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Abstract

From beginning to end, the Knights Templar were a mysterious order. Little is known of their origins, and most of their records were destroyed during the suppression in the fourteenth century. In addition, they combined seemingly incompatible objectives: warriors and monks, as well as laity and clergy. This study bridges those divides, providing the historical developments from a secular and religious context. To understand the Templars’ foundation, it needs to be based on a premise that combines the ideologies of the priestly and knightly classes—salvation and the means to attain it. The conclusions were drawn following a multi-disciplinary approach. The primary source materials included the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, patristic authors, medieval literature, canon law, the Templars’ rules, in addition to monastic cartularies and chronicles. The secondary sources were a similar collection from various disciplines. The approach allowed for the examination of the Templars from multiple angles, which helped to highlight their diversified origins. The Knights Templar were the product of a long evolution beginning with the Pauline imagery of the Christian as a soldier battling his/her own spiritual demons and continuing through the call for a crusade to defend the Patrimony of Christ. Throughout those centuries two fundamental questions persisted: how do we save souls and how can I be saved?
Introduction

Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153) heaped high praise on the Knights Templar in their infancy: “It seems that a new knighthood has recently appeared on the earth … It ceaselessly wages a twofold war both against flesh and blood and against a spiritual army of evil in the heavens.”¹ Two hundred years later the Templars were vilified as “wolves in sheep’s clothing, in the habit of a religious order vilely insulting our religious faith, are again crucifying our Lord in these days.”² The meteoric rise of the Poor Fellow-Soldiers of Christ and the Temple of Solomon (more commonly known as the Knights Templar) and their equally swift fall has fueled fanciful tales and scholarly research. The order promoted their mythological origins and the extreme charges leveled against them by Philip IV of France (1285-1314) created an atmosphere of speculation. As such, their origins are shrouded in myth and greater attention has focused on their rise to power and their ignominious end. Given the scant evidence, scholars have accepted the medieval chronicles’ assessment of the Templars’ original mission as having been the protection of pilgrims to the Holy Land.³ The question of their purpose may be settled, but not the rationale for their existence. The Templars were the manifestation of clerical and knightly ideals for the proper ordering of war and the salvation of people.

¹ Bernard of Clairvaux, De Laude Novae Militiae 1.

² Philip IV, “Order to Arrest the Templars (September 14, 1307).”

The Knights Templar and the idea of warrior-monks in general is an enigma. Even if one does not believe that Christianity is a nonviolent religion, the idea that monks are peaceable is ingrained in the concept of a Christian monk—one who leaves the world to focus solely on prayer to God. In the early medieval period, it was to monasteries, among other places, that the Vikings set their sails because they were less defended and provided rich plunder. So the question arises as to how this phenomenon was created. A holistic approach is necessary, one that combines the aspirations of the Church and the concerns of secular society. The Templars were a new type of religious life. They inhabited the world of the warrior and the monk. To approach the topic as solely an ecclesial movement, which is the paradigm of scholars, instead of a combination of secular and ecclesial movements will fail to appreciate the complexity of these lay-clerics. It is only by viewing the interlocking needs of the secular and ecclesial realms that an authentic understanding can be achieved for the rise of the monks who fought for Christ.

As Christianity grew into the dominant religion of the Roman Empire, it needed to reconcile the Scriptural prohibitions against violence and the need to defend its patron, Rome. Ambrose of Milan (c.340-397CE) and Augustine of Hippo (354-430CE) built on Cicero’s (106-43BCE) classical understanding of bellum iustum (just war theory). They provided a theological framework, which established a strictly regulated defensive war. Despite the chaotic world in which they lived, Ambrose and Augustine saw their system as the means to reestablish the Pax Romana under the headship of Jesus Christ and His emperor. During the imperial period, Ambrose and John Chrysostom (c. 347-407CE)

---

4 The prominent scholars in the field who advocate the religious approach are Malcolm Barber and Jonathan Riley-Smith.
began to redefine defense in terms of ensuring orthodoxy, orthopraxis, and the security of Christians against any injury inflicted by pagans. The new paradigm allowed for militant Christianity to use force. The Church’s way was correct and the end justified the means when the salvation of souls was at stake.

The collapse of the Western Empire obfuscated the original intent of bellum justum and the Church sought a new relationship with the Germanic leaders. Violence became a regular feature of the Early Middle Ages, as petty warlords vied with one another for territory and power as well as their inability to defend Europe from outside invasions. The rampant blood lust was a concern not only to clerics, but to secular leaders as well. The religious leaders’ control over salvation allowed them to begin developing a theological underpinning to ease Christian-on-Christian violence. In the late-tenth century, they proposed the Pax Dei (Peace of God) and Treuga Dei (Truce of God), which sought to limit the places and times for war. They also created a distinction between knights that fought for justice and order (militia) and those who did not (malitia). The princes, who were concerned to create more stable principalities, also accepted the latter idea. Nevertheless, clashes between the ecclesial and secular rulers who were attempting to centralize their power ensued. The Investiture Controversy is the most famous example of this division. The struggle between Emperor Henry IV (1056-1105) and Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085) was the catalyst solidifying the theological rationale for knightly aid to the Church. In defense of his position, Pope Gregory VII called on the milites Petri (knights of St. Peter) to fight tyranny under the direction of the papacy.
Medieval Europe was fraught with violence and warriors were valued for providing a semblance of order and stability. The bellatores (knightly-class), therefore, provided an essential function in society—protection. The knights’ role ensured that they were constantly surrounded by combat or the preparations for combat. Because of their regular involvement in martial activities a stigma of sinfulness surrounded them, which necessitated forgiveness if they wanted to spend eternity in heaven. As the struggle for power between the princes and bishops waged, knights were less inclined to be subservient to clerics even within the spiritual realm. They sought alternative means to purification, preferably ones controlled by the bellatores. The oratores (priestly-class) were not immune to the power struggles that were waging, but they were also concerned with the growing violence. The sanctity of holy seasons and places were violated, the disorder disrupted the Church’s ability to perform its mission, and Christians were killing fellow Christians. To the pastorally inclined cleric, Christendom was destroying itself. The Knights Templar, at least in the foundational period, provided an avenue in which the lay desire for salvation was met and the destructive nature of war was redirected. The eleventh century provided the perfect catalyst for a new form of religious life.

The Knights Templar’s origins appear to be simple. However, they cultivated their own hagiographic mythology surrounding their origins. A group of knights, who had either participated in the First Crusade (1096-99) or arrived shortly thereafter, observed the need to protect pilgrims. Pilgrims arrived at the port city of Joppa and were regularly harassed, robbed, or killed on their inland voyage to Jerusalem. The early Templars decided, therefore, to band together to protect the pilgrims as they travelled to Jerusalem and other sites holy to Christians and, as they saw it, perform the pious actions of a
corporal work of mercy. It was to be their way of cooperating with God’s grace, i.e. salvation. Naturally an armed group of knights were not to be left to their own devices and quickly both the Latin Patriarchs of Jerusalem and the King of Jerusalem, Baldwin II (1118-1131), worked to regularize their status—requesting formal approval at a Church Council in 1129.

The Templars were a different type of institution, which helped to spawn similar groups known generally as military orders. They were a fully recognized religious order, exempt from the control of the local civil and religious leaders—answerable only to their Grand Master and the papacy. At the same time, they were not a traditional clerical order that was controlled by ordained men. A two-prong approach will be necessary to understand their creation. In the medieval worldview, where the sacred and profane intermixed on a regular basis, the Knights Templar presented a new way to combine the two spheres. Laymen controlled the pathway to salvation and the Church directed its action. It failed, not because of a flawed cooperation, but as a result of outside forces and greed.

As noted earlier, the scholars of Templar history have had little material on which to proceed. Malcolm Barber, the preeminent, modern scholar on the Templars, has been able to provide additional material to the hagiographic tradition. In *The New Knighthood*, he identified two societal trends, which ushered in military orders. The first was the reforming movements led by the papacy. The Gregorian reforms had a ripple effect on secular society too, leading people to pious action. The second was the Church’s
advocacy of the peace movements and the redirection of martial energies to the crusades.\(^5\) Barber’s earlier article, “The Social Context of the Templars,” went further into depth on the two trends. He argued that the original Templars wanted to direct their piety into a quasi-monastic life. A life devoted to poverty, chastity, obedience, but channeled through Gregory VII’s call for a *miles Christi* (knights of Christ). Barber declared, “the emergence of the Order should therefore be seen as an important expression of the ideology of knighthood which the Church had been vigorously promoting.”\(^6\) He excludes other significant influences in the Templar’s development.

Barber points to Hugh Peccator’s letter to the Templars (c.1128) and Bernard of Clairvaux’s *De Laude Novae Militia* (c.1135) as significant evidence of his position. He posited the letter to have been meant for Templars to the exclusion of the public, whereas *De Laude* was for increasing awareness and prestige. On the surface, they fulfilled the dual purpose of retention and reinforcing the Templars as a model of the Church’s knighthood.\(^7\) The private/public dichotomy only distorts the image because it relegates Bernard to propaganda and discounts independent, lay expressions as a means to attract recruits. Two potential avenues for exploring secular concerns were mentioned but directed toward his hypothesis. The Templars provided a means for former *malitia* to be saved by force of arms.\(^8\) Instead of directing it toward personal desire and the maintenance of the knightly way of life, he attributed it to a medieval understanding of


charity–conversion by the sword. Another example was the similarities between the
investiture ceremony of a Templar and the dubbing of a secular knight. Barber allocated
the symbolism as a usurpation of knightly ways to sacred ends, instead of a connection
with their former way of life. In the end, Malcolm Barber provides a picture of the
Templars in which they are a means by which the Church controlled warrior society.

Jonathan Riley-Smith’s most recent work, *Templars and Hospitallers as Professed
Religious in the Holy Lands*, also credits the formation of the military orders to
ecclesiastical prerogatives. Riley-Smith’s emphasis was not on the Templars’ origins but
their perception as an order to the outside world. He wanted to know why the Templars
failed. His answer was lack of diversification in apostolates. They were warriors and
when *Outremer* was lost they ceased to have a legitimate purpose. As a military
institution, Riley-Smith regarded them as the Church’s alternative to secular orders of
chivalry. Their origins were the result of capable soldiers, who desired to live a religious
life–seen as no different than new recruits for the Cistercians or Premonstratensians.

Riley-Smith observed that the Templar Rule, Hugh Peccator’s letter, and *De Laude*
described the Templars as the “antithesis of chivalry” and squarely positioned “Templar
knighthood … in monastic history.” They were monks whose apostolate was simply
justified because of the needs of *Outremer*’s rulers.

Few contemporary sources relate to the origin of the Templars. There are passing
notices of Hugh de Payns (c.1070-1136), the first Grand Master, as a witness in charters

---


10 Jonathan Riley-Smith, *Templars and Hospitallers as Professed Religious in the Holy Land*
(Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010), 60.

11 Riley-Smith, *Templars and Hospitallers*, 12.
and early benefices given to the order. And chronicle evidence concerning the Templars’ origin is insignificant until a generation following their creation. The papal exemptions *Omne datum optimum* (1139), *Milites templi* (1144), *Militia dei* (1145), as well as, Bernard of Clairvaux’s *De Laude* and Hugh the Sinner’s letter to the Templars provide some of the religious motivation. The rule, however, remains vital. The work done by Judi Upton-Ward and Simonetta Cerrini has been the most influential on the study of the Templar Rule since the production of critical editions by Henri de Curzon in 1886 and Gustav Schnürer in 1908.

Cerrini and Upton-Ward have established that the French Rule is an adaptation of an earlier, so called Primitive Rule, which may have been the direct work of the Council of Troyes. Upton-Ward believes that the rule received significant additions when translated into French during the Grand Mastership of Robert de Craon (1136-1149). The substance of the changes help to understand how the Templars viewed themselves and what they saw as important to their daily lives.

Simonetta Cerrini’s *magnum opus*, *La Révolution des Templiers*, is currently only available in French, but she analyzes the nine extant manuscripts that contain the Templar Rule. She focuses not on the rule alone. The other documents in each manuscript also provide important information on the ideals and lived expressions of Templar values. Her research helped to uncover Templar beliefs, such as the power of redemption through perseverance in suffering, the importance of balancing asceticism with their military

---


activities, and their unusual emphasis on toleration, which was evidenced by openness to Islam and non-traditional liturgical practices.¹⁴

Though not directly involved in historical research on the Knights Templar, Richard Kaeuper’s work has opened new possibilities for research. His work has focused on understanding knighthood, particularly its devotion to faith and salvation. Traditional medieval studies neatly divide the social world into clerics, knights, and peasants. The clerics and peasants were seen as the people most concerned with salvation. Yet, Kaeuper argues that knights were deeply concerned with their souls. His novel, but convincing, use of Romance literature places new emphasis on other fictional texts. The knights did not necessarily write literature, yet in their acceptance or rejection of a work they dictated the message within it. Literature, therefore, provides a new lens through which to understand the hopes, aspirations, and ideas of the knightly class.

Chapter 1

The Development of Just War and Militant Christianity

The Christian Scriptures contain contradictory statements on peace and war. The Hebrew Scriptures contain the great stories of the Conquest of Canaan and the battles for liberation against the Seleucids and other empires. At the same time there are scenes where violence is averted–Moses assuaging YHWH on Mount Sinai or the Prophet Jonah preaching Nineveh into repentance. Similar events occur as well in the New Testament. Despite the contradiction, the popular consensus remains that Christianity is a peaceful religion. The reality, however, is not always so clear. Christianity understood itself within its contemporary time and adjusted. The basis was their understanding of Christ, later supplemented with the Scriptural tradition, but always rooted in time.

The early Christian Church tended toward pacifism, exemplified by its lack of aggression toward their persecutors, but no formal dogma existed. As the persecutions receded and Christianity received imperial favor, Christians began to see military action in a positive way because it achieved a spiritual good–the preservation of peace and order, as well as orthodoxy. Despite the necessity for defending the new Christian-Roman Empire, the seeming incompatibility between the violence necessary to defend the empire and Christianity remained. Therefore, Christian apologists and theologican created detailed precepts to define bellum iustum, both the circumstances in which a war may be waged (ius ad bellum) and the way a war is conducted (ius in bello).

15 On the Conquest of Canaan see the Book of Joshua, and 1 and 2 Maccabees for the war against the Seleucids.

16 Exodus 32:7-14; Jonah 3:1-10 (New American Bible). All quotations and references will be taken from the New American Bible.
For guidance in understanding the role Christians were to have in violent activities, they turned to the foundational documents of Christianity, i.e. Scripture. The Christian canon was not established until the fourth century; nevertheless, many principal texts such as the canonical Gospels, Letters of Paul, and the Hebrew Scriptures—in the Septuagint form—were generally understood to be edifying to their readers. As their name implies, Christians sought to imitate Jesus of Nazareth’s example; and the Gospels, in addition to oral tradition, provided the framework. The general portrayal of Jesus in those texts was as a pacifist. The Beatitudes found in the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plains are considered the quintessential synthesis of Jesus’ teaching. In them, He preached on the virtues of meekness, mercy, and peacemaking, which are far removed from a call-to-arms. The Matthean and Lucan sermons continue by explicitly stating how a follower of Jesus should respond to an act of physical violence: “But I say to you, offer no resistance to one who is evil. When someone strikes you on your right cheek, turn the other one to him as well.” Jesus presented a new way and anathematized the dictate of just retaliation dating back to the code of Hammurabi.

In addition to the sermons, the lived experience of Jesus in the canonical texts also showed a desire to not engage in violent activity. The Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John all coincide in Jesus’ reaction to Simon-Peter’s attack on the slave of the High Priest. Jesus of Nazareth, who condemned the violence, ordered Peter to sheath his

18 Matthew 5:39.
19 One of the famous dictates in the Code of Hammurabi (c. 1772BCE) was canon 196, which legislated the removal of an eye from the individual who had caused the loss of another person’s eye. The principle of lex talionis is found in the Hebrew Scriptures too, see Levitivus 24:19-21; Exodus 21:22-25; Deuteronomy 19:16-21.
sword; He then went peacefully into custody.\(^{20}\) The examples of pacifism abound, but another example helps to illustrate that the canonical Jesus refused violence even when it could prove His authority and defend His teachings. The Gospel of Luke recounts a story of Jesus’ travel to Jerusalem in preparation for the crucifixion. He was preparing to arrive in a Samaritan town and was refused hospitality. The disciples who were present with him (James and John) wanted to “call down fire from heaven to consume them” for the Samaritan village’s slight to Jesus, and instead of sanctioning the action, He rebuked the disciples.\(^{21}\) This phrase by the disciples is an allusion to the Prophet Elijah’s action in 2 Kings 1:9-12, when he commanded fire from heaven to destroy the warriors of King Ahaziah who had forsaken YHWH for the god Baalzebub. In fact, some manuscripts highlight the connection between the two incidents by inserting the phrase “as Elijah did” to James and John’s plea.\(^{22}\) The connection of a miraculous event between Elijah and Jesus would have solidified Jesus’ message as having come from YHWH, and as such, irrefutable by the contemporary Jewish authorities. Yet, the canonical accounts imply that Jesus had a different way to prove His message and authority—crucifixion and resurrection. The surrender, humiliation, and defeat of Jesus stands in stark contrast to Constantine’s vision: \textit{in hoc signo vinces}.

Despite the overwhelming emphasis on non-aggression by Jesus, there is one incident that stands as an anomalous contradiction to utter pacifism. All the canonical Gospels recount the Cleansing of the Temple in strikingly similar ways. Jesus visited the


Jerusalem temple and was incensed when He encountered the moneychangers and the merchants selling animals for sacrifice. Though there are variations on the particular means by which He drove them from the temple precinct–whipping, overturning tables, or disrupting their business–it is evident that Jesus was angry about the situation and chose to use a violent method to achieve His aim. In each of the accounts, His rationale is stated either by a direct quotation or allusion to the prophecy of Isaiah. Though Jesus does not use capital force to achieve His goal, a precedent was established–a holy objective could be attained through physical violence.

It is surprising that Isaiah’s prophecy is used as the rationale for Jesus’ action. The patristic authors had an affinity for Isaiah, most notably Justin Martyr (c. 100-165), Irenaeus of Lyons (died c. 200), and Clement of Alexandria (c. 150-215). They created a direct connection between Isaiah’s prophecy and Jesus of Nazareth. He was the fulfillment of Isaiah 53:

He was spurned and avoided by men, a man of suffering, accustomed to infirmity, one of those from whom men hide their faces, spurned, and we held him in no esteem. Yet it was our infirmities he bore, our sufferings that he endured, while we thought of him as stricken, as one smitten by God and afflicted. But he was pierced for our offenses, crushed for our sins, upon him was the chastisement that makes us whole, by his stripes we were healed … Though he was harshly treated, he submitted and opened not his mouth; like a lamb led to the slaughter or a sheep before


24 Isaiah 56:7. Isaiah spoke of the temple in Jerusalem as being a place where all people, including the Gentiles, came to pray to YHWH. The Christian text adds that the prophecy was hindered because of the actions of the money-changers.

the shearsers, he was silent and opened not his mouth. ... [T]hrough his suffering, my servant shall justify many, and their guilt he shall bear.\textsuperscript{26}

Even within the context of the Hebrew Scriptures this passage was a prophecy of the expected messiah. The early Christians understood Jesus to have been the messiah; and they interpreted His experiences in the Garden of Gethsemane, the trial before Pilate, and the crucifixion as fulfilling Isaiah.

As noted earlier, the Christian scriptures were only beginning to be assembled during the first generation of Christianity and not completed until the fourth century. When the followers of Jesus thought about scripture, it was the \textit{Septuagint} that was their reference point.\textsuperscript{27} A prominent motif in the \textit{Septuagint} is the power of YHWH to fulfill the Covenant made with the Chosen People, often employing warfare against Israel’s enemies. Pertinent examples are: the explicit reference to YHWH as a warrior in the Song of Moses after the destruction of the Egyptian army and the conquest of Canaan by the direct intervention of YHWH.\textsuperscript{28}

A notable precedent is related in the First Book of Maccabees. First and Second Maccabees belong to a group of texts known as deuterocanonical. The deuterocanonical texts are not considered a part of the Hebrew Scriptures though they were contained in the Greek \textit{Septuagint}; therefore, the early Christians considered these texts as scriptural. The books recount the Jewish revolt against the Seleucid Empire (c.167-

\textsuperscript{26} Isaiah 53:3-11.

\textsuperscript{27} Veselin Kesich, \textit{Formation and Struggles: The Birth of the Church, AD33-200} (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2007), 135-137. In addition, as Christianity flourished, it did so primarily among Gentiles who did not have a facility with Hebrew. In order for them to read the Hebraic Scriptures they turned to a Koine Greek translation commissioned in the third century BCE. For more information on the development of the Sepuagint (LXX), see Karen Jones and Moisés Silva, \textit{Invitation to the Septuagint} (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000).

\textsuperscript{28} Exodus 15:3; Joshua 6:1-12:24.
160BCE) and the subsequent Hasmonaean-rule over Judaea. As related in 1Maccabees, shortly after the revolt began, the Seleucid garrison stationed in Jerusalem massacred a group of rebels because they refused to defend, or even present, themselves on the Sabbath. Upon hearing of the deaths of their compatriots and coreligionists, the Maccabean leadership decided that defense was permissible on the Sabbath—not a violation of the Decalogue—and were confirmed in their interpretation by the addition of Hasidic Jews to their cause.\textsuperscript{29} As with the cleansing of the temple by Jesus, the principle aim was the preservation of religious observance that was threatened by King Antiochus IV’s decrees. A single law may be broken in a particular instance, in order to preserve the totality of the Torah.

The lack of direction evident in the scriptural texts continued in the writings of the persecuted church. The predominant, non-violent model of the New Testament was the prevailing praxis for the early Christians however. The New Testament employed martial imagery, but repurposed to a spiritual battle. Whether wrapped in a cloak of battling demons or barbarians, fighting on behalf of God remained in the Christian consciousness. It was not a stretch to move from attacking the spiritual representative of the devil to a physical representative in the fourth century.

In the \textit{Second Apology}, Justin Martyr explained the origin of war and all other vices. For him war was not from God, but the machinations of demons that implanted it into humanity.\textsuperscript{30} Tatian (c. 120-180) took Greco-Roman mythology at its word and conceded that wars were undertaken upon the advice of the god Apollo, who in the

\textsuperscript{29} 1Maccabees 2:31-48.

\textsuperscript{30} Justin Martyr, \textit{Second Apology} 5.
Christian mindset was a demon.\textsuperscript{31} Soldiers, therefore, did the bidding of demons. One of the actions closely associated with soldiers, and therefore their demon masters, was the persecution of Christians. Mob violence, public opinion, and official imperial policy played a significant role in the continued brutal violence inflicted on Christians, but it was the soldier, in his duty with police-actions, that was fixed in the Christian mind as the enemy. The soldiers were the ones who arrested Polycarp, lit the fire under Antipas of Pergamum, beat and slew the Apostle Thomas, hammered the nails into Pionios in Smyrna, and mistreated Dionysius of Alexandria as well as Cyprian of Carthage.\textsuperscript{32} As such, the Patristic authors needed to explain why these atrocities happened and give hope to those suffering.

Tertullian (c. 160-220), who held both heretical and orthodox Christian beliefs, provided an underlying rationale for why war cannot come from God. He turned to the example of Jesus of Nazareth’s rebuke to Peter’s attack on Malchus—in this incident he sees a universal principle. The censure by Jesus was a condemnation, not of Peter’s imprudent action alone, but “He cursed for the time to come the works of the sword.”\textsuperscript{33} In Tertullian’s theological construct it is impossible, therefore, for God to will war or violence. As noted above, the only solution to the author of war was Satan. Though the nuanced arguments concerning free will were not yet made, it was individuals committing sin (the desire of the devil) that brought war.

\textsuperscript{31} Tatian, \textit{Oratio ad Graecos} 19.


\textsuperscript{33} Tertullian, \textit{De Patientia} 3.
Hippolytus of Rome (c. 170-235) noted the sinful nature of the warrior occupation as one forbidden to Christians. The three objectionable practices he listed as incompatible with Christianity were the execution of people, the military oath (i.e. cult of the emperor), and the purple dress of the military governors and civil magistrates.\footnote{Hippolytus of Rome, \textit{The Apostolic Tradition} 2.16.17-19.} Roman law and custom reserved the wearing of purple for those in high positions, those who represented either the Roman senate or the Roman emperor. Christian belief forbade Christians from wearing purple, as well. Though it was not because of the color itself, but because the pursuit of it indicated avarice, envy, and pride. In addition, to have been a military governor or civil magistrate meant that it was on his orders that executions and persecutions occurred. It is not surprising then that Hippolytus went further and declared that any Christian or catechumen who sought out such a position should be excommunicated “for he has despised God.”\footnote{Hippolytus of Rome, \textit{The Apostolic Tradition} 2.16.17-19.} In \textit{De Corona}, Tertullian offered similar sentiments. He was more explicit in directly tying the actions of soldiers with the persecution of Christians themselves, accusing soldiers of, among other things, protecting the devil they swore to reject and resting on the spear that pierced Jesus’ side at the crucifixion.\footnote{Tertullian, \textit{De Corona} 11.}

Other patristic authors extrapolated the sinful qualities of military life and war. War was presented as an escalating consequence of other sinful actions. In the \textit{Clementine Homilies} (c. 100-300), the author employed a series of rhetorical questions, one of which explained war as the consequence of lust. For the homilist, Greco-Roman

\footnote{Hippolytus of Rome, \textit{The Apostolic Tradition} 2.16.17-19.}
\footnote{Hippolytus of Rome, \textit{The Apostolic Tradition} 2.16.17-19.}
\footnote{Tertullian, \textit{De Corona} 11.}
mythology provided bad moral examples. The homily did not mention or imply specific myths; nevertheless, the Trojan War may be such an example of a war waged on lust. Paris’ desire for Helen and Menelaus’ desire to retrieve her led to the fall of a civilization by war. Tertullian continued his attack on soldiers when he described their motivations to be based on greed. When Gregory Thaumaturgus (c. 213-270) reminisced upon Origen’s (c. 184-253) teachings, he mentioned an example having been made of the soldiers who were vain in addition to greedy. The vitriol climaxed when soldiers were accused of being the lawlessness they were supposed to prevent—“who are stained in battle and have shed the blood of hundreds without justice.” The soldiers, in the patristic authors’ opinion, had allowed their passions/sins to devolve. Hippolytus equated them no better than beasts that treated others, both Christians and non-Christians, as animals too.

The soldier was the enemy and his ways were foreign to God. He swore to the genius of Caesar and held transient things equal to or greater than Jesus the Lord. He broke the commandments, was unjust, immoral, and persecuted Christians. The Christian, according to Justin, was to have turned from those ways:

[W]e who formerly delighted in fornication, but now embrace chastity alone; … we who valued above all things the acquisition of wealth and possessions, now bring what we have into a common stock, and communicate to every one in need; we who hated and destroyed one another, and on account of their different manners would not live with

---

37 Clementine Homilies 4.20.
38 Tertullian, Patientia 7.
39 Gregory Thaumaturgus, Panegyric on Origenes 6.
40 Didaskalia 4.4.
41 Hippolytus of Rome, Commentary on Daniel 3.8.9.
men of a different tribe, now, since the coming of Christ, live familiarly with them, and pray for our enemies.  

A Christian was unable to be a soldier. Roland Bainton argued, however, that Tertullian’s harsh words in *De Corona* and his admission in the *Apology* to the presence of Christians in all ranks of society, including the army, are a testament to their presence. The accounts of the martyrdoms of soldiers, to which Bainton also alludes, signifies a presence but not necessarily an active military one. Bainton argued that the majority of soldiers martyred for their faith were on account of their refusal to offer the customary sacrifice and not for pacifism. Yet, he is unable to show adequately that there existed men who were already Christians before joining the army, in other words those who did not balk at warfare. He also acknowledged that if Christians were present in the army, there existed the ability for them to not engage in the seedier sides of military life.

Despite Justin’s appraisal of an early utopist vision for Christianity, an undercurrent of resentment and hatred is found in some apologists, particularly Tatian and Tertullian. In directly challenging the accusations made against Christian practices, Tertullian charged pagan Rome with similar crimes. He reminded the Romans of their previous child-sacrifices, which he contended were still done contemporaneously but in secret, in addition to abortions and exposing infants. Romans, he claimed, also practiced

---

44 Bainton, *Christian Attitudes*, 69.
parricide, unjustly tortured even after someone confessed, and committed adultery.46 Apart from Tertullian’s accusations, there also existed an ominous foreshadowing in the descriptions that were beginning to be applied to the followers of non-orthodox positions (i.e. heretics). The Clementine Homilies depict Simon Magus—the archetype of a heresiarch—“like a war-chieftain attended by his spearmen.”47 Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258) described non-orthodox Christians as pests, who wielded “swords and poisons … for subverting the truth.”48 Tertullian spoke of another group as enemies of truth—soldiers.49 By equating heretical beliefs as instruments of war and non-orthodox Christians as soldiers, the patristic authors combined the two greatest threats to the fledgling Church. The soldier’s occupation—linked with sinful behavior and within the realm of devils—was then applied to heretics. As soldiers were from demons, so were heretics, as soldiers were sinners, so were heretics, and as soldiers should be rooted out of the Christian community, so should heretics.

The early Christians had much to fear from the Roman Empire and the soldiers who were the instruments of persecution. They created a framework, in which sin enslaved soldiers and allied them with devils, in order to rationalize their experiences. And, at least in official statements, the early Christian leadership attempted to stop fellow Christians from partaking in a martial life because of those connections. Nevertheless, when these same patristic authors needed an image for their own struggles against the

46 Tertullian, Apology 2, 9, 46, 50.
47 Clementine Homilies 3.29.
48 Cyprian of Carthage, Epistle 72.4.
49 Tertullian, Apology 7.
devil, they chose the soldier paradigm. The groundwork had been laid in scriptural
precedence—the Pauline corpus called for the creation of Soldiers for Christ.

Paul of Tarsus (c. 5-67), who experienced persecution, lived in a different era of
the Church. The persecution he experienced, at least from the scriptural record, was
primarily inter-religious—either with the Jewish community or with Jewish Christians. In
some ways, except for his martyrdom in Rome, the Roman Empire was his protector.\(^{50}\)
Without the knowledge of two centuries of persecution by the Romans, Paul’s association
of spiritual combat appears to be a good model. He equates the protective gear of the
soldier with spiritual virtues: the breastplate of faith and love or righteousness, the helmet
that is hope, armor of God, girded with truth, and the Gospel as boots.\(^{51}\) He also saw
value in the obedience, which soldiers gave to their commanders, and applied the same to
a Christian’s obedience to Christ.\(^{52}\) He saw this model—armored and provisioned with
spiritual weapons—as the metaphor to illustrate the battle between Christians and demons,
who were understood to interfere in the daily lives of people.\(^{53}\) At the same time though,
he cautioned not to take the metaphor too far. It was the spiritual realm to which it
applied, “for, although we are in the flesh, we do not battle according to the flesh.”\(^{54}\)

The patristic authors picked up the martial imagery of Paul, despite their previous
disdain for Roman soldiers. Ignatius of Antioch’s (c. 35-108) *Epistle to Polycarp* echoed
the sentiments of Paul, calling on Christians to “satisfy the Commander under whom you


\(^{51}\) 1 Thessalonians 5:8; Ephesians 6:15-18.

\(^{52}\) 2 Corinthians 10:5-6.

\(^{53}\) Ephesians 6:12.

\(^{54}\) 2 Corinthians 10:3.
serve.” He continued by adding that through the good works performed in obedience to Christ, as a soldier received his pay, so Christians will receive their eternal reward.\(^{55}\) The apocryphal *Acts of Paul* (c.185-195) and *Acts of Peter* (c.100-200) presented the apostles, shortly before their martyrdoms, calling Christians soldiers of Christ who are commanded to fight the enemies of God. The *Acts of Peter* imply that harm should come to the perpetrators of error and sin—however, it is unclear if the author was referring to people or demons.\(^{56}\) As the third century progressed, greater use was made in glorifying the life of the Christian as a spiritual warrior. Even Tertullian found elements of language for spiritual combat that he praised, and Origen found a way to reconcile the Hebrew Bible with his understanding of the Christian God.\(^{57}\)

Following the Pauline example, a respect for the Roman Empire and its army was found too. Christians blamed their persecution on the soldiers. The Synoptic Gospels recorded Jesus saying that His followers should be obedient to civil authorities.\(^{58}\) Paul reiterated this theme and claimed that it was a commandment from God that Christians pay their taxes and obey their rulers.\(^{59}\) The individual actions of injustice inflicted on Christians were an exception to the rule of the general justice inherent in the Roman judicial process. Irenaeus went a step further and argued that the state can do the will of God. The judicial process was the means by which the wicked are punished. He argued that reward or punishment was due for good works and sins, both in the present life and


\(^{56}\) *Acts of Paul* 10; *Acts of Peter* 7, 8.

\(^{57}\) Cadoux, *Early Christian Attitude*, 164-166.


\(^{59}\) Romans 13:1-7.
in the age to come. The state through its judicial procedures, therefore, accomplished the
task in the corporeal realm.60 Regardless of the power of violence to do good, Christians
were still admonished that they should not be eager to become the instrument of God’s
vengeance.61

When the early Christians acknowledged the power and authority of God over all
things, they were left to deal with how to understand the persecutions within this
paradigm. The persecutions needed to have a purpose. Christians, in continuity with the
Chosen People of Israel, were inserted into the Deuterocanonical Cycle.62 The Jewish
people, in the scriptural texts, had required periodical reminders to return to YHWH and
so they received punishment by God at the hands of other nations. In a like manner,
Christians also required purgation and a call to return to righteousness. The Romans
became the instrument, martyring and persecuting Christians, which God subsequently
used to promote conversion in God’s people.63

After the rise of Constantine (312-337), Christianity became a favored religion in
the empire, eventually becoming the official religion in the late fourth century.64
Christians, therefore, raised new questions about the legitimate use of armed force in the
maintenance of a Christian empire. The Empire became the perfect tool of God. The
Patristic authors had taught that God ordained all legitimate power. Now those chosen to

60 Ireanaeus, Against Heresies 4.36.6; The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching 20.
61 Bainton, Christian Attitudes, 193-194.
62 1 Peter 1:1-2.
64 See Michael Grant, Constantine the Great: The Man and His Times (New York: Charles
lead were fellow Christians, who in theory always rule justly. Since Rome was the world, the command of Jesus to “make disciples of all nations” was fulfilled.\textsuperscript{65} The Christian \textit{mens} shifted to the preservation of the message and how to respond when the Christian, Roman Empire was threatened externally and internally. Christian ideology baptized war along with other parts of pre-Christian Rome through the intervention of Ambrose of Milan and Augustine of Hippo.

The world into which Ambrose and Augustine were born was a perilous one. Germanic invaders were threatening to destroy the Empire, as they had already conquered vast areas of Gaul, the Iberian Peninsula, and North Africa. The invaders, seen as barbarians, were the enemies of culture and order, which was symbolized by Rome. It was the order, seen by the Roman Christians as having been established by God, which was to spread the message of Christianity. The myth surrounding the Battle of the Milvian Bridge (312) had been the link.\textsuperscript{66} In the popular imagination of Christian Rome, Constantine was the “Lord’s Anointed” who brought a return to the \textit{Pax Romana}. The German threat was made worse because the majority of the tribes were Arian; so there was an added connection to them as destroyers of that which was holy, i.e. orthodoxy.

Ambrose had been the imperial governor in Milan before he was consecrated as bishop of that city. His background suited him to a sympathetic position on the defense of the state. As an educated man he was also well versed in Roman political discourse,

\textsuperscript{65} Matthew 28:19.

\textsuperscript{66} According to Christian tradition, on the eve of the battle between Constantine and Maxentius (306-312), Constantine received of a vision of the Chi-Ro (a Christian symbol for Jesus Christ) and was told that through this sign he was to be victorious. He used this sign as his standard and subsequently won the victory. Christian hagiography used the incident as the first step in Constantine’s conversion to Christianity.
and so his principal work that touches on just war theory, *On the Duties of the Clergy*, is seen by some scholars to be a reworking of Cicero’s *De Officiis*. He borrowed from this text two principles: mercy is to be given for those who ask and honesty in dealing with the enemy.⁶⁷ An addition to the classical interpretation was Ambrose’s insertion that clerics were to abstain from violence, “the thought of warlike matters seems to be foreign to the duty of our office … nor is it our business to look to arms, but rather to the affairs of peace.”⁶⁸ There remained, therefore, some reluctance for a total espousal of violence in the defense of the state. Just war was a duty, but it was a lesser duty. For those called to the defense of the Empire–emperors, governors, magistrates, and soldiers–it was an absolute duty.

Ambrose justified war in the context of a moral or religious duty incumbent upon Christians by appealing to the Hebrew scriptures, in particular the conquest of Canaan and the Maccabean revolt. In each of these cases, war was not sought for its own benefit or proof of manly prowess, but it was sought in defense of righteousness. Ambrose used Moses as an example for the maintenance of justice and good will in a community, which was created through duty and mutual support. He wrote, “Moses feared not to undertake terrible wars for his people’s sake … so as to give freedom to the people.”⁶⁹ Freedom within the Jewish and Christian context referred to the Covenant between God and the Chosen People. Moses’ wars, therefore, can be seen as a defense of the promise of God to provide a specific territory to the Chosen People and for the ability of the same people to fulfill their obligation through rituals and customs. In the context of the Roman
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⁶⁷ Bainton, *Christian Attitudes*, 90.

⁶⁸ Ambrose of Milan, *On the Duties of the Clergy* 1.35.75.

Empire—which is seen as an instrument for evangelization—that which was applied to
Israel and Judah is now transferred to Rome in the same way that the New Covenant was
seen to replace the Old Covenant.

Augustine of Hippo built upon the foundation of his teacher to create for the
Western world the rules of *bellum iustum*. Like Ambrose before him, the Hebrew
Scriptures were Augustine’s justification to preserve what Jesus of Nazareth had won on
the cross. Augustine lived to see Alaric sack Rome (410) and the Vandals, who had
converted to Arianism and given succor by the Donatist, capture Africa (429-442). In
fact Augustine died in the same year that the Vandals besieged Hippo, and it affected his
outlook on human nature. In the earthly city, perfection was not attainable and so
salvation—the heavenly city—was of supreme importance. It was not the protection of the
state that allowed one to raise arms against another, but to safeguard against the
destruction of the soul and the maintenance of righteousness.

The urgency of Augustine’s era required him to create practical solutions for his
immediate circumstances. As such, Augustine did not write a systematic treatise on just
war, but applied principles to various situations that his community faced. He witnessed
innocent people killed, as well as, unnecessary destruction and devastation. In order to
provide meaning to their deaths, he imposed a Christian ethos on the Ciceronian
system. He reconciled the reality with his belief structure by concluding that war was

---

70 Arians were considered heretics by orthodox Christians because they denied the divinity of
Jesus Christ, whereas Donatists were heretical because they believed only a person in a state of grace was
capable of performing the Sacraments. The orthodox belief held that Christ was both God and man and
that it was Christ who performed the Sacraments, as such the priest’s state of grace was irrelevant.

71 Bainton, *Christian Attitudes*, 95; Robert Regout, *La Doctrine de la Guerre Juste de Saint
Augustin à nos Jours: d’après les Théologiens et les Canonistes Catholiques* (1934; repr., Darmstadt,
the product of sin; even the wicked could be used “for the sake of removing or punishing their sins.”

The system created by Augustine had five principle points: right intention, just cause, conducted by legitimate authority, as a last resort, and properly conducted. If war was, by nature, wrong, then it required a serious reason to be conducted at all. Augustine believed that the only legitimate use of armed force was in defense. In *Quaestionum in Heptateuchum*, he provided a clear principle that a state may go to war in order to avenge a wrong committed against any nation and the perpetrators refused to make amends. Nevertheless, he rejected total war; he continued that war should exist only to “restore that which was wrongfully taken.” Rome became his model because it achieved justice, prosperity, and order. He claimed that Roman wars were the result of envy on the part of their enemies, who sought to take by force that which Rome had achieved. Because they were the victims of injustice, they were right in taking up arms in order to defend themselves. When war was fought to right a wrong, the just combatants were doing the will of God because they were restoring God’s justice and punishing the wicked. Yet, because God desired the unification of people, the response needed to be proportional to the harm inflicted so that a lasting peace could be created.
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73 Regout, *La Doctrine*, 44.
74 Augustine of Hippo, *Quaestionum in Heptateuchum* 6.10.
75 Augustine of Hippo, *City of God* 3.10.
76 Augustine of Hippo, *Epistle 189 ad Bonifacium* 6; *Epistle 138 ad Marcellinum* 4; *City of God* 29.13; John 17:21.
As an example of an unjust act of war, Augustine quoted the Matthean Gospel passage in which Jesus rebuked Peter for cutting off the ear of the high priest’s slave.\textsuperscript{77} In his interpretation, Peter erred because he did not possess the authority to attack, i.e. wage war. The ability to wage war lay within the “constituted authority.”\textsuperscript{78} In Augustine’s mind, the cosmic order provided a hierarchical structure and that the king alone possessed the power to wage war. The king should be guided in justice when making that decision.\textsuperscript{79} Augustine and Ambrose seem certain that private individuals do not possess the right to kill anyone. The right to kill belongs solely to the state.\textsuperscript{80} These patristic authors removed from private citizens the ability to wage war because they were unable to be dispassionate. Augustine wrote, “the wars of Moses … carried on by divine command, he showed not ferocity … acted not in cruelty … and warning those who needed warning.”\textsuperscript{81} The legitimate authority was to ensure that all which pertained to \textit{bellum iustum} was satisfied. The insistence on the king’s authority was paramount, even to the point that if a monarch called for an unjust war, the sin was not the soldier’s.\textsuperscript{82}

As the empire dealt with the onslaught of the Germanic tribes it also found itself increasingly mired in theological questions. The empire contained non-Christians (i.e. Jews and pagans), in addition to non-orthodox followers of Jesus. When Emperor Constantine convened a universal Church council at Nicaea (325), it was to create a

\textsuperscript{77} Matthew 25:51-52.
\textsuperscript{78} Augustine of Hippo, \textit{Contra Faustum} 22.70.
\textsuperscript{79} Augustine of Hippo, \textit{Contra Faustum} 22.75.
\textsuperscript{80} Bainton, \textit{Christian Attitudes}, 97-98.
\textsuperscript{81} Augustine of Hippo, \textit{Contra Faustum} 22.74.
\textsuperscript{82} Augustine of Hippo, \textit{Contra Faustum} 22.75.
single faith because he believed, in part, that a unified faith had the ability to unite his empire. The consequence of this action was that the state was now responsible for enforcing Nicaean Christianity. The formerly condemned were now in positions of power.

Maintaining a link with the past became important for Christians to understand themselves in their new context—political Christianity created Christians who converted for access to the political favors it was able to bestow. The memory of the martyrs was the focal point in defining what it meant to be a Christian. When chastising his congregation in Antioch for transgressing what was acceptable behavior for Christians, John Chrysostom specifically pointed to the assembled hierarchs at the Council of Nicaea, most of whom had personally experienced persecution. He noted that the current practices of Christians shamed the saints’ memories and betrayed them. Ambrose as well, when writing to another bishop, evoked the memory of the martyrs as leading Christians to greater heights in the spiritual life.

The zeal of some Christians was such that they began to attack synagogues and old pagan shrines, such as occurred in 388 when a group of Christians destroyed the Jewish synagogue in Callinicum. Civil authorities saw these as breaches of public order and sought to punish the perpetrators. In addition, the close link between Judaism and Christianity created instances of syncretism in which Christians attended Jewish

---


84 John Chrysostom, *Discourse Against Judaizing Christians* 3.3.4-5.


synagogues and participated in their festivals. Ambrose and John Chrysostom preached against the perceived affronts to Christianity by sanctioning violence. The underlying theme was that Christians are required to do what is holy and good, which meant fostering and preserving their religion. In a strange twist, acts of aggression were seen as a defense of Christianity.

In 384, the Prefect of Rome, Symmachus (c. 345-402) who was a pagan, requested the return of the Altar of Victory in the Senate chamber and that the traditional oaths be reinstated. Ambrose learned of the petition sent to Emperor Valentinian II (375-392) and responded with a pastoral letter to the emperor. Ambrose’s view of the situation was that the return of the altar would do two things. The first was that it had the potential to draw Christians into apostasy. The second was to imply that if Valentinian acceded to Symmachus’ request he would place himself in the same position as the pagan Emperors of Rome who persecuted Christians, and he would be attacking God. The Ambrosian principle was that anything that seemingly elevated non-Christian faiths to equality or superiority with Christianity was an attack upon the faith and must be resisted.

Theodosius the Great (379-395) received a similar admonition, along with a passive justification for violence by Christians against non-Christians. A group of Christians, roused by the their local bishop, attacked and destroyed a Jewish synagogue in 388. Around the same time, a group of monks had destroyed a local, Valentinian church. In response, the state punished the leaders of the Christian mob by ordering the bishop and monks to pay restitution for the damages. Ambrose was enraged at the

87 Ambrose of Milan, Epistle 17 ad Valentinianum 17.4.
88 Ambrose of Milan, ad Valentinianum 17.16-17.
impiety of Theodosius, demanding that he not force the bishop to make restitution. The punishment required the bishop to make a choice: become a martyr for the faith by refusing the emperor’s order or to become an apostate by acquiescing. The bishop, according to Ambrose, had acted imprudently but rightly.89 The actions of the mob properly punished the Jews: “Rightly are they accused of their crimes … pardon, therefore, is not for them; punishment surely reaches them.”90 Ambrose charged that if Theodosius did not amend the punishment, he would “give this triumph over the Church of God to the Jews.”91 On the question of the monks, it was a straightforward case. The Valentinians had prevented the monks from chanting the psalms on the road and were, therefore, justly punished.92

In a letter to his sister on these incidents, Ambrose provided a more in-depth rationale. He gave it within the context of a homily on Jeremiah 1:2, which he delivered in the emperor’s presence. He noted that harsh actions (i.e. violence) were necessary to help those who have gone astray return to the fold.93 In other words, the Jews and Valentinians were erring brothers who required harsher tactics to return them to God. Ambrose later recounted that he secured Theodosius’ promise to rescind his previous orders because he refused to continue the Mass until the emperor repented.94 The concession by the emperor was significant. Ambrose did not sanction violence, as he

89 Ambrose of Milan, Epistle 40 ad Theodosium 6-7.


91 Ambrose of Milan, ad Theodosium 40.20.

92 Ambrose of Milan, ad Theodosium 40.16.

93 Ambrose of Milan, Epistle 41 ad Marcellinam 2-4.

94 Ambrose of Milan, Ad Marcellinam 41.28.
noted that the bishop was imprudent, but he tacitly agreed that when Christians go too far they should not be punished because they are doing their Christian duty. He sanctioned violence as a means to convert others or defend perceived injuries to the faith.

John Chrysostom took it a step further. Instead of passively accepting the injury inflicted on others by Christians, he deemed it essential to the practicing of one’s faith. In 386, while he was still a priest in Antioch, he preached a series of sermons entitled Against the Jews. The purpose of these sermons was to chastise the congregation for engaging in Jewish practices, e.g. attending synagogue services and keeping Jewish festival fasts. He understood Jewish people to be enemies of the Christian faith, and “that they try to entice and catch the more simpleminded sort of men.”95 In describing Jewish synagogues, he saw them as havens for demons and places of extreme impiety.96

The duty of a Christian was to safeguard not only their own soul but also that of their co-religionists. Failure to come to the aid of a Christian being tempted by Jewish practices was tantamount to heresy, and he claimed that a Christian was doomed to eternal damnation if they did not help.97 Any means was available “so that each of you may win over your brother. Even if you must impose restraint, … force, … treat him ill and obstinately, … do everything to save him from the devil’s snare.”98 If there is resistance, then a Christian, Chrysostom taught, must be ready to lay down his life.99 He saw Christianity being attacked by the Jews and it was for Christianity’s defense and the
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95 John Chrysostom, Discourses Against Judaizing Christians 6.6.11.
96 John Chrysostom, Judaizing Christians 1.6.3.
97 John Chrysostom, Judaizing Christians 3.1.3, 3.1.7, 8.9.4.
98 John Chrysostom, Judaizing Christians 1.4.5.
99 John Chrysostom, Judaizing Christians 4.7.3.
sake of souls that any means necessary could be used. The violence appears to be restricted to fallen away Christians—understood in this context as heretics—but he did sanction violence directly against the perceived perpetrators. Christians needed to be soldiers ready for battle or garrisoning the walls of the city, and they were expected to “let the Jews learn how we feel.”\(^{100}\)

In the span of three and a half centuries, the Christian Church underwent significant changes, evolving from a small, parochial group to the official religion of Rome. It dealt with external threats and internal divisions and then received power to enforce its own will. Through it all there remained an undercurrent of a threatened Church. Jews, pagans, heretics, Romans, barbarians all were perceived as a threat at one time or the other. From these threats, a militant Christianity emerged—one that did not see itself as the aggressor but the victim.

Soldiers were the enemy and non-orthodox beliefs were fit into the soldier paradigm. Once Christianity was dominant and threatened by invasion, Augustine saw war, even if just, as remaining sinful. God was able to make good come out of war, but its basis was the devil. Yet, Christians liked the soldier motif for spiritual combat. Saint Benedict in the fifth century said that monks are soldiers, who are called to battle for the true king.\(^{101}\) The interplay of soldiers for Christ and that non-believers are enemies of Christ began to create the shift taken up in the Middle Ages for holy war. Pagans, Jews, and heretics, by being themselves, threatened all that had been accomplished. To persecute them seemed, therefore, to be doing the will of God. A more systematic

\(^{100}\) John Chrysostom, *Judaizing Christians* 7.6.10.

\(^{101}\) *Rule of Benedict* Prologue.3.
theology for crusade was not yet established; instead, a license was given for mob violence in the name of God.
Chapter 2
The Medieval Church’s Redirection of War to the Holy Lands

Imperial power in the western half of the empire began its decline as Emperor Constantine shifted the center of authority from Italy to Asia Minor. The near simultaneous Germanic migration into the empire created a power vacuum in the west to which the papal bureaucracy entered. Over the next several centuries, the Roman Pontiffs solidified their political and ecclesial power. As such, the control and direction of physical force required modification to the *bellum iustum* theology elucidated by Ambrose of Milan and Augustine of Hippo. The Germanic populace contained a warrior culture with which the Roman Church first attempted to work, then control, and finally direct.

The third and fourth centuries were a period of growing attempts by the Roman Church to consolidate its power universally, though it achieved greater success in the western half of the empire. A significant turning point in papal ascendency was Emperor Valentinian III’s (425-455) decree in the summer of 445 granting far-reaching authority to the Bishop of Rome over the western empire. Pope Leo the Great (440-461) had appealed to Valentinian for help. Leo hoped to check the growing influence of Hilary of Arles (429-449) and his desire to create an independent-metropolitan church in Gaul. The resulting decree established, *de jure*, the Roman Bishops’ power to legislate for the Church, as well as, provide the final court of appeals.

---

The secular authority bestowed on the papacy by Valentinian had a far ranging impact on the development of the medieval papacy—the secular power legitimized Roman prerogatives of superiority. In a worldview in which no separation of church and state existed, the power in the ecclesial realm affected the secular world too. The early Constantinian vision prefigured this model. The Christian structure of one Lord, one faith, and one baptism dovetailed his vision of one empire and one emperor.\textsuperscript{103} Christianity was a means for him to unite his empire and deviations from that faith were not tolerated.\textsuperscript{104} Constantine convoked and presided over the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (325) to define the theology of Jesus of Nazareth as divine and commissioned the creation of the Scriptures’ canon. The secular law had a long tradition of codification; now too Christianity was systematized—all were to know the faith to which they adhered.

Over the next several centuries, the power to posit doctrine became a focal point of conflict. A series of non-orthodox beliefs imposed by the imperial and patriarchal courts in Constantinople (e.g. Monothelitism, Iconoclasm, Nestorianism) were, to the papal party, convincing arguments that neither the emperors nor patriarchs were capable of defining orthodox beliefs.\textsuperscript{105} In 449, Emperor Theodosius II (408-450) called for a

\textsuperscript{103} Ephesians 4:5.

\textsuperscript{104} For more information on Constantine’s policy on imperial Christianity, see Grant, \textit{Constantine the Great}, 125-186.

\textsuperscript{105} Monothelitism was the belief that Jesus Christ possessed two natures (human and divine) but only one will, which was controlled by his divine nature. The iconoclasts believed that all images of Jesus or the saints were idolatrous and sought, therefore, to destroy them. Nestorianism was the term used for the Assyrian Church of the East by its detractors. They held that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was the Christokos (Christ-bearer) and not the Theotokos (God-bearer), though centered on Mary, it is generally considered a Christological heresy.
Church council in Ephesus that supported Monophysitism.\textsuperscript{106} Two years later, the Council of Chalcedon rejected the decisions of Ephesus and promoted the orthodox position of two natures in Christ. Pope Leo the Great (440-461) had prepared a treatise to be read at Chalcedon. The records of the council note that following the presentation of the \textit{Tome of Leo}, the assembled bishops acclaimed, “[T]his is the faith of the Apostles … Peter has spoken thus through Leo.”\textsuperscript{107} Though unintended by the eastern bishops present to be a statement on Roman superiority, Leo capitalized on the acclamation. Rufinius of Aquileia (340-410) previously had translated into Latin a letter attributed to Clement of Rome (92-99) and addressed to James the brother of the Lord (d. 62), who was the Bishop of Jerusalem, which gave an apostolic foundation to Pope Leo’s arguments to papal hegemony. The letter related the story that shortly before St. Peter’s martyrdom, he ordained Clement bishop in his place, and he entrusted him with the “chair of discourse” and the “power of binding and loosing.”\textsuperscript{108} Leo used this letter as evidence that the power of Peter was passed to successive Bishops of Rome—the popes were the legal heirs of Peter’s patrimony.\textsuperscript{109} The Roman Bishops saw a universal jurisdiction for their ministry. As God’s representatives, they were tasked with defending orthodoxy against the encroachment of Satan. Their duty as bishops was to ensure the salvation of all Christians.

\textsuperscript{106} Monophysites believed that Jesus Christ had only one nature, and that the divine and human elements comingled together.

\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Acts of the Council of Chalcedon}, Session 2.

\textsuperscript{108} Pseudo-Clement, \textit{Epistle of Clement to James} 2.

\textsuperscript{109} See Bernhard Schimmelpenning, \textit{The Papacy}, translated by James Sievert (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992) for a more complete account of the rise of the papacy.
A full discussion on the development of the early papacy is not germane to this study, but one theory proposed in the late fifth century established papal diplomatic policy until the twentieth. Pope Gelasius (492-496) was an avid defender of papal supremacy by means of the Two-Swords Theory, based on the Gospel accounts of the arrest of Jesus of Nazareth in the Garden of Gethsemane. According to John’s Gospel, when Jesus was about to be arrested, Peter drew his sword and sliced off Malchus’ ear. Jesus rebuked Peter and ordered his sword sheathed. As noted in the previous chapter, the early Christians interpreted this incident in a pacifist way and it became the basis for later canonical legislation prohibiting clerics from engaging in battle.

Gelasius concurred that because Peter represented the clerical state, and more importantly the papacy, he was not to wield the instrument of violence. Nevertheless, he possessed the sword. Peter—the archetype of the Bishop of Rome—was not to use the sword, but instead possessed the ability to direct its use. The power to command, as Jesus did in the Gospel account, was given to Peter. The papal position, published in Gelasius’ letter Duo sunt, was sent to Emperor Anastasius (491-518) in 494. In the letter, he reminded the aged, but new, emperor that in spiritual matters he was subservient to the clerics and was obliged to obey them. Yet, both Gelasius and Anastasius combined the spiritual and the secular realms in their minds. The right ordering of society—a state
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110 For additional information on the development of the papacy, see Robert Eno, The Rise of the Papacy (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1990).
111 John 18:3-11.
112 Matthew 16:18.
113 Gelasius, Duo Sunt.
function—also aided the faithful to salvation. The theology for clerical involvement in secular affairs was posited.

As the papacy was developing a theology on the church’s role in the affairs of the state, the migration of Germanic peoples into the Roman Empire was well underway. Beginning in the fourth century, and lasting for about two hundred years, various Germanic tribes crossed into the empire in search of land, wealth, and the comforts of Rome. The Roman populace from North Africa to Gaul, and even Italy itself, eventually found themselves ruled by Germanic princes. The new Germanic rulers were generally either polytheists or Arians, in addition to embodying a warrior ethos. Ulfilas (c.310-383), a Gothic convert to Christianity, had successfully preached Arianism in Germany after being ordained a bishop by Eusebius of Nicomedia (d.341) and later given support by Emperor Constantius II (337-361). Some Germanic tribes, however, also embraced orthodox Christianity. As either non-Romans, pagans, or heretics, the Germans were seen as a threat to the established order.

Though each tribe had its role to play in the development of medieval Europe, the Franks were a powerful confederation that dominated Gaul. Clovis (c.466-511), leader of the Salian Franks, succeeded in uniting the Frankish tribes together and conquered much of Gaul thereby establishing Merovingian rule. The Gallic Church, and later the Roman Church, saw his conversion to orthodox Christianity as an important event in the solidification of the Church in Europe. Clovis had been a pagan, but was married to Clotilde (475-545), the Christian daughter of King Chilperic II of Burgundy (463-493). As Clovis’ political power grew, his pagan heritage caused discord among the Gallo-Romans. Not to discount his spiritual rationale, but his conversion to orthodox
Christianity in 496 provided greater legitimacy to his rule, support among the Gallo-Romans, and a further rationale to expand his kingdom (i.e. spreading the orthodox faith to heretical and pagan territories).\textsuperscript{114}

One of the early chroniclers for the conversion of Clovis was Gregory of Tours (c.538-594). Gregory was a member of the Gallo-Roman aristocracy, the Bishop of Tours, and was well connected, though sometimes with turbulent relations, to the rising Frankish rulers. He recorded the history of Gaul up to his own time, being particularly interested in the Christianization of his homeland. In Book 2 of \textit{Historia Francorum}, Gregory noted that Clovis was initially hesitant to become a Christian. However, in his war against the Alamanni—who were Arians—Clovis’ army was being annihilated. He then requested the aid of his wife’s god and promised conversion if victory was achieved. Clovis was quoted as saying that his own gods possessed no power to aid him and so, “I now call upon thee, I desire to believe thee, and only let me be rescued from my adversaries.”\textsuperscript{115} The battle was won and Clovis fulfilled his promise to convert.

Gregory, in relating the events of Clovis’ Baptism, remarked that “another Constantine advanced to the baptismal font … and of his army more than 3000 were baptized.”\textsuperscript{116} The connection between Constantine and Clovis was meant to imply a mutually beneficial relationship between church and state. Clovis was transformed, in Gregory’s eyes, from a petty tyrant to a righteous, protector of Christianity. His fortunes had changed. In the \textit{Historia Francorum}, the descriptions of Clovis’ adversaries altered,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{115} Gregory of Tours, \textit{Historia Francorum} 2.30.
\textsuperscript{116} Gregory of Tours, \textit{Historia Francorum} 2.31.
\end{flushright}
Gregory afterwards noted their religious affiliation. Gundobad and Godegisel were Arians, as well as, the Goths under Alaric.\textsuperscript{117} Clovis no longer fought solely for the expansion of his kingdom, but for the expansion of the Christian faith. Gregory quoted Clovis’ desire to conquer Alaric’s territories because “these Arians hold parts of Gaul.”\textsuperscript{118} Like Constantine two hundred years previously, in Gregory’s narrative, Clovis enforced orthodox Christianity and provided support to the Church.

The communitarian nature of the Franks explains the mass conversion that accompanied Clovis. Nevertheless, the description of the other catechumens as soldiers is poignant. Besides the assumed divine aid in the victory over the Alamanni, Gregory was explicit in acknowledging God’s support in the victory over Alaric.\textsuperscript{119} In an allusion that Pope Urban II (1088-1099) was to use to his advantage five hundred years later, Gregory also placed the Franks within the Hebraic tradition of holy war. As Clovis besieged the city of Vienne, following the renege of Gundobad, trumpet blasts signaled the eminent capitulation of the city.\textsuperscript{120} It was reminiscent of Joshua’s victory over Jericho, in which the priests blew their trumpets and the walls crumbled.\textsuperscript{121}

The symbiotic relationship the Church pursued with the German rulers guaranteed its survival, but it also meant accommodation. Various elements of Germanic culture, in particular the warrior-ethos, was baptized. As a warrior people they carved their way into Roman territory and required the sword to maintain that position. The image of Christ’s

\textsuperscript{117} Gregory of Tours, \textit{Historia Francorum} 2.32, 2.37.

\textsuperscript{118} Gregory of Tours, \textit{Historia Francorum} 2.37.

\textsuperscript{119} Gregory of Tours, \textit{Historia Francorum} 2.37.

\textsuperscript{120} Gregory of Tours, \textit{Historia Francorum} 2.33.

\textsuperscript{121} Joshua 6:1-21.
crucifixion as the lamb led to the slaughter shifted the cross into a weapon Christ used against His adversaries. Bainton wrote, “When these lusty warriors embraced the cross, they regarded it not as a yoke to be placed upon their pugnacity, but as an ensign to lead them in battle.” The Constantinian image came full-circle; the Chi-Ro symbol for the victory at the Milvian Bridge was the cross in Gaul. Belief in Jesus Christ as the Savior and Second Person of the Trinity was dependent upon His ability to deliver victories to His followers.

The belief in Jesus as the warrior-god was widely circulated. Bainton noted the famous, Old Saxon retelling of the Gospel, *Heliand* (early ninth century), that refashioned Jesus as a chieftain and the apostles as warriors. The scene in the Garden of Gethsemane, used previously, is again a good example:

> Then Simon Peter, the mighty, the noble swordsman flew into a rage … His heart became intensely bitter because they wanted to tie up his Lord there. So he strode over angrily, that very daring thane, to stand in front of his Commander, right in front of his Lord. No doubting in his mind, no fearful hesitation in his chest, he drew his blade and struck … so that Malchus was cut … in the head that his cheek and ear burst open with a mortal wound! … The men stood back—they were afraid of the slash of his sword.

The redactor further altered the remainder of the story in the *Heliand*. Peter is again commanded by Jesus to put away his sword, but the redactor omitted Jesus’ condemnation of violence. Instead, Jesus proclaimed that it was not His intention to fight at that moment. If God’s plan was battle, He possessed a limitless, angelic army that no human army could withstand—their weapons would be useless and not a warrior would be

---

122 For Scriptural references on Jesus as lamb, see Isaiah 53:7; Jeremiah 11:19; Acts 8:32-35.
123 Bainton, *Christian Attitudes*, 103.
124 *Heliand* 58.
left alive. The Heliand was not an isolated story. The Dream of the Rood, seventh or eighth century, was a work of popular devotion that also depicted Jesus as a chief. It relates a vision that a man received of the Holy Cross—the cross upon which Jesus was crucified. In the vision, the cross or rood described itself as the instrument of salvation. The vision depicted the crucifixion as a battle, complete with an opposing army. Jesus, as king, fought and died on behalf of His people—“The Son, mighty and successful, was victorious in that quest.” The king’s dedication to the point of death was an honorable action to the Germanic peoples, and something to which other leaders were expected to emulate. For them, to die in battle was the greatest achievement of an individual; it provided entrance into heaven. The motif existed in the pre-Christian religion of the Germanic peoples too. The old gods were warriors and heaven was the repose of great soldiers.

Christianity adapted to its new environment, in which the Baptism of Clovis was symbolic for the future relationship between the secular and ecclesial realms for the next several centuries. For example, the pattern repeated three centuries later when Pope Leo III (795-816) crowned Charlemagne (768-814) Emperor of the Romans in the West on Christmas Day 800. The Roman way (law, monastic life, liturgy, etc.) became the

---

125 Heliand 58.
126 The Dream of the Rood.
standard that the emperor expected throughout his domain and the eastern territories he subjugated.

The transformation of Jesus Christ from the sacrificial victim into the warrior-god, who wielded the cross in battle, had far-reaching implications. As an arbiter of justice, God showed the guilt of an individual through trial by ordeal or the rightness of a cause through trial by combat. In the medieval mind, God sought the right ordering of society and, therefore, manipulated the natural world to show God’s favor or displeasure. In disputes between the landed magnates, they needed evidence of divine displeasure on their enemies. The political ambitions of these leaders often meant the proof was spurious. The real test for God’s favor became the outcome of the battle–God was on the side of the victor. The small limits placed on war before the tenth century were insufficient to stop those knights and lords who desired war.

Tenth century France witnessed a brief union of all three classes of society against the unbridled destruction. The result of the collaboration was the peace councils of the tenth and eleventh centuries. The councils have come under increased scrutiny in recent years, particularly the motivations of the bishops to provide an orderly plundering of land. Yet, the general consensus remains the protection of non-combatants and church properties from unnecessary destruction.

---


Local church councils were not the exclusive domain of clerics, often attracting the nobility who sought to protect their interests. The Council of Limoges (994) was different; the clerical order actively encouraged the participation of the *laborares* (peasant-class). It has been argued that the council was a work of fiction, but its influence on other documented councils bear testimony to its importance. The council's activities culminated in a mass demonstration, in which relics of the local patron saint (Martial), as well as others, were displayed to bear witness to the ratification of the conciliar proceedings. A miracle manifested Divine approval. The event profoundly affected all present and a new phenomenon began—an alliance of peace and justice.\(^{130}\)

The alliance created what became known as the *Pax Dei* and *Treuga Dei*. Together they provided the opportunity for certain places and certain times to be free from violence. Church properties, which were vast, were free from pillaging, as well as those people protected by the Church (women, peasants, and clerics). As an example, the Council of Charroux (989) provided three limitations to warfare. The first protected churches and their property, requiring compensation if it was harmed and *anathema* to those who did not. The second protection sought to prohibit the seizure of livestock belonging to peasants and the poor. The final security ensured protection from harm for clerics, provided they were not engaged in combat.\(^{131}\) It was understood that these people

---


\(^{131}\) The *Acts of the Council of Charroux* (989), Mansi 19:89-90, translation by Thomas Head. The same three threats of anathema were made at the Synod of Aquitaine (c.1000); see Thomas Head, “The Development of the Peace of God in Aquitaine (970-1005),” *Speculum* 74, no. 3 (July 1999): 656.
and lands belonged to God; and it was a sacrilegious act, therefore, to appropriate or harm what was God’s.\textsuperscript{132}

In addition, the councils forbade warfare during the holy seasons and special liturgical days. As consecrated times, they commemorated the redemptive acts of God or His saints and to profane them was an act of sacrilege. The \textit{Truce of God} promulgated at the Council of Cologne (1083) is a representative example of the days consecrated to peace:

From the first day of the Advent of our Lord through Epiphany, and from the beginning of Septuagesima to the eight day after Pentecost and through that whole day, and throughout the year on every Sunday, Friday and Saturday, and on the fast days of the four seasons, and on the eve and the day of all the apostles, and on all days canonically set apart–or which shall in the future be set apart–for fasts or feasts, this decree of peace shall be observed.\textsuperscript{133}

In all, nearly one-half of the year was cordoned off from violent activities. The punishment for violating the \textit{Peace of God} or the \textit{Truce of God} was, if the individual was unrepentant, excommunication.

As in the example of the \textit{Heliand’s} depiction of Jesus’ arrest in the Garden of Gethsemane, the angelic hosts and the saints were understood to be capable of protecting God’s own when required. The saints, for several centuries, had been the guardians of monasteries.\textsuperscript{134} The presence at the peace councils of saintly relics promoted these saints as protectors of the \textit{Pax Dei} and \textit{Treuga Dei}. Saint Martial was one such saint, whose
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\textsuperscript{132} Magnou-Nortier, “The Enemies of the Peace,” 78-79.


martyrology the monks of the Abbaye de Saint-Martial rewrote following the Council of Limoges.

St. Martial’s original Vita established him as an apostle to the Gauls, as well as, a kinsman of St. Peter and an early disciple of Jesus. The updated Vita fit better with his new stature as protector of the Limoges Peace of God. It credited St. Martial with the conversion of Duke Etienne of Guyenne. He had desired to wed Valerie of Limoges, a Christian noblewoman. However, she had previously vowed a life of chastity to Christ and refused marriage to the duke. Her refusal occasioned her martyrdom at the hand of Etienne’s squire. As the squire related the events to Duke Etienne, Valerie brought her own severed head to him. An angel then appeared and struck the squire, killing him in front of the duke. Duke Etienne summoned Martial and said, “Most holy man, I sin in shedding innocent blood, but I implore you if you resuscitate my squire I will believe in your God.” Martial brought the squire back to life and Etienne was baptized.\textsuperscript{135} The conversion was total, Etienne became in the Vita a powerful magnate who brought peace to his area of Gaul, made a pilgrimage to Rome, promoted a devotion to the cult of Martial, and most importantly manifested his love of peace and the church–the ideal of feudal authority and military service, a true milites.\textsuperscript{136}

Martial’s success was not restricted to conversions but also his ability to protect the Peace of God during his own time. The demon, Bagarreur (the fighter), led a band of demons that drowned Hildebert, the son of Count Arcadius of Aquitaine. Martial went to the river and commanded the demons to return the body of Hildebert. After he was

\textsuperscript{135} La Vie de saint Martial 12-13: “Très saint homme, j’ai péché en répandant le sang innocent mais je t’impore afin que tu ressuscites mon écuyer et que tu me fasses croire à ton Dieu.”

\textsuperscript{136} Landes, “Between Aristocracy and Heresy,” 192.
raised from the water, the saint then brought him back to life.\textsuperscript{137} As their leader’s name implies, the demon-band represented the warrior-class. They “always seek to fight and are always quick-tempered and irritated.”\textsuperscript{138} The unbridled knight was an enemy of the peace, and so it was Martial’s duty to put things back into proper order (raising of Hildebert) and defeat the demons.\textsuperscript{139} The implication was clear—what he was able to accomplish during his lifetime, Martial could repeat in the present context.

The bishops had been the principle advocates of the peace council movement, though it was not uncommon for monasteries to have been the site of the councils. In addition, monasteries had utilized similar tactics in protecting their own properties from the ravages of war. The monks were no strangers to war themselves. As mentioned in chapter one, the preeminent document for monastic regulation, the Rule of St. Benedict, had associated monks with warriors. The monks interpreted it, as the author of the Rule of St. Benedict intended, in the vein of spiritual combat.\textsuperscript{140} Yet, they were also known to take up arms in defense of a just cause as well. For the monks, who were members of the \textit{bellatores} before entering the monastery, it was a question of knowing when war was right and when it was not.\textsuperscript{141}

\textsuperscript{137} \textit{La Vie de saint Martial} 15.

\textsuperscript{138} \textit{La Vie de saint Martial} 15: “qu’il cherche toujours la bagarre et qu’il est toujours colèreux et irrité.”

\textsuperscript{139} Landes, “Between Aristocracy and Heresy,” 192-193.


The monastic authors of the mid-eleventh century seized on a trend that affected the bellatores, who experienced an “awakening of the consciousness of its superiority.” ¹⁴² The Pax Dei and Treuga Dei had some success in altering the perceptions of society. It created awareness that the norm for Christians was peace (Pax Christiana) and it was incumbent upon society to maintain it. Knights were not prepared to accept themselves individually as the disrupters of the peace, but they believed gangs of warriors who were not faithful to their liege lord were capable of disrupting the peace and destroying the social order. The good knights, on the other hand, protected the Church, the poor, and the oppressed; they listened to clerical appeals and fought the destructive nature of the enemies of the social order. ¹⁴³

It was a fine line, however, between a good knight and a roving band that violated the Pax Christiana. Andrew of Fleury recorded Archbishop Aimon of Bourges’ actions following his peace council (1038). The archbishop pressed upon all men over the age of fourteen to swear to uphold the peace council’s decisions and to defend by force, if necessary, the peace. The oath had a positive effect. Peace was established and violators were quickly punished, seeking “safety in flight, harried by divinely inspired terror.” ¹⁴⁴ Yet, Andrew of Fleury noted a change after peace was established. He wrote that the defenders of the peace began to be ambitious. Archbishop Aimon transformed into a disturber of the peace when he attacked the city of Beneciacum. Stephen, the lord who controlled Beneciacum, had, according to Andrew of Fleury, broken his vow of peace.


¹⁴⁴ Andrew of Fleury, Miracula S. Benedicti 5.2.
and deserved punishment. The issue was the unbridled force Archbishop Aimon used. He burned down Stephen’s castle with fourteen hundred people (men, women, and children) inside. Aimon had now violated the Peace of Bourges. As there was no one else to punish the archbishop, Andrew of Fleury reported that God used Odo, the only man remaining who had refused to take the oath, as the means for God to enact justice against the archbishop. The forces of Odo were victorious.145

It did not matter who led the ignoble knights or the supposed protectors of the peace. One thing was made clear–God desired that peace not be violated. Even in the heat of battle, God scrutinized the actions of all. Abbot Bernard of Clairvaux clarified in De Laude Novae Militiae that war had limitations, and to violate those limitations placed one’s soul in peril. Addressing the Knights Templar, Bernard exhorted them to be brave in battle, and yet, not desire the death of men but the death of evil deeds.146

Bernard of Clairvaux believed that war was an inevitable part of his society. In that realization, he preached the Second Crusade (1145-1149), which he justified because its aim was the restoration of Christ’s Patrimony and the repulsion of an aggressor.147 The difference between the good knights (militia) and the bad knights (malitia) depended upon their actions and behaviors.148 The malitia were concerned with vanities, luxuries, and vice, and they engaged in tournaments and private wars against fellow Christians. Tournaments and feudal wars were in Bernard’s mind the greatest waste and the product

145 Andrew of Fleury, Miracula S. Benedicti 5.3-4.
146 Bernard of Clairvaux, De Laude 4.
148 Bernard used Latin word play to distinguish between good knights (militia) and bad knights (malitia); the term can be translated as bad or malicious.
of Satan. Writing to Abbot Suger of St. Denis (c. 1081-1151), then regent of France, Bernard implored him to cancel the tournament scheduled after Easter 1149. Bernard believed tournaments were evil because Christians died for no purpose. The vows made by Lords Henry and Robert to kill one another during the tournament made this one particularly diabolical, threatening the stability of the kingdom.\(^1\) Bernard believed no good was possible from such actions and that the threat to the state also threatened the Church. His rationale for opposing private wars between feudal lords was two-fold. First, they were motivated not by any semblance of the common good or restoration of property, but were the product of egoism and ambition. Secondly, it was those whom the Church protected that suffered the greatest because their homes and villages were destroyed. The poor were left to die without help in restoring their property.\(^2\)

Bernard was not an innovator in monastic warfare theology, but his prestige allowed his ideas to spread among the populace.\(^3\) His guiding principle remained, however, the “superiority of the religious vocation over the call to arms.”\(^4\) Bernard’s hagiographer highlighted Bernard’s conviction from an early age. The *Vita S. Bernardi* records that Bernard desired to enter the monastery at Cîteaux, but his relatives persuaded him to continue in the knightly ways. The siege of Grancey changed his mind, and he in turn persuaded many of his relatives and friends to join him at the Cistercian
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\(^1\) Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter CCCCC* (Ep. 376 in Migne).

\(^2\) Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter XCVII*.

\(^3\) Leclerq, “Saint Bernard’s Attitude,” 31.

\(^4\) Leclerq, “Saint Bernard’s Attitude,” 10.
monastery.\textsuperscript{153} He and his relatives moved from being *malitia* to *bellatores pacifici* (peaceful warriors) or *militia Christi* (knights of Christ).\textsuperscript{154} The combination of knighthood with the *vita perfecta* (life of perfection) was a topic that fascinated Bernard. The Templars were men who embodied the chivalric ideals with the monastic life and dedicated themselves to the restoration of peace.\textsuperscript{155}

Seizing on the social concern for the maintenance of order and peace. Church leaders also turned to ecclesiastical law to strengthen their position. The eleventh and twelfth centuries were the age of the decretals. Although their primary emphasis was not war, they did treat the subject in light of the call to crusade.\textsuperscript{156} Anselm of Lucca (1036-1086) and Gratian (mid-twelfth century) were the most influential. They also discussed the topic of just war and a knight’s legitimate or illicit participation in it.

The emphasis on legal precedent began as part of the Gregorian Reforms, which actually began with the pontificate of Leo IX (1049-1054). Accretions of secularization into the Church began following the collapse of the Carolingian Renaissance (late eighth and ninth centuries). Secular encroachments into ecclesial affairs created bishops who were known more as warriors than saints. Simultaneously, the Bishops of Rome embroiled themselves into local politics in the Italian peninsula. Pope Leo’s reforms sought to extract the papacy and the Church from outside political forces as well as

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotetext[153]{William of Saint-Thierry, *Vita S. Bernardi* 1.10-13.}
\footnotetext[154]{The term *bellatores pacifici* was used by Bernard of Clairvaux to describe the Premonstratensians (see Letter 275, Ep. 346 in Migne), and he often referred to his own monks of Clairvaux as *militia Christi*.}
\footnotetext[155]{Bernard of Clairvaux, *De Laude* 2.}
\footnotetext[156]{Decretals were collections of precedents on various topics of Church law and practice. The decretal authors generally favored patristic texts and papal decrees.}
\end{footnotesize}
reform the clerical life that in some instance had become depraved. The status quo was challenged and opposition formed. To protect the reforms in their infancy the papacy called for war against the Count of Tusculum and then the Normans in southern Italy.\footnote{Leclerq, “Saint Bernard’s Attitude,” 7-10.}

Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085) commissioned Anselm of Lucca to justify papal actions against other enemies of the reforms. In *Contra Guibertum* and *De Caritas* Anselm provided the justification for papal wars by striking a balance between violence and his understanding of *caritas* (charity). The Anselmian view held that if someone was in error (i.e. heretic), a schismatic, or attacked widows and orphans they were against God. Within his theological framework, to be against God was tantamount to damnation. Yet God willed that all people be saved; and so as members of the Church, whose mission is salvation, it is incumbent upon the Christian faithful to use all means at their disposal to bring the other person back to the path of salvation. The same reasoning was used by John Chrysostom to justify violence against the “Judaizing” Christians, by Ambrose of Milan to justify the attacks on Jews and non-orthodox Christians, as well as, by the inquisitions that developed later. Guibert of Ravenna (1029-1100) was an anti-pope, who had taken the name Clement III and was supported by Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV. He was, therefore, a schismatic, and a good Christian fought him to save Guibert’s soul.\footnote{Leclerq, “Saint Bernard’s Attitude,” 7-10.}

Gratian provided a more systemic response to war and re-presented the Augustinian and patristic positions. War was the place where the interests of Church and state needed to coincide. *Causa 23* provides an example. In the case of an heretical
bishop, there is a duty to take up arms against him because his false teachings injure the faithful and the state. Nevertheless, an individual was not able to choose any cause he wanted. The seriousness of the act demanded that license be given by the papacy and imperial consent given before action was taken. Gratian went beyond looking at the act itself, reinforcing the moral act of individuals engaging in warfare. He concluded that within bellum iustum an individual knight was capable of sinning and the justness of a cause did not excuse all behaviors. Gratian and Anselm, therefore, laid the foundation for the use of physical coercion to advance the interests of the Church.

Pope Gregory VII was prepared to use all options available to ensure the success of his reforms. One of the central issues was to reestablish the independence of the episcopacy from secular control; the specific act was the investiture of bishops with the power of their office. Within the secular, hierarchical structure, bishops were landed magnates and politically powerful men. As such, the princes and rulers had secured fealty from the bishops for the lands they held on behalf of the ruler. The process of fealty for the episcopacy had evolved into the ruler bestowing upon the bishop the symbols of his office (miter, crosier, ring, and pectoral cross). The secular realm saw the symbols as indicative of the bishops’ political office; however, they also represented their spiritual authority. The bestowal of spiritual authority by a layman was not acceptable to the reforming popes. Gregory VII believed that the secular usurpation of his authority
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159 Gratian, Decreti, Pars Secunda, Causa XXIII, Quaestia I (PL 187:1159-1166).

weakened his ability to enact reforms. If the papacy was not the institution that provided bishops with their authority, they were free to ignore its orders.\(^\text{161}\)

Pope Gregory drew from the intellectual-ecclesial currents of his day and framed the Investiture Controversy as a struggle between good and evil; in other words, Emperor Henry IV and like-minded princes were attacking the right ordering of society. Gregory VII introduced the language of crusade. Through the winter and spring of 1074, the pope and emperor were engaged in heated diplomacy. Pope Gregory sought support from other princes. He addressed a letter to Count William of Burgundy (1057-1087) to gather an army and place it “in the service of St. Peter” for the Church’s freedom. The pope asked the count to communicate this directive to other nobles loyal to Rome so that a vast army might deter Emperor Henry from further action.\(^\text{162}\) The invocation of St. Peter provided an alternative rallying point than Gregory VII alone; it might be possible to defy Hildebrand but not the Chief of the Apostles.\(^\text{163}\) It was also a reminder that the pope was the successor of St. Peter and possessed the keys given to Peter by Christ—the power of the ecclesial realm over the secular.\(^\text{164}\)

The need for *milites Petri* (knights of St. Peter) was not isolated to Europe. Pope Gregory also wanted to send an armed expedition to Constantinople to aid the Byzantines


\(^\text{162}\) Gregory VII, “To Count William of Burgundy (Feb. 2, 1074).”

\(^\text{163}\) Hildebrand was Gregory VII’s given name. In addition, a common practice of nobles was to swear loyalty to St. Peter when on pilgrimage to Rome, for which Gregory often reminded them.

\(^\text{164}\) Matthew 16:18.
against “pagans.”165 In his call for a crusade, Gregory noted the authority of St. Peter, which goaded his readers to render aid to fellow Christians who suffered.166 In an attempt to broach a peace with the emperor, Pope Gregory VII invited Emperor Henry IV to join the crusade to Jerusalem in December 1074. The pope explained his rationale for the crusade to Henry. Pope Gregory wanted to preserve the Christian faith, and he saw it as an opportunity to end the fifty-year schism with the Eastern Churches. He wrote, “almost all the Easterners are waiting to see how the faith of the Apostle Peter will decide.”167 In doing so, he explicitly aligned the entire western world with the authority of the Bishop of Rome. If Henry IV had accepted the call to crusade, he would have ceded the principle that the clerics commanded the nobles, even in war.

In the same year that Pope Gregory made his call for a crusade to Jerusalem, he also wrote to the Hungarian king. In this letter, he chastised King Solomon (1053-1081) for his actions that were “grievously offensive against St. Peter.” King Solomon’s offense was accepting the crown of Hungary from Emperor Henry IV. In the rebuke, Gregory cited several precedents indicating papal suzerainty over Hungary: the vassalage of King Stephen (d.1038) in 1000 to Pope Sylvester II (d.1003), Emperor Henry III’s (1017-1056) recognition of papal authority over Hungary by sending the “insignia of sovereignty” to Pope Leo IX, and the same emperor’s gift of a spear and crown to the shrine of St. Peter.168 The spear and crown is a vital connection in papal authority over
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165 Pope Gregory was referring to the Seljuk Turks, who migrated from Central Asia conquering Persia and Asia Minor. By the time they invaded the Byzantine Empire, they had converted to Sunni Islam.

166 Gregory VII, “Summoning the Faithful to Defend Constantinople (March 1, 1074).”

167 Gregory VII, “To Henry IV (December 7, 1074).”

168 Gregory VII, “To King Solomon of Hungary (October 28, 1074).”
secular rulers. The symbolic nature of these gifts was that it was St. Peter who had led the imperial armies to victory—the victory was St. Peter’s and not the emperor’s. The understanding of saint-generals leading armies was not foreign to medieval mythology. Tales of the Reconquista often credited St. James the Greater with Christian victories over Muslims on the Iberian Peninsula and the English believed St. George aided them in their campaigns. And to the victor go the spoils; St. Peter had proven in trial by combat his right to administer the Kingdom of Hungary and received just tribute. King Solomon was aligned with Henry IV during the Investiture Controversy; therefore, an attack on the validity of Henry’s vassal can be interpreted as propaganda. Nevertheless, it still goes to Gregory’s core understanding—the authority of the Roman Church was absolute.

Pope Gregory was convinced that Emperor Henry violated the liberties of God and St. Peter. Turning to biblical imagery, he presented examples of good and bad kings. The example of a bad king was Saul. God chose him to be king, yet Saul gave glory and credit to himself. God, therefore, punished him by taking it away and giving in to David. King David on the other hand was blessed “by reason of his humility.” The threat was clear; divine retribution awaited Henry if he continued to defy the will of the papacy. The reform of the Church and the order of society were imperiled, and to Pope Gregory the secular rulers who interfered threatened their own souls and that of their subjects.

The simultaneous call for a crusade and the Investiture Controversy should not be separated. In a divinely ordained hierarchy, the usurpation of power of one order from the other is a grave injustice. Injustices needed to be rectified; if princes or priests did not avenge the evil done, God’s punishment followed. God entrusted the princely rulers to

\[169\] Gregory VII, “To Henry IV (December 8, 1075 or January 8, 1076).”
protect their subjects from harm and violence, even self-induced violence. It is not a leap
to see the harm inflicted on the peasants because of warfare and knights at tournaments as
God’s punishment upon a sinful Europe that refused to amend its ways. Pope Gregory
saw his duty as righting a wrong. He attempted to redirect the knightly energy to a right
intention and just cause. In order to do it, he needed to prove that he was the legitimate
authority.

In a few words, Pope Gregory VII made his case for the crusade:

A people of the pagans have been pressing hard upon the Christian
empire, have cruelly laid waste the country almost to the walls of
Constantinople and slaughtered like sheep many thousand Christians.
… But it is not enough to grieve over this event; the example of our
Redeemer and the duty of brotherly love demand of us that we should set
our hearts upon the deliverance of our brethren. For as he offered his life
for us, so ought we to offer our lives for our brothers.¹⁷⁰

He laid out the criteria for *bellum iustum*. The intention for a crusade was based in the
crusaders’ love of God and their fellow Christians, not for vengeance against the
“pagans.” The murder of Christians provided the just cause. The belief that the Islamic
rulers were tyrannical meant that no diplomacy or discourse was possible. Only two of
the criteria were not expressly mentioned: legitimate authority and right conduct. It is
here that the supreme authority of the papacy was needed to rally Europe outside of its
internal boundaries for the greater good, the defense of Christendom. And, since the war
was to be conducted under the auspices of the Roman See, it would have been properly
conducted under the banner of St. Peter.

The political situation quickly deteriorated after Emperor Henry IV’s subjugation
to Pope Gregory VII at Canossa in January 1077. The hoped-for crusade did not

¹⁷⁰ Gregory VII, “Summoning the Faithful to Defend Constantinople (March 1, 1074).”
materialize, Gregory VII ended his days in exile, and the investiture issue was not settled until 1122. The pope did inject another important element into the idea of crusade, bearing fruit under Pope Urban II. Pope Gregory did not introduce the term pilgrimage into the crusading lexicon, but he inserted spiritual benefits by the language used. He directed the crusade toward Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulcher. He also noted that Outremer was the place where many saints had gone to strengthen their faith and that for himself he desired such an opportunity. These sites were the preeminent pilgrimage places for Christians; to go and pray there offered enormous spiritual benefits. Pope Gregory offered to the emperor and his army the opportunity for abundant grace.

The Pax et Treuga Dei, coupled with the strengthening of monarchies in Europe, began to have limited success in ensuring peace. Nevertheless, wars and tournaments continued to create instability and hardships. The Roman Church did not abandon its goal to create a united Christendom under papal authority, which was to preserve peace and Christianize the world. The year 1095 brought a new attempt to solidify Christendom and direct its martial activities away from its own destruction and toward a common foe, Islam.

At the Council of Clermont (1095), Pope Urban II called for the liberation of the Holy Lands, and it met with overwhelming support. The call to crusade was not a spontaneous event. It was first mentioned at the Council of Piacenza (March 1095). The Byzantine Emperor, Alexius I Comnenus (1081-1118), sent representatives to the council seeking assistance against the Seljuk Turks. It was an inspirational message to Urban II, who spent the summer of 1095 traveling throughout France encouraging the clergy and

171 Gregory VII, “To Henry IV (December 7, 1074).”
laity to support the Eastern Christians. The sermon on November 27, 1095, clarified Urban’s intentions for an armed pilgrimage.\textsuperscript{172}

In her book on crusade preaching, Penny Cole highlights the significance that the call for crusade came through preaching. It was highly unusual at this time period for the laity to be the recipient of a homily, which was generally reserved for clerics and monks. Furthermore, originality was discouraged and repetition of patristic homilies was preferred. Pope Urban II broke the mold. His source material was accepted Christian doctrines on justice and peace, which he combined with catechetical instructions on the proper behavior of Christians (expected material for exhortations to the laity). Yet, he blended it in a new way. The occasion of the pope preaching to the people was an event in itself, but its content was completely unexpected.\textsuperscript{173} Urban found a new way to return to the principles of just war.

Five differing versions exist of Pope Urban’s speech: Fulcher of Chartres (b. c.1059), Robert the Monk (d. 1122), the anonymous Gesta version (c. 1100), Balderic of Dol (c.1050-1130), and Guibert Nogent (c.1055-1124). All were written several years after the council but not all the chroniclers had attended it. Nevertheless, there is a similarity in theme. Robert’s version contains variations that are helpful in understanding the tenor of Urban’s message and what allowed his call to succeed.\textsuperscript{174}


\textsuperscript{173} Cole, \textit{The Preaching of the Crusades}, 5-7.

\textsuperscript{174} Robert’s presence at the Council of Clermont cannot be confirmed, see Cole, \textit{The Preaching of the Crusades}, 13-15.
Robert of Rheims began with an appeal to flattery, equating the Franks with the “race chosen and beloved by God.”¹⁷⁵ The biblical imagery was a two-sided compliment for it contained a subtle reference to a need for repentance. According to the Hebrew Scriptures, the Jewish people often strayed from the covenant. The result was God inflicting punishment on them so that they repented and returned to following God’s commandments. It was meant to instill in Urban’s listeners repentance.¹⁷⁶ Robert’s version leaves the reason for repentance unanswered until later. He instead began to describe the great atrocities inflicted upon Christians in Outremer by “a race utterly alienated from God.”¹⁷⁷ He intended the tales of cruelty to inflame the passions of the hearers, interspersing religious desecration with accounts of rape and the dehumanizing act of Muslims leading men around on leashes made from their own intestines.

It is evident that Urban of Robert’s memory attempted to apply the Augustinian criteria to the situation he faced. His greeting was more than flattery and a call to repentance; it established a movement toward right intention and justice. As a holy people there were certain expectations for them, such as prayer and alms giving. Urban demanded more. The Israelites had to travel to the Promised Land, and when they arrived they had to fight for it because it was God’s will. The new Israelites were being called to do the same—follow God’s will, as explained by the pope. Augustine of Hippo’s formula for just cause was “[t]hose wars may be defined as just which avenge

¹⁷⁵ Robert the Monk, Historia Hierosolymitana.
¹⁷⁷ Robert the Monk, Historia Hierosolymitana.
Urban chose his examples, which are told in the other versions as well, because they were abominable to an honor-bound society. The raping of women called into question offspring’s legitimacy and the rights of inheritance, as well as, degraded a man’s martial prowess if he was unable to defend women. The use of intestinal leashes was a reference to the domestication of animals, equating fighting men with tame puppies.\(^\text{179}\) “On whom therefore is the labor of avenging these wrongs … if not upon you?”\(^\text{180}\) These were injuries that demanded justice.

Robert’s history continued with flattery, focusing on the great deeds performed by the Frankish ancestors. The Frankish hero, Charlemagne (768-814), is invoked and praised for his victories over pagan kings and expanding Christendom. It was to remind the hearers that the blood of Charlemagne ran through their veins still. “They must not be held back from responding to God’s call and thus from achieving great deeds out of an excessive love of temporal possessions.”\(^\text{181}\) Urban had outlined the sins of the Franks. He spoke of their land as too small for its population, unable to provide the necessary resources. The lack of resources, he claimed, led to murder, war, and hatred, which are symbols of petty feudal squabbles and tournaments. Instead, the Franks should reconcile themselves to one another and take possession of the land given to the “children of


\(^\text{179}\) Cole, The Preaching of the Crusades, 14.

\(^\text{180}\) Robert the Monk, Historia Hierosolymitana.

Israel.” He ended the speech by granting the remission of sins to any who partook the journey. The crowd responded, “Deus vult! Deus vult!”

The criteria of just cause, legitimate authority, and proper conduct are treated in the final section of Urban II’s speech. The preservation of peace and order was an ideal sought by religious and secular leaders of the medieval world, though not often attained. An element of peace was unity and cohesion among Christians. The statements on the misdeeds of the Franks, therefore, need to be understood in this context. In the High Priestly Prayer of Jesus in the Gospel of John, He prayed for the unity of Christians, “so that they may be one.” The unity desired by Jesus was an important motivation for medieval churchmen; it was the foundation for the desire to establish Christendom. The senselessness of Christian attacking and/or killing a fellow Christian appalled them, especially if there was a greater need. The crusade was a means by which to unite Christians together in a common cause. The crusades were justifiable under bellum iustum on this account alone.

Only Robert the Monk’s version of Clermont recorded the invocation of Charlemagne. The rallying of Frankish valor is implied, but again there is more to the symbol presented. Pope Leo III (750-816) crowned Charlemagne, which in the papal understanding implied submission of the emperor to the pope. In a way, it prefigured the ideas found in Gratian’s Causa 23, the goals of Charlemagne and Leo were the same. They were understood to have worked together in a symbiotic relationship. The statements in Robert’s version described Charlemagne extending the “territory of the
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182 Robert the Monk, *Historia Hierosolymitana*: “God wills it! God wills it!”

183 John 17:21.
holy church.” By this phrase, he meant that dioceses and religious houses were established and endowed, but also that Christianity was spread and prospered. Charlemagne ensured uniformity of practice in monastic legislation and cultic worship. In addition, the eastward expansion of the Holy Roman Empire created new territories that followed the disciplines of Rome. It was the cooperation of the secular and spiritual realm that was the animating force behind Urban’s appeal. He was not forced to concede temporal authority, nor was he required to yield it. Instead, he proposed the right ordering of society, a symbiotic relationship in which the interests and goals of the Church and state aligned.

From the fifth through the eleventh centuries, Western Europe remained a violent place. Often Europeans were at the mercy of outside forces, however, they were capable of creating many of their own problems. The Roman Church saw expedient options to ensure the survival of Christianity and its ability to flourish. It took these opportunities as a means to direct the world, not for power necessarily but to create a Christian kingdom. The principles on warfare created in the classical world were not forgotten, however. Instead they were interwoven and applied to the circumstances of the contemporary world. At its core, the principle was a world in which peace and stability reigned, a fitting tribute to the Prince of Peace. The effectiveness of the Church’s actions was not always apparent, but seeds were sown. The rightness or sinfulness of an individual’s action was his/her own concern, which profoundly affected the way the laity understood their place in the divine order.

---

184 Robert the Monk, *Historia Hierosolymitana.*

Chapter 3

The Creation of a Lay Theology of Salvation Based on War

In hindsight, much has been made of Duke William of Aquitaine’s (875-918) gift of the town of Cluny to a group of Benedictine monks in September 910. Yet, William’s motivations were much simpler. As recorded in the charter, he gifted the land for the soul of my lord king Odo, of my father and my mother; for myself and my wife—for the salvation, namely, of our souls and bodies;—and not least for that of Ava … for the souls also of our brothers and sisters and nephews, and of all our relatives of both sexes; for our faithful ones who adhere to our service.  

The concern for the afterlife was heightened because of the intense violence of the tenth century. The Vikings made periodic raids that left many dead and others without sustenance to sustain themselves. Disease was rampant and crop failures where a perennial danger. Many, including the nobility, hoped for a better life in heaven. Forgiveness of sins and prayers for souls were the means to ensure a better afterlife. Yet, it was the Roman Church that controlled the avenues to salvation—the Sacraments. As the battles between secular and ecclesial rulers over the next two centuries attested, lay princes chaffed under ecclesial dominance. The governing bellatores desired a world in which all people within their domains, including churchmen, were subject to them. An important element in this plan was to wrest control of the power of salvation from the oratores. Knights believed they needed salvation because of their sins, but they wanted it on their own terms.

---

Knights were keenly aware that their profession, though necessary, was sinful. It violated the Decalogue proscription against killing. An early tenth-century, French penitential, though acknowledging differing levels of culpability, saw killing as a sin that required penance. The proscription required the knight to do forty day’s penance for each man he killed in battle. A similar punishment is found in an eleventh century penitential as well. Bernard Verkamp has shown that it was not killing alone that made the knightly profession sinful; regardless, the knight remained unworthy of heaven until he atoned.

Several options were available to the nobility to prepare them for eternity: the Sacrament of Penance, endowing chantries, and pilgrimage. In many ways, ecclesiastical control enveloped all three methods, though it was possible for a layperson to go on pilgrimage or endow a monastery on his or her own volition. Time and again, cartulary documents cited the remission of sin as the rationale behind a donor’s largesse to a monastery. Marcus Bull warns historians not to take the documents at face value because the monks often prepared the charters, and the charters were occasionally the result of
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187 The Decalogue is the commandments God gave to his people on Mount Sinai (Exodus 20:1-17)–the fifth commandment (Exodus 20:13) forbids killing.


land disputes—not known to modern readers—between lords and abbots. Nevertheless, the cartularies were binding contracts that stipulated the gift of the noble in exchange for prayer and sometimes a small remuneration in either direction. For example, the Cartulary of the Monastery of St. Peter in Vigeois records several donations made in the tenth and eleventh centuries. One was made by Guarsenda who gave his dwelling to the monastery “for the salvation of his, his father’s, his mother’s, and all his ancestors’ souls.” In another example from the same cartulary, Elijah Alderbert and his mother gave their home to the monastery for the protection of their souls and that of Hugh Alderbert. They were to remain living in the house until their deaths, and until their demise they provided four sextarii of wine and wheat each year to the monastery. If looked at in a purely contractual way, the landowner gave something of value in exchange for what she or he also perceived to have value. The preeminent payment by the monks was prayer, so the fact that these gifts existed meant the donor believed the monks’ prayers were efficacious in eradicating sin.

Pilgrimages, on the other hand, were an outgrowth of private confession. The loss of Britannia to the Roman Empire (fifth century) also meant the end of episcopal-based Christianity. Celtic Christianity became widespread in the British Isles. One of the practices that differentiated it from Roman Christianity was the development in the sixth


192 See *Cartulaire de L’Abbaye de Vigeois en Limousin (954-1167)*, ed. M. de Montégut (Limoges: Ducourtieux & Gout, 1907).

193 *Cartulaire de Abbaye de Vigeois en Limousin 1*: “pro salute anime sue et patris sui et matris sue et omnium parentum suorum.”

194 *Cartulaire de Abbaye de Vigeois en Limousin 20.*
century of individual, private penance, which differed from the Roman practice of public confession. Irish missionaries subsequently transplanted the model to the continent, and between the ninth and thirteenth centuries it gradually became the standard practice. A penance found in early penitentials was pilgrimage.\footnote{Joseph Martos, \textit{Doors to the Sacred: A Historical Introduction to Sacraments in the Catholic Church}, rev. ed. (Liguori, MO: Liguori/Triumph, 1991), 284-289.}

The penitentials assigned pilgrimages for a variety of different sins, though usually for serious offenses (e.g. sacrilege, murder, and fornication in certain circumstances). The eleventh century \textit{Irish Canons} of Worchester required “hard penance on pilgrimage” for those who stole from the shrines of saints, churches, or kidnapped one of the bishop’s men.\footnote{“Irish Canons,” in \textit{Medieval Handbooks of Penance: A Translation of the Principal Libri Poenitentiales and Selections from Related Documents}, ed. John McNeill and Helena Gamer (1938; repr., New York: Octagon Books, 1965), 425-426.} Whether traveling to the shrine of a local saint or one of the principle medieval pilgrim sites (Compostella, Rome, or Jerusalem), the process was meant to be purifying. It was possible that a pilgrim might not return because of the arduousness and dangers of the journey. The end result was the remission of sins or an indulgence for those who spontaneously undertook the journey.\footnote{Bull, \textit{Knightly Piety}, 204-249.}

One of the most significant pilgrimages undertaken during the late eleventh century was the First Crusade (1095-1099). No contemporaneous accounts of Pope Urban II’s speech at the Council of Clermont on November 27, 1095 exist. They were all \textit{post factum} accounts and were prejudiced by subsequent events. There are some themes that exist across the spectrum that provide some understanding of the situation and the mindset of the protagonists. The first is that the crusade was understood as a pilgrimage.
Jerusalem was the traditional pilgrimage destination for several centuries up to the Frankish invasion of the Levant. The destination was a major factor in the crusaders’ understanding, and so they adopted distinctive clothing (i.e. the taking of the cross and the pilgrim’s staff). Furthermore, the crusader-knights spoke of their expedition as a pilgrimage, particularly in monastic cartulary documents drawn up to protect their holdings while away or to conclude amiable terms with monasteries with which they had been in conflict.\textsuperscript{198} As an example, the nobility in the environs of L’Abbaye de Fleury turned to the monks for help in financing their trip to Jerusalem. In the chapter deliberations concerned with discussing the loans to the travelers, they were named as *Hierosolymam peregre profecturus* (pilgrims bound for Jerusalem).\textsuperscript{199}

Self-definition of pilgrimage by the crusaders is valuable in understanding the role of the second belief concerning the crusade—the attachment of an indulgence. As a voluntary pilgrimage there was an indulgence attached. The official language of the indulgence granted by Pope Urban II was not recorded. As the call for the crusade developed, the canonical view was that the crusade indulgence included remission of temporal punishment for confessed sins and not a blanket remission of all sins.\textsuperscript{200} Yet, crusade preachers promised the world, “distorted in the lavish and unconditional promises … offered crusaders just what they surely needed to hear and wanted to possess: unambiguous assurance of sins forgiven in this world and a safe passage through


\textsuperscript{199} *Recueil des chartes de l’abbaye de Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire* 150.

devilish perils to glory in the next.” Riley-Smith again makes a poignant observation, of all the promised martyrs’ crowns only one Levantine crusader was honored, Rainald Porcher. The crusaders marched off with the belief that they were saved. Without sanctioned saintly intercessors, models of holy lives and devotion to duty were still needed.

In The Awntyrs off Arthure at the Terne Wathelyne (late fourteenth to early fifteenth centuries) the ghost of Queen Guinevere’s mother confronted her and Sir Gawain. The ghost, addressing Guinevere, provided a warning to her daughter—be charitable and not aligned with the excesses of courtly life—and to pray for her soul that she might not suffer long in purgatory. Gawain, concerned for his own soul, queried the ghost, “’How shall we prevail,’ said the knight, ‘who seek to fight and in so doing violate the people of many kings’ lands?’” As a knight, he was keenly aware that his actions were not those expected of a Christian. He, therefore, sought the advice of this specter on how to avoid a similar fate for himself. He ignored the traditional path of sacramental absolution for the advice of one similar to himself by station.

Richard Kaeuper has argued that by examining the Arthurian legends, particularly those involving the Grail, it is possible to construct an idea of aristocratic piety in the High to Late Middle Ages. In doing so, he claims that there existed a knightly desire for
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201 Richard Kaeuper, Holy Warriors, 69.
204 The Awntyrs 261-264.
The predominant interpretation of the search for the Holy Grail is that it is a metaphor for salvation. The Grail had caught the Blood of Christ, which flowed from Jesus of Nazareth’s side at the Crucifixion, and according to legend was entrusted to Joseph of Arimathea. As such, Christian knights consider the Grail as the pre-eminent relic in Christendom; the only tangible item greater was the Eucharist—understood to be the actual Body and Blood of Christ. In addition, knights had co-opted Joseph of Arimathea as one of their own, the first Christian knight and the ancestor of Sir Galahad. The search for the Grail was the search for holiness and sanctification. It was not the possession of the relic that was essential, but the journey itself and the hardships endured. It was a pilgrimage in its own right, which knights undertook on their own accord.

The romance versions of the Arthurian legends, unfortunately, postdate the First Crusade and the formation of the Templars. The legends gained prominence on the continent through the work of Chrétien de Troyes and Marie de France in the late twelfth century, which is more than one generation after the creation of the Templars in 1119/29. The struggles between nobles and churchmen existed long before and continued after the crusades. It is possible then that the crusades ignited a passion for the Grail and infused new life into an already existing motif. The jongleurs, who entertained the nobility at court, were known for singing the *chansons de geste* (songs of heroic

---


deeds). In fact, Wace (c.1115-1183) records in *Roman de Rou* (c.1160-1175) that in preparation for the battle of Hastings, Taillefer—Duke William’s *jongleur*—“who sang right well, rode mounted on a swift horse before the duke, singing of Karlemaine, and of Rollant, of Oliver and the vassals who died in Renchevals.”

It is impossible to know for certain if Taillefer sang what is understood today as the *Chanson de Roland* (*Song of Roland*), but the epics were indeed known and various versions of the *chansons de geste* were widely popular among the *bellatores*.

The *Chanson de Roland* is the most commonly known and earliest recorded work of the *chansons de geste* tradition, but the *Chanson de Guillaume* (*Song of William*) and *Gormont et Isembart* were greatly circulated prior to the mid-twelfth century. The earliest version of the *Chanson de Roland* is the Oxford/Bodelein version, recorded shortly after 1098 and possibly circulated orally as early as the late eighth century.

The *Chanson de Guillaume* is thought to be the newest of these three epics and preserved in only one manuscript dated to the mid-thirteenth century. Despite the late date, the source material may predate the written *Chanson de Roland* and some scholars believe it to have been first copied around 1100-1120. Surviving only in fragmentary form, *Gormont et Isembart* may have been recorded as early as the later-half of the eleventh century.

---


Official documents and pronouncements, though advancing bishops’ and kings’
authorized viewpoints, do not necessarily reach into the core beliefs of individuals.
Entertainment, which keeps people at ease because it is familiar, can be an aid to reach
their understanding of the world. The *chansons de geste* tradition centered on singing
heroic tales of great warriors of the early Frankish empire, frequently employing
Charlemagne (768-814), members of his court, or his ancestors and progeny. The
*jongleurs*, who performed these epics, were staples at Frankish courts during festive
occasions and vilified by churchmen for their association with “making love, admiring
feminine beauty, holding festivities, and fighting in tournaments.”212 Regardless of these
ecclesiastics’ view, the *jongleurs* were an ever-present staple of the noble life. Their
patrons welcomed them at court because they provided stories that were entertaining, as
well as, spoke to the needs and aspirations of the nobility.213

Suzanne Fleischman has remarked on *jongleurs’* and copyists’ verb tenses used in
performance narrative (e.g. *chansons de geste*). She noted that the typical tense
employed was the present tense and it has often been understood as a way to make the
past more vivid. Fleischman took it one step further and explored the meaning of these
texts if viewed through Old French linguistic understanding, which when understood
even in a past tense expressed ongoing action. The value of this observation is that the
language maintains the existence of the events related; she remarks, “*all* reading and *all*
speaking of past events suppose, in the reactualization required by the process of
encoding and decoding, the voice of the sender or that of the addressee, re-PRESENT-ing

212 John Baldwin, “The Image of the Jongleur in Northern France Around 1200,” *Speculum* 72,
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(November 2010): 181.
in consciousness particular signifieds by their signifiers.”  

The jongleurs’ performances, therefore, were a greater social event than just among the individuals present. It created a connection, in the present moment, between the ancestor, whose deeds were immortalized, and his progeny.

Fleischman’s argument also opens a new understanding on the inter-relationship of the *chansons de geste* and the central act of Christian worship—the Eucharist. Contained within the Eucharistic Liturgy is a theological concept known as *anamnesis*, which is Greek for memory—within the liturgy the Latin term used is *memoria*. This term is used during, and shortly after, the consecration of the bread and wine at Mass. Referencing Luke 22:19 and 1Corinthians 11:24-25, the priest prays,

> As often as you do this, do it in memory of me. And so, Lord, your servants and all your holy people call to mind the blessed passion of the same Christ your Son, our Lord, and likewise his resurrection from the dead, and also his glorious ascension into the heavens.  

The theological understanding was that the celebration being performed was not a re-enactment or performing a new sacrifice; instead, the *memoria* made the actions of Jesus Christ on Holy Thursday through Easter Sunday present again—the bread and wine distributed at Mass was the same distributed by Jesus in the Upper Room.

In the medieval world, the interaction between the sacred and profane was understood. The contemporary celebrations of the Eucharist made present the actions of


215 *Roman Canon*: “Haec quotiescúmque fecéritis, in mei memoriam faciétis. Unde et mémores, Dómini nostri, tam beátæ passiónis, necnon e ab inferis resurrectiónis, sed et in cælos gloriósa ascensiónis.”

216 For a fuller discussion on the development and theology of the Roman Mass, see Martos, *Doors to the Sacred*, 203-267.
Christ at Calvary, as well as the redemptive nature of those actions. Medieval Christians understood Calvary and the Eucharist as affecting them in the present moment. In a similar way, the connection between the heroic deaths of Sir Vivien at L’Archamp (Chanson de Guillaume) and Count Roland at Roncevaux (Chanson de Roland) to stop the Saracens was taking place in the hearers’ presence, who were then able to share in the honor, glory, and redemptive acts of these martyrs. There exist early exempla of holy soldiers (i.e. Martin of Tours, the Theban Legion, Forty Martyrs of Sebaste, etc.), but the hagiography for these saints emphasized their refusal to engage in combat. Beginning in the tenth century, however, it became possible for soldiers to be holy and still remain fighting men. As a consequence of this development, knights sought the blessing of the church on their weapons and armor as holy objects. It was an association that the Roman Church welcomed as it attempted to pull the secular into the sacred to wield greater influence. Knighthood began to develop as a possible avenue for holiness, especially when engaged to fight against injustice and Saracens.

The saints were imitators of Jesus and, therefore, if knights can be holy then Christ contained knightly qualities: “if Christ suffered combat and laid down his life


219 Prior to the crusades, Western Europeans had little contact with Muslims, the exceptions were on the Iberian Peninsula and the French borderlands of the Pyrenees. Within contemporary literature they were portrayed as similar to the pagans of ancient Rome, as such, all non-Christs were referred to as Saracens regardless of place of origin or religion. For a further discussion on this topic see John Tolan, “Saracens as Pagans,” Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 105-134.
willingly, so do his warrior heroes.” The chansons de geste provided the more explicit link between the redemptive act of Calvary and the battlefield. The Chanson de Guillaume provides similar incidents in the death of Vivien with the death of Jesus on the Cross. The first connection occurs when Vivien received a wound, which was his eventual undoing. The location is key,

And then a knight from Barbary attacked him: …
In his right hand a cutting dart he carried;
He shook it thrice then in a trice it landed; …
In Vivien’s side a mighty wound it battered …
He put his hand behind his back to find
The Pagan’s shaft and wrench it from his side.\footnote{Chanson de Guillaume 773-785.}

The Barbary knight’s attack was not the blow that killed him, although it weakened him to the point where he eventually was unable to fend off further attacks.\footnote{Chanson de Guillaume 917-925.} In the Johannine Gospel, the body of Jesus, as it hung on the cross, was also pierced in the side with a lance.\footnote{John 19:31-37.} Indeed a single event may be a coincidence, but two other events help to solidify the connection. After he was injured in the side, Vivien continued to fight off the advances of the Moors. In order to maintain his strength, he drank. The description in the text notes that the water tasted like gall and he spewed it out.\footnote{Chanson de Guillaume 864.} The Gospel of Matthew relates a similar incident in which the soldiers offered Jesus wine that was mixed with gall and it was refused.\footnote{Matthew 27:34.} In the final incident, both those who killed Jesus

\footnote{Kaeuper, Holy Warriors,120.}
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and those who killed Vivien wanted to ensure that their bodies were not problems after their deaths. 226

*Jongleurs* often used familiar phrases and stock ideas in the recitation of *chansons de geste*. 227 Likewise, the story of Jesus’ crucifixion was a familiar trope known to those listening to the performance. Nevertheless, to unite the death of an individual to the death of Jesus implied a holiness that was often associated with the martyrs. For instance, in one account of the martyrdom of St. Saturninus of Toulouse (c.257), the saint was aware that his death was approaching and asked two of his priests to remain with him. The priests remained temporarily but fled when Saturninus was captured and dragged to the city. 228 The description is similar to events in the final days of Jesus, in which He predicted His crucifixion before going to Jerusalem, asked the disciples to remain with him in the Garden of Gethsemane, and they abandoned Jesus when the temple guards arrested him. 229 The hagiographic tradition had long used the Pauline principle that dying like Jesus ensured the promises He made about the resurrection. The *jongleurs* incorporated that belief into their *chansons*. All who died defending Christianity, including those who took up arms, were martyrs.

Explicit references are made in both the *Chanson de Roland* and the *Chanson de Guillaume* to the act of martyrdom made by the new saintly warriors. After suffering great loss of life attacking the Moors, Sir Vivien attempted to rally the troops with a war cry:

226 Matthew 28:11-15; *Chanson de Guillaume* 928.


228 Martin of Tours, *History of the Franks* 1.30.

While we still live, let blood for blood be paid!
St Stephen and the host of martyred Saints
Are no more blest than any man this day
Who dies for God on Archamp’s bloody plain.\(^{230}\)

Vivien and his troops had gathered to stop King Desramed of Cordoba’s invasion of France after Count Thibaut had fled the field of battle. The shift in the rationale from their initial purpose for being at L’Archamp portends the holiness of their action—they fight now for God because their earthly liege lord fled. The combat is now a fight between the forces of God and the forces of evil. John Tolan has explained the significance of the shift in the late-eleventh to early-twelth centuries to understanding Muslims as pagans. They were believed to be the archetype of the old Roman pagans, and so to die at the hands of the new pagans (i.e. Saracens) was the same as the martyrdoms of Polycarp, Felicity and Perpetua, Peter and Paul.\(^{231}\) The references to martyrdom are multiplied in the *Chanson de Roland*. Archbishop Turpin, one of the knights who stays to fight the rearguard action, proclaims all who die “will be martyrs holy” and “[t]he Saint you will be sitting beside.”\(^{232}\) The holiness of these men was certain. According to the *chanson*, even the Muslim enemy knew the true fate—heaven—of those who died at Roncevaux.\(^{233}\)

Viewed with the perspective of martyrdom, the *chansons* become hagiography. The purpose of hagiography was not to provide an accurate rendition of the saint’s life but “to demonstrate how the saint exhibited those universal characteristics of sanctity

\(^{230}\) *Chanson de Guillaume* 544-547.


\(^{232}\) *Chanson de Roland* 1134, 1523.

\(^{233}\) *Chanson de Roland* 965.
common to all saints of all times.”

Nancy Durling notes that there are prevalent themes in hagiography (i.e. “birth, youth, moment of saintly self-awareness, renunciation of the world, life of saintly self-denial, death and … posthumous miracles”), but flexibility is allowed for the individuality of particular saints. The jongleurs assumed the role of monkish scribes and adapted their stories. Within the three chansons being discussed there are several elements that fit traditional hagiographic texts: virtue, protection by God, a priestly/intercessory nature, and death.

The hero of Gormont et Isembart was King Louis III (879-882, portrayed as the son of Charlemagne in the chanson), though it was Hugh who exhibited saintly zeal in battle. Gormont had slain Ernault of Ponthieu and then proceeded to mock Jesus, questioning His ability to rise from the dead if He was not able to help Ernault in battle. Hugh arrived “[a]nd when he heard our Lord reviled, his heart was filled with darkest spite.” Despite King Louis’ pleas for Hugh to remain by his side, Hugh disobeys the earthly ruler and bests Gormont in single battle. Gormont is saved only because more Saracens (Vikings) arrive. Hugh reacted because his true lord was insulted.

In the struggle between the papacy and monarchy in the late-eleventh century, a core issue was the superiority of one realm of power over the other. In the controversy between Pope Gregory VII and Emperor Henry IV, the papacy attempted to reassert its dominance over the appointment of bishops, which had previously yielded to monarchical appointments. Henry IV refused to accede to the pope’s demands and

---


236 Gormont et Isembart 198-199.
responded to Gregory VII’s threat of excommunication by poignantly laying out his position,

You have threatened to take [my empire] away, as if we had received it from you, and as if the Empire and kingdom were in your disposal and not in the disposal of God. Our Lord Jesus Christ has called us to the government of the Empire.\(^{237}\)

As a means to distance clerical involvement in the affairs of state, knights understood themselves to have no mediator between themselves and God in their homage.\(^{238}\) When King Louis prepared himself to do battle against Gormont in *Gormont et Isembart* his prayer is a reminder to God that he holds his realm directly from God “and bow the knee to no one else,” and he goes on to defeat Gormont in battle with divine aid.\(^{239}\) In order to show his authority in the spiritual and secular realms, Charlemagne used his direct fealty to God in order to bestow his own and God’s blessing upon Sir Ganelon.\(^{240}\)

The figure of Charlemagne plays a significant role in the lay understanding on the issue. Eugene Vance argues that Charlemagne’s opposition to the Second Council of Nicaea’s (787) restoration of icons was because he believed it to conflict with the cult of relics. Relics were a means by which Charlemagne was able to unite his vast empire under the protection of God with him as the sole leader or vicar of Christ.\(^{241}\) The two swords in the *Chanson de Roland*, Durendal and Joyeuse, were the connection the

---


\(^{239}\) *Gormont et Isembart* 376-395.

\(^{240}\) *Chanson de Roland* 339-342.

jongleur employed to illustrate the Carolingian motif. The swords contained important relics to Christianity. Durendal, Roland’s sword, contained St. Peter’s tooth, Basil of Caesarea’s blood, St. Denis’ hair, and cloth of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Charlemagne’s sword, Joyeuse, contained a greater relic, the lance that pierced the side of Christ on the Cross and was credited with the victory for the crusaders at Antioch (1098). God had entrusted these holy relics to Charlemagne, who at God’s direction gave Durendal to Roland. They signify to the noble mind the right ordering of society. The power of God is ensconced in the pommel of a warrior’s sword, and the warrior wields the sword on behalf of God. The hearer of the chanson knew Roland, the Twelve Peers, and Charlemagne fought for God because the hoped for prize was the reconversion of Spain to Christianity.

The Codex Calixtinus (c. twelfth century) associated Charlemagne with the Spanish Reconquista. Tradition ascribed the five-book codex to Pope Callixtus II (1119-1124), most of the text concerned the pilgrimage route to Compostella and miracles performed by St. James the Greater. However, the fourth book, independently circulated, contained a history of Charlemagne and Roland. The same tradition ascribed it to Archbishop Turpin, a companion of Roland at Roncevaux. The Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandii records that as Charlemagne prepared to end his long wars, he received a vision from St. James to rescue the land of his burial from the Saracens, that St. James

242 Ashe, “A Prayer and a Warcry,” 357.
243 Chanson de Roland 2346-2348.
244 Chanson de Roland 2503-2506.
246 Chanson de Roland 85-86; 101-102.
was to provide assistance to Charlemagne in battle, and lead him to his shrine to worship
(El Camino de Santiago).\footnote{Pseudo-Turpin, Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi 2.} The continued tradition surrounding St. James was that he
did not abandon those who fought on behalf of Christianity in the Iberian Peninsula. He
became known as Santiago Matamoros (St. James the Moor-Slayer) for literally fighting
in battle against the Moors.

The importance of saintly and divine aid was not lost on the compilers of the
chansons. Gormont continued to show his martial prowess by killing nearly every
nobleman who dared to present himself. Louis III, therefore, faced him in direct combat
after he lamented losing so many nobles. Gormont’s aim had not been an issue in
previous challenges, but when he faced Louis he missed three consecutive times. The
jongleur credits God’s mercy.\footnote{Gormont et Isembart 360-419.} A related incident occurred in the Chanson de Roland.
Though Count Margariz will eventually be killed in the melee, divine aid is granted to
him while he charged a thousand Moors and “God guards his body from the blow.”\footnote{Chanson de Roland 1304-1319.} It
became more explicit during the Crusades, but prior to the twelfth century it was an
established practice that God aided the righteous in victory. Trial by combat was a
common means to settle disputes.\footnote{Constance Bouchard, Strong of Body, Brave & Noble: Chivalry & Society in Medieval France
(Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998),128-129.} According to Oderic Vitalis, the Frankish crusaders
received reinforcements at a critical moment in the Battle of Antioch (June 1098). The
army of white lead by Sts. George, Demetrius, and Mercurius, though not seen by all,
affected all the belligerents and victory swung to the crusaders. To have heavenly aid was not a miracle per se but an expectation. If you fight for God as His vassals, God will reward you in some measure—victory on earth or in heaven.

The chansons have demonstrated within secular matters that knights and princes require no mediation between them and God. To allow clerical control in any aspect of knightly life opened the possibility for erosion in the secular realm. The chansons, therefore, provided an usurpation of priestly power to knights. To elevate these heroic warriors to saintly status provided sympathetic intercessors for the bellatores. Nevertheless, it was not enough. Intercession and the power of absolution needed to be found in these warriors prior to their deaths. The acceptance of God by their actions can then be shown:

God sends him Cherubim, his angel,  
And Saint Michael of Peril;  
Together with them, Saint Gabriel there flies;  
The soul of the Count, they bear to Paradise.  

God sent special messengers to Roland to carry him into paradise. The special action showed God’s pleasure in the knightly action on God’s behalf, both physical and spiritual combat.

The role of the priest was multifaceted and some of the more important functions he performed were to bless, absolve sins, and intercede on behalf of people. Charlemagne’s ability to bestow Christ’s blessing has already been noted. Sir Vivien rallied the troops multiple times in the Chanson de Guillaume. After his men continued to beat back the Saracens’ waves of attack, the nobles began to waver. His final call-to-

---

251 Orderic Vitalis, Ecclesiastical History 9.3.559-560.
252 Chanson de Roland 2393-2396.
arms was prayer, in which he asked God to protect those who fought for God’s cause and
to beseech Count William (755-812/14, also known as St. William of Gellone) or King
Louis to come to Archamp and relieve them.\textsuperscript{253} Roland, concerned for the souls of his
men, absolved them twice. In one absolution, he directs forgiveness of sins directly to
Archbishop Turpin.\textsuperscript{254} Other means of purification was also available to the soldiers.

As mentioned previously, knights required absolution if they desired to go to
heaven. Despite the assurance of salvation to those who were the vassals of God and
died in God’s service or the indulgence of the crusading pilgrimage, additional
guarantees were needed. Theologians debated, without a consensus at the beginning of
the twelfth century, the place for the soul to wait before the Last Judgment. Some
theologians advocated the ideas of Augustine of Hippo, in which the better souls
underwent a trial, while the worse souls waited in hell with some mediation of their
suffering. Others believed in a Christian version of Sheol. The commonality of the
various opinions was the necessity of the soul’s purgation, which took place by a fiery
torment. In addition, the prayers, Masses, and penances offered by others on the soul’s
behalf or works done in life could ease the suffering.\textsuperscript{255}

Prayers and Masses for the Dead multiplied during the Carolingian period and
continued to expand under the care of the Cluniac monks. The greater consciousness

\textsuperscript{253} *Chanson de Guillaume* 539-565.

\textsuperscript{254} *Chanson de Roland* 1854-55, 2250-2258.

\textsuperscript{255} Jacques Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago: University of
toward the dead increased their presence in medieval literature.²⁵⁶ Ghosts became prophets to the listeners, warnings of the fate that awaited them if they did not amend their ways. Yet, at the same time the ghosts became models for the purifying state. Their bodies endured the torments and afflictions of the afterlife. A knight understood bodily suffering and how to endure corporeal pain.²⁵⁷ In the knightly ethos, wars became holy endeavors. They provided the knight with the opportunity to do penance with his body, alleviating him of the need for purgation in the afterlife. The *bellatores* adapted the theological rationale to their own circumstances.

The battlefield was a pseudo-Purgatory.²⁵⁸ Raluca Radulescu observed that the trials undertaken by the knights in literature were seen as the equivalent of the torments in Purgatory and acted as the necessary penances for their sins.²⁵⁹ Within the three *chansons* under discussion only one specifically refers to a cleric, *Chanson de Roland*. Archbishop Turpin’s priestly virtues, however, were downplayed; it was his knightly qualities that were repeatedly praised.²⁶⁰ As Roland and his men prepared for battle, Turpin granted absolution to all the Franks. His penance is peculiar; they must fight the Saracen enemy.²⁶¹ In the *chanson*, Roland has fought the fight to the bitter end and


²⁵⁷ Martin, ”Economy of Pain,” 194.


²⁶⁰ *Chanson de Roland* 1509-1509, 1671-1675, 2242-2245.

²⁶¹ *Chanson de Roland* 1124-1144.
suffered grievous wounds that a normal man could not bear, “his brain issues forth from his ear.” In a final act, he removed his gauntlet and raised it to God in filial/fealty offering.\footnote{Chanson de Roland 2260, 2365, 2373-2374.} Roland’s sufferings in battle cleansed him from sin, so he was able to offer himself unblemished to God.\footnote{Ashe, “A Prayer and a Warcry,” 358.}

The perfection of the lives of Vivien, Roland, and Louis, as well as the meaning that their \textit{vitae/chansons} illustrate, are codified in their deaths. They are soldiers. They are holy. They are models of the liberated knight. And those who imitate their example share their glory. Ashe commented on the \textit{Chanson de Roland} in a way that is typical for the three \textit{chansons}, “in its form as a sung, rhythmical, aural experience, it offers itself almost as a secular liturgy, ritualistic and formulaic in its basic materials, vivid and cathartic in its execution.”\footnote{Ashe, “A Prayer and a Warcry,” 357.} \textit{Gormont et Isembart} can be understood as the saddest of these \textit{chansons} because none of the heroes survive. King Louis was able to kill Gormont in hand-to-hand combat and chase down the traitor Isembart. By his own prowess and full might of his power, in killing Gormont he killed himself. He lived only thirty days past the battle.\footnote{Gormont et Isembart 360-419.} As a king of France, his subjects enshrined his body in Saint-Denis to be venerated for all eternity. Roland built his own proto-shrine. He marked the rocks nearby and made his way to a pine tree and rested beneath, facing Spain.\footnote{Chanson de Roland 2397-2376.} The Saracens (Vikings) did not allow a shrine to be built for Vivien. They hid his body because they
feared his intercessory power. Charlemagne, in *chanson* as in real life, cultivated the relics that were the symbol of his religious freedom. He removed his weapons and approached Roncevaux a pilgrim to gather the relics and send their power throughout the empire.

Certainly not every knight who lived from 900 to 1200 saw a connection with the warrior saints of Roncevaux, L’Archamp, and Saucourt-en-Vimeu. Nor were all knights certain that salvific grace was available outside the traditional bounds of the Roman Church’s Sacrament or if it should be sought there. Nevertheless, there was a pervading ethos, which wanted to allow knights to be knights in their full valor and still remain pious Christians. There was a struggle being fought between the inherent contradiction of killing and Christianity.

Martial prowess was all the *bellatores* knew, and they were exemplary in their profession. The problem was the nagging suspicion that their deeds were not right in the sight of God. They were assured by the Church, their king, and immortalized in song. Yet, for some knights it was not enough. If the knights (*miles Christii*) were perfect and the monks (*athleti Christii*) were perfect, some wondered what a combined state of life might entail.

---

267 *Chanson de Guillaume* 925-927.

268 *Chanson de Roland* 2498-2531; 2845-2854. For more information on Roncevaux as a pilgrimage site, see Vance, “Style and Value,” 84-96.
Chapter 4

A New Look at the Foundation of the Knights Templar

The ecclesial and seculars worlds sought a new way of being a knight. It needed to ensure there were fighters for justice and the defense of Christendom, as well as, solidifying the knightly exploits as a means to ensure salvation. The Poor Fellow-Soldiers of Christ and the Temple of Solomon fit the bill. As a new institution with a unique purpose, the early Templars had the ability to create an idyllic life, as they understood it.

The available evidence on the earliest Templars is limited. There exist passing references to the Templar Master as a witness to documents in the early twelfth century, but their foundation was limited to later chroniclers.\(^{269}\) In addition, the Rule of the Templars, approved at the Council of Troyes, was originally published in Latin, which posed a problem to a growing religious membership who were unfamiliar with the language. It was soon translated into French and additions necessitated by their mode of life were included.\(^{270}\) The translation was not based on the Latin version created at Troyes, but on the structure originally present by Hugh de Payns.\(^{271}\) Despite being an international order, few manuscripts (nine in total) survived their fourteenth-century suppression.\(^{272}\) A collection of the earliest grants to the Templars did survive their destruction, however. The cartulary, edited by André d’Albon in 1913, provides an


\(^{270}\) Upton-Ward, Rule of the Templars, 1-17.


\(^{272}\) Cerrini, La Révolution, 22-29.
invaluable resource for the organizational thought of the first and second generation Templars. The exhortations on the Templars by Bernard of Clairvaux and Hugh the Sinner add a theological understanding of the military order’s existence. Though a seemingly disparate collection of evidence, these sources are the key to seeing the dual origins of the Templars.

The foundations of the Templar order is difficult to ascertain, in part due to the mystery about themselves they cultivated, as well as, the lack of contemporary chronicler evidence. The four principal chronicles noting the emergence of the Templars recorded their creation fifty to sixty years afterwards (1180s and 1190s), at a critical time in the order’s history. They were at the height of their power, and yet the loss at Hattin (July 4, 1187)—though the Templars distinguished themselves well—created a snowball effect, on both the demise of the Latin Kingdoms and the Knights Templar Order. William of Tyre (c.1130-1186), Michael the Syrian (c.1126-1199), and the author of Ernoul’s chronicle had contact with the Templars in Outremer but were not yet born when the order began in 1119. Variations exist in the chronicles, though they generally adhere to the hagiographic material favored by the order.

Prior to their recognition at the Council of Troyes in 1129, a group of knights, who had come to defend the Holy Lands, undertook the protection of the pilgrimage routes and to live a life of prayer. Tradition relates that initially there were nine knights, led by Hugh de Payns and Godfrey de Saint-Omer (dates unknown). The legend continues that the early Templars were extremely poor, to the point in which two knights
rode together on one horse. In addition, they claimed to have remained small (only the original band of knights) until 1129 when their numbers expanded exponentially.\textsuperscript{273}

The discrepancies that appear in the chronicles are noteworthy. In regards to the raison d’être for the Templar foundation, only Walter Map’s (c. 1130-1210) chronicle provides the canonical view. He wrote about Hugh, a knight who had gone on pilgrimage and had heard of a cistern near Jerusalem that was used by Christians. It was often the site of ambushes. He attempted to defend the Christians from attack at the well, which succeeded for a while, but eventually the pagani joined forces and his strength was not enough. Map continued that Hugh was not deterred and gathered other pilgrim-soldiers for permanent or temporary service to aid him in protecting Christians and living a “regime of chastity and sobriety.”\textsuperscript{274} William of Tyre attested to the protection of pilgrims but removed the impetus from Hugh de Payns. In his rendition, a group of knights, led by Hugh and Godfrey, desired to live as canons regular. They were provided with the necessities for a religious life by the bishops and nobles of the area. They devoted themselves to a life of prayer and,

in addition to their profession, the Lord Patriarch and bishops, for the remission of their sins, enjoined upon them the protection of the pilgrims and the roads’ safety against robbers and attacks.\textsuperscript{275}

In William’s understanding, the Patriarch was the driving force behind the apostolic work of the Templars, without which there would have been only nine additional canons.

\textsuperscript{273} See Barber, \textit{The New Knighthood}, 1-37.

\textsuperscript{274} Malter Map, \textit{De Nugis Curialium} 1.18.

\textsuperscript{275} William of Tyre, \textit{Chronicon} 12.7: “Prima autem eorum professio, quodque eis a domino patriarcha et reliquis episcopis in remissionem peccatorum inunctum est, ut vias et itinera maxime ad salutem peregrinorum contra latronum et insidias pro viribus conservarent.”
Michael the Syrian and the *Chronique d’Ernoul* purported more secular and martial origins to the order. Michael relates that Hugh de Payns came to Jerusalem on pilgrimage and vowed not to return to Europe, remaining a monk. After three years of service to King Baldwin II, he had distinguished himself in battle and Baldwin did not wish to lose a strong warrior. He then encouraged Hugh to remain in the army. Hugh and the thirty knights who accompanied him were given the House of Solomon on the Temple Mount from the king as well as villages to provide for their needs—the patriarch also contributed some churches. Baldwin appeared content to create another noble in the Kingdom of Jerusalem because of the superior military acumen of Hugh. Michael adds, “they imposed upon themselves the rule of monastic life.”

The *Chronique d’Ernoul* directly tied the Templars to the First Crusade (1096-1099) because some of the crusader-knights joined together as the Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulcher of Jerusalem. Some of those same knights later grew restless from the lack of action and complained, “there is need in the land and we obey a priest, not engaging in battle.” These men consulted with King Baldwin, who sought the advise of his council, and they secured release from the Prior of the Holy Sepulcher to establish a martial order of monks.

Some of the written accounts can be explained through individual biases, positions, and circumstances, but the remaining text leaves pertinent observations. For example, William of Tyre believed the Templars to be arrogant and prideful because of

---

276 Michael the Syrian, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien* 15.11: “Pour eux, ils s’imposèrent la règle de vivre monastiquement.”

277 *Chronique d’Ernoul* 2: “et besoinge en est en lle tiere; el sommes obeisant à un priestre, si ne faisons ouvrre d’armes.”

278 *Chronique d’Ernoul* 2.
their exemptions from all secular and ecclesial authorities, except the Pope. It does not mean, however, that he should be discounted. He also praised their earliest endeavors. He did not follow the canonical history explicitly, but he did imply that they were men who wanted to live a form of religious life. William included their desire to be canons regular, which were communities of priests who followed the Rule of St. Augustine. They were, however, persuaded from that desire to form their military order.

The least helpful of the chronicles is Walter Map’s. He was a well-educated Welshman, who is known to have traveled throughout Western Europe. He was attached to the court of King Henry II (1154-1189) and, as such, possessed no first hand accounts of the Templars in Outremer. It is not surprising then that his account more closely aligns with the official history, as he was more dependent upon the tales of others, possibly from Knights Templar themselves.

Ernoul and Michael provided in their recollections a concern by the original founders for personal holiness, and they implied that the martial activities of the knights were efficacious unto salvation. Michael the Syrian was the Syriac Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch. He wrote in Syriac, a language not commonly known among the Frankish rulers and clergy, and as a monophysite he was protected from persecution but was not beholden to the state. Ernoul’s chronicle was a product of the official history of the


280 William of Tyre, *Chronicon* 12.7: “in manu domini pariaarche Christi servicio se mancipantes, more canonicorum regularium in castitate et obedientia et sine proprio velle perpetuo vivere professi sunt.”

281 After the conquest of Jerusalem, Duke Godfrey de Bouillon (1099-1100), ruler of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, established the canons regular in Jerusalem from former knights.

282 Barber, *The Templars*, 27.
Kingdom of Jerusalem by an unknown author who was familiar with the Jerusalem court, and it provides an independent Latin source apart from William of Tyre.\textsuperscript{283}

As noted earlier, Michael wrote that Hugh de Payns came to Jerusalem as a pilgrim.\textsuperscript{284} He desired to be a monk, but he and his men were a valuable resource to the monarchy as knights. William of Tyr’s addition, which specified their desire to be canons, showed that he wanted to leave the world in the traditional manner of a religious vocation. King Baldwin desired to change Hugh’s mind. According to Michael the Syrian, the king explained that to be a monk ensured only his individual salvation.\textsuperscript{285} The implication was clear that the potential to save more souls was available through military action. Following along the ecclesial understanding of holy war, fighting for a just cause (the defense of the Kingdom of Jerusalem) was salvific. In addition, a monk’s life was devoted to asceticism–Hugh and his companions’ desire. In a monastic order devoted to warfare, the traditional exercise of fasting was not a practical option. The replacement was in the warrior’s activity, which was battle. Ernoul’s chronicle made it clear that they saw their salvation (purification) through acting in the world. The purification of the body was still available in a new form of monastic life. Hugh was not bound to continue in the army beyond his three-year commitment, but he chose to do so because it provided him with what he desired. Michael the Syrian had established the link already when he conjoined the initial army commitment and Hugh de Payns, “having come from Rome for

\textsuperscript{283} Barber, \textit{The Templars}, 30.

\textsuperscript{284} Michael the Syrian, \textit{Chronique} 15.11: “\textit{un homme franc vint de Rome pour prier à Jérusalem.}”

\textsuperscript{285} Michael the Syrian, \textit{Chronique} 15.11: “\textit{pour travailler à sauver son âme seule.}”
prayer.” A final example from the chronicles, Ernoul stated that they did not wish to be ruled by priests. The Templar rule did not provide for priests nor did they have their own priests serving them in the beginning. Militia Dei, Eugene III’s papal decree, permitted them in 1145 to recruit priests, but they never became full members of the order. The Grand Master, who directed all activities of the order, was a layman. The chronicles, far from being definitive, do provide helpful corollaries. People not beholden to the Templars wrote the chronicles, providing an outsider’s perspective. The outside perspective provides the public perception of the new order. They were a religious order, yet they had different goals and objectives. Their fellow knights understood these objectives: war and salvation.

The perception of the Knights Templar was almost as important as the reality, shown with horrific consequences from 1307-1314. The knights found a great champion in Bernard of Clairvaux. As the most respected churchmen of his era, De Laude provided the Templar’s principal image to Western Europe and encouraged the growth of their order. In addition, the Letter to the Templars by Hugh Peccator provides an inside look into how the order was to understand themselves. Jean Leclerq discovered Hugh the Sinner’s letter within a twelfth century manuscript, possibly belonging to the Hospitaller Grand Priory near Nimes, in 1957. It was found between a copy of the Templar Rule and

---

286 Michael the Syrian, Chronique 15.11: “un homme franc vint de Rome pour prier à Jérusalem ... après avoir aidé le roi à la guerre pendant trois ans.”

287 The original rule mentioned clerics only twice. The clerics were twice permitted meat on Sundays and their payment was food and clothing only. The rationale for “payment” is explained in the rule itself, because they “remain in charity for a fixed term.” They were not part of the order but fulfilled the spiritual needs of the Templars; see Latin Rule of the Templars 3 and French Rule of the Templars 64. All quotations from the Templar Rule will be from the Latin edition.
Bernard’s treatise.\textsuperscript{288} The authorship of the letter is unknown, but most scholars believe Hugh de Payns or Hugh of St. Victor (c. 1096-1141) wrote it sometime around 1130.\textsuperscript{289} The importance of this document is not in its author, but that the Templars used it. The Templar Rule regulated the day-to-day activity and Hugh’s letter provided the heart and soul.

Hugh the Sinner’s letter was responding to threats within the order, which questioned their validity. Hugh began the letter with a warning to the warrior-monks to be on guard against the deceit and subterfuge of the devil. The devil had three purposes: cause individuals to sin, corrupt good intentions, and divert acts of virtue. The Scriptures were the remedy he suggested to combat the devil. In particular, he quoted an unknown scriptural passage that Christians are called to “stay in your place.” He explained that everyone is given an integral purpose, or call in life, as a member of Christ’s body. Failure in one’s duty results in the destruction of the whole.\textsuperscript{290}

He directly addressed the issue in stark terms. The Templars profess war against the enemies of the faith and in defense of Christianity. Those who claimed it is in anyway illicit, harmful, sinful, or an obstacle to higher union with God, are agents of Satan. The order battles sin and overcomes temptation as other regulars do, but in a different manner. The warrior-monk is the agent of God’s justice and he receives his due. If he believes that a higher calling exists for him, it is the result of pride. He


\textsuperscript{289} Leclerq originally attributed it to Hugh de Payns, see Leclerq, “Un document,” 84-85; whereas Malcolm Barber attributes it to Hugh of St. Victor, see Barber, The New Knighthood, 42. For a modern scholar advocating Hugh de Payns’ authorship, see Cerrini, La Révolution, 45-49.

\textsuperscript{290} Hugh Peccator, Letter to the Templars 1.
continued that the Templars might not be the highest order in prestige, yet “know that in every order the one who is better is the one who is higher.” The warrior-monk seeks his salvation where God has placed him. The life of a contemplative monk is geared toward union with God and the imitation of His life. Hugh saw a new way to the same end. Christ did not sit around praying, instead He “toiled and fought on earth with the wicked and evil men.” The Templars’ method for union with God was found in their actions in the world fighting the enemies of Christ.

The implication was that Jesus’ life was a continual crucifixion. The physical battles endured by the Templars were their crucifixion. As Christ brought salvation to the world through His agony and death, so too did the Templars participate in the sanctification of the world through their own. The Letter to the Templars dovetailed two concerns of the Church and society. Men who were enemies of Christ existed. If they were not resisted, parts of the Body of Christ (the Church) would be lost. On the other hand, salvation was found through imitating the passion of Christ, and it was a cleansing process for the soul. Hugh Peccator feared that the great work of the Templar order might be lost. If they failed, souls would be lost, the enemies of Christ would reclaim His patrimony, and the devil would win. The Templars were God’s chosen vehicle.

Bernard of Clairvaux was from a strong bellatores background and, as a Cistercian, lived a pure form of Benedictine monasticism. Having rejected the warrior’s way when he entered the monastery, he possessed a pessimistic view of secular life. 

---

292 Hugh Peccator, Letter to the Templars 5.
293 The Cistercians sought to purify cenobitic monasticism, stripping it of the accretions of centuries of medieval politics and feudal obligations. They sought the obedience of the Rule of Benedict and only the Rule—ex integro ad litteram.
In the “new knighthood,” he discovered a way of life combining the *vita perfecta* and knighthood not geared for damnation but glorification. This form of knighthood was acceptable to him because its intention was right—*non nobis Domine, non nobis, sed nomini tuo da gloriam.*

Bernard of Clairvaux began *De Laude* acknowledging the presence of God’s power with the Templars. Their ability to destroy the enemies of God provided the proof for Bernard. In fighting God’s enemies, they waged a two-fold battle: the first against “flesh and blood” and the second against a “spiritual army of evil.” Individually, he saw them as commonplace, but both being done by the same men was “worthy of all wonders.”

Bernard condemned the secular knighthood for many reasons:

You cover your horses with silk, and plume your armor with I know not what sort of rags; you paint your shields and your saddles; you adorn your bits and spurs with gold and silver and precious stones … you bind yourselves with effeminate locks and trip yourselves up with long and full tunics … you have dared to undertake such a dangerous business on such slight and frivolous grounds.

In Bernard’s monastic eyes, it was all pride and vanity. They were condemned because their intention was wrong; they fought for personal grandeur. The Templars rejected all the knightly accoutrement and focused on God.

---

294 See Bernard of Clairvaux, *De Laude* 3. In unambiguous terms, Bernard declared that the result of armed combat between knights was “the moral sin of the victor and the eternal death of the vanquished.”

295 Psalm 115:1: “Not to us Lord, not to us, but to your name give the glory” was the motto of the Templars.

296 Bernard of Clairvaux, *De Laude* 1.

297 Bernard of Clairvaux, *De Laude* 3.

The shift in intention was everything for Bernard of Clairvaux. It provided a new way to look at the battlefield. The battle became the way the *athleti Christi* perfected his life, not killing for the thrill of battle but the destruction of evil.\(^{299}\) He removed sin not only from himself but also from the world.\(^{300}\) The praiseworthy actions of the new knight in combat produced the same results as the cloistered monk’s ascetical tools. The monk purified his flesh for the salvation of his soul and the world. The bruises, scars, severed limbs, burns were the new knights’ purification.

As noted earlier in chapter three, nobles gave land and other valuables to monasteries because they believed that the activity of the monks impacted the state of one’s soul in the afterlife. Monks prayed and the soul’s time in purgatory was shortened. The Templar cartulary records that as early as 1127, pious nobles donated lands to the Templars “for the salvation of my soul and the souls of all my ancestors.”\(^{301}\) As monks, the Knights Templar were bound to attend choir. The requirement was “to hear with pious and pure hearts Matins and the complete divine services.”\(^{302}\) The prescription to hear the divine services was not the same as to pray them. The knights were religious, but they were still not ordained and so were not able to lead religious services. In the ecclesial structure, they were the same as the Cistercian *conversi*.\(^{303}\) In the contractual

\(^{299}\) Bernard of Clairvaux, *De Laude* 4: “If he kills an evildoer, he is not a mankiller, but, if I may so put it, a killer of evil.”

\(^{300}\) Bernard of Clairvaux, *De Laude* 4.

\(^{301}\) *Cartulaire général de l’Ordre du Temple* 9 (October 30, 1127): “pro salute anime mee omniumque parentum meorum.”

\(^{302}\) Latin *Rule of the Templars* 1; French *Rule of the Templars* 9.

\(^{303}\) *Conversi* was the term given to “laybrothers,” who were men who professed religious vows but were not treated the same as choir monks. In the Cistercian tradition, they shared in the good works of the choir monks but were not understood to have contributed to them except through manual labor to provide
system of the charter, something else must be provided by the knights that is efficacious to souls, since their prayers were not what was sought. 304

In the years shortly following the recognition of the Templars at the Council of Troyes, new terminology was sometimes employed. Addended to the common title of the Templars in these charters was their mission, “in the defense of Christianity.” 305 In some respects, the power to intercede (prayer in the monastic regimen) shifted to the military activities of the warrior-monks. Few other possibilities remain that had the ability to affect the afterlife. Certainly the priests temporarily assigned to the Templars, those who prayed the divine services, might possibly offer the prayers for the benefactors. Nevertheless, it seems the donors wanted the connection to the Templars and not their hired sacramental ministers. The Knights Templar only had their actions in battle, which on the authority of Bernard of Clairvaux, the Council of Troyes, and later Popes Innocent II, Celestine II, and Eugene III was a means to purification and salvation.

The structure of medieval society placed each person in his or her proper place. God decided if you were going to be a knight/prince, monk/priest, or peasant. It might be possible to move from one to another but not both, at least until the arrival of the Templars. Bernard of Clairvaux, a staunch advocate of divine order, proclaimed, “I do not know if it would be more appropriate to refer to them as monks or soldiers, unless


304 The Rule seems to imply that the Templars prayers are not of the same caliber as the clerics. In the procedures for a dead brother, only those knights attending the body pray one hundred Paternosters for seven consecutive nights. In addition, the “chaplains and clerics doing temporary service … offer to Christ the established Office and Mass for his soul.” Latin Rule of the Templars 2; French Rule of the Templars 62.

305 Cartulaire du Temple XLIII (January 30, 1131/2): “et ipsis fratribus ibidem Deo in defensione Xpistianitatis militatibus.” More examples are found in Cartulaire du Temple XL and XLIV.
perhaps it would be better recognizing them as being both.” It was a combination that had not existed in Christian history before (Canon Law forbid clerics from shedding blood), yet it was the Rule of the Templars that navigated their dual existence.

According to the Templar tradition, the order had lived according to the Augustinian Rule for a decade prior to the creation of their Rule and recognition in 1129. The Rule derived at the Council of Troyes is far removed from the Augustinian Rule used previously. Instead, it has greater similarities to the Rule of St. Benedict. There were a number of abbots present at the council, in addition to the bishops. The abbots were either from Benedictine or Cistercian abbeys, so the strong Benedictine flavor of the Rule of the Templars is not surprising. However, the members of the council were preparing a religious rule for laymen, not priests. The Rule of St. Augustine was meant for priests, living in community. It was not, therefore, suitable for the Templars.

The Rule of the Templars, in many ways, exhibits the ideals of the Council of Troyes and the early Templars. As with all ideals, the lived reality does not always coincide with those ideals. The rapid translation into French, as well as the addition of the “Hierarchical Statutes,” “Penances,” “Conventual Life,” and “The Holding of Ordinary Chapters,” attest to a belief among the Templars that the ideals or spirit of the rule was not lived out, particularly the need for warfare regulation. Nevertheless, the Primitive Rule (Latin Rule) of the Templars provides how the Church and its knights bridged the divide between the sacred and secular.

The “Prologue” provides a good observation on the give and take that was necessary for the ideas of the Church and knights to combine. The Rule of the Templars

---

306 Bernard of Clairvaux, De Laude 8.
begins, “Our words are directed primarily at all those who reject the option to follow their own desires and are willing to fight with purity of mind for the highest and true King so that they choose to take up the armor of obedience and a noble life.”

It is strikingly similar to the opening words of the Rule of St. Benedict. The Pauline idea of spiritual warfare, long the purview of monks, was now tied to the activity of the Templars. The words take on a slightly different meaning in the context of knighthood and physical combat. Lest one forget the martial necessities of the new order, it continued that their purpose was defending the Church.

The council’s methodology was also included in the “Prologue.” The clerics heard Hugh de Payns describe the rule of life the knights had been following; they then included what they thought fitting and “what seemed absurd to us we have rejected.” It is not known what was rejected, but the assembled nobles were then given a vernacular version, to which they too “investigated what was best with the utmost care and criticized roundly what seemed to them absurd.”

The three noblemen noted as aiding the Council of Troyes were Count Theobald II of Blois (1090-1152), Count William II of Nevers (d.1148), and Andrew of Baudement (unknown). Little is known of Andrew, but the counts had been crusaders and politically active men. Their ability to criticize and participate in the proceedings helped to shape the Templars into an order that was able to protect society, spiritually and physically.

---

307 Latin Rule of the Templars Prologue; French Rule of the Templars 1.

308 Rule of Benedict, Prologue.3: “[I]f you are ready to give up your own will, once and for all, and armed with the strong and noble weapons of obedience to do battle for the true King, Christ the Lord.” Translation from Timothy Fry et al., eds., RB 1980: The Rule of St. Benedict in Latin and English with Notes (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1981).

309 Latin Rule of the Templars Prologue; French Rule of the Templars 1.

310 Latin Rule of the Templars Prologue; French Rule of the Templars 3.

311 Latin Rule of the Templars Prologue; French Rule of the Templars 6.
The Rule appears to be what was expected of a monastic rule. It includes legislation requiring silence during meals with someone reading a book for the community’s edification.\footnote{Latin Rule of the Templars 7-8; French Rule of the Templars 23-24.} There is a chapter on obedience. It states that the orders of the Master are to be understood as if they come from God and that nothing is to be done without permission, the only exceptions are visiting the Holy Sepulcher at night and praying anywhere in Jerusalem.\footnote{Latin Rule of the Templars 32; French Rule of the Templars 39, 41.} In addition to the purely monastic rules, regulations peculiar to a military order were included also. The knights were permitted, on account of the order’s poverty, three horses and one squire.\footnote{Latin Rule of the Templars 29-30; French Rule of the Templars 51.} A significant modification from the monastic practice was the mediation on the rules of fasting. The Rule of Benedict, the western-standard for monasticism, prohibits the eating of meat except for those who were ill.\footnote{Rule of St. Benedict 36, 39.} The Templars, however, received meat three times a week and if a day was missed because of a special fast they received a double portion the following day. Two meat dishes were also prepared on Sundays for the fully professed knights.\footnote{Latin Rule of the Templars 9; French Rule of the Templars 26.}

Monks were meant to be ascetics and in every instance mentioned in the rule, a modification was made to the life of the Templars. In addition to the acceptability of meat, the Templars’ Rule allowed the knights to eat multiple meals each day, except Friday when only one meal was permitted from All Saints (November 1) to Easter.\footnote{Latin Rule of the Templars 12; French Rule of the Templars 28.} The knight could also be excused from attending Matins if his service the previous day
was too great, instead he was to remain in bed and say a set number of fixed prayers.\footnote{318} The attendance at the liturgical services was important, as they were for other pious laymen. In addition, the maintenance of strength to perform military action was of preeminent importance. The necessity for rest and fasting, therefore, trumped other considerations. The act of battle, “free[ing] the eastern church from the filth of the pagans and defeat[ing] the enemies of the Christian faith,” was of preeminent importance.\footnote{319} It was able to take the place of those other deeds.

Despite the foundation of the Knights Templar as an order destined for war against the enemies of Christ. Only two chapters in the Primitive Rule speak of warfare, as opposed to thirteen sections in the “Hierarchical Statutes” and twenty in “The Holding of Ordinary Chapters.” The first mention in the Rule of the Templars on warfare refers to attacking lions. Templars were obliged in all times and places to kill lions.\footnote{320} The chapter follows those that prohibited hunting, hawking, and traveling with a fowler. The lion’s nature to attack posed a risk to Christians and is, therefore, a proper target for the Knight Templar. The Rule of the Templars also provided the biblical image from Jesus that there is no greater love than to lay down your life for a friend.\footnote{321} It appears to imply that any act done for the preservation of Christian life is meritorious before God. The concept received a further boost a few chapters later; it states that the Templars “mingle
knighthood with religion … kill the enemy without sin." In these two passages from the Rule, the Bernardine concept of intentionality appears to be missing. Nevertheless, at the beginning of the Rule and in the Prologue, the Templar is one who has renounced his own desires and fights with a pure mind.

The miles Christi did not seek the vanities of the secular knighthood. They sought to rid themselves of anything that might attract attention to himself as an individual. To ensure that no ostentatious displays of wealth were permissible for a Templar, an ingenious method was devised. Templars’ bridles and spurs were forbidden to be made of gold, silver, or covered with jewels. An exception was granted if they were old and given in charity, but they were to be painted so that it did not glitter. Stripping off the ostentation of wealth is reminiscent of a scene in the Awntyrs off Arthure (ll. 495-652). Sirs Galeron and Gawain faced each other in combat arrayed in their finest armor. Throughout the battle, the two combatants inflicted heavy damage on their golden armor, proving useless at protecting their bodies. The precious gems mounted on their swords and shields flew across the field with each stroke of the blade. The precious metals and jewels represented the vanities that were stripped away through combat, which allowed for the two knights to free themselves from their bondage.

The warrior-monk’s state of life aided him in the process of stripping away the vanities. The profession ritual summarized it well in the consecratory prayer said over the new Templar after making his profession. It began with an assurance of the holiness

---

322 Latin Rule of the Templars 48; French Rule of the Templars 58.
323 Latin Rule of the Templars Prologue, 1; French Rule of the Templars 1,9.
324 Latin Rule of the Templars 34; French Rule of the Templars 52.
325 Awntyrs 587-590.
of the Templars’ life because the Church sanctioned the Rule. The warrior-monk had renounced the vanities of the world in order to embrace eternal love. All blessings and grace were his when he completed his profession.\textsuperscript{326} The totality of his life (profession, service in the destruction of the enemies of Christ, and his death) brought him to eternal life. He was born a knight and he will be able to die a knight, secure in redemptive glory.

The Rule of St. Benedict provides that the abbot was the final arbiter of the monastic legislation. It was on his authority that regulations could be increased or decreased. To solidify this understanding of the abbot’s role, Benedict said that the abbot held the place of Christ in the monastery.\textsuperscript{327} The Master held a similar position in the commanderie, “brothers should put [the Master’s orders] into action without delay as if it were God’s command.”\textsuperscript{328} He had the ability to disperse the goods of the community to the brethren as he saw fit and did not require permission to do so. It was to the Grand Master and the pope that obedience was required. They were laymen, placed outside the normal structure of the ecclesial hierarchy. \textit{Omne Datum Optimum} (March 29, 1139) ensured that they were free from all tithes and taxes, granting them the same exempt status as other religious orders. The theology of warfare had made their actions holy. They and their contemporaries saw their actions on the battlefield redemptive. The world had a religious order, and the Church possessed an army.

\textsuperscript{326} French \textit{Rule of the Templars} 278.

\textsuperscript{327} \textit{Rule of St. Benedict} 2.2.

\textsuperscript{328} Latin \textit{Rule of the Templars} 32; French \textit{Rule of the Templars} 39.
Conclusion

The High Middle Ages (c. 1000-1300) experienced an explosion of creativity. Scholasticism created new ways to understand theology, seeking to define Truth in infinitesimal detail. Kings and bishops desired legal codification in order to simplify ruling over their subjects. Economic and agricultural advances provided the opportunity for population growth. Popular literature shifted from moral parables to romantic fiction. These changes were a small sample of the revolution that occurred. None of them developed in a vacuum or on a consistent trajectory; multiple events and ideas affected and influenced their development. The same was true for the Poor Fellow-Soldiers of Christ and the Temple of Solomon.

The Knights Templar’s formation is enigmatic without a bimodal approach. The oratores and bellatores classes had much to gain and their interests coalesced around order, stability, and salvation. The Templars were a monastic order, professing vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. They lived and prayed in common and directed their lives along an ecclesiastically approved rule as interpreted by their superiors. Simultaneously they were warriors—fierce in battle and vowed never to surrender. Devotion to God and a single-minded purpose of war was not imaginable to a clerical mind.

Since the time of Constantine, the Roman Church saw the necessity and benefits of war. Nevertheless, war needed to be controlled. The sanctioning of war without supervision by a spiritual power led to chaos. Even when directed to a right end, the
potential for tyranny remained. Proper guidance was needed and the only one the Roman Church trusted to guide the bellatores were the oratores. The normalcy of war in the Middle Ages was a fait accompli, the work of the Church was positing approved rationale, which became justice, charity, and peace. The task began through threats of divine punishment (Pax et Treuga Dei) and codification of law, which was a secular priority as well. As the Church’s program was moderately successful and experienced obstruction by powerful rulers who preferred the status quo, the whole enterprise of war shifted to Outremer. The battle cry of Clermont in 1095 appeared to signal the triumph of the Gelasian model of spiritual authority. It was a short-lived victory.

The knightly-class did not hold the same view as the Church on the administration of power. They did not see themselves as inherently flawed and in need of paternalistic direction. The may have shared the same goal—salvation—but the method varied. Kings and princes were chosen by God to govern people. With a God-ordained mission, they believed they were directed by God and did not require the intermediacy of the Church. The power struggles of the eleventh and twelfth centuries were the battleground for this disagreement. As the new gesta form of literature developed during this period, it is not surprising to see these themes of lay independence interwoven with martial deeds of the past. Literature provided an avenue for lay aspirations. They desired salvation. They desired forgiveness. They desired a validation of their way of life. They desired to achieve eternity on their own terms.

329 See Gregory of Tours, Historia Francorum 2.42. Gregory of Tours applauded Clovis’ conversion to Christianity and the expansion of Christianity he initiated. However, at his death, he was portrayed as a man preoccupied with his own power.
Two parallel ways of perfection developed, one dictated by the Church and the other by the secular world. The military orders, led by the Knights Templar, attempted to bridge that gap. The Templars were a lay-religious community that sought God through war and the direction of the Church. By papal privileges they were exempt from all authority on earth, except their Grand Master and the papacy. They combined the miles Christi and the athleti Christi. The glory of the battlefield became the glory of Christ and a means to salvation. Their prayers were directed for the salvation of souls.

Nevertheless, the creation of the Poor Fellow-Soldiers of Christ and the Temple of Solomon was indicative of their fall. Knights had gained control over their own salvation, but the Templars were closely aligned with the clerical hierarchy. They created a new battlefront in the struggle between clerical and secular authority. In the end, the Templars lost their purpose. They ceased having their unique position as a combination of the interests of bellatores and oratores. They became a pure, ecclesial institution that possessed the wealth that Philip IV wanted, and he took it.\(^330\)

Historians often divide medieval society into three separate categories: knights, clerics, and laborers. The limitations of social interaction at that time reinforced this convenient division. Regardless of the distinction, clerics were the products of their knightly or peasant stock. Workers and priests occasionally joined together in defense of common purposes, as did monks and kings. Secular rulers were the protectors of their serfs. On rare occasions, as witnessed during the peace council movement, all united in a

\(^{330}\) Barber, *Trial*, 178-192.
common cause. All were a part of Christendom and saw themselves seeking God together.\textsuperscript{331}

\textsuperscript{331} John 17:22.
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