderen en Henegouwen onder het huis van Dampierre 1244–1384», in *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden*, II, 399–440; E. De Maesschalk, *De graven van Vlaanderen, 861–1384*, Leuven, Davidsfonds,

integration into the Burgundian union between 1384 and 1433, out of thirty rulers, eight were in fact princesses whose personal rule lasted approximately one third of the total duration of the period considered here³. Such figures would bring shame to our contemporary democratic societies if those feminine leaders had not been flanked by their husbands or other male characters. But of course most of the time, they and their subjects had to bear the tutelage of princes consorts who were generally chosen in foreign countries so as not to disturb the internal balance of power inside their own fiefdoms.

Countesses and duchesses as daughters or sisters of previous princes could be said to be natural, for they were autochthonous and benefited from the tried and tested legitimacy of a local dynasty⁴. On the contrary, their husbands seemed to be imposed from the outside: they did not always know the languages spoken in their adopted countries or the customs, habits and ways of thinking. They typically brought with them exotic retainers and could even be suspected of secretly working for a hostile power.

Wim Blockmans, whose article deals with a problem similar to mine, already highlighted the main features of such a risky business⁵. Things usually went smoothly provided imported princes acted in strict accordance with native laws and customs, did not surround themselves with foreign counsellors and proved scrupulous in the judicial field. I modestly intend to have a look on our control sample in this respect.

2012; M. Vandermaesen, «Het graafschap Henegouwen 1280-1384», in *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden*, II, 441-51; *Hainaut: mille ans pour l'avenir*, eds Cl. Billen - X. Canonne - J.-M. Duvosquel, Brussels, Fonds Mercator, 1998.

3. Joan of Constantinople (Flanders and Hainaut, 1205-44), Margaret of Constantinople (Flanders and Hainaut, 1244-78/80), Margaret of Avesnes (Hainaut, 1345-56, Holland and Zeeland, 1345-54), Joan of Brabant (1355-1406), Margaret of Male (Flanders and Artois, 1384-1405), Jacqueline of Bavaria (Hainaut, 1417-33, Holland and Zeeland).

4. Th. de Hemptinne, «Marguerite de Male et les villes de Flandre. Une princesse naturelle aux prises avec le pouvoir des autres (1384-1405)», in *Femmes de pouvoir, femmes politiques durant les derniers siècles du Moyen Âge et au cours de la première Renaissance*, eds É. Bousmar - J. Dumont - A. Marchandise - B. Schnerb, Brussels, De Boeck, 2012, 477-92.

5. See his contribution in this volume.

In order to do so, I think it will be more suitable to isolate the Flemish case, inasmuch as Flanders remained a vassal of the French kingdom, which asserted a certain right of intervention throughout the period. Then I will try to assess the amplitude of the authority which princely husbands could exercise on their new subjects, and hunt down potential limitations attributable to their condition. Finally this article considers the tensions and conflicts which might have emerged when such husbands originated from a neighbouring territory in which indigenous identity threatened to dissolve.

French intrusions into Flemish matrimonial affairs?

Two important facts must be borne in mind to understand Franco-Flemish relationships from around 1200 on. On the one hand, the king of France was the pre-eminent suzerain over the main part of the Flemish territory. On the other hand, they had recently reached a showdown which could have resulted in the destruction of one of those involved⁶. It was therefore no surprise if French kings were so sensitive about succession events in the area and especially marriages of countesses. Spouses could be considered as tools in the hands of powerful overlords marrying off protégés or trustworthy men. Sovereigns systematically resorted to such pressures on younger Flemish countesses who happened to be also countesses of Hainaut down to 1280. Philip Augustus, for instance, objected to Enguerrand of Coucy's generous proposal (50,000 pounds) and worked out the details of the marriage contract between Joan of Constantinople and Fernando of Portugal who was expected to be a French puppet⁷. Some years later, when she planned to re-marry, Saint Louis forbade her to choose Simon de Montfort, the Earl of Leicester and son of the main character of the Albigenian crusade, but finally

6. Medieval historiographical aspects are discussed by I. Guyot-Bachy, *La Flandre et les Flamands au miroir des historiens du royaume (X^e-XV^e siècle)*, Villeneuve-d'Ascq, P.U. Septentrion, 2017.

7. J. Baldwin, *Philippe Auguste et son gouvernement. Les fondations du pouvoir royal en France au Moyen Âge*, Paris, Fayard, 1991, 265.

approved of Thomas of Savoy, his own uncle by marriage⁸. As for Joan's sister Margaret, who was to become her successor, she was allowed to re-marry with William of Dampierre, a knight from Champagne who owed much to his monarch⁹. Needless to say, Margaret of Male's marriage in 1369 to Philip of Burgundy, brother of King Charles V, was also a French initiative¹⁰.

What about the reactions of the Flemish political community to these massive interventions? Those in strong positions loudly voiced their discontent. In 1212 the citizens of Ghent shut their doors upon the arrival of the newly-weds, Fernando and Joan, and let everyone know how much they resented the union of their countess who, so they said, had been bought and sold by the king of France¹¹. Backed by English money and soldiers, the same Ghentenaars initially resisted Philip the Bold's accession for almost two years in a row before seeking his pardon in 1385¹².

8. Th. Luykx, *Johanna van Constantinopel, gravin van Vlaanderen en Hene-gouwen: haar leven 1199/1200-1244; haar regeering 1205-1244 vooral in Vlaanderen*, Antwerpen - Utrecht, N. V. Standaard-Boekhandel - W. De Haan N. V., 1946; G. Sivéry, «Jeanne et Marguerite de Constantinople, comtesses de Flandre et de Hainaut au XIII^e siècle», in *Jeanne de Constantinople, comtesse de Flandre et de Hainaut*, ed. N. Dessaux, Paris, Somogy Éditions, 2009, 15-31.

9. Ch. A. Duvivier, *La Querelle des d'Avesnes et des Dampierre jusqu'à la mort de Jean d'Avesnes 1257*, Brussels - Paris, C. Muquardt - A. Picard, 1894.

10. J.-B. Santamaria, «Chantage maternel, patriotisme capétien ou réalisme diplomatique? Le rôle de la comtesse d'Artois et de Bourgogne Marguerite de France et de ses conseillers dans le mariage de Marguerite de Male et de Philippe le Hardi», *Publications du Centre européen d'Études bourguignonnes (XIV^e-XVI^e s.)*, 53 (2013), 29-49. On the (very French) ceremonial dimension, see M. Boone, «Le Mariage de Marguerite de Male et de Philippe le Hardi de Bourgogne: une entrée royale dans la Flandre comtale», in *Die Erbtöchter, der fremde Fürst und das Land: die Ehe Johanns des Blinden und Elisabeths von Böhmen in vergleichender europäischer Perspektive/L'Héritière, le prince étranger et le pays. Le mariage de Jean l'Aveugle et d'Élisabeth de Bohême dans une perspective comparative européenne*, ed. M. Pauly, Luxembourg, Centre luxembourgeois de Documentation et d'Études médiévales, 2013, 209-24.

11. Luykx, *Johanna van Constantinopel*. In the end, the couple made their entry in Ghent, whose inhabitants agreed to pay a large sum to compensate the harm they had caused. The princes granted a new organisation of the city council and the annual election of the aldermen.

12. R. Vaughan, *Philip the Bold: The Formation of the Burgundian State*, Woodbridge, Boydell, 2005, 19-38.

Although foreign counts differed somewhat from the obedient creatures they were meant to be, they did not have much room for manoeuvre. Because of an accumulation of French infringements, Fernando soon converted to the Francophobic cause, thus falling into line with Flemish weavers who badly needed the English wool supply to thrive. But his attempt was harshly punished. He was defeated and taken prisoner at Bouvines in July 1214 and he remained imprisoned for the next twelve years¹³. He was released only after the payment of a heavy ransom. After that, he toed the French line until his death in 1233 and so did his subjects. All his fellow *jure uxoris* counts of Flanders – counts by the right of their wives – had to come to terms with their royal suzerain. Philip the Bold even borrowed institutional reforms from a French model by establishing in Lille both a chamber of accounts and a council chamber¹⁴. But conversely his affiliation to the Valois provided incentive to develop the Flemish economy, especially as he managed to get the franc devalued. That revival certainly helped him to gain acceptance by his subjects¹⁵.

Princely husbands: Modest proposals?

For the reasons I mentioned, the political scope of princely husbands could not be very broad in Flanders. After his release, Fernando remained faithful to the Crown and the record of his seven free years is rather poor, except for a victorious campaign in the county of Namur¹⁶. Thomas of Savoy, Joan of Constantinople's second husband, was not very active in either of his counties of the Low Countries. Since two of his nieces had married Henry III and Louis IX (the respective Kings of England and France) he could have strengthened relationships with England if he had not been bypassed by Saint Louis. Knights and towns of Flanders and Hainaut took oaths of allegiance directly

13. G. Duby, *Le Dimanche de Bouvines*, Paris, Gallimard, 2005.

14. Vaughan, *Philip the Bold*, 127–34.

15. Fr. Autrand, *Charles VI*, Paris, Fayard, 1994, 116–18.

16. L. Vanderkindere, *La Formation territoriale des principautés belges au Moyen Âge*, Brussels, H. Lamertin, 1902, I, 204–5.

to the latter, who also personally invested nobles with their fiefs and finally even forbade Thomas to go to England without his express permission¹⁷.

What is more surprising is that well after Flanders and Hainaut separated, such an impressive monarch as Louis of Bavaria (also known as Louis IV of the Roman Empire) did not dare to meddle in the internal affairs of Hainaut¹⁸. He had married Margaret II of Avesnes in 1345, who succeeded her brother William II two years later. But the mighty Emperor's one and only decision regarding Hainaut was the promise he had made not to divide the disparate assembly of three counties – Hainaut, Holland and Zeeland – which had been created in 1299 by Margaret's grandfather, John Ist¹⁹. Needless to say, Louis greatly preferred to be involved in the German intrigues than in the fiefdoms his wife had brought as a dowry²⁰.

There existed some practical restrictions to the power of well intentioned husbands. Among them can be counted Fernando of Portugal who, as noted above, spent twelve years waiting in Paris and only nine ruling his counties. In a less dramatic way, Wenceslaus of Luxemburg, Joan of Brabant's husband since 1352, was kept prisoner by his enemies only eleven months after his defeat at Baesweiler in 1371²¹. Another diversion consisted in entrusting one's power to a son or even to governors. That is exactly how Louis of Bavaria and Margaret proceeded as regards Holland and Zeeland which were left with their son William, and Hainaut which was run by John, Lord of Beaumont²². In the

17. A. Marchandisse, «La Maison de Savoie et les principautés belges durant la première moitié du XIII^e siècle», in *Pierre II de Savoie. «Le Petit Charlemagne»* († 1268), eds B. Andenmatten – A. Paravicini Bagliani – E. Pibiri, Lausanne, Université de Lausanne, 2000, 233–55.

18. M. Clauss, *Ludwig IV. der Bayer: Herzog, König, Kaiser*, Ratisbonne, Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2014.

19. 1299: *een graaf, drie graafschappen: De vereniging van Holland, Zeeland en Henegouwen*, eds D. E. H. de Boer – E. H. P. Cordfunke – H. Sarfatij, Hilversum, Verloren, 2000.

20. Margaret herself was not much involved in local government. See M. Maillard-Luypaert, «Marguerite d'Avesnes, Madame de Hainaut (1346–1356): «faible femme» ou femme affaiblie?», in *Femmes de pouvoir*, 325–47.

21. J. Fantysová-Matějková, *Wenceslas de Bohême. Un prince au carrefour de l'Europe*, Paris, P.U. Paris-Sorbonne, 2013.

22. Maillard-Luypaert, *Marguerite d'Avesnes*.

first case, it meant that local rule was transferred from a natural princess to a natural prince without the intermediary of a complete outsider, the unnatural husband. The last limitation was, of course, death, whether natural or not, of the husband. Some expressed their sensitivity by leaving the stage before their wives assumed succession. Such was the case of William II of Dampierre who died in 1231, thirteen years before his wife, Margaret of Constantinople, became a double countess²³. Others proved so ephemeral that they could be called «epiphenomena». Louis of Bavaria died two years after the accession of another Margaret to her triple county.

Philip the Bold, ruler of Flanders and Artois from 1369-1404, could be cited as an exception to the rule of near futility, even though Margaret of Male was by no means a window dressing²⁴.

Political societies: Distrustful of neighbours?

Towards the end of our period, various actors of those political societies tended to make clear that they did not want their principalities dissolved into bigger transnational entities. New mergers that might have stemmed from marriages between two

23. Although briefly regent of Flanders, he is nothing but a shadow in the eventful life of Margaret. Here is a number of milestones for a gendered approach of her rule – let us notice, incidentally, that she is constantly flanked by her elder sister, Joan: K. S. Nicholas, «Women as Rulers: Countesses Jeanne and Marguerite of Flanders (1212-1278)», in *Queens, Regents and Potentates*, ed. Th. Vann, Dallas, Boydell & Brewer, 1993, 73-89; K. S. Nicholas, «Countesses as Rulers in Flanders», in *Aristocratic Women in Medieval France*, ed. Th. Evergates, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999, 111-37; Fr. Canadé Sautman, «Constructing Political Rule, Transforming Gender Scripts: Revisiting the Thirteenth-Century Rule of Joan and Margaret, Countesses of Flanders», in *Representing Medieval Genders and Sexualities in Europe, Construction, Transformation and Subversion, 600-1530*, eds E. L'Estrange – A. More, London – New York, Routledge, 2011, 49-65.

24. M. Bubenicek, «Was the Couple a Palliative to the Absence of the Prince? The Political Role and Influence of Margaret during the Reign of Philip the Bold, Duke and Count of Burgundy (1384-1404)», in *Absentee Authority across Medieval Europe*, eds Fr. Lachaud – M. Penman, Woodbridge, Boydell & Brewer, 2017, 171-90 (even though the article focuses on the Burgundian territories).

neighbouring rulers seemed to threaten local identities. It was very different from past personal unions of Flanders and Hainaut, or Hainaut, Holland and Zeeland. That was why counties did not agree to be the target of greedy adjacent principalities that had managed to seize their princesses.

A member of the successful and Imperial House of Luxemburg, Wenceslaus, married Joan of Brabant in 1352 when he was only 15 and she 30²⁵. In January 1356, the *Joyous Entry*, even if it was intended to address first and foremost Joan as the successor of her father John III, took place in a series of constitutional documents, aimed at the restriction of the couple's political latitude and to guarantee Brabantine indivisibility²⁶. Some months later, Wenceslaus had to produce another charter, very similar to the *Joyous Entry*, for Limburg. It soon became obvious that the duke and the duchess did not always plan things together, as Wenceslaus decided on his own to negotiate with the count of Flanders about the fate of the city of Mechelen. Then Brussels and Leuven played the princess card against her husband. Brussels inhabitants had the lords who had signed the treaty arrested. As for him, he was officially recognised as the regent in Brabant at the beginning of 1357 and would inherit the duchy if she were to die before him. The House of Luxemburg would consequently take Brabant. On various occasions, however, the Estates of Brabant took advantage of his blunders to have their privileges confirmed, especially after they had to pay his enormous ransom. He was then forced to renew the *Charter of Kortenberg* of 1312, the Brabantine *Magna Carta* which established a representative council of knights and townsmen²⁷.

25. S. Boffa, «Les Mariages de Jeanne de Brabant avec Guillaume de Hainaut et Wenceslas de Bohême», in *Die Erbtöchter/L'Héritière*, 181-207.

26. É. Lousse, «La Joyeuse Entrée brabançonne du 3 janvier 1356», *Schweizer Beiträge zur allgemeinen Geschichte*, 1 (1952), 139-52; R. Van Bragt, *De Blijde Inkomst van de Hertogen van Brabant Johanna en Wenceslas (3 januari 1356). Een inleidende studie en tekstuitgave*, Leuven, Nauwelaerts, 1956. On what the text became, see V. Vrancken, *De Blijde Inkomsten van de Brabantse Hertogen. Macht, opstand en privileges in de vijftiende eeuw*, Brussels, ASP Academic & Scientific Publ, 2018.

27. Fantysová-Matějková, *Wenceslas*. Joan's image is studied by K. Van't Land, «Prince ende vrouwe der lande vorscreven. Hertogin Johanna van Brabant in de ogen van haar chroniqueur», *Ex tempore*, 17 (1998), 97-118.

Enmity between man and wife went some steps further with John IV, Duke of Brabant and Jacqueline, Countess of Hainaut, Holland and Zeeland. Although joyful, the successive attempts to kidnap him or even to poison him are none of our business here²⁸. What really matters is that he met with no great success among his alleged Hainaut subjects. Nevertheless it is worth noticing in passing that he who had always been painted as a loser briefly took possession of Holland and Zeeland in 1425. To be frank, he even invaded Hainaut, where he was hated. The Estates of Hainaut twice approved of their countess's resolution to divorce from John. First in 1420, when Jacqueline on the advice of her own mother Margaret of Burgundy decided that her plate was full, since her husband had not been able to secure her northern counties from the appetite of her uncle, John of Bavaria, and had gone as far as to deprive her of her ladies-in-waiting. And once more in December 1424, when she arrived in Mons with five thousand soldiers, that she had already picked up in England alongside her new husband, Humphrey of Gloucester, King Henry V's brother, who was supposed to repulse the Brabantine army and redress the numerous injuries his lady had had to endure²⁹. Humphrey, in his turn, was but a minor part in the history of Hainaut, since he left the county four months later, never to return. He even wedded Elizabeth Cobham in

28. É. Bousmar, «Jacqueline de Bavière, empoisonneuse et tyrannicide? Considérations sur le meurtre politique au féminin entre Moyen Âge et Renaissance», *Publications du Centre européen d'Études bourguignonnes (XIV^e-XV^e s.)*, 48 (2008), 73-89; G. Lecuppre, «Fuir l'influence d'une belle-mère à poigne. Les rapt de Jean IV de Brabant», *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes*, 39 (2020), 119-32.

29. É. De Borchgrave, Art. «Jean IV», in *Biographie nationale de Belgique*, 1889, X, 275-80; the highly controversial H. P. H. Jansen, *Jacoba van Beieren*, The Hague, Kruseman, 1976; M. Boone, «Jacqueline of Bavaria in September 1425, a Lonely Princess in Ghent?», *The Ricardian: Journal of the Richard III Society*, 13 (2003), 75-85; R. Nip, «Conflicting Roles: Jacqueline of Bavaria (d. 1436), Countess and Wife», in *Saints, Scholars and Politicians. Gender as a Tool in Medieval Studies*, eds M. Van Dijk - R. Nip, Turnhout, Brepols, 2005, 189-207; A. Janse, «Jacqueline of Bavaria and John of Brabant. The Princely Body as a Political Asset», *Micrologus*, 22 (2014), 317-39; Id., *Een pion voor een dame. Jacoba van Beieren (1401-1436)*, Amsterdam, Balans, 2009; É. Bousmar, «Jacqueline de Bavière, trois comtés, quatre maris (1401-1436): l'inévitable excès d'une femme au pouvoir?», in *Femmes de pouvoir*, 385-455.

1429 after the pope's decision to annul his union with Jacqueline. It is likely he was not much regretted³⁰. Be that as it may, neither John IV nor Humphrey of Gloucester belonged to the tiny group of well accepted princes consort in the Low Countries. However, had John survived, he would have gathered a bunch of five principalities and represented a serious rival to his cousin Philip the Good.

Conclusion

In that particular area and that particular time, the position of imported prince, whether from far away or from the vicinity, was precarious enough. Most of the time, they were either short-lived or powerless or placed under duress, and often caught between the devil of French tutelage and the deep blue sea of local prerogatives. Only Philip the Bold stood out against the others and all the stars were aligned in his favour: he belonged to a remarkable family, succeeded a discredited count, was able to crush a major rebellion and to show mercy at its very end, before reviving the economy.

Generally speaking, princely husbands formed a variety of fragile rulers, little more respected than children, but related to the difficulties of female power. Their rule was a kind of concession on the part of their subjects, who mainly supported their natural princess and more or less willingly accepted the principle of a limited and conditional mandate. They acted both as representatives and as part-time or remote princes. And yet they were a useful defence for their wives. Let us briefly consider what happened to princesses once they became isolated women or widows.

In 1225, Countess Joan was almost expelled from her Estates by an impostor who passed himself off as her father Baldwin of Flanders and Hainaut, first Latin Emperor of Constantinople. She was nearly overthrown by a coalition of dissatisfied lords, boiling

30. C. M. Harker, «The Two Duchesses of Gloucester and the Rhetoric of the Feminine», *Historical Reflections/Réflexions historiques*, 30 (2004), 109-25.

cities and plotting princes. Meanwhile, Fernando was in prison and she had to beg for royal help to cope with the situation³¹.

Some decades later, her sister, the widow Countess Margaret, was faced with a full-scale civil war between the sons of her two husbands, who prematurely laid claim to her inheritance³². Margaret of Avesnes, in the mid-fourteenth century, just a few years after she had lost her husband Louis of Bavaria, had to wage war against her son William who finally extorted both Holland and Zeeland from her. Significantly, the solution she had considered was to plead her cause at the English court and, as the Hundred Years War raged, French observers feared she would marry an English prince³³.

After Wenceslaus died, Joan of Brabant, who was really affected by the loss, was progressively forced by her brother-in-law, Philip the Bold, to recognise her sister Margaret and her nephew Anthony as her successors and had to resign power in his favour³⁴.

Finally, all that Jacqueline of Bavaria could do to counter her rude uncle was to marry her cousin from Brabant; and all that she could do to resist her husband's *volte-face* was to marry once again with a stronger man – or at least so she hoped³⁵.

Princely husbands were indispensable to natural princesses. As far as they were concerned, they were neither unnatural nor supernatural actors, but temporary elements – tolerated with resignation.

31. G. Lecuppre, «Jeanne de Constantinople face au fantôme du père», in *Jeanne de Constantinople, comtesse de Flandre et de Hainaut*, ed. N. Dessaux, Paris, Somogy Éditions, 2009, 33–41.

32. Duvivier, *La Querelle*.

33. H. M. Brokken, *Het ontstaan van de Hoekse en Kabeljauwse twisten*, Zutphen, Walburg Pers, 1982.

34. Vaughan, *Philip the Bold*, 100–2.

35. Janse, *Een pion*.

ABSTRACT

Gilles Lecuppre, *Anything but Natural? Princely Husbands in the Low Countries (Thirteen-Fifteenth Century): Accepatation or Distrust?*

While the neighbouring monarchies were gradually adopting constitutions that clearly excluded women from power, the pre-Burgundian Low Countries not only allowed and accepted female succession, but demanded it. Of course, most of the time princesses and their subjects had to bear the tutelage of princes consort who were generally chosen in foreign countries, which avoided disturbing the balance of powers inside their own fiefdoms. But in this particular area and at this particular time, the position of an imported prince, whether from far away or close by, was precarious enough. Most of the time, they were either short-lived, powerless or placed under duress, and were often caught between the devil of French tutelage and the deep blue sea of local prerogatives. Only Philip the Bold stood out against the group. All in all, princely husbands were indispensable to natural princesses. As far as they were concerned, they were neither unnatural nor supernatural actors, but temporary elements – tolerated with resignation.

Gilles Lecuppre

Université catholique de Louvain
(Louvain-la-Neuve)
gilles.lecuppre@uclouvain.be