



Society for French Historical Studies

The Uses of Heterodoxy: The French Monarchy and Unbelief in the Thirteenth Century

Author(s): Robert E. Lerner

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *French Historical Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (Autumn, 1965), pp. 189-202

Published by: [Duke University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/285843>

Accessed: 08/11/2011 22:31

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Duke University Press and Society for French Historical Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *French Historical Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE USES OF HETERODOXY: THE FRENCH
MONARCHY AND UNBELIEF IN THE
THIRTEENTH CENTURY

By

ROBERT E. LERNER

To the modern reader, schooled in the civil libertarian principles of John Stuart Mill, one of the most repugnant passages in the otherwise delightful *History of Saint Louis* by the Sire de Joinville is the passage in which Saint Louis discourses upon the defence of the faith. According to the King of France, it was hopeless to argue with nonbelievers. Only one recourse lay open to the God-fearing layman, and that was to defend his religion, not with words, but with a good cutting sword, until the opponent was able to argue no longer.¹ This passage has been considered typical of the policy of thirteenth-century French rulers. The French kings have been seen fighting the Albigensians, defending the faith in the Holy Land, and finally, executing the disastrous Crusade to Aragon in close league with the Papacy. A frequently quoted fact is that three successive French kings died on crusades in the thirteenth century. But this is only one side of the coin. Little noted by historians is the fact that the French monarchy in several cases actually posed as a defender of unbelief. This circumstance at first sight seems paradoxical, but on closer inspection it appears that the curious role of the French monarch as protector of heretics casts an interesting light on the methods of the Capetians in the development of royal hegemony.

An interesting example is the case of the Amaurians of Paris.² The members of the Amaurian heresy, unearthed in

¹Jean, Sire de Joinville, *Histoire de Saint Louis*, ed. N. de Wailly, Société de l'Histoire de France (Paris, 1868), pp. 18-20.

²There are numerous accounts of the Amaurian heresy. Among the best are Wilhelm Preger, *Geschichte der deutschen Mystik in Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 1874-93), I, 173-84; G. C. Capelle, *Amaury de Bène; étude sur son panthéisme formel*, Bibliothèque Thomiste, XVI (Paris, 1932); and Herbert

1210, claimed to have been followers of the Parisian scholar, Amaury of Bène. The doctrine they adhered to was pantheistic, antinomian, and replete with a stubborn denial of Christian dogma. Under ordinary circumstances such a group would have been persecuted to extinction. Yet, although several leaders were condemned by a local synod and handed over to the flames, the heresy proved to be remarkably tenacious. Remarkable also was a certain peculiar relationship the heretics seem to have maintained with the French royal house.

Evidence for the relationship of the Amaurians to the Capetians begins with the presumed founder of the heresy, Amaury of Bène. Amaury was born in the diocese of Chartres, but, like so many other young men of his day, he migrated to Paris in pursuit of learning. There, after following the art's course, he turned to theology, which he studied and taught very freely, following his own method, and never inquiring as to what others had said.³ As a result, he established a great reputation and his name came to the attention of royalty. A significant passage in the Anonymous Chronicle of Laon, completed in 1219, reports that Amaury received the patronage of the royal heir, the future Louis VIII, who considered him to have been a man of flawless opinions.⁴

Amaury, very much like Abelard, had a temerarious spirit which made him many enemies, and his doctrine was entirely unacceptable to his associates. At the height of his fame, he was denounced by his fellow instructors at Paris for errors in doctrine, and in the year 1206 was forced to appeal his case to the Pope at Rome. When Innocent III upheld the opinion of the Parisian masters, Amaury recanted,

Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter*, 2nd ed. (Hildesheim, 1961), pp. 355-73. I have treated the heresy as the earliest manifestation of Free-Spirit thought in my Princeton dissertation, *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Thirteenth Century* (1964).

³ William the Breton, *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, in *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton*, ed. H. F. Delaborde, Société de l'Histoire de France (Paris, 1882-85), I, 230-31.

⁴ *Chronicon universale Anonymi Laudunensis*, ed. A. Cartellieri and W. Stechele (Leipzig and Paris, 1909), p. 69: "Item sciendum, quod iste magister Almaricus fuit cum domino Ludovico, primogenito Regis Francorum; quia credebatur vir esse bone conversacionis et opinionis illese." cf. also, Charles Petit-Dutaillis, *Étude sur la vie et le règne de Louis VIII* (Paris, 1894), p. 5.

returned to France, and died shortly thereafter, some say of a broken heart. His ideas, however, lived on. The leadership of the heresy discovered in 1210 consisted primarily of Parisian scholars and priests who were probably disciples of Amaury.⁵ Their spokesman was a man called William the Goldsmith, who not only preached pantheism and antinominism, but also indulged in prophecy. This prophecy, as reported by Caesarius of Heisterbach, displayed a noteworthy affinity for the cause of the Capetians.

According to Caesarius, William the Goldsmith said that the Pope was Antichrist and that Rome was Babylon. He prophesied that within five years four great plagues would come, that the kings of the earth would slay each other, and that heavenly fire would rain down on the prelates of the Church. After this purgative, a new world would dawn, in which "all the kingdoms of the earth will be subject to the King of the French and to his son, who will live under the dispensation of the Holy Spirit and never die." Furthermore, there would be given to the Kings of France "twelve loaves, which are the knowledge and the power of the scriptures."⁶ William's prophecy, flattering the King of France and his son Louis, reads like a harbinger of the propaganda of Pierre Dubois enunciated some one hundred years later. Most clearly, it is the sort of chauvinism that would not have offended Philip Augustus.

The Amaurian case was not closed with the condemnation of 1210. The ban was reiterated at Paris in 1215,⁷ and at the Fourth Lateran Council during the same year. But the text of the Lateran decree was curious. Referring to the dogma which had caused so much consternation to the Parisian officials, the Lateran decree condemned the Amaurian doctrine for being "not so much heresy, as it is insanity."⁸ This

⁵ The leaders of the Amaurian heresy are named by Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum*, ed. J. Strange (Cologne, 1851), I, 304. This list includes the name of Amaury's private secretary. Caesarius' list coincides accurately with the list presented in the Parisian condemnation of 1210, ed. H. Denifle and E. Chatelain, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* (Paris, 1889), I, 70.

⁶ Caesarius of Heisterbach, I, 305.

⁷ Denifle and Chatelain, I, 79, n. 20.

⁸ J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*

phrase, in reference to heretics who considered themselves to be guided by the Holy Spirit, and who declared that the Pope was Antichrist, is surprisingly mild. Yet it could be dismissed as a mere stylistic quirk of the papal chancery had not the manner of the Lateran condemnation been the subject of direct comment later in the century.

This commentary is none other than that of the influential canonist and Cardinal, Henry of Susa, known most familiarly as Hostiensis. Hostiensis touched upon the heresy of Amaury in his *Apparatus* to the Decretals of Gregory I. There he enumerated three of the primary Amaurian errors. Then he went on to ask why these errors were not explicitly enumerated in the decree of the Lateran Council. The answer, according to Hostiensis, was that Amaury had certain disciples who were still alive at the time of the Council on whose account an enumeration of the Amaurian errors was suppressed. Furthermore, in the opinion of Hostiensis, it was still most suitable not to mention the names of these influential disciples.⁹ The circumspection of Hostiensis is not difficult to understand. In the middle of the thirteenth century, when Hostiensis was writing, the Papal Curia had absolutely no reason or desire to offend the French monarchy. But there can be little doubt that the prudent remarks of Hostiensis were an oblique reference to the patronage of the Capetians for the Amaurian heresy.¹⁰

The events surrounding the condemnation of the Amaurians run parallel to other noteworthy occurrences concerning unbelief in the reign of Philip Augustus. Philip sometimes allowed his own interests to coincide with those of the

(Florence and Venice, 1759-98), XXIII, 986: "... doctrina non tam heretica censenda sit quam insana."

⁹ Hostiensis, *Apparatus in Decretali Gregorii I*, in Capelle, *op. cit.*, p. 94: "Si queras quare dogma istud non fuit specificatum in hoc consilio, respondeo in genere, quod Amalricus iste habuit quosdam discipulos tempore hujus consilii adhuc superstites, ob quorum reverentiam suppressum extitit dogma istud, quorum etiam nomina adhuc honestius est suppressere quam specialiter nominare."

¹⁰ Preger, *op. cit.*, I, 183-184, and Hermann Reuter, *Geschichte der religiösen Aufklärung im Mittelalter* (Berlin, 1875-77), II, 235-236, believe the remark of Hostiensis to have applied specifically to Louis VIII. Recently a similar judgment has been made by Hermann Ley, *Studie zur Geschichte des Materialismus im Mittelalter* (Berlin, 1957), p. 218. There is little reason to ascribe the reference specifically to one man. Influence might have been wielded by any important member of the French entourage.

Papacy, but he never once permitted himself to be used as a tool. Concerning the Albigensian persecution he was particularly refractory. As is well known, Innocent III made his first requests for aid in extirpating the Albigensian heresy in May 1204 and February 1205. When Philip proved dumb to these entreaties, Innocent waited more than two years and then, in November 1207, wrote to Philip again, offering full crusading indulgences to all those who participated in a punitive venture against the South. Philip, however, temporized once more and replied that he was too busy with his struggle against the English to be of service. Finally, after the murder of the papal legate Peter of Castelnau in January 1208, Innocent made a supreme effort. He ordered a crusade to be preached throughout northern France and sent a special legation headed by Cardinal Guala to plead with Philip Augustus. But Philip still remained obdurate. Not only did he refuse to participate in a punitive expedition, but he also forbade the use of the skillful mercenaries he needed for his war against England, allowing only the participation of his feudal vassals in what was later to be known as the Albigensian Crusade.¹¹

Contemporary with Philip's equivocal policy regarding the Albigensians was his display of tolerance toward the Jews. Philip was certainly not a tolerant man by nature or conviction. On his accession to the Kingship in 1180, the rash young King enacted harshly restrictive measures for the Jews of his kingdom, and in 1182 he expelled them from France. It was only in 1198 that Philip gave the Jews license to return to royal lands. Even then it may be assumed that his decision was based more upon maturer pecuniary consideration than abstract principle. But afterwards, Philip showed surprising indulgence to the Jews—an indulgence especially noteworthy during an era that was captivated by

¹¹ The preliminaries to the Albigensian Crusade are best described by Henry Charles Lea, *History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1888), I, 136-152; Achille Luchaire, *Innocent III. La croisade des Albigeois* (Paris, 1905); and, most recently, Pierre Belperron, *La croisade contre les Albigeois et l'union du Languedoc à la France* (Paris, 1942), pp. 121-57.

crusading hysteria.¹² Following his conquest of Normandy in 1204, Philip took measures to ensure that Jews did not leave royal lands either in Normandy or in the Île de France. In return for strict financial controls, Philip allowed the Jews a great number of privileges and even allowed certain Jews to stay at the Châtelet.¹³

Innocent III, whose intolerance for Jews was unrestrained, reacted immediately. In January 1205 Innocent wrote a vigorous letter to Philip protesting against what he called the favoritism to Jews shown in the Kingdom of France.¹⁴ Innocent wrote another angry missive on the subject six months later. Having received no reply from Philip, Innocent addressed himself this time to the Archbishop of Sens and the Bishop of Paris. In his letter to these two officials Innocent once more complained about the privileges accorded to the Jews of France. He protested against the custom of having Christian nurses for Jewish children and other similar abuses. In characteristic language Innocent declared that the Jewish offenses to the Christian faith were so scandalous that it was sinful not only to speak of them, but even to think of them, and he concluded by urging appropriate action on the part of the French King.¹⁵

Perhaps in reaction to this onslaught, Philip published an ordinance which can be dated to about 1205. This ordinance allowed the excommunication of Christian women who nursed Jewish babies, but this was by no means a major retreat. On the major points—buying from Jews, selling to Jews, or working for Jews—Philip forbade excommunications within his own realms.¹⁶ Furthermore, in 1206 Philip published an *établissement* which granted the Jews additional

¹² In general on Philip's policy toward the Jews, Gavin I. Langmuir, "Judei nostri' and the Beginning of Capetian Legislation," *Traditio*, XVI (1960), 209-14, and 204, n. 3 for an excellent review of the bibliography.

¹³ Léopold Delisle, *Catalogue des Actes de Philippe-Auguste* (Paris, 1856), #890 and #890A: "Isti Judei Remanebunt in Castelleto Secundum Pontem."

¹⁴ Innocent III, *Opera omnia*, ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae latinae cursus completus* (Paris, 1844-64), CCXV, 501-503; Auguste Potthast, *Regesta pontificum romanorum* (Berlin, 1874-75), I, #2373.

¹⁵ Innocent III, 694-695; Potthast, #2565.

¹⁶ *Ordonnances des rois de France de la troisième race*, ed. E. Laurière et al. (Paris, 1723), I, 39-42.

stability.¹⁷ Interestingly enough, 1206 was the same year that saw the condemnation of Amaury of Bène in Rome. Innocent did not abandon his efforts to enforce greater restrictions on the Jews. A letter of January 1208 to Hervé, Count of Nevers, once more protested against the privileges accorded to Jews,¹⁸ and Innocent's legislation against the Jews at the Lateran Council is well known. But these efforts did not move Philip. The position of Jews in his kingdom was preserved, and the end of his reign saw a final decree which underlined their supervised status.¹⁹

The history of Philip Augustus, then, shows his determined reluctance to participate in the Albigensian Crusade, his refusal to persecute Jews on the orders of the Pope, and the covert support of his administration for the Amaurian heresy, reflected in the evidence of authorities so disparate as the Anonymous of Laon, the German monk Caesarius of Heisterbach, and the Roman canonist Hostiensis. Philip's motivation was obviously varied. His reluctance to fight the Albigensians probably revolved about his numerous commitments in other areas, and his tolerance for the Jews was no doubt based on financial motives. Both, however, display a willingness to defy papal directives, and the very fact that such conduct was objectionable to the Papacy might perhaps have been an added motivation. The support for the Amaurians is the hardest to evaluate, yet one can only conjecture that Capetian patronage was based on the anti-hierarchical tendencies of the heretics. In Philip's chess game with Innocent III strategy was of the essence, and Philip might have been thinking in terms of using the Amaurian heresy as a pawn to advance a royal gambit.

Philip Augustus has never received a reputation for piety, and his equivocal attitude toward unbelief might not appear to be very surprising. The case of Louis IX and his mother Blanche of Castile, however, is entirely different. The piety of the royal saint is legendary. Joinville's story recounted at

¹⁷ Nicolas Brussel, *Nouvel examen de l'usage général des fiefs en France* (Paris, 1727), I, 576-79; Delisle, #1003.

¹⁸ Innocent III, 1291-1293; Potthast, #3274.

¹⁹ Luc d'Achery, *Spicilegium*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1723), III, 589.

the beginning of this article is only one of the numerous testimonies to Louis' conviction. Most recently the intimate relationship between Louis and the mendicant orders has been described and the evidence fully justifies the use of the satirical appellation of "Frater Ludovicus" for the ruler of France.²⁰ Blanche's piety is also untainted and many authorities regard her own religious precepts and upbringing as a primary source of Louis' saintliness.²¹ All these facts notwithstanding there is evidence to indicate that neither Saint Louis nor Queen Blanche were indifferent or acquiescent to what they regarded as papal abuse or encroachment.

The evidence for the case of Saint Louis has been presented in two very significant articles by Father Gerard J. Campbell, S. J. Father Campbell has shown that in the age of Gregory IX and Innocent IV, when bell, book, and candle were becoming almost standard equipment for the furtherance of the papal program, Saint Louis endeavored continually to limit the use and extent of excommunications and other ecclesiastical censures in the realm of France.²² Father Campbell has also shown that the document preserved by Matthew Paris purporting to be a protest of the French against papal abuses is known as the "Protest of Saint Louis" with justice. According to Father Campbell, this memoir, read by a French ambassador at the court of Innocent IV in 1247, is substantially authentic, and although its language is very exaggerated it agrees largely with positions taken by Saint Louis elsewhere.²³ And as Father Campbell is the first to point out, this "Protest of Saint Louis" "is not precisely what one would call a mild document."²⁴

Saint Louis, however, was always steadfast in his belief and never once thought of giving aid to heretical or unruly elements. He was often reluctant to enforce excommunications in Languedoc when he suspected that their motives

²⁰ Lester K. Little, "Saint Louis' Involvement with the Friars," *Church History*, XXXII (1964), 125-148.

²¹ For example, Charles Petit-Dutaillis, "Saint Louis," *Cambridge Medieval History* (Cambridge, 1911-1936), VI, 331.

²² "The Attitude of the Monarchy toward the use of Ecclesiastical Censures in the Reign of Saint Louis," *Speculum*, XXXV (1960), 535-555.

²³ The Protest of Saint Louis," *Traditio*, XV (1959), 405-418.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 408.

were pecuniary or political, but when a mere suspicion of heresy was involved he never waived.²⁵ The same can not be said for his equally pious mother, Blanche of Castile. The uprising of the *Pastoreaux* which took place in 1251, during the time when Blanche was acting as regent for the crusading Saint Louis, was the occasion of action on Blanche's part which was almost as equivocal as that of Philip Augustus.

The background of the *Pastoreaux* uprising is important for giving perspective both to the outbreak and to Blanche's reaction to it. While Saint Louis was waging his idealistic crusade in Egypt, another crusade, no less significant, if somewhat less idealistic, was being waged in Europe. This was the papal crusade against the Hohenstaufen, launched by Gregory IX against Frederick II in 1240, and maintained with unabated vigor by Innocent IV.²⁶ Popular enthusiasm for this crusade was not great, for not only had it brought internecine war in its wake, but it had also diverted Christian arms from the aid of hard-pressed *Outremer*.²⁷ Louis IX himself had frequently tried to span the breach between the Empire and Papacy, but never to any avail.²⁸ He had, therefore, to support his crusade from French resources alone, because Frederick II and Innocent IV, like the Lion and the Unicorn, were too intent on fighting each other to be distracted with other problems.

In the year 1250 the issue of both crusades was quickly determined. The wreck of Louis IX's army in the miasmas before Mansourah and his subsequent capture unquestionably doomed his well-planned venture. But the King, after his release on the payment of a large ransom, decided to remain in the East while his two surviving brothers returned to France. Louis hoped that Pope Innocent could be persuaded to make peace with Frederick II, who could then lend considerable succor to the French in the Holy Land.

²⁵ Campbell, "Attitude," 542-547.

²⁶ On this crusade see Joseph R. Strayer, "The Political Crusades of the Thirteenth Century," in *A History of the Crusades*, ed. K. M. Setton (Philadelphia, 1955-62), II, 348-59.

²⁷ Palmer A. Throop, "Criticism of Papal Crusade Policy," *Speculum*, XIII (1938), 397-403.

²⁸ Elie Berger, *Saint Louis et Innocent IV* (Paris, 1893), pp. 1-33, 238-67.

Accordingly, after their return, the King's brothers visited the Pope at Lyons in order to engineer such an agreement. Innocent IV, however, again turned a deaf ear to King Louis' entreaties for peace.²⁹

These events took place in the late summer of 1250. In December of that year Frederick II suddenly died and the situation seemed momentarily altered. With Innocent's antagonist disposed of there could be no further excuse for the papal crusade, and all Christendom could unite in a war against Saracens that would end all wars against Saracens. But Innocent IV, bent on destroying the entire Hohenstaufen "viper brood," frustrated this design by continuing his battle against Frederick II's son, Conrad IV.³⁰ Louis IX, gallantly remaining in the Holy Land, could not expect serious aid from Europe, and France had sustained two great disappointments—the defeat of King Louis in the East, and the continuance of war by Pope Innocent in the West.

It is in this context that the *Pastoreaux* uprising must be placed.³¹ During the spring of 1251, while Pope Innocent was excommunicating Conrad IV, a mysterious, impressive looking old man began haraunging crowds of peasants and shepherds in northern France. This was Jacob, otherwise known as the "Master of Hungary," who announced that Saint Louis must be aided in the Holy Land by an army of shepherds, since Christ's nativity had first been revealed to shepherds, not knights.³² He declared that this message had been

²⁹ Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H. R. Luard, Rolls Series 54 (London, 1872-83), V, 175.

³⁰ On Innocent's decision to continue the war, which really became evident only in the winter of 1251, Carl Rodenberg, *Innocenz IV und das Königreich Siciliens* (Halle, 1892), pp. 90-99.

³¹ The political context of the *Pastoreaux* uprising must be re-emphasized in light of the work of the Soviet historian W. L. Kerov, "The Uprising of the 'Pastoreaux' in Southern Netherlands and France in 1251," *Questions of History* #6 (1956), 115-23 (in Russian). Kerov sees the uprising as a peasant reaction to poverty and "feudal exploitation," with little regard for the emotional, religious, and political factors involved. These factors are touched on briefly by Jean Delalande, *Les extraordinaires croisades d'enfants et de pastoreaux au moyen age* (Paris, 1962), pp. 41-51, who was unaware of Kerov's work, but the basic account is still the short notice of Reinhold Röhrich, "Die Pastorellen," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, VI (1884), 290-296. I would like here to express my gratitude to Herr Joseph Goeke of the University of Münster for aid in translating Russian.

³² *Annales S. Benigni Divionensis, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores* (hereafter cited as MGHS) (Hannover, 1826-1928), V, 50.

revealed to him by a vision of Mary, who had given him written instructions which he always carried in his hand.³³ Jacob had a great charismatic appeal and his success was instantaneous. In the shortest space of time he collected a huge following, which included the young and the impressionable, but also a different class of "shepherds," variously labelled as "robbers," "murderers," "excommunicates," "apostates," "heretics," "pagans," "camp women," and "ravishers."³⁴ Fancying himself a saint, Jacob distributed crosses to all of his followers, and absolved sins like an ordained priest.³⁵ In this character he granted the sacrament of marriage freely, and was even said to have married nine men to one woman.³⁶ In addition, he claimed a miraculous touch that could cure the blind, the lame, and the impotent, but in the sobering cool of a monastery cell a skeptical cleric later denied that Jacob had any miraculous powers and attributed his success in making the lame walk to the expedient of giving them a swift kick in the shins.³⁷

As the *Pastoreaux* passed through the city of Amiens they remained peaceful and were considered to be holy men.³⁸ The only group that denied their sanctity was the clergy, and a furious antagonism soon developed between *Pastoreaux* and priests.³⁹ Jacob accused the Cistercians of greed,

³³ Primat, *Chronique, Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France* (hereafter cited as HF) (Paris 1738-1876), XXIII, 8; *Chronicon S. Laudi Rotomagensis*, HF, XXIII, 395; John of Tayster, *Annales*, MGHS, XXVIII, 589; Matthew Paris, *op. cit.*, 247.

³⁴ *Chronicon universalis Mettensis*, MGHS, XXIV, 552: ". . . latronum, exulum, apostatarum, paganorum, hereticorum et meretricum. . ." William of Nangis, *Chronicon*, ed. H. Géraud (Paris, 1843), I, 435: ". . . latrones et homicidae. . ." Matthew Paris, 248: ". . . fures, exules, fugitivi, excommunicati. . ." *Chronica minor auctore minorita Erphordiensi*, MGHS, XXIV, 200: ". . . meretrices, latrones, magi et malefici. . ." Primat, 8: ". . . larrons, ravisseurs, homicides. . ."

³⁵ *Chronique anonyme des Rois de France finissant en 1286*, HF, XXI, 83; *Chron. S. Laudi Rotomag.*, 396; John of Columna, *E mari historiarum*, HF, XXIII, 123; Bernard Gui, *E floribus chronicorum*, HF, XXI, 697; *Chroniques de Saint-Denis*, HF, XXI, 115.

³⁶ Primat, 9; *Chroniques de Saint-Denis*, 115; Columna, 123.

³⁷ Primat, 9; Tayster, 589; *Annales de Burton*, ed. H. R. Luard, *Annales monastici*, Rolls Series 36 (London, 1864-69), I, 291; *Chronicon S. Martini Turonensis*, MGHS, XXVI, 476: ". . . capiebat infirmas per tibias et membra et ita fortiter stringebat, quod propter dolorem quem habebant dicebant se sanos esse, ad hoc quod possent de manu sua evelli."

³⁸ For the *Pastoreaux* at Amiens, *Chroniques de Saint-Denis*, 115.

³⁹ Primat, 9; *Annales de Wintonia*, ed. H. R. Luard, *Annales monastici*, Rolls Series 36 (London, 1864-69), II, 92; *Chronicon Normanniae*, HF,

and Benedictines of gluttony, the canons regular of secularism, and the Franciscans and Dominicans of vagrancy and hypocrisy. In addition, he called the bishops money-lovers, and made such statements about the Roman Curia that they were reported to have been unmentionable.⁴⁰ When a brigade of *Pastoreaux* arrived at Rouen, they received considerable support from the population to wage war against the clergy. Combined forces of *Pastoreaux* and townsfolk drove Archbishop Eudes Rigaud from out of the great Rouen cathedral during a Pentecost service. Attacks on church property continued for several days, and it was only after the *Pastoreaux* had left Rouen that the Archbishop was able to indicate that calm had been restored.⁴¹

In the face of such conduct, Queen Blanche's attitude toward the *Pastoreaux* appears startling. Whether members of the *Pastoreaux* adhered to specific heretical points of doctrine is impossible to say, and it is not likely.⁴² Yet their outward bearing was certainly and obviously hostile to the Church. Nonetheless, when the *Pastoreaux* arrived at Paris, Blanche welcomed them. She summoned their leader Jacob into her presence, and, like others before her, was very impressed with his appearance. Blanche treated Jacob with honor, offering him gifts, and left him to do what he wished.⁴³ As a result of this license, the *Pastoreaux* ran riot. Jacob, wearing a bishop's mitre, preached in the Church of St. Eustache and blessed crowds with his own holy water throughout Paris. A mob of *Pastoreaux* broke into another church during a service and robbed a priest of his habit, crowning him in mockery with a wreath of roses. Several clerics who opposed the outrages were killed, and others were thrown into the Seine. The *Pastoreaux* finally made a

XXIII, 214; Thomas of Chantimpré, *Bonum universale de apibus* (Douai, 1627), p. 140.

⁴⁰ Matthew Paris, 249.

⁴¹ For the *Pastoreaux* at Rouen, *Annales de Burton*, 291; *Chron. S. Laudi Rotomag.*, 396; *Chronicon Rotomagense*, HF, XXIII, 339; *Chronicon S. Catharinae de Monte Rotomagi*, HF, XXIII, 401-402; Eudes Rigaud, *Visitationes*, HF, XXI, 575.

⁴² Cf. Martin Erbstößer and Ernst Werner, *Ideologische Probleme des mittelalterlichen Plebejertums. Die freigeistige Häresie und ihre sozialen Wurzeln* (Berlin, 1960), pp. 80-81.

⁴³ Matthew Paris, 248; Primat, 9; Nangis, 435; *Chroniques de Saint-Denis*, 115; "La royne le fist mout honorer et li donna granz dons."

concerted attempt to attack the University, but fortunately for the scholars (among whom might have been Saint Thomas Aquinas), the *Petit Pont* leading to the Latin Quarter was blocked off in time to forestall the invasion.⁴⁴ Despite this display of violence, the *Pastoreaux* were permitted to leave Paris without harm, for Blanche "held to be good" all that they had done.⁴⁵

After the *Pastoreaux* had carried their violence to extreme limits in Orléans and Bourges, Blanche reversed her original decision and ordered them to be destroyed.⁴⁶ But her conduct at Paris was notable and is worthy of consideration. The regent's action in the affair of the *Pastoreaux* was by no means typical. Blanche had put down more threatening uprisings in her experienced career, and she was not the sort of woman to yield before an unruly host of vagabonds.⁴⁷ Her reception of the *Pastoreaux*, then, must have had some purpose. The explanation of her action lies most probably in the configuration of political circumstances. The disappointment of Louis' defeat in the Orient had been a great blow to Blanche, and she was further embittered by the attitude of Pope Innocent toward Louis' crusade.⁴⁸ This fact is underlined by her proceedings against the French knights who took the cross against the Emperor Conrad. Blanche ordered the lands of all those who left France to fight the Emperor to be confiscated, and, according to Matthew Paris, she remarked trenchantly that "those who fight for the Pope should be supported from the Pope's possessions, and let them go and never return . . ." ⁴⁹ Blanche's bitterness undoubtedly conditioned her reception of the *Pastoreaux*. Perhaps she felt that in Louis' straightened circumstances any reinforce-

⁴⁴ For the *Pastoreaux* at Paris, *Annales Hamburgensis*, MGHS, XVI, 383; *Chron. universalis Mettensis*, 522; Nangis, 208; *Chroniques de Saint-Denis*, 115-116; *Annales de Burton*, 291; *Annales de Oseneia*, ed. H. R. Luard, *Annales monastici*, Rolls Series 36 (London, 1864-69), IV, 100.

⁴⁵ *Chroniques de Saint-Denis*, 116: ". . . il avoit la royne si enchantée et toute sa gent, qu'elle tenoit mout bien à fait quanqu'il feroient."

⁴⁶ Matthew Paris, 251; Letter of Adam Marsh, ed. J. S. Brewer, *Monumenta Franciscana*, Rolls Series 4 (London, 1858), I, 109.

⁴⁷ Elie Berger, *Histoire de Blanche de Castille* (Paris, 1895), p. 401.

⁴⁸ *Throop*, *op. cit.*, p. 404: "There is no doubt . . . that Blanche of Castille shared the resentment of the lower classes for the Papacy's apparent neglect of her son."

⁴⁹ Matthew Paris, 260-261.

ments, whether they be so disorganized as the *Pastoreaux*, would be of assistance in the Holy Land. More likely is the theory that in her embittered state of mind Blanche was clearly not averse to condoning a movement that was hostile to the hierarchy.

This recital of incidents has not been meant to indicate that the Capetian monarchs of the thirteenth century were impious. Far to the contrary, most of them would have considered themselves to have been good Christians. But the policy of tolerating anti-clerical or heretical movements when it coincided with royal needs was a new development. In my opinion it is another aspect of "The Laicization of French and English Society in the Thirteenth Century," described by Joseph R. Strayer in a now famous article,⁵⁰ and the concept of *La naissance de l'esprit laïque*, expounded by Georges de Lagarde.⁵¹ Although the thirteenth century has been considered to have been a golden age of authoritative faith, it was also, as Paul Sabatier noted a long time ago, a golden age of heresy.⁵² This heresy was by nature consistently anti-papal, and therefore it frequently coincided with the policy of the French kings. For, with the overcoming of imperial might, the thirteenth century also saw a new polarization of power between the Popes and the Capetians. Most frequently these two powers managed to work together, but there was always an undercurrent of distrust. History does not usually progress by leaps and the policy of Philip the Fair did not spring suddenly out of the heads of a few shyster lawyers. The occasional toleration of anti-hierarchical elements by the French monarchy prefigured not only the policy of Philip the Fair, but also the development of a new order opposed to the universal pretensions of the Church and supporting the exercise of national authority.

Western Reserve University

⁵⁰ *Speculum*, XV (1940), 76-86.

⁵¹ (Louvain and Paris, 1957-63).

⁵² *Vie de S. François d'Assise*, ed. définitive (3rd ed.) (Paris, 1931), xiii.