heights which involved expenses which were obviously considerable. Even to-day such ruins as Gisors bear witness to that. The pious Louis IX was a great founder of churches and hospitals for his religious feelings determined him to assume responsibility for some of the expenditure on public assistance which, for many centuries, the Church alone had met. "Like the writer who has made his book and illuminated it in gold and blue, this king," said Joinville, "illuminated his kingdom with fine abbeys and many Houses of God." We no longer possess the famous hospital of the Quinze Vingt built near the Saint Honoré gate for three hundred blind people of Paris but we still have almost intact the beautiful Sainte Chapelle built to receive the Crown of Thorns.¹

The expenses of the diplomatic system began to appear in the budget. Lacking permanent ambassadors, the king certainly hired agents in foreign countries through whom he gained information; he paid pensions to influential people (particularly in Germany) and sent very frequent missions specially to the Court of Rome, the political centre of Christian Europe. Similarly within the kingdom he guaranteed the loyalty of certain nobles by hard cash.²

The support of a small permanent army in time of peace was not a very heavy burden. The troop of knights, crossbowmen, horse or foot sergeants, and "gunners" which formed the military establishment was largely maintained by means of the lands and residences which the king granted to warriors of proved fidelity.³ Garrisons, in time of peace, were disbanded or reduced to a few men.⁴ In times of war he relied on the feudal and seigniorial levies we have already described. More and more, however, warriors both noble and base born were being recruited for wages. During the period of Philip Augustus's conquests, a famous band of scouts commanded by Cadoc appeared in the accounts for the year 1202 at £3,290 Parisian. There is little doubt that it consisted of three hundred foot sergeants each paid eight pence a day. According to the same account, a sapper received a shilling

¹ LXVIII, § 758; LVI, 86 ff.; CDXII, 107 ff.; DCXI, 119 ff.
² XXXI, intro., p. cxvi; DXVII, 375; DXV, 40, n. 2.
³ XXXI, n. 650, 698a, 817, 946a, 955, 1097, 1124, 1399, 2139, 2140.
⁴ See a roll of about 1254 in LXXII, iv, acta omissa, n. 3973."
and a half (eighteen pence), a mechanic fifteen pence; a crossbowman on foot one or two shillings; a mounted crossbowman or sergeant three shillings. A knight's fee was about six shillings. All these soldiers were signed on at the last moment, sometimes along the route, merely for the number of days estimated as necessary to finish the expedition. In 1231 when she had to make war on the Count of Brittany, Blanche of Castile engaged Breton nobles for preference.1

The king's wars against his vassals during the period we are studying here were relatively short and more burden on the peasants whose holdings were ravaged than on the monarchy. The crusades were the ruinous adventure. The army assembled at Bourges in 1226 to exterminate the Albigensian heretics was undoubtedly the biggest that a Capetian monarch had ever commanded.2 When Saint Louis set out on his disastrous expedition to Egypt he needed enormous sums for the transport of the crusaders in Italian boats, for the accumulation of the "mountains" of wheat and barley which Joinville saw heaped up in Cyprus, for the ransoms of the prisoners including the king himself, and, subsequently, to carry out the great works of fortification in Syria. When the king returned after six years of absence and incessant appeals for funds he still sent money and men to the Holy Land.3 There was also the costly crusade for the conquest of the kingdom of Sicily, which the Pope entrusted to Charles of Anjou the king's brother.4 Finally the preparations for the Tunisian crusade which was cut short by the king's death demanded an even greater effort.5 All these extraordinary expenses, however, were met by ecclesiastical tithes, money wrung from the cities, from crusaders who wished to be relieved of their vows, and by all sorts of expedients. The administrative correspondence of Alphonse of Poitiers forms a supplement to the very scanty royal documents and shows us this prince, during the three years preceding the Tunisian crusade, alienating forests and dues, selling charters of liberties to the towns, letters of pardon to criminals, and finally ordering the arrest of all Jews and

1 CL, 100–121; CLXX, 302 ff.; DCXXXI, 318 ff.
2 DXVII, 295.
3 LXVIII, §§ 180–1; DXCV, 254 ff. CLXX, 956 ff.
4 GODL, 596 ff.
5 LXXII; iv, numerous acts of the years 1268–1270; CLXIX, p. lv ff.
the seizure of their goods in order to force them to redeem them.\footnote{CDLXXXV, 518; LXX.} By these means they succeeded with some difficulty, in spite of resistance and complaints, in collecting the necessary money and paying off more or less completely the Italian bankers who had made advances.

What, from the financial point of view, were the results of the reigns of Philip Augustus, Louis VIII, and Saint Louis? We have no exact knowledge of the extent of the resources which each of these monarchs could command. The General Account of receipts and expenses from All Saints Day, 1202, to Ascension, 1203, which Brussel has preserved for us, alone includes the three terms at which the provosts and bailiffs came to make their accounts and there is reason to believe that certain receipts and expenses are not entered there at all. If we take into account only those which appear there, we see that, in this critical year when Philip Augustus was realizing all his resources, he had the disposal of £197,000 Parisian including £59,000 drawn from his war treasury.\footnote{CDXXXVI, 131.} After the annexations made at the expense of John Lackland the receipts were considerably increased and the king built up his reserves again. The pious legacies which Philip Augustus made in his will of 1222 to the King of Jerusalem and to the knightly orders sworn to defend the Holy Land, to those whom he feared he might have wronged, to the poor and the Church, and the considerably smaller amounts which he bequeathed to his family and suite amounted, in money and jewels, to £419,600 Parisian without allowing for a sum which was certainly considerable but for which we have no figures left to his successor for the defence of the realm.\footnote{XXXI, n. 2172; CCXI, iv, 2nd part, 558 ff., 568 ff.} It was the result of a prudent and economical administration and his consistent opposition to merely adventurous projects.

On the finances of Louis VIII, we have two documents, the first is his will, the legacies of which amount to £105,000, the remainder being left to his heir. Secondly the General Account of Candlemas, 1227, presented three months after his death of which we possess the totals: receipts £53,729 14\(\frac{1}{2}\)s., expenditure of £37,480, a balance of £16,249 14\(\frac{1}{2}\)s. and a surplus in the chest of £128,898 16\(\frac{1}{2}\)s. The situation on the accession of Louis IX was, therefore, quite satisfactory.
It seems clear to us that although Saint Louis avoided extravagant expenditure he was not a prudent financier. 1 At the end of his reign he was exclusively occupied with the salvation of his soul, making restitutions, and preparing for the Crusade. The famous reform of the provostship of Paris, the character of which has been so badly appreciated for many years, shows us that payments by assignment on the provostship of Paris were continually increasing although the revenues remained stationary so that no one was willing to accept the farm of the provostship. It was necessary to put it in the charge of an official who would render accounts and the deficit had to be made up by the Treasury. 2 In his will of 1270, made in Paris before his departure for Tunis, Saint Louis began by distributing a relatively moderate sum —about £20,000—between Queen Margaret, his wife, the religious foundations, the houses of God, the poor, and his servants. He declared that he did not know whether he left enough money to satisfy all these gifts but that did not prevent him subsequently bequeathing £10,000 to his daughter Agnes and the remainder to the royal heir. This document not only reveals a straightened treasury but also an indifference towards accuracy which, in its contempt for exact division, contrasts very strongly with the meticulous will drawn up during the same period by Alphonse of Poitiers. 3

Nevertheless, the monarchy had an established administration and was provided with considerable resources. It was ready to act. In fact, during this period it was carving out at a very rapid rate the course of its development. Some part of its forces was employed, it is true, in the crusade against the Moslems but, from the crusade against the heretics, which, as we shall see, others had initiated and almost carried through, it was able to draw considerable profit.

1 On the accounts of Saint Louis, cf. De Wailly in H.F., xxi, p. Ixxiii ff.;
2 CLXXXVI, 531 ff.
3 LXXII, iv, 5988, 5712.
CHAPTER II

RELATIONS OF THE FRENCH KINGS WITH THE CHURCH AND THE HOLY SEE, 1202-1270. THE CRUSADES AGAINST THE ALBIGENSIA NS AND IN THE EAST

I

THE PRINCIPLES OF ROYAL POLICY

"THE King of France" wrote the poet of the Gestes de Louis VIII, "is, at all times, the shield of Holy Church." 1 The kings of the period we are studying, Philip Augustus, Louis VIII, and Louis IX, to whom we must add Blanche of Castile, were faithful servants of the Catholic Church although they always fought against it for what they considered the rights of the temporal power. Even the most material of them, the least subject to mystical ecstasy, Philip Augustus, was a believer who had suffered for Christ in the Holy Land. There was united to this sincere faith a practical sense which led him to appreciate the value of the alliance between the monarchy and the Church. Contemporaries have called him "the very pious patron of clerks", 2 and have attributed these words on his death bed, "My son, I beg you to honour God and Holy Church as I have done. I have gained considerable profit from it and you equally will enjoy many advantages." 3 We cannot explain his religious policy better than by this quotation. To describe it in terms of the measures he had to take against over-ambitious bishops and to assess it as anticlerical is to do it some injustice. 4 As for Louis VIII he died during a crusade against the heretics. His wife, Blanche of Castile, who played a leading role in politics both as regent and queen mother, was austere in her devotion. She reconciled piety with a determined opposition towards bishops who displayed undue

1 LXXXIV, lines 1009–1010.
2 XXXIV, 400.
3 DXVII, 406; DCXI, iv, 2nd part, 580–1.
4 Cf. DXXVIII, i, 54.
independence. From the beginning of this chapter, however, the figure who demands our chief attention is Louis IX. This saint went even farther than Philip Augustus in defence of the temporal power. It is essential to understand in what way and for what basic reasons this spirit of resistance, which we should be wrong to call "secular", could be allied with the most ardent piety and the most devoted respect for the Church. Then we shall have really appreciated what was the religious policy of the Capetians at the apogee of the feudal monarchy.

Louis IX was the son of a father who had been nicknamed "The Lion" and his grandfathers, Philip Augustus and Alphonse the Noble, King of Castile, were men of valour. On the maternal side, he was the great-grandson of the Empress Eleanor and the great King of England, Henry II. Trained by his mother Blanche, he had been brought up in a school of activity. Personally, he was of a nervous, irascible temperament but he possessed a firm will. He was a brave knight and a king who could punish severely. He complained, like many mystics, that he had not the gift of tears, and, when he prayed, could not "water the dryness of his heart." He was no bigot, had no love for fanatics, and was horrified by hypocrisy. His relations with his followers, as they are reported to us by his friend the Sire de Joinville, reveal his malicious gaiety. After his majority, he passed several years of brilliant youth and this fine knight won great admiration, "slender, tall stature, angelic countenance, and gracious figure." Joinville has told us how he hid from his mother to make love to his young wife, Margaret of Provence, but he was chaste and had an unsmirched soul. He had been brought up in the practices of an exalted devotion and he developed more and more rigorous habits of mortification. He was afraid of not loving his Saviour enough and not suffering enough for him. He deprived himself of earthly enjoyment, submitted to regular beatings with chains of iron, and attended the sick and the poor, preferably the most repulsive. Worn out by vigils and fasting and still infected by an ague he had caught in Saintonge during the war against

1 CLXX, 100-2, 275-285; DCLI, 66 ff. On the regencies of Blanche of Castile see CDLXIII, chap. iii.
2 I have chiefly used LXVIII, LVII, CXXXII. Cf. CXIV, chap. xii; De Wailly, Éclaircissements, i, in LXVIII.
the English in 1242, he all but died in 1244. There is no doubt that the idea of approaching death contributed not a little to make him an ascetic.

Before he was forty, the gallant knight had became bald, bent, and sickly. He dressed himself now as a priest and the people of Paris called him Frater Ludovicus. His devotion always remained enlightened, however: his beliefs were founded on a thorough knowledge of Holy Scripture and, in place of the interminable masses which his cousin the King of England attended, he preferred long meditations, reading sacred texts, sermons, and discussions on morals with his followers.

For such a man who had been placed on a throne the essential obligation was to guide his subjects towards heaven and to assure the salvation of their souls. He believed that a consecrated king had a mission in this respect and this was obviously one of the reasons why he retained the crown in spite of his secret desire to abdicate. He sought to fulfil all the promises he had made at his consecration. He believed that the unction he had received from the vial brought from heaven for the baptism of Clovis imposed on him very extensive obligations. He considered also, however, that it conferred rights upon him and a direct communication with God. On occasions of important decisions, if his conscience showed him clearly the course to pursue, he would listen to nobody. At such moments he believed himself inspired by God. As a result, in spite of his affectionate deference towards the Holy See and the clergy, in spite of the joy he experienced in travelling from monastery to monastery and dining in the monks' refectories, he considered himself able to draw the limit between the spiritual and the temporal, to distinguish the prerogatives of the two powers which, to his mind, had been created to seek the same ends by different means, and to co-operate in bringing about the triumph of Christ. In his opinion it was possible for Pope and clergy to be mistaken and he had the right to say so and resist them. He was called on to speak very sharply to his bishops, to forbid a papal legate to interfere in certain matters, and it was

1 LVI, 50, 129–180, and XLVI, 7, are very definite on the desire to abdicate.
2 XXX, 450–1, 548 ff., 749, etc., and the notes of Delisle; XXIV, 454–5; DXIV, 588–9.
3 LXVII, §§ 673–5; LXXII, ii, n. 2415.
only at the end of his life that he displayed an excessive
docility towards the Holy See. In short, in spite of considerable
differences of personal temperament, these four sovereigns
pursued the same religious policy differing only in minor
details. Moreover all four of them, even including Philip
Augustus,\(^1\) were glorified by the Church.

II

SERVICES RENDERED BY THE CHURCH. ROYAL FAVOURS TO
THE CHURCH

The exchange of services between the two powers was
incessant. The bishops were more than ever charged with
political or administrative responsibilities and many of the
Court functionaries were clerks. The Church agreed, as
in the past, to share certain demesnes with the king by means
of partnership agreements. Philip Augustus, chiefly concerned
not to weaken his position, made very few gifts to the chapters
and convents but he confirmed their goods and privileges.
Louis VIII and Louis IX heaped favours on them as the
Trésor des Chartes and the Cartularies bear evidence.
There was rarely need by now to protect them against feudal
violence; but the king frequently gained lay lords when
they gave up tithes usurped by their ancestors.\(^2\)

The University of Paris, an important ecclesiastical foundation,
subject to the pontifical authority, owed to Philip
Augustus its independence of the provost of the capital.
In 1200, even before it was a corporation or a legal personality
possessing a seal, masters and scholars were recognized as
justiciable only in the Church courts. In 1225 when the
legate forbade the University to have a seal, provoked a riot
of the scholars, and excommunicated twenty-four masters,
Louis VIII interfered. It was not easy to show indulgence
in the scholars' pranks and, at the same time, maintain good
order. In 1229 Blanche of Castile agreed with the Bishop of
Paris and the legate to deal with them severely: the
University resisted and dispersed and, in the end, Blanche
yielded.\(^3\)

\(^1\) **XXIV**, ii, n. 4542 (25th October, 1223).
\(^2\) **XXX**, 780 and note.
\(^3\) **XXXI**, 629; **GDL**, 89 ff.; **DXXVII**, 289–290; **CLXX**, 132 ff., 204 ff.;
**DLVIII**, i, chap. v; **CCCLXX**.
RELATIONS WITH THE CHURCH

III

THE LIBERTIES OF THE CHURCH AND THE SUPREMACY OF THE CROWN

We should be making a very false characterization, however, of the relations between the monarchy and the world of the Church if we instanced only these mutual services and royal concessions. In other spheres, the king dominated the Church.

In the first place the king was the feudal chief of the ecclesiastical barons. Philip Augustus gained the homage of the bishops of Cahors, Limoges, and Clermont and thus won some support in the areas which were in dispute with his enemies. He enforced a more and more exacting recognition of his prerogatives as suzerain. We have seen how after 1185 he had refused to do homage to the Bishop of Amiens. Till the end of his reign he continued negotiations for his release from homage in return for various concessions. His successors demanded, as he had done, feudal services from the Church. On several occasions some of the bishops tried to refuse host service or at least the personal service which was distasteful to them. The king sometimes forced them to yield, sometimes to accept some agreement but he would not allow the matter to be settled by precedent: there are examples of this during each of the three reigns.

In the same way suit of Court had to be rendered by the bishop or his agent. If it became necessary to enforce obedience the king would seize the revenues of the rebel. Philip Augustus considered that, for the defence of the realm, he could demand anything of the clergy and put forward a claim to build a fortress on episcopal land. In a memorandum drawn up by Saint Louis’s advisers and presented to the Pope in 1247 the theory is taken to its extreme: "The right of the king is that he can take as his own all the treasures of the churches and all their temporal goods to meet the necessities of himself and his realm."

1 DLXX, 101 and notes.
4 XXXI, n. 1399–3; DLXX, 102; LXVI, iv, second part, 298–4; DXXVII, 408–9; LXXII, ii, n. 2582.
5 LXXII, ii, n. 2206 (ann. 1232).
6 LXXI, n. 1803, 1830.
7 Memorandum published in LXXX, vi, add., 99–112.
The rivalry between the two jurisdictions acquired an unprecedented importance: the progress of canon law and the tacit or overt support of the Holy See gave arms to the clergy and a long era of conflicts opened out. The bishops tried to withdraw themselves completely from the royal jurisdiction and, in their turn, Philip Augustus, Blanche of Castile, and Saint Louis maintained their right to summon them before their Court and do judgment on them when the case concerned temporal matters.\textsuperscript{1}

On the other hand, the recognized right of the Church to judge not only in matters of faith, wills, and marriages but also of oaths was a source of grave abuse, for feudal loyalty was based on the oath. In general neither of the two powers allowed principles to hamper them and the king’s ministers hesitated no more than the judges of the ecclesiastical courts about contravening them. The right of asylum, excommunication, prohibition of loans at interest, or Sunday trading, the punishment of clerks guilty of a capital crime were equally matters of controversy.

In 1205–6 the king held in Paris an assembly to discuss these questions and the \textit{réponses} of the king and his barons sound an echo of the famous Constitutions of Clarendon. The line of conduct followed by the kings and their advisers at this period was consistently firm and reasonable and they no more accepted the encroachments of the Church than they tolerated the violence of local officials or of the communes.\textsuperscript{2} But the problem was not settled. The lay power and the ecclesiastical remained on a war footing. In 1225 the Chronicler of Tours tells us:

The archbishops and bishops of France, in the presence of the legate, made insistent demands of the king and his barons for the right to judge, in cases concerning moveables, all men summoned before them by churchmen. They said that this jurisdiction was a right of the Gallican Church. He declared, with peremptory arguments, that this was an unreasonable demand since cases concerning moveables which were not claimed as being concerned with oaths, faith, wills, or marriage were purely lay matters with which the ecclesiastical tribunal had no concern. . . . Finally, by the interventions of Divine Grace and the legate, the parties left the matter undecided.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{XXI}, n. 1241 ff., 2034; \textit{DCLXX}, 103; \textit{CLXX}, 101–2, etc.

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{XXI}, n. 927–9, 1209, 1477, 1811, etc.; \textit{LXVIII}, §§ 61–4, 670–1; \textit{CCXCVI}, 65 ff., 98; \textit{CLXXXVIII}, 140.

\textsuperscript{3} \textit{XXV}, 309; \textit{CCXCVI}, 99.
Ten years later, the barons and councillors of the king at a meeting held at Saint-Denis discussed rebellions of churchmen against the king their patron. For instance, the Archbishop of Tours had forbidden the abbots and priors of his province to plead in cases concerned with temporal affairs in the Court of the king or a lord. The Archbishop of Rheims and the Bishop of Beauvais had refused to recognize the jurisdiction of the king's Court over the temporalities. Barons and councillors drew up and sent to the Pope a memorandum which has been preserved in the Trésor des Chartes ¹; the Pope is urged to watch over and safeguard the king, his barons, and the kingdom.

The reply of Pope Gregory IX was that the king and his barons were making attempts against the liberties of the Church.

The accession of Innocent IV ² who was "to reign or rather to fight for eleven years six months and ten days" (1243–1254) led to a recurduessence of anti-clericalism. The hostility which he evoked by his animosity against the Emperor Frederick II was heightened by the imperial manifesto published in France and turned against the clergy who were, however, far from uncritical in their approval of the policy of Innocent IV. Frederick II wrote to the sovereigns of Europe in the early months of 1246: "It has always been our settled intention to reduce clerks of every order, and particularly the higher ranks, to their position in the primitive Church to live as apostles and to imitate the humility of the Lord."

In the course of this same year a movement gradually developed in France against the "Liberties of the Church". Finally, in November, the barons in their turn issued a manifesto which agreed remarkably with that of Frederick II: "the kingdom," they said, "was founded by warriors and not by clerks and it was to the wars of Charlemagne and other kings that the Church of France owed its existence, to the generosity of the nobles that it owed its castles. Humble at first but full of intrigue the clerks have finished by monopolizing the jurisdiction which belonged to the secular princes. These sons of serfs have reached a position where they judge free men by their laws. They must be reduced to the status

¹ LXXXII, n. 2404; CCXCVI, 99–100.
² For all that follows see GLXXXII; DXIII, iv, 121 ff.; CCXCVI, 100–7.
of the primitive Church. Henceforward, neither layman nor cleric may begin an action (except in cases of heresy, marriage, or usury) before the ecclesiastical courts on pain of confiscation and mutilation.” As a result, the barons signed a treaty of alliance against the clergy to defend their rights and undertook to pay a levy of one-hundredth part of their annual revenues for the assistance of those who were threatened by the ecclesiastical authority.

Innocent IV immediately sent instructions to his legate in France. “These attacks,” he wrote, “have been inspired in the French baronage by the Emperor, that enemy who is working for the overthrow of the faith.” The legate was ordered to excommunicate the leaguers (statutarii) and all those who had accepted their statutes. The faith was certainly not the object of the attack for the four commissioners named by the leaguers—the Duke of Burgundy, the counts of Brittany, Angoulême, and Saint Paul—were pious men who had gone on crusade at the same time as Saint Louis. During Louis IX’s stay in the Orient (1248–2254), since the most ardent barons had gone with him, the league gradually disintegrated. It had aroused, even in the towns, measures against the extension of ecclesiastical justice.

The king had not given his explicit support to this lay defence organization but he had not disavowed it and the original of the treaty of alliance of the statutarii exists in the Trésor des Chartes; during his absence, although the regency was in the hands of the pious Blanche of Castile, the king’s agents, particularly in the South, became aggressive and conflicts over jurisdiction became more numerous. It was only after the return of Louis IX that matters were settled.

In the history of the relations between the Capetian monarchy and the Church, the nomination of bishops and abbots was a serious matter and aroused even more controversy than the quarrels over jurisdictions. From the thirteenth century, the question began to be raised in three ways: the king wished to preserve his ancient prerogatives, the clergy their liberties, and the pretensions of the Holy See were growing. We must remember that the king had regalian rights in a great number of bishoprics and abbeys even outside his demesne.

1 LXXII, ii, n. 3569.
The southern districts and Brittany, alone, were not within his grasp.\(^1\) When an episcopal or abbatial seat was vacant the chapter or convent humbly sought permission from the king to proceed to an election; in the interval, the king enjoyed the revenues, nominated to vacant benefices, and only gave up the regale when he confirmed the election and the new dignitary tendered him an oath of loyalty. On the other hand, even in normal times, he had the presentation to a certain number of prebends in the churches. With these he could pay for services rendered and win himself supporters.

Philip Augustus, during the second part of his reign, made many concessions which can scarcely be explained except by his need of money or by political reasons the details of which have escaped us. Not only did he rarely refuse to grant freedom of election or to approve an election that had been made, not only did he re-establish in Normandy canonical election but he gave up the right of granting permission to elect in favour of the Chapter of Langres and he gave up his enjoyment of the regale during the vacancy of the see in this bishopric and also in Arras, Auxerre, Nevers, and Mâcon.\(^2\) On the other hand, on three occasions, he allowed the Holy See to dispose of very important sees: Sens, Rheims, and Paris. Louis VIII, Blanche of Castile, and Louis IX maintained their rights in theory with possibly rather more determination than Philip.\(^3\) The instructions to his mother left by Saint Louis on his departure for the Holy Land bear witness to this.\(^4\) In practice, however, they showed themselves conciliatory and generous. The restoration of the revenues taken during the period of the regale became customary: Louis VIII granted this, in the newly annexed demesnes, for the sees of Angers, Le Mans, and Poitiers on condition that the new bishops swore fidelity within forty days. Examples are frequent during the reign of Saint Louis but the king kept his rights.\(^5\) More surprising, at first glance, is the ease with which Blanche of Castile and Saint Louis allowed the violation of the freedom of canonical election by

\(^{1}\) DCLXX, 98–9.

\(^{2}\) XXXI, n. 791, 855, 1021a, 1102, 1115; CIXII bis, 108 ff. The date of some of these renunciations in return for finance corresponds to critical periods, for example, 1293–4.

\(^{3}\) DXVII, 408 ff.; CXXXII, 373–4; DXXXIII, 168 ff.

\(^{4}\) LXXXVII, i, 60.

\(^{5}\) DXVII, 410; CXXXII, 41 ff., 374 ff.; CXXX, 407.
the Pope who appointed many bishops directly. Thus, in 1229, the Cardinal of Saint-Ange, the legate of Gregory IX, appointed the Bishop of Noyon.\(^1\) Innocent IV agreed with the Archbishop of Rouen to raise to the see of Evreux the Dean of St. Martin of Tours and suggested for the see of Noyon the candidate who had received the support of a minority of the canons, Pierre Charlot. There is an explanation for all this, however; in 1229, Blanche of Castile could not thwart the legate who was supporting her against the rebel barons; the dean of St. Martin had been recommended to the Pope by Saint Louis and as for Pierre Charlot, he was a natural son of Philip Augustus.\(^2\) We need not conclude from these last examples that Louis IX was a hypocrite. He would only give his support to worthy candidates and he lived in such close contact with the Church that his conscience could not allow him to abuse his position in such a case.

\* \* 

### IV

**Relations with the Holy See**

The relations of the monarchy with the Holy See from 1202 to about 1260 were not as good as with the French clergy. Though there was no failure of professions of love and respect, the two powers came into conflict on many occasions. The long considered and obstinately developed policy of the Holy See could not be sidetracked. To guarantee the security of the Pope in Rome, to prevent the domination of the Emperor in Italy, to take advantage of every opportunity to subject the monarchs to the suzerainty of the Holy See, to maintain peace between Christians, to deliver the Holy Land, to exterminate heretics, in short, to establish under the direction of the Pope the Kingdom of God on earth—these were the items in the programme of Innocent III. We have seen that he was involved in almost perpetual conflict with Philip Augustus; the question of the repudiation of Isambour, serious as it was from the point of view of canon law, ended in compromise; but the external policy of Philip Augustus, the part played by Innocent III

\(^1\) LXXII, ii, n. 1988.  
\(^2\) CLXXII, 39 ff.
to force John Lackland to recognize him as suzerain, and the subsequent protection given to this English vassal, by the Holy See when the former was an enemy of the King of France gave rise to a permanent antagonism between the courts of Paris and Rome. Louis VIII did not really reach a reconciliation with Honorius III until he agreed to lead an army against the Albigensians.

The attitude of Saint Louis in the mortal combat between the Hohenstaufen and the Popes Gregory IX and Innocent IV was generous and loyal and, even if Charles of Anjou ended by taking advantage of the exhaustion of the two parties to win a kingdom for himself, it is impossible to doubt the disinterestedness of Louis IX. He maintained the prestige of the French Crown and when the French prelates, on their way to the Council of Rome, were captured at sea, he forced Frederick II to set them at liberty (1241). But he did not attempt to take advantage of circumstances to seize the kingdom of Arles or even Lyons, which he could easily have done, and he refused the imperial crown for his brother Robert of Artois. Like all the idealists of the Middle Ages, he considered that the Empire and the Holy See were both divine institutions and should not be subject to the greedy and vengeful spirit of man. When Innocent IV, whose position in Rome was very insecure, crossed the Alps and established himself at Lyons, the agents of the French king came to urge a policy of conciliation. Had not Frederick II offered to submit to the arbitration of the kings of France and England? Innocent IV refused all compromise and declared his opponent deprived of his dominions (1245). Louis IX held the balance equal; he continued to treat Frederick II in a friendly fashion, but two years later when he announced his intention of marching on Lyons, either to carry off the Pope, or, possibly, to stage a repetition of Canosa, the King of France let Innocent IV know that he would protect him against all violence and Frederick abandoned the project.¹

In 1244 Saint Louis had taken the Cross and for some time he hoped for the co-operation of Pope and emperor in the expedition he was preparing. He probably did not realize that both sides were playing him false. Did he know that in

¹ OCLXX, chap. i, iv, vii; OOLLXXXVI, p. exxxix ff.; CCXCVII, 136 ff.; OOLLXXXIX, chap. i–v.
1246 the Pope gave secret orders for the preparations for the crusade, which had been started in Germany, to be broken off so that he could recruit supporters unhindered for his battle with the emperor or that Frederick II warned his friend, the Sultan of Egypt, that it was the intention of the King of France to stage his campaign in the Nile valley? In any case, he ceased to count on the reconciliation of the two adversaries and set out for the East in 1248. He remained there six years.

During his absence Frederick II died (13th December, 1250), Innocent IV returned to Rome, and soon the cause of the Hohenstaufen was supported only by a bastard son of the dead emperor, Manfred, acting in the name of Conradin, Frederick’s grandson. Manfred, with the support of an army of Saracens, expelled the Pope from the kingdom of Sicily. On his return from the East, Louis IX, considering Conradin as the legitimate heir, remained neutral at first but Manfred, a friend of the Moslems, inspired him with a violent antipathy. On the other hand, the idea of the crusade continued to obsess his mind and govern his policy. As the Holy See was occupied by men who knew how to handle him and win his support, his attitude gradually began to be modified.

In 1261 a Frenchman of energetic but stubborn character became Pope Urban IV; on his accession, he appointed three of Louis’s advisers as cardinals, one of whom, Guy Foulquoi, an intimate friend of the king, was Urban’s successor under the name of Clement IV (1265–8). During these pontificates there was a very close alliance between the Capetian monarchy and the Holy See. From the reign of Urban IV onwards, Louis IX had come to consider the question of Sicily as bound up with the pacification of Christianity and the deliverance of the Holy Land.

One of the king’s brothers, Charles, was marked out, by his character and history, to serve the ends of the Holy See. A man of olive complexion with a harsh and frowning countenance who looked more Castilian than French, he had unbounded ambitions. His appanage of Anjou and Maine was of little interest to him; he dreamed of a

1 CLXXII, 231–3, 354–5.
2 CCCCLXXVI, 293 ff., 401 ff.
3 CXCVI, 376 ff.; CCCCLXXVI, 410 ff.
Mediterranean empire. Innocent IV had facilitated his marriage with Beatrice, Countess of Provence, in order to install in that imperial possession a man who could finally ruin the prestige which the Hohenstaufen had been able to retain there. The nobility and the free towns of the district were accustomed to having no master; Charles broke the resistance of the barons and secured the excommunication of Marseilles which was in revolt. Active and determined, with a delight in administration and bureaucracy, he imposed his authority by brute force. He took advantage of factions in Piedmont to extend his power over certain Italian lordships which were seeking protection against Genoa and Asti.  

This was the man to whom Innocent IV and Urban IV, in succession, offered the kingdom of Sicily. Louis IX, who was held in high respect by his family, could have stopped it all by his veto. French knights and money, however, were essential for the defeat of Manfred and it was fairly easy to convince Louis that, in declaring Frederick II deprived of his fief in Sicily, the Pope had been exercising his right as suzerain and that consequently Conrado could not be heir to it. Other scruples, however, continued to worry him. Should he use the resources of France on the reconquest of Sicily when the Pope and Manfred could easily come to agreement and the most disturbing news was coming from the East? Charles of Anjou and the papal emissaries evidently knew how to show him that the essential condition for the success of the future crusade was that a dependable man should reign in Sicily which was a first class supply base for the crusaders. He allowed himself to be persuaded and assumed the responsibility for this great adventure which was to have so many consequences. He opened negotiations with Urban IV. The agreement of 15th August, 1264, was in part his work. He allowed his subjects to engage, in great numbers, in the service of Charles, and the Holy See to levy crushing taxes on the Church of France. Charles of Anjou, crowned King of Sicily at Saint Peter’s in Rome on 6th January, 1266, conquered his kingdom in a month.  

1 DXXIII, chap. i-xii; CCLXVII, 172 ff.; CCLXXXVI, 397 ff., 415 ff.; CCLXXXIX, chap. v-vi; CLX, chap. vi; CCLXX, 357 ff.

2 CLXXII, 396 ff.; CCLXXVI, 370 ff.
merciless execution of Conradin, the triumph of the Holy See over the Hohenstaufen was established.

We have no knowledge of what Louis IX thought of the reign of terror by which his ruthless brother sought to assure his position. He was becoming more and more absorbed in his dreams and his last word was to be "O Jerusalem!" He no longer thought of anything but winning martyrdom fighting the Moslems, or even Paradise converting them.

With the arrival of this period in his life, when the monarchy was quite definitely, in his opinion, only an instrument for the salvation of himself and others, there could be no question of conflict between the Holy See and Louis IX, but this had not always been so.

We must look back some years to the period when Louis IX privately disapproved of the refusal of the Papacy to come to any agreement with the Empire. He openly condemned the exactions and the abuse of power which resulted from the bellicose policy of Innocent IV and from which the French Church had to suffer. In 1246-7, the time at which the polemics between Innocent IV and Frederick II were at their height, the King of France expressed his dissatisfaction. He was himself very scrupulous in presentation to benefices, only gave those of which he had control to the most worthy, and avoided plurality. Innocent IV, however, maintained a Court of pomp and ceremony at Lyons and the mode of life of his following aroused some comment; moreover, he was always in need of money to carry out his policy and he seriously annoyed both clergy and king by his demands. He claimed to have the gift of canonries, archdeaconries, archpriesthoods, deaconries, and curacies by apostolic "provision" for the benefit of the clerks who had served him or even who happened to be his clients or relations, whether they were French, Italians, or Spaniards, and without any obligation of residence. In fact the number which he granted them often made residence impossible. We can see from his registers, for example, that his chaplain, master Étienne, was provided with many canonries or prebends in different parts of France and a dozen Spanish benefices. The tax of a tenth agreed to by the French clergy for the royal crusade was raised by pontifical collectors, during the following five years from 1245 onwards, often in a most brutal fashion under threat of
excommunication. The Holy See disposed of the money raised at its own discretion for the benefit of the crusaders whom it regarded with most favour. Further, it demanded money to meet its own needs. When apparently threatened in Lyons by Frederick II, Innocent IV sought to levy on the goods of the Church, particularly in Burgundy, a tax of a seventh and even a fifth of its revenues. Even further, he invited the French clergy to send him an army.¹

There is no doubt that these abuses and arrogant pretensions aroused violent indignation in France. The Papacy, during its residence in Lyons, was extremely unpopular with all classes of French society. There was a continual demand to know why Innocent IV refused the offers of reconciliation and arbitration made by Frederick II and it was the most ardent supporters of the crusade who were embittered by his haughty obstinacy. They passed from hand to hand the letters of Frederick II "to all of the kingdom of France" (22nd September, 1245), in which he asked that Louis IX should arbitrate in the quarrel, promised to fulfil all the decisions of the French king and set out on crusade with him at once. In the thundering exordium of these letters we find an echo of the old quarrel between Innocent III and Philip Augustus:—

We have good reason for thinking that the Roman pontiffs of the past and of the present have gravely injured us and the other kings, territorial princes, and nobles . . . in the fact that, against God and justice alike, they assume the power, the jurisdiction, and the authority to install, to dethrone, and to expel from their empire, their kingdoms, their principalities, and their lordships, kings, princes, and magnates in the temporal exercise against them of a temporal power, freeing their vassals from the oath by which they are bound to their lord and promulgating sentences of excommunication against the lords . . . and in the fact that if a quarrel arises between lords and their vassals, the said pontiffs, on the demand of one party alone, impose their temporal intervention and believe that their arbitration must be accepted. . . .²

We have seen how next year the French barons leagued themselves against the Church but their object was only to check the encroachments of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. To protest against the excessive power of the Holy See was the concern of the king and the French clergy themselves. In fact, on 2nd May, 1247, Ferry Paté, Marshal of France, one

¹ CLXXII, 267 ff. ² LXXII, ii, n. 3380.
of the diplomats whom Louis loved to employ, arrived at Lyons with representatives of the bishops and the whole French clergy. He complained to Innocent IV of the abuses that we have mentioned above. Their grievances were detailed in a long memorandum which was presented to the Pope in June by an emissary of the king. It said that the king's patience was exhausted and that his barons, in an assembly recently held at Pontoise had upbraided him for, allowing the destruction of the kingdom. At that time when all the temporalities of the French Church should be at the King's disposal for the defence of the realm, the Pope claimed to use them for his own needs. As for benefices, he was distributing them to foreigners. "Things have reached such a pass that the bishops cannot provide for their well educated clerks or the worthy people in their diocese, and this is to the detriment of the king and all the nobles of the realm whose sons and friends, up till the present, have been provided for in the church." The wealth of the king was being carried abroad and religious worship was being undermined. The churches of France should have been able to help the king to carry out the crusade and still retain some resources for the defence of the kingdom. The Pope promised inquiries and made some small concessions but that was all.  

Historians have not yet determined with any exactness what was the policy followed by the successors of Innocent IV but certainly the financial demands of Rome remained heavy. The Italian bankers profited very much by making advances to the Pope and securing the excommunication of recalcitrants. Meetings of the clergy to make some protest were held in Paris but Louis IX could say no more. He needed the money of the Church and the support of the Pope for the second crusade he was about to initiate and for the expedition of Charles of Anjou to Sicily. His correspondence with his friend Clement IV (1265–8), who had also been a clerk in the Parliament of Paris previously, reveals complete mutual confidence. After the death of Clement, while the Holy See was vacant the cardinals sent to Louis IX, some weeks before his departure for Tunis, a long letter on the subject

---

1 CLXXII, 82 ff., 189 ff., 267 ff.
3 LXXII, iv, passim.
of the union of the Greek and Latin churches by which they stimulated his zeal as the most Christian prince. This affectionate alliance between the Holy See and the Capetian monarchy at the end of Saint Louis's reign prevents our admitting the authenticity of the "Pragmatic Sanction" dated March, 1269, by which the king appeared as commanding respect for the liberties of the churches of the kingdom and forbidding the imposition of taxes on them by the Roman Curia. However, there is no doubt of the spurious character of this document. It was forged during the fifteenth century by the advisers of Charles VII who wished to base their position on some precedent and invoke the religious policy of Saint Louis as a justification of their own. They committed several blunders which reveal its falsity and, particularly, that of dating this Gallican manifesto in a period when there was a tacit compromise between the Crown and the Holy See at the expense of the French Church.

V

THE CRUSADE AGAINST THE ALBIGENSANS. THE INQUISITION

There was constant anxiety that Philip Augustus, Louis VIII, and Saint Louis should faithfully maintain the cause of the faith against false priests, blasphemous Christians, heretics, Jews, and pagans. They interfered in questions of discipline and concerned themselves with reforming the churches and monasteries where divine worship was neglected, and Saint Louis asked Pope Alexander IV that no one should prevent him dealing severely with married or criminous clergymen. Philip Augustus had blasphemers thrown into the water; Saint Louis showed himself so harsh towards them that Clement IV interfered and advised the king to decide in consultation with his barons and prelates what temporal penalties should be inflicted on them "without going as far as mutilation or death". Saint Louis tried, without any

1 15th May, 1270: LXXII, iv, n. 3691.
2 DCLXV; DXVI, 333–206.
3 XXXI, n. 1028, 1486; DXVIII, 410; LXXII, iii, n. 4243, 4244 bis, 4578, 4580.
4 CXII, § 5.
5 LXVIII, § 685; LVI, 26–7; LXXXVII, i, 99; LXXII, iv, n. 5404.
great success, to convert the Jews. The rabbis tried in vain to defend the Talmud which the Pope had ordered to be destroyed; the pious king had every copy he could find burnt. He had no sympathy for the discussions between Christian and Hebrew theologians, which were then very fashionable, and he forbade laymen to take part in them fearing that they might be worsted; the only thing that a layman can do who hears the Christian laws being slandered by a Jew is to draw his sword and "plunge it in his stomach as far as it will go".¹

One of the great events of the period we are studying was the pursuit of heresy, the extermination of part of the population of the South, and the annexation of Languedoc and Toulouseain to the royal demesne. To write the history of the Albigensian crusade would be to go beyond the scope of this book; we have only to examine the royal policy which was not at first involved in this bloodstained tragedy.

The name Albigenes heretici is given to the heretical Cathares (= Pars) by a contemporary, the famous author of the Histoire Albigeoise, Pierre des Vaux de Cernay, because Albi was undoubtedly one of the principal religious centres of his time. Catharism, however, extended not only throughout the south of France; it had followers in Lombardy and in the Slav countries of the Balkans, and was very probably of Oriental origin.² Many of its rites prove that it originated in a Christian heresy but its metaphysics and its morality set it apart as a religion nearer to the beliefs of Zoroastrianism than to the Christian faith. The Cathares admitted neither the resurrection of the body, Purgatory, nor Hell, and considered the terrestrial life, matter, the work of Satan. Among them, the “Perfect” practised chastity and abstinence and it was believed that after death, for which they were eager, their souls would return directly to God. They comprised, however, only a small minority which gained respect for their virtues, the love of the population for their good works, and led a religious life of great fervour. The mass of “Believers” or “Imperfects” were convinced that their souls would be saved after tests of metempsychosis and they

¹ LXVIII. §§ 51-3; CDXXV, particularly vol. i, 247 ff., 254 ff.; DCLI, 118 ff.; CLXX, 340-1.
² On the obscure question of the origins of Catharism, see the bibliographies and summaries given by F. Vernet and E. Vacandard in D.Th.C., vols. ii and vii, articles “Cathares” and “Inquisition”.
lived without fear. It is easy to understand that this religion, based on disgust with the material world, was of a sort to develop in the population easy morals and a merry character.

During the course of the twelfth century before the rise of Catharism, the Catholic clergy had been losing ground. They were recruiting to their ranks badly and with the utmost difficulty and they frequently led a scandalous life. In addition their wealth excited the covetous. The adherence of the upper nobility of the South to Catharism can undoubtedly be explained, in very large part, by a desire to secularize ecclesiastical possessions.¹

The Holy See knew of all this but, for a long time, the fight against the emperors engaged all their energies. Innocent III was the first to deal with the matter systematically. He fumbled for a long while through lack of the necessary temporal support. He hoped to convert the Count of Toulouse, Raymond VI, who was one of the heads of Catharism but, tortuous and elusive, Raymond was able to evade his promises. The King of Aragon, Peter II, was not much more worthy of his confidence. There was no doubt about the orthodoxy of Philip Augustus who had already ordered the burning of the Cathares,² but to the ever more urgent invitations which the Pope sent him from 1204 onwards he replied by refusals or by demands that the Holy See could not accept. Master of Normandy, he feared an English revival and he wished to manœuvre in such a way that he did not compromise the defence of the kingdom and did not waste his resources of men and money. Later on the successes of Simon de Montfort were obviously disagreeable to him. He could not watch with satisfaction the formation in the South of a great Catholic principality possibly more dangerous for the monarchy than the dynasties of Toulouse and Foix. Raymond VI was the brother-in-law of John Lackland and Philip was, with some reason, suspicious of him but he had no desire to see the Count of Toulouse dispossessed unless it was in favour of the House of Capet. His natural mistrust,

¹ On the doctrine and its propagation, see, in addition to the articles of Vernet and Vacandard, DXXVII; CCCXXXII; DCXLVI; CDXLII, ii, chap. i; CXLV, chap. ii-iii; CDLXXXVII; CCLX, 294 ff.
² LVII, bk. i, l. 407 ff. In 1210, he was to order the burning of the heretic disciples of Amaury de Chartres (Chronicle of Guillaume le Breton, §§ 153–4).
the age he had reached, and the general circumstances decided him in favour of an almost complete neutrality. Events, as we shall see, proved him right in the end. He was too soon to pluck the fruits of his prudence but he lived long enough to see them ripening. In 1207 Innocent III abandoned the cautious policy of conversations and missions which had not succeeded and asked Philip Augustus to undertake the direction of a crusade. Philip demanded that the Pope should impose a truce on the King of England under the sanction of excommunication. If John Lackland withdrew from the war he had recommenced in Poitou it would be possible for the King of France to fall in with the wishes of the Holy See on condition that he could return to the North with his vassals if the truce was broken. He could only tax his demesne and the royal abbeys and he promised a contribution only if the nobles and prelates gave one also. Innocent III, however, was in violent conflict with John Lackland at this moment and could not impose a truce on him. Some weeks later, the legate Pierre de Castelnau was assassinated by a squire of Raymond VI and the crusade was decided (15th January, 1208). When Innocent III repeated his request, Philip maintained his conditions. At this moment, the theocratic doctrine and the doctrine of the lay power came into collision but the clash of theories had no great practical result. Innocent III claimed the right to summon Christians to the campaign for the extermination of heretics and to offer them the conquered territory as spoils: this was to be known in canon law as “the Exhibition of the Prize”. Philip Augustus consulted the lawyers of his Court and wrote to the Pope:—

Concerning the fact that you are offering the lands of the Count of Toulouse to those who occupy it, you should know that we have learnt from learned men and scholars that you have no right to act in this fashion until such time as the count has been condemned for heresy. Then, and only then, you can publish the judgment and instruct us to confiscate those lands since they are our fiefs. You have not yet informed us that, in your judgment, the Count is condemned.

The crusaders began to march in June, 1209, and a war of massacres began. Simon de Montfort, a minor lord of the Paris region, showed such qualities as a captain and organizer that the legate Arnaud Amalric recognized in him the chief

1 XXXI, p. 513; DXXIV, 37 ff.
who was lacking. He was made Viscount of Beziers and Carcassonne "at the instance of the barons of God's army, the legates and the priests present" (August, 1209). Innocent III did not wish to be committed too far and had not given up hope of forcing Raymond VI to submission and preserving his principality for him. He did not like Simon de Montfort as he frequently showed him but the King of France continued to refuse his support and in the South, thrown into chaos by a war of atrocities, Simon de Montfort, relying on Arnaud Amalric, who had taken the Archbishopric of Narbonne for him, was the only man capable of re-establishing order and orthodoxy. We find him pursuing heresy even as far as Perigord, and even when Peter II of Aragon decided to give the Count of Toulouse the support which he owed him as his suzerain Simon remained the conqueror (Muret, 1213). Innocent III accepted the submission of Raymond in vain. At the Lateran Council the assembled prelates refused to follow the Pope's example; Raymond VI was declared dispossessed and exiled from his dominions; his only son, Raymond VII, could retain only those territories not conquered by the Crusaders, that is to say Beaucaire, Nîmes, and, outside the kingdom, Provence. All the conquered lands were conferred on Simon de Montfort (Decree of 14th December, 1215).¹

Philip Augustus, at this period, was bound by the promise he had made the English barons to help them to dethrone John and he nursed the chimera of an invasion of England. He had allowed his son to make a pious expedition to the South which profited nobody but Simon de Montfort,² and in 1216, at the meeting where Louis of France expounded his rights to the Crown of England and maintained his determination to enforce them, in opposition to the legate, Philip Augustus consented to receive the homage of Simon de Montfort for the Duchy of Narbonne, the County of Toulouse and the Viscounty of Beziers and Carcassonne (Melun, 24–25th April).³ His son was threatened with excommunication and it was impossible to resist the legate on every point. However, he fully intended to make use of his rights as king and lord

¹ On the crusade under Innocent III: XCI, with valuable notes; CXXII, ii, chap. ii ff.; CXCVIII, vi; CXX, iv, 2nd part, 264 ff.
² April–May, 1215: CXVII, 189 ff.
³ XXX, n. 1659; CXVII, 98 ff.; CCXI, iv, 2nd part, 522.
and many of his acts during this period show him using Simon de Montfort as a lieutenant of the monarchy in the South.¹

The deposition of Raymond VI did not have the results which the authors of the decree of 1215 expected. He handed over the conduct of the affairs of the dynasty to his son who undertook to recover the lost possessions. At the voice of Raymond the Young the courage of the Cathares revived; Toulouse invited him. Simon de Montfort advanced rapidly, it was necessary to besiege Toulouse which resisted successfully and Simon was killed (25th June, 1218). Amaury, the son of Simon, did not possess his father’s talents and the intervention of the King of France or a powerful prince became necessary: Philip Augustus was obliged to let the direction of the new campaign be taken by his son to prevent it being given to the Count of Champagne.²

Louis of France, with the personal assistance of the bishops of Senlis, Noyon, and Tournai, launched a campaign in the Agenais which Raymond the Young had just reconquered. Marmande was taken and destroyed: “All the burgesses were killed and their wives and children as well, all the inhabitants numbering about five thousand,” as the historiographer Guillaume le Breton coldly tells us. Toulouse remained impregnable, however, and the sack of Marmande was useless. The barons did not want to continue the campaign and, at the end of three months, Amaury was left to depend on his own forces. At the moment when Philip Augustus died, Amaury had lost nearly all his father’s conquests. The “Perfests” emerged from the mountains and forests where they had taken refuge, began preaching again, and reopened their schools.³

It was Louis VIII who finally engaged the monarchy on the mission which Philip Augustus had refused to undertake. In spite of his uncertain health he was a bellicose man and a very fervent Catholic. The Pope Honorius III hesitated for some time doubtful whether to sacrifice the new Count Raymond VII but, as frequently happened, the legate who represented him in France had fewer scruples than he had.

¹ DXVII, 189, n. 1.
² DCXLVIII, vii, 485 ff.; CCLXI, iv, 2nd part, 541 ff.
³ DXVII, 197 ff.
The legate Romain, Cardinal of Saint Ange, was an imperious and energetic man who certainly, for several years, played an important role in Capetian policy. At the Council of Bourges (30th November, 1225) he secured the rejection of the offer of submission made by Raymond VII and at the Assembly of Paris (28th January, 1226) he excommunicated the count and transferred his territories to the king. Finally, Amaury de Montfort yielded all his rights to Louis VIII.

The Crusade was short and decisive. The prestige of the monarchy was already so high that protestations of enthusiasm for orthodoxy and the monarchy commenced even before Louis VIII arrived in the South. The southern clergy, or rather, I should say, the bishops and abbots recently invested who were men trusted by the Holy See or those who thought it best to bury their past, travelled about the region receiving submissions. The king had issued an ordinance condemning known heretics to the stake and their protectors to civil death (April, 1226). The monarchy officially adopted the cruel custom which the crusaders of 1209 had introduced into the South and which it had itself been applying in the North for a long time without the sanction of any definite ordinance. It was the "first French law which sanctioned the punishment of heresy by death by fire". Finally, the strength of the royal army was shown in the capture of the strong town of Avignon which had refused to allow the crusaders to pass. By sentence of the legate the walls of the town were razed although they were on imperial territory. That provides a very characteristic testimony of the power which the popes assumed over heretical territories. The lands of Raymond VII on the left bank of the Rhône were occupied in the name of the Holy See by the king's forces who remained in Provence until 1234. This helps us to understand the panic which seized the nobility and towns of Languedoc on the king's arrival. His expedition was a military procession. "The whole region trembled and from every quarter delegates arrived at the king's camp." At a meeting held at Pamiers (October, 1226) it was decided in principle that all fiefs and demesne confiscated or to be confiscated from the heretics belonged of right to the king. Toulouse still held out but royal seneschals were installed in Beaucaire and Carcassonne.¹

¹ OałVI, 595 ff. ² DXVII, chap. iv–v; DXXIV, 68 ff.
The premature death of Louis VIII only delayed Raymond's submission for a few years. After the systematic devastation of the Toulousain by the royal troops, he was obliged to accept the very harsh terms imposed by the legate; the king permanently retained the seneschalships of Beaucaire-Nîmes and Carcassonne-Béziers. The count retained only the Toulousain, Agenais, Rouergue, Quercy, and the north of Albigeois (Treaty of Paris, 1229). Personally inclined to a kindly and tolerant policy, he was, henceforward, watched by the bishops and legates and as soon as he showed any signs of lukewarmness he was excommunicated. In 1233 he was forced to publish the statutes against heresy and to allow the organization of the Inquisition in his dominions in the same way as in the new royal seneschalships. A pitiless and incessant persecution eradicated Catharism. Even more characteristic than the examinations and treaties that have come down to us was the poem which the Dominican Izarn composed on his debate with the heretic bishop Sicart de Figueiras: "Look," says the inquisitor, "at the ravenous fire which is consuming your fellows. Tell me in a word or two, will you burn in the fire or join with us?" ¹

In practice the heretics had only the choice between conversion, death or flight. Tolerant Catholics were persecuted. Many families were decimated and ruined. Following the attempt of Raymond Trancavel of Carcassonne who tried to resume possession of his inheritance (1240), the Inquisitors redoubled their zeal and thus provoked a revolt which involved almost all the South. Two of them were massacred at Avignonet not far from Toulouse. Raymond was in communication with the enemies of the King of France and believed the moment had come to take his revenge. He threw off his mask and seized Narbonne and Béziers at the moment when his ally Henry III had just disembarked at Royan to reconquer Saintonge and Poitou. But the victory of Louis IX over the English at Saintes demoralized the men of the South. Threatened by a new crusade which would deprive him of all his possessions, on 20th October, 1242, Raymond VII sent to Louis IX and Blanche of Castile supplicatory letters. He obtained peace on condition that he destroyed heresy

¹ **XXIX, 283 ff.**
in his dominions. The last castles which were the usual retreats of the heretics were not slow to fall. Raymond VII, henceforward faithful to his promise, worked zealously. In the year of his death (1249) he ordered the burning near Agen of eighty Cathares who had confessed their errors and whom an Inquisitor was willing to let live. After his death, the king's brother, Alphonse de Poitiers, who married the daughter of Raymond VII and took possession of Toulouse, showed himself less barbarous but he maintained his position by persecutions, the profits of which the king left to him. The rest of the native nobility was ruined. Catharism had been able to develop in the twelfth century owing to the support of the aristocracy and the absence of repression: reduced to nothing but a heresy of the poor and surrounded by inquisitors it gradually disappeared. Under the Valois, there is scarcely any trace of it to be found.¹

The only thing that remained was the Inquisition for which Saint Louis was directly responsible. It was thanks to his active support that the popes Gregory IX and Innocent IV were able to establish the Inquisition in France at a time when, in most European countries, the secular clergy refused the cooperation of the Dominicans and rejected the terrible means they had been led to take to crush the heroic resistance of the "Perfects"—secret inquiry, secret trial, repeated and captious questioning, torture to enforce a confession and the names of accomplices.

We can fix the year 1233 as the date of the organization of the Inquisition in France. The persecution extended practically throughout the kingdom. Louis IX and his mother paid the expenses of the Inquisitors and gave them a guard responsible for their protection. The secular clergy, at the instance of the Pope and king, abandoned their established prerogative of persecution. The blindness of Saint Louis is well shown by the credit he gave to brother Robert le Petit, a converted Cathare, called, for this reason, the Bulgarian (Bulgur = Cathare). Protected by royal sergeants and encouraged by Gregory IX between 1233 and 1239, this Inquisitor covered Burgundy, Champagne, and Flanders with martyr's stakes.

¹ LXXII, ii, n. 1992, 2234, 2995, etc.; CDVII, bk. ii, chap. i; CLXX, chap. ii, iii, v, vii; CXLVII, 448 ff.; CXLXXX, 154 ff., and app. i; DCLV, 57 ff.
When the persecutors against Catharism flagged for lack of Cathares, the procedure of the Inquisition remained. It was to have a fateful influence on criminal law in France.¹

VI

SAINT LOUIS’S CRUSADES AGAINST THE MOSLEMS

The history of the religious policy of the French kings from the beginning of the thirteenth century to 1270 is very closely bound up with the history of the Crusades. One of the grievances of the Holy See against Philip Augustus and Louis VIII was that they devoted their attention to destroying the Angevin Empire instead of thinking about the deliverance of the Holy Land and remained deaf to all appeals from Rome. This was undoubtedly one of the reasons why those kings who wanted to safeguard their reputation as “Bucklers of the Church” considered their close alliance with the French clergy so necessary and made them so many concessions. With Saint Louis, on the other hand, the idea of freeing the Holy Land quickly became the dominating idea of Capetian policy. In contrast to a king of England who gave the Pope nothing but empty promises, a Frederick II who had friendships with Moslems, or even an Innocent IV who reached the point, as we have already said, of forbidding the preparations for the crusade in Germany,² Saint Louis represents the survival of the ardent crusader of earlier ages who is active in the cause and ready to die for it. After him, men made ambitious projects but few sacrifices.

The Mongol invasion which had destroyed the empire of the Kharismian Turks in Asia and showed itself momentarily as far as the shores of the Adriatic had set in motion dangerous forces³; in September, 1244, bands of Turks, flying before the Mongols, had taken possession of Jerusalem. Frederick II

¹ CDVII, i, chap. viii ff.; XXXVII; CCLXV; CCLXIV; XIX, i, intro., p. xlv ff.; DXXXII; CCLXXVIII; article “Inquisition” (with bibliography) in D.Th.C.; CCCXXXIII, chap. iii; CCCXIX; CCCII, 437 ff., 631 ff.; CLXXXIII, chap. ii.
² Cf. the severe words on the Court of Rome and the “disloyal people there” which Joinville attributes to the legate Eudo of Châteauroux, Saint Louis’s companion in the East: LXVIII, § 611; CLXXII, 220 ff.
³ See DXXXV, 322 ff.
had only recently recovered the Holy City as a result of his negotiations with his friend Malek-el-Khamil, the Sultan of Egypt. Now, however, he could attend to nothing but defending himself against Innocent IV who was seeking his destruction. When the news of the fall of Jerusalem reached France Saint Louis was in the grip of an attack of malaria and generally believed to be on the point of death. He had scarcely recovered the use of speech when he took the vow to go on crusade.

The history of Saint Louis’s crusades concerns our subject only indirectly. It is sufficient to recall what prestige they brought the Capetian monarchy even in Asia and Africa at a time when knightly heroism brought more glory than did ability. Saint Louis decided to attack the Sultan of Egypt in his own dominions, not without good reason, for the kingdom of Jerusalem could only be re-established and its security assured if the power of the sultan was destroyed. The expedition was carefully prepared at enormous expense; it was at that period that Aigues-Mortes was created. In spite of the recent Crusade of Jean de Brienne in Egypt, however, there was no detailed information available on the character of the Nile. The royal army arrived before the mouth of Damietta on 5th June, 1249, only a few days before the beginning of the floods and it had to wait six months for them to subside. Damietta had been taken but stores were running low and indiscipline in the army was growing. The march on Cairo was a disaster. The Crusaders, decimated by scurvy and dysentery and harassed by the Saracens, suffered terribly. It was necessary to retreat and finally the army and the king himself were captured. On the point of death, Saint Louis was cured by an Arab doctor but the emirs treated him most brutally. Under threat of death he refused to yield the fortified places of Syria. He freed what remained of his army on conditions of ransom and himself by giving up Damietta. He passed into Syria and there engaged in strengthening the fortifications. Even the news of his mother’s death, which was the greatest loss of his life, did not make him decide to return (27th November, 1252). At this period he again opened negotiations with the Grand Khan of the Mongols which he had ingeniously started some years before with the idea of bringing these
pagans over to Christianity. On the second occasion, as on the first, he received only an islet invitation to make his submission. Finally, as a result of the urgent appeals of his loyal subjects, he re-embarked for France (24th April, 1254), after a four year stay in Asia, leaving in the East the reputation of a saint.¹

All the efforts and sacrifices had been in vain. After the departure of Saint Louis, the Mongols and Moslems quarrelled over Syria.² The King of France, from 1267 onwards, made new preparations to deliver the Holy Land but, at the last moment, in circumstances which have remained mysterious, his objective changed.³ Did Charles of Anjou, established in Sicily, persuade his brother that in the ancient province of protoconsular Africa he could rekindle the great flame of Christianity which had burned there of old?

The certain thing is that Louis IX, who ceased to see things clearly when he was concerned with the propagation of the faith, believed that the Emir of Tunis was prepared to become a convert. If El Mostansir obstinately clung to his errors a conquered Tunisia would at least provide immense resources for a new expedition to Egypt. On 1st July, 1270, Louis embarked “to root out completely from Africa the errors of the Saracen infidels”.⁴ He was so weakened by illness and mortification that he could not keep his seat on a horse. He had scarcely arrived in Africa when he died, as he wished, a martyr. On his return, throughout the journey of his mortal remains, miracles were reported in increasing numbers.⁵

The period of history that we are studying in this book ends with the canonization of the king. The French monarchy had never enjoyed such an exalted place in the moral sphere but it had also made immense advances in the political arena.

In a previous chapter, we have already seen how within half a century, by the development of established institutions

¹ See, in particular, the admirable account of Joinville, LXVIII, and the explanation, xvi of the editor: LXVII; CXXIV, 489–492; LXVII; DCLXXII, i; CCCLXVI, i; CCCLIII; CCCLXXII, 231 ff.; DCXXXV, 325–331; CDLXVI.
² BLXXI, 365 ff.; CXXV, 228 ff.; DCXXV, 322–324.
⁴ Letter of King Philip the Bold: XXX, n. 801.
⁵ XCV, 88 ff.
and traditions, the monarchy established itself with an administration, a judiciary, and finances. It would have been very surprising if, before this moral and material advance of the monarchy, the independence of the nobility and the free towns had remained intact. In practice, in spite of the respect of a Saint Louis for the rights of others, an era of decline was setting in for them. It is this which we have still to examine.
CHAPTER III

HEGEMONY OF THE CAPELIAN MONARCHY IN FRANCE.
PRESTIGE IN THE WEST, 1202–1270

I

THE ANARCHY

Thanks to energetic monarchs and their reliable ministers the Capetian monarchy during the first two-thirds of the thirteenth century had brought off a difficult coup. To the benefit of French unity and civilization throughout its widely extended demesnes and even beyond, it had won acceptance for the principles of peace and order. Their bailiffs and seneschals had, on occasion, committed abuses which it had been necessary to stamp out but many of them had been excellent administrators. Good or bad they had won respect for the name of the king and worked, in co-operation with the lawyers of the Curia Regis, to draw from the feudal position of the king as overlord all the advantages which custom and its interpretation allowed. Saint Louis, inspired by a religious appreciation of his duties and a certainty of his rights as a consecrated king, had gone even farther. Full of horror and disgust at the internal wars in which he had taken part during his mother’s regency he was not satisfied with a vigorous check on feudal rebellions. He dared to publish and put into effect an ordinance forbidding personal revenge and the wearing of arms. He was the first to strike a blow at the communal separatism which was one of the roots of disorder and his equitable administration was successful in bringing about the assimilation of the newly annexed territories. He said that war between Christians was a sin and put his theory into practice. He was chosen as arbitrator by the nobles who quarrelled among themselves, by foreign magnates, and by the English at war with their king. He gave his dynasty a glory which was to last for many centuries. The present chapter will be devoted to a study of these facts.