

Godfried Croenen

Galbert of Bruges and Jean Froissart feature amongst the Low Countries' best-known medieval historiographers, popular with the modern undergraduate student and general reader alike, although only partly for the same reasons. Both chroniclers are generally seen as key witnesses or principal sources for important historical events – the murder of the Flemish count in Galbert's case; the Hundred Years' War in the case of Jean Froissart. Both use direct speech and other rhetorical devices to recreate a sense of dramatic space, thereby achieving an intense effect of directness, as if the reader were personally present at the battlefield or in the count's hall, witnessing for himself the events described.ⁱ Modern critics and historians – to an extent deceived by this directness of style – have often ignored, misunderstood or played down the literary aspects of both authors' writings.ⁱⁱ As a result, Galbert and Froissart have frequently been seen as naive and rather uncomplicated or uncritical history-writers. But because of their supposedly uncomplicated character, they have also been singled out as excellent mirrors of the medieval mind-set or *mentalités* – of 12th-century Flemish burghers and 14th-century aristocracy of Western Europe respectively.ⁱⁱⁱ

The similarities between the two historiographers, however, go beyond the modern reception of their work, as a closer inspection will show, in particular a comparison of Galbert's narrative of the events of 1127-1128 with one of Froissart's lesser known writings, the so-called *Chronique de Flandre*.^{iv} This latter text records the urban revolt in Flanders against the count in the years 1379-1385, also known as the "Ghent War". The *Chronique de Flandre* is best known as part of Book II of Froissart's general *Chroniques*, but it was in origin probably a separate work, written around 1385-1386, after Froissart had finished Book I of his *Chroniques*, but before he began work on the continuation of this text, what editors now refer to as Book II; when he extended his historical narrative to 1386, Froissart must have decided to incorporate his *Chronique de Flandre* as one of the narrative threads into the general *Chroniques*.^v

Like the events recorded by Galbert, the Flemish revolt of 1379-1385 and Froissart's narrative of it are closely linked with the question of good government and legitimate rulership; with the political power struggles between the large Flemish cities – Bruges, Ghent and Ypres – and between cities and countryside; and with the issue of princely taxation versus urban privileges and liberties. The direct cause of the conflict in 1379 lay in the undertaking of the citizens of Bruges to try, with the consent of count Louis of Male, to circumvent the Ghent staple monopoly by constructing a canal that would link Bruges to the river Leie (Lys), thereby providing it with direct access to the grain-producing areas of Northern France.^{vi} When construction workers entered the Ghent area in 1379, dissatisfaction amongst the Ghent shippers, already fuelled by recent new duties levied on behalf of the count, reached boiling point and led to a military expedition against the Bruges workmen. The situation quickly worsened as the result of the arrest of a Ghent burgher in the city of Eeklo by the comital bailiff Roger of Atrive, which was perceived as an infringement of the city's privileges. This affair eventually came to a head with the attack on the person of the bailiff himself inside the city of Ghent, which left the bailiff dead and the county in disarray.

The killing of Roger of Atrive and the expedition against the Bruges canal builders were both the work of the so-called "White Hoods", an urban paramilitary band led by Jan Yoens, the former dean of the Ghent shippers' guild. During the civil war that ensued, this gang was seen terrorising the Ghent hinterland and organising military expeditions further

afield. As a result of these military operations, weaver-dominated magistracies were installed at Bruges and Ypres; smaller cities and towns, like Oudenaarde, Damme, Dendermonde and Kortrijk, were all forced into the coalition led by Ghent. The Ghent rebellion entered a new phase in January 1382, when Philip of Artevelde, son of James of Artevelde, the popular Ghent leader of the 1340s, became one of the captains of Ghent and effective leader of the opposition against the Flemish count. At the instigation of Artevelde, the Ghent forces marched on Bruges, where the count was preparing an attack, and defeated the troops of Bruges at Beverhoutsveld (3 May 1382), thereby forcing the count to seek refuge in France. Artevelde claimed the regency over the whole county of Flanders and quickly implemented a personal rule based on the combination of brutal force and intimidation of political enemies. By the summer and autumn of 1382, however, a military expedition led by the French king was underway that ended in the battle at Westrozebeke (27 November 1382), where Philip of Artevelde was killed and the Ghent militia humiliatingly defeated.

Despite this defeat and despite the recapture or re-submission of most cities in Flanders, including Bruges and Ypres, the Ghent rebels kept holding out against the allied forces of the French king and the Flemish count. Supported by the English, who sent a – largely ineffective – military expedition to Flanders, Francis Ackerman, the new Ghent captain and regent of Flanders, achieved some measure of military success by taking Oudenaarde and holding Damme, but he failed in his attempt to capture the town of Aardenburg. Efforts to re-establish peace led to nothing as Ghent hardened in its refusal to accept Louis of Male as legitimate count. Only after the count's death, in January 1384, and after further military defeats of the Ghent militia, could the city be forced into submission. Ghent agreed to a relatively favourable peace treaty with Philip of Burgundy, son-in-law and successor of Louis of Male, which marked the end of the Ghent War.

=====

Although the events recorded by Froissart in his *Chronique de Flandre* took place almost exactly a century and a half after those in Galbert's *De multro*, the two narratives, by and large, share the same geographical setting and important aspects of the socio-economic and cultural context. The general themes, of uprising against the count, of military clashes and of acts of violence are also common to both works. It should, then, come as no surprise that they both share a number of recurring themes and motifs.

Both Galbert and Froissart repeatedly refer to the practice of burning down houses as thoroughly effective and highly symbolic means of punishment. In the opening chapters of his work, Galbert recounts how the count was advised to burn down Borsiard's house as punishment for his plundering of the peasants, an action which was the direct cause for the murderous attack on count Charles ([10], 11-12, 17-18; trans., 105-106). On 7 April the citizens of Saint Omer burned down the house to which Eustace of Steenvoorde had fled ([56], 14-15; trans., 207). And on 9 July 1128 count William Clito burned down the houses of the knight Ansbold and his brothers and sisters in Oostkamp when he realised that he was not able to take the stronghold of the local *praeco* ([116], 35-36; trans., 303). Froissart refers to the same practice early on in his narrative, when the Ghent people, after killing the count's bailiff, went to the houses of the Mayhuus brothers, Jan Yoens's personal enemies. When they found nobody there, they “demolished [these houses] completely ... as if [the Mayhuus brothers] were traitors to the whole city”.^{vii}

Another parallel between the two works is the references to disguise as a means of escaping. Galbert mentions Fromold, “the most evil of Borsiard's serfs” who tried but did not succeed in escaping “dressed in a woman's cloak as disguise” ([29], 19-21; trans., 154). Alger,

the chamberlain of Bertulf, was more successful and made his escape disguised as a priest ([35], 26-29; trans., 163-164). In Froissart's *Chronique de Flandre*, the motif of disguise is used elaborately in the chapters recounting the humiliation of count Louis of Male fleeing after Artevelde's victory at Beverhoutsveld.^{viii} Upon hearing the news of the Ghent victory and warnings about the Ghent militia heading for the market place, the count swapped his harness and military attire for the *houppelande* of his squire.^{ix} Louis was then forced to seek refuge in a poor woman's house, sharing a humble bed with her children in order to mislead the men of Ghent who were in hot pursuit. The next day, the count finally managed to escape the city, on his own, without being recognised or having the normal honours being paid to him, forced to go on foot and dressed like a servant.^x

Another way of escaping immediate danger or a violent death was to seek refuge in a church, but from Galbert's and Froissart's works the reader can learn that in the heat of the battle the protection offered by such sacred buildings was often only theoretical. Hence the repeated accounts in both works of people seeking refuge in churches only to find that the church is set alight and that they will be burned alive. This happened for example during the siege of Oudenaarde by count William Clito on 5 May 1127 ([80], 15-17; trans., 250). The next year the same William tried to burn alive one of his rivals, Arnold, in the church of Saint Bertin ([97], 21-22; trans., 272). And on 15 May 1128, William attacked Oostkamp and set fire to the church after the *praeco* had fled inside ([111], 7-14; trans., 292-293).

Froissart recounts with verve the defeat of the Ghent militia in Nevele, where the count ordered fire to be set to the church in which one of the Ghent captains, Jean de Launnoy, and his men had fled. In a scene reminiscent of the siege of count Charles's murderers in the castle in Bruges in Galbert's narrative, Jean de Launnoy, who had barricaded himself in the church tower, asked the besiegers to be ransomed but was taunted to take the "nice jump". Feeling the heat of the flames, Jean decided he would rather be killed than burnt alive, but in the end – as Froissart notes with a macabre sense of irony – he suffered both fates: after jumping onto the drawn weapons of the besiegers he was cut into pieces and thrown back into the fire.^{xi}

=====

Although direct textual influence from Galbert's work on Froissart's *Chronique de Flandre* seems highly unlikely, it is striking that some scenes in Froissart's narrative seem to echo Galbert's quite closely.^{xii} One such passage concerns the Ghent militia marching on Bruges. Galbert describes how the men of Ghent arrived on 14 and 15 March 1127 to assist with the siege of the count's murderer: "[W]hen they heard that they could make their own attack in the siege, they assembled all the bowmen and skilful makers of military equipment, and also bold plunderers, murderers, thieves, and anyone ready to take advantage of the evils of war, and they loaded thirty wagons with arms." ([33], 10-14; trans., 160).

Froissart tells us of a similar endeavour when in 1379, after the initial hostilities which marked the beginning of the Ghent War, Jan Yoens suggested taking the Ghent militiamen to Bruges to test whether that city would side with the count or with rebel Ghent: "Then those who were going on this mission were ordered per parish: and so they took provisions and were mustered appropriately and then they left Ghent, between nine and ten thousand troops, and took with them plenty of wagons loaded with provisions".^{xiii} Although Froissart does not refer explicitly here to the spoils of war as an incentive for the Ghent expedition, the behaviour of the militiamen in later expeditions show that this must have been a factor in the eagerness with which Yoens's proposal was met.^{xiv}

Galbert, in his description of the arrival of the Ghent militias outside the city walls of

Bruges, stresses the initial tense situation and the danger of enmity and aggression on both sides, but then goes on to describe how talks between the leaders of the parties quickly led to a compromise whereby the Ghent troops were allowed inside the city:

“[W]hen they had reached the gates of the town, they dared to enter forcibly, but all the men of the siege, who ran up from the inside, resisted them face to face, and there would have been a general struggle if the wiser ones in both ranks had not come to terms. For, after giving and receiving hands, the men of Ghent pledged themselves by faith and swore an oath that they would join them in the siege and share fully their efforts and arms and counsels, while respecting the place and the property of our [= Bruges'] citizens (...) Then the men of Ghent came in with a great crowd and filled up the area around the castle” ([33], 17-27; trans., 161).

The arrival of the Ghent militias outside the city walls of Bruges in Froissart's *Chronique de Flandre* in 1379 is very reminiscent of the scene in Galbert's work. Here Jan Yoens also finds the city gates closed; the request to open the gates is met with what Yoens sees as a delaying tactic which prompts him to launch an attack immediately to force his entry.

“And the men of Ghent arrived at the palisades and the moat surrounding Bruges, headed by Jan Yoens on a black horse. There Yoens dismounted and took his battle axe in his hand. When those who were defending the gate saw that they were no match and that the Ghent troops were ready to attack them, they were all afraid. And some went through the high street to the market, shouting ‘Here! Here! The Ghenenars are here! Quickly, quickly, to the city walls! They are already at the gates!’ Those of Bruges who ran up to the market to have counsel were all afraid and the masters of the great guilds were in no mood to have long talks about our or their business. And the majority of the commonality wanted the gates to be opened.”^{xv}

Under pressure from the townspeople, the burgomaster and others from the urban government go to the gates to have talks with Jan Yoens; an agreement is quickly reached after which the Ghent troops enter the city; a treaty is then sealed.

“In this parley they came to an agreement that because of their friendship they would open the defences and the gate to them, and all then entered the city (...) And it was a most beautiful thing to see them enter the city in orderly fashion. They then went to the market place (...) Between those of Ghent and those of Bruges was then made, sworn and agreed an alliance so that they would always stay shoulder to shoulder, like good friends and neighbours.”^{xvi}

=====

Galbert's and Froissart's historiographical works thus share a number of motifs, some of which have been briefly discussed above. More importantly, some of the central themes are also common to both narratives. Of crucial importance in both works are the interconnected themes of excessive pride and revenge. Feuds, as chains of attack, counter-attack and revenge, play an important role as the initial cause of larger historical developments and as almost inexhaustible reservoirs of uncontrollable energy which move the action and the narratives forward. In Galbert's *De Multro*, it is the violent feud between the nephews of

provost Bertulf and the nephews of Thancmar of Straeten that triggers the murder of count Charles ([9], trans., 102-104). The attack on the count is immediately followed by a killing spree in which Borsiard and his men take revenge on a number of people against whom they had been harbouring grievances, including a certain Henry “whom Borsiard suspected of the death of his brother Robert” ([16], 10-12; trans., 121). The murders of Walter of Loker and the castellan of Bourbourg were also obviously the result of intense hatred directed at the people close to the murdered count.

Once count Charles was murdered, revenge for this deed was sought by his kinsmen and vassals. Gervaise the chamberlain was the first to set the vengeance on foot^{xvii}, but he was soon joined by other vassals of the count. Among the kinsmen were the different candidates^{xviii} for the office of count, but also the French king Louis VI, who was at the same time feudal lord and first cousin of the murdered count.^{xix} In the letters he sent to the Flemings the king stated explicitly that he had “come to carry out vengeance” and he sent them his “thanks for avenging Charles, his kinsman” ([52], 9-10; trans., 195; [47], 4-5; trans., 187).

In Froissart's *Chronique de Flandre* it is a complex web of feuds, hatred and enmity that sparks off the machinations to oust Jan Yoens from the office of dean of the shippers' guild, which in turn leads to Yoens's burning desire for revenge on the Mayhuus family.^{xx} Froissart tells us that Yoens had long enjoyed count Louis of Male's favour and that he had, in the past, carried out a contract-killing for him. Because of this murder, Yoens had been banned from the city of Ghent, but the count had been able to get this punishment reversed. Yoens had been re-instated in his possession and appointed to the office of dean of the Ghent shippers' guild. The favour enjoyed by Yoens, however, had awakened the jealousy of the Mayhuus brothers, a family of Ghent shippers. The Mayhuus, furthermore, were related to one of the parties in a long-running blood-feud in the city of Damme, in which Yoens was also involved because of his kinship ties with the other party.

Although the details of the Damme feud are fairly vague and although Yoens did not seem to care too much about it at all,^{xxi} by the time he lost the office of dean of the shippers' guild as well as his livelihood, the desire for revenge had become all-consuming and unstoppable. Outwardly, Yoens placidly accepted falling out of the count's grace, but inside there burned a violent energy as he promised himself to take revenge: “I have slept a while, but it is clear that at the slightest opportunity I will wake up and cause such trouble between the city and the count, that it will cost 100,000 lives.”^{xxii} Soon enough, the incident with the Bruges canal builders provided him with that opportunity and this set into motion a cycle of violence that acquired its own logic and quickly became virtually unstoppable. Yoens's manipulation of the Ghent people fuelled the initial action against the Bruges workmen and the attack on Roger of Atrive, led to the destruction of the count's castle at Wondelgem and finally to the military expedition against Bruges, after which Yoens died of a sudden illness.^{xxiii}

Much more than in Galbert's narrative, revenge and counter-revenge are the prime motives in Froissart's *Chronique de Flandre* for many of the actions taken. Count Louis of Male by no means stands outside of this logic of violence, as he is involved with the violent and manipulative ways of Yoens and the Mayhuus brothers right from the beginning. He also falls into all the traps set for him by Yoens, who realises that he will not escape the count's wrath if peace is ever re-established between Ghent and the count.^{xxiv} Yoens, therefore, keeps manipulating the people of Ghent into actions that will further incense the count and make any chance of peace impossible, a tactic which later in the *Chronique de Flandre* will also be whole-heartedly adopted by the Yoens's successors as leaders of the Ghent rebellion, Philip of Artevelde and Pieter van den Bossche.

The deliberate destruction of the count's favourite castle of Wondelgem, presented by Yoens as an accident, prompts the count to summon his noblemen and vassals to his court at Lille "to have counsel what actions have to be taken and how they can get counter-revenge from those of Ghent".^{xxv} The result, however, is a more general rising of the Flemish cities and the siege of the city of Oudenaarde by the rebellious urban troops, which is only ended after peace talks organised at the initiative of the count's son-in-law, Philip of Burgundy. Louis of Male accepts the peace deal, but in secret goes on seeking revenge from Bruges and Ghent, especially for the destruction of his much-loved castle at Wondelgem.^{xxvi}

A vicious revenge attack on forty Ghent shippers in early 1380 by some noblemen, relatives of the murdered bailiff Roger of Atrive, sparks up the action again and leads to the White Hoods destroying part of the fortifications around Oudenaarde, an action explicitly characterised as "contrevengance" in the accusation addressed to the city of Ghent by the count's councillors.^{xxvii} As a result, the responsible captain of the White Hoods, Jan Pruneel, is banished and peace with the count is again established. But the count, again, takes advantage of the temporary re-establishment of law and order to have Pruneel executed and Ypres purged of his enemies, contrary to the peace deal that had been brokered.^{xxviii} The White Hoods react to this defiantly by destroying castles of the nobility in the vicinity of the city. The count then lets "the knights and squires wage war against the Ghentenars and revenge their damage."^{xxix}

The logic of the feud – hatred fuelled by violent actions, in turn leading to new actions which themselves cry out for revenge – does not stop there but keeps moving forward in the *Chronique de Flandre* until, finally, in 1385, the more sensible and peace-loving members of the Ghent patriciate, tired of years of violence and of being dominated by an easily manipulated mob, succeed in brokering a peace deal with the duke of Burgundy.

=====

Revenge, in Galbert's and Froissart's works, is an important theme, a catalyst for the actions and reactions of individual characters and thus a structuring principle for the dramatic action. Furthermore, it is also at the heart of an eschatological conception of history and historiography that is clearly predominant in the whole of Galbert's work and to an extent also in Froissart's *Chronique de Flandre*. Vengeance in the *De Multro*, to be sure, operates not only on the level of the human individual, but also on a second, higher level. For Galbert sees history as directly planned and arranged by God, and divine punishment as one of the principal ways in which God intervenes directly in this world.^{xxx}

Although the immediate causes for the murder of count Charles are to be sought in the feud between the nephews of Bertulf and those of Thanemar of Straeten, the underlying logic is a divine retribution for events that had taken place generations earlier, that is the betrayal of Arnold of Flanders by his uncle Robert the Frisian and the murder of castellan Boldran by Erembald.^{xxxii} Galbert, from the same eschatological point of view, explains a number of unusual deaths in 1127 and 1128 as divine punishments and thus as clear signs of the guilt of the persons concerned. Galbert sees God's hand in the deaths of Walter of Vladslo, Baldwin of Aalst and Didier, who apparently died from natural causes, and of Lambert of Aardenburg, who died in battle.^{xxxiii}

God's wrath is released to punish deeds that are, in Galbert's eyes, contrary to important moral values and principles, as with Walter of Vladslo and Baldwin of Aalst, who in Galbert's words, "had acted contrary to Christian conduct."^{xxxiii} When looked at more closely, however, most of the crimes punished in Galbert's *De Multro* can be classed primarily in three general categories: breaches of kinship solidarity, breaches of loyalty

between feudal lord and vassal, and refusal to accept the God-given social order. The first two are represented by the betrayals of Arnold of Flanders, castellan Boldran and count Charles by their vassals and kinsmen; the last concerns the failure of the Flemish people to accept William Clito as count, even if he acted as a tyrant.^{xxxiv}

The crimes committed by Bertulf and his family members are exacerbated by their being unrepentant and overproud, something Galbert stresses time and again.^{xxxv} This attitude is most clear in the hardening position of the conspirators, who would rather die than give up and admit guilt.^{xxxvi} *Superbia* or excessive pride is ultimately the refusal to accept the divine truth as signified to humans by the events of history, by supernatural signs mentioned several times in Galbert's narrative,^{xxxvii} or in ordeals.^{xxxviii}

Excessive pride in itself can also be seen as a crime that should be punished, just as repentance makes it possible for those who have sinned to avoid divine punishment. So, when William Clito repents before the battle of Axspoele, he is victorious against the obstinate Flemings, who refuse to accept him; and when subsequently the Flemings and count Thierry finally repent, God intervenes again and William Clito dies in an accident.^{xxxix}

Although Froissart shares Galbert's eschatological view of history in general, he is too much imbued with the complex reality of history to try to explain every event he narrates in terms of God's intervention. Like Galbert, he may point a condemning finger at the Devil as the originator of the conflict in Flanders and as instigator of sin and *superbia*, but this seems little more than a literary commonplace.^{xl} For he is acutely aware of the social and economic circumstances as well as of the personal frictions as causes contributing to the beginnings of the Ghent War. Unlike Galbert's, Froissart's historiography also has a place for contingency in history, for accidental and random events, a world view which he undoubtedly shared with his contemporaries.^{xli} Because of this, God intervenes only intermittently and not systematically in the *Chronique de Flandre*.

Froissart refrains from seeing God's hand in most deaths, as becomes clear for example from his narration of the death of Yoens. The first major episode in the *Chronique de Flandre* tells how Yoens is driven out of office by the Mayhuus brothers and shows the lengths to which he goes to take revenge on them and their patron, the count. This first episode ends shortly after the Bruges expedition, discussed above, when the Ghent troops march on Damme. The people of Damme open the city gates and entertain Yoens and his men for two days. On the second night, Yoens suddenly becomes ill and dies the following day. Because of the suddenness of his death, Froissart reports a rumour that Yoens may have been poisoned, but completely forgoes the opportunity here to explain this death as divine punishment.^{xlii} The same is true for the death of another Ghent captain, Francis Ackerman, that concludes the final major episode.

The case is less clear for the death of count Louis of Male, who died in 1384, towards the end of the *Chronique de Flandre*. Although Froissart, like Galbert, was essentially conservative in social outlook, believing in a divinely sanctioned social order, throughout the *Chronique de Flandre* he voices fairly implicit but still fairly strong criticism of the count.^{xliii} The Ghent victory at Beverhoutsveld, explicitly represented by Froissart as an ordeal, is in this respect very similar to the battle of Axspoele in Galbert's narrative. But in 1382 it is the Ghent militia who are victorious over the count. God teaches the count a lesson, by giving victory to Philip of Artevelde and the Ghent troops after their public and honest act of penitence. In the chase after the defeat, Louis is utterly humiliated, as he will have to humiliate himself later on in the narrative, after the battle at Westrozebeke, by asking the French king for mercy on behalf of the cities of Bruges and Kortrijk.

Froissart repeatedly represents the victory at Beverhoutsveld as the outcome of God's intervention.^{xliv} But fortunes for Ghent change quickly as Artevelde forgets humility and

penitence and instead shows an overweening pride: he behaves like a prince and governs as if he were the count. No wonder, then, that God looks favourably on the French expedition because he “wanted these overproud Flemings to be beaten.”^{xlv} As at Beverhoutsveld, the battle at Westrozebeke a few months later is represented as an ordeal. Again, Artevelde requests God’s help, but various supernatural signs clearly point already to an imminent defeat. Artevelde, who anticipates the outcome, makes cowardly arrangements to flee the battlefield at the slightest bad sign, but eventually dies an dishonourable death, from asphyxiation rather than from battle wounds.

=====

The theme of divine or supernatural punishment for pride puts the *Chronique de Flandre* firmly in an epic tradition.^{xlvi} It also shows interesting differences between the moral value systems of Galbert, Froissart and our own time. For “orgueil” seems to be the only serious sin for which divine punishment is unleashed in Froissart’s work.^{xlvii} Other types of behaviour, like cunning, duplicity and cruelty, that today would be seen as morally wrong and not fitting for a ruler, are tolerated or even positively reported by Froissart, who is much more Machiavellian and far less a naive admirer of chivalry than often claimed.^{xlviii} Time and again Froissart stresses the pride and presumption of characters like Artevelde, whom the people of Ghent see “as their God” after the victory at Beverhoutsveld^{xlix}, or the bishop of Norwich, who led the disastrous English expedition to the Continent and who “thought he could fly as if he had wings”.¹ It is these mental states and their effects that warrant divine intervention and the ultimate failure of the characters’ endeavours. This is summed up succinctly by Pieter van den Bossche when he comments on Artevelde’s demise: “If Philip of Artevelde is dead, it is because of his pride.”^{li}

The question of punishment of course also raises the question of guilt and in particular of who is to blame for the disastrous effects on the county of the uprisings of 1127-1128 and 1379-1385. In this respect, Galbert and Froissart both seem to conceive of guilt as something fairly mechanical that is in important respects different from a modern, individualistic concept reliant upon the idea of responsibility. In terms of narrative technique, Froissart’s work is structured as long chains of events, often developed in parallel.^{lii} Through these chains the author contrasts, juxtaposes and links specific episodes, especially the opening events of a chain, with their eventual outcome as he sees them. The instigators of the initial events are held responsible, in the final analysis, for all that is eventually caused by their actions, whether or not they could foresee the effects of their deeds. That is why Froissart lays a good deal of blame on the people of Bruges, because they wanted to build a canal, and returns in his conclusion to the fairly trivial Damme feud as one of the main contributing factors to the Ghent War. While Galbert’s narrative technique is in this respect different from Froissart’s, he passes a similar judgment on Borsiard and the nephews of Thanemar, who, because of their feud, are seen as equally guilty of the murder of the count and hence responsible for all subsequent events.^{liii}

Galbert’s and Froissart’s narratives of the uprisings in Flanders in the 12th and 14th centuries are both intelligent, complex and interesting works, for their value as historical sources as well as for their literary qualities. Although they are very different in some respects – the language in which they are written; the professional background of their authors; their personal involvement in the events they record – they also have a number of similarities, some of which I have addressed in this essay and which -- when compared – serve to highlight the specificities of each. Both authors wrote on very similar subject matter, within the same geographical setting, and shared important aspects of the socio-economic and

cultural context. They used similar literary motifs, explored similar moral and political motives, and shared some of their main themes. Finally, their works are grounded in a similar philosophy of history.^{liv}

University of Liverpool
School of Modern Languages
Chatham Street
Liverpool L69 7ZR
United Kingdom

Notes

i. For Galbert, see Rider, *God's Scribe*, pp. 77-111; for Froissart, see Ainsworth, "Style direct"; Id., "Froissardian Perspectives", p. 61; Diller, *Attitudes chevaleresques*, p. 162.

ii. Compare Rider, *God's Scribe*, pp. 3-8; Diller, *Attitudes chevaleresques*, pp. 2-4, 75. The rehabilitation of Froissart's reputation as a literary author is mainly due to Diller, Ainsworth and Zink, see Diller, *Attitudes chevaleresques*; Ainsworth, *Jean Froissart*; Zink, *Froissart et le temps*. For Galbert's literary artistry, see Rider, *God's Scribe*, pp. 77-111.

iii. Martin, *Mentalités médiévales*, pp. 57-58, 172-173, 392-393.

iv. The *Chronique de Flandre* survives in three 15th-century manuscripts, BnF Paris, MS français 5004, BM Cambrai, MS 746 and MS 792. A scholarly edition of this text is not available but is currently being prepared by the present author. BnF Paris, MS français 5004 is the only complete manuscript and all references in this essay will be to that manuscript.

v. Book II of Froissart's *Chroniques* will be referred to in the scholarly edition by G. Raynaud. Short extracts concerning Flanders can be found in the English translation by Brereton, pp. 231-251. A translation into modern French of a large selection of relevant passages can be found in the edition by Poulet, pp. 107-171.

vi. For the historical context of the Ghent War of 1379-1385, see Nicholas, *The Van Arteveldes*, passim; Id., "The Scheldt Trade", pp. 1-9; Id., *Medieval Flanders*, pp. 227-231; and Van Herwaarden, "The War in the Low Countries".

vii. MS fr. 5004, fol. 16r: "La furent toutes leurs maisons fustees ne riens n'y demoura, et tantost abattues par terre et jectees tout ainsi comme se ilz fussent trahitour a tous le corps de la ville." Compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.178. The following year the Ghent troops destroyed houses in the countryside around Ghent belonging to noblemen who supported the count, MS fr. 5004, fol. 44r-v; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.226-227.

viii. The episode starts with Philip of Artevelde's dramatic speech at the Ghent market place, inciting the people to a final stand, and ends with the pillaging and partial destruction of the castle of Male after the defeat of the Bruges militia, MS fr. 5004, fol. 91v-116r; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 10.212-241. On this whole episode and its literary value, see the detailed analysis in Ainsworth, "Du Berceau".

ix. MS fr. 5004, fol. 105r-v; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 10.230.

x. MS fr. 5004, fol. 112v: "Le dimence de nuyt, le conte de Flandres yssy de la ville de Bruges, tous seulz et descongnez, de la robbe de l'un de ses varletz". In the later version which was inserted into his *Chroniques*, Froissart specifies that the count was dressed in a "povre et simple hoppelande", Froissart, *Chroniques*, 10.237.

xi. MS fr. 5004, fol. 60v-61r: "Quant le conte de Flandres fu venus en la plache devant le moustier et il vey que les Gantois se recueilloient la dedens et estoient recueilliet, il commanda a boutter le feu ou moustier et tout ardoir. Son commandement fu tantost fait et le

f[e]u aporté et grant foison d'estrain et de menus bois que on mist et appoya tout autres du moustier et puis boutta on le f[e]u dedens. Ce f[e]u monta tantost amont qui se prist es couvertures du moustier. La mouroient les Gantois qui estoient dedens, a grant martire, car ilz estoient ars et se ilz yssoient hors, ilz estoient emboulez et regectez ou fu. Jehan de Launoy, qui estoit en la tour du clocquier, se veoit ou point de la mort et estre tous ars, car le clocquier s'esprendoit a ardoir. Si cryoit a ceulx qui estoient bas: 'Raenchon!' et offroit sa taise qui estoit toutte plainne de flourins. Mais on ne faisoit de ses parolles que rire et galler et disoit on: 'Jean de Launoy, venez ycy par ces fenestres parler a nous et nous vous recueillerons. Faictes le beau sault, ainsi que vous advez fait saillir les nostres. Il vous convient faire ce sault.' Jehan de Launoy, qui se veoit en tel party que c'estoit sans remede et que le f[e]u le costoit de si prez que ilz couvenoit que il fust ars, entra en paour et eult plus chier a estre occhis que ars. Et il fu l'un et l'autre, car il sailly hors par les fenestres enemy eulx et fu recueilliés des lanches et picques et la fu decoppez et depechiés et puis jetté ou f[e]u. Ainsi fina Jehan de Launoy." Compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 10.69-70.

xii. It seems indeed very unlikely that Froissart had any knowledge of Galbert's work, given the manuscript tradition of the *De Multro*, which lay virtually buried and unknown to most people until it was edited in the 17th century by Henschen and Van Papenbroeck, cf. Rider, *God's Scribe*, 2 and Galbertus, *De multro*, XXIX-XL. One further striking textual parallel between Galbert and Book II of Froissart's *Chroniques*, however, should be mentioned here. Galbert describes how Boldran, castellan of Bruges was murdered by Erembald, when Boldran and his men were taking part in a military expedition on the river Scheldt. They were fully prepared for the fight and were wearing their cuirasses, when night fell. During the night the castellan went "to the rim of the ship to urinate" when "Erembald, running up from behind, precipitated his lord into the depths of the rushing water" ([71]; trans., 239). The dangers of wearing armour close to deep water is echoed by Froissart when he tells us about the fate of Albert of Hangest, Croenen, "Heroes and Anti-Heroes", 14, note 32.

xiii. MS fr. 5004, fol. 21v: "Adont furent ordonnez par paroiches tous ceuls qui yroient en celle legation. Si se pourveirent et ordonnerent et tout par moustre, ainsi comme a eulx appartenoit. Et se partirent de Gand entre IX a X mille hommes et emmenerent grant charroy et grant pourveanches." Compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.187.

xiv. Galbert also repeatedly mentions the treasure of the count as one of the reasons why the murderers were besieged, [64], transl., 224.

xv. MS fr. 5004, fol. 22r-v: "Vindrent les Gantois jusques aux barieres de Bruges et aux fossez, Jehan Lyon tout devant, monté sur ung noir morel et mist tantost se piet a terre et prist sa hache en sa main. Quant ceulx qui gardoient la porte, veïrent que point n'estoient si fort et veïrent les Gantois en belle ordonnance pour eulx assailir, si furent tous effraez. Et s'en alerent les aucuns parmy la grant rue jusques au marchié en criant: 'Veez les cy ! veez les cy, les Gantois ! Or tost ! or tost aux deffenses ! Ilz sont ja devant nos portes !' Ceulx de Bruges qui s'assambloient ou marchié pour eulx conseilier, furent tous effraez et n'orent les grans maistres loisir de parler ensamble ne de ordonner nulles de nos besoingnes ne des leurs. Et voullioient la plus grant partie de la communaulté que tantost on leur alast ouvrir les portes." Compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.188.

xvi. MS fr. 5004, fol. 22v-23r: "En ce parlement ilz furent si bien d'accort que par grant amour on leur ouvry les bailles et la porte, et entrerent tous dedens et chevauchoit le burghemestre

dalez Jehan Lyon, qui bien se moustroit hardy et oultrageux homs. Et toutes ses gens le suyvoient armez au cler. Et fu adont tres belle chose d'eux veoir entrer en la ville par ordonnance. Et s'en vinrent ens ou marchié et ainsi comment ilz venoient, il s'ordonnoient et rengoient sur la place et tenoit Jehan Lyon ung blanc baston en sa main. Entre ceulx de Gand et ceulx de Bruges furent la faictes alyances jurees et convenenchees que ilz devoient demorer a tousjours les ungz dalez les aultres, ainsi comme bons amis et voisins." Compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.189.

xvii.[26] and [54], 19-21; trans., 147-149, 200.

xviii.The execution of Bertulf by William of Ypres was characterised as a "harsh vengeance", indicating that William was not just acting as the presumptive ruler but also as kinsman of the murdered count ([57], 5-6; trans., 208).

xix.Gertrude of Saxony, who was first married to count Florent I of Holland and then to count Robert I of Flanders, was the maternal grandmother of both count Charles and king Louis VI of France, see Galbertus, *De multro*, pp. 184-185. This fact had escaped J.B. Ross, see Galbertus, *The Murder*, 187, note 4. Galbert refers three times to the kinship ties between king Louis VI and count Charles, twice calling Charles the king's "nepos", which here must be understood as cousin or kinsman, Galbertus, *De multro*, [47], 5; trans., 187; [64], 32; trans. 226. In their defiance of the king and of his choice of William Clito as count, the burghers of Bruges claim that the Flemings had exceptionally allowed the king to intervene in the election of a new count because of his close family relationship to the deceased count, [106], 48-49; trans., 285.

xx.MS fr. 5004, fol. 3v-7r; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.158-167.

xxi.MS fr. 5004, fol. 3v-4r: "En ce temps avoit ung aultre lignaige a Gand, que on appelloit les Mahieu [= Mayhuus], et estoient iceulx VII freres les plus grans de tous les navieus. Entre ces VII freres y avoit ung que on appelloit Ghiselbrecht, lequel avoit grant envie sur Jehan Lyon [= Yoens]. Couvertement de ce que il le veoit si bien du conte, et soubtilloit nuit et jour comment il le pourroit hoster de sa grace, pluseurs fois ot empensé que il le feroit occhire par ses freres, mais il ne ousoit pour la doubtance du conte. Tant subtilla, visa et ymagina que il trouva le chemin. Et la cause principalement pourquoy il s'entrehayoient, je le vous diray. Anciennement avoit en la ville du Dam eu une guerre mortelle de deux riches hommes navieus et de leurs lignaiges, qui s'appelloient l'ung messire Jehan Piet et l'autre sire Jehan Bar. De celle guerre d'amis estoient mors eulx XVIII. Ghiselbrecht Mahieu et ses freres estoient du lignaige de l'un et Jehan Lyon de l'autre. Ces haynnes couvertes estoient ainsi de longtemps nourries entres ces deux, quoy que ilz parlaissent, beussent ou mengassent aucunes fois ensamble." Compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.160-161.

xxii.MS fr. 5004, fol. 7v: "J'ay dormy ung temps, mais il appert que a petit d'affaire je me resveilleray et metteray ung tel trouble entre ceste ville et le conte qu'il coustera cent milles vies." Compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.166.

xxiii.MS fr. 5004, fol. 7r-24r; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.166-190.

xxiv.While pretending that it was an accident, Yoens deliberately sets fire to the castle at Wondelgem, at the very moment a Ghent delegation is holding talks with the count: "Et pour

ce le fist Jehan Lyon que il ne vouloit venir a nulle paix, car bien savoit que quelque traictié que il y auroit de paix, si y mettroit il la vie”, MS fr. 5004, f. 19v; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.184. When the count hears the news, he immediately sends the Ghent delegation home, refusing any further talks, which was exactly what Yoens wanted: “Or fu Jehan Lyon trop grandement resjoys quant il vit que le conte de Flandres volloit ouvrir adcertes et que il estoit si enflambés en felonnie que ceulx de Gand ne pouoient venir a paix et que il avoit par ses soubtilz ars boutté la ville de Gand si avant en la guerre que il convenoit – vouldissent ou non – que ilz guerroyaissent.” MS fr. 5004, fol. 21r; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.186.

xxv. MS fr. 5004, fol. 21r: “pour avoir conseil comment ilz se pourroient cheuir de ces besoingnes et contrevengier de ceulx de Gand”; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.186.

xxvi. MS fr. 5004, fol. 34r-v; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.211-212.

xxvii. MS fr. 5004, fol. 41r; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.222.

xxviii. MS fr. 5004, fol. 43v-44r; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.226.

xxix. “Adonc abandonna li contes as chevaliers et escuiers a faire guerre as Gantois et a contrevengier leurs damages”; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.226.

xxx.[14], 19-25; trans., 117-118.

xxxi. Rider, *God's Scribe*, pp. 70-73.

xxxii.[89], [91], [92] and [108]; trans., 262-265 and 287-289; compare Rider, *God's Scribe*, p. 175-176.

xxxiii.[91], 19; trans., 264.

xxxiv. Rider, *God's Scribe*, pp. 142-183.

xxxv.[8], [13], [26], 40-43; trans., 101-102, 114-115, 149.

xxxvi.[8] 16-19,[38], 34-35; trans., 102, 170.

xxxvii.[12], 1-6, [59], 5-14, [84], 43-58; trans., 111-112, 214, 256.

xxxviii.[105], 2; trans., 282

xxxix.[114], 18-24, 68-76, [120]; trans., 297, 299-300, 308-310.

xl. In the opening chapter dealing with the Ghent War in the *Chroniques*, Froissart remarks that some of his readers would say “that it is the Devil's work; because you know or have heard the wise say that the Devil works night and day to instigate war and hatred wherever he sees peace”. This remark was, in my opinion, inserted when the *Chronique de Flandre* was incorporated into the general *Chroniques* and does not appear in the original: Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.159; and compare MS fr. 5004, fol. 1r-2v. Other references to the Devil's work in the *Chroniques* were also inserted when, as I believe, the *Chronique de Flandre* was

reworked: Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.165; compare MS fr. 5004, fol. 7r. In the *Chronique de Flandre*, however, Froissart does mention the Devil, but only when reporting direct speech, MS fr. 5004, fol. 40v; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.221. And in his description of ominous signs before the battle at Westrozebeke, he reports on loud noise and light heard and seen by Artevelde: “Or dient aucuns que c'estoient les deabbles d'enffer qui la jouoient et tournoyoient ou la bataille devoit estre pour la grant proie que ilz y atendoient”, MS fr. 5004, fol. 184v; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 11.41-42.

xli. Ainsworth, *Jean Froissart and the Fabric of History*, p. 88. To give but one example of this: in Book I (“première rédaction proprement dite”) of his *Chronicles*, Froissart blames the disastrous outcome for the French of the Battle of Crécy not on divine punishment but simply on bad fortune: “Vous avez cy dessus en ceste histoire bien oy parler de la bataille de Crecy, comment fortune fut moult merveilleuse pour les François (...)”. In the margin of one of the manuscripts, a 15th-century reader noddingly noted: “Fortune, non mies permission divine” [“Fortune, not divine sanction”], BM Arras, MS 1063, fol. 229v.

xlii. MS fr. 5004, fol. 23v-24r: “En ce sejour et moult soubdainement prist une maladie a Jehan Lyon, dont il fu tout enflez et la proppre nuyt que la maladie lui prist, il avoit souppé en revel avec damoiselles de la ville, pourquoy les aucuns vouldrent dire et maintenir que il fu la empoisonnez. De ce ne sçay je riens de certain. Mais l'endemain que la maladie lui prist, il fu mis en une littiere et aportez a Ardembourg. Il ne peult aler plus avant et la morut, dont ceulx de Gand furent moult courouchiés et desbaretez.” Compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.190.

xliii. See Ainsworth, “Froissardian Perspectives”, pp. 67-72 and Id., “Du Berceau à la bière”, who shows many of the literary means used by Froissart to construct this negative judgment on Louis of Male. Ainsworth, however, ultimately hesitates to embrace this negative interpretation of the character of Louis of Male in the *Chronique de Flandre*. The context of the present essay does not permit me to discuss this important issue at full length. It is, however, interesting to pause for a moment over the opening passage dealing with the causes of the Ghent War, which was heavily expanded when Froissart reworked his text for inclusion into the general *Chronicles*. In the reworked version, the author presents the envy between the main Flemish cities as the prime cause. He then praises the “wise and subtle” count, “who did all he could to avoid war and friction between his people and himself, so much that never a lord tried harder than he did”, because “no war could break out between [Bruges and Ghent] unless their lord, the count, agreed to it”. Froissart, *Chroniques*, 9.159-160. This statement is in stark contrast to the immediately following narration, in which Froissart shows how it was in fact the count who allowed the conflict to develop and continue over several years. In my view, this should be read as a sharp oxymoron which sums up Froissart's judgment of Louis of Male's qualities as a ruler.

xliv. MS fr. 5004, fol. 109r, 112r, 114r; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 10.234, 10.236, 10.238. See also Ainsworth's important discussion of Froissart's conflation of scriptural references, which brings out the count's *hubris*, Ainsworth, “Du Berceau à la bière”.

xlv. MS fr. 5004, fol. 195r; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 11.57.

xlvi. Croenen, “Heroes and Anti-Heroes”.

xlvii. Ainsworth, *Jean Froissart and the Fabric of History*, p. 76.

xlviii. See the percipient discussion of this general feature of the *Chroniques* in Diller, "Froissart: Patrons and Texts."

xlix. MS fr. 5004, fol. 117v; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 10.242.

l. MS fr. 5004, fol. 138v; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 11.132.

li. MS fr. 5004, fol. 201v; compare Froissart, *Chroniques*, 11.67.

lii. Calin, "Narrative Technique"; Diller, "Romanesque Construct".

liii. [45], 1-2; trans., 182; [113], 29-32; trans., 295

liv. I would like to thank Jeff Rider warmly for the intellectually stimulating opportunity to widen my current work on Froissart by comparing it to Galbert's *De Multro*. Jeff's stimulating remarks have helped me greatly in developing further some parts of the paper given at the Leeds 2001 conference. Peter Ainsworth has given much-valued feed-back on an earlier version of the present essay.