

a 057008

Cover illustration. Detail from the tapestry "La Justice de Trajan et d'Archambault," woven at Tournai(?) (1435-61). Reproduced courtesy of the Bernisches Historisches Museum, Bern, Switzerland.

(7)

The *American Historical Review* appears in February, April, June, October, and December of each year. It is published by the American Historical Association, 400 A Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003, and is printed and mailed by the William Byrd Press, 2901 Byrdhull Road, Richmond, Virginia 23228.

The *AHR* is sent to members of the American Historical Association and to institutions holding subscriptions. Membership dues: For incomes over \$30,000, \$40.00 annually; \$20,000-\$29,999, \$35.00; \$15,000-\$19,999, \$30.00; \$10,000-\$14,999, \$20.00; below \$10,000 and joint memberships, \$10.00; associate (non-historian) \$20.00; life \$650. The proportion of dues allocated to the *AHR* is \$15.00. Subscription rates effective for volume 83, Class I, *American Historical Review* only, United States, Canada, and Mexico \$99.00, foreign \$13.00. Further information on membership, subscriptions, and the ordering of back issues is contained on the two pages 1(a) and 2(a)—immediately preceding the advertisements.

Information concerning the submission of manuscripts and other matters of interest to authors and reviewers is contained on page 2(a), immediately preceding the advertisements.

Notice of nonreceipt of an issue must be sent to the Membership Secretary of the Association within three months of the date of publication of the issue. Changes of address should be sent to the Membership Secretary by the first of the month preceding the month of publication. The Association is not responsible for copies lost because of failure to report a change of address in time for mailing. Postmaster: Please send notification (Form 3579) regarding undelivered journals to American Historical Association, 400 A Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003.

The Association cannot accommodate changes of address that are effective only for the summer months.

The *AHR* disclaims responsibility for statements, either of fact or opinion, made by contributors

© AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION 1978
All rights reserved

Second-class postage paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices

VOLUME 83 • NUMBER 4 • OCTOBER 1978

The American Historical Review

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Editor: OTTO PFLANZE

Associate Editor: PAUL R. LUCAS

Assistant Editors: ANNE LEE GEARHART
NELSON D. LANKFORD
GAIL MALMGREEN

Editorial Assistants: DANIEL F. HARRINGTON,
JAMES P. KROKAR, ROSEMARY ORTHMANN, KATHLEEN PREVO,
DALE R. SORENSON, KENNETH P. STEVENS, ELIZABETH A. WILLIAMS

Advertising Manager: KATHLEEN D. SWIGER

Board of Editors

DAURIL ALDEN
University of Washington

ELIZABETH A. R. BROWN
*Brooklyn College,
City University of New York*

MARIUS JANSEN
Princeton University

WILLIAM O. AYDELOTTE
University of Iowa

PHILIP D. CURTIN
Johns Hopkins University

CHARLES TILLY
University of Michigan

ROBERT H. BREMNER
Ohio State University

EUGENE GENOVESE
University of Rochester

REGINALD ZELNIK
*University of California,
Berkeley*

R. DON HIGGINBOTHAM
*University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill*

X 215-18

Anticipatory Association of the Heir in Early Capetian France

ANDREW W. LEWIS

MODERN HISTORIANS HAVE TRADITIONALLY VIEWED ROYAL SUCCESSION in early Capetian France as a conflict between hereditary and elective principles. Although the operation of these principles can be traced elsewhere in medieval Europe, especially in Germany, they have had a particular interest for France, where the dispossession of the last Carolingians was followed by the reign of a line of kings who lacked dynastic legitimacy. The essential means by which the early Capetians were seen to have kept the throne in their family was through the association of the eldest surviving son in the royalty during the father's lifetime. By this maneuver the elder king could control the proceedings and so extend the rule by his line. In 987, the first year of his reign, Hugh Capet thus thwarted the designs of those who wished for an elective monarchy by having his son Robert consecrated and crowned king. Robert in turn associated his eldest son and, upon the premature death of the first son, had his second son anointed and crowned. Succeeding kings continued the practice until 1179, when Philip Augustus was made king with the ailing Louis VII. The practice has been seen as a reflection of the weak hereditary title of the dynasty until the reign of Philip Augustus, who abandoned the custom. The Capetians have been viewed as truly hereditary monarchs only from the time when they were able to discontinue this practice in favor of the automatic or quasi-automatic succession of the son upon his father's death.¹

Comparison with other medieval European monarchies has seemed to con-

A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association in Atlanta in December 1975. I am indebted to Georges Duby for valuable advice during my early work on this topic, to Charles T. Wood, C. Warren Hollister, Elizabeth A. R. Brown, and Jeremy DuQ. Adams for helpful suggestions for the present revision, and to Steven P. Marrone for his generous help in obtaining materials. The following abbreviations have been used throughout: *AVD* (*L'Art de vérifier les dates et les faits historiques*, 10 [Paris, 1818]), *HF* (Martin Bouquet et al., eds., *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, 24 vols. [Paris, 1738–1904]), and *LTC* (Alexandre Teulet et al., eds., *Layettes du Trésor des Chartes*, 5 vols. [Paris, 1863–1909]).

¹ This interpretation has dominated modern scholarship since the publication of Achille Luchaire's classic works; see his *Histoire des institutions monarchiques de la France sous les premiers Capétiens, 987–1180*, 1 (Paris, 1883): 57–83. Luchaire's thesis remained virtually unchanged in the second edition; see *ibid.*, 1 (2d ed., Paris, 1891): 60–87. Luchaire's presentation formed the core for Percy Ernst Schramm, *Der König von Frankreich. Das Wesen der Monarchie vom 9. zum 16. Jahrhundert*, 1 (2d ed., rev., Darmstadt, 1960): 97–111 (these pages are little altered from the first edition of 1939). His thesis was also the framework used by many other scholars; in particular, see Charles Petit-Dutaillis, *La monarchie féodale en France et en Angleterre (X^e–XIII^e*

firm this interpretation. Five German emperors of the tenth and eleventh centuries, then four Hohenstaufen, insecure in their hereditary titles, had their sons elected or crowned king during their own lifetimes. One of them, Otto II, was even made emperor with his father, and only the pope's refusal to perform the coronation ceremony blocked a similar plan by Frederick Barbarossa.² Henry I of England, faced with the Norman claims of his nephew, William Clito, had his son William Adelin named king-designate; and Stephen, for analogous reasons, attempted to have his own eldest son crowned.³ Whether Henry II of England, whose hereditary claim was undisputed after 1153, acted on similar motives in effecting the coronation of his son, the young Henry, is a separate question.⁴ The recurrence of the same practice in these monarchies has tended to demonstrate that anticipatory association of the heir was a royal device to ensure hereditary rule in the face of opposition to it.⁵ Most scholars have treated the measure as a kind of touchstone and have largely discounted evidence that the Capetian throne was hereditary before the reign of Philip Augustus on the grounds that the Capetians must have lacked dynastic legitimacy if they still found it necessary to associate their heirs.⁶

siècles) (Paris, 1933), trans. by E. D. Hunt as *The Feudal Monarchy in France and England from the Tenth to the Thirteenth Centuries* (London, 1936), 27–30, 311; Robert Fawtier, *Les Capétiens et la France: Leur rôle dans sa construction* (Paris, 1942), trans. by Lionel Butler and R. J. Adam as *The Capetian Kings of France: Monarchy & Nation (987–1328)* (London, 1960), 48–58; and Ferdinand Lot and R. Fawtier, *Histoire des institutions françaises au Moyen Âge*, vol. 2: *Institutions royales* (Paris, 1958), 12–16.

² There were eleven such anticipatory associations, even if Otto I's designation by the dying Henry I in 936 is not included: Otto II as king in 961 and as emperor in 967 with Otto I; Otto III as king in 983 with Otto II; Henry III with Conrad II in 1028; Henry IV with Henry III in 1053; Conrad and Henry V, sons of Henry IV, with the latter in 1087 and 1098–99; Henry, son of Conrad III, with his father in 1147; Henry VI as king in 1169 with Frederick I, and Frederick's plan to make Henry co-emperor; Frederick II in 1196 with Henry VI; and Henry and Conrad, sons of Frederick II, with their father in 1220 and 1227. See Georg Waitz, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter König Heinrich I.* (Leipzig, 1885), 172–73; Rudolf Köpke and Ernst Dümmler, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse* (Leipzig, 1876), 322, 429; Karl and Mathilde Uhlirz, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Otto II. und Otto III.*, 2 (Berlin, 1954): 6–9; Ernst Steindorff, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich III.*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1874–81), 1: 4, 2: 227–28; Gerold Meyer von Kronau, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich IV. und Heinrich V.*, 7 vols. (Leipzig, 1890–1909), 1: 8–9, 4: 160–61, 5: 26–27, 57; Wilhelm Bernhardt, *Konrad III.*, 2 (Leipzig, 1883): 546–47, 558; Theodor Toeche, *Kaiser Heinrich VI.* (Leipzig, 1867), 27, 41, 435–36, 443–46, 513–27; and Thomas C. Van Cleve, *The Emperor Frederick II of Hohenstaufen: "Immutator Mundi"* (Oxford, 1972), 116, 123–24, 402.

³ For the association of William Adelin with Henry I in 1119 and 1120, see C. Warren Hollister, "Normandy, France, and the Anglo-Norman Regnum," *Speculum*, 51 (1976): 224–29. On Stephen's efforts for his eldest son, Eustace, in 1152, see R. H. C. Davis, *King Stephen, 1135–1154* (Berkeley, 1967), 117.

⁴ In 1155, Henry II had the English barons swear fealty to his eldest son, William, as heir to the throne and swear also to make his second son, Henry, king if William died prematurely. But this measure was taken at the beginning of the reign, when Henry could have feared that his brothers might dispute the rights of his sons in the event of his own early death. The association of the young Henry in 1170 is best understood as part of the partition of the succession to Henry II and Eleanor that Henry II arranged in 1169. Robert of Torigny, *Chronicle*, in Richard Howlett, ed., *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I*, 4, Rolls Series, no. 82 (London, 1889): 184, 240–41, 245; and W. L. Warren, *Henry II* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1973), 108–11.

⁵ Although the sketch of monarchical comparisons given here is more detailed than those found generally in the scholarship, such comparison has been a premise in many studies. For citation of Carolingian, Ottonian, and other monarchical precedents, see Schramm, *König von Frankreich*, 81, 106–07, 109, 111; Lot and Fawtier, *Institutions royales*, 14; and Jan Dhondt, "Election et hérédité sous les Carolingiens et les premiers Capétiens," *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 18 (1939): 935. For citations by English historians of Capetian precedents for the anticipatory association of the young Henry, see G. O. Sayles, *Medieval Foundations of England* (rev. ed., New York, 1961), 349; and Warren, *Henry II*, 110–11.

⁶ Luchaire, *Histoire des institutions monarchiques*, 1 (2d ed.): 87; Petit-Dutaillis, *Feudal Monarchy in France and England*, 311; and Lot and Fawtier, *Institutions royales*, 15.

ON CLOSER EXAMINATION, however, there are strong reasons to distrust this interpretation, which was based on comparisons of monarchical practice. First, the monarchies so compared were conspicuously different from one another, as were the circumstances of their successions. In Germany, the changes of dynasty and the known opposition of the princes and, often, of the papacy to hereditary rule in the German kingdom make that case unique, at least from the time of the investiture controversy onward.⁷ In England, Henry I and Stephen wanted to associate their sons because of challenges to their rule by members of their own families who had superior hereditary claims.⁸ In France, after the very first years of Capetian rule, similar situations did not arise. When the rule of certain Capetians was challenged, it was by the kings' younger brothers, who were dissatisfied with their station or whose alleged rights to the throne were advanced by barons seeking their own gain. Rule by the dynasty itself was not contested.⁹

Second, not all Capetian cases of anticipatory association had the same purpose. The cases are, in fact, highly individual in character. The association of Robert II with Hugh Capet appears clearly as a maneuver to assure Robert's succession to the throne, despite the lack of hereditary right. Hugh proposed Robert's consecration on the pretext that, since he intended to go to Catalonia to aid the count of Barcelona against a Muslim invasion, two kings were needed to maintain stability if one of them was killed on the expedition. Although there was some opposition to the plan, Hugh's will prevailed and Robert was crowned; but the expedition to Spain never occurred.¹⁰ The situation was different a generation later, when Robert had his own sons crowned. No one contested the principle that he should be succeeded by one of his sons, though there was intense dispute over which of them should be chosen. The eldest son, Hugh, was associated without difficulty, but after his death, when the king proposed to have his second son, Henry, consecrated, the queen and certain magnates protested that the third son was better

⁷ For a synthesis of the German situation, see Geoffrey Barraclough, *The Origins of Modern Germany* (rev. ed., New York, 1969), 115, 120-21, 154-59, 162, 200-04.

⁸ It may well be that, since Robert Curthose had never succeeded in making himself king of England, the claims of his son, William Clito, to that kingdom were weaker than those of William Adelin, who was the son of the reigning monarch; in contrast, Clito's rights in Normandy, of which his father was hereditary duke and in which Henry I's status was undefined, were undeniably strong. In practice, the two successions were interrelated and, with the exception of the single element of the homage to the French king for Normandy, were so treated by Henry I. See Hollister, "Normandy, France, and the Anglo-Norman Regnum," 214-20, 224-33; Charles W. David, *Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1920), 181-85; and William of Malmesbury, *De gestis regum Anglorum*, ed. William Stubbs, 2, Rolls Series, no. 90 (London, 1889): 495.

⁹ For a fine treatment of this point, see Dhondt, "Élection et hérédité sous les Carolingiens et les premiers Capétiens," 951-52. I discount Suger's charge, written sixty years after the alleged event, that in the early 1080s the count of Corbeil had boasted that he would make himself king; the count did not have the resources to realize such a scheme. Suger also stated that William II of England aspired to the French throne. Suger, *Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, ed. and trans. Henri Waquet (Paris, 1929), 150, 16. Neither of Suger's claims carries conviction; both are probably attributable to his desire for drama in his account.

¹⁰ Richer, *Histoire de France (888-995)*, ed. and trans. Robert Latouche, 2 (Paris, 1937): 164-66, nn.; and Dhondt, "Élection et hérédité sous les Carolingiens et les premiers Capétiens," 936-37. Also see Ferdinand Lot, *Les derniers Carolingiens: Lothaire, Louis V, et Charles de Lorraine* (Paris, 1891), 216-17, 220-21, 163. I credit Hugh with less sincerity in this proposal than does Lot; it would have been reckless for Hugh to have journeyed to Spain before resolution of the challenge for the throne that was certain to come from the Carolingian: Charles of Lorraine.

qualified; only after much controversy was the king able to impose his own choice.¹¹ In the third generation, Henry I had his eldest son, Philip, consecrated under still different circumstances. Henry was planning to invade Normandy and, not surprisingly, wished to have his seven-year-old heir crowned before this extremely dangerous campaign. Given the lack of sources, it is impossible to determine whether Henry was concerned over his son's actual right to the throne or only desired to strengthen Philip's position in expectation of what in that society would almost necessarily be a troubled minority.¹²

The instances of royal association from the twelfth century add further diversity. Louis VI was "designated"—but not crowned—king during his father's lifetime.¹³ Louis VI's eldest son, Philip, was designated king as a small child but was consecrated only nine years later, after Louis had re-asserted control over the royal government through the ouster of the overpowerful Garlande family from the great offices of his household; the association thus appears as an act of consolidation of the father's strengthened position.¹⁴ The last case of Capetian anticipatory association, that of Philip Augustus in 1179, was occasioned by a crisis in the health of Louis VII that rendered the old king unable to rule.¹⁵ From birth Philip had been proclaimed heir to the throne and was widely accepted as such. Although his association may have prevented interregal disturbances at his father's death—that is, breaches of the peace due to the temporary lack of royal enforcement—the evidence will not really permit the reading that his right to the throne was in question.¹⁶

Of the examples of Capetian association, therefore, only the first, that of Robert II with Hugh Capet, clearly fits the traditional interpretation. The last, that of Philip Augustus with Louis VII, plainly does not. The intervening

¹¹ Dhondt, "Élection et hérédité sous les Carolingiens et les premiers Capétiens," 937-38. But note that Dhondt has followed the error of the editors of the *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France* in attributing one of the essential documents to Odolric, bishop of Orléans; the writer was almost certainly Hildegard of Poitiers. For the error, see *HF*, 10: 504; and, for the correction, see Christian Pfister, *Études sur le règne de Robert le Pieux (995-1031)* (Paris, 1885), 76 n. 1.

¹² For the context for this consecration, see Jan Dhondt, "Les relations entre la France et la Normandie sous Henri I^{er}," *Normannia*, 12 (1939): 465-86. For the coronation itself, see the protocol from it in *HF*, 11: 32-33. On the minority of Philip I, see Maurice Prou, ed., *Recueil des actes de Philippe I^{er}, roi de France (1059-1108)* (Paris, 1908), xxviii-xxxii; Eugène de Certain, ed., *Les Miracles de saint Benoît* (Paris, 1856), 313; and the archbishop of Reims to the pope, in *HF*, 11: 498. In his letter the archbishop expressed his fear that without the king the unrestrained quarrelling of the barons would bring about the ruin of the kingdom.

¹³ Augustin Fliche, *Le règne de Philippe I^{er}, roi de France (1060-1108)* (Paris, 1912), 78-83; and Achille Luchaire, *Louis VI le Gros: Annales de sa vie et de son règne (1081-1137)* (Paris, 1890), nos. 8, 11, 16, 31, etc.

¹⁴ Leopold Delisle, "Sur la date de l'association de Philippe, fils de Louis le Gros, au gouvernement du royaume," *Journal des savants* (1898), 736-40; and Luchaire, *Louis VI le Gros*, xlix-lviii, nos. 399, 420, 433. For such a motive for anticipatory association, note the advice to Louis VI after Philip's death that he make his second son, the future Louis VII, king "ad reffellendum emulorum tumultum"; Suger, *Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, 268.

¹⁵ Rigord, *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, in Henri-François Delaborde, ed., *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1882-85), 1: 9-10.

¹⁶ For a fuller presentation of this view, see my "Royal Succession in Capetian France: Studies of Familial Order and the State" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1973), chap. 2: "Philip Augustus as Heir to the Throne." For an inventory of most of the documents, see Alexander Cartellieri, *Philipp II. August, König von Frankreich*, 1 (Leipzig, 1899): "Beilagen," 49-61. On the disorders that customarily occurred at the deaths of kings, see Auguste Molinier, ed., *Vie de Louis le Gros par Suger suivie de l'histoire du roi Louis VII* (Paris, 1887), 147.

cases are obscure in many regards, but the applicability of the received explanation to them is problematical at best. In the absence of clear documentation to the contrary, scholars have generalized the significance of the first case to all other instances of the measure over the course of two centuries, as if its purpose had been the same each time. The implausibility of that premise for a society that was governed chiefly by custom is evident: it seems unlikely that people for whom property rights were established by the "long usage" of thirty or forty years would not willingly accept the Capetians as their royal dynasty after a reign of seventy or even one hundred years.¹⁷ If anticipatory association of the heir is taken as proof of such an anomalous interpretation, our appraisal of that custom should be reassessed.

The only constant element in the Capetian practice of anticipatory association was the father's wish or expectation that his son should succeed him on the throne. Comparison with other medieval European monarchies reveals little more than that German and Anglo-Norman royal fathers had the same wish or expectation and that some of them used this means to ensure their sons' successions. Nothing in the evidence requires that anticipatory association of the heir be seen necessarily as a sign of a weak hereditary title, and the example of Henry II of England and the young Henry strongly suggests that such was not always the case.¹⁸ Reference to Carolingian precedents offers no reliable guidance, because the circumstances of the monarchy when Charlemagne and Louis the Pious associated their sons were radically different from those of later generations. It is arguable, moreover, that the Carolingian cases are extraneous to the period under review, since the tenth- and eleventh-century rulers either were unaware of them or else understood such knowledge as they had in ways that can no longer be determined or properly assessed.¹⁹ A comparative survey of this usage among the medieval monarchies is thus of limited value.

¹⁷ Dhondt alone has argued that from the beginning the Capetians were secure in their control over the royal succession and thus were "la dynastie royale"; "Élection et hérédité sous les Carolingiens et les premiers Capétiens," 951-53. Disproportionate attention has been paid to "anti-Capetian" or "legitimist" statements in some of the chronicles; see the review by Karl Ferdinand Werner, "Die Legitimität der Kapetinger und die Entstehung des 'Reditus regni Francorum ad stirpem Karoli,'" *Die Welt als Geschichte*, 12 (1952), 208-13. But see Gabrielle M. Spiegel, "The *Reditus Regni ad Stirpem Karoli Magni*: A New Look," *French Historical Studies*, 7 (1971): 153 n. 36; and my "Dynastic Structures and Capetian Throne-Right: The Views of Giles of Paris," *Traditio*, 33 (1977): 242, n. 77. Many writers repeated from their sources the charge that Hugh Capet was a usurper, but they seem to have regarded his successors as legitimate kings. In isolated cases the dynasty itself was condemned, but such instances appear far removed from the political realities; for example, a chronicle from the monastery of Evrière, at Angers, which styled the Capetians *pseudo-reges*, was written during the late 1050s, a period of firm alliance between Henry I and the count of Anjou; Paul Marchegay and Émile Mabille, eds., *Chroniques des Églises d'Anjou* (Paris, 1869), 163; and Olivier Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou et son entourage au XI^e siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1972), 1: 79-81, 89-91. Fulk Réchin of Anjou, ca. 1100, held the Capetians in low regard in comparison to the Carolingians, but he did not question the Capetian royal title; see the *Fragmentum Historiae Andegavorum auctore Fulcone Richa, comite Andegavorum*, in Paul Marchegay and André Salmon, eds., *Chroniques d'Anjou* (Paris, 1856), 376, 379, 381. Werner has hypothesized an increased interest in the Carolingians and, as a corollary, reproaches of dynastic illegitimacy against the Capetians in the twelfth century; "Die Legitimität der Kapetinger," 211-18. But Henry II's careful observance of his feudal obligations toward Louis VII provides better evidence of the attitude of the magnates; see Robert of Torigny, *Chronicle*, 162, 203, 240-41.

¹⁸ See note 4, above.

¹⁹ For the same reason, discussion of anticipatory association in the Byzantine empire has been excluded. Although the German emperors surely knew of such cases, it is uncertain whether the Capetians

MORE FRUITFUL INSIGHTS are gained if the range of comparison is enlarged to include the greater nobility—that is, if Capetian practice is compared not with that of dissimilar monarchies but with the customs of other strata within French society. Anticipatory association in princely and baronial successions has never been systematically studied. Many examples of it have long been known, but those cited in the standard scholarly manuals all date from after 987—beginning, in fact, soon after the association of Robert II with Hugh Capet. These cases have been seen, therefore, as baronial imitations of Capetian royal practice.²⁰ If the single occurrence of the measure among the late Carolingians—the association of Louis V with Lothair in 979—has been considered, the precedent for the nobility has been seen as larger than merely Capetian, and thus the royal character of the practice and its use to buttress disputed hereditary right have seemed to be confirmed.²¹

Different perspectives are supplied, however, by instances of the same practice among the great nobility, some of which predate 989. The earliest example that I have seen comes from the Capetian ancestors: the association of Hugh the Great with Robert I in the latter's county and in the abbacy of Saint-Martin of Tours, which was attested in 913.²² By the 960s other cases of the measure appeared among the dukes of Normandy, the counts of Mâcon, Flanders, and probably Blois, and the viscounts of Dijon. By 989 the duke of Aquitaine also used anticipatory association of the heir.²³ Numerous examples

did. The only reference to such practice by the Byzantines that I have seen in the sources regarding France appears in a letter from Pope Alexander III to Archbishop Henry of Reims and dates from 1171 or 1172; *HP*, 15: 925 (Jaffé, no. 12103).

²⁰ Achille Luchaire, *Manuel des institutions françaises: Période des Capétiens directs* (Paris, 1892), 230-40; and Émile Chénon, *Histoire générale du droit français public et privé des origines à 1815*, 2 (Paris, 1929): 247-49. In contrast to royal practice, anticipatory association among the nobility has been viewed largely as a means of preserving the indivisibility of the great holdings. Although this purpose sometimes lay behind its use, it was neither the sole nor necessarily the principal one; see pages 915-16, below.

²¹ For this association, see Lot, *Les derniers Carolingiens*, 108-09. In this instance, the challenge came from the king's own brother, Charles of Lorraine.

²² Karl Ferdinand Werner, "Untersuchungen zur Frühzeit des französischen Fürstentums (9.-10. Jahrhundert) (i)," *Die Welt als Geschichte*, 18 (1958): 287.

²³ For Normandy (William Longsword with Rollo, 920s), see Dudo of Saint-Quentin, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, ed. Jules Lair, *Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie*, 3d ser., 3, pt. 2 (1865): 173, 181-83; and Ferdinand Lot, *Études sur le règne de Hugues Capet et la fin du X^e siècle* (Paris, 1904), 183 n. 5. For Mâcon (Leotaldus with Alberic I, 935, and Alberic II with Leotaldus, 960), see Barthélemy Rameau, "Les comtes héréditaires de Mâcon," *Annales de l'Académie de Mâcon*, 3d ser., 6 (1901): 130, 136. For Flanders (Baldwin III with Arnulf I, 958-62), see Léon Vanderkindere, *La formation territoriale des principautés belges*, 2 vols. (2d ed., Brussels, 1902), 2: 292-93. For Blois (Odo I with Theobald le Tricheur, 950s), see Benjamin Guérard, ed., *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Père de Chartres*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1840), 1: 54, 2: 351. Interpretation of these charters is uncertain, because additions to the subscriptions to the documents were made after the dates of the acts themselves; see Ferdinand Lot, *Études sur le règne de Hugues Capet et la fin du X^e siècle* (Paris, 1903), 398 n. 2. But in the same note Lot took the Count Odo who subscribed another charter for St.-Père to be Odo I, and that act is from 954; see Guérard, *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Père*, 1: 199. That Theobald is called *nobilissimus comes* and Odo only *comes* in one of these charters may imply that Theobald was still alive and that he was the senior count at the time of Odo's subscription (950?); see Guérard, *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Père*, 2: 351. For Dijon (Ralph with Robert, 958 or 951), see Lot, *Les derniers Carolingiens*, 329-30, 326 n. 1. For Aquitaine (William V with William IV), see Walther Kienast, *Der Herzogstitel in Frankreich und Deutschland (9. bis 12. Jahrhundert)* (Munich, 1968), 196 nn. 144, 146. Two other apparent cases of such practice must be discounted. Karl Ferdinand Werner has demonstrated that the instance formerly accepted for the county of Troyes in 980-81 did not occur; Werner, "Die Nachkommen Karls des Grossen bis um das Jahr 1000 (1.-8. Generation)," in Wolfgang Braunfels and Percy Ernst Schramm, eds., *Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, 4 (Düsseldorf, 1967): 462 at 7.4. Two charters from Anjou show the heir to that county as "count" in 976 and probably in the 980s; but, since both are known only from an unreliable textual tradition and one of them is

of it are recorded from the eleventh century, when such cases occurred again in Normandy, Mâcon, Flanders, and (variably) either Blois or another holding of that family and in the comital families of Amiens and Valois, Beaumont-sur-Oise, Meulan, Nevers, and others, as the heirs of those counts were associated in part or all of their prospective inheritances and in the comital title.²⁴ Other such cases can be cited for the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.²⁵

The chronology of these cases indicates that the great nobles did not simply adopt the practice from a royal model. The pattern was more complicated than that. It cannot be assumed that the tenth-century magnates knew of the Carolingian precedents of more than a century earlier, which for modern schematizations have marked the usage as royal in origin. It is more likely that the tenth-century nobles followed contemporaneous examples familiar to them. One obvious model for the anticipatory associations of the sons of Lothair and Hugh Capet was the case of Otto I of Germany, maternal uncle to both of them, who had his son crowned king in 961 and made co-emperor in 967.²⁶ The lines of probable influence do not, however, point simply to Otto; while Lothair and Hugh certainly knew of the German example,

demonstrably interpolated, both charters must be disregarded unless other evidence appears. See Arthur Bertrand de Broussillon, ed., *Cartulaire de Saint-Aubin d'Angers* (Angers, 1896), nos. 211, 281; and Guillot, *Le comte d'Angou*, 1: 139 n. 43.

²⁴ For Normandy (Richard III with Richard II, 1025, and Robert Curthose with William the Conqueror, 1065/6–1087), see William of Jumièges, *Gesta Normannorum ducum*, ed. Jean Marx (Rouen and Paris, 1911), 96–97; Marie Fauroux, ed., *Recueil des actes des ducs de Normandie, 911–1066* (Caen, 1901), nos. 34, 36, 55; and David, *Robert Curthose*, 12. For Mâcon (Guy with Otto-William, 997–1003; Otto II with Otto-William, 1095–26; and Geoffrey with Otto II, 1031), see Rameau, "Les comtes héréditaires de Mâcon," 141–44; Alexandre Bruel, ed., *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny*, 6 vols. (Paris, 1876–1900), 3: nos. 2387, 2468, 2484, 4: no. 2852; and *HF*, 10: 385, 397. For Flanders (Robert II with Robert I, 1086–93), see Charles Verlinden, *Robert I^{er} le Fison, comte de Flandre. Étude d'histoire politique* (Antwerp, 1935), 135–37; and Fernand Vercauteren, ed., *Actes des comtes de Flandre, 1071–1128* (Brussels, 1938), nos. 5, 7–9, 12, etc. For Blois-Champagne (Theobald III and Stephen with Odo II, 1034–37, and Stephen-Henry with Theobald III, 1074–89), see Henri d'Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1859–69), 1: 355–56, 378, 470–73, 396–99; and Prou, *Recueil des actes de Philippe I^{er}*, nos. 67, 78, 86. For Amiens-Valois (Simon with Ralph IV, 1069–74), see *HF*, 11: 433–34. Earlier cases from the same family are probable, but the evidence for them consists of the sons' subscriptions with the comital title to the father's charters; and it is possible that the sons' subscriptions or titles were added after the father's death; for Walter III and Ralph III with Drogo, 11208(?), see Ferdinand Lot, *Études critiques sur l'abbaye de Saint-Wandrille* (Paris, 1913), no. 8. Also see Prou, *Recueil des actes de Philippe I^{er}*, no. 103. For Beaumont-sur-Oise (Geoffrey with Ivo II, 1039–59), see Joseph Depoin, *Les comtes de Beaumont-sur-Oise et le prévôt de Sainte-Humaine de Conflans* (Pontoise, 1915), 22–24, 48–49, 228. The appearance of another Count Geoffrey of Beaumont in 1023, during the lifetime of Count Ivo I, may indicate an earlier case of anticipatory association in this family; see Fauroux, *Recueil des actes des ducs de Normandie*, no. 25; and Depoin, *Les comtes de Beaumont-sur-Oise*, 20–21. For Meulan (Hugh III with Wateran I, 1059–68), see Jules Joseph Vernier, ed., *Chartes de l'abbaye de Jumièges (v. 825 à 1204)*, 1 (Rouen and Paris, 1916); no. 26; Lot, *Études critiques sur l'abbaye de Saint-Wandrille*, no. 32; and Joseph Depoin, *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Martin de Pontaise* (Pontoise, 1895–1909), 311 n. 315. For Nevers (Reginald I with Landri, 1005–28, and Reginald II with William I, 1079), see René de Lespinasse, *Le Néonais et les comtes de Nevers*, 1 (Paris, 1909), 219; *HF*, 10: 385, 397; and Prou, *Recueil des actes de Philippe I^{er}*, no. 95. Some holders of lesser honours also associated their sons; see, for the viscounty of Chartres in 1036–60, for example, Adolphe de Dion, "Le Puiset aux XI^e et XII^e siècles," *Mémoires de la Société archéologique d'Eure-et-Loir*, 9 (1889): 8–10, 5–6. The importance of the practice should be judged not simply by the number of cases but also by the length of time such arrangements were in effect in any region; accordingly, in this and subsequent notes the dates shown for anticipatory associations are in each instance those of the duration of the measure—that is, usually from the earliest record of it until the father's death.

²⁵ See notes 31, 40, 45–46, 49–52, 70, below.

²⁶ See note 2, above. For the kinship, see Werner, "Die Nachkommen Karls des Grossen bis um das Jahr 1000," table, nn. at 6.47, 7.9.

they would also have known that their kinsman, Count Arnulf I of Flanders, had made his son, Baldwin III, count with him in 958. They would have known, too, of the cases from Blois in the 950s and Mâcon in 960.²⁷ The geographical distribution of the examples is significant. In a period when royal activity was increasingly restricted to the region of Paris, these cases were found on all sides of the king's lands: the earliest examples appeared to the northwest, west, south, and southeast of the Ile-de-France; later instances completed the circle. To the received, chronological or "vertical," model of anticipatory association in Capetian practice may be added "horizontal" planes, as similar cases among the nobility are arranged by region, date, and known contacts among the persons to form some image of what any particular generation could have known. From this context, multiple influences—some royal, others princely or baronial—are discernible as background for later practice, particularly after the middle of the eleventh century. The source and nature of the precedents, as contemporaries would have perceived them, thus varied from case to case.²⁸

What is most striking from this evidence is not that certain nobles practiced anticipatory association but that many, or even most, of them did so when their hereditary titles to their honors and lands were not in dispute. From Rollo through William the Conqueror, for example, every duke of Normandy but one either associated his eldest son in the ducal title or formally designated him as heir.²⁹ Whatever may have been the case under the first three dukes, it is not plausible that Richard II, the fourth of his line, or William the Conqueror, the seventh duke and sixth generation of the family, took this step because of weak hereditary right.³⁰ The same may be said of William Talvas,

²⁷ See note 23, above. As for the kinship, Hugh Capet and the wife of Arnulf I were descended from Herbert I of Vermandois, Lothair and Arnulf from Charles the Bald and from Alfred of Wessex; see Werner, "Die Nachkommen Karls des Grossen bis um das Jahr 1000," table, nn. at 6.4, 6.30, etc.; and Erich Brandenburg, *Die Nachkommen Karls des Grossen (I.–XIV. Generation)* (Leipzig, 1935), tables 1, 5.

²⁸ In central France, for example, Aldebert III of La Marche had, by 1086, associated his eldest son in his county; *AFD*, 227. Aldebert III had attended the coronation of Philip I and may have been influenced directly by the royal example; *HF*, 11: 33. But he would also have known that his neighbor, Aldebert II of Périgord, had associated his son in that county by 1080; *AFD*, 203. Aldebert of Périgord had not attended the coronation of Philip I, though doubtless he knew of it. In the viscounty of Limoges, the case of anticipatory association recorded 1111–24 was far removed from any royal prototype; see Maurice Ardent, "Liste chronologique et manuscrite des vicomtes de Limoges," *Congrès scientifique de France, 26 session tenue, à Limoges, en septembre 1859*, 2 (Paris, 1860): 297; and *AFD*, 254. Similar variations could be cited from other regions. So complex was the derivation of precedents that for the local populations sometimes, or probably often, the regional nobility furnished the models by which the distant kings' were conceived; see my "L'idée de successions royale et baroniale chez Bernard I^{er}," *Annales de Midi* (forthcoming).

²⁹ For the anticipatory associations, see notes 23–24, above. For the designations of Richard I by William Longsword and of Richard II by Richard I, see Dudo of St.-Quentin, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, 220–22, 297; for that of William the Conqueror by Robert I, see William of Jumièges, *Gesta Normannorum ducum*, 111–12.

³⁰ Doubtless William's attitude was influenced by the disorders of his own minority and by the rebellions against him by members of his own family; see David C. Douglas, *William the Conqueror: The Norman Impact upon England* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1964), 37–55, 62–66. Also see, for the deathbed speech that Orderic Vitalis attributed to William, Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 4 (Oxford, 1973): 82–84. The position of Robert Curthose as heir was, however, considerably stronger than William's had been, especially since Robert's grandfather, Baldwin V of Flanders, and his cousin, Philip I of France, would certainly have moved to defend him had his right to the succession been challenged in the event of William's early death.

the twelfth-century count of Ponthieu and Alençon, who, although the sixth generation and seventh member of his line to hold Ponthieu, associated with himself in that county first his eldest son and then his grandson, upon the son's early death.³¹

Reconstruction of the custom as it probably appeared to contemporaries yields similar conclusions. Formal statements as to the nature of anticipatory association are rare and very partial. No general explanation of the usage may exist at all.³² Even statements of the motivation in particular instances are unusual, perhaps in part because of the scarcity of narrative texts. Most cases of the practice are known only incidentally, from the titles used in the sons' subscriptions to charters issued during the fathers' lifetimes. Perhaps the best early source for contemporary ideas on the subject is the history of the dukes of Normandy written at the beginning of the eleventh century by Dudo of Saint-Quentin, chaplain to Duke Richard I. Although Dudo did not formally explain the principles of Norman succession, his views may be inferred from comments throughout the text. Clearly, he assumed that the ducal rule was hereditary: in one passage he explicitly called it a *regnum haereditarium*.³³ Against this background, his portrayal of the actual practices of ducal succession is remarkable. Describing the successions to the first three dukes, he attributed the anticipatory association or designation of their heirs to a variety of motives: because Rollo was old and no longer able to lead his followers into battle, he made William Longsword duke; William Longsword designated and had the barons swear fealty to Richard I because William, out of concern for his son's youth, wanted to assure stability for his domains through a smooth succession; Richard I, in anticipation of his death, designated Richard II because the barons had asked him which of his sons was to succeed.³⁴

It is impossible to assess Dudo's reliability on the events themselves, but as a reporter of eleventh-century attitudes he is authoritative. In this regard, the credibility of his account is confirmed by the chronicle of his near-contemporary, the Burgundian Rodulf Glaber, who recorded the anticipatory associations of the kings of France in almost exactly the same terms as those that Dudo independently used to describe the Norman succession. Glaber attributed the association of Louis V with Lothair to the father's fear that his son might otherwise be denied the throne, that of Robert II with Hugh Capet to the old king's failing health and consequent inability to control a turbulent baronage, and that of Henry I with Robert II to the father's selection of which of his sons would succeed him.³⁵ The account of the association of Robert II

³¹ Clovis Brunel, ed., *Recueil des actes des comtes de Ponthieu (1026-1279)* (Paris, 1920), v-vi, nos. 23-26, 48-49, *passim*.

³² I have seen none, and, because of the reasoning outlined below, I doubt that there are any; see pages 923-27 below.

³³ Dudo of St-Quentin, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, 220. For Dudo as chaplain, see Fauroux, *Recueil des actes des ducs de Normandie*, no. 13. For his other close ties to the ducal family, see his *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, 18-21, 119-20, 125, 295.

³⁴ Dudo of St-Quentin, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, 173, 181-83, 220-23, 297.

³⁵ Maurice Prou, ed., *Rodulf Glaber. Les cinq livres de ses histoires (900-1044)* (Paris, 1886), 9, 26, 84.

with Hugh Capet is inaccurate, but for present purposes the value of the record as a whole is what it shows of contemporary beliefs.³⁶ In their statements on anticipatory associations, the writings of Dudo and Rodulf Glaber are mutually corroborative that the practice did not have the single and constant meaning that modern scholarship has ascribed to it; rather, it was subject to quite varied interpretation at the time. The evidence of their accounts is the weightier, moreover, since the two men wrote in different decades, about different events, and in localities far removed from each other, yet for audiences that both presumed would share their views.

The lessons of these texts may be extended to other regions. The surviving narrative texts contain only fragmentary data for this topic, but a considerable body of relevant information can be pieced together from scattered references in those works and from the extant charters. From this record it appears that a contemporary observer who knew of anticipatory association chiefly from the perspective of a close follower of the king would have had little reason to connect it with a disputed hereditary title. Examination of the documents from the reign of Philip I (1060-1108) allows partial reconstruction of the composition of the king's entourage and of his contacts with the nobility from outside his usual circles. Of those nobles who used the practice, only the usurper Robert I of Flanders, who was almost never at Philip's court, can be said to have done so because of a contested title.³⁷ For the others, the sources either imply other reasons for the practice or record none at all. Of the two cases in which Philip I is known to have taken part in the ceremony of association, neither seems to have involved a disputed succession, and other families who employed the measure and whose members figured occasionally in the royal circle also appear to have been secure in their hereditary rule.³⁸

ANTICIPATORY ASSOCIATION OF THE HEIR in France was thus not a distinctively royal usage. Nothing tied it peculiarly either to the Capetian dynasty or to the crown. It was a feature of numerous successions, and thus successions provide the framework within which it may be understood. In noble society the anticipatory association of the heir might have any of several possible functions, only one of which was the reinforcement of a weak hereditary title. It was sometimes a means of transmitting the father's entire inheritance to his eldest son to the exclusion of the cadets. In other cases,

³⁶ Note that another Burgundian writer of ca. 1050 gave substantially the same version of Robert II's association with Hugh Capet; see the *Vita Garnerii*, in *HF*, 10: 382.

³⁷ For this association, see the references in note 24, above; for the lasting imputation of illegitimacy in this case, see Galbert of Bruges, *Histoire du meurtre de Charles le Bon, comte de Flandre (1127-1128)*, ed. Henri Pirenne (Paris, 1891), 110-15.

³⁸ For the instances of Philip's participation, see the references for the associations of Robert Curthose of Normandy in 1065-66 in note 24, above, and of Fulk V of Anjou in 1106 in note 45, below. For the presence in Philip's entourage of the members of other families who practiced anticipatory association—notably Theobald III of Blois and his son, Stephen-Henry; Ralph IV of Valois and his sons; and William I of Nevers and his son, Reginald—see Prou, *Recueil des actes de Philippe I^{er}*, nos. 2, 22-23, 39, 66-67, 78, 86, 95.

when the family had several holdings, it was used in conjunction with a partition of the estate or the assignment of apanages as one element in a more complicated successional plan. Occasionally, it provided a coadjutor to an ailing, elderly father.³⁹ Yet again, it could mark a recognition or an endowment of a prospective heir who had come of age; in cases of this sort, the association was sometimes linked to the marriage of the heir and the assignment of a dowry to his wife.⁴⁰

This description sketches the possible arrangements only in broad outline. Variations were numerous. In 995 or 996, for example, Duke Richard I of Normandy appointed his eldest son to succeed him and specified which lands should be given to the cadets. Richard II, by contrast, formally associated his eldest son in the duchy and invested his second son with a county but left it to his successors to make provision for the younger cadets.⁴¹ Odo II of Blois and Champagne, who in the 1030s provided for a future division of his holdings between his two sons, made both of them counts during his own lifetime. His son, Theobald III, when effecting a similar partition among his own sons, made only the eldest of them count before his own death.⁴² Some cases of anticipatory association provided the heir with support from a portion of the family's property until he came into his full inheritance.⁴³ In others, when the father had two or more counties to leave to his sons, the eldest might be associated in his entire share of the succession.⁴⁴

In exceptional cases, the anticipatory association was enacted by initiative other than the father's. Thus, in 1103 the intention of the old count, Fulk IV

³⁹ For the transfer of the entire inheritance to the eldest son, see, for example, the associations of Reginald I of Nevers and Geoffrey of Mâcon, note 24, above. Also see notes 49–50, below. Capetian parallels are the successions to Henry I and Louis VI, see notes 12, 14, above. For partitions of estates, see the successions to Richard II of Normandy, Odo II and Theobald III of Blois and Champagne, and William Talvas of Ponthieu; notes 41–42, below, and note 31, above. A Capetian parallel is the succession to Robert II, see pages 908–09, above, and Jan Dhondt, "Note sur les deux premiers ducs capétiens de Bourgogne," *Annales de Bourgogne*, 13 (1941): 30–38. For William Longsword as coadjutor with Rollo in Normandy, see Dudo of St.-Quentin, *De moribus et actis primarum Normanniae ducum*, 173, 181–83. This same motive probably figured in the associations of Baldwin III with Arnulf I of Flanders and of Fulk V with Fulk Réchin of Anjou, see note 23, above, and page 917, below. A Capetian parallel is the association of Philip Augustus with Louis VII; see note 15, above.

⁴⁰ This same motive was the reason for the association of John, son of Robert III of Alençon, in 1205; see Henri-François Delaborde et al., eds., *Recueil des actes de Philippe Auguste, roi de France*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1916–), 2: no. 995. It was one of the considerations in that of Geoffrey Plantagenet with Fulk V of Anjou in 1127–28; see page 917, below. The association of Robert II with Robert I of Dreux in 1184 coincided with or slightly preceded the second marriage of Robert II; André Duchesne, *Histoire généalogique de la maison royale de Dreux* (Paris, 1691), 45, 238, 248. Either an association or measures similar to one were effected in 1189 at the time of the marriage of the heir to the county of Meulan; Étienne Deville, ed., *Cartulaire de l'église de la Sainte-Trinité de Beaumont-le-Roger* (Paris, 1912), nos. 255, 261. But see Depoin, *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Martin de Pontaise*, 323–24.

⁴¹ For Richard I, see Dudo of St.-Quentin, *De moribus et actis primarum Normanniae ducum*, 207. For Richard II, see William of Jumièges, *Gesta Normannorum ducum*, 96–97. For corroboration of William of Jumièges's account, see Fauroux, *Recueil des actes des ducs de Normandie*, no. 55. It was, in fact, the young William the Conqueror who endowed these cadets; William of Jumièges, *Gesta Normannorum ducum*, 119.

⁴² Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne*, 1: 378, 355, 472–73, 396–99, 425–26.

⁴³ For Theobald III's possession of the county of St.-Florentin during his father's lifetime, see Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne*, 1: 378; for Robert II of Flanders, see Verlinden, *Robert I^{er} le Frison*, 136–37; and, for Robert II as "lord of Dreux" but without his parents' other holdings during his father's lifetime, see Duchesne, *Histoire généalogique de la maison royale de Dreux*, 238, 248.

⁴⁴ Thus, for Leotaldus, Guy, and Otto II of Mâcon, see Rameau, "Les comtes héréditaires de Mâcon," 130–31, 141–42; and for Guy II and John of Ponthieu, see Brunel, *Recueil des actes des comtes de Ponthieu*, v–vi.

Réchin of Anjou, to disinherit Geoffrey Martel, his son of his second marriage, in favor of Fulk V, his son by his third wife, Bertrada of Montfort, drove Geoffrey to rebellion. Geoffrey prevailed by force and compelled his father to associate him as count as the price of reconciliation. Three years later, Geoffrey was killed in battle in Normandy. Upon learning of his death, King Philip I, step-father of Fulk V, invested the latter with the county of Anjou, acting apparently on his own authority as overlord and without known consultation with the youth's father.⁴⁵ Occasionally, the same measure was used by a childless count, either a bishop who had inherited a county or a layman, to designate which of his collateral relatives should succeed him.⁴⁶ In some instances, the young count was largely independent of his father; in others, he was clearly subject to paternal control.⁴⁷

From the late eleventh century onward, variations linked to pilgrimage or crusader activity appeared. Thus, Robert II of Flanders, who earlier had been styled count in a few charters of his father and others (perhaps because he had been proclaimed heir), was officially invested with the title in 1086, immediately prior to his father's departure for the East; and in that capacity he governed the county as regent during his father's absence. After Robert I's return the son retained the comital style, although he continued to administer only a portion of the county.⁴⁸ By contrast, the association of Geoffrey Plantagenet with his father Fulk V as count of Anjou in 1127 or 1128, at the time of Geoffrey's betrothal and marriage to the Empress Matilda, became a permanent transfer of the county when within two years Fulk departed Europe to marry the heiress to the kingdom of Jerusalem.⁴⁹ A generation later, Fulk's son-in-law, Thierry of Alsace, count of Flanders, made comparable, if broader, arrangements for his succession prior to his own trips to the Holy Land. In 1157, on the eve of his third such trip, Thierry provided ecclesiastical

⁴⁵ For the associations themselves, see Joséphe Chartrou, *L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151: Foulque de Jérusalem et Geoffroy Plantagenêt* (Paris, 1928), 1–4. For problems in the interpretation of both of these associations, see Guillet, *Le comte d'Anjou*, 1: 117 n. 528, 123 n. 503. But see notes 55, 57, below. These events may be of particular importance for an explanation of Philip I's decision not to have the future Louis VI consecrated during his own lifetime and to grant Louis only the title *rex designatus*; see note 13, above. Philip I's direct knowledge of the sometimes adverse consequences of anticipatory association included not only a familiarity with the problems of Fulk Réchin but also the lessons of his own involvement in the settlement of one revolt by Robert Curthose against William the Conqueror; see Douglas, *William the Conqueror*, 236–39, 239 n. 4.

⁴⁶ For the association in the 1030s of Theobald with his uncle, Hugh, bishop of Auxerre and count of Chalon, see Brunel, *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny*, 4: nos. 2845, 2848, 2905, etc. The case of Ivo and count of Soissons and lord of Nesle, and his nephew, Cono, is more complicated. In 1157 Ivo declared Cono his heir if he himself died without issue; in 1172 Cono was called Ivo's successor; from 1176 until Ivo's death in 1178, both men appear with the titles "count of Soissons" and "lord of Nesle"; see William Mendel Newman, *Les seigneurs de Nesle en Picardie (XII^e-XIII^e siècle): Leurs chartes et leur histoire*, 2 vols. (Paris and Philadelphia, 1971), 1: 34–35; 2: nos. 29–30, 58, 73–78.

⁴⁷ Among sons or grandsons who were largely independent were Leotaldus of Mâcon, Stephen-Henry of Blois, and Guy II and John of Ponthieu. See Brunel, *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny*, 1: no. 432; Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne*, 1: 396–400; and Brunel, *Recueil des actes des comtes de Ponthieu*, nos. 23–26, 48–49, *passim*. For sons largely dependent, note the heirs of Odo II of Blois and note Robert Curthose of Normandy and Robert II of Flanders. Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne*, 1: 317–20, 333, 343, 378, 472–73; David, *Robert Curthose*, 13, 19, 29, *passim*; and Verlinden, *Robert I^{er} le Frison*, 135–37.

⁴⁸ Verlinden, *Robert I^{er} le Frison*, 135–37, 21, 21 nn. 2–3.

⁴⁹ Chartrou, *L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151*, 21–24; and C. Warren Hollister and Thomas K. Keefe, "The Making of the Angevin Empire," *Journal of British Studies*, 12 (1973): 15.

placement for two of his cadets and established Philip, his eldest living son, as "heir and count of all Flanders" under the protection of his kinsman, Henry II of England. Seven years later, after the estates of his other children had been assured through marriage, Thierry departed again, to settle permanently in the East, leaving Philip with the full comital title as his successor in Flanders.⁵⁰

Distinctive cases are recorded for the French possessions of the kings of England. In 1120 Henry I made his son, William Adelin, duke-designate of Normandy, not only to guarantee his eventual succession despite the challenge from William Clito, but also to perform homage for the duchy to Louis VI, which Henry himself refused to do.⁵¹ In 1169 Henry II associated his eldest living son, the young Henry, as duke of Normandy and count of Anjou and made Richard, the second son, count of Poitiers with Eleanor of Aquitaine as part of a comprehensive successional plan.⁵²

A similar variety of arrangements appeared in cases involving the sons of widows who held lordships in their own right. In such situations, the son frequently assumed the title of his mother's honor during her lifetime. It is unclear whether these cases are strictly comparable to those of anticipatory association with a father, because—although all such measures of coseigniorship imply the son's right of inheritance—some cases in which the son took his mother's title indicate that he was the chief lord and active administrator of the holding, as if she were ineligible to exercise lordship. Thus, in the eleventh century the countess of Vendôme was little more than an arbiter in the fate of her county, which was held and governed in turn by her father, her half-brother, and her sons rather than by herself. Again, in the first decades of the twelfth century, the widowed countess of Vermandois saw her county placed under royal wardship during the minority of her son, who was recognized first as count-designate and then as count during his mother's lifetime. In the 1090s, there was even shared rule at Bourges between the husband of the viscountess and their son-in-law, with both men simultaneously entitled lord of Bourges.⁵³ But variations and contrasts are found. At the end of the twelfth

⁵⁰ Adriaan E. Verhulst, "Note sur une chartre de Thierry d'Alsace, comte de Flandre, pour l'abbaye de Fontevrault (21 avril 1157)," in *Études de civilisation médiévale (IX-XII siècles): Mélanges offerts à Edmond-René Labande* (Poitiers, 1973), 711-19; and Robert of Torigny, *Chronicle*, 193, 220. For Thierry's children, see Vanderkindere, *La formation territoriale des principautés belges*, 1: 301-15.

⁵¹ Hollister, "Normandy, France, and the Anglo-Norman Regnum," 224-27. There was a partial precedent for Henry's action in the policy of William the Conqueror with regard to Robert Curthose and the county of Maine. Robert twice did homage for Maine to the counts of Anjou. In 1067 or 1064 he did so as fiancé of Margaret, minor heiress to the county. But he performed the second homage, in 1081, as surrogate for his father after William's second conquest of Maine; Margaret had died some years earlier, before celebration of the marriage, and the best title for the claim to Maine was a dubious agreement by which Herbert II of Maine was alleged to have made William his heir. See David, *Robert Curthose*, 9-11; Robert Latouche, *Histoire du comté du Maine pendant le XI^e et le XII^e siècle* (Paris, 1910), 32-39; and Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou*, 1: 105-06, 105 n. 470, 119-20.

⁵² Warren, *Henry II*, 108-11.

⁵³ For the countess of Vendôme, see Charles Métais, ed., *Cartulaire de l'abbaye cistercienne de la Trinité de Vendôme*, 1 (Paris, 1893), no. 6; and Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou*, 1: 27 n. 139, 38 n. 184. For the countess of Vermandois, see Luchaire, *Louis VI le Gros*, nos. 35, 81, 123, 134, 166, 299. The mother-countess Adela styled herself *Vicomtessium comitissa* and her two elder sons *futuri comites* in a charter of 1103; Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MSS Coll. Moreau, 41, f. 99. In 1109 the eldest son, Ralph, was called *Vermandonum futurus*

and beginning of the thirteenth centuries, almost simultaneously, the son of the widowed lady of Venisy (Aube) held and did homage for that castle, while the son of the widowed countess or lady of Braine (Aisne) used only the title he had inherited from his father and avoided mention of his mother's lordship in his titulary for as long as she lived.⁵⁴ Clarification of these inconsistencies must await systematic study of the chronological and regional differences in the property rights of women.

The diversity of these cases warns against hasty adoption of a narrow definition of anticipatory association. Although, from a juridical or strict procedural criterion, the essential element of the measure was the formal association of the heir in the office of his father or other relative, the substance—both in intention and in practical effect—varied from case to case. Numerous contemporaries, moreover, appear to have been unimpressed by precisely the aspect that usually seems most important to modern scholars, for the son who had been associated with his father was not always given the father's title in the documents. In some cases, the son appears with the title; in others, he is only styled son of the titled parent.⁵⁵ These inconsistencies in diplomatics are attributable in part to the usages of different scribes, for in the eleventh and twelfth centuries many royal and baronial charters were drawn not by the donor's chancery but by clerks of the recipient ecclesiastical establishments.⁵⁶ The usage reflects also a lack of stress on the son's title in the

comes in an act of Louis VI, and the subscriptions gave him the same title; Edmond Martène and Ursin Durand, eds., *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum amplissima collectio*, 1 (Paris, 1724): 624-25. In 1110 Ralph, independently of his mother, issued a charter in which he was styled "per gratiam Dei designatus Vifromandensium comes"; William Mendel Newman, ed., *Charters of St. Fursy of Peronne* (Cambridge, Mass., 1977), no. 7. In 1114 Adela herself styled Ralph (but neither of her other sons) *comes*; Victor de Beauvillé, *Histoire de la ville de Montdidier*, 1 (2d ed., Paris, 1875): 485 no. 2. Adela remained active until the end of her life; her charters style her countess but sometimes do not use the comital title for her son; see, for example, Joseph Depoin, ed., *Recueil de chartes et documents de Saint-Martin-des-Champs, monastère parisien*, 1 (Paris, 1912): no. 161. For the viscountess of Bourges, see Philippe Labbé, *Histoire du Berry abrégée dans l'éloge panegyrique de la ville de Bourges* (Paris, 1647), 192-93. The charter is explicit in noting that both mother and daughter were living.

⁵⁴ Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne*, 3: app. 22, no. 285: "Dominus Erardus de Venisy tenet castrum de Venisy a domino Campanie . . ." This arrangement is the more remarkable since Erardus's mother, Alice of Venisy, had remarried, and her second husband sometimes styled himself "lord of Venisy"; Maximilien Quantin, ed., *Recueil de pièces pour servir au Cartulaire général de l'Yonne* (Auxerre, 1873), no. 103. Also see *ibid.*, nos. 24, 245; and Newman, *Les seigneurs de Nesle en Picardie*, 2: 340 n. 5. For the property, see Charles Lalore, *Documents pour servir à la généalogie des anciens seigneurs de Tréand* (Troyes, 1872), nos. 72-73, 124-25. For Agnes, countess of Dreux and Braine, and her son, Robert II, see Duchesne, *Histoire généalogique de la maison royale de Dreux*, 250-51. In anticipation, however, the charters of others sometimes referred to the son as "count of Braine"; *ibid.*, 239.

⁵⁵ For references to Theobald III and Stephen-Henry of Blais and Champagne, for example, see Prou, *Recueil des actes de Philippe I^{er}*, nos. 67, 78, 82. Walter, son of Ralph IV of Valois, was styled variably either count or Ralph's son; *ibid.*, nos. 2, 22. It is unclear here, however, whether the comital title implies an association of Walter with Ralph or refers to Walter's maternal inheritance of Bar-sur-Aube. One charter refers to William VII, son of Robert II of Auvergne, as *comes* in the body of the act but records his subscription as "S. Wilhelmi, filii ejus"; *ibid.*, no. 135. For William as count in another charter from his father's lifetime, see *AD*, 134. Similarly, a charter of Ralph IV of Valois from 1069 calls his son, Simon, *comes* in the formula of the date but *Comitis filius* in the subscription; *HE*, 11: 433. Such usage long remained mixed in some regions. A charter of Delphinus, count of Auvergne, and his son William from 1199 called William only *filius meus* in the announcement of the act, although William's seal on the document styled him *comes*; *LTC*, 1: no. 501.

⁵⁶ For the best demonstration of this point, see Françoise Gasparri, *L'écriture des actes de Louis VI, Louis VII, et Philippe Auguste* (Paris, 1973), 17-26, *passim*. Also see Newman, *Les seigneurs de Nesle en Picardie*, 2: 11-14.

eyes of contemporaries. Given their premise of hereditary succession, the word "son" often included the connotation "heir," and the authors of these documents did not always consider more specific designation of status necessary.

A hasty reading of the sources might suggest uncertainty as to the son's title, but that inference is unjustified. To take the clearest example, Philip, eldest son of Louis VI, was proclaimed *rex designatus* in 1120, and he was mentioned with that title in numerous royal charters issued between that date and his consecration in 1129; but other royal charters from the same years style him only *filius noster* or *filius regis*. Conversely, in popular usage, though seldom in the formal diplomatics, a son who had not been associated with his father might be called by the latter's title in expectation of his eventual succession.⁵⁷ Finally, a number of other measures that resemble anticipatory association must be viewed in conjunction with it. Thus, in both the nobility and the aristocracy of simple lords, the father might arrange for his son or sons to do homage in advance to his lord for the inheritance, or he might in his own lifetime effect a legal transfer of his holdings to the son, usually the eldest, whom he had chosen as heir.⁵⁸ Other variations could be cited.

Many problems are obscure. It is apparent that anticipatory association was not uniform in character. On the contrary, the variations indicate a diversity, not only of intent, but of probable form and of the relative importance attributed to it from case to case. The ideas behind those instances of the practice that are least emphasized in the sources are barely distinguishable from the premises of the countless charters from nobles and petty lords that so carefully recorded the consent of the heirs, especially that of the eldest son, to alienations from the family property.⁵⁹ Why some families practiced anticipatory association of the heir and others did not is also unclear. Nor is there a sure explanation for the somewhat sporadic character of the custom: that, for example, a given family employed it in one generation but not in the next. In general, the outlines of successions that included the measure appear

⁵⁷ For Philip, see Luchaire, *Louis VI le Gros*, nos. 302, 310, 317, 321, 363, 424; but also see *ibid.*, nos. 365, 408, 419. For similar variations of title for Louis VI as *rex designatus*, see *ibid.*, 291–93, nos. 22, 24, etc. Louis VI is never called "king" in the extant acts of Philip I. Prou, *Recueil des actes de Philippe I^{er}*, cviii–cix. For contemporaneous variations in Anjou, see Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou*, 1: 117–18 n. 528. For a text in which, after the record of a donation by the son-count to which the father had consented, the latter, who is called count in the body of the act, appears in the subscriptions only as *pater eius*, see *ibid.*, 2: no. 439. For popular usage, see Lewis, "L'idée de successions."

⁵⁸ Georges Duby, *La société aux XI^e et XII^e siècles dans la région mâconnaise* (Paris, 1953), 173, 279–280. For a case of similar homage from Flanders, see *HF*, 16: 63–64.

⁵⁹ In this regard, there is some confusion in the vocabulary of modern scholarship. Depoin has described Robert II of Meulan as "dès 1157, associé aux actes de son père"; *Carulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Martin de Poitiers*, 323. And Lot has written of Richard of Vernon as "associé à son père Guillaume dès 1165"; *Études critiques sur l'abbaye de Saint-Wandelle*, 178 n. 4. But in neither case is there evidence of full anticipatory association. The distinction between anticipatory association and the shared property rights that required the consent of the kinsmen to alienations is often vague, for William and Richard of Vernon, for example, see Léopold Delisle, ed., *Recueil des actes de Henri II, roi d'Angleterre, concernant les provinces françaises*, Introduction (Paris, 1909), 437 n. 6, and, for Richard and his son, see *ETC*, 1: no. 441. An undated charter (ca. 1184?) of Robert I of Dreux to Notre-Dame of Estrée succinctly illustrates the problem: "Ego R. Comes Drocensis [...] Et R. filius meus Comes per Dei gratiam post me futurus [...] filius meus et petrus filius meus. Notum fieri volumus . . .", Archives de l'Eure, H 319, ff. 59^v–60^r. Also see note 55, above.

to have been the same as in those which did not: the exclusion of cadets from the inheritance, successional partitions, and the granting of apanages are found in both categories. In rare instances, partial explanations for such differences are possible, but more often the extant sources are insufficient for such hypotheses.

ANTICIPATORY ASSOCIATION OF THE HEIR, as a successional phenomenon, was linked to, or was part of, the familial structure of the noble class, since, once the heritability of offices and of the lands attached to them was established, the family became the cadre for the exercise and transmission of the related rights of lordship and property. Within this setting, anticipatory association was one of a number of organizing practices found variably but often in the dynastic arrangement of the noble family that emerged in France in the tenth and early eleventh centuries. As, with the fragmentation of royal and even princely power, the higher nobility established themselves in permanent control over fixed territories, and their rule became hereditary—that is, a patrimony—their families assumed the vertically linear structure of dynasties, in contrast to the earlier clan structure. The families, in effect, organized themselves around their patrimony and its devolution. The sons, or one of them, inherited; the holding then became indivisible, and primogeniture was introduced to preserve it. Cadets might receive provision through the inheritance of lesser holdings, marriage to heiresses, or ecclesiastical placement—or they might be disinherited—while the eldest normally received the undivided patrimony.⁶⁰

The parallel between the Capetians and the greater nobility in this regard is clear. For the Capetians the crown was the family's patrimonial *honor* in direct analogy to the principal *honor* of a noble family. The comparison is not absolute; obviously, some aspects of the royalty precluded a simple equation of it to a barony. No recorded spokesman of the time—that is, no educated cleric or monk—would have regarded the religious office of the king as wholly the private possession of anyone, and the lay magnates doubtless recognized differences between kingship and their own titles. But the election and consecration that set the king apart from other magnates were constitutive acts pertaining to his office. In terms of familial structures, they are nonessential in that through the channels of direct personal inheritance the son possessed the right to his father's office and lands that led to his anointment as king.⁶¹ The

⁶⁰ For these patterns of inheritance, chiefly see Georges Duby, "Structures familiales aristocratiques en France du XI^e siècle en rapport avec les structures de l'État," in Tadeusz Manteuffel and Aleksander Gieysztor, comps., *L'Europe aux IX^e-XI^e siècles: Aux origines des États nationaux*, Actes du colloque international sur les origines des États européens aux IX^e-XI^e siècles, tenu à Varsovie et Poznań du 7 au 13 septembre 1965 (Warsaw, 1968), 57–62. For regional and other variations, see my "The Capetian Apanages and the Nature of the French Kingdom," *Journal of Medieval History*, 2 (1976): 129 n. 14.

⁶¹ Some studies have treated election- and consecration-right as contradictory to a hereditary basis for royal rule. This was not necessarily the case. Recent research suggests that the election of the king of France was less a procedure of selection of the next monarch than it was a consent or acclamation that signified acceptance of him and that obligated the electors to respect his rights and jurisdiction. See,

crown did not alter the basic patterns within which the lay titles and fortunes devolved. The royalty occupied the same place for the Capetians, considered as a family and viewed through the succession, that the duchy of Normandy did for the descendants of Rollo and that various counties did for the families of their counts.

As a successional practice that promoted the dynastic ordering of the family, anticipatory association of the heir is easily understood as one feature of this system. In individual cases its function is sometimes unclear because the uses varied. The measure could help establish the precedents by which the possession became hereditary, as in the association of Robert II with Hugh Capet and in some of the earlier cases among the nobility. In different circumstances the same measure was not the cause but the result of the hereditary character of the holding, as in the association of Philip Augustus with Louis VII and in most examples of the practice among the French nobility of the twelfth century. In short, although the measure, when it was used, was part of the hereditary transmission of the office and property, its occurrence alone is evidence only of the wishes or expectations of the principals. By itself anticipatory association does not indicate whether hereditary succession was an object of dispute or a shared premise in the particular context.

Early Capetian successional usage has thus been judged by an index of variable meaning. Comparison between the French and the German or English monarchies placed in high relief and seemed to confirm as the whole what in reality was only one of the possible meanings of the measure. The fallacy of that approach is rooted in its limited selection of data. By treating the anticipatory association of the heir almost solely as an aspect of constitutional history, narrowly construed, it pulled out of societal context, and applied a static interpretation to, a practice that was part of broader social and political history and accordingly was more supple. The essential elements of its usage are not the shared traits of monarchies considered very nearly in the abstract, but rather the interrelated structures of kinship, property-holding, and rule within the given society. With respect to Capetian succession, the most relevant material comes from the common practices of the other great titled and landed families that surrounded and informed the kings.

especially. Walther Kienast, "Die französischen Stämme bei der Königswahl," *Historische Zeitschrift*, 206 (1968): 1-21; and John M. Wallace-Hadrill, *Early Germanic Kingship in England and on the Continent*, Ford Lectures for 1970 (Oxford, 1971), 133-35. Abbo of Fleury's discussion of royal election in his chapter "De fidelitate regis," in which he argued the magnates' duty to aid the king, supports this thesis; see Abbo of Fleury, *Collectio canonum*, in Jacques-Paul Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus . . . series latina*, 139 (Paris, 1880): 478. The protocol from the election of Philip I reflects the same idea; *HF*, 11: 32-33. The documents on the associations of the sons of Robert II probably can be read in the same way; see the sources of note 11 above. Schramm's concepts of "freier" and "gebundene Auswahlen" describe other aspects of the proceedings but do not give full value to this one; *König von Frankreich*, 1: esp. 102. The significance of royal election is also complex. By ecclesiastical theory, it was the anointment that made the king, and, thus, a man of nonroyal blood could be raised to kingship by the same means. But strict construction of that theory ignores the fact that the French queens were also consecrated, to make them fertile and mothers of offspring worthy of the throne. E. H. Kantorowicz, "The Carolingian King in the Bible of San Paolo fuori le mura" (1935), reprinted in Michael Cherniavsky and Ralph E. Giesey, eds., *Selected Studies by Ernst H. Kantorowicz* (Locust Valley, N.Y., 1965), 82-94, and Wallace-Hadrill, *Early Germanic Kingship*, 132-34. The effect was to make only kings' sons the progeny of unions that had been specially blessed to produce future kings. From this perspective, the royal consecrations strengthened the claims of hereditary monarchy.

THE FIRST LESSON from a comparison of royal with baronial practice, thus, is that the supposed link between anticipatory association and weak hereditary titles is no longer apparent if for focus on the crown one substitutes attention to the common structures of the ruling class within the society. The second lesson, no less important, is that the customs of the French nobility do not allow the fixed, even rigid, institutional character that study of kings alone has suggested for the measure. In restricting its examination to royal practice, the constitutional focus has viewed the eight Capetian cases of anticipatory association chiefly in relation to each other. One effect of this approach has been to draw links between these cases, forming them into an identifiable system from which the strength of Capetian throne-right relative to resistance to the hereditary principle was deduced. The diversity in circumstances and apparent intent of the same measure as used by the nobility casts the bases for this schematization into doubt.

These insights may help clarify why, from the reign of Philip Augustus, the Capetians no longer practiced anticipatory association. Historians have seen Philip's departure from the successional policy of his predecessors as a symbolic turning-point in the establishment of hereditary Capetian rule, but speculation as to the immediate reasons for the change has been vain because of the lack of comment on the subject in the extant sources.⁶² The strongest safe judgment was simply that from that time the Capetians did not consider it necessary to associate their heirs. That opinion assumes, however, that it was necessity that had caused earlier Capetians to practice anticipatory association, and that premise is quite uncertain. For, if the implications of patrimonial succession are accepted, it need not follow either that a disputed hereditary title had required the Capetians to employ anticipatory association to buttress their position or that discontinuance of the custom by Philip Augustus signals a sudden change in their status.⁶³

Since the sources do not explain what Philip's action—or, rather, his inaction—signified, perhaps concern with the question is itself misplaced. Perhaps his decision not to associate his heir had no special significance at all. Although modern scholarship has treated Philip's succession as a constitutional landmark, contemporary writers—not only those who were close to

⁶² There is no foundation in the sources for the suggestion by Lot and Fawtier that the Carolingian descent of Louis VIII through both paternal and maternal lines may explain why Philip Augustus did not associate him on the throne; *Institutions royales*, 16. In fact, although the sources record Carolingian descent for both Philip and his first wife, Isabella of Hainaut, almost no text that mentions the one also notes the latter; see the sources of Werner, "Die Legitimität der Kapetinger," 205-05, 220-25. The knowledge or belief that Philip Augustus and Louis were descended from Charlemagne is documented from the late 1190s, but this descent was not presented as a basis for their rule; see Lewis, "Dynastic Structures and Capetian Throne-Right," 240-47.

⁶³ Petit-Dutaillis has asserted that it was because of the "growth of the royal authority" during the reign of Philip Augustus that Philip "had been able to dispense with" the practice of anticipatory association; *Feudal Monarchy in France and England*, 311. But Philip Augustus appears to have been confident of his son's rights from the time of Louis' birth, long before the great increase in royal power during the second half of the reign; Lewis, "Royal Succession in Capetian France," chap. 3: "Royal Succession in the King's Business: The Evidence of the Chancery Records, 1180-1206." If a symbolic date were to be set for the discontinuance of anticipatory association by the Capetians, the best choice would not be 1223, the year of Philip's death, but rather 1190, the date he departed for a hazardous crusade leaving as heir an unconsecrated child not yet three full years of age.

Capetian circles, but others who were far removed from them—do not appear to have noticed anything unusual about it. Their silence on the point does not mean that they were unaware either that Louis VIII, Philip's successor, had not been associated with his father on the throne or that earlier Capetians had employed such association, for most of the writers knew both. Rather, the occurrence of the same omission in so many texts implies that the chroniclers did not consider this circumstance important.⁶⁴ The only writer who described the accession of Louis VIII as unusual was Vincent of Beauvais, who in the early 1240s traced Carolingian descent for Louis through his mother and claimed that in him the kingdom of the Franks had been "returned to the family of Charlemagne."⁶⁵ Vincent did not, however, link this descent to the fact that Louis had not been associated as king before Philip's death. Indeed, Vincent paid scant attention to anticipatory association, not only with regard to Louis VIII but, more notably, for the early Capetians as well. In his *Speculum historiale*, Vincent recorded, under the appropriate years, the succession of Capetian kings at their fathers' deaths, but he noted or alluded to only three cases of anticipatory association: that of Philip Augustus, together with the paralysis and then the death of Louis VII, in a single chapter on the change of reigns in 1179–80; that of Louis VII in the context of the visit to France by Pope Innocent II, who performed the ceremony; and that of Philip, eldest son of Louis VI, when explaining that the coronation of Louis VII followed the death of his brother, Philip, who "had recently been anointed king."⁶⁶ He did not mention the other cases, although all of them had been recounted in numerous earlier texts.⁶⁷ It would thus appear that to Vincent of Beauvais the whole practice of anticipatory association was of negligible importance.

This attitude accords well with the lessons from baronial usage. If the latter are considered together with the history of Capetian practice, it is apparent that Philip Augustus did not abandon a system, for there was no system to abandon—only a number of instances in which various arrangements of coseignory had been used in differing circumstances to achieve differing, though related, ends. By viewing anticipatory association almost solely as a

⁶⁴ For writers close to the court, see William de Breton, *Plaitipulus libri XII*, in Delaborde, *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton*, 2: 346; and the *Chronicon Tarnense magnum*, in *HF*, 18: 303–04. For writers from other regions, see, for example, *HF*, 18: 345. Bernard Tier of Limoges did not even record the accession of Louis VIII in any of his extant notes; although he included Philip's name in several lists of the deaths that had occurred during 1223, he did not mention Louis as king until his record of the events of 1224; see Henri Duplès-Agier, ed., *Chroniques de Saint-Martial de Limoges publiées d'après les manuscrits originaux* (Paris, 1874), 114–18. For English writers, see, for example, *HF*, 18: 117–18, 209. For the views of lay magnates, the only direct evidence I have found is that implicit in a charter from 1224 of Philip Hurepel, half-brother of Louis VIII, which speaks of the latter as "post patrem nostrum jam confirmatus in regno"; Léopold Delisle, "Recherches sur les comtes de Dammarin au XIII^e siècle," *Mémoires de la Société impériale des Antiquaires de France*, 4th ser., 1 (1866): 241.

⁶⁵ Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, 30:125–26, in *Bibliotheca mundi seu Speculum maioris praesulis Bellovacensis* . . . 4 (Douai, 1624): 1275–76. On Vincent and his source for this idea, see Werner, "Die Legitimität der Kapetinger," 203–05, 219–20.

⁶⁶ Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, 29:22, 27:13, in *Bibliotheca mundi*, 1193, 1099.

⁶⁷ For Vincent's other notes on the early Capetian successions, see *Speculum historiale*, 24:93, 24:107, 25:16, 25:35, in *ibid.*, 993, 1001, 1007, 1014.

Capetian practice, many scholars have taken a series of cases that occurred in a single family over the course of two hundred years and have posited an institution of set character, when in fact nothing firm enough to be called an institution existed. Broader examination reveals what is better understood as a number of particular cases that shared only the framework of patrimonial succession within the dynastic family. Within that context, such measures as anticipatory association were employed, varied, discontinued, or never used at all, according to the circumstances of the particular family or generation.⁶⁸

FROM THE EARLY TWELFTH CENTURY, however, the higher nobility tended to practice anticipatory association less often than previously. The change was undramatic but is discernible. The family of Blois and Champagne, which in earlier generations had often used the measure, no longer did so after the end of the eleventh century.⁶⁹ The general trend was more complex. Some families that had practiced the measure in isolated instances in the eleventh century did so again in the twelfth century; others did not use it again; still others, who had not used it earlier, did so for the first time.⁷⁰ But overall there was a decrease. Although at least one case of the practice is recorded in France for every decade of the twelfth century, the usage appears to have been increasingly exceptional. Significantly fewer cases of it are recorded from the reigns of Louis VII or Philip Augustus than from that of Philip I, despite the far greater documentation for the later period. In addition, there are geographical and chronological contrasts: while in the time of Philip I the practice appeared simultaneously in several regions, under Philip Augustus it was rare, with one case recorded for one region in a given decade but the next instance far distant and perhaps ten years later.⁷¹ The decline in the use of the

⁶⁸ A case in point is the line of the counts of Meulan, whose successional arrangements in the twelfth century varied with each generation; see Depoin, *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Martin de Pontaise*, 315–16, 320–24; and Émile Houth, "Robert Preud'homme, comte de Meulan et de Leicester (8 avril 1081–3 juin 1118)," *Bulletin philologique et historique (jusqu'à 1610) du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques* (1963), 801–04; "Galeran II, comte de Meulan: Catalogue de ses actes précédé d'une étude biographique," *ibid.* (1960), 628–29, 645, 638, and "Catalogue des actes de Robert II, comte de Meulan," *ibid.* (1961), 502–04.

⁶⁹ The last case recorded for this line was the association of Stephen-Henry with Theobald III; see note 24, above.

⁷⁰ For families that had practiced anticipatory association earlier and now did so again, note the counts of Clermont-en-Auvergne and of Flanders; see *HF*, 16: 112; Étienne Baluze, *Histoire généalogique de la maison d'Auvergne*, 2 (Paris, 1708): "Preuves," 249–50, 254, 256, etc.; and notes 55, 24, 50, above. The intended succession to Robert II of Meulan is probably another such case; see notes 40, 24, above. The evidence is uncertain, but there may have been such a case also in the county of Beaumont-sur-Oise; see Louis Douët-d'Arcq, *Recherches historiques et critiques sur les anciens comtes de Beaumont-sur-Oise du XI^e au XIII^e siècle* (Amiens, 1853): "Preuves," 25; and note 24, above. But the counts of Mâcon and of Burgundy did not continue anticipatory association into the twelfth century; see notes 23–24, above. Yet the counts of Pontthieu, Anjou, and Alençon did not practice anticipatory association until the 1100s; see notes 31, 40, 45, above. The subscription of Hugh Britto as count of Ramerupt in 1101, during the lifetime of his father Andrew, signifies another such case; Luc d'Achery, ed., *Spicilegium, sive Collectio veterum aliquot scriptorum*, 3 (Paris, 1723): 437.

⁷¹ From the time of Philip I, shared rule appears among the dukes of Normandy, the counts of Flanders, Blois, Valois (probably twice), Meulan, Nevers, La Marche, Périgord, Anjou (twice), Auvergne, and Ramerupt, and the viscounts of Chartres; see notes 24, 28, 45, 55, 70, above. The viscounty of Bourges also had shared rule, although under different circumstances; see page 918, above. Another instance (in Beaumont-sur-Oise) ended at the time of Philip's consecration; see note 24, above. From the reign of Louis

measure signaled by the Capetians was thus a wide-spread phenomenon that occurred in the nobility over the course of several generations.

No corresponding changes in the outline of baronial successions appeared during the same time. Rather, the forms used to effect these arrangements were altered to the degree that anticipatory association was employed less often than before. Partial explanations for the decline of anticipatory association may be proposed: the relative decrease in baronial violence since the eleventh century, the greater frequency of intervention by the Capetian overlords in cases of disorder, the enhanced rights of primogeniture in successions. Objections may be raised to all of these—and exceptions cited—but on balance each of them contributed to increased order in the society. In most cases, the means by which successions were arranged are not known; only the results are recorded. Rarely, there is proof of the use of the very old practice of oral dispositions by the father.⁷² In other cases, few of which can be linked to traditions of anticipatory association, the increasing use of written testaments is recorded from the reign of Philip Augustus.⁷³

The change in usages is best documented for the kings. On the eve of their departures for crusades—that is, in circumstances in which earlier kings and magnates had associated their heirs—Philip Augustus in 1190 and Louis VIII in 1225 made written testaments.⁷⁴ These testaments, however, did not prescribe, but presupposed, the succession of the eldest son. The will of Philip

VII, the only instances I have found are those from the counties of Ponthieu, Flanders, Soissons, Auvergne, and, perhaps, Beaumont; see notes 31, 46, 50, 70, above. From the reign of Philip Augustus, the counts of Dreux, Meulan, Auvergne, and Alençon practiced shared rule; see notes 40, 70, above. Doubtless these lists are incomplete, but they are sufficient to indicate the trend. Note, too, that the reigns considered were of almost equal duration: forty-eight years for that of Philip I, forty-three years each for those of Louis VII and Philip Augustus. The span of time for the use of the measure indicates its relative currency among the higher nobility: in the time of Philip I, it was used by the houses of Normandy (1067/66–87), Meulan (1076–68?), Vaison (1080 or 1080–71), Blois-Champagne (1074–89), Périgord (1080–before 1114), La Marche (1086–88), Flanders (1086–93), etc.; under Philip Augustus, by contrast, it is found in Dreux (1184–88), Meulan (1185 or 1186–90), Auvergne (1199–1230?), and Alençon (1203–before 1215). The generalizations advanced here about the gradual decline in anticipatory association among the higher nobility may not be applicable, however, to similar measures used by local aristocrats. From 1195 to 1200, for example, both father and son called themselves lord of Bazoches (Aisne); Newman, *Les seigneurs de Nesle en Picardie*, 1: 127 n. 7. For similar arrangements in the family of Vernon (Eure), see note 59, above.

⁷² For one such case, see Thomas K. Keefe, "Geoffrey Plantagenet's Will and the Angevin Succession," *Albion*, 9 (1974), 266–71.

⁷³ The early forms of these procedures varied. The major testamentary provisions of Count Robert II of Meulan were contained in the marriage contract of his heir; see note 40, above. The testament of Ralph I of Coucy (1190) was produced after consultation between Ralph and his vassals and appears as a record of the decisions then reached; André Duchesne, *Histoire généalogique des maisons de Guines, d'Artois, de Gand, et de Gaucy* (Paris, 1631), "Preuves," 353–54. That of Guichard of Beaujeu was a personal instrument, the authority of which lay in the written document, which Guichard caused to be authenticated by the seal of the future Louis VIII as well as his own and by the citation of five of his knights as witnesses; Marie-Claude Guigou, "Testament de Guichard III de Beaujeu (18 septembre 1216)," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 18 (1857): 161–67. Some testaments provided for bequests to churches and to favored retainers while leaving the devolution of the lands either to the rule of custom or to regulation under a separate document; see, for example, the testament of Alice, lady of Venisy, from 1220; Quantin, *Recueil de pièces pour faire suite au Caritave général de l'Yonne*, no. 245. It is not that testaments were a new practice in the time of Philip Augustus, nor at all a universal one, but rather that their use was more frequent than than it had been earlier. For one older example, and another form, see the announcement by Louis VII in 1157–58 of the testamentary dispositions of Count Ivo of Soissons; Newman, *Les seigneurs de Nesle en Picardie*, 2: no. 30. Other earlier examples and variations could be cited.

⁷⁴ Delaborde, *Recueil des actes de Philippe Auguste*, 1: no. 345; and *LTC*, 2: no. 1710. Also see, for Philip's testament of 1222, *LTC*, 1: no. 1536.

Augustus from 1190 established a regency to administer the kingdom during his absence and, in the event of his own death, until the future Louis VIII came of age. That of Louis VIII referred to the heir as "our son who succeeds us in the kingdom" and chiefly regulated the assignment of appanages to the cadets, pious donations, and other matters. There is no doubt that these kings were concerned about their successions. Philip Augustus had refused to go on crusade before the birth of his heir; and, since his sons were all minors, on his deathbed Louis VIII secured oaths from the attendant magnates promising the immediate consecration of his eldest surviving son or that of the second son in the event that the eldest died before he could be crowned.⁷⁵ In principle, the succession of the eldest son was assumed and was left to the sanction of custom. Other functions formerly met through anticipatory association were effected by other means. Thus, the support of the heir who came of age during his father's lifetime was provided from the revenues of holdings assigned to him, in the case of Louis VIII from his maternal inheritance plus additional properties given him by his father. The dower for Louis's wife was provided from some of those same lands.⁷⁶ At the death of Louis VIII, his heir was too young for such needs to have arisen, but the same situations were met through similar arrangements in the reign of St. Louis.⁷⁷

What emerges, therefore, is not a sudden shift in institutions but rather a shift in preferences among both received and current usages. In broadest terms, a shift from premises of coseignory or condominium of son with father to one of full lordship for the father and guaranteed rights of succession for the eldest son is detected, although even in this no more than a change in stress, or in the degree of stress, may be argued. With reference specifically to the Capetians, only very general conclusions may be advanced. If by the reign of Philip Augustus the throne was clearly hereditary, it has yet to be determined by what time it became so. The association of Philip Augustus with Louis VII appears to have been occasioned by special circumstances and devoid of clear constitutional significance. In view of the successional arrangements of the barons, it is questionable whether earlier instances of anticipatory association in the Capetian dynasty had the meaning previously imputed to them and whether the throne was not hereditary in the eleventh century as well. It is evident, however, that the direct evidence for anticipatory association as an index of the strength or weakness of hereditary claims will not bear the weight that traditional historiography has placed upon it.

⁷⁵ For Philip Augustus, see Rigord, *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, in Delaborde, *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton*, 1: 48. For Louis VIII, see *LTC*, 2: nos. 1811–12. Also see *LTC*, 2: 1823–28; and Charles T. Wood, *The French Appanages and the Capetian Monarchy, 1224–1328* (Cambridge, Mass., 1966), 15–16.

⁷⁶ Charles Petit-Dutaillis, *Étude sur la vie et le règne de Louis VIII (1187–1226)* (Paris, 1894), 205–06; Martène and Durand, *Veterum scripturarum et monumentorum amplissima collectio*, 1090; and *LTC*, 2: no. 2562.

⁷⁷ *LTC*, 4: nos. 5489, 5497, 3: nos. 4192, 4412, 4434. For the position of the heir with respect to the throne during the reign of St. Louis, see Louis Carolus-Barré, "Le prince héritier Louis (1214–1260) et l'interim du pouvoir royal de la mort de Blanche de Castille (novembre 1252) au retour de saint Louis en France (juillet 1254)," *Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1970), 588–95; and Wood, *French Appanages and the Capetian Monarchy*, 16 n. 23.