

The Advent of the Pastores (1251)

In: Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire. Tome 66 fasc. 2, 1988. Histoire - Geschiedenis. pp. 249-267.

Citer ce document / Cite this document :

Dickson Gary. The Advent of the Pastores (1251). In: Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire. Tome 66 fasc. 2, 1988. Histoire - Geschiedenis. pp. 249-267.

doi : 10.3406/rbph.1988.3626

http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/rbph_0035-0818_1988_num_66_2_3626

The Advent of the *Pastores* (1251) (*)

Gary DICKSON

University of Edinburgh

While Louis IX of France was in *outramer*, salvaging what he could from his disastrous Egyptian crusade, and his mother Blanche of Castile was regent of France in his absence, there occurred, in 1251, 'one of the most remarkable movements of the Middle Ages' ⁽¹⁾, the unauthorized *crucesignatio pastorellorum*, the crusade of the shepherds (*pastores, pastoureaux*) ⁽²⁾. We know a good deal about this popular crusade, and what we know is the result of work accomplished by earlier scholars, such as Röhricht and Berger; and, in our own time, by, among others, Cohn, Lerner, Jordan, Richard, and most recently, and comprehensively, Malcolm Barber ⁽³⁾.

(*) As this is to be the first of a series of studies on medieval revivalism, I should like to dedicate it to Professor Gavin I. Langmuir of Stanford University, teacher and friend, whose Collingwoodian approach to historical problems has illuminated the field of medieval Antisemitism. I wish to thank Professor Jonathan Riley-Smith and his amiable postgraduate students, who received my paper at the Institute of Historical Research, London, with such courtesy and helpfulness.

(1) R. RÖHRICHT, 'Die Pastorellen (1251)', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. VI (1884), p. 295.

(2) The title appears in a rather late source *Chronicon Girardi ab Arvernia*, in M. BOUQUET (ed.), *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France* (afterwards: *R.H.G.F.*), Vol. XXI, p. 215, a chronicle which terminates in 1288, and which seems to be the source of Bernard Gui's similar usage, cf. *R.H.G.F.*, Vol. XXI (1855), p. 697.

(3) RÖHRICHT: *supra*, pp. 290-96. E. BERGER, *Saint Louis et Innocent IV* (Paris, 1893), pp. 382-83, but also very useful for the period. Hereafter, BERGER, refers to this book, and *not*, IDEM., *Histoire de Blanche de Castile* (Paris, 1895), pp. 393-401. Another older work which should not be ignored is: H. WALLON, *Saint Louis et son temps* (Paris, 1875), Vol. I, p. 427ff. These titles and the modern works following by no means constitute a comprehensive bibliography of the movement. N. COHN, *The Pursuit of the Millennium*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1961), pp. 82-87; R. E. LERNER, 'The Uses of Heterodoxy', *French Historical Studies*, Vol. IV (1965), pp. 189-202; W. C. JORDAN, *Louis IX and the Challenge of the Crusade* (Princeton, 1979), pp. 110-116; J. RICHARD, *Saint Louis* (Paris, 1983), p. 257ff.; M. BARBER, 'The Crusade of the Shepherds in 1251', in *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History* (ed. J. F. SWEETS) (Lawrence, Kansas, 1984), pp. 1-23. I am grateful to Dr. Barber for supplying me with a photocopy of his important article. After I had already reached my conclusions, I came across A. TUILIER, 'La Révolte des pastoureaux et la querelle entre l'université de Paris et les ordres mendiants', in *La Piété*

Neither the nature nor the character of this movement is any longer in doubt. This was an enthusiasm of the peasantry, rooted in the countryside, but in contact with important urban centres, which saw socially marginal, often youthful, agricultural labourers, landless shepherds, cowherds, dairy maids, household servants – later to be joined by assorted riff-raff (*ribaldi*)⁽⁴⁾ – from the Low Countries and northern France, who were setting out to aid and avenge King Louis, and to rescue the Holy Land from the clutches of the Saracens. Again and again, contemporary chroniclers restate these motives as the enthusiasts's professed aims⁽⁵⁾. Naturally, such intentions demonstrate both the extent of the popular diffusion of the mystique of Capetian kingship⁽⁶⁾, and widespread popular adherence to the crusading ideology summed up in the papal conception of Christendom⁽⁷⁾. Initially, the shepherds's crusade was peaceful. Before the *pastores* reached Paris and obtained Queen Blanche's blessing, there is no evidence to hint at their subsequent career of anticlerical and antisemitic violence⁽⁸⁾. But the important problem of the shift from orthodox though unofficial collective enthusiasm, to disruptive mob violence cannot be discussed at present, for here our concern lies with the still relatively unexplored question of the movement's inception.

From the *pauperes* of 1095-96 to the *pastoureaux* of 1320⁽⁹⁾, the Western European history of the crusades was punctuated by a series of peasant movements.

Populaire au Moyen Age, Vol. I of *Actes du 99^e Congrès National des Sociétés Savantes*, Section de phil. et d'hist. jusqu'à 1610 (Paris, 1977), pp. 353-67. Although the author's assertions are stimulating, his main arguments require more careful demonstration to sustain them.

(4) Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora* (ed. LUARD; Rolls Series), Vol. V (London, 1857) (afterwards cited as: MP), p. 248: *Confluebant igitur ad ipsorum consortium fures, exules, fugitivi, excommunicati, quos omnes ribaldos Francia vulgariter consuevit appellare ...* And note the *Chron. Rotomagensis*, R.H.G.F., Vol. XXIII (1876), p. 339: *quidam ribaldi qui faciebant se pastores*.

(5) Amongst the chroniclers ascribing some or all of these motives to the *pastores*, see: *Vie de Saint Louis par Guillaume de Nangis*, R.H.G.F., Vol. XX, p. 383; Iohanne de Columna, R.H.G.F., Vol. XXIII, p. 123; *Chron. Sancti Laudi Rotomagensis*, R.H.G.F., Vol. XXIII, p. 395; *Chron. Minor Auctore Minorita Erphordiensi*, M.G.H. *Scriptores* (hereafter: SS.), Vol. XXIV, p. 200; Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica* (ed. G. Scalia), Vol. II (Bari, 1966), p. 645. This list does not draw from all available texts. L. S. LE NAIN DE TILLEMONT, *Vie de Saint Louis*, Vol. III (Paris, 1848), p. 430, summarizes their aims as (1) to help St. Louis, (2) to conquer the Holy Land, (3) to avenge the injury done to the King and his brothers.

(6) Cf. P. ALPHANDÉRY & A. DUPRONT, *La Chrétienté et l'Idée de Croisade*, Vol. II (Paris, 1959), pp. 258-59.

(7) Best concise discussion in D. HAY, *Europe: the Emergence of an Idea* (2nd ed.) (Edinburgh, 1968), chapter 2.

(8) See JORDAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-14.

(9) *Pauperes*: The impressive recent study by J. RILEY-SMITH, 'The First Crusade and the Persecution of the Jews', *Studies in Church History*, 21, *Persecution and Toleration* (ed. W. J. SHEILS) (Oxford, 1984), pp. 51-72, brings out what has previously been underplayed in this movement: the important rôle which the knights and the crusading captains had in it. *Pastoureaux*: M. BARBER, 'The Pastoureaux of 1320', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 32 (1981), pp. 143-66.

Like their counterparts in earlier and later peasant movements, the *pastores* of 1251, as crusaders, assumed a providential rôle in the fate of Christendom. Myths of election allowed the socially marginal to participate in the aristocratic, prestige-conferring enterprise of the crusades. A shared concern for the conflicts of Christendom characterized these movements of popular orthodoxy. Another feature of these popular orthodox revivals was an unanticipated responsiveness to events, both distant, like the mishaps of King Louis in the East, and proximate, like the preaching of the anti-Hohenstaufen crusade. In peasant societies where socioeconomic deprivation provided a suitable background for collective arousal, the repercussions of these and similar events could produce extraordinary effects, which the movement of the *pastores* illustrates. Unfortunately, the comparative history of popular crusading revivals is hampered by the lack of a framework of established data. Grand interpretations do not compensate for missing answers to the most elementary questions. This is particularly true when it comes to the shepherds' crusade, for when we read the scholars closely the impression we obtain of its origins becomes ever more cloudy. On the whole, the more cautious scholars describe a movement already in existence over a wide area for no readily discernible reason. Let us attempt to remedy this situation by paying strict attention to three crucial elements — time, place, and circumstance.

Much depends upon ascertaining the time of the movement's origins as precisely as the evidence permits. For revivals like the crusade of the *pastores*, the active phase, or movement proper (*motio, expeditio, crucesignatio*, etc.) is mainly characterized by collective itinerancy, which is what usually first brings it to the notice of the chroniclers. Prior to this active phase, however, is a period of group formation, frequently obscure and unreported, when the nucleus of the later movement, the religious crowd, assembles. This period we may call the latency phase. If we can arrive at a more or less accurate date of when the movement proper commenced, it should be possible to estimate the time of the latency phase. Then, having done this, we can measure the duration of the entire revival.

It is equally vital to discover the location of the movement's original homeland, that is, the territory of primary group activity during the latency phase. Just as situating the revival in time fixes its place in the world of events, so localization is the necessary first step in determining what specific cultural, social, and political influences impinged directly upon the enthusiasts. Thanks to the scholars of Perugia, we now can do this for one important thirteenth-century movement, the flagellants (*disciplinati*) of 1260⁽¹⁰⁾. The best that can presently be achieved for the *pastores*, however, is to assign the movement to a broad geographical area ; pinpointing its

(10) For example, note U. NICOLINI, 'Bevignate e Raniero Fasani', in *Settimo centenario della morte di Raniero Fasani* (Perugia, 1984), p. 107ff, with references to the earlier literature.

first home within its regional setting awaits the detective skills of archivists, and locally-based historians and savants (¹¹).

Historians of popular crusading movements have traditionally been concerned to establish the crusading framework or context for the emergence of popular crusades. Thus it is generally agreed that whether or not Peter the Hermit was himself actually present at the Council of Clermont in 1095, Peter's crusade amounted to a response to Urban II's summons (¹²). As for the crusade of the *pueri* in 1212, Miccoli has effectively resurrected de Janssens's view, which even Raedts has accepted, that it was the supplicatory processions called for by Innocent III on behalf of the endangered Spanish Church, as the crisis of the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa drew nearer, which prompted the first processions of the *pueri* (¹³). Finally, in respect to the *pastoureaux* of 1320, Barber has stressed the cumulative effects of a series of events, arguing that royal, baronial, and papal agitation for an impending crusade had unforeseen results: 'Hardly a year had passed since 1312 ... when there had not been some attempt to incite enthusiasm for the crusade ... The danger that some people ... would take the call for a crusade seriously, became a reality with the rising of the French rustics in 1320' (¹⁴). A crusading context for the *pastores* of 1251 has often been assumed or asserted, but it has never been thoroughly examined. Now this sort of exploration of the crusading background and the immediate 'precipitating events' which led to the shepherds's crusade must not be equated with a full-scale explanation. Deepseated social, economic, and cultural factors have to be put to one side. Having entered this caveat, I propose to investigate the crusading context of the *pastores* movement in the penultimate section of this essay.

1. WHEN DID THE *CRUCESIGNATIO PASTORELLORUM* BEGIN ?

The end of the shepherds's crusade is easier to trace than its beginning. The decline and disintegration of the movement comes with the departure of the *pastores* from Paris. This was the movement's terminal and violent stage, and for it we have

(11) Even with the help of inter-library loans, to pursue local history at a distance is always a frustrating task.

(12) This is implicit in H. Hagenmeyer's standard (though dated) *Peter der Eremit* (Leipzig, 1879), pp. 106-8. Now, however, note the discussion in E. O. BLAKE and C. MORRIS, 'A Hermit goes to War', *Studies in Church History*, Vol. 22 (Oxford, 1985), pp. 79-107.

(13) G. MICCOLI, 'La "crociata dei fanciulli" del 1212', *Studi Medievali*, Vol. II.2 (3rd ser.) (1961), pp. 440-43 on the Spanish situation and Innocent III's processions. Cf. G. DE JANSSENS, 'Étienne de Cloyes et les croisades d'enfants au XIII^e siècle', *Bulletin de la Société Dunoise*, no. 90 (1891), pp. 112-13, mentioning the processions. Finally: P. RAEDTS, 'The Children's Crusade of 1212', *Journal of Medieval History*, Vol. III (1977); extremely valuable for its study of the chronicles, but all else should be treated with caution; comments on the processions: p. 305.

(14) BARBER, 'Pastoureaux', *loc. cit.*, p. 161.

two reliable reports which situate bands of 'crusaders' simultaneously both northwest and south of Paris, at Rouen and Orleans, respectively. As both cities are approximately equidistant from Paris, we can assume that separate groups of enthusiasts left Paris around the same time. The evidence supplied by the monk Thomas of Sherborne – for eight days a prisoner of the *pastores* – allows Matthew Paris to place them at Orleans on St. Barnabas's day (11 June) (15). At Rouen meanwhile, Archbishop Eudes Rigaud noted in his *Register* that this popular tumult disrupted his Pentecost synod (11-12 June) (16). Whitsun then fell on 4 June, and its octave extended the feast until the 11th (17). The Rouen chroniclers confirm Eudes's testimony, and also make it perfectly clear that the *commotio pastorum* in Rouen was a phenomenon of the movement's disintegration, and certainly not of its inception (18). This is a point to be kept in mind.

After 11 June, secure chronological milestones are harder to find. Apparently overlooked as a source for the shepherds's crusade, the *Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds* does admittedly terminate in 1301. Yet its precise dating and its avoidance of all anachronism or legend-building in its concise treatment of the 1251 movement do inspire a degree of confidence. From the Bury chronicler we learn that the clash between *pastores* and the clergy at Orleans took place on 13 June, and that the *magister pastorum* was killed – where he was slain is not specified – on the 16th of that same month (19). Such a date is not unreasonable (20). On very good evidence, Barber assigns the brief and abortive English epilogue to the shepherds's crusade to early July (21). No dates are available for any of the other incidents involving bands of *pastores*, but surely by this time the movement had virtually collapsed.

Paris, then, was the real turning point for the *pastores*. Quite plausibly, Jordan surmises that they reached Paris in early June of 1251 (22). If this is so, it could very well be that the dramatic appearance of the most prominent of the shepherds's leaders, the so-called Master of Hungary, at the Paris church of Saint-Eustace, outfitted in the garb of a bishop (which he was not), coincided with the feast of

(15) MP, p. 249 (Orleans), p. 253ff. (Thomas of Sherborne).

(16) *The Register of Eudes of Rouen* (trans. BROWN; ed. O'SULLIVAN) (New York & London, 1964), pp. 127-28, and fnt. 8.

(17) C. R. CHENEY (ed.), *Handbook of Dates* (London, 1945). Cf. JORDAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-15.

(18) *Chron. Rotomagensis*: cited fnt. 4, *supra*; *Chron. S. Laudi Rotomag.*: cited fnt. 5, *supra*, p. 396.

(19) A. GRANSDEN (ed. & transl.), *The Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds, 1212-1301* (London, 1964), pp. 17-18, and fnt. 1, where Gransden refers to the *magister pastorum* as 'Roger'.

(20) Cf. MP, p. 249ff.

(21) BARBER, 'Crusade of the Shepherds', *loc. cit.*, p. 6.

(22) JORDAN, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

Pentecost (4 June) ⁽²³⁾. And if the *pastores* were at both Rouen and Orleans by 11 June, then we can suppose that they abandoned Paris on the 8th or 9th of June ⁽²⁴⁾.

The journey of the *pastores* to Paris won for them their most outstanding and remarkable accomplishment: Queen Blanche's favour and recognition. Of that journey, however, but one fact is recorded. The *pastores* were in Amiens, and it must have been from Picardy that their march to Paris started ⁽²⁵⁾. But this is not to say, as some writers have alleged, that the shepherds's crusade originated in Picardy ⁽²⁶⁾. Although we cannot date the presence of the *pastores* in Amiens, and cannot track their line of march to Paris, we are fortunate to have two further credible witnesses, both of whom were in France at the time of the shepherds's crusade, and whose testimony sheds light on the vexed question of when the movement commenced.

Overwrought and frightened by the memory of the recent anti-mendicant violence of the *pastores*, a Parisian Franciscan poured out his version of what the shepherds had done and what he imagined they intended to do, in a letter to Adam Marsh and the Oxford brethren. 'This unexpected evil arose', he said, 'not long ago, during the Easter season' (*nuper in festo Resurrectionis ... surrexit malum inopinatum*). The writer fails to specify where the movement began, although he does say that it came to Paris after some time had intervened ⁽²⁷⁾. (In 1251, Easter Sunday fell on the 16th of April, and the Easter octave ended on the 23rd).

No less a figure than Boniface of Savoy, Archbishop of Canterbury, is our second eminently trustworthy witness. He was returning to England from the papal court at Lyons when 'that plague' — the shepherds's crusade — broke out. For what Matthew Paris has to say about the aims and beliefs of the *pastores*, the supposed revelations of the Master of Hungary, and the kindness and favour which Queen Blanche lavished upon the shepherds, Boniface of Savoy was his informant. The Archbishop arrived back in England around the 11th of June, 1251. This explains why he has nothing to say about the violence of the *pastores*, nor about the pseudo-episcopal preaching of the Master of Hungary, which he would have been sure to mention, had he known of it. When Matthew Paris narrates these later developments, his account derives from Thomas of Sherborne. So we may conclude

(23) See J. VIARD (ed.), *Les Grandes Chroniques de France*, Vol. VII (Paris, 1932), p. 164.

(24) The point to bear in mind is the approximate equidistance from Paris of Rouen and Orleans. J. W. NESBITT, 'The Rate of March of Crusading Armies in Europe', *Traditio*, Vol. 19 (1963), pp. 167-81, estimates that for the men of Peter the Hermit 'the rate was 17.7 average daily miles' (p. 173), but his calculations are not really relevant to much shorter distances, marched without delays, or kit. It is thus not unreasonable to suppose that for only three or four days, the *pastores* could average 20 or 25 miles per day. (I wish to thank my wife for assisting me with facts and figures).

(25) VIARD, *op. cit.*, Vol. VII, p. 163.

(26) E.g., COHN, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

(27) *Annales Monastici* (ed. LUARD; Rolls Series), Vol. I (London, 1864), 'Annales de Burton', pp. 290-93.

from this that Queen Blanche's welcome to the shepherds antedated the 4th of June, by which time the Archbishop of Canterbury had probably left the Ile-de-France for England.

Boniface of Savoy must also have been the ultimate source for Matthew Paris's malicious gibe that it was the departure of the papal party from Lyons which encouraged the movement of the shepherds to flourish in France. Boniface, on the contrary, had no intention of smearing the papacy with such allegations. His purpose in affirming that *haec pestis post Pascha incepit in regno memorato*, that is, that the shepherds's crusade began in the Kingdom of France after Eastertide, and observing, almost in the same breath, that it was during Eastertide that Innocent IV left Lyons, was exactly the opposite of Matthew's. Probably, he sought to show that the Pope knew nothing about the movement at the time of his departure. Unfortunately, the Archbishop of Canterbury has not a word to say about the whereabouts of the *pastores* before they came to Paris (28).

Both of these reliable testimonies may be reconciled without undue difficulty. What we then have is this : During the Easter season of 1251 (i.e. 16-23 April) the shepherds's crusade, the active phase of it, began. After Eastertide, but before Pentecost, it came to France.

2. WHERE DID THE *CRUCESIGNATIO PASTORELLORUM* ORIGINATE ?

The most straightforward way of dealing with this question is to survey all the relevant evidence provided by the chroniclers. We need to bring together whatever the chroniclers tell us about the territories traversed by the enthusiasts, or about their own native lands.

The philosopher Roger Bacon claims to have set eyes on the *magister Pastor* himself. Be this as it may, he patently exaggerates when he avers that the crusade of the shepherds agitated *totam Alemanniam et Franciam* (29). Still, his reference to Germany points us in an eastward-looking direction. Adam Marsh's Paris correspondent makes reference to a multitude of mysterious knights, garbed in white, who then appeared *in partibus Alemanniae* (30). Apocalyptic or apocryphal, the white

(28) MP, p. 248. The reference works on Boniface of Savoy stand in need of correction : the *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. II, pp. 812-14, followed by the *Dict. d'Hist. et Géog. Eccles.*, Vol. IX, cols. 944-46, have him return to England in late 1252. On the papal departure from Lyons, see BERGER, p. 367 and fn. 2. It should be understood that Boniface of Savoy does not state that the *pastores* actually came to Paris ; but when he mentions Queen Blanche's approval he implies that they did so. It is always possible that the oblique reference in Matthew Paris to the Saint-Eustace incident (MP, p. 249 : *Et cum eorum summus dux praedicaret, stipatus undique armatis ... etc.*), if that is what it is, also comes from Boniface of Savoy.

(29) J. H. BRIDGES (ed.), *The 'Opus Majus' of Roger Bacon* (Oxford, 1897), Vol. I, p. 401.

(30) 'Annales de Burton', *op. cit.*, p. 292.

knights appear in the same territory. A clearer report comes from the Vosges. Richer of Senones, writing c.1254-64, and painting the movement of 1251 in the darkest colours, maintains that the evil enchanters responsible for its inception, sprang from the lands of Lotharingia, Burgundy, and France, in that order of precedence⁽³¹⁾. The easterly location of Richer's monastery lends authority to the historical primacy, as he sees it, of the Lotharingian borderlands.

Much more specific, however, is the key passage from Jean du Vignay's translation of Primat's chronicle (c. 1250-85): 'Et de toutes les diverses parties du royaume meismement il acouroient, de Breban, de Flandres, de Henaut, et de Picardie'⁽³²⁾. Right away, we should note the significant omission from this list of Normandy. Normandy, as it was argued earlier, was evidently not a primary territory of recruitment. Similarly, we are justified in considering Picardy (and Amiens) as not more than an assembly-point *en route* to Paris⁽³³⁾. Without doubt, the *pastores* picked up enthusiasts in Picardy. But it is clear that the true beginnings of the revival lie farther to the east. Our French chronicler may be judged guilty of patriotically overextending the frontiers of the Capetian realm. But the point to bear in mind is that, once again, the Lotharingian borderlands, Lower Lorraine in particular, along with the important county of Flanders, have been singled out. Finally, to complete the picture, Guillaume de Nangis (d. 1300) states that *primo per Flandriam et Picardiam*, the shepherds's crusade reached France⁽³⁴⁾. Perhaps we should now pay special attention to Flanders, and possibly Brabant.

Unfortunately, no equally firm conclusions can be drawn about the first homeland of this popular crusade by examining the ethnic origins of its known leaders. While the name of the shepherd Roger suggests a Francophone locality, the more notorious Jacob, otherwise known as the Master of Hungary, was, according to the chroniclers, an apostate Cistercian, fluent in French, German, and Latin, and in fact a native of

(31) *Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae*, M.G.H.SS., Vol. XXV (ed. WAITZ; 1880), p. 310.

(32) *Chronique de Primat*, traduite par Jean du Vignay, R.H.G.F., Vol. XXIII, p. 8. Cf. A. MOLINIER, *Les Sources de l'histoire de France*, Vol. III (Paris, 1903), p. 101, no. 2531; p. 102, no. 2532; for de Nangis, *infra*, fnt. 34.

(33) There is one source, however, which does make it seem as if the movement began in Picardy. The *Chronique anonyme*, in R.H.G.F., Vol. XXI, p. 83 (which BARBER, 'Crusade of the Shepherds', *loc. cit.*, p. 19 and fnt. 8, says was probably written before 1297), states *s.a.* 1250: 'En cèle anée meismes, les patouriaus de Picardie et de toute France s'assemblèrent par l. pastour qui avoit non Rogier, qui estoit leur mestres ...' Now this chronicler pays particular attention to the troop of *pastores* under Roger, to the neglect of the others. The central purpose of the movement is omitted, along with all mention of Paris and Queen Blanche. It could be that Roger was a leader of the Picard shepherds.

(34) Guillelmi de Nangiaco, *Chronicon*, R.H.G.F., Vol. XX (1840), p. 554. Perhaps one should also note the late (d.1383) Flemish chronicler of Saint-Bertin, Jean le Long, *Chron. S. Bertini*, M.G.H.SS., Vol. XXV (ed. O. HOLDER-EGGER), p. 846 (*s.a.* 1252) who says 'Eodemque anno pastorelli in magna multitudine per Flandriam et Franciam discurrerent ...'.

Hungary⁽³⁵⁾. Although it is always possible that a Hungarian domiciled for a number of years in, say, Flanders or Brabant, could acquire the skill to communicate directly with peasant enthusiasts in their own tongue, it is also not without interest that facility in French and German, as well as in Latin, the clerical language, is precisely what we would expect from an educated Fleming or Brabantine. The indication that Jacob joined the movement at a later stage, in Amiens⁽³⁶⁾, may be accurate, or it may be part of an attempt to portray him as a scheming opportunist and manipulator of other men's passions⁽³⁷⁾. Jacob's personal charisma might have been sufficient to outweigh a lack of close ethnic or linguistic affinity with his peasant following, but in most thirteenth-century popular revivals such strong bonds were the norm. And there are plausible alternatives to a belief in Jacob's Hungarian nationality. Hungary and the Tartar (Mongol) menace were associated in the religious and indeed prophetic preoccupations of the period⁽³⁸⁾. If Jacob was not really a Hungarian refugee⁽³⁹⁾, could the title of 'Master of Hungary' have served to cloak him in apocalyptic portentousness? Of course, Jacob might also have been a Flemish or Brabantine Cistercian who had resided for some years in a Hungarian monastic house. More speculatively still, was there a Brabantine or Flemish toponym which to thirteenth-century French ears sounded like 'Hungary', and once having been affixed to Jacob, stuck? My object in raising these questions is not of course to provide definitive answers, but to stimulate further study.

All in all, this discussion, however much it inevitably falls short of localizing the original homeland of the movement of 1251, at least puts paid to the misleading assumption, commonplace in studies of medieval popular enthusiasms, that a revival like that of the *pastores*, which ultimately attracted adherents over a relatively wide area, operated throughout that area more or less simultaneously. It did not. So far as we are able to reconstruct it, there was a coherent line of march. From Flanders, or perhaps further east, from Brabant, the movement gathered impetus and advanced to Picardy, and thereafter, from Amiens, it set out on the road to Paris. At this point, Paris, the Capetian royal city, drew the *pastores* like a magnet.

Altogether, the cultural and political tensions within the Franco-Imperial borderlands, plus the longstanding crusading tradition in this region, offer us ample

(35) MP, pp. 246-7. For the other chroniclers, see the references in BARBER's 'Crusade of the Shepherds', *loc. cit.*, p. 19, fnnts. 10-11. A. GABRIEL, 'Maître Jacques de Hongrie', *Nouvelle Revue de Hongrie*, Vol. LXVI (1942), pp. 148-59, adds nothing to the sources, but fills in some Franco-Hungarian background information.

(36) Cf. VIARD, *op. cit.*, Vol. VII, p. 163.

(37) R. HILTON, *Bond Man Made Free* (London, 1973), p. 100 believes that the chroniclers turn the Master of Hungary into the classic 'outside agitator'.

(38) The prophetic aspect is well brought out in R. E. LERNER, *The Powers of Prophecy* (Berkeley, 1983).

(39) TUILIER, *loc. cit.*, p. 354 thinks that the Master of Hungary was 'certinement originaire des pays du Saint-Empire romain germanique — ou des pays alliés', pointing out in fnnt. 4 that Hungary was then allied with the German princes against the Mongols.

grounds for concentrating our search for origins here. Now what remains to be done is to recover the immediate circumstances for the advent of the *pastores*, in Flanders or Brabant, towards Eastertide, 1251.

3. WHAT WAS THE CRUSADING CONTEXT FOR THE *CRUCESIGNATIO PASTORELLORUM*?

'The shepherds's crusade of 1251,' asserts B. Z. Kedar, 'was a mere reaction to the defeat sustained by the army of King Louis in Egypt' (40). Not all historians would feel comfortable about subscribing to so ringing a declaration – several are content to juxtapose Louis's defeat and the coming of the *pastores*, implying rather than affirming a connection – but a qualified version of Kedar's assertion does represent the prevailing opinion (41). On the face of it, the link seems reasonable enough. After all, the professed aim of the *pastores* themselves, to come to the rescue of the King of France, would appear to confirm it. More significantly, evidence exists to support the view that the failure of the Egyptian crusade was a particularly painful blow to Flanders.

In the course of the thirteenth century, Capetian influence steadily increased beyond the Meuse, and even beyond the Scheldt (42). For example, Robert d'Artois, Louis IX's brother and one of his leading crusade commanders, was married to the eldest daughter of Henry II of Brabant. Of greater consequence for our purposes, in 1246, King Louis, adjudicating competing claims to rule Hainaut and Flanders, awarded the latter (including imperial Flanders!) to Guillaume de Dampierre. The Count of Flanders remained closely tied to the King of France, and in fact led a large Flemish contingent on Louis's crusade in Egypt. Of the prisoners forced to remain behind in Muslim hands when King Louis and Count Guillaume were released from their shared captivity, how many were Flemings? News of their incarceration would have filtered back to Flanders, once the miserable outcome of Louis's crusade became widely known.

Louis was ransomed on 6 May 1250. As he set sail for Acre, some of his former crusading captains were returning directly to France. We cannot be sure if the Count

(40) B. Z. KEDAR, 'The Passenger List of a Crusader Ship, 1250', *Studi Medievali*, 3rd series, Vol. XIII, fasc. 1 (1972), p. 279.

(41) Cf. RICHARD, *op. cit.*, p. 257: 'L'appel du roi trouve, par contre, une résonance inattendue dans les milieux populaires ...' This manner of introducing the shepherds's crusade into the biography of Louis IX is typical.

(42) Information for this paragraph comes from: *Ibid.*, pp. 330-31; H. PIRENNE, *Histoire de Belgique*, Vol. I (2nd ed.) (Brussels, 1902), pp. 221; 234ff.; 244ff. JORDAN, *op. cit.*, p. 67. O. HINTZE, *Das Königtum Wilhelms von Holland* (Hist. Stud., Heft 15) (Leipzig, 1885), p. 92ff. Perhaps it should be noted that the papal legate assisted in the 1246 adjudication. I have not been able to locate a study of Flemish participation in Louis's crusade comparable to H. Van Werveke's valuable essay in *Moyen Age*, Vol. 78 (1972), pp. 55-90 on Flemish involvement in the third crusade.

of Flanders accompanied them, or followed Louis to Acre, because Joinville has him do both, recording his departure both in May and in August (⁴³). It was during this interval, the summer and early autumn of 1250, that information concerning the fate of Louis's crusade reached northern Europe. Matthew Paris tells us that Earl Richard of Cornwall, then resident in London, heard the dreadful news on 16/17 July (⁴⁴). What amounted to a public announcement came in a papal letter to Archbishop Eudes Rigaud of Rouen, which Innocent IV obviously intended for circulation, and which was probably written between 12-31 August. As a study in contrast, Innocent IV's doleful letter on the captivity of Louis deserves to be anthologized opposite the same Pope's jubilant epistle on the death of Frederick II, not so many months later.

The relevance to us of Pope Innocent IV's anguished letter lies in its contribution to heightening awareness of and arousing sympathy for the vanquished King and his crusaders. Berger remarks that no practical measures are to be found in the letter (⁴⁵), but perhaps this is not quite fair. Under the circumstances, Innocent was doing what he was best suited to do. By mobilizing popular opinion behind the King of France, he was thus preparing the way for the practical proposals to follow. His letter, however, outlines what had become the traditional spiritual response to a crusading crisis. Throughout cities and dioceses, the Pope urges, there should take place solemn rites : a liturgy of general supplication of both clergy and people. The faithful should also receive weekly sermons of exhortation (⁴⁶). Yet the significance of this letter must be kept in perspective. Normandy, as we have seen, was not an initial terrain of recruitment for the *pastores* ; and, even though Innocent's message and its recommended rituals might have spread eastwards to Picardy and beyond, both news and liturgy would have arrived too early to have provoked the first stirrings of the shepherds's crusade.

Possibly of far greater direct importance for the inception of the *pastores* was the letter which Louis IX himself composed in Acre and sent back to France on 10 August 1250 with the Counts of Poitiers and Anjou (⁴⁷). In this remarkable document in which the King chronicles his own crusade, Louis does not fail to

(43) RICHARD, *op. cit.*, p. 238 and p. 241, pays the penalty for following Joinville so closely, and does the same. LE NAIN DE TILLEMONT, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV (1848), pp. 262-63, reasons on good grounds that the Count went to Acre with Louis. See A. WAUTERS, 'Guillaume de Dampierre, comte de Flandre de 1246-1251', in *Biographie Nationale de Belgique*, Vol. VIII (1884-85), cols. 444-49 ; here col. 448.

(44) MP, p. 147ff.

(45) Innocent IV's letter to Eudes Rigaud : F. DUCHESNE (ed.), *Historiae Francorum Scriptores*, Vol. V (Paris, 1649), pp. 415-17. A. POTTHAST, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* (shortened hereafter to : Potthast), Vol. II (Berlin, 1875), p. 1160, no. 14053, summarizes it. Potthast says that the papal letter comes *sine nota chronol.*, but he suggests 12-31 August for it. BERGER, p. 343.

(46) DUCHESNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 417.

(47) *Ibid.*, Vol. V, pp. 428-32.

mention the emotive subject of the prisoners still left behind in Egypt. His conclusion is a powerful appeal to the 'knights of Christ' :

Hasten, then, and let those whom the power of the Most High shall inspire to come in person or send help, be ready to cross the sea in this coming April or May (*in passagio ... mensis Maii vel Aprilis*). As for those who cannot be ready for this first passage, let them at all events be ready for the St. John's day passage. The nature of the task calls for speed, and every delay will be fatal ⁽⁴⁸⁾.

Was a copy of this letter carried back to Flanders by Count Guillaume, if this was indeed the true time of his departure? The urgent tone of this letter, together with the April date set for the projected passage, make Louis's appeal a crucial reference point for the coming of the *pastores*, whose active phase, as we know, began in April. Nonetheless, given the nature of medieval popular revivals, it is impossible to credit that this letter alone would have sufficed to inspire a peasant enthusiasm so many months afterwards. To apprehend the crusading context for the advent of the shepherds's crusade, therefore, it seems that we must now direct our attention to another crusade altogether.

As early as 1246, while Louis IX of France was just preparing for his Egyptian crusade and Henry Raspe, Duke of Thuringia (d. 1247), was the reigning papal anti-king in Germany, Innocent IV ordered the preaching of the anti-Hohenstaufen crusade in Hainaut and the German borderlands ⁽⁴⁹⁾. Those who enrolled in this papally authorized venture received the same crusade indulgence as that given to those recruited for the Holy Land expedition. In 1247, King Louis protested to the Pope about the preaching of this alternative crusade, which, as he realized, threatened to undermine his own recruitment drive, particularly in the lands along the Franco-Imperial frontier. Accordingly, late in that same year, Innocent IV prohibited the commutation of vows for the Holy Land crusade into vows for the anti-imperial crusade precisely in those key dioceses near the borders of Germany, such as Liège and Cambrai. Nevertheless, throughout the period of Louis's preparation and departure, the anti-Hohenstaufen crusade continued in Germany.

Innocent's crusade against the deposed Emperor Frederick II and his house was fortified by the election of Count William II, *comes Hollandie et Zelandie*, as King of the Romans (1247-56), and papal champion in the Empire. Count William knew how to exploit the internal political tensions in the Low Countries to his own advantage. Thus he was able to bring to his side the disappointed archrival of Guillaume de Dampierre in Flanders, Jean d'Avesnes, formerly awarded Hainaut by

(48) I have used the translation appended to R. Hague's English version of Joinville's *Life of St. Louis* (London, 1955), pp. 247-54 ; here, p. 254.

(49) BERGER, pp. 231-33. Also note : HINTZE, *op. cit.*, pp. 22 ; 95ff. RICHARD, *op. cit.*, pp. 330-31.

Louis IX, and now in 1248 invested with Namur by William of Holland. Moreover, at the siege of Aachen (1248), Count William drew anti-Hohenstaufen crusaders from Holland, France, Picardy, and Flanders. The Duke of Brabant was there as well, although he had taken the cross to fight in Louis's crusade in the East.

Innocent kept up the pressure on Frederick by ordering the German-based Franciscans and Dominicans to preach the crusade against him and his followers (2 January 1249), especially in those areas where Count William enjoyed the greatest support, including the borderland dioceses of Cambrai and Liège. Much to the anger and chagrin of Blanche of Castile, who wanted an undivided Christian effort to succour her son, even the death of Frederick II (13 December 1250) and the subsequent succession of Conrad IV, failed to halt Innocent IV's unrelenting war against the Hohenstaufen.

In the course of the papal-imperial struggle, between 1249-54, two friars often received papal instructions to raise up crusaders against Frederick, and then Conrad, both within Germany, and its borderlands. Both of these friars were committed to the anti-imperial cause. They were the Franciscan John of Diest and the Dominican William of Maaseik, and both were chaplains to William of Holland⁽⁵⁰⁾. For both of them, urgent papal crusading instructions were dispatched from Lyons during February, 1251. In a letter dated the 5th of that month, Fr. William was told to preach the cross against Conrad and his allies throughout all of the Kingdom of Germany, offering full crusade indulgences to those who took the vow⁽⁵¹⁾. Again, in a separate directive, also dated 5 February, Fr. William and his fellow Dominican Leo of Broma were given permission to hear confessions and impose penances in conjunction with their crusade preaching⁽⁵²⁾. From Lyons, Pope Innocent IV unceasingly pursued his enemies. On 10 February, the Pope addressed two similar letters to Fr. John of Diest. The first of these papal letters provided the Brabantine Franciscan with the necessary authorization and indulgences for the crusade against Conrad and his followers, without, however, making reference to the territory of his anticipated crusade preaching activities⁽⁵³⁾. In contrast, the second of Innocent's epistles to Fr. John does specify the prescribed area of his preaching mission, and, by so doing, it proves to be of direct relevance and of the highest value to our inquiry.

(50) J. B. FREED, *The Friars and German Society in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1977), p. 153 and *passim*.

(51) The text is summarized in E. BERGER (ed.), *Les Registres d'Innocent IV*, Vol. II (Paris, 1887), p. 182, no. 5036. Cf. POTTHAST, Vol. II, p. 1170, no. 14170. The full text is printed in C. RODENBERG (ed.), *Epistolae Saeculi XIII*, Vol. III (MGH. Epist.) (Berlin, 1894), pp. 35-36, no. 48, *Ut talentum scientie*.

(52) BERGER, *Registres, op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 182, no. 5037, *Eidem fratri*.

(53) *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 181, no. 5031, *Cum, sicut te*. Cf. POTTHAST, Vol. II, p. 1171, no. 14176. The text appears in full in L. WADDING, *Annales Minorum*, Vol. III (Quaracchi, 1931), p. 280, but with the amusing error of *contra quemdam Fratrem*, instead of (cf. POTTHAST) *contra quondam Fridericum*!

Accordingly, on 10 February 1251, the Pope, writing from Lyons, instructed Fr. John of Diest to rouse men to take the cross against Conrad and his supporters *in illis partibus Flandriae in quibus esse dicitur in generali usu Theutonicum idioma* ⁽⁵⁴⁾. And we have very good evidence confirming that John of Diest actually did carry out his crusade preaching mission where Innocent IV commanded that he should do so. Under the year 1251, Matthew Paris relates that the Pope ordered *praedicationem sollempnem et communem in partibus Braibantiae et Flandriae* against the forces of Conrad. This statement is straightforward and trustworthy. But when the English chronicler further informs us that fuller (*ampliores*) crusade indulgences were granted for the anti-Conrad crusade than for the crusade to the Holy Land, then we may register surprise and disbelief. Either contemporary oral tradition or Matthew Paris's characteristic anti-papal bias was responsible for such exaggeration. Nothing of the kind can be found in the papal letters addressed to Fr. John of Diest ⁽⁵⁵⁾.

Along with Count William of Holland's court, Fr. John of Diest was at Middelburg (Zeeland), until 20 February 1251 ⁽⁵⁶⁾. Thereafter, his whereabouts become more difficult to determine, and so we cannot be certain where he was when Innocent IV's crusade instructions eventually reached him. Count William and his court, however, can be traced to Arnemuide by 16 March ⁽⁵⁷⁾. To suppose that the papal letters in question were delivered to Fr. John either at Middelburg, or at Arnemuide, is therefore reasonable ⁽⁵⁸⁾. In the execution of his papal duties, Fr. John would have headed for Flemish-speaking Flanders south of Zeeland. It is likely that this would have been imperial Flanders (*Reichsflandern, Rijksvlaenderen*), from Zuid Beveland, to Waes, to the county of Alost (Aalst) ⁽⁵⁹⁾. Afterwards, he

(54) BERGER, *Registres, op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 181, no. 5032, summarizes the text, *Ut negotium generalis*. Cf. POTTHAST, Vol. II, p. 1171, no. 14177. The full text is reproduced in both WADDING, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 280 and in RODENBERG, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 42, no. 54, II, with only minor differences in spelling.

(55) MP, p. 260. TUILIER, *loc. cit.*, p. 357 notices the connection, but aside from remarking that the Pope 'fit prêcher ces indulgences dans les régions de Flandre et de Brabant qui étaient justement le foyer de la révolte' (i.e. the shepherds's crusade), he does not clarify the actual origins of the movement. Moreover, he evidently believes Matthew Paris regarding the *omnium peccatorum remissionem ampliores videlicet quam pro peregrinatione in Terram sanctam*.

(56) W. LAMPEN, 'Joannes Van Diest, O.F.M., Hofkapelaan van Graaf Willem II en eerste Nederlandsche Bisschop uit de Minderbroedersorde', *Bijdragen voor de Geschiedenis van het Bisdome van Haarlem*, Vol. 44 (1926), pp. 299-312; here, note pp. 304-5.

(57) Seemingly, by the 17th of the same month, the court was at Maastricht. See J. F. BÖHMER, *Regesta Imperii*, Vol. V.1 (new ed. J. FICKER) (Innsbruck, 1881-82), p. 945.

(58) Cf. LAMPEN, *loc. cit.*, p. 305.

(59) I have drawn valuable material from: F. LOT, 'La frontière de la France et de l'Empire sur le cours inférieur de l'Escaut du IX^e au XIII^e siècle', in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, Vol. LXXI (1910), pp. 5-32. Generally helpful as well were the discussion, references, and map (p. 387) in C. A. J. ARMSTRONG, 'The Language Question in the Low Countries: the

might have moved south and west, skirting Brabant, along the northern boundary of the diocese of Cambrai. The area of Alost southwestwards made it something of an intersection for the men of 'Breban, de Flandres, de Henaut' to assemble in their multitudes (⁶⁰). Probably somewhere in this region, Fr. John of Diest preached the anti-Hohenstaufen crusade towards the end of March or very early April, the period coinciding with the latency phase of the shepherds's crusade.

The plausibility of such a hypothesis is strengthened by the historical background of religious and political agitation in the region. During 1224-25, for instance, the impostor known as the Pseudo-Baldwin attracted a numerous following around Valenciennes and Tournai, but support for him extended as far as Lille, Ghent, and Bruges. Flemish resistance to French encroachment in the county certainly played a part in his rise to prominence (⁶¹). Later, in 1236, the French Dominican Inquisitor Robert le Bougre was at work burning heretics in Cambrai, Douai, Lille, and in surrounding villages. His heresy-hunting persisted during 1236-37 in Flanders; in 1238 he was to be found in the diocese of Liège (⁶²). Even in imperial lands beyond Capetian France, Robert 'had with him an armed band from the King' (⁶³). We have already seen that the France of Louis IX continued to make gains in the Low Countries. Perhaps this is best shown by participation in Louis's crusade, and also by the formation of pro-French feudal alliances. Moreover, the Flemings were currently exercised in opposing the domination of Count William of Holland, who was attempting to increase his power in Flanders (⁶⁴). These various political and cultural tensions in the region naturally found expression in the volatile enthusiasm of popular movements.

4. THE ADVENT OF THE *PASTORES*

At the inception of the *crucesignatio pastorellorum* lies an intriguing paradox, which is this. Louis IX had appealed for help from the 'knights of Christ', urging them to embark for the Holy Land that very April in which the shepherds's crusade came into being. Moreover, in Flanders, the presence of Count Guillaume de Dampierre, Louis's crusading comrade and fellow captive, meant that the King's

Use of French and Dutch by the Dukes of Burgundy and their Administration', in J. HALE *et al.* (ed.), *Europe in the Late Middle Ages* (London, 1965), pp. 386-409. I have made careful use of the maps pertaining to ecclesiastical and political history in P.-C. VANDER ELST, *Atlas des Pays-Bas* (Brussels, 1831).

(60) Cf. *supra*, fnt. 32.

(61) COHN, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-81.

(62) É. DE MOREAU, *Histoire de l'Église en Belgique*, Vol. III (Brussels, 1945), pp. 596-98.

(63) C. H. HASKINS, 'Robert le Bougre and the Beginnings of the Inquisition in Northern France', in his *Studies in Mediaeval Culture* (New York, n.d.), pp. 193-244; here note, p. 220.

(64) HINTZE, *op. cit.*, pp. 95, 105-6, *passim*.

plight could not have been forgotten. So, given the professed aims of the *pastores*, the movement of 1251 would at first sight appear to be nothing more than a popular response to the King of France's plea for additional crusaders. Nevertheless, in reality, its origins were more complex. Not only had Louis's vital letter of appeal reached Flanders much earlier ; but also no letter would have been sufficient to rouse the enthusiasm of illiterate peasants. Preachers or processions caused medieval crowds to gather, not documents, and Louis's letter does not seem to have been preached in the manner of a papal crusading summons. Evidently, then, it was the Brabantine Franciscan John of Diest's preaching of the crusade against Conrad IV, zealously carried out at the instigation of Pope Innocent IV, on behalf of his ally the King of the Romans, Count William of Holland, which directly precipitated a popular revival dedicated to aid and avenge the King of France, and to rescue the Holy Land from the Saracens.

Deflection from the one crusade to the other could have been prompted by opposition, and we know that popular opposition to the papal war against the Hohenstaufen existed. The great canonist Hostiensis observed in his *Summa aurea* 'that "the simple" would still prefer to go on crusade to the Holy Land, and revealed that when he had been in Germany he had encountered protests against the use of the crusade against the Staufen' (65). Hostiensis and the papal legate Hugh of Saint-Cher travelled northwards in the party of Count William of Holland, who left Lyons on 19 April 1251, and was in Strasbourg by the 12th of May, which indicates that Hostiensis's comment pertains to a time after the shepherds's crusade had begun ; however, opposition to the papal crusade was continuing (66).

An undercurrent of opposition to this same crusade might also be detected amongst the passengers of the *St. Victor*, who had assembled to follow King Louis to Damietta, or wherever else his crusade should take him. They were by no means typical Christian warriors. Kedar has analyzed the passenger list and discovered that over 75% of the pilgrims intending to voyage East, and perhaps settle there, came from non-knightly backgrounds. From their names, so far as one may judge, many of these popular crusaders were of northern French birth. Still, 'several dozens' of them also 'came from various parts of the Empire, where the crusade had been preached not against the Muslims, but against Frederick II and Conrad exclusively' (67). The *St. Victor's* passenger list was the product of a lawsuit, the verdict of which was given at Messina, on 30 July 1250, which means that the pilgrims had probably left their respective homes around April or May of that year. About a year

(65) N. HOUSLEY, *The Italian Crusades* (Oxford, 1982), p. 37.

(66) BÖHMER, *op. cit.*, Vol. V.1, p. 946 : Hugh perhaps remained in Lyons somewhat longer than William ; and he is not documented at Strasbourg until 20 June. According to J. QUETIF and J. ECHARD, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, Vol. I (reprinted Turin, 1961), Hugh of Saint-Cher was in Liège before 29 December 1252 (p. 195).

(67) KEDAR, *loc. cit.*, pp. 278-79.

before the coming of the *pastores*, therefore, these crusaders from imperial territories entrusted their fate to Louis of France. Their decision was tantamount to a rejection of the papal war against the Empire.

From Matthew Paris we have a final piece of evidence illustrating opposition to the anti-Hohenstaufen crusade, which bears directly upon the advent of the *pastores*. According to him, in 1251, when the urgent needs of her son in *outramer* were weighing heavily upon her mind, Blanche of Castile convoked a council of her barons. Most scholars accept the substance of Matthew's report, although not all the details of his account can be taken as presented⁽⁶⁸⁾. The chronicler relates that the barons fully shared their Queen's outrage at the Lord Pope's 'new and internal war'; they also bitterly rebuked the friars, recipients of so many gifts from the French nobility, who were busily engaged in promoting the conflict. Reportedly, the Queen, in a vehement outburst, expropriated and exiled those who had taken the cross in the papal cause⁽⁶⁹⁾. Altogether we are left in no doubt about the extreme hostility of Queen Blanche and her magnates toward the anti-Conrad crusade, perceived by them as detrimental to Louis's interests in the Holy Land.

The *Chronica majora* (s.a. 1251) records Blanche's convocation of the nobles after the narration of the shepherds's crusade; but no chronological relationship is thereby established, and scholars have felt free to reverse this order⁽⁷⁰⁾. Indeed, exactly when the baronial assembly took place remains uncertain. Matthew Paris, however, believes that two factors were responsible for provoking it. The first of these was the promulgation of the imperial crusade in Brabant and Flanders — a key point already cited from Matthew⁽⁷¹⁾ — where, as we know, Fr. John of Diest, O.F.M., and Fr. William of Maaseik, O.P., were doing precisely what the French nobles blamed the *Praedicatores et Minores* for doing: preaching the Pope's war. The second stimulus for the convening of the council, in the English chronicler's opinion, was the arrival of a gloomy letter from King Louis, sent from his camp at Caesarea. Now Louis did in fact write to his brother the Count of Poitiers from Caesarea, on 11 August 1251. But Berger argues persuasively that this letter, in both tone and content, differs greatly from Matthew Paris's summary, so much so that one may well question if it is really the letter which Matthew pretends to be discussing⁽⁷²⁾. Putting this unresolved problem aside, let us remember that with the

(68) MP, pp. 260-61. Cf. BERGER, p. 371, fnt. 2: 'Il y a certainement dans ce récit une part de vérité ...' The same position can be detected in the scholars who report and give credence to Matthew Paris's words: LERNER, *loc. cit.*, p. 201; JORDAN, *op. cit.*, p. 112; M. PURCELL, *Papal Crusading Policy, 1244-91* (Leiden, 1975), p. 78; etc.

(69) MP, p. 260.

(70) E.g., JORDAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-13; M. W. LABARGE, *Saint Louis* (London, 1968), p. 147ff; and Berger, who seems to place the baronial council 'au printemps de 1251' (p. 371) but before the *pastores* (p. 382).

(71) See fnt. 55 *supra*.

(72) BERGER, p. 371ff, fnt. 2. LABARGE, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-38 devotes some attention to this letter. Note the sceptical comments of LE NAIN DE TILLEMONT, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, p. 266, that

approach of the Spring passage – the period singled out in Louis's letter from Acre ⁽⁷³⁾ – the plight of the King would have preoccupied Queen and people, and that this growing anxiety coincided with the preaching of Fr. John of Diest in Flanders, which then must have come to the Queen's notice. And, as Housley maintains, the territory in which the issue of recruitment to the papal war kindled Blanche's anger must have been the borderlands of France and Germany ⁽⁷⁴⁾. Surely Matthew Paris points us towards the frontier when he says that *fuit praedicta praedicatio per fines Francorum* ⁽⁷⁵⁾, because the suggestion that the anti-Conrad crusade was preached throughout France is patently absurd.

So, if it was the Pope's *novum praelium*, and especially preaching and recruitment for it in Flanders and Brabant, which became the focus of Blanche's anxiety and anger towards April of 1251, then considerable importance must be attached to Matthew Paris's laconic statement of what resulted from the nobles of the region faithfully executing their Queen's harsh measures against the condemned papal warriors of their land :

The neighbouring nobles ... acted in a similar way to all in their territories who had assumed the cross in consequence of such preaching. And so the preaching dwindled away, and those who had taken the cross were recalled (*Et ita emarcuit praedicatio et signati revocabantur*) ⁽⁷⁶⁾.

The countermeasures emanating from Paris thus proved to be effective. Papal crusade preaching along the Franco-Imperial borderlands was nipped in the bud.

Whether or not French royal opposition to the anti-imperial crusade, plus the support of pro-French feudatories in the region, and possibly also Flemish elements

'cette description (i.e. of Louis's letter by Matthew Paris) est différente de la vérité'. The letter is to be found in the *Layettes du Trésor des Chartes* (ed. TEULET, DE LABORDE, and BERGER), Vol. III, pp. 139-40, no. 3956. As Matthew Paris does not cite or paraphrase Louis's 1250 appeal from Acre, there is a chance that his version of this letter from Caesarea represents a conflation or confusion of the two. Here Matthew seems to be talking about a quasi-public letter *misit ad matrem, fratres, et fideles suos* (Vol. V, p. 260), whereas the actual letter was addressed to *karissimo fratri et fideli suo A(lfonso), Pictavensi et Tholosano comiti* exclusively. Matthew Paris does *not* provide a date, either for the letter or for the council of the barons which it supposedly provoked (*Quo audito, domina Blanchia...*). The important thing, for Matthew, seems to be the function of the letter in precipitating the council. The relationship, according to him, was : (1) preaching of the anti-Conrad crusade *in partibus Braibantiae et Flandriae*, (2) *Ipsisque diebus* : the receipt of Louis's letter, and (3) the calling of the baronial assembly by Queen Blanche. The second of these steps is not really necessary : As I have argued in the text, the approaching Spring passage, together with the anti-Hohenstaufen crusade activity, would have been sufficient to have prompted Blanche to convoke the barons.

(73) Cf. *supra*, fnnts. 47-48.

(74) HOUSLEY, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

(75) MP, p. 260.

(76) *Ibid.*, pp. 260-61. I have here adapted the translation of J. A. GILES, *Matthew Paris's English History*, Vol. II (London, 1853), p. 463, towards a more literal rendering of the text.

by no means eager to further Count William of Holland's ambitions in Flanders, together provided the counterthrust – from the cause of Innocent IV to the cause of Louis of France – which helps to make the coming of the *pastores* explicable, this is at least a tenable working hypothesis, open to others to confirm or to invalidate. Given this hypothesis, however, there is a certain irony in Queen Blanche's initially favourable attitude towards the *pastores* and their aims, an irony parallel to that of the stories of Pope Innocent III's benevolent disposition towards the *pueri* of 1212, who were, as current historical opinion has it, the creatures of the processions which he ordered on behalf of Christian Spain⁽⁷⁷⁾. Far from being a novelty, the theme of the unforeseen consequences of crusade agitation is a recurring aspect of the history of the popular crusades.

(77) See fnt. 13 *supra*. For the stories of Pope Innocent III and the *pueri* of 1212 : *Annales Stadenses*, *M.G.H.SS.*, Vol. XVI, p. 355 ; both the *Annales Marbacenses*, *M.G.H.SS.*, Vol. XVII, p. 172 and *Chron. Albrici Monachi Trium Fontium*, *M.G.H.SS.*, Vol. XXIII, p. 893 have the Pope insisting on the conditional fulfilment of their vows. All these stories have a semi-legendary quality.