With best wishes,
Joseph R. Strayer
X 233-32

A CHAPTER REPRINTED FROM

Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe

EDITED BY THEODORE K. RABB AND JERROLD E. SEIGEL

CONTRIBUTORS

Joseph R. Strayer
J. Russell Major
Lacey Baldwin Smith
J. Wilson Ferguson
J. H. Hexter
Felix Gilbert
Maurice Lee, Jr.
A. J. Carlson
Paul J. Hauben
Theodore K. Rabb
Lynn White, Jr.
Gene A. Brucker
Jerrold E. Seigel
Richard M. Douglas
Myron P. Gilmore
George Huntston Williams
E. William Monter
Davis Bitton
Roland Mushat Frye
Wilbur Samuel Howell

Princeton University Press
Princeton, New Jersey

FRANCE: THE HOLY LAND, THE CHOSEN PEOPLE, AND THE MOST CHRISTIAN KING

JOSEPH R. STRAYER

TWO turning points are obvious in the development of the modern state in Western Europe. The first was a shift in loyalties. As long as loyalties (and obedience) were hopelessly divided between ecclesiastical and secular authorities, and as long as the fraction of loyalty which went to secular authority was still further divided among local lords, provincial rulers, and kings, it was hard to frame a concept of the state and almost impossible to make the concept a reality. Only when primary (though not exclusive) loyalty went to one secular authority could the state come into existence.

The other turning point was closely related to the first. A state must have a certain permanence, and it must have this permanence in geography as well as in time. A state must have authority not only over such people as choose to give loyalty to its head but over all people who live within certain boundaries. Early kings were kings of peoples, not of regions. A king of the Goths was king of the Goths whether they were settled on the shores of the Baltic, the Black Sea, or the Bay of Biscay. A king of the Franks was king of the Franks whether he ruled east or west of the Rhine. Kingship was like kinship, primarily personal and only incidentally territorial. A kingdom was composed of people who recognized a certain royal family as *their* royal family, just as a kin-group was composed of people who recognized the founders of a certain family as their common ancestors.

A state could not be based on such uncertain foundations. In the thirteenth century there were, in the heart of what we would now call France, men who denied that they belonged to the kingdom of France or that they owed any service to its ruler.[1] The king and his agents,

[1] See, e.g., the part of the record of the great lawsuit over royal and episcopal rights in Gévaudan, published by the Société d'Agriculture, Sciences, et Arts de la Lozère under the title *Mémoire relatif au paréage de 1307*, ed. A. Maisonobe (Mende, 1896). The bishop of Mende asserted his independence throughout the process: e.g., p. 522, "non erat memoria mortalium quod aliquis Gaballitani Episcopus recognovisset se regis Francie fidelem vel subditum aut episcopatum de regno Francie esse." The nobles of Gévaudan went even further and said that the bishop was "rex in Gaballitano" (Archives Départementales, Lozère, G872, foll. 38^{v}-40).

quite rightly, viewed these assertions as a threat to their new concepts of government. They insisted that the kingdom was a geographical unit and that within certain boundaries the king had final authority.[2] The concept of the kingdom as a territorial entity was essential in solving the problem of divided loyalties.

Brute power and administrative skill were necessary factors in establishing both loyalty to a single authority and acceptance of the idea that the single authority controlled all men and all lands within fixed limits. There was no point in being loyal to local lords who could be crushed by a stronger ruler. There was more reason to accept the assertion of central authority in regions where it had never existed if accepting central authority meant increased security and better government. But, although power and administrative skill were necessary factors, they were not sufficient by themselves. A state based on power alone has a poor chance for survival. A state built on improved administrative techniques is not apt to gain undying popularity. People soon take the benefits of the new techniques for granted and regret the cost, both in money and in the loss of local privileges. They find that the new techniques may only create new problems—long and expensive foreign wars instead of short, cheap, local wars, financial extortion by bureaucrats instead of by barons. The best administration creates only a tepid loyalty, and very few administrations remained at their best during the Middle Ages.

In short, real loyalty is based neither on fear nor on self-interest. There has to be genuine respect, admiration, and, if possible, love for the object of loyalty. This sort of attitude is not always easy to achieve, and, unfortunately, in Western Europe the state emerged at a time when it was difficult to have respect and admiration for any man or any institution. In some regions the problem was never really solved—hence, the chaotic condition of parts of Germany and Italy after 1300. In France the problem was solved, not completely, but well enough so

[2] One of the strongest statements appears in the Gévaudan case, p. 521. Since the bishop is "intra fines regni, erat imperio predicti domini regis subjectus." The king can take any property within the realm for the common welfare, "cum omnia que sunt intra fines regni sui sint domini regis. . . ." The king is "imperator in regno suo et imperare possit terre et mari, et omnes populi regni sui ejus regantur imperio. . . ." The bishop's lawyers answered this last assertion very much in the fashion of Hotspur: "Porro utrum dominus rex sit imperator in regno suo vel non, et utrum possit imperare terre et mari et elementis et si obtemperarent ipsa elementa si eisdem imperaret, responsio advocato regio relinquatur . . ." (p. 532).

that the French state could survive the disasters of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

One peculiar aspect of the problem in France was that the transfer of loyalty to the king and the definition of the kingdom as a territorial unit took place almost simultaneously, culminating in the reign of Philip the Fair. England had had clearly defined boundaries for generations, and it was equally clear, at least by the end of the twelfth century, that all authority within those boundaries came directly or indirectly from the king. But the thirteenth century Capetians had to invent the France which they claimed to rule. They had to make men proud of the country as well as loyal to the king; they had to expand the idea of France to make it match the expansion of their own power.[3]

Some excellent things have been said about the "religion of monarchy" in France, often by Germans who have looked on the early growth of French nationalism with some envy.[4] These works touch on the concomitant theme of France as a favored land filled with superior people, but they do not give it quite the importance it should have. A religion without followers would be an idle dream; a most Christian king ruling over the heathen or infidel might become a martyred saint but scarcely a power in European politics. It was the union of the two ideas of the sacred king and the holy country which speeded the emergence of the French state at the end of the thirteenth century.

It is scarcely necessary to mention the development of the beliefs which made the king a sacred ruler: the coronation oil brought down from heaven, the healing of the scrofulous, the possession of the relics of Charlemagne, the Crusade tradition. All this has been discussed with great learning by Bloch and by Schramm. Only one point needs to be stressed: the holiness of the king reflects credit on his kingdom. As Guillaume le Breton puts it, "because our king is more worthy

[3] This paragraph was written before the appearance of the stimulating article by Charles T. Wood, "*Regnum Francie*, a Problem in Capetian Administrative Usage," *Traditio*, XXIII (1967), 117-147.

[4] P. E. Schramm, *Der König von Frankreich* (Weimar, 1939); Helene Wieruszowski, *Vom Imperium zum nationalen Königtum* (Munich/Berlin, 1933); K. Wenck, *Philipp der Schöne von Frankreich* (Marburg, 1905); H. Finke, *Weltimperialismus und nationale Regungen im späteren Mittelalter* (Freiburg/Leipzig, 1916); F. Kern, *Die Anfänge der französischen Ausdehnungspolitik* (Tübingen, 1910); H. Kämpf, *Pierre Dubois und die geistigen Grundlagen des französischen Nationalbewusstseins um 1300* (Leipzig/Berlin, 1935). The basic book in French is Marc Bloch, *Les rois thaumaturges* (Strasbourg, 1924).

than any other king, the greater excellence of our kingdom is made clear."[5] Another closely associated idea is that the holy and pious king reigns over an especially devout kingdom. For example, the protest on behalf of the king to the Pope in 1245 calls Louis IX a "most Christian prince" and then goes on to speak of the "kingdom of the Franks, where men are accustomed to be most devout."[6] Primat expressed the same idea a generation later when he said that the faith was held more fervently in France than in any other land.[7] He added that one reason for this devoutness was that "la fonteine de clergie" flourished at Paris and that chivalry and scholarship worked together for good.[8] Guillaume de Nangis tied all these ideas together when he used the fleur de lis, a symbol of royal holiness, as a symbol of the preeminence of France. In his interpretation the three petals of the flower represent faith, learning, and military power; France is illustrious for all three, and these virtues flourish more abundantly in France than in other kingdoms.[9]

It is clear that by the middle of the thirteenth century the ideas of the unique position of the French king[10] and the special devotion of his kingdom to the true faith were generally accepted. Neither had yet been fully tested in the work of building a state, however. Louis IX, in extending his authority, relied more on his own reputation for decency, justice, and determination than on theories of sacred kingship. There were several vigorous arguments between him and the Church, but none of these controversies went so far that a man had to choose between loyalty to the king and loyalty to the Pope. He went

[5] ". . . quo major nostri patet excellentia regni dignior ut vere rex noster rege sit omni" (*Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton*, ed. H. F. Delaborde [Paris, 1885] II, 21, lines 345-346).

[6] ". . . regnum Francorum, ubi solebant homines esse devotissimi" (Mathew Paris, *Chronica majora*, Rolls Series [London, 1882] VI, 99, 100).

[7] *Les grandes chroniques de France*, ed. J. Viard (Paris, 1920-) I, 5 ("la foi . . . fust plus fervement et plus droitment tenue que en nule autre terre . . .").

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

[9] *Recueil des historiens des Gaulles et de la France* (Paris, 1738-), XX, 320 ("Jesus Christus voluit tribus predictis gratiis, scilicet fide, sapientia, et militia specialius quam cetera regna regnum Francie sua gratia illustrare. . . . Quasi dicerunt toti mundo: fides, sapientia et militie titulus abundantius quam regnis ceteris sunt regno nostro. . . .").

[10] Even the Englishman Mathew Paris admits this uniqueness, *Chronica Majora*, V, 480: "rex Francorum qui terrestrium rex regum est, tam propter eius coelestum iniunctionem, tum propter sui potestatem et militie eminentiam"; and, 606, "rex Francorum regum censetur dignissimus."

further in forcing a choice between loyalties in secular affairs; in many parts of the realm it was made clear that loyalty to the king took precedence over loyalty to a great lord. This obligation, however, was stressed especially in the region of fully developed feudalism. In parts of the South, and especially in the ecclesiastical lordships, men could doubt for another generation whether they were bound to the king in any way.

Louis also made a start—but only a start—in defining the territorial limits of his kingdom. The treaty with England made it clear that Aquitaine was part of the kingdom, and the treaty with Aragon cancelled French claims to Roussillon and Catalonia in return for Aragonese renunciation of suzerainty over parts of Languedoc. But very little was done to define the long eastern frontier with the Empire, and the status of southern prelates, such as the bishops of Mende and Viviers, was left in doubt. Even in the settlements which were reached with England and Aragon, Louis thought more in terms of feudal and family relationships than in terms of fixing the boundaries of a sovereign state.

In short, although Louis did a great deal to strengthen loyalty to the monarchy and made some attempt to define the boundaries of his kingdom, he never pushed either process to its ultimate limits. No emergency which required such an effort arose in his reign, and Louis by character and training preferred compromise to sweeping assertions of royal authority. Louis's successor, Philip the Bold, did little more than his father. By asserting his right to the lands of Alfonse of Poitiers, Philip strengthened his position in the South, especially in forcing the Count of Foix to recognize royal suzerainty. But this was only a partial success; the Count of Foix in the next reign tried once more to gain a wide measure of autonomy, and in the campaign which led to the surrender of the Castle of Foix the southern bishops denied that they owed military service to the king.[11]

Philip the Fair was in a very different position. For the first time in almost a century the king of France had to wage a long, dangerous, and expensive war. For the first time in two centuries a French king found himself involved in a bitter controversy with the Pope. The test could no longer be avoided. Philip had to demand men and money from all parts of his kingdom. He had to assert that all people living within certain boundaries were "in regno et de regno" (in the kingdom

[11] *Histoire Générale de Languedoc*, Privat edition (Toulouse, 1872-1904), X, *preuves*, cols. 111-115.

and part of the kingdom) and, hence, were required to aid in the defense of the kingdom. He had to insist that loyalty to king and kingdom took precedence over all other loyalties, including loyalty to the Pope and to the Church.

Philip did not, of course, succeed completely in making these claims effective. He had to compromise in many cases. He received less money than he wanted, and he had to leave more power in the hands of some bishops and barons than he would have liked. The amazing thing is that he succeeded as well as he did and that his success did not require, to any significant degree, the use of force. Every part of what he considered to be the kingdom of France contributed men and money to his campaigns. Every part of the kingdom supported him in his controversy with Boniface VIII. There was, naturally, opposition to his policies, but the opposition usually took the form of legal protests and could be handled by political manipulation or decisions of the royal courts. Only at the very end of the reign, when both king and people were weary after years of crisis, were there serious rebellions. The concessions made by Philip and by his successor show how little inclination the government had to use force to put down internal opposition. The relative moderation of the demands of the rebels shows how successful Philip had been in gaining acceptance for his basic doctrines. The baronial leaders admitted that defense of the kingdom took primacy over all other loyalties and privileges. Their chief goal was to limit the consequences of this principle.

If Philip did not rely on force, then he must have relied on persuasion and propaganda. This fact has long been realized, and I do not propose to repeat the analysis of documents which are already well known. I do want to stress two points: first, that the propaganda was effective in all parts of the realm and, second, that it glorified the kingdom fully as much as it did the king. The basic theme ran something like this: the kings of France have always been pillars and defenders of the faith; the people of France are devout and pious; the kingdom of France is so specially favored by God that it is the most important part of the Church. (As one recent German writer put it, "God couldn't get along without France.")[12] Therefore, any attack on the rights of the king or the independence and integrity of his kingdom is an attack on the faith. Conversely, any steps taken by the king

[12] Friedrich Sieburg, *Gott in Frankreich* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1932), p. 56. See also the excellent discussion of this topic in Wieruszowski, *Vom Imperium zum nationalen Königtum*, pp. 146-150.

to defend and strengthen his kingdom are for the good of the faith and the benefit of Christendom.

The first of these propositions needs little discussion, but a few special points may be made. Although Valois was quite right in saying that the title "rex Christianissimus" was not a monopoly of French kings at this time[13] and that it was seldom used by the popes of the late thirteenth century,[14] it should be noted that the phrase appeared in almost every type of royal propaganda. It is not surprising that Nogaret and Dubois spoke constantly of the most Christian king of France,[15] but so did the prelates of France writing to Boniface VIII in 1302[16] and the masters of theology of Paris discussing the arrest of the Templars.[17] Moreover, writers who had no special reason to call the king "most Christian" did so as if it were common form: for example, the provincial Council of Sens in 1292[18] and a rather pro-papal crusade propagandist.[19] Counting references proves nothing, but I have a strong impression that Philip was called "rex Christianissimus" more often than his father and grandfather had been and that this was not a purely accidental occurrence.

As for the other phrases describing the king's piety, his zeal for the faith, his responsibilities as "champion of the faith and defender of the Church,"[20] they are too numerous and too well known to list. We

[13] Noel Valois, "Le roi très chrétien," in Baudrillart, *La France Chrétienne dans l'Histoire* (Paris, 1896), pp. 319-320.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 322.

[15] P. Dupuy, *Histoire du differend d'entre le pape Boniface VIII et Philippe le Bel* (Paris, 1655), pp. 45, 242, 326, 358; Pierre Dubois, *Summaria brevis*, ed. Hellmut Kämpf (Leipzig, 1936) p. 26; Pierre Dubois, *De recuperatione terre sancte*, ed. Ch. V. Langlois (Paris, 1891), p. 100; Robert Holtzmann, *Wilhelm von Nogaret* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1898), pp. 257, 275.

[16] Dupuy, p. 67.

[17] G. Lizerand, *Le dossier de l'affaire des templiers* (Paris, 1923), p. 62.

[18] Georges Digard, *Philippe le Bel et le Saint-Siège* (Paris, 1936), p. 281.

[19] Wenck, *Philipp der Schöne*, p. 18. It might be added that the popes occasionally used the phrase; e.g., Nicolas IV in 1289, asking Philip to ease pressure on the Church of Lyon, spoke of him as a "princeps Christianissimus" and told him that through honoring the Church "locum magnum obtines inter ceteros catholicos principes orbis terre" (P. Bonnassieux, *De la réunion de Lyon à la France* [Lyon, 1875], p. 45). In the bull *Ausculta fili*, Boniface VIII managed to use the term as a rebuke in comparing Philip to "progenitores tui, Christianissimi principes" (Dupuy, *Histoire du differend*, p. 52).

[20] Dupuy, p. 102. See also pp. 297, 517, and Lizerand, *Le dossier*, p. 127. A variant of this idea is that the royal house of France was always "veritatis directrix ac ecclesie auxiliatrix" (see Dupuy, pp. 124, 297).

might note, however, the remarkable sermons of the Dominican Guillaume de Sauqueville,[21] in which he says that the "heir of France" is, like Christ, "the son of David"[22] and that "Christ, the king of the Franks [the free or the French: the word has both meanings in the text], used and uses in His two comings two banners," the fleur de lis and the war banner which is "entirely blood colored." "The sign of the first coming of Christ was the lily of virginity . . . but at His second coming, to war on sinners, he will carry the blood-red banner." So the first banner signifies the mercy of the king, but the second marks his wrath.[23] If the king of France is a type of Christ and if, as Guillaume implies, the kingdom of France is a type of the heavenly kingdom,[24] then resistance to the king and attacks on the kingdom are obviously sinful.

One immediate deduction from this doctrine would be the right of the king to require money for defense of the realm. This argument was, in fact, especially effective with the clergy. In 1294 Cluny made a grant to the king as "the leader . . . of the cause of God and the Church and the fighter for all of Christendom."[25] About the same time the bishops of Brittany, the prelates of the province of Lyon, and the order of Prémontré all praised the faith and orthodoxy of the French kings in making their grants.[26] Philip gave the idea a somewhat dif-

[21] N. Valois, in *Histoire littéraire*, XXXIV, 298ff., gave a general account of Guillaume's life and work but said nothing about the sermons praising the king. H. Kämpf, *Pierre Dubois*, printed the sermon "Osanna filio David" on pp. 112-114. The most thorough study was made by Hildegard Coester in a typewritten thesis (Frankfurt, 1935/36) entitled "Der Königskult in Frankreich um 1300 im Spiegel von Dominikanerpredigten." The late Professor Kantorowicz, who directed the thesis, was kind enough to let me use his copy. Unfortunately, this copy could not be found among his papers after his death. I therefore quote directly from the manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale, but it was Miss Coester's work which called this manuscript to my attention.

[22] Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. lat. 16495, fol. 97.

[23] *Ibid.*, fol. 101 ("Modo rex Francorum Christus in duplo adventu suo usus est et utetur duplici vexillo. . . . Signum enim adventus sui primi fuit flos vel lilium virginitatis . . . set vexillum adventus secundi, quando veniet contra adversarios ac peccatores debellandum erit totum coloris sanguinei. . . . Primum vexillum non indicabit furorem sed pacem et mansuetudinem regis. . . . Sed secundum vexillum sanguineum ab eo indicabit furorem regium . . .").

[24] *Ibid.*, foll. 97v, 101. See the discussion of these texts below, pp. 14-15.

[25] ". . . prosecutor . . . cause Dei et ecclesie, et totius Christianitatis athleta" (Archives Nationales [henceforth cited as A.N.], J259, no. 3; printed in part in Bruel, *Chartes de Cluny*, VI).

[26] A.N., J1035, nos. 36, 37, 39.

ferent turn—and incidentally showed the close connection between the holiness of the king and the sanctity of the kingdom—when he asked the clergy of Tours for a double tenth in 1305. He told them that they owed "spiritual and temporal aid to preserve, defend and guard the unity of this realm . . . a venerable part of the Holy Church of God." He went on to say that they should not value their goods above the welfare of the people—"since it is for this welfare that Jesus Christ . . . exposed himself to death"—and that failure to pay would be to violate a "sacred ministry."[27]

Almost equal emphasis was placed on the piety and orthodoxy of the French people, a proposition which may seem a little strange, considering the vast number of heretics in France in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Yet, as far as I can find, the claim was never seriously challenged; perhaps the zeal of the royal family covered the sins of the people. Nogaret spoke of the Gallican nation, a nation "well known to be most Christian,"[28] and the so-called *Remonstrances du peuple de France* claimed that "la pueble du royaume de France . . . ha esté et sera par la grace de Dieu devost et obeissant a seinte Yglise plus que nul autre."[29] Dubois praised the right reason, constancy, and firmness of the French, in which they excelled all other nations,[30] and, as we shall see, Clement V called the French a chosen people.[31]

Both the merits of its kings and the devoutness of its people made France a holy land, and much of the praise of the kingdom was actually praise of either the rulers or their subjects. Philip himself said in 1308 that the kingdom was blessed by the firmness of its belief in Christ,[32] and he repeated the idea in a letter of 1312 to Henry VII: "Jesus Christ, the Most High, finds in this realm, more than in any other part of the world, a sure foundation for the holy faith and the Christian religion and the deepest devotion to Himself and His vicars and ministers, since He has noticed that He is loved, feared and honored in this country above all others."[33] Dubois, also, spoke of the

[27] ". . . auxilium spiritualiter et temporaliter ad conservationem, deffensionem, et custodiam unitatis ipsius regni . . . pars venerabilis ecclesie sancte Dei"; "hec enim est salus pro quam Jesus Christus . . . morti se ipsum exposuit" (A.N., J350, no. 5).

[28] Dupuy, *Histoire du differend*, p. 335.

[29] Lizerand, *Le dossier*, p. 84.

[30] Dubois, *Summaria brevis*, pp. 12, 21.

[31] See below, p. 15.

[32] G. Picot, *Documents relatifs aux Etats-Généraux* (Paris, 1901), p. 487.

[33] "Altissimus Jhesus Christus in regno ipso pre ceteris partibus mundi sancti

habitual devotion of the kingdom of the French, greater than that of other kingdoms,"[34] and an appeal to the king to carry on the case against Boniface VIII condemned attacks on the honor and liberty of "the most Christian . . . king of France and his most devout and most Christian kingdom."[35]

An effective variant on this theme was the idea that the kingdom was an essential or even principal part of the Church and that, therefore, to injure France was to weaken the Church. Very early in the reign, while Philip was still on reasonably good terms with the Papacy, he said that to lessen his "status" would hurt the French and perhaps the universal Church.[36] Again and again during the struggle with Boniface, Nogaret spoke of France as "a venerable part" of the Church, as "the chief and most noble member of the Church," or even as the "principal pillar supporting the Roman Church and the Catholic faith."[37] Thus, Nogaret could argue that in defending his fatherland, as he was bound to do,[38] he was actually working for the salvation of the Church.[39]

Even more, the kingdom had been blessed by God with wisdom and justice as well as piety. It was therefore flourishing, prosperous, and deservedly preeminent in the world. Dubois's remarks on this subject

---

fidei et religionis christiane stabile fundamentum reperiens sibique et eius vicariis et ministris summam devocionem considerans sicut se in eo pre ceteris amari, timori, et honorari conspexit" (Wenck, *Philipp der Schöne*, p. 72; from *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum*, IV, no. 811).

[34] Dubois, *Summaria brevis*, p. 26, "solita devocio regni Francorum pre ceteris regnis."

[35] Holtzmann, *Wilhelm von Nogaret*, p. 257. Boniface himself in *Etsi de statu* spoke of the "Christianissimi regni Francie."

[36] Digard, *Philippe le Bel et le Saint-Siège*, II, 250 (about Sept., 1289).

[37] Dupuy, *Histoire du differend*, pp. 241, 309, 325; Holtzmann, *Wilhelm von Nogaret*, p. 275. See esp. Dupuy, p. 241; France is a "venerabilem partem ecclesie sancte Dei, ac principalem columnam sustentionis ecclesie Romane, doctrine sacre pagine et fidei Catholice splendore lucens. . . ."

[38] Dupuy, p. 309, "quisque teneatur patriam suam defendere," see also pp. 310, 312.

[39] Dupuy, p. 250; Nogaret says he acted with righteous zeal to defend the faith, the Church, and the kingdom "agonizando pro iustitia, pro Romana Ecclesia, pro Republica . . . ac pro sua patria . . . ac pro suo domino Rege Francie. . . ." See also Holtzmann, *Wilhelm von Nogaret*, p. 268. There is an excellent discussion of this material in E. H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies* (Princeton, 1957), pp. 249-259.

are well known[40] but have often been dismissed as the exaggerations of an obscure pamphleteer who was seeking to attract attention.[41] But, as we have seen, some of this glorification of France dates back to a period long before Dubois wrote,[42] and some of the most fervent praise of France comes from a letter written by Philip at a time (ca. 1289-1290) when neither Dubois, Nogaret, or any of the other extremists could have influenced him. Philip said that all Christians agreed that no other kingdom abounded in "such peace, such regard for justice, such prosperity, such happiness."[43] He went on to claim that even Jews and Saracens admitted that France was more prosperous than any other kingdom in the world, a prosperity based on "a highly developed regard for justice, from which in turn, by the grace of God, has come the fullness of our peace."[44]

It is not surprising that Nogaret spoke of France as a kingdom "which God established to endure forever," strong in arms and firm in faith. But in the same place he refers to an old theme, that the kingdom has the singular privilege "that there the source of wisdom and knowledge shines and flourishes among the learned";[45] this kingdom, blessed by God, surpasses all other kingdoms in faith, justice, respect for the freedom of the Church, and other virtues. Strongest of all is

[40] Dubois, *Summaria brevis*, pp. 11, 12, 21, and *De recuperatione*, pp. 128, 129, 139.

[41] There is some danger that, after being overrated, Dubois is now being underrated. He is important, not because he influenced policy, but because he represented the views of the hundreds of officials who worked for the king throughout France. The *Summaria brevis*, especially, is not a patriotic tract; it is a lawyer's brief suggesting ways of curbing the power of ecclesiastical courts. I have studied the careers of several hundred lawyers who worked for the king in this period; most of them, and especially the procurators (the position Dubois held) would have agreed with Dubois's main line of argument. See n. 43.

[42] See above, and also Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, pp. 237-238.

[43] Digard, *Philippe le Bel et le Saint-Siège*, II, 269. Note that this document is an emphatic statement of the supremacy of royal justice over the claims of the Church of Chartres to exemption. Cf. p. 249: "nullum et nullius judicis territorium . . . infra fines regni nostri exemptum a nostra jurisdictione recognoscimus . . . nec recognoscere proponimus in futurum." In other words, praise of France as a land of piety, peace, and plenty is used to justify sweeping assertions of royal power, especially in the field of justice. This is Dubois's formula long before Dubois wrote; the idea came to him from higher authority, and by the time he composed his pamphlet it was already a commonplace in the royal court.

[44] ". . . ex matura observacione justicie ex qua observacione Deo summe grata provenit habundantia nostre pacis" (*ibid.*, p. 274).

[45] Dupuy, *Histoire du differend*, p. 326. See above, p. 6.

the assertion that "God . . . chose it as his own, special kingdom,"[46] or, in another document, that "the kingdom of France was chosen by the Lord and blessed above all other kingdoms of the world."[47] This claim is echoed, a little more modestly, in 1312 in the letter Philip sent to Henry VII (which Nogaret might well have helped compose). Because France is firm in the faith, and loves and honors Jesus Christ, "He determined that it should be honored above all other kingdoms and principalities by a certain unique and distinctive eminence."[48]

Guillaume de Sauqueville was a much less lucid writer than Nogaret, perhaps because some of his comparisons would have seemed too bold if he had stated them explicitly. But the way in which he plays with the word France is striking. First France comes from "freedom . . . because the heirs of France are not subject to the Empire." The Empire is evil (in a bad pun he derives "empire" from "en pire"), and to be free of the Empire is to be free of sin. When St. Nicholas freed himself from worldliness by fasting, he was "part of the kingdom, not of the Empire." Spiritually, "no kingdom is Frank or free except the kingdom of heaven," or, as he put it later, "properly speaking no kingdom should be called the Frank [French] kingdom except the kingdom of Christ."[49] This remark is followed by the passage in which Christ is said to use the fleur de lis and the oriflamme as his banners. Now, Guillaume certainly does not say that the kingdom of France *is* the heavenly kingdom; but he does imply that there is some resemblance between them, and those who heard (rather than read) his sermons might have been a little confused about how close the resemblance was. Even if Guillaume were only making a series of learned puns, they were puns which could have been made only about France. And since the first pun ("France comes from freedom because France is free of the Empire") would have seemed true and sensible

[46] "Deus . . . tanquam sibi peculiare regnum illud eleget" (Dupuy, p. 384).

[47] ". . . regnum Francie a domine electum et benedictum pre ceteris regnis mundi" (Lizerand, *Le dossier*, p. 116).

[48] ". . . sic ipsum pre ceteris regnis et principatibus singulari quadam eminencio prerogativa disposuit honorari" (Wenck, *Philipp der Schöne*, p. 72, from *M.G.H., Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum*, IV, no. 811).

[49] ". . . franchyse . . . quia heredes Francie non subiciuntur imperio"; "nullum regnum est Francie seu liberum nisi regnum celorum"; "proprie loquendo nullum regnum debet vocari regnum Francie nisi solum regnum Christi" (Bibliothèque Nationale, MS lat., foll. 97, 97^{v}, 101). See Kämpf, *Pierre Dubois*, pp. 112-113, and Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, pp. 238, 255.

to most Frenchmen, the last pun ("the Frank or free kingdom is the kingdom of heaven") may have seemed equally true.

It may appear that men like Nogaret, Dubois, and Guillaume de Sauqueville took such extreme positions that their assertions have little importance. But these were not lonely zealots working for hopeless causes like Ramon Lull (who, incidentally, agreed with the French propagandists on the virtues of Philip the Fair).[50] They were all responsible men, even if their degree of responsibility varied from that of a minister of state to that of a court preacher to that of a provincial procurator. The really surprising thing is how well such different men agreed and how clearly they were reflecting the common opinion of many Frenchmen. Clement V may have been weak, but he was not foolish, and, when he was trying to end the wretched business of the accusations against Boniface VIII, he found it expedient to use most of the ideas, and even the phrases, which we have been discussing. The bull *rex glorie* gave papal sanction to the concept of the holy kingdom and the chosen people: "The King of Glory formed different kingdoms within the circuit of this world and established governments for diverse peoples according to differences of language and race. Among those, like the people of Israel . . . , the kingdom of France, as a peculiar people chosen by the Lord to carry out the orders of Heaven, is distinguished by marks of special honor and grace."[51]

After this endorsement little more needed to be done. The publicists of the reign of Charles V repeated, and perhaps sharpened, the old themes, but they added nothing new. Within another generation a peasant girl from the very fringes of the kingdom believed as firmly

[50] Wenck, *Philipp der Schöne*, pp. 11-12, quoting Lull's *Liber natalis*: "Philippus rex Francie in quo, pre ceteris mundis rectoribus, singulariter pollent hodie justitia, veritas, fides, charitas, recta spes . . . humilitas et devotio et christiana religio . . . cum ipse sit pugil ecclesie et defensor fidei christiane . . . ."

[51] "Rex glorie . . . in huius orbis orbita diversa regna constituit, diversorum populorum regimina secundum divisiones linguarum et gentium stabilivit, inter quos sicut israeliticus populus . . . sic regnum Francie in peculiarem populum electus a Domino in executione mandatorum celestium specialis honoris et gratie titulis insignitur" (*Registrum Clementis Papae V* [Rome, 1885-1892], no. 7501). Gregory IX had said almost as much in 1239: "Dei filius . . . diversa regna constituit, inter quae, sicut tribus Juda inter filios patriarchae ad specialis benedictionis dona suscipitur, sic regnum Franciae prae caeteris terrarum populis praerogativa honoris et gratiae insignitur." L. Gautier quoted this letter in *La chevalerie* (Paris, 1895), pp. 64-65, n. 2. I could not find it in the Register of Gregory IX.

in the sacred king and his holy kingdom as she did in God and the saints.[52] Like her better educated predecessors, she was sure that God needed France.

This was the great good fortune of the French kings and their people. In the difficult task of rearranging basic loyalties to concentrate them on king and kingdom, they could avoid, to a very large degree, any feeling of contradiction between their duties to the Church and their duties to the state. The most Christian king ruled a chosen people who lived in a kingdom which was the principal support and eternal defender of the faith. Loyalty to France was bound to be loyalty to the Church, even if the Church occasionally doubted it. As Kantorowicz has shown, all governments of the period were trying to develop a "political theology" which transferred religious symbols and slogans to the political sphere. It was easier for the French to do this than for any other government because the transfer started early and was largely completed by the end of the thirteenth century.

For the same reason, the French, earlier than any other continental kingdom, solved the problem of the "mosaic" state—that is, a state put together out of provinces which had strongly autonomous cultural, legal, and institutional traditions. These local loyalties could not be eradicated, but they could be subordinated to a higher loyalty to king and kingdom. No local lord, however ancient his lineage, could be compared to the king, heir of Charlemagne, anointed by heaven, worker of miracles. The king could be accepted as a symbol of unity because, as Guillaume de Sauqueville pointed out, he was a type of Christ. And the unity which he symbolized, the unity of the kingdom of France, could be accepted because France was a symbol of the kingdom of heaven. In France the religion of nationalism grew early and easily out of the religion of monarchy, and, although neither the degree of French unity nor the depth of French nationalism should be exaggerated, both were strong enough to give France a clear advantage over her neighbors for many centuries.

[52] J. Quicherat, *Procès de condamnation et de rehabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc* (Paris, 1841-1849) V, 127 ("Tous ceulx qui guerroient audit saint royaume de France, guerroient contre le roy Jhesus . . .").