

Were There Any Crusades in the Twelfth Century?

GUIBERT OF NOGENT, in a famous phrase, described the First Crusade as a new path of salvation which allowed laymen to earn redemption without changing their status and becoming monks.¹ This theme was taken up by later apologists and recruiters of further military expeditions to the Holy Land, notably St Bernard in his praise of the Templars in the late 1120s and his preaching of the Second Crusade in the 1140s, where the new opportunity was restyled as a unique bargain which God was offering his faithful. This identification of a fresh means of grace, a new form of holy war, has been generally accepted by modern historians. Even Carl Erdmann, for all his painstaking excavation of the roots of crusading, insisted on the novelty of the First Crusade. The events of 1095–9 have been commonly regarded as marking an epoch in the Church's acceptance of secular militarism; in the development of theories of holy war; and in opportunities for the legitimate expression of lay military and chivalric ambitions. Yet the evidence from the eighty years after the capture of Jerusalem hardly supports such categorical assumptions.

With hindsight, we may see the First Crusade as spawning a new movement which both characterized and shaped western Christendom for centuries. Contemporaries clearly did not. Their twelfth-century hindsight led them to different conclusions, namely that the First Crusade was unique and, especially after the fiascos of 1101 and 1146–9, unrepeatable.² The First Crusade was remembered as a symbol of loyalty and honour, a focus and inspiration for traditional secular qualities, not as a new way of salvation or a new form of holy war. Thus the English baron, Brian FitzCount, c.1143, saw the First Crusaders as supremely loyal knights (*boni milites*).³ Given the loyalist axe he was grinding at the time, it could be argued that FitzCount was merely scoring a debating point. Although in a different style, Eugenius III said much the same in the bull *Quantum praedecessores* of 1146 which launched the Second Crusade. It was to the memory of the First Crusaders and to the honour of their descendants that Eugenius

1. Guibert of Nogent, 'Gesta Dei per Francos', in *R[ecueil des] H[istoriens des] C[roisades]*, ed. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres (Paris, 1841–1906), Documents Occidentaux, iv, 124.

2. Robert of Rheims, 'Historia Iherosolimitana', *RHC Occ.*, iii, 723; J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London, 1986), ch. 6.

3. H. W. C. Davis, 'Henry of Blois and Brian FitzCount', *ante*, xxv (1910), 301–3.

appealed.¹ His lead was followed by the popularizers and propagandists.²

Far from being a new way of salvation, the crusade was an old way of gaining reward, by loyal service to a master (the pope or, more generally, Christ), only writ large. Besides the need to emulate the heroism of the First Crusaders, Pope Eugenius identified two desired consequences of the proposed expedition: 'so that the dignity of the name of Christ may be enhanced ... and your reputation for strength, which is praised throughout the world, may be kept unimpaired and unsullied'. It is the 'ancestral laws' which need defending. Thus the religious rhetoric was underpinned by traditional themes of obligation, defence, honour and glory. Eugenius showed little interest in creating a new ecclesiastical institution or movement. He sought a specific response to a specific problem – the threat to Christian Outremer – and found it in calling for a repetition of the 1096 expedition. The lack of a clearly identifiable crusade institution by 1146 is further suggested by the ease with which Bernard of Clairvaux transmuted the enterprise into an occasion for mass repentance and spiritual reform. It is often argued that *Quantum praedecessores* marked a new stage in institutionalizing the crusade, indicated by the statement of secular privileges, sumptuary regulations and the indulgence. However, the Second Crusade led nowhere. Although the papal bulls and the experience of the preaching and military campaigns provided a fresh set of precedents and memories, it is hard to see in, for instance, Eugenius's association of his indulgence with that offered by Urban II the presence of a definite current ideology, nor is it obvious that he wished to develop one.³

In this Eugenius was typical of the period before the Third Crusade, when what we call 'the Crusades' in fact covered a fragmented series of military and religious activities that lacked coherence: general expeditions (only one between 1101 and 1188); private armed and unarmed pilgrimages, not all of which can be proved to have been undertaken in response to specific or general papal authorization; the interest of settlers in the east, such as Fuleher of Chartres or even William of Tyre, to create a process of constant reinforcement; and the birth and growth of the military orders. Each activity was distinct in motive, appeal and implementation, with nobody seriously trying to

1. *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*, ed. J. P. Migne (1844–64), cxxx, cols. 1064–6. E. Caspar, 'Die Kreuzzugsbullen Eugens III', *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, xlv (1924), 285–305, at 300–5; for an English translation, L. and J. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: Idea and Reality* (London, 1981), pp. 57–9.

2. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Opera*, ed. J. Leclercq et al. (Rome, 1957–77), vols. vii–viii, *Epistolae*, nos. 256, 288, 363–5, 371, 380, 467–9. *Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*, trans. B. S. James (London, 1953), nos. 391–6, 398–401, 408, 410; J. Bédier, *Les chansons de croisade* (Paris 1909), pp. 8–11 ('Chevalier, Mult Estes Guariz', esp. 1.4: 'Ki li vut fait tels deshenors').

3. For *Quantum praedecessores*, see *supra*, p. 554, n. 1; cf. J. G. Rowe's comment that the bull was 'a shot in the dark': 'Origins of the Second Crusade', in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, ed. M. Gervers (New York, 1992), p. 86; in general, see G. Constable, 'The Second Crusade as Seen by Contemporaries', *Traditio*, ix (1953), esp. 247–65.

incorporate these diverse strands into one institution, theory, or even name.

The inability of an otherwise articulate and categorizing intellectual elite to agree or even propose a term for the activity which later was named 'crusade' has tended to be noted without too much comment by modern observers. Yet the terminological vagueness of the twelfth century may be significant. To put it crudely, *we* know there were crusaders: *they* did not; or, if they did, their perception was far from the canonically or juridically precise definition beloved of some late twentieth-century scholars. The hesitancy of twelfth-century canonists has been tellingly exposed by Professor Gilchrist in two acutely revisionist articles in the 1980s.¹ His arguments can, however, be extended to wider aspects of twelfth-century crusading, in order to suggest that the impact of this type of holy war was less distinctive than many, myself included, have assumed. In a non-crusading context, crusading, popular or not, appears more as an extension of existing social or religious activities than as a radical departure from them. Compare it with becoming a monk, as did some contemporary apologists.² Unlike monasticism, crusading was not a lifetime's vocation, guided by carefully elaborated rules which inspired a culture distinct from the rest of lay society. In law and action, its operation remained confused with other habits and forms. As an awareness of a continuing tradition – as opposed to a glittering memory of the First Crusade – it grew haphazardly. For clarity, definition and uniformity, one must look at Innocent III and beyond. The twelfth century is crusading's Dark Ages.

An obvious question to ask concerns the effect of crusading on its participants. The charter evidence from the First and Second Crusades points to a strong pious impulse: the desire for active repentance and forgiveness of sins. The mechanism of the armed pilgrimage was different, but the inspiration – the desire for salvation – was traditional. It was closely allied to customary expressions of piety, especially donations to, and associations with, monasteries which, conveniently, acted as both material and spiritual bankers for crusaders.³ Crusading motives, where religious, were solidly embedded in contemporary spiritual anxieties and aspirations. However, the campaigns themselves did possess the

1. J. Gilchrist, 'The Erdmann Thesis and the Canon Law, 1083–1141', in *Crusade and Settlement*, ed. P. Edbury (Cardiff, 1985), pp. 37–45; id., 'The Papacy and War against the "Saracens"', 795–1216', *The International History Review*, x (1988), 174–97. Cf., for a different recent view, H. E. J. Cowdrey, 'Canon Law and the First Crusade', in *Horns of Hattin*, ed. B. Z. Kedar (Jerusalem, 1992), pp. 41–8. For a similar, more general perspective: C. Morris, *The Papal Monarchy* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 277–80.

2. Cf. J. A. Brundage, 'St. Bernard and the Jurists', *Second Crusade and Cistercians*, pp. 29–30; Riley-Smith, *First Crusade*, esp. pp. 150–2.

3. Constable, 'Second Crusade', 241–4; id., 'Medieval Charters as a Source for the History of the Crusades', in *Crusade and Settlement*, pp. 73–89; id., 'The Financing of the Crusades in the Twelfth Century', in *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem Presented to Joshua Prawer*, ed. B. Z. Kedar et al. (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 64–88. Cf. M. Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade* (Oxford, 1993), esp. chs. 4 and 6.

special quality of a mission, with the element of pilgrimage central. During the Second Crusade, when Jerusalem was in Christian hands, the expedition to the East was, to Odo of Deuil, the 'via Sancti Sepulchri' and to Louis VII the 'sacrosanctae peregrinationis iter'.¹ The sanctity of the enterprise was reflected in attendant miracles and the belief that casualties were martyrs.² With martyrdom, however, the new cloaked the old. Radulfus Glaber, in the mid-eleventh century, had assumed that those who fell fighting the infidel merited Paradise, even if it could be argued that technically they were not martyrs. In his *Decretum*, Gratian cited Carolingian authorities who recognized the same spiritual reward.³ If perceptions of crusaders were formed by pre-existing attitudes, their experiences were often extraordinary. The physical circumstances of such long and hazardous campaigns made them so. Yet the expeditions were finite; experiences became memories, models of conduct and good stories. These hardly provided the basis for a new institution or formal ideology.

Veterans of the First Crusade were accounted heroes (or, if they had deserted, villains).⁴ They could gain material favours, as with Robert of Normandy, who received especially pleasant conditions of custody between 1106 and 1134 because Henry I decided to treat him 'not as an enemy captive but as a noble pilgrim', a reference to Robert's inflated reputation as a leader of the Crusade.⁵ Responses to the survivors of the largely unsuccessful Second Crusade were, inevitably, more muted and confused. Their actions were not obviously taken as models or precedents – even, it appears, at the time of the Third Crusade.⁶ But crusading exerted no general influence on future behaviour, to the occasional

1. Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII in orientem*, ed. V. G. Berry (New York, 1948), pp. 2–3; *R[ecueil des] h[istoriens des] G[aulles et de la] F[rance]*, ed. M. Bouquet et al. (Paris, 1738–1904), xv. 488; Constable, 'Second Crusade', 216–44.

2. J. Riley-Smith, 'Death on the First Crusade', in *The End of Strife*, ed. D. M. Loades (London, 1984), pp. 14–31; id., *First Crusade*, esp. pp. 91–100, 112–19. Cf. the Iberian experiences during the Second Crusade of Duodechlin of Lahnstein: *M[onumenta] G[ermaniae] H[istorica], S[criptores]* (Hanover etc., 1826–), xvii. 28; 'De Expugnatione Scalabis', in *Portugaliae Monumenta Historica, Scriptores*, vol. i (Lisbon, 1856), pp. 94–5. Perhaps miracles were more a feature of successful campaigns; martyrs were common to all sorts: Constable, 'Second Crusade', 221–2.

3. Radulfus Glaber, *Historiae Libri Quinque*, ed. J. France (Oxford, 1989), pp. 82–5; Gratian, *Decretum*, ed. A. Friedberg (Corpus Iuris Canonici, vol. i, Leipzig, 1879), Causa XXIII: Quest. V, c. xlvii; Quest. VIII, c. vii.

4. Compare Robert of Flanders ('his memory will live for ever') with the deserters Stephen of Blois or the Grandmesnil brothers: Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. T. Arnold (Rolls Series), London, 1879), p. 238; Orderic Vitalis, *Eccl[esiastical] Hist[ory]*, ed. M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1969–80), v. 98, 106, 268, 324, vi. 18.

5. C. W. David, *Robert Curthose* (Cambridge, Mass., 1920), p. 179 and n. 17; Robert of Torigni, 'Chronicle', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, vol. iv, ed. R. Howlett (RS, London, 1889), pp. 85–6.

6. P. Edbury, 'Looking Back at the Second Crusade', in *Second Crusade and Cistercians*, pp. 163–9; compare the tone and content of *Audita tremendi* (*infra*, p. 560, n. 4) with *Quantum praedecessores*.

disquiet of the church authorities. Unlike in the thirteenth century, there was no continuing institutional presence of crusading after the event, such as special prayers or parish collecting boxes. Returning Jerusalemites in 1099, for all the expressions of contrition evident in their charters of three years earlier, appeared eager to pick up the familiar threads of their secular lives. Raimbold Croton was one of the heroes of the First Crusade, especially in the region of Chartres, where he enjoyed the reputation of being the first crusader to enter Jerusalem. Ralph of Caen, Albert of Aachen and Baldric of Dol all mention his heroism at Antioch and Jerusalem.¹ Yet, a few years after his return, Raimbold, incensed at a local monk who had beaten some of his servants for stealing hay, had the unfortunate cleric castrated. For this the church authorities forbade the former *miles christi* from bearing arms for fourteen years. Raimbold, apparently shocked into penitence, appealed to Bishop Ivo of Chartres who, knowing his canon law, declined to get involved directly but, in view of Raimbold's bravery at Jerusalem, sent him to Pope Paschal II for absolution. This Raimbold presumably received, for soon afterwards he met his death in one of the interminable and sordid petty wars in the Île de France.² The First Crusade may have widened the scope of knightly endeavour and provided fresh heroes, but it did little to alter the realities of life, a point echoed by Orderic Vitalis when lamenting the death of Robert of Flanders, trampled in the royal retreat from Dammartin, a sad fate for a 'bellicosus Jerosolimitae'.³

The squalid career of Raimbold Croton, illustrating the political success and the many personal failures of the ideal and practice of the First Crusade, may be seen to have consolidated a close relationship between the Church and the *ordo pugnatorem*, at the very least an increased recognition of the mutual benefits. From all sides of religious debate, from Peter the Venerable of Cluny, Suger of St Denis and Bernard of Clairvaux, there was agreement about the potential virtue of the knightly order and its violent activities, specifically when protecting ecclesiastical interests.⁴ Yet, consciously or not, these apologists were following a long tradition, stretching back to papal approval of Carolingian militarism in the eighth century and beyond, for example the

1. Orderic Vitalis, *Eccl. Hist.*, v. 168; Petrus Tudebodus, 'Imitatus et Continuatus Historia Peregrinorum' in *RHC Occ.*, iii. 218–19; Ralph of Caen, 'Gesta Tancredi', *ibid.* iii. 689; Albert of Aachen, 'Historia Hierosolymitana', *ibid.* iv. 410; Baldric of Dol, 'Historia Jerosolimitana', *ibid.* iv. 49, n. 12, 71, n. 7, 102, n. 8.

2. *PL*, cxii, cols. 144–5, no. 135; Orderic Vitalis, *Eccl. Hist.*, vi. 158.

3. *Ibid.* 162.

4. Suger, *Vie de Louis le Gros*, ed. H. Waquet (Paris, 1929), pp. 78–9; *Letters of Peter the Venerable*, ed. G. Constable (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), i. 409; *Letters of St Bernard*, no. 391, p. 461; Bernard, *Opera*, iii. 215.

praise in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* for Edwin, Oswald and Oswy.¹ In February 1145, Pope Lucius II died from wounds received leading his troops in an attempt to secure control of the city of Rome. But this was not a sign of any new dispensation in favour of acceptable holy violence. In the tenth century, both John X (914–28) and John XII (955–63) personally took part in fighting.² Warrior bishops are not unusual in the twelfth century: Ralph of Bethlehem; or Rainald von Dassel of Cologne; or Hubert Walter, then of Salisbury. But they represented an old habit which, if anything, was dying out, as the logic of Gregorian separation of functions and powers seeped into law, custom and expectations, although there remained some vigorous episcopal campaigners, such as Bishop Despensers of Norwich in the fourteenth century, and episcopal war administrators who occasionally donned armour, as, apparently, did Archbishop Boniface of Canterbury, preparatory to mugging the prior of St Bartholomew's, London, in 1250.³

The First Crusade was part of an old process of justifying wars against pagans and enemies of the pope in an atmosphere where war was a familiar, necessary burden, not an inevitably abhorrent evil. Even Burchard of Worms, in the early eleventh century, a man usually regarded as extremely hostile to Christian approval of war, saw a role for legitimate warfare fought with good intent.⁴ The First Crusade only appeared as the beginning of a coherent movement retrospectively when that movement existed, after 1187. This impression is confirmed by a closer look at papal responses. Here we find a reluctance to define the crusade as an institution, maybe because it was not regarded as such. Colin Morris has suggested one reason for this. Because Jerusalem was in Christian hands, 'there was no plan for an unrestricted offensive against the heathen and no need to discuss its justification.' He adds that

1. Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1967), esp. bks. ii and iii; Gilchrist, 'Papacy and War', 179–83; 'Annals' and 'Revised Annals of the Kingdom of the Franks', in *Charlemagne: Translated Sources*, ed. P. D. King (N.p., 1987), *passim*; cf. p. 85, for papal absolution in the war against Tassilo of Bavaria. For contemporary Carolingian acceptance of church militancy, see the Veronese poem of the late eighth century on Pippin of Italy's victory over the Avars, verses 4 and 13, and Ernoldus Nigellus's pre-840 poem 'In Honorem Hludovici Pii' regarding the Frankish conquest of the Frisians and Saxons, lines 275 and 281–4; both in P. Godman, *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 188–91, 254–5. But cf. Alcuin's essentially pacifist response to the sack of Lindisfarne in 793 (*ibid.*, pp. 126–39).

2. For Lucius II, see the references in J. Kelly, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Popes* (Oxford, 1986), p. 172; H. Zimmermann (ed.), *Papstregesten, 911–1024* (Vienna, 1969), no. 34, p. 14, and no. 35, p. 15; Liutprand of Cremona, 'Historia Ottonis', *Opera*, ed. J. Becker (Hanover/Leipzig, 1915), pp. 166–7; Gilchrist, 'Papacy and War', 179 ff.

3. Ralph of Bethlehem: William of Tyre, 'Historia Rerum in Partibus Transmarinis Gestarum', *RHC Occ.*, i–2, p. 162; B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States* (London, 1980), pp. 117–18, 123, 125, 130–1, 157, 164–5. Rainald von Dassel: R. Munz, *Frederick Barbarossa* (London, 1969), esp. p. 95 and refs. Hubert Walter: *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, ed. W. Stubbs (RS, London, 1864), p. 116. Boniface of Savoy: Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ed. H. R. Luard (7 vols., RS, London, 1872–83), v. 121–2. Bishop Despensers: R. B. Dobson, *The Peasants' Revolt* (London, 1970), pp. 236–8, 259–61.

4. Gilchrist, 'Papacy and War', 174–9.

pilgrimage and the military orders, not the crusade, provided the link between the Holy Sepulchre and the West.¹ But this is only part of the answer. Between the rare papally-launched general expeditions, men took the cross to go east, and many were armed and fought: for example, during Hugh de Payens' recruitment tour in 1128 and on the departure of Fulk of Anjou in 1129, the military objectives were explicit.² Although it was only in 1146–8 that a general expedition was achieved, the papacy was involved in a number of plans which, if effected, could have led to similar campaigns, as in 1106, 1150, 1157, 1165, 1169, 1181, and 1184–5.³ Each occasion demonstrated the limitations of papal power and, after 1150, commitment.

In 1106, Paschal II gave Bohemond a papal banner and appointed as legate Bruno of Segni, a veteran of Urban II's preaching tour of 1095–6. A new *via sancti sepulchri* or *ire Hierusalem* was preached at a council held in Poitiers. The only practical result was Bohemond's unsuccessful attack on Epirus in 1107–8, a final outcome, for all Steven Runciman's chill condemnation, not necessarily envisaged by the pope.⁴ Papal loss of control of crusades was, after all, a constant feature of the Middle Ages. In 1150, Eugenius III was involved in a scheme to redeem the disasters of the Second Crusade by a new expedition to the East. St Bernard himself tentatively accepted leadership of this enterprise, perhaps to vindicate his role in launching the Second Crusade. Any prospect of a new expedition was vitiated by conflicting objectives: either Outremer, after the military disaster of Inab in 1149, or an assault on Byzantium, as preferred by the Sicilians and some French. But Eugenius III, in his bull *Immensum pietatis opus* of April 1150, was distinctly lukewarm.⁵ What finally killed the idea was the explosion of criticism of the Second Crusade, and even of the crusading ideal itself, hostility which was still vivid twenty years later. In a letter of 1169 from the entourage of Thomas Becket, the Second Crusade was condemned as 'grievous to the Church', being an illustration that 'gifts offered from theft and wrongdoing are not pleasing to God'. The same letter mocked the reputation as a holy warrior of William IV of Nevers, who had died in Palestine of a

1. Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, pp. 277–80.

2. Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, sub anno 1128, in *English Historical Documents*, vol. ii, ed. D. C. Douglas (London, 1953), p. 195; William of Tyre, 'Historia', p. 40; *Gesta Ambazensium Dominorum, Chroniques d'Anjou*, ed. P. Machegay and A. Salmon (Paris, 1856), p. 205 (cf. Fulk's visit of 1120 which was, apparently, explicitly penitential: Orderic Vitalis, *Eccl. Hist.*, vi, 310). Cf. Calixtus II's authorization of a crusade and the Venetian response in 1122–4: J. Riley-Smith, 'The Venetian Crusade of 1122–4', in *I communi italiani nel regno di Gerusalemme*, ed. B. Kedar (Genoa, 1986), pp. 337–50.

3. On papal policy in the twelfth century, see E.-D. Hehl, *Kirche und Krieg im 12. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1980), and Morris, *Papal Monarchy*. More specifically: R. C. Smail, 'Latin Syria and the West, 1149–1187', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., xix (1969), 1–20.

4. S. Runciman, *History of the Crusades* (Cambridge, 1951–4), ii, 46–9 (p. 48: 'The interests of Christendom as a whole were to be sacrificed to the interests of Frankish adventurers'); J. G. Rowe, 'Paschal II, Bohemond of Antioch and the Byzantine Empire', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xlix (1966), 165–202; Orderic Vitalis, *Eccl. Hist.*, vi, 68–73; Suger, *Vie de Louis le Gros*, pp. 44–51.

5. E. Vacandard, *Vie de Saint Bernard, abbé de Clairvaux* (2 vols., Paris, 1895), ii, 439–46. *RHGF*, xv, 457, no. 65.

fever, and who, said the writer, 'was not even killed by Parthian darts or Syrian swords, so that no hero's glorious death could bring him consolation; but widow's tears, poor men's sorrow and complaints of churches are thought to have snuffed him out ingloriously.'¹ In such an atmosphere, papal approval of crusading was liable to be cautious.

Repeated calls for assistance from the East received muted replies. One reason for this was the widespread suspicion of the *pullani*, the inhabitants of Outremer (who were in no formal sense crusaders at all). Westerners, reared on the increasingly embroidered legends of heroism from the First Crusade, often failed to grasp the policies and habits of those who lived permanently in the Levant.² Moreover, as Morris remarks, with Jerusalem in Christian hands the rhetoric of Clermont was inappropriate.³ When it became suitable, after 1187, the response from a generation wedded to the Jerusalem pilgrimage was massive. Domestic problems also distracted papal attention: enemies in Italy (from the 1130s to 1170s) and Germany (from the 1150s to 1170s); the feuding of French provincial dynasties, characteristic of the period to the 1140s, then partly subsumed in the feuding between Capetians and Angevins from the 1150s; and on the frontiers of Christendom, in Spain and Germany, local holy causes which occupied putative crusaders to Palestine. Inevitably, with this absence of political concentration on the Holy Land (often forgotten by crusader historians), papal responses lacked originality. In 1165, Alexander III replied to appeals from the East merely by reissuing *Quantum praedecessores*; and two other of his encyclicals, *Inter omnia* (1169) and *Cor nostrum* (1181), were heavily, if inconsistently, dependent upon Eugenius III's model, a pattern of unadventurous plagiarism continued by Lucius III when he reissued *Cor nostrum* in 1184–5. The contrast between these cautious and conservative encyclicals and Gregory VIII's explosive *Audita tremendi* of 1187 is striking in urgency, originality, theological apparatus and tone. Yet even here the indulgences, legal immunities and sumptuary proposals followed very closely those of *Quantum praedecessores*.⁴ In 1176, when Pope Alexander called upon the chivalry of France to go to assist Manuel I Comnenus secure a road to the Holy Sepulchre across Asia

1. *Letters of John of Salisbury*, ed. W. J. Miller and C. N. L. Brooke, vol. ii (Oxford, 1979), p. 632, no. 287; C. J. Tyerman, *England and the Crusades* (Chicago, 1988), pp. 37–8; E. Siberry, *Criticism of Crusading* (Oxford, 1985), esp. pp. 190–2 (cf. pp. 77–80).

2. On the early development of these legends, see M. Bennett, 'First Crusaders' Images of Muslims: The Influence of Vernacular Poetry', *Forum for Modern Languages Studies*, xxii, no. 2 (1986), 101–22; for a different emphasis, N. Daniel, *Heroes and Saracens* (Edinburgh, 1984), *passim*. Robert of Normandy even had false legends – such as his refusal of the crown of Jerusalem and his splitting of a Muslim emir into two – concocted during his lifetime: e.g. pre-1125 (Robert died in 1134), William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs (2 vols., RS, London, 1887–9), ii. 433, 460, 461.

3. Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, pp. 277–8.

4. *PL*, clxxx, cols. 1064–6; cc, cols. 384–6, 599–601, 1294–6; Smail, 'Latin Syria and the West', 18; R. Hiestand (ed.), 'Papsturkunden für Templer und Johanniter', *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, lxxvii (1972), nos. 165, 175. For *Audita tremendi* (29 Oct. 1187), see Roger of Howden, *Gesta regis Henrici Secundi*, ed. W. Stubbs (2 vols., RS, London, 1867), ii. 15–19, and A. Chroust (ed.), 'Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris', *MGHs* (Berlin, 1928), v. 6–10.

Minor, he did not explicitly mention any spiritual rewards.¹ For much of the 1160s and 1170s, Alexander appeared more concerned to use the cause of the Holy Land as a diplomatic lever to move Henry II and Louis VII towards reconciliation.²

One novel approach was proposed in 1157 by the English pope, Hadrian IV. Apart from appealing for warriors to hasten to free and defend the Holy Places, he offered indulgences to those who, unable to campaign in person, instead sent horses, military equipment and other aid. This extension of penitential advantages to those indirectly involved was to become a pivotal feature of crusading from the reign of Innocent III onwards. But there is little sign of Hadrian's offer being taken up, let alone built upon in practice or theory.³ Yet it was not as if twelfth-century popes held back from sanctioning war or associating spiritual benefits with it, any more than they had in the previous three centuries, as in the cases of Leo IV (847–55) and John VIII (872–82).⁴ Papal supporters in Flanders, Germany and Italy continued to receive remission of sins. At Pisa in 1135 those who fought against the antipope Anacletus were offered the same indulgence as Urban granted at Clermont.⁵ Elsewhere, good causes were frequently described by clerical commentators as attracting spiritual rewards. In 1115, French royal troops attacking the bandit lord Thomas of Marle (himself a veteran of 1096–9) were described as 'the general assembly of the Christian army', who attacked Thomas's castle as an act of penance meriting salvation.⁶ According to Henry of Huntingdon, the English soldiers who defeated the Scots at the Battle of the Standard in 1138 were assured by the bishop of the Orkneys of the justice of their cause, and that those who perished would enjoy remission of the penalties of their sins.⁷

Across Europe national or communal interests attracted spiritual rewards. Full indulgences for the casualties of battle were offered to those who fought against *rouiters* in Languedoc in 1139 and against enemies of Norway in 1164.⁸ In 1148, the German campaign against the Wends was explicitly linked to the Second Crusade by St Bernard.⁹ Contemporaries depicted numerous campaigns in the Iberian

1. P. Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, vol. ii (Leipzig 1886), p. 296, no. 12684.

2. Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, ch. 2, esp. pp. 40–5.

3. *RHGF*, xv. 681–2; cf. Gelasius II's idea of indulgences commensurate with material contributions from non-participants towards the siege of Saragossa, 10 Dec. 1118: *PL*, clxiii, col. 508, no. 25.

4. *MGH, Epistolae*, vol. v (Berlin, 1898), p. 601; vol. vii (Berlin, 1921), pp. 126–7.

5. On this aspect of the council of Pisa, see N. Housley, 'Crusades against Christians', *Crusade and Settlement*, p. 23.

6. Suger, *Vie de Louis le Gros*, pp. 174–6; Guibert of Nogent, *Autobiographie*, ed. E.-R. Labande (Paris, 1981), p. 410; Orderic Vitalis, *Eccl. Hist.*, vi. 258–9.

7. Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, pp. 262–3; cf. his account of the speeches before the battle of Lincoln (1141) by the leaders of both sides, each of which appealed to a just cause and God's active favour, although without mention of indulgences: *ibid.*, pp. 268–73. For a similar account of the bishop of the Orkneys: John of Hexham, in Simeon of Durham, *Opera*, ed. T. Arnold (RS, London, 1885), ii. 293.

8. Housley, 'Crusades against Christians', pp. 24–6.

9. Bernard, *Epistolae*, no. 467; *Letters of St Bernard*, no. 394.

peninsular and western Mediterranean in 1147–9 in ways equivalent to expeditions to the Holy Land, although they were essentially continuations of local enterprises aimed at territorial or commercial gain. The Genoese attack on Almeria in 1146 was described in an entirely secular way, but the same writer, Caffaro, placed the successful capture of Almeria the following year in the context of religious conflict and papal authorization.¹ In 1166, the Synod of Segovia promised anyone who fought for Castile remission of enjoined penance 'as he would gain by going to Jerusalem', although whether this can be taken as meaning the Jerusalem pilgrimage or crusade is typically unclear.² A diversity of ecclesiastical authority for such indulgences, by no means all papal, is evident, suggesting that, despite the activity and rhetoric, the papacy did not construct a new institution and that, in any case, it would have been difficult to achieve any uniformity of application.

This is not to say that the events of the First Crusade had no effect. The model of Urban II's holy war was adapted and applied to campaigns against the Moslems in Spain and the western Mediterranean. Members of the Italian and Catalan expedition to the Balearic islands (1114–16) were given crosses and indulgences, an offer applied by Calixtus II in 1123 more generally to all who fought the infidel in Spain. At the Lateran Council of 1123, the Jerusalem privileges of 1095 were explicitly associated with campaigning in the Iberian peninsular. However, this application was not universal or consistent. In 1118, in the pre-1095 tradition, Gelasius II offered plenary remission of sins only to those who died in the siege of Saragossa. Similarly, the northern Italian involvement in the Balearic campaign should be compared with the Pisan and Genoese attack on Mahdia in 1087, which had equally been surrounded by the language of pilgrimage and holy war. The account of the successful siege of Santarem in March 1147 talked of God choosing 'new wars in our days' and called the achievement miraculous. But there are no specifically crusading elements, such as indulgences or pilgrimage. The banner raised over Santarem was that of the king of Portugal. A few months later, at Lisbon, it was the banner of the cross the same king displayed in triumph.³ Here, as elsewhere, novelty and tradition are difficult to disentangle, probably because contemporaries were unaware of distinctions observed by modern historians.

1. Caffaro, 'Annales Ianuenses', ed. L. T. Belgrano, *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*, vol. ii (Rome, 1890), pp. 33–5; 'Ystoria captionis Almarie et Turtuose', *ibid.*, pp. 79–89; Constable, 'Second Crusade', 226–35.

2. P. Linehan, 'The Synod of Segovia (1166)', *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law*, x (1980), 42.

3. *PL*, clxii, col. 515, for Lorenzo of Verona's account of recruitment for the Balearic campaign. For Calixtus's letter of 2 April 1123: D. Mansilla, *La documentación pontificia hasta Innocencio III* (Rome, 1955), no. 62; and for the 1123 Lateran decree: J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio* (Florence/Venice, 1759–98), xxi, col. 284. For Gelasius II's letter of 1118: *PL*, clxii, col. 508, no. 25; H. E. J. Cowdrey, 'The Mahdia Campaign of 1087', *ante*, xcii (1977), 1–29; 'De expugnatione Scalabis', pp. 94–5; *De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, ed. C. W. David (New York, 1936), p. 175. In general: R. A. Fletcher, 'Reconquest and Crusade in Spain, c. 1050–1150', *TRHS*, xxxvii (1987), 31–47; Bull, *Knighthood Piety*, ch. 2.

The same can be said of the formulae of crusading which infected political responses to national wars, as in Spain in 1166 or the Baltic in 1148, and the literature of war. In Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain* (1136), before Arthur's battle with the pagan Saxons, Archbishop Dubricius exhorts the Christian troops: 'You who have been marked with the sign of the Christian faith ... if any of you is killed in this war that death shall be to him as a penance and an absolution for all his sins.'¹ These motifs would have been familiar alike to the educated cleric who had heard the epic accounts of the First Crusade and the layman who had listened to the early redactions of the crusade *chansons*. But it is almost impossible to identify what is old and what new: honour; justice; defence of home, country and comrades; God's favour; salvation for those who die; absolution; and remission of sins.

One source which, perhaps more than most, illustrates this confluence of tradition and innovation is the anonymous, possibly eyewitness account of the siege of Lisbon in 1147, the *De Expugnacione Lyxbonensi*, long taken as an example of the establishment and extension of crusading.² What actually emerges from the *De Expugnacione* is an enterprise ideologically much less distinct or coherent than might be expected after the celebratory accounts of the First Crusade by contemporaries – or even modern crusader camp-followers. In its lack of clarity and definition, the *De Expugnacione* shows how the activity of crusading could not, and cannot, be disassociated from pre-existing and concurrent attitudes to legitimate war, and how crusading as a distinct attitude to war, at least by the time the text was written, probably in mid-century, had failed to alter patterns of military endeavour, even when that endeavour was part of a crusade.

A key passage in the *De Expugnacione* is the famous speech in which the Bishop of Oporto tries to persuade the crusaders to turn aside from their voyage to Palestine and help the king of Portugal capture Lisbon from the Moors. Often quoted is the Bishop's remark: 'The praiseworthy thing is not to have been to Jerusalem but to have lived a good life while on the way.'³ Yet in some ways this sermon, whether delivered or not, was unnecessary. It had long been accepted that fighting the infidel was meritorious, not least in the Iberian peninsular. Crusaders in 1096–9 had stopped *en route* to capture Moslem cities both on and off the route. The Bishop of Oporto seems to be trying to persuade crusaders to do what they would have been happy to do anyway, their stated reservations being pragmatic and tactical, not ideological. Of course, although sometimes taken as such, the Bishop's speech was not a crusade

1. Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia Regum Britanniae*, ed. A. Griscom and R. Ellis Jones (London, 1929), pp. 437–8; L. Thorpe's translation, *History of the Kings of Britain* (London, 1966), p. 216, infers, almost certainly correctly, that 'professione insigniti' implies the sign of the cross.

2. *De Expugnacione Lyxbonensi*.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 70–85 (p. 78 for the quotation, which is a play on words from a letter of St Jerome to Paulinus).

sermon. To divert the crusaders' *iter*, he falls back on the traditional themes of the *bellum justum*: self-defence, right intent, rightful possession, just cause, divine authority. Here at least, despite Gilchrist's argument that there was little Augustinian theory in twelfth-century martial rhetoric, is a strongly Augustinian justification. Although the weight of quotation is biblical, there are references to Ambrose, Jerome, Isidore of Seville and John Chrysostom as well as Augustine, all of which suggest that the author, or his source, was no run-of-the-mill hedge-priest.¹ Indeed, the whole speech parallels Gratian's *Causa* 23.

The Bishop of Oporto, in his initial appeal, stops short of offering explicit spiritual rewards, merely a share in the loot. Oblivious to the irony, he is following long custom when he declares: 'Quit you like good soldiers; for the sin is not waging war, but in waging war for the sake of plunder.'² With the right intent, then, the crusaders could – and did – receive generous material payment. When, during the assault itself, the Bishop and an anonymous cleric, possibly the author, offer absolution and remission of sins – but only for those who die in battle and only after fresh absolution, beyond the contract of the crusaders' vows – they are also following a tradition which had papal approval as far back as the early ninth century.³ Like those who attacked Constantinople in 1204, the troops who assaulted Lisbon in 1147 (or those who sacked Messina in 1190 or Cyprus in 1191) were conducting battles familiar long before 1095: they were crusaders, in that they had taken the cross, but these battles did not fulfil their vows.⁴

The reaction of the lay crusaders in *De Expugnatione* is equally devoid of any awareness of a new knighthood. The Flemish and Rhinelanders are portrayed as bloodthirsty and greedy despite 'the guise of pilgrimage and religion'. One group of Anglo-Normans preferred to push on into the Mediterranean unless payment and subsistence could be guaranteed. Most telling of all are the views attributed to the hero of the account, Hervey de Glanvill. In persuading the doubters to join the Lisbon siege he appealed, like Brian FitzCount and Eugenius III, to 'the virtues of our ancestors', the valour of the Norman race, glory and 'the counsels of honour', hardly specific crusading qualities.⁵ Unlike accounts of the First Crusade, there is little consciousness of uniqueness, of being the new Maccabees, the *militia* of Christ. (There is not much more in the account of Louis VII's crusade by Odo of Deuil

1. *Ibid.*, pp. 78–82 (the patristic references were almost certainly not taken directly from the originals); Gilchrist, 'Papacy and War', 189–90; Cowdrey, 'Canon Law and the First Crusade', *passim*.

2. *De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, p. 83.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 126–7, 146–59; Gilchrist, 'Papacy and War', 182 and n. 43, for references and quotations.

4. Cf. the renewed absolution for the crusaders at Constantinople in the winter of 1202–4 and the arguments employed by the clergy then: Geoffrey de Villehardouin, *De la conquête de Constantinople*, ed. P. Paris (Paris, 1838), pp. 71–2.

5. *De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, pp. 134–5; pp. 104–11, for Glanvill's speech; pp. 104–5, for the resistance of the Veils; *passim*, for hostile comments on the actions and motives of the Flemish and Rhinelanders.

either.)¹ At Lisbon, even the final military confrontation is seen in terms which owe nothing to crusading as such. A parley was arranged with the Moors 'so that we might not appear to be attacking except unwillingly'. To establish a just cause, the Moslems are requested to surrender their rule of what had been Christian land. Then, in the manner of twelfth-century *chansons de geste*, Christian indignation is aroused by Moslem blasphemy and taunts at the possible misbehaviour of the crusaders' wives left at home. In general, a chivalric gloss is given to the conflict, which is called a 'trial of the sword', with God as the judge.² This chivalric strain is echoed in the precisely contemporary crusading song, 'Chevalier, mult estes granz', where the Second Crusade is described as a tournament between Hell and Paradise ('un turnei enpris entre Enfer e Pareis').³

The fusion of traditional behaviour and fresh attitudes is apparent throughout the Second Crusade. As has already been remarked, the freedom with which St Bernard shaped and developed his preaching, even to the point of apparently embracing Sibylline prophecies of the Last Emperor, testifies to a lack of definition in the crusade.⁴ Observers recognized that some of the expeditions of 1146–8 had particular features, especially those destined for the Holy Land. But in many theatres of war, in Spain, the western Mediterranean and the Baltic, religious elements were grafted on to existing political ambitions. Normal temporal aspirations were not suspended. Possibly because of the Second Crusade's outcome, the language of its participants tended to be less spiritually intense than that used of the First.⁵ It is a measure of the combination of the secular and the spiritual that Conrad III and Louis VII, like Hervey de Glanvill, thought their crusades offered hope of temporal fame. In July 1147, in a letter to Wibald of Corvey, Conrad expressed the hope that his journey would lead to 'the prosperity of the whole Church and the honour of our realm'. Louis echoed the sentiment, writing from Antioch in the spring of 1148: 'Either we shall never return or we shall come back with glory for God and the kingdom of the Franks.'⁶

The central point is that there was little that was new. However, this continuation of earlier church attitudes and papal policy has been misinterpreted as being a consequence of the First Crusade or, at least, of the initiatives of the Gregorian papacy. The First Crusade may have confirmed or extended existing beliefs in the goodness of battle and may

1. Odo of Deuil, *De Profectione*, *passim*.

2. *De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, pp. 122–3, for the 'trial of the sword'; pp. 114–25, for the challenge and the Muslim reply; pp. 130–32, for Muslim taunting.

3. Bédier, *Chansons de croisade*, p. 10.

4. H.-D. Kahl, 'Crusade Eschatology as Seen by St Bernard in the Years 1146–8', *Second Crusade and Cistercians*, pp. 35–47, esp. pp. 42–3.

5. E.g. the unemotional account, by the priest Duodechlin of Lahnstein, of the capture of Lisbon by a naval expedition. Miracles only appeared as *post hoc* signs of divine approval: *MGHS*, xvii. 27–8.

6. P. Jaffé, *Monumenta Corbeiensia* (Berlin, 1864), p. 126, no. 48; *RHGF*, xv. 495–6.

eventually have aided the growth of intellectual structures within which the perception of that goodness could be translated into specific, popularly intelligible rewards, spiritual and material. But, as Gilchrist has suggested, it can hardly be said to have done so in Causa 23 of Gratian's *Decretum* (1140). Despite its extensive and detailed discussion of ecclesiastically sanctioned warfare, Causa 23 ignores anything that could be called specifically crusading, an omission not rectified by canonists for more than half a century.¹ Thus the debate about the centrality or not of so-called 'political' or non-Holy Land 'crusades' misses the point. There was holy war in the twelfth as in earlier centuries which attracted spiritual benefits of various sorts. For some of these wars, fairly randomly except when they were directed towards the Holy Land, warriors adopted the cross, perhaps to evoke the morale of the First Crusade. But to worry, with Professor Housley, as to whether in such cases 'the full apparatus of the crusade was brought to bear' is to suppose that such apparatus existed.² If, as Housley claims, there had emerged 'by 1198, a fairly stable group of crusading institutions centring on the legal ceremony for taking the cross', it was a development which largely post-dated 1187.³

The main institutional novelty before 1187 connected with crusading was the development of the military orders. They were quickly accepted. By the early 1140s, the conservative Orderic Vitalis was describing their members as 'admirable knights who devote their lives to the bodily and spiritual service of God and, rejecting all things of this world, face martyrdom daily'.⁴ But to join the Templars, at home or, as many did, in the East, was not synonymous with becoming a crusader: it was an alternative. The commitment and experience were of a different nature. The military orders were obviously one inheritance from the First Crusade, but they served a minority and did not necessarily accelerate the elaboration of the theory or practice of crusading.⁵ Rather they were seen, as by St Bernard, as a new stage in the much older process of the Christianizing of knighthood.⁶ The legacy of the First Crusade certainly included distinctive ceremonial adoption of the cross and the enjoyment of some sort of remission of the penalties of sin (or,

1. Gilchrist, 'Erdmann Thesis', *passim* and esp. n. 63.

2. Housley, 'Crusades against Christians', p. 31.

3. Ibid. Housley's argument, stressing continuity and fusion of forms, supports my contentions, but he maintains a misleading typology which sets 'crusade' and 'ecclesiastical warfare' at odds, in need of 'juridical fusion' by Innocent III. My argument is that Innocent III transformed one sort of ecclesiastical warfare into juridical crusading.

4. Orderic Vitalis, *Eccl. Hist.*, vi. 310.

5. On the contrast with secular knighthood, A. Grabois, 'Militia and Malitia: The Bernardine Vision of Chivalry', *Second Crusade and Cistercians*, pp. 49–56; in general, M. Barber, *The New Knighthood* (Cambridge 1993), pp. 1–114. Cf. also those who temporarily attached themselves to the orders, but had not taken the cross.

6. 'It is not from the accident of war but from the disposition of the heart that either peril or victory is allotted to the Christian': St. Bernard, 'De Laude Novae Militiae', in *Opera*, iii. 215; translated by L. and J. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, pp. 102–3.

as Eugenius III called it simply, 'remission of sins') and an array of temporal privileges associated with those of pilgrims: in *Quantum praedecessores* these included protection by the Church, legal immunity for the duration of the expedition, permission to raise mortgages and a moratorium on the repayment of debts.¹ However, formal organization was rudimentary and papal and ecclesiastical control unsystematic. The origins of crusade institutions at a local level are extremely obscure. Contemporaries, no less than modern historians, could be perplexed.²

The First Crusade lent pilgrimage to the Holy Land a new dimension, but did not create a separate tradition. The twelfth century was the golden age of pilgrimage to the Holy Land, not least for reasons of practicality. However, the distinction between a pilgrim and a crusader is often hard to detect, an uncertainty which reflected reality. Not all armed pilgrims fought, and not all westerners who did fight in Syria had necessarily taken the cross. In 1172, Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony, led a substantial armed pilgrimage to Jerusalem, but neither the images of crusading nor the intent to fight were involved. It is wholly unclear whether the pilgrims described by Albert of Aachen as eager for the fray in 1102 or 1107 had adopted the cross or not. The sources do not mention it, nor do they distinguish between crusader and pilgrim because all are called *peregrini*. Those settled in the East in defence of the Holy Land rarely if ever took the cross.³

Pilgrimage and crusade were fused together. Crusaders bore the staff and satchel of the pilgrim; pilgrims bore crosses and carried arms. Both shared an indiscriminate vocabulary of the *peregrinatio*, as well as some of the privileges and the status of quasi-ecclesiastics. Louis VII of France took the cross at Vézelay at Easter 1146 and the pilgrim's wallet at St Denis in June 1146, his response to the pull of crusade as distinct from pilgrimage being decidedly ambivalent if Professor Grabois is to be believed.⁴ In charters of the twelfth century, it is rarely possible to distinguish the two exercises: Giles Constable's analysis of charter evidence which claims to show how crusades were funded applies equally, indeed identically, to pilgrims. As Constable himself admits: 'The charters gave no evidence ... that [the crusader] differed in any

1. Caspar, 'Kreuzzugsbullen', 300-5; *PL*, cxxx, cols. 1064-6.

2. For the confusion of a panel of clerics facing a claim to crusader immunity in 1106-7: *PL*, cxii, cols. 176-7 and *infra*, p. 571, n. 2.

3. J. S. C. Riley-Smith, 'Peace Never Established: The Case of the Kingdom of Jerusalem', *TRHS*, xxviii (1978), 87-8, 94-5 and n. 47, 102; cf. id., 'Venetian Crusade'; William of Tyre, 'Historia', p. 549, is silent on the doge's status in 1124, the implication being that he was a pilgrim; Albert of Aachen, 'Historia Hierosolymitana', pp. 595-7, 600-1, 632-4; K. Jordan, *Henry the Lion*, trans. P. S. Falla (Oxford 1986), pp. 150-4.

4. Odo of Deuil, *De Profectione*, pp. 8-11, 14-19; A. Grabois, 'The Crusade of Louis VII: A Reconsideration', *Crusade and Settlement*, pp. 94-104; cf. the distinctly non-martial tone of the reference to Louis's crusade in the Second Crusade song 'Chevalier, Mult Estes Guariz': Bédier, *Chansons de croisade*, p. 8.

essential respect from other pilgrims, or that he was required to go with any army or to fight the pagans, though many of them did.¹

It is often presumed that those who adopted the cross, following the action of the First Crusaders, did so consciously to signal their martial intentions. Those who abandoned Robert of Normandy's army at Bari in 1096 marked their departure by 'taking up again their pilgrim staves'.² The cross was closely identified with the special form of penitential warfare begun in 1096 and, as Michael Markowski has noticed, came to be associated particularly, although not exclusively, with expeditions to the Holy Land.³ Although commonly referred to as *peregrini*, from 1097 at the latest crusaders were distinguished as being 'signed with the cross'.⁴ The *Gesta Francorum* describes how crusaders sewed crosses on to their garments.⁵ By the first Lateran Council of 1123, beside the language of pilgrimage, popes referred to warriors assuming the cross: for instance Eugenius III in 1145 and 1148, Alexander III in 1169 and 1181, and Gregory VIII in 1187.⁶ Yet chroniclers continued to use the word 'pilgrim' indiscriminately, even eyewitnesses such as William of Tyre. Perhaps he did not see much of a difference?

The notions of unarmed pilgrimage and armed crusade were less discrete than the apparent contradiction of purpose and function might imply. The cross tended to suggest violence. But this was not universal. The English hermit, Godric of Finchale (d. 1170), according to his late twelfth-century biographer, visited Palestine twice. On each occasion he contented himself with seeing the Holy Places, fasting and other self-imposed physical privations. Yet Godric had apparently taken the cross both times and had borne the *vexillum crucis* throughout his pilgrimages.⁷ The biography gives pause to those seeking easy categorization of crusade and pilgrimage. Orderic Vitalis, writing a few years after the event, describes the reaction of those supporters of William Clito not pardoned by Henry I after William's death in 1128: '... many others, distressed by their master's death, took the Lord's cross and, becoming exiles for Christ's sake, set out for his sepulchre in Jerusalem.'⁸ This

1. Constable, 'Medieval Charters', p. 77; for the relevant discussion on the invisibility of crusading in charters, pp. 74–7 and, generally, pp. 73–89. Cf. id., 'Financing of the Crusades', which suffers from the same evidential problem.

2. Fulcher of Chartres, 'Historia Iherosolymitana', *RHC Occ.*, iii, 329.

3. M. Markowski, 'Crucesignatus: Its Origins and Early Usage', *Journal of Medieval History*, x (1984), 157–65. For bearing the cross against the Moors of the Balearic islands and Spain: Lorenzo of Verona, 'De Bello Balearico', *PL*, clxiii, col. 515; Mansilla, *La documentación pontifica*, no. 62; and *supra*, p. 562, n. 3.

4. H. Hagenmeyer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088–1100* (Innsbruck, 1902), p. 142.

5. *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, ed. R. Hill (London, 1962), p. 7.

6. Mansi, *Collectio*, xxi, col. 284; *PL*, clxxx, cols. 1065, 1320; cc, cols. 599–601, 1294–6; Howden, *Gesta Henrici*, ii, 18–19.

7. *Libellus de Vita et Miraculis S. Godrici Heremite de Finchale*, ed. J. Stevenson (Surtees Soc., 1847), pp. 33–4, 52–7; cf. William of Newburgh's account of Godric's visit to Jerusalem barefoot and in poverty: 'Historia rerum Anglicarum', ed. R. Howlett, in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard*, vol. i, pt. 1 (RS, London, 1884), p. 149.

8. Orderic Vitalis, *Ecc. Hist.*, vi, 379.

may be regarded as euphemistic cover for a prudent act of self-preservation in the face of political disaster. But whether they intended to fight or not is impossible to judge. This elision of themes, so characteristic of the period, is neatly summed up in a charter of 1120, written on behalf of one Guillaume le Veneur from Touraine who was declared to have 'accepted the cross as a sign of his pilgrimage (*in signum peregrinationis*)'.¹

The development of the liturgical rite for taking the cross confirms this conjunction of practices. J. A. Brundage finds no explicit evidence of formal liturgical ceremonies from the first half of the twelfth century. However, they may be presumed. St Bernard dispensed crosses at Vézelay in 1146. Godric of Finchale had, his biographer claims, been given the cross on one occasion by a priest, and Guillaume le Veneur's charter indicates that taking the cross was already, by 1120, a formal solemnization of a special pilgrimage vow. The ceremony began explicitly to be associated with a particular form of pilgrimage: Guillaume le Veneur's charter describes taking the cross as 'the habit of these kinds of pilgrims', and a mid-twelfth-century Angevin observed that Fulk of Anjou's assumption of the cross in 1128 was 'following the custom of such pilgrimages'.² Unfortunately, the sources fail to make clear exactly what was distinctive about these journeys. Was it that they had military intent (unlikely, in view of Godric's experience), or, perhaps, that they were directed towards Jerusalem? Perhaps each region was different. If so, that may account for a flexibility of application in, say, Italy, while in northern France (where the two sources were written), the cross implied a Jerusalem pilgrimage. This uncertainty in the evidence may itself support the idea that even the giving of the cross implied no sharply defined or uniformly applied institution.

All surviving twelfth-century rites for taking the cross so far discovered are closely associated with ceremonies for departing pilgrims.³ Two particular features of such ceremonies are worth emphasizing. First, in papal references, taking the cross marked the moment when the offered privileges came into force, the wearing of the cross being a sign of the validity of the claim to protection. As Michael Clanchy has shown, such a ceremonial guarantee of a contract was commonplace in a society in which literacy was still patchy among the secular elites.⁴ The symbol rather than the letter secured the contract. Some of the surviving rites from the twelfth century confirm the papal linkage between taking

1. *Chartes de St. Julien de Tours*, ed. L. J. Denis (2 vols., Le Mans, 1912-13), i. 87-8, no. 67.

2. J. A. Brundage, 'Crucesignari: The Rite for Taking the Cross in England', *Traditio*, xxii (1966), 289-310; Odo of Deuil, *De Profectione*, pp. 8-11; *Vita Godrici*, p. 33 (where the cross was given by a priest); *Chronica de Gestis Consulum Andegavorum*, *Chroniques d'Anjou*, p. 152; *Chartes de St. Julien de Tours*, i, no. 67.

3. Brundage, 'Crucesignari', *passim*; K. Pennington, 'The Rite for Taking the Cross in the Twelfth Century', *Traditio*, xxx (1974), 429-35.

4. See *supra*, p. 566, n. 3; M. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record* (London, 1979), esp. pp. 244-8, for crosses.

the cross and protection, but on a much broader and more fundamental level. As the so-called Lambrecht Pontifical of the second half of the twelfth century has it, the cross is a sign of God's protection and a surety of personal immunity from dangers both physical and spiritual: 'Accept the sign of the cross of Christ in heart and body so that you may be protected from all your enemies and from all wiles of the Devil.'¹ This formula remained unchanged for centuries. The cross was more than a focus of piety, a symbol of devotion, a public confirmation of a vow or, like a pilgrim's badge, a sign of the wearer's special status. It was a talisman, appealing to the deepest anxieties of the traveller and warrior, a guarantee of safety as well as salvation. As such, the pacific Godric of Finchale had as much need of it as Richard the Lionheart.

Another significant aspect of the surviving twelfth-century rites is that while they are all linked to pilgrim ceremonies, they are different from each other.² The impression is that there was no standard ceremony for taking the cross. Indeed, despite the inclusion of a rite in the thirteenth-century Roman Pontifical, there remained no standard ceremony for the rest of the Middle Ages. In the face of increasing attempts to impose uniformity and in view of the importance attached by the papacy to crusading after 1187, this is remarkable. But it exposes one characteristic of twelfth-century crusading too easily belittled by those historians in search of precise canonistic definitions: diversity of local custom and individual response was the norm. The papacy was not in control of a homogeneous movement. Disparity of practice, uncertainty of focus and the absence of legal definition suggest an elusive and protean phenomenon. The crusade meant different things for different people, both at different times and at the same time. That is not to deny the seriousness of crusading, nor the new range of experiences associated with it. But these functioned as part of existing habits and traditions and, in the twelfth century, marked no sharply defined new era beyond the occupation, and thus accessibility, of the Holy Places. The development of crusading as an institution depended on its familiarity, not its novelty; on its acceptability, as much as its challenge. If the activity was innovative in being especially physically demanding, the tensions which it assuaged – spiritual, social, political or economic – were not.

This new exercise was obviously not without effect. Crusaders' privileges, for example, had extensive implications, their legal and fiscal immunity being guaranteed by the Church and upheld, in theory, by the

1. Pennington, 'Rite', 433, late twelfth-century, possibly Italian; cf. similarly wide protective powers in the so-called Bari Pontifical (ibid. 432). For a fourteenth-century example: A. Franz, *Die kirchlichen Benediktionen im Mittelalter*, vol. II (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1909), p. 284.

2. See the examples in Brundage, 'Crucesignari', and Pennington, 'Rite'. As Pennington notes (p. 431), the differences, even when not great, suggest 'an *ad hoc* basis, without having many established models on which to rely. ... Perhaps the crusade was not considered to be more than an ephemeral ecclesiastical institution, and the liturgical texts reflect this attitude.'

secular authorities.¹ The effectiveness or consistency of either is hard to assess, the evidence from the twelfth century being limited and contradictory. In 1106, Hugh du Puiset, who had taken the cross to join Bohemond's crusade, appealed to Pope Paschal II to defend his and his vassals' property, threatened by Count Rotrou of Perche. Hugh claimed protection under papal decrees as a 'Hierosolymitanus'. Paschal passed the buck to the archbishop of Sens and Ivo of Chartres. The latter, in turn, submitted the case to a committee of clerics who, in some confusion, were unable to decide between feudal rights and ecclesiastical immunity, not least because 'the institution of committing to the church's care the possessions of *milites* going to Jerusalem was new'. Ivo, in spite, or perhaps because, of his expertise as a canon lawyer, sent the case back to the Pope unresolved. Even if this instance is taken as a sign of the operation of crusading institutions, it is apparent that the local clergy had little idea of what to do. Furthermore, the immunity claimed by Hugh itself derived from Urban II's association of the privileges of crusaders with those which existed under the earlier eleventh-century provisions of the Truce of God, as well as those customarily enjoyed by pilgrims.²

In Hugh du Puiset's case, any superior lay power was absent, which, although unsurprising in the final year of King Philip the Fat, may explain the ineffectiveness of the immunity. Local ecclesiastical officials remained unsure of their ground. In November 1146, Eugenius III had to instruct the bishop of Salisbury that church jurisdiction did not extend to disseisin committed before the victim took the cross. *Quantum praedecessores* had itemized the crusaders' immunities, but some still found their operation confusing. Being promulgated for specific journeys, such as the 1145–6 call to arms, the privileges had no permanent application, hence the repeated papal renewals up to *Audita tremendi* in 1187.³ However, later in the century, at least in north-west Europe, the secular, not the ecclesiastical arm seems to have taken the lead in defining protection and, perhaps, even extending the range of the temporal privileges. The *De legibus et consuetudinibus* attributed to Glanvill (c. 1180) described special immunities for pilgrims to Jerusalem, including a unique variant of the writ *mort d'ancestor*, but failed to draw a distinction between crusade and pilgrimage. Significantly, perhaps,

1. In general, see the classic survey, J. A. Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law and the Crusader* (Madison, 1969).

2. *PL*, cxii, nos. 168–70, 173, cols. 170–4, 176–7. For Urban II and the application of the Truce of God provisions: Riley-Smith, *First Crusade*, pp. 22, 26 and refs.; and Bull, *Knights of Piety*, pp. 21–69.

3. *Epistolae Pontificum Romanorum ineditae*, ed. S. Löwenfeld (Leipzig, 1885), no. 199, pp. 103–4; Howden, *Chronica*, ii. 15–19.

that had to await the lawyers of the thirteenth century.¹ In 1188, the Anglo-French crusade ordinances, not papal bulls, extended the financial privileges with a precision and detail not seen before.² Although as early as 1166 Alexander III had offered plenary indulgences to those who fought in the Holy Land for at least two years, the first mention of the crusader's term of immunity and protection in action is on the Pipe Roll of 1191/2.³ During the Third Crusade, as in the First, the practice of crusading fashioned the institution, not vice versa.

In a wider social dimension, it is equally hard to assert much independent or unique impact. The financial needs of departing crusaders certainly aided the concurrent opening of freer local land markets through mortgages and sale of property. Warfare in the East gave fresh scope for military enterprise, but, by its nature, was of limited significance. There was no channelling of violence away from domestic conflicts. There was only one general expedition between 1101 and 1188. Successful crusaders were those who had trained in the hard school of European war. If war in twelfth-century western Europe was more ordered, less anarchic or fragmented than in the tenth century, then crusading, with its large capital sums and structured recruitment, was a symptom of change, not a cause. The same can be said for the variety of motives contemporaries observed in crusaders, from those such as Etienne de Niblens (c. 1100), who was said to lament the pollution of his life, and Ulric Bucel, who was described as being 'more concerned for the health of his soul than the honour of his earthly existence', to those who, in the words of the hostile Würzburg annalist, 'lusted after novelties and went in order to learn about new lands'.⁴ The crusade was not the only outlet for such diverse emotions: not all adventurers bothered to seek Jerusalem; nor did all pious lay knights. Warfare nearer home or the patronage of monasteries could, and did, serve just as well.⁵ Pursued by a minority of free society, crusading provided an extension of prevailing habits rather than an alternative to them.

1. Glanvill, *Tractatus de legibus et consuetudinibus regni Angliae*, ed. G. D. G. Hall (London, 1965), pp. 16–17 and 151; for the distinctions drawn between pilgrimages and crusades, Henry de Bracton, *De legibus et consuetudinibus Angliae*, ed. T. Twiss (6 vols., RS, London, 1878–83), v. 159–65 (although as Professor Thorne has shown, Bracton was almost certainly not the author); John de Longueville, *Modus Tenendi Curias* (c. 1307), *The Court Baron*, ed. F. W. Maitland and W. P. Baildon (Selden Soc., London, 1891), p. 82. Cf. Jean de Joinville's reference (c. 1290s) to the 'pelerinaige de la croix': *Histoire de St. Louis*, ed. N. de Wailly (Paris, 1868), p. 2.

2. *Councils and Synods, with Other Documents Relating to the English Church*, gen. ed. F. W. Powicke (Oxford, 1964–81), vol. i, pt. 2, pp. 1028–9, for the crusader's term of three years.

3. *In quantis pressuris*, 29 June 1166: Hiestand, *Papsturkunden für Templer und Johanniter*, no. 53; *Pipe Roll 3 Richard I*, ed. D. M. Stenton (London, 1926), pp. 33 (where, in line with the 1188 ordinances, Richard of Clare pleads for a moratorium for his debts 'ad terminum cruce signatorum') and 76. In general, it may be noted that most of the evidence used by Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law and the Crusader*, to show how privileges worked comes from the Public Record Office, i.e. the archives of secular, not ecclesiastical government.

4. *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny*, ed. A. Bruel, vol. v (Paris, 1894), no. 3737, p. 87; *Cartulaire de l'abbaye cardinale de la Trinité de Vendôme*, ed. C. Metais (Paris, 1893–7), ii, no. 402, pp. 157–8; 'Annales Herbipolenses', ed. G. H. Pertz, *MGHS*, xvi. 3.

5. For two recent regional studies of this: C. B. Bouchard, *Sword, Miter and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980–1198* (Ithaca, NY, 1987); Bull, *Knightly Piety*.

Crusading was far from escapist; it was integrated into existing patterns of thought and behaviour, a reflection, not a rejection of social attitudes. To take one example, companionship and comradeship formed a central feature in contemporary accounts of crusading, as in society in general. In both, the cohesive power of friendship and association should not be ignored. Where institutional bonds lacked either strength or inspiration, the group, community or commune formed by mutual self-interest provided a necessary sense of belonging and a structure of material support. To such emotions did the Cistercians appeal with great initial success. It is no coincidence that Ailred of Rievaulx, one of the Cistercians' more effective recruiters, wrote a treatise *De Amicitia*; nor that the Cistercians played a central role in the inspiration of, and recruitment for, the Second Crusade. St Bernard himself saw crusade armies as sworn associations, modelled on monastic communities, bound together by love of God.¹ The important ties of the *familia* can be traced in the vernacular romances of Chrétien de Troyes no less than in the growth of corporate identity among the clerks and courtiers of Angevin kings, as chronicled by Walter Map.² Crusading fitted this pattern. It is not just in the stories of campaigning that we find evidence of camaraderie: repeatedly in descriptions of crusade recruitment there are references to groups of relatives, friends and neighbours. Some entered into formal communes, as in 1147, 1189 and 1217.³ The young crusaders described as *coniurati*, who terrorized the Jewish communities of England in Lent 1190, were not untypical, bound together by shared location, kinship, class and friendship.⁴ Crusading could create or more often reinforce such communion, inexplicable if divorced from its social and cultural context.

Did crusading create new patterns of virtue to admire? It may be that Urban II had some hopes of it. Those who interpreted Urban's thoughts in the subsequent generation depicted him as offering the crusade as an alternative, which brings us back to Guibert of Nogent. But the idea of the holy warrior was not new and the Jerusalem *iter* soon became the consummation, not the expiation, of a chivalric career.⁵ Crusading

1. C. Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual, 1050-1200* (London, 1972), esp. pp. 96-107; Brundage, 'St Bernard', pp. 29-30. For possible Cistercian influence on popular crusade songs on the theme of love, M. Switten, 'Singing the Second Crusade', *Second Crusade and Cistercians*, pp. 67-76.

2. Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, ed. M. R. James et al. (Oxford, 1983); W. L. Warren, *Henry II* (London, 1973), ch. 8; Chrétien de Troyes, *Arthurian Romances*, trans. D. D. Owen (London, 1987).

3. *De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, pp. 56-7, 104-5; 'De itinere Frisonum', in *Quinti belli sacri scriptores minores*, ed. R. Röhrich (Geneva, 1879), pp. 59, 69; 'Gesta Crucegerorum Rhenanorum', *ibid.*, p. 30; Ralph of Diceto, 'Ymagines Historiarum', in *Opera Historica*, ed. W. Stubbs (2 vols., RS, London, 1876), ii. 65; Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, pp. 69-79, 182-3.

4. Ralph of Diceto, 'Ymagines', ii. 65; William of Newburgh, *Historia*, pp. 308-24; Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, esp. pp. 71-4 and refs.; generally, *id.* 'Who Went on Crusades to the Holy Land?', *Horns of Hattin*, pp. 1-26.

5. There were elements of this by the Second Crusade: cf. St Bernard's appeal to 'the mighty men of valour', *Letters*, no. 391; Bédier, *Chansons de croisade*, pp. 8-11. The implication is plain in FitzCount's or Orderic Vitalis's admiration of the First Crusaders and their essentially chivalric rather than their

heroes were regarded in terms of existing typology, such as honour and loyalty. It is consistent with this response that Peter of Blois, in his panegyric on Reynald of Chatillon, the *Passio Reginaldi*, written shortly after 1187, should be eager to claim his hero as an example of apostolic poverty, i.e. not a specifically or exclusively crusading virtue.¹

The *Passio Reginaldi* has been described as a piece of crusade hagiography. Although standing in the long, pre-crusading tradition which justified violence and sanctified holy warriors, the *Passio* marks a new beginning in its intensity, imagery, and purpose. There is a distinctive quality which can only be called crusading. Peter of Blois chose to describe the celebrated killing of Reynald by Saladin in the Sultan's tent after the battle of Hattin (4 July 1187). Reynald's opportunistic career of excess and self-advancement is transmuted into one of moderation and self-denial. Claiming that his knowledge of Reynald's last moments came from an eyewitness, Aimery of Lusignan, Peter has Reynald display fortitude and constancy in the face of the infidel's blandishments and threats. Facing death, Reynald attempts to convert Saladin. At the end, Reynald's death is seen as a victory, a memory of Christ's passion, a doorway to everlasting life, a consummation of his pilgrimage. The image of the cross is everywhere, just as it was to be in most surviving crusade sermons from the 1190s onwards. The concentration on the cross in this and other Third Crusade *excitatoria* was fuelled by the loss of a relic of the Holy Cross at Hattin. For Peter of Blois the cross is 'the Ark of the New Testament, the banner of salvation, the title of sanctity, the hope of victory ... the foundation of faith, the conqueror of Hell', etc. Oddly echoing Saladin's own nickname for Reynald, Peter declared: 'As elephants are roused to battle by the sight of blood, so, and more fervently, does the sight of the Holy Cross and the remembrance of the Lord's Passion rouse Christian knights.'² At last, crusade propagandists had worked out a coherent imagery, concentrating on the cross as an all-purpose symbol of militant loyalty to Christ and spiritual redemption, and allied to a strong vein of secular romance in depicting both Christian warriors and their infidel foes. The sacrifice demanded of the faithful soldier of Christ is distilled into a vision of glory which shines with remorseless consistency through the *exempla* of later crusade

spiritual reputations (eg. Raimbold Croton). Yet the parallel strand of renunciation or substitution of chivalry remained. Cf. the remarks of Josserand de Brancion during St Louis' first crusade, 'Lord... take me out of these wars among Christians ...': Joinville, *Vie de St Louis*, p. 99.

1. Peter of Blois, 'Passio Reginaldi principis olim Antiocheni', *PL*, ccvii, cols. 957-76; M. Markowski, 'Peter of Blois and the Conception of the Third Crusade', *Horns of Hattin*, pp. 261-9; R. W. Southern, 'Peter of Blois and the Third Crusade', *Studies in Medieval History Presented to R. H. C. Davis*, ed. H. Mayr-Harting and R. I. Moore (London, 1985), pp. 207-18; cf. Riley-Smith's comments, *Historical Research*, lxiii (1990), 233.

2. *PL*, ccvii, col. 974; cf. B. Hamilton, 'The Elephant of Christ: Reynald of Châtillon', *Studies in Church History*, vol. xv, ed. D. Baker (Oxford, 1978), pp. 97-108. For Saladin's use of the nickname: Abou Chamah, 'Le Livre des deux Jardins', *RHC, Documents orientaux*, iv, 233.

sermons and propaganda, as well as forming a growing theme of vernacular poets.¹

The *Passio Reginaldi* is just one instance of the new impetus towards defining the crusade provided by the battle of Hattin, the capture of a relic of the Holy Cross and loss of Jerusalem in 1187. Almost immediately the customary vagueness in describing crusaders vanished. Perhaps in consequence of recruiting requirements and the implications of crusader privileges for raising money as well as men, the status of a crusader, contrasted to a pilgrim, was defined with precision. The adoption of the cross was now clearly established as separating the two activities of crusading and pilgrimage. The terms of the Saladin Tithe of 1188, in both Angevin and Capetian lands, granted exemption from payment of the tax to those who had taken the cross, a privilege widely abused, according to a contemporary crusade song.² For the first time on a Pipe Roll the term *crucesignatus* was used in 1191/2, although *cruasiatus* appears on the Pipe Roll of 1188/9.³ By the mid-1190s, the designation in Latin was standard: crusaders were *crucesignati* (or equivalent words), and merited an order of privileges different from those of pilgrims as they performed a markedly different function. In the vernacular, although the language of pilgrimage persisted as long as crusading, a distinctive crusading vocabulary was soon developed. In French, the verb *croisier* or *croiser* can be found at the time of the Third Crusade, as well as in the chroniclers of the Fourth Crusade, Robert of Clari and Geoffrey de Villehardouin. By extension, *croisié* described those who had taken the cross.⁴ Words for the institution itself are contained in William of Tudela's poem (c. 1213) on the Albigensian Crusade: *crozada*, *crozea*, *crozeia*.⁵

It could be argued that the difference between pilgrimage and crusade had been inherent since 1095, but only after 1187–8 was it recognized in law and government action, that is secular law and secular government. The running was made not by canonists or curial legists, but by servants of temporal powers. It has even been suggested that Innocent III himself was introduced to the word 'crucesignatus' by Gerald of Wales in 1199 (previously popes had favoured more laborious phrases based on *crucem*

1. Bédier, *Chansons de croisade*, pp. 34 and 70 for two songs of c. 1189 associated with the Third Crusade (and, more generally, pp. 67–73); cf. the tone of the slightly earlier *Chanson d'Antioche*, ed. S. Duparc-Quioç (Paris 1977–8); C. Morris, 'Propaganda for War: The Dissemination of the Crusading Ideal in the Twelfth Century', *Studies in Church History*, vol. xx, ed. W. Shiels (Oxford, 1983), pp. 79–101; 'Ordinatio de predicatione S. Crucis in Angliae', in *Quinti belli scriptores*, ii. 1–26; Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, pp. 160–6 and refs.; P. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991), esp. chs. 5–7.

2. *Councils and Synods*, loc. cit.; Bédier, *Chansons de croisade*, p. 45 ('Bien me Deusse Targier', verses 3 and 4).

3. *Pipe Roll 1 Richard I*, ed. J. Hunter (London, 1844), p. 20; *Pipe Roll 3 Richard I*, pp. 28, 33, 58, 76; cf. Markowski, 'Crucesignatus', *passim*.

4. Bédier, *Chansons de croisade*, p. 21, l. 36 of 'Vos qui ameis de vraie amor', and, p. 45, verse 3 of 'Bien me Deusse Targier'; Villehardouin, *La Conquête*, p. 1 ('Tuit cil qui se croiseroient'); Robert of Clari, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, ed. P. Lauer (Paris, 1924), p. 4 (*croisiés*).

5. *La chanson de la croisade contre les Albigeois*, ed. P. Meyer (Paris, 1875–9), ll. 393, 409, 2450.

accipere). Gerald, a clerk of Henry II and a preacher of the cross in Wales in 1188, had been using the word since before 1191.¹ The distinctive word for crusaders did not first appear after 1187. The phrase had occurred since the First Crusade. In letters, chronicles, and in some of the rites for taking the cross, 'crux' and 'signare' appear together. A solitary source from the Second Crusade uses the word 'cruziatur'.² However, it was only during and after the Third Crusade that the term 'crucesignatus' (and 'crucesignata') gained wide currency; and the initiative seems to have come from temporal authorities, not the papacy. It would be entirely in keeping with a view of crusading as not at first a clearly defined phenomenon if the pressure for its legal and practical definition came from secular, not ecclesiastical, law and government, as long as we remember always that both were administered by educated clerics.

Whatever else, the Third Crusade marked a watershed. I have argued for this in institutional terms. It also appears to have been true in more popular aspects. In the corpus of surviving crusade sermon *exempla* (mainly thirteenth-century and later) there are few stories which refer to crusades before 1187; not even the First Crusade is exploited.³ There are two good reasons for this. One is that Hattin and its aftermath redefined crusading in practice and then, with Innocent III, in theory. The other is that crusading before Hattin was hardly a discrete activity. Like King Lear's wit it was pared on both sides, by pilgrimage and holy war. Ironically, the essence of pre-1187 crusading is to be found not in the content of Peter of Blois's *Passio Reginaldi*, but in its subject. Raynald first appears as a mercenary of Baldwin III at the siege of Ascalon in 1153. Two excellent marriages made him successively prince of Antioch and then lord of Kerak and Oultejordain. He believed in aggression as the best method of advancement. In his career he pillaged Cyprus and terrorized the Red Sea. He became identified with an actively hostile policy towards Saladin. His end, hacked to death by Saladin himself, was entirely appropriate: extreme violence in the best of company. He was an adventurer who had tasted the pleasures of success as well as the miseries of a Moslem prison for sixteen years. His opportunism ended in death and his transfiguration into a martyr: an 'athlete of the Lord' indeed, as Peter of Blois put it in a cliché famous long before 1095. But

1. Markowski, 'Crucesignatus', 160–1.

2. 'Annales S. Iacobi Leodicensis', *MGHS*, xvi. 641.

3. Look, for example, at the English *Ordinatio* of 1216, *passim* (*supra*, p. 375, n. 1), where there is only one First Crusade *exemplum*, and none about the period 1099–1187; or the *exempla* of Jacques de Vitry: G. Frenken, *Die Exempla des Jacob von Vitry* (Munich, 1914), nos. lxxii, xcvi, and p. 149. The anecdote about Jocelin I of Edessa's beard is hardly crusading, no. lxxi; T. F. Crane, *The Exempla of Jacques de Vitry* (Folk Lore Soc., London, 1890), nos. lxxxv, lxxxix, cxix, cxxii, clxiii, cccxi, cccxii; nos. cxxiv and cxxi are timeless; only nos. xxxvi and xc, both concerning Templars, are clearly about events pre-1187, perhaps an intentional comment on what Jacques saw as the order's decadence (no. xc). Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, pp. 163–5 and refs.; Cole, *Preaching of the Crusades*, pp. 115, 123–5, 131–3, 195, 197–9; F. C. Tubach, *Index Exemplorum* (Helsinki, 1969), nos. 238, 1041, 1043–4, 1390–5, 2497, 3087–8, 3802, 3804, 4005, 4114–17, 4538, 4722–4, 5199.

there is no evidence that Raynald ever took the cross.¹ In the twelfth century he did not have to, because, in some senses, there were no crusades to fight.²

Hertford College, Oxford

C. J. TYERMAN

1. *PL*, ccvii, col. 969; William of Tyre, 'Historia', pp. 796, 802; Hamilton, 'Elephant of Christ', *passim*, where the point is missed by assuming, wrongly, that all who lived and fought in Frankish Outremer were crusaders: cf. Riley-Smith, 'Peace Never Established', 87–8, 102.

2. E.-D. Hehl, 'Was ist eigentlich ein Kreuzzug', *Historische Zeitschrift*, cclix (1994), 297–336, appeared too late for me to incorporate into this article.