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CHAPTER I

DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM

The crusades were one of the most romantic episodes in Western history. Their participants have been the subject of epic poems, chivalric romances, and even modern adventure novels. They have also been a favorite subject with historians down through the ages. Scholars have written about such diverse things as the rate of march of crusading armies, the legal theory of kingship in the kingdom of Jerusalem, and the nature of the crusading vow. Yet they have neglected the intellectual history of the crusading movement. How did the Christian of the Middle Ages justify killing in the name of the Prince of Peace? What led them to think that God would approve their actions? Did the leaders of these expeditions have firmly set practical objectives in mind when they embarked? These are questions that have not been fully answered.

I plan to examine the writings of the clerics who were prominent supporters of the crusades in order to determine exactly how they justified armed expeditions to the Holy Land. I also hope to see what practical plans the leaders of these expeditions had in mind before they departed, and to determine what their clerical supporters hoped to gain by promoting such adventures. To narrow the scope of this paper to manageable proportions, I propose to limit myself to a discussion of the second and third crusades. On
the basis of the evidence, I will suggest that a marked shift in emphasis from the ideal to the practical occurred after the second crusade.

Modern historians have approached this subject from several different perspectives. James Brundage in his book *Medieval Canon Law and the Crusader* looks at how theologians defined a crusader's legal status and his obligations. Palmer Throop in his book entitled *Criticism of the Crusade, A Study of Public Opinion and Crusade Propaganda* discusses arguments current in the thirteenth century both for and against the crusades. Throop does not confine his study to just one particular social group. Instead, he tries to cover as many different social groups as possible. Giles Constable, in his article *The Second Crusade as seen by Contemporaries*, brings out the fact that after the second crusade failed, criticism of the crusade and of those who promoted it became widespread.

Some historians have chosen to focus on the first crusade. Carl Erdmann in *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade* treats of how the idea of crusade came to exist in the minds of the men of Western Europe in the eleventh century. Paul Alphandery with A. Dumont wrote about the popular notions of the first crusade held by the average crusader in his book *La Chrétiene et L'idée de Croisade*. Alphandery does say something about the second crusade though the book is primarily concerned with the first expedition. Still another important modern work on the idea of crusade is *The Formation of the Crusade Idea* by E. O. Blake.
Here, Blake reviews the ideas of earlier writers on the crusading ideal particularly Erdmann and Alphandery. Perhaps one more historian should be mentioned. Paul Rousset has contributed to the understanding of what the first crusade was about in his book *Les Origines et Les Caractères de La Première Croisade*.

Though all these works talk about the idea of crusade and tell us what some contemporaries thought about it, none of them tells us specifically how the clergy justified killing in the name of the Prince of Peace. Throop, for instance, tells us how the papacy in the thirteenth century used different types of propaganda to promote a crusading zeal among the general populace, but he does not address himself to the question of how the papacy justified issuing such propaganda in the first place. Alphandery deals with ideas in the popular consciousness and not with ideas among the clergy. Erdmann outlines the process by which the Germanic ethic of a warrior society was harmonized with Christian notions of peace, but he neglects to set out for us the intellectual conclusions on which this synthesis took place.

Brundage restricts himself to discussions of canon law. Again, like Throop, he defines the views of men on a subject which is never formally questioned. Though canon law may tell us how the term crusader was legally defined at any given period, it does not tell us how anyone justified being a crusader in the first place. Constable concerns himself with the criticism of the second crusade that arose after that crusade's ignominous failure. Though he points out that many different groups had recognized
the futility of the second crusade and together had resisted St. Bernard’s call for another expedition, he does not specifically answer the question of how the clergy justified the crusade in the first place. Both Rousset and Blake fall short of the mark for the same reasons. They do not discuss the clergy with respect to their problem of justifying a military expedition in the name of Christ.

My paper will focus specifically on this topic neglected by the authors cited above. It will attempt to show how the leaders of the second and third crusades justified sending their expeditions, and then what they hoped these expeditions would accomplish. I believe that such a study clearly shows that the men of the second crusade were far more idealistic in what they hoped the crusade would accomplish and less practical in the actual planning of the expedition than their grandchildren who participated in the third crusade.
CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND

Since the clergy who promoted the second and third crusades had access to the ideas of their predecessors who had gone on the first expedition, it is necessary to take a look at the heritage left by these earlier writers. The origin of the idea of crusade has been discussed in several books—some of which have already been mentioned. Of these, perhaps the best is Carl Erdmann's *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*. Erdmann maintains that the idea of crusade arose out of the conflict between the ideals of the early church and Germanic ethics. The early church had taught an ethic of peace and humility which contrasted with the war-oriented ethic of the German warrior class. These two ethical systems came into conflict when the Germanic Peoples of late antiquity moved into the Christian Roman Empire. From this intermingling arose a synthesis which justified the use of violence under certain circumstances. This synthesis then underwent a series of evolutionary changes until by the late eleventh century it had become sufficiently developed to justify the launching of a crusade. Erdmann states that the first written works which try to formally discuss this synthesis appear in the ninth century. He points out several steps in the eleventh century that directly lead to the first crusade: with the reformed papacy of Leo IX (1049-1054), the church began to make alliances with secular rulers; for example, the pope giving
his blessings to the Norman forces before the battle of Hastings. Erdmann has also studied papal banners and the use to which such banners have been put. He points out that over the centuries these banners changed in use from being simply the flag of the pope to being his battle standard. In summary, Erdmann claims that the idea of the Christian knight in the service of the church is a harmonization of the anti-war/peace ethic of the early church with the war ethic of the German warrior class.

This explanation alone, if true, helps explain the origin of the ideal of a Christian warrior as he is portrayed in such works as the Song of Roland, but not how or why such a warrior came to be a reality. It has been suggested that the first crusade was the result of the Church trying to direct and make good use of something that it could not eliminate. The feudal nobility was going to fight no matter what, so the church tried to channel its violent energy into something constructive. Such a view holds that the Peace of God movement sponsored by Cluny in the tenth century was essentially a failure. Regardless of what actually precipitated the first crusade, Erdmann believes that the idea of crusade was in the minds of the men of Europe before the speech of Urban at Clermont in 1095. In the ninth century, Franks who died defending Rome had been considered martyrs. Early in the eleventh century, spiritual privileges had been offered by Leo IX to those who would take apart in the Reconquista of Spain. Gregory VII had also talked of sending an expedition to the East both to protect
pilgrims and to reunite the Eastern and Western Churches. The idea of a crusade did not magically appear in 1095.10

Did the participants of the first crusade consider themselves primarily soldiers? In theory, no. They called themselves pilgrims, Jerusalem being their destination. Those crusaders who stayed behind after the conquests of Edessa and Antioch were continually pressured to fulfill their vow to visit Jerusalem. When Count Stephen of Blois returned home before reaching the Holy City, he was so criticized by everyone, including his wife, that he was forced to return to the Holy Land from which he was never to return. This idea of crusader as pilgrim predominated in the early crusades. In fact, there was no special appellation for crusader until the thirteenth century.11

If the crusaders considered themselves pilgrims, then it seems appropriate to discuss some of the background of the idea of pilgrimage. A pilgrimage may be defined as a journey to a sacred shrine of relic by a person seeking a larger personal fulfillment of his religion.12 The especial holiness of this sacred shrine or relic was supposed to strengthen the pilgrim's spiritual life or perhaps perform a miracle for him. According to James Brundage, the idea of a pilgrimage as an ascetical religious practice is partially derived from the New Testament picture of a man as a wanderer on earth striving for his heavenly home.13 Pilgrimages had been undertaken in the early church even though some of the Church Fathers, as Augustine and Jerome, had spoken out against them, claiming that it was better to seek the heavenly Jerusalem.
in one's own heart. The Fathers even listed many dangers that the pilgrims would needlessly have to face. Nevertheless, there remained a steady stream of travelers to the Holy Land throughout the Middle Ages. By the eleventh century, pilgrims were under the special protection of the papacy. They were even given special benefits in lodging and travel expenses.

As I stated earlier, the word pilgrim was used throughout the twelfth century to describe a crusader. The majority of crusaders took vows as pilgrims to visit Jerusalem. However, the notion of crusader as pilgrim underwent some dramatic changes in the thirteenth century. Some of these changes should be stated now so as to avoid confusion later. As the thirteenth century wore on, a larger and larger portion of the crusading armies was composed of mercenaries. Mercenary soldiers are hardly pilgrims. In fact, the third crusade was the last crusade to make Jerusalem the center of its effort. The Christians of Western Europe also were no longer as eager to undertake a crusading expedition as they had been in the twelfth century. After St. Louis' death at Tunis, the papacy was unable to stir up enough enthusiasm to mount another expedition. By the fourteenth century, the crusader as pilgrim was a romantic notion of the past. Those crusaders who were defeated at the battle of Nicopolis in 1396 were led by King Sigismund of Hungary who was trying to save his kingdom from the advancing Turks.

That a change was taking place in people's conception of a crusade is borne out by a study of the development of the crusader's vow. At the time of the first crusade there did not exist any
finely-wrought definition of the crusader's vow. In 1141, Gratian discussed the vow but did not make any reference to the special problems of crusaders. Eventually, decretalists worked out definitions for three types of vows. A vow which was solemnly made in public was considered enforceable in the ecclesiastical courts. The necessity of making fine distinctions probably arose when people began to wonder just what they had obligated themselves to and whether they could get out of these obligations. As the vow became better defined, so did the special privileges of a crusader. For example: a crusader could even take a vow without the consent of his wife. The taking of the vow was extremely important. Only the pope could release a crusader from his vow.

According to Brundage, the first widely read account of the crusades in English was written by Thomas Fuller in 1639. Fuller sums up in his book *Historie of the Hole Warre* the arguments of his own age both for and against the justness of the crusades. His ideas will provide a good spring-board for a detailed study of the clergy's ideas on the second and third crusades. In favor of the crusade, Fuller says:

1. All the earth is God's land let out to tenants: but Judea was properly his demesnes, which he kept long in his own hands for himself and his children. Now though the infidels had since violently usurped it, yet no prescription of time could prejudice the title of the King of Heaven, but that now the Christians might be God's champions to recove his interest.

2. Religion bindeth men to relieve their brethren in distresse, especially when they implore their help, as now the Christians in Syria did: whose intreaties in this case, sounded commands in the ears of such as were previously disposed.
3. The Turks by their blasphemies and reproaches against God and our Saviour, had disinherited and divested themselves of all their right to their lands; and the Christians, as the next undoubted heirs, might seize on the forfeiture.

4. This warre would advance and increase the patrimony of Religion, by propagating the Gospel, and converting of infidels. If any object that Religion is not to be beaten into men with the dint of the sword; yet it may be lawfull to open the way by force, for instruction, catechising, and such other gentle means to follow after.

5. The beholding of those sacred places in Palestine would much heighten the adventurers devotion, and make the most frozen heart to melt into pious meditations.

6. This enterprise was furthered by the persuasions of sundry godly men, S. Bernard, and others. Now though a lying spirit may delude the prophets of Achap, yet none will be so uncharitable as to think God would suffer his own Michaiah to be deceived.

7. God set his hand to this warre and approved it by many miracles which he wrought in this expedition, and which are so confidently and generally reported by credit-worthy writers that he himself is a miracle who will not believe them.20

Fuller claims that these reasons all stem from piety. However, other reasons also justified the "Holy Warre." These reasons spring from politics. That a holy war can be the result of political policy seems to be a contradiction in terms, nevertheless Fuller can list some.

1. Palestine was a parcell of the Romane Empire, though since won by the Saracens: and though the Emperour of Constantinople could not recover his right, yet did he always continue his claim, and now (as appeared by his letters read in the Palacentine Councel) Alexius requested the Princes of the West to assist him in the recovery thereof.

2. A preventive warre grounded on a just fear of an invasion is lawfull: But such was this Holy Warre. And because most stresse is laid on this argument, as the main support of the cause, we will examine and prove the parts thereof. . . Lastly, this warre would be the sewer of Christendome, and drain all discords out of it. For active men like mill-stones in motion, if they have no other grist to grind, will set fire one on another.
Europe at this time surfeited with people, and many of them with stirring natures, who counted themselves undone when they were out of doing; and therefore they employed themselves in mutual warres and contentions: But now this Holy Warre would make up all breaches, and unite all their forces against the common foe of Christianite.  

From the verb tenses which Fuller uses, we can tell that some of his arguments were supposed to have been borrowed from the crusaders themselves, while other arguments are the judgments of men of his own age. It will be interesting to compare what the clergy of the twelfth century actually said about the justification of the crusade with the reasons Fuller states.
CHAPTER III

SOURCES

Fortunately for the scholar, some of the best medieval historians wrote histories of the crusades. One of these great historians was Archbishop William of Tyre (1130-1190), whose book *The History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea* is one of the best sources for the political situation in Palestine at the time of the second crusade. Having lived most of his life in the East, William knew far more about Outremer than did most Western writers whose ignorance was all too often complete. William also had the advantage either of knowing Arabic himself or at least of having access to someone who knew the language. Unlike many of his contemporaries, he did not accept every rumor or piece of hearsay as an accurate account of what had happened. He does not appear to have invented facts and episodes to fill gaps in his knowledge. He did make an effort to talk to as many eye-witnesses as possible and to augment his information by consulting official documents. Yet William was not entirely free from all the hazards of history writing. In the beginning of his book, he cites the common notion of his day that an angel came to Peter the Hermit and told Peter to see the pope and make complaint to him about the situation of the Christians in Palestine. According to William, the result of this complaint was that expedition to the Holy Land which modern historians call the first crusade. However, modern historians agree that Pope Urban

12
had already developed the idea of a crusade in his own mind before Peter received his vision in Jerusalem. Occasionally, William can be accused of betraying a prejudice towards his own kingdom. He will sometimes accept as "just" actions which benefit his own kingdom while he condemns similar actions by others.

A good example of a man who let his own viewpoint influence his reporting of the facts is Odo of Deuil (d. 1162). His De profectione Ludovici vii in Orientem is the major source for the role of the French in the second crusade. Odo was the chaplain of Louis VII on the crusade and therefore was in a position to observe first hand many of the events that he has related. Odo was an influential man in the France of his day and had access to many important meetings between Louis and his barons. If one word can be used to describe Odo's history, it is "Anti-Greek." His fanaticism against the Greeks is so strong as to cast a pall over the entire work. Nevertheless, Odo's express purpose in writing the book was to preserve the deeds of his king for posterity and to provide helpful advice for future crusaders.

Another cleric who travelled with his ruler to the Holy Land was the German bishop Otto of Freising (d. 1158). As a bishop and a half-brother to King Conrad III, Otto was also an important figure at court. Otto was not just the king's chaplain. He was a military leader who was entrusted with the command of a large detachment of soldiers. He tells the story of the crusade in small chapters contained in two larger works The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa and the Chronicon. In The Deeds of
Frederick Barbarossa, Otto even interrupts his account of the crusade to give us a complete description of the encounter between Gilbet of Poiters and Bernard of Clairvaux. Unlike Odo, Otto does not seek a scape-goat for the crusade's failure. He makes no mention of Greek treachery. Otto's two works are the best accounts of the German side of the crusade.

The fourth major source for the Western side of the crusade is the De expugnatione Lyxbonensi. It is important because it is a first hand account written by a layman who wasn't a member of the nobility. The anonymous author was probably an Englishman—if we can judge from the praises that he gives to the English soldiers. For our purposes, the work is important because it contains a lengthy speech on the crusade by Bishop Peter of Oporto. The book gives a lively account of the details of the siege and of the organization of the crusader army. It is an interesting history because it tells of the deeds of the middle class. No great noble was in the ranks of the crusaders at Lisbon.

There also exist several accounts of the crusade although none are as interesting as Anna Commena's history of the first crusade, the Alexiad. Two of the best of these chronicles were written by John Cinnamus and Nicetas Choniates. Northern Palestine also contributed historians. Matthew of Edessa, Michael the Syrian, and Nerses Schorholi give us information about these areas.

For a knowledge of those crusaders who went East against the Slavs, the best source is the account of the priest...
Helmhold the Saxon, The Chronicle of the Slavs. This work is primarily a history of the efforts of Christian missionaries among Slavic peoples. Although primarily a missionary, Helmhold did devote a few pages to the efforts of the crusaders in Eastern Germany.

With the Christian side of the crusade being so thoroughly represented, it is only fair to mention that there do exist several Moslem accounts. Perhaps the best known of these is the Damascus Chronicle of Ibn-al-Qualanisi (d. 1160). Its author lived in Damascus during the second crusade and his account of events can be used to cast light on the dates and explanations given in Western chronicles. His description of events points out the fact that there were two sides to the crusades.

Besides chronicles, there are other source materials for the intellectual history of the crusade. The chief spokesman and promoter of the crusade was the Cistercian monk, Bernard of Clairvaux. His reputation for piety was very great as Thomas Fuller has already told us. About fifteen of his letters and two of his treatises provide us with a wealth of information as to how this monk justified the sending of armed men to the Holy Land. His letters complete and augment ideas stated in his treatise De laude novitiae Militiae. The treatise De consideratione, written after the crusade had failed, was intended to be a guide to Pope Eugenius the III (1145-1153) on how to continue his spiritual life despite the pressures and duties of his office.
In book five of the work, Bernard discusses his own role in promoting the crusade.

The writings of Eugenius himself are also important sources. His papal bull *Quantum praedecessores*\(^{37}\) is especially valuable. In this bull, Eugenius granted indulgences to the crusaders and he was careful to state exactly what conditions had to be fulfilled before the indulgence became effective. By studying this document we can draw some conclusions as to how Eugenius viewed the idea of a crusade.

Another important source is the *History of the Papacy* by John of Salisbury.\(^{38}\) This little book is mainly a character sketch of Eugenius III and provides us with some details of events occurring at the papal court at this time.

Though there arose a tremendous amount of criticism of the second crusade after its failure, it was not directed at the idea of crusade. It was aimed at the waste of time and effort.\(^{39}\) Criticism was leveled at the participants but not at the idea of crusade.

The third crusade contains its share of source materials as well. However, the materials are not so widely distributed as were the sources for the second crusade. Most of the chronicles were written by Englishmen or Normans about King Richard.

One of the most complete accounts of the English role in the crusade is the *History of the Holy War* by the jongleur Ambroise.\(^{40}\) Ambroise's poem in old French is also of some importance in the history of literature. It is considered by some
to be a transitional piece between the fictional *chanson de geste* and the prose narratives of Villehardoun and De Joinville. Another chronicle of the English role in the crusade was written by the monk Roger of Hoveden (d. 1201). Roger, like Otto of Freising, wrote a universal history in which he discussed the third crusade. There is even a small chapter devoted to the second crusade. Still, the lion's share of Roger's work is devoted to discussing events between the years 1189 and 1192. That he included many letters and treaties in their entirety, suggests that he must have travelled outside his monastery in order to have had access to so many documents.

Two other important chronicles were written by Geoffrey of Vinsauf and Richard of Devizes. Both tell of the glorious deeds of King Richard. Richard of Devizes was a Carthusian monk at the monastery of Witham in England. How he acquired his information is unknown, but his history is important because he ties events occurring in England with events taking place in the Holy Land. His work is brief and to the point. Geoffrey of Vinsauf, on the other hand, probably accompanied Richard on the crusade. He was most likely a cleric and came from a noble Norman family. His history is not so complete as that of Roger of Hoveden but yet contains more information than the account Richard of Devizes.

Other lesser known chronicles that tell of Richard's deeds were written by Benedict of Petersborough, Ralph of Coggeshal, and Ralph of Diceto.
The German expedition of Frederick Barbarossa is amply covered in Ansbert's *Expeditio Frederici*, another detailed eye-witness account. It is by far the best record of Frederick's crusade. The deeds of Phillip of France are also praised. They are told by Ricord in the *Gesta Phillipi Augusti*. Given Phillip's meager contribution to the crusade, this work must have been difficult to write.

Since Constantinople played a minor role in the third crusade, there are no major Byzantine chronicles on the subject. There are, however, several Moslem accounts. Perhaps the most interesting of these is the Memoirs of Usanah ibn Munquidh (d. 1188). Though Usamah, a Syrian, died before the Western armies departed for the Holy Land, his descriptions of the life of Frankish and Arab aristocrats in Outrmer give us some insight to the conditions in the kingdom of Jerusalem when the armies of Richard and Phillip arrived.

As in the case of the second crusade, there exist source materials other than chronicles which shed light on the ideas of the clergy towards the crusade. Giraldus Cambrensis has left us two books of this sort. *The Itinerary Through Wales* and his *Description of Wales* are narrative accounts of the Welsh countryside written while Giraldus was accompanying Archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury on a trip designed to gather recruits for the crusade. Giraldus occasionally made reference to the purpose of his journey—to gather recruits for the crusade. By studying
Giraldus' work, we can learn both how men were recruited for the crusade and what Giraldus himself thought of his job.

Another important source is the letter of Gregory VIII (1187) to all the faithful. This letter is similar to the previously mentioned bull of Eugenius III in that it also grants an indulgence. In this letter Gregory tells us much about what he thought a crusade should be.

In 1189, when the general enthusiasm for the crusade should have been at its height, we find the first criticism of the idea of crusade. In a work by the cleric Ralph Niger, we find a systematic analysis of the whole crusading movement. He was the first man to claim that any crusade was wrong. In listing his arguments, Ralph was forced to make at least some reference to the ideas of his opposition, and it is here that we can gather information as to how the crusade was justified. Interestingly enough, after Ralph had listed all these reasons why a crusade is wrong he then gave some practical advice on how to make such an enterprise a success. With this survey of the primary sources, we are now ready to examine the sources themselves to see if they contain the answers to those questions posed at the beginning of this paper.
CHAPTER IV

THE SECOND CRUSADE

How was the second crusade justified by the clergy of the twelfth century? What did they expect the crusade to accomplish generally? The second crusade was the concerted effort of most of Western Christendom to assault the infidel wherever he could be found. In light of this, the answers to the above questions will give important information about the intellectual history of the middle twelfth century. This crusade was probably the largest military adventure undertaken during the Middle Ages. Besides the armies of Conrad II of Germany and Louis VII of France, Amadeus of Savoy and Alfonso of Toulouse led large armies to the Holy Land. Expeditions were also launched at the same time against the Wends in Saxony and the Moors in Spain and Portugal. The crusaders to the East were accompanied by large groups of unarmed pilgrims who hoped to follow the victorious armies into Jerusalem. Departing in the spring of 1147 with high hopes of success, the crusaders returned in late 1148, having accomplished nothing except the conquest of Lisbon.

The crusade had its beginnings in the fall of the Latin county of Edessa to the forces of the Moslem leader Zengi on Christmas Day, 1144. In response to this, Queen Melisend of Jerusalem sent Bishop Hugh of Jabala to the West to seek aid for the Eastern church. Hugh met Eugenius III at Viterbo and was
able to convince him of the urgency of the situation. Soon the crusade was underway.

The result of this meeting between Hugh and Eugenius was the bull *Quantum Praedecessores*58 which Eugenius issued on December 1, 1145. This document gives a clear picture of Eugenius' views on the crusade. In the first line, he reminds the Franks how earlier popes had labored "Pro liberatione orientalis ecclesiae."59 Next he tells how Urban II had summoned the bravest and strongest warriers in France and Italy who, "Inflamed by the ardor of charity came together, that they might gather a great army, divine aid being with them, they liberated that city in which our Savior chose to suffer for us and where he left for us his glorious sepulcher as a memorial of his own passion."60 Eugenius has already referred to two things that his predecessor Urban had thought important: (1) The virtue of freeing the oppressed Church in the East; (2) The virtue of preserving Christian holy places from corruption by pagans. The first issue can be readily understood, but the second deserves further comment. Eugenius seems to be saying here that he agrees with Urban's idea that the spiritual significance of an inanimate object such as a church can be contaminated by a non-believer.

A few lines later, Eugenius moves up in time to his own age and says that the sins of the Christians have caused Edessa to be taken by the infidels and that the clergy now lie dead and the relics of the Saints are trodden under foot.61 Sin has been the cause of the Christians' failure in Edessa. Now that Edessa has fallen, the clergy and the holy things of God have been subjected
to evil forces. If one has sinned and separated himself from God and His support, he usually undertakes some sort of penance to try and correct matters. Since Edessa was lost because of sin and Eugenius prescribes a crusade as a means of recovering the city, it follows that such a crusade must contain some penitential value. If this is true, then the armed expeditions he was sending to the East also had some of the aspects of a pilgrimage attached to them.

This armed expedition was not going to just restore the political kingdom of Edessa: Eugenius mentioned how the first crusade had the good effect of spreading the name of Christ. The second crusade would, he hoped, bring new converts to the faith. People were to act quickly and with arms, or there would not be any Christians left on the Earth to do any converting. Because of Edessa's sins, "How great a danger threatens the church of God and all of Christianity." The holy war then, was also going to be waged for the very survival of the Christian faith.

In order to encourage people to take up arms for the Church, Eugenius offered them a plenary indulgence. Not just anyone was supposed to receive this automatically. It was offered only to those who went on crusade with a devout heart. Eugenius said, "By the authority granted to us by God, we do grant and concede to those who by considered devotion had resolved to undertake and to perform such a holy and necessary work and labor, that remission of sins which our previously mentioned predecessor Pope Urban did institute and we decree that the wives and sons of the crusaders and all of their property and possessions to remain under the protection of the
holy church and also under our archbishops, bishops, and other prelates of the church. The crusader was to be prompted to take the cross by devotion and not greed or any other base motive.

Eugenius continued, "If anyone is fortified in debt to another, and they begin so holy a journey and are not released from past interest; or if any others are bound for them, we free them by apostolic authority." It is by having a pure and devout heart that the crusaders are entitled to these privileges. To hammer home the point, Eugenius continued: "We grant that whoever should begin and complete so holy a journey, or dies during it, should obtain absolution from their sins which they have confessed with a humble and contrite heart." The sinner is only able to receive pardon for those sins for which he specifically seeks absolution with a pure and contrite heart. Eugenius does not grant a blank pardon. To those who had been living in sin all of their lives, it must have seemed like manna for heaven. As Gibbon says "At the voice of their pastor, the robber, the indendiary, the homicide, arose by thousands to redeem their souls by repeating on the infidels the same deed which they had exercised against their Christian brethren; and the terms of atonement were eagerly embraced by offenders of every rank and denomination. None were pure; none were exempt from the guilt and penalty of sin; and those who were the least amenable to the justice of God and the church were the best entitled to the temporal and eternal recompence of their pious courage." Whether the crusading armies were as full of wicked sinners as Gibbon suggests might be open to debate, yet, he does bring out the point that
Eugenius' offer of an indulgence was an aid in recruiting participants. Whatever their moral state before taking the cross, Eugenius wanted them to depart for Jerusalem with truly penitent hearts.

Eugenius directed his bull to the French. "Eugenius bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his dearest son Louis, illustrious and glorious king of the Franks..." This was done for practical reasons. At the time, Eugenius was in exile from Rome because of a local uprising. He hoped to persuade Conrad of Germany to deploy his forces to restore him at Rome. Therefore he only preached the crusade to the French. In fact, in his bull, Eugenius makes no mention at all of any German contribution to the first crusade. At that moment, he was also trying to make his troublesome neighbor to the South, Roger of Sicily, do something constructive for Christendom. But then Bernard of Clairvaux while chasing down the errant monk Radulf, decided to preach the crusade to the Germans. When Conrad announced his intention of going on crusade, Roger of Sicily, his mortal enemy, immediately withdrew himself from any part in the crusade. Eugenius received the news coldly but there was nothing he could do. The loss of Roger's aid was a heavy blow. His fleet could have provisioned the crusaders on their march. The knowledge he had acquired about Arabic culture while fighting in Africa would also have been helpful. Perhaps most important of all, if Roger had gone on crusade, he could not have undertaken to attack Byzantium just as the crusaders were most dependent on aid from the Greeks. Eugenius' plans had been only partially carried out. True, an expedition had been launched to the East, but it was
composed, in part, of the wrong troops and Eugenius was still in exile from Rome. Eugenius' practical aim was to get himself placed back in Rome and not to mark out specific military targets in the Holy Land.

A very important man in the promotion of the crusade was Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153). Though he was not responsible for formulating the initial idea of the crusade, he was given a major role in preaching it by Eugenius. As the leading cleric of his age, his opinions and ideas were influential. Bernard himself, though, claimed no responsibility either for the crusade's beginning or its failure. He claimed only to be acting on orders from the pope through whom God's orders were given.

Bernard's letters concerning the crusade actually represent a completion of the ideas that he had set forth some years earlier in his treatise De laude novae Militiae. In this treatise, Bernard explained the difference between secular wars (which are to be despised) and holy wars. He had nothing but contempt for the chivalry of his day because it was concerned only with wealth and glory. He said, "What is the cause of wars and the root of disputes among you, except unreasonable flashes of anger, the thirst for empty glory, or the hankering after some earthly possession? It is certainly not safe to kill or to be killed for such causes as these." Wars for wealth or glory were bad. A crusade then, can not be justified by any acquisition of wealth or glory. Bernard here undercuts several of the arguments advanced by Fuller.
Some men of the seventeenth century may have justified the crusade from matters of policy. Bernard of Clairvaux did not.

Still, Bernard wrote this treatise at the request of his friend Hugh of Payens as an exhortation to the brethren of the newly established order of the Knights of the Temple. This semi-monastic order was founded to protect pilgrims in the Holy Land. The Templars were supposed to be combination knight-monks who took religious vows. They were often pictured as two men on one horse to symbolize their poverty. These knight-monks were different from regular monks in that knights of the temple carried weapons and engaged in physical combat. These knight-monks could kill. How does Bernard justify this? This knight is not fighting for earthly glory but for Christ. The slain knight will be a martyr. "Rejoice, brave athlete, if you live and conquer in the Lord: but glory and exult even more if you die and join your Lord." The knight who kills pagans is not a murderer. "The knight of Christ, I say, may strike with confidence and die yet more confidently, for he serves Christ when he strikes, and serves himself when he falls. Neither does he bear the sword in vain, for he is God's minister, for the punishment of evildoers and for the praise of the good. If he kills an evildoer, he is not a mankiller, but, if I may so put it, a killer of evil. . ." Still this does not mean that pagans were to be killed simply because they were pagans. Rather they were to be killed because they had committed evil. What evil was this? Bernard answers, "I do not mean to say that the pagans are to be slaughtered when there is any other way to keep them from harassing
and persecuting the faithful, but only that it now seems better to destroy them than that the rod of sinners be lifted over the lot of the just, and the righteous put forth their hands unto iniquity." Pagans deserve to die because they persecute the faithful. The point here is that Bernard did not blindly demand the extermination of everyone who was not Christian.

Bernard shared with Eugenius the idea that pagans can defile the Christian holy places by simply entering them. Bernard said that if Jesus threw the money changers out of the temple because they defiled the house of prayer by their traffic, then surely to let pagans stable horses in a church is a worse crime. "Consider that it is even more shameful and infinitely more intolerable for a holy place to be polluted by pagans than to be crowded with merchants." The infidel has offended God on two accounts and therefore deserves punishment.

If the pagans have offended God, He is able to send ministers of justice to chastise them. Though God may do this, how does Bernard justify Christians killing in the name of the Prince of Peace? Bernard's reply is "What then? If it is never permissible for a Christian to strike with a sword, why did the savior's precursor bid the soldiers to be content with their pay, and not rather forbid them to follow this calling." However, the Christian is not to kill deliberately. "If you happen to be killed while you are seeking only to kill another, you die a murderer. If you succeed, and by your will to overcome and conquer you perchance kill a man, you live a murderer." Thus it seems that
a templar is to die in the defense of the innocent rather than aggressively seeking to kill his enemy. "Indeed the true Israelite is a man of peace, even when he goes forth to battle." The templar may end up killing a pagan in the performance of his duty to protect pilgrims, but he is not to kill deliberately.

Bernard emphasized this theme in his letters. However, he did add several additional themes. One of these concerned sin. The Christians were suffering in the East because of their sins. In his letter to the English people, Bernard referred to the indulgences offered by Eugenius III and Urban II. He said, "Look at all the sinners spared in the first crusade... die in the Holy Land that you might live unto God." Though the crusader is a sinner, God is offering him this chance to die as a martyr. The crusade is a God inspired event to save the souls of sinners. Bernard continues, "Yes the Lord could send down angels to drive the Turks out, but he is testing the Christians."

Another notion brought out in his letters is the idea of brotherhood. Cries from the Eastern Church are responsible for the West's action, and "If the church is in trouble and we do not do anything about it... where is the love of our brother; we deserve damnation." He furthered this idea by saying "The Eastern church is now crying out in such misery that anyone who does not sympathize from the bottom of his heart with her is no true son of the church." The infidels have offended God, persecuted our Christian county of Edessa. With these things having taken place what knight would not go on crusade?
Still everyone was not to go on crusade. Bernard said that any monk that left for a crusade should be excommunicated. Monks always carry the sign of the cross on their hearts. "Do not be upset, dear daughter, that your brother had given up the cross to make himself poor for Christ; for to be a monk is to be a soldier." The crusades then were a way of salvation for the secular Christian.

Bernard's effectiveness as a preacher was astounding. According to Odo of Deuil, so many people took the cross when Bernard preached at Vezelay that he was forced to tear up his own garment to provide a sufficient number of crosses. In Germany, after an initial failure, he persuaded thousands more to take the cross. Central to Bernard's notion of a crusader was a sincerely repentant sinner trying to please God. Several times he specifically said that one must confess his sins before taking the cross. He reiterated the warning given by Eugenius in his bull about wearing costly apparel to the Holy Land for the sake of vanity. The crusade was not a war for glory but a chance for sinners to embrace salvation.

Occasionally, Bernard mentioned the idea of the Holy Land being a special province of the earth that God has reserved for himself and the Christians. At one point he says "The Lord is losing his land," and asks whether the servants of the cross will cast "Holy things to the dogs, pearls before swine?" Bernard seems to share the idea of Eugenius that Christians ought not to allow the infidel to take control of the Holy Land because they will desecrate the Christian shrines.
Bernard was thoroughly convinced that the crusade was a divinely approved affair. In his letter to Duke Wladislaus, Bernard said "This time is not like any time that has gone before, new riches of Divine mercy are descending on you from Heaven." If God approves of the crusade, how could any man fail to take the cross?

However, the Jews were not to be considered pagans. They were reminders of the Lord's passion. Bernard said that it was an act of Christian piety "Both to vanquish the proud and also to spare the subjugated." It was in order to suppress the monk Radulf, who was preaching a crusade against the Jews, that Bernard first went into Germany. According to the Jewish annalist Rabbi Ephraim of Bonn, Radulf exhorted Christians to "Avenge the crucified one upon his enemies who stand before you; then go to war against the Ishmaelites." Concerning Bernard's role in stopping Radulf, Ephraim says "All the gentiles regarded this priest as one of their saints, and we have not enquired whether he was receiving payment for speaking on behalf of Israel." The meaning of all this is that Bernard did not intend the crusade to be a license to kill anyone who was not Christian.

Bernard discussed the crusade's failure in his treatise De Consideratione. He blamed the crusaders for the disasters that befell the Christian armies. They were blamed because they did not pay attention to the pope or to himself when they were warned to have a devout heart filled with contrition. Concerning the wickedness of the crusaders, Bernard said, "But if the Jews were
vanquished and punished because of their iniquity, is it any wonder that those who did likewise suffered a similar fate." He still maintained that the holy places were being defiled. "The holy places are being threatened. . . . the riches of the Christian people are being taken away." Bernard did admit that the Christians committed sin and that this was the reason that God's grace, which had been offered to them at the beginning, was withdrawn.

In summary, Bernard felt that war against the infidel was justified because they had offended God by seizing his land and harassing his subjects. The Christian was justified in taking part in the expedition because it was really an opportunity for people to embrace salvation; the Christian could kill pagans because he was an instrument of God striking down evil doers. However, the Christian was not to kill deliberately. His primary task was to protect pilgrims and the holy places from defilement. It was all right if a pagan was killed providing that the crusader was intent only on fulfilling his duty. Bernard hoped that many people would take advantage of this opportunity to die as martyrs and embrace salvation. In one place, Bernard mentioned how no smart merchant would refuse the deal that the Lord was offering him.

Another monk who wrote about the crusade was the abbot of Cluny, Peter the Venerable. Peter's exact stand on the crusade is still subject to some difference of opinion. While most modern historians agree that Peter was not opposed to the idea of crusade, some contend that he was merely following the crowd while others give Peter some credit for original thought on the subject.
Virginia Berry maintains that Peter did not question either the motives of the crusade nor its methods—killing vast numbers of the infidel. On the other hand, James Kritzeck takes issue with Berry and claims that "In Peter's mind the idea of 'Holy War' or at least many of its implications remained somewhat problematical." To back up his thesis, Kritzeck cites a letter from Peter to Louis VII where Peter says, "God does not will cold-blooded murder or outright slaughter." To cement his argument, Kritzeck quotes a letter from Peter to Bernard in which Peters says, "But some may say, The church has no sword." Christ took it away when he said to Peter, "Put back thy sword into the scabbard; for all those who take the sword will perish by the sword." This is true indeed, the church does not have the sword of a king but the staff of a shepherd. . . . Yet it may also be said to have a sword, according to him, and take into you the helmet of salvation and the sword of the spirit, which is the Word of God. This is not the place to decide who is right—Berry or Kritzeck. I simply point out that evidence exists which would suggest that Peter, like Eugenius and Bernard, did not see the killing of pagans as being the primary objective of the second crusade.

The anonymous author of the De expugnatione Lyxbonensi has left us a record of a sermon delivered by Bishop Peter of Oporto to an assembled crowd of crusaders in Portugal. The bishop was trying to persuade the crusaders to stay to help in the siege of Lisbon before proceeding to the Holy Land. Our author tells us that the sermon was delivered in Latin so that everyone had to hear it
through interpreters. However, the author does not tell us whether the text of the speech that he recorded in his chronicle was written down from a copy or from memory. If the speech was recorded from memory, it is possible that there is a discrepancy between what the bishop actually said and what was recorded for posterity. Hence, a touch of caution must be used in analyzing what Bishop Peter is alleged to have said.

Bernard had called members of the Eastern church brothers. Bishop Peter used this idea in a slightly different form when he spoke of Mother Church. All Christians form one whole. When the pagans oppress the Eastern church, the whole body suffers. "To you, mother church, as it were with her arms cut off and her face disfigured, appeals for help: she seeks vengeance from your hands for the blood of her sons." The crusader is called on to defend his mother's children. They are not asked simply to defend them but also to take vengeance for those already slain. If this sounded too brutal for Christians, Peter had this response. "There is no cruelty where piety towards God is concerned. . . . for the sin is not in waging war but in waging war for plunder." Bernard had also spoken of wars for plunder being wrong whereas a holy war could be justified, but he was not so coarse. He had listed many qualifications under which a holy war had to be conducted to be just. Peter, on the other hand, lists only a few general qualifications. Peter does not mention anything about having a devout and contrite heart. While Bernard went to great lengths to show under what conditions a Christian could kill, Peter says nothing.
Peter identified God with the Holy Land even more closely than either Bernard or Eugenius. He said, "Verily, dear brothers you have gone forth without the camp bearing the reproach of the cross; you are seeing God while he may be found, in order that you may lay hold on him. For it seems not strange that men should go unto God, since for the sake of men God also came among men." Here Peter seems to be saying that God can more easily be found the Holy Land than anywhere else. The physical journey to the Holy Land seems to be equal to a spiritual one.

Actually, Peter does have two qualifications which the crusader must possess to make his actions just. He must be without envy. "Envy must be entirely cast out. Therefore, it is very necessary for those who are travelling through the dangerous places of the earth to be on their guard against this vice, whereby other people's welfare is lost and their own destroyed." The crusader should also have an innocent heart. "Verily, dear sons, reborn of a baptism of repentance, you have put on Christ once more, you have received again the garment of innocence to keep it stainless. Take care lest you wander away again after your own lusts. 'Put away the evil of your doings' from your midst. Purge your souls, that is your minds, to be a temple sanctified unto God." The teachings of the Gospels that a Christian should be a lover of peace seems to have bothered Peter a good deal, for he spends much of his sermon trying to defend his championing of the crusade. He begins his defense by claiming that the crusaders would really be acting in self-defense. They would not be taking
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up the arms of violence to lay waste the property of others. The
Holy Land belongs to God and as His children, the crusaders can
claim that Palestine really belongs to them. Besides, they were
taking up arms on the command of a higher authority. "But now by
God's inspiration you are bearing the arms [of righteousness] by
which murderers and robbers are condemned, thefts are prevented,
acts of adultery are punished, the impious perish from the earth,
and parracides are not permitted to live nor sons to act
unfilially." The crusaders are to act just as violently as they
would if they were sinning, only this time it is justified because
their cause is righteous. "Since it is just to punish murderers
and sacrilegious men and poisoners, the shedding of their blood is
not murder. Likewise he is not cruel who slays the cruel. And he
who puts wicked men to death is a servant of the Lord for the reason
that they are wicked there is ground for killing them." Once
one makes up his mind that all pagans are wicked, killing them be­
comes easily justified. Peter proceeds to pile up authority after
authority to show that violence can be used against evil men. He
even included a quotation from Augustine's letter to Donatus: "An
evil will must not be allowed its liberty, even as Paul, who per­
secuted the church of God, was not permitted to carry out his worst
intentions." Finally Peter said, "Indeed, such works of ven­
geance are duties which righteous men perform with a good con­
science. Brothers, be not afraid, for in acts of this sort you
will not be censured for murder or taxed with any crime; on the
contrary; you will be adjudged answerable if you should abandon your enterprise.

Peter certainly lacked the refinement of St. Bernard. Much of his talk concerned killing, vengeance, and murder instead of penance, contrition, and the salvation of souls. It should be pointed out at this point that the men Peter was preaching to were on their way to the Holy Land. The bishop was trying to persuade them to delay their plans and assist in the siege of Lisbon. The fact that the crusaders were eventually persuaded to stay, indicates that they were not part of any organized crusading effort. They could afford to take as much time as they wanted in reaching the Holy Land.

Fortunately, the author of the chronicle did not take all the bishop's advice to heart. He stated that the Christians were not to glory in the affliction of the wicked because God had hardened their hearts. He even prayed that God would have mercy on the pagans and convert them. He reported how the crusaders offered the pagans a chance to go in peace if they would only return to the Christians what was originally theirs. He pointed out with praise how the English, after the surrender of Lisbon, kept their oath not to pillage and plunder—an oath which the Flemish failed to keep.

Those clerics who wrote histories of the crusade also expressed their ideas about it in their writings. Odo of Deuil claims to have written his history as an aid to future crusaders. Odo seems to have thought that the Christians did very few things
that were pleasing to God. He continually referred to the wickedness of the crusaders. He said that Louis "enacted laws necessary for securing peace and other requirements on the journey, which the leaders confirmed by solemn oath. But because they did not observe them well, I have not preserved them either." Odo continually lamented the lack of discipline shown by the crusaders. In fact, the crusaders were so undisciplined that they caused themselves nothing but grief. Odo referred to this lack of discipline as sin responsible for alienating God. Part of the crusaders' problems were caused when the Franks decided that the Byzantines were not Christians so therefore "They were judged not to be Christians and the Franks considered killing them a matter of no consequence and hence could with more difficulty be restrained from pillage and plunder." This notion of killing Byzantines because they were not Christians probably did not bother Odo at all, for he despised the Greeks. When it was suggested that the crusaders seize Constantinople, Odo replied, "But alas for us, nay for all St. Peter's subjects, their word did not prevail." Since the Greeks were wicked people and heretics too, Odo justified temporarily diverting the crusade against the Byzantine empire.

Another clergyman who favored the taking of Constantinople was bishop Godfrey of Langres. Godfrey was a cousin of St. Bernard and a Cistercian monk. Odo, who described the bishop as a man of wise intellect and of saintly piety, has recorded for us Godfrey's reasons for wanting to take the city. First of all, the city could be easily taken since its walls were weak. Secondly, if the
capital were taken, the rest of the empire would capitulate without a struggle. One need not be considered a murderer for this deed because the Byzantines were Christian in name only. Besides, the Greeks could threaten the crusaders. To prove that this was a possibility, Godfrey mentioned how the emperor John Comnenus had defeated Raymond of Antioch and had replaced the Latin bishops with heretical Greek bishops. About this action, Godfrey had this to say: "Nevertheless, God, who knows, judges, and avenges such things as these, willed that he should wound himself with a poisoned arrow and end his shameful life as a result of that slight wound." God favors those who attack the Greeks. Godfrey did not have the same views of the crusade as did some of the other churchmen we have studied.

However, there was a party among the crusaders, led by bishop Arnulf of Lisieux, which disagreed with Godfrey on this issue. In their reply to Godfrey, this opposition party pointed out clearly what they thought the goal of the crusade to be: "Without knowledge of the law we cannot judge about their (The Byzantines) good faith. The fact that he attacked Antioch was evil, but he could have had justifiable reasons which we do not know. It is certainly true that the king has recently conferred with the pope and that he was not given any advice or command concerning this point. He knows and we know, that we are to visit the Holy Sepulcher and, by the command of the supreme pontiff, to wipe out our sins with the blood or the conversion of the infidels. At this time we can attack the richest of the Christian cities and enrich ourselves, but in so doing we must
kill and be killed. And so if slaughtering Christians wipes out our sins, let us fight. Again, if harboring ambition does not sully our death, if on this journey it is as important to die for the sake of gaining money as it is to maintain our vow and obedience to the supreme pontiff, then wealth is welcome; let us expose ourselves to danger without fear of death." Arnulf’s party clearly had the better argument and it was his side which finally carried the day. This conflict between Arnulf and Godfrey points out how divergent the motives of the crusaders were. Odo’s concluding comment on the debate was that Godfrey would have won if it had not been for Greek treachery.

Odo often described the crusaders as pilgrims. Yet, he distinguished the armed pilgrims from non-combatants. He complained that having so many non-combatants on the crusade hurt the army. He recommended that future crusades be composed only of those men capable of carrying arms. "For the weak and helpless are always a burden to their comrades and a source of prey to their enemies." Odo had definite ideas about the practical success of the crusade. He did very little talking about blessed martyrs or of the vast numbers of people rushing out to receive the abundance of divine mercy being offered them. Odo wrote his book as a guide to future crusaders so they would not repeat Louis' mistakes. His chief advice was not to trust the Greeks. After the crusade's failure he said, "And both nations will always have something to bewail if the sons of these men do not avenge their parent's death. To us who suffered the Greek's evil deeds, however, divine justice, and
the fact that our people are not accustomed to endure shameful injuries for long, give hope of vengeance." Odo lacked any sense of fairness toward the Greeks and shows that he lacked a full understanding of what Bernard and Eugenius had intended the crusade to be.

From the evidence, it seems as though Odo never gave much thought as to what justified a Christian in killing. At least if he had any reasons, he did not tell us what they were. It would appear that for Odo, the fact that his king was on crusade with the approval of the pope was all that was necessary. Odo was a much more practical man than Bernard. He wanted the crusade to achieve concrete success and was not overly concerned with intellectual theory.

Another contemporary clergyman who wrote on the crusade was Otto of Freising. As brother to King Conrad III of Germany, Otto was an important figure in the administration of his brother's kingdom. Since he led a large detachment of Conrad's army himself, his writings provide an excellent first hand source for the German effort during the crusade. If Otto was involved in the conduct of the war itself and made no complaint about his role, it seems reasonable to assume that he did not object to the idea of crusade and hence, his writings become suitable matter for our study.

Like Odo, Otto blamed the failure of the crusade on the sins of the crusaders. Like every other man studied so far, Otto expected the crusaders to measure up to some moral standard and their failure to do so resulted in God withdrawing his aid from an enterprise which He had originally favored.
Otto's explanation of why the crusade failed tells us much about the man. He was not content merely to say that the sins of the crusaders caused God to withdraw His aid. He had to construct an elaborate logical argument to explain how the crusade was both good and bad at the same time. From this explanation, we can draw much information as to how Otto justified the crusade and of what his practical aims consisted.

Otto began by saying, "Now because some of the little Brethren of the church being offended marvel, and marvelling are offended at the effort of our aforesaid expedition, in as much as starting out from so lofty and good a beginning it came to so fitful a conclusion—no not a good one—so it seems they must be answered as follows." Otto then inserts an elaborate and confusing exercise in logic. He discusses several philosophical terms such as 'relative good,' 'absolute good,' 'just,' and 'temperate.' His intention here is to point out that what is good relative to this or that man is not good for all men in all circumstances. "Just as it does not follow if the Ethiopian is white of tooth, therefore he is white, or conversely, if he is not black of tooth, therefore he is not black. This is also evident from the use we make of Holy Scripture, when we say it was not good for the Jews or for Judas to betray Christ, or to crucify Him, although it was good for us.... Thus in Holy Scripture the badness of the Jews does not invalidate the fact that for all humanity Christ's passion was good." Otto continues, "From this it follows by analogy for the same reason, with reference to our aforesaid expedition, that
though it was not good for the enlargement of boundaries or for the advantage of bodies, yet it was good for the salvation of many souls, on condition however that you interpret the word 'good' not as an endowment of nature but always in the sense of 'useful'." On the practical level, Otto wanted the crusade to produce some tangible results. He did not tell us whether he hoped the crusade would enlarge those kingdoms already existing in the East, create new kingdoms, or increase the patrimony of the German empire. Yet, the crusaders were to accomplish something. I am left with the suspicion that he did not really know what the crusade was supposed to accomplish. He and Conrad were going to arrive in the East and then decide what to do. Though Otto spoke of material gain, the above quotations prove that he did see the spiritual side of the crusade. I should also point out that Otto, unlike Odo, did not bring up the subject of besieging Constantinople.

After proving that the crusade could have had both a good and a bad side, Otto proceeded to discuss the matter of Bernard's preaching. "And yet, if we should say that the holy abbot was inspired by the Spirit of God, to arouse us, but that we, by reason of our pride and arrogance, not observing the salutary commandants have deservedly suffered loss of property and persons, it would not be at variance with logical processes or ancient examples: although it is true that the spirit of the prophets does not always accompany the prophets." Otto seems to think it entirely possible then, that God called for the crusade through the saintly Bernard and then let it come to disaster because the crusaders did not behave
properly. This could mean that Otto believed Bernard's statements about the crusaders having to have devout and contrite hearts if God's work, the crusade, was to be successful. Another possibility is that Otto really had in mind only a general notion of sin and its consequences in this life and he was not referring to any specific ideas of Bernard or Eugenius. After all, nearly all the commentators on the crusade's failure mentioned the sins of its participants as a primary reason. The latter possibility would suggest that Otto, like Odo, did not really share in the fullness of Bernard's thought.

The extent to which Otto emphasized the practical side of the crusade would tend to bear this out. In his explanation of the crusade's failure, he first mentioned how it did not result in any newly conquered territory. It is only after this that he mentions that the crusade "yet" resulted in some good: namely the salvation of souls. He did not speak of the great number of souls saved in the first crusade because of God's great mercy. Instead, he only mentioned that some souls were saved during the recent crusade to point out that it was not a complete disaster. The emphasis seems to be on the practical side of the crusade. Yet, Otto also felt that God had ordained the crusade and that it was not simply another war of conquest.

Otto then, held views on the crusade which were much closer to those of Bernard and Eugenius than to those of Odo of Deuil or Peter of Oporto.

The remaining great Latin chronicle of the crusade is that written by Archbishop William of Tyre. Like the other clergymen
discussed so far, William supported the crusade. After the failure of the second crusade, he even went to the West to try to stir up enthusiasm for a new one.

William seems to have seen Palestine as a geographical area under the special political leadership of God. To William, when the Christian states of Palestine were under attack by a non-Christian enemy, it was as if the whole state of Christendom were under attack, which meant that all the members of that state were required to aid in repelling the enemy. When the county of Edessa fell, William lamented, "Edessa, devoted to the Christian name from the time of the apostles, the city which was rescued from the superstitions of the infidels by the words and preaching of the Apostle Thaddeus, suffered the undeserved yoke of servitude." Since William lived in Palestine and had frequent dealings with the Moslems, he had come to have a certain measure of respect for Arabic culture. His work is devoid of any rhetoric which describes all Moslems as wicked human beings empty of all merit. In contrast to most Western Christians, William even had a few good things to say about certain Moslems, as Anar of Damascus. He spoke out against those Christians who tried to instigate war against peaceful Moslem neighbors. He felt that treaties with Moslems should be scrupulously observed. William believed that it was necessary to maintain peaceful relations with at least some Moslem neighbors because he felt the Christians were not strong enough to drive them all out.

William believed that God guided the Christians in their battles. In one instance, he tells us that the Moslems had started
a brush fire with the hope that the wind would carry it towards the Christian army. However, just as the flames were about to consume the Christians, a bishop held up a portion of the true cross and offered up many prayers. Miraculously, the flames changed direction and destroyed the pagan army. On another occasion, the army was lost without guides until a white knight appeared to lead the men to safety.

In common with his fellow clergymen who supported the crusade, William held that all those who died in defense of the Holy Land were martyrs. Concerning the men who had died during the siege of Edessa, William said, "their names are forgotten but are surely written in Heaven, for they died with a glorious end for the sake of the faith and liberty of the people of Christ." This further drives home the point that the clergy of the twelfth century believed that man pleased God by dying in the service of His people.

Eugenius had referred to the Christians in the East as sons, and Bernard had talked about helping our brethren in the East. William tied these two ideas together in his notion of a Christian commonwealth. All Christians are subjects of God who can call on the aid of their fellow members when needed. Yet, they are also brothers, and William approvingly talked about Eugenius's motives for calling for a crusade. "Pope Eugenius III, a devout man of God, also felt the solicitude of a father for his sons of the East, it was said, and was in full and affectionate sympathy with them. He dispatched throughout the various regions of the West religious men, eloquent in exhortation, powerful both in word and deed, to inform
princes and people, tribes and tongues everywhere of the intolerable sufferings of their brethren in the East and to arouse them to go forth to avenge these terrible wrongs." A Christian, then, should go on crusades to relieve the injustices and sufferings of his fellow members in Christ.

William also described the crusade as a pilgrimage pleasing to God. The crusader is not only helping his brethren in the East but is also undertaking an expressly religious expedition. William cried out to God that the crusaders "longed to adore the traces of thy footsetps and to kiss the venerated places which thou hast consecrated by thy bodily presence." William mentioned this with reference to the crusader's defeats in Asia Minor. He wondered how an expedition undertaken for such noble ends had been allowed to come to so ignominious a failure. William provided an answer to his own question. "But the Lord in His just, although secret, judgment rejected their service and did not regard it as an acceptable offering, perhaps because it was offered with unworthy hands." William is repeating what is by now a well worn phrase—that the sins of the Christians caused God to withdraw His aid.

As a native Palestinian, William had different practical aims for the crusade from most Westerners. Whereas Westerners like Otto of Freising seemed to have had no firm idea what they were going to do when they set out, William had definite ideas as to what purpose the crusader armies should have been put. He wanted above all to have the Kingdom of Jerusalem strengthened. He sided with those Palestinian barons who hoped to make use of the crusading armies.
to increase the prestige and power of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Each baron within the kingdom also hoped to increase his own personal power and wealth. "From the first, the great and powerful lords of these countries had cherished the hope that through the valiant assistance of these sovereigns who were coming they might be able to enlarge and extend their boundaries immensely." He then proceeds to tell how the people and king of Jerusalem felt that they had the best chance of receiving this aid because so many of the most sacred holy places were located within the Kingdom of Jerusalem. When Louis delayed at the court of Raymond of Antioch, the people of Jerusalem became so worried that Louis had decided to give his aid to Raymond that they sent the Patriarch out to persuade Louis to come to Jerusalem. When Louis finally arrived in the city, all of the clergy were there to greet him with hymns and chants. Though Louis and Conrad may have had imprecise plans as to what they would do when they reached the Holy Land, the barons of Outremer had already decided among themselves what the kings were going to do. Unfortunately, the rivalry for personal power among the barons destroyed any unity of purpose that might have existed. Consequently, when Louis and Conrad left Palestine, William said that they lost all interest in the events happening in Outremer. One member of Conrad's army, however, was to keep the crusade in mind over the years and that man was Frederick Barbarossa.

William did not directly address the question of how the crusade was justified. His history was primarily concerned with local events in Palestine. When the armies of Louis and Conrad
embarked they became a part of his narrative. However, they never became a focal point of interest in his work. Still from what William did say, we can form a clear opinion of what he thought of these expeditions coming over from the West. William believed the crusade to have been spawned by noble notions of serving God and of protecting Christian brethren in the East. However, the crusaders did not come with clean hands so their sacrifice was refused by God and the crusade failed.

The second crusade, with its various expeditions against the Wends, Turks, and Moors ended in almost complete failure. The response of Western Europe to this failure was primarily negative. There are a great many chronicles and poems which treat of the crusade and its failure. Some claimed Bernard was a false prophet. Others, like Odo of Deuil, blamed the crusade's failure on tangible things like Greek treachery. Subsequent efforts to raise interest in another crusade failed. It was to take a major catastrophe in the East, the fall of Jerusalem, to revive the crusading spirit in the West.

When we review the aims and ideals of the clergy, defending the second crusade we find basic agreement. All believed the crusade was called by God. Some stated that they believed this because Bernard of Clairvaux preached the crusade. Bernard himself claimed that God had called through the pope for the crusade. All agreed that it was justifiable for Christians to kill under certain circumstances. All agreed that the Christians in the East were either brothers, sons, or fellow subjects of the same realm deserving aid.
All accepted the idea that those who died on crusade were martyrs. The crusaders were also seen as pilgrims who had to fulfill their vow to visit Jerusalem. Finally, all felt that the holy places of Palestine were especially sacred to God because His son had laid claim to the area by His physical presence on Earth and that they had an obligation to preserve His patrimony.

When we begin to talk of what these men hoped the crusade would accomplish, we find a certain vagueness. Bernard made no mention of cities, lands, or countries to be conquered. He was primarily interested in the salvation of souls. Pope Eugenius was no more specific in his military plans. Both men wanted the Holy Land to be free from the pagans but they seem to have had no idea as to how this would be done—as one might expect since they were clergymen. Odo and Otto were interested in acquiring more territory, but they too, had no idea of what their armies would do after they reached Jerusalem. What is most significant is that neither makes any mention of their respective kings having any idea either. They hoped to follow the path of the first crusaders—never mind the fact that circumstances had changed and they could sail directly to Acre. Upon arriving in Palestine, the kings followed the advice of the local barons. The only man we have discussed so far who had any real plan for the crusade was William of Tyre. He wanted the crusade to expand the political boundaries of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. We can see that the men of the second crusade departed without any firmly set military objectives in mind. They were
relying on the tradition of success established by their fore­
thers on the first crusade to lead them.
CHAPTER V

THE THIRD CRUSADE

The third crusade is commonly called the king's crusade because the three leading monarchs of Christendom, Frederick Barbarossa, Richard the Lion-Hearted, and Phillip Augustus, were supposed to have joined together into one irresistible army to expel the infidel from Jerusalem. Such unity did not exist. Frederick departed on foot for the Holy Land and was drowned in the Saleph River in Asia Minor before Richard and Phillip had even started out. Phillip and Richard were not on the best of terms and soon after the siege of Acre was completed, Phillip went back to France to plot with Richard's brother, John, the English king's overthrow. The story of the third crusade in the Holy Land is really the story of Richard of England since his army was the one which spent the most time in Palestine and did the most fighting. Therefore it is not surprising that the bulk of the chronicles on the third crusade were written by Englishmen or Normans.

Like the second crusade, which was occasioned by the fall of Edessa, the third crusade was brought about by the fall of another city in the East--Jerusalem herself in 1187. When news of this disaster reached the West, Pope Gregory VIII issued the first call for a crusade though his successors, Clement III and Celetine III, had to bring the crusade to its conclusion. Like his predecessor Eugenius, Gregory also granted indulgences to all the participants.144
France and England began to prepare for the crusade in earnest. Special taxes were levied, as the Saladin tithe of Henry II. Many prelates were sent all over Europe to preach the crusade. One such prelate was Archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury. The archbishop was accompanied on his recruiting trip to Wales by Giraldus Cambrensis. While accompanying the archbishop Giraldus wrote two books in which he gives us some insight into how the crusade was preached. We are told that the archbishop usually preached in the morning. Giraldus mentioned that many men tried to withdraw from their vows only a short time after they had taken them. It seems as though many a man was persuaded to take the cross under the emotional pressure of the archbishop's speech only to regret it after he had time to cool down and think the thing over. Giraldus tells how one man redeemed his pledge by handing over for the use of the crusade one-fifth of his lands. In all, Giraldus claims Baldwin's efforts to have recruited three thousand healthy men for the crusade.

Some of the anecdotes Giraldus told about people who took the cross clearly indicate that he felt taking the cross was a good work pleasing to God. On one occasion, he told of a woman who thanked God for giving her a son deemed worthy enough to go on crusade. In another story, a man wanted to take the cross but was prevented by his wife. Because of her intervention, she received a vision which said "Thou hast taken away my servant from me, therefore what though lovest most shall be taken away from
thee."¹⁴⁹ A short time later, she lost her son. Such stories could not help but persuade the people of Europe that God had ordained the crusade.

Giraldus does not seem to have taken his mission of preaching the crusade entirely seriously. While assisting the archbishop, he wrote two works on the Welsh countryside and none about his mission. Within these works, his references to his preaching and his purpose for being in Wales do not occur as often as one might expect. It is as if his mission was really incidental to the opportunity to write about his native land.¹⁵⁰ The extent to which Giraldus failed to mention what he was doing in Wales in the first place leads us to believe that he never questioned the "justness" of the crusade. It was obviously not a controversial point to him. It is as if preaching a crusade was as commonplace and accepted as preaching against the Devil.

Geoffrey of Vinsauf was much more involved with the crusade than Giraldus. He interjects a few different notions about the crusade. He begins his chronicle not with St. Bernard's idea that the "Lord is losing his land," but rather with his own belief that the Lord is purifying his land. The Turks are agents not of Satan, but of God. They had been sent from heaven to chastise God's children who have given themselves over to sin.¹⁵¹

The Lord's hand fell heavy upon his people, if indeed it is right to call those His people, whom uncleanness of life and habits, and the foulness of their vices, had alienated from His favor. Their licentiousness had indeed become so flagrant that they all of them, casting aside the veil of shame, rushed headlong, in the face of day into sin. It would be a long task and
incompatible with our purpose to disclose the scenes of blood, robbery, and adultery, which disgraced them, for this work of mine is a history of deeds and not a moral treatise: but when the ancient enemy had diffused, far and near, the spirit of corruption, he more especially took possession of the land of Syria, so that the other nations now drew an example of uncleanness from the same source which formerly had supplied them with the elements of religion. For this cause, therefore, the Lord seeing that the land of His birth and place of His passion had sunk into the abyss of turpitude, treated with neglect His inheritance, and suffered Saladin, the rod of His wrath, to put forth His fury to the destruction of that stiff necked people: for He would rather that the Holy Land should, for a short time, be subject to the profane rights of the heathen, than it should any longer be possessed by those men, whom no regard for what is right could deter from things unlawful.152

If a notion like this had existed at the time of the second crusade, it certainly was not a common one for none of the major figures of the crusade voiced it. Saladin is an agent of God sent to punish sinners. If this is true, then the idea arises that it would be foolhardy to resist God's agent until he had completed his appointed task. One might expect Geoffrey to list some reasons why he thought Saladin's mission was completed and therefore safe to launch a crusade against him. However, Geoffrey gives us no reasons. Instead, he proceeds to tell us of the glorious deeds of Richard and of the many martyrs finding their way to heaven.

Since Geoffrey glorifies the crusaders in general and Richard in particular throughout the chronicle, we must assume that he did not intend for the ideas contained in his opening chapter to constitute a criticism of the idea of crusade. A possibility is that Geoffrey is echoing ideas taken from the Old Testament. God was always sending some avenger to punish the Israelites. Nebuchadnezzar
had been such an avenger. However, the success of the pagan is only temporary and does not at all negate the gifts of God to his people who continue to serve Him. God aided Daniel while his fellow Israelites were being punished and He will also aid the crusaders. Geoffrey seems to have believed that the pagans, though evil in themselves, were being used by God to chastise sinful Christians. Even then, this did not mean that God would not help those Christians who with a pure heart still loved and served Him faithfully.

After the first chapter, Geoffrey gets down to his real purpose, glorifying Richard and the crusaders. He is firmly convinced that the crusaders were pilgrims dying as martyrs. As soon as the crusader died, his soul triumphantly ascended to heaven. Geoffrey speaks with joy of those prisoners who obtained martyrdom by pretending to be templars. Though he makes no specific reference to what frame of mind the pilgrim was supposed to have in order to obtain the crown of martyrdom, he raises at one point the question of whether those who died of famine were to be considered martyrs because of the sins they had committed along the way. I believe Geoffrey is suggesting that those who were starving committed such heinous crimes in their search for food that they deserved death as a punishment and not as an honor. In connection with this, He also mentioned some pilgrims who damned their own souls by renouncing their faith to obtain food.

Another justification of the idea of crusade that had been foreign to the second crusade can be found in Geoffrey's work. This idea is contained in a long letter which Frederick Barbarossa wrote
to Saladin before he departed on crusade. In this letter, Frederick claimed the Holy Land for himself since it had formerly been part of the Roman Empire. As Holy Roman Emperor, he was only trying to restore what had been stolen from his ancestors. This idea could not have been popular in the West as the French had provided most of the knights in the first two crusades and the Latin kingdoms existing in Palestine at that time were Frankish principalities. In fact, Frederick departed for Palestine on his own without waiting for any help from the other heads of Christendom. It seems unlikely that Richard of Phillip would have labored in the Holy Land to reconquer a province for the German emperor. Frederick's notion was certainly inimical to Byzantium which claimed Palestine for herself. However, Frederick first said that Palestine belonged to the Christians. He mentioned the fact that it also happened to have been a province of the Roman empire as an aside. Yet, Geoffrey chose to emphasize the fact that Frederick was trying to recover his own land. This seems strange since Geoffrey could only support Frederick's claim by denying the claim of his own king, Richard.

The remaining reasons Geoffrey used to justify the crusade have already been stated. Christians are being robbed and murdered so therefore the crusaders must come to their help. The holy places and relics must not be defiled by infidels. "Glorious was Jerusalem the city of God." After the first chapter, we hear nothing more about Saladin being an agent of God. Finally, Geoffrey did not hold to all the opinions of the Franks. Although he too hated the Greek Christians, he did not believe that it was just to attack them.
An abbreviated chronicle of the third crusade was written by an English Carthusian monk, Richard of Devizes. Richard did not feel called upon to justify the crusade. His primary aim in writing his chronicle seems to have been to exalt the religious motives of King Richard. He does not even tell us that the expedition failed because of the sins of the crusaders. However, from the praises which he heaps on King Richard, we can infer some of his beliefs.

Richard claimed the English king left on crusade to avenge wrongs committed against Christ. The cause of the king's journey was Christ. He lamented the fact that the pagans still held Jerusalem. From these statements, it is clear that our monk believed the crusade to be a war waged to defeat the enemies of Christ and to preserve the holy places for desecration. Thus, Richard justified the crusade on the grounds that Christ directed the expedition against those who sought to deny His name and pollute His temples.

The practical aims of Richard were much better defined than the aim of the men of the second crusade. To free Jerusalem was the aim of Richard saw for his king. The king was not going to arrive in the Holy Land with absolutely no idea of what he was going to do next.

Richard believed that a crusader's vow was something sacred. No one, not even a clergyman, should back out of his vow for any reason. When Walter, Archbishop of Laon, decided to renounce his crusader's vow by claiming that bishops should preach and not fight, Richard had harsh words for him: "Whilst forgetting shame, he
pretended, with that devotion which is diffidence, the most
wretched of mothers, brought forth, that pastors of the church
should rather preach than fight, and that it is not meet for a
bishop to wield other arms than those of virtue." The idea, of
course, is that bishops not only can wield arms but should do so.
This is in contradiction to Bernard and Eugenius who seemed to say
that clergy should only attend the crusade as spiritual leaders.
Though Richard of Devizes questioned Walter's sincerity, King
Richard did not, for he let Walter go—though without the money he
had donated to the crusade. In fact, the king went through his
army and weeded out "Such as could not bear arms, and with a ready
mind could use them; nor did he suffer those who returned to take
back with them their money, which they had brought thus far, or
their arms." King Richard seems to have listened to Odo of Deuil, who said the large number of non-combatans with Louis' army
had hindered its effectiveness.

Richard also believed that the crusaders who died were martyrs.
He even considered martyrs those Christians who were compelled to
rebuild the walls of Jerusalem.

Neither Richard nor Geoffrey laid down sophisticated reasons
for their beliefs. They were men enchanted with one of the most
daring and imposing men of their generation. While Richard glorified
the religious motives of his king, Geoffrey glossed over anything which
might tarnish the king's glory. When King Richard ordered the killing
of 2,700 Moslem prisoners, Geoffrey claimed that the deed was done by
divine grace to punish those who had murdered Christians.
According to Geoffrey, the army was so devoted to its cause of liberating the Holy Sepulcher that the men cried out "Help, help for the Holy Sepulcher with contrite hearts and much weeping." During battle, the crusaders would call out "Aid us o God, and the Holy Sepulcher. . . . How great must have been the blackness of our sins to require so fiery an ordeal to purify it." Such language tends to glorify the army, its leader, and to give a romantic air to the crusade. Even the mentioning of the crusaders' sins is said in such a way that the reader wonders at their nobility of soul in being able to bear up under such suffering. He gives a last plaudit to the crusading movement by calling the members of the first crusade heroes worthy of the deepest veneration because they had been true in their hearts to the Lord's service. No writer of the second crusade viewed things in quite this light. Bernard believed the second crusade would provide a means of salvation for many a sinner. Geoffrey, on the other hand, applauded the chivalric heroism of the crusaders. Richard of Devizes also applauded the heroism of the crusaders, especially King Richard.

In the chronicle of Roger of Hoveden, we have one of the complete accounts of the crusade. Roger was able to do much travelling to collect and study many documents for his history. One such document which he includes in its entirely in his history is Gregory VIII's (1187) letter to all the Faithful. In this letter, Gregory spelled out to Western Christendom what kind of an expedition he wished to send to the Holy Land. Gregory mentioned many of the things that Eugenius had said half a century earlier:
Through penitence and works of piety to the Lord... to those who with contrite heart, and humbled spirit undertake the labor of this journey, and depart in sorrow for their sins and in true faith, we promise full pardon for their offenses and eternal life.  

These words are less specific than those of Eugenius. There is no emphasis on having a devout and contrite heart or of confessing one's sins. Gregory merely lists these qualifications in one sentence and does not expound on any of them as Bernard did. Gregory does not require the crusader to confess each sin which he hopes to be pardoned for, but instead, a general pardon is given with a promise of eternal life. There is no question here of the crusader merely being freed from penance of his sins. The crusader receives eternal life.

Gregory also had a different conception of the cause of the disasters in the East. Both Eugenius and Bernard had acknowledged sin as a reason for the disasters that befell Edessa and the armies of the second crusade but neither recommended penance for the whole of Christendom. However, this is exactly what Pope Gregory did. According to Roger's text, Gregory said, "Still we must not believe that it is through the injustice of the judge who smites but through the iniquity of the sinful people that these things have come to pass." To appease God, Gregory called for several good works. He decreed a lenten fast for the next five years on the sixth day of each week; mass was to be chanted at the ninth hour from Advent until Christmas on the fourth day of each week and on Saturday; and finally, all persons who were not nobles and were in good health were to abstain from meat on the second day of each week.  

Gregory must have taken seriously the notion of Christian sin being
responsible for the disasters in the East. Since the letter and therefore the penances which it contained were addressed to all the faithful, we can assume that Gregory believed that all Christendom was involved in the events that had occurred in Palestine. Jerusalem fell not because of the sins of the Eastern Franks alone but because Christendom was sinning.

Like St. Bernard, Gregory said that the Christians were being tested. To help them meet this test, he granted to them a plenary indulgence which freed all those who took part in the crusade with a devout and contrite heart from all penance. This indulgence was in addition to the promise of eternal life mentioned earlier. They were to have "Remission of penance imposed for all sins of which they shall have made due confession." One wonders why Gregory used such a general statement when discussing the conditions necessary for obtaining eternal life but imposed specific conditions necessary to receive remission of penance. Perhaps men of the late twelfth century were very much concerned with the idea of penance as something they had to deal with in their everyday lives. Therefore they were interested in knowing what pains they were to be spared.

Gregory continues in his letter to say that the property of the pilgrims would be under the protection of the church. The pilgrims were also absolved from paying interest on their debts while on crusade. Finally, they were to depart in plain dress. Henry and Phillip followed up the last of these ideas by issuing decrees that no one was to swear profanely, play at dice, wear elaborate clothing, or eat fancy dishes. No one was to take a woman along.
with him unless she was a laundress. Finally, no one was to go on crusade unless he was rich enough to afford decent clothing. No one was to go in rags or torn clothing. The kings did not want paupers who had to be equipped by the army, though those who could afford to pay their own way were not to dress as if they were going on a picnic. Some groups were exempt from all or part of these rules. Gregory followed the precedent of Eugenius in such matters while Henry and Phillip seemed to have taken to heart Odo of Deuil's warnings about the liability of non-combatants and too much non-essential baggage.

Roger's chronicle contains as well a letter from the Patriarch of Antioch to King Henry II of England. The Patriarch asked Henry to praise God by liberating the Eastern Church from the clutches of the Saracens. "We ourselves with all possible contribution, and smiting our guilty breasts, cry unto God that he will give you both the will and ability of thus acting to the praise and glory of His name." The patriarch continues, "True, we justly deserve the punishment God is visiting upon us, but we are sorry for our mis-doings and now pray to God to send you to deliver us from the Saracens." The patriarch has claimed that though God was punishing the Eastern Church because of her sin, she has now repented and therefore the West should consider themselves agents of God sent to deliver a now contrite people. From the patriarch's point of view, one can see how both Saladin and the crusaders could be agents of God. Though Geoffrey of Vinsauf said that Saladin had been used by God, he never specified the point at which God took
away His favor from the Saracen and gave it over to the Christians. The patriarch gave that point—when the Eastern Christians repented of their sins and became contrite.

Roger reported some of the coarser notions about the holy war that were around in his day. Without any editorial comment, he mentioned that many people thought God would help the crusaders wipe out the infidels just as He had aided the Israelites in the Old Testament. This view certainly conflicts with the sentiments of the anonymous author of the De expugnatione Lyxbonensi who had asked God to convert the pagans so that they would not have been killed. In another instance, Roger quoted a crusader's lament, "For who can do other than grieve for the slaughter of so many saints, so many sacred houses of the Lord profaned, princes led captive, dwellings destroyed, and nobles hurled at the feet of slaves." The hurling down of slaves comes last in this sentence but it was probably not least.

Roger claimed Richard still operated from purely religious motives. Richard set out for the Holy Land with the intention of restoring Jerusalem to its rightful king—Guy. He did not take up the cross to increase the power and wealth of England. Roger even tells us a story of how Richard received a dispensation from heaven to see himself in a dream as the sinner he truly was. This led Richard to call together all the bishops and archbishops of his army to confess his sins and receive penance. This glorification of Richard and his devout intentions shows that many people
justified Richard's warfare by saying it was approved by God in Whose service Richard accomplished his deeds.

Roger also records some of the convential justifications mentioned during the second crusade: Palestine is the Lord's land and His children are called on to protect it. The holy places are being defiled and polluted by pagans. One cleric named Berther said that to die on crusade was to repay Christ for dying on the cross. The crusaders were to be rough and rugged men since the hardships of war for the Lord would be difficult. Berther also lamented the fact that a portion of the true Cross had fallen into heathen hands when the soldiers of the kingdom of Jerusalem had been defeated at the battle of Hattin on July 25, 1187. For the crusaders not to attempt to get it back would be to mock the suffering Christ endured for us.

Shortly after Richard's departure from Acre, Pope Celestine III stated his reasons as to why the crusade had been launched.

Whereas, for the purpose of repelling the injuries done to the people of Christendom, and wiping away that stain to our common faith which the pollutions of the pagans, in the capture of the Holy Land, which had been named the inheritance of the Lord, had perniciously and violently imprinted thereon, and for cleansing the Holy City and the Sepulcher of our Lord from the abominations of the Saracens and others, who held possession thereof, as also for the purpose, with the assistance of the Divine mercy, or rescuing it from their power, the Apostolic See, . . . sent its nuncios to different parts of the world. . . . granted indulgences to those proceeding hither. . . .

There is no new idea here. Celestine admitted, "And you may know beyond a doubt, that it was in consequence of the discords that arose, that the achievements of the hoped-for victory was taken away from the Christian chivalry by reason of the quarrels and frequent
rancours that had sprung up in the army, and because they had made the flesh their arm, and had withdrawn their hearts from the Lord." The crusaders failed because of their sins. This time we do have specific references to what kind of sins they committed. They were proud and quarreled among themselves.

Celestine did not despair of rescuing the Holy Land. After discussing why the crusade failed, he immediately called for another expedition. This time he asked: "Out of regard for the Divine love and their own salvation, if anyone has on any ground entertained feelings of rancour against another, and has despised the advice of man, he will for the creator do away with the same; lest grounds for mutual dissension may still exist, which have hitherto, as you are well aware, deprived us of our achievement of victory, and have, without any advantage, brought the greater part of this multitude into peril of death."  

Here, we have a statement of some of the things that had been causing the crusades to fail. The Christians were not united and selfish interests seem to have prevailed. The last two lines seem to suggest that Celestine did not believe many of the crusaders died having the proper frame of mind since he said many were brought into peril of death "without any advantage." Otto of Freising had said that though a crusade might be a military failure, it could still be profitable for the salvation of souls. Celestine seems to have denied that. The result of Celestine's preaching was a crusade launched by Henry VI of Germany. Henry's crusade departed for the Holy Land but came to nothing for Henry died enroute of a fever.
The third crusade had just been justified by many of the same reasons adduced for the second crusade. Perhaps the only new ideas were those of Berther and Geoffrey of Vinsauf. . . . The goals for the crusade were now better defined. Jerusalem was to be liberated. Berther also hoped to regain the portion of the true cross lost at the battle of Hattin.

Until the year 1200, criticism directed against the crusades pointed out the waste of manpower and wealth caused by that particular crusade's failure. Only Peter the Venerable hinted that the idea of crusade may have been wrong. The criticisms tended to be like those of Celestine—directed against the wicked crusaders. However, in Ralph Niger we have an exception to that rule. He is perhaps the first man to marshal arguments against the idea of crusade. His arguments, contained in his book *De Re Militari et tribus viis Jerosolmitanae Peregrinationis*, were written in 1189, just two years after the fall of Jerusalem, when the crusading spirit should have been at its height. 187

Ralph maintained that it was not just for Christians to kill in the name of faith. He questioned whether killing another human being could atone for sin. It was better to try to convert the pagans. Ralph also argued along the lines of Geoffrey of Vinsauf, claiming that God was using Saladin to punish the sinful Eastern Franks. Ralph remarked that God was actually doing the Eastern Christians good by punishing them. Repeating a centuries old admonition, Ralph said that it was the heavenly Jerusalem and not the Earthly that was important. Besides, the energy and expense
of a crusade could be better applied at home in checking the rising
growth of heresy.

Many of Ralph's arguments were hinted at in the writings of
other clergymen who favored the crusade. St. Bernard had pointed
out that a Christian was not going to obtain any special merit by
killing. The Christian was to die a martyr. The anonymous author
of the De expugnatione Lyxbonensi had spoken of it being better to
convert the pagans. So had St. Bernard. Geoffrey of Vinsauf had
mentioned the idea of God using Saladin to punish the Christians.
Yet all these people had felt that God had ordered the crusade.

Though Ralph had argued that the crusade was wrong, he still
expected people to take their vows anyway. After assuming this,
he then proceeded to give some concrete advice on how to make the
crusade a success. This sign of equivocation would suggest that
Ralph was not entirely convinced by his own arguments or that he
believed the force of public opinion to have been too strong to
fight.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

We have seen that the third crusade was justified by the clergy by many of the same reasons by which they had justified the second crusade. In 1189 as in 1145, a crusader was portrayed as a pilgrim hoping to obtain martyrdom in the Holy Land. In both instances, the pilgrims were exhorted to have devout and contrite hearts. The Christians in the East were still seen as brothers needing protection and the Holy Land was a place special to God. Advocates of both crusades believed they were ordained by God. Though the basic justifications remained the same, we can still see that there was a change in the attitude of the West towards the idea of crusade.

While the West was busily preparing for the second crusade, there was little talk about God punishing anyone for his sins. There was no mention of a Moslem leader being an agent of God. The West viewed the proposed crusade as a gift from God for the salvation of souls. People felt that the crusaders would march victoriously into Jerusalem as their grandfathers had done before them. The possibility of defeat was unthinkable--after all, they were fulfilling the will of God. It was only after the Christian armies had been defeated in Asia Minor that questions about the crusade arose. After the crusade's failure, works appeared all over Europe condemning the sins of the crusaders. The anonymous chronicler at
Wurzburg called the preachers of the crusade witnesses of anti-
Christ, sons of Belial, and pseudo-prophets. The idea of possible failure was now firmly engraved on the Western consciousness.

By the third crusade, things had changed. Though people still believed that God had willed the crusade, the possibility of failure had forced them to view the situation in a different light. Men were now concerned that sin might cause them to fail. The chroniclers mentioned more often and with greater emphasis the sins of the East which had caused the fall of Jerusalem. Many people such as the Patriarch of Antioch made public acknowledgment of the justness of God's wrath. Gregory VIII was influenced by the prevailing idea of sin to impose various acts of penance on Christendom. Nothing like this had been seen during the second crusade.

Though many clerics felt that sin was the cause of the crusaders' misfortunes, they still believed that God wished them to go on crusade. When the third crusade also failed, more and more people began to question the practicality of a crusade until opposition became widespread during the thirteenth century. When the crusades led by St. Louis of France in the thirteenth century failed, the eagerness of the West to undertake another crusade was severely dampened. St. Louis was an acknowledged holy man who had failed. It was now evident that the wickedness of the leaders of the crusade was not the only reason that the crusade had failed.

During the first two crusades, we find little evidence of people trying to escape from their crusader's vow and doing so successfully. Instead, special attention was given to the eagerness
of Louis and Conrad to fulfill their vows. The crusaders at the
seige of Lisbon proceeded on to Jerusalem after securing their share
of plunder. When Stephen of Blois returned home during the first
crusade without fulfilling his vow, he was so severely criticized
by everyone, including his wife, that he was forced to return to the
East. \(^{190}\) When Peter the Hermit fled from the seige of Antioch in
1198, he too was forced to return to the army. \(^{191}\) Even Bohemond was
pressured into leaving his newly won principality of Antioch to ful-
fill his vow. \(^{192}\) During the third crusade we find many instances of
people not fulfilling their vows. Giraldus Cambrensis mentioned
people handing over part of their property for the use of the crusade
in lieu of travelling to Jerusalem themselves. Richard the lion-
hearted himself dismissed from his army all those who would not bear
arms. Richard of Devizes claimed that some of the clergy tried to
maintain that their vows were not binding on the grounds that bishops
were to preach and not fight. Finally, Phillip of France returned
from the East without even making an honest attempt to fulfill his
vow only to have the pope absolve him from it on his return. A half
a century earlier, such an action would have been un-thinkable. It
seems that by the third crusade the level of idealism present during
the first two crusades had disappeared.

By 1189, men began to approach the crusade on a more practi-
cal level. Bernard of Clairvaux had said little more than that the
crusaders should free the holy places from defilement by the infidel.
Before Louis and Conrad departed with their armies, they had no real
military objectives in mind. They were going to march to Jerusalem
first and then decide what to do. William of Tyre wanted the crusaders to enlarge the boundaries of the kingdom of Jerusalem while Raymond of Antioch wanted Louis' army to benefit his own principality. The generally accepted aim of the third crusade was specific. It was to free Jerusalem from the control of Saladin.

At the beginning of the second crusade, the Western armies felt compelled to follow the route of the forefathers during the first crusade. They hoped to follow in their predecessors' glory and triumphs. By the third crusade a slightly different vision had occurred. Richard and Phillip no longer felt obligated to follow the old crusader routes to the East. Part of the reason for this change in attitude can be attributed to the disgust which the West generally felt for the Byzantines because of their alleged misconduct during the second crusade. While it is true that Frederick Barbarossa led his army along the old crusader routes, it must be remembered that the Germans did not share the hostility the French felt towards the Greeks after the second crusade. After the third crusade, both French and Germans were in harmony in their hatred of the Greeks. In fact, the Germans of the third crusade reported many instances of treachery by the Greeks just as Odo of Deuil had done. They accused the Greeks of trying to poison them. They even alleged that the Patriarch of Constantinople had offered absolution to any Greek who would kill a German. 193

The spiritual dimension of the third crusade was curtailed. Where Bernard and Eugenius had laid out very carefully what must be done if a crusader was to achieve the end of the crusade,
i.e. embrace salvation, Gregory VIII was much more general and
Celestine III does not even mention the saving of souls as one of the
reasons for calling for the crusade. Geoffrey of Vinsauf paid little
attention to religious motives of King Richard and instead glorified
his heroic actions.

The clergy at the time of the third crusade did not develop
many new ideas to justify a crusade. They seemed content to rely on
the ideas forged by earlier generations. In 1190, the idea of
crusade was completely accepted and un-questioned. But like all
movements in history, the zeal and idealism of the early founders
proved to be too much for their successors to match.

In many ways, this practicality of the third crusade did
have its advantages. With the exception of the Germans, the West
was able to land its armies intact in Syria. Because of the absence
of large numbers of non-combatants, the armies were more effective.
While the second crusade with all its idealism gave no aid to the
East, the third crusade did insure the continued existence of a
Christian state in the East for another ninety years.
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