

H-France Review Vol. 10 (February 2010), No. 25

M. Cecilia Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis. Kingship, Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2008. xvii + 331pp. Appendixes, bibliography, and index. \$45.00 U.S. (cl). ISBN 978-0-8014-4550-7.

Review by Daisy Delogu, University of Chicago.

France's remarkable Louis IX, or Saint Louis, has long been the object of scholarly attention. Born in 1214, Louis became king in 1226 as a boy of twelve. He was guided, not only in his youth but throughout his life, by his mother Blanche of Castile—a remarkable woman in her own right. In 1248 Louis embarked on his first and most famous crusade. Upon his return to France six years later he enacted a number of reforms of the kingdom, most notably concerning the administration of justice. He likewise enacted a number of what might be considered personal reforms—wearing the simplest dress, increasing his public charity and almsgiving, and engaging in acts of penitence and humility. He embarked upon his second and last crusade in 1270, and died the same year of illness before the gates of Tunis. Louis was an exemplary figure during his own lifetime both for his piety and for his kingship, and this exemplarity was confirmed by his canonization in 1297.

Louis's life and its impact has garnered the attention of those concerned with questions of later medieval sanctity, such as André Vauchez, scholars of royal or dynastic saints, such as Robert Folz or Gábor Klaniczay, and on the part of those interested in political or military history, kingship, or the Capetians, as in studies by Jean Richard, William Chester Jordan, and Elizabeth A. R. Brown. Jacques Le Goff's monumental 1996 biography of Louis IX combines a study of the king's life with a consideration of the process of his canonization and the various groups who participated in the formation of *Saint Louis*. As both a king and a saint, Louis IX's life and deeds are among the best documented of any medieval figure, and these sources have been mined by scholars interested in his life, as well as his saintly afterlife. One might have imagined, particularly in the wake of Le Goff's magnum opus, that there was little room remaining for scholarly intervention. This is not the case however, as M. Cecilia Gaposchkin shows in *The Making of Saint Louis. Kingship, Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*.

Gaposchkin's book is not a biography. It is, rather, a sort of post-mortem, which takes as its point of departure the king's death in 1270. She relies upon a heretofore underused (if not un-used) source, the liturgical offices, liturgical hours, and sermons created to honor Louis, in order to trace the very local and specific "readings" of Louis that circulated and were promoted among different constituencies, including various mendicant or clerical orders, Louis's descendents, and members of the nobility. Gaposchkin's book is itself a kind of local reading, one which demonstrates with deftness and nuance how the image of Louis was made and remade over the two or so generations following his death and subsequent canonization. Gaposchkin rightly points out that the liturgical offices, hours, and sermons are essential and dynamic sources that can provide varying or competing interpretations of a single saint. Her handling of these sources is admirable, and has effectively transformed the basis of our possible understandings of Louis IX. The book's subtitle is somewhat broader than the material covered, and while kingship, sanctity, and crusade do constitute important aspects of her consideration of Louis, these topics in and of themselves are not the focus of her attention.

The Making of Saint Louis is divided into an introduction, eight chapters, a short excursus on the liturgical office, a conclusion, and four appendixes. The first three chapters focus on the period from Louis's death to his canonization, while the final five provide a series of close readings of the images of Saint Louis that were created in various milieu. In her introduction Gaposchkin notes that Louis's canonization took place during a pause in the action, as it were, in the ongoing struggle between Philip the Fair of France, Louis's grandson, and Pope Boniface VIII. Thus despite Louis's acknowledged reputation for piety and the genuine religious motivations behind the movement to have him sainted, his canonization cannot be disentangled from the political and institutional pressures that surrounded it. At the same time, the rise of the mendicant orders had brought about changes in the notion of sainthood which made sanctity less compatible with kingship than it had been in earlier periods, yet more compatible with lay saints engaged in a life of active charity and piety. How then, Gaposchkin asks, was Louis able to reconcile the paradox of his kingly and saintly identities? In order to answer this question Gaposchkin turns to the liturgical sources mentioned above which, though less well known to modern scholars than the many medieval lives of Louis, were arguably much more widely circulated among publics contemporary to Louis's canonization, and therefore were able to exert considerable pressure on the image of the king-saint that would emerge from this period.

Chapter one, "The Making of a Saint, 1270-1297," looks at the canonization process itself which, since the papacy had institutionalized the canonization requirements and procedure, was quite an affair. She discusses the well-known pre-canonization vitae of Geoffroy of Beaulieu and William of Chartres, and the post-canonization vita of William of Saint-Pathus, which takes as its source the over 330 interviews that were held by the papal curia to establish the evidence of Louis's sanctity. She argues that in these early texts Louis's rulership (which she defines as the exercise of power, as opposed to kingship, which refers to the personal qualities of the king) played a relatively minor role, and that the mendicant ideals of active Christian piety and humility were far more important in the initial construction of a saintly identity for Louis IX. Chapter two, "The Canonization of 1297," examines the immediate political context of the canonization itself, in particular as it related to the ongoing conflicts between Philip the Fair and Boniface VIII. In his bull of canonization and sermons preached to promote the cult of now-Saint Louis, Boniface constructed an image of Louis as a just king, one protective of the rights of the Church, thereby establishing a "standard of royal behavior by which to upbraid Philip" (p. 59).

Chapter three, "Constructing the Cult: Bones, Altars, and Liturgical Offices," examines where and by what means Louis's cult was established. Not surprisingly, Louis's canonization had the greatest impact in Paris and the Ile-de-France, and Philip the Fair, who had worked tirelessly to have his grandfather canonized, worked just as hard to promote his cult. Philip was not successful in his efforts to have Louis's remains moved from Saint Denis to the Sainte Chapelle, but he was able, in 1306, to obtain Louis's head. Philip sought to transform the Sainte Chapelle into a monument to Louis and to Capetian kingship writ large, and also to meld Louis's saintly kingship with the kingship of Christ. Though six liturgical offices were composed for Louis, they were not adopted universally by the orders responsible for them, and so proper celebration (i.e., celebration focused on Louis individually) of Louis's cult was largely confined to Paris and its immediate surroundings. The section entitled "Excursus: A Short Primer on the Structure of the Liturgical Office" contains much useful information, but its location in between chapters three and four is somewhat jarring, and it might better have been included as an appendix.

The second half of Gaposchkin's book consists of a series of close readings of the images of Louis created in texts composed in a variety of different milieu. Gaposchkin affirms that the representation of Louis that emerged from a given context was shaped by the aims, ideals, and self-definitions of those promoting it. Philip the Fair and the Capetians for instance (discussed in chapter four, "Royal Sanctity and Sacral Kingship") defined Louis's sanctity in terms of his kingship in an effort to sacralize kingship in general, and Capetian kingship in particular. The texts produced in or for a royal setting emphasized the idea that the king's authority came from God, and depicted Louis's sanctity as the result of the

quality of his rulership. Gaposchkin shows that Louis was construed as a saint for the French people in particular and that “his spiritual constituency was defined by the political community of his earthly reign” (p. 103). The Cistercians and Dionysians (the subject of chapter five) constructed an image of Saint Louis that incorporated Biblical ideals of kingship that focused on humility, service, devotion, and obedience to God, rather than on divine election or sacral royalty, and that also spoke to the monastic ideas of exile from God, imprisonment of and in the body, and the chastisement of the flesh. Gaposchkin argues that the rise of the mendicant orders had altered the spiritual values of society at large, and that the monastic modeling of Saint Louis “according to the older, contemplative ideals represented a conservative impulse suited to sacralize the values of the institution itself in the face of a broader social challenge” (p. 152).

The Franciscan version of Saint Louis (described in chapter six) was closely modeled on that of Saint Francis himself, but Gaposchkin notes that Franciscan ideals were themselves tempered over the course of the thirteenth century such that wealthy lay people could achieve them. The Franciscans had to reconcile their increasing political and spiritual power with the Franciscan ideals of renunciation and poverty, and they did so in part by turning their focus to identification with Christ. Louis’s crusade was understood as analogous to Francis’s vow of poverty, and also as a kind of passion that united Louis with Christ. In addition, Louis’s professed willingness to renounce wealth and power (in spite of the fact that he did not actually do so) attested to his saintliness. She concludes that “if Louis, as king, were able to fulfill the ideal set forth by Francis through the quality of his faith, then the Franciscan ideal was attainable even by those in positions of wealth and power” (p. 180). In chapter seven, Gaposchkin turns to a consideration of Jean de Joinville’s life of Louis. She espouses the critical position according to which Joinville’s life was composed at two different historical moments, and with two distinct aims. The central crusade narrative commemorated Joinville’s relationship with the king over the course of the latter’s first crusade, while the frame discussed Louis’s sanctity defined, for Joinville, by his “ideal, just and Christian kingship” (p. 188). Not unlike Boniface VIII, Joinville constructed an image of a kingly ideal, incarnated by Louis, which he used to reproach the reigning king, Philip the Fair.

In chapter eight, Gaposchkin examines books of hours, as well as other texts and art objects constructed in or for a royal or noble setting. The Capetians were, by and large, the driving force behind Louis’s cult. Gaposchkin shows that Saint Louis was both a model for subsequent Capetian kings (admittedly one that was sometimes thrown in their faces, à la Joinville), as well as an emblem of the sanctity of the House of France (understood broadly, such that it included for instance the Angevin and Valois dynasties). She notes that Louis’s charity, humility, and concern for the poor made him a model not only for kings, but for queenly conduct as well.

In her conclusion Gaposchkin shows how Louis IX was invoked in later centuries as a symbol of political legitimacy, and how his cult was revived and more widely diffused in the seventeenth century by Louis XIII and Louis XIV. In addition, she underscores the richness and variation in the early history of devotion to Louis and the importance of liturgical sources in uncovering and appreciating this richness. In a previous chapter Gaposchkin had noted “how powerful liturgy could be in creating, defining, and reinforcing local ideological priorities” (p. 151), and her keen and sensitive readings of these liturgical sources, as well as her attention to local phenomena, are the most important contributions of this book. In the passage cited above Gaposchkin reads the importance of liturgy in defining and reinforcing local ideological priorities back onto itself, affirming “the importance of local practice, history, and identity in making sense of the meaning of liturgical texts” (p. 152). I would have liked to see Gaposchkin read her sources outward by exploring the broader issues that she herself identifies in her conclusion, for “Louis’ sanctity— and sanctity generally—was not only the representation of social ideals but also a vehicle for a cultural discussion of ideals, a symbolic focus of competing ideologies and values, and a mechanism of articulating and constructing identity” (p. 243). As it stands, Gaposchkin’s book provides valuable readings of a series of neglected sources, and thoughtfully nuances previous understandings of this most written-about king.

Daisy Delogu
University of Chicago
ddelogu@uchicago.edu

Copyright © 2010 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for redistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of H-France Review nor re-publication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France. The views posted on H-France Review are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.

ISSN 1553-9172