

INTRODUCTION

Approaches to Princely Power

And because in various lordships there dwell many powerful ladies, such as baronesses and great landowners, who nevertheless are not at all called ‘princesses’ – this name of ‘princess’ is not suitable save for speaking of empresses, queens, and duchesses; and although countesses are not called ‘princesses’ in every country, let us rather consider them numbered among the aforesaid princesses, because they follow quite closely on the rank of duchess according to the dignity of lands – we will speak here firstly to the said baronesses, of whom there are many in France, Brittany, and elsewhere, who would surpass many countesses in honour and power, even though the name of ‘baron’ is not so great as that of ‘count’.¹

These remarks by Christine de Pizan in her *Livre des trois vertus* (1405) might initially appear narrowly concerned with defining the role of medieval princesses, but they in fact speak to many of the difficulties inherent to the complicated phenomenon of princely power in general which the present book investigates. These issues concentrate around three primary lines. First, Christine referred to members of the highest reaches of political society, a distinct group upon whose exclusivity she insisted.² Yet she found it immediately necessary to relax this strict definition as a function of rank in favour of those who were essentially ‘close enough’. What they all had in common, Christine suggested elsewhere,

¹ ‘Et pour ce que en diverses seigneuries sont demourans plusieurs poissans dammes, si comme baronesses et grans terriennes, qui pour tant ne sont mie appelees princeps – le quel nom de princeps n’affiert estre dit ne mais des empereris, des roynes et des ducheces ... et quoy que les contesses ne soyent mie en tous païs nommees princeps, mais pour ce que elles suivent assez le renc des ducheces selon la dignité des terres, entendons d’elles ou nombre dessusdit des princeps – parlerons icy premierement aux dictes baronesses, dont assez y a en France, en Bretagne et aultre part, qui passeroient en honneur et en poissance moult de contesses, est il, quoy que le nom de baron ne soit si grant que de conte’: C. de Pizan, *Le Livre des trois vertus*, ed. C. C. Willard (Paris, 1989), 149–50.

² Cf. *ibid.*, 10.

Introduction

was their status as rulers.³ This conflicts, however, with her decision to exclude the baronesses while recognizing their status and power. Moreover, her usage in other passages of the phrase ‘roynes et princepses’ suggests a contrastive sense that designated instead the tier just below the royalty (or royal women who had not yet come to rule).⁴ Second, Christine also easily elided these princesses and their male counterparts, comparing the positions of the former by reference to the latter. While she certainly did not see princely gender as interchangeable, the similarities between many of their responsibilities as rulers meant that the power they wielded was not inevitably tied to their gender. The powerful baroness was expected to have the ‘heart of a man’ (*courage d’homme*), while Christine also stressed that some of her advice for the princess could apply equally to the prince.⁵ Finally, the potential equivalence of the ‘prince et princepsse’ was rooted in the basic principle that wives derived their status (and the wealth and authority that accompanied it) from their husbands.⁶ This relationship meant that princely power operated within a shared space, yet such collaboration did not efface the individual identities of the two rulers involved.⁷

This brief sample admirably knots together many of the coexisting and often competing norms which shaped the expectations and practice of princely power during the late Middle Ages. Individually, such strands have been explored in current scholarship on the political society of later medieval France and its neighbours, especially from the standpoint of rulers and monarchy, women’s history, and nobility and lordship. This book aims to focus on the interactions of these strands, on the balancing act between noble and royal, female and male, collective and individual. More importantly, it aims to cut across these usual categories of analysis to treat the authority of the prince from a more integrated point of view: the mutual influence of these different aspects made them fundamentally inseparable, and we can learn more about each from the study of the whole. Given the scope of this inquiry, I have chosen to use a case study as a window onto this complexity. This has the practical benefit of controlling the source material and facilitating a close attention to detail, but also demonstrates that the variability and mutability of princely power was not simply a by-product of considering the magnate class as a whole: it lay at the core of even a single individual experience of such authority.

³ ‘Haultes dames regnans en dominacion’: Pizan, *Vertus*, 10.

⁴ Ibid., 9, 28, 35, 50, 88, 121 (in addition to women at the head of principalities other than kingdoms).

⁵ Ibid., 70; ‘que ce apertient a faire non mie seulement a princepsse, mais a prince pour maintes raisons’: ibid., 150 (cf. 71, 78, 79, 132, 143).

⁶ Ibid., 12, 150.

⁷ Ibid., e.g. 33.

Introduction

For this purpose, the career of Jeanne de Penthièvre (c.1325–84) offers an especially fruitful study. By the age of 12, her parental inheritance made her a countess and *dame* of numerous territories across northern France and, as heir to her uncle Duke Jean III (r.1312–41), she had the further prospect of becoming duchess of Brittany and viscountess of Limoges. The political and material importance of her titles led to her marriage to Charles de Blois (c.1319x21–64), nephew of King Philippe VI of France (r.1328–50). But her succession to the duchy in 1341 was challenged by her half-uncle Jean de Montfort (d.1345); although the *parlement* of Paris formally accepted Jeanne and Charles' claim, support from the English King Edward III (r.1327–77) enabled Jean (and after his death, his eponymous son) to wage war against them for nearly two and a half decades, a conflict that was closely bound up with the opening struggles of the Hundred Years War. Ultimately, Jeanne's aspirations were frustrated by the death of her husband at the battle of Auray in 1364 and the installation of their rival's son as Duke Jean IV (1339–99) the following year. Nevertheless, she still had those twenty-three years to assert herself as the ruler of Brittany, and she continued to maintain and advance her interests at the highest levels of French political society for the rest of her life.

Despite its historical interest, Jeanne's rule has never been subject to in-depth analysis and represents a fresh field, so to speak, for the exploration of princely authority.⁸ Its potential stems in no small part from the continual tensions and repeated shifts that marked her rule. Jeanne's contested rulership did not fit neatly into a narrative of the rise of French principalities by which sovereign authority tried to replicate itself down the aristocratic ladder, but rather sheds light on the struggle to define the upper boundaries of the medieval elite alongside the possibilities afforded by this liminal position. As a woman exercising seigneurial power, she can help us understand how the patterns of lordship routinely accommodated both men and women with and without reference to gendered distinctions. As a co-ruler for the first half of her adult life, Jeanne's role will necessarily be set in something of a comparative context: her authority cannot be evaluated without reference to Charles' (just as his could not be dissociated from hers), offering a relational perspective that illuminates the exclusive and inclusive tendencies within lordly power structures while making clear the integrity of Jeanne's experience of power.

⁸ To date, the only scholarly works focusing specifically on Jeanne de Penthièvre (and always in comparison with her counterpart in the war, Jeanne de Flandre) are the brief surveys of F. Plaine, 'Jeanne de Penthièvre, duchesse de Bretagne, et Jeanne de Flandre, comtesse de Montfort: étude biographique et critique,' *Mémoires de la Société archéologique et historique des Côtes-du-Nord* 6 (1874), 1–47, and K. E. Sjørnsen, 'The war of the two Jeanne: Rulership in the fourteenth century,' *Medieval Feminist Forum* 51.1 (2015), 4–40.

Introduction

From this vantage point, I do not seek to establish a single definition or model of princely power. Rather, I show that there were multiple coexisting standards of princely action, and that navigating between these requirements, ideological as well as practical, was more important for the exercise of power than adhering to any single approach. This study contributes to current re-evaluations of the sociopolitical processes of the later Middle Ages, and in particular the recent emphasis on alternative possibilities (over fixed trajectories) and an integrated analytical perspective (over isolated factors). Adding princely authority to this agenda opens new perspectives on the construction of power among the nobility and demonstrates that lordship retained salience as a dynamic political category in a period more often characterized in terms of increasingly exclusive, monarchical power.

THE ANATOMY OF PRINCELY POWER: A HISTORIOGRAPHICAL PERSPECTIVE

Taking a broad perspective on the nature of princely power means drawing on several different conversations taking place within recent scholarship, which I will review here before outlining what Jeanne's case can add to this general picture. Some of the dominant narratives have been more receptive to outside currents than others, but there are certain questions which recur across these contexts and tie them together. These range from issues of chronology and change over time, to the nature of 'official' power, to the parameters of who did and did not participate in the political process. For clarity, I will here gather the threads of this scholarship under three main headings based around social lines: the monarchy, queenship, and the nobility. If these are of course not wholly distinct categories, they at least have the merit of drawing attention to some of the major avenues of approach which have contributed to this area of inquiry, and their common points help highlight some of the outstanding questions which the present study can help address.

Monarchy and Political Ideologies

Any study of princely power runs immediately into the same challenge that Christine encountered six centuries ago: there was no strict, technical definition of a 'prince' in the Middle Ages.⁹ The term was

⁹ K. Ubl, 'The concept of *princeps* in late medieval political thought: A preliminary survey,' in T. Huthwelker, J. Peltzer, and M. Wemhöner (eds.), *Princely Rank in Late Medieval Europe: Trodden Paths and Promising Avenues* (Ostfildern, 2011), 259–80.

The Anatomy of Princely Power: A Historiographical Perspective

used indiscriminately of kings and queens and of the great lords and ladies who held their lands from the monarch.¹⁰ The *Très Ancienne Coutume* of Brittany (c.1312–25) even spoke of the ‘duke of Brittany and the other princes of the duchy’.¹¹ Furthermore, prerogatives such as delivering justice, owning land, and commanding service of others were replicated all the way up and down the ladder of the medieval nobility (if not always cast in comparable terms).¹² At the same time, Christine asserted that such a definition existed, even if it was far from perfect, and a strict demarcation is not a prerequisite to the study of the phenomenon, as John Watts has observed: ‘the “prince” was, after all, a recognised, if somewhat indistinct, grade of society’.¹³

Despite this fluidity, the medieval prince has, particularly in scholarship on France, been largely bound to the model of the king, perhaps in part because dedicated in-depth studies are relatively few. Certainly, the royal paradigm, as the quintessence of rulership, invited emulation by other powerful French lords. The princes of Burgundy and indeed, of Brittany in the fifteenth century, as well as those of Armagnac, Foix/Béarn, Bourbon, and others, not only operated on a political level comparable to their French overlords (to whom many were moreover closely related), but mirrored much of their ceremonial and ideologies.¹⁴ Late medieval France was less a unified polity than a network of ‘states within states’, of principalities less consequential than the kingdom but to varying degrees

¹⁰ M. Pacaut, ‘Recherche sur les termes “princeps, principatus, prince, principauté” au Moyen-Âge,’ in *Les Principautés au Moyen-Âge* (Bordeaux, 1979), 22–3; R. Fossier, ‘Sur les principautés médiévales particulièrement en France,’ in *Principautés*, 10–11. This usage applied both in works of political theory and in administrative practice.

¹¹ ‘Duc de Bretagne et des autres princes de la Duchie’: *TAC*, no. 221 (numbered paragraphs in this source refer to the text of the *coutume* itself, otherwise page numbers will be used); cf. J. Kerhervé (ed.), introduction to *Noblesses de Bretagne du Moyen Âge à nos jours* (Rennes, 1999), 17.

¹² J. Watts, *The Making of Politics: Europe, 1300–1500* (Cambridge, 2009), 71, 78; cf. P. Contamine, ‘La Seigneurie en France à la fin du Moyen Âge: quelques problèmes généraux,’ in *Seigneurs et seigneuries au Moyen Âge: actes du 117e Congrès national des sociétés savantes* (Paris, 1993), 22.

¹³ Watts, *Politics*, 95; cf. A. M. Spencer, *Nobility and Kingship in Medieval England: The Earls and Edward I, 1272–1307* (Cambridge, 2014), 10.

¹⁴ See for example B.-A. Pocquet du Haut-Jussé, *Deux fœdaux: Bourgogne et Bretagne (1363–1491)* (Paris, 1935); P. Tucco-Chala, *La Vicomté de Béarn et le problème de sa souveraineté des origines à 1620* (Bordeaux, 1961); R. Vaughan, *Philip the Good: The Apogee of Burgundy*, 2nd ed. (1970; Woodbridge, 2002); B. Guillemain, preface to *Les Principautés au Moyen-Âge* (Bordeaux, 1979), 7; M. Jones, ‘The crown and the provinces in the fourteenth century,’ in D. Potter (ed.), *France in the Later Middle Ages 1200–1500* (Oxford, 2002), 61–89; G. Small, ‘The crown and the provinces in the fifteenth century,’ in Potter, *France*, 130–54; D. J. D. Boulton and J. R. Veenstra (eds.), *The Ideology of Burgundy: The Promotion of National Consciousness, 1364–1565* (Leiden, 2006); G. Small, *Late Medieval France* (Basingstoke, 2009), 213–14; P. Charon, *Princes et principautés au Moyen Âge: l'exemple de la principauté d'Évreux, 1298–1412* (Paris, 2014), 307–40.

Introduction

autonomous.¹⁵ Historians have therefore prioritized attempts to pinpoint the origins of these royalizing tendencies, at the expense of exploring other ideologies and expectations relevant to princely individuals.¹⁶ The comparison between the duke and the king, however, was problematic, and for more than political reasons. Although French royal authority expanded over the course of the Middle Ages, Susan Reynolds has questioned the assumption that the king was ever considered merely first among peers.¹⁷ It is significant that, for all their pretensions, these princes did not attempt to transform their titles to actually claim kingship.¹⁸ The nature of kingly authority, in particular, was idealized and discussed much more than that of the rest of the nobility.¹⁹ These fissures suggest that our understanding of princely power should not be limited to the royalizing trajectories that are fully visible only in retrospect: princes were not only princes when they achieved this state, or insofar as they worked to achieve it. In this, scholarship on the development of German principalities proves a useful guide, since the relative weakness of the royal model in that political space has led to a more explicit recognition of the diversity (as well as the common points) of princely experiences. If quasi-royal tendencies have not gone unremarked there either, the emphasis has been placed on the lack of a concerted princely programme towards any specific, teleologically identified objective.²⁰ This open approach has shed

¹⁵ P. S. Lewis, *Later Medieval France: The Polity* (London, 1968); B. Guenée, *L'Occident aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles: les États* (Paris, 1971); M.-T. Caron, *Noblesse et pouvoir royal en France, XIII^e–XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1994); Small, *France*, 35–50.

¹⁶ Cf. Watts, *Polities*, 11, on the 'search for the origins of the new'. For this French narrative in a European context, see the discussions in B. Demotz (ed.), *Les Principautés dans l'Occident médiéval* (Turnhout, 2007). On some of the difficulties that come with assuming a royal, statelike model, see É. Lecuppre-Desjardins, *Le Royaume inachevé des ducs de Bourgogne (XIV^e–XV^e siècles)* (Paris, 2016), esp. 13–18. Conversely, Bisson has emphasized the nobility of high medieval princes over their regality: T. N. Bisson, 'Princely nobility in an age of ambition (c. 1050–1150),' in A. J. Duggan (ed.), *Nobles and Nobility in Medieval Europe: Concepts, Origins, Transformations* (Woodbridge, 2000), 101–13.

¹⁷ S. Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900–1300*, 2nd ed. (1984; Oxford, 1997), xlviii. Cf. Lewis, *Polity*, 85; R. A. Jackson, *Vive Le Roi! A History of the French Coronation from Charles V to Charles X* (Chapel Hill, 1984); R. Cazelles, *Société politique, noblesse et couronne sous Jean le Bon et Charles V* (Geneva, 1982); J. Krynen, *L'Empire du roi: idées et croyances politiques en France, XIII^e–XV^e siècle* (Paris, 1993).

¹⁸ Watts, *Polities*, 72.

¹⁹ Four influential studies are D. Delogu, *Theorizing the Ideal Sovereign: The Rise of the French Vernacular Royal Biography* (Toronto, 2008); J. Krynen, *Idéal du prince et pouvoir royal en France à la fin du Moyen Âge (1380–1440): étude de la littérature politique du temps* (Paris, 1981); E. A. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1957); M. Bloch, *Les Rois thaumaturges: étude sur le caractère surnaturel attribué à la puissance royale particulièrement en France et en Angleterre* (1924; repr., Paris, 1961).

²⁰ J. Rogge, 'The growth of princely authority: Themes and problems,' in G. A. Loud and J. Schenk (eds.), *The Origins of the German Principalities, 1100–1350: Essays by German Historians* (London, 2017), 24–5; W. Hechberger, 'Princely lordship in the reign of Frederick Barbarossa,' in Loud

The Anatomy of Princely Power: A Historiographical Perspective

light on the resilience and adaptability of the nobility, and in so doing encourages a reconsideration of French princely power that does not rely on the monarchy as the dominant explanatory mechanism.

It is also problematic to use royal power as a metric for its princely counterpart when kingship itself was not monolithic, but encompassed a range of possible models of power. The shared background of Anglo-French political theory nevertheless led to substantively different outcomes for the two monarchs in the late medieval period.²¹ Conversely, even within a single royal tradition, different modes of ruling could yield successful results.²² The relative positions, relationships, and interests of the king and the rest of political society have therefore been increasingly subject to revision in recent scholarship. Justine Firnhaber-Baker has compared the incidence of seigneurial war in the Languedoc region alongside royal policy on such warfare to challenge both the classification of this war as 'private' and the idea that it was uniformly treated by the French kings as illegitimate; instead, she found that this war could constitute an accepted form of distributed power when used in support of public order, and served the purposes of both lords and king.²³ Across the Channel, following an agenda first advocated by Bruce McFarlane, there has been a well-developed interest in the power vested in local nobilities that counterbalances England's reputation as a remarkably centralized kingdom.²⁴ The increasing emphasis among continuators of this approach on the ongoing renegotiation of sociopolitical ideas, from the nature of rank to the shape of the polity, has done much to open new perspectives on the role of the king.²⁵ The complicated co-evolution of monarchic and noble power challenges a simple top-down analogy from the one to

and Schenk, *German Principalities*, 40, 59; B. Arnold, *Princes and Territories in Medieval Germany* (Cambridge, 1991), esp. 17, 211–12, 219, 281–2, 284; and, in a comparative context with England, the essays in Huthwelker, Peltzer, and Wemhöner, *Princely Rank*.

²¹ C. T. Wood, *Joan of Arc and Richard III: Sex, Saints, and Government in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1988); E. Powell, *Kingship, Law, and Society: Criminal Justice in the Reign of Henry V* (Oxford, 1989).

²² C. Carpenter, *The Wars of the Roses: Politics and the Constitution in England, c. 1437–1509* (Cambridge, 1997), 65–6.

²³ J. Firnhaber-Baker, *Violence and the State in Languedoc, 1250–1400* (Cambridge, 2014).

²⁴ K. B. McFarlane, *The Nobility of Later Medieval England: The Ford Lectures for 1953 and Related Studies* (Oxford, 1980); and for a more recent synthesis, G. Harriss, *Shaping the Nation: England, 1360–1461*, *The New Oxford History of England* 7 (Oxford, 2005).

²⁵ G. Harriss (ed.), *Henry V: The Practice of Kingship* (Oxford, 1985); C. Given-Wilson, *The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages: The Fourteenth-Century Political Community* (London, 1987); Powell, *Justice*; C. Carpenter, *Locality and Polity: A Study of Warwickshire Landed Society 1401–1499* (Cambridge, 1992); J. Watts, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship* (Cambridge, 1996); Spencer, *Earls*. For a concise and effective survey of the historiographical implications of this approach, see R. Davies, 'The medieval state: The tyranny of a concept?', *Journal of Historical Sociology* 16 (2003), 280–300.

Introduction

the other: the influence was mutual.²⁶ More importantly, since kingship itself did not have a single fixed and independent trajectory, any parallel between the king and the prince must reflect the complexity of royal rule in a way that has not typically been the case in France.

Better still, the ongoing reassessment of these social dynamics should be extended to princes in their own right, for their position in the social hierarchy had distinctive implications for contemporary perceptions of the shape of political power. Although Europe in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was characterized by processes above and below kingdoms, and by different expressions of statelike (or less-statelike) power structures, Watts has noted

the failure of most [medieval] works of political reflection to allow for subsidiary political units ... which were not sovereign, or independent, but formed part of larger wholes. A parallel uncertainty concerned the role of great territorial lords, ecclesiastical princes and the leaders of municipalities in the governments of kings and princes.²⁷

The discrepancy, however, is less between the norm and the messy reality, but between prescriptive norms and implicit norms. The position of these subsidiary powers was no less recognized for not being included in works of political theory; it merely adhered to other standards than those discussed in these texts. Nor was navigating this variability an unconscious process. Watts has emphasized the advantages of engaging in a give-and-take of prerogatives between different social strata: kings could benefit from increasing the power of their subjects, and subjects could benefit from acknowledging royal authority. He observes that from moment to moment it could make ‘more sense to play the subject or play the ruler’.²⁸ Appearances of ‘uncertainty’ thus came less from the lack of an ideal than from the presence of multiple, contingent possibilities, and these could readily be turned to advantage rather than confusion. It would be a mistake to reduce the options afforded to princes by their ambivalent social position to a single inflexible agenda.

In coming to terms with this web of medieval sociopolitical dynamics, the choice of perspective is essential. There were, for one thing, multiple

²⁶ Again, some German historians have proved more willing to model a cooperative distribution of power between princes and kings, and in a way which has revised understandings of princely power itself: Hechberger, ‘Princely lordship,’ 53; Arnold, *Princes*, 72–3, 202–9, conclusion.

²⁷ Watts, *Politics*, 262.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 203–4 (cf. 73, 91, 208, 272). Cf. J. Bianchini, *The Queen’s Hand: Power and Authority in the Reign of Berenguela of Castile* (Philadelphia, 2012), 9, on the ‘symbiosis’ between the nobility and the crown, and Given-Wilson, *English Nobility*, 172–3, on regional reciprocity in England.

The Anatomy of Princely Power: A Historiographical Perspective

prescriptive norms: political writings gave one version, but law another (and law itself contained many competing views, much to the delight of contemporary lawyers). Moreover, we should not give greater weight to explicitly formulated ideas than to implicit ideologies which nonetheless demanded an equal degree of conformity. Otto Oexle has argued that ‘in order to understand the interrelationship between social structures and their “notion of themselves”, we must account for three circumstances: (1) the given social reality, (2) the image people have of it, and (3) the behavior of people that results from this image, which in turn creates and shapes reality’.²⁹ We might go further to point out that reality, image, and behavior should each be plural: the underlying cross-pollination ensured that no stage could be governed by a single norm exclusively, although there were of course patterns of emphasis. The results of this process were very visible in the social spectrum with which I began above: the gradients of power that separated kingdoms from petty lordships operated in part because of the internal feedback of the system as a whole.³⁰ Prioritizing only the most visible social models in interpreting the operative space of princely power imposes an orderliness on this dynamism that was more illusory than substantive.

Queenship and the Distribution of Power

Much of the most innovative work done on women and power in the Middle Ages has taken place under the auspices of the study of queenship, a field which has grown significantly in recent decades and which, thanks to its re-evaluation of monarchic power structures alone, must be considered integral to the study of medieval power even beyond the purview of gender studies. The idea that certain qualities and experiences transcended those of any one queen was first advanced by Françoise Barry’s comparison of French queens across the Ancien Régime.³¹ Since then, many of the themes which she identified, from court ceremony to household administration, cycles of power to position in law, have been more fully fleshed out.³² The most significant developments for the

²⁹ O. G. Oexle, ‘Perceiving social reality in the early and high Middle Ages,’ in B. Jussen (ed.), *Ordering Medieval Society: Perspectives on Intellectual and Practical Modes of Shaping Social Relations*, trans. P. Selwyn (Philadelphia, 2001), 94.

³⁰ Watts, *Polities*, 97.

³¹ F. Barry, *La Reine de France* (Paris, 1964).

³² Three important essay collections are J. C. Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (1993; repr., New York, 1998); K. Nolan (ed.), *Capetian Women* (New York, 2003); and Z. E. Rohr and L. Benz (eds.), *Queenship, Gender, and Reputation in the Medieval and Early Modern West, 1060–1600* (New York, 2016); see also the work of M. Gaudé-Ferragu, *La Reine au Moyen Âge: le pouvoir au féminin, XIVe–XVe siècle* (Paris, 2014).

Introduction

present study, however, have concerned the place of the queen within the wider framework of the monarchy. A few years after Barry, Marion Facinger focused on the Capetian queens to the early thirteenth century to further the appreciation of the queen's role as a partner in royal government, although she posited a decline in their official participation by the time of Philippe Auguste.³³ This was not arbitrary, for the rise of bureaucratic administration and the separation of the queen's household from the king's divorced her domestic sphere from politics.³⁴ But Miriam Shadis, among others, has argued against this model, which relied on an ahistorical distinction between public and private that led Facinger to downplay later queens' roles too much.³⁵ Indeed, the study of post-Capetian queens has also called attention to the importance of French queens regent, a 'vocation' which, André Poulet argues, stemmed from the entrenchment of queenly power in her dynastic role.³⁶

In light of these developments, we must consider how these important insights might or might not apply to a non-royal context, and what benefits accrue from moving with similar questions beyond the boundaries of royalty. It is particularly striking that Amalie Föbel, after framing a conversation about the political action of medieval noblewomen, goes on to focus on queens instead: this not only takes for granted that what is said of queens pertains to all women of power, but suggests how difficult it can be to leave the framework of monarchy.³⁷ To some extent the isolated study of queens and queenship is justified. In France in particular, the exclusion of female royal heirs in the fourteenth century *did* increase the divide between the male and female monarch, and between the queen and the rest of the nobility.³⁸ Elite heiresses like Jeanne, or her

³³ M. Facinger, 'A study of medieval queenship: Capetian France, 987–1237,' *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 5 (1968), 46 and passim. This tallied with Barry's identification of a change in queenship after the thirteenth century: Barry, *Reine*, 263.

³⁴ Facinger, 'Queenship,' esp. 46.

³⁵ M. Shadis, 'Blanche of Castile and Facinger's "Medieval Queenship": Reassessing the argument,' in Nolan, *Capetian Women*, 137–61.

³⁶ A. Poulet, 'Capetian women and the regency: The genesis of a vocation,' in Parsons, *Medieval Queenship*, 93–116. Cf. E. McCartney, 'Ceremonies and privileges of office: Queenship in late medieval France,' in J. Carpenter and S.-B. MacLean (eds.), *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women* (Urbana, 1995), esp. 185ff.; C. Taylor, 'The Salic law, French queenship, and the defense of women in the late Middle Ages,' *French Historical Studies* 29 (2006), esp. 556ff.; R. Gibbons, 'Isabeau de Bavière: reine de France ou "lieutenant-général" du royaume?,' in É. Bousmar et al. (eds.), *Femmes de pouvoir, femmes politiques durant les derniers siècles du Moyen Âge et au cours de la première Renaissance* (Brussels, 2012), 101–12.

³⁷ A. Föbel, 'The political tradition of female rulership in medieval Europe,' in J. M. Bennett and R. M. Karras (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Women and Gender in Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 2013), 68–83.

³⁸ P. Viollet, 'Comment les femmes ont été exclues, en France, de la succession à la couronne,' *Mémoires de l'Institut national de France* 34.2 (1895), 125–78; C. Taylor, 'The Salic law and the Valois