In his encyclical *Quantum praedecessores* of December 1145 Pope Eugenius III wrote of those who had answered the call to the First Crusade that they had been ‘fired by the ardour of charity’.

In an *excitatorium* of the late 1180s Peter of Blois argued that Christians would gain merit if, fired by the zeal of charity, they fight fiercely those who blaspheme against Christ, pollute the sanctuary of the Lord and in their pride and miscreance abase the glory of our Redeemer.

In the 1260s the French poet Rutebeuf, lamenting the failure of his countrymen to move themselves to recapture Jerusalem, exclaimed that ‘the fire of charity is cold in every Christian heart’. These writers used the theological word *charitas*, *charitei* for Christian love, heightened it in a traditional Christian way with the words ‘fired,’ ‘fire’, and linked it to the crusades. Since love has always been held to be fundamental to all Christian ethics, including the ethics of violence, it is worth asking how representative they were of the apologists for the crusading movement. I hope to show that the idea of the crusader expressing love through his participation in acts of armed force was an element in the thinking of senior churchmen in the central Middle Ages. An understanding of this can help us place the crusades in the context of the spiritual reawakening of western Europe that accompanied the eleventh-century reform movement. Christian love, however, was presented to the faithful in a way that they would understand, rather than in the form that would have reflected the complexities of the relationship between violence and charity as understood by theologians and canon lawyers. My discussion is limited to the justification of crusades to the East, although crusaders were not by any means only to be found in expeditions launched to recover or aid the Holy Land; they also campaigned in Spain, along the shores of the Baltic and even in the interior of western Europe.

Christian charity encompasses love of God and love of one’s neighbour, and both these expressions of love were touched on by apologists for the crusades: in September 1096 Pope Urban II promised the indulgence to those Bolognese who joined the First Crusade, ‘seeing that they have committed their property and their persons out of love of God and their neighbour’; and St Bernard, writing in the 1140s of news of Muslim victories:

*This is the text of an inaugural lecture delivered at The Royal Holloway College, University of London, 10 May 1979.*

CRUSADING AS AN ACT OF LOVE

If we harden our hearts and pay little attention...where is our love for God, where is our love for our neighbour? It was believed that crusaders particularly expressed their love of God in the way they became literally followers of Christ. From the first, they were treated as 'soldiers of Christ', who had joined an expedition out of love for him. And the taking of the cross, the sewing of a cross on a man's garments as a symbol of his vow to crusade, was seen as a response to Christ's statement: 'Whosoever doth not carry his cross and come after me cannot be my disciple' (Luke xiv, 27). It is notoriously difficult to establish exactly what occurred at the Council of Clermont in November 1095, but it is possible that Pope Urban II preached the First Crusade on the basis of this text: the author of one of the accounts of the council mentioned that he had done so when he ordered the crusaders to sew crosses on their clothes; and another witness also referred to it, in a narrative in which Urban was made to remind his audience of Christ's words,

He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me. And everyone that hath left house or father or mother or wife or children or lands for my name's sake shall receive an hundredfold and shall possess life everlasting (Matt. x, 37, xiv, 29). There is evidence that, whatever Urban actually said, a chord was struck in the hearts of those who responded to him. The anonymous author of the Gesta Francorum, who took part in the First Crusade, opened his narrative with a moving reference to the subject.

When already that time drew nigh, to which the Lord Jesus draws the attention of his people every day, especially in the Gospel in which he says, 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me' (Matt. xvi, 24), there was a great stirring throughout the whole region of Gaul, so that if anyone, with a pure heart and mind, seriously wanted to follow God and faithfully wished to bear the cross after him, he could make no delay in speedily taking the road to the Holy Sepulchre. The German Ekkehard of Aura, who was himself in the East in 1101, compared the crusaders to Simon of Cyrene, and the French King's chaplain Odo of Deuil began his account of the Second Crusade with the words,
In the year of the Incarnation of the Word 1146, at Easter at Vezelay, the glorious Louis, ... King of the Franks and Duke of the Aquitanians, ... undertook to follow Christ by bearing his cross in order to be worthy of him.11

An anonymous twelfth-century poet wrote:

‘You who love with true love
Awake! Do not sleep!
The lark brings us day
And tells us in this hideaway
That the day of peace has come
That God, by his very great kindness,
Will give to those who for love of him
Take the cross and on account of what they do
Suffer pain night and day
So that he will see who truly loves him.’12

This seam of devotion was richly worked by authority. In c.1144, in a bull that was often to be reissued, Pope Celestine II wrote that the Temp- lars,

new Maccabees in this time of Grace, renouncing earthly desires and possess- sions, bearing his cross, are followers of Christ.13

And the image of the crusader denying himself and actually taking up Christ’s cross was particularly strongly expressed at the turn of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries by Pope Innocent III,14 to whom God was a benefactor owed by all profound and unrepayable debts of gratitude.

Who would refuse to die for him, who was made for us obedient unto death, a death indeed on the cross?15

If God underwent death for man, ought man to question dying for God?16

Innocent expatiated on the relationship between the crusader and the cross in his great encyclical Quia maior, which launched the Fifth Crusade.

We summon on behalf of him who when dying cried in a great voice on the cross, made obedient to God his father unto death on the cross, crying so that he should save us from the eternal crucifixion of death; who, indeed, for his own sake summoned us and said, ‘If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me’ (Matt. xvi, 24).

And in this clearly he said, ‘Whoever wishes to follow me to the crown should also follow me to the battle, which is now proposed to all as a test’.17

12 Les chansons de croisade, eds. J. Bedier and P. Aubry (Paris, 1909), p. 20. F. -W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert Kreuzzugsdichtung des Mittelalters (Berlin, 1960), p. 325 has suggested that vernacular poetry reflected the themes of crusade preaching. I am inclined to think that the traffic of ideas was two-way.
15 Innocent III, Register, no. 302; see also Innocent III, ‘Opera’, ccxv, col. 1339.
16 Roger of Howden, iv, p. 72. This echoes Urban II at Clermont as reported by Baldric of Dol, p. 15.
In a letter of 1208 to Leopold of Austria, Innocent had also stressed the insignificance of the crusader's action when compared to that of Christ.

You receive a soft and gentle cross; he bore one that was sharp and hard. You wear it superficially on your clothing; he endured it really in his flesh. You sew on yours with linen and silk threads; he was nailed to his with iron and hard nails.\textsuperscript{18}

His pontificate marks a climax in the use of this imagery, but the love of God expressed by crusaders may still have been a popular theme in thirteenth-century sermons. The \textit{Ordinacio de predicacione S. crucis in Anglia} of c. 1216, obviously following Innocent, referred to those entering the service of the cross as observing the commandment to love God with all one's heart,\textsuperscript{19} and Cardinal Odo of Châteauroux, who in 1245 was given the task of preaching and organizing a new crusade from France, devoted a homily to the subject. Preaching on the text, 'Amen I say to you that . . . you who have followed me . . . shall also sit (alongside) . . . when the Son of Man shall sit on the seat of his majesty' (Matt. xix, 28), Odo enjoined his audience to forsake everything for the love of God: true conversion could only come about through love of God rather than of earthly things and a man could love his neighbour only as an expression of his love of God. He went on to tell his listeners that

It is a clear sign that a man burns with love of God and zeal for God when he leaves country, possessions, house, children and wife, going overseas in the service of Jesus Christ . . . Whoever wishes to take and have Christ ought to follow him; to follow him to death.\textsuperscript{20}

There can be little doubt that the audiences addressed by popes and preachers saw the expression of love for God in terms that were real to them, above all in the light of their relationship with and the loyalty they owed to secular rulers. And these rulers were also feudal lords. At the time the ties between vassals and their lords were regarded as being so close and were held in so emotional a way that feudal terminology was used by the poets of courtly love to describe the devotion of the perfect lover to his lady.\textsuperscript{21} To the crusaders, Christ was a king and lord who had lost his inheritance, his \textit{haereditas or patrimonium}, to the pagans: indeed the image of the Holy Land as Christ's inheritance, which was an old one, was used in one of the accounts of Pope Urban II's speech at Clermont\textsuperscript{22} and often thereafter; even as late as 1274, Pope Gregory X wrote in his \textit{Constitutiones pro zelo fidei} of the feelings of charity that should be aroused in Christian hearts at its loss.\textsuperscript{23} It was the duty of Christ's subjects to fight for the recovery or in the defence of Christ's heritage as they would for the

\textsuperscript{18} Innocent III, 'Opera', cxxv, col. 1340.
\textsuperscript{20} Odo of Châteauroux, 'Sermones de tempore et sanctis', ed. J. B. Pitra, \textit{Analecta novissima} (Paris, 1888), ii, pp. 310–15. For an even later example, see Rutebeuf, pp. 121, 128.
\textsuperscript{22} Guibert of Nogent, 'Historia quae dicitur Gesta Dei per Francos', \textit{RHC Oc.}, iv, p. 137. See also Baldric of Dol, p. 14.
domains of their own lords, and the anonymous twelfth-century poet, from whose crusade song I have already quoted, expressed a common opinion when he wrote that 'he who abandons his lord in need deserves to be condemned' 24.

Faced by a world that saw things in such concrete terms the popes tended to express themselves on this matter in a cloudy way, probably because theologians could not bring themselves to use too explicitly the feudal relationship, with its notions of contract and reciprocal obligations, as a means of describing man's relationship to God. Carl Erdmann has drawn attention to the ambiguous way in which, as he turned for help to the feudal knighthood in the 1070s and 1080s, Pope Gregory VII used the feudal terms miles, fidelis and servitium, 25 and the same was true of Gregory's successors. But popes could also on occasion specifically use the images of the everyday world to bring home to people what was meant by loving God. Innocent III, for instance, was fond of referring in this way to Christ as a king.

Consider most dear sons, consider carefully that if any temporal king was thrown out of his domain and perhaps captured, would he not, when he was restored to his pristine liberty and the time had come for dispensing justice, look on his vassals as unfaithful and traitors against the crown and guilty of lèse majesté unless they had committed not only their property but also their persons to the task of freeing him?... And similarly will not Jesus Christ, the king of kings and lord of lords, whose servant you cannot deny being, who joined your soul to your body, who redeemed you with his precious blood, who conceded to you the kingdom, who enables you to live and move and gave you all the good things you have... condemn you for the vice of ingratitude and, as it were, the crime of infidelity if you neglect to help him? 26

At about the same time the great preacher James of Vitry developed what Innocent was saying in one of his sermons, although he was careful to point out that man's relationship with Christ was not a feudal one.

When a lord is afflicted by the loss of his patrimony he wishes to prove his friends and find out if his vassals are faithful. Whoever holds a fief of a liege lord is worthily deprived of it if he deserts him when he is engaged in battle and loses his inheritance. You hold your body and soul and whatever you have from the Supreme Emperor and today he has had you called upon to help him in battle; and though you are not bound by feudal law, he offers you so many and such good things, the remission of all sins, whatever the penalty or guilt, and above all eternal life, that you ought at once to hurry to him. 27

Later in the century, Odo of Châteauroux, in the sermon to which I have already referred, asked his audience a question coloured by the aspirations and feelings of the world in which they lived. 'What is loving God if it is not desiring his honour and glory?' 29 Churchmen, therefore, could portray the

26 Innocent III, 'Opera', ccxiv, cols. 809-10; and see ccxv, col. 1500; Innocent III, 'Quia maior', ed. Tangl, pp. 89-90.
crusader's love of God in terms that laymen could recognize as being analogous to their regard for their earthly superiors. But the presentation of theology in everyday terms is revealed even more strikingly in the expression of the idea of love for fellow-men.

The belief that crusading expressed love of one's neighbour as well as love of God also dated from the First Crusade. It has long been accepted that an important element in Pope Urban's thinking when he preached the cross was the opportunity he saw of bringing fraternal aid to Christians in the East, oppressed by or in danger from the Muslims. Baldric of Dol, in his account of the sermon at Clermont, laid emphasis on the supposed suffering of the Eastern Christians and made Urban make a typical distinction between the barbarisms of internal strife in France and the virtues of helping the East.

It is dreadful, brothers, dreadful, for you to raise thieving hands against Christians. It is much less evil to brandish the sword against the Muslims; in a particular case it is good, because it is charity to lay down lives for friends.

The development of the idea of violence expressing fraternal love can be illustrated from the sources for the history of the Military Orders, which were linked closely to the crusades, even if the brothers in them were not technically crusaders. The founding of the Order of Knights Templar is a remarkable event in the history of the religious life. One of the chief attractions of the First Crusade, which followed closely on a change in the Church's thinking on the rôle of laymen, was that now at last the laity had a task to perform, pleasing to God, for which they were especially equipped and which professed religious were not permitted to undertake. In a well-known passage in his history of the crusade, Guibert of Nogent welcomed the fact that now laymen could attain salvation through works without entering a monastery, and the sudden realization that the leading crusader Tancred, torn between 'the Gospel and the world', had of the new rôle for Christian warriors, and his enthusiastic response to it, is evidence for the force of this idea, as is the emphasis on the 'new knight' still to be found in the writings of St. Bernard half a century later. But so dominant was the appeal of the religious life and so superior was its status that, within 20 years of the capture of Jerusalem, professed religious were themselves taking on the rôle of warriors, usurping the special function of the laity. All contemporaries were struck by the fact that a new kind of religious life had come into being, in which the brothers could hardly have acted in a more secular way. The compilers of the Templar rule wrote that

30 Baldric of Dol, pp. 13–15. See also Hugh of S. Maria, 'Itineris Hierosolymitani Compendium', RHC Oc., v, p. 363; Narratio Floriacensis', RHC Oc., v, p. 357.
31 See Riley-Smith, What were the crusades?, pp. 70–1.
We believe that by divine providence this new kind of religious order was founded by you in the holy places, so that you combine soldiering with the religious life and in this way the order can fight with arms and can without blame smite the enemy.36

The association in the Templar life of both religious and military practices was a point also made in St. Bernard’s treatise, the *De laude novae militiae*,37 and in the early thirteenth century, by which time the Hospital-lers had also taken on military responsibilities and the Spanish and German Military Orders had been founded, James of Vitry wrote of the brothers concerning whom the Lord says, ‘I will encompass my house with them that serve me in war, going and returning’ (Zac. ix, 8). Going in time of war, returning in time of peace; going by means of action, returning by means of contemplation; going in war to fight, returning in peace to repose and devotion to prayer, so that they are like soldiers in battle and like monks in convent.38

The appearance of religious dedicated to war was bound to lead to controversy. In the 1160s and 1170s Pope Alexander III was worried by the transformation of the Hospital of St. John into a Military Order,39 and as early as the 1120s someone, perhaps Hugh of St. Victor, had to answer on the Templars’ behalf critics who maintained that a monastic profession to defend with arms the faith and Christendom was ‘illicit and pernicious’ and that it would lead the Templars into sin because war was activated by hatred and greed.

I say to you that you do not hate, which is unjust, because you do not hate man but iniquity. Again I say, you are not greedy, which is unjust, because you acquire that which should justly be taken on account of sins and that which is justly yours because of the work that you do.40

But the real reply was given in 1139 by Pope Innocent II in *Omne datum optimum*, the papal charter for the Templars, and it was a reply that drew attention to the love shown by the brothers.

As true Israelites and most instructed fighters in divine battle, filled with the flames of divine charity, you carry out in deeds the words of the Gospel, ‘Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friend.’41

In 1155 this was re-emphasized by Pope Adrian IV in *Sicut sacra evangelia*, in phrases that were often to be repeated in later papal letters.

The knights of the Temple... are especially called to the service of the omnipo-

---

41. *Papsturkunden für Templer und Johanniter*, ed. Hiestand, no. 3 (pp. 205–6). See also *Cartulaire général de l’ordre de Temple 1119–1150*, ed. Marquis d’Albon, i (Paris, 1913), no. 4. ‘Such eminence of charity and grace of praiseworthy honesty are seen to abound among the devoted knights of the Temple of Jerusalem’.
tent God and are numbered with the heavenly host. This is indicated by their reverend habit and is shown by the sign of the cross of Our Lord which they wear on their bodies. Indeed they have been founded for this purpose, that they do not fear to lay down their lives for their brothers.\footnote{Papsturkunden für Templer und Johanniter, ed. Hiestand, no. 27; and see nos. 38, 54, 75, 93.}

The same attitude was to be found with regard to the Hospitallers as they took on military duties. The first reference to a military wing in their statutes treated it as an extension of their charitable work.

These eleemosynary grants have properly been established in the holy Order of the Hospital, except for the brethren-at-arms, whom the holy Order keeps honourably, and many other bounties.\footnote{Cartulaire général de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de St. Jean de Jérusalem (1100–1310), ed. J. Delaville Le Roulx (Paris, 1894–1906), no. 627.}

And in 1191 Pope Celestine III referred to the Hospitallers, fighting the infidel and looking after the poor, as 'the children of peace and love... servants in Christ of the holy poor of Jerusalem and of all lands everywhere.'\footnote{Ibid., no. 911.} In this respect the Military Orders sprang from the same stem as did the other new orders of the time, demonstrating in their own fashion the concern for charitable work and the care of one's neighbour that so many of them showed.

The idea that crusading expressed fraternal love was, of course, also put forward in encyclicals directed chiefly at the laity. In 1169, Pope Alexander III, responding to a request for aid from the Kingdom of Jerusalem, published a major appeal with the widest possible circulation. He began it by stressing the rôle of love.

Among all the means that Divine Wisdom has provided for the exercise of charity in the midst of temporal affairs, it would be difficult to find a field of action in which this charity could be expressed with more glory with regard to virtue, and with better results with regard to rewards, than in aid to relieve the needs of the Church in the East and the faithful of Christ, by defending them against the onslaught of the pagans, so that both the cult of the Divine Name does not fail and the virtue of brotherhood shines forth praiseworthy.\footnote{Alexander III, 'Opera omnia', PL cc, col. 599. See also cols. 601–2. For the background, see R. C. Smail, 'Latin Syria and the West, 1149–1187', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th ser., xix (1969), pp. 13–4.}

In 1215 Innocent III returned to the theme of love in Quia maior, this time love for Christians in territories occupied by the Muslims.

How does a man love according to divine precept his neighbour as himself when, knowing that his Christian brothers in faith and in name are held by the perfidious Muslims in strict confinement and weighed down by the yoke of heaviest servitude, he cannot devote himself to the efficacious work of liberating them? In this he transgresses the command of that natural law which the Lord declared in the Gospel. 'All things... whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them.' (Matt. vii, 12). Is it by chance that you do not know that among them (the Muslims) many thousands of Christians are held in servitude and in jail, tortured with innumerable torments?\footnote{Innocent III, 'Quia maior', ed. Tangl, p. 90.}
Now, the striking thing about these references to love is that they are one-dimensional and therefore not truly Christian. Love of neighbour was always treated in crusade propaganda in terms of fraternal love for fellow-Christians, never in terms of love shown for enemies as well as friends. And this one-sided view of love did not properly reflect Christian teaching in the past or at the time. One has only to read the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard to find a contemporary theologian putting before his readers a more fully rounded view. By neighbour, Peter stressed, one must mean all mankind. Certainly, he argued, fellow-Christians ought especially to be loved and, in that we cannot show equal love to all, they should come first, since they are members of the same body and recognize the same Father. It is, moreover, sufficient to love enemies straightforwardly and not to hate them; in this respect love of enemies comes last in a scale of expressions of love. But he emphasized that enemies must be included in our love for all men and he quoted St. Augustine to the effect that it is more virtuous to love enemies than friends.47

The Christian tradition on violence, moreover, the foundations of which had been laid by the Fathers, naturally stressed the rôle of love, for enemies as well as friends, in the use of force. St. Augustine had treated the matter comprehensively. To him, just violence required right intention on the part of the imposers of force as an essential pre-requisite. In his treatise on the Sermon on the Mount, containing one of his earliest essays on the subject, he stressed that the intention behind punishment designed for the purpose of correction had to be to make the offender happy; it had to be imposed out of love by those who had in this matter overcome hatred. Christ had denounced hatred seeking vengeance, not love desiring to correct the object of love. Further, many noble and saintly men had in the past inflicted death as a punishment for sins. Those put to death had suffered no injury from it; rather, they were already being injured by their sins and their state might have become far worse had they been allowed to live. Augustine referred here to the prophet Elijah killing on authority from God and he drew attention to St. Paul delivering a sinner over to Satan for the destruction of his flesh, so that his spirit might be saved (I Cor. v, 5). He admitted that he did not really understand the meaning of the words St. Paul had used, but he maintained that it was clear that, whatever St. Paul did mean, he intended to save a soul; in other words that this was a punishment imposed through love.48 To Augustine, the intentions of those who authorized violence and of those who participated in it had to be in favour of justice, a virtue which for him assigned to everyone his due, working through love of God and love of one's neighbour.49 It being often more loving to use force than indulgence, it followed that just violence had love for those on whom it was meted out as the mainspring of action; and this kind of motivation would mean that one would be careful to employ only such violence as was necessary.50 Augustine often wrote of the way

41 Peter Lombard, *Sententiarius libri quatuor* (*PL* ccxii), iii, D. xxvii, c. 4, DD. xxi-xxx.
43 For instance, see *De civitate Dei* (*Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina*, xlvii-xlviii), XIX, vii, xxi.
parents could express their love for their children by correcting them,\textsuperscript{51} and
he also referred to the violence sometimes needed in healing the sick or in
rescuing men from physical danger against their wills.\textsuperscript{52} The scriptures were
combed by him for references to acts or expressions of violence, motivated
by love, perpetrated by Moses and Elijah,\textsuperscript{53} by St. Paul,\textsuperscript{54} by a loving God
and even by a loving Christ, as when he scourged the stall-keepers out of
the Temple and blinded St. Paul on the road to Damascus.\textsuperscript{55} All of this
provided a basis for his justification of the repression of heresy. It was
right, and a sign of love and mercy in imitation of Christ, for a loving
Church, in collaboration with a loving state, to force heretics from the path
of error for their own benefit, compelling them to goodness in the same
way as the host at the wedding feast in Christ's parable had sent out his
servant to force those in the high-ways to come to the banquet.\textsuperscript{56}

Augustine's thought was very influential in the central Middle Ages. On
most of the criteria for Christian violence crusading ideas followed his. But
they did not on love. One explanation might be that since Augustine
devoted most of his writing on violence to justifying the suppression of
heresy—and made little distinction between force associated with war
against external foes and force used internally to repress heretics—his
approach was one that could lead more naturally to an emphasis on love as
a disciplinary force, for which parallels could be drawn with family life.
But, in fact, writers at the time of the crusades also treated violence against
external and internal injurers under the same general heading. And since
they did not distinguish the forms of violence, at least as far as the
justification of force went, one would not expect crusade propagandists to
have done so either.

It might also be pointed out that certain premisses in Augustine's
thought were alien to the theology of the central Middle Ages and that this
might explain why the justifiers of crusading violence did not follow him on
the issue of love of enemies as well as friends. In particular, he had a very
negative attitude towards free will, and this led him to have a pessimistic
view of the ability of most of mankind truly to act through love. The fact
was that those whom love restrained were less numerous in this world than
those who had to be restrained by terror. Fear, instilled by the penal laws
of the Roman emperors against heresy, forced men to truth, and many
were brought to the true faith and to salvation who otherwise would not
have known it. Moreover, fear gave the faint-hearted the excuse to break
with heresy.\textsuperscript{57} Augustine could, therefore, compare just and unjust perse-

\textsuperscript{51} 'De sermone Domini in monte', I, xix § 63; 'In epistolam Ioannis ad Parthos tractatus' (\textit{PL} xxxv), VII § 8; 'De civitate Dei', XIX, xvi; 'Epistolae', nos. lxxxv § 2, cxxxviii § 14, cliii § 17, clxxxv §§ 7, 21.

\textsuperscript{52} 'Epistolae', nos. xciii §§ 2–4, clxxxv §§ 7, 33–4.

\textsuperscript{53} 'De sermone Domini in monte', I, xx § 64; 'Contra Faustum Manichaeum' (\textit{PL} xlii), xxii
§ 79; 'Contra litteras Petiliani' (\textit{PL} xlii), II, lxxxvi § 191.

\textsuperscript{54} 'De sermone Domini in monte', I, xix § 65; 'Contra Faustum Manichaeum', xxii § 79;
'Contra epistolam Parmeniani' (\textit{PL} xliii), iii § 3; 'Contra litteras Petiliani', II, xx § 44.

\textsuperscript{55} 'Contra litteras Petiliani', II, xix § 43, lxxxv § 1, 'Epistolae', nos. xciii § 7, clxxxv § 22.

\textsuperscript{56} 'Epistolae', nos. lxxix § 6, xciii §§ 1, 6, c §§ 13, 16, cxxxviii §§ 14–15, clxiii §§ 3–10,
clxxxv §§ 23–4, 46; 'Contra Gaudentium' (\textit{PL} xlii), i § 28; 'Sermones' (\textit{PL} xxxviii), no. cxiii § 8.

\textsuperscript{57} 'Epistolae', nos. xciii §§ 1–3, 17–19, cliii § 16, clxiii § 2, clxxxv §§ 7, 13–15, 21, 29, 32.
cution: the Roman state, in alliance with the Church, imposed a just persecution, while the pagan emperors and the wicked persecuted unjustly.58 He argued that Christ had promised blessedness for those persecuted for justice's sake, but had said nothing about those persecuted for the sake of injustice. Nobody became a martyr merely by suffering for religion. 'It is not the penalty that makes a martyr, but the cause'.59 So the essential thing was the justice of the cause for which one suffered, and an image Augustine used was that of Christ, unjustly crucified, hanging on the cross between the two thieves, who had been justly condemned.60 Playing down free will it was, of course, fairly easy to justify violence in terms of love shown to those incapable of motivation to good except by fear. But it was far less easy to do so if one shared the highly developed notions of free will that were common in the central Middle Ages, since coercion potentially limited the operation of free will in the coerced. In a dictum in his important *Causa XXIII* on violence, the canonist Gratian, writing in c.1140, showed anxiety about this matter.61

Augustine's approach to free will, moreover, resulted in an indifference to the salvific value of works.62 In fact he did not really believe that any special merit attached to the participants in his violence. He wrote that Abraham had shown 'praiseworthy' compliance with God's order to sacrifice Isaac,63 but he seems to have regarded even acts of violence on God's specific command—a category of force to which he paid special attention—as being merely blameless.64 One would be quite wrong to refuse such an order, but only doing one's duty if one obeyed it. In fact the man who owed obedience to the giver of a command, whether God himself or God's minister, did not himself kill: he was an instrument in the hand of the authorizer.65 To the apologists for the crusades, on the other hand, merit, which of course stemmed from the dominant position held by the concept of free will, played so large a part that a recent historian of the crusades has defined holy war in terms of its meritoriousness.66

But, apart from Gratian's *dictum* to which I have already referred, theologians of the time of the crusades do not seem to have found it difficult to graft ideas of free will and merit onto Augustinian thought.

---


60 'Epistolae', no. clxxx § 9.

61 Gratian, 'Decretum', ed. E. Friedberg, *Corpus iuris canonici*, i (Leipzig, 1879), C. 23, q. 6, c. 4 d.p.c.


63 'Contra Faustum Manichaeum', xxii § 73.

64 *Ibid.*, xxii § 75. I hope to consider Augustine's views on violence at the command of God and their influence on crusading thought in a later paper.

65 'De civitate Del', I, xxi, xxvi; and see also 'Contra Faustum Manichaeum xxi' § 75; 'Quaestiones in Heptateuchum' (*Corpus Christianorum*, *Series Latina*, xxxiii), VI, x.

Indeed, if there is one feature of their treatment of love and violence it is how Augustinian it is; and quotations from Augustine, including those which emphasized love of enemies, predominate in their writings. It was St. Anselm of Lucca, a supporter of Pope Gregory VII, who in books XII and XIII of his Collectio canonum, written in c.1083, collected the basic Augustinian texts on violence, including those on force and love, and passed them on to his successors as authorities for the arguments that the Church did not persecute but expressed love when she punished sin; that Moses, using force on orders from God, did nothing cruel; that punishment could be imposed not out of hatred but out of love; and that wars could be benevolent in intention.\(^{67}\) Anselm was followed by Ivo of Chartres who, in his Decretum and Panormia, written in France in c.1094 on the eve of the First Crusade,\(^{68}\) used his authorities to demonstrate that love of neighbour demanded that in normal circumstances one should not kill.\(^{69}\) One should not embark on punishment unless one had personally overcome hatred; indeed penalties could be imposed on those who killed out of hate and not out of zeal for justice.\(^{70}\) But Ivo stressed, in an Augustinian passage that was later to be used by Gratian, that the exercise of Christian forebearance (patientia) did not entirely rule out necessary fighting.\(^{71}\) Love, in fact, could involve physical correction, in the same way as a father punished a son or a master a servant.\(^{72}\) To coerce one's neighbour could be to love him and the man who punished evil did not persecute but loved.\(^{73}\) Indeed in the Panormia, which was a popular work,\(^{74}\) three chapters were devoted to the arguments, taken entirely from St. Augustine, that neighbourly love demanded that men prevent their neighbours from doing evil and that Christians could, in fact, sin if they did not persecute those engaged in evil works.\(^{75}\) Ivo maintained that wars fought by true Christians were in fact acts of pacification, since their aim was peace.\(^{76}\)

The works of Anselm of Lucca and Ivo of Chartres foreshadowed that of Gratian, but in no way approached the subtlety and honesty of Gratian's treatment of force in Causa XXIII of his Decretum, written in c.1140. He began by facing up squarely to the passages in the New Testament that appeared to forbid Christians to use violence of any kind, but he then took his readers through a mass of material that gradually revealed the Christian justification of violence. On the issue of love, including love of enemies, he was, like Anselm and Ivo, fundamentally Augustinian. The use of force was not entirely forbidden in the precepts of forebearance (patientia),\(^{77}\) for
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\(^{73}\) 'Decretum', x cc. 62, 76, 95; 'Panormia', viii c. 36.

\(^{74}\) Fournier and Le Bras, op. cit., ii, p. 97.
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while they should be interpreted as meaning that clemency and tolerance should be shown, bad sins ought to be punished, as in the cases of Ananias and Sapphira on the condemnation of St. Peter—this was a favourite example of the Fathers and of those writing on violence in the central Middle Ages—of Elymas who was blinded on the word of St. Paul and of the sinner whom St. Paul handed over to Satan.78 Evil must not be rendered for evil and one should love, not persecute, enemies,79 but Augustine's analogies of the doctor prescribing for patients and the heads of households correcting sons and servants were drawn on.80 Out of maternal love the Church could prescribe medicine for sinners, and anyway better the wounds of a friend than the kisses of an enemy.81 Men were bound to love their enemies, to pray for them and show mercy to them, but the demands of love should mean that they could not allow others to sin with impunity. Acts of mercy could themselves be unjust, and one such act could lead to universal harm.82 And so the restless were usefully corrected by the office of public power. It was better to love with severity: persecution was not always culpable for it could serve love.83 And the wicked could be forced to goodness: men had the example of Christ to follow here; nobody loved more than he did, yet he forced St. Paul onto the path of righteousness. Moses, too, punished the Israelites not out of cruelty but out of love. Correction was an attribute of mercy, as could be found by reading not only the Old Testament, but also the New, although the examples in it were more rare.84 Gratian believed that he had established from his authorities that punishment in itself was permitted and did not necessarily involve hatred.85

As a final example of the treatment of love and violence at the time of the crusades one might look at St. Thomas Aquinas's early polemical treatise Contra impugnantes, written in 1256.86 This again was Augustinian in its approach and it repeated the argument that Christ only gave the apostles, who were simple and uneducated men, power to authorize punishment by means of force after he had taught them to love their neighbours absolutely.87

Reading these works one glimpses what seems to be a different world to that portrayed in crusading propaganda. Instead of the one-dimensional notion of fraternal love for fellow-Christians, violence is treated in the context of love for all mankind, enemies as well as friends. For all its obvious faults, one is bound to admire the subtlety and learning of the canonists' treatment of force and to recognize that it has an authentic place in the Christian ethical tradition. But it must be stressed that theologians and canonists and the popes and curial clerks who wrote the calls to
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82 Zbid., C. 23 q. 4 cc. 32 d.p.c., 33.
83 Zbid., C. 23 q. 4 c. 37.
84 Zbid., C. 23 q. 4 cc. 43–4, 51.
85 Zbid., C. 23 q. 4 c. 54 d.p.c.
crusade did not live in different worlds. Pope Alexander III, for instance, in whose name was issued one of the encyclicals from which I have quoted, was himself a canonist and the author of a commentary on Gratian's *Decretum*. It is not believable that the popes who proclaimed crusades and the more respectable preachers who whipped up enthusiasm for them did not grasp the complexity of the Christian position. They must have presented their one-sided version of love deliberately, with a view to the audience they were addressing.

It could be that they dared not do otherwise. A feature of the attitudes of twelfth-century lay society as revealed in its vernacular poetry was its blind, uncompromising hatred of the infidel, expressed, for instance, in Charlemagne's famous declaration in the *Song of Roland* that 'Never to paynims may I show love or peace'. Through the epics runs the theme of an implacable war of conversion against non-Christians, a theme that expressed itself in the slaughters that accompanied the conquests of the First Crusade and the forced conversions that were perpetrated in the East and in Spain. Only towards the end of the twelfth century did the picture of the 'noble heathen', the pagan who was capable of good actions, begin to take hold among ordinary laymen. Given this feeling, it was hardly possible for crusade propagandists to write in terms of love of enemy; on the contrary, crusading literature and propaganda played on the xenophobia by the use of emotive terms—enemies of God, servants of the Devil, servants of the Anti-Christ—to describe the Muslims.

But this negative explanation is not sufficient. The popes and their representatives must have brought up the subject of love because of the positive feelings they knew would be aroused in those who listened to their appeals. I believe that, as with love of God, we find here echoes of the secular world. It will have been noticed that in the sources from which I have quoted the words most commonly used to refer to fellow-Christians are brothers (*fratres*) and friends (*amicī*). And at this time the word *amicus* as often as not meant kinsman, rather than simply friend, as in a French eleventh-century document which referred to

> his friends, that is to say his mother, his brothers, his sisters and his other relatives by blood or by marriage.

Men hearing these words would be encouraged to think of fellow-Christians as their relatives and the specific use of this kind of imagery is to be found in one of the reports of Pope Urban's sermon at Clermont, in which he was said to have referred to the Eastern Christians as

---

91 For the terms used at the time of the First Crusade, see Rousset, *op. cit.*, pp. 104–5.
92 Bloch, *op. cit.*, pp. 123–4. Bloch (ibid., p. 231) argued that the word *amicus* was also often used of a vassal. For references to *amicī*, perhaps in this sense, see Fulcher of Chartres, p. 137; Henry of Albano, cols. 360–1. For the use of the terminology of mercenaries with reference to crusaders, see Fulcher of Chartres, p. 136; Baldric of Dol, p. 15.
your full brothers, your comrades, your brothers born of the same mother, for you are sons of the same Christ and the same Church.\footnote{Baldric of Dol, pp. 12–13. See also Fulcher of Chartres, pp. 132–3, for a reference to the Eastern Christians as ‘confratribus vestris’.

\footnote{G. Duby, The Chivalrous Society (London, 1977), p. 146.}

\footnote{Or their mother’s inheritance: see, for instance, Peter of Blois, ‘De Hierosolymitana peregrinatione acceleranda’, PL ccvii, col. 1063.}

\footnote{Bloch, op. cit., p. 125; and see pp. 123–33.}

\footnote{For the First Crusade, see Rousset, op. cit., pp. 105–6; and for ideas of vengeance in the epics, see Rousset, op. cit., p. 126.}

\footnote{Innocent III, Register, no. 302. See also Roger of Howden, iv, p. 165; Innocent III, ‘Quia maior’, ed. Tangl, p. 90.}

It is well-known that in the central Middle Ages kinship was regarded as creating the same sort of binding obligations as vassalage. The family was a source of strength to the individual, and ties of kinship took precedence, along with vassalage, over all others. It looks as though crusade propagandists decided to present crusading love to laymen in the same terms as love of family. And if one accepts Georges Duby’s belief that in twelfth-century knightly families ‘the patrimony seemed indeed to have been the essential support for the recollection . . . of family consciousness’,\footnote{Or their mother’s inheritance: see, for instance, Peter of Blois, ‘De Hierosolymitana peregrinatione acceleranda’, PL ccvii, col. 1063.} then the idea of Palestine as the hereditary patrimony of Christ takes on a new meaning. In an age obsessed by family land-holdings, Christ’s children were being aroused by threats to their father’s inheritance.\footnote{Baldric of Dol, pp. 12–13. See also Fulcher of Chartres, pp. 132–3, for a reference to the Eastern Christians as ‘confratribus vestris’.

\footnote{G. Duby, The Chivalrous Society (London, 1977), p. 146.}

\footnote{Or their mother’s inheritance: see, for instance, Peter of Blois, ‘De Hierosolymitana peregrinatione acceleranda’, PL ccvii, col. 1063.}

\footnote{Bloch, op. cit., p. 125; and see pp. 123–33.}

\footnote{For the First Crusade, see Rousset, op. cit., pp. 105–6; and for ideas of vengeance in the epics, see Rousset, op. cit., p. 126.}

\footnote{Innocent III, Register, no. 302. See also Roger of Howden, iv, p. 165; Innocent III, ‘Quia maior’, ed. Tangl, p. 90.}

My suggestion that crusading charity was presented to the laity as an example of family love leads to a further point. Marc Bloch has written that ‘the Middle Ages, from beginning to end, and particularly in the feudal era, lived under the sign of private vengeance’.\footnote{G. Duby, The Chivalrous Society (London, 1977), p. 146.} The history of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries is punctuated by violent vendettas. The Church was naturally opposed to them, but it looks as though in its preaching of crusades it was not averse to using the imagery of the family feud to attract knights. Vengeance on the infidel who had oppressed Christians’ brothers and seized their father’s patrimony was a theme in crusade propaganda;\footnote{For the First Crusade, see Rousset, op. cit., pp. 105–6; and for ideas of vengeance in the epics, see Rousset, op. cit., p. 126.} and when in 1198 Pope Innocent III referred to crusaders being summoned

as sons to take vengeance on injury to their father and as brothers to avenge the destruction of their brothers\footnote{Innocent III, Register, no. 302. See also Roger of Howden, iv, p. 165; Innocent III, ‘Quia maior’, ed. Tangl, p. 90.} everyone must have known what he meant. The crusade was in this sense a blood-feud waged against those who had harmed members of Christ’s family.

But I would also argue that love, even in the debased form in which it was presented to potential crusaders, was theologically essential to the crusading movement, because for Christians in all ages sacred violence cannot be proposed on any grounds save that of love. And the idea of charity contributed to the crusades’ attraction in that, while all sorts of motives and feelings conditioned the response of Latin Christians to the popes’ appeals to take the cross, contemporaries really did feel that they were engaging in something morally satisfying. In an age dominated by the theology of merit this explains why participation in crusades was believed to be meritorious, why the expeditions were seen as penitential acts that
could gain indulgences, and why death in battle was regarded as martyrdom. In the 1930s Carl Erdmann, in his influential book on the origins of the movement, linked it to the eleventh-century reformers who were, he explained, ‘the very men who stood for the idea of holy war and sought to put it into practice’. His association of the reform movement with the development of the crusading idea was one of the most striking features of a brilliant study, but it can be argued that he did not take things far enough; that, although he gave evidence for a relationship between reform and sacred violence, he did not explain why such a relationship existed. In fact, as manifestations of Christian love, the crusades were as much the products of the renewed spirituality of the central Middle Ages, with its concern for living the \textit{vita apostolica} and expressing Christian ideals in active works of charity, as were the new hospitals, the pastoral work of the Augustinians and Premonstratensians and the service of the friars. The charity of St. Francis may now appeal to us more than that of the crusaders, but both sprang from the same roots.

\*\* Erdmann, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 143 and \textit{passim}.\*