

THE SECOND CRUSADE AS SEEN BY CONTEMPORARIES

By GILES CONSTABLE

I. INTRODUCTION¹

The years between 1146 and 1148 were signalized in the annals and chronicles of Medieval Europe by Christian campaigns on all fronts against the surrounding pagans and Moslems.² The most important of these was directed towards the Holy Land, against the Moslems, who had recently seized Edessa. It consisted of no less than five expeditions. The two largest armies, commanded by the Emperor³ Conrad III and King Louis VII of France, followed the same route overland across the Balkans to Constantinople; both met with crushing defeats in Asia Minor and finally reached the Holy Land, as best they could, by land and sea. A third force, under Amadeus III of Savoy, moved down Italy, crossed from Brindisi to Durazzo, and joined the army

¹ A bibliography of the Second Crusade will appear as a part of the chapter by Virginia Berry in the forthcoming co-operative History of the Crusades. In spite of its age, the most complete account is still that of Bernhard Kugler, *Studien zur Geschichte des zweiten Kreuzzuges* (Stuttgart 1866); but for the German aspects of the crusade, that of Wilhelm Bernharti, *Konrad III.* (Jahrbücher der deutschen Geschichte; 2 vols. paged consecutively, Leipzig 1883) 512-684, is fuller and more accurate. The best narrative in English is that of Steven Runciman in the second volume of his *A History of the Crusades* (Cambridge 1952) 247-88. In addition to the abbreviations listed at the front of this volume, the following will be used: *Ann.* for *Annales*; *Bern.* for *Sancti Bernardi ... Opera Omnia* I (PL 182; Paris 1859); *Chron.* for *Chronicon* or *Chronica*; MGH SS for *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores (rerum Germanicarum)* (Hannover 1826ff.); MGH SS. r. G. for *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum ex Monumentis Germaniae historicis separatim editi* (Hannover 1840ff.); PU for the *Papsturkunden* volumes in the series published by the 'Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen'; RHGF for the *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France* (ed. Martin Bouquet; new. ed. by Léopold Delisle; Paris 1869ff.). For his encouragement and assistance in the preparation of this article I am especially grateful to Professor Robert L. Wolff of Harvard University. I am also indebted for many valuable suggestions to Mrs. Virginia Berry, of Winnipeg, and to Professors Helen M. Cam and Herbert Bloch of Harvard.

² For all references on the campaigns mentioned in this introduction, see individual discussions below. The twelfth-century sources draw no clear line between the Moslems and the heathens: they were both *pagani*. The heathen Slavs were even, on occasion, referred to as *Saraceni*, see PL 180.1385 (JL 9325) and Vincent of Prague, *Ann. seu Chron. Boemorum*, MGH SS 17.664.

³ Conrad III is known only by courtesy as Holy Roman Emperor, since he was never crowned as such. The Popes always referred to him as 'King.' Alfonso VII of Castile (see below) was both crowned and recognized by the Papacy as King of Kings and was commonly called 'Emperor' by contemporaries: on the imperial title in Spain, see Percy Schramm, 'Das kastilische Königtum und Kaisertum während der Reconquista,' *Festschrift für Gerhard Ritter* (Tübingen 1950) 90f.

of Louis at Constantinople late in 1147. In August of the same year a naval expedition led by Alfonso of Toulouse left the South of France and arrived in Palestine probably in the spring of 1148. At the same time, a joint Anglo-Flemish naval force sailed along the north coast of Europe, assisted the King of Portugal in the capture of Lisbon, proceeded around the peninsula early in 1148, attacked Faro, and presumably reached the Holy Land later that year. Meanwhile, in the northeast, four armies co-operated in a campaign against the pagan Wends across the river Elbe: a Danish army joined the Saxons under Henry the Lion and Archbishop Adalbero of Bremen in an attack on Dubin; another, larger, army led by Albert the Bear of Brandenburg and many other temporal and spiritual lords advanced against Demmin and Stettin; a fourth expedition, finally, under a brother of the Duke of Poland attacked from the southeast. In 1148, on the south shore of the Mediterranean, a powerful fleet under George of Antioch extended the control of Roger II of Sicily over the entire littoral from Tripoli to Tunis. In the West, four campaigns were directed against the crumbling power of the Almoravides. The Genoese in 1146 sacked Minorca and besieged Almeria. During the following year, the Emperor Alfonso VII of Castile advanced south through Andalusia and captured Almeria with the aid of a strong Genoese fleet, which in 1148 sailed north and joined the Count of Barcelona in his campaign against Tortosa. In the previous year, Alfonso Henriques of Portugal had captured Santarem and secured the assistance of the Anglo-Flemish fleet for an attack on Lisbon, which fell late in 1147.

The magnitude and scope of these campaigns was without precedent in the early Middle Ages. Their permanent result was, however, inconsiderable. Ten years later, only Lisbon and Tortosa remained in Christian hands as the substantial gains of those tremendous efforts, which elsewhere met with miserable defeat or but ephemeral success. They raise, nevertheless, many interesting problems for the historian of the Middle Ages and of the crusades in particular. Were these campaigns interrelated? By what were they moved and how were they organized? Such questions provoke an inquiry into the attitude of contemporaries towards the expeditions and the reaction to, and explanation of, the incredible lack of Christian success. Finally, the whole subject has a bearing on the definition and development of crusading theory.

The answers to these problems must be sought in the contemporary western sources: contemporary, because later writers saw and interpreted the events in a different light; western, because these alone reveal the Latin point of view.⁴ The evidence found in such material, however, leaves much to be

⁴ I shall not consider here either William of Tyre, who was thoroughly non-Western in his attitude and also not fully contemporary, or the Greek historians Cinnamus and Nicetas, on whom see Kugler (n. 1 above) 36-43; id., *Neue Analekten zur Geschichte des*

desired. It would be hopeless to expect that in the twelfth, any more than in the twentieth, century contemporary writers could express completely the motives of the men whose actions they describe. Many factors other than those they mention must have played an essential part in the genesis and development of the campaigns of 1146-8. Moreover, like all medieval sources, these must be studied in the light both of the information available to the writer and of 'the sense of responsibility' with which he approached his task.⁵

In neither of these respects are the sources considered in this paper fully satisfactory. The defect is not in their numbers, for the contemporary sources in print must alone add up to well over a hundred. But the events which they record occurred thousands of miles apart, on the outermost edges of Christendom, and it is therefore not surprising that no one writer mentions all these expeditions. Each source was limited by its environment, both in space and in time; their writers could record only what came to their attention and this depended on where and when they lived and wrote and whom and what they saw and heard. They included, moreover, in their works only what they considered worthy or significant; and many, seeing the sad defeats of these Christian armies, agreed with Robert of Torigny that 'almost nothing successful and nothing worthy of mention was done on that expedition.'⁶ Many jotted down merely the most outstanding facts, or copied them from a neighbor, with the result that several accounts of the events are virtually identical.⁷ Here a seeming relation between the recorded events is evidence not of any connection in the mind of the author but merely of his adherence to strict chronology. Many writers did more than this, however, and their accounts suggest certain answers to the problems raised by a consideration of the campaigns of 1146-8. In accordance with their knowledge and position, from the humblest annalist to the Pope and Emperor, most of these writers found some connecting features in these expeditions. In their attitudes towards the events themselves, their genesis and their failure, may be found some idea of the medieval concept of crusade.⁸

zweiten Kreuzzuges (Tübingen 1883) 29-50; and Runciman (n. 1 above) II 475-7. The *Gesta Ludovici VII* is now believed to have been written after 1274; see Bernhard Kugler, *Analekten (sic) zur Geschichte des zweiten Kreuzzuges* (Tübingen 1878) 1-13, and Auguste Molinier, *Les sources de l'histoire de France II: Époque féodale, les Capétiens jusqu'en 1180* (Paris 1902) 300-1.

⁵ V. H. Galbraith, *Historical Research in Medieval England* (The Creighton Lecture in History, 1949; London 1951) 3-4.

⁶ Robert of Torigny (Robertus de Monte), *Chronica*, in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, etc.* IV, ed. Richard Howlett (Rolls Series 82; London 1890) 154.

⁷ Bernhardt, *op. cit.* (n. 1 above) 560 n. 61: 'Es scheint, dass derselbe Bericht über den Kreuzzug an mehrere Klöster versendet wurde.'

⁸ In certain respects the approach of this article is paralleled for the First Crusade by

II. MILITARY SCOPE AND POPULAR MOTIVES

It has long been customary for historians of the Second Crusade to deal with only two expeditions, those headed by Conrad III and Louis VII. Occasionally, also, they devote some attention to the capture of Lisbon and to the campaign across the Elbe. They almost universally omit any mention of the concurrent expeditions to the East of Amadeus of Savoy and Alfonso of Toulouse. Yet both of these involved considerable armies led by powerful princes, were directed towards the Holy Land, and should therefore be considered parts of the Second Crusade in its most restricted definition.⁹ The reason for this narrowness in the prevalent modern view of the crusade is easily found in the original sources, where these omissions are no less striking

Paul Rousset in *Les origines et les caractères de la première Croisade* (Neuchâtel 1945). In his review of this work in *Speculum* 23 (1948) 328-31, John LaMonte accused Rousset of 'an infatuation with words' (329) and of trying 'to reestablish the old thesis of the crusade as essentially a religious movement, away from which recent research has been steadily moving' (331). 'To assume...', LaMonte said, 'that because one finds repeated affirmations of the religious motive in contemporary literature religion was the essential cause of the crusade seems to be a rather naïve deduction' (329). While I agree with LaMonte that Rousset tends to neglect political, social, and military factors in the motivation of the crusade, I believe that it is misleading to speak of 'propaganda value' and of 'official clerical accounts' (329) in the Middle Ages, and that to call the early twelfth century 'a period when religiosity was at a premium' and to compare St. Bernard to *Pravda* (329-30) is carrying cynicism too far.

⁹ On the expedition of Alfonso of Toulouse, see the *Continuatio Premonstratensis* (Sigeberti), MGH SS 6.454; *Chron. de Nîmes*, in Claude DeVic and Joseph Vaissete, *Histoire générale de Languedoc* (new ed. Toulouse 1872-92) V: Chroniques 5.27-31; Richard of Poitiers, *Chron.* RHGF 12.416; Geoffrey of Vigeois, *Chron.* in Philip Labbé, *Nova Bibliotheca* II (Paris 1657) 306; *Anonymous Chron. ad annum 1160*, RHGF 12.120; Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. Thomas Arnold (Rolls Series 74; London 1879) 279; *Chron. Turonense*, RHGF 12.473; and among more recent works see Reinhold Röhrich, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* II (Berlin 1878) 94; P. Boissonade, 'Les personnages et les événements de l'histoire d'Allemagne, de France, et d'Espagne dans l'œuvre de Marcabru (1129-50)', *Romania* 48 (1922) 228-9; Runciman II 280; and especially DeVic and Vaissete III 752f. and IV 223-4. On the expedition of Amadeus of Savoy, see Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem*, ed. and tr. Virginia Berry (Columbia Records of Civilization 42; New York 1948) 24, 66-8; *Anonymous Chron. ad annum 1160*, RHGF 12.120; *Ann. Mediolanenses minores*, MGH SS 18.393 and among more recent works see Carlo Guarmani, *Gl'Italiani in Terra Santa* (Bologna 1872) 169; C. W. Previté Orton, *The Early History of the House of Savoy* (Cambridge 1912) 309-13. Odo of Deuil refers to Amadeus as the Count of Maurienne, an alternative title of the Counts of Savoy that appears frequently in contemporary sources. *L'art de vérifier des dates* (3rd ed. Paris 1783-7) III 614, and Auguste Molinier, *Vie de Louis le Gros par Suger* (Collection de Textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'Histoire; Paris 1887) 159 n. 20, err in calling him Amadeus II of Savoy, as do Mrs. Berry, in Odo of Deuil, *op. cit.* 78 n. 37, and Henri Waquet, in Odo of Deuil, *La Croisade de Louis VII, Roi de France* (Documents relatifs à l'histoire des Croisades 3; Paris 1949, 51 n. 1, in calling him Amadeus II of Maurienne,

than in more recent works. The authors of the most widely-known contemporary accounts accompanied in person the French or German armies and therefore concentrated their attention on these.

It is at once the great advantage and the great danger of an eye-witness source that it records certain events very fully. The author knows his facts, but he seldom knows all the facts, and his point of view is consequently often more limited than that of someone viewing the events from a distance. This applies preeminently to the writers on the Second Crusade. The *De profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem*, by Odo of Deuil,¹⁰ is without question the most important single work on this campaign and at the same time a remarkable historical document. It is an authoritative account of the adventures of the troops under Louis VII until they reached Antioch early in 1148. Odo was an educated and observant author, who, as chaplain to the King, was in an excellent position to gather accurate information. It is, nevertheless, regrettable that he never continued the work beyond the Spring of 1148, and, above all, that he approached his subject from a very narrow viewpoint. Far from being 'an ecclesiastic of real stature,' as he has recently been called,¹¹ there is no evidence that he was outstanding either for his intellect or for his practical ability. His account of the Second Crusade is frankly devoted to the two aims of praising the King of France and of serving as a guide for future crusaders.¹² He is therefore at all times prone to exculpate the King and to dwell upon the difficulties besetting his soldiers. Odo blamed the failure of the expedition largely on the Greeks and their Emperor Manuel, whose alleged perfidy is almost a secondary theme of this work.¹³ He eagerly hoped for revenge and in no way condemned the devastating attacks of the Sicilian fleet in 1147-8 on the Byzantine Empire at Corfu and on the Greek mainland.¹⁴ He does not mention any of the other contemporaneous Christian campaigns.¹⁵ Even the army of Conrad III, which preceded the French

¹⁰ There have recently appeared two editions of this work, by Virginia Berry and by Henri Waquet (cited in n. 9 above); these were reviewed in *Speculum*, respectively, by John LaMonte, 23 (1948) 502-4, and Peter Topping, 26 (1951) 385-7.

¹¹ Topping 386; cf. Waquet (n. 9 above), introduction. It is, on the contrary, perhaps surprising that later, as Abbot of St. Denis, Odo did not play a more prominent part in the political and intellectual life of his time, cf. Berry (n. 9 above), intro. p. xvi.

¹² *Ibid.* xvii.

¹³ With unblushing prejudice, Odo even attributes the aid given by the Greeks at Constantinople to their desire to lull the French into a sense of security in order to deceive them later: *ibid.* 68; cf. Richard Hirsch, *Studien zur Geschichte König Ludwigs VII von Frankreich* (Leipzig 1892) 55-6.

¹⁴ Odo of Deuil, ed. Berry 98; cf. 58 and 82.

¹⁵ One cryptic passage says that 'parant naves maritimi cum rege navigio processuri,' *ibid.* 12; but it is not clear whether this refers to the Anglo-Flemish crusaders (as Charles David assumes: *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi* [Columbia Records of Civilization 24; New York 1936] 12), or to the fleet of Alfonso of Toulouse, or to the ships that carried the soldiers of the Count of Savoy from Brindisi to Durazzo.

across the Balkans by a few months, is only casually mentioned, and then, as a rule, in a strongly anti-German tone.

Odo, to do him justice, was not altogether unaware of his own narrow attitude and of the gaps in his information. In several places he makes an effort to present a point of view different from his own; and once, with exceptional perspicuity, he remarks that, 'He who knows a matter partially, judges partially; but he who knows not a case as a whole is unable to make a correct judgment.'¹⁶ It is therefore particularly unfortunate that in spite of its expressly limited purpose Odo's account has been pressed into service by modern writers as if it embraced the history of the entire Second Crusade.¹⁷

A useful corrective to Odo's attitude in the *De profectione* can be found in the letters of his royal master, Louis VII.¹⁸ The most important of these are three in number, written respectively 'at the Gates of Hungary,' at Constantinople, and at Antioch; and they are all addressed to the Abbot Suger, the king's trusted adviser and regent, to whom he could express himself with complete frankness. Since Suger was critical of the entire undertaking,¹⁹ Louis might have been expected to conceal some of his troubles, though his chronic lack of funds, for which he urgently asks in each letter, might on the other hand have led him to exaggerate his difficulties. His account is in fact remarkably moderate. In spite, he says, of 'many dangers and almost unbearable labors,'²⁰ he arrived safely at Constantinople, where he was well received by the Emperor Manuel²¹ and everything was 'joyful and prosperous with us.'²² In Asia Minor, however, 'both on account of the fraud of the Emperor and on account of our own guilt, we suffered many hardships.'²³ He tells of the raids of brigands, the difficulties of the terrain, the attacks of the Turks, and the lack of food. But throughout his account of the eventual arrival at Attalia on the south coast of Asia Minor and of the embarkation for Antioch, Louis makes no reference to the Greeks, whereas Odo of Deuil throughout blames the crusaders' misfortunes on the treachery of Manuel. Louis' account, moreover, though very brief, is accurate and specific, and its viewpoint, though limited, is sane and unprejudiced.²⁴

¹⁶ Odo of Deuil, ed. Berry 72.

¹⁷ Runciman II 478, says, for instance, that 'The history of the Second Crusade is fully treated in the *De Ludovici VII profectione in Orientum* (sic) of Odo de Deuil...'

¹⁸ RHGF 15.487, 488, 495-6; cf. Achille Luchaire, *Études sur les actes de Louis VII* (Paris 1885) nos. 224, 225, 229 (pp. 171-3). It should be remembered that as the King's chaplain, Odo may have seen and even have written Louis' letters.

¹⁹ Bernhardt (n. 1 above) 518.

²⁰ RHGF 15.488.

²¹ *Ibid.* 495-6.

²² *Ibid.* 488.

²³ *Ibid.* 495-6.

²⁴ Writing to Manuel in the 1160's, Louis mentioned that 'honor quem nobis in Domino

The same can be said of the three letters written by the Emperor Conrad III to his regent and adviser, Abbot Wibald of Stavelot.²⁵ The first announces his safe arrival in the lands of the Byzantine Emperor, about July, 1147. The second was written early in 1148 from Constantinople, where Conrad had returned after his disastrous defeat near Dorylaeum in central Anatolia. Of the Emperor Manuel, he says that 'he showed us such honor as, we have heard, was never shown to any of our ancestors.'²⁶ Soon afterwards Conrad and part of his army went by sea to Palestine, whence he wrote again to Wibald to say that he planned to return in September, 1148, 'when all has been done in that region that God desires or the inhabitants permit.'²⁷ For, he goes on to explain, the siege of Damascus by the combined French, German, and Jerusalemite armies failed on account of the treason 'of those whom we least feared,' and the crusaders were forced to return 'equally in anger and in grief.' The Germans then proceeded to Ascalon, where, Conrad says, they were 'again cheated by those men.'²⁸ Just who these traitors were is not clear. Both the Templars and the King of Jerusalem were prominently mentioned.²⁹ But Conrad certainly attributed the crusaders' failure in Palestine to treachery, and his crushing defeat in Asia Minor to adverse circumstances and the attacks of the Turks, rather than to the hostility of the Greeks.

More important than these letters, both for its factual content and for its concept of the plan and failure of the crusade, is the report given by Bishop Otto of Freising in his *Chronica* and in his *Gesta Friderici primi*.³⁰ Otto was a personage of high importance, both secular and ecclesiastical: a half-brother of Conrad III and uncle of Frederick Barbarossa, a member of the Cistercian order and a scholar and thinker of exceptional learning, intellectual power, and piety. He was in addition among the leaders of the German army on the Second Crusade³¹ and had therefore access to all sorts of in-

peregrinantibus apud vos exhibuistis, Deo auctore, a memoria nostra nunquam excidet,' *Lettres de rois, reines, et autres personnages ... tirées des Archives de Londres par Bréquigny* I, ed. J. J. Champollion-Figeac (Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France; Paris 1839) 1.

²⁵ *Monumenta Corbeiensia*, ed. Philipp Jaffé (Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum 1; Berlin 1864) nos. 48 (p. 126), 78 (p. 152-3), and 144 (p. 225-6).

²⁶ *Ibid.* 153.

²⁷ *Ibid.* 225-6.

²⁸ *Ibid.* 225-6.

²⁹ See below, 273-4.

³⁰ Otto of Freising, *Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus*, ed. Adolf Hofmeister (MGH SS.r.G; Hannover-Leipzig 1912) and *Gesta Friderici primi imperatoris*, edd. Waitz and von Simson (MGH SS.r.G; 1912). On Otto, see Kugler (n. 1 above) 7-10; Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* III (ed. P. Lehmann; Munich 1931) 376-88; and Charles Mierow, introduction to Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities* (Records of Civilization 9; New York 1928).

³¹ On Otto's part in the crusade, see Kugler (n. 1. above) 158-60, and Eberhard Pfelfer, 'Die Cistercienser und der zweite Kreuzzug,' *Cistercienser-Chronik* 47 (1935) 107f.

formation. But Otto was one of those writers whose high hopes in the crusade were sadly dashed by its failure, and he could never bring himself to write a connected account of its disasters.³² Only in isolated passages does he refer to the crusade and display his powerful and original point of view.³³ His first-hand knowledge was indeed no less restricted than that of Odo of Deuil and concerned primarily the preaching of the crusade by St. Bernard, its origins in Germany, and the movements of the German army. His *Gesta Friderici*, moreover, was certainly written for the specific purpose of eulogizing Frederick Barbarossa. But Otto had a broader approach than Odo and in his works included references to the contemporary expeditions against the Wends and against Lisbon and Almeria. Above all, he viewed his material with a breadth of human experience and an integrated point of view altogether at variance with the petty reporting and ready prejudices of Odo of Deuil.

In Otto's works can be seen something of a wider conception behind the crusade, of a plan which included not only the expeditions to the Levant, but also the campaign against the heathen Slavs³⁴ and perhaps also the expedition which captured Lisbon — which was, he says, 'recently seized from the Saracens by our men.'³⁵ This broad concept of the crusade as a whole required a broad explanation for the failure of the major armies. Otto does not dwell on the treachery of the Greeks, the hardships of the route, or the enemy attacks. On the contrary, he integrates this disaster into his belief in human sinfulness and his attitude of Christian resignation combined with optimistic trust in God, Whose ways are hidden, but Whose purpose is always good. Otto never doubts that there is a valid reason for the failure of this enterprise. 'If our expedition,' he says, 'was not good for the extension of boundaries or the comfort of our bodies, it was good, however, for the salvation of many souls.'³⁶

³² 'Verum quia peccatis nostris exigentibus, quem finem predicta expeditio sortita fuerit, omnibus notum est, nos, qui non hac vice tragediam, sed iocundam scribere proposuimus hystoriam, aliis vel alias hoc dicendum relinquimus,' Otto of Freising, *Gesta*, p. 65.

³³ Principally in the *Chronica*, 1.26 (p. 59); 4.18 (p. 207); 5.18 (p. 247); cf. introduction, xlii; and in the *Gesta*, 1.35-47 (pp. 54-67); 1.62-6 (pp. 88-95); and 2.16 (p. 119).

³⁴ 'Saxones vero, quia quasdam gentes spurciculis idolorum deditas vicinas habent, ad orientem proficisci abnuentes cruces itidem easdem gentes bello attemptaturi assumpserunt a nostris in hoc distantes, quod non simpliciter vestibis assutae, sed a rota subterposita in altum protendebantur,' *Gesta* p. 61.

³⁵ '... a nostris nuper Sarracenis ablata est,' *Chronica* 1.26, p. 59. Since these crusaders were mostly Flemings and Englishmen, and therefore not subjects of Conrad III, the *nostris* presumably refers to them as brother-crusaders.

³⁶ *Gesta* 1.65, pp. 91-4. Later in this chapter, he says: 'Quamvis, si dicamus sanctum illum abbatem (Bernardum) spiritu Dei ad excitandos nos afflatum fuisse, sed nos ob superbiam lasciviamque nostram salubria mandata non observantes merito rerum perso-

The exploits and outcome of the naval expedition that assisted King Alfonso of Portugal at the siege of Lisbon are described by at least two eyewitnesses. Of these the more important is the anonymous author of the *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, a crusader, perhaps an Anglo-Norman priest, who wrote probably at Lisbon during the winter of 1147-8.³⁷ His remarkable and vivid narrative is perhaps the most detailed surviving record of any military expedition in the twelfth century.³⁸ Although few personal opinions are expressed, it is an entertaining and valuable description of the attitude of a simple crusader. There are in addition three letters written by participants in this expedition, which may be grouped together as the 'Teutonic Source,' since they present the German and Flemish as against the more English viewpoint of the author of the *De expugnatione*.³⁹ These two accounts show on the whole a remarkable agreement. Neither, however, clearly states what were the origins of the expedition or whether it was inspired by the preaching of the Second Crusade. Charles David has shown that among these crusaders the motive of personal profit was not unconsidered and that theirs was one of a series of semi-piratical Anglo-Flemish expeditions along the coast of Spain.⁴⁰ It appears, furthermore, in the *Annales Elmarenses* that these sailors pillaged the coastal towns and shipping in much the same way as the crusading armies pillaged the countryside.⁴¹ On the other hand, the sources reveal that their aims were not entirely selfish and that this expedition should also be regarded as part of the broader crusading effort. When before the siege the Christians urged the Moslems to give up Lisbon in peace, a spokesman for the city replied that, 'Verily, it is not the want of possessions but ambition of the mind which drives you on... By calling

narumve dispendium reportasse, non sit a rationibus vel antiquis exemplis dissonum...,' *ibid.* 93.

³⁷ *De exp. Lyx.* (cited n. 15 above). On this crusade, besides the works of Cosack, Röhrich, Bernhardt, Kurth, Herculano, and De Castilho cited by David in his introduction, see H. A. R. Gibb, 'English Crusaders in Portugal,' *Chapters in Anglo-Portuguese Relations*, ed. Edgar Prestage (Watford 1935) 9-16; Alexander Cartellieri, *Der Vorrang des Papsttums zur Zeit der ersten Kreuzzüge 1095-1150* (Weltgeschichte als Machtgeschichte; Munich and Berlin 1941) 370-3; H. V. Livermore, *A History of Portugal* (Cambridge 1947) 74-80; and my own 'Note on the Route of the Anglo-Flemish Crusaders,' *Speculum* 28 (1953) 525-6. I have been unable to locate a copy of the study by A. A. L. Pimenta, *A conquista de Lisboa em 1147* (Lisbon 1937).

³⁸ Cf. Paul Riant, *Expéditions et pèlerinages des Scandinaves en Terre Sainte I* (Paris 1865) 223, who here also overthrows the old idea that Scandinavians took part in this expedition.

³⁹ *De exp. Lyx.* intro. p. 49.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 12-26; Gibb (n. 37 above) 8-9 and 16.

⁴¹ *Ann. Elmarenses*, in *Les Annales de Saint-Pierre de Gand et de Saint-Amand*, ed. Philip Grierson (Commission Royale d'Histoire; Brussels 1937, pp. 74-115) 111.

your ambition zeal for righteousness, you misrepresent vices as virtues.⁴² These men felt strongly that the hand of God was with them in their attack on Lisbon. Those who were killed were regarded as miracle-working martyrs.⁴³ The harangue to the troops, just before the final assault, was made by one of their priests and is an early example of a crusading sermon.⁴⁴ The stringent oath that was taken by everyone to preserve the peace and regularly to attend divine service shows the influence of St. Bernard and of the rule written by him for the Templars.⁴⁵ This oath, and the establishment of elected officials ('who were called judges and *coniurati*') to enforce its provisions, mark an important step in the organization of crusading armies.⁴⁶ Even more important is the fact that this oath included a vow of pilgrimage to the Holy Land, for, after the crusaders had wintered at Lisbon, Duodechin says, 'then they sailed through many perils and arrived, just as they had sworn, at the sepulchre of the Lord.'⁴⁷ On their way they attacked Faro, and some may have joined the siege of Tortosa,⁴⁸ but in any case these crusaders regarded their campaigns in Portugal as only a contribution to, or rather a stage in, the fulfilment of their vow against the enemies of Christendom.⁴⁹

⁴² 'Non enim vos rerum inopia, sed mentis cogit ambitio ... ambitionem vestram rectitudinis zelum dicentes, pro virtutibus vitia mentimini,' *De exp. Lyx.* 120-1.

⁴³ Letter of Duodechin of Lahnstein, MGH SS 17.28. See also the contemporary *Indiculum foundationis monasterii sancti Vincentii Ulixbone*, in *Portugaliae Monumenta Historica, Scriptores* I 91-3, whose author, perhaps an eye-witness, says: 'Contemplor barones istos fortissimos de terris suis ad hoc egressos fuisse, et ad hoc venisse ut hic moriantur pro Christo, eius bella bellando, et contra hostes fidei dimicando viriliter.' The church of the cemetery where the English dead were buried was known as Santa Maria dos Mártiros. Many miracles were performed at their tombs. See *De exp. Lyx.* 132-4 and 134 n. 1; see below, 237-40.

⁴⁴ *De exp. Lyx.* 146-58; see below, 239 and 241. The preacher may himself have been the author of the *De exp. Lyx.*; see 146 n. 3, and Valmar Cramer, 'Kreuzpredigt und Kreuzzugsgedanke von Bernhard von Clairvaux bis Humbert von Romans,' *Das Heilige Land in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Palästinahefte des deutschen Vereins vom heiligen Lande, 17-20; ed. V. Cramer and G. Meinertz; Cologne 1939) 60-2.

⁴⁵ See Hermann Conrad, 'Gottesfrieden und Heeresverfassung in der Zeit der Kreuzzüge,' *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung* 61 (1941) 98-9, and Peter Rassow, 'Die Kanzlei St. Bernhards von Clairvaux,' *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige*, Neue Folge 3 (1913) 270.

⁴⁶ *De exp. Lyx.* 56. David suggests (p. 57 n. 5) a possible connection between this oath and the *leges pacis* in certain municipal charters in Flanders. Cf. Conrad 90-1, 98-9, and 115.

⁴⁷ MGH SS 17.28.

⁴⁸ See my 'Note' (n. 37 above).

⁴⁹ Cf. the same point of view from the Portuguese side in the speech of the Bishop of Porto, *De exp. Lyx.* 68-84; see below, 246-7 and n. 178, and Cramer (n. 44 above) 55-60. See also the *Translatio sancti Vincentii*, in *Analecta Bollandiana* 1 (1882) 270-8, whose author says, '... visum est illis non contra Saracenos Syriae progrediendum, cum illi in Hispania sibi essent in offendiculum,' 273. I can find no justification for Erdmann's

This same attitude of participation in a larger undertaking is found in the references of many annalists and chroniclers not only to this expedition against Lisbon but also to many of the other campaigns of 1147-8. Most of these writers were not present at the events they describe, although they may frequently have had access to eye-witness material. Their accounts are seldom factually correct or complete and therefore have been perhaps unduly neglected by some historians. They often consider their subject, however, from a broader point of view and a wider scope of knowledge than do the eye-witnesses.

One of the most interesting of these secondary original sources is the *Chronica Slavorum*, written about 1167/8 in Schleswig-Holstein, by Helmold of Bosau, an important authority on the early history of the Slavs.⁵⁰ Helmold discusses the origins of the Second Crusade at some length. 'To the initiators of the expedition, however,' he remarks, 'it seemed (advisable) that one part of the army be devoted to the Eastern regions, another to Spain, and a third against the Slavs who live next to us.'⁵¹ And in the following pages he devotes a chapter to each of these campaigns. Of the capture of Lisbon he says that, 'This alone was successful of the entire work which the pilgrim army achieved.'⁵²

It is worth remarking that Helmold speaks here of the 'entire work' and the 'pilgrim army' both in the singular: each of these three campaigns was to him part of a universal enterprise undertaken by a single Christian army.⁵³

sceptical view of the Portuguese crusades as purely economic and political enterprises into which the natives, in order to further their own selfish ends, tried to draw crusaders destined for the Holy Land: Carl Erdmann, 'Der Kreuzzugsgedanke in Portugal,' *Historische Zeitschrift* 141 (1929-30) 23-53. Cramer 56 n. 21 points out that, 'Erdmann spricht zu Unrecht davon, dass die Predigt des Bischofs (von Porto) gerade eine Rede zur Abhaltung vom Kreuzzug sei.' The English, German, and Portuguese sources show that on neither side was the campaign in Portugal ever considered more than a temporary break in the achievement of the ultimate purpose of the crusaders in the Holy Land, although the Bishop emphasized that it is sinful for a Christian to neglect an opportunity to assist a brother and that the campaign in Portugal is in itself a righteous war. As Cramer says, 59: 'Wenn Bischof Peter alsdann den Kampf gegen die Mauren als gleichwertig mit der Jerusalemfahrt hinstellt, so befindet er sich keineswegs im Gegensatz zu den Urhebern der Kreuzzüge.' See below, 258f.

⁵⁰ Helmold of Bosau, *Chron. Slavorum*, edd. Lappenberg and Schmeidler (MGH SS.r.G; Hannover-Leipzig 1909). On Helmold and his work, see Manitius, *op. cit.* (n. 30 above) 493-8.

⁵¹ Helmold, *op. cit.* 115.

⁵² 'Hoc solum prospere cessit de universo opere, quod peregrinus patrarat exercitus,' *ibid.* 118. Of the Wendish Crusade he says: 'Statim enim postmodum in deterius coaluerunt; nam neque baptisma servaverunt nec cohibuerunt manus a depredatione Danorum,' 123.

⁵³ This point should be emphasized in opposition to those who consider each of these campaigns as a separate crusade, such as Riant (n. 38 above) 225 n. 1, and A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire* (2nd English edition, Madison 1952) 419.

This point of view was not uncommon among the German annalists and chroniclers. The Teutonic source on the capture of Lisbon seems to have circulated widely and to have been incorporated, to a greater or lesser degree, into the accounts of the more widely-known expeditions to the Holy Land and against the Slavs. This three-fold concept of the crusade is found in several German chronicles⁵⁴ and also, it will be remembered, in the works of Otto of Freising, who had certainly not seen the letters relating to the capture of Lisbon.⁵⁵

Several other writers, who do not mention Lisbon, linked together the Eastern and the so-called Wendish Crusades. Among these is Vincent of Prague, who wrote his important annals not long after 1167.⁵⁶ He tells how the crusade was preached in Bohemia and how the members of the ruling family there took the cross with the intention of going to the Holy Land and only at the last minute decided to direct their crusading energies against the Wends.⁵⁷ Saxo Grammaticus in his *Gesta Danorum* gives a long description of the campaign of the Danish armies inspired by the crusading bull and sermons.⁵⁸ And an anonymous continuator of Sigebert's chronicle records that 'the Dacians, Westphalians, and leaders of the Saxons agreed that, while the others were going to Jerusalem against the Saracens, they would either altogether exterminate the neighboring people of the Slavs or would force them to become Christian.'⁵⁹

This passage emphasizes not only the connection between these campaigns but also the savage spirit that inspired the expeditions against the Wends.⁶⁰

⁵⁴ *Chron. Montis Sereni*, MGH SS 23.147; *Ann. Palidenses*, MGH SS 16.82-3 (cf. Wilhelm Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, 6th ed. Berlin 1893-4; II 435-8); *Ann. Magdeburgenses*, MGH SS 16.188-90 (cf. Wattenbach II 438-9); *Continuatio Gemblacensis* (Sigeberti), MGH SS 6.389-90 (cf. Wattenbach II 162); *Chron. Regia Coloniensis*, ed. Georg Waitz (MGH SS.r.G.; Hannover 1880) 82-6.

⁵⁵ See above, 221.

⁵⁶ MGH SS 17.654-710; of him Wattenbach II 320 says, 'eine unserer wichtigsten Quellen.'

⁵⁷ MGH SS 17.663. The three leading Bohemians in the crusade were Prince Otto of Olmütz and his brothers Svatopluk and Wratislav, see Bernhardt 569.

⁵⁸ Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum*, edd. J. Olrik and H. Raeder (Copenhagen 1931) 14.3.5, pp. 376ff.

⁵⁹ MGH SS 6.392; cf. the same idea in the *Casus monasterii Petrishusensis*, MGH SS 20.674-5 (composed in 1156: Wattenbach II 391).

⁶⁰ On this campaign see Bernhardt 563-78; *Regesten der Markgrafen von Brandenburg* ed. Hermann Krabbe I (Veröffentlichungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Mark Brandenburg; Leipzig 1910) 28-9; George Artler, 'Die Zusammensetzung der deutschen Streitkräfte in den Kämpfen mit den Slaven von Heinrich I. bis auf Friedrich I.,' *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Thüringische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 29 (Neue Folge 21; 1913) 313-319; Austin Lane Poole, 'Germany, 1125-52,' CMH 5 (Cambridge 1926) 354-6; Margret Bündung, *Das Imperium Christianum und die deutschen Ostkriege vom zehnten bis zum zwölften Jahrhundert* (Historische Studien, ed. E. Ebering 366; Berlin 1940) 35-50; and Cartellieri (n. 37 above) 374-6.

Certain recent historians have maintained that this spirit was altogether secular. They point out that this was but one of about a hundred and seventy-five campaigns conducted by the Germans against their neighbors in the East between 789 and 1157⁶¹ and that it was part only of the political and economic 'Drang nach Osten' of the Germans throughout the early Middle Ages.⁶² They imply that this campaign of 1147 should not be linked with that against the Moslems in the Near East. Such a view is in no way supported by the sources. Economic and political ambitions played an important, and for many individuals perhaps a decisive, part in the genesis and outcome of this campaign against the Wends.⁶³ But the dichotomy between temporal and spiritual motives and between the interests of the secular and ecclesiastical leaders should not be overemphasized.⁶⁴ The sources show that this campaign was almost universally regarded as a pilgrimage and its army as a *peregrinus exercitus*. 'A religious motive,' Tancred Borenius once said, 'provided the whole conscious basis of the idea of Pilgrimage,' of which the cross worn by these soldiers, like the later pilgrims' badges, was the outward sign.⁶⁵ Of these crusaders more than others perhaps, the real motives were mixed and secular interests played a dominant part. Nevertheless, the fact that some appear to have joined this campaign because it seemed less arduous than the crusade to the East;⁶⁶ the connection, how-

⁶¹ Konrad Schünemann, 'Ostpolitik und Kriegführung im deutschen Mittelalter,' *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 17 (1937) 32-3.

⁶² See, for instance, Bündung, *op. cit.* 50: 'Der Wendenzug ist im ganzen gesehen weniger ein ritterlicher Kreuzzug als ein Eroberungskrieg der deutschen Grenzfürsten geworden, der nur noch sehr beiläufig Spuren der Kreuzzugs-idee zeigt.' Cf. Cartellieri 376, and James W. Thompson, 'The German Church and the Conversion of the Baltic Slavs,' *American Journal of Theology* 20 (1916) 205-30 and 372-89, who called the crusade a 'sinister mixture of bigotry and lust for land,' 381.

⁶³ Vincent of Prague, for instance, says: 'Saxones potius pro auferenda eis terra, quam pro fide Christiana confirmanda tantam moverant militiam,' MGH SS 17.663. But Vincent was a Bohemian and not unprejudiced.

⁶⁴ Karl Jordan, 'Heinrich der Löwe und die ostdeutsche Kolonisation,' *Deutsches Archiv für Landes- und Volksforschung* 2 (1938) 789: 'Das Unternehmen war vor allem an der Diskrepanz gescheitert, welche sich zwischen den Forderungen der Kirche und den politischen Zielen der sächsischen Fürsten im Wendenland auftat.' Carl Erdmann, on the contrary, emphasizes in his *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte 6; Stuttgart 1935) 91-7, that the early campaigns against the Slavs in the East were marked by 'das Zusammentreffen von Heidenkrieg und Heidenmission,' 95.

⁶⁵ Tancred Borenius, *Mediaeval Pilgrims' Badges* (Opuscula of Ye Sette of Odd Volumes 90; London 1930) 7-8; Otto of Freising, *Gesta* (cited n. 30 above) 61. Theodor Mayer, in 'Das Kaisertum und der Osten im Mittelalter,' *Deutsche Ostforschungen*, edd. H. Aubin, O. Brunner, W. Kohte, and J. Papritz, I (Deutschland und der Osten 20; Leipzig 1942) 291-309, says with respect to the eastern policy of the Empire: 'Ideell deckten sich also die Absichten und Ziele des Kaisertums und des Papsttums völlig,' 295.

⁶⁶ *Casus monasterii Petrishusensis*, MGH SS 20.674.

ever obscure, of its origins with the diet called at Frankfurt to consider the crusade of Conrad III; the letters of Pope Eugene III and of Bernard of Clairvaux;⁶⁷ and above all the almost unanimous agreement of the sources leave no doubt that in fact as well as in the minds of contemporaries the crusade against the Wends was closely connected with the campaign to protect the Holy Land.⁶⁸

The French and English annalists and chroniclers had on the whole only slight information about expeditions other than the principal crusade to the East. Often, however, they knew more than the Germans about events in Spain; and this is not surprising in view of their geographical proximity and especially of the popularity at this time of the pilgrimage route to Compostella.⁶⁹ At least four contemporary English writers, including the historian of Melrose in Scotland, and many of the minor French writers mention the attacks on Lisbon, Almeria and Tortosa.⁷⁰ Most of these were simple annalists, who merely listed events as they came to their attention. Their entries, however, are occasionally joined by some simple connective, such as 'meanwhile' or 'moreover,' in which can be seen the germ of a more fully related view of the crusade. More elaborate is the account of five of the campaigns given in the *Continuatio Premonstratensis* of Sigebert's chronicle,⁷¹ where the references to the four less important expeditions are woven into the more complete description of the crusades of Conrad and Louis. This construction makes it clear that in the author's mind, although he nowhere says so, these campaigns were connected and directed towards one purpose.⁷²

⁶⁷ See below, 245-6 and 255-7.

⁶⁸ Otto Volk, *Die abendländisch-hierarchische Kreuzzugs-idee* (Halle a.S. 1911) 41: 'Der Slavenkreuzzug von 1147 ist aber unmittelbar mit dem zweiten orientalischen in Zusammenhang zu bringen...' See Mayer (n. 65 above) *passim*; Bündung (n. 60 above) 41; Michel Villey, *La Croisade: Essai sur la formation d'une théorie juridique* (L'Église et l'État au Moyen Âge 6; Paris 1942) 210-12.

⁶⁹ Marcelin Defourneaux, *Les Français en Espagne aux XI^e et XII^e siècles* (Paris 1949) *passim*; esp. 69: 'La grande époque du pèlerinage, l'âge d'or de Saint-Jacques de Compostelle, ne commencèrent cependant qu'avec les premières années du XII^e siècle.' Cf. Borenus (n. 65 above) 10 and 18-9.

⁷⁰ Alexandre Herculano, *Historia de Portugal I* (4th ed. Lisbon 1875) 528-30, mentions in all fifteen contemporary and later sources on the fall of Lisbon. To these may be added Gervase of Canterbury, *Chronica de tempore regum Angliae Stephani, Henrici II, et Ricardi I*, ed. Wm. Stubbs in *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury I* (Rolls Series 73; London 1879) 137-8; *The Chronicle of Melrose*, edd. Alan and Marjorie Anderson (Studies in Economics and Political Science 100; London 1936) 34; and several French chronicles, such as the *Chron. Sancti Victoris Massiliensis*, RHGF 12.349.

⁷¹ MGH SS 6.454. It was composed, up to 1155, by an anonymous Premonstratensian monk in the diocese of Rheims or Lyons.

⁷² Robert of Torigny, who as Abbot of St.-Michel-du-Mont had exceptional sources of information in an endless supply of pilgrims' tales, mentions all but two (the Wendish

The most important narrative of the capture of Almeria and Tortosa is that written by the Genoese historian Caffaro di Caschifellone in his *Ystoria captionis Almarie et Turtuose*.⁷³ Caffaro, who died in 1166, played a prominent part in public life in Genoa,⁷⁴ and this account, though probably not that of an eye-witness, was certainly based on first-hand reports⁷⁵ and rivals in vividness and wealth of detail even the longer *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi*. The Genoese fleet left in 1147, and co-operated with Alfonso VII of Castile, under the terms of a treaty concluded in 1146, in the siege and capture of Almeria. The Genoese then sailed to Barcelona, where they spent the Winter before assisting Count Ramon Berenger IV in his attack on Tortosa.

Crusade and the Genoese expedition of 1146) of the many Christian campaigns of these years: *Chron.* (n. 6 above) 152-5. But his notices are on the whole annalistic and unconnected.

⁷³ Caffaro, *Ystoria Captionis Almarie et Turtuose*, in *Annali Genovesi* I, ed. L. T. Belgrano (Fonti per la Storia d'Italia 11; Genoa 1890) 79-89. On this campaign see F. W. Schirrmacher, *Geschichte von Spanien* IV (Gotha 1881) 143f.; Otto Langer, *Politische Geschichte Genuas und Pisas im 12. Jahrhundert* (Historische Studien, ed. W. Arndt 7; Leipzig 1882) 23-35; C. Manfroni, *Storia della Marina Italiana (400-1261)* (Leghorn 1899) 207-15; Adolf Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte der Romanischen Völker des Mittelmeergebiets bis zum Ende der Kreuzzüge* (Handbuch der mittelalterlichen und neueren Geschichte, edd. Below and Meinecke, Abt. III; Munich-Berlin 1906) 317-19; Cartellieri (n. 37 above) 420-2. The principal objection to Caffaro's excellent account of the capture of Almeria and Tortosa is the impression it gives that this was one campaign, whereas it was in fact two campaigns, in both of which the Genoese cooperated. This is clearly seen in the treaties preserved in the *Liber iuris* and printed in the *Codice diplomatico della Repubblica di Genova*, ed. Cesare Imperiale di Sant'Angelo (Fonti per la Storia d'Italia 77, 79, 89; Rome 1936-42). Here are found the agreements, made in September, 1146, in which the Genoese promised to assist the Emperor of Spain in an attack on Almeria in May of the following year and in which the Emperor, in return, undertook to attack also and promised certain rights to the Genoese in the city if it fell (I nos. 166-7, pp. 204-9). The Genoese stipulated that they were bound to join in no enterprise other than that against Almeria, in case they wished to ally with the Count of Barcelona. This they did by a treaty, concluded in 1146, in which the Genoese agreed to assist, after the capture of Almeria, in an attack on Tortosa; the Count on his side granted to the Genoese property and privileges in Tortosa should the city be captured (I nos. 168-9, pp. 210-17). These treaties were quite separate and indicate that each of these campaigns was a distinct undertaking. The later dealings of the Genoese with Alfonso and Ramon Berenger confirm this impression: see in the *Codice dipl.* I nos. 182-3 (pp. 228-30), 190-1 (pp. 236-40), 214-6 and 243-4 (pp. 265-7 and 291-5), and III nos. 52-3 (pp. 137-40). On the other hand, it must be remembered that these campaigns were both part of the wider effort of the Spanish Reconquest; and no doubt Alfonso's summons to join the campaign against Almeria stimulated in Ramon Berenger a desire to recapture Tortosa.

⁷⁴ On Caffaro, see Cesare Imperiale di Sant'Angelo, *Caffaro e i suoi tempi* (Turin and Rome 1894).

⁷⁵ The *Ann. Ianuenses*, in *Annali Genovesi* (n. 73 above) 1-75, apparently referring to the *Ystoria*, say that it was made 'a sapientibus ..., qui viderunt et interfuerunt,' 35. Belgrano, *Ann. Ianuenses*, intro. p. xc-xci, and Imperiale, *op. cit.* 210-1, however, both believe that Caffaro did not accompany the expedition in 1147-8. In this case, the passage in the *Ann.* may mean that Caffaro wrote his work from eye-witness reports.

Economic and political interests certainly played a large part in the origins of this expedition. Both Almeria and Tortosa were centres of Moorish pirates who preyed on Italian and other Christian shipping,⁷⁶ and both were wealthy cities: facts which weighed heavily with the hard-headed Genoese,⁷⁷ who had probably planned an expedition against Almeria before the Second Crusade was even thought of.⁷⁸ They had, however, a tradition of co-operation with the crusaders against the Moslems in both the East and the West;⁷⁹ and in 1147 the preaching of the crusade and a papal summons did not leave them unmoved, for Caffaro says that 'the Genoese (were) instructed and summoned by God through the Apostolic See (and) made an oath to raise an army against the Saracens of Almeria.'⁸⁰

This combination of spiritual and temporal motives, which characterized many of the campaigns of the Spanish Reconquest, is strongly marked in the other sources. The Spanish sources in particular show more clearly than

⁷⁶ The anonymous chronicler of Alfonso VII says of the pirates at Almeria: 'qui circumcuentes diversa maria, nunc subito egressi terra Barenis, et terra Ascalonis, et Regionis Constantinopolitarum, et Siciliae, et Barcinonensis, et nunc Genuae, nunc Pisae, et Francorum, aut Portugaliae, et Galleciae, vel Asturianorum praedas captivos Christianos navibus adversantes fugiebant...', *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris*, ed. H. Florez, *España Sagrada* 21.398.

⁷⁷ See the account of the capture of Almeria, under the year 1154, in the *Notae Pisanae*, MGH SS 19.266, which are called 'sehr merkwürdig und lehrreich' by Wattenbach (n. 54 above) II 326. Schaube (n. 73 above) emphasizes the economic aspects of this expedition, the expense of which produced a financial collapse in Genoa: see Imperiale (n. 73 above) 226f. and Hilmar C. Krueger, 'Post-War Collapse and Rehabilitation in Genoa, 1149-62,' *Studi in onore di Gino Luzzatto* (Milan 1949) I 117-28. Economic considerations always influenced the policy of the Genoese, who in 1137/8 had even allied with the King of Morocco: Manfroni (n. 73 above) 195.

⁷⁸ See below, 235.

⁷⁹ They had attacked Tortosa in 1093: see the *De liberatione civitatum Orientis*, in *Annali Genovesi* I 97-124; *Chron. Adefonsi Imperatoris*, ed. L. T. Belgrano, 'Frammento di poemetto sincrono su la Conquista di Almeria nel MCXLVII,' *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria* 19 (1887) 400. They had played an important part in the First Crusade: see Manfroni 136-65, and Runciman I 112 and 219.

⁸⁰ Caffaro, *Ystoria* 79; cf. Jacobus de Voragine: 'ad preces summi pontificis,' *Iacopo da Varagine e la sua Cronaca di Genova*, ed. Giovanni Monleone (Fonti per la Storia d'Italia 84-6; Rome 1941) II 336; Carlo Sigonio, *De Regno Italiae*, in *Opera Omnia*, ed. Ludovico Muratori (Milan 1732) II 698; and Angelo Manrique, *Cisterciensium ... Annalium Tomus Secundus* (Lyons 1642) under 1146, vi (pp. 35-6) and 1147, i 11-12 (pp. 55-7). On the crusading vow, see below, 240. The Genoese appear to have taken oaths in connection with this expedition on at least three other occasions: before leaving Genoa, the consuls 'omnibus discordantibus pacem iurare preceperunt' (Caffaro, *Ystoria* 80, line 6, cf. lines 12-4); then twice before the walls of Tortosa, the Genoese swore not to join battle without the common counsel and permission of the consuls (*ibid.* 86) and not to leave Tortosa before the city fell (*ibid.* 87). To capture Tortosa, 'pro honore Dei et civitatis Ianuens' (*ibid.* 85), they wintered at Barcelona.

Caffaro's *Ystoria* that the attacks on Almeria and Tortosa were not one campaign, but two separate expeditions, in both of which the Genoese co-operated.⁸¹

There is an exceptionally complete account of the campaign against Almeria in the *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris*,⁸² whose author may well have seen the events he records. The greater part of the description of the expedition — 'the celebrated deeds of the sainted men'⁸³ — is in heavy leonine hexameters, but a short introduction in prose tells of the alliance between Genoa and the Emperor Alfonso,⁸⁴ who then sent as an envoy the Bishop of Astorga to summon the Counts of Barcelona and Montpellier to join this army 'for the redemption of their souls.'⁸⁵ Within Alfonso's own territories, the Bishops of Toledo and Leon summoned the faithful to battle: 'They absolve crimes; they raise their voices to the heavens; they promise to everyone the reward of both lives; they promise gifts of silver and (heavenly?) crowns; they promise also whatever gold the Moors have.'⁸⁶ So, the author says, 'the trumpets of salvation sound throughout the regions of the world,'⁸⁷ and with pompous elaboration and eulogy he describes the gathering of the Spanish and French soldiers⁸⁸ under the Emperor Alfonso, the new Charlemagne.⁸⁹

This reference to Charlemagne is interesting in view of the popular concept of the great Carolingian as the Christian champion against the Moslems and

⁸¹ See above, n. 73.

⁸² For the two editions cited, see above nn. 76 (Florez) and 79 (Belgrano). There is another edition in *Las Crónicas Latinas de la Reconquista*, ed. A. Huici (Valencia 1913) II 170-439. For the prose I use that of Florez, for the verse, that of Belgrano. The poem is incomplete, breaking off at verse 387.

⁸³ *Chron. Ad. Imp.* ed. Belgrano, verse 4.

⁸⁴ See above, n. 73.

⁸⁵ *Chron. Ad. Imp.* ed. Florez 398. On Bishop Arnold of Astorga, 'cuius micat inclytus ensis' in this campaign (*Chron. Ad. Imp.* ed. Belgrano v. 376), see Belgrano pp. 404 and 422 n. 2; and *España Sagrada* 16.207, where in 1150 Alfonso makes him a grant 'por el servicio que le hicieron en la guerra contra los Saracenos.'

⁸⁶ *Chron. Ad. Imp.* ed. Belgrano vv. 44-7: 'Crimina persolvunt, voces ad sydera tollunt, Mercedem vite spondent cunctis utriusque, Argenti dona promittunt cumque corona, Quidquid habent Mauri rursus promittunt auri,' as had Urban II in the First Crusade. On the celebrated Archbishop Raymond of Toledo, see Charles H. Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass. 1927) 52 and 286.

⁸⁷ *Chron. Ad. Imp.* ed. Belgrano v. 55.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* vv. 50f.; for the most complete description of the Spanish forces listed in this poem, see Prudencio de Sandoval, *Chronica del Inclito Imperador ... Alonso VII* (Madrid, 1600) 138-40; also Schirrmacher (n. 73 above) 147. The troops included men from Leon, Asturia, Castile, and Toledo; the Count of Zamora and Salamanca, the Count of Urgel, the King of Navarre, and many others.

⁸⁹ *Chron. Ad. Imp.* ed. Belgrano vv. 20-1; see Ramon Menendez Pidal, *El Imperio Hispanico y los Cinco Reinos* (Madrid 1950) 167.

of his war in Spain as a crusade.⁹⁰ These ideas were especially current towards the middle of the twelfth century, when the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* was composed in France and when the cult of Charlemagne was at its height in Germany and was soon to culminate in his 'canonisation' (1165).⁹¹ Alfonso VII was, moreover, in his own right a celebrated crusader. In 1136 he had re-established the Confradía de Belchite 'in order to defend the Christians and to oppress the Saracens and to free the Holy Church.'⁹² His crusading activity was extolled by the Provençal troubadour Alegret⁹³ and by Marcabru, who in his 'Empeaire, per mi mezeis,' written probably in 1138,⁹⁴ called for a general crusade against the Almoravides and condemned the inactivity of Louis VII:

Mas Franssa Peitau e Beiriu
Aclina un sol seignoriu,
Venga sai Dieu son fieü servir!
Qu'ieu non sai per que princes viu
S'a Dieu no vai son fieü servir!⁹⁵

In this poem Marcabru adumbrated the plan of a joint crusade by the combined forces of Castile, Navarre, and Barcelona together with troops from across the Pyrenees. This idea was realized on a yet larger scale in the campaign of 1147. But since the *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris* breaks off sharply when the army was still at Baeza,⁹⁶ it throws no new light on

⁹⁰ On the development of the medieval legend of Charlemagne see Paul Lehmann, *Das literarische Bild Karls des Grossen (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Abteilung, 1934, IX)*: 'Unter dem Einfluss der religiösen Erregung ... hatte sich immer mehr das fromm-heroische Bild von Karl als dem Bekämpfer und Besieger der Ungläubigen in den Vordergrund gedrängt,' 34; and Robert Folz, *Le souvenir et la légende de Charlemagne dans l'Empire germanique médiéval* (Publications de l'Université de Dijon 7; Paris 1950), especially, with respect to the theme of Charlemagne as a crusader, 137-8 and 166-7; more generally, 159-237.

⁹¹ On the pseudo-Turpin, composed 1147/68, see Lehmann 30, and Folz 223-5 and 235-7; on the *Vita sancti Karoli*, composed 1170/80, see Lehmann 33 and Folz 214-21; on the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* and its connection with the Second Crusade, see Alfred Adler, 'The *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* in New Light on Saint-Denis,' *Speculum* 22 (1947) 550-61.

⁹² See Schramm (n. 3 above) 110-1; and Peter Rassow, 'La Confradía de Belchite,' *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español* 3 (1926) 220-6.

⁹³ In his 'Ara pareisson l'aubre sec': see Boissonade (n. 9 above) 237-8 and 239 n. 3, and Schramm 113.

⁹⁴ The date of this famous poem is much disputed: see *Poésies complètes du Troubadour Marcabru*, ed. J.-M.-L. Dejeanne (Bibliothèque Méridionale, 1^{re} Série, 12; Toulouse 1909) 229, where Diez, Suchier, and Lewent are cited in favor of 1146-7 and Meyer, in favor of anterior to 1147. Boissonade 222 and 233-7 examines the poem in great detail with a view to dating it in 1138 or 1138-45 at the outside.

⁹⁵ *Poésies complètes* no. 22 (pp. 107-10) strophes 10-11; see Schramm 113.

⁹⁶ This army first moved on Calatrava, which fell in January, 1147 (Sandoval [n. 88 above] 123-4 and 126; Schirrmacher [n. 73 above] 147 n. 2) and was granted first to the

the capture of Almeria itself. Its account of the origins of the expedition is, nevertheless, of great value. The character of the arguments in the speeches of the Bishops of Toledo and Leon, the references to the redemption of souls and to *tuba salutaris*, the comparison of Alfonso VII with Charlemagne, and the characterization of the soldiers as 'sainted men' are all unmistakable signs of the crusading nature of this campaign. On the other hand, in case these spiritual blessings were insufficient inducement, the bishops also offered Moorish gold to participants in this enterprise. For there is a large measure of truth in Dozy's remark that 'a Spanish Knight of the Middle Ages fought neither for his country nor for his religion; he fought, like the Cid, to get something to eat.'⁹⁷

No such complete description exists of the capture of Tortosa, Lerida, and Fraga by the Count of Barcelona and his allies in 1148-9.⁹⁸ An idea, however, of the character of this campaign may be gained from the records of Alfonso I of Aragon and of Ramon Berenger IV relating to these cities and to the Catalanian and Aragonese Reconquest in general.⁹⁹ Most im-

Templars and later was defended by the Cistercians of the Abbey of Fitero in Navarre. So was established the Order of the Knights of Calatrava, which Alexander III approved in 1164: A. H. Thompson, 'The Monastic Orders,' CMH 5.682. Alfonso's army then took Anjudar and Baños before setting siege to Baeza: *Chron. Ad. Imp.* ed. Belgrano v. 298 and pp. 420 n. 3, 421 n. 1. (On Anjudar: Schirmacher 149; on Baeza: Sandoval 124-5; *España Sagrada* 16.483, 22.272, 36. cxciv [see n. 229 below]; Schirmacher 149.) Here they encountered strong opposition, and many troops had already gone home (*Chron. Ad. Imp.* ed. Belgrano vv. 334-7) by the time when, during the summer, envoys arrived at Baeza from the Catalanian, French, and Genoese forces that had meanwhile gathered at Almeria (*ibid.* vv. 340f.). The Bishop of Astorga, however, rallied the remaining Spanish troops to go on to Almeria. The poem breaks off in the middle of his speech.

⁹⁷ Dozy, *Recherches sur les Musulmans d'Espagne* II 203 and 233, quoted by Roger Merriman, *The Rise of the Spanish Empire I: The Middle Ages* (New York 1918) 88; cf. Schramm 113.

⁹⁸ Excluding, that is, the very brief *Ann. Barcinonenses*, MGH SS 19.501, written in a twelfth-century hand on the last leaf of a manuscript of Visigothic laws. Later Spanish chronicles, of which there are several, naturally viewed this campaign in a different light from contemporaries.

⁹⁹ *Colección de documentos inéditos del Archivo General de la Corona de Aragon*, ed. D. Próspero de Bofarull y Mascará, IV (Barcelona 1849) nos. 51 (pp. 113-23), 54 (126-9), 56 (130-5), 58 (136-40), 61 (144-68), 70 (193-6), 139 (328), and 147 (347-55). In 1131, Alfonso of Aragon willed that '... si Deus dederit michi Tortosam tota sit ospitalis iherosolomitani,' *ibid.* no. 2, p. 11. Ramon Berenger in 1136, however, granted the entire city and diocese of Tortosa to William VI of Montpellier (*ibid.* no. 22, pp. 53-4, in a mutilated form; and *Liber Instrumentorum memorialium: Cartulaire des Guillems de Montpellier*, ed. A. Germain [Montpellier 1884-6] no. CLII, pp. 284-5), who in his will in 1146 bequeathed the city to his younger son William (Luc d'Achery, *Spicilegium*, edd. Baluze and Martène [Paris 1723] III 498-500; and *Liber Instr. mem.* no. xcv, pp. 177-83). Several of the charters listed above concern the problem of the division of Tortosa after the conquest. In spite of the grants to the Hospitallers and to William of Montpellier, one third of the city seems

portant among these is Ramon Berenger's huge grant in 1143 to the Knights of the Temple in Jerusalem. The purpose of this great charter is explicit: 'for the crushing, conquest, and expulsion of the Moors, for the exaltation of the faith and religion of sacred Christianity, ... for the exercise of the office of a military order in the region of Spain against the Saracens, for the remission of my sins, for the honor of God, Who honors those honoring Him, (and) for the salvation of the soul of my father.'¹⁰⁰ This statement of a conscious religious motive could hardly be clearer, and its form here is certainly not purely conventional.¹⁰¹ No less specific, although perhaps not disinterested, was Marcabru, who in his 'Pax in nomine Domini' contrasted the zeal against the Moslems of Ramon Berenger and the Templars with the inertia of the Christians living north of the Pyrenees.¹⁰² It has been said that Alfonso I of Aragon 'placed the idea of reconquest before his successors as a feasible policy. In his hands this policy assumes a definitely religious character.'¹⁰³ Both of these tendencies lived on in the policy of Ramon Berenger, to whom the recovery of Tortosa, Lerida, and Fraga was a source of both temporal and spiritual satisfaction. So, after these victories, in a charter of 1149, he thanks God, 'Who in His love, after the space of so many years, has deigned to restore in our times the church of Lerida, (which was) subjected to the perfidy of the pagans, to its former state of the Christian religion.'¹⁰⁴

The presence on the campaigns both against Almeria and against Tortosa of other than Spanish troops is not without importance. It has already

to have been given to William of Moncada and another to the Genoese (see n. 73 above) and yet another portion to the Templars (presumably under Ramon Berenger's grant of 1143: see n. 100 below). However, William, the son of William VI of Montpellier, still called himself 'William of Tortosa' as late as 1157 (D'Achéry III 526). The whole problem is confused, and the explanations advanced by DeVic and Vaissete, *op. cit.* (n. 9 above) III 739-40, and by Defourneaux, *op. cit.* (n. 69 above) 177, are not altogether satisfactory.

¹⁰⁰ *Colección* no. 63, pp. 93-9; also Pierre de Marca, *Marca Hispanica*, ed. E. Baluze (Paris 1688) 1291-4; *España Sagrada* 43.241-5 and 484-8 (Fifth Council of Gerona, 1143).

¹⁰¹ It is too specific for a conventional arenga and was clearly composed for this charter.

¹⁰²

En Espagna, sai, lo Marques

E cill del temple Salamo

Sofron lo pes

E-l fais de l'orguouill paganor...

Poésies complètes no. 35 (pp. 169-71) strophe 7. The date of this poem is no less disputed than that of the 'Emperaire': see *ibid.* 235. Milà and Suchier date it 1146/7; Meyer argues from the reference to the death of the Count of Poitou (1137) 'que le vers del Lavador n'est pas de beaucoup postérieur à cet événement'; Crescini and Lewent follow Meyer, as does Boissonade (n. 9 above) 231. While 1138 is not impossible, the reference to the Templars appears to suggest a date posterior to the great privilege of 1143.

¹⁰³ H. J. Chaytor, *A History of Aragon and Catalonia* (London 1933) 55.

¹⁰⁴ *España Sagrada* 47.255.

been seen that the Genoese fleet co-operated in both these attacks. So, also, did the Templars and Count William VI of Montpellier, who was summoned to assist 'for the salvation of his soul' by Alfonso VII and who came with two of his sons and probably a considerable force of men.¹⁰⁵ This William was a remarkable man; among other things he was a friend of St. Bernard and after his return from Spain, before July 1149, he became a Cistercian monk at the abbey of Grandeselve near Toulouse.¹⁰⁶ Soldiers not only from all Christian Spain, therefore, with the exception of Portugal,¹⁰⁷ but also from France joined the army gathered against Almeria.¹⁰⁸ Campaigning with the Count of Barcelona, moreover, were both French and English soldiers, probably some of the Anglo-Flemish crusaders on their way to the Holy Land, as well as other foreigners.¹⁰⁹ The Viscount of Béarn, Peter of

¹⁰⁵ Caffaro, *Ystoria* 86; *Codice diplomatico ... di Genova* I 236-8; *Chron. Ad. Imp.* ed. Belgrano v. 348: 'in ordine magnus.' It is not impossible that William came with the Genoese, as DeVic and Vaissete (n. 9 above) III 738-9, suggest, although Caffaro does not mention this. The Counts of Montpellier had a tradition of co-operation with the Genoese, who with the Pope had assisted William VI to reestablish his power in Montpellier in 1143: A. Germain, *Histoire de la Commune de Montpellier* I (Montpellier 1851) 19-21; *Liber Instr.* (n. 99 above) xi; Manfroni (n. 73 above) 195; Archibald R. Lewis, 'Seigneurial Administration in Twelfth Century Montpellier,' *Speculum* 22 (1947) 568. 'Remarquons ... l'intervention génoise dans ces affaires Montpelliéraines et Aragonaises...', says Germain, *Liber Instr.* xii; 'Guillem VI attacha une si haute valeur à cette intervention, que, pour en reconnaître le bienfait, il concéda aux Génois une maison à Montpellier, où ils eurent dès lors un centre commercial.'

¹⁰⁶ The new Abbot of Grandeselve, in 1149, was Alexander of Cologne, who had been converted to the monastic life by St. Bernard during his preaching of the crusade in the Rhineland, 1146-7: Joseph Greven, 'Die Kölnfahrt Bernhards von Clairvaux,' *Annalen des historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein* 120 (1932) 10-12. On William of Montpellier, see Manrique, *Cist. Ann.* II (n. 80 above) under 1149, III 5 (pp. 130-1); *Histoire littéraire de la France...* par les religieux Bénédictins ... de Saint Maur, 13.324f.; DeVic and Vaissete III 737f., 778, 820, and IV 182-3 (note 37, viii); and the *Liber Instr.* vi-xii. The Counts of Montpellier were vassals for part of their lands both of the King of Castile and of the Counts of Barcelona and therefore had close relations with Spain in the twelfth century. William VI took a special interest in Catalonia, and as a monk he was present at the foundation of the Abbey of Vaullure (Santa-Cruz) by William of Moncada: DeVic and Vaissete III 820; Defourneaux (n. 69 above) 177. See also his interesting will, cited n. 99 above.

¹⁰⁷ Schirmacher (n. 73 above) 147: '... man vereinigte sich zum erstenmal zu einer gemeinsamen kriegerischen Aktion.' See, also, Modesto Lafuente, *Historia General de España* V (Madrid 1851) 68-9; Defourneaux 175-6; Menendez Pidal (n. 89 above) 166-7.

¹⁰⁸ Menendez Pidal 166-7; DeVic and Vaissete III 737: 'La guerre qu'Alphonse VII, Roi de Castile, avoit entreprise alors contre les infidèles d'Espagne, partagea la noblesse de la Province entre cette expédition et celle de la Terre Sainte.'

¹⁰⁹ See my 'Note on the Route of the Anglo-Flemish Crusaders,' *Speculum* 28 (1953) 526. On the vexed problem of the participation of Pisans in the campaign, I do not agree with Belgrano in his belief (*Chron. Ad. Imp.* p. 398) that they were present: Caffaro and the *Notae Pisanae* make no mention of them, nor the letter from the Pisans to Ramon Berenger in *Colección* (n. 99 above) no. 154, pp. 371-2, nor a charter of Alfonso which mentions

Gabarret, assisted at the capture of Lerida and Fraga.¹¹⁰ Nicholas, Abbot of St. Rufus, near Avignon, was with these troops at least some of the time.¹¹¹ Also present were Ermengarde, Viscountess of Narbonne, her uncle Berenger, Abbot of La Grasse, and the consuls of Narbonne, all of whom are mentioned in a charter dated during the siege, in September, 1148. By this Ramon Berenger granted a market place and exemptions to the Narbonnais 'in gratitude for what the inhabitants of Narbonne have expended of their goods and of their lives for the defense of the faith against the infidels.'¹¹²

The third campaign against the Moors in 1147-8 was in Portugal, and was led by King Alfonso Henriques, whom an anonymous contemporary called 'the wonder-making destroyer of the enemies of the cross of Christ'¹¹³ and to whom Marcabru addressed a poem praising his victories over the Moors.¹¹⁴ This campaign was by no means restricted to the attack on Lisbon, for which he secured the assistance of the Anglo-Flemish fleet. It opened in March, 1147, with the capture of Santarem, of which there is an excellent account in the anonymous *De expugnatione Scalabis*,¹¹⁵ perhaps the work of an eye-witness. Though its main concern is a detailed description of the

Genoese aid: Peter Rassow, 'Die Urkunden Kaiser Alfons VII. von Spanien,' *Archiv für Urkundenforschung* 10 (1928) 444 and 11 (1929) 99-100. The two sources where they are mentioned — Robert of Torigny, *Chron.* (n. 6 above) 155 and *Chron. Ad. Imp.* ed. Belgrano v. 347 — are not reliable. The confusion may have arisen, as Langer (n. 73 above) 31 n. 2 suggests, out of the undoubted Pisan participation in the attack on Majorca in 1114-5: Chaytor (n. 103 above) 57; Defourneaux 155; or, I think, perhaps more likely, out of the fact that one of the Genoese leaders was named Ansaldo Pizo: Caffaro (n. 73) *passim*; *Ann. Ianuenses* (n. 75) 35; or possibly out of the presence at the siege of Lisbon of a Pisan engineer, who may have gone on to Tortosa: *De exp. Lyx.* 142 and 162; letter of Duodechin, MGH SS 17.28. Pisa was in any case throughout this period occupied by a war with Lucca. In point of fact, she objected to the Genoese attack in 1146 on Minorca, over which the Pisans asserted a claim on the grounds of their earlier expedition: Manfroni (n. 73 above) 208. Of the presence, however (which appears to have hitherto escaped notice), of Ventimiglians on this expedition, there can be no doubt: *Codice diplomatico* (n. 73 above) I no. 194, pp. 242-3.

¹¹⁰ Defourneaux 177-8.

¹¹¹ See below, 262.

¹¹² Archives, Hôtel de Ville, Narbonne, caisson 5: cited in French translation by DeVic and Vaissette III 739. More generally on French participation in the Reconquista, see Defourneaux *passim* and E. Benito Ruana, 'España y las Cruzadas', *Anales de Historia antigua y medieval* (1951-2) 103-11.

¹¹³ *Indiculum ... sancti Vincentii* (n. 43 above) 91: 'inimicorum crucis Christi mirificus extirpator.'

¹¹⁴ Boissonade (n. 9 above) 229-30.

¹¹⁵ In *Portugaliae Monumenta Historica, Scriptores* I 94-5. On this capture, see Herculano (n. 70 above) 360f. and n. xxi, 526-8; Luiz Gonzaga de Azevedo, *História de Portugal*, ed. Domingos Mauricio Gomes dos Santos, IV (Lisbon 1941) 46-55; Antonio Brandão, *Crónica de D. Afonso Henriques*, ed. A. de Magalhães Basto (Lisbon 1945) 99-111; Livermore (n. 37 above) 73-4.

attack on the formidable stronghold on the river Tagus, the introduction is a paean in praise of the victory. 'Gather all the people for the praise of Christ,' the author says, 'clap your hands, sing well to Him in acclamation, and say: Hear, O ye Kings, give ear, O ye princes of all the earth! The Lord has chosen new wars in our days ... God through our king has captured Santarem, the mightiest of all the cities of Spain.' ¹¹⁶ On this expedition Alfonso was accompanied by the Knights of the Temple, to whom all the ecclesiastical property in the city was granted after its capture. ¹¹⁷ Only then did the King proceed, presumably with the Templars, to the attack on Lisbon. After the fall of that city, he completed his campaign of 1147 by the capture of several strongholds near Lisbon: Cintra, Almada, and Palmela. ¹¹⁸

There remain to consider only two expeditions against the Moslems in the years 1146-8. To one of these, the Genoese attack on Minorca and Almeria in 1146, reference seems to be made only in the *Annales Ianuenses* of Caffaro. ¹¹⁹ Here, in contrast with his account of the campaign in the following year, he makes no mention of a religious motive. Its purpose seems to have been largely strategic and economic, that is, piratical. The failure to take Almeria at this time led to the alliance of the Genoese with Alfonso VII. ¹²⁰ But apart from this it is impossible to connect this expedition with the Second Crusade.

The same can be said of the attack on North Africa by Roger of Sicily in 1148. ¹²¹ Of the contemporary western writers consulted for this paper, three only refer to this campaign. Two of these, Robert of Torigny and the Premonstratensian continuator of Sigebert's chronicle, have already been mentioned. Both associate it with the Second Crusade and seem to have

¹¹⁶ *De exp. Scal.* (n. 115 above) 33-5. Cf. Psalm 46; Jud. 5.3, 8.

¹¹⁷ Grant of April, 1147: *Documentos da Chancelaria de Afonso Henriques*, ed. Abiah E. Reuter (Chancelarias Medievais Portuguesas 1; Coimbra 1938) no. 145, pp. 209-10. See Herculano 366 n. 1 and 367 n. 1; Brandão 109 and 110 (a document of 1154, showing that the Templars got the property). On the part played by the Templars in the Portuguese Reconquest, see Livermore 80-1.

¹¹⁸ *De exp. Lyx.* 178; *Chron. Conimbricense*, in *Portugaliae Monumenta Historica, Scriptores* I 2; *Chron. Lamecense*, *ibid.* 19-20; Herculano I 404-6; Azevedo 90-1; Gibb (n. 37 above) 16.

¹¹⁹ *Ann. Ianuenses* 33-5.

¹²⁰ Langer (n. 73 above) 25.

¹²¹ On this expedition see Michele Amari, *Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia*, ed. Carlo Nallino (Catania 1933-9) III 421 and 441; Mantroni (n. 73 above) 198-201; Erich Caspar, *Roger II. und die Gründung der Normannisch-Sicilischen Monarchie* (Innsbruck 1904) 419-21; Ferdinand Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile* (Paris 1907) II 162-5; Edmund Curtis, *Roger of Sicily* (New York and London 1912) 251-4; Francesco Cerone, *L'opera politica e militare di Ruggiero II in Africa ed in Oriente* (Catania 1913) 63f.

regarded it as at least partly religious in purpose.¹²² The third, Abbot Peter the Venerable of Cluny, is more specific. His letter to Roger, written probably in 1148, urged him to make his peace with Conrad III and to ally with him against the enemies of the Church. 'For as we have often heard,' he says, 'many gains for the Church of God have come from the lands of the enemies of God, that is, of the Saracens, through your military valor.'¹²³ Peter, however, had an axe to grind: he wanted to promote a Catholic alliance against the Byzantine empire; and his evidence for the religious motive of Roger's campaign is not altogether convincing.

The facts can hardly bear the interpretation that the expedition was a part of the Second Crusade, or a crusade in itself. The conquest of North Africa was a well-established political ambition of the Norman-Sicilian kings,¹²⁴ whose interest in the spread of Christianity was secondary to the extension of their own power. This is clearly shown by the fact that Roger's first reaction to the crusade in 1147 was to take advantage of the Byzantine Emperor's preoccupation with the crusaders at Constantinople to attack Greece,¹²⁵ in return for which Manuel called him 'the common foe of all Christians.'¹²⁶ Cerone has clearly shown that Roger's attack on Africa in 1148 was the result of an appeal for help from the rebel Jusûf at Gabes. Unable to maintain two naval campaigns at once, and at the same time unwilling to forego this opportunity to realize his ambitions on the south shore of the Mediterranean, Roger 'preferred the capture of Africa to that of Greece.'¹²⁷ He may indeed have also fostered the spread of Christianity there, but only in so far as this reinforced and established his political power.¹²⁸

¹²² Robert of Torigny, *Chron.* 153. The continuator of Sigebert, MGH SS 6.454, devotes five lines to this campaign and mentions that Roger restored the Archbishop of Africa (Al Mahdia) to his see: cf. J. Mesnage, *Le Christianisme en Afrique: Déclin et extinction* (Algiers and Paris 1915) 219-20 and 225. The fact that the Bishops of Al Mahdia seem to have resided at Palermo (Mesnage 219-20) suggests that Roger II may have used them as instruments of his dynastic policy.

¹²³ Peter the Venerable, *Epistolae*, in *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, ed. Martin Marrier (Paris 1614) ep. 6.16, col. 915. Peter here offers his sympathy to Roger on the death of his son, Roger, Duke of Apulia (May 2, 1148): Caspar 428; Curtis 294 and 239-40.

¹²⁴ See Caspar 397f.; Chalandon 157-62; Curtis 242-63; Cerone *passim*.

¹²⁵ Caspar 377-84; Chalandon 135-7; Curtis 227f.; Cerone 58-63; Cartellieri (n. 37 above) 367-9; Konrad Heilig, 'Ostrom und das Deutsche Reich um die Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts,' *Kaisertum und Herzogsgewalt im Zeitalter Friedrichs I.* (Schriften des Reichsinstituts für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde 9; Leipzig 1944) 161-2: '... zweifellos hat er (Roger) damit auch dem Kreuzzugsunternehmen schwer geschadet.'

¹²⁶ Cerone 68.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.* 63-4.

¹²⁸ Amari (the only scholar whom I have found who discusses this aspect of Roger's campaign) thought otherwise: 'Assaltando l'Africa dunque nella state del 1148, il re de Sicilia compariva per la prima volta nel grande accordo cattolico,' *op. cit.* (n. 121 above) III 421. He, however, does not appear to have realized fully the connection of this cam-

This judgment on Roger II may be unjust or merely the result of a paucity of Christian sources. Decisions on mixed motives are always open to discussion. Certainly the other campaigns of 1146-8 were also inspired by a variety of interests, but none the less these differed from Roger's undertaking. John LaMonte recently defined a crusade as 'a war against the enemies of the Church, conducted under the auspices of the Church for ecclesiastical purposes, with spiritual privileges specially assured to participants.'¹²⁹ If allowance is made for other than ecclesiastical causes and leadership, this definition may fairly be applied to most of the campaigns of 1146-8. But it certainly does not fit the expedition to North Africa.

The campaigns against the Moslems in the East and in Spain and against the Wends were marked by a specifically religious character which distinguishes them from the normal dynastic warfare of the Middle Ages: the character of pilgrimage. The participants in these expeditions all expected to enjoy the benefits accruing to pilgrims, that is, entire remission of their repented sins or at least of the penance imposed therefor. In nearly all the sources these expeditions have a marked salvatory or penitential character. It is a significant fact that contemporaries most frequently referred to these expeditions by the name of *peregrinatio* and to the participants as *peregrini* or *peregrinantes*, who were therefore only by context distinguished from the thousands of pilgrims who annually visited the Holy Land and other sacred places.¹³⁰ Several sources attributed a double purpose to the campaign: 'for

paign with Roger's withdrawal from Greece; but he realized Roger's aim, for he says of the crusade that Roger 'ne usava gli'avvantaggi,' *ibid.*

¹²⁹ John LaMonte, 'La Papauté et les Croisades,' *Renaissance* 2-3 (1944-5) 155.

¹³⁰ Other common names for the crusade include *iter*, *expeditio*, and *projectio*, sometimes with *Dei* or *Ierosolymitana*, and occasionally with some such phrase as *ad debellandos paganos* to indicate its military character. In no contemporary source is it called a crusade; the nearest equivalent is in the *Ann. sancti Iacobi Leodiensis*, MGH SS 16.641, where the soldiers are referred to as 'crucizatur.' Among the sources using the terms 'pilgrimage' and 'pilgrims,' see: *Ann. Herbipolenses*, MGH SS 16.3; *Ann. sancti Dionysii*, MGH SS 13.720; *Continuatio Praemonstratensis*, MGH SS 6.453; *Continuatio Claustroneoburgensis II*, MGH SS 9.614; Helmold of Bosau, *Chron. Slavorum* (n. 50 above) 115f.; Hildegard of Bingen, who referred to the Pope as 'pater peregrinorum': J. M. Watterich, *Pontificum Romanorum ... Vitae ab aequalibus conscriptae* (Leipzig 1862) II 302; William of Saint-Denis, in both the *Vita Suger* (in *Oeuvres complètes de Suger*, ed. Lecoy de la Marche [Société de l'Histoire de France; Paris 1867] 394-5) and 'Le dialogue apologétique du moine Guillaume, biographe de Suger,' ed. A. Wilmart, *Revue Mabillon* (1942) 103 and 109. Pfeiffer (n. 31 above) 8-9 has drawn attention to the fact that in the Middle Ages *peregrinatio* was a general term embracing the modern concepts of pilgrimage and crusade; but he maintains that medieval men in fact made this distinction. The sources on the Second Crusade do not support this view: they draw no clear line between a crusade and a pilgrimage. The crusaders were quite as much pilgrims as they were fighters: see Romuald of Salerno, *Chron.* ed. C. A. Garufi, *RIS* 7. 1 229; Richard of Poitiers, *Chron.* RHGF 12.416, who says that King Louis '... in urbe Sancta, causa orationis, ut peregrinus re-

pilgrimage and for the avenging of Christianity,' says the author of the *Gesta Abbatum Lobbiensium*.¹³¹ Others seem even to have considered that pilgrimage was the primary purpose of these expeditions.¹³² Cardinal Boso, the papal biographer, refers to the Second Crusade merely as 'a very great expedition from the Western regions,'¹³³ which distinguishes it in no way in character from smaller pilgrimages.

Like their predecessors half a century earlier, and as befitted the members of 'the army of the living God,'¹³⁴ summoned by 'the edict of the true King,'¹³⁵ the participants in these expeditions marched or sailed under His banner, the *Vexillum crucis*, and all bore the mark of a cross.¹³⁶ A bull of

mansit'; Odo of Deuil, *De prof. Ludov.* ed. Berry (n. 9 above) 2; *Monumenta Boica* 12.329; *De glorioso rege Ludovico*, in *Vie de Louis le Gros par Suger* (n. 9 above) 160-1; and nn. 131 and 132 below. In their original forms, Erdmann has shown (*op. cit.* n. 64 above, 281-3), there was no popular association of the ideas of pilgrimage and of war against the heathen. By 1150, however, they were fully equated. This important development was principally the result of the fact that, through the exercise of the ecclesiastical power of remission of sins, a military expedition against non-Christians was put on an equal spiritual basis and rewarded with the same spiritual benefits as a pilgrimage: *ibid.* 306-7 and 319. There was as yet, however, little consciousness of the crusade as an institution or of the Second Crusade as a successor to the First. Very few sources refer to it as a *second* crusade at all: see *Chron. Regia Coloniensis*, rec. II (n. 54 above) 82; Bern. ep. 363, col. 568 (reference to Peter the Hermit); Henry of Huntingdon, *Hist. Angl.* (n. 9 above) 281; letters of the Emperor Manuel, RHGF 15.440-1 and 16.9-10. Louis VII was conscious of following a precedent: Odo of Deuil, ed. Berry 58 and 130; and Odo himself may have consulted an account of the First Crusade: William of Saint-Denis, 'Dialogue' 103. Important evidence of the survival at St. Denis of the tradition of the First Crusade is the window given by Suger, which is now lost but was reproduced by Montfaucon in his *Les Monuments de la Monarchie Française* I (Paris 1729) plates L-LIV (389f.); cf. F. de Mély, 'La Croix des premiers Croisés,' in vol. III of Paul Riant, *Exuviae sacrae Constantinopolitanae* (Paris 1904) 2-11.

¹³¹ MGH SS 21.329. The *Chron. Regia Coloniensis* 82-3 says, '... mota sunt omnia regna Occidentis et accensa desiderio eundi in Ierusalem et visitare sepulchrum Domini ac dimicare contra gentes quae ignorant Deum et dilatare terminos christiani imperii in Oriente.'

¹³² This is the case, for instance, with two crusaders who were not of very high rank. So Lambert of Ardres says that his father joined the crusade 'ut dominicum venerari et ... sepulchrum videre mereretur,' *Historia Comitum Ghisnienium et Ardensium*, MGH SS 24.633. Abbot Hermann of St. Martin of Tournai went '... gloriosum Domini Jesu Christi sepulchrum invisere multo ardore sitiens...', D'Achéry, *Spicilegium* II 926. Cf. *Ann. Ratisponenses*, MGH SS 17.586.

¹³³ *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Louis Duchesne II (Paris 1892) 387.

¹³⁴ Peter the Venerable (n. 123 above) ep. 6.16, col. 915.

¹³⁵ Charter of Henry of Prunnen, in Joseph von Hormayr, *Die Bayern im Morgenlande* (Munich 1832) 43.

¹³⁶ *De exp. Lyx.* 156. On the use of the cross and the cross-banner in the First Crusade and earlier, see Erdmann (n. 64 above) 30f. and 318-9. For an interesting archaeological study of the crusaders' cross, see F. de Mély (n. 130 above) 1-21; cf. the crosses worn by the crusaders illustrated on plate 1 in Runciman vol. II (fresco at Cressac, Charente)

Calixtus II refers to the soldiers of the Spanish Reconquest as those 'who have placed the sign of the cross on their clothes.'¹³⁷ Holding up the cross, and speaking in words strongly reminiscent of the motto of Constantine, a priest cried 'In hoc vexillo ... vincetis'¹³⁸ to the Anglo-Flemish sailors and signed them with a cross.¹³⁹ Otto of Freising records that the crusaders against the Wends wore a cross with a circle underneath, a *globus cruciger*, to distinguish it from the simple cross of the crusaders in the Holy Land.¹⁴⁰ Those gathered at the great Council of Vézelay, in 1146, an anonymous chronicler says, 'received from Bernard (of Clairvaux) the sign of pilgrimage, as is the custom, that is, the cross.'¹⁴¹ There is no reason to believe that this cross was restricted to the fighting members of these armies; it was the usual pilgrims' badge.¹⁴² Here then is further evidence that the special religious

and Peter the Venerable, *Sermo de laude dominici sepulchri*, in Edmond Martène and Ursin Durand, *Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum* V (Paris 1717) 1439 B.

¹³⁷ JL 7116: Edmond Martène and Ursin Durand, *Veterum Scriptorum ... Amplissima Collectio* I (Paris 1724) 650-1, and *Bullaire du Pape Calixte II*, ed. Ulysse Robert (Paris 1891) II no. 454, pp. 266-7. See also the canons of the Ninth Ecumenical Council: Charles-Joseph Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles*, ed. and tr. H. Leclercq, V 1 (Paris 1912) 635.

¹³⁸ *De exp. Lyx.* 156 and n. 1.

¹³⁹ See above, 222, and n. 44.

¹⁴⁰ Otto of Freising, *Gesta* (n. 30 above) 61; cf. Bern. ep. 457, col. 652. As a Christian symbol, the *globus cruciger* dates back to late Antiquity. On the Ticinum silver festival issue of 315, Constantine 'bears on his shoulder the Cross of Christ with the globe on top': Andreas Alföldi, *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome*, tr. Harold Mattingly (Oxford 1948) 43 and 129 n. 14, cf. 131 n. 21. 'Die christlichen Kaiser führen als Bekrönung des Globus zunächst das Christusmonogramm, dann das Kreuz... Die Bedeutung des Kreuzes haben schon Prokop und Suidas richtig gewürdigt; es ist ein bildlicher Ausdruck für unsere Bezeichnung « von Gottes Gnaden »': Alois Schlachter, *Der Globus, seine Entstehung und Verwendung in der Antike* (*ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ*, Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Weltbildes und der griechischen Wissenschaft 8; Leipzig-Berlin 1927) 69; cf. Alföldi, 'Eine spätrömische Helmform und ihre Schicksale im Germanisch-Romanischen Mittelalter,' *Acta Archaeologica* 5 (1934) 141-2. It persisted throughout the Middle Ages, in both Byzantine and Western art as a symbol of divine majesty and as an emblem of Christian temporal power: see Didron, *Iconographie Chrétienne* (Paris 1843) 597; Schlachter 105; Alföldi, 'Helmform' 143-4; André Grabar, *L'Empereur dans l'Art byzantin* (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg 75; Paris 1936), plates v, xxiv fig. 1, and xxx fig. 21; Percy Schramm, 'Das Herrscherbild in der Kunst des frühen Mittelalters,' *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg* 2 (1922-3) part I, 158 and plates vii-viii, figs. 13-17. It appeared frequently on medieval coins and seals: Gustave Schlumberger, Ferdinand Chalandon, and Adrien Blanchet, *Sigillographie de l'Orient Latin* (Haut Commissariat de l'État Français en Syrie et au Liban, Service des Antiquités: Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 37; Paris 1943), plates i (1,2,3,4), v (1), vi (1,2,3), vii (1,2,3, 5,6,9), etc.; and Florence Harmer, 'The English Contribution to the Epistolary Usages of the Early Scandinavian Kings,' *Saga-Book of the Viking Society* 13 (1949-50) part III, 137, 140-1 and figs. 3 and 4.

¹⁴¹ RHGF 12.120.

¹⁴² See above, 225, and n. 65; and Étienne van Cauwenbergh, *Les pèlerinages expiatoires*

nature of these crusaders, in the root meaning of the term, was that of pilgrimage.

The crusaders' cross had, by the middle of the twelfth century, advanced a long way from its early medieval significance as a battle standard against the pagans. But this character was not altogether lost.¹⁴³ It still had a significance for the organization of the crusading armies, as did various oaths taken by the soldiers. The military regulations established by the Anglo-Flemish crusaders, and accepted by them in a stringent oath, to preserve order, obey the leaders, and attend regular religious service, have already been noted.¹⁴⁴ Odo of Deuil says that for the French army at Metz, Louis 'established laws necessary for (the preservation of) the peace and for the other requirements on the way, which the leaders confirmed by (their) oaths and faith.'¹⁴⁵ The Genoese took vows to obey their leaders and to carry out the purpose of their expedition.¹⁴⁶ The reference of the Magdeburg chronicler to the army gathered against the Wends as a 'societas' implies that it was bound by some kind of common oath.¹⁴⁷ With justice, therefore, a charter of Duke Welf characterized the year 1147 as the time 'when the entire Roman world swore together ... for the expeditions to Jerusalem.'¹⁴⁸

The nature of these oaths was related, however, not only to the military organization of the crusaders but also to their religious character as pilgrims. The vow of pilgrimage was, of course, a familiar concept in the Middle Ages; and to it now was linked the idea of the crusaders' cross, found in the chronicle previously quoted, as a badge of pilgrims, the external sign and reminder of their vow. The Genoese swore to remain at Tortosa until the city fell; the English and Flemings had sworn to reach Jerusalem, as had countless other soldiers in the eastward-bound armies: the oath was not taken simply to preserve order, but to attain a specific object and to reach a specific place. In this it closely resembled or was perhaps identical with the vow of pilgrimage.

This resemblance was naturally the closer in that both the pilgrimage and the crusade were undertaken in order to secure specific spiritual benefits for the participants. Unlike the pilgrimage, however, the crusade, in the view of many contemporaries, went beyond this highly personal religious relation. It had a marked spirit of self-sacrifice. 'To lay down their lives

et judiciaires dans le droit communal de la Belgique au Moyen Age (Université de Louvain: Recueil de Travaux publiés par les Membres des Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie 48; 1922) 22-3.

¹⁴³ Erdmann (n. 64 above) 318 suggests that in this cross may be seen the first intimation of the modern uniform.

¹⁴⁴ See above, 222.

¹⁴⁵ Odo of Deuil, ed. Berry 20.

¹⁴⁶ See above, n. 80.

¹⁴⁷ *Ann. Magdeburgenses*, MGH SS 16.188.

¹⁴⁸ *Monumenta Boica* 7.348.

for their brethren and to free the Christian people from the sword of the pagans' were the aims of the crusaders according to an anonymous Bohemian monk.¹⁴⁹ The Anglo-Flemish priest compared them to the apostles: 'You, most dearly beloved brothers, (have) followed Christ as voluntary exiles who have willingly accepted poverty...' ¹⁵⁰ Gerhoh of Reichersberg, in many respects the most bitter critic of the crusaders, nevertheless regarded their purpose as pious and indeed compared their sacrifice to that of Christ Himself: 'Since indulgence from sins was promised by the Apostolic See to fighters and penitents,' in this crusade, he explained, and 'most greatly to those who died in such holy strife, requiting their Savior, Who had died for them.' ¹⁵¹ The crusade had therefore a salvatory and penitential value far beyond the interests of the individual crusader; he who died on crusade was a martyr and a saint, who stored up merit in heaven for his brethren.¹⁵² It was the concern therefore not only of the participants themselves but of the entire Christian community. So before the assault on Santarem, Alfonso of Portugal encouraged his troops with the news that 'today ... general prayer is offered for us both by the Canons of Santa Croce, to whom I announced this matter and in whom I trust, and by the other clergy together with the entire people.' ¹⁵³ Likewise Conrad III, in a letter to Wibald in 1147, wrote that, 'As the progress of our journey is aimed at the welfare of the whole Church and the honor of our realm, we hope and request to be assisted greatly by your prayers.' ¹⁵⁴ It is not suggested here that any strict uniformity of crusading theory can be found in the sources. In particular the idea of vicarious satisfaction went considerably beyond the more narrowly personal interpretation of the crusade found in the theories of Eugene III and St. Bernard, who were themselves, as will be seen, not in complete agreement over this problem.

Many of the more popular ideas are illustrated in the charters issued by

¹⁴⁹ *Monachi Sazavensis Continuatio* (Cosmae Chronicarum Bohemorum), MGH SS 9.159; cf. 1 John 3.16.

¹⁵⁰ *De exp. Lyx.* 152.

¹⁵¹ Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Commentarius aureus in Psalmos*, ed. Bernhard Pez in *Thesaurus Anecdotorum novissimus* V (Augsburg 1728) 794 (also in MGH, *Libelli de Lite* III [Hannover 1897] 437): '...reddentes vicem salvatori suo, qui pro eis mortuus est.' Cf. *Lamentations* 3.64 and 1 Timothy 5.4.

¹⁵² See *Chron. Ad. Imp.* ed. Belgrano v. 4, and above p. 222 and n. 43. For references in the AS to miracles performed by participants in the Second Crusade, see Ch. Kohler, 'Rerum et personarum quae in Actis Sanctorum Bollandistis ... ad Orientem latinum spectant Index analyticus,' *Mélanges pour servir à l'histoire de l'Orient latin et des Croisades* I (Paris 1906) 104-212, to whose list may be added St. Ernest, AS 7 November, III 608-17.

¹⁵³ *De exp. Scal.* (n. 115 above) 95.

¹⁵⁴ *Monumenta Corbeiensia* (n. 25 above) ep. 48, p. 126.

crusaders. These have been collected for the region of Bavaria by Hormayr,¹⁵⁵ and others can be found in local cartularies and collections. Many gifts to ecclesiastical houses resembled that of Herant the Old of Falkenstein to Antwart, made 'at the time when the said Lord Herant desired to go to Jerusalem in order to visit the sepulchre of the Lord.'¹⁵⁶ Some grants were made on condition that the property was to be restored to the donor if he returned;¹⁵⁷ others specified that the gift was to be made only if the donor did not return.¹⁵⁸ Many crusaders were forced to sell their property in order to meet the heavy expenses of the journey. To raise money for this purpose and 'in remission of my sins,' Theoderic of Flanders sold some property to the monks of Clairvaux.¹⁵⁹ Others made grants to religious houses in return for protection for their wives and families.¹⁶⁰ These are but a few examples from many.¹⁶¹ While it must be borne in mind that apparent gifts

¹⁵⁵ Hormayr (n. 135 above) 43-6, whose examples are mostly taken from the *Monumenta Boica*. His citations are occasionally erroneous, but there is no evidence that these documents are forgeries, like those in some of Hormayr's works: see Friedrich Bock, 'Fälschungen des Freiherrn von Hormayr,' *Neues Archiv* 47 (1928) 225-43.

¹⁵⁶ Hormayr 43.

¹⁵⁷ See, for instance, the *Monumenta Boica* 3.84 (Hormayr 43); *Urkundenbuch des Herzogthums Steiermark*, ed. J. Zahn I (Graz 1875) no. 270, p. 281, and no. 266, p. 279. Reginher of Tovernich made his grant to Admont whether he returned or not: *ibid.* no. 271, p. 282.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.* no. 294, p. 302 (cf. Jakob Wichner, *Geschichte des Benediktiner-Stiftes Admont von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Jahre 1177* [Graz 1874] 100 and n. 2); *Codex traditionum ecclesiae collegiatae Claustroneoburgensis*, ed. Maximilian Fischer (Fontes Rerum Austriacarum, Abt. II, vol. 4; Vienna 1851) no. 396, p. 85 (cf. Fischer, *Merkwürdiger Schicksale des Stiftes und der Stadt Klosterneuburg* II [Vienna 1815] no. 87, p. 51).

¹⁵⁹ PL 185 il. 1824. Likewise Conrad of Peilstein sold various lands 'pro remedio anime sue et pro precio sexaginta quinque librarum': *Urkundenbuch ... Steiermark* no. 265, p. 278 (Wichner 102-3; Albert von Muchar, *Geschichte des Herzogthums Steiermark* III [Graz 1846] 347).

¹⁶⁰ *Urkundenbuch ... Steiermark* no. 268, p. 280 (Wichner no. 15, p. 216).

¹⁶¹ Besides Hormayr, see the documentary references cited by Röhrich (n. 9 above) II 311-20, in his list of German pilgrims; *Cartulaire de l'Abbaye N.D. de Bonnevaux*, ed. Ulysse Chevalier (Documents historiques inédits sur le Dauphiné 7; Grenoble 1889) no. 244, pp. 102-3; *Recueil des Chartes de l'Abbaye de Cluny*, edd. Auguste Bernard and Alexandre Bruehl, V (Collection de Documents inédits sur l'Histoire de France; Paris 1894) no. 4131 pp. 473-4 (Bernard III of Uxelles, 'quando voluit ire Iherosolimam,' disclaimed any rights in the lands of Cluny); *Urkundenbuch für die Geschichte des Niederrheins*, ed. Theodor Lacomblet I (Düsseldorf 1840) no. 364, pp. 249-50; *Urkundenbuch ... Steiermark* nos. 266-275, pp. 278-84; no. 290, pp. 299-300; no. 425, p. 406 (cf. Wichner nos. 13-18, pp. 214-8); Wichner pp. 101, 174, and 182 (Poppo of Piber sold his estate for twenty-five pounds and a horse before leaving on the crusade); Emile Bridrey, *La condition juridique des croisés et le privilège de croix* (Paris 1900) 48 n. 3 (unedited charter of Louis VII); Luchaire (n. 18 above) no. 215, p. 168, and perhaps no. 395, pp. 227 and 407-8; von Muchar III 347, and IV (Graz 1848) 401f.; J. P. von Ludewig, *Reliquae Manuscriptorum omnis aevi* IV (Frank-

were often in reality sales, the fact remains that much property changed hands on account of the crusade and not always to the material advantage of the crusaders. 'At the root of the pious transaction,' A. H. Thompson once said, 'was the desire to obtain forgiveness for sin and remission of the penalty due to it;¹⁶² and any consideration of motive should take these gifts and sales into account.

The most complete contemporary statement of the crusaders' motives is found in the *Annales Herbipolenses*, whose anonymous author was, however, thoroughly critical of the entire undertaking.

Different men, however, had different purposes. For some, eager for novelty, went for the sake of learning about strange lands; others, driven by want and suffering from hardship at home, were ready to fight not only against the enemies of the cross of Christ but also against Christian friends, if there seemed a chance of relieving their poverty. Others, who were weighed down by debt or who thought to evade the service that they owed their lords or who even were dreading the well merited penalties of their crimes, while simulating a holy zeal, hastened (to the

furt and Leipzig 1722) 196-8; and cf. the later, but very interesting, letter from Alexander III to Louis VII: JL 10796, RHGF 15.789-90.

By such purchases, mortgages, and gifts many churches substantially increased their property. 'Tempore quo expeditio Jerosolymitana ... totum commovit fere occidentem, ceperunt singuli tanquam ultra non redituri vendere possessiones suas, quas Ecclesiae secundum facultates suas suis prospicientes utilitatibus emerunt': *Monumenta Boica* 3.540. And the author of the *Chron. Tornacensis*, in *Corpus Chronicorum Flandriae*, ed. J.-J. de Smet II (Brussels 1841) 564, says of the crusaders: '... nonnulla praedia et possessiones quae habebant vendentes, pretiumque eorum secum deferentes.' This occasionally led to difficulties. Bartholomew of Cicon, on his 'deathbed' at Jerusalem, promised to return to the priory of Mouthier-Haute-Pierre a mill and seven serfs; but when he recovered, he thought better of his promise, which, however, the priory, with the aid of the Archbishop of Besançon, forced him to keep: see Auguste Castan, *Un épisode de la deuxième croisade* (Besançon 1862). On the other hand, it must be remembered that crusading clerics were not above selling the property of their churches: see *Translatio sancti Mamantis*, AS, 17 August, III 443. Laymen, also, occasionally seized ecclesiastical possessions for this purpose: Theoderic of Flanders took two pieces from the treasury of St. Columba at Sens: *Chron. Senonense Sanctae Columbae*, RHGF 12.288.

On the financing of this crusade in general, see Pfeiffer (n. 31 above) 78-81; Bridrey 45-6 and 66f. The relevant sources, of which Mrs. Berry has kindly sent me a list, include the *Fragmentum hist. ex veteri membrana de tributo Floriacensibus imposito*, RHGF 12.94-5; a letter from John of Ferrières to Suger, *ibid.* 15.497; and a letter from the royal chancellor Cadurcus to Suger, *ibid.* 497-8. But the evidence of these and later (Ralph of Diceto and Matthew Paris) sources is either unreliable or indefinite. Louis VII may have subjected certain churches to a crusading aid, but it is far from clear that this was a general tax, of which many historians speak. Nor does this levy appear to have roused any 'mécontentement général,' to which Bridrey 69 and A. Vuitry, *Études sur le régime financier de la France avant la Révolution de 1789* (Paris 1878) 390-1, refer. This whole problem is in need of further study.

¹⁶² A. H. Thompson, 'Medieval Doctrine to the Lateran Council of 1215,' CMH 6.694.

crusade) chiefly to escape such inconveniences and anxieties. With difficulty, however, there were found a few who had not bowed the knee to Baal, who were indeed guided by a sacred and salutary purpose and were kindled by love of the divine majesty to fight manfully, even to shed their blood, for the sake of the holy of holies.¹⁶³

III. ECCLESIASTICAL THEORY AND PAPAL DIRECTION OF THE EXPEDITIONS OF 1147-8

St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, is the traditional hero of the Second Crusade. In almost all the contemporary sources and in the later authorities, where he shares the honors with Louis VII and occasionally with Pope Eugene III, Bernard appears as the principal organizer and preacher.¹⁶⁴ It is, indeed, hard to imagine the crusade apart from this commanding figure, whose letters and personal activity inspired the participation of the greater part of Europe in these expeditions. He was at first reluctant to assume this burden. The reason may have been the political motive suggested by Gleber¹⁶⁵ but was more probably the ecclesiastical prohibition against preaching by the regular clergy. Even ordained monks and abbots were permitted to preach outside their monasteries only on the delegation of the Pope or diocesan bishop.¹⁶⁶ But at Easter, 1146, on the express command of the Pope, Bernard began to preach the crusade at Vézelay, where he marked with the cross of pilgrimage King Louis and many French nobles. During the Winter of 1146-7, he was in the Lowlands and Germany, where his preaching and concurrent miracles changed the entire character and scope of the undertaking by securing the co-operation of Conrad III and the German princes.¹⁶⁷ The crusading ardor thus aroused in Saxony and Bohemia was turned against the Wends. In June and July of 1147, Bernard visited Languedoc;¹⁶⁸ and although by this time the army of Louis VII had already left France, it is

¹⁶³ *Ann. Herbipolenses*, MGH SS 16.3; cf. Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Libri III de Investigatione Antichristi*, ed. F. Scheibelberger I (Linz 1875) chap. 67, and in MGH, *Libelli de Lite* 3.374-5.

¹⁶⁴ The bibliography on St. Bernard is enormous; for a list of books and articles dealing with Bernard and the Second Crusade, see Pfeiffer (n. 31 above) 44 n. 16. Georg Hüffer, 'Die Anfänge des Zweiten Kreuzzuges,' *Historisches Jahrbuch* 8 (1887) 391-429, especially emphasizes the part played by Eugene III.

¹⁶⁵ Helmut Gleber, *Papst Eugen III* (Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen und neueren Geschichte 6; Jena 1936) 43-8.

¹⁶⁶ This was suggested by Pfeiffer 8-10, whose idea I develop below, Appendix A.

¹⁶⁷ See Bernhardi (n. 1 above) 532-3; Georg Hüffer, *Der heilige Bernhard von Clairvaux I: Vorstudien* (Münster 1886) 70-103. H. Cosack, 'Konrads III. Entschluss zum Kreuzzug,' *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 35 (1914) 278-96; Greven (n. 106 above); Pfeiffer 48f.

¹⁶⁸ The purpose of this visit seems to have been to deal with local heresy: Bern. ep. 242 coll. 436-7.

difficult not to associate Bernard's presence with the departure in August of the naval expedition under Alfonso of Toulouse¹⁶⁹ and particularly with the crusading activity in Spain of William of Montpellier.

More important, however, than the preaching of St. Bernard and the activity of his agents¹⁷⁰ were the letters which he sent all over Europe and which were presumably read to hundreds of congregations. Of his crusading letters, only ten are known today. Nine relate to the campaign against the Moslems in the Holy Land and have been minutely studied by Peter Rassow;¹⁷¹ the tenth was written later, after March, 1147, for the crusade against

¹⁶⁹ Alfonso himself had taken the cross at Vézelay: *De glorioso rege Ludovico in Vie de Louis le Gros* (n. 9 above) 158. On Bernard's visit and the departure of this expedition, see DeVic and Vaissete III 752-5 and IV 223-4 (note L, xii).

¹⁷⁰ In general, on the active part played by the Cistercians in the preparations for the crusade, see Pfeiffer 44-54 and 78-81. When possible, Bernard preached the crusade in person rather than by letters carried by agents: in ep. 363, col. 565, he says, 'Agerem id libentius viva voce...' Occasionally other Cistercian abbots were able to preach, such as Rainald of Morimund: Pfeiffer 46; cf. Hilde Fechner, *Die politischen Theorien des Abtes Bernhard von Clairvaux in seinen Briefen* (Bonn and Cologne 1933) 61. Simple monks were presumably not allowed to preach (cf. Appendix A) but were sent with letters wherever Bernard or another abbot was unable to go. Most celebrated among these is Rudolph, who in at least one chronicle (*Gesta Abbatum Lobbiensium*, MGH SS 21.329) appears as a crusading preacher more important than Bernard, since he took it on himself, with Lambert Abbot of Lobbes as translator, to preach the crusade in the Summer and Autumn of 1146 in the Lowlands and in the Rhine valley, where he aroused a terrible persecution of the Jews. St. Bernard was furious (see his ep. 365 to the Archbishop of Mainz, who may well have been nervous, remembering the sack of the archiepiscopal palace at Mainz during the riots connected with the First Crusade: Runciman I 138-9) and sent Rudolph packing back to Clairvaux: see Bernhardt 522-4; Cosack 281-2 and 294 n. 1; Pfeiffer 46-7. — Bernard's secretary Nicholas wrote several crusading letters for his master: Rassow (n. 45 above) 245-6; on Nicholas, see Augustin Steiger, 'Nikolaus, Mönch in Clairvaux, Sekretär des hl. Bernhard,' *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige* 38 (Neue Folge 7; 1917) 41-50; Pfeiffer 45; and Jean Leclercq, 'Saint Bernard et ses secrétaires,' *Revue Bénédictine* 61 (1951) 220. The secretary Geoffrey carried a letter to the Bretons: Rassow 265 and 274; on Geoffrey, see Leclercq 220-5, and Greven (n. 106 above) 6-8. Geoffrey, together with another secretary, Gerhard, was constantly with Bernard on his travels for the crusade: Pfeiffer 46f. Abbot Adam of Ebrach carried to the diet of Regensburg (February, 1147) two of Bernard's letters, one of which was taken on to Bohemia by Henry of Olmütz: Rassow 265-6 and 274-5; Heinrich von Fichtenau, 'Bamberg, Würzburg, und die Stauferkanzlei,' *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung* 53 (1939) 274; Pfeiffer 49 and 51-2. He probably also carried a letter to Abbot Gerlach of Rein, who preached the crusade in the Steiermark and Carinthia: Pfeiffer 49 and 52-3.

¹⁷¹ To Speyer, East France and Bavaria, Cologne, Brescia, England, Bohemia, Brittany and possibly Spain: see Rassow 243f. and Cosack 293-6. The letter to the Archbishop and congregation of Cologne has since been printed by Greven 44-8. To these letters should also be added that addressed to the Hospitallers discovered at Jena by Jean Leclercq and published in the *Revue Mabillon* 43 (1953) 1-4, together with an interesting letter written

the Wends, and differs from the others in both form and content.¹⁷² To these letters may be added a few others which bear upon the crusade. These include a letter to the Pope, one to Archbishop Henry of Mainz, and another written in Bernard's name to recommend to the Emperor Manuel a young crusader, Henry of Meaux, later Count of Champagne, and father of the future King of Jerusalem.¹⁷³ A letter mentioned by Hüffer and Vacandard further suggests that Bernard addressed a crusading appeal to Spain.¹⁷⁴ It is possible, also, that his letter 308 to Alfonso Henriques refers to the 1147 campaign in Portugal.¹⁷⁵ There is in any case evidence of Bernard's influence in Portugal at this time. Alfonso, it will be remembered, was the son of an ambitious knight from Burgundy and maintained connections with this area. As recently as 1146 he had married Mathilda, the daughter of the crusading Count Amadeus III of Savoy.¹⁷⁶ After the fall of Santarem, and in honor of this victory, Alfonso founded the Cistercian monastery of Alcobaca.¹⁷⁷ In addition, the speech of the Bishop of Porto to the Anglo-Flemish

to Louis VII by one 'W. Dei gratia dux et miles Christi et servus crucis,' who says, in words strongly reminiscent of Bernard's crusading letters, that he has received the cross 'ex manibus sanctissimis abbatis Claraevallis' and discusses the preparations for, and the route of the crusade.

¹⁷² Bern. ep. 457, coll. 651-2; Rassow 275; see n. 222 below.

¹⁷³ Bern. epp. 247 (coll. 445-7), 365 (coll. 570-1) and 468 (coll. 672-3). On ep. 468 see Rassow 274 and E. Pfeiffer, 'Die Stellung des hl. Bernhard zur Kreuzzugsbewegung nach seinen Schriften,' *Cistercienser-Chronik* 46 (1934) 276 n. 28. Epp. 256 and 364 (coll. 463-5 and 568-70), which Mabillon dates 1146, in fact refer to the preparations for the crusade of 1150: *ibid.* 306 n. 90.

¹⁷⁴ Hüffer (n. 164 above) 392, and E. Vacandard, *Vie de saint Bernard* (3rd. ed. Paris 1903) II 303 n. 1, who mention a letter 'ad peregrinantes Jerusalem' in the Royal Archives at Barcelona. Rassow was unable to locate this letter: *loc. cit.* 246.

¹⁷⁵ The meaning and date of this letter are not above dispute. Mabillon's late date of 1153 seems to be based upon a confusion between 'Peter the brother of Your Excellency' (Petrus Celsitudinis vestrae frater) and Peter Abbot of Celle to whom ep. 419 is addressed: *Sancti Bernardi ... Opera omnia*, ed. Jean Mabillon (Paris 1839) I 1.937. The letter certainly suggests that this Peter joined the Second Crusade: see Azevado (n. 115 above) 47-8. If it may therefore be dated in 1147, it shows that Bernard was in close touch with Portugal at this time. Another letter to Alfonso, in Manrique, *Cist. Ann.* II (n. 80 above) under 1147, ix (p. 71) appears to be a forgery: see Mabillon, *Bernardi... Opera* I 1.767-8 and 959; De-fourneaux (n. 69 above) 212-3.

¹⁷⁶ Previté Orton (n. 9 above) 292-3; Livermore (n. 37 above) 83.

¹⁷⁷ Leopold Janauschek, *Originum Cisterciensium Tomus I* (Vienna 1877) 110; L. H. Cottineau, *Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés* (Mâcon 1939) I 50-1. The inscription printed by Brandão (n. 115 above) 147 suggests 1147 rather than 1148 as the foundation date; the Peter mentioned here may be either the brother or the son of Alfonso Henriques (*ibid.* 147-50) — possibly the brother mentioned by St. Bernard in ep. 308 (see n. 175 above). Cf. De Broqua, *Le Portugal féodal de Clairvaux* (Dijon 1927) 31, whose suggestion of 1142 seems to have no basis whatsoever.

crusaders shows the influence of Bernard.¹⁷⁸ Be this as it may, the crusading letters alone show that Bernard regarded the crusade as embracing the efforts of all Christian Europe.

The essence of Bernard's crusading theory is contained in his letter 363, of which the text was sent in an almost identical form to Cologne, to Speyer, and to the East Franks and Bavarians.¹⁷⁹ Here he announces that the enemies of the cross, the pagans, have risen up against the Church. This is God's punishment for our sins; but since He is good, even while He punishes us, He provides us with a means of salvation through the crusade. 'Behold, brothers,' he calls, '... (now) is the time of plentiful salvation.'¹⁸⁰ This is 'a time rich with indulgence,' 'a jubilee year.'¹⁸¹ He urges his hearers to take advantage of this great opportunity and to rise up in response. 'Accept the sign of the cross,' he says, 'and you will obtain pardon equally for all things which you confess with a humble heart.'¹⁸² He mentions also some of the temporal benefits of crusaders, but his greatest stress is upon the penitential, salvatory nature of the crusade. Nowhere does he say that the crusade must be to the Holy Land; he only exhorts men to take the cross of pilgrimage, to fight against the foes of God, and so to win salvation.

This passionate enthusiasm and eloquence and an emphasis on the personal religious significance of the crusading vow were the great contributions of Bernard of Clairvaux to the Second Crusade and to crusading theory in general.¹⁸³ The planning and organization of the campaigns seem to have

¹⁷⁸ *De exp. Lyx.* 68-84; see n. 49 above. Rassow 271 considers this speech evidence of Cistercian influence on the author of the *De exp. Lyx.*; but I agree with Cramer (n. 44 above) 59 n. 26, that it has the appearance of being a genuine report, not a literary concoction. In this case, it witnesses the presence of Bernard's ideas in Portugal. On the influence of St. Bernard on Alfonso Henriques' 1147 campaign, see Azevedo 46-8 and 95, who concludes that, 'certo é que nessa concessão, obtida de Eugénio III, para a expedição contra Lisboa, o principal agenciador foi o mesmo S. Bernardo, a isso movido pelo nosso primeiro rei,' 47; and Livermore, who says that the Cistercians were established in Portugal before 1143 and that they 'performed the enormous task of peopling and cultivating the newly-won territory,' 81.

¹⁷⁹ Bern. ep. 363, coll. 564-8. The last three sections did not appear in the earliest version of the crusading letter, that to Bishop Mainfred and the congregation of Brescia, in Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, ed. A. Theiner, 18 (1094-1146; Bar-le-Duc 1869) 646-7; see Rassow 273. On Bernard's crusading theory see Adolf Gottlob, *Kreuzablass und Almosenablass* (Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen 30-1; Stuttgart 1906) 110-13; Nikolaus Paulus, *Geschichte des Ablasses im Mittelalter* I (Paderborn 1922) 199-200; Pfeiffer (n. 173 above) 278f.; Cramer 49-55; and Rousset, *op. cit.* (n. 8 above) 152-68.

¹⁸⁰ Bern. col. 565.

¹⁸¹ Bern. col. 566; cf. Villey (n. 68 above) 146.

¹⁸² Bern. col. 567.

¹⁸³ On the importance of Bernard's letters in the history of the preaching of the crusades, see Reinhold Röhricht, 'Die Kreuzpredigten gegen den Islam,' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 6 (1884) 555, and Cramer 54-5.

been more the work of Pope Eugene. For, while the studies of Rassow have shown that Bernard had no part in the genesis of the crusade before the Council at Vézelay in 1146, the work of Caspar has convincingly demonstrated that the formal origin of the crusade must be traced to the Pope's crusading bull of December 1, 1145.¹⁸⁴ St. Bernard himself made this clear when he wrote to the Pope in 1146 about 'the good work which (King Louis) has begun at your instigation...'¹⁸⁵ Even before this, and perhaps as early as May 1145, Eugene had granted a remission of one seventh of their penance to those who gave aid to the knights of St. John in Jerusalem or to the Templars in Spain.¹⁸⁶ Now, in the bull *Quantum predecessores* (I), he officially declared a crusade. It is addressed to the King, nobles, and people of France. The Church of the East is in danger, he says: as a punishment for our sins, Edessa has fallen, and the whole of Christendom is threatened. He urges and requires devout men in France and Italy to rise and protect the Eastern Church. To such men he promises 'that remission of sins which our predecessor Urban established' and he takes their property and families under the protection of the Church. Such soldiers of the Lord, he continues, should not wear rich clothes, nor bring along dogs or hawks. Nor are they bound to pay usury. And he concludes by repeating that 'by the authority vested in us by God we grant such remission of sins and absolution ... that whoever will faithfully begin and complete such a holy journey or will die on it, will obtain absolution from all his sins which he will have confessed with a contrite

¹⁸⁴ Erich Caspar and Peter Rassow, 'Die Kreuzzugsbulen Eugens III.,' *Neues Archiv* 45 (1924) 285-305. Caspar's conclusions are supported by Gleber (n. 165 above) 37-8, who gives a careful survey of previous opinions and says of Caspar's work: 'Damit ist zugleich festgelegt, dass Eugen III. den ersten Anstoss zur neuen Kreuzzugsbewegung gegeben hat,' 38. Although Gleber admits that it is not impossible that Louis VII reached a similar idea independently, he certainly acted later than the Pope. The statement by Marshall W. Baldwin, 'The Papacy and the Levant during the Twelfth Century,' *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America* 3 (1944-5) 280, that 'a comparatively recent study (Gleber) suggests that King Louis VII of France assumed the initiative and was supported later by Pope Eugenius III,' appears to misinterpret Gleber's work. For a thorough bibliography, up to 1939, of the vexed problem of the origins of the Second Crusade, see Cramer 45 n. 1.

¹⁸⁵ Bern. ep. 247, coll. 445-7.

¹⁸⁶ *PU in Frankreich*, ed. Wilhelm Wiederhold, *Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Philologisch-historische Klasse 1907 (Beiheft) no. 22, pp. 91-2 (May 10, 1145?); Gleber, Beilage III [pp. 191-206] no. 20); *PU in Spanien, II: Navarra und Aragon*, ed. Paul Kehr, *Abhandlungen der Ges. der Wiss. zu Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Neue Folge 22.1 (1928) no. 57, pp. 360-1 (Nov. 9, 1145-6; Gleber no. 40); *PU in Sizilien*, ed. Paul Kehr, *Nachrichten...* 1899, no. 3, p. 313 (Nov. 13, 1145-6; Gleber no. 41); *Acta Pontificum Romanorum inedita*, ed. J. von Pflugk-Harttung I (Tübingen 1880) no. 201, pp. 183-4 (Oct. 27, 1145-6; JL 8829). It seems highly probable, from their content, that these bulls belong to 1145. Such grants were, of course, nothing new. Cf. also Eugene's bull of July 16, 1145-6 (JL 8821), of which the Nov. 13 bull is an almost exact repeat.

and humble heart and will receive the fruit of eternal reward from the Remunerator of all things.'¹⁸⁷

The most important element in this bull from the view-point of crusading theory was its concept of the indulgence, of which the transcendental implications were here fully developed. 'Herewith Eugene III,' Valmar Cramer has said, 'conceives of a clearer idea of the indulgence than Urban II. Whereas the latter spoke in his crusading canon only of the remission of the outer penitential punishment imposed by the Church, Eugene III, by appealing to the power over the Keys of the Pope as successor to the Prince of the Apostles, Peter, includes as well for the first time absolution from temporal [i. e. divine] punishments of sin which, independent from the ecclesiastical penitential discipline, are inflicted by God for every sin.'¹⁸⁸

This statement may exaggerate the extent of conscious innovation in *Quantum predecessores*. Eugene himself clearly regarded his indulgence as similar in nature to that of 1095. Certain scholars, moreover, incline towards the view that the indulgence in the later eleventh century included the remission not only of the ecclesiastical but also of the divine punishment.¹⁸⁹

Essentially, however, the idea expressed by Cramer is correct. The first half of the twelfth century was a period of widespread confusion and rapid development of ecclesiastical teaching concerning the forgiveness of sins.¹⁹⁰ Nothing illustrates this more clearly than the widely diverging views expressed by Gratian and Peter Lombard on the sacrament of penance, and in the works of these and other contemporary theologians it is impossible to find any fully consistent or clear doctrine on this subject. Theology distinguished three different effects of the sin upon the sinner: sin made him liable, first, to eternal damnation or divine punishment after death; second, it brought the stain of guilt or damage onto the soul; and it entailed, third,

¹⁸⁷ JL 8796; Otto of Freising, *Gesta* 1.36, pp. 55-7.

¹⁸⁸ Cramer (n. 44 above) 48. Cf. Paulus (n. 179 above) I 199; Bernhard Poschmann, *Die abendländische Kirchenbusse im frühen Mittelalter* (Breslauer Studien zur historischen Theologie 16; 1930) 225-7; and especially Gottlob (n. 179 above) 105, who says: 'Die transcendentalen Wirkungen des Ablasses traten in dem zweiten Kreuzzuge ... zum ersten Male deutlich hervor.'

¹⁸⁹ Joannes Morinus, *Commentarius historicus de disciplina in administratione sacramenti Poenitentiae* (Antwerp 1682) 775; Josef Jungmann, *Die lateinischen Bussriten in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Forschungen zur Geschichte des innerkirchlichen Lebens 3/4; Innsbruck 1932) 285-9; and Paul Anciaux, *La théologie du sacrement de pénitence au XII^e siècle* (Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis: Dissertationes ad gradum magistri..., Series II, 41; Louvain and Gembloux 1949) 51 n. 3.

¹⁹⁰ This subject has been carefully studied by Amédée Teetaert, *La confession aux laïques* (Univ. Cath. Lovan.: Diss. II 17; Wetteren-Bruges-Paris 1926) 85-101, and by Anciaux 50-1, 196-208, and 272-4, who says of Gratian: 'Le manque de clarté dans l'exposé du célèbre canoniste illustre à sa façon la complexité du problème au sujet de la confession, aussi bien que les hésitations des auteurs de la première moitié du XII^e siècle,' 207.

ecclesiastical punishment. It was universally accepted that the priesthood had complete control over ecclesiastical discipline, but Peter Lombard and Gratian make it clear that there was considerable disagreement over the extent to which priestly absolution touched upon the other two effects of sin. Peter points out that some authors, while reserving to God the remission of the guilt (the *macula culpae* or *contagio ac caecitas mentis*), claimed for the clergy the power of remitting the divine punishment (the *debitum aeternae mortis* or *debitum futurae poenae*). Other theologians, however, reserved to God both these functions and consequently in the sacrament of penance asserted the efficacy of contrition rather than of confession.¹⁹¹

This latter point of view tended to prevail in the early twelfth century and was powerfully developed by Abaelard. He emphasized in his doctrine of penance the sole efficacy of contrition and therefore reduced the power of the priest in this sacrament to a declaration of the divine pardon (granted at the moment of inner repentance) and to the right of excommunication, reconciliation, and the imposition of penitential satisfaction (the ecclesiastical punishment).¹⁹²

Hugh of St. Victor in particular reacted against this doctrine and against its purely declarative interpretation of priestly absolution and its reservation to God of the power to remit both the guilt and the eternal punishment. He argued that by virtue of the power of the Keys all priests enjoyed the authority not merely to declare the pardon granted by God but actually themselves to remit the divine punishment. 'In confessionem,' he claimed, 'peccatum ipsum, id est debitum damnationis absolvatur.'¹⁹³ In this teaching he was followed by the Victorine school, by Otto of Lucca, and to a certain extent by Peter Lombard, who admitted that God would confirm the remission by a priest of the divine punishment of a repentant sinner.¹⁹⁴ Peter preserved, however, the essentials of the Abaelardian doctrine and reserved to God the ultimate power to remit both the guilt and the divine punishment.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹¹ Anciaux 328f. 'Gratian in his *Decretum*,' says E. F. Jacob ('Innocent III,' CMH 6.38), 'had balanced and compared the views of those who said that contrition alone was necessary and confession to a priest merely the attestation of pardon, and of those who maintained that complete remission could not take place before confession and satisfaction.'

¹⁹² Anciaux 275-95. This doctrine was followed by many twelfth-century canonists, including Roland Bandinelli (Alexander III), Omnebene, and Zachary of Besançon, on whom see Anciaux 263-4 and 312f. Teetaert (n. 190 above) emphasizes that 'au douzième siècle l'attention des théologiens se concentre sur l'efficacité de la contrition, qui est regardée à cette époque comme la partie principale et l'élément le plus important de la discipline pénitentielle,' 85.

¹⁹³ Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* 2.14.8 (PL 176.568). On Hugh see Teetaert 91-2, 94, 99; Anciaux 295-302; Jacob (n. 191 above) 38. Cf. Paulus (n. 179 above) I 254-9.

¹⁹⁴ Anciaux 328f.

¹⁹⁵ Peter Lombard, *Sententiarum libri IV*, 4.18.8: 'Ecce qualis et quantus est usus apo-

St. Bernard, in opposition to Abaelard, recognized the power of the Keys to bind and loose in Heaven as well as on earth;¹⁹⁶ but in his doctrine of penance he resembled Abaelard in his concentration upon the inner state of the sinner and with him asserted the sole efficacy of contrition and repentance.¹⁹⁷ He attached great importance, however, also to confession. To obtain forgiveness, according to Bernard, the crusader needed both to take the cross and humbly to confess his sins. The crusading cross was in itself the *signum vitae*.¹⁹⁸ This opportunity of salvation was freely offered to all sinners by the Lord, Who in His mercy 'deigns to summon for His service murderers, robbers, adulterers, perjurers, and those guilty of other crimes as if [they were] a people who do that which is right.'¹⁹⁹ Nowhere, either here or in his other writings about the crusade, does he mention outer satisfaction. His whole emphasis is upon the almost sacramental efficacy of the crusading cross and upon the spiritual condition of the sinner in the eyes of God.

Eugene III, on the other hand, tended more towards the Victorine point of view. The emphasis in *Quantum predecessores* is upon the papal promise of eternal reward and the direct ecclesiastical remission of the divine punishment for sin. Eugene's appeal to the power of the Keys confirms Cramer's opinion that by this time a basic change had occurred in the concept of the indulgence. On account of this new element, the Pope also put more stress upon exterior satisfaction as a sign of contrition and guide for papal action. Satisfaction — the performance of everything possible to remedy the evil effect of the repented sin — became therefore an essential factor in this concept of the doctrine of penance. This is illustrated by the case of Count William II of Ponthieu. Eugene required the Count, before departing with the crusading army of Louis VII, to restore to the abbey of Troarn a farm which he had seized.²⁰⁰ Otherwise his crusade would, spiritually, be in vain,

stolicarum clavium. Iam ostensum est ex parte qualiter sacerdotes dimittant peccata vel teneant, et iam retinuit sibi Deus quandam singularem potestatem dimittendi vel retinendi, quia ipse solus per se debitum aeternae mortis soluit, et animam interius purgat' (PL 192.888-9).

¹⁹⁶ Anciaux 291.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.* 248-53. In his *Ad Hugonem de S. Victore epistola de baptismo*, PL 182.1037, Bernard says that 'sola nihilominus poenitentia et cordis contritione obtinere veniam creditur, ne iam pro eo damnetur.'

¹⁹⁸ Bern. ep. 363, col. 566. For Bernard on confession, see the references in Anciaux 251-2; and particularly his *De laude novae militiae* c. 12 (PL 182.938).

¹⁹⁹ 'Quid est enim nisi exquisita prorsus et inuentibilis soli Deo occasio saluationis, quod homicidas, raptos, perjurios, caeterisque obligatos criminibus, quasi gentem quae iustitiam fecerit, de seruitio suo submonere dignatur Omnipotens?' Bern. ep. 363, col. 566; cf. Ezechiel 18.21. Also in his *De laude novae militiae* Bernard rejoiced that thieves and perjurers entered the Order of the Temple: see Rousset (n. 8 above) 164.

²⁰⁰ Samuel Löwenfeld, 'Documents relatifs à la Croisade de Guillaume, Comte de Pon-

'for never are holocausts which are polluted by an association with robbery pleasing in the eyes of the Almighty.'²⁰¹ In this way the Pope set his face resolutely against the development of the popular idea of the crusade as a convenient method of avoiding inconvenient obligations at home.

Both Eugene and Bernard insisted on the necessity of contrition and confession. But for the former, the crusading indulgence was essentially a matter between the individual and the Church, whereas for the latter it was a matter between the individual and God. In the view of St. Bernard, confession was not principally a means of obtaining absolution but rather a sacramental sign, established upon examples in the Old and New Testaments, and a subjective influence on the sinner, inducing a wholesome sense of shame. For him, God was the author of the crusade, which was a special and exceptional Divine Grace for the salvation of men. In the crusading bulls of Eugene III, the crusade appears as a papal grace, an institution for the transmission to men of the Pope's power of absolution from divine as well as from ecclesiastical punishment.²⁰²

Apart from this important contrast, the concepts of the crusade found in *Quantum predecessores* and in Bernard's crusading letter are substantially

thieu,' *Archives de l'Orient latin* 2 (1884) Documents, 254, Eugene III to William of Ponthieu: 'Quia vero signum crucis dominice assumpsisti et ad iter Ierosolymitanum accingeris, nolentes te laborem tantum non ad anime tue profectum arripere, nobilitati tue mandamus et exhortamur ... ut praefato abbati et monachis ... antequam iter incipias, in eorum (iudicium) arbitrio vel iudicio iusticiam facias.' Cf. the letter from Eugene to the Archbishop of Rouen and the Bishops of Coutances and Évreux and the letter from Hugh of Rouen to Count William, *ibid.* William had taken the cross at Vézelay (*De glorioso rege Ludovico*, in *Vie de Louis le Gros* [n. 9 above] 159) and seems to have cared little for the ecclesiastical prohibitions. As R. N. Sauvage, *L'Abbaye de Saint-Martin de Troarn* (Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie, 4th Series, 4; Caen 1911) 26, says: 'Les menaces de l'archevêque, son parent, lui semblaient, sans doute, peu dangereuses, et les censures ecclésiastiques n'étaient pas chose nouvelle pour lui.' In any case, he departed with the army of Louis VII before restoring the property of the Abbey. See Sauvage 23-9, and *Epistolae Pontificum Romanorum ineditae*, ed. Samuel Löwenfeld (Leipzig 1885) no. 201, p. 105.

²⁰¹ JL 9166; Löwenfeld, 'Documents' 253. Cf. the view of Peter Lombard that good acts performed in a state of mortal sin are never meritorious: Anciaux 269-70; and the view of Ralph Niger with regard to the Third Crusade: George B. Flahiff, 'Deus non vult: A Critic of the Third Crusade,' *Mediaeval Studies* 9 (1947) 173.

²⁰² This difference in point of view is clearly seen in the versions of Bernard's letters for the Crusade. In the earliest version, he urged men to take the cross with the words: 'Suscipe crucis signum, et omnium pariter, de quibus corde contrito confessionem feceris, indulgentiam obtinebis,' ep. 363, col. 567. In the latest version, the letter to Duke Ladislaus of Bohemia, this had been rephrased to read: 'Suscipite signum crucis, et omnium, de quibus corde contrito confessionem feceritis, plenam indulgentiam delictorum hanc vobis summus pontifex offert, vicarius eius cui dictum est: Quodcunque solveris super terra, erit solutum et in coelo,' ep. 458, col. 653; see Rassow (n. 45 above) 262-3.

the same.²⁰³ The differences are that Bernard expressed himself more loosely and with greater warmth, while the Pope restricted the crusade to the East and the soldiers from France and Italy and showed more concern than Bernard for the definition of the temporal privileges and for the organization of the army. It is easy for admirers of the Mellifluous Doctor to decry this cautious and narrow policy of the Pope because it lacked the popular appeal and the magnificent depth and scope of their hero's preaching;²⁰⁴ but in so doing they are judging in view merely of the immediate events of 1146-8. Eugene, it is true, was not by nature an imaginative or vigorous man of affairs. He had been raised to the throne of Peter from his quiet life as a Cistercian Abbot less than a year before the issue of this bull; and in it, as its opening *Quantum predecessores* shows, he evinces an anxious respect for precedent and tradition.²⁰⁵ There was, however, much practical wisdom in this caution. The fact remains that this bull marks a fundamental step in the development of the crusades and of crusading thought. Urban II never issued a general crusading bull.²⁰⁶ It was therefore to *Quantum predecessores* and to its concept of crusading privileges that all future crusaders looked back. Built on the growth and events of half a century, this bull set the pattern for the juridical development of the crusade and as such laid the basis of the crusade as an institution in European history.²⁰⁷

To what extent this was a personal contribution of Eugene III, it is hard to say. Any answer to this question depends in part upon an estimate of Eugene's character and of the influence upon him of Bernard of Clairvaux and his other advisors; an influence which was unquestionably profound, in view of his Cistercian background and of his connection with what Kle-

²⁰³ Bernard clearly regarded *Quantum predecessores* as fundamental, although Villey (n. 68 above), perhaps goes too far in saying that, 'sa prédication n'est qu'un commentaire de l'encyclique *Quantum predecessores*,' 106. Bernard developed its ideas from his own, highly spiritual attitude. He had, in any case, a profound influence on Eugene's thought.

²⁰⁴ For instance, Ursula Schwerin, *Die Aufrufe der Päpste zur Befreiung des heiligen Landes* (Historische Studien, ed. E. Ebering 301; Berlin 1937) 74: '... die Kreuzzugs-enzyklica Eugens III. ... ist zu arm im Gedanklichen, zu wenig schwungvoll in Sprache und Stil, um Ursache einer derartigen Massenbegeisterung sein zu können.'

²⁰⁵ It is evidence of the conservatism and the memory of the Papacy that alone among the Western sources of the Second Crusade, the papal bulls show a strong consciousness of the precedent of the First Crusade, cf. n. 130 above.

²⁰⁶ Erdmann (n. 64 above) 320; Cramer (n. 44 above) 47f.; Villey 105-6; and Alexander Gieysztor, 'The Genesis of the Crusades,' *Medievalia et Humanistica* 6 (1950) 26-7.

²⁰⁷ Cramer 48: 'Diese Bulle ist in formaler Hinsicht Vorbild für alle späteren Kreuzzugsaufrufe der Päpste geworden.' For an interesting discussion of the development of crusading theory, see Villey, who calls the indulgence the 'expression juridique précise de ce caractère salutaire de la croisade,' 148; on *Quantum predecessores*, see *ibid.* 106-7, and Schwerin 74-5.

witz has aptly characterized as the new reformed papacy, which came into power with Innocent II and which found its principal support in France.²⁰⁸ It is not always possible, therefore, to distinguish clearly between the policies of the Pope, of St. Bernard, and of the papal Curia. This answer depends also on the precedents upon which *Quantum predecessores* was built. Although the sources for these are not complete, there can be little doubt that most of the ideas were not original to this bull. Here, however, they were set down together for the first time, and in this form they impressed themselves upon the minds of men.²⁰⁹ The development of ideas that is marked in the historical works of the later twelfth century by the emergence of the crusade as a Christian institution rather than a mere historical event was principally the result of the crusading bulls of 1146-7.

Eugene reissued *Quantum predecessores* in a slightly revised form on March 1, 1146.²¹⁰ He also wrote about the crusade during this year to the Emperor Manuel, who replied in August, 1146, that he stood ready to assist the French crusaders, and again in March, 1147, when he evinced some alarm at the prospect of the crusade and asked for Eugene's aid in securing from Louis a guarantee for the good behaviour of his troops.²¹¹ Already by November 26, 1146, the Pope was in correspondence with the Bishop of Salis-

²⁰⁸ Hans-Walter Klewitz, 'Das Ende des Reformpapsttums,' *Deutsches Archiv für Geschichte des Mittelalters* 3 (1939) 371-412.

²⁰⁹ Cf. for instance the crusading hymn in the *Analecta hymnica medii aevi*, edd. G. M. Dreves and C. Blume, 45^b, no. 96, p. 78, dated by Dreves as 12th (13th 14th) century. The ninth stanza is reminiscent of the crusading bulls:

Illuc quicumque tenderit
Mortuus ibi fuerit
Caeli bona receperit
Et cum sanctis remanserit.

²¹⁰ JL 8876. For an ingenious, if not altogether convincing, account of the circumstances of this reissue, see Gleber (n. 165 above) 45-6. It differs from the earlier bulls in its slightly increased prohibitions against luxury: see Caspar and Rassow (n. 184 above) 287-8. This *Quantum predecessores* (II) may be the 'omni favo litteras dulciores' mentioned by Odo of Deuil, *De prof. Ludov.* ed. Berry 8. More probably, however, Odo is here referring to some other, lost letter sent by the Pope to Louis: Bernhardt (n. 1 above) 519; Hüffer (n. 164 above) 405-6; Gleber 45 and n. 7, where he cites authorities disagreeing with this view.

²¹¹ For the text of the letter of August, 1146 (Franz Dölger, *Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit*, Reihe A, Abteilung I: *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches* II [Munich and Berlin 1925] no. 1348) see RHGF 15.440-1; for the text of the letter of March, 1147 (Dölger no. 1533) see Werner Ohnsorge, 'Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Manuels I. von Byzanz,' *Festschrift Albert Brackmann* (Weimar 1931) 391-3. Manuel also wrote to Louis VII: Dölger no. 1349. On these letters, see Ohnsorge 371-81, whose conclusions are accepted by Dölger, in his review of Ohnsorge's article, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 31 (1931) 446-7; Gleber 48-9; Cartellieri (n. 37 above) 351. On Manuel's attitude, see Chalandon (n. 121 above) II 133-5.

bury concerning the progress of the crusading movement in England.²¹² On October 5, 1146, he issued his crusading bull *Divina dispensatione* (I) to the clergy of Italy. In it he praised the example of King Louis and the French nobles and urged the Italians to participate in 'such a holy labor and victory' and so to win the privileges of the crusade.²¹³

Early in 1147, the Pope started northwards towards France accompanied by no less than seventeen Cardinals. He went by way of the Mont Genève pass and reached Paris by April 20.²¹⁴ At Clairvaux, on April 6, he saw again, after more than six years, his friend and mentor St. Bernard; and five days later, at Troyes, he issued *Divina dispensatione* (II), addressed to all the faithful. Here again he praises those who have already taken the cross and are preparing to free the Eastern Church.

'The King of Spain, also,' he says, 'is powerfully armed against the Saracens of those regions, over whom he has already frequently triumphed...' 'Certain of you, however, (are) desirous of participating in so holy a work and reward and plan to go against the Slavs and other pagans living towards the North and to subject them, with the Lord's assistance, to the Christian religion. We give heed to the devotion of these men, and to all those who have not accepted the cross for going to Jerusalem and who have decided to go against the Slavs and to remain in the spirit of devotion on that expedition, as it is prescribed, we grant that same remission of sin... and the same temporal privileges as to the crusaders to Jerusalem...' 'Furthermore, since we know it to be advantageous that some religious, wise, and literate person be among you, who may care for your peace and tranquillity and preserve unity among you and advise you concerning the promotion of the Christian religion, we provide for this purpose our venerable brother A(nselm) Bishop of Havelberg.'²¹⁵

In its basic theory of crusading, this bull differs in no way from *Quantum predecessores* or *Divina dispensatione* (I), which it resembles also in structure and occasionally in wording. In two respects, however, both in the broader concept of the crusade and in the appointment of a legate, the Pope here made an important advance on the ideas expressed in his three earlier crusading bulls, and it is tempting to associate these changes with the meeting at Clairvaux five days before it was issued.

Not only the participation of the Germans but also an entirely new front of attack were now included within the scope of the crusade. It is clear that the Germans had played no part in Eugene's original plan, and their inclusion was one of Bernard's principal achievements.²¹⁶ The Pope seems in fact to

²¹² *Epistolae Pont. Rom.* (n. 200 above) 103; JL 8959.

²¹³ *PU in Malta*, ed. Paul Kehr, *Nachrichten ... Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Kl. 1899, no. 3, 388-90.

²¹⁴ His route can be traced from his bulls in JL 8991-9021; see Gleber 51-2.

²¹⁵ JL 9017; PL 180.1203-4.

²¹⁶ See p. 244 and n. 167 above.

have disapproved at first of this decision of Conrad III.²¹⁷ This need occasion neither surprise nor the elaborate explanation suggested by Gleber.²¹⁸ In view of the precedent of the First Crusade and of his own conservative temperament, Eugene naturally addressed his earlier crusading bulls to the French and to the Italians.²¹⁹ He may also have had some genuine concern for the state of the Empire in Conrad's absence and may perhaps have seen more clearly than Bernard the difficulties that would result from joint German and French participation in the crusade.²²⁰

It was for this reason perhaps more than any other that Eugene welcomed a diversion of the German forces against the Slavs.²²¹ There appears to be no evidence that this idea originated with Bernard,²²² although he was present

²¹⁷ Cosack (n. 167 above) 290 reconstructs Eugene's reaction from Conrad's reply; Heinz Zatschek, 'Wibald von Stablo,' *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung*, Ergänzungsband 10 (1928) 325; Gleber 50f.

²¹⁸ Very briefly, that Eugene had hoped to return to Italy accompanied by Conrad to crush the papal enemies at Rome: Gleber 50 and 53-5.

²¹⁹ Also to the English and the Low Country men, see below, pp. 260-1. These four peoples were those who had played the principal parts in the First Crusade. Erdmann (n. 64 above) 272-4 brings out that in the eleventh century crusading thought had its broadest development in France and Italy. Urban II may have seen the First Crusade in theory as a general offensive to free Christendom (*ibid.* 306 and 321; J. Lecler, 'L'idée de Croisade d'après les travaux récents,' *Études* 29 [1936] 52-4), but he never developed this idea fully, and the response in fact was limited. On the scornful attitude of the Germans towards the First Crusade, see Ekkehard of Aura, in A. C. Krey, *The First Crusade* (Princeton 1921) 42. Speaking of the Second Crusade, therefore, Karl Hampe correctly says: 'Das Unternehmen gewann sogleich einen universaleren Charakter als die erste Kreuzfahrt, bei der Urban wesentlich nur den französischen Lehnadel nach dem Orient gelenkt hatte,' *Deutsche Kaisergeschichte in der Zeit der Salier und Staufer* (10th ed. by F. Baethgen, Heidelberg 1949) 133. On the German attitude towards the First Crusade, see also Albert Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* IV (Leipzig 1903) 895.

²²⁰ Most modern scholars agree that this fact played an important part in the failure of the crusade: Kugler (n. 1 above) 95f; Vasiliev (n. 53 above) 419-22; Bernhardt 532-3; Cartellieri 357; Peter Rassow, *Honor Imperii: Die Neue Politik Friedrich Barbarossas 1152-1159* (Munich and Berlin 1940) 26. The division of responsibility is not, however, quite as easy as Vacandard, with sublime self-confidence, suggests: 'A la distance où nous sommes de ces événements, il est facile de les juger avec impartialité et d'établir exactement la part de responsabilité qui revient à chacun des auteurs de la seconde croisade,' *op. cit.* (n. 174 above) II 450.

²²¹ See Appendix B.

²²² Bernard's letter for the Wendish Crusade, ep. 457, coll. 652-4, appears to me to have been written after *Divina dispensatione* (II). On this important point I disagree with Hüffer (n. 164 above) 427 n. 1; Rassow (n. 45 above) 265; Artler (n. 60 above) 314; Bündung (n. 60 above) 37-40, and others who hold that this letter preceded in date the papal bull. Several reasons incline me towards the opposite opinion. In the first place, it seems highly improbable, in view of Bernard's extreme deference in taking up the preaching of the crusade, that he would here have taken upon himself the authority to change completely the original concept and especially to grant full indulgence to these new crusaders.

at the Diet of Frankfurt in March, when the plan was probably first suggested. It may have come from the Saxon princes and prelates,²²³ possibly from Anselm of Havelberg himself. There can be no question that there was a large measure of self-interest in this proposal; but to stress this motive to the exclusion of all others is as mistaken as to deny it altogether. These men both sought and valued ecclesiastical support and approbation of their campaign.

The papal Curia had since the eleventh century repeatedly asserted its interest in the eastward expansion of Germany.²²⁴ Especially in the second quarter of the twelfth century it attempted to exert an increasing control over German affairs by means of frequent *legati a latere*.²²⁵ Eugene III gave a new and more powerful character to this policy in his bull of April 11,²²⁶ which states in definite terms the religious nature and papal direction of this expedition. Although he had had no hand in its initiation, therefore, the Pope lost no time in incorporating this energy into the wider effort and in so doing made a significant contribution not only to the future of the 'Drang nach Osten'²²⁷ but also to the character of the Second Crusade.

Divina dispensatione (II) also includes a significant reference to the campaign against the Moors in Spain. This information may have come through Genoa or Savoy, or perhaps from St. Bernard, who was in 1147 probably in touch with Catalonia and Portugal.²²⁸ There is, however, evidence that

Secondly, the language of this letter suggests that it is subsequent at least to the Diet of Frankfurt. 'Quia enim verbum hoc crucis parvitati nostrae Dominus evangelizandum commisit, consilio domini regis et episcoporum et principum, qui convenerant Frankonovort, denuntiamus ... Placuit autem omnibus in Frankenevort congregatis, quatenus...', coll. 651-2. The 'Dominus' here may indeed refer to the Pope; and in any case, since the diet lasted until late March (Bernhardi 545f.), Bernard can hardly have written his letter before then. There is in the third place some evidence that Bernard sent with each of his letters a copy of the papal crusading bull: see n. 247 below. If this supposition is correct, he could not have sent letter 457 before Eugene had issued the relevant bull, *Divina dispensatione* (II).

²²³ Volk (n. 68 above) 41-2.

²²⁴ Friedrich Baethgen, 'Die Kurie und der Osten im Mittelalter,' *Deutsche Ostforschungen* (note 65 above) 310-30. After the Investiture Controversy, Baethgen says, the Curia 'versuchte, im Osten sich unabhängig vom Reich ihre eigenen Machtposition zu schaffen ...,' 330.

²²⁵ Hauck (n. 219 above) IV 160f.; p. 160 n. 7 he lists the papal legates in Germany from ca. 1125 to 1150.

²²⁶ Baethgen 324: 'Hatte es früher der Ostmission nur aus der Ferne seinen Segen gespendet, so nahm es jetzt ihre Leitung in die eigenen Hände.' Eugene was also more active than his predecessors in taking German monasteries under papal protection: see Hauck IV 165.

²²⁷ Baethgen 324-5: 'Damit hatte das Prinzip der gewaltsamen Bekehrung in der Ostmission Eingang gefunden...'; but care should be taken not to overestimate the extent of ecclesiastical concern for this movement.

²²⁸ See pp. 246-7 above.

the Pope took an independent interest in the Spanish Reconquest, although no papal letters to this effect are known from the years 1146-7, when it can only be surmised from certain Spanish charters that the Curia was in correspondence with the court of Alfonso VII.²²⁹ But in April, 1148, Eugene wrote from Langres to Alfonso saying that 'we gladly grant your requests to make an expedition against the tyranny of the infidels.'²³⁰ Clearly at some time before this Alfonso had asked the Pope to approve his plans for a crusade.

Papal concern for the expulsion of the Moslems from Spain dates back at least to the time of Alexander II and Gregory VII, who in 1074 planned a Christian campaign in Spain.²³¹ Following this example, Urban II, at the time of the First Crusade, issued a bull urging the Spaniards to direct their crusading energies against the Saracens at home.²³² Both in this bull and in one of Pascal II some ten years later,²³³ these expeditions in Spain were regarded not only as complementary but also as equal, on a spiritual basis, to the campaigns against the Moslems in the Holy Land.²³⁴

²²⁹ *España Sagrada* 36.cxcii-iv: 'Carta facta Palentiae XIII. Kalendas Martii Era MCLXXXVI quando praefatus Imperator habuit ibi colloquium ... de vocatione Domini Papae ad Concilium, et in anno quo ab eodem Imperatore capta fuit Almaria et Baeza...'; cf. similar charters in Azevado (n. 115 above) 109 n. 1 (document of the National Archives, Madrid, C. D. *Samos* 794-21-1) and 106 n. 1. It should be noted that these charters are dated 1186 *Era Hispanica* (1148) and yet in the same year that Alfonso took Almaria, that is, 1185 (1147): the only explanation seems to be that, although in the *era Hispanica* the number changed on January 1 (H. Grotelfend, *Taschenbuch der Zeitrechnung* [8th ed. by O. Grotelfend, Hannover 1941] 14), they reckoned the year as running from Easter to Easter or March 25 to March 25 (Grotelfend 12-4; Reginald Lane Poole, 'The Beginning of the Year in the Middle Ages,' *Studies in Chronology and History* [Oxford 1934] 1-27). In any case, the papal letters must have arrived in 1147. I can find no reference in *España Sagrada* or Gerhard Säbekow, *Die päpstlichen Legationen nach Spanien und Portugal bis zum Ausgang des XII. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin 1931) to a council attended by a papal legate, at Burgos in 1146, which Schramm (n. 3 above) mentions, p. 111. Is he perhaps referring to the Burgos council of 1136, which was attended by Cardinal Guido (*España Sagrada* 26. 438-40; Rassow, *loc. cit.* n. 92 above, 212f.)?

²³⁰ JL 9255; PL 180.1345-6. See Paul Kehr, *Das Papsttum und der Katalanische Prinzipat bis zur Vereinigung mit Aragon*, in *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 1926, No. 1, p. 62; Erdmann (n. 49 above) 32; Cartellieri (n. 37 above) 379; Schramm 112.

²³¹ *Epistolae Pont. Rom.* (n. 200 above) no. 82, p. 43; see Erdmann, *loc. cit.* 28 and *Entstehung* (n. 64 above) 292-5; Lecler (n. 219 above) 48-54; Paulus (n. 179 above) I 195-8; Villey (n. 68 above) 195-8; Ruano (n. 112 above) 111-14; Runciman I 90-1.

²³² *PU in Spanien I: Katalonien*, ed. Paul Kehr, *Abhandlungen ... Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Kl. Neue Folge 18.2 (1926) no. 23, p. 287-8.

²³³ JL 5840; PL 163.45; Villey 197; Paulus I 197: Oct. 14, 1100. See also Pascal's other bulls for a crusade on the Iberian peninsula: JL 5863 and 6485; Paulus I 197.

²³⁴ Bridrey (n. 161 above) 30-2; Ernst Schlée, *Die Päpste und die Kreuzzüge* (Halle 1893) 44-5 and 49; Cramer (n. 44 above) 59; and especially Villey 197-201; see n. 49 above. So

Gelasius II, Calixtus II, Lucius II, and, through their legates, Honorius II and Innocent II, all displayed an active interest in the Reconquest,²³⁵ and Eugene III was in no way behind his predecessors in this respect. The original issue of *Quantum predecessores* may in fact have been based upon some of the earlier crusading bulls for Spain. In May 1145, he reissued a bull of Urban II, Gelasius II, and Lucius II for the recovery of Tarragona, 'for the reconquest of which our predecessors are known to have labored greatly.'²³⁶ In the same year he urged the faithful to assist the Templars in Spain.²³⁷ In 1152, he issued a bull, addressed to all Christians, in which he granted the usual crusading privileges to all who 'go with the noble Count Ramon of Barcelona for the defense of the Christian faith and of the entire holy Church.'²³⁸ Finally, there is the fact that the Pope specifically called upon the Genoese to join the campaign in Spain in 1147.²³⁹

the charter which reestablished the Order of Belchite in 1136 promised complete remission of sins to all who joined the Order. In addition, 'Qui vero ibidem deo per annum servire voluerit, eandem quam si Jherusalem tenderet, remissionem assequatur. ... Simili autem remissione sepulchrum domni de captivitate ereptum est et Maiorica et Cesaraugusta et alie, et similiter deo annuente iter Jherusalemitanum ab hac parte aperietur et ecclesia dei, que adhuc sub captivitate ancilla tenetur, libera efficietur,' Rassow (n. 92 above) 224-5.

²³⁵ Gelasius II, apparently following now-lost documents of Urban II, issued two bulls for the Spanish Reconquest: JL 6636 (PL 163.489-91) and 6665 (PL 163.508); see Paulus *op. cit.* I 197, and Villey 201. In the second of these, Gelasius not only freed 'a suorum vinculis peccatorum' anyone who with a contrite heart died for the recovery of Saragossa but also assigned to the discretion of the provincial bishops the indulgence to be granted to those who simply joined this enterprise or even aided in the rebuilding of the church or the support of the clergy. For Calixtus II, see n. 137 above and Paulus I 197-8. Lucius II in 1144 reissued the bull of Urban II and Gelasius II for the reconquest of Tarragona: *PU in Spanien* I no. 53, pp. 320-2; and when it was recovered, Tarragona was held by the Count of Barcelona as a papal fief: E. W. Watson, 'The Development of Ecclesiastical Organisation and its Financial Basis,' CMH 6.555. A synod called at Compostella in 1125 by Diego Gelmirez, the legate of Honorius II, granted full indulgence to crusaders in Spain: *España Sagrada* 20.427-30; Paulus I 198; Villey 206. The papal legate Guido of SS. Cosmas and Damian was present at the Council of Burgos (1136), which promised remission of sins to members of the Order of Belchite (see nn. 229 and 234 above), and he presided at the Fifth Council of Gerona (1143) when Ramon Berenger made his great grant to the Templars (see pp. 231-2 above and Säbekow, *op. cit.* n. 229 above, 46).

²³⁶ *PU in Spanien* I no. 54, pp. 322-4. It is interesting for the method by which Eugene composed his crusading bulls that in this one he followed word for word not the most recent issue of this bull by Lucius II but that of Gelasius II (see n. 235 above).

²³⁷ See n. 186 above.

²³⁸ JL 9594; *Colección* (n. 99 above) no. 128, pp. 314-5. This bull, undated by Bofarull, may have been taken for a bull of 1146/7 (see n. 240 below). It was reissued by Anastasius IV: *ibid.* no. 133, 320-1; *PU in Spanien* I no. 70, pp. 346-7.

²³⁹ See above p. 228 and n. 80; 'Regesti delle lettere pontificie riguardanti la Liguria,' *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria* 19 (1887) no. 117, p. 59. A precedent for this may have been not only the Genoese participation in the First Crusade but also the indulgence granted to the Pisans who attacked the Balearic Islands in 1114-5 (see n. 109 above):

This evidence can leave no doubt of the interest shown by Eugene III in the Spanish campaigns. It has frequently been asserted that he in fact issued a crusading bull for the expedition against Tortosa, and it would certainly not have been inconsistent with his policy to have done so.²⁴⁰ During the fifth decade of the twelfth century the Curia maintained a close connection with Portugal. Alfonso Henriques in 1143 placed himself under the special protection of the papacy;²⁴¹ and the re-establishment by Eugene III of the Bishoprics of Lisbon, Viseu, and Lamego was closely linked with the reconquests of 1147.²⁴² In the Iberian peninsula, therefore, as in eastern Germany, the Popes were quick to bring under a certain measure of control movements which originated independently;²⁴³ and, while the separate national character was never entirely lost, this effort of Church and State was now successfully incorporated into the wider effort of the crusade.²⁴⁴

St. Bernard certainly addressed a crusading letter to England, probably

Chron. Monasterii Casinensis, MGH SS 7.789; Paulus I 197; Erdmann (n. 64 above) 170; Villey 215-6; Ruano (n. 112 above) 113 and, cited by him, Antonio Alcover Sureda, *El Islam en Mallorca y la cruzada pisano-catalana* (Palma en Mallorca 1930).

²⁴⁰ Manrique, *Cist. Ann.* II (n. 80 above) under 1148, XIII, 8-10; Lafuente, *op. cit.* (n. 107 above) 70; Paul Kehr, *Das Papsttum und die Königreiche Navarra und Aragon bis zur Mitte des XII. Jahrhunderts*, in *Abhandlungen der Preuss. Akad. Phil.-hist. Kl.* 1928 No. 4, pp. 50-1 (with no reference); Defourneaux (n. 69 above) 177; Cartelleri (n. 37 above) 422. I have been unable to locate this document or to find clear evidence that it was issued, cf. n. 238 above.

²⁴¹ Säbekow (n. 229 above) 47-8; Livermore (n. 37 above) 67-9.

²⁴² *De exp. Lyx.* (cited n. 15 above) 178-80; Carl Erdmann, *Das Papsttum und Portugal im ersten Jahrhundert der Portugiesischen Geschichte*, in *Abhandlungen der Preuss. Akad. Phil.-hist. Kl.* 1928 No. 5, pp. 34-5.

²⁴³ Of considerable interest in the history of papal direction of the crusading effort in Spain is the visit of the legate Hyacinth, Cardinal deacon of Santa Maria in Cosmedin, in 1155: Säbekow 49-51; Johannes Brixius, *Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums von 1130-1181* (Berlin 1912) 52. Hyacinth, later Pope Celestine III, was enthusiastic for the Reconquest: see his letter in *PU in Rom*, ed. Paul Kehr, *Nachrichten ... Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Kl. 1903, no. 12, pp. 48-9. He presided over two councils in Spain, at Valladolid and at Lerida (the first council there since its recovery). The canons of these councils (Valladolid: Erdmann, *Papsttum und Portugal* 55-8; Lerida: F. Valls-Taberner, 'Ein Konzil zu Lerida im Jahre 1155,' *Papsttum und Kaisertum: Festschrift Paul Kehr*, ed. Albert Brackmann [Munich 1926] 364-8) closely resemble each other. Canon I is a fully developed crusading bull; it unquestionably reveals the influence of Rome, yet shows that as late as 1155 the Papacy was not even in theory the only ecclesiastical authority capable of conferring the spiritual and temporal benefits of a crusade: cf. bull of Gelasius II, n. 235 above; contrast Villey, *op. cit.* 100-1.

²⁴⁴ Cf. Ernst Kantorowicz, 'Pro Patria Mori in Medieval Political Thought,' *American Historical Review* 56 (1951) 478 n. 22, who says that 'in Spain the whole development (of the crusade) was different in so far as crusading idea and national idea or patriotism coincided'; see Erdmann, *Hist. Zeitschr.* 141 (n. 49 above) 23f. and *Entstehung* (n. 64 above) 88-90, 269-70; cf. n. 49 above.

in the summer of 1146, and there is evidence that a papal bull was there at the same time. Eugene's letter to Bishop Jocelin of Salisbury, in November, 1146, shows that men who had been disseized of their lands by King Stephen or his opponents before the preaching of the crusade had subsequently taken the cross and claimed the ecclesiastical protection granted to the property of crusaders.²⁴⁵ Since Bernard did not mention this privilege in his letter, it was presumably known in England from a papal crusading bull. A copy may have been sent by Bernard with his letter, but the fact that the Bishop of Salisbury addressed his enquiries to the Pope shows that Eugene himself took an active part in the organization of the crusade.

That copies of the crusading bulls were sent elsewhere is known from narrative sources, which reveal that papal letters reached Denmark, Tournai, the monastery of Lobbes in the Lowlands, the Count of Flanders, and Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux.²⁴⁶ There is in addition the evidence of the bull *Quantum predecessores* (III), issued in 1165 by Pope Alexander III, who says that for the Second Crusade 'our predecessor of holy memory Pope Eugene sent exhortatory letters throughout the various parts of the earth.'²⁴⁷

Eugene promoted the crusade not only by his letters but also by his per-

²⁴⁵ 'For those men, moreover, whom our beloved son S(tephen) illustrious king of the English or his adversaries disinherited on the occasion of the war held for the realm before they took the cross, we are not willing that ecclesiastical justice should be exercised,' *Epistolae Pont. Rom.* (n. 200 above) no. 200, pp. 103-4. For the names of some of the more important English crusaders, see *De exp. Lyx.* 5-6 (to David's citations for William of Warenne may be added *Chron. of Melrose*, cited n. 70 above, 23) and Heinrich Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im XI. und XII. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig 1899) 357 n. 2. David regards the response in England as slight (*De exp. Lyx.* 3-12), whereas Böhmer says that as a result of the crusade the number of fighters in the English civil war was sensibly diminished, and the war therefore took on a new character, 357; cf. also 407. For Scots on the crusade, see *De exp. Lyx.* 106 and Rassow (n. 45 above) 269-7.

²⁴⁶ Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum* (n. 58 above) 376; Hermann (Abbot of St. Martin) of Tournai, *Narratio restaurationis Abbatiae S. Martini Tornacensis*, in D'Achery, *Spicilegium* II 926; *Gesta Abbatum Lobbiensium*, MGH SS 21.329; Arnulf of Lisieux, *Letters*, ed. Frank Barlow (Camden Third Series 61: London 1939) 210: 'In expeditione ... Iherosolimitana ad quam me sanctus pater Eugenius destinavit invitum...' See also the *Ann. Herbipolenses*, MGH SS 16.3: 'Testes sunt huius apostolice admonitionis epistole hinc et inde per diversarum regionum ac provinciarum terminos directe et in plerisque ecclesiis ad inditium predictae expeditionis diligenter recondite.'

²⁴⁷ JL 11218; PL 200.383-6. Cosack (n. 167 above) 279 believed that this was a purely formal expression and maintained that 'nach diesem (zeitgenössischen) Quellenmaterial tritt in keinem Lande die offizielle Kreuzpredigt unabhängig von Bernard auf...' It is true that Bernard appears to have sent with each of his crusading letters a copy of the relevant papal bull: see the evidence cited by Cosack 279 n. 6, to which may be added the fact, kindly suggested by Dom Jean Leclercq, that in the Munich MS 22201, which was written at Windberg in 1165 (cf. Hüffer, *loc. cit.* in n. 164 above, 411), Bernard's ep. 363 is preceded by *Quantum predecessores*. The foregoing evidence, however, indicates that Eugene sent at least some copies of his crusading bulls directly and independently.

sonal activity. Of this there is little evidence, but a few references suggest that it was not unimportant. Until early in 1147 he was occupied in Italy and probably had little opportunity to preach the crusade in person. At that time, however, he started northwards to France. No pressing political need, as has been suggested, forced him to leave Italy; and it is probable, as Reginald Lane Poole said, that 'his primary motive for visiting France was that he might preside over the preparations for the Second Crusade.'²⁴⁸ At Vico d'Elsa, not far from Siena, in January 1147, he conferred a privilege on the abbey of St. Rufus (at that time near Avignon) in a bull addressed to the Abbot N.²⁴⁹ This was presumably Nicholas Breakspear,²⁵⁰ who in 1149 became Cardinal Bishop of Albano and five years later was elevated to the papacy as Adrian IV. He seems to have accompanied the legate, Archbishop William of Arles, to Spain in 1140,²⁵¹ and was there again in 1148-9, since in writing to Nicholas, by that time Pope, in 1156, Count Ramon Berenger said that 'in the acquisition of Lerida and of the church of Tortosa you saw our labor and sweat in part with your own eyes...'²⁵² It does not seem fanciful to connect the meeting of Nicholas with the Pope in 1147 with his presence during the following year among the Spanish crusaders, to whom he acted perhaps as an unofficial legate.

By March 7, Eugene was at Susa,²⁵³ and on the following day, 'in the presence of Pope Eugene,' Amadeus III of Savoy received, in return for a confirmation of the privileges of San Giusto di Susa, eleven thousand Susian solidi in order to pay the costs of his pilgrimage to Jerusalem, to which he was, he says, 'advised and instructed by the most blessed lord Pope Eugene.'²⁵⁴

²⁴⁸ R. L. Poole, in John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis* (Oxford 1927) intro. xii.

²⁴⁹ JL 8999 (not 8998 as cited by R. L. Poole, 'The Early Lives of Robert Pullen and Nicholas Breakspear,' *Studies in Chronology and History* [Oxford 1934] 294 n. 4).

²⁵⁰ Poole 294. Kehr, in *PU in Spanien I* (n. 232 above) no. 60, pp. 331-2, prints a bull dated from St. Peter's on Dec. 12 and addressed to 'Ni. abbati ecclesie Sancti Rufi.' Kehr assigns this document to 1152, in which case it would throw into utter confusion the slight knowledge gathered by Poole concerning the early career of Nicholas Breakspear. For Nicholas became Cardinal Bishop of Albano by December 16, 1149, at the latest (Brixius [n. 243 above] 56; JL II p. 20, indicates him as subscribing from January 30, 1150), and this bull would indicate that his successor at St. Rufus also bore the name of Nicholas — unless, that is, it may be dated December 12, 1149, when Eugene was certainly in Rome (JL 9359-9363) and presumably also Nicholas (see above). This bull may therefore be the last grant made to Nicholas as Abbot of St. Rufus. As Adrian IV, in any case, Nicholas Breakspear is known to have taken an interest in Spanish affairs: Kehr, *Das Papsttum und die Königreiche...* (n. 240 above) 51.

²⁵¹ Villanueva, *Viage literario a las Iglesias de España XI* (1850) 199, cited by Poole, *loc. cit.* 294; Säbekow, *op. cit.* (n. 229 above) 45.

²⁵² Kehr, *Das Papsttum und der Katalanische Prinzipat...* (n. 230 above) 90-1; *Das Papsttum und die Königreiche...* 51.

²⁵³ JL 9009; Previté Orton (n. 9 above) 309.

²⁵⁴ *Regesta Comitum Sabaudiae*, ed. Domenico Carutti (Bibliotheca Storica Italiana 5;

It seems that Bernard also urged Amadeus to join the crusade,²⁵⁵ but this passage shows that his participation was principally the result of the personal intervention of Eugene III.

That the Pope preached the crusade in France is clear from the works of Odo of Deuil and of the monk William of St. Denis, who says that at Paris Eugene granted his 'blessing and licence of pilgrimage.'²⁵⁶

Finally, where he could not supervise the preparation and organization of the crusade in person, the Pope did so by means of his legates. To the armies going to the Holy Land, he sent 'Theodwin (Cardinal) Bishop of Santa Rufina and Guido Cardinal priest of San Chrysogono, prudent indeed and honest men, ... who may keep those men in concord and love and watch for their salvation both in spiritual and in temporal matters, with God's aid...' ²⁵⁷ John of Salisbury, however, who probably knew them both, regarded them as 'good men indeed but not suitable for such a position,' both on account of their characters and because neither was familiar with the French language — one was German and the other Florentine.²⁵⁸ Perhaps for this reason Eugene seems to have chosen in addition two French bishops, Arnulf of Lisieux and Godfrey of Langres, 'who were to journey with the said King (Louis) to Jerusalem and acted in (the Pope's) place in the government of the Christian people.'²⁵⁹ John of Salisbury bitterly disliked these bishops, of whom he says that 'they boasted that they held the papal legation in the army, although they had not received this power, (and) were so quarrelsome that they hardly ever agreed in any advice.'²⁶⁰ But they

Turin 1889) no. ccxciv, pp. 105-6; Previt  Orton 309 n. 3. Cipolla has cast doubt on this charter, but Previt  Orton, 197 n. 2 and 309 n. 3, says that 'it is hard to see what part of the contents is not genuine.'

²⁵⁵ *Petit Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de Saint-Sulpice en Bugey*, ed. M.-C. Guige (Lyon 1884) 2; Previt  Orton 309-10; *Regesta Com. Sab.* no. ccxcii, p. 105.

²⁵⁶ William of St. Denis, *Dialogue* (n. 130 above) 103; Odo of Deuil, *De prof. Ludov.* ed. Berry 14-6; cf. *Chron. Mauriniacensis*, RHGF 12.88. Odo here mentions that, 'Affluent multi multarum partium utrique miraculo, videlicet regi et apostolico peregrinis'; and it is not impossible that Eugene put on a pilgrim's costume in order to symbolize his spiritual participation in the crusade.

²⁵⁷ JL 9095; PL 180.1251-2. See Kugler (n. 1 above) 104-6; Brixius (n. 243) 43, 47; and Johannes Bachmann, *Die p pstlichen Legaten in Deutschland und Skandinavien 1125-59* (Historische Studien, ed. E. Ebering 115; Berlin 1913) 80-3.

²⁵⁸ John of Salisbury, *Hist. Pontif.* (n. 248 above) 55.

²⁵⁹ *Anonymi vera narratio fundationis prioratus Sanctae Barbarae*, RHGF 14.502. On Godfrey's part in the Crusade, see Hermann Wurm, *Gottfried, Bischof von Langres* (W rzburg 1886) 16-34, and Pfeiffer (n. 31 above) 107f. I have been unable to consult the article by G. Drioux, 'Geoffroi de La Roche,  v que de Langres, et la seconde croisade,' *Cahiers Hautmarnais* (1948) 166-72. On Arnulf in the Crusade, see Barlow, in Arnulf of Lisieux, *Letters* (n. 246 above) introduction xxv-vii.

²⁶⁰ John of Salisbury, *Hist. Pontif.* 55.

may in fact have held a limited legation for the French army and have been appointed on the suggestion of St. Bernard, since Godfrey was a former Prior of Clairvaux and Arnulf an ancient protégé of Bernard. Bishop Alvis of Arras seems also to have held a papal commission, for the historian of the monastery of Anchin says of him that 'by the order of the lord Pope Eugene (he was) made father and pastor of the entire army on the journey to Jerusalem.'²⁶¹ He died *en route*. Perhaps the Pope hoped to control the crusade through this plethora of legates.²⁶² The result, in fact, seems to have been disastrous confusion.

Eugene originally planned that Bishop Henry of Olmütz should accompany the army of Conrad III and in July, 1147, wrote to him that 'since we trust greatly in your affection and know that the policy of the King (Conrad III) depends greatly on your advice and opinion, we instruct Your Solitude that you strive in all ways to urge (and) to advise the King that he should labor for the honor and exaltation of his mother the Holy Roman Church and to unite the Church of Constantinople to her.'²⁶³ Conrad was brother-in-law to the Emperor Manuel, and Eugene clearly hoped that ecclesiastical union might be achieved by this means.²⁶⁴ This plan was, however, not so closely linked to the crusade in the mind of Eugene as it had been in the mind of Urban II.²⁶⁵ Perhaps, as Norden suggests, Eugene feared that by stressing the issue of ecclesiastical union he would supply fuel to the anti-Greek fires of the papal enemy Roger of Sicily, who might have attacked the Byzantine Empire on the pretext of serving Rome.²⁶⁶ In any case, when Henry of Olmütz decided to join the Wendish crusade, Eugene

²⁶¹ *Historia Monasterii Aquicinctini*, MGH SS 14.588.

²⁶² On the duties of these legates, see Schlée (n. 234 above) 19-23. Ohnsorge (n. 211 above) 380 suggests that they were sent at the desire of the Emperor Manuel, who in his letter of March, 1147, asked the Pope to send a Cardinal with the French army. The example of the First Crusade, moreover, established a precedent for appointing a legate for the crusading army.

²⁶³ JL 9095; PL 180.1251-2. It appears surprising that Eugene did not select for this purpose Anselm of Havelberg, who had in 1136 debated at Constantinople with Nicetas of Nicomedia concerning the union of the Churches: see Johannes Dräseke, 'Bischof Anselm von Havelberg und seine Gesandtschaftsreisen nach Byzanz,' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 21 (1900) 160-85; Louis Bréhier, 'Attempts at Reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches,' CMH 4 (1923) 600; and Georg Schreiber, 'Anselm von Havelberg und die Ostkirche,' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 60 (Dritte Folge 11; 1941) 357-62. Anselm had an exceptional understanding of the differences between the Greeks and the Latins. He met Eugene III at Tusculum in 1149 (not 1145, as in D'Achery, *Spicilegium* I 161) and wrote for the Pope his remarkable *Dialogorum libri III* about his discussions with Nicetas: D'Achery I 161-207; see Dräseke, *loc. cit.* 167f.

²⁶⁴ Walter Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz* (Berlin 1903) 77-82.

²⁶⁵ Gleber (n. 165 above) 36-7 and 58-9; Erdmann (n. 64 above) 299-301.

²⁶⁶ Norden 83-4.

does not seem to have entrusted this mission to anyone else.²⁶⁷ He wrote that he doubted if any progress could be made towards union by Conrad in Henry's absence; but he approved the Bishop's decision and asked him to send news of the progress of the Wendish crusade.²⁶⁸ The official legate to this campaign was, however, Anselm of Havelberg, whose duties for these armies were much the same as those of Theodwin and Guido for the armies of Conrad and Louis.²⁶⁹ The Pope also instructed Wibald of Stavelot to join this expedition.²⁷⁰ More perhaps than any of Eugene's explicit statements, these instructions to three prominent ecclesiastics are clear evidence of his interest in the Wendish Crusade and of his determination to bring it under ecclesiastical control and to turn it to religious ends.

The policy of Pope Eugene is therefore an essential clue to an understanding of the contemporary plan and theory of the Second Crusade. The sources examined in Section II reveal the underlying salvatory character of most of the expeditions of 1147-8 and show that in the minds of many contemporaries these campaigns were regarded as parts of a whole, a concerted effort against Islam and paganism by one Christian 'pilgrim army.' The sources and documents just discussed confirm this interpretation of the Second Crusade from another point of view. However narrow the concept and fortuitous the policy of Eugene III and the Curia in their origins and development, however much they made use of movements which originated outside the Church, it is clear that by the Spring of 1147 they viewed and planned the crusade not simply as one campaign against the Moslems in the Holy Land but as a general Christian offensive, and had incorporated into this plan practically every major military expedition against non-Christians of these years. The means of this incorporation was essentially the papal power of indulgence and remission of sins and penance, and this power was exercised through the instrumentality of papal bulls. In the crusading bulls of Eugene III the concept of the papal crusading indulgence was developed in its classic form, and around it there began to crystallize an institutional concept of temporal privileges and military regulations that exerted its influence on Christian thought throughout the Middle Ages.

²⁶⁷ Gleber 59; Norden 83.

²⁶⁸ JL 9110; PL 180.1262. Henry of Olmütz was one of the most important papalist bishops in the Empire: JL 9296 and 9325.

²⁶⁹ See p. 263 above.

²⁷⁰ See Appendix B.

IV. THE REACTION TO THE FAILURE

The disastrous defeats of the Christian army became known in the West probably before the end of 1147.²⁷¹ 'The lamenting rumor sounded within Gaul,' says Geoffrey of Auxerre,²⁷² and thus found its way into the annals and chronicles. Least successful of all was the great crusade to the Levant, where the Moslems were exultant,²⁷³ and on the failures there most of the chroniclers concentrate their attention.²⁷⁴

It has been seen earlier that in the writings of Odo of Deuil and Otto of Freising there are found two opposite explanations of the failure of the crusade in the East. The former presents rational reasons for the disasters — the hostility of the Greeks and Turks and the difficulties of the route²⁷⁵ — whereas the latter ascribes the failure purely to human sin and to the obscure workings of the ways of God. For the most part, the reactions of contemporaries lay somewhere between these natural and supernatural explanations.

Very few writers attributed this great Christian catastrophe entirely to inexplicable Divine Will. Such reasoning is an act of exceptional faith in any age; and it is not surprising that the two principal representatives of this supernatural position were Otto of Freising and Bernard of Clairvaux, both Cistercians and both men of great spiritual fortitude. The reaction of Otto has already been discussed.²⁷⁶ Although he suggests that perhaps the sins of men aroused God's anger, fundamentally he can find no reason for the failure of this enterprise, the product of the co-operation of the finest spirits in Christendom, other than the inscrutable but ever good Will of the Almighty.

On St. Bernard fell the brunt of the popular disappointment and disillusion at the failure of the crusade, in so far as this resentment fell on any one man. For the majority of Christians he had been the prime mover of these campaigns; many miracles, also, had seemed to confirm God's favor and interest

²⁷¹ Carried in letters and by deserters: see Bernhardt 643 and n. 27.

²⁷² *Bernardi ... Opera* (n. 175 above) II 2.2198.

²⁷³ *Notae Pisanae*, MGH SS 19.266: 'Unde gens paganorum magnam habuerunt baldansa et letitia, christiani tristia.' Cf. Kugler 212f.

²⁷⁴ The attitude of contemporaries to the failure of the crusade seems never to have been studied adequately. See the brief remarks, mostly on the reaction against the Cistercians, in Röhrich, *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.* (n. 183 above) 6. 555-6, and *Beiträge* (n. 9 above) II 79 and 102-3, nn. 90-1; Hirsch (n. 13 above) 55-6; Hauck (n. 129 above) IV 895-6; Cramer (n. 44 above) 46 and 53-4; Cartellieri (n. 37 above) 379-80; and the interesting study of Flahiff (n. 201 above) 162-79.

²⁷⁵ Odo, it is true, believed that God was with the expedition, the failure of which must be in accord with His inscrutable Will: cf. Odo of Deuil, ed. Berry xxvi; but he always concentrated on the human and natural causes of the calamities. The fact that he hoped for revenge on the Greeks shows that he did not regard the failure as a divine punishment.

²⁷⁶ See above, p. 220. Otto knew Bernard's *De Consideratione*: Otto of Freising, *Gesta* 93.

in his work.²⁷⁷ For this reason, as his friend and biographer Geoffrey says, 'either the simplicity or the malignity of certain men raised a great scandal against him because of his preaching of the journey to Jerusalem.' ²⁷⁸ Geoffrey goes on to emphasize, by way of excuse, that this preaching was undertaken only at the express command of the Pope and the urging of Louis VII.

Bernard himself however disdained such justifications as these in the two passages where he deals with this problem, in the letter to his uncle Andrew, a Templar, and at the beginning of the second book of his treatise *De consideratione*.²⁷⁹ Never for one instant did his complete faith in God and in himself as the instrument of God's will falter; and he gladly took on his own shoulders the blame. Citing Scripture at every turn, he emphasized that the ways of the Lord are indeed obscure and deep, and yet His judgments are always not only just but also merciful. This the history of mankind reveals. Again and again he repeats that God's promises can never compromise His righteousness. In so doing Bernard turns the tables on his critics and flings their reproaches back in their own teeth. Who are you, he seems to ask, of little faith, who dare to criticize what you cannot possibly understand? Yet, he says in his letter to Andrew, it is the supreme example of God's mercy and patience that He does not reject these impious men. 'You do well, comparing yourself to an ant,' he says, 'For what else than ants are we sons of men, born of the earth and sweating for useless and empty things? ... The reward of our warfare is not of (this) earth, not from below; its prize is far away and from the uttermost lands.' ²⁸⁰

This stern and uncompromising theory was, of course, strong meat, fit food for a St. Bernard or an Otto of Freising, also, perhaps, for Eugene III, whose letter of condolence to Conrad III²⁸¹ was clearly written under the influence of Bernard's ideas. For lesser spirits, however, it was indigestible; and other writers found various compromises by which they preserved their

²⁷⁷ On Bernard's miracles in connection with his crusading activity, see Hüffer (n. 167 above) 96-9.

²⁷⁸ *Bernardi ... Opera* II 2.2195-6; cf. the life by Alan, who says that 'quidam minus intelligentes scandalizati fuerunt,' *ibid.* 2464. See Pfeiffer (n. 31 above) 146-7, and Fechner (n. 170 above) 63.

²⁷⁹ Bern. ep. 288, coll. 493-4; *De consideratione*, tr. George Lewis (Oxford 1908) 37-41. Pfeiffer 148 suggests that Bernard's principal defense against this criticism was to throw the responsibility for the crusade onto Eugene III and Louis VII. This, perhaps, was his defense against the charge that he had, without authorization, preached the crusade (see Appendix A); but fundamentally, as he emphasizes in *De consideratione*, both the Pope and he himself obeyed a divine mandate in this matter. Rousset's assumption, *op. cit.* (n. 8 above) 159, that Bernard implicitly suggested that 'les croisés sont donc eux-mêmes la cause de leur défaite' is not justified by the text of *De consideratione*, nor, I believe, by the general tenor of Bernard's crusading thought. Cf. also Flahiff 164 n. 12.

²⁸⁰ Bern. ep. 288, col. 493.

²⁸¹ JL 9344; Otto of Freising, *Gesta* 94-5.

belief in the supernatural causes of the failure of the crusade without putting such a severe strain on their faith.

Among the most remarkable of these positions is that occupied by Gerhoh of Reichersberg and by the author of the *Annales Herbipolenses* (of Würzburg).²⁸² They in effect took the opposite viewpoint to that of St. Bernard and boldly asserted that the whole enterprise was from the start the work of the Devil. 'God permitted,' begins the account of the crusade in the *Annales Herbipolenses*, 'that the Western Church be afflicted, since its sins required (this punishment). Thereupon, certain pseudo-prophets were in power, sons of Belial, heads of Anti-Christ, who by stupid words misled the Christians and by empty preaching induced all sorts of men to go against the Saracens for the freeing of Jerusalem.'²⁸³ And they continue in this vein: the crusade was a revolt inspired by the Devil against the righteous punishment of God. Small wonder, therefore, that it ended in disastrous failure. Gerhoh of Reichersberg is less explicit, but he treats of the crusade under the general heading of *Libri tres de investigatione Antichristi*,²⁸⁴ in which he bitterly attacks the prevailing conditions in the Church of Rome.

Neither of these authors strictly maintains this attitude of utter condemnation. They include much purely descriptive material, often of considerable factual importance. These writers were not crabbed, ill-informed, or out-of-touch with the main line of development of crusading theory. Gerhoh was provost of an important monastery and in frequent correspondence with the Pope, with whom he was on excellent terms.²⁸⁵ The annalist of Würzburg incorporated valuable first-hand material into his account, since not only did he himself presumably witness the passage of the crusader armies through Würzburg, but he also specifically says that he met many returned soldiers who had been captured by the Turks in Asia Minor and

²⁸² Kugler 31-6; Manitius (n. 30 above) III 427.

²⁸³ *Ann. Herbipolenses*, MGH SS 16.3; cf. Hauck IV 896.

²⁸⁴ Gerhoh, ed. Scheibelberger (n. 163 above) 139-46 and 151-8, and in *Libelli de lite* 3.374-8 and 380-4. In some respects Gerhoh seems to have depended upon the *Ann. Herbipolenses*. See also his less virulent criticism of the crusade in his *Commentarius* (cited n. 151 above), Psalm 39 col. 794, and in the *Ann. Reicherspergensis*, MGH SS 17.461-4.

²⁸⁵ JL 8914: May 4, 1146 (*Germania Pontificia*, ed. Albert Brackmann I [Berlin 1911] Reichersberg no. 16, pp. 194-5) and JL 8922: May 16, 1146 (*ibid.* no. 17, pp. 195-6), where the Pope says to Gerhoh that, 'fervorem tuae religionis ex earum (litterarum) inspectione manifeste cognovimus ... et devotionem tuam in Domino collaudamus,' PL 180.1139; see Hüffer (n. 167 above) 201, and especially Konrad Sturmhöfel, 'Der geschichtliche Inhalt von Gerhohs von Reichersberg 1. Buche über die Erforschung des Antichrists,' *Jahresbericht der Thomasschule in Leipzig für das Schulfahr 1886-7* (Program no. 504, Leipzig 1887) part I p. 3. Sturmhöfel (11f.) carefully examines Gerhoh's account of the crusade and points out that in spite of his prejudice and frequent untrustworthiness, he includes some material presumably based upon eye-witness reports, although his real importance for the historian of the Second Crusade lies in his distinctive attitude.

later released.²⁸⁶ Nor were these two isolated in their attitude, of which they were only the most extreme examples.²⁸⁷ It should also be noted, however, that their point of view is not cynical and has none of the secular scepticism of the thirteenth century 'crusader's song':

Ire si vis ad sermonem
Cave, precor, Ciceronem
Ne per verbi rationem
Reddat crucis te prisonem.²⁸⁸

On the contrary, the explanation of the failure of the crusade advanced by Gerhoh and the Würzburg annalist was in its way no less boldly convinced or less spiritual than that of Bernard of Clairvaux.

It is interesting that Bernard seems never to have considered accompanying in person the crusading armies. When, during his preaching of a new crusade in 1150, at Chartres, he was almost elected general and leader of the expedition, Bernard wrote to the Pope, 'What (is) more remote from my profession, even if my strength were sufficient, even if the skill were not lacking?'²⁸⁹ It is probable, in fact, that Cistercian monks were forbidden by the General Chapter to join the crusade.²⁹⁰ These regulations were based upon a funda-

²⁸⁶ *Ann. Herbipolenses*, MGH SS 16.5. The Armenians seem to have been instrumental in ransoming crusaders taken prisoner by the Turks, see *Casus mon. Petrishusensis*, MGH SS 20.674; *De s. Ernesto Abbate Zwifaltensi*, AS 7 November, III 612 and 617; and the *Vetus de s. Ernesto documentum*, which I have been unable to consult but which is analyzed by Kugler 10.

²⁸⁷ See n. 278 above. Also in the First Crusade, Ekkehard reports, many people considered the enterprise vain and frivolous: cited by Runciman I 141 n. 2. It is perhaps to these that an anonymous author refers when he says of the failure of the crusade (PL 155.1098) that 'Gallia tota dolet, et ego, gens impia gaudet.' Cf. *Chron. Sancti Petri Erfordensis*, in *Monumenta Erphesfurtensia*, ed. O. Holder-Egger (MGH SS.r.G; Hannover 1899) 176; *Ann. Sancti Iacobi Leodiensis*, MGH SS 16.641. An interesting document, written according to Heinemann in 1147, bewails the sad state of the Church at this time when 'Satan ... tanta fortitudine catenas, quibus legatus est, concutit,' *Codex Diplomaticus Anhaltinus*, ed. Otto von Heinemann, I (936-1212; Dessau 1867-73) no. 336, pp. 252-4. In view of this evidence, Flahiff (n. 201 above) 165-6 perhaps overestimates the novelty of the opposition of Ralph Niger, writing in 1189, to the idea of crusading. Cf. n. 291 below.

²⁸⁸ H. Pflaum, 'A Strange Crusader's Song,' *Speculum* 10 (1935) 337-9. Since it is written in a thirteenth-century hand, I see no reason to agree with Cartellieri (n. 37 above) 343, that it applies to the Second Crusade. For anti-crusading songs in the vernacular, see Hauck, *op. cit.* 4.898.

²⁸⁹ Bern. ep. 256, col. 465.

²⁹⁰ Pfeiffer (n. 31 above) 8-10. In 1157, the General Chapter of the Cistercian Order decreed that monks 'qui de ordine exeunt ita ut Jerusalem eant vel aliam peregrinationem aliorum faciant ... sine omni personarum acceptione de domibus propriis amoti, mittantur in alias domos ordinis perpetuo numquam reversuri,' *ibid.* 8. That Cistercian monks in fact joined the Second Crusade does not affect the general validity of this order, which was fully in accord with medieval crusading theory. Urban II forbade monks'

mental Christian belief in the unimportance of wordly events and upon the Cistercian principle of strict abstention from the affairs of this world. With regard to pilgrimages this spirit was expressed by St. Augustine and many of the Greek fathers and found its *locus classicus* for the Middle Ages in Letter 58 of St. Jerome, who said that 'it is praiseworthy not to have been in Jerusalem but to have lived well for Jerusalem.'²⁹¹ Bernard himself expressed a similar idea in one of his letters concerning pilgrim-monks: 'The object of monks is to seek not the earthly but the heavenly Jerusalem; and this not by proceeding with (their) feet but by progressing with (their) affections.'²⁹² In this idea that the pilgrimage and the crusade — although perhaps in themselves pious and good works — offered many opportunities for sin and were the signs of a wrong orientation in a Christian's life, as well as in the idea of the crusade as a rebellion against God's punishment of the Church, lay, I think, the basis of the criticism of Gerhoh and the Würzburg annalist, who found here in addition an explanation of the failure of the crusade.

For other writers, however, there was an easier compromise. They preserved their belief that God had wrought this disaster, but to ease the strain on their faith they found an explanation for this divine punishment. Among the most exceptional of these writers was the Cistercian Abbot John of Casa-Maria, who in a letter to Bernard explained his view of the failure.²⁹³ He recognized that this was God's punishment on the crusaders, who had started piously but had turned into evil ways. The Lord, however, was not to be outdone by this: 'In order that His Providence in the ordering of it (the crusade) might not fail, He turned their wickedness into His mercy...' and decreed (here John makes use of an idea from the *City of God*) that 'the host of angels who had fallen were to be replaced by those who died there (in the Holy Land)';²⁹⁴ and since He had foreseen that the crusaders, although sin-

joining the First Crusade without the permission of their abbots (JL 5670); cf. Schlée (n. 234 above) 48-9; Flahiff 176-7; and Bridrey (n. 161 above) 50-1, who says that, 'quant aux moines, ils ne pourront jamais faire le vœu de croisade sans autorisation spéciale,' 51; and see also the letter of Innocent III to the Bishop of Troyes, PL 214.58-61, no. 69.

²⁹¹ *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*, ed. Isidor Hilberg I (CSEL 54; Vienna and Leipzig 1910) 529: 'non Hierosolymis fuisse, sed Hierosolymis bene vixisse laudandum est.' Augustine, ep. 78, PL 33.268-9; *Contra Faustum* 20.21, PL 42.384-5. Gregory of Nyssa and Chrysostom, quoted by Bernhard Koetting, *Peregrinatio Religiosa* (Forschungen zur Volkskunde 33-5; Regensburg and Münster 1950) 422-4. See the quotations in Pierre Mandonnet, *Saint Dominique*, edd. M. H. Vicaire and R. Ladner II (Paris 1937) 25 n. 66; van Cauwenbergh (n. 142 above) 16; Koetting 421-6 (bibliography on p. 426 n. 21); Runciman I 40 n. 1. Even the author of the *De imitatione Christi* wrote that, 'qui nimum peregrinatur, raro sanctificatur,' 1.23.4.

²⁹² Bern. ep. 399, col. 612.

²⁹³ Bern. ep. 386, coll. 590-1.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.* col. 590. Cf. Augustine, *De civ. dei* 22. 1; *Enchiridion* 29.

ful, would be redeemed in this way, He had granted to Bernard 'the grace of preaching and laboring in this matter.'²⁹⁵ This remarkable intelligence, John says, came to him in a vision from St. John and St. Paul; and it was in any case an ingenious explanation to reassure the Abbot of Clairvaux of his divine mandate to preach the crusade.

Other writers did not go so far. They merely saw the failure as a punishment for the sins of the crusaders. Henry of Huntingdon, who died in 1155, is typical of this attitude. He says of the crusaders that 'their incontinence, which they practised in open fornications, and even in adulteries, ... and finally in robbery and all sorts of evils, came up before the sight of God... Who withdrew his favor from the armies, which consequently were defeated.' 'At the same time,' however, he continues, referring to the expedition to Lisbon, 'a certain naval force not of powerful men and trusting in no great leader other than Almighty God, since they set forth humbly, prospered greatly.'²⁹⁶ This general attitude was shared by many contemporaries, including the Würzburg annalist and especially Gerhoh of Reichersberg, who naturally maintained that nothing good could be done on the crusade.²⁹⁷

This explanation of the failure depended on the idea that the grace of God, originally with the armies, was withdrawn on account of His anger at the sins of the crusaders, who were thus left without defence in a bitterly hostile environment.²⁹⁸ This view is paralleled on the positive side in the Dialogue of the monk William of St. Denis, who attributed the individual survivals of Louis VII and certain other crusaders to the fact that divine grace was always with them.²⁹⁹

Most contemporaries, however, found no need to see the disasters of the Second Crusade in the light of a supernatural explanation. They were content with the natural causes, without troubling themselves with the problem

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.* See Rousset (n. 8 above) 168 on this letter, which shows the influence of Bernard's thought. Cf. Geoffrey of Auxerre, in *Bernardi ... Opera* (n. 175 above) II 2.2196: 'Quod si placuit Deo tali occasione plurimorum eripere, si non Orientalium corpora a paganis, Occidentalium animas a peccatis.'

²⁹⁶ Henry of Huntingdon, *Hist. Angl.* (n. 9 above) 280-1.

²⁹⁷ Robert of Torigny, *Chron.* (n. 6 above) 154; Vincent of Prague, *Ann.* MGH SS 17.663; *Gisleberti Chron. Hanoniense*, MGH SS 21.516; *Vita Ludovici VII*, RHGF 12.286; *Continuatio Gemblacensis* (Sigeberti), MGH SS 6.390: '... quia in hostico illo multa scelera, multa illicita et flagitiosa patrata sunt ab eis, et ob hoc ira Dei ascendente super eos, omnis conatus eorum in vacuum cessit'; *Casus mon. Petrishusensis*, MGH SS 20.674; William of Newburgh, *Historia Anglicana*, in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen*, etc. ed. Richard Howlett (Rolls Series 82; London 1884-5) I 66. Cf. also *Ann. Rodenses*, MGH SS 16.719.

²⁹⁸ See n. 297 above. Cf. *Ex anonymo Blandinensi Appendicula ad Sigebertum usque in annum 1152*, RHGF 14.20: 'Sed eorum conatus fuit inanis, quia Deus non erat cum eis.'

²⁹⁹ William of St. Denis, *Dialogue* (n. 130 above) 105-6 and 109: '... Domini gratia, que, famulum suum indesinenter protegens, comes individua euntem et precedebat et subsequuta est,' 106.

of why God allowed these to overwhelm the crusade. Among these writers are found some who emphasized non-human factors and others who emphasized primarily human actions; and in this latter group there are those who blamed men other than the crusaders and those who blamed the crusaders themselves.

Nearly all the sources on the Second Crusade mention at some point or other the difficulties encountered by the crusaders: the bad weather, the floods, the impassable rivers and mountains, the disease, and above all, the lack of food and water. They are too many to specify, but Odo of Deuil mentions most of them.³⁰⁰ A special group among these writers connected these natural phenomena, especially the floods and famines, with signs and portents such as comets and an eclipse of the moon.³⁰¹ Others were inclined to see in them — as indeed in the entire outcome of the crusade — the fulfilment of biblical or popular prophecies.³⁰² This was representative of the inability of these writers to see any event or circumstance in entirely naturalistic terms.

Most of the sources mention the attacks of the Saracens as one cause of the catastrophe. More interesting than these are the writers who believed that certain groups of Christians, themselves not crusaders, contributed to the defeats. The most obvious and important among these were the Greeks, whose treachery and perfidy appear constantly in the work of Odo of Deuil. Although few were as extreme in their criticism as he was, a large number of contemporaries clearly believed that the Greeks were responsible for the misfortune of the crusading armies in Asia Minor.³⁰³ Modern historians,

³⁰⁰ Cf. the poetic lament over the failure, composed ca. 1150 according to the authors of the *Histoire littéraire* (n. 106 above) 13.88-90, in PL 155.1095-8. The *Historia Welforum Weingartensis*, MGH SS 21.468, mentions the 'ciborum insolentia.' Cf. the somewhat later Lambert of Ardres, *Historia*, MGH SS 24.633-4: 'Multi enim fame, multi aeris inclementia, multi adversantium insidiis et ictibus, multi invaliditudine corporis, multi qualicumque infirmitate correpti, interierunt. Inter quos et pater meus non, ut mentiuntur quidam, fame deperiit, sed invaliditudine corporis debilitatus et totis viribus destitutus, morti succubuit.'

³⁰¹ *Ann. Magdeburgenses* MGH SS 16.188; *Ann. Palidenses*, *ibid.* 83; *Chron. Ekkehardi Continuatio brevis*, in *Monumenta Erphesfurtensia* (n. 287 above) 70; Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *De invest. Antichr.* (n. 163 above), in *Libelli de lite* 3.383; Helmold of Bosau, *Chron. Slav.* (n. 50 above) 116: 'Multa vero portenta visa sunt in exercitu illis diebus, futurae cladis demonstrativa.'

³⁰² *Ann. Sancti Iacobi Leodiensis*, MGH SS 16.641; *Chron. Sancti Petri Erfordensis* 176; Geoffrey of Vigeois, *Chron.* (n. 9 above) 306. The Sibylline prophecies for 1147 appear in Otto of Freising and several other twelfth-century sources: see W. von Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit IV: Staufer und Welfen* (2nd ed.; Leipzig 1877) 502 and 505-6.

³⁰³ Röhrich (n. 9 above) II 79 is hardly correct in saying that, 'nur wenige Stimmen luden dem griechischen Kaiser die Schuld auf.'

basing their interpretation on that of Odo, have perhaps placed too much emphasis on this attitude. Otto of Freising and Conrad III, who were both in a position to know, make no reference to Greek treachery and, in fact, speak of the Emperor Manuel in the warmest terms. This point of view was not uncommon among the German writers; and it may indeed represent an actual difference in the treatment of the German and French troops by the Greeks. The *Annales Palidenses* tell of Manuel's care of Conrad during his illness in the winter of 1147-8;³⁰⁴ Helmold shows the Greek Emperor sadly contemplating the crusaders' rash determination to march across Asia Minor;³⁰⁵ the Würzburg annalist put into Manuel's mouth a long speech explaining to Conrad the difficulties and dangers of a march to Iconium and urging him to proceed directly to Jerusalem with a small picked force. Even when Conrad persisted in his original decision, this annalist says, Manuel assisted him in all ways, with arms and supplies, both before and after the terrible expedition into Anatolia. Nowhere does he mention treachery, even though his account was partly based upon the reports of released prisoners, who might well have felt bitter towards the Greeks.³⁰⁶ In any case, this evidence definitely shows that all Western Europe did not believe that the Greeks had betrayed the crusade.³⁰⁷

There was a more widespread unanimity of opinion that the siege of Damascus was betrayed in some way by the Latin inhabitants of the Holy Land. Conrad III stated this for a fact; and he and the other sources leave doubt only over the question of whether this treason was committed by the King of Jerusalem, the Templars, or the Princes of Syria.³⁰⁸ There is no clear definition of the exact nature of the treachery; it may in fact have been honest but exceedingly unwise advice. The Westerners, however, had little doubt that Damascene money entered into the matter somewhere. Gerhoh of Reichersberg fully exploited this situation. He believed that the guilt lay with the Jerusalemites, not only for the failure of the siege but for the disaster of the entire crusade. With the voice of an avenging prophet he thundered against them. Avarice alone, he says, moved them to call on the West for assistance; they desired not peace but 'almost solely the acceptance of money, whether from the offerings of the pilgrims or from the re-

³⁰⁴ *Ann. Palidenses*, MGH SS 16.83: 'Rex Grece Conradum regem valida infirmitate detentum summa fecit curare diligentia, nisus per hoc expiari adnotata sibi circa Teutonicos malivolentia.'

³⁰⁵ Helmold of Bosau, *Chron. Slav.* 120.

³⁰⁶ *Ann. Herbipolenses*, MGH SS 16.4-5.

³⁰⁷ Cf., among modern historians, Ferdinand Chalandon, *Les Comnène* II (Paris 1912) 286-8; Vasiliev (n. 53 above) 420; Cartellieri (n. 37 above) 357f.

³⁰⁸ For a list of these sources, see Röhrich II 101 n. 76, and Bernhardt 675 n. 37. Cf. Cartellieri 363.

demption of the besieged.' ³⁰⁹ And with scornful satisfaction he recorded the irony with which most of the treason 'gold' turned out to be copper.

Finally, there are a few writers who attributed the failure of the crusade to the mistakes and blundering of the crusaders themselves. Needless to say, Gerhoh of Reichersberg and the *Annales Herbipolenses* figure among these. The Würzburg annalist, in the passage quoted above, acutely discerned the unruly members in the makeup of the crusading armies; he sharply criticized Conrad for his rejection of Manuel's wise advice, and in several other places condemned the general management and leadership of the crusade. The author of the *Chronicon Mauriniacense* blamed the lack of discretion and experience of Louis VII,³¹⁰ the annalist of Egmond specified the error in the choice of route as one reason for the failure of the armies,³¹¹ and an Angevin writer said, 'I think that the misfortune resulted from the deliberate arrogance of the French.'³¹² Odo of Deuil himself spoke of the 'stupid pride of our people.'³¹³ Geoffrey of Vigeois bitterly condemned the lack of ecclesiastical contributions towards the expenses of the crusade.³¹⁴ For the Wendish Crusade, also, Vincent of Prague attributed the failure to the material motives of the Saxon princes.³¹⁵

The most damning criticism of the leaders of the crusade came from the pen of John of Salisbury in his *Historia Pontificalis*, where he says that he has written 'nothing except what I knew to be true by sight or hearing or what was confirmed by the writings and authority of trustworthy men.'³¹⁶ These sources were certainly of the very highest authority; his material on the Second Crusade, which corresponds to no other known source material, may have come from the legate Cardinal Guido or from some companions of Louis VII, the Count of Flanders, or the Count of Champagne,³¹⁷ with all of whom John was on familiar terms. He was in addition a man of exceptional wisdom, experience, and moderation, to whose judgments careful consideration must be given. His contribution to the factual knowledge of the crusade

³⁰⁹ Gerhoh of Reichersberg, in *Libelli de lite* 3.377.

³¹⁰ RHGF 12.88. Louis seems in part to have blamed himself for the failure: RHGF 15.495-6.

³¹¹ *Ann. Egmundani*, MGH SS 16.456.

³¹² *Liber de compositione Castri Ambaziae*, in *Chroniques des Comtes d'Anjou*, edd. Louis Halphen and René Poupardin (Collection de textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'histoire; Paris 1913) 24. The principal part of this work goes to 1137 and is of no historical value (see intro. xlvii-lvi); an account of the Second Crusade is the only entry after 1137 (*ibid.* lv n. 3) and appears to be contemporary.

³¹³ Odo of Deuil, *De prof. Ludov.* ed. Berry 22.

³¹⁴ Geoffrey of Vigeois, *Chron.* 306.

³¹⁵ Vincent of Prague, *Ann.*, MGH SS 17.663.

³¹⁶ John of Salisbury, *Hist. Pontif.* (n. 248 above) 4.

³¹⁷ R. L. Poole, intro. to John of Salisbury, xxv. The sections on the Second Crusade are: ch. 5, pp. 12-3, and chs. 23-6, pp. 52-61.

is unfortunately slight, although of some value for the events in Syria and the Holy Land in 1148.³¹⁸ John's great gift as an historian was his ability to estimate the influence of personalities on events; and his characterizations of Louis VII, Theoderic of Flanders, Arnulf of Lisieux, Godfrey of Langres, and the two papal legates are full of interest and life. It is therefore of particular importance that his account of the crusade consists principally of a bitter attack on its leadership. He gives a fascinating picture of the quarrels between the legates and between the spiritual and temporal lords and of the crippling rivalry between the French and German armies. He at least clearly believed that incompetence and internal tensions were the primary reasons for the failure.

It is interesting to compare this point of view with that of a close personal friend of John of Salisbury, Pope Adrian IV. Writing to Louis VII in 1159, he cautioned him against rashly undertaking a crusade against the Moors in Spain.

'For Your Excellency ought to recollect,' he says, '... how on that other occasion, when Conrad of good memory, previously King of the Romans, and you yourself undertook the journey to Jerusalem without caution, you did not receive the expected result and hoped-for profit; and (you should remember) how great a disaster and cost resulted therefrom to the Church of God and to almost the entire Christian people. And the Holy Roman Church, since she had given you advice and support in this matter, was not a little weakened by this; and everyone cried out against her in great indignation, saying that she was the author of so great a peril.' ³¹⁹

It is significant that this gloomy view of the crusade was found among most of its principal planners. Already by August, 1149, Eugene III spoke of Louis' return as 'to the light out of the darkness' ³²⁰ and later, in a letter to Suger, he called the crusade 'the severe disaster of the Christian name which the Church of God has suffered in our times.' ³²¹ Bernard himself never for one moment minimized the magnitude of this disaster, of which he said, 'We all know that the judgments of God are true; but this judgment is so deep that I could almost justify myself for calling him blessed who is not offended thereat.' ³²²

The most convincing evidence, however, of the disillusionment and discouragement which followed the failure of the Second Crusade is found not

³¹⁸ *Ibid.* xxvi; Kugler 13-20.

³¹⁹ JL 10546; PL 188.1615. See Defourneaux (n. 69 above) 172f.

³²⁰ JL 9347; PL 180.1396. Cf. Bernard, who in his ep. 377 to Suger speaks of Louis' presence on the crusade as an 'exile': col. 582.

³²¹ JL 9385; PL 180.1414. Cf. JL 9398 (*ibid.* 1419) and *Continuatio Aquicinctina* (Sigeberti), MGH SS 6.406: 'Numquam audita tanta infelicitate corporali Christiani exercitus.'

³²² Bernard, *De consideratione* (n. 279 above) 38.

in the literary sources but in the poor response which greeted the efforts of Bernard and Suger to organize a new expedition for the relief of the Holy Land in 1150³²³ and in the reduced number of new Cistercian monasteries established after 1147.³²⁴ These facts exemplify the widespread reaction against crusading in general and against the Cistercians in particular.

The form and depth of this reaction must be judged in relation to the hope and enthusiasm with which these campaigns had been conceived. The Second Crusade, to a far greater extent than the First, won the support of the ecclesiastical and secular authorities of Europe. Championed by the most powerful princes and inspired by the most persuasive spiritual leader of the century, it appeared to men as divinely predestined to victory. It aroused soldiers on every frontier of western Christendom and incorporated them under the common cross of pilgrimage. The formal origin of this idea and its development into a grandiose scheme of Christian defence and expansion may be found in the letters of Eugene III and St. Bernard. The wider influence of this plan, the roots of contemporary crusading thought, and the more popular attitudes towards the crusade have been seen in chronicles and documents. Upon such subjects, literary sources are by their nature unable to give entirely satisfactory evidence, and the conclusions drawn from them should be considered in part as hypotheses, to be amplified and modified by future research. In certain directions, however, their evidence is impressive and points towards a revised interpretation of the Second Crusade, in its widest sense, and of the place it occupies in the history of the crusades.

APPENDIX A

St. Bernard's Preaching of the Second Crusade

In the medieval as in the modern Church the right of preaching was strictly subject to the bishop's control and might not be exercised by the lower clergy without the authorization (*missio*) either of the diocesan bishop or of the universal ordinary, the Pope.¹ So in the eleventh century the Abbot of Fulda

³²³ Vacandard (n. 174 above) II 442-50; Pfeiffer (n. 31 above) 149.

³²⁴ See Janaschek (n. 177 above) I 287f. Franz Winter, *Die Cistercienser des nord-östlichen Deutschlands* I (Gotha 1868) 56, says: 'Jener verunglückte Kreuzzug von 1147 hat dem heiligen Bernard in den Augen der Sachsen seinen Heiligenschein genommen und seinem Orden unter ihnen einen mehr als zwanzigjährigen Stillstand auferlegt.' But this is too extreme, cf. Pfeiffer 145. Certainly 1147 was the peak year, after which there was a sharp reduction in the number of new houses; but the falling off in the middle and late 1150's was presumably largely owing to the death of St. Bernard and to the stringent restriction on the foundation of new abbeys enacted by the General Chapter in 1152: see *Statuta capitulorum generalium ordinis Cisterciensis*, ed. J.-M. Canivez, I (Bibliothèque de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique 9; Louvain 1933) 45.

¹ R. Ladner, 'L'Ordo Praedicatorum avant l'Ordre des Prêcheurs,' in Pierre Man-

enjoyed the right to preach as a special privilege from Leo IX.² When in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries an increasing number of monks took holy orders and claimed this right, 'il s'éleva dans les rangs du clergé séculier et jusque dans les cloîtres eux-mêmes des voix qui voulaient interdire au moine toute espèce d'activité pastorale et surtout la prédication.'³ Nor was this attitude surprising in view of the widespread disorganization and ignorance of the clergy and the grave danger of the spread of heresy through unauthorized preaching.⁴

Although a few voices were raised in favor of the right of an ordained (and even of a lay) monk to preach,⁵ many twelfth-century theologians agreed with Jerome that 'monachus autem non doctoris habet, sed plangentis officium.'⁶ Under the heading, 'Nullus monachus preter Domini sacerdotes audeat predicare,' Gratian wrote:

Monachi autem, et si in dedicatione sui presbiteratus (sicut et ceteri sacerdotes) predicandi, baptizandi, penitentiam dandi, peccata remittendi, beneficiis ecclesiasticis perfruendi rite potestatem accipiunt, ut amplius et perfectius agant ea, que sacerdotalis officii esse sanctorum Patrum constitutionibus conprobantur: tamen executionem suae potestatis non habent, nisi a populo fuerint electi, et ab episcopo cum consensu abbatis ordinati.⁷

Bernard himself made use of the familiar quotation, 'Monachus predicare non audeat quantaecumque scientiae sit.'⁸ The General Chapter of the Cistercian Order in 1199 refused to undertake the preaching of the Fourth Crusade because, as Ladner puts it, 'une telle activité ... ne répondait pas à la fonction de l'Ordre.'⁹ In 1212, indeed, the Chapter decreed that, 'De monacho Prulliacensi nuncupato Petro heremita praecipitur ut in instanti revocetur a praedicatione Albigenis, nec ipse nec alius aliquis sine licentia Capituli generalis de cetero praedicationis officium audeat usurpare.'¹⁰

It does not therefore appear surprising that Bernard was unwilling to preach the crusade without the authorization of the Pope. It is for this reason, I think, that in his writings about the crusade he emphasized that in its preaching he acted purely as a papal delegate. This was not an effort to escape the responsibility for the failure of the crusade — that, he always held, lay with God — but to defend himself against the charge that he had never been duly commissioned to preach the crusade.¹¹ Only thirty years before, in 1118, a

donnet, *Saint Dominique* (Paris 1937) II 13: 'Qui prêchait sans délégation ni permission était dès l'abord classé comme hérétique,' *ibid.* 15; cf. 28-9.

² PL 143.610.

³ Ladner 24-5.

⁴ *Ibid.* 15-24.

⁵ *Ibid.* 25-6.

⁶ Quoted *ibid.* 25, cf. n. 68.

⁷ *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, ed. Emil Friedberg (*Corpus Iuris Canonici* I; Leipzig 1879), Dictum post c. 19, C. XVI, q. 1 (coll. 765-6).

⁸ *Sermo* 64 in *Cantic.*, PL 183.1085.

⁹ Ladner 40.

¹⁰ *Statuta Cap. Gen. Ord. Cist.* ed. J.-M. Canivez (Louvain 1933) I 1212: cited by Ladner 25 n. 66.

¹¹ As early as 1146 he wrote to the Pope saying that, 'Mandastis et obediivi,' ep. 247, PL 182.447.

council at Fritzlar had condemned Norbert of Xanten for preaching without authorization and had compelled him to suspend his activity until he was accorded special permission as an 'apostolic preacher' by Gelasius II.¹² Bernard presumably desired to obtain a similar general delegation before he undertook the preaching of the crusade.

APPENDIX B

Eugene III and German Participation in the Second Crusade

Eugene probably received the news of Conrad's decision not long after Christmas, 1146, and he sent back Cardinal Bishop Theodwin¹ with the letter mentioned above.² Theodwin reached Frankfurt in mid-March,³ and soon after Conrad sent Bishops Buco of Worms and Anselm of Havelberg and Abbot Wibald of Stavelot, who met Eugene at Dijon on March 30. They brought two letters to the Pope from Conrad,⁴ who in one requested Eugene to confirm Wibald's election as Abbot of Corbie and in the other announced that he had received the papal letter and had called a diet at Frankfurt,⁵ where his young son Henry had been chosen to rule in Conrad's absence. He expressed regret that he had taken the cross without Eugene's permission but assured him that this action was prompted by true love. He also invited Eugene to visit Germany. The selection of the young Henry as regent may have been suggested as a conciliatory move by the Cardinal Theodwin, since this appointment was certainly more pleasing to the Curia than that of the other possible candidate, Archbishop Henry of Mainz.⁶

Wibald describes the meeting with the Pope at Dijon in his letters 35 and 180.⁷ The legates were well received by Eugene, he says: 'tunc enim iniunxit nobis in virtute obedientiae et in remissione peccatorum nostrorum, ut ad debellandos christiani nominis hostes ac Dei aecclesiae vastatores trans Albim super paganos militarem: cum tamen sciret, hoc nequaquam a nobis posse fieri, nisi ex Corbelensis aecclesiae expensa et milicia.'⁸ This is quite explicit and sounds very much like a personal injunction to the imperial legates, and the later appearance of Anselm and Wibald on the Wendish Crusade supports this view.⁹ It seems impossible that this passage refers to *Divina*

¹² Ladner 36-7; a similar privilege had been granted to Robert d'Arbrisselles and others, *ibid.* 33-6.

¹ Brixius (n. 243 above) 47; on Theodwin's many legations to Germany, see Hauck (n. 219 above) IV 161.

² See n. 217 above.

³ Bachmann (n. 257 above) 78; Gleber (n. 165 above) 54.

⁴ *Monumenta Corbelensia* (n. 25 above) nos. 33 (pp. 111-2) and 34 (pp. 112-3); see Zatschek (n. 217 above) 324-5.

⁵ Bernhardt 545f.; Zatschek 455-6.

⁶ Gleber (n. 165 above) 54-5.

⁷ *Monumenta Corbelensia* 114 and 242-3; see Zatschek 325 and 353-5, and Ludwig Mann, *Wibald, Abt von Stablo und Corvey, nach seiner politischen Thätigkeit* (Halle 1875) 32f.

⁸ *Monumenta Corbelensia* 243; cf. Mann 32-3.

⁹ On Wibald's somewhat brief participation in the crusade, see Joseph Bastin, *Wibald, Abbé de Stavelot et Malmédy, du Mont-Cassin et de Corbie* (Verviers 1931) 44-5. On Anselm, cf. n. 263 above.

dispensatione (II). The terms are somewhat different, and there is no reason to believe that the envoys were with Eugene as late as April 11 at Troyes. They probably returned at once, accompanied by the papal chancellor, Cardinal deacon Guido of Saints Cosmas and Damian,¹⁰ with the papal reply, to Conrad at the diet of Strasbourg, April 18, 1147.¹¹ In this case, furthermore, Eugene could have appointed Anselm of Havelberg legate only during their meeting at Dijon.

It was probably, therefore, at this time that the envoys presented the idea of the Wendish Crusade to the Pope, who immediately endorsed it by his appointment of Anselm and his injunction to Wibald. He then proceeded to Clairvaux, discussed the matter with Bernard, and issued *Divina dispensatione* (II). There is, as Gleber points out,¹² no reason to agree with Cosack¹³ that Eugene remained angry with Conrad or that there was any split between the Pope on one side and Conrad and Bernard on the other over this matter of German participation in the crusade. Nor does there appear to be any basis for Zatschek's opinion that the Pope's displeasure with Conrad was responsible for his delay in the confirmation of Wibald as Abbot of Corbie.¹⁴ Eugene knew that it was impossible to force Conrad back on his vow and after March 30 probably welcomed the idea of a diversion of German troops against the Slavs.¹⁵

Harvard University.

¹⁰ Brixius 43.

¹¹ Bachmann 79-80.

¹² Gleber 56-8.

¹³ Cosack (n. 167 above) 290f.

¹⁴ Zatschek, *loc. cit.* 325. Eugene's objections to the confirmation of Wibald were presumably based upon (a) the dubious canonicity of the election, against which the deposed Abbot Henry of Nordheim had already appealed to Rome, and (b) Wibald's pluralism: he was already Abbot of Stavelot and Malmedy and ex-Abbot of Monte Cassino. See Mann 32; and Bastin 36f., who says that 'Eugène III fut d'ailleurs bientôt rassuré sur la régularité de l'élection. Une délégation de moines corbiens lui en porta la preuve à Meaux et il prit dès lors l'abbaye et son supérieur sous sa protection spéciale,' 42.

¹⁵ Cf. his letter to Henry of Olmütz, JL 9110, p. 265 above.