

**Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte**

Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris

(Institut historique allemand)

Band 47 (2020)

**Elizabeth A. R. Brown**

**Orderic Vitalis and Hugues of France, Putative Son of  
Louis VI and Adelaïde of Maurienne**

DOI: 10.11588/fr.2020.1.86569

---

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.

# Zur Forschungsgeschichte und Methodendiskussion

ELIZABETH A. R. BROWN

## ORDERIC VITALIS AND HUGUES OF FRANCE, PUTATIVE SON OF LOUIS VI AND ADELAÏDE OF MAURIENNE

Hugues of France has been a thorn in the flesh and an embarrassment to the historians who have dealt with him since in his »*Historia ecclesiastica*« Orderic Vitalis (1075–ca. 1142), monk historian of Saint-Évroul in Normandy, declared him the fourth and last son of King Louis VI of France (1081–1137, r. 1108–1137) and his wife Adelaïde of Maurienne († 1154)<sup>1</sup>. Announcing Louis VI's advent in 1108 after the death of his father King Philip (1052–1108, r. 1060–1108), Orderic wrote that Louis ruled for twenty-nine years, experiencing »good times and bad« (*inter prospera et adversa*), and that his wife Adelaïde, daughter of Humbert of Maurienne, bore him four sons: Philippe, Louis *Florus*, Henri, and Hugues<sup>2</sup>. Orderic is the only

- 1 As Amanda Jane HINGST observed, citing Orderic Vitalis's »*Historia ecclesiastica*« is complicated because of the different editorial principles observed in the two major editions: *Written World: Past and Place in the Work of Orderic Vitalis*, Notre Dame 2009, p. 137. The complete edition by Auguste LE PRÉVOST, working with Léopold DELISLE, appeared between 1838 and 1855: *Historiæ ecclesiasticæ libri tredecim; ex veteris codicis Uticensis collatione emendavit, et suas animadversiones adjecit*, 5 vols., Paris 1838–1855 (Publications de la Société de l'Histoire de France); DELISLE's *Notice sur Orderic Vitalis* is found in vol. 5, p. i–cvi, and was also published separately. Marjorie CHIBNALL's edition in 6 volumes, published between 1969 and 1980, is less complete and differs in the presentation of book 7: *Historia Ecclesiastica. The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, Oxford 1969–1980. I will refer to the work as »*Historia ecclesiastica*«, giving the conventional books and chapters, and cite Chibnall's ed. before Le Prévost's. – I use the following abbreviations: BnF = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France; MGH = *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica* (SS, *Scriptores*); RHGF = *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, (ed.) Martin BOUQUET et al., 24 vols., Paris 1738–1904. I extend warm thanks to Emily Zack Tabuteau and to Richard C. Famiglietti for their counsel and suggestions.
- 2 Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 11, ch. 34; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 6, p. 154–155; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 4, p. 284–285 (*Ludovicus Tedbaldus ... [sceptro] Gallorum xxviii annis ... potitus est. Hic Adelaïdem filiam Humberti principis Interfontium duxit uxorem, quæ peperit ei quatuor filios Philippum et Ludovicum Florum, Henricum et Hugonem*). André DUCHESNE included this passage in the *preuves* of his *Histoire genealogique de la Maison Royale de Dreux*, et de quelques autres Familles illustres, qui en sont descenduës par Femmes, Paris 1631, p. 220, reading *xviii. annis*, as in Le Prévost's edition (where, in n. 4, p. 284, Le Prévost noted »Ce calcul est encore inexact«, since Louis ruled for 29 years); CHIBNALL believed (vol. 6, p. 155 n. 5) that the figure was »probably altered after the first draft«. For Louis and Adelaïde's other children, including Robert (1125/1126–1188), Philippe (1132/1133–1161), Pierre (1135/1136), and Constance († after 1176), as well as three or more sons whose names are unknown and who were in-

contemporary historian who mentioned Hugues, and his testimony was, if known, disregarded for some five hundred years. There is no other evidence of Hugues's existence.

After a lapse of almost five centuries, Orderic's Hugues began to attract notice. Since then, attending to and respectful of Orderic's testimony, historians, antiquarians, and genealogists have conscientiously attempted to incorporate Hugues into the royal family. Having come to believe that Orderic was fully capable of elaborate invention and manipulating the truth for his own purposes<sup>3</sup>, I have concluded that Hugues does not and never has had a bona fide place in the family of Louis VI and Adelaïde, and that Orderic created him out of whole cloth. Before explaining my position, I will consider the strategies André Duchesne (1584–1640) and later historians have used to include Hugues among the offspring of Louis and Adelaïde. Then, after analyzing the context in which Orderic made his allegation, I will discuss Orderic's treatment of the Capetian line, focusing particularly on Louis VI's illegitimate daughter Isabelle, his eldest son Philippe, and his namesake and successor Louis VII, as well as Hugues Capet, the founder of the Capetian line and the ancestral homonym of the son Orderic assigned to Louis VI.

### André Duchesne, Later Historians, and Hugues of France

After Hugues appeared in Orderic Vitalis's history as the fourth and last son of Louis VI and Adelaïde of Maurienne, I have found no trace of him for almost half a millenium. At long last, owing to André Duchesne, the first editor of Orderic's »*Historia ecclesiastica*«, Hugues became a serious candidate for inclusion in the royal family, despite the fact that nothing was known about him. Hugues was first revealed to the general public in the collection of Norman historical works that Duchesne published in 1619, which included Orderic's »*Historia ecclesiastica*«<sup>4</sup>. At the end of the volume

terred at the house of Saint-Victor, see my forthcoming article, *The Children of Louis VI of France and Adelaïde of Maurienne, and the Date of a Historical Compendium of Saint-Denis*. The date of Constance's birth is unknown, although she was married in March 1140 to Eustace of Blois, count of Boulogne, and son of King Stephen of England (r. 1135–1154); Eustace died in 1153, and in 1154 Constance was married to Raimond of Toulouse, who abandoned her in 1166. There is no evidence that Constance had any children of her first marriage, although she did of her second, soon after she was wedded. If she was born after Robert and before the second Philippe, between ca. 1127 and 1131 or 1132, she may have been in her early teens when first married, although it is not impossible that she was younger. In the genealogical chart that accompanies his book, Andrew W. LEWIS placed Constance between Robert (and Hugues, whom he said died young) and the junior Philippe: *Royal Succession in Capetian France. Studies on Familial Order and the State*, Cambridge MA 1981 (Harvard Historical Studies, 100), p. xiii; tr. as *Le sang royal: la famille capétienne et l'État, France, X<sup>e</sup>–XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, (tr.) Jeannie CARLIER, Paris 1986 (Bibliothèque des histoires), p. 19.

- 3 In *Written World* (as in n. 1), p. 10–11, HINGST considered the possible reasons why Orderic deferred discussing until the relics' partial recovery in 1131 the theft of saintly bodies (including its founder's) from Saint-Évroul in the mid-tenth century, for which see Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 6, ch. 10; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 3, p. 302–343; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 3, p. 83–120. On the relic theft, see also below.
- 4 André DUCHESNE, *Historiae Normannorum scriptores antiqui*, Paris 1619, dedicated (at Paris, on the kalends of April, 1619) to the clergy, Parlement (*Senatus*), and people of Rouen. Orderic's

a genealogical tree contains the names of the children of Louis VI and Adelaïde who appear in the histories and provides references to the pages where they are mentioned. Six sons are listed: Philippe (crowned as king), Louis *Florus* (who succeeded his father), a second Philippe (dean of Saint-Martin of Tours)<sup>5</sup>, Hugues, Henri (archbishop of Reims), and Robert<sup>6</sup>. The tree also includes a daughter Constance, and another daughter, the spouse of Guillaume of Chaumont, to whom Orderic Vitalis alluded when, recounting events of 1119, he identified Guillaume as Louis VI's son-in-law, without, however, discussing (or naming) his wife<sup>7</sup>. Thus, relying on Orderic, Duchesne added to the royal children known from other sources Hugues and a daughter, whose name he did not give but who is elsewhere called Isabelle.

Duchesne must have had doubts about Hugues. He did not appear in a more perfunctory genealogy centered on Adelaïde of Maurienne that Duchesne also published in 1619, in his survey of the kings, dukes, and counts of Burgundy and Arles<sup>8</sup>. Here Duchesne listed as Louis and Adelaïde's children two daughters, of whom he said the younger married Guillaume of Chaumont, but just five sons – Philippe, Louis the young, Henri (archbishop of Reims), Robert of Dreux, and Pierre of Courtenay and Montargis<sup>9</sup>. Thus Duchesne omitted Hugues and the second Philippe who had appeared in the Norman genealogy, and added Pierre of Courtenay, absent from the Norman list doubtless because none of the histories Duchesne edited in the volume mentioned him. Evidently Duchesne trusted Orderic Vitalis enough to retain the daughter who was the wife of Guillaume of Chaumont. Hugues, however, did not appear.

»Historia ecclesiastica« is found on p. 319–925, and on p. 1074 Duchesne's genealogical table of »part of the family of the kings of the French«, which included Emma, duchess of Normandy, and Margaret, queen of England (*PARS FAMILIÆ REGVM FRANCORVM, In qua EMMA Normanniæ Ducissa, & MARGARETA Regina Angliæ*).

- 5 In the genealogy (*Historiae Normannorum scriptores* [as in n. 4], p. 1074), DUCHESNE referred for the second Philippe to a passage in a work he entitled »Chronica Normanniæ« (ibid., p. 976–1014 [997B]), which he had found in a Saint-Victor MS (a fifteenth-century compilation, BnF, lat. 14 663, fol. 133r–158r, 158r–168v, the first part of which consists of excerpts from the chronicle of Robert of Torigni, with many chronological errors; for Philippe see ibid., fol. 141r–v). There, under the year 1159, the statement *Mortuus est PHILIPPVS filius Ludouici Regis Francorum, Decanus sancti Martini Turonis*, follows the announcement of the death in childbirth of Queen Constance of France. I discuss Duchesne's treatment of the second Philippe in more detail in my forthcoming article (as in n. 2).
- 6 Robert was also cited in the »Chronica Normanniæ« (*Historiae Normannorum scriptores* [as in n. 4], p. 981B), under the year 1143, when Louis VII arranged his marriage to the widow of the count of Perche, Rotrude.
- 7 *Historiae Normannorum scriptores* (as in n. 4), p. 1074 (*N. altera filia vxor Guillelmi de Caluomonte*, referring to the text of Orderic's »Historia ecclesiastica« in ibid., p. 856–857). See Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 12, ch. 19; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 6, p. 248–249; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 3, p. 368–369. On this woman, named Isabelle, see Jean DUFOUR, *Un faux de Louis VI relatif à Liancourt (Oise)*, in: *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 144 (1986), p. 39–67 (46, 66–67); and Patrick VAN KERREBROUCK, *Nouvelle histoire généalogique de l'auguste maison de France*, vol. 2, *Les Capétiens 987–1328*, Villeneuve d'Ascq 2000, p. 82–83.
- 8 André DUCHESNE, *Histoire des roys, ducs, et comtes de Bourgongne, et d'Arles*, Paris 1619, p. 619–620.
- 9 *Et deux filles, dont la puisnée espousa GVILLAVME de CHAVMONT, qualifié gendre du Roy LOVYS VI. par Orderic en son Histoire Ecclesiastique*: ibid., p. 620.

In his masterful history of the house of Dreux, published in 1631, Duchesne wavered. He hesitated to acknowledge Hugues as a rightful member of the royal family, yet he was reluctant to exclude him entirely. Apparently torn between accepting and rejecting Orderic's testimony, Duchesne did not situate Hugues in the formal family tree at the beginning of the volume, where Louis and Adelaïde's children were listed as Philippe, Louis, Henri, Robert, Philippe, Pierre, and Constance<sup>10</sup>. Nor did he mention Hugues in the section of the work where he described the better known children born to the king and queen<sup>11</sup>. But Hugues crept in at the end of the account, where Duchesne introduced him in connection with otherwise unknown sons of Louis and Adelaïde who had been buried at Saint-Victor in Paris, whose existence is known through an act of the couple's son Henri, future archbishop of Reims, which Duchesne included in the *preuves* that accompanied the history of Dreux<sup>12</sup>. In this connection Duchesne proposed, rather tentatively and obliquely, that one of the sons interred at Saint-Victor to whom Henri referred might possibly be this Hugues. »The order of [the sons'] birth and names remains unknown«, he declared, »unless perhaps one of them is Hugues, mentioned by Orderic as the fourth son of Louis the Fat«<sup>13</sup>. Duchesne's proposal was exceedingly cautious, and, as has been seen, his doubts were pronounced enough to lead him to omit Hugues from the schematic table at the beginning of the book<sup>14</sup>. However hesitant, Duchesne's remarks about Hugues, like his comments on the additional sons buried at Saint-Victor, have had significant consequences.

Duchesne paused before committing himself, and when he pronounced he did so cautiously. In contrast, subsequent historians have proceeded with assurance. While differing over Hugues's sibling rank, they have adopted him as a child of Louis and Adelaïde. In 1652 Philippe Labbe (1607–1667) identified Hugues as the seventh and youngest son, who died young<sup>15</sup>. Nine years later, in his book on the »royal house« of Courtenay, Jean du Bouchet (1599–1684) followed Labbe but made Hugues the

10 DUCHESNE, *Histoire de Dreux* (as in n. 2), p. 2.

11 *Ibid.*, p. 6–12.

12 *Ibid.*, p.11, 225–226 (*quosdam de FILIIS SVIS fratribus nostris, cum ex hac vita decederent, in eadem Religionis Domo sepeliri mandavit*); the act was confirmed by Louis VII in 1146. I discuss Henri's act and the evidence regarding the sons buried at Saint-Victor in a forthcoming article (as in n. 2).

13 DUCHESNE, *Histoire de Dreux* (as in n. 2), p. 11 (*Il est vray qu'oultre ces six fils precedents le Roy LOYS LE GROS & ADELE son espouse en eurent encore quelques autres. Mais ils moururent jeunes, & furent enterrez dans le Chapitre de l'Abbaye de S. Victor lés Paris. Ce qui s'apprend d'une Charte de HENRY leur frere, en laquelle il fait mention d'eux, sans toutesfois les nommer. Les vestiges de leur sepulture paroissent dans le mesme Chapitre, grauez sur deux pierres blanches, où pour toute inscription il y a seulement en deux mots, que ce sont les enfans du Roy, Regia proles. Parquoy l'ordre de leur naissance, & leurs noms propres, sont demeurez incognus: si ce n'est que HVGVES, rapporté dans Orderic pour quatriesme fils de LOYS LE GROS, ait esté l'un d'iceux [Ordericus lib. xi. Hist. Eccles.]*).

14 For the table, see DUCHESNE, *Histoire de Dreux* (as in n. 2), p. 2.

15 Philippe LABBE, *Tableaux Genealogiques de la Maison Royale de France*, Paris 1652, p. 48. In the second volume of his *L'Abregé Royal de l'Alliance Chronologique de l'Histoire Sacrée et Profane*, Paris 1651, p. 170, Labbe listed as the offspring of Louis and Adelaïde Philippe, Louis, Henri, Robert, Philippe, and Pierre, although he judiciously added to the list &c., in order to leave space for others, including, presumably, Hugues and Constance.

fourth rather than the seventh son because Orderic Vitalis assigned him that rank – without noting that Orderic attributed only four sons in total to Louis VI. As a result, by du Bouchet's reckoning Philippe, Louis, and Henri preceded Hugues, and Hugues was followed by Robert, Philippe, Pierre, and Constance<sup>16</sup>. In the three editions of his influential »Histoire genealogique«, published between 1674 and 1733, le Père Anselme de Sainte-Marie (1625–1694) endorsed du Bouchet's schema, which, owing to Anselme's authority, has influenced all later descriptions of Louis VI's family<sup>17</sup>.

More recently, in 1981 and again in 1986, Andrew W. Lewis accepted Hugues as Louis VI's child<sup>18</sup>. Concerned about his sibling rank, Lewis cited Orderic's testimony making him Louis's fourth son (without explicitly noting that Orderic listed only four sons) but concluded that Hugues was probably younger than his brother Robert (who was born between 1124 and 1126), and was thus his parents' fifth son. Following Duchesne, Lewis considered Hugues likely to be one of the royal sons who died in childhood, to whom Henri referred as buried at Saint-Victor. Lewis indeed proposed that Orderic Vitalis »name[d] one of [these sons] Hugh« – although Orderic had said nothing about Saint-Victor<sup>19</sup>. Lewis thought the name must have been

16 Jean DU BOUCHET, *Histoire généalogique de la maison royale de Courtenay*, Paris 1661, p. 4 (*La quatriemes en ordre de naissance selon Orderic au liure XI. de son Histoire Ecclesiastique auoit nom HVGVES, & lequel sans doute mourut jeune, car il ne se treuve point nommé avec ses freres dans les Chartes du temps*).

17 In the first edition of his work, Anselme followed du Bouchet (*HUGUES, mort sans doute jeune, car il ne se trouve point nommé avec ses Freres dans les Chartes du temps*) – as he did in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> editions, with slight variations: *Histoire de la Maison Royale de France, et des grands officiers de la Couronne*, 2 vols., Paris 1674, vol. 1, p. 76–77, and for Pierre, vol. 1, p. 409; see also the second ed., *Histoire genealogique et chronologique de la Maison royale de France*, (ed.) Honoré CAILLE, seigneur DU FOURNY, 2 vols., Paris 1712, vol. 1, p. 44, 225; and the 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., *Histoire genealogique et chronologique de la Maison royale de France*, (ed.) les P. Ange de Sainte Rosalie (François RAFFARD) and Simplicien, 9 vols., Paris 1726–1733, vol. 1, p. 75, 473. It is noteworthy that Achille LUCHAIRE, who recognized Orderic's biases and distortions (see n. 26 below), apparently did not accept Hugues as a son of Louis and Adelaïde. In *Louis VI le Gros. Annales de sa vie et de son règne (1081–1137)*, Paris 1890, p. xxxiv, he attributed just six sons and a daughter to the royal couple, and he did not include any son named Hugues in his index. I discuss Luchaire's views of Orderic at greater length in a forthcoming article (as in n. 2).

18 »Orderic can be read as making Hugh the fourth son, but Robert, born 1124–1126, was probably older than he«: LEWIS, *Royal Succession* (as in n. 2), p. 249 n. 61; tr. in *id.*, *Sang royal*, p. 309 n. 61 (»Il est possible de comprendre, chez Orderic, qu'Hugues était le quatrième fils, mais Robert ...«). In the text of his book (*Royal Succession*, p. 50), LEWIS stated that »Robert was almost certainly the elder«; tr. in *id.*, *Sang royal*, p. 90 (»Robert étant presque certainement l'aîné des deux«).

19 LEWIS, *Royal Succession* (as in n. 2), p. 249 n. 61. The translation in *id.*, *Sang royal* (as in n. 19), p. 309 n. 61 is confusing: »Orderic Vital ... donne à l'un d'eux le nom d'Hugues. Je n'ai pas réussi à trouver le nom des autres [sic].« The reference to »le nom« in the singular suggests just one other son, whereas the plural »des autres« suggests that there were more than one. In *Les Capétiens* (as in n. 7), p. 82–83, without giving a source, VAN KERREBROUCK suggested that a fifth son, Hugues (said to have been born ca. 1122 and to have died at an early age), was perhaps buried at Saint-Victor (»mort en bas âge, peut-être inhumé en l'église de Saint-Victor à Paris, fondée par son père«) and listed a ninth »enfant, mort en bas âge et inhumé en l'église abbatiale de Saint-Victor à Paris«. A forged charter of Louis VI for the house of Tiron dated 12 April 1120 mentions *dulcissimus filius noster in ipso Tyronensi cenobio per nos oblatas*, and although the son is not named in the charter, he has been (wrongly) identified with the son Hugues mentioned by

bestowed because the older sons Philippe, Louis, Henri, and Robert had been named, »following in reverse the order of kings in the Capetian dynasty« – although in fact the first son was called after his grandfather King Philip and the next for his father, before the reverse pattern was followed, with the third called after his great-grandfather King Henry (r. 1027–1060) and the fourth after his great-great-grandfather King Robert (r. 987–1031) – and the putative Hugues after Robert’s father, the founder of the dynasty, Hugues Capet<sup>20</sup>.

In 1990 Jean Dufour similarly endorsed Hugues as Louis VI’s son, and suggested that he was »perhaps« one of two children who died young and were buried at Saint-Victor, but he also pointed out that Orderic was the only contemporary historian to mention him, and in the genealogical table he provided (where Hugues was listed as fifth son, between Robert and Pierre) a question mark follows his name<sup>21</sup>. Ten years later, in 2000, Patrick Van Kerrebrouck likewise declared Hugues Louis VI’s fifth son, saying he was born »vers 1122«, died young, and was perhaps buried at Saint-Victor<sup>22</sup>. In the comprehensive study of Louis VI that he brought out in 2007, Éric Bournazel followed Dufour in making Hugues Louis’s fifth son, although, like Dufour, he placed a question mark after Hugues’s name in a genealogical table he adapted from Dufour’s<sup>23</sup>.

### Orderic Vitalis and Hugues of France

As has been noted, Orderic Vitalis is the only contemporary or near-contemporary historian who recorded Hugues’s existence. English-born, a monk of Saint-Évroul in Normandy, Orderic was fascinated by the past and aimed to preserve the deeds he deemed worthy of commemoration, particularly those distinguished by their drama. He was a moralist. The praise and blame he assigned was sometimes direct, sometimes oblique. His narratives reflect his assessments. Having honed his talents in editing and expanding Guillaume of Jumièges’s »Gesta Normannorum ducum«, a task he finished around 1113, he devoted the rest of his life to his »Historia ecclesiastica«<sup>24</sup>. In thirteen books he recounted the history of the church from Christ’s birth through his own times, paying special attention to the Normans and to Saint-Évroul’s

Orderic: LEWIS, *Royal Succession*, p. 250 n. 72; tr. in ID., *Sang royal*, p. 311 n. 72; VAN KERREBROUCK, *Les Capétiens* (as in n. 7), p. 90 n. 77; see *Cartulaire de l’abbaye de la Sainte-Trinité de Tiron*, (ed.) Lucien MERLET, 2 vols., Chartres 1882–1883, vol. 1, p. 46–49 (48).

20 LEWIS, *Royal Succession* (as in n. 2), p. 58; tr. in ID. *Sang royal*, p. 90.

21 Jean DUFOUR, *Louis VI, roi de France (1108–1137)*, à la lumière des actes royaux et des sources narratives, in: *Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 134/2 (1990), p. 456–482 (p. 468 n. 56, 469). In Dufour’s genealogical table (p. 469) Pierre de Courtenay appears as the sixth son, younger than the second Philippe, but Dufour did not give his birthdate or discuss him further.

22 VAN KERREBROUCK, *Les Capétiens* (as in n. 7), p. 82 (and see n. 19 above), where Henri, the third son, is said to have been born between 1121 and 1123; Robert, the fourth son, was assigned a birthdate between 1124 and 1126 (*ibid.*, p. 307).

23 Louis VI le Gros, Paris 2007, p. 420 n. 37, 466–467.

24 CHIBNALL, General Introduction, in her ed. of Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), vol. 1, p. 31; Elisabeth M. C. VAN HOUTS, Introduction, in: *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni*, EAD. (ed.), 2 vols., Oxford 1992–1995 (*Oxford Medieval Texts*), vol. 1, p. lxvi–lxxvii.

patron saint and its past, and in the last seven books focusing on the rulers of Normandy and England and the clashes of the Normans and English with the French<sup>25</sup>. His loyalties and sympathies lay with the Anglo-Normans. While not unwavering, his hostility to the French erupts intermittently throughout his history, particularly in his treatment of the Capetians, who were rivals of and often warred with the Normans and English<sup>26</sup>.

Orderic mentioned Louis's son Hugues in the 34<sup>th</sup> chapter of his eleventh book, which was written in 1136, a year before Louis VI died in 1137, and which, with the rest of the work, he updated sporadically until his own death five or so years later. The eleventh book focuses on the years 1101 to 1114, the first part of the reign of Henry I of England and Normandy (1068–1135, r. 1100–1135). Turning to France, Orderic noted the death in 1108 of King Philip and the succession of his son Louis, and then described Louis and his wife Adelaïde as having just four sons: Philippe, Louis *Florus*, Henri, and Hugues. The names of the first three – Philippe, Louis, and Henri – were well known and their existence amply attested<sup>27</sup>. To them Orderic added Hugues.

Could Orderic have heard it rumored that Louis VI and his wife had only four sons and that the last was called Hugues? Nothing is impossible – although by 1136 Louis VI and his wife had had many offspring, none otherwise known to have been

- 25 On the contents of the books, and the order and dates of their composition, see DELISLE, Notice (as in n. 1), p. xxv–lx; and CHIBNALL in her ed. of Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), vol. 1, p. 45–48. Both Delisle and Chibnall noted corrections and additions that Orderic made to his earlier work before his death.
- 26 For background, I have drawn on DELISLE, Notice (as in n. 1); HINGST, *Written World* (as in n. 1); Marjorie CHIBNALL, *The World of Orderic Vitalis*, Oxford 1984; EAD., her General Introduction to her ed. of Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), p. 115 (published in 1980); and the essays by different authors assembled in: Orderic Vitalis. *Life, Works and Interpretations*, (ed.) Charles C. ROZIER et al., Woodbridge 2016, especially William M. AIRD, Orderic's Secular Rulers and Representations of Personality and Power in the *Historia ecclesiastica* (p. 189–216); and Emily ALBU, *Worldly Joy and Heavenly Joy: The Tone of the Historia ecclesiastica* (p. 217–242), who commented incisively on Chibnall's inclination to stress the positive aspects of Orderic's qualities as a historian, including his objectivity and accuracy. LUCHAIRE was far less laudatory and commented repeatedly on Orderic's untrustworthiness and his hostility to Louis, in Louis VI (as in n. 17), p. xx–xxi, xxv, 4 (no. 4), 290–291, 311–312. Likewise, Karl Ferdinand WERNER insisted on Orderic's animosity toward the Capetians, in *Die Legitimität der Kapeitinger und die Entstehung des »Reditus regni Francorum ad stirpem Karoli«*, in: *Die Welt als Geschichte* 12 (1952), p. 203–225, especially p. 211 (noting the influence on Orderic of the »*Historia Francorum Senonensis*«). In *Le roi tué par un cochon. Une mort infâme aux origines des emblèmes de la France?*, Paris 2015 (La librairie du XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle), p. 54–55, Michel PASTOUREAU declared Orderic »souvent hostile aux rois capétiens«. Cf. BOURNAZEL, Louis VI (as in n. 23), p. 19, who noted that Orderic's history was »parfois confuse dans sa chronologie«, but thought him more respectful of the Capetians than do others. I discuss the *Sens* chronicle and the historiographical tradition at Saint-Denis in my forthcoming article, Charles the Bald, the Miraculous Translation of his Remains, and the Construction of the Past at Saint-Denis.
- 27 A letter of Pope Calixtus II (r. 1119–1124) to Louis VI dated 19 February 1124 mentioned Philippe, Louis, and Henri: LUCHAIRE, Louis VI (as in n. 17), p. 157 (no. 340); Bullaire du pape Calixte II, 1119–1124. *Essai de restitution*, (ed.) Ulysse ROBERT, 2 vols., Paris 1891, vol. 2, p. 301 (no. 485); and the forthcoming article mentioned in n. 2 above, where I also discuss the genealogy in Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 2013, fol. 222, prepared ca. 1125, which also lists only these sons.



named Hugues. Still, misleading information about the royal children indeed circulated. A compact history of the French from the fall of Troy to 1108, extended to 1137, which was probably composed at Saint-Denis and is known as the »*Abbreviatio*« (incipit *Anthenor et alii*), ascribes five sons and a daughter to the royal couple, giving the names of neither the fifth and last son nor the daughter, and listing the first four sons (in incorrect order) as Philippe, Louis, Robert, and Henri<sup>28</sup>. This history appears to have circulated widely in Normandy<sup>29</sup>, and likely traces of its influence can be found in Orderic's writings<sup>30</sup>. As to Orderic's enumeration of Louis VI's sons, his listing of the first three sons in correct order suggests that he had reliable information about the royal family. So too does his knowledge that the wife of Guillaume of Chaumont was Louis VI's daughter. Why then did Orderic award Louis and Adelaïde a child named Hugues as the fourth and last of their sons?

Orderic's antipathy to the Capetian house, revealed in many passages in his »*Historia ecclesiastica*«, suggests, I propose, that Orderic assigned Hugues to Louis VI and Adelaïde of Maurienne because the name evoked that of Louis VI's great-great-great-grandfather Hugues Capet (ca. 940–996), founder of the Capetian line, who in 987 had become king of France despite the existence of Carolingian claimants to the throne, descendants of Charlemagne. As will be seen, Orderic knew the accounts of Hugues Capet's rise to power that presented him as an ambitious, upstart traitor, who gained the throne by enlisting the aid of the turncoat bishop Ascelin of Laon. Orderic had his own more moderate views of Hugues Capet, which I will examine

- 28 RHGF, vol. 12, p. 67; MGH SS, vol. 9, p. 405–406 (*Acceptit autem uxorem filiam Humberti Morinense, vel, ut vulgo dicitur de Intermontes; ex qua genuit filios quinque, Philippum, Ludovicum, Robertum, Henricum; quinti nomen non occurrit memoriae, qui et puer decessit: habuitque ex ea filiam unam*); see also BnF, lat. 4937<sup>2</sup>, fol. 27r; and lat. 14 663, fol. 192v. Without mentioning the incorrect birthorder, the editors of RHGF (published in 1781, p. 67 n. g) identified the unnamed and youngest son as *Hugo* and the unnamed daughter as Constance, and also added the names of Philippe, archdeacon of Paris, and Pierre of Courtenay. Georg WAITZ, who edited the work for the MGH (1851, p. 406 n. 87), supplied the names Hugues, Philippe, and Pierre. Note also the mistakes in the account of the family of King Henry of France that Orderic composed for the *Gesta Normannorum ducum* (as in n. 24), (ed.) VAN HOUTS, vol. 2, p. 152–153, and cf. the editor's comment, vol. 1, p. lxxii.
- 29 Rosamond MCKITTERICK pointed out the wide circulation of the »*Abbreviatio*« in Normandy, in: *Postérité et transmission des œuvres historiographiques carolingiennes dans les manuscrits des mondes normands*, in: *L'historiographie médiévale normande et ses sources antiques, X<sup>e</sup>–XII<sup>e</sup> siècle: actes du colloque international de Cerisy-la-Salle et du Scriptorial d'Avranches (8–11 octobre 2009)*, (ed.) Pierre BAUDUIN, Marie-Agnès LUCAS-AVENEL, Caen 2014, p. 25–40, especially p. 28, 36. Robert of Torigni († 1186) appears to have used the »*Abbreviatio*« in the edition of the »*Gesta Normannorum ducum*« on which he worked in the late 1130s and continued correcting for two decades: *The Gesta Normannorum ducum* (as in n. 24), (ed.) VAN HOUTS, vol. 1, p. lxxix–xcj; vol. 2, p. 242–245.
- 30 Like the »*Abbreviatio*«, Orderic's »*Historia*« associated with Adelaïde's father the placename *Intermontes* (similar to the current Piedmont): see notes 2 and 28 above. Similarly, the wording of Orderic's description of the accidental death in 1131 of the young King Philippe – *per uicos Lutetiorum ludens persequeretur de equo corruit* – echoes that used in the »*Abbreviatio*« – *urbe Parisius, de equo corruens, mortuus est*: RHGF, vol. 12, p. 67; MGH SS, vol. 9, p. 406.3; cf. Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 13, ch. 12; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 6, p. 420–423; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 5, p. 26–27. Like the account in the »*Abbreviatio*«, Orderic's report does not mention the pig that caused the young Philippe's fall, a subject of considerable interest to contemporaries and to others who recorded the event: PASTOUREAU, *Le roi tué* (as in n. 26), p. 43–56, and *passim*.

below. Nonetheless, however Hugues had gained the throne, the questions raised about his accession weighed with increasing heaviness on his heirs and successors as they attempted to establish themselves as a legitimate, divinely approved line. King Henry, Hugues Capet's grandson, indeed named his third son Hugues, but after this the name fell into royal disfavor, arguably because of the increasingly pointed charges of illegitimacy that dogged Hugues Capet's descendents<sup>31</sup>. Emphasizing the Capetians' links with Hugues Capet served as a reminder of the controversial origins of Capetian rule.

### Orderic Vitalis's Hostility toward the Capetians

The context in which Orderic announced the names of Louis VI and Adelaïde's four sons makes clear his lack of regard for Louis's father Philip, and for Louis himself. Before turning to Louis and his children, Orderic dwelled on King Philip's decision to be interred at Fleury rather than at Saint-Denis because as a »terrible sinner« he did not dare to be buried near the body of »such a great martyr« for fear of incurring the awful fate that had long ago been visited on Charles Martel (whose damnation for appropriating church property was recounted in the »Visio Eucherii«). Orderic had already insisted on the king's sinful and disreputable behavior in books eight and nine, where he described at length Philip's shocking marriage to Bertrade of Montfort and the church's condemnation of his deeds. Orderic's final comments on Philip in book nine made clear the king's likely reasons for avoiding burial at Saint-Denis. »Chastised by the pontiffs of Gaul for having of his own free will deserted his wife – and [Bertrade] her husband – [Philip] was unwilling to renounce the suspect covenant, but, wasted by age and disease, he rotted away, sobbing, on the dungheap of adultery<sup>32</sup>.« Orderic did not mince words.

In the eleventh book, after introducing Louis and his four sons in chapter 34, Orderic went on to describe the opposition Louis encountered during the first years of his reign from the tyrannical nobles his father had never tamed, whose resistance forced Louis to turn to the bishops of France for support. In the next chapter Orderic recounted the failures, defeats, and frustrations Louis had experienced before his

31 For the last Carolingians and the early Capetians, see Christian SETTIPANI, with Patrick VAN KERREBROUCK, *Nouvelle histoire généalogique de l'auguste maison de France*, vol. 1<sup>1</sup>, *La pré-histoire des Capétiens*, 481–987: Mérovingiens, Carolingiens et Robertiens, Villeneuve d'Ascq 1993, p. 327–339, 408–419. On the circumstances of Hugues Capet's accession and its consequences, see WERNER, *Die Legitimität der Kapetinger* (as in n. 26); and Elizabeth A. R. BROWN, *La généalogie capétienne dans l'historiographie du Moyen Âge: Philippe le Bel, le reniement du *reditus* et la création d'une ascendance carolingienne pour Hugues Capet*, in: *Religion et culture autour de l'an Mil: royaume capétien et Lotharingie. Actes du colloque Hugues Capet 987–1987. La France de l'an Mil*. Auxerre, 26 et 27 juin 1987 – Metz, 11 et 12 septembre 1987, (ed.) Dominique IOGNA-PRAT, Jean-Charles PICARD, Paris 1990, p. 199–214.

32 Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 8, ch. 20; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 4, p. 260–263; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 3, p. 386–391; see also *ibid.*, bk. 9, ch. 2; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 5, p. 10–11; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 3, p. 462 (*A pontificibus Gallie castigatus quod ille uxorem et ipsa maritum ultro deseruerit, a fædo reatu respiscere noluit, sed senio et ægritudine tabidus in adulterii stercore flebiliter computruit*).

father's death, with his stepmother undermining him and abetting his enemies<sup>33</sup>. Orderic commenced by saying that in his youth Louis had been betrothed to a daughter of Count Gui of Rochefort but had been unable to govern the county because of the nobles' hostility. Why did they oppose him? According to Orderic, because »he had given Lucianne, the virgin to whom he had been betrothed, to Guichard of Beau-lieu«<sup>34</sup>. Here Orderic twisted the truth and manipulated chronology, presenting as a betrothal what had been a marriage that was dissolved in 1107 at the Council of Troyes, and mis-identifying Lucianne's second husband, who was Guichard de Beaujeu<sup>35</sup>. As it stands, Orderic's statement suggests that Louis was resisted because he had handed over to another man a woman to whom he had simply been betrothed – leaving the woman's virginal state in doubt and providing grounds for suspicion that she might have borne Louis the daughter who, as has been seen, was wedded to Guillaume of Chaumont.

As to Guillaume, Orderic dealt with him in book twelve, recounting events of the year 1119. There Orderic referred to him twice as »the king's son-in-law«, without giving the name of his wife, the king's daughter. Drawing attention to Guillaume as *gener regis* obviously raised interest in the identity of the woman who was married to the man whom Orderic described, unflatteringly, as a »haughty and angry young novice«, eager for lucre, one of whose rash escapades resulted in his capture and the payment of a huge ransom<sup>36</sup>. Clearly the woman could not have been the son of Adelaïde of Maurienne (who was Louis's second wife, as Orderic had made clear, and as his readers might well have known – despite Orderic's failure to mention it – had married Louis just four years before 1119, in the spring of 1115)<sup>37</sup>. Thus Guillau-

33 Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 11, ch. 35; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 6, p. 156–159; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 4, p. 285–288. Of Louis's coronation Orderic simply said that he was *Aurelianus intronizatus*, without mentioning the opposition to his installation that led to the ceremony's being held in Orléans rather than in Reims, for which see LUCHAIRE, Louis VI (as in n. 17), p. 30–31 (no. 57); Christof ROLKER, Marcel SCHAWÉ, *Das Gutachten Ivos von Chartres zur Krönung Ludwigs VI.*, in: *Francia* 34 (2007), p. 146–157; Johanna DALE, *Royal Inauguration and the Liturgical Calendar in England, France, and the Empire, c. 1050–c. 1250*, in: *Anglo-Norman Studies XXXVII: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2014*, (ed.) Elisabeth VAN HOUTS, Woodbridge 2015, p. 83–98 (p. 86–88).

34 *In iuventute sua Ludouicus filiam Guidonis Rubei comitis de Rupeforti desponsauit, et hereditario iure competentem comitatum subiugare sibi satagit. Capreosam et Montem-Leberici et Betholcortem aliaque oppida obsedit, sed multis nobilibus illi fortiter obstantibus non optinuit, presertim quia Lucianam uirginem quem desponsauerat Guiscardo de Bello Loco donauerat*: Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 11, ch. 35; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 6, p. 156–157; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 4, p. 285.

35 Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 11, ch. 35; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 6, p. 156 n. 2–3; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 4, p. 285–286 n. 3. Citing LUCHAIRE, Louis VI (as in n. 17), p. 27 (no. 50), CHIBNALL pointed out in her ed. of the »*Historia ecclesiastica*« (vol. 6, p. 156 n. 3) that Lucianne married Guichard of Beaujeu.

36 Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 12, ch. 19; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 6, p. 248–249; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 4, p. 368–369 (*Tunc Guillelmus de Caluimonte gener regis aliique superbi tirones, irati quod Britolii nichil lucrati fuissent, ad Tegulense castrum fere ducenti diuerterunt, ut sibi aliquid emolumenti seu laudis uendicarent. Porro Gislebertus, Tegulensis castellanus ... [V]enientibus uero Francis subito prosiluit, generumque regis Guillelmum comprehendit, pro cuius redemptione cc argenti marcos habuit*).

37 VAN KERREBROUCK, *Les Capétiens* (as in n. 7), p. 81 and 87 n. 45.

me's wife must have been either the daughter of Louis VI's first wife – in which case that wife was not a virgin when she and Louis parted – or a bastard. In either case, whatever the birth status of the king's daughter and whatever her name, Orderic made clear that her husband, a royal son-in-law, was an unsuccessful, immature, pre-tentious upstart and braggart.

Describing the death in 1131 of the young King Philippe in the twelfth chapter of his thirteenth book<sup>38</sup>, Orderic stressed the simplicity of the prince's ways, rather than the winning qualities ascribed to him by Suger and the chronicler of Morigny, who agreed that he was »a charming flower of a boy«<sup>39</sup>. More important, rather than

38 For Orderic's account, see his *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 13, ch. 12; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 6, p. 420–424; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 5, p. 26–27. PASTOUREAU reviewed the different accounts of Philippe's death, in *Le roi tué* (as in n. 26), p. 43–56. Pastoureau accepted the date 13 October given by Orderic Vitalis, which he believed confirmed by entries in the obituaries of nearby churches (*ibid.*, p. 55). However, the obituaries of the major establishments in Paris, including Saint-Denis, where Philippe was buried, and its dependency Argenteuil, seem to me to suggest that he died on 14 October: *Obituaires de la province de Sens*, (ed.) Auguste MOLINIER et al., 4 vols., Paris 1902–1923 (*Recueil des historiens de la France, Obituaires*), vol. 2, p. 275, 300 (14 October, Saint-Germain-des-Prés); p. 285 (15 October, also Saint-Germain-des-Prés); p. 328 (14 October, Saint-Denis); p. 350 (14 October, Argenteuil); p. 391 (14 October, Saint-Magloire); although note p. 462 (12 October, Saint-Martin-des-Champs); a few of the notices refer to Philippe as *puer*. Although Suger stated that Philippe's accident occurred while he was riding *per ciuitatis Parisiensis suburbium*, the testimony of the chronicler of Morigny that he fell *in angiportu* (a narrow alley) seems more likely to be accurate; similarly, Orderic Vitalis had him riding *per vicos Lutetiorum* (through the quarters or neighborhoods of Paris). See Suger, *Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, (ed.) and (tr.) Henri WAQUET, Paris 1964 (*Les classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Âge*, 11), p. 266; *id.*, *Œuvres complètes de Suger*, (ed.) Albert LECOY DE LA MARCHE, Paris 1867 (*Publications de la Société de l'histoire de France*, 139), p. 138–139; *La chronique de Morigny (1095–1152)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (ed.) Léon MIROT, Paris 1909 (*Collection de textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'histoire*, 41), p. 55–56; and BOURNAZEL, *Louis VI* (as in n. 23), p. 194 (who followed Suger). A list of kings in one of the chancery registers of Philip Augustus described Philippe as *a porco interfectus* and *mortuus in Greva Parisius*, which would be understandable if he died in Paris itself: the list is found in Register C, Paris, Archives nationales, JJ 7, fol. 145, and is edited in Elizabeth A. R. BROWN, *La notion de la légitimité et la prophétie à la cour de Philippe Auguste*, in: *La France de Philippe Auguste: le temps des mutations. Actes du Colloque international organisé par le C. N. R. S.* (Paris, 29 septembre – 4 octobre 1980), (ed.) Robert-Henri BAUTIER, Paris 1982 (*Colloques internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique*, 602), p. 77–110 (p. 103–104), reprinted in *EAD.*, *The Monarchy of Capetian France and Royal Ceremonial*, Aldershot 1991 (*Variorum Collected Studies Series*, 345), no. I. Cf. William Chester JORDAN, *The Historical Afterlife of Two Capetian Co-Kings Who Predeceased Their Fathers*, in: *Louis VII and His World*, ed. Michael L. BARDOT, Laurence Wade MARVIN, Leiden, Boston 2018 (*Later Medieval Europe*, 18), p. 114–125 (p. 123) (»the accident happened on the outskirts of old Paris«).

39 *Interea Philippus puer quem ante biennium Ludouicus rex in regem consecrari fecerat, quiq[ue] pro simplici nectare morum omnibus qui cognoverant eum placuerat, dum quendam armigerum per vicos Lutetiorum ludens persequeretur de equo corruit, et membris horribiliter fractis in crastinum obiit. Sic sine confessione et uatico coram patre et matre iii idus octobris mortuus est, et cum magno luctu inter reges Francorum tumulatus est:* Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 13, ch. 12; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 6, p. 420–423; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 5, p. 26–27. Compare Suger's description of Philippe as *floridus et amenus puer, ... bonorum spes timorque malorum*: Suger, *Vie de Louis VI* (as in n. 38), (ed.) WAQUET, p. 266; *id.*, *Œuvres* (as in n. 38), (ed.) LECOY DE LA MARCHE, p. 138. That Orderic should have ascribed to the young Louis the nickname *florus* seems worth noting, particularly because of its links with the name Florus given to Louis VI's

attributing Philippe's death to his horse's accidental encounter with a pig in a narrow street in Paris, as was generally reported, Orderic portrayed him as falling from his horse, »his limbs horribly shattered«, while he playfully (*ludens*) pursued a companion through the city. Not only this. Orderic went on to state that the prince died without having confessed and without having received the last sacraments, in his father and mother's dwelling, three days before the ides of October, 13 October. The precision of the date he gave – which he is the only contemporary chronicler to mention – added credibility to the first part of his statement, even though the most reliable sources indicate that the young king died a day later, on 14 October<sup>40</sup>. This, of course, raises the question whether Orderic chose the 13<sup>th</sup> of the month because the number thirteen possessed negative connotations in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, a question to which I have not yet been able to find an answer.

Just as in describing Philippe's death Orderic suggested that he was a prankster and incompetent horseman, so also he implied that although Philippe died in his parents' presence, they had not taken care to insure the presence of a priest to whom their son could confess and from whom he could receive communion before he died<sup>41</sup> – which of course boded ill for the welfare of his soul. The contrast could scarcely have been stronger with the holy, sacrament-laden, model death Orderic attributed, seven chapters later, to King Henry of England in December 1135. Dubbing him *katholicus*, Orderic described the king's dying exhortation to all to preserve the peace and protect the poor, his confession and penance, and the absolution he received from the priests who anointed him with holy oil and gave him communion before he commended himself to God<sup>42</sup>. Not only that. Immediately before recounting Henry's holy passing (on a Sunday, 1 December), Orderic gratuitously introduced a paragraph dedicated to a brush with death he said Louis VI had experienced at about the same time. Alleging that Louis was stricken with diarrhea, Orderic described the king's fear of dying and his consequent attempt to settle his quarrels with his nobles – and the divine reprieve he was given so that he could »correct his life« (*pro correctione uitae*)<sup>43</sup>. The dissimilarity between Louis and Henry and their confrontations with mortality was, as Orderic portrayed them, inescapable.

half-brother, the second son (after Philippe) born to Bertrade de Montfort, for whom King Louis's father Philip abandoned his mother Berthe in 1092: VAN KERREBROUCK, *Les Capétiens* (as in n. 7), p. 71–73.

40 Both LUCHAIRE (Louis VI [as in n. 17], p. 219 [no. 474]) and PASTOUREAU (*Le roi tué* [as in n. 26], p. 54–55) were impressed by Orderic's exactness. Bernard Gui gave the date 3 ides of October, probably because he knew Orderic's work; so too did Jean of Saint-Victor, who seems to have relied on Bernard Gui. For Bernard Gui, see BnF, lat. 4976A, fol. 177r; lat. 4985, fol. 126v; nouv. acq. lat. 779, fol. Clxxvijr; for Jean, see BnF, lat. 15 011, fol. 380r.

41 PASTOUREAU interpreted the passage similarly, in *Le roi tué* (as in n. 26), p. 54–55.

42 Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 13, ch. 19; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 6, p. 449–450; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 5, p. 50 (*Denique katholicus rex de seruanda pace et tutela pauperum omnes obsecrauit, et post confessionem pœnitentiam et absolutionem a sacerdotibus accepit, oleique sacri unctione delimitus et sancta eucharistia refectus Deo se commendauit*).

43 Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 13, ch. 18; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 6, p. 446–449; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 5, p. 48–49 (*Metu igitur mortis domum suam et quæque habebat disposuit ... omnipotens Adonai ... spacium uitæ prolongauit, et meliorationem transacti status pro correctione uitæ ex insperato contulit*). See LUCHAIRE, Louis VI (as in n. 17), p. 254 (no. 559), for the king's illness in October and November 1135.

After recounting young Philippe's death, Orderic passed in chapter twelve to King Louis's subsequent arrangement of the coronation of his son Louis in Reims by Pope Innocent II (which occurred on 25 October 1131). Here Orderic disparaged the significance of the solemn occasion by announcing that the ceremony displeased people of all ranks – laymen who had hoped to increase their standing after the king's death and clergy wishing to claim the right to elect the new king. Hence, Orderic said, if they could have done so, they would have opposed the consecration of the young prince<sup>44</sup>. Orderic is the only contemporary to record the opposition, which eerily recalls the circumstances to which Ivo of Chartres attributed Louis VI's coronation in 1108 in Orléans rather than in Reims – to which Orderic had not alluded<sup>45</sup>. Such testimony scarcely flattered either the king and his son and namesake.

Orderic's account of the death of Louis VI and the accession of his son and namesake in August 1137, recounted in the 32<sup>nd</sup> chapter of book thirteen, subtly disparages the king and also his son and successor, who was sixteen or seventeen when his father died. Opening the chapter with the deadly heat wave that struck from July through mid-September, Orderic then described the king's dispatch of Louis to marry Eleanor of Aquitaine, again dubbing the young man *florus* and calling attention to his youth by declaring that his father »committed him to the guardianship« of two of the kingdom's leading nobles. Having made clear two chapters earlier that before dying (in Santiago), Eleanor's father William had ordered her marriage to the young king Louis and made Louis »heir of all his right« (*totius iuris sui heredem*)<sup>46</sup>, Orderic here presented Louis VI as sending »the army of Gaul« »to subjugate the region«. Thus he imputed to the king bellicose intentions that contrast sharply with Louis VI's determination to insure that the entourage inflict no harm on the region's inhabitants and alienate no one, which Abbot Suger emphasized<sup>47</sup>. Proceeding, Orderic depicted

- 44 Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 13, ch. 12; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 6, p. 422–423; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 5, p. 27 (*quæ consecratio quibusdam Francis utriusque ordinis displicuit. Quidam enim laicorum post mortem principis spem augendi honoris habebant, quidam uero clericorum ius eligendi et constituendi principem regni captabant. His itaque pro causis, nonnulli de ordinatione pueri musitabant, quam procul dubio impedire si potuissent summopere flagitabant*). Despite his distrust of Orderic, in Louis VI (as in n. 17), p. 221–222 (no. 478), LUCHAIRE mentioned his report, although he noted that he found it »difficile de dire à quels évènements le chroniqueur fait ici allusion«, and acknowledged that »[l]es autres sources ne donnent rien à cet égard«; see *ibid.*, p. 221 (no. 476), for the date of the young Louis's coronation (confirmed by other sources besides Orderic). Rolf GROSSE discussed the importance of the pope's participation in the ceremony, in *Scire et posse. Ludwig VI. von Frankreich*, in: Heinrich V. in seiner Zeit. Herrschen in einem europäischen Reich des Hochmittelalters. Fachtagung, 16. bis 18. Juni 2011 in Bochum, (ed.) GERHARD LUBICH, Cologne, Vienna 2013 (Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters, 34), p. 233–251 (p. 248–249); see also p. 235–236 on Ivo of Chartres.
- 45 Explaining the decision, Ivo wrote, *Erant enim quidam regni perturbatores, qui ad hoc omni studio uigilabant, ut aut regnum in aliam personam transferretur, aut non mediocriter minueretur*: ROLKER, SCHAWÉ, *Das Gutachten Ivos von Chartres* (as in n. 33), p. 154. See n. 33 above.
- 46 *Eodem tempore Guillelmus Pictauesium dux ... ante aram beati apostoli [Jacobi] uenerabiliter defunctus est. Filiam uero suam Ludouico iuueni Francorum regi in coniugem dari precepit, ipsumque regem totius iuris sui heredem constituit*: Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 13, ch. 30; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 6, p. 480–483; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 5, p. 81.
- 47 *Ludouicum Florum filium suum accersit, eumque ... tutelæ commisit, et cum exercitu Gallie in Aquitaniam direxit, ut filiam Pictauesis ducis uxorem duceret, totumque ducatum sicut Guillelmus dux constituerat sibi subiugaret. Interea Ludouicus rex nimietate estui in Aquilina*

Louis VI as suffering and dying in the forest of Yvelines on two nones of August (4 August) and being buried »among kings« at Saint-Denis, with his son Louis (described as *puer*) being crowned on the following Sunday (8 August) at Poitiers and thus »gaining the kingdom of the French and the duchy of Aquitaine, which none of his forebears had held«. Orderic's report thus suggests that the young Louis alone was crowned at Poitiers three days after Louis died, that through this coronation he gained possession of France as well as Aquitaine, and that he had somehow won Aquitaine by means other than marriage. Having earlier cast aspersions on the young Louis's coronation in Reims on 25 October 1131, here Orderic conveniently disregarded it, and portrayed him as being crowned to secure not only Aquitaine but also France a few days after his father's death, a ceremony for which there is no other evidence and which seems unlikely to have occurred<sup>48</sup>.

Except for the reference to Louis VI's burial at Saint-Denis, these assertions of Orderic are unsubstantiated and differ from reports in other sources, which show that the king died in Paris on 1 August, the feast of Saint Peter's Chains, three days before the date Orderic gave<sup>49</sup>. The chronology of events is by no means clear, but the double coronation and marriage of Louis and Eleanor may have taken place in Bordeaux on the same day that Louis died, 1 August<sup>50</sup>. While they were still in Bordeaux, Louis

*silua aegretavit, et crescente languore ii nonas Augusti hominem exiuit atque in ecclesia sancti Dionisii Ariopagite inter reges regiam tumulationem accepit. Sequenti autem dominico Ludovicus puer Pictavis coronatus est; et sic regnum Francorum et Aquitanie ducatum quem nullum patrum suorum habuit nactus est:* Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 13, ch. 32; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 6, p. 490–491; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 5, p. 88. Cf. the account in Suger, *Vie de Louis VI* (as in n. 38), (ed.) WAQUET, p. 280–283; ID., *Œuvres* (as in n. 38), (ed.) LECOY DE LA MARCHE, p. 146 (*nobilissimum virorum exercitum, quingentorum et eo amplius militum de melioribus regni colligit ... Copiosas etiam gazas ... deliberans, ne quid in toto ducatu Aquitanie rapiant, ne terram aut terre pauperes ledant, ne amicos inimicos faciant regia majestate interminat*).

- 48 Daniel F. CALLAHAN discussed ducal coronation rituals, in Eleanor of Aquitaine, the Coronation Rite of the Duke of Aquitaine and the Cult of Saint Martial of Limoges, in: *The World of Eleanor of Aquitaine: Literature and Society in Southern France between the Eleventh and Thirteenth Centuries*, (ed.) Marcus BULL, Catherine LÉGLU, Woodbridge 2006, p. 29–36.
- 49 A charter issued by Louis VII in 1146–1147 confirms the evidence for the date of Louis VI's death provided by obituaries and by Suger: DUFOUR, *Louis VI* (as in n. 21), p. 480; Suger, *Vie de Louis VI* (as in n. 38), (ed.) WAQUET, p. 284–287; ID., *Œuvres* (as in n. 38), (ed.) LECOY DE LA MARCHE, p. 146–148; LUCHAIRE, *Louis VI* (as in n. 17), p. 270 (no. 595) (noting that the obituary of Argenteuil differs from Orderic); Achille LUCHAIRE, *Histoire des institutions monarchiques de la France sous les premiers Capétiens (Mémoires et documents). Études sur les actes de Louis VII*, Paris 1885, p. 154, 376–377 (no. 172) (*in anniversario patris mei, id est ad Vincula Sancti Petri*).
- 50 Suger wrote that Louis and Eleanor were crowned and married in Bordeaux on a Sunday without specifying a precise date, possibly because of the ceremony's striking coincidence with Louis VI's death, and, even more, Suger's likely chagrin and grief at being absent from Paris and Saint-Denis when the king died and was buried, which doubtless affected his account of these events, with which his *Life of Louis* ends: *Vie de Louis VI* (as in n. 38), (ed.) WAQUET, p. 282–283; Suger, *Œuvres* (as in n. 38), (ed.) LECOY DE LA MARCHE, p. 146–147 (*die dominica ... prefatam puellam cum eo diademate regni coronatam sibi conjugio copulavit*). Suger recounted the return of the royal entourage (*pervenimus*) through Saintonge to Poitiers *cum exultatione totius terre* before discussing Louis VI's death; he did not mention the celebration of any ceremony in Poitiers, nor did he explicitly mention the young Louis's presence there. The chronicle of Morigny

issued a solemn charter as king of the Franks and duke of Aquitaine in favor of the province's ecclesiastics<sup>51</sup>. The couple may still have been in Bordeaux when they learned of Louis VI's death, probably four days after he had died<sup>52</sup>. Yet again Order-

emphasizes how quickly after the marriage and coronation news of the king's death reached Bordeaux – and also the speed with which the new king departed for Paris, leaving Eleanor in charge of the bishop of Chartres: Chronique de Morigny (as in n. 38), p. 67–68 (*legali vinculo sociatus ... inposicione aureorum diadematum insignitus ... ecce legatus pernici cursu delatus advolat ... Audito itaque ... fine patris, tener ille animus novi sponsi sine mensura confunditur, et exuto indumento leticie, tunica meroris vestitur ... Communicato itaque cum proceribus et sapientibus viris de necessitate reversionis consilio ... Ab Aquitania itaque Ludovicus disgreiciens ... Parisius peciit*). In his notes to the edition, MIROT tried to reconcile this evidence with Orderic's account by having Louis learn of his father's death at Poitiers after being crowned there on 3 August and then return to Paris, »vraisemblablement à la fin d'août 1137«. In L'Abregé Royal (as in n. 15), vol. 2, p. 179–180, LABBE had indeed declared that the news of his father's demise reached Louis in Poitiers as he was returning from Bordeaux, but the chronicle of Saint-Étienne de Limoges that he included in his *preuves* (ibid., vol. 2, p. 621–622) does not mention Poitiers (or Louis VI's death), saying simply that Louis left Bordeaux after solemnly marrying Eleanor. Wrestling with the problems posed by the differences among the chroniclers, Alfred RICHARD accepted Orderic's testimony concerning Poitiers, which led him to posit the introduction of a novel ritual there for the »sacre du duc et de la duchesse« and also to state that in Bordeaux Louis and Eleanor were simply married (according to him on 25 July) (with no reference to a coronation), that Louis issued the charter in favor of the prelates of Bordeaux not as king but »en qualité d'époux désigné de la fille de Guillaume VIII«, and that the couple left Bordeaux on the day of their wedding: *Histoire des comtes de Poitou 778–1204*, 2 vols., Paris 1903, vol. 2, p. 60–62. Citing no source, Jean DUFOUR placed the marriage at Bordeaux »dans les derniers jours de juillet 1137«: Suger, personnage complexe, in: Suger en question. Regards croisés sur Saint-Denis, (ed.) Rolf GROSSE, Munich 2004 (Pariser Historische Studien, 68), p. 11–20 (p. 13).

51 Louis's charter favoring the province's churches was issued by him as »the younger Louis, son of the great Louis, by grace of God king of the French and duke of the Aquitanians«. Confirming an act of his father, it was dated 1137 (*anno regni nostri quarto/sexta*), in Bordeaux in *palatio nostro*, in the presence of the archbishops of Bourges, Tours, and Bordeaux, the bishops of Chartres, Orléans, Agen, Angoulême, and Saintes, and Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis. See LUCHAIRE, Louis VI (as in n. 17), p. 265 (no. 581); ID., Études sur les actes (as in n. 49), p. 83, 97–98 (no. 1) (esp. p. 98 n. 1, expressing reservations concerning Orderic's account); RHGF, vol. 16, p. 2–3 (*Ego Ludovicus junior, magni Ludovici filius, Dei gratia Rex Francorum et Dux Aquitanorum ...*); Nicolas BRUSSEL published the text from the Chambre des comptes register »Qui es in cœlis«, fol. 222, in: *Nouvel examen de l'usage général des Fiefs en France pendant le XI. le XII. le XIII. et le XIV<sup>e</sup>. siècle*, 2 vols., Paris 1727, vol. 1, p. 287–289 n. a. LABBE drew on the register »Croix« (p. 191), for the version he published in L'Abregé Royal (as in n. 15), vol. 2, p. 607–609 (no. IX), where the text of Louis VI's act is followed by the final clause of his son's confirmation. Jean DUFOUR edited Louis VI's act in: *Recueil des actes de Louis VI, roi de France (1108–1137)*, 4 vols., Paris 1992–1994 (Chartes et diplômes), vol. 2, p. 312–319 (no. 387); Dufour believed (ibid., p. 316) that Louis confirmed his father's act after learning of his death, but Louis's title in the act suggests to me that he issued the confirmation before the news had reached him.

52 The chronicle of Morigny (as in n. 38), p. 67, reports that news of the king's death was brought by a *legatus pernici cursu*, and but he could scarcely have traveled the 583 km. between Paris and Bordeaux (or indeed Poitiers) in less than four days: Robert-Henri BAUTIER, Recherches sur les routes de l'Europe médiévale, in: *Bulletin philologique et historique (jusqu'à 1610) du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques* (1960), p. 99–143 (p. 102–103); ID., Recherches sur la chancellerie royale au temps de Philippe VI, in *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 122 (1964), p. 89–176; and 123/2 (1965), p. 313–459 (p. 398–401), reprinted in ID., *Chartes, sceaux et chancelleries. Études de diplomatique et de sigillographie médiévales*, 2 vols., Paris 1990 (*Mémoires et documents de l'École des chartes*, 34), vol. 2, p. 615–852 (p. 788–791); Arlette HIGOUNET-NADAL,



ic's account of these events, critically important for the Capetians, is distorted, misleading, and on essential points incorrect<sup>53</sup>.

### Orderic Vitalis and Hugues Capet

Orderic had mixed feelings about Hugues Capet, the founder of the Capetian line, whom he called Hugues the Great (*Hugo Magnus*) – as he did Hugues's father (ca. 898–956), thus leading to confusion among editors as well as readers<sup>54</sup>. Hugues's father had been no friend to Saint-Évroul, Orderic's own house, since he was ultimately responsible for the theft of three holy bodies cherished at the monastery, including that of the house's founder, Saint Évroul. Yet in recounting the story of the theft in the sixth book of his history, focused on the history of Saint-Évroul, Orderic took pains to emphasize that the fault was not entirely the elder Hugues's. As Orderic made clear, the spoliation occurred because Louis d'Outremer (r. 936–954), king of the Franks, had treated the elder Hugues badly, rousing Hugues's anger and prompting him to order his troops to wreak vengeance on the Normans<sup>55</sup>. A speech by Bernard the Dane designed to turn Louis against Hugues indeed denounced Hugues as liar and traitor and a traitor's son<sup>56</sup>. But perhaps in part because some of their patron saint's bones were eventually returned to Saint-Évroul, a century after the theft, and because the remains that stayed in France were appropriately venerated, in the sixth book Orderic treated Hugues Capet's accession to the throne in 987 neutrally, with restraint and without animus. »After the death of Hugues the Great«, Orderic wrote, »his son Hugues the Great succeeded him in the duchy, and when rivalries arose among Charles and the leading nobles of the realm, Hugues obtained the kingdom and transmitted it to his heirs up to today«<sup>57</sup>. In this brief, matter-of-fact pas-

Le Journal des dépenses d'un notaire de Périgueux en mission à Paris (Janvier–Septembre 1337), in: *Annales du Midi* 76/3 (1964), p. 379–402 (p. 382).

- 53 Luchaire, Mirot, Richard, and I are not alone in having been misled by Orderic's testimony: see the preceding two notes; LUCHAIRE, Louis VI (as in n. 17), p. 268 (no. 589); Elizabeth A. R. BROWN, Eleanor of Aquitaine Reconsidered: The Woman and her Seasons, in: *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Lord and Lady*, (ed.) Bonnie WHEELER, John Carmi PARSONS, New York 2002 (*The New Middle Ages*), p. 1–54 (p. 6); and, e. g., Ralph V. TURNER, *Eleanor of Aquitaine, Queen of France, Queen of England*, New Haven 2009, p. 48–49.
- 54 On Hugues Capet and his father, see SETTIPANI, *La préhistoire des Capétiens* (as in n. 31), p. 408–419.
- 55 Orderic described the theft of the relics in *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 6, ch. 10; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 3, p. 302–343, especially p. 314–317; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 3, p. 83–120, especially p. 96–97. The other bodies were those of Saints Évremond and Ansbert. See also HINGST, *Written World* (as in n. 1), p. 10–12, and n. 4 above. Delisle and Chibnall assigned the major work of composing the first and second books to the years 1136 and 1137, and concluded that book five was started in 1127 and book six in 1130 or 1131: DELISLE, *Notice* (as in n. 1), p. xlv–xlvi; CHIBNALL, *General Introduction*, in her ed. of Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), vol. 1, p. 45–46.
- 56 Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 6, ch. 10; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 3, p. 312; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 3, p. 93–94.
- 57 *Defuncto Hugone magno filius eius Hugo magnus in ducatu successit, et ortis quibusdam similitatibus inter Karolum et regni optimates Hugo regnum optinuit, et heredibus suis usque hodiernum diem reliquit*: Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 6, ch. 10; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 3, p. 324–325; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 3, p. 104–105. For the return of relics to Saint-Évroul,

sage Orderic did not identify Charles (953–post 991), who was in fact the Carolingian claimant to the throne, son of King Louis IV d'Outremer, brother of Louis's son and successor King Lothar IV (941–986, r. 946–986), and uncle of Lothar's son and successor King Louis V (ca. 966–987, r. 979–987). Nor did Orderic comment on the means Hugues employed to »obtain« the realm.

Orderic probably wrote this assessment in or around 1131, soon after the house of Saint-Évroul recovered part of the relics that had been stolen almost two centuries earlier. In his fifth book, dedicated to the archbishops of Rouen and written somewhat before, Orderic's appraisal of Hugues's accession to power was fundamentally similar. Louis V is not mentioned in the section dedicated to Hugues, 42<sup>nd</sup> archbishop of Rouen (r. 949–982), where, following the death of Louis (IV) and the six-year reign of his son Lothar (IV), »the progeny of Charlemagne was [said to have been] completely driven from rulership of the realm, as Charles and the other sons of Lothar were seized and Hugues elevated to the kingship«<sup>58</sup>. Here Orderic disregarded Louis V, muddled the identity and fate of Charles, and twice used the passive voice to dodge the issue of responsibility for capturing the Carolingians, and shield Hugues from reproach by having him raised to rulership rather than seizing the throne. Orderic's account in the fifth and sixth books of his history resembles that of Guillaume of Jumièges in the »Gesta Normannorum ducum«, which Orderic revised and expanded, where Louis V was also disregarded, and Hugues Capet »was chosen by all« to replace the dead king Lothar, with the »support« of Duke Richard of Normandy<sup>59</sup>.

Yet Hugues is presented more negatively in the first book of Orderic's history, which Orderic composed some five years after the fifth and sixth books. A grand survey of universal history from the birth of Christ consisting largely of carefully

ibid., (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 3, p. 326–342; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 3, p. 115–120. In the section he devoted to the theft of the holy bodies, Orderic appears to me less hostile to Hugues in particular than to the Franks in general; for a different assessment, see HINGST, *Written World* (as in n. 1), p. 11–12, 14.

58 Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 5, section 42; (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 3, p. 82–85; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 2, p. 364 (*Ludouico defuncto, Lotharius filius eius vi annis regnavit in quo progenies Karoli magni a regno funditus destituta est. Karolus enim aliique filii Lotharii regis capiuntur, et Hugo magnus, Hugonis magni filius, in regem eleuatur*). According to the version of the »Historia Francorum Senonensis« that Orderic seems to have consulted, Lothar died in 976, and his son Louis reigned six years before dying in 982: CHIBNALL's ed. of Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), vol. 4, p. 345–351 (p. 348) (where Chibnall published the version of the »Historia Francorum Senonensis« found [with appended notes on Norman history, *ibid.*, p. 351–352] in a MS originally from Saint-Étienne of Caen that contains what survives of Orderic's seventh book, now Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 703B; this version differs from that edited by Georg WAITZ, MGH SS, vol. 9, p. 348, 364–369 [relying on S. Germain François Harlay N. 485, now BnF, lat. 13 702, dating from the first half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century] and that used by Duchesne, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 733A, fol. 1r–4r; as Chibnall pointed out in her ed. of Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica*, vol. 4, p. xv–xvi, in their editions of the »Historia ecclesiastica« both Duchesne and Le Prévost included the entire Sens chronicle as the first three chapters of book seven, as if Orderic had written it or included it without modification in his history, neither of which is the case).

59 The *Gesta Normannorum ducum* (as in n. 24), (ed.) VAN HOUTS, vol. 1, p. 132–133 (*mortuo Franchorum rege Lothario, in illius loco ab omnibus subrogatur Hugonis ducis Magni filius Hugo Capet admimiculante ei duce Ricardo*).

edited excerpts from different sources, the book was virtually completed around 1136, when Orderic was also engaged in composing the eleventh book of his history<sup>60</sup>. Here Orderic's portrayal of Hugues reflects the negative biases of two of his sources, although Orderic modified them to produce a picture that is more neutral. The seventh book of Orderic's work, which is only partly preserved, seems to have presented »a roughly chronological general history« focused on Normandy and France, and if Orderic in fact completed it, its depiction of Hugues Capet likely mirrored the account he gave in the first book<sup>61</sup>.

In book one Orderic's primary and fundamental source for his account of Hugues's accession was the »*Historia Francorum Senonensis*«, whose animosity toward Hugues is unlimited<sup>62</sup>. Like many others, Orderic valued this history, and a copy of it is preserved in a manuscript containing the surviving portions of Orderic's seventh book<sup>63</sup>. Orderic also drew for at least one critical element on a work whose outlook was very different: the history of the »modern« kings of France that Hugues of Fleury had finished in about 1115 as a sequel to his own »*Historia ecclesiastica*«<sup>64</sup>, where

- 60 Orderic's account of Hugues Capet's accession is edited only by LE PRÉVOST (as in n. 1), vol. 1, p. 169–172. Despite the many changes Orderic made in the sources he used in the first two books of his history, Chibnall unfortunately decided not to reproduce the passages Orderic took (and generally adapted) from other sources, attributing her decision to publish them »in an abbreviated form, without translation, to the escalating costs of publication«, and to her belief that »[m]any readers of this series of texts (Oxford Medieval Texts) will never consult them« and her hope that »the indications of Orderic's sources« which she gave would »be sufficient for the needs of any scholars who may wish to use the material to investigate medieval historiography and hagiography more deeply«: see CHIBNALL's ed., vol. 1, p. vi, written in 1980; and, for her comments on Orderic's treatment of his sources, *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 45–46, 49–63 and especially p. 127–128. Thus Chibnall indicated that Orderic simply extracted the account of Hugues Capet's accession from the »*Historia Francorum Senonensis*« and summarized the story of the Valerian prophecy found in what she described as »*Relatio S. Walarici*«, giving an incorrect reference she derived from Le Prévost's edition: *ibid.*, vol. 4, p. 155; cf. the ed. of LE PRÉVOST, vol. 1, p. 172 n. 1. The text of the prophecy on which Orderic drew is found in: *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti*, (ed.) LUC D'ACHERY, Jean MABILLON, Venice 1734, p. 546–552 (»*Historia relationis corporis S. Walarici abbatis in Monasterium Leuconense. Auctore Anonymo, qui sæculo 12. vixit. Ex mss. & Aprilii Bollandiano*«).
- 61 On the seventh book, see CHIBNALL, in her ed. of Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), vol. 1, p. 47.
- 62 WERNER discussed the biases of the »*Historia Francorum Senonensis*« and Orderic's use of it, in: *Die Legitimität der Kapetinger* (as in n. 26), p. 209–211. For the history, see n. 58 above.
- 63 See CHIBNALL's ed. of Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), vol. 1, p. 47, 121; and vol. 4, p. xiii–xvii, 345–351, 351–352; and n. 58 above. As VAN HOUTS showed, Guillaume of Jumièges used the *Sens* history in »*Gesta Normannorum ducum*«: see her ed. (as in n. 24), vol. 1, p. xxxix, lxix; vol. 2, p. 33 n. 3.
- 64 I have relied on Georg WAITZ's edition of portions of history of the »modern« kings of France to 1108 (»*Liber qui modernorum regum Francorum continet actus*«), in *MGH SS*, vol. 9, p. 376–395 (p. 384–385), and on the MSS, *ibid.*, p. 340. As Jean-François LEMARIGNIER has showed, the continuation of Aimoin of Fleury's »*Historia Francorum*« (which Waitz cited as one of Hugues's sources) reproduces the »*Historia Francorum Senonensis*« for the years 898–1015: *Au-tour de la royauté française du IX<sup>e</sup> au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in: *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 113 (1955), p. 5–36 (p. 34, and p. 29–30, 32 for its use for earlier events). A full edition of Hugues of Fleury's »modern« history is as sorely needed as a new edition of his »*Historia ecclesiastica*«: cf. Nico LETTINCK, *Pour une édition critique de l'»Historia ecclesiastica« de Hugues de Fleury*, in: *Revue bénédictine* 91 (1981), p. 386–397.

the author went to some lengths to avoid condemning Hugues Capet or questioning his right to the crown. To account for Hugues Capet's accession, Orderic also offered a condensed and redacted account of the so-called Valerian prophecy, which attributed Hugues's accession to divine intervention rewarding him for restoring Saint Valery's remains to their proper resting place yet limiting his line's rule to seven generations. The story's resonance with Saint-Évroul's actual loss of its sacred relics may have made it appealing to Orderic. Still, Orderic's ambivalence towards Hugues Capet led him to shape and edit the prophecy.

Describing Hugues's accession to power, Orderic began by saying that King Lothar died in 976 (and was buried at Reims), and that his son Louis reigned for eleven years (and was buried at Compiègne), statements that are close to the Sens account<sup>65</sup>. As to Charles, son of Louis IV d'Outremer and Louis V's uncle, Orderic followed the Sens history in describing him (wrongly) as Lothar's son and Louis V's brother. However, rather than stating (like the Sens chronicle) that Charles »succeeded« Louis, Orderic simply said that he »wanted to reign« (*regnare uoluit*). Here Orderic was likely influenced by Hugues of Fleury, who wrote that Charles (correctly identified as Louis's uncle), »desired to succeed his nephew«<sup>66</sup>. But Orderic did not follow Hugues of Fleury in exonerating Hugues Capet and dissociating him from Charles's loss of the crown by blaming the realm's *proceres* and the treasonous Ascelin, bishop of Laon<sup>67</sup>. Rather, Orderic adhered to the Sens chronicle in reporting that Hugues

65 Orderic's *xi annis* may be a misreading of or an attempt to correct *vi annis* in the »Historia Francorum Senonensis«: Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1); (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 1: p. 169; and for the »Historia Francorum Senonensis«, *ibid.*, (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 4, p. 348. In Hugues of Fleury's »modern« history, Louis is said to have become king in 976 and to have reigned for two years: MGH SS, vol. 9, p. 384.20–21; cf. LE PRÉVOST's ed. of Orderic, vol. 1, p. 170 n. 4, continued from 169, where the editor said that Hugues of Fleury assigned Louis a reign of nine years.

66 MGH SS, vol. 9, p. 384 (*patruus eius Karolus cupiens nepoti succedere*). Cf. the »Historia Francorum Senonensis«, in Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1); (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 4, p. 348 (*Cui successit Karolus frater eius, filius Hlotharii regis. Eodem anno rebellauit contra Karolum Hugo dux Francorum ...*).

67 Hugues of Fleury emphasized that Louis (V) died *sine sobole*, and he also absolved Hugues Capet of responsibility for Charles's capture, saying that the *proceres* of France and »especially« (*maxime*) Ascelin, bishop of Laon, *pessimus proditor*, placed Charles in custody in Senlis with his sons Charles and Louis, where Charles shortly died, after which his sons fled to the emperor, where they also died: MGH SS, vol. 9, p. 384–385. Then, he declared, the *proceres* of France chose Hugues Capet and »raised him to the royal throne« at Noyon (*Hugonem assumentes ... illum regio sublimauere solio*). Hugues of Fleury proceeded to announce, foreshadowing Vincent of Beauvais, that the second line of the kings of France here failed, and the realm was transferred »to the third generation« »by the judgment of God, who raises those whom he wishes to raise, and humbles those he wishes to humble« (*Sicque deficiente secunda regum Francorum linea, translatum est regnum in terciam generationem, Dei hoc optante iudicio, qui quos uult eleuat et quos uult humiliat*). After this Hugues rehearsed the transfer of the realm from the Merovingians to the Carolingians »by the judgment of Pope Zachary«, and gave a short summary of highlights of Carolingian rule (emphasizing the separation of the *regnum Francorum ab imperio Romanorum* under Charles the Bald), before reiterating his earlier declarations that when Louis (V) died without children (here *sine liberis*), the *proceres* of France chose Hugues Capet as king (here *provecxerunt super se Hugonem Magnum, Hugonis ducis Francia filium*). See also Elizabeth A. R. BROWN, Vincent de Beauvais and the »Reditus Regni Francorum ad Stirpem Caroli Imperatoris«, in: Vincent de Beauvais: intentions et réceptions d'une œuvre encyclopédique au Moyen-Âge. Actes du XIV<sup>e</sup> Colloque de l'Institut d'études médiévales, organisé conjointement par

Capet rebelled against Charles, omitting, however, the explanation that he did so because Charles had »received« – that is, married – the daughter of Herbert, count of Troyes. Then, like the Sens history, Orderic stated that Hugues, frustrated in his attempt to capture Laon, where Charles and his wife were dwelling, conspired with Ascelin, bishop of Laon, to take the city – and Charles as well. Orderic followed the Sens history in calling Ascelin *uetulus presul* (in the Sens chronicle *traditor uetulus*), and although Orderic did not label him *episcopus falsus* (as did the Sens history), he inserted his own harsh denunciation of Ascelin, echoing the judgment of Hugues of Fleury, who called Ascelin *pessimus proditor*. Orderic's own condemnation of the turncoat ecclesiastic was fiercer than Hugues of Fleury's: »Forgetful of his status and age, and of the death that soon awaited him, imitating Ahitophel and Judas, [Ascelin] did not blush to become a traitor<sup>68</sup>.« Orderic paraphrased the remainder of the Sens chronicle's account, saying that Ascelin betrayed Laon at night, and that Hugues conquered Charles and his wife and imprisoned them in a tower in Orléans. At this point Orderic finally identified Charles's wife as the daughter of Herbert of Troyes. Omitting the statement in the Sens chronicle that »Charles had not yet been anointed as king because of the resistance of Hugues« (*Nondum autem ipse Karolus erat unctus in regem, resistente Hugone duce*), Orderic simply declared that there (in Orléans) Charles had two sons, Louis and Charles. At this point Orderic proclaimed, »Thus the descendents of Charlemagne ceased ruling in France« (*et exinde progenies Karoli Magni regnare in Francia desiit*), only then announcing Hugues Capet's unction at Reims (which he misdated 993), and saying (incorrectly) that Hugues's son Robert was consecrated king in the same year and ruled for thirty-eight years<sup>69</sup>.

Orderic may have calculated that adding a date and precise regnal years would increase his account's credibility – whether or not the information was correct. By pro-

l'Atelier Vincent de Beauvais (A. R. Te. M., Université de Nancy II) et l'Institut d'études médiévales (Université de Montréal) 27–30 avril 1988, (ed.) Serge LUSIGNAN, Monique PAULMIER-FOUCART, Alain NADEAU, Saint-Laurent, Paris 1990 (Cahiers d'études médiévales, Cahier spécial, 4), p. 167–196. Hugues then recounted Pepin's »elevation to the royal throne« (*regali solio sublimatus*), replacing the last Merovingian Childeric, declared *inutilis et ineptus*, by judgment of the Roman pontiff Zachary and by the *proceres* of the Franks. As Hugues of Fleury presents it, the Carolingians ruled until Louis died without heirs, after which the *proceres* of France »elevated over themselves Hugues the Great, son of Duke Hugues of France« (*proceres Franciae ... provexerunt super se Hugonem Magnum, Hugonis ducis Franciae filium*).

68 *Porro ille ordinis sui et etatis, contigueque sibi mortis immemor, Achitophel et Iudam imitatus, non erubuit fieri traditor*: Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 1, ch. 24; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 1, p. 170. Ahitophel, who betrayed David (2 Sam./2 Kings 15:12), was regularly linked with Cain and Judas as an exemplar of treason. Orderic referred to Ahitophel again in bk. 4, ch. 13 ([ed.] CHIBNALL, vol. 2, p. 314–315; [ed.] LE PRÉVOST, vol. 2, p. 261–262), in a speech attributed to Waltheof, earl of Northampton, in refusing in 1075 to join the conspiracy against William the Conqueror launched by Roger, earl of Hereford, and Ralph, earl of Norwich: see (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 3, p. 310–315, especially p. 310 n. 2.

69 *Anno ... DCCCXCIII<sup>o</sup>, Hugo dux in regem Remis unctus est. Eodem quoque anno Robertus filius eius rex ordinatus est, et regimine regni xxxviii annis functus est*: Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 1, ch. 24; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 1, p. 171. Cf. the account in the Sens chronicle (*ibid.*, [ed.] CHIBNALL, vol. 4, p. 348): *Eodem anno unctus est in regem Remis ciuitate Hugo dux, et in ipso anno Rodbertus filius eius rex ordinatus est. Hic deficit regnum Karoli Magni*. According to Hugues of Fleury, Robert became king in 995 and reigned for 34 years: MGH SS, vol. 9, p. 385.36.

claiming the failure of Charlemagne's line before describing the formal accessions of Hugues Capet and his son to the throne, Orderic may have hoped to distance the Capetians from the change of dynasty. In contrast, in the Sens chronicle, the consecrations of Hugues Capet and his son were mentioned before the solemn announcement, *Hic deficit regnum Karoli Magni*. Here the two first Capetian kings, Hugues Capet and Robert, were explicitly linked with the extinction of the rule of Charlemagne himself rather than his progeny. Thus Orderic struck a balance between the Sens chronicle's reading of the change of dynasty and the interpretation of Hugues of Fleury, who attributed to God's inscrutable judgment and the action of the magnates (*proceres*) of France Hugues Capet's elevation to the throne, and who presented the Capetian accession as »the translation of rulership« to a »third line« of kings from a »second one«, mentioning Charlemagne and his house before again emphasizing that after Louis V died childless the realm's *proceres* raised Hugues Capet to power<sup>70</sup>.

To explain Hugues Capet's accession Orderic presented his own drastically condensed account of the Valerian prophecy, which guaranteed the Capetians divinely approved rulership of France for seven generations<sup>71</sup>. Devoid of the laudatory comments concerning Hugues Capet found in his source<sup>72</sup>, Orderic's version suggests disapproval – although not outright condemnation – of Hugues's act. At the outset, to describe the deed that »a certain vision« (*quædam visio*) had moved Hugues to accomplish Orderic used the phrase *tantum facinus* – a phrase that could mean »such a great crime« but could also be interpreted to signify no more than »such a great deed«. Here Orderic may have been using a verbal stratagem to hedge his bets. The only other pejorative words Orderic used in his account of the prophecy are found at the end, where he declared that Hugues had »invaded the realm«, while blunting the statement's force by inserting the phrase »as is said«<sup>73</sup>. Orderic's stylistic strate-

70 MGH SS, vol. 9, p. 384–385. Later, in a passage concerning Arnoul, archbishop of Reims, the illegitimate brother of King Lothar, Orderic followed the Sens history in saying that Hugues Capet hated him *quia de regali prosapia Karoli Magni erat* but suppressed the statement in the Sens chronicle that Hugues »wanted to exterminate King Lothar's progeny« (*uolens exterminare progeniem Hlotharii regis*): Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 1, ch. 24; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 1, p. 172; cf. the Sens chronicle, in (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 4, p. 348.

71 Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 1, ch. 24; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 1, p. 169–172; cf. (ed.) CHIBNALL, vol. 1, p. 155 and especially n. 3. Orderic's references to place names and other details demonstrate that he was using the account published by D'ACHERY and MABILLON (as in n. 60). Cf., in their edition, p. 547, 549: *in pagum Vvinnacensem, in locum qui dicitur Legonauis ... Sithiu ... arenosum Somonæ alveum*; and, in Orderic's account, (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 1, p. 171–172: *de monasterio Sithiensi ... et Legonao cenobio in Vinnacensi pago ... super Somine flumen*. I have not yet been able to consult MS 1407 of the Bibliothèque municipale of Rouen, which Chibnall cited as containing the account of the return of the body that Orderic employed.

72 The account of the translation on which Orderic relied states that Hugues *gubernabat strenue partem Francigenæ patriæ*, called him *in divino cultu devotus, Dei & Sanctorum cultor humillimus*, and compared his restoration of Valery's remains to the Israelites transporting Joseph's body out of Egypt, likening Valery to Joseph and Hugues Capet to Moses: *Acta Sanctorum, Sæculum Quintum* (as in n. 60), p. 548, 549–550.

73 *Ad tantum facinus Hugonem quædam visio animavit ... et impetu fortitudinis suæ Arnulfum Deo volente terruit ... Non multo post, ut dictum est, regnum invasit, et progenies eius usque in hodiernum diem in regno perduravit. Quatuor enim reges de stirpe iam regnaverunt ipsius, id est*

gies enabled him to avoid denouncing Hugues outright without expressing tolerance or approval of his actions, but the passages he dedicated to Hugues make clear that his perspective was markedly different from Hugues of Fleury's, and that he was not an ardent admirer of the founder of the Capetian line.

In Orderic's version of the prophecy, Saint Valery appeared to Hugues in Paris and promised that he and his *progenies* would rule in France »up to the seventh generation« if Hugues made Arnoul of Flanders transfer his body from Saint-Bertin, where it had been taken, back to its proper resting-place at Leuconay in Vimeu. As Orderic recounted the story, »by God's will« Hugues terrified Arnoul into acquiescence, and then proceeded to invade the kingdom of France, where, subsequently, he and four of his descendants had ruled successively<sup>74</sup>. Orderic's solemn announcement that four kings of Hugues's line had already reigned and his sober enumeration of their names – Robert, Henry, Philip, and Louis – witnessed that time was inexorably passing and that the Capetians' divinely ordained possession of the throne would end in three lifespans.

Orderic himself seems to have had both positive and negative feelings about the founder of the Capetian dynasty and his father, feelings that were doubtless affected by both men's relations and interactions with the house of Saint-Évroul, and particularly the theft of its patron saint's remains. Still, Orderic knew from the sources he used how divided his contemporaries were concerning the legitimacy of Hugues Capet's accession to the throne of France and the continuing rule of his descendants. Orderic did not depict Hugues Capet as quite as unprincipled as the king appears in the *Sens* chronicle, but he made it clear that Hugues was a rebel and that he connived with at least one traitor in order to gain the throne.

## Conclusion

In light of Orderic's animosities toward the French royal house, the adeptness with which he often disparaged the Capetians, and his access to accurate information about them and their activities, it does not seem beyond the bounds of possibility that Orderic ascribed a son called Hugues to Louis VI and Adelaïde of Maurienne in order to remind his audience of the Capetian's direct descent from an ancestor widely considered an ambitious and unscrupulous schemer and traitor who had plotted to gain the crown of France and establish his line in place of the Carolingian house. A son named Hugues served as a reminder of the shameful origins that were attributed to the Capetian dynasty. Further, by limiting Louis VI's progeny to four sons, rather than the full complement Orderic must (or surely could) have known he had, Orderic depicted the ruler as a considerably less prolific progenitor than he was, whereas a later allusion to the king's illegitimate daughter not only called into question the king's morality but also opened the possibility that the king's first wife, Lu-

*Rodbertus, Henricus, Philippus et Ludovicus*: Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 1, ch. 24; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 1, p. 171–172; for Chibnall, see *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 155.

74 Orderic, *Historia ecclesiastica* (as in n. 1), bk. 1, ch. 24; (ed.) LE PRÉVOST, vol. 1, p. 171–172. In Orderic's retelling of the story Arnoul also restored the body of Saint Richer.

cianne, was not as virginal when Guichard of Beaujeu wedded her as she had been when Louis married her.

In my view, a historian who was antipathetic and unsympathetic to the French (and especially the Capetians) and who got the number of Louis VI's children wrong should not be trusted as a reliable recorder of a name that he alone mentioned and that by its very nature was controversial. Hence I propose eliminating Hugues from the list of Louis VI's sons and consigning him once and all to the realm of legend, propaganda, and rumor.