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This dissertation explores two areas of human experience that have been criticized as potentially dangerous and uncontrollable almost consistently since Late Antiquity: violence and those who engage in it, and emotions. However, it will be seen that in the Western Mediterranean and Southern and Central Western Europe, from Late Antiquity through the early-Twelfth Century, these areas were carefully controlled and directed by complex philosophical and religious systems.

Polytheist Roman, and later patristic Christian, authors who wrote within classical and late antique philosophical and religious systems created the accepted norms for the undertaking of organized violence – that which was fought under recognized leadership and undertaken for an acceptable moral or ethical goal. These authors also constructed norms for acceptable experiences and expressions of emotions such as anger, fear, courage, joy, sorrow and religious devotion. This project demonstrates that attitudes toward both violence and emotion changed slowly over time as the Christian faith rose to dominance in the Roman Empire; the western Roman Empire dissolved into Christian successor kingdoms; Christian institutions in the west grew in number and complexity as well as territorial and cultural influence; and territorial conflicts inside Europe and conflicts on and beyond its borders classified by contemporaneous and later historians as holy wars and crusades brought Christians face to face with new forces they perceived as enemies who threatened the faith.
This dissertation examines a large number of clerically authored and influenced juridical, prescriptive, narrative, and epistolary texts composed from Late Antiquity through the Early Twelfth Century, for evidence of attitudes toward and definitions of emotions, and attitudes toward organized violence. Changes over time in attitudes concerning organized violence and methods for judging those who shed blood will be seen in juridical texts by popes and other ecclesiastical or monastic leaders. Christians came to be seen as able to consciously direct their emotions for the benefit of their religious devotion, in order to avoid or gain forgiveness for sin and to help them move closer to God. Changes in emotion will be seen in clerically authored and influenced textual accounts of organized violence, and in the emotions attributed to Christian participants, from the tenth through twelfth centuries. These authors will be seen to have described emotions to provide evidence of actors motives for violence, that which separated those who sinned by shedding blood out of greed from those who used violence out of love to correct enemies for their own good and to protect fellow Christians.

As will be briefly discussed in the conclusion to this project, modern scientific research on emotions suggests that these systems also influenced historical actors internal neurobiological experiences. But as I argue from a culturalist historical perspective throughout this project, changes in their experiences were equally the products of texts by western clerical authors, and lay authors writing with clerical influence, in which changes over time in emotions and attitudes toward violence are seen.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The 1095 expedition to the East, later known as the First Crusade (1095–1099), was not the first armed conflict Christians undertook for the sake of their faith and fellow believers.¹ However, because of this crusade’s success, as well as the fact that a greater numbers of sources recording its initial organization and eventual outcome survived than seen in any previous medieval military action, it would influence the undertaking of spiritually sanctioned warfare and attract historians’ attention for centuries.² Extant texts

---


provided detailed accounts of papal organization of and recruitment for the mission and documented participants’ journeys, challenges, and achievements in the East. But throughout these accounts, clerical chroniclers and clerical and lay epistolary authors also described crusaders’ personal experiences and emotions.

Clerical chronicler and crusade participant Fulcher of Chartres wrote of the crusaders’ departure from Europe, noting that, “none flinched from going because for love [amorem] of God they were leaving all that they possessed, firmly convinced that they would receive a hundredfold what the Lord promised to those who loved [diligentibus] him.”\(^3\) Such faith helped crusaders act with courage to achieve victory. As crusade leader Stephen of Blois wrote of the numerous battles at Antioch in a letter home to his wife, “we fought with bold spirits [animis ferocioribus], under the leadership of

---

\(^3\) Fulcher travelled on crusade as chaplain to crusade military leaders Stephen of Blois and Baldwin of Boulogne. The Latin edition of this chronicle used in this project is Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1913). Translations from this work that appear in this chapter are found in Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095-1127*, trans. Frances Rita Ryan, ed. Harold S. Fink (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1969), with slight changes to word choices. For this passage, see Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana* 1.12, 328: nequaquam proinde mulcebantur, quin propter amorem Dei cuncta quae possidebant relinquere: indubitanter credentes illud centeplum percipere, quod promisit Dominus diligentibus se,” Ryan, 74.
Christ…. with the aid of the Lord God, we conquered and most assuredly killed an innumerable host of them.”

Despite crusaders’ love of God and the courage they gained from trusting that he would lead them to victory, various chroniclers described them experiencing and expressing fear. Albert of Aachen, a non-participant clerical chronicler who based his account on the reports of returning veterans, wrote that when one group of crusaders saw what they believed to be a large number of enemy tents, “they were afraid [timuerunt] with great fear [timore].” On another occasion, according to Fulcher of Chartres, crusaders who found themselves surrounded by enemies were “trembling [trepidi] and frightened [pavefacti].”


5. Albert of Aachen is named only in the introductory sentence of one thirteenth century manuscript of the Historia Ierosolimitana, but historians have agreed that he is the singular author of the chronicle because of consistencies in the text. He may have desired to participate but been unable to do so because of his position as a priest at the cathedral church of Aachen. For Albert’s identity see Susan B. Edgington, “Introduction,” in Historia Ierosolimitana, History of the Journey to Jerusalem, ed. and trans. Susan B. Edgington (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), xxiii–iv; and Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, 1.1, ed. and trans. Edgington, 2. Also see Conor Kostick, The Social Structure of the First Crusade (Boston: Brill, 2008), 51, 85. The Latin edition, and English translation, of Albert’s chronicle used in this project is that of Edgington, with slight changes to her translation when needed for greater accuracy. For this passage see Ibid., 3.6, 148: “timuerunt timore magno.”

In addition to their fears, the crusaders’ sorrow was described as well. Clerical chronicler and crusade participant Raymond D’Aguilers wrote that after the capture and beheading of the “most illustrious and beloved knight” Roger of Barneville, “sorrow [dolor] and fear [timor] took possession [invasere] of our people.”7 Albert of Aachen wrote of the lengthy struggle for Antioch, “while these massacres, ambushes, and attacks took place…a daily lament [lamenta] over those killed might be heard in the camp.”8 But according to Raymond, beyond just lamenting their losses, such intense emotions drove “many to the desperation [desperationem] of escape.”9 This desire to escape or avoid action angered the military leaders of the expedition. According to an anonymous crusade chronicler who participated in the expedition, while at Antioch the military leader Bohemond of Taranto “was angry [iratus]” when his troops refused to leave houses in which they were hiding, and “ordered the city be put to the torch.”10

7. Raymond D’Aguilers described himself as a priest of the cathedral church of St. Mary of Le Puy in the Auvergne region of France. He initially undertook the crusade with a party of high-ranking clerics, but later travelled with and became the priest and chaplain to a crusade military leader. The Latin edition of this chronicle used in this project is Raymond D’Aguilers, Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Iherusalem, in RHC Oc. 3, 235-309. English translations are those found in Raymond D’Aguilers, Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Iherusalem, trans. John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1968), with slight changes to word choices. For this passage, see Raymond D’Aguilers, Historia Francorum 9, 252: “miles clarissimus et carissimus…Invasere igitur nostros dolor et timor,” Hill and Hill, 6, 49.


10. There have been numerous theories concerning this author’s identity. For the most recent discussion of past theories of the identity of this author and hypothesis of a “production team” of two secular clerics and two laymen, see Nirmal Dass, “Introduction,” in The Deeds of the Franks and other Jerusalem-Bound Pilgrims: The Earliest Chronicle of the First Crusades,
Although the loss of fellow knights evoked fear and sorrow in crusaders, these deaths were also described as bringing joy to the deceased. According to an anonymous chronicler, during a lengthy siege, “many of our men suffered martyrdom and gave up their blessed souls to God with joy [letantes] and gladness [gaudentes], and many of the poor starved to death for the name of Christ.”

Moving close to the city of Jerusalem also brought the crusaders great joy, as described by Albert of Aachen. When they reached the nearby city of Bethlehem and “heard the name Jerusalem,” Albert wrote that, “all the people burst into floods of tears [fletum] of weeping [lacrimarum] because of joy [leticia].” However, military victory at Jerusalem – including the collection of spoils – brought even greater joy. As clerical participant author Peter Tudebode wrote of the crusaders’ entrance into the city, “Then they ran through all the city taking gold, silver, horses, mules, and houses packed with all kinds of riches. Afterwards, all came rejoicing and weeping with joy to the Holy Sepulchre of our savior.”

---


These are just a few examples of the love of God, courage, fear, sorrow, anger, and joy that clerical and lay authors described among crusaders during the 1095 expedition to the East. Love of God drove crusaders to join the expedition and aided their activities in the East by fueling their courage. But crusaders still experienced fear of danger to themselves and their peers. Such fear angered crusade leaders when it hindered the undertaking of the mission. Both potential military losses and the deaths of crusaders brought sorrow to the peers of the deceased, though such deaths were believed to have brought the deceased joy as they moved closer to God. Crusaders also experienced joy on earth from the victories and material rewards they believed God granted them.

Scholars seeking insight into narrative or epistolary accounts of crusaders’ as well as other knights’ emotions must choose how to approach such descriptions. Are such references to emotion objective records of knights’ affect? Or were such references entirely dependent on the authors’ perspectives? What cultural and intellectual influences shaped the authors’ perspectives? Do the authors’ descriptions of emotions show changes over time as a result of these influences? Finally, do these descriptions of emotion reflect

(Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1974), with slight changes to word choices. As will be seen in the citations of the Latin and English sources for Tudebode’s text, the English version, based on fewer manuscript sources, is not entirely synchronous with the Latin edition found in the RHC Oc. Tudebode, known to originally come from Poitiers, described himself as priest from Civray. See Tudebode, *Hierosolymitano Itinere* 1.1, in RHC Oc. 3, 9: “Sacerdotis sivracensis.” According to Jay Rubenstein this self-identification is present in four out of the five surviving manuscripts. See Jay Rubenstein, “What is the *Gesta Francorum* and who was Peter Tudebode,” *Revue Mabillon* 16 (2005): 189. For this passage see Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano* 15.4, 110: “Mox cucurrerunt per universam civitatem, capientes aurum et argentum, equos et mulos, et domos plenus omnibus divitiis. Postea venerunt omnes gaudentes et prae nimio gaudio plorantes ad nostri Salvatoris Sanctus Sepulchrum,” trans. Hill and Hill, 11, 119.
any differences between clerical and lay authors’ attitudes toward the knights themselves?

Guided by these questions, this dissertation examines descriptions of emotions among Western Christian knights as they participated in or intentionally avoided organized military activities from the mid-tenth through early-twelfth century. Many scholars have recently used the term “arms bearer” to refer to men with weapons training who intentionally risked the sin of homicide by entering military conflicts.14 I agree that this term would best identify armed men of all classes who were prepared to engage in violence, prior to the mid-twelfth century.15 However, for narrative ease this dissertation

14. A number of historians have recommended caution when using the word “knight” as a general translation for miles or chevalier because of its assumptions of social, political, chronological and geographic consistency. See for example Richard Barber, “When is a Knight not a Knight?,” in Barber, The Knight and Chivalry, Revised ed. (Rochester: Boydell Press, 2000), 1–17; Matthew Bennett, “The Myth of the Military Supremacy of the Knightly Cavalry,” in Armies, Chivalry and Warfare in Medieval Britain and France: Proceedings of the 1995 Harlaxton Symposium, ed. Matthew Strickland (Stamford, Lincolnshire: Paul Watkins, 1998), 304. Marcus Graham Bull and Dominique Barthélemy have recommended the use of the name “arms bearer” as well as symbolic and literal references to the “ideology of the sword” to distinguish those who intentionally risked the sin of homicide by using weapons from those who did not. See Marcus Graham Bull, Knightly Piety and the Lay response to the First Crusade (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 17; Dominique Barthélemy, The Serf, the Knight and the Historian, trans. Graham Robert Edwards (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009), 144–7, 152–3. However, Barthélemy has also argued that since variations in terms for knights and nobles were trends in clerical terminology rather than evidence of different kinds of fighters or dramatic changes in their numbers, modern terms for “knight” can be used without concern for specificity. See ibid., 137-153. Most recently, Katherine Allen Smith has eschewed the word knight, referring to all milites who participated in warfare during the late-tenth through early-twelfth century changes in the clerical construction of the identity of lay miles Christi as “arms bearers” or “warriors.” See Katherine Allen Smith, War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture (Rochester: Boydell and Brewer, 2011), 100.

15. Historians have dated the birth of high medieval knighthood to the mid-twelfth century construction of distinctions between knights and other mounted warriors in both rank and function in the mid-twelfth century. See for example Jean Flori, L’Essor de la Chevalerie, Xle-XIIe Siècles, pref. Léopold Génicot (Geneva: Droz, 1986), 209.
will use the general terms “soldier” for those who participated in organized military activities in Late Antiquity under imperial leadership, “warrior” for those who fought from Late Antiquity through the mid-ninth century, and “knight” for those who did so under royal or aristocratic leadership from the mid-ninth century on. The military activities to be discussed (in which these men either participated or avoided) include any activities that could be considered “legitimate violence” according to Max Weber’s definition of violence as something undertaken by those who claim the territorial monopoly on such behavior. But the judgment of the legitimacy of such violence and the freedom or guilt from sin of those who engaged in it was a contentious subject at the time the narrative and epistolary texts discussed in this project were written.

This project's approach to emotion is informed by modern constructivist theories of emotion, and especially by what Piroska Nagy and Damien Boquet would call a moderate constructivism. This position recognizes the neurophysiological causes and

16. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, ed. Hans H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, Preface by Bryan S. Turner, 2d ed. (Abington: Routledge, 1991), 78. In Weber’s speech and essay the state claimed the monopoly on violence, but in the late-antique and medieval periods discussed here dominant forces included Roman emperors, kings, bishops, archbishops, the pope, and others who acted as territorial lords.

effects of emotion, but argues that the experiences and descriptions of such causes, and thus of the emotions, are culturally constructed. Clerical authors were familiar with the emotions that the knights they described were likely to experience and express while participating in or avoiding organized military conflicts as a result of their own or close relatives’ military training. But the emotions that they and the lay authors they influenced chose to include suggest that they sought to attribute emotions that would best contribute to the images of the knights they sought to construct, as well as the behavior among knights they sought to encourage. Nevertheless, because eyewitness authors also based their accounts on personal experiences or the reports of others, their descriptions of emotion frequently reveal inconsistencies between the behaviors they expected, saw, or

---


heard among knights and their portrayal of those men’s achievement of patristic and medieval ideals for emotion and violence.  

The texts this dissertation examines were written from the mid-tenth through early-twelfth centuries. These include one hagiographic *vita*, and multiple chronicles and epistolary accounts of organized military activities. They were all written in Western Europe or in territory in the Middle East that Christians considered the Holy Land. Read with greater attention to what Gabrielle Spiegel has called the “social logic of the text” than to their claims to truth, clerical and lay authors’ descriptions of knights will be seen to reflect patristic as well as medieval penitential, conciliar, and juridical references to emotions, interpersonal violence, and the sin of homicide. Differences seen over time both in and between texts with clerical authorship and the few written by laymen, or that reflect predominately lay influence, will be seen to reflect changes in clerical and lay perceptions of and attitudes toward those who participated in military activities.

21. Clerical authors also shared in the understanding of the stylistic and content requirements for Christians’ authorship of “eyewitness” accounts and “histories. For medieval authors’ distinctions between types of sources, see Yuval Noah Harari, “Eyewitnessing in Accounts of the First Crusade, the *Gesta Francorum* and other Contemporary Accounts,” in *Crusades* 3 (2004), 98; idem, *Renaissance Military Memoirs: War, History and Identity, 1450-1600* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004), 8–10, 27–8.


23. While clerics have been believed to be the dominant literary force until the eleventh and twelfth century, more recent research finds literacy among aristocrats in Europe from the Early Middle Ages. See for example Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton University Press, 1987); Rosamond McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, repr. 1995); Warren Brown, “When Documents are
Historians have traditionally seen the eleventh and twelfth centuries as a period of important changes in clerical perceptions of the roles of knights, the position of warfare in society and the faith, and shifts in the papal, conciliar and juridical thought that ultimately led to ecclesiastical acceptance and support for holy war and crusading. But by examining narrative and epistolary accounts of emotion among knights in their intellectual and cultural historical context, this project builds on recent arguments that such changes in ecclesiastics’ attitudes toward violence and their judgment of those who engaged in it began long before the tenth century. In classical Greece as well as during the Roman Republic and Empire, war was to be undertaken according to strict moral guidelines. According to priests of Roman polytheism, war could be undertaken only from specific causes and for specific goals, only after peace had been sought, and after specific religious rituals had been performed. This faith technically neither condemned

Destroyed or Lost,” Early Medieval Europe 11 (2002): 337–8, 365. Aristocrats were capable of producing letters or chronicles with or without clerical assistance by 1095, but literacy may not have been widespread among lower-ranking knights. See Kaeuper, Holy Warrior, 18.

24. See for example Erdmann, Origin, 86, 144, 171, 180, 245-6, 334, 348.


nor approved of killing during such wars, but the military oath of obedience granted soldiers permission to do so when ordered by a superior.  

The Christian faith initially condemned wars undertaken by the non-Christian Roman Empire. But as will be seen in this dissertation, the eventual dominance of this new faith in the Roman world encouraged its adherents to make such activities compatible with their own values.  

A prominent part of Christian thinkers’ reconfiguration of Roman ideals regarding war was an increase in the attention paid to the motives of soldiers who participated in organized military actions. Some historians credit Augustine of Hippo with the introduction of this concern with the judgment of soldiers’ actions, but classical guidelines for warfare revealed similar concerns. Greek and Roman philosophers had called for war to be undertaken with benevolence, by soldiers who focused on the causes and goals of the conflict and reserved the greatest loss of lives and destruction of property for enemies who were the most unjust. As I will show in this dissertation, patristic authors adopted this and other motive requirements to defend soldiers’ participation in warfare.

---


But classical and late-antique philosophers linked humans’ motives to more than just their undertaking of violence and other public behaviors. Motives or “action-tendencies” were also closely related to the experience and expression of emotion.\(^{32}\) Stoics believed emotions to include both judgments of circumstances and the desire to act in response.\(^{33}\) Neoplatonists recognized both voluntary and spontaneous emotions, only the former of which were based on conscious judgments.\(^{34}\) While voluntary emotions could be channeled to encourage correct actions, spontaneous emotions were to be controlled to reduce their occurrence and the actions that could result.\(^{35}\) As will be seen here, patristic authors who built from these philosophical traditions, and medieval jurists who in turn built on patristic theories, also believed that emotions fueled the motives that drove those who experienced them to action. This dissertation will show that this theoretical foundation’s intellectual and cultural influence also shaped narrative and epistolary authors’ literary approach to praising or condemning those who engaged in or avoided organized violence.

---


35. Ibid., 104.
This dissertation will demonstrate that hagiographical, narrative, and epistolary texts composed from the mid-tenth through mid-twelfth century reflect ideals for Christians’ behavior found in patristic and medieval penitential thought, and collected by jurists. Medieval confessors, and both monastic and ecclesiastical leaders, sought evidence of knights’ motives for action in order to praise, explain, justify, or condemn their participation in or avoidance of organized military conflicts according to their achievement of these ideals.\textsuperscript{36} Such evidence would justify the praise of those who eschewed violence, as well as save those who committed potentially sinful violence from the need to undertake penance or face punishment after death.\textsuperscript{37} Reflecting their awareness of this juridical need, as early as the mid-tenth century clerical authors described emotions among knights to provide evidence of correct motives for other clerics’ judgment of their actions as well as possible emulation by other knights.

Authors’ attributions of emotions to knights began long before 1095, but the First Crusade, 1095–1099, was the first papally-organized military expedition for which the pope presented clear motive requirements and provided a few examples of how

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
participants would be seen to demonstrate these motives. Clerical narrative authors, and clerical and lay epistolary authors, used these papal requirements and examples as a framework to prove the presence of correct motives among participants in the expedition. But inconsistencies remained between authors’ descriptions of emotion among knights on the expedition and the ideal motives from which they were expected to undertake the mission. The 1095 Crusade, even with its success, did not finalize the process of ecclesiastical approval of Christian knights as holy warriors who assuredly fought for the faith. That would not come until after the conflicts that this dissertation covers, with the foundation of the early military orders and further changes in juridical thought.

**Outline**

The chapters that follow will examine attributions of emotion to knights in narrative and epistolary sources from the mid-tenth through early-twelfth centuries. This evidence will be discussed in the context of penitential and juridical thought concerning violence from Late Antiquity through the same period. The emotions and affective concepts to be discussed include fear, courage, joy, sorrow, anger, and love of God or religious devotion. This range of emotions will be seen to reflect the diverse affective experiences that authors believed knights were likely to experience in the field. However, I will also show that authors’ attributions of each of these emotions in hagiographic texts, chronicles or letters served specific purposes for the defense or condemnation of knights’ behavior.

Influential writings by patristic authors as well as medieval penitential and juridical texts will be examined for evidence of clerical and ecclesiastical attitudes toward
and legislation concerning violence that was intended to shape knights’ behavior. Patristic and early medieval discussions of mental states and emotions will also be discussed, as evidence of the intellectual and cultural context that informed clerical and lay authors’ narrative and epistolary accounts of knights’ emotions as well as both penitential and juridical authors’ conceptions of motives and their judgment. While I have sought direct links in vocabulary, in all of these texts I have found the repetition of concepts to be more common than the repetition of specific words between these bodies of sources.

Changes over time in these discourses will be highlighted, to provide insight into the changes in the authors’ attributions of emotion to knights in narrative accounts of their behavior. It will be seen that after centuries of efforts, authors who wrote about the First Crusade (1095-1099) had the greatest success in portraying knights as consistently achieving ecclesiastically required ideals, based on patristic, penitential and juridical thought, for their motives for participation in a military expedition. But even in accounts of that successful holy war inconsistencies in the emotions attributed to knights reveal that clerical authors who sought to compose eyewitness chronicles still admitted doubts that knights were in fact engaging in just violence.

Chapter two of this project, “Historiographies,” will present historiographical overviews of the areas of research that have most informed my examination of primary sources. These include the modern study of emotion in the social sciences and history; historians’ study of attitudes toward violence and those who undertook it in both the crusades and in general medieval military history; and historians’ study of both
penitential and juridical thought in their cultural contexts. All of these areas will be shown to have shifted to a focus on cultural influences on human behavior. Scholars have found such influences to be most clearly discerned through the study informants or authors’ personal attitudes to the events around them. For the study of medieval history, this has revealed links between intellectual and cultural history.

Chapter three, “Affective Defense,” will discuss patristic theologians’ and medieval penitential authors’ and jurists’ references to violence and emotion, through the mid-eleventh century. Such authorities permitted military action when it was undertaken for acceptable goals by institutionally approved leaders, but in times of perceived political and social instability attention turned to the motives of participants. Following ancient and early medieval theories of emotion, and contemporary penitential practices, jurists came to see knights’ mental states, discernable in their experiences and expressions of emotion as evidence of their motives. This could enable knights to be judged to be free from sin while engaging in their secular functions.

Chapter four, “Just Knights, Just Wars,” will examine select clerical authors’ hagiographical and narrative accounts of knights’ avoidance of or participation in interpersonal violence or organized military action in the tenth and eleventh centuries. These authors attributed emotion to the knights on whom they wrote as evidence of their states of mind, to secure other clerics’ trust in their motives. Such descriptions will be seen to reflect ideas seen in patristic and juridical thought on violence and emotion. When used in hagiography this method constructed a politically and socially unattainable
ideal. But when applied to real world conflicts it justified and defended knights’ professional activities, securing their value in the assistance of ecclesiastical leaders.

Chapter five, “Creating the Crusader,” will examine ideas in juridical thought concerning the judgment of violence and those who undertook it that directly preceded Pope Urban II’s call for participants in the 1095 expedition to the East, as well as the multiple accounts of that papal recruitment sermon delivered at Clermont. Though it was most directly influenced by the bible, this sermon will be seen to have also reflected juridical ideals in its presentation of specific states of mind and motives as necessary for knights’ participation in the papal mission. The achievement of these ideals would ensure that participants would be considered worthy of both divine assistance in the conflict and spiritual rewards for their actions.

Chapter six, “Feeling Like a Crusader,” will discuss clerical chroniclers’ and epistolary authors’ attributions of mental states and emotions to knights in Pope Urban II’s 1095 expedition. Authors described knights’ achievement of the juridical and papal ideals found in Pope Urban II’s sermon at Clermont to verify that they undertook violence with the motives that jurists had argued were just. This would prove that they, and their conflict, were just. But the contradictions seen between authors’ descriptions of knights’ emotions and papal ideals for their experiences and behavior will show that despite the success of the mission not all clerical or lay authors believed that knights could actually achieve these ideals.

My conclusion will summarize this project’s findings, and then discuss historians’ efforts to examine knights’ own motives for engaging in violence and the emotions they
experienced and expressed while doing so outside of their portrayals by clerical authors. The challenges historians have faced in doing so suggest the need for alternate approaches to the examination of knights’ internal states. Recent scientific approaches will be introduced that may suggest ways to circumvent the reliance on cultural ideals shared by clerics and laypeople, if their methods can be applied to medieval historical research.
CHAPTER TWO
HISTORIOGRAPHIES

Scholars in the areas of investigation that have informed my dissertation have turned to studying historical periods’ distinct cultural components from the perspectives of those who lived within them. The study of clerical and clerically-influenced lay authors’ attributions of emotion to knights reveal historically and culturally dependent perspectives on both emotion and violence, and how these related to the judgment of those who participated in organized military activities. Together, these areas of investigation shed light on changes over time seen in descriptions of emotion among knights from the mid-tenth through early-twelth centuries.

The Interdisciplinary Study of Emotion

According to modern historians of emotion, casual references to emotion have long been included in ancient and modern scholars’ presentations of historical actors’ responses to events.1 Since the late nineteenth century, scholars in the social sciences and historians have linked emotions to transitions from social disorder to order; immaturity to

maturity. These scholars defined periods or cultures according to their members control of the seemingly “hydraulic” flow of emotions. Modern approaches to emotion in the social sciences and history that have influenced my research eschew these perspectives, instead seeking to objectively study emotions as cultural phenomena.

Research on Emotion in the Social Sciences

This dissertation’s examination of descriptions of emotion among soldiers or knights by clerical and lay authors is informed by theories that were first developed by


cultural anthropologists of the “Culture and Personality” school, writing from the 1930s through 1950s, as well as psychologists’ cognitive appraisal theory, developed in the 1960s. Through the combination of these approaches, emotions were understood to be physiological responses that were experienced or observed according to culturally dependent interpretations of both the affects and their causes.\(^4\) These theories fueled the studies that have most directly influenced this study’s approach to emotion, especially the cultural constructionist and performative theories of Clifford Geertz, Pierre Bourdieu, Kenneth J. Gergen, Claire Armon-Jones, and others, developed from the 1970s through 1980s.\(^5\) These scholars found emotions themselves to be culturally constructed products,


\(^5\) Clifford Geertz introduced the idea that all elements of human life and experience were distinct cultural products that reflected and contributed to the public and private “performance” of culture. See Clifford Geertz, “The Impact of the Concept of Culture on the Concept of Mind,” in The Interpretation of Cultures (New York: Harper Collins, 1973), 49–51; idem, “The Growth of Culture and the Evolution of Mind,” in The Interpretation of Cultures, 79–82. Also see J. C.
dependent on psychological, physical, and verbal practices intentionally or unintentionally taught by and displayed for others.


Catherine Lutz saw constructions of emotion and their relationship to other cultural influences to produce “discourses” that occur in and about social life. I will show that authors who described emotions, their intended audiences, and the historical actors whose emotions they described participated in a shared emotional discourse. Medieval authors’ understanding of emotions, and their reasons for attributing emotions to the historical actors on whom they wrote, dated back to Late-Antique patristic authors’ ideas concerning emotion and human behavior. Changes to this discourse from Late Antiquity through the early-twelfth century will be seen to reflect changes over time in the cultural and intellectual milieu in which its participants lived.

This project focuses on the construction and purpose of textual references to emotions in the sources and periods it examines. But it must be noted that since the 1980s and 1990s, psychologists James Averill and Gergen, among others, have argued that emotional discourses influence the mental and physical experiences of emotions among those who consciously or unconsciously participate in them. Recent neurobiological research has dramatically expanded scientists’ understanding of the human brain and


emotions. Some scholars have called for the integration of neuroscientific and cognitive psychological models of emotion, finding links between culturally dependent forms of affect and measurable neurophysiological responses through the use of brain-imaging technology.9

Scholars outside of the pure social sciences, specifically historians, see arguments that join cultural and neurobiological theories of emotion to be fertile ground for research. Barbara H. Rosenwein has described the study of the history of emotions as providing an ideal venue for the combination of biological, “universalist” or “presentist” and cultural constructionist theories.10 William M. Reddy and Nagy and Bouquet have all recommended that historians adopt a theory they call moderate constructivism. In this approach, neurobiological findings could be used to suggest ways in which cultural products, including texts, art, architecture, rituals, and ideals for behavior could have shaped cognition, and thus emotion.11 As applied in this project, this approach to the


study of emotion suggests that the cultural discourses of emotion that patristic and medieval authors constructed likely influenced the experience of emotion of those who lived within them. Efforts to examine historical actors’ actual experiences of emotion will be discussed further in this project’s conclusion.

Research on Emotions in Historical Study

The work of social scientists has long influenced historians’ investigation of emotion. Medieval and Renaissance historians of the 1960s and 1970s were some of the first to examine accounts of emotions among historical actors outside of developmental or hydraulic models, in the context of contemporaneous theology, philosophy, and political life. In the 1980s American historians were the first to develop new theories and methods for research on the history of emotions. Peter and Carol Stearns’ research on emotion has supported the idea of culturally and chronologically variable standards for emotions. They argued that standards for emotional experience and expression, and the understanding of the concept of emotions, were inextricably linked to broader socio-cultural norms. This theoretical approach, initially dependent on publications that


13. Peter N. Stearns and Carol Z. Stearns, “Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards,” AHR 90 (1985): 813–4. Changes over time to a culture’s emotionology reflected and contributed to changes in these norms as well. See Corrigan, “Introduction: Emotions Research and the Academic Study of Religion,” 12. Their approach was influenced by the quantitative methodology of the “new social history,” which linked authors’
offered formal advice for emotion and behavior and focused on what people thought of the expression rather than the experience of emotion, has been seen as incompatible with most medieval historical research.  

Medievalists, as well as historians of other periods, have turned to a wider range of forms of evidence, and methodological approaches, for the study of historical emotional standards. Beginning in the 1970s and 1980s, historians informed by anthropologists’ approaches began to see authors’ personal perspectives and experiences as integral to their accounts of contemporaneous events. Moving into the 1990s through this century, Mary Carruthers, Johannes Fried, and others have criticized modern perspectives and their subjects’ behavior and emotional discourses to the material context in which they lived. See Peter N. Stearns, “Chapter 2: History of Emotions,” in The Handbook of Emotion, 3d ed, ed. Michael Lewis, Jeannette M. Haviland-Jones, and Lisa Feldman Barrett (New York: Guilford Press, 2008), 19; idem, “The New Social History: an Overview,” in Ordinary People and Everyday Life: Perspectives on the New Social History, ed. George Rollie Adams and James B. Gardner (Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1983), 1–21. Also see Bennett, "Fear and its Representation,” 31.


historians for not reading medieval authors’ works according to their own narrative paradigms. They argue that medieval authors intentionally did not convey objective accounts of reality because they saw the interpretation of events as imparting meaning that was more important than the “real” events themselves. Yet, as Walter Pohl clarifies, to maintain readers’ trust the events they described had to be likely enough to have occurred and call for interpretation.

To avoid epistemological confusion, Dominick LaCapra has recommended “radical constructivism” for the study of cultural history, arguing that the greatest insight into historical cultures can be gained through the study of the “performative, figurative, aesthetic, rhetorical, ideological and political factors that ‘construct’ structures – stories,


17. Walter Pohl, “Memory, Identity and Power in Lombard Italy,” in The Uses of the Past, 27; discussed in Gabriele, An Empire of Memory, 69.
plots, arguments, and explanations – in which referential statements are embedded and take on meaning and significance.”¹⁸ When approached in these ways, medieval authors become informants for their culture. The narrative and epistolary sources whose descriptions of emotion this dissertation examines will be read in the cultural context in which they were written. This context will be seen to have produced both authors’ attitudes toward emotions themselves and the historical actors whose emotions they described.

I will discuss historians’ interest in attitudes towards knights later in this historiography. But here it is important to note that historians who have moved away from developmental or hydraulic models for emotions and focused on their cultural construction have found that historical authors’ texts reflected the internally rational systems for the explanation and control of emotions with which they were familiar. Research in the intellectual history of the philosophy of emotions by Richard Sorabji and Simo Knuuttila, for example, has found philosophical, theological, and scientific ideas from Classical Greece and Rome through the Middle Ages to convey rational emotional discourses.¹⁹ Most recently, Damien Boquet has found shifts in theories of emotion occurring from the Early Middle Ages through the twelfth and thirteenth century that


expanded the field of emotions to the entirety of human nature, from bodily impulses to
the will and intellect. Theologians believed that emotions could help Christians achieve
salvation when they were products of reason, but viewed spontaneous emotional
outbursts with suspicion.\textsuperscript{20} My research has found descriptions of knights’ emotions to
reflect intellectual discourses that preceded or were contemporaneous with their authors.
These included patristic attitudes toward emotions and ideas about human motives for
action through early to high medieval penitential and juridical thought, as discussed by
Sorabji and Knuuttila, and also reflect the first glimpses of the specific changes Bouquet
has found.

Many recent studies of emotion have been based on historians’ textual analysis of
authors’ vocabulary, in both theoretical treatises and narrative references to emotion,
according to clearly explained and defined methodologies.\textsuperscript{21} Texts that are related
geographically, in genre, or authorship, are examined for changes over time in authors’
terminology for emotional experiences and expression. Through this approach, scholars
can discern the context and frequency of word usage, the importance of some emotions in
comparison to others, and the relationship between the literary vocabulary, standards for
emotion, and reports of emotion among historical actors.\textsuperscript{22} But as a number of historians

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20} Damien Boquet, “Des racines de l’émotion. Les préaffects et le tournant
\item \textsuperscript{21} For the purposes and challenges of this approach, see Nagy and Boquet, “Pour une
histoire des émotions,” 39–43.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Rosenwein supports attention to the language of emotion and emotive word choices
as a way for historians to move beyond current scientists and social scientists’ “universalist” and
“presentist” theories, as well as to get a complete picture of changes over time in theories of
\end{itemize}
have stressed, the emotional significance of words must be discerned from their context in texts’ narratives, and their meaning established through the study of the phrases in which they occur in both the narratives and theoretical references to them, with care to avoid the misapplication of modern concepts.23

This examination of narrative and epistolary authors’ descriptions of knights’ emotion follows much of the methodology that Rosenwein has presented.24 I have gathered narrative and epistolary sources in which authors have attributed emotions to knights, and theoretical texts that refer to ideals for emotions and the relationship between emotions and actors’ internal states. I have identified emotion words in both of these bodies of sources, with attention to their textual, rhetorical, social, political and cultural contexts. I will show that the vocabulary for emotion seen in narrative accounts of knights emotions while they avoided or engaged in organized military activities, will be seen to have reflected that which was used in papal, conciliar and juridical texts’ discussions of ideal motives for violence or pacifism, as well as the emotions that were emotion and their reported experience. See Rosenwein, idem, “Problems and Methods in the History of Emotion,” Passions in Context 1 (2010), 2–12; idem, “Thinking Historically about Medieval Emotions,” History Compass 8:8 (2010): 833–4, 836; idem, “Emotion Words,” in Le sujet des émotions au moyen âge (Paris: Beauchesne, 2008), 93–6; idem, Emotional Communities, 26–9.


expected of penitents as evidence of their remorse. Likewise, I will link the vocabulary for emotion found in narrative and epistolary sources of the First Crusade to the ideals for crusaders’ motives for participation and likely experiences in the east that authors presented in their accounts of Pope Urban II’s recruitment sermon. Accounts of the sermon did not clearly identify as many motives for violence or emotions as had been seen in previous juridical texts or recommendations for penitents. But authors who wrote about participants in the crusade attributed emotions and motives for violence to them according to prior models in order to present their affective states as comparable to that of the pope and Christians who sought penance, as well as to place them within the pope’s standards for the undertaking of the expedition as a just conflict. But in sources from a the wider field of military conflicts, as well as those related to the First Crusade, such correlations demonstrate the application of standards for emotion to the judgment of human behavior, including the use of emotions for the explanation of actors’ motives for action.

Historians focusing on emotions have linked them to a wide range of intellectual, social and cultural developments. Michael Clanchy, Stephen White and Laurent Macé, have linked emotions to social and legal organization in medieval secular and ecclesiastical systems of governance.25 According to William Ian Miller, emotions

structured interpersonal relationships within social and political groups because of the
bonds they inspired, as well as reinforcing expectations for group members’ behavior. They
were not circumstantial connections, however. Gerd Althoff saw authors’ accounts
of emotion during secular and ecclesiastical rituals to provide evidence of social bonds
and reinforce political ranks, in support of their own political and social goals and
biases.

Historians have long seen persuasion as a vital part of oral and written rhetoric,
with authors seeking to influence both audiences’ perceptions and conduct. Joachim
Knape has explained that authors at times presented clear imperatives for their readers’
behavior, but also formulated their accounts of events so that readers or listeners could

---


easily adopt rules for action from the story they were presenting. A number of historians and literary scholars who have focused on authors’ depictions of clerical and secular leaders’ speeches to knights have found that they delivered such imperatives that were linked to emotions. Beyond such imperatives, however, authors’ practice of presenting historical actors positively or negatively according to their affective responses to contemporaneous events was a common way to characterize them throughout the Middle Ages. Rosenwein and Bruce Brasington have examined such descriptions, seeing them as a method authors used to present historical actors’ behaviors and states of mind in ways compatible with accepted standards for emotion in their social group, community, class, or larger society as a whole.


According to Knape, authors validated or condemned certain models for rulership, social and political structures, behaviors, and emotional responses to events, through the behaviors and emotions they described.\textsuperscript{33} Jonathan Riley-Smith, Sophia Menache, and Susanna Throop have argued that chroniclers described emotions to encourage similar reactions among their texts readers or listeners, since shared affect could drive audiences to aid those of whose exploits they read or heard.\textsuperscript{34} This project will show that narrative and epistolary authors described knights’ emotions to celebrate or condemn those of whom they wrote, and to encourage both similar behavior by other knights and similar judgments by other readers. Authors used knights’ experiences and expressions of emotion to show lay readers or listeners what internal states – motives, desires, and goals – were expected to drive them to undertake or avoid violence. Clerical readers or listeners were in turn shown what emotions to encourage or condemn among knights. But in the periods of time this dissertation discusses, from Late Antiquity through the early-twelfth century, changes are seen in authors’ descriptions of emotion.

Historians agree that standards for the appropriate experience and expression of emotion were not static. C. Stephen Jaeger argues that efforts to control emotions and limit violence were part of Carolingian courts’ and tenth- and eleventh-century cathedral

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 125.

schools’ efforts to direct emotions toward social, economic, and political goals.\textsuperscript{35}

Looking at changing standards for emotion after the eleventh century, Jean Delumeau and Peter Dinzelbacher also linked changes over time in standards for emotion to ecclesiastical leaders’ desire to redirect emotions to outlets that were perceived as more productive for historical actors and society.\textsuperscript{36} Like the “civilizing process” of Norbert Elias, the changes these scholars saw were encouraged with the hope of achieving specific goals.

However, historians writing outside the paradigm of the “civilizing process” have also found changes in standards for emotion. William M. Reddy saw smaller groups who felt dissatisfied or disenfranchised by what they saw as the dominant emotional discourse seeking to change it by actively condemning and working against it.\textsuperscript{37} In contrast,


\textsuperscript{36} Jean Delumeau argued that clerics sought to control lay violence by encouraging the widespread fear of divine chastisement because of the interpersonal violence caused by economic, political, and environmental stresses experienced in the later Middle Ages. See Jean Delumeau, \textit{Le péché et la peur: la culpabilisation en Occident, XIIIe–XVIIe siècles} (Paris: Fayard, 1983); trans. Eric Nicholson, \textit{Sin and Fear: the Emergence of a Western Guilt Culture, 13th–18th Centuries} (New York: St. Martins, 1990), 2–4. Peter Dinzelbacher described clerical leaders linking lay Christians’ potential experiences of fear from material and spiritual dangers to the threat of non-Christian enemies inside and outside of Europe. See Peter Dinzelbacher, \textit{Angst im Mittelalter: Teufels-, Todes- und Gotteserfahrung; Mentalitätsgeschichte und Ikonographie} (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1996), 93–4. The fear of material and spiritual suffering influenced all aspects of human life, including the desire to join religious communities. See \textit{idem, Bernhard von Clairvaux: Leben und Werk des berühmten Zisterziensers} (Darmstadt: Primus, 1998), 14.

Rosenwein found changes in communities’ standards for emotions occurring as a result of a combination of social, political, intellectual, and cultural transitions within them. These changes often accompanied shifts in rule and were propagated by accompanying shifts in control of textual production. Emotional communities themselves moved into or out of “ascendance” as a result of their ability to influence or control such transitions.

The descriptions of emotion that this dissertation examines reveal slight changes over time in authors’ portrayal of knights’ achievement of standards for emotion as well as ideals for just violence. From the mid-tenth through the early-twelfth century authors shifted from presenting historical actors’ emotions only in ways that reflected patristic, penitential and juridical ideals for lay Christian behavior to describing a wider range of emotions in reaction to positive and negative stimuli. Such accounts may have provided more accurate portrayals of the emotions that knights were likely to have had in the field. But as the role of motives in the judgment of violence became fully elaborated, highlighting the need for the evidence of motives that emotions could provide, descriptions of knights that included deviation from the ideals of the faith reflected and likely contributed to ecclesiastical doubts in their ability to act only for the good of their faith and fellow Christians.

usefulness in the analysis of other historical periods and modern culture. Also see Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 198.


39. Ibid., 200.
This dissertation examines authors’ descriptions of knights’ emotions as authorial constructions, rather than seeking to understand the experiences and expressions of emotion of knights themselves. But not all modern scholars of emotion have embraced the idea that authors’ accounts should be seen as distinct from affect experienced by historical actors. In his discussion of public displays of emotion, Althoff argued that the emotions described by medieval authors were in fact cognitive reactions to events, though the forms for their expression were culturally dependent. Peter Dinzelbacher stressed historians’ need to recognize variations in emotion, seeing the greater intensity he found in historical emotional experience and expression as evidence of cultural differences rather than social immaturity. But given what historians know of literary rhetoric and authors’ reasons for writing, texts cannot be seen as objective records. Though he believed that the emotions authors described were actually experienced in some way, Althoff doubted that any author could objectively describe his or her own emotions in a way that would be universally understood.


historical reality. The belief that they could was “naïve security.” As Rosenwein succinctly states, “we no longer think of texts as transparent windows onto ‘reality,’” but know that the references to emotions they contain must be read in their wider cultural and intellectual context.

The authors whose descriptions of emotion have been examined for this dissertation were eyewitnesses of the military conflicts of which they wrote or were otherwise familiar with knights and warfare. What they knew of knights’ experiences of emotions in the field are likely to have informed their descriptions of the men of whom they wrote. These descriptions had to be plausible to maintain readers’ trust, but ultimately depended on how they chose to portray knights, according to standards for emotions and the undertaking of violent activities presented in patristic, penitential, and juridical texts. Changes in them thus also reflect changes in attitudes toward knights and the violence they were undertaking, so must be understood in the context of medieval military history and the development of holy war or crusading as ecclesiastically defensible or sanctioned military activities.

**Crusade Studies and Medieval Military Historiography**


43. Rosenwein, Emotional Communities, 28. Assuming these accounts to be evidence of experiences of emotions with universal physiological, mental, and linguistic features may hinder historical analysis as it might contradict any notion of change over time.
Military professionals and historians writing on medieval military history in the late nineteenth century were the first to construct the enduring image of heavily armed warriors relying on mass charges in conflicts, and fighting primarily for personal glory.44 Scholars of general medieval military history believed that their research was hindered by a lack of detailed sources for military conflicts and noteworthy battles with decisive outcomes prior to the Hundred Years’ War.45 But at the same time, nineteenth century crusade scholars were able to take advantage of the large number of primary sources related to crusading to investigate those papally-sanctioned conflicts.46 After reassessing the general timeline of the conflicts called crusades, they turned to the secular political, military and economic contexts of crusading, often linking crusade history to

---


45. According to the methodology for military history developed by Carl von Clausewitz in the 1870s, these elements were required for the scholarly study of battle outcomes and their political, social, economic and moral ramifications in all periods of military history. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed. and trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976; 1984), discussed in France, *Western Warfare*, 11.

contemporaneous changes in global politics. The study of general medieval military history did not go through dramatic shifts in scholarship until after the mid-twentieth century, when scholars began to reassess past arguments concerning the structure of medieval armies, ideas about medieval social organization in Western Europe, and concepts of chivalry. But crusade historians began to approach their material in new ways by the 1930s. The modern approaches in both these areas of research that have most


influenced my work reflect the influence of contemporary changes in the social sciences and the interdisciplinary study of cultural influences on human behavior.49

**Crusade Studies**

In the 1930s, a few crusade historians turned to the investigation of crusaders themselves and the meaning of their actions in within their own cultures.50 Dana Carleton Munro believed that questions about the personality and motives of crusaders arise as soon as the campaigns are thought of as “real events.”51 My research reflects Munro’s interest in crusaders themselves, especially clerics’ understanding of them. Its chronological/theoretical framework grows from the paradigm that began with Carl Erdmann’s 1935 *Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens* and was continued by his critics. His examination of how the idea of the crusade initially developed and became such a powerful ecclesiastical and popular concept introduced one of the most influential approaches to crusade studies.52


50. This was in part a response to early-twentieth century challenges to colonialism and imperialism, both held by many to have been products of the crusades. See Tyerman, *Debate*, 155–6.

51. Dana Carleton Munro, “A Crusader,” *Speculum* 7:3 (1932): 321. While demonstrating interest in historical subject’s personal experiences, Munro showed his intellectual perspective to be a product of the early twentieth century with his closing statement that “…human nature has not varied much throughout the ages.” See ibid., 335. This article, also Munro’s presidential address to the Medieval Academy of America, saw eyewitness clerical chronicler of the First Crusade Fulcher of Chartres’ accounts of crusaders’ experiences on the expedition as products of his social and professional background. See ibid., 321–5.

According to Erdmann, Late Antique Christians adapted the traditional Roman concept of *bellum iustum* to make war in defense of both the faith and their now Christian Roman Empire a morally acceptable undertaking. According to the Roman ethical system, moral responsibility rested on the leader who called for acts of violence to be committed, not on the individual soldiers who committed them. But ecclesiastical leaders’ approval of a Christian *bellum iustum* could not outlast the Christian Roman Empire as the unified political authority whose leaders were permitted to wage war.

Erdmann saw Pope Gregory I’s (540-604) approval of the use of organized military activity to protect missionaries by subduing pagans after the end of western imperial rule as the potential introduction of the use of external aggression to aid the faith. But this use of violence had not been wholly accepted in Late Antiquity and would not be in the Early Middle Ages. Erdmann stressed that both patristic and early medieval ecclesiastics believed the attitudes with which secular leaders and soldiers or knights undertook a war to be antithetical to the faith, more concerned with political or material gain than the ideal struggle to achieve closeness to God. Epitomizing a life distant from God, soldiers or knights could only become revered as saints by acting in

54. Ibid., 8.
55. Ibid., 11.
56. Ibid., 9–11.
57. Ibid., 11–16.
opposition to their military profession.\(^{58}\) The Christian Carolingian Empire reinforced the idea that war could be morally acceptable, but that even when undertaken and overseen by a papally-supported Christian ruler such a conflict had to be defensive.\(^{59}\) However, despite this caveat, according to Erdmann contemporaries saw papal or ecclesiastical support or participation in such activities as evidence of corruption among those authorities.\(^{60}\)

Ecclesiastical attitudes toward war and the laymen who engaged in it only changed over time as the culture of the lay and clerical Christians themselves changed. Erdmann linked the greatest shift in early medieval attitudes toward violence to the entrance of militaristic Germans into the Christian world. Since their conversion did not dramatically change their worldview, German ideals about moral warfare slowly influenced the ecclesiastical leaders and laypeople of the Christian world they entered.\(^{61}\) This is seen in the militarization of holy figures such as the Archangel Michael, who over time was increasingly portrayed and venerated as the prince of heavenly hosts leading his troops into battle.\(^{62}\) Such imagery had symbolic or metaphorical significance to ecclesiastical leaders, but offered lay Christians the first example of a synthesis of

\(^{58}\) Ibid., 14, 16.

\(^{59}\) Ibid., 16, 22–3.

\(^{60}\) Ibid., 15.

\(^{61}\) Since the papacy of Gregory I, the Church had assimilated pagan ideas it encountered. See ibid., 19–20.

\(^{62}\) Ibid., 20.
heavenly and earthly military service.\textsuperscript{63} This positive portrayal of earthly military activity explained the appeal that the concept of crusading had for lay Christians. Without the import of Germanic military ethics, there would have been no Christian knighthood and no First Crusade.\textsuperscript{64}

This background material laid the foundation for Erdmann’s primary argument about the origin of crusading, later commonly known as the “Erdmann thesis.” After the end of Carolingian rule, and under the influence of Germanic ideals, ecclesiastical leaders’ aversion to warfare waned as they simultaneously took on public roles in secular governance and provided moral and spiritual support for knights while they defended Christian territories against external and internal aggression.\textsuperscript{65} During this time the church began to transfer the ideal of undertaking \textit{bellum iustum} from Christian monarchs to knights themselves, and came to see war as capable of being not only just but holy in itself.\textsuperscript{66} Popes after the mid-eleventh century used the idea of a holy war to call on knights to participate in military missions, to strengthen their own authority in both the ecclesiastical and secular hierarchies.\textsuperscript{67} In this way, Erdmann offered one of the first

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{63} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{64} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{65} Ibid., 26–8.
\item \textsuperscript{66} Ibid., 59, 94.
\end{itemize}
presentations of the theological and legal ideas associated with crusading as responses to specific cultural contexts. Crusade ideology developed from the social, intellectual, political, and psychological forces behind ecclesiastical leaders’ organization of, and knights’ participation in, such expeditions.68

Historians admired Erdmann’s scholarship and the possibilities his research offered for crusade studies, but many began to reassess his argument soon after it was published.69 From the 1930s through 1960s, concerns centered on whether ecclesiastical officials or lay Christians were most responsible for the birth of crusade ideology, how the concepts of holy war and crusading fit into penitential and ecclesiastical law, and if the practice of crusading should be seen as completely divorced from participants’ potential material interests.70 The English translation of Erdmann’s text was first


69. Ibid., 189.

published in the 1970s, expanding its influence on scholarship through the later twentieth century. Until recently, historiographers of crusading led by Jonathan Riley-Smith and Giles Constable categorized crusade scholars’ work as traditionalist, pluralist, popularist, generalist, penitential, and sentient empathist, according to their continuation of some of the earliest arguments raised by Erdmann’s critics. Such categorization has recently fallen out of favor, since historians’ research does not always fit only one area of investigation, and according to Tyerman such categorization often raises more questions than it answers.

crusading as an expression of faith among laymen, and found the dual nature of holy war as a military and spiritual undertaking in defense of the church to have appeared long before the mid-eleventh century. The penitential nature of participation in such activities was the key to its appeal. See articles by Étienne Delaruelle, published 1941-1954, collected in Delaruelle, L’idée de croisade au moyen âge, intro. Jean Richard (Turin: Bottega d’Erasco, 1980). See Flori, La guerre sainte, 21–2, 29; Baldwin, “Foreword,” xxii. In the 1940s Michael Villey complained that Erdmann had not adequately discussed the changes in juridical thought that enabled distinctions to be made between crusades and the holy wars that ecclesiastical officials had previously supported. See Michel Villey, La croisade, essai sur la formation d’une théorie juridique (Paris: J. Vrin, 1942), discussed in Baldwin, “Preface,” xxii; Constable, “Historiography of the Crusades,” 21. In 1965 Hans Eberhard Mayer argued against Erdmann’s idea that ideology rather than destination defined crusading, stressing that Jerusalem was the required destination for a holy war to be considered a crusade. Mayer attributed knights’ enthusiasm for participation in the First Crusade and other missions to the East not to popular religious devotion to Jerusalem, but to younger sons’ need to secure their own land and wealth as inheritance customs tightened. See Hans Eberhard Mayer, The Crusades, trans. John Gillingham, 2nd ed (London: Oxford University Press, 1972; 1988), 7, 9–11, 20, 22–5, 26, 29, 33, 36, 99, 138.


73. For a critique of categorization, see Tyerman, Debate, 226–7.
Nonetheless, the areas on which Erdmann’s first critics focused have continued to garner attention. The discussions that have most influenced this dissertation include questions concerning the distinctions between holy wars and crusade, the role of spiritual rewards in crusading, and knights’ motives for participating in a crusade. In each of these lines of investigation historians have sought to avoid generalizations, examining slight changes over time in texts to achieve a complete image of ideas and events within their intellectual, cultural, social, and political context. This dissertation is most concerned with how texts by clerical authors writing about military conflicts and their participants from the mid-tenth through the late-twelfth centuries would have understood and reflected these issues.

**Holy War and Crusade**

One of the greatest divisions among crusade historians since Erdmann has been how, and even whether or not, historians should distinguish between holy wars and crusades. Given that the Medieval Latin term closest to the modern concept of “crusade” or “crusader,” _crucesignatus_, “signed with the cross,” was not used exclusively to distinguish crusaders from other pilgrims until the end of the twelfth century, this is not an easy distinction to make.\(^7\) What matters most to this dissertation is whether or not clerics who described participants in conflicts that historians now consider to be crusades

---

or holy wars would have seen these knights and their military activities as different from one another.

Jonathan Riley-Smith presented the requirements for holy wars to be considered crusades as their being initiated by papal appeals, encouraged by official preaching, and participants taking vows to fight and receiving temporal and spiritual rewards.\(^\text{75}\) This definition has allowed historians such as John Gilechrist, Joseph F. O’Callaghan, Paul E. Chevedden, Iben Fonnesberg-Schmidt, and Jonathan Phillips to suggest that expeditions destined for multiple locations or destinations besides Jerusalem were understood to be crusades – according to modern definitions of the term – by their organizers and participants.\(^\text{76}\) However, Tyerman and Chevedden have argued that the elements that made a holy war a crusade all developed slowly after 1095 as the Church systemized, institutionalized or created structural arrangements that could promote crusading,


practices for crusaders to follow for making vows and raising funds to participate, and the
authors of accounts of crusades and crusaders developed consistent narrative tropes.  

This was an extended process, completed as late as the Third Crusade or during
pontificate of Innocent III (1198–1216).  

If this is the case it remains to be asked – as
will be done in this dissertation – whether or not authors who wrote about participants in
the First Crusade portrayed them as markedly different from knights who had previously
participated in conflicts that had been considered holy. In short, if the First Crusade
created the “crusaders.”

Historians who have built from the work of Michel Villey have focused on
similarities between holy wars and those that were later considered crusades, blurring the
lines between the two types of Christian conflicts. They consider crusades to be holy
wars fought in defense of the faith that emphasized the concept of just war; begun
through the efforts of ecclesiastical leaders at all levels to mobilize warriors in support
and defense of the papacy and Christendom against any perceived enemy; believed to
have been the accomplishment of God’s will on Earth and to have achieved the ideal of

77. Chevedden called the belief that crusading and crusade institutions began with Pope
Urban II’s sermon at Clermont a “Big Bang Theory,” which he discredits in favor of seeing the
success of the crusade movement as an outcome of the growth of papal influence. See
Chevedden, “Canon 2 of the Council of Clermont (1095) and the Crusade Indulgence,” in
Annuarium historiae conciliorum; internationale Zeitschrift für Konziliengeschichtsforschung

(Malden: Blackwell, 2002), 100–2, 124–5; Chevedden, “Canon 2 of the Council of Clermont
(1095) and the Crusade Indulgence,” 253–4.

Christian knighthood; and to have been linked to the regional movements known as the Peace and Truce of God.⁸⁰ According to historian of canon law Ernst-Dieter Hehl, this approach to defining holy wars and crusades accurately positions both types of military undertakings within their wider cultural and chronological contexts.⁸¹ The distinction between holy wars and crusades thus rests entirely on the scale of conflicts, the spiritual rewards granted to participants, and their activities being thought of as not only just and acceptable according to juridical thought but actually pleasing to God. This distinction, however, did not influence authors’ descriptions of participants, as much as the distinction between political or territorial conflicts and holy wars in general. Clerical authors’ judgments of whether knights fought for economic, political or territorial interests, or were engaged in war as an act of religious devotion, thus shaped all of the experiences and expressions of emotion they attributed to them in the field.

Many crusade historians have linked holy wars and the advent of crusading to regional movements known as the Peace and Truce of God. These movements were products of ecclesiastical efforts to garner assistance for the defense of the papacy and

---


⁸¹ Ernst-Dieter Hehl argued that since a crusade could have been any war fought at the order of and with the authority of God, Pope Urban II’s singular innovation in 1095 was to fit the crusade concept into “a historical-theological schema” or “a theology of war.” See Hehl, “Was ist eigentlich ein Kreuzzug?,” 301, 307; Constable, “Historiography of the Crusades,” 17.
Christendom against internal enemies. Historians have argued that clerical authors’ and participating knights’ belief that the meetings associated with these movements reflected God’s will on earth may have also encouraged knights to seek to fulfill his will by achieving ecclesiastically supported ideals for Christian knighthood. But Herbert E. J. Cowdrey has countered the idea that regional Peace and Truce of God movements influenced the birth of papally-organized crusades, instead linking these conflicts purely to ideas of pilgrimage and more general notions of holy war. Yet he believes that these movements did contribute to the concept of Western Christendom as a united entity, which could itself have encouraged participation in the crusade. I will demonstrate that the clerical accounts of Peace and Truce meetings examined for this dissertation presented knights as eager to express religious devotion in ways linked to their secular profession, when called to do so by ecclesiastical leaders.

Beyond episcopal and papal support of religious devotion in Europe itself, the city of Jerusalem itself played a vital role in the first articulation of the crusading idea. Giles Constable and William Purkis have both argued that the 1095 mission to Jerusalem

82. See above, p. 50 n. 80.


84. Cowdrey, “From the Peace of God to the First Crusade,” 61.
provided the lasting model for “crusading” as a spiritual mission.⁸⁵ Paul Chevedden has made it clear that while Pope Urban II called for the “liberation of the Church of God” because of his need for a military alliance with the Byzantine Empire, participants believed that this required returning the city of Jerusalem to Christian rule.⁸⁶ Clerical and lay authors’ descriptions of knights’ religious devotion and emotions during the crusade, especially those that were related to the goals of the crusade itself, will reveal the influence of the city of Jerusalem on participants. This influence was unequalled in organized military activities that had been considered acceptable to the pope, or gatherings of the Peace and Truce of God movements, that preceded the First Crusade.

**Spiritual Rewards**

In their comparisons of holy wars and crusades historians have stressed that the 1095 expedition was not the first military expedition for which the papacy granted spiritual rewards to participants.⁸⁷ Erdmann provided plentiful examples of spiritual rewards granted to knights for their avoidance or engagement in violence prior to 1095, which he saw culminating in Pope Urban II’s granting of remission of penance or sin to

---


⁸⁷. See for example Chevedden, “Canon 2 of the Council of Clermont (1095) and the Goal of the East Crusade,” 91–3; Chevedden, “Canon 2 of the Council of Clermont (1095) and the Crusade Indulgence,” 275–7; Gilchrist, “The Papacy and War Against Saracens,” 183–4.
those who participated in the First Crusade.⁸⁸ He did not, however, explain changes over time seen in the details of such rewards.⁹⁰ Building from the work of Michel Villey, John Gilchrist, James A. Brundage, and Riley-Smith have called on historians to offer more detail concerning changes over time in penitential and juridical thought related to crusading.⁹⁰ I will attend to these changes over time and their influences on authors’ descriptions of emotions among knights while they engaged in potentially sinful organized military activities.

This chapter will provide a separate discussion of the historiography of penitential and juridical thought. But the questions most pertinent to crusade studies include how long before the First Crusade spiritual rewards were given for military service, whether these rewards were actually for military service itself or for the completion of a penitential act, and whether or not participants in the holy wars for which spiritual rewards were granted or the First Crusade were held to the same standards for penitence


⁹⁰. Housley, Contesting, 35.

as penitents fulfilling their confessors’ requirements in other ways. Herbert E. J. Cowdrey and Robert Shaffern found Pope Urban II’s grant of spiritual rewards for crusade participation to be similar to previous remissions of penance that reform popes of the eleventh century such as Alexander II and Gregory VII had offered knights who answered their requests for aid. However, Erdmann, Flori and Chevedden have also argued that as early as the ninth century Pope John VIII assured secular military leaders who organized, fought, and killed others in conflicts he supported that both their sins and penance would be forgiven in exchange for their activities so that they could enter heaven. Flori specifies that this was not the “crusade indulgence” that later popes would offer, but served as an assurance to lay Christians that such a war was considered fair and useful to Rome, the Church, and God, and so in no circumstances endangered the souls of those who took part. This dissertation will argue that the important shift to trace between these examples of spiritual rewards is what was actually considered to have made the knights deserving of the rewards they were offered.


92. Erdmann, Origin, 27–8; Flori, La guerre sainte, 51–3; Chevedden, “Canon 2 of the Council of Clermont (1095) and the Crusade Indulgence,” 267

93. Flori, La guerre sainte, 53.
Ninth century military leaders were told that they would be granted spiritual protection because the conflicts in which they participated fit the requirements for a war to be just. But according to Shaffern, eleventh century papal requirements for confession prior to participation, and the presentation of participation as a personal sacrifice, made the spiritual rewards they offered to knights identical to those offered for non-military penitential acts. Crusaders were rewarded not for participation in a just war but for undertaking penance. Janus Møller Jensen supports the idea that participation in the crusade was a penitential act, but he stressed that because of the expense, sacrifices and danger participation in holy wars or crusades were expressions of piety different from undertaking a penitential pilgrimage.

Engaging in warfare could itself be a penitential practice for knights, but how would they be judged as penitents? Shaffern points out that after the 1095 crusade ecclesiastical leaders agreed that spiritual rewards for military participation depended to a greater extent on knights interior disposition, personal contrition, and desire for absolution than their outward behavior. But it will in fact be seen in this dissertation that clerical and lay authors who described knights they supported praised their devotion to God and the Church, and their desire for spiritual rewards and fear of punishment prior to and during the First Crusade. It will also be seen that the emotions authors attributed to knights they supported were chosen to strengthen this image. Many historians now

believe that concern for knights’ religious devotion suggests that understanding what constituted a crusade and how such missions fit into the larger cultural context may depend on understanding those who undertook it and why – or how those who undertook it were portrayed - as much as understanding the goals of those who organized it.

**Knights’ Motives for Crusading**

Many crusade historians have turned to the investigation of knights’ motives for participating in the 1095 expedition to the East. This investigation of authors’ descriptions of knights and crusaders will provide insight into the ideals for these motives. Accounts of knights’ military activities from the late-tenth through early-twelfth century will be shown to reflect changes over time in cleric’s use of emotions as evidence of their motives for engaging in violence. Among modern historians, interest in crusaders’ motives for participation in a dangerous but spiritually rewarding expedition has most directly carried on the interests of Dana Carleton Munro and Carl Erdmann. Jonathan Riley-Smith supports the investigation of crusaders’ motives as enabling “a new, more credible, picture of the crusaders and influences on them.”97 Crusade scholars now widely agree that a wide range of religious and secular motives influenced crusade participants, which must be understood in their broader intellectual, cultural, social, and economic contexts.98

---

97. Riley-Smith, *What were the Crusades?*, xvi–ii.

Historians such as Riley-Smith, Giles Constable, Marcus Graham Bull, Jonathan France, and Susan B. Edgington have turned to the examination of charters for monastic and ecclesiastical donations, families’ traditions of crusade participation, and vernacular chansons de geste that portrayed or referred to crusading in addition to returning to chronicles and letters.\(^9^9\) They have found knights to have been driven to participate by their families’ histories of acting out of religious devotion, such as traditions of involvement in Peace and Truce of God movements, agreements to enter conflicts at the request of local ecclesiastical leaders, and long-term relationships with religious houses.

---

around them. Joining the 1095 expedition to the East or later crusades was another activity that fit this pattern. While this dissertation does not examine crusaders’ motives for initially joining the 1095 expedition, I have found that authors who described knights made it clear that their experiences in the East reflected their prior military and religious dedication, achievements and goals. Descriptions of knights’ emotions can convey details about the effects that authors hoped their motives for joining the expedition or remaining in it - their loyalty to fellow crusaders, other Christians, and devotion to the faith – would have on them in the field.

Descriptions of emotions in crusade chronicles have attracted the attention of a few crusade historians. According to Constable, historians who built from Erdmann’s ideas to examine the crusades as a popular spiritual movement linked its appeal to “the inner spirit and motives of crusaders and their leaders.”100 Their approach highlighted the emotions of organizers, preachers and recruits, but reflected the developmental or hydraulic theories that influenced the early historical study of emotion.101 In the 1980s Riley-Smith introduced this direction of inquiry to ecclesiastical approval of such military activities. Rather than seeing knights personally driven to join crusades by uncontrollable emotions, he argued that senior churchmen encouraged knights’


participation in them as the opportunity to participate in an act of Christian charity that encompassed both love of God and love of one’s neighbors. Recruitment texts and sermons for the crusade, and prior ecclesiastically-authorized wars, presented love as a motive, and accounts of the successful expedition all described love for God and fellow Christians as common emotions among the knights while they fought in the war. The audiences of secular leaders and knights that popes would have addressed for crusade recruitment understood this love for God and one’s neighbor in familiar social and political terms.

Since Riley-Smith’s discussion of love, other historians have looked at individual or closely-related emotions described among crusaders as well as larger trends in affect as a whole. Susanna Throop has investigated concepts of vengeance as they relate to crusading, appearing in texts after the mid-twelfth century as the legal and emotional concept of zelus. Throop argued that by encompassing ideas of anger, love, imitation, emulation, vengeance and self-sacrifice, the concept of zelus provided a way to convey the ideal of intense devotion that ecclesiastical leaders and authors of crusade chronicles


believed should drive participation in the crusade. Stephen Bennet has also examined accounts of emotions among crusaders, focusing on fear on the First Crusade. He found that chroniclers’ descriptions of fear among crusaders reinforced the image of the crusade as a manifestation of divine will that was closely linked to the religious devotion of its participants. Authors’ presentations of fear thus reflect the overlapping elements of Church leaders’ changing attitudes toward war and their desire to influence knights, knights’ likely experiences of fear, and the role of this emotion in knights’ experiences of God’s will and religious devotion. Like the studies of Throop and Bennet, this project will seek to discern the influence of the larger cultural context in which authors lived on their descriptions of emotion. However, while these authors focused on individual emotions, I will argue that the full range of emotions authors attributed to knights was necessary to construct the identity of the crusader.

Sophia Menache has examined descriptions of a wide range of emotions among crusade organizers and knights on crusade in both clerical chronicles and lay chansons, focusing on those caused by violence during a few influential events in these missions 1096-1187. She links the changes over time she saw in the emotions, from a

106. Ibid., “Zeal, Anger and Vengeance,” 201.


108. Ibid., 29, 47.


predominance of love, hate, and sorrow, to increased frustration, confusion, anger and the desire for vengeance, to major successes and failures in expeditions to the East.¹¹¹ Menache argued that this shift in emotion was part of an ongoing political narrative intended to inspire knights to engage in violence in the service of the church. But in this short article she did not relate this narrative to changes in standards for emotional experience and expression or overall attitudes toward violence.

Carrying on the work of Menache and others, I will examine authors’ descriptions of a wide range of emotions among knights on the First Crusade, in the context of contemporaneous thoughts on violence and emotion. But historians also now examine knights’ experiences on crusades and the expeditions themselves within their larger intellectual and cultural historical contexts. It has been argued that spiritual rewards for military service appeared well before 1095; that knights were motivated to participate in the first and later crusades by their families’ histories of military and devotional activities; and that emotions played an active role in knights’ participation in crusades because of their own experiences as well as through efforts of church leaders. To see the First Crusade and its participants in their larger historical context it should thus be asked how authors described knights’ desire for spiritual rewards in other conflicts prior to the 1095 expedition; what they presented as motivating knights to participate in or avoid military conflicts; and if and how authors described knights’ emotions in such conflicts. The comparison of these elements of knights’ participation in the First Crusade and

¹¹¹. Ibid., 3–11, 13–19.
organized military conflicts prior to 1095 will help us to discern if and how the clerics and laypeople who wrote about these crusaders understood them and their expedition to the East to be distinct from other organized military activities and the knights who participated in them. To engage in this area of investigation, however, requires a discussion of the historiography of general medieval military history, outside of the crusades.

General Medieval Military Historiography

While crusade historians began examining the conflicts on which they focused in a cultural and intellectual historical context in the 1930s, in the 1970s and 1980s J. F. Verbruggen and John Contamine were the first historians to successfully encourage others to examine the cultural and intellectual influences on medieval warfare prior to and outside of the crusades. Reflecting the influence of the contemporary interdisciplinary study of cultural influences on human behavior, they presented participants’ emotional and psychological states such as courage, fear, reactions to danger, and motives for violence as essential elements in military conflicts. Since the 1980s historians have continued to build on their work, approaching military history from what Richard Abels calls a “culturalist” perspective. He considers this approach vital to the study of military history, since “cultural considerations and constraints fundamentally


shaped medieval warfare at all levels.”\textsuperscript{114} Such examinations have explored who fought and why, what constituted legitimate and illegitimate conduct in war, what defined victory, and how the physiological and psychological states associated with war were understood and experienced as emotions.\textsuperscript{115} This approach, on which my approach in this dissertation is based, recognizes the culturally dependent biases and authorial intents of those who described and conveyed this information.\textsuperscript{116}

But long before Abel’s culturalist approach, one of the first areas of medieval military history to be examined with a focus on its cultural context was the concept of chivalry as a code or multiple codes of conduct that defined the identity of Christian knights. Historians of the late-nineteenth century had presented such codes as necessary for the enforcement of order in military and civilian contexts.\textsuperscript{117} According to Léon Gautier, militaristic chivalric ideals had been necessary to control Germanic warriors’ “ill-regulated passions.”\textsuperscript{118} The idea that a uniform code of chivalry was needed for the

\textsuperscript{114} Richard Abels, “Cultural Representation and the Practice of War,” \textit{Journal of Medieval Military History} 6 (2008): 3. Abels described culturally dependent areas as including “defining \textit{causus belli}, to strategic and tactical decision-making, to the conduct and experiences of ordinary soldiers.” He used the word “soldier” for all men who engaged in military activities to avoid distinctions between those who fought as a condition and expression of class membership and those who fought as members of an institutional military. See ibid., 3, note 8.

\textsuperscript{115} Ibid., 3.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., 23, 29.


control of violence would remain the dominant through the mid-twentieth century, with Sidney Painter contributing to it by introducing three types of chivalric ideals for the control of violence, including militaristic, religious, and courtly.\textsuperscript{119} He saw these ideals as equally important to all of society, but with authors from each ordo presenting their own version of chivalry being most successfully achieved.\textsuperscript{120} Painter reflected the idea of authors’ subjective perspectives shaping their work, but chivalry was still a code for behavior into which knights were placed to control their excessive violence. There was no question of changes over time in this code, in knights’ violence, or in how their perspectives were portrayed, all of which are concerns that now figure prominently in investigations of the medieval military cultural history.

Since the 1970s, historians have sought to more precisely date the development of chivalric ideals, to discern who developed and imposed them and why they did so, and why knights may have chosen to follow them. It is now widely agreed that from as early as the ninth century lay and clerical authorities used chivalric ideals and rituals, which were in fact religious ideals and rituals, to strengthen their social and political influence.\textsuperscript{121} Some historians have rejected both the idea of identical forms of chivalry

---

\textsuperscript{119} Sydney Painter, \textit{French Chivalry: Chivalric Ideas and Practices in Mediaeval France} (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940), 149.

\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., 150, 152, 160, 166.

and a uniform “knightly” class throughout Europe for whose members it was an ideal.\textsuperscript{122}

But at the same time, others have seen clerics’ constructing and disseminating the ideals of a “religious chivalry” to counter and supersede the attention to prowess, bravery, and loyalty to secular leadership seen in “militaristic chivalry,” which they held responsible for the excessive interpersonal violence around them.\textsuperscript{123} However, according to Kaeuper, the dual systems of militaristic and religious chivalry may have been so contradictory that neither could control lay violence.\textsuperscript{124} Most recently, recognizing the existence of discrete “systems” of chivalry as a modern myth, scholars have sought to understand whatever

\begin{flushright}


\textsuperscript{124} Kaeuper, Chivalry and Violence, 28–30.
\end{flushright}
standards for behavior may have existed from the perspectives of knights themselves. For example, how would knights personally benefit from chivalric codes? Andrew Cowell and Richard Kaeuper found knights, clerics and laymen willing to compromise in their behavior in order to independently achieve the goal of limiting interpersonal violence. Religious devotion was held in common by both groups in medieval Christian society, though they had different opportunities to express devotion.

While crusade historians have long seen faith as a primary motive for knights’ participation in holy wars and crusades, medieval military historians have only discussed the role of religious devotion in a wider range of political and territorial conflicts since the 1980s. In research published from mid-1980s through the early twenty-first century, Michael McCormick has found descriptions of expressions of faith by knights in liturgical rituals, confession, and penitential practices in the majority of accounts of military conflicts. John R. E. Bliese found both lay and clerical authors to have


described speeches by secular and clerical leaders that encouraged knights’ military participation based on their devotion, as well as their ideals for bravery – suggesting the presence of the systems of military and religious chivalry found by other scholars.128

Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach also found compatibility between these two systems, seen in changes over time in ecclesiastical leaders’ and clerical authors’ attitudes toward war; knights’ devotional activities in the field and those performed for them by those who remained at home in western Europe and the Levant; and what such practices may have meant for knights.129

Linking the study of medieval military history and that of the crusades, David S. Bachrach argues that the inception of expeditions that ecclesiastical leaders considered


holy contributed to the development and popularization of the idea of military service as praiseworthy. But it must be remembered that participation in such expeditions, whether to the East or elsewhere, grew from the ideals and religious practices that preceded it.\textsuperscript{130} Clerical leaders drove the growth of rituals in the field and changes in pastoral responses to Christians’ guilt for the sin of homicide. These developments were products of changes in juridical thought that equally benefited the clerics, ecclesiastical institutions, and knights involved.\textsuperscript{131}

This project builds on David S. Bachrach’s work, examining clerical and lay descriptions of knights, especially their emotions and religious devotion. The differences I have found between authors’ descriptions of emotions in accounts of conflicts prior to 1095 and those of the First Crusade suggest that this expedition reflected a shift in attitudes toward knights who were involved in organized military activity. This shift is seen most clearly in the pope’s 1095 presentation of clearly stated guidelines for participants’ motives for undertaking the expedition, and expectations for the experiences they were likely to have while they did so. Because of these guidelines and expectations, clerical and lay authors who wrote of this expedition were able to more consistently present participants in the expedition acting from these motives and having the expected experiences than had been possible for other missions.

\textsuperscript{130} Bachrach, \textit{Religion and the Conduct of War}, 192–3.

\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., 191–2.
Clerical and lay authors’ attributions of emotions to participants in organized military conflicts prior to 1095 and during First Crusade provide insight into contemporaneous attitudes concerning the experience and expression of emotion, but also reflect contemporaneous attitudes toward violence and those who committed it. This will require further examination of penitential and juridical thought concerning violence and those who undertook it, as well as the role of Christians’ personal motives and emotions in their undertaking of penance.

**The Historiography of Juridical and Penitential Thought**

Like the other areas of medieval historical research examined here, the modern study of penitential and juridical thought began in the nineteenth and early-twentieth century. Specialists in Roman law were the first to seek legal systems that superseded national or regional boundaries, and cultural, political, geographic, and economic distinctions, and believed they had found that in medieval canon law. Early twentieth-century scholars of canon law reinforced this paradigm by making generalizations based on distinct examples of patristic and scholastic thought without discussing them in their historical contexts. These scholars were uninterested in penitential thought.

According to Wolfgang P. Müller, legal scholars believed that the early-medieval composition of penitential manuals that offered flexible processes for reconciliation with


the Church after sins had been committed obscured the relationship between church law and penance.¹³⁴ Because they were for pastoral rather than ecclesiastical use, these texts created an “unprecedented formal dichotomy between penitential and canonical literature.”¹³⁵ According to Abigail Firey, penitential manuals were seen as “private” law, without authority or official sanction, unlike the canon law that was believed to be Roman in form, origin, and sanction.¹³⁶ Historians and early legal scholars accentuated this distinction by focusing exclusively on either canonical or penitential source material.¹³⁷ Aside from Villey, who encouraged the examination of the crusades in the context of penitential and juridical thought, until the mid-twentieth century scholars focused exclusively on either juridical or penitential source material.¹³⁸


¹³⁵ Ibid.


¹³⁷ According to Firey, the authors of the first history of canon law that covered material prior to Gratian, Paul Fournier and Gabriel Le Bras, described penitentials as inferior to Roman legal traditions and a threat to Romano-legal discipline. See Paul Fournier and Gabriel Le Bras, Histoire des Collections Canoniques en Occident depuis les Fausses Décrétales jusqu’au Décret de Gratien, 2 Vols. (Paris: Recueil Sirey, 1931), discussed in Firey, A Contrite Heart, 66 n. 8. For work prior to Fournier and Le Bras that focused on penance and confession, see for example Henry Charles Lea, A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church, 3 Vols. (Philadelphia: Lea Brothers & Co., 1896).

¹³⁸ Villey, La croisade, essai sur la formation d'une théorie juridique; Müller, “Medieval Church Law,” 3–4.
In the mid-twentieth century Stephan Kuttner’s call for a “new conception of legal history,” considering laws and legal systems within the context of broader cultural and intellectual developments, dramatically changed the study of ecclesiastical law and penitential thought.¹³⁹ According to Müller, Kuttner argued that canon law developed according to new scholastic methods, in response to the political and economic needs of the twelfth century.¹⁴⁰ Other historians soon expanded his argument, moving the development of canon law to centuries before the twelfth and linking it to changes seen in cultural and intellectual history and events such as the crusades.¹⁴¹ Having found clear evidence of juridical thought changing over time, legal historians have sought to clearly define its chronological development as well as to see the relationship between penitential and juridical thought.

Kuttner introduced the timeline accepted by most modern scholars to describe the changes in patristic and early-medieval legal thought that led to the twelfth-century

¹³⁹. Stephan Kuttner explained that “every document bearing upon the social and economic structure…the political, judicial, and administrative organization, upon customs and practices, and the ideological concerns of a given civilization at any given stage in its history” is “a tool of writing the history of its law ‘as it really was.’” See Stephen Kuttner, “Methodological Problems Concerning the History of Canon Law,” Speculum 30:4 (1955): 541.


development of canon law. Kuttner divided the history of medieval canon law into two phases, the first from roughly 500 through c. 1140 and the appearance of Gratian’s Concordia discordantium canonum, or Decretum, which he argued had introduced systematic juridical thought, and the second coming afterward. According to Brundage the first period, the one on which this dissertation focuses, actually had plentiful juridical ideas that were shaped by penitential thought and the needs of distinct Christian communities. But according to Müller, in recent scholarship historians without legal training have tended to focus on penitential and juridical ideas prior to Gratian’s Decretum, while those with it examine canon law after that text appeared.

Like historians of canon law, historians of penance have also sought to date the development of different types of penitential practice and fit them into larger cultural changes. According to scholars of the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century,


143. See Bellamo, 35–37, 40–54. For the position of Roman law in this timeline, and twelfth century jurists need to develop their own jurisprudence, see Kenneth Pennington, “Roman Law in the Early Twelfth Century,” in Handlung und Wissenschaft: die Epistemologie der praktischen Wissenschaften im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2008), 12.


the development of private penance reflected the increase in religious sophistication and interest in self-reflection that accompanied the Renaissance’s “discovery of the individual.” But throughout the twentieth century, medievalists and renaissance historians dated that “discovery” to earlier periods and concluded that it was not a smooth, linear process. At the same time, those who focused on the appearance of private penance, or even found divisions between private, non-solemn public, solemn public penance, and tariffed, repeatable penance, have also traced them further back and found their development to be non-linear as well.


148. For a shift from public to private penitential practice and a variety of new types of penance appearing from the Early Middle Ages to the eleventh and twelfth century, see Bernhard
Recent studies of penitential practices by Mary Mansfield, Mayke de Jong, Sarah Hamilton, Rob Meens, Karen Wagner, and Abigail Firey, examining penitential practice found in penitential manuals, liturgical sources, narrative sources, episcopal letters and juridical collections have found chronological overlap between the public activities known to have been the norm in Late Antiquity and the private or “secret” practices that appeared from the ninth through the thirteenth centuries. As Wagner argues, it is difficult to draw a line between private and public ritual practices, since the process of undertaking penance always included elements of both. Confession and the imposition of penance were conducted in private to a priest or bishop, but the rituals that preceded the undertaking of penance were public. As Wagner explained, “given the communal nature


of medieval society no penitential satisfaction remained private."150 Both private and public penance served didactic functions, ensuring that laymen understood their faith, as well as showing the community the responsibility that sinners held to heal their souls.151 At the same time, the hearing of confession and oversight of penance could enhance the authority of the ecclesiastical officials involved, especially if the penitent was a secular leader.152

Like historians of penance, historians of canon law have recently turned to re-dating ideas in early-medieval juridical collections, investigating and questioning assumed connections between their ideas as well as the simplicity or complexity of early jurists’ texts. Awareness of changes over time in editions of Gratian’s *Decretum* has been vital to the re-dating of what has been considered fully-developed canon law.153 Many historians now agree that though the mid-twelfth century saw dramatic changes, juridical thought had already been developing into a complex, theoretically grounded system. In

150. Wagner, “*Cum aliquis venerit ad sacerdotem,*” 204–5.


2010 Christophe Rolker introduced a new key point in the development of juridical thought before Gratian, linked to dates of composition of Ivo of Chartres’ *Decretum* and *Panormia* and doubts about his authorship of the latter text.\textsuperscript{154} To make sense of the distinctions between these texts and their authorship, Rolker argued that juridical texts should be seen to reflect ecclesiastical leaders’ and lower-ranking clerics’ demands for authoritative legal collections, an approach that places these texts in the context of cultural, intellectual and political history.\textsuperscript{155}

Most scholars now agree that juridical thought reflected and contributed to changes seen in social, cultural, religious, and intellectual history.\textsuperscript{156} Many find that collections reflected the social and educational backgrounds of those who compiled them, and some have noted the changing juridical roles of those whose behavior they regulated.\textsuperscript{157} Scholars have adopted this approach in their investigations of cultural


\textsuperscript{155} Ibid., 297.


\textsuperscript{157} For authors’ positions in the Church and personal backgrounds influencing their problem solving and what they chose to include in their canonical collections, see Greta Austin, “Jurisprudence in the Service of Pastoral Care: The *Decretum* of Burchard of Worms,” *Speculum* 79 (2004), 929–59; idem, "Vengeance and Law in 11th century Worms: Burchard and the Canon Law of Feuds," in *Medieval Church Law and the Origins of the Western Legal Tradition*, 66–76; Brasington, “What Made Ivo Mad?,” Austin, “Authority and the Canons in Burchard's *Decretum* and Ivo's *Decretum*,” in *Readers, Texts and Compilers in the Earlier Middle Ages: Studies in Medieval Canon Law in Honour of Linda Fowler-Magerl* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2009), 35–58;
influences on authors’ perspectives, taking into account the motives of authors who collected and organized juridical collections, and have sought to discern the relationships between developments in juridical thought and contemporaneous historical events, the concept of just war, and changes over time in Christians’ attitudes toward violence and expectation for holy warriors.158

Modern scholars of juridical and penitential thought have found that over time practical manuals and the collections of canons that referred to them placed growing

---

importance on links between actors’ internal states and external behavior. Penitential acts were thought to influence penitents’ minds and bodies, causing changes in mental states that would encourage Christians’ religious devotion and behavior that was free from sin. As theorized by modern scholars and stated in penitentials, authors of penitentials and juridical texts expected Christians’ behavior and emotions to reflect their religious devotion and freedom from sin or desire for forgiveness. But only a few historians have explored if and how juridical and penitential thought was described as influencing knights who were engaged in organized military expeditions.

Scholars who have examined the relationship between juridical ideals for knights’ behavior and their experiences in the field while they engaged in military conflicts have first sought evidence that clerics presented juridical ideals to them. The presentation of these ideals in military contexts may have depended on the intended audiences of the texts in which they were conveyed, or in the case of accounts of speeches, their listeners. John R. E. Bliese explained that references to juridical ideals were very rare in accounts of clerical and secular leaders’ battlefield orations. Leaders delivered speeches to knights in the field during both crusades and territorial or political conflicts to inspire courage and assure them of victory. But these speeches’ lack of references to juridical ideals


161. Ibid., 207–8.
suggests that clerics did not make them an active part of knights’ and secular leaders’ experiences in the field.\textsuperscript{162} Rather than reminding knights of the just cause of a fight according to the ideals for just war, the motive necessary for participants in a conflict to be free from sin, these speeches encouraged knights’ hatred of their enemies, desire for vengeance, and love of booty.\textsuperscript{163} But while Bliese described the ecclesiastical and secular leaders who delivered speeches and the knights who were their listeners, he did not discuss the authors of these accounts, their texts intended audiences, or the conflicts they described as variables that may have affected references to juridical thought.

However, not all chronicles of military activity show disconnections between juridical thought on violence and knights’ behavior in the field. Looking at only one crusade chronicle, Jonathan Phillips found the clerical author of the second crusade chronicle \textit{De expugnatione Lyxbonensi} describing participants’ experiences on their journey as well as motivational speeches by a bishop, a secular leader, and himself to present juridical ideals as the basis for knights’ actions on the expedition.\textsuperscript{164} This author may have sought to reassure the clerics who read this chronicle, who may have doubted that this siege should be considered part of the Second Crusade, undertaken by knights

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{162} Bliese, “Just War as Concept and Motive in the Central Middle Ages,” 14.
\item \textsuperscript{163} Ibid., 6–9, 12–4.
\end{itemize}
from the correct spiritual motives rather than the desire for wealth.¹⁶⁵ Philips credits this mid-twelfth century chronicle’s frequent use of these ideals to the growth of the study and production of canon law collections in the first half of the twelfth century.¹⁶⁶

While the influence of juridical thought on medieval authors’ accounts of organized military activities increased over time, and authors’ references to their ideas reflected their texts’ intended audiences, scholars have consistently found plentiful evidence that knights participated in confessional and penitential rituals. Acts of penance undertaken for mortal sins that required disarmament, pilgrimage, and changes in dress, diet and participation in family life are thought to have imposed lifelong social, professional and religious disabilities on the knights who undertook them.¹⁶⁷ Some historians have argued that the possible lack of easily repeatable penance until the seventh century may have made it difficult for knights to become and remain free from


But penitential rituals were not only undertaken in times of peace. Clerically-led prayer, as well as the undertaking of confession and penance, were vital elements in knights’ participation in warfare that were believed to secure the support of divine and saintly figures and aid in victory. Historians have found accounts of the crusades to offer the most frequent and detailed examples of penance during wartime, from the First Crusade being organized and undertaken as a penitential pilgrimage, to the rituals of public penance undertaken in the field for military success while it was under way.

However, what is lacking from most of these examinations of juridical thought and penitential practice in medieval military conflicts is the discussion of their possible influences on authors’ descriptions of the mental states and behavior of knights in the field. Riley-Smith, Throop, and Bennett’s examinations of emotion among crusaders all

---


focused on only one emotion or group of related emotions and found descriptions of them in juridical and penitential texts and among knights on crusade to be relatively consistent over time. In contrast, Menache found change over time in the emotions presented to crusaders as motives for violence and in descriptions of emotion among them, but links these changes to events on crusades themselves to a greater extent than to new directions in juridical thought or penitential practice. Scholars’ discussions of emotions among knights in political and territorial conflicts have found authors to have focused on chivalric ideals as motives and guides to behavior to a greater extent than juridical or penitential values. But according to modern scholars’ studies of early and high medieval juridical and penitential systems, both clerical and lay authors who wrote of knights’ activities would have been equally concerned for knights’ states of mind while they participated in such conflicts or holy wars such as crusades. After all, authors of juridical collections and penitential manuals found evidence of penitents’ remorse and desire for forgiveness in their personal emotional states and public displays of emotion.

Authors’ descriptions of emotions among knights who avoided participation in or participated in organized military conflicts, including both political and territorial conflicts as well as crusades, reflected their knowledge of juridical thought and


173. See for example Bliese, “Fighting Spirit and Literary Genre;” idem, “Just War as Concept.”
penitential practices concerning violence and sin. In their desire to defend or praise the actions of the knights on whom they wrote, authors were especially concerned with the judgment of sinners and penitents according to their internal states and motives. To meet this need, they described knights’ emotions to provide evidence of their internal states and motives for violence, to defend their actions as not only free from sin but, in the case of crusaders, warranting spiritual rewards in return for their military activities. And like the other penitential practices in which Christians engaged, knights’ experiences and expressions of emotions in the field could provide instruction to those who read or heard of the chronicles and letters, concerning what emotions should be experienced and how they should be expressed.

Conclusion

The areas of historiography that have influenced this project share common elements. Since the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries historical and cultural studies have shifted away from evolutionary and developmental ideals that suggested both cultural and human maturation, and universals in emotional development, social and economic identities, and legal systems. Instead, modern researchers recognize that historical authors’ contributions to all of these areas are the product of historical cultural and intellectual changes, influenced by historical events.

The chapters that follow will examine both clerical and clerically-influenced lay authors’ accounts of knights’ emotions while they avoided or participated in organized military activities, with attention to the social and cultural identities of the authors. Authors’ accounts reflect their familiarity with preceding and contemporaneous attitudes
towards emotions and violence. I have sought evidence of this familiarity in the texts themselves by comparing the words and concepts found in hagiographic, narrative and epistolary accounts of knights with those found in patristic, penitential, and juridical texts that deal with emotions and violence. Authors of patristic, penitential, and juridical texts will therefore be investigated as well, to discern what influenced the changes they brought to thought on emotion and attitudes toward violence from Late Antiquity through the early twelfth century. Overall, this approach will be seen to provide insight into the development of western Christian thought on emotion; attitudes toward violence and those who avoided or committed it; the use of emotion as evidence for the judgment of human action; and ultimately, the use of mental states such as emotion for the definition of social identity. Did the experiences and expressions of emotion that an author attributed to a knight define him as a “holy warrior,” who fought in an ecclesiastically approved or organized conflict? It depended on the author, his reasons for writing, and the audience for his text.
CHAPTER THREE
AFFECTIVE DEFENSE

The genesis of the concept of crusade, warfare free from the sin of homicide and for which participants would be rewarded, can be traced to patristic and medieval penitential and juridical authors’ changing attitudes towards violence and those who committed it from the fourth through the mid-eleventh centuries.¹ Patristic authors initially followed Roman standards for just conflicts, in which organized violence was considered just or unjust according to the authority by which, and the goals for which, it was undertaken. But early medieval clerics and jurists increasingly condemned organized violence, and the warriors who participated. As penitential practices developed and informed juridical theory, the emotions of penitents became key to confessors’ discernment of sinners’ guilt.² This chapter will discuss the growth of patristic


theologians’ and medieval jurists’ concerns for Christians’ behavior and their turn to the
discernment of motives. It will be seen that patristic and juridical authors, influenced by
contemporaneous theories of emotions, believed that they could – or should be able to –
discern the motives for Christians’ actions in their internal experiences and external
expressions of emotion. Emotions thus became key to the judgment of Christians’
freedom from or guilt for sin.

**Warfare in the Christian Roman Empire**

While the Old Testament used military imagery widely, the New Testament most
often presented Christians as members of a persecuted minority fighting for survival.
Their persecution would conclude in the end times of Revelation, through wars in which
Christ would lead the faithful to heavenly victory.\(^3\) But this was not an endorsement of
Christians’ participation in combat. Christian authors initially supported pacifism in all
personal and military conflicts, in large part in opposition to Roman territorial and
political aggression.\(^4\) According to late-second/early-third century Christian author
Tertullian, for example, war was not permitted to Christians because the Jewish
kingdoms had fallen under Roman control.\(^5\) His contemporary, Origen of Alexandria,

---

3. Old Testament warriors received divine support when they faced danger, to achieve
victory against enemies of God's people. Louis J. Swift, *The Early Church Fathers on War and
Military Service* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1983), 19, 20–3. Also see Frederick Russell, *Just
War in the Middle Ages* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 8–9; Roland H. Bainton,
*Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace, A Historical Survey And Critical Reevaluation*

4. For a counter argument that only a minority of Christian laymen and clerics were
actively pacifists, though all pacifists were drawn to Christianity, see Jenny Teichman, *The
Philosophy of War and Peace* (Charlottesville: Imprint Academic, 2006), 23.

directly argued that the Jews of the Old Testament had been correct in fighting to defend their territory but Christians’ possession of the gospels rather than land made literal violence unnecessary. Christians were to engage in spiritual warfare instead. Roman men killed for refusing to serve in the army or for disobeying orders to fight out of faith were considered martyrs, equal to any others who died for their beliefs.

The conversion of Roman Emperor Constantine (274-337) to Christianity changed the relationship between members of the new faith and their secular leaders. That Constantine was a Roman emperor who could be loyal to divine leadership positively affected Christians’ perceptions of both military service itself and wars undertaken by the Empire. Romans had long engaged in organized violence according to

---


9. For Constantine as a channel for divine power according to both Christianity and the Imperial Cult, see Marta Sordi, “The Christians’ Attitude to the ‘Political Theology’ of the Empire and the Imperial Cult,” in *The Christians and the Roman Empire*, trans. Annabel Bedini (London: Croom Helm, 1983), 171–3. Eusebius of Caesarea’s description of Constantine's reign
a strict philosophical and religious ethical system. After Constantine, patristic ecclesiastical leaders adapted this system to their faith and accepted the need for the military defense of their increasingly Christian Empire. In contrast to earlier patristic admonitions for Christians to avoid violence, canon three of the 314 Council of Arles urged Christian troops in the Roman army not to lay down their arms in times of peace but to ensure that they would be prepared for defense when conflicts arose. According to Thomas Sizgorich, patristic leaders came to see Christians’ violent personal self-defense and territorial defense as necessary steps in the history of their faith through its birth, formative traumas, and eventual triumph over enemies.

provided Christians with a model for a secular leader who ruled by the will of God and whose actions should be seen as spiritually driven by the earthly application of divine justice. See In Praise of Constantine: A Historical Study and New Translation of Eusebius’ Tricennial Orations, ed. and trans. Harold A. Drake (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976). Some patristic authors who wrote during Constantine’s rule did not quickly turn away from pacifism. According to Arnobius of Sicca (d. 330) it was always better to shed one's own blood than that of another. See Arnobius, Adversus nationes, libri VII 1.6, discussed in Swift, Early Church Fathers, 60.


11. Eastern patristic authors accepted Christians’ participation in organized violence undertaken according to Roman military traditions more rapidly than those in the West. See Swift, Early Church Fathers, 95; Laiou, “The Just War,” 33.


Patristic Authors on Emotions and Violence

Bishop Ambrose of Milan (339-397) was the earliest patristic author to present warfare and soldiers’ activities as potentially compatible with the faith.14 His moral treatise De officiis presented the roles that clerics and the Church should play in the Roman world, reflecting his involvement in territorial, political and clerical crises in the 370s-80s, as well as the development of a balance of authority between ecclesiastical and imperial powers.15 Though clerics were the primary audience for this text, Ambrose also intended for them to use it in their pastoral care of laymen.16 References to emotion and attitudes toward violence in De officiis reflected Ambrose’s combination of Roman philosophical and civic traditions with ideas of divine justice and religious heroism found in the Old Testament.17

Ambrose described his text’s focus as the duty of the soul rather than the body, but recommended training and preparedness for the achievement of success in


15. For Ambrose’s pre-ecclesiastical secular political career influencing his attitude toward warfare, see Bainton, Christian Attitudes, 89–90. For his involvement in clerical dogmatic struggles and imperial political contests, see Ivor J. Davidson, “Introduction,” in Ambrose, De officiis, ed. and trans. Davidson, Vol. 1 (2001; repr. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 64–73. For Ambrose’s concern for the role of clerics and the Church in Roman society, see ibid., 5–6, 13–5, 59. For an explanation of why the correct title of Ambrose’s work is De officiis rather than De officiis ministrorum, see ibid., 1–2.


philosophical and spiritual struggles as much as for those undertaken physically.\textsuperscript{18} Consistent emotional self-control was absolutely necessary. “Each of us must make sure to avoid everything that moves the soul. The inner self must learn to look after itself and take proper care of its instincts; just as it needs to beware of all that is hostile to it, it also needs to keep a close eye on itself.”\textsuperscript{19} Anger [{\em iracundia}], for example, needed to “be avoided, or kept within proper limits. An indignant [{\em indignatio}] temper is a lure towards evil that draws people into sin: it so disturbs the spirit that it leaves no room for reason.”\textsuperscript{20} Uncontrolled emotions such as “anger [{\em ira}] or distress [{\em dolor}] or fear of death [{\em formido mortis}],” could “paralyze the mind and strike it with some unforeseen blow.”\textsuperscript{21} Such states were evident to onlookers, since the face of one whose soul was “shaken [{\em exagitatur}]” and reason “lost [{\em amittitur}]” by such emotions was seen by observers to be “inflamed [{\em inflammatur}] with anger [{\em iracundia}] or desire [{\em libidine}],” to grow “pale [{\em pallescit}] with fear [{\em timore}], or is unable to contain the sense of longing at the sight of sensual pleasure and gets quite carried away with delight [{\em laetitia}].”\textsuperscript{22} To be

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{18} See Ambrose, \textit{De officiis} 1.175, ed. and trans. Davidson, 218; and 1.32, 134. The translations included here are those of Davidson, with slight adjustments to word choices according to context.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid. 1.228, 248: “Caveat etiam motus animi sui: ipse enim sibi et observandus et circumspiciendus est et, ut adversum se cacendus, ita etiam de se tuendus.”

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid. 1.90, 170: “Caveatur iracundia aut, si praecaveri non potest, cohibeatur; mala enim illex peccata indignatio est, quae ita animum perturbat ut ratione in relinquat locum.” Also see 1.93 and 1.96, 172.

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid. 1.97, 174: “Exanimat enim mentem plerumque ira aut dolor aut formido mortis et improvise percellit inctu.”

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid. 1.229, 250. “Unde plerumque non solum animus exagitatur, amittitur ratio, sed etiam inflammatur vultus vel iracundia vel libidine: pallescit timore, voluptate se non capit et nimia gestit laetitia.”
\end{flushright}
overwhelmed by emotions was a state easily recognizable to others, but dangerous to those who were.

Ambrose condemned intense emotions that threatened the personal control that enabled reason to guide human action. But unlike stoic philosophers, he approved of the experience and expression of emotions that he considered beneficial. Anger, sorrow, and fear of death could hurt those who experienced them, but both being loved and having love for others were beneficial to all involved. Christians’ love for one another commended them to God, but achieving this valuable love was a process. The desire for justice “begins with piety: first towards God, second towards our country, third towards our parents, and lastly all others.” From piety “we love life itself as a gift of God.” Ultimately, from these beginnings, “true love was born, “which puts others before itself, not seeking its own interests.” Such love led naturally to justice, a reflection of the desire for both peaceful fellowships with others and to strengthen communities. Love for his people enabled a leader to


25. Ibid. 2.134, 343.

26. Ibid. 1.127, 190: “Iustitiae autem pietas est: prima in Deum, secunda in patriam, tertia in parentes, item in omnes.”

27. Ibid., 1.127, 190: “vitam amamus tamquam Dei munus.”

28. Ibid., “caritas…quae alios sibi praefert, non quaerens quae sua sunt.”

29. Ibid. 1.130, 192.
suffer through any dissatisfaction with him they expressed, since with such love he could save them from both divine and mortal enemies’ wrath. Threats to a community’s peace, especially when it resulted in the deaths of those who were loved, made a good leader “mourn [doluit], and weep [flevit], and in seeking to avenge [ultus] his death he proved the commitment he felt in his conscience. He was more concerned that the death of an innocent man should be left unavenged than that his own death be duly mourned.”

A loving leader would defend his people in such situations, but the faithful of even the lowest status should act with confidence that God would aid their efforts to defend and avenge their own people.

Bishop Ambrose’s introduction of classical philosophical concepts of defense in natural law reveal that he accepted violence in both self-defense and divinely aided vengeance. Men would, and should, seek to protect themselves from harm. As Ambrose explained, according to both divine law in the Old Testament and the natural law that it inspired, Christians have an obligation to protect and aid one another. This “help” could be brought through “devotion or our duty or our money or our good works, or by

30. Ibid. 2.30–2, 284–6.
31. Ibid. 2.33, 286–8: “Doluit et flevit, prosecutes exsequias honestavit, mortem ultus conscientiae fidem praestitit…magis sollicitus ne innocentis mortem inultam relinquuerent quam quo suam mortem doleret.”
32. For the example of Judith facing Holiphernes, see ibid., 3.82–5, 404–6.
33. Ibid. 1.128, 192. According to Knuuttila, stoics described all animals as having a natural tendency to reject what was harmful and accept what was appropriate. As Cicero explained, humans thus should desire to reject what was harmful and seek the good. See Knuuttila, Emotions, 56.
whatever other means are available to us.” But while Ambrose seemed to counter the argument that Christians should embody Christ in his bestowal of grace and refusal to inflict injuries, he still stressed the hazards of using violence even in self-defense or the defense of loved ones. A Christian was to fulfill his obligations to other men without being “kept back from doing his duty by a fear [terrore] of danger,” but to always remember, “Everyone who will have struck with the sword will be killed by the sword.” To defend others without concern for one’s own safety was the ideal, evidence of courage.

Ambrose described courage as the most valuable virtue. “Courage [fortitudo], the virtue which leads people to protect their country from barbarians in times of war, or which in peacetime makes them defend the weak, is full of justice.” Someone who acts out of just courage “masters himself and contains his anger [ira],” does not “yield to cowardice [ignavium]” or “desert the faith out of fear [metu] of danger,” is not “tempted

35. Ibid. 1.135, 194: “adiumentum ferre alteri vel studio vel officio vel pecunia vel operibuus vel quolibet modo ut inter nos.”

36. Ibid. 1.132, 192.

37. See for example ibid. 1.135, 194: “ab officio vel periculi terrore revocetur;” 3.27, 370: “omnis enim qui gladio percusserit, gladio ferietur.” Quotes such as these can be traced to Jesus’ advice to his disciples concerning how to respond to the officials who will come to apprehend him. Mt. 26:52, in Biblia Sacra Vulgata, 4th ed, ed. Robert Weber and Roger Gryson (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 1569; “tunc ait illi Iesus converte gladium tuum in locum suum omnes enim qui acceperint gladium gladio peribunt;” in The Holy Bible: Douay-Rheims, Challoner revision (Rockford: Tan Books, 2000), 37: “Then Jesus said to him, ‘Put up again thy sword into its place: for all that take the sword shall perish with the sword.’”

38. Moses and Judith both exemplified this when facing their people’s powerful enemies. See Ambrose, De officiis, 1.135, 194-6; 3.88, 406.

39. Ibid. 1.129, 192: “Fortitudo, quae vel in bello tuetur a barbaris patriam vel domi defendit infirmos…plena iustitiae sit.”
by desires [cupiditatibus] or broken by fear [metu],” and in war prefers “death to slavery and disgrace [turpitudini].”40 But without the motive of justice the fearlessness that courage could inspire or the power it could bring “leads only to wickedness.”41 Ambrose used Old Testament warrior kings to provide examples of fearless courage that was just and free from anger.42 King David “had the wisdom of courage [prudentiam fortitudinis] in battle,” so that he never engaged in war unless first provoked, and never undertook a conflict without first consulting the lord.43

But the courage of a warrior king was not the only type of courage that Ambrose praised. As he wrote, this could be compared to the same virtue among biblical figures such as Daniel, who “through faith and with greatness of spirit…out of weakness grew courageous [forte]” through his own spirit without the aid of others.44 These and other comments suggest that Ambrose recognized internal and external courage, material and spiritual, among soldiers and those who were not. Spiritual courage was “true courage, the kind possessed by the athlete of Christ,” Ambrose wrote, held only by “the man


41. Ibid., 1.176, 220: “sine iustitia iniquitatis materia est.”

42. Ibid. 1.175, 218.

43. Ibid. 1.177, 220: “Itaque prudentiam fortitudinis comitem habuit in proelio.”

44. Ibid. 1.178, 220: “Sed non haec sola praecella fortitudo est, sed etiam illorum gloriosam fortitudinem accipimus qui per fidem magnitudine animi…evaluerunt de infirmitate fortes.”
strengthened in Christ Jesus.” 45 For such a man there was “affliction on all sides: ‘conflicts without, fears [timores] within.’ And yet, though constantly in dangers [periculis]...he remained unbroken in spirit and kept on in the fight, and so he emerged in the end stronger than his own weakness.”46 But at no point did Ambrose’s De Officiis state that a soldier could not also be an athlete of Christ, engaging in physical as well as spiritual battle with courage comparable to that of the heroes of the Old Testament. 47

Christians’ actions were judged according to the motives behind their behavior. According to Bishop Ambrose these were recognizable to others. “The intention of your emotion [adfectus] stamps its own mark on your works,” he wrote, “and this is how your motive is assessed.”48 God could easily discern the motives of Christians. As Ambrose explained, “Look what a judge of character you have – he consults you; to see how he should react to your work, he first asks questions of your mind.”49 Ambrose’s portrayal

45. Ibid. 1.183, 224: “Haec vera fortitude est quam habet Christi athlete...Quod praeceptum non dat nisi qui est confortatus in Christo Jesus.”

46. Ibid. 1.183, 224: “Adflicto undique: ‘foris pugnae, intus timores.’ Et quamvis in periculis...animo tamen non frangebatur sed proeliabatur adeo ut potentior suis fieret infirmitatibus.”

47. For the argument that Ambrose in fact was solely focused on clerics and foresaw no application of these ideas to soldiers or any lay Christians, as would come in the Middle Ages, see Katherine Allen Smith, War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture (Rochester: Boydell and Brewer, 2011), 12.

48. Ambrose, De Officiis 1.147, 202: “Adfectus tuus nomen imponit operi tuo: quomodo a te proficiscitur sic aestimatur.” Davidson translates adfectus as heart, the perceived basis for emotion, and a te proficiscitur as “motive.” A more literal translation of the latter phrase would be “starts from you” or “proceeds from you” but I believe Davidson is correct in his correlation of the ideas of “motive” and “reasons for starting.”

49. Ibid.: “Vides quam morale iudicem habeas: te consulit; quomodo opus suscipiat tuum mentem tuum prius interrogat.”
of God as a judge with concern for the motives or intentions behind actions in part reflected his experience as a judge in the legal affairs of his community. 50 Roman law had valued the ideas of motive or intention as far back as the Twelve Tables, which had distinguished between accidental and intentional crimes. 51 Prior to Ambrose, as recently as the second and third century, Roman jurists had defined acts according to their motives or intents, evidence of which was required for proof that they were criminal and, if so, of subjects’ guilt. 52

God had an advantage above mortal judges, in his ability to look within believers’ minds. This could be a challenge to humans, but Ambrose found an instructional example in what he considered an authoritative manual for both ideal behavior and judgment, the Old Testament. In the case of a kidnapped baby, King Solomon sought to discern who was the mother and who was the kidnapper. Having threatened the infant with death, he was able to identify the mother by her “shouting, overwhelmed by feeling [adfectus],” that she was willing to give her child to the other so that he would live. 53 The king recognized the mother’s identity by using “wisdom [sapientia] to discern the secrets of the woman’s conscience, to bring out the truth from the hidden depths of her being…the


very depths of her soul and mind.” Such legal practices proved and reinforced Ambrose’s idea that emotions could be felt correctly or incorrectly, and that emotions could be evidence of mental states, including correct or incorrect motives for violence.

Augustine of Hippo (354-430), a student of Ambrose, made some of the most influential contributions to Christian attitudes concerning violence and emotion. Augustine was a Numidian, born in Thagaste to a *decuriale* family of mixed Christian and Roman Polytheist faiths. His father Patricius funded as much of his education as the family could afford, so that young Augustine would be on his way to associations with local nobility and positions in provincial government that would dramatically improve the family’s social standing. Augustine was introduced to Christianity by his mother and educated in Roman political theory and rhetoric in preparation for his career, but from his own study of Greek and Roman philosophy became interested in the

54. Ibid. 2.47, 294: “Sapientiae igitur fuit latentes distinguere conscientias, ex occultis eruere veritatem…animae et mentis viscera.”


independent search for wisdom. But when neither philosophy nor the bible offered him what he believed were straightforward paths to wisdom he turned to Manichaeism, attracted by what he saw as its rational cosmology. But eventually he found the Manichean faith too simplistic and returned to philosophy, especially Late Platonism or Neoplatonism. After moving to Milan Augustine converted to Catholic Christianity, having been influenced by Simplicianus, Archbishop of Milan (397-400) as well as slowly impressed by the content and delivery of sermons by Ambrose.

Throughout his adult life Augustine oversaw the education and spiritual well-being of others, as a tutor of classical rhetoric to students of the highest Roman classes in Thagaste, Carthage and Rome, as the municipal chair of rhetoric in Milan, and later as the bishop of Hippo to the priests and ethnically, socially, and economically diverse congregations of his bishopric. According to Garry Wills, as a tutor and a preacher he

57. For Augustine’s mother’s Christianity and interest in his conversion, see Brown, Augustine: Biography, 17–18, 26; O’Donnell, Augustine, 2, 6. For Augustine’s education in Roman political theory and early interest in philosophy, see Brown, Augustine: Biography, 23–24, 29–30; Carol Harrison, Augustine: Christian Truth and Fractured Humanity (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 4–7; Wills, Saint Augustine, 26; Rist, Augustine: Ancient, 8–9.


59. Brown, Augustine: Biography, 45, 47–9; O’Donnell, Augustine, 4, 6, 46; Clark, Augustine, 6–8; Harrison, Augustine: Christian Truth, 10–11, 13–15; Wills, Saint Augustine, 34, 38, 44


was concerned with gaining students’ and audiences’ interest and maintaining their attention. His success with all groups was based on his ability to gain the psychological participation of diverse audiences by using material examples with which they were familiar to illustrate abstractions.\textsuperscript{62} But during his teaching and and prior to his preaching, both while he was a Manichean and while turning from Manichaeism to Late Platonism, he began to write. After his conversion, ordination as a priest and appointment as Bishop of Hippo, Augustine became one of the most prolific authors of sermons, letters, and religious treatises of the patristic period.\textsuperscript{63}

Augustine wrote \textit{De civitate dei}, a lengthy Christian apologetic, from roughly 412 to 426.\textsuperscript{64} He began this text in response to accusations by remaining polytheist Romans that the sack of Rome by Alaric in 410 was the result of Christians’ disloyalty to Roman history and traditions.\textsuperscript{65} But besides wanting to respond to concern over the barbarian attack, Augustine had also been asked to respond to the long-lasting North African

\begin{itemize}
  \item[63.] See Clark, \textit{Augustine}, 3, 8–11, 94; Harrison, \textit{Augustine: Christian Truth}, 15–6; Wills, \textit{Saint Augustine}, 42, 50, 64, 94, 99. For the count of Augustine’s works, based on his own incomplete list, as 93 books, 300 letters and 400 sermons, see Wills, \textit{Saint Augustine}, xii.
  \item[65.] Dyson, “Introduction,” xi–ii; Brown, \textit{Augustine}, 290, 293; Clark, \textit{Augustine}, 94, 96; Wills, \textit{Augustine}, 99, 114; O’Donnell, \textit{Augustine}, 11. While he admits that the sack of Rome in 410 provided the context in which Augustine began this text, Peter Brown argues that the greatest influence of that event on the \textit{civitate Dei} was that the influx of refugees into North Africa provided it with a ready audience. A text that could have been purely exegetical instead directly confronted paganism. See Brown, \textit{Augustine}, 311.
\end{itemize}
Donatist heresy by the Catholic imperial commissioner Flavius Marcellinus. Augustine perceived the Donatists and other heretical groups as threatening the Church, the Christian community, and thus the Christian Empire by suggesting that their adherents could set themselves apart as those on whom God particularly smiled by their own virtue, without moral guidance. According to Peter Brown and Garry Wills, in his efforts to oppose these heresies, Augustine approved of the humane, careful suppression of internal heresies as an expression of Christian Empire’s interests superseding of those of the former, polytheist Roman Empire. Public horror at the 410 sack of Rome was interpreted productively for this purpose, seen as God’s corrective response to heretics’ errors that clearly demonstrated the discipline believers could face. This explanation of violence as undertaken out of justice for the good of those who had been or could be injured, and thus the reasons it could undertaken without condemnation, built from Ambrose’s work as well as ethics found in classical Greek and Roman philosophy. Augustine’s attention to religious belief and motives for violence makes his texts, especially the *civitate Dei*, valuable for the study of emotions as well.


68. Brown, *Augustine*, 290–1; Wills, Augustine, 102, 114.


71. For Augustine’s value for the study of the history of emotion, see Knuutila, *Emotions*, 152.
De civitate Dei provided an exhaustive analysis of affect. Augustine referred to Lucius Apuleius Platonicus’ (125–180) definition of humans among other entities, including animals, gods and demons. Humans were “animal in genus, with souls capable of feeling emotion,” and “rational in mind.” Emotions distinguished humans, and demons, from animals because of the disruptions they could cause. Feeling affect [passio], experiencing a disruption [perturbatio], and being overcome by movements of the mind contrary to reason [motus animi contra rationum], were not possible without the possession of reason. But this possession of reason and ability to experience affect were beneficial. According to Augustine, “the rational nature is better, even when it is miserable [misera], than that from which reason or sensation is absent, and which can therefore experience no misery [miseria].” After all, reason that permitted the experience any type of affect also permitted even “temporary happiness [felicitas].”

Augustine believed that religious devotion shaped men’s experience and use of emotion, and could save them from disruption by guiding them to or strengthening their  


73. Augustine, De civitate Dei 8.17.6: “Perturbatio est enim quae Graece pathos dicitur; unde illa voluit vocare animo passiva, quia verbum de verbo passio dicetur motus animi contra rationum,” Dyson, 337.


75 Augustine, De civitate Dei 8.16.25: “melior est enim temporalis felicitas quam misera aeternitas,” Dyson, 336.
reason. “God subjects the mind to ruling itself and puts the passions into keeping of the
mind, so that moderated and restrained they are converted into an instrument of
justice.”76 According to John Rist the use of the mind for justice centered on altruism –
moral decision-making and offers of aid to others.77 Augustine complained that Stoic
philosophy was too critical of affect, especially in its condemnation of compassion.78 He
offered a contrasting approach, explaining “in our discipline the question is not whether a
pious soul is angry [irascatur], but why he is angry; not whether he is sad [tristis], but
from where the sadness comes; not whether he is afraid [timeat], but what he fears.”79 He
called for the judgment of actions and emotions [motus], according to the will or purpose
[voluntas], of the person experiencing them. “If it is perverse,” Augustine wrote, “his
motus will be perverse; but if it is guided well they will be not only blameless but
praiseworthy.”80

76. Augustine, De civitate Dei 9.5.3: “Deo quippe illa ipsam mentem subicit regendam et
iuuandam mentique passiones ita moderandas atque frenandas ut in usum iustitiae convertantur,”
Dyson, 365.


78. Augustine, De civitate Dei 9.5.11, CCSL 47. For further discussion of Augustine’s
ideas in contrast to Stoicism, and Augustine’s interpretation of Aulus Gellius’ story of
compassion felt during a storm at sea, see Knuutila, Emotions, 153–6, 160–2.

79. Augustine, De civitate Dei 9.5.5: “in disciplina nostra non tam quaeritur utrum pius
animus irascatur, sed quare irascatur, nec utrum sit tristis, sed unde sit tristis; nec utrum timeat,
sed quid timeat,” Dyson, 365

80. Augustine, De civitate Dei 14.6.1, CCSL 48: “Interest autem qualis sit voluntas
hominis; quia si perversa est, perversos habebit hos motus; si autem recta est, non solum
inculpables, verum etiam laudabiles erunt,” Dyson, 590. For a discussion of Augustine’s senses
of emotion and volition, see Bonnie Kent, “Augustine’s Ethics,” in Cambridge Companion to
Augustine, 221.
Christians living “in accordance with holy scriptures and their sound doctrine… feel fear [metuunt] and desire [cupiunt], sorrow [dolent] and joy [gaudent], and because their love [amor] is right all these feelings of theirs are right.”81 Bonnie Kent suggests that this attention to emotions was part of a moral psychology, used to demonstrate a person’s decision to sin or move closer to God.82 The correct use of “anger [irasci]” was its direction toward sinners to correct them, “sadness [contristari]” should be offered as sympathy to lessen the burden of those who suffer, and “fear [timere]” experienced and acted on for those in danger so they might be saved.83 A Christian should be “a lover [amator]” of good and “hate [oderit] evil,” hating the sins while loving those who committed them.84 Christians were right to fear for themselves, however, since they “fear [metuunt] eternal punishment and desire eternal life,” and “fear to sin.”85 Living according to, and studying, divine rules brought humans greater understanding and experience of God. Augustine wrote “he who studies wisdom will be blessed [beatus] when he begins to enjoy [frui] God.”86 Blessedness brought happiness, according to


86. Augustine, De civitate Dei 8.8.37, CCSL 47: “beatum studiosum sapientiae…cum frui deo coeperit,” Dyson, 324.
Middle Platonists’ ideas that the perfect end for human beings was likeness to God. Happiness was then found by seeing eternal truths through the purified eyes of the soul.87

Achieving a blessed state brought greater freedom, but to do so required Christians to be more than passively morally right. As Augustine wrote, “no one except the blessed [beatus] can live as he wants, and no one is blessed except the just.”88 Righteousness through striving for justice was the only way to achieve a state of blessedness. But “even the righteous man himself will not live as he chooses except after he will have reached the place where he is altogether unable to die, to be deceived, and to be injured and is certain that he will always be so.”89 Death was the only way to secure unending blessedness, and joy in closeness to God.90 Before achieving the ultimate joy through death, however, Christians’ desire for joy and closeness to God while on earth was closely linked to their desire for peace.91

This desire for peace unavoidably linked all humans to war. Even among the most violent humans, Augustine argued, peace was the goal of all conflicts. All perpetually sought spiritual perfection and the peace and joy that followed, despite the challenges

87. See Knuuttila, Emotions, 88.
89. Augustine, De civitate Dei 14.25.2: “etiam ipse iustus non vivet ut vult nisi eo pervenerit ubi mori falli offendi omnino non posit eique sit certum ita semper futurum,” Dyson, 627-828.
91. Augustine, De civitate Dei 19.12.1, CCSL 48, Dyson, 634.
they faced as mortals.\textsuperscript{92} Efforts to achieve peace were expected to result in emotions. A wise man who does not want war “will grieve [\textit{dolebit}]” over being compelled to wage it by the “deplored [\textit{dolenda}]” iniquities of his enemies.\textsuperscript{93} Both the victorious and the vanquished suffered from the need to engage in warfare by divine order. Wise men should suffer over having to wage any war at all, “evil so great, so horrible and so cruel.”\textsuperscript{94} In the waging of such a war “every victory…is a humiliation inflicted on the conquered by divine judgment, either to correct their sins or to punish them.”\textsuperscript{95} A man who did not himself endure such things and thought of them without anguish was actually more miserable, “believing himself blessed [\textit{beatus}] only because he has lost all human feeling.”\textsuperscript{96} But Augustine saw the killing of an enemy in these circumstances as an exception to God’s command not to kill other men.\textsuperscript{97} Whoever fulfilled a divine command to kill was “like the sword that aids its user.”\textsuperscript{98} Becoming God’s own weapon

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{92} Augustine, \textit{De civitate Dei} 19.10.17, Dyson, 932. Augustine, \textit{De civitate Dei} 19.12.7-9, Dyson, 634.
\item \textsuperscript{93} Augustine, \textit{De civitate Dei} 19.7.30-34: “dolebit…dolenda,” Dyson, 929.
\item \textsuperscript{94} Augustine, \textit{De civitate Dei} 19.7.37: “mala tam magna, tam horrenda, tam saeva,” Dyson, 929.
\item \textsuperscript{95} Augustine, \textit{De civitate Dei} 19.15.16: “omnis victoria, cum etiam malis provenit, divino judicio victos humiliat, vel emendans peccata, vel puniens,” Dyson, 943.
\item \textsuperscript{96} Augustine, \textit{De civitate Dei} 19.7.37: “se putat beatum, quia et humanum perdidit sensum,” Dyson, 929.
\item \textsuperscript{97} Augustine, \textit{De civitate Dei} 1.21.1, CCSL 47, Dyson, 33.
\item \textsuperscript{98} Augustine, \textit{De civitate Dei} 1.21.2: “sicut adminiculum gladius utenti,” Dyson, 33.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
was a hardship, the endurance of which was proof of strength and of the greatness of his soul, since it meant a man intentionally risked his own death.99

Ambrose and Augustine both gave humans active roles in the experience and expression of emotion and violence. Rather than Christians being subject to them, emotions grew from their *voluntas*. As a result, emotions were evidence of correct or incorrect states of mind and motives for action. Mental and spiritual preparation, including obedient devotion to God and the study of the Scripture to shape the will, could help Christians control harmful emotions and teach them how to best use those they correctly experienced. Like emotion, violence could also be the product of correct or incorrect will. It could be used beneficially, and in some cases was required. For both authors, experiences and expressions of emotion during participation in acts of violence were expressions of mental states and motives, evidence of humans’ righteousness, desire for justice and their efforts to move closer to God.

Ambrose and Augustine provided carefully developed ideals for emotion and violence, but they were not the only ecclesiastical officials to show concern for Christians’ behavior. Since pastoral discipline and the discernment of the level of sin Christians committed were episcopal responsibilities, bishops had long been concerned with the way violence was undertaken and the forgiveness of sins that ensued.100 Clement, bishop of Alexandria (c. 150–215), may have been the first to allow an

99. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 1.22.1-.18, Dyson, 34.

additional cleansing of sin for Christians after their baptism. Tertullian (c. 160–c. 225) described the type of penance being conducted in Carthage and Rome, in his De paenitentia. In the process of *exomologesis* he described, sinners dressed in sackcloth and covered in ashes prostrated themselves before a bishop after mass, knelt in front of the congregation, wept to garner his mercy, and begged to be granted whatever penance to perform that the bishop judged to be fitting. The sinners’ public displays of emotion were necessary for the process of penance, to demonstrate that they had confronted their sins and that they sought submission to divine judgment, punishment or mercy. Bishops gathered together to discuss issues but they were individually responsible for overseeing pastoral care, including penance as its most powerful tool. While the public confessional ritual has been thought by historians to stress exterior ritual to a greater


extent than interior remorse, penitents’ public displays of remorse were vital to the bishop’s judgment, just as they were thought to be to that of God.\footnote{Meens, “Historiography,” 74; Graf, “Konfession,” 269.}

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage (d. 258), discussed this repeated penance in a few of his letters, but in his letter to ecclesiastical officials in Rome stressed that it was admissible only for minor sins, rather than serious errors like apostasy or homicide.\footnote{Cyprian of Carthage, “Epistula 9: Presbyteris et Diaconibus Romae;” CCSL 3B, ed. G.F. Diercks (Turnhout: Brepols, 1994-1996).} However, almost a century later, Basil, bishop of Caesarea (329/30-379), had recommended that lengthy and exhaustive penance be permitted for the most serious sins. He excommunicated those guilty of homicide for twenty years, during four of which they were to publicly weep, confess their sins, and beseech the faithful to pray on their behalf outside the doors of the church.\footnote{Basil of Caesarea, “Epistula 217: To Amphilochius, on the Canons,” Canon 56, in \textit{Basil: Letters 186-248}, Vol. III, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930), 247–9; James Q. Whitman, \textit{The Origins of Reasonable Doubt: Theological Roots of the Criminal Trial} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 34.}

Bishops who sought to more effectively deal with the potential sins of Christian soldiers applied ideas that had been presented by Ambrose and Augustine to real world cases. According to Jean Flori, Augustine’s contemporary Maximus, bishop of Turin (d. c. 408-23) wrote that it was a soldier’s personal responsibility to undertake violence for correct reasons.\footnote{Flori, \textit{La guerre sainte}, 44. For Maximus’ biography, see K. S. Frank, “Maximus, 3. M., Bf. v. Turin,” in \textit{Lexikon des Mittelalters}, Vol. 6 (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1977-1999), col. 427. Maximus may have been born in the province of Raetia, and became bishop after moving to Turin. See Boniface Ramsey, ed. and trans., \textit{The Sermons of St. Maximus of Turin} (New York:}
counter to their faith provided that they fought solely for defense of the Christian empire. The problem Maximus found lay in men claiming that they could not to be blamed for their sins when they fulfilled their duties, since their own wills were overcome by their positions as soldiers.110

Bishop Maximus stressed that soldiers were required to fulfill their military duties according to Christian ethics for the undertaking of war. “To serve in the military is not a sin,” he wrote, “but it is a sin [peccatum] to soldier [militare] for the sake of plunder [praedam].”111 He thus condemned the use of spoils to pay soldiers as encouraging excessive violence and sin, calling for troops to see their responsibilities as honorable Christians to be as binding as their responsibilities as Roman soldiers.112 Secular Christians might believe that they had complete personal freedom, since a monastic or clerical profession did not restrict their behavior, but as he wrote, “norms for living are


111. Maximus, “Sermo 26,” 8: “Non enim militare delictum est, sed propter praedam militare peccatum.” For the English translation on which mine is based, see “Sermo 26: ‘On What is Written: Give the Things That are God’s to God, and On Soldiers,’” in Sermons of St. Maximus, ed. and trans. Ramsey, 63. Maximus’ idea may have been based on reference is to Lk 3:14, in Biblia Sacra Vulgata, 4th ed, ed. Robert Weber and Roger Gryson (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 1611: “interrogabant autem eum et milites dicentes quid faciemus et nos et ait illis neminem concutiatis neque calumniam faciatis et contenti estote stipendiis vestris;” The Holy Bible: Douay-Rheims, Challoner revision (Rockford: Tan Books, 2000), 69: “And the soldiers also asked him, saying: And what shall we do? And he said to them: Do violence to no man; neither calumniate any man; and be content with your pay.”

prescribed for all offices.” “Every sex, age and dignity is challenged to live well. Military service should be the first in honor among all Christians.”¹¹³ But only through active devotion to the faith could soldiers and Christians of all rank succeed in their efforts.¹¹⁴ The fifth century Roman Empire needed to be defended, and Christian soldiers were expected to do so honorably with a full sense of responsibility to the faith, acting only with correct motives.¹¹⁵

**Emotions in Early-Medieval Judgments of Sin and Violence**

Christian religious leaders in the Western Roman Empire’s successor kingdoms brought the faith and patristic thought from Late Antiquity into the Early Middle Ages.¹¹⁶ For example, while some historians have raised doubts concerning the influence of Augustine’s works through the Early Middle Ages, others have found them to have been actively copied throughout Europe from the fifth and sixth centuries on.¹¹⁷ Early

---


¹¹⁵. Maximus was also concerned with clerics’ motives in “Sermo 26.” He condemned Arian heretics as well as members of the Catholic clergy whom he accused of acting more like businessmen than clerics. See ibid., 23.85–.89.


¹¹⁷. For doubts in Augustine’s influence, based in the rarity of the appearance of the term *bellum iustum* from the fifth through early-eleventh centuries, see John Gilchrist, “The Papacy and War Against Saracens,” *IHR* 10 (1988): 176–8. David A. Lenihan has argued that Augustine’s theological ideas were ignored for centuries, but then came to be reinterpreted by theologians and attributed to him to bolster their own arguments. See Lenihan, “The Influence of Augustine’s Just War,” *Augustinian Studies* 27:1 (1996) 55-94; idem, “The Just War Theory in
medieval interest in *De civitate dei* has been linked to its conveying patristic biblical exegesis and contributing to the creation of the monastic lifestyle, but with seven of its almost 400 editions dated prior to the ninth century and usually transmitted through monastic *scriptoria* in its full form, it also preserved and disseminated Augustine’s ideas concerning violence and emotions.\(^\text{118}\) But without a united Christian Empire, led by a Christian emperor, early medieval ecclesiastical officials became uncertain about how to judge both Christian soldiers’ actions and the conflicts in which they fought. According to Augustine’s standards for acceptable violence, only those who embodied divine will on the battlefield killed without guilt for the sin of *homicidio*. But if one were guilty the soul would have to be cleansed of sin.

Penitential ideas and methods for judging guilt for sins, especially homicide, developed in tandem in the early middle ages.\(^\text{119}\) Until relatively recently, historians argued that all early medieval forms of confession and penance continued to be publicly

---


119. Joseph Goering argues that penitential thought was not officially unified until the twelfth century, with Gratian’s *Decretum* and Peter Lombard’s *Sentences*. Masters used disputes to illustrate a common, if complicated, view of penance and give students the tools they needed to engage the entire tradition they were inheriting. See Joseph Goering, “The Scholastic Turn (1100-1500): Penitential Theology and Law in the Schools,” in *New History of Penance*, 219–21.
performed sacramental acts that imposed lifelong social, professional and religious disabilities on those who undertook them. While historians now find that this type of penance was not universally practiced, according to Kevin Uhalde this practice was portrayed as most effective by reforming bishops after the third century. That bishops sought agreement on the need for the complete fulfillment of penitential requirements for the most serious sins is seen in episcopal rulings at the Council of Tours (461), the Council of Vannes (465), the Council of Épône (517), and the Council of Orléans (538), which all presented penance as necessary for those found guilty of homicide to avoid excommunication. But this personal performance of penance served a public, didactic function for the community. Anyone who returned to the same sinful behavior after their penance would be excommunicated so that, according to the Council of Tours,


“others might be frightened [terreantur] by his example.”

To disregard required penance was evidence that the sinner was “heedless of obligations” [inmemor].

Sermons by Caesarius, Bishop of Arles (502-42) introduced some new ideas to early medieval penance, describing a variety of good works that could be undertaken throughout a Christian’s life with salvific effects. Almsgiving, fasting and prayer could heal the wounds of sin and hold back divine judgment. Caesarius believed that if a sinner “enacted fruitful repentance in his whole heart [toto corde] with all his strength [totis viribus],” “forgave [indulgeat] all his enemies with his whole heart,” and “wanted [volverit] to complete these tasks faithfully with a humble and contrite heart [humili et contrito corde]” the Lord would forgive him. The bishop believed this approach to repentance for any sin to be more effective than seeking it only once near the end of life, which he described as counter to what had been clearly requested in the Gospels. Waiting until death for repentance left sinners seeking forgiveness from God without offering their own forgiveness to others, or having undertaken penance “with great


125. See for example “Concilium Epaonense,” 24: “Canon 23. …inmemor.”


127. Ibid., “Sermon 60,” 2.1: “toto corde et totis viribus fructuosam paenitentiam agat… omnibus inimicis suis toto corde indulgeat…si haec fideliter humili et contrito corde implere volverit.”

128. Ibid., 3.10.
compunction and humility [*grandi compunctione et humilitate*].” For Caesarius, the efficacy of penitential acts depended on sinners’ emotional investments in their behavior, seen in their personal or public demonstrations of devotions to the faith.

Pope Gregory I (r. 590-604) offered clear statements that repeatable penitential acts brought forgiveness for sins, and presented sinners’ states of mind as instrumental in bishops’ judgment. John Moorhead described Gregory’s encouragement of self-knowledge contributing to “Christianized stoicism,” but also argued that the pope’s attention to Christians’ mental states and their discernment at the same time reflects Augustine’s positive portrayal of emotions as potentially beneficial to Christians. Like Bishop Ambrose and Bishop Augustine before him, his attitudes were likely shaped by his involvement with the larger secular and ecclesiastical world. Before his retirement, entrance into a monastery and eventual elevation to the papacy, Gregory held offices in which he was responsible for civic, economic and military affairs, as well as diplomatic relations between the papacy and Roman imperial government. This pope’s career and worldview reflects the Western Roman Christian Empire’s efforts to keep its political, philosophical, and religious traditions alive, as the cultural influence of its northern and

129. Ibid., 3:1: “cum grandi compunctione et humilitate paenitentiam agat.”


131. Gregory had held positions of Prefect of Rome and papal apocrisiarius to Constantinople, as well as being responsible for supplying and organizing troops in times of conflict in Italy and Rome as the city’s bishop, see Moorhead, *Gregory*, 1-10; Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca; Cornell University Press, 2006), 79; Robert A. Markus, *Gregory the Great and His World* (Cambridge: University Press, 1997), 4, 11.
western neighbors increased in the early middle ages. His political activity and written works reflect these perspectives as well.

According to Moorhead, Pope Gregory’s numerous surviving texts, including letters, exegetical works and homilies, present a remarkable coherence despite their varied content. Rosenwein described these texts, because of their number and consistency in the audiences they addressed, as providing clear insight into the emotional community in which he lived. Because teaching and preaching were at the center of Pope Gregory’s diverse texts they can also provide a view into his and his audience’s attitudes toward violence and the judgment of those who may have sinned by committing it.

Pope Gregory’s Liber Regulae pastoralis was written circa 591, immediately after he was elected. This text’s advice to pastors and clerical leaders reflected his spiritual experiences as a monk, but also his knowledge of human behavior in a wide range of contexts. The Regula effectively applied the ideals of a monastic system onto the larger world of secular clerical and purely secular politics. Gregory sent excerpts of

---


137. Ibid., 8.
the text to eastern patriarchs and western missionary monks, and for centuries after its composition western ecclesiastical leaders gave it to newly appointed bishops.\textsuperscript{138} His second major general work, \textit{Dialogorum libri iv}, was written early in his papacy, in 593.\textsuperscript{139} This four book fictional dialogue between the pope and a deacon, Peter, covered a wide range of ideas but consistently reminded Christians of the divine forces that surrounded them.\textsuperscript{140} According to Moorhead, this text seems to have been written for a general elite audience, with Gregory in the position of spiritual father guiding an inexperienced student.\textsuperscript{141} Like the \textit{Regula}, the \textit{Dialogi} was widely disseminated and read, and contained concepts that also appeared in more focused works such as his \textit{Moralia in Job}, \textit{Homiliae in Hiezechihelem}, \textit{Homiliae xl in Evangelia}, and \textit{Expositio in Canticum Canticorum}.\textsuperscript{142}

Pope Gregory I’s approach to Christian education in the faith and judgment of sin provides insight into bishops’ experiences preaching to congregations, hearing their confessions, and deciding on suitable penances for the sinners among them. Though in other texts the pope expressed concern that emotions could seize control of Christians’ mind, distract them from their faith, and lead them into vice, his \textit{Regula} stressed that pastors should carefully craft sermons to appeal to large audiences subject to “diverse

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid., 10; Moorhead, \textit{Gregory}, 13.


\textsuperscript{140} Ibid., i-vii; Moorhead, \textit{Gregory}, 15.

\textsuperscript{141} Moorhead, \textit{Gregory}, 15.

\textsuperscript{142} Ibid., 15-16.
passions” that would carry messages appropriate to every listener. 143 Gregory admitted this was a challenge, encouraging the preacher to direct his sermon to individual parishioners’ distinct needs. 144 Pastors could not easily discern these parishioners’ emotional states since they were influenced by both circumstances and individual temperaments, but pastors still tried to compose sermons to personally appeal to all of them. 145 As Gregory explained, “let the joyful [laeti] learn by harsh threats what they should fear [timeant]; let the sad [tristes] hear joys of the rewards which they can anticipate.” 146

Pastors were to use emotions to actively encourage parishioners’ correct behavior. Gregory told them to carefully praise even the slightest good works, though not to the extent that these were seen as sufficient to replace the most praiseworthy actions. 147 But such praise would make these actions more appealing, making exhortations to do them more successful. 148 Besides praising and encouraging good works, it was also pastors’
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duty to seek out hidden faults. Censure should be undertaken carefully, however, since even though fear of punishment could keep a Christian from committing evils, good should be loved for its own sake. Gregory thus encouraged pastors to inspire the personal desire to be free from sin among their parishioners, which could be seen in their expressions of emotion.

The pope’s *Dialogi* and *Regula* both linked emotions to Christians’ efforts to engage in correct behavior and their need to seek forgiveness for their errors. The human soul in this world was a ship moving upstream, constantly getting pressed back by the forces that assailed it. For Christians to make any spiritual headway they needed to take action whenever possible. Awareness of guilt was the first step. According to Gregory, “each type of fault is lamented [planguntur] by penitents.” “There are mainly two sorts of compunction, because the soul thirsting for God first feels it out of fear [timore], afterwards out of love [amore].” “First it weakens [afficit] itself in tears [lacrimis] because, while it recoils from its wickedness, it very much fears [pertimescit] eternal punishment for those committed.” But this movement from one unpleasant
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153. Ibid., 3.34.6: “Principaliter uero conpunctionis genera duo sunt, quia deum sitiens anima prius timore conpungitur, post amore,” Zimmerman, 173.
154. Ibid., 3.34.8: “Priors enim sese in lacrimis afficit, quia, dum malorum suorum recolit, pro his perpeti supplicia aeterna pertimescit,” Zimmerman, 173.
emotional state to the next was a beneficial process, since “when fear [formido] will have been banished by long anxiety [anxietudine] and sorrow [moeroris], a certain security of the hope of pardon is born and the soul/mind is inflamed by the love [amore] of celestial joys [caelestium gaudiorum].” Christians were assured of forgiveness, but it would be aided by their being overcome by weeping. Gregory cited biblical evidence for weeping as expressions of contrition and sorrow, as well as sorrow over others’ ill fate or sins. The shedding of tears bathed those who sorrowed in the “waters of their affliction” and cleansed their souls. The experience of sorrow for past sin, which according to most other references would be proven in its expression, acted as reparations to God. But for a sinner to not cry or lament for their sin suggested that they lacked a contrite heart and had no desire to make reparations.

Pope Gregory I stressed that besides Christians’ experiencing compunction and contrition, as seen through their tears, it was also necessary for those who sought divine

155. Ibid., 3.34.10: “At vero cum longa moeroris anxietudine fuerit formido consumpta, quaedam iam de praesumptione veniae securitas nascitur et in amore caelestium gaudiorum animus inflammatur,” Zimmerman, 173.

156. Ibid., 3.34.3: “divisiones aquarum deduxit oculus meus,” Zimmerman, 173. See Jer. 31.15–6, in Biblia Sacra Vulgata, 1210: “Vox in excelsa audita est lamentationis fletus et luctus Rachel plorantis filios suos et nolentis consolari super eis quia non sunt. Haec dicit Dominus quiescat vox tua a ploratu et oculi tui a lacrimis quia est merces operi tuo ait Dominus et revertentur de terra inimici;” The Holy Bible, 849–50: “A voice was heard on high of lamentation, of mourning, and weeping, of Rachel weeping for her children and refusing to be comforted for them, because they are not. Thus said the Lord: Let thy voice cease from weeping, and thy eyes tears: for there is a reward for thy work, said the Lord: and they shall return out of the land of the enemy.”
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forgiveness to commit no more sins and offer demonstrations of faith through good works – acts of penance. According to Gregory’s *Regula*, Christians’ attempt to gain forgiveness from past sins by ceasing to commit new ones, without lamenting past errors and cleansing oneself through tears, was insufficient.\(^\text{160}\) Confession of sins provided an opportunity for Christians to publically lament the sins “by which evil they had been sated, which weighed down the inmost parts of their mind, by confession they cast away, [but] which they resume after confession when they repeat [such evil].”\(^\text{161}\)

Beyond ceasing to sin and lamenting past errors, it was necessary for Christians to undertake good works to gain forgiveness throughout their lives. In his *Regula* Pope Gregory told pastors how to encourage devotional activities, but in the *Dialogi* he explained how they could be used to seek forgiveness for sin. Gifts to God were personal sacrifices, which would only be accepted when the Christian who made them was willing to adopt the humble role of victim.\(^\text{162}\) The sinner was required to first remove the serious sin of discord or disagreement from his heart.\(^\text{163}\) But after this step, there was no reason to put off penance until death. Whenever someone faces guilt for sin, the pope wrote, he should undertake penance to gain divine forgiveness. As the pope wrote, “let him do that good for himself while he lives that every one hopes will be done by others after his
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162. Idem, *Dialogi* 4.61.2; idem, *Regula* 3.30.45.

death.”

Any kind of good work could be salvific, as long as it was completed. Overall, sinners “are to be admonished that if they really wish to be free from evils, they should have a great horror [perhorrescant] of eternal punishments, but grow into the grace of love [amoris gratiam] by cherishing charity.”

Penitential practices were changing at the time of Pope Gregory’s pontificate, as Anglo-Irish missionary monks brought new manuals for penance to Western Europe from the sixth or seventh centuries on. These manuals, based on monastic practices and inspired by conflict settlement practices in contemporary Celtic and Germanic societies, introduced a tariff system for penances. Rather than penitents relying on the personal
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judgment of bishops, confessors instead ordered sinners to undertake penitential acts according to the severity of their sins. It is important to note that the time that a penitent was required to devote to his efforts to gain forgiveness was getting shortened. Rather than the three years that Basil of Caesarea had prescribed, a number of texts reduced the penance required for killing in warfare to forty days. Based on the instructions for the rituals of penance found in early medieval penitential manuals, as well as liturgical texts, Karen Wagner and others have shown that penitential rituals still relied on both private and public elements, especially with the introduction of private or “secret” confessions. This was a monastic practice, in which a monk confessed his inner secrets to a senior in the order, so that a superior could know their shortcomings and achievements on their way to perfection.

When adapted to the laity, penance would include private confession to a confessor priest or bishop, participation in public or private prayer, almsgiving or pilgrimage that symbolized the penitents’ desire for forgiveness, and absolution of the

---


penitent’s sins. Because these activities were rooted in the disciplinary practices found in monastic life as well as the communal elements of public penance, and influenced by authors such as Augustine, stress would still be placed on the didactic value of the visible influence of rituals on penitents and those around him, as well as of their gestures that conveyed obedience, interior contrition and sacrifice.

While historians have found repeatable penance and private penance in early medieval Irish and Anglo-Saxon penitential manuals, they can also be seen in contemporaneous episcopal and conciliar rulings. According to Constance van de Weil, the Council of Toledo (589) and the Synod of Châlon-sur-Saône (644–56) officially approved repeatable private confession to alleviate sin. But the Council of Clichy (626–7) and the Council of Rheims (627–30) recognized the complexity of judgments of sin when it specified that penance was required from a man who had “voluntarily committed homicide, not violently resisting but killing by force.” Repeatable penance, with severity that depended on the sin, made participation in organized military activities much safer for the souls of Christian warriors.

**A New Christian Empire**


174. Besides Augustine, Wagner also notes the influence of Origen of Alexandria and John Cassian (circa 360–435). See ibid., 207–8, 211.


Ecclesiastical approval of Christians’ engagement in warfare continued smoothly from Late Antiquity into the early middle ages with the conversion of tribes on the periphery of the Western Empire. Historians debate how much power early medieval monarchs actually wielded, but find secular leaders of the Merovingian dynasty expanding their territories as early as the fifth century, and by the seventh and eighth century were constructing images of authority by combining centers of power, moving between political centers, and strengthening hierarchical networks within families and courts.\textsuperscript{177} By the eighth century Merovingian kings had extended Frankish power across most of what had been the Roman province of Gaul, except for territories held by the Lombards in Northern Italy and Visigoths in Spain, through both military efforts and political alliances.\textsuperscript{178} The ecclesiastical officials supported their actions, as since the conversion of King Clovis in the late fifth century Franks had brought Western, Orthodox Christianity with them into new territories.\textsuperscript{179} Carolingian rulers later benefited from maintaining this association with the Church.

Accounts by Carolingian historians, as well as surviving Merovingian documents, described Merovingian leaders’ development of a complex court bureaucracy, from
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which the Carolingian dynasty grew. The ceremonial, judicial, political and military position of the *maior palatii* became a site of competition between aristocratic factions who sought dominance over one another and over the Merovingian rulers for whom they worked. Merovingian kings and their *maiores* consistently engaged in the practice of holding annual assemblies at which laws were proposed and approved, military objectives considered and warriors gathered, to strengthen their authority. These practices, and the authority they granted, would all shape Carolingian cultural, political, and religious practices.

While the Merovingians had produced relatively stable Christian kingdoms, the rule of the Frankish king Charles (742–814), emperor (800–14), known as Magnus after his death, came to represent the birth of a new Christian empire through the work of ninth, tenth, and eleventh century authors who wrote of his accomplishments. Charles achieved this level of support through his promotion of influential and literate supporters


to positions of power in ecclesiastical institutions and in his court. However, rather than starting an empire entirely on his own, as his biographers suggested, historians now recognize that he expanded his political influence and territorial holdings by continuing the political and military efforts of his ancestors Pippin I (580–640), Pippin II (635–714), Charles Martel (688–741), and father Pippin III (714–68) – the “Pippinids” – that had enabled them to seize power from the Merovingians. Even the recognition of Charles’ leadership and granting of imperial titles to him by the pope, which would provide essential ideological potential for subsequent imperial ambitions among medieval European rulers, was prefaced by the papal anointing of his father, Pippin III.

Building from the work of his ancestors, Charles was able to enact economic, political, religious and educational reforms with the help of his educated clerical courtiers. These had a lasting influence on Western Europe, later called the “Carolingian Renaissance.”


with cultural centers in Spain, the Lombard kingdom of Northern Italy, and Spain, as well as increasing visits and immigration by educated Visigoth, Italian, Anglo-Saxon and Irish secular clerics and monastic missionaries. All of these geographic areas, and groups, are known to have been undertaking the same reforms that Charles encouraged in his territory. Scholars have recommended that Carolingian developments during and after Charles’ reign be considered a renewal or a correctio rather than a renaissance.

One aspect of Charles’ interest in religious renewal can be seen in his support of both religious rituals undertaken at home in the service of war, and by warriors in the field. David S. Bachrach has traced the development of public military rites from Late Antiquity through the thirteenth century, and found that the Late Antique addition of Christian practices to and eventual replacement of polytheist Roman field rituals accompanied the first glimpses of repeatable penance. In the Early Middle Ages, as violence seemed to become more frequent and the efficacy of repeatable penance became less uncertain, such rituals increased.

But a contrast can still be seen between cultures that consistently followed Roman models for penance, and those that eagerly adopted – or created – Irish/Anglo-Saxon penance. Visigoths in Iberia engaged in rituals before battle similar to those seen in Late


190. For biblical and liturgical reform, see for example ibid., 22–3.

191. For Late Antique Christians’ prayers in the field, see for example Bachrach, Religion, 8–16, 18–9.
Antique penitential practice. The military leader lay prostrate on the ground and prayed, before receiving personal blessings, and blessings on his weapons and battle standards, from clerics who accompanied the army.\textsuperscript{192} In contrast, the English monk Bede (672–735) described a different approach to penance in the midst of one conflict, in which a priest came to the field to pray to God for the army, a cross was set up so that warriors could pray before it, and the king who led them called on men to kneel and pray with him, assuring them that God would protect them because they fought in a just cause to defend their people.\textsuperscript{193} These Northumbrian warriors were able to achieve victory after this because they were “fortified [\textit{munito}] by faith.”\textsuperscript{194}

Merovingian forces were also described as dramatically influenced by religious devotion and rituals in the field. Gregory, Bishop of Tours (538–94) wrote of the conversion of Clovis I (481–511), the first warrior to unite multiple tribes under one Merovingian king.\textsuperscript{195} When he saw his own army risking a loss to the Alemanni, he “raised his eyes to heaven, and with remorse [\textit{compunctus}] in his heart he burst into tears [\textit{lacrimis}]” and begged Jesus for aid, promising he would convert if his army was
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Having sought aid from Jesus with the demeanor that has been seen among penitents, Clovis did convert after his victory.

The Carolingian dynasty was also described by contemporaneous historians as being started by a king with intense devotion to the faith, but who was eager to work with the papacy. The first biography of Charles was the *Vita Karoli*, written circa 817–23 by his educated courtier Einhard (775–840). Einhard sought to defend the king after his death in 814, in response to criticism of his reign by his surviving son Louis the Pious’ (814–40). Thomas F. X. Noble has stressed that this text, one of the few *vita* written by a lay author, portrayed Charles and others Einhard supported according to the ideals for emperors of the past, but retained the king’s differences from them as a Christian Frank as positive elements. Writing in defense of the dynasty, Einhard began his *vita* with Pippin III. According to Einhard, the first Carolingian king, Pippin III was acting as if he were ruler of the Franks already when the Merovingian king for whom he worked, Childeric, was deposed. He was eventually officially made king on the authority of the

---


pontiff, however, and held the throne alone for fifteen years. Einhard was focused on providing a lineage that was granted papal recognition, but Pippin had a more complex relationship with the papacy.

According to the *Annales Regni Francorum*, in 749, before Pope Stephen II’s grant of a title to Pippin, Bishop Burchard of Würzburg had sent an enquiry to Pope Zacharias to ask if the man who was wielding royal power should be called king, since there was already someone called king who was not fulfilling his office. The pope agreed that Pippin should be made king. With this support, Pippin was then elected as king according to Frankish customs. In 753 Pope Stephen came to Francia, seeing support for the papacy against Lombard aggression. The pope then anointed Pippin as king, with holy oil, and with him his sons Charlie and Carlomann. Roger Collins has explained that this was intended to reinforce a ceremony already used among the Franks, but that it was in fact the first time that the act of anointing with holy oil had been used
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for one of their kings as well as the first time a pope had travelled to Frankish territory. According to the *Annales*, after his anointing, in 755 Pippin attacked the Lombards, and “by Gods help and the intercession of the blessed apostle Peter, Pippin with his Franks stood out as the victor.” The Merovingian dynasty had a founder whose religious devotion was remembered, and the Carolingians a king who was remembered for his religious devotion, his desire to be a just leader, and his loyalty to the papacy. Both of these men’s devotion aided their military and political success.

Charles, continuing in his father’s footsteps, was presented by his earliest biographer Einhard as demonstrating just Christian kingship in his style of rule and his personal qualities, seen in his emotions, as well as his devotion to the faith and loyalty to the papacy. Writing of the king’s war with the Saxons, Einhard explained that it was necessary because of their ferocity, hostility to Christianity, and frequent transgression of divine and human laws. “He was never willing to tolerate people who perpetrated such things, so avenged their treachery and exacted punishment either by leading an army against them or by sending in one of his counts.”

---


209. Ibid., “Nam numquam eos huiusce modi aliquid perpetrantes inpune ferre passus est, quin aut ipse per se ducto aut per comites suos misso exercitu perfidia ulcisceretur et dignam ab eis poenam exigeret;” trans. Noble, 28.
Charles was willing to undertake difficult wars to avenge injustice and harm those who opposed the faith. According to Einhard, “of all those who ruled over people in his time, he was the wisest and the most outstanding in the greatness of his soul.”  This may have been why, after the death of his father, he was able to bear his brother’s “jealousy [invidiam] with such patience [patientia] that it seemed remarkable to everyone that he could not be provoked to anger [iracundiam] by him.” But he did express emotion over personal loss. When he was told of the death of Pope Hadrian, “whom he held in a special bond of friendship, he wept [flevit] as if he had lost a brother or a deeply cherished [karrissimum] son.”

Charles used violence productively for the well being of Christians, and expressed emotions correctly according to patristic standards. But he also effectively handled basic requirements of just rule. As a king, and later emperor, Charles frequently met with delegations of other leaders, who after he became emperor feared that he would take their lands. But he made treaties with them instead, so there would be no cause for offense. He took on and completed many projects, including bridges to assist trade and travel and navies for defense, but Einhard most praised his completion of the Basilica of the Holy
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Mother, at Aachen. This project was a product of the religious devotion that Einhard attributed to him, that led him to attend church two or three times a day when it was possible, and make generous donations of vessels, vestments, and other valuables. His generosity also extended to caring for the poor, as seen in his plentiful offering of alms to aid them throughout the East as well as in his own country. However, he was most generous to the Church of the Apostle Peter at Rome, to which he donated huge amounts of gold, silver and gems.

Charles’ history of donation to and defense of the Church and the papacy in Rome led to his gaining the imperial title. Conflicts between the papacy and residents of Rome could lead to violence, and on one occasion Charles visited Rome to aid Pope Leo II (750–816) after he had been attacked and injured by supporters of the previous pope. He intended to remain in the city briefly, but spent the whole winter there. “He accepted the titles of emperor and augustus” on Christmas, but according to Einhard “at first he was so opposed to this that he affirmed that he would not even have entered the church that day, although it was a most important feast, if he had known what the pope was going to do.” But once Charles had received this title near the end of his life, which his humility
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218. Ibid. 28, 29–30: “Quo tempore Imperatoris et Augusti nomen accepit. Quod primo in tantum aversatus est ut adfirmaret se eo die quamvis praecipue festivitas esset, ecclesiam non intraturum, si pontificis consilium praescire potuisset;” trans. Noble, 44.
found hard to bear, he ensured it would be carried on by his own son Louis, already King of Aquitaine.219

With just Christian imperial leadership again secured under the rule of Charles and his sons, religious practices related to organized military practices again expanded. Charles increased efforts to secure the participation of lay and clerical Christians at home in fasts, alms, prayers, and masses designed to help secure divine aid for knights in the field.220 With the close links between Christian imperial and ecclesiastical rule, Charles was able to require prayers from secular clerics at all hierarchical levels as well as monks.221 Besides rituals to aid armies by Christians who remained at home, Charles and the emperors who followed him called for specific devotional activities in the field. Priests and bishops were required to accompany warriors to conflicts, to guard saints’ relics that accompanied armies, conducted masses, and hear confessions.222 While in wars against non-Christian enemies rites conducted after military successes could be celebratory, those conducted after conflicts among Christians were penitential.223

219. As Einhard explained, he called an assembly of aristocrats to which he invited his son, where he crowned him and ordered that all in attendance recognize the young king as emperor and augustus. See ibid. 30, 31.
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Christians who were victorious against others of their faith engaged in penitential fasts and mourning for victims on both sides of conflicts.\textsuperscript{224}

Clerics who accompanied knights into the field heard private confessions, providing the opportunity for divine assistance to be personally sought. Pastoral care in the field could aid victory, as well as assuring knights that they would be free from sin through the careful assignment of appropriate penances.\textsuperscript{225} A key element of battlefield confessional practice, however, was the need for personal reflection. For a knight to confess his own sins before battle meant that he would have to admit any potentially incorrect motives he might have, to the confessor and himself.\textsuperscript{226} Clerical sermons and secular leaders’ battlefield orations stressed that they would receive divine support, and their sins could be forgiven, if they fought to aid God and out of a sense of responsibility to fellow Christians, thus fighting in accordance with divine law.\textsuperscript{227}

Even as Carolingian emperors were presented as personally embodying ideals of justice, some ecclesiastical officials continued to question the motives behind lower-ranking knights’ violence.\textsuperscript{228} In his letter to Otgar, archbishop of Mainz (r. 826–47), Hrabanus Maurus (780-856) argued that any killing in any battle was homicide and
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required penance. Even with more frequent confession and penitential practices, no one could be certain of knights’ motives for violence, given humans' tendencies towards selfishness and greed. The fragmentation of the Carolingian Empire contributed to these doubts, which shaped ecclesiastical authorities’ attitudes toward violence from the late ninth century on.

The Need to Control Violence By Knights

The imperial title continued in German territories, but without a leader granted papal approval in Western Francia ecclesiastical officials found it increasingly difficult to believe or argue that the conflicts embodied justice and that knights who participated were beyond reproach. The purpose of most conflicts changed, as well. Rather than expanding the Christian Empire and spreading the faith to non-Christian neighbors, European Christians now faced new invasions from outsiders as well as internal conflicts. Once again lacking a united Christian Empire led by a Christian emperor, ecclesiastical officials throughout the Church hierarchy held varying opinions of the military actions knights were permitted to undertake. Many suggested ideal motives, and
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related mental states for arms bearers, to assist priests in judging knights’ participation in or avoidance of such acts. This system would simplify, and could thus aid, clerics’ judgment of lay Christians’ actions.

Ninth century invasions of territory in Western Christendom resulted in conflicts that clerics easily argued were just, in which they saw it necessary for knights to engage in violence in defense of fellow Christians and the Church. After attacks in Bari (841) and Taranto (846), and with awareness of threats to Rome, Pope Leo IV (r. 847-855) wrote to Emperor Lothar I (r. 817-855) concerning possible conflicts against the “Saracens, who they say have come secretly and furtively into Roman harbors.”

He asked arms bearers to come by sea and land on the coast at Rome to guard papal property, but offered no promise of a spiritual or material reward. But Rome was attacked, with Peter’s basilica looted. Fearing future attacks, after strengthening Rome’s fortifications and forming alliances with neighboring cities on the coast, the pope sought aid from the Franks in a new letter that introduced many of the elements to be repeated in later papal calls to military action.

---


Pope Leo IV’s second letter to the Franks specifically called on them to, “after putting aside all fear [timore] and terror [terrore], strive to act bravely [viriliter] against enemies of the holy faith and adversaries of all regions.” They could live up to the achievements of their predecessors who had defended the faith before them. Knights “who will have died faithfully in this military struggle will not have those heavenly places denied to them,” provided they died “for truth of the faith, salvation of the soul, and defense of the homelands of Christians.” Pope Leo IV did not describe specific behaviors that would be seen as evidence of knights’ desire to act out of justice, but did stress their need to cast aside the fear of death in battle. Heaven was mentioned only for those who died in battle, and no spiritual rewards were offered to those who survived. The pope may have hoped there would be no danger of knights fighting for material rewards if they survived, since the spiritual rewards if they did not – even if they killed enemies during the conflict – were so great. Historians argue that similar requests for aid and promises of spiritual rewards were sent out by popes who followed, even as forces of the Franks and sent by the Byzantines slowly regained territory in the southern Mediterranean.
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Abbot Regino of Prüm, writing circa 906, took a more conservative position concerning organized violence. Regino may have come from a noble family near Speyer, but spent his life as a Benedictine monk and then abbot at Prüm, and later, abbot of St. Martin’s, at Trier. He wrote his *Libri duo de synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis* when already at Trier, at the request of the archbishop there.\(^{241}\) This text was dedicated to Hatto I, archbishop of Mainz, and its collection and analysis of conciliar rulings reflects the interest in juridical theory already seen in Mainz in the work of Hrabanus Maurus. After repeating Maurus’ 853 condemnation of all instances of homicide, the abbot suggested that knights who participated on either side of a conflict between secular leaders might be fighting for justice. These men should not all face the spiritual discipline demanded by Christian authorities, since “God's judgment is always just, and worthy of no rebuke.”\(^{242}\)

Abbot Regino would have preferred for divine judgment to be the only one involved, but warned that it was “nevertheless necessary” for clerics “to consider those who desire to defend this criminal murder.”\(^{243}\) Some who claimed to be fighting for

\(^{241}\) The complete copies of the genuine form of this text are found in four manuscripts dated from the tenth to the twelfth centuries, but there are seven additional interpolated versions extant from the tenth and eleventh century. See Lotte Kéry, *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages (c. 400-1140): A Bibliographical Guide to the Manuscripts and Literature* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1999), 129–30.


\(^{243}\) Ibid., 234: “tamen oportet eos considerare qui hanc necem nefarium defendere cupiunt.”
justice may have been fighting out of greed and the desire to gain earthly favor. Their actions thus may have been “the business of murder” rather than an embodiment of justice.244 God was expected to discern knights’ motives, but clerics hoped to be able to do so as well. Yet through evidence from Exodus and Deuteronomy, Regino concluded that a priest could not in fact distinguish between someone acting from God’s will and one who was simply seditious to a local ruler.245 To be safe, the abbot recommended that penance be required of all who kill “in public war,” as was required of Christians who accidentally kill a cleric, who kill their fathers, or who injure or disable a personal enemy.246 But among these, homicide committed in war actually resulted in the least penitential debt.247

Secular ecclesiastical leaders who sought assistance from knights were more willing to see the benefits of violence undertaken correctly than monastic clerical leaders. The latter group was most concerned with how to discern the proper methods for judging knights violence, and may have feared it. Pope Leo IV’s desire to attract knights to papal military plans encouraged him to imagine them capable of expressing acceptable motives for violence, to be seen in their decisions disregard fear and risk death for his goals. But fifty years later Abbot Regino doubted clerics’ ability to judge the undertaking of any violence by knights. Clerical concerns for, and methods for judging, violence committed

244. Ibid., 234: “industriam homicidium.”
246. Ibid. 51, 234; 52, 235; 53, 235; 54, 235.
247. Ibid. 51, 234: “Si quis hominem in bello publico occiderit, XL dies poeniteat.”
by knights eventually resulted in additional legislation, as well as ecclesiastical and monastic officials bringing discussions about unacceptable violence to knights themselves.

Episcopal Efforts to Reduce Violence

Near the end of the tenth and early eleventh century, ecclesiastical and monastic leaders in Auvergne, Aquitaine, Burgundy, and Catalonia began to confront lay exactions, or violence they experienced or perceived as a threat against them.248 These officials both developed and repurposed theological, social and political tools that augmented their own authority.249 While there have been notable debates concerning the level of social disorder ecclesiastical and monastic leaders actually faced, their efforts were most successfully undertaken in territories that were under Capetian rule.250 Organizers of public meetings called for the return to past, idyllic periods of peace and


249. Head, "Peace and Power," 1; Cushing, Reform, 42. While in Aquitaine, Burgundy and N. France, bishops and abbots faced threats from lay aristocrats, German ecclesiastical leaders were in the middle of a conflict between the emperor and the pope. See H. E. J. Cowdrey, “From the Peace of God to the First Crusade,” in The Crusades and Latin Monasticism, 11th-12th Centuries (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 1999); reprinted from Le primera cruzada, novecientos años despues: el concilio de Clermont y los orígenes del movimiento cruzado, ed. Luis García-Guijarro Ramos (Madrid: Castelló d’Impressió, 1997), 52–4. For the ideas of the peace councils giving clerical leaders increased influence over secular authorities, see Thomas Head, “The Development of the Peace of God in Aquitaine (970-1005),” Speculum 74 (1999): 658–70.

250. Cushing, Reform, 45.
justice they found in the bible and imagined under Carolingian rule.\textsuperscript{251} Kathleen Cushing stresses that this did not mean that ecclesiastical and monastic officials were consciously pursuing an organized agenda.\textsuperscript{252} But since the meetings were a response to perceived danger, and lay participation in them a sign of their success, the solutions they presented led to the development of a clear agenda whether or not they had initially been intended to do so.

The earliest efforts to promote peace between aristocrats and clerics are found in assemblies in the Auvergne region (978–94), called by Bishop Guy II of Le Puy (r. 975-995).\textsuperscript{253} The first meeting was held at Saint-Germain-Laprade, an open field outside of the town of La Puy.\textsuperscript{254} Bishop Guy II gathered his own bishopric’s leading aristocrats, \textit{milites} and \textit{rustici}, and a few neighboring bishops, and called on laymen to refrain from attacking Church properties as well as return stolen properties and goods.\textsuperscript{255} According to

\begin{footnotesize}
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\item 251. For both biblical and Carolingian references to peace and justice, see Head, "Peace and Power," 2. For modern historians discussions of the myth of an idyllic Carolingian past, see Cushing, \textit{Reform}, 45.
\item 252. Cushing, \textit{Reform}, 46.
\item 254. Cushing, \textit{Reform}, 39.
\item 255. For \textit{milites} and \textit{rustici} being called to the field along with bishops, see \textit{Chronicon monasterii S. Petri Anticiensis}, in \textit{Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Chaffre du Monastier, ordre de Saint-Benoît, suivi de la chronique de Saint-Pierre du Puy, et d'un appendice de chartes}, ed. Ulysse Chevalier, Collection de cartulaires 8 (Paris: Picard, 1864), 152; discussed in Head, “Peace and Power,” 3. Also see Dominique Barthelemy, “The Peace of God and Bishops at War in Gallic Lands from the Late Tenth to the Early Eleventh Century,” trans. Graham Robert
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Dominique Barthélemy, Thomas Head and Christian Lauranson-Rosaz, despite his threats of excommunication, Guy, from an aristocratic family himself, was able to get attendees at this meeting to agree to the oath only by gathering the armies of his brother and nephews to intimidate them by taking hostages. Meetings in the Auvergne that followed included one in Coler, near Aurillac (circa 980), and another soon after at Saint-Paulien, outside of Le Puy (993/994). These councils sought to limit lawlessness by demanding that knights in attendance swear to protect secular and regular clerics, their lay laborers, animals and ecclesiastical properties from violence, and condemned secular lords’ legal demands. Those who violated the oath would be excommunicated.


256. Barthélemy, “The Peace of God and Bishops at War,” 7; Head, “Peace and Power,” 3-4; Lauranson-Rosaz, “Peace,” 118. For Guy relying on secular support because he lacked the episcopal support necessary to enforce ecclesiastical sanctions, see Cushing, Reform, 39.


258. “Statuta per Widonem Aniciensem,” cols. 271–2. For the councils at Coler and Saint-Paulien as monastic because the bishops in attendance were not named, see Lauranson-Rosaz, “Peace,” 124. Also see Cushing, Reform, 39.

The general principle at all three Auvergne councils was that those who did not carry weapons and their property were protected from attack.\footnote{260} Thus, whether all the oaths were eagerly sworn or the result of intimidation, as had reportedly been the case at Laprade, the knights who participated were placed in a clear position of responsibility to the church.\footnote{261} Bishop Guy II tried to enforce this Peace of God throughout his episcopate, but his efforts did not result in other bishops organizing their own gatherings, or in larger numbers of attendees than those he had initially invited. There was no new Peace assembly in the Auvergne until circa 1036, but the ideas presented at these earliest councils would influence those that followed in other regions.\footnote{262}

While the meetings in the Auvergne are not thought to have directly resulted in a “peace movement,” councils held in Aquitaine during and afterwards did fully develop into a “movement” built on the conceptual groundwork seen in the Auvergne.\footnote{263} A council held at Charroux (989) attracted bishops from a wider region than had attended the Auvergne councils. These included men from Bordeaux, Poitiers, Limoges, Périgueux, Saintes, and Angoulême.\footnote{264} These bishops had all experienced secular lords’ attacks on their property or demands for excessive exactions, and sought not only to stop
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\item [261.] Erdmann, Origin, 57–94, esp. 63; Cushing, Reform, 42.
\item [262.] Head, “Peace and Power,” 5; Cushing, Reform, 39.
\item [263.] Tomaz Mastnak, Christendom, The Muslim World, and Western Political Order (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 4; Flori, La guerre sainte, 73.
\item [264.] Head, “Peace and Power,” 5.
\end{itemize}
such behavior but also to gain aristocratic support and defense. The canons of this council ordered that those who broke into and stole from churches, took farm animals from clerics or helpless laypeople, or injured clerics, were to be declared anathema. Meetings that produced canons such as these were held frequently in the decades that followed, attracting increasing numbers of clerical and lay attendees. Though initially recruiting aristocrats to their cause, bishops who organized these councils also encouraged enthusiasm among lower classes of laypeople, especially knights, perhaps to exercise greater pressure on the aristocrats. The presence of both saints’ relics and large crowds at the gatherings may also have been intended to provide both holy and


266. “Concilio Karrofense, apud Karrofum Pictavensis,” in Sacrorum Conciliorum, Vol. 19, col. 89–90. On the role these decisions had in unifying bishops, seen in their agreement that anyone who harmed any of them should be equally chastised by all of them, see Heinrich Fichtenau, Living in the Tenth Century: Mentalities and Social Orders, trans. Patrick J. Geary (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 391–2. Also see Flori, La guerre sainte, 79–80; Cushing, Reform, 41.

267. Head lists Peace councils at Limoges (994) and Poitiers (999/1000, 1010/11, 1015, 1025, 1029/30, and 1036), but he argues that it was likely that there were also meetings at Poitiers in 1005 and 1020. He omits meetings at Limoges, Charroux, and Bourges from 1027-1034, normally part of such lists, arguing that these were likely inventions of Adhémar of Chabannes. See Head, “Peace and Power,” 5–6 and idem, “Development of the Peace of God,” 669-680. For a list of Peace meetings that includes the three that Head discounts, see Flori, La guerre sainte, 82–90. For a defense of the study of the 1031 Council of Limoges for insight into contemporary conceptions of the peace movement, despite it “not being particularly helpful…to speculate about what particularly occurred” because of the authorship of its only source, see Anna Trumbore Jones, "Discovering the Aquitanian Church in the Corpus of Adhémar of Chabannes," in Haskins Society Journal 19, ed. Stephen Morillo with William North (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), 97.

268. Fichtenau, Living in the Tenth Century, 433.
mortal witnesses to the oaths taken by aristocrats in attendance.269 Such assemblies
became a regular force in Aquitanian politics for the next fifty years, which fostered the
spread of the practice to Burgundy.270

Though many lay aristocrats publicly supported the peace, some early-eleventh
century ecclesiastical and monastic officials saw violence against clerics, church property
and monastic institutions as continuing unabated. More expansive legislation was
introduced at the Councils of Elne-Toulouges (1027), Bourges (1038), and Narbonne
(1054), some of which had been suggested in the past peace councils of Saint-Paulien
(993/994), and Anse (994) in Burgundy.271 The canons of Saint-Paulien forbade all
violence against ecclesiastical and monastic properties, but permitted episcopal lords to
use it to bring their own territories under control.272 Those of Anse declared that anyone
who undertook violence against Cluny, its dependents, and its animals, or violated the
council’s moral expectations for lay Christians – especially concerning engaging in
business on the Sabbath – would be anathema and suffer everlasting punishment if they

269. Cushing, Reform, 40.
270. Ibid., 39.
271. For the canons of the Council of Elne-Toulouges, see “Synodus Helenensis in prato
Bourges is found in Andrew of Fleury, Miracula s. Benedicti, 5.1–4, in Les miracles de Saint
Benoît, écrits par Adrevald, Aimoin, André, Raoul Tortaire et Hugues de Sainte Marie moines de
Fleury, ed. Eugène de Certain (Paris: Mme. ve. J. Renouard, 1858), 192–8. For the canons of the
827–32. For the canons of Anse, see “Concilium Ansanum,” in Sacrorum Conciliorum, Vol. 19,
cols. 99–104. For discussions of Saint-Paulien and Anse, without mention of their canons
inspiring those of Elne-Toulouges, Bourges, or Narbonne, see Head, “Peace and Power,” 5.
272. “Statuta per Widonem Aniciensem,” col. 271. Also discussed in Head, “Peace and
Power,” 5.
did not undertake penance. These early councils thus condemned most acts of violence but justified others, and reminded laypeople of the restrictions on their behavior considered necessary for all Christians. Rulings at Elne-Toulouge, Bourges, and Narbonne applied these ideas more directly.

The Councils of Elne-Toulouge and Narbonne both approved canons that were intended to influence the undertaking of violence, and reminded attendees of the need for knights to take responsibility for their actions. The bishops who organized the meeting at Elne-Toulouges (1027) publically asked God to influence the hearts and minds of the faithful so they would agree to more complex restrictions of their behavior than found at previous peace councils. Lay aristocrats and their subordinates were to swear not to engage in violence against clerics, monks or any Christians on their way to or from meetings or devotional activities within thirty paces of a Church, or against their own enemies, from Saturday afternoon through Monday. Elne-Toulouges may have been the first to describe the new arrangement as a “peace or truce.” According to Barthélemy, contemporaries would have seen pax Dei and treuga Dei as incompatible

---


synonyms, in both the style of the language used and their real or imagined definitions. Calling the conciliar decision a truce rather than a peace highlighted the distinctions between temporary diocesan truces on earth, and the eternal peace of heaven. 277

The organizers of the Council of Narbonne (1054) described this meeting as necessary because past oaths that bishops had demanded were being ignored. 278 Bishops at this council restricted violence even further, declaring it unlawful during and between the advent, vigils, feasts, and other holy days. 279 While attendees were told that the responsibility for judging both lawful and unlawful acts of violence had been given to bishops, they were reminded that the murder of Christians in any conflict was a sin. 280 The shedding of any Christians’ blood was equated with the shedding of Christ's blood. 281 But in cases of unintentional unjust homicide among mortals a bishop could allow the sinner to make amends through the law. 282


278. “Concilium Narbonense,” col. 827

279. Ibid., col. 828. Also see Mastnak, Christendom, 6.

280. For bishops’ responsibility, see for example "Concilium Narbonense," 828–9. For the shedding of Christians’ blood, see "Concilium Narbonense," 827.

281. “Concilium Narbonense,” 827. This equation may show the influence of Bishop Gerard I of Arras and Cambrai and others, who argued that Christians should recognize themselves in Christ; see Rachel Fulton, From Judgment to Passion: Devotion to Christ and the Virgin Mary, 800-1200 (New York: Columbia University, 2002), 87.

Episcopal powers were further expanded at the Council of Bourges (1038). While the basic ideas approved at Bourges were added to the records of the Council of Limoges, held a few weeks later, unlike the prior gatherings discussed here no extant canons survived from this council. Council organizer Archbishop Aimon of Bourges’ ideas and the council’s rulings are found in Benedictine monk Andrew of Fleury’s *Miracula sancti Benedicti*, written circa 1043. This monastic author’s opinion of this council and the events that followed it are clear in his account. Andrew described the archbishop gathering his suffragen bishops, and after seeking their advice demanding that all men over age fifteen swear an oath similar to what had been presented at past peace councils. The archbishop himself, and others who took the oath, promised “with [their] whole heart and mouth” to defend the church and attack those who threatened it, and to not be distracted by the possibility of wealth or “drawn away from the path of

---

283. Once of the challenges historians face in the assessment "Peace of God" meetings is the nature of documentary evidence. Of the twenty-two peace councils known to have occurred there are contemporary accounts of only eight, of which only four include conciliar canons. Hagiographical accounts of councils are valuable, but their incidental descriptions of the councils must be understood within their other discourses and objectives. See Cushing, *Reform*, 39–42. For the inclusion of information from the councils at Bourges and Berry councils in records of the Peace Council of Limoges, see Barthélemy, “The Peace of God and Bishops at War,” 11.


righteousness.”286 But unlike the oaths of previous councils, knights who took this one
were personally required to enforce others’ obedience.287 Knights who swore the oath
were to turn their weapons against anyone who violated it; clerics, their holy banners.288

According to Andrew, this approach was initially effective. Men who took the
oath “drove away the condemned many times, so that with the help of God they so
terrified [exterrebant] the rebels that they sought safety in flight, overpowered by
divinely-inspired fear [terrore].”289 But this success was soon canceled by Archbishop
Aimon’s violation of his own oath and leading the men he commanded astray. He fell
prey to “the root and incentive of all evil, greed,” and his men took violence against
oathbreakers too far in their massacre of most of the population of Bengy sur-Craon.290
However truthfully Andrew’s account presented the Council of Bourges and its
repercussions, the author clearly initially supported the ideals of the Peace and Truce but
condemned that council’s approval and use of violence. Their own leader had misled the
knights, whose motives had initially been correct. Archbishop Aimon’s forces, and the

286. Ibid., 193-194: “toto corde et ore…exorbiter a tramite rectitudinis.”
289. Ibid., 193: “multotiens perfidos exturbantes…ita Dei adjutoric exterrebant
rebelles…fugae praesidium expeterent, divino terrore perculsi.” Inconsistencies in spelling in this
passage may be due to editorial errors in the publication.
290. Ibid., 5.3, 194-195: “radix et fomentum omnium malorum, cupiditas.” For that
massacre, see ibid., 5.2. Also see Mastnak, Christendom, 11–3; Barthélemy, “The Peace of God
and Bishops at War,” 12. Fleury refers to “Beneciacum,” but Thomas Head estimates this to be
archbishop himself, were described as having received their own divine judgment in the form of secular prince Odo of Déols’ military victory over them.\textsuperscript{291}

Pope Leo IV, Abbot Regino of Prüm, the numerous bishops who organized the Peace and Truce councils held to limit and systematize lay violence and even monastic hagiographer Andrew of Fleury clearly saw arms bearers’ behavior as dangerous, but able to be controlled and directed. During invasions and threats of further invasions, Pope Leo IV had sought and offered spiritual rewards to knights who helped prevent the killing of Christians by non-believers. But aside from urging knights to have no fear, the pope made no requests concerning knights’ motives or states of mind while they participated in this action, assuming that any action they took would have been motivated by the desire for spiritual rewards and to defend fellow Christians. But as foreign threats waned lay territorial violence attracted greater attention.

The Peace and Truce councils of the late-tenth and early-eleventh centuries reveal a fear of knights’ violence, which drove their episcopal organizers to encourage more detailed restrictions on laypeople’s behavior and greater complexity in the oaths to keep the peace that they were asked to take. Responding to the violence they believed to be surrounding them, the clerical leaders who organized the councils agreed that the killing of Christians was akin to the shedding of Christ’s blood and needed to be stopped. But efforts to direct violence productively appeared again near the mid-eleventh century, with calls to discipline those who broke Peace and Truce oaths they had made. Seeing or

hearing of the successes such councils could achieve, popes after the mid-eleventh century would recall past efforts and ideas of rewards for arms bearers as well as the need to inspire the same excitement and ideal of personal responsibility linked to Peace or Peace and Truce councils. The ecclesiastical systematization of efforts to control both arms bearers’ violence and their personal motives would continue, and move more broadly into the active direction of violence.

Juridical Efforts to Control and Direct Violence

The control and direction of violence remained an active ecclesiastical concern long after the major councils of the Peace and Truce movement. Archbishops, bishops, abbots, and lower ranking clerics worked with arms bearers in their own diocese or territories to lessen violence, but juridical scholars and popes turned to these issues in a larger context. This growth in scholarship in theology and juridical theory should be seen in the larger context of eleventh century social, economic, and intellectual change. Besides popes taking a more active role in governance of the entire Church, the end of European invasions – or the threat of invasions – by outsiders provided new opportunities for political stabilization, economic growth, and institutional consolidation.\textsuperscript{292}

Intellectual pursuits expanded dramatically during this period, as the new cathedral schools spread academic discourse beyond the walls of monasteries and letters of abbots.\textsuperscript{293} Discussions of concerns about violence and the discernment of motives for

\textsuperscript{292} Cushing, \textit{Reform}, 22–4.

\textsuperscript{293} Ibid., 25.
it would no longer be found only in specific monasteries, diocesan councils or synods, but came to be widely shared among scholars who desired to contribute or respond to the intellectual, social, and cultural changes that surrounded them. According to Cushing, the most influential extension of papal government in the eleventh century was the new emphasis on juridical theory law as a vital tool for jurisprudence, and the resulting papal support of the compilation of numerous new canon law collections. Many of eleventh century popes were also legal scholars, and during their papacies were eager to both use and contribute to juridical theories concerning violence. As they undertook efforts to strengthen the papal influence on lay Christians and the faith, popes and the compilers of juridical thought they supported became eager to discern how to control or direct violence most effectively for the benefit of all of Christendom.

Burchard of Worms dealt with the judgment of violence in his *Collectarium canonum* or *Decretum* composed circa 1008-1012. His work began the developments in juridical thought and increased papal dependence on theorists that would continue...
throughout the eleventh century. As Greta Austin explains, though modern scholars have had little respect for this text as a work of legal reasoning, it should be seen as a coherent, systematic and apparently authoritative body of law. Burchard’s selection of juridical ideas gave primacy to the bible, as seen in its interpretation by patristic authors, popes, and ecclesiastical councils. He also included biblical interpretations found in penitential manuals, but generally only when they were in agreement with those also found in other sources. Burchard carefully chose canons to include according to the authority of their authors – based on their age – as well as how simply they presented legal ideas for a wide audience. He wrote for students of law, priests, and other bishops, so that they could both contribute to the further development of legal theory and apply his ideas in pastoral settings. Burchard’s selection of canons that discussed violence focused on acts that resulted in death, but not all such instances resulted in the sin of homicide. The sinfulness of the action and the severity of the sin were directly linked to the guilty party's social identity, motives and personal responsibility for violence.

According to Burchard’s system, the only type of killing not thought to incur guilt for the sin of homicide was a free man’s killing of his own servant, whether or not it had

297. Greta Austin, The Shaping of Church Law Around the Year 1000: The Decretum of Burchard of Worms (Burlington: Ashgate, 2009), 239.
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been ordered by a legal official.\textsuperscript{301} The power of the superior party over the life and death of the inferior made this murder free from sin, but the killer was still expected to lament what he had done.\textsuperscript{302} In contrast, a man who killed an equal by his own choice or by the order of his superior had sinned and was required to undertake penance.\textsuperscript{303} Burchard thus presented examples of juridical thought that supported statements that had been made by Hrabanus Maurus and Regino of Prüm, that any intentional killing that required treachery, as in war, was homicide and required penance.\textsuperscript{304}

Burchard chose sources that left the judgment of such killings and those who committed them, when committed at the command of a leader considered legitimate, up to divine will.\textsuperscript{305} But as Burchard explained, with the highest earthly power he recognized, the pope, judging few men to be legitimate secular leaders, Christians had to judge one another. Killers would try to excuse their own actions, but material motives were generally assumed.\textsuperscript{306} Since only God, “to whom the secrets of all things are clear,”
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could know the truth, all men who killed an equal in or outside war should be considered, and consider themselves, guilty of homicide and undertake the appropriate penance.307

Burchard presented lengthy penances as necessary to obviate the sin of homicide, but according to the system of tariffed penance the duration and severity of the penance depended on the severity of the sin. Killing in battle, when committed under the command of a legitimate leader, required three years of penance and five years of excommunication.308 When a similar killing was committed independently, and no peace had been called, there were more severe penitential requirements.309 Those committed accidentally or intentionally “by your own greed [per tuam cupiditatem]” or “in anger [in ira],” required forty days of fasting and five to seven years of exclusion from public prayer.310 But if the sinner delayed or refused to undertake the appropriate penance it could take up to fifteen years for him to return to the community of the faithful.311 This experience of public punishment, however, resulted in spiritual perfection at the end of life.312
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As presented by Burchard’s collection, all lay violence was sinful and could only be properly directed by legitimate princes who led knights in just wars. But aside from knights acting out of obedience to a just prince and God, avoiding the unjust motive of greed and not acting out of anger, Burchard offered no further details of what motives made it acceptable for them to undertake violence and how their acting from correct motives could be discerned by mortal judges. But with the clearly delineated requirements for acceptable and unacceptable violence that Burchard presented, eleventh century popes could safely apply the approaches of their predecessor Pope Leo IV, and the archbishops and bishops who organized and Peace and Truce assemblies could urge knights to avoid violence, or to enforce others avoidance, out of their devotion to the faith. While Burchard chose canons that presented general instances of just and unjust violence, his introduction of distinct spiritual and institutional goals would benefit ecclesiastical leaders who sought to call on knights to act on their behalf and took responsibility for the judgment their sins.

Papal Direction of Violence

Christians' efforts to conquer the Iberian Peninsula were escalating as Pope Alexander II (r. 1061-1073) began his reign. Muslim rule of Iberia had become


unstable with the collapse of the Umayyad Caliphate of Cordoba into a number of smaller
kings (taifas) circa 1031. Seeing their opportunity to confront and gain tribute from
their Muslim neighbors, Iberia’s small Christian kingdoms began to more adamantly seek
assistance from the pope and Latin Christian secular leaders in their reconquest of former
Visigoth territory.  

Starting in the second half of the eleventh century, large numbers of
armed Europeans began to respond to such calls for aid and travel to the Iberian
Peninsula. Their decisions were influenced by the Cluny-encouraged growth of
pilgrimage to the shrine of Santiago de Compostela, as well as marriages between
Frankish aristocratic families and those ruling Iberian Christian territories.

Pope Alexander II supported knights’ participation in military efforts in Iberia,
offering approval and spiritual encouragement to participants. Before his election to
the papal throne, this pope had been Anselm of Badagio, who became Anselm I, Bishop
of Lucca. According to Sally N. Vaughn, he may have studied at the monastic school of
Lanfranc of Bec, which became a center of legal and theological education among
students from Francia, Normandy, Gascony, Flanders, German territories and Italy.
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318. Sally N. Vaughn, “Lanfranc, Anselm, and the School of Bec: In Search of the
Students of Bec,” in The Culture of Christendom: Essays in Medieval History in Memory of
This education seems to have prepared him to apply juridical ideals about killing and the potential guilt for sin that it could cause to a new context.

Pope Alexander II stated his attitude toward killing in his 1063 letter to Archbishop Wilfred of Narbonne. He condemned Christians’ killing as the sin of homicide but wrote that it was acceptable in two cases: the punishment of crime and the fight against non-Christian enemies. Soon after, he wrote to the clergy of Volturno concerning the large numbers of knights headed for Iberia. This letter made no direct reference to violence, but because these men wished to travel to a place where it was being committed as part of the Reconquista historians have debated whether or not this should be considered the first of what will later be called a “crusade indulgence.” The Pope told knights setting out to carefully achieve the aims they had been divinely inspired to undertake. He trusted that by their giving serious consideration to their plans, knights could correctly undertake their pilgrimage. To ensure the safety of their souls, his letter requested that before their departure they confess their sins and be given penance to undertake. But through his papal grant, their journey would count as its fulfillment. As he explained, “We, indeed, by the authority of the holy apostles Peter and Paul, lift their


320. See Paul E. Chevedden, “Canon 2 of the Council of Clermont (1095) and the Crusade Indulgence,” 277–9, 281; Bull, *Knights Piety*, 73–5. For the argument, that this indulgence was in fact being granted only for pilgrimage, see Herbert E. J. Cowdrey, “Pope Gregory VII and the Bearing of Arms,” in *The Crusades and Latin Monasticism, 11th-12th Centuries* (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 1999), 28.

Penance and grant remission of their sins.” Even if this is not entirely a “proto-
indulgence” this promise of forgiveness did offer a reward for a pilgrimage to a place
where violence would be expected by both the pilgrims and the clerics calling on them to
make the journey.\footnote{323}

Pope Alexander II's spiritual support of Christian knights who may have planned
to act in defense of the faith and pilgrims was reiterated and elaborated by two of his
successors: his papal successor, Gregory VII (circa 1020–85), and the successor to his
previous position as Bishop of Lucca, his nephew Anselm II (circa 1036-1086). These
three were acquainted with one another through geographic, social, and institutional links
prior to and during the years they held their highest positions.\footnote{325} Pope Gregory VII’s
support of military action in defense of the Church was only one aspect of his religious

\footnote{322. Ibid., “Nos vero auctoritate sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli et penitentiam eis
levamus et remissionem peccatorum facimus.”}

\footnote{323. Bachrach, Religion, 103; James A. Brundage, Medieval Canon Law and the
opposed the killing of non-Christians who had not harmed Christians. For his request that Jews in
Europe and Spain not be killed by men on their way to fight the Muslims, see Alexander II,
“Wilfredo Narbonensis,” 43; and his letter to the bishops of Spain, “Alexander papa II omnibus
episcopis Hispaniae,” in Ivo of Chartres, Decretum, 3.114, ed. Martin Brett, Dec. 15, 2009,
http://project.knowledgeforge.net/ivo/decretum.html (May 2012). For violence in defense of
fellow Christians slowly becoming beyond reproach, see Janus Møller Jenson, "Peregrinatio sive

\footnote{324. Kathleen G. Cushing, Papacy and Law in the Gregorian Revolution: The Canonistic
Work of Anselm of Lucca (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 43.}

\footnote{325. For Pope Gregory VII's connections to Pope Alexander II, while they were still
Hildebrand and Anselm I, see H. E. J. Cowdrey, Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085 (Oxford: Oxford
and political reforms intended to strengthen papal authority, a project in which reformers who followed him would be aided by the canon law collection of Bishop Anselm II.  

Pope Gregory VII's support of Christian military activity was closely linked to his desire to strengthen papal authority. Soon after his appointment he had called for assistance for troops who would act in the service of St. Peter, *militia servitus Petri*, to protect the Roman Church and the papacy from threats to its liberties and property. His 1074 letter to Count William of Burgundy (1020–1087) asked for these forces to be used to intimidate Normans who opposed papal power, and to then move on to the East to aid the Byzantines in their conflicts with their non-Christian neighbors. When there was no response he sent a second letter one month later to a few recipients, describing the devastation of Constantinople and slaughter of thousands of Christians there. Recipients of the letter were urged to pity the empire, and be “moved by appropriate


compassion [*compassione*]” to render assistance. When there was once again no response, the pope sent yet another letter in 1074, to the German Emperor Henry IV (1080–1108).

Pope Gregory VII and Emperor Henry IV were already involved in the conflict over investiture. Henry IV’s apologetic letter to the pope in 1073, in which he admitted his wrongdoing and requested assistance restoring order to the Archbishopric of Milan, had briefly alleviated tension between them. In his 1074 letter in response to the emperor, the pope praised the man’s new loyalty, and then told him of events in Constantinople. The pope explained that he wanted knights to travel to the east as *militia servitus Petri*, and was himself “touched by great sorrow [*dolore*] even to the desire for death” to go himself. While he ends this letter asking the emperor to protect the Church for him if he is able to go, and with a wish that God will absolve his sins, he offered no spiritual rewards directly stated to be granted in exchange for participation in this planned expedition.

---

330. Ibid., “digna compassione moveat.”


While the results of these requests are unclear, the pope continued to ask knights to journey east to aid Byzantium. Like those who defended the papacy in Europe, knights who aided the pope in this conflict would be defending the Church and ecclesiastical property.\textsuperscript{335} Despite the new obstacle to papal authority that the investiture conflict presented, in his many requests for military service Pope Gregory VII had overcome one of the primary problems involved in armed Christians’ participation in just wars: legitimate authority. From this pope’s point of view, a papally organized just war would have unquestionably legitimate authority and its participants would be beyond reproach.\textsuperscript{336} But ensuring that knights fought from the correct motives was the second problem, which even fighting for the pope could not guarantee.

Bishop Anselm II of Lucca's \textit{Collectio Canonum}, compiled circa 1081-1086, dealt with discerning armed Christians’ motives for violence.\textsuperscript{337} Much like Burchard of Worm’s \textit{Decretum}, Anselm II's \textit{Collectio} has primarily been considered a compilation of pre-existing ideas. But according to Kathleen G. Cushing, the author carefully selected passages from Burchard’s and other authors’ texts to support a clear ecclesiastical and |

\begin{flushright}
335. Cowdrey, “Pope Gregory VII and the Bearing of Arms,” 29. For calls to action in the investiture crisis, to free the Church of Ravenna from German control, see \textit{Epistolae} 8.7, 524–5; 8. 12, 531–2; 8. 13, 532–4; and 8. 14, 534–5, discussed in ibid., passim. The pope was distracted from his efforts to strengthen the papal position in the East by the investiture conflict, but his early requests for arms bearers to travel to the East to aid Byzantium have been considered influential in the development of the idea of a crusade to the East. See Asbridge, \textit{First Crusade}, 26–28; and Nicholson, \textit{Medieval Warfare}, 26.


337. Full versions of Anselm II's text survive in 17 manuscripts, dated from the very end of the eleventh through the twelfth century, that scholars have divided into 5 recessions. The majority of these are traced to Northern Italy, though some copies also made it to Cambridge, Paris, and Berlin. See Kéry, \textit{Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages}, 218–21.
\end{flushright}
papal reform agenda. Anselm II highlighted participants’ motives in Old Testament examples of acceptable violence. For example, Moses had punished those who had offended God “not with hatred [odio] but by love [amor], so that the soul would be saved.” A man who carried out such “war with kindness [benevolentia]” was “just and pious [iustus et pius],” as long as he remained devoted to the cause to which he was called. Wars undertaken in this way were intended to correct rather than kill enemies, to ensure that they would be converted, become penitent and be saved from eternal judgment.

God observed knights who undertook violence, and provided aid if he judged their actions to be expressions of justice. But fighting a conflict this way required immense effort. As Anselm II explained, “enemies of the Church must be opposed with all the strength of one’s mind and body.” But God could be asked to aid in these efforts: “we ask the Lord who can enable your strong arm to to crush the enemies and

---


341. Ibid. 13.12, 195.

342. Anselm II of Lucca, 13.5, 194

343. Ibid. 13.28, 199: "Quod eclesie inimicis omni vivacitate mentis et coporis sit obviandum."
sharpen the mind with the zeal [zeló] of faith in him like the point of a flashing sword.”344 Anselm II's defense of just war approved Pope Gregory VII’s military projects, and inspired his own use of violence to hold off German imperial forces at Sorbaria.345 But he saw that knights would need assistance to participate in the conflict with appropriate motives. According to one of Anselm’s vitae, attributed to Bardo of Lucca, the bishop instructed knights who were about to fight for him “on what grounds and with what intention they should fight” before granting them remission of sins for their service.346

From Anselm II's point of view, if a knight risked the dangers of war to achieve peace for a higher authority with divine judgment at the forefront of his mind, he was worthy of a spiritual reward. Gregory VII’s reforms and his investiture conflict with Henry IV resulted in new developments in the papacy's attitude toward war, taken further by Anselm II and other supporters of increases in papal authority. Participation in military actions in the service of the Church was becoming a highly valued spiritual act. But even those who participated in papally organized military missions could still be guilty of homicide, and unable to receive spiritual rewards, if they fought with the wrong intentions.347

344. Ibid., “Persolventes preterea paternae caritatis affectum Dominum petimus, quo [qui] brachium vestrum ad comprimendos hostes forte efficiat, et mentem eius eius fidei zelo.”

345. Bachrach, Religion, 104. For Anselm’s possible presence at battles, see Cushing, Papacy and Law, 136–8.


Conclusion

This chapter has followed changes over time in Christian attitudes towards violence and those who engaged in it, and the related role of emotions in the judgment of violence and sin in general. These attitudes have been seen to reflect the cultural, social and political contexts in which they appeared.

In Late Antiquity, patristic authors such as Ambrose and Augustine, educated in ancient, classical and late antique philosophical and political ideals, constructed the first uniform system for the judgment of violence and understanding of emotion in which all Christians were expected to participate. Both emotions and violence required control and direction, but could be positively influenced by religious devotion. Late antique penitential practice, especially repeatable penance, depended on the use of emotion to aid religious devotion by guiding Christians to correct action and away from sin. As had been the case during the polytheist Roman Empire, violence was to be consciously used for the benefit of the Christian Empire.

The Early Middle Ages brought the combination of Roman and European customs that introduced Christian values to new frameworks. This affected all areas of Christian life, but is clearly seen in Anglo-Irish penitential manuals that circulated throughout Europe. But even as new, tariffed systems for repeatable penance that included a wider variety of spiritual practices were introduced, Pope Gregory I’s work showed that attitudes toward emotion as evidence of actors internal states continued to reflect ancient, classical and late antique philosophical concepts and patristic ideals concerning religious devotion, violence, and the practice of penance.
From the sixth through ninth centuries the application of Christian values to non-Roman populations in Europe would result in attempts to create a new Christian empire, in which ecclesiastical and secular officials played an equal part in the guidance of the faithful. While historians who recorded the activities of these new kings and emperors often sought to present the actors on whom the wrote breaking entirely new ground, this period did result in the first meaningful alliances between secular and ecclesiastical leaders. War undertaken by a new Christian Empire came to be treated similarly to those of the polytheist Roman empire, with personal and public rites before and after conflicts, as well as penitential practices while men were in the field. However, even with just leaders in place, knights’ religious devotion and motives for violence could still be questioned.

As a result of invasions at the end of the ninth century, ecclesiastical officials matched their condemnation of Christians’ violence against members of their own faith with support of aggression against foreign and invading enemies. To a far greater extent than had been the case at the end of the Western Roman Empire, the presence of enemies seen as a certain threat to Christian society and its faith encouraged more positive attitudes toward organized military activities. Warriors needed to defend themselves, their families, and the faith, but doubts remained concerning the justness of organized military activities if they lacked just leaders who were given ethical responsibility.

While the end of the tenth and early eleventh century saw decreased external threats, ecclesiastical officials in some areas of Western Francia described themselves as confronting what they saw as an outbreak of clearly unjust violence. Their efforts to
secure oaths by knights to abstain from violence made these armed Christians increasing responsible for their own actions. Rather than reliance on a just leader and a clearly just conflict to secure the judgment of organized military activities and those who undertook them as also just, emphasis was placed on knights’ personal decisions to act according to ecclesiastical ideals. At the same time, in areas apparently untouched by this violence, stability brought prosperity, population growth, and renewed interest in the compilation of juridical thought. At the start of the eleventh century jurists renewed older models of the necessity of just leadership, but still highlighted motives for violence that would be condemnable among knights. Since only God could know knights’ true motives, penance was urged for all knights who might be guilty of homicide.

In the course of the eleventh century it became clear that violence could be useful for Christian society and ecclesiastical officials, including the papacy. With the increased authority of the pope and his support of monarchs there was an increased supply of just secular leaders who could encourage knights to follow them into organized military activities. Popes who sought to present themselves as responsible for the safety of all Christians increasingly became involved in activities that would strengthen Christendom as a whole. Knights who fought in the service of the pope in defense of Christians would be fighting in a just conflict, but events in the early eleventh century had cast lasting doubts on their motives for participation. Juridical collections compiled near the end of the eleventh century organized biblical, patristic, and early medieval material that supported both increased papal authority and military activity, as well as combining requirements for just wars based on leadership with those that paid greater attention to
knights’ motives. Knights who undertook violence through mental and physical efforts, especially the conscious selection of correct motives, would deserve any spiritual rewards that could be granted to them and be free from any penitential liability.

It must be asked to what extent clerics believed these attitudes toward violence and emotion, especially concerns for sin and the need to provide evidence of motive, could be seen among knights. The next chapter will explore whether or not authors’ portrayals of Christians who intentionally avoided or engaged in any kind of organized military activities reflected the juridical and penitential ideas developed from the third through late-eleventh century.
CHAPTER FOUR

JUST KNIGHTS, JUST WARS

Medieval clerical authors who sought to celebrate knights’ military successes or avoidance of violence faced a challenge. For knights to be spiritually secure they had to achieve the ideals for peace and violence presented by patristic authors, conciliar rulings and juridical collections. The increasing importance placed on knights’ motives, after the tenth century, required that clerics discern their reasons for acting in the judgment of their behavior. This chapter will examine clerical authors’ narrative accounts of knights' activities. Authors who sought to praise the knights about whom they wrote described their subjects’ experiences and expressions of emotions as evidence of their reasons for avoiding or engaging in military action. It will be seen, however, that these authors did not always consistently present their subjects achieving the ideal links between motives and behavior on which their actions were judged.

Narrative Accounts of Pacifism, Violence, and Motive

The authors of hagiographical and narrative prose accounts of knights’ activities to be discussed in this chapter described their subjects’ experiences and expressions of emotions as evidence of their motives for peace or violence. The actors in these narratives would be judged by other clerics, and authors hoped for them to be judged as just and free from sin. Abbot Odo of Cluny, who until age nineteen had been educated for a life in an aristocratic secular household, composed his tenth century De Vita Sancti
Geraldi at the request of Abbot Aymo of Saint-Martial in Limoges.¹ This hagiographical text may have provided a model for warriors’ behavior, but certainly reflected conciliar and juridical ideas that applied to arms bearers who committed violence at the time of its composition.²

Another regular cleric, Radulphus Glaber, wrote the Historiarum Libri Quinque in the early-eleventh century.³ Experiencing little of the secular world, Glaber spent his youth and young adulthood in a number of Benedictine monasteries and eventually settled at Cluny circa 1050. But Glaber portrayed the military and devotional behavior of Northern French aristocrats, with whom he likely still identified.⁴ His text’s account of

---


³ Glaber’s text covered events with which he was familiar, as well as more distant ones that involved local Northern French aristocrats. The edition used here is Radulphus Glaber, Historiarum Libri Quinque, ed. and trans. John France, in Glaber, Opera, ed. Neithard Bulst, trans. France and Paul Reynolds (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 1–253, hereafter referred to as HLQ. Translations from Latin included in this chapter are those of France, with slight changes for greater accuracy.

⁴ France, "Introduction," in Opera, liv. For relationships between those who entered the cloister or ecclesiastical governance and their extended families who remained in the secular world, see for example Constance Brittain Bouchard, Sword, Miter and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), 23–4, 43, 46, 63, 65, 67, 253.
the experiences and behavior of primarily aristocratic laypeople and clerics in Northern France may reflect a wider field of clerical opinions of violence and their approaches to judging it according to the motives of those who committed it.

A Norman secular cleric William of Poiters wrote the *Gesta Guillelmi*, circa 1071-1077, in defense of Duke William of Normandy's conquest of England.5 This author was from an influential Norman family and had trained to become a knight before entering the Church.6 He travelled to school at Poitiers but eventually returned to become a chaplain to Duke William of Normandy.7 His experience of the secular world informed his detailed account of violence, while his education at the school of Saint-Hilaire-le-Grand in Poitiers likely provided him with knowledge of theology, conciliar law and juridical thought that informed his use of evidence for proof of the motives of those whose military actions he supported.8 This education enabled and informed his composition of this text in response to ecclesiastical officials’ suspicions of the duke and his subordinates’ motives in this conflict.9

---


7. Ibid.


In 1067 the bishops of Normandy responded to the Normans’ successful conquest of 1066 with new, detailed prescriptions for penitential practices in to be undertaken by those who had fought for Duke William.\(^{10}\) They defined the severity of the sin that accompanied knights’ violent acts and guilt for homicide during this conquest, and thus the penance required of them, according to both their relationship with the duke and knowledge of their own action in the field.\(^{11}\) Papal approval and enforcement of this ruling in 1070 followed the duke and his advisors’ seeking papal oversight for ecclesiastical reforms in England, which they may have done to avoid their own condemnation for the conquest.\(^{12}\) Such concern for obedience and support of censure could be taken as clear evidence of the devotion of a just ruler, who sought the safety of his own and subordinates’ souls. William of Poitiers, chaplain to Duke William, contributed to this effort by doing his part to convince the Norman bishops of the duke’s and his men’s religious devotion, presenting their successful conquest as both itself just as well as undertaken by a just leader.

All of these accounts of knights’ activities should be understood in the context of contemporaneous conciliar rulings and juridical ideas, and the patristic texts that


\(^{11}\) Separate requirements for penance were presented for arms bearers who knew they had killed enemies in battle, who struck enemies without killing them, and those who did not know if those they struck had been killed. See *Councils and Synods with other Documents Relating to the English Church I: 871-1204*, Vol. 2, ed. Martin Brett, Dorothy Whitelock, and Christopher N. L. Brooke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 581–4.

influenced them. These authors will be seen to have carefully selected experiences and expressions of emotion to attribute to the actors in their texts. Their own secular or ecclesiastical backgrounds informed their perceptions of knights and military activities in the field, and drove their portrayal of the knights about whom they wrote.

A Good Warrior: Gerald of Aurillac

Besides attracting attention and interest to the sites of late-antique and early medieval saints’ relics, hagiographers composed *vitae* to provide models for behavior for lay Christians. Abbot Odo of Cluny’s tenth century *De Vita Sancti Geraldi* was written in this context, to show that an aristocratic arms bearer could lead a life pleasing to God. According to Thomas Head, this portrayal of an aristocrat of Aurillac was specifically intended to reduce violence among local secular leaders, and between them and ecclesiastical authorities. Saint Gerald was described as worthy of emulation because of his conduct and everyday life as much as, or perhaps more than, his miraculous

13. James B. McGregor argued that clerics saw warrior-saints primarily as exemplars for behavior until the late-eleventh century, after which they were most frequently called on as intercessors. See James B. McGregor, “Negotiating Knightly Piety: The Cult of the Warrior-Saints in the West, c. 1070–c. 1200,” *Church History* 73:2 (2004): 320.

activities. The emotions attributed to Gerald were chosen to ensure that all aspects of his character would be worthy of emulation, and to leave no room for doubt in his devotion that would risk the misinterpretation of his motives. Odo's description of Gerald made it clear how those who acted with the correct motives for violence or peace would be rewarded, but in fact minimized the role violence actually played in his life as an aristocratic landholder.

From a young age, Gerald’s emotions and behaviors set him apart from other children. According to Odo, “children, through the incitement of their corrupt nature are accustomed to be angry [irasci] and envious [invidere], and to wish to be revenged [ulcisci].” Gerald, however, had a “certain sweetness and modesty [verecundia] of mind,” that protected him from such selfish states. For example, throughout his life, Gerald did not want the holiness others perceived in him to garner undue attention. In particular, he did not want to be known for the miraculous healing acts attributed to him in which others strongly believed. The attention that resulted from such ability, counter to Gerald’s desire for modesty, caused him to experience and express emotion.

On at least three occasions both distant neighbors and people who held property from him sought him out to use his hand-washing water as a cure for themselves or loved ones. When one man came to him and told of his vision that this water could cure his


son’s blindness, the count became “afraid [intremuit] and troubled in his mind [mentes consternatus], refusing to be so presumptuous.”18 Gerald calmly told the man that an illusion had deceived him, which might also delude him and to tempt him to attempt something God did not grant.19 Gerald explained his fear of such deception in more detail on another occasion, when a nobleman came seeking help for his own health. The count refused to aid him, saying, “With sighs [suspirans] and tears [flebat]” that “he feared [timeret] it might be a deceit of the devil wishing to make use of the occasion to deceive him.”20 On another occasion, when a woman approached him as he passed through Italy and told him of a dream she had that he could restore her son’s sight, he “rebuked [exprobravit]” her and “fled, disturbed [concitus].”21 Gerald’s rebuke at this time was unlike the dangerous anger Odo had described among children, but on other occasions such emotion was linked to violence.22

The first man who had come seeking aid for his son understood Gerald’s reticence to be an expression of his “humility [humilitatis].”23 But this “understanding [intelligens]” did not keep him from procuring the water from one of Count Gerald’s

---


19. Odo of Cluny, *De vita Geraldi* 2.10, 212; *Life*, 332.


22. See above, p. 177 n. 16.

23. Ibid. 2.10, 212.
servants. And according to Odo, it did restore his son’s sight. The count never learned of that theft, but he did learn of such thefts on other occasions, when the water restored the sight of one of his servants, when it healed the limb of an apprentice blacksmith, and when it restored the sight of the son of the woman who had spoken to him in Italy. When the wrongdoer came forward, Gerald did not respond aggressively. He simply dismissed the thief who had aided his servant, after he learned of the theft. When the woman in Italy brought her healed son before him he “he went away silently in tears [lacrimis],” while all were praising the deed.

But without a thief who admitted wrongdoing, Gerald’s response to the cure of the apprentice was far less calm. Having been unable to identify the thief, he was moved to “severe threats…that if a serf did it he, he should be maimed, and that if a free man, he would be reduced to servitude.” Such threats suggest anger, but Odo attributed no anger to Gerald. Instead, he described the count experiencing fear. “He feared [timebat] nothing more than praise,” Odo wrote. According to patristic and early medieval ideals for Christians’ fear, he may have feared failing as a just leader by succumbing to pride.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid. 2.11, 212; 2.13, 214; 2.20, 222–4.

26. Ibid., 2.11, 212.

27. Ibid. 2.20, 224: “ille tacens et lacrimis ibat,” Life, 338.

28. Odo of Cluny, De vita Geraldi 2.11, 212: “vehementi interminatio...quia, si servus faceret, membris truncaretur, si vero liber, postea suus non esset,” Life, 333.


this threat successfully strengthened Gerald’s position as a just leader, by enforcing his will, it could benefit the subordinates he could aid in the future.31

Odo made it clear that Gerald’s greatest desires were to please God and aid those who most needed it. This made Gerald a good Christian layman, and a just leader. The nobleman whom Gerald had refused to help had argued that the count might have been acting against the will of God by not using a gift he had been given, for others’ benefit, on the pretext of humility.32 It would have been better for him to help those who needed it, he argued, than send away in sadness those he could have helped.33 This was seen as a concern of Gerald’s as well, when he allowed the thief he had expelled back into his service, and gave coins to the formerly blind woman the thief had helped.34 He treated that theft just as he did others that were unrelated to miracles, in which he allowed the wrongdoer freedom with no retribution.35 But beyond selflessness, Gerald was described as having a personal investment in his ability to perform good works. Gerald was concerned that if his healing gift was a diabolic deception it would “to deprive him of the

31. For a just leader’s ability to peacefully aid his subordinates, see chapter 3, pp. 93–5, 134–5.

32. Odo, De vita Geraldi 2.13, 214. For the humility that Einhard attributed to Charles, that may also have been doubted, see chapter 3, pp. 134–5.

33. Odo, De vita Geraldi 2.13, 214.

34. Ibid.

35. Ibid. 1.25, 172; 1.26, 172.
reward [mercede] for any good he had done.” Gerald, described as careful to remain free of pride, still wanted God to recognize and reward his good works.

Outside of concern for his ability to perform miracles, the emotions Odo attributed to Gerald were linked to his performance of his duties as a just leader. As an aristocrat concerned with maintaining peace in his own lands and among his subordinates, and as a just leader who sought peace among all Christians, all conflicts were a source of concern. But in times of potential violence, Gerald experienced fear for the well being of others rather than his own. On one journey to Rome, Gerald restrained pilgrims who responded badly to a request for tolls, “fearing [metuens] it would start rebellion.” Gerald did not experience or express fear over dangers that he might face in a military conflict, such as pain or death. His assurance that God would frighten his enemies and provide him with victories left him nothing to fear. But Odo did describe Gerald causing fear in others; especially subordinates who sought to please him. “When he spoke rebukingly [increpative],” Odo wrote, “[his words] seemed like goads and were feared [tumerentur] almost more than mere words

Odo described subordinates’ fear of Gerald as so powerful that its influence on them could be classed among miracles. One one occasion one of Gerald’s subordinates,


38. Ibid. 1.41, 192.

Rainald, violated an oath that he had made to the count, and he and his subordinates preyed on a community that Gerald had assigned to a monastery. Some members of the community called on the count, who was not present, for aid during an attack. Soon after, it seemed to Rainald that Gerald appeared to him one night, demanding that he keep his oath and “warning [iuramenti] him to cease troubling the community”\(^40\) Rainald himself obeyed, but put little effort into restraining his subordinates. Gerald once more “appeared, threatening, angrily [furibundus] reproached him [exprobrauit] with the good he had done to him, for which he had received only evil, and striking him on the head threatened him with death to follow.”\(^41\) According to early medieval thought on violence the desire for vengeance was warranted, as the man was harming the innocent.\(^42\) This was the correct response of a just leader.

As stated previously, Odo attributed no personal fear of violence to Gerald. Patristic and early medieval texts all presented God aiding those who acted with sufficient religious devotion.\(^43\) This provided assurance that the devoted could look


\(^41\) Odo, *De vita Geraldi* 11, 276: “minax apparuit…pro quibus ille mala reddebat, furibundus exprobrauit, atque percuciens eum in capite, e vicino mortem sibi secuturam comminatus est,” *Life*, 362.

\(^42\) While patristic authors saw anger as acceptable primarily for correction but also for vengeance, in the early middle ages the desire for vengeance was attributed to Charles concerning enemies who harmed his people. See chapter 3, pp. 134, 136–7.

forward to divine assistance when it was needed. This sense of security may explain the complete absence of clear expressions of courage, an emotion that modern scholars understand as the willingness to act despite fear. Odo could not portray Gerald specifically expressing courage in the face of bodily harm if fear was impossible because of his assurance of God's protection. The intensity of Gerald’s devotion protected the count from actually experiencing fear, but it did not benefit his image as an aristocratic landowner among other lay lords.

Gerald did his best to avoid military conflicts because of his religious devotion, but he still had to act as a military leader when it was necessary. When he could not inspire enough fear among enemies and was forced to fight in defense of the weak he carefully avoided bloodshed and casualties, even at the expense of his own territorial wealth. The count attempted to peacefully pacify an opponent, Arnaldus, known to hate peace, by giving gifts to him and weapons to his men. But this enemy acted even more bravely, attributing this behavior “not to piety but cowardice [ignaviae].” In fact, as a

44. According to William Ian Miller, courage in the midst of danger is dependent on an actor’s cultural context, since fear of death, pain, mutilation, and other dangers are likely evolutionary adaptations. See William Ian Miller, *The Mystery of Courage* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 7, 12, 206. For the influence of other emotions on courage, see chapter 3, pp. 95–7.

45. For courage depending on a comparison with cowardice, acting out of fear, see Miller, *The Mystery of Courage*, 133.


result of this desire to avoid violence and willingness to lose territory some of his own vassals “frequently complained that he was soft [mollis] and timid [timidus]…as though he was powerless [impotens].” 48 Gerald acted as a just leader when necessary, but paid greater attention to God’s opinion of him than that of his enemies or own subordinates.

Among all of the emotions Odo attributed to Gerald linked to his religious devotion, those described as most beneficial to him and his relationship with God were joy and sorrow. The count’s greatest source of joy was his closeness to God, the blessedness praised by Augustine.49 According to Odo, for a man to be “blessed and happy [beatum et felicem]” meant that “even on earth he did not lose the love due to his good works, and in heaven is received in the love of the saints.”50 Apparently Gerald’s fear of pride in his miraculous healing had not been unfounded! But beyond not being subject to pride on earth, as Odo explained, “truly he is happy [felix] who has injured none, oppressed none” and garnered no complaints while holding secular power.51 The achievement of these challenging goals would help maintain peace, which would encourage and assist the achievement of the joy found in the closeness to God.52


52. Joyful closeness to God was only achievable through peace. See chapter 3, pp. 107–8.
Gerald experienced and expressed joyful closeness to God during prayer. For many years Gerald went to evening prayers in a church, a habit that Odo described as having been directed by God.53 He began the prayers before others, and remained alone after them. In this way “all the more sweetly [dulcius] as it was more in private he tasted the savor of internal sweetness [dulcedinis]. After a time he came out to his men joyous [letus] and brisk [alacer].”54 Gerald also experienced intense joy through prayer when on pilgrimage, from a similar closeness to the saints and the promise of heaven. As Odo wrote, concerning the count’s eagerness to visit and pray at the tombs of Saint Martin and Saint Martial, “I believe he saw in contemplation how the ranks of the blessed rejoice [letantur] in the court of heaven. With those to whom he was soon to be joined he had to some extent a foretaste of the joy [gaudium] of his Lord.”55

But besides experiencing joy from his own closeness to God, Gerald could also experience such emotion when part of a group acting together out of devotion to the faith. Divine aid on such occasions brought him great joy. When a group with which Gerald traveled on a pilgrimage to Rome found themselves short of food, they became “anxious [anxiabatur].”56 After one of the pilgrims retrieved a fish that had jumped out of the water

53. Odo of Cluny, De vita Geraldi 2.16, 218.

54. Ibid., “Et tunæ temporis tanto dulcius quanto et secretius interne dulcedinis saporem degustabat. Quandoque autem letus et alacer, vel ad stratum pro tempore, uel ad suos egrediebatur;” Life, 336.


56. Odo, De vita Geraldi 2.19, 222, Life, 337.
when it saw him, he “joyfully [letus]” returned to the count.\textsuperscript{57} Gerald “went into his tent and kneeling down prayed for a while in tears [lacrimis]…rather devoutly returned thanks to Him for everything that happened. When he arose from prayer he cheerfully [letus] joined himself to the company.”\textsuperscript{58}

Any divine attention brought joy, including aid he provided after punishing the faithful. According to tenth-century medieval jurists, divine judgment, and the resulting discipline – when compared to human judgment and discipline – was always just.\textsuperscript{59} When the count briefly experienced attraction to a woman and sought marriage, he lost his sight for seven years. But “he not only did not grieve [doluit], over this affliction, but even rejoiced [gavisus] in the Lord that He had deigned to scourge him.”\textsuperscript{60} Gerald especially appreciated the punishment because it allowed his sins to be “punished in this life.”\textsuperscript{61} Even a knight who avoided violence worried about punishment for his sins after death.

Odo described Gerald as beloved by his people. Gerald's own joy over his close relationship with God inspired joy in those who knew him, even at his death. “His passing was relieved by a certain sweetness [dulcedini] inasmuch as they knew that for

\textsuperscript{57} Odo, \textit{De vita Geraldi} 2.19, 222, \textit{Life}, 337.


\textsuperscript{59} See chapter 3, pp. 139, 142,

\textsuperscript{60} Odo of Cluny, \textit{De vita Geraldi} 3, 246: “Qua percussione non solum non doluit, quin etiam plurimam est gavisus quod eum flagellare dignitatus sit,” \textit{Life}, 349–50.

him rejoicing \textit{[gaudendum]} rather than grief \textit{[lugendum]} was called for.\textsuperscript{62} Though human nature made those who loved the count “sad \textit{[tristabantur]}” at his death, they believed that the angels “rejoiced \textit{[letabantur]}.”\textsuperscript{63} Gerald himself would be “happy \textit{[felix]}” after death, since through devotion, he had naturally come to “distinguish the precious from the worthless.”\textsuperscript{64} Gerald's relationship with God was his primary source of joy, but the problems he saw in others' devotion were his greatest source of sorrow.

Gerald experienced and expressed sorrow over Christians’ lack of devotion. “He broke out in lamentation \textit{[plangoris]} at the sight of men giving themselves to evil.”\textsuperscript{65} He “sighed \textit{[ingemiscebat]} in disgust \textit{[pertesus]}” that men were “perishing through love of the world, that piety was failing and iniquity abounded.”\textsuperscript{66} According to patristic and early medieval authors, such sorrow was natural for a human possessing reason who cared about others’ well being.\textsuperscript{67} Challenges Gerald encountered in his own efforts to please God were unsettling, but did not bring him sorrow when there was an explanation.

\textsuperscript{62} Odo of Cluny, \textit{De vita Geraldi} 8, 254: “dereliquit… meror quadam dulcedine respersus esset – pro eo quod scirent quia talis fuit ut de illo magis gaudendum sit quam lugendum,” \textit{Life}, 353.

\textsuperscript{63} Odo of Cluny, \textit{De vita Geraldi} 8, 254, \textit{Life}, 353.

\textsuperscript{64} Odo of Cluny, \textit{De vita Geraldi} 8, 256: “Felix atque Geraldus qui separauit preciosum a vili,” \textit{Life}, 354.


\textsuperscript{67} See chapter 3, p. 105, 121–2. Religious devotion also made emotions such as sorrow correct and beneficial when properly directed. See chapter 3, p. 105.
outside of human control. During the construction of a monastery he supported, an accident occurred that caused casualties. This was not itself a source of sorrow, because such difficulties were evidence that the project was truly pleasing to God and thus seen as a threat by Satan. However, after building the monastery Gerald became overwhelmed by sorrow about how long it took him to attract monks to the new foundation. He “wept [flebat] copiously [ubertum],” and according to Odo described himself as “worn out by sorrow [merore]” over his having provided so much for monks but being unable to find any. Gerald felt that humans had failed him, but at the end of his life his closeness to God would keep him from experiencing sorrow over his own death. In fact, when he was near death he prayed tearfully to be delivered from the world, not to remain in it.

As presented by Odo of Cluny, Gerald provided the perfect model for secular aristocratic leaders in his military, social, political, and spiritual activities. He was the perfect model of a just leader in his careful avoidance of unnecessary violence, his desire to aid his dependents, and the dedication he showed to support of monastic institutions. His devotion to the faith fueled his concern for the safety of his own soul and eagerness to undertake whatever discipline would bring him divine forgiveness, but this devotion also brought him security with his inevitable mortality. Because of this security Gerald was willing to risk his life in frequent pilgrimage, as well as to engage in potentially dangerous military activity when it was necessary for the well being of his dependents.

68. Odo of Cluny, De vita Geraldi 2.4, 202.
69. Odo of Cluny, De vita Geraldi 2/3.2, 246; Life, 349.
70. Odo of Cluny, De vita Geraldi 6, 250.
Odo explained all of Gerald’s behaviors, presenting the motives for them in his accounts of Gerald’s emotions. The value of these descriptions was seen in how open for interpretation Gerald’s actions could be, as for example in the case of his admonitions to people who sought his healing abilities. He was not being selfish in his refusals, but feared both diabolical trickery as well as losing his chance to aid his dependents. Similarly, his avoidance of military action and desire for peace was praiseworthy for a Christian, but he risked being accused of cowardice if his devotion to the faith was not known. That Gerald’s emotions could reveal these internal motives for action suggested that those of others could be presented and their motives discerned in this manner as well. Odo’s portrayal of Gerald’s emotions and violence fit clearly into patristic and early medieval jurists’ ideals for armed Christians’ behavior, with his potentially contentious activities and emotions clearly directed to specific goals. But while Gerald achieved these ideals as a saint, authors found it more difficult to attribute such styles of just rule and successful emotional direction to other aristocratic landowners.

Not All Warriors Are Saints

Radulphus Glaber’s Historiarum Libri Quinque was composed in the first half of the eleventh century. As the author explained, he wrote to tell the story of men in the Roman world who “from the year 900 of the Incarnation of the Word, are distinguished as cultivators of the Catholic faith and justice.” Like Odo, he conveyed his subjects’ motives for behavior, including violence, through their emotions. Many of these were

71. Glaber, HLQ, 1.4, 8: “ab anno DCCCC incarnate creantis ac vivificantis omnia Verbi ad nos usque qui clarvere viri in Romano videlicet orbe insignes catholice fidei cultores et iustitie.”
closely linked to devotion. But unlike Odo, Glaber presented the deeds of great men who were not saints. His portrayal of the influence of devotion may have come from a desire to positively present those with whom he was personally familiar, influenced by his own likely aristocratic family background. But beyond their religious devotion, Glaber conveyed few positive representations of the warriors of whom he wrote. His text reflects contemporaneous doubts about the motives of arms bearers and the trustworthiness of secular leaders.

Glaber never portrayed lay aristocratic leaders expressing fear of injury or death in battle. But as had been recommended by Pope Gregory I’s ideals for effective pastoral guidance, fear of divine punishment for their battlefield activities did drive their actions when away from it. “When he had shed much blood in many battles in many places,” Count Fulk of Anjou, “driven by fear [metu] of hell,” travelled on pilgrimage to the tomb of the savior in Jerusalem. But the count was not certain that pilgrimage itself could save him from hell, since he continued to sin. So while in the East he decided to build a church and a monastery in his territory back home for monks “who clearly might intervene day and night for the redemption of his soul.”

72. Glaber was well-informed about a number of high-ranking Burgundian families, interested in genealogy and carefully indicated the status of his subjects. He displayed specific contempt for rustici, a term which in the early eleventh century was becoming a designator of status. See France, “Introduction,” in Opera, xxxiii-xxxiv.

73. See chapter 3, pp. 122–3.

74. Glaber, HLQ, 2.4.5, 60: “Cum in diversis preliorum eventibus plurimum humanum fudisset sanguinem, metu gehenne territus.”

75. Ibid., “qui videlicet die noctusque pro illius anime redemptione intervenirent.” For the praiseworthiness of just leaders’ donations, see chapter 3, p. 135.
According to Glaber, while constantly in fear of divine retribution himself, Count Fulk inspired fear in his own lay subordinates and clerics of all ranks. In his description of the dedication of the count’s new church, Glaber explained that “fear [terror] of Fulk” compelled many of his lay subordinates and even bishops living under his rule to be present for the ceremony.”76 While the author did not describe the count engaging in public, physical disciplinary action as he did other leaders, the reactions of Fulk’s subordinates suggested that he was feared as a figure of unquestionable authority.77 But by the standards of most ecclesiastical authors, as well as the ideals that Odo of Cluny had presented in Saint Gerald of Aurillac’s style of rule, this count's authority was not an expression of justice.

That fear among subordinates or enemies strengthened a leader’s authority is also seen in Glaber’s description of the influence of fear on men’s ability to undertake violence. Count Fulk of Anjou's son Geoffrey had been attempting for more than a year to gain control of a city that had been granted to him by the king of the Franks, when two sons of an enemy of his father arrived to oppose him.78 Geoffrey prayed to St. Martin and other saints to aid him, promising to restore saints’ relics and Church property in the city.

76. Glaber, HLQ 2.4.7, 62: “Fulconis terror.”

77. Glaber did not describe the Count of Anjou engaging in public acts of violence to frighten his people, but he did provide an example of the eastern emperor reinforcing his authority with a display of violence. He publicly disfigured a Roman aristocrat who appointed a pope he preferred at the expense of the candidate the emperor supported. See ibid., 1.4.12, 24. Glaber did not describe fear among witnesses, but the emperor demonstrated the danger of disobedience in order to prevent it in the future. For the political purposes of displays of royal anger, see Gerd Althoff, “Ira Regis: Prolegomena to a history of Royal Anger,” in Anger’s Past, 59-74.

78. Glaber, HLQ 5.2.19, 243.
that his enemies had seized. After this prayer, when he and his forces approached their enemies, “fear [terror] so struck [invasit] the troops of the brothers” that they were unable to fight. There was no doubt among onlookers or “frightened [formidolosum]” listeners that Geoffrey’s victory had been achieved after he “piously [pie]” invoked the aid of St. Martin. Many of those who fled reported that this leader and his entire army appeared to be clad in shining white robes, and that the numerous enemies were captured in battle without bloodshed.

Knights like Geoffrey may have heard of other incidents in which the intercession of divine forces on Christians’ behalf caused fear among their enemies. Glaber described one battle between Christians and Saracens in Africa in which “a tremor of horror [horroris tremo]” spread through the enemy when Christians seemed to be winning. When the Saracens attempted to flee they became disorganized and “by the strength of God were struck dumbfounded [stupentes].” With God or saints hindering Christians’ enemies, those who prayed for aid could fight without fear.

While fear was rarely expressed or literally stated to have been assuaged through devotional activities, lay leaders and knights in Glaber’s chronicle also rarely expressed

79. Ibid.
80. Ibid: “dumque venirent uterque partes in comminus tantus terror invasit exercitum duorum fratrum.”
81. Ibid., 243–4.
82. Ibid., 244.
83. Ibid., 4.7.22, 206.
84. Ibid., 4.7.22, 206: “virtute Dei stupentes heserunt.”
courage or bravery. In the only example Glaber gave of a military leader inspiring bravery in battle, he described the Count of Anjou’s actions after he was thrown from his horse. “He arose again enraged with too much fury [*nimio accensus furore*], and he spoke, lifting [*relevans*] and sharpening [*exacuens*] the spirits of his men.”\(^{85}\) Fulk’s speaking after overcoming the physical challenge of being thrown from his horse provided an example to be emulated, as well as renewing his men’s desire to fight.\(^ {86}\) But according to patristic and early medieval standards for emotion, while Fulk’s behavior had the desired effect his anger was only defensible if it drove his men to action and did not hinder his own.\(^ {87}\)

Glaber also described clerical efforts to encourage bravery among their own subordinates, but they were less effective than military leaders were with their men. The bishop of Prague told clerics who were to travel with him on a preaching expedition that he had received a vision telling him he would “would receive the crown of martyrdom” on the journey, but that “they should not fear [*ne paverent*] because besides him no one of them was to be killed.”\(^ {88}\) Closeness to God through martyrdom was the ideal form of eternally peaceful closeness to him.\(^ {89}\) But Glaber gave no indication that this reassurance

\(^{85}\) Ibid., 2.3.4, 58: “Qui exsurgens nimio accensus furore, dictis relevans exacuensque suorum animos.”

\(^{86}\) Ibid.


\(^{88}\) Glaber, HLQ 1.4.10, 22: “martirii coronam esset accepturus, ac ne paverent eis pariter indicavit quia praeter eum ibidem nemo ex eis erat perimendus.”

\(^{89}\) See chapter 3, p. 106–7.
enabled the men to more eagerly or energetically engage in the expedition, though they
did carry out the plans that had already been made. Glaber provided only one instance of
laymen of low rank relying on faith to lessen their fear, but their faith was in error.
Attempts by heretical enemies of the faith to rely on their beliefs did not have a positive
outcome. Heretics condemned for their faith and sentenced to burning initially “cried out
that they wanted this” outcome, but right before burning denied their faith and claimed to
have been deceived by the devil.90 Their heresy offered no promise of martyrdom for
their faith.

Glaber provided very few examples of joy among lay Christians, from both
spiritual and material causes. That spiritual influence was in fact what made it necessary
for Christians to control their emotions, shaping their experiences and expressions of joy.
According to Glaber, reflecting Augustine’s sense of emotions as proof that humans
possessed reason, “only to humans, above other animals, was given the power to be more
blessed [beatius].”91 This reason enabled humans to emulate the higher, spiritual order.
But since this gift also granted them the risk of turning out “more wretched than any
creature,” control and direction of their emotions was a necessary part of this
emulation.92

Joy from closeness to God, a correct cause for the emotion according to patristic
and early medieval thought, was seen in Glaber’s description of a Burgundian lay

90. Ibid., 3. 31, 150: “hoc velle proclamabant.”

91. Ibid., 3.8.28, 144: “Soli etiam homini datum est pre ceteris animantibus fore sese
beatius.” See chapter 3, pp. 106.

pilgrim’s behavior in Jerusalem. After he had seen the holy sites he threw himself to the ground and with “tears [lacrimis] he exalted [exultavit] in the Lord with indescribable joy [iubilio].” He said “Lord Jesus...if this year my soul will depart from this body, let me not return to my own land but let it come to be done in the sight of the place of your ascension.” According to Glaber, the pilgrim’s desire for death in the holy land was a sign of the intensity of his devotion. “Truly he was free from that vanity [vanitate],” Glaber wrote, “which inspires so many to set out only to have the achievement of the journey to Jerusalem.” Glaber described the pilgrim dying soon after, demonstrating his devotion once again. He returned to his hostel, prayed, laid down “with a cheerful [alacris] face” instead of eating dinner, received the Eucharist, “sweetly [dulciter] bade all farewell, and gave up his spirit.” Eagerness to die on pilgrimage was evidence of an intense desire for closeness to God, which, as through prayer, would bring joy.

The devotion that made this closeness a source of joy made a believer’s death a calm, cheerful experience. But Glaber also described Christians experiencing joy from causes that had been condemned by patristic authors. He described enemies’ suffering bringing joy to Christians. When a Saracen tried to interrupt a ceremony at the Holy

---

93. Glaber, HLQ 4.6.18, 200: “cum lacrimis inenarrabile mentis iubilo exultavit in Domino.”

94. Ibid. 4.6.18, 200 “Domine Ihesu...si hoc anno est mea anima ex hoc corpore migratura, non hinc recedam sed in conspectu loci tue ascensionis fieri contingat.”

95. Ibid., “Iste procul dubio liber a vanitate, ob quam multi proficiscuntur, ut solummodo mirabiles habeantur de Iherosolimitano itinere.”

96. Ibid.: “vultu alacris…illisque dulciter salutatis emisit spiritum.”
Sepulcher he was seized by a demon, but was then killed by some of his own men.\textsuperscript{97} That death caused “terror [\textit{terrorem}] in all of the community [of Saracens] who were present.”\textsuperscript{98} But for the Christians it “produced joy and exultation [\textit{gaudium et exultationem}].”\textsuperscript{99} They could appreciated that God had achieved vengeance, using a demon and enemies of the faith, for a good cause, but as patristic authors had made clear the deaths of enemies should not produce joy.\textsuperscript{100}

As was the case with joy, Glaber rarely portrayed sorrow among lay Christians. Material losses and spiritual threats were both perceived as injustices, which caused sorrow. In contrast to both patristic and early medieval idealizations of death as an expression of devotion or way to gain greater closeness to God, and in contrast to his own description of the joyful death of a pilgrim devoted to the faith, Glaber more often presented death as source of sorrow. Sorrow followed death that was believed to have come too soon or to have been undeserved, rather than eagerly sought as an expression of devotion.\textsuperscript{101} Glaber told of a young aristocrat who had returned to his parents after a conflict with his father.\textsuperscript{102} Soon after this change of heart, “while he was showing to all the incomparable grace of body and mind…envious \textit{invida} death stole him suddenly

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{97} Ibid., 4.6.19, 202.
\item \textsuperscript{98} Ibid., “Quod factum omnibus in commune terrorem immisit.”
\item \textsuperscript{99} Ibid., “Gaudium et exultationem prebuit.”
\item \textsuperscript{100} See chapter 3, pp. 107–8.
\item \textsuperscript{101} For King Charles’ sorrow over what he saw as a similarly unwarranted death, see chapter 3, pp. 134–5.
\item \textsuperscript{102} Glaber, HLQ 3.9.33, 152.
\end{itemize}
from the hostile world.”

This death seemed unjust to the young man's family and Glaber's fellow monks, who asked him to compose a funerary poem. He wrote

“Creator, spare worldly sorrow [mestis], let weeping [fletus] comfort the deepest sorrows [doloribus], let it nurture the grieving [merentes] [and] the sobbing [singultuum] groans [gemitus].”

According to Pope Gregory I, tears such as these provided evidence of intense emotion; in the case of sinners, cleansing their souls by providing evidence of their contrition.

As has been seen in Odo’s account of Gerald of Aurillac’s life, such a display of emotion could gain’s God’s attention, resulting in joy or assistance being granted to those who prayed tearfully. Such an effort was also seen in Glaber’s description of a king’s response to the discovery of heresy in his territory with “too much sadness [tristis] and grief [merens] because he in fact feared [metuebat] both the ruin of his kingdom and the destruction of its souls.” In agreement with patristic ideals for leadership and religious

103. Ibid., 3.9.33, 152: "Dum igitur incomparabili mentis simul ac corporis decore flororet...repente illum mors invida mundo subripiuit."

104. Ibid.

105. Ibid., 3.9.33, 154: "Plasmator, parce mestis mundialibus, succurat fletus intimis doloribus, pascat merentes singultuum gemitus."

106. See chapter 3, pp. 121–2.

107. For example, see p. 185–6 above.

108. Glaber, HLQ 33.8.26, 140: "tristis ac merens nimium effectus, quoniam et ruinam patrie revera et animarum metuebat interitum."
devotion, this expression of sorrow demonstrated the king's orthodoxy and concern for the protection of his subjects as a just leader.\textsuperscript{109}

Of the emotions Glaber described among Christians, he most rarely presented anger. Count Fulk of Anjou’s anger when he rose from the ground after being knocked from his horse usefully inspired his men to action, yet the conflict to which it drove them was not just.\textsuperscript{110} This was the product of strife between himself and his sister’s husband, the count of the Bretons, over territory and rulership, with no evidence that Fulk’s subordinates were being harmed.\textsuperscript{111} In another struggle, “Fulk and another were swollen [\textit{tumidus}] with pride [\textit{superbia}] and fled from peace.”\textsuperscript{112} Fulk’s state of mind and reason for undertaking violence were again counter to juridical ideals for both just rulership and anger.\textsuperscript{113}

Religious devotion inspired many of the emotions Glaber portrayed, but he also frequently presented it shaping his subjects’ behavior in its own right. Glaber himself praised its presence. He wrote that a man should desire knowledge of and closeness to God above lesser, earthly desires.\textsuperscript{114} The man “grows better and more beautiful as his love [\textit{amorem}] brings him nearer to these things...whoever lacks the desire for this love

\begin{itemize}
  \item 109. See chapter 3, p. 94.
  \item 110. Glaber, HLQ 2.3.4, 58.
  \item 111. Ibid. For the risks of anger, see chapter 3, pp. 92–3, 134.
  \item 112. Glaber, HLQ 3.2.6, 104: “uterque tumidus superbia idcirco et pacis refuga.”
  \item 113. For the avoidance or control of incorrect anger, see chapter 3, 96, 104, 134, 158.
  \item 114. Glaber, HLQ 3.8.29, 145.
\end{itemize}
[amoris] will become without a doubt lower and more wretched than any beast of the field.”\textsuperscript{115} This ideal fit early medieval conceptions of the love of God encouraging correct action, avoidance of sin, and the undertaking of efforts to gain forgiveness.\textsuperscript{116} According to Glaber, at the time he wrote many Christians were publicly acting together out of love for God to achieve these goals.

As Glaber described, “by divine inspiration in a pact first confirmed in Aquitaine, and then little by little throughout Gaul,” men agreed “through both fear [timorum] and love [amorem] of the Lord” to limit the days of the week on which they could use force to steal from one another or enact vengeance, and to accept execution or excommunication if they disobeyed.\textsuperscript{117} Large numbers of men swore to place the love of God above their earthly desires, and accepted material and spiritual responsibility for their actions.\textsuperscript{118} But these oaths for the “Truce of God,” clearly aimed at knights, occurred at meeting in which bishops had gathering together large crowds who expressed great enthusiasm for peace.\textsuperscript{119} The councils “generated such ardor [ardore]” that “the bishops raised their croziers to the heavens, and all cried out with one voice to God, their hands...

\textsuperscript{115} Ibid.: “Fitque tanto melior atque pulchrior quanto his per amorem heserit vicinor, atque in quantum meior, in tantum illi qui summe bonus extat Creatori similior. Et idcirco patenter datur intellegi quoniam quisquis hominum huius amoris ac deterior, omni procul dubio fiet pecude miserior ac deterior.”

\textsuperscript{116} See chapter 3, pp. 119–22.

\textsuperscript{117} Glaber, HLQ 5.1.15, 236: “Inspirante divina gratia primitus in partibus Aquitanicis, deinde palatim per universum Galliarum territorium, firmari pactum propter timorum Dei pariter et amorem…”

\textsuperscript{118} For Peace and Truce of God Councils, see chapter 3, pp. 144–52.

\textsuperscript{119} Glaber, HLQ 5.1.15, 236: “treuga Domini.”
extended: “Peace! Peace! Peace!”

For Glaber, this display of devotion and unity “would be a sign of a perpetual covenant that they promised between themselves and God.”

Besides engaging in public acts of devotion at home, Glaber also described more pilgrims than ever setting out for Jerusalem. They included great numbers of men and women of all classes. Aristocratic knights may have been frequent pilgrims, as seen in Fulk of Anjou’s making three to five pilgrimages to the Holy Sepulchre. This number of pilgrimages was rare for one man, and the dangers of travel by sea meant that they were not undertaken without need for – and hope for – forgiveness of sin. Besides visits to such sites demonstrating love for God, devotion was also shown by donations to them. Glaber described Norman Duke Richard II’s large gift to the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem for its maintenance and to assist pilgrims who traveled there. As discussed

120. Ibid., 4.5.16, 196: “Quibus universi tanto ardore accensi ut per manus episcoporum baculum ad celum elauarent, ipsique palmis extensis ad Deum: ‘Pax! Pax! Pax!’ unanimiter clamarent.”

121. Ibid., 4.5.16, 196: “esset videlicet signum perpetui pacti de hoc quod spoponderant inter se et Deum.”

122. Ibid., 4.6.18, 198.

123. Ibid., 2.4.5, 60 n. 2.

above, wealthy aristocratic knights like Fulk of Anjou also donated funds for the foundation of monasteries at home, to gather monks who would pray for their sins. Such acts also reflected the desire for forgiveness of sins, but the behaviors Glaber attributed to Fulk suggest that he was likely to undertake penance and then return to sin. This was a practice that had garnered clerical complaints.126

According to Glaber, the opportunity to place the faith and defense of the Church above secular interests opened new ways for knights to express devotion. Besides the obedience to bishops at peace or truce councils, Glaber also showed the development of new types of political and spiritual relationships between knights and clerical officials. He described the Norman knight Rodulf visiting and appealing to Pope Benedict to end a conflict he was having with a secular aristocrat.127 “Seeing him to be the finest soldier,” the pope used this opportunity to “complain of the Greek’s invasion of the Roman Empire” and recruit the Norman to assist him in fending off them off.128 In contrast to Leo IV’s experiences recruiting knights to assist him, this knight agreed to help him without the offer of spiritual rewards.129 This successful exchange expanded to more examples of reciprocity, as more secular leaders who had previously seemed to lack

125. Glaber, HLQ 1.5.21, 36.
126. See chapter 3, pp. 112, 120–3.
127. Glaber, HLQ 3.1.3, 98.
128. Ibid.: “Qui, cernens eum pugne militari elegantissimum, cepit ei querelam exponere de Graecorum invasione Romani imperii…”
129. Ibid., 3.1.3, 97. Glaber also provided evidence of political obedience to the pope, such as princes’ leaving it to him to choose who would hold the office of Roman emperor. See ibid., 1.5.23, 38.
devotion to the faith or obedience to the Church sought and received aid and defense from the ecclesiastical officials. Glaber thus presented secular and clerical authorities successfully aiding each other to limit political and territorial conflicts that could harm Christians, with benefits to both sides.

Glaber described increased devotion among laymen, helping to strengthen the Church and papacy. By doing so, he highlighted a growing interest he saw among knights in achieving Christian ideals for just violence. He was optimistic at times, seeing mutually beneficial relationships between secular aristocrats and ecclesiastical officials. But his text also revealed a lingering distrust of the motives and emotions of secular leaders and knights of all ranks. God offered aid at the last minute to sinners whose pleas seemed genuine. Glaber gave such an example of divine aid, when a thief who had been caught repeatedly was about to be executed begged for mercy. After many entreaties, God responded, so “by divine will, the rope then snapped [and] he fell to earth a free man.” As seen in late antique and early medieval discussions of penance, God granted forgiveness in exchange for clear contrition, usually seen in tears. But just as early medieval conciliar rulings had described as the case with many penitents, the thief’s miraculous survival did not result in permanent changes in his behavior. According to

130. For papal aid to Fulk in a political and territorial struggle with a bishop, see ibid., 2.4.6, 60–2.
131. Ibid., 3.6.21, 128.
132. Ibid., 3.6.21, 130: “Tunc nutu divino, ruptis ligaminibus, suscepit terra solutum hominem.”
Glaber, after his escape he returned to his former crimes. If laymen known to have engaged in incorrect behaviors could return to them after receiving God's mercy, Glaber would expect them to also do so after having received aid or forgiveness from ecclesiastical officials.

Glaber's descriptions of emotion and religious devotion showed Christians to have intense religious beliefs. The decisions of religious authorities concerning violence were also shown to have affected them. Many of the emotions Glaber attributed to them reflected late antique and early medieval ideals for the control and productive use of emotion. But emotions he described among them that were triggered by violence did not. Glaber described knights’ unjust military actions and harming of innocents troubling them, he made it clear that they engaged in such activities with hope for forgiveness and continued divine and ecclesiastical aid. Their devotion in effect lessened their fears of spiritual and material suffering, while instilling in them both a fear of divine retribution and belief in divine forgiveness. Glaber saw knights eagerly participating in this complicated system of rewards and punishments by undertaking pilgrimages and donations to shrines, and building new religious foundations to reflect positively on their souls. But he did not trust that they would cease sinning if their sins were forgiven. For Glaber, the interpersonal violence and organized military activities in which they participated, including organized military conflict between neighboring landowners and within families, were fought for material goals and were consistently unjust.

134. Glaber, HLQ 3.6.21, 128.
William of Normandy’s Holy War

While Pope Alexander II (r. 1061-1073) had asked Christians to travel to the Iberian peninsula and potentially engage in violence free from the sin of homicide to defend others of their faith in 1063, that judgment of killing during an organized military activity would be difficult to apply to the Duke of Normandy's 1066 conquest of England.135 William of Poitiers was not present for Duke William’s conquest, but used participants’ eyewitness accounts and information he collected about the duke and his family to present the conquest as a just conflict beneficial to Christians and the Church in England.136 The author defended this invasion of England as nothing but the lawful claiming of an inheritance.137 The chaplain’s portrayal of Duke William and his men’s emotions reflects his knowledge of the mental states that aristocrats and lower-ranking knights themselves would have believed were ideal for just leaders. His use of this shared system was carefully crafted to support his goals for readers’ perception of the conflict and its participants.

William of Poitiers never attributed fear to the Duke of Normandy; indeed, the duke disdained it. On one occasion he disagreed with an ally who suggested flight from a difficult battle, but after that ally was killed in battle he proceeded to attack the enemy.

135. For Pope Alexander II’s support of military participation in Iberia, see chapter 3, pp. 160–2.

136. William of Poitiers was influenced by his classical education as well as the lives of bishops and archbishops. See William Poitiers, Gesta Guillelmi, ed. and trans. Davis and Chibnall, xx-xxi.

137. Ibid., 1.36, 57; 1.41, 68; 2.29, 150.
specifically because of his “disdaining all fear [formidinem] and shame [dedecus].”¹³⁸

The clearest expression of fear on the battlefield was flight, which in one case followed
the Norman knights and their footsoldiers being “terrified [perterriti]” by the “ferocity
[saevitia]” of their English enemies.¹³⁹ However, it was “not too shameful [pudenda] to
give way to flight” in this instance because Norman troops believed their duke was dead,
and it allowed them to gain an advantageous position against their enemy.¹⁴⁰ Though
neither the author nor the duke stated this directly, this attitude could reflect the ancient
and late antique philosophical ideal, reiterated by patristic authors, that emotions could be
disruptive and hinder humans’ actions in times of crisis.¹⁴¹

Duke Williams’ personal lack of fear provided evidence that he was a just leader
who could act without worldly, material distractions. It also proved that he was devoted
to the faith and placed trust in the pope. According to the author, before beginning his
invasion of England the duke sought approval from Pope Alexander II, and received a
banner with the pope’s blessing as a symbol of St. Peter’s support.¹⁴² Any experience or
expression of fear by the duke or his subordinates risked suggesting that they lacked
respect for papal authority, or the correct motives in their mission and faith in its justice.

¹³⁸. Ibid., 2.24, 138: “formidinem omnino dedignans aut dedecus.”
¹³⁹. Ibid., 2.17, 128: “Ecce igitur hac saevitia perterriti avertuntur.”
¹⁴⁰. Ibid., 2.17, 128: “Non ergo nimis pudenda fuga cessere”
¹⁴¹. See for example chapter 3, pp. 103–4.
¹⁴². William of Poitiers, Gesta Guillelmi, 2.3, 104.
But Duke William’s lack of fear and disdain for it among his subordinates also offered him opportunities to display another just quality in contrast, kindness toward his enemies. William of Poitiers described a Norman enemy of the duke, a relative named Guy, “shamefully [*turpissime*]” fleeing from a battlefield.\(^\text{143}\) Duke William pursued Guy’s men, but “moved by kinship, the humble submission and the wretchedness of the defeated, he did not seek out harsh vengeance.”\(^\text{144}\) In all contexts in the *Gesta Guillelmi*, both in Normandy and during the conflict in England, fear only appeared when it benefited the Normans, when those to whom it was attributed were not knights, or when its presence provided an opportunity for Duke William to act mercifully as a just leader.\(^\text{145}\)

William of Poitiers’ portrayal of Duke William of Normandy as a just leader did not preclude him from describing the duke tactically choosing whom to encourage to trust him and whom to intimidate. Both approaches strengthened his authority. When dealing with allies, his lawful, restrained behavior reduced people’s fear of him and his army. “Such was his moderation and wisdom that abundant provision was made for the soldiers and their hosts; no one was permitted to seize anything.”\(^\text{146}\) As a result, a man

\(^{143}\) Ibid. 1.9, 10.

\(^{144}\) Ibid., 12: “Motus dux consanguinitate, supplicitate, miseria victi, non acerbius uendicauit.”

\(^{145}\) The duke was not concerned when the King of France entered his territory to maintain his power in it, but according to William of Poitiers clerics and common people feared for themselves, their properties and their families. See ibid., 1.30, 46.

\(^{146}\) Ibid., 2.2, 102: “Ea illius temperantia fuit ac prudentia: militibus et hospitibus abunde sumptus ministrabatur; nemimi rapere quippiam concedebatur.”
could thus pass Duke William’s knights “without trembling [exhorrescens].”  

But among his enemies the duke was feared on account of his reputation for military prowess. William of Normandy had been so respected as a young man that news of his first arming as a knight “spread fear [metum] throughout Francia.” Much later, enemies in a castle he approached during his conflict in England saw him coming and “dismayed [perculsi] at his approach, put their trust neither in the building’s natural defenses nor fortifications, or in their numbers of men.”

Ennemy leaders sought to cause fear among others as well, but through personal, intentional acts of violence, rather than personal renown. When Alfred and Edward, the Duke of Normandy's kinsmen and heirs to the English throne journeyed to England to claim their inheritance from King Harold Godwinson (circa 1022–1066), the king imprisoned Alfred, executed some his men, and then ordered him to be blinded and exiled. According to William of Poitiers “he intended to entirely frighten away

147. Ibid.: “militum cernens non exhorrescens.”

148. Ibid., “qui rumor metum Franciae detulit omni.”

149. Ibid., 2.28, 144: “At eius propinquitate Angli perculsi, neque naturae vel operis munimento, neque multitudini virorum confidunt.”

150. Ibid., 1.3, 4. For Alfred and Edward’s connections to Duke William and his family, see ibid. 1.1, 2–2, 4. For the punishment of blinding as more just than execution, see Geneviève Bührer-Thierry, “‘Just Anger’ or ‘Vengeful Anger’? The Punishment of Blinding in the Early Medieval West,” in Anger’s Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages, ed. Barbara H. Rosenwein (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 75–91.
Edward with the sufferings of his brother.”\(^{151}\) He was not successful, however – William of Poitiers attributed no fear to Edward.

Duke William of Normandy and his subordinates all prized courage on the battlefield. The duke worked to actively inspire bravery among his troops, in speeches and displays of personal courage. On one occasion when his men seemed to falter, he “urges on the enterprise, gives orders, encourages [hortatur], strengthens [confirmat] those lacking in confidence [diffidentes] and promises a happy [laetum] outcome.”\(^{152}\) On another, when men were about to flee, he jumped in front of them, lifted off his helmet, and reminded them that God would aid him.\(^{153}\) As a result, the men “recovered their spirits/courage [animos]."\(^{154}\) The duke’s motivational speeches, potentially at the expense of his own safety, provided further evidence that he was a just leader.\(^{155}\)

Duke William of Normandy’s encouragement to his subordinate knights was closely linked to the idea that successful battles, and the bravery needed to achieve them, were necessary for them to gain or maintain honorable reputations. The duke reminded his men of their biblical and regional ancestors’ reputations as well as their own past

\(^{151}\) William of Poitiers, *Gesta Guillelmi* 1.3, 4: “Edwardum omnino abstere intendebat germani calamitatibus.”

\(^{152}\) Ibid. 1.40, 66: “urget incœptum, praecipit, hortatur, confirmat diffidentes, laetum exitum pollicetur.”

\(^{153}\) Ibid., 2.18, 130.

\(^{154}\) Ibid.: “recepœrunt animos.”

\(^{155}\) See chapter 3, pp. 93–5, 132–5.
military successes to encourage them to continue fighting.\textsuperscript{156} This idealization of biblical and historical successes in maintaining peace or achievements in military conflicts already had a long tradition in Christian history.\textsuperscript{157}

But as presented by William of Poitiers, the desire to earn and maintain a reputation comparable to their ancestors risked inspiring condemnable motives among the duke’s knights. He described Duke William leaving men to guard one location, but “influenced by the hope of memorable deeds” they set up an ambush for their opponents rather than just securing the area.\textsuperscript{158} As a result, “many of the less cautious [\textit{cauti}] of these forces were captured.”\textsuperscript{159} The ambush, a display of pride in their own military accomplishments and unjust love of war was thus duly punished.\textsuperscript{160} Past military successes strengthened courage, but the desire for too many was dangerous.

William of Poitiers described Duke William of Normandy’s reign and successes in England bringing joy to his subordinates there and in Normandy, but never to the duke himself. This was certainly a careful approach, by the author, to insure that the victorious duke would not be accused of enjoying bloodshed.\textsuperscript{161} This was necessary, since victories that were joyful to the Norman knights included, for example, the final, victorious battle

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{156} See for example William of Poitiers, \textit{Gesta Guillelmi} 2.15, 124-126.
\textsuperscript{157} See chapter 3, pp. 96–7, 98–9, 121–2.
\textsuperscript{158} William of Poitiers, \textit{Gesta Guillelmi} 1.26, 38: “Adducti in spem memorandi facinoris.”
\textsuperscript{159} Ibid., 40: "numerosa pars minus cauti excipiuntur."
\textsuperscript{160} See chapter 3, pp. 94–6, 136–7.
\textsuperscript{161} See chapter 3, pp. 106–8.
\end{flushright}
in which they had seized, looted, and burned a castle. His knights’ “spirits exulting [exultantes animos]” as they achieved the victory, “shouted with joy to one another [gratulantem clamorem]” as they took possession of the building.\textsuperscript{162} That this victory secured the kingship for duke William brought joy to all of Normandy. “No happier [laetior] day ever dawned on her than that on which she learned for certain that her leader, to whom she owed he peaceful condition, was a king.”\textsuperscript{163} The duke and his knights’ joy at a military victory risked condemnation.\textsuperscript{164} But that the duke’s achievement of such goals in the field contributed to his desire for peace and safety placed this experience of joy in line with patristic ideals.\textsuperscript{165}

Duke William’s subordinates in Normandy sought peace and safety on earth. William of Poitiers described both the duke’s military reputation and history as a just leader supporting the belief that he could bring them this security. The author described the duke’s arming as a warrior when a young man, which had caused fear in his enemies, as “the most festive joy [gaudium] in the highest degree for all who desired peace and justice.”\textsuperscript{166} William of Poitiers’ offered this example as evidence of Duke William’s

\begin{enumerate}
\item[162.] William of Poitiers, \textit{Gesta Guillelmi} 1.40, 66: “Normanni alacerrime concurrunt, exultantes animos et gratulantem clamorem pariter tollentes, certatim irrumpunt, potenter munitione potiuntur.”
\item[163.] Ibid., 2.32, 154: “Nullus unquam illuxit ei dies laetior, quam cum certo rescivit principem suum, auctorem sui quieti status, regem esse.”
\item[164.] See chapter 3, p. 107–8
\item[165.] See chapter 3, pp. 108–9, 111–2.
\item[166.] William of Poitiers, \textit{Gesta Guillelmi} 1.6, 6: “Illuxit tandem gaudium festivissimum summe cunctis, qui pacem et iustitiam desiderabant.”
\end{enumerate}
identity as a legitimate, just authority, serving as a foundation for the joyful peace and
security he was described as bringing to his subjects. The author then described him
living up to this role in his protection of churches, defense of the weak, imposition of fair
laws, equitable justice, and prohibition of unnecessary violence.\footnote{167}

According to the patristic standards that had first defined violence that was free
from sin, the bar that early medieval clerics had set through their idealization in
Carolingian rule and the peace and truce of God councils, it was clear that Duke William
was a just, loving leader.\footnote{168} In fact, joy at the duke’s accomplishments was so widespread
that the emotion was even feigned by former enemies to prevent further violence. When
men over whom he had achieved victory met him to agree to swear obedience “they
assume smiling [\textit{hilares}] faces and cheerful [\textit{laetas}] voices to applaud him.”\footnote{169} This
example of enemies’ dishonest display of emotion highlighted moral differences between
the two sides of the conflict.

The author made it clear that the heroes of his chronicle, unlike their enemies,
were experiencing and expressing emotion according to theological and juridical
standards for correct behavior. These differences were seen clearly in William of
Poitiers’ account of the behavior of Earl Godwinson when Edward and Alfred came to
England to claim Alfred’s inheritance. As stated previously, he tortured Alfred to cause
fear in Edward. But according to William he also did this because he “delighted

\footnote{167. Ibid., 1.6, 8.}

\footnote{168. See chapter 3, pp. 93–6, 129–30, 134–7, 149–53.}

\footnote{169. William of Poitiers, \textit{Gesta Guillelmi} 1.38, 62: “Fingunt hilares vultus, laetas voices, plausus congratulantes.”}
[delectabat] in making his enemy’s life being more painful than death;” the “undeserved tribulations of Alfred brought joy [gaudium]” to him.\textsuperscript{170} That Godwinson enjoyed torturing Alfred to lessen Edward’s military involvement was clear evidence that he was not a just leader. He deserved disciplinary violence from a just authority.

In contrast to joy, William of Poitiers rarely portrayed sorrow among Duke William of Normandy and his subordinates. The descriptions of their sorrow he did include, however, were more compatible with patristic and early medieval juridical ideals than their joy had been. While the duke and his men were not described experiencing and expressing sorrow over the need to engage in warfare, they did experience and express the emotion for the suffering of both elite allies and enemies.\textsuperscript{171} This was, after all, according to Augustine the humiliation of the vanquished by divine judgment.\textsuperscript{172} For example, William of Poitiers described the loss of a Norman enemy’s army to Duke William as “a sad [triste] spectacle, a miserable death.”\textsuperscript{173} This loss was considered especially worthy of sorrow since the losers had recently been so renowned.\textsuperscript{174}

William of Poitiers’ descriptions of the duke and his subordinates’ expressions of sorrow for those they defeated in battle served a clear political purpose. Such sorrow insulted the formerly renowned vanquished, and provide a positive portrayal of the

\textsuperscript{170} Ibid., 1.3, 4: “Delectabat ipsum vita inimici gravior morte.” Ibid., 1.4, 6: “Alveradi indignissimae aerumnae tibi improbissimo gaudium.”

\textsuperscript{171} Ibid., 1.44, 5.

\textsuperscript{172} See chapter 3, pp. 107–8.

\textsuperscript{173} William of Poitiers, \textit{Gesta Guillelmi} 1.27, 40: “Spectaculum triste, letum miserabile.”

\textsuperscript{174} Ibid., 1.27, 40.
victors as just and actively devoted to their faith. As Duke William and his supporters
were reported to have commented on their enemies’ loss, “Through pious victory,
weeping [lachrimato] for your downfall, we pity [miseramur] and mourn [plangimus]
you.” According to early medieval penitential standards, such tears suggested honest
contrition for their victory or sins in battle, though such contrition would have been
meaningless if the war continued. But even if the tears were ineffectual, sorrow for the
suffering of this vanquished enemy highlighted the humility of the victors and their
desire, as just knights, to defend the weak. As presented by William of Poitiers, the
duke’s sorrow for his enemies provided further evidence that he would follow the humble
and generous model of just lordship provided by his ancestors.

In his defense and justification of Duke William's invasion of England, William
of Poitiers portrayed the duke with intense devotion to his faith and loyalty to the papacy.
This was necessary, the author explained, to counter possible misinterpretations and
intentional distortions of the duke and his deeds. Pope Alexander II granted his papal
banner in support of the mission when the duke sought it, but unlike his discussion of the
military efforts on the Iberian Peninsula he did not suggest that those who participated

175. Ibid., 2.25, 140: “cum pio victore, tuam ruinam lachrimato, miseramur et plangimus
te.”
176. See chapter 3, pp. 119–22.
178. William of Poitiers, Gesta Guillelmi 1.47, 78.
179. Ibid., 1.36, 578.
could be free from the sin of homicide. But even without a papal grant of the remission of sins, the pope’s approval was his public statement that this military effort was a just act. That it was undertaken in response to the theft of the duke’s inheritance, and to achieve peace, would leave its participants free from guilt for the sin of homicide. Such a judgment enabled the duke to “more safely and confidently attack his enemies.”

William of Poitier’s accounts of the duke’s and most of his men’s confidence in the mission thus itself provided evidence that they undertook a just war with the correct motives and bore appropriate respect for and devotion to ecclesiastical and spiritual powers.

According to the author, the duke sought to reflect his father’s and more distant ancestors’ devotion, just as he encouraged his own troops to do. He paid more attention to spiritual and divine authority than earthly politics, even while engaged in military activities, because God's kingdom was eternal and unchanging. Perhaps because of the success he had seen among his ancestors, the duke believed that those who persevered in their dedication to God would be rewarded with “crowns and palaces shining eternally with inestimable beauty in the most glorious city.” The duke attributed his territorial and political success in life to God, and hoped that greater success would come after


181. William of Poitiers, Gesta Guillelmi 2.3, 104: “confidentius ac tutius invaderet adversarium.”

182. Ibid., 1.47, 78.

183. Ibid.: “Diademata atque palatia inaestimabili perpetual decore satellitum suorum perseverantiae disponentem in illa gloriosissima civitate veri summique boni patria.”
death, when he could hope for eternal glory. Here his sentiment reflected a devotional ideal to which all Christians were to strive, eternal closeness to God.

While Duke William was portrayed as acting from the desire to achieve military successes in order to achieve peace, become closer to God, and to emulate his ancestors, William of Poitiers also made it clear that such devotion was spurred by fear of divine punishment. As he explained, in agreement with patristic tradition, God rewarded those who persevered in their faith but destroyed those who were “too devoted to earthly delights.”

Personal fear of God and divine vengeance provided a framework for acceptable causes for violence, which justified Christians’ own use of force against those who they believed to be sinners. The duke’s behavior was influenced, according to William of Poitiers, by his “wisely [salubriter]” remembering that he should seek to please God, “a judge [who] looks from on high on the deeds of earthly powers, and distributes mercy and punishment to each according to his desserts.” So the duke did undertake vengeance against those who harmed Christians, but “with pious [pia] restraint

184. Ibid., 2.30, 152.
187. For the unjust violence of William of Arques and Duke William’s just violence against him, see William of Poitiers, Gesta Guillelmi 1.23, 32–.25, 38.
188. Ibid., 1.25, 38: “salubriter pensans qui arbiter, quam tremendus, terrenae potestatis acta desuper prospectat, moderatae clementiae ut immoderatae saevitiae omnique meritorum qualitati sua cuique decernens.”
he always avoided slaughter unless the pressures of war or some other grave necessity compelled it.” 189

The author’s presentation of such restraint made Duke William’s behavior compatible with patristic and early medieval jurists’ ideals for participation in just warfare. The duke did not enjoy war but had to undertake it to aid his subordinates, avenge wrongs, and defend Church interests. In one case this meant opposing a relative, his uncle Archbishop Mauger, who was abusing his ecclesiastical office. 190 William of Poitiers saw this type of warfare as just not only because it was undertaken in defense of the Church but because the duke’s undertaking of such action against his own brother could have been defended as the benevolent desire to aid and correct an opponent rather than kill him. 191 The duke’s donations of wealth taken from England to churches in his territory also ensured that he would be seen as a just authority motivated by faith rather than greed. According to William of Poitiers, this was his intention in making donations so great that “the magnitude of the benefaction, always living, will not allow the memory of the benefactor to die.” 192 This portrayal of the influence of Duke William’s belief in

189. Ibid.: “pia continentiam caedem semper uitauerit, nisi bellica vi aut alia gravi necessitudine urgent.”

190. For Duke William’s relationships with abbots and bishops, see ibid., 1.51, 82. For his choice of divine love over familial affection in his conflict with his uncle, see ibid., 1.53, 86.

191. For biblical, patristic, and medieval ideals, see chapter 3, pp. 92–4, 95–6, 104–8, 111–2, 120, 135, 166.

eternal praise and rewards could offer a clear model for emulation by other aristocratic
arms bearers and their subordinates.

William of Poitiers’ descriptions of Duke William of Normandy and his
subordinates reflect his efforts to fit the conquest into the system for just wars and
motives that developed from patristic and early medieval juridical thought. But the text
suggested conflicts between the ideals necessary for the military action itself and those
who achieved victory in it to be considered just, and the experiences that informants
related to him. William of Poitiers’ belief that the duke entered into the conflict solely to
bring peace and justice to a territory that was rightfully his made it a just war. The
successful conquest brought peace and justice, and its success had the correct blend of
joy from pleasing God and sorrow for enemies. But the author could not present all who
participated in the conflict as entirely faultless.

While the duke’s actions were defensible through the influence of his religious
devotion on his motives, seen in his emotions, William of Poitiers did not present this as
the case for his subordinate knights. Their fear and sorrow were not alleviated, and their
courage and joy were not supported, solely by their faith. Duke William, who according
to William of Poitiers’ presentation was an unquestionably just leader and an
intermediary between his men, their ancestors, the Church, and God, guided their
religious devotion and emotions. Duke William’s men certainly acted out of obedience to
a just prince, laudable behavior according to early medieval conciliar law and the collections of early jurists, but were they themselves free from sin?193

Conclusion

This chapter has shown that clerical authors, whether celebrating a saint, condemning the violence of those seen as threats and praising those who were not, or defending the instigation of a military conflict by a close friend and patron, wrote with an awareness of patristic and juridical thought concerning violence and emotion. Their descriptions of emotion provided evidence for aristocrats and knights’ motives for violence so that others could praise or condemn them and their actions. Authors’ use of this approach was closely linked to their goals in portraying the aristocrats and knights about whom they wrote.

Clerical authors of narratives that described knights’ activities, and sought to provide insight into their character and motives for violence, all followed basic patristic and early medieval theorists ideas about emotion. As discussed in chapter three, Ambrose and Augustine had both seen emotions as evidence of the state of the soul. The soul had to be carefully groomed and guided to correct behavior, and emotions could be used as tools to do so. Pope Gregory I had furthered this idea, in his belief that emotions could be manipulated through rhetoric for the improvement of souls. Such rhetoric could thus influence lay Christians through sermons, but it could also influence the emotions of those who heard of or read the chronicles clerics wrote to praise or condemn armed

193. For conflicts between obedience and just motives, see chapter 2, pp. 149–50. For the need for both obedience to a just leader and just motives, later presented by Bishop Anselm II of Lucca, see chapter 3, pp. 165–8.
Christians’ behavior. The praise of deeds and mental states could encourage listeners or readers to repeat or emulate them, while their condemnation could encourage others to avoid them.

Abbot Odo of Cluny presented a hagiographical role model for knights in his De Vita Sancti Geraldi. Even if not directly influential on knights, this text was likely to have influenced the clerics who read or heard of it and shared it with their sinful parishioners. Count Gerald fit the models for spirituality, emotion, and violence found in the patristic and early medieval works by ecclesiastical officials and juridical authors that preceded Abbot Odo’s composition of his vita. Ambrose’s recommendation for spiritual and physical training was clearly seen in Gerald’s youth, in both his early skill at arms and the love of scriptural study that had been praised by both Ambrose and Augustine of Hippo. From a young age Gerald also achieved ideals that had been presented by both Ambrose and Augustine for emotional self-control and maturity, though as an adult he responded to situations that caused him to lose emotional control with flight on a few occasions. That such flight would have successfully hidden Gerald’s emotions suggests that Abbot Odo was familiar with Ambrose having condemned emotional disruptions that were intense enough to be recognized by onlookers.

Gerald’s experiences and expressions, or lack, of joy, anger, fear, courage, joy and sorrow fit well into Augustine’s greater concern for why an emotion was felt than that it was felt at all. The saint’s emotions revealed him to look entirely toward God and Christ for authority, protection and discipline. This affected how he perceived his own role in secular society, since his relationship with God both saved him from mortal fears
and drove him to act with humility, as well as to seek peace to a degree that was at times socially and economically debilitating to him in his role as a land-holding aristocrat. Odo portrayed Gerald’s efforts to support peace and justice leading him to achieve the ideals of Ambrose, Augustine and even Maxentius for how a Christian aristocrat or knight should act justly for the good of the faith. His humility placed him squarely within the Carolingian ideals for arms bearers that the legislation of peace and truce councils strove to revive. Gerald was an embodiment of the peace and truce councils’ idyllic past. But his intense fear of spiritual errors and worry about falling into them also reflected penitential and early juridical thought, especially the need to closely analyze one’s own and others’ states of mind and behaviors.

Odo’s *De Vita Sancti Geraldi* made it clear that Gerald was a saint whose actions aristocrats and knights should strive to emulate, but were unattainable – and even undesirable – for most laymen. Monastic author Radulphus Glaber’s *Historiarum Libri Quinque*, however, offered an often contradictory, seemingly personal mix of praise and condemnation. The knights Glaber praised fit some late antique and patristic ideals, while those he condemned displayed the faults that the author, conciliar legislation and early juridical thought had also condemned.

Glaber described a lack of expressions of fear in military conflicts among the aristocratic knights. This seemed to more often result from their pride in their military abilities than their trust in divine support, as Gerald had enjoyed. But when fear seemed likely to be experienced, for example when losing a battle, these knights did turn to prayer. Despite this, Glaber described military leaders as being more effective than
preaching clerics in encouraging bravery among knights. Their military reputations and
ability to intimidate their men gave more authority to their admonitions to avoid
cowardly acts such as flight than clerics’ references to personal or divine gratitude and
spiritual rewards after death. This had been the case among the heretics, whose beliefs
could not strengthen their courage to face execution in peace as well as those of Catholic
knights in battle.

Lack of reliance on spiritual influences also seems to have affected Glaber’s
attributions of joy to knights. While Glaber presented lay Christians who were not
knights experiencing joy from spiritual causes such as closeness to God, often intense
enough to produce tears, knights and military leaders experienced no joy from their
military endeavors. But lay Christians who were not knights did experience joy at the
sight of the suffering and death of an enemy. The enemy’s death came at the hands of
members of his own community and seemed to have been an expression of divine
vengeance enabled by a demon, however, and was not the work of a Christian knight.

Attributions of sorrow to knights were also rare. Glaber’s examples of its
occurrences linked it to material losses, spiritual threats, and helplessness in the face of
perceived injustices. Deaths that were prayed for as a way to move closer to God or the
saints had brought joy, but all other deaths that were not intentionally sought brought
sorrow and the shedding of tears. This emotional state and its display were products of
feelings of helplessness. The tears and sorrow of the parents of a young man and the
monks of Glaber’s monastery who were told of the story, including the author, were
products of feelings of helplessness. The only action available to those who experienced
this loss was to give voice to their suffering, to cry out to God. A king’s tears and sorrow, and fear, over the spiritual safety of his subjects after heresy was discovered, also suggested the same sense of helplessness. The sorrow Glaber attributed to the king, however, also showed that he was a just leader and concerned for his subordinates’ spiritual well being.

Glaber described experiences of joy and sorrow in ways that supported those who had them being recognized as just knights or leaders, but his attributions of anger to Christians provided examples of the combination of condemned and justifiable emotions. Anger could be used productively to drive others’ to action, but experiences of anger from unjust causes made it likely that its expression would be unjust as well. Christians had to carefully choose which kinds of anger to permit to influence their actions, and how it should.

Throughout Glaber’s descriptions of affect among Christians he also presented the aristocrats and knights on whom he wrote displaying religious devotion in a manner comparable to Pope Gregory I’s notion of Christians as ships struggling to move upstream to spiritual success. Their devotional activities reflected their sense of being in constant spiritual danger. The fault Glaber most frequently described among knights was the consistent return to sinful behavior. Leaders and lower ranking knights’ fear of divine punishment encouraged them to undertake repeated penances and make donations to fund monasteries where monks would pray for their souls. But these men were described as ignoring the basic requirement of early jurists that a sinner had to remain

cleansed of sin to actually be forgiven. As a result, even occasionally praiseworthy knights were left in the position of Fulk of Anjou, perpetually repeating a cycle of unjust action, guilt for sin, and penance. Knights were eager to publicly express their religious devotion by making oaths in which they agreed to restrictions on violence and even their potential punishment for disobedience, but they continued to participate in unjust territorial, intra- and inter- familial conflicts with other Christians.

William of Poitiers wrote his *Gesta Guillelmi* specifically to address concerns for the sinfulness of those the text portrayed, to defend his patron’s actions. The chronicle recorded the successes of a victorious military leader, which were worthy of recording on their own. But the duke and his men’s warfare had to be just, according to juridical standards, to prevent future episcopal condemnations. Emotions were thus carefully attributed to highlight Duke William's justness and religious devotion in contrast to his enemies.

Descriptions of expressions of fear were instrumental in presenting Duke William’s devotion to the faith. That the duke had no material fears and expressed no fears related to battles can be seen as evidence of his devotion to the faith and the pope. Prior to war he had sought and received papal support for his mission and protection, in the form of a papal banner. But unlike the duke himself some of his troops did occasionally experience fear. In a time of crisis he was able to reassure them that they should have no fear because God would aid him. But any expression of fear of loss in battle by the duke may have suggested a lack of devotion to the faith or loyalty to the pope. In fact, any expressions of fear by the duke’s forces would have had a negative
connotation. Since the duke had assured them of the divine aid he would receive, fear would mean a lack of trust in him as well as religious devotion.

William of Poitiers did describe Duke William productively using the only type of fear he experienced, fear of God. He feared the divine vengeance he saw enacted on others, and that he believed he was helping God to carry out. This fear fueled his just behavior, including restraint of his violence in conflicts, kindness to allies and to enemies who fled, and general efforts as a just leader to maintain peace and security for his subordinates and to aid the Church. But there was no prohibition against a just leader using his enemies’ fears to his own advantage. Duke William’s military abilities frightened his enemies, just as they brought his subjects joy. His justness as a leader was shown in this, especially when compared to unjust enemies who enjoyed causing suffering and fear to all.

Though Duke William is described as a just leader, his knights do not always act consistently as just warriors. For example, besides fighting to secure land that had been unjustly denied to him, William of Poitiers also described Duke William and his men seeking victories to strengthen their reputations. They were told to live up to their ancestors’ reputations, as well as those of biblical role models. As the author explained, such behavior drove the men to hasty actions and to use less caution than needed. Such behavior suggested pride in military accomplishments in themselves and a love of war. According to William of Poitiers’ narrative, the duke’s men incurred a loss as punishment for their unjust behavior. More often, however, the duke's military subordinates enjoyed military successes under his leadership, because of the joy they experienced from
securing peace. The joy that his knights expressed from victories themselves, however, risked condemnation as love of war itself.

Like fear, joy was an emotion that could reveal the justness of those who experienced it. As a just ruler, Duke William brought joy to his political subjects and military subordinates. In his efforts to avoid unnecessary violence he offered his enemies peace after his successes in battle. To accept this peace and avoid any additional condemnation his enemies feigned happiness at the “peace” he had brought to them. William of Poitiers’ demonstrated distrust of enemies’ emotions as proof of their motives. How could peace be made with enemies if those who saw and spoke with them could not read their states of mind? More disturbing to the author, however, may have been the idea that they did experience joy from entirely unjust causes. An enemy leader’s enjoyment of needlessly torturing his enemies was further proof of how he, and thus all his men, differed from Duke William and his forces.

William of Poitiers further demonstrated that Duke William was a just leader in his attributions of sorrow to him. He never expressed sorrow over the war he was undertaking, because it was necessary to oppose unjust enemies. But the duke did experience and express sorrow verbally as well as through tears for others’ suffering. This even occurred in cases when their military loss and injury could be seen as the divine judgment of an unjust enemy. Such expressions of sorrow, especially since the intensity of the sorrow depended on the renown of the enemy, were expressions of humility for a respected military leader. But for a devoted Christian, the tears were evidence of internal contrition that could help cleanse a killer of guilt for sin. Such tears
were ineffectual if more homicides were committed, but they still presented the duke as a just, devoted Christian leader.

Above all, William of Poitiers described Duke William as a just leader undertaking the conflict out of religious devotion. Just as he encouraged his knights to achieve their ancestors’ level of bravery, he sought to to achieve his ancestors’ intensity of devotion. The duke's devotion was stronger than that of his men; he, rather than faith, inspired courage in them. He was striving for closeness to God, according to patristic ideals, by undertaking a war out of devotion in order to achieve peace. But no matter how just Duke William and his subordinates’ military actions were presented, violence was still being undertaken against Christians. Only Duke William was consistently proven to be just, having personally sought papal approval and secured the blessed banner.

All of the authors discussed in this chapter described knights’ emotions as evidence for their motives for violence or non-violence, according to the developing system of juridical ideals. But as seen here, in cases of actual violence these ideals and method of proof were difficult to apply with certainty if the justness of conflicts themselves and their participants could be questioned. What would have happened if Gerald of Aurillac had shed blood while seeking closeness to God? If Count Fulk of Anjou had engaged in organized military action while on pilgrimage? Or if Duke William’s knights had been granted forgiveness of sins and the promise of martyrdom in exchange for just behavior in the field? The next chapter will discuss juridical collections composed right before the First Crusade that attempted to offer new paths to the undertaking of just war, and Pope Urban II’s recruitment to that assuredly just conflict.
CHAPTER FIVE
CREATING THE CRUSADER

By the second half of the eleventh century, popes and other ecclesiastical leaders sought aid from knights with increasing frequency. Those leaders and juridical theorists had come to accept some types of organized violence and those who engaged in it, while continuing to condemn others. Knights’ motives remained key to the judgment of their actions, but conflicts themselves posed a challenge. Only a military expedition organized by the pope or a secular leader with papal support could be assuredly just. Its participants, fighting according to ecclesiastically approved motives, would be not only free from the sin of homicide but could deserve spiritual rewards. But efforts by Popes Leo IV, Alexander II and Gregory VII to recruit participants for such conflicts had not met overwhelming success, while ecclesiastical councils condemned secular conflicts between Christians and those who participated in them even if they had papal approval. Clarifications of, and consistency in, juridical thought concerning violence and the judgment of those who participated in it would be necessary for popes to successfully recruit knights to their defense, as well as to maintain politically valuable relationships with Europe’s ruling aristocrats and monarchs.

This chapter will examine ecclesiastical officials’ and jurists’ efforts to meet this challenge in new collections of juridical thought in the last decades of the eleventh century. I argue that Pope Urban II’s understanding and presentation of the 1095
expedition to the East should be seen in the context of this direction of jurists’ thought, as well as having been shaped by the widely recognized influence of biblical exegesis and patristic thought. The pope will be seen to have introduced the expedition as a just war and presented motives that were clearly expected to drive knightly participation. This chapter will show that while emotions themselves did not figure prominently in the pope’s sermon, he presented clear links between the motives he expected to drive knights' participation and the emotions he believed they could expect to experience in the field. If emotions were to be seen as evidence of motives for action, there would be no questions concerning crusaders’ voluntas and motus in this assuredly just war.


2. For Augustine’s concepts of motus and voluntas, see chapter 3, pp. 103–4. The Latin term closest to the modern concept of “crusade” is crucesignatus, referring to crusade participants as “signed with the cross.” This term was used to distinguish crusaders from other pilgrims. But neither the term, nor the cross, was used exclusively to identify those who participated in armed expeditions to the East until the end of the twelfth century. See Michael Markowski, “Crucesignatus: Its Origins and Early Usage,” Journal of Medieval History 10 (1984): 157–65; Christopher Tyerman, “Were There Any Crusades in the Twelfth Century?” English Historical Review 110 (1995): 575; Jonathan Riley-Smith, “The Idea of Crusading in the Characters of the Early Crusaders,” in Le concile de Clermont de 1095 et l’appel à la croisade (Rome: Publications de l’Ecole Française de Rome, 1997), 157–9; Christoph T. Maier, Crusade Propaganda and Ideology: Model Sermons for the Preaching of the Cross (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 52–54; Giles Constable, "Historiography of the Crusades," in Crusaders and
The Purpose of Christians’ Participation in Military Action

Collections of juridical thought composed in the last decades of the eleventh century addressed the contradictions in attitudes toward violence that ecclesiastical authorities and jurists had found difficult to reconcile. These texts do not present a sharp divergence in thought from prior works, but rather reflect authors’ increasing focus on the construction and defense of straightforward arguments using a diverse range of authorities. Their justification of organized military actions undertaken for ecclesiastically approved purposes placed even greater importance on knights’ motives than had been seen in the works of earlier thinkers. Armed men would be told that it was their responsibility to engage in any violence only for the good of the Christian community, purely out of a desire to aid it, and that this motive could be as clear through their expressions of emotion as their desire to gain forgiveness for their sins.

Ideals for Christian Knights

Bishop Bonizo of Sutri (c. 1045–1095) was a prolific author, and one of the most outspoken defenders of both eleventh-century ecclesiastical and papal reform, and the use of violence in the service of the church. Little is known of Bonizo’s life before his time

_Crusading in the 12th Century_ (Burlington: Ashgate, 2008), 11. Until the term _crozada_ began to irregularly appear in Spain and southwestern France in the early thirteenth century, an expedition to the East to recover Christians’ territory and defend holy land was known as a _peregrinatio, iter, via, expeditio, or later, passagium_. See Constable, “Historiography of the Crusades,” 11–2.

as bishop of Sutri (c. 1074–1082), and then bishop of Piacenza (c. 1088-1089) through election by the anti-simony Patarene reformers.\(^4\) Two of his texts, the *Liber ad amicum*, c. 1086, and the *Liber de vita christiana*, written c. 1090, provided new justifications for ecclesiastical involvement in armed conflicts and knights’ participation in them, likely influencing Pope Urban II’s support of the First Crusade in 1095.\(^5\)

Historians have considered the *Liber ad amicum* to be a clearly polemical text.\(^6\) The *Liber de vita christiana*, however, has been seen as a canonical collection comparable to those of Bishop Anselm II of Lucca and other authors, albeit directly reflecting Bonizo’s own experiences.\(^7\) But John A. Dempsey stresses that both works, as well as other eleventh century juridical collections, should be seen as polemical responses to the ecclesio-political struggles going on around them rather than purely academic

---


5. Novikoff, “Licit and Illicit,” 189, 194. According to Ian S. Robinson, the *Liber de vita christiana* was the most widely disseminated of the bishop’s works, but only seven manuscripts of the entire text survive, dating from the mid-12th through 15th century. See Robinson, *Papal Reform*, 43. For extant manuscripts, see Kéry, *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages*, 234–5.

6. For the *Liber de amicum* as a polemical text and the *Liber de vita christiana* as canonical, see Glass, “The Bishops of Piacenza,” 223; Novikoff, “Licit and Illicit,” 188–9, 194; Robinson, *Papal Reform*, 41.

treatises. Bonizo’s attitude toward violence in both was strongly influenced by his knowledge of or personal experience in contentious papal elections; papal and ecclesiastical reform efforts; internal conflicts between ecclesiastical leaders; and papal struggles with secular leaders over lay investiture.

To address the need he saw to defend the Church and the Catholic faith itself, Bonizo’s *Liber ad Amicum* introduced the question of whether or not it was acceptable for a Christian to engage in violence for this purpose. He used biblical evidence and a lengthy, carefully constructed chronology of Church history through his own time to prove that it was permitted. The experiences of the earliest Christians showed that the opportunity to suffer with and follow a leader into danger for the good of one’s soul was not to be lamented but seen as an honor worthy of rejoicing. Imitating Christ should


9. For the influence of these contexts, including his involvement in Church reform as a Patarene, personal injuries during ecclesiastical struggles with Guibertines, and papal relations with secular leaders such as Countess Mathilda of Tuscany, on the attitudes toward violence found in both the *Liber ad Amicum* and *Liber de vita christiana*, see Dempsey, “Holy War to Patient Endurance,” 216-21, 234, 239, 251. For the *De vita christiana* as a vehicle for Bonizo’s condemnation of the countess by declaring all military leadership by women to be counter to divine law, see David Hay, “Canon Laws regarding Female Military Commanders up to the Time of Gratian: Some Texts and Their Historical Contexts,” in *A Great Effusion of Blood? Interpreting Medieval Violence*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 287–313.


free believers from fear of death, as it ensured that they would, like him, sit at God’s side after death. Christian Roman emperors who followed this path had successfully governed their Empire in peace. But Roman emperors’ disobedience resulted in the Empire suffering divine wrath through barbarian invasions.

Bonizo presented contemporaneous Christian leaders as having a responsibility to lead forces to oppose internal or external enemies of the faith, following in the footsteps of Christian Roman emperors. All other Christians should follow them to war. Knights were not to be condemned for their actions to aid the faith, since their sacrifices in the field were as beneficial as those of other laymen at home for their communities or the Church. Recalling an argument that had been made by Maximus of Turin (d. c. 408–23) among others, to encourage knights to avoid spoils, Bonizo further defended knights’ ability to undertake military service, comparing them to ancient soldiers that God asked to “serve as soldiers content [contenti] with their stipend.” Bonizo encouraged knights to avoid self-aggrandizement in the field through looting, as well as by building

16. Bonizo, Liber ad amicum 9, 618; Book of Bonizo, 258.
reputations for their military skills. But since Christ had healed soldiers no less than others, they could return to the army after baptism and serve both an earthly and heavenly king for the sake of justice. “You should not think it is not possible,” Bonizo wrote, “to please God in military armor.” Therefore, Bonizo concluded, “let the most glorious knights of God fight for truth and strive for the sake of justice, but fight in their souls against the heresy that exalts itself against God.” Knights were to bear arms in service to a just earthly leader, but were also to wage internal warfare against distractions from their correct devotion to God and the faith.

Besides examining elements of the Christian faith such as sin and penance that figured prominently in other collections of canon law, Bonizo's *Liber de vita christiana* discussed the proper role of knights and other lay Christians. Just as in other collections, its canons were selected to fit the author’s primary political, social, or reform concerns. In his discussions of sin, for example, Bonizo made it clear that ecclesiastical

---


22. Glass, “The Bishops of Piacenza,” 223; Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, 319. Bishop Bonizo also discussed the roles of other laymen identified by their professions, such as merchants, craftsmen, and farmers.
officials at all levels had to strive to live blamelessly. Evil men were everywhere inside and outside the Church, opposed only by God and those who were able to aid him. This collection was intended to help clerics deal with spiritual threats to their flocks and themselves.

Bonizo provided clear advice for both spiritual and earthly behavior in his discussion of Christian knights. For Alex Novikoff, Bonizo’s portrayal of knights can be understood to formalize the secular responsibilities of Christian knights as a distinct class of laymen. According to Tomaz Mastnak, this is one of the first examples of ecclesiastical recognition of Roman and Germanic warriors’ ethical systems. This presentation of ecclesiastical expectations for Christian knights’ professional and religious behavior only five years prior to Council of Clermont (1095) can be linked to the idea of a growth in piety among knights directly before the First Crusade. Marcus Graham Bull has shown this growth to have been crucial to its appeal and the success of Pope Urban II’s call for the liberation of Jerusalem.

Bonizo saw devout knights as able to stand beside and assist clerics in achieving a


24. For example, ibid. 1.27–.28, 26.


church that would be free from threats and heresies, and able to achieve doctrinal goals.  

Knights would please God through their willingness to give their own lives to protect their lords; to fight for the good of the community; to suppress heretics and schismatics; to defend widows and the poor; to refrain from violating the faith; swearing falsely to their earthly or heavenly lords; or seizing booty.  

Martyrdom for the faith for these reasons was a way to gain forgiveness of sins, alongside charity, love of God, and love and forgiveness of fellow Christians.

If knights killed while fulfilling these requirements for obedience and refraining from sin, they were described as having acting in God’s service and thus were not guilty of the sin of homicide.  

Citing Augustine, Bonizo stressed that killing violators of divine law was simply carrying out God’s judgment.  

But if knights did not act out of the desire to assist the Church or please God – killed without a superiors’ official judgment that a crime or sacrilege had been committed – they would be both guilty of the sin of homicide and superfluous to the Christian faith.  

These ideals for knights’ behavior and military

---
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activity highlight Bonizo’s and others’ belief in the need for knights’ obedience and loyalty to their superiors, whether secular or religious. As Tomaz Mastnak observed, they believed that “without such obedience society would surely collapse.”

In Bonizo’s texts, God or Christ was recognized as the legitimate authority by and for whom just wars could be waged, enabled by the pope and papally approved secular leaders. Since a knight’s personal loyalty to his military leader – now his dedication to the faith – was the basis for his actions being acceptable to society, even greater pressure was placed on his inner disposition. Knights who were obedient to their military leader out of religious devotion could only wage just wars. Through his selection of canons embodying these ideas, and the explanations he offered in his own commentaries, Bonizo organized and clarified ideas that juridical authors and councils had been developing and discussing since the end of the Western Roman Empire.

**Ideals for Christian Warfare**

Bishop Ivo of Chartres (1040-1115) also lived through an age of dramatic reforms, including changes in papal authority in relation to secular leaders, and the relations between monasteries and both the ecclesiastical and secular world. Little is known of Ivo’s early life, besides his birth in or near Chartres, but according to Christof Rolker his letters reveal that he became involved in many of these areas of change through his ecclesiastical career as a monk, an abbot, and finally a bishop with close
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relationships to both popes and kings. Ivo’s letters, those of other authors and narrative sources, have also suggested his possible interest and involvement in the First Crusade, perhaps by influencing Pope Urban II’s (r. 1088-1099) public recruitment efforts at the Council of Clermont. The possible influences of Ivo’s juridical collections on the inception of the First Crusade, as well as later clerical accounts of knights on the expedition, support the new schema for both the dating and authorship of these collections proposed by Christof Rolker.

Since the nineteenth century historians and legal scholars have described Ivo of Chartres’ Decretum and Panormia as reflecting the first of the final steps in the development of early juridical thought into what Stephen Kuttner called the classical period of canon law, achieved with the appearance of Gratian’s Decretum (c. 1140). Ivo’s texts have been seen to set forth a system for the interpretation of juridical texts that


became central to the work of later theorists.⁴⁰ Both the Decretum and Panormia have been dated to the late-eleventh century, though as early as the sixteenth century some scholars recognized them to be very different works.⁴¹

Though they have been dated conterminously, the Decretum and Panormia are distinct in their survival rate, organization, and content. Far fewer manuscript copies of the longer Decretum have survived than of the much shorter Panormia, though the survival of smaller fragments of the former texts suggests that more copies were produced.⁴² Since the thirteenth century the Decretum has been seen primarily as a storehouse of conciliar and papal decrees from which more organized collections were later composed.⁴³ Historians have seen the Panormia, however, as the most innovative
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⁴⁰. Rolker, Canon Law, 24, 29-49, 61, 107, 248, 292-293.

⁴¹. Also see Martin Brett, “Urban II and the collections attributed to Ivo of Chartres,” 44. For the distinctions between the Decretum and the Panormia first becoming clear through the collection of manuscripts for the printing of Ivo’s Opera Omnia, 1499-1647, see Rolker, Canon Law, 31–4.

⁴². Four copies of the entire Decretum that may have been produced in the early-twelfth century have been found in Chartres, Paris, the Vatican, and London. See James Brundage, The Medieval Origins of the Legal Profession: Canonists, Civilians and Courts (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 95; Martin Brett, “Ivo, Decretum, Prefatory note,” 2–11, http://knowledge-forge.net/ivo/decretum/idecforw_1p3.html; Bruce Brasington, “Table of Panormia MSS,” 2, http://knowledge-forge.net/ivo/panormia/mslist_1p3.pdf. For a list of extant manuscripts of the Decretum and their locations, also see Lotte Kéry, Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages (c. 400–1140): A Bibliographical Guide to the Manuscripts and Literature (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1999), 250–1. According to Rolker, the Panormia included 1200 canons, and the Decretum 3760. See Rolker, Canon Law, 124. Roughly forty-five copies of the Panormia dated to before the mid-twelfth century were produced throughout France, Britain, Germany, Austria, and Italy. See Brundage, Medieval Origins, 95. For extant manuscripts of the Panormia, also see Kéry, Canonical Collections, 253–8.

⁴³. For Vincent of Beauvais’ reference to Ivo and his work in his Speculum Historiale, c. 1240, see Rolker, Canon Law, 27–9. For the Decretum as a “private preparatory work” and a “storehouse of texts,” see Hermann Wasserschleben, Beiträge zur Geschichte der vorgratianische Kirchenrechtsquellen (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1839), 60, 77; discussed in Rolker, Canon Law, 39.
and revolutionary of Ivo’s texts, as well as more innovative than other contemporaneous collections. As more Panormia manuscripts were found, scholars increasingly considered this collection a “modern,” “scholastic,” product of the emerging medieval universities.

In his efforts to examine Ivo of Chartres’ work outside of extant paradigms, Rolker has positioned the Decretum and the Panormia in the context of their author’s other texts as well as contemporaneous collections by other authors. He found that the Decretum both reflects and is reflected in Ivo’s learned correspondence, while the Panormia’s distinct elements do not appear in these other texts. Rather than representing a clear break from other works produced during the eleventh century’s dramatic growth in juridical collections, he found Decretum to have been heavily influenced by the content and organization of Burchard of Worm’s Decretum. Ivo took that collection’s form and content, and added canons from other contemporaneous collections, decretals by Popes Nicholas I (c. 800-867), John VIII (872-882), Urban II, and Roman legislation found in Justinian’s Corpus Iuris Civilis.

While many of the Panormia’s canons are also found in the Decretum, Rolker found that the versions included in the former show a break from previous collections in

44. For the tradition of seeing the Panormia as the most innovative and distinctly “Ivonian” of Ivo’s works, initially introduced by Augustin Theiner, Hermann Wasserschleben, Paul Fournier and Gabriel Le Bras in the nineteenth through early-twentieth century, see Rolker, Canon Law, 44, 46, 123.

45. Rolker, Canon Law, 40, 292.

46. Ibid., 49.

47. Ibid., 107–9.
its presentation of material. The Panormia often rearranged and shortened, and sometimes misattributed, canons it held in common with the Decretum. Each work’s selection and organization of canons can be seen to convey a distinct philosophy of law. While the Decretum included contradictory canons, presenting their differences as examples of the wide range of God’s mercy and judgment, the Panormia sought unity and coherence by omitting contradictions. As a result, the Panormia focused on simple, objective criteria for right versus wrong, just versus unjust behavior.

Differences in the content and organization of the Decretum and the Panormia led Rolker to reassess their dates of composition. Differences in their dates of composition are also suggested by the references to both texts found in other sources. The Decretum’s extant copies and references to a single great work by Ivo in other sources suggest a wide awareness of the text outside of Chartres by the early-twelfth century. But Rolker has found no references to the Panormia in other sources until the Leges Henrici Primi, compiled circa 1115, suggesting that it was most likely completed 1110-15. The new date of composition Rolker hypothesizes for the Panormia, along with its differences
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52. Ibid., 1–3, 4, 256–7, 265.
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from the *Decretum* in content and organization, support the idea that the two texts had
distinct authors. Rolker is certain of Ivo’s authorship of the *Decretum* because of clear
connections between that work and his letters and his *Prologus*, as well as other medieval
authors’ references to his having composed a single volume of canons. The *Decretum*
and *Panormia* were previously thought to represent closely related stages in Ivo’s legal
thought, or to have been composed separately by him and one of his students or peers in
Chartres. But Rolker argues that with the new date of composition for the *Panormia* it
remains possible that it originated in Chartres and was the work of one or more of Ivo’s
unnamed collaborators or students who also collected and were influenced by other
juridical law collections shortly before or soon after his death.

New attempts to establish the authorship of the *Decretum* or the *Panormia* have
had a huge impact on the history of juridical thought. After all, the structure and
methodology of the *Panormia*, not the *Decretum*, introduced the idea of an author’s
arrangement of contradictory canons guiding readers to concrete conclusions. But if the
*Panormia* is not the work of Ivo, and the *Decretum* a clear inheritor of previous
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collections and methods, scholars of canon law may consider Ivo and his work to be less innovative. To maintain Ivo’s prestige, Rolker recommends a new approach to the study of juridical thought that focuses on its position in intellectual and political history, to which we should add cultural history as well. The *Decretum* can be seen in the context of its cultural and intellectual milieu when it is discussed in relation to juridical thought prior to the First Crusade and the crusade itself.

If the *Decretum* was composed *circa* 1093-5, it would certainly share elements common to eleventh century legal collections. The possible relationship between Pope Urban II and Ivo of Chartres suggests that the pope’s call for participants in the crusade could have been influenced by the thoughts that shaped the *Decretum*, if not the collection itself. Similarly, the collection’s ideas may have influenced participant authors who wrote of knights’ experience and activities in the field immediately after the crusade, but the collection also could have influenced non-participant authors in the west who wrote during and after the crusade. Because of the immediacy of its time of composition in relation to papal recruitment for the First Crusade and the expedition itself, this text’s treatment of organized military actions and motives for violence in such contexts will be discussed here.

60. Ibid., 295, 297.

61. Ibid., 297. Also see chapter 2, pp. 28–30, 77–9.

62. For letters by Ivo of Chartres included in Urban II’s papal register, see Martin Brett, “Some New Letters of Popes Urban II and Paschal II,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 58:1 (2007): 75–96. For Ivo’s relationship with Urban II as necessary for his securing the office of Bishop of Chartres, see Rolker, *Canon Law*, 14–5. For Urban II’s potential influence on Ivo as a papal reformer, see ibid., 44. For Urban II’s knowledge of Ivo of Chartres’ expertise in theology and law, see ibid., 90.
Bishop Ivo's treatment of homicide in the *Decretum* reflected the ideas of earlier juridical texts, but he presented more clearly delineated criteria for the discernment of potential sinners’ guilt or innocence. Book 10 of this collection began by explaining that all ecclesiastical and secular laws prohibited the shedding of human blood. Throughout this book, however, Ivo presented agreement among patristic and early medieval juridical authors that such violence was permitted in certain circumstances. As had been seen in works by patristic authors and included in preceding medieval collections, violence against barbarians and thieves in defense of the weak was “full of justice.” Those who harmed evil men, whether striking them or imposing capital punishment, were acting as judges for God and embodying justice within them. Men who committed such violence in obedience to divine authority were just, even if the secular authorities they obeyed were not.

These formulations reflected the increasingly respected criteria by which violence would be judged as just or sinful. It was objectively good, just, to enact God’s will by


67. Ibid. 10.110, 48.

68. Bauer, “Ivo of Chartres, the Gregorian Reform,” 46.
opposing people or things that were objectively evil. According to Dominique Bauer, ecclesiastical reformers’ advocacy of the need for secular leaders – with papal support – to regulate the social order, contributed to the growth of this objective legal system in the late eleventh century. According to Daniel Baraz, objective legal systems organized actions into consistent categories, in which actions are judged according to one uniform measure without regard for the context in which they occurred or actors’ and observers’ personal perspectives. Divine will had long been respected as the unifying legal force that was free from all subjective, mortal influences. This was strengthened by the institutional Church coming to be seen as an embodiment of the transcendent Church, and the growth in papal secular authority. But even as objective law gained in strength, subjective law, in which judgments were based on individual's motives and intent, remained a driving force behind the defining of a conflict as just.

Ivo found legal material pertinent to subjective law in patristic works, especially those of Augustine. Citing Augustine’s letter to Publicola, he explained that while

69. Ibid., 51.

70. The development of objective law and the juridical subject, the individual as an actor who participated in objective law, were the first stage of the twelfth-century Renaissance's changes in the study of and attitudes toward human enterprise. See Dominique Bauer, “The Twelfth Century and the Emergence of the Juridical Subject,” Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung (2004): 208–9; 217, 220.


73. Ibid., 218; and idem, “Ivo of Chartres, the Gregorian Reform,” 49.
Christians were not permitted to kill in self-defense, a soldier could do so in defense of others if lawfully given that authority by higher official.74 To serve in the military and follow such orders was not a source of sin as long a knight did not act out of a personal desire to kill, hatred, greed, for the sake of personal enrichment or plunder, or because he favored a secular lord over God.75 Christians’ ideal motives for undertaking war, and the states of mind that could reflect them, were shown in another example from Augustine, his letter to Marcellinus, also seen in Anselm II of Lucca’s Collectio canonum.76 “If this earthly republic guards Christian precepts, not waging wars without benevolence [benevolentia], the peaceful social life of piety and justice are easily encouraged…. For if it can be done mercifully [misericorditer], even war could be carried out for the good…so that [with] licentious appetites [licentiosis cupiditatibus] tamed, defects that would destroy ought to be either eradicated or overwhelmed by a just authority.”77

Ivo offered the evidence above to explain and justify a call for aid to the papacy that Pope Leo IV (790-855) had made to Emperor Lothar (r. 817-55), in case of a Saracen

74. Ivo of Chartres, Decretum 10.1b, 1. See Augustine, “Epistula 47: Augustinus Publicolae dissolvit aliquot ex propositis quaestionibus,” in PL 33, col. 184–7. Also see Ivo, Decretum, 10.98, 42.

75. Ibid. 10.120, 51; 10.122, 5; 10.125, 52; 110.152, 62.


77. Ivo of Chartres, Decretum 10.107, 45–6: “Si terrena ista respublica precepta Christiana custodiat, et ipsa bella sine benevolentia non gerentur, ut ad pietatis iustitieque pacatam societatem victis facilius consoletur…Misericorditer enim si fieri posset, etiam bella gerentur a bonis, ut, licentiosis cupiditatibus domitis, hec vitia perderentur, que iusto imperio vel extirpari vel premi debuerunt.
invasion in central Italy. Since God would recognize those who died for the faith, the salvation of their homeland, and defense of fellow Christians, “after putting aside fear [timore] and terror [terrore],” Christian knights were to “be zealous [studete] to act manfully [or with courage] [viriliter] against enemies of the holy faith and adversaries of all regions.”

“For the Almighty knows that if anyone of yours shall die, he died for the truth of faith, the salvation of the country and to defend Christians, [and] for that reason will win a reward from him.” But as Ivo found by using more evidence from Augustine, even before any lives were sacrificed God would observe how they conducted themselves in the field to ensure that their actions were free from sin.

In previous juridical collections, clerics’ concerns for knights’ guilt for sin had led authors to turn to the practice of penance, as Ivo did in Decretum, Book 15. His belief that repentance was an internal state of mind for the sinner, visible in its external display, was clear from the beginning of Decretum 15. He included Pope Gregory I’s support of tears as spiritually cleansing, calling on the penitent “to weep for the sins of the past, and

78. See Bachrach, Religion, 42–3. For the recipient of Pope Leo IV’s letter also being listed as Emperor Louis in different editions of Ivo’s Decretum, see Decretum 10.84, 38 n. 2. For Leo IV’s letters, also discussed above in chapter 3, pp. 139–41. See “Epistola 28,” MGH Epistolae 5, 601.12–20.

79. Ibid. 10.87, 38: “Omni timore ac terrore deposito, contra inimicos sancte fidei et adversarios omnium regionum viriliter agere studete.”

80. Ibid. 10.87, 39: “Omnium vestrum nosse volumus caritatem, quoniam quisquis (quod non optantes dicimus) in hoc belli certamine fideliter mortuus fuerit, regna illi celestia minime negabuntur. Novit enim omnipotens, si quislibet vestrorum morietur, quod pro veritate fidei et salvacione patrie ac defensione Christianorum mortuus est, ideo ab eo pretitulatum premium consequetur.”

81. Ibid. 10.109, 47. See Augustine, De moderate coercendis haereticis: ad Bonifacium comitem epistola, in qua praxin Ecclesiae ostendit (Holmis: Enaeus, 1696).
to not permit any [more] by lamenting.”

He also presented this idea from the seventh century *De Penitentiali Theodori*, which he used frequently as evidence of sinners’ need to undertake confession and penance to gain forgiveness. Here it provided evidence that sinners needed to display personal awareness of their guilt and desire for forgiveness through their experience and expression of emotion. For example, “no priest or bishop can heal the wounds of sins, or take away the sins of their souls, except through excellent care and tearful [lacrimarum] prayer.” Tears were necessary to cleanse the soul of capital crimes.

Bishop Ivo demonstrated that in the early history of the faith internal states were held to be more important for forgiveness than an organized, ecclesiastically overseen penitential system. His use of evidence made it clear that he believed such states to be vital for penance, but that the involvement of ecclesiastical officials of all ranks was also necessary. Sinners’ recognition of personal guilt may was needed for them to start the process of penance, but by the time Ivo wrote there were penitential systems in place that he and other juridical authors required also be respected. A combination of subjective and objective requirements for penance was thus necessary for sinners to gain forgiveness.

---

82. Ivo of Chartres, *Decretum* 15.1, 1, http://project.knowledgeforge.net/ivo/decretum.html/ivodec_15_1p4.pdf: “Penitentia est peccata preterita deflere, et deflenda non admittere.” For Gregory I’s references to weeping as evidence of contrition and sorrow, which were necessary for forgiveness, see for example Gregory, *Regula*, 3.30.93–94, 104; 3.30.97; 3.30.102, discussed in chapter 3, p. 123.

83. Ibid. 15.51, 16: “Ita quoque nullus sacerdotum vel pontifex peccatorum vulnera curare potest, aut animabus peccata auferre, nisi prestante sollicitudine et oratione lacrimarum.”

84. Ibid. 15.201, 60.

85. Ibid. 15.108, 36.
Ivo provided ample evidence that by the late-eleventh century sinners were required to perform specific acts as evidence of their realization of guilt and the efforts they were willing to undertake to gain divine forgiveness. Homicide was one of the most serious sins, for which sinners were required to undertake the longest and most intense penitential acts. Though in the worst cases sinners were to undertake such penance for ten years, if the guilty party was acting under another’s command penance was reduced to three years, and if the crime occurred during a public war it was further reduced to one year. Participants in organized violence undertaken for ecclesiastically acceptable reasons, in which knights were subordinate to men respected as just leaders, were treated more leniently. Confessors gave such knights lesser prescriptions for penitential acts, but penance undertaken for any length of time still restricted their freedom of movement and action. According to Ivo’s reference to the 1023 Council of Seligenstadt, a sinner was required to remain in the the location where he had made his confession and been given the order of penance until it was complete. In the case of subordinate knights, this inability to travel would limit their ability to fulfill military

---

86. Some of the authors and sources to whom Bishop Ivo referred, besides a number of popes and accounts of church councils, included Augustine, Bede (673-735), Bishop Theodore of Canterbury (r. 668-90), Bishop Halitgar of Cambrai (r. 817-31), and Bishop Fulbert of Chartres (r. 1006-28). Bishop Fulbert’s Poenitentiale Fulberti was a common text in monasteries for the administration of penance and cura animarum while Ivo was living in monasteries and after he gained his episcopal office. Fulbert may have been responsible for Chartres’ reputation as a center of cathedral school education. See Rolker, Canon Law, 88, 91.

87. For homicide classed alongside sodomy, adultery and the burning of churches as sins against nature, see Ivo of Chartres, Decretum 15.190, 57.

88. Seven years of penance were required in all cases of homicide, but up to ten years if the victim did not deserve it. See ibid. 15.187, 55.

89. Ibid. 15. 185, 55.
orders. Offering solutions, Ivo presented a variety of options for penitential acts, which often had fewer requirements that would prevent knights from fulfilling military responsibilities.

Fasting was a common recommendation for penance, with food restricted to bread and water. But almsgiving was also presented with fasting, as an alternative activity. Ivo described the *De Penitentiali Theodori* telling priests that if they saw sinners they should counsel them in repentance, advising them “how long to fast or how much to give as alms to redeem their sins.” Penitential options that included monetary donations remained common, but over time required greater and more specific levels of material investment. Ivo provided an example from the ninth century *Poenitentiale Pseudo-Romanum*, which may have been composed by Bishop Halitgar of Cambrai (d. 831). Besides including this text’s demand that all sinners fulfill penance by following requirements for fasting on bread and water and avoiding further sin, Ivo also cited its permission for a sinner to be excused from performing penance by donating enough funds for three hundred masses a year, or up to one thousand solidi in alms to the poor. According to Constance Brittain Bouchard, aristocrats who could afford to do so would have eagerly participated in such a program as a literal investment in their spiritual well

---

90. See for example, ibid. 15.113, 38; 15.189–95, 57–8; 15.201, 60.

91. Ibid. 15.51, 16: “quantum debeat ieiunare, aut elemosinis redimere peccata sua.”


93. Ivo of Chartres, *Decretum* 15.50, 16; 15.113, 38; 15.205, 61.
being. But this option for penance clearly limited the possibilities for a reduction of penance to the wealthy.

For lay Christians with little or no wealth, personal expressions of devotion through prayer could also bring divine forgiveness. Ivo described prayer as a penitential option found in an eighth century manual attributed to the English monk Bede (672/3–735). Sinners unable to fast and who had nothing to donate could engage in lengthy, physically strenuous prayers. Those who knew the Book of Psalms were to genuflect and lie prostrate on the ground seventy times while reciting certain psalms, while those who did know the psalter were to perform the same sequence one hundred times while saying the Pater Noster. Lay penitents could perform this program of prayer, but it did require that they be able to devote the time and be physically capable of performing the procedure.

There was also an extant tradition of knights of aristocratic status entering monasteries to gain spiritual security, or encouraging others to do so for them. According to Bouchard, by the eleventh and twelfth century many lay aristocratic or

---

94. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries many wealthy aristocrats would still be willing to pay large sums of money as a form of investment for their spiritual well being. See Constance Brittain Bouchard, Sword, Miter and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), 224, 228–9.

95. For doubts in Bede’s authorship of one or more penitential manuals, and the likelihood that many attributed to him were actually produced by Bishop Egbert of York (d. 768), see Allen J. Frantzen, “The Penitentials Attributed to Bede,” Speculum 38:3 (1983): 573–97, esp. 591–2.

96. Ivo of Chartres, Decretum 15.204, 61.

97. Bull, Knightly Piety, 115; Bouchard, Sword, Miter and Cloister, 59, 63, 65.
lower ranking knights, and secular clerical officials, decided to enter monasteries near the ends of their lives. They sought the spiritual benefits of religious life but wanted to delay turning aside from their secular responsibilities for as long as possible. The wealthiest aristocrats made sizable donations when they or their young heirs entered monastic life for their own benefit or that of their relatives still in the world, though monastic institutions allowed novices to enter with or without such gifts.

However, joining a monastery was a challenge for even the wealthiest aristocrats who had the support of their families and subordinates. Citing a letter by Pope Gregory the Great to bishops of Sicily who faced increasing interest in monasticism among lay Christians, Ivo clarified that any knight who sought to join a monastery must confess his sins, fulfill all required penance, and live independently as a regular cleric for three years before he could become a novice in an institution. Adult oblates, especially knights, also faced the task of acclimating to the clerical community, and using any skills they had for the benefit of their institution. A layman of any class could not easily replace penance with leaving the secular world to gain freedom from his sins.

Ivo of Chartres’ *Decretum* reflected the development of clerics’ judgment and justification of violence. Violence undertaken for the good of Christians, the Church and the faith was judged to be good for its own sake, but those who participated, whether

---


leaders or lower-ranking knights, still had to meet certain criteria. To be judged to be personally acting out of correct motives, seen to act from appropriate states of mind, and clearly experiencing and expressing guilt for their possible sins, meant that knights would be considered just by those who observed and described their activities. If knights’ engagement in violence was a sacrifice of personal material interests that risked their spiritual well being, undertaken for the good of others, their actions would be less sinful than those of men who engaged in unjust violence out of greed and selfishness. Mortal judges, and God himself, would see that they clearly deserved forgiveness for their sins.

Though Ivo believed in the necessity of the personal realization of guilt and expressions of devotion that had initially been most important to Christians, he supported the systemization of the practice of penance and its clerical oversight. His inclusion of alternative forms of penance showed eagerness for a wider range of physical, social, material and spiritual sacrifices to be offered for the sake of spiritual rewards. As judged by clerics according to the standards of more senior authorities, many of the same actions and motives came to be seen as grounds for both the judgment of violence as just and penitential acts as warranted and efficacious. The idea that personal sacrifices were expected to be displayed for penance to be judged as efficacious, and violence to be judged as just, will be seen in Pope Urban II’s call for knights’ participation in the 1095 expedition to the East.

The First Crusade as a Papal Innovation

In 1088 Odo of Lagery, whose ecclesiastical career had already included high-ranking monastic and regular offices, was elected as Pope Urban II. This election came in the midst of the continued struggle over investiture that had begun between Pope Gregory VII (c. 1020–85) and German Emperor Henry IV (1050–1106). Odo was elected by cardinals who supported the Gregorian reform, while the papal bureaucracy was in disorder following Pope Gregory VII's exile from Rome, the brief reign of an anti-pope, a papal vacancy, and the short pontificate of Gregory's immediate successor Victor III (r. 1086-1087). Pope Urban II began strengthening papal government from the start of his reign, introducing offices and ceremonies to demonstrate the dual power of the pope as a spiritual and secular authority. His support of the First Crusade was a vital part of this process, giving him the opportunity to redirect conflicts within the Church and in western Europe.


Christendom to external enemies and help knights strive to achieve the secular and spiritual ideals furthered by Bonizo of Sutri and Ivo of Chartres.\textsuperscript{106}

Pope Urban II actively fostered the reform of the papacy and supported relationships between high-ranking ecclesiastical officials and the aristocrats who could provide them with secular political and military assistance. The pope maintained the support of reformers within the Church by stressing his loyalty to Gregorian principles, while offering concessions to those who had opposed Gregory or himself in order to subdue the reform movements’ enemies. Such concessions were enabled by what historians have called a “theory of dispensation,” that the pope had the ability to suspend ecclesiastical law as well as produce it.\textsuperscript{107} But to achieve reform goals within the Church, he also had to fight the politically weak position in which the papacy had been left by the investiture controversy. He sought and maintained close relationships with lay aristocrats for this purpose.\textsuperscript{108} Such efforts to strengthen papal authority also led him to support improving the relationship between the papacy and the Byzantine Empire, and reuniting the Churches of the East and West with the Pope at its head.\textsuperscript{109}

Pope Gregory VII had shown interest in improving relations between the East and West with his offer of military aid in 1074, supporting military activity in defense of the

\textsuperscript{106} Mastnak, \textit{Crusading Peace}, 79–81.


\textsuperscript{108} Morris, \textit{Papal Monarchy}, 122–3.

\textsuperscript{109} For Urban II’s idea being linked to his knowledge of the Donation of Constantine, Johannes Fried, \textit{Donation of Constantine and the Constitutum Constantini} (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 18. For the secular territorial impact of this donation, see Robinson, \textit{Papacy}, 310.
Eastern Church as a way to strengthen his own authority. But Pope Urban II went further to renew the relationship between the papacy and the Eastern Empire, ending the excommunication of the Emperor Alexius I Comnenus at the council of Melfi in 1089. To continue strengthening this relationship, the pope received representatives from the Byzantine Emperor at the Council of Piacenza in 1095, who asked for military support to oppose incursions of Seljuk Turks into Asia Minor. Foreign mercenaries were common in Byzantine army, so this may have been an effort to recruit paid knights. While it is not known if the pope understood this to be a search for mercenaries, he could have hoped that his involvement could be evidence of papal influence, and ultimately papal supremacy, over Western secular leadership. This request for military aid spurred

110. See discussion in chapter 3, p. 162.


114. Historians agree that the emperor's representatives were just seeking mercenaries. See Tyerman, *Fighting For Christendom*, 111. But the visit from the Byzantines and the papal
Urban II's encouragement of the armed expedition to the East later known as the First Crusade.\textsuperscript{115}

Papal Recruitment at Clermont

Pope Urban II's most influential call for knights to travel to the East occurred at the Council of Clermont in November 1095, halfway through a tour of Frankish territories that he undertook to garner lay aristocrats' support for his papacy.\textsuperscript{116} Clerics and prominent laymen attended this meeting, similar to those at which participants had been sought for the Peace and Truce of God.\textsuperscript{117} The pope’s recruitment sermon for an expedition to the east was delivered at the end of the council. This sermon was not actions they encouraged would enable the pope to strengthen his position against the German Emperor Henry IV, regain control and influence in northern Italy and Frankish territory; see France, \textit{Crusades and the Expansion}, 44.


preserved in its entirety, but segments of it survive in the works of secular and regular clerical crusade chroniclers.

Five authors provide accounts of the sermon, but only three of them are believed to have been present at the council, and only one of them was a crusade participant. Fulcher of Chartres (1058/1059-post 1127) was the only author to describe Pope Urban II’s sermon who both attended the council and participated in the crusade. After the council he made the journey as chaplain to Stephen of Blois, later turned to serving Baldwin of Boulogne, and after the expedition remained permanently in the East.118

While living there he wrote his *Historia Hiersolymitana*.119 This lengthy chronicle was composed in two redactions, one completed circa 1101–5, and the other circa 1124–27/8.120 Copies of the earliest edition began to circulate almost immediately, evidenced by its influence on other chroniclers who wrote before 1124.121

---

118. For Fulcher’s transfer from service under Stephen of Blois to Baldwin occurring before there was an apparent need to do so, see Tyerman, *God's War*, 161. For a recent discussion of Fulcher’s biography and his crusade experiences’ influences on his chronicle, see Conor Kostick, *The Social Structure of the First Crusade* (Boston: Brill, 2008), 40–2.

119. The Latin edition of this chronicle to be used here is Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hiersolymitana*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1913). Translations from this work have been taken from Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095-1127*, trans. Frances Rita Ryan, ed. Harold S. Fink (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1969), with slight changes to word choices for greater contextual accuracy.


The most influential chronicler to describe Pope Urban II’s sermon was an unnamed author or authors who participated in the crusade but was most likely not present at Clermont. This anonymous author wrote the influential *Gesta francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum* circa 1099–1101. There have been numerous theories concerning the identity of this lay or clerical author, but it has been most recently suggested that this very early chronicle was written by a small group of clerics and laymen who contributed equally to the text. Though it remains likely that this or these authors were not in attendance at Clermont, this stylistically simple account of crusade recruitment and events on the expedition is known to have influenced both eyewitness and non-eyewitness accounts of the same events.


123. For the anonymous author’s attitudes toward the poor, knowledge of scripture, and terms used for social classes suggesting his identity as either a knight or a cleric, see Kostick, *Social Structure*, 12–23. For the most recent discussion of past theories of the identity of this author and the most recent hypothesis of a “production team” of two secular clerics and two laymen, see Nirmal Dass, “Introduction,” in *The Deeds of the Franks and other Jerusalem-Bound Pilgrims*, 2-6.

Other chronicles that provide accounts of Urban II’s sermon were written by authors present at Clermont but not on the crusade itself. One of these was Abbot Baldric of Bourgueil (b. 1050, in office 1079-1106), who became archbishop of Dol (in office 1107-1130). He wrote his Historia Hierosolymitana soon after he received his office at Dol, with the intent of improving the Anonymous Gesta francorum. His student Robert of Reims (d. 1122), a Benedictine monk and then abbot at Reims, was asked to write his own account of Pope Urban II’s sermon at Clermont because he had attended the council. But like his teacher, Baldric was not a participant in the expedition itself. He also wrote his own chronicle, the Historia Ierosolimitana, circa 1116 as a new version of the

France and William G. Zajac (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 39–70; idem, Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 377. Jay Rubenstein argues that Anonymous and other authors may have gotten much of their shared material from a currently unknown source he has called the “Jerusalem text,” which was most likely a collection of crusaders anecdotes recorded by a cleric while they were still in the field. See Jay Rubenstein, “What is the Gesta Francorum and who was Peter Tudebode,” in Revue Mabillon 16 (2005): 184, 188-9, 197.


127. For the most recent discussions of Robert of Reims, see Kostick, Social Structure, 66; Carol Sweetenham, Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade: Historia Ierosolimitana (Burlington: Ashgate, 2005), 1–3. For Robert of Reims’ career as an abbot as his own house and later at the Priory of Senuc, see Riley-Smith, First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading, 135–6.
Jonathan Philips describes Baldric and Robert’s primary contributions to the *Gesta* as “a more flowery style,” but Conor Kostick clarifies that Baldric made the work richer in detail, and Robert’s addition of roughly 15,000 words introduced new information that positioned crusade events in a biblical context.

A final author influenced by the anonymous chronicler, who was not present at Clermont, was the Benedictine Abbot Guibert of Nogent (c. 1055–1124). He initially wrote his *Gesta dei per Francos* soon after assuming his abbacy at Nogent-sous-Coucy, circa 1108, but undertook revisions circa 1122. According to Jay Rubinstein, crusade historians often have not seen this text as a valuable crusade source in part because of it being based on the *Gesta Francorum*. But historians have recently highlighted the value of this chronicle for understanding the reception of the crusade movement in


Northern France and among aristocratic Frankish clerics, as well as its providing more material than the other new versions of the *Gesta* because of the inclusion of reports of visions and miracles, details of the crusaders’ initial departure and reports from those who were returning.132

Accounts of Urban II’s sermon at Clermont, whether reported from memory or based on others’ texts, provided the details of the sermon that authors sought to portray as having resonated most strongly among the pope’s listeners.133 The pope described the motives he wanted to drive Christians’ participation in the expedition, including personal social and emotional relationships with each other, fellow Christians, and God. He introduced these concepts to the sermon’s listeners within a secular framework of duty and responsibility, but closely linked them to spiritual concerns. This sermon will be seen to reflect ideas concerning violence found in juridical thought through the eleventh century, as well as previous portrayals of emotions among knights while engaged in military activities by hagiographers and clerical chroniclers. The pope did not introduce new ideals for knights but provided clearly delineated guidelines by which knights who participated in the expedition would be judged as just and deserving of divine assistance in the field as well as personal spiritual rewards. Assurance of such assistance and


rewards were necessary to make such an unusual military expedition appeal to potential
recruits.

Pope Urban II began the sermon at the Council of Clermont by describing the
Franks as having a responsibility to act for the faith when called to do so. Guibert said
that the pope described them as deserving of praise for their piety in taking up arms to
defend their country, as the Maccabees had in defense of their Temple in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{134}
By eagerly taking on this defensive role they would prevent future destruction, as well as
have the opportunity to live up to their biblical predecessors’ accomplishments. Such an
ideal was not new, having been presented in the ninth century by Pope Leo IV as the
most laudable goal for all knights.\textsuperscript{135} According to Fulcher of Chartres and Robert of
Reims, however, the pope focused on the Franks themselves. They were “chosen by and
beloved of God,” set apart from other nations.\textsuperscript{136} He called on them to be “soldiers of
Christ” instead of “robbers” themselves, to fight those who harmed Christians and

\textsuperscript{134} Guibert of Nogent, 2.4, 112. For the role of the Maccabees in the creation of a
concept of just warriors approved by both reforming popes and juridical authors, see Oliver
Münsch, “Hate Preachers and Religious Warriors: Violence in the Libelli de lite of the Late
Eleventh Century,” in Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old Testament Faith-Warriors
(1 and 2 Maccabees) in Historical Perspective, ed. Gabriela Signori (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 161–
76. For the Maccabees becoming exemplars for humans fulfilling divinely sanctioned vengeance,
see Thomas Bisson, “La Vengeance de Dieu: de l’exégèse patristique à la réforme ecclésiastique
et à la première croisade,” in La vengeance, 400-1200 ed. Dominique Barthélemy, François
Bougard, and Régine Le Jan (Rome: École Francais de Rome, 2006), 452–3, 468–9, 472–5. Also
see Jean Dunbabin, “The Maccabees as Exemplars in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries,” in The
Bible in the Medieval World, ed. Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood (New York: Ecclesiastical

\textsuperscript{135} See Leo IV, “Epistola 28,” MGH Epistolae 5, 601.12–.20, discussed in chapter 3,
pp. 139–41, as well as above, pp. 246.

\textsuperscript{136} Robert of Reims, 1.1, 727: “Gens Francorum...a deo electa et delecta;”
occupied their property instead of fighting against their own “brothers and relatives.”

“If you allow them to continue much longer,” the pope warned, “they will conquer God’s faithful people much more extensively.”

Fulcher of Chartres presented knights as benefiting from fulfilling their defensive responsibilities. In his account, the pope explained that a knight who heard of the expedition to the East should want to participate as a friend to God, since aiding him in this mission would please him. The idea of friend here suggested the loyalty and allegiance expected within contemporary political and military relationships. Bonizo of Sutri had described such loyalty and obedience among knights to their superiors as necessary for the continued function of society. This was especially true when the superiors in question were those to whom all Christians owed obedience, God and the Church. Through their obedience, Christian knights and military leaders considered to be just would enjoy a personal friendship with God that offered spiritual benefits. As had been the case among knights described in hagiography and whose military endeavors

137. Fulcher of Chartres, 1.3, 136: “Nunc fiant Christi milites, qui dudum exstiterunt raptores; nunc iure contra barbaros pugnent, qui olim adversus fratres et consanguinos dimicabant.”

138. Fulcher of Chartres, 1.34: “Sic aliquandiu in quiete siveritis multo latius fideles Dei supergredientur.”

139. Fulcher of Chartres, 1.2, 126: “Si quidem amici Dei esse vultis, libenter exercete quae ei placere sentitis.”


141. For Bishop Bonizo of Sutri, see above, pp. 231–2.
clerical authors described, the presence and actions of a strong leader, especially a divine leader, encouraged bravery and ensured victory.\textsuperscript{142} But according to Ivo of Chartres, personal obedience to God meant that knights themselves could be just and receive divine favor, even if their own secular leaders were not.\textsuperscript{143}

Knights were assured of just leadership in this military expedition. The pope organized it, but God or Christ would lead participants into battle and fight with them.\textsuperscript{144} But those military leaders demanded obedience. According to Fulcher, Pope Urban II warned possible participants that God might actually condemn those at home who did not venture forth and defend Christians in the East.\textsuperscript{145} This statement suggests the Council of Clermont’s primary role as a meeting at which the Peace or Truce of God was called. Meetings linked to the Truce of God had expanded the earlier Peace oath to require not only the avoidance of violence against the weak and powerless, but also the undertaking of violence in defense of those Christians.\textsuperscript{146} But as had been described by monastic

\textsuperscript{142} For patristic and early medieval examples of the idea that God would aid devoted believers, see chapter 3, pp. 94, 128–9, 130–1, 136, 167.

\textsuperscript{143} For Ivo of Chartres’ requirement for just behavior by all knights see above, p. 243–4.

\textsuperscript{144} See for examples Fulcher of Chartres, 1.3, 324; Baldric of Dol, 1.4, 15; Guibert of Nogent, 2.4, 140.

\textsuperscript{145} For God’s refusing to reward western Christians, and even punishing them, if they let those in the East be harmed, see Fulcher of Chartres, 1.4, 322; 1.3, 324.

\textsuperscript{146} See chapter 3, p. 146–48.
author Andrew of Fleury, even knights and clerics who swore to defend the weak risked succumbing to the desire for wealth and power.  

Pope Urban II asked knights to fight under divine leadership, using their martial skills for a spiritual purpose. The First Crusade has been described as an example of a mutual rapprochement of two areas of life, warrior and saint, most often seen as mutually exclusive.  

In agreement with Late Antique and early medieval authors, Bonizo of Sutri and Ivo of Chartres presented the idea that violence could be undertaken to defend others and achieve justice for them. Baldric presented this opportunity, and concern for suffering, as an activity that would help the knights who participated as well. To aid others and their own souls these knights could “lay down the sword-belt of earthly knighthood, or bravely [audacter] go forth as knights of Christ.” Pope Gregory VII had envisioned a militia servitus Petri acting under papal leadership to protect the Roman Church and the papacy, but Pope Urban II now called on knights to join the expedition as Christi milites who fought directly under divine leadership to defend the Church and all Christians.

147. See chapter 3, p. 152–3.


150. Baldric of Dol, 1.4, 14: “aut istiusmodi militiae cingulum quantocisc deponite, aut Christi milites audacter procedite, et ad defendendum Orientalem Ecclesiam velocius concurrite.”

Pope Urban II called on knights to participate in the crusade rather than to leave their military profession to act purely out of devotion to their faith. Baldric of Dol described the pope condemning violence undertaken by knights out of greed. “It is horrible [horrendum] that you extend a rapacious [rapacem] hand against Christians; it is less evil to brandish your sword against Saracens, and even a singular good, because it is charity [caritas] to lay down your life for your brothers.”

According to all the clerics who provided accounts of Pope Urban II’s sermon, the harming of weak Christians was akin to harming Christ and the city of Jerusalem. Participation in the mission offered the opposite, an enormous act of charity to save Christians, their city, and Christ, for which knights were asked to give time, resources, and risk sacrificing their lives. Agreeing to such an act, especially if martyrdom would likely be involved, would provide clear evidence of religious devotion.

152. Baldric of Dol, 1.4, 15: “Horrendum est, vos in Christianos rapacem manum extendere; minus malum est in Sarracenos gladium vibrare, singulare bonum est; quia et caritas est, pro fratricus animas ponere.”

153. Fulcher of Chartres, 1.3, 323; Robert of Reims, 1.1, 728; Baldric of Dol, 1.4, 12; Guibert of Nogent, 2.3, 140–1.


Besides the desire to act out of love or charity, and willingness to give one’s life, other emotions also provided evidence of religious devotion. The pope linked these emotions to his own motives for recruiting for this expedition to the East, that he hoped would drive knights’ actions. According to Baldric of Dol, he described Eastern Christians’ and pilgrims’ plight causing sorrow for him.156 Hoping that their plight would not reflect badly on the papacy, which was still facing its own challenges, he reportedly said “We, who are now made a disgrace [opprobrium] to our neighbors, with scorn [subsannatio] and derision [illusio] by those who are around us, we share the suffering [condolemus] of our brothers and we suffer together [compatiamur], at least in tears [lacrimis].”157 The pope’s presentation of his own sorrow can be seen in the context of confessors’ modeling of emotions for sinners, which Karen Wagner has argued was used to guide penitents to and through the undertaking of efficacious penance in penitential practices dating back to the Early Middle Ages.158 But if the pope is also seen as a source of both secular and ecclesiastical political influence, his sorrow can be compared to early-eleventh century clerical author Radulphus Glaber’s description of a king’s sorrow over the threats to his subjects, personally moved by the plight of his people.159 Through the

156. Baldric of Dol, 1.4, 12–4.

157. Ibid., 1.4, 14: “Nos, qui iam facti sumus opprobrium vicinis nostris, subsannatio et illusio his qui in circuitu nostri sunt, condolemus et compatiamur fratribus nostris, saltem in lacrimis.”


159. See chapter 4, pp. 197–8.
recruitment of lay aristocrats and their subordinate knights the pope could alleviate the suffering of Christians in the East, and from Baldric’s perspective at the same time counter the disrespect that the papacy believed that the Church suffered.

Authors described Pope Urban II calling on knights to participate in this expedition out of obedience to superiors, and with just motives, but they also presented him justifying the mission according to penitential standards. Authors described Pope Urban II enumerating the sacrifices and suffering that those who set out for the East would experience during the expedition. According to the anonymous author and Baldric of Dol, the pope warned potential recruits of “misery, poverty, nakedness, persecution, want, illness, hunger, thirst, and other discomforts.”\textsuperscript{160} But these threats were intended to attract, rather than scare away, potential recruits.

The anonymous chronicler described Urban II presenting this suffering as a way to assist knights in their emulation of Christ and his disciples. The pope said, “as the Lord said to his disciples, ‘It is required that you suffer many things for my name.’”\textsuperscript{161} Participating knights were offered a way to imitate Christ, as had been long-practiced by other devoted Christians. This projected suffering also can be seen in the context of Pope Gregory I’s and Bonizo of Sutri’s descriptions of intentional sacrifices by knights as necessary for them to gain forgiveness for their own sins as well as for the safety of the

\textsuperscript{160} See for example Baldric of Dol, 1.5, 15; Anonymous, 1.1, 1: “miserias, paupertas, persecutiones, egestates, infirmitates, nuditates, famem, sitim et alias huiusmodi.”

\textsuperscript{161} Anonymous, 1.1, 1–2: “sicuti Dominus ait suis discipulis: ‘Opertet vos pati multa pro nomine meo.’”
Christian community. Knights’ desire to participate in this expedition would be clear evidence of not only their loyalty to the faith and Church, and love of fellow Christians, but also their willingness to admit guilt for sin by making penitential sacrifices.

Pope Urban II told potential recruits that their sacrifices would make them worthy of rewards. Authors who described him promising rewards for participation presented variations in his offer, but it was clearly related to previous papal and episcopal grants. In the most detailed descriptions of this reward, Pope Urban II explained that those who took the journey out of devotion would be granted remission of sin or penance, and heavenly peace, glory, or martyrdom, by himself as pope according to God's will. In contrast, in the simplest description, according to the anonymous author the pope simply

162. Jonathan Riley-Smith argues that these threats of potential sacrifices ensured that participants would see themselves as chosen by God to fulfill divine plans, as well as fitting the biblical model of the Maccabees. Jonathan Riley-Smith, The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading (New York: Continuum, 2003), 154. Also see Pope Gregory I’s Regulae and Dialogorum, chapter 3, pp. 118–23; and Bishop Bonizo of Sutri’s Liber de vita christiana, above, pp. 229–36.

163. The spiritual benefits offered to participants by Pope Urban II are also found in the pope’s personal recruitment letters, and were the only aspect of the council dealing with the expedition preserved in the council's canons. The Council of Clermont produced sixty-one canons preserved in written form in fourteen varied manuscripts. The oldest of these texts, composed during and immediately following the council, was a record book from the episcopate of Bishop Lambert of Arras now known as the Liber Lamberti Atrebatensis. For the manuscripts of the canons, see Somerville, Councils of Urban II, Vol. 1, 7–9, 142. For the Liber Lamberti, see ibid., 46, 59.

164. Fulcher of Chartres, 1.3, 324; Robert of Reims, 1.2, 729; Baldric of Dol, 1.5, 15; Guibert of Nogent, 2.3, 138. Jean Flori argues that the pope only intended to offer remission of penance and a gift of eternal happiness, but authors reported that he had promised remission of sin and martyrdom. Jean Flori, “Ideology and Motivations in the First Crusade,” in Palgrave Advances in the Crusades, ed. Helen J. Nicholson (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), 20, 22.
said, “great will be your reward.”\textsuperscript{165} But this variation in definition by those who recorded Pope Urban II’s sermon is entirely reasonable, as the concept of “crusade indulgence” did not have a precise definition at the time of the First Crusade.\textsuperscript{166}

Popes and other ecclesiastical leaders had previously offered grants of spiritual rewards when they made requests for military assistance. Popes Leo IV had promised heaven to the men on whom he called to fight if they died on their mission.\textsuperscript{167} But Pope Alexander II and Gregory VII had promised a remission of sins and penance, or absolution of sins, to those who responded to their requests for assistance even if they survived.\textsuperscript{168} Bishop Anselm II of Lucca supported Pope Gregory VII’s promise of a reward, and offered similar spiritual rewards himself to any who aided him in the defense of his own episcopate against German imperial forces.\textsuperscript{169} God would recognize and reward those Christians for their benevolent motives and devotion to the faith.\textsuperscript{170} The “crusade indulgence,” involving forgiveness of both penance and sin for all participants,

\textsuperscript{165} Anonymous, 1.2, 2: “Persequetur vos larga retributio.”

\textsuperscript{166} James Brundage, \textit{Medieval Canon Law and the Crusader} (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), 145.

\textsuperscript{167} See chapter 3, p. 140.

\textsuperscript{168} For Pope Alexander II, see chapter 3, pp. 160–2. For Pope Gregory VII, see chapter 3, pp. 162–5.

\textsuperscript{169} See chapter 3, p. 167.

\textsuperscript{170} Ibid.
slowly developed in juridical thought after the First Crusade as a product of that expedition and prior grants of spiritual rewards.\footnote{171. Paul E. Chevedden, “Canon 2 of the Council of Clermont (1095) and the Crusade Indulgence,” in \textit{Annuarium historiae conciliorum; internationale Zeitschrift für Konzilienforschung} 37:2 (2005): 253, 258, 303, 306–7, 318–9, 321.}

Most contemporaneous to Urban II’s sermon, Ivo of Chartres had reiterated ideas seen in the works of Burchard of Worms, Anselm II of Lucca, and others that stressed that violence undertaken for the good of others was simply less sinful than that which was committed for greed and selfishness.\footnote{172. See for example chapter 3, pp. 157–9, 165–8. Also see above, p. 244–7.} Mortal judges and God could clearly see the difference, and those who fought from proper motives clearly sought to gain forgiveness for their sins. For all authors, a knight’s willingness to risk the dangers of war to achieve peace, with divine judgment as his primary concern, separated him from those who fought for personal gain and made him worthy of a spiritual reward.

The idea that participation in a difficult military endeavor could replace other forms of penance expected of knights reflected the general development of penitential practices. Since Late Antiquity, councils and authors who discussed penance recommended it for or required it from all who committed acts of violence, for the safety of their souls.\footnote{173. See chapter 3, pp. 109–11, 114–16, 123–26, 157–8, 161–2.} Even as late as the tenth century, Regino of Prüm believed that since priests were in fact unable to fully discern the justness of conflicts, all who committed any kind of violence should undertake penance.\footnote{174. See chapter 3, p. 142.} But as had been the case among
authors who developed penitential programs before him, homicides committed in wars incurred the least penitential debt.\textsuperscript{175}

In his \textit{Decretum}, however, Ivo of Chartres suggested that clerics’ concerns for securing knights’ spiritual safety risked disruption of their secular responsibilities. Given papal and episcopal interest in the use of knights’ skills in the service of the church, as well as the need to support peaceful relations between secular leaders and their armed subordinates, Ivo supported penitential practices such as prayer and donation of alms that knights could undertake with the least disruption.\textsuperscript{176} Pope Urban II’s recruitment sermon at Clermont offered knights the clearest possibility of forgiveness for sins and spiritual rewards, while continuing to act within their profession.

Besides love of holy sites and fellow Christians, sorrow for fellow Christians, and religious devotion driving just knights to action, authors of accounts of Pope Urban II’s sermon at Clermont presented an additional emotion also linked to the expedition. Guibert of Nogent, writing almost a decade after the success of the crusade, described the pope saying, “judge by what sorts of hearts these joys [\textit{gaudia}] can be conceived when we see the holy city awakened by your support.”\textsuperscript{177} This joy was based on spiritual achievement, but depended on the physical defense of the city and violence against those who had harmed it. Early medieval hagiographical references to knights’ experiences of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{175} See chapter 3, pp. 142–3.
\item \textsuperscript{176} See above, p. 246–52.
\item \textsuperscript{177} Guibert of Nogent, 2.3, 139: “\textit{perpendite quibus cordibus gaudia illa poterunt concipi, quum sanctam civitatem vestro adminiculo viderimus suscitari.”}
\end{itemize}
joy, such as found in the *De Vita Sancti Geraldi*, reflected Augustine’s ideals for purely spiritual joy, but clerical authors’ accounts of violence increasingly deviated from it over time.¹⁷⁸ Radulphus Glaber described knights experiencing joy from their own closeness to God, but also from their enemies’ failures.¹⁷⁹ Moving further away from late-antique ideals, William of Poitiers also presented joy as a product of earthly causes such as good leadership and military victories.¹⁸⁰ In his subtle opposition to the penitential requirements placed on Duke William of Normandy and his subordinates, the author may have included such experiences of joy as evidence that the Norman knights were themselves just warriors, fighting to achieve peace and justice.¹⁸¹ They would be free from sin, free from the need to regret the actions they had been forced to undertake, and thus free to enjoy what they achieved and the methods by which they achieved it. Abbot Guibert described aid to Jerusalem bringing the spiritual joy of securing peace, as well as the earthly joy in the successful undertaking of an ecclesiastically approved military conflict.

Besides spiritual benefits, Pope Urban II also referred to material rewards in his appeal to participants. According to Fulcher of Chartres, the anonymous chronicler, and

---

¹⁷⁸. For Saint Gerald of Aurillac’s Augustinian joy at closeness to God, see chapter 4, pp. 184–5.

¹⁷⁹. For Radolphus Glaber’s discussion of joy, see chapter 4, pp. 194–6.


¹⁸¹. For spiritually acceptable or useful sources for joy, chapter 3, pp. 104–5, 107, 119–21. For the penitential requirements bishops placed on William of Normandy and his forces, approved and enforced by the papacy after 1070, see chapter 4, p. 175.
Robert of Reims, Urban II told his audience that they or those whom they recruited to journey to the East should vow to take part with no concern for material obligations. The pope may have meant valuables collected from enemies on the journey or the battlefield, an acceptable activity in juridical thought provided that it was not done to excess. This type of reassurance suggests that the pope understood that the expense of participation might turn some knights away from the expedition, and recognized that material rewards remained attractive even when spiritual rewards were the primary motivator. Chronicles of the expedition frequently referred to spiritual and material rewards, presenting them as the sources of many of the emotions attributed to crusaders.

As presented by chroniclers, Pope Urban II's sermon harmonized spiritual and secular reasons why knights should journey to the East. Participants had to demonstrate willingness to adopt a biblically granted role and embark on the mission according to ecclesiastically correct motives. The sermon provided examples for the motives that would ensure that that the expedition to the East, and knights’ participation in it, were

182. Fulcher of Chartres, 1.3, 324; Anonymous, 1.2, 121; Robert of Reims, 1.2, 729.

183. Baldric of Dol, 1.5, 15; Robert of Reims, 1.1, 728–1.2, 729.


185. According to Jean Flori, God or Christ would permit material rewards to be found while he provided spiritual rewards, just as a secular lord might reward his troops for service in the field but still permit them to collect spoils. Jean Flori, “Ideology and Motivations in the First Crusade,” in *The Crusades*, ed. Helen J. Nicholson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 27–28.
just. The motives for the expedition as a whole, and for knights’ own participation, was illustrated by references to the pope’s and Christians’ emotions – those caused by the injustices that Christians were called to oppose, as well as those that would result from their successful opposition.

The pope’s descriptions of the suffering participants would experience on the journey also provided a clear framework for the judgment of their motives. If knights were warned of the personal challenges and suffering they would face, it could be inferred that those who agreed to participate were acting from motives other than the desire for material gain. The pope envisioned knights’ participation coming from their desire to make personal material sacrifices out of religious devotion, rendering them worthy of both diverse spiritual rewards and divinely assisted victory.

**Conclusion**

The sermon at Clermont should be seen as consistent with overall developments in juridical thought concerning violence, especially those of the eleventh century. That Pope Urban II called for knights’ assistance and offered spiritual rewards was not a sharp break from the actions of past popes and episcopal officials who had called for either peace or organized violence in the service of the Church. But – as clerical authors reported his sermon – Pope Urban II responded to novel political, social, and geographic circumstances with a new interlocking of discrete elements. These included attitudes toward objectively just and unjust violence, the need for violence to be undertaken with subjectively correct motives, and the use of subjects’ mental states in the judgment of their motives and actions by both divine and human judges. This clear combination of
concepts brought the pope greater success than those before him who had previously attempted the recruitment of knights to aid in papal actions.186

The success of Pope Urban II’s sermon for recruitment was most directly aided by his grant of diverse spiritual rewards to all who lived or died on an expedition that they were expected to undertake out of religious devotion. The papal rewards and role of participants’ motives fit into penitential practices that had developed by the late-eleventh century. Ecclesiastical officials and jurists had all come to judge material donations of alms for the sake of fellow Christians and the institutional church, expressions of devotion through physically taxing programs of prayer, and the act of stepping away from worldly responsibilities to enter religious life, as effective for Christians’ gaining forgiveness for sins. Pope Urban II called for knights to participate in a papally supported expedition that combined all of these penitential elements, while allowing knights to fulfill their military responsibilities to their secular superiors or subordinates. Riley-Smith and William J. Purkis have argued that this blend of activities meant equivalence between crusading and monasticism.187 According to Riley-Smith, the crusade was a virtual “military monastery on the move.”188 The monastic nature of the crusade, and its

186. The response the pope elicited from knights was far more positive than had been seen for previous papally initiated endeavors, perhaps because his presentation of the expedition and the expedition itself were so distinct from prior conflicts. See Riley-Smith, *First Crusade*, 2. Also see chapter 3, pp. 160–2, 163–5, 167–8.


188. Riley-Smith, *First Crusade*, 2.
participants, is reinforced by the devotional expectations for crusaders, as well as the emotions that were sought as evidence of that devotion.

Pope Urban II’s sermon offered the clearest guidelines yet composed for the judgment of knights’ motives according to their emotions. The chapter that follows will discuss clerical authors’ use of this system as a framework for evidence of the justness of the 1095 expedition to the East and its western Christian participants. This would be necessary to defend the widespread recruitment of knights and their military and spiritual successes. Eleventh century jurists, after all, did not view participants in organized violence as fully free from sin, no matter how just the conflict itself seemed to be.
CHAPTER SIX

FEELING LIKE A CRUSADER

Pope Urban II’s recruitment sermon at Clermont in 1095 and those that followed in the course of his travels through the Limousin, Gascony, the Bordelais and the Bazadais fuelled excitement among knights and others for undertaking the expedition later known as the First Crusade. According to accounts of the pope’s sermon, he had presented specific motives that he expected to drive knights to undertake the expedition, to become what would later be called crusaders. The pope warned his listeners of experiences they were going to have that were likely to cause emotion among them. He also described himself experiencing, and in some accounts he expressed, emotions that reflected his motives for calling the expedition.

Karen Wagner has argued that according to penitential practices dating back to Bede, confessors were to explain and model expectations for emotions to sinners to guide them to and through the undertaking of


2. For the term “crusader,” see chapter five, p. 228 n.2.


4. See chapter five, pp. 267–9, 272.
efficacious penance. But beyond what he stated in his sermon as expected of others, Pope Urban II’s own states of mind also became a model for crusaders’ emotions, providing evidence of their expected motives for participation and experiences in the field as penitents deserving of spiritual rewards.

Clerical authors who had previously written of knights and their experiences in military conflicts had faced a challenge in portraying those who achieved military success according to ecclesiastical ideals. But Pope Urban II’s sermon in 1095 offered clear expectations for knights’ motives for becoming crusaders that were expected to shape their experiences in the field, and suggested a few ways these could be discerned through participants’ emotions. To a great extent, accounts of the First Crusade written during and immediately after its success reflect the ideals presented in the pope’s sermon. Inconsistencies in knights’ embodiment of the pope’s ideals in these sources, however, will show that some doubts remained concerning knights’ motives for joining the expedition and behavior while in the East.

This chapter will demonstrate that in addition to conveying what they had witnessed in the East, eyewitness clerical chroniclers and clerical and lay epistolary authors sought to prove that participants in the First Crusade were free from the sin of homicide in the field and deserving of both the spiritual rewards and the divinely aided


6. For crusaders as penitents, see Giles Constable, “The Place of the Crusader in Medieval Society,” in Crusaders and Crusading in the 12th Century (Burlington: Ashgate, 2008), 146, 155–7; Riley-Smith, The Crusades, 12–3.
military victories promised to them by Pope Urban II. To do so, they attributed emotions to knights that would present their motives, participation and experiences in the East as compatible with the guidelines suggested by Pope Urban II’s sermon at Clermont and contemporary legal collections. The emotions found in the chronicles, and to a far lesser extent the letters, to be discussed here include anger, sorrow, fear, courage, and joy. Authors linked these emotions to the religious devotion they portrayed among knights in their interactions with one another and responses to events around them.

The pope did not directly refer to all of these emotions in the sermon at Clermont, and they are not always included in contemporary legal texts. But as will be seen in this chapter, there are conceptual links between these emotion and violence that can be traced to late antiquity and the early middle ages that continued through these sources. Inconsistencies between clerical authors’ accounts of knights’ emotional experiences and expressions and the ideals found in Pope Urban II’s sermon and other texts, however, will be seen to reflect continued doubts about knights’ motives. The First Crusade achieved an ideal for holy warfare, but both monastic and secular clerical authors’ continued distrust of knights would keep the first crusaders from being presented as fully achieving the identity of holy warriors.

**Doubts about Recruits**

Historians agree that opposition to the expedition during recruitment seems to have been slight and tied to continued conflicts between the German empire and the

---

7. For eyewitness and supposed eyewitness authors’ most common purposes in writing, see Yuval Noah Harari, “Eyewitnessing in Accounts of the First Crusade, the *Gesta Francorum* and other Contemporary Accounts,” in *Crusades* 3 (2004): 77, 98.
papacy over investiture. But the cathedral canon Albert of Aachen, likely author of the chronicle *Historia Ierosolimitana*, described an Italian priest sharing doubts about knights’ motives with a pilgrim who questioned him about the expedition to the East. “Different people think different things about this journey,” he explained. “Some say that this desire has been aroused in all pilgrims by God and the Lord Jesus Christ, others that the Frankish leaders and numerous common people are entering the journey lightheartedly.” The priest was unsure about joining the mission, since the difficulties knights faced while passing through Hungary and other kingdoms on their way east may have been the result of their sinful motives. After the priest expressed his doubts, the pilgrim admitted that he was in fact St. Ambrose, the bishop Ambrose of Milan. He defended the mission as a holy enterprise for laymen to undertake. He assured the priest

---


11. Ibid., “Alii dicunt a Deo et Domino Iesu Christo hanc in omnibus peregrinis suscitatem voluntatem, alii pro levitate animi hanc Francigenas primores et plurimum vulgus insistere.”

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid., 308–9.
that the mission had been called by God, and that “without a doubt, among martyrs of Christ in the heavenly hall, you will know those counted, enrolled and joyfully [*feliciter*] crowned as whoever had anticipated death on that path, who became exiles in Jesus’ name and persevered with pure and blameless heart [*puro et integro corde*] in God’s love [*dilectione*], and abstained from avarice, theft, adultery, and fornication.”¹⁴

There is no evidence that clerics’ potential distrust in knights’ motives hindered their recruitment of knights for the expedition, but Albert of Aachen was either personally concerned or wanted to make it clear that such distrust was a possibility. But not all clerics who may have had doubts at the start of the 1095 expedition would have had their doubts allayed by a saint who had been a respected patristic authority on just violence. So clerical authors of chronicles, and clerics and laymen who wrote letters back to the west, would defend the mission and its participants. They commemorated and celebrated the accomplishments of those they considered deserving of victory and papally promised spiritual rewards, and blamed failures on divine punishment for clear instances of sin.¹⁵

The chronicles and letters to be examined here were all written *circa* 1106-1111 by eyewitnesses or non-participants who relied on veteran informants. The Anonymous

---


Gesta Francorum, introduced in chapter five, was chosen for analysis because it provided the framework for the majority of narrative accounts of the First Crusade.\textsuperscript{16} The chronicle it most directly influenced will also be examined here, the Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere, written sometime before 1111 by the priest Peter Tudebode.\textsuperscript{17} Tudebode, known to originally come from Poitiers, described himself as a priest from Civray.\textsuperscript{18} While it is not certain which military leader he accompanied, according to his account he may have had two brothers who were knights, Arvedus and Arnaldus, who were killed on the expedition.\textsuperscript{19} Conor Kostick explains that the value of this chronicle has been a subject of debate among historians since nineteenth century editors first concluded that it was derived from the Gesta.\textsuperscript{20} In the 1970s historians began to further doubt its independence when they noted additional elements shared between it, the Gesta, and Raymond

\textsuperscript{16} See chapter five, 258.

\textsuperscript{17} For the uncertain dating of Peter Tudebode’s chronicle, see Jonathan Riley-Smith, The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 1986), 61; The Latin edition used here, cited above, is Tudebode, Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere, in RHC Oc. 3, 3–113. English translations here are those found in Tudebode, Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere, trans. John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1974), with slight changes in word choices for greater contextual accuracy. As will be seen in the citations of the Latin and English sources for Tudebode’s text, the English version, based on fewer manuscript sources, is not entirely synchronous with the Latin edition found in the RHC Oc. 3.

\textsuperscript{18} For Peter Tudebode having been a priest in Civray, see Tudebode, Hierosolymitano Itinere 1.1, in RHC Oc. 3, 9: “Sacerdotis sivracensis.” According to Jay Rubenstein this self-identification is present in four out of the five surviving manuscripts. See Jay Rubenstein, “What is the Gesta Francorum and who was Peter Tudebode,” in Revue Mabillon 16 (2005): 189.

\textsuperscript{19} For Arvedus, see Peter Tudebode, Hierosolymitano Itinere 10.8, 67; for Arnaldus, ibid., 12.3, 85. Also see Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere, trans. Hill and Hill, 72, 93, n. 11.

\textsuperscript{20} Kostick, Social Structure, 23.
D’Aguiler’s *Historia Francorum*.\(^{21}\) As Susan Edgington and Jay Rubenstein explain, however, Tudebode’s chronicle offered independent accounts of the major events of the crusade.\(^{22}\) Kostick describes Tudebode’s work as differing from the *Gesta* and that of Raymond D’Aguilers in its more frequent references to distinctions between economic and social classes, suggesting that the author may have been more attuned to the activities and needs of the poor.\(^{23}\) Tudebode’s attitudes toward knights, and their motives and emotions differed as well.

Two accounts of the expedition related to the *Gesta* but with additional independent material will also be discussed here. According to Kostick, Raymond D’Aguilers’ *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem* has received little attention from historians because of the material it shares with the *Gesta* and the *Hierosolymitano Itinere*, despite its value for the study of the First Crusade.\(^{24}\) Raymond used key events

\(^{21}\) Ibid., 24.

\(^{22}\) Jay Rubenstein suggests that Peter Tudebode’s chronicle may have been based on an earlier version of the Anonymous *Gesta*, or an entirely different chronicle on which the *Gesta* was also based, the “Jerusalem text.” If this is the case Peter Tudebode edited and annotated a chronicle, but did not write a new one. See Rubenstein, “What is the *Gesta Francorum*,” 197–202; Susan B. Edgington, “The First Crusade: Reviewing the Evidence,” in *The First Crusade: Origins and Impact*, ed. Jonathan Phillips (New York: Manchester University Press, 1997), 56.


from the *Gesta* to provide a timeline for the expedition, but added descriptions of events he had witnessed, learned of from informants, and in some cases deduced from conjecture. He described himself as a canon of the cathedral church of St. Mary of Le Puy in the Auvergne region of France, and may have written his work with a lay co-author, Pons of Balazun. He initially set off for the east with the Provençal group that accompanied Adhémar of Monteil, bishop of Le Puy, but in the course of the expedition became a priest and chaplain to Count Raymond IV of Toulouse and Saint-Gilles (c.1042-1105), with whom he and Pons then travelled. He likely completed his chronicle *circa* 1101-1105, writing with the stated intention of correcting lies that he believed “the weak and fearful [*pavidi*]” had been spreading.

The eyewitness chronicle of the cleric Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hiersolymitana*, introduced in chapter five, was composed in the East during and after the

---


28. According to Kostick, these dates are suggested by the information he provided concerning Count Raymond’s plans to return to Europe, which would have been contradicted by his participation in a Lombard and French expedition to Anatolia in the summer of 1101. See Kostick, *Social Structure*, 28; Raymond D’Aguilers, *Historia Francorum* 20, 301. France also pointed out that Fulcher of Chartres’ references to the chronicle suggest that it was known in Jerusalem by 1101-5. See France, “Critical Edition,” cxxxix, cited in Kostick, *Social Structure*, 28. Concerning Raymond’s reasons for writing his chronicle, see Raymond D’Aguilers, *Historia Francorum*, 235: “imbelles et pavidi.”
Like that of Raymond D’Aguilers, Fulcher’s work was influenced by the timeline of the expedition that the *Gesta* provided and a number of sections borrowed directly from that text. But Fulcher’s chronicle also reflects its author’s own experiences and efforts to gather information in the East concerning events he did not witness. He was more careful than Raymond, however, to avoid obvious conjectures such as the details of private conversations among the Christian knights’ enemies.

One account of the expedition composed entirely independently from the Anonymous *Gesta* has also been examined, the *Historia Ierosolimitana*, believed to have been written by cathedral canon Albert of Aachen. The first six books of this twelve book chronicle, in which the material to be discussed here is found, are believed to have been written *circa* 1100-1102, immediately after the success of the 1096-1099 expedition. Unlike the other chroniclers to be discussed in this chapter, Albert was not himself a participant in the expedition but wrote his work according to the eyewitness accounts of numerous returning knights. Because of its large number of informants this chronicle is

29. See chapter 5, p. 257.


33. Albert of Aachen may have desired to participate but been unable to do so because of his position at the cathedral church of Aachen. Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 1.1, 2; Edgington, “Introduction,” in *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxiii. Also see Kostick, *Social Structure*,...
considered valuable for social and cultural history, though at times it presents contradictory or implausible accounts of events.\textsuperscript{35} Most important for this investigation, Albert’s accounts of events and participants’ experiences and expressions of emotions reveal the influence of juridical attitudes toward violence and the understanding of emotion on a less scholarly author, or even his knightly informants.\textsuperscript{36}

In addition to chronicles, letters by the expedition's participants composed \textit{circa} 1096–1101 that contain even slight references to emotions have also been examined. Clerical authors, and lay authors writing with clerical oversight, sought to share accounts of crusaders’ experiences in the East with readers or listeners in Europe, as well as request spiritual and material assistance.\textsuperscript{37} As in the case of the chronicles, these letters will be examined to see whether or not they reflect the influence of Pope Urban II’s

\textsuperscript{51} According to Herbert E. J. Cowdrey, knights who survived the hardships and suffering of the armed pilgrimage to Jerusalem and lived to tell about it were respected for their experiences and as sources of information, considered “living martyrs” who had become closer to God. Herbert E. J. Cowdrey, “Martyrdom and the First Crusade,” in \textit{Crusade and settlement: papers read at the First Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East and presented to R. C. Smail}; ed. Peter W. Edbury (Cardiff, U.K.: University College Cardiff Press, 1985), 51–52.


\textsuperscript{36} Kostick, \textit{Social Structure}, 86.

sermon, previous juridical and conciliar attitudes toward violence, the need for the
discernment of motives among the expeditions’ participants, and the use of references to
crusaders’ emotions for this purpose.

Accounts of the First Crusaders

Clerical and lay authors all portrayed crusaders as holy warriors, distinct from
previous Christian knights, and the crusade as distinct from previous ecclesiastically
sanctioned military activities. But the instances in which this construction was not
successful – contradictions between ecclesiastical ideals and the emotions and behaviors
attributed to knights – suggest the continued presence of distinctions between
ecclesiastical ideals and clerical authors’ conceptions of knights and their experiences.

Anger

As Sophia Menache explains, chroniclers used a wide spectrum of words to refer
to anger, without clear differentiations between anger, hatred, the violence it could
inspire, and vengeance or revenge.\textsuperscript{38} Augustine had approved of Christians becoming
angry \textit{[irasci]} when it was directed toward sinners to correct them.\textsuperscript{39} Susanna A. Throop
sees the desire for vengeance linked to anger in the concept of royal anger, \textit{ira regis}, in
which leaders who felt that they or their subordinates had been wronged acted quickly to

\textsuperscript{38} Sophia Menache, “Love of God or Hatred of your Enemy? The Emotional Voices of
the Crusades,” \textit{Mirabilia: Journal of Ancient and Medieval History} 10 (2010), http://www.rev-

\textsuperscript{39} See Augustine, \textit{De civitate Dei} 9.5.8, CCSL 47: “irasci,” discussed in chapter 3, p.
105.
achieve justice. But this was also “righteous anger,” based on the divine desire to support the good and eliminate evil, which was to be emulated as an expression of love. For educated audiences of readers with knowledge of patristic and juridical thought as well as the bible, as well as for less educated listeners who heard of these ideas from preachers or their confessors, such anger was understood to justify extraordinary measures. The idea that holy war was an act of vengeance, driven by such anger, had been the basis for wars undertaken previously to aid Christian communities, so was familiar by 1095. Yet in accounts of his sermon, while Pope Urban II described the injuries and insults committed by Christians’ enemies in great detail to spur his listeners to action, he did not directly state that he was experiencing anger. Eyewitness chronicles and letters of the First Crusade in fact contained few references to anger and


42. Menache, “Love of God or Hatred of your Enemy?,” 5.

43. Flori, Croisade et Chevarie, 189; Throop, Crusading as an Act of Vengeance, 47.

44. See for examples Fulcher of Chartres, Historia Hierosolymitana 1.1.2, 1.1..5, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1913), 120–1, 123; Guibert de Nogent, Dei gesta per Francos et cinq autres textes 2.4, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis 127A (Turnholti: Brepols, 1996), 116–7. For accounts of Pope Urban II’s reflection of the theme of vengeance without stating anger directly, see Flori, Croisade et Chevarie, 184–8.
related emotions among crusaders, from any cause. It appeared much more frequently in the work of the non-participant Albert of Aachen. But in all chronicles where it did appear, anger was attributed to the military leaders of the expedition and God.

Eyewitness chroniclers described knights and military leaders on the mission experiencing anger at insults to the faith and the mistreatment of fellow Christians and crusaders. Enemies were described as aware that insults to the Christian faith would drive crusaders to action. Raymond of Aguilers wrote that outside the walls of Ma’arrat-an-Nu’man they desecrated crosses affixed to the walls of the city, “so that they would provoke [provocarent] us the most.” According to Peter Tudebode, leaders “were very angered [nimis irati]” by the slaughter of Christian knights while they foraged during the siege of Jerusalem. They expressed and acted on anger or became upset when men’s disobedience hindered the mission, or when elements of the mission itself – such as their own men or the Byzantine Emperor Alexios I Commenus – seemed to hinder their plans. The anonymous author described Bohemond of Taranto experiencing intense anger at his own troops in the city of Antioch when they refused to leave the homes in which they were hiding to defend the city. “He was angry [iratus], and ordered the city be put to the torch” to get them to flee from their hiding places. These authors described vengeance


as sought even when “anger” was not specifically attributed. Peter Tudebode explained that Bohemond was “too upset [nimis dolens est]” when he heard that at the Emperor Alexios II had attacked his army, and “considered how he would be able to have vengeance [vindictam].”⁴⁸ Both experiencing anger at opponents and being upset by their actions could inspire the desire for vengeance.

However, neither the knights of the crusade nor its leaders always rushed to action themselves out of anger or a desire for vengeance. While Count Bohemond had thought about taking vengeance himself before acting, others instead called on God to seek vengeance for them. Fulcher of Chartres wrote that even before they set out for the East, when he and the knights with whom he travelled encountered a conflict between the forces of Pope Urban II and his enemies in the Church in Rome, “we heartily desired that nothing be done except as vengeance [vindictam] by the lord.”⁴⁹ Crusaders could even seek this aid after death. The anonymous author described a large number of crusaders who had been killed in a conflict in which the crusaders were ultimately victorious requesting such action when they arrived in heaven as martyrs. Together they said “Avenge [Vindica], O Lord, our blood which was shed for you.”⁵⁰ God was called on to take the correct action.

---


There was greater variety in descriptions of anger and the desire for vengeance in Albert of Aachen’s chronicle than in those of eyewitness authors. As in the works of eyewitness authors, Christian leaders experienced anger when they believed others – whether the Eastern Emperor, any enemies in the East, or their own knights – were harming fellow Western Christians or threatening their authority to pursue the mission. In contrast to Peter Tudebode’s description of Count Bohemond as “upset” by Emperor Alexios’ actions, Duke Godfrey of Bouillon and his army became “furiously angry [ira exarserunt] and they refused to serve [the emperor] beyond the faith and peace treaty any longer.”

Duke Godfrey and his men attacked the city of Constantinople soon after, but no condemnation was made by Albert of Aachen or his informants. Eyewitness chroniclers described leaders thinking of vengeance but Albert of Aachen presented them taking it.

Hastily undertaken violence was also seen in Albert of Aachen’s account of Duke Godfrey’s attack on a bear that was harrying a Christian pilgrim. Seeing a bear attempting to catch and devour a fleeing man, “the duke, as he was accustomed and ready to help his Christian comrades in times of misfortune,” drew his sword and rushed into the woods to aid him. When the failure of his initial attack left him and the pilgrim vulnerable, “the Duke, indeed, considering that the cunning and evil animal resisted him

51. Ibid., 2.8, 72–5: “Unde dux et omnis societas in ira exarserunt, et illi ultra fide and pacis seruare noluerunt.”

52. Albert of Aachen, 2.12, 78.

53. Ibid., 3.4, 142–143: “Dux vero sicuti solitus erat et promptus ad omnia adversa Christianis confratribus subvenire.”
with brave [audaci] savagery, moved [motus] in spirit he was strongly indignant [indignatur], approached in a rash and blind [temerario et ceco] attack so that he might pierce its beastly liver.”\(^{54}\) As presented by Albert, a just leader who sought to protect the weak was angered by any enemies who threatened Christians, and sought to oppose them immediately without concern for personal danger.

The captivity of a crusade leader or an attack by a wild animal both caused anger because of the danger they posed to the mission. Conflicts between Western Christian leaders themselves, which could also threaten the mission, had the same effect. Despite differences in the object of the anger, its expression was always linked to a perceived lack of obedience or respect. Difference in intensity of anger, and its effects on a knight’s actions, is noteworthy. Prince Bohemond of Taranto’s “heart was consumed by very great envy and indignation [indignatio] toward [Count] Raymond” after he lost the sole leadership of the city of Antioch to him.\(^{55}\) But “seeing the opportunity in [Duke] Godfrey's departure and [Count] Raymond's absence” the prince and his men were able to overcome the forces obedient to the count, which had remained in the city to guard it, and to take it for themselves.\(^{56}\) Rather than hastily rushing into violence to achieve his goals, Bohemond only acted when he had a clear opportunity. However, according to Pope

\(^{54}\) Ibid., 3.4, 142–143: “Dux vero astutum et pessimum animal considerans in feritate audaci resistere, motus animo vehementer indignatur, temerario et ceco impetu propinquat belue ut iecur eius perforet.”

\(^{55}\) Ibid., 5.26, 370: “cor permaxima invidia et indignatio adversus comitem Raimundum mordebat.”

\(^{56}\) Ibid., “videns oportunitatem Godefridi ducis discussione et Raimundi absentia.”
Urban II’s recruitment sermon, any secular leader’s quest for sole lordship would be counter to the ideal of purely spiritual motives for participation.57

Crusade leaders’ efforts to secure political authority extended to their enforcement of Christian morals, which they generally believed was necessary to secure divine aid and lessen the potential for divine anger. Chroniclers described knights’ worries about God punishing them by causing suffering or denying aid. Fulcher of Chartres, the anonymous chronicler and Peter Tudebode all wrote that the battle for Antioch went badly “because of our sins [pro nostris delictis].”58 But in times of low morale due to disagreement among leaders, increased mortality from attacks and famine, or military losses, leaders and lower-ranking knights all took action. On one occasion, Albert of Aachen described adulterers being expelled from camp. “This justice by the people of God was corroborated by the sentence of the leaders,” he wrote, “so that God’s anger [ira Dei]

---

57. Bohemond’s motives for crusading have been questioned in modern crusade historiography, but a materialist portrait of him has remained dominant. Steven Runciman argued that his goal in the First Crusade was to set up a Mediterranean empire for himself. See Steven Runciman, The First Crusade (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 46–7. The majority of crusade historians generally agree that crusaders and most of their leaders were driven equally by spiritual and secular concerns, but many have continued to doubt Bohemond’s motives. Norman Housley, for example, saw Bohemond as an opportunist publicly acting from a minimum of socially acceptable piety. See Norman Housley, Contesting the Crusades (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 83. Even historians focusing on on crusaders’ spiritual motivations have vacillated in their assessment of this leader. For example, Jonathan Riley-Smith portrayed a pious Bohemond in 1983 and a materialist Bohemond in 1987. See Jonathan Riley-Smith, “The Motives of the Earliest Crusaders and the Settlement of Latin Palestine, 1095-1100,” English Historical Review 98:389 (1983): 721–36; idem, The Crusades: A Short History (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1987), 22–3.

might be placated.”59 Knights acted on their own from the same concerns as well, expelling married and unmarried women from their camp “lest they displease [displicerent] the lord by the sordid pollution of lust.”60 Crusaders worried about incurring God’s anger, since any actions counter to his will threatened his assistance in their victory and threatened the spiritual rewards that had been presented by the pope. For chroniclers of the expedition, crusaders’ efforts to please God provided evidence of their loyalty to their divine leader.

One area in which Christian leaders and knights seem to have been at odds was in decisions of how to treat captive enemies. Albert of Aachen’s informants described the treatment of enemy captives by Count Raymond and Tancred Marchisus, nephew of Prince Bohemond.61 During the conquest of the city of Jerusalem, Count Raymond allowed a large number of the Christians’ enemies who fled for their lives to take shelter


60. Fulcher of Chartres, 15.14, 340: “ne forte luxuriae sordibus inquinati Domino displierent.”

on the roof of the Temple of Solomon. They planned to escape from the city after formally receiving Tancred’s banner as evidence of his protection, but such treatment of enemies incited anger and violence among the expeditions’ lower-ranking knights. “[The captives] were pleading with much prayer for their lives, being in danger of death, but it did the poor wretches no good at all. For with many resentful [indignantibus] and the Christians incensed with rage [furore], not one of them escaped with his life.” From Albert’s perspective, crusaders’ desire for vengeance overcame their obedience to a military leader. As Riley-Smith presented in his analysis of the role of love or charity in juridical thought on violence, the correction of enemies out of love required force, and to use less than necessary out of mercy actually risked leaving their souls in danger. It was morally justifiable for the crusaders’ to ignore their superiors’ potential plans, but the unnecessary slaughter of the enemy was condemnable. Pope Urban II had not expressly forbidden such killing in his sermon at the Council of Clermont, but Ivo of Chartes’ Decretum, likely produced contemporaneously to that council, had specified that love of one’s neighbor, including enemies, required that Christians punish only out of zeal for justice and, whenever possible, avoid killing.

62. Albert of Aachen, 6.28, 438.

63. Ibid., 6.28, 440–1: “Qui multa prece pro uita flagitantes, in mortis articulo positi…Sed minime misellis profuit. Nam plurimis super hoc indignantibus et Christianis furore commotis, non unus quidem illorum uius euasit.


The knights of the mission were angered by the protection of enemies in Jerusalem whom they were desperate to “correct.” But Tancred, their protector, in turn became enraged by the disrespect Christian knights had shown him in attacking men to whom he had granted protection. “Tancred, glorious knight, was fired up [accensus est] with violent anger [ira vehementi] about this insult to him, and he would not have quieted down without discord and great vengeance [grandi ultione furor], except for the advice and opinion of greater and wiser men, that soothed his pride.”66 They counseled him that “all Saracens and gentiles who are held prisoner for ransoming with money, or already redeemed, should be put to the sword without delay, so that we shall not meet with any problem from their trickery or machinations.”67 The dangers of captives’ trickery seemed outweighed by the dangers of the crusaders using them as pawns in their desire for respect and personal influence, whether it was fueled by the juridical ideal that discipline should correct the errors of wrongdoers for the good of their souls, or financial gain through the ransoming captives.68 But Tancred’s justness as a knight and military leader

66. Albert of Aachen, 6.29, 440–1: “Tancradus uero miles gloriosus super hac sibi illata iniura ira vehementi accensus est, nec sine discordia et grandi ultione furor illius quieuisset, nisi consilium et sententia maiorum ac prudentium illius animum…temperasset.”

67. Ibid., “uniuersi Sarraceni et gentiles, qui captiui tenentur pecunia redimendi aut redempti sine dilatione in gladio corruant, ne fraude aut ingeniis illorum nobis aliqua aduersa occurrant.”

68. For the common practice of ransoming captives, see for example Guy Halsall, Warfare and Society in the Barbarian West (New York: Routledge, 2003), 229.
of the expedition was ultimately shown in his willingness to respect and heed the advice of his own superiors and avoid undue strife.  

Letters written by participants in the crusade contained very few references to anger among western Christians or their enemies. For example, Stephen of Blois’ letter to his wife, 24 June 1097, described the crusaders pursuing and fighting enemies at the cities of Nicomedia and Nicaea with “fierce spirits [animis ferocibus],” but there was no reference to anger, fury, indignation, or the need to achieve vengeance. He only literally described anger or rage when it was caused by the military losses of crusaders. After numerous losses at Antioch the crusaders “burned with fury [furore accensi] against the sacrilegious Turks, so came together prepared to die for Christ out of sorrow [dolore] for their brothers.” As seen in chronicles, events could cause intense sorrow or intense anger. Anselm of Ribemonte also described the struggle for Antioch in his second letter to Archbishop Manassus of Reims, in July 1098. But his account, which ended with the crusaders’ victory at Antioch, neither referred to to anger among them nor sorrow over their losses. Anger was only experienced and expressed when vengeance was called for.

69. See for example Bonizo of Sutri, Liber de vita christiana 2.2–3, 34–5, discussed in chapter 5, p. 231.

70. “IV. Epistula Stephani comitis Carnotensis ad Adelam uxor suam,” 138: “Nostri autem velocissime parati, Turcos animis ferocibus receperunt.”

71. Ibid., 151: “furore accensi in sacrilegos Turcos pro Christo mori parati, pro fratrum dolore concurrerunt.”

72. “XV. Epistula II Anselmi de Ribodimente ad Manassem archiepiscopum Remorum,” 156–60
The chronicles and letters discussed above reveal differences in attributions of anger to crusaders by clerical participant authors, clerical authors informed by laypeople, and lay epistolary authors. Participant clerical chroniclers and epistolary authors described anger among military leaders and their subordinate knights that fit into Pope Urban II’s ideal motives for the expedition. Anger and sorrow was experienced for the same reasons, over harm or potential harm to fellow Christians or the expedition. But anger also fueled the desire for vengeance, in response to perceived injustice. In the few lay epistolary references to anger it was tied to the outcome of a battle and never portrayed among crusaders over personal offenses.

Albert of Aachen’s chronicle, however, described anger more frequently and distinct differences from the ideals of Pope Urban II’s sermon at Clermont. While the anger his chronicle described as fuelled by papally approved causes such as harm committed against Christians always resulted in positive outcomes, anger experienced over personal offenses endangered the mission by driving men to hasty action. The patristic author Ambrose had warned of the dangers of anger and considered it an emotion that needed to be restrained. As Albert of Aachen explained, it drove men to commit actions they regretted. The consequences of such anger and the actions it inspired show a clear link between sorrow and anger. Participant chroniclers’ leaders avoided such sorrow by carefully considering actions before undertaking them, while Albert of

Aachen’s crusaders’ acted out of anger frequently and as a result caused or experienced sorrow and more anger.

Sorrow

Eyewitness clerical chroniclers described Pope Urban II recruiting knights for an expedition to the East because of the suffering of Christians in the holy land. Their suffering caused them sorrow, and him sorrow in recounting it.\textsuperscript{74} Albert of Aachen also described suffering as the cause for the crusade. But rather than describing the crusade as beginning with Pope Urban II’s successful recruitment sermon at Clermont, Albert reported that Peter of Amiens, Peter the Hermit, began the crusade by gathering participants after he returned from a pilgrimage to the holy land. On his visit to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, “certain unlawful and wicked things were presented to him, and he received them with a sad \textit{tristi} mind, groaning \textit{infremuit} in spirit.”\textsuperscript{75} When he visited the patriarch of Jerusalem and asked why he “allowed gentiles and wicked men to defile the holy places and let offerings be carried off” and what could be done, the man “offered a tearful \textit{flebilia} response” that he and his own forces were too weak to respond to their persecutors.\textsuperscript{76} Seeing that aid was clearly needed, Peter returned

\textsuperscript{74} Discussed in Chapter 4, 263.

\textsuperscript{75} Albert of Aachen, 1.2, 4–5: “Ubi in oratorio dominici Sepulchri presentatus visa quedam illicita et nefanda tristi animo accepit, et infremuit spiritu.”

\textsuperscript{76} Albert of Aachen, 1.2–3, 4–5: “cur pateretur gentiles et impios sancta inquinare et ab hiis fidelium oblations asportati requirit…flebilia profert responsa.”
from the East and began to recruit Christians of all classes who were willing to defend the holy land and end Christians’ suffering there.\(^{77}\)

With sorrow driving both versions of the initial organization of the crusades, knights who participated in the expedition for the correct motives would be expected to experience sorrow as well. They should sorrow for the suffering of Christians in the East, and authors described sorrow among them for their fellow crusaders on the mission as well. But Pope Urban II had also warned crusade participants of the sorrow for themselves they would experience on the expedition as a result of their own sacrifices. As was the case with anger, authors use a number of terms and behaviors as evidence of experiences and expressions of sorrow among knights who traveled to the East. After all, sorrow might be expected in a military conflict, over lost loved ones or territory.\(^{78}\) So, although the First Crusade was an overwhelmingly successful mission sorrow still figured prominently in references to crusaders emotions.

---


When examining sorrow it should be remembered that according to Pope Urban II’s recruitment sermon at Clermont, the deaths of fellow participants should have been celebrated as achievements of God’s grant of martyrdom. But as with anger, distinct differences can again be seen between Albert of Aachen’s chronicle and those of eyewitness chroniclers. Albert of Aachen’s informants consistently described experiences and expressions of intense sorrow at the deaths of crusade participants with no mention of martyrdom.79 For example, while the Christians were constantly under attack during the lengthy battle for Antioch their sorrow never seemed to lessen. “A daily lament [lamenta] over those killed could be heard in the camp;” and as the battle continued, “the people vehemently mourned [luxit]” lost family and friends.80 However, even after the eventual victory at Antioch, when Anselm of Ribemonte, count of Ostrevant and Valenciennes, was killed by a rock thrown at a fortress near Jerusalem, “the princes grieved [dolentes] and were troubled [turbati] by the death of their brother and fellow knight.”81 The grief and lamentation of Albert of Aachen’s informants suggests that they were less affected by the spiritual rewards promised for participation, including martyrdom and closeness to God, than by the mortal risks of the battlefield.

In contrast, participant chroniclers such as Fulcher, the anonymous author and Peter Tudebode frequently described crusaders as more focused on the spiritual rewards of deaths on the expedition than the deaths themselves. Fulcher of Chartres wrote that

79. Albert of Aachen, 2.29, 112; 3.52, 218; 4.28, 290; 376–8.
81. Ibid., 5.31, 376–7: “Dolentes et turbati principes de interitu fratris et commilitionis.”
knights “struggling [agonizantes] for a long time” in battle “many voluntarily completed the course of the martyrs.”82 Their deaths did not cause sorrow, but the anonymous chronicler and Peter Tudebode highlighted the dramatic display of sorrow by Guy of Hauteville, Duke of Amalfi, when he heard of the supposed death of his brother and former military superior, Prince Bohemond of Taranto. Guy “began to cry and to shriek [plorare et ululare], and to beat his breast violently,” and exclaimed “if only I had received blessed martyrdom with you, that I would have seen you raised up to your most glorious end!”83 According to Gerd Althoff and Laurent Macé, such displays of intense sorrow served a public function in the portrayal of actors’ personal characters and relationships with one another.84 In this case sorrow provided evidence of Guy’s religious devotion as well as his both fraternal and hierarchical relationship with Bohemond. His display of loyalty to God in his desire for martyrdom, and to Bohemond in his desire to

82. Fulcher of Chartres, 1.16.4, 226–7: “Diu enim agonizantes…martyrii cursum multi voluntarie complessent.”


loyally die with him certainly fulfilled the requirements for obedience presented by Bonizo of Sutri, Ivo of Chartres, and Pope Urban II.  

But beyond references to martyrdom, all chroniclers did attribute sorrow to crusaders over the deaths and suffering of fellow knights and leaders. The most intense experiences and expressions of sorrow, such as Guy’s, appeared for, and from, men of the highest rank.  

According to Albert of Aachen’s informants, crusaders who were “indeed offended and sad [offensi et tristes]” wept over the “cruel death and abominable treatment” of Duke Robert of Normandy. According to Raymond D’Aguilers and Albert of Aachen, the capture and beheading of Roger of Barneville, Lord of Cotentin, “most famous and beloved by all,” as he pursued retreating enemies, caused “sorrow [dolor] to invade” the Christians.  

The most intense expressions of sorrow over the loss of a leader followed the death of a beloved ecclesiastical official. But in contrast to their treatment of the loss of secular leaders, the eyewitness clerical authors who described such deaths made it clear that Christians on the mission trusted that such a death brought the deceased closer to God. Raymond D’Aguilers described his own and other Christians’ “grief [luctus]” after the death of the papal legate Adhémar of Monteil, bishop of Le Puy, as so great that

86. Fulcher of Chartres, 8.6, 330; 9.5, 322; Albert of Aachen, 2.29, 111; 3.48, 212.
87. Albert of Aachen, 2.34, 120–1: “Offensi vero et tristes, universi lamentabuntur confratrem tam crudeli nece et vili tractatu perisse.”
88. Raymond D’Aguilers, 9, 252: “miles clarissimus et carissimus omnibus, nomine Rogerius de Barnevilla...Invasere igitur nostros dolor;” Historia Francorum, trans. Hill and Hill, 49. Also see Albert of Aachen, 4.28, 290.
“when considering the magnitude of things we cared to write, we were unable to express anything for a while.”

The anonymous author and Tudebode explained that the legate was more than a spiritual leader. “There was grief [angustia], distress [tribulatio] and great sorrow [dolor] throughout the whole army of Christ, for [the bishop] was a helper of the poor and a counselor of the rich, and himself ordained clergy, preached and reminded the knights [to care for the poor].”

Adhémar had been a key figure on the mission, actively maintaining morale, and as a representative of the pope acting as the primary mediator between the mission's leaders, participants and divine forces.

But ultimately, according to the anonymous author and Peter Tudebode, it had to be understood that he left this world “by the will of God,” and “his most saintly and happy [felix] soul rejoiced with the angels” after his death.


D’Aguilers, his appearance the day after his death to the servant Peter Bartholomew in a vision.93

Besides sorrow over the loss of fellow participants on the expedition, the anonymous author and Tudebode also described intense sorrow over material losses. Such losses, and the sorrow they engendered, fit into the framework for personal sacrifice that Pope Urban II had presented in his sermon at Clermont.94 According to the anonymous author and Peter Tudebode, participants in the expedition who lost their mounts and supplies while climbing a mountain “stood sorrowfully [tristes], wringing their hands on account of too much sorrow and grief [tristitia et dolore].”95 These men lost the markers of their warrior identity, making it more difficult for them to carry out their mission.96 As had been the case with anger, authors portrayed the experience of this intense emotion coming from threats to the mission.

Intense anger had been dangerous for the mission, but expressions of intense sorrow benefitted the crusaders by gaining the attention of divine and saintly forces. Writing of God’s assistance on the expedition, Raymond D’Aguilers wrote of one

93. Raymond D’Aguilers, 13, 262

94. See chapter 5, pp. 268–70.


occasion when the crusaders had withstood a number of assaults and waited anxiously for a new attack to begin. “There was such lamentation [luctus] and clamor in the camps to God, that you would think the piety of God descending because of the abundance of tears [lacrymarum].” According to patristic and early medieval penitential practices, tears were the most reliable evidence of personal contrition and the desire for forgiveness, attracting divine attention and favor.

However, aid could come to crusaders even without tears. At the lengthy battle for Antioch, “as long as our men were confused [conturbarentur] and when they fell into desperation [desperationem], divine mercy was present and comforted those who were very sad [tristes].” Because of knights’ need to publically display prowess, for them to be frozen in confusion and desperation for aid was potentially deleterious to their professional image. Their behavior may have been presented in this way to show their sacrifice of their identity as trained warriors as equal to the exposure of inner contrition through tears. In the case of a holy war, such confusion could also suggest that knights lacked the religious devotion that would place them securely under divine leadership in battle. But divine assistance had arrived.

97. Raymond D’Aguilers, 8, 249: “Tantus vero luctus et clamor in castris ad Deum erat, ut affluentia lacrymarum Dei pietatem descendendam putares.”

98. See for example chapter 3, pp. 108–9, 120–1, 130.

99. Raymond D’Aguilers, 9, 253: “dum nostri conturbarentur, et quam in desperationem ruerent, divina clementia eis adfuit…nimum tristes tali modo consolata est.”

Later in the protracted battle for Antioch, Peter Tudebode described saintly assistance arriving at just the right time. St. Peter and the Virgin Mary appeared to a priest when he and the crusade’s leaders were assembled on a mountain outside the city. He begged for help when knights were overcome “with grief and sorrow [tristibus ac dolentibus] and ignorant of what course of action to take” during a series of attacks.\(^{101}\) They promised the assistance of saints and knights who had died on the way to Jerusalem to knights who demonstrated religious devotion by undertaking penance, marching barefoot through the city, giving alms to the poor, hearing mass, and taking communion.\(^{102}\) According to Raymond D’Aguilers, the saints who gave clerics and knights devotional instructions and alleviated their intense sorrow over the potential failure of their mission also told them the location of the Lance of Longinus, soon after the discovery of which crusaders won their fight for the city.\(^{103}\)

Besides being provided by spiritual figures, aid also seemed to come from mortals

\(^{101}\) Peter Tudebode, 10.9, 68: “Quadam autem die, stantibus nostris majoribus sursum in montanea ante castellum tristibus ac dolentibus, nescientibus quid facere debuissent;” Hierosolymitano Itinere 7, trans. Hill and Hill, 74.

\(^{102}\) Peter Tudebode, 10.9, 69; Hierosolymitano Itinere 7, trans. Hill and Hill, 75.

\(^{103}\) Raymond D’Aguilers, 10, 253–11, 259; 13, 265–8. For the “discovery” of the lance and the importance of its unearthing being used by chroniclers to explain the crusaders’ unlikely victory at Antioch, see Thomas Asbridge, “The Holy Lance of Antioch; power, devotion and memory on the First Crusade,” in Reading Medieval Studies: Annual Proceedings of the Graduate Centre for Medieval Studies in the University of Reading 33 (2007): 4, 13, 18, 21–2, 26. The “rescue” of the Lance of Longinus, a soldier’s lance that had pierced Christ, fit the paradigm of the crusade as the defense of Christians’ faith as well as the relic itself being a symbol that fit its rescuers. Knights seeking forgiveness of their sins through their worldly profession could understand a roman soldier’s conversion after piercing the side of their savior. For the use of relics as symbols by those who venerated them, based on their own identities as much as the history of the relic, see Patrick J. Geary, Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Middle Ages, revised ed. (New Jersey: Princeton, 1978; 1990), 7–9, 22.
in the case of an emergency. Peasants from the city of Marash greeted the knights that the anonymous author described experiencing intense sorrow over supplies lost in the mountains after their descent. The peasants were “rejoicing [letantes] and bringing much merchandise.”104 When seen in the context of earlier penitential ideas, later reiterated by Ivo of Chartres, intense or even debilitating sorrow was evidence of participants’ desperation for spiritual purity and divine aid, which would be answered by a loving, just God.105 In fact, any aid provided to the crusaders was a product of divine will.106 As Fulcher of Chartres explained, “The Lord does not give victory to splendor of nobility nor brilliance of arms but lovingly helps in their need the pure in heart and those who are fortified with divine strength.”107 Just as the pope had promised, participants were rewarded for their devotion and personal sacrifices. The intensity of those sacrifices was shown in crusaders’ sorrow. But nonetheless, they appreciated the material and spiritual rewards that their suffering earned them as they struggled on the expedition, as well as those that would only come after their military successes or martyrdoms.

As was the case with anger, western Christians’ letters home provided few descriptions of sorrow among crusaders. In the letters examined here the only reference


106. If every event in the natural world was seem to stem from God’s act of creation, and the crusade itself was an act of divine will, all human actions during the crusade could be so credited as well. See for example Riley--Smith, First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading, 11, 16, 23, 39, 91, 100, 119.

107. Fulcher of Chartres, 12.1, 197: “Sed forsitan supplicatione nostra Dominus placatus quia nec nobilitatis pompae nec armis lucidis triumphare favet, sed menti purae et virtutibus divinis munitae in necessitate pie subvenit.”
to sorrow among the crusaders is seen in the knight Anselm of Ribemonte’s second letter to Archbishop Manassas of Rheims. After Bohemond’s and Count Raymond’s forces were repulsed during a battle for Antioch, he described “all our men bewailing [dolentes] their disgrace and grieving [gementes], for a thousand of our men fell that day.” To experience and express sorrow for the deaths of fellow Christians fit the model for the emotion presented by Pope Urban II and repeated in chronicles, but the pope had offered reassurance of the rewards of martyrdom for the deceased. This should have at least tempered the knights’ sorrow.

However, Anselm offered an explanation for sorrow among the knights on whom he wrote. The men did not intentionally sacrifice themselves for the mission, but died because “those seeking to acquire a name for themselves had attacked incautiously.” He presented these deaths as the result of personal faults, rather than knights’ intentional sacrifices for the expedition. In fact, most events that caused sorrow in the chronicles were described in letters with no mention of the emotion. As Anselm explained, “the more bitter they [the trials on the mission] were, the more eager our men were to endure them.” Thus, following Pope Urban II’s references to sorrow in his sermon, Anselm

108. “Epistula II Anselmi de Ribodimente ad Manassem archiepiscopum Remorum,” 158: “nostri omnes dolentes atque suum dedecus pariter gementes, nam illa die mille de nostris corruerant.”

109. See chapter 5, pp. 269–71. For previous references to the martyrdom of holy warriors, also see, in the same chapter 4, pp. 192, 225,

110. Ibid.: “cupientes sibi nomen adquirerem … incaute adierunt.”

111. Ibid., 159: “quanto asperiores tanto alacriores nostri in sustinendo fuerunt.”
did not describe this emotion among knights for sacrifices intentionally undertaken for
the mission because there was no guilt, no regrets.

Clerical chroniclers’ descriptions of experiences and expressions of sorrow
among participants in the 1095 expedition to the East are generally congruous
with the sorrow that authors reported Pope Urban II to have described. Modifications to
papal ideals, however, presented the experience and expression of sorrow in ways that
would most appeal to knights. For example, God granted spiritual and material rewards to
crusaders during their times of sorrow and suffering rather than only after their military
success or martyrdoms. A comparison of eyewitness clerical chroniclers’ accounts and
that of Albert of Aachen suggests that this was a distinction between clerical and lay
perspectives. Albert himself corroborated Pope Urban II’s ideals for participants’ motives
through his descriptions of Peter the Hermit’s experiences in the East. But his chronicle
did not portray knights themselves as having internalized the ideals of the Clermont
sermon to the same extent as those described by participant clerical authors, especially
concerning martyrdom as the most valuable reward for participation. Albert of Aachen,
familiar with possible clerical reservations about the expedition, may have been
demonstrating them himself.

Lay participants who wrote letters home convey further variations in knights’
adoption of the ideals presented in Pope Urban II’s sermon. Anselm of Ribemonte’s brief
references to sorrow reflect his desire for the rewards the pope promised, knights’ sorrow
over the loss of fellow crusaders, and their need for presentation of themselves as
successful in the field. His perspective supports Richard W. Kaeuper’s idea of influential
interchanges between ecclesiastics’ ideals and knights’ military ideals. Having lost a battle and mourned the deaths of fellow crusaders, Anselm publicly admitted his forces’ tactical errors in their desire to be seen as eager to suffer through the personal sacrifices brought on by the expedition itself. He and his forces thus remained eligible for spiritual rewards.

Fear

While the pope – and Peter the Hermit – had expressed sorrow over the fate of Christians in the East and expected it among those who sought to aid them, the sermon at Clermont asked knights to engage in a military expedition to aid their fellow Christians without fear. Clerical chroniclers described the pope saying that participants in the mission should have no concerns for their physical or spiritual safety and in fact should seek out personal danger. Their experiences in the East would be unpleasant, including such ills as “misery, poverty, nakedness, persecution, want, illness, hunger, thirst, and other discomforts,” but they were not told of the risk of fear. The idea that those who feared God would be protected so should have no fear of the world through which they passed also appeared in contemporaneous juridical thought, and would appear in


113. See for example Baldric of Dol, 1.5, 15; Anonymous, 1.1, 1: “miserias, paupertas, persecutions, egestates, infirmitates, nuditates, famem, sitim et alias huiusmodi.”
countless sermons in the centuries that followed. But despite this admonition, Peter Tudebode explained that among the many “anxieties [anxietates] and hardships [multas angustias] suffered in the name of Christ and for the journey of freeing the Holy Sepulchre” were “trials [tribulationes], famine [fames], and fears [timores].” Fear was frequently described among Christian knights of all classes in chronicles of the 1095 expedition. Chroniclers will also be seen to have linked fear to other potentially negative emotions, like anger and sorrow. But to an even greater extent than other emotions, it was absent from letters written by participating clerics or knights.

Eyewitness clerical chroniclers described fear differently among crusaders of different social classes or military rank. Fulcher of Chartres explained that at Antioch “some withdrew themselves from the difficult siege, some from want [egestatem], some from cowardice [ignavium], some from fear [timorem] of death, first the poor [pauperes], then the rich.” Peter Tudebode and the anonymous author told of an almost identical occurrence, writing of the flight of “the little people [gens minuta], along with the most poor [pauperrima]” when they realized that “the possibility of aid or assistance was

114. Kaeuper, Holy Warrior, 70, 72. Also see Bonizo, Liber ad amicum 1, 572; Book of Bonizo, 160–1, discussed in chapter 5, 231; Ivo of Chartres, Decretum 10.87, 38, discussed in chapter 5, 246.


116. Fulcher of Chartres, 16.6, 341: “qui ab obsidione tam anxia se removerunt, alii propter egestatem, alii propter ignavium, alii propter mortis timorem, primum pauperes, deinde locupletes;” History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, trans. Ryan, 97.
thoroughly lacking.” Tudebode began this anecdote with the caveat, however, “Our leaders were in great fear [pavore].” The crusaders’ leaders were afraid, but the poor were the first to flee. According to Conor Kostick, eyewitness clerical chroniclers of the crusade were influenced by the biblical tradition of cowardice among “the poor,” pauperes, whose defenselessness made fear unavoidable.

Because of their weakness in a foreign land, general supply problems, and need for saintly and divine assistance, all participants on the 1095 expedition could be classified as pauperes. But crusade leaders still made efforts to limit the fears of the poor and minimize their flights. Raymond D’Aguilers wrote of one occasion in which crusaders needed to raise money to pay to cross a river to avoid their enemy’s attacks. When crusade leaders were able to gather the funds and movement became possible it was “very useful at that time, because the poor [pauperes] people of the army feared [metuebant] the frequent attack of the enemy.” The risk of fear and flight among the poor provided just leaders, responsible for the defense of others, with the opportunity to fight despite their own fears and help their dependents.


118. Peter Tudebode, 6.5, 42: “Majores quoque nostri in nimio erant pavore.”

119. Kostick, Social Structure, 34.

120. Ibid., 32, 121.

121. Raymond D’Aguilers, 6, 245: “multum illo tempore profuit; quoniam pauperes de nostro exercitu…frequentem hostium asolutionem metuebant.”
Both Albert of Aachen and eyewitness chroniclers described fear as experienced and expressed by knights when they faced danger, though the ways authors presented them overcoming it differed. None of the authors condemned the experience or expression of fear itself if knights remained in the field and chose to act – or could be made to do so – despite the threats they perceived. For example, Albert of Aachen explained that when Tancred Marchisus and his forces and another group of Christians saw each other from their mountainous camps, both sides “were afraid [timuerunt] with great fear [timore].”\(^\text{122}\) Each group judged the other to be enemies, but they remained encamped and warned others who arrived of the danger nearby. These crusaders’ fears, albeit misplaced, encouraged them to aid other participants in the mission.

That men were not condemned for the experience of fear in itself was seen at the battles for Antioch and other cities. Crusade leaders Duke Godfrey of Bouillon and Duke Robert of Normandy tried to organize their knights to scale the walls of Antioch on ladders, but saw that the men “shook [concussa sunt] with fear [metu] and excessive doubt, each one hesitating about being first to enter.”\(^\text{123}\) As was seen above in the discussion of anger, the expedition’s leaders used aggressive displays to spur their subordinates to action. The leaders responded by admonishing them, “roaring [infremuerunt] with too much spirit,” that they needed to risk death to receive eternal

\(^{122}\) Albert of Aachen, 3.6, 148–9: “timuerunt timore magno.”

\(^{123}\) Ibid., 4.18, 276–7: “Sed metu et nimia dubietate corda eorum concussa sunt, et singuli hesitantes de prima ingressione.”
rewards.\textsuperscript{124} But their advice was simple: it was better to act for the right spiritual reasons outside of Antioch than to survive for earthly rewards, since “we all have to die somehow.”\textsuperscript{125} This speech lessened the knights’ fears and they mounted the ladder to enter the city.\textsuperscript{126}

Besides crusade leaders’ influence, the encouragement to fight in an imminent battle despite fear could also be more personal, driven by love of family or religious devotion rather than respect for a military leader. Fulcher described knights who contemplated flight before battle being stopped and dissuaded from such action by God, saints, or a deceased relative, and then doing the same for others by relating their experiences.\textsuperscript{127} But in all cases, as long as knights were convinced to ignore or overcome their fears, or participate despite them, neither they nor their experience and expression of fear were condemned. After all, for knights to not participate out of fear could cause danger for the mission. According to the anonymous chronicler and Peter Tudebode, when the city of Antioch was attacked, Prince Bohemond of Taranto found his troops were “shut up in the houses afraid \textit{timebant}, some from hunger and others from fear

\textsuperscript{124} Ibid.: “nimium spiritu infremuerunt.”
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid.: “Mori enim habemus quocumque modo.”
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid., 4.19, 276.
\textsuperscript{127} For the appearance of God to a cleric about to flee, see Fulcher of Chartres, 1.20.1, 245. For an arms bearer who was about to flee who was dissuaded by the appearance of his brother, who had died on the expedition, see ibid., 1.20.2, 246–7
[timore] of the Turks.”¹²⁸ As mentioned previously, Bohemond got his subordinates out of the houses by burning part of the city to drive out the enemies, but “he was very sad, fearing [timens] for the churches of Saint Peter and Saint Mary, and the other churches.”¹²⁹ According to Herbert E. J. Cowdrey, this concern for Church property may have been a long-term result of peace and truce of God efforts, a sacred responsibility that he would have been taught was given to kings for the protection of ecclesiastical property within their territory.¹³⁰ Given that Antioch was later conquered, neither Bohemond’s fears nor sorrow had any impact on the mission. But such emotion highlighted his praiseworthy devotion to the expedition and the faith, and his identity as a just Christian leader.

The most dangerous and most condemned expression of fear on the mission by a high-ranking knight was flight from battle. The anonymous chronicler, Tudebode, and Fulcher of Chartres provided multiple examples of flights by participants of all ranks, but flight by a high-ranking mounted arms bearer was the most condemned. According to the

---


anonymous author and Tudebode, “imprudent [imprudens]” count Stephen of Blois “shamefully ran off to another camp.”  
His escape was especially condemned because he had just been chosen to be the leader of the expedition – the only attempt the crusaders made to select a singular leader – and he blamed his need to leave on an illness.  
Even after his retreat Stephen was “thoroughly terrified [perterritus].... seized by too much fear [timore], he disgracefully [turpiter] fled with his army with great speed.”  
Stephen's flight from the ultimately victorious battle for Antioch was considered unwise or shameful, but his retreat from the expedition was a disgrace.

Non-participant author Albert of Aachen's account of Stephen's flight lacked personal condemnations of his action, but suggested he was either lying about his illness or taking advantage of it as a pretext for flight. “I don’t know from what cause Stephen of Blois declared himself taken by a sickness…nor above all able to remain in the siege any further,” Albert wrote, but “wishing his brothers well he left them by the opportunity of his illness.”  
But clerical authors’ opinions of Stephen’s flight all reflected worries


132. Ibid.


about the effects his absence would have on their survival. As Albert of Aachen explained, “when he left, four thousand men of war followed him, who were of his company.”\(^{135}\) The retreat of a leader meant the loss of his subordinates, but fear spread to his equals and superiors as well. Stephen convinced those he met in the course of his retreat to flee with him, which almost included the Emperor of Constantinople and some forces he was bringing to Antioch to aid the western Christians. According to Tudebode and the anonymous author, when Stephen told Emperor Alexios what had happened he became “overwhelmed by fear [timore perterritus],” but Bohemond talked him out of turning around and returning to Constantinople.\(^{136}\)

Tudebode, the anonymous chronicler, and Albert of Aachen described another flight that threatened to spread fear to others. William of Grandmesnil, William of Melun, and six other knights fled from Antioch after the end of battle in which they had been “overwhelmed by fear [timore perterriti],” when “fear [formido] and despair of living increased, and thoughts of escape sprang up in the hearts of many because of the burden of daily suffering.”\(^{137}\) Unlike Stephen of Blois, they fled after the battle rather than before it, but physically paid for their cowardice as well as negatively influenced others. As result of their climbing over the city wall and rushing to a seaport “nothing remained of

---

135. Albert of Aachen, 4.13, 268–9: “Eo itaque recedent, quatuor milia virorum belligerorum eum secuta sunt, qui de eius fuerant comitatu.”


their hands and feet except bone.” However, they were still able to spread the false information at the port they reached. Their story that the crusaders had all perished so “dumbfounded” sailors they met that, “overwhelmed by fear [timore perterriti],” the men set out from the port hastily, were surprised by Turks and their ships destroyed. Here the flight of a small number of knights resulted in additional deaths, but because so few participants in the expedition itself were lost, William of Grandmesnil and those who fled with him were not condemned as strongly as Stephen of Blois and his men.

While fellow crusaders and chroniclers condemned knights’ flights from fear and the negative influence they could have on others, there were occasions when the eyewitness chroniclers described the public forgiveness of such flights by crusade leaders. Tudebode wrote of another flight by William of Melun, this time with Peter of Amiens, from Prince Bohemond’s camp at Antioch. That military leader was the only one to condemn their flight. After they were retrieved, the prince called the men “miserable [infelix],” “infamous [infamia],” “shameful [dedecus],” and “wicked [scelus],” but took no action. Instead, when a large number of knights in the camp petitioned Bohemond for leniency, he responded, “I, for your love [amore], gladly

---


agree.”\textsuperscript{141} William of Melun and Peter of Amiens’ flight would have had little negative effects on the mission, and through their cowardice as \textit{pauperes} they led others to Christian charity. Bohemond’s public protection of them, his charity, contributed to his image as a just leader to his men.

While it has here been shown that chroniclers described flights from fear among crusaders of all classes, they rarely linked it to a stated fear of death. Only Albert of Aachen’s chronicle described participants who fled as “fearing [metuentes] for their lives.”\textsuperscript{142} But he also presented clerics reminding participants to think of the “reward which Lord Jesus will give back to all those who are to die for his love [\textit{amor}] and favor [\textit{gratia}] on this journey.”\textsuperscript{143} Similarly, Duke Godfrey of Bouillon assured his knights that they should not fear risking death because “whether we live or die we are the Lord’s.”\textsuperscript{144} But this encouragement was portrayed as far more effective in participant clerical chronicles than in that of Albert of Aachen.

Participant clerical authors more frequently referred to the expectation of death with no reference to fear. As Raymond D’Aguilers wrote of a group of crusaders under attack in the battle for Jerusalem, “The servants of God patiently endured this, holding to the purpose of faith, either that they might die or avenge themselves in person on their

\begin{quote}

\textsuperscript{142} Albert of Aachen, 3.41, 204: “vite sue metuentes.”

\textsuperscript{143} Ibid., 4.38, 306: “premium quod Dominus Iesus omnibus hiis redditurus est qui eius amore et gratia hac in via moritur in sunt.”

\textsuperscript{144} Ibid, 3.60, 234–5: “quia sive vivimus sive morimus Domini sumus.”
\end{quote}
enemies.” 145 The anonymous author described an intense battle in which the enemy intentionally frightened the crusaders with shouts and threatening gestures, driving many to flight, but no fear was stated. 146 On another occasion he described some knights who had been surrounded as “all thinking of death,” but again with no reference to fear. 147

Pope Urban II’s sermon had given a clear reason to experience no fear of death: that it would result in a heavenly position of martyrdom. The anonymous author and Peter Tudebode showed that crusaders’ embrace of this idea lessened their fears. After one battle they both explained that many of the mission’s participants who were killed had “received martyrdom,” and “we believe that they ascended to Heaven and received the white robes of martyrs.” 148 Since faith successfully encouraged participation despite any fear of injury or death in battle, to leave in the middle of a battle was a clear sign of one’s inability to engage in personal sacrifice or to trust in God’s aid, as well as a lack of desire to move closer to him.

Like the chronicles, letters written by lay and clerical participants in the expedition described Christian knights in situations that could cause fear. But as in the case of other emotions, fear was far less frequent in letters than the chronicles.

145. Raymond D’Aguilers, 20, 298: “ista patienter servi Dei sustinebant, habentes fidei propositum, vel quod occumberent, vel quod ad praesens se de hostibus vindicarent.”


147. Anonymous, 10.37, 88: “putabant mori.”

Archbishop Dagobert of Pisa, Duke Godfrey and Count Raymond at one point described the crusaders at Antioch as so surrounded by the enemy that “no one dared [auderet] to leave the city,” but no one was described as fearful or any of the other related states.149 People later known as fearful in participant clerical chronicles mentioned no personal fear in their letters. Stephen of Blois described no fear or illness, the supposed causes of his flight from Antioch, in his letters to his wife.150 Participants’ letters’ only attributed fear to Christian knights when it personally threatened others’ safety or the goals of the expedition as a whole. Anselm of Ribemonte referred to the “various tribulations” experienced by the crusaders on their journey in his second letter to Archbishop Manassas of Rheims. Among others difficulties, these include hunger, bad weather, and the “flight of fearful [timidorum] troops.”151 For Anselm, fear itself was not a tribulation to be suffered, but fearful knights were.

Fear was a useful emotion for providing evidence of knights’ motives for participation. Chronicles that described the 1095 expedition presented fear or its absence among Christian participants as evidence of their devotion to the mission, their faith in papally promised divine rewards and their willingness to make personal sacrifices. But this meant that any experiences of fear intense enough to prevent participation were a


sign of crusaders’ lack of devotion, faith, and willingness to sacrifice. Such weakness was condemned for endangering fellow Christians and the mission, but it also endangered the knights’ souls. The pope’s promise of martyrdom and forgiveness of sins was only achievable by men devoted to the faith and the mission, so flight from battle made one ineligible. 152 Knights who wrote letters to recipients in the west, even writing with clerical assistance, had a simpler view of fear. Crusaders simply did not admit their own or others’ experience of an emotion that risked threatening other knights and the expedition as a whole. Suffering through the effects of fear on the crusaders who admitted to it or acted because of it, whether it caused inaction or flight, was a sacrifice made for the mission.

Courage

Chroniclers described Christian knights on the 1095 expedition fighting despite of, or overcoming, fear as evidence of their devotion to the faith and the goals of the mission. Accounts of Pope Urban II’s sermon at Clermont referred to courage and military virtues directly, as well as knights’ need to willingly act despite potential personal fear. Robert of Reims described the pope celebrating God’s gifts of “glory in arms [deceus armorum],” “greatness of spirit [magnitudinem animarum],” and “physical agility [agilitatem corporum],” held by the predecessors of those who heard, or would

hear of, the sermon at Clermont. The deeds those ancestors had achieved through these gifts should “incite [their] souls to manliness [virilitatem].” Listeners were told that the defense of the Holy Sepulchre was a worthy enterprise in which the brave Franks could be seen to “recollect the virtues of [their] predecessors.” Guibert of Nogent described the pope calling on crusaders to act as eagerly as the Maccabees had in their own defense of their faith and temple. But participants in the expedition also had a new model for courage. Fulcher of Chartres wrote that the pope called on knights to be ever-vigilant shepherds, ready to guard their flocks from wolves at all times. Any lack of alertness to danger – lack of courage – among them was “carelessness [incuriam] or negligence [negligentiam],” through which sheep could be lost to wolves.

In chronicles of the 1095 expedition, participants were frequently described intentionally engaging in dangerous activities. Knights encouraged each other to face danger, when the anonymous chronicler and Peter Tudebode described knights urging each other to achieve bravery in the midst of battle by saying, “Be united entirely in the faith of Christ and the victory of the holy cross, because today if God is pleased all will

154. Ibid., “Moveant…incitent animos vestros ad virilitatem.”
155. Ibid., “virtutis priorum vestrorum reminiscimini.”
156. Guibert of Nogent, 2.4, 112, discussed in chapter 5, p. 262, n. 134.
157. Fulcher of Chartres, 1.2, 322.
158. Ibid., “incuriam…aut negligentiam.”
be made rich.”159 The promise of either spiritual or material rewards strengthened knights’ desire to remain in battle. Knights who were brave enough to remain in battle were often compared to others who were believed not to be doing so.160 According to Peter Tudebode, Christian knights scaling the city walls of Marra were attacked so rapidly that many threw themselves from the wall “terrified by fear [timore perterriti].”161 Those who remained on the wall during the assault were “most courageous [or most wise, skillful, experienced, or sensible] [prudentissimi].”162 To call these men prudentissimi, from prudenter, calls to mind Stephen of Blois’ imprudenter flight from Antioch right before a battle. The outcome of the battle for Marra may have influenced Tudebode’s judgment: that the walls remained guarded terrified the enemy, who fled into the city.163 Those who remained in battle had acted wisely, since their bravery gave them an advantage over the enemy.

Military leaders’ previous accomplishments and religious devotion encouraged bravery among their knights. Tudebode described knights in one battle who had begun to


160. William Ian Miller asserts that in all military contexts cowardice was the baseline against which courage could be measured. See William Ian Miller, The Mystery of Courage (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 133.


163. Ibid.
turn away from it returning to the field and attacking the enemy after “seeing that
Bohemond’s standard was carried most bravely/wisely [prudentissimi] before all
others.” Raymond D’Aguilers described the trust that Duke Godfrey of Bouillon’s
knights placed in him because of his religious devotion. Their belief that he was “God’s
vicar [vicarium Dei]” lessened their fears, because to them it insured that God would aid
their victory. But as in the cases of European territorial conflicts prior to 1095, leaders’
own actions in the field most influenced men’s trust and provided models of bravery for
others to emulate.

Albert of Aachen showed leaders in battle urging their men to follow them into
danger. His informants told him “Duke Godfrey and Bohemond, not slowing their horses,
fly through the enemies with loose reign...strengthened their allies through admonition,
exhorting them repeatedly to slaughter their enemies manfully [viriliter].” Leaders
garnered praise in the field and provided models for behavior by taking the most
dangerous positions among their knights. As Raymond D'Aguilers wrote of Count
Raymond of Toulouse and Saint-Gilles, “How great was the bravery [fortitudine] and

164. Peter Tudebode, 6.11, 44: “Videntes...quod vexillum Boamundi tam prudentissime
foret ante alios delatum;” Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere 4, trans. Hill and Hill, 52.

165. Raymond D’Aguilers, 14, 267: “vicarium Dei.”

166. For Count Fulk of Anjou as an exemplar of bravery, see chapter 4, p. 165; for the
Bishop of Prague’s motivational speech, see chapter 4, p. 190; for similar speeches and behavior
by Duke William of Normandy, see chapter 4, pp. 204–5.

167. Albert of Aachen, 2.27, 108–9: “Dux Godefridus, Boemundus, non equo tardantes,
laxis frenis per medios hostes advolant...socios sepe hortantes ad trucidandos hostes viriliter
ammonitione consolantur.”
judgment the count displayed…fighting in the rearguard he was always defending his 
people, at no time ahead but always the last one to get camped.168

In times of increased danger in which fear was likely to have been experienced, 
authors described leaders inspiring courage among their subordinates by delivering public 
speeches. According to the anonymous author, after seeing large numbers of the enemy 
approaching, Bohemond warned his men that the battle would be difficult and assigned 
them specific tasks for the battle according to their rank or status.169 Mounted knights 
were told to go out to fight “manfully/bravely [viriliter],” and footsoldiers to set up the 
camp and its defenses “wisely/skillfully [prudenter].”170 Bohemond presented bravery as 
a requirement for participation in battle, stating, “if they want to fight today, let them 
come manfully [viriliter].”171 The effectiveness of this type of speech depended on 
knights’ trust in and respect for the military capabilities of their leaders. As the 
anonymous author reported, they responded to Bohemond by exclaiming “You are wise 
and skillful [prudens]...Do and carry out for us and yourself everything that seems good

168. Raymond D’Aguilers, 1, 236: “Quanta vero fortitudine et consilio comes ibi 
claruerit...in postremus pugnans, semper populum defendens erat; nunquam prior, sed semper 
ultimus hospitabatur.” Raymond’s praise for fighting in the rear guard suggests support for the 
tactics shown in the Chanson de Roland, in which the rearguard was the most dangerous position 
and most important for the survival of an army. See La Chanson de Roland, ed. Gerard J. Brault 

169. The sights and sounds that convinced Bohemond of the danger was the large number 
of Turks “all at once [began] to hiss gibberish and shout, saying with loud voices in their own 
language some devilish sound I don't understand.” See Anonymous, 3.9, 18: “Turci coeperunt 
stridere et garrire ac clamare, excelsa voce dicentes diabolicum sonum nescio quomodo in sua 
lingua.”


171. Ibid., 3.9, 19: “Et si hodie luctari volunt, viriliter veniant.”
Knights trusted Bohemond as a just leader, who had in the past proven his courage, to make the right decisions for the mission and for his subordinates. While military leaders fostered courage and were trusted to make tactical decisions in the field, ecclesiastical leaders and clerical officials of all ranks also filled vital roles in the expedition. Clerics bolstered knights’ courage through sermons. Tudebode explained that through biblical examples, bishops and priests “strengthened [confortabant]” participants by including passages such as Matthew 10:28, “fear [timere] not those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul,” in their sermons. Religious rituals were also valuable tools for lessening fear. Raymond D’Aguilers wrote that in times of weakness knights were “brought back to firmness and strength…through the salvation of penance [salutiferam poenitentiae] and aid of fasting.” Pope Urban II had not called for any devotional rituals to be undertaken by crusaders in his sermon at Clermont, but as seen in military narratives prior to those of the 1095 expedition, this had long been a customary practice in appeals for divine assistance when knights were in the field. Devotional acts strengthened knights’ courage in the field by encouraging the belief that divine support would be given.

172. Ibid., 6.17, 36: “Tu sapiens et prudens...omne bonum quod tibi videtur, nobis et tibi operare et fac.”

173. Peter Tudebode, 2.3, 12: “confortabant…‘Nolite timere eos qui occidunt corpus, animam vero non possunt occidere,’” for Matthew 10:28, see idem, note 35.

174. Raymond D’Aguilers, 2, 238: “per salutiferam poenitentiae atque ieiunii opem ad tantam constantiae fortitudinem sunt reducti.”

175. See for example Bachrach, Religion and the Conduct of War, 38–43, 78–98.
Clerical military leaders on the expedition were especially able to inspire courage, because of their providing material and spiritual aid. Papal legate bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, not permitted to bear arms himself, had subordinate knights with him on the expedition. His aid to the mission included providing financial assistance to needy knights and military leaders, but his own banner was carried into battle as a symbol of strength.\textsuperscript{176} He was also able to provide one type of assistance beyond what had been offered by secular leaders. According to Raymond of Aguilers, knights reported that he appeared after his death to guide them through penance, fasting, and lengthy processions to ensure they would make it over city walls, first at Antioch and later at Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{177}

As seen in the value of religious rituals and aid from saints, crusade chroniclers presented divine assistance strengthening courage. Non-participant chronicler Albert of Aachen described divine assistance enabling Christian victories from the start of the expedition. His lay informants told him “with God's aid the war was unyielding to the enemy.”\textsuperscript{178} God enabled the crusaders’ victories, but he made sure they remained safe outside of battle as well. For example, when a knight who pursued an enemy across a deep river on horseback found himself entirely submerged, he still reached the other side still sitting on his horse “by the protection of God’s grace.”\textsuperscript{179}

\textsuperscript{176} For the horror of Bishop Adhémar's banner falling during a difficult battle, see Anonymous, 6.14, 32. For Adhémar's contributions to Count Raymond's funding his troops, see Raymond D’Aguilers, 6, 245.

\textsuperscript{177} See Raymond D’Aguilers, 13, 262; 20, 296.

\textsuperscript{178} Albert of Aachen, 4.52, 330–1: “Sed Deo auxiliante ingravatum est bellum gentibus.”

\textsuperscript{179} Albert of Aachen, 3.44, 206: “Deo protegente cuius gratia.”
In contrast, participant chroniclers presented God’s assistance in a more encompassing way. According to the anonymous chronicler, enemies were overcome in battle by God’s will.\textsuperscript{180} Raymond D’Aguilers described God’s strength as the only thing that could stop Christians’ enemies and protect his believers.\textsuperscript{181} He, the anonymous author and Tudebode specified, “God, who conferred victory on our knights, was doing battle with our footsoldiers.”\textsuperscript{182} After all, God “was merciful [misercors],” [and] “did not permit his knights to perish.”\textsuperscript{183} That God would not permit crusaders to fail meant that battles during the expedition should be left in his control, credited to his will. According to Raymond D’Aguilers, the clerical and military leaders of the expedition formally agreed to this after their early victory at Nicaea had been won through divine strength rather than human skill. “Our affairs should be entrusted to him. We ought not revere kings or leaders of kings, and neither fear [formidare] places nor times since the Lord has rescued us from many dangers [periculis].”\textsuperscript{184}

From Raymond D’Aguilers’ perspective, divine protection had placed knights in a position equal to the military heroes of the Old Testament, the Maccabees, as Pope Urban

\textsuperscript{180} Anonymous, 6.17, 37.

\textsuperscript{181} Raymond D’Aguilers, 7, 247; 8, 250.

\textsuperscript{182} Raymond D’Aguilers, 7, 247: “Deus, qui militibus nostris victoriam conferebat, in peditibus nostris praebatur.”

\textsuperscript{183} Anonymous, 3.9, 20 and Peter Tudebode, 3.3, 27: “misercors qui non permisit suos milites perire;” \textit{Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere} 3, trans. Hill and Hill, 36.

\textsuperscript{184} Raymond D’Aguilers, 4, 241: “ideo ipsi de nobis committendum esse. Non oportere vereri reges, aut regum principes; nec formidare loca vel tempora, quam Dominus de tam pluribus periculis nos eripuisset.”
II’s sermon at Clermont had introduced as a goal for the mission’s knights to achieve. Raymond D’Aguilers wrote “We pronounce God wonderful then, in the Maccabees, and even more wonderful in ourselves.”¹⁸⁵ The leaders of the expedition had officially decided that they could achieve the successes of their biblical forefathers, with victories ensured by God. As long as they remained devoted to the faith, they would have no reason to lack courage.

As has been seen in the case of other emotions, clerical and lay authors of letters described courage and bravery among Western Christian knights much less frequently than authors of chronicles. Archbishop Dagobert, Duke Godfrey and Count Raymond spoke “of the courage [fortitudinis] of our brothers,” but provided no details of this courage.¹⁸⁶ Like participant clerical chroniclers, lay authors of letters credited divine forces with providing the guidance in the field responsible for knights’ bravery. Stephen of Blois’ second letter to his wife Adele described the many battles undertaken to secure the city of Antioch as being fought with “most fierce [ferocioribus] spirit…under the leadership of Christ, with God always fighting on our behalf.”¹⁸⁷ This divine support increased knights’ courage, since they expected to be “brought to the joys of paradise” if

---

¹⁸⁵. Ibid., 7, 245: “Deum, tunc in Machabaeo mirabilem, in nostris mirabiliorem annuntiamus.”


killed in battle. The lack of fear expressed in these letters but presence of courage and religious devotion shows knights achieving the ideals for crusaders presented in accounts of Pope Urban II’s sermon.

Christian authors’ accounts of courage or bravery on the 1095 expedition reflected Pope Urban II’s ideal of the Christian faithful serving God and flourishing under divine leadership. Pope Urban II’s recruitment sermon at Clermont had offered models for emulation in recruits’ ancestors, as well as biblical and pastoral imagery. Participants lived up to these models by consistently seeking out danger and successfully confronting it in defense of the weak, or by aiding others in their efforts to do so, as in the efforts crusaders made to assuage their fellows’ fears. In both chronicles and letters, the crediting of victories to divine will made courage clear evidence of devotion to the faith and desire for the spiritual rewards Pope Urban II had promised. Secular and ecclesiastical leaders, who consistently credited their own strength to divine aid, played a vital role in fostering courage in the field through their own behavior, motivational speeches, material support and spiritual or moral guidance. The material and spiritual influence of ecclesiastical officials who were also military leaders, as seen in the case of bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, demonstrate that courage in both areas were equally necessary for the success of the expedition.

188. Ibid., 150: “ad Paradisi gaudia intulerunt.”

189. See for example chapter 4, pp. 268–9.
Joy

Chroniclers described Pope Urban II’s recruitment sermon at Clermont presenting the benefits to be gained from participation in the expedition. According to patristic tradition, closeness to God that brought freedom from mortal suffering was the greatest joy Christians could seek, and according to juridical thought, defense of the defenseless was the most important goal for just leaders. But the pope did not describe the winning of battles and gaining of material rewards that were an expected part of the process of returning Jerusalem to Christian rule to be in themselves to be a source of joy. Guibert of Nogent, however, writing almost a decade after the expedition, specified that the successful defense of the holy land would bring gaudia to the faithful. As will be seen, while chroniclers of the crusade and epistolary authors presented crusaders achieving joy from the ideals Pope Urban II had presented, they also extended it to sources that he had not approved.

All chroniclers described joy among crusaders as a product of their military activities. The prospect of any battle was a source of joy, according to Albert of Aachen’s description of knights preparing to enter a battle “rejoicing [iocundi] in songs of exultation and all sweet music, as happy [letati] as if they were going to a feast.”

Military successes on the way to Jerusalem also brought joy. The anonymous author, for

202. For Pope Urban II’s references to material rewards, see chapter 5, pp. 273–4.
203. See chapter 5, p. 272.
204. Albert of Aachen, 6.43, 458–9: “voce exultationis...tamquam ad convivium pergentes laetati.”
example, described the crusaders “rejoicing [gaudentes] in happy [felici] triumph” after a success at Antioch. Raymond D’Aguilers provided greater detail concerning specifically what elements of this success brought joy. It was “pleasing and delightful [jocundum atque delectabile]” to the Christian knights that many of their enemies fell to their deaths as they escaped the city, though, as Raymond wrote, “we grieved [doluimus]” over the deaths of their horses. But the experience of joy at the deaths of enemies was not something that Pope Urban II had encouraged among participants. This joy was in fact counter to juridical ideals for the treatment of the weak and vanquished.

The Christians’ arrival at Jerusalem was accompanied by intense joy. As the anonymous chronicler and Peter Tudebode reported, “rejoicing [letantes] and exulting [exultantes], we came to the city of Jerusalem.” Albert of Aachen described this joy as a reflection of participants’ belief that reaching the city at all was a reward for their personal sacrifices on the mission. “All broke out for joy [leticia] in the weeping of tears [lacrimarum],” he wrote, “because they were so close to the holy places for which they had suffered so many hardships, so many dangers, so many kinds of death and

206. Raymond D’Aguilers, 9, 251–2: “jocundum atque delectabile…doluimus.”
207. Radulphus Glaber had described Christians enjoying frightening and injuring their enemies. See chapter 4, pp. 190–1.
208. See for example chapter 3, pp. 95, 106.
famine.”210 The military victory in Jerusalem brought even greater joy. D’Aguilers
described the Christians’ conquest of Jerusalem as bringing a “new joy [gaudium], a new
and perpetual happiness [laetitia] [because] all our suffering and labors was made into
joy and exultation [gaudium et exsultationem].”211 After this success, according to
Tudebode, “they all came rejoicing and weeping with great joy [nimio gaudio plorantes]
to the Holy Sepulchre of our Savior.”212

Following crusade military and clerical leaders’ agreement right before reaching
Antioch to credit divine forces for military victories, chroniclers described crusaders
demonstrating religious devotion by joyfully thanking God for their successes. The
anonymous chronicler wrote that after gaining control of Antioch the knights entered the
city “with great rejoicing [gaudio], we praised and blessed God who gave victory to his
people.”213 Saints also brought joy during and after a successful conquest by promising
further divinely aided victories. According to the anonymous chronicler and Raymond
D’Aguilers, Saint Andrew appeared to the servant Peter Bartholomew to tell him where
the Lance of Longinus could be found after the city of Antioch was taken, which would

210. Albert of Aachen, 5.45, 402–3: “omnes pre leticia in fletum lacrimarum fluxerunt,
eo quod tam vicini adessent loco sancto...pro qua tot labores, tot pericula, tot genera mortis et
famis passi sunt.”

211. Raymond D’Aguilers, 20, 300: “novum gaudium, nova et perpetua laetitia...omnes
dolores atque labores nostros gaudium et exsultationem fecit.”

212. Peter Tudebode, 15.4, 110: “Postea venerunt omnes gaudentes et prae nimio gaudio
plorantes ad nostri Salvatoris Sanctus Sepulchrum;” Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere 11, trans
Hill and Hill, 119.

213. Anonymous, 9.29, 70: “cum magno gaudio, laudavimus et benediximus Deum, qui
victoriam dedit populo.”
prevent whoever carried it from being overcome by the enemy. He was told that he and his fellow participants would receive God’s aid within five days, “from which they will remain happy [laeti] and rejoicing [gavisi].” The city was guaranteed to remain in Christian hands by the promise of the discovery of the lance. This vision, and the eventual discovery of the lance, brought intense joy to Peter and others on the expedition. Raymond D' Aguilers wrote, “I am unable to say how much joy and exultation [gaudium et exsultatio] filled the city at that time.” St. Andrew’s promise of the lance assured Christians that they would hold Antioch.

Victory and divine assistance were sources of joy, but so were the deaths of Christians on the expedition. The promise of martyrdom has been seen to have reduced fear of death and strengthened crusaders’ courage, but the opportunity to move closer to God also brought them joy. The anonymous chronicler and Tudebode wrote that those dead from a battle or any cause on the journey “returned their happy [felices] souls to God with joy and gladness [letantes gaudentesque].” This did not mean however that the process of achieving martyrdom – dying in the field – itself brought joy. Tudebode described knights who died in battle exclaiming, “our God! Why did you not protect our


216. Raymond D’Aguiers, 11, 257: “Quantum gaudium et exsultatio tunc civitatem replevit, non possum dicere.”

blood which was shed in your name?” as they “rose joyfully [laetantis] to heaven.”\textsuperscript{218}

Martyrdom and heaven were desired, but clerical authors still portrayed knights as eager to avoid pain and suffering despite the rewards they received for these sacrifices. But a crusader could achieve martyrdom without a painful death in battle. Chroniclers described any death on the expedition bringing the dead closer to God even if from illness or advanced age. Peter Tudebode described the death of Adhémar of Le Puy, though also a source of great sorrow, as a joyful martyrdom after which “his most happy [nimia felix] soul rejoiced with the angels.”\textsuperscript{219} The joy brought by closeness to God overshadowed the loss of life, for those who died as well as those who loved and respected them.

While closeness to God brought joy, chroniclers also described participants enjoying the collection of spoils after battle. But it was made clear that such activity, focused on material rewards, carried great risks. Raymond D’Aguilers described knights who, “counting and identifying their spoils…while listening to pagan dancing girls, feasted splendidly and proudly,” forgot to defend their position.\textsuperscript{220} They were attacked soon after.\textsuperscript{221} The author did not literally attribute joy to the knights reveling in their spoils, but valuables, including both precious goods and necessary supplies such as food

\textsuperscript{218.} Ibid., 8.2, 46--47: “in coelum laetantis ascendebant…‘Quare non defendis sanguinem nostrum, Deus noster, qui hodie effusus est pro tuo nomine?’”

\textsuperscript{219.} Peter Tudebode, 12.4, 85: “Cuius sanctissima nimia felix exsultat cum angelis;” Hierosolymitano Itinere, trans. Hill and Hill, 93.

\textsuperscript{220.} Raymond D’Aguilers, 9, 252: “enumerando et recognoscendo spolia…audiendo saltatrices paganorum splendide ac superbe epularentur.”

\textsuperscript{221.} Ibid.
and water, were understood in his and other chronicles to be a source of joy. Pope Urban II had wanted participants in the expedition to appreciate spoils as provided by God, but D’Aguilers described the knights at Antioch as “in no way mindful of God who had granted them so great a blessing.” Spoils were, above all, physical evidence of victory so did not actually need to be valuables to contribute to the joy of what should be a primarily spiritual success. Similarly, Albert of Aachen reported that after the battle for Nicaea “Christians cut off the heads of the dead and wounded as a sign of victory, and returned with joy [gaudio] to their fellows.” To experience such joy from victory, distinct from divine aid, was not compatible with Pope Urban II’s ideals for participants’ experiences on the mission.

The anonymous chronicler presented ecclesiastical leaders’ solution to knights becoming distracted from the mission and their religious devotion, by wealth. He reported that after Jerusalem had been captured a message was promulgated “excommunicating anyone who turned aside for plunder as long as battle was being waged.” They were allowed, however, to “return with blessed joy [felici gaudio],” after the battle, “to take whatever could have been predestined to be given to them by the

222. Albert of Aachen described a valley found near Marra, in which plentiful provisions were gathered, being named “Joy” by the crusaders. See Albert of Aachen, 5.31, 376.

223. Raymond D’Aguilers, 9, 252: “nullatenus Dei memores, qui tantum benedicium eis contulerat.” For Pope Urban II’s permission for spoils to be taken, see chapter 5, 274–5.


The taking of spoils was acceptable if a battle or the defense of captured territory was not hindered, and valuables taken were understood to be divine gifts. No comments or recommendations were made concerning the taking of trophies such as the heads of enemies.

Letters written by clerics or laymen on the crusade included more references to joy than they had other emotions. It should be remembered, however, that not all accounts of successes in letters contained literal references to joy. The people of Lucca on the expedition wrote their letter to share news of the knights’ accomplishments. “Greetings full of peace and gladness [gaudii] in the Lord,” they began, “[we write] to the praise and glory of the redeemer.” But while the success they celebrated at Antioch followed “labor and danger,” the letter did not report that the victory itself actually brought joy to the crusaders in exchange for their efforts.

Two lay epistolary authors did report that Christians’ experienced joy from conflicts, though the sources of their joy differed. Count Stephen of Blois’ second letter to his wife described events during the battles for Nicaea and Antioch. He described one battle fought by crusaders at Antioch, and their victory, but explained that “[the enemy] killed many of our brothers and their souls were borne to the joys [gaudia] of paradise.”

---

226. Ibid., “reverterentur cum felici gaudio ad capiendum quicquid eis predestinatum esset a domino.”


228. Ibid., 165: “laborem et pericula.”

The Christians’ success in what seemed at the time to be the final battle for the city, credited to God, also brought joy to participants. Stephen wrote, “Fighting with the strength that God gives we killed an innumerable multitude, God continually fighting with us, we also carried back to the army more than 200 of their heads so that the people of Christ might rejoice [congratularentur].”\textsuperscript{230} Count Stephen, like Albert of Aachen, celebrated the crusaders’ accomplishments even if God aided them.

Anselm of Ribemonte also wrote of the battles for Nicaea and Antioch, but referred to struggles in both conflicts. Many crusaders were killed at Antioch, but rather than describing their deaths as martyrdoms that caused joy for them and those who were present, he commented that the western church should “rejoice [gaudeat] that she has begotten such men, who are acquiring for her such a glorious name and who are so wonderfully aiding the eastern church.”\textsuperscript{231} He believed that crusaders’ earthly accomplishments should bring joy, rather than their deaths. As seen in Stephen’s letter, however, Anselm described crusaders’ practice of bringing enemies’ heads back as evidence of military victory and a source of joy. After the battle for Nicaea, he wrote “our men returning from victory and bearing many heads fixed upon pikes and spears furnished a joyful spectacle for the people of God.”\textsuperscript{232}

\textsuperscript{230} Ibid., 151: “Dei eos pugnando devicimus et de ipsis sine numero, Deus semper pro nobis autem proeliane, interfecimus, et etiam plus quam 200 capita eorum, ut inde congratularentur Christi populi;” trans. Peters, 288.


Participants’ sharing of news of the expedition was intended to help the recipients of their letters understand what they were experiencing. This would encourage prayers for them, which were thought to bring more joyful success. In his second letter to the Archbishop Manassus of Reims, Anselm of Ribemonte explained that he wrote so that Christians in the west could “share equally in our sufferings, and rejoice [gaudeatis] with us in ours successes.” Anselm may have hoped that a reminder of the challenges the crusaders faced would encourage more prayers for their success. Archbishop Dagobert, Duke Godfrey of Bouillon and Count Raymond of Toulouse asked Pope Paschal II to “multiply [his] prayers and supplications in the sight of God with joy and exultation [iocunditate et exsultatione], since God has manifested his mercy in fulfilling by our hands what he had promised in ancient times.” Continued prayers of thanks would encourage future aid and military successes, and thus the continued experiences of joy among the knights and others on the expedition after their victory in the East.

Chronicles and epistolary accounts of the expedition to the East all presented knights’ successes on the expedition as sources of joy. Most eyewitness clerical chroniclers’ accounts of the crusaders’ experiences in the field and their joy at martyrdom showed participants following the path presented by Pope Urban II’s sermon at Clermont. But though participants benefited from the greater closeness to God they seemed to


enjoy, the term *beatus* was never used. Their successes on the march and in battle, from God’s assistance, more often brought them earthly *gaudium* than made them spiritually *beatus* in exchange for their sacrifices. Material joy was clearly sought, but Raymond D’Aguilers was the only participant clerical author to criticize knights for deviating from Pope Urban II’s ideals for participants – and they were reported to have paid heavily for their errors. The differences in accounts of emotion seen between eyewitness clerical chroniclers, non-participant chroniclers who were informed by lay participants’ accounts of joy on the mission, and lay authors of letters, suggest why this chronicler, who said he wrote in part to counter lies that he had heard were being made by unhappy veterans, could have felt his criticism justified.\(^{235}\)

Knights who later reported their own experiences on the expedition to Albert of Aachen or wrote letters home described crusaders experiencing joy from achieving their own military victories, albeit aided by God, and gaining material rewards, rather than primarily from achieving closeness to God. These experiences of joy suggest that the spiritual goals of the mission may have been lesser motives for knights’ participation than accounts of Pope Urban II’s sermon presented as preferred. However, apparently understanding the temptations that material rewards presented for all participants, authors did describe clerics urging knights to restrain their enjoyment of material wealth and channel it into gratitude to God for the sake of the mission and their souls. Among Christians, both participants’ joy and the success of the expedition would have been impossible without religious devotion.

\(^{235}\) See above, p. 226.
Conclusion

This chapter’s discussion of references to anger, sorrow, fear, courage, and joy among knights on the 1095 expedition to the East has shown differences in the presentation of emotions by participant and non-participant clerical chroniclers, and lay epistolary authors. All the authors sought to present the knights of whom they wrote according to the ideals for crusaders that Pope Urban II had presented in his sermon at Clermont. Their defense of this achievement demonstrates how distinct they believed these knights were from past warriors who had been considered holy, just or fought for the church. Authors’ attributions of emotions for this purpose reveal how important they believed the proof of knights’ motives for participation in the expedition to be for the justness of the expedition and the spiritual purity of the knights.

Participant clerical chroniclers almost consistently attributed emotion to crusaders according to the ideals presented for them in Pope Urban II’s sermon at Clermont. Non-participant crusade chronicler Albert of Aachen, who was not at Clermont and based his account entirely on material gathered from crusaders and others, presented additional ideals from other sources, including a message from a priest’s vision of Ambrose of Milan and Peter Amiens’ personal reasons for supporting an expedition to the East. But while these calls to action all presented similar ideals, Albert of Aachen’s attributions of emotion to crusaders frequently differed from those of participant chroniclers.

Pope Urban II and others had approved of anger to correct sinners, and to foster vengeance against those who harmed believers and the Christian faith itself. These authors described anger and the desire for vengeance driving crusaders to avenge harm to
fellow Christians, including both non-combatants and knights. The crusaders’ anger was easily manipulated by their enemies, as seen in their responses to enemies who dramatically showed contempt for the faith before onlookers to lure them into conflicts.

Crusaders also felt sorrow from the threats, physical harm, and material losses that they and other Christians faced. Chroniclers had described Pope Urban II organizing the crusade out of sorrow for the plight of Christians in the East, but crusaders’ sorrow was more often caused by the dangers that the pope had said they would face as they undertook the mission. Authors demonstrated the intensity of this sorrow by describing crusaders shedding of tears, which frequently attracted divine and saintly attention. The martyrdom of fellow crusaders in itself was most often not a source of sorrow, since they were achieving closeness to God as a reward for their participation in the mission. Yet crusaders’ experience of the loss of community leaders and loved ones brought sorrow. The level of sorrow experienced for the deceased was directly linked to their status and social, spiritual, and material influence on participants in the mission. Certainly the martyred crusaders were thought to still assist the expedition from heaven. But they were no longer present to contribute to the military, and in the case of bishop Adhémar, military, spiritual, and financial, efforts of forces on the ground.

Anger and sorrow were both sound motives for participation in the crusade, but carried risks for the mission and its crusaders. Albert of Aachen’s descriptions of crusaders who did not achieve Pope Urban II’s and others ideals for participation in the mission highlighted these risks. He described crusade military leaders as well as men of lower rank experiencing and acting on anger, and seeking vengeance for personal
offenses. When facing enemies of any kind a leader’s defense of fellow Christians easily became a defense of personal status if the enemy seemed to remain standing against him from a lack of personal respect. Leaders overwhelmed by such anger risked taking action too hastily, endangering his own and others’ lives. Such behavior was evidence that he had been overcome by anger that impeded his reason. But in Albert of Aachen’s descriptions, such selfish vengeance was described without negative repercussions, if it was planned and did not endanger large numbers of crusaders or the mission.

Albert of Aachen’s crusaders also differed from those described by participant chroniclers in their expressions of sorrow. While participant chroniclers presented men expressing sorrow to highlight the personal sacrifices they made for the mission, the most frequent source of sorrow that this non-participant author described was produced by the deaths of fellow crusaders. Rather than focusing on the joy martyrdom brought through the deceased’s closeness to God, crusaders he described were overwhelmed by the loss of loved ones. Such sorrow reflected crusaders’ desire to avoid death, fueling their fear of it. However, unlike his descriptions of anger, Albert of Aachen never described such sorrows having a negative impact on crusaders besides those who personally experienced them or on the mission itself. From this non-participant author’s perspective, crusaders could undertake the expedition outside of Pope Urban II’s ideals – at least for sorrow – without condemnation or negative repercussions.

The distinctions between participant clerical chroniclers and the non-participant Albert of Aachen’s attributions of emotion are also clear in their presentation of fear. Pope Urban II and others who offered ideals for crusaders believed that they should have
no fear on the expedition. The divine support and spiritual rewards they were to receive made their journey safe and rewarded their sacrifices. Participant chroniclers described most crusaders experiencing fear, but achieving the pope’s ideals for the emotion by it not affecting their actions in the field. Their expressions of such fear could result in visitations by saints or deceased crusaders, as well as divine or saintly assistance. Crusaders thus may not have achieved victory if they had not experienced fear and continued to fight.

The most negative result of the experience of fear was its leading to flight. Participant chroniclers condemned such behavior through descriptions of the reactions of other crusaders as well as personal critiques of those who fled. Flights by leaders who influenced large numbers of subordinates or other leaders were the most condemned. They were expected to be just leaders who were devoted to the faith, and the loss of potential combatants – their subordinates – risked impeding the mission. Such actions also suggested that fearful crusaders lacked religious devotion or trust in God. Their behavior was condemned for being unwise because of the harm it could cause fellow crusaders, as well as it making them ineligible for spiritual rewards. Unlike participant clerical chroniclers, however, Albert of Aachen described men frequently experiencing and acting on fear, including fear of death in battle, without condemnation. This frequency of fear and crusaders’ lack of reassurance by the idea of martyrdom suggests that Albert of Aachen’s informants and the author himself saw religious devotion and spiritual rewards as having less influence on their experiences of the battlefield than their basic desire to survive.
Courage and joy were the two most positive emotions attributed to crusaders in the field, and were presented similarly by participant chroniclers and Albert of Aachen. In his sermon, Pope Urban II had presented the men he was trying to recruit as innately courageous, inheriting the strength from both earthly ancestors and biblical forefathers. Crusaders’ successes on the mission illustrated their achievement of these ideals, which in turn fostered more courage. All crusade chroniclers presented crusaders’ courage as making them eager to seek out danger to defend the weak. This was how the crusaders themselves saw God, aiding them out of mercy to his faithful subordinates. Military and clerical crusade leaders fuelled crusaders’ courage, delivering speeches and sermons that reminded them of the rewards of the mission and the divine assistance they would receive. Religious experiences such as the discovery of relics, and rituals including penance, processions and fasting had a similar effect, especially when they were undertaken at the urging of saints or deceased relatives who appeared to give advice. This assured crusaders that their eternal souls would benefit from the spiritual rewards and divine attention they were receiving during the mission. Military leaders’ ability to bolster their men’s courage by an assurance of these rewards was even more pronounced if they themselves were seen as exemplars of intense religious devotion who enjoyed a close relationship with God. Participant chroniclers in fact described the military and religious leaders of the crusade formally giving control of the crusade to God after he brought them their earliest victories. It was in this assignment of military responsibility that participant chroniclers’ accounts and that of Albert of Aachen diverged, having otherwise contained similar presentations of courage. Participant chroniclers described
the crusaders as strengthened by God winning battles for them, while Albert of Aachen’s crusaders received God’s defense and assistance in the field to win battles on their own.

Pope Urban II’s sermon at Clermont had presented ideals for joy, though it went unmentioned by the additional providers of ideals for the mission or crusaders. According to accounts of the pope’s sermon written at the time of the crusade the closeness to God that participants would achieve would help them become *beatus*. Almost a decade later, however, a chronicler quoted him saying that the retrieval and revival of the holy land would be a source of *gaudium*. Both of these states were to be achieved through God’s grants of spiritual or material gifts. While in the case of martyrdom the resulting closeness to God was a praiseworthy source of joy, the pope made it clear that the divine gift of material rewards was to be appreciated to a greater degree than the rewards themselves. Similarly, the achievement of goals sought by the crusade – or any war – was to be a source of joy, but not the act of going to war itself. The examination of attributions of joy by participant authors and the non-participant Albert of Aachen has shown that all authors presented the crusaders both deviating from and achieving these papal ideas.

The experiences of joy counter to papal ideals, described by both participant clerical authors and Albert of Aachen, all came from material causes. Knights joyously entered battle and enjoyed killing enemies, both of which were counter to Pope Urban II’s ideals for joy on the mission. Crusaders also enjoyed the collection of spoils, likewise counter to the pope’s ideals. Material justification for this papal demand may be seen in one participant clerical author’s critique of such behavior, in which a few men’s
distraction by loot resulted in their being attacked. Clerical and military leaders of the crusade developed a compromise, to reduce such danger. Crusaders were encouraged to first secure a territory and then loot. Such behavior was permitted to bring them joy as long as they realized that God had granted their victory, and ability to collect wealth.

Crusaders also experienced joy from papally approved causes, however. As the pope said it would, crusaders’ arrival at Jerusalem brought them joy. The intensity of this joy was shown in the tears shed by the Christians after their arrival, much like cases in which the intensity of sorrow was seen in the presence of tears. In both cases authors wrote that the emotions among crusaders were so intense that it was difficult to describe them. But the intense joy that crusaders felt at Jerusalem was fueled by a stated cause, their proximity to holy places. Clerical authors described these knights believing that their presence there was a reward for the struggles they had experienced on the expedition. The divine and saintly aid that helped crusaders get through conflicts and to the holy city was also a source of joy, as the pope said it would be. This joy at closeness to the divine was also seen in the achievement of martyrdom, at least to the crusaders described by participant authors, as the pope had said it should. But deviating once again from Pope Urban II’s ideals, the sacrifice of one’s life to achieve this state did not actually bring joy. This seems counter to the ideal of self-sacrifice that Pope Urban II presented as a driving motive for the mission.

Crusaders’ letters to recipients in the West differed dramatically from the chroniclers, making far fewer references to emotions. Epistolary authors were influenced by both Pope Urban II’s ideals for religious devotion and crusaders’ desires to celebrate
military successes. Among emotions, however, while chroniclers had presented religious devotion influencing the majority of crusaders’ emotions, letters paid the greatest attention to religious devotion itself. Negative emotions such as anger, sorrow, and fear were hardly described in letters. Anger was only attributed to crusaders when vengeance for military losses or disrespect for the faith called for it. Knightly authors of letters expressed sorrow over their own military errors, but not over events such as those Pope Urban II had warned them about on the mission itself. Fear was rarely mentioned, attributed only to men whose behavior threatened the mission.

In contrast, positive emotions such as courage and joy were described more frequently. Courage was celebrated, though credited to divine will rather than described as a personal trait among crusaders. Joy was the most frequently mentioned emotion. Crusaders’ success in the East was described as bringing great joy to all Christians, though it was rarely described among the authors of letters or crusaders themselves. Crusaders themselves were most often described expressing joy when coming to a city to fight, or when martyred in their struggles. The most common mental state described in these letters was the experience and expression of religious devotion, presented as distinct from the emotions and behaviors it influenced in the chronicles. The frequency of thanks offered to God, descriptions of religious rituals and prayers, and requests for prayers made it clear that authors of letters wanted their readers to be aware of the intensity of crusaders’ faith.

Differences in depictions of crusaders’ emotions by participant and non-participant clerical chroniclers, and epistolary authors, are at least partially explained by
these authors’ reasons for writing. Pope Urban II’s call for western participation in the expedition was a way to strengthen his papal position. Western Frankish clerical participants supported his taking this role, and thus the mission itself. Participant clerical chroniclers wrote to commemorate the success of the expedition as a Christian and papal accomplishment, evidence of divine beneficence and support of the Pope Urban II’s papacy.

The pope was an assuredly just leader and an expedition in defense of Christians in danger was itself just. But contemporary juridical thought still placed emphasis on the personal motives of laymen who participated in potentially homicidal acts of violence. The majority of clerical participants who wrote about the mission accompanied secular military leaders of the crusade, to whom they acted as advisors and confessors. Their defense of these men as just leaders was a form of pastoral care for them, to support their continued expressions of religious devotion and just leadership. That the men who undertook the mission were just also provided additional support for the mission, as undertaken for juridically acceptable motives at all levels. Authors’ presentation of military leaders’ emotions, influenced by religious devotion, made it clear that they were for the most part dedicated to the faith and the church. Accounts of these military leaders efforts to reinforce papal ideals during the expedition strengthened their image as devoted to the faith, and able to positively influence their subordinates. That their leadership and motivational speeches, as well as clerical leaders’ sermons, positively influenced subordinate crusaders revealed both their own closeness to God as well as their subordinates’ juridically approved obedience.
However, inconsistencies seen between knights and their leaders’ emotions, and Pope Urban II’s ideals for the mission, conveyed remaining criticisms of armed Christians. Even western Frankish clerical authors who supported the mission still saw knights as prone to greed, challenged by personal sacrifices, and in danger of doubting the role of divine leadership in their lives. Men on the mission they described as failing to achieve papal ideals served as a warning to others, but participant authors would not have included their behaviors as an object of criticism if their behavior had not been recognized as familiar and perceived as a threat.

The non-participant chronicler Albert of Aachen’s account of crusaders’ behavior, relying on the accounts of veterans, was written to celebrate crusaders’ successes. But his reliance on crusaders for details about the perspectives of their fellow participants reveal that he was less invested in defense of the mission as a papally accomplished just war than on the experiences of crusaders themselves. The chronicle makes it clear that the knights of the expedition – the author’s informants – did not always interpret their own and their fellow participants’ states of mind according to the ideals set out by Pope Urban II’s sermon. But rather than shaping veterans’ accounts to be more compatible with Pope Urban II’s and other’s ideals for the crusade, his presentation of knights behavior reflected elements compatible with accounts of Christian knights written prior to 1095, as discussed in chapter four of this dissertation. His portrayal of the crusaders suggests that he doubted that all knights could achieve the papal ideals for states of mind and behavior that would have secured their positions as just, holy warriors according to the standards presented as required of crusaders during and after 1095.
Letters written by lay crusaders reveal further examples of the use of emotions as evidence of crusaders’ internal states, as well as crusaders’ achievement of the ideals Pope Urban II had presented. These letters were written to inform and reassure ecclesiastical leaders in the West, as well as participants’ families and communities, that the expedition was a just conflict fought for the right motives that was successful because of the divine approval secured by crusaders’ religious devotion. Authors of letters asked those who received them to pray for increased divine aid for the expedition as well as offer thanks for what had been accomplished. In texts much shorter than chronicles these authors presented themselves and most other crusaders achieving papal ideals for devotion and sacrifice, and critiqued the minority of crusaders’ failures to achieve ideals such as a lack of fear and eager seeking of martyrdom. Like the chroniclers examined, authors of these letters did not present all knights on the expedition entirely achieving the papal ideals that would guarantee their identity as crusaders and their deservedness of the spiritual and material rewards of which Pope Urban II spoke.

Overall, this examination of evidence has found that attributions of emotions and religious devotion to crusaders as evidence for their motives for violence reveal inconsistencies between papal ideals and what authors presented. Laymen who wrote with direct or indirect clerical influence defended crusaders’ behavior by relying more often on religious devotion rather than the range of emotions likely experienced and expressed in the field. But both participant and non-participant clerical chroniclers’ efforts to do the same, using emotions as evidence for knights’ motives for violence, were hindered by the authors’ own doubts in the men on whom they wrote. According to most
of the authors discussed, despite promises of divine aid and spiritual rewards, the
behavior of crusaders did not entirely deviate from that of previous knights who had been
described as devoted to the faith, or participants in organized military activities that had
been undertaken with papal approval or considered just. If, as some historians have
suggested, the First Crusade did not on its own create the institution of “crusading,”
perhaps it should also not be thought to have fully created the “crusader” as a distinct
knightly identity.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

This project has examined two areas of human experience that scholars have, since Late Antiquity, criticized as potentially dangerous and uncontrollable – violence and those who engage in it, and emotions. But the examination of penitential and juridical thought, and authors’ use of emotions as evidence of historical actors’ mental states and motives, reveals that both violence and emotions were both consistently influenced, if not carefully controlled and directed, by complex intellectual and cultural systems. In fact, from late antiquity to the early twelfth century these elements became inextricably linked, as Western Christians became desperate for insight into historical actors’ motives for violence and methods for their discernment.

This dissertation has shown that despite early pacifist ideals within the Christian faith, and the influence of classical and late antique philosophies that favored the limitation of emotion, patristic authors approved both the undertaking of violence and the experience and expression of emotions according to carefully defined standards. Though pacifist ideals were dominant in the early centuries of the Christian faith, as seen in the ideas of Tertullian, once Christianity became the dominant religion of the Roman Empire patristic authors such as Ambrose and Augustine, and ecclesiastical leaders such as Bishop Maximus of Turin, approved the undertaking of some types of organized violence
as a just and honorable activity. Such violence was to be undertaken with the desire to correct believers out of paternal love rather than to avenge their behavior out of hate. That emotions provided the correct motives for such violence would be shown in their expression. Late Antique penitential practices that developed at the same time also reflected this concept, since bishops saw penitents’ expressions of emotions as evidence of their contrition, the experience of emotion driving them to seek forgiveness.

Patristic authors involved in parochial leadership and counseling of their communities, most often bishops, saw potential benefits in emotions. Seeing emotions as the force that drove believers to action, authors called on Christians to carefully direct their emotions toward goals that would strengthen their faith, for the benefit of both their relationships with God and the Christian community as a whole. Properly directed emotions would reflect Christians’ desire to move closer to God, which was thought to be the ideal motive for all of their actions. But patristic authors also warned that without suitable direction, experienced for incorrect reasons or directed at sinful goals, emotions and the motives they inspired or reflected could be dangerous.

With the dissolution of the Christian Roman Empire ecclesiastical and monastic leaders began to question the undertaking of organized military activities. Patristic theories of emotion and motive survived, and their continued application to Christians’ behavior encouraged the further development of penitential practice. The Early Middle Ages brought conflicts between Christians and against external enemies, which left participants in danger of guilt for the sin of homicide, and penitential practices reflected the increasing recognition that violence undertaken by Christians outside of obedience to
a just leader had to be judged according to its severity and the motives that personally
drove those who committed it. But ecclesiastical officials were anxious to support secular
leaders who could assist them in securing peace. In efforts to secure such alliances,
clerical authors’ support of the new Christian Empire resulted in their portrayal of new
converts with increasing devotion to the faith and willingness to work with the papacy.

Clerical and lay authors’ construction of the Christian Empire governed by just
Merovingian and Carolingian leaders who were devoted to the faith briefly secured the
spiritual safety of warriors who fought under them for the benefit of fellow Christians.
Penitential practices that developed in the eighth and ninth centuries show that such
leaders and warriors could independently, or with the assistance of priests, call on God to
aid them on the battlefield. But participants in organized military activities who fought
under a just leader were still urged to contemplate their own motives and make them
known – and able to be corrected – through private confession. It was clearly safer for
participants’ souls, and portrayed as more conducive for their victories, for them to fight
both by the order of a just leader as well as out of correct, devotional, motives.

But the dissolution of the Carolingians’ Christian Empire soon decreased papal
support of leaders of the Western Franks. Without a leader trusted to be just and acting
for the good of all Christians, to whom subordinates could securely act in obedience,
there were even fewer opportunities for organized military activities to be deemed just
and those who engaged in it to be free from sin. Christians’ motives for violence also
came to be considered less trustworthy in regions where clerics feared that violence was
dramatically increasing. Seeing the need for knights to act in the service of their own
communities rather from the self-interest they feared was driving them, ecclesiastical officials called on them to act from their own religious devotion. In the late tenth and early eleventh century Frankish and Burgundian bishops’ Peace and Truce of God meetings focused on knights’ personal responsibility for violence and enforcement of peace. As in late antique penitential practice, the public recognition of condemned activities and call for knights to take correct action was intended to appeal to their desire for spiritual safety, to be achieved through the just defense of the Christian community.

Juridical collections composed in the tenth and eleventh century for use by ecclesiastic officials reiterated past requirements for just conflicts and those who undertook them to be free from sin. Collators carefully selected examples that stressed the need for just leaders and provided examples of just behavior, but they also devoted greater attention to the personal motives of those who engaged in organized violence. Such collections supported the efforts of popes who in the absence of secular leaders they believed they could consistently trust sought to themselves attract knights to their service as territorial leaders, to act in defense of Christendom. Popes attempted to do so throughout the eleventh century, but would only achieve success when they recruited knights to their service with a balanced blend of appeals to their desire to obey just leadership and their need to act independently for their own spiritual security.

As attitudes toward violence and opinions of what emotion could represent developed from the fourth through eleventh centuries, they influenced clerical and lay authors who wrote in support of warriors. They described warriors and knights’ participation in religious activities such as almsgiving and pilgrimage, or engaging in
military action when called to so by an ecclesiastical official, as evidence of their devotion to the faith, and their emotions as evidence of the internal states that shaped their behavior. But clerical authors who sought to describe knights in ways accurate according to their socially and culturally constructed identities faced challenges in presenting them as beyond reproach. Saint Gerald of Aurillac’s emotions showed his religious devotion aiding him in his relationship with God throughout his life, and helping him to act as a just leader once he was an adult aristocrat. But the efforts Gerald took to avoid violence were harmful for his reputation as a knight. The emotions authors described among knights who chose to engage in organized military activities portrayed them consistently attempting – and often failing – to find a balance between spiritual and secular motives. The emotions attributed to knights reflected patristic ideals for both Christians’ emotions in the service of religious devotion and the motives for which just wars were to be undertaken. But clerical authors’ frequent descriptions of knights’ decidedly unjust behavior and lack of religious devotion during military conflicts indicates continued clerical distrust of armed laymen.

Accounts of the 1095 expedition to the East, written during and soon after its success, showed a shift in clerics’ use of emotions as evidence of knights’ motives for violence. Pope Urban II’s presentation of a framework for the motives he sought to drive the participation of knights he recruited made it clear that the value of participation to knights as a penitential exercise depended on their internal mental states. According to penitential theory, these would be visible in their emotions. But clerical chroniclers’ and clerical and lay epistolary authors’ accounts of knights’ emotions on the expedition reveal
their assumption of a consistent struggle between just and unjust motives for violence, especially among leaders of the expedition, as they struggled to fit papal ideals into their own perspectives of how wars should be undertaken.

Historians recognize that clerics’ and even lay authors’ attributions of emotions and behavior to knights in the field were not objective observations, but products of their interpretation of events to achieve a narrative purpose. But how closely related is any of what these clerical authors described among knights likely to have been to their actual experiences and expressions of emotion? While the knights involved in the events on which authors wrote were certainly biologically driven to seek physical safety, clerical officials of all ranks wanted their responses to threats and willingness to make sacrifices to reflect the ideals that patristic theologians and medieval ecclesiastical leaders and jurists had produced for both participation in organized violence and the experience and expression of emotion. If our evidence for the influence of ideals comes from those who produced them, how can we understand the experiences and perspectives of those presented as achieving them? This conclusion will briefly discuss modern historians’ study of knights’ personal motives and expressions of emotion, introducing another possible approach to this area of investigation, suggested by the work of modern sociologists and neurobiologists.

**Historical Evidence for Knights’ Affect**

In recent decades historians have actively sought insight into lay people’s religious devotion. Studies of donations to religious institutions, child oblation and adult conversion show that European aristocrats actively sought relationships with
ecclesiastical foundations.¹ Lay Christians offered donations of land, wealth, or family members for the spiritual wellbeing of those who remained in the secular world, as well as to fund their participation in the First Crusade.² But besides references to the circumstances underlying donors’ gifts, the formulaic language of grants of donation was an entirely clerical construction, though many of the underlying ideas on which they were based were shared between monks and lay donors.³ Laypeople’s personal perspectives are still often unclear, beyond the economic, social, and spiritual engagement with the monasteries that these institutions report.

Scholars of military cultural history have examined literary accounts of events purported to have lay authorship as a window into knights’ experiences.⁴ However, these sources present challenges for the period of study of this project. The earliest chanson


that relates arms bearers’ activities in the field is believed to be the *Chanson de Roland*,
the extant text of which is dated to the late eleventh century.⁵ But there is little certainty
concerning its form in earlier performances as opposed to its manuscript content. Given
that its extant content and literary form shares much in common with later *chansons* of
the twelfth century, it is difficult to discern how much of its content is chronologically
specific and thus how reliable it is as a source for chronologically specific lay
perspectives.⁶

Despite the lack of reliable sources for the presentation of lay perspectives free
from clerical influence, one may also turn to modern scholars’ historical and socio-
cultural theories. Pre-modern soldiers who participated in organized violence at various
times generally shared similar – though class-specific – educational and social
backgrounds. These backgrounds constructed role-specific identities, which could change
according to circumstances. According to sociologists Jan E. Stets and Peter J. Burke,
social identity and individual identity are both developed from self- or external
perceptions of subjects' membership in a social group or their fulfilling of a social role.⁷
For Peter Marsh, the public expression of these multiple or singular identities defined
them to their holders, and it is through this process that individuals internalize the moral

---


frameworks that accompany them.\(^8\) Lay aristocrats’ identities were formed and expressed through their education, including religious formation and class-specific professional training.\(^9\) This identity was constructed to define group members in opposition to others. Historian Walter Pohl has argued that such “strategies of distinction” justified, defended, and showcased the distinct identity of those inside a group from others outside it. He found Late Antique authors using such strategies, descriptions of their appearance and behavior, to convey the identity of group members.\(^10\) But in the texts examined in this project, subjects’ experiences and expressions of emotion, physical abilities, appearance, and religious devotion were frequently used to juxtapose them as just knights or leaders strengthened by divine assistance, against other knights and leaders who were not.

Identity also informs the positive or negative judgment of the experiences or expressions of specific emotions that defines a group and its presentation.\(^11\) For Barbara

---


H. Rosenwein this resulted in the creation of “emotional communities.” An emotional community could make use of these strategies of distinction, with attributions of affective experience and expression intentionally setting members of the group apart from those outside it. This was clear in descriptions of Western Christians’ enemies on the First Crusade, whose experiences and expressions of emotions were presented less frequently, in less detail and with distinct differences from those of the Christian participants in the mission. This often reflected the lack of security and peace they suffered, from, among other things, not being Christian.

Historian Richard Kaeuper has argued that the dramatic expressions of affect portrayed among lay aristocrats and knights in a variety of settings were to be expected among populations with distinct codes for behavior and performative definitions of identity. But challenges to behavior and its perception by members of one’s group and outsiders could arise when potentially contradictory identities overlapped. Knights experienced seemingly contradictory self definitions during the early development of juridical thought concerning violence and those who engaged in it. This could have


13. For example, for crusaders’ enemies expressing sorrow over the potentially unavoidable and meaningless death of loved ones, see Tudebode, 10.7, 65–66; for their fear of death in battle, see Albert of Aachen, 6.23, 430–2.


resulted in the seemingly contradictory experiences and expressions of emotion described by clerical chroniclers.

Possible Applications of Modern Neurobiological Research?

Modern studies of the neurobiological evidence for emotional experiences have found that knowledge of and performance of emotion can influence subjects’ neurophysiologic experiences.\textsuperscript{16} Recent research has demonstrated that neurological responses to emotional stimuli are more intense when subjects cognitively focus on their experience of emotion.\textsuperscript{17} This may have influenced authors’ use of emotion as evidence of motives in their accounts of military conflicts. The emotions authors attributed to knights were intended to be familiar to readers or listeners, to garner their emotional involvement in the events, even as the emotions were presented to justify or condemn knights’ potentially sinful behavior.\textsuperscript{18} Readers’ emotional involvement with chronicles or


letters they heard or read could thus guide them to the adoption of new norms for emotions, when they were presented as clearly beneficial. This is consistent with psychologists’ recent findings that religious beliefs influence subjects’ emotional responses to personal challenges.¹⁹

Ultimately, however, because of clerical authorship and influence on texts attributed to laymen, historical actors’ experiences and expressions of emotions and religious devotion are indistinguishable from the effects of clerical ideals on them. Late-Antique and Medieval clerics and laymen were members of the same culture, with varying levels of literacy, and participated in and were influenced by the same constructions. These paradigms for experiencing, understanding, defining and describing emotions informed references to emotion in verbal and textual records, which in turn informed subjects’ experiences, expressions, and understanding of their own emotions.²⁰ Cultural influences thus make purely “natural” responses to events unidentifiable and, for

---


the purposes of historical studies, irrelevant. Modern research suggests, however, that many of the emotions that authors described, including those categorized into forms of religious devotion, are likely to have occurred. And through the efforts of hagiographers, chroniclers, epistolary authors and *chansonniers*, readers or listeners could imagine them and be influenced by them as well.

---


22. Modern brain imaging techniques and physical examinations have been used to discern that humans respond neurophysiologically to perceived threats or rewards, in cases of both actual events and memories of them. See Jaak Panksepp, “Neurologizing the Psychology of Affects: How Appraisal-Based Constructivism and Basic Emotion Theory Can Coexist,” *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 2:3 (2007): 281–96; Emily A Holmes and Andrew Matthews, “Mental imagery in emotion and emotional disorders,” in *Clinical Psychology Review* 30 (2010): 350–3.
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