SALUTARE ANIMAS NOSTRAS: THE IDEOLOGIES BEHIND
THE FOUNDATION OF THE TEMPLARS

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY,
HUMANITIES, PHILOSOPHY, AND POLITICAL SCIENCE
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

By
Rev. Fr. Thomas Bailey, OSB

NORTHWEST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY
MARYVILLE, MISSOURI
MAY 2012

Running Head: *SALUTARE ANIMAS NOSTRAS*

Salutare Animas Nostras:

The Ideologies Behind the Foundation of the Templars

Rev. Fr. Thomas Bailey, OSB

Northwest Missouri State University

THESIS APPROVED

_____

Thesis Advisor   Date

_____

_____

_____

Dean of Graduate School   Date

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?

CONTENTS

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)."

[3] Examples of this hypothesis are found in Malcolm Barber, *The New Knighthood: A History of the Order of the Temple* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 6; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *Templars and Hospitallers as Professed Religious in the Holy Land* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dam Press, 2010), 10-14; Judi Upton-Ward, "Introduction," in *The Rule of the Templars: The French Text of the Rule of the Order of the Knights Templar* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1992), 1-2.

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.[4] 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

---

[5] Malcolm Barber, *The New Knighthood: A History of the Order of the Temple* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 38-39.

[6] Malcom Barber, "The Social Context of the Templars," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fifth Series 34 (1984): 31.

[7] Barber, "Social Context*,*" 34-38.

[8] Barber, "Social Context*,*" 37.

charity–conversion by the sword. Another example was the similarities between the

investiture ceremony of a Templar and the dubbing of a secular knight.[9] 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.[10]

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."[11] 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

---

[9] Barber, "Social Context*,*" 38.

[10] Jonathan Riley-Smith, *Templars and Hospitallers as Professed Religious in the Holy Land* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dam 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.[12] Upton-Ward believes that the rule received significant additions when

translated into French during the Grand Mastership of Robert de Craon (1136-1149).[13]

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

---

[12] Simonetta Cerrini, "A New Edition of the Latin and French Rule of the Temple," in *The Military Orders, Vol. 2,* ed. Helen Nicholson (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1998), 207-216; Judi Upton-Ward, "Introduction," in *The Rule of the Templars: The French Text of the Rule of the Order of the Knights Templar* (Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1992), 1-17.

[13] Upton-Ward, *Rule of the Templars,* 12-13.

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.

---

[14] Simonetta Cerrini, *La Révolution des Templiers: Une histoire perdue du XIIe siècle* (Paris: Perin, 2007), 48-68, 135-188, 219-240.

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.[15] 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.[16] 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.[17] 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."[18] Jesus presented a new way and anathematized the dictate of just retaliation dating back to the code of Hammurabi.[19]

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

---

[17] Matthew 5:3-12; Luke 6:20-26.

[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 2Kings 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: *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

---

[20] Matthew 26:51-56; Luke 22:49-51; John 18:10-11.

[21] Luke 9:51-56.

[22] Carroll Stuhlmueller, "The Gospel According to Luke," in *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, ed. Raymond Brown, Joseph Fitzmyer, and Roland Murphy (Eagle Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), 142-143.

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.[23] In each of the accounts, His rationale

is stated either by a direct quotation or allusion to the prophecy of Isaiah.[24] 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).[25] 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

---

[23] Mark 11:15-17; Matthew 21:12-13; Luke 19:45-46; John 2:13-16.

[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.

[25] Christoph Markschies, "Jesus Christ as a Man Before God: Two Interpretive Models for Isaiah 53 in the Patristic Literature and Their Development," in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources,* ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher, trans. Daniel Bailey (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004), 228.

the shearers, he was silent and opened not his mouth. … [T]hrough his suffering, my servant shall justify many, and their guilt he shall bear.[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 *Septuagint* that was their reference point.[27] A prominent motif in the *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.[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 *Septuagint*; therefore, the early Christians considered the these texts as scriptural. The books recount the Jewish revolt against the Seleucid Empire (*c.*167-

---

[26] Isaiah 53:3-11.

[27] Veselin Kesich, *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, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000).

[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.[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 *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.[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

---

[29] 1Maccabees 2:31-48.

[30] Justin Martyr, *Second Apology* 5.

Christian mindset was a demon.[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.[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."[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.

---

[31] Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos* 19.

[32] C. John Cadoux, *The Early Christian Attitude to War* (1919; repr., New York: The Seabury Press, 1982), 92-93.

[33] Tertullian, *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.[34] 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."[35] In *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.[36]

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 *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

---

[34] Hippolytus of Rome, *The Apostolic Tradition* 2.16.17-19.

[35] Hippolytus of Rome, *The Apostolic Tradition* 2.16.17-19.

[36] Tertullian, *De Corona* 11.

mythology provided bad moral examples.[37] 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.[38] 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.[39] 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."[40] 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.[41]

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] Hippolyltus 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.[42]

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.[43] 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.[44] 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.[45]

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

---

[42] Justin Martyr, *First Apology* 14.

[43] Roland Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), 68.

[44] Bainton, *Christian Attitudes*, 69.

[45] Bainton, *Christian Attitudes*, 79-81.

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

---

[50] Acts of the Apostles 21:27-40, 23:12-35, 25:1-22.

[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

---

[55] Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle to Polycarp* 6.

[56] *Acts of Paul* 10; *Acts of Peter* 7, 8.

[57] Cadoux, *Early Christian Attitude,* 164-166.

[58] Mark 12:17; Matthew 22:21; Luke 20:25.

[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.

[63] Robin Young, "Martyrdom as Exaltation," in *Late Ancient Christianity*, ed.Virginia Burrus, vol. 2 of *A People's History of Christianity*, ed. Denis Janz (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 77-79.

[64] See Michael Grant, *Constantine the Great: The Man and His Times* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1993), 125-210.

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.[65] The Christian *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.[66] In the popular imagination of Christian Rome, Constantine was the "Lord's Anointed" who brought a return to the *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,

---

[65] Matthew 28:19.

[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

---

[67] Bainton, *Christian Attitudes*, 90.

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

[69] Ambrose of Milan, *On the Duties of the Clergy* 1.28.135.

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.[70] 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.[71] 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 Thélogiens et les Canonistes Catholiques* (1934; repr., Darmstadt, Germany: Scientia Verlag Aalen, 1974), 39.

the product of sin; even the wicked could be used "for the sake of removing or punishing their sins."[72]

The system created by Augustine had five principle points: right intention, just cause, conducted by legitimate authority, as a last resort, and properly conducted.[73] 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."[74] 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.[75] 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.[76]

---

[72] Augustine of Hippo, *City of God* 19.15; *cf.* Regout, *La Doctrine,* 43-44.

[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.[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."[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.[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.[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."[81] The legitimate authority was to ensure that all which pertained to *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.[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

---

[77] Matthew 25:51-52.

[78] Augustine of Hippo, *Contra Faustum* 22.70.

[79] Augustine of Hippo, *Contra Faustum* 22.75.

[80] Bainton, *Christian Attitudes*, 97-98.

[81] Augustine of Hippo, *Contra Faustum* 22.74.

[82] Augustine of Hippo, *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.[83] 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.[84] Ambrose as

well, when writing to another bishop, evoked the memory of the martyrs as leading

Christians to greater heights in the spiritual life.[85]

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.[86] 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

---

[83] Thomas Sizgorich, *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity: Militant Devotion in Christianity and Islam* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 49, 57-65.

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

[85] Ambrose of Milan, *Epistle* 72 *ad Constantium*, in *Saint Ambrose: Letters*, translated by Mary Melchior Beyenka (New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc, 1954), 93.

[86] Sizgorich, *Violence*, 88.

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.[87] 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.[88] 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.

[90] Ambrose of Milan, *Epistle* 77 *ad Horontianum*, in *Saint Ambrose: Letters*, translated by Mary Melchior Beyenka (New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc, 1954), 251.

[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

---

[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.[102] The resulting decree established, *de jure*, the Roman Bishops' power to legislate for the Church, as well as, provide the final court of appeals.

---

[102] Susan Wessel, *Leo the Great and the Spiritual Rebuilding of a Universal Rome* (Boston: Brill, 2008), 53-96.

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.[103] Christianity was a means for him to unite his empire and deviations from that faith were not tolerated.[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.[105] In 449, Emperor Theodosius II (408-450) called for a

---

[103] Ephesians 4:5.

[104] For more information on Constantine's policy on imperial Christianity, see Grant, *Constantine the Great,* 125-186.

[105] Monotholetism 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.[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 *Tome of Leo*, the assembled bishops acclaimed, "[T]his is the faith of the Apostles

… Peter has spoken thus through Leo."[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."[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.[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.

---

[106] Monophysites believed that Jesus Christ had only one nature, and that the divine and human elements comingled together.

[107] *Acts of the Council of Chalcdeon*, Session 2.

[108] Pseudo-Clement, *Epistle of Clement to James* 2.

[109] See Bernhard Schimmelpfennig, *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.[110] 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.[111] 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.[112] 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.[113] Yet, both Gelasius and Anastastius combined the spiritual and the secular realms in their minds. The right ordering of society–a state

---

[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).[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 *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."[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."[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 *Historia Francorum,* the descriptions of Clovis' adversaries altered,

---

[114] J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 23-27.

[115] Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum* 2.30.

[116] Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum* 2.31.

Gregory afterwards noted their religious affiliation. Gundobad and Godegisel were Arians, as well as, the Goths under Alaric.[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."[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.[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.[120] It was reminiscent of Joshua's victory over Jericho, in which the priests blew their trumpets and the walls crumbled.[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

---

[117] Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum* 2.32, 2.37.

[118] Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum* 2.37.

[119] Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum* 2.37.

[120] Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum* 2.33.

[121] Joshua 6:1-21.

crucifixion as the lamb led to the slaughter shifted the cross into a weapon Christ used

against His adversaries.[122] 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."[123] 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.[124]

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.[125] Jesus was depicted as the eternal suzerain and Peter played the role of the

Germanic princes who were duty bound to protect their lord and did so without hesitation

or fear.

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."[126] 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.[127]

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.*

[127] For more information on the religions beliefs of the Germanic people before Christianity, see James Russell, "Germanic Religiosity and Social Structure," in *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity: A Sociohistorical Approach to Religious Transformation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 107-133.

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.[128] 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.[129] Yet, the general consensus remains the protection of non-combatants and church properties from unnecessary destruction.

---

[128] See Robert Bartlett, *Trial by Fire and Water: The Medieval Judicial Ordeal* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); George Neilson, *Trial by Combat* (1890; reprint, Union, NJ: Lawbook Exchange, 2000).

[129] Elisabeth Magnou-Nortier, "The Enemies of the Peace: Reflections on a Vocabulary, 500-1100," translated by Amy Remensnyder in *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992), 69-79.

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

---

[130] Richard Landes, "Between Aristocracy and Heresy: Popular Participation in the Limousin Peace of God, 994-1033," in *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000,* ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992), 127.

[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.[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 *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.[133]

In all, nearly one-half of the year was cordoned off from violent activities. The

punishment for violating the *Peace of God* or the *Truce of God* was, if the individual was

unrepentant, excommunication.

As in the example of the *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.[134] The presence at the peace councils of saintly relics promoted these saints

as protectors of the *Pax Dei* and *Treuga Dei*. Saint Martial was one such saint, whose

---

[132] Magnou-Nortier, "The Enemies of the Peace," 78-79.

[133] "Bishop Sigwin of Cologne to Prince-Bishop Frederick I of Münster (1083)," in *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*, 2nd ed., ed. Edward Peters (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971), 38-39.

[134] Thomas Head, "The Judgment of God: Andrew of Fleury's Account of the Peace League of Bourges," in *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landis (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992), 220.

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.[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*.[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

---

[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.*"

[136] Landes, "Between Aristocracy and Heresy," 192.

raised from the water, the saint then brought him back to life.[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."[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.[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.[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 *bellatores* before entering the monastery, it was a question of knowing when war was right and when it was not.[141]

---

[137] *La Vie de saint Martial* 15.

[138] *La Vie de saint Martial* 15: "*qu'il cherche toujours la bagarre et qu'il est toujours coléreux et irrité.*"

[139] Landes, "Between Aristocracy and Heresy," 192-193.

[140] For more information on monastic theology in the medieval period, see Katherine Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion 37 (Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2011).

[141] Tim Davis, *Saint Bernard of Clairvaux: A Monastic View of Medieval Violence* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1998), 19-25.

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

---

[142] Aryeh Grabois, "*Militia* and *Malitia*: The Bernardine Vision of Chivalry," in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, ed. Michael Gervers (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 50.

[143] Grabois, "*Militia* and *Malitia*," 52-53.

[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.

[147] Jean Leclerq, "Saint Bernard's Attitude Toward War," in *Studies in Medieval Cistercian History II*, ed. John Sommerfeldt (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976), 22-25.

[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.[149] 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.[150]

Bernard was not an innovator in monastic warfare theology, but his prestige allowed his ideas to spread among the populace.[151] His guiding principle remained, however, the "superiority of the religious vocation over the call to arms."[152] 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

---

[149] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter CCCCV* (Ep. 376 in Migne).

[150] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter XCVII*.

[151] Leclerq, "Saint Bernard's Attitude," 31.

[152] Leclerq, "Saint Bernard's Attitude," 10.

monastery.[153] He and his relatives moved from being *malitia* to *bellatores pacifici*

(peaceful warriors) or *militia Christi* (knights of Christ).[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.[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.[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

---

[153] William of Saint-Thierry, *Vita S. Bernardi* 1.10-13.

[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*.

[155] Bernard of Clairvaux, *De Laude* 2.

[156] Decretals were collections of precedents on various topics of Church law and practice. The decretal authors generally favored patristic texts and papal decrees.

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.[157]

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.[158]

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

---

[157] Leclerq, "Saint Bernard's Attitude," 7-10.

[158] Leclerq, "Saint Bernard's Attitude," 7-10.

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.[159] 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.[160] 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

---

[159] Gratian, *Decreti, Pars Secunda, Causa XXIII, Quaesta I* (PL 187:1159-1166).

[160] Ernst Dieter Hehl, "War, Peace and the Christian Order," in vol. 4 of *The New Cambridge Medieval History:* c. *1024*-c. *1198, Part I*, ed. David Edward Luscombe and Jonathan Riley-Smith (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 219-220.

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.[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.[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.[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.[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

---

[161] See Uta-Renate Blumenthal, *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988); Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State, 1050-1300* (1964; reprint, Toronto: Medieval Academy of America, 1988).

[162] Gregory VII, "To Count William of Burgundy (Feb. 2, 1074)."

[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.

[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

---

[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."[169] 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.[171] 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.[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.[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.[174]

---

[172] Penny Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095-1270* (Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy of America, 1991), 1-2.

[173] Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades*, 5-7.

[174] Robert's presence at the Council of Clermont cannot be confirmed, see Cole, *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*.

[176] Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades*, 13-14.

[177] Robert the Monk, *Historia Hierosolymitana*.

injuries."[178] 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.[179] "On whom therefore is the labor of avenging these wrongs … if not upon

you?"[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."[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

---

[178] Augustine of Hippo, "Exposition on Psalm 45," quoted in Bainton, *Christian Attitudes*, 96.

[179] Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades*, 14.

[180] Robert the Monk, *Historia Hierosolymitana*.

[181] Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades*, 14-15.

Israel." He ended the speech by granting the remission of sins to any who partook the journey. The crowd responded, "*Deus vult! Deus vult!*"[182]

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."[183] 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

---

[182] Robert the Monk, *Historia Hierosolymitana*: "God wills it! God wills it!"

[183] John 17:21.

holy church."[184] 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.[185] 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*.

[185] Isaiah 9:6.

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.[186]

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.

---

[186] "The Foundation Charter of the Order of Cluny," in *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, ed. and trans. Ernest Henderson (London: George Bell & Sons, 1892), 330-331.

Knights were keenly aware that their profession, though necessary, was sinful. It violated the Decalogue proscription against killing.[187] An early tenth-century, French penitential, though acknowledging differing levels of culpability, saw killing as a sin that required penance. The proscription requited the knight to do forty day's penance for each man he killed in battle.[188] A similar punishment is found in an eleventh century penitential as well.[189] 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.[190]

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 mehods, 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

---

[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.

[188] Regino, "Ecclesiastical Discipline," in *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), 317.

[189] Buchard of Worms, "The Corrector and Physician," in *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), 325-328.

[190] See Bernard Verkamp, "Moral Treatment of Returning Warriors in the Early Middle Ages," *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 16, no. 2 (Fall 1998): 223-249.

land disputes–not known to modern readers–between lords and abbots.[191] 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.[192] 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."[193] 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.[194] 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

---

[191] Marcus Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: The Limousin and Gascony,* c.*970*-c.*1130* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 157-166.

[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.[195]

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 *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.[196] 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.[197]

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

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.

---

[195] Joseph Martos, *Doors to the Sacred: A Historical Introduction to Sacraments in the Catholic Church*, rev. ed. (Liguori, MO: Liguori/Triumph, 1991), 284-289.

[196] "Irish Canons," in *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.

[197] Bull, *Knightly Piety*, 204-249.

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.[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).[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.[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

[198] Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 22-26.

[199] *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire* 150.

[200] Richard Kaeuper, *Holy Warriors: The Religious Ideology of Chivalry* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 68-71.

devilish perils to glory in the next."[201] Riley-Smith again makes a poignant observation, of all the promised martyrs' crowns only one Levantine crusader was honored, Rainald Porchet.[202] 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.[203] 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?'"[204] 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

---

[201] Richard Kaeuper, *Holy Warriors,* 69.

[202] Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders: 1095-1131* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 73.

[203] *The Awntyrs off Arthure at the Terne Wathelyne* 188-189, 216, 235-236, 250-253.

[204] *The Awntyrs* 261-264.

salvation not controlled by the Church.[205] 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 Arimethea. 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 Arimethea as one of their own, the first Christian knight and the

ancestor of Sir Galahad.[206] 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.[207] 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

---

[205] See Richard Kaeuper, "Knights and Piety," in *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 45-62.

[206] Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence*, 33.

[207] See Ad Puter, "The Twelfth-Century Arthur," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Arthurian Legend,* ed. Elizabeth Archibald and Ad Putter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 36-52; Jane Taylor, "The Thirteenth-Century Arthur," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Arthurian Legend,* ed. Elizabeth Archibald and Ad Putter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 53-68.

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."[208] 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.[209] 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.[210] Surviving only in fragmentary form, *Gormont et Isembart* may have been recorded as early as the later-half of the eleventh century.[211]

---

[208] Wace, "Roman de Rou," in *Master Wace: His Chronicle of the Norman Conquest from the* Roman de Rou, trans. Edgar Taylor (London: William Pickering, 1837), 189.

[209] Jane Gilbert, "The Chanson de Roland," in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval French Literature*, ed. Simon Gaunt and Sarah Kay (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 22-23.

[210] Michael Newth, *Heroes of the French Epic: A Selection of* Chanson de Geste (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2005), 31-34.

[211] Newth, *Heroes of the French Epic*, 7.

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, No. 3 (July 1997): 635.

[213] Carl Martin, "The Awntyrs off Arthure, an Economy of Pain," *Modern Philology* 108, No. 2 (November 2010): 181.

in consciousness particular signifieds by their signifiers."[214] 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.[215]

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.[216]

In the medieval world, the interaction between the sacred and profane was

understood. The contemporary celebrations of the Eucharist made present the actions of

---

[214] Suzanne Fleischman, "Evaluation in Narrative: The Present Tense in Medieval 'Performed Stories,'" *Yale French Studies* 70 (1986): 226-229.

[215] *Roman Canon:* "*Haec quotiescúmque fecéritis, in mei memoriam faciétis. Unde et mémores, Dómini nostri, tam beátæ passiónis, necnon e ab ínferis resurrectiónis, sed et in cælos gloriósæ 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.[217] It was an association that the

Roman Church welcomed as it attempted to pull the secular into the sacred to wield

greater influence.[218] Knighthood began to develop as a possible avenue for holiness,

especially when engaged to fight against injustice and Saracens.[219]

 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

---

[217] Philippe Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, trans. Michael Jones (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher, 1984), 275-277; Katherine Smith, *Making Medieval Monastic Culture*, 158-159.

[218] Laura Ashe, "A Prayer and a Warcry: The Creation of a Secular Religion in the Song of Roland," *The Cambridge Quarterly* 28, no. 4 (April 1999): 350-351.

[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-Christians 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."[220] 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[221]

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.[222] In the

Johannine Gospel, the body of Jesus, as it hung on the cross, was also pierced in the side

with a lance.[223] 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.[224] The Gospel of

Matthew relates a similar incident in which the soldiers offered Jesus wine that was

mixed with gall and it was refused.[225] In the final incident, both those who killed Jesus

---

[220] Kaeuper, *Holy Warriors*,120.

[221] *Chanson de Guillaume* 773-785.

[222] *Chanson de Guillaume* 917-925.

[223] John 19:31-37.

[224] *Chanson de Guillaume* 864.

[225] Matthew 27:34.

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.

[227] Newth, *Heroes of the French Epic*, vii.

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

[229] Matthew 20:17-19, 26:56b; Mark 10:32-34, 14:32-33, 14:50; Luke 18:31-34.

> 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-twelfth 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.

[231] Tolan, *Saracens*, 106-109.

[232] *Chanson de Roland* 1134, 1523.

[233] *Chanson de Roland* 965.

common to all saints of all times."[234] 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.[235] 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."[236] 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

---

[234] Patrick Geary, *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages*, rev. ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 9.

[235] Nancy Durling, "Introduction to the Life of St. Alexis," in *Medieval Hagiography: An Anthology*, ed. Thomas Head (New York: Routledge, 2001), 318.

[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

---

[237] "Henry IV to Gregory VII," in *Those Who Prayed: An Anthology of Medieval Sources*, ed. Peter Speed (New York: Italica Press, 1997), 254-255.

[238] Ashe, "A Prayer and a Warcry," 354-355.

[239] *Gormont et Isembart* 376-395.

[240] *Chanson de Roland* 339-342.

[241] Eugene Vance, "Style and Value: From Soldier to Pilgrim in the Song of Roland," *Yale French Studies,* Special Issue (1991): 77-80.

jongleur employed to illustrate the Carolingian motif.[242] 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.[243] 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).[244] 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.[245] 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.[246]

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 Rotholandi* 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.

[245] Ashe, "A Prayer and a Warcry," 357-358.

[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*).[247] 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.[248] 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."[249] 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.[250] 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,

---

[247] Pseudo-Turpin, *Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi* 2.

[248] *Gormont et Isembart* 360-419.

[249] *Chanson de Roland* 1304-1319.

[250] Constance Bouchard, *Strong of Body, Brave & Noble: Chivalry & Society in Medieval France* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998),128-129.

affected all the belligerents and victory swung to the crusaders.[251] 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.[252]

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.[253] Roland, concerned for the souls of his men, absolved them twice. In one absolution, he directs forgiveness of sins directly to Archbishop Turpin.[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.[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

---

[253] *Chanson de Guillaume* 539-565.

[254] *Chanson de Roland* 1854-55, 2250-2258.

[255] Jacques Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 133-135.

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

---

[256] Jean-Claude Schmitt, *Ghosts in the Middle Ages: The Living and the Dead in Medieval Society*, trans. Teresa Fagan (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 33-34.

[257] Martin,"Economy of Pain," 194.

[258] See Richard Kaeuper, "The Hero and the Suffering Servant," in *Holy Warriors: The Religioius Ideology of Chivalry* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 116-130.

[259] Raluca Radulescu, "How Christian is Chivalry?," in *Christianity and Romance in Medieval England*, ed. Rosalind Field, Phillipa Hardman, and Michelle Sweeney (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2010), 78; Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and Idea*, 26-28, 111-114.

[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.[262] Roland's sufferings in battle cleansed him from sin, so he was able to offer himself unblemished to God.[263]

The perfection of the lives of Vivien, Roland, and Louis, as well as the meaning that their *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 *Chanson de Roland* in a way that is typical for the three *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."[264] *Gormont et Isembart* can be understood as the saddest of these *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.[265] 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.[266] The Saracens (Vikings) did not allow a shrine to be built for Vivien. They hid his body because they

---

[262] *Chanson de Roland* 2260, 2365, 2373-2374.

[263] Ashe, "A Prayer and a Warcry," 358.

[264] Ashe, "A Prayer and a Warcry," 357.

[265] *Gormont et Isembart* 360-419.

[266] *Chanson de Roland* 2397-2376.

feared his intercessory power.[267] 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.[268]

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 Christi*) were perfect and the monks (*athleti Christi*) 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

---

[269] Malcolm Barber, "The Origins of the Order of the Temple," Studia *Monastica* 12, No. 2 (1970): 225-226.

[270] Upton-Ward, *Rule of the Templars*, 1-17.

[271] Cerrini, "New Edition," 212.

[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.[273]

The discrepancies that appear in the chronicles are noteworthy. In regards to the

raison d'etre 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."[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.[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.

---

[273] See Barber, *The New Knighthood*, 1-37.

[274] Malter Map, *De Nugis Curialium* 1.18.

[275] William of Tyre, *Chronicon* 12.7: "*Prima autem eorum professio, quodque eis a domino patriarcha et reliquis episcopis in remissionem peccatorum iniunctum est, ut vias et itinera maxime ad salutem peregrinorum contra latronum et incursatium 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."[276] 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."[277] 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.[278]

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 règl de vivre monastiquement.*"

[277] *Chronique d'Ernoul* 2: "*et besoingne en est en lle tiere; el sommes obeisant à un priestre, si ne faisons euvre d'armes.*"

[278] *Chronique d'Ernoul* 2.

their exemptions from all secular and ecclesial authorities, except the Pope.[279] 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.[280] William included their desire to be canons

regular, which were communities of priests who followed the Rule of St. Augustine.[281]

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.[282] Ernoul's chronicle was a product of the official history of the

---

[279] Malcolm Barber, *The Trial of the Templars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 11.

[280] William of Tyre, *Chronicon* 12.7: "*in manu domini pariarche 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.[283]

As noted earlier, Michael wrote that Hugh de Payns came to Jerusalem as a pilgrim.[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.[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

---

[283] Barber, *The Templars, 30.*

[284] Michael the Syrian, *Chronique* 15.11: *"un homme franc vint de Rome pour prier à Jérusalem."*

[285] Michael the Syrian, *Chronique* 15.11: *"pour travailler à sauver son âme seule."*

prayer."[286] 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.[287] *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.[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.[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.[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

---

[288] Leclerq, "*Un document sur les débuts des Templiers*," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 52, No. 1 (1957): 83.

[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.

[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."[291] 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."[292] 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.[293] Having rejected the warrior's way when he entered the monastery, he possessed a pessimistic view of secular

---

[291] Hugh Peccator, *Letter to the Templars* 4.

[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*.

knighthood.[294] 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.[295]

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."[296] 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.[297]

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.[298]

---

[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.

[298] See Latin *Rule of the Templars* 19-22, 27-28, 34-35, 37; French *Rule of the Templars* 17-20, 22, 43, 52-54, 68.

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

---

for the choir monks' needs. For more information on the *conversi* see, Louis Lekai, "Lay Brotherhood," in *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality,* (Kent, OH: Kent State UP, 1977), 334-346.

[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 militantibus*." More examples are found in *Cartulaire du Temple* XL and XLIV.

perhaps it would be better recognizing them as being both."[306] 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."[307] It is strikingly similar to the opening words of the Rule of St. Benedict.[308] 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.[309] 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."[310] 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."[311] 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.[312] 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.[313] 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.[314] 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.[315] 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.[316]

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.[317] The knight could also be excused from attending Matins if his service the previous day

---

[312] Latin *Rule of the Templars* 7-8; French *Rule of the Templars* 23-24.

[313] Latin *Rule of the Templars* 32; French *Rule of the Templars* 39, 41.

[314] Latin *Rule of the Templars* 29-30; French *Rule of the Templars* 51.

[315] *Rule of St. Benedict* 36, 39.

[316] Latin *Rule of the Templars* 9; French *Rule of the Templars* 26.

[317] Latin *Rule of the Templars* 12; French *Rule of the Templars* 28.

was too great, instead he was to remain in bed and say a set number of fixed prayers.[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.[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.[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.[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

---

[318] Latin *Rule of the Templars* 17; French *Rule of the Templars* 33.

[319] Celestine II, *Milites Templi* (January 9, 1144).

[320] Latin *Rule of the Templars* 45; French *Rule of the Templars* 56.

[321] John 15:13.

knighthood with religion … kill the enemy without sin."[322] 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.[323]

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.[324] 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.[325] 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.[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.[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."[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. *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.

---

[326] French *Rule of the Templars* 278.

[327] *Rule of St. Benedict* 2.2.

[328] Latin *Rule of the Templars* 32; French *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 ecclesially 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.[329] 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.[331]

---

[331] John 17:22.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

"The Acts of the Council of Charroux (989)." In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, edited by Thomas Head and Richard Landis, Appendix A, Document 1, 327-328. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992.

"Acts of Peter." In *The Other Bible*, edited by Willis Barnstone, 426-444. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984.

"Acts of Paul." In *The Other Bible*, edited by Willis Barnstone, 445-458. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984.

Andrew of Fleury. "*Miracula S. Benedicti* 5.1-4." In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000,* edited by Thomas Head and Richard Landis, Appendix A, Document 11, 339-342. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Aurelian. "Vie de saint Martial évêque de Limoges et apôtre des Gaules." In *Naissance d'apôtre: La vie de saint Martial de Limoges*, edited by Richard Landes and Catherine Paupert, 45-103.

Ambrose of Milan. "Ad Constantium." *Saint Ambrose: Letters*. Translated by Mary Melchior Beyenka, 90-100. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc, 1954.

_____. "Ad Horontianum." *Saint Ambrose: Letters*. Translated by Mary Melchior Beyenka, 245-251. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc, 1954.

_____. "Ad Marcellinam." In vol. 10 of *The Nicene and Post Nicene-Fathers,* 2nd series, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, 445-450. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1955.

_____. "Ad Theodosium." In vol. 10 of *The Nicene and Post Nicene-Fathers,* 2nd series, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, 440-445. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1955.

_____. "Ad Valentinianum." In vol. 10 of *The Nicene and Post Nicene-Fathers,* 2nd series, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, 411-417. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1955.

_____. "On the Duties of the Clergy." In vol. 10 of *The Nicene and Post Nicene-Fathers,* 2nd series, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, 1-89. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1955.

"The Awntyrs off Arthure at the Terne Wathelyne." In *Middle English Romance,* edited by Stephen Shepherd, 365-377. New York: W.W. Norton, 1995.

Augustine of Hippo. "Ad Bonifacium." In vol. 1 of *The Nicene and Post Nicene-Fathers,* 1st series, edited by Philip Schaff, 552-554. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

_____. "Ad Marcellinum." In vol. 1 of *The Nicene and Post Nicene-Fathers,* 1st series, edited by Philip Schaff, 481-488. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

_____. "Contra Faustum." In vol. 4 of *The Nicene and Post Nicene-Fathers,* 1st series, edited by Philip Schaff, 155-345. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

_____. "City of God." In vol. 2 of *The Nicene and Post Nicene-Fathers,* edited by Philip Schaff, 1-511. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.

Bernard of Clairvaux. "Letter XIV." In vol. 1 of *The Complete Works of S. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux*, edited by Samuel Eales, 54-56. London: Hodges, 1889.

_____. "Letter XCVII." In *The Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*, translated by Bruno Scott James, 143. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1998.

_____. "Letter CCLXXV." In *The Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*, translated by Bruno Scott James, 348. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1998.

_____. "Letter CCCCV." In *The Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*, translated by Bruno Scott James, 476-477. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1998.

_____. "In Praise of the New Knighthood." Translated by Conrad Greenia. In *Treatises III*, introduction R.J. Zwi Werblowsky. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1977.

Buchard of Worms. "The Corrector and Physician." In *Medieval Handbooks of Penance: A Translation of the Principal* Libri Poenitentiales *and Selections from Related Documents*, edited by John McNeill and Helena Gamer, 323-345. 1938. Reprint, New York: Octagon Books, 1965.

Cartulaire général de l'Ordre du Temple, 1119?-1150: recueil des chartes et des bulles relatives à l'ordre du Temple, edited by André d'Albon. Paris: H. Champion, 1913.

"The Catalan Rule of the Templars." In *The Catalan Rule of the Templars: A critical edition and English translation from Barcelona, Archivo de la Corona de Aragón, Cartas Reales, MS 3344*, translated by Judi Upton-Ward. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003.

Celestine II. "Milites Templi."   In *The Templars*, edited by Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate, 64-65. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

"The Fourth Ecumenical Council: The Council of Chalcedon." In vol. 14 of *The Nicene and Post Nicene-Fathers,* 2nd series, edited by Henry Percival, 243-296. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1900.

"Chanson de Guillaume." In *Heroes of the French Epic: A Selection of* Chansons de Geste, translated by Michael Newth, 47-142. Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 2005.

"Chanson de Roland." The Oxford version translated by Laura Wright. New York: Vantage Press, 1960.

Clementine Homilies. "Homily 3." In vol. 8 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 239-251. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

_____. "Homily 4." In vol. 8 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 252-256. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

Cyprian of Carthage. "Epistle 72." In vol. 5 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 379-386. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, edited by Francis Xavier Funk. 1905. Reprint, Torino: Bottega D'Erasmo, 1979.

"The Dream of the Rood." In *Anglo-Saxon Spirituality: Selected Writings*, translated by Robert Boenig, 259-263. Mahway, NJ: Paulist Press, 2000.

Ernoul. *Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier*. Edited by M.L. de Mas Latrie, Paris: Jules Renouard, 1871.

Eugene III. "Militia Dei."   In *The Templars*, edited by Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate, 65-66. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

"The Foundation Charter of the Order of Cluny." In *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, edited and translated by Ernest Henderson, 329-333. London: George Bell & Sons, 1892.

Fulcher of Chartres. "Gesta Francorum Jerusalem Expugnatium." Translated by Oliver Thatcher. In *A Source Book for Medieval History*, edited by Edgar McNeal, 513-517. New York: Scribners, 1905.

Gelasius. "Duo Sunt." In *Readings in European History*, vol 1, edited by James Robinson, 72-73. New York: Ginn & Company, 1904.

Le Grand Chroniques de France: selon que elles sont conserves en l'Eglise de Saint-Denis en France, vol.1. Edited by M. Pauline Paris. Paris: Techener Libraire, 1836.

Gratian. *Decretum Gratiani*. Vol. 187 of *Patrologiae Latinae*, edited by J.P. Migne. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1891.

Gregory of Tours. *History of the Franks*, translated by Ernest Brehaut. New York: Columbia University Press, 1916.

"Gormont et Isembart." In *Heroes of the French Epic: A Selection of* Chansons de Geste, translated by Michael Newth, 11-28. Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 2005.

Gregory VII. "To Count William of Burgundy (Feb. 2, 1074)." In *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII: Selected Letters from the Registrum*, translated by Ephraim Emerton, 22-23. New York: Octagon Books, 1966.

_____. "To Henry IV, (December 8, 1075 or January 8, 1076)." In *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII: Selected Letters from the Registrum*, translated by Ephraim Emerton, 86-90. New York: Octagon Books, 1966.

_____. "To Henry IV (December 7, 1074)." In *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII: Selected Letters from the Registrum*, translated by Ephraim Emerton, 56-58. New York: Octagon Books, 1966.

_____. "To King Solomon of Hungary (October 28, 1074)." In *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII: Selected Letters from the Registrum*, translated by Ephraim Emerton, 48-49. New York: Octagon Books, 1966.

_____. "Summoning the Faithful to Defend Constantinople (March 1, 1074). In *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII: Selected Letters from the Registrum*, translated by Ephraim Emerton, 25-26. New York: Octagon Books, 1966.

Gregory Thaumatourgos. "Panegyric on Origenes." In vol. 6 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 21-39. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

"Heliand." In *The Heliand: The Saxon Gospel*, translation and commentary by G. Ronald Murphy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Hippolytus of Rome. *The Apostolic Tradition*. Edited by Gregory Dix. London: S.P.C.K., 1968.

_____. *Commentaire sur Daniel*. Sources Chrétiennes. Edited and translated by Maurice Lefèvre. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1947.

Hugh Peccator. "Letter to the Soldiers of Christ in the Temple in Jerusalem." In *The Templars*, edited by Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate, 54-59. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Ignatius of Antioch. "Epistle to Polycarp." In *Early Christian Writings*, translated by Maxwell Staniforth with a revised translation by Andrew Louth, 109-112. New York: Penguin Books, 1987.

Irenaeus of Lyons. "Against Heresies." In vol. 1 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 315-567. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

_____. "The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching." Translated by Armitage Robinson. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920.

"Henry IV to Gregory VII." In *Those Who Prayed: An Anthology of Medieval Sources*, edited by Peter Speed, 254-255. New York: Italica Press, 1997.

Innocent II. "Omne Datum Optimum." In *The Templars*, edited by Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate, 59-64. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

"Irish Canons," in *Medieval Handbooks of Penance: A Translation of the Principal* Libri Poenitentiales *and Selections from Related Documents*, ed. John McNeill and Helena Gamer, 425-426. 1938. Reprint, New York: Octagon Books, 1965).

John Chrysostom. *Discourse Against Judaizing Christians*. Translated by Paul Harkins. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1979.

Justin Martyr. "First Apology." In vol. 1 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 163-187. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

_____. "Second Apology." In vol. 1 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 188-193. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

Krey, August. *The First Crusade: The Accounts of Eyewitnesses and Participants*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1921.

"Letter of Hugh 'Peccator' to the Templars in the East." In *The Templars: Selected Sources Translated and Annotated,* edited and translated by Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate, 54-59. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Martin of Tours. *History of the Franks*. Translated by Ernest Brehaut. New York: Columbia University Press, 1916.

Michael the Syrian. *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche (1166-99)*. Edited and translated by J.B. Chabot, 3 vols. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1905.

Orderic Vitalis. *Ecclesiastical History*. Edited by Marjorie Chibnall. 6 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.

Peter Tudebode. *Historia de Hierosolymitano*. Translated by John Hill and Laurita Hill. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1974.

Philip IV of France. "Order to Arrest the Templars (September 14, 1307)." In *The Templars*, edited by Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate, 244-247. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Pseudo-Clement. "Epistle of Clement to James." In vol. 8 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 218-222. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

Ralph of Caen. "Gesta Tancredi." In *Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade,* translated by Bernard Bachrach and David Bachrach. Abingdon, UK: Ashgate Publishing Group, 2005.

"Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire," edited by Maurice Prou and Alexandre Vidier. Paris: A. Picard et fils, 1907.

Regino. "Ecclesiastical Discipline." In *Medieval Handbooks of Penance: A Translation of the Principal* Libri Poenitentiales *and Selections from Related Documents*, edited by John McNeill and Helena Gamer, 314-321. 1938. Reprint, New York: Octagon Books, 1965.

"Regula pauperum commilitionum Christi Templique Salomonici." In *The Templars*, edited by Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate, 31-54. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Robert the Monk. "Historia Hierosolymitana." Translated by Oliver Thatcher. In *A Source Book for Medieval History*, edited by Edgar McNeal, 517-521. New York: Scribners, 1905.

"The French Rule of the Templars." In *The Rule of the Templars: The French Text of the Rule of the Order of the Knights Templar,* translated and introduced by J.M. Upton-Ward. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1992.

"The Latin Rule of the Templars." In *The Templars*, edited by Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate, 31-54. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

"Bishop Sigwin of Cologne to Prince-Bishop Frederick I of Münster (1083)." In *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*. 2nd edition, edited by Edward Peters, 38-41. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971.

Tatian. "Oratio ad Graecos." In vol. 2 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 59-83. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

Tertullian. "Apology." In vol. 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 17-60. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

_____. "De Corona." In vol. 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 93-103. New York:Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

_____. "De Patientia." In vol. 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 707-717. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

Pseudo-Turpin. *Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi*. Translated by Thomas Rodd. London, 1812.

"La Vie de saint Martial, évêque de Limoges et apôtre des Gaules." In Naissance d'Apôtre: La Vie de saint Martial de Limoges, edited by Richard Landes and Catherine Paupert, 45-103 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1991).

Wace, "Roman de Rou." In *Master Wace: His Chronicle of the Norman Conquest from the* Roman de Rou, translated by Edgar Taylor. London: William Pickering, 1837.

Walter Map. *De nugis Curialium*. Edited and translated by M.R. James, revised by C.N.L. Brooke and R.A.B. Mynors. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.

William of Saint-Thierry. *Vita S. Bernardi*. Translated into French by Antoine Le Maistre. Paris: A Vitré et Vve. M. Durand, 1649. <http://www.archive.org/details/laviedesbernardp00lema>, accessed Feb. 1, 2012.

William of Tyre. *Willemi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi Chronicon.* Edited by R.B.C. Huygens, 2 vols., Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis, 63 and 63A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1986.

Secondary Sources:

Asbridge, Thomas. *The First Crusade: A New History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Ashe, Laura. "A Prayer and a Warcry: The Creation of a Secular Religion in the Song of Roland." *The Cambridge Quarterly* 28, no. 4 (April 1999): 349-367.

Bainton, Roland H. *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.

Baldwin, John. "The Image of the Jongleur in Northern France Around 1200." *Speculum* 72, No. 3 (July 1997): 635-663.

Barber, Malcolm, and Keith Bate. "Historical Introduction." In *The Templars*, edited by Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate, 1-23. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Barber, Malcolm. *The New Knighthood: A History of the Order of the Temple*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

_____. "The Origins of the Order of the Temple." *Studia Monastica* 12, No. 2 (1970): 219-240.

_____. "The Social Context of the Templars." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fifth Series 34 (1984): 27-46.

_____. *The Trial of the Templars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Barthélemy, Dominique. *L'an mil et la paix de Dieu: La France chrétienne et féodale, 980-1060*. Paris: Fayard, 1999.

Blaettler, James. "Preaching the Power of Penitence in the *Silos Beatus*." In *Medieval Sermons and Society: Cloister, City, University*, edited by Jacqueline Hamesse, Beverly Kienzle, Debra Stoudt, and Anne Thayer, 35-61. Louvain-la-Neuve: Fédération Internaionale des Instituts d'Études Médiévales, 1998.

Bloch, Marc. *The Growth of Ties of Dependence*. 2nd edition. Vol. 1 of *Feudal Society*. Translated by L.A. Manyon. 1962. Reprint, New York: Routledge, 2001.

_____. *Social Classes and Political Organization*. Vol. 2 of *Feudal Society*. Translated by L.A. Manyon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blumenthal, Uta-Renate. *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.

Bouchard, Constance. *Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987.

_____. *Strong of Body, Brave & Noble: Chivalry & Society in Medieval France*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Boysel, Nicholas. "Bernard of Clairvaux and the Knights Templar: The New Knighthood as a Solution to Violence in Christianity." MA thesis, University of Akron, 2009.

Brodman, James. "Rule and Identity: The Case of the Military Orders." *The Catholic Historical Review* 88, No. 3 (July 2001): 383-400.

Brown, Andrew. *Church and Society in England, 1000-1500*. New York: Palgrave-MacMillan, 2003.

Bull, Marcus. *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

_____. "Origins." In *The Oxford History of the Crusades*, edited by Jonathan Riley-Smith, 15-34. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Cadoux, C. John. *The Early Christian Attitude to War*. 1919. Reprint, New York: The Seabury Press, 1982.

Callahan, Daniel. "The Peace of God and the Cult of the Saints in Aquitaine in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries." In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, edited by Thomas Head and Richard Landis, 165-183. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Campbell, Emma. "Clerks and laity." In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval French Literature*, edited by Simon Gaunt and Sarah Kay, 210-224. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Cerrini, Simonetta. "A New Edition of the Latin and French Rule of the Temple." In *The Military Orders, Vol. 2,* edited by Helen Nicholson, 207-216. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1998.

_____. *La Révolution des Templiers: Une histoirre perdue du XIIe siècle*. Paris: Perin, 2007.

Claster, Jill. *Sacred Violence: The European Crusades to the Middle East, 1095-1396.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Chareyron, Nicole. *Pilgrims to Jerusalem in the Middle Ages.* Translated by W. Donald Wilson. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Cole, Penny. *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095-1270.* Cambridge, MA: The Medieval Academy of America, 1991.

Contamine, Philippe. *War in the Middle Ages.* Translated by Michael Jones. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher, 1984.

Cowdrey, H.E.J. *The Crusades and Latin Monasticism.* Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 1999.

Davis, Tim. *Saint Bernard of Clairvaux: A Monastic View of Medieval Violence.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1998.

Delaney, Carol. "Sacrificial Heroics: The Story of Abraham and Its Use in the Justification of War." In *The Just War and Jihad: Violence in Judaism, Christianity, & Islam*, edited by R. Joseph Hoffmann, 217-230. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2006.

Duby, Georges. *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined.* Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Durling, Nancy. "Introduction to the Life of St. Alexis." In *Medieval Hagiography: An Anthology*, edited by Thomas Head, 317-320. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Ewing, Thor. *Gods and Worshippers: Religion and Society in the Viking and Germanic World.* Stroud, UK: Tempus, 2008.

Fleischman, Suzanne. "Evaluation in Narrative: The Present Tense in Medieval 'Performed Stories.'" *Yale French Studies* 70 (1986): 199-251.

Fletcher, Richard. "The Barbarian Conversion from Paganism to Christianity." In *Contesting Christendom: Readings in Medieval Religion and Culture*, edited by James Halverson, 35-44. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2008.

Flori, Jean. "Ideology and Motivations in the First Crusade." In *The Crusades*, edited by Helen Nicholson, 15-36. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Geary, Patrick. *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages.* Rev. ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Gergen, Thomas. *Pratique juridique de la paix et trêve de Dieu à partir du concile de Charroux (989-1250)*. Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang, 2004.

Gilbert, Jane. "The Chanson de Roland." In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval French Literature*, edited by Simon Gaunt and Sarah Kay, 21-34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Goetz, Hans-Werner. "Protection of the Church, Defense of the Law, and Reform: On the Purposes and Character of the Peace of God, 989-1038." In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, edited by Thomas Head and Richard Landis, 259-279. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Grabois, Aryeh. "*Militia* and *Malitia*: The Bernardine Vision of Chivalry." In *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, edited by Michael Gervers, 49-56. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Grant, Michael. *Constantine the Great: The Man and His Times*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1993.

Haper-Bill, C. "The Piety of the Anglo-Norman Nightly Class." In *Proceedings of the Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Sutides II, 1979*, edited by R. Allen Brown, 63-77. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1980.

Head, Thomas. "The Judgment of God: Andrew of Fleury's Account of the Peace League of Bourges." In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, edited by Thomas Head and Richard Landis, 219-238. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992.

_____. "The Development of the Peace of God in Aquitaine (970-1005)." *Speculum* 74, No. 3 (July 1999): 656-686.

Hehl, Ernst-Dieter. "War, Peace and the Christian Order." Vol. 4 of *The New Cambridge Medieval History:* c. *1024*-c. *1198, Part I*, edited by David Edward Luscombe and Jonathan Riley-Smith. 185-228. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Hiestand, Rudolf. "The Military Orders and Papal Crusading Propaganda." In *The Military Orders, Volume 3: History and Heritage*, edited by Victor Mallia-Milanes, 155-166. Aldershot, Great Britain: Ashgate, 2008.

Hoffmann, R. Joseph. "Just War and Jihad: Positioning the Question of Religious Violence." In *The Just War and Jihad: Violence in Judaism, Christianity, & Islam*, edited by R. Joseph Hoffmann, 47-62. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2006.

Housley, Norman. *Contesting the Crusades*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Kesich, Veselin. *Formation and Struggles: The Birth of the Church AD33-200*. The Church in History. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2007.

Jubb, Margaret. "The Crusaders' Perception of Their Opponents." In *The Crusades*, edited by Helen Nicholson, 225-244. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Kaeuper, Richard. *Chivalry and Violence in the Medieval Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

_____. *Holy Warriors: The Religious Ideology of Chivalry*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.

Landes, Richard. "Between Aristocracy and Heresy: Popular Participation in the Limousin Peace of God, 994-1033." In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, edited by Thomas Head and Richard Landis, 184-218. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Le Goff, Jacques. *The Birth of Purgatory*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Leclerq, Jean. "Un document sur les débuts des Templiers." *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 52, No. 1 (1957): 81-91.

_____. "Saint Bernard's Attitude Toward War." In *Studies in Medieval Cistercian History II*, edited by John Sommerfeldt, 1-39. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976.

Lloyd, Simon. "The Crusading Movement, 1096-1274." In *The Oxford History of the Crusades*, edited by Jonathan Riley-Smith, 35-67. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Magnou-Nortier, Elisabeth. "The Enemies of the Peace: Reflection on a Vocabulary, 500-1100. In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, edited by Thomas Head and Richard Landis, 58-79. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Maier, Christoph. *Crusade Propaganda and Ideology: Model Sermons for the Preaching of the Cross*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Martin, Carl Grey. "The Awntyrs off Arthure, an Economy of Pain." *Modern Philology* 108, No. 2 (November 2010): 177-198.

Markschies, Christoph. "Jesus Christ as a Man Before God: Two Interpretive Models for Isaiah 53 in the Patristic Literature and Their Development." In *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources.* Edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher, translated by Daniel Bailey, 225-323. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004.

Martos, Joseph. *Doors to the Sacred: A Historical Introduction to Sacraments in the Catholic Church.* Rev. ed. Liguori, MO: Liguori/Triumph, 1991.

Meyendorff, John. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions: The Church AD450-680.* The Church in History. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1989.

Painter, Sidney. *Mediaval Society.* New York: Cornell University Press, 1951.

Partner, Peter. *God of Battles: Holy Wars of Christianity and Islam.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300).* The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Radulescu, Raluca. "How Christian is Chivalry?" In *Christianity and Romance in Medieval England*, edited by Rosalind Field, Phillipa Hardman, and Michelle Sweeney, 69-83. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2010.

Regout, Robert Hubert Willem. *La Doctrine de la Guerre Juste de Saint Augustin à nos Jours: d'après les Thélogiens et les Canonistes Catholiques*. 1934. Reprint, Darmstadt, Germany: Scientia Verlag Aalen, 1974.

Riley-Smith, Jonathan. *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

_____. "The State of Mind of Crusaders to the East, 1095-1300." In *The Oxford History of the Crusades*, edited by Jonathan Riley-Smith, 68-89. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

_____. "Crusading as an Act of Love." In *Medieval Religion: New Approaches*, edited by Constance Hoffman Berman, 49-67. New York: Routledge, 2005.

_____. *Templars and Hospitallers as Professed Religious in the Holy Land*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dam Press, 2010.

Robinson, I.S. *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest: The Polemical Literature of the Late Eleventh Century*. New York: Manchester University Press, 1978.

Routledge, Michael. "Songs." In *The Oxford History of the Crusades*, edited by
    Jonathan Riley-Smith, 90-110. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Russell, James. *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity: A Sociohistorical
    Approach to Religious Transformation.* New York: Oxford University Press,
    1994.

Salisbury, Joyce. "'In Vain Have I Smitten Your Children': Augustine Defines Just
    War." In *The Just War and Jihad: Violence in Judaism, Christianity, & Islam*,
    edited by R. Joseph Hoffmann, 203-216. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2006.

Schimmelpfennig, Bernhard. *The Papacy*. Translated by James Sievert. New York:
    Columbia University Press, 1992.

Schmitt, Jean-Claude. *Ghosts in the Middle Ages: The Living and the Dead in Medieval
    Society*, translated by Teresa Fagan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Smith, Katherine. *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture.* Studies in the
    History of Medieval Religion 37. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2011.

Steinberg, Theodore. *Reading the Middle Ages: An Introduction to Medieval Literature*.
    Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2003.

Stuhlmueller, Carroll. "The Gospel According to Luke." In *The Jerome Biblical
    Commentary*. Edited by Raymond Brown, Joseph Fitzmyer, and Roland Murphy,
    115-164. Eagle Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

Sizgorich, Thomas. *Violence and Belief in Late Antiquity: Militant Devotion in
    Christianity and Islam*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.

Southern, R.W. *The Making of the Middle Ages*. New Haven: Yale University Press,
    1953.

Tierney, Brian. *The Crisis of Church and State, 1050-1300*. 1964. Reprint, Toronto:
    Medieval Academy of America, 1988.

Tolan, John. *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination*. New York:
    Columbia University Press, 2002.

Tyerman, Christopher. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*. Cambridge, MA:
    Belknap Press, 2006.

Upton-Ward, Judi. "Introduction." In *The Rule of the Templars: The French Text of the
    Rule of the Order of the Knights Templar*, 1-17. Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1992.

Vance, Eugene. "Style and Value: From Soldier to Pilgrim in the Song of Roland." *Yale French Studies,* Special Issue (1991): 75-96.

Verkamp, Bernard. "Moral Treatment of Returning Warriors in the Early Middle Ages." *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 16, No. 2 (Fall 1988): 223-249.

Wallace-Hadrill, J.M. *The Frankish* Church. Oxford History of the Christian Church, edited by Henry and Owen Chadwick. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Williamson, Joan. "The Chanson de Guillaume: Why Warriors Wage War." In *Actes du XIe Congrès international de la Société Rencesvals, (Barcelone, 22-27 août 1988)*, 359-372. Barcelona: Real Academia de Buenas letras, 1990.

Young, Robin. "Martyrdom as Exaltation." In *Late Ancient Christianity*. Edited by Virginia Burrus, 70-92. Volume 2 of *A People's History of Christianity*, edited by Denis Janz. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.