

As every schoolchild knows, the great invention of the modern, post-revolutionary period of politics is the separation of Church and State. Before 1791 (or 1648, if one wishes to take a longer view), we are told, these two powers were locked in eternal combat, struggling for a sovereignty that was necessarily limited, leaving a wake of suffering through persecution, repression, and conflict, all of which was solved by the totalisation of the State and the banishment of the Church to private conscience.

But for all its narrative power, this account has been boldly and convincingly challenged by Andrew Willard Jones in his new study of political practice under Louis IX. As its title suggests, Jones sets out to journey beyond our presentist paradigm by examining the world of Guy Foucois (later Pope Clement IV), a royal lawyer and ecclesiastical prelate. This is by no means a biography of Foucois, but Jones cleverly uses this character—to our eyes enmeshed in both ‘Church’ and ‘State’—as a peg on which to hang his wider-ranging argument.

Jones first takes the reader through the the medieval rhetorical and conceptual frameworks through which contemporaries interpreted the problems of government, demonstrating that our notions of ‘religious’ and ‘secular’ have no purchase in the context of the thirteenth century. Rather than imagine ‘Church’ and ‘State’ as independent, essentialist institutions in competition with each other for sovereignty or power as a limited resource, we must try to envision a society where individuals and institutions were differentiated through their rights and privileges, which were in turn bound to cooperate and uphold each other in friendship. Peace, not violence, was the assumed norm—however elusive it might prove in reality. As a result, cooperation (*consilium et auxilium*) rather than competition (a ‘monopoly on violence’) was seen as the aim of government. Jones provides a particularly helpful analogy through the modern economic interaction of the public and private sectors: we recognise these to be different, with their own proper spheres, but neither has any existence independent of the other, and they do not seek to achieve totality at the expense of the other (pp. 157-9). This is the longest section of the book, and in some ways the most interesting, as Jones administers a fascinating ‘red pill’ that dismantles the reader’s assumptions of universal political realities. Of course, we always use modern paradigms to interpret the past (how could we do otherwise?); Jones’ criticism of the ‘Church and State’ model is not simply that it is modern, but that it is teleological, privileging the rise of the nation-state as the ‘true’ story of political history, even in ages before such a concept existed.

The chief example that Jones provides for this alternative system is the Albigensian Crusade (1208-1229), using the movement’s contemporary appellation as the *negotium pacis et fidei* as the basis for the medieval synthesis. To Jones, this *negotium* stretched far beyond the crusade itself, to encompass the entire idealised understanding that undergirded medieval politics (Jones focusses especially on primary sources from outside of the crusade, such as royal coronation rituals or Louis’ *Grande Ordonnance* of 1254, as evidence for his argument). Mercenaries (as enemies of the peace) and heretics (as enemies of the faith) were conceptually linked, important less for their positive definitions and more for their failure to inhabit the proper social order. Thus linked, they also fused: order was the responsibility of everyone, whether clerk or layman,

to uphold, and so both the temporal and the spiritual sword were needed to effectively combat those who violated it. The ecclesiastical inquisitors into ‘heretical depravity’ and the royal *enquêteurs* who examined cases of injustice throughout the kingdom were thus engaged in the same mission; indeed, were often—as in the case of Guy Foucois—the same people. While elements of this argument may sound familiar, Jones deploys them in a fresh way, taking concerns about these deviations seriously, rather than seeing them as simple constructs to serve a ‘persecuting society’. This section also includes the best discussion of the criminal meaning of *faidit*—a thorny term associated with heresy and outlawry in the Midi—that this reader has yet seen.

The second section concerns the solutions of medieval government, namely the networks of friendship that underpinned any political ‘system’. With ‘peace’ as the organising principle of society, these circles of cooperation formed the basis of government, as institutions adhered in individuals and their relationships with one another. Thus, Jones argues, there was no place for ‘law’ as we understand it; instead, ‘customs’ reflected or violated a preexisting peace, depending on whether they were good or bad. Using the records of *Parlement* and the Mise of Amiens as examples, he shows that legislation was not conceived as prescriptive, but always reactive, attempting to redress a violation of the ‘peace’. Thus specific rights and privileges, the differentiating features that underpinned an order based on hierarchy rather than equality, were ‘discovered’ more than ‘created’. Once discovered, they were then upheld by networks joined through affective devotion and dedicated to this vision of ‘peace’; their ‘organised force’ was directed against the illegitimate ‘violence’ of bad custom. But they were not totalising; if compiled and aggregated, they ‘would not cover the whole social space’ (p. 182). There was therefore no exclusive royal prerogative to violence, but rather a restriction of force to the upholding of right, as usually arbitrated by *Parlement* (and by no means always in the king’s favour). This is all convincingly argued, but might have benefited from deeper engagement with secondary literature about customary law. Moreover, while *Parlement* may indeed function as Jones describes, it would be useful to have more discussion of how non-royal prescriptive legislative codes—such as the Feudal and Penal Charters of Flanders (1200) or the Statutes of Pamiers (1212)—fit into his theory. Although the latter were promulgated in response to a crisis—the Albigensian Crusade—there is much in them that is ‘new’; which is perhaps why Louis abolished much of their former jurisdiction after 1229. But the question remains: were all new customs *ipso facto* bad, even if legislated in accordance with the Church reform that so embodied Jones’ synthesis?

In the third section, Jones discusses the role of the papal legate, highlighting its evolution in this period from a personal commission tied to the lifetime of the pope who created it, to a semi-permanent proconsular office tied to the undying institution of the papacy. The purpose of this section is to highlight the royal role in the construction of the institutional office of legate and its attendant canonical justification. Rather than a simple tool of a ‘papal monarchy’ or ‘theocracy’, the evolution of the cardinal legate *a latere* into a sort of papal proconsul was as much in response to the needs and requests of the Crown—particularly in the face of extended vacancies of the Chair of St Peter as the century wore on—as those of the Church. The point is well-made,

but one wonders if it needs quite as much space as is devoted to it here (three chapters). Coming on the heels of the exciting ‘rooting up and planting’ of our understanding of the temporal and spiritual powers, the fine explorations of canon law relating to legatine missions during an interregnum somewhat retard the pace of the book.

Jones concludes by laying his reconstructed theory of medieval political society—thus far built upon primary sources found at the coalface of government, such as royal inquests, peace treaties, chancery letters, and canon law—next to contemporary scholastic ideas on the subject. This reader would have liked to have seen engagement here with his earlier discussion of the ‘monopoly on violence’: how does Jones’ dismissal of the concept of sovereignty in the Middle Ages affect our understanding of Augustinian and Thomistic ideas about ‘*auctoritas principis*’ (so often interpreted by modern thinkers as ‘sovereignty’) in a just war (e.g. in *Summa theologiae*, ii. 2, q. 40, art. 1)? One imagines the answer would be found in Jones’ vision of differentiated rights, but this might have been explicitly detailed here. Instead, Jones focusses his attention on systematic theology. Intriguingly, he strips much of the Thomism from St Thomas Aquinas, attempting to read him according to his own political context rather than in the universalised air of later theologians. Jones sees in Thomas a unity of ‘conversion’ that runs through his theological as well as his political thought (if, indeed, we can still think in such terms at the end of Jones’ argument). Just as the Old Testament is subsumed into the New or nature into grace, so are the interdependent temporal and spiritual swords fully realised in the temporal and spiritual powers; that is, they operate as swords (physical force and excommunication) in the realm of sin, but as powers (providing authority and sacraments) in the realm of grace. Necessarily, they act together, rather than seeking to dominate the other. Jones therefore ultimately finds a confirmation of his model in the articulation of a contemporary theorist.

It likely comes as no surprise to reveal at this point that Jones is a Roman Catholic: this comes through clearly in his writing, which at times takes a confessional tone. The obvious concern, then, is one of anachronism, of the imposition of nineteenth-century Catholic certainties back onto the medieval past because of an assumed static continuity. However, Jones’ very purpose is to reach behind those expectations of spiritual and political power born from the Counter-Reformation and the Treaty of Westphalia, the Risorgimento and the First Vatican Council (or, for that matter, the Lateran Treaty). As a result, his Catholicism enriches rather than obfuscates his conclusions, as his faith combines with his *ressourcement* to offers what he calls, echoing Henri de Lubac, a dynamic ‘complete act’ of French social and political order in the thirteenth century.

The one point where readers may judge Jones’ faith to have weakened his argument, if not his conclusions, is in the assumed normativity of the vision he presents. Because his book deals—quite literally—with a saint and his government’s relationship with a civil and ecclesiastical servant—Guy Foucois—who likewise never seems to put a foot wrong, the reader is tempted to believe that this ‘complete act’ was taken for granted. Perhaps it was. But it was also represented by men who subscribed to a vision of reformed Christianity—ultimately triumphant—that had been and still was hotly contested throughout Christendom. To his great credit, Jones

does transcend the argument over who—Church or Crown—invented such ‘discourse’ and transmitted it to the other; as with so much else, this question rests on the problematic foundation of the modern ‘Church and State’ narrative, and moreover wrongly assumes incompatibility and hermetically sealed categories (pp. 294-5). All the same, it would be useful to lay Jones’ picture over other medieval societies in different times and regions. Jones himself does hint at such comparisons with the Carolingian and Hohenstaufen empires (pp. 153-4, 163), and a thorough comparative study naturally would go beyond the scope of Jones’ already hefty volume; in the end, this is less a criticism than a testament to the value of his work for further avenues of study.

A minor complaint is the inconsistent translation of placenames. Usually, these are put into familiar French, but occasionally confusing Latinized forms are retained: e.g. ‘Sanctus Georgius’ for ‘Saint-Georges’ (p. 179), ‘Vallis-Sarnaius’ for ‘Vaux-de-Cernay’ (p. 184), or ‘Beate-Marie (*sic*) de Clarmonite’ for ‘Notre-Dame de Clermont’ (p. 209). This is distracting and potentially disorienting for the reader.

Such typographical irritants aside, this book is a great contribution to political historiography; it has had a profound effect on this reader’s own thinking, and he hopes it will be widely read and discussed by medievalists and others. It is striking that in this age of unparalleled ease of access to and comparison of historical sources, most contributions to the literature are so relatively modest. This monograph is commendable in many respects, but none more so than its daring and convincing thesis that substantially revises our view of medieval politics with such a thorough alternative ‘complete act’.