



## Normandy and the Council of Basel

C. T. Allmand

*Speculum*, Vol. 40, No. 1. (Jan., 1965), pp. 1-14.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0038-7134%28196501%2940%3A1%3C1%3ANATCOB%3E2.0.CO%3B2-M>

*Speculum* is currently published by Medieval Academy of America.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/medacad.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# SPECULUM

## A JOURNAL OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

---

---

Vol. XL

JANUARY 1965

No. 1

---

---

### NORMANDY AND THE COUNCIL OF BASEL

BY C. T. ALLMAND

#### I

THE Council of Basel was not only a council of the Holy Roman Church. It was one of the largest international assemblies of late mediaeval Europe, where not only cardinals, bishops, priests, and theologians but also the lay representatives of secular rulers met, using the assembly as a forum for settling their religious and political disputes.

The part played by certain countries, among them France and England, in the events of these years has already been studied. We now propose a further short study, that of the relations between the Council of Basel and the duchy of Normandy, nominally part of France, but in fact governed by the English since 1418, when they had won control of it by conquest.

Interests and policies at the council frequently conflicted. The English administration in Normandy gave qualified support to the papacy, but in the duchy, as in the University of Paris which the English also controlled, there existed a conciliarist spirit which had to be held within reasonable bounds. It was here that attitudes towards the council were influenced by political factors, and the English, although favoring some reforms, were obliged to support the side of authority, the papacy. It would have been politically dangerous to act otherwise.

It must further be recalled that the pontificate of Eugenius IV was witnessing the final stages of the Hundred Years War. Yet it was difficult to agree to conditions for peace. Neither of the participants would give way. In the midst of this diplomatic battle, fought at Basel and Arras, was Normandy. Plainly she was involved in that side of the council's work.

Above all there was the realization that war was not simply a matter of politics. There were greater issues at stake, issues involving not only persons and institutions, but also theories of ecclesiastical and civil government. Such, in brief, was the background to events now to be described.

#### II

"We demand of your Grace," wrote Pope Eugenius IV to John, duke of Bedford, regent of France for the English, probably in the first half of 1432, "with

paternal charity and respectfully request that you may not allow innovations to take root or scandals to arise. And if by chance there should be occurrences from which either the royal Highness or your Excellency should suffer, and over which we may have some control, you may in all confidence write to us."<sup>1</sup> The tone of the letter was friendly, yet it contained a definite warning. Eugenius, confronted with the harsh reality of a general council of the church which he, involved in war within his own territory, could not properly control, was facing the first crisis of his turbulent pontificate.

His attempt to dissolve the council and transfer it from Basel, where it was sitting, to the more congenial territory of Bologna, had not been successful. On 11 February 1432 he had written to several princes and bishops, criticizing those who were assembled at Basel and summoning them to Bologna. One such letter, destined for the duke of Bedford,<sup>2</sup> asked him to order any of his representatives, or *oratores*, to leave Basel and proceed at once to the new council, where reform and the extirpation of heresy might be attempted. Bedford, however, never undertook what the pope had requested him to do: hence the rather anxious tone of the letter quoted above, written probably a few months later. Was Bedford inclined to support the fathers at Basel? Eugenius might have reason to think so, and his desire that the regent should not favor innovations would be a roundabout way of warning him not to support the conciliar theories with which the fathers were beginning to oppose the pope.

Although he had been pope rather less than a year, Eugenius IV must have been familiar with the recent history of proconciliar activity in the lands under the regent's administration, and with Bedford's ecclesiastical policy during the decade since the death of Henry V. He would have known that in 1425, a year or so after the ending of the Council of Siena, the English had become insistent in their demands that a general council should soon be summoned, and that Bedford had sent the abbot of Ourscamp to Rome in November to address Martin V and the College of Cardinals on the need for reform.<sup>3</sup> He would also have been aware that Bedford had, at the same time, posed as the defender of the "Gallican" liberties, and had adopted the radical demands of that position, including that of free capitular elections and a system of clerical patronage not subject to papal control. True, this stand had been of short duration, and the pope and regent were once again on the best of terms. But conciliar ideas persisted, especially in the minds of members of the "royal daughter," the University of Paris. With the approach of the year 1431, and the consequent likelihood, if the terms of the decree *Frequens* of the Council of Constance were observed, that a new general

<sup>1</sup> "Quare Nobilitatem tuam cum paterna caritate requirimus et affectuose rogamus ut non patiaris fieri novitates et scandala suscitari. Et, si aliqua forte sint propter que Celsitudo regia vel tua Excellentia perturbetur, super quibus per nos provisio fieri possit, nobis confidenter scribas" (Arch[ivio] Vat[icano], Arm. XXXIX, 6, f. 189; N. Valois, *La crise religieuse du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle: Le Pape et le Concile, 1418-1450* [Paris, 1909], I, 201, n. 2).

<sup>2</sup> Geneva, Bibl. Publique et Universitaire, MS. lat. 27, no. 1.

<sup>3</sup> B.M., MS. Cleopatra E. III, ff. 26-30; B(ibliothèque) N(ationale), N. acqs. fr. 7626, f. 473; Valois, *Le Pape et le Concile*, I, 84: Valois described Bedford at this time as the "défenseur zélé" of the "Gallican" liberties.

council would be summoned, the more active the Parisian doctors became. They wrote to Cardinal Beaufort to seek his support in bringing pressure to bear on the papacy to summon the council.<sup>4</sup> The chapter of Rouen cathedral, many of whose members were graduates of the university, and the synod of the ecclesiastical province of Sens, prepared to lend support to the cause.<sup>5</sup>

Yet, after the council had been active for some three years, John of Ragusa could write that in spite of her activity in the late 1420s, and of letters imploring the king to send an embassy to Basel, England had not chosen to take any part in the council's deliberations.<sup>6</sup> It is now known why England acted in this way.<sup>7</sup> How did the rulers of Normandy view the Council of Basel?

Like his brother Henry V, John of Lancaster, duke of Bedford, was a man of deeply orthodox religious convictions who, in England, had helped to suppress Lollardy. As a ruler he was able and astute, a moderate and a *politique*. When Henry V died, tragically and unexpectedly, in the late summer of 1422, Bedford inherited for his nephew the land of France, or at least those parts which had come under English control by treaty or conquest. In fact, if not in name, he was now the ruler of the English lands across the sea.

A stable political situation in Normandy demanded the proper application of the concordat which Martin V had negotiated with the French nation at Constance in the spring of 1418, an agreement which was to remain valid for a period of five years. It made the papacy and the king the two main patrons of the higher grades of the clergy, while the local patrons were granted only a smaller, less valuable share of ecclesiastical appointments. The terms favored university graduates, and on many occasions the lower clergy voiced their opposition to the system in the court of the *Parlement de Paris*.<sup>8</sup> This criticism increased as it became obvious that Martin V was intent, with the connivance of Henry V,<sup>9</sup> to stretch his rights to their limits. Bedford began quietly, co-operating with the pope in appointing to the archbishopric of Rouen in 1423, in spite of the chapter having canonically elected another candidate. Later, in 1424, with the assistance of the English delegation, he helped to bring about the early dissolution of the Council of Siena, which Martin V had been unwillingly obliged to summon in accordance with the terms of the fateful decree *Frequens*.<sup>10</sup> Nothing would indicate that the regent was anti-papal, or that he seriously favored conciliar theory.

<sup>4</sup> H. S. Denifle and A. Châtelain, *Auctuarium Chartularii Universitatis Parisiensis* (Paris, 1897), II, 416.

<sup>5</sup> Seine-M(aritime), G. 2126, ff. 89<sup>v</sup>, 90, 92<sup>v</sup>; S. Luce, *Jeanne d'Arc à Domremy* (Paris, 1886), p. 239.

<sup>6</sup> "Et valde admirandum, quod cum prefatus dominus rex pro acceleratione dicti concilii Basiliensis ferventissime laboraverit, nunc jam quasi per triennium, eodem stante et congregato concilio, tepuerit, et licet saepissime per hoc sacrum concilium imploratus fuerit per solemnes ambasiatores et epistolas, nullus tamen adhuc suo nomine comparuit, qui se huic sacro concilio incorporaret" (*Monumenta Conciliorum Generalium seculi decimi quinti* [Vienna, 1857], I, 65).

<sup>7</sup> A. N. E. D. Schofield, "England and the Council of Basel" (unpublished London Ph.D. thesis, 1956).

<sup>8</sup> Archives N(ationales), X<sup>ba</sup>. 68, ff. 5<sup>v</sup>-6<sup>v</sup>; X<sup>1a</sup>. 1481, f. 29<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> Henry V had decided not to impose the Statute of Provisors in Normandy (E. F. Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century* [Oxford, 1961], p. 199).

<sup>10</sup> E. F. Jacob, *Essays in the Conciliar Epoch* (Manchester, 1953), pp. 54-55.

What followed, therefore, was unexpected. After the ending of the Council of Siena, the chief French delegate, the archbishop of Rouen, travelled to Rome to present certain requests to the pope on behalf of the duke of Bedford. These were in no way extreme, and cannot be taken as such. It was reasonable to request that only suitable and loyal persons be appointed to offices and benefices in Normandy, and that the regent should have some say in the matter: that, on account of the war, certain ecclesiastical cases be judged locally, and that annates should be partly remitted, or payment at least delayed. The possibility of reform was also mentioned.<sup>11</sup>

From what is known of Bedford's character and the situation in which he found himself, it is difficult to deduce active support for the old "Gallican" cause, or to detect a real desire to mar the hitherto good relations with Rome. Had he wished to make a firm stand for the "Gallican" principles, or to injure the papacy's influence in Normandy, Bedford could easily have done so, assured as he was of the support of the *parlement*, a body anti-papal by tradition. Yet when the pope answered in a manner considered vague and unsatisfactory, Bedford nonetheless decided to assume the role of defender of the "Gallican" liberties.

Although scarcely convinced of the truth of his cause, the regent may have been trying to improve his bargaining position with Rome. The concordat of 1418 had recently expired, and he probably hoped, by means of an extreme and uncharacteristic act, to wring further concessions from the pope. In this he was to be disappointed. Martin kept his nerve and acted boldly. He himself soon proposed to regulate ecclesiastical appointments by a new agreement whose terms were even more favorable to the papacy; at the end of 1425 the Burgundian party in the *Grand Conseil* in Paris, an element pro-papal by sympathy and self-interest, prevailed upon the regent to accept these conditions and be received back into the papal fold. From then on, for several years, relations were friendly:<sup>12</sup> appointments were made which were to Bedford's liking: amicable letters were exchanged between Rome and Paris, and the Burgundian councillors there received the pope's personal thanks for what they had done on his behalf.<sup>13</sup>

Thus stood the situation at the beginning of 1431; the regent and the papacy on good terms, but with memories of past discords still existing: the University of Paris, with the backing of the chapter of Rouen cathedral and others, demanding that a general council be called. On 1 February the pope finally authorized Cardinal Cesarini, on his way to lead an expedition against the Hussites, to preside over the council, which was summoned to meet at Basel. Three weeks later, on 20 February, Martin V died.

The council's beginnings were inauspicious. There was consternation and doubt

<sup>11</sup> A.N., P. 2298, pp. 815-825.

<sup>12</sup> E.g., two extracts from letters written by the pope about this time to the duke of Bedford: ". . . jucundissima nobis est commemoratio nominis tui" (Arch. Vat., Arm. XXXIX, 4, ff. 245<sup>v</sup>-247): "Si ergo cognoveris nos tibi et tuis posse proficere, confidenter scribas et tibi persuadeas nos te amare in intimis caritatis nostre visceribus collocatum" (A.N., LL<sup>4a</sup>, f. 125). See also J. Haller, *England und Rom unter Martin V.* (Rome, 1905), p. 53.

<sup>13</sup> Arch. Vat., Arm. XXXIX, 4, f. 291; Arm. XXXIX, 6, f. 162; A.N., LL<sup>4a</sup>, ff. 64<sup>v</sup>, 126<sup>v</sup>.

as to what would happen under the new pontificate. The duke of Bedford preferred to play a waiting game; he could do little else since Normandy was at the time ruled by the royal council which had accompanied the young Henry VI to France for his coronation. The University of Paris, however, was allowed to send a delegation to Basel, and it proved to be one of the first to arrive.<sup>14</sup> Cesarini, having been defeated by the Hussites, only came some five months later, and on 12 November was given power to dissolve the existing council and summon a new one at Bologna, a papal city.<sup>15</sup> Involved in war around Rome and wracked by illness, Eugenius had what he considered to be a plausible excuse for summoning the fathers to a place within his own sphere of influence. But the papal instrument of dissolution provoked an outcry at Basel: the fathers had no hesitation in deciding to stay where they were, and bitterly criticized the pope. The struggle with Rome now started in earnest.

Bedford, once again in sole command in France, had not yet decided which side to favor; he certainly could not, with complete ease of conscience, totally disregard the papal dissolution of the council. Like Shakespeare's Cressida, he may have thought that "achievement is command: ungain'd beseech"; he would not yet show his hand. Both sides sought to win him. On 11 February 1432 Eugenius wrote asking him to order those under his authority to forsake Basel for Bologna where, it was added, they might better see to the regent's affairs.<sup>16</sup> Bedford did not comply with this request, for the letter probably never reached him.<sup>17</sup> At the same time he was subjected to other pressures. In February and March 1432 the fathers sent two envoys to Paris to seek the support of the "Gallican"-minded *Parlement*, and to ask it to petition the king, prelates, and others vitally concerned to take a positive interest in conciliar activities. On 7 April the *parlement* decided to seek support for the council from the duke of Bedford,<sup>18</sup> who himself soon granted an audience to Nicholas Lami, an envoy from Basel. On 21 April the regent wrote the first of two surviving letters to the fathers, in a friendly and conciliating tone, seeming to wish them well. He had, he said, heard about the continuation of the council from Lami, whom he now authorized, together with one Henri de Bièvre, to explain his views to the fathers. He ended by invoking the aid of the Holy Spirit upon their deliberations.<sup>19</sup> On 13 June Lami, back from his mission, submitted his report.<sup>20</sup>

What may have been Bedford's views at this moment in the spring of 1432? If there were some, at Basel through hope, in Rome through fear, who thought that he had a bias towards conciliar theory, the responsibility was largely his. In 1424 he had put forward suggestions for reform, but these had been brushed aside, only

<sup>14</sup> *Monumenta Conciliorum*, I, 70-71.

<sup>15</sup> Geneva, Bibl. Publique et Universitaire, MS. lat. 27, no. 5.

<sup>16</sup> Geneva, Bibl. Publique et Universitaire, MS. lat. 27, no. 1.

<sup>17</sup> Schofield, "England and the Council of Basel," p. 61.

<sup>18</sup> A.N., X<sup>1a</sup>. 1481, f. 54<sup>v</sup>; Valois, *Le Pape et le Concile*, I, 200, n. 3.

<sup>19</sup> Grenoble, Bibl. Municipale, MS. 1059, ff. 12<sup>v</sup>-13.

<sup>20</sup> J. Haller, *Concilium Basiliense: Studien und Quellen zur Geschichte des Concils von Basel* (Basel, 1897), II, 141.

to be followed by an outburst of "Gallicanism," with demands that a general council be quickly summoned. If this did not amount to conciliarism, it nevertheless expressed sympathy with some of the aims of the council fathers.

Further evidence of this pro-conciliar leaning is to be found in the second letter which Bedford wrote to the council in the spring of 1432. In it he described the fathers as "Amici carissimi," and expressed the hope that the work which they had begun might be brought to a happy conclusion.<sup>21</sup> As an orthodox, and especially as an English prince, Bedford was interested mainly in matters of reform, which he had himself mooted in 1424, the extirpation of heresy, and the important matter of reunion with the Greeks. That was as far as his support for the aims of the council would take him. The continual attacks which the fathers launched on the papacy deeply shocked him.

Bedford was thus in sympathy with some of the council's aims: others of its activities distressed him. He could not associate himself, either openly or secretly, with the attacks being launched upon the papal authority. The ecclesiastical settlement in Normandy, which was an important foundation of his secular power, depended upon the goodwill of the papacy. He could not attack Rome without the risk of undermining his own authority, an authority which sometimes showed signs of weakness. His best policy was to do nothing. Yet he was clearly reluctant to prevent those territories over which he ruled from being represented at Basel. Although Normandy, unlike England, might not send an official delegation, Bedford probably felt that the clergy should be allowed to go to the council.<sup>22</sup>

The University of Paris and the chapter of Rouen cathedral were quickly in the field, while the bishop of Coutances, who was to spend the remainder of his life in the council's service, was one of the first prelates to arrive at Basel.<sup>23</sup> Early in February 1432 Bedford had informed the Rouen chapter that the council was to continue,<sup>24</sup> in spite of the pope's bull of dissolution. The regent may have been influenced by a bull of Cardinal Cesarini, dated 5 November 1431, summoning the archbishop of Rouen, his suffragans, and those clergy entitled to attend, to come to Basel with the utmost speed, and he may have decided not to stand in their way.<sup>25</sup> Yet the reaction had scarcely been an exodus to the city by the Rhine. Indeed, so dissatisfied were the fathers by the results of this appeal that, realizing that the regent was unlikely to lend them active support in their struggle with the papacy, they dispatched a further letter to Rouen, stressing the duty of the pre-

<sup>1</sup> Douai, Bibl. Municipale, MS. 198(ii), ff. 91<sup>v</sup>-92; J. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Venice, 1792), xxx, 129-131: "... cupiens exitum felicem rerum per vos salubriter inceptarum . . ." Further evidence of Bedford's desire to co-operate with the council on matters of reform is in A.N., X<sup>1a</sup>, 8605, f. 24<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>22</sup> A conciliar decree of 15 February 1432 had declared that no one could legally be prevented from attending the council (J. Gill, *Eugenius IV, Pope of Christian Union* [London, 1962], p. 44).

<sup>23</sup> "Et nest a oublier messire Jehan (*sic*) de Montjeu, de la nation de Bourgongne, evesque de Coustance en Normandie, legat du concile de Basle, qui mourut en executant sa legation en la ville de Prague, lan de nostreseigneur mille iij<sup>e</sup> xl" (B.N., MS. fr. 947, f. 183).

<sup>24</sup> Seine-Mme., G. 2126, f. 149<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>25</sup> Seine-Mme., G. 3613. See *Monumenta Conciliorum*, I, 124: "Tunc dominus Philibertus [de Montjeu] . . . obtulit equum et expensas pro uno nuntio usque ad Normanniam pro praelatis vocandis et citandis" (30 October 1431).

ates and clergy of the province to attend.<sup>26</sup> Although the archbishop of Rouen, the bishop of Evreux, and other clergy, some representing several interests, left for Basel the following summer, the results of the appeal can scarcely have been considered successful by the fathers. Bedford's policy of inactivity had achieved what he wanted.

The regent's sympathy for the council was therefore expressed by not preventing those who wished to go from going. Normandy was thus represented, in an unofficial way. Why not, then, in an official manner, as England was soon to be? It is not sufficient to state that Bedford was shocked by the council's anti-papal attitude and disappointed by the lack of reform in which he was undoubtedly interested. The real reason was a political one; unlike England, Normandy was probably never invited to send an official delegation, as the fathers did not recognize the division of France brought about by the Treaty of Troyes, signed in 1420. Since they enjoyed the active support of the Valois kingdom and its clergy, they would not ask the regent, ruling territories under a title which they did not recognize, to send an official delegation.

The English, on the other hand, pursuing a policy in France based on the concept of the dual kingdom, would want Normans to be included in a joint delegation. It was therefore logical for Bedford to decline to send an independent one from Normandy, and rather to include Normans in the second English delegation in 1434. Yet this decision, in view of the council's attitude, was in itself a miscalculation, an example of the same stubborn refusal to face facts which led to the isolation of England after the Congress of Arras in 1435. Considering what happened to the Normans in the second delegation, it may be assumed that they would have suffered the same fate had they gone earlier, either with the English in 1433, or independently. To the fathers Normandy was legally part of Valois France: her delegates should be members of the Valois embassy, or should not come at all.

Bedford, one suspects, fully realized this. It is quite likely that he was party to the decision not to send reinforcements, which were to have included Normans, to help the first English delegation in May 1433.<sup>27</sup> He probably realized too, that what the Council of Basel, unlike that of Constance, wanted, was not so much recognition by official delegations representing a nation — since voting was no longer by nations but by commissions — as the recognition which the presence of individuals, who could serve on these commissions, would represent. Thus, by not preventing the archbishop of Rouen or the bishops of Coutances and Evreux, none of them politically reliable, from going to the council,<sup>28</sup> and by permitting

<sup>26</sup> Haller, *Concilium Basiliense*, II, 178.

<sup>27</sup> A. N. E. D. Schofield, "The First English Delegation to the Council of Basel," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XII (1961), 185.

<sup>28</sup> The archbishop of Rouen and the bishop of Coutances were appointed envoys of the duke of Burgundy to the council on 1 September 1433. As Thomas Basin commented, these two, together with the bishop of Evreux, preferred to desert their flocks and live outside the jurisdiction of a government which they were reluctant to recognize. Service at the Council of Basel gave them the opportunity which they needed (T. Basin, *Histoire des règnes de Charles VII et de Louis XI*, ed. J. Quicherat Société de l'histoire de France [Paris, 1857], III, 375-376).



the various cathedral chapters and other ecclesiastical bodies to be represented, Bedford was indirectly helping the aims of the fathers. It was anything that smacked of official approval that had to be avoided. At this very time, May 1433, the bishop of Noyon, an active royal councillor and papal conservator of privileges of the University of Paris, revoked a recent order that all the university's students and graduates should contribute six *deniers* towards the cost of sending a university delegation to Basel.<sup>29</sup> Although he might not actually stop such a body from going, the regent could not permit direct contributions to be made towards its expenses: it would not be politic to allow the university to appear as supporting the pope's greatest rival.

For necessity demanded the maintenance of friendly relations with the papacy. The regent, in the pursuit of peace and good government in the territories under his control, depended much upon an understanding with the church. He must be able to rely, for the success of his administration, upon the clergy, in particular upon the bishops and the *litterati*. To ensure this, he must count upon the system of provisions which had been arranged with the papacy. The constitution of Martin V had been renewed by Rome in 1431, but as yet nothing had been done on the Norman side. With the spirit at Basel becoming daily more radical and anti-papal, it was to the regent's interests to renew this agreement before criticism became too vocal in France and Normandy.<sup>30</sup> To forestall such a possibility, the constitution was renewed on 12 May 1432,<sup>31</sup> the opposition of the *parlement* which was encountered a year later, when the document was presented for formal registration, showing clearly how wise this step had been.<sup>32</sup>

By acting in this way Bedford had moved considerably closer to Rome. A short time before he had taken a further step towards putting relations with the pope on a surer and more amicable footing. It had been arranged that Zano da Castiglione, who had gone to Rome perhaps to persuade Eugenius IV to renew Martin V's constitution, should be translated from Lisieux to Bayeux, the bishopric having been previously reserved to the Holy See. Although the Council of Basel was not to pronounce on the subject of capitular elections until June 1433, Bedford must have known that he and the pope were acting solely in their own interests, and not in those of reform. Together they had flouted the wishes of the chapter, expressed in an election, as well as those of the duke of Burgundy, who was to appeal to the fathers, but to no effect.<sup>33</sup> The pope and the regent now realized that it was to their mutual interest to stand together; events at Bayeux were to justify them.<sup>34</sup> In an undated letter to Bedford, probably written by Eugenius late in 1431, the

<sup>29</sup> Seine-Mme., G. 3613.

<sup>30</sup> Schofield, "England and the Council of Basel," pp. 51-52.

<sup>31</sup> A.N., X<sup>1a</sup>, 8605, ff. 24-24<sup>v</sup>. The University of Paris was entirely in favor of such action (A.N., X<sup>1a</sup>, 4797, f. 66<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>32</sup> A.N., X<sup>1a</sup>, 1481, ff. 73<sup>v</sup>, 74<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>33</sup> J. Toussaint, *Philippe le Bon et le Concile de Bâle, 1431-1449* (Brussels, 1942), docs. 30, 31, 32; Haller, *Concilium Basiliense*, II, 166.

<sup>34</sup> In 1434 the dean and chapter of Bayeux wrote to the Council fathers expressing their satisfaction in their new bishop. He had been appointed by the pope, whom they wished to obey in all matters (Douai, Bibl. Municipale, MS. 198 (ii), ff. 32<sup>v</sup>-33).

pope had praised his devotion to the church, which was as it should be in one descended from so noble a line, and promised to do everything possible to be of assistance in the future.<sup>35</sup> It might have been added that, in arranging this translation, Eugenius and Bedford were deliberately acting against the rapidly growing radical spirit of Basel.<sup>36</sup>

For some time afterwards, however, Bedford did nothing. The act books of the Rouen chapter provide evidence of interest in the activities of the council, and Bruneti's record shows that more Normans arrived at Basel after the spring of 1433. The period of immediate tension between the pope and the fathers was now drawing to an end. True, Eugenius had been declared contumacious on 19 February 1433, but a few days previously he had authorized the council to meet at Basel without, however, recognizing its previous existence or acts. But the two bulls *Dudum Sacrum*, one issued in August, the other in December 1433, restored an uneasy peace between the parties.

While he must have welcomed this reconciliation, Bedford was probably shocked by such acts as the declaration of contumacy. His worst suspicions about the council were being confirmed. He was not in England in the early summer of 1432 when the bishop of Lodi, Landriani, was received and, under the influence of the duke of Gloucester, the decision was taken to send an English delegation to Basel. This first delegation, which travelled to the council primarily to take part in the discussions with the Hussites<sup>37</sup> (a fact which may help to explain the absence of Normans, who were not so concerned with the dangers of the heresy), did not remain long however, having left by the end of June 1433.<sup>38</sup>

The two bulls *Dudum Sacrum*, and the recognition which Eugenius thereby accorded the council, must have made matters much easier not only for the rulers in England, but for Bedford as well. In October 1433 the bishop of Lodi returned to London — where Bedford was — pleading for a second English delegation to

<sup>35</sup> Arch. Vat., Arm. XXXIX, 6, ff. 188<sup>v</sup>-189.

<sup>36</sup> Zellfelder (*England und das Basler Konzil* [Berlin, 1913], p. 45) pointed out that many of the bishops, having been provided by the pope at the regent's request, sometimes in opposition to the wishes of the cathedral chapters, were unlikely to act contrary to their own interests by supporting the council, an assembly bent on enforcing free elections.

<sup>37</sup> The first English delegation went to Basel "especially and principally for the reduction of the Bohemians to the integrity of holy mother church" (quoted by E. F. Jacob, "The Bohemians at the Council of Basel, 1433," *Prague Essays*, ed. R. W. Seton Watson [Oxford, 1949], p. 110).

<sup>38</sup> Having no representation at Basel had its drawbacks, as Bedford realized in the summer of 1433, when he heard of the verbal attack launched by the archbishop of Rouen against the king of England and his rule in Normandy (B.M., MS. Harley 826, f. 48<sup>v</sup>). An attack by the royal officers upon the privileges of the same archbishop and the bishop of Avranches also provoked an appeal to Basel (Seine-Mme., G. 34, 35; Haller, *Concilium Basiliense*, II, 527, 538; III, 366).

Other cases involved a dispute over the bishopric of Sées (C. T. Allmand, "L'évêché de Sées sous la domination anglaise au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Annales de Normandie*, XI (1961), 303-307), litigation between the archbishop and the abbot of St Ouen, Rouen (Seine-Mme., G. 1276; Douai, Bibl. Municipale, MS. 198 (ii), ff. 368<sup>v</sup>-369), and a case of disputed jurisdiction over the will of a former vicar-general of Rouen (Seine-Mme., G. 2127, f. 154<sup>v</sup>; G. 1194, 3652). These, and other examples, show that unresolved litigation was sometimes taken before the council, although in at least one case (Seine-Mme., G. 1194) the contestants were threatened with civil penalties if they referred their dispute to an authority outside the royal jurisdiction. This was a blow at the practice just described.

be sent to Basel. This could now be agreed to more easily and by early in 1434 arrangements were being made. On 31 May, and again three days later, two lists of delegates were drawn up, neither of which, however, contained any Norman names, a surprising omission in view of the tenacity with which the Treaty of Troyes, which had established the dual kingdom, was held. It was nevertheless soon decided, perhaps by Bedford, that since the *raison d'être* of this second English delegation was to take part in discussions concerning peace in France, it would be necessary to send persons qualified to speak authoritatively on this issue. If such persons were clerics, so much the better. The choice was limited, but there can be little doubt that Pierre Cauchon and Zano da Castiglione, respectively bishops of Lisieux and Bayeux, were the best envoys to represent Normandy. Orders were issued in London on 6 July to pay Castiglione for going to the council, and on 10 July the name of Cauchon, coupled to that of the canon of Rouen, Pierre Maurice, a theologian, and the archdeacon of Coutances, Nicolas David, a lawyer by training, appeared with those of the Englishmen travelling to Basel.<sup>39</sup>

On 17 August the Englishmen arrived, "in bono numero" as Bruneti recorded.<sup>40</sup> None denied them the right of a place as the envoys of Henry VI as king of England. But when the Normans, who had presumably travelled directly from France, came a short time later, they soon encountered trouble. Could they properly be received "tamquam ambasiatores regni Francie,"<sup>41</sup> or as the bishop of London, obeying instructions to give support to his Norman colleagues,<sup>42</sup> put it, as the envoys "Henrici regis Anglie et Francie pro suo Francie regno"?<sup>43</sup> The archbishop of Lyons, chief envoy of Charles VII and an implacable opponent of the English, refused to admit that any not in the Valois delegation could speak for the land or church of France.<sup>44</sup> His supporters carried the day, in spite of the pleading that the Norman envoys had much to propose concerning the problem of peace in France.<sup>45</sup> The matter was referred to a commission, where it was still being discussed on 20 January 1435.<sup>46</sup> In spite of this, all hope had not been abandoned in London, for on 10 February a new list of delegates, this time to include Castiglione, was drawn up, and two days later the king wrote to Cardinal Cesarini, president of the council, claiming to have heard that although ambassadors had been sent to represent his French kingdom, they had not yet obtained a hearing, and requesting that they quickly be accorded one.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>39</sup> B. N. MS. fr. 20880, no. 76; B.M., Add. Ch. 11825. The name of Castiglione, not having been included in the list of 10 July 1434 (T. Rymer, *Foedera*, x, 595-596), was added only on 10 February 1435 (*Foedera*, x, 603), by which date he was probably already at Basel.

<sup>40</sup> Haller, *Concilium Basiliense*, III, 176.

<sup>41</sup> *Monumenta Conciliorum*, II, 771.

<sup>42</sup> Thomas Bekynton, *Official Correspondence*, ed. G. Williams, Rolls Series (London, 1872), II, 268-269.

<sup>43</sup> *Monumenta Conciliorum*, II, 771.

<sup>44</sup> J. G. Dickinson, *The Congress of Arras, 1435* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 25-26.

<sup>45</sup> *Monumenta Conciliorum*, II, 772.

<sup>46</sup> Haller, *Concilium Basiliense*, III, 290: ". . . ad videndum cum deputatis aliarum deputacionum de audientia danda vel non dominis Lexouiensi et Baiocensi ambasiatoribus."

<sup>47</sup> B.M., MS. Cleopatra E. III, f. 68; *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England*, ed. H. Nicolas (London, 1835), IV, 297-298.

All attempts at obtaining recognition for the Normans, however, were destined to fail: no further mention of them is made in the records. After the abolition of annates at the twenty-first session, on 9 June 1435, the English delegation soon left Basel. Cauchon almost certainly went directly to Arras for the peace congress:<sup>48</sup> Castiglione probably travelled into Italy to join the papal curia,<sup>49</sup> and nothing is known of the movements of either Pierre Maurice or Nicolas David.<sup>50</sup> The interests of Normandy now had to be seen to by those who had come otherwise than officially to the council. It may be noted, in view of the strong English objections to the abolition of annates as a blow which might prove fatal to the papacy, that, late in 1435 and early in 1436, the bishop of Evreux spoke on behalf of the archbishop and bishops of the province of Rouen, protesting against the abolition, by the decree on annates, of the *deportus*, a special Norman tax due from each benefice holder to his bishop at the time of taking up a benefice.<sup>51</sup> In spite of all their reforming zeal, even those bishops who had gone voluntarily to the council found it difficult to act against their self-interest.<sup>52</sup>

The withdrawal of the English delegation almost coincided with the death of the duke of Bedford, and the reconciliation of the duke of Burgundy and Charles VII at the Congress of Arras, an event which such English as were at Basel did not join in celebrating. However, Normans still continued to arrive in small numbers at the council, and the Rouen chapter, ever interested in conciliar activity, confirmed its proctors there as late as May 1436.<sup>53</sup> Yet the duchy, since the regent's death more under the direct control of England, and more inclined to take orders in such matters from the growing Henry VI, now followed the positive pro-papal lead which she was given.

On 18 September 1437 Eugenius IV, who had yet again broken with the fathers, transferred the council to Ferrara, where he ordered all those at Basel to proceed for the opening a few months later. Some strongly resisted this move and on 24 January 1438 they suspended the pope, one Nicholas Loiseleur, canon of Rouen, being party to this step. This was too much even for so undecided a body as the chapter of Rouen. On 18 February the canons decided to recall Loiseleur, who was one of their proctors at Basel, on the grounds that their church was too poor to sustain the cost of his attendance. The real reason for this move was that he had taken part in the suspension of the supreme pontiff, and had the intention of voting for his deprivation and deposition, in defiance of the declared will of the king, who wished to support the pope. A message to this effect, the language showing that it was clearly inspired by the secular power, was taken to Loiseleur,

<sup>48</sup> B.N., MS. fr. 20884, no. 64.

<sup>49</sup> Castiglione was "en court de Romme" in 1436 (Bayeux, Bibl. Capitulaire, MS. 205, f. 106<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>50</sup> It is even possible that they never went to Basel at all.

<sup>51</sup> Haller, *Concilium Basiliense*, III, 606: IV, 69.

<sup>52</sup> This protest was itself criticized by others holding benefices in Normandy.

<sup>53</sup> Seine-Mme., G. 2127, ff. 163<sup>v</sup>, 168<sup>v</sup>. In a list of nonresident canons and chaplains (ff. 169<sup>v</sup>-170), dated 5 June 1436, six, including the Cardinal Branda da Castiglione, were said to be at the curia, and four, including the archbishop, at the council. On 1 December 1436 the chapter received to a vacant canonry "vigore certarum literarum et summarum a sacro consilio Basiliensis emanatarum" (G. 2133), showing that the authority of the council was still influential in Rouen

but as he was on an embassy to England (of all places) for the council at the time, the chapter decided to write again at the end of July.<sup>54</sup>

In the meantime, other active steps were being taken to bring support to the pope and his council at Ferrara, where the union with the Greeks was to be attempted. In March 1438 Louis de Luxembourg, now archbishop of Rouen, received bulls from Eugenius ordering him to assemble the prelates and other churchmen of his province to discuss the matter: the earl of Warwick, the king's lieutenant in France, asked those not of the Rouen province yet within the English obedience to attend as well.<sup>55</sup> On 21 May Luxembourg wrote to Philibert de Montjeu, bishop of Coutances, and to his vicar general, to inform them of a papal bull by which all bishops having a right to sit in an ecumenical council were to proceed to Ferrara.<sup>56</sup> Montjeu, occupied with Hussite affairs for the Council of Basel, paid no heed, but Zano da Castiglione, already in Italy, was incorporated into the new council where, at Florence in the following year, he signed the decree of union.<sup>57</sup>

From now on Normandy virtually followed the example of England. Yet there was still, in certain quarters, some latent support for the Council of Basel. On 31 December 1437 Eugenius wrote to the faithful Louis de Luxembourg, asking him to persuade the bishops of Evreux and Séez, "cum multis aliis de tua provincia in Basilea existentes," to leave Basel as they were acting contrary to the orders of the Holy See.<sup>58</sup> From this letter, as from other sources, it seems clear that some, for personal gain, deliberately chose to defy the pope. The surviving volumes of supplications to the Council of Basel prove this conclusively. As late as August 1439 Robert Barbier, canon of Rouen, petitioned the assembly for the benefice of St-Pierre de Montfort, near Rouen; he claimed to have received it from the legal patron, the abbot of Bec, but the archbishop of Rouen had refused to collate him since the pope, whom Barbier claimed to have been deposed, had already allocated the benefice as having previously belonged to a member of the curia.<sup>59</sup>

Such action, which was an open attack on the validity of the constitution for appointments to benefices agreed to between Rome and Normandy some years previously, could only provoke reaction. Not only were men like Barbier — and

<sup>54</sup> Seine-Mme., G. 2128, ff. 107, 107<sup>v</sup>, 141<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>55</sup> " . . . A Ancellot Dupont . . . pour ung voyage . . . fait de Rouen a Lysieux, Bayeux et Coustances . . . pour porter certaines lettres touchans le Concile de Bale, lesquelles monditseigneur envoioit aux evesques desdis Lisieux, Baieux et Coustances pour les convoquer a Rouen . . . " (Seine-Mme., G. 39). See *Proceedings . . . of the Privy Council*, v. 89.

<sup>56</sup> Seine-Mme., G. 1909.

<sup>57</sup> Castiglione also signed for Louis de Luxembourg, Pierre Cauchon, and the abbot of Mont Saint Michel (copy of the decree of union in the *Bibliothèque Municipale* at Bayeux), and for Pasquier de Vaux, bishop of Meaux (B.N., MS. grec, 430). By 1 July 1438 Hugues de Villemar, canon of Rouen, *abbreviator* of papal letters, was already with the pope at Ferrara (Seine-Mme., G. 2128, f. 161<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>58</sup> Arch. Vat., Reg. Vat. 374, ff. 215<sup>v</sup>-216.

<sup>59</sup> Lausanne, Bibl. Cantonale et Universitaire, MS. G. 863, ff. 151<sup>v</sup>-152<sup>v</sup>. Stress was laid on the action "quod Gabriel tunc Eugenius papa quartus longe tunc post suspensionem eius a totali papatus administratione per hoc sacrum concilium factam," and which was consequently invalidated.

there were others<sup>60</sup> — denying the pope's powers and acknowledging the conciliar authority residing at Basel, but they were also directly attacking the English administration in Normandy. On 9 January 1439 instructions were issued at Rouen that only orders emanating from the curia were to be acted upon, that all found carrying letters from Basel were to be arrested, and any who acted upon these were to be considered rebels.<sup>61</sup>

This decision led to at least two interesting cases which show how persistent was what may be termed the "pro-Basel" feeling in Normandy. In the summer of 1439 a large sum of money raised in the duchy by virtue of indulgences granted by the pope, and intended for the reunion with the Greeks, had been placed in the treasure house of Rouen cathedral for safekeeping. The chapter, however, when called upon to surrender it, refused to do so, and the *bailli* of Rouen, acting for the king, was obliged to seize the money by force. For this act of defiance, which was said to have been done "sous umbre ou coulleur de deffenses procedans de Basle," the chapter had its temporalities taken into the royal hands.<sup>62</sup>

The second case concerned Guillaume Auberyve, an archdeacon of Coutances, who was tried at Rouen by a specially constituted commission of royal councillors, accused of treason for helping the king's enemies by causing letters from Basel to be published, and thereby causing great scandal. Although one letter, claiming the pope deposed and excommunicated, had been read in open chapter at Coutances, witnesses were found to support Auberyve, who was acquitted.<sup>63</sup> It is of interest to note that he was of the diocese of Coutances whose bishop, Philibert de Montjeu, had been president of the Council of Basel, and leader of several missions to Bohemia, where he was to die while in the council's service. Auberyve's apparent support of Basel may perhaps be attributed to this influence.

Finally, may be cited the example of Zano da Castiglione, bishop of Bayeux, to whom Eugenius IV granted special powers to act against those, not only of his own diocese but of the entire ecclesiastical province of Rouen, who had dared to remain at Basel and elect an anti-pope, or who were, secretly or openly, support-

<sup>60</sup> A number of supplications from Normans are recorded for the period 1437 to 1439 in the Lausanne manuscript, and in Geneva, Bibl. Publique et Universitaire, MS. lat. 61. Neither volume contains any supplication from England.

<sup>61</sup> Seine-Mme., Fonds Danquin, XII, Fiefs et aumones; C. de Beaurepaire, *Les états de Normandie sous la domination anglaise* (Paris-Rouen, 1859), doc. XXIV. This proclamation was read at the assizes of Auge, held at Pont l'Évêque later the same month, and at the *sergenterie* of that town early in February.

<sup>62</sup> Seine-Mme., G. 3613. On 17 October, soon after these events, the pope wrote to Louis de Luxembourg concerning those who refused to give up money raised on indulgences granted by the Council of Basel. The archbishop was authorized to use ecclesiastical sanctions against them (G. Hofmann, *Epistolae Pontificiae ad Concilium Florentinum Spectantes*, [Rome, 1944], i, ii, doc. 223). Money raised from indulgences had already been the subject of two letters from Eugenius to Luxembourg, the second being to thank him for having seized money raised by order of the council fathers (Arch. Vat., Reg. Vat. 374, ff. 215<sup>v</sup>-216; Reg. Vat. 375, f. 5<sup>v</sup>). See Gill, *Eugenius IV*, pp. 102, 116.

<sup>63</sup> Seine-Mme., G. 1164, 1165; C. de Beaurepaire, *Pièces du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle relatives au diocèse et aux évêques de Coutances*, Société de l'histoire de Normandie (1905), pp. 175-181.

ing such actions.<sup>64</sup> Their offices were reserved to the pope, who alone might absolve them. As a consequence, a small number of Normans, or persons holding benefices in Normandy, were deprived, and their offices and cures given to those more faithful to the traditional papacy.<sup>65</sup> As late as July 1443 one Paul Sanson, a clerk of the diocese of Coutances, received papal absolution from his excommunication for having remained at Basel and supported the anti-pope, Felix V.<sup>66</sup>

It is probable, however, that these were isolated cases; certainly the administration never wavered in its loyalty to Rome.<sup>67</sup> On 17 May 1440, Henry VI wrote from Windsor to Louis de Luxembourg and the other members of the royal council at Rouen. Threatening with confiscation of goods any who, contrary to his orders, might dare to support the assembly at Basel, he condemned the fathers who had remained there, criticized them for their puny numbers, and censured them for having elected an anti-pope.<sup>68</sup> The tone of this letter was similar to an undated one in which the king, addressing the fathers, levelled the same criticisms at them, and pleaded with them to lend their support to the true pope: "Nolite, patres, schisma facere."<sup>69</sup> With a divided and uncertain France to rule, the orthodox Henry would not have it otherwise. Schism at the head might spread to the body. For this reason all his territories, and especially Normandy, must be given a lead and made to hold to it. That of legitimacy was the best one to follow.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF NORTH WALES  
BANGOR, WALES

<sup>64</sup> Arch. Vat., Reg. Lat. 372, ff. 118–118v; Reg. Vat. 375, ff. 179v–181. It is impossible to estimate what influence the reforming decrees of the Council of Basel had in Normandy, but it was probably only little. In this context it is of interest to observe the views of Rolando Talenti, Italian secretary to the bishop of Bayeux, who, writing to the chapter of Avranches cathedral probably before the episcopal election of 1442, exhorted the canons to observe the decrees of the fathers, "precipue autem novas ordinationes concilii Basiliensis, que tam salubriter et sancte circa huiusmodi electiones digeste sunt." In spite of this, the new bishop was provided by the pope (J. Laffetay, "Notice sur la vie et les écrits de Roland des Talents, chanoine de Bayeux," *Bulletin de la Société d'agriculture, sciences, arts et belles-lettres de Bayeux*, 1852–1855, p. 43, quoting a manuscript in the capitular library at Bayeux).

<sup>65</sup> Arch. Vat., Reg. Lat. 372, ff. 160–161; Reg. Lat. 376, ff. 168v–170, 231v–232; Reg. Suppl. 366, ff. 178v–179; Seine-Mme., G. 2130, ff. 16, 119v.

<sup>66</sup> Arch. Vat., Reg. Suppl. 395, ff. 54v–55.

<sup>67</sup> In December 1439 Louis de Luxembourg was created a cardinal (Seine-Mme., G. 3590), at the same time as John Kemp. This was doubtless a recompense to Normandy and England for their loyalty to the papacy.

<sup>68</sup> Seine-Mme., G. 2129, ff. 125–125v.

<sup>69</sup> Geneva, Bibl. Publique et Universitaire, MS. lat. 27, no. 77.