

An approach to crusading ethics

Article

Published Version

Riley-Smith, J. (1980) An approach to crusading ethics.
Reading Medieval Studies, VI. pp. 3-19. ISSN 0950-3129
Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/84666/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

Publisher: University of Reading

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

An Approach to Crusading Ethics

The crusades were supported overwhelmingly by contemporaries. Critics were few; and those critics who questioned them fundamentally, as opposed to those who merely wanted to improve them or were doubtful about certain aspects of them, were very rare indeed. Men and women of all classes were prepared to embark on enterprises that involved much hardship and suffering and endangered their lives. Of course they had all kinds of motive, but it is clear that ideals did play a very large part. These ideals, therefore, including the moral theology of violence, are worth studying. But the ethics, as opposed to the laws, of crusading is a subject that historians have shied away from, choosing to adopt, in place of rational enquiry, expressions of high-minded moral outrage which are fair enough, but really only show how much moral perceptions have changed. Many of the popes who proclaimed crusades and the preachers who recruited the faithful for them were moral men, some of them recognised by their contemporaries as saints, with a real concern for Christian ethics, and the same is true of many of those who answered their call. Condemnation does not help us to understand why sincere men believed crusading violence to be positively good and something demanded of the faithful by God.

A crusade was a form of holy war, but holy war was itself only one expression of a wider concept, that of sacred violence. Crusading thought emerged from a ferment of argument about rebellion and throughout its history it was fuelled by ideas justifying the physical repression of heretics. Sacred violence requires as a premise the conviction that God and his intentions for mankind are intimately associated with the well-being of a political structure here on earth which has become threatened. It is therefore positively sanctioned, even ordered, by God, since it is employed to preserve something that embodies his wishes for mankind, and participation in it is a moral imperative. The fundamentals of this idea were laid down very early, particularly around 400 by St Augustine, who established certain criteria according to which, he believed, sacred violence could be recognised. He required a just cause, which always related to injuries inflicted by others, the only response to which could be a violent one. With regard to legitimate authority, he envisaged violence not only authorised by ministers of God like emperors, but also directly commanded by God himself. And he maintained that right intention must mean that the participants should always be motivated by love.¹

The first and most important stage of theoretical development had ended by 600 and it is today a sort of orthodoxy to see the Church in the eleventh century turning to force after 400 years in which its views had been ambiguous if not predominantly pacifist.² This is probably wrong. It is true that, except for a short period in the ninth century, there was very little theoretical writing on force. But over and over again one comes across rather

unthinking applications of the old ideas, and it is clear that during this time merit, which along with free will had been played down in Augustine's thought, came to be attached to participation in sacred violence. It is, however, true that, although by the eleventh century a large body of writing on Christian violence was in existence, it was scattered and not easily available. Certain ideas had passed into Christian thinking and had been put into practice, but what was required was synthesis and systematisation; and this process began in the 1080s.

In it the crucial figure appears to have been Anselm of Lucca, a nephew of Pope Alexander II and a supporter of Pope Gregory VII, who undertook a defence of Gregory's stand in the Investiture Contest and in particular of the pope's appeal to lay knights to support him with arms. In Anselm's 'Collectio canonum' of 1083 are to be found passages from the major writings of Augustine on violence, including the fundamental texts on love and on God as the direct authoriser of force, together with relevant extracts from the writings of SS Jerome and Ambrose and Popes Gelasius, Pelagius and Gregory I, collected to show that the Church could lawfully sanction rebellion and persecution.³ In 1085-6 Anselm developed his views in his 'Liber contra Wibertum', written against the anti-pope Clement III, in which, following Augustine, he argued that the Church had the right to call on heretics to be compelled by force to return to orthodoxy.⁴ Almost as important as Anselm were John of Mantua, from the same circle, who proclaimed the popes' authority over the temporal sword,⁵ and Ivo of Chartres, whose 'Decretum' and 'Panormia', written in France on the eve of the preaching of the First Crusade, also contained the full range of Augustinian writings, together with texts from the ninth century on the martyrdom of those who died in defence of Christendom. And in the 'Panormia', a popular abbreviation of the 'Decretum', Ivo devoted some chapters to the precedents for the authorisation of war by popes.⁶ By 1095, then, the basic Augustinian texts, supplemented by some from the ninth century, had been brought together in a digestible way, even if the process of assimilation and verification - some of the passages quoted were from forged documents - was to continue. This was an essential step before a crusade - a formal war proclaimed on God's behalf by the pope - could be preached.

But, looking at the way the Gregorian reformers at the same time redeveloped the old Late Roman theories on force and approached the lay knight-hood of western Europe for practical military aid, one can see attitudes to violence being expressed on several levels. Intellectuals like Anselm of Lucca, engaged in polemic but never forgetting the rounded Christian view, and Ivo of Chartres thought in ways that were fully in the Christian tradition: no man might use force on his own behalf, but could participate in it at the command of a legitimate public authority; violence must have a just cause and, although heretics might be coerced to submit to the Church's teaching, wars of conversion were forbidden, because pagans should be brought to the

faith only by reason; the authorisers and participants in violence must love those they opposed, for charity had to be shown to enemies as well as friends. In comparison the Song of Roland, which dates from the same period, contained an exceptionally crude approach to Christian violence, a xenophobic hatred of non-Christians and a strong belief in the right to convert by force. Certain theological ideas manifested themselves at this popular level. There was a notion of war approved by God, although very little understanding of the Church as mediator in this - Charlemagne's role in the Song of Roland echoed that of the Carolingian, Ottonian and Salian emperors as Pauline ministers of divine wrath - and there was a belief in the martyrdom of those dying in the fight for the faith. But the general approach to be found in the Song of Roland and other epics, reflecting what the laity thought, must have embarrassed senior churchmen.⁷ On the other hand, while they cannot have liked it, they tried to come to terms with it. At the time individual members of the clergy, supporters of reform, were encouraging local lords to defend the Church by force of arms and acting as publicists for Christian violence, while responsible clerics all over Christendom were trying to improve the morals of their flocks by popularising serious theology in terms that ordinary laymen would find comprehensible and by reconciling it with the ideals of knighthood. One example among many is to be found in Orderic Vitalis's account of the activities of Gerold, the Earl of Chester's chaplain,

who did his best to turn the men of the (earl's) court to a better way of life by putting before them the examples of their ancestors ... To great lords, simple knights and noble boys he gave salutary counsel; and he collected tales of combats of holy knights from the Old Testament and from modern Christian stories for them to imitate. He told them vivid stories of the conflicts of Demetrius and George, of Theodore and Sebastian, of Duke Maurice and the Theban Legion and of Eustace, supreme commander of the army and his companions, who won through martyrdom the crown in heaven.⁸

The gap between the views of theologians and the public, and the efforts of some of the clergy to bridge it, were features of crusading thought in the central Middle Ages. First there were the theologians: among them Gratian, whose 'Causa XXIII' on violence was a masterpiece of sophistication and subtlety, in which the reader was taken inexorably step by step from arguments against the use of the force to a classic justification of it, resting on what appeared to be an irresistible weight of authorities;⁹ Peter Lombard, whose Sentences, the standard text-book on theology, contained a fully rounded approach to love of enemies;¹⁰ and St Thomas Aquinas, who gave a new clarity to the old theology of force.¹¹ Then there were those whose business it was to arouse the faithful and pass the theology on to them: the

popes, whose encyclicals, setting out ideas that could be transmitted to the people in sermons, were directed at a wide audience, including both trained theologians and the laity; preachers like St Bernard, James of Vitry and Odo of Châteauroux; publicists like Peter of Blois and the historians of particular expeditions, who were nearly all - though not all - churchmen. In their writings we find the ideas of the theologians drastically modified as they were expressed in terms the laity could understand. And below them, among the laity themselves, there seethed emotions, prejudices and a medley of Christian, semi-Christian and pre-Christian beliefs, varying from class to class and region to region, growing more sophisticated as time progressed, but remaining even at the end of the thirteenth century, the products almost of another world to that of the theologians.

The trichotomy can be illustrated in all sorts of ways. I have already pointed out that at the highest theological level it was recognised that the just cause demanded that crusades could not be wars of aggrandizement but should be defensive reactions to injuries inflicted on Christendom or its members. There were, it is true, some rarified arguments going on, particularly in the thirteenth century. Could the pope, as heir of the Roman emperors, wage a just war against any barbarians anywhere, simply on the grounds that they were barbarians, in imitation of what was thought to have been the bellum iustum et pium of Ancient Rome? Could he, as Vicar of Christ, use the crusade as a judicial punishment to be imposed on pagan rulers for sins such as refusing to let in missionaries? But in general great efforts seem to have been made by the leaders of the Church to persuade at least themselves that crusades were defensive responses to injury or aggression.¹² The orthodox justification would be expressed by those, like Hostiensis or Humbert of Romans, who were answering serious objectors,¹³ and it would find its way into papal letters, as it did in the tortuous argument used by Pope Innocent III in 1199 to justify the Livonian crusade. Missionaries had gone into Livonia and had made converts. These converts had come under pressure from their pagan neighbours, so that the 'Church of Livonia' was in danger. A crusade, therefore, would be launched to 'defend' that Church.¹⁴ But one cannot help feeling that these statements were for the benefit of the more educated clergy. In many papal encyclicals, in sermons and in crusade memoirs there was also an ambiguity which surely stemmed from the difficulty of selling the just cause to the people, among whom flourished alien ideas so powerful that some way of meeting them had to be found. For instance, the idea of the crusade as a war of conversion seems to have been very deeply rooted. As everyone knows, the First Crusade was in practice punctuated by incidents in which the garrisons of captured fortresses were given the alternatives of conversion or death, and in the Drang nach Osten and the German crusade associated with it conquest and the spreading of Christianity were closely linked. In the 1140s, faced by this potent conviction, Pope Eugenius III and St Bernard sailed close to

the wind: Bernard forbade any truce with the pagans 'until such time as, with God's help, either their religion or they themselves shall be wiped out'.¹⁵ The beautiful sequence composed at Aachen before 1215 for the festal mass of the canonised Charlemagne expressed the idea of the emperor conducting a missionary war.

Hic est Christi miles fortis
Et invictae dux cohortis
Decem sternit millia

.....

Infideles hic convertit
Fana, deos hic evertit
Et confregit idola. 16

In 1209 Pope Innocent III encouraged the King of Denmark to take the Cross 'to extirpate the error of paganism and spread the frontiers of the Christian faith'.¹⁷ It must be stressed that one never finds senior churchmen positively and unambiguously proposing wars of conversion, but the phrases they used were cloudy and this represents their attempts to come to terms with popular aspirations.

Popularisation would also explain the use constantly made of images like that of the Holy Land as Christ's haereditas or patrimonium - it should be remembered that this was a time when the patrimony was beginning to loom large in the minds of the European nobility - which led naturally to the idea of the crusade as a war of vengeance by Christ's family against those who had stolen his personal property: 'vengeance' appears in the texts nearly as often as 'liberation', the official word for what happened in Palestine in 1099. The idea of patrimony even came to be associated with the Livonian crusade. One of the local Slav rulers was persuaded to donate his land to Our Lady, whose cult, centred on Riga, was very strong among the Baltic Christians. It was reported that in 1215 at the Fourth Lateran Council the Bishop of Livonia addressed the pope as follows:

Holy Father, as you have not ceased to cherish with your holiness's care the Holy Land of Jerusalem, the country of the Son, so also you ought not to abandon Livonia, the land of the Mother, which has been up to now among the pagans and is far from the care of your consolation and is now desolate again. For the Son loves his Mother and, as he would not care to lose his own land, so too he would not wish to have his Mother's land endangered.

Innocent III was reported as replying:

We shall always be careful to help with paternal solicitude the land of the Mother in the same way as we help the land of the Son. ¹⁸

The frequency with which the image of Palestine as Christ's patrimony was used suggests that it meant something very real to the public.

Ambiguity is also to be found when one turns to the issue of authority. It was axiomatic that the pope was speaking on God's behalf when he proclaimed a crusade, and St Bernard wrote of God speaking through him. ¹⁹ The God of the theologians was the mighty and immanent God of Israel, actively concerned with and operating in the world, and this image survived all the disappointments of the twelfth century to receive perhaps its finest expression in Innocent III's response, echoing the language of the Old Testament, to the victory of the Spanish Christians over the Moors at Las Navas de Tolosa in 1212, practically the only crusading success of his pontificate.

God, the protector of those hoping in him, without whom nothing is true, nothing firm, multiplying his mercy on . . . the Christian people and letting loose his anger on the people who have not known the Lord and on the kingdoms which have not invoked his most holy name, according to what was once foretold by the Holy Spirit, makes a laughing stock of the peoples who were murmuring rashly against him and has mocked those with empty minds, by humbling the arrogance of the strong and causing the pride of the infidels to be laid low. Who, hoping in horses, because they were many, and in knights, because of their great strength, had no trust in holy Israel and neglected to call upon God. Nay rather they have dared to put God, living and true, to the test, haughtily raising their voices against him and lifting up their eyes. But blessed be God, who placed a ring in their nostrils and a bit in their mouths, giving to them according to their works and repaying them according to the wickedness of their behaviour, so that Moab might see how much greater is his indignation and pride than fortitude and strength, and that all who love his name may hope in the Lord, seeing that he does not withdraw his mercy from those who hope in him, but is near to all who call on him in truth, giving strength to sinners and multiplying their vigour; so they should not yet doubt the truth of what they read; how those who hope in the Lord have strength, run and do not labour, were walking and did not weaken, because God will give strength to his people. ²⁰

It was natural for crusade propagandists to describe God to their audiences in contemporary earthly terms; in this they were only following the example set by the Old Testament. The idea of God as a secular king constantly recurs, particularly in Innocent III's appeals.

Consider, most dear son, consider carefully that if any temporal king was thrown out of his domain and perhaps captured, would he not, when he was restored to his pristine liberty and the time had come for dispensing justice, look on his vassals as unfaithful and traitors against the crown and guilty of lèse majesté unless they had committed not only their property but also their persons to the task of freeing him? ... And similarly will not Jesus Christ, the king of kings and lord of lords ... condemn you for the vice of ingratitude and, as it were, the crime of infidelity ... if you neglect to help him? ²¹

But a problem popes and preachers faced - it arises in the language used by Innocent - was that most western kings were also feudal lords, and the feudal bond with its mutual obligations dominated the thoughts of those to whom the pope's appeals were transmitted. Churchmen would not want their audiences to think of their relationship to God or Christ as a feudal one, because a feudal lord was made not by his birth, lands or wealth but by his contract, which meant that he had legal obligations towards his vassals. God, of course, had no such obligations towards his subjects, which explains the cloudiness and ambivalence to be found in ecclesiastical writings on this matter and at least one specific statement, in the middle of an analogy of this kind, that God was not a feudal lord. ²²

But there was little the senior clergy could do. When we reach down to the laity we find images of God as a feudal lord constantly recurring in vernacular poetry, and a consequence would be occasionally a blind feudal reaction to disaster, in which God was blamed for deserting his people just as if he had been a lord who had failed to protect his vassals.

Why have you allowed the people following you to fall into the hands of your enemies? Why have you forsaken so soon those who wanted to free your road and the way to your sepulchre? ... We and other Christians will forsake you and remember you no more. ²³

Lord ... he is a fool who follows you in battle. ²⁴

Ah God ... why have you treated our king (Louis IX of France) badly ... allowing him to suffer such shame, he who has tried to serve you with all his might? ... You have given him poor reward. 25

It must have been to counter this that the Church developed the argument, which was repeated with increasing force throughout the period, that God only permitted defeat and disaster to punish the unworthy people who were his instruments. But although this resulted in some wretched participants being subjected to violent criticism, one wonders again how much effect it had outside ecclesiastical circles. 26

Other striking examples of the gulf that yawned between theologians and the laity and of the difficulties preachers had in bridging it can be found when one turns to right intention. Crusade preachers adapted the idea of Christian charity to the needs and beliefs of their audience in ways that made what resulted quite unlike what was taught by the theologians. It is very noticeable that love of neighbour was presented to the faithful entirely in terms of love of fellow-members of the Christian family and never in terms of love of enemy; partly, of course, because the public would not have found the concept of love of Muslim enemies comprehensible, and partly because the Church chose to present the crusade as a kind of vendetta or blood-feud, in which Christians avenged harm done to their father, their father's property and their brothers. 27 While it had been easy for St Augustine, moreover, with very restricted ideas on free-will and merit, to write about violence as he did, it was more difficult for the theologians of the central Middle Ages, in whose thought free-will and the salvific value of works played a large part. In 'Causa XXIII' Gratian agonised on the question whether the actions of someone coerced into behaving rightly benefited him in the eyes of God. 28 In the propaganda there was no trace of this concern, and free will and merit were blithely grafted on to Augustinian ideas as if no conflict between them existed; presumably the laity were not expected to have the discernment to worry about such nice contradictions. But, on the other hand, anxiety was revealed about one consequence of a belief in merit. For over a century after the issuing of the first indulgence to fighters against the Moors in Spain in 1063 the Roman curia tried to make up its mind on the meaning of the grants it had begun to make. The wording of papal encyclicals shows confusion, worry and vacillation, before the final decision, reached by Pope Alexander III, that an indulgence was a remission of the penalties for sin imposed in this world or the next by God. This was a case in which the laity led the way: it is clear that by 1095 ordinary Christians were already convinced that an indulgence wiped the slate clean, and in this way they were at least 85 years ahead of the curia. 29

The complicated relationships between theology, propaganda and the

public can be illustrated further by looking at the ideas on God's authority expressed during the First Crusade. It is impossible to establish exactly what Pope Urban II said in his famous sermon at Clermont. The four detailed accounts of it, although written by men who were probably present when it was delivered, were all composed years later, after the enterprise had succeeded, it seemed miraculously.³⁰ But it is likely that Urban made some remark to the effect that he was speaking on God's behalf, a claim taken up in the refrain 'God wills it' that became the battle-cry of the crusaders. A deed of mortgage to the monastery of Cluny drawn up five months later referred to the impending campaign as being 'on God's behalf',³¹ and a letter from Stephen of Blois, written as the main army crossed Asia Minor, described it as the 'army of God'.³²

In October 1097, as the crusade approached Antioch in Syria, a new idea was suddenly expressed, which suggests that the victories over the Turks in Asia Minor had confirmed for the crusaders that they were engaged in God's own war. Adh mar of Le Puy, the papal legate, and the Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem summarised in a despatch the successes so far and went on:

But how is this? We are few in comparison to the pagans.
Truly God fights for us.³³

This was taken up in the following January in a letter from the bishops in the army.

How one against a thousand? Where we have a count the enemy has forty kings; where we have a regiment the enemy has a legion; where we have a knight they have a duke; where we have a footsoldier they have a count; where we have a castle they have a kingdom. We do not trust in any multitude nor in men nor in any presumption but in the shield of Christ and justice, under the protection of George and Theodore and Demetrius and St Blaise, soldiers of Christ accompanying us.³⁴

With the capture of Antioch and Jerusalem and the defeats of great Muslim relieving forces the chorus swelled. 'We were so few.' 'God did marvels.' 'The right hand of God fought for us.' 'The earth fought for us.'³⁵ These phrases were uttered over and over again, and the new pope, Paschal II, added another dimension by writing of the way the success of the crusade had fulfilled the prophecies of scripture.

We see fulfilled in you what the Lord promised to his people through the prophet. 'I will live', he said, 'with them and I will walk with them'. He has lived through the faith in your hearts and he has walked with you in your works, as is clearly

to be seen in your defeat of his enemies. The Lord has certainly renewed his miracles of old. ³⁶

Constantly in the sources, and particularly in contemporary accounts of the crusade, one comes across expressions of wonder at the goodness and power of God and the conviction that success against all odds could only have been divinely ordained. For instance, in the history of Robert of Rheims, the most popular of those written at the time, the crusade was the work of God operating through his elect, the Franks, and, again, quite literally fulfilling the prophecies.

But after the creation of the world and except for the mystery of the salvific Cross, what more marvellous thing has occurred than in this pilgrimage of our men of Jerusalem in modern times? ... This was not human work, but divine ... For what king or prince could conquer so many cities and castles, fortified by nature, skill and human ingenuity, except for 'the blessed race' of the Franks, 'whose Lord is its God; the people whom he has chosen for his inheritance?'

When it pleased God, he led the Frankish people from the ends of the earth and by means of them wished to liberate Jerusalem from the unclean people. This was long ago prophesied by Isaiah when he said, 'I may bring your sons from afar ... The sons of pilgrims will build up your walls and their kings will minister to you'. These and many other things we find in the books of prophecy, which are relevant to this liberation done in our days. ³⁷

But to many in the crusading army the power of God revealed itself also in a stream of heavenly instructions delivered to visionaries. These visitations do not seem to have begun until the army was in Asia Minor, but after it had reached Antioch they came thick and fast, and one gets the impression that thereafter the actions of the army were greatly affected by orders transmitted by the inspired. Christ appeared in several visions. The most persistent visitor was St Andrew, and there are also to be found references to visions of Our Lady and SS Agatha, Demetrius, George, Giles, Mark, Mercury, Nicholas and Peter, together with crusaders who had already died, above all Adhémar of Le Puy, who seems to have been constantly appearing in the later stages of the campaign. These messengers came in dreams, but visitors from heaven could also take on physical forms in daylight: an army of angels, saints and dead crusaders, led by SS George, Demetrius and Mercury, was believed to have helped the Christian forces defeat the Muslims beneath the walls of Antioch on 28 June 1098, ³⁸ and Adhémar of Le Puy, who had been dead for nearly a year, was seen leading the crusaders over the walls

of Jerusalem on 15 July 1099.³⁹ High ecclesiastics reported having visions,⁴⁰ but the particularly inspired came from lower down the social scale, and were all from southern France: two priests called Stephen of Valence and Peter Desiderius and a poor layman called Peter Bartholomew. Peter Bartholomew reported a barrage of instructions from on high and seems to have enjoyed quite a dominant position in the army from June 1098 until April 1099, when he died after undergoing an ordeal by fire. He had offered to take this because of what seems to have been growing scepticism in the army,⁴¹ but Raymond of St Gilles, whose follower he had been, continued to believe in him even after his death: one of the most curious incidents on the crusade occurred after the capture of Jerusalem, when Raymond insisted on being ferried on a raft across the Jordan before going through a re-baptism, because months before St Andrew, through Peter Bartholomew, had ordered him to do so. No one in Raymond's company knew why he had to do this, but they carried out St Andrew's instructions to the letter.⁴²

The messages delivered to the visionaries covered a lot of matters, but above all relics and the liturgical and penitential practices demanded of the crusaders by God to placate him. Relics, of course, were believed to be powerful aids in battle; the most extraordinary of them was the Holy Lance, discovered on 14 June 1098 under the floor of the cathedral of Antioch on instructions passed to Peter Bartholomew by St Andrew.⁴³ But saints would also reproach those they visited for not picking up their relics at places passed through by the army; St George even appeared to identify certain relics as his own.⁴⁴ Instructions on liturgy and penance comprise by far the greatest number of messages, and in its later stages the crusade took the form of a massive penitential procession, while the crusaders fasted constantly and participated in elaborate ceremonies. A good example of this can be found towards the end, when the army was encamped outside Jerusalem and was apparently getting nowhere. Adhémar of Le Puy appeared to Peter Desiderius and ordered the army to fast and to process barefooted round the city. A great procession, led by priests in vestments carrying crosses, wound its way from Mt Sion to the church of St Stephen and on to the Mount of Olives, where a sermon was preached, and the church of St Mary of the Valley of Josaphat, almost completing a circuit of the walls and visiting all the holy places that lay just outside them.⁴⁵

The God revealed in the sources for the First Crusade was not only immanent and all-powerful. He was also a jealous God, who had to be placated regularly and he kept closely in touch with the crusaders by sending certain inspired spirits among them a stream of heavenly messengers. One might be tempted to see in this simply a reflection of the beliefs of everyone, from high ecclesiastic to ordinary layman. At least two bishops claimed to have had visions, and a belief in a world physically manipulated by a divine presence - and everyone accepted that - will have the consequence that

nothing can be certain or truly phenomenal. But in fact the sources also reveal quite widespread scepticism, especially among senior churchmen with regard to the discovery of the Holy Lance, which was only found after Peter Bartholomew had himself scrambled down into the trench dug in the floor of the cathedral of Antioch. Adh mar of Le Puy was sceptical, although the provenaux, who accompanied him in the Battle of Antioch, carried the Lance with them, which gave some contemporaries the impression that he had accepted it; later, as we shall see, the story was circulating Europe that he had been buried at the spot where the Lance had been found. At least one other Latin bishop was doubtful; so was Arnulf of Chocques, chaplain to the Duke of Normandy, papal legate and later first Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem. The Duke of Normandy was not happy; neither were Bohemond of Taranto, his nephew Tancred and the Count of Flanders.⁴⁶ Of the great men in the army only Raymond of St Gilles is known to have been strongly committed to the authenticity of the Lance; he took charge of it and his chaplain carried it into the Battle of Antioch.⁴⁷

There was, of course, little that the doubters could do in the face of the blind faith of the majority; and Bohemond, Robert of Normandy and Robert of Flanders joined Raymond of St Gilles and other leaders in writing a letter to the pope in which they announced Peter Bartholomew's visions and the finding of the Lance.⁴⁸ One can understand how the senior clergy who were present would have been reluctant to question too strongly something that had raised morale at a difficult time - when the Lance was discovered the army was in great danger - even though Adh mar seems to have expressed his doubts quite openly. But what is incredible is that no scepticism seems to have been voiced by senior clergy who were not personally involved with the day-to-day fortunes of the crusade. In October 1098 the clergy and people of Lucca, a town which supported Church reform, transmitted, for the widest possible circulation to bishops throughout the Church, the account of one of the citizens, who had just returned from the East, in which the appearance of St Andrew, the discovery of the Lance and the participation of the heavenly host at the Battle of Antioch were reported in detail.⁴⁹ In September 1099, six months after Peter Bartholomew had failed the ordeal by fire, Archbishop Daimbert of Pisa, who had met the secular leaders of the crusade on their way home, joined them in writing a letter to the pope, in which the Lance, as a potent relic carried into battle, was still given credit for the victory of Antioch.⁵⁰ And in April 1100 the pope himself referred to the discovery of the Lance as one of the miracles that had for him marked the course of the crusade.⁵¹ Later, when the narratives of the crusade came to be written, the discovery of the Lance became in nearly all of them a climax and only two of the authors were sceptical.⁵² The attitude of two others, who had not been on the crusade, is instructive. Baldric, Abbot of Bourgueil and then Archbishop of Dol, was a scholar and quite a prolific writer.⁵³ Guibert of Nogent was one of the more remarkable and learned men of his

time⁵⁴ and he openly expressed reservations about the lengths to which the cult of relics had gone: in his 'De pignoribus sanctorum' he refused to accept the authenticity of relics like the tooth or the umbilical cord of Our Lord, since veneration of these suggested a denial of the Resurrection and debased the importance of the Real Presence in the Eucharist; and he was scathing about the duplication of relics - two heads of St John the Baptist, two bodies of St Firminus - and about what he believed was the creation of relics to please benefactors, like the body of St Exuperius which was, he maintained, a peasant's corpse disinterred to impress Bishop Odo of Bayeux.⁵⁵ Yet Baldric described the visions of Peter Bartholomew and the discovery of the Lance without one note of criticism.⁵⁶ And Guibert, in quite a critical narrative of the crusade, in which he repeated some of the arguments he had used in 'De Pignoribus' and refused to take on trust some of the more incredible details in earlier accounts, maintained that the Lance was authentic because of Adhémar of Le Puy's acceptance of it. I have already pointed out that Adhémar was in fact openly sceptical, but Guibert had read that the Lance had been carried into the Battle of Antioch by the bishop's company and he had also heard that Adhémar had been buried in the trench in the floor of the cathedral of Antioch in which the Lance had been found. This story must have been circulating at the time, but there is no confirmation of it in eye-witness accounts. Guibert apparently found no difficulty in accepting it; it is probable that he wanted to believe it.⁵⁷ A dubious series of incidents, which had worried senior clergy and some of the secular leaders present, the prime mover of which had miserably failed the ordeal, was elaborated in propaganda and later accounts, even by responsible churchmen, so that it became enshrined as a miracle of God, not only in popular imagination but also in the highest levels in the Church.

The reactions to visions and to the discovery of the Lance reveal how complicated were the relationships between theology, propaganda and public opinion, for the publicists, and among them the senior clergy, did not only modify theology for popular consumption; they themselves were influenced by the public they were addressing. It has been suggested that vernacular literature reflected the crusading ideas expressed by popes,⁵⁸ but scholars have never considered how far the popes came under the spell of popular ideas that found expression in vernacular literature. It is, in fact, clear that the traffic was two-way. And so a researcher in this subject has to keep track of three winding roads, the central one of which is linked to those on either side of it by many little paths. These roads follow the views of the intellectuals, a subject for students of medieval theology; popular opinions, which have been examined mostly by those interested in medieval literature; and the statements of popes and preachers, mediating between the other two, reflecting sometimes one set of beliefs and assumptions, sometimes the other.

JONATHAN RILEY-SMITH
ROYAL HOLLOWAY COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

NOTES

1. See J.S.C. Riley-Smith, What Were the Crusades?, London 1977, pp.15-17; J.S.C. Riley-Smith, 'Crusading as an act of love', to appear in History, 65, 1980.
2. C. Erdmann, The Origin of the Idea of Crusade, tr. M.W. Baldwin and W. Goffart, Princeton 1977, pp.12-57; H.E.J. Cowdrey, 'The Genesis of the Crusades', in The Holy War, ed. T.P. Murphy, Columbus 1976, pp.17-21.
3. A. Stickler, 'Il potere coattivo materiale della Chiesa nella riforma gregoriana, secondo Anselmo da Lucca', Studi gregoriani, 2, 1947, 235-85.
4. MGH, Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum, 1, 519-28.
5. See I.S. Robinson, 'Gregory VII and the Soldiers of Christ', History, 58, 1973, 185-6.
6. PL 161, cols. 689-746, 1303-18.
7. See P. Boissonade, Du nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland, Paris 1923, pp.291-2; P. Rousset, Les origines et les caractères de la première croisade, Neuchâtel 1945, pp.110-33.
8. Orderic Vitalis, Historia Ecclesiastica, ed. M. Chibnall, Vol.3, Oxford 1972, 216. See I.S. Robinson, Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest, Manchester 1978, pp.100-3.
9. 'Decretum', ed. E. Friedberg, Corpus iuris canonici, 1, Leipzig 1879, cols. 889-965.
10. PL 192, cols. 812-19.
11. Especially in 'Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem', Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P.M. edita, 41, Rome 1970, 146-8. See F.H. Russell, The Just War in the Middle Ages, Cambridge 1975, pp.258-91.
12. Riley-Smith, What Were the Crusades?, pp.18-33; M. Villey, 'L'idée de croisade chez les juristes du moyen âge', Relazioni del X congresso internazionale di scienze storiche: III, Storia del medio evo, Florence 1955, pp.568-81.

13. Hostiensis, Summa Aurea, Venice 1570, fol. 296b-297a; Humbert of Romans, 'Opus tripartitum', ed. E. Brown, Fasciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum, 2, London 1690, 190-8.
14. Innocent III, Opera omnia, PL 214, cols. 739-40.
15. Eugenius III, Epistolae et Privilegia, PL 180, cols. 1203-4; Bernard of Clairvaux, Epistolae, PL 182, col. 652.
16. R. Folz, Études sur le Culte liturgique de Charlemagne dans les églises de l'Empire, Paris 1951, pp.122-3.
17. Innocent III, Opera, PL 216, col. 117.
18. Henry of Livonia, 'Chronicon Lyvoniae', MGH SS, 23, 293.
19. Bernard of Clairvaux, 'De consideratione', Opera, ed. J. Leclercq et al, 3, Rome 1963, 411.
20. Innocent III, Opera, PL 216, col. 703.
21. Ibid., PL 214, cols. 809-10; and see PL 215, col. 1500; Innocent III, Quia maior, ed. G. Tangl, Studien zum Register Innocenz' III, Weimar 1929, pp.89-90.
22. James of Vitry, 'Sermones vulgares', ed. J.B. Pitra, Analecta novissima, 2, Paris 1888, 422. See Erdmann, op.cit., pp.201-10; Robinson, art. cit., pp.177-84.
23. Gesta Francorum, ed. R. Hill, London 1962, p.64.
24. Monk of Montaudan, Les poesies, ed. M.J. Routledge, Montpellier 1977, p.106.
25. Austorc d'Aurillac, 'Sirvantés', ed. A. Jeanroy, Romanische Forschungen, 23, 1907, 83-4.
26. See J.S.C. Riley-Smith, 'Peace never established: the case of the Kingdom of Jerusalem', TRHS 5th ser., 28, 1978, 96-9.
27. Riley-Smith, 'Crusading as an act of love', passim.
28. 'Decretum', C.23, q.6, c.4 d.p.c. (cols. 949-50).

READING MEDIEVAL STUDIES

29. Riley-Smith, What Were the Crusades?, pp.57-62. See H.E. Mayer, The Crusades, Oxford 1972, pp.33-6.
30. Fulcher of Chartres, Historia Hierosolymitana, ed. H. Hagenmeyer, Heidelberg 1913, pp.132-8; Baldric of Bourgueil, 'Historia Jerosolimitana', RHC Oc., 4, 12-16; Robert of Rheims, 'Historia Iherosolimitana', RHC Oc., 3, 727-30; Guibert of Nogent, 'Gesta Dei per Francos', RHC Oc., 4, 137-40.
31. A. Bernard and A. Bruel, Chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny, 5, Paris 1894, 51.
32. H. Hagenmeyer, Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100, Innsbruck 1901, p.138.
33. Ibid., p.142.
34. Ibid., p.147.
35. For example, ibid., pp.168-74.
36. Ibid., p.178.
37. Robert of Rheims, pp.723, 882.
38. See S. Runciman, A History of the Crusades, 1, Cambridge 1951, 248.
39. Raymond of Aguilers, Liber, ed. J.H. and L.L. Hill, Paris 1969, p.151.
40. Hagenmeyer, op. cit., p.142; Raymond of Aguilers, pp.89-90, 119.
41. Raymond of Aguilers, pp.120-4; Fulcher of Chartres, pp.238-41; Ralph of Caen, 'Gesta Tancredi', RHC Oc., 3, 682. Raymond of Aguilers (passim) gave the most detailed account of the visions, but two of them were referred to in all the eye-witness accounts.
42. Raymond of Aguilers, pp.71, 153. See Fulcher of Chartres, p.241; Ralph of Caen, p.682.
43. See Runciman, op. cit., pp.241-6.
44. Raymond of Aguilers, pp. 90-1, 133-4.

READING MEDIEVAL STUDIES

45. Raymond of Aguilers, pp.143-4. For the procession, see especially Peter Tudebode, Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere, ed. J.H. and L.L. Hill, Paris 1977, pp.137-8.
46. Raymond of Aguilers, pp.84-6, 116-7, 119-20, 123-4, 127-8; Fulcher of Chartres, pp.235-41; Ralph of Caen, p.678. For the Lance at the Battle of Antioch, see Raymond of Aguilers, pp.81-2; Hagenmeyer, Kreuzzugsbriefe, p.167; Gesta Francorum, p.68; Peter Tudebode, p.110.
47. Raymond of Aguilers, pp.69, 71, 75, 81-2, 88; Fulcher of Chartres, pp.237-8, 241; Ralph of Caen, pp.677-8, 682-3.
48. Hagenmeyer, Kreuzzugsbriefe, p.163.
49. Ibid., pp.165-7.
50. Ibid., pp.169-70.
51. Ibid., p.178.
52. Fulcher of Chartres, pp.235-41; Ralph of Caen, pp.676-8, 682-3.
53. RHC Oc., 4, iii-vi.
54. RHC Oc., 4, xv-xvi.
55. PL 156, cols. 607-80.
56. Baldric of Bourgueil, pp.67-8, 73-4.
57. Guibert of Nogent, 'Gesta', pp.196-7, 203, 217-8, 252; and see pp.132-3, 251-2.
58. F.-W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert, Kreuzzugsdichtung des Mittelalters, Berlin 1960, p.325.