**A Diabolical Martyrdom: Urbain Grandier, the Transgressive Outsider, and the Surrogate Victim in *The Possession at Loudun***

**Abstract**

Throughout the 1630s, the town of Loudun, France, is gripped with an ongoing crisis of demonic possession that involves every member of the community.  As historian Michel de Certeau demonstrates in his book *the Possession at Loudun,* the townsfolk express and attempt to expel their anxieties through a surrogate victim: Urbain Grandier, the priest of Saint-Pierre-du-Marché, is judged and executed as a sorcerer.  In doing so, the Loudunais seem to closely follow the framework constructed by René Girard in his book *The Violence and the Sacred* for understanding the surrogate victim and their role in ritual sacrifice.  A transgressive stranger to the community, here Grandier, is symbolically purged, and with him all their sins, fears, and worries.  Grandier’s death, however, does not end the violence. This paper will bring the works of de Certeau and Girard into dialogue in order to better understand the position of both Urbain Grandier and the exorcist Father Surin in the demonic possession at Loudun.  Although Grandier seems to be a perfect Girardian transgressive outsider and sacrifice, his death does not restore balance to the community; instead, the enigmatic Father Jean-Joseph Surin must also take on many characteristics of the surrogate victim in order to end the troubling events.

The town of Loudun during the 1630s is a troubled place. Rocked by both plague and religious conflict, the town is a hotbed of anxieties and violence, of evils “without explanation”.[[1]](#footnote-1) As tensions grow, the town is plunged into the crisis of a demonic possession, gripping first the local Ursuline convent and later the entire community.[[2]](#footnote-2) Starting in September 1632, the Ursulines begin to report the presence of a malevolent shadow within their convent. Its residents experience the “cries and writhing bodies” that would endure for years to come.[[3]](#footnote-3) Within days, the possession spread. By October, Loudun is alive with fear of the diabolical: exorcism is declared expedient and a suspect named.[[4]](#footnote-4) As Michel de Certeau indicates in his book *The Possession at Loudun*, this possession is perhaps a logical development. In many respects, the possession events help the Loudunais come to terms with their anxieties by providing a course of action by which order can be restored. Part of this occurs naturally; in the words of René Girard’s *Violence and the Sacred*, if left “unappeased, violence seeks and always finds a surrogate victim”.[[5]](#footnote-5) As Loudun grapples with the growing fear associated with a possession event, the community desperately needs their own scapegoat. In these circumstances, their victim takes the form of the sorcerer. This accusation is an important one, for by assigning a sorcerer the Loudunais designate their surrogate victim and set into motion a series of events culminating in a restorative sacrifice. In the end, it is the priest of Saint-Pierre-du-Marché Urbain Grandier, known throughout the community for his often-adulterous affairs and his radical religious beliefs, who is assigned the dual role of perpetrator and surrogate victim. The town identifies him as the sorcerer responsible for conducting the devil’s business in the Ursuline convent and for inflicting demons upon the innocent nuns living there.[[6]](#footnote-6) In becoming the sorcerer, Grandier’s expulsion as a surrogate for the violence within his community is the key to restoring societal order. Thus de Certeau raises the question: To what extent does Urbain Grandier fulfill the role of surrogate victim in the possession at Loudun?[[7]](#footnote-7) Only by bringing the work of both Girard and de Certeau into conversation can we answer this question and understand the events that transpired at Loudun. This paper illustrates that in Michel de Certeau’s *The Possession at Loudun,* the ‘sorcerer’ Urbain Grandier largely fulfills the role of surrogate victim at Loudun as defined by René Girard. However, Girard’s analysis of Grandier’s role breaks down after his death, as the violence in the community persists. This complicates the roles of others involved in the possession, especially for Father Surin, who in performing his role as exorcist seems to take on the characteristics of a surrogate victim himself.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Certainly, the town of Loudun in ready for an outpouring of anxiety as great as that offered by an apparent demonic possession. By 1632, over fifty years of crisis and strife has taken its toll. Most present in the lives of the Loudunnais is a plague epidemic that ravaged their town. Over three thousand die that year alone, a tragedy that seems “incomprehensible and… meaningless”.[[9]](#footnote-9) As de Certeau indicates, no “treatment, and therefore no doctor, could overcome it”. The plague in Loudun is “an evil without explanation,” destined to scour the afflicted population without respite.[[10]](#footnote-10) Fear of it and of the inevitable death it engenders are the townsfolk’s constant companion, whose only option is to attempt to lock it out and let the pestilence run its course.[[11]](#footnote-11) These anxieties surrounding disease are only compounded by the lingering memory of the French Wars of Religion in the late sixteenth century. At that time, Protestants and Catholics “tore God limb from limb” in Loudun’s streets; almost sixty years later, at the time of the possession, the old animosities still simmered.[[12]](#footnote-12) Catholic forces had reclaimed Loudun, but the work to fully re-establish their authority in the town is still ongoing. The Huguenot presence is still influential; the tension between the denominations still palpable.[[13]](#footnote-13) In the face of this continued religious tension and disease, it is unsurprising that the Loudunnais need relief from the burden of their troubles, some means to expel them from their society. A possession seems to offer such relief: it is no coincidence that the first reports of possession in the Ursuline convent coincide with the last reports of plague cases in 1632.[[14]](#footnote-14) Demonic possession offers a model by which the community can heal. It is a public ritual, something the plague had previously prevented, that allows them to divert the violence in their society. All Loudun needs for the mechanisms of possession is a sacrifice, a surrogate victim.[[15]](#footnote-15)

In this troubled milieu, Urbain Grandier certainly appears to be a logical fit for this role. Despite his important role as priest in the community, he makes himself a metaphorical outsider by rejecting important societal norms. To Girard, the foreigner is “imbued with the sacred” when they enter a community.[[16]](#footnote-16) As an outsider, they are not beholden to the rules that help the society “maintain a precarious independence” from the workings of the sacred.[[17]](#footnote-17) These rules are then broken. In his ignorance, the outsider transgresses upon them. Thus the transgressing stranger is at once human and more than human, sharing a very close bond with the sacred.[[18]](#footnote-18) Given Grandier’s ecclesiastical education and occupation as priest, his connection to the sacred is an explicit one[[19]](#footnote-19). He is also “not a native son” of Loudun: born in Bouère, Grandier did not arrive in Loudun until 1617.[[20]](#footnote-20) That being said, by the time of the possession Urbain Grandier is not a literal foreigner, but a figurative one. His role as priest of Saint-Pierre-du-Marché keeps him a part of the community, but his actions keep him separate from it. Grandier “seduces his public” both with his charm and his rhetorical abilities, which draws the ire of the Loudunais.[[21]](#footnote-21) They are especially concerned with the spell his silver tongue casts over their wives. Indeed, Grandier has been known to engage in several affairs; he had even been “arrested on a morals charge” and imprisoned in 1629.[[22]](#footnote-22) In “’frequenting girls and women’” throughout the town, Grandier is “riding roughshod” over the social norms of Loudun, which are, as de Certeau indicates, ferociously upheld.[[23]](#footnote-23) In essence, this makes him a target: de Certeau explains that Loudun excluded Grandier because “he manifested…the instability of the traditional beliefs” in his shocking behaviour.[[24]](#footnote-24) This situation is further exacerbated with the publication of Grandier’s radical treatise in defense of clerical marriage. As a result of these transgressions and the eloquence with which he communicates them, the Loudunais create a “’deviant’” figure capable of restoring a “cohesion of a cosmos”.[[25]](#footnote-25) On account of his transgressive acts, Loudun “marks” Grandier “as a stranger” and distances itself from him; in doing so, the community constructs an outsider figure with which their collective anxieties can be purged.[[26]](#footnote-26)

There is a clear correlation between Girard’s analysis of Oedipus and de Certeau’s of Grandier. In examining both of these analyses, the ways in which these men function as a means of absolving their community of collective sin becomes evident. A significant part of the formulation of the Oedipal myth is the transferral of that collective sin onto a single figure, the sacrificial victim. In Girard’s analysis, any societal ills expressed in Thebes, with particular reference to the plague that has befallen the city, are impressed onto the figure of Oedipus, who “becomes the repository” of their sins.[[27]](#footnote-27) However, Oedipus, unlike Grandier, willingly assumes “sole responsibility” for the “evils abroad in the community” and, by doing so, resolves Thebes’ sins.[[28]](#footnote-28) In the case of Grandier, the role of the surrogate victim is assigned to him. Even at his trial, he “denies having committed the crime of which he is accused”.[[29]](#footnote-29) Like Oedipus, however, Grandier becomes “the human scapegoat” by which the community can expel its violent nature.[[30]](#footnote-30) As the sorcerer, Grandier shoulders the burden of culpability not only for the possession event, but the anxieties which produced it.[[31]](#footnote-31) Like Oedipus, the violence is channelled into the transgressive stranger, who then forms the sacrifice. In this way the community is “stripped” of its violence.[[32]](#footnote-32) Having taken on the blame, it becomes necessary for the surrogate victim to be “expelled from the community” in order to rid it of its affliction.[[33]](#footnote-33) For Urbain Grandier, this process begins with his isolation in prison, which serves as a sort of quarantine to prevent the violence from further spreading its infection throughout Loudun. This process, however, continues; unlike Oedipus, who is cast out of Thebes in his expulsion, Grandier must be “destroyed in order to absolve Loudun of its sins”.[[34]](#footnote-34)

The theatre of the possession is rife with expectations: it is expected that the affliction is caused by a sorcerer, and it is expected that his death will end the possession event. Even in the execution itself there is an anticipated pattern of events; in establishing such a pattern, Grandier’s death is transformed into that ritual expulsion of the surrogate victim. As de Certeau indicates, the “diabolical crisis” is only rendered possible by “a death”, which it requires for the pattern of the possession to play out.[[35]](#footnote-35) This collective murder is the ultimate act of inflicted violence and one that permits the restoration of the cultural order in Loudun after its many disturbances. As Girard indicates, the death of the surrogate victim, that ultimate act of violence, “ensures” the “’purgation’ of violence” from the community.[[36]](#footnote-36) To do so, the community must re-enact the initial act of violence which served that function. In Loudun, “it takes a life burning at the stake” in accordance with a pre-established precedent for this purification to occur.[[37]](#footnote-37) In adopting such a pattern of events, the execution of Grandier is made into a performance. He has been accused, isolated, and judged as the sacrificial victim; the only step left is the expulsion from the community. On the day of the execution, a crowd of thousands comes to watch the execution and to witness the sacrificial rite.[[38]](#footnote-38) De Certeau indicates that this act “escapes history”, with varying accounts of the execution published in its aftermath.[[39]](#footnote-39) In this way the ritual can maintain its secrecy. Afterwards, Grandier’s “ashes are scattered” and the “traces of the sorcerer wiped clean” lest any remnant of the sacrificial victim and the violence that he represents remain to pollute the community again.[[40]](#footnote-40) The ritual has been completed, and equilibrium supposedly restored through it.

Despite his ritualized execution, Urbain Grandier fails in his assumed role as surrogate victim. Though he functions as one, his death is unsuccessful in dissipating the violence of the possession at Loudun. In defense of Girard’s ideas, the execution is partially successful as a sacrifice: the “camps lose… what constituted them as adversaries” as the confrontations constructed around the surrogate victim collapse.[[41]](#footnote-41) Grandier himself is successfully removed from the community.[[42]](#footnote-42) Yet this ends neither the violence in Loudun nor its expression in the possession. Although Grandier’s death is supposed to restore social order in Loudun, it does not; the violence the execution is designed to expel persists. As a result, Girard’s analysis breaks down because it is incompatible with the continuation of the possession at Loudun. Girard explains the failure of the surrogate victim as a result of the degree of its connections to the community in which it functions. The surrogate victim is a Goldilocks figure: too connected and the violence in the community will proliferate, but too separate and the sacrifice will not work.[[43]](#footnote-43) By this logic, Grandier would have been either too much of an outsider or too closely connected in Loudun to effectively serve his role as the sorcerer. But de Certeau is adamant that this is not the case. Rather, he argues that the community of Loudun specifically made Grandier a “deviant” so that it could sacrifice him “to itself” in an attempt to restore order.[[44]](#footnote-44) De Certeau even claims that Grandier’s death is successful and in accordance with Girard’s understanding of the surrogate victim: it “satisfies” the group and assures the community that “*there is order*”.[[45]](#footnote-45) And yet that cannot be true, for although the unanimity of the community dissipates with the sacrificial victim, the disorder and violence remain in the form of the possession. The demons persist for years[[46]](#footnote-46).

The issue of the possession and its surrogate victim is further complicated by the arrival of Father Jean-Joseph Surin at Loudun in 1634. A Jesuit priest and mystic, he is only sent to the town after the failure of Grandier’s death in order to continue the fruitless work of removing the demons afflicting the Ursuline nuns.[[47]](#footnote-47) As a result, the enigmatic Surin not only challenges Girard’s understanding of the relationship between the exorcist and the surrogate victim, but in doing so he appears to take on the role of the sacrifice himself. While Surin can engage in an “act of violence against the devil and his associates”, he cannot totally fulfill the role of the exorcist in the manner that Girard describes.[[48]](#footnote-48) Girard’s understanding of exorcism is dependent on the quarrel between exorcists which “emulates the unanimous violence” present in the sacrificial proceedings.[[49]](#footnote-49) This argument is instrumental in determining who will be the scapegoat for the community’s collective violence. Therefore, Girard believes that the function of the exorcist is at once to mimic the violence inherent in the rites and to help project this violence onto the sacrificial victim. In doing so, the exorcists assign the role of scapegoat in the community.[[50]](#footnote-50) This is not, however, a function that Surin can perform. He is not an alien investigator as Girard’s exorcist is; “parachuted into” the theatre of Loudun, Surin becomes “subject to the laws of that ‘place’” in a way that Girard’s exorcist is not.[[51]](#footnote-51) Rather, he becomes a part of the community, much like Grandier, and he is far more connected to it than Girard’s impartial party. Furthermore, the designation of Grandier as surrogate victim makes Girard’s quarrel among exorcists impossible for Surin. Any argument that he engages in as exorcist does not create space for sacrifice to occur because the sacrificial processes have already chosen a scapegoat, engaged in a collective murder, and expelled the surrogate victim from the community prior to Surin’s arrival in 1634.[[52]](#footnote-52) Without Grandier, it is impossible for Surin to construct a relationship with the scapegoat in the same way that Girard describes. As a result, Surin’s role becomes an enigmatic one. As he says about himself, “‘*Et factus sum magna quaestio* (and I have become a great question)’”. In seeing Urbain Grandier as the surrogate victim, Father Surin’s own role in Loudun becomes a mystery.[[53]](#footnote-53)

In many respects, the enigmatic role that Father Surin takes on is that of the surrogate victim itself. Like Urbain Grandier, Surin comes from outside the community and is made subject to its laws.[[54]](#footnote-54) Furthermore, he and the other exorcists experience an “isolation in the town”; despite being quickly folded into the community, they are held at arm’s length much in the same way as Grandier before them.[[55]](#footnote-55) Surin’s method is much less confrontational and sensational than the bodily acts of the exorcisms that preceded his arrival, focussing on prayer for “the relief of the mother superior” in order to eliminate the demons.[[56]](#footnote-56) In doing so, however, Surin makes himself vulnerable to the contagious violence present in the possessed; as de Certeau says, “the doctor must take the illness upon himself” in order to cure it.[[57]](#footnote-57) By succumbing to the affliction of possession it seems that Surin takes on the burden of the community’s sins, and the force of violent unanimity within the community is directed against him. In other words, rather than taking on the disease in order to cure it, Surin’s possession is part of receiving the violent unanimity of the community, transforming him into a surrogate victim. This is further exacerbated by his correspondence with Father Doni d’Attichy about his affliction, which is then spread throughout France.[[58]](#footnote-58) However, his role as surrogate victim is most evident in his expulsion from Loudun. Removed by his superiors in 1636, Surin departs Loudun a husk of himself, only to return the following year in order to resolve the possession for good.[[59]](#footnote-59) At this point, Surin is expelled not only from Loudunais society but from society at large: he spends the rest of his life shunned by the community around him, seemingly in a form of social death.[[60]](#footnote-60) In this way, despite the enigma of his role in Loudun, Surin begins to fulfill the surrogate victim role that Grandier was assigned.

In conclusion, Urbain Grandier seems to be a logical surrogate victim with which to purge Loudun of the disorder present within its social structure. As a prominent recent arrival of the Loudunais community, Grandier becomes a transgressive stranger within Loudun, a role further exacerbated at once by his radical deviance from strongly held beliefs and by his occupation, which explicitly ties him to the sacred. As a result, the community of Loudun is able to project their anxieties, foremost among them the possession itself, and to transform the priest of Saint-Pierre-du-Marché into their scapegoat. As René Girard indicates, it becomes necessary for this surrogate victim to be expelled from the community; for Grandier, this takes the form of a highly performative burning at the stake. Girard’s analysis, however, falls short in the case study presented by Michel de Certeau: not only does the violence not end in Loudun, but it continues despite Grandier being primed for the surrogate’s function. Girard’s analysis is further complicated by the arrival of Father Surin following the death of Grandier. While Girard’s ideas as outlined in *The Violence and the Sacred* are upheld to an almost remarkable degree by de Certeau in *The Possession at Loudun,* the main purpose of the surrogate victim still fails. Further analysis of this type is required in order to fully understanding the mechanics of the possession. By applying other aspects of Girard’s understanding of not only the surrogate victim but also other aspects of the sacrificial rite, a greater understanding of Grandier’s role can be achieved. In particular, such analysis is needed to understand the “*magna quaestio”* of the enigmatic Father Surin, whose role is incapacitated by the absence of a functional surrogate victim.*[[61]](#footnote-61)* As a result, the investigator, made subject to the laws of the community, seems to become something more than an exorcist in the theatre at Loudun.
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