

VII

THE COUNCILS OF PIACENZA AND CLERMONT

The crusade was first proclaimed by Urban II at the Council of Clermont on November 27, 1095. So we must believe, unless evidence of earlier publicity is found. Some have thought that the pope preached the crusade earlier in the same year at the council which he held at Piacenza, but if this was the case, what he said failed to produce any widespread popular response. To be sure, contemporary writers were not immediately impressed by the historical significance of his November speech, and, as Chalandon

The crusade inspired considerable contemporary historical literature, but is not mentioned in any existing document written before the Council of Clermont, and seldom in sources that appeared before the undertaking had come to a successful end. For letters which give information about the beginning of the movement, consult P. Riant, *Inventaire critique des lettres historiques des croisades* (AOL, I, 1881), pp. 1-224. The letters of Gregory VII are found in *MGH, Epistolae selectae* (ed. E. Caspar), II, and any others that contain references to immediate antecedents are in H. Hagenmeyer, *Epistolae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100* (Innsbruck, 1901). For the Council of Piacenza the chief source is Bernold of St. Blaise, *Chronicon* (MGH, SS., V): Bernold died in 1100. See D. C. Munro, "Did the Emperor Alexius I Ask for Aid at the Council of Piacenza?" *AHR*, XXVII (1922), 731-733.

The earliest account of the Council of Clermont and its antecedents is that of Fulcher of Chartres, *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem peregrinantium* (ed. H. Hagenmeyer, Heidelberg, 1913). Fulcher was an intelligent, observant man who had read the classics at Chartres. He went on the crusade and spent the rest of his life in the east, and although he wrote the first part of his history about 1101, he may have revised it later. See on this D. C. Munro, "A Crusader," *Speculum*, VII (1932), 321-335.

Another contemporary historian who had first-hand knowledge of the east, having accompanied the crusaders in 1101, was the German, Ekkehard, author of a universal chronicle. About 1115, he wrote his *Hierosolymita*, an account of the crusade, which was intended to be a part of his *Chronicle* (ed. H. Hagenmeyer, Tübingen, 1877), and which contains some observations about conditions just before the crusade.

Three other historians of the crusade, who did not accompany the expedition, but were at the Council of Clermont, wrote their accounts in the early twelfth century: Guibert of Nogent (*Historia quae dicitur Gesta Dei per Francos*, in *RHC, Occ.*, IV) was a well-educated and critical person for his time — "the theologian" of the crusade, Villey calls him. Most of Guibert's history is based on the anonymous *Gesta* (see the following chapter), but the reflections and observations in the first part of his work are very interesting and useful. Another historian who, like Guibert, undertook to put the material in the *Gesta* in what was then regarded as good literary form, was Baldric of Dol (*Historia Hierosolimitana*, *RHC, Occ.*, IV), who wrote about 1107-1110. Robert the Monk (*Historia Hierosolymitana*, *RHC, Occ.*, III) also used the *Gesta* as the source of his history, but added other information, including an account of the council at Clermont. His work was very popular, and was not written before 1122, according to C. Cahen (*La Syrie du nord à l'époque des croisades*, Paris, 1940, p. 10, note 1). Another contemporary, William of Malmesbury (*Gesta regum*, ed. W. Stubbs, Rolls

has indicated, neither Raymond of Aguilers nor the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* mentions Clermont. But, although these early chroniclers were eager to get on with the story of the expedition in which they participated, others, who attended the council, were careful not to neglect it. Thus Robert the Monk, when he undertook to rewrite the *Gesta* soon after the turn of the century, complained that his source did not have its proper beginning at Clermont. The glorious success of the crusade brought fame to the council where it originated.

At first Urban was regarded as the author of the movement that began at Clermont. Bernold, writing while the crusade was in progress, said "the lord pope was the chief author of this expedition." Writing from Antioch in 1098, the leaders asked the pope to come over and finish the war "which is your very own".¹ But Urban had said that it was "God's work", that "Christ was the leader" — and so plausible did such propaganda seem that the success of the movement was regarded as divinely assured. If

Series, 2 vols. London, 1887-1889), wrote about the council some thirty years after. As he was not there, he depends chiefly on Fulcher, but adds information gained from others who attended.

The beginnings of the crusade have interested recent historians. C. Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedanken* (Stuttgart, 1935), traces the ideas which contributed to crusading from patristic times, and is a rich source of information for all antecedents. He has been criticized for not distinguishing between holy war and crusade. M. Villey, *La Croisade: Essai sur la formation d'une théorie juridique* (Paris, 1942), indicates that Urban was the originator of the crusade as an institution. P. Rousset, *Les Origines et les caractères de la première croisade* (Neuchâtel, 1945), reveals ideas and attitudes in contemporary literature. B. Leib, *Rome, Kiev, et Byzance à la fin du XI^e siècle* (Paris, 1924), emphasizes church union. Two articles by W. Holtzmann, "Studien zur Orientpolitik des Reformpapsttums und zur Entstehung des ersten Kreuzzuges," *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, XXII (1924), 167-199, and "Die Unionsverhandlungen zwischen Kaiser Alexios I und Papst Urban II im Jahre 1089," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXVIII (1928), 39-67, give other views of the significance of church union. F. Chalandon, *Histoire de la première croisade* (Paris, 1925), suggests that the importance of the Council of Clermont has been overemphasized. M. W. Baldwin, "Some Recent Interpretations of Pope Urban's Eastern Policy," *The Catholic Historical Review*, XXV (1940), 459-466, and A. C. Krey, "Urban's Crusade, Success or Failure?" *AHR*, LIII (1948), 235-250, hold union of the churches to have been Urban's guiding motive. D. C. Munro, "The Speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont," *AHR*, XI (1906), 231-242, analyzes the versions of the pope's speech as reported by chroniclers who were present. R. Crozet, "Le Voyage d'Urban II et ses négociations avec le clergé de France," *RH*, CLXXIX (1937), 271-310, and "Le Voyage d'Urban II en France," *Annales du Midi*, XLIX (1937), 42-69, has traced the pope's itinerary, and A. Fliche, "Urban II et la croisade," *Revue de l'histoire de l'église de France*, XIII (1927), 289-306, suggests the possible effect of the journey in France on Urban's decision to preach the crusade.

Among other recent discussions of origins may be noted: E. Joranson, "The Spurious Letter of Emperor Alexius to the Count of Flanders," *AHR*, LV (1950), 3-43; S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. I, *The First Crusade* (Cambridge, 1951); F. Duncalf, "The Pope's Plan for the First Crusade," *The Crusades and Other Historical Essays Presented to D. C. Munro* (New York, 1928), pp. 44-56; U. Schwerin, *Die Aufrufe der Päpste zur Befreiung des Heiligen Landes von den Anfängen bis zum Ausgang Innocenz VI* (Ebering, Historische Studien, 301, Berlin, 1937).

¹ Bernold, *Chronicon* (MGH, SS., V), p. 464; H. Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, p. 164: "... bellum, quod tuum proprium est."

it was "not human but divine", as Ekkehard said, whoever started it was merely an agent of the Lord. A legend, which was given a long life by the popular historian of the crusades, William of Tyre, indicated that Peter the Hermit was the divine agent who was sent to persuade the pope to initiate the crusade, and it was believed that he carried a letter from heaven as his credential. Not until the last of the nineteenth century did history finally discredit this legend and restore credit to the great pope who was the author of the plan which he proposed at Clermont.²

But how much of the proposal was originated by Urban II? Although it seems to have taken contemporaries by surprise, the crusade was so quickly accepted that it is clear the public was ready for it. Quite simply the author of the *Gesta* says that the crusade came when "the time was at hand" for all to take up crosses and follow Christ. The modern way of putting it is that the crusade was preceded by a long trend of thought which conditioned minds to the idea of holy war.³ Urban had only to propose carrying the holy war to the eastern Mediterranean to show that such a proposal had an immediate appeal to the popular imagination. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that the scheme which the pope devised to put this proposal into effect was original, not so much in the elements of which it was composed as in the synthesis of parts which were known and understood. The "time" for such attention to the practical problems of organization did not come until a human mind capable of such planning was ready to apply itself to the problem of how to raise large armies to serve the church. Unfortunately, the antecedents of this papal plan are not evident. There is no mention of the crusade in any source written before Clermont that is now in existence.

The idea of carrying the holy war against the Moslems to the eastern end of the Mediterranean (but not any way of implementing the idea) seems to have come to Urban from his famous predecessor, Gregory VII, who had proposed an expeditionary force to aid the Byzantine Christians in their struggle with the Selchükid Turks. Inasmuch as Urban undertook to carry out Gregory's ideas, to be his *pedisequus*, as he put it, it may be assumed that he felt it to be his duty to put Gregory's proposal into effect. He did so with the same remarkable success that he had in advancing the Gregorian reform program; waging a winning

² H. Hagenmeyer, *Peter der Eremit* (Leipzig, 1879).

³ C. Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens* (Stuttgart, 1935).

struggle with Henry IV; and, in general, restoring to the papacy the prestige which Gregory had lost.

Just two years before Gregory became pope in 1073, the disastrous defeat of the Byzantine army at Manzikert had opened up all Anatolia to the raids of nomad Turks. In the meantime, Byzantine rule in southern Italy had been overthrown by the Normans, and the imperial forces were unable to deal with the Pechenegs in the Balkans. In this desperate situation, the young basileus, Michael VII, disregarded the controversial separation of Greek and Latin churches which followed the so-called schism of 1054 and made an appeal to the newly chosen pope for aid. When an imperial embassy with a friendly letter to Gregory had been well received, Dominic, patriarch of Grado (who, as a Venetian, may have had contacts at Constantinople), was chosen to carry a favorable reply back to Michael. Gregory, of course, hoped to bring about a reunion of the churches under the recognized dominance of Rome.⁴

Although it is not known that anything was said about military aid from the west in this diplomatic exchange of good will, Gregory soon after proposed that some of the *fideles* of St. Peter should go to the help of the Greeks. On February 2, 1074, the pope wrote to William, count of Burgundy, asking him to fulfil the vow that he had taken to defend the possessions of St. Peter, and to notify Raymond, count of St. Gilles, Amadeo, count of Savoy, and other *fideles* of St. Peter to join the countess Beatrice and her husband, Godfrey of Lorraine, in an expedition to pacify the Normans in southern Italy by a show of force, and then cross over to Constantinople, where the Christians "are urging us eagerly to reach out our hands to them in succor."⁵ On March 1, the pope called for recruits because he had learned that the pagans "have been pressing hard upon the Christian empire, have cruelly laid waste the country almost to the walls of Constantinople and slaughtered like sheep many thousand Christians." But by September 10, Gregory seemed to think that the urgency had passed, for he wrote William VII, duke of Aquitaine and count of Poitou, "the report is that the Christians beyond seas have, by God's help, driven back the fierce assault of the pagans, and we are waiting for the counsel of divine providence as to our future course."

⁴ Riant, *Inventaire* (AOL, I), pp. 59-60.

⁵ For the six letters that Gregory wrote concerning this plan, see his *Registrum* (MGH, *Epistolae selectae*, II), pp. 69-71, 75-76; 126-128, 165-168, 173. Quotations are from Emerton's translations in *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII* (Columbia University, Records of Civilization, New York, 1932).

Three months later, the pope was no longer in doubt when he wrote to young Henry IV, king of Germany: "I call to your attention that the Christians beyond the sea, a great part of whom are being destroyed by the heathen with unheard-of slaughter and are daily being slain like so many sheep, have humbly sent to beg me to succor these our brethren in whatever ways I can, that the religion of Christ may not utterly perish in our time — which God forbid."

With exaggerated optimism, Gregory told the young king that 50,000 men were prepared to go "if they can have me for their leader," and suggested that they might "push forward even to the sepulcher of the Lord." Naively, he even asked Henry to protect the Roman church during his absence. December 16, the pope followed with a general call to *fideles* beyond the Alps, and at the same time wrote to the countess Matilda that he hoped she would accompany the empress Agnes, who was expected to go. But January 22, 1075, when he wrote to his former abbot, Hugh of Cluny, he made no mention of any expedition to aid Greek Christians, although he complained that they were "falling away from the Catholic faith".

When Gregory became involved in the desperate conflict with the western emperor, he had to give up his hopes of winning friends at Constantinople, and instead of helping the Greeks to repel Turkish invaders, the pope gave his blessing to an invasion of the empire by Normans. Although he had tried to check Norman aggression in southern Italy during the early years of his pontificate, as the letter to the count of Burgundy indicates, he had to reverse his policy when hard pressed by Henry IV. In 1080, by concessions, he induced Robert Guiscard to become his ally, and when the Normans prepared to invade the Balkan peninsula, Gregory gave his support to this buccaneering enterprise. He had excommunicated Nicephorus III Botaniates, who had deposed Michael in 1078, and Guiscard asserted that he intended to restore Michael, whose son had been betrothed to the Norman's daughter, to the throne. Although it was known that the real Michael was living in a monastery, Guiscard exhibited a Greek monk who pretended to be the deposed emperor. Gregory seems to have accepted this fraud, and on July 24, 1080, he wrote to the bishops in Apulia and Calabria that all *fideles* of St. Peter should aid Michael, "unjustly overthrown," and that all fighting men who went overseas with the emperor and Robert should be faithful to them, which obviously referred to the pretender.⁶ When Guiscard's undertaking

⁶ *Registrum* (MGH, *Epp. selectae*), II, 523-524.

seemed successful, the pope congratulated him, while trying to impress him with the danger that threatened the Roman church, for Henry IV, subsidized by Byzantine gold, was closing in on the city of St. Peter. Alexius Comnenus, who became emperor in 1081 by deposing Nicephorus III, at first had asked the pope to restrain the Normans, but when it became clear that Gregory was a "Norman pope", he gave his support to Henry IV. Thus, at Constantinople, the pope, who had once wished to send military aid to the empire, came to be regarded as a hated enemy.⁷

Thus, all Gregory's hopes of ending the schism between east and west were destroyed when political necessity drove him into the Norman alliance. However, in 1085 the death of both Guiscard and his papal ally relieved the tension, and better understanding between east and west seemed possible. But, although the abbot of Monte Cassino, who became Victor III, had been in friendly correspondence with Alexius, he was too dependent on Norman support to do much to restore papal prestige. Not until the Frenchman, Odo of Lagery, became pope on March 12, 1088, did the church have a leader capable of saving the papacy from the crisis into which Gregory VII had precipitated it.

Odo, who took the name of Urban II, had been a pupil of Bruno, the founder of Chartreuse, at Rheims, where he became canon and archdeacon. Later he became a monk and prior of Cluny, and it was on abbot Hugh's recommendation that he entered the service of Gregory VII, who made him cardinal-bishop of Ostia, and sent him on the difficult mission of being papal legate in Germany, where he was when Gregory died. Odo supported Victor III, whom other reformers opposed because he was not a strong supporter of Gregory's reform program, and it is said that Victor nominated Odo as his successor. Certainly no one was better qualified to restore the prestige of the papacy, which had sunk so low that Bernold relates that only five German bishops recognized the new pope. Although the countess Matilda of Tuscany loyally supported the rightful pope, much of northern and central Italy was dominated by the partisans of Clement III, the anti-pope, while the Romans, who had seen their city looted by the followers of Gregory's Norman ally, favored the schismatics. "Guibert [Clement III], however, urged on by the support of the aforesaid emperor and by the instigation of the Roman citizens, for some time kept Urban a stranger to the church of

⁷ See the violent condemnation of Gregory by Anna Comnena. *Alexiad.*, I, xiii, 2-7 (ed. Leib, I, pp. 47-49).

St. Peter." But, according to Bernold, Urban would not use force to obtain possession of the city and, except for a few months when Clement had to leave, his visits to Rome were clandestine and brief. During most of the first five years that he was pope, he found it necessary to wander about in Apulia and Calabria, where he was assured of Norman protection. It is not surprising, therefore, that a few days after being consecrated, he set out to find count Roger, Guiscard's brother, most influential of the Norman chiefs, who was then completing the conquest of Sicily. There the pope held a conference with him at Troina.

One topic that the pope brought up for consideration was the advisability of reopening diplomatic relations with Constantinople. Geoffrey Malaterra, historian of the Italian Normans, says that the pope asked the count's advice about accepting an invitation to a church council at Constantinople for consideration of the differences between the two churches. Roger urged acceptance, but, as Malaterra tells the story, Urban was prevented from participating in such a meeting by the hostility of the anti-pope and his partisans at Rome.⁸ It seems clear, however, from evidence given by Walter Holtzmann that what Urban wanted to know was whether the count had any intention of renewing the war on Alexius, which had undone the efforts of Gregory VII to maintain close relations with the eastern church. When the pope was able to assure the basileus that there would be no further Norman aggression, he, not the basileus as Malaterra thought, made a move to open negotiations. He asked that his name be put on the diptychs at Constantinople inasmuch as it was not excluded by any synodal acts. Alexius, finding that this was true, induced a synod to grant the request, but on condition that Urban send his profession of faith in the customary systatic letter, and participate in person, or through representatives, in a council to be held at Constantinople eighteen months later for the purpose of settling the controversial issues that divided the churches. The patriarch also assured the pope, who had complained that Latins were not allowed to worship in their own fashion in the empire, that they had the same freedom as Greeks in the territories under Norman rule. Urban also made another friendly move at this time, September 1089, by removing from Alexius the excommunication which Gregory had imposed on Nicephorus III.⁹

⁸ Malaterra, *Chronicon*, iv, 13 (*MPL CXLIX*, 1191, 1192).

⁹ W. Holtzmann, "Unionverhandlungen zwischen Kaiser Alexios I und Papst Urban II im Jahre 1089," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XXVI (1920), 38-67. See P. Charanis, *AHR*, LIII (1948), 941-944, for an analysis of the documents published by Holtzmann, and above, chapter VI, pp. 216 ff.

There is no evidence to show that Urban ever sent a profession of faith, and he did not accept the invitation to discuss the union of the churches. No doubt he knew that the Greeks would not accept the supremacy of Rome, which the reform movement in the west was striving to establish. On other points of difference, the Greeks may have been more conciliatory, but here also the Gregorian program offered little hope of compromise. Urban, usually the tactful diplomat, seems to have been much the partisan at Bari in 1098. When the discussion held there with Greek churchmen of southern Italy did not go to his liking, he called upon Anselm of Canterbury to defend the Latin cause, and when this champion seemed to overwhelm the Greeks by his dialectic, Urban exulted. Such is the report of Eadmer, the biographer of Anselm.¹⁰

There is reason to assume that Urban did not wish to enter into negotiations about ecclesiastical matters in 1089, because controversy might have marred the friendly relations that he had established with the Byzantine emperor. He could be well satisfied with the significant diplomatic victory that he had won, for he had brought about a reversal of Greek policy in the west. As long as the Normans were a serious menace to the empire, it had been imperial policy to cause trouble for them in Italy by subsidizing Henry IV. Furthermore, as long as this alliance lasted, the anti-pope, Clement III, had hoped to obtain recognition at Constantinople. Urban had changed all this by being able to assure Alexius that the Normans were no longer to be feared. By obtaining the favor of the eastern emperor, the pope had gained an important advantage over his enemies in Italy.

It has been asserted that Alexius was glad to have cordial relations with the pope because he hoped to get military help from the west. Later, of course, the pope did recruit large armies, but what military aid did the emperor hope to obtain from a pope who was virtually an exile in Norman Italy? It was not until later, when papal prestige had risen, that there was much possibility of obtaining such help. "The fact that Alexius had frequently asked for aid before the Council of Piacenza is universally admitted."¹¹ But mercenaries, not armies going forth to holy war, was the kind of military aid the basileus wanted. Anna Comnena says that her father did all that he could to collect a mercenary army by letters,

¹⁰ Eadmer, *Historia novorum in Anglia* (ed. M. Rule, Rolls Series, no. 81 [1884]), pp. 104 to 106.

¹¹ D. C. Munro, *AHR*, XXVII (1922), 733, note 11.

and even indicates that he awaited a mercenary army from Rome about 1091.¹² It is more plausible to assume that Anna's statement refers to the military contingent promised to Alexius by the count of Flanders.

Robert the Frisian, count of Flanders, went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem about 1087 to 1090 or 1091. On his return trip he was received with great honor by Alexius, who apparently asked him to send mercenaries. Robert, binding himself by the sort of oath that Anna thought was customary among the Latins, pledged himself to send five hundred mounted warriors when he returned to Flanders. The count kept his word, and the contingent reached Alexius with a gift of one hundred and fifty excellent horses, and the emperor was able to purchase all other horses which were not needed by these western horsemen.¹³ It may be that the emperor wrote to the count of Flanders at this time, and that his letter became the basis for the famous *epistula spuria*, which was used later for propaganda.¹⁴ Ekkehard, without saying when, tells us that the emperor wrote "not a few" letters to the pope asking aid for the defense of the eastern churches.¹⁵ Returning pilgrims, who may have been indoctrinated by Byzantine propaganda as well as disturbed by their own experiences, added their testimony to the requests made at higher levels. The pope, we may feel sure, was well informed about the situation in the east. Nevertheless, there is no evidence to show that he made any effort to send help to the emperor before the Council of Piacenza in 1095.

In the meantime, as contemporary sources do make clear, Urban was very busy trying to combat the "schismatics", and to build up papal prestige in the west. At one stage, his position seemed so desperate that his staunchest supporter, the countess Matilda, actually tried to negotiate a compromise peace with the triumphant German emperor, and, although more than forty years old, she married seventeen-year-old Welf (V) of Bavaria in order to win him over to the papal cause. Urban endeavored to secure the support of prominent prelates by relaxing the severity of the reform program in special instances, and in 1093 his diplomacy was successful in inducing Conrad, Henry's heir, to rebel against

¹² *Alexiad*, VIII, v, 1 (ed. Leib, II, 139). Urban, who did not have any authority in Rome, could not have sent troops from the city at this time.

¹³ *Alexiad*, VII, vi, 1; VII, 4; VIII, iii, 4 (ed. Leib, II, 105, 109, 135).

¹⁴ For the best and most recent discussion of this letter, see E. Joranson, "The Spurious Letter of Emperor Alexius to the Count of Flanders," *AHR*, LV (1950), 811-832. The conclusion is that the letter in the form in which it has come down to us was used in 1105 by Bohemond in his campaign to recruit an army with which to attack the emperor.

¹⁵ Ekkehard, *Hierosolymita*, V, 2, 3 (ed. Hagenmeyer, pp. 81-82).

his father. By this time, as the emperor was losing support in Italy, Urban was able to enter Rome, where early in 1094 he secured possession of the Lateran, which the abbot of Vendôme obtained by bribing a partisan of the anti-pope to surrender it. Later in 1094, Urban moved north, visiting Pisa, Pistoia, and Florence. "Now that he had prevailed nearly everywhere," says Bernold, he issued a call for a council to meet at Piacenza early the next year, "among the schismatics themselves and against them, to which he summoned bishops from Italy, Burgundy, France, Allemania, Bavaria, and other countries."¹⁶ The council was in session the first week in March 1095, and its agenda consisted of ecclesiastical matters, chiefly of measures for the furtherance of the Gregorian reform program, and condemnation of the "schismatics". The presence at Piacenza of important lay personages shows how greatly the prestige of the pope had increased. Praxeda, the discarded wife of Henry IV, was there to make scandalous accusations against her royal husband. King Philip of France sent representatives to argue against his excommunication for adultery which had been imposed at the Council of Autun the preceding year, while king Peter of Aragon became the vassal of the papacy and agreed to pay an annual tribute. Lastly, and most impressive of all, no doubt, was the embassy from Constantinople with a request from the emperor that the pope urge western fighting men to aid in the defense of the eastern church, which the pagans had almost destroyed in the regions which they had occupied, extending almost to the walls of Constantinople. When he preached outside the city in the open fields to a crowd too large for any church, the pope incited many to give such help, and urged those who intended to go to take oath that they would give faithful aid to the emperor to the best of their ability.¹⁷ It has often been suggested that this means that the pope preached the crusade at Piacenza, but all that Bernold says is that Urban urged warriors to go to aid Alexius, which was what Gregory had proposed earlier. It is possible, of course, that the pope had in mind much of what he proposed a few months later at Clermont, for it

¹⁶ Bernold, *Chronicon* (MGH, SS., V), p. 461.

¹⁷ Formerly Bernold (MGH, SS., V), p. 462, was the only source for this Byzantine appeal and the papal response to it. Confirmation by another contemporary source was found by D. C. Munro (*AHR*, XXVII [1922], 731-733). Bernold's reference to the oath is interesting in view of the vow to complete the pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulcher that crusaders were required to take (see below, p. 247) and the insistence of Alexius that the leaders of the crusade bind themselves to him by oath (see below, p. 284). Bernold says, "Ad hoc ergo auxilium dominus papa multos incitavit, ut etiam jurejurando promitterent, se illuc Deo annuente ituros et eidem imperatori contra paganos pro posse suo fidelissimum adjutorium collaturos. . . ."

does not seem probable that he thought out all the ideas in his plan for the crusade in the short time between Piacenza and Clermont, but what Bernold reports has little or no resemblance to the later proposal.¹⁸

Urban stayed at Piacenza for a month before moving on to Cremona, where Conrad, son of Henry IV, became a vassal of the papacy. After visiting other Lombard cities, Vercelli, Milan, Como, he arrived at Asti about June 27. A month later the papal party was at Valence, and, although the usually reliable Bernold says that the trip was made by sea, it seems more likely that Fulcher of Chartres, who went from France to Italy with the crusaders the next year, was right in reporting that the pope crossed the mountains.¹⁹ Urban was glad to revisit Cluny, where he had been a monk. When he dedicated the altar of the abbatial church in the famous monastery, he announced that his main reason for coming to France was to do honor to Cluny,²⁰ and the charters and confirmations to Cluniac houses that mark his trail throughout southern France indicate that his desire to favor Cluny was not mere rhetoric.

There was, in fact, much ecclesiastical business to justify the journey to France, where the condition of the church and papal influence had greatly deteriorated during the preceding centuries of disorder, and the Gregorian reform program and the struggle over investiture had added to ecclesiastical confusion. Consequently, there were many jurisdictional disputes that papal legates had not been able to settle but which might be adjusted by the personal diplomacy of Urban himself. Furthermore, the pope, as he became more influential, became more and more firm in urging the clergy to conform to the ecclesiastical reform. Urban desired to have the churchmen of France discuss and legislate in councils such as the one held at Piacenza. The business transacted is indicated by the acts of the papal chancery and local charters by which the itinerary has been traced. There is no reason to

¹⁸ See A. Fliche, "Urbain II et la croisade," *Revue de l'histoire de l'église de France*, XIII (1927), 289-293. B. Leib (*Rome, Kiev, et Byzance*, pp. 180ff.) holds that the union of churches must have come up for discussion. Bernold's only mention of the church is that the emperor asked help for its defense (*ut aliquod auxilium sibi contra paganos pro defensione sanctae ecclesiae conferrent*), which cannot be used to imply anything more than it says. Inasmuch as Alexius had formerly proposed a council to consider the obstacles to union, and had found the pope not interested, it seems improbable that he would raise the question again. There is no evidence to indicate that Urban had become any more willing than before to become involved in arguments with the Greeks.

¹⁹ Fliche, who decided that Urban visited St. Gilles twice before going to Clermont, accepts Bernold's statement. Crozet, who has made a careful study of Urban's itinerary in France, thinks that Fulcher, who is supported by Albert of Aix, is correct.

²⁰ *MGH, SS.*, XIV, 100; Bouquet, *RHGF*, XIV, 101.

doubt Urban's statement that he came to Gaul on ecclesiastical business.²¹

But Urban also said that he came to France with the intention of appealing for aid to the eastern Christians. The pope gave this explanation for his journey in his letter to the Flemings, which was written soon after the Council of Clermont.²² Fulcher, writing after the crusade, having recalled all the troubles of both clergy and laity that the pope wished to correct, goes on to say: "When he heard, too, that interior parts of Romania were held oppressed by the Turks, and that Christians were subjected to destructive and savage attacks, he was moved by compassionate pity; and prompted by the love of God, he descended the Alps and came into Gaul; in Auvergne he summoned a council to come together from all sides in a city called Clermont."²³ But there is no way for us to know how much the desire to send aid to eastern Christians may have influenced Urban to cross the mountains. Neither can it be determined when he prepared a plan for a crusade, so different from what he had preached at Piacenza. It can only be suggested that he probably found encouragement to mature his plans in southern France, where holy war was well understood.

Feudal France, at this time, had a considerable surplus of fighting material. Young men, trained to the profession of arms and knowing no other, who were without prospect of inheriting feudal holdings, turned to robbery at home or adventure abroad. The church, especially in southern France, had endeavored to control feudal anarchy by creating the institutions known as the Peace of God and the Truce of God. But the mass meetings, oaths, and other means used in this eleventh-century peace movement were not enough to check private warfare and brigandage, and it was fortunate for French society that many young warriors went abroad to fight for booty or lands in England, Spain, and southern Italy and Sicily. That France, then, was an excellent recruiting ground for a crusade, we may assume Urban understood. But, if we can believe the writers who reported his speech later, he was also interested in bringing peace within Christendom by siphoning off many of the troublemakers in a foreign war.²⁴

Many French warriors had participated in the reconquest in

²¹ Crozet, *RH*, CLXXIX, 272, quotes from the Cartulary of St. Sernin of Toulouse, "Factum est cum in partes Gallie pro negotiis ecclesiasticis venissemus."

²² Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, p. 136.

²³ Fulcher, *Gesta Francorum* (ed. Hagenmeyer), I, 3, p. 121.

²⁴ See L. C. MacKinney, "The People and Public Opinion in the Eleventh-Century Peace Movement," *Speculum*, V (1930), 181-206.

Spain, and Cluny had done much to give this struggle the character of a holy war. As the black monks had established their colonies in the territories recovered from the Moslems, they were much interested in extending their holdings, and by the close of the eleventh century, Cluny was so well established in the Christian part of the peninsula that almost every prelate of importance there had been taken from one of her houses. In her monasteries along the "French road" that went to Compostela, the pilgrims heard the legends, containing much propaganda for holy war, which provided the material for the epic poems. The monks prayed for those who went forth to do battle for the faith, and, in gratitude, the warriors gave a share of their plunder to the monasteries. At Cluny, and the Cluniac priories where he stopped, Urban, who was planning to send aid to Christians who were being attacked by Moslems in the east, found sympathetic listeners who were interested in the holy war in Spain.

The small Christian kingdoms in northern Spain had received much aid from France in the reconquest, and Spanish kings had become closely connected with the noble families of southern France. Thus Raymond of St. Gilles, count of Toulouse, was the half-brother of two counts of Barcelona, and his third wife was the daughter of the king of Castile, Alfonso VI. This Spanish ruler had first married a daughter of the duke of Aquitaine, and later a daughter of the duke of Burgundy. Peter I, king of Aragon, whose mother was a sister of the French lord, Ebles of Roucy, married another daughter of William VIII, duke of Aquitaine and count of Poitou, who headed the French expedition that captured Barbastro in 1064, a deed which was celebrated in a *chanson de geste*. In 1073, Ebles of Roucy went to Spain with an army that Suger said was fit for a king.²⁵

The disastrous defeat of Alfonso at Zallaca, in 1086, permitted the victorious Murābiṭs (Almoravids) to advance northward again, and caused the Spanish Christians to send urgent appeals for help to friends and kinsmen beyond the Pyrenees. According to one report, Alfonso threatened to permit the enemy to pass through his territories into France if he did not receive aid.²⁶ French lords, among them the duke of Burgundy, crossed into

²⁵ M. Defourneaux, *Les Français en Espagne*, pp. 136-137; *La Siège de Barbastro* (ed. J. L. Perrier, *Les Classiques français du moyen-âge*, Paris, 1926); Suger, *Vita Ludovici* (ed. Waquet, *ibid.*, Paris, 1929), p. 26. On the Spanish reconquest, see above, chapter II, section A.

²⁶ Defourneaux, *Les Français en Espagne*, p. 143, note 3, and chapter III; Erdmann, *Entstehung*, pp. 88, 89, 124; P. Boissonade, *Du nouveau sur la chanson de Roland* (1929), calls all these expeditions to Spain crusades. Rousset, *Première croisade*, p. 35, holds that they were not crusades.

Spain about this time, but seem to have accomplished little in arresting the Moslem advance. As this had happened a few years before Urban came to France, it is evident that he found many who had recent first-hand knowledge of the holy war in Spain.

Popes before Urban had been interested in the reconquest.²⁷ Gregory VII had insisted that Spain "was from ancient times subject to St. Peter in full sovereignty," and "it belongs to no mortal, but solely to the Apostolic See." In 1073, he announced that Ebles of Roucy had agreed that all conquered territory in Spain was to be held in fief of St. Peter, and he forbade anyone to take part in his undertaking unless this was understood.²⁸

In his younger days, before he left France to serve Gregory VII, Urban, we may be sure, had learned much about the reconquest, especially when he was a Cluniac monk and prior. No doubt he had observed French interest in this peninsular war, and could have known about the expedition of Ebles of Roucy at first hand. Soon after becoming pope, while the papacy was in rather desperate straits, Urban revealed his interest in the holy war in Spain. In 1089, he assured all who would participate in the rebuilding of the frontier post of Tarragona that by so doing they would secure the same help toward salvation as from a pilgrimage to Jerusalem or other holy places.²⁹

The pope left Italy accompanied by an entourage of distinguished prelates. In addition to four cardinals, there were two archbishops (one of whom, Daimbert of Pisa, was to become patriarch of Jerusalem), several bishops, and John of Gaeta, the famous papal chancellor. Other ecclesiastical dignitaries joined along the way, to assist in affairs that concerned their own jurisdiction as well as to enjoy the opportunity of being with the pope and his influential associates. The party found lodging and entertainment in wealthy monasteries, where Urban had conferences with influential persons, ecclesiastical and lay, from the regions about. One is naturally inclined to assume that the pope was eager to sound out public opinion in regard to interest in the sufferings of the eastern Christians before he undertook to recruit

²⁷ M. Villey, *La Croisade*, p. 69, questions Erdmann's belief that Alexander II initiated or directed the expedition that captured Barbastro, or that he granted an indulgence to those who participated. There is no proof that Raymond, count of St. Gilles, participated in this expedition. The fact that his third wife was the natural daughter of Alfonso VI creates a probability that he was in Spain at some time.

²⁸ M. Villey, *La Croisade*, pp. 70-73, says that there is no indication that the papacy gained any such temporal advantage.

²⁹ Villey, *La Croisade*, p. 72; Riant, *Inventaire, AOL*, I, 68-71; Erdmann, *Entstehung*, p. 292.

important lay leaders for the expedition that he was planning to organize. But the sources tell only of ecclesiastical business, and only one bit of evidence gives a clue to any such effort to interest anyone in the crusade. Baldric of Dol says that after the pope had delivered his famous oration at Clermont, envoys from Raymond, count of Toulouse, appeared and announced that their lord had taken the cross.³⁰ If this is a fact, it is clear that Raymond knew what the pope intended to do at Clermont, and, no doubt, had been solicited by Urban. If the count had been enlisted, it is very probable that others had been approached, and possibly recruited. Such a shrewd politician as Urban would not have ventured to launch his undertaking without having assurances of adequate human support, even though he believed it all to be "God's work".

The pope was at Le Puy when he issued his call for the council at Clermont. Here he had opportunity to confer with the bishop, Adhémar of Monteil, who came from a noble Valentinois family. A good horseman, trained in the use of arms, he had defended his church from neighboring lords with vigor, and, according to one rumor, he had been on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.³¹ Inasmuch as Urban was to make Adhémar his papal legate for the crusade some three months later, it may be assumed that the matter had been under discussion at Le Puy. Fliche, without any evidence, surmises that Adhémar proposed that the pope go to consult with the count of St. Gilles.³² At any rate, after a stop at the monastery of Chaise-Dieu, August 18, which seems to have been frequently visited by Raymond, the papal party moved rather rapidly southward and arrived at St. Gilles about the end of August.

Fliche thinks it is probable that Raymond was in the vicinity of St. Gilles at the time of Urban's weeklong stay at this famous monastery. In June he had attended the marriage of his son, Bertram, to a daughter of Odo, duke of Burgundy. Having recently inherited the county of Toulouse and other family holdings on the death of his brother, Raymond had become the greatest lord in southern France, as he was count of Rodez, Nîmes, Narbonne, and Toulouse, as well as marquis of Provence. Although he had been excommunicated for a consanguineous marriage, and had supported simoniacal prelates, he had been suggested for an expedition overseas as one of the *fideles* of St. Peter by Gregory

³⁰ Baldric of Dol, *Historia* (RHC, Occ., IV), p. 16; Fliche, "Urbain II et la croisade," *Revue de l'histoire de l'église de France*, XIII (1927), 296-299.

³¹ Devic and Vaissete, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, IV, 147.

³² Fliche, "Urbain II et la Croisade," pp. 290-297.

VII in his letter to the count of Burgundy, and probably the reforming papacy had found him as coöperative as any of the great lords of the time. He had formed matrimonial alliances with two rulers who were at war with the Moslems; his second wife was a daughter of count Roger of Sicily, and his third, who accompanied him on the crusade, was a daughter of king Alfonso VI of Castile. It has been suggested that Raymond had the very natural ambition to be chosen leader of the crusade, but there is no proof to indicate that the pope ever entertained this idea. Certainly, if the pope had desired a lay leader, he would have considered the count, who, as far as we know, may be regarded as the first crusader.

It has also been intimated, again by Fliche, that Urban may have hoped to enlist the support of Odo, duke of Burgundy, who had fought in Spain, although the prospect that Philip I, king of France, might be induced to join the expedition could not have been seriously entertained as Philip seemed to be so enamored of Bertrada of Montfort, wife of Fulk Rechin, count of Anjou, that he was prepared to defy all ecclesiastical discipline. At the Council of Autun, in 1094, where Hugh of Die, archbishop of Lyons and papal legate, presided, the sentence of excommunication had been imposed on the king, who had appealed his case to the pope at Piacenza. Urban had reserved decision until he should be in France, hoping to induce the king to mend his ways. No doubt this was the matter discussed at a meeting between Philip and Hugh at Mozac, which is near Clermont, not long before the council met.³³ The duke of Burgundy was present at this conference, and it is the guess of Fliche that the crusade was discussed and that Odo was so loyal to his suzerain that he would not support the pope's plans unless the king's adultery was condoned. If so, it is a most unusual example of loyalty to a king when the great lords of France had so little respect for Capetian weakness.

After a leisurely journey up the Rhone valley, with stops for dedications, consecrations, and ecclesiastical affairs, the party reached Cluny about October 18, and remained at the famous monastery, where Urban had once been a monk, until the end of the month. It has been said that Cluny, which had promoted pilgrimages to Jerusalem as well as to Compostela, and had en-

³³ A. Fliche, *Le Règne de Philippe Ier, roi de France* (Paris, 1912), pp. 58-59, and "Urbain II et la croisade," p. 300.

³⁴ A. Hatem, *Les Poèmes épiques des croisades* (Paris, 1932), pp. 63-78; Erdmann, *Entstehung*, pp. 60ff., 285, note 4, 304; Fliche, "Urbain II et la croisade," p. 300. On the role of Cluny in promoting pilgrimage, see above, chapter II, section D.

couraged holy war in Spain, contributed much to the initiation of the crusade.³⁴ But surely the pope had the very mature plan, which he presented at Clermont a month later, well prepared by this time. No doubt he asked his former abbot, Hugh, for advice, because he certainly wished to have the support of Cluny, but there is no evidence to show that Hugh had anything to do with initiating the plan that Urban was to propose. But the abbot did accompany the pope on his long journey through southern France, and may have done much to arrange the itinerary so that the papal party would be entertained at Cluniac houses, and the pope rewarded such hospitality by favors in the form of grants of privileges which often included exemption from secular control.

By November 14, the party had reached Clermont, and the pope opened the council on the 18th. The responsibility of arranging for the entertainment of the delegates in his city seems to have been too much of a strain on bishop Durand, who died that night. The estimates of how many churchmen were there vary from one hundred and ninety to four hundred and three. Fulcher of Chartres and Guibert of Nogent put the figures at three hundred and ten and four hundred bishops and abbots, but the bull dealing with the primacy of Lyons, a controversial affair on which some may not have cared to be counted, was signed by twelve archbishops, eighty bishops, and ninety abbots. This, Chalandon thinks, may be regarded as a sort of official roll call of the members. In his letter to the faithful of Bologna, Urban made a much more extravagant claim, when he said that the plenary indulgence decreed at Clermont had been endorsed by nearly all the archbishops and bishops of Gaul.

It was southern France, as Crozet has shown, that was best represented in the council; the Burgundies, Anjou, Poitou, Aquitaine, and Languedoc sent large delegations. On the other hand, there were only two bishops from the Capetian sphere of influence, although we have Urban's statement that king Philip did not prevent others from going. William II of England did forbid his clergy to go, and only three bishops and one abbot represented Normandy, although it is not reported that duke Robert interfered in the matter. A few came from regions farther north, including the bishops of Toul and Metz, while an archbishop, two bishops, and an abbot came from Spain. The hardships and dangers of travel and infirmity may have prevented some prelates from attending, and a few sent excuses. Lambert, bishop of Arras, was kidnapped near Provins by a robber lord named Guarnier

Trainel, and the pope had to threaten to excommunicate the offender in order to get Lambert released.³⁵

Although the Council of Clermont became famous for initiating the crusade, it devoted so much of its time and energy to ecclesiastical business that, at first, contemporaries seem to have regarded it as not very different from Piacenza, or the synods at Tours and Nîmes which came after. There were various controversial issues, some of long standing, that came up for decision. Thus, the archbishop of Sens, who took the side of the king in his efforts to keep his mistress without being excommunicated, would not recognize the primacy of Hugh of Die, archbishop of Lyons, and was suspended. But as the count of Anjou had made formal complaint about his wife's being, as everyone knew, the royal mistress, and as Philip would not promise to give her up, Urban could no longer find pretext to postpone action, and excommunicated the guilty pair. Nevertheless, Hugh, the king's brother, did take the cross and lead a contingent on the crusade.

The legislation passed by the council consisted chiefly of reform measures passed by earlier councils, with further definition and provision for better regulation. Only two canons can be regarded as having any bearing on the crusade. The first canon, which proclaimed the Truce of God, might be regarded as papal confirmation of the peace movement, which up to this time had been a matter of regional action, but, although he believed that the crusade would promote peace in the west, the pope must have realized that peace at home might make men more willing to enlist in an expedition which would take them far away for a long period. The second canon was obviously intended to stimulate recruiting, inasmuch as it promised plenary indulgence to all who would go to liberate the church of God in Jerusalem. If they were animated by devotion, and not by the desire for fame or money, the journey (*iter*) would take the place of all penance.³⁶

On November 27, when the ecclesiastical business of the council had been completed, Urban went outside the city to address an

³⁵ F. Chalandon, *Histoire de la première croisade*, pp. 24-28; Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, p. 137; R. Crozet, "Le Voyage d'Urban II," *RH*, CLXXIX (1937), pp. 282-287; *Letter from Urban to Guarnier Trainel (PL CLI)*, cols. 429-430.

³⁶ As the canons of the council have not survived in any official copy, they have been taken from a list which apparently belonged to bishop Lambert of Arras (Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum amplissima collectio*, XX, 815-820) and from the summaries given by Ordericus Vitalis and William of Malmesbury. See Chalandon, *Première croisade*, pp. 33-35; Riant, *Inventaire (AOL, I)*, p. 109, note 3. Urban had previously endorsed the Truce at Melfi in 1089, and at Troia in 1093 (A. Fliche, *La Réforme grégorienne*, Paris, 1926, p. 283). In his letters from Antioch to the archbishop of Rheims, Anselm of Ribemont hopes that there is peace at home (Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, pp. 144, 160). See also Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, pp. 136-137.

audience which was too large for any church.³⁷ It is understandable that the prospect of listening to a pope and seeing so many high prelates had drawn many people from the neighboring region. In a letter from the archbishop of Rheims to Lambert, bishop of Arras, in which the papal summons to the council was transmitted, it was suggested that the bishop bring Baldwin, count of Mons, with him, and Urban wrote to the Flemings shortly after the council that he had urged (*sollicitavimus*) the princes of Gaul and their followers to liberate the eastern Christians. From these slender bits of evidence it might seem that Urban made some effort to have lay lords in his audience, but later writers have given greatly exaggerated estimates of such attendance. Passing over Ekkehard's one hundred thousand (for which a loudspeaker would seem necessary), we have Baldric reporting "innumerable powerful and distinguished laymen, proud of their knighthood . . . from many regions." Robert mentions bishops and lords from France and Germany, but qualifies his statement by adding that no lay lord, qualified to be chosen leader, was there. Chalandon thinks that the failure of both Raymond of Aguilers and the author of the *Gesta* to mention Clermont indicates that this council did not seem very different from any of the others that Urban was holding to promote church reforms.³⁸ Such vague references do not tell us how many of the "great multitude" that departed in 1096 may have been the first fruits of the papal oratory. But, after all, the number of immediate recruits was not significant if many could be enlisted later, and the assembly at Clermont provided a favorable opportunity for the pope to give publicity to his plan. It was not to laymen but to ecclesiastics that Urban entrusted the task of promoting the enterprise, and immediately after the main address, or possibly the next day, we are told that he urged the bishops to proclaim the crusade in their churches, "with their whole souls and vigorously to preach the way to Jerusalem." The crusade had such popular appeal that Urban would have conferred fame on any place where he decided to announce it.

The idea caught popular imagination and the undertaking soon inspired an outburst of writing. The deeds done overseas seemed

³⁷ J. Gay, *Les Papes du XIe siècle et la chrétienté* (Paris, 1926), p. 375, says that just as the council was about to dissolve, the pope decided to preach the crusade. I find no evidence to support this. It is more reasonable to assume that the whole affair was carefully planned.

³⁸ The failure of Bernold, in his notes for 1095, to mention that the crusade was preached at Clermont may add something to this argument from silence, but in his notes for 1096 he tells of a great multitude starting for Jerusalem and says that the pope had earnestly preached the crusade at all previous synods (Bernold, *Chronicon*, MGH, SS., V, pp. 463-464).

to provide the only contemporary material heroic enough for the *chansons de geste*, and the chronicles written about it have much of the epic spirit.³⁹ Writing the history of the expedition was started by participants — the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* (completed by 1101), Raymond of Aguilers, and Fulcher of Chartres. Of these, Fulcher is the only one who tells of what happened at Clermont, where it is generally assumed he was present.⁴⁰ Three other writers, who were there, wrote accounts of the assembly soon after the turn of the century when the undertaking was known to be a glorious success, and all three, Baldric of Dol, Robert the Monk, and Guibert of Nogent, used the *Gesta* as their main source, endeavoring to rewrite the simple story of an eyewitness in the stilted Latin then regarded as the mark of good style. Nevertheless, all three added, what the *Gesta* had omitted, an account of the beginning at Clermont. Robert says that an abbot Bernard showed him a history (the *Gesta*) which displeased him because of its literary crudity, and because it did not have the beginning of the story at Clermont. He suggested that Robert, who had been there, should do it over, and put "a head on such acephalous material." The story of Clermont, as first told by these four writers, was to be used again and again by later chroniclers and modern historians.

Although it is probable that all four were present, they relate what happened after the oration somewhat differently. Robert says that the emotional enthusiasm awakened by the pope culminated in a great shout of *Deus lo volt* (God wills it), and Baldric recalled how many applauded by stamping on the ground, while others were moved to tears, and that discussion soon became animated. Then Adhémar came forward, knelt before the pope, took the vow to go to Jerusalem, and received the papal blessing, all of which seems so dramatic that it may have been prearranged. Urban then commanded all who were going, to obey Adhémar as their leader (*dux*). He also directed all who took the vow to go to sew cloth crosses on their shoulders as a symbol or badge of their profession to follow Christ, who had said, "If anyone wishes to come after Me, let him deny himself, take up his cross, and follow Me." Fulcher says, "O how fitting it was, how pleasing to us all to see these crosses, beautiful, whether of silk, or woven

³⁹ Marc Bloch, *La Société féodale*, I (Paris, 1939), 157; Ordericus Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, IX, 1 (ed. A. Le Prevost, Société de l'histoire de France, 5 vols., Paris, 1838-1855), III, 458, says, "Nulla, ut reor, unquam sophistis in bellicis rebus gloriosior materia prodiit. . . ."

⁴⁰ Munro, "The Speech of Urban II at Clermont, 1095," *AHR*, XI (1906), 232, note 10, says that he finds no evidence that Fulcher was there.

gold, or of any kind of cloth, which these pilgrims, by order of pope Urban, sewed on the shoulders of their mantles or cassocks or tunics once they had made the vow to go." To Baldric it seemed to be the mark of an honorable profession like the belt of knighthood. Thus Urban initiated a most effective advertising device, for everywhere people would want to know about these *cruce signati*.⁴¹ Finally, after the cardinal Gregory had led the crowd in the *Confiteor*, Urban dismissed his audience with his blessing. He had launched the crusade. What had he said to do that?

All four chroniclers, Fulcher, Baldric, Robert, and Guibert, tell what they claim they had heard the pope say at Clermont, but, as they were trying to recall it all several years later, it is not surprising that their speeches differ. Chalandon suggests that what they wrote must be regarded as just rhetorical exercises; and medieval chroniclers, in the manner of classical historians before them, often made up imaginary speeches. Naturally Urban's oration, which had initiated the glorious crusade, seemed famous enough to deserve the very best rhetorical treatment, and these writers were not inhibited by any appreciation of the importance of accurate reporting. In fairness to them, however, it must be noted that they frankly say that they are not giving the exact words of the pope.⁴² Furthermore, whenever they agree, as they frequently do, there is a fair probability that they are recalling ideas that Urban used in his speech.⁴³

According to Munro, the pope seems to have made at least three speeches about the crusade. Fulcher first reports what must have been the pope's inaugural address with which he opened the council. "When these and many other things were well disposed of, all those present, clergy and people alike, gave thanks to God and welcomed the advice of the lord pope Urban, assuring him, with a promise of fidelity, that these decrees of his would be kept." He spoke of the evils in society, denounced simony, and urged the clergy to stay free from secular control. In short, this was an ap-

⁴¹ Erdmann, *Entstehung*, pp. 318-319, suggests that this was the first army badge and the first step in the direction of a uniform. According to the *Gesta*, when Bohemond first learned of crusaders coming to Italy, he asked what emblem they wore, and was told that they wore the cross of Christ on the right shoulder or between their shoulders. *Gesta*, I, 4 (ed. Bréhier), p. 18.

⁴² "His ergo etsi non verbis, tamen intentionibus usus est." — Guibert. "Haec et id genus plurima peroravit." — Robert. "His vel hujus modi aliis." — Baldric.

⁴³ For a study of the ideas given in the reports of the speech, see D. C. Munro, "The Speech of Urban II at Clermont, 1095," *AHR*, XI (1906), 231-242. Paul Rousset, *Les Origines et les caractères de la première croisade*, p. 58, does not approve of the method used by Munro. He prefers to follow Hagenmeyer, and accepts ideas from Baldric, Fulcher, and Robert, but not from Guibert.

peal for conciliar action on church reform, and it ended with insistence on the Truce of God. "Let him who has seized a bishop be considered excommunicate" must have sounded timely to prelates who probably knew that the bishop of Arras had just been kidnaped by a robber baron. Fulcher next goes on to the main speech, and under the heading, "the pope's exhortation concerning the expedition to Jerusalem," he says: "Since, O sons of God, you have promised the Lord to maintain peace more earnestly than heretofore in your midst, and faithfully to sustain the rights of Holy Church, there still remains for you, who are newly aroused by this divine correction, a very necessary work, in which you can show the strength of your good will by a further duty, God's concern and your own. For you must hasten to carry aid to your brethren dwelling in the east, who need your help, which they have often asked."⁴⁴

The purpose of the address was to persuade fighting men to enlist in this holy war, and to induce the bishops and abbots of the council to promote the undertaking. Consequently, it seems clear, the pope used what he believed were convincing arguments, the sort of propaganda that came to be called *excitatoria*, and the ideas attributed to Urban were to be used over and over by popes and crusading preachers. But it must not be forgotten that the reports of the speech that we have were written several years later and were most certainly colored by what the chroniclers knew about the ideas and emotions which had actually inspired the great popular movement. It is possible to make some check on the speeches written by the chroniclers by comparing them with Urban's letters to the people of Flanders and Bologna. But in the letters, as in the speech, there were the arguments, the propaganda by which the pope was trying to persuade people to take the cross. He was not trying to give historical causes.⁴⁵

No doubt Urban began by appealing to the Franks, as Robert puts it, a "race chosen and loved by God," whose epic hero, Charlemagne, had overthrown the kingdoms of the pagans.⁴⁶ According to Fulcher, the pope asked these valorous Franks to go

⁴⁴ Quotations are from translations in A. C. Krey, *The First Crusade* (Princeton, 1921).

⁴⁵ Rousset, *Les Origines*, pp. 59-62, confuses causes, purposes, and arguments.

⁴⁶ Guibert revealed some such racial pride when he said to an archdeacon of Mainz, "If you think the French are such weaklings and cowards that you can injure by ridicule a name whose fame extends to the Indian Ocean, tell me to whom pope Urban called for aid against the Turks. If the Franks had not with strength and courage interposed a barrier to the Turks, not all you Germans, whose name is not even known in the east, would have been of use." Guibert, *Gesta Dei per Francos* (*RHC, Occ., IV*), p. 136. The title of his history, he says, was intended to honor his people.

to the aid of the eastern Christians in the Byzantine empire because the Turks had "advanced as far into Roman territory as that part of the Mediterranean which is called the Arm of St. George. . . ." Fulcher, of course, had verified this when he went on the crusade, but Robert, who stayed at home, also refers to the losses of the eastern empire. "The kingdom of the Greeks is now dismembered by them [Turks] and deprived of territory so vast in extent that it cannot be traversed in a march of two months." Although Guibert recalled only that the pope lamented the sufferings of the pilgrims, Baldric, who does not mention the Greeks, has the pope emphasize the religious unity that should exist among all Christians, who were all blood-brothers, "sons of the same Christ and the same church: . . . It is charity to risk your lives for your brothers." That Urban did plead for aid to eastern Christians, as reported by the chroniclers after the crusade, is made certain by the pope himself in his letter to the Flemings written soon after he spoke at Clermont.⁴⁷

But much as Urban wished to aid fellow Christians in the east, he likewise intended that the crusade should benefit the people of the west by substituting foreign war for private warfare at home. As reported by the chroniclers, he was brutally frank in condemning internecine war and brigandage. "You, girt about with the belt of knighthood, are arrogant with great pride; you rage against your brothers and cut each other to pieces. . . . You the oppressors of children, plunderers of widows; you, guilty of homicide, of sacrilege, robbers of another's rights; you who await the pay of thieves for the shedding of Christian blood — as vultures smell fetid corpses." So Baldric reports. Robert's version indicates a plea for peace: "Let, therefore, hatred depart from among you, let your quarrels end, let wars cease, and let all dissensions and controversies slumber." The crusade, then, was intended to supplement the Truce of God which the council had already endorsed, and Fulcher says: "Let those who have been accustomed to make private warfare against the faithful, carry on to a successful conclusion a war against infidels, which ought to have been begun ere now. Let those who for a long time have been robbers now become soldiers of Christ. Let those who once fought brothers and relatives now fight against barbarians as they ought."

⁴⁷ It is interesting to note that Baldric and Robert put the pope's plea for the eastern Christians so emphatically although they were in sympathy with Bohemond's drive to raise an army to make war on the emperor Alexius. See A. C. Krey, "A Neglected Passage in the *Gesta*," *Munro Essays*, pp. 57-78.

Was it possible to interest men who committed such crimes against their Christian neighbors in the sufferings of far-away eastern Christians? Did Urban expect to arouse western warriors and robbers by such appeals to altruistic sentiments? Gregory VII, it would seem, had tried to arouse interest in the troubles of the Greeks by a similar appeal without results. But Urban went on to tell of the desecration of churches and holy places, perhaps knowing that injuries to sacred places or things seemed greater atrocities to his contemporaries than the sufferings of human beings. Many feudal lords had made the pilgrimage to Compostela; others had made the long, hard journey to Jerusalem; the count of Anjou, Fulk Nerra, had atoned for his many crimes by making the trip three times. Such men, who had slight regard for human life or human suffering, seem to have felt that it was a shame that the most sacred of all Christian shrines, the Holy Sepulcher, should be in the "defiling" hands of "infidels". Guibert's report of Urban's speech consists largely of a learned disquisition on the religious significance of Jerusalem, and Robert has the pope declaim that it "is the navel of the world; the land is fruitful above all other lands, like another paradise of delights." In Baldric's summary, we read that it was intolerable that the place sanctified by the presence of Christ should be subjected to the abominations of the unbelievers. Gregory VII had made a casual suggestion about going on to Jerusalem, but Urban preached holy war for the recovery of the holy city, which became the goal toward which the crusaders directed their march. Contemporary writers called them the "Jerusalemites" (*Hierosolymitani*), who followed the way (*iter*) to the Holy Sepulcher, or the "Jerusalem route".

Bohemond was told that the crusaders appearing in Italy were going to the Lord's Sepulcher.⁴⁸ Urban told the people of Flanders that he had urged war to liberate the eastern churches and "the holy city of Christ, made illustrious by his passion and resurrection." He wrote another letter because he was pleased to know that citizens of Bologna had decided to go to Jerusalem.⁴⁹

To go to pray at the Holy Sepulcher was the best of all Christian pilgrimages. The crusaders were fighting pilgrims who set out to open up the route to Jerusalem, which had been obstructed by

⁴⁸ *Gesta*, I, 4 (ed. Bréhier, p. 18). Bernold says that a large multitude began to go to Jerusalem in 1096. The histories of both Robert and Baldric are entitled *Historia Hierosolymitana*; that of Fulcher, *Gesta Francorum Hierusalem peregrinantium*.

⁴⁹ "Nonnullis vestros in Hierusalem eundi desiderium concepisse audivimus, quod nobis plurimum complacere noveritis" (Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, p. 137).

the Selchükids, and to liberate the holy city. Previously pilgrims had not even been armed for defense; the *milites Christi* were pilgrims undertaking a war of offense.⁵⁰ To liberate Jerusalem, the crusaders did much fighting and endured extreme hardships, and when they finally got inside the holy city, they all went weeping to pray in the church of the Holy Sepulcher. Soon after, the purpose of their journey fulfilled, most of them turned their faces homeward. It would seem that Urban found the pilgrimage to be the most effective means of sending armies to the east. But Villey thinks that we must not fall into the error of believing that Jerusalem was the fundamental end of the expedition for Urban; the chroniclers, he suggests, made it into what it was not originally — a war for the Holy Sepulcher.⁵¹ If the pope did send crusaders to Jerusalem, as he did, in order to get them to aid the Greeks, it seems obvious that either he was guilty of deliberately deceiving all those who went, or he was misunderstood. There is no reason, however, to assume that he did not have as strong a desire to recover Jerusalem as the men who actually did liberate it, and, after all, it is only conjecture that he was more interested in sending aid to Byzantium than in recovering the holy city.⁵²

The pope did not neglect to hold out the promise of material gains which would be derived from holy war against the Moslems, stronger incentives to his feudal contemporaries than any altruistic suggestions of fighting and dying for the eastern "brethren". In Baldric's version, Urban held out the prospects of loot, which had made the reconquest in Spain so attractive to French warriors. "The possessions of the enemy will be yours, too, since you will make spoil of his treasures. . . ."⁵³ To plunder, according to Robert, was added the hope of conquest: "wrest that land (*terra sancta*) from the wicked race, and subject it to yourselves, that land which, as the scripture says, 'floweth with milk and honey' . . ." Urban seemed to believe that the French needed *Lebens-*

⁵⁰ "Decisive evidence has never been adduced to prove that pilgrims, prior to the crusades, had begun to arm for defense." E. Joranson, "The Great German Pilgrimage," *Munro Essays*, p. 40. But see above, chapter II, section D, p. 76.

⁵¹ Villey, *Croisade*, pp. 83, 95. Erdmann, *Entstehung*, pp. 374, 363, note 2, holds that modern research has shown that Urban intended the crusade to help Byzantium. Jerusalem, he says, was the *Marschziel*, not the *Kampfziel*. P. Charanis (*Speculum*, XXIV, 93, 94) gives a statement from a thirteenth-century Greek writer, who says that Alexius "exploited the feeling, widely prevalent in the west, that the domination of the Holy Land by the Turks was intolerable."

⁵² "Le but véritable de la croisade, c'est le Saint-Sépulchre qu'il faut délivrer, la route de Jérusalem qu'il faut rendre libre. Tous les chartes parlent du voyage de Jérusalem, de cette ville, terme du pèlerinage guerrier" (Rousset, *Les Origines*, p. 73).

⁵³ The propagandistic *epistula spuria* to the count of Flanders told of the material gains to be obtained in the Byzantine empire.

raum for colonization. Their land, Robert quotes him as saying, "is too narrow for your large population; nor does it abound in wealth; and it furnishes scarcely enough food for its cultivators. Hence it is that you murder and devour one another." And, of course, migration, especially of landless troublemakers, would relieve pressure and promote peace in the west.

Plunder, conquest, and adventure were strong incentives to unemployed fighting men, but the pope emphasized the religious gains to be obtained in the undertaking. Unlike other wars, recruiting for the crusade was carried on by preaching. Urban strove to awaken enthusiasm for the liberation of eastern Christians and the holy places by urging enlistment in the holy war, which was God's work, in which He was the omnipotent leader, and, according to the chroniclers, the crusaders believed that God was always with them, aiding them in battle, withholding such support when their sins demanded. Their feudal wars were sinful, but robbers could become soldiers of Christ by taking the cross. Guibert argues that wars for the protection of the church are legitimate, and because men had become so filled with greed that both knights and common folk were engaged in mutual slaughter, God instituted this new way of salvation "in our time". By becoming crusaders it was possible to obtain God's favor without leaving the world as was necessary in taking the vows of a religious order, and giving up liberties or lay garments.⁵⁴ Thus the pope offered the opportunity for a new kind of religious service, in which, without giving up their customary pursuits of fighting and brigandage, knights could obtain moral and spiritual rewards. The privileges that Urban offered were definite and precise.

It later became customary for popes to grant such privileges in a bull of the crusade. But, although Eugenius III, in his bull for the Second Crusade, said that he was reissuing what Urban II had enacted for his expedition, there is no record that such regulations were incorporated in any bull for the First Crusade.⁵⁵ As already indicated, one very important privilege is to be found in the list of canons adopted by the Council of Clermont, namely, that an indulgence was to be granted to all who should go to liberate Jerusalem,⁵⁶ provided they were motivated not by desire for honor or money, but by devotion only. This was not "remission of sins", although Urban used the phrase in his letter to the Flemings. It

⁵⁴ Guibert, *Gesta Dei per Francos* (RHC, Occ., IV), p. 124.

⁵⁵ Villey, *Croisade*, p. 106. On the bull issued by pope Eugenius III see below, chapter XV, p. 466.

⁵⁶ "Iter illud pro omni poenitentia reputetur" (Mansi, XX, 816).

was remission of the penance which the church imposed for sins, as the pope makes clear in his letter to the faithful of Bologna, in saying that the pilgrimage would take the place of penance for all sins for which they would make "true and perfect confession". Just what the religious value of pilgrimages had been before is not clear, although when Urban offered those who would rebuild Tarragona the same advantages that were attached to the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, it would seem he assumed that whatever religious gain this might be was generally understood. At any rate, what was granted in precise terms by the canon at Clermont was something more. Pope Eugenius III, in his crusading bull of 1145, says this form of indulgence was originated by Urban. Villey says it is the first instance of plenary indulgence to be found in canon law.⁵⁷

Inasmuch as the canon specified that the indulgence should be granted to those who went to liberate the church at Jerusalem, it may be asked whether unarmed pilgrims, of whom there were many on the crusade, obtained full remission of all penance. According to Robert, the pope had said: "We do not command or advise that the old, or the feeble, or those unfit for bearing arms, undertake this journey. . . . For such are more of a hindrance than an aid. . . ." In his letter to the pilgrims of Bologna he said that neither clerks nor monks should go without the permission of their bishops or abbots, and he further directed that bishops should see to it that priests and clerks did not go without their knowledge and approval. "For this journey would profit them nothing if they went without such permission," writes Robert. Evidently the pope intended that the clergy should screen out unarmed pilgrims who were not qualified to be *milites Christi*.

Urban intended that the clergy should have control of enlistment by requiring all recruits to take a solemn vow to pray at the Holy Sepulcher, and the cross was put on as the sign that they had taken such a vow. According to Robert, Urban proclaimed that whoever decided to go on the pilgrimage, after making this promise, and offering himself "as a living sacrifice", should "wear the sign of the Lord's cross".⁵⁸ For Guibert, putting on the cross was somewhat similar to joining a religious order. "He [Urban] instituted a sign well suited to so honorable a profession [vow] by making the figure of the cross, the stigma of the Lord's passion, the emblem of chivalry, or rather what was to be the chivalry of

⁵⁷ Villey, *Croisade*, pp. 142-145

⁵⁸ Robert, *Historia* (*RHC, Occ.*, III), pp. 729, 730.

God." Fulcher says that the cross was put on after taking "the vow to go". In 1099, Manasses, the archbishop of Rheims, said, "those who have taken the vow of pilgrimage have put on the sign of the cross."⁵⁹ Urban, therefore, intended that the act of joining the army of the Lord should be a sort of solemn initiation, which the clergy could use to eliminate those who were unfit to go. That crowds of unarmed pilgrims followed the armies is proof that the papal injunctions were not carried out.⁶⁰

As the way was long and beset with peril and hardship, and the pope knew that the initial enthusiasm, aroused by preaching, would not last, the vow to pray at the Holy Sepulcher was intended to hold the "wearers of the cross" to their task. Furthermore, the "sword of anathema" threatened all who became faint-hearted and turned back. Guibert says: "He commanded that if anyone, after receiving this emblem, or after openly taking this vow, should shrink from his good intent through base change of heart, or any affection for his parents, he should be regarded as an outlaw forever, unless he repented and again undertook whatever of his pledge he had omitted." Writing from Antioch, in 1097, Adhémar said that all wearers of the cross who had stayed home were apostates and should be excommunicated. In 1099, Manasses, archbishop of Rheims, urged Lambert, bishop of Arras, to round up all who had failed to fulfil their vows unless sickness or lack of means had prevented them from making the journey. In December of the same year, pope Paschal II wrote to the clergy of Gaul to raise more recruits for the aid of the crusaders in the east. Those who had put on the cross, he said, should be compelled to go, and all who had deserted the army at Antioch were to remain excommunicate until they went back to finish their pilgrimage.⁶¹ This was no idle threat as Stephen, count of Blois, discovered. Since he had run away from Antioch and returned home, either public opinion, or his wife, or both, forced him to join the crusading armies of 1101 and complete the journey to Jerusalem. Thus, to the attractive offer of plenary indulgence, Urban added the vow to complete the pilgrimage, and it seems that violation of this vow was regarded as desertion from the *militia Christi*, to be punished with severe ecclesiastical penalty.

For the many who died before reaching the Holy Sepulcher to obtain the "remission of sins", it was generally believed that their

⁵⁹ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, p. 176.

⁶⁰ W. Porges, "The Clergy, the Poor, and the Non-Combatants on the First Crusade," *Speculum*, XXI (1946), 2.

⁶¹ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, pp. 142, 175, 176.

souls would go to heaven. Guibert reports that Urban said, "We now hold out to you wars which contain the glorious reward of martyrdom." Baldric quotes Urban's exhortation thus: "... and may you deem it a beautiful thing to die for Christ in that city in which He died for us. But if it befall you to die on this side of it, be sure that to have died on the way is of equal value, if Christ shall find you in his army." Fulcher's version of Urban's words is: "And if those who set out thither should lose their lives on the way by land, or in crossing the sea, or in fighting the pagans, their sins shall be remitted. This I grant to those who go, through the power vested in me by God.... Let those who have been hirelings at low wages now labor for an eternal reward." The chroniclers are sure that this promise was fulfilled. The author of the *Gesta* said that those who died at Nicaea obtained martyrdom, and even the poor folk who died of famine in Christ's name triumphantly assumed the mantle of the martyrs in heaven.⁶² Stephen of Blois wrote his wife that the souls of Christians who had been killed had entered the joys of paradise. From Antioch in 1098, the leaders reported that three thousand of their followers were dead in peace, "who without any doubt glory in eternal life."⁶³ Spiritual rewards seemed certain to all who persevered.

The pope offered temporal as well as religious privileges in his drive to win recruits to his enterprise. Inasmuch as the crusaders were soldiers of Christ engaged in a war sponsored by the church, not only were they taken under ecclesiastical protection, but the church also undertook to protect both their families and property so that they would not leave wives, children, or holdings to the uncertainties of feudal society. In a sense this was the Truce of God which had been approved by the Council of Clermont, but the pope seems to have made it especially applicable to crusaders for three years, or as long as they were absent.⁶⁴ Fulcher says that Urban urged the clergy to enforce the Truce, and Guibert reports that Urban "condemned with a fearful anathema all those who dared to molest the wives, children, and possessions of these who were going on this journey for God...." In December 1099, pope Paschal II ordered that their property should be restored to the returning crusaders just as Urban himself had established "by synodal definition". In 1122, pope Calixtus II granted such pro-

⁶² *Gesta* II, 8 (ed., Bréhier), p. 42.

⁶³ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, pp. 150, 154; Rousset, *Les Origines*, pp. 81-83.

⁶⁴ Whether the council acted on this protection of families and property is not certain. See E. Bridrey, *La Condition juridique des croisés et le privilège de la croix* (Paris, 1900), pp. 8, 113, note 2.

tection to crusaders, "just as had been done by pope Urban."⁶⁵ It seems clear enough that Urban initiated the "Privileges of the Cross", and that it was an innovation is indicated by the request made by Ivo of Chartres, a famous canon lawyer, for an interpretation of this "new institution", inasmuch as he was not sure that he had jurisdiction in a case which involved the loss of his holding by a crusader.⁶⁶

What the pope was asserting was that the possessions of crusaders, *militēs Christi*, were to be temporarily as exempt from secular control as the property of the church. Obviously this was a very considerable extension of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Temporal rulers were to be deprived of the services and payments of vassals who enlisted in the papal armies for an indefinite period of service overseas. Once William the Conqueror had punished a vassal, than whom he knew of no better warrior, by taking away his fief because he went off to fight Moslems in Spain without permission.⁶⁷ But so popular was this holy war that neither kings nor feudal lords seem to have made protest against the invasion of their feudal rights.

Pope Urban II, then, had come to Clermont with a well-prepared scheme for raising an army with which to make holy war on the enemies of Christianity. It was a method of recruiting that worked so well that popes were to continue to use the same method of launching crusades at home as well as abroad. It does not seem reasonable to assume that so effective a plan had been conceived quickly, say in the period between Piacenza and Clermont, and it may be noted that there is no trace of it in anything that Gregory VII had proposed. Urban assumed responsibility for this new form of holy war which he was initiating. Unable to go himself, he said that he had appointed a churchman "in our place". Bishop Adhémar, he said, was to be the leader (*dux*), and all who went should obey his legate's commands as they would his own. There is no evidence that the pope had any intention of selecting a layman to head the forces he intended to recruit by offering religious inducements for military service. To be sure, the legate was a fighting bishop who marched at the head of his own contingent and led his men into battle. But the legate associated himself with the much larger army of the count of Toulouse, and it was the news that Raymond, the greatest lord in France, had

⁶⁵ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, p. 175.

⁶⁶ Bridrey, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-135; Villey, *Croisade*, pp. 151, 152.

⁶⁷ Ordericus Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica* (ed. Le Prevost, III), p. 248.

taken the cross that gave Urban assurance that there would be a crusade. Perhaps Urban did not realize that his preaching and the religious incentives which he had proclaimed would result in a widespread popular movement, and it may be, as Fliche suggests, that he did not anticipate that Adhémar would have the difficult task of controlling several lay leaders. At any rate, he suggested that Flemings who wished to go should join Adhémar's forces before the date of departure.⁶⁸ That the bishop of Le Puy was regarded as their head was so stated by the leaders, when after Adhémar died, they wrote from Antioch asking the pope to come and finish his war.⁶⁹ There can be no doubt about its being Urban's war.

Urban stayed in France for more than eight months after the Council of Clermont. The records of the dedications, confirmations of grants, and privileges with which he rewarded the monasteries where he was entertained, and the records of other matters of ecclesiastical business, naturally do not refer to the crusade. Other sources tell little more. There is, of course, the letter that the pope himself wrote to the Flemings not long after Clermont, and there is evidence that the pope preached the crusade at Limoges, where he celebrated Christmas, and at Angers in February.⁷⁰ He held two more councils, and we are told that at Tours, as at Piacenza and Clermont, he preached in the open air. We may assume without authority for doing so that he urged his hearers to take the cross. As for the synod held at Nîmes in July, the only suggestion that the crusade was considered is the probability that Raymond, count of Toulouse, was there. Nevertheless, it must be assumed that Urban used such gatherings to arouse enthusiasm and spread knowledge of his undertaking. Surely, as a later chronicler said, wherever he went he endeavored to induce men to go and free Jerusalem from the Turks.⁷¹

The papal party moved on into the Limousin after leaving Clermont on December 2, instead of going northward into Capetian territory. Possibly, as has been suggested, the pope assumed that he would not be able to promote either crusade or ecclesiastical business successfully where the king was excommunicate and was

⁶⁸ "... eiusque comitatui tunc se adhaerere posse" (Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, p. 137); Fliche, "Urbain II et la croisade," p. 303.

⁶⁹ The leaders referred to Adhémar as "ille Podiensis episcopus, quem tuum vicarium nobis commiseras," and "qui ab Urbano suscepit curam Christiani exercitus" (Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, pp. 164, 141).

⁷⁰ Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie* (ROL, VI), nos. 14, 18.

⁷¹ "Ubicumque fuit praecepit cruces facere hominibus et pergere Jerusalem et liberare eam a Turcis et aliis gentibus" (quoted by Crozet, *op. cit.*, p. 272).

supported by high churchmen. After successful preaching at Limoges, the pope moved on to the pleasant city of Poitiers, where he may have found that obdurate young man, William IX, the troubadour, count of Poitou and duke of Aquitaine, son of the old Spanish campaigner, Guy-Geoffrey. But, although the pope visited Poitiers twice and spent some time traveling through Aquitaine, there is no evidence to show that this early troubadour, who had little respect for the clergy, ever met the pope. Certainly he did not decide to atone for his sins by becoming a crusader till later. In fact, he seems to have deliberately waited until Raymond was safely on his way to the Holy Sepulcher to move in and take over Toulouse, to which his wife had a claim, being the daughter of the former count, Raymond's elder brother.⁷² Neither do we know whether Urban conferred with Fulk, count of Anjou, whose wife had deserted him for the king of France. However, it was at Angers, where he preached the crusade, that the pope commissioned Robert of Arbrissel, who later founded the Order of Fontevrault, to preach the crusade in the Loire valley.⁷³ No doubt it was at the pope's urging that Hélie, count of Maine, took the cross, and at Le Mans, Urban commissioned Gerento, abbot of St. Bénigne of Dijon, to promote the crusade in Normandy and England. Then, without entering Normandy, the pope turned southward for the council at Tours, and another visit in Poitiers before moving on through Aquitaine.

During the month of April 1096 the party visited monasteries in Aquitaine, where the pope consecrated the cathedral at Bordeaux on May 1. Moving on through Gascony into the lands of count Raymond, after a brief stop at Toulouse, where he arrived on May 7, Urban went northward to visit the famous Cluniac monastery of Moissac, where he found much interest in Jerusalem as well as the holy war in Spain.⁷⁴ Returning to Toulouse he had opportunity to discuss plans for the crusade with count Raymond, who was present when Urban consecrated the church of St. Sernin, and it is possible that Raymond accompanied the pope as he traveled through Languedoc, with stops at Carcassonne and various monasteries. It may be that when Urban preached at Maguelonne, on June 28, he persuaded William of Montpellier, who

⁷² J. L. Cate, "A Gay Crusader," *Byzantion*, XVI (1944), 503-526, and below, chapter XI, p. 348.

⁷³ *Vita B Roberti de Arbrissello, Acta Sanctorum*, Febr. tom. III, Febr. 25, p. 611.

⁷⁴ A. Gieysztor, "The Genesis of the Crusades; the Encyclical of Sergius IV," *Medievalia et Humanistica*, V, 1-25; VI, 2-33. According to this study, the encyclical was propaganda written at Moissac.

was present, to take the cross. At Nîmes, where he opened the council on July 5, he dedicated the cathedral with count Raymond and important prelates of the region present. In a grant made at this time Raymond specified that he was going to Jerusalem.⁷⁵ Before the council ended on July 14, the pope was informed that the brother of the king of France would lead a contingent of crusaders, and that Philip had repented and agreed to give up his mistress. Although the king's repentance turned out to be short-lived, it seems certain that Urban could be satisfied that his plan for an expeditionary force to invade the Moslem east would be carried through. As he prepared to return to Italy, he sent two bishops to Genoa, where they preached so successfully that many prominent citizens took the cross, and the city prepared a fleet of thirteen vessels which eventually set sail in July 1097.⁷⁶

After a second visit to the monastery of St. Gilles, the pope prepared to leave France, and he was crossing the Alps by August 15, the date that he had set for the departure of the crusaders. A month later, while at Pavia, he wrote his letter of explanation to citizens of Bologna who were interested in the pilgrimage to Jerusalem. By November 1096 crusaders from France, the duke of Normandy and the counts of Flanders and Blois, stopped long enough to obtain his blessing at Lucca as they marched toward the ports on the Adriatic. The sight of their armies on the way to rescue the Holy Sepulcher assured Urban that his carefully prepared plan for the crusade was going to be carried out.

⁷⁵ Devic and Vaissete, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, V, 472-473.

⁷⁶ Caffaro, *De liberatione civitatum orientis* (RHC, Occ., V), pp. 49, 50.