

Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte

Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris

(Institut historique allemand)

Band 24/1 (1997)

DOI: 10.11588/fr.1997.1.60675

Rechtshinweis

Bitte beachten Sie, dass das Digitalisat urheberrechtlich geschützt ist. Erlaubt ist aber das Lesen, das Ausdrucken des Textes, das Herunterladen, das Speichern der Daten auf einem eigenen Datenträger soweit die vorgenannten Handlungen ausschließlich zu privaten und nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken erfolgen. Eine darüber hinausgehende unerlaubte Verwendung, Reproduktion oder Weitergabe einzelner Inhalte oder Bilder können sowohl zivil- als auch strafrechtlich verfolgt werden.

›HOMAGIUM‹ AND ›AMICITIA‹: RITUALS OF
PEACE AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE IN THE ANGLO-FRENCH
NEGOTIATIONS OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY¹

When Philip II of France summoned King John of England to appear before his court in 1202, it was clear that he acted as feudal overlord, treating John as his vassal, who had to defend himself against the charge that he had denied justice to one of his men. Two years before, in the treaty of Le Goulet², John had acknowledged that he was to hold his inherited continental possessions as fiefs (*sicut feoda debent*) from the king of France³. It seems that this concession was not at all new, since several of John's predecessors had done homage to the French king. What was new in 1202 was the fact that Philip II made use of his suzerainty in a formal procedure which legitimized his political and military actions against the English king. By 1202 feudal custom was obviously recognized as an enforceable law and doing homage had become an act clearly defining the legal relationship between lord and vassal⁴.

- 1 Paper read at the International Medieval Congress Leeds (10th July, 1996). I intend to discuss the questions addressed here more amply in my habilitation-thesis »England und Frankreich an der Wende vom Hoch- zum Spätmittelalter. Verträge und Vertragsverhandlungen«. As for the present paper, I wish to thank Andrew Morgan Rapp (Stanford) and Pegatha Taylor (Berkeley) for their kind revision of my English text. Prof. William Henry Jackson (St Andrews) and many others, to whom I owe thanks, have kindly contributed to the references given in the footnotes.
- 2 The treaty of Le Goulet was concluded in May 1200 (probably on May 22nd; cf. *Recueil des Actes de Philippe Auguste*, ed. Henri-François DELABORDE, Charles PETIT-DUTAILLIS, vol. II, no. 633, p. 178, n. 1) after intense mediation by the papal legate Petrus Capuanus; cf. Bernd SCHNEIDMÜLLER, *Le Goulet*, in: *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 5, col. 1806; Werner MALECZEK, *Petrus Capuanus. Kardinal, Legat am 4. Kreuzzug, Theologe († 1214)*, Vienna 1988, p. 102 sqq.; Frederick M. POWICKE, *The Loss of Normandy 1189–1204. Studies in the history of the Angevin empire*, 2nd ed., Manchester 1961, p. 134–138; Alexander CARTELLIERI, *Philipp II. August. König von Frankreich*, vol. 4, Leipzig 1921, p. 36 sq. and 39–43.
- 3 *Layettes du Trésor des Chartes*, ed. Alexandre TEULET, vol. 1, no. 578, p. 218: *sicut rectus heres tenebimus de domino rege Francie omnia feoda sicut pater noster et frater noster Ricardus ea tenuerunt a domino rege Francie et sicut feoda debent*; this edition is based on the surviving original of John's ratification (*Archives Nationales Paris*, J 628, *Angleterre II*, no. 1). The ratification of the treaty by King Philip is worded correspondingly; *Actes de Philippe Auguste* (see n. 2) vol. 2, no. 633, § 13 = *Diplomatic Documents preserved in the Public Record office*, ed. Pierre CHAPLAIS, London 1964, no. 9, p. 22. On the diverging copies of this text, the original of which is lost, see Charles PETIT-DUTAILLIS, *Les copies du traité de paix du Goulet*, in: *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 102 (1941) p. 35–50; CHAPLAIS, *Diplomatic Documents*, no. 9, p. 23.
- 4 In 1202 it became clear that the treaty of Le Goulet had made an important innovation, when it added the words *et sicut feoda debent* to the traditional clause that John was to hold his French fiefs as his predecessors had. The treaty concluded by Richard I and Philip II on December 5th, 1195 between Issoudun and Charost, on which the treaty of Le Goulet was based, had not contained any clause defining Richard's continental possessions as fiefs; *Actes de Philippe Auguste* (see n. 2) vol. 2, no. 517 = CHAPLAIS, *Diplomatic Documents* (see n. 3) no. 6; for the nexus between the treaties of Issoudun and Le Goulet cf. *Actes de Philippe Auguste* (see n. 2) vol. 2, Nr. 633, § 1 = CHAPLAIS, *Diplomatic Documents*, no. 9, p. 20: *scilicet quod ipse tenebit nobis et heredibus nostris pacem, quam frater suus rex Ricardus fecit nobis inter Exoldunum et Carrociun*. The treaty of Messina, concluded

Many historians have argued that the successful trial against John Lackland was the result of a long-term policy of the French kings, who maintained their formal suzerainty over the whole of France during a long period of weakness, in anticipation of the moment when they could make good on what had become a mere legal claim⁵. This opinion implies that the French kings of the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries had understood their position as feudal overlords in nearly the same way as Philip II did in 1202. By looking at the development of the Anglo-French feudal relationship between the Norman Conquest and the Hundred Years War more closely⁶, however, we can clearly distinguish three periods marked by the different meanings attributed to the ritual of homage in each:

a) Before the accession of Henry II contacts between the English and the French kings were sparse and the *homagium* for the duchy of Normandy was rarely performed⁷. To be exact, our sources mention only three instances of homage done for Normandy explicitly: In 1120, sure of his own power, but in need of a legitimizing security for the succession of his son, Henry I paid Louis VI a considerable sum of money in order to make him accept the homage of William Aetheling⁸. A similar arrangement was made for Eustache, the son of King Stephen, in 1137, and again in 1140 after the death of Louis VI⁹. Apparently, the *homagium* for Normandy was performed – if it was performed at all –, not because the French kings insisted on their suzerainty, but upon request of the English kings, who used it to solve problems of disputed possession and especially of succession.

This traditional model still prevailed at the accession of Henry II as junior duke of Normandy. Together with his father Geoffrey the young duke came to Paris in August 1151 and did homage to King Louis VII. Once again, it was mainly the future English king, not

in March 1191, had been more explicit, stating that Richard was to hold his French fiefs as *homoligiis* of the French king *sicut predecessores sui*, but even here, as in all preceding treaties, any allusion to a more general concept of feudal obligations is missing; Actes de Philippe Auguste (see n. 2) vol. 1, no. 376 = CHAPLAIS, Diplomatic Documents (see n. 3) no. 5.

5 Cf. e.g. Joachim EHLERS, *Geschichte Frankreichs im Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1987, p. 94; Jacques BOUSSARD, *Philippe Auguste et les Plantagenêts*, in: *La France de Philippe Auguste. Le temps des mutations*, ed. Robert-Henri BAUTIER, Paris 1982, p. 263–289, here: p. 263 sq.; see also n. 7. In contrast to this, John W. BALDWIN, *The government of Philip Augustus. Foundations of French royal power in the Middle Ages*, Berkeley 1986, p. 259–264, and Jean DUNBABIN, *France in the making 843–1180*, Oxford 1985, p. 256 sq., have pointed out that the notion of a clear hierarchy of fiefs with the king as apex was a relatively new idea, introduced by Suger of Saint-Denis in the first half of the 12th century and implemented after the accession of Philip Augustus only.

6 For a general survey of this development cf. George P. CUTTINO, *English medieval diplomacy*, Bloomington 1985; Newell G. ALFORD, *Homagium et servitium debitum in Anglo-French relations during the Middle Ages*, M.A. thesis State University of Iowa 1941.

7 The few instances of homages for Normandy before 1120 mentioned in our sources are so ambiguous that even a controversy could arise as to whether the dukes of Normandy should be considered French vassals before the end of the 12th century at all. In fact, it is doubtful whether any Norman count/duke did homage to the French king after the end of the Carolingian dynasty. Jean-François LEMARIGNIER, *Recherches sur l'hommage en marche et les frontières féodales*, Lille 1945, p. 73 sq., gives a short summary of the debate between Jacques FLACH, *Les origines de l'ancienne France, X^e et XI^e siècles*, 4 vol., Paris 1886–1917, and Ferdinand LOT, *Fidèles ou vassaux? Essai sur la nature juridique du lien qui unissait les grands vassaux à la royauté depuis le milieu du IX^e jusqu'à la fin du XII^e siècle*, Paris 1904; cf. also A. DUMAS, *Encore la question: Fidèles et vassaux?*, in: *Nouvelle Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 1920, p. 159–229 and 347–390.

8 *Liber monasterii de Hyda*, ed. Edward EDWARDS (Rolls Series 45), London 1866, p. 309; cf. C. Warren HOLLISTER, *Normandy, France and the Anglo-Norman regnum*, in: *Speculum* 51 (1976) p. 202–242, here: p. 225 sq. (especially n. 130 and 136 sq.).

9 Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. Thomas ARNOLD (Rolls Series 74), London 1879, p. 260; cf. HOLLISTER (see n. 8) p. 227.

his overlord, who took an interest in the ritual being performed: The price this time was the Norman Vexin, which was handed over to the French king, and it is certainly not by chance that our two sources, one Norman and one French, do not stress that Henry did homage, but rather that Louis VII accepted it¹⁰.

b) Things changed considerably, however, during the reign of Henry II. This time, there were no claimants to the continental possessions of the English king other than his own sons. On the other hand, the extension of these possessions and the intensification of French royal government multiplied the possible sources of conflict, as well as the occasions for negotiations and personal meetings between the English king and his French overlord¹¹. Under these circumstances, the traditional ritual of homage acquired a new function: It now served as the outward form to conclude a peace treaty between the two kings, who in fact treated each other as equals.

This is most obvious in the famous treaty of Ivry, concluded in 1177 and renewed at Gisors in 1180 after the accession of Philip II¹². The mutual obligations of the two kings are described in traditional terms: They both promise to preserve each other's life, limbs and earthly honour (*quod uterque nostrum alteri conservabit vitam, membra et terrenum honorem*), with the only difference that Henry calls Louis *dominus*, while the latter calls him *homo et fidelis*. This interpretation of the *homagium debitum* of the Norman duke was by no means new: Dudo of St-Quentin had used the same words 150 years before to describe the agreement of St-Clair-sur-Epte in 911. Towards the middle of the 12th century, Robert of Torigni had adopted Dudo's words to describe the Norman-French treaty of Jeufosse concluded in 965, adding the explanation that the only difference between the duke and the king was that the latter does not do homage to the first (*nichil aliud differt inter illos nisi quod homagium non facit rex Franciae comiti Normanniae*)¹³. The treaty of

10 Robert of Torigni, *Chronicle*, ed. Léopold DELISLE, Rouen 1872, vol. 1, p. 255 (= Rolls Series 82.4, p. 162): *rege assumente hominum Henrici ducis de ducatu Normanniae ... Parisius*; *Historia gloriosi regis Ludowici*, ed. Auguste MOLINIER (Collection de textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'histoire 4), Paris 1887, p. 161: *rex ... eum pro eadem terra in hominem ligium accepit*; cf. LEMARGINIER (see n. 7) p. 94; Wilfred L. WARREN, *Henry II*, London 1973, p. 42.

11 Contacts simultaneously intensified considerably. Unlike his predecessors, Henry II frequently met his French overlord in person; LEMARIGNIER (see n. 7) p. 100–108. Richard I continued this practice (*ibid.*), which came to a stillstand only after the trial against John Lackland.

12 As to the place and date of the treaty concluded in 1177, which is also (and more correctly) known as the treaty of Nonancourt, cf. *Recueil des Actes de Henri II*, ed. Léopold DELISLE, Elie BERGER, Paris 1920, vol. 2, p. 62 sq., n. 1; CARTELLIERI (see n. 2) vol. 1, Leipzig 1899/1900, p. 25, n. 3. Its text has been (insufficiently) published in *Recueil des Actes de Henri II*, vol. 2, no. 506. The original not having survived, it is only preserved in historiographical sources: *Gesta regis Henrici secundi*, ed. William STUBBS (Rolls Series 49.1), London 1867, p. 191–193 = Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. ID. (Rolls Series 51.2), London 1869, p. 144–146; Gervase of Canterbury, *Chronica*, ed. ID. (Rolls Series 73.1), London 1879, p. 272–274; Gerald of Wales, *De institutione principum*, ed. George F. WARNER (Rolls Series 21.8), London 1891, p. 166–169 (with errors); Ralph of Diceto, *Ymagines Historiarum*, ed. William STUBBS (Rolls Series 68), London 1876, vol. 1, p. 421 sq. gives an abridged version with date and place; cf. BOUSSARD (see n. 5) p. 264, n. 3; CARTELLIERI (see n. 2) vol. 1, Leipzig 1899/1900, p. 25 (n. 3) 211, *Nachträge* 133; vol. 2, Leipzig 1906, p. 11 (with further references). – The text of the treaty concluded at Gisors in 1180 is a mere repetition of the treaty of Ivry: *Recueil des Actes de Philippe Auguste*, ed. Henri-François DELABORDE, Paris 1916, vol. 1, no. 7, p. 8–10; cf. CARTELLIERI (see n. 12) vol. 1, p. 75–79; vol. 1, *Beilagen*, no. 76, p. 67.

13 Dudo of St-Quentin, *De moribus et actis primorum Normannorum ducum*, ed. Jules LAÏR (*Mémoires de la Société des antiquaires de Normandie* 3.3), Caen 1865, p. 169 (= PL 141, col. 650 sq.): *Karolus rex duxque Robertus, comitesque et proceres, praesules et abbates iuraverunt ... patricio Rolloni vitam suam et membra et honorem totius regni insuper terram denominatam, quatenus ipsam teneret et possideret*; cf. Hans HATTENHAUER, *Die Aufnahme der Normannen in das westfränkische Reich*, Hamburg 1990. – Robert of Torigni supplementing the *Gesta Norman-*

1177, however, goes a step further still. In giving the reason for their mutual feudal obligations, the two kings do not refer to any legal tradition, but state that they are and want to be friends (*sic sumus et amodo volumus esse amici*). They thereby integrate the feudal idea of mutual faith into the larger concept of *amicitia* and thus stress the promise of mutual peace, protection and assistance expressed by the *homagium*. Conversely, the hierarchically differentiated functions of the ritual (the legitimation of the vassal's possession of his fiefs and his acknowledged subordination to his overlord) recede into the background¹⁴.

As Gerd Althoff has shown us, the three main bonds that kept early medieval societies together – kinship, friendship and feudo-vassalic faith – were by no means mutually exclusive¹⁵. In the early tenth century, for example, the East-Frankish king Henry I, who understood himself as *primus inter pares* rather than as a ruler, could make his kingship acceptable to his fellow-dukes by entering into formal *amicitiae* with them. These pacts of friendship were expressed and confirmed by ritualized feasts (*convivia*) and other ostentatious gestures stressing the equal rank of both partners¹⁶.

It may seem daring to transfer this well-attested early medieval model to a political relationship of the 12th century, but the parallels are obvious. The traditional form of the Norman *homagium* aimed at minimizing the humiliation involved in the act by choosing a

normum Ducum of William of Jumièges in c. 1139 used an abridged version to describe the effects of the treaty of Jeufosse up to his own time: *Quapropter comes Normannie de Normannia tantummodo facit hominum et fidelitatem regi Francie de vita sua et de terreno honore*; The Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis and Robert of Torigni, ed. Elisabeth VAN HOUT (Oxford Medieval Texts), 2 vol., Oxford 1992/1995, vol. 2, p. 286. This addition, as with the rest of Robert's *Addimenta* at the end of his version of the Gesta Normannorum Ducum, is based on the Brevis relatio de origine Willelmi conquestoris, ed. J.A. GILES, in: Scriptores rerum gestarum Willelmi conquestoris (Publications of the Caxton Society 3), London 1845, p. 1–21, written between c. 1114 and 1120; cf. VAN HOUT, vol. 1, p. lxxix sq., lxxxiv sq., cxxvi–cxxviii; vol. 2, p. 280 (n. 4), 286 (n. 3). For a historiographical assessment of Dudo of St-Quentin and Robert of Torigni cf. Norbert KERSKEN, *Geschichtsschreibung im Europa der »nationes«* (Münstersche Historische Forschungen 8), Cologne, Weimar, Vienna 1995, p. 81–92. – The full version of the formulaic phrase *conservabo vitam et membra et terrenum honorem* was again adopted by Henry II in a letter to Louis VII, probably written in the summer or autumn of 1158: *Ego rex Henricus assecurabo regi Francorum sicut domino vitam suam et membra sua et terrenum honorem suum, si ipse mihi assecuraverit sicut homini et fideli suo vitam meam et membra mea et terras meas, quas mihi conventionavit, de quibus homo suus sum*; Recueil des actes de Henri II (see n. 12) vol. 1, no. 88, p. 195; cf. Gunnar TESKE, *Die Briefsammlungen des 12. Jahrhunderts in St. Viktor/Paris*, Bonn 1993, p. 120, 156, 336, 353 (no. 60); DUNBABIN (see n. 5) p. 262. – For the problem as a whole cf. LEMARIGNIER (see n. 7) p. 96–99 (esp. n. 95); HOLLISTER (see n. 8) p. 229–231.

14 Consequently, formalized *amicitia* rather than feudo-vassalic subordination was the main point of the treaties of 1177 and 1180 in the eyes of the contemporary chroniclers. Ralph of Diceto (see n. 12) confined his abridged version of the text to the part discussed here. Roger of Howden (see n. 12) p. 143, calls it *amicitia et finalis concordia*, obviously in an attempt to provide his reader with a more precise definition than the generic term *pax et concordia* used in the Gesta regis Henrici secundi (see n. 12) p. 191. Gervase of Canterbury (see n. 12) p. 271, even introduces the treaty by an elaborate tripartite rhetorical climax (*caritatis vinculum, dilectionis sententia, pignus amoris*) exclusively stressing its function to assure stable political friendship between the two kings: *Sed quoniam praedicti reges saepe ad invicem fuerant irati, saepe concordati, sed nullo caritatis vinculo confirmati, in unam convenerunt dilectionis sententiam, tandemque scriptum subscriptum quasi pignus amoris concuderunt*.

15 Gerd ALTHOFF, *Verwandte, Freunde und Getreue*, Darmstadt 1990.

16 ALTHOFF (see n. 15) p. 108 sq. The impression that the treaty of 1177 did not aim at establishing a clear feudo-vassalic dependency is further enhanced by an additional charter in which Louis VII promised the Norman officials *auxilium et consilium*, thus taking over the traditional obligations of a vassal; Thomas RYMER, *Foedera I.1*, 3rd ed., London 1816, p. 35.

place on the Norman-French border (*hommage en marche*) and by adding the kiss of peace (*osculum pacis*) after the rite, two symbolic elements demonstrating that the king and the duke were nearly equal in status. For the second half of the 12th century, the designation of the duke as *amicus* must be added to this list, all the more so as its use extended beyond the dry language of written treaties. The idea that friendship and feudo-vassalic faith could be connected was by no means obsolete by the 12th century; the *Chanson de Roland*, written in its extant form between 1130 and 1170, employs in this sense *par amur et par feid* (through love and loyalty) as a standing formulaic phrase¹⁷. In fact, the visits of the Angevin kings to Paris, which often occurred immediately or soon after doing homage, may be understood as ritualized acts of *amicitia*. Forming a complementary part of the rite of *homagium*, these acts mitigated the aspect of feudo-vassalic subordination and reinforced the mutual obligation to keep faith and peace.

In 1158, two years after renewing his homage to Louis VI, Henry II came to Paris, where he was received *in magna gloria et honore*, and having conquered Brittany in the name of the French king, he conducted his overlord through his territories *non impari quam ille eum per Franciam gloriae et honoris magnificentia*¹⁸. As late as 1201, John Lackland visited Philip II in Paris, where he was entertained sumptuously at the royal palace¹⁹. This visit was certainly not the product of a »brief euphoria« after the treaty of Le Goulet, as Baldwin puts it²⁰. Rather it was intended to complete by a demonstrative act of friendship the peace established by John's homage a year before.

In fact, these visits were celebrated as rituals of friendship following traditional rules. In 1187, at Gisors, Richard the Lionheart made peace with Philip II under dramatic circumstances. On his own behalf and on that of his father, he submitted to his overlord in an homage-like act (*suoque eidem oblato gladio, nudato etiam capite et flexis genibus rogavit humiliter, ut animi sui motum mitigaret*, as Gervase of Canterbury put it)²¹. Having accepted

17 *Chanson de Roland*, v. 86, 3460, 3801, 3810, 3893; cf. William T. COTTON, *Par amur et par feid*. Keeping faith and the varieties of feudalism in *La Chanson de Roland*, in: *The Rusted Hauberk. Feudal Ideas of Order and Their Decline*, ed. by Liam O. PUDON, Cindy L. VITTO, Gainesville 1994, p. 163–191.

18 Gervase of Canterbury (see n. 12) p. 166; cf. R.W. EYTON, *Court, household, and itinerary of King Henry II*, London 1878, p. 17 (5th Feb. 1156), 41 (Sep. 1158), 42 (Nov. 1158). Robert of Torigni (see n. 10) vol. 1, p. 312, describes the visit in similar terms: *Exinde rex evocatus a rege Francorum cum paucis venit Parisius et inaestimabili honore a rege Ludovico et a Constancia regina et a proceribus regni exceptus est, gaudentibus Francis et de pace duorum regum et de adventu tanti hospitis tripudiantibus*. The use of the term *evocatus* has frequently been understood as a hint that Louis VII had formally cited Henry II according to feudal law, but it seems more likely that Robert only wanted to stress that Henry II had been invited by his overlord. The visit itself should not be seen as an exaction of feudal obligations, but as a compensation for Henry's homage in 1156, which he had renewed verbally in a letter during the preliminary negotiations preceding the peace agreement of August 1158 (cf. n. 13).

19 Rigord, *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, ed. Henri-François DELABORDE, Paris 1882, p. 150; Roger of Howden (see n. 12) vol. 4, p. 819; cf. Wilfred L. WARREN, *King John*, 2nd. ed., London 1978, p. 73.

20 BALDWIN (see n. 5) p. 97.

21 Gervase of Canterbury (see n. 12) p. 372. In Gerd Althoff's terminology, this ceremony could also be described as a *deditio*, since it was an act of demonstrative submission ending an escalating conflict. Nevertheless, the similarity with the act of homage remains striking. In the late medieval illustrated versions of the *Grandes chroniques de France* both rituals are represented so similarly that they are almost indistinguishable. So BALDWIN (see n. 5) ill. 3 (after p. 298), could interpret the illustration of the manuscript Walters Art Gallery Baltimore 138 (copied c. 1400), f. 15r as »Vassals offering their swords to Philip Augustus in homage«, while Anne Dawson HEDEMAN, *The royal image. Illustrations of the Grandes chroniques de France (1274–1422)*, Berkeley 1991, p. 147 and 193, sees the same picture as »Surrender of Tours or Le Mans«; on the representation of Anglo-French homages of the 13th and 14th century cf. *ibid.*, p. 116–120.

his submission, Philip conducted Richard to Paris *ad ostendendam cunctis initam concordiam*²². There the humiliating act of submission was compensated for by an ostentatious demonstration of *amicitia*. The king honoured Richard so greatly, as Roger of Howden tells us, that they ate every day at the same table and from the same dish, and at night their beds did not separate them (*quem rex Franciae in tantum honorabat, quod singulis diebus in una mensa ad unum catinum manducabant et in noctibus non separabat eos lectus*)²³. Brundage along with many other recent historians has assumed that Richard had a sexual affair with his young French overlord²⁴, and Boswell even concludes that »in the 12th century the ... future king of England could fall head over heels in love with another monarch without losing support from either the people or the church«²⁵. Yet, there can be no doubt that Roger's account refers to a widespread ritual of *amicitia* rather than a spontaneous outbreak of personal emotions: The practice of sleeping in one bed as a demonstration of political friendship and confidence has been established for Henry II and William Marshal²⁶, and John of

22 Gervase of Canterbury (see n. 12) p. 372.

23 *Gesta regis Henrici secundi* (see n. 12) vol. 2, p. 7; Roger of Howden (see n. 12) vol. 2, p. 318; cf. John BOSWELL, *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality*, Chicago 1980, p. 231 sq.; John GILLINGHAM, *Richard the Lionheart*, London 1978, p. 107. For the years 1180 to 1192, the *Gesta regis Henrici secundi* (which must probably be attributed to Roger of Howden, too) seem to consist of contemporary notes revised in or after 1192; cf. David CORNER, *The Gesta regis Henrici secundi and Chronica of Roger, parson of Howden*, in: *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 56 (1983) p. 126–144. For the period covered by the *Gesta regis Henrici secundi*, the *Chronica* written by Roger of Howden in the late 1190s and finished shortly in or after 1201, is mainly a more-or-less carefully abridged and revised version of the former. Describing Richard's visit to Paris in 1187, Roger of Howden adopts the account given in the *Gesta regis Henrici secundi*, but he slightly alters their wording. After the quotation given above, he omits the words *et dilexit eum rex Franciae quasi animam suam*, which refer to the biblical account of David and Jonathan (Sam. I, 18.1, 18.3, 20.17; cf. C. Stephen JAEGER, *L'amour des rois. Structure sociale d'une forme de sensibilité aristocratique*, in: *Annales E.S.C.* 46, 1991, p. 547–571, here: p. 548). This can be explained by his general tendency to abridge, in order to keep his chronicle manageable (Antonia GRANSDEN, *Historical writing in England c. 550 to c. 1307*, Ithaca 1974, p. 228 sq.), but it might also indicate a revised attitude towards Richard. While the *Gesta regis Henrici secundi*, completed immediately after the accession of Richard in 1190, tend to idealize Richard and to see his accession as a new dawn (*Gesta regis Henrici secundi*, vol. 2, p. 75 sq.; cf. GRANSDEN, p. 223), Roger of Howden, writing about ten years later, knew that this hope had not been fulfilled. Moreover, he might have refrained from honouring Philip by a biblical reference comparing him with King David.

The *Gesta regis Henrici secundi* continue their account *et in tantum se mutuo diligebant, quod propter vehementem dilectionem, quae inter illos erat, dominus rex Angliae nimio stupore arreptus admirabatur, quid hoc esset*. Roger of Howden omits the verbal construction *et in tantum se mutuo diligebant, quod* and replaces *dilectio* by the stronger and more technical word *amor* (cf. n. 14). Thus at the same time intensifying and depersonalizing the message of the text, he further stresses the political rather than the personal implications of the new *amicitia* between Richard and Philip.

24 On Richard's alleged homosexuality cf. James A. BRUNDAGE, *Richard Lion Heart*, New York 1973, p. 88 sq., 202 and 257 sq., refuted by John GILLINGHAM, *Richard the Lionheart*, London 1978, p. 7, 107, 130, 161 sq., 283 and 289; IDEM, *Some legends of Richard the Lionheart. Their development and their influence*, in: *Richard Coeur de Lion in history and myth*, ed. Janet L. NELSON, London 1992, p. 51–69, here 60–63 (with references).

25 BOSWELL (see n. 23) p. 298; for a survey of the current state of research on homosexuality in the Middle Ages and a general criticism of Boswell's approach cf. Warren JOHANSSON, William PERCY, *Homosexuality*, in: *Handbook of Medieval Sexuality*, ed. by Vern L. BULLOUGH, James A. BRUNDAGE, New York 1996, p. 155–189.

26 *L'histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, ed. Paul MEYER, Paris 1891, vol. 1, p. 324, v. 8984: *lors le couchèrent en un lit* (4th sep. 1189); cf. Sidney PAINTER, *William Marshall*, Baltimore 1933, p. 71; Jessie CROSLAND, *William the Marshall*, London 1962, p. 65. As to the interpretation of the verse cf. GILLINGHAM, *Richard* (see n. 24) p. 107 = IDEM, *Some legends* (see n. 24) p. 63, who tacitly cor-

Salisbury proudly mentions that Pope Hadrian IV (1154–1159) ate from the same dish with him when he visited him as an old friend at Rome²⁷. In fact, the combination of both gestures as a confirmation of a peace agreement can be traced back to the early Middle Ages. Gregory of Tours tells us that two of his fellow-citizens, Sicharius and Chramnisindus, settled a long blood feud by a pact of *amicitia* and finally became so fond of each other that they frequently ate together and slept in the same bed (*in tantum se caritate mutua diligenter, ut plerumque simul cibum caperent ac in uno pariter stratu recumberent*)²⁸.

c) The period during which the *homagium*, complemented by ritualized gestures of *amicitia*, served as the outward form of a peace treaty came to an abrupt end when Philip II started to insist on the feudo-vassalic subordination of those who had done homage to him under his jurisdiction²⁹. As the ritual of homage had not changed, he and his contempo-

rects Meyer's translation »they put him into a bed« (vol. 3, p. 112). – The friendship between the young emperor Otto III and his teacher and advisor Bishop Adalbert of Prague is described in similar terms by the author of the Roman *Vita Adalberti*, ed. Jadwiga KARWASIŃSKA (*Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, N.S. IV.1), Warsaw 1962, p. 35 and 63 (= MGH SS IV, p. 591). According to this account, Adalbert stayed at Otto's side day and night *velut dulcissimus cubicularius*, because he loved him; cf. Gerd ALTHOFF, *Otto III.*, Darmstadt 1996, p. 97 and 202 (with further references to other versions of the *Vita Adalberti*); JAEGER (see n. 23) p. 549 (n. 13); J.-M. SANSTERRE, *Otton III et les saints ascètes de son temps*, in: *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia* 43 (1989) p. 377–412, here: 381 sq. The author of the *vita* stresses that Adalbert did not so *seculi aliquo amore captus*; this shows that the practice was neither uncommon nor restricted to religious advisors. – Further written evidence for sleeping in one bed as a ritual of friendship seems to be rare for the central Middle Ages. Artistic representations, however, as in the famous capital from Autun depicting the three Magi as crowned kings sleeping under one cover (Gertrud SCHILLER, *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst*, Gütersloh 1966, vol. 1, p. 110; Louis RÉAU, *Iconographie de l'art chrétien*, vol. 2.2, Paris 1957, p. 252 sq.) prove that the idea was by no means uncommon. – As a ritual confirming a peace arrangement it subsisted as late as 1325, when (at least according to later Habsburgian historiography) King Louis the Bavarian »shared table and bed« with his former rival, Duke Frederick the Fair of Austria, with whom he was to rule jointly »like a brother« during the following years; cf. Adam WANDRUSZKA, *Das Haus Habsburg*, 6th ed., Vienna 1987, p. 73.

27) John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon*, ed. J.B. HALL (*Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Medievalis* 98), Turnhout 1991, p. 183: *Et cum Romanus pontifex esset, me in propria mensa gaudebat habere convivam et eundem ciphum et discum sibi et mihi volebat et faciebat me renitente communem*; cf. BOSWELL (see n. 23) p. 216, n. 30. – According to Petrus Damiani, *Vita beati Romualdi*, ed. Giovanni TABACCO (*Fonti per la Storia d'Italia* 94), Rome 1957 (= PL 145, p. 975 C), Emperor Otto III granted the same honour to his cleric Tammo, *qui, sicut dicitur, in tantum regi familiaris et carus extiterat, ut utriusque vestes utrumque contegerent et amborum manus una parobsis communi sepe convivio sotiaret*; cf. ALTHOFF (see n. 26) p. 204; C. Stephen JAEGER, *Marke and Tristan. The love of medieval kings and their courts*, in: *In hôhem prise. A Festschrift in honor of Ernst S. Dick* (*Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik* 480), Göppingen 1989, 185 sq.; IDEM (see n. 23) p. 549, n. 12. – That a host shared his bowl with his guest in order to honour him, is a frequent motif in twelfth-century poetry; cf. e.g. Chrétien de Troyes, *Perceval*, v. 1564 sq. and the other references given by E.H. RUCK, *An Index of themes and motifs in twelfth-century French Arthurian poetry* (*Arthurian Studies* 25), Cambridge 1991, p. 115, no. O-c-16. It was so common a practice that it could even serve as point of reference for a dishonouring punishment in Arthurian poetry: Having raped a young lady, Greoreas is forced to eat out of the same trough as the dogs for one month; Chrétien de Troyes, *Perceval*, v. 7111–7115, adopted by Wolfram of Eschenbach, *Parzival*, 524, 17 sq. and 528, 24–29.

28) Gregory of Tours, *Historiarum libri decem*, ed. Bruno KRUSCH, Wilhelm LEVISON (*MGH SS rer. Mer.* 1.1), Hannover 1951, p. 432, l. 20 sq.; cf. ALTHOFF (see n. 15), p. 93 sq. For a historiographical assessment of this episode in the context of the *Historiae* cf. Martin HEINZELMANN, *Gregor von Tours (538–594)*, Darmstadt 1994, p. 56 sq.

raries were probably convinced that in doing so he did nothing but exercise a right which all his predecessors had had. In fact, he completely changed the meaning of the ritual by narrowing its significance to that one of its three elements which had hitherto been the least important. Under these circumstances the function of the *homagium* had to change, too. As it had become an act which defined the legal status of lord and vassal and restricted the extent to which the latter could rule independently, doing homage could no longer serve as the mere form of a peace treaty. Instead, now (and only now) the question when, where and how homage was to be done became a major point in the Anglo-French treaty negotiations³⁰.

Lemarignier and other historians have tried to solve the problem described here by distinguishing between legally different forms of homage (*hommage de paix* for peace-agreements, *hommage vassalique* for acts of subordination)³¹. Evidence for this distinction, however, remains extremely sparse. In fact, it is undeniable that throughout the 12th century, doing homage was not a clearly defined legal act, but remained a flexible ritual able to cover a wide variety of relationships. In the Anglo-French relationship at least, the emerging claim of the French kings to sovereignty over the whole of France was only one, and perhaps the least important, of its elements.

29 BALDWIN (see n. 5) p. 259–303; cf. also Jean-Pierre POLY, Eric BOURNAZEL, Couronne et mouvance. Institutions et représentations mentales, in: La France de Philippe Auguste (see n. 5) p. 217–234; Josette METMAN, Les inféodations royales d'après le »Recueil des actes de Philippe Auguste«, *ibid.*, p. 503–517.

30 CUTTINO (see n. 6) p. 11, 60 sq., 65, 73 sq.

31 HOLLISTER (see n. 8) p. 231; LEMARIGNIER (see n. 7) p. 81–83; Pierre PETOT, L'hommage servile. Essai sur la nature juridique de l'hommage, in: *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 1927, p. 68–107, here: p. 82–84.