

---

*H-France Review* Vol. 17 (October 2017), No. 201

William Chester Jordan and Jenna Rebecca Phillips, eds., *The Capetian Century, 1214-1314*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2017. xvi + 359pp. €100.00 (cl). ISBN 978-2-5035-6718-1.

Reviewed by Adam J. Davis, Denison University.

The essays in this volume grew out of a conference held at Princeton University in 2014 on “the Capetian century, 1214-1314.” The importance of the thirteenth century for the “making of France” has long been recognized. Despite this volume’s title, however, these essays do not seek to create a triumphalist narrative about the rise of “the European superpower of the High Middle Ages” (p. x) or affirm thirteenth-century claims (both inside and outside the kingdom) for the Capetians’ paramountcy. Rather, the essays explore different dimensions of Capetian France — developments in royal administration, patterns of patronage, the crusading movement, ideals of kingship, and the exercise of and ideas about power — from the Battle of Bouvines in 1214, a decisive Capetian victory against the English and their Germanic allies, to the death of Philip IV the Fair (d. 1314), whose reign was marked, among other things, by the crumbling of the Capetian-papal alliance, the persecution of the Templars, and the expulsion of the kingdom’s Jews.

After a brief introduction, part one of the book, “Royal Patronage and Expressions of Kingship,” explores the French crown’s connection to various institutions, offices, and religious orders. William J. Courtenay traces the relationship between the French crown and the University of Paris, from the privileges accorded by Philip Augustus to the university in 1200, which marked its first official recognition, to the end of Philip the Fair’s reign. Members of the university regarded their institution’s privileges as protected more by the papacy than the French crown. It was only during the reign of Louis IX that the university began to receive material support from the royal court. Indeed, before the reign of Philip the Fair, the crown could be quite tough on criminous scholars, and kings did not seek to use the university as an instrument of propaganda. This changed with Philip the Fair, who made “attempts to draft or co-opt the University of Paris in support of royal policy,” (p. 11) the most notable example being the arrest and trial of the Templars. Yet as Courtenay shows, Philip was not all that successful in getting the university masters to do his bidding.

Anne Lester draws attention to some of the shared devotional ideals between Cistercians and thirteenth-century Capetians. One cannot understand the meaning of Capetian sanctity during this period, she argues, without taking stock of the way Cistercian spiritual ideals shaped royal ideology. Moreover, the Cistercians played an active role in preserving the memory of the Capetians and they shared the Capetians’ enthusiasm for the crusading movement. Cistercian houses were attractive to members of the royal family not only as “centres of prayer and commemoration,” (p. 18) but as a refuge from the world of politics. Capetians also showed a proclivity for being buried in Cistercian houses, particularly Royaumont. At the same time, Lester argues that the Capetian patronage of the Cistercians needs to be placed within the context of broader aristocratic patronage of this and other religious orders. Rather than associating a Capetian monarch with one favorite religious order, such as Saint Louis with the mendicants, and seeing a “sequential and progressive” (p. 21) movement from religious order to religious order as one passes from

king to king, Lester instead rightly sees “multivalent motivations that guide devotion and inform religious patronage” (p. 21).

While the religious patronage of the Capetians varied, as Sean Field shows, Louis IX, Philip III, and Philip IV were quite consistent in choosing Dominicans as their confessors. Dominicans also regularly served as papal inquisitors during this period. The offices of royal confessor and inquisitor only came into being during Louis IX’s reign, and what interests Field is how and why these two offices converged. Philip III’s confessor, Lawrence of Orléans, went on to become inquisitor, but did not hold the two offices at the same time. Although inquisitors were appointed by the pope, Philip IV helped oust one Dominican inquisitor he believed was working against his interests, and once another Dominican he trusted was serving as inquisitor — William of Paris — the king tapped him to serve simultaneously as his confessor. Field points out some of the ways that the roles of confessor and inquisitor were related, and he demonstrates why Philip IV might have been so concerned to have an inquisitor whom he could trust during his prosecution of the Templars and jurisdictional conflicts with the papacy.

Several of the essays in this volume explore Capetian royal ideology, and M. C. Gaposchkin asks how a young future king learned about the duties of kingship. Beginning around 1215, moralized bibles, “an exclusive project of the Capetian court” (p. 77), functioned as visual mirrors for princes. Gaposchkin notes the emphasis that these bibles placed on the symbol of the sword, symbolizing the king’s temporal power received from the church. Through images, texts, and moral allegories, the moralized bibles conveyed that “the king is the sword arm of the church, and his function is to serve the church by enforcing the church’s priorities” (p. 77). While noting that these bibles did not present a consistent ideological program, Gaposchkin nonetheless notes the bibles’ recurring message that kings are justified in using force to defend the interests of the church, a message Louis IX clearly internalized. While this notion was present in earlier ideals of kingship, the moralized bibles of the 1220s and 1230s, the period of the Albigensian crusade, applied the notion of using royal power to serve the church to the particular objective of wiping out heresy and unbelief.

Part two of the book addresses how power was exercised and represented. Xavier Hélyary investigates how Capetian army recruitment functioned from 1260 to 1314. By considering what motivated men to serve in the French royal army, Hélyary assesses how much control Capetian kings had over the nobility. Overall, he finds, kings did not have much trouble raising large armies, since war was considered “part of what it was to be noble” (p. 118). Some members of the nobility, however, were reluctant or even opposed to joining the army, and Philip IV felt the need to use propaganda to persuade the nobility of their duty to defend the realm. Moreover, some squires avoided being dubbed a knight as a way to avoid the military service and expenses associated with knighthood. As a result, Philip III instituted the payment of wages for military service and extended the obligation to serve to all nobility, not just vassals of the king. While the motivations for joining the royal army varied based on the context, Hélyary finds that the financial benefits from wages were minimal, and that other incentives tended to matter more, such as the possibility of receiving royal gifts or new titles and opportunities, to say nothing of the desire for glory.

The exercise of power is also central to Hagar Barak’s essay on how developments in thirteenth-century French royal administration marked a “managerial revolution.” She points to Philip Augustus’s replacement of baronial counselors with salaried professional managers — clerks and knights of lesser status — as a turning point in France which had no parallel in England. These “new men” were appointed by the French royal court because of their administrative experience, and they tended to be more dependent on, and therefore loyal to the crown than the wealthy barons they had replaced. According to Barak, this “managerial revolution,” which “created a separation between ownership and control in the government of the kingdom” (p. 143), helped transform what had essentially been a French oligarchy into a state.

Turning to the representation of power, Brigitte Bedos-Rezak considers what thirteenth-century attitudes toward royal seals and documents reflected about “the semiotic roots of political consent.” Focusing on the case of William of Auvergne, who was bishop of Paris, master of theology at the University of Paris, and advisor at the royal court, Bedos-Rezak finds that in his *De legibus* (1228-1230) William came to conclude that artefacts such as royal documents and seals have no material agency and thus a limited ability to transmit royal authority. Rather, William believed that “concrete signs operated at human will or by consensus” (p. 169).

Part three turns to the last chronological period covered by the book and the reign of Philip the Fair, with a particular focus on the king’s ministers. Élisabeth Lalou reflects on Robert Fawtier’s conception of Philip the Fair. Fawtier, who died in 1966, devoted much of his career to launching the *Corpus philippicum*, a collection of all the acts of Philip the Fair and his administration. Fawtier was interested in the question of who was most responsible for shaping the policies of Philip the Fair, the king or his ministers. Fawtier was adamant that Philip was indeed responsible for his own policies even if the ministers he chose played a role in formulating those policies.

In contrast, Elizabeth A. R. Brown casts the king’s ministers, particularly Guillaume de Nogaret, as having had significant agency. As Brown shows, Guillaume used his rhetorical talents and even his orthography to present himself as an “unpretentious and diffident southerner” (p. 204) and by doing so, “insulated himself and his family from the jealousies and rivalries of the royal court” (p. 202). He did this while attacking the memory of Boniface VIII and seeking absolution for his own papal excommunication.

Guillaume Nogaret is also a central focus of Julien Théry-Astruc’s essay, which presents Guillaume as a “pioneer of royal theocracy” who helped redefine the relations between the papacy and the Capetian monarchy. It was Guillaume who was largely responsible for the arrest and prosecution in 1301 of Bernard Saisset, the bishop of Pamiers, whom Guillaume charged with heresy and treason against the king. What was novel about the way Guillaume formulated the crimes that Saisset had allegedly committed was his suggestion that any crime against God was a crime against the king. As Théry-Astruc convincingly shows, Guillaume appropriated papal rhetorical style and adopted canonical ideas while framing arguments on behalf of the monarchy. For Guillaume, in the words of Théry-Astruc, “the Capetian king was to be substituted for the Pope as Christ’s deputy and as supreme defender of the faith” (p. 243).

Crusaders and crusading orders are the topic of the final section of the book, which demonstrates the more global reach of Capetian France during this period. Jochen Burgtorf studies how members of the Montaigu family, which hailed from Auvergne, ended up not only among the nobility and clergy in Auvergne, but the crusader states, including Lusignan Cyprus, serving as master of the Templars, master of the Hospitallers, and archbishop of Nicosia. Burgtorf shows the limits of family loyalty, particularly in the context of family members holding ecclesiastical offices. “Family members,” he argues, “usually took a back seat to the interests of their respective religious institutions” (p. 298).

The question of family connections is also central to Paul Crawford’s study of the French crusade leader, Renaud of Châtillon. Crawford challenges the widespread notion, first propagated by William of Tyre, that Renaud was “an upstart without prospects.” Rather, he demonstrates that Renaud was far better connected than usually thought, as evidenced by the Duke of Burgundy’s arranging for his daughter to marry Renaud, and Renaud’s children (and grandchildren) going on to have illustrious marriages and careers.

The final essay in the volume deals with the aftermath of the trial of the Templars. Helen Nicholson asks about the fate of those Templars who survived the trial of 1307-1314 and were not imprisoned. According to the instructions of Clement V and John XXII, the vows that former Templars had taken were still valid and they were therefore not permitted to return to a secular life. Assuming they were innocent or had confessed to their crimes (and if not, they were to be tried), these former Templars were enjoined to enter

a religious house where they would receive a pension drawn from former Templar properties. As Nicholson shows, however, what became of former Templars depended in part on the region they were in and the local enforcement of ecclesiastical (and secular) authorities. In Aragon, Italy, and Germany, for example, former Templars were permitted to stay in their order's former houses or return to their family homes. Some took up secular careers and entered into marriages, while some became involved in military activities, while still others engaged in lawlessness.

This is an exceptionally strong and thought-provoking collection of essays on the Capetians during the thirteenth century. Admittedly, little attempt is made to answer a question raised in the introduction about why, and in what ways, this French dynasty was different from its contemporaries in other kingdoms. But taken together, the essays paint a rich and varied picture of the significant Capetian innovations during this period -- in governance, in formulating ideas about kingship, in religious devotion and patronage -- as well as the Capetians' efforts, often quite violent, to impose order.

#### LIST OF ESSAYS

William Chester Jordan, "Introduction"

Anne E. Lester, "Saint Louis and Cîteaux Revisited: Cistercian Commemoration and Devotion during the Capetian Century, 1214-1314"

Sean L. Field, "King/Confessor/Inquisitor: A Capetian-Dominican Convergence"

M. C. Gaposchkin, "Kingship and Crusade in the First Four Moralized Bibles"

Xavier H elary, "French Nobility and the Military Requirements of the King (c. 1260 – c. 1314)"

Hagar Barak, "The Managerial Revolution of the Thirteenth Century"

Brigitte Miriam Bedos-Rezak, "The Ambiguity of Representation: Semiotic Roots of Political Consent in Capetian France"

Elizabeth A. R. Brown, "Philip the Fair and his Ministers: Guillaume de Nogaret and Enguerran de Marigny"

Julien Th ery-Astruc, "The Pioneer of Royal Theocracy: Guillaume de Nogaret and the Conflicts between Philip the Fair and the Papacy"

 elisabeth Lalou, "Robert Fawtier's Philip the Fair"

Jochen Burgdorf, "Travels, Troubles and Trials: The Montaigu Family between Capetian France and Lusignan Cyprus"

Paul F. Crawford, "An Upstart without Prospects? The Familial Context of Renaud of Ch atillon and its Implications"

Helen J. Nicholson, "What Became of the Templars after the Trial of 1307-14?"

Adam J. Davis  
Denison University  
[davisaj@denison.edu](mailto:davisaj@denison.edu)

Copyright © 2017 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 edistribution/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 republication 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