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Abstract

This paper aims to re-evaluate the place of Philip II “Augustus” in the canon of medieval French historiography, and seeks to examine his reign within the context of the development of an ideology of sacral Capetian kingship, as opposed to the more traditional interpretation of the rise of the political power of the Capetian dynasty. While acknowledging Philip’s crucial contribution to the emergence of medieval France as one of the pre-eminent political powers of Latin Christendom in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, this paper argues that the wider historiographical field has diminished Philip’s equally important role in the construction of sacral Capetian ideology, presenting him as a proto-realpolitik monarch, rather than one overly concerned with spiritual or symbolic authority. In challenging the predominant historiographical portrayal of Philip II, this paper returns to an older tradition of scholarship embodied in historians such as Marc Bloch and Ernst Kantorowicz that emphasized both the sacerdotal understanding and representation of medieval monarchical power to contemporary theorists, and further argues that there existed a theoretical framework of uniquely Capetian sacral kingship that informed Philip’s most significant political and administrative reforms, and which he was intimately aware of and responding to. Moreover, Philip presided over the maturation of Capetian monarchical ideology through his own contributions in the patronage of the abbey of Saint-Denis, and a reinforcement of ties between the emergent Dionysian center of historical writing, the veneration of Saint Denis, and the Capetian monarchy. Alongside this development, Philip’s reign saw the revival and incorporation of Carolingian symbolism and nomenclature into the canon of Capetian monarchical conventions, which enhanced the sacral reputation of the Capetian dynasty and legitimized the dramatic expansion of political and territorial authority that characterized Philip’s rule. Ultimately, Philip’s contribution to an ideology of sacral Capetian
kingship was highly significant in that it saw the emergence of a nascent understanding of a communal identity of *Franci* in *Francia*, united under the figure of the sacral Capetian king and through shared ethnic, linguistic, and religious historical heritage, which would come to full fruition during the reigns of Louis IX and Philip IV.
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Chapter 1: From Dieudonné to Augustus: The Evolution of Philip II in Historical Literature and Modern Scholarship

The reign of Philip II of France (r. 1180-1223) has long been regarded as a turning point in the fortunes of the Capetian monarchy, both by contemporary writers and modern historians. More commonly known as Philip “Augustus”, the French king is hailed as the progenitor of the French state, and held responsible for the ascendency of the Capetians as the dominant Christian monarchy in Western Europe during the High Middle Ages. Philip’s reign coincided with a dramatic territorial expansion of the kingdom of France, hitherto restricted essentially to the Ile-de-France region, and with a concomitant increase in the political power wielded by the monarchy; it is therefore unsurprising that, particularly in the French historiographical tradition, Philip II is viewed as the founder of the French state.¹ Yet what is often overlooked in the many studies of Philip’s reign is his contribution to, and indeed confirmation of, the sacral kingship so closely associated with the medieval French monarchy, to the point where the Capetian monarchs of later centuries were frequently referred to as rex christianissimus or ‘most Christian king’. This close relationship of secular and sacral power in the figure of the monarch arguably found its epitome in the person of Louis IX (r. 1226-1270), who was canonized by the Church in 1297, and whose substantial contributions to the sacral reputation of the Capetian monarchy were equally matched by the judicial and governmental reforms enacted during his reign.² This is not

to suggest that Louis IX was solely responsible for the construction of an ideology of sacral French kingship in the thirteenth century, but when elaborating upon the venerable tradition of sacral monarchy in medieval France, historians often either excise Philip II entirely – drawing a line of succession from the pious Louis VII (r. 1137-1180), leader of the Second Crusade, to Louis VIII (r. 1223-1226) who died while returning from a campaign against the Albigéois, and ending with Louis IX – or suggest that Philip’s contribution to this ideology were minimal at best. By contrast, Philip II is remembered for his territorial conquests and the expansion of royal political power, but his devotion and piety, or lack thereof, are viewed either as irrelevant or as a brief aside that detracts from the truly vital contributions of his reign to the political aggrandizement of the Capetian monarchy.

I would argue that Philip’s role in the maturation of a tradition of sacral Capetian monarchy cannot be overlooked, and indeed that they played a central role in providing the foundation for the edifice of sacral kingship that was aggressively advanced during the time of Louis IX. Indeed, many historians of the reign of Louis IX indicate, albeit briefly, that Philip II was cited frequently by the king and his court as an exemplar of sacred kingship, and that many of the actions undertaken by the pious monarch were a deliberate echo of similar, if not identical, measures carried out during the reign of Philip II. While not to downplay the significance of

---


French territorial expansion and the growth of the political power of the Capetian monarchy which occurred during Philip’s reign in the development of monarchical power in Capetian France, this paper suggests that Philip’s reign must be re-examined within the broader context of ideas of sacral kingship that circulated in medieval Europe during the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Furthermore, that Philip was both actively engaged with said theories and actively involved in the advancement of an ideology of specifically French sacred monarchy, which historians have particularly associated with the writings of Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis (c. 1081-1151). Despite Philip’s noted lack of enthusiasm for the patronage of literature – whether historical works or the emergent genre of troubadour poems whose popularity was developing in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries – and the much-maligned portrait of the French king which emerges from many of the contemporary sources of the period, Philip was far from a passive participant in the development of Capetian tradition of sacral monarchy. This paper will argue that Philip engaged in several deliberate attempts to consolidate the Capetian mythos of sacral monarchy during his reign, particularly in regards to the connection between the Capetians and Charlemagne, as well as strengthening the association between the monarchy and the monastery.


of Saint-Denis, and laying the foundation for its emergence as the principal centre of pro-
Capetian historical literature and primary supporter of the ideological program of monarchical
supremacy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. This paper does not seek to directly
compare the reigns and policies of Philip II and Louis IX, but rather suggests that Philip
established a precedent of monarchical ritualism and patterns of behavior which incorporated
new elements into a pre-existing tradition of sacerdotal Capetian monarchy that would form a
central part in the realization of an ideology of Capetian sacral kingship in the later thirteenth
century.

Philip II occupies a particular place in the broader historiographical field of Capetian
France, a highly successful and long-lived ruler whose sweeping territorial conquests and
comprehensive institutional and bureaucratic reforms bridged the gap between the weakness of
the early Capetians and the highly successful reigns of later Capetians such as Louis IX and
Philip IV “the Fair” (r. 1285-1314), under whom France was regarded as the foremost Christian
power in medieval Europe. The general consensus among historians is that Philip II was a
transformational figure in regards to the concurrent growth of administrative bureaucracy and
political power of the Capetian monarchy in the High Middle Ages, but that his reign served as
more of a transitional period in relation to the development of a royal ideology of Capetian
kingship, particularly when compared to the concerted efforts on the part of his successors in

---

7 Baldwin, The Government of Philip, 392-94; Andrew W. Lewis, Royal Succession in Capetian
124-27; Hallam and Everard, Capetian France, 145; Thomas N. Bisson, The Crisis of the
Twelfth-Century: Power, Lordship, and the Origins of European Government (Princeton:
Colette Beaune, The Birth of an Ideology: Myths and Symbols of Nation in Late-Medieval
Berman, Law and Revolution: The Formation of the Western Legal Tradition (Cambridge:
Harvard University Press, 1983), 462-64
fostering a myth of sacral Capetian rule. In some respects, this is a result of the often unfavorable, if somewhat inevitable, comparisons made between Philip and both Richard I “the Lionheart” and to Louis IX, the saintly King, comparisons made by modern historians and contemporary observers alike. Though a competent strategist who personally participated in the siege of Acre in 1191 and who led his army to victory at the Battle of Bouvines in 1214, Philip was never the dashing chivalric hero of troubadour poetry like Richard. Though a conventionally pious ruler who was referred to as *rex christianissimus* by no less a figure than Pope Innocent III in 1209, Philip could not compete with the fervent asceticism, aggressive piety and devotion to the crusades of his grandson. ⁸ An impressive record of territorial conquest and administrative reform, Philip’s reign was perceived as marred by his reluctance to participate in the crusading movement, his conflicts with the papacy over his marital disputes, and his unappealing personal character, all of which essentially excised him from the tradition of sacral Capetian monarchy that was cultivated by monarchs such as his predecessor Louis VII “the Pious”. In an early article, John Baldwin provides a brief sketch of the personality of Philip, which he suggested was quite distinct from a deliberately cultivated public personage that existed in narrative chronicles, arguing that the French king was “a politically astute, manipulative, calculating, penurious, and un gallant ruler – in short, the ultimate discourteous knight”, a portrait which has proven remarkably resilient in the broader historiography. ⁹ Robert Bautier takes a more flattering view

---


of Philip’s foibles, suggesting that “Philippe Auguste le fut sans aucun doute . . . . Ce fut avant tout un remarquable tactician de la politique, un home sachant jauger partenaires et adversaires et découvrir leurs faiblesses et en profiter”.  

Despite these occasional historical interpretations, the broader depiction of the French king remains the same – Philip’s reign, while crucial to the development of Capetian monarchical in the thirteenth century, was nonetheless minimal in regards to the sacral foundations of Capetian kingship that would become so critical to the reigns of later kings such as Louis IX and Philip IV.  

This historiographical view is furthered by the reputation of Philip as a reluctant crusader who – despite his reign coinciding with a period of intense crusading fervor – was muted in his support for holy war and indeed viewed it as a distraction from his primary aim in aggrandizing the secular power of the French monarchy in Europe. More recent scholarship, however, has sought to challenge this historical analysis and portrayal of Philip, with historians such as William Jordan, Jacques Le Goff, and Cecilia Gaposchkin noting the extent to which Louis IX and later Capetians built upon the symbolism and rituals which were constructed and elaborated upon during Philip’s reign.  

In particular, a number of specific rituals and practices that demonstrated the institutional closeness of the Capetian monarchy and the monastery of Saint-Denis from the time of Louis IX were, as these historians note, deliberately copied from the reign
of Philip II; moreover, much of the language and symbolism that first emerged during Philip’s rule quickly became staples of the mythos and sacral imagery of the Capetian dynasty in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Matthew Gabriele, meanwhile, has argued compellingly that Philip actively contributed to the development of royal mythology through his patronage of the abbey of Saint-Denis, and the increased association with Charlemagne and the Carolingians that functioned as a cultural aegis to construct a notion of France as a sacred community led by the figure of the sacral king.¹³

To some extent, the question of Philip’s personality is irrelevant to the wider discussion of his place within the canon of sacral Capetian kingship – indeed, the emphasis upon Philip’s supposedly negative character arguably obscures his active contribution to this tradition as observed by more recent scholars. In a wide-ranging biography on Louis IX, Le Goff suggests that “Starting around this time, the holiness of one’s life and manners would carry more weight than miracles, which were only the seal . . . that gave a final stamp of approval to one’s moral and religious perfection” but that Philip’s dubious personal virtues, when viewed alongside the supposed miracles and visions which were associated with him throughout his life, conformed to an older model of sacral kingship.¹⁴ This paper argues that an analysis of Philip’s reign which, while acknowledging the importance of his contribution to the institutional framework and monarchical power of medieval France, moves beyond this and the ossified negative portrayal of Philip’s character, allowing for a more nuanced exploration of how Philip fundamentally

¹⁴ Le Goff, Saint Louis, 373-74; Beaune, The Birth of an Ideology, 90-91, 173
transformed the idea of sacral Capetian kingship through his active development of a distinctly sacred royal ideology. In challenging the belief that Philip was indeed, “the ultimate discourteous knight”, this paper argues that Philip II furthered the emergence of the idea of a sacred community of France led by the figure of the king, as can be seen both through more recent trends in the historiographical field and in a re-evaluation of the narrative primary material.\(^{15}\)

More broadly, this historiographical portrayal of Philip II as a ruler whose greatest victories were achieved in spite of his dearth of personal piety and crusading zeal emerges from a similar treatment of the French king in the primary source material. Philip’s most strident critics were Anglo-Norman writers, such as Richard of Devizes who dismissively calls Philip “their paltry King of the French”, and the author of the *Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, who claims that “Le roi de France était fin et plus rusé qu’un renard”, condemning Philip as a weak monarch who manipulated others.\(^ {16}\) The condemnation of Anglo-Norman chroniclers is unsurprising given that the dramatic increase in Capetian power gained under Philip II came almost exclusively at the expense of the Plantagenets whom these writers served. James Naus in particular is highly critical of English historiography of Philip, noting that “not only have scholars tended to follow the Anglo-Norman line concerning Philip’s behavior . . . they have also internalized its distortions without due regard to Philip as a sort of corrective” which, while understandable given the greater availability of Anglo-Norman sources, has contributed

\(^{15}\) Baldwin, “The Case of Philip,” 207

significantly to an ossified portrayal of Philip as a bad crusader and scheming king.\textsuperscript{17} Even among French chroniclers, however, Philip was not universally praised, with one of his earliest biographers describing Philip’s failed military campaign of 1198 and Richard I’s subsequent successes as divine punishment for both Philip’s exactions against the Church and his readmission of Jews into the royal domain, a theme which emerges again in the writings of Guillaume de Nangis several centuries later.\textsuperscript{18} Gilles de Paris, author of the \textit{Karolinus}, dedicated the work – which functioned both as an instructional exemplar for princes and a history of the life of Charlemagne – not to Philip II but to his son, the future Louis VIII (r. 1223-26), and further suggests that Louis should emulate his father’s great deeds in battle, but to avoid Philip’s moral and marital failings. Similarly, the \textit{Latin Chronicle of the Kings of Castile} refers to Louis VIII as “the illustrious King of the French” upon his death in 1226 while returning from his crusade against the Albigéois heretics, though the chronicler does not offer such laudatory terms for Philip II upon his death in 1223.\textsuperscript{19}

Philip fares even worse in the literary works of aristocratic troubadours such as Bertran de Born and Conon de Béthune, with the former lambasting the king for his perceived lack of largesse and valour in battle in comparison to Richard I and the latter criticizing both Philip’s

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\end{thebibliography}
unwillingness to generously patronize the arts and entertainment at his court and his lack of appreciation for the emergent vernacular form of verse, with both men finding Philip wholly at odds with the chivalric ideals popularized by the vernacular *chansons* and incorporated into aristocratic poetry. Bertran is wholeheartedly contemptuous of Philip and his unwarlike reputation, stating “King Philip, what a pity . . . that he is not really noble . . . . The French shouldn’t get their hopes up, because they need a leader, they should fear his weakness”. 20 This paper argues that these poems, often drawing heavily from the genre of the *chansons*, represented a vernacular medium that enabled the aristocracy to express their own understanding of sovereignty, monarchy, and the role of the king. Moreover, as argued by Robert Stein and Gabrielle Spiegel, these aristocratic-sponsored vernacular histories and verse compositions frequently existed in dialogue and in opposition with the more “official” discussions of kingship and theory that emerged primarily from the monastery of Saint-Denis and writers associated with the royal court. 21 Aristocratic troubadours, while the exception rather than the rule, constructed an understanding of medieval kingship that relied upon notions of martial prowess and glory, as opposed to moral restraint and piety that characterized a pre-existing understanding of medieval kingship in service to the Church. This was a response to the development of a coherent royal


ideology that emphasized the adherence of the Capetians to an understanding of kingly sovereignty that drew from both secular and spiritual authority, and was used to justify the expansion of political and territorial control during Philip’s reign to great effect. The spread of the genre of the *chansons de geste*, its impact, reception, and rapid reproduction in lyrical form amongst the aristocracy, and the notion of chivalric kingship it espoused arguably confirmed the strengthening of royal Capetian ideology during Philip’s lifetime. Furthermore, it challenges both the traditional historiographical depiction of Philip as uninterested in the development of Capetian monarchical ideology and his reputation as a lacklustre Christian ruler, suggesting instead Philip’s adherence to an oppositional understanding of kingship rooted in moderation, morality, and obedience to clerical norms that was developed in primarily ecclesiastical treatises on medieval kingship such as Suger’s *Deeds of Louis the Fat* and John of Salisbury’s *Policraticus.*

This is not to suggest that Philip was wholly without his defenders – perhaps the most praiseworthy and well-known is Guillaume le Breton’s *Philippidos*, a verse epic written to glorify the Battle of Bouvines which served as a panegyric extolling the virtues of the French king, presenting him as the realization of the ideal of a sacred, united France. The chief biographer of Philip, Rigord of Saint-Denis, despite occasional criticisms of Philip’s somewhat flexible policy towards the Church, was generally favorable towards the monarch in his *La Vie*

---

*de Philippe Auguste*, while Anglo-Norman writer Gerald of Wales, in his *De Principis Instructione*, considered Philip a far superior king to the Plantagenets, both in term of his moral and political conduct. Nevertheless, the exchange in sobriquets of “Augustus” and “Magnanime” for “Dieudonné” was an attempt by contemporary writers to portray Philip in the best possible light, namely by highlighting his military and political triumphs in order to downplay his lackluster credentials as a sacral Capetian king. The concentrated emergence of numerous pro-Capetian and pro-Philip histories in the early thirteenth century arguably signifies both the strength of the Capetian dynastic myth, and both Philip’s place within this canon and his contribution to its longevity. Even from this perspective, however, Philip remained essentially a passive actor, whose reign was interpreted and reimagined by admiring chroniclers for the glorification of the Capetian dynasty and the justification of their cultural and ideological supremacy among Christian kingdoms in the later medieval period.

John W. Baldwin’s magisterial *The Government of Philip Augustus* is emblematic of the wider historiographical treatment of Philip II and the persistent, if malign, portrait of the Capetian monarch. In his preface, Baldwin asserts that his aim was to explore “the development of government during Philip’s reign” and to examine the dramatic financial and institutional

---

24 While the principal origins of the term *Dieudonne* came from the circumstances of Philip’s birth, Rigord also claims that it was due to his love of the church and fervent support of ecclesiastical rights against the nobility, at least in the early years of his reign. Rigord ceases to use the epithet *Dieudonne* and *rex christianissimus* in his chronicle, but renews its usage towards its conclusion. The first use of the term *Augustus* by Rigord is after the successful conclusion of a conflict with Philip’s vassals, resulting in territorial gain for France – thus Philip “augmented” the realm, though Rigord also notes that Philip was born in the month of August. Rigord, *Histoire de Philippe*, 135, 393-95; Gerald of Wales, *De Principis Instructione Liber*, ed. George F. Warner (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1891), 320-22; Daniel Power, “The Norman Church and the Angevin and Capetian Kings,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 56 (2005): 215-20; Baldwin, “The Case of Philip,” 196
changes effected by the Capetian monarch during the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. In doing so, Baldwin suggests that the definitive chronological and narrative study of Philip’s reign had been completed in the early twentieth century, in Alexander Cartellieri’s four volume *Philipp II Augustus, Konig von Frankreich* which was published in 1921, and thus Baldwin elected to lay the groundwork for an expansion into the field of institutional and governmental history in medieval France. This is not to suggest that Baldwin overlooks the development of royal ideology during this period, or indeed the attempted association of sacral symbolism with both the person of Philip II and the Capetian monarchy more widely, as he notes that “in ideology as well as in the workings of administration, Philip had forged the essential components of royal government, which Louis IX and later Philip the Fair coordinated into a puissant policy that dominated Western Christendom”, a sentiment shared by earlier historian Robert Fawtier, but nonetheless chooses to focus the bulk of his work on the evolution of functional and effective government during Philip’s rule. This resurgent scholarly interest in the reign of Philip II, centered around Baldwin’s work and the impressive collection of articles and essays published in 1982 in a colloquium entitled *La France de Philippe Auguste: Le temps de mutation*, coincided with a broader push towards the study of administrative history in the medieval period during the 1970s and 1980s, which prioritized the use of archival evidence, cartulary records, and other bureaucratic source materials to supplement the narrative chronicles of the time. If situated within this broader trend in the historical scholarship of the time, the emphasis upon Philip’s administrative accomplishments is perfectly understandable, as it was only under Philip II that

---


26 Bradbury, *Philip Augustus*, 214-15

the French monarchy began compiling such governmental records in earnest, though it shifts the focus of historical analysis away from Philip’s contribution to the development of a more abstract culture of royal and sacral symbolism.\textsuperscript{28}

This emphasis upon Philip II as the founder, in some respects, of the French state, is particularly evident in the French-language historiography, whose titles – including Jean Flori’s \textit{Philippe Auguste: La Naissance de l’État Monarchique}, Georges Bordonove’s \textit{Les Rois qui ont fait la France: Philippe Auguste le Conquérant}, and the works of a 1982 colloquium published by Robert Bautier entitled \textit{La France de Philippe Auguste: Le Temps des Mutations} – make abundantly clear the crucial role played by Philip in the consolidation of proto-state of France within the French-language historiographical tradition.\textsuperscript{29} The Battle of Bouvines holds, to a certain extent, an analogous position in French popular cultural memory to that of the Battle of Hastings in England, and while the historical scholarship is not so blatant, by the latter part of the twentieth century Philip had clearly emerged as a central figure in the development of the modern French state and occupied a distinct and crucial place within the national story of France, with Spiegel noting that Bouvines is often portrayed as “an extended metaphor for the shift from feudal to administrative kingship that . . . characterized the governmental innovations of the

This historiographical development was the result of a wider project of “medievalization” in the aftermath of the First and Second World Wars, where the search for a common cultural memory bound in similarly shared historical experience saw a return to the medieval period for inspiration for a wider narrative of French national history. Such a phenomenon is articulated by historians J. F. Benton and Anne Lester, with the former highlighting the surge in publication numbers of translations of the *Chanson de Roland* and Lester noting that, for the French government of the time, “a return to the medieval could thus cement a new Catholic and civic post-war order”.

Jean Flori describes Philip as “un roi moderne” while Bordonove makes a comparison between Philip’s political acumen and that of the absolutist monarch Louis XIV of early modern fame, and further suggests that “C’est qu’avec lui la monarchie sort enfin de l’ombre, s’éleve comme un soleil levant, dont les premiers rayons éclairent une France enfin recomposée, l’ébauche de l’hexagone”. French-language historiography also draws heavily from the arguments of state-building historians such as Perry Anderson’s *Lineages of the Absolutist State* and Thomas Ertman’s *Birth of the Leviathan* who elaborate upon the medieval origins of the state through the centralizing apparatus of monarchical control over a fractured, feudal nobility, and consider the feudal revolution to have occurred primarily in the thirteenth and fourteenth century.

---

centuries in medieval Europe.\textsuperscript{33} Kimberly LoPrete, in an article discussing recent
historiographical trends in the study of Capetian women in the medieval period, notes that for
many twentieth century historians, Philip’s reign “had been inscribed by . . . nationalist
predecessors as the moment when a recognizably French state-like government emerged” and it
is important to recognize here that Philip is clearly viewed as a king whose interests were
principally on the territorial expansion of temporal power, and it is through this historiographical
analysis of proto-state construction that Philip is primarily depicted in historical scholarship.\textsuperscript{34}
To some extent, it is this emphasis on the development of a politically and territorially powerful
Capetian France during Philip’s reign necessitated a reduction of emphasis upon the symbolic
and ritualistic element of Capetian power, as that had been the recourse of early kings whose
theoretical sovereignty far outstripped their real strength. Conversely, Philip’s actualization of
theoretical feudal power in his capacity as monarch meant that he no longer needed to emphasize
so powerfully the symbolic culture of Capetian authority to buttress his claims to French
sovereignty, and thus there was little need for more substantial narrative historiographical
exploration than the works of historians such as Cartellieri, Fawtier, and others.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{34} LoPrete, “Historical Ironies,” 272-74
\textsuperscript{35} Ronald Walpole’s work from the late 1970s also shared this understanding of Philip’s reign
and its principal contribution to French history, noting that “It was really during the reign and
While the English-language historiography places a similar importance on Philip’s reign in its contribution to the growth of Capetian monarchical power and the emergence of the medieval proto-state, in many cases Philip is treated almost exclusively within the context of his political struggle against the Plantagenet Dukes of Normandy, whose contemporaneous position as Kings of England goes some ways to explaining the focus placed by historians such as Ralph Turner and John Gillingham upon Philip’s role in the collapse of Plantagenet hegemony in Western Europe.\(^\text{36}\) This territorial growth is often paired with the narrative of an aggressively centralizing monarchical bureaucracy, whose power grows largely at the expense of the feudal nobility and landed magnates such as the Dukes of Normandy, the Counts of Flanders, and others. Philip’s reign proves critical in the emergence of what Thomas Bisson describes as a “feudal monarchy”, where the majority of political power is tied to the person of the king and the institution of monarchy more broadly.\(^\text{37}\) This argument is also taken up by Ralph Turner, who notes that “the term ‘fief’ only gained a precise definition in Philip’s time . . . . Philip Augustus used new feudal definitions to intervene freely in the territories of France’s dukes and counts, seeking to interpose his suzerainty”.\(^\text{38}\) Baldwin points to a similar phenomenon in an article on the rise of “administrative kingship” under Philip II; such a process is also evident in Flori’s work, where he details the spread of royal justice and power through the deployment of royal officials such as the baillis and expanded power for the pre-existing prêvots. The most compelling example of both the newfound political power of the Capetians and the deftness with which Philip deployed the language of feudal monarchy is found in the justification provided for

\(^{36}\) Turner and Heiser, _The Reign of Richard_, 247-248; Gillingham, _Richard I_, 335; Stein, _Reality Fictions_, 183
\(^{38}\) Turner and Heiser, _The Reign of Richard_, 40; Fawtier, _The Capetian Kings_, 62-63
Philip’s invasion of Normandy in the early twelfth century – the French king, having had his summons to John I in his capacity as Duke of Normandy rejected, convened a tribunal that declared John guilty of felony and that his fiefs were forfeit in 1202. To admirers such as Guillaume le Breton, Philip was merely acting in his rightful role as feudal sovereign; for Gerald of Wales, moreover, Philip’s conquests were viewed within the prism of divine punishment for the violent depredations of the Plantagenets, against whom Philip and the Capetians more broadly were depicted as the idealization of the medieval sacral king. To his detractors – particularly the Anglo-Norman chroniclers who witnessed the collapse of Angevin hegemony in Western France with dismay – the invasion of Normandy was a shameful and underhanded trick which emphasized the true nature of the French monarch, whose only victories on the battlefield were against the hapless John, nicknamed “Softsword” and renowned for his military incompetence, and never against the valiant Richard.

Philip’s failure to live up to an emergent chivalric ideal that praised valour in battle and largesse in victory forms a consistent criticism in the works of Bertran de Born and other troubadours, who cite his reluctance to engage in warfare as a fundamental flaw in his reputation as a king, particularly in comparison to the contemporary Richard I. In delineating the two kings in regards to their martial prowess, Bertran derisively portrays Philip as a lamb, while praising Richard as a lion, stating that “I like the way of the lion, who is not cruel to a conquered creature,

---

but is proud against pride . . . . For a mighty nobleman you should fight all day!". Philip also displayed a noted lack of enthusiasm for tournaments – going so far as to prevent his son, Louis, from participating in such activities – and his repeated defeats at the hands of Richard were attributed largely to his physical cowardice and mediocre strategic ability by contemporary writers, a verdict which is echoed strongly in modern scholarship. Baldwin, for example, argues that Philip’s greatest military triumph at Bouvines was engineered and conducted largely by Brother Guerin of Senlis (c. ?), a Hospitaller knight and prominent member of Philip’s court, rather than due to any inherent ability of the Capetian king himself, while Philip’s victory at Bouvines is considered the sole exception to an otherwise chequered military career. A similar criticism of weakness and lack of martial ability is leveled at Philip by the Anglo-Norman poet Ambroise in his verse account of the events of the Third Crusade which, though not explicitly a chanson de geste, was nonetheless heavily informed by the genre, and Ambroise strongly implies such a connection through the language and actions he ascribes to Richard I. As noted by Marianne Ailes, Ambroise deploys Philip as a dramatic foil for his hero, Richard – and invariably, the Capetian monarch comes off the worse, as Richard is depicted as more generous, more competent in battle, and more committed to the crusade, as the Angevin monarch remains in the Levant for the duration of the expedition. Philip’s early departure from the Third Crusade – which will be discussed in greater detail in subsequent sections of this paper – was attributed to cowardice by the anonymous author of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum, as well as by both

41 Bertran de Born, The Poems of Bertran, 432; Bisson, The Crisis of the Twelfth Century, 435; Gillingham, Richard I, 260-61
Ambroise and Richard of Devizes, who dismiss wholeheartedly the argument that Philip was gravely ill. This argument retains traction in modern historiography, where Philip’s principal aim in departing the crusade was evidently to launch an invasion of Normandy in Richard’s absence, and others argue that the Third Crusade proved such a harrowing physical experience that it left the French king fundamentally scarred and with a nervous disorder that would play out most prominently in his 1193 dismissal of his wife, Ingeburg of Denmark (c. 1175-1236).44

In this respect, however, the vehement criticism of Philip’s perceived inadequacies as a warrior king seem at odds with broader discussions on the role of warfare more generally in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, and indeed with Philip’s own actions during the many wars of his reign. The comparison of the lamb and the lion is interestingly turned on its head by Gerald of Wales’ De Principis Instructione, where the chronicler asserts that the defeat of the lion and the leopard – the heraldry of Richard personally and the Plantagenets as a dynasty – by the simple lily of the Capetians was a divine judgement upon the contrasting morals of the Plantagenets and Capetians, where the piety and humility of the latter defeated the violent aggression of the former.45 The lily and its significance to Capetian heraldry also incorporated Marian imagery, and both its literal and figurative meanings would be deployed by Philip in
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concert with his political and military victories to construct a hybrid nature of secular and spiritual sovereignty as exerted by the Capetians. Moreover, while it is difficult to definitively prove the main reason behind Philip’s aversion to both the hosting and participating in tournaments, the Capetian monarch’s attitudes were largely in line with broader papal pronouncements on the subject, as articulated by Innocent III’s Ad liberandum of 1215. Building upon the earlier Quia maior, Innocent’s Ad Liberandum stated “although tournaments have been prohibited generally in several councils with fixed penalties, we firmly forbid them to be held for three years under pain of excommunication, because . . . they are greatly hindering the business of the cross”.

This articulation of the ecclesiastical condemnation of a fundamental component of chivalric kingship – namely the participation of kings in tournaments to highlight their martial prowess – suggests again that Philip acted within a model of behavior and monarchical practice that conformed more closely to the understanding of pious kingship embodied by earlier Capetian kings, and its crusading connation challenges both Philip’s supposed unwillingness to contribute effectively to the crusading movement and the charge of physical cowardice.

Philip’s reluctance for unbridled warfare can be construed as a more appropriate and monarchical attitude towards conflict, which is also reflected to some extent in Anglo-Norman criticisms of Richard’s reckless conduct on the Third Crusade. More broadly, however, Philip’s perceived aversion to combat can arguably be seen as conforming to an alternative view of the relationship between the medieval monarch and warfare that can be gleaned from the Latin Chronicle of the Kings of Castile, where the anonymous author heavily criticizes Alfonso VIII (r. 1158-1214) for his failed invasion of Gascony in 1205. Upon Alfonso’s withdrawal from
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Gascony in 1208, the chronicler claims that “this was a happy day . . . when the king yielded to persistence and desisted from this undertaking! Gascony would have wasted . . . gold and would have exhausted the nobility”, suggesting that a good Christian king would recognize the limitations of wars for conquest and glory and act accordingly, as Philip himself did. This obsession with battlefield glory is similarly criticized by Guillaume le Breton, who condemns Richard’s glory-seeking behavior in his Philippidos, stating that “le vaillant roi, jaloux de conserver son honneur autant qu’il lui est possible, prefere cet honneur au parti qui lui offre plus de securité”.

Beyond the somewhat obvious explanation that the majority of charges of cowardice are levelled at Philip II by Anglo-Norman chroniclers, it is also possible to discern a diversion in the literary portrayal of the ideal monarch at war during the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Alongside the chivalric warrior-king of vernacular poetry, which were rooted in Carolingian traditions of military strength being strongly associated with rulership, the period saw the emergence of what Christopher Allmand describes as the “thinking commander”, a concept which Allmand suggests grew out of the dux of Roman texts, specifically the De Re Militari of Vegetius, written in the fifth century, and coincided with a transformation in the “warrior-chief” role of the monarch to one more resembling a battlefield commander against the backdrop of a developing theory of feudal monarchy. While less glamorous than the dramatic battles favored by troubadours, and for which Richard was particularly known for, Philip played
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a critical role in the expansion and evolution of French military power during his reign, and is
credited personally with the expansion of fortifications around Paris and the development of a
dedicated corps of royal ingenieurs in order to fortify and defend the borders of the kingdom.
Indeed, one historian notes that the dramatic shift towards a militarization of the medieval polity
under Philip II was a sharp contrast with the policy of his father Louis VII, noting that “Cette
rupture avec le passé est la conséquence du désir de reconquête du royaume et du maintien des
nouvelles frontières . . . a la différence de son père qui n’a pas été un grand bâtisseur . . .
Philippe Auguste ouvre une voie nouvelle”. 51 Philip’s ability to manipulate others, often
described as the political machinations of a calculating and cowardly sovereign, can instead be
viewed as the hallmarks of an effective military commander, one who, according to Guillaume le
Breton, was heavily implicated in the military stratagems that led to victory at Bouvines, fought
not against John “Softsword” but Otto IV of Brunswick (r. 1209-15), Holy Roman Emperor, and
earlier captured the castle of Chateau-Gaillard, widely considered by contemporaries to be
impregnable, in 1204. 52

Moreover, Philip’s personal reputation for cowardice is somewhat undeserved, as both
Guillaume le Breton and later writer Guillaume de Nangis highlight Philip’s physical
engagement in combat during the Battle of Bouvines, with de Nangis noting that “le roi lui-
même, entouré d’une multitude de vaillants hommes, venait après son armée, les ennemis,
frappés tout à coup comme d’épouvante et d’horreur, passèrent sur le flanc septentrional de
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l’armée”. Furthermore, Philip emerges as far more soldierly in the works of French writers such as Guillaume le Breton, who at one point describes Philip’s conduct in battle against Henry II with glowing praise, emphasizing that “ni le nombre des guerriers ni la nouvelle que le roi des anglais accourt en toute hâte ne peuvent effrayer Philippe”. A salient example of this sharply divergent portrayal of the Capetian monarch can be seen in contemporary accounts of Philip’s failed attack on Gisors in 1198 – the French king, forced to retreat after a sudden attack by Richard, was caught on a bridge which collapsed under the weight of the French knights and had to be dragged from the water by his attendants. Anglo-Norman writers mock Philip for this episode, suggesting that in his panic at the advance of Richard and his unseemly haste to retreat, the French king was plunged unceremoniously into the river; French writers, however, suggest that Philip was valiantly defending the rear and exhorting his knights to withdraw in an orderly fashion when the bridge collapsed. Another anecdote of Philip’s martial inclination emerges from the staunchly anti-Capetian L’Histoire de Guillaume le Marechal, which details a peculiar episode in 1186 where Philip challenged Henry II to a duel in order to settle a recent territorial dispute, with each sovereign accompanied by four companions, an episode which was later the focus of a satirical song by Bertran de Born as the duel never occurred. Though the author uses the incident as an opportunity for William the Marshal to lecture Henry on the treacherous nature of the French king and to demonstrate the superior chivalry of the Angevin nobles, the incident nonetheless highlights an often overlooked aspect of Philip’s personality, namely that of a warrior and general. While the biases of the French chroniclers must be taken into account, the
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repeated instances of Philip’s presence on the battlefield emphasizes both his willingness to wage war and participate directly in combat, even if such engagements did not always lead to feats of extraordinary valor or victory.

Indeed, in some cases, as Jim Bradbury points out, Philip’s personal engagement in physical combat is simply overlooked, as on the Third Crusade, or else dismissed outright as a minor engagement at odds with his overall reputation for cowardice, noting that “the author of the Itinerarium considered Philip’s reason for returning . . . cowardice . . . . In Plantagenet chronicles, when Philip retreats it is cowardice, when he makes peace it is weakness”.57 Though both Richard and Philip fell ill upon their arrival in the Levant – a sickness identified variously as arnoldia, which caused one’s hair and fingernails to fall out, a dysentery-like illness, or a form of scurvy – Anglo-Norman chroniclers are quick only to note that Richard, despite this illness, continued to engage in combat, supposedly being carried out in a litter to fire crossbow bolts at the besieged Muslim garrison. One asserts that “the king himself . . . ordering, exhorting, and inspiring, and he was thus everywhere . . . so that to him alone might be ascribed what each man did”, presenting Richard as a man unafraid to enter the battlefield and place himself in physical danger in service to the crusading cause.58 While few Anglo-Norman writers wholly dismiss Philip’s contribution at the siege of Acre, Philip’s personal military participation is noticeably absent from these Anglo-Norman sources, though Roger of Hovedon does state that “by the mercy of God, it came to pass that they both recovered from this sickness, and became stronger
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and more hearty than ever in the service of God”.  

By contrast, French chroniclers emphasize both Philip’s soldierly qualities and his long-term military contribution to the siege of Acre and the Third Crusade, despite the similarly grave illness that afflicted the Capetian monarch, and employ the same anecdote of Philip being carried out in his sickbed to attack the city’s defenders with a crossbow. Rigord makes specific reference to Philip’s personal participation in the siege, and states that “Philippe, roi de France . . . attaqu la cité d’Acre si vigoreusement que, après que ses perrières et ses mangonneaux aient détruit les murs de cette cité”. In a similar fashion, the Old French Continuation of William of Tyre, which itself was less praiseworthy of Richard I’s actions on the Third Crusade, records that “directly after his arrival he mounted a horse and went right through the host and around the city . . . . He ordered his crossbowmen and archers to shoot continuously so that no one could show a finger above the walls”. In addition to these examples, Guillaume le Breton claims that the French forces had already succeeded in breaking the walls of Acre in several places and had constructed a number of effective siege engines under Philip’s direction. Philip’s conduct at Acre, notwithstanding the controversy over his decision to depart the crusade before Jerusalem had been captured, again highlights the divergent portrayals of Philip in the Anglo-Norman chronicles versus other accounts of the Third Crusade. Despite arriving at the siege prior to Richard, Anglo-Norman writers suggest that Philip was
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62 The account of Baha al-Din also emphasizes the equal participation of both monarchs in combat even after their illness, with the author noting “The accursed king of England . . . fell seriously ill . . . . Furthermore, the king of France was wounded, but this only made them more determined and stubborn”. Bradbury, *Philip Augustus*, 90; Baha’al-Din Ibn Shaddad, *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, trans. D. S. Richards (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2001), 153
incapable or unable to capture the city without the aid of the great Plantagenet warrior; by contrast, French sources suggest Philip chose not to take the city, so that both kings could equally share in the glory of victory and not to upstage Richard. Given Philip’s interest in the development of city fortifications and his successful sieges against Plantagenet castles in Normandy in his wars against Henry II, Richard I, and John I, it is difficult to argue that the Capetian monarch was wholly incapable of capturing the city, and suggests that the diminution of his martial contributions to the Third Crusade stem more from the anti-Capetian bias of Anglo-Norman sources rather than a genuine appraisal of Philip’s contribution to the expedition.\footnote{Richard of Devizes, \textit{The Chronicle of Richard}, 44-48; Rigord, \textit{Histoire de Philippe}, 303-305; Guillaume le Breton, \textit{La Philippide}, 206; Bradbury, \textit{Philip Augustus}, 88-90; Naus, \textit{Constructing Kingship}, 124; Erlande-Brandebourg, “L’architecture militaire,” 595-97}

Indeed, Philip’s willingness to embark upon the Third Crusade in light of the recent birth and ill-health of his son and sole heir arguably demonstrates personal courage of a different sort, as it left the kingdom of France in a relatively precarious situation vis-a-vis the succession, much as Richard himself did little to settle the succession issue of the various Plantagenet holdings before departing for the Third Crusade. In addition, Joinville, who was unafraid to criticize Philip’s decision to depart the Third Crusade in 1191, nevertheless offers praise for his bravery in leaving the bulk of his troops behind to assist Richard and returning to France with only a small escort. Ultimately, while Philip in many respects failed to fully realize the religious-military idealism of the vernacular poetry which was popular amongst the lay nobility in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, and which Benton argues represented a enculturative myth of loyalty and community for the warrior nobility of the period, the Capetian monarch was far from the timid and cowardly king who plotted the downfall of the Plantagenets from the
shadows.\textsuperscript{64} And though few chroniclers suggest that Philip was capable of such feats as unhorsing three knights with a single lance – as was suggested about Richard I by Roger of Hovedon – sources show the French king was nonetheless willing to place himself in personal danger when the situation arose, conforming more broadly to a tradition of Capetian warrior-kings which will be explored in greater detail in subsequent sections found in the writings of Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis (c. 1081-1151) on Louis VI (r. 1108-1137) and those of Odo of Deuil (c. 1110-1162) on Louis VII.\textsuperscript{65}

Though the focus of this paper is on the ideological impact of Philip’s reforms rather than the mechanical details – masterfully analyzed by John Baldwin – it is nonetheless critical to examine the key administrative changes which enabled Philip to carry out a political programme that was heavily informed by an ideological component. The reduction in the political power of the nobility which represented a key point in Philip’s reign was furthered by a deliberate elevation of the lesser nobility and, in some cases, the emergent \textit{bourgeoisie} to administrative positions within Philip’s court. Philip’s favorable policies towards the \textit{bourgeoisie} persisted throughout his reign, including his notable patronage of communes in Paris and throughout the royal domain, that allowed the Capetian monarchy to take full advantage of their financial resources.\textsuperscript{66} Following the death of Hugh de Champfleury (c.?), who had served as chancellor under Philip’s father, in 1185, Philip elected to leave the position vacant, a trend which would
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accelerate throughout his reign as more of the “old guard” who had served in the previous regime
died. As Jordan notes, by the end of Philip’s life, “there was no longer a grand sénéchal du
royaume; the powers of the grand chambrier had been attenuated; and the chancellorship was . . .
. vacant”, thus providing for Louis IX a model of governance which was strongly associated both
symbolically and politically with the person of the monarch.67 The growth in political power of
the Capetian monarchy was also expressed through the evolution of its language of governance,
and in the relegation of both Capetian queens and eldest sons to a position of relative
subordination to the ruling monarch; unlike in the reigns of Louis VII, Louis VIII, and Louis IX,
women played virtually no political role in Philip’s long reign, and Miriam Shadis suggests that
this was a deliberate attempt to centralize more political power in the developmental process of
feudal monarchy, as she notes that Philip’s court was “highly organized, highly masculine . . .
there had not been an active queen consort in his reign”.68 This exclusion of women also
manifested itself in Philip’s attempts to “limit the alienation of property to the church by . . .
female relatives”, which reflected a consistent trend of Philip’s reign in the consolidation of
political power in the singular figure of the monarch, while advancing an ideological programme
that emphasized the sacral nature of the king as the head of the Frankish community.69 Similarly,
Philip was the first king who refused both to name his son in royal charters and to co-crown his
heir during his lifetime, a phenomenon known as “associative kingship” which had persisted
since the first Capetian kings and bolstered the relative territorial and political weakness of the
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nascent Capetian dynasty during the early medieval period. While some scholars have argued that this indicated the growth in Capetian power under Philip II – in that the king felt secure enough in his position to abandon the tradition – in this respect Philip was merely continuing a trend which had begun under Louis VII, who had refused to co-crown Philip until the former was virtually completely incapacitated by a stroke in 1179.70

A clear demonstration of Philip’s dual political agenda in the reduction of the nobility and the restriction in power of other members of the royal family itself can be found in the ordinance of 1190, described by John Baldwin as the “ordinary testament”, a wide-ranging document which detailed the form of government in France while Philip was away on the Third Crusade and arguably presents the clearest depiction of the fundamental administrative and political reforms that substantially augmented the power of the Capetian monarchy under Philip and his successors.71 Though Philip named his mother, Adela of Champagne (c. 1140-1206), as co-regent of the kingdom alongside his uncle William of the White Hands (c. 1135-1202) the Archbishop of Reims, neither wielded full royal power in the absence of the king. Philip also appointed a council of ten men, the majority of whom were not numbered among the great nobles of France, and six of whom were bourgeoisie from Paris, an inclusion which in conjunction with the aforementioned provisions for the fortification of the city clearly highlighted the central place of Paris in Philip’s royal ideological project.72 The deliberate

72 The importance of the Ordinance of 1190 in the development of monarchical power is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that Rigord includes it virtually verbatim in his Vie de Philippe Auguste. H. F. Delaborde, ed., Recueil des Actes de Philippe Auguste (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale 1916), 416; Bradbury, Philip Augustus, 79; Hallam and Everard, Capetian France, 204-205; Rigord, Histoire de Philippe, 277-85; Bordonove, Les Rois, 278
elevation of such “new men” as Walter the Younger (c.?) and Brother Guerin of the Hospitallers to positions of power within the royal administration represented a significant advancement in the growth of monarchical power, as Philip no longer relied so heavily upon the great nobles of France enabling the construction of a genuinely monarchical apparatus of government which could stand in opposition to the power of the landed magnates. This aim was established moreover through the institution of the *baillis* and *prévots*, governmental officials who bore no ties to the lands they were assigned to but were appointed by the monarchy. These men were salaried officials, often drawn from the lesser nobility or knightly classes, and so were less disposed to a common class antagonism to the centralizing efforts of Philip’s rule. The *baillis*, in particular, were a significant development as they enabled more frequent dispensation of justice via inspections and maintained the juridical prerogatives of the monarchy in areas that were previously inaccessible to the person of the king.73 This development finds support from more traditional scholarship on the evolution of the state, with scholars such as Robert Descimon emphasizing the role of a “hierarchy of office holders”, that is a bureaucracy bound only to the service of the centralized state in the establishment of monarchical governance. Similarly, Harold Berman argues that “Bailiffs and seneschals . . . were servants of the crown . . . . The introduction of the system of bailiffs was a precondition for the development of a central, professional, royal judicial body”.74 The widespread use of such officials provided the Capetian monarchy with the ability to project said newfound power far beyond the Île-de-France region,

and laid the foundation for further administrative and political reforms that would be carried out in the later thirteenth century. The ordinance of 1190, furthermore, made allowance for the city of Paris to collect its own revenues, a provision which Bordonove, Baldwin, and others suggest reflected the forward-thinking and practical nature of Philip’s reign more broadly; the document provides a valuable insight as to the well-studied portrait of Philip as an administrative and political innovator. The nature of the ordinance of 1190, however, must not be overlooked – it was a document prompted by the pressures of the crusading movement, and thus demonstrates the transnational aspect of the crusades and its impact on the development of monarchical power and government in medieval Europe. Though Philip likely drew inspiration from the centralizing efforts of contemporary medieval monarchs such as Henry II, it is clear that only the extraordinary circumstances of the crusading movement allowed the Capetian monarch to enact such far-reaching judicial reforms that laid the foundation for the dramatic expansion of Capetian political power in the early thirteenth century. The successful implementation of the baillis can, for example, be contrasted with Philip’s failure to introduce a lasting French equivalent to the Saladin Tithe of England in the years preceding his departure for the Third Crusade in 1190. The institution of the baillis and the elevation of the bourgeoisie of Paris, which formed a significant plank of Philip’s broader campaign to centralize the political power of the Capetian monarchy and to shatter Plantagenet hegemony in western France, also emerged from a pre-

existing framework of theory that emphasized the sacral duty of the monarch to maintain justice and defend the common good, which in its particularly Capetian form came to oppose the strength of over-mighty vassals such as the Dukes of Normandy.

While the conquest of Normandy occupies a central role in much of the historiography devoted specifically to the reign of Philip II, there nonetheless remains division in the scholarship as to extent of the impact this conquest had on the royal French domain and concurrent administrative reforms being enacted by Philip’s government. Earlier historians argue that the absorption of Normandy and other Plantagenet territories, whose fiscal and political systems were significantly more developed and robust than their Capetian counterparts, allowed Philip to export the Anglo-Norman system of administrative governance and taxation to the French royal domain. For example, Henry Myers, in discussing the rapid growth of political power and administrative reach of the Capetian government under Philip II, argues that the royal baillis were heavily informed by the “itinerant justices” of Henry II of England (r. 1154-89).77 Though the bulk of the machinery of Angevin government remained intact in Normandy following the conquest of 1204 – in some cases with only minor differences in nomenclature – the majority of administrative office-holders were non-Normans, including some individuals who had participated directly in the conquest themselves.78 Others suggest that the fundamental

77 This historiographical argument also makes note of the fact that Philip retained the majority of Angevin administrative institutions in Normandy after 1204, suggesting an easy merger between the two systems that could have been the result of Philip having already borrowed from Henry II. Myers, Medieval Kingship, 193; F. M. Powicke, “The Angevin Administration of Normandy,” The English Historical Review 21 (1906): 644; Hollister and Baldwin, “The Rise of Administrative Kingship,” 897; Berman, Law and Revolution, 464
78 The most prominent of these mercenaries-turned-administrators was a soldier named Lambert Cadoc (c. ?), who was appointed as castellan of Gaillon, after having successfully defended it against Richard I in 1195, and later fought in the Battle of Bouvines, after which he was appointed the bailli of Pont-Audemer. Jordan, Louis IX, 39; Hallam and Everard, Capetian
reforms which enabled the Capetian monarch to conquer the bulk of the Angevin territories had already been enacted by the beginning of the twelfth century, though it is highly likely that said reforms in administration and taxation were heavily based upon the Anglo-Norman system. French historians, however, tend to emphasize Philip as the principal actor in this political reformation, with Bordonove arguing that “Il est réel que Philippe Auguste fut, en quelque sorte, le fer de lance de ce mouvement”. Baldwin refers to the 1190s as the “decisive decade” of Philip’s reign, and argues that the true effectiveness of the reforms included in the Ordinance of 1190 were to some extent hidden by the repeated military defeats against Richard I, but that the sudden collapse of Angevin Normandy in 1204 illuminated the steady pace of administrative and financial reform in prior years.

While the political power and reach of the Capetian monarchy expanded significantly in the period following the Third Crusade, more recent scholarship has sought to place the “decisive decade” somewhat earlier, namely in the years immediately preceding Philip’s departure on the Third Crusade in 1190. Jim Bradbury suggests that the reduction in power of the “Champenois” faction – centered around Philip’s maternal family – and critical victories both political and military over the Count of Flanders and the Duke of Normandy which occurred in the first decade of his reign challenged the notion that Capetian fortunes only began to rise after Philip returned from the Third Crusade in 1191. Other historians suggest that Philip drew much of his administrative model from concurrent developments in the Church, citing the predominant influence of high-ranking ecclesiastical officials in the early years of Philip’s reign, including his
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uncle, William of the White Hands. While the loss of the vast majority of written records of Philip’s early reign during a skirmish with Richard I at Fréteval in the late twelfth century renders it virtually impossible to accurately pinpoint the original model of the financial and administrative changes deployed by the Capetian king, it is clear that, regardless of wider trends in the centralization of monarchical, ducal, and indeed papal power during the thirteenth century, the administrative reforms implemented by Philip were critical in the development of a centralized apparatus of monarchical control. The benefits accrued by Philip through this widespread phenomenon of political centralization are evidenced through the relatively easy absorption of the greater ducal principalities such as Normandy into the royal domain, as the Capetian monarch took advantage of similar trends in governmental reform that had already been underway. Beyond Philip’s manipulation of feudal dues and ties of vassalage, the French monarch also benefited from the fortuitous death of a number of prominent noble rivals while on crusade, such as the Philip, Count of Flanders (r. 1168-1191) in 1191, and the departure of others such as Baldwin of Hainaut (r. 1194-1205) who would later become the first Latin Emperor of Constantinople and Henry of Champagne (r. 1181-97) who reigned briefly as King of Jerusalem, which arguably averted a situation comparable, for example, to the revolt of the nobility against John I (r. 1199-1216) which led to civil war in the early thirteenth century.

Bradbury’s Philip Augustus argues that the defeat of the Angevins represented both the culmination of Philip’s lifelong ambition and the principal contributing factor to the
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implementation of his institutional and administrative changes, while Daniel Power’s comprehensive scholarship on the conquest of Normandy effected by Philip in the early thirteenth century likewise asserts that Philip’s victories were gained through a confluence of the incompetence of King John of England and the successful evolution of feudal government in Capetian France. There is a danger, however, in describing the post-Bouvines period as the apogee of Philip’s rule, the point at which Philip’s ostensible purpose had been fulfilled, as historians risk minimizing the continued, indeed accelerated, contribution to the ideology of sacral Capetian monarchy under Philip until his death in 1223. William Jordan suggests that an ideal of Philip II as an “elder statesman”-like figure – particularly after the deaths of both Innocent III and John I in 1216 – had taken hold among contemporary writers and some modern historians, where Philip divulged a significant portion of the responsibilities of the monarchy onto his son Louis, and other counselors, an image reinforced to some extent by the life of Louis IX, where the saintly king would reminisce fondly to individuals such as Jean de Joinville (c. 1224-1317) about the wisdom passed down by the ageing Philip. This was also a period which saw a shift towards a more pro-crusade and pro-ecclesiastical stance on the part of the Capetian monarchy, a shift often attributed to the growing influence of Louis VIII, who was regarded as more pious and enthusiastic about the broader crusading movement than his father. However, recent scholars including both Jordan and Jacques Le Goff have suggested that, in the wake of Philip’s dominant military victory at Bouvines and the expiration of other great rulers, the


Capetian monarch was able to act on long-held beliefs and sentiments that he could not have done earlier due to the recurrent political and military crises of his reign. In the aftermath of Bouvines, Philip formally acknowledged Simon de Montfort (c.1175-1218) as Count of Toulouse in 1216, began to pursue a more aggressive policy towards the Jews of the royal domain, and ordered the dispatch of a contingent of French soldiers to participate in the ongoing Albigensian Crusade; moreover, Philip himself promised to join the Albigensian Crusade in a letter written to the newly elected Pope Honorius III (r. 1216-1227) in 1218, and allowed his son Louis to launch a crusading expedition the following year. It is unlikely that Philip, who by 1218 had reigned for nearly forty years and was approaching the venerable age of fifty, genuinely sought to return to the field of battle against the Albigeois, but his willingness to participate in crusades and patronize the broader crusading movement again challenges the notion of an impious king and reluctant crusader that remains particularly dominant in the historiography.

The transition from Dieudonné to Augustus represented more than the fulfillment of Philip’s supposed lifelong ambition to break the power of his over-mighty vassals and establish, in theory as well as practice, the political sovereignty of the Capetian monarchy. Philip did not merely augment the royal domain territorially and politically, but also played a crucial role in the foundation of a framework of sacral Capetian ideology through his confirmation of pre-existing
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norms of Capetian moral behavior. Closely associated with Philip’s perceived failings as a crusader is the accusation that he was, on the whole, an impious king whose reputation was marred by his maltreatment of his second wife, Ingeburg of Denmark, and his reluctance to found religious houses and build new churches.\textsuperscript{88} This characterization of the French king emerges not merely from Anglo-Norman accounts – many of whom lambast Philip particularly for his bigamous marriage with Agnes de Méran (c. ?-1201) and his maltreatment of Ingeburg – but also from Rigord who, though initially referring to Philip as \textit{rex christianissimus} and \textit{semper Augustus} in his chronicle and recounting a number of miraculous and divine events associated with Philip’s early life, abruptly ceases to use the term after 1191, a literary decision that John Baldwin notes coincided with Philip’s early return from the Third Crusade, his repudiation of Ingeburg in 1193, and his readmission of the Jews in 1198.\textsuperscript{89}

Despite this seemingly poor record of saintly behavior, it is important to note that Rigord resurrests the use of both terms in 1205, the immediate context for which was likely Philip’s donation of several relics acquired during the Fourth Crusade to the abbey of Saint-Denis where Philip took part personally in the penitential procession which deposited the relics at Saint-Denis. An alternative explanation, however, can be found in the use of the term following his successful conquest of Normandy in 1204. This event, considered a sign of divine favour that recognized the Capetian monarch’s superior morality by Gerald of Wales, formed a component of Philip’s ideological contribution to an image of the sacral Capetian monarchy, whose victories came both
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through divine intervention and due to their nature as the most Christian of kings who punished the wicked in accordance with their sacral duty as medieval monarchs.\textsuperscript{90} The origins of the term \textit{rex christianissimus}, as noted by John Baldwin, stemmed from a longstanding and positive relationship between the papacy and the Capetian monarchy, though the evidence that it could be withdrawn and reapplied suggests that it was not merely an empty honorific, but one that wielded historical clout and that had to be earned through the virtuous deeds or moral standards of the monarch in question.\textsuperscript{91} Gerald of Wales in particular adopts this position, and praises the Capetian dynasty and Philip specifically for their morally righteous behaviour, favorably contrasting Philip’s refusal to utter blasphemous oaths with the colorful and frequent swearing of the Plantagenets, as well as Philip’s aforementioned disdain for tournaments and other chivalric pastimes.\textsuperscript{92} Similarly, Philip’s noted unwillingness to lavish gifts upon troubadours, and his expulsion of such entertainers from his court in 1212 is lauded as an action to be imitated by other princes by later writer Guillaume de Nangis who, like Rigord and Guillaume le Breton, describes Philip as “le roi très chrétien” and “toujours Auguste” in his \textit{Chroniques Capétiennes}.\textsuperscript{93}

The use of the term by Guillaume de Nangis is particularly significant, as de Nangis is most well-known for his biographical, indeed hagiographical, works of Louis IX, and he exerted such
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an influence over the historical writings of Saint-Denis in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries that Gabrielle Spiegel argues “the monastery produced no major historian of a stature comparable to . . . Guillaume himself in the thirteenth. The authority of his work dominated all subsequent Dionysian writing”. Given Guillaume’s likely familiarity with the actions and deeds of Louis IX which ultimately earned him sainthood, his description of Philip Augustus in a similar fashion points to an enduring sense that Philip was not merely a part of a continual tradition of sacral Capetian kings, but that he had actively contributed to its conclusion in Louis IX. An example of such behavior can be found in the writings of both Rigord and Guillaume le Breton who emphasize an episode in 1196, when due to an unusually high rainfall the banks of the Seine overflowed and caused significant damage to the city of Paris. Rigord states that Philip “émû de pitié, fit distribuer aux pauvres sur son propre avoir des aumônes plus larges et il pressa affectuesement par ses lettres les évêques, les abbés, et tout le peuple d’en faire autant”. Rigord’s description of Philip’s swift response to the flood demonstrates Philip’s personal interest in Paris as his capital and his fulfillment of a duty to provide and defend the poorer subjects of his realm, in accordance with his position as a sacral Capetian monarch; it also places Philip within a longer narrative of charitable Capetian kings, as both Louis VI and Louis VII were praised by contemporary chroniclers for their generosity towards the least of their subjects. As this paper will explore in greater detail, this concern for the wellbeing of the poor and the people of Paris reflected an enduring commitment of Philip’s reign to the development of said city into the political and cultural capital of medieval France, as well as a symbol of the
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secular and spiritual authority wielded by the Capetian monarchy. Moreover, it engaged with a theoretical view of the sacral nature of monarchical power and the divine duty inherent to that office to protect and care for the health of the realm, which formed a crucial component of the coronation oath sworn by Philip.

It is within this context that Philip’s broader policy towards the Church, both in regards to his personal relationship and his financial policies, must be re-examined. While at times heavily criticized by contemporaries, Philip’s approach was nevertheless often compared favorably to that of the Plantagenets, Richard and John alike by Gerald of Wales, who stressed the duty of a Christian king to defend the Church and how admirably Philip fulfilled this role. A cogent example of the image of Philip as a friend to the Church emerges from an anecdote recorded by Jean de Joinville, where Louis IX supposedly told a tale where Philip was notified that the clergy were obstructing royal justice and encroaching upon royal taxation rights. The king, according to Louis’ story, merely stated “he believed this to be true, but that considering all the favours God had shown him, he would rather forfeit royal rights than quarrel with God’s priests”. As one of many aphorisms of wisdom purportedly passed down to Saint Louis by Philip Augustus, its veracity may be questioned, but it nonetheless indicates both that Louis IX perceived of Philip as an exemplar in sacral kingship, and that an image of Philip as a friend to the Church and a monarch who enjoyed the favor of God persisted in subsequent decades. Moreover, though the argument that Philip was the “beguiling seducer” of the Norman churches under Angevin rule, and that his more lenient policies towards the Church played a significant role in the conquest of Normandy in the early thirteenth century has been challenged, there nonetheless emerges a
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general consensus in the scholarship that Philip was, if only marginally, a more generous ruler to the church than his Angevin rivals. French chroniclers, and to some extent Philip himself, deliberately cultivated this image of the king as the defender of ecclesiastical rights and privileges against the depredations of the rapacious nobility. Alongside his earliest military campaigns against the Count of Flanders, Philip’s campaign against John in particular was frequently described in terms that suggested Philip’s principal aim was to restore the rights of English and Norman churchmen, who themselves were thrilled to ally themselves with the “most Christian King”. The construction of a Capetian monarchy challenging the privations inflicted upon the Church by its enemies emerged alongside a wider push by Philip to consolidate the image of the Capetian monarchy as both secular and sacred, a project which will be explored in greater detail in subsequent chapters of this paper.

We find examples early in Philip’s reign of his favoritism towards the church and, while it is clear that he was not as generous as Louis VII or Louis IX towards the clergy, his policy of adjudicating in their favor in disputes over taxation and land exemplified a relatively consistent trend throughout his reign, as well as his frequent attempts to impose taxes for new crusades, though he himself did not lead an expedition after 1190. Moreover, Philip’s relationship with the clergy, though confrontational at times, was nonetheless viewed by contemporaries as more
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munificent and significantly less mercurial than that of the Plantagenets; combined with his more favorable personal qualities, this lent further credence to the claims of the Capetian monarchy to the title of *rex christianissimus* and proved a potent addition to the ideology of sacral Capetian kingship.¹⁰¹ Such a policy ensured the loyalty of the Gallican church that was evidenced in their sanction of his marriage to Agnes de Méran and his divorce of Ingeburg, and partly explains the persistent image of Philip as a passably sacral Capetian king in ecclesiastical sources, though this is not to deny the long-term development by which the Capetian and Carolingian monarchs retained a tight political grip upon the Gallican clergy and ecclesiastical communities that also served to develop a communal sense of Frankish identity that added a territorial and spiritual aspect to a pre-existing understanding of *Francia* under the figure of the sacral Capetian king, a concept that this paper will explore in greater detail in subsequent sections examining the works of Suger and Odo of Deuil.

An image of Philip II as a pious and morally upright king persisted in later centuries, as Jean de Joinville, in his *Life of Saint Louis*, notes that Louis IX frequently referred to Philip as an exemplar in both good governance and moral rule, which were considered inseparable within the tradition of Capetian kingship, and Joinville himself considered Philip to be a *preudomme* or “worthy man”, in regards to his reign and his character.¹⁰² As noted by Bradbury, “Philip . . . . at vital moments in his career he publicly asked aid from God, and gave thanks to God afterwards for his successes”, as witnessed in his conduct on the Third Crusade and again prior to the Battle of Bouvines, a policy of public and ritualistic worship that would be further expanded during the

¹⁰² Joinville, “The Life of Saint Louis,” 284, 311
reign of Louis IX as a formal component of the sacral presentation and ideological foundation of the Capetian monarchy.\footnote{Bradbury, Philip Augustus, 166-67; Jordan, Louis IX, 217; Le Goff, Saint Louis, 9-10; Gaopschkin, The Making of Saint Louis, 7-10; Villehardouin, “The Conquest of Constantinople,” 13} The esteem Louis IX felt for Philip II was mirrored by the abbey of Saint-Denis, where Anne Robertson in The Service-books of the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis notes that the mass celebrated on the anniversary of Philip’s death was as elaborate and ceremonial as that of Dagobert I (r. 623-634) and Robert II “the Pious” (r. 987-1031), and was only partially reduced in pomp in the fourteenth century as a result of the growing influence of the cult of Saint Louis, indicating that the abbey placed Philip squarely within the narrative of sacral Capetian monarchy.\footnote{Anne Walters Robertson, The Service-Books of the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis: Images of Ritual and Music in the Middle Ages (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 92-93; Le Goff, Saint Louis, 268-72} The cultivation of Saint-Denis during Philip’s reign and his active patronage of the abbey to construct a durable edifice of sacral Capetian kingship will be explored in greater detail in subsequent sections of this paper, but it is important to challenge the notion that Philip was uninterested in the development of a vernacular mythology of Capetian kingship.

In addition to Philip’s noted aversion to swearing, his reluctance to patronize troubadours and other entertainers, John Baldwin – in a more recent study of Philip and his contribution to the growth of Paris as the premier urban center of medieval France – notes that Philip did not indulge in hunting following a near-death experience in his youth, providing yet another point of contrast between Philip and his contemporaries such as Richard I and placing the Capetian monarch at odds with the emergent concept of chivalric kingship as articulated by vernacular writers such as Bertran de Born, which glorified the warlike and extravagant characteristics of
the medieval king.105 Another element of this opposition to chivalric kingship lay in the phenomenon described by Le Goff as “the king’s speech”, which he defines as follows: “it was measured speech, moderate as befitting a king . . . who sought to replace the ideal of the valorous knight’s excesses with that of the prud’homme’s moderation. At the same time, his speech enacted the repression of bad speech, of swearing and blasphemy”.106 While Le Goff applies this definition to Louis IX, both he and Georges Bordonove note that the saintly king modeled much of his behavior – including his royal speech – on the precedent established by Philip, and it is clear that the “suppression of bad speech” can be linked to Philip’s uncompromising attitude towards swearing and the punishment of blaspheming in his court. Rigord, in relation to Philip’s upstanding moral attitude, notes that “il abominait tellement les blasphèmes illicites . . . s’il arrivait à un chevalier ou à quelque autre joueur de jurer par mégarde en sa présence, il était aussitôt plongé, sur ordre du roi, dans une rivière ou dans un lac”.107 Furthermore, Rigord emphasizes that – notwithstanding Philip’s later record of poor behavior – this particular edict was rigorously upheld throughout the entirety of Philip reign.108 However, in eschewing tournaments, extravagant language, and other trappings of the emergent concept of chivalric kingship, Philip elected to model his monarchical image upon a pious and sacral archetype that adhered more strongly to the ideal of kingship expressed by ecclesiastical writers, which
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garnered both the friendship and praise of the papacy and ultimately bolstered the Capetian ideology of sacral monarchy and its claim to enjoy the protection of God by virtue of the moral rectitude of its dynasty. Furthermore, in conforming more closely to an ecclesiastical theory of kingship in his deliberate rejection of chivalric behavior, Philip emphasized the continuation of a Carolingian trend of justice as reflected by the personal qualities of the king.

The repeated use of such saintly and religiously-charged language to describe Philip and his reign suggests that the emergence of Louis IX as the epitome of sacral kingship in the thirteenth century did not wholly efface Philip from the genealogy of sacral Capetian kings, and it is clear that later medieval writers saw no serious contradiction in incorporating Philip II into a progressive narrative of sacral Capetian kingship, notwithstanding the widespread acknowledgement of his lacklustre crusading reputation and dubious marital disputes. While Philip was at times condemned for his unambitious program of church construction, it must be noted that he ordered the building of the church of Notre-Dame de la Victoire in 1215, which served a dual purpose in its political commemoration of his victory at Bouvines and as a reminder of the divine favor which allowed Philip’s triumph, and paid for the construction of an abbey at Mantes in memorial of Agnes de Méran, who died there in 1202.109 Bradbury and Baldwin also argue that Philip’s financial donations to other orders – most notably a significant contribution to both the Templars and Hospitallers in his will, as well as a substantial endowment for lepers and the poor – are often overlooked, with Bradbury further highlighting Philip’s contributions to smaller and newer religious orders as atypical enough to suggest a personal stake

on the part of the Capetian king beyond the generic exercise of monarchical duty. It is also important to note the role of both military orders in the development of Capetian governmental machinery, a phenomenon that highlights the interrelation of the crusading movement and the development of administrative kingship, which suggests an inherent ideological component to seemingly political actions. Guerin, a member of the Hospital Order as we have seen, was a highly trusted official whose influence was “active in the chancery, in finances, in justices, and in administration” as well as the military planning that led to victory on the field of Bouvines. In a similar exercise of trust in the military orders and reflection of the interconnection between the wider crusading movement and the development of royal political power in medieval Europe, Philip used the Templars to collect and process royal revenues in Paris each year. Philip also played a significant role in revitalizing the construction of Notre-Dame in Paris, a project that would be completed nearly a century after his death, yet gained renewed emphasis during the early thirteenth century – before departing for the Third Crusade, Philip issued an act which confirmed the continued royal support for the construction of the church. Philip’s close relationship with the city of Paris and his personal involvement in the development of the city shall be explored further in this thesis, but the hybrid nature of Philip’s interest in the continued construction of Notre-Dame is clear, as it represented a physical manifestation of the sacral nature of kingship itself, rooted in the spiritual and temporal aspects of Capetian power.

Though it is important to note that the majority of such positive depictions of Philip II emerge from French sources, many of which were closely tied to the royalist propagandizing project of Saint-Denis and the Capetian dynasty itself, they challenge the notion of Philip as a wholly impious ruler who remained outside the traditional genealogy of sacral Capetian kingship, and suggest that Philip did not merely continue in this tradition, but actively enhanced it.

In re-examining Philip’s contribution to the emergence of a symbolic culture of Capetian kingship that drew from religious imagery, it is important to consider the contextual relationship of Mary and the Capetian monarchy, but also Philip more specifically. The most obvious connection lies in the use of the *fleur-de-lys* in the royal coat-of-arms of the Capetians, a development which only fully materialized during the reign of Louis IX and whose eschatological significance to the Capetian ideology of sacral kingship will be explored in a subsequent section of this paper. However, both Bradbury and Colette Beaune emphasize the special protection supposedly imparted upon Philip by Mary, where “she spared his army from thirst at the siege of Montrichard, helped him to escape drowning . . . and brought Philip victory at last at Bouvines”.\(^\text{113}\) Beyond the deliberate association of Marian imagery with the political triumphs of the Capetian monarchy, it is important to note that Marian intervention and imagery were frequently used by chroniclers during Philip’s early life. Mary was invoked in contemporary accounts of Philip’s survival during a childhood incident where he disappeared for several days while on a hunting expedition near Compiegne – his return without harm was attributed to the protection of both Saint Denis and Mary, as Philip returned within days of the feast of the Assumption and had supposedly offered prayers to both religious figures while
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lost. Furthermore, Philip’s own birth – widely considered a miracle event by contemporary writers – was also attributed to Mary’s favor, as he was born on the feast of the Assumption, and afterward Louis VII made a pilgrimage to a Marian shrine in thanks; furthermore, Philip’s first coronation at Reims in 1179 was, as noted by Guillaume le Breton, “au jour vénérable sanctifié par la sainte Assomption de la bienheureuse Marie”. In presenting the fleur-de-lys as their principal heraldic symbol, Philip displayed both an awareness of and devotion to the emergent Marian cult and more firmly linked the Capetian dynasty to sartorial imagery that deliberately evoked a sacral association. Moreover, the virtues embodied in the lily were precisely those which, according to Gerald of Wales, elevated the Capetians above their rivals and which stood in direct opposition to the idea of chivalric kingship, rooted in valour and largesse, a challenge to the emergent culture of aristocratic independence which likely buttressed the more practical program of political and territorial expansion undertaken by Philip during the thirteenth century. While historians note that contemporary writers perceived there to be a close connection between France and Mary, it was only during Philip’s reign that such a relationship was incorporated into an ideology of sacral kingship which stood in opposition to the emergent notion of chivalric monarchy and instead articulated a vision of Capetian rule grounded in both spiritual and secular authority.

If Philip’s unappealing and somewhat dour personality marked him as distinct from the chivalric ideal which emphasized largesse and passion, it certainly meshed with a canon of a more austere form of Capetian kingship, which emphasized the connection between the ruler’s personal qualities and the general maintenance and political health of the kingdom. And while
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Rigord’s sudden return to a more laudatory tone in his description of the French monarch can easily be attributed to the generous gift of sacred relics to the church at Saint Denis, Philip is also designated as *rex christianissimus* by Pope Innocent III in a letter dated from 1209 in which he requests that Philip lead a crusade against the Albigensian heretics of Toulouse. This was one of several entreaties by the pope to Philip to lead a new crusade which indicates that Innocent III, at least, viewed Philip as a committed crusader and pious Christian king. This acknowledgment of the Capetian king as *rex christianissimus*, which continued a historically close relationship between the papacy and the Capetian monarchy, came despite the sometimes fractious and mischaracterized relationship between Innocent and the French king, with the former placing France under interdict in 1199 as a result of the Capetian ruler’s marriage to Agnes de Méran, and later threatening Philip with excommunication. Moreover, it was Innocent III in a letter from 1202 entitled *Per Venerabilem* who confirmed the supremacy of the King of France in temporal affairs, just as the papacy was supreme in theocratic affairs, and furthermore asserted the independence of France from the Holy Roman Empire or any other secular authority. Philip, while threatened with excommunication, was nevertheless restored to the good graces of the papacy in 1202 following the death of Agnes and the French king’s assurance to return Ingeburg to her rightful honours; by contrast John I, excommunicated in 1209, was only able to regain Innocent’s favour by the somewhat extraordinary act of surrendering his kingdom as a
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papal fief.\textsuperscript{118} Given Innocent’s penchant for interfering in the medieval political world – perhaps
the most poignant example was his decision to support Otto of Brunswick as Holy Roman
Emperor over Philip of Swabia (c. 1177-1208) in the early thirteenth century in order to prevent
the unification of Sicily and the Holy Roman Empire under the House of Staufen – and his
willingness to condemn those leaders whom he considered lacking in the appropriate level of
support for the papacy and his ambitious crusading program, Innocent’s open and relatively
consistent support for Philip’s position as temporal and sacral king should not be dismissed as
mere rhetorical flourish.

Though many of Innocent’s favorable policies towards Philip and France more generally
can be linked to his political adventurism – Baldwin, for example, suggests that Innocent’s
legitimation of Philip’s children by Agnes de Méran shortly after her death was a somewhat
transparent attempt to recruit the French king to his cause against Otto of Brunswick – Philip in
some cases elected to follow the commands of the papacy even when they clashed with his
political ambitions.\textsuperscript{119} Innocent excommunicated John in 1209, and subsequently gave his
blessing to Philip to prepare an invasion of England in 1212, which the Capetian king undertook
with enthusiasm, and the enterprise itself was emphasized by contemporary chroniclers in
language akin to a crusade, where Philip is described as eager to punish John for the wrongs he
had committed against the Church and to restore the full authority of exiled clerics who had
found safe haven in France.\textsuperscript{120} Following the battle of Bouvines, Philip’s son Louis launched a
largely successful invasion of England, and received the homage of numerous Angevin barons at
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London in June 1216. Yet when the papacy demanded that the invasion be called off – partially as a result of John surrendering England to Innocent III as a papal fief – Philip, though likely frustrated, quickly complied and ordered his son to return, despite the strident objections of both Louis himself and his wife, Blanche of Castile (c. 1188-1252). If the relationship between Innocent III and Philip II cannot be described as wholly positive, it is likewise an exaggeration to view Philip’s resistance of Innocent’s imperial pretensions as a precursor to a wider historical narrative of Gallican ecclesiastical independence. The close institutional partnership between the Capetian monarchy and the papacy, which provided significant legitimacy to the argument of the Capetians as the most Christian dynasty of medieval Europe, was maintained and in some cases innovated during Philip’s reign as a result of the individual relationship of Philip and Innocent III. If Philip expressed only conventional piety in the evaluation of modern scholars, his actions suggest an individual very much aware of the notion of Christian monarchs as the secular sword of the Church, and likewise committed to his role as rex christianissimus.

One of the more salient arguments that challenge the traditional historiographical portrait of Philip as a politically-minded monarch first and a Christian one second, lies in the repeated appeals made by various popes that Philip lead a crusade to the Levant. Innocent III sent several letters throughout his pontifical tenure urging Philip to lead the Fourth and Albigensian Crusades, and the latter was similarly articulated in a letter from Pope Honorius III from the last years of Philip’s life — beyond this, of course, was Gregory VIII’s (r. 1187) appeal that Philip lead what would become the Third Crusade in 1187. Furthermore, Philip was granted a papal
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dispensation that absolved him of his crusading vow from Pope Celestine III (r. 1191-98), this
despite the opprobrium associated with leaving the crusade as evidenced by the social
ostacization experienced by nobles such as Stephen of Blois upon their abrupt return from the
First Crusade, and the specter of excommunication that loomed over the perceived failure to
complete one’s crusading vow. The anonymously composed The History of the Expedition of the
Emperor Frederick describes Philip’s encounter with Celestine in a manner which clearly
indicated both the close institutional relationship between the papacy and the Capetian
monarchy, but also the shifting expectations in regards to monarchical participation in the
crusades, as “the pope . . . earnestly encouraged him with pious admonishment to work for the
liberation of the land of the Lord. He also gave him presents and the gift of holy blessing, as his
dearest son and a beloved pilgrim, and granted him . . . the kiss of peace”.123 The German
chronicle’s description of Philip’s departure and reception by the papacy challenges the vitriolic
condemnation leveled by Anglo-Norman writers, and suggests that the historical portrait of
Philip as a reluctant crusader and lacklustre sacral king stemmed largely from a narrow reading
of the primary materials. Such an encounter also suggests that there already existed a tacit
understanding of Philip’s enduring commitment to the crusading movement that extended
beyond personal participation on the expedition.124 It is important, moreover, to recognize that in
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virtually all instances Philip was asked to lead the expedition which points to a recognition on the part of the papacy as to the uniquely Frankish nature of the crusading movement and the prominent, to some extent natural, place of leadership occupied by the French nobility and the Capetian monarchy within it. This understanding of the Crusades as a distinctly Frankish endeavor will be returned to at a later point in a discussion of its role within the construction of a wider Frankish cultural identity during Philip’s reign, but can also be evidenced through the work of Guibert of Nogent, who argues that the Crusades formed a part of a sacral destiny specifically set aside for the Frankish people, and in the *De Profectione Ludovici VII* of Odo of Deuil, who emphasizes the special connection between leadership of the crusades and the Capetian monarchy early in his work.\(^\text{125}\)

Philip is frequently portrayed in the historiographical field as the outlier in a lineage of committed crusader-kings from Louis VII to Louis IX, but his substantial, if non-participatory, contributions to the wider crusading movement were reflected in a broader popular understanding of Philip’s own reputation as a crusading king and in more recent historiographical scholarship by Gaposchkin, Naus, and others. Given the interrelation of the crusading movement and the growth of monarchical power in medieval Europe, this paper suggests that the assertion of Capetian regalian rights was a result of Philip’s cultivation of a particular image as a crusading king and pious Christian, a portrayal aided by the deployment of a symbolic economy that emphasized the spiritual underpinnings of secular monarchical power. Philip’s manipulation of the crusades should not, however, detract from his substantial

---

*Romance Quarterly* 60 (2013): 107; O’Callaghan, *The Latin Chronicle*, 64-65; Alberic de Trois-Fontaines, “Chronico Alberici,” 701, 753

contributions to the wider movement, and it is clear that he acted in accordance with a pre-
existing tradition of Capetian efforts to associate the prestige of the crusades with that of the
monarchy, and moreover that his lacklustre enthusiasm for the crusades was reflected in the
reigns of both his son and grandson. While Louis VIII and Louis IX are both considered to be
more enthusiastic crusaders, both monarchs sought to balance their responsibility to the crusades
with their secular responsibilities as Kings of France, a point emphasized by Joinville in his
criticism of Louis IX’s second crusade.\(^{126}\) Though it is tempting to view Louis VIII’s swift
launching of an Albigensian expedition in 1226 as a decisive break with his father’s crusading
policy when he agreed to Honorius’ request in 1226, it is crucial to note that Louis demanded
significant concessions from Honorius before formally accepting leadership of the Albigensian
Crusade.\(^{127}\) So substantial were these demands, particularly in regards to financial support from
the papacy, that Honorius initially refused them, but later accepted Louis’ chief request, namely
an acknowledgement that any lands conquered during the course of the expedition would
become part of the royal domain, a ruthless exaction of territory that seems at odds with the
general historical portrayal of Louis as a far more pious and enthusiastic crusader than his
father.\(^{128}\) Moreover, historians have noted that Louis VIII’s short reign represented less of a
break and more of a gradual transition from that of Philip II to Louis IX, with Louis VIII himself
stating that he was continuing Philip’s policy in regards to the south of France, with one noting

\(^{126}\) Joinville, “The Life of Saint Louis,” 329  
that “Honorius III had to give Louis VIII very generous terms in 1225 to persuade him to join the armies of the pope. It was the French crown that ultimately benefited the most”.

The persistent association of the divine and miraculous throughout Philip’s life and reign, while stemming primarily from writers strongly associated with the French court, nonetheless indicates that despite his conflicts with the papacy and the blot of bigamy, for contemporaries Philip remained largely true to a contemporarily recognized ideal of sacral Capetian kingship. Le Goff highlights the litany of miracles and visions that Rigord and Guillaume le Breton accorded to Philip, noting that “Rigord attributes three miracles to Philip . . . he pushed back the time of the harvests, made miraculous water surge forth in the middle of a drought, and found an equally miraculous ford in the Loire with his lance”. In addition to these recorded miracles, a further incident which Guillaume le Breton describes entails how Philip received a vision of God whilst his ship was caught in a violent storm on his return journey from the Levant in 1190. If Philip was less pious and ascetic in his personal habits than his father or grandson, that fact should not obscure his commitment to the preservation and enhancement of a visual and symbolic tradition of sacral monarchy which manifested itself in the formalization of religious rituals, a stronger association between the church of Saint-Denis and the Capetian dynasty, and a renewed emphasis upon the Capetians as crusaders, all of which contributed to the maturation of an understanding of Capetian sovereignty as rooted in spiritual and secular authority.

130 Le Goff, Saint Louis, 373; Rigord, Histoire de Philippe, 177-78
131 Guillaume le Breton, “Gesta Philippi,” 192-94
In spite of the assertion of Elizabeth Hallam, who argues that “Philip Augustus . . . died, in apparently a far more pious way than he had lived”, it is clear that Philip was quickly incorporated into the narrative of sacral Capetian kingship by contemporary writers and successive generations of Capetian rulers themselves. 132 Jean Dunbabin, for example, notes the persistent glorification of Philip by successive French kings, and states that “as long as the Capetian line lasted, there were Philips . . . . It . . . became, along with the much more explicable Louis, a hallmark of the Capetian line”. 133 A common phrase used by French historians of Philip II is that the Capetian king was “un homme d’État”, whose principal goal was to expand the political power of the monarchy, but often accomplished this at the expense of fulfilling his role as a truly devout Christian king, but there is clearly a need to move beyond a limited analysis of Philip’s political and administrative achievements within a purely secular frame. 134 The growth of monarchical power, the concurrent weakening of the feudal nobility, and the expansion of French territory converged alongside an aggressive ideological programme that sought to present the Capetian monarch as the head of a sacred community of Franks, an authority figure invested by divine will and representative of both temporal and religious power.

The traditional historiographical portrayal of Philip as a good king, but a bad crusader; a political mastermind par excellence, but an unlikeable personality and impious individual has been challenged by more recent scholarship, and is difficult to maintain upon a close re-examination of the narrative chronicles which emerge from the same period.

132 Hallam and Everard, *Capetian France*, 174
Though Philip II rarely indulged in the more extravagant shows of piety that characterized the reign of his grandson, to dismiss his devotion as merely conventional and shallow overlooks the significant efforts made by Philip to strengthen the ideological edifice of sacral Capetian kingship as well as his personal contributions to ensure the safety and security of his poorest subjects in fulfillment of his sacral coronation oath. If Philip was not as brave as Richard I, he nonetheless was a competent military commander who played a crucial role in expanding and preserving French territory through battlefield campaigns, while his attitude towards warfare and other chivalric enterprises aligned more closely with that of the papacy and an understanding of medieval kingship which opposed the chivalric behavior of the vernacular aristocratic literature of the thirteenth century, much as Philip’s own program of monarchical centralization challenged aristocratic power in the same period. Ultimately, the transition from *Dieudonné* to *Augustus* should not be analyzed as the maturation of a king whose sole aim was the political aggrandizement of his territory at the expense of his greatest rivals. Rather, Philip remained a pious king in the mould of earlier Capetians through his conventional piety and behavior, while the principal political reforms of his reign emerged within a framework of theory that emphasized the sacral nature of monarchical power more generally, and the unique connection the Capetians had to the title of *rex christianissimus*.

Before exploring in greater detail the fundamental contributions Philip made to the development of an ideology of sacral Capetian kingship, this paper will analyse the intersection between secular and spiritual authority as held by medieval monarchs, and the theoretical structure of sacerdotal kingship that informed Philip’s reign and his political decisions. By applying such a framework of analysis to Philip’s reign, this paper argues that the drive towards the administrative and political strengthening of the Capetian monarchy was accompanied by a
concurrent emphasis upon the symbolic and ideological elements of medieval authority. It was in this particular hybrid ideology of sacral Capetian kingship which he played a crucial role in forming and laying the groundwork for the reign of Louis IX, which William Jordan acknowledges that “even when we pay due regard to the impressive accomplishments of the saint-king’s predecessors . . . it was Louis IX who was . . . responsible for giving substance to the . . . identity, purpose, and destiny of the kingdom of France”.

Chapter 2: “I am only a man, but a man who is King of France” – Philip Augustus and the Ideological Foundations of Sacral Capetian Kingship

In many respects, the reign of Philip II was charged with religious and eschatological significance prior even to his birth, with several chroniclers recording a vision beheld by Louis VII, where he saw a young boy surrounded by the great vassals of France, drinking from a chalice which held their blood. Rigord places the date of this vision shortly before Philip’s birth in 1165, while Gerald of Wales dates it to 1179 – the year before Philip’s “birth”, arguably, as the august King of the French through his coronation at Reims. Both chroniclers, however, suggested that it represented a foreshadowing of Philip’s divine duty in raising up the pious Capetian monarchy to its rightful head of a sacred, united, Frankish community. Philip’s birth in 1165, as aforementioned to the third of Louis’s wives, was described by contemporaries as a divine reward for the piety of Louis VII and his repeated prayers, and as it continued the unbroken line of Capetian kings, Philip was given the nickname Dieudonné. Furthermore, as we have seen, both Rigord and Guillaume continued to report miracles and divine events associated with Philip’s life and deeds even after he had been titled Augustus and after his early return from the Third Crusade. Indeed, Guillaume le Breton notes that Philip was reluctant to fight at Bouvines because it was a Sunday, and also notes that Philip prayed for victory before the battle and thanked God after its successful conclusion – a somewhat odd action, given Philip’s supposed indifference to the crusade and his duties as a Christian king. Unlike the

136 Bordonove suggests that this vision was also confirmed by a hermit from the area surrounding Vincennes. Rigord, *Histoire de Philippe*, 121-22; Gerald of Wales, *De Principis*, 227, 292; Guillaume de Nangis, *Chroniques capétiennes*, 55-56; Bordonove, *Les Rois*, 32-33

miraculous events of Louis IX, Philip’s miracles reflected an institutional commitment to the idea of sacral Capetian kingship, rather than extraordinary personal piety; like Louis VII’s vision of the chalice of blood, Philip’s miracles stemmed from his position as King of France, and in turn reinforced the sacral nature of the monarchy and its perceived role within medieval society. Each of the miracles mentioned by chroniclers were clearly aimed at constructing an image that reflected the glory and divine favor bestowed upon the Capetian monarchy, perhaps in recognition of Philip’s less than saintly reputation, rather than a manifestation of genuine personal holiness. For example, Rigord notes that in 1196, in the wake of severe flooding, Philip participated “comme un homme de peuple, avec larmes et soupirs” in a penitential procession to the church of Saint-Denis to pray for divine alleviation of the natural disasters.138 While ostensibly a personal act of devotion, Philip’s engagement in relation to Saint-Denis and acting as the defender of the poor meshed with earlier writings on the role of the Capetian king as the rightful defender of the less fortunate and protector of the church, while the royal connection to Saint-Denis and Philip’s role in enhancing it will be explored in further detail in subsequent sections of this paper.139

This aspect of Philip’s life and reign has often been overlooked by historians, but more recent scholarship aimed at the study of the ideological and symbolic loci of medieval monarchical power have lent new perspectives to Philip’s commitment to Capetian kingship that move beyond the bureaucratic and political. In exploring Philip’s conquest of Normandy in the early thirteenth century, one cannot lose sight the critical role of Capetian royal ideology in both
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138 Rigord, Histoire de Philippe, 339
139 Turner, “Richard Lionheart and the Episcopate,” 518-19; Duby, The Legend of Bouvines, 165
wooking Norman lords away from the Plantagenet orbit, and in legitimizing the conquest as a natural return to a glorious and communal Carolingian past. In examining the growth of the administrative power and reach of the Capetian monarchy during Philip’s reign, this paper argues that it was not merely a secular phenomenon as the maintenance of justice and the reduction of the landed magnates meshed closely with ideas of the sacral role of the king as the preserver of justice and head of a sacred community, as proposed by medieval theorists such as Abbot Suger and John of Salisbury. In the case of Suger, moreover, the development of a more robust understanding of monarchical power and ideology emerged as a “rex Francorum in the tradition of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, and Charles the Bald”, pointing to an interrelation between understandings of medieval kingship as rooted in both spiritual authority and historical precedent.140

Philip enlarged the concept of sacral Capetian kingship through a commitment to an ideological programme that paralleled his administrative reforms and territorial conquests. By the time of Louis IX it was no longer sufficient that a Capetian monarch be pious and a friend of the church, as was the case of Louis VII, in order to be recognized as a rex christianissimus et francorum; the king must also have augmented the realm through territorial conquests and demonstrably increased the tangible power of the kingdom, as Louis IX did in formally absorbing Toulouse into the royal domain in the mid-thirteenth century and through his comprehensive administrative overhauls, a shift in understanding which owed a significant debt

to the reign of Philip II. This is evidenced by the advice provided by a dying Louis to his own son, Philip III, where the saint-king exhorts his successor to both be a morally righteous ruler and an enthusiastic supporter of the Church, but also to retain control of the royal domain and administer secular justice by force if necessary.\textsuperscript{141} Though Philip’s reign has been characterized as a turning point in the political fortunes of the Capetian monarchy, and emphasized as the period during which administrative kingship in medieval France took shape, this paper suggests that a return to an earlier concept of sacral kingship as articulated by scholars such as Ernst Kantorowicz and Marc Bloch is necessary to more fully evaluate the theoretical framework that informed Philip’s policies and the hierarchy of ideas that influenced the significant political achievements of his reign. Kantorowicz’s work is of particular relevance, as it charts the evolution of the proto-state as “a re-secularized offshoot of the Christian tradition and whether the new patriotism did not thrive also on ethical values transferred back from the patria in heaven to the polities on earth”.\textsuperscript{142} Such a process can be explored through the revival of Carolingian imagery and symbolism by Philip to construct a viable communal identity of Francia that was bound to the figure of the monarch, in addition to a shared territorial and ethnic character, which aided the construction of an ideology of legitimately sacral Capetian rule.\textsuperscript{143} While the historiographical turn in the 1980s towards closer examination of administrative records produced scholarship which exposed the daily machinery of medieval governance and the manner of its expansion, more recent scholarship, including a jointly written article by Sean
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Fields and Cecilia Gaposchkin, emphasizes that “the governmental machinery in place by the time of Philip IV could not have done its work without the development, dissemination, and popular embrace of a royal ideology that linked the Capetian kings and their subjects.” 144 Similarly, Bisson argues that, for the medieval world, “power is moral, not political” and was reflected as much in ideals of prestige and theories as hard political realities, particularly in the wake of the emergent literary culture of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, where the widespread dissemination and consumption of vernacular literature lent greater impetus to the propagandizing efforts of medieval monarchs to present themselves in an era of chivalric romance and panegyric history. 145 This articulation of the locus of monarchical power that extended beyond administrative and financial reforms echoes the return to an understanding of medieval monarchical power as oriented around symbolism, ritual, and a mutual feedback loop where medieval Church and medieval polities exchanged insignia and political rituals until “the ruling individuals, both spiritual and secular . . . had an imperial appearance and the regnum a clerical touch”. 146 Such a phenomenon of symbolic exchange is perhaps most evident in the language of crusader sources, where “terminology relating to secular leadership could also apply to religious figures” and where the participation of bishops and clergymen in pitched battles was a commonplace occurrence; a dialectical relationship existed between secular and spiritual authority which enabled the grounding of monarchical political power within a framework of religious and spiritual thought. 147

144 Fields and Gaposchkin, “Questioning the Capetians,” 568
146 Kantorowicz, The King’s Two Bodies, 193; John of Salisbury, Policraticus, 135-37
This was particularly evident in the coronation rites of medieval monarchs, which involved the use of sacred oil in the manner of a religious sacrament that contributed to the “notion of sacred royalty . . . . a more or less vague connection of cause and effect between the ‘sacrament’ of chrism and . . . its recipients”. The very act of coronation transformed the monarch into a figure who wielded both religious and secular authority, and thus it is clear that a large portion of monarchical legitimacy and theoretical power emerged from its divine association and supposedly sacral origin, notwithstanding the relative impiety of the particular monarch involved. An examination of the coronation ceremony, both the ritual of unction and the oaths undertaken by the medieval monarch, during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries indicates a widespread contemporary belief in the sacral origins of both monarchical power and kingly duty, in that the medieval monarch was perceived to hold secular authority as a political leader and religious authority by virtue of the anointment by holy oil. Marc Bloch’s *The Royal Touch* remains a valuable piece of secondary scholarship in this field, and he notes that the deliberate evocation of Biblical kings such as Aaron, David, and Solomon in the coronation rituals of the Carolingians and their successor dynasties “was not simply a picture of the Jewish kings, but also the priests and the prophets”, and emphasizes that the anointment of kings was carried out in the same manner as the anointment of religious officials. This use of Old Testament references, which aimed to incorporate the Frankish monarchies into a eschatological schema of history that lent an unassailable air of legitimacy to the King of the Franks, saw an early example in Helgaud’s (c.?) description of Robert the Pious as a “new David”, would be continued in Philip’s reign, namely in the issuance of the Ordo of 1200, which itself was

148 Bloch, *The Royal Touch*, 129-32
modeled upon a Carolingian coronation ceremony that deployed the metaphor of Samuel anointing David to indicate the hybrid sovereignty bestowed upon the Frankish kings.\textsuperscript{150} Similarly, Kantorowicz emphasizes the spiritual transformation which occurred as a result of the consecration of the monarch through the unction, incorporating the medieval king into a Christological framework that, in turn, applied eschatological significance to the nascent feudal order of medieval society.\textsuperscript{151} This paper argues that the administrative reforms undertaken during Philip’s reign could not be divorced from a theoretical framework that emphasized the sacerdotal power wielded by the medieval monarch and the sacred duties inherent to the kingly office.

Roger of Hovedon, describing Richard I’s coronation in 1189, clearly indicates that the assumption of the monarchal office entailed a commitment to the fulfillment of spiritual and secular duties alike, noting that “They then clothed him in the royal robes . . . after which the said archbishop delivered to him the sword of rule, with which to crush evil-doers against the Church”, and further describes the sacral nature of the oaths taken to protect the subjects of the realm and to uphold the law.\textsuperscript{152} Such an invocation is also found in the \textit{Latin Chronicle of the Kings of Castile} when it described the ascension of Alfonso VIII, and its emphasis upon the spiritual nature of a king’s duty to provide secular justice for the realm.\textsuperscript{153} The metaphor of the “two swords” and the role of the king in protecting the Church and, more broadly, maintaining justice within the kingdom played a crucial role in anchoring the hybrid sovereignty of medieval
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monarchs, and it is a point which emerged in a number of ecclesiastical writings on the theory of medieval kingship and its relationship with the Church. The medieval monarch swore to defend the churches of his kingdom, and the rights of his subjects, and Delogu argues that the overriding vision of medieval kingship among clerical theorists still conformed to “Augustine’s notions of kingship centred on the triumvirate of peace, order, and justice”, a perspective which indisputably underpinned the principal political and administrative accomplishments of Philip’s reign, as this paper will explore in a later section.\textsuperscript{154} This understanding of medieval kingship manifests itself distinctly in both Suger and Rigord’s accounts of the coronations of Louis VI and Philip II respectively, with both authors emphasizing the divine blessings bestowed upon the Capetian kings at their accession, their promise to defend the church, and the importance of maintaining the health of the realm in their coronation oath as bound with spiritual authority. Crucially, both French chroniclers stress the sacral duty of the Capetian monarch in both punishing the wicked and defending the poor, two elements of sacerdotal understanding of kingship which underpinned some of Philip’s more prominent political activities. Suger, like Roger of Hovedon, employs the analogy of the two swords in his narration, stating that the Archbishop of Sens “anointed him with the oil of the most sacred unction and . . . . He took from him the sword of the punishment of evildoers, . . . . With the approval of the clergy and the people, he devoutly handed him . . . the scepter and the rod that symbolize the defense of the churches and the poor”.\textsuperscript{155} Suger’s suggestion that it was both “the clergy and the people” who acclaimed the king is distinct from Rigord, who focuses upon the collection of powerful nobles that paid homage to Philip as King of the French. Suger’s recourse to “the people” appealed to a
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broader sense of shared communal identity, with the monarch as the focal point, which would be expanded significantly during Philip’s reign through his revival of Carolingian symbolism and imagery and his expansion of the royal domain to encompass territory analogous to the concept of *Francia* as it existed under the later Carolingians.

Rigord, writing of Philip’s first coronation in 1179, also makes note of “l’onction royale” and stresses the feudal superiority of the Capetian monarch over his vassals; in a subsequent section, he expounds upon Philip’s love of justice and even-handed rule, as well as his fervent faith in the sacral duties of the monarchical office, noting that “il eut la crainte du Seigneur pour maitre – parce que la crainte du Seigneur est le commencement de la sagesse –, priant et suppliant humblement le Seigneur de diriger tous ses actes et tous ses pas”.  

156 While the rite of unction was a nigh-omnipresent aspect of the medieval coronation ceremony, the Frankish version maintained several unique characteristics which would be further enhanced during Philip’s reign, so much so that Gaposchkin argues that “under Philip Augustus . . . the articulations of a royal ideology were manifest in literature and art, drawing on a classicizing tradition . . . as well as an emphasis on the sacralising implications of the coronation rites”.  

157 As evidenced by Suger’s description of the presence of “the oil of the most sacred unction” at Louis VI’s second coronation in 1108, the French kings claimed that the chrism used was, in fact, a divine artifact bestowed upon Saint Remigius, who then used it to anoint Clovis as the first King of the Franks in 509.  

158 This assertion, which formed the core of the claim of the Capetian monarchy to the title of *rex christianissimus* in the thirteenth and later centuries, was according
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to Bloch “the royal act par excellence. In France, it was so intimately linked to the royal title that the great vassals . . . never dared to appropriate this particular act”, a ritual so imbued with spiritual significance that it indisputably points to the contemporary medieval understanding of monarchical power as both religious and temporal.\(^{159}\)

This paper will explore in greater detail both the dynastic implications of the Capetian insistence upon the continued use of Reims as the principal site for their coronation ceremonies, as well as the importance of Reims as a spiritual center in the mythistory of France more generally, but the use of the Holy Ampulla invoked a clear recognition of the sacerdotal and priestly powers of the Capetian monarchs, and demonstrated the symbolic nature of Capetian political power during the period. Furthermore, it reinforced an understanding of a Frankish community united under a single, continuous line of Christian monarchs, as well as through its commitment to Christian orthodoxy and its allegiance to the papacy.\(^{160}\)

Philip’s reign would see a further development of the idea of a communal sense of “Frankishness”, rooted jointly around the figure of the monarch and its Christian faith, largely through his patronage of Saint-Denis and his revival of Carolingian symbolism, policies which acted in dialogue with a pre-existing notion of a collective Frankish identity and were exacerbated through the maturation of an ideology of sacral Capetian monarchy.

Philip’s chief administrative reforms were not implemented in a vacuum of theoretical thought and in moving beyond the essential machinery of governmental and administrative


\(^{160}\) Suger’s description of Louis VI’s coronation of his second son, Louis VII, is striking in this respect, as it is clear that only the rite of unction, not blood, which made Louis a king: “We advised him to have his son Louis . . . crowned with the royal diadem . . . and made king with him by anointing with holy oil”. The specific mention of Clovis and Saint Remigius is also found in the memoranda recorded from Philip I’s coronation in 1059. Kantorowicz, *The King’s Two Bodies*, 338-39; Suger, *The Deeds of Louis*, 150; Jackson, *Ordines*, 238-39
reform during Philip’s reign the evidence of an extensive program of ideological development emerges which fits an older pattern of historiographical thought that tends to be overlooked in Philip II, and both his adherence to and expansion of an understanding of the philosophical underpinnings of Capetian kingship.\(^{161}\) By returning to an understanding of medieval sovereignty as rooted in sacral and theological terms, this paper points to the emergence of a specifically Capetian form of sacral kingship which aggressively developed a theory of divine rulership and emphasized its special connection with God. The structure of medieval kingship in France was rooted in an understanding of the sacral nature of the institution of monarchy, and the shared lineage by which successive kings claimed the theoretical powers both spiritual and secular inherent to the position. This can be seen in the retention of the Merovingian coronation rites, which emphasized the priestly aspect of the monarch and imbued the position of King of the Franks with a sense of unbroken continuity and religious authority, a point which will be explored in further detail in an analysis of the emergence of the *reditus regni ad stirpem* during Philip’s lifetime.\(^{162}\) This ideology of sanctified Capetian monarchy was enhanced during Philip’s reign through his focused patronage of the monastery of Saint-Denis and cultivation of the relationship between the emergent Dionysian worship and the institution of monarchy, as well as policies designed to link the Capetians with the broader cultural and intellectual consciousness of the crusading movement through the medium of Frankish identity and Carolingian heritage.

While Philip played a fundamental role in the creation and dissemination of an ideology of sacral Capetian kingship, it would only find its ideal realized in the person of Louis IX; nevertheless,

\(^{161}\) Naus, *Constructing Kingship*, 112-14; Bradbury, “Philip Augustus and King John,” 357-61

this paper argues that a pre-existing framework of ideals and theory on the sacral nature of kingly sovereignty informed Philip’s policies of political and administrative reform, and furthermore laid the groundwork for a wider acceptance of the expanded secular authority of medieval kingship among contemporaries.

The twelfth and thirteenth centuries saw a significant flowering of theoretical texts on the duties of the medieval monarch, a phenomenon which emerged against the backdrop of both the fervor of the crusading movement and the consolidation of medieval kingdoms into cohesive, proto-state polities under a centralized monarchical apparatus, a corpus of medieval writing which has seen substantial secondary scholarship devoted to the structure and powers available to the medieval monarch. The medieval king, according to Daisy Delogu, “was expected to exemplify a dizzying, and sometimes conflicting, array of qualities and behaviour. On the one hand, the medieval king had a quasi-sacral character . . . . The ideal king was also a warrior, and in particular the defender of God and the Church” and this paper has already, albeit briefly, touched upon the notion of the king as the instrument of justice as a sacred duty that was unassailable by secular challengers, a theory which unites general theories of sacral kingship with its more localized Capetian offshoot.\(^\text{163}\) Medieval justice was not, however, limited solely to daily judicial functioning and the maintenance of law and order, but also encompassed the defence of rights enjoyed by various strata of medieval society; crucially, the medieval king was urged to defend the rights of all his subjects and the common welfare, as opposed to a small segment of society, a delineation which formed a prominent part of the coronation oath in France and played a major role in the legitimation of Philip’s conquests and expansion of royal

\(^{163}\) Delogu, *Theorizing the Ideal Sovereign*, 3
authority. While papal pronouncements, particularly in regards to the Crusades, emphasized the defense of ecclesiastical privileges, royalist authors often emphasized the duty of the king to protect his secular realm and his subjects. In both cases, however, the maintenance of justice was considered a sacral prerogative which owed as much to the monarch’s moral fibre as to his quantifiable power and in both cases, an understanding of the king’s justice emerges as an underlying principle in Philip’s expansion of Capetian territorial and political power, which points to a confluence of sacred and secular authority in the realization of Philip’s political ambitions.

Ecclesiastical writers – which this paper identifies as theorists whose works were composed largely outside of the Capetian courtly orbit – emphasized that the principal role of the king was to serve as the secular sword of the Church, to function as the “right hand of God” and defend the Church from enemies external and internal. In upholding justice, the principal duty of the medieval king was to provide justice for the clergy and to defend it from the deprivations of the territorial aristocracy, in a similar fashion to the manner in which the feudal lord had a duty to defend their subjects. The emergent political system of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, referred to for the sake of convenience as the feudal system, can be applied as an analogy for broader medieval society, with God occupying the position of overarching feudal monarch and Christian monarchs representing his vassals. Thus, just as a king expected some degree of

military service and loyalty from his vassals, monarchs owed their “feudal” obligations to God in terms of service to the Church, defense of its prerogatives, and adherence to its injunctions, a position which would take on new valences in the wake of the crusading movement. Janet Nelson suggests that this exhortation to fight in God’s name and to protect the Church as the sacred duty of the medieval king carried with it strong Carolingian connotations, arguing that the twelfth and thirteenth century saw the emergence of a perception that “the ruler who fights God’s battles under his orders bears the true Carolingian stamp”.\(^\text{166}\) This emphasis upon the king’s role as the ultimate lawmaker and the connection between upholding justice and sacral duty was not, however, limited to those areas which had been ruled by the Carolingians, but was instead expressed by authors in regards to a number of medieval monarchs. In his criticism of William II (r. 1087-1100), Guibert of Nogent lambasts the English king as “a very lawless man and enemy of the Church . . . whom God slew”, equalizing the maintenance of justice as the highest duty of a monarch, and clearly intimates that the king who oppressed the Church and flouted laws would face divine punishment.\(^\text{167}\)

In a similar fashion, Gerald of Wales’ \textit{De Principis Instructione} cautions that “Principalis itaque principis intentio, sicut et praelati necnon et privati cujuslibet, esse debet placere Deo in operibus suis”, and later asserts that the rise of the Capetians at the expense of their rivals was directly correlated to their piety and willingness to render due service and obeisance to God and the Church.\(^\text{168}\) This condemnation of the unjust and lawless behavior of the Plantagenet dynasty,


\(^{168}\) Gerald of Wales, \textit{De Principis}, 144, 322
though not Gerald’s unstinting praise of the Capetians, is evident in English chronicles as well, including the works of thirteenth-century writer Matthew Paris who stated “According to the dispositions of He who . . . arranges everything agreeably, serenity returned to England after . . . John’s death . . . . Peace was established throughout the whole kingdom, and the servants of God could breathe again in peace”. The connection between the administration of justice and the sacral nature of monarchical sovereignty also emerges in the Latin Chronicle of the Kings of Castile, where Alfonso VIII was praised by the chronicler due to his “comfort in the Lord, and to dispense justice which he always loved and forcefully and wisely administered until the end of his life”, a passage which also indicates the acceptance of the use of force by the monarch to enact justice in the royal domain. Conversely, as can be gleaned from the widespread censure of John I, a king’s failure to fulfill this sacred duty led to divine punishment – disturbances and lawlessness in the realm were clearly attributed by medieval chroniclers to the divine scheme of historical action which punished the wicked and rewarded the pious, a framework of divine accountability which strongly connected the ideas of secular justice and sacral duty.

The development of theories on kingly judicial supremacy formed the backdrop to the growth of centralized monarchical governments during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and it is difficult to avoid the correlation between the two, particularly as the principal tool in the expansion of monarchical power lay in the growth of a bureaucratic apparatus whose primary

169 We have seen that Gerald was highly critical of the morals of the Plantagenets and strongly implied a connection between the monarch’s personal qualities and the broader dispensation of justice and health of the kingdom. Gaposchkin, The Making of Saint Louis, 53-54; Matthew Paris, Chronicles of Matthew of Paris: Monastic Life in the Thirteenth Century, ed. and trans. Richard Vaughan (New York: St Martin’s Press, 1984), 44; Giles of Paris, “Carolinus,” 288-91
170 O’Callaghan, The Latin Chronicle, 19
purpose was often the maintenance of justice and order throughout the royal domain, a purpose which the medieval monarchy gradually arrogated from the Church through the secularization of concepts such as the Peace and Truce of God. It is, moreover, a point of confluence between more general theories on medieval kingship and a particular Capetian brand that is found in the works of historians such as Suger, Odo of Deuil, and Rigord. The king’s role as ultimate lawgiver forms a fundamental aspect of Suger’s writings on the sovereignty of the king, and his works are considered the foundational documents of Capetian monarchical ideology and paving the way for the rise of centralized monarchy during the reign of Philip II. This position has however been challenged by Lindy Grant’s *Abbot Suger of St-Denis*, where the author instead presents Suger as a staunch Gregorian whose aim was the subordination of the secular monarchy to the service of the Church, an ideal which can also be found in Rigord’s works and his criticisms of Philip’s policies toward the church. The principal argument leveled against viewing Suger as ideological forerunner to Philip II lies in his unwillingness to sanction the use of force by the king, except in the context of punishing enemies of the Church. However, as this paper will explore in subsequent sections, Suger’s writings would promulgate an understanding of the joint interests of the Church and Capetian monarchy, viewing an insult to one as to the other, and so would lay the groundwork for the development of a hybrid vision of Capetian monarchical sovereignty and rule. Regardless of Suger’s authorial intent, it is clear that his work emphasizes the sacral duty of the Capetian monarch to uphold justice and defend the Church, and it was this ideology of monarchical supremacy that became harnessed to the political triumphs and

propagandizing efforts of Philip and his court during the thirteenth century to construct a durable ideological program of Capetian kingship in partnership with, if not in servitude to, the church.

Suger, particularly in his *Deeds of Louis the Fat*, sought to justify and embellish the centralizing efforts of Louis VI – considered by some historians the first Capetian king to substantively increase dynastic power beyond the traditional confines of the Ile-de-France region – by portraying Louis’ efforts to subdue the landed magnates as a defense of ecclesiastical rights, and thus wholly within the legitimate exercise of monarchical power while simultaneously fulfilling the king’s sacral duty as upholder of justice.174 A particular episode of note was Louis’ expedition against Thomas of Marle (c. 1073-1130), which occurred well outside the confines the royal domain, but was described by Suger as a legitimate incursion to preserve order and administer justice, as “by their powerful right arm and by virtue of the office they have sworn to uphold, kings put down insolent tyrants whenever they see them inciting wars . . . persecuting the poor, and destroying churches. Kings put a stop to their wanton behavior”.175 Suger’s account clearly defines a uniquely monarchical zone of sovereignty, emphasizing the supremacy of the king over the aristocracy while simultaneously presenting the duties of the monarch as service to the Church. For Suger, the reduction of the nobility and the elevation of the monarchy were two interconnected goals, though Suger was always careful to portray the king as subservient to God and the Church via its Gallic interlocutor, Saint Denis.176 Furthermore, Suger echoes the understanding of Guibert of Nogent in equating the preservation of ecclesiastical rights with the preservation of the secular kingdom, describing Louis VI’s punitive expedition into the Auvergne in 1122 as “they were rushing to take revenge on the men of the Auvergne for this

175 Suger, *The Deeds of Louis*, 106-107
176 Grant, *Abbot Suger*, 16-17; Hugenholtz and Teunis, “Suger’s advice,” 202-203
insult against the church and the kingdom”\textsuperscript{177} This rhetorical assimilation illustrates the perception of the hybrid nature of medieval monarchical sovereignty, one which is evident in the works of other ecclesiastical theorists in their delineation of monarchical duty as acquired through the sacred coronation oath. Suger’s contemporary Odo of Deuil, who accompanied Louis VII on the Second Crusade, repeatedly uses the familiar metaphor of the two swords – one secular and the other spiritual – in reference to the dual nature of medieval Capetian kingship when describing Louis VII’s selection of both Suger and the Count of Nevers as regents in his absence; the two men represented the hybrid sovereignty held by the singular figure of the Capetian monarch.\textsuperscript{178} In his \textit{De Profectione Ludovici VII}, Odo also highlights several qualities in Louis VII that the author presents as crucial to the maintenance of an image of sacral Capetian kingship – like Suger, Odo emphasizes both Louis’ just nature and his respect for the law, but also stresses that Louis was, if only briefly, a warrior-king who personally fought on the battlefield.\textsuperscript{179} In addition to these admirable qualities, Odo notes that Louis often offered prayers to God both before and after battle, regardless of its conclusion – all elements which, according to Rigord and Guillaume le Breton, were noticeably present during Philip’s tenure as King of the French, and which suggests that Philip’s actions should be examined within a pre-existing framework of sacral monarchical behavior with which he actively engaged.\textsuperscript{180}

The works of Odo and Suger suggest an interpretation of Capetian monarchical supremacy that was different from the \textit{primus inter pares} form which had persisted since the

\textsuperscript{177} Suger, \textit{The Deeds of Louis}, 134
\textsuperscript{178} Hallam and Everard, \textit{Capetian France}, 213-14; Odo of Deuil, \textit{De profectione}, 15, 21; Panofsky, introduction, 2-3
\textsuperscript{179} Odo of Deuil, \textit{De profectione}, 119
accession of Hugh Capet – if only within the confines of judicial authority, the Capetian monarch was portrayed as the supreme lawgiver, whose authority stemmed from God and thus existed above the nobility of the realm. Furthermore, Suger’s conflation of the Gallican church with the Capetian realm also speaks to an understanding of medieval France as a cohesive cultural and religious community which extended beyond the territorial limits of the Capetians’ domain, insofar as those French territories held the same beliefs; this shared identity, then, justified the theoretical suzerainty of the Capetian monarchy over those areas. This paper argues that these theoretical assumptions laid the groundwork for Philip’s actualization of Capetian sovereign rights through recourse to judicial supremacy and rhetoric, and further informed the attempts by Philip and his court to present his political conquest within a narrative of continuity, devotion to Saint-Denis, and a return to a Carolingian precedent.

The frenetic pace of judicial intervention during Louis VI’s reign aimed to extend the presence and power of the Capetian monarchy into the lands of its theoretical vassals, but also sought the fulfillment of a sacral duty inherent to the institution of medieval kingship. Such a policy can be arguably interpreted as a precursor to the development of the baillis in 1190 under Philip II, which replaced the physical and literal presence of the king with a corps of bureaucratic officials whose sole allegiance was to the Capetian monarchy. In both cases, royal justice was spread beyond the Ile-de-France region, which served as a tangible reminder of the political supremacy of the Capetian monarchy, and in both cases the maintenance of order was praised by the clergy, as is evidenced by Philip’s later reputation as a great lawgiver which was closely linked to the baillis and his role in their creation.181 Administrative innovations such as the

baillis, the streamlining of the prêvots, and the institutional reforms that developed the financial health and independence of urban bourgeoisie worked both to expand the political power of the Capetian monarchy and its accessible financial and material resources, and to reinforce the image of Philip as a king who fulfilled a sacral duty to uphold justice and defend the health of the realm. Moreover, Philip’s establishment of communes and favorable relations with the emergent bourgeois of France extended to his territorial conquests – he created numerous communes in Normandy following 1204 that clearly aimed to develop the financial resources of the territory in a more efficient way than the Angevin administration and to reduce the strength of a Norman nobility that may have proven troublesome in the wake of Capetian monarchical centralization. It also played a fundamental role in the rapid integration of Normandy with the wider Capetian domain, which benefited from Philip’s economic interest in communes, and indicated his fulfillment of the coronation oath to preserve and protect all his subjects through his expansion of bourgeois rights and economic privileges. Thus, the evolution of an ideology of sacral kingship worked in tandem with a wider socio-economic process of political centralization to contribute to the maturation of Capetian kingship during the thirteenth century, where “the rise of royal and princely power . . . . revealed a triumphant, dynastic lordship, reinforced both by an increasingly elaborate ideology and an increasingly effective structure of governance and administration, chiefly the creation of institutions of justice and finance”.
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One of the principal tools in the expansion of monarchical power during the thirteenth century lay in the growth of the ability of medieval kings to impose their judicial will upon the realm – Philip’s reliance upon legal arguments is well noted by historians, and his political conquests such as that of Normandy were invariably depicted as lawful punishment of the illegal acts of his vassals. This can also be seen through the institution of the *baillis*, which increased the presence and reach of the Capetian bureaucracy and simultaneously reduced their dependence upon the information and courts of the landed magnates. Guillaume de Nangis, writing of Philip’s decision to invade Normandy at the beginning of the thirteenth century, emphasized the legal aspect of the conquest, particularly Philip’s feudal rights to punish his vassal for illegal actions, which Guillaume helpfully lists before concluding that “c’est pourquoi, accusé et cité par les barons de France devant le roi des Français, dont il était le vassal, comme après beaucoup de citations il ne voulut point comparaître, il fut, par le jugement des pairs, dépouillé de ses fiefs”.\(^{184}\) Crucially, however, the confluence of spiritual authority as embodied in the maintenance of justice which was present in medieval political theory suggests that Philip’s recourse to legal vocabulary also sought to justify his political actions within the context of his role as a sacral Capetian king. It also likely contributed to the rapid transference of allegiances witnessed in the case of numerous Norman lords from Plantagenet to Capetian rule.\(^{185}\) The close connection between the law, justice, and the sacral duty of a medieval monarch

\(^{184}\) Guillaume cites as fact the rumor that John had murdered his nephew, Arthur of Brittany (c. 1187-1203), his seizure of Isabella d’Angouleme (c. 1188-1246), the betrothed of one of Philip’s prominent vassals, and his depredations against the church as crimes committed by the Plantagenet ruler, which Philip was punishing in fulfillment of his sacral duty as feudal overlord of France. Berman, *Law and Revolution*, 464-65; Guillaume de Nangis, *Chroniques capétiennes*, 106

suggests that Philip’s efforts to present a legally binding case for his conquest of Normandy represented a step towards a realization of the full range of sovereignty wielded by the Capetian monarchy, both in its capacity as the feudal suzerain of France, and as a sacral king whose authority stemmed from God via the rite of unction and the swearing of the coronation oath. In this respect, Suger’s writings provided a valuable foundation for the program of monarchical centralization undertaken during Philip’s reign, as the “taming of the nobility” through punishment of their illegal behavior, and the maintenance of justice throughout the royal domain functioned as two sides of the same coin, though it was clearly the broader socio-economic and political advancements effected by Philip’s early administrative reforms that allowed him to actualize a hitherto theoretical understanding of Capetian political sovereignty drawn from both spiritual and secular authority.\textsuperscript{186}

In analyzing the intersection between secular and spiritual power exercised by the Capetian monarchy, the emergence of Paris as the \textit{de facto} capital of the medieval French kingdom provides a salient example of the literal fusion of temporal and ecclesiastical sovereignty in service to the legitimizing ideology of sacral Capetian kingship; however, Paris’ status and place within France would only truly develop during the reign of Philip Augustus, whose interest in the city reflected a confluence of political purpose and an attempt to take advantage of the inherent religious symbolism and imagery of the city. The king was born at Reims, reigned in Paris, and was buried in Saint-Denis – a geographical collusion that partly

explains Philip’s own efforts to both patronize Saint-Denis and his professed desire to radically transform Paris into a center of monarchical and political control, as well as the spiritual center of the Frankish realm. Grant, in her study of Suger and his writings, ironically notes that while much of this was due to the efforts of Suger to associate Saint-Denis with the Capetian government, “the unintended result was to reduce St-Denis to a satellite – vital, but a satellite – of the great and growing city of Paris, an outlying adjunct to the royal palace”.187 While historians note that Paris had significant resonance as the center of Capetian political power prior to the thirteenth century, there is broad agreement in the historiographical field that Philip’s reign was a transformative period for Paris; this paper argues, however, that Paris played a role not merely in the process of monarchical centralization of political power, but also as a potent symbol of the cultural and ideological component of Capetian monarchical authority.

Georges Bordonove describes Philip as “un roi parisien”, and John Baldwin argues compellingly that Philip was the principal impetus behind the growth of Paris into the capital city of medieval France; the proximity of Saint-Denis to the city also contributed to the gradual expansion of Paris into the most prominent center of Capetian monarchical authority.188 Contemporary writers also spoke of Philip’s program of urban development and personal interest in the city – Rigord for example describes an incident where Philip reportedly noted the malodourous odors and cramped streets of the city and vowed to pave the streets, clean the city, and modernize it, by medieval standards at least. Rigord also uses this opportunity to expand upon the Trojan origins of the city, claiming its name originated from Paris son of Priam, and
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thus confirmed the divine descent of Philip and the Capetians from the kings of Troy, in the same genealogical tree which included the Carolingians and Merovingians.\footnote{Philip’s personal connection to the city can also be explained by a number of other factors, including it being the burial place of his first wife Isabel of Hainaut, as well as through the number of rapturous receptions the city supposedly granted him. Guillaume le Breton and Rigord both note celebrations in Paris at the news of his birth in 1165, his return from the Third Crusade in 1191, and after his victory at Bouvines in 1214. Rigord, *Histoire de Philippe*, 192-95; Guillaume le Breton, “Gesta Philippii,” 170-172; Guillaume le Breton, *La Philippide*, 16-19, 303; Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, 581; Beaune, *The Birth of an Ideology*, 241; Kantorowicz, *The King’s Two Bodies*, 253; Hornaday, “A Capetian Queen,” 87-88; Baldwin, *The Government of Philip*, 80} The Trojan origins of the Franks, a common theme among the works of French writers contemporaneous to Philip and repeated again in Primat’s *Grandes Chroniques*, would likely have been common knowledge in the Capetian court, and so it is distinctly possible that Philip saw in his Parisian revitalization a demonstration of the mythical and kingly origins of the Capetians and an expression of the venerable tradition of continuous authority held by the dynasty. Furthermore, Paris – though not formally the capital of the realm – was believed to have been the seat of government for successive Kings of the Franks beginning with Clovis, and so already held immense political and symbolic significance to the French monarchy, which likely informed Philip’s policies to develop the city as the cultural, political, and economic center of the Capetian royal domain.\footnote{Gregory of Tours, *The History of the Franks*, 154, 217; Baldwin, *The Government of Philip*, 373-74; Spiegel, “Medieval Canon Formation,” 645; Flori, *Philippe Auguste*, 144; Primat, *Les Grandes Chroniques*, 138-42}

Notwithstanding Philip’s role in revitalizing the stalled construction of Notre-Dame-de-Paris, which expressed the Capetian monarch’s personal interest in elevating Paris to a center of ecclesiastical as well as political authority, this paper has already highlighted the elements of the “ordinary testament” of 1190 that specifically aimed to protect and develop Paris’ economic interests, a policy that reflected his forward-thinking and pragmatic approach to feudal kingship,
in that it maximized the financial resources available while concentrating political power closer to the monarchy and further from the aristocracy. ¹⁹¹ However, Philip’s economic policies, both toward Paris and more generally, fit within a framework of thought that advocated as the king’s sacred duty the protection of the weakest and lowest of his medieval subjects as well as to defend the common good of the kingdom. Notably, John Baldwin argues that this commitment to the defense of the wider realm and its subjects formed a part of Philip’s coronation oath, noting that “at his coronation at Reims he took an oath to preserve peace for the church of God and all Christian people. In ecclesiastical terms such peace involved providing protection for the unarmed . . . which in turn included traveling merchants”. ¹⁹² Moreover, Philip’s economic concessions to Paris expanded the financial resources available to the Capetians and precipitated the socio-economic changes that enabled the successful imposition of monarchical control throughout medieval France and the centralization of political power under the figure of the king in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, signifying again the confluence of secular and spiritual authority held by the king and the dual nature of Philip’s economic and political program of monarchical expansion. A further indication of the importance placed upon the economic development of Paris and the patronage of the wider French merchant class was the legend of the presence of the bourgeois militias of Paris at the Battle of Bouvines, in close proximity to the

¹⁹¹ Baldwin, Paris, 77-81; Rigord, Histoire de Philippe, 277-79, 285; Delaborde, Recueil des Actes, 332-33, 416-18, 434-45; Bradbury, Philip Augustus, 69-71
¹⁹² Philip’s swift and generous response to the flooding of the Seine in 1196 also falls within this understanding of the sacral duty of the medieval monarch, and furthermore engaged in a pre-existing tradition of charitable work by the Capetian monarchy. Suger makes specific mention of an instance where Louis VI “had taken up the cause of the poor and orphans, and had subdued tyrants with powerful force,” again illustrating the correlation in Capetian political thought between defending the weak, dispensing justice, and subduing the nobility to exercise the rightful authority of the monarch. Baldwin, Paris, 47; Kantorowicz, The King’s Two Bodies, 259-60; Berman, Law and Revolution, 466; Odo of Deuil, De profectione, 143; Suger, The Deeds of Louis, 62-63
While unlikely to be true, the contemporary belief in the presence of representatives of Paris at the greatest military and political triumph of Philip’s reign enabled Bouvines to be portrayed as a battle for Francia, both in regards to a shared ethnic community and a contiguous territory that found its common pole in the figure of the sacral Capetian monarch; furthermore, it clearly indicates the hybrid approach that Philip’s reign took towards the development of Paris and the fulfillment of a political program of monarchical centralization more broadly, namely its role in developing an ideology of sacral Capetian rule in the thirteenth century.

Philip’s reign also saw the foundation of the University of Paris, which would become under Louis IX one of the foremost centers of theological study in medieval Europe, and a powerful symbol of the intellectual and cultural power of the Capetian monarchy. Moreover, it enabled the training of a class of bureaucratic officials drawn from the emergent bourgeoisie to serve in the expanding royal government, a phenomenon which further reduced the political leverage of the French magnates and contributed to the centralization of power under the Capetians. Moreover, the Capetians forbade the formation of new universities throughout the thirteenth century, which ensured that there was “only one studium generale, in their kingdom . . . Paris, already the seat of monarchy, the royal city par excellence, came more and more to be France’s intellectual capital” a development which lent further prestige to the Capetian dynasty and credence to its claims of superiority in Latin Christendom.194 As this paper discussed in earlier sections, the development of Paris and its emergence as the dominant political center of
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medieval France owed much to Philip’s personal investment and further played a crucial role in constructing a physical manifestation of the dual nature of Capetian sovereignty that would be enhanced by successive Capetian monarchs including Louis IX and Philip IV. It unified the principal elements of monarchical power articulated by Le Goff – *sacerdotium, studium, and regnum* – in a single geographical space whose proximity to major religious institutions and the royal palace constructed a durable edifice and easily identifiable center of Capetian royal supremacy. Moreover, in the close association of monarch, city, and patron saint, Paris and its environs formed a physical locus of an enculturative ideology that opposed the emergent chivalric culture of the feudal nobility and reinforced the image of the monarch as the head of a sacred community of France. It created, again according to Le Goff, a “sacred triangle of monarchical space” that reflected Philip’s commitment and recognition of the politics of place in the construction of Capetian royal ideology.195 While Philip’s patronage of Paris can be attributed to the pragmatic appraisal of its strengths as a city, its location in the traditional heartland of the Capetian domain, and its economic incentives, the concurrent expansion of Paris’ spiritual authority through the establishment of the University of Paris and the cultivation of Saint-Denis cannot be overlooked, particularly as Philip’s policies in those areas would be extended during the reign of Louis IX and Philip IV with the express purpose of constructing a city which embodied both the spiritual and secular sovereignty of the Capetian monarchy. It is thus unsurprising that Guillaume le Breton describes Paris as “que caput est regni” toward the end of Philip’s reign, a position the city would occupy for centuries.196

195 Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, 274-75, 426; Bradbury, *Philip Augustus*, 69
196 Matthew Paris praises the theological schools of Paris which flourished during Louis IX’s reign, another policy which Louis developed upon the work of Philip II. Guillaume le Breton, “Philippidos,” 11; Bradbury, *Philip Augustus*, 71; Matthew Paris, *Chronicles of Matthew*, 187
Philip’s political triumphs, territorial conquests, and administrative reforms were accompanied by a concurrent and concerted effort to reinforce the notion of a sacred community of the French, led by the figure of the monarch whose hybrid sovereignty stemmed both from a Carolingian precedent of secular rule and a divine sanction drawn from the figure of Saint Denis and the rite of divine unction that accompanied the coronation ceremony. The expansion of royal bureaucracy, the conquest of Normandy, the growth of Paris as a royal capital, and establishment of Capetian suzerainty over the majority of medieval France emerged within a theoretical framework that emphasized the feudal superiority of the monarch over his vassals, and which delineated the sacral nature of a king’s duty to maintain justice and order in the realm. In returning to an older historiographical tradition that focuses upon the duality of spiritual and secular power wielded by medieval monarchs and emphasizes the importance of symbolism and imagery to medieval kingship, Philip’s principal administrative and political accomplishments were informed by a theoretical framework that emphasized the sacral duties and nature of medieval sovereignty. Furthermore, the key events and reforms of Philip’s reign, including the Ordinance of 1190, the conquest of Normandy in 1204, and the French victory at Bouvines in 1214, both reinforced and actively described within a narrative of uniquely Capetian sacral kingship that can be discerned from Suger, Rigord, and successive writers, which emphasized both the special protection of God, an unswerving commitment to the defense of the papacy and church, and a claim to overarching suzerainty of France. While emphasizing the ideological component of Philip’s administrative reforms and political victories, this paper argues that a reorientation towards the symbolic and ritualistic elements of sacerdotal power as manifested in medieval monarchies enables a reevaluation of Philip’s reign that focuses upon his contributions to royal Capetian ideology and the precedent of kingly behavior and action he established, which
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would become incorporated into the formal canon of Capetian monarchical practice during the reigns of his successors. If the reign of Louis IX saw the realization of the ideal sacral Capetian king, it must be noted that many of his accomplishments directly built upon, or indeed imitated, those first observed during the reign of Philip II, who can be said to have presided over the maturation of a conceptual understanding of sacral Capetian rule during the early thirteenth century.
Chapter 3: The King of Saint-Denis: Philip Augustus and the Abbey of Saint-Denis

The tight-knit relationship between the abbey of Saint-Denis and the French monarchy during the medieval period proved to be one of the most powerful tools in the evolution of an ideology of sacral Capetian kingship, with the abbey flourishing under royal patronage to become a thriving center of historical writing that created a durable legitimizing myth for the claims of the Capetians to be the ‘most Christian kings’ of Europe. By the close of the thirteenth century, Saint-Denis had become virtually inseparable from the fortunes of the Capetian dynasty, boasting by then the position of royal necropolis, and guardian of the coronation regalia of the Capetian kings, as well as keeper of the oriflamme, the sacred banner of the French monarchy, with many of these specific developments occurring during the reign of Philip II in the early thirteenth century. In conjunction with Philip’s wider policies aimed towards making the city of Paris a physical representation of the dual nature of sacral sovereignty, Saint-Denis acquired a symbolic status akin to that of a national church. The monastery’s connection with Saint Denis and its physical closeness to the seat of political power in medieval France focused the idealization of medieval Frankish society as a singular, sacral entity bound by a common identity and led by the most Christian of monarchs, as articulated in William Jordan’s comparative study A Tale of Two Monasteries: Westminster and Saint-Denis in the Thirteenth Century.\(^{197}\) The growth in the ecclesiastical power and prestige of Saint-Denis during Philip’s rule solidified a relationship whereby the monastery was an active partner and ally in the distribution of a royalist conception of French history, one that buttressed Philip’s impressive political and administrative reforms with an ideology of Capetian rule imbued with divine favor and sanction. This paper argues that Philip contributed to the development of a pre-existing culture of symbolic power.

---

\(^{197}\) Jordan, A Tale of Two Monasteries, 27-28; Naus, Constructing Kingship, 17-18
that reinforced the framework of Capetian monarchical superiority in medieval France through aggressive royal patronage of the monastery Saint-Denis, his engagement with the rituals associated with the cult of Saint Denis, and his deployment of physical representations of Saint Denis such as the oriflamme, all of which constructed an image of monarchical sanctity, that was subsequently disseminated to a wider popular audience from Saint-Denis.

Saint-Denis owed its name, and much of its spiritual prestige, to the story of the martyr Denis, who was “the principal apostle to Gaul and the first bishop of Paris”, and already enjoyed both widespread veneration among the local population and a link to the first inklings of a concept of unified identity for medieval France. Yet, despite falsified documents emerging in the early eleventh and mid-twelfth centuries which claimed that the village of Saint-Denis had been willed to the abbey by Dagobert I and that Saint-Denis had been granted supremacy over the entirety of churches in France by Charlemagne, the abbey of Saint-Denis truly rose to prominence only in the mid-twelfth century under the abbacy of Suger, whose close relationship with Louis VI and Louis VII saw the emergence of a number of vernacular and Latin historical tracts in support of the Capetian monarchical project of political centralization and marked a significant development in the construction of the ideology of sacral Capetian kingship. Indeed, a historiographical tendency to retroactively impose the prominence enjoyed by Saint-Denis in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries backwards risks overlooking the significant contributions made by individuals such as Suger, Philip II, and Louis IX in creating a new understanding of the relationship between Saint-Denis and the monarchy, and its subsequent

impact upon the growth of Capetian ideological power. Under Suger, the abbey of Saint-Denis would emerge as one of the predominant churches in medieval France, rivalling the cathedral at Reims – where Capetian kings were traditionally crowned – in regards to its association with the Capetian monarchy. The evolution of Saint-Denis as a center of historical writing, furthermore, was strongly abetted by Suger’s own interest in history and the access of the monastery to a number of classical and ecclesiastical historical texts. Indeed, Georges Duby notes that some chronicles referred to the Capetian monarchs as the “King of Saint-Denis”, thus presenting a tradition of sacral kingship in which the French kings ruled in the name and under the protection of Saint Denis, a tradition which Philip’s reign maintained and greatly enhanced. This tradition is exemplified in Suger’s Deeds of Louis the Fat, where he describes Louis VI’s closeness to the church of Saint-Denis in glowing terms, noting that “this hightborn stripling followed the ancient custom of Charles the Great and other excellent kings . . . and clung to the holy martyrs of St Denis and their monks with innate tenderness”, pointing to a connection between the church and Charlemagne which would figure prominently in Philip’s contribution to the maturation of Capetian royal ideology.

Though the culmination of this trend toward the production of vernacular royalist history would emerge in the reign of Louis IX with the publication of Primat’s Les Grandes Chroniques de France, arguably the first comprehensive history of France written from a “national” perspective, this paper argues that the reign of Philip II proved critical in laying the foundation for the central position of the abbey of Saint-Denis in sacral Capetian ideology in the thirteenth

---


201 Suger, The Deeds of Louis, 24; Hugenholtz and Teunis, “Suger’s Advice,” 201-203
and fourteenth centuries. Philip’s patronage of Saint-Denis, both the abbey itself and its symbolic status as the center of a sacral Frankish culture, alongside his extraordinary political achievements, precipitated a new phase of historical writing which placed Philip squarely at the center of a revitalized ideology of sacral Capetian kingship that emphasized both the religiosity of the French kings but also their ability to expand the kingdom. Preceding abbots of the monastery had sought to associate Saint-Denis with such hallowed figures from the semi-mythology of Frankish history as Dagobert and Clovis, but this “relationship between abbey and throne, which had prospered under the Carolingians, was cemented under the Capetians, and during their reign Saint-Denis’ standing became paramount”. This paper argues that, while other Capetian monarchs undoubtedly lavished financial donations and grants of land, Saint-Denis’ association with the monarchy was only formally incorporated into the institution and public ceremony of Capetian kingship as a result of Philip’s reign. The dialectical relationship between monarchy and patron saint was reflected in the concerted use of Dionysian symbolism such as the oriflamme to construct an ideology of monarchical power rooted in both secular and religious authority, whereby the political sovereignty of the Capetians was sanctioned and legitimized through the divine authority of God and Saint Denis.

While Philip was not the subject of an officially authorized biography from Saint-Denis unlike Suger’s *The Deeds of Louis the Fat* or the works of Guillaume de Nangis on Louis IX, Rigord, was a monk of Saint-Denis, and Guillaume le Breton, though not formally a member of the ecclesiastical community of Saint-Denis, drew heavily from Rigord’s work in the
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composition of his *Philippide* and also wrote a continuation of Rigord’s *La Vie de Philippe Auguste*, with both authors being fairly consistent in their praise of the Capetian monarch. Later works of history from the monastery, including Primat’s *Les Grandes Chroniques* and Guillaume de Nangis’ *Chroniques Capétiennes* share this relatively positive portrayal of Philip II, whose reign was venerated by Saint-Denis with the same level of reverence as that of Louis IX, Dagobert I, and Robert II “the Pious”, all of whom were considered to have been exemplars of the ideals of sacral Capetian kingship and had strong ties to Saint-Denis during their reigns.  

Spiegel notes that Saint-Denis adhered strongly to the medieval understanding of the morally didactic nature of history, arguing that the historical works of Saint-Denis “are permeated with a moral conception of history whose primary function is seen as the encouragement of virtue and disparagement of evil through an objective narration of examples drawn from the past”. While it is crucial to acknowledge the historical biases the monks of Saint-Denis would have undoubtedly felt towards their monarchical benefactors, and the likely embellishment of Philip’s devotion to the cult of Saint Denis, it is also clear that the dramatic rise in the proliferation of vernacular historical work emerged towards the end of Philip’s reign, which resulted from the deliberate policy of patronage and royal support that Philip provided during his rule to construct a durable association of crown and church. An exploration of the veneration of Philip and his incorporation into the canon of sanctified kings by the monastery within this context clearly indicates that Philip played a crucial role in the evolution of Saint-Denis as the principal center.
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and supporter of a wider ideology of sacral Capetian monarchy that ran parallel to his policy of territorial and political expansion at the expense of prominent nobles.

One of the earliest examples of Philip’s interest in the patronage of Saint-Denis lay in the choice of the abbey as the location of his second coronation on the 29th of May 1180, following the ceremony which anointed him co-monarch alongside his father in 1179 that was held at the cathedral in Reims. According to Giselbert of Mons, a Flemish chronicler of the period, Saint-Denis was suggested as a location by Philip, Count of Flanders, who was one of the more prominent advisors in the last years of Louis VII’s reign, and the earliest years of Philip’s rule; he was also the maternal uncle of Philip’s first wife, Isabel of Hainaut who was also crowned at Saint-Denis in 1180, and closely related to Philip’s mother, Adela of Champagne. The choice of Saint-Denis by Philip of Flanders, with its closer ties to the Carolingian dynasty versus the association of Reims with the Merovingians, was likely a political move to demonstrate his power over the new king and to further emphasize the importance of the House of Alsace in its association with Charlemagne and the Carolingians. However, it is difficult to view the young king as a passive actor in this situation, given that contemporary writers emphasized that, even before the death of Louis VII, Philip actively participated in the governance of France, evidenced by the fact that he began to issue royal charters in his own name from 1179 onwards without including the name of his father, as well as his shift towards a more punitive policy vis-a-vis the Jews of France. The contemporary evidence of Philip’s early participation and interest in

---

governance suggests that it was unlikely he had no input whatsoever in the selection of Saint-Denis as the location of his second coronation.\textsuperscript{207} Moreover, while the majority of references to the Carolingian connection with the Capetians emerged later in Philip’s own reign – including the \textit{reditus regni ad stirpem} which will be discussed in greater length in subsequent sections – Louis VII adopted Carolingian imperial nomenclature at several points during his reign, and the association of Charlemagne with the Capetian dynasty was furthered through the vehicle of the crusades in the writings of Odo of Deuil and Abbot Suger. Likewise Louis VI clearly invoked a Carolingian historical tradition in 1124, when he visited the abbey of Saint-Denis to claim the \textit{oriflamme} in preparation for an invasion of France by the Holy Roman Emperor which never came to pass.\textsuperscript{208} In addition, according to Rigord, Philip himself had been blessed with the protection of Saint Denis – described by the chronicler as “Saint Denis, patron et defenseur des rois des Francs” – during a hunting mishap in his youth, when the young Philip had been separated from the rest of the hunting party and reportedly prayed to Saint Denis for his safe return.\textsuperscript{209} While obviously apocryphal, the story suggests that there already existed a close association of Saint Denis and his protection with the Capetian monarchy.\textsuperscript{210} Philip was, in all likelihood, aware of the resonance of the Carolingian association, and the linkage of
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\textsuperscript{210} This action would be repeated in 1190, when Philip’s son Louis fell ill while the king was away on crusade. An elaborate procession, including Adela and William of White hands, went to Saint-Denis to pray for Louis’ recovery – his recovery from illness, and Philip’s near-simultaneous recovery in the Levant were both attributed to the protection of Saint Denis and the innate holiness of the French kings and Capetian dynasty. This paper has already explored the Marian connection to this episode as well. Lombard-Jourdan, “\textit{Montjoie et Saint-Denis!”}, 214; Guillaume le Breton, \textit{La Philippide}, 98-99; Primat, \textit{Les Grandes Chroniques}, 206-11; Owen, “The Prince and the churl,”142; Spiegel, “The Cult of Saint-Denis,” 57
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Charlemagne in particular with the church, and so his acquiescence to the decision to hold his second coronation at Saint-Denis suggests a deliberate personal investment in the early construction of a religio-political ideology of legitimacy that could be applied to the broader French territory outside of the Ile-de-France region.

The choice of Saint-Denis was all the more significant as Capetian kings were traditionally crowned at Reims, in accordance with the tradition that Clovis I, the first King of the Franks, had been anointed with holy oil by Saint Remigius in the city that bore his name; thus, all subsequent kings were crowned in an identical ceremony which demonstrated the unbroken commitment of the French monarchy to both the Catholic church, and the dual nature of religious and political sovereignty held by the king, with Guillaume le Breton describing Louis VIII as receiving “l’onction celeste” in 1223. Furthermore, the use of the Holy Ampulla enabled the Capetian monarchy to present themselves as the authentic inheritors of the Frankish sovereignty enjoyed by both the Merovingians and Carolingians, a point emphasized through the dynastic continuity implied in the use of the Reims chrism. This paper has already explored the significance of Reims within the political and symbolic context of the Capetian coronation ceremony, and it within this understanding that Philip’s choice of Saint-Denis as the location for his second coronation becomes all the more significant in analyzing his personal contribution to the development of an ideology of sacral Capetian kingship. While Philip’s first coronation
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indeed occurred at Reims, the selection of Saint-Denis elevated the latter to an analogous position that laid the foundation for the ecclesiastical dominance of Saint-Denis in later centuries, a focus which was exacerbated by Philip’s later decision to transfer custody of the coronation regalia – the crown, scepter, and royal sword – from Reims to Saint-Denis in 1179. Philip later confirmed the transfer of the regalia in his final will and testament in 1223, a move that ensured the close association of the Capetian monarchy with a religious figure whose stature approached that of a patron saint, and a religious institution already emerging as the foremost production center of historical writing in medieval France, a shift which coincided with the broader revival of literacy and emergent vernacular, lay interest in history in what has been termed by some historians as the “twelfth century renaissance”. As such, it is unsurprising that a number of vernacular translations of Rigord and Guillaume le Breton’s works, as well as several fragmentary works chronicling the reign of Philip II, emerged towards the end of Philip’s life. This flourishing of historical writing, made feasible by the dramatic territorial conquests of Philip’s reign coupled with his consistent support for the ecclesiastical primacy of Saint-Denis as royal church, played a major role in the dissemination of a historical legitimacy of royal supremacy at both the popular and learned level. Spiegel, for example, notes that, though Guillaume le Breton was not formally affiliated with the ecclesiastical community of Saint-

Denis, his use of its materials for his own works indicated “growing recognition within the royal entourage of the authoritative and, perhaps, official status of Dionysian chronicles”. 214

Furthermore, the appearance of vernacular historical works was not limited to pro-Capetian writings, with both Robert Stein and John Baldwin pointing to the anti-monarchical writings and poems of prominent noble troubadours that emerged in the same period as a baronial reaction of resentment against the imposition of royal authority under Philip. It is likely that the development of rival historical works that criticized Philip’s expansion of monarchical authority were commissioned in response to the successful development of an ideology that justified the growth of Capetian political power under Philip. Aristocratic patronage of vernacular history and poetry critical of the centralizing monarchy, alongside their veneration of the chivalrous *preudomme* as the ideal of noble behavior represented a challenge to Capetian ideology on multiple levels – not merely a response to Philip’s political and territorial conquests, it aimed to undercut the principal foundations of Capetian legitimacy in its self-conception as a sacred institution enjoying of the special protection of God and Saint Denis. 215 It is important to note, moreover, that Philip’s efforts to associate Saint-Denis more strongly with the Capetian monarchy were not merely reflective of individual preference, as despite the protests of the ecclesiastical community of Reims, Saint-Denis’ guardianship of the coronation regalia was formally recognized during the reign of Louis IX and subsequent Capetian kings. Unlike the revival of Carolingian symbolism and nomenclature, Saint-Denis enjoyed a limited connection to

the mythic foundational narrative of the Franks, as opposed to ecclesiastical centers such as Reims or Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire; its rise to prominence owed a great deal to Philip’s patronage, which in turn was likely impacted by the significant influence of Suger at the court of Louis VII.  

As this paper has already discussed, a significant portion of the mystique and legitimacy associated with the coronation ceremony of the Frankish kings was drawn from the location of Reims itself and its connection with the Merovingians. By contrast, Philip’s decision to hold his second coronation at Saint-Denis transferred, or at the very least divided, the locus of monarchical sacral authority to a new area, one which was closer to Paris and to the seat of secular kingly authority and tapped into the Dionysian myth of rule over France in its entirety. Given Philip’s interest in Saint-Denis and his willingness to devolve duties such as the keeping of the royal regalia to the foundation, such actions suggest a king who was aware of the importance of symbolism to the ideological framework of Capetian kingship and a commitment to sovereignty that drew from political power and religious imagery.

While all contemporary accounts of Philip’s second coronation note the presence of the Count of Flanders, only Giselbert describes the Count’s participation in the ceremony with any significant detail, noting that “Count Philip of Flanders and Vermandois, the queen’s uncle, standing nearby and bearing the royal sword at the same time”, a passage incorporated almost verbatim into Les Grandes Chroniques, with Anne-Lombard Jourdan noting that the “royal
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216 Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire, or Fleury, had strong connections with the Capetian dynasty due to its geographic location between Senlis and Orleans, deep in the traditional domain of the Capetians, and monks of Fleury composed one of the earliest openly pro-Capetian histories of France, the Historia Francorum, as well as Helgaud’s Life of Robert the Pious, both of which strongly endorsed an ideology of sacral Capetian rule over all of France. Reims’ connection with the French monarchy emerged from its connection with Clovis and Remigius. Naus, Constructing Kingship, 20-21; Laurent, Pour Dieu et pour le roi, 42; Suger, The Deeds of Louis, 62 n. b
sword” in question was considered by contemporaries to be the sword of Charlemagne.\textsuperscript{217} The annotation and labelling of the royal sword as the blade of Charlemagne is an interesting addendum which further suggests that Philip was aware both of the importance of his marriage to Isabel in the union of the Carolingian and Capetian dynasties, but also of the value in more closely associating himself with the mythos of Charlemagne in particular and the church of Saint-Denis more broadly. Rigord, however, recounts a different anecdote, where the vessel of holy oil used during the coronation ceremony spilled and drenched both Philip and Isabel, an incident which Rigord is keen to assert reflected the overflowing piety and glory that was to characterize Philip’s reign, and was likely a deliberate attempt to retroactively connect the later triumphs of Philip’s rule specifically with Saint-Denis. Historians note that Guillaume le Breton, one of the few other contemporary chroniclers of Philip’s reign, does not mention this episode in his account of the second coronation ceremony, which lends greater weight to the argument that Rigord included the anecdote purely for the purposes of embellishing the reputation of Saint-Denis.\textsuperscript{218} Primat’s \textit{Grandes Chroniques}, while similarly refraining from repeating verbatim Rigord’s account, presents a different miracle entirely – the author recounts that, when Philip and Isabella knelt to be anointed, the lamps in Saint-Denis burst into flame, and the author insists that this miracle was proof both of Philip’s enjoyment of Dionysian protection, and of the holiness of his person and subsequent reign.\textsuperscript{219} These tales of miraculous happenings are important to
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consider within the typical historiographical context of Philip’s reign as one of primarily political, not spiritual, significance to the growth of Capetian monarchical power as they clearly indicate that Philip was considered a sacral monarch within a canon of Capetian tradition by both contemporaries and successive courtly writers, and that the extraordinary litany of political and military triumphs that furthered the political power of the Capetian monarchy were also incorporated within an ideological framework of Capetian sacral kingship. Furthermore, they point to a distinct connection between the secular and spiritual in the coronation rites of the Capetian monarchs, where assumption of the crown inherently reflected a sacred obligation to protect the church and the poor, a responsibility that lends a new valence to the political aggrandizement undertaken by Philip in opposition to the French nobility. The duties of the French monarch were taken from God, and so the king occupied a convergent space in which secular authority and sacerdotal power were intertwined, a process greatly enhanced by association with the patronage and protection of Saint Denis that was so carefully cultivated by Philip and the Capetian monarchy.

A more direct example of the intersectionality of secular and sacred power can be seen in Philip’s donation of relics to Saint-Denis in 1205, which were obtained from the newly-crowned Latin Emperor of Constantinople in the wake of the Fourth Crusade. This act represented a major development in the formalization of the dependent relationship of Saint-Denis and the Capetian monarchy, and the emergence of Saint-Denis as one of the primary ecclesiastical centers of medieval France in support of the centralizing project of the monarchy in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The role of relics, particularly in the context of the crusading movement, was incredibly significant, as relics “evoked ideas of martyrdom, the imitation of Christ and a proximity to the Holy Land that relics from the West . . . could not”, and so Philip’s gift in 1205
contributed to the evolving ideology of Capetian kingship as intimately tied to the Crusades and the figure of Saint Denis.\textsuperscript{220} The relics also played a role in the spread and sustenance of an idea of sanctified peace which, through the act of donation by various nobles led to “the strongly penitential faith of the monks . . . associated with magnates in the moving experiences of mysterious power”.\textsuperscript{221} In this particular context, Philip and the Capetian dynasty would have reaped the benefits of association with sanctified relics and their corresponding role in the maintenance of peace in the royal domain which, in turn, reinforced the notion of a monarch’s sacral duty to uphold justice and order. Moreover, the presence of relics within a church lent it considerable prestige and, as this paper has briefly touched upon in regards to the rights to guardianship of the Capetian regalia, Saint-Denis did not yet hold total spiritual ascendancy over France. Philip’s donation of such famous relics likely contributed significantly to the reputation of Saint-Denis as the spiritual center of the Capetian kingdom; historians argue that Philip’s donation of the relics was so significant that “Philip Augustus is considered equal to Charles the Bald and second only to Dagobert as a patron of Saint-Denis”.\textsuperscript{222} This level of veneration which is clearly reflected in the liturgical celebrations allotted for the commemoration of Philip’s death, his elaborate funeral, and the reciprocal commitment of the Dionysian monastic community to the propagation of Capetian royal ideology, both during Philip’s reign and in later centuries.
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While Philip was far from the only Capetian king to provide objects of veneration to Saint-Denis, a tradition which finds examples during the reigns of his predecessors and successors, his continuation of the custom provides a clear instance of his engagement and awareness of a wider canon of sacral Capetian kingship, namely where the triumphs of the Capetians were due to the grace of Saint Denis and God, and where the Crusades constituted the most public display of Capetian piety and moral righteousness. Rigord, who recounts the donation of relics, notes that “Philippe roi des Francs, en gage de charité et d’amour, offrit à l’église de Saint-Denis l’Aréopagite les très précieuses reliques . . . . Toutes ces reliques le très chrétien roi des Francs les remit de sa propre main à Henri, l’abbé”. Philip’s donation was considered significant even by Anglo-Norman chroniclers such as Ralph of Coggeshall, who praised the action as reflective of Philip’s piety and of the superior moral quality of the Capetian monarchy in comparison to the Plantagenets. Philip’s personal participation in the ritual of relic donation would likely have enhanced his standing as a sacral monarch through a salient reminder of his commitment to the wider crusading movement and his connection to the Latin Empire, particularly in light of the role of the crusades in legitimizing the Capetians’ claim to the title of rex christianissimus. It enabled Philip to portray himself, and the institution of the monarchy more generally, as supportive of the crusades without actually departing for the Levant while also placing him within a distinct tradition of crusading Frankish kings that contributed to the sacral image of the Capetian dynasty. In this respect, the cultivation of Saint-Denis by Philip reinforced the relationship between secular and sacerdotal power, as Philip’s relationship with
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the monastery and the saint himself conflated the political and administrative reforms of his reign with the ecclesiastical favor bestowed by Saint Denis as a result of Philip’s piety and devotion. The public ceremony of relic donation ensured the institutional connection of Saint-Denis and the Capetian monarchy, and its location within the wider contextual moment of the Fourth Crusade likely evoked an understanding of a transnational community of Franci united in a single church and under a single, sacred monarchy.\textsuperscript{225}

It is also worth contrasting Philip’s donation of relics to Saint-Denis with that of Louis IX, whose passionate desire for the collection and display of saintly relics comprised a significant part of his role in the development of a sacral ideology of kingship, as “Louis never missed an opportunity to associate the glory of the king with the glory of God”.\textsuperscript{226} Though Louis did provide relics for the church of Saint-Denis, his greatest accomplishment in regards to the association of saintly artifacts and the sanctification of the Capetian monarchy was his construction of Sainte-Chapelle in the 1240s, intended by Louis to function as a distinctly royal, but ultimately personal, sanctuary. By contrast, Philip’s decision to send relics to Saint-Denis represented a gesture of munificence that fostered a stronger associative bond between Saint-Denis and the institution of Capetian kingship; furthermore, it elevated Saint-Denis to a position of ecclesiastical supremacy in medieval France that laid the foundation for its dominant place within the propagation of Capetian royal ideology in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{227} Philip’s actions challenge the notion of an impious monarch whose overriding aim was the political domination of his rivals, and instead suggests that Philip played a fundamental role in
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developing an understanding of Capetian sacerdotal monarchy that drew from religious symbolism and imagery. Moreover, Philip once again emerged as a model for the more fully realized ideal of sacral kingship in Louis IX, and his conduct represented a precedent that was imitated during Louis’ time, whereby the glory of God was firmly linked to the glory of the Capetian dynasty.

Perhaps the most compelling evidence to suggest Philip’s personal attachment to Saint-Denis and his contribution to its evolution as the central ecclesiastical supporter of royal ideology can be found in the episode of the four bezants. According to a falsified charter known as the “Donation”, Charlemagne supposedly called an ecclesiastical council at Saint-Denis and demanded that the monastery be recognized as caput omnium ecclesiarum regni, and that its abbot be titled the Primate of France. Furthermore, he reportedly claimed to hold France in fiefdom from God and Saint Denis the martyr – and in recognition of this, he placed four golden bezants upon the altar of the church in an act of vassalage, and “directed that his successors should do so also, bound not by human but divine servitude”. This practice was formally institutionalized during the early years of Louis IX, where the monarch would visit Saint-Denis on the feast day of that figure and duly offer four gold bezants in recognition of the French monarchy’s vassalage. It is important to recognize, however, that Louis was merely imitating the example of Philip II, who resurrected the practice in the early thirteenth century, with Spiegel
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and Baldwin suggesting it was between 1204 and 1211.\textsuperscript{230} In light of Philip’s reputation as an effective manipulator of feudal ties, such a deliberate act of vassalage and recognition of the feudal suzerainty of Saint Denis is all the more striking, as it is highly unlikely that Philip did not grasp the significance of reviving the tradition of the four bezants, and points to Philip’s recognition of the importance of Saint-Denis and its symbolic value in underscoring the divine foundation of Capetian rule.\textsuperscript{231} The patronage Philip invested upon the church of Saint-Denis was reciprocated through the monastery’s wholehearted commitment to the royalist ideology of sacral kingship, as evidenced in the proliferation of pro-Capetian historical texts in the thirteenth century and in the incorporation of the celebration of kingly death anniversaries into the liturgical calendar.

This monetization and formalization of a pre-existing, if theoretical, feudal relationship served as a model for Philip’s transformation of ties of feudalism into a coherent set of obligations, both financial and material. This act of homage takes on further significance when evaluated against the development of Saint-Denis as a center of pro-Capetian historical writing, an evolution greatly accelerated by Philip’s donation of relics and recognition of Saint Denis’ feudal superiority. In exchange, the ecclesiastical community of Saint-Denis actively participated in the construction of a historical record that emphasized monarchical supremacy, both temporal and spiritual, that would find its most obvious embodiment in \textit{Les Grandes Chroniques}. As Spiegel notes, “Philip Augustus . . . saw in this claim an ideological justification for shared
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aspirations. By adhering strictly to the terms of the false charter, their actions framed the conviction, or at least the pious hope, that they too ruled all France and . . . recognized no superior except God and Saint Denis”. 232 In adhering to the terms of vassalage implied in the Carolingian charter, Philip engaged with an earlier strain of theory propagated by Suger in his justification of Louis VI’s punitive expeditions beyond the Capetian domain – by framing themselves as rulers of all France through their relationship with Saint Denis, Philip and his successors could actualize the theoretical feudal dues of other French vassals under the aegis of divine right and thus justify their expansion by the same terminology. This argument is further supported by the manner in which Suger, whose abbacy at Saint-Denis preceded Philip’s reign, described the church and its relationship with the Frankish kings, particularly its guardianship of a number of objects closely tied to the royal expansionary project of the Merovingians, Carolingians, and Capetians. In his De Rebus in Administratione sua Gestis, an account of the renovation and artistic restoration of the abbey of Saint-Denis during his tenure as abbot, Suger notes that “We saw to it . . . that the famous throne of the glorious King Dagobert . . . was restored. On it, as ancient tradition relates, the kings of the Franks, after having taken the reins of government, used to sit in order to receive, for the first time, the homage of their nobles”. 233 This passage, notwithstanding Suger’s attempt to more firmly associate Saint-Denis with the history of the Frankish monarchies and the Frankish realm itself, also points to the conflation of secular and spiritual sovereignty exercised by the Frankish kings, including the Capetians. The reception of feudal homage by the monarch paralleled the homage supposedly done by the monarch to Saint Denis, and clearly presents the abbey of Saint-Denis as the locus of feudal authority for the
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French monarchy and through their partnership and subservience to the saint, an understanding that was undoubtedly reinforced by Philip’s revival of the tributary practice of the four bezants.

The appeal to the ultimate feudal hierarchy, in which kings held their lands in fiefdom from God, allowed Philip to imbue his rule with a sacral character that furthermore combined the notion of France inextricably with that of the Capetian monarchy. It also provided a powerful weapon against the resistance, both political and ideological, of his vassals to the expansion of monarchical power. Philip’s patronage of Saint-Denis played a fundamental role in the development of an ideology of sacral Capetian kingship, as it built a locus of symbolic value where both rex and regnum were united in their veneration of a patron saint. This development was poignantly illustrated in the transition of Philip’s royal title from rex Francorum – a title derived from Carolingian tradition and suggesting a commonality with the people, rather than the land – to rex Franciae, which held both broader Carolingian implications and implied Capetian sovereignty over all French lands, in the early thirteenth century. The relationship between monarchy and patron saint provided cultural cohesion and was furthermore imbued with a distinctly feudal character that reflected itself more broadly in Philip’s reign and emphasized the close interplay between symbolic and administrative elements of monarchical control in the medieval period.²³⁴ The transformation of the Capetian monarch from “personal ruler to impersonal bureaucratic ruler” alongside the development of administrative kingship and governmental bureaucracy owed as much to the cultural and symbolic as to the administrative and political.²³⁵ While the latter has occupied the bulk of historiographical study, this paper
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suggests that Philip engaged equally heavily in the former through his patronage of Saint-Denis and his efforts to more firmly link the emergent Dionysian cult with an image of the Capetian monarchy as divinely ordained, whose authority was “part of an eternal pattern of behavior which was rooted in the spiritual nature of political society established by God”.

The cogent association of Saint Denis, both the saint and the church, with the Capetian monarchy can further be explored through the Crusades, and particularly an analysis of the French component of the Children’s Crusade of 1212, a somewhat infamous incident whose connection to the development of an ideology of sacral Capetian kingship has been largely overlooked by historians, both contemporary and modern. The leader of the French contingent of youths or pueri, a shepherd named Stephen of Cloyes (c. ?), claimed to possess letters from God addressed specifically to Philip II, and moreover claimed that his duty was to deliver the letters to the French king at the church of Saint-Denis, and from there the Capetian monarch would lead a crusade to reclaim the Levant for the forces of Latin Christendom.

While the incident is only briefly mentioned by even contemporary writers – the only surviving chronicles to recount it are fragmentary records such as the *Chronicon universale anonymi laudunensis* – Gary Dickson argues that the French element of the Children’s Crusade represented a major development in the cultivation of an ideology of sacral Capetian kingship, particular as “Stephen’s movement was . . . captivated by the mystique of the Capetian monarchy. Furthermore, Stephen of Cloyes’s . . . authority . . . . was allegedly sealed by the possession of celestial letters addressed to Philip
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Unlike the “People’s Crusade” of 1096, or indeed the German aspect of the Children’s Crusade, where it was the virtue of the common peasantry that would achieve victory, a phenomenon repeated in Peter of Blois’ claims for a “crusade of the poor” during the early thirteenth century, the focus of Stephen of Cloyes’ supposed divine mission was the recruitment of Philip II. The Anonymous of Laon notes that “Stephanus quidam puer . . . dicebat Dominum sibi in specie peregrini pauperis apparuisse et ab eo panem accepisse, eique literas Regi Francorum ad eum ex diversis partiabus Galliarum . . . . Ipso moram apud Sanctum-Dionysium faciente”, emphasizing Stephen’s role as merely the transmitter of a divine message intended for Philip II. This theme is similarly evident in the works of both Alberic of Trois-Fontaines and later chronicler Matthew Paris, pointing to the all-encompassing atmosphere of crusading zeal that permeated medieval France during the thirteenth century and the persistent understanding of the centrality of the Capetian monarchs to the leadership of the Crusades. The strength of the Capetian ideology of sacral kingship was closely connected to the wider crusading movement, and the Children’s Crusade clearly points to a growth in that trend during Philip’s reign. Philip’s participation in the Third Crusade and his continued support of other expeditions buttressed his status as rex christianissimus, which in turn aided in “the mutation from earthly to heavenly protector . . . an age that witnessed the beginnings of a sentiment of a collective identity based on
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the notion of a France made up of the French at whose head was the . . . king”. When examined alongside the repeated appeals of Innocent III that Philip lead the Fourth and later Albigensian Crusades, it is clear that Philip was perceived of as the natural leader of any future crusade, a position occupied by individuals whose reputation as sacral, Christian warriors were unquestionable. Furthermore, this speaks to the gradual arrogation of crusading prestige into the broader ideology of sacral Capetian kingship, in which Philip’s reign clearly played a major role.242

It is important to recognize that Stephen sought Philip not in Paris, nor even the cathedral of Reims, but at Saint-Denis, a distinction crucial as it illustrates the strength of the institutional association of the Capetian monarchy with the abbey, in that Saint-Denis occupied the space of a proto-national entity in the mind of the general populace. Beyond the institutional closeness of Saint-Denis and the Capetian monarchy, Stephen’s pilgrimage to Saint-Denis to meet Philip can arguably attest to a personal attachment of Philip himself to the church that challenges the argument that Philip was largely indifferent to religious affairs, as indicated by his personal participation in processions that accompanied the deposition of the relics in 1205, and the construction of a specific prayer psalter from Saint-Denis for Philip around 1210-16.243 The episode of the Children’s Crusade marked a crucial milestone in the development of a notion of collective cultural identity in medieval France, where the Christian, Frankish nature of its

subjects owed its special relationship with Saint Denis to the sacral nature of the Capetian kings and their dual sovereignty as secular and religious figures. Its emergence during Philip’s rule suggests a concentrated effort by the Capetian ruler to firmly associate the monarchy with the Dionysian cult and to present that relationship as proof of both the sacral nature of Capetian kingship and their right to rule all France. While it is possible to view Philip’s dispersal of the would-be crusaders upon consultation with his advisors can be viewed as further evidence of his crusading apathy – the entire episode arguably represented a chastisement of Philip and the Christian nobility for their crusading failures and lack of enthusiasm – this paper argues that the incident of the Children’s Crusade pointed to the persistent image of Philip as a holy, crusading king among the wider French populace, notwithstanding his abandonment of the Third Crusade, his unwillingness to lead the Albigensian Crusade and his conflict with the papacy over his marital status. This formed a crucial component both of Philip’s own reputation as a sacral king, but also in the process of constructing a durable institutional connection between the French monarchy and the Crusades which would play a crucial role in the development of an ideology of sacral Capetian rule.

The close relationship between the monastery of Saint-Denis and Philip was clearly recognized by contemporaries, and his canonical place within the tradition of sacral Capetian kingship was arguably confirmed through Philip’s death and burial at Saint-Denis, and the elaborate rearrangement of royal tombs in 1267 at the behest of Louis IX. By this point, the reputation of Saint-Denis as the official royal mausoleum was unchallenged, and barring Philip I (r. 1060-1108) and Louis VII, all Capetian kings since Robert the Pious had been buried within

Saint-Denis’ confines, with the latter being reinterred within the basilica in 1267. The omission of Louis VII was due to his decision to be buried at Barbeau Abbey, a religious house he had founded, while Philip I’s decision was portrayed by contemporary writers as a result of his impious life and unworthiness, particularly in comparison to his son Louis VI. Suger, for example, writes that “some people said they had heard him explain his decision to be separated from the burial place of the kings . . . who are buried as if by natural right in the church of the blessed Dionysius. He felt that he had been less benevolent than his predecessors toward that church”. Suger’s argument clearly reflected a broader contemporary perspective on the growing importance of being seen as a friend to the Church more widely, and Saint-Denis specifically, as inseparable from the position of a sacral Capetian monarch. Suger’s position suggests that kingly burial at Saint-Denis, while customary, was not formally a right allotted to the Capetians, and yet contemporaries saw no serious contradiction in burying Philip with great pomp in the church of the patron saint of France, indicating that Philip was indeed “benevolent . . . toward that church”, and not so removed from the canon of sacral Capetian kings as his namesake. Moreover, as discussed in earlier sections, the masses celebrated to honor the anniversary of Philip’s death were accompanied by the highest degree of ceremony and reverence, with similar observances being held for other Capetian monarchs renowned for both their piety and strong relationship with Saint-Denis, as “in matters of ceremony, these
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246 This can also be seen in Fulcher of Chartres’ dismissive attitude towards Philip I in his chronicle of the First Crusade, where he describes the French monarch as contributing to the climate of sin and irreverence that characterized the late eleventh century. Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095-1127*, trans. Frances Rita Ryan (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1969), 61; Suger, *The Deeds of Louis*, 10-11

anniversaries were comparable to the annuale of Christmas at the highest level . . . . What is more, their introduction into the calendar and the liturgy . . . coincided precisely with the inception of the chronicle tradition at Saint-Denis”.

Significantly, Robertson notes that the masses celebrated for the death anniversary of Philip actually displaced the commemorative mass for feast of Phocas on July 14, and similarly notes that the commemoration of Alphonse of Poitou (c.1220-71), a brother of Louis IX, replaced the feast of Saint Rufus on August 27. This integration of commemorative masses for secular rulers into the liturgical calendar formally sanctified the Capetian monarchy and its connection with the monastery of Saint-Denis. Moreover, its coincidence with the reign of Philip II strongly indicates the scale of his personal influence upon the emergence of Saint-Denis as the preeminent ecclesiastical partner in the construction of sacral Capetian kingship, which “emphasized the traditions and legitimacy of the central political power” as the fundamental essence, to some extent, of the unified cultural community of medieval France.

An analysis of the Louis IX’s physical rearrangement of the royal necropolis in 1267 itself cannot be overlooked, as the actual structure of the mausoleum was highly significant. Guillaume de Nangis, a contemporary writer to Louis IX, provides a description that “les rois et les reines qui descendaient de la lignée de Charlemagne . . . furent placés avec leurs images taillées du côté droit du monastère, et ceux qui descendaient de la lignée du roi Hugues Capet furent placés à gauche”, leaving in no doubt Louis’ intention to flaunt the unbroken line of Frankish kings, united under the protection of Saint Denis, and his genealogical descent from
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Charlemagne. Guillaume omits the detail that Louis placed the tombs of both Philip II and Louis VIII in the center, where they functioned as a bridge between the two dynasties in confluence with the *reditus regni ad stirpem* which had become popularized in thirteenth century French literature. The continuous and effective association of the monarchy with Saint-Denis during Philip’s reign paved the way for the expansion of royal sacral ideology under Louis IX, many of whose most prominent actions mimicked those of his grandfather. In a very literal sense, Philip and his reign were perceived by contemporaries as the bridge between an older generation of sacral kings and a new one embodied by Louis IX, one grounded in both spiritual and temporal sovereignty. Louis was praised by contemporaries both for his religious piety and his territorial conquests, and was routinely compared to Philip in regards to his qualifications as a ruler, particularly in regards to his contribution to the construction of judicial and administrative bureaucracies. In a similar fashion, the monastery of Saint-Denis – through its sanctification of the Capetian kings, its preservation of the royal regalia, and the consecration of all monarchical activities including coronation and war – represented a physical location of temporal and religious sovereignty. Lewis notes that the rearrangement of the tombs in Saint-Denis played a crucial role in the development of an ideology of sacral Capetian kingship, noting that “the Capetian dynasty, now incorporated into the single kingly lineage which unified the national history, had assumed the form from which it could be glorified as the symbol of France”; it is important to recognize, however, that such a thorough connection was made possible by the substantial advance in the closeness of Saint-Denis and the Capetian monarchy that occurred

250 Guillaume de Nangis, *Chroniques capétiennes*, 210-11; Urbanski, *Writing History for the King*, 29; Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, 212; Pernoud, *Blanche of Castile*, 70
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during Philip’s reign. Moreover, when viewed within the broader context of Philip’s drive to develop the city of Paris into the cultural and political capital of the Capetian royal domain, the elevation of Saint-Denis to such a position of official monarchical importance arguably formed a sacred trinity of space in conjunction with the city of Paris, and the cathedral at Reims that spoke to the significance of place in constructing medieval sovereignty and Philip’s recognition of its contribution to the ideology of sacral Capetian rule.

Philip’s second coronation at Saint-Denis, and his continued cultivation of the abbey and its relationship with the Capetian monarchy, points to an attempt at the sacralization of Philip’s temporal and political conquests, by associating his defeat of powerful nobles such as the Count of Flanders and the Duke of Normandy with the blessings of Saint Denis as the patron saint of both the monarchy and France more generally. This pattern of behavior reflected an earlier commitment by Suger to the image of the king as the “tamer of the nobility”, whose interest and sacred duty lay in the preservation of the kingdom – and the Church – over the rights of the aristocracy; Philip’s use of religious imagery and symbolism in his attentions to Saint-Denis existed within a theoretical tradition that highlights the interconnectivity of medieval state-building and theories of sacral governance. Concurrent to his pursuit of legal and military efforts against his vassals, Philip’s campaign to extend the power of the Capetian monarchy encompassed a symbolic and ritualistic element that drew upon a notion of divine Capetian rule to further justify his political and administrative reforms. Robert Stein, in *Reality Fictions*, argues that one of the principal conflicts that emerged from the “crisis of the twelfth century”
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was over the nature of kingly authority – whether the king was *primus inter pares*, or “first among equals”, or a singularity unto himself and beholden to no other temporal authority, as articulated in Innocent III’s letter *Per Venerabilem*. 254 Philip’s efforts to associate the monarchy with Saint Denis and the notion of divine sanction clearly indicates an attempt to portray the monarch as wielding both religious and temporal authority, and his patronage of Saint-Denis as a center of production for historical literature sought to appropriate the medium of historical writing to legitimize the expansion of monarchical power at the expense of the nobility. This argument can be extended to encompass the vision of Louis VII as recounted by Gerald of Wales, which clearly presented Philip as a lord above other lords, where the figure of the king is distinguished from the general aristocracy by virtue of his superior blood and relationship with God. 255 The recourse to such abstract notions of sovereignty formed the backdrop to the assertion of political power through the expansion of the monarchical bureaucratic apparatus and the territorial conquests of the early thirteenth century; if the font of kingly authority in the medieval period was divine, then the ideal sacral monarch owed fealty and service to God, reflected in such secular activities as the preservation of justice and participation in the crusading movement and which in turn was emblematic of a cosmic feudal order that formed the template of a French medieval society that Philip sought to actualize during his reign. 256

The connection between religious and secular authority also emerges in contemporary accounts of the Battle of Bouvines, where as previously mentioned, writers such as Guillaume le Breton and Philippe Mousket indicate that Philip prayed to Saint Denis for victory prior to the

---

255 Gerald of Wales, *De Principis*, 227; Rigord, *Histoire de Philippe*, 121-23
battle and claimed the *oriflamme* for his campaign, the royal standard which features prominently in virtually all contemporary accounts of the battle. The former contrasts the resplendent and ostentatious banners of Otto IV with the simplicity of the *oriflamme* and the royal standard, and moreover emphasizes the strong connection between the *oriflamme* and a venerable tradition of Capetian monarchy, noting that “l’oriflamme; son droit est d’etre, dans toutes les batailles, en avant de toutes les autres bannières, et l’abbe de Saint-Denis a coutume de la remettre au roi toutes les fois qu’il prend les armes et part pour la guerre”. Guillaume’s work, moreover, describes the *oriflamme* as the *vexillum beati Dionysii* or the “banner of Saint Denis”, and states that it was also referred to as the *oriflamme* of Carolingian vintage in a more popular sense, clearly indicating the confluence of Carolingian mythos with the notion of Saint Denis as the protector of the French monarchy. The conflation of the *oriflamme* – a crimson banner sometimes associated with Charlemagne, which is described as such in the vernacular *Chanson de Roland* – and the *vexillum*, the banner of the Vexin which was the fief of the church of Saint-Denis but was held by the Capetian monarchy by the time of Bouvines, enabled Philip to claim both spiritual and temporal ascendancy over medieval France, and contributed decisively to Philip’s construction of a cohesive ideology of sacral monarchy which legitimized Capetian territorial expansion and the assumption of feudal dominance by Philip himself.\(^{258}\)

The deliberate literary contrast of Otto’s gold-encrusted standards with the plain symbolism of the *oriflamme* and the lilies of the royal standard are likewise evoked by Gerald of
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\(^{258}\) The *vexillum* was held by the Capetian monarchy in their capacity as the Counts of the Vexin, nominally the territory of Saint-Denis and captured by Philip I in 1076, and so the monastery retained physical guardianship of the sacred flag. Spiegel, *The Chronicle Tradition*, 30-31; Robertson, *The Service-Books*, 97; Lombard-Jourdan, “*Montjoie et Saint-Denis!*” 217-220; Marcel, *La Chanson de Roland*, 95; Suger, *The Deeds of Louis*, 127-28; Bloch, *The Royal Touch*, 136; Spiegel, “The Cult of Saint Denis,” 59; Grant, *Abbot Suger*, 116-17
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Wales to highlight the superior humility and moral quality of the Capetian monarchy, and Philip II more specifically, that ultimately enabled the triumph of Bouvines and the territorial expansion of medieval France.\(^{259}\) Philippe Mousket’s verse *Historia Regum Francorum* presents a more flamboyant depiction of the *oriflamme* which, notwithstanding its embellishment, echoes Guillaume in placing the banner, and its associative protection of Saint Denis, at the heart of Philip’s victory, stating that “and when the Saint-Denis banner/In front of them was raised,/It seemed to them that Saint Denis/Over it had a dragon placed/To devour and slay them”; a similar image is described in *Les Grandes Chroniques*, written nearly a century after the battle, where the *oriflamme* is hoisted at the forefront of the French host, ahead of even the royal standard.\(^{260}\)

The presence of lilies as depicted on the royal banner by Primat as “l’enseigne roial au cham d’azur et aus flors de lis d’or”, carries a further association of religious symbolism and authority, in that the lily was considered to be the symbol of Mary and thus held great sartorial and symbolic significance in its reflection of the ideal of kingship emulated by the Capetians.\(^{261}\) Its emergence as one of the principal heraldic symbols of the French monarchy aimed to present the morality of the Capetian monarchy and its close relationship with the divine, reflecting to some extent an attempt to demonstrate a parallel relationship between “their temporal role and the spiritual duties of the beatific mother”.\(^{262}\) The virtues thought to be embodied in the lily – gentleness, timidity, and humility – were both the antithesis of contemporary understandings of

\(^{259}\) Gerald of Wales, *De Principis*, 319-21; Guillaume le Breton, *La Philippide*, 270; Baldwin and Simons, “The Consequences of Bouvines,” 247
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medieval monarchy as rooted in chivalric valor, and the specific values praised by writers such as Gerald of Wales as a sign of the holiness of the Capetian kings.

Furthermore, the understanding of the lily as symbolic of Mary contributed another layer to the sacerdotal foundations of Capetian monarchical sovereignty.\textsuperscript{263} While Le Goff and other historians emphasize the use of the \textit{fleur-de-lys} by Louis IX to indicate the three strata of medieval society and their union under the Capetians, both Jim Bradbury and Marc Bloch note that Philip was the first Capetian monarch who made a particular point of emblazoning the \textit{fleur-de-lys} on the royal livery of his knights and likewise had a new royal banner made which prominently featured the golden \textit{fleur-de-lys}, described by Guillaume le Breton at Bouvines as “ubi videbant signum regale, vexillum videlicet floribus lilii distinctum”, decisions that demonstrated Philip’s awareness and enhancement of a tradition of sacral symbolism.\textsuperscript{264}

Furthermore, the \textit{fleur-de-lys}, as the symbol of the Virgin Mary, reflected precisely those virtues which writers such as William of Puylaurens and others praised as emblematic of the Capetians’ sacral rule and their claim to divine favor, with William noting that “the King of Heaven protected the kingdom of France from on high” in the aftermath of Louis VIII’s untimely death in 1226 and the elevation of Blanche of Castile to the regency for her young son.\textsuperscript{265} The \textit{fleur-de-lys}...

\textsuperscript{263} Gerald of Wales, \textit{De Principis}, 321; Bertran, \textit{The Poems of Bertran}, 426-27; Lombard-Jourdan, \textit{Fleur-de-lis}, 13; Pernoud, \textit{Blanche of Castile}, 90-91
\textsuperscript{264} Guillaume le Breton, “Gesta Philippi,” 281; Bradbury, \textit{Philip Augustus}, 244
lys, like the oriflamme, had become by 1248 one of the most distinctive of French monarchical symbols, a process aided by its association with the great triumphs of Philip’s reign, cementing the association of Marian and Dionysian protection with the Capetian monarchy. The oriflamme’s literal fusion of secular and religious symbolism within a cultural context of Carolingian mythos and Capetian rule contributed to the evolution of the figure of the monarch from a temporal to divine ruler, who presided over a community united in history, faith, and linguistic and ethnic culture.266 This dualistic interpretation of monarchical prerogative was enhanced by the wider crusading movement, as it represented a wilful and obvious example of secular war for religious purpose and vice versa, and the sanctification of warfare even when not directly against Muslims or occurring in the Levant, as would be evidenced by the Albigensian Crusade.267

It is important, furthermore, to recognize that the oriflamme, by virtue of its association with the Chanson de Roland, also carried a crusading connotation – in the Chanson, the oriflamme is carried before Charlemagne’s armies as they march to war with the Muslim emirs of Spain, and the oriflamme figured prominently in the departure ceremonies of the Capetian kings as they departed for crusade, as witnessed during the reigns of both Louis VII and Philip himself.268 In his account of the Second Crusade, Odo of Deuil states that Louis VII “requested from St. Denis the oriflamme and the permission to depart (a ceremony which was always the custom of our victorious kings) . . . . Then he prostrated himself most humbly on the ground; he

266 Kantorowicz, The King’s Two Bodies, 193-212; Gaposchkin, The Making of Saint Louis, 102-105; Lombard-Jourdan, Fleur-de-lis, 160-61; Bloch, The Royal Touch, 133-36
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venerated his patron saint”, a passage which emphasizes both the role of Saint Denis as the protector of king and kingdom, but also the peculiar arrangement whereby the Capetians theoretically ruled France as feudal vassals of the saint. While such a demonstration of pious humility was characteristic of Louis VII, Odo’s description of the ceremony is strikingly similar to Rigord’s account of Philip’s departure for the Third Crusade in 1190, where he notes “le roi Philippe s’en vint à l’église du très saint martyr Denis . . . En effet de toute antiquité il était d’usage chez les rois des Francs, chaque fois qu’ils prenaient les armes contre l’ennemi, de prendre l’oriflamme . . . Aussi le très chrétien roi, prosterné humblement en prière sur le pavement de marbre, devant les corps des saint martyrs”. The ceremony of claiming the oriflamme for the Third Crusade was repeated upon Philip’s early return from the expedition, and in the case of the latter, Rigord notes that Philip participated personally in a penitential procession to Saint-Denis, and offered the church “une magnifique piece de soie” in thanks for his safe return and for the preservation of the kingdom during his absence. In the wake of the Second and Third Crusades, the presence of the oriflamme at Bouvines and earlier French campaigns suggests a deliberate pattern of symbolic presentation that aimed at the sacralization of all combat involving the Capetian monarchy and the arrogation of divine protection and sanction to Capetian political and territorial ambitions. The ritualistic and ceremonial episode depicted by Rigord clearly points to Philip’s engagement with an earlier tradition of sacral Capetian kingship in his association of the oriflamme with the institution of the Capetian

269 Odo of Deuil, De profectione, 16-18; Phillips, The Second Crusade, 126-27
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monarchy and the wider crusading movement, which points to the crucial role of the crusades in developing the notion of sacral Capetian kingship and Philip’s fundamental role in that process.272

Philip would undoubtedly have been aware of the Carolingian and religious associations of the oriflamme, and its presence at Bouvines, a victory won over an excommunicate emperor in defense of the papacy, contributed to the emergence of a “cult of Charlemagne” towards the end of Philip’s reign, one which emphasized the legitimate and enduring connection of the Capetians to their predecessors.273 Indeed, the visual symbolism of the oriflamme, and its assimilation of Carolingian and Dionysian imagery that contributed to the emergence of a durable edifice of sacral Capetian kingship, was reflected in the war-cry of the French at Bouvines, namely “Montjoie-Saint Denis!”, with Montjoie being the name of Charlemagne’s battle-standard in the Chanson de Roland.274 Historians have also noted that Philip’s address prior to the battle exhorting his troops to victory, as recounted by Guillaume le Breton, closely mimicked the format of the speech of Charlemagne in the Chanson de Roland prior to the final confrontation with the Muslim emirs, a comparison heightened by the presence of the oriflamme and the deployment of similar terminology in both situations, such as the reference to a united Frankish community – including both Normans and French, but also Flemings and others – as well as an appeal for divine intervention on the rightful, French side.275 Given the relative unanimity of French sources on the occurrence of Philip’s speech, it appears that the Capetian king did indeed
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speak prior to Bouvines; even if this was not the case, the deployment of such a device by chroniclers was in likely awareness of the Carolingian connotation that would have been familiar to a lay audience, and therefore represents a deliberate attempt to link the sacral kingship of Philip to a vernacular tradition of Carolingian inheritance.276 Philip’s discourse prior to Bouvines, alongside the presence of the oriflamme, represented a concerted attempt to reframe the triumph of Capetian political authority as one of divinely inspired and sacral right; indeed, that Philip’s conception of expanding the power and territory of the Capetian monarchy was inseparable from the symbolic nature of hybrid medieval sovereignty. The presence of the oriflamme at Bouvines, with its obvious connection to Saint Denis, enabled Philip and his court to portray the defeat of the Plantagenets and the achievement of Philip’s territorial ambitions within a narrative of sacral Capetian monarchy, where Philip fulfilled the idealized role of protector of the papacy and “Frankish kingship in the service of the Holy See”.277 Furthermore, it strengthened the historiographical school which emphasizes Philip’s role in the relentless expansion of a centralizing monarchy, as Philip was “presented as fighting for the common welfare, the wider society” in opposition to the self-centered and self-seeking aristocracy; it also points to the development of an inclusionary ideology of a ideal Frankish community partly in a shared Carolingian heritage and catholic faith.278

Ultimately, while Philip’s patronage of Saint-Denis fits within a longer narrative of royal support for the abbey, when viewed within the context of his disinclination to found and fund
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churches, it becomes all the more remarkable that Saint-Denis enjoyed such continued and lavish support during his reign. While Suger may have invented the term *patronus coronae* in his attempt to describe the particular relationship between Saint Denis and the French kings, it was principally due to the developments and patronage of Philip’s reign that Denis became the patron saint of the Kings of France and, consequently, how the abbey of Saint-Denis came to occupy such a prominent place as the principal supporter of the ideology of sacral Capetian kingship in the later medieval period. Philip’s relationship with Saint-Denis – including the institutional link between the monarchy and the abbey, and his own personal veneration of the saint, challenges the traditional historiographical portrayal of a king who was uninterested in the symbolic implications of Capetian power and more focused upon the realities of political power as manifested through territorial and bureaucratic control. Instead, Philip’s revival of Carolingian rituals such as the tributary donation of the four bezants, his transference of the coronation regalia from the custody of Reims to Saint-Denis, and his frequent visitation to the church all suggest a clear awareness of the importance of developing a symbolic culture of power to buttress and justify his program of political and administrative centralization. Moreover, in his patronage of Saint-Denis over other prominent ecclesiastical centers such as Reims or Fleury, Philip engaged with a prior understanding of the importance of the Dionysian cult to the medieval conception of “France”, as well as the notion of a wider Frankish community bound together under the figure of the sacral monarch, its unwavering Christian orthodoxy, and the divine protection extended by Saint Denis. Though the abbey enjoyed a close relationship with the monarchy before Philip’s reign, the early thirteenth century saw an institutionalization of the association of the Capetian monarchy and Saint-Denis through a pattern of behavior and action
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that contributed to the contemporary understanding that “Philip Augustus is considered . . . second only to Dagobert as a patron of Saint-Denis”.

Robertson notes that the special liturgical *fons bonitatis* was reserved for the “most solemn festivals” which included four royal death anniversaries – Dagobert, Charles the Bald, Philip II, and Louis IX. Bruzelius, *The 13th-Century Church*, 11; Robertson, *The Service-Books*, 47-50, 165; Spiegel, *The Chronicle Tradition*, 56-59; Maier, “Crisis, Liturgy, and Crusade,” 653-54; Lombard-Jourdan, “*Montjoie et Saint-Denis!*”, 218-21
Chapter 4: The Carolingian Connection – The Court of Philip II and The “Cult of Charlemagne”

By the beginning of the thirteenth century, Charlemagne came to occupy a particular point of focus for medieval Christian history and mythology, as well as political theories of kingly sovereignty, and often emerged as the idealization of Christian monarchy in both its secular and spiritual duties. The emergence of written texts such as the anonymously composed Chanson de Roland, the Johannes translation of the Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle, and the construction of the crusading window at Saint-Denis within close temporal proximity, moreover, served to emphasize Charlemagne’s preeminence as a just monarch, enthusiastic crusader and the symbol of the unique destiny of the Franks, all closely linked concepts in medieval political thought. As Matthew Gabriele notes, “the Charlemagne legend was also a legend of the Franks, with the man standing as an exemplar for a larger truth . . . the Franks . . . leading and defending the populus christianus by the strength of their arms”.\(^\text{281}\) In this context, Philip’s efforts to claim Charlemagne as a specifically monarchical figure as opposed to the imperial Charlemagne of the Holy Roman Empire and the chivalric warrior of the chansons de geste played a major role in providing a common ideological foundation for the Capetian monarchy as rulers of a united, sacral community of Frankish origins, and the legitimation of the sweeping changes which emerged during his reign.\(^\text{282}\) The extent of the importance of Charlemagne to the court of Philip

\(^{281}\) Gabriele, An Empire of Memory, 129; Turner and Heiser, The Reign of Richard, 177

\(^{282}\) The Johannes’ translation of the Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle, made during Philip’s reign, places “King of France” as Charlemagne’s first title, followed by “Emperor of the Romans”, an indication of the attempt to appropriate the Carolingian king for Capetian propagandist purposes. This phenomenon is also present in Philip Mousket’s Historia Regum Francorum. Lombard-Jourdan, “Montjoie et Saint-Denis!”, 219; Brown and Cothren, “The Twelfth-Century Crusading Window,” 20-21; Loud, The Crusade of Frederick, 135; Walpole, The Old French Johannes, 131; Philip Mousket, “Historia Regum Francorum,” 727
II, however, has divided the historiographical field, particularly in regards to Philip’s own interest and propagation of a supposed Carolingian revival. More recent scholarship downplays its significance in favor of a re-examination of the revival of Alexandrian imagery and the Trojan origins of the Franks, and further suggests that the scattered nods to Charlemagne were the work of overly admiring adherents of Philip such as Guillaume le Breton and not indicative of a widespread effort to incorporate the Carolingian king into an ideology of Capetian kingship.  

Older scholarship, however, argued that Philip was central to a revival of interest in Carolingian mythos and in harnessing it to the development of an ideological edifice of Capetian rule, particularly in regards to the justification of his expansion of the political power and territory of the royal domain.

This paper argues that the concentrated emergence of Carolingian references in both contemporary vernacular and ecclesiastical works during Philip’s reign, alongside his investment in strengthening the relationship of the Capetian monarchy with the abbey of Saint-Denis, reflected a wider attempt to incorporate Charlemagne and the Carolingian inheritance into a monarchical ideology of sacral Capetian kingship that justified and legitimated not simply the claim of the Capetians to the title “King of the Franks”, but rather the extraordinary territorial expansion that occurred during Philip’s reign. Moreover, the specific cultivation of a Carolingian association – with the implication of a broader communal identity of ethnic and territorial “Frankishness” – accelerated significantly during Philip’s lifetime, and was deliberately pursued.

---

to cement the relationship between the Capetian monarchy and the proto-national sentiment of France, and to engage in the appropriation of a pre-existing symbolic economy to bolster the increased prestige and political power of the Capetian dynasty.

One of the most prominent historiographical divides in the scholarship surrounding Philip’s relationship with Charlemagne emerges in the study of the *reditus regni ad stirpem Karoli Magni*, a common trope in thirteenth-century Dionysian literature that originated in 1196 in the writings of Andrew of Marchiennes. It quickly, however, became incorporated into the wider French historical canon – the *reditus* is presented as fact in both Giles of Paris’ *Karolinus*, and Primat’s *Les Grandes Chroniques* of Saint-Denis, and can be seen in various iterations in other histories of the Capetians. The *reditus regni*, in its full articulation, literally meant a return to the bloodline of the Carolingians, heralded primarily through the dual phenomena of Louis VII’s marriage to Adela of Champagne and Philip II’s marriage to Isabel of Hainaut. These two unions ultimately produced Louis VIII, a monarch whose parental lineage on both sides boasted descent from Charlemagne and thus restored the blood of the Carolingians to the Capetian-held throne. By definition, the *reditus regni* reflected a belief in the idea of “holy blood” that, notwithstanding its Christological associations, inherently carried an understanding of medieval kingship as sacral, as it relied upon a return to the bloodline that was sanctified through the act of Clovis’ coronation by Remigius and through the saintly nature of Charlemagne as the ideal spiritual and secular ruler. The continuity assured by the *reditus regni*, and the sacral
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associations of the bloodline contributed to the portrayal of Philip’s birth as miraculous, doubly so due to the Carolingian ancestry of his mother, while Beaune notes that the period in which the *reditus regni* gained favor was also one in which “saw the development of a cult of the blood of Christ throughout the Latin Christian world”.

The primary emphasis within the *reditus regni* lay upon the unbroken continuity of the bloodline and the legitimacy it conferred through its connection with the near-mythical Merovingian and Carolingian kings, which paralleled the unbroken faith of the Frankish kings and their subjects. Such a phenomenon was perhaps best exemplified in the detailed, if somewhat fanciful, genealogy that Rigord included in his *Vie de Philippe Auguste* which traced Philip’s descent through both the Merovingians and Carolingians, as far back as Priam and the Trojans. Some historians, including Andrew Lewis and Robert Fawtier, argue that the purpose of the *reditus regni* was plain – in emphasizing a return to the Carolingians, the Capetian monarchy sought to downplay the ugliness that surrounded the accession of Hugh Capet in the ninth century, an event that retained a perception of an illegal usurpation even in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Thus, the *reditus* functioned as a legitimizing device for the Capetian claim to be Kings of the Franks. The legitimizing properties of the *reditus regni* become more salient in the wake of a twelfth-century revival of interest in the Valerian prophecy, in which Saint-Valery reportedly foretold Hugh Capet that his dynasty would rule France, but only until the seventh generation – renewed interest in the prophecy during the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries was due, historians suggest, to the fact that

---
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Philip II was the seventh monarch of the Capetian lineage. Furthermore, much fanfare was made of the two Carolingian marriages by contemporary French writers, with Guillaume le Breton quick to point to both Adela and Isabel’s descent from Charlemagne which imbued both Philip and his son Louis with the sacred blood of the Carolingian kings, suggesting a genuine attempt on the part of court writers to emphasize the legitimizing aspect of the *reditus regni*. One of the principal historiographical arguments against allocating greater significance to the Carolingian association was that the Capetians’ ties to Charlemagne were tenuous at best, and were definitively weaker than those of the Counts of Flanders – as such, Anne Latowsky notes that “imperial eschatology and Trojan genealogy . . . offered two incommensurate visions of dynastic continuity, and the French monarchy espoused the latter”. As such, the *reditus* conveniently circumvented the negative interpretation of the prophecy, and challenged the dynastic ties of other French noble houses to Charlemagne, as through Philip’s marriage to Isabel of Hainaut the Carolingian bloodline was restored to the throne upon the accession of their son Louis. The swift transferal of the *reditus* to the works of prominent and pro-Capetian writers indicated a recognition on the part of Philip’s court to challenge the prophecy and its implications of illegitimacy through recourse to a blood tie to the legendary Charlemagne and the Carolingians.
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292 Giselbert of Mons’ chronicle provides some evidence to support this, as he recounts an incident where the Count of Flanders chooses to join the contingent of the Holy Roman Emperor rather than that of Philip II at a peace conference, due to the former state’s closer relationship and association with Charlemagne and the Carolingians. Latowsky, *Emperor of the World*, 235, DeLogu, *Theorizing the Ideal Sovereign*, 78; Spiegel, “The Reditus Regni,” 171; Flori, *Philippe Auguste*, 144-45; Giselbert of Mons, *Chronicle of Hainaut*, 110
More recent scholarship, most notably by Gabrielle Spiegel, has raised the possibility of an alternative purpose to the *reditus regni* – rather than a legitimation of the Capetian dynasty and its right to rule as Kings of the Franks, it was to defend the territorial conquests effected by Philip II which imposed Capetian rule upon areas well outside their traditional realm, but within the broader sphere of pre-existing Carolingian sovereignty. The argument that the *reditus regni* was principally used to justify the Capetian right to the throne is somewhat problematic, as it is at odds with the fact that Philip was the first Capetian monarch who felt confident enough in his position that he dispensed with the practice of associative kingship. This was a policy historians argue had been established to secure the Capetian claim to the throne in the immediate aftermath of their succession of the Carolingians, though even Louis VII resisted it until the last year of his life, which demonstrated the quantitative advance in Capetian political power and legitimacy during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. This refusal to divulge any aspect of monarchical authority, a trend which persisted throughout Philip’s life in his relationship with Louis, arguably strengthened the image of the Capetian monarch as a sacral figure whose authority was both superior to his contemporaries and inseparable from the individual. In both cases, however, it seems clear in refusing to formally designate their sons as *rex designatus*, Louis VII and Philip II believed their sons would succeed them by virtue of their blood, a conviction that arguably confirmed a widespread prior understanding of the sacral legitimacy that had already been incorporated into a wider canon of Capetian ideology, notwithstanding the
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late twelfth-century emergence of the *reditus regni*, and the security of the Capetian dynasty in its claims to France.\textsuperscript{296}

Consequently, when seen in another light the *reditus regni* formed a crucial component of a strategy of ideological vindication that was pursued by Philip to strengthen an understanding of Capetian kingship as sanctified and rooted in Carolingian tradition. This paper argues that the incorporation of the *reditus regni* into the French historical canon during Philip’s reign both enabled the consolidation of a cohesive medieval French polity, a process which subsequently led to the “century of Saint Louis”, and was facilitated by the remarkable expansion in the political power of the Capetian monarchy that emerged from the administrative reforms undertaken by Philip’s government. The primary purpose of the *reditus* was “not to legitimize the already-powerful Capetian dynasty, but to authorize Philippe Auguste’s political and military activities by overtly and elaborately associating them with the emperor Charlemagne”, a single facet of a wider revival of Carolingian symbolism and imagery that Philip deliberately employed to justify his program of political and governmental reform.\textsuperscript{297} The recourse to Charlemagne and the Carolingians also enabled Philip to redefine the sovereign powers of the Capetian monarchy, and actualize a number of previously theoretical feudal obligations in regards to taxation, maintenance of justice, and submission of his vassals. Spiegel notes that the *reditus* “made possible the equiparation of France and the empire which enabled Capetian kings to insist on their independent, and ultimately sovereign, status . . . . It suggested a kind of authority . . . which . . . could be elaborated to validate new kinds of royal power, not the least of which was
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the right to taxation”. Philip’s recourse to the principles of sacral authority enabled the actualization of pre-existing, albeit theoretical, financial and feudal obligations. The successful collection of taxes in the early decades of the thirteenth century, after a more persistent emergence of a symbolic Carolingian economy and following a deepening of ties between the monarchy and Saint-Denis, contrasts sharply with Philip’s failure to impose a French equivalent of the Saladin tithe in the years preceding the Third Crusade. The use of the *reditus regni*, and Carolingian symbolism more widely, against the wider backdrop of the Crusades was a crucial component in the construction of a comprehensive philosophy of Capetian kingship, demonstrating Philip’s contribution to both the political and theoretical foundations of Capetian authority. Moreover, the pressures of the crusading movement played a major role in the strengthening of medieval European monarchies – it was the need to raise, fund, and transport armies of holy warriors that provided the initial impetus for Philip’s ability to institute taxes and troop levies, a process which was closely linked to the growing association of the Capetian and Carolingian dynasties in the early thirteenth centuries.

Philip himself is referred to as *Karolus* or *Karolide* in a number of instances by both contemporary writers and later sources, with *Les Grandes Chroniques* in particular reflecting the close association of the Carolingian and Capetian monarchs. Guillaume le Breton, for example, describes Philip as *Karolide* after the Battle of Bouvines, a term with clear Carolingian
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connotations, and at other points of his narrative calls Philip “le descendant de Charles”, and elaborates upon the similar conduct of both leaders in battle.\(^{300}\) His contemporary, Giles of Paris, wrote the *Karolinus*, a work that resembled the later genre of the *miroir des princes* but was ostensibly a biography of Charlemagne, in the early twelfth century and in it describes both Philip II and his son Louis as descendants of Charlemagne in a genealogical and metaphorical sense.\(^{301}\) While Rigord does not explicitly use Carolingian epithets, he includes an entire chapter on the descent of Philip and the Capetians from Charlemagne and their shared inheritance as sacral Christian monarchs, and to portray Philip within a continuum of French patronage of the church; Rigord’s usage of the title *Augustus*, moreover, elicited comparisons to the imperial title of Charlemagne.\(^{302}\) Despite Philip’s avowed disdain for the patronage of historical writing, both Guillaume le Breton and Giles of Paris were members of Philip’s royal retinue, and it is unlikely that their work did not reflect, to some extent, a prevailing attitude that sought to harness the mystique and newfound interest in the Carolingian mythos to the ideology of sacral Capetian kingship within the court at the time. These writers built upon an earlier tradition of drawing metaphorical comparisons between the Carolingians and Capetians – the use of the title *rex Francorum*, for example, persisted through both dynasties – though it was only during the reign of Philip that a specifically genealogical link was propagated, a project that revolved around the idea of the *reditus regni* and the merger of the two dynasties.\(^{303}\)

\(^{300}\) Guillaume le Breton, *La Philippide*, 75-76; Primat, *Les Grandes Chroniques*, 139-42
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This Carolingian revival, however, extended beyond the immediate environs of Philip’s court – Gerald of Wales, for example, frequently compared Philip to Charlemagne, and claimed that Philip’s conquests were unlike any since the time of Charlemagne, and that he had restored the French kingdom to its glorious Carolingian past. He furthermore recounts an anecdote where Philip himself described Charlemagne as his kingly exemplar at a conference between Philip and Henry II in 1189. Philip, supposedly, was deep in thought and, when questioned about the subject of his intense meditation, reportedly inquired whether God would allow his reign to approach the triumphs of Charlemagne and whether he personally could be as virtuous and effective a ruler as his Carolingian ancestor – regardless of the veracity of this tale, it suggests that Philip’s personal commitment to the association of the Carolingians with the Capetian monarchy was recognized even by authors outside of the royal court. Likewise, Bertran de Born – a frequent critic of Philip’s character and the growth of monarchical power during his reign – also refers to Philip’s descent from Charlemagne as a matter of course, in one instance observing that “if King Philip burned a boat of Richard’s . . . Then I’m sure he would be imitating Charlemagne, who was among the best of his kinsmen”. It is within this context of a Carolingian renaissance that Innocent III’s letter *Per Venerabilem* takes on a deeper meaning – in proclaiming Philip as independent of the Holy Roman Empire in his capacity as King of the French, Innocent subscribed to the prioritization of the monarchical Charlemagne, as King of the Franks, over the imperial Charlemagne, and enabled the appropriation of the Charlemagne myth for the ideological foundations of Capetian kingship. Beyond the issuance of *Per Venerabilem*,
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however, Innocent explicitly acknowledged Philip’s descent from Charlemagne in his letter “Novit Ille” from 1204 addressed to the archbishops and bishops of France, noting that “et Carolus . . . de cujus genere Rex ipse noscitur descendisse”. The specific context of 1204, in the wake of Philip’s conquest of Normandy, is particularly relevant as it reinforces the argument that the emphasis upon the Carolingian relationship in Philip’s reign was in large part motivated by an attempt to legitimize the territorial expansion of the kingdom of France and the concurrent growth of Capetian dynastic power. In regards to Innocent’s proclamation, and the use of such Carolingian references in the vernacular poetry of Bertran de Born, one can find evidence as to the wider effect and reception of royal attempts to assert a stronger connection between a mythic Carolingian heritage and an agenda of political legitimation of Capetian political and territorial conquest. Philip’s principal goal in reviving a symbolic Carolingian economy was to harness its legitimizing potential to the construction of “an ever-widening zone of royal protection . . . to extend the enterprise . . . to the vastly larger realm inherited from the Carolingians”. Ultimately, while the realization of administrative and judicial reforms undertaken in the late twelfth century was a large part of this project, this paper argues that Philip also pursued this aim through the development of an ideology of sacral Capetian monarchy rooted in Carolingian tradition, the protection of Saint-Denis, and the wider crusading movement.

One of the earliest, and most controversial among modern historians, incidents in regards to the extent of Philip’s personal commitment to the propagation of a Carolingian-Capetian association was the naming of one of his bastard sons Petrus Karlotus or Pierre Charlot (c. 1208-50), born to an anonymous “woman of Arras” according to contemporary chroniclers, who avoided recording the details of his birth likely due to their reluctance to acknowledge Philip’s penchant for extramarital affairs. Several historians argue that the selection of Karlotus was a deliberate evocation of the name Charles, which was relatively atypical of the Capetian naming tradition, and alongside the name Louis indicated a willful revitalization of the use of names that were strongly associated with Charlemagne and his dynasty. The importance of naming conventions in the medieval period cannot be overstated, as noted by Dunbabin, who argues that “the name had come to be associated with the office held by the eldest males in the family . . . . Names therefore articulated, but also reinforced, family identity”. Others, however, note that Charlot was the third bastard born to Philip, and unlike Philip Hurepel (c. 1200-34) or Marie (c. 1198-1238), was bundled into a clerical life and remained largely absent from his father’s political program of monarchical expansion, suggesting that the significance of Pierre Charlot’s name was grossly overstated by historians. In revisiting the life of Pierre Charlot and the significance of his name to Philip’s contribution to the evolution of an ideology of sacral Capetian monarchy, it is important to note that, following his birth, the name Charles was incorporated into the mainstream naming conventions of the Capetian monarchy, as Louis VIII’s seventh child was Charles of Anjou (c. 1227-85), and that Charlot was the first instance of a

tradition which would persist for several centuries. In some respects, Charlot’s status as a third son freed Philip II to select a name closer to him personally, rather than ones which were locked into a Capetian tradition such as “Philip” or “Louis”, the latter of which was notably identified with both the Carolingians and Merovingians.312

Furthermore, Charlot was not wholly removed from the political landscape, as he was appointed to the bishopric of Noyon, an important religious posting in medieval France, and was legitimized by Pope Honorius at the request of Philip in 1217, much like Philip’s earlier children by Agnes de Méran, which suggested an attempt to incorporate Pierre Charlot and his name into the mainstream ideology of the Capetian monarchy.313 Finally, Pierre Charlot was tutored by Guillaume le Breton, who in fact dedicated the initial edition of La Philippide to Charlot, and only later to Louis VIII, with Guillaume himself highlighting the importance of Charlot’s name, noting that “l’honneur de ton nom je l’ai appelé la Carlotide . . . et que la renommée des Charles survive même a ceux qui en ont porté le nom”.314 Given Guillaume’s relatively high standing in the court of Philip II – he was Philip’s personal chaplain and was present at the Battle of Bouvines in such capacity – his recognition of the importance of Philip’s decision to re-introduce the names Charles arguably points to a personal effort on the part of the Capetian monarch to

312 An alternative spelling and pronunciation of “Clovis” saw it written as “Louis”. Interestingly, Louis VIII’s other children bore witness to a wider emphasis upon a Carolingian ancestry – beyond Louis and Charles, there was also Philip Dagobert (c.1222-32). Schneidmuller, “Constructing identities,” 39; Dunbabin, “What’s in a name?” 950-51; Le Goff, Saint Louis, 42-43; Gabriele, An Empire of Memory, 137-38; Lewis, Royal Succession, 113; Spiegel, “The Reditus Regni,” 172
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appropriate the Carolingian association for the strengthening of an ideology of Capetian kingship. Philip’s personal interest in the revival and usage of Carolingian history for the purpose of constructing an enculturative mythos of Capetian monarchy can also be seen in his resurrection of a number of phenomena from the Carolingian period, including the judicial institution of the “Twelve Peers”, the presentation of the royal sword as the sword of Charlemagne during his second coronation, and the coronation Ordo of 1200, a document that detailed the specific rites and verbal rituals that the new king was to undertake upon his ascension as king. The importance of the Ordo of 1200, as noted by Gaposchkin, was that it copied almost verbatim a ninth century coronation ordinance from the Carolingian period that reinforced the hybrid nature of Capetian authority, as it utilized the metaphor of Samuel anointing David to illustrate the significance of the rite of unction as delineating the King of the French as wielding sacred authority alongside temporal power, a ceremony that continued the tradition of the sacred ampoule of holy oil as depicted in Gregory of Tours’ account of Clovis’ coronation and baptism. While Louis VIII was the first king to be crowned in accordance with the Ordo, it was first revived at the beginning of the thirteenth century, and likely by Philip in the aim of engaging with the broader revival of Carolingian associative traditions to strengthen the ideological underpinnings of Capetian rule.

However, despite Le Goff’s assertion that Capetian court and dynastic interest in the Carolingians became a “fervor” under Philip II, the link has been challenged by recent historians as over-exaggerated and inconclusive. Notwithstanding the earlier discussion of the

significance – or lack thereof – in the name Pierre Charlot, historians Baldwin and Latowsky point to the development of the myth of the Trojan origin of the Franks as more culturally relevant in Philip’s reign. As this paper has discussed, the Trojan myth was employed by contemporaries in regards to Paris, as well as the Capetian dynasty itself. Likewise, there is little evidence of a strong tradition of Carolingian allusion in earlier Capetian historical writing – perhaps to avoid uncomfortable memories of the muddy circumstances of Capetian succession, few Capetian writers including Suger emphasize wholeheartedly a close association between the Capetians and Carolingians. While Philip is now frequently referred to as Philip Augustus in the historiographical field, the sobriquet Magnanime was also frequently deployed by contemporary authors, a term which both Baldwin and Latowsky argue drew a powerful connection with Alexander the Great, rather than a Carolingian or Roman context. Latowsky in particular suggests that contemporaneous to Philip’s reign, it was the title Magnanime rather than Auguste which would have been most common. Similarly, the title of Guillaume’s La Philippide evoked the Alexandreis of Walter of Chatillon, a ten-book work of epic poetry written at the end of the twelfth century and dedicated to Philip’s uncle, William of the White Hands. Given its date of composition of roughly 1178-82, recent historians have argued that the coronation of Alexander depicted in the epic was designed to reflect the recent coronation of Philip II in 1179, and David Townsend states that “it created a vogue in the ensuing years for classicizing epics, notably the Ylias of Joseph of Exeter and the Philippidos of Guillaume le Breton”. Furthermore, Philip himself bore a name with obvious Alexandrian connotations,
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namely that of Philip of Macedon, Alexander the Great’s father, a point that lends further support
to the assertion that the Alexandreis was very much written with the young Philip in mind. In the
Alexandreis, Walter poses a rhetorical question to his audience, inquiring whether a Frankish
king as virtuous as Alexander would ever emerge; in the event he does, Walter is confident that
he would lead the Franks to spread the blessings of Christendom throughout the world. Such an
expression of pious optimism could partly be attributed to the supposedly miraculous birth of
Philip Dieudonné and the divine events associated with his early life. Walter’s account,
moreover, reinforces the belief in the uniquely sanctified destiny of the Frankish people, united
as an ethnic and religious community, a theme that this paper argues would be taken up by later
writers during Philip’s reign to both justify Philip’s territorial expansion of the French royal
domain and to legitimate an ideology of sacral Capetian monarchy.

However, while this paper does not deny the importance of the Trojan origin story to the
development of a Capetian ideology of sacral kingship, it argues that the presence of texts on
both the Trojan origin and Carolingian ancestry of the Capetians and Franks more generally
suggests that Philip and his court adopted a multifaceted approach to the legitimation of Capetian
monarchical supremacy. Though Dunbabin argues that “in ordinary parlance Augustus meant
“emperor” . . . . it seems that in the popular mind Augustus followed Philip as naturally as “the
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pious” was coupled with Louis”, it is somewhat irrelevant as to which legend Philip viewed as more accurate or more favorable. The proliferation of vernacular mythhistories and foundational legends during the period indicates that his reign was a formative time for the development of an ideology of sacral Capetian kingship and its roots in the past; in both cases, moreover, Philip’s personal contribution cannot be disputed. While this paper has only discussed the emergence of a concerted revival of Carolingian symbolism, both it and the myth of the Franks’ Trojan origins formed a mutually reinforcing framework with Philip’s political and territorial conquests to provide the basis for an ideology of sacral Capetian kingship that legitimized his secular program of expansion. Much like Philip’s lavish patronage of Saint-Denis, the revival of Carolingian motifs during his reign in the service of the Capetian ideology of sacral kingship cannot be overlooked as merely a personal quirk of Philip himself, nor a singular event tied exclusively to the extraordinary expansion of Capetian strength during his rule, as its incorporation into the monarchical canon persisted after Philip’s reign, as evidenced by the introduction of “Charles” into Capetian naming conventions and the canonization of the *reditus regni* within Dionysian historical literature.

Moreover, a salient example of the link between the revival of a symbolic economy of Carolingian nomenclature and imagery, and the growth of monarchical political power under Philip, can be seen in the conquest of Normandy in the early thirteenth century, and its relatively peaceful absorption into the kingdom of France – made all the more remarkable in comparison to the later fighting that accompanied Louis IX’s acquisition of Toulouse later in the thirteenth century. Recent scholarship by Daniel Power, Ralph Turner, and others has sought to locate the
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impetus of the loss of Normandy within a broader historical interpretation of the collapse of Angevin rule and the rise of administrative kingship in medieval France, pointing to the advance of monarchical centralization and the professionalization of a proto-bureaucracy that enabled Philip to take fullest advantage of his financial and material resources in his conflict with the Plantagenets.\textsuperscript{324} Other historiographical schools focus on the incompetence of John I and his inability to maintain the rigorous military campaigns of his predecessor as the principal cause of the Angevin collapse.\textsuperscript{325} A consistent theme presented, however, is Philip’s willingness to maintain the institutions of Plantagenet governance in Normandy, seen in a number of charters issued following the conquest in 1204 though the majority of government officials were replaced with Capetian loyalists. Jordan argues that “this leniency with their institutions was successful in inducing the Normans to accept the conquest . . . . It is a fact that Normandy showed the least residual hostility to the royal presence of all the provinces that were conquered in the early thirteenth century”\textsuperscript{326}

While not to downplay the importance of the substantial administrative changes enacted by Philip in the conquest of Normandy, nor to overlook Philip’s political acumen in allowing the more advanced governmental system of the Plantagenets to remain in place, there existed a significant ideological and symbolic component in Philip’s strategy of control in the former Angevin lands, one that drew heavily from an idealized and shared cultural history between Normans and Franks that was rooted in descent from Charlemagne and the Carolingians. In their
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capacity as Dukes of Normandy, the Plantagenets did homage to the Capetians as their vassals, and more recent scholarship has emphasized the degree of cultural and intellectual contact between the two sides, particularly amongst the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the aristocracy.

Philip’s revival of Carolingian symbolism in the development of an ideology of Capetian authority appealed to a supranational and communal origin under Carolingian rule that posed a major challenge to the disparate territories of the Angevin Empire and made painfully apparent its lack of a coherent, unifying ideology. Another example of the fluidity of the border between Plantagenet and Capetian territory is demonstrated by the fact that the literary genre of the chansons was itself strongly developed in Normandy and Aquitaine, but quickly found popularity and reception throughout the Capetian domain, highlighting the transcultural atmosphere that enabled the rapid transfer of ideals among a broadly cohesive set of territories. This phenomenon was further evidenced through the role of Saint-Denis and other powerful churches that held land in both Normandy and France, thus serving as transnational conduits of written texts and theories on medieval sovereignty. Historians furthermore have repeatedly emphasized the similarities in the judicial and administrative apparatuses in Normandy and France that suggested a more permeable border in regards to the transmission of ideals and norms of government. The Chanson de Roland, for example, specifically presents Charlemagne as addressing Normans as “Franks”, just as he does with the French proper, and Walpole argues that its retelling in the thirteenth-century Johannes’ translation of the Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle likewise transforms the polyglot army of the Carolingian empire into “a French
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army, in which all the feudal elements, domains and classes alike have been united by the wise dispensions of a good and respected king”.

This emphasized both the shared heritage of the Normans and French as well as the idealized feudal order in which the king was supreme.

Though the project of presenting both Normans and French as composite members of a wider sacred community finds evidence in the works of writers such as Guibert of Nogent, as well as Norman chroniclers anxious to demonstrate the hoary lineage of the Plantagenets from the Carolingians, the early thirteenth century witnessed an acceleration of such an endeavor that largely coincided with the political absorption of Normandy into the Capetian royal domain. This shared identity was rooted in a connection to a mythologized historical interpretation of the Carolingian realm, and likely contributed to the expansion in the use of Carolingian symbolism and imagery during Philip’s reign, and its subsequent incorporation into a wider discourse on the sacral nature of Capetian sovereignty.

The continued depiction of Normans and French as “Franks” is further evidenced in the description of the events of the Fourth Crusade by numerous French chroniclers of Philip’s reign, where the achievements of the Fourth Crusade are incorporated into a broader canon of sacral Frankish destiny, one that was a reflection of the piety of the Capetian monarchs; the extent and strength of this association can be seen in the interchangeable use of the word peregrini or “pilgrims”, a term virtually synonymous with crusader for the term Franci in a letter written by Berenguela of Castile (c. 1180-1246) to her sister, Blanche, in 1212 following the successful
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Christian victory at the Battle of Las Navas de Tolosa. Andrew Lewis, in *Royal Succession in Capetian France*, notes that “in the absence of ethnic or territorial unity, nationalism meant allegiance to the king and crown, exaltation of the royal line was susceptible of conflation with praise of the French people”, a merger which can similarly connected with the associative connotations between the Capetian monarchy and Saint Denis that were cultivated during Philip’s reign. Moreover, such a process was noticeably absent in the conquest of Toulouse and the southern French lands effected through the catalyst of the Albigensian Crusades and finalized during the reigns of Louis VIII and Louis IX – contemporary writers perceived a clear distinction between the Albigeois and the French, while no such division was actively promoted by French writers in regards to the Normans. As Christopher Maier illustrates, French preachers such as Eudes de Chateauroux and Philip the Chancellor pointedly denounced the denizens of Toulouse as “schismatic heretics and other infidels” who stood in stark contrast to the virtuous and wholly catholic subjects of the Capetians, a category which included the recently conquered Normans. Perhaps most telling is the absence of any such crusading rhetoric in describing the conquest of Normandy – while the *oriflamme* was at Bouvines, the battle was portrayed as primarily fought against the German Otto of Brunswick in defense of the papacy. In a stark contrast, contemporary observers made no effort to hide the crusading aspect of the war in Toulouse, where the Cathar heretics were to be purged from the Christian body of the Frankish
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community, of which Normandy was a member. As such, this paper argues that the evocation of Carolingian heritage represented one facet of a deliberate policy of enculturation aimed at easing the transition from Plantagenet to Capetian rule in the Angevin territories, one that existed alongside Philip’s more pragmatic and well-documented attempts to politically integrate Normandy into the kingdom of France and which took advantage of and enhanced the cohesion of an ideology of sacral Capetian kingship.

One of the earliest instances of the conflation of Normans and French under the broader term of *Franci* emerges in Guibert’s account of the First Crusade, entitled *The Deeds of God Through the Franks*, where the entirety of the crusaders are described as belonging to a unified and divinely inspired community of Franks, claiming that “God reserved this nation for a great task” and later expounding upon the noble and exclusive ancestry of the Franks as a people who were nonetheless tied to a geographical conception of territory, stating “the name of the Frankish race, stands forth with regal majesty everywhere and . . . France, the mother of virtue and resolve in accordance with God’s will”.

Guibert wrote in the early twelfth century, after the successful conquest of Jerusalem and the establishment of Outremer, a collection of Frankish principalities ruled by the crusading nobility, and after highlighting the special connection between the Frankish realm and the papacy, Guibert emphasizes that the majority of the leaders of the First Crusade were of Frankish origin, and engages in a genealogical sleight of hand in regards to

---


336 Guibert, *The Deeds of God*, 41, 68, 80
Bohemond of Taranto (c. 1054-1111), a somewhat infamous member of the First Crusade and who was not, in fact, from northern France but Norman Sicily. Despite Bohemond’s Norman background, Guibert insisted that “his family was from Normandy, a part of France, and since he had obtained the hand of the daughter of the King of the Franks, he might be very well be considered a Frank”, a statement that clearly expresses Guibert’s conflation of Normanni and Franci within a single category.\textsuperscript{337} Interestingly, however, Guibert did not extend similar treatment to Raymond of Toulouse (c.1041-1105), another of the principal leaders of the crusade, instead noting dismissively that “Raymond, Count of Saint Gilles is placed last . . . . Because he lived at the furthest edge of France, he has offered us less information about his activities”, suggesting that the Frankish community had its limits and was not merely medieval shorthand for what is now modern France.\textsuperscript{338} Guibert’s indication that he knew little of Raymond’s history and deeds points to a lesser degree of contact and the absence of a communal framework of cultural and intellectual understanding between Toulouse and France than that between Normandy and France. This is also evidenced in William Jordan’s work on the fractious relationship of the Capetian monarchy with the Jews of medieval France, where he notes that similar treatment of Jews in the majority of northern French territories emerged from “a single north European culture” that included German, French, English, and Rhenish principalities, while distinguishing the treatment of religious minorities in Toulouse as a different analytical category entirely.\textsuperscript{339}

\textsuperscript{337} This argument was likely reinforced when Bohemond married Constance (c. 1078-1125), daughter of King Philip of France, in the early twelfth century. Guibert, \textit{The Deeds of God}, 39; Robert the Monk, \textit{The Historia Hierosolimitana of Robert the Monk}, ed. D. Kempf and M. G. Bull (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013), 14-15; Naus, \textit{Constructing Kingship}, 8; Suger, \textit{The Deeds of Louis}, 43-45
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Guibert’s work, while not widely popularized among the laity, emerged alongside concerted efforts by the Capetian monarchy to likewise associate themselves as Kings of the Franks with the success of the expedition. James Naus, for example, highlights the emergence of a number of “second-generation” accounts of the First Crusade – including works by Guibert and Robert the Monk – which frequently reinterpreted the events of the crusade that were recorded in the eyewitness Gesta Francorum in a manner that downplayed the absence of Philip I and the early departure of his brother, Hugh of Vermandois (c. 1057-1101) and instead definitively presented the Capetian monarchy as participant by association in a distinctly Frankish endeavor.\textsuperscript{340} Guibert’s text is of particular interest to this paper as it was relatively critical of the Capetian monarchy, yet defends the decisions of Hugh and Stephen of Blois (c. 1045-1102) to depart the crusade during the siege of Antioch. In fact, the author specifically states that the absence of monarchs from the crusade was to its benefit, “lest the visible royalty seem to arrogate to itself divine operations”, a succinct encapsulation of both Philip II’s relationship in particular and wider Capetian policy towards incorporating the crusades into an ideology of divine kingship.\textsuperscript{341} Notwithstanding Guibert’s subdued hostility towards the Capetian monarchy, this paper argues that The Deeds of God Through the Franks played a major role in developing the notion of Normans and French as one people, and laying the groundwork for a popular understanding of Normandy as a component part of a shared cultural and historical space as the royal domain; an idea which would be used during the reign of Philip II to bolster his image as a
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sacral Capetian *rex Franciae* as opposed to merely *rex Francorum* to construct an ideological justification for his conquest of Normandy. The transition to the use of the title *rex Franciae*—whichDubynotesbegan only after 1204—was significant as it shifted the locus of Frankish identity to the figure of the monarch who wielded political authority as opposed to an ethnic community or territory, highlighting a trend in the emergence of “administrative kingship” that characterized Philip’s reign where government became both more personally tied to the king and expanded to incorporate greater bureaucratic and judicial functions.\(^{342}\)

Further evidence for the existence of a wider intellectual and cultural imagining of Normandy and France as components of the same entity can be observed in the deployment of the terminology of reunification by the majority of contemporary chroniclers to describe Philip’s conquest of Normandy in 1204. Alberic of Trois-Fontaines and Guillaume de Nangis both explicitly refer to the “reunion” of Normandy with France, with the latter noting that “le roi, maître de toute la Normandie . . . la réunit au corps de son royaume, trois cent trente-deux ans après que le roi Charles, surnommé le Simple, l’avait donnée . . . au Danois Rollon”.\(^{343}\) As we have seen, Guillaume le Breton—who most frequently describes Philip as *Magnanime* in his work—elects to use the sobriquet *Karolide* during the climax of *La Philippide* at the victory of Bouvines, almost certainly an attempt to engage with a supranational Carolingian heritage to implicitly justify the conquest of Normandy by a Capetian king.\(^{344}\) Furthermore, Rigord also makes reference to a reunion of Frankish territories and a return to a Carolingian whole when
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recording the events of 1204, a theme that emerges consistently in French-language accounts of Philip’s conquest of Normandy.\(^{345}\) The concerted and strikingly similar language deployed by these French writers to illustrate the communal identity which bound together even territories outside the traditional Capetian domain suggests a concerted effort to represent a sacred community of Franks, one that found wide reception due to pre-existing cultural imaginings of the identity and composition of the Carolingian realm, to which the Capetians were portrayed as legitimate successors. It also, in line with the revisionist interpretation of the *reditus regni*, strongly indicates a concerted and multifaceted project of ideological justification on the part of Philip and his court in the legitimation of the expansion of Capetian political and territorial power rooted in a symbolic economy of power. Ralph Turner notes that “writers of the period sometimes reflected on the contrast between their own troubled times and the age of Charlemagne, when all the Franks had been united”, a sentiment of nostalgia that points to the existence of a widespread understanding of a shared Frankish community.\(^{346}\) It also suggests an implicit acceptance of the overarching suzerainty of the King of the Franks, embodied in the thirteenth century by Philip II and the Capetian dynasty, and thus reinforces the argument that Philip’s deployment of Carolingian symbols reflected upon his attempt to legitimize the expansion of Capetian political power and to construct a durable edifice of Capetian royal ideology.\(^{347}\)

The deliberate revival of Carolingian symbolism and imagery in association with royal Capetian ideology played a significant role in the legitimation of Philip’s territorial conquests.
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and the expansion of Capetian political power through its appeal to a supranational, semi-
mythologized past and a communal identity defined, in some respects, by adherence to Frankish
monarchical sovereignty. Gabriele argues that “it was only in the early twelfth century that

Normanni and Franci ‘ceased to be synonyms’”, a development that owed a great deal to the
attempts of Henry II and Richard I to construct a durable myth that could consolidate the
disparate Angevin Empire and maintain the authority of the Plantagenet dynasty.348 This was, as
earlier discussed in relation to the propagation of aristocratically patronized vernacular histories
and poems, a process inspired largely by the strength of the Capetian ideology of historically
legitimate and sacral kingship, with Turner noting that one of the principal reasons behind the
collapse of Angevin dominance in Western France was the Plantagenet failure to construct a
viable counter-history to that of the Capetians, one which was strengthened significantly through
its appropriation of an overarching Carolingian ancestry.349 Before Henry II, Norman writers
such William of Jumièges sought to embellish the Carolingian ancestry of the Dukes of
Normandy and belittle the Capetians by returning to the theme of unlawful usurpation, stating
that “I wish to point out the noble origin of the count of Anjou to those who do not know, and I
also want to show how the third dynasty of the Kings of France . . . descended from the counts of
Anjou”.350 Jumièges’ account was likely an attempt to counteract the Capetians’ greater
historical legitimacy while nonetheless emphasizing a retained connection to a supranational
Carolingian heritage and history, an account in line with a wider twelfth-century effort on the
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part of numerous aristocratic dynasties to forge ancestral myths to justify political authority.\textsuperscript{351}

While this project ultimately failed it, much like Guibert’s \textit{The Deeds of God}, contributed to the development of a broader popular and intellectual atmosphere in which Normans and the French were essentialized as component members of a sacral Frankish community that was united under the figure of the Capetian monarch in their capacity as successors to the Carolingians. As a result, though the ease with which Normandy was absorbed into the Capetian royal domain was undoubtedly effected through Philip’s maintenance of Plantagenet governing institutions and taxation practices, it was furthered on a theoretical level through the promulgation of a notion of shared Carolingian identity and Frankish cultural history that notably aided the consolidation of Capetian conquests into a cohesive medieval polity unified around the figure of the king.\textsuperscript{352}

In evaluating the use of Carolingian symbolism and references, both made personally by Philip and within the wider context of his reign, this paper suggests that Philip sought to continue a policy of Carolingian metaphorical association, as observed in the earlier works of Suger and Odo of Deuil, in order to co-opt the language of aristocratic resistance and establish a vision of France in which the nobility, while an integral component, were nonetheless subservient to the king in both theory and practice.\textsuperscript{353} In the case of the former, Janet Nelson argues that “Suger . . . could fuse the full range of Carolingian traditions with contemporary themes, presenting Louis VI as a paladin of Christian warfare, defending the Church”.\textsuperscript{354} Latowsky, likewise, notes that
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Odo of Deuil “by tying the memory of Charlemagne’s successes in the East to the success of the First Crusade, he would have created a typological relationship between the Frankish king and the distinctly Frankish triumph of 1099”. Philip’s emphasis on a rightful Carolingian heritage also aimed to take advantage of the fictionalized reputation of Charlemagne as the proto-crusader, a phenomenon indicated by the elaborate leave-taking ceremony he undertook before the Third Crusade, his donation of relics acquired in the Fourth Crusade to Saint-Denis, and his prominent display of the oriflamme in wars frequently depicted within the context of his political and territorial ambitions. Philip’s exploitation of the crusading movement and his embrace of Charlemagne the crusader sought to tap into a fervor of broader crusading enthusiasm that permeated multiple strata of French society, evidenced by such phenomena as the crusading window of Saint-Denis, and a widely read and popular vernacular translation of the Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle. This was in order to formalize the pre-existing relationship between the French monarchy and the institution of the Crusades as an emblem of the sanctity of the Capetian dynasty itself, though such an instrumental view of Philip’s crusading policies should not detract from his substantial financial and ideological commitment to the Crusades as this paper discussed in earlier sections.

The deployment of Carolingian references and imagery served both to justify Philip’s aggressive centralization of power under the monarchy and to insulate him from criticism by cloaking his actions within an edifice of hoary tradition, and a shared cultural and historical 
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experience. It enabled the Capetian monarchy to tap into a supranational *imperium Francorum* that eschewed imperial Roman connections in favor of royal Frankish connotations that maintained the belief in “authority stemming from the essential Frankishness of the Capetians’ domain”\(^{357}\). The expansion of royal power at the expense of Philip’s principal vassals, witnessed both through direct territorial conquest and the growth of a monopolial proto-bureaucracy in officials such as the *baillis*, cannot be viewed as purely a political program, as the Carolingians emphasized the relationship between “personal virtue and the health of the kingdom . . . . The idea of royal justice through virtue was something of a constant in kingship literature”\(^{358}\). As discussed in earlier sections, the notable administrative and judicial reforms for which Philip’s reign is better known were informed by a theoretical framework that emphasized the dual nature of monopolial power as both secular and spiritual, which was bolstered by Philip’s recourse to a Carolingian precedent\(^{359}\). Unlike the campaigns of Louis VI, which were largely focused on the assertion of royal control within the Ile-de-France region, Philip’s conquests encompassed land traditionally outside the Capetian royal domain, and the utilization of a symbolic economy of Carolingian imagery enabled Philip to construct an ideology of rightful Capetian rule over the entirety of what is now considered “France” and what had been conceived of as a territorially contiguous *Francia* under the later Carolingians. As this paper discussed in an earlier section, the importance of upholding justice and punishing illegitimate actions on the part of the nobility formed a crucial part of the sacerdotal pact the medieval monarch accepted during his coronation ceremony, and it carried a particular Carolingian valence that Philip clearly relied upon to justify
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the expansion of Capetian monarchical power during his reign. The use of Carolingian symbolism and ritual played a major role in the development of an ideology of sacral kingship and acted in concert with Philip’s patronage of Saint-Denis, as evidenced by their continued usage by later Capetian monarchs. This was also reflected in the nature of Philip’s conquests, which were portrayed in a fashion that rendered Philip a new Charlemagne who enjoyed the special protection of God through the intercession of Saint Denis and restored the ethnic community of Fransi to their rightful territorial domain of Francia, which had always existed in a seamless transition from the Merovingians to the Carolingians and finally to the Capetians. This recourse to the Carolingians was all the more significant as few of Philip’s vassals could refute an authority based upon the semi-legendary Charlemagne, and thus rather than an illegitimate assertion of power by the usurping Capetians, Philip’s policy was represented as a restoration of a rightfully monarchical prerogative from the Carolingian period.

While it is tempting to see the remarkable expansion of both political power and territorial control that occurred during the reign of Philip II as acquired at the expense of a significant contribution to the symbolic culture and development of an ideology of sacral kingship, it is clear that the two elements were deeply interconnected and that the evolution of secular monarchical power actively contributed to and drew from a locus of symbolic and ideological force in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Neither the fact that Philip was the first
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Capetian monarch to do away with certain traditions of Capetian ideological power, such as the practice of associative kingship, nor his reputation for lackluster personal piety should detract from the intellectual framework of symbolic ritual and imagery that informed his political program of monarchical centralization and expansion of royal rights. Moreover, his contribution to the ideology of sacral Capetian monarchy can be seen most obviously in his patronage of the abbey of Saint-Denis and its project of historiographical legitimation, and in his revival of Carolingian symbolism, ritual, and nomenclature, policies which would become staples of the formal canon of Capetian monarchical practice and tradition in the successive centuries.

The exchange of Dieudonné for Augustus by contemporary chroniclers has often been cited by modern historians as evidence of Philip’s mediocre reputation as a sacral Capetian king, while the persistent use of Augustus in modern historiographical studies of Philip’s reign bespeaks an implicit clash of personalities in the thirteenth century history of France – Philip II, the conqueror, and Louis IX, the saint. However, this paper argues that much of the religious and ideological edifice of Capetian kingship perfected during the reign of Louis IX built upon the innovative foundations of Philip II, and moreover that the prominent political and administrative achievements of Philip’s reign operated within a uniquely Capetian theoretical hierarchy of ideals that saw no separation between the development of a powerful, centralizing monarchy and the fulfillment of divine duties inherent in the position of medieval kingship; Philip’s reign saw the emergence of a coherent ideology of sacral kingship in France which built upon earlier theories of monarchy by Suger, but the ultimate result was that “Philip Augustus turned Suger’s agenda inside out”. Philip’s reign retained the core characteristics of medieval
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kingship as defined by an older historiographical tradition including Bloch and Kantorowicz, but was furthered through an active attempt on the part of Philip and his court to enhance the ideological and symbolic strength of the Capetian dynasty through his elevation of Saint-Denis to the premier position of ecclesiastical authority in medieval France, and in his relatively successful effort to firmly construct an idealized community of Franci in Francia, united by a shared faith, ethnic identity, and singular monarchical dynasty. While it is clear that Philip and his court effectively manipulated a symbolic economy of Carolingian and Dionysian imagery in the service of the construction of an ideology of sacral Capetian kingship, this does not negate the argument that Philip’s reign operated within an earlier tradition of political thought which emphasized the dual nature of medieval sovereignty. Rather, it suggests that Philip himself was engaged in a dialectical relationship with a hierarchy of ideals that underpinned the shifting notion of medieval kingship during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and his recourse to the patronage of Saint-Denis and his usage of Carolingian symbolism were a response to this phenomenon as much as an instrumentalist project. Within this context, it is unsurprising that Philip’s reign saw both a dramatic expansion in the political power and administrative capabilities of the Capetian monarchy, as it emerged against the wider backdrop of the crusading movement, arguably the most effective encapsulation of the dual nature of medieval political sovereignty. The transition, then, from Dieudonné to Augustus, can be seen as indicative of the maturation of Capetian monarchical ideology during Philip’s reign – from a monarch whose personal piety was paramount, to one whose principal role lay in the preservation of the royal domain and the expansion of its territorial and political power, both of which would be displayed during the long reign of Louis IX.
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