

**IMAGES OF THE MILITARY ORDERS, 1128-1291:
SPIRITUAL, SECULAR, ROMANTIC.**

Thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

at the University of Leicester

by

Helen J. Nicholson M.A.(Oxon), A.C.A.

Department of History

University of Leicester

December 1989

UMI Number: U025382

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U025382

Published by ProQuest LLC 2015. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346



CONTENTS

	Page
Abbreviations	i
Acknowledgements	1
Introduction	2
Chapter one: the rulers of Catholic Christendom and the military orders	16
(a)the papacy:	16
(i)the bases of the relationship	16
(ii)criticism	30
(b)monarchs:	41
(i)influences on patronage	42
(ii)changes in patronage, and the growth of criticism	58
Chapter two: the views of the clergy	75
(a)initial praise, and fundamental criticism	76
(b)criticism of privileges	87
(c)other criticism	94
(d)changes in attitudes after 1250	107
(e)good relations	111
(f)chapter summary	125
Chapter three: the views of the laity	128
(a)the landholding classes in western Europe	135
(i)factors affecting donations	135
(ii)criticism	150
(b)the landholding classes in Germany and eastern Europe	164
(i)factors affecting donations	165
(ii)criticism	170
(c)other groups	173
(i)non-noble classes	173
(ii)women	178
(iii)heretics	180
(iv)non-Catholic Christians, Jews and Muslims	181
(d)chapter summary	185

Chapter four: the representation of the military orders	
in literary sources and legend	188
(a)legends and unlikely tales in chronicles	190
(b)the military orders in epic and romance	202
(c)changes in literature after c.1250	227
(d)fictional image and everyday image: the question of influence	230
Chapter five: The military orders` self-perception and presentation	234
(a)accounts of the brothers` achievements	238
(b)spiritual reinforcements: saints, miracles and relics	250
(c)historical justification	261
(d)literature generated by the orders for their own members	269
(e)appealing to the orders` dual role	270
(f)winning the confidence of princes	278
(g)the success of these measures	280
Conclusion	285
Appendix I: the implication of the military orders in the loss of Acre	299
Appendix II: Donations to the military orders, 1128-1291	304
Bibliography	309

ABBREVIATIONS.

- AOL *Archives de l'orient latin*, publiés sous le patronage de la Société de l'orient latin, 2 vols. (Paris, 1881-4)
- BEC *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*
- BEFAR Bibliothèque des écoles française d'Athènes et de Rome
- BLVS Bibliothek des litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart
- Cart. *Cartulaire Général de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de S. Jean de Jérusalem, 1100-1310*, ed. J. Delaville le Roulx, 4 vols. (Paris, 1894-1905)
- CFMA Classiques Français du moyen age (Paris, 1912ff.)
- GRL Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur
- HDFS *Historia diplomatica Fridericii Secundi*, ed. J. L. A. Huillard-Bréholles, 6 vols. in 11 (Paris, 1852-61, reprinted Turin, 1963)
- MGH *Monumenta Germaniae Historia*, ed. G. H. Pertz et al. (Hanover, Weimar, Stuttgart and Cologne, 1826ff.)
- MGHC *MGH Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum*, ed. L. Weiland, 3 vols. (Hanover, 1893) in *MGH Legum Sectio IV (Leges 2. Quarto)*
- MGHES *MGH Epistolae Selectae XIII e regestis pontificum Romanorum selecti*, ed. G. H. Pertz and K. Rodenburg, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1883-94)
- MGHL *MGH Legum*, series in folio, ed. G. H. Pertz, vol.2 (Hanover, 1887)
- MGHS *MGH Scriptores*, 32 vols. (1826-1934)
- PL *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*, ed. J. P. Migne, 217 vols., and 4 vols. of indexes (Paris, 183-64)
- PPTS Palestinian Pilgrims` Text Society
- RHC *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*, pub. L'Académie des Inscriptions et de Belles-Lettres, 16 vols. (Paris, 1841-1906)
- RHC DocArm RHC *Documents Armeniens*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1869-1906)
- RHC Occ RHC *Historiens Occidentaux*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1841-95)
- RHC Or RHC *Historiens Orientaux*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1872-1906)

RHGF *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de France*, ed. Bouquet et al., new edition ed. L. Delisle, 24 vols., (Paris, 1878)

RIS ns *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores: Raccolta degli storici Italiani dal cinquecento ad millecinquecento*, ed. L. Muratori: new edition ed. G. Carducci, V. Fiorini, P. Fedele (Citta di Castello, Bologna, 1900ff.)

ROL *Revue de l'orient Latin*, 12 vols. (Paris, 1893-1911)

RRH *Regesta regni Hierosolymitani, and Additamentum*, ed. R. Röhricht (Innsbruck, 1893, 1904)

RS Rolls Series. *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores*, 99 vols. (London, 1858-1911)

SATF Société des anciens textes français

SHF Société de l'histoire de France

SOL Société de l'orient latin

TLF *Textes Littéraires Français*, 1ff. (Geneva, 1949ff.)

TRHS *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*

UB Urkundenbuch

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many have given me welcome assistance in the preparation of this thesis. I would like to acknowledge in particular the immense help I have received from the staff of Leicester University Library, especially the staff of inter-library loan, and the staff of the British Library, London. Without their patience and persistence much material would have been unavailable to me. I am also most grateful to Dr. M. Barber, Dr. A. Luttrell, Professor A. N. Newman, Professor J. Riley-Smith, Valerie Rudd, Dr. E. Siberry, Judith Upton-Ward, John Walker and Dr. D. T. Williams for their advice and suggestions. My supervisor, Dr. Norman Housley, has been an invaluable source of inspiration and guidance. My greatest thanks must go to my husband, ever patient and encouraging, even when it seemed that the thirteenth century would go on for ever.

INTRODUCTION

Whatever confusion may exist among the general public of the present day, the public in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were in no doubt as to the character and function of the military orders of the Holy Land. They were religious orders, which had been formed to care for and defend pilgrims in the Holy Land, to protect the Holy Places from the attacks of the Muslims, or to recover what was lost.¹ Those orders which were also hospitals also cared for sick and poor pilgrims. As a natural extension of these functions, the better educated clergy and laity, especially those in areas adjoining non-Christian lands, believed that the military orders did or should assist in the conversion of Muslims and Pagans to Christianity.² Their disagreement was over the extent to which the military orders fulfilled these functions.

Their opinions are significant, for two main reasons. Firstly, the image of the military orders, which were founded as a result of the Latin Christian conquest of the Holy Land, was closely related to the image of crusading. It has long been argued that the popularity of crusading declined during the thirteenth century, and that this itself contributed towards the declining popularity of the military orders. However, recent studies, notably by Elizabeth Siberry and

¹E.g., Cart., no.1602; Marquis d'Albon, ed., *Cartulaire général de l'ordre du Temple, 1119?-1150* (Paris, 1913) no.87; HDFS 1 p.280.

²E.g., Cart., nos. 181, 1742, 3322; Isaac of Etoile, Sermon 48, PL 194, col. 1854; A. J. Forey, *The Templars in the Corona de Aragon* (London, 1973) p.377; 'Ex Chronico Turoniensi auctore anonymo, S. Martini Turon. canonico,' RHGF 18 p.304; *Urkundenbuch der Deutschordensballei Thüringen*, ed. K. H. Lampe, vol.1, Thüringische Geschichtsquellen, neue Folge 7 (Jena, 1936) nos.397, 473.

Norman Housley,³ have contended that, far from declining in popularity, the concept of crusading remained immensely popular and its field widened to include campaigns throughout Europe. An improved knowledge of developments in the image of the military orders during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries will assist towards a better understanding of this issue.

Secondly, the trial of the order of the Temple, instigated by Philip IV of France in 1307, leading to the dissolution of the order by Pope Clement V at the Council of Vienne in 1312, has long been attributed by historians, directly or indirectly, to the order's unpopularity. It has been claimed either that the order was unpopular due to the great abuses within it, i.e., the charges which were brought against the order during its trial, and that public outcry prompted Philip IV of France to move against it, or that its unpopularity enabled Philip to bring charges against the order and cause it to be dissolved for his own purposes. However, historians have differed over when the order began to become unpopular. As Philip's destruction of the order had wide implications, for example, in revealing the weakness of the papacy in the face of a determined lay power, it is vital that this question be reexamined in depth.

A limited amount of research has already been done into this question. Jonathan Riley-Smith, examining the Hospitallers, reviewed major sources of criticism of both the Hospital and the Temple, the attitudes of the secular clergy to the orders' exemptions, and Roger Bacon's complaint that the

³E. Siberry, *Criticism of Crusading, 1095-1274* (Oxford, 1985); N. Housley, *The Italian Crusades. The Papal-Angevin alliance and the crusades against Christian lay powers, 1254-1343* (Oxford, 1982) pp.151-6, 158-9, 162-70, 252-3, 257; cf. H. E. Mayer, *The crusades*, trans. J. Gillingham, 2nd edition (Oxford, 1988) pp.320-1, note 143; and see below, pp.143-5.

military orders impeded the conversion of pagans.⁴ Marie Luise Bulst-Thiele, in her biography of the masters of the Temple, noted that there were few direct attacks on the order of the Temple, and that criticism was matched by praise; but she did not examine the subject in any detail.⁵ Joshua Prawer, in a study of the military orders' political role in the Holy Land in the second half of the thirteenth century, traced the criticism which produced the hostile public opinion underlying the dissolution of the Temple back to the crusades of 1239-1240.⁶ He concluded that all three of the major military orders were equally unpopular and were considered by contemporaries to be, to all intents and purposes, indistinguishable, but that destruction of the Temple rather than any of the other orders was the result of the Temple's failure to find a new field of operations after the loss of Acre. In contrast, Marian Melville, writing on the order of the Temple, traced this type of criticism back to the crusade of the emperor Frederick II.⁷ Peter Partner, while tracing the downfall of the Templars to changing attitudes towards the Church and towards knighthood, considered that the Templars

⁴J. Riley-Smith, *The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem and Cyprus, c.1050-1310* (London, 1967) pp.201-4, 385-9.

⁵M. L. Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus Militiae Templi Hierosolymitani Magistri: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Templerordens 1118/9-1314*, *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, nr.86* (Göttingen, 1974) p.341 note 223, pp.316-7, no.105a.

⁶J. Prawer, 'Military orders and crusader politics in the second half of the XIIIth century,' in J. Fleckenstein and M. Hellmann, eds., *Die Geistlichen Ritterorden Europas, Vorträge und Forschungen*, 26 (Sigmaringen, 1980) p.220.

⁷M. Melville, *La vie des Templiers* (Paris, 1951) pp.165-6.

made 'an important political mistake' in remaining loyal to the papacy during the quarrel between the papacy and Frederick II; but he considered the criticism of William, Archbishop of Tyre, to have been 'most damaging of all.'⁸

In recent years, historians have become aware that the problem is more complex than was previously thought. In 1985, Alain Demurger declared that much deeper research was needed.

'Une étude systématique des textes, et pas seulement des textes narratifs (je pense aux textes juridiques, aux procès) permettrait de se faire une idée plus précise de cette impopularité et de sa genèse.'⁹

In 1986 Judith Upton-Ward completed an M. A. thesis on the subject of attitudes towards the Templars from 1119 to 1312.¹⁰ Unlike most earlier studies, she noted praise of the orders as well as criticism, and did not confine her study to the narrative sources, also examining the order's image in the Grail romances. The work was necessarily limited in scope by the confines in time and length of an M. A. thesis, and, as it deals only with one military order, does not illuminate the problem of why the Temple alone was destroyed, and not the Hospital or Teutonic order. Nevertheless, it was the most thorough and balanced study of the subject to date.

The reason the subject has never been examined in detail is, quite simply, its breadth and complexity. Firstly, in order to assess the image of the any one of the military orders accurately, it is necessary to study at least all three of the

⁸P. Partner, *The murdered magicians: the Templars and their myth*, (Oxford, 1982) pp.24-26, 31-32, esp. pp.31, 24.

⁹A. Demurger, *Vie et mort de l'ordre du Temple, 1118-1314* (Paris, 1985) p.223.

¹⁰J. M. Upton-Ward, 'Attitudes towards the Templars (c.1119 to 1312)', unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Reading, 1986. I am grateful to Mrs. Ward for permission to read her thesis.

major military orders: the orders of the Temple, Hospital of St. John and the Teutonic order.¹¹ This is particularly vital when weighing the opposing theories as to why the order of the Temple was destroyed: either that its combination of military and monastic roles had never been accepted by the bulk of the clergy or laity,¹² or, as Praver argued, that the continued military activity of the Hospital and Teutonic order in the early fourteenth century enabled them to silence their critics, while the less active Temple was rendered vulnerable to attack. By comparing evidence of donations for all three orders, we may attempt to ascertain how many donors considered the military or hospitable aspects of the orders to be important, and how many seem to have regarded all military orders simply as monastic orders, men who would pray for their souls.

¹¹The other military orders were either mainly national in scope, such as the order of Calatrava, which received some possessions outside Spain but was hardly noted by commentators, or, although international, developed too late to attract the attention of donors and commentators as military orders or defenders of the Christian faith, such as the order of St. Lazarus or the order of St. Thomas of Acre. John Walker of the University of St. Andrew's is currently working on a Ph.D. thesis concerning patronage of the order of St. Lazarus in England in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. I am grateful for his comments and opinions on the matter of motivation of patronage. Alan Forey's article, 'The military order of St. Thomas of Acre,' *English Historical Review*, 92 (1977) 481-503, is definitive.

¹²E.g., C. Morris, *The Papal Monarchy. The Western Church from 1050 to 1250* (Oxford, 1989) p.281 refers to 'contemporary unease at the confusion of ideals which they represented.' As the other international military orders combined the role of hospitals with their military activities, they represented less of a departure from traditional ideals of monasticism.

In examining the evidence for one order in isolation it is tempting to blame a particular problem faced by that order on its own peculiar characteristics, while in fact it was a general problem among monastic orders. For example, Marian Melville cited a papal bull for the order of the Temple, dated 1209, as proof that the order was experiencing a crisis of morale in the early thirteenth century, as many grand bailiffs were refusing to obey the master and wished to leave the order and enter the contemplative life. She had not seen the papal bulls in the cartulary of the Hospital for 1208 and 1209, which indicate that this was a general problem among the military orders at this time, and that the Hospital was experiencing it before the Temple.¹³

Secondly, it is necessary to examine the orders' image during the twelfth as well as during the thirteenth century, for the military orders were criticized from their first beginnings.¹⁴ However, the criticism changes; a point which is not obvious unless criticism over a considerable period of time is considered. The present study covers the period between the first general recognition of the order of the Temple in western Europe at the council of Troyes in 1128, to the loss of Acre in 1291. Immediate reactions to the loss of Acre, that is, those expressed during 1291, are examined in Appendix I.

Thirdly, it is necessary to consider the development throughout this period of the concepts which lay behind the existence of the military orders, monasticism and knighthood. Although this has been done to a limited extent by Peter Partner, as noted above, new research, such as that by Jean

¹³Melville, *Vie des Templiers*, pp.131-2, p.283 note 26; Cart., nos. 1318, 1329.

¹⁴A. Forey, 'The military orders in the crusading proposals of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries,' *Traditio* 36 (1980) 317.

Flori into the development of knighthood,¹⁵ is constantly altering the picture. Jean Flori has broken new ground by examining not only latin sources originating with the clergy, but also vernacular sources originating with the laity. Without resort to vernacular sources it is impossible to discover the views of the laity, who seldom expressed themselves in latin during our period; but these sources present special problems of interpretation. It is often difficult to judge the influence of a vernacular verse text, in that verse, being easy to memorize, often had a much wider circulation than the number of manuscripts surviving would indicate. Thus, although only one twelfth-century manuscript of the *Chanson de Roland* survives, other evidence, such as references in chronicles and even the naming of children, indicate that the poem was very widely known during this century. In calculating the significance of vernacular texts, therefore, it is necessary to weigh up all the evidence concerning the text, such as the existence of later manuscripts, other references to it, and the extent to which the opinions it contains are contained in other vernacular texts. The problems in interpretation, however, are far outweighed by the extent to which these texts enrich our understanding of the attitudes and ideals of the laity of this period.

These lay vernacular texts reveal, for example, that lay criticism of the papacy, secular and regular clergy was continually growing throughout our period. Alongside this criticism, revealing the same dissatisfaction with the present state of the Church, monasticism was continually developing and

¹⁵J. Flori, *Idéologie du glaive: préhistoire de la chevalerie* (Geneva, 1983); *L'Essor de la chevalerie, XIe-XIIe siècles* (Geneva, 1986); 'La notion de chevalerie dans les chansons de geste du XIIe siècle. Etude historique de vocabulaire,' *Le Moyen Age*, 81 (1975) 211-44, 407-45; 'Pour une histoire de chevalerie: l'adoubement dans les romans de Chrétien de Troyes,' *Romania* 100 (1979) 21-53.

evolving completely new forms, from friars to beguines, while alongside these developed the austere heresy of Catharism, which called a select few to complete purity of life. Criticism also came from the clergy: in the twelfth century schools-trained secular clergy such as John of Salisbury and Walter Map attacked the privileges of the regular clergy and denied their spiritual supremacy.

Knighthood was also developing, from a concept described mainly by the clergy, probably with little effect on the average knight, to a broader ideal expressed in the literature of the knightly classes, the *chanson de geste*, or epic, and the romance, although how far those ideals were put into practice will always be a matter for conjecture. The military orders were a product of the early twelfth century, representing, but not dictating, the spiritualization of knighthood. Hence, while the Templars were the best of knights on the early twelfth-century model of Roland, they fell far short on the more sophisticated, rational and individualistic 1230s model of Tristan. When the concept of the military order first appeared, it was hailed by the clergy as being the salvation of knighthood, but the *chansons* and romances indicate that some knights remained convinced that their worldly service alone, if done in God's name, was sufficient to save them. Many would prefer to seek salvation through the service of their lady or through their own personal quest for God, rather than joining a monastic order, even if it was a military monastic order.¹⁶ It is not strictly true, however, to state, as Peter Partner does, that the knightly ideal of the lone quest for salvation was an innovation of the thirteenth century. The epic hero had always been a lone figure, and knights had always preferred to act

¹⁶Cf. M. Keen, *Chivalry* (New Haven and London, 1984) pp.44-63; and see below, pp.148-150, 228-9.

alone, to the despair of their commanders.¹⁷ One of the great achievements of the military orders was to weld these proud, honour-seeking individualists into an effective fighting force.¹⁸ Yet the continuing attraction of the lone quest shows that the orders failed to convince knights in general that cooperation was necessary or desirable.

Fourthly, in order to obtain a full picture of the development of their image, it is necessary to view the military orders in the whole of Europe. In Germany and eastern Europe, the concept of the military order seems not to have been welcomed with the same enthusiasm as it was, for example, in England. However, I shall not set out in detail evidence from areas where extensive research has recently been carried out and where I have nothing new to add. I have excluded detailed discussion of the views of the nobility of the Holy Land, as they have recently been included in studies by

¹⁷Cf. P. Partner, *The Murdered Magicians*, pp.39-40; and see, e.g., *The Historia regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth, I*, ed. N. Wright (Cambridge, 1985) pp.119-120; *Le Siège de Barbastro*, ed. J.-L. Perrier, CFMA 54 (Paris, 1926), lines 1924-1937; *La chevalerie d'Ogier de Danemarque*, ed. M. Eusebi (Milan and Varese, 1953) *passim*; *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, in W. Stubbs, ed., *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I*, 2 vols., RS 38 (London, 1864-5)1 pp.268-9, 371-2.

¹⁸*La Règle du Temple*, ed. H. de Curzon, SHF (Paris, 1886) p.126 para.166; Odo of Deuil, *de profectioe Ludovici VII in orientem*, ed. V. G. Berry (New York, 1948) pp.124-8.

Jonathan Riley-Smith, Jean Richard and Hans Mayer.¹⁹ Likewise, reactions to the international military orders in Spain, where the Muslims' territories were being being conquered by the Christians throughout our period, and many national military orders were also formed, have been included in the extensive research carried out by Alan Forey and Robert Burns;²⁰ I have therefore not discussed them in depth.

Any thesis covering so broad a topic, spanning nearly two centuries and most of Europe, will inevitably encounter the problem of approach. National, chronological and social divisions present themselves. I have divided the material firstly by social divisions, and, subsequently, nationally and chronologically as seemed necessary to assist clarity. However, any division will be, to a certain extent, artificial. Many dukes or counts, especially in eastern Europe, were, to all intents and purposes, independent rulers. Many bishops and archbishops, especially in Germany, were effectively secular lords, and their attitudes towards the military orders were shaped accordingly. A trouvère may be expressing his own point of view as a landless knight in one poem, and that of his wealthy and noble lord in the next. Each of these problems

¹⁹Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, e.g. pp.39-40. 55-7, 66-9, 89, 118-9, 152-63, 169-71, 183-6; J. Richard, *Le comté de Tripolie sous la dynastie Toulousaine (1102-1187)* (Paris, 1945) pp.62-70; *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, trans. J. Shirley, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1979) e.g. pp.265, 325, 374; H. E. Mayer, 'Studies in the History of Queen Melisende of Jerusalem,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 26 (1972) 93-182; *The crusades*, pp.278-9.

²⁰E.g., Forey, *Corona de Aragon, passim*; 'The military orders and the Spanish reconquest in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,' *Traditio* 40 (1984) 198-234; R. I. Burns, *The crusader kingdom of Valencia: reconstruction on a thirteenth-century frontier*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1967) 1 pp.173-196.

must be resolved individually; often they cannot be resolved and must be left open. A separate section has been set aside for the consideration of the orders' image in works now considered to be fiction; legends included in works by the clergy, and the 'romantic' image of the orders in epic and romance. Although it is not always clear how far twelfth and thirteenth century audiences discriminated between fact and fiction, these sources are essentially *sui generis* and call for separate treatment.

The word 'image' is itself fraught with dangers and difficulties. Obviously, there was no single image of the military orders at any one particular time. There were concepts, ideals and spiteful rumours which circulated, formed by the turn of events, the preconceptions and prejudices of onlookers, and the orders' own deliberate efforts; but even establishing the nature of these concepts, ideals and rumours requires careful judgement. For example, it is impossible to discover exactly what the man in the field made of the military orders, as he left no written records. If his lord issued a charter acknowledging that this man had requested that he be transferred to the lordship of the Hospitallers, we may assume that he considered the Hospitallers to be favourable lords; and if his lord issued a confirmation of a gift which this man had given to the order in alms for his soul's sake, we may assume that he had a good opinion of the Hospital's spirituality. Yet it is unlikely that we can discover why he thought the Hospital to be more spiritually worthy than the Cistercians over the hill. It may be that he preferred the Hospitallers because they spoke the local dialect, whereas the Cistercians were of higher social origin and did not. He may declare in his charter that he is giving his gift for the poor of Jerusalem, but these are probably the words of the Hospital's scribe, and not his own. We may only say that he approved of the Hospital as a religious order, as he considered the Hospitallers' prayers to be effective. When considering the charter of a more wealthy, educated donor, who could employ a personal scribe and could read the charter when it was written, it is more likely that the expressed motive in the charter is the

donor's own. Yet even a gift in alms could conceal a sale;²¹ so that the matter is never certain.

Even this evidence is to a large extent missing for the order of the Temple, whose central archive is lost. Thus the favourable evidence of donation charters is biased towards the Hospital and the Teutonic order. Evidence for the Temple must be laboriously constructed out of a multiplicity of local cartularies, and the time and labour required in examining these is not repaid by the rewards. I have not, therefore, examined as much charter evidence for the Temple as for the Hospital, and this will tend to distort my results. For example, although I have found records of beguines giving gifts to the Hospital and to the Teutonic order,²² I have found none for the Temple: yet this does not mean that there were none. Some questions, therefore, remain open.

Other forms of evidence present their own problems. Most of the recorded opinions expressed outside the charters originated with the clergy, and almost all those recorded in the twelfth century did so. The majority of such opinions are criticisms, as indifference and favour seldom require recording. In the same way, many records of disputes between houses, with bishops and laymen, survive, but few records of friendships. Historians, looking for criticism in order to justify the dissolution of the order of the Temple, have tended to notice only where criticism occurs, not to weigh it against criticism of other monastic orders, and not to notice where it does not occur.

Again, there is the problem of determining how influential or representative an opinion was. There is no disputing that

²¹Cf. Mayer, *The crusades*, p.278.

²²Cart., nos. 4002, 4159; *Urkundenbuch der Deutschordensballei Hessen*, ed. A. Wyss, 3 vols., Publication aus den K. Preussischen Staatsarchiven, nos. 3, 19, 73; Hessisches Urkundenbuch 1 (1879-1899, reprinted Osnabrück, 1965) 1 no.526.

the Old French translation of the 'Historia' of William, archbishop of Tyre, was very popular during the thirteenth century.²³ It has therefore been assumed that William's scandalous tales of the Hospital and, particularly, the Temple, had a ruinous effect on the orders' reputation.²⁴ However, the nobles who read the old French translation of William of Tyre's scandalous tales of the Hospital's dispute with the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Temple's preference for gaining money to gaining converts, were probably the same as those who commissioned and read works such as *Renaut de Montauban*, *Bueve de Hantone* or *La Chastelaine de Vergi*, which gave a favourable role to the military orders. To assume that they would have believed William's stories as truth and accepted the rest as fiction is to ascribe to them twentieth-century values and hindsight. Rather, the indication is that William's European audience regarded his history as a collection of romantic, exotic tales of the Orient, far from reality as they understood it.²⁵ It is unwise to assume that Europe reacted *en masse* to tales for or against the military orders; individual reactions would depend on an individual's own attitudes and experience. Individual attitudes may only be clearly distinguished when an individual acted for or against the orders.

This study, then, seeks to examine images of the military orders as these were expressed in various forms, in charters, chronicles, papal bulls, satirical verse, romances, or funerary inscriptions, and to identify as far as possible individuals who held these images, establishing patterns of consistency between individuals over time and space. It will be shown that, although there was considerable criticism of the military

²³R. H. C. Davis, 'William of Tyre,' in D. Baker, ed., *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages* (Edinburgh, 1987) p.71.

²⁴E.g., Partner, *The Murdered Magicians*, p.24ff.

²⁵ Davis, 'William of Tyre,' pp.70-1, 73-5.

orders, of their canonical basis as monastic orders, of their performance of their role and of their other activities, its significance has been greatly exaggerated. Criticism peaked around the years 1240-1250, as a result of the crusades of 1239-1240, the final loss of Jerusalem and defeat at La Forbie in 1244, and the war between pope and emperor. After this the plight of the Holy Land, and hence the military orders, became overshadowed by crusades in Europe, especially in Sicily. Even when Acre was lost, in May 1291, the immediate reaction in Europe was to extol the military orders for their courage in the face of the enemy, and to blame the papacy for concentrating its resources in Sicily rather than sending effective aid to the Holy Land.²⁶ This study will, however, end by showing that the loss of Acre was more damaging to the order of the Temple than to the other military orders, in that it was held to be particularly responsible for the defence of the Holy Land.

²⁶See Appendix I.

CHAPTER ONE:

THE RULERS OF CATHOLIC CHRISTENDOM AND THE MILITARY ORDERS.

An examination of the image of the military orders must begin here. The policies of papacy, emperor and kings formed a backdrop to the operations of the military orders. They organized, or failed to organize, expeditions to the Holy Land; levied, or failed to levy, taxes for the assistance of the Holy Land; and led the way in patronage of the military orders, or in their exploitation. The connections between papacy or monarchs and the military orders did much to shape the orders' image in the eyes of their subjects, both of those who loved them and of those who did not. It was on the rulers of Catholic Christendom that the military orders depended for their privileges, the protection of their brothers and property, and thus their income and their very survival. Indeed, although the papacy claimed their first allegiance, in the end the orders depended for their survival on the attitude of whomever held power in the localities, the representative of pope, king, or the local landlord.

(a) The Papacy.

(i) The bases of the relationship.

The protection of the Latin Christian settlement in the Holy Land and the pilgrims travelling within it was a principal concern of the papacy. Successive popes therefore fostered and protected the military orders of the Holy Land, whose task it was to protect at first pilgrims, and subsequently the whole settlement; urging them to persist in war on the Muslims rather than in making truces or in fighting between themselves.¹ Papal concern to protect Catholic Christians from non-Catholics ensured papal support also for the military orders set up in

¹E.g., *Les registres de Gregoire IX*, ed. L. Auvray, 4 vols., BEFAR (Paris, 1896-1955) no.4129; *Les Registres de Nicolas III*, ed. J. Gay, BEFAR (Paris, 1938) no.167.

Spain, Livonia and Prussia for the defence of Christians against Muslims and pagans, as well as for military confraternities formed within Europe to combat heresy.²

The language of their bulls indicates that these popes had the highest opinion of the orders. From Celestine II's bull *Milites Templi Hierosolymitani* of 1144, the Templars were frequently compared to the Maccabees, Biblical warriors who had fought the Gentiles in defence of the Temple and the land which God had given His people;³ Honorius III made a similar comparison for the Teutonic order, as did his successor,

²E.g., PL 200, cols. 1024ff. (order of St. James of Santiago); R. Hiestand, ed., *Papsturkunden für Templer und Johanniter*, Abhandlungen der Akad. der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, dritte Folge, no.77 (Göttingen, 1972) no.89 (order of Mountjoy); Innocent III, 'Liber Registorum sive Epistolarum,' (henceforth 'Register') 3 vols., PL 214-216: 216 col. 509, year 14 no.149 (Swordbrothers of Livonia); *Registres de Gregoire IX*, nos. 241-2 (Dobrin order of Prussia); A. Forey, 'The Military Orders and Holy War against Christians in the Thirteenth Century,' *English Historical Review*, 104 (1989) 6-9 (orders to combat heresy).

³Hiestand, nos. 8, 9, 11, 20, 26, 28, 32, 33, 44, 46, 49, 146; PL 188 col. 1537; C. R. Cheney and M. G. Cheney, eds., *The Letters of Innocent III (1198-1216) concerning England and Wales. A Calendar with an appendix of texts* (Oxford, 1967) no.192; *Les registres de Clement IV*, ed. E. Jordan, BEFAR (Paris, 1893-1945) no.1764.

Gregory IX;⁴ while Honorius III, Alexander IV and Clement IV applied it to the Hospital.⁵ The brothers were also referred to as *athletae Christi*,⁶ although this was a phrase which need not imply military activity, just as the words *milites Christi* were used to refer to monks long before they were applied to crusaders or of military orders.⁷ The brothers were also described by the popes of the second half of the thirteenth

⁴E. Strehlke, ed., *Tabulae Ordinis Theutonici ex tabularii regii Berolinensis codice potissimum*, new edition with preface by H. E. Mayer (Jerusalem, 1975) Honorius III: p.290 no.321, p.333 no.403, Gregory IX: pp.56-7 no.72;cf. *ibid.*, p.329 no.389: Honorius III compares the Teutonic brothers to Mattathias, the father of Judas Maccabaeus.

⁵Cart., nos.1536 (as Strehlke, no.389) 2928, 3153.

⁶Templars as *athletae Christi*: Hiestand, nos. 38, 64, (*Paci et Quieti*, reissued nos. 65, 70, 82, 85, 91, 99, 100, 119, 137); PL 200, col. 774 no.856; *Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae et cuiuscumque generis Acta Publica...* ed. T. Rymer and R. Sanderson, enlarged and amended by A. Clark and F. Holbrooke, 4 vols. in 7 parts, (Record Commission, London 1816-69) 1,1 p.333 (*Paci et Quieti*). Hospital as *athletae Christi*: Cart. nos. 290, 3997; in *Paci et Quieti*, Cart. nos. 429, 1064, 1564, 1625, 1644, 1681, 1723, 1873, 1909, 2128, 2309, 2318, 2333, 2374, 2415, 2447, 2501, 2579, 2619, 2620, 2891, 2954, 3155, 3257, 3258 (last issued by Clement IV). Teutonic order as *athletae Christi*: Strehlke, no. 358; in *Paci et quieti*: *ibid.*, nos. 379, 391, 392, 426, 433, 448, 454, 457, 503. All three orders: *Les registres de Nicolas IV*, ed. E. Langlois, 1 vol. in 2, BEFAR (Paris, 1905) nos. 4204-6, Cart. no. 4147, Strehlke nos. 665-6. Temple and Hospital: MGHES 1 no.80, p.60.

⁷Flori, *Idéologie du glaive*, p.9ff.

century as *pugiles Christi*, a purely military term.⁸ The brothers' dedication and self-sacrifice were praised, and their readiness to lay down their own lives and property in the service of their fellow-Christians. However, this praise did not reflect simply admiration, but also the importance of the service which the military orders performed for Christendom, and their political importance to the papacy.

Honorius II's recognition of the order of the Temple in 1128 was a natural development of the recruitment of warriors by the Church to defend the Church. Since Leo IX had led a military expedition against the Norman threat to the papal territories in 1053, popes had readily used force to repel their enemies in Italy, and Honorius himself had done so: in early 1128, he was engaged in promoting a war against Roger of Sicily, who was claiming Apulia. The similarity between the role of the military order and the role of crusading knights has often been noted; the recognition of the military monastic order has been depicted as a natural succession to the first crusade.⁹

However, despite the precedents, there were certainly doubts among the clergy as to the validity of such an order. While it was agreed that knights could win salvation by using their arms in God's cause, this was only in the context of the crusade; these knights remained in the world and did not join a religious order. To transform these laymen into religious,

⁸Teutonic order: Clement IV in Strehlke, no.647. Temple: *Registres de Nicolas IV* no.4098. Hospital: *Registres de Nicolas III*, no. 188, Cart. no.3677.

⁹P. Partner, *The lands of St. Peter - the Papal State in the Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance* (London, 1972) pp.165-6; Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, pp.143-153; I. S. Robinson, 'Gregory VII and the soldiers of Christ,' *History*, 58 (1973) 169-192; A. Forey, 'The emergence of the military order in the twelfth century,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 36 (1985) 175-195, especially 183-189.

living in a community under a rule, was a new development, threatening to destroy the exclusivity of monasticism.¹⁰ It is probable that papal recognition of the concept of the military order was the result of pragmatic rather than ideological considerations: a response to the necessity of defending the Holy Land and a recognition of the order's potential value in reforming knighthood. Bernard of Clairvaux hinted at such considerations in his letter of encouragement to the knight-brothers, stating that Saracens would not have to be killed if there was any other way in which they could be prevented from attacking the faithful, and pointing out that the order recruited the undesirable elements, thereby ridding Europe of them.¹¹

The papacy certainly regarded the lifestyle of the military orders to be less spiritually advanced than those of the more traditional monastic orders such as the Benedictines or the Cistercians. Therefore, although the military orders possessed privileges which forbade brothers to leave the order without the permission of the master, the papacy would generally grant such permission in favour of devout brothers who wished to advance in their spiritual life. Such a transfer was declared to be an improvement, 'a move towards the right hand of the Most High.' Only occasionally were such applications refused: for example, in 1246 a large number of Teutonic brothers were forbidden to leave their order for a

¹⁰Cf. F. H. Russell, *The Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1975) p.294-6; Forey, 'The emergence of the military order,' 189-194; and see below, chapter 2 pp.78-87.

¹¹Bernard of Clairvaux, 'Liber ad milites Templi de laude novae militiae,' in J. Leclercq and H. M. Rochais, eds., *S. Bernardi Opera*, 8 vols. (Rome, 1957-77) 3 pp.217, 223; cf. Hugh Peccator writing to the Templars on the validity of their profession: J. Leclercq, 'Un document sur les débuts des Templiers,' *Revue de l'histoire ecclésiastique*, 52 (1957) 86-89.

stricter one because of the necessity to preserve the order's forces.¹² The necessity of Christendom overruled spiritual desirability.

Further evidence of the pragmatism which underlay papal attitudes to the military orders appeared in papal attitudes towards the militarization of the order of the Hospital. Alexander III continued to refer to the order as purely hospitaller, caring for the poor and sick, long after it had become militarized and had played a significant role in King Amalric I's Egyptian expeditions.¹³ Twice between 1168 and 1180 he wrote to the order, urging the brothers to continue in their original vocation, rather than taking up arms, except in emergencies.¹⁴ His reasons for this were that they should follow their customs and not cross the limits set by their predecessors; and that 'it may be believed that one can be better defended through love and mercy shown towards the poor than through strength of arms,' (*magis per caritatem et misericordiam erga pauperes exhibitam quam per fortitudinem armorum credatur posse defendi*). Papal concern was aroused partly out of a respect for tradition, for the *status quo*, and particularly out of a determination to protect the order's

¹²*Les registres d'Innocent IV*, ed. E. Berger, 4 vols., BEFAR (Paris, 1884-1921) 1 no.1661; see also Cart., nos.271, 1318. For applications granted, see, e.g., PL 200 cols. 228-9, no.162, col. 1333, no.158; *Die Register Innocenz' III*, ed. O. Hageneder and A. Haidacher, 2 vols. in 4 (Graz-Cologne, 1964-8, and Rome-Vienna, 1979-83) 1 no.379, 2 no.54; *Regesta Honorii Papae III*, ed. P. Pressutti, 2 vols. (Rome, 1888-95, reprinted Hildersheim/New York, 1978) nos.1971, 5794.

¹³A. Forey, 'The Militarization of the Hospital of St. John,' *Studia Monastica*, 26 (1984) 79; Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, pp.60-1.

¹⁴Cart., nos.391*ter*, 527; Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, p.76.

rule, which had received papal sanction; if orders were to be allowed to act outside their rules and develop as they pleased, who knew what might happen? They would bring the Church into disrepute, and show papal authorization to be worthless. Just as important, however, was the conviction that the office of arms was inferior in spiritual terms to that of caring for the poor and sick. By taking up arms, except in cases of necessity, the order of the Hospital was not becoming more, but less, holy.

The military order, then, received papal approval and support because it was essential to the defence of pilgrims in the Holy Land; yet, as it was not as spiritually desirable as other orders, the papacy did not encourage other orders to take up its functions. Nevertheless, in order to facilitate their work on behalf of pilgrims in the Holy Land, the papacy granted both the Temple and Hospital extensive exemptions from ecclesiastical dues and episcopal authority. The granting of these privileges demonstrates not only the orders' need but also the growth and extension of papal authority across the whole of the Latin Church during the twelfth century. The primacy of the See of Rome within the Christian Church had received new emphasis from the papal reformers of the second half of the eleventh century. In the twelfth century this theoretical primacy was gradually translated into real authority: the papal court became the court of appeal from all ecclesiastical courts, a papal bull was considered to be a prerequisite to a crusade, papal recognition essential to the cult of a saint. Religious orders were eager to obtain papal approval of their privileges in the face of episcopal pressure, while the granting of such privileges underpinned papal authority.¹⁵ Hence, despite the protests of the secular clergy, more and more extensive privileges were bestowed on the

¹⁵The development of papal authority is described by Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, pp.98-101, 107-8, 128-132, 205-19, 568-577. For discussion of the military orders' privileges see, e.g., Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, pp.376-7, 379.

military orders.¹⁶

On the other hand, it should be noted that papal favour appears to have been particularly great during periods when the papacy was under pressure. In the privileged monastic orders the papacy had influential and sometimes powerful allies. Two of Innocent II's three bulls of privilege for the Hospital were granted during his long struggle against the antipope Anacletus II. Marie Luise Bulst-Thiele thought it significant that his great bull of privilege for the Temple, *Omne Datum Optimum*, was granted immediately after he had gained full control of the papal see.¹⁷ The events of Alexander III's pontificate again illustrate this tendency. Forced to flee from Rome immediately after his election, struggling against the emperor and a rival supported by the emperor, heavily in debt and usually in exile from Rome, Alexander was more in need than most popes of reinforcements to his prestige and authority. According to Gerald of Wales, he used to declare that he held three orders dearer than all the rest, and wished to protect them: the Templars, Hospitallers and Cistercians.¹⁸ On a day-to-day basis, Alexander depended on the services of three brothers of the order of the Temple, who held the posts of papal almoner

¹⁶ For the reactions of the secular clergy see, e.g., John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, ed. C. C. J. Webb, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1909) 2 p.198 Book 7 ch.21, 695a; William, Archbishop of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. R. B. C Huygens, 2 vols., *Corpus Christianorum - continuatio medievalis* 63 (Turnholt, 1986) 2, pp.812-4, 817-22, Book 18 chs.3, 6-8.

¹⁷Cart., nos.113, (1135) 122, (1137) 130 (1139-43); Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, p.34; cf.Partner, *Lands of St. Peter*, pp.168-180.

¹⁸Gerald of Wales, *Opera*, ed. J. S. Brewer *et al.*, 8 vols., RS 21 (London, 1861-91) 4 p.205; Partner, *Lands of St. Peter*, pp.203-215.

and chamberlains: Brothers Peter, Franco and Bernard.¹⁹ These were positions which would only be awarded to men close to the pope, whom he felt that he could trust implicitly; no doubt they won many concessions for their order from the pope.

It is, therefore, scarcely surprising that in 1179 the clergy at the third Lateran Council were unable to obtain any lasting measures to restrict the military orders' operations, despite bitter complaints.²⁰ The pope claimed that he had been unaware of the abuses of which the orders were accused, and issued decrees to prevent them;²¹ but the losses suffered by the military orders at the council were soon made good. The bishops had complained that the orders were receiving churches and tithes from laymen without the consent of the diocesan bishop; Alexander III had decreed that they were to cease this practice, and were to return those which they had received 'in modern times,' a phrase left undefined but which obviously pleased all parties. Some three months later, the pope defined 'modern times' as 'within the last ten years,' for the benefit of Roger des Moulins, master of the Hospital. It is probable that the bishops had been thinking of a much longer period, such as the last century. In the following month, Alexander wrote to the order of the Temple in similar vein.²² He himself admitted that this was 'a benign interpretation,' made 'for the

¹⁹M. L. Bulst-Thiele, 'Templer in Koniglichen und Papstlichen Diensten,' in P. Classen and P. Scheibert, eds., *Festschrift Percy Ernst Schramm*, 2 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1964) p.301.

²⁰Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, ed. M. R. James, C. N. L. Brooke and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1983) p.70.

²¹Cart. no. 560; for other decrees concerning these abuses issued by Alexander III, see nos. 273, 275, 277.

²²Cart., no.566 (for the Hospital's claim to have existed since apostolic times, see chapter five pp.261-3); Hiestand, no.105.

sake of your religion and the sake of piety.` It did not endear him to the bishops, but Alexander obviously valued the support of the privileged monastic orders more than that of the bishops.

We may suggest similar considerations behind the extraordinary readiness of his namesake, Alexander IV, to grant anything requested by the military orders, especially the Teutonic order. His generosity was no doubt increased by his good nature, and his friendship with his notary, the Teutonic brother John of Capua. However, it is probable that he was also anxious to placate papal supporters in the face of the threat posed to papal power in southern Italy by Manfred of Sicily; hence he tended to grant favours to papal supporters without thorough investigation of the facts. Two separate crusades were authorized in Prussia (one led by the Teutonic order and one by rival Polish princes); the pope was apparently unaware of the geography of the area. He also gave to the Hospital, in 1255 and 1256, the monasteries of Mount Tabor and of St. Lazarus of Bethany on the grounds that they had been destroyed by the Saracens, and that the Hospital needed the additional revenue to finance its struggle against the enemies of the Christian faith; whereas in fact the house of St. Lazarus was undamaged and occupied by nuns, while the Hospital was involved in no fighting, as a truce was in force.²³

For Clement IV, political weakness rendered him unable to enforce commands in the face of intransigence from papal supporters, although he made a show of authority. He inherited from Urban IV a dispute between the papacy and the order of the Temple over the order's failure to dismiss Brother Stephen de Sissy from the office of marshal on papal command. According to Clement, writing to the master and brothers of the order in March 1265, it was not Stephen's original crime but the order's

²³W. Kuhn, 'Ritterorden als Grenzhüter des Abendlandes gegen das östliche Heidentum,' *Ostdeutsche Wissenschaft* 6 (1959) 42-52 sets out the evidence for the two crusades; Cart., nos.2726, 2781, 2993 for the Hospital's acquisitions.

disobedience to the papacy which could not be tolerated. Surely Christ, when he bestowed the keys of the kingdom of Heaven on St. Peter, had not exempted the order of the knighthood of the Temple or its officers or persons from Peter's authority? The master and brothers should consider what fate would await them from the prelates and princes of the world if the papacy was to withdraw its protective arm. They depended entirely on the papacy's aid, after God's. They had been in 'error,' not of doctrine, but in believing themselves exempt from papal authority. Clement added that the papacy and the Church had already tolerated much from the order, and told his addressees not to try his patience any longer. Strong words, indeed; but Clement went on to say that he had decided to absolve Stephen, although the master was to punish him, and amend his own disobedience.²⁴ In fact, as the master and brothers were no doubt well aware, the pope could not afford to do otherwise than reconcile himself to the order. At the time that this letter was written, Clement was hard pressed by Manfred, in financial crisis, and was being forced to make large concessions to Charles of Anjou in order to secure his military assistance. His lengthy letter of rebuke to the order was his attempt to salvage as much papal dignity and authority as possible from the fiasco. It was not just a question of what the order of the Temple would do if the papacy was to withdraw its protective arm; what would the papacy do without the services and support of the order of the Temple?

The continuing reliance of the papacy on the military orders as trustworthy men is illustrated by the considerable number of brothers engaged by the popes as personal servants. This reflected not so much the personal sanctity and integrity of the brothers as the problems experienced by the papacy in finding reliable officials. A Templar and a Hospitaller often

²⁴*Registres de Clement IV*, no.836; cf. Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.242-5, for discussion of this dispute.

appear as papal *cubicularii*;²⁵ Brother John of Capua of the Teutonic order appears as papal notary under Alexander IV and Urban IV, while Brother Wultard of the Teutonic order was Urban's chaplain and penitentiary, and Brother Hermann of Livonia was his *hostarius*.²⁶ These three won a number of concessions for their order from the popes they served. Other offices filled by members of the orders include that of marshal under Urban IV, filled by successive Templars, *hostarius* under Nicholas III, held by a Templar, chaplain, held by the prior of the Hospital in Acre under Urban IV, and porter, held by a Hospitaller under Martin IV.²⁷

Popes also employed the knight-brothers in a variety of other duties which required men of the utmost fidelity. Following the treaty of San Germano between Pope Gregory IX and the emperor Frederick II in 1230, Hermann of Salza, master of the Teutonic order, was entrusted with a number of properties

²⁵Gregory IX: MGHEs 1 p.677 no.778 (Brother Bonvicinus, Templar). Innocent IV: 'Niccolò da Calvi e la sua vita d'Innocenzo IV con una breve introduzione sulla istoriografia Pontificia nei secoli XIII e XIV,' ed. F. Pagnotti, *Archivio della R. Societa Romana di Storia Patria*, 21 (1898) 85, 87, 97 (Br. Bonvicinus, Templar, and Br. Thomas, Hospitaller). Urban IV: *Les registres d'Urbain IV*, ed. J. Guiraud, 4 vols., BEFAR (Paris, 1901-29) no.2276 (Br. Lambert, Templar: he may be the same as the Br. Lambert who was procurator of the Temple at Rome under Alexander IV: *Les registres d'Alexandre IV*, ed. C. Bourel de la Ronciere et al., 3 vols., BEFAR (Paris, 1896-1953) no.723). Clement IV: Cart., no.3320 (Brother P. de Beauvoisin, Hospitaller). Nicholas IV: *Registres*, no.7146 (Br. Huguitionus, Templar); Bulst-Thiele, 'Templar,' pp.302-4.

²⁶Strehlke, no.560; *Registres d'Urbain IV*, no.213.

²⁷*Registres d'Urbain IV*, nos. 1244, 1786, 2487; Bulst-Thiele, 'Templar,' p.303, 304; Cart., no. 3094, 3789.

by the emperor which he was to retain, as a neutral party, until the treaty was carried out.²⁸ Urban IV appointed Brothers Raymond, Berard de Gallerceto and Martin, of the order of the Temple, as custodians of the castle of Perrochio, near Spoleto, Rocca Caesis, Spoleto diocese, and Trebis respectively.²⁹ Gregory X appointed Brother William de Villaret of the Hospital as vicar of the county of Venaissin in 1274; this appointment was renewed by Nicholas III and Martin IV.³⁰ Members of the military orders were also used by successive popes as messengers, treasurers and judge-delegates.³¹ However, not all the brothers were as trustworthy as the pope believed: one of Villaret's successors in the Venaissin, Brother Raymond de Grassa, was later convicted of adjudging to his order some castles and villages within this county to which his order had no right.³² In July 1220 Honorius III explained to his legate, Pelagius, that he had entrusted the transportation of a large volume of cash to the Templars and Hospitallers because he had no other messengers whom he could trust better; although his tone suggests that he and his legate did not entirely trust even the Templars and

²⁸MGHES 1 pp.334-5, no.415, nos. IV, VIII, XVII.

²⁹*Registres d'Urban IV*, no. 880, vol. 1 nos. 59, 126; Bulst-Thiele, 'Templer,' p.303.

³⁰Cart., nos. 3536, 3648, 3770, 3778.

³¹E.g., Bulst-Thiele, 'Templer,' pp.301-4 (Brother Durand, Templar, p.301, was probably identical with Brother Durand or Thurand, a Hospitaller: MGHC 2 p.42, no.33; Thomas Wykes in *Annales Monastici*, ed. H. R. Luard, 5 vols., RS 36 (London, 1864-9) 4 p.56); *Registres de Gregoire IX*, nos. 3696, 3846, 3852, 4455; *Registres d'Innocent IV*, nos. 5288, 5300; Cart., nos. 2897, 3789.

³²*Registres de Nicolas IV*, no.7283.

Hospitallers.³³

In some cases, trust was based on personal friendship. Urban IV had been patriarch of Jerusalem prior to his elevation to the papal see, and therefore in daily contact with the military orders; he was probably personally acquainted with the brothers whom he appointed as castellans, as he was with Amaury de la Roche, who was grand commander of the Temple in the Holy Land before he was appointed as master of the order in France on the insistence of Louis IX and Urban IV in 1264.³⁴ Gregory X had been papal legate in the Holy Land before his election as pope, and had probably been as close to the military orders as Urban.

This close relationship did not necessarily work in the orders' favour. In the first place, as the papacy's European authority was based on canonical claims and the prestige of the see of St. Peter rather than force,³⁵ it could not always enforce the privileges and exemptions which it demanded for its privileged monastic orders. This is demonstrated by numerous reissues of the same privilege by the same pope, and complaints that the bishops and their clergy ignored papal instructions.³⁶ Secondly, not only was papal protection not as effective as it might have appeared; it also came with strings attached. It was granted for the advantage of Christendom and, hence, for the papacy, not for the order alone, as Clement IV's letter of

³³MGHES 1 p.90, no.124.

³⁴Cart., no. 3028, p.31; *Registres d'Urbain IV*, nos. 760, 765; for the close relationship between the patriarch of Jerusalem and the officials of the Temple, see also G. Servois, 'Emprunts de Saint Louis en Palestine et en Afrique: Appendice,' BEC 19 (1858) p.291ff.; RRH no. 1347, pp.352-3.

³⁵Cf. Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, pp.128-30, 187.

³⁶E.g. *Registres d'Innocent IV*, no.4957.

early 1265 to the Temple makes clear;³⁷ and it was effective only until the papacy saw fit to revoke it. Innocent IV gave some of his legates power to dispense with the privileges of exempt orders if they were disobedient,³⁸ while the military orders' exemption from papal taxation was overruled in time of financial crisis. In the second half of the thirteenth century, when the papacy was in great need of cash for its wars, all exempt orders in France had to contribute towards a tithe for Charles of Anjou's Sicilian campaign, despite fierce opposition, while Nicholas IV refused the military orders' claim to exemption from a similar tithe despite their plea that a third of their revenues were used to help the Holy Land. He granted them exemption only from the tithe on this third.³⁹ Their exemption from liability to pay procurations to papal legates, except cardinal legates, was overruled and effectively abolished.⁴⁰

(ii) Criticism

As a result of the close relationship between the papacy and the military orders, popes always expected the orders to

³⁷*Registres de Clement IV*, no.836.

³⁸*Registres d'Innocent IV*, nos. 2973, 3006, 4667, 4711, 8320.

³⁹*Registres de Clement IV*, nos. 217, 811, 1451, and cf. no.134; *Registres de Nicolas IV*, nos. 617, 618, 1142-1152, 2136 (etc.) 4204-6. Gregory X had, however, agreed to their full exemption from a tithe destined for the Holy Land itself: *Les Registres de Gregoire X (1272-1276) et de Jean XXI (1276-1277)*, ed. J. Guiraud and E. Cadier, BEFAR (Paris, 1892-1960) nos.1048, 1056, 384, 409; Strehlke, no.651.

⁴⁰E.g. *Registres de Gregoire IX*, no. 1368; *Registres d'Alexandre IV*, no.533; *Registres de Clement IV*, no.295; *Registres de Nicolas III*, nos. 330, 341, 342; *Les registres d'Honorius IV*, ed. M. Prou, BEFAR (Paris, 1886-8) no.199.

subordinate their own interests to papal policy, that is, the interests of Christendom as the papacy perceived them. Papal criticism of any or all of the military orders usually reflected such political considerations, rather than the seriousness of the orders' misdemeanours.

A fine example of this is the long-running dispute between the Templars and the Teutonic brothers over the latter's white mantles. The Templars claimed that these mantles could easily be mistaken for their own, as they indeed were.⁴¹ Innocent III, whose paternalism towards monastic orders made him concerned to maintain proper order between them, chided the Teutonic brothers at Acre for wearing white mantles, and ordered that they cease.⁴² However, the approach of his successor, Honorius III, was affected by his wish to remain on good terms with the emperor Frederick II, who shared many papal interests: the crusade, the maintenance of order in Italy and the subjugation of heresy.⁴³ In the months following his coronation of Frederick and his consort, Constance, on 22 November 1220, Honorius issued more than fifty bulls bestowing privileges and protection on the Teutonic order. Among these, on 9 Jan. 1221, was a bull confirming their statutes regarding

⁴¹E.g. Roger of Wendover, *Flores Historiarum*, ed. H. R. Hewlett, 3 vols., RS 84 (London, 1886-9) 3 p.108; cf. Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ed. H. R. Luard, 7 vols., RS 57 (London, 1872-83) 3 p.318, and note; and cf. HDFS 4 p.515.

⁴²Strehlke, nos.299-300, pp.269-70; cf. B. Bolton, 'Via Ascetica: a papal quandary,' *Studies in Church History 22: Monks, Hermits and the ascetic tradition* (Oxford, 1985) pp.161-191.

⁴³Cf. J. M. Powell, *Anatomy of a Crusade, 1213-1221* (Philadelphia, 1986) pp.112-3, 181-3, 196-7.

dress, and forbidding anyone to trouble them over this.⁴⁴ On 17 April 1222 he wrote directly to Peter de Montacute, master of the Temple, and his brothers, rebuking them for troubling the Teutonic brothers over their white mantles. 'Inclined by the merit of their religion and the prayers of our dearest son in Christ Frederick...who, on the day of his coronation, asked this from us as a special gift, we have confirmed their institution... strengthening the house with other privileges, indulgences and liberties.' The privilege of wearing white mantles was, the pope stated, specially obtained by the Teutonic brothers from the pope. Even if reverence for the pope and emperor could not hold the Templars back from their attacks on the Teutonic order, they ought to be held back by the derision of all who heard of it, to whom it seemed ridiculous, 'as it is,' that the Templars should be so angry at the brothers of another order wearing a white mantle.⁴⁵ Two days later, Honorius confirmed a gift to the order by the emperor of two hundred ounces of gold a year, for buying white mantles.⁴⁶

The same considerations affected Gregory IX's approach to the dispute when on 13 September 1230 he wrote to the master and brothers of the Temple, forbidding them to trouble the Teutonic brothers over their white mantles. Two months previously the pope and emperor had been reconciled in the Treaty of San Germano, and the pope was now anxious to improve relations with the emperor by protecting and promoting the order most dear to him. Yet, where the Teutonic order was not involved, Gregory had sympathy with the Templars' complaints, intervening to settle in their favour a dispute with the order

⁴⁴Strehlke, no. 308, pp.275-9; Pressutti, no.2963, and nos. 2867, 2962, 2979, 2981-2, 2985-94, 2999-3001, 3004-8, 3013-25, 3061, 3065-73, 3078-82, 3086-88, 3177;cf. HDFS 2 p.1.

⁴⁵MGHES 1 pp.134-5, no.192.

⁴⁶Pressutti, no.3928; Strehlke, p.148 no.151.

of St. Thomas over the similarity of their habits.⁴⁷

In the interests of peace with the emperor Frederick II, Gregory IX also strove to enforce the emperor's truce with Egypt, forbidding the Templars to attack the Muslims, although meanwhile urging the emperor to return the property he had confiscated from the Temple and Hospital.⁴⁸ For the same reason, he showed considerable favour to the Teutonic order in its campaigns against the pagan Prussians, instructing the friars to preach the Prussian crusade throughout Germany and eastern Europe. In 1235 he allowed the incorporation of the knighthood of Christ of Dobrin, founded by Bishop Christian of Prussia, into the Teutonic order, and in 1237 he permitted the order to take over the knighthood of Christ of Livonia, or Swordbrothers.⁴⁹

Eric Christiansen has ascribed papal readiness to grant concessions to the Teutonic order in the Baltic area to a desire to outbid the emperor Frederick in winning the order's support.⁵⁰ Certainly this was true up to a point: Gregory supported the order in Prussia before he made peace with the

⁴⁷*Registres de Gregoire IX*, nos. 491, 3005.

⁴⁸MGHES 1 pp.345-6, nos. 427-8; *Registres de Gregoire IX*, nos. 544, 545; Cart., nos. 1975-6.

⁴⁹*Preußisches Urkundenbuch*, ed. A. Philipps et al., 6 vols. to date (Königsberg, Aalen and Marburg, 1882-1986) 1,1 nos. 72, 102, 103, 108, 110, 112, 118, 122, etc.; E. T. Kennan, 'Innocent III, Gregory IX, and Political Crusades: a study in the disintegration of papal power,' in G. F. Lytle, ed., *Reform and authority in the medieval and reformation Church* (Washington D.C., 1981) pp.29-31; P. M. Tumlner, *Der Deutsche Orden in Werden, Washsen und Wirken bis zum 1400* (Montreal and Vienna, 1955) pp.262ff, 592ff.

⁵⁰E. Christiansen, *The Northern Crusades: the Baltic and the Catholic Frontier 1100-1525* (London, 1980) p.104.

emperor at San Germano. However, the fact that relations between the papacy and the Teutonic order deteriorated after the second excommunication of the emperor indicates that the bulk of papal concessions to the order had been made as a result of papal-imperial cooperation.⁵¹

Papal complaints against the Teutonic order after March 1239, therefore, must also be seen in the light of political events. It was not that the order had suddenly declined in virtue, but that hitherto the pope had not been willing to entertain criticism. On 11 June 1239, Gregory wrote to the master and brothers rebuking them for supporting the excommunicate emperor, 'that Sathenas.'⁵² On 20 August 1239, he wrote to his subdeacon concerning the concession of the Hospital of St. Jacob of Andrevida to the Teutonic order by Geoffrey II of Villehardouin, lord of the Morea. Although Gregory had previously confirmed this concession, he now ordered that it be investigated and reversed, following accusations of fraud against the Teutonic order. Geoffrey of Villehardouin was ordered not to interfere.⁵³ On 12 January 1240, the pope wrote to the master and brothers of the order instructing them to prepare and present to him before next Michaelmas their justification for having thrown off the authority of the Hospital, in violation of a bull of Celestine II of 9 December 1143. This was not only an attack on the Teutonic order, but was also intended to win over the Hospital; in June 1239 Brother Bertrand de Barras, prior of the Hospital of St. Gilles, had drawn up an agreement with the emperor.⁵⁴

⁵¹Kennan, 'Innocent III,' p.30.

⁵²MGHES 1 p.645, no.749.

⁵³*Registres de Gregoire IX*, nos. 4917, 3878, 4918; see also 6070, 6071; Strehlke, nos. 131, 132, 133, 139.

⁵⁴Cart., nos. 154, 2247, 2230; cf. Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, pp.173-5.

Finally, on 11 April 1240, Gregory wrote to the bishop and two provosts of Meissen, concerning the `excesses` of the Teutonic house in Prussia, and listing complaints that he had received from Bishop Christian of Prussia: that the brothers would not allow converts to be baptized, that they had been torturing new converts who were faithful to the bishop, forcing some to relapse, and that when the bishop was in captivity they did not attempt to ransom him, but invaded his land and carried off his chattels. This was not the first letter of rebuke which Gregory had sent to the Baltic, but it was the first dealing solely with the Teutonic brothers.⁵⁵ It is clear that Gregory only entertained these accusations because it suited his political purposes to do so.

Other criticism, however, was prompted by the necessity to keep the monastic orders on `the straight and narrow way` and to restrain abuses. Such concern for the morality of the orders stemmed from papal responsibility both for the maintenance of standards in the Church and for the defence of the Holy Land. Innocent III's determination to stamp out abuses in the almscollecting and confraternities of the orders of the Hospital and Temple seems to have been largely a result of the former.⁵⁶ The Temple in particular was sharply rebuked for abusing its privileges during interdicts, admitting all and sundry to its confraternity, and ignoring the orders of papal legates.⁵⁷ In the same way, the pope condemned the `customary fraud` of the Hospitallers in their dispute with the bishop of Gardiki, and forbade the orders of the Hospital and Temple in the diocese of Rheims to bury excommunicants. Although he esteemed them, Innocent explained, both for their regard for

⁵⁵*Preuß. UB*, 1,1 pp.100-2, no.134; *Registres de Gregoire IX*, nos. 4125, 5139; Kennan, `Innocent III,` pp.31-2.

⁵⁶Cf. B. Bolton, `Via Ascetica,` pp.164-5.

⁵⁷PL 215 cols. 1217-8, Book 10 no.121, 216 cols. 1209-1210, Appendix no.12; *Die Register Innocenz` III*, no.450.

religion and their devotion to him, he could not and ought not allow to remain uncorrected anything against God and justice.⁵⁸

Such vigilance was essential to protect the reputation of the papacy, for, as Gregory IX informed the Templars and Hospitallers of the provinces of Bordeaux and Tours in 1136, their abuses brought the papacy into disrepute. Many claimed that the abuses occurred because of 'the excessive favour which we do not cease to expend on you.'⁵⁹ Certainly, Gerhoh of Reichersberg, writing 1162-3, William of Tyre and Walter Map, writing in the 1180's, and Roger Bacon, writing 1266-68, complained that the military orders had excessive influence over the papacy: Gerhoh, William of Tyre and Map thought this was achieved by bribery, Bacon by subtle persuasions.⁶⁰ In 1289 Jacquemart Giélée mocked the Templars' and Hospitallers' habit of appealing to the papal court over every dispute.⁶¹

General pastoral concern gained a special urgency from the

⁵⁸PL 216 cols. 591-5, esp. col. 592B, Book 15 nos. 59, 71, col. 645, Book 15 no.131.

⁵⁹*Registres*, no. 3116; *Cart.*, no.2139; cf. *Rotuli Hundredorum temp Hen. III & Edw. I in turr. Lond. et curia receptae Scaccarii Westm. asservati*, 2 vols. (London, 1812-8) 1 pp.53, 83, 291, 2 p.228.

⁶⁰Gerhoh of Reichersberg, 'De investigatione Antichristi,' ed. E. Sackur, *MGH Libelli de Lite Imperatorum et Pontificum*, 3 (Hanover, 1897) pp.378, 379, 384-5, 391; William of Tyre, 2 Bk.18 ch.7 p.820; Walter Map, p.70; Roger Bacon, *Opus Maius*, ed. J. H. Bridges, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1877-1900, reprinted Frankfurt, 1964) 3 p.122, part 3 ch.13. The first three of these complained of the Hospitallers, the fourth of the Teutonic order. See also Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora* 5 p.97 on the Temple and Hospital at the Roman court in 1250.

⁶¹Jacquemart Giélée, *Renart le Nouvel*, ed. H. Roussel, SATF (Paris, 1961) lines 7469-7490.

necessity to ensure the security of the Holy Land. Abuses were regarded as weakening the military orders both spiritually and strategically; spiritually because sin invited divine retribution in the form of defeat, and strategically because, for example, the orders' quarrels were a drain on their resources. Gregory IX's criticisms of the Temple and Hospital in March 1238 were probably prompted by the forthcoming French crusade, and the need to ensure that the military orders were ready and able to assist the crusaders.⁶² Likewise, Gregory X's letter of July 1235 to the Hospitallers, ordering them to cease their quarrels with other religious orders in Acre, was a preliminary to his planned crusade.⁶³

However, the orders' failings also had their uses, in detracting attention from the failings of the papacy. Thus popes occasionally appear to have exploited criticism of the military orders' activities in the Holy Land in order to deflect criticism from the papacy for failing to send assistance. For instance, in September 1278 Nicholas III wrote to the orders of the Hospital, Temple and the Teutonic order, urging them turn their attention to God and His land, lest they, who before all other sons of light ought to intend that the Holy Land be cleansed of pollution, and who were especially assigned to the defence of the land, be found blameworthy.⁶⁴ This command was very similar to that of Gregory X of 1275.

⁶²*Registres*, nos. 4129, 4156; *Cart.*, no.2186; it is possible that Gregory was also anxious to reform the orders in order to encourage the emperor's assistance for the crusaders. Possibly the complaints had come from the emperor himself; certainly the spitefulness of the accusations is reminiscent of Frederick's later accusations against the Templars: cf. *Registres* nos. 3932-4; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 4 p.302.

⁶³*Cart.*, no.3581.

⁶⁴*Registres de Nicolas III*, no.167; *Cart.*, no. 3674.

Yet Nicholas did not share his predecessor's plans to launch a crusade; he seems rather to imply that the defence of the Holy Land was the sole responsibility of the military orders, and that they could expect no help from the papacy. This attitude was in accordance with an opinion expressed by Master Richard Mepham, dean of Lincoln, in 1274 at the second council of Lyons, that the military orders who guarded the Holy Land needed no additional papal aid, as they had vast possessions which would be quite adequate to support an army if they were liquidated.⁶⁵ Such criticism of the order's use of their assets was very convenient for a papacy with no resources to spare for the Holy Land, as the blame for losses could be shifted off papal shoulders on to the military orders. After the loss of Acre, papal reaction was again to shift the burden of responsibility on to the military orders by suggesting that unification of the orders might assist the recovery and retention of the Holy Land.⁶⁶

Thus the papacy not only formed its own image of the military orders and their role, but also influenced the formation of the orders' image in the minds of others. This was also done indirectly, as a result of papal policy. In the second half of the thirteenth century, the papal emphasis on

⁶⁵ Richard stated that many kings and princes openly claimed this. It may have been in the course of this discussion that the proposal to unify the military orders was first raised, as part of reform to render them and their use of their assets more efficient: *Councils and Synods with other documents relating to the English Church*, ed. D. Whitelock, F. M. Powicke *et al.*, 2 vols. in 4 (Oxford, 1964-1981) 2,2 ed. F. M. Powicke and C. R. Cheney, pp.814-6; cf. *Le Dossier de l'affaire des Templiers* ed. G. Lizerand (Paris, 1923) pp.2-4.

⁶⁶*Dossier*, p.4; S. Schein, 'The image of the crusader kingdom of Jerusalem in the thirteenth century,' *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 64 (1986) 706.

the need to install a friendly regime in Sicily and to crush heresy before launching a crusade to the Holy Land, was considered by contemporaries to have resulted in losses of Christian territory and eventually the loss of Acre.⁶⁷ It was papal policy that it was necessary to crush Christian opponents in Europe before going to the help of the holy places,⁶⁸ and that the officials of the military orders also should assist in this as far as possible. Given that the papacy regarded exempt monastic orders as servants of the papacy, these expectations were reasonable; but they hindered the orders in the practice of their proper vocation. In 1264 the master and brothers of the Temple were forced to appoint Brother Amaury de la Roche as master of the order in France, because he would be useful to Louis, king of France and Pope Urban IV in this role; although he was far more useful to his order in the Holy Land. Working in the interests of Charles of Anjou, king of Naples, rather than those of his order, Amaury subsequently prevented Louis IX's Tunisian crusade from achieving anything. Likewise, Brother Philip d'Eglis, prior of the Hospital in France, was created prior of the Hospital in Sicily on Charles' request and papal instructions. In October 1267, Clement IV authorized him and his brothers to take up arms against King Charles' enemies in Sicily, in remission of their sins; they did so, but in retaliation the Sicilians destroyed the Hospital's houses in Sicily, cutting down the fruit trees and vines. In addition,

⁶⁷E.g., Ricaut Bonomel, 'Ir'e dolors s'es dins mon cor asseza,' ed. A. de Bastard, 'La colère et la douleur d'un templier en Terre Sainte,' *Revue des langues romanes*, 81 (1974) 357, strophes V and VI; Bartholomew of Neocastro, 'Historia Sicula,' ed. G. Paladino, RIS ns 13,3 pp.108-9; cf. Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 6, 'Liber Additamentorum,' p.197, no.95.

⁶⁸N. Housley, 'Politics and Heresy in Italy: Anti-Heretical Crusades, Orders and Confraternities, 1200-1500,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 33 (1982) 194-5.

Philip failed to repay the loans which, as prior in France, he had raised for Charles' benefit on the security of the Hospital's possessions. Appalled by the damage done to the order, the master, Hugh Revel, recalled Philip to the Holy Land in 1268, but the command was overruled by Clement, who retained Philip in office until Easter 1269.⁶⁹ This episode was very harmful to the order's image in Sicily, as well as weakening it financially and therefore preventing it from operating effectively in the Holy Land.⁷⁰

Papal support was essential to the military orders in that only the papacy could call a crusade, issuing a crusading bull with a promise of indulgence for all who participated. However, because of their political problems in Europe, popes were often more concerned with protecting themselves than with launching crusades. The papacy's willingness to bestow privileges upon the military orders and to make them exempt orders, answerable only to the papacy under God, was not only a move to protect pilgrims in the Holy Land but also a response to its own problems: threats to its authority in Italy, from the emperor and in the Church in general from the bishops. These same problems meant that the orders' dependence on the papacy would reap them as many disadvantages as benefits. Whatever popes might declare in their bulls for the military orders, in practice the papacy regarded them as much as supporters in its political and financial crises as defenders of the Holy Land, and as a result successive popes exploited the military orders as far as possible, drawing on their wealth and utilizing their best officials, to the detriment of the orders' real vocation. In practice the papacy could do little to protect the military orders, except by words; it had great authority and prestige, but little real power. Most of the real power in Europe was

⁶⁹Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.245-7; Cart., nos. 3221, 3228, 3279, 3285, 3308 (vol.4), 3321.

⁷⁰Cart., no.3308; Bartholemew of Neocastro, p.7.

held by secular monarchs: their image of the military orders was crucial for the orders' well-being.

(b) Monarchs.

The high esteem in which members of the military orders were held by monarchs throughout Europe and the Latin east is evidenced by the fact that brothers were considered worthy royal counsellors and servants,⁷¹ and by the friendships which existed between individual monarchs and brothers. The brothers were appointed to positions of responsibility, serving as procurators and messengers,⁷² financial officers, (Templars in

⁷¹Cf. Walter Map, p.114; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 2 p.196, Bk. 7 ch.21, 693c-d.

⁷²E.g., MGHC 2 pp.206-9, nos.168, 169 (Brother Hermann of Salza, master of the Teutonic order, for Frederick II); MGHC 3 p.64 no.76 (Brother Berengiar, prior of the Hospital in Germany, for Rudolf I); *Recueil des Actes de Henri II, roi d'Angleterre et Duc de Normandie, concernant les provinces francaises et les affaires de France*, ed. L. Delisle and E. Berger, Introduction (Paris, 1906) and 3 vols. (Paris, 1916-1927) 1 pp.407-8 no.262 (Brother Ernold and Brother Philip, Hospitaller, guiding Henry II's envoys on a secret mission to the pope); Bulst-Thiele, 'Templer,' *passim*.

particular appearing as royal almoners,⁷³) and royal ministers, often with great authority and influence.⁷⁴ This high esteem, however, was not only a reflection of the brothers' personal sanctity, but also a response to factors beyond their control, such as the crusading and dynastic traditions of monarchs, and the political connections of the orders, as well as more abstract influences such as royal perceptions of knighthood.

(i) Influences on patronage

It is no exaggeration to say that support for, or participation in, crusading was an indispensable part of kingship during the

⁷³E.g., Bulst-Thiele, 'Templer,' *passim*; H. Johnstone, 'Poor relief in the royal households of thirteenth century England,' *Speculum* 4 (1929) 163; A. Sandys, 'The financial and administrative importance of the London Temple in the thirteenth century,' in A. G. Little and F. M. Powicke, eds., *Essays in Medieval History presented to Thomas Frederick Tout*, (Manchester 1925) pp.147-162; L. Delisle, 'Mémoire sur les opérations financières des Templiers,' *Mémoires de l'Institut National de France, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 33,2 (1889) pp.40-73; Forey, *Corona de Aragon*, pp.344-46; A. Macquarrie, *Scotland and the Crusades, 1095-1560* (Edinburgh, 1985) pp.15-16, 50; and see below, note 92.

⁷⁴E.g., the Teutonic brothers in the Holy Roman Empire c. 1240: Albert von Beham und regesten *Innocenz IV*, ed. C. Höfler, BLVS 16b (Stuttgart, 1847) p.14; D. Wojtecki, 'Der Deutsche Orden unter Friedrich II,' in J. Fleckenstein, ed., *Probleme um Friedrich II*, Vorträge und Forschungen, 16 (Sigmaringen, 1974) pp.219-23; Hugh of Forcalquier, master of the Hospital in Aragon under James I: *The chronicle of James I, King of Aragon, surnamed the conqueror, written by himself*, trans. J. Forster, 2 vols. (London, 1883) pp.183-8, 191, 221, 267-9, 297, 301-6, 317 etc.; and see below, notes 90, 92, 138.

twelfth and thirteenth centuries.⁷⁵ The military orders benefitted accordingly. Monarchs who were unable to go on crusade showed their dedication to the Holy Land by patronage of the military orders. Over a period of many years, Henry II of England sent money to the orders of the Temple and Hospital for the Holy Land, while Wladislas II, king of Bohemia, gave the order of the Hospital a number of properties in Bohemia in thanks for the brothers' offer of hospitality to him at such time as he was able to come to the Holy Land on crusade.⁷⁶ According to Ailred of Rievaulx, King David of Scotland, who would have gone on crusade had his subjects not advised against it, kept 'the best brothers' of the Temple with him and made them guardians of his morals day and night.⁷⁷

Monarchs who had been on crusade often retained the military orders in their affection as a result of the services which they had rendered them while they were in the Holy Land, as did Louis VII and Louis IX of France, Richard I and Edward I.

⁷⁵Cf. S. Lloyd, *English Society and the Crusade, 1216-1307* (Oxford, 1988) pp.201, 216.

⁷⁶*Itinerarium*, p.26; Gerard of Wales, 8 p.191; H. E. Mayer, 'Henry II of England and the Holy Land,' *English Historical Review*, 97 (1982) 724-5; Cart., no.405.

⁷⁷John of Fordun, *Chronica gentis Scotorum*, ed. W. F. Skerne, *The Historians of Scotland*, 1 (Edinburgh, Edmonton and Douglas, 1871) p.242; Macquarrie, *Scotland and the Crusades*, pp.15-16.

of England, and Andrew of Hungary.⁷⁸ This was not, however, invariably the case. Conrad III of Germany seems to have had the military orders in mind, as well as the Frankish nobility of the Holy Land, when he complained at the end of his crusade that the siege of Damascus had failed because of treason from those he had least feared. The emperor Frederick II remarked drily that he would not speak about the sort of aid which the patriarch and the masters and brothers of the military orders had given him in the Holy Land, except to contrast it with the devoted assistance which he had received from the Teutonic order.⁷⁹

Moreover, the military orders were valued because of the influence a monarch might exercise in the Holy Land through them. Frederick particularly valued the Teutonic order because it protected his interests in the Holy Land. The same has been claimed for Henry II's donations to the orders of the Temple and Hospital. Charles of Anjou, king of Naples and Sicily, seems to have regarded the order of the Temple under Brother

⁷⁸Louis VII: *Etudes sur les actes de Louis VII*, ed. A. Luchaire, (Paris, 1885) pp.174-6, nos. 236, 239, 240; J. Tardif, ed., *Monuments Historiques*, (Paris, 1866) pp.267-8, no. 504. Louis IX: Cart., no.3303. Richard I: *ibid.*, no. 955. Andrew of Hungary: *Ibid.*, nos. 1590-1, 1602-3, 1803. Edward I: Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.280-282; Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, p.312.

⁷⁹*Monumenta Corbeiensia*, ed. P. Jaffé, *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum*, 1 (Berlin, 1864) pp.225-6 no.144; MGHL p.262.

William de Beaujeu in a similar light.⁸⁰

The value placed by monarchs on the military orders in the struggle against the enemies of Christendom is indicated by the frequency with which they were called upon to assist a monarch against non-Christians on his frontiers outside the Holy Land. In the crisis of the Tatar invasions of 1241, the Templars and Hospitallers of Silesia and Hungary fought alongside the royal army and lay barons, as any landholders would have done;⁸¹ but monarchs also called on the orders to act as defenders against non-Christians in the longer term. A monarch's expectations of the orders in this area were often disappointed, as the orders were generally unwilling to take up the burden of such assistance outside the Holy Land. This could be because they could not afford the additional drain on their resources, as appears to have been the case for the Templars when first invited to send brothers to Aragon; or because too many restrictions were placed upon them, as the Hospital apparently decided after making an agreement in 1247 to assist the king of Hungary against the Tatars; or that insufficient inducements and guarantees were offered to them, as the Teutonic order seems to have judged in the face of the initial offers of

⁸⁰Richard, *Latin Kingdom*, 1 pp.264-5, 266, 286; Mayer, 'Henry II of England,' 721-739; cf. Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, p.260, on Charles' possible influence on the election of Brother William de Beaujeu as master of the Temple; on Beaujeu's subsequent support for Charles' interests in the Holy Land, 'L'Estoire de Eracles empereur et la conqueste de la Terre d'Outremer,' RHC Occ 2 p.475; Richard, *Latin Kingdom*, 2 pp.413-7.

⁸¹Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, p.212-3; B. B. Szczesniak, *The Knights Hospitallers in Poland and Lithuania* (The Hague and Paris, 1969) p.19.

Conrad, Duke of Cujavia and Masovia, in the land of Culm.⁸² Monarchs, of course, were unwilling to offer more than was absolutely necessary, from a well-founded fear that the order would become too powerful and threaten their own authority. For this reason, the rulers of Livonia and Poland at first preferred to set up their own independent local orders which could be more easily controlled. Yet these suffered from the disadvantage that they lacked resources and could not attract recruits as easily as the more famous international orders.⁸³

Remarkably, the image of the orders was as defenders of only the frontiers of Christendom. Although some educated clergy thought otherwise,⁸⁴ monarchs did not regard them as defenders of Christendom from the enemy within. Where it was necessary to defend Catholicism against heretics or schismatics, i.e. in the south of France, the Latin empire of Constantinople and Italy, there was no appeal to the international military orders. Instead, in France and Italy, the local ruler or pope formed local orders, which were more responsive to local conditions and more easily controlled.⁸⁵ In the Latin empire of Constantinople, no local orders were

⁸²Forey, *Corona de Aragon*, pp.15-24; Kuhn, 'Ritterorden als Grenzhüter,' 52-9; H. Boockmann, *Der Deutsche Orden: Zwölf Kapitel aus Seiner Geschichte* (Munich, 1982) pp.68-69, 72-92.

⁸³Kuhn, 'Ritterorden als Grenzhüter,' 12-16, 26-42.

⁸⁴Forey, 'Military Orders and Holy War,' 2 (quoting Jacques de Vitry and Thomas Aquinas).

⁸⁵Housley, 'Politics and heresy in Italy,' 195-196; E. Delaruelle, 'Templiers et Hospitaliers en Languedoc pendant la croisade des Albegeois,' *Cahiers de Fanjeaux*, 4: *Paix de Dieu et guerre sainte en Languedoc en XIIIe siecle*, (1969) 315-334; Forey, 'Military orders and Holy War,' 2-4, 6-9, 14-15. But cf. Strehlke, no.131.

formed, but all religious orders which were granted territory were expected to perform military service for it.⁸⁶ Moreover, few monarchs saw the military orders as anything more than *defenders* of Christendom; there was little reference in the charters of monarchs to the military orders converting pagans to the Christian faith, which indicates that they did not consider that the orders were or should be involved in conversion; in contrast to the beliefs of the clergy.⁸⁷

Crusading was not only an indispensable part of kingship, but was also imposed on monarchs by dynastic tradition. A dynastic obligation to the crusade brought with it an obligation to patronize the military orders, or, at least, the obligation to follow one's ancestors to the Holy Land could be redeemed to some extent by patronage of the military orders. Beatrice Lees, in her study of the Templar Inquest of 1185, deduced that dynastic influences had prompted the generous donations of King Stephen and his wife Matilda to the order of the Temple; Stephen's father and uncle had been crusaders, while his queen was a niece of Godfrey de Bouillon and of

⁸⁶*Crusaders as conquerors: The chronicle of the Morea, translated from the Greek*, ed. H. E. Laurier (New York and London, 1964) pp.127, 130, 148-51; B. Bolton, 'A mission to the Orthodox? The Cistercians in Romania,' in D. Baker, ed., *Studies in Church History, 13: The Orthodox Churches and the West*, (Oxford, 1976) pp.180-1.

⁸⁷Three rulers of Aragon are the exceptions: Raymond-Berengar IV to the Hospital in 1143, Cart., no. 181; Peter II to the Temple, 17 Nov. 1208: Forey, *Corona de Aragon*, p.377; James I to the Hospital, 1221: Cart., no.1742.

Baldwin I, king of Jerusalem.⁸⁸ She did not, however, suggest such motives for the generous welcome which Henry I of England gave to Hugh de Payns in Normandy in 1128,⁸⁹ although Henry was himself the youngest brother of a crusader. It is equally likely that such patronage was prompted by piety and a desire to win divine favour through patronizing a new, virtuous order.

In any case, Stephen's successors continued his patronage of the orders of the Holy Land, often raising brothers of the Hospital and Temple to positions of the highest trust.⁹⁰ Besides the Temple and Hospital, other orders based in the Holy Land also received royal favour: the order of St. Lazarus received an annual pension from c.1184 onwards, and various privileges; the Teutonic order received an annual pension

⁸⁸*Records of the Templars in England in the twelfth century: the Inquest of 1185 with illustrative documents*, ed. B. A. Lees, *Records of Social and Economic History of England and Wales*, 9 (London, 1935) pp. xxxix-xl; *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum, 1066-1154*, 3, (1135-1154) ed. H. A. Cronne, R. H. C. Davis (Oxford, 1968) pp. 310-315, nos. 843-866 *passim*.

⁸⁹*The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: a revised translation*, ed. D. Whitelock, D. C. Douglas and S. Tucker (London, 1965) p. 194.

⁹⁰Henry II: letter of John, bishop of Poitou, to Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, 1165, in *Materials for the History of Archbishop Thomas Becket*, ed. J. C. Robertson, 7 vols., RS 67 (London, 1875-85) 5 pp. 220-1 no. 116. Richard I: Roger of Howden, *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols., RS 49 (London, 1867) 2 p. 173. John: Rymer's *Foedera*, 1, 1 p. 144. Henry III: Bulst-Thiele, 'Templer,' p. 296 (yet John fitzGeoffrey, note 43, was not Brother Geoffrey's son but Geoffrey fitzPeter's son); R. C. Stacey, *Politics, Policy and Finance under Henry III, 1216-1245* (Oxford, 1987) pp. 77, 115, 139-140, 141; Sandys, 'The London Temple,' p. 150. Edward I: Cart., nos. 3782, 3790; Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, p. 312.

following the marriage of Henry III's sister Isabel to the emperor Frederick II in spring 1235, while the order of St. Thomas of Acre claimed Richard I as its founder.⁹¹

Dynastic tradition can also be discerned as an influence both on crusading and on patronage of the military orders in the Capetian dynasty from Louis VI, but with a significant difference. Unlike the rulers of England, all French monarchs from Louis VII to Philip III were personally involved in crusading, although not necessarily to the Holy Land. Perhaps partly because of this, but also because of their need to centralize power rather than dispersing it in donations, French monarchs were less enthusiastic donors to the military orders than monarchs of England. However, certain individuals won particular favour: Brother Garin, a Hospitaller, was a close friend of both Philip II and Louis VIII, becoming bishop of Senlis and chancellor of France;⁹² the Templar Brother Amaury de la Roche was a trusted friend and servant of Louis IX; while the Templar Brother Arnulf of Wesemael was trusted by both

⁹¹Rymer's *Foedera*, 1,1 pp.40, 49 ; *Rotuli Chartarum in Turri Londiensi asservati*, ed. T. D. Hardy, (London, 1837) 1,1 (1199-1216) pp.67b-8; *Calendar of the Charter Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office*, vol. 1ff., 1226ff., (London, 1903ff.) 1 (1227-1257) p.200; Lloyd, *English Society*, p.240, note; Forey, 'St. Thomas of Acre,' 481-2, 494.

⁹²Brother Garin: the anonymous of Béthune, in RHGF 24, pp.764, 768; C. Petit-Dutaillis, *L'Étude sur la vie et le règne de Louis VIII, 1187-1226* (Paris, 1894) pp.221, 295, 335-6. See also p.445 for Brother Chrétien of the Temple, almoner of Louis VIII, and E. Hallam, 'Aspects of the monastic patronage of the English and French royal houses, c.1130-1270,' unpublished Ph.D. thesis (University of London, 1976) p.232.

Philip III and Philip IV.⁹³ These friendships indicate that the orders in general remained in the Capets' favour even when few or no donations were being made, and steps were being taken to recall donations which had been made in the past.⁹⁴

Dynastic tradition could work both ways; not only did it confer an obligation of patronage, but patronage could be used to reinforce dynastic tradition. The Staufen emperor Frederick II and his sons made much of the dynastic connection of the Staufen with the Teutonic order, partly based on the order's claim to be the descendant and heir of the German Hospital in Jerusalem prior to 1187.⁹⁵ After the destruction of the Staufen dynasty, subsequent kings of the Romans took up patronage of the order, but never to the same extent. The order was in any case widely patronized throughout the empire: William of Holland was merely following his father in protecting the order and endowing it, although in one charter

⁹³The evidence is set out in full by Bulst-Thiele, 'Templer,' pp.303-4, 307-8.

⁹⁴See below, pp.59-60.

⁹⁵Frederick II: HDFS 1 p.288, 2 p.224, 282, 3 pp.154-5, 497, 4 pp.393 (references to his grandfather, father and uncle, his grandfather and father, or his ancestors having founded and patronized the house); J. F. Böhmer, ed., *Regesta Imperii 5: Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs unter Philipp, Otto IV, Friedrich II, Heinrich (VII), Conrad IV, Heinrich Raspe, Wilhelm und Richard, 1198-1272*, ed. J. F. Böhmer, J. Ficker et al., 4 vols. (Innsbruck, Cologne and Vienna, 1881-1983) 1 no. 4542 (Conrad IV: refers to his father's gifts), no. 4715 (Manfred: states that his great-grandfather, Frederick I, founded the house, and that his grandfather and father fostered it) no.4774 (Conradin: reference to an alleged gift by his grandfather and father).

he specifically stated that he was following his imperial predecessor.⁹⁶ Likewise, Richard, Earl of Cornwall and king of the Romans, in a charter issued immediately after his election declared that he was confirming the order's liberties, privileges and rights as given by his predecessors; his promptness in issuing this charter indicates the importance for an imperial candidate in winning the order's support, and may indicate that the order had been instrumental in securing his election. In a later charter he referred to the time of the emperor Frederick and his son Henry.⁹⁷ Rudolf of Habsburg, count of Kybourg and landgrave of Alsace, took the order under his protection in the names of the emperor Frederick and his son Henry; but he also patronized the order of the Hospital, which had received little attention from his predecessors.⁹⁸

None of the German monarchs showed much interest in the order of the Temple, even when this order began to attract donations in Germany. This suggests that the image a monarch held of one or other of the military orders depended not only on his concern for the Holy Land or his dynastic connections with the Holy Land, but also on other factors. Attitudes towards the military orders varied with geography, political circumstances, and social differences.

In western Europe (France, the British Isles and Spain) the Temple was the most popular of the military orders until around 1185. This was partly the result of fashion: it was one of the most recently created religious orders, and, as Isaac of

⁹⁶*Regesta Imperii* 5, nos. 4897, 5128; reference to his predecessors: no. 5159.

⁹⁷*Ibid.*, nos. 5335, 5464.

⁹⁸J. F. Böhmer, ed., *Regesta Imperii 6: Die regesten des Kaiserreichs unter Rudolf, Adolf, Albrecht, Heinrich VII, 1273-1313*, ed. J. F. Böhmer, O. Redlich and V. Samanek, 2 vols. (Innsbruck, 1898-1948) nos. 33, 282, 288, 643, 810, 1044, 1069, 1627, 2257.

Etoile complained, the most recent idea is always the most popular.⁹⁹ The influence of St. Bernard seems to have been important in popularizing the order; in addition, the first master, Hugh de Payns, and some of his brothers, had made a tour of western Europe in 1128-9, publicizing their work and seeking alms. Hence the order was probably better known in Europe than other orders of the Holy Land.¹⁰⁰ There was great spiritual credit to be won in patronizing a new order, its virtue as yet unspotted, still poor and reliant on alms; as well as great political advantage in the long term, as a new order had no political ties and could be manipulated more easily than long-established orders. For the same reasons, Henry II and Richard I of England were enthusiastic patrons of the order of Grandmont.¹⁰¹

Another factor in the favour of the order of the Temple was its knighthood. When its rule was first approved at the council of Troyes, it was the only military monastic order.¹⁰² Whereas some of the clergy and even the papacy seem to have had doubts over the equality of the order of the Temple to other monastic orders, kings and their nobles and knights had no doubts.¹⁰³ Possibly they considered a military order to be more honest and high-principled than secular clergy or monks,

⁹⁹Sermon 48, in PL 194, cols. 1853-1856.

¹⁰⁰M. Barber, 'The origins of the order of the Temple,' *Studia Monastica*, 12 (1970) 229, 233-6, 237-8; and cf. D'Albon, *Cartulaire*, nos. 41, 45.

¹⁰¹E. M. Hallam, 'Henry II, Richard I and the order of Grandmont,' *Journal of Medieval History*, 1 (1975) 165-171.

¹⁰²Forey, 'The emergence of the military order,' 175-6.

¹⁰³See, e.g. the description of the donations given to the order 1128-9 in Barber, 'The origins of the order of the Temple,' 233-6.

who appear in twelfth-century knightly literature as treacherous, greedy, and cowardly.¹⁰⁴ It is notable that the order of the Temple was more popular with both Louis VII and Henry II than the order of the Hospital, although their respective heirs preferred the Hospital to the Temple. Although the Hospital had been performing a military role in the Holy Land since the 1130's, its military role was not generally recognized in the West until after the third crusade.¹⁰⁵ Apparently the popularity of this order among the monarchs of western Europe increased as its militarization became known, although it may also be contended that the order's popularity grew as knowledge of *all* its activities increased. Donors are more willing to give when they are fully aware of the uses which will be made of their money.

¹⁰⁴E.g., *La chanson de Roland*, ed. F. Whitehead (Oxford, 1946) lines 1605-7, 1876-81: date disputed, but probably early twelfth century: p.xiii, and see A. Moisan, *Répertoire des noms propres de personnes et de lieux cités dans les chansons de geste françaises et les oeuvres étrangères dérivés*, 5 vols (Geneva, 1986) I p.58; *Le couronnement de Louis: chanson de geste du XIIe siècle*, ed. E. Langlois, CFMA 22 (Paris, 1984) lines 1692-99: date: c.1130 (Moisan, p.38-9); *Les deux rédactions en vers du Moniage Guillaume: chansons de geste du XIIe siècle*, ed. W. Cloetta, 2 vols., SATF (Paris, 1906-11) II lines 510-521, 637-646, 669-676, 1039-41: date: before 1180 (see Moisan, p.54); *Le moniage Rainouart 1, publié d'après les manuscrits de l'Arsenal et de Boulogne*, ed. G. A. Bertin, SATF (Paris, 1973) *passim*, especially lines 3169-3202, 3279-93, 3375-96, 3837-3905, 4943-74, 5491-97: date: 1190-1200 (p.lxxvii).

¹⁰⁵Forey, 'The militarization of the Hospital,' 75-89; chroniclers hardly ever mention the deeds of the Hospitallers before 1187, Lambert Waterlos being the exception: *Annales Cameracenses*, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGHS 16, p.547; Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, p.86, note 1.

In Germany and Eastern Europe, attitudes to the individual military orders were entirely different. The order of the Temple attracted very little patronage in the twelfth century, except in Lorraine, Bavaria, and Brunswick. The first, of course, borders on Champagne, where the order originated: Michael Schüpferling judged that the house here, in Metz, dated from St. Bernard's visit to the city in 1133. He connected the acquisitions of land in Bavaria and Brunswick to the pilgrimages to the Holy Land of Duke Welf of Bavaria (1168) and Duke Henry the Lion of Saxony (1173) respectively.¹⁰⁶ It was thought by Hans Prutz that King Lothair II (1125-1137) gave the commandery of Supplingenburg to the order before 1130, but the charter evidence does not begin until the thirteenth century.¹⁰⁷ In contrast, the Hospital began to attract patronage during the first half of the twelfth century: a gift of land at Mailberg and Zogelsdorf in Austria was confirmed by King Conrad III sometime between 1138 and 1152, and again by the emperor Frederick I in 1156.¹⁰⁸ In 1158 and 1185 the emperor Frederick I confirmed the order's liberties and privileges in his estates. His first charter of this sort for the Temple was issued in November 1184, which indicates that the Temple accumulated estates in Germany much more slowly than

¹⁰⁶M. Schüpferling, *Der Tempelherren-orden in Deutschland. Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde von der philos.fakultät der Universität Freiburg in der Schweiz* (Bamberg, 1915) pp.14-15, 69-70, 87-88.

¹⁰⁷*Ibid.*, p.91; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, p.211.

¹⁰⁸Cart., no.246; this was given by Karold, a nobleman, in gratitude for the hospitality he had received from the order in the Holy Land. Cf. no.81 (?1128).

did the Hospital.¹⁰⁹

The earliest royal donation in Hungary to the order of the Hospital was made by King Stephen III in 1168; the earliest royal gift to the Temple was apparently not until 1198, when King Henry gave the order in Hungary liberties and exemptions. In his will he gave two thirds of his property to the Temple and the Hospital, for the Holy Land.¹¹⁰ The first gift by a ruler of Bohemia to the Hospital in Jerusalem was made by King Wladislas II in 1169;¹¹¹ the order was particularly favoured by his successors, who greatly praised its charitable work in their charters, but made little mention of its military activity.¹¹² The Temple did not receive a royal donation in Bohemia until the 1220s.¹¹³

The initial indifference to the order of the Temple in

¹⁰⁹Cart., nos. 270, 764; *Die Reichskanzler vernehmlich des X, XI und XII Jahrhunderts nebst einem Beitrage zu den Regesten und zur Kritik der Kaiserurkunden dieser Zeit*, ed. K. F. Stumpf-Bretano, vol.3: *Acta Imperii adhuc inedita: Acta Imperii inde ab Henrico I ad Henricum VI usque adhuc inedita, Urkunden des Kaiserreichs aus dem X, XI, und XII Jahrhunderts* (Innsbruck, 1865-1881) 1 p.739 no.528; this may have been a result of the papal-imperial conference in Verona in November 1184: Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, pp.199-200.

¹¹⁰Pressutti, no. 5912; Cart., no.1218.

¹¹¹Wladislas II, king of Bohemia, Cart. nos. 278, 401.

¹¹²Cf. Cart., no.2132: a charter of Premysl, Margrave of Moravia and later King of Bohemia, which refers to the brothers as 'fighting for God.' However, this seems to refer to their monastic life rather than to their fighting the Saracens.

¹¹³Schüpferling, p.163; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, p.211 note 4.

these areas was clearly not caused by indifference to the Holy Land, as the order of the Hospital was welcomed. It is possible that the rulers of Germany and eastern Europe were adverse to the order of the Temple because it was a French order, and much favoured by the king of France, notably during the second crusade. The fact that some near-contemporary German sources claimed that the Templars had betrayed King Conrad III at the siege of Damascus in 1148 seems to have been a result of this xenophobia.¹¹⁴ The Hospital, on the other hand, although it was also predominantly a French order and favoured by the king of France, had been founded by Amalfi merchants, and therefore may have been seen as being more international in character.

Again, the Temple's close connection to the papacy may have prejudiced the emperor and his supporters against it; but the Hospital was equally close to the papacy, while the Templars were not inexorably anti-imperial. In February 1160, after the newly-elected pope, Alexander III, had fled Rome and Octavian of Monticelli, the emperor's candidate, had been elected in his place as Pope Victor IV, the master and brothers of the Temple of Jerusalem in Monte Aventino rendered their obedience to Victor.¹¹⁵

Another hypothesis is that the Temple in Germany and eastern Europe held no attraction as a knightly order, for the knights of Germany lacked the prestige and 'class-awareness' of their counterparts further west. Not until the late twelfth century, when the ideals of knighthood began to filter in from France, did German knights begin to regard their social order

¹¹⁴ *Annales Herbipolenses*, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGHS 16 p.7; John of Würzburg, *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae*, PL 155, col. 1087: cf. col. 1085 on the Hospital and col. 1082 against the French (written c.1170); John of Salisbury, *Historia pontificalis*, ed. M. Chibnall (London and Edinburgh, 1956) p.57 on the king of France (written 1164).

¹¹⁵ MGHC 1 p.261 para.4.

with pride. They then took up the idea of a military order with enthusiasm, but, because of hostility to anything French, founded their own German order, reforming the Teutonic Hospital at Acre into a combined military/hospitaller order of the kind they had admired in the Hospital of St. John. However, even this hypothesis cannot be stated with confidence, as it has recently been shown by Jean Flori that the concept of knighthood was far more developed among German writers in the twelfth century than it was among French writers, and that the Church deliberately encouraged the growth of a knightly ethic within the Empire as a result of the dispute between papacy and emperor, transferring to knights the moral duties traditionally ascribed to the emperor. Hence it is probable that German knights were aware of the individuality and importance of their `class` long before French knights. Again, even though German knights, or *ministeriales*, were unfree in law, by the end of the twelfth century they had much power and influence and were calling themselves *nobiles* and *domini*, as knights did in France.¹¹⁶

The explanation probably lies in a combination of factors. It may even be that the Temple, lacking the resources to penetrate into Germany, did not attempt to solicit donations in this area.

Finally, the orders' political connections could be a decisive influence on royal patronage. For instance, King Leo I of Armenia's affection for the Teutonic order was undoubtedly due to its connections with the German emperor, who had given him his crown.¹¹⁷ Alfonso I of Aragon seems to have been more impressed by the papal connections of the orders of the

¹¹⁶Flori, *L'Essor de la chevalerie*, pp. 231, 253-7, 257-63, 266-7, 329f; B. Arnold, *German Knighthood 1050-1300* (Oxford, 1985) pp.53-55, 69-75.

¹¹⁷J. Riley-Smith, 'The Templars and the Teutonic knights in Cilician Armenia,' in T. S. R. Boase, ed., *The Cilician kingdom of Armenia* (Edinburgh, 1978) p.111ff.

Hospital, Temple and Holy Sepulchre when he bequeathed his kingdom to them than by their work on behalf of Christendom.¹¹⁸ For King John of England after May 1213, and the government of his son's minority, the papal connections of the orders of the Temple and Hospital were invaluable; they were among the few whom the royal government could trust.¹¹⁹ For Frederick II, support of the Teutonic order in Prussia and the Swordbrothers in Livonia enabled him to extend his claims of imperial suzerainty over these distant regions.¹²⁰

(ii) Changes in patronage, and the growth of criticism

The difference in patterns of donation between western and eastern Europe continued into the late thirteenth century. In western Europe, the favour shown by monarchs to the orders, relying on their members in government and showering the orders with privileges and property, inevitably led to the orders becoming too powerful and independent for monarchs' liking. As a result, no further donations were given, and monarchs took steps to recover land and privileges previously granted away. The same occurred in Hungary, but not in Bohemia, where the

¹¹⁸E. Lourie, 'The will of Alfonso I, 'El Batallador,' king of Aragon and Navarre: a reassessment,' *Speculum*, 50, (1975) 635-51.

¹¹⁹E.g. Bulst-Thiele, 'Templer,' pp.297-9; although the brothers appear in the royal records spasmodically in the early years of John's reign, they appear far more frequently after 1213: *Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum in Turri Londinensi asservati*, ed. T. D. Hardy, 2 vols. (London, 1833-44) *passim*; *Rotuli Litterarum Patentium in Turri Londinensi asservati*, ed. T. D. Hardy, (London, 1835) *passim*; Patent Rolls, 1216-1225, *passim*.

¹²⁰HDFS, 2 pp.549-52, 583-5 (March and May, 1226): Frederick was giving rights he did not possess.

orders continued to attract donations from the monarch.¹²¹

It is probable that the lack of generosity shown by Philip II of France, for example, towards the order of the Temple was an indirect result of his father's many gifts to the order: he wished to recover royal power for the crown, not to grant it away, and took steps to recover royal rights from the orders of the Temple and Hospital, giving little. This was continued by his son.¹²² Elsewhere in western Europe, monarchs were also becoming concerned about loss of royal demense and dues through mortmain, and taking steps to prevent it, culminating in England with the statute of mortmain of 14 Nov. 1279.¹²³ In Sicily, Frederick II enacted what he claimed to be an ordinance of his predecessors which prevented any religious order from acquiring in mortmain any hereditament. This was applied to the Teutonic order as well as to the Temple and Hospital. However, the allegiance of the Temple and Hospital to the papacy was claimed to be a factor behind this measure: the

¹²¹The military orders do not seem to have been much affected by the recovery of alienated imperial property in Germany by Rudolf of Habsburg. I have found no evidence for the Hospital or Temple, while the Teutonic order was spared: Strehlke, pp.243-4, no.266.

¹²²*Recueil des Actes de Philippe Auguste, roi de France*, ed. H.-Fr. Delaborde, C. Petit-Dutaillis *et al.*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1916-1979) 4 pp. 403-5 no.1736; *Layettes du Trésor des chartes*, ed. A. Teulet *et al.*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1863-1909) 2 pp. 117, 319, nos. 1914, 2453, 3 p.116, no.3917.

¹²³See, for example, S. Raban, *Mortmain legislation and the English Church, 1279-1500*, (Cambridge, 1982) pp.21-3.; P. A. Brand, 'Control of Mortmain alienation in England, 1200-1300,' in J. H. Baker, ed., *Legal Records and the Historian* (London, 1978) pp.29-40.

orders were a threat to Frederick's authority.¹²⁴ Louis XI of France and his successors gave the orders of the Temple and Hospital nothing but confirmation charters, while continuing to restrict previously-won privileges.¹²⁵ Whereas Philip II had been generous to these two orders and to the kingdom of Jerusalem in his will, Louis IX and his son Philip III left nothing.¹²⁶ Presumably, they considered that these orders were already sufficiently well endowed, and less deserving than the friars and hospitals to whom the bulk of their bequests were made. There is no reason to doubt the words of Richard Mepham, dean of Lincoln, speaking at the second council of Lyons in 1274, stating that many kings and princes were of the opinion that the military orders had no need of further financial assistance, as they had vast possessions which would be quite adequate to support an army, if they were realized.¹²⁷ The

¹²⁴HDFS 4 pp.227-9, 3 pp.73-5, 5 pp.252-3.

¹²⁵Charters for the orders: L. Delisle, ed., *Cartulaire Normand de Philippe-Auguste, Louis VIII, Saint Louis et Philippe le Hardi* (Caen, 1882, reprinted Geneva, 1978) nos. 601, 797; Cart., no.3303; acts restricting or reducing the orders' privileges: *Layettes*, 4 pp.387-8 no.5583; Le comte Beugnot, ed., *Les Olim ou registres des Arrêts rendus par la cour du Roi*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1839-48) 1 pp.647, 929, 2 pp.193, 248-9; E. Boutaric, ed., *Actes du Parlement de Paris*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1863-7, reprinted Hildesheim/New York, 1975) 1 no. 2025; Cart., nos. 2900, 2968, 3011, 3411, 3416, 3418, 3479, 4072, 4100; and cf. *Cartulaire Normand*, no.993.

¹²⁶*Recueil des actes de Philippe Auguste*, 4 pp.471-2, no.1796; *Layettes*, 4 pp.419-21 no.5638; L. d'Achery, and L. F. T. de la Bavière, eds., *Spicilegium sive collectio veterum aliquot scriptorum qui in Galliae Bibliothecis delituerant*, 3 vols. (new edn., Paris, 1723) 3 pp.691-2.

¹²⁷*Councils and Synods*, 2,2 p.815.

monarchs of Europe were concerned to obtain value for money, not only in relation to the military orders, but in regard to all religious orders. This concern illustrates not so much distrust and dissatisfaction with the military orders in particular by 1274, but with religious orders in general.

Just as the newest religious order was considered to be the most virtuous, so the well-established orders, those most favoured by a monarch's predecessors, could be seen as corrupt and in need of reform simply because they were too familiar a part of the administration. This probably accounts for the fact that, after c.1250, the order of the Hospital became more popular at the English court than the order of the Temple. After 1255 the post of royal almoner was filled by a secular clerk, instead of a Templar as formerly. After 1266 the Temple acted less and less frequently as part of the royal wardrobe.¹²⁸ Brother Rocelin de Fos, master of the Temple in England between 1252-1256, was a trusted servant of the king and high in his affections,¹²⁹ but his successors were not so well-favoured. Although the king still gave gifts to the masters of the Temple in England, he preferred the priors of

¹²⁸Johnstone, 'Poor relief,' p.163; Sandys, 'the London Temple,' p.151.

¹²⁹Bulst-Thiele, 'Templer,' pp.299-300; he was master in England until 1256: *Close Rolls of the reign of Henry III preserved in the Public Record Office, 1227ff.*, (London, 1902ff.) (1254-1256) p.423. See also *ibid.*, (1251-1253) p.428; W. Shirley, ed., *Royal and other historical letters illustrative of the reign of Henry III, from the originals in the Public Record Office*, 2 vols., RS 27 (London, 1862-66) 2 pp.69-70, 70-71, 76-81, 83, 91-2.

the Hospital.¹³⁰

In addition, although in 1231 Henry and his wife, Eleanor of Provence, had bequeathed their bodies to the order of the Temple, in 1245 Henry had begun to rebuild the abbey church at Westminster as a shrine for St. Edward the Confessor, and he later gave his body to this, his own foundation, revoking his earlier gift to the Temple.¹³¹ With this new foundation, Henry seems to have turned his back on the patterns of patronage laid down by his father and grandfather, and correspondingly reduced the Temple's importance in his administration. He began to replace the Templars with the Hospitallers; his son Edward followed him, appointing his friend Brother Joseph de Chauncy as royal treasurer. The Hospitallers under Edward attained the importance that the Temple had held under his grandfather and

¹³⁰One Brother Robert de Manneby received particular favour; presumably he was the same as the prior of the Hospital in England, 1256-62: *Calendar of the Patent Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office*, 1216ff. (London, 1901ff.)(1247-1258) pp.170, 343, 359, 391, 454, 460, 555, (1258-1266) p.366. The Temple received its accustomed gifts in alms and deer (*Close Rolls*, 1247ff, *passim*; *Calendar of the Liberate Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III*, 6 vols. (London, 1916-1964) 4 pp.53-4) in addition to individual gifts: *Close Rolls* (1251-1253) p.279, (1261-1264) p.53 (Brother Robert Scrop), (1264-1268) p.4; *Patent Rolls*, (1258-1266) pp.586-7. However, the Hospital received more individual gifts: *Close Rolls*, (1251-1253) pp.30, 152, (1256-1259) pp.92, 217, 240, 372-3, (1259-1261) p.416-7, (1261-1264) pp.79, 82, 83, 360, (1264-1268) p.274, (1268-1272) p.361; Cart., no.3427.

¹³¹*Charter Rolls*, 1 pp.135, 210-1; W. Dugdale, ed., *Monasticon Anglicanum*, new ed., 6,2 (London, 1830) p.818 nos. 1,2;cf. E. Hallam, 'Royal burial and the cult of kingship in France and England, 1060-1330,' *Journal of Medieval History*, 8 (1982) 372.

father; although the Temple was still favoured.¹³² Like the London Temple, the Hospital at Clerkenwell was becoming an important financial centre: the first recorded instance in the Close Rolls of its use as a place for the payment of debts was in September 1276.¹³³

In contrast, at the French court the order of the Temple seems to have been more highly favoured after 1250,¹³⁴ whereas, under Philip II and Louis VIII, the Hospital had been the more highly favoured of the two orders. In 1307 Philip IV claimed to have trusted the Templars so completely that he had entrusted his sons to them to be educated. The Temple of Paris also continued to act as royal treasury, a witness to the order's reputation for integrity and efficiency, at least in comparison to other royal servants.¹³⁵

In Hungary, the situation was similar to that further west. King Andrew of Hungary made donations to all three of

¹³²Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, p.312; *Calendar of the Close Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office. Edward I.* (London, 1900ff.) (1271-1279) p.32; special concessions to the Hospital: *ibid.*, p.378; *Patent Rolls* (1281-1292) p.113; cf. *List of Ancient Correspondence of the Chancery and Exchequer preserved in the Public Record Office, P.R.O.* Lists and Indexes 15 (reprinted New York, 1968) 18, no.134; gifts to both orders: *Close Rolls* (1279-1288) pp.209, 335, 392; *Patent Rolls*, (1281-1292) p.442.

¹³³*Close Rolls* (1272-1279) p.428; also, for loans by the order: (1279-1288) pp. 347, 479, 480, 534, (1288-1296) pp.30, 34, 49. No such loans had hitherto been recorded in the Close Rolls.

¹³⁴*Registres d'Urbain IV*, no. 760; Bulst-Thiele, 'Templer,' pp.303-4, 306-8.

¹³⁵William Rishanger, *Chronica et annales*, ed. H. T. Riley, RS 28,2 (London, 1865) p.493; L. Delisle, 'Mémoire,' pp.40-61.

the major military orders,¹³⁶ but these gifts were subsequently revoked, from the Teutonic order by Andrew himself and from the Temple and Hospital by his successor, Bela IV (1235-1270). The Teutonic order suffered because its power and independence in the land of Burza were viewed as a threat to the king; the other confiscations, which affected all religious orders, were claimed by Bela to have been necessary because of the poverty of the kingdom following the Tatar invasions.¹³⁷ As in western Europe, the kings of Hungary seem to have considered that monastic orders in general and the military orders in particular had sufficient resources of their own, and that the kingdom had given enough.

In Bohemia, in contrast, patronage towards the military orders continued, although the order of the Temple received little: Wenceslas I (1228-1253) founded a house of the Temple in Prague in the 1230's, as well as houses of Friars Preacher and Minor, and the Poor Clares; while Wenceslas II was said to have adopted a Templar as his counsellor, one Brother Berthold of Gepzenstein, who had been in the entourage of Duke Rudolf,

¹³⁶Temple: Thomas of Spalato, *Historia Pontificum Salonitanorum et Spalatinorum*, ed. L. von Heinemann, MGHS 29 p.578; Pressutti, no. 5913; Hospital: Cart., nos. 1590-1, 1602-3, 1803; Teutonic order: Strehlke, nos. 158-160, 163.

¹³⁷Teutonic order: Strehlke, nos. 166-8; Boockmann, pp.68-9; Temple and Hospital: *Registres de Gregoire IX*, no. 2917; Hospital: Cart., nos. 2135, 2182, 2896, 2920; see also gifts, *ibid.*, nos. 2198, 2445, 3124, 3265. The order of St. Lazarus also suffered in the confiscations.

son of King Rudolf of the Romans.¹³⁸ Yet this may have been an error for a Hospitaller or a Teutonic knight, as the Hospital and Teutonic order attracted considerable patronage from the rulers of Bohemia.¹³⁹

In the case of the Teutonic order, this was because the rulers of Bohemia had a great interest in acquiring authority in Prussia. In a confirmation charter to the Teutonic order in 1251, while he was ruler but not yet king of Bohemia, Premysl Ottokar II declared that he was issuing the charter because of the `continual labour which the brothers faithfully and frequently perform in overseas parts and also in Prussia for the Church of God against the barbarity of the pagans.`¹⁴⁰ In 1254 he led a crusade to Prussia and worked in cooperation with the Teutonic order, financing the building of a fortress in Samland, named Königsberg in his honour. However, the order did not entirely trust his motives: when he took the cross in 1260 to go against the Tatars, Pope Alexander IV ordered him not to enter the order`s lands without the brothers`

¹³⁸Wenceslai I regis historia,` ed. D. R. Köpke, MGHS 9 pp.18, 167; *Die Königsaaaler Geschichts-Quellen mit den zusätzen und der Fortsetzung des Domherrn Franz von Prag*, ed. J. Loserth, *Fontes rerum Austricarum*, 1, 8 (Vienna, 1875) pp.99-100; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus* p.283.

¹³⁹E.g., Teutonic order: *Codex Diplomaticus et Epistolaris regni Bohemiae*, ed. G. Friedrich et al., 5 vols. in 7 (Prague, 1904-1981) 4 nos. 276, 209, 223, 433, 5 nos. 39, 210, 265, 514, 653; *Preuß. UB* 1,1 no.305; *UB Thüringen*, no.174; Hospital: *Cart.*, nos. 2548, 2549, 2685, 2777, 2803, 2850, 2999, 3072, 3315, 3324, 3438, 3689, 3707, 3738.

¹⁴⁰*Cod. Dip. Boh.* 4 no.209.

consent.¹⁴¹ In contrast, his favour for the Hospital seems to have been based entirely on its hospitable work; a gift of 1254 was given 'for the use of the poor,' because it was the order's 'special sollicitude to feed and give drink to the poor of Christ.'¹⁴²

Although the reduction in royal patronage seems to have been due at least in part to a belief that the military orders were no longer living up to their original high spiritual standards, there are few recorded instances of monarchs openly criticizing their spirituality. Some royal criticism of the military orders was prompted by dissatisfaction with the spiritual standards of the clergy as a whole. Although knighthood seems to have been an important factor in attracting or discouraging the patronage of monarchs, royal criticism of the clergy indicates that by the end of the twelfth century the Templars were also conceived of as monks, as much as the Cistercians or Benedictines. Roger of Howden recorded a tale of this time, describing how Richard I of England responded to a challenge from the famous preacher Fulk of Neuilly. Rebuked for his three 'daughters,' pride, greed and sensuality, Richard retorted that he had married pride to the Templars, greed to the Cistercians, and sensuality to the prelates. This tale was repeated by Gerald of Wales, Matthew Paris and (in the fourteenth century) Walter of Guisborough, with some variations: Gerald, as an aspiring prelate himself, substituted

¹⁴¹*Cod. Dip. Boh.* 5 no.235; and cf. no. 514; MGHES 3 p.692 no.670 for Ottokar's later plans for advance in Prussia in cooperation with the Teutonic order; E. Christensen, *Baltic Crusade*, p.102.

¹⁴²Cart., no.2685.

the black monks for the prelates.¹⁴³

By 1250 the Hospital was also being included. Matthew Paris recorded Henry III of England declaring to the prior of the Hospital in England:

‘You prelates and religious, but especially Templars and Hospitallers, have so many liberties and charters, that your superfluous possessions make you proud, and your pride makes you mad. Therefore what was imprudently conceded should be prudently revoked, and what was unadvisedly dispersed, advisedly revoked.’¹⁴⁴

Much as Matthew Paris was inclined to place his own opinions in the mouths of others, these words are compatible with Henry’s general policy of recovering rights granted away by himself and his predecessors to the Church, and probably represent his actual opinion.

The so-called ‘satirical will’ attributed to Frederick II on his deathbed, and therefore dating from around the same date as Henry III’s complaints, also sees the Templars and Hospitallers as religious, no more and no less troublesome than other prominent orders. According to this, as Frederick was dying, the religious orders came importuning him for some legacy. He therefore drew up a will, bequeathing, firstly, to the Templars and Hospitallers pride, ‘which they ought to have forever, as long as their order lasts,’ secondly, to the Friars Preacher and Minor discord, ‘which they ought to have as long as the spirit quickens their flesh and bones,’ to the grey and black brethren avarice, ‘as long as the world remains,’ and to

¹⁴³Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. W. Stubbs, 4 vols., RS 57 (London, 1868-71) 4 pp.76-77; Gerald of Wales, 4 p.54, 6 p.44; Matthew Paris, *Flores Historiarum*, ed. H. R. Luard, 3 vols., RS 95 (London, 1890) 2 pp.116-7.

¹⁴⁴Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 5 p.339.

the white brethren sensuality `for ever and ever, Amen.`¹⁴⁵

It is unclear how far such criticisms of the orders affected contemporaries. Contemporaries were probably well aware that royal criticism of the military orders was usually prompted by political goals rather than dissatisfaction with the orders' discharge of their vocation or their spiritual standards. In the case of the emperor Frederick II, his criticism of the military orders, in particular, of the order of the Temple, was inspired by his struggle with the papacy, which the order of the Temple supported faithfully. When the order's officials were submissive to him, he was full of praise for them. His attitude to the military orders was shaped by his concept of his office and the extent to which they were prepared to conform to this, rather than by their own merits.¹⁴⁶ As his contemporaries could not have been ignorant of this, it is hardly surprising that his specific criticisms of the order of the Temple were not taken up, or, at least, were seldom recorded. Frederick's blame of the order of the Temple and the barons of the Holy Land for the disaster at La Forbie in October 1244 was not repeated by any contemporary

¹⁴⁵E. Winkelmann, ed., *Acta inedita seculi XIII: Urkunden und Briefe zur Geschichte des Kaiserreichs und des Konigreichs Sicilien in den Jahren 1198 bis 1273*, (Innsbruck, 1880) 1 p.370 no.437.

¹⁴⁶HDFS 5 pp.727-8; H. M. Schaller, 'Die Kaiseridee Friedrichs II,' in Fleckenstein, ed., *Probleme um Friedrich II*, pp.109-134, especially pp.130-1.

chronicler except Matthew Paris.¹⁴⁷ Hence it became known to later writers, but not to contemporaries. On the other hand, a tale of the Hospital and Temple's attempt to murder him during his crusade, although only recorded by Matthew Paris during his lifetime, reappears half a century later, admittedly somewhat altered, in the work of the Sicilian and anti-papalist Bartholomew of Neocastro. It is therefore possible that his criticisms circulated orally among his supporters, although they were not recorded in writing.¹⁴⁸ In the same way, at the second council of Lyons, James I of Aragon criticized the Templars' seeming lack of enthusiasm for a crusade, in order to enhance his own image as an eager crusader and faithful servant of the pope: he was hoping that the pope would agree to crown him. No doubt fully aware of this, the rest of the delegates supported the master of the Temple rather than the king.¹⁴⁹

Monarchs not only criticized the military orders

¹⁴⁷Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 4 p.302, *Flores* 2 pp.264, 272; other contemporary chroniclers mention the battle but do not ascribe blame: Burton Annals, in *Annales Monastici*, ed. H. R. Luard, 5 vols., RS 36 (London, 1864-69)1 pp.257-63; Waverley Annals, *ibid.*, 2 pp.334-5; 'Eracles,' pp.429-431; *The Chronicle of Melrose: a facsimile edition*, ed. A. O. and M. O. Anderson (London, 1936) p.95; 'Annales S. Pantaleonis Coloniensis,' ed. H. Cardauns, MGHS 22 p.539; 'Annales S. Rudberti Salisbergensis,' ed. D. W. Wattenbach, MGHS 9 p.788; 'Annales Ianuensis,' in *Annali Genovesi di Caffaro e de'suoi continuatori dal MXCIX al MCCXCIII*, ed. L. T. Belgrano and C. I. di Sant'Angelo, new edition, 5 vols., *Fonti per la Storia Italia* nos. 11-14bis (Rome, 1890-1929) 3 p.157.

¹⁴⁸Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 3 pp. 177-9; Bartholomew of Neocastro, pp.116-7; cf. HDFS 3 p.491 note 1, 5 p.708.

¹⁴⁹*Chronicle of James I*, pp. 646-653; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, p.262.

themselves, but caused criticism to arise. Sometimes this was done without any evil intention. For instance, in Sicily between 1268 and 1272, Charles of Anjou, king of Naples and Sicily, succeeded in making the usually inoffensive order of St. Lazarus extremely unpopular by enforcing in the order's favour a law that all lepers must be segregated from healthy persons and be compelled to live in leper houses. The lepers' families violently resisted the enforcement of this law, particularly because the order of St. Lazarus received the lepers' worldly goods.¹⁵⁰ Close relations with monarchs involved the orders in political events which they would otherwise have avoided: for instance, the Teutonic order's dependence on the emperor Frederick II implied its inclusion with those excommunicated as his adherents.¹⁵¹ On the other side of the coin, Frederick II's dispute with the papacy antagonized German chroniclers against the orders of the Temple and Hospital; this will be examined in the next chapter.

Connections between the brothers in a particular kingdom and its king frequently conflicted with the order's interests elsewhere and its international interests as a whole. This occurred, for example, in 1160, when the Templars entrusted with the safekeeping of three castles in the Vexin, an area disputed between Henry II of England and Louis VII of France, surrendered them to Henry II in circumstances which were strictly legal but suspicious. Louis had the Templars responsible exiled from France, but Henry welcomed and honoured them. This episode diminished the Templars in the esteem of

¹⁵⁰R. Filangieri, ed., *I Registri della cancelleria Angioina*, vols. 1ff. (Naples, 1950ff.) 2 pp.65-6, no.234, 7 pp.274-5, no.29, 8 p.110, no.105.

¹⁵¹Boockmann, p.98.

the English chroniclers, to say nothing of the French.¹⁵² Philip of Novara's memoirs show the Templars, Hospitallers and Cistercians winning nothing but contempt from the young Balian of Ibelin for their attempts to remain in the favour of the emperor Frederick and the pope following the treaty of San Germano.¹⁵³ Marie Luise Bulst-Thiele has suggested that Philip II of France was less favourable towards the order of the Temple than his father had been because of the order's close links with the English monarchy.¹⁵⁴

Around 1240, Innocent IV angrily accused brothers of the Temple and Hospital and the Teutonic order of assisting the emperor Frederick II in Italy. Elsewhere, however, the orders had suffered at the emperor's hands; even the property of the Teutonic order in Sicily was confiscated.¹⁵⁵ In 1288, Alfonso III, king of Aragon, wrote in fury to the marshal and convent of the Hospital because, despite the favour which his ancestors had shown the order, brothers of the Hospital had assisted the French during their invasion of Aragon in 1285, and the order

¹⁵²Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, 1 p.218; William of Newburgh, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, in R. Howlett, ed., *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I*, 4 vols., RS 82 (London, 1884-90) 1, p.159; *Records of the Templars*, pp.lii and note, 273.

¹⁵³Philip of Novara in *Les Gestes des Chiprois, recueil de chroniques françaises écrites en orient aux XIII et XIV siècles*, ed. G. Raynaud, SOL (Paris, 1887, reprinted Osnabrück, 1968) pp.86-8.

¹⁵⁴Bulst-Thiele, 'Templer,' p.294.

¹⁵⁵Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.190, 215 note 21; Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, pp.173-5; Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii V*, 1 no.4637.

was currently persecuting his friends and relatives.¹⁵⁶ Such conflicts of loyalty were inevitable for an international order whose members were trusted by rival monarchs as officials and ministers.

Association of individual brothers with popular or unpopular monarchs affected their image in the eyes of onlookers: Brother Garin the Hospitaller, servant of Philip II and Louis VIII of France, was much admired by 'Anonymous of Béthune' and William the Breton, although some were shocked by his coarse sense of humour, and Innocent III rebuked him for supporting Philip II's attempt to divorce his queen, Ingeborg.¹⁵⁷ Garin served popular kings; in contrast, Brother Geoffrey the Templar, almoner of Henry III of England, was heartily disliked by Matthew Paris simply because the chronicler disliked the king.¹⁵⁸

To sum up: while the enmity of a monarch could render the orders' privileges worthless, as in Sicily under Frederick II, the support of the monarch gave individual brothers temporary power and influence, but it did not necessarily benefit the order in the long term or at an international level. Like popes, emperors and kings did not give gifts for nothing. Apart from the spiritual credit to be gained, they expected service: even if not the feudal services from which the

¹⁵⁶Cart., no.4007.

¹⁵⁷Anonymous of Béthune, RHGF 24 pp.764, 766, 768; William the Breton, 'Gesta Philippi Augusti,' 175, 182-196, in *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton, historiens de Philippe-Auguste*, ed. H. F. Delaborde, 2 vols. (Paris, 1882-5)pp.256-7, 267-288; Registers of Innocent III, 15 no.107, PL 216 cols. 618-9.

¹⁵⁸Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 3 pp.412, 629; Sandys, 'London Temple,' p.150; R. Vaughan, *Matthew Paris* (Cambridge, 1958) pp.147, 261.

military orders were customarily exempted, then service as confidential advisers, ambassadors, treasurers; sometimes undertaking missions too dangerous for anyone else.¹⁵⁹ Yet the military orders generally accepted this, and, despite their exempt status, regarded the monarch of the realm as their liege lord. In 1164 Brother Geoffrey Fulcher, preceptor of the Temple in France, wrote from the Holy Land to Louis VII, 'his dearest lord,' assuring him that he had carried out his instructions to the word: 'Don't think that what I rejoiced to receive from your mouth when I left you, has slipped from your servant's mind.' Over a century later, circa July 1280, Nicholas le Lorgne, master of the Hospital, wrote to Edward I of England: 'to the very high and powerful lord and most especial benefactor beyond all other princes and lords of land, my lord Edward...his own in all things, Brother Nicholas le Lorgne...in all honour and all reverence, greetings and ready will to all his royal commands and pleasures.'¹⁶⁰ In 1274 the representatives of the Temple and Hospital at the second council of Lyons declared: 'We are sons of and directly subject to the sacrosanct Roman Church and we will be, as the Lord acts, in the future. We are and will be sons of

¹⁵⁹E.g., *Recueil des actes de Henri II*, 1 pp.407-8, no.262; *Patent Rolls*, (1258-1266) pp.476-7.

¹⁶⁰RHGF 16 pp.38-9 no.124; RRH no.398; Champollion-Figeac, ed., *Lettres de rois, reines et autres personnages des cours de France et d'Angleterre depuis Louis VII jusqu'à Henri IV*, 1 (Paris, 1839) pp.338-9, no.253.

obedience...¹⁶¹ Yet Brother Hermann of Salza, master of the Teutonic order, who described himself 'as one who loves the honour of the Church and Empire and is intent on the exaltation of both' was bitterly experienced in the dilemma that faced an order which served two masters.¹⁶² The military orders' success was their undoing. Indispensable to pope and monarchs, their spiritual image suffered as they grew wealthy and their brothers obtained positions of responsibility and influence, while their worldly allegiances, often conflicting, hampered their pursuit of their military vocation.

¹⁶¹P. Amargier, 'La défense du Temple devant le concile de Lyons en 1274,' in *1274: L'année charnière: Mutations et continuités*, Colloques internationaux du Centre national de la recherche scientifique (Paris, 1977) pp.499-500, no.13. The memorandum containing this declaration is undated, but can be shown from internal evidence to refer to the second council of Lyons.

¹⁶²MGHL p.264; MGHC 2 p.167 no.123.

CHAPTER TWO:
THE VIEWS OF THE CLERGY.

Criticism of the military orders by members of the clergy falls into three broad categories.

Firstly, there was fundamental criticism of the concept of a military order: this was sometimes the result of a certain contempt for the knightly class and a belief that `those who fight` could never be the spiritual equals of `those who pray,` but it also represented a conviction among some of the more educated and deep-thinking clergy that violence had no place in the extension of Christendom. Such views were held by members of both secular and regular clergy, but were seldom expressed.

Secondly, and partly as a result of the first, there was criticism of the military orders` privileges. This was voiced particularly by those involved in ecclesiastical administration; mainly the secular clergy, but also those monks whose interests came into conflict with the orders` privileges on a day-to-day basis. It was also voiced by those clergy educated in the schools, such as John of Salisbury and Walter Map, who protested against the privileges of all the regular clergy on canonical grounds.

Thirdly, there was the criticism voiced by chroniclers, ostensibly based on the orders` failings in the Holy Land, but underpinned by a plethora of personal and national prejudices. These chroniclers included both secular and regular clergy, men of widely divergent historical and literary talent, some, such as William, archbishop of Tyre, writing for the edification of Christendom, while many monastic annalists wrote primarily for the information of their own provincial house. Nevertheless, due to the didactic purpose inherent in the writing of history, the opinions expressed by chroniclers in general were remarkably similar.

Evidence for criticism does not remain consistent throughout the period 1128-1291, but diminishes after c.1250. Good relations existed alongside criticism throughout the period.

(a) Initial praise and fundamental criticism.

At first glance, the initial reactions of the clergy to the creation of the first military order appear to have been wholly favourable. Between April 1130 and April 1131, Simon, bishop of Noyons, and the canons of St. Mary of Noyons issued a charter for the order of the Temple, declaring:

‘We give thanks to God, because through His mercy he has restored the order which had perished. For we know that three orders have been instituted by God in the Church, of prayers, defenders and workers.

However, while the other orders were already to a large extent tottering, the order of defenders had almost completely perished; but God the Father and our Lord God Jesus Christ, God’s son, had mercy on his Church; through the infusion of the Holy Spirit in our hearts, in these most recent times, he deigned to restore the lost order. And in the holy city where once the Church began to grow, there the lost order of the Church began to be restored.’¹

In 1128 Guigues, abbot of La Grande Chartreuse, wrote to Hugh de Payns, master of the new order, in order to encourage him and his brothers in their spiritual battles. He called the brothers ‘our dearest and most venerable lords and friends in Christ’ and asked them ‘dearest, most preeminent and most notable for your merits,’ to remember him in their prayers ‘in the holy places which you protect.’² Jerusalem clearly played an important part in creating this favourable image of the

¹D’Albon, *Cartulaire*, no.31; cf. G. Duby, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society imagined*, trans. A. Goldhammer, (Chicago, 1980) *passim*; *Règle*, pp.11-12, paras. 1-2.

²*Lettres des premiers Chartreux*, I, Sources Chrétiennes no.88 (Paris, 1962) pp.154-160.

order.³

Yet most clerical writers seem to have been influenced not by their own experience of the new order, but by the writings of Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux. Writing for Hugh de Payns, sometime between 1128 and 1136, Bernard called the order 'a new kind of knighthood,' and declared that the brothers' desire was to die for Christ against the infidel; they lived a simple life, peaceful at home, fierce in battle, and were both monks and knights.⁴ Over the next two decades, monks of Normandy, Burgundy and the Empire echoed this description: such as Orderic Vitalis, the monk Simon of St. Bertin of Sith, Otto of Freising and Richard of Poitou, a monk of Cluny.⁵ Anselm, an Augustinian canon and bishop of Havelberg, wrote in his *Dialogues* at some length in praise of the order, stating that Pope Urban II had approved it: a more illustrious pope than

³See also a letter of a Cistercian monk, Gauchier, to an unnamed Templar in the Holy Land: 'blessed are the eyes which see what you see,' he declared, asking him to pray for 'your Galtier:' PL 196, cols. 1616-7, letter 18.

⁴St. Bernard of Clairvaux, 'Liber ad Milites Templi,' pp 214, 215, 220-222. Although quite well-known, this was not one of Bernard's best-read pieces: 33 manuscripts survive (p.208).

⁵Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History*, ed. M. Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1969-80) 6 p.310, Book 21 ch.29; Simon of St. Bertin, 'Gesta Abbatum Sancti Bertini Sithensium,' ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGHS 13 p.649 (written c.1135-7: p.603 and note 11, p.604); Otto, bishop of Freising, 'Chronicon,' ed. R. Wilmans, MGHS 20 pp.252-3 (written between 1143 and 1147); 'Ex Richardi Pictaviensis Chronica,' ed. G. Waitz, MGHS 26 p.80 (written 1153).

Honorius II.⁶

According to Anselm, the papacy had confirmed that the new order was of equal merit with monks and regular canons. This remark and the work of Bernard hint that some harboured doubts over the validity of a religious order founded for military purposes. Bernard seems to have been arguing against critics who declared that the brothers were murderers and that knights could never be the spiritual equals of monks. He retorted that the brothers were 'malicides,' not homicides, because they hated not the man but the evil in him; and that they were quite different from the knights of the world: this was a new knighthood, the brothers practised self-denial and lived in austerity, they were pious and obedient, so that they could not be told apart from monks.⁷ In the same way, a letter to the brothers from one Hugh 'Peccator,' variously identified as being Hugh de Payns himself or Hugh of St. Victor, states that 'certain indiscreet persons' have been undermining the brothers' confidence, saying that their vocation is illicit and harmful, a sin and an obstacle to their spiritual advancement. Hugh urged the brothers to persevere in their vocation. Simply because their order was not as illustrious as others, it was not less necessary for Christendom:

'Often the things which are more ignoble are more useful. The foot touches the ground, but it carries the whole body..... The roofs of houses receive the rain and hail and winds; but if there were no roofs, what would the painted panelling do?'

Hugh also defended the brothers against accusations of the sin of hate: 'you do not hate the man but the iniquity,' and of the sin of greed in taking spoils, because the workman earns his pay. These allegations being made against their order,

⁶PL 188, col. 1156 (writing 1145: col. 1139 note 3). Anselm seems to have confused the brothers with the crusaders.

⁷St. Bernard, 'Liber ad milites Templi,' pp.214-5, 217, 220-2.

although they seemed to be good, were the work of Satan, disguised as an angel of light.⁸

The earliest surviving example of the expression of this kind of doubt appears in two letters of Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny, written around the year 1148, in connection with Humbert de Beaujeu, a local lord, who had joined and subsequently abandoned the order of the Temple. Peter wrote to Ebrard de Barres, master of the Temple in France, asking him to release Humbert from his vows. He commenced his letter assuring Ebrard of his love and admiration for the order, but went on to state that Humbert would be doing more important work subduing the nominally Christian troublemakers in the Beaujolais, such as the vicomte of Mâcon, than in subduing the Saracens who were threatening the holy places. Furthermore, writing to Pope Eugenius II on the same matter, he declared that he and many of his monks were of the opinion that if Humbert had left an order of canons, monks or hermits, any order of ancient institution, he would deserve censure,

`but since he only changed from one knighthood to another, since the sword which he had taken up against Saracens, he transferred to false Christians, worse than Saracens...`

he should not be forced to return.⁹ This letter indicates that not all the educated clergy believed that a monastic order could carry on the profession of knighthood, nor that knights could be the spiritual or social equals of monks. As the

⁸Leclercq, `Un document sur les débuts des Templiers,` 86-9, esp. p.86 paras.1,2.

⁹*The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, ed. G. Constable, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1967) 1 pp.407-413, nos. 172-3, esp. no.173 p.411; for other doubts on Christians waging war, see B. Z. Kedar, *Crusade and Mission: European approaches towards the Muslims*, (Princeton, 1984) pp.98-9; cf. Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, p.338, which greatly exaggerates opposition towards the concept of the knight-monk.

papacy and St. Bernard approved of the order, it is hardly surprising that such doubts were seldom expressed in writing.

Doubts over the vocation of the military orders remained throughout the period under examination, although those who spoke out against either the concept or the orders' actual activities were mostly notable individualists from remote corners of Europe whose work had only a small circulation, and cannot be taken as representative of the clergy in general.¹⁰ Such doubts were not necessarily expressed as such. The Würzburg annalist who condemned the Templars for pride, fraud and jealousy during the course of the second crusade was probably prompted by his opposition to the crusade, and thus the order's vocation.¹¹ More cautiously, Isaac de l'Etoile, English-born, a Cistercian philosopher and theologian, expressed misgivings over a military order which used force to convert pagans: 'a certain new knighthood whose order, as one man says wittily, comes from the fifth gospel, so that it forces unbelievers to the faith with lances and clubs.' He was probably describing the Templars: although the order did not set out to convert the Saracens, crushing the Saracens and converting them went hand in hand. Isaac went on to assert that the use of force was likely to deter rather than to encourage converts.¹² Over a century later, his opinion was

¹⁰Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, pp.111-2; cf. Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, p.281.

¹¹'Annales Herbipolenses,' pp.3-7, esp. p.7; G. Constable, 'The Second Crusade as seen by contemporaries,' *Traditio* 9 (1953) 268-9. But cf. Ralph Niger, who opposed the third crusade yet exonerated the military orders from all blame for the disasters in the Holy Land: Radulphus Niger, *De re militari et triplici via peregrinationis ierosolimitane*, ed. L. Schmugge (Berlin, 1977) p.194, Bk.3 ch.85.

¹²Isaac de l'Etoile, Sermon 48, PL 194, col.1854; Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, pp.104-6, and cf. 65-72, 159-161.

repeated by the Franciscan Roger Bacon, also an Englishman, in his *Opus Maius*, which was written on the command of Pope Clement IV. Although Roger was not averse to using force against pagans, he declared that the military orders' desire for domination over the pagans had rendered the latter impossible to convert.¹³

Roger was particularly concerned at the policies of the Teutonic order in Prussia. During the thirteenth century there were various complaints against the military orders in Livonia and Prussia, alleging that their treatment of the pagans or new converts hindered conversions or caused apostasy.¹⁴ In 1258 the guardian of the Minorites in Thorn and the brothers of the convent in Prussia defended the Teutonic order against such accusations being made against them in the curia.¹⁵ Roger, however, was unique among westerners in making such allegations. It is likely that he had his information from one of his fellow Franciscans who had been working to convert the Prussians peacefully on behalf of the Polish princes Kasimir

¹³Roger Bacon, *Opus Maius*, 3 pp.121-2; Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, pp.177-9.

¹⁴E.g., Swordbrothers: Pressutti no.3786 (anonymous complaint); *Registres de Gregoire IX* nos. 2286, 2287 (complaint of the papal legate); Teutonic order: *Preuß. UB* 1,1 pp.100-2, no.134, (complaint of Bishop Christian of Prussia) 1,2 pp.56-7, 60-2, nos. 62, 65 (anonymous complaints of 1258, possibly by Bishop Bartholomew of Lukow and the Polish princes Kasimir and Boleslaw: see Kuhn, 'Ritterorden als Grenzhüter,' 49-51); MGHES 3 pp.70-1 no.90: mutual accusations by Archbishop Albert of Riga and the Teutonic order.

¹⁵*Preuß. UB*, 1,2 no.65.

and Boleslaw.¹⁶

Writing in the 1280s, Ramon Llull, a Majorcan mystic whose vocation was to convert the Muslims, did not oppose violence against pagans *per se*, but he criticized the military orders for using violence on each other, for this dishonoured God. In his opinion, if they were united into one, and the brothers were educated in disputation, they could go into Saracen lands to defeat the Saracens both in deeds of arms and in words, and so convert them.¹⁷

A century earlier Walter Map, a cleric in the household of Henry II of England, archdeacon of Oxford, canon of St. Paul's and Lincoln, *raconteur* and satirist, had also criticized the military orders for the use of force, but his argument was based on the creed of non-violence preached in the gospels. He wondered how, as Christ forbade Peter to defend Him with a sword, the Templars could justify the use of the sword to defend Christendom; and observed wryly that, under their protection, Christendom was continually losing land, while the Muslims gained. Events alone proved that the military order was not pleasing to Christ; Christendom had made its conquests through peaceful preaching, not by force.

Only one manuscript of his work survives, and it does not appear to have circulated, although, as Map was famed as a *raconteur*, his opinions on the use of force were probably well known.¹⁸ Some four decades after Map wrote, Jacques de Vitry,

¹⁶His complaints against the order are remarkably similar to those of 1258. A general chapter of the Friars minor was held in Paris in 1266, where Bacon was under open arrest; probably brothers from eastern Europe were present.

¹⁷Ramon Llull, 'Blanquerna,' in *Obras Literarias*, ed. M. Batllori and M. Caldentey (Madrid, 1948) Bk.4, ch.80, paras. 7, 11, pp.407-8, 410.

¹⁸Walter Map, pp.xxii, 60-62; Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, pp.106-8, 111.

bishop of Acre, refuted these arguments, declaring them to be heretical. 'If we did not resist the Church's enemies,' he declared, 'the Saracens and heretics would have already devastated the whole Church.'¹⁹ Certainly heretics did reject the use of force by Christians, so that any criticism of the use of force against pagans could be construed as being tainted with heresy.²⁰ However, there remained sufficient doubt on the matter for Thomas Aquinas to discuss it: he concluded that a religious institution could be founded for military service, provided that it was acting on behalf of others, in the service of God.²¹

Other intelligent clergymen had no criticisms of the military orders for the use of violence, even though some of these belonged to the same school of humanist thought as Walter Map. Writing in 1159 in his *Policraticus*, John of Salisbury was bitterly critical of their privileges, but conceded that the Templars 'almost alone amongst men wage legitimate war.' This did not, however, give them the right to usurp ecclesiastical offices.²² Following Saladin's defeat of the Christians in 1179, Nigel de Longchamps, a Benedictine of

¹⁹Jacques de Vitry, 'Sermones vulgares,' in J. B. Pitra, ed., *Analecta novissima spicilegii Solesmensis: Altera continuatio 2, Tusculana* (Paris, 1888) sermon 38, p.419; Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, pp.127-8.

²⁰E.g., the Passau anonymous in *Quellen zur Geschichte der Waldenser*, ed. A. Patschovsky and K.-V. Selge, *Texte zur Kirchen und Theologiegeschichte*, Heft 18 (Gütersloh, 1973) p.81; Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, p.174.

²¹Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 2a2ae. 188,3: Blackfriars edn. vol. 47 (London, 1973) pp.188-92; cf. Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, pp.183-4.

²²John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 2, pp.198-9, Bk.7, ch.21, 695a.

Christchurch, Canterbury, mocked the Templars' rash self-sacrifice: a man who joined their order would be given a well-fed horse and a white mantle, but would immediately be killed in battle. He gave no hint, however, that a monastic order should not fight.²³ Some three decades later, Guiot de Provins, former trouvère turned Cluniac, declared his great admiration for the order of the Temple: 'It is the order of knighthood. They are in great honour in Syria: the Turks fear them fiercely, for they are like a castle, a wall against them; they will never flee in battle,' while chiding them for their pride and admitting that he himself would never have the courage to join them. Although he criticized the Hospital for its militarization, this was because the order seemed to have forgotten its original purpose and its charity.²⁴ In his *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, completed in 1249, Alexander the Minorite identified 'the armies which are in Heaven' of Revelations chapter 19 verse 14 with the military orders, discussing their formation and role and saying that they fought

²³Nigel de Longchamps, *Speculum Stultorum*, ed. J. H. Mozley and R. R. Raymo (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1960) pp.76-7, lines 2051-2068. For the parallels between his work and that of John of Salisbury, Walter Map and Gerald of Wales, see p.6. This poem was immediately popular: pp.8-9.

²⁴Guiot de Provins, 'La Bible,' in *Les Oeuvres de Guiot de Provins, poète lyrique et satirique*, ed. J. Orr (Manchester, 1915) lines 1709-88, 1789-1818, and pp.xi-xvii.

`both spiritually and bodily for the Lord.`²⁵

Nevertheless, Alexander added that spiritual knighthood is greater in the Lord's eyes than bodily knighthood. He was not alone in this opinion: even where the military orders' validity was recognized, they were usually regarded as being the spiritual inferiors of other religious orders. Although their harsh discipline was widely admired,²⁶ the letter of Hugh 'Peccator' demonstrates that the orders' rules were not considered to be particularly strict.²⁷ Despite their simple lifestyle, those entering a military order did not have to greatly change their attitudes or priorities. In comparison to

²⁵Alexander Minorita, *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, ed. A.

Wachtel, MGH Die Deutschen Geschichtsquellen des Mittelalters 500-1500, Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 1 (Weimar, 1955) pp.401-3; no details are known of this writer except for his name: pp.viif., xii; his approval of the military orders may be connected with his opposition to the emperor Frederick II (pp.430-1, 507) whom he equates with the Beast of chapter 13. Eight manuscripts survive, three of which date from the thirteenth century; three more have been lost (pp.xii-xxi).

²⁶Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, 2 p.354 (Temple); the anonymous pilgrim 5,2 in *Anonymous Pilgrims I-VIII (11th and 12th centuries)* trans. A. Stewart, PPTS 6 (London, 1894) pp.29-30 (Temple); Nigel de Longchamps, p.77 lines 2069-2076 (Hospital); Jean de Joinville, *La vie de Saint Louis: le témoignage de Jehan, seigneur de Joinville. Texte du XIVe siècle*, ed. N. L. Corbett (Quebec, 1977) p.189, paras. 507-8 (Hospital).

²⁷Leclerq, 'Un document,' 87-9, paras. 2-5; cf. *Registrum Epistolarum fratris Johannis Peckham, archiepiscopi Cantuariensis*, ed. C. T. Martin, 3 vols., RS 77 (London, 1882-5) 3 p.860, no.617; chapter one, pp.20-1 and note 12, above; but cf. Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.195, 248-9.

the monks of Grandmont or Chartreuse, or Citeaux in its early days, their life was relatively easy; as they always had to be fit to fight, excessive fasting and vigils were forbidden, and it was recognized that brothers would often need to miss services. Although they underwent great deprivations on campaign, these were common to all knights and did not necessarily win them approval from the clergy.²⁸ In fact, as Jacques de Vitry made clear, in the case of poorer knights their lifestyle improved.²⁹ In addition, they lacked the learning which marked other monastic orders.³⁰

It is likely that there was also an element of jealousy in this attitude. The novelty and spiritual prestige of the military orders' vocation, the defence of the Holy Land, exercised a great attraction for lay donors and led to their acquiring privileges and wealth which far outstripped those of many longer-established houses.³¹ But, at the same time, the

²⁸E.g. *Règle*, pp.33-7, paras. 23, 26-8, pp.182, 202-3, paras. 312, 355-6; *Aliscans, chanson de geste*, ed. F. Guessard and A. de Montaiglon (Paris, 1890, reprinted Nendeln, 1966) p.101, lines 3342-54, on the great hardships faced by knights.

²⁹Jacques de Vitry, sermon 37, pp.410-11: this indicates that this was a problem in every order; A. Forey, 'Recruitment to the military orders (twelfth to mid-fourteenth centuries)' *Viator*, 17 (1986) 164-5.

³⁰Cf. *The Hospitallers' Rule, (Miraculis et Regula Hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerosolimitani)* ed. K. V. Sinclair, Anglo-Norman Texts 42 (Oxford, 1984) lines 587-92; B. Z. Kedar, 'Gerald of Nazareth: a neglected twelfth-century writer in the latin east. A contribution to the intellectual monastic history of the crusader states,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 37 (1983) 63,77.

³¹Cf. Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, pp.257, 280-1.

military orders' knightly vocation was demonstrably the cause of their most criticized vice, pride, the greatest of the seven deadly sins. Pride was noted and condemned first in the Hospitallers by the German commentator Gerhoh of Reichersberg (in 1162-3) and in the Templars by the author of the Würzburg annals, in the 1180s by William of Tyre and Walter Map, and subsequently by writers such as Guiot de Provins, Jacques de Vitry, Matthew Paris, and Ramon Llull.³² Pride (*fierté*) was a normal characteristic of knights, for whom it was no more than a natural confidence in their own abilities.³³ To compound this, by the early twelfth century both knights and monks had considerable pride in their own profession, as being that most able to please God; hence knight-monks would be doubly proud.³⁴ Yet, ironically, monastic hostility must also have contributed towards the military orders' aloofness.

(b) Criticism of Privileges.

A conviction that military orders were inferior to traditional forms of monasticism, and doubts over the fundamental bases for the existence of military orders, although seldom expressed, must have heightened criticism of the military orders' privileges. Such criticism was not aimed at the military orders alone. Great resentment was felt by the secular clergy towards

³²Gerhoh of Reichersberg, p.384, ch. 67; 'Annales Herbipolenses,' p.7; William of Tyre, 1 p.555, Bk.12 ch.7, 2 p.813, Bk.18 ch. 3, p.1002, Bk. 21 ch.28 (29); Walter Map, p.62; Guiot de Provins, 'La Bible,' lines 1745-1788; Jacques de Vitry, sermon 37, pp.406-8; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 3 p.177, 4 pp.168, 302; Ramon Llull, 'Blanquerna,' Bk.4 ch.80 para.7, p.408.

³³Cf. B. Hamilton, *Religion in the Medieval West* (London, 1986) p.134.

³⁴E.g. *Roland*, lines 1876-1882; Flori, *Essor de la chevalerie*, p.209.

the privileges granted to the regular clergy by the papacy, which not only undermined the income and authority of the seculars, but were also regarded as being contrary to canon law and Biblical teaching.³⁵ The Cistercians in particular aroused anger, resentment, and fear.³⁶ Nevertheless, as the secular clergy at the third Lateran Council of 1179 singled out the Templars and Hospitallers by name for their abuse of their privileges and flouting of episcopal authority,³⁷ it appears that their privileges were considered to be especially unreasonable. Clergy who believed that the new military orders were inferior to the traditional monastic order would not have accepted their entitlement to exemption from payment of tithes and interdict, or the right to build their own chapels and to bury their own *confrères*.³⁸ In addition, by 1179 the military orders were known not to be fulfilling their function in the Holy Land with complete success: in particular, in respect to

³⁵E.g. John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 2 pp.190-201, Book 7 ch. 21; Walter Map, pp.70-2.

³⁶E.g., John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 2 pp.199-200, Bk.7 ch.21, 695d; Walter Map, pp.72-112; *Councils and Synods*, 2,1 pp.83-4; C. V. Graves, 'The Economic activities of the Cistercians in medieval England, 1128-1307,' *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis* 13 (1957) 45-55.

³⁷Cart., no.560.

³⁸For the principal privileges of the military orders, see, e.g.: Hiestand, nos.3, 8; Cart., nos. 30, 113, 122, 130; Strehlke, nos.303, 305, 306, etc.. Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, pp.377-88.

the failure of the second crusade.³⁹ No doubt William, archbishop of Tyre, and his fellow-delegates from the kingdom of Jerusalem, made much of the orders' military failings in the east and their refusal to render obedience to the patriarch of Jerusalem.⁴⁰

There were also other factors which combined to arouse episcopal ire against the orders. They were recently founded, in an age when antiquity validated; they were ubiquitous, not only owning property all over Europe, but also sending out alms-collectors on a regular basis; their work was done far away, across the sea, where few had the opportunity to see its effects, and they were continually claiming that they were impoverished and in need of larger and larger sums of money. The western clergy, unable to appreciate the worsening situation in the east, and preoccupied with their own pressing needs, could not have been expected to keep responding favourably to these appeals. In the mid-thirteenth century,

³⁹The order of the Temple was blamed for the failure in two near-contemporary accounts, and may have been intended in a third: The 'Casus monasterii Petrihusensis,' ed. O. Abel and L. Weiland, MGHS 20 p.674 (written before 1156: p.622): blames 'knights of God' which could be crusaders or Templars; 'Annales Herbipolenses,' p.7: blames Templars; John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, ed. M. Chibnall (Edinburgh, 1956) p.57 (written 1164) stated: 'some impute the treachery to the Templars.' No contemporaries blamed the Hospital, which was not yet recognized in the West as a military order; yet its reputation probably suffered simply because it was a Palestinian order. Cf. A. Forey, 'The failure of the siege of Damascus in 1148,' *Journal of Medieval History* 10 (1984) 13-23; Constable, 'Second Crusade,' 273-4.

⁴⁰William of Tyre, 2 p.998, Bk.21 ch.25 (26), and 1 p.555, Bk.12 ch.7, 2 pp.812-4, 817-23, Bk.18 chs.3, 6-8; Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, p.389.

Matthew Paris neatly summed up their bewilderment:

`The Templars and Hospitallers...receive so much income from the whole of Christendom, and, only for defending the Holy Land, swallow down such great revenues and sink them as if into the gulf of the abyss...`⁴¹

Complaints against the privileges of the military orders continued throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, both from the bishops and from rival monastic orders. As the Teutonic order acquired the same privileges, it also met with the same problems in enforcing them.⁴² Some disputes broke out over the orders' use of the privileges as given, others over their abuse of them. A few examples will suffice. In 1165 Pope Alexander III requested the Templars in the dioceses of Lyons and Cavailon to give way in a dispute with a neighbouring monastery over tithes, in view of the monastery's need. In 1186-7 a particularly bitter dispute over privileges arose at Trani in Italy between the Hospital and the archbishop of Bari, during which the canons and clergy entered the Hospital's church and carried off the crucifix, urged the people not to give the Hospital alms, and forbade anyone to attend their services, on pain of excommunication. In 1247 Henry, bishop of Constance, complained to Pope Innocent IV that the masters and brothers of the Hospital, the Teutonic order and the order of the Holy Spirit in his diocese were giving church burial to excommunicated men and those under interdict. In 1273 the canons of Dunstable quarrelled with the Hospitallers over the burial of a suicide, one of the Hospitallers' *consorsors*, but gave up the case because they

⁴¹Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 3 pp.177-8.

⁴²E.g. Strehlke, nos. 312, 315, 316-9, 322-4, etc.

feared the Hospitallers' privileges.⁴³ The order of St. Thomas of Acre apparently tried to claim the same privileges as the major military orders, as in 1279 it came into dispute with John Peckham, archbishop of Canterbury, over its claim to exemption from episcopal visitation.⁴⁴

Some conciliar and synodal decisions after 1179 repeated the complaints of 1179 against the military orders. The council of Westminster of 1200 reiterated the decrees of the third Lateran council virtually verbatim. The fourth Lateran council (1215) repeated them again, but without mentioning the military orders by name. A synod held at Nîmes between 1242 and 1272 repeated them more briefly, as did the decrees of the council of Riez in 1285 and the synodal statutes of Cahors, Rodez and Tulle in 1289.⁴⁵ Two bulls of Alexander IV, of 1256 and 1257, asserting the rights of the French diocesan bishops in the face of the abuses of the Hospitallers, Templars and other religious, indicate that the contention was as great as ever and the military orders' privileges were still at its centre despite the even more hated privileges of the friars. Yet it is possible that, by the mid-thirteenth century, tradition demanded that general complaints about monastic privileges should centre on the military orders. When specific complaints were made, as they were in 1274 by Bruno, bishop of

⁴³PL 200, cols. 363-4, no.337; Cart., nos. 816-7; MGHES 2 p.281, no. 383; Annals of Dunstable, in *Annales Monastici*, 3 p.260.

⁴⁴Forey, 'St. Thomas of Acre,' 492.

⁴⁵*Councils and Synods*, 1,2 pp.1068-9 section 14; J. D. Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 55 vols. (Florence, Venice, Paris, Arnhem, and Leipzig, 1759-1962) 22 cols. 1047-50; Cart., nos. 2281 bis, 3887, 4029.

Olmütz, no mention was made of the military orders.⁴⁶

It is significant that most of the complaints of abuse of privileges came from the French clergy. By the second half of the thirteenth century, relations were particularly strained in France and in the Holy Land, where the orders had been longest established and their privileges were most entrenched. In the Holy Land disputes were embittered by a shortage of land, as most Christian territory had been lost to the Muslims.⁴⁷ In France, the situation was aggravated by the royal policy of recovering alienated crown rights and lands, many of which had fallen into ecclesiastical hands. Several cases came before the French royal court involving disputes between the Hospital and bishops: for example, involving the bishop of Sisteron in 1251, the bishop of Beauvais, in 1278, and the dean and chapter of Laon, in 1287.⁴⁸ There is also evidence for an increasing number of disputes between the Hospital or the Temple and other religious houses in France in the second half of the thirteenth century, notably a particularly difficult case which began in 1289, involving the Hospital, Temple and Friars Minor in a dispute over papal privilege claimed by Raymond, abbot of St.

⁴⁶Cart., nos. 2805 (26 March 1256) 2863 (17 March 1257); Bruno of Olmütz, 'Bericht am Papst Gregor X,' in C. Höfler, 'Analecten zur Geschichte Deutschlands und Italiens,' part 1, *Abhandlungen der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, series 3, 4 part 3 (1846) 23-6; and see below, note 91.

⁴⁷E.g., Bishop of Hebron: Strehlke, nos. 101, 102, 104, 126; Cart., nos. 3120, 3202, 3203, 3515; Bishop of Acre: Strehlke, no.112, Cart. nos. 1718, 1911, 2200, 2199, 2865; Bishop of Tortosa: Cart. 2553, 2613, 3093, 3278, 3282, 3307; *Registres d'Innocent IV*, no.5129, 5861; *Registres d'Urban IV*, nos. 1709, 1710.

⁴⁸Cart., nos. 2570, 3644, 3960.

Gilles.⁴⁹ Such disputes enhanced the orders' reputation for greed, but were common throughout society.

If the bishops continued to attack the privileges of the military orders, the orders continued to fear the bishops. Frequently, when faced by a recalcitrant monastic order, popes resorted to the threat of revoking its privileges, thereby leaving it to the bishops' mercy: in March 1265 Clement IV, attempting to cow the order of the Temple, reminded the master and brothers how the papacy had fostered the order to the great offence of the churches, and asked them what they would do if the papacy was to withdraw its protection of them against the prelates and princes.⁵⁰ In a memorandum of 1274, the master of the Temple and representatives of the Hospital and Temple, bound for the second council of Lyons, were instructed to tell the cardinals at the council that the bishops were intending to press for the brothers to be subjected to their jurisdiction, and to present reasons why this should not be done. The orders' problems and good works were described. The memorandum added:

'If, which God forbid, our order is subjected to the prelates' jurisdiction, we will have more to do in guarding our possessions against them than against the infidel Saracens, because, notwithstanding our privileges, they inflict many hardships on us...'⁵¹

It is not now known why the military orders particularly feared

⁴⁹Cart., nos. 4051, 4052, 4096, 4146, 4160; *Les registres de Nicolas IV*, nos. 1306, 2739, 4098, 4974, 4975; see also *Les Olim*, 1 pp.37-8, 741-2, *Actes*, 1 p.379, no.512; Cart., nos. 2866, 2881, 3137, 3476, 4024, 4068, 4151.

⁵⁰E.g., *Die register Innocenz' III*, 1 no.450; PL 215 cols. 1217-8, registers of Innocent III 10 no.121; MGHES 1 p.645 no.749; Bolton, 'Via Ascetica,' pp.183-5; *Registres de Clement IV*, no.836.

⁵¹Amargier, 'La défense du Temple,' p.497, no.7.

loss of their privileges at this time, but episcopal pressure against their privileges may have increased in response to their defeats and losses of territory in the Holy Land.

Nevertheless, the surviving evidence indicates that the orders' fears were unfounded. At the councils held in early 1292, summoned by Pope Nicholas IV to discuss how the Holy Land could be recovered, there was no suggestion that the military orders' privileges should be abolished. The prelates' concern was that the orders' resources should be properly used and that the orders should work together efficiently.⁵² It is likely that the military orders had overestimated the threat from the bishops, both in view of the many bishops favourable to the orders and in view of the equal or greater episcopal hostility towards other monastic orders. Jacquemart Gielée depicts his Templar as paranoid.⁵³

(c) Other criticism

The military orders also suffered criticism for other reasons, most of which were recorded by chroniclers seeking to draw a moral message from recent events.

One of the most damaging accusations was that the military orders were more eager to acquire wealth than to advance Christendom, whether through battle or through conversion. This was partly a reaction to the orders' constant and pressing alms-collecting in the West, and their exploitation of their privileges in order to obtain the maximum possible income, and

⁵²Council of Canterbury: *Councils and Synods*, 2,2 pp.1107-8, 1112, 1113; Lyons: Bartholomew Cotton, *Historia Anglicana*, ed. H. R. Luard, RS 16 (London, 1859) p.213; Arles: *ibid.*, p.215; Rheims: John Thilrode, 'Chronicon,' ed. J. Heller, MGHS 25 p.581; Sens: *ibid.*, p.582; Salzburg: Eberhard, Archdeacon of Ratisbon, 'Annales,' ed. P. Jaffé, MGHS 17 p.594.

⁵³Renart le Nouvel, lines 7567-70; and see below, pp.112, 117-22.

partly the result of failures in the East. One of the earliest accusations of this kind was made by the chronicler of the Benedictine abbey of Egmond in Frisia, probably from information provided by Norwegian crusaders, concerning the siege of Ascalon in 1153. The chronicler records that the knights of the Temple were at first rather reluctant to fight, because they used to obtain a large income from attacking the relief caravans which the emir of Cairo regularly sent to the city. However, when they realized that their reputation in the Christian camp was suffering, they were ashamed and attacked the city at dawn, killing an enormous number of Saracens.⁵⁴ William, archbishop of Tyre, developed this story to make the Templars prevent the capture of the city through their greed for booty; he also told a number of other stories in which the conversion of non-Christians was likewise prevented.⁵⁵ William's stories had a wide circulation. Walter Map used them as illustrations of the problems caused by the Templars' love of war, although he did not emphasize the monetary motive.⁵⁶ In the 1190s, Guy of Bazoches, a veteran of the third crusade who died as cantor of St. Etienne de Chalons in 1203, wrote a history drawing on William's work, although he only repeated one of William's stories concerning the military orders' love of money, that of Templars and the Assassins, somewhat altered. In another case he rejected William's account in favour of a version more favourable to the Templars. His work was used by

⁵⁴*Fontes Egmundenses*, ed. O. Oppermann, Werken uitgegeven door het Historisch Genootschap (Gevestigd te Utrecht) derde Serie, no.61 (Utrecht, 1933) p.161; MGHS 16 p.459; P. Riant, *Expéditions et pèlerinages des Scandinaves en Terre Sainte au Temps des Croisades* (Paris, 1865) p.258ff.

⁵⁵William of Tyre, 2, pp.798-9, Bk.17 ch.27, pp.822-3, Bk.18 ch.9, pp.953-5, Bk. 20 chs.29-30.

⁵⁶Walter Map, pp.62-6.

Aubrey, a monk of Trois-Fontaines, c.1240.⁵⁷ In 1279 a friar minor, Thomas Tusci, repeated William's tales about the Templars and the Assassins, although with details altered.⁵⁸ Similarly, some chroniclers heard that the Templars had deliberately sabotaged the siege of Damascus in 1148 in exchange for Muslim gold.⁵⁹ By the beginning of the thirteenth century, these tales had developed into a legend which told how the military orders had accepted a bribe of false gold in order to lift a Christian siege of a Saracen stronghold.⁶⁰

Another potentially dangerous accusation was that the military orders were more eager to make peace with the Muslims than to fight them, thus preventing Christian advance. Menko, abbot of Werum in Frisia, writing in the early 1270s, was of the opinion that this was the result of cowardice; Odo, bishop of Tusculanum and papal legate on the first crusade of Louis IX, seems to have considered it to be the result of political ineptitude.⁶¹ The incident he described was recounted later in

⁵⁷Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, p.82; William of Tyre, 1, p.76; Aubrey des Trois Fontaines, ed. P. Scheffer-Boichorst, MGHS 23 pp.846, 859.

⁵⁸*Thomas Tusci Gesta Imperatorum et Pontificum*, ed. E. Ehrenfeuchter, MGHS 22, p.507.

⁵⁹*Annales Herbipolenses*, p.7 (written soon after the second crusade); Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. J. Stevenson, RS 66 (London, 1875) p.12 (written in the early thirteenth century).

⁶⁰See below, chapter four, pp.190-5 for a full discussion of these tales.

⁶¹*Menkonis Chronicon*, ed. L. Weiland, MGHS 23, pp.557-8; Odo, bishop of Tusculanum, in *Spicilegium sive collectio veterum aliquot scriptorum*, ed. L. d'Achery, new edn. ed. L. F. T. de la Barre, 3 (Paris, 1723) p.625.

the thirteenth century by both John Columna and William de Nangis, and in the fourteenth in the 'Chroniques de Saint-Denis.' The last of these adapted the story to show that the master of the Temple had deliberately set out to halt Louis' crusade; but the earlier writers do not seem to have held such a sinister interpretation of events.⁶²

Some chroniclers seem to have repeated such stories as much from love of a good story and scandal as from conviction. Yet Matthew Paris indicates that lurking beneath the scandal lay a constant suspicion that the military orders could not be trusted. He complained that the Christians could not believe reports of good news from the Holy Land even when they came, because of 'the ancient infamy of the Templars and Hospitallers, for it is said that they always procure discord between Christians and Saracens in order to prolong the war and so collect money from the pilgrims coming from everywhere.'⁶³ Such suspicion was partly the result of a traditional suspicion of orientals;⁶⁴ partly of a misunderstanding of the military orders' financial burden and the true situation in the east, despite constant letters of information sent from the east to the west;⁶⁵ and partly also of the natural desire of Europeans to exonerate themselves for military failures in the Holy Land. In addition, however, and particularly in the case of Matthew Paris and William of Tyre, it arose from broader, national and political concerns.

It has been suggested that William of Tyre was opposed to

⁶²John of Columna, 'Mare Historiarum,' RHGF 23 p.119; William of Nangis, 'Gesta Ludovici,' RHGF 20 pp.366-8; 'Chroniques de Saint-Denis,' RHGF 21 p.114.

⁶³Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 4 p.291.

⁶⁴See below, chapter four, note 4.

⁶⁵Cf. Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.69, 106, 161, and note 9, 238-9, 241-2, 250-1, 263.

the very concept of a military order; but an examination of his `Historia` reveals that, on the contrary, although he believed that clergy in general should not fight, he approved of the military orders provided that they fulfilled their function effectively, and were obedient to their bishops, paying tithes and other dues.⁶⁶ Historians have also traced the causes of his antagonism to the political factions which existed within the kingdom during the reign of Baldwin IV. The order of the Temple was closely connected with the court faction led by Agnes de Courtenay, queen mother; but William was opposed to this faction, for Agnes and her supporters were outsiders, western Europeans, enemies of William's patron, Raymond, count of Tripoli, and their policies seemed set to destroy the Latin kingdom.⁶⁷ This does not, however, explain William's hostility towards the order of the Hospital, which was also friendly towards Count Raymond, a *confrère* of the order.

William of Tyre's antagonism towards the military orders had deeper roots than this. As archbishop of Tyre and former royal chancellor, William believed that the military orders' defiance of royal and/or patriarchal authority had brought great harm on the kingdom of Jerusalem and on Christianity. As religious men, they were bound to obey the divinely-ordained authorities, but as they became wealthy they had grown proud and rebellious. He devoted six chapters of the eighteenth book of his `Historia` to describing how the Hospital acquired independence from the patriarch of Jerusalem, the troubles that this brought on the Church, and contrasting their present contumacy with their past obedience.⁶⁸ As for the Temple,

⁶⁶Morris, *Papal monarchy*, p.281; William of Tyre, 2, p.661, Bk.14 ch.22, p.776, Bk.17 ch.12, p.831, Bk.18 ch.14, p.1032, Bk.22 ch.17(16).

⁶⁷See, e.g., P. W. Edbury and J. G. Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge, 1988) pp.17-22.

⁶⁸William of Tyre, 2, pp.812-822, Bk.18 chs.3-8.

although he made only general accusations that this order was contumacious towards the patriarch, he cited a number of incidents to demonstrate that the Templars' refusal to submit to royal authority had brought great damage on the kingdom.⁶⁹

William's 'Historia' was written for a European audience, in defence of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. He intended to show Europeans that the Latin kingdom could be saved, and how it could be saved: not through foolish outsiders, such as Philip, count of Flanders, and Guy of Lusignan, nor through the military orders. He revealed the orders as proud, rash, quarrelling between themselves and refusing to cooperate with other Palestinian nobles; not only failing to defend the Holy Land, but actually weakening it. He seldom mentioned their successes, minimized their positive role, and emphasized their failures.⁷⁰

The 'Historia' had a very wide circulation, both in Latin and in French translation, and it was used by many other chroniclers. R. H. C. Davis has pointed out that William failed to make his message understood.⁷¹ However, as his anecdotes about the military orders, especially about the order of the Temple, were often repeated by chroniclers, they seem to

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, 1, p.555, Bk. 12, ch.7, and, for example, 2, p.879, Bk.19 ch.11, p.955, Bk.20 ch.30.

⁷⁰E.g., William does not mention the Templars' victory of 1157 described in RHGF 15 p.682, nor the Muslims' fear and respect of the orders: Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, pp.75-6; nor describe Geoffrey Fulcher's role in making a truce with Egypt, although he was an experienced diplomat: William of Tyre, 2, p.887, Bk.19 ch.18; Bulst-Thiele, 'Templer,' pp.290-1; cf. Davis, 'William of Tyre,' pp.65-70; Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, pp.25, 159-66.

⁷¹'William of Tyre,' pp.71-75: Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, p.4.

have been at least half-believed.⁷²

Apart from his own prejudices, William of Tyre was a careful historian, sifting his evidence and distinguishing between reliable and unreliable sources. In contrast, Matthew Paris was a credulous, undiscerning scandalmonger, and a bigot. His opinion of the orders of the Temple and Hospital, however, was not much different from that of William of Tyre.

Matthew Paris (c.1200-1259) was a monk of the Benedictine abbey of St. Albans. He began to write his major historical work, the *Chronica Majora*, circa 1245, beginning at the year 1236; for the period before 1236 he followed the work of his predecessor at St. Albans, Roger of Wendover, expanding, 'improving', and sometimes correcting. Until 1251 he wrote some time after events, and with the benefit of hindsight; after this date he appears to have been writing contemporaneously. The *Chronica Majora*, while useful for judging Matthew's own opinions and those of his various sources, did not have a large circulation, although it was used by some chroniclers late in the thirteenth century. Of his other works, the *Flores Historiarum*, which he began in 1250 or soon after, was very popular, surviving in nineteen manuscripts, and was widely used by other chroniclers; the *Historia Anglorum*, written c.1250 to 1255, was only used by two other chroniclers. The *Abbreviatio* does not appear to have been circulated, as it only survives in one manuscript.⁷³ All in all, Matthew exerted considerable influence on clerical and, probably, secular thought through his writings.⁷⁴ This was unfortunate for the orders of the Temple and Hospital, as Matthew criticized them in virtually all that they did; yet it must be admitted that none of the chroniclers who used

⁷²See above, pp.95-6.

⁷³Vaughan, pp.59-60, 76-7, 102-3, 113-4, 152-154.

⁷⁴For Matthew's friends among laymen and women see Vaughan, pp.13-17, 181.

Matthew's work before 1291 repeated his stories against them.

In some instances, he was merely echoing the opinions of his informants. Hence we learn that Richard, Earl of Cornwall, was angered by the orders' constant quarrels over policy and considered that the Templars had insulted him, that the emperor Frederick blamed the Templars and the *Poulains* for the defeat at La Forbie in October, 1244, and that the entourage of William Longespee had greatly praised the courage and integrity of the Templars and Hospitallers at Mansourah in February 1250, where William had died.⁷⁵

On other occasions, he gave his own opinions. Matthew was a man of curious mind and broad vision; his interests stretched, geographically, from Ireland to the far East, and he was the only chronicler of the thirteenth century to mention the military order of St. Thomas, as well as the only English chronicler of his time with much to say of the Teutonic order: he thought well of it, because of its connection with the emperor Frederick II. He also mentioned the order of St. Lazarus a number of times, whereas no other chronicler mentioned it more than once, if at all.⁷⁶ In this he was atypical of his age.

Nevertheless, in many other respects Matthew's opinions were those of the common monk. He was not a great thinker: unlike John of Salisbury, Walter Map or William of Tyre, he had not been educated at one of the great schools of Europe; he was opposed to all change; he was opposed to all earthly authority, resentful of both the papacy and the monarchy; his major concern was the interest of his own house, not of society or the Church as a whole; he hated foreigners, having no

⁷⁵*Chronica Majora*, 4 pp.139, 525, 302, 5 pp.147-154.

⁷⁶E.g., *Chronica Majora*, 3 pp.490, 318, 4 pp.168, 342, 5 p.158, 196, 630, 745, *Flores Historiarum*, 2 p.272; *Historia Anglorum, sive...Historia Minor, item Abbreviatio Chronicorum Angliae*, ed. F. Madden, 3 vols., RS 44 (London, 1866-9) 2 pp.378, 410, 472, 483-4, 3 pp.95, 277, 317.

conception of the sanctity of King Louis IX of France, but despising him as a Frenchman. In all these matters, as Richard Vaughan has shown, his opinion was `neither the result of rational consideration, nor of informed opinion, but of resentment and prejudice.`⁷⁷ But in this he represented the majority. His opinions, and the reasons behind them, are therefore important.

Matthew's prejudices inevitably led to dislike of the military orders: they were among the more recently founded religious orders, represented a departure from traditional monasticism, and were composed largely of foreigners, who were faithful servants of the papacy and the monarchy. In Matthew's opinion, the orders of the Temple and Hospital were proud, treacherous, envious of each other and of others who threatened to surpass them, such as the emperor Frederick II, did not make proper use of their resources, and were eager to prolong the war against the Muslims in order to make a profit for themselves.⁷⁸ They were often rash, they sometimes preferred alliance with Muslims to peace with Christians, their quarrels promoted the Muslim cause, and their reports should not always be believed.⁷⁹

However, Matthew also admitted that the knight-brothers had some virtues. Although this gained them little credit in his eyes, they were loyal to the king and pope; they were brave in the face of the enemy, refusing to surrender to the Tatars,

⁷⁷Vaughan, pp.136-143, 264-5, esp. p.141.

⁷⁸E.g., *Chronica Majora*, 3 pp.177-9, 4 p.291, 5 pp.745-6; *Flores*, 2 pp.194-5, 250, 264, 272; *Historia Anglorum*, 2 pp.312-5, 368 and note, 472, 477, 3 pp.259, 270 (as 2 p.368).

⁷⁹E.g., *Chronica Majora*, 3 pp.404-6, 4 p.291; *Flores*, 2 p.264, *Historia Anglorum*, 2 p.472.

fighting to the death at Darbsak and at Mansourah.⁸⁰ He had some favourable words for Thierry, prior of the Hospital in England, perhaps because he was a friend of Earl Richard of Cornwall, who was a patron of Matthew.⁸¹ With the benefit of hindsight, he realized that Brother Geoffrey the Templar had exercised some beneficial restraint on the king, and, under pressure from his informants or other influences, he was prepared to admit that the stories told against the military orders were untrue.⁸² Most of his more favourable remarks were recorded after 1250, by which time the order of the Temple was no longer as prominent in royal favour as it had formerly been, and was therefore less irritating to Matthew; again, increasing age may have mellowed him a little, or made him more wary of attracting enemies.

However, in his most popular and influential work, the *Flores*, Matthew had little good to say of either the order of the Temple or the Hospital, and much bad to say of the Temple. This was apparently due to the criticism which the Temple received from the emperor Frederick II; the Hospital, which became reconciled with Frederick, largely escaped.⁸³ In the *Flores*, Matthew produced an exciting, readable history, full of scandal; and there was, therefore, little room for praise or explanation. Thus his readers could be left believing that the Hospital was a nonentity, with little significance in the Holy Land except for its involvement in Christian defeats, and that the Temple was largely to blame for these defeats.

In contrast to Matthew Paris, it is interesting to

⁸⁰E.g., *Historia Anglorum*, 2 pp.164-5, 3 p.259; *Chronica Majora*, 5 p.655, 3 pp.404-6, 5 pp.147-154.

⁸¹*Chronica Majora*, 3 p.406, 4 pp.44, 643.

⁸²*Chronica Majora*, 3, p.629 and note, 5 p.150; *Historia Anglorum*, 2 p.312 note 4, 3 p.259.

⁸³*Flores*, 2 pp.194-5, 250, 264, 268, 272.

consider his predecessor as chronicler at St. Albans, Roger of Wendover. Roger shared Matthew's prejudices, but not his wide geographical vision, and he was favourable towards the military orders: never disparaging them and sometimes praising them. He had most to say of the order of the Temple, with which he was obviously the most familiar, and least of the Teutonic order, which he only mentioned once, evidently where it was specifically mentioned by his informant. He knew little of this order, mistakenly identifying the Teutonic brothers in Frederick II's embassy to Henry III of 1235 as Templars. To some extent, like Matthew Paris, his opinions were shaped by his sources; the great praise he heaped on the knight-brothers during his account of the fifth crusade was taken from his source, Oliver, *scholasticus* of Cologne. However, he also told an independent story of the Temple, depicting it as a model of integrity in the face of royal tyranny. According to this, in 1232 Henry III demanded that the master of the Temple in England surrender to him the 'no little treasure' which the disgraced Hubert de Burgh had stored at the London Temple. The master refused to do so without the leave of the man who had deposited it with them, and maintained this stance despite Henry's threats. Roger presented Henry as wishing to use violence, but fearing to use it against Church property. Hubert, however, as the martyr of the piece, readily agreed to give his money up to the king.⁸⁴

As the master of the Temple at this time, Roger of Sandford, was a personal friend of the king, it is surprising to find the chronicler portraying the order as a defender of liberty against a tyrant. It appears that Roger of Wendover was unaware of the close relations between the order of the Temple and the kings of England. He makes no mention of the order's support for King John, nor of its services for Henry III. It is likely that this relationship was not well known

⁸⁴Roger of Wendover, *Flores*, 3 p.41, and 2 pp. 206-7, 228-9, 236, 238, 240, 242-4; cf. W. L. Warren, *King John* (London, 1961) pp.11-13.

until the appointment in 1236 of Brother Geoffrey the Templar as Keeper of the Wardrobe.⁸⁵ This ignorance, added to Roger's lack of interest in the emperor Frederick, whom Matthew supported, meant that, unlike Matthew, he had no prejudices which would turn him against the military orders.

The support of the order of the Temple, and, to a lesser degree, of the Hospital, for the papacy during its conflict with the emperor Frederick II, not only aroused the hostility of Matthew Paris, but also, naturally, of some German chroniclers. The 'greater annals' of Cologne were written contemporaneously, so that they give a laudatory account of the orders during the fifth crusade (taken from the work of Oliver, *scholasticus* of Cologne) but for 1237 record with relish that the emperor Frederick refused to give any assistance to the Templars after their defeat at Darbsak. On the other hand, the annals publicized a miracle at the tomb of St. Elizabeth of Marburg, for the glory of the Teutonic order, a faithful supporter of Frederick.⁸⁶ Another critic was Conrad of Lichtenau, provost of the abbey of Ursberg from 1226 to 1240. He blamed the papal legate, the Templars 'and other governors' of the army for the failure of the fifth crusade: they had rejected the sultan of Cairo's favourable terms because of their pride. According to Conrad, the emperor Frederick II had sustained much 'as they say' during his crusade from the *perfida prodicione* of the Templars, 'but the hospitallers of the house of St. Mary Teutons' alone faithfully assisted him.'⁸⁷ Aubrey des Trois-Fontaines was also more favourably

⁸⁵Sandys, 'London Temple,' p.150; for Roger of Sandford, see, e.g., *Close Rolls* (1251-53) p.279: Henry gave him a gift of four does.

⁸⁶'Annales Colonienses Maximi,' ed. K. Pertz, MGHS 17, pp.832, 833-5, 846, 845.

⁸⁷'Continuatio Cuonradi praepositi Urspergensis,' ed. O. Abel and L. Weiland, MGHS 23, pp.381, 383.

inclined towards the emperor than the military orders during the crusade of 1229: remarking that the patriarch, Templars and Hospitallers were opposed to Frederick's peace with the sultan, 'but the petty Christian people and pilgrims, who were allowed by the peace to go freely to the Lord's sepulchre, gratefully received the peace and magnified the emperor for it.'⁸⁸ Aubrey's attitudes, however, may have been based as much on sympathy for the poor as favour for the emperor.

Closely linked to political prejudice was dislike of foreigners. Again, Matthew Paris was not the only clerical writer whose attitudes towards the military orders was tainted by this influence. For example, the writings of two Germans, the priest John of Würzburg, and the monk Otto of St. Blasien, show them to have resented French domination of the crusades and of the Holy Land. In addition, they accused the Templars of treachery against their fellow-Christians. It is tempting to see the first attitude contributing towards the second, particularly as Otto of St. Blasien's distrust of the Temple and Hospital did not extend to the Teutonic order, which he was careful to exonerate from blame for events during the third crusade.⁸⁹ French chroniclers were also prone to such prejudice. The chronicler of Limoges was the only contemporary chronicler to blame the loss of the Templars' castle of Saphet on treachery from within; however, he took care to record that

⁸⁸Aubrey des Trois-Fontaines, p.925.

⁸⁹John of Würzburg, cols. 1087, 1082; Otto of St. Blasien, 'Continuatio Sanblasiana,' ed. R. Wilmans, MGHS 20, pp.318, 327.

a Syrian and an Englishman were responsible.⁹⁰ It therefore seems likely that he was attempting to pass blame for the disaster on to those he despised, rather than that he was repeating an eye-witness account.

(d) Changes in attitudes after 1250

Criticism did not remain constant throughout our period; evidence for hostility towards the military orders diminishes in the second half of the thirteenth century. There were two major reasons for this. Firstly, as new religious orders were founded, the military orders ceased to be the latest and most innovative monastic orders. With the establishment of the mendicant orders, the military orders and the Cistercians ceased to be the orders most hated for their privileges. In 1274 Bruno, bishop of Olmütz, writing to Pope Gregory X, protested at length of the usurpation of priestly functions by the friars, but made no mention at all of the military orders.⁹¹

Secondly, the public profile of the military orders was reduced in the second half of the thirteenth century. This may be seen clearly in the writings of Gilbert of Tournai, Friar Minor, and Humbert de Romans, Friar Preacher, who show little real knowledge of the military orders. Gilbert, writing a

⁹⁰ `Maius Chronicon Lemovicense,` RHGF 21, p.773-4; cf. `Chronicon Rothmagensis,` RHGF 23, p.340; `Continuatio 1 Minoritae Erphodiensis,` ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGHS 24, p.205; `Cronica S. Petri Erfordiensis Moderna,` ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGHS 30 p.403; cf. `Chronique de Primat,` traduite par Jean du Vignay,` RHGF 23, p.83, and `Eracles,` pp.454-5.

⁹¹ Bruno of Olmütz, `Bericht am Papst Gregor X,` pp.23-6; see also, e.g., Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 3 pp.287-8, 332-4, 4 pp.9, 256, 279-80, 291-4, 511-7, 5 pp.73-4, 194-5, 546, 744; Vaughan, p.138; `Dunstable annals,` pp.213, 336-7 (under 1259 and 1287).

report in the same way as Bruno of Olmütz, criticized every part of the Church in turn: the bishops were defective in lifestyle, knowledge, doctrine and diligence, there were many irregularities among monks (although he had little to say against the friars), nuns were very corrupt and the beguines were condemned out of hand. However, when he came to the military orders, he had nothing of his own to say about them: he took his entire *critique* from Jacques de Vitry's thirty-seventh sermon, sometimes verbatim, sometimes in summary. This resulted in a reference to the Swordbrothers of Livonia as an order still in existence, whereas in fact it had been incorporated into the Teutonic order some forty years previously. Apparently Gilbert, determined to say something on every section of the Church and of society, could find nothing of his own to say against the orders, but preferred the safe and respectable ploy of quoting from an established authority. He did not discuss the Teutonic order: like most Frenchmen, he probably knew virtually nothing about it.⁹²

Humbert of Romans, fifth prior-general of the Dominican order from 1254 to 1263, also used the works of Jacques de Vitry when compiling his work *'De eruditione praedicatorum,'* but he used the *Historia Orientalis* rather than the sermons. He recommended particular points which should be impressed on each group under consideration: for the Hospitallers, the need to preserve vigorous discipline, and to remain humble rather than becoming proud; for the Templars, to learn to be good warriors in the spiritual battle as well as the physical; and for the Teutonic brothers, not to offend their patroness, the Blessed Virgin Mary, to concentrate on spiritual improvement as well as care for the poor and warfare, and to provide not only necessities for their countrymen but also for their salvation, as St. Paul did for his fellow-countrymen. The general impression given is that Humbert did not know a great deal

⁹²Gilbert of Tournai, *'Collectio de Scandalis Ecclesiae,'* ed. A. Stroick, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 24 (1931) 40-62, esp. 56-7, para.17.

about the Teutonic order and was somewhat at a loss for ideas: his account of the brothers is derived purely from Jacques de Vitry, and he apparently knew nothing of their work in Prussia or the complaints that they were not allowing the Prussians to be converted. He believed that the order was still pure in spirituality and devoted to the prelates, which the evidence of papal bulls indicates was not the case.

Likewise, he had nothing of contemporary relevance to say of the order of the Temple: his account of them owes its greatest debt to St. Bernard's *de Laude*. His awareness that the Hospitallers' greatest problem was pride need only show that he had read William of Tyre's *Historia*,⁹³ but it is interesting that he should see pride as a failing of the Hospitallers and not of the Templars. The fact that he makes no mention of the Hospital as a military order further indicates that he relied entirely on authorities for his assessment and not on his own experience or opinions. Yet, had he been hostile to the military orders, this might have been expected to have been reflected in his work; whereas in fact his tone was approving and encouraging.⁹³

Apparently neither of these friars was aware of the attacks on the military orders by the friar Roger Bacon. Although Roger was not thrown into prison until 1277, he had been under supervision in Paris since 1257 and perhaps this was sufficient to prevent the circulation of his works.⁹⁴

The profile of the military orders fell as the plight of

⁹³Humbert de Romans, *De eruditione praedicatorum*, Liber II: *Modo Prompte cudendi Sermones ad omne hominum et negotiorum genus*, in M. de la Bigne, ed., *Maxima Bibliotheca veterum patrum et antiquorum scriptorum ecclesiasticorum*, 27 vols. (Lyons, 1677) 25 pp.472-474; cf. Jacques de Vitry, *Historia Orientalis*, in J. Bongars, ed., *Gesta Dei per Francos*, 2 vols. in 3 (Hanover, 1611) pp. 1082-1085; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, p.317, note 105a.

⁹⁴Roger Bacon, *Opus Maius*, 1 pp.xxi-xxxiii, 3 pp.121-2.

the Holy Land became overshadowed by the papal Sicilian wars and kingdoms' internal affairs, such as disputes between the king and his barons in England, or rivalry for the crown in Germany. Although Europe received frequent pleas for help from the Holy Land, apparently the Holy Land no longer captured the imagination of writers as it had done earlier in the century, for few chroniclers mentioned it. Two reasons may be proposed for this. Firstly and most importantly, because of the conflicts in Europe, few crusades were actually going to the Holy Land: hence chroniclers had to rely on letters for news, which were not nearly so interesting as eyewitness reports. There was little or no personal involvement with the Holy Land among writers in Europe, and therefore little appreciation of the actual situation. Secondly, the information that came from the Holy Land was almost invariably bad. As early as 1248 the Hospital had been renting lands subject to the provision that the whole kingdom of Jerusalem might be lost to the Saracens; around 1263 a French poet lamented the insecurity of Acre.⁹⁵ It would not have been surprising if the western public had already resigned itself subconsciously to the loss of the Holy Land. The present decade has seen signs of 'compassion fatigue' among a concerned western public constantly bombarded with pictures of the dead and dying from continual disasters in the Third World; something similar seems to have happened among chroniclers of the second half of the thirteenth century. The real business of the Holy Land was too bad to be considered; writers preferred to fantasize, to treat the Holy Land as if it was a land of fable and legend, rather than a real place with

⁹⁵Cart., no.2482; *Li Romans de Claris et Laris*, ed. J. Alton, BLVS 169 (Tübingen, 1884; reprinted Amsterdam, 1966) line 49; cf. *Oeuvres complètes de Rutebuef*, ed. E. Faral and J. Bastin, 2 vols. (Paris, 1959-60) 1 p.500, lines 91-2 (writing c.1277: p.496).

real problems.⁹⁶ A generation grew up thinking the military orders incapable of winning a battle against the Muslims, and watching crusades go to Sicily rather than Acre. The fact that the few crusades which did reach the Holy Land achieved little only served to reinforce this image. Hence events in the Holy Land, and the deeds of the military orders, faded out of the chronicles, not to return until the loss of Acre again jolted Europe into concern.

Such a change accounts for the relative increase in the popularity of the military orders amongst clerical commentators in the second half of the thirteenth century. There were few hostile comments by chroniclers after the death of Matthew Paris,⁹⁷ whereas the evidence of charters and episcopal registers indicates that, outside the Holy Land and France, where the orders had been longest established, relations were usually peaceful and sometimes very good.

(e) Good relations.

There is evidence for good relations between the military orders and the clergy throughout their history, but it is usually overlooked in favour of criticism.

⁹⁶Cf. M. R. Morgan, 'The Rothelin continuation of William of Tyre,' in B. Z. Kedar, H. E. Mayer and R. C. Smail, eds., *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem presented to Joshua Prawer* (Jerusalem, 1982) pp.254-257.

⁹⁷The major exception is the second Bury chronicler, who twice accuses the Templars of treachery. He was writing between 1285 and 1296, that is, possibly after the loss of Acre; certainly the inaccuracies in his work indicate that he wrote a long time after the events he describes. See *Chronica Buriensis, the Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds 1212-1301*, ed. A. Gransden (London and Edinburgh, 1964) pp.xvii, 46-47, 82; cf. A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c. 550 to c. 1307* (London, 1974) pp.396-9.

In the Holy Land, the orders won the approbation of some of the clergy who worked alongside them. Jacques de Vitry, Augustinian canon and bishop of Acre from 1216 to c.1228, while recognizing that the military orders had serious faults, such as pride, greed and usurping the rights of the prelates, believed that they were necessary for the defence of Christendom, and should be encouraged to reform themselves, rather than condemned outright. He suggested that the orders should send brothers to the schools to learn theology, so that the brothers might do everything according to scripture.⁹⁸ He praised the hard work and expenses of the order of the Temple in building Castle Pilgrim: 'an honourable work...for that castle has burdened the Saracens more than all the Christian army has done.' He also praised the Templars' courage during the siege of Damietta. His specific opinions of the Hospital are not known, although he had a long dispute with the order over the rights of the diocese of Acre.⁹⁹

Fidenzio of Padua, provincial vicar of the Friars Minor in the Holy Land from c.1266-1291, although he blamed the military orders for contributing towards the general disorder by quarrelling among themselves and refusing to obey the king, gave a long and sympathetic account of the siege and fall of the Templars' castle of Saphet, which shows that he, as vicar, had close and friendly relations with the order. The master had asked Fidenzio to send two friars to the garrison in the castle, which Fidenzio had done. Fidenzio described the Templars as resisting for as long as they could and then, seeing that there was no possibility of help reaching them, negotiating the best terms of surrender possible. When the

⁹⁸Jacques de Vitry, Sermon 37, pp.405-414, esp. p.412.

⁹⁹*Lettres de Jacques de Vitry (1160/1170-1240) évêque de Saint-Jean-d'Acre*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens (Leiden, 1960) pp.99-100, III lines 41-8; pp.115, 121, V lines 69-75, 251-2, p.124, VI lines 34-5, 47-52; Cart., nos. 1718, 1911, 2199, 2200.

sultan betrayed his word, not one of the brothers denied the faith, and the night after 'the aforesaid martyrs' had been executed a great light shone over their bodies, although none of the Saracens were converted by it. Fidenzio wrote shortly before the fall of Acre, but before January 1291.¹⁰⁰

Another friar, the Dominican Burchard of Mount Sion, was in broad agreement with Fidenzio, although he visited the Holy Land only briefly, sometime between 1274 and 1284. Although he regretted the loss of the military orders' fortresses, in particular the loss of Saphet, he blamed the state of the Holy Land not on the military orders but on the Palestinian Franks in general.¹⁰¹ Other clerical pilgrims to the Holy Land were greatly impressed by the military orders, although some merely mentioned their presence. The priest John of Würzburg, who visited the Holy Land c.1170, was full of praise for the hospitality and military work of the Hospital, but was less enthusiastic about the Temple, which he suspected of implication in the failure of the second crusade at Damascus. In contrast, the priest Theodoric, who was in the Holy Land

¹⁰⁰Fidentius de Padua, 'Liber recuperationis Terrae Sanctae,' in P. G. Golubovich, *Bibliotheca Bio-Bibliographia Della Terra Sancta e dell'oriente francescano*, 2 (Quaracchi, 1913) pp.15, 24-5; Schein, 'The image of the crusader kingdom,' 706.

¹⁰¹J. C. M. Laurent, ed., *Peregrinatores medii aevi quatuor*, 2nd edition (Leipzig, 1873) pp.31, 34, 83, 88-9; A. Grabois, 'Christian pilgrims in the thirteenth century and the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem: Burchard of Mount Sion,' in *Outremer*, pp.292-3 and note 23, sees this as 'an open charge against the Templars, whom he accused of betrayal.' Burchard may have been repeating the chronicler of Limoges' tale, RHGF 21 p.773, that a Syrian brother betrayed the fortress, but he may equally well have been referring to the Sultan's treachery: 'Eracles,' pp.454-5; cf. Primat, RHGF 23 p.83; Abou 'L-Feda, 'Annals,' RHC Or 1 p.151.

c.1172, was full of praise for both orders. An anonymous pilgrim of the late twelfth century, probably a cleric, was particularly impressed by the courage and discipline of the Templars; he also admired the Hospital, but had less to say about it.¹⁰² The German pilgrim Wilbrand of Oldenburg, who visited the Holy Land in 1211 as leader of an embassy sent by the emperor Otto IV to Leo of Armenia, in the company of the messengers of the duke of Austria and Brother Hermann of Salza, master of the Teutonic order, very much admired the castles of the military orders, particularly those of the Hospital. He was also impressed by the legendary history of the Hospital.¹⁰³ Benoit, bishop of Marseilles, while on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1240, encouraged the Templars to rebuild the castle of Saphet, which had recently come back into their hands: he was quoted as praising the order's founders as 'holy knights' and saying that 'your religion today is very renowned and famous with God and men.'¹⁰⁴

Clerics who were present during crusades generally received a favourable impression of the military orders. This was the case for Odo of Deuil during the second crusade, and during the fifth for a certain Italian cleric in the entourage

¹⁰²*Jerusalem pilgrimage, 1099-1185*, ed. J. Wilkinson, J. Hill and W. F. Ryan, Hakluyt Society, 2nd series, 167 (London, 1988) pp.104, 178, 200, 217, 233, 239-40; John of Würzburg, PL 155 cols. 1085, 1087; *Theodoricus: Libellus de Locis Sanctis*, ed. M. L. and W. Bulst (Heidelberg, 1976) pp.21, 26-7, 35, 36, 37, 43, 44, 46, 49; *Anonymous Pilgrims* pp.29-30.

¹⁰³Laurent, ed., *Peregrinatores*, pp.162, 169, 170, 174, 188-9; Riley-Smith, 'Templars and Teutonic knights in Cilician Armenia,' p.111.

¹⁰⁴R. B. C. Huygens, ed., 'Un nouveau texte du traité "De constructione castris Saphet",' *Studi Medievali*, 3rd. series, 6 (1965) 379-81, esp.381.

of the papal legate and for Oliver, *scholasticus* of Cologne. Odo praised the discipline and courage of the Templars: the Italian cleric praised both the Temple and Hospital, but particularly the Temple, whose brothers appear in one vivid scene proclaiming Christ and calling upon St. George to come to their help against the blaspheming Muslims who had just broken into the Christian camp. It is possible that this writer was concerned to prove the Templars' integrity, in view of rumours circulating during the crusade against them, the Hospitallers and the king of Jerusalem.¹⁰⁵

Oliver *Scholasticus*, as revealed in his *Historia regum Terrae Sanctae* and *Historia Damiatina*, was almost invariably favourable towards the military orders. Although following William of Tyre in his history of the Holy Land, he modified or removed William's attacks on the military orders, and his verdict on the controversial Gerard de Ridefort, master of the Temple 1185-89, was that he was an active knight, though impetuous and rash. In his history of the fifth crusade, most of which he witnessed himself, he had only praise for the military orders, except for once during the disastrous battle of 29 August 1219, where some of the Hospitallers ran away, although the Templars, the Teutonic brothers and the rest of the Hospitallers were 'like a wall for the fleeing.' The Templars, who had been first in the advance, were the last to return; and, in the final battle, the Templars protected the

¹⁰⁵Odo of Deuil, pp.124, 134; MGHS 31, p.669; 'Gesta obsidionis Damiatinae,' Johannes de Tulbia, 'de domino Johanne Rege Ierusalem', 'Liber duelli Christiani in obsidione Damiatinae exacti,' in R. Röhrich, ed., *Quinti Belli Sacri Scriptores Minores*, SOL (Geneva, 1879) pp.99-100, 130-1, 157, also pp.80, 103, 121, 132, 135, 145, 159, 161-2; Cart., no.1633.

rear of the army `at great danger to themselves.`¹⁰⁶

Oliver`s work enjoyed a wide circulation. England traditionally had close links with Cologne, and it is no surprise to discover that a copy of Oliver`s *Historia Damiatina* reached Roger of Wendover. This work was also used by the annalist of Cologne, by the author of the *Gesta Crucigerorum Rhenanorum*, who may also have been a man of Cologne, by the annalist of the abbey of St. Rudbert of Salzburg, the chronicler of St. Peter`s of Erfurt, and, slightly adapted, by the author of the *Historia Damiatina* attributed to Jacques de Vitry.¹⁰⁷ It must have done much to restore European confidence in the military orders after the failures of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Although they might be unsuccessful, their integrity, faith and courage was beyond reproach. So favourable was Oliver`s work towards the order of the Temple that Matthew Paris apparently thought that a Templar had written it.¹⁰⁸ It is not obvious why Oliver favoured the Templars over and above the Hospitallers or Teutonic order, particularly in view of the fact he himself was

¹⁰⁶*Die Schriften des Kölner Domscholasters, Späteren Bischofs von Paderborn und Kardinalbischofs von S. Sabina, Oliverus*, ed. H. Hoogeveg, BLVS 202 (Tübingen, 1894) `Historia regum Terrae Sanctae,` pp.142-3, also 118, 119, 126, 129; cf. pp. 120, 134; `Historia Damiatina,` pp.214-5, 217, 271, also pp.180, 194-5, 209-11, 223-4, 234, 244-5, 254-6, 273; cf. 279, para.84.

¹⁰⁷Roger of Wendover, 2 pp.202-4, 206-7, 228-51; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 3 pp.35-42, 44-56; `Annales Colonienses Maximi,` pp.832-36; `Gesta crucigerorum Rhenanorum,` in Röhrich, ed., *Quinti Belli*, p.36ff.; `Annales S. Rudberti Salisburgensis,` pp.780-81; `Cronica S. Petri Erfordiensis Moderna,` pp.385-9; `Historia Damiatina,` in Bongars, ed., *Gesta Dei*, 1,2 p.1125ff.

¹⁰⁸Paris, *Historia Anglorum*, 2 p.232, and note 6.

a German; it may have been because of family or personal connections, or perhaps he simply admired this order more than the others.

However, it was not only those who had visited the Holy Land who approved of the military orders. Those clergy who were concerned for the defence of the Holy Land had a particular interest in the orders. In 1206 Herbert, bishop of Salisbury, confirmed a grant to the Templars of Sandford because, he said, it was his duty to help those who struggled to defend the Christian faith against its enemies.¹⁰⁹ In 1261 Bishop Volrad of Halberstadt gave two pieces of land which his sister Margaret had conferred on the cathedral to 'our beloved brothers in Christ of the knighthood of the Temple, having inspected their constancy of faith, fortified by which they do not fear to oppose themselves day and night manfully against barbarous nations.' In contrast, a gift to the Teutonic order was given from reverence for the order's patroness, the Blessed Virgin Mary.¹¹⁰ A charter of 1261 issued by Hermann, bishop of Kammin, to the Templars, emphasized the brothers' self-sacrifice 'in zeal for the Christian name against the attacks of the infidel...under devoted obedience to the Holy See...for the defence of the oriental Church, to which they dedicate perpetual service.' He spoke of heavy losses in the field and described the brothers' deaths as martyrdoms which should bring rejoicing. These words were taken from the preamble to a bull of Alexander IV issued to the order in 1255; although presumably the bishop approved them. In another charter of 1285 refers to more personal motives: the 'multifarious and many kinds of services affectionately, devotedly and incessantly shown to us' by the Templars, and the brothers'

¹⁰⁹*The Sandford Cartulary*, ed. A. M. Leys, 2 vols., Oxfordshire Record Society nos. 19, 22 (Oxford, 1938-41) no.264.

¹¹⁰*Urkundenbuch des Hochstifts Halberstadt und seiner Bischöfe*, ed. G. Schmidt, vol. 2, Publicationen aus den K. Preußischen Staatsarchiven, 21 (Leipzig, 1884) nos. 1028, 1013.

alms to the poor.¹¹¹

These fine words, honest as they may have been, gloss over the most important consideration underlying the good relations between Hermann of Kammin and the Templars; the brothers were valuable to the bishop because they brought uncultivated land under cultivation. The same motive prompted the friendship and donations of the bishops of Lebus towards the order of the Temple between 1232 and 1244.¹¹² On the underdeveloped, underpopulated north-eastern frontier of the Empire, the orders' economic usefulness to the bishops outweighed their inconvenience, at least until the land was settled.¹¹³

The military orders were also assured of the support of the secular clergy in areas outside the Holy Land where they defended the land against pagan attack, and, in some cases, because they assisted in their conversion. Henry of Livonia, a German priest working in Livonia who became the pastor of the newly-converted Letts, worked alongside the Knights of Christ of Livonia, or Swordbrothers. In his chronicle of Livonia, written between 1225 and 1228, he had much praise for their courage and tenacity, as well as the piety of individual brothers, although he did not condone their mistreatment of the

¹¹¹*Pommersches Urkundenbuch*, ed. K. Conrad, R. Prümers, et al., 10 vols. (Stettin and Cologne, 1868-1984) 2 nos. 696, 1352; cf. *Les registres d'Alexandre IV*, no.482.

¹¹²*Codex Diplomaticus Brandenburgensis. Sammlung der Urkunden, Chroniken und sonstigen Geschichtsquellen für die Geschichte der Mark Brandenburg und ihrer Regenten*, ed. A. F. Riedel, 41 vols. (Berlin, 1838-69) A 19 p.1 no.1, 20 p.182 no.8, 24 pp.1-2 no.2.

¹¹³W. Kuhn, 'Kirchliche Siedlung als Grenzschutz, 1200 bis 1250 (am Beispiel des mittleren Oderraumes)' *Ostdeutsche Wissenschaft* 9 (1962) 48-50.

converts nor their quarrels with the bishop.¹¹⁴ Thomas of Spalato in Dalmatia, archdeacon of Spalato from 1230 to 1268, praised the courage of the master of the Temple of Hungary and his men, together with the king of the Rutheni, Coloman, and archbishop Hugrin, who went out to fight the Tatars in April 1241, while many of the Hungarian knights were terrified to go against them. Although they made great slaughter on the enemy, the king and archbishop barely escaped with their lives and the master and his brothers were killed.¹¹⁵ Bruno, bishop of Olmütz, professed a great affection for the Teutonic order, not only because of its hospitality, but also because of its defence of Christendom. However, for reasons less obvious, he also addressed the brothers of the Temple in Cejkovice with affection: *'cum plenitudine amiciciae et favoris.'*¹¹⁶

Although, by the second half of the thirteenth century, there is little evidence of good relations between French bishops and the military orders, some does survive. The register of Eudes Rigord, archbishop of Rouen 1248-1269, shows him lodging with the Hospitallers or at the Paris Temple, and installing the candidates of both Templars and Hospitallers to churches where they held the advowson.¹¹⁷ In 1255 Bartholomew, bishop of Cahors, gave two churches to the order of the Temple, represented by Brother Raembaud de Caron, in return for his service to the bishop, and in token of 'the great familiarity'

¹¹⁴Henry of Livonia, *Chronica Lyvoniae*, ed. W. Arndt, MGHS 23 p.246ff., especially p.273 on Brothers Berthold and Arnold, p.305 on Brother Rudolf.

¹¹⁵Thomas of Spalato, p.587.

¹¹⁶*Cod. Dip. Boh.* 5,1 pp.626-7, no.422, 5,2 pp. 185-7 no.594.

¹¹⁷*Registrum Visitationum archiepiscopi Rothomagensis: Journal des visites pastorales d'Eude Rigaud, archevêque de Rouen*, ed. T. Bonnin (Rouen, 1852) pp.67, 85, 95, 247, 709, 716, 722.

which had long existed between the order and the bishops of Cahors.¹¹⁸ In the twelfth century relations had often been amicable. In 1132 Elbert, bishop of Châlons, had given the order of the Temple a concession of tithes and revenue in recognition of the assistance they gave pilgrims in the Holy Land; Henry, archbishop of Rheims, had been friendly towards the order during the 1160s and 1170s.¹¹⁹ In the Holy Land also, relations could be good even in the difficult conditions of the thirteenth century: the archbishop of Caesarea in the 1230s was friendly towards the order of St.Lazarus and the Temple, while Paul of Segni, a Friar Preacher, bishop of Tripoli in the 1270`s, was a Templar *confrère*.¹²⁰

The registers of English bishops indicate that relations were usually peaceful and sometimes even friendly. Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln 1235-1253, not only instituted the orders` presentees without objection, but also gave the order of the Temple the church of Rothley under certain conditions; although Matthew Paris depicted him in lengthy and fruitless dispute with the Templars, Hospitallers and other

¹¹⁸A. du Bourg, *Ordre de Malte: Histoire du Grand-Prieuré de Toulouse* (Toulouse, 1882) pièces justificatives, no.CI.

¹¹⁹D`Albon, *Cartulaire*, no. 46; PL 200 cols. 687-8, 690-1, 771, 774, nos. 748, 751-3, 852, 856; *The letters of John of Salisbury*, ed. W. J. Miller, et al., 2 vols. (London, 1955 and Oxford, 1979) 2 pp.176-8, no.176.

¹²⁰Comte de Marsy, ed., `Fragment d`un cartulaire de l`ordre de Saint-Lazare, en Terre Sainte,` AOL 2, `Documents,` pp.154-5, nos. 37-8; Règle, p.286, para.546; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.267-9.

exempt orders over their privileges.¹²¹ In 1279, Walter Giffard, archbishop of York, made a gift to the Hospital of the church of St. Felix, of which the order already held the patronage; he referred in his donation charter to the brothers' *hilaris et grata* hospitality, its honour and support for the downtrodden poor, and their constant and generous liberality. A later archbishop of York, John le Romeyn, gave further evidence of good relations between the archbishops and the Hospital when in 1288 he gave the prior of the order in England a gift of ten deer.¹²²

The Franciscan John Peckham, archbishop of Canterbury 1278-1293, seems to have held much respect for the order of the Temple, although, as a man of great integrity and personal austerity, he might have been expected to despise the brothers, if they were as worldly as Matthew Paris declared. He used the order's house in London as a meeting place for councils and synods, while in his work *Defensio Fratrum Mendicantium*, written before he became archbishop, he had set the order of the Temple alongside the order of Grandmont. A century before, Walter Map had considered the latter as the only pure order remaining. While allowing that both these orders, as well as canons and friars, had declined from their original high ideals, John Peckham maintained that it was still better to enter one of these orders than to remain a layman, in order to

¹²¹*Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste, Episcopi Lincolniensis*, ed. F. N. Davis, Canterbury and York Society 10 (London, 1913) *passim*; *Rotuli Ricardi Gravesend diocesis Lincolniensis*, ed. F. N. Davis et al., Canterbury and York Society 31 (Oxford, 1925) pp.162-3; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora* 5 p.97.

¹²²*The register of Walter Giffard, lord archbishop of York 1266-1279*, ed. W. Brown, Surtees Society 109 (Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1904) pp.47-8; *The register of John le Romeyn, lord archbishop of York, 1286-1296*, ed. W. Brown, 2 vols., Surtees Society 123, 128 (Durham, London and Berlin, 1913-1916) 2 p.60.

obtain salvation.¹²³

The best relations between bishops and military orders by the second half of the thirteenth century are found in Germany. Not only the Hospital and the Teutonic order were favoured, but also the Temple, which was, for example, entrusted with the nunnery of Mühlen by Bishop Eberhard of Worms in 1272.¹²⁴

Friendly relations also existed between the military orders and other monastic orders, although records are few as good relations seldom require written records. The connections between the Cistercian order and the Temple are well known; these did not cease with the death of St. Bernard, as is made clear by a letter from Brother Philip de Plessis, master of the Temple, to Arnold I, abbot of Cîteaux, in 1202, asking for the Cistercians' prayers and saying that 'since our house took its institution from yours,' the Templars were especially bound to love the Cistercians, and the Cistercians should in turn love

¹²³*Councils and Synods*, 2,2 p.1428 (index): councils at the New Temple, London: shows thirteen councils were held here 1250-1300, six of which were during Peckham's time; *Fratris Johannis Pecham quodam Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis: Tractatus Tres de Paupertate*, ed. C. L. Kingsford, A. G. Little, F. Tocco (Aberdeen, 1910) p.173 lines 293-6; cf. Walter Map, pp.52-4, 112-4. Two manuscripts of the *Defensio* survive. It was probably written between 1250 and 1270.

¹²⁴Schüpferling, p.33, and see, e.g., *ibid.* pp.26-7; Cart., nos.2649, 2676, 4001 (but cf. 2994, 3193;) Wojtecki, 'Der Deutsche Orden unter Friedrich II,' pp.214-6; *UB Thüringen*, nos. 131, 187, 223, 225; D. Wojtecki, *Studien zur Personengeschichte des Deutschenordens im 13 Jahrhundert*, Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des östlichen Europas, Band 3 (Wiesbaden, 1971) p.62.

them.¹²⁵ Friendships also existed between individual houses. For example, around 1180, the canons of Osney and Templars of Cowley drew up a charter of 'special love,' by which each would support the other: this was a result of the friendship which one of the canons, Master Gaut, held for the Temple before he entered Osney.¹²⁶ In 1274, the Teutonic order took the nuns of the house at Quedlinburg into their confraternity, because of the nuns' friendship towards the brothers and their works of charity: this included not only a sharing in the Teutonic order's masses, vigils, etc. but also in the brothers' loss of blood in the Holy Land, Livonia and Prussia 'for the amplification of the Catholic faith.'¹²⁷ In 1289 the monks of the monastery of Lehnin took the brethren of the Hospital at Werben into their fraternity.¹²⁸ Such associations might be caused not only by regard for the other order's sanctity but also by hopes of benefitting from its power and influence.¹²⁹

There were also friendly relations between the more radical and unconforming religious and the military orders. In the twelfth century, a few hermits were recorded as admiring the spirituality of the orders of the Hospital or Temple:

¹²⁵Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus* p.149 note 6, pp.360-2, esp. 361.

See also above, p.77 notes 3,4; Caesarius of Heisterbach, below, ch. 5 p.239. A number of Templars became Cistercians: see, e.g., Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus* p.37, note 32, pp.50, 377; PL 200 cols. 228-9 no.162; cf. Cart., nos. 1318, 1329.

¹²⁶Sandford *Cartulary*, no. 58 and note, no. 57.

¹²⁷UB *Thüringen*, no.259.

¹²⁸Cart., no.4028; *Cod. Dip. Brand.*, A 6 p.20 no.19.

¹²⁹E.g., *Registres d'Urbain IV*, no.713.

again, a few knight-brothers became hermits.¹³⁰ In 1288 and 1291, two beguines gave the order of the Hospital money with which to buy property, while in 1291 another gave some property to the Teutonic order at Marburg.¹³¹

Friendships could be personal as well as general. According to his *Vita*, Brother Jordan, second general of the Dominican order (d.1227) was friendly with the order of the Temple, although he spoke very little French. Again, at their general chapter of 1243 the members of the Dominican order were instructed not to obstruct donations to the Templars 'who are devoted friends of the order,' from dying persons whom they might confess. This friendship may account for Humbert of Romans' favourable attitude towards the order. A series of letters from officials of the Hospital in the Holy Land to Brother Walter of Saint Martin, Friar Preacher, between 1251 and 1252, indicates that the Hospital also had friendly

¹³⁰E.g., Godric of Finchale preached to the sick in the Hospital during his second visit to Jerusalem, before 1100; Reginald of Durham, *Libellus de Vita et Miraculis S. Godrici Heremitaie de Finchale*, ed. J. Stevenson, Surtees Society 20 (1844) p.57; cf. B. Ward, *Miracles and the Medieval mind; Theory, record and event 1000-1215* (Aldershot, 1987) p.77; *Butler's Lives of the Saints*, revised H. Thurston and D. Attwater, 4 vols. (London, 1956) 2 pp.361-2. Geoffrey, a hermit near Cirencester: *Sandford Cartulary*, no.335. See also Kedar, 'Gerald of Nazareth,' p.66; *Cart.*, nos. 403, 434.

¹³¹*Cart.*, nos. 4002, 4159; *UB Hessen* no.526.

relations with members of this order.¹³²

(f) Chapter summary

Three points in particular emerge from this study of attitudes of the clergy towards the military orders. Firstly, that the area where there is the least evidence for friendly relations between the military orders and the rest of the clergy in the later thirteenth century, France, was also the area of least opposition to the arrest of the Templars. In Germany, the arrest did not proceed so smoothly, while the English prelates were cautious and unenthusiastic, especially in the province of York.¹³³

Secondly, there was no general condemnation of the military orders from the source where it might most be expected: from the austere and idealistic friars. Humbert de Romans, John Peckham, Fidenzio of Padua and Jordan all showed respect or even friendship for one or more of the military orders. Equally under attack from the laity for their failings, it seems that prominent members of religious orders did not attack each other by the end of the thirteenth century. Even in the case of Gilbert of Tournai, his criticism of the bishops and of older monastic orders is far greater than that of the military orders.

Thirdly, the most savage criticism of the military orders came from the regular rather than from the secular clergy. The

¹³²*Acta Sanctorum*, ed. J. Bollandus (Antwerp, 1643ff, reprinted Brussels, 1966) Feb. II pp.733-4, para.66; *Monumenta ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum Historica*, 3, *Acta capitulorum Generalium*, ed. B. M. Reichert, 1 (Rome and Stuttgart, 1898) p.26; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 6, *Liber Additamentorum*, pp.203-7, nos. 100-2.

¹³³S. Menache, 'Contemporary attitudes concerning the Templars' affair: propaganda's fiasco?' *Journal of Medieval History*, 8 (1982) 137-8, 140-1; Bulst-Thiele, 'Der Prozeß gegen der Templerorden,' in *Geistlichen Ritterorden*, 391-2.

secular clergy in general tended to be more philosophical in attitude than regulars. The bishops were forced by their office to be pragmatic, realistic and tolerant. They had to live alongside a multitude of refractory monastic orders, all privileged to a greater or lesser extent; they had to reconcile the demands of their office, of the papacy and of the monarchy; their outlook was, by necessity, less idealistic than that of the cloistered monk. Again, the cloister bred chroniclers of narrow mind, seeing only the interests of their own houses, fond of gossip and scandal to enliven the daily round. Their criticism was often ill-informed and based on rumour and prejudice.

In some respects, the problems in relations between the military orders and the papacy, bishops and other religious orders were simply those of all religious orders of the period. Many of those who criticized them had even greater criticism for other sections of the Church, as did John of Salisbury, Nigel de Longchamps, Walter Map, Matthew Paris or Gilbert of Tournai, although they were singled out by those whose opposition was mainly political/national, such as William of Tyre or Otto of St. Blasien. The greatest criticism of their privileges was voiced during the twelfth century, while the greatest criticism of their moral standards appeared during the first half of the thirteenth. After circa 1250, as the military orders slipped out of the public eye, so did their vices.

Much of the criticism was the result of factors outside the military orders' control, or unavoidable if they were to discharge their duties effectively. Their particular function led to their being singled out as the butt of scandalous tales from the Holy Land in some monastic chronicles; the virtues which had won them the trust of pope and princes also won them the hostility of any cleric who might be opposed to pope or prince. Their international nature, coupled to their pressing and continual financial needs for maintaining the defence of the Holy Land, meant that exemptions from episcopal authority were essential for their operation, but these in turn aroused vociferous hostility, both from the episcopacy and from those clergy opposed to such privileges on canonical grounds. The

fact that they followed an active rather than a contemplative lifestyle and shed blood won them the disdain of a few clergy and lessened their status in the eyes of some others. Yet, nevertheless, it was recognized that they performed an important function, necessary for Christendom. If Jacques de Vitry complained that they abused their privileges and grew proud, while the bishops at the councils of 1292 bemoaned the fact that their resources had not been efficiently used and that they quarrelled among themselves, the solution was always seen to be reform, not abolition. At the grassroots, in the localities, relations between houses and between brothers and bishop were as often good as they were bad, and perhaps the scandalous stories were not taken particularly seriously. As Walter Map drily remarked:

Perhaps many lie when they tell these stories about the lords Templars; let us ask them themselves and believe what we hear. How they behave at Jerusalem I do not know; here with us they live harmlessly enough.¹³⁴

¹³⁴Walter Map, p.68; cf. Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, p.389.

CHAPTER THREE:
THE VIEWS OF THE LAITY

Much of what has already been said of the monarchs may also be said of the landholding laity whom they ruled. Some of the influences on patronage were the same, such as crusading, dynastic tradition, and knighthood. As in the case of monarchs, patterns of patronage in western Europe were different from those in eastern Europe: in particular, the thirteenth century saw developing criticism of the orders in western Europe, whereas in eastern Europe the only criticism was based on territorial rivalry. It is also necessary to consider the views of those outside the noble/knightly class, the merchants and peasantry; of women, bearing in mind the male domination of society and of the military orders; and of those outside Roman Catholic Christendom, as far as these can be determined.

The surviving charters reveal that the birth of the military order was welcomed with much enthusiasm by lay landowners from the highest nobility to the humblest freeholder. In 1133 or 1134 one Laureta gave all she possessed in the village of Douzens to:

the knights of Jerusalem, living together in one mind in Solomon's Temple and manfully waging war daily against the unexpected Saracens, against the most impious who try to destroy God's law and the faithful servants of God; thereby following the Gospel...¹

Laureta certainly had no doubts as to the validity of such an order. Roger, viscount of Béziers, declared similar opinions when on 1 April 1133 he gave the order his village of Brucafel

¹D'Albon, *Cartulaire*, no. 62; P. Gérard and E. Magnou, eds., *Cartulaires des Templiers de Douzens*, Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, série in 8°, 3 (Paris, 1965) pp.50-1, no.40.

and a piece of land where the brothers could build a village and populate it:

`to the Jerusalem knighthood of the Temple of Solomon and the brothers fighting for God there for the guard and defence of the holy city of Jerusalem and holy Christianity....so that almighty and merciful God may deign for us to live in good perseverance and, after the course of this life, receive us in a good end and confession from this world, amen.`²

At the end of our period good opinions were still being expressed of the military orders by the laity. In 1291 one Isabelle of Aversa declared that she was giving the Hospital at Capua a church and convent which she had founded, as she had found by experience that the order's life, habit and religion rendered welcome and continual service to the Lord. In 1289 Albrecht, landgrave of Thuringia, confirming a gift to the Teutonic order, declared that he pursued the brothers with special affection because they did not cease to pour out their blood continually and unceasingly for the expansion of the Christian faith in the Holy Land, Livonia and Prussia, for the name of the Crucified. In 1286 the margraves Otto and Otto of Brandenburg `moved by the most sincere affection` which they had towards `the order of the holy house of the Knighthood of the Temple and the brothers serving God in that order,` gave, to the honour of God and His Mother, the town of Zielenzig and several villages.³

On the other hand, around 1220 Hugh, lord of Berzé,

²D`Albon, *Cartulaire*, no.63; *Cartulaires de Douzens*, no.115 (114), pp.107-8.

³Cart., no.4154; *UB Thüringen*, no.473; *Cod. Dip. Brand.*, A 19 pp.125-6, no.4; see also V. Carrière, ed., *Histoire et cartulaire des Templiers de Provins* (Paris, 1919) no.160, for a donation of 1301 in which the donor, Lady Aveline, expresses thanks to the Templars for their daily services and goodness to her.

complained that the orders of the Temple and Hospital in the Holy Land prevented criminals from being brought to justice, in 1230 Philip de Nanteuil accused the three major military orders of cowardice and treachery, and circa 1270 the troubadour Daspol declared that the Templars and Hospitallers were full of pride and avarice, doing evil instead of good.⁴ Clearly, opinions of the military orders were mixed.

The evidence for lay opinions of the military orders is, however, fragmentary and scattered. Virtually none of the laity set their opinions of the military orders down in writing in the twelfth century, and relatively few even in the thirteenth century. It is therefore difficult to build up a consistent picture of the orders' image, not only across the whole of lay society, but also within groups holding similar interests, such as merchants or the higher nobility.

Some evidence may be found in the appointment of members of the orders to positions of responsibility. As in the case of monarchs, the frequent appointments of members of the military orders as counsellors and servants, to positions of great power and influence, and the friendships which developed between individuals and brothers of the military orders are evidence of the high esteem in which the which the brothers were held, and their personal sanctity. At his death in 1219 William Marshal, count of Striguil and Pembroke, had a Templar,

⁴*La 'Bible' au seigneur de Berzé*, ed. F. Lecoy (Paris, 1938) lines 271-293; Philip de Nanteuil, 'En chantant veil mon Duel faire,' in J. Bédier and P. Aubry, eds., *Les chansons de croisade* (Paris, 1909, reprinted Geneva, 1974) p.223, strophe 4; Daspol, 'Seinhos, aujas, c'aves saber e sen,' lines 49-56, in P. Meyer, 'Les derniers troubadours de la Provence d'après le chansonnier donné a la Bibliothèque impériale par M. Ch. Giraud,' BEC 5 (6ème série) (1869) 289.

Brother Geoffrey, as his almoner;⁵ Brother John, a Templar, was almoner of Count Ferrand of Flanders in 1229;⁶ Brother Henry, commander of the Temple's *bailie* of Brabant, was almoner of John, duke of Brabant, in 1278.⁷ In 1187 the troubadour Guilhem de Berguedan appointed two Templar commanders as the executors of his will, giving the order a generous donation.⁸ Thierry of Nussa, prior of the Hospital in England from 1236, was a friend of Richard, earl of Cornwall, and Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester; in the 1250s Brother Heidenreich, of the Teutonic order, commander of Zwätzen, was a special friend of Dietrich, burgrave of Kirchberg; in 1291 Brother Gerhard of Gollnow of the Hospital was held in special affection by the Dukes Bogislaw IV, Barnim II and Otto I of Silesia and Cassubia.⁹ However, the evidence for such relationships is, by its nature, fragmentary and incomplete,

⁵*L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal, comte de Striguil et de Pembroke*, ed. P. Meyer, 3 vols., SHF (Paris, 1891-1901) lines 18317-18320.

⁶*Liberate Rolls*, 1 p.123.

⁷Rymer's *Foedera*, 1,2 pp.549, 550.

⁸M. de Riquer, 'El testamento de trovador Guilhem de Berguedan,' *Mélanges de linguistique et de littérature romanes a la mémoire d'Istvan Frank, Annales Universitatis Sarraviensis* 6 (1957) 580-3.

⁹Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 4 pp.44, 56; *UB Thüringen* nos. 132, 137; *Cart.*, no. 4138.

concerning, in the main, only the higher nobility.¹⁰ It is also impossible to know why a particular friendship developed; it may have been based on character rather than an individual's membership of a military order, therefore telling us nothing of lay opinions of the military orders.

Another general indicator of the orders' popularity at any point in time is the number of donations being made. Although the charters of donation may give no motive for a donation, or may express a motive in the words of the order receiving it rather than those of the donor, the very fact of a donation in alms indicates that the donor had a high opinion of the order's spirituality. A major motive for almsgiving was to obtain the prayers of the donee; since only the prayers of the worthy, it was believed, would be heard by God, a donor would not 'waste' his or her alms on an unworthy order when many good causes were available.

Appendix II gives a summary of donations to individual military orders in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Although this includes donations by monarchs and clergy as well as the laity in general, this does not distort the conclusions materially as patterns of donation were fairly consistent across these three sections of society. Geographical variations were also consistent across all sections of society: donations in Germany and eastern Europe began later than those in western and southern Europe, but continued at a high level to the end of the thirteenth century, whereas those in western and

¹⁰While George Duby has shown that between 1180 and 1220/30 the division between lords and knights vanished, so that all nobles were knights and all knights nobles, he also emphasizes that in Germany the two groups did not merge in marriage until the late fourteenth century, while in France an ancient 'nobility of blood,' seen as superior to other knights, remained: G. Duby, *The chivalrous society*, trans. C. Postan (London, 1977) pp.78-9, 178-185, 95, 103-4, 107; cf. *La Mort le Roi Artu, Roman du XIIIe siècle*, ed. J. Frappier, TLF 58 (Geneva, 1964) pp.24, 27, paras. 26, 29.

southern Europe began to decline after 1240-1260.

Donations varied 'vertically' rather than 'horizontally', i.e. between the high nobility and poorer knights rather than between the high nobility and high clergy. Comparing the results of Delaville le Roulx' cartulary of the Hospitallers, which consists mainly of the donations of the high nobility, monarchy and high clergy, with those of local cartularies such as the Hospitallers' Essex cartulary, which contains mainly donations by poor knights and free peasants, it appears that donations by the higher nobility began to fall at an earlier date than those of lower social standing, at the beginning of the thirteenth century rather than around the middle of the century. This trend was noticed by J. C. Ward in his study of the endowments of an English noble family, the Clares, and by S. Raban in her study of the effects of the statute of mortmain in England,¹¹ and appears to be common to the high nobility throughout western Europe for donations to every religious order. The decline in donations after 1240-1260 among the lower social groups may be due partly to similar considerations as affected the higher nobility: an exhaustion of land available for donation and changing attitudes towards endowment. However, it may also be due to changing attitudes towards the military orders: as Michael Gervers noted, the beginning of the decline in donations coincides with the final loss of Jerusalem. Moreover, it also coincides with a series of disastrous or unmemorable campaigns in the Holy Land, 1239-1254.¹²

¹¹J. C. Ward, 'Fashions in monastic endowment: the foundations of the Clare family, 1066-1314,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 32 (1981) 446-51; S. Raban, *Mortmain legislation*, 131-2.

¹²M. Gervers, ed., *The cartulary of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in England, Secunda Camera. Essex*, Records of Social and Economic History, new series 6, published for the British Academy (Oxford, 1982) pp.xlv-xlvi.

An obvious cause for the decline in donations would seem to be the mortmain regulations introduced by monarchs and local lords in various parts of Europe during the thirteenth century: by Frederick II in Sicily, Thibaud, King of Navarre and Count of Champagne in Champagne and Brie, and various regulations in France and England, culminating in England with the Statute of Mortmain of 1279.¹³ However, although exaggerated by such legislation, a decline in donations is detectable before any legislation was introduced,¹⁴ while donations continued in spite of legislation. In England, the *inquisitiones ad quod damnum* and licences given to the military orders for acquiring land after the introduction of the Statute of Mortmain reveal a multiplicity of gifts and alienations to the military orders. Although these were mostly from lesser landholders, one donation to the order of the Hospital in 1285 was made by Robert de Veer, earl of Oxford. Occasionally it is stated that the transaction is a sale, and in one case a tenant of the order of the Temple, Gilbert of Grantham, surrendered his messuage to the order because of poverty, but in most cases no explanation is given. It is probable that most of these transactions were sales, but some of them may have been gifts

¹³HDFS 4 pp.227-9; *Layettes*, 2 p.455 no.2936, 3 pp.246-9, no.4184; *Recueil des actes de Philippe Auguste*, 4 pp.403-5, no.1736; A. Molinier, ed., *Correspondance administrative d'Alphonse de Poitiers*, 2 vols., Collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, (Paris, 1894-1900) nos. 920, 961, 1030-2; Raban, *Mortmain legislation*, pp.21ff; Brand, 'Control of Mortmain alienation,' pp.29-40.

¹⁴Raban, *Mortmain legislation*, pp.131-2.

in alms.¹⁵ Hence it appears that statutes were not decisive in influencing the level of donations.

Obviously the historian of the military orders will wish to ascertain how far this trend was affected by attitudes to the military orders in particular rather than to monastic orders in general. In order to do this, it is necessary to consider the factors which were likely to affect the orders' popularity and to establish how these changed over our period.

(a) The landholding classes in western Europe.

(i) Factors affecting donations.

The great importance of crusading among the nobility encouraged their patronage of the military orders: crusading families such

¹⁵Cart., no.3882; *Patent Rolls*, (1281-92) p.486, and pp.120, 147, 225, 243-4, 343, 436, (1272-81) p.381; *List of Inquisitions ad quod damnum preserved in the Public Record Office*, 2 vols., P.R.O. Lists and Indexes 17 (reprinted New York, 1963) p.20, no.9, p.23, nos.1,5, p.25, no.28, p.26, no.25, p.27 nos.10,14. Nineteen transactions, some involving a number of individuals, are recorded as licences granted or inquisitions made for the order of the Temple from November 1279 to the end of 1291; ten are recorded for the Hospital. It is possible that the figure for the Hospital is low; as it enjoyed Edward's particular favour, it may have been less closely watched by royal officials than other religious orders.

as those of St. Omer,¹⁶ Beaujeu,¹⁷ Brienne,¹⁸ and Mowbray¹⁹ patronized the orders of the Temple, Hospital, Teutonic order and the order of St. Lazarus. In some cases, donations towards a military order was specifically stated to be due to the donor's own experience of the order's services in the Holy Land. Nigel of Amundeville, a member of a prominent Lincolnshire family, made a donation to the order of St. Lazarus in 1242-3 in return for the great honour which the order had done him overseas.²⁰ Godfrey III, 'the courageous,' duke of Lorraine, was still more eloquent:

'When, for the remission of my sins, I had loaded my body and my shoulders with the sign of the

¹⁶D'Albon, *Cartulaire*, nos. 17, 141, 205, 375; Osto of St. Omer became a prominent Templar in England: *Records of the Templars*, pp.xlviii, li-liv; Bulst-Thiele, 'Templar,' p.293.

¹⁷M. Méras, *Le Beaujolais au Moyen Age* (Villefranche-en-Beaujolais, 1956) esp. pp.32-3, 59; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.259-60.

¹⁸H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, 'Catalogue d'actes des comtes de Brienne, 950-1356,' BEC 33 (1872) nos.37, 146-7, 151, 163, 165, 167, 169, 171, 189, 191, 192.

¹⁹D. A. Greenway, ed., *Charters of the Honour of Mowbray, 1107-1191*, Records of social and economic history, new series 1 (London, 1972) pp.22-27, nos.23-31, pp.124-5, nos.170-1, pp.182-5, nos.270-6; R. V. Taylor, ed., 'Ribston and the Knights Templars,' *Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal*, 8 (1884) 8 pp.281-3, nos.20-1.

²⁰*The Burton Lazars Cartulary: a medieval Leicestershire estate*. Burton Lazars research group, ed. T. Bourne and D. Marcombe (University of Nottingham, Dept. of Adult Education, 1987) p.63, f.249; C. Tyerman, *England and the Crusades, 1095-1588*, (Chicago and London, 1988) pp.205-6.

crucified saviour, with him leading me I reached the place where the feet of the Most High stood. When, then, I had visited the venerable and sacrosanct sepulchre of the Lord and all the places of the saints, with pious intention of mind, at last I came to the church of the blessed Hospital, founded in honour of God and His most blessed Mother and Saint John, the Lord's forerunner; seeing in it the indescribable anointings of the Holy Spirit, which are poured out and humbly bestowed on the poor and imbecile and infirm, I vowed a vow to God and paid it to the Most High. For I gave, and offered with devoted intention of mind, to the aforesaid church of the blessed Hospital, and to all its brothers, the hospital house on my freehold at my town of Brussels founded at Caudenburg.²¹

William Longespee, son of William Longespee, third earl of Salisbury, and a crusader with Richard, earl of Cornwall in 1240 and with Louis IX of France in 1249-50, was friendly towards the Templars, and, according to the contemporary poem recounting his death at Mansourah in 1250, died fighting alongside a brother of the order, his faithful companion.²² Yet, as William was related to the king, his friendship with the order was probably due to the family tradition of patronage for the order as well as his own experience of the order's virtues.

During a crusade, the military orders' usual difficulty in communicating their actual situation and problems to the west

²¹Cart., no.649; also nos.299, 370, 382, 400.

²²'Du bon William Longespee,' in A. Jubinal, ed., *Nouveau recueil de contes, dits, fabliaux, et autres pièces inédits des XIIIe, XVe, et XVe siècles*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1839-42) 2 pp.339-353, esp. pp.346-353; D. A. Trotter, *Medieval French Literature and the Crusades, 1100-1300*, (Geneva, 1987) p.209; *Sandford Cartulary*, p.7, no.4 and note.

was overcome. Crusaders could see and appreciate the problems for themselves at first hand, and the reality of the orders' need was brought home to them. Some of the most generous gifts to the orders were made during, or as a result of, a crusade: Leopold IV, duke of Austria, was said to have given at least 6,000 marks of silver to the Teutonic order on his departure from the fifth crusade, and 50 marks of gold to the Templars to assist in the construction of Castle Pilgrim, while Ranulf, earl of Chester, gave the Templars 500 marks of silver for the same purpose. Both had seen the construction work at first hand and realized its value for Christendom.²³ During the same crusade, John Harcourt gave on his deathbed to the Templars his ten librates of land at Rothley, Leics. The Harcourts, however, had been patrons of the order in the past, so that John was merely carrying on a family tradition.²⁴

In the twelfth century, family ties and tradition were all-important in dictating patronage.²⁵ Ties of loyalty were another important factor. In particular, royal patronage of an order could encourage royal servants to patronize or even to enter it, as did Thierry Galeran, servant of Louis VII of France. Two masters of the Temple had served the kings of Jerusalem before joining the order: Eudes de St. Amand, marshal and then constable of the city of Jerusalem under Baldwin III, king of Jerusalem, and butler of his successor, Amalric I, and Gerard de Rideford, who had been royal marshal under Baldwin

²³Oliver *Scholasticus*, 'Historia Damiatina,' p.207.

²⁴*Rot. Lit. Claus.* 1 (1204-24) p.402b, 21 Oct. 1219; *Records of the Templars*, p.208 no.2, p.227 no.1, p.232 no.6, pp.238-9 no.13.

²⁵Cf. C. B. Bouchard, *Sword, Miter and Cloister: nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198*, (Ithaca and London, 1987) *passim*.

IV.²⁶ However, family ties were more important than ties of loyalty. For example, some opponents of royal patrons of the Temple were, with their families, nevertheless enthusiastic patrons of the order: such as Geoffrey de Mandeville, first earl of Essex; Roger of Mowbray; and Robert de Ros.²⁷

In contrast, in the case of Hugh de Neville, one of the rebel barons disinherited after the royal victory at Evesham in 1265, his favour for the military orders may have been intended as an indirect means of recovering royal favour. In showing special favour to the order of St. Thomas, he probably hoped that the order would intercede for him with King Henry III, nephew of the order's supposed royal founder. However, his preference for this order was also due to its English nationality; it would have welcomed and assisted him, an English pilgrim. In his will, made at Acre in 1267, Hugh bequeathed to this order his palfrey and arms, to the Temple a standing goblet decorated with the arms of the king of England, to the Hospital forty shillings to support the poor, to the order of St. Lazarus three shillings, and many other small donations to other houses, such as the order of Holy Trinity and the Friars Preacher and Minor. The commander of St. Thomas

²⁶Bulst-Thiele, 'Templer,' p.292; RRH nos.321, 336, 341, 354, 366, 369, 397, 400, 587, 588.

²⁷D'Albon, *Cartulaire*, nos.192, 220 ('Pagan of the Lord's Temple' may not be a Templar, as normally Templars bore the title *Frater*); Annals of Walden in Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum* 4 p.142; for Mowbray, see note 19 above, and *Records of the Templars*, p.liv note 8; Taylor, 'Ribston and the Knights Templars,' 7 (1882) pp.433-7, nos.1-2, p.441, no.5, also pp.438, 443, nos.3,7: Robert de Ros, one of the 'rebel barons' in 1216, gave Ribston to the Temple, and later entered the order himself.

was one of his executors.²⁸

Emphasis was placed during the discussion of monarchs' views of the military orders on the importance of knighthood in encouraging donations to the military orders in western Europe. There it was suggested that lay distrust of the clergy in general and monks in particular led monarchs to patronize and trust the knight-brothers in preference. The same influence would not only encourage knights to endow the military orders but also to enter one, rather than a traditional monastic order. The differences between the monastic and knightly lifestyle were immortalized in *Le moniage Guillaume* and *Le moniage Rainouart*, written between 1180 and 1200, in which the knights appear as too large for monastic habits, unable to sing or read, with appetites too great for the abbey to support, more generous than monks and more devout. They are always ready to resort to violence, and unable to conceive of non-resistance; Rainouart soon becomes so bored in his abbey that he again takes up a semi-military existence, defending the coast near the abbey from Saracen raiders.²⁹ Although both knights and monks in these tales are caricatures, doubtless they reflected the opinions of many of the knightly class for whom they were written, who would therefore favour an active knightly order where they could continue to exercise their profession of arms in God's service for a longer period than the crusade allowed. It was probably the military function which led Gilbert de Lacy, sometime between the years 1148 and 1160, to enter the order of the Temple, of which he and his family were patrons; W. E. Wightman has suggested that he was bored of life 'as a provincial landlord and a glorified country

²⁸M. S. Giuseppe, 'On the testament of Sir Hugh de Neville, written at Acre, 1267,' *Archaeologia*, 56,2 (1899) 352-4.

²⁹*Moniage Guillaume*, I lines 125-141, 151-167, 173-181, 209-273, 291-394; II lines 223-53, 657-660, 486-96, 1039-41, 2494-5, 6622-6; *Moniage Rainouart*, lines 1-371.

squire.³⁰

However, it would be misleading to maintain that knighthood was all-important in attracting donations and recruits to the military orders. The orders had other aspects which did not appeal purely to knights. They also offered the means for travel; the warning in the Templars' admission ceremony that a brother would be sent to Acre, Tripoli, Antioch, Armenia, Apulia, Sicily and so on would have been no disincentive to many a young man, noble or ignoble, who wished to see the world; for one clerk this was his express motive for joining the order of the Hospital.³¹ This must have been a particular attraction while the orders were based in Jerusalem. For others, the certainty of travel offered the certainty of escape from difficult home circumstances: the most famous example is Hugh, Count of Champagne, who seems to have joined the order of the Temple in order to escape from his wife Elizabeth. This aspect of the military orders' vocation became a common theme in romantic poetry and literature.³²

The majority of the orders' recruits came from the less noble knightly and free peasant families; in Germany, from the *ministeriales*.³³ For such men, entrance into a military order would lead to an increase in social standing, and open doors to hitherto unimaginable opportunities.³⁴ Men such as Brother Garin, who rose to be bishop of Senlis under Philip II of

³⁰W. E. Wightman, *The Lacy family in England and Normandy, 1066-1194*, (Oxford, 1966) pp.188-9, 207, 213.

³¹*Règle*, p.339, para. 661; *Die Register Innocenz' III*, 2 no.54.

³²Barber, 'Origins of the order of the Temple,' 223, 227-8; see below, chapter four, pp.208-10.

³³Forey, 'Recruitment to the military orders,' 143-144.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 165, 166.

France and chancellor of France under his son and grandson, and Hermann of Salza, master of the Teutonic order (1209-1239) and advisor and friend to the emperor Frederick II, came from obscure backgrounds to international influence. But even noble knights sometimes joined a military order from such motives. In 1170 Roger, bishop of Worcester protested to his cousin Henry II of England that because the king had given no help to his younger brother R., 'an active knight,' he had been driven by poverty to leave the secular knighthood and join the Hospital of Jerusalem.³⁵

For the lower class of knight, or non-knights, the military orders had the attraction that they were not exclusively noble orders, whose members did not, in the main, know Latin. This was an attraction to the man of poor knightly family who had no education, as well as to the donor who preferred to deal with men who spoke his language.³⁶ More important, however, in attracting the alms of such donors was the fact that the Temple and Hospital, in particular, had many small houses, scattered across Europe. Such donors appear to have preferred orders whose houses were sited close to their

³⁵William fitz Stephen, 'Vita Sancti Thomae,' in *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, 3 p.105; W. L. Warren, *Henry II* (London, 1973) p.216.

³⁶*The Hospitallers` Riwle*, lines 577-592; the Templars` 'Vitas Patrum,' in P. Meyer, 'Notice sur le manuscrit Fr 24862 de la Bibliothèque Nationale contenant divers ouvrages composés ou écrits en Angleterre,' *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et autres Bibliothèques*, 35 (1896) p.141; C. Brunel, ed., *Les Plus Anciennes Chartes en Langue Provençale: recueil des pièces originales antérieures du XIIIe siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1926-52) 2 pp.xi-xii.

own homes.³⁷ In this respect the military orders were regarded no differently from other religious orders.

The factors of crusading, family tradition and knighthood altered considerably during the period under investigation, and this in turn affected noble and other knightly attitudes towards the military orders. In the case of crusading, for example, there appears to have been a reduction in interest in the crusade to the Holy Land after c.1240-1250. This can be easily accounted for: following the crusades of 1239-40 and 1249-54, the final loss of Jerusalem and defeat at La Forbie in 1244, we should expect to see a growth of disillusionment in crusading. Matthew Paris certainly declares that this was the case. Elizabeth Siberry has recently argued that this despondency was considerably less than that following the defeat of the second crusade,³⁸ but it could be proposed that hopes for the second crusade were higher than they were by 1250; and that therefore the reaction was greater. However, Hans Mayer's contention, that the increases during the course of the thirteenth century in indulgences offered for listening to crusade sermons proves a decline in interest, is not convincing: the indulgence, like money, was subject to inflation and was being traded everywhere in greater and greater quantity during the century.³⁹

It seems that, while crusading continued to attract active interest, the crusade to the Holy Land faded into the distance behind new and less daunting crusade opportunities. By the early thirteenth century the crusade was no longer restricted

³⁷Cf. J. Walker's forthcoming paper, 'Motives for the patronage of the order of St. Lazarus in England,' in J. Loades, ed., *Monastic Studies: the continuity of tradition*.

³⁸Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 5 p.108-9; Siberry, *Criticism of Crusading*, pp.86-9, 193-7, 219.

³⁹Mayer, *The Crusades*, pp.320-1, note 143.

to the Holy Land: there were crusades to Livonia, to the Albigeois; later to Prussia, to Sicily and to Aragon; while in England, during the two civil wars between king and barons, 1215-7 and 1264-5, both sides appealed to crusade ideology.⁴⁰ The crusades in Italy were specifically linked to the crusade to the Holy Land: the Church in Italy must be defended before a crusade could be launched overseas, while Sicily was an essential part of the organization of any crusade. Norman Housley has shown that the Italian crusades sometimes received as much support from potential crusaders as the crusade to the Holy Land.⁴¹ In 1265 the Templar Ricaut Bonomel complained that crusaders were going to Lombardy rather than the Holy Land, with resultant losses to the Christians in the latter.⁴² As Erwin Stickel has argued, knights would be less willing to leave family, friends and property and brave the dangers of the deep when crusading indulgences could be had close at hand.⁴³

The result of these changes were the same for the laity as for the clergy.⁴⁴ Although the Holy Land still held a tremendous attraction, and although information and appeals for help were coming frequently from the Palestinian Franks and the military orders, the plight of the Holy Land tended to be overlooked in favour of more immediate, local issues. It even seems to have been deliberately avoided; everyone preferred not to think about it. Not unnaturally, western Europeans

⁴⁰Tyerman, *England and the crusades*, pp.133-151.

⁴¹Housley, *The Italian Crusades*. pp.62-70, 151-6, 158-9, 162-70, 252-3, 257.

⁴²Ricaut Bonomel, 'Ir'e dolors,' 357, strophe V.

⁴³E. Stickel, *Der Fall von Akkon. Untersuchungen zum Abklingen des Kreuzzugsgedankens am Ende des 13 Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt/Munich, 1975) p.185.

⁴⁴See above, chapter 2, pp.110-12.

preferred to ponder the successes of crusades nearer at home to the failures overseas. This is reflected in the nobility's reading tastes. The old tales of the capture of Jerusalem were still being read and copied,⁴⁵ but no new tales were written of later events. As the author of the verse romance *Clariss et Laris* complained, circa 1263, there was too much to write about the wars in the Holy Land, and as he would not be able to avoid assigning blame, he would bring the wrath of the families of those concerned down on him. 'It is not good for me to tell the truth; I would be a martyr, not a saint, for in telling the truth openly there is nothing but sadness and torment; of those who live now, at this moment, I cannot make a becoming tale, if I should wish to tell the truth.' Instead, he wrote an Arthurian romance, which would make better hearing.⁴⁶ M. R. Morgan concluded that: 'the story of Jerusalem came to be seen in a light not unlike the half-mystic, half-heroic atmosphere that surrounded the story of Arthur...'⁴⁷ The military orders belonged to the real kingdom of Jerusalem rather than to the world of romance, and hence they and their plight slipped out of the public eye.⁴⁸

This was not, however, the whole story, for by 1250 the military orders' connection with the Holy Land was not always regarded by donors as being of central importance. Jean Richard has drawn attention to a donation charter of 1249 in which the Hospitallers and Templars are regarded by Dannon,

⁴⁵E.g., Eleanor of Provence, wife of Henry III of England, owned a copy of the *Chanson d'Antioche: Close Rolls*, (1247-51) p.283.

⁴⁶*Clariss et Laris*, lines 60-88.

⁴⁷M. R. Morgan, *The chronicle of Ernoul and the continuations of William of Tyre* (Oxford, 1973) p.187; cf. Morgan, 'The Rothelin continuation,' pp.254-5.

⁴⁸See below, chapter four, pp.228.

lady of Villy, as being on a par with the Cluniacs and Cistercians: 'that is to say, at the side of contemplative orders whose prayers seemed to her able to aid her soul at the time of Judgement. It is not to the combatants of the Holy Land...that her legacy is addressed. It is to pious men who practise the rule of the Temple, a rule of Benedictine and Cistercian inspiration, and who are men of prayer.'⁴⁹

As motives for donations were seldom stated in donation charters, it is difficult to ascertain to what extent the military orders' original vocation was decisive in prompting donations towards the orders. Jerusalem was usually, although not invariably, mentioned in charters of donation as part of the order's name, but only rarely did donors make specific reference to the needs of the Holy Land. Even where such reference was made, this need only demonstrate the rhetorical skill of the clerk who was drawing up the charter, unless the donor declared some personal interest, such as his own recent return from the east. In some cases, however, the Holy Land was specifically *excluded*. An outstanding example of this comes from Germany: in 1278 Henry 'der Erlauchte,' margrave of Meissen and Osterland, and his sons Albrecht and Dietrich, gave the Teutonic order the monastery of Zschillen. Witego, bishop of Meissen, agreed to the donation, but the revenues of the monastery were not to be sent to the Holy Land, Prussia or Livonia.⁵⁰ Other donations were to provide benefits for the donor, such that it was unlikely that any benefit would accrue to the Holy Land: such as donations for lamps to burn in the orders' chapels, or to support a chaplain to say mass for the

⁴⁹J. Richard, 'Les Templiers et les Hospitaliers en Bourgogne et en Champagne méridionale (XIIe-XIIIe siècles),' in Fleckenstein and Hellmann, eds., *Geistlichen Ritterorden*, pp.241-2.

⁵⁰*UB Thüringen*, no.298, p.243, also nos.296, 299.

donor's soul.⁵¹ A donation at Provins by Peter and his wife Maria in 1257 'not wishing to remain ungrateful for the benefits and graces which the preceptor and brothers of the knighthood of the Temple of Provins have benignly conferred on them in their necessities,' probably refers to a loan made to the donors by the order.⁵² For many donors, the orders' ability to provide cash when they required it, and to provide assurance of security in their old age through membership of the confraternity, was more important than their deeds in the Holy Land. Although their establishment in the Holy Land had originally been a prerequisite of their holiness, as local houses became well established this ceased to be the primary attraction for donors. Tales of disasters in the Holy Land and accusations of treachery against the military orders may have had little effect on their image at a local level, and donations for lamps and to support chaplains may have been prompted as much by the fact that the order was the nearest local monastic order as by its service in the Holy Land.

Other factors, therefore, must have operated, to cause a reduction in donations to the orders. One of these was, as discussed above, simply a reduction in donations to all monastic orders during the thirteenth century, first amongst the high nobility, then amongst donors of lower social status.⁵³ Insofar as the military orders were simply regarded as monastic orders at a local level, they suffered the same loss of donations as other monastic orders. The same trend is visible in criticism of the orders, as will be discussed below.

⁵¹E.g., *Sandford Cartulary*, nos. 74-6, 81, 87, 120, 125, 146, 162, 221; *Cart.*, nos. 1785, 1788, 1817, 2112, 2963, and cf. 3500 (restricting future exploitation of the gift); *Charter Rolls*, 1 pp.125, 135; Forey, 'St. Thomas of Acre,' 487, 492-3.

⁵²*Cartulaire de Provins*, no.161.

⁵³See above, pp.132-3.

There is also evidence that family traditions of donation became less important in western Europe in the thirteenth century.⁵⁴ Nevertheless some families did continue their tradition of patronage of the military orders, such as the counts of Forez⁵⁵ of Urgel,⁵⁶ Brienne,⁵⁷ and the viscounts of Béarn.⁵⁸

Attitudes to knighthood were also changing throughout our period. As the clergy and the poets strove to define knighthood, its role in society, its duties and privileges, knightly ideals developed far beyond the 'new knighthood', of St. Bernard, an order of potential martyrs, or the knighthood depicted in the *Chanson de Roland*, where knights served God better with their swords than monks with their prayers. The writers of romances not only exalted knighthood but also pointed out its pitfalls and mocked its more ridiculous aspects. They declared that knights should avoid senseless violence, and should be ruled by reason and self-control; evidently the self-image of their patrons. Thus, during the first decades of the thirteenth century, the knight Raoul de Houdenc depicted his hero Meraugis de Portlesguez esteeming character above beauty and defeating his enemies through brain

⁵⁴Ward, 'Fashions in monastic endowment,' 446-51.

⁵⁵Cart., nos. 268, 600, 843 (Guy II, Guy III), 1431, 1453 (Renaud de Forez), 1599, 1666, 1938, 2233, 2234 (Guy IV), 3488, 3489 (Guy VI); there were also disputes after 1250: *ibid.*, nos. 3043, 3249, 3487, 3685.

⁵⁶D'Albon, *Cartulaire*, nos. 47, 475; Cart., nos. 36, 515, 855, 960, 1308, 3698*bis*.

⁵⁷Arbois de Jubainville, 'Catalogue d'actes des comtes de Brienne,' (after 1250) nos.189, 191, 192, cf. no.180.

⁵⁸D'Albon, *Cartulaire*, no. 338; Cart., nos.1781, 3723, 3989, 4089; *Patent Rolls*, (1247-58) p.142.

rather than brawn; while one of the continuators of Chrestien de Troyes' *Perceval* declared that a wise knight did not fight because he wished, but only when he was forced to do so. Around the year 1230, the author of the prose *Tristan* depicted the courageous and intelligent knight Kahedin refusing to fight for the honour of the lady he loved or to win honour for himself: 'if it should happen by some chance that you should throw me dead to the ground at the first blow, what honour will you do me then? And this could very well happen!'⁵⁹

Alongside this scepticism towards the traditional warlike values of knighthood appeared increasing criticism of the same values in the military orders. By the early thirteenth century, lay observers were tempering their admiration for the order's selfless courage with criticism for the disastrous defeats which resulted from it. Ernoul, former squire of Balian d'Ibelin, blamed the disaster of 1 May 1187 on the pride of the master of the Temple. Guiot de Provins, trouvère turned Cluniac, was of the opinion that the Templars fought too fiercely: 'I would rather be a coward, and alive, than dead and the most admired man in the world.'⁶⁰ Rational men were no longer convinced by papal promises of salvation for martyrs.

⁵⁹Raoul de Houdenc, *Meraugis de Portlesgues*, ed. M. Friedwagner (reprinted Geneva, 1975) *passim*; *The continuations of the Old French Perceval of Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. W. Roach et al., 5 vols. in 6 (Philadelphia, 1949-1983) 2 lines 1529-1531; *Le roman de Tristan en Prose*, ed. P. Ménard, 1 TLF 353 (Geneva, 1987) p.194, and pp.174-5, 191-4; see also *La Queste del Saint Graal, roman du XIIIe siècle*, ed. A. Pauphilet, CFMA 33 (Paris, 1980) p.54, pp.229-32.

⁶⁰*La continuation de Guillaume de Tyr, 1184-97*, ed. M. R. Morgan (Paris, 1982) pp.39-40, 41, chs. 26, 28; Guiot de Provins, 'La Bible,' lines 1695-1739; cf. similar attitudes among the clergy: Nigel de Longchamps, p.77, lines 2063-8; *Itinerarium* pp.70, 268-9, 371-2.

This new attitude towards the orders' vocation is neatly expressed in the record of a debate between Adam de Givenci and William le Vinier sometime during the first half of the thirteenth century, concerning whether there is more value in the consummation of love or in hope for future consummation. Adam states the case for consummation:

... A man loves for what he will enjoy, not for something that he will never enjoy. You wish to serve like a Templar, for nothing. Hope alone serves to recompense your service...⁶¹

With one stroke, Adam dismissed the ethic of martyrdom glorified by St. Bernard and in the *Chanson de Roland*. Nor was he alone in his cynicism: this debate survives in five manuscripts, which, in view of the fact that many of contemporary romances survive in only one, indicates that it enjoyed a fair degree of popularity amongst the sophisticated, educated nobles who indulged in such debates and appreciated their dry humour. Adam's casual joke epitomizes the changes taking place in noble attitudes towards knighthood and the means of salvation by the mid thirteenth century, and underlines further the changing attitudes examined above, towards the crusade to the Holy Land. The questioning of traditional views of crusading had an inevitable effect on donations to the military orders.

(ii) Criticism.

Changing attitudes were not only reflected in a decline in donations, but also in the growth of criticism. We should expect criticism of the military orders by the western nobility to centre on their conduct during crusades, Europeans' only opportunity to see the knight-brothers in action. However, due

⁶¹A. Långfors, A. Jeanroy and L. Brandin, eds., *Recueil général des Jeux-Partis français*, 2 vols. in 1, SATF (Paris, 1926) 2 p.109 no.128, strophe 3. William le Vinier died in 1245: 1 p.xliv.

to the nature of the sources, such criticism is difficult to identify with confidence. Accounts of the crusades written by crusaders tended to be written in the epic tradition, which took a favourable view of the military orders.⁶² Where lay criticism was recorded by clerical historians, it may incorporate clerical prejudices, and therefore needs careful analysis. For example, to judge from the account of Matthew Paris, there was considerable crusader criticism of the military orders following the defeat at Gaza in 1239: he quotes a letter from Amaury de Montfort to this effect. However, the account given by the 'Rothelin' continuation of William of Tyre's chronicle records that the criticism directed towards the military orders by the defeated French crusaders was not only unjustified but was also unrepresentative of the crusading host as a whole, as most of the host had not joined the disastrous expedition.⁶³

Matthew also quotes a letter from Richard, earl of Cornwall, concerning his crusade of 1240-1, expressing his exasperation at the military orders' constant quarrels. Peter Jackson, in his study of the crusades of 1239-41, considered that this letter was genuine, but that it misrepresented Richard's real motives. He showed that Richard himself had been playing a double game, claiming not to be committed to any policy while already determined to pursue the emperor's policy of alliance with Egypt; hence his account was probably

⁶²E.g. Ambroise, *Estoire de Guerre Sainte*, ed. G. Paris, Collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, (Paris, 1897) lines 3021-3036, 4755-8, 7237-77, 7691-2; 'Fragmentum de captione Damiatæ,' Provençal account of the capture of Damietta in *Quinti Belli Sacri Scriptores*, pp. xxxviii-ix, 180-1, 185-190; and see below, chapter four, p.202 and following.

⁶³Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 4 pp.25-6; 'La continuation de Guillaume de Tyr, de 1229 à 1261, dit du manuscrit de Rothelin,' RHC Occ 2 pp.538-49.

distorted. On other occasions he was friendly towards the orders: before his crusade he had given gifts to both the Hospital and Temple on the death of his wife, Isabel of Gloucester, while he showed particular friendship towards the Hospital, perhaps because the order had recently made its peace with the emperor Frederick II, his brother-in-law and friend.⁶⁴

The evidence for lay criticism of the military orders' actions during crusades, therefore, is inconclusive. More significant is the incidental criticism of Jean, lord of Joinville, who was irritated not by the orders' military actions but by the Templars' bureaucracy and the arrogance of the treasurer. He is unlikely to have been the only crusader aggravated by such apparently petty matters. Yet Jean also admired the disciplinary procedures of the Hospital, and both orders' ability to control the Assassins.⁶⁵

Criticism of a different sort appears in the English Hundred Rolls (begun in 1284-5), the depositions of local juries of 'lawful men,'⁶⁶ indicating the extent to which royal rights had been usurped. The juries often protested that the military orders' privileges damaged royal interests and interfered with local administration; yet they made the same complaints of laymen and of other religious orders. The Hundred Rolls illustrate vividly the great resentment felt by lay landholders in the second half of the thirteenth century

⁶⁴Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 4 p.139, see also pp.44, 56; P. Jackson, 'The crusades of 1239-41 and their aftermath,' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 50 (1987) 46-7; *Annals of Tewkesbury, Annales Monastici*, 1 p.114; see also Cart., no.2230, and no.2301 (1246).

⁶⁵Jean de Joinville, pp.168-9, paras. 412-4, pp.161-3, paras. 381-5, p.189, paras. 507-8, pp.177-8, paras. 453-5.

⁶⁶Preferably knights, but in any case freemen: cf. H. M. Jewell, *English local administration in the Middle Ages* (Newton Abbot, 1972) pp.11-12.

towards ecclesiastical misuse of power.⁶⁷

Yet it is notable that, although the military orders were included in this general criticism of religious orders, specific and serious criticism of the military orders alone was extremely rare. Only in two areas were they singled out for their papal privileges, which 'impede and subvert all common justice and excessively oppress the people.'⁶⁸

Much of the nobility's criticism of the military orders does not survive in such direct statements, but rather in the work of the trouvères and troubadours whom the nobility patronized. It is tempting to see these professional political protesters as expressing the views of a broad band of the population, but in fact they may not even have been expressing their own views, only those of whomever paid them; and they sought to mould opinion, rather than expressing it. Moreover, it is very difficult to determine how wide a circulation their works enjoyed, as they may have circulated orally far beyond the range indicated by the surviving manuscripts. As a result, it is possible to argue, as Elizabeth Siberry has done, that their significance has been greatly exaggerated.⁶⁹ Yet, even

⁶⁷*Rot. Hund.*, e.g., 1 pp.117, 129, 295, 378; 2 pp.27, 226, 318, 320; C. Perkins, 'The Knights Templars in the British Isles,' *English Historical Review* 25 (1910) 218-22.

⁶⁸Criticism of the Hospital, *Rot. Hund.* 1 p.58 at Wirksworth, Derbys., and of the Hospital and Temple (in that order) at 'Routhinton,' Warwicks.: *ibid.*, 2 p.228.

⁶⁹Trotter, pp.211-2, 217, 225 (on Rutebuef), 227; P. A. Throop, 'Criticism of papal crusade policy in Old French and Provençal,' *Speculum*, 13 (1938) p.382; cf. Siberry, *Criticism of Crusading*, pp.6-11, who argues that many trouvères and troubadours were expressing their own ideas, rather than those of a patron; but it is impossible to state when this was the case.

when all these problems have been taken into account, these poets provide a rare insight into lay attitudes towards the military orders.

The work of some trouvères and troubadours was favourable towards the orders: depicting them as energetic champions of Christ, in contrast to the pleasure-loving, idle and cowardly rulers of Europe, who failed to go to their assistance. Marcabru, in his poem 'Pax in nomine Domine,' urging lords and young knights to go and fight for God in Spain against the Muslims, complained that: 'In Spain, here, the marquis and those of the Temple suffer the weight and the load of the pagans' pride,'⁷² while none went to their aid. This poem survives in seven manuscripts, a surprisingly high number for so short a piece, easily memorized; it obviously enjoyed a wide circulation. Similar complaints were voiced in 1221 by the Auvergne poet Peirol, returning from the fifth crusade: commending the Hospital, Temple and King John of Jerusalem to God, he lamented that the present kings of England, France and Spain, the marquis of Montferrat and the emperor were failing to go on crusade as their forebears had done. Peirol was a poor knight in the service of the dauphin of Auvergne (ruled 1169-1234), who was a generous patron of troubadours; the opinions he expresses here were, therefore, probably shared by the dauphin.⁷³ Again, in 1277 the Parisian trouvère Rutebuef concluded a poem bewailing the state of the Holy Land by addressing William de Beaujeu, master of the Temple: 'Now you may see...what the world is accustomed to serve. They have no care to serve God to conquer holy Paradise like the doughty

⁷²*Poésies complètes du troubadour Marcabru*, ed. J. M. L. Dejeanne (Toulouse, 1909, reprinted New York and London, 1971) no.xxv, p.171. Dated 1146-7 or 1138-45: Constable, 'Second Crusade,' 230, note 94.

⁷³Peirol, 'Pus flum Jordan ai vist e.l monimon,' in *Peirol, troubadour of Auvergne*, ed. S. C. Aston (Cambridge, 1953) pp.3-4, 161-3, no. XXXII; only 2 mss. survive.

knights of yesteryear, Godfrey, Bohemund and Tancred...`
Elsewhere in the poem he urged the barons to help God, Acre and the Temple.⁷⁴ The master of the Temple was depicted as being above all others responsible for the safety of the Holy Land, with no mention being made of the other military orders. Unfortunately, it is unclear on whose behalf Rutebuef was writing: he had a number of patrons, but the patron of this poem is unknown.

Some criticism was primarily political. The blistering attack of Bernart Sicart de Marvejols was written in response to the Treaty of Paris, 1229, between Louis IX and Raymond VII, count of Toulouse. He wrote lamenting the state of the Languedoc, subjected to the French, and criticizing the military orders and the clergy for their part in this. He declared that he disapproved of the Temple and Hospital because of their pride, arrogance, simony, and great possessions; no one was ever admitted who was not rich or had a great inheritance; they had abundance and great well-being, but their religion consisted of ruses and treachery.⁷⁵ The only unique criticism here, simony, is supported by other evidence;⁷⁶ the remaining accusations were repeated by other critics. None were original in criticism of monastic orders, which underlines the fact that Bernart's real grievance against the orders was political. They had received generous gifts in the Languedoc

⁷⁴Rutebuef, 1 p.508, lines 327-335, p. 502, line 134, p.504, lines 219-20; 2 mss. survive.

⁷⁵Bernart Sicart de Marvejols, 'Ab greu cossire,' in M. Raynouard, ed., *Choix des poésies originales des troubadours*, 4 (Paris, 1819) pp.192, strophe 3; quoted by S. Thiolier-Mejean, *Les poésies satiriques et morales des troubadours du XIIe siècle a la fin du XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1978) pp.345-6. This only survives in one manuscript.

⁷⁶E.g., Register of Innocent III, PL 216, cols.890-1, 16 no.90; *Règle*, pp.285-8, paras. 544-9.

since their foundation, yet they had not protected their patrons against the crusaders.⁷⁷

There was little criticism from professional troubadours of the orders' handling of the defence of the east. Circa 1270, in a poem recounting a debate with God over the state of the Holy Land, Daspol depicted himself as asking God why the Saracens could not be converted instead of killing so many Christians. God's reply, that the orders of the Temple and Hospital now did evil instead of good, and were full of pride and avarice, seems to imply that the Saracens would not be able to kill so many Christians if the military orders were discharging their duties instead of 'sleeping in their sin.' It is possible that Daspol thought that the military orders should be working to convert the Muslims. Yet 'God's' reply indicates that he was echoing the assertion of St. Bernard, that as the Muslims could not be converted they should be destroyed; and criticizing the military orders for their failure to do this.⁷⁸ After the end of our period, around the time of the Templars' arrest, Rostanh Berenguier would blame the Templars for pride, wasting the riches they were given for the Holy Land in idleness and good living in Europe; and both the Templars and Hospitallers for cowardice in allowing the Muslims to remain in possession of the Holy Land for so long.⁷⁹ However, these were the only two poets to criticize the orders' military failures.

In contrast, Hugh, lord of Berzé, who had seen the orders at work in the Holy Land, declared circa 1220 in his 'Bible,' that nothing could be said against the orders of the Temple and

⁷⁷Delaruelle, 'Templiers et Hospitaliers en Languedoc,' 327-330.

⁷⁸Daspol, 'Seinhos, aujas, c'aves saber e sens,' lines 41-56; St. Bernard, 'Liber ad milites Templi,' p.217.

⁷⁹'Pos de sa mar man cavalier del Temple,' in 'Les derniers troubadours de la Provence,' 497-8, and see 484-485.

Hospital if only they could agree between themselves and work together, `for they give up their bodies in martyrdom and defend the sweet land where the Lord died and lived.` He went on to add, however, that their privilege of giving asylum to criminals had led to many murderers escaping justice. Hugh's bitterness indicates that he had personal experience of the problem. He went on to examine other monastic orders and to conclude that despite their grave faults, it is possible to win one's salvation in a religious house, for the world is even more perverted. He was not alone in his views, as at least five manuscripts of his work were produced.⁸⁰

Hugh's criticism was based on moral considerations; the military orders were criticized, not for being poor soldiers, but for being poor monks. Many works criticizing the Church and clergy were composed during the thirteenth century, by both laymen and clergymen in lower orders, most of which do not mention the military orders at all.⁸¹ This does not, however, mean that the orders were seen as less corrupt than other orders, for where they were criticized, they were criticized as severely as the rest. Rather, it seems that they were seen as the least important of the regular orders. The exception is Jacquemart Gielée's poem, *Renart le Nouvel*, and this may reflect the interests of his patron.

One such moral critic was Peire Cardenal, who came from noble knightly family, and began his education training to be a canon, before taking up a career as a troubadour. He wrote eighty-five *sirventes*, of moral, religious or general satire,

⁸⁰Hugh, lord of Berzé, *la Bible*, lines 261-293, 349-370, pp.22-5.

⁸¹Works which do not mention the military orders include: *Guilhem Figueira, ein provenzalischer Troubadour*, ed. E. Levy, (Berlin, 1880) (lived c.1215-1245); *Guillaume le Clerc, Le Besant de Dieu*, ed. P. Ruelle (Brussels, 1973), written 1226 or 1227; *Le lamentations de Matheolus*, ed. A.-G. Van Hamel (Paris, 1892), writing 1298.

but only one of these mentions the military orders, and even it is of uncertain authorship. This was *Mon chanter vueil retraire*, written after 1222; it is not known whether or not it was written for a specific patron or, if so, for whom. In this the poet criticized the actions of society on the grounds that, when men reach the final judgement, only good deeds and words will be able to save them. The clergy were criticized for setting a bad example, including the Temple and Hospital for their pride.⁸²

Similar opinions were held by the author of *Sur les états du monde*, written in the first half of the thirteenth century, and the anonymous interpolator into Raoul de Houdenc's *Songe d'Enfer*, but their approach was satirical. The first remarked that the Templars were doughty men, but then added that they loved money too much. The Hospitallers, on the other hand, loved their horses too much: 'They have no care for buying women's services, as long as they have their horses..' Another English poem of the early fourteenth century, *Ordre de Bel Ayre*, also remarked on the Hospitallers' beautiful mounts. Neither writer had much to say of the military orders, concentrating on the worse excesses of the rest of the clergy; and each poem survives only in one manuscript. In the sole manuscript of the interpolated *Songe d'Enfer* they only appeared briefly as the devils feasted on sinners; roasted, alongside false hermits. They did not appear in the other nine manuscripts of the poem; possibly the original author, a poor knight from the Beauvais region, did not consider them

⁸²*Poésies complètes du troubadour Peire Cardenal (1180-1278)* ed. R. Lavaud (Toulouse, 1957) pp.388-93; seven mss. survive. The poem may be by Raimon de Castelnou.

significant or objectionable enough to include.⁸³

The most interesting of the moral critics was Jacquemart Giélée, a Flemish trouvère writing in Lille in 1289.⁸⁴ His satirical poem, *Renart le Nouvel*, survives in four manuscripts, all copied in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth centuries; the oldest and most beautiful of which was copied for Guy de Dampierre, count of Flanders, who was related to the master of the Temple, William de Beaujeu, and who was a friend of the order. It is possible that the poem was written for Guy, and this makes its remarks on the military orders particularly interesting.⁸⁵

Giélée recounts the triumph of evil over society. He describes how Renart the fox, whose name means treachery, unscrupulousness, and everything contrary to nobility and courtesy, perverts the only good things remaining in society: the love of a knight for his lord, for his friend and for his lady. The clergy are already corrupted, but, as becomes clear towards the end of the poem, not entirely; for the friars are unable to reach the heights of *Haut Orgueil*, (Great Pride) attained by the rest of the clergy, and call on Renart for help, asking him to lead them. He refuses, but gives them his sons, with whose help the Dominicans reach Great Pride, while

⁸³ `Sur les états du monde,` and `Ordre de Bel Ayre,` in I. S. T. Aspin, ed., *Anglo-Norman Political Songs*, Anglo-Norman Texts 11 (Oxford, 1953) pp.117, 123, no.XI verses 24-5, pp.130-1, 134, no.XII lines 71-78; Raoul de Houdenc, *Songe d'Enfer*, ed. M. T. Mihm, Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, Band 190 (Tubingen, 1984) pp.vii, pp.2-5, 8-9; ms W p.146, lines 361-4.

⁸⁴ See my forthcoming paper, `Jacquemart Giélée's *Renart le Nouvel*: the image of the military orders on the eve of the loss of Acre,` in Loades, ed., *Monastic Studies*.

⁸⁵ *Renart le Nouvel*, pp.7-10; Cart., no. 3507; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, p.261, note 10, and pp.362-3, nos.3-4.

the Franciscans, hampered by St. Francis' rule, reach *Outreucidier* (Big Ideas) which is, Giélée informs us, only ten leagues from Great Pride.⁸⁶

The hermits remain untouched, for, when Renart goes to join them, he discovers that they do not lead the luxurious life he had believed, and departs in disgust. However, fame of his name reaches Acre, where the orders of the Temple and Hospital take it up. Previously untainted by *renardie*, 'foxiness,' they are now no better than the rest. In fact, they come to surpass the rest, for when they bring a case against each other in the papal court, Renart agrees to become their master, an honour he refused to the friars.⁸⁷ The poem ends with Renart seated at the top of the wheel of Fortune, with Pride at his right and Guile at his left, clad in the habit of the Templars and Hospitallers.⁸⁸ We have already seen that pride and guile were attributes particularly associated with the military orders.

The most interesting aspect of this text, however, is that Giélée sets out the arguments which the Templars and Hospitallers put forward in turn as their justification for claiming Renart, thereby giving a detailed picture of the orders as they were perceived by some of their contemporaries in 1289. The differences between the orders are striking; the Templar is not a trained speaker, his argument is simple and unskilfully delivered, repeating again and again 'we are defenders of the Holy Church' and emphasizing the danger to Europe from the Muslims. The Hospitaller is a wise man and a good speaker, and his argument is carefully structured. He not

⁸⁶*Renart le Nouvel*, lines 7199-7330.

⁸⁷*Ibid.*, lines 7469-7666; C. Régnier, review of H. Roussel's thesis, 'Etude sur Renart le Nouvel du poète lillois Jacquemart Giélée (Lille, 1956),' *Revue du Nord*, 41 (1959) 118.

⁸⁸*Renart le Nouvel*, lines 7667-7720.

only presses the service of his order for Christendom, in fighting the Muslims and saving sick pilgrims, but also attacks the Templars, saying that his order has existed longer than the Temple, that his brothers do more damage to the Muslims than do the Templars, and blaming the Templars for the Christians' failure in the east, because they are envious of the Hospitallers and are in league with the Muslims. Renart, however, obviously sees each order as being as corrupt as the other, for he is unable to choose between them, and decides to be master of both. Giélée shows clearly the weakness of the order of the Temple in the war of words in Europe, and the strength of the Hospital, its exploitation of its double role and active, aggressive stance in justifying its policies.⁸⁹ The Templar can only blame European lords for persecuting his order and declare that, if his order does not receive help, it will have to leave the Holy Land; a threat made many times in the order's history.⁹⁰ This contrast throws some light on the French Templars' inability to defend themselves effectively during the trial of the order.⁹¹

Giélée's depiction of the orders quarrelling over Renart, almost coming to blows and then deciding to take their case to the papal court, is a clear illustration of the impression made by the orders' quarrels on contemporaries. Hugh, lord of Berzé, and Richard, Earl of Cornwall, had criticized them for their disagreements, as did Matthew Paris, and it was later

⁸⁹For further discussion, see below, chapter five, p.270ff.

⁹⁰E.g., *Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le trésorier*, ed. L. de Mas Latrie, SHF (Paris, 1871) p.161; *Die Register Innocenz` III*, 2 no.247; Register of Innocent III, PL 216 col.56 year 12 no.45; Burton Annals, p.494; Ch. Kohler and Ch. V. Langlois, eds., 'Lettres inédits concernant les croisades (1275-1307)' BEC 52 (1891) p.56.

⁹¹Cf. Praver, 'Military orders,' pp.227-8.

blamed by some for the loss of Acre.⁹²

Renart le Nouvel, then, is not only one man's image of the military orders, but is endorsed by other writers. However, amidst all the complaints made against the orders, *Renart* underlines those which were most striking to Giélée and his audience, an audience which included the count of Flanders, himself a would-be crusader. The question remains as to why Giélée selected the military orders as those most fitting to accompany *Renart* on his final triumph, particularly if his patron was a friend of the order of the Temple. It seems likely that the military orders, as defenders of the Holy Land, represented for Giélée the final bastion of all that was good in the Church and in the world. The subversion of the friars was unimportant in comparison, which was why *Renart* gave his sons to the friars, but kept himself for the military orders. Their capture by *Renart* marked the final triumph of evil in the world.

To sum up this examination of criticism: criticism of the military orders began to be expressed by the nobility of England and France in the thirteenth century, and reached a peak around the years 1240-1250. The military orders were criticized for pride, avarice, simony, encouraging lawlessness, quarrelling between themselves, and a luxurious lifestyle. They were also, but less often than might be expected, blamed for Christian defeats in the Holy Land. Jacquemart Giélée depicted them as the most corrupt of all orders, in that they represented the Holy Land, and therefore their fall was the most deplorable of all the clergy. On the other hand, barely a mention was made of one area in which they totally failed, the conversion of the Muslims. Only the troubadour Daspol referred to it, with the implication that the orders' role was not to

⁹²See above, pp.102, 152, 157, and below, pp.300 note 7; see also, e.g., *Cart.*, nos. 3581, 3992; *Dossier*, pp.8-10; cf. Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.235, 282; Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, pp.469, 443-50.

convert but to destroy. Yet, the writer of *De constructione castri Saphet* laid some emphasis on the aid which the Templars' new castle would give to mission work among the Muslims, which indicates that he believed Europeans to be concerned about this matter.⁹³ This raises the interesting question of how far the poets' criticism of the orders was based on their actual character and deeds, and how far was it based on convention, in a society where literature was ruled by convention.

The bulk of this criticism originated in France. Yet, even within France, the orders were still held in high esteem despite nobles' determination to limit their further acquisition of property and to recover what they could. Alphonse, Count of Poitiers, younger brother of Louis IX, is a notable example; although he enforced mortmain regulations against the Temple and Hospital, he also gave the orders gifts, protected them from their enemies, and entrusted the organization of his second crusade to two brothers of the Temple, Brothers Jean de Kays and Guy de Burg.⁹⁴ In England, although some bitter complaints were made against the orders during the compilation of the Hundred Rolls, during the *Quo Warranto* investigations which followed, from 1278-94, the juries supported the military orders' claims more often than they denied them. This indicates that hatred of the orders was by no means as established or widespread as the Hundred Rolls

⁹³*De constructione castri Saphet*, 386.

⁹⁴E.g., *Correspondance...d'Alphonse de Poitiers*, nos. 129, 220, 420, 453, 1282; *Cart.*, nos. 3394, 3256, 3267, 3268, 3270, etc.; Bulst-Thiele, 'Templer,' p.306.

might seem to imply.⁹⁵

(b) The landholding classes in Germany and eastern Europe

Attitudes towards the military orders in Germany and eastern Europe in the thirteenth century were quite different to those further west. As explained above,⁹⁶ donations to the military orders here began later and continued more slowly than in the rest of Europe. However, by the end of the twelfth century, the concept had gained acceptance; the Teutonic Hospital at Acre was transformed into a military order in 1198, and rapidly gained donations in Germany and throughout the domains of the emperor.⁹⁷ Perhaps because the Teutonic order made a military order respectable in the eyes of German donors, the Hospital and Temple also began to gain donations more rapidly.

The increase in donations to the Hospital in this area during the thirteenth century can be seen in Appendix II. For the Temple, Michael Schüpferling compiled a list of all Templar possessions in Germany and eastern Europe, 77 in all. Although the dates at which these were acquired by the order are mostly unknown, judging from the earliest evidence of each property being in the Templars' possession, 56 of these properties passed into their hands during the thirteenth century, and five in the twelfth; the rest are not recorded before the fourteenth century. 16 of those recorded in the thirteenth century are recorded before 1230, 19 between 1230 and 1250, and 21 during the rest of the century. From this evidence it appears that

⁹⁵*Placita de Quo Warranto, temporibus Edw. I, II & III in curia receptae Scaccarii Westm. asservata* (London, 1818) e.g., pp.117, 129, 251-2, 277, 280-1, 341, 353, 356, 375-6, 588, 596, 678, 692, 747, 761-2, 765, 786, 787-8, 792; only in Sussex (pp.761-2) did the jury declare that the orders had overstepped their privileges in many areas.

⁹⁶Chapter 1, pp.54-7.

⁹⁷Tumler, pp.69-79, 83, 90ff.

the order of the Temple received most of its property in Germany and eastern Europe before 1250. Certainly, most of the donations it received in eastern Europe date from before 1250; after 1250 much monastic property in north-eastern Europe was confiscated. However, as the figure for the period 1250-1300 should probably include some of the 16 properties recorded later, it appears that although the level of donations fell after 1250, it did not fall as substantially as it fell elsewhere in Europe.⁹⁸

(i) Factors affecting donations.

Motives for donations in Germany were seldom stated in charters, but, so far as can be deduced, they appear to have been influenced by the same factors as those in western Europe: loyalty to monarchs, dynastic tradition, and the crusade to the Holy Land. On the north-eastern frontier of the Holy Roman Empire and in Poland⁹⁹ these factors continued to operate, but the principal concern of donors was to ensure the speedy colonization of unpopulated, unproductive land.

Dieter Wojtecki attempted to establish that a major factor prompting *reichministeriales* to patronize the Teutonic order was the order's connection with the Staufens.¹⁰⁰ Few donors were so specific, but in 1274, Henry Russe, vogt of

⁹⁸Schüpferling, pp.240-1 (note that less than 50% of these properties passed to the Hospital on the Temple's dissolution); Kuhn, 'Kirchliche Siedlung,' 46-53.

⁹⁹Although the dukes of Poland were independent rulers, as their attitude towards the military orders was very similar to that of the dukes of Brandenburg, Pomerania and Silesia, which were within the empire, they are discussed here rather than in chapter one, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication.

¹⁰⁰Wojtecki, 'Der Deutsche Orden unter Friedrich II,' pp.187-207.

Plauen, stated that the patronage of the past holy Roman emperors for the Teutonic order was a contributory factor in his making a donation. There is more direct evidence for the importance of family connections; in 1274 the vogts of Gera, the brothers Henry and Henry, (*sic*) made a donation to the order in the hands of their `beloved uncle, Hartmann of Heldrungen,` while in 1265 Sophie, dowager duchess of Brabant, daughter of the Blessed Elizabeth of Thuringia, gave some tithes to the Teutonic brothers of Marburg, because, she said, the house had been propagated by her ancestors and endowed by her uncles.¹⁰¹

In other cases, family tradition can be deduced as a motive for donation, as patronage continues from one generation to the next. For instance, the Askanier margraves of Brandenburg were enthusiastic patrons of the Hospital and, after 1280, of the Temple. They made many donations to the Hospital, while Margrave Otto IV `the Small`, younger brother of the margrave Otto III, entered the order of the Temple in 1286 on the death of his wife. After two years he left, and joined the Cistercians of Lehnin; possibly seeking a stricter rule, or a richer order.¹⁰²

The needs of the Holy Land were seldom an expressed motive in Germany. A few donors to the Hospital expressed their concern for this matter. Henry, count of Furstenburg, founded the Hospital of St. John at Villingen in 1253, later saying

¹⁰¹UB *Thüringen*, no. 266; UB *Hesse*, 1 no.218. Sophie did not mention that her mother had founded the hospital at Marburg, which her uncles had given to the Teutonic order.

¹⁰²E.g. Cart. nos. 289, 3068, 3845, 3893, 3900, 3949; *Cod. Dip. Brand.*, A 19 pp.125-6 no.4, p.174 no.3; D p.15; *Registres de Nicolas IV* no. 7460; H. Lüpke, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Templerordens im Gebiet der nordostdeutschen Kolonisation: Inaugural-Dissertation*, (Bernburg, 1933) pp.38-9; Schüpferling, pp.116, 124, 134, 141; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus* p.377.

that he had done this in assistance and defence of the Holy Land and in honour of the house of St. John the Baptist.¹⁰³ In 1268 Conrad I, count of Fribourg, gave his *ministeriales* full liberty to transfer themselves or their property to the Hospital, saying that he did this in view of the Hospitallers' religious way of life and hospitality and their work to increase the Catholic faith, in honour of God, the Blessed Virgin Mary, St. John the Baptist and all the saints and in help of the Holy Land.¹⁰⁴ This is one of the few charters indicating that a nobleman believed that the Hospital's role included the conversion of non-Christians, as well as their repression, and that he believed this to be important; he implies that the two activities went hand in hand.

The attitude of other donors was more parochial. A charter of Albert, count of Gleichen, of 1283, declares that he is giving a gift to 'the religious men of the order of St. Lazarus of the knighthood of Christ of Jerusalem in assistance for the new structure and habitation begun by the brothers in Helmsdorf..', showing a mixture of spiritual and local interests, and an unusual awareness of the military function of the order.¹⁰⁵

Interestingly, in donations to the Teutonic order there was seldom any mention of the Holy Land. Only the noblest of German donors considered it important: such as the lord of Schinei, the counts of Eberstein, the vogt of Plauen, the king of Bohemia's steward, the count of Orlamünde, the lord of Arnshaugk, and the landgrave of Thuringia. A few of these nobles also spoke of the order's role in spreading the faith. However, as these were the families who in more settled times would have been leading crusades to the Holy Land themselves, this is not surprising; it was unusual for less noble donors to

¹⁰³Cart., nos. 2860 and note, 2883, 3733.

¹⁰⁴*Ibid.*, no.3322.

¹⁰⁵Schüpferling, p.110.

mention the Holy Land. Perhaps more surprisingly in view of its geographical proximity, there was little reference to Prussia either.¹⁰⁶ It may be that its defence of Christendom was considered too obvious to mention, but it is also possible that the Teutonic order's nationality was more important to donors than its activities.

In eastern Europe, the principal interest of nobles, as of bishops, in the military orders was as colonizers.¹⁰⁷ However, seldom was colonization mentioned as a motive when endowments were made: princes' professed motive in giving was to assist the defence of Christendom in the Holy Land. As they themselves were involved in the defence of Christendom against the Prussians and Tartars, such concern was understandable, if unexpectedly altruistic. In addition, some were more directly interested in the defence of the Holy Land: Otto III, margrave of Brandenburg, was planning a crusade in 1265, although this never materialized.¹⁰⁸

Before November 1291 Duke Premislaw II of Greater Poland gave the order of the Temple a vast gift of uninhabited land around the lake of Drawiczka in subsidy of the land of Jerusalem, for the salvation of his and his ancestors' souls. This was the last great donation of land made to the order.¹⁰⁹ Colonization was also a principal motive for the dukes of

¹⁰⁶UB *Thüringen*, nos. 167, 203, 263, 310, 397, 404, 473.

¹⁰⁷F. L. Carsten, *The Origins of Prussia*, (Oxford, 1954) pp.13-14; Lüpke, *Untersuchungen*, *passim*; Kuhn, 'Kirchliche Siedlung,' 6-55.

¹⁰⁸Cart., no.3172.

¹⁰⁹*Pommersches UB*, 3 pp. 140-1, no. 1596; H. Lüpke, 'Das Land Tempelburg. Ein historische-geographische Untersuchung,' *Baltische Studien*, 35 (1933) 43-97.

Silesia in donations to the Templars¹¹⁰ and Hospitaliers, but, again, the dukes preferred to declare that they were prompted by the need of the Holy Land. In March 1280, Henry IV of Silesia, in the presence of Rudolf I, King of the Romans, and Hermann of Brunshorn, grand preceptor of the Hospital in Germany and Poland, gave the Hospital the right of patronage of the church of Brieg, declaring that his donation was prompted by the brothers' 'blessed and celibate life,' and that he was giving this:

'for the reverence of Our Saviour and the honour of His most glorious Mother and St. John the Baptist and for the subsidy of the Holy Land, for which the aforesaid brothers show themselves to be a wall of defence and a tower of strength incessantly against those blaspheming the name of Christian and the orthodox faith...'

These fulsome praises seem anachronistic in 1280, when the order had only Margat remaining of its castles in the Holy Land, and, despite successes against the Muslims, had obviously failed to protect the Holy Land from 'those blaspheming the name of Christian.' Nowhere else in Europe did such praises for the order flow, not even from the mouth of Edward I or of the pope. The influence of Rudolf I, a patron of the Hospital, probably coloured the words of the charter; in addition, the duke was well disposed towards Brother Hermann of Brunshorn, praising his 'clara merita.' Yet whatever the duke's true motives for giving, the preamble indicates that the Hospital was very valuable to him. It was repeated by the dukes Bernard of Silesia and Boleslaw of Oppeln in their own charters for the order. In 1281, Bernard of Silesia rephrased it: 'because the Lord, providing for the whole of His Church, has raised them up as a tower of strength against the prophaners and blasphemers of the orthodox faith.' Despite these unusually fine words,

¹¹⁰Lüpke, *Untersuchungen*, p.16; K. Eistert, 'Der Ritterorden der Tempelherren in Schlesien,' *Archive für Schlesische Kirchengeschichte*, 14 (1956) 2, 8-9, 19-20.

his gift was typical: a stretch of uninhabited, indefensible and unproductive land.¹¹¹

(ii) Criticism

There was little lay criticism of military orders in Germany. The image of the Temple may have benefitted from the role of its namesake in Wolfram von Eschenbach's popular romance *Parzival*.¹¹² Disputes broke out over property rights, as they did elsewhere in Europe.¹¹³

No expressed criticism of the military orders developed in eastern Europe, except of the Teutonic order. Nevertheless, after 1250 pressure began to be exerted on them to give up their properties.¹¹⁴ Helmut Lüpke attributed the Templars' losses in areas under the control of the Askanier dynasty of Brandenburg to the latter's political hostility towards the order, although adding that gradually they were reconciled and that after 1280 the Askanier supported the order. Walter Kuhn, however, has shown that these losses were general to all monastic orders in north-eastern Europe, including the Hospitallers, whom the Askanier supported. The confiscation of monastic lands by lay lords seems to have been a reaction against the vast estates granted away by previous generations, which, now that their boundaries were secured and the land had been brought under cultivation and was profitable, their

¹¹¹Cart., nos. 3718, 3744, 3897, 3762; see also 3439, 3639; Szczesniak, pp.18-20.

¹¹²See chapter four, pp.219-221.

¹¹³E.g., *UB Thüringen*, nos. 244, 377; Cart., nos. 2752, 2804, 2957.

¹¹⁴Cart., no.3266; *Pommersches UB*, 2 nos. 891, 914, 1312, p.536; *Registres de Nicolas IV*, no.6096.

successors wished to recover.¹¹⁵

The Teutonic order, of course, held a different position. Donations were more an indication of the order's power and the support it received from the papal see than a reflection of the donors' conception of its holiness. Its role in north-eastern Europe was more that of a powerful lay ruler than of a monastic order. The order's friendship was valuable, its enmity dangerous.

It is in the light of its political power, rather than its moral standards, that we must consider the criticism of the Teutonic order which reached the papal court in the first half of 1258. The brothers were accused of forbidding the word of God to be preached to the Prussians, sloth in carrying out the commands of the Holy See, forbidding incest and adultery to be corrected among the Prussians, forbidding oratories to be built and Catholic priests instituted there, destroying old churches, impeding the sacraments of burial, confession, baptism and the eucharist, and repressing the new converts. The order was defended by the Friars Minor, who preached and supported its crusade in Prussia, and Samovit, Duke of Masovia, who stood to make territorial gains through his support of the order. The letters which these parties sent to Rome were undoubtedly based on a proforma supplied by the order, as they are almost identical, talking of the order's magnificent struggles against the Prussians, and declaring that those who had left many great dignities in the world, lordships and honours, in order to widen the boundaries of the Christian faith, exposing their property and bodies to death every moment, would not violate the statutes of their profession.¹¹⁶

The accusations probably originated with Samovit's brother, Duke Kasimir of Cjuvia and Lesznc, Duke Boleslaw of Krakaw-Sandomir and their supporters. Walter Kuhn has drawn together

¹¹⁵Lüpke, *Untersuchungen*, p.16; Kuhn, 'Kirchliche Siedlung,' 46-53.

¹¹⁶Preuß. UB, 1,2 nos.62, 65.

from the papal bulls sent to Prussia from 1253 to 1257 evidence for a plan by these dukes to win part of Prussia for themselves, either through peaceful mission or through an alternative crusade, to which the pope readily agreed, unaware that this would conflict with the Teutonic order's claims.¹¹⁷ Hence, as for Richard of Cornwall and Bernard Sicart de Marvejols, discussed above, moral criticism of a military order masked political conflict; although the criticism may have been soundly based, it does not express the critic's true grievances towards the order.

In closing this examination of attitudes towards the military orders in Germany and eastern Europe, it is necessary to ask why the Germans remained favourable and uncritical towards the military orders after western Europe had ceased to be generous, and had begun to voice criticisms. The solution must lie partly in the fact that the orders' estates developed later; they were less entrenched than in western Europe, and their privileges less established and therefore less of an irritant than they were elsewhere. Again, after 1229 it was difficult for Germans to travel to the Holy Land, initially due to the dispute between emperor and pope, and subsequently because of the closing of the land route as a result of the Tatar invasions.¹¹⁸ Those who had a concern for the Holy Land had to express their concern in an indirect way; giving to the military orders was a convenient means of doing this. Yet, because few Germans reached the Holy Land, they did not see the weakness of the military orders as did French crusaders, or the Frisians who gave information to the Frisian chronicler

¹¹⁷Kuhn, *Ritterorden als Grenzhüter*, 42-52; note also *Preuß.*

UB, 1,1 no. 94 for Kasimir's opposition to his father's original gift to the order.

¹¹⁸One who did was Henry, duke of Mecklenburg: *RRH* 1492, 1501.

Menko.¹¹⁹ Their image of the military orders as unblemished knights of Christ remained intact. Although the orders' financial problems were known,¹²⁰ there seems to have been little interest in actual defeats and successes in the Holy Land, to judge from the meagre reports in the chronicles.

(c) Other groups.

(i) Non-noble classes.

To date the discussion has centred on the nobility. However, by the end of the thirteenth century the merchant classes were also of importance in the patronage of monastic orders. Without the support of this increasingly influential and wealthy section of society, no order could hope to survive or flourish. There is evidence to indicate that at least some members of the merchant classes had a good opinion of the military orders. For example, in the area of recruitment, Dieter Wojtecki has shown that some members of the burgher and patrician families of Thuringia joined the Teutonic order, although it was a smaller proportion than from other sections of society; ten brothers from those fully identified in the Thuringian *bailie* (10%), and four from those sent from Thuringia to Livonia or Prussia (6%).¹²¹

The notorious alliances made during the thirteenth century between the Venetians, Pisans, Genoese and the individual military orders in the Holy Land were based on the power and influence of the different parties and their mutual self-interest rather than respect for each other's spirituality.¹²² In such dealings the military orders were

¹¹⁹Menko, pp.555, 557-8, 558-9.

¹²⁰E.g., Cart., nos. 3920-1; *UB Thüringen*, no.167.

¹²¹Wojtecki, *Studien*, pp.78-79, 88-90.

¹²²Richard, *Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, 2 pp.365-7, 414; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.233-4, 240, 264; cf. p.271.

regarded by their allies as international financial and military corporations rather than as devoted men of God, the 'poor knights of Christ' which the Templars still claimed to be.¹²³ There were similar motives behind the friendship of the citizens of Riga with the Swordbrothers of Livonia, in the 1220s and 1230s; a friendship which only lasted as long as they shared a mutual enemy.¹²⁴ Likewise, Bartholomew of Neocastro, a judge of Messina, criticized the orders of the Temple and Hospital because of their support for papal policies which he hated.¹²⁵

Members of the merchant classes, however, also made donations in alms to the military orders, indicating that their spiritual vocation was recognized and admired. As in the case of donations by the knightly classes, most donations do not mention the Holy Land or charity, but the few exceptions show that the orders' primary purpose was not ignored. For example, in 1267 the German town of Friedburg recognized a gift by the late Bertold Heillericcher and his wife Lucard to the order of the Hospital 'in support of the Holy Land and remission of their sins.' In 1253, Nicolas of Arco, son of Léon of Randazzo, a Genoese, gave the Hospital a house at Acre, because of the order's charity towards the poor.¹²⁶ At Metz the order of the Temple had a thriving confraternity. An agreement survives from 1288, setting out the respective duties of the order and the confraternity, and providing for a lamp to be kept burning before the image of Our Lady in the house of the

¹²³E.g. Cart., nos. 3028-9.

¹²⁴W. Urban, *The Baltic crusade* (Decatur, 1975) pp.131-2, 137, 141, 142, 145, 257ff; cf. Aubrey des Trois Fontaines, p.930.

¹²⁵Bartholomew of Neocastro, pp.iiiff., 7, 116-7; cf. 108-9.

¹²⁶*Urkundenbuch der Stadt Friedburg 1* (1216-1410) ed. M. Foltz (Marburg, 1904) pp.17-8, no.52; Cart., no.2662.

Temple.¹²⁷

The military orders, particularly the Temple, were important to merchants as safe depositories for valuables, although the noble classes also used them for this purpose. All monastic orders were used in this way, but the military orders differed in that, as international orders constantly sending cash overseas, they could also arrange for the secure transfer of funds. This was a role shared with the Italian bankers, but, according to the evidence examined by Jules Piquet, relations between the two groups seem to have been amicable. The importance of the London Temple as a safe depository is demonstrated by the fact that in 1263 the Lord Edward's theft of monies deposited there caused a riot of the citizens.¹²⁸

Just as the orders came into conflict with the nobility over their privileges and land rights, they came into conflict with the merchant classes over their privileges and trading rights. Generous donations to the orders earlier in their history resulted in bitter conflicts during the course of the thirteenth century, exacerbated by the orders' relentless exploitation of their privileges in order to meet their continual and increasing need for cash. In about 1270, the citizens of Provins protested to Thibaud, count of Champagne, that the Templars were charging toll for the weighing of wool, so that the abbeys which had traditionally supplied the townsmen with wool were taking it elsewhere. A few years later, during the Hundred Roll inquiries, the burghers of Plumton and Dartmouth in Devon complained of the Hospitallers' exemption from toll, which they claimed was 'in prejudice of

¹²⁷H. von Hammerstein, 'Der Besitz der Tempelherren in Lotharingen,' *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Lothringische Geschichte und Altertumskunde*, 7,1 (1895) 19 no.38.

¹²⁸J. Piquet, *Des Banquiers au moyen âge: Les Templiers: Étude sur leurs opérations financières* (Paris, 1939) pp.90-2; Dunstable Annals, pp.222-3.

the lord king,` but which also damaged their own trade. There was also great resentment among the burghers of Totnes and Grimsby at the privileges of the Hospitaliers and Templars respectively which enabled them to have the burghers summoned to answer cases in courts at the other end of the country, at immense expense and inconvenience to the burghers. In Dublin the river Liffey, essential as a navigation route and valued for its fish, was a source of continual dispute between the Hospital and the citizens. At Erfurt in 1259 Rudolf, abbot of Schotten, and his fellow judges, in a case involving the Teutonic order against the vogt and consuls of Muhlhausen, reassured the latter that the order was justified in its claims over certain churches in Muhlhausen. `One must not in any way presume that men who, of their own accord, have abandoned themselves and their property for God`s sake would wish to claim parishes by surreptitious cunning, in danger and scandal to themselves and very many others.`¹²⁹ This was a familiar argument; that the brothers were men of honour, who would not deliberately imperil their reputation nor their souls.¹³⁰

Distinguishing the attitudes of the masses towards the military orders is more difficult, and only the most general conclusions may be reached. There are indications that, because their privileges were extended to their `men,` or tenants, the military orders were generally regarded as good

¹²⁹Provins: *Cartulaire de Provins*, nos. 148, 151. Plumton: *Rot. Hund.*, 1 pp.77, 96, and cf. p.317. Grimsby: *ibid.*, 1 pp.83, 291, 401, and cf. 2 p.320; Perkins, `Knights Templars,` 220-1. Dublin: J. T. Gilbert, ed., *Historical documents of Ireland*, RS 53 (London, 1878) p.75 no.16, p.79. Cart., no.2987. Muhlhausen: *UB Thüringen*, no.147.

¹³⁰Cf. Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 5 p.150; *Preuß. UB*, 1,2 nos. 62, 65.

landlords.¹³¹ However, there are also records of disputes.¹³² Some donations were made, sometimes a villein requesting that he or she be transferred to the order's service.¹³³

It has been claimed that the *fabliaux*, humorous, sometimes scurrilous old French poems, offer an accurate insight into the interests and concerns of the merchant classes and peasantry. In fact, as has recently been shown, they were written for the high nobility and recited in seigneurial courts, although they were also recited in bourgeois houses, public places and in the houses of well-off villeins. They appealed to all classes, and, like all literature of this period, followed certain conventions; so that they are not strictly realistic. However, it is striking that the military orders only make one appearance in these poems, and that completely respectable. In the version of *La Housse Partie* written by one Bernier, the Temple is cited as the order into which a knight is most likely to retire in his old age. This version of the *fable* has been dated to the second half of the thirteenth century. In contrast, the Franciscans appear in two *fabliaux*, both times in a dubious role, and the parish priest appears regularly, usually as a would-be seducer, and married.¹³⁴

¹³¹RHGF 24 p.221, no.1509; *Diplomatic documents preserved in the Public Record Office*, 1 1101-1272, ed. P. Chaplais (London, 1964) no.113; Perkins, 'Knights Templars,' 217-8.

¹³²E.g. *Records of the Templars*, pp.clxxxiii, p.57 (Lockridge).

¹³³M. Gervers, *The Cartulary of the Knights of St. John*, p.xxxviii; Cart., no. 89.

¹³⁴P. Ménard, *Les Fabliaux: contes à rire du moyen age* (Paris, 1983) pp.46ff, 72-5, 87-107; W. Noomen and N. von den Boorgaard, eds., *Nouveau recueil complet des fabliaux*, 3 vols. (Assen/Maastricht, 1983-6) 3 no.16, pp.179, 197-8 lines 146-9.

(ii) Women

It might be assumed that the military orders would exercise little attraction for women, as they represented a function from which women were excluded. That such an assumption is unjustified is demonstrated by the large number of donations the military orders received from women, some of which have been cited above. There is certainly no good reason why a military order should have seemed alien to women, for Christian women took as active a part in warfare as possible, although they did not ride out on horseback to engage the foe. For some, to whom this aspect of crusading was denied, patronage of a military order would seem the best alternative. The military function of the Temple was specifically lauded by some women donors, such as the Laureta quoted at the beginning of this chapter. On the other hand, it must be admitted that it does not seem to have been the most important influence on donations. In the case of donations to the Hospital, it was the charitable function which women donors stressed. Others admired the brothers for their sanctity, as did Hedewig, wife of Henry I, duke of Silesia,¹³⁵ or regarded them as contemplatives, the equals of monks.¹³⁶

The attraction of the orders for women is also demonstrated by the large number who entered a military order. Women were admitted as full sisters by the order of the Hospital and the order of St. James of Compostella, and as 'half-sisters' by the Teutonic order.¹³⁷ As well as founding houses for women, the Hospital was eager to take over existing

¹³⁵*Acta Sanctorum*, ed. J. Bollandus *et al.*, (Antwerp, 1643ff., reprinted Brussels, 1966) Oct. VIII p.232, para.32.

¹³⁶E.g., Dannon lady of Villy, cited by Richard, 'Templiers et Hospitaliers en Bourgogne,' pp.241-2.

¹³⁷A. Forey, 'Women and the military orders in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,' *Studia monastica* 29 (1987) 63-97; Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, pp.240-2.

houses of sisters, such as Acornbury before 1233, and St. Lazarus of Bethany in 1256. Both of these houses were acquired in circumstances which suggested fraud by the order, and the donations were later revoked.¹³⁸ The order seems to have been so successful in attracting women recruits, for whatever motives, that in 1262 the general chapter of the order passed a decree declaring that no more sisters were to be admitted without the master's leave and with regard to the profit of the house if sisters were admitted, or loss if they were not; and instructing that the prior was not to receive sisters who were young or of 'suspicious age.'¹³⁹

This concern to preserve high moral standards within the order led the compilers of the Latin rule of the Temple to forbid the admission of any women at all. The later French translation declared that women were *no longer* to be admitted, indicating that women had been admitted despite the prohibition.¹⁴⁰ Although there is evidence in the twelfth century of the order attempting to enforce the spirit, if not always the letter, of the rule,¹⁴¹ by the early fourteenth century even this had ceased. During the trial of the order Brother Ponzard de Cizy, preceptor of Payns, referred to the admittance of women as an established and commonplace practice.¹⁴²

¹³⁸Cart., nos. 2047, 2167, 2781, 2993.

¹³⁹Cart., nos.3039, para.22.

¹⁴⁰*Règle*, p.69: latin 56, french 70.

¹⁴¹*Cartulaire de la commanderie de Richerenches de l'ordre du Temple (1136-1214)*, ed. le Marquis de Ripert-Monclar (Avignon, 1907) no.7; *Records of the Templars*, p.210 no.5.

¹⁴²*Dossier*, pp.158-60: he complained that these sisters were then abused by the same masters who had admitted them. Forey, 'Women and the military orders,' 66.

These women certainly did not join the order with the intention of fighting the infidel. Rather, in the entry of women into this purely military order we see further evidence that, in the localities, it soon became regarded as simply another contemplative order. When one Azalais gave her property and herself to the order in 1133, she did so because of her wish to follow Christ in His poverty, to serve God and obey the master, not from any wish to defend Christendom. Other women seem to have retired into the order in their widowhood and old age.¹⁴³ This indicates that they had a good opinion of the order's standards of sanctity, but also that they had no conception of the order's special function, in which women might be a burden on much-needed resources.

The attitudes of women towards the military orders, in particular the order of the Temple, indicate that they were successful in winning approval and participation even from that section of society to which they might have been expected to appear most alien. However, this success led to expectations which the orders could not do otherwise but satisfy, but which undermined their distinctive character and might weaken them in the performance of their vocation.

(iii) Heretics

The heretics, Cathars and Waldensians, were opposed to the military orders on a matter of doctrine, believing that Christians should not use force against their enemies, nor to encourage non-Christians to convert. Jacques de Vitry indicates that by c.1220 their arguments were having a

¹⁴³D'Albon, *Cartulaire*, no.68; see also E. Petit, *Histoire des Ducs de Bourgogne de la race Capétienne*, 9 vols. (Dijon, 1885-1895) 2 p.393 no.622; Richard, *Templiers et Hospitaliers en Bourgogne*, p.234; Schüpferling, pp.61-2.

considerable demoralizing effect upon the knight-brothers.¹⁴⁴

There are no recorded instances, however, of antagonism between the military orders and the heretics. During the Albigensian crusade, the orders of the Hospital and Temple did not take up arms against the heretics, although representatives of the orders appeared on the side of the Church during the war, and the Temple occasionally lodged crusaders.¹⁴⁵ Both orders were regarded by the inquisitors as fully orthodox,¹⁴⁶ but, in the Treaty of Paris of 1229, they were regarded as neutral.¹⁴⁷

(iv) Non-Catholic Christians, Jews and Muslims

The attitudes of these groups towards the military orders are

¹⁴⁴Jacques de Vitry, sermon 38, pp.419-420; the Passau anonymous in *Quellen zur Geschichte der Waldenser*, p.81; Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, p.174.

¹⁴⁵Delaruelle, 'Templiers et Hospitaliers en Languedoc,' 315-6; Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernay, 'Historia Albigensium,' RHGF 19, pp.60, 71, 100-1; Guillaume de Puylaurens, *ibid.*, p.218.

¹⁴⁶RHGF 24 pp.320-1, no.1, p.363 no.10.

¹⁴⁷Guillaume de Puy-Laurens, pp.222-3. The Hospitallers had good relations with Raymond VI of Toulouse, the protector of the Cathars, who was their *confrère*, and after his death while under excommunication they threw their mantle over his body and took it away, as the Templars had done for the excommunicate Geoffrey de Mandeville in the previous century: Guillaume de Puylaurens, pp.214-5; Cart., nos. 1334, 1612, 1617; Annals of Walden, *Monasticon Anglicanum* 4 p.142. Raymond, however, was not a Cathar himself, and the Hospital's action does not indicate that the order sympathized with the heretics.

interesting in that, although they were free from many of the prejudices which influenced the attitudes of the brothers' co-religionists, they often concur with their opinions.

There was some admiration for the military orders. Benjamin of Tudela, a Spanish Jew who visited Jerusalem c.1170, made particular mention of the Hospital and Temple, which appear to have greatly impressed him.¹⁴⁸ In the late twelfth century, Michael the Syrian, Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch (1166-99), praised the discipline and self-sacrifice of the Temple and Hospital, their charity to the poor, and their hospitality. He mentioned their military function, protection for pilgrims and the defence of the Holy Land against the Muslims, but also noted their tolerance of all Christians, whatever their creed. He was not, however, aware that there were two orders, thinking them one and the same. The thirteenth-century Armenian translator of his work realized that a difference existed, but apparently believed that the Hospital fought the Muslims and practised hospitality, while the Temple existed purely to acquire land; perhaps a reflection on the poor relations between the Temple and King Leo of Armenia, and the order's long struggle to recover the castle of Baghras.¹⁴⁹

Michael's successor as Jacobite chronicler, Gregory Abû'l-Faraj, known as Bar Hebraeus, and his continuator, regarded the military orders, both Templars and Hospitallers, as recklessly brave and brilliant warriors, but treacherous and too fond of

¹⁴⁸*The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, ed. M. N. Adler (London, 1907) pp.22-3.

¹⁴⁹*Le chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche, 1166-1199*, ed. J. B. Chabot, 4 vols. (Paris, 1899-1910) 3 pp.201-3; RHC DocArm. 1 pp.331-3; Riley-Smith, 'The Templars and the Teutonic Knights in Cilician Armenia,' pp.99, 101-3, 105-8.

gold.¹⁵⁰ His observations are strikingly similar to those of European writers. They are also endorsed by the Russian Orthodox chronicler of Novgorod, describing the Teutonic order; the brothers were skilled warriors, but treacherous, 'the accursed transgressors of right.'¹⁵¹ Nevertheless, alliance with the Teutonic order offered tempting possibilities to a ruler wishing to consolidate his position and extend his power; in 1254 Prince Daniel made an alliance with the intention of winning some territory from the pagan Prussians, while Mindaugas of Lithuania used the brothers' influence to establish himself firmly as king of the Lithuanians, then broke his alliance with them.¹⁵²

The Muslims were of the same general opinion. The military orders were terrible enemies, who should be given no quarter. Treachery against them was pardonable, for they themselves were treacherous. Their annihilation was a cause for great rejoicing. 'Imād ad-Dīn al-Isfahānī, secretary of Saladin, regarded the military orders as the backbone of the Christian forces. Every rhetorical celebration which he wrote

¹⁵⁰*The chronography of Gregory Abū'l-Faraj, 1225-1286, the son of Aaron, the Hebrew Physician, commonly known as Bar Hebraeus, being the first part of his political history of the world*, trans. E. W. Budge, 2 vols. (London, 1932, reprinted Amsterdam, 1976) 1 pp.280, 282, 308-9, 381, 389, 396, 463; see Appendix I for his continuator's description of the loss of Acre.

¹⁵¹*The chronicle of Novgorod 1016-1471*, trans. R. Mitchell and N. Forbes, Camden 3rd series 25 (London, 1914) pp.85-7, 93-4, 101-3.

¹⁵²*Preuß. UB*, 1,1 nos. 298, 273, 274, 324; *Livländische Reimchronik*, ed. F. Pfeiffer, BLVS 7B (Stuttgart, 1844) lines 2448ff.

over the defeat of the Christians included a reference to the Templars and Hospitallers. `What evils he cures in harming a Templar!` The brothers were intractable enemies, who, even when the Muslims thought they had them cornered, would sally out by night and massacre them in their beds. Saladin always had any he captured put to death, he recorded, because of their violent hatred for the Muslims.¹⁵³ This was standard practice among Muslim generals.¹⁵⁴ Abou `L-Feda, who was born at Damascus in 1273 and was an eyewitness of some of the events he recorded, rejoiced over the capture of Margat: `In this memorable day were revenged the evils caused by the house of the Hospitallers, and the brightness of day replaced the shadows.` He happily admitted that Sultan Beibars had massacred the garrison of Safed after they had surrendered on the understanding that their lives would be spared.¹⁵⁵ Nevertheless, friendly relations did exist between the military orders and certain Muslim princes, although Muslim chroniclers, like their Christian counterparts, deplored any friendship with

¹⁵³ `Imâd ad-Din al-Isfahâni, (519-597/1125-1201) *Conquête de la Syrie et de la Palestine par Saladin*, trans. H. Masse, (Paris, 1972) pp.31, 81-2, and also 15-17, 29, 30-31, 36-7, 45, 69, 97, 125, 142-4, etc.; also in Ibn Alaty, `El-Kamel Altevarylch,` RHC Or 1 pp.736-7.

¹⁵⁴Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, pp.75-76.

¹⁵⁵Abou `L-Feda, pp.161, 151, and also 112, 158; see also Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, p.141 for other Muslim comments on the Hospitallers of Margat.

the enemy faith.¹⁵⁶

(d) Chapter summary

The evidence discussed in this chapter reveals that some images of the military orders held by the laity were not simply the result of prejudice, for they were held universally, by all who encountered them, friend and foe. The military orders were admired by both lay Christians and non-Christians for their great courage in battle, and zeal for their faith, although by the mid-thirteenth century in more sophisticated circles they were regarded as foolishly idealistic. Alongside this great courage, however, lay their pride, the root of the intransigence which `Imād ad-Din both admired and feared. Both friend and foe agreed that they could not be trusted, an indication that the brothers put the interests and policies of their order before fidelity to Christian or Muslim allies; an unquestioning loyalty to the corporation, a common fault among monks.

These were moral faults, which undermined their spirituality. It is important to distinguish between criticism of the military orders themselves and criticism directed against all monastic orders, in which the military orders were sometimes included by name and sometimes overlooked. Just as some of the clergy distrusted them as knightly orders, so they were criticized by laymen as monks: their dual character brought them dual criticism. It is also important to consider conflicts between the orders and nobility or burgesses in the

¹⁵⁶E.g., *Memoirs of an Arab-Syrian gentleman, or, an Arab knight in the Crusades: memoirs of Usamah ibn-Munqidh*, trans. P. K. Hitti, (Beirut, 1964) pp.161, 163-4; Cart., no. 2149 (also sent to the Temple); Registers of Innocent III, PL 215, col. 689, 8 no.119; Abou `L-Feda, p.120; Riley-Smith, *Knights*, p.78, note 1, p.162; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.200, 221, 226-7, 276.

wider context of the conflict between monastic property-holders and laymen during the thirteenth century; the military orders were far from being the only monastic orders whose privileges aroused lay ire. Again, although Malcolm Barber has drawn attention to the Temple's harsh terms of leasing property and land to laymen and judged that they aroused antagonism, such terms were standard for their time.¹⁵⁷

Turning to criticism specifically aimed at the military orders, surprisingly few laymen criticized them for failing in their particular vocation: the defence of pilgrims and the Holy Land. The criticism of the disgruntled crusaders of 1239 and 1240 had more to do with political differences, both within the crusader army and in Europe, than the orders' own failings, although it was no less damaging for that. It was more common for Europeans to be criticized for failing to assist the military orders in the Holy Land than for the military orders to take the sole blame.

The most striking aspect of lay criticism of the military orders before 1291 is how little there was; and even this little was mostly confined to France. Taken in the context of criticism of the Church as a whole, it pales into insignificance.¹⁵⁸ When, at the end of our period, Jacquemart Gielée turned his satirical eye upon the Hospital and Temple, although he placed them at the head of the whole Church as encapsulating the seven deadly sins, this was apparently because, as guardians of the Holy Land, they had represented

¹⁵⁷M. Barber, 'The social context of the Templars,' TRHS 34 (1984) 44-5; cf. the Hospital in AOL 2 pp.206-7 (1234); *Cartulaire de Provins*, no.136 (the abbey of Connery rents land to the Temple); cf. Forey, *Corona de Aragon*, pp.222-8 on the Templars' problems in exacting dues from their tenants.

¹⁵⁸Cf. Perkins, 'Knights Templars,' 215, 218-9, 221, 229-30.

spiritual purity; they were God's warriors fighting for the triumph of good over evil. Although the increasing realism of thirteenth-century attitudes and the victories of the Muslims in the Holy Land had eroded this image, they had not destroyed it.

CHAPTER FOUR:
THE REPRESENTATION OF THE MILITARY ORDERS IN LITERARY SOURCES
AND IN LEGEND

It is only in recent years that historians have begun to discover the value of literary sources as historical evidence. In particular, the pioneering studies of Jean Flori into the development of the ethic of knighthood have made great use of literary sources, both romances and *chansons de geste* or epics, piecing together evidence which by its nature does not exist in the clerical chronicles.¹ Although such evidence may be unreliable as an actual representation of its period, it can give valuable insights into the attitudes and prejudices of the class for which it was produced: primarily the knightly classes, both high and low nobility, but by the thirteenth century also the merchant classes and wealthy peasantry, in fact anyone who could afford to pay a minstrel for his trouble.² In the same way, the 'non-factual' material which appears in latin chronicles and annals, such as miracle stories and moralizing anecdotes adapted from actual events, gives valuable insights into the attitudes and prejudices of the intended audience of these works: educated laymen and the clergy.

Although the image of the military orders in both these types of literature was largely stereotyped, a caricature rather than an accurate portrayal, there is a considerable

¹E.g. Flori, 'La notion de chevalerie dans les chansons de geste'; 'L'adoubement dans les romans de Chrétien de Troyes.'

²Cf. Ménard, *Les Fabliaux*, pp.101-2; by the end of the twelfth century even some noble literature acknowledged the existence of the merchants and peasantry: cf. P. Noble, 'Attitudes to social class as revealed by some of the older *Chansons de Geste*,' *Romania*, 94 (1973) 359-385.

dichotomy between the stereotype in stories or legends included in latin chronicles, and that in vernacular romances and epics.³ In the legends of the chroniclers the orders were usually portrayed as greedy, envious and treacherous, impeding the triumph of the Christians for the sake of their own interests; although they were redeemed by their courage in battle and even some renegades were shown as men of conscience and integrity. There remained throughout a notion that the military orders were 'extraordinary'; closely connected with the magical, mystical Muslim world, whether as dupes or as victors. As a natural progression from this, a few other legends, not from the chronicles, portrayed them as supernatural beings, associated with the miraculous and inexplicable. However, only rarely were they seen as being spiritually outstanding.

Among the romances and epics the spiritual aspect of the military orders' vocation received even less attention than in the chronicles. They were knights of Christ, men of great courage and piety, although the latter was not stressed but taken for granted. Their 'extraordinariness' here appeared as a special association with lovers.

The greedy, envious image which was assigned to the military orders by chroniclers was in part a development from clerical criticism of the orders. However, two factors exaggerated it: the geographical location of the orders' main activities, and the nature of the literature in which this image appeared. The orders' image in the chroniclers' legends was very similar to the western European view of easterners in general, especially the Muslims: the orient was thought to be a place of extraordinary men and beasts, of mystery and magic, of extraordinary wealth, while Muslims, Greeks and Palestinian

³Cf. Trotter, *Medieval French Literature*, pp.29, 33-4, 249.

Franks alike were considered to be treacherous.⁴ Simply because they were based in the Holy Land, the military orders acquired this 'oriental' image. The order's persistent pleas for monetary aid ('greed') and Christian military failures such as at Damascus in 1149 ('treachery') would have reinforced this image, but did not create it.

Again, histories tended to be pessimistic and moralizing, and hence any group or institution which received attention was more likely to be criticized than praised. This may explain why, even in the vernacular chronicle written for Bernard the treasurer, critical legends are told of the military orders. In contrast, romances and epics were intended to be more for entertainment than education: their outlook on the world was altogether more optimistic. In addition, knightly audiences were more favourably disposed towards the military orders than were the the clergy in general, while they distrusted the clergy, except the unconforming hermits.⁵

(a) Legends and unlikely tales in chronicles.

Most of these concerned the accusations aimed at the military orders, especially by the clergy: that they were greedy,

⁴E.g. Chrestien de Troyes, *Cligès*, ed. A. Micha, CFMA 84 (Paris, 1982) pp.vi-viii and lines 5488ff; *The legend of Duke Ernst*, trans. J. W. Thomas and C. Dussère (Lincoln (Neb.) and London, 1979) *passim*; *La Bataille Loquifer*, ed. J. Runeberg, Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fenniae, 38 no.2 (Helsingfors, 1913) *passim*; Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Parzival*, ed. K. Lachmann and W. Spiewok, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1981) Bk. 1, 13.16-58.26; Odo of Deuil pp.66-88, 98; William of Tyre, 2 p.887-9, Bk.19 chs.18-19; *Itinerarium* pp.45-6; Gerhoh of Reichersberg, p.377.

⁵E.g., *L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, lines 18351-18378, 18233-18260, 18468-18496; *Moniage Guillaume*: I lines 125ff, II lines 100ff; *Moniage Rainouart*, *passim*; Duby, *The Three orders*, pp.306-7.

treacherous and envious. Their pride was a contributory factor in each of these vices. As a result of these vices, the advance of Christendom was often prevented. They were not, however, accused by the chroniclers of cowardice or indulging in pleasure. The accusation of greed was the most frequent, usually appearing in the form of the legend of the enchanted gold.

This legend tells how a greedy fool was cheated out of his possessions by magicians, who paid him in base metal that had been enchanted to look like gold.⁶ In the version concerning the military orders, it is placed in the context of the siege of a Muslim stronghold: variously Harenc in 1177, Damascus in 1148, and Tibnin in 1197. Just as the stronghold was on the point of surrender, the Templars, or the Templars and Hospitallers according to versions told after c.1220, accepted a large sum of gold from the Muslims to end the siege and depart. However, when they later examined their gains, they found that the 'gold' was only copper. The story was told by Gerhoh of Reichersberg (before 1161-2) and Michael the Syrian (before 1199) of the Palestinian Franks at the siege of Damascus in 1148.⁷ However, when first told of the Templars, by Roger, parson of Howden, at the end of the twelfth century,

⁶Other versions appear in, e.g., Gregory of Tours, *Histoire de Francs*, ed. H. Omont and G. Collon, 2 vols., Collection de Textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'histoire (Paris, 1886-93) 1 pp.133-4, Bk.4 ch.42.; 'Math, son of Mathonwy,' in *The Mabinogion*, trans. J. Gantz (Harmondsworth, 1976) p.101.

⁷Gerhoh of Reichersberg, p.377; *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, 3 p.276; c.f. Bar Hebraeus, 1 p.274.

it concerned the siege of Harenc.⁸ Between 1209 and 1222, Otto of St. Blasien, describing the German crusade, applied the story to the Templars at the siege of Tibnin.⁹ Around 1210, Gervase, a monk of Canterbury, was retelling it in the context of the siege of Damascus, with the Templars rather than the Palestinian Franks as the guilty dupes.¹⁰

It is clear that the story was used as a convenient excuse by western chroniclers as to why expeditions to the Holy Land had failed to achieve anything. Its transfer from the men of Jerusalem in general to the Templars in particular reflected a growing realization in the West not so much of the Templars' responsibility for the defence of the Holy Land as of their fallibility. It is interesting that this did not come until after the Third Lateran Council, the writing of William of Tyre's chronicle, and probably after the loss of Jerusalem. The first of these events marked the first and greatest outburst of the secular clergy's opposition to the military orders' privileges, the second informed the reader that the military orders, particularly the order of the Temple, impeded the Christian cause in the Holy Land more than they advanced it, while in the battles of 1187 the military orders had been

⁸Roger of Howden, *Gesta*, 1 pp.130-1, note 10; *Chronica*, 2 p.131-2; D. Corner, 'The *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi* and *Chronica* of Roger, Parson of Howden,' *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 56 (1983) 126. The Christians were indeed bribed to abandon this siege, but the gold was genuine: Abou 'L-Feda, p.48.

⁹Otto of St. Blasien, p.327.

¹⁰Gervase of Canterbury, 1 pp.137-8; cf. Ralph of Coggeshall, p.12.

seen to fail despite their great courage.¹¹ The order of the Temple therefore became an obvious target for blame for any defeat, to a far greater extent than in the past.

After the fifth crusade, however, the Hospital was also added to the tale, alongside the Templars; both appear in the version of the story in the abridgement of Ernoul's chronicle written up to 1227.¹² This adjustment reflects a growing realization in the West that the Hospitallers performed the same functions as the Templars and therefore shared the same responsibilities, the same temptations and the same faults. It seems probable that the events of the fifth crusade had detrimentally affected the image of the Hospital in the West in that during the crusade they, the Templars and the king of Jerusalem, had been accused of some now unknown treachery,¹³ which endorsed the image painted of the order in this legend.

After this the story did not appear in any new chronicle until Albert Milioli, notary of Reggio, wrote his chronicle of the emperors, between 1281 and 1286: he told it of the Templars, Hospitallers and the king of Jerusalem, in the context of the siege of Damascus.¹⁴ By this date the legend was obviously well known, and too often connected with the siege of Damascus to be ascribed to later incidents in the orders' history, so that it does not appear during their

¹¹Some of the tales in William of Tyre's chronicle were repeated by Walter Map before 1187: *De Nugis* pp.xxv-xxvi, xxix-xxx, 62-6; the whole chronicle was known in England by 1192: Davis, 'William of Tyre,' p.71.

¹²I.e., M. R. Morgan's mss A, B and z: Morgan, *The chronicle of Ernoul*, pp.11-3, 46-50; *Ernoul* pp.12-13.

¹³MGHES 1 no.79 pp.57-8, no.80 p.60; Cart 1633.

¹⁴Albert Milioli, 'Liber de temporibus et aetatibus et Cronica imperatorum,' ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH 31 pp.339, 639-40. Also printed as 'Codex Estensis' PL 213 cols. 511-2 note 23.

conflicts with the emperor Frederick, for example. On the other hand, it may be that it became unfashionable; certainly it is omitted by chroniclers who might have been expected to repeat it, such as Roger of Wendover, Matthew Paris and Aubrey des Trois-Fontaines. The development in the orders' image, particularly after 1250, would also have discouraged further use of this legend: this will be discussed further below.

Greed was also an important factor in two stories told of the order of the Temple by William of Tyre, in both of which the order was shown to love money more than winning the conversion of Muslims: the story of the capture of Nasr ed-Din, and the story of the murder of the Assassins' envoys.¹⁵ The account of Abou `L-Feda indicates that Nasr certainly was not converted to Christianity during his captivity, as William claimed: had he been, no doubt the authorities in Cairo would have publicized the fact when he was executed.¹⁶ In William's hands, the tale was merely a piece of spiteful libel, but in the hands of Walter Map it was spun into a miniature epic, a version of the popular tale of the Muslim who wished to become a Christian and who embraced the faith as soon as he was captured by the Christians. What dishonour for the Templars, for having sold him back! Steadfast in the face of torture, he received a martyr's death.¹⁷ There was, however, another version of this tale in circulation, in which the Templars were God's instruments of justice against the treacherous murderer

¹⁵William of Tyre, 2 pp.822-3, Bk. 18 ch.9, pp.953-55, Bk. 20 chs.29-30.

¹⁶Abou `L-Feda, pp.30-31.

¹⁷Walter Map, pp.62-6 (written 1184-1187).

Nasr, and their booty God's reward to them.¹⁸

In contrast, the only source for William's story of the Templars' murder of the Assassins' envoys was William himself, and the various chroniclers who repeat this story followed his judgement on the order,¹⁹ with the exception of Jacques de Vitry, bishop of Acre, who carefully refrained from stating that the murderer was a Templar.²⁰ The implication is that he did not believe the order was guilty. Western chroniclers, however, were happy to accept any story which fitted the order's image.

Less damaging was the Templars' role in the story of John Gale and Saladin's nephew. When first noted by Robert of Torigny, the order's role epitomized its steadfastness in the face of adversity and fidelity to its rule: the master of the order, Eudes de St. Amand, was shown refusing to be released in exchange for Saladin's nephew, whom the order was holding captive. In a subsequent version, however, the order was shown as swift to take the opportunity of winning a large ransom by assisting the renegade John Gale to betray and capture the young man who had befriended him in his exile. In a final version, the tables were turned completely against John Gale, who first betrayed his Christian lord and his faith and then his Muslim lord (Saladin) and his trust, while the Templars, although still powerful, played a rather dubious role in

¹⁸Continuatio Premonstratensis, ed. D. L. C. Bethmann, MGHS 6 pp.455-6; Guy of Bazoches in Aubrey des Trois Fontaines, pp.846 (written 1190's, and c.1240; recorded under 1162, instead of 1154); Baldwin of Ninove, 'Chronicon,' ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGHS 25, pp.534 (written in the second half of thirteenth century: pp.515-6).

¹⁹Walter Map, p.66; Guy of Bazoches in Aubrey des Trois-Fontaines, p.859; *Thomae Tusci*, p.507 (written 1279: p.464); Oliver *Scholasticus*, p.129.

²⁰Jacques de Vitry, 'Historia Orientalis,' col.1063.

capturing a helpless child. Saladin became the heartbroken uncle, desperate to obtain the release of his sister's son. The Templars' gains, far from being their just reward for prowess, look distinctly ill-gotten.²¹

With the accusations of greed went accusations of envy and treachery.²² One legendary account of the orders' envy and its harmful results appears in Matthew Paris' *Chronica Majora* and, with details altered, in Bartholomew of Neocastro's *Historia Sicula*, the former of which was written in England in the mid thirteenth century and the latter in Sicily late in the same century, but which shared a hatred of the papacy. It is as papal agents that the military orders appear in this story, plotting to bring about the death of the emperor Frederick by exploiting their close contacts with the Muslims. Matthew rewrote his account three times, decided to erase it because it was offensive to the Templars, and finally admitted that it could not be true: 'For it is not credible that such wickedness should flow from religious men, although they would seem to help the pope.' Nevertheless it was an excellent story, and fine propaganda against the pope; too good to be ignored.²³

The alleged treachery of the knight-brothers appeared in legends in connection with the orders' greed, but was also the cause of renegades. In the real world, all three of the military orders experienced problems with brothers who left the

²¹Robert of Torigny, *Chronicle*, in R. Howlett, ed., *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen*, 4 p.288; *Ernoul*, pp.255-6; *Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr (1184-97)* pp.58-9; c.f. Abu Shamah, 'The Book of the Two Gardens,' RHC Or 4, p.185.

²²E.g. 'Annales Herbipolenses,' p.7.

²³Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 3 pp.177-9; *Flores Historiarum*, 2 pp.194-5; *Historia Anglorum*, 2 pp.312-5 and note 4, p.312, 3 p.259; Vaughan, pp.60, 61, 108, 113-4; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus* pp.182-3; Bartholomew de Neocastro, pp.114-7; cf. HDFS 3 p.491 note 1, 5 p.708.

order and fled to the Saracens, and in the orders' statutes such an action was considered to be a crime by which the brother would lose the house forever.²⁴ In addition, a number of Christian laymen deserted to the Muslims during the history of the Latin Syria.²⁵ It was a widespread problem.

However, the great majority of renegades known in the west were Templars. William of Tyre mentioned the Armenian prince Melier, who first joined the order of the Temple and then abandoned his order, allied himself with Nuraddin and attacked Armenia, taking from his erstwhile brothers all their property.²⁶ Roger of Howden had heard of a Brother Robert of St. Albans, who had gone to Saladin in late 1186 and promised him the land of Jerusalem, in return for which Saladin promised him his sister's daughter in marriage and made him seneschal of all his kingdoms: that is, second only to Saladin himself. This has a fairytale ring about it: in return for his great deeds, the hero wins the Sultan's heiress and all his kingdom! However, Robert's attempt to capture Jerusalem failed.²⁷ Matthew Paris, recounting the story of the apostacy of a French knight during Louis IX's first crusade, went on to tell how

²⁴*Règle*, p.154 para.230 (before 1187) p.230 para. 422 (first half of thirteenth century), pp.296-7 paras. 568-70 (1257-1265); *Die statuten des Deutschen Ordens nach die Altesten Handschriften*, ed. M. Perlbach (Halle, 1890)p.86 no.39, 'Very Great Faults' no.5; Cart., no. 2213.34 (c.1239).

²⁵E.g. *Ernoul*, pp.60, 255; 'Roberti Canonici S. Mariani Autissiodorensis Chronicon,' ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGHS 26 p.249; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 5 p.387.

²⁶William of Tyre, 2 p.949, Bk.20 ch.26.

²⁷Roger of Howden, *Gesta*, 1 p.341; *Chronica*, 2 p.307. In medieval legends of the distant past and fairytales, succession went down the female line: the king's sister's children succeeded him.

`forty years before,` (*sic*) during the fifth crusade, Brother Ferrand of the Temple had deserted to the Saracens because a good horse was taken from him. He was `strenuous in arms and well-considered in counsel,` and, because of him, the Christians lost Damietta; but then, struck by guilt, he saved their lives.²⁸ Bernard the Treasurer's chronicle records that a Spanish knight, a Templar renegade who had retained his Christian faith, served Coradin, Sultan of Damascus, and so impressed his master with his constancy that he was made regent and guardian of his three sons on his death. This is apparently the `Martin` referred to by Aubrey des Trois-Fontaines; Aubrey called him a Hospitaller, but his own evidence indicates that the knight was a Templar.²⁹

All these renegades were praiseworthy, despite their apostasy: Melier remained a redoubtable warrior, while Brothers Robert, Ferrand and Martin were wise counsellors who were admired and influential among the Muslims. Ferrand and Martin, indeed, were better men than any of the Muslims: only through Ferrand was Damietta lost, only through Martin was Damascus guarded. It seems that European chroniclers were so reluctant to grant the Muslims any advantage that they attributed as many of their victories as possible to men who had been Christians. With a curious irony, the men who should have been the best of Christ's knights became in the chroniclers' imagination the only men able to overcome the Christians.

In the same way, the chronicler of Limoges, unable to credit that the reputedly impregnable fortress of Saphet could have succumbed to siege, accused the Templar commander of treachery: noting, however, that this man was a native Syrian (and therefore untrustworthy) and that an Englishman was his accomplice, with a neat xenophobic flourish. Other contemporary chroniclers, however, were able to admit that the castle fell by siege, or at least that its loss was due to

²⁸*Chronica Majora*, 5 p.387.

²⁹*Ernoul*, p.458; Aubrey des Trois-Fontaines, pp.925, 945.

Muslim treachery.³⁰

It is notable that only one renegade was attributed to the Hospital, Brother Martin, who was probably a Templar in any case. This may simply have been an error on the part of Aubrey des Trois-Fontaines, but the important point is that he, unlike every other chronicler, was prepared to recognise that the Hospital, as well as the Temple, suffered from renegade brothers. This may reflect a change in the image of the Hospital from that of a simple, honest charitable order to that of a more dashing and scandalous military order. By 1240, when Aubrey was writing, the Hospital was thoroughly associated with the Temple: both were accused of treachery during the fifth crusade, both had suffered at the hands of the emperor Frederick II and had been in conflict with the emperor, both were accused of treachery over the Christians' defeat at Gaza in 1239, both were included in the legend of the enchanted gold. It was therefore conceivable that the Hospital also had renegade brothers. However, this image never developed to the same extent as that of the Temple: perhaps because, after 1250, the military orders ceased to be regarded as suitable subjects for legends.

The fairytale aspect of some of these legends has already been mentioned. In a similar vein, Ralph of Coggeshall, who was fond of unlikely tales of the supernatural, told a story of some mysterious visitors to his monastery, who were mistaken for Templars and welcomed enthusiastically, but then vanished without trace.³¹ 'Supernatural,' however, did not mean 'spiritual'. The orders were not generally associated with spiritual matters, except indirectly in tales of miracles of the Blessed Virgin Mary, where the grateful knight joins a military order: in one tale of this type, Walter Map's tale of

³⁰'Chronicon Lemovicense,' pp.773-4; 'Chronicon Rothmagensis' p.340; 'Cronica S. Petri Erford.' p.403; Primat, RHGF 23 p.83; 'Eracles,' pp.454-5; c.f. Abou 'L-Feda, p.151.

³¹Ralph of Coggeshall, pp.134-5.

Aimery, the knight joined the order of the Temple; in another, told by Stephen de Bourbon about 1260, he joined the order of the Hospital.³²

None of these tales go so far in their fairytale depiction of the military orders as the Breton legends recorded by the Abbé Guillotin de Corson in his study of the Templars and Hospitallers in Brittany.³³ Nevertheless, the seeds of the legends of the imaginative peasantry are present in the legends told by the supposedly well-educated and rational chroniclers. Like the chroniclers' legends, the peasants' tales developed traditional stories, but went to greater extremes in their portrayal of the Templars. On the one hand, they were *les chevaliers sans peur et sans reproche*, who were more than they seemed; on the other, malignant otherworldly spirits carrying off young ladies. It is impossible to state when these legends were first told of the Templars. If Roger of Howden was prepared to accept that Saladin offered to make the renegade Robert of St. Albans seneschal of his whole kingdom, and Bernard the Treasurer believed that a renegade Templar was appointed regent of the sultanate of Damascus, then it is feasible that Breton peasants told their legends of the order of the Temple even during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. However, there is no direct evidence of this.

What did they tell of the Hospital? Before the fifth crusade, it seems, nothing; and even after it, not a great

³²Walter Map, pp.58-60; for Mary's involvement in this miracle, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts, British Museum*, ed. H. L. D. Ward, 2 vols. (London, 1883-93) 2 p.662; *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues tirés du recueil inédit d'Étienne de Bourbon, Dominicain du XIIIe siècle*, ed. A. Lecoy de la Marche, SHF (Paris, 1877) pp.105-6, no.123.

³³L'abbé A. Guillotin. de Corson, 'Traditions populaires concernant le Temple et l'Hopital en Bretagne,' *Bulletin archeologique de l'association Breton*, 19 (1901) 244-9.

deal. The order of the Hospital was criticized alongside the order of the Temple for its privileges, and it was equally as oriental as the order of the Temple, but these two factors alone were not enough to inspire legends in the chronicles. The deciding factor appears to have been its militarization: only as it became perceived in the West as a full military order did legends begin to be told of it. Yet, it still escaped the excitement and scandal of tales such as those of Brother Robert of St. Albans or Brother Ferrand. It seems that either its brothers did not involve themselves in matters which made good stories, or that chroniclers could not conceive of it. The order remained partly hospitaller; charitable, respectable and a poor subject for scandalous stories.

Only one story was told glorifying its hospitaller function, concerning, like so many other stories, Saladin. According to the so-called 'Minstrel of Rheims,' writing in 1260, Saladin stayed at the Hospital in Acre in disguise, in order to discover for himself whether the tales of the Hospital's great charity to sick pilgrims were true. Pressed to eat something, he asked for the right front hoof of Morel, the master's priceless warhorse. When he had recovered from his amazement at such a request, the master consented to the sacrifice of his horse for the sake of a man's life and the reputation of the house; but, just as the hoof was about to be cut off, Saladin cried out that he had changed his mind, and asked for mutton instead. The story went on to describe the large donation which Saladin made to the order after his return to his own country, and that he and his mother were buried at Acre. A great lamp, it concluded, hung over the tombs, which was paid for by the Hospitallers, in thanks for the great gifts that Saladin and his mother gave them.³⁴

Another story also associated the order with a sultan of Egypt, at the time of Louis IX's first crusade. Following

³⁴*Récits d'un ménestrel de Reims au treizième siècle*, ed. N. de Wailly, SHF (Paris, 1876) pp. xxxiv, 104-9, 112, paras. 198-208, 213.

Louis` release from captivity, a number of Christian captives were also released, among them the master of the Hospital, William de Châteauneuf. The annals of Winchester state that the master knighted the sultan of Egypt; the annals of Osney, more cautiously, state only that the sultan was knighted at this time. It is likely, however, that the Winchester annals report popular belief; a similar legend existed concerning Saladin and Humfrey of Toron, lord of Crac of Montreal.³⁵

Chroniclers told no legends of the other military orders: the Teutonic order, the orders of St. Lazarus or of St. Thomas. None of these orders were much in the public eye, or caught public notice to the same degree as the Temple or Hospital. To be the subject of legends and anecdotes, an order had to capture the imagination of writers and to develop or have developed around its brothers a distinct image which allowed them to be inserted into familiar stories: as the greedy dupes in the tale of the enchanted gold, as the bold adventurer in the tale of Robert of St. Albans. However, while chroniclers preferred a tarnished image which allowed them to scandalize their readers and to moralize on declining standards in society, the writers of epic and romance retained the military orders` original image as virtuous knights of Christ almost undamaged throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

(b)The military orders in epic and romance.

Literary convention assigned to the military orders a number of roles, which developed and multiplied with time. Firstly, they appear as monks, fulfilling the traditional roles of monks: providing a place of penance for wrongdoers, a place of retirement from the world, either at the end of one`s life, as a thankoffering to God, or for a man grieving at a personal loss; and performing various charitable duties, guiding pilgrims, giving lodging and giving burial to the dead. Secondly, they appear as knights of Christ, usually fighting at

³⁵Winchester annals, *Annales Monastici*, 2 p.92; Osney annals, *ibid.*, 4 pp.99-100. *Ernoul*, p.36; *Itinerarium* p.9.

the hero's side against the enemies of the faith, but in *Parzival* preventing the hero from approaching the holy place, the Grál castle. As a corollary to their role as knights they appear as counsellors of kings and of the hero. However, while their spiritual virtues are always taken for granted as prerequisite for these roles, they are never stressed to the extent of making the military orders the spiritual guides of the Christian knight. The assistance which they give the hero is secular and physical rather than spiritual.³⁶

The earliest reference to the military orders in an epic or romance appears in *Raoul de Cambrai*, written between 1175 and 1200. This was a popular tale, to judge from the number of references to it in other twelfth and thirteenth century texts. The story is set in the tenth century A.D., and describes the career of Bernier, squire of Raoul de Cambrai. After Raoul has burned down the convent where Bernier's mother was a nun, killing all the inmates, Bernier pursues and kills Raoul. Threatened with death by Raoul's uncle, Bernier offers to sail to Acre and serve with the Templars there in penance. The offer, however, is not accepted.³⁷

A similar role for the order appears in *Orson de Beauvais*, written between 1180 and 1185, or early in the thirteenth century. This work was not well known, although it probably remained popular at Beauvais beyond the thirteenth century; a fifteenth-century prose romance refers to it. It was also known in Lorraine, where the only surviving manuscript was copied at the end of the thirteenth century. It is set in the eighth century, in the reign of Charles Martel. Here the Templars appear in a false account given by Hugh, count of

³⁶Some of the references which follow are given by E.

Langlois, *Table des noms propres de toute nature compris dans les chansons de geste* (Paris, 1904); Moisan, vols. 1-2.

³⁷*Raoul de Cambrai, Chanson de Geste*, ed. P. Meyer and A. Longnon, SATF (Paris, 1882) pp. xxxiii-lv; lines 3427-8; Moisan, 1 p.58.

Berri, of the fate of his companion, Orson, whom Hugh has in fact sold to the Muslims. Hugh claims that Orson, on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, confessed to him that he had planned to assassinate King Charles, and then entered an abbey of the Holy Sepulchre; he later alters this account, saying that Orson entered the order of the Temple. The bishop of Beauvais in the 1180's was an enthusiastic crusader, which may account for the poet's interest in the real Jerusalem and the order of the Temple during a period when few works of fiction mentioned either.³⁸ Patronage by crusaders may explain references to the military orders in other works, such as the poems of Jean Renart, but for the most part such simple explanations cannot be given, as the patron is unknown.

The order appears in the same role again in the immensely popular works *La chevalerie d'Ogier de Danemarche* and *Renaut de Montauban*. Both works are set in the ninth century, in the reign of Charlemagne. *Ogier* was written around the end of the twelfth century; *Renaut* dates from the twelfth century. However, in the case of *Renaut*, it is unclear when the order of the Temple was introduced into this role; in the oldest surviving manuscript, written in the mid thirteenth century, it is the Holy Sepulchre, not the Temple, which is cited as a place of penance. It appears that the order of the Temple was introduced in place of the Holy Sepulchre by a redactor who knew that it was right and proper for a literary hero accused of murder to offer to go overseas and serve at the Temple, as occurred in *Raoul* and *Ogier*. In *Ogier*, in fact, both the Hospital and Temple are mentioned at this point, the first

³⁸*Orson de Beauvais, chanson de geste du XIIe siècle*, ed. G. Paris, SATF (Paris, 1899) lines 3319-3321, pp.lxii-lxviii, lxxviii-lxxx; Moisan, p.56; *Itinerarium*, pp.67, 122.

mention of the order of the Hospital in epic literature.³⁹

The same theme reappeared in *La Fille du Comte de Ponthieu*, a popular legend which linked the descent of Saladin with the counts of Ponthieu. The count of Ponthieu is depicted making a pilgrimage to the Holy Land and serving for a year with the Templars in penance for a murder, in this case the murder of his own daughter.⁴⁰ As the daughter eventually turns out to be the great-grandmother of Saladin, these events are presumably supposed to have taken place in the late eleventh century. The date that this tale was composed is unclear, but it was probably written nearer 1250 than 1200, as it is in prose rather than verse.

However, in Jean Renart's *Roman de la Rose* or *Guillaume de Dole* (written c.1228) the theme is slightly altered. Here it is not a hero who is to go overseas to the Temple, but the villain, the emperor's seneschal who sought to block the path of true love.⁴¹ This break from literary convention may be partly explained by the fact that Jean Renart was not writing for the 'popular market,' but for the entertainment of an

³⁹*La chevalerie Ogier*, line 10427, and pp.34-5: 5 manuscripts survive; *Renaut de Montauban, oder die Haimonskinder, Altfranzösisches Gedicht*, ed. H. Michelant, BLVS 67 (Stuttgart, 1862) p.337 line 10; cf. *Renaut de Montauban, édition critique du manuscrit Douce*, ed. J. Thomas, TLF 371 (Geneva, 1989) line 11000, etc., and p.9; Moisan, p.58. *Renaut* survives in 13 manuscripts.

⁴⁰*La Fille du Comte de Ponthieu: nouvelle du XIIIe siècle*, ed. C. Brunel, CFMA 52 (Paris, 1926) p.22, lines 305-310; Barber, 'Social Context,' 41.

⁴¹Jean Renart, *Le Roman de la Rose ou Guillaume de Dole*, ed. F. Lecoy, CFMA 91 (Paris, 1962) line 5589; *L'Escoufle, Roman d'aventure*, ed. F. Sweetser, TLF 211 (Geneva, 1974) pp.vii-viii, xiii.

upper-class audience of refined tastes and discernment. Only one manuscript survives, and there is no other evidence to indicate that the work was well known outside the court of the bishop of Beauvais, for whom it was written. The tale is recounted at a genteel pace, interspersed with romantic songs; it is realistic and full of the careful detail lacking in most romances; it is charming and courtly, or, as the average knight would have considered, boring and tedious. Nevertheless, the evidence of the text indicates that the author frequented or knew of the courts of the great lords of France, and it is possible that those who moved in such sophisticated circles would have appreciated Jean Renart's talent. In this case, it is interesting that the literary image of the order of the Temple as a suitable place of penance was still accepted in 1228 by high and low nobility alike.

Three works written by Jean Renart survive, of which two, *L'Escoufle* and *Roman de la rose*, mention the Templars. *L'Escoufle* was written between 1200 and 1202, and dedicated to Baldwin, count of Flanders and Hainaut, who had recently taken the cross. Like Jean Renart's later work, it survives in only one manuscript, and was not, apparently, known outside the court of the poet's patron, so that the importance of its depiction of the military orders lies more in the extent to which it followed the literary image depicted in other, better known works, than in the extent to which it influenced that image. In the *Roman de la rose*, Jean reworked one familiar image of the order of the Temple; in *L'Escoufle*, he also depicted the order as a place of retirement from the world, and the brothers as knights of Christ, both images reflecting the order's actual role in the world.

In *L'Escoufle*, the knight who is to retire into the order of the Temple is the hero's father, lying on his deathbed. The doctors in fact suggest that the dying knight should take this step: 'for it would be a great shame if such a doughty man should die in his bed like a beast.'⁴² In contrast, in the

⁴²*L'Escoufle*, lines 2390-2395, pp.vii, xii.

biography of William Marshal, earl of Pembroke, written in the 1220's, the hero had given his body to the order many years before. The biography is based on the testimonies of those who knew the Marshal, but adapted according to the conventions of romance; it was popular enough among the English nobility for the earl of Warwick to possess a copy in the early fourteenth century.⁴³ In the third French version of *Bueve de Hantone* (written after 1220), the hero's father-in-law enters the order of the Temple, specifically to do penance for his sins: he states that during his life he has destroyed many cities, burned many towns and destroyed many towers, making many orphans and widows. William Marshal had similar but less serious sins on his conscience.⁴⁴ *Bueve of Hantone* was a popular hero, but this particular version of his adventures survives in only three manuscripts and three fragments.

Knights were also depicted entering the Temple as a place of retirement in various parts of the Crusade Cycle, but for various motives. At the end of some manuscripts of the *Chanson de Jérusalem*, it is announced that Harpin de Bourges is to retire into the newly-formed order of the Temple 'pour servir': no other motive is given.⁴⁵ In the third part of *Les Chétifs*, the Christian Baldwin and Muslim Corbaran undertake to serve at the Temple for a year as a thankoffering if they are preserved from their present peril: the implication is that these are two

⁴³L' *Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, lines 18351-18378, 18233-18242; M. Blaess, 'L'abbaye de Bordesley et les livres de Guy de Beauchamp,' *Romania*, 78 (1957) 514.

⁴⁴*Der festländische Bueve de Hantone, Fassung III*, ed. A. Stimming, 2 vols., GRL 34, 42 (Dresden, 1914-1920) 1 lines 16279-82, 16297-9, 2 pp.1-11; Moison, p.36. *Guillaume le Maréchal*, lines 18481-18496.

⁴⁵*The Old French Crusade Cycle, vol. VII: the Jérusalem continuations, Part 1: La chretienté Corbaran*, ed. P. W. Grillo (Alabama, 1984) pp.xvi-xvii.

of the first knights of the Temple.⁴⁶ In the *Jérusalem continuations* of the late thirteenth/early fourteenth centuries, Harpin de Bourges is shown as having entered the order of the Temple, not simply in retirement but following the death of his wife.⁴⁷ This last had by this time become a familiar theme: entrance into a military order as a result of personal loss.

This theme first appeared in fiction in the work of the poet Gontier de Soignies, writing in the early thirteenth century, before 1227/8. Lamenting his failure in love, he declares that, in order to escape the pains of love and to avoid hearing about love, he will leave the world, go overseas for God's sake and join the order of the Temple.⁴⁸ A similar story had, however, already appeared in works of history: in the abridged chronicle of Ernoul, and in the Genoese *Regni Iherosolymitani Brevis Historia*, written at the beginning of the thirteenth century. According to these sources, Gerard de Rideford, master of the Temple, had originally joined the order as a direct result of his failure to win the hand of the heiress of Botron. However, in a version of Ernoul's chronicle nearer to his original, it is stated that Gerard joined as a

⁴⁶*The Old French Crusade Cycle, vol.V: Les Chétifs*, ed. G. M. Myers (Alabama, 1981) lines 2147-2148, 3058; this is thought to have been written around 1180: S. Duparc Quioc, *La Chanson d'Antioche: Étude critique* (Paris, 1978) pp.132-9; cf. G. M. Myers, *Les Chétifs - Étude sur le Développement de la chanson*, *Romania*, 105 (1984) 65-75, where it is shown that the third part was a later interpolation written to extol the knights of Beauvais. Ten MSS. survive.

⁴⁷*The Old French Crusade Cycle vol.VII*, p.xx, and note 24, pp.xx-xxi.

⁴⁸*Gontier de Soignies: il canzoniere*, ed. L. Formisano, (Milan and Naples, 1980) no.XVIII *lan quant voi esclarcir*, p.130, lines 63-4, and p.lx.

result of illness: presumably retirement when in fear of death, as in the examples quoted above.⁴⁹

The theme reappeared in the immensely popular *Chastelaine de Vergi* (written in the thirteenth century, before 1288), where the story ends with all the major characters bar one dead of grief or violence; the lone survivor, the duke, enters the order of the Temple. However, in two of the ten manuscripts used by the editors of this text, he enters the order of the Hospital.⁵⁰ This is the only occasion in which the Hospital appears in this romantic role. The familiarity of the theme is underlined by its appearance in the romance *Sone of Nausay* (written during the second half of the thirteenth century). Here the noble young lady Ydain is informed by her nurse Sabine that because she has refused Sone's love, he will go overseas and give himself to the Temple, as if this was an act expected from disappointed young lovers, tantamount to killing himself.⁵¹

Reminiscent of this role is the remark in the second and third French versions of *Bueve de Hantone* by the countess of Hantone to her lover, Doon of Mayence, murderer of her husband, that she will send her son Bueve overseas to serve at the

⁴⁹*Ernoul*, p.114; 'Regni Iherosolymitani Brevis Historia,' in *Annali Genovesi*, 1 pp.137-8; MGHS 18 p.3; *Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr (1184-97)*, p.46 para.33.

⁵⁰*La Chastelaine de Vergi, poème du XIII siècle*, ed. G. Raynaud, 2nd edn. revue par L. Foulet, CFMA 1 (Paris, 1912) p.iii and lines 941-3. One of these two 'odd' manuscripts dates from the thirteenth century, the other from the fourteenth (pp.iv-v, 35).

⁵¹*Sone von Nausay*, ed. M. Goldschmidt, BLVS 216 (Tübingen, 1899) lines 8705-6. The poem probably dates from after 1264, as it assumes that a lady rules Beirut: pp.552-4. Trotter does not date the text: *Medieval French Literature*, pp.159-163.

Temple in order to prevent his taking vengeance on Doon.⁵² These references, and that in Jean Renart's *Roman de la rose* to the Temple as a place of punishment for a man who opposed the way of true love, indicate a close connection in the minds of readers and listeners of epic and romance literature between the order of the Temple and love, courtly or otherwise. This connection is most marked in *Sone*, where the Templar master of Ireland, Margon, appears as a lovers' go-between, arranging a meeting between his queen and the fugitive Sone, and later bringing the queen's child to Sone in Norway, where he acts as its godfather.⁵³

The military orders also appeared in other monastic roles, fulfilling their charitable and hospitable functions. The charitable function first appeared in literature after the fifth crusade, around 1225, in the French versions of the romance of *Bueve de Hantone*. In the second French version, a Templar guides a pilgrim to the land of 'Hermine' to find King Bueve; in the third French version, Templars greet the fugitive Bueve and direct him to Jerusalem, where he offers in the Temple of Solomon his warhorse and armour, in return for a pilgrim's garb. The patriarch gives him a meal, a mule and a hundred shillings, while the Templars give him twenty pounds.⁵⁴ Again, in *La Fille du Comte de Ponthieu*, the Templars of Brindisi lend money to the destitute count and his entourage,⁵⁵

⁵²*Der festländische Bueve de Hantone, Fassung II*, ed. A. Stimming, 2 vols., GRL 30, 41 (Dresden, 1912-1918) lines 536-6 (dated to 1225 by Moisan, p.36); *Fassung III*, 1 line 470, note; this only appears in one manuscript of the three manuscripts and two fragments surviving.

⁵³*Sone von Nausay*, lines 6437-6840, 17525-17662.

⁵⁴*Bueve de Hantone, Fassung II*, 1 line 17578; *Fassung III*, 1 lines 3180-3197, 3240-5, 3249.

⁵⁵*Fille du Comte de Ponthieu*, pp.39-40, lines 570-3.

while in *Sone* the Templars of Ireland take in the fugitive Sone, his Norwegian sweetheart Odee, and his horse Morel, then assure their guests' safe escape from the country without the knowledge of the amorous queen.⁵⁶

Closely connected to the role of hospitality was the role of burying the dead. Again, this role was first assigned to the order in fiction after the fifth crusade, around 1225, in the third French version of *Bueve de Hantone*.⁵⁷ Here it is the hero's uncle, killed in battle by the Muslims, whom brothers of the order bury. Subsequent instances, however, were linked with love. In the fictional *vida* of the troubadour Jaufré Rudel, written just before the middle of the thirteenth century, the hero takes the cross and crosses the sea in order to set eyes on the countess of Tripoli, whom he has loved without ever seeing her. Becoming ill on the voyage, he has one glimpse of her beauty before expiring in her arms. Heartbroken, she has him buried in the Temple of Tripoli and becomes a nun.⁵⁸ Here the order becomes the eternal resting-place for a lover, rather than a place of escape for his lifetime.

The most notable appearance of the order in this role, however, and its only appearance in Arthurian romance outside the work of Wolfram von Eschenbach, was in *Clariss et Laris*, which may be dated from the evidence of its introduction to the period 1261-1268, probably before 1263, as it refers to the Tatars as a threat to the Holy Land, but not the sultan of Egypt.⁵⁹ This text survives in only one manuscript, and may not have been intended for a wide audience; its humour suggests

⁵⁶*Sone von Nausay*, lines 5995-6916.

⁵⁷*Bueve de Hantone*, *Fassung III*, line 15828.

⁵⁸*Les chansons de Jaufré Rudel*, ed. A. Jeanroy, CFMA 15 (Paris, 1924) pp. vii, 21.

⁵⁹*Clariss et Laris*, lines 40-9.

that the author was writing only for his immediate circle of friends. His concern for the Holy Land, his sense of humour and his realism may all have been factors prompting him to place the Templars in the role of hosts and undertakers for wandering knights, a role usually assigned in Arthurian romance to hermits.

The Templars appear in connection with the adventures of the *Lai Hardi*, the brave, black knight, who has undertaken to avenge a young lady whose lover has been murdered. The Templars bury the dead man and lodge the *Lai Hardi* and the lady. After her lover has been avenged, the lady returns to the grave and falls dead upon it. 'The Templars laid her in the grave alongside her lover and then wrote letters which explained her death; they were of fine enamelled gold.'⁶⁰

Again the Templars' appearance is linked to love and the tragedy of love; perhaps this is why the writer considered them more suitable than hermits, who were only interested in love for God. Significantly, burial of dead knights is the only aspect of the hermit's role which the knight-brothers are assigned. The hermit also appeared in Arthurian romance as the spiritual adviser of the wandering knight, a role which, it might have been expected, would be more naturally assigned to the Templars, but in which they never appear. Even in *Parzival*, where the *templeise* appear as chaste guardians of the Grál, they do not act as spiritual guides to knights seeking spiritual fulfilment; they act only on a secular level. Indeed, most of their appearances are in realistic romances such as Jean Renart's *L'Escoufle* and *Roman de la rose*, *Sone de Nausay*, and the more realistic epics, especially those based on historical fact such as *Gille de Chyn* and the Crusade Cycle; they are not at home in the spiritual fantasy world of Arthurian romance, *Maugis d'Aigremont* or *La Bataille*

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, lines 9863-9871, 9907-9922.

Loquifer.⁶¹ They are presented as a religious order of the highest standards; but knights do not look to them for guidance as to what a knight should be. Rather, they accompany the hero and give him physical assistance, either charitable or military.

The Templars first appear in a military role alongside Richard of Montivilliers in *L'Escoufle* (1200-1202).⁶² They reappear, this time with the Hospitallers, in Gautier de Tournai's *Gille de Chyn*, written in the 1230s. This work, surviving in only one manuscript, was apparently commissioned by the monks of St. Ghislain to publicize the career of their noble patron, whose body lay buried in the abbey church. It is not known when Gilles de Chyn was in the Holy Land, but it was certainly before the militarization of the Hospital.⁶³

One of the Templars' most striking appearances in this role was in the Anglo-Norman poem *Du bon William Longespee*, written probably at his family's request to commemorate his death at the battle of Mansourah in 1250. The master of the Temple is depicted as fighting with great skill and courage, wreaking much damage on the Muslims before he himself is slain and his soul carried at once to God. The soul of a Templar who is slain assisting him is said to have been carried off by St. Michael: 'singing, to paradise, where he will be in glory with Almighty Jesus,' while another Templar, Brother Richard or Wymound of Ascalon, an English brother, is one of five companions who fight to the death at William's side. The poet

⁶¹E.g., Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Parzival*, 2, Book 9: 443.6-445.30, esp. 444.23, 468.23-30; Gautier de Tournay, *L'Histoire de Gille de Chyn*, ed. E. B. Place (Chicago, 1941) lines 2355-7, 2365ff., 2372ff., 2478ff., 2506-7, 2613-5; *Maugis d'Aigremont, chanson de geste*, ed. P. Vernay, Romanica Helvetica 93 (Berne, 1980).

⁶²*L'Escoufle*, lines 1060-1065.

⁶³*Gille de Chyn*, pp.5-6, 10-11.

has high praise for him: 'li noble guerrer, 'mult vaillant, 'hardi fust e vaillant, 'li hardi combataunt; he encourages William in the name of God and His Mother, and swears never to desert him while he is alive; only after William's death does he finally fall, over his companion's body.⁶⁴ This poem enjoyed some success among the English nobility, as the earl of Warwick possessed a copy in the early fourteenth century.⁶⁵

The Hospital makes no appearance at all in this poem, but both orders appear in *Esclarmonde*, written between 1250 and 1300. They are depicted as fighting valiantly, but, when the Muslims have been put to flight, the Templars pursue the hero, Hugh, who is chasing the fugitives, and forbid him to follow them any further. Although no criticism is expressed, the situation is reminiscent of events during the crusade of 1239, when the orders were criticised by some French crusaders for hindering them from winning prestige in deeds of prowess against the Muslims.⁶⁶ *Esclarmonde*, then, shows a clear departure from literary tradition and a recognition of contemporary reality. However, this is the only French epic or romantic work of the period to 1300 in which this aspect of the orders' image appears.

Three German works also depicted the military orders in a military role: one of these, however, may belong to the fifteenth century. The earliest of the three was Ulrich von Etzenbach's *Wilhelm von Wenden*, based on the legend of St. William of Parrit: the hero, a Muslim prince, wishes to become a Christian and sets off for Jerusalem to seek baptism,

⁶⁴'Du bon William Longespee,' pp.339-353.

⁶⁵M. Blaess, 'L'Abbaye de Bordesley,' 513.

⁶⁶*Esclarmonde, Clarisse et Florent, Yde et Olive, drei Fortsetzungen der chanson von Hugh de Bordeaux*, ed. M. Schweigel (Marburg, 1889) lines 1942-2035, esp. 1944, 2010, 2013-4, 2020-1 (survives in only one manuscript); Moisan, p.45; 'Rothelin,' pp.539-40.

accompanied by his wife, but loses both her and her newborn children *en route*. In Jerusalem he receives baptism from the patriarch and joins the Christian army riding out to fight the Muslims, with the Teutonic brothers, the Hospitallers and the Templars; Wilhelm is described alongside these last, wishing to be their comrade in their prize of salvation. This is the only occasion in epic or romance where the Templars are held up as Christian knights whose example is to be emulated. However, they are presented as a model to the converted Muslim, representing all Christendom, rather than an example to the Christian knight who is seeking to advance in the spiritual life.

Ulrich was for a long period court poet of King Wenceslas II of Bohemia; he wrote this poem between 1287 and 1297. Although it survives in only two manuscripts, his prominent post would have enabled his work to reach a considerable audience within the court alone. In view of the fact that the Hospitallers and Teutonic brothers were more esteemed in Bohemia than the Templars, it is surprising that the Templars are singled out as the epitome of Christian knighthood for Wilhelm's emulation; the discrepancy demonstrates that literary convention could be more important than a patron's personal preference.⁶⁷

The long version of *Wolfdietrich*, written between 1280 and 1300, gives more prominence to the Teutonic order than any other epic or romance written before 1300. Arriving at Acre, the hero is met by the master of the Teutonic house, who greets him warmly. On being informed by the master that the house has been suffering great damage from the Muslims, *Wolfdietrich* declares that he will ride out and destroy the Muslim's army

⁶⁷Ulrich von Etzenbach, *Wilhelm von Wenden*, ed. H.-F. Rosenfeld, *Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters* 49 (Berlin, 1957) lines 3784-3793, 3841-3848; F. W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert, *Kreuzzugsdichtung des Mittelalters. Studien zu ihrer Geschichtlichen und Dichterischen Wirklichkeit* (Berlin, 1960) pp.280-3, 393.

with the assistance of forty of the brothers; this he does. At the end of his life, in retirement in the monastery of St. George at Tischâl, he again rides out to drive back a Muslim army, this time assisted by `five hundred lords of the Temple,` apparently a joking reference to his own monks.⁶⁸ *Wolfdietrich* was a popular tale, surviving in four different versions. This was the last to be composed; although it survives in ten manuscripts, these all date from the fifteenth century. It is therefore impossible to know how popular it was in the thirteenth century. Nevertheless, it is significant in indicating that, even when the existence and importance of the Teutonic order became recognized in German literary tradition, the Templars retained a niche as outstanding knights of Christ. It is possible that this was due to the work of Wolfram von Eschenbach as much as to the actual reputation of the order in Germany.

The date of the last of these German works is disputed. *Orendal* has been variously dated to before 1170, after 1196, and `the late middle ages;` only one manuscript of the verse romance survives, dated to 1477, but two printed versions also survive, one in prose. The simplistic style, language and storyline suggest the earlier date, but this is incompatible with the appearance of the Templars, who are hardly likely to have appeared in German romances before they began to appear in French epics. Wentzlaff-Eggebert dated it to after 1196. He was of the opinion that it began as a genuine crusader romance, but was rewritten in the late middle ages into its present

⁶⁸*Ortnit und die Wolfdietriche nach Müllenhofs vorarbeiten*, ed. A. Amelung and O. Jänicke, 2 vols., Deutsches Heldenbuch 3,4 (reprinted Dublin and Zurich, 1968) 3 pp.iii-iv, 4 pp.xv, 56-62, V lines 106-140, p.227, X line 65.2, p.229, X line 79.1.

disjointed form, as a tale of a hero winning his bride.⁶⁹ The Templars appear as the loyal servants of Bride, queen of Jerusalem; they are noble men but lack spiritual awareness, ignoring the hero on his first arrival at the Sepulchre, and refusing to ride out with him against the Muslims on the grounds that they will not follow a captain who is not wearing armour. However, they ride out to assist their queen the moment that they see that she has ridden into battle, and accept Orendal as their king as soon as they realize the truth of the situation, setting him honourably on the throne. Again they appear in connection with a love affair, and again their role is secular rather than spiritual, but more so than in previous works. It is impossible to say whether the Templars appeared in the earlier version of the poem in the same dubious role that they play in the fifteenth-century version; however, as all other pre-trial German romances are favourable towards the order, it is probable that they did not.⁷⁰

Side by side with a role as knights of Christ, the military orders perform an advisory role. This is usually in the Holy Land, but, in *Sone*, the Templar Margon acts as chief minister to Sone and is left in a position of authority when

⁶⁹Orendal, ed. H. Steinger, *Altdeutsches Textbibliothek* 36 (Halle, 1935) pp.iii-vi, and lines 836-43, 866-70, 884-91, 1201-4, 1340-1, 1676-1685, 1949-2016, 2161-2186; *Geschichte der Deutschen Literatur 1: Der Deutsche Literatur von Karl dem Grossen bis zum Beginn der Höfischen Dichtung, 770-1170*, ed. H. de Boor (Munich, 1949) pp.256-7; Wentzlaff-Eggebert, pp.379-380.

⁷⁰Ottokar's *Reimchronik*, which criticizes all the military orders, dates from after the trial of the Temple: M. Fischer, 'Criticism of Church and Crusade in Ottokar's Osterreichische Reimchronik,' *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 22 (1986) 157, 162; and cf. *Die Kreuzfahrt des Landgrafen Ludwigs*, written 1306, (*ibid.*, 162), which praises the order.

Sone is summoned to Rome to become emperor. Margon had previously been the trusted adviser of the queen of Ireland. His prominent role in Norway implies, interestingly, that he has some responsibility for the Grail castle, but this is not stated in the surviving text.⁷¹ The Hospital and Temple also appear in positions of responsibility in the Holy Land, acting to choose a new king.⁷² They perform a similar role in the first and third French versions of *Bueve de Hantone*.⁷³ Similarly, in *L'Escoufle*, the Templars appear with the patriarch and barons as part of the king's council.⁷⁴ Again, this role is realistic, but only in *Sone* does the orders' role approach the importance it held in reality.

Mention has been made of Margon the Templar apparently holding responsibility for the protection of the Grail castle in the romance of *Sone of Nausay*. It is unclear whether the author of this romance intended any significance in this, but, if he did, he must have been familiar with what has become the Templars' most famous appearance in romance, as guardians of the Grail

⁷¹*Sone von Nausay*, lines 17607-618, 17659-60. The abbot of the Grail castle is entrusted with the care of Sone's heir, but Margon, Sone's chief adviser, is left behind in Norway and is last seen recording the sorrow of the people at Sone's departure: lines 18005-6. A folio is lost from the manuscript after this point.

⁷²*Ibid.*, lines 20527-20530, 20580-2, 20601-4.

⁷³*Der festländische Bueve de Hantone, Fassung I*, ed. A. Stimming, GRL 25 (Dresden, 1911) lines 10554-7 (one manuscript survives: p.xi); dated to 1220-1225 by Moison, p.36; *Fassung III*, lines 15552-3.

⁷⁴*L'Escoufle*, lines 798-801.

castle in Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival*.⁷⁵

Wolfram wrote for Hermann, landgraf of Thuringia, in the early thirteenth century, before 1210. His 'Grál' was a holy stone, brought by angels from heaven, which supplied all its guardians' wants and needs. So holy an object must not be approached by sinful men, so the Grál Castle required a holy knighthood to guard it. In that the place where the Grál was housed was called by Wolfram 'the temple',⁷⁶ it is reasonable that the guardians of the holy stone should be called Templars. These men serve under a commander, patrol the area around the Grál Castle to drive away intruders, and remain chaste. From time to time, however, they may be sent away from the Grál Castle to rule other lands, and in this case they may marry. They serve in penance for their sins, but there is no evidence that Wolfram envisaged them as living under a monastic rule; and their badge is a turtle dove, the symbol of chastity, not a cross. Although they are guardians of sanctity and are allowed to gaze upon holy things barred from ordinary sinners, they do not act as spiritual advisers or guides to those seeking sanctity; as usual in romances, this role is taken by a hermit. The Templars also appear in the so-called *Titurel* fragments, which recount events before those in *Parzival*: here their role is the same as in *Parzival*.⁷⁷

It is probable that Wolfram's choice of Templars to guard his castle was influenced by the great interest which he and

⁷⁵Eighty-six manuscripts survive, forty-four of which date from the thirteenth century: B. Schirok, *Parzivalrezeption im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt 1982) p.57.

⁷⁶*Parzival*, Book 16, 816.15.

⁷⁷*Parzival*, 2 Book 9: 443.6-445.30, 468.23-30, Book 16: 792.20-24, 793.21-28, 797.13-15, 802.11-20, 804.4-7, 805.22-23, 816.5-6, 16-17, 821.18-21; *Wolframs von Eschenbach Parzival und Titurel*, ed. E. Martin 1 (Halle, 1920) p.298, line 11.

his patron had in the mysterious East, and Wolfram's own sympathetic interest in the Muslims.⁷⁸ His poem certainly cannot be taken as implying that he, a poor German knight, possessed any secret knowledge about the order of the Temple, which at that time still held very little property in Germany, and most of whose members were French; Wolfram's French was not fluent. Although Wolfram claims a Provençal source, 'Kyot,' there is no reason to suppose that this is more than literary convention, any more than his contemporary Manessier really found the Latin text of his Graal story at Salisbury.⁷⁹ However, his work does appear to have had an influence on the literary image of the order of the Temple in German romances, as other German authors who cited his work referred to the Templars as guardians of the Grál. For instance, at the end of the thirteenth century, the author of *Reinfrid von Braunschweig* remarked *à propos* of a turtle dove offered as a prize at a tournament: 'I think that this had come from the Grál, where, on many occasions, in battles and expeditions, the Templars were seen bearing the chaste turtle dove,' and goes on to add that only the chaste could serve at the Grál.⁸⁰ As Wolfram's work enjoyed great popularity among German speakers, it is possible that it was instrumental in encouraging patronage towards the order of the Temple in the thirteenth century; but this can only be speculation. It may, however, be said that

⁷⁸Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Parzival*, trans. A. T. Hatto (Harmondsworth, 1980) pp.421-3, 424, 428, 438.

⁷⁹Hatto, pp.427-8; *The continuations of the Old French 'Perceval' 5: The Third Continuation by Manessier*, lines 42658-42668.

⁸⁰*Reinfrid von Braunschweig*, ed. K. Bartsch, BLVS 109 (Tübingen, 1871) lines 782-791; see also *Der Marnier*, ed. P. Strauch (Strasbourg, 1876, reprinted Berlin, 1962) p.127 XV 16: 'Ich sunge ouch wol wie Titurel/ templeise bi dem Grále züge;' cf. Schiroke, p.65ff.

Wolfram's selection of the name 'Templar' for the guardians of his Grail implies that his image of the actual order was of a holy, dedicated, chaste order of knights; otherwise he would have gone to greater pains to distinguish his *templeise* from the real order.

Although the Templars do not appear in other Grail romances, there are some connections between the 'perfect knight' who wins the Grail, and the Templars and/or the military orders in general. Scholars have noted the parallel between the red cross on a white field which is borne by Galaad in *La Queste del Saint Graal*, the thirty-three holy men clothed in white with a red cross on the breast who meet Perlesvaus at the castle of the four horns, and the red cross on white which was borne by the Templars. However, this device was also borne by other military orders and confraternities, while the Hospitallers bore the same colours in reverse, a white cross on a red field.⁸¹ Of course, the flag of St. George is also a red cross on a white field. Thus the fact that a knight bears this symbol in a romance need not imply a connection with the Templars, but simply that he is a knight of Christ, the white

⁸¹*Queste*, pp.26-9, especially p.28 line 9; *Perlesvaus: Le Haut Livre du Graal*, ed. W. A. Nitze and J. Atkinson Jenkins, 2 vols. (reprinted New York, 1972) 1 p.388 lines 9588-9590; J. Upton-Ward, 'Attitudes towards the Templars,' pp.39-40; Trotter, p.157; the order in fact bore a black and white shield, with a red cross emblazoned on the white section: F. Tommasi, 'L'ordine dei Templari a Perugia,' *Bolletino della deputazione di Storia Patria per L'Umbria*, 78 (1981) plate 7 fig.11 (following 64); the knights of Christ of Livonia bore a red cross on a white field, with a red sword, while the Prussian order bore a red sword and star on a white field: Kuhn, 'Ritterorden als Grenzhüter,' 12, 27; the Militia of the Blessed Virgin Mary also bore a red cross: Housley, 'Politics and Heresy in Italy,' 206; see also Cart., no.627 (p.426), no.2928.

symbolizing purity, the red martyrdom.⁸²

The *Queste del Saint Graal* does make a specific connection between the order of the Temple and the perfect knight by stating that Solomon knew of the coming of the perfect knight and prepared for it.⁸³ Yet the implication here is, not that the Templars are perfect knights, but that they are lacking: Galaad is the fulfilment and completion of knighthood. The new knighthood of the *Queste* surpasses and replaces the old knighthood of the Templars: the new knighthood is based on a personal relationship between the knight and his God, without need for an order, and the perfect knight does not kill his enemies but spares them to repent.⁸⁴ It was as if the author of the *Queste* saw that the military orders had failed to reform knighthood, and was setting up a new ideal to replace them: although it was an ideal which excluded all but those of the highest birth.⁸⁵

The following points may be drawn from this survey of the military orders in epic and romance.

Firstly, as the authors, patrons and circulation of individual works within this survey are for the most part unknown, it is impossible to state categorically why the military orders appear in some works but not in others, or to gauge the influence of the orders' fictional role on their image in reality. It is not even certain that their literary image could influence their image in the real world.⁸⁶ These

⁸²*Règle*, pp.27-8, para. 17 on white mantles.

⁸³*Queste*, pp.220-226.

⁸⁴*Queste*, p.54, but cf. pp.229-233.

⁸⁵J. Frappier, 'Le Graal et la chevalerie,' *Romania* 75 (1954) 207.

⁸⁶Cf. Trotter, p.249.

problems aside, the military orders' roles in epic and romance were sufficiently standardized for us to define their literary image precisely. This image, unlike that painted in the chroniclers' legends, was unextraordinary, often unexciting, and depicted the military orders in roles which they carried out in reality, although conventualized and romanticized, especially in *Parzival*. The knight-brothers took a supporting role, assisting the hero in his battles, giving him food and shelter, advising him, providing a suitable place of retirement. This role was usually minor: only in *Sone de Nausay* was it crucial. Spiritual guidance, where it was needed, was always in the hands of hermits. Although the military orders were considered fit places for penance or for retirement, they were never held up as an ideal of knighthood at which Christian knights were to aim.

The emphasis in the epics and romances is very much on the Christian knight making his own peace with God, without the intervention of a monastic order. Where a knightly hero joins a monastic order in order to make his peace with God, he meets numerous difficulties, and it is made clear that the knight was more pleasing to God as a knight than as a monk.⁸⁷ The romancers, or, rather, their patrons, preferred the individual way of obedience, particularly the way of the hermit;⁸⁸ failing this, a knight could make his peace with God through living a

⁸⁷E.g. *Moniage Guillaume*, *passim*; *Moniage Rainouart*, *passim*; *Ornit und Wolfdietriche*, p.220ff., X 11 to end.

⁸⁸E.g. *Renaut de Montauban*, line 14095 to end; *Queste*, p.279, lines 14-18; *Mort Artu*, pp.260-263; *Third Continuation*, lines 42551-42637; *Perlesvaus*, 1 p.408, lines 10179-10185; *Escanors*, ed. H. Michelant, BLVS 178 (Tübingen, 1886) lines 24811-25204.

godly life in the world.⁸⁹ Although the military order appears in literature as a suitable place to do penance, and a few knights are depicted entering a military order towards the end of their lives, their subsequent careers in the order are never a matter of interest as are those of Perceval or Escanor in their hermitages. This is, however, hardly surprising. It was only natural that knights, never renowned for their discipline or ability to work together, should prefer to hear of knights winning salvation by an individual path than in an order. Again, it was only natural that they should prefer to exalt knights who sacrificed everything for the love of a woman, the likes of Lancelot, Tristan and Palamedés, rather than knights who sacrificed everything, including their independence and freedom of action, for the far less tangible love of God.

Secondly, the military orders did not begin to appear in literary works until the last quarter of the twelfth century: *Raoul de Cambrai* was not written before 1175. It is possible that one reason for this was that the majority of fictional works were set in some dim and distant past, whereas the military orders were known to be recent foundations. Admittedly, the average knightly audience, like its modern counterpart, had only a vague idea of historical perspective, but nevertheless individuals were unlikely to accept that the orders had existed from time out of mind while they themselves could remember a time before the existence of the military orders. *Raoul de Cambrai* actually lived in the tenth century; *Orson de Beauvais* is set in the eighth; *Ogier de Danemarque* and *Renaus de Montauban* are set in the early ninth century; *Parzival* and *Claris et Laris* are set in the time of Arthur, thought to have lived in the early fifth century A.D.; *Titirel* is set in the previous century, as *Titirel* is stated to have been *Parzival*'s great-grandfather; *Wolfdietrich* is apparently

⁸⁹E.g. *Mort Artu*, p.225; Chrétien, *Guillaume de l'Angleterre, roman du XIIe siècle*, ed. M. Wilmette, CFMA 55 (Paris, 1978) *passim*; also heroes such as Sone de Nausay, Bueve de Hantone.

set in the fourth/early fifth century, as St. George was the hero's godfather.⁹⁰ *Sone de Nausay* is set in the late seventh century;⁹¹ *La Fille du Comte de Ponthieu* imagines the Templars established at Acre, and Acre in Christian hands, in the time of Saladin's great-grandmother. Only the Crusade Cycle, more faithful to its historical basis, announces at the end of the *Chanson de Jérusalem* that the establishment of the Hospital and Temple is still to come.⁹² It is significant that such tales began to appear at the same time as the legends of the orders' ancient histories were becoming established; epic and legend reinforced each other.

Thirdly, and most importantly, of the three major military orders, it is the Templars who predominate in epics and romances, not only those written by Frenchmen but also in German works. Of a total twenty-eight works examined above, only nine mention the Hospital, and two the Teutonic order. This is the same kind of pattern as was found in the examination of chroniclers' legends and anecdotes.

In the case of legends, it could be argued that more tales were told against the Templars because the Templars were more unpopular than other military orders: however, the evidence examined in chapters one to three has shown that this was not

⁹⁰Raoul de Cambrai, p.xviff; Orson de Beauvais, p.lxvii; *Lancelot, Roman de prose du XIIIe siècle*, ed. A. Micha, 9 vols., TLF 247 etc. (Geneva, 1978-1983) 6 p.19 ch.31, pp.5-6 ch.9, states that Arthur was not over fifty years of age in A.D.426; *Ortnit und Wolfdietriche*, 3 pp.193-4 B I 173-6, 4 p.96, VI 182.

⁹¹*Sone von Nausay*, pp.522-3: Sone's grandfather died in A.D.632.

⁹²'La chanson de Jérusalem - a critical edition,' ed. N. Thorpe, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Reading University (1980) lines 9884-8. I am grateful to Dr. Thorpe for permission to read his thesis.

the case. What is more, not all the legends were wholly derogatory: many, such as the tales of renegades, indicated admiration for the order. Likewise, there is no evidence that the order of the Temple appeared more often in epic and romance than other military orders because it was *more* popular. This was clearly not the case in Germany, for example, where the Teutonic order was the most popular of the three major military orders, yet, in German romances, the Temple usually received more attention than the Teutonic order.

It appears that the order of the Temple had captured the imagination of chroniclers and poets alike to a far greater extent than the other military orders. This would be partly because the order of the Temple was the first military order, but also because it was the only international military order which had not developed from being a hospital. Other military orders shared its exotic location, in the Holy Land, and its religious aura, but only the order of the Temple, with its unconventional vocation, could be regarded as untouched by the pious, respectable and colourless hand of conventional monasticism. It seems to have been perceived to consist entirely of knights and their squires, men who were adventurous, exciting, amenable to love, a little scandalous. Such an image made it uniquely suited to play a role in legends, epics and romance. Although the order was known to be religious, this fact remained in the background: the brothers were holy knights, rather than knightly monks. Thus, for example, although the Church was notoriously hostile to lovers, the Templars, as knights, could be expected to be friendly towards them.

If the military aspect of an order was important in encouraging writers to develop legends around it, then we might expect the order of the Hospital to have acquired legends as it became progressively militarized and its military role was more and more in the public eye. As has been seen, this was the case: from around 1220 the order appeared in the legend of the enchanted gold, Matthew Paris' tale of the assassination attempt on Frederick II, and a number of other legends, while its first appearance in epic came in the last decade of the twelfth century. However, there were never as many legends

developed around it as there were around the Temple; instead, after 1250 fewer legends were recorded of the military orders, and the orders made fewer appearances in literature: only nine of the twenty-eight works in which they appear were written after 1250.

(c) Changes in literature after c.1250.

By 1250, the heyday of the verse romance and epic was over. Old epics were still being read and copied, notably the Crusade Cycle, but few were being written.⁹³ Since its first appearance in the early thirteenth century, the prose romance had rapidly gained popularity, apparently because it was considered to be `truer` than works in verse.⁹⁴ By 1300 the epic had fallen so low in the esteem of the nobility that Jean de Grouchy, priest and theoretician of music at Paris, had no conception that the nobility would care to listen to such works, writing in his work *de Musica* that the epic was suitable listening for the aged, working citizens, and servants during their leisure hours.⁹⁵ Verse romances still enjoyed some

⁹³Cf. Trotter, p.101, and P. Aebischer, ed., *Le voyage de Charlemagne à Jérusalem et à Constantinople*, TLF 115 (Geneva, 1965) p.29. The crusade cycle was still being copied and adapted: Duparc-Quioç, *La Chanson D'Antioche* pp.63-8.

⁹⁴E. Baumgartner, `Les techniques narratives dans le roman en prose,` in N. J. Lacy, D. Kelly and K. Busby, eds., *The legacy of Chretien de Troyes*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1987) 1 pp.167-8; D. B. Tyson, `Patronage of French Vernacular History writers in the Twelfth and Thirteenth centuries,` *Romania*, 100 (1979) 186-7.

⁹⁵H. Krauss, `La chanson de geste dans le système des genres littéraires,` in K. H. Bender, ed., *Les épopées de la croisade*, *Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Literatur*, Beiheft 11 (Stuttgart, 1987) p.175.

popularity, and even the most eminent of patrons commissioned them; but the new works seem to have enjoyed a very limited circulation compared to older poems, surviving only in single manuscripts.⁹⁶ When in 1312 Guy of Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, gave a part of his library to the Abbey of Bordesley, virtually all the non-devotional texts were epics or verse romances: obviously his family had collected these avidly in the past, but now no longer wished to house them.⁹⁷

The prose romances were set in an imaginary chivalrous past, and conceded far less to contemporary realities than either epics or verse romances. Most of the appearances of the military orders in literature were in the more 'realistic' works; it is therefore not surprising that the writers of prose romances found no place for them. What is more, the concept of knighthood which was exalted in the most popular prose romances was at odds with that represented by the military orders. In such romances, audience attention was focussed on the knight who served his lady faithfully, rather than the knight who served God: even where, as in *La Queste del Saint Graal*, the latter was shown to be superior to the former.⁹⁸ Furthermore, in the extremely popular prose romance *Tristan*, written circa 1230, even the Christ-like Galaad, chaste and dedicated to God, was declared to be a knight inferior to the lover Tristan,

⁹⁶E.g., *Escanors*, composed for Eleanor of Castile, wife of King Edward I of England: lines 8-9, 22-60.

⁹⁷M. Blaess, 'L'Abbaye de Bordesley,' 511-8.

⁹⁸The *Perlesvaus*, which exalts the knight who serves God, survives in seven manuscripts or parts of manuscripts (1 pp.3-12); cf. *Lancelot*, which survives in 'around a hundred' manuscripts or fragments, 1 pp. ix-x; *Queste*, surviving in around forty manuscripts, pp.iii-v; *Mort Artu*, in almost fifty manuscripts, pp.xxx-xxxiii; *Le Roman de Tristan en Prose*, ed. R. Curtis, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1985); *Le Roman de Tristan*, ed. Ménard: around 82 manuscripts are known (p.8).

dedicated to his mistress.⁹⁹ The military orders and the ideals which they represented were no longer the epitome of knighthood.

What is more, by 1250 the orders had undergone something of a transformation, rendering them less suited to legend and romance. As injured parties, they had been at the forefront of the wars between the emperor Frederick and the papacy. At the same time, they were prominent in the governments of Europe, as bankers or as royal officials. These developments would have tended to erode their image as extraordinary, holy knights. They had become an established part of the *status quo* in Europe. Meanwhile, events in the East had become decidedly depressing, the orders' image as invincible knights of Christ was plainly unsupported by reality, and the attention of Christendom had shifted from crusades in the Holy Land to those nearer home.¹⁰⁰

Moreover, the image that the military orders were accorded in the chroniclers' legends, of being greedy, envious and treacherous, seems to have been considerably amended by the defeat of the crusaders at Mansourah in 1250. A well-publicized speech, in which the military orders pleaded with Robert I, count of Artois, not to advance to certain disaster, combined with their reputed courage in the battle which followed, seems to have done much to reverse their reputation as men who sought to prevent Christian advance against the Muslims. According to the account which became known to

⁹⁹E. Loseth, *Le Roman en prose de Tristan, le Roman de Palamède et la compilation de Rusticien de Pise. Analyse critique d'après les manuscrits de Paris* (Paris, 1891) pp.349-51 paras.494-502, p.289 para.405, p.307 para.448, but cf. p.307 note 2, where seven MSS. depicted Galaad defeating Tristan in one encounter. Two of these are late thirteenth century or fourteenth century and the rest are fifteenth or sixteenth century.

¹⁰⁰See above, chapter two pp.110-1, chapter three pp.143-5.

Matthew Paris, the count of Artois had goaded the knight-brothers with the rumours that 'the whole land of the East would have long ago been won, if we laymen had not been prevented by the frauds of the Templars and Hospitallers and by others who proclaim themselves to be religious.' The brothers had hotly denied this, and, to prove their integrity, had ridden into battle alongside the count. As they had predicted, the Christians were routed, and only two Templars, one Hospitaller and one villein escaped.¹⁰¹ This had been a battle in the style originally associated with the military orders, against hopeless odds, fought for the glory of God. It was a terrible defeat, but something of a propaganda coup: very few derogatory legends were recorded after this date.

The disappearance of the military orders from epic and romance, as well as from the chronicles, was not, therefore, a result of their declining reputation. If this had been so, they would simply have appeared in increasingly dubious roles, betraying Christendom in epics and romances, and worse in the chronicles. Instead, they simply ceased to be attractive subjects for the imagination, and so were increasingly ignored by writers. Where their duties in government, for example, could prove useful to the plot, their role was as great as before, or more so, as in the case of the Templars in *Sone de Nausay*. When they did appear, there was little sign of a declining reputation.

(d)Fictional image and everyday image: the question of influence.

As stated above, insufficient details are known of the writers, patrons and circulation of the works discussed for firm conclusions to be drawn as to the influence which the orders' image in these works would have had. It may be noted, however, that most of the works in which the military orders receive the

¹⁰¹Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 5 pp.148-154; cf. 'Du bon William Longespee,'; 'Rothelein,' pp.604-6, *Ménestrel de Reims*, pp.196-8, paras. 381-3.

best and most thorough treatment had only a small circulation, if the number of manuscripts surviving is a reliable guide to popularity: *L'Escoufle*, *Claris et Laris*, and *Sone de Nausay* survive only in single manuscripts. Others were better known: *Bueve de Hantone III* survives in three manuscripts and three fragments, while *Raoul de Cambrai*, *Ogier le Danois*, *Renaus de Montauban* and *La chastelaine de Vergi* all enjoyed a wide circulation, as did *Parzival*. Nevertheless, without specific references to the military orders' role in legend or romance by contemporaries, it cannot be said with certainty that a particular role was accepted, taken up by the popular imagination and treated as the norm. A few such instances occur: the reference to Wolfram von Eschenbach's Templars in *Reinfrid von Braunschweig* indicates that, as a result of Wolfram's work, this author and his expected audience were familiar with the Templars as active, chaste knights, the guardians of holiness, although they may only have regarded this as a literary image, not an image of reality.¹⁰²

Again, the reported words of Robert, count of Artois, at Mansourah, directly reflect the words recorded of the master of the Temple, Gerard de Ridefort during the advance to Hattin, in 1187, by the squire Ernoul, and, indirectly, the persistent accounts of the military orders impeding Christian advance in the Holy Land, such as the tale of the enchanted gold and those told by William of Tyre and Matthew Paris.¹⁰³ Although the report goes on to refute the count's accusations, the implication is that they were well known in Europe.

How far did audiences believe what they heard? Walter Map advocated that they should ask the Templars themselves about the tales told of them, rather than believing all that they

¹⁰²Note 80, above; cf. Trotter, pp.29, 33-4.

¹⁰³*Rothelin*, p.604 (spoken by a knight with the count); *Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr (1184-97)*, p.45; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 3 p.177-9; and see above, pp.191-5.

were told;¹⁰⁴ but he said it tongue in cheek, probably to divert criticism which would fall on him for repeating such tales. Belief would vary with the hearer's own critical faculties and own experience of the military orders. However, s/he would also be influenced by the medium in which the information was presented. Anything in Latin was widely believed: the vernacular was less trusted, but prose was thought to be truer than verse.¹⁰⁵ *Exempla* from vernacular Arthurian romances and Carolingian epics in verse were used by crusade preachers, indicating that they expected their audience to believe them;¹⁰⁶ the writers of such tales often claimed to have obtained their information from a Latin source, but nevertheless some doubted their veracity.¹⁰⁷ It is more likely that the chroniclers' legends, and anecdotes written in Latin, would receive general belief, than the accounts of the military orders written in French or German verse; but, on the other hand, the accounts written in the vernacular are more likely to express the knightly classes' own views of the military orders.

From the point of view of the military orders themselves, neither the Latin legends nor the vernacular epics and romances portrayed a desirable image, for both were inaccurate. The

¹⁰⁴Walter Map, p.68.

¹⁰⁵Tyson, 'Patronage of French vernacular history,' 186-7; Baumgartner, 'Les techniques narratives,' pp.167-8.

¹⁰⁶Trotter, pp.20-27; Lloyd, *English Society*, pp.96-7.

¹⁰⁷E.g. Bertrand de Bar-sur-Aube, *Girart de Vienne*, ed. W. van Emden, SATF (Paris, 1977) lines 8-12; *Tristan*, ed. Curtis, 1 p.39 lines 1-7; Ambroise, lines 4179-4202; cf. J. M. A. Beer, *Narrative conventions of truth in the Middle Ages* (Geneva, 1981) who argues that the truth assertion was a convention which was deliberately parodied and that a sophisticated audience would recognize it as such: pp.9, 11, 85.

legends tended to paint too scurrilous a picture, thereby discouraging patronage, while the epics and romances painted too rosy a picture, leading contemporaries to compare the perfection of historical fiction with worldliness of the present day, and to conclude that the military orders' high standards had greatly declined.¹⁰⁸ Again, legendary tales of victories, when contrasted with the reality of the second half of the thirteenth century, would prompt contemporaries to ask why God had abandoned the military orders, and some to conclude that they must have become sinful. As a result, the military orders were forced to counter legend and romance invented by outsiders by devising and fostering propaganda which reinforced and bolstered the image they wished to convey of themselves.

¹⁰⁸E.g. Hugo von Trimberg, *Der Renner*, ed. G. Ehrismann, 4 vols., BLVS 247, 248, 252, 256 (Tübingen, 1908-9) 2 lines 11133-6; *Johannis Pecham, tractatus tres de paupertate*, p.173 lines 293-6: John later refutes this criticism.

CHAPTER FIVE:
THE MILITARY ORDERS' SELF-PERCEPTION AND PRESENTATION.

In the preceding chapters, we have examined the image of the military orders in the eyes of various individuals: from the clergy and laity, the ruling classes and the ruled, those who spoke on their own behalf and those who framed the opinions of others, those concerned to express the truth and those whose main concern was to tell a good story. It is now necessary to consider how far these images were the chance result of events, or of the preconceptions and prejudices of these individuals, and how far they were deliberately fostered by the military orders themselves. Monastic orders in general certainly acted to protect their image and to attack their detractors,¹ and it was only to be expected that the military orders should do the same. Moreover, the evidence indicates that they not only acted to silence criticism, but also took positive steps to circulate information designed to improve their image.

The necessity of retaining a good image in the west was a problem for the whole of the Latin East, and one of which the princes were painfully aware, at least by the time of the emperor Frederick II's crusade.² For the military orders, competing with other monastic and charitable institutions for alms and other privileges great and small, the maintenance of a good image was particularly important. Although a donor might give a small gift in response to persistent requests, it was far more profitable to convince donors that the order deserved their greatest patronage; but competition was fierce.³

In addition, the orders needed to maintain the morale of

¹John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 2 pp.196-7, Book 7 ch.21, 694a; Walter Map, p.110; Vaughan, pp.117-24.

²*Gestes*, pp.39, 43, 45, paras. 126, 127, 129.

³Gervers, *Cartulary of the knights of St. John*, p.xxxix.

their brothers, both in the East and in the West, ensuring the unity of the order despite divisions of geography and in the face of conflicting claims on the brothers' loyalty from the Holy Land, the local monarch and the papacy.⁴ Again, they needed to maintain the orders' image as monastic orders dedicated to Christ's service in order to attract recruits of the right sort, men with a vocation rather than criminals seeking to escape from justice or adventurers wishing to see the world. Popular misconceptions as to the quality of life within the orders obviously encouraged the wrong kind of recruits: the admission ceremony of the order of the Temple shows the order trying to correct these misconceptions before the applicant committed himself too far.⁵

As no evidence survives as to how the military orders went about forming policy, it is not possible to trace the processes by which the orders decided upon or changed the presentation of their image. There may have been no systematic policy-formation, the orders solely relying on the initiatives of the master and leading members, and the custom of the order. Policy-making has to be deduced from its results. Evidence does exist to show that the orders were concerned about their image and aware of the need to avoid scandal. Much has been made of the commemorative inscription of Peter of Vieillebride, master of the Hospital 1239-1242, which was erected at Acre in such a position as to be seen by crusaders and pilgrims arriving from Europe, and which declared the success of his policy of alliance with Egypt. Less well known is a commemorative inscription for Hugh de Quiliugo, marshal of the Temple, date unknown: *providus eximie, miles bellator, fortis, pedes, assiliator; hostibus horribilis, cum sociis humilis*, a Templar in the tradition of St. Bernard's *De Laude*, as all the

⁴The problem is described in Cart. no. 3308.

⁵Règle, p.337 para.658, p.339 para.661.

literate who passed would realize.⁶

Circa 1274, William de Beaujeu wrote to the Templars of Aragon urging them to make peace with the Hospitallers, because of the need to avoid scandal and offence to others.⁷ The rules of the Hospital, Temple and Teutonic order contain references to the need to protect the orders' reputation among outsiders.⁸ By the mid-thirteenth century, the rules of all three orders contained regulations forbidding the brothers to make public the chapter proceedings of the order, or to allow outsiders to see copies of the rule.⁹ If the rule was kept secret, the brothers could not be criticized for failing to keep it; the prohibition on discussing chapter proceedings with outsiders was intended to protect the reputations of individual brothers who were accused of, or confessed, faults during chapter meetings. It also enabled the order to keep secret incidents which could have proved highly damaging to the order, such as

⁶Prawer, 'Military orders,' pp.223-4; 'Nouveaux monuments des croisiés recueillis en Terre Sainte,' ed. Clermont-Ganneau, AOL 2, C 462-3.

⁷Quoted by A. Forey, 'A thirteenth-century dispute between Templars and Hospitallers in Aragon,' *Durham University Journal* 80 (1988) 185-6.

⁸E.g., Cart., nos.70.4, 3039.22, 3396.19; *Règle*, p.286 para.546, pp.289-90 paras.553-4, pp.291-2 para.558.

⁹Cart., nos.2213.75,82 (c.1239), 3396.24 (1270), 3844.7,8 (1283); *Règle*, p.153 para.225 (12th century, before 1187) p.189 para.326, p.228 para.418 (13th century, probably before 1250), p.288 para.550 (1257-65): a Templar could discuss chapter proceedings with an outsider but might not name a brother, unless he was dead. *Die Statuten des Deutschen ordens*, p.83, 'greater crimes,' no.3 (written before 1264); cf. I. Sterns, 'Crime and punishment among the Teutonic Knights,' *Speculum*, 57 (1982) 88.

an incident during the magistracy of Hermann de Perigord, master of the Temple, when a number of brothers were found to have entered the order by simony, or the only recorded case of sodomy during the history of the order, which was not noted by any outside contemporary source.¹⁰ The Hospital first introduced an *esgart* (judgement) to forbid brothers from revealing 'the things which are said in chapter' following a complaint from Pope Gregory IX in March 1238 that he had heard that the brothers were guilty of several gross abuses;¹¹ perhaps the order was anxious to prevent the pope from hearing of such things in future.

However, these measures were purely preventative: they could not improve the orders' image, only prevent it being damaged; and they could only prevent internal abuses from coming to light, such as heresy among the brothers; fraudulent practices towards outsiders would soon become notorious whatever steps the orders might take. In addition, there is evidence that outsiders did not trust the secret internal workings of the order of the Temple, at least, any more than bureaucracy is ever trusted.¹² Positive measures were also needed.

Onlookers certainly expected the orders to be concerned about their image. In 1235 Pope Gregory IX wrote to the Templars and Hospitallers, ordering them to settle their dispute over certain mills at Acre because it was causing scandal throughout Christendom, as well as weakening the Holy Land; while others declared that the orders would not do the evil deeds of which they were accused, because they would harm

¹⁰*Règle*, pp.285-8, paras.545-9, pp.297-8, para.573.

¹¹Cart., no.2186.

¹²William of Tyre, 2 p.955, Bk. 20, ch.30; Joinville, pp.168-9, paras.412-4.

their reputation, and their souls.¹³

It is possible to identify various positive influences on the military orders' image as knighthoods of Christ which could be easily manipulated in order to project a favourable image. One influence on the orders' image was, obviously, reports of the brothers' exploits in the Holy Land. Sometimes these appear to have originated with the brothers, sometimes with a third party. Another was the sanctity attached to an order through its connections with the events of Christ's life, that of His Mother, or other Biblical events; or through miracles in which the order participated in some way. A third was the image which the orders could project of themselves in standard form charters of donation and documents emanating from the orders. The orders could also influence their own image through their attempts to win the favour of western monarchs. Although, taken apart, these factors might seem insignificant, taken together they produce a coherent picture, indicating that the military orders were constantly concerned to maintain and improve their image in the west, if necessary at the expense of their rival military orders.

(a)Accounts of the brothers' achievements.

These were of two sorts: those which celebrated the knight-brothers' piety and those which celebrated their prowess. The latter implied the former, as it was thought that only through their faithful service to God could the brothers win victories.¹⁴

It is not surprising, in view of the predominance of the order of the Temple in legend and fiction, that most of the accounts celebrating the brothers' piety were told of the order of the Temple. The source of these accounts is not always clear. Jacques de Vitry recounted a number of such inspiring

¹³Cart., no.2120; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 5 p.150;
Preuß.UB, 1,2 nos. 62, 65; *UB Thüringen*, no.147, p.111.

¹⁴E.g. *Bataille Loquifer*, lines 1617-9.

tales in his two sermons to a military order, presumably the order of the Temple: the story of `lord Bread-and-Water,` the Templar who fasted too much and could not sit his horse in battle; a story of the courage of the master of the Temple in the face of defeat at the siege of Ascalon; the Templar who bid his horse Morel carry him to paradise as they rode into battle; and the tale of `Templar`s leap`: the Templar who escaped from the Saracens by sending his horse leaping from the cliff road into the sea. The story of `lord Bread-and-Water` was particularly notable, being both humorous and containing a valuable spiritual message, and was later quoted by the Dominican Stephen de Bourbon: although the hero of the tale was rebuked for his excessive zeal, the story reflected well on the piety of the brothers.¹⁵ As these tales recount details which could not have been known to anyone outside the order, they must have been told to Jacques by the brothers themselves.

Caesarius of Heisterbach, one of the preachers of the fifth crusade, repeated in his *Dialogus Miraculorum*, written between 1219 and 1223, a story demonstrating the Templars` steadfastness in prayer, and the rewards this brought them: surprised at prayer by a Saracen attack, the brothers were commanded by their master to remain praying, and, seeing their piety, the Lord sent an army of angels to defeat the Saracens. The Templars were not at all surprised by this, according to the account given to the captive Saracens. As Caesarius was friendly with at least one member of the order, perhaps he had heard this anecdote from him. By using this tale to encourage others to like piety, he implied that his audience took the piety of the Templars for granted. As the *Dialogus* was one of the most influential treatises of its kind in the Middle Ages, this particular illustration of the Templars` piety would have

¹⁵Jacques de Vitry, sermon 37 pp.412-3, sermon 38 p.420;
Anecdotes d`Étienne de Bourbon, p.164, para.188.

become well-known.¹⁶

The order of the Hospital does not appear to have collected or recounted such stories in the twelfth or thirteenth centuries. The nearest thing to an account of this kind told of the order was the minstrel of Rheims' account of Saladin's sojourn at the Hospital in Acre; and unlike the other accounts, which seem to have had some basis in truth, this one is obviously a legend.¹⁷ The Teutonic order, on the other hand, did record such 'improving tales': the *Livländische Reimchronik* was written to record the piety and prowess of the Teutonic brothers in their early years in Livonia, while in the 1320s Peter of Dusberg compiled a collection of such accounts from the brothers' early days in Prussia.¹⁸ Such works would encourage both the brothers and patrons of the order.

While it can be stated with confidence that tales of the brothers' piety originated within the orders, this is not always the case with tales celebrating the orders' prowess.

From time to time, there appeared in individual western European chronicles unique accounts of events in the Holy Land, including detailed descriptions of the deeds of one or more of the military orders, although elsewhere in these same chronicles little or no mention was made of them. These include the annals of Egmont's account of the siege of Ascalon

¹⁶*Caesarii Heisterbachensis monachi ordinis Cisterciensis Dialogus miraculorum*, ed. J. Strange, 2 vols. (Cologne, Bonn and Brussels, 1851) 2 pp.119, 360; Schein, 'The image of the crusader kingdom,' 712.

¹⁷See above, chapter 4 pp.201-2.

¹⁸*Livländische Reimchronik*, ed. F. Pfeiffer, BLVS 7B (Stuttgart, 1844) *passim*; Peter von Dusberg, *Chronik des Preussenlandes*, ed. K. Scholz and D. Wojtecki (Darmstadt, 1984) pp.112-4, para.12, p.118 para.17, pp.122-4 para.22, p.180 para.64, p.184 para.66, p.188 para.69, pp.344-8 paras.230-3, p.350 para.236.

in 1154; the description by Lambert Waterlos of Amalric I's Egyptian campaign of 1168, which gives particular prominence to the prowess of the master of the Hospital; Ralph of Diceto's account of the victorious charge of Eudes de St.Amand, master of the Temple, and his brothers at the battle of Montgisard in 1177; Richard of Durham's account of the victory of Bohemund VI, prince of Antioch, and the forces of the Temple and Hospital, over the Turks at *Blanht* in 1254; the notice given by the chronicler of Bury St. Edmund's of the death of 'the flower of knighthood, Brother John of Marlow of the Hospital,' at the battle between Acre and Saphet on Palm Sunday, 1260, which he misdates to 1270;¹⁹ and an account given by the *Annales Colmarienses Miores* of a victory of the Hospitallers of Margat over the Saracens in 1281. This last was also reported in the work of Bar Hebraeus and the 'Annales de Terre Sainte' but in no other western European work.²⁰ No source is given for any of these accounts. The military orders were certainly not directly responsible for the circulation of some which, although they praise the orders' prowess, are not completely complimentary: for example, the account of the siege of Ascalon, which was probably relayed to the annalist by some of the crusaders who arrived from 'overseas' during the course of the siege.²¹ Events which corresponded with the presence of a crusading expedition in the Holy Land, such as the battle of Montgisard, were probably reported by returning crusaders.

¹⁹ *Fontes Egmundenses* pp.160-163; Lambert Waterlos, pp.547-9; Ralph of Diceto, *The Historical Works*, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols., RS 68 (London, 1876) 1 p.423; *Chronicon de Lanercost, MCCI-MCCCXLVI*, ed. J. Stevenson, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1839) p.60; *Bury Chronicle*, p.46.

²⁰ 'Annales Colmarienses Miores,' ed. P. Jaffé, MGHS 17 p.208; Bar Hebraeus, p.463; 'Annales de Terre Sainte,' ed. R. Röhrich and G. Raynaud, AOL 2, 'Documents,' p.457, A.

²¹ Riant, *Pèlerinages*, pp.258-9.

Other events were reported by merchants.²² Yet certain accounts, especially those from the second half of the thirteenth century, when fewer crusaders went out to the East, probably travelled to the West in letters from the military orders themselves.

The military orders were responsible for a large proportion of the continual stream of information which was sent from the Holy Land to the West throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in order to publicize the deeds of the Palestinian Franks, to emphasize their plight and their need for aid; but also to celebrate their victories, thereby reassuring patrons that good use was being made of their alms, and that God was still showing them His approval.²³ Such news reports were deliberately designed to mould the image that western Christendom held of the Latin East, and were intended for wide circulation even where they were addressed to an individual. For example, a letter of Thomas Berard, master of the Temple, to the master of the Temple in England, appears in the Burton annals, while a letter from Hermann von Salza, master of the Teutonic order, to Leo, cardinal of Holy Cross in Jerusalem, was recorded in the Scottish chronicle of Melrose. Matthew Paris collected a vast store of such material for his chronicle, and it is likely that his numerous friends and contacts forwarded documents to him.²⁴ Sometimes such publicity was unsuccessful: a detailed account written into the chronicle

²²E.g., a Genoese account of Hattin: RRH Additamentum no.664a.

²³E.g., Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 4 pp.337-344, 6, Liber Additamentum, pp.348-50; Burton Annals, pp.368-9; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.238-9; R. C. Smail, 'Latin Syria and the West, 1149-1187,' TRHS, 5th series 19 (1969) 1-21.

²⁴RRH nos. 1299, 926; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora* 4 pp.288-291, 307-311, 6, Liber Additamentum, pp.152-4, 155-162, 167-9, 191-7, 203-7; see Gransden p.409 for the sources of the Burton Annals, and pp.360-1 for Matthew Paris' sources.

of Coupar Angus in the fourteenth century, describing a partially successful expedition by the Hospitallers and Templars in 1266, seems to have come from a letter sent to England by the Hospital soon after the event; it was apparently overlooked by all contemporary chroniclers in favour of the more immediate crisis of the barons' war.²⁵ In other cases the contents of a letter seem to have circulated orally, and to have become corrupted.²⁶ Again, such publicity could fall on hostile ears. Matthew Paris commented dourly that many Christians could not believe good reports from the Holy Land in 1244, because they distrusted the Templars and Hospitallers; in 1250 rumours of success which turned out to be false so disillusioned some listeners that they refused to believe any subsequent reports, even those which were true.²⁷

Through such regular reports to the West, the orders strove to remain in the 'public eye.' The order of the Temple, in particular, was at pains to publicize the immense resources it was pouring into the building and maintenance of fortresses for the protection of pilgrims and Christian territory. The treatise *De Constructione Castri Saphet* was apparently written for the order by a Palestinian Frank who had learnt the events behind the rebuilding of the fortress from the more senior members of the order: its purpose was to impress on the reader the great gain which the order had won for Christendom by refortifying this strategic site, enabling preaching of the Word amongst the Muslims, and allowing Christian pilgrims to visit the famous places within the vicinity of the castle. The writer showed how God's hand had worked to enable the

²⁵A *Scottish Chronicle known as the Chronicle of Holyrood*, ed. M. O. and A. O. Anderson, Publications of the Scottish History Society, 3rd series 30 (Edinburgh, 1938) pp.9, 173-7, and note 4, p.173.

²⁶Cart., no.3782, p.425; *Bury Chronicle* p.77 and note.

²⁷Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 4 p.291, 5 p.118.

reconstruction to take place, and went on to declare that the Templars had won so many miraculous victories over the Muslims since the castle was rebuilt that he could not repeat them;²⁸ unfortunately for the order, as almsgivers in the West were fond of hearing about victories. Although the treatise *De Constructione* only survives in two manuscripts, the order's publicity campaign appears to have been successful, to judge from the extensive coverage given to the loss of the castle in 1266,²⁹ and the remarks of the master of the Hospital that the Temple had boasted a good deal about it.³⁰

In the same way, in 1218 the order of the Temple found a publicist for their new fortress of the 'Castle of God's Son' or 'Castle Pilgrim,' in Oliver, *scholasticus* of Cologne. The castle had been constructed with the assistance of pilgrims, but at such great expense that Jacques de Vitry, bishop of Acre, wondered where on earth the order had found the money. Part of the cost had been met by donations from Leopold, duke of Austria, and Ranulf, earl of Chester, but the order would have been anxious to publicize the building as far as possible in order to encourage donations from the West towards the expenses of construction and upkeep.³¹ Oliver had been greatly impressed by this castle. Although he himself was present at the fortification of Caesarea while Castle Pilgrim was being constructed, he recorded nothing of Caesarea at all; but he

²⁸ *De Constructione Castri Saphet*, 358, 382-7.

²⁹ E.g., *Chronicon Lemovicense*, p.773-4; *Chronicon Rotomagensis*, p.340; *Continuatio l Minoritae Erphod.*, p.205; *Cronica S. Petri Erford.*, p.403; cf. *Primat*, p.83.

³⁰ *Cart.*, no.3308, 4 p.292.

³¹ *Lettres de Jacques de Vitry*, p.99 lines 44-5; Oliver *Scholasticus*, p.207. Pressutti, no.4098, 23 July 1222: Honorius urges the faithful to make donations towards the Templars' expenses on the castle.

gave a detailed account of the fortification of `the Castle of God's Son` in a letter of late August or September 1218, to the archbishop of Cologne, the prior and all the clergy, which he repeated in his *Historia Damiatina*. His history, and his account of the building of the castle, was used by other German and English chroniclers, thereby further publicizing the Templars' achievement in building and maintaining this fortress.³²

Likewise, early in 1229 Hermann von Salza wrote to Pope Gregory IX that the Teutonic order had begun to build a new castle in the mountains, Montfort; in July 1230 the pope urged all Christians to make donations towards the cost of building this castle.³³ Although there is less evidence concerning the castles of the Hospital, there is some indication that the order publicized the role of their castle of Margat.³⁴ The continuing importance of the fortification and garrisoning of castles in the maintenance of the military orders' image is underlined by the fact that one of the last achievements of the order of the Temple before the loss of Acre was to gain permission from Pope Nicholas IV to acquire the ruined fortress of *Castavilla*, in order to restore it for the protection of pilgrims.³⁵ As it is unlikely that the order possessed the resources for such an undertaking, it can hardly have been more than a public relations manoeuvre, designed to reassure the papacy and patrons in the West that it was still active in guarding the pilgrim routes, the function for which it had originally been established.

³²Oliver *Scholasticus*, pp.290-291, 169-72; see above, p.116.

³³MGHL p.264; Strehlke, no.72.

³⁴Cart., nos. 3308, 3766, and `Annales Colmarienses maiores,` p.208.

³⁵*Registres de Nicolas IV*, no.5209, 3 May 1291.

For the brothers must always be seen to be doing something, in order to reassure such as Matthew Paris that their great undertakings did justify the immense sums of money which they took from Christendom.³⁷ The importance of this is underlined by the fate of the military orders which lacked the resources to attract general attention to themselves by garrisoning castles, organizing raids on the Muslims and sending messengers regularly to the West; they remained poor, so poor in the case of the order of St. Thomas of Acre that by the 1260's the brothers in Acre were negotiating terms of incorporation into the order of the Temple.³⁸ The order of St. Lazarus fared only slightly better: whereas the order of St. Thomas was unable to attract attention from chroniclers outside England, the brothers of St. Lazarus occasionally won a mention in western chronicles, when the brothers had acted excessively rashly or suffered exceptionally high losses in the field.³⁹ Nevertheless, there was only slight awareness in the West that this was a military order.⁴⁰ Even the Teutonic order was unable to attract much attention from western writers for its deeds in the Holy Land, and when it did appear it was always in a background role, although a source originating in the Holy Land gave it more prominence.⁴¹ It did not achieve fame until

³⁷Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 3 p.178.

³⁸Forey, 'St. Thomas of Acre,' 494.

³⁹Forey, 'St. Thomas of Acre,' 486, 488-9; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 5 p.745; Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica*, ed. G Scalla, 2 vols. (Bari, 1966) pp.255,14; Joinville, pp.195-6.

⁴⁰Where references can be dated, they date from after 1250: Schüpferling, p.110 (1283); *Burton Lazars cartulary* p.38 f.73 (1261), p.44 f.117, p.55 f.201 bis; *Patent Rolls* (1266-72) p.526 (1271), (1281-92) p.137 (1284) p.431 (1291).

⁴¹'Rothelin,' p.637.

the loss of Acre.⁴² In that the orders of the Temple and Hospital had already won the limelight in the Holy Land, the move to Prussia was essential for the growth of the order. In Prussia and Livonia it seems to have been successful in publicizing its achievements against the pagans, for, even though outside Germany little was known of the actual facts of the conquest, westerners were left believing that its success was far greater than was actually the case. William of Rubruck, a Flemish Friar Minor, setting out in 1253 to the far east on a mission to the Great Khan, thought that, at that time, the Teutonic brothers had already conquered Prussia, that they could acquire Russia too, if they would put their hand to it, and that the Tatars would flee them. In retrospect, Peter of Dusberg did not consider Prussia to have been subjugated until 1283.⁴³ It is evident that eminent French friars such as Humbert of Romans and Gilbert of Tournai, who had studied the state of the Church in some detail, nevertheless knew virtually nothing about actual deeds of the Teutonic order, and assumed that it was faultless. In contrast, Roger Bacon, who possessed detailed knowledge of the order, criticized it.⁴⁴ Hence partial ignorance could be bliss; however, a lack of detailed knowledge of the order's activity outside Germany meant that it also won very little patronage outside Germany.⁴⁵

The Teutonic order's expansion into the north-east European frontier illustrates how the military orders' need to maintain a high profile encouraged them to take fresh

⁴²See Appendix I.

⁴³*The journey of William of Rubruck to the Eastern parts of the world, 1253-65, as narrated by himself*, trans. and ed. W. W. Rockhill, Hakluyt Society, 2nd series 4 (London, 1900, reprinted Nendeln, 1967) p.94; Dusberg, p.336.

⁴⁴See above, pp.81-2.

⁴⁵Cf. Tumlner, pp.178-181.

initiatives. Hence the Teutonic order had taken up the opportunity of establishing a settlement in the sparsely populated Burza, on the eastern frontier of Hungary. Later, having been evicted from Hungary, the order moved to Prussia, while also seizing every possible opportunity to acquire property in the Holy Land.⁴⁶ The order of the Hospital was prepared to accept gifts of land from Leo, King of Armenia, in return for guarding the Cilician March against the Turks, a heavy responsibility which the Templars had refused.⁴⁷ The Hospital also undertook, on 2 June 1247, to repopulate a large part of Little Wallachia, which King Bela IV of Hungary had given it, and to take up arms against the Tatars if they should attempt to invade the kingdom, providing a set number of men. The king gave similar concessions to those given to the order by the count of Tripoli in the 1140's, but the order was not to be allowed to establish an independent march, as it had in the county of Tripoli.⁴⁸ It was a fine acquisition for the order, but one which it did not retain; by 1260 it appears to have given up its claim to the area.⁴⁹ Perhaps this was because of the restrictions placed on its autonomy, or because its resources were too stretched by Louis IX's crusade for it to be able to invest further in Hungary, or because the brothers considered that military activity in Hungary would be contrary to the order's original purpose, whatever the long-term opportunities.

The order of the Temple was even less enthusiastic towards taking up such opportunities. It hesitated some years before

⁴⁶Boockmann, p.68ff.

⁴⁷Registers of Innocent III, PL 214 col.1005-6, year 5 no.43.

⁴⁸Cart., nos. 2445, 144.

⁴⁹Kuhn, 'Ritterorden als Grenzhüter,' 58.

taking up military responsibilities in Aragon;⁵⁰ it refused King Leo's offer in Armenia. Walter Kuhn suggested that the order was prepared to take on military activity against the pagan Prussians in the 1250's, but this was no more than a hypothesis.⁵¹ It appears that the order was so set in its original vocation, the defence of pilgrims in the Holy Land and the additional military responsibilities which this involved, that it refused to contemplate any expansion in its operations. Such a lack of flexibility was an inevitable result of the order's single vocation, in that it would attract recruits who shared that single vocation, in contrast to the military-hospitaller orders, which appealed to candidates of broader vision and more versatile talents. However, it is also likely that the master and senior brothers considered the order's commitments in the Holy Land were so great, and its resources so limited in comparison, that it could not afford to take on additional commitments.

It was dangerous to rely solely on the publication of military successes in order to attract the confidence and alms of Christendom. During periods of upheaval in Europe, such as the 1260s in England, reports of military successes went largely unpublicized. During periods of military reversals, the West tended to declare that God was sending these defeats on the Latin East as a punishment for sin, and was therefore reluctant to send aid. The search for success by expanding operations into the eastern European frontier could reduce the orders' prestige in the eyes of patrons who considered such expansion as a betrayal of the Holy Land. The military orders had, therefore, to use other methods to underline their sanctity, less vulnerable to fortune.

⁵⁰D'Albon, *Cartulaire*, nos.145 (1137-Nov.1143) 154 (27 April 1138) and 314 (27 Nov. 1143).

⁵¹Kuhn, 'Ritterorden als Grenzhüter,' 50.

(b) Spiritual reinforcements: saints, miracles and relics.

An obvious way for an order to convince patrons of its sanctity was to ensure the canonization or beatification of its founders or leading members. Other 'modern' orders, such as the Cistercians, and the orders of Friars Preacher and Minor, had such saints, and it might have been expected that the military orders would have set out to obtain canonizations for their most outstanding martyrs, thereby demonstrating divine approval for their vocation.

However, there is no evidence that they did so. The order of the Hospital certainly boasts a number of saints which are ascribed to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,⁵² but none of these were famed as knight of Christ; their claim to sanctity was totally conventional, and some probably did not exist. Those listed by J. Riley-Smith are as follows: the Blessed Raymond du Puy; Nicasius of Palermo; the Blessed Gerard; the Blessed Gerard Mecati; the Blessed Gerhard the German; St. Flore, nun of Beaulieu; St. Ubaldesca of Pisa; St. Hugh of Genoa. Of these, although the Blessed Raymond du Puy and the Blessed Gerard were respected by contemporaries, there is no evidence that special cults developed around them at this time, while St. Flore was not, in fact, born until 1300, dying in 1347, and therefore lies outside our period.⁵³

Nicasius of Palermo is listed by Giacomo Bosio in his

⁵²Ch. Kohler, 'Rerum et personarum quae in Actis Sanctorum Bollandistis et analectis Bollandianis obviae ad orientem latinum spectant: Index analyticus' ROL 5 (1897) 521-2; Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, pp.271-2.

⁵³William of Tyre, 1 p.375, Bk.7 ch.23, 2 p.812, Bk.18 ch.3; *Butler's Lives*, 4 pp.38-9.

history of the order of St. John.⁵⁴ Bosio describes Nicasius under the year 1242, his only evidence for the saint's existence being images in the churches of Palermo, which call him a 'knight of the holy order of Jerusalem,' or 'martyr, knight of our lord Jesus Christ,' and state that he suffered from swollen glands in his neck. It was believed that the invocation of his name was an effective cure for similar conditions. In 1782 Vincenzo Venuti published an historical investigation purporting to prove Nicasius' existence, in which he stated that Nicasius belonged to the noble Sicilian family of Burgio, joined the Hospital and died in the Holy Land at the battle of Hattin, on 4 July 1187. His principal evidence for this was a charter, dated 24 August 1232, ascribed to the emperor Frederick II, which Huillard Bréholles pronounced '*falsum, imo falsissimum.*'⁵⁵ The contemporary sources for the battle of Hattin mention no such person, and Nicasius is not in the *Acta Sanctorum* under 4 July. The vagueness of this evidence puts Nicasius into the same legendary category as the Blessed Gerard Mecati and the Blessed Gerhard the German.

The authors of the *Acta Sanctorum* were in doubt as to whether Gerard Mecati, or Gerard of Villamagna as he is more generally known, had ever joined the order of St. John, and ascribed him only to the third order of St. Francis.⁵⁶ The

⁵⁴I. Bosio, *Dell'Istoria della sacra religione et illustrissima militia di S. Giovanni Gierosol^{mo}*. 3 parts, new ed. (Rome, 1621-1684) 1 p.622-4; E. J. King, *The Knights Hospitallers in the Holy Land* (London, 1931) p.214.

⁵⁵V. Venuti, 'Dell'esistenza, professione e culto di S. Nicasio martire. Discorso storico-critico,' in F. Testa, ed., *Opuscoli di auctori Siciliani* 7 (Palermo, 1762) pp.22-3, 47, 99, no.4; HDFS 4 pp.956-7. Perhaps the connection with Hattin is a result of confusion between Nicasius and the Templar Nicholas, a martyr of Hattin: *Itinerarium* p.16.

⁵⁶*Acta Sanctorum*, May III p.246ff.

date of his death is variously given as 1244, 1247 or 1277; his 'Life' was not written until after 1551, by the local parish priest.⁵⁷ He spent most of his life as a hermit living in the vicinity of his home village, but was said to have accompanied his lord on the third crusade in his youth, and to have been captured by the Saracens. This lord the village priest called an *Hierosolymitanus Eques*, which by the time of writing meant a knight of the Hospital, but in 1187 would have meant a Palestinian Frank or a Templar. It was through the influence of this lord that Gerard was supposedly admitted to the order of the Hospital: 'the knights of Rhodes,' as his biographer wrote, with unconscious anachronism. All in all, Gerard appears as a half-legendary figure, the focus of a local cult and of local identity. His adventures in the Holy Land may well have been the invention of devotees who believed that a pilgrimage to the Holy Land was an essential part of the spiritual development of a man of his time. His 'Life' may include the deeds of more than one man. What is certain, however, is that his cult won no prestige for a military order during our period.

The same may be said of the Blessed Gerhard of Germany, otherwise known as Gerland of Germany or John of Poland, another *Eques Hierosolymitanus* ascribed by later hagiographers to the order of the Hospital. However, as his body was discovered in the church of St. Mary de Templo in Calatagironi, Sicily, an area where the Hospital is not known to have held any property, the Bollandists were inclined to believe that he had been a Templar. If Bosio is correct in assigning his career in Sicily to the 1240's, and the rediscovery of his body to 1327, around eighty years later, it is highly unlikely that any of the citizens of Calatagironi could have personally remembered this holy knight, and memories could have become confused as to which order he had belonged. In any case, if he had been a Templar, they would not have declared him as such, as the Avignonesse papacy would not have agreed to the

⁵⁷Butler's *Lives*, 2 pp.378-9.

beatification of a member of an order dissolved as the result of French pressure. It is more likely that the body of an unknown knight was 'discovered' at an opportune time by a town in need of a patron saint to protect its interests and to act as a focus for urban pride. Again, Gerland's cult won no prestige for a military order during our period, and his virtues were those of peace, not war.⁵⁸

The last two saints to be discussed are better documented, and were canonized soon after their deaths. The 'Life' of St. Ubaldescha (died 1206) is particularly interesting, as she came, unusually, from a poor family, and was baking bread when she received her call to join the order of the Hospital.⁵⁹ However, although these saints would have brought honour to the order of the Hospital during our period, their sanctity was entirely conventional. St. Hugh of Genoa was famed for his humility and charity, not for his prowess: there is no record that he was ever sent overseas to fight in the Holy Land.⁶⁰

It is notable that all the saints so far discussed won their fame in Italy. Only one saint ascribed to a military order during this period lived outside Italy: John of Montfort, described as being a knight of the Temple, and buried on Cyprus.⁶¹ In fact, as L. de Mas Latrie made clear, he was John, Count of Montfort, a companion of Louis IX on his first crusade, and brother of Philip of Montfort, lord of Tyre. He died on Cyprus, presumably from fever, and was buried at the

⁵⁸*Acta SS.* June III p.651ff.

⁵⁹*Acta SS.* May VI pp.854-9.

⁶⁰*Acta SS.* Oct. IV pp.362-4.

⁶¹*Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, Istituto Giovanni XXIII nella pontificia Università Lateranense, 12 vols. (Rome, 1961-70) 6 pp.845-6; L. de Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'Île de Chypre sous le règne des princes de la maison de Lusignan*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1852-61) 1 p.344.

church of Notre Dame des Champs. In time this `noble knight of Christ,` a man of great prestige, became confused with the knights of Christ of the Temple, an order of great prestige, so that later hagiographers assumed that he had been a Templar.⁶² In later centuries John of Montfort would be honoured as a knight of Christ; but not in the thirteenth century.

In the thirteenth century, the only area where members of military orders became saints was Italy. This would indicate that it was the Italians, not the military orders, who wanted saints; and that the existence of these saints was a result of the fragmentation of power in Italy, of fierce civic pride and rivalry, not of the deliberate policy of their order. Individual towns and cities needed saints to bolster the status of their city. The total lack of cults elsewhere based on members of the military orders even suggests that the military orders may have resisted the development of such cults. Perhaps it was not desirable in a military order that one member be honoured above the rest: brothers must learn to work together as equals. All were potential martyrs, all deceased brothers were remembered in the daily service. Peter of Dusberg`s history of the Teutonic order mentions many individual brothers as an example to their successors, but does not raise any above the rest.⁶³ It is possible that the order of the Hospital in Italy was more willing than the other military orders to allow cults to develop around its members; it is possible, but not very likely, that the Hospital`s members were more saintly than those of the other military orders. More probably, the Italians` preference for Hospitallers simply reflects the order`s later predominance. In time, all local saints known to have been `knights of Jerusalem` would have been ascribed to the most prestigious contemporary military order, the order of the Hospital,

⁶²*Acta SS.* May V pp.270-1.

⁶³*Règle*, pp.21-2, para.9, pp.202-3, paras.355-6; Dusberg, part 3, *passim*, p.96ff.

although they might originally have belonged to the order of the Temple or the Teutonic order. In any case, any local cults of Templar saints would have been adjusted after the dissolution of the order and the saint 'assigned' to another order.

It is important to stress that although the concept of a military order had received papal approval in 1128, none of those whom local opinion created saints were noted for their self-sacrifice for Christ on the battlefield. Although Nicasius of Palermo was called a 'martyr,' his special claim to sanctity was the suffering he experienced in his neck; no details of his alleged martyrdom have survived. In the same way as the military orders caught the imagination of the writers and audiences of epic and romance, but were never considered to be of equal spirituality to hermits, so popular Italian piety did not conceive that laying down one's life for Christ on the battlefield was of equal merit to living a life of self-denial and charity, the traditional route to sanctity. Although Gerard Mecati was said to have gone on crusade, nothing is recorded of his deeds in the Holy Land except that he was captured.

The military orders, then, did not win sanctity for themselves and their role through the creation of saints. Instead they associated themselves with their own patron saints. It is hardly surprising, in view of the popular attitude to the best route to sanctity, that these patron saints were all pacific, often women, rather than the military saints such as Michael, George or Sebastian. Admittedly the Teutonic order had some connection with St. George, but this was not exploited so much as its connection with the Blessed Virgin Mary or with St. Elizabeth of Marburg.⁶⁴ Only once was the order of the Temple associated with St. George during our

⁶⁴Dusberg p.202, para.83; *UB Thüringen*, no.121: a donation of 15 March 1252 by Henry, margrave of Meissen and Osterland, in honour of the 'holy martyr George'; for the B.V.M. and St. Elizabeth, see below.

period, and the Hospital not at all.⁶⁵ The Hospital, obviously, laid greatest stress on the patronage of St. John the Baptist, although William of Tyre alleged that the order's patron had originally been St. John the Almsgiver.⁶⁶ However, as was normal for monastic orders, the B.V.M. was also cited in charters of donation to the order.

The order of the Temple regarded the B.V.M. as its special patroness. This may have been a result of Cistercian influence, but in any case Mary's cult had been rapidly gaining popularity during the order's early years, so that it would have been more surprising had the order not adopted Her as patroness.⁶⁷ The earliest surviving donation to the order citing Her was made by Guy VIII, dauphin, count of Albon, on 30 January 1132. The next was made by William of Alaian, viscount, at Toulouse on 2 November 1134. After this donations to God, St. Mary and the order appeared regularly. On 24 May 1137, Ermengaud de Son took the unprecedented step of dedicating a gift to 'the knighthood of the Blessed Mary which is in Jerusalem.'⁶⁸ Many of the order's churches and chapels were dedicated to Mary; donations were frequently made to maintain the light burning before Mary's image or Her altar in the

⁶⁵*Itinerarium*, p.7.

⁶⁶William of Tyre, 1 p.123, Bk.1 ch.10, 2 pp.816-7, Bk.18 ch.5.

⁶⁷Cf. Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, pp.464-5.

⁶⁸E.g. D'Albon, *Cartulaire*, nos.43, 95, 139; see also nos. 119, 120, 124, 125 etc.; *Sandford Cartulary*, *passim*; *Charter Rolls*, 1 pp.125, 135, 210, 211, 227, 249; *Cod. Dip. Brand. A* 19 pp.1-2 nos. 2,3, pp.124-6 nos. 2, 4; *Cartulaires de Douzens*, *passim*; *Cartulaire de Richerenches*, *passim*: note that nos. 67, 69, 206-7, 227 refer to Mary rather than to the Temple; but cf. *Cartulaire de Provins*, where no mention is made of Mary.

order's churches.⁶⁹ There were also a number of legends of the B.V.M. associated with the order of the Temple: the Annunciation was said to have taken place in the Temple of Solomon, a `fact` nowhere recorded in the New Testament;⁷⁰ the Templars bore witness to the miracle of the icon of Our Lady of Saidnaia, collecting and distributing the milk which flowed from the icon whenever they had a truce with the Muslims;⁷¹ it was claimed that a stone upon which She had rested was outside the order's fortress of Castle Pilgrim.⁷² Their devotion was emphasized in early 1308, during the trial of the order, in a letter from an anonymous sympathizer to the doctors and scholars of the University of Paris. Amongst other things, this declared that the brothers had, for the salvation of their souls, dedicated themselves to the service of the glorious virgin, bearing the cross perpetually in reverence of Christ.⁷³

Like the order of the Hospital, the order of St. Lazarus, while acknowledging St. Lazarus as its principal patron, also

⁶⁹*Sandford Cartulary*, nos. 74-6, 81, 87, 120, 125, 146; H. von Hammerstein, `Der Besitz der Tempelherren in Lotharingen,` 19 no.38; *Registres de Nicolas IV*, nos. 685, 897, 2986, cf. 3157.

⁷⁰`La chanson de Jérusalem,` line 7681.

⁷¹P. Devos, `Les premières versions occidentales de la légende de Saidnaia,` *Analecta Bollandiana*, 65 (1947) 255-6, 258, 273; cf. *De Constructione*, 379 lines 31-2.

⁷²W. A. Neumann, ed., `Drei mittelalterliche Pilgerschriften III: Philippi Descriptio Terrae Sanctae,` *Oesterreichische Vierteljahresschrift für katholische Theologie* 11 (1872) 76.

⁷³C. H. Cheney, ed., `The Downfall of the Templars and a letter in their defence,` in C. H. Cheney, ed., *Medieval Texts and Studies* (Oxford, 1973) p.326.

claimed the patronage of the B.V.M.;⁷⁴ again, the knights of Christ of Livonia were dedicated to Her, as was the whole land of Livonia.⁷⁵ However, it was the Teutonic order that laid the greatest emphasis on its relationship with God's Mother. The full title of the order became fixed around 1220, during the fifth crusade: 'The Hospital of St. Mary of the Teutons in Jerusalem.'⁷⁶ The order fought under Her banner, to the last man if need be;⁷⁷ according to the order's own tradition, the Prussians were on one occasion defeated on seeing Mary bearing the order's banner into battle, at which sight their courage failed.⁷⁸

Other saints associated with the order of the Temple included St. Euphemia, whose relics were kept at Castle Pilgrim. There were a number of St. Euphemias, including some native to Syria, but the order claimed that this was the illustrious St. Euphemia of Chalcedon, miraculously translated to Athlit from Chalcedon in Greece. It may be suspected that the relics were more likely to have arrived in the wake of the fourth crusade; but there are no records of relics of this saint ever having been in Palestine.⁷⁹ In any case, the relics impressed the pilgrims. The order also had direct contact with

⁷⁴E.g. *The Burton Lazars Cartulary*, folios 1a, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19 and *passim*.

⁷⁵Henry of Livonia, *Chronica*, pp.313-4; *Livländische Reimchronik*, lines 3259-60.

⁷⁶Boockmann, p.34.

⁷⁷*Livländische Reimchronik*, lines 8430-59, 10686-7.

⁷⁸Dusberg, p.260, para.32; see also pp.112-4, para.12.

⁷⁹'Philippi Descriptio,' p.76; *Acta SS.* Sept V p.252ff; cf. *Bibliotheca SS.* 5 cols.153ff, especially 162, for the various saints of this name.

Saint Hedewige, wife of Henry I, the Bearded, of Silesia; her `Life` records that, when the knotted girdle which she had been wearing as a form of mortification wore out, `a certain religious man, from the order of the Templars,` presented her with another, an action which the saint declared had been inspired by God.⁸⁰ Likewise, the Hospital won the respect of St. Elizabeth of Thuringia, who entrusted to it her hospital at Marburg.⁸¹ Such friendships must have improved the knight-brothers` image as solemnly pious men of God, rather than frivolous knights.

The order of the Temple was also involved in the promotion of local cults. At Perugia, it was one of the parties attempting to secure the canonization of the local anchorite S. Bevignate, but was unsuccessful.⁸² Again, a crippled Templar was reported as having been cured by the relics of St. William of York in 1283.⁸³ Nicholas IV recorded that many miracles were taking place at the order`s church at Silva, Rodez diocese, which was dedicated to the B.V.M., although he did not specify whether there was any particular cause for these, such as the presence of relics.⁸⁴

Not to be outdone, the Teutonic brothers possessed the head of St. Barbara at Kulm, declaring that the saint had deliberately abandoned her former resting place among the

⁸⁰Eistert, `Tempelherren in Schlesien,` 8; *Acta SS.* Oct VIII p.232, para.32.

⁸¹Cf. Cart., no. 2008.

⁸²Tommasi, `L`ordine dei Templari a Perugia,` 9-10, 49-50, no.5.

⁸³*Acta SS.* June II p.145, para.44: *quidam religiosus de ordine militae Templi Jerosolymitani.*

⁸⁴*Registres de Nicolas IV,* no.897.

Pomeranians to come among them.⁸⁵ They also possessed the body of St. Elizabeth of Thuringia at Marburg. Oil, it was claimed, flowed miraculously from her tomb, which the brothers collected and distributed to religious men for the establishment of basilicas in honour of St. Elizabeth.⁸⁶ The occurrence of miracles at the local level in connection with such relics reflected favourably on the sanctity of the order: St. Barbara would not have chosen to remain among unholy men.

Like all religious institutions, the military orders collected every sort of relic, in order to attract pilgrims and, therefore, alms. The Teutonic order in Prussia possessed a portion of the Lord's Cross: in 1233 Gregory IX issued a request to the crusaders in Prussia to adore this when it was displayed to them, and promised that for those who went to adore the cross, ten days' penance would be remitted.⁸⁷ In a pilgrim's guide to Jerusalem of circa 1170, mention is made of the Hospital's church of St. John the Baptist, 'which is to be honoured not only because of its very holy relics, but also because of the most famous alms it gives.'⁸⁸ Another guide, from early in the century, mentions that one of these very holy relics was 'the stone water pot in which the Lord made the water into wine.'⁸⁹ Relic-collecting led to competition, even within the order itself: in 1281 Nicholas le Lorgne, the master of the Hospital, commanded the prior of S.Gilles, Brother William of Villaret, to give up some relics which he had illegitimately acquired from the brother who was taking them to

⁸⁵Dusberg, pp.138-140, para.36.

⁸⁶Boockmann, p.51; 'Annales Colonienses Maximi,' p.845.

⁸⁷*Registres de Gregoire IX*, no.1536 (12 Oct. 1233).

⁸⁸*Jerusalem Pilgrimage*, pp.21, 239.

⁸⁹*Ibid.*, pp.11, 178.

the priory of Auvergne.⁹⁰ Obviously the prior had felt that his house was in need of additional tourist attractions.

(c) Historical justification.

The military orders also attempted, to a greater or lesser degree, to improve their prestige by claiming illustrious founders and long histories. In the twelfth century, the image of the orders of the Hospital and Temple suffered simply because they were 'modern' orders, created within the last hundred years, and lacking the authority which came with long establishment.⁹¹ They met this criticism by devising a history stretching back to Old Testament times. For the order of the Hospital, the order's version of this history survives in an Anglo-Norman text of 1181-1185 as well as in other material emanating from the Hospital and various third-party references; for the Temple, no such clear-cut evidence survives, but there are indications that the order claimed ancient ancestors, even if it did not claim a distant history.

The earliest reference to the Hospital's claim to have existed from the time of the Apostles appears in Gerhoh of Reichersberg's *De investigatione Antichristi*, in which the claim was used against the order as justification for the patriarch's authority over it.⁹² Gerhoh, however, then qualified this by going on to say that even if the modern Hospital had not existed from ancient times, every other house in Jerusalem was subject to the patriarch. The legend was obviously in circulation, but not everyone accepted it without question. In the early 1180's, the English house of the order produced the *Riwle*, which summarized the order's rule in Anglo-

⁹⁰Cart. 3797.

⁹¹Cf. Walter Map, p.124.

⁹²Gerhoh of Reichersberg, p.378; cf. R. Heistand, 'Die Anfänge der Johanniter,' in Fleckenstein and Hellmann, eds., *Geistlichen Ritterorden*, pp.32-6.

Norman for the benefit of those brothers who could not read Latin, and also gave a history of the order from its alleged foundation by Bishop Melchiazar and King Antiochus in Jerusalem, at the time of the first Roman emperor (in fact, in the third century B.C.). This claimed that Judas Maccabaeus had been a patron of the order, that John the Baptist's parents had served there, that Christ visited the Hospital with His disciples and spoke some of His most famous words there, that this was the house where He appeared to the disciples after His resurrection, and that this was the house where the first Christians met together; St. Stephen had been master there.⁹³ None of this had any Biblical foundation; but if we consider how many events in the Bible, and how many of Christ's sermons, were recorded as having taken place in the Temple, it appears likely that this pseudo-history was developed at least in part in competition with the order of the Templars.

In July 1191, Pope Celestine III stated as an accepted fact that Christ sanctified the Hospital by His presence during His time on earth; this was repeated by Innocent IV in 1254. In 1274, Rudolf, king of the Romans, stated in a general confirmation charter for the order that it 'is known to have flourished from antiquity.' Most interestingly, sometime in the period 1262-1267, a period of disaster for the Christians in the Holy Land, Hugh Revel, master of the Hospital, writing a letter of accreditation for the order's alms-collectors in Europe, informed his readers that Pope Urban II 'in whose time Jerusalem was captured,' and his successors had set up a confraternity for the order, in which he had promised to all who gave alms a share in the prayers and alms which had been given 'in the Holy Hospital from the time of the Holy Apostles, who set up the Holy Hospital in the early Church, and of St. Stephen the protomartyr, who after their division obtained the

⁹³*The Hospitallers' Rivle*, p.xlviii, lines 1-368; K. V. Sinclair, 'The Anglo-Norman miracles of the foundation of the Hospital of St. John in Jerusalem,' *Medium Aevum*, 55 (1986) 102-8.

priorate of the place, and which are made forever. His material was carefully selected at a time of crisis; the confraternity had, in fact, been set up by Innocent II, but Urban II, and the reminder of the capture of Jerusalem, was far more auspicious. The Hospital, formerly dating itself from the time of the Old Testament, is now made a creation of the apostles, and, notably, of the first martyr. The suggestion was made to potential donors that the Hospital shared these men's sanctity, propensity for martyrdom, and the hope of recapturing Jerusalem.⁹⁴ As Brother William of San Stefano, a brother of the order, remarked late in the thirteenth century: 'I reckon that seekers (of alms) invented these things in order to get more...'⁹⁵

The claims of the order of the Temple to a long history are not so clearly preserved. No complete pseudo-history survives as it does for the Hospital, but there is evidence that the order connected itself with illustrious groups or figures of former times. Between 1150 and 1175 a translation of the Book of Judges into French was undertaken at the request of the leading Templars in England, Stephen of Hastings and Osto of St. Omer. This was an obvious choice of translation for the order, instructing the listener in the successes and failures of those defending the land which God had given them. Five manuscripts survive, four in French and one in Provençal: none of the four is the original, so the text appears to have enjoyed considerable popularity for so serious a vernacular work. Presumably to hold the interest of his listeners, the translator inserted some material not in his original which had special application to the Templars: for example, after a description of the lands taken by various tribes of Israel, following Judges chapter 1 verse 21, the translator went on to

⁹⁴Cart., nos. 911, 2674, 3562(p.317), 3002.

⁹⁵William of San Stefano, 'Comment la sainte maison de l'Hospital de S. Johan de Jerusalem commença,' RHC Occ 5 p.424, ch.2.

state that the lineage of Levi was chosen to serve God in the Temple, `for they had no fief nor possession, for God, who is sufficient for giving all goods and to help all needs, was their inheritance.` This was an anachronism: the Temple had not yet been built, and the tribe of Levi served at the Ark of the Lord. Again, at chapter five verse 13, beginning: `Saved are the remnants of the Lord`s People, ` one manuscript states: `Saved are the remnants of the Lord`s Temple.` At chapter eight verse 27 a description of an Ephod is given by the translator: `Ephod is a sort of vestment which the provost had then for serving in the Temple, in the time of the Old Testament.` Here the scribes of two manuscripts realized that this was an anachronism and replaced `Temple` with `Tabernacle.` However, the translator seems to have accepted that the Temple already existed, as if it had always done so, and that God`s true worshippers (here the Israelites) had served in it ever since they came into the Holy Land. The Levites appear as forerunners of the Templars.⁹⁶

The most obvious name for the Templars to claim as founder was that of King Solomon. Like the B.V.M., he was often, but not invariably, mentioned in donation charters.⁹⁷ There is some indication in the romance *La Queste del Saint Graal* that

⁹⁶*Le Livre des Juges. Les cinq textes de la version française faite au XII siècle pour les chevaliers du Temple*, ed. the Marquis d`Albon, Société des Bibliophiles Lyonnais (Lyon, 1913) pp.i-iii, 1, p.6 line 21, p.18 lines 37ff. (Bib. Nat. 6447) pp.31-2 chapter 8 verse 27.

⁹⁷E.g. D`Albon, *Cartulaire, passim; Records of the Templars*, pp.137-8 nos 1,2,3,4,5,7, p.145f. nos.1,2, and *passim; Cartulaires de Douzens, passim; Sandford Cartulary, passim;* but cf. *Cartulaire de Provins*, once only, no.93 (1127); Brunel, *Plus anciens chartes*, once only, no.130; *Cartulaire des Templiers de Vaour (Tarn)* ed. C. Portal and E. Cabié, Archives historiques de l`Albigeois, fasc. 1 (Albi, 1894) once only, no.109.

Solomon was linked with an ideal of knighthood, in that he is shown rejoicing at having been told that his final descendant will be a knight better than Joshua.⁹⁸ However, this connection could be accounted for simply by the fact that Solomon was a greatly respected figure at this period, regarded as an ideal of kingship and wisdom.

In the late twelfth-century *Libellus de expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum*, in the account of the battle of 1 May 1187, Gerard de Rideford, Master of the Temple, is shown addressing his brothers before the engagement: 'Remember your fathers the Maccabees, whose function of fighting for the Church, for the Law, for the inheritance of the Crucified, you have already been undertaking for a long time.' He goes on to remind them that their 'fathers' overcame the enemy not by force of numbers but by faith and justice and observing the mandates of God. Probably the author of the *Libellus* invented this speech, but it is unlikely that he would have attributed these words to the master unless they were the sort of language which the order actually used.⁹⁹ If the order claimed to be the descendant of the Maccabees, with Judas Maccabaeus as a past or first master, then the Hospital's eagerness to claim Judas as a past patron may be explained by the rivalry between the two orders. However, as in the case of Solomon, Judas Maccabaeus was a figure greatly respected throughout Christendom, the epitome of the knight of God. In the romance *Lancelot*, written circa 1215, Judas is claimed as one of the first knights (as is King David, with a cheerful disregard for chronology); all knights are called to be God's knights, and in this respect Judas Maccabaeus was indeed the forefather of the

⁹⁸*La Queste del Saint Graal*, p.221.

⁹⁹*Libellus de expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum*, in *Radulphi de Coggeshall, Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. J. Stevenson, RS 66 (London, 1875) pp.211-2.

Templars, but also of the rest of knighthood.¹⁰⁰

The order could certainly claim, and with more justification than the Hospital, that many incidents during Christ's ministry had taken place in the Temple; and it could also benefit from contemporary fascination with the Temple, and the legends built up around it, particularly those concerning their patroness, Mary.¹⁰¹ There is also evidence that the order attempted to 'rearrange' the holy sites in Jerusalem in its own interests, claiming that the traditional site of the Sheep Pool was incorrect, and that the real pool was a larger one, nearer to their house.¹⁰² There is no evidence, however, that the order claimed that knights of God had been serving at the Temple at the time of Christ, as the Hospital claimed that their house had been in operation during this period.

What does appear is that the Templars claimed that there had been knights of God specially assigned to the defence of the Holy Land from the infidel since the time of the Judges, or of Judas Maccabaeus, and that the modern order of the Temple was a direct descendant of these. At some point in its history, the order of St. Lazarus also claimed existence from the time of Judas Maccabaeus.¹⁰³

Whatever the orders might claim, however, contemporary chroniclers tended to agree with William of Tyre in placing the establishment of the Hospital in the eleventh century and of

¹⁰⁰*Lancelot*, 7 pp.255-6, XXIa 19.

¹⁰¹S. Schein, 'Between Mount Moriah and the Holy Sepulchre: the changing traditions of the Temple Mount in the Central Middle Ages,' *Traditio*, 40 (1984) 175-195; see above, p.257.

¹⁰²*Jerusalem Pilgrimage*, pp.74, 240.

¹⁰³*Burton Lazars cartulary*, p.2; P. Bertrand de la Grassière claims that this was accepted in 1151, but gives no reference: *L'ordre militaire et hospitalier de Saint-Lazare de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1960) p.15; cf. *Jerusalem Pilgrimage*, p.200.

the Temple in the early twelfth century. Some, particularly the sources dating from before William wrote, granted the order of the Temple a longer history, and traced its foundation to knights who had remained in Jerusalem after the first crusade. In this respect, the orders' `propaganda` may be seen to have failed.¹⁰⁴ On the other hand, the fact that the orders appear in a number of romances and epics set in the distant past indicates that the knightly classes were at least prepared to accept these pious legends; although it must be admitted that most listeners probably had no idea of historical perspective.¹⁰⁵

While the Teutonic order did not claim ancient foundation, it did claim that Frederick of Staufen, Duke of Swabia, was involved in its foundation, and also claimed to be a descendant of the former German Hospital in Jerusalem, which led to disputes of sovereignty with the Hospital.¹⁰⁶ The order's claim to be a continuation of the Jerusalem hospital was supported by

¹⁰⁴William of Tyre, 1 pp.553-5, Bk.12 ch.7, 1 p.375, Bk.7 ch.23, 2 pp.814-7, Bk.18 chs.4-5; Jacques de Vitry, `Historia Orientalis,` cols.1082-1084; William of Andres, interpolation into the `Historia` of Andrew of Marchian, ed. G. Waitz, MGHS 26, p.209; Guy of Bazoches in Aubrey des Trois Fontaines, pp.819-20. The following date the order of the Temple from c.1099: Simon of St. Bertin, p.649; Anselm of Havelburg, PL 188 col.1156; Otto of Freising, pp.252-3; *Ernoult*, pp.7-8; *Les Chétifs*, lines 2147-8, 3058; `La chanson de Jérusalem,` lines 9884-8; cf. *Règle*, p.14 para.3 and D'Albon, *Cartulaire*, no.16, which state that 1128 was the ninth year of the order's existence.

¹⁰⁵ See above, pp.224-5.

¹⁰⁶`Narratio de primordiis ordinis Theutonici,` in *Die statuten des Deutschen ordens*, pp.22-3, 159-160, (Frederick, Duke of Swabia); Jacques de Vitry, `Historia Orientalis,` cols.1084-5.

Frederick of Staufen's nephew, Frederick II, in order to 'establish' a long dynastic connection with the order, underlining his own claim to be rightful heir to the imperial throne.¹⁰⁷ Chroniclers, however, were not convinced: opinions differed over when the order began, but the majority considered that it was founded in the early years of the thirteenth century.¹⁰⁸ The views on the order held by Humbert de Romans (taken from Jacques de Vitry) indicate that this could be no bad thing: as a modern order in the thirteenth century, it was seen as being still virtuous and faithful to its first calling, untouched by the blemishes of older, declining orders.¹⁰⁹

The order of St. Thomas of Acre also claimed a royal foundation, in this case by Richard I of England; it had, in fact, been founded by the chaplain of Ralph of Diceto, although Richard may have assisted in the original endowment. Whether the legend was true or false, it was believed, enabling the

¹⁰⁷HDFS 1 p.288, 2 p.224, 282, 3 pp.154-5, 497, 4 p.393; cf. U. Arnold, 'Entstehung und Frühzeit des Deutschen Ordens, zu Gründung und innerer Struktur des Deutschen Hospitals von Akkon und des Ritterordens in der ersten Hälfte des 13 Jahrhunderts,' in Fleckenstein and Hellmann, eds., *Geistlichen Ritterorden*, pp.81,85, 88-95.

¹⁰⁸'Annales Colmarienses minores,' ed. P. Jaffé, MGHS 17 p.189 (the order began in 1212); 'Rebus de Alsaticis ineuntis saeculis XIII,' ed. P. Jaffé, MGHS 17 pp.232, 235 (it began around 1211); 'Chronicon Montis Sereni,' ed. E. Ehrenfeuchter, MGHS 23 p.163 (began in 1190, in the time of Frederick, Duke of Swabia); 'Cronica S. Petri Erford.,' p.355 (founded in 1200, by the emperor Henry VI at Acre). Only William of Andres stated that it began in 1127, at the same time as the order of the Temple: MGHS 26 p.209. Jacques de Vitry thought that it began at Jerusalem, but gave no date: 'Historia Orientalis,' cols.1084-5.

¹⁰⁹Humbert de Romans, 'De eruditione,' p.473.

order to claim the patronage and protection of Henry III and Edward I, without which it could not have survived.¹¹⁰

(d) Literature generated by the orders for their own members.

Some of this material has already been discussed: pious legends such as those later recorded by Peter of Dusberg; pseudo-historical material such as the Hospitallers' *Riwle*; and the Templars' translation of the Book of Judges. However, the military orders also produced or commissioned other works in the vernacular which were intended to educate the brothers and to shape their self-image, and which could be read aloud during meals in place of Latin texts which few of the brothers could understand. These were always serious, pious works, often based on the Bible or on the legend of a saint. At the end of the thirteenth century, the Teutonic order produced works on subjects such as the life of the B.V.M. and of St. Martina, the legend of the Holy Cross, the Fathers of the Church, and the Biblical heroines Judith and Esther.¹¹¹ An anonymous writer produced for Brother Henry d'Arcy, commander of Temple Bruer 1161-1174, an Anglo-Norman version of the *Vitas Patrum*, and subsequently a number of other works, *Thais*, *Antécrist* and *Descent de St. Paul en l'enfer*.¹¹² These works differed in their circulation: the first two survive in two manuscripts, the third in three and the fourth in one. Again, a number of the works produced for the Teutonic order, such as the 'Life' of St. Martina and 'Judith,' only survive in one manuscript, whereas the *Sünden Widerstreit*, an allegorical depiction of virtue fighting against vice, survives in five. No doubt some works were considered more useful than others.

¹¹⁰Forey, 'St. Thomas of Acre,' 481-2, 492, 494.

¹¹¹K. Helm and W. Zieseemer, *Die Literatur des Deutschen Ritterordens*, (Giessen, 1951) p.41ff.

¹¹²M. D. Legge, *Anglo-Norman Literature and its background*, (Oxford, 1963) pp.191-2.

The works produced for Brother Henry d'Arcy were very monastic in tone, extolling chastity, prayer, fasting and the solitary life. No mention at all was made of military activities. This must reflect the lifestyle which the brothers followed in a provincial commandery such as Temple Bruer, and bears out the theory of Jean Richard, that the brothers of the military orders living in Europe were regarded as being no different from ordinary monks.¹¹³ The *Livre des Juges*, of course, is largely devoted to warfare, but the translator's principal concern was to emphasize the importance of holding to the faith, virtues such as chastity, and the disasters which befell God's people when they ignored these principles. Such reading matter was not entirely successful in transforming the brothers into good monks, and they continued to indulge in more typically knightly reading.¹¹⁴ Nevertheless, literature produced by individual brothers reveals them as devout and orthodox in their beliefs.¹¹⁵

(e) Appealing to the orders' dual role.

Charters and official documents contain a wealth of information on the self-image which the military orders attempted to project: both documents originating with the orders, and those originating outside the orders, but which the orders dictated

¹¹³Richard, 'Templiers et Hospitaliers en Bourgogne,' pp.241-2.

¹¹⁴Some Hospitallers owned copies of romances and chronicles: Cart., no.3039.42,39. The Rule of the Temple does not suggest that the brothers read romances, but one Templar commander wrote a love poem on the blank page at the end of his commandery's copy of the Rule: J. Oliver, 'The Rule of the Templars and a courtly ballade,' *Scriptorium*, 35 (1981) 303-6.

¹¹⁵E.g., Oliver le Templer, 'Estat aurai lonc temps en pessamen,' in Raynourd, ed., *Choix des poésies*, 5 p.272; Ricaut Bonomel, 'Ir'e dolors.'

or influenced. These indicate that the military orders, in particular the order of the Hospital, did not rely wholly on their military activity to attract alms and to form the brothers' self-image. Rather, they actively exploited their dual role, hospitable and military, tailoring their self-image to their circumstances and correspondents.

The earliest example of this occurred in the 1170's. The order of the Hospital had become undeniably militarized, having taken part in the Egyptian campaigns of Amalric I; but this development had given rise to complaints from within and without the order. When the master, Jobert, wrote to Henry, archbishop of Rheims, asking for a place of refuge (*receptaculum*) for his order within the diocese of Rheims, he made much of the order's hospitable work, but no mention of its military activity.¹¹⁶

A later example appears in two donations to the Hospital in August 1240, made by Andrew III, Lord of Vitré, and Geoffrey IV, lord of Preuilly, pilgrims in the Holy Land. These were clearly based on a standard form of charter, beginning: 'Seeing and attending the works of piety and mercy which are done daily and incessantly in the holy house of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, considering also the welcome service shown to me with honour by the master and brothers of the said Hospital...' The emphasis was on charity: there was not a word of the order's military role. This is interesting in view of the military orders' implication in the crusaders' defeat at Gaza the previous year. It would be natural for the Hospital to wish to be seen for the moment as a simple order which fulfilled the works of charity, rather than in the somewhat tarnished role of a powerful military order.¹¹⁷

By the mid-thirteenth century the Hospital was thoroughly militarized and known throughout Christendom to be a military order; but the master of the order continued to stress his

¹¹⁶Cart., no. 438.

¹¹⁷Cart., nos. 2257, 2258; 'Rothelin,' pp.538-49, ch.26ff.

position as 'Custos pauperum Christi,' with no hint of his role as a military commander. When Hugh Revel, master of the Hospital, wrote to the prior of St. Gilles in 1268 to ask for the help of the brothers in the west, he spoke as if the order was purely military in purpose, its properties given to it for the help of the Holy Land, with no mention of Christ's poor.¹¹⁸ Yet, in an open letter written sometime between 1262 and 1267 to accredit the order's alms-collectors in the west, Hugh Revel made no reference at all to the order's military work, writing as if the order was a Hospital only, and stressing its alleged connection with the Apostles.¹¹⁹ Both letters were a result of the disasters which the Christians had suffered at the hands of the Muslims in the 1260's: probably Hugh thought it impolitic to remind potential donors of his order's involvement in these disasters, and preferred to dwell on the successful side of the order's work. Again, in a general charter of confirmation for the order in 1268, Louis IX made no mention of the order's role in the protection of Christendom, speaking only of its support for the poor, although he may have considered military operations to form part of this support.¹²⁰ Equally disconcerting is a statement by Hugh Revel of 20 October 1281 that a gift by one John Perez to the order had been made to 'our lords the infirm poor,' when John had stated no such thing in his donation charter; his donation was made in return, he said, for the order's goodness to him. Possibly this emphasis on the order's service for the poor was intended to bolster the brothers' self-confidence following the loss of the Hospital's

¹¹⁸Cart., no. 3308.

¹¹⁹Cart., no. 3002.

¹²⁰Cart., no. 3303; cf. J. Riley-Smith, 'Crusading as an Act of Love,' *History*, 65 (1980) 177-92; Forey, 'Emergence of the military order,' 187.

stronghold of Crac in April of that year.¹²¹

Most interesting of all in this connection is a bull of Pope Nicholas IV, 15 March 1291. He had previously banned all alms collecting for the Holy Land, in order to prevent collection by unauthorized collectors: all collectors must be licensed. The Hospital, however, was now granted leave to collect alms because the brothers had informed him that they were not collecting for the Holy Land but for the poor and sick.¹²² The timing of this statement by the order, so soon before the loss of Acre, when the final catastrophe must have been clear to those controlling the order, indicates that Hospital was actively exploiting its dual role in order to maintain its position in public opinion. This is also indicated by Jacquemart Gielée.¹²³

The Teutonic order, in contrast, does not appear to have used its dual role in this way during this period, perhaps because its resources were so much less than those of the Hospital that it preferred to rely on diplomatic influence at the imperial and papal courts, rather than spending money influencing public opinion. The bulk of donations were given simply to 'the Teutonic house,' emphasizing neither hospitality nor knighthood, and indicating that, to most donors, its national identity was the most important thing about the order.

While the master of the Hospital emphasized in his charters his role as the custodian or servant of Christ's poor, the brothers of the Temple emphasized their original ideal as 'poor knights of Christ,' a title which also appeared in

¹²¹Cart., nos. 3419 (p.251), 3433, 3417.

¹²²*Les registres de Nicolas IV*, no.4635; Cart., no. 4149.

¹²³*Renart le Nouvel*, lines 7614-7645.

charters of donation to the order.¹²⁴ Although the order was also involved in attending to the needs of pilgrims and almsgiving, this aspect of its work very seldom received emphasis. It was occasionally mentioned in donation charters, so occasionally that it seems to have been included by the donor rather than the order: an image projected on to the order rather than one it fostered.¹²⁵ A few hospitals were given to the order.¹²⁶ Like the Hospital and the Teutonic order, it was expected to ransom captives.¹²⁷ Pope Alexander IV twice referred to the order's charity to the poor and its hospitality.¹²⁸ In the early fourteenth century, Walter of Guisborough had heard that the master of the Temple had cured the Lord Edward when the latter was stabbed by an Assassin at Acre, and Jacques de Molay underlined the order's charitable work while arguing against the amalgamation of the military

¹²⁴E.g. Comte de Marsy, 'Fragment d'un cartulaire,' p.156 no.39; D'Albon, *Cartulaire*, nos. 20, 129, 130, 188, 286, 288, 511; see also nos. 33, 68, 380; Cart., nos. 2902, 3028, 3029; *Records of the Templars*, p.193 no.23, p.203 no.8, p.233 no.7, p.245 no.4, p.269 no.5; *Sandford Cartulary* nos. 51, 308, 335, 382; *Rotuli Chartarum*, p.3-3b; *Cartulaire de Richerenches*, nos. 3, 10, 38-40, 146; *Règle*, p.20 para.8.

¹²⁵D'Albon, *Cartulaire*, nos. 46, 74, 363, 555; *Pommersches UB.*, 2 no.1352; *Monuments Historiques*, pp.267-8, no.504.

¹²⁶E.g., D'Albon, *Cartulaire*, no.364; *Registres de Clement IV*, no.1914; *Registres d'Innocent IV*, no.2869; Richard, 'Templiers et Hospitallers en Bourgogne,' pp.239-40; *Sandford Cartulary*, nos. 282-6, 289, 281, and p.200 note 4.

¹²⁷MGHES 1 p.98 no.135; RRH 1492, 1501; Cart., nos. 1682, 1861.

¹²⁸Rymer's *Foedera*, 1,1 pp.333, 334.

orders.¹²⁹ It may be said that the brothers' role of protecting pilgrims in the Holy Land and laying down their lives on behalf of the rest of Christendom was charity in itself, and that other charitable works were not stressed because they were taken for granted.¹³⁰ However, circa 1170 John of Würzburg made it clear that he was more impressed by the Hospital's combined role than by the predominantly military role of the Temple, saying that, although its alms were sufficient, they were not a tenth of the Hospital's.¹³¹ As the traditional forms of charity clearly also impressed the Italian towns more than military activity, it might be expected that in times of crisis and defeat the order would have striven to remind public opinion in the west that it performed the more conventional charitable tasks, feeding the poor and sheltering the sick; but only once does it appear to have done so.

This one occasion is mentioned in the memorandum setting out the arguments which the master of the Temple and *maiores utriusque ordinis*, the great men of the orders of the Temple and Hospital, were to put to the Roman cardinals on the occasion of the second council of Lyons in 1274, in support of the orders' continuing exemption from episcopal jurisdiction.¹³² One of these arguments was that if exemption was lost the orders' work on behalf of pilgrims would suffer:

'Again, you know how they are held by the institutes of the order (to give help) to pilgrims crossing the sea, the poor, orphans, and any poor

¹²⁹ *The chronicle of Walter of Guisborough*, ed. H. Rothwell, Camden society 3rd series, 89 (London, 1957) p.209; cf. 'Chronicon Hanoniense quod dicitur Balduini Avennensis,' ed. J. Heller, MGHS 25 p.464. *Dossier*, pp.6, 10.

¹³⁰Cf. Riley-Smith, 'Crusading as an Act of Love,' 177-92.

¹³¹John of Würzburg PL 155 col.1087.

¹³²Amargier, 'La défense du Temple,' pp.495-500.

persons in constant need, and the hospitals especially are to give hospitality, seek alms, receive the poor, assist pregnant women at childbirth, feed newborn babies, and minister suitable food to any sick person, according to the advice of professional doctors.`

Although the emphasis here was on the charitable work of the `hospitals,` presumably the Teutonic order as well as the Hospital, the Temple too was appealing to its charitable work as a justification of its existence as a privileged order. It is notable that it was at the second council of Lyons that the proposal to unify the military orders was voiced for the first time;¹³³ in view of Jacques de Molay`s later appeal to the order`s charitable work as one of the justifications for its continued independent existence, it appears that the order only drew attention to its more conventional hospitable work when its very existence was under threat. It is notable that Jacquemart Giélée, whose picture of the military orders` self-defence is clearly based on reality, shows the Templar only appealing to his order`s military activity to justify its claim to preference; admittedly, the Templar is an incompetent speaker, but the point rests.¹³⁴

This would indicate that the order of the Temple felt its position in the eyes of Christendom to be sufficiently secure without resort to ingenious arguments to shore up its reputation. Jacquemart Giélée`s Templar seems to believe that his order alone is responsible for the safety of the Holy Land, demanding that Renart be given to his order with the threat that otherwise the Templars will have to abandon the Holy Land. The order`s frequent threats to this effect indicate that this belief was common among the brothers, and that they expected

¹³³*Dossier*, p.2.

¹³⁴*Renart le Nouvel*, lines 7549-7585.

Christendom to agree with them.¹³⁵ There was some justification for this attitude, as evidenced by the prominence given to the order in epics and romances, as against the Hospital or the Teutonic order, and in reactions to the loss of Acre.¹³⁶ However, by the late thirteenth century, the order could not afford to be complacent, both in the face of events in the East and in Europe and of fierce and effective rivalry from the order of the Hospital, to judge from *Renart le Nouvel*.

Renart le Nouvel is not the only evidence that the military orders sought to boost their own image, in a relative sense, by denigrating their rivals. There was a concerted campaign by the orders of the Hospital and Temple against each other in the early 1240's, over the question of whether the Palestinian Franks should ally with the Sultan of Damascus, as the Temple preferred, or with the Sultan of Egypt, as the Hospital preferred.¹³⁷ There is slight evidence that during the 1250's the order of the Temple in Germany assisted the Polish princes who were attempting to launch a crusade in Prussia in competition with the Teutonic order.¹³⁸ Records of repeated settlements made between the three great military orders demonstrate that rivalry existed, although official policy was that the orders remain on friendly terms.¹³⁹

¹³⁵*Ibid.*, lines 7558-7581; *Die register Innocenz III*, 2 no.247; *'Ernoult'*, p.161; *Registers of Innocent III*, PL 216, year 12 no.45; *Burton Annals*, p.494; *Kohler and Langlois, 'Lettres inedites'*, no.2 p.56.

¹³⁶See above, pp.226-7; *Rutebuef*, 1 p.508, lines 327-335; Appendix I.

¹³⁷*Prawer, 'Military orders'*, pp.223-4; *Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora*, 4 pp.288-91.

¹³⁸Kuhn, *'Ritterorden als Grenzhüter'*, 42-52.

¹³⁹Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.235, 282.

Such negative policies in any case tended to backfire on the orders themselves: as Gregory IX pointed out to the Temple and Hospital in 1235, their quarrels scandalized Christendom. Other witnesses bear this out.¹⁴⁰ What is more, because the orders were so frequently in conflict, inter-order criticism was unlikely to convince anyone. Giélee's attitude to the Hospitaller's speech of attack against the Temple indicates that he, and his audience, did not believe any of the Hospitaller's slanders.

(f) Winning the confidence of princes.

The 'propaganda' described above was not simply broadcast through open letters and the tales carried orally by the order's messengers. Diplomatic efforts were also aimed directly at certain influential figures, such as Louis VII, king of France, in the twelfth century, and Edward I, king of England, in the thirteenth.¹⁴¹ The Teutonic order ensured continuing support for its crusade in Prussia through its influence at the papal court.¹⁴²

The relationship between the military orders and the rulers of Europe and the Holy Land has already been discussed at length in chapter one. Here it is only necessary to underline the fact that although relationships developed chiefly in response to the ruler's need for reliable and confidential servants, they were also of great value to the military orders, so that an order might go to some lengths to assure itself of the friendship of a particular prince. At the

¹⁴⁰Cart., no. 2120; Ramon Llull, *Blanquerna*, Bk. 4 ch.80, pp.407-8; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 5 pp.745-6; *Historia Anglorum*, 2 p.472; Menko, p.555; Bartholomew of Neocastro, p.132.

¹⁴¹Small, 'Latin Syria and the West,' 1-21; Lloyd, *English Society*, p.232ff., and appendices 1-2.

¹⁴²Roger Bacon, *Opus maius*, 3 p.122.

most basic level, the prince's favour could be gained by giving him a gift,¹⁴³ but in order to cement a close relationship the order would appoint a member of the order who was already a friend of the prince as a high official of the order within the prince's realm. For example, it was with the intention of assuring the friendship of Louis IX for the order of the Temple that Urban IV urged, and the order consented to, the appointment of Brother Amaury de la Roche as preceptor in France in 1264.¹⁴⁴ The election of Conrad, landgrave of Thuringia, as master of the Teutonic order in 1239 was certainly a political move, based not so much on Conrad's personal qualities as his rank: as the counts of Thuringia were closely bound to the emperor Frederick II, his election served to ensure the continuation of the Teutonic order's close relations with the emperor.¹⁴⁵ The election of Hermann of Perigord as master of the Temple in 1232 indicates the brothers' desire to select a master who would be acceptable to the emperor: Hermann had previously been master of the order in the emperor's possessions of Sicily and Calabria.¹⁴⁶ The election of William of Beaujeu as master of the Temple in 1273 was declared by Hugh Revel, master of the Hospital to have been in honour of Beaujeu's relatives: Philip, king of France and Guy, count of Flanders.¹⁴⁷ Hugh Revel did not mention another relative, Charles of Anjou, king of Naples and Sicily, but in fact Charles' influence had probably been decisive in securing William's election: William had been master of the order in Sicily and Calabria before his election, and was a convenient

¹⁴³E.g., Cart., no. 2213.106.

¹⁴⁴*Registres d'Urbain IV*, nos. 760, 765, 771.

¹⁴⁵Boockmann, pp.45, 51-2.

¹⁴⁶Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.189-190.

¹⁴⁷Cart., no. 3507.

instrument for Charles to advance his ambitions in the East. Certainly William pursued those ambitions with dogged determination after his election.¹⁴⁸ The order of the Temple probably hoped to find in Charles of Anjou a strong king of Jerusalem, influential in the West and with considerable support from his relatives in the West, who could maintain a large army in the Holy Land and reestablish Christian power. In contrast, the house of Lusignan, kings of Cyprus, were weak and held out little promise for Christian resurgence in the Holy Land.

The case of Charles of Anjou amply illustrates the problem for the orders of relying on the support of princes. No prince would become the protector of the military orders unless he himself hoped to make substantial gains from it, at minimum cost to himself. Close connections with any one European prince brought the order into conflict with other princes, who were usually also its patrons. The orders could spend considerable time and money keeping princes informed of events in the Holy Land and urging that they send military aid, but to no avail. In short, policies aimed at winning the confidence of princes tended to cost more than they gained. Nonetheless, when the military orders were in severe financial straits, as the Temple was by 1253 and the Hospital by 1268,¹⁴⁹ it was cheaper to rely on diplomatic activity than to use valuable men and resources in manning newly-constructed castles and launching raids on the Muslims, which was necessary to win the approval of chroniclers and lesser patrons in the west.

(g) The success of these measures.

How far were the military orders successful in shaping their own image in the minds of Christendom? Their performance in two areas in particular may enable their spiritual image to be determined with some precision. One of these was the popular

¹⁴⁸Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.260, 264-7, 273-4.

¹⁴⁹*Registres d'Innocent IV*, nos.6237, 6256; *Cart.*, no. 3308.

recognition of sanctity in the creation of saints. As we have seen, few members of the military orders were so honoured during the period under examination, and then only for the traditional virtues of peace, and not as knights of Christ. In this respect the concept of the military order failed to achieve the highest reputation at the popular level, among clergy or laity, as was achieved, for example, by the hermits.

The military orders also failed to achieve the prestige, power and recognition of spiritual worth which derived from the election of members of a monastic orders to bishoprics. Of course, bishoprics and archbishoprics, and higher offices within the Church, were not assigned purely on the grounds of a candidate's sanctity but also because of his education, family connections, or political influence; but as few members of the military orders attained episcopal rank, it seems that few fulfilled any of these criteria.

There is a problem in identifying brothers of the Temple who became bishops or archbishops, as it was common for a brother to give up his order on elevation to a see.¹⁵⁰ Of four brothers of the Temple elected to a bishopric or archbishopric during this period, only two, Brother Richard, admitted as bishop of Lavello in 1226, and Brother Umbert, bishop of Paneas in 1262, remained brothers;¹⁵¹ Hugh de Nissun, elected as bishop of Sebaste in 1263, seems to have become a canon of the Holy Sepulchre on his election, while William de St. Jean, elected as archbishop of Nazareth in 1288, seems to have left

¹⁵⁰For the contrary view, see Bulst-Thiele, review of H. E.

Mayer, ed., 'Das Itinerarium Peregrinorum,' *Historische Zeitschrift*, 198 (1964) 381; Bulst-Thiele, 'Noch einmal das Itinerarium Peregrinorum,' *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 21 (1965) 596.

¹⁵¹Richard: Pressutti, no. 5969. Umbert: Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus* p.254.

the order.¹⁵²

As three of these sees were in the Holy Land, where the order had great influence, it is probable that these brothers was elected more because of the influence of their order in the see than for their innate virtues. Most of the other brothers of military orders elected during this period were elected to sees under their order's control. At least two Hospitallers held the see of Valenia in the Holy Land, one in the 1190's, and one in the late 1280s.¹⁵³ Two brothers of the Teutonic order held the see of Ermland in the 1250s; a Teutonic brother was made bishop of Lithuania on Mindaugas' conversion; on the request of the Teutonic brothers in the service of Pope Urban IV, Brother Ermund of the order became bishop of Kurland in 1263; in 1265 Brother Frederick of Husen, a brother-priest, was bishop of Culm, while in 1274 Brother Christian of Muhlhausen became bishop of Sambia.¹⁵⁴

Brother Garin of the Hospital became bishop of Senlis in 1213 as a result of his service for Philip II of France.¹⁵⁵ The election of other brothers may have been due to the

¹⁵²Hugh: *Registres d'Innocent IV*, nos. 6350, 6490; *Registres d'Alexandre IV*, nos. 1151, 1152, 1153; *Registres d'Urbain IV* nos. 260, 264; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, p.219. William: *Registres de Nicolas IV*, no. 165; B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: the secular Church* (London, 1980) p.279.

¹⁵³Cart., no. 999; Hamilton, *Latin Church*, p.240; Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, p.413; cf. Cart., no. 1432.

¹⁵⁴Ermland: C. Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica medii aevi*, 2nd edition (Munster, 1908) p.433; *Registres d'Innocent IV*, no. 4855. Lithuania: *ibid.*, nos. 7998, 8041. Kurland: *Registres d'Urbain IV*, no. 213; MGHS 23 p.553. Culm: *Registres d'Urbain IV*, no. 711. Sambia: MGHS 30 p.423.

¹⁵⁵Petit-Dutaillis, *Louis VIII*, pp.335-6.

influence of their order, or to their own talents or connections. Brother Alan, prior of the Hospital in England, became bishop of Bangor in 1195.¹⁵⁶ Other electees met with problems. Brother Richard of the Temple was elected bishop of Lavello in 1217, but Pope Honorius III ordered him to be removed, and only in 1226 allowed him to be admitted, on condition investigation be made. Brother Gerbhard of Plaien, of the Teutonic order, was bishop of Passau in 1224, but many of his clergy would not render him obedience, because he was a brother of the Teutonic order. Brother Guy of 'Aurreliaco,' a Hospitaller, was one of two candidates elected to the see of Calvi in Italy in 1273: an investigation was made, and Guy's election was quashed.¹⁵⁷ It seems that the military orders lacked the necessary authority at the level of episcopal elections to enable them to have their candidates admitted.

The evidence, therefore, indicates that the members of military orders were not generally able to attain episcopal or archepiscopal office, except within their orders' areas of direct influence. This is in stark contrast to other 'modern' orders, notably the friars and Cistercians. However, it may be that the military orders preferred not to have their members created bishops, except within their own territory, because they suffered from a continual manpower shortage, and could not afford to 'lose' members in this way.

The general effect of the orders' attempts to shape their image can be seen in the attitudes adopted towards the orders which have been discussed in the first four chapters. They were to a some extent successful. They convinced the papacy of the necessity of their exempt status, which was never, despite numerous threats, rescinded. If they were criticized alongside

¹⁵⁶J. H. Round, 'Garnier de Nablous, prior of the Hospital of England, and Grand Master of the order of Jerusalem,' *Archaeologia*, 58,2 (1903) 388.

¹⁵⁷Pressutti, nos. 5969, 4736; *Registres de Gregoire X*, no.265; Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica*, 2nd. edn. p.159, note 1.

other religious orders, they were never the most severely criticized. On the other hand, to judge from the satire of Jacquemart Gielée, many of the arguments used to justify their exempt status and to attract the alms of the faithful were recognized as hollow by intelligent onlookers by the late thirteenth century, if not before. The ceaseless flow of information from the East to the West, the orders' constant emphasis on their poverty and the justice of their cause, never persuaded enough influential patrons and potential crusaders in the West to act on their behalf. Insofar as they were not enabled to carry out their primary role of protecting the pilgrims to the Holy Land, in that Acre was lost, their attempts to win over Christendom were a failure. Yet, in that they escaped from the loss of Acre with their reputations largely intact, and Christendom still looking to them to spearhead attempts to recover the Holy Land, they were successful.

CONCLUSION

We have considered the images of the military orders held by the papacy, by various monarchs, members of the clergy and laity, their image as portrayed in legend and romance, and how the orders themselves strove to mould their own image. It remains to draw these images together and to summarize the patterns which existed across society, time and Europe.

The orders attracted praise and criticism throughout the period under investigation. While the praise remained substantially the same, extolling the brothers as knights of Christ who laid down their lives for their brothers and for the defence or extension of Christendom, the criticism changed. The early doubts over the validity of a military monastic order faded as the orders became established and as still more controversial orders and groups, such as the friars and beguines, appeared; as they became part of the spiritual landscape, they began to be criticized alongside other monks for slackness. Likewise, the complaints of the second half of the twelfth century over their privileges, disputing their canonical basis and criticizing their abuse of them, were in the thirteenth century largely transferred to the friars.

If we were to draw up a table showing the criticism and praise of the military orders over the period 1128-1291, we would see that, until the emperor Frederick II's crusade of 1229, periods of praise and of criticism alternated, and tended to be mutually exclusive. Although there was some criticism of the orders before the second crusade, based almost entirely on the canonical basis of a military order, most reactions were favourable. After the second crusade, from the late 1150's until the loss of Jerusalem, there was little praise and a great deal of criticism, the bulk of which was prompted by the orders' possession and abuse of extensive ecclesiastical

privileges,¹ although some commentators, namely John of Würzburg and the Würzburg annalist, criticized the Temple's alleged part in the defeat of the second crusade.

The courage displayed by the Templars and Hospitallers during their defeat at Nazareth on 1 May 1187, and in the face of martyrdom by Saladin at Hattin on 4 July 1187, won them considerable praise from clerical and lay writers in the West.² Likewise, reports of the brothers' courage during the Christian siege of Acre gained them much admiration.³ Their courage and steadfast faith in the face of the Muslim threat was exalted, and their rashness, pride and greed overlooked. However, although the third crusade saved the kingdom of Jerusalem, its failure to recover the city and the disappointments and disasters of the years which followed seem to have reflected badly on the prestige of the military orders. During the next two decades, the tale of the enchanted gold was first applied to the military orders, and writers as diverse as Roger of Howden, Guiot of Provins, and Innocent III expressed their

¹E.g., by John of Salisbury, Gerhoh of Reichersberg, William of Tyre, Walter Map and the bishops at the third Lateran Council.

²E.g., *Carmina Burana; lateinische und deutsche Lieder und Gedichte, einer Handschrift des XIII Jahrhunderts*, ed. J. A. S., BLVS 16,1 (Stuttgart, 1847) no. 26, verses 8, 12, p.30; G. Paris, ed., 'Un poème latin contemporain sur Saladin,' ROL 1 (1893) 439-40; *Libellus de expugnatione*, pp.211-6, 225, 237, 239; *Itinerarium*, pp.6-8, 16-17 ; Ambroise, 2489-2506; H. Prutz, ed., 'Ein zeitgenössisches Gedicht auf die Belagerung Accons,' *Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte*, 21 (1881) 457-94, lines 125-6, 145-156.

³E.g., Ambroise, lines 3021-33; Prutz, 'Gedicht auf die Belagerung Accons,' lines 767-786, 1125-8.

dissatisfaction with the orders' worldliness.⁴

With the embarkation of the fifth crusade, expressed attitudes again became more favourable, notably in the letters and sermons of Jacques de Vitry, and in the works of Oliver *Scholasticus*. However, during the dispute between the emperor Frederick II and the papacy opinions became sharply divided; those representing the opinions of the Palestinian Franks, such as the chronicler whose work was used by Bernard the Treasurer, Philip of Novara, and opponents of Frederick, such as Philip Mousket, favoured the orders of the Temple and Hospital,⁵ while supporters of the emperor, such as Matthew Paris, tended to denigrate them.⁶ This was a low point of popularity; the emperors' antagonism coincided with the ending of the Albigensian crusade, the crusades of 1239-40, the final loss of Jerusalem and the rising popularity of the newly-created, austere friars. The events of Louis IX's crusade, however, redressed the balance somewhat, as the defeat at Mansourah was widely recognized to have been due to the stupidity of the king's brother, Robert of Artois, rather than the orders' failure. After the crusade of Louis IX, expressions of criticism or praise became rarer. There was some criticism of the orders in connection with the second council of Lyons, from Gilbert of Tournai, Richard Mepham, and King James I of Aragon; but they were not mentioned by other writers on the state of the Church, such as Bruno of Olmütz or Humbert de Romans, and,

⁴Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, 4 pp.76-77; Guiot de Provins, 'La Bible,' lines 1745-1782, 1789-1818; Registers of Innocent III, PL 215 cols. 1217-8, Bk.10 no.121, 216 cols. 591-4, Bk.15 no.69, col.688, Bk.15 no.162.

⁵*Ernoul*, pp.462-5; Philip of Novara's memoirs in *Gestes des Chyprois*, pp.28-9, para.102, p.49, para.137, p.50, para.138; Philip Mousket, 'Historia Regum Francorum,' ed. A. Tobler, MGHS 26, pp.819-820, lines 31015ff., 31158ff.

⁶See above, pp.105-6.

according to James, were supported by the majority of the delegates at the council.⁷

Praise and criticism, then, fluctuated in accordance with events external to the military orders. During a period without crusades, particularly after the failures of the second crusade, their spiritual failings, their abuses of their privileges and worldly wealth, tended to come to the fore; during a period of crusading, attention was fixed on their prowess and their faults were overlooked, unless the crusade met with problems, when they, as guardians of the Holy Land, were blamed. Given that the orders never commanded crusades, only giving military support and advice, their image may be considered to have borne little relation to their actual behaviour.

Between 1128 and 1291 the military orders were criticized for being proud, envious, avaricious, lacking charity for their fellow orders or using violence on each other, treacherous, being in alliance with Muslims, being slothful or cowardly, rash, impeding the conversion of pagans, and not using their extensive assets effectively in support of the Holy Land. It is necessary to ask how far these criticisms were justified.

That the knight-brothers were proud can hardly be doubted; nevertheless, they usually bowed quickly enough to the wishes of secular rulers. Charges of envy, obviously, cannot easily be substantiated, but the accusations of avarice seem to have had substance behind them. Jacquemart Gielée's *Templar* states that the order must keep increasing its possessions, in order to defend the Holy Church;⁸ the orders were, like the

⁷Gilbert of Tournai, pp.56-7, para.17; Richard Mephram, in *Councils and Synods*, 2,2 p.815; *Chronicle of James I*, pp.648-50; Bruno of Olmütz, 'Bericht,' 18-28; Humbert of Romans, 'Opus Tripartium,' in *Fusciculus rerum Expetendarum et Fugendarum*, ed. E. Brown, 2 vols. (London, 1690) 2, Appendix, pp.185-228.

⁸*Renart le Nouvel*, lines 7571-5.

Cistercians, always willing to acquire land or other possessions. According to the story of the enchanted gold, they were prepared to betray their Christian comrades in order to do this. Certainly one attempt to bribe Templars was successful, when Brother Hugh of Stockton and other Templars of the English house released some criminals from their house at Bisham in exchange for a silver goblet. The consuls of Muhlhausen suspected the Teutonic brothers of claiming parishes which had not been granted to them, while in 1288 the Hospitallers and Templars in the kingdom of Sicily were accused of taking over monasteries and buying others which belonged by right to the Roman Church.⁹ Many legal cases arose out of such acquisitiveness; from the now infamous case of Christine, evicted from her own house by Brother Brian de Jay, preceptor of the Temple in Scotland, once before 1292, and then again in 1296;¹⁰ to a minor case in 1282 between the Hospital and Enguerrand de Fieffes, knight, who maintained that a loan of 200 pounds which the order was claiming from him was in fact cash which they had paid him for a sale: the order lost its claim.¹¹ Such cases cannot have helped the orders' reputation. Although they were far from being unique among monastic orders in being involved in such disputes, they had a particular reputation for legal manoeuvring which caused considerable

⁹On the Cistercians' avarice: Walter Map, pp.86-98, 104-110; and cf. Graves, 'Economic activities of the Cistercians,' 45-55. *Close rolls*, (1251-1253) p.428; *UB Thüringen*, no.147; *Cart.*, no. 4014.

¹⁰G. Barrow, 'The aftermath of war; Scotland and England in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries,' *TRHS* 28 (1978) 112-4; Walter Scott based the villainous Templar of *Ivanhoe*, Brian de Bois-Guilbert, on the character of Brian de Jay as recorded in this case.

¹¹*Cart.*, no.3788.

annoyance to lay opponents.¹²

The accusations of avarice may also have reflected hostility to the orders as moneylenders. However, no specific complaints were ever made against these operations, except Jean de Joinville's annoyance at the Temple's bureaucracy. In contrast, in his poem 'Mon chantar vueil retraire,' Peire Cardenal criticized the canons regular for lending at interest.¹³

We have already noted the deep impression which the orders' quarrels made on their contemporaries.¹⁴ Although the military orders had a reputation for never being in agreement with each other, in fact they often co-operated, as Jonathan Riley-Smith and Marie Luise Bulst-Thiele have shown.¹⁵ Not only did the officials of the orders make frequent attempts to bring peace between the brothers, but local houses, or brothers within them, made gifts to each other on various occasions: on

¹²Cart., no.3656; Strehlke, nos. 104, 106; Brand, 'Control of mortmain alienation,' pp.35-6; Forey, 'A thirteenth century disputation,' 182-5, 186; *Rot. Hund.* 1 pp.58. 83, 291, 401, 2 p.320; cf. Cart., no.2139.

¹³Joinville, pp.168-9, paras.412-4; Peire Cardenal, 'Mon chantar vueil retraire,' pp.390-1, strophe 4; cf. Bulst-Thiele, 'Der Prozeß gegen der Templerorden,' in Fleckenstein and Hellmann, eds., *Geistlichen Ritterorden*, p.377.

¹⁴See above, chapter three, p.162 ; Menko, p.555; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 4 pp. 139, 291, 5 pp.745-6; Flores, 2 p.264; *Historia Anglorum*, 2 p.472; Bartholomew of Neocastro, p.132; Hugh, lord of Berzé, *La Bible*, lines 261-266; Fidenzio of Padua, p.15, para.10; Gilbert of Tournai, p.57, para.17; Ramon Llull, 'Blanquerna,' pp.407-8, Bk.4, ch.80 para.7.

¹⁵Riley-Smith, *Knights of St. John*, pp.150-1, 469, 443-50; Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.235, 282, cf.191-2.

one such occasion the Templars of Breisig referred to `the discreet men in Christ, the dearest commander and brothers of the house of St. John of Jerusalem in Nuenburg.`¹⁶ However, friendship seldom makes news, whereas disputes between the defenders of the Holy Land were excitingly scandalous; and it was easy to blame the troubles of the Holy Land on so obvious a cause.

The military orders were often accused of treachery or deceit. One reason for this was the many well-publicized cases of renegades occurring during their history.¹⁷ Sometimes, however, a supposed renegade was no more than the commanding officer of a fortress besieged by the Saracens, forced to come to terms in order to save as much as he could for the order. On other occasions, accusations of treachery were simply attempts by crusaders, disappointed of victory over the Saracens, to blame someone other than themselves for their defeat. The remarks attributed by Matthew Paris to the Templars and Hospitaliers at the battle of Mansourah sum up the orders' natural defence against such accusations; why should they have joined a religious order if they were then to strive to overturn the Church and lose their souls?¹⁸

Less frequent were accusations that the brothers were in alliance with the Muslims; perhaps surprisingly, in view of the declaration of Gérald de Montréal that Brother William de Beaujeu was in close contact with a Saracen emir.¹⁹ At the beginning of the thirteenth century, Leo, king of Armenia, had complained to Innocent III that the Templars were allied with

¹⁶*Urkundenbuch für die Geschichte Niederrheins*, ed. T. J. Lacomblet, 4 vols., (reprinted Aalen, 1960) 2 p.88, no.171 note 2; cf. Cart., no. 3577.

¹⁷See above, chapter four, pp.197-9.

¹⁸Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 5 p.150.

¹⁹*Gestes*, pp.235, 240.

the sultan of Aleppo against him.²⁰ Otto of St. Blasien, writing between 1209 and 1222, accused all the Palestinian Franks, including the Templars and Hospitallers, of being friendly with the Muslims and so impeding the Germans' crusade.²¹ Some later critics complained that the alliances of the Templars, or the Templars and Hospitallers, with the Muslims of Damascus or Cairo, were harming the Christian cause in the Holy Land.²² Similar accusations were made against the Swordbrothers in Livonia, and the Hospitallers in the Latin empire of Constantinople.²³ Rather than accusing the orders of allying with Muslims, chroniclers preferred to depict them as the Muslims' dupes.²⁴

Accusations that the orders were not sufficiently enthusiastic about their vocation, of sloth or cowardice, were usually the reaction of Europeans who failed to comprehend the actual situation in the Holy Land.²⁵ Nevertheless, the rumours

²⁰Register of Innocent III, PL 215 col.689, 8 no.119.

²¹Otto of St. Blasien, p.327.

²²Gregory IX in Cart., no. 2149; the emperor Frederick II in Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 4 p.302; Robert of Artois in *ibid.*, 5 pp.149-50; Odo, bishop of Tusculanum, in *Spicilegium*, 3 p.625; repeated by John of Columna, p.119, and William of Nangis, *Gesta Ludovici*, pp.366-8.

²³*Registres de Gregoire IX*, no.2287; Cart., no.2186.

²⁴E.g., Roger of Howden, *Gesta*, 1 p.131 note 10 (ms.B).; Otto of St. Blasien, p.327; Gervase of Canterbury, 1 pp.137-8; *Ernoul*, pp.12-3; Albert Milioli, pp.639-40.

²⁵E.g., Philip de Nanteuil, *En chantant veil mon duel faire*, *Rothelin*, pp.538-49; Ambroise, lines 7691ff.; Roger of Wendover, 1 p.209; but cf. William of Tyre, 2 p.1008, Bk.22 ch.2.

that the Templars were unwilling to besiege Ascalon in 1154 because they would lose a rich source of plunder were probably well founded.²⁶ With this accusation we should expect to find the criticism that the orders were fond of easy living, *luxure*, which included a lack of chastity. The nearest thing to such an accusation is the remark of the writer of *Sur les états du monde*, in the first half of the thirteenth century, that the Hospitallers had no use for hired women as long as they had their horses; which were famed for their quality.²⁷ Jacquemart Gielée also implies such an accusation by placing both the Temple and Hospital under the control of *renars*. There were many complaints that the orders were wealthy,²⁸ and the orders themselves were at pains to point out to new recruits that life in the orders was not as comfortable as their image might have led them to believe;²⁹ but direct accusations of *luxure* were reserved for Cluniacs and the bishops.³⁰

There were very few direct criticisms of the orders' use of violence; the overwhelming bulk of Christendom approved of

²⁶*Fontes Egmundenses*, p.161.

²⁷'*Sur les états du monde*, p.123, XI verse 25.

²⁸E.g., William of Tyre, 1 p.554, Bk.12 ch.7, 2 p.817, Bk.18 ch.6; Walter Map, p.60; Bernart Sicart de Marvejols, 'Ab greu cossire,' strophe 3, lines 42-3; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 4 p.291.

²⁹*Règle*, p.337 para.658, p.339 para.661.

³⁰Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, 4 pp.76-77; Gerald of Wales, 4 p.54, 6 p.44; Matthew Paris, *Flores*, 2 p.117; cf. Frederick II in Winkelmann, ed., *Acta inedita*, p.370, no.437, lines 18-9, where the 'white brethren,' presumably Cistercians, are accused of *luxure*.

it.³¹ Yet accusations that the brothers were rash or failed to keep discipline may indicate opposition to the use of violence. Such accusations appeared sporadically, especially in connection with defeats; for instance, expressed by the Benedictine satirist Nigel de Longchamps shortly after the defeat of the Christians forces by Saladin in June 1179, and by Matthew Paris as a cause of the defeat of the Templars at Darbsak in 1237. This was a particularly significant criticism, as initially the Temple's discipline had greatly impressed onlookers.³²

Accusations that the brothers impeded the conversion of pagans were more common, originating in William of Tyre's popular tales; but also appeared in relation to the activities of the Swordbrothers and the Teutonic order in Livonia and Prussia.³³ There is no reason to doubt these accusations. The Teutonic brothers were quoted as declaring that they held more power as lords of pagans than as lords of Christians. Slaves were a valuable commodity, and the military orders feared economic loss if their slaves were baptized; their exploitation would be limited, and the way opened for their manumission. In 1262, the general chapter of the Hospital issued statutes forbidding slaves to be baptized without the master's special permission.³⁴ Although others might consider that the orders should be encouraging conversions, the orders were more concerned to guard their economic interests so as to press on more effectively with their military and hospitaller

³¹Cf. Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, especially pp.111-2.

³²Nigel de Longchamps, lines 2064-8; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 3 p.405; cf. Odo of Deuil, pp.124-8.

³³See above, chapter four, pp.194-5; *Registres de Gregoire IX*, nos. 2287, 3792-5; *Preuß. UB*, 1,1 no. 134, 1,2 no.65.

³⁴*Preuß. UB*, 1,1 no.134, p.101; *Cart.*, no.3039.49; Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, pp.48, 53, 146-151.

activities.

Europeans, of course, did not believe that the military orders had any need to guard their assets so jealously; they believed that they were rich, and that their constant cries of poverty were the result of using their assets inefficiently. Matthew Paris first recorded this complaint, but it was so natural a reaction to the orders' extensive immunities from episcopal authority that it is probable that it had been voiced for many years, at least since the Third Lateran Council, and probably since the orders first started to acquire extensive properties in the west. The complaint arose in 1274 at the second council of Lyons and at the Church councils held in February 1292, as a result of the loss of Acre. On the former occasion, Richard Mepham expressed it as the general opinion of monarchs.³⁵ The orders' defence was that they had far greater expenses than any monarch of western Europe, and very little income from their western possessions, for various reasons.³⁶ Certainly, the bureaucracy of the orders was inefficient, but, given the level of development in communications and finance in the thirteenth century, it is hard to see how they could have used their resources more effectively. Nevertheless, the complaints from the West were understandable; they saw *l'escorche qui est par defors*, the orders' vast estates, privileges and exemptions, and were unable to understand how the orders could fail to make ends meet, unless they were riddled with corruption, or avaricious, or deceitful. Through the medium of letters alone, the military orders could not convince Europeans of the true crisis in the East.³⁷

³⁵Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 3 p.178, 4 p.291; *Councils and Synods*, 2,2 pp.815, 1112 (14); Bartholomew Cotton, pp.208-9, 213; John of Thilrode, p.581.

³⁶E.g., Burton *Annals*, pp.493-4; *Cart.*, no.3308.

³⁷Cf. Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus*, pp.69, 161, esp. note 9, 202, 239-40, 250-1, etc.

It is important to note that the two most outrageous accusations against the order of the Temple during the trial - sodomy and idolatry - never appeared among the criticisms of the order during its history before 1291. Pope Gregory IX once accused the Hospital of having heretics among its ranks, and warned the brothers to reform themselves; which they apparently did, as the problem was never mentioned again. The orders' rules contained strict penalties for the sins of heresy or sodomy, but any cases which occurred did not attract public attention. It is impossible that Matthew Paris or Jacquemart Gielée should not have mentioned sins of this type, had they known of them. In contrast, John of Salisbury and Walter Map had made accusations of homosexuality against Cistercians and Cluniacs; presumably for the same reason that public schoolboys have had such a reputation in more recent times.³⁸ Probably the military orders were thought to be too manly to resort to such practices, as they practised the virile profession of arms; keeping the brothers away from women was a far greater problem.³⁹ It is clear that the charges brought in the trial were no more than conventional accusations made against political opponents.⁴⁰

While much of the criticism aimed at the military orders was justified or at least had a reasonable basis, it was balanced by praise, and, although the orders' critics might

³⁸Cart., no 2186; *Règle*, pp.153-4, para.231, p.229 para.418, p.230 para. 422, pp.297-8 paras. 571-3; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 2 p.199, Bk.7 ch.21, 695c-d, and note on line 21; Walter Map, p.80.

³⁹*Règle*, p.156 para.236, p.243 para.452, p.309 para.594; Cart., nos. 70.4,9, 2186; *Die statuten des Deutschen Ordens*, p.50 no.28, p.52 no.31, pp.80 no.2.

⁴⁰M. Barber, 'Propaganda in the Middle Ages: the charges against the Templars,' *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 17 (1973) 42-57.

call for reform, there were no calls for abolition. Criticism was aimed at all the military orders in general, although the Temple and the Hospital, in that order, received most attention from critics, simply because they were most in the public eye; and it was insignificant in comparison with the criticism aimed by both secular and regular clergy and the laity against corruption and lack of spirituality within the Church as a whole. Much of the criticism aimed at the military orders was simply part of this greater discontent at the state of Christendom, and must be considered in that context; it did not indicate vast discontent with the military orders in particular.

Yet, there was an aspect to this criticism which was seldom expressed but which must be understood. Any criticism of the military orders was significant, in that they were the defenders of the Holy Land and all Christendom, 'the defenders of the Holy Church,' as Jacquemart Giélée's *Templar* put it.⁴¹ Their early popularity, the praises and gifts heaped upon them, reflected this. But, 'from everyone who has been given much, much will be demanded,'⁴² and higher standards of behaviour were expected from the military orders than from other religious orders. Jacquemart Giélée's treatment of them indicates that they were seen to represent the highest standards of the Church, the last bastion of virtue. In his moralizing poem *Der Renner*, completed in 1300, Hugh of Trimberg drew attention to the decline of the 'high Templar order' as symptomatic of that of all monastic orders, while John Peckham, archbishop of Canterbury, mentioned the Temple alongside the Grandmontines as an order which had formerly been of the highest virtue.⁴³ Moreover, unlike other monastic orders, the

⁴¹*Renart le Nouvel*, lines 7559-60.

⁴²Luke, ch.12 verse 48.

⁴³Hugo von Trimberg, *Der Renner*, lines 11133-6; John Peckham, *Tractatus tres de paupertate*, p.173 lines 293-6.

military orders had a specific vocation in which they could be seen to succeed or to fail: the care of pilgrims in the Holy Land and the defence of Christendom. Failure was taken as a sign of God's displeasure, and therefore of sin.

The military orders were, therefore, particularly vulnerable to criticism, and none more so than the order of the Temple. This was not so much because it lacked the dual function of the Hospital and Teutonic order, but because, as we discussed in chapter four, it had caught public imagination to a greater degree than the other military orders, and was therefore more in the public eye. Moreover, as the first military order, it was considered to be principally responsible for the protection of the Holy Land; this would become clear in the reactions to the loss of Acre.⁴⁴

Yet its weakness did not necessarily involve its destruction. In 1291 the order of the Temple and the other international military orders were well-established religious orders, indispensable to pope and kings, widely respected for their wealth and power, if not always their virtues. Christendom looked to them to spearhead the recapture of the Holy Land, after undergoing a few fundamental, necessary reforms to render them more efficient.⁴⁵ The orders were not so corrupt that they could not be saved. The concept of the military order remained unquestioned, and abolition unthinkable; at least, no one appears to have thought of it.

The images of the military orders 1128-1291 form, at best, only a backdrop to the trial and the destruction of the order of the Temple. The specific causes of the order's destruction must lie nearer to hand, in the politics of the reign of Philip IV of France, and the activity, external and internal, of the order in the early fourteenth century.

⁴⁴See below, Appendix I.

⁴⁵Forey, 'Military orders in the crusading proposals of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.'

APPENDIX I:

THE IMPLICATION OF THE MILITARY ORDERS IN THE LOSS OF ACRE.

European reactions to the loss of Acre have been studied in depth by Silvia Schein.¹ However, her study of the military orders fails to appreciate certain points, which I now intend to highlight.

As defenders of the Christians in the Holy Land, it was inevitable that some blame for the loss of the city of Acre would fall on the military orders. The letter of John de Villiers, master of the Hospital, written soon after the loss of the city, suggests that popular opinion, and John himself, felt that all the brothers should have died rather than allow the city to be lost. He escaped, he wrote, only after he had done all he could to defend the city; he had been mortally wounded, and was carried into a ship by his servants. Otherwise, the reader senses, he would have remained until the end; he seems to have regretted having survived.²

One of the earliest third-party accounts of the loss of the city, that of the monastery of St. Peter of Erfurt, reinforces this impression. According to this account, written before news of the evacuation of Sidon and Castle Pilgrim had reached the writer, the Templars, and all those who had taken refuge in their house after the city fell to the Saracens, seeing that they had no hope of being rescued, conferred, prayed, committed their souls to Christ and then rushed out on the Saracens and fought valiantly to the last man. In default of better information on the fate of the last defenders of the city, this was obviously felt to be a fitting end for the knight-brothers; the implication is that every brother died,

¹S. Schein, 'The West and the Crusade, 1291-1313; Attitudes and Attempts,' unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge, 1980.

²Cart., no.4157.

that the order itself was destroyed with Acre.³

Other chroniclers also indicate that it was at first believed that all the Templars at Acre had died.⁴ Thaddeo of Naples refuted this, but stated that all the Teutonic brothers had been annihilated.⁵ In view of this, Nicholas IV's proposal that the military orders be unified would have appeared a reasonable measure to provide for the remaining brothers in the West. Some fifteen years later, Jacques de Molay, master of the Temple, accused Nicholas of calling the Church councils and making this proposal only in order to make it appear that he was doing something to deal with the situation, and to deflect blame for the loss of the city from himself.⁶ Although *De Excidio civitatis Acconis* endorsed Nicholas' suggestion that divisions between the military orders had contributed towards the downfall of Acre, it is likely that most of those contemporary chroniclers who blamed the military orders for the loss of the city did so as a result of the papal proposal.⁷

³Cronica S. Petri Erford., pp.424-5.

⁴Geoffrey de Callone, 'Chronicon,' RHGF 22 p.9; Jacobo d'Oria, in *Annali Genovesi*, 5 p.130.

⁵*Magistri Thadei Neapolitani, Historia de desolacione et conculcacione civitatis Acconensis et tocioe terre sancte, in A.D. MCCXCI..*, ed. P. Riant (Geneva, 1873) pp.20-22, 23-4. Thaddeo was probably a clerk: Schein, 'The West and the Crusade,' p.91.

⁶*Dossier*, p.4; Schein, 'The image of the crusader kingdom,' 706, agrees.

⁷*De excidio urbis Acconis Libri II*, in E. Martène and U. Durand, eds., *Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentum*, 5 (Paris, 1729) col.766; Dunstable annals, p.366; Bartholomew of Neocastro, p.132; but cf. p.108ff., where he blames the pope.

Unusually, in view of the orders' past history of being accused of treachery, for example, at Damascus on the second crusade, the orders' integrity was left unquestioned in the direct wake of the loss of Acre. Only a letter sent from the king of Armenia, purported to have been sent to him by the sultan of Egypt, accused the Templars of acting treacherously, and rejoiced that all three orders had been utterly destroyed. Although the letter was recorded both by Bartholomew Cotton at Norwich and in the episcopal register of Winchester, such accusations by the hated enemy were more likely to vindicate the military orders' reputation in Christian eyes than blacken it.⁸ Thaddeo of Naples denounced those Templars and Hospitallers who had failed to give their lives in the defence of the city as dishonoured cowards, but did not accuse them of treachery.⁹ The order of the Temple was, however, depicted in the popular *De Excidio Civitatis Acconis* as having been late in coming to the defence of the city and ineffectual when it appeared, in striking contrast to the order of the Hospital, in particular Brother Matthew de Clairmont, the marshal, who was described at considerable length with much rhetoric and stirring speech as a true knight of Christ, his death glorious martyrdom. This account, written soon after the loss of the city, was the most popular of the accounts of the disaster, surviving in a large number of Latin and French manuscripts, and was copied into a number of chronicles.¹⁰ The *De Excidio*

⁸Bartholomew Cotton, p.216; *Registrum Johannis de Pontissara, episcopi Wyntoniensis AD MCCLXXXII-MCCCXIV*, ed. C. Deedes, 2 vols., Canterbury and York Society 19 and 30 (London, 1915-24) 2 pp.481-2.

⁹Thaddeo of Naples, pp.20-22, 23.

¹⁰'De excidio,' Temple: pp.781, 782-4, Hospital: pp.772-3, 779, 781-2; Schein, 'The West and the Crusade,' p.82; William de Nangis, 'Chronicon,' RHGF 20 p.573-4; Morgan, 'Rothelin Continuation,' pp.256-7.

must have done a great deal to redress the balance in the Hospitallers' favour, after they had suffered the humiliating publicity defeat of failing to be annihilated in the loss of the city, even retaining their master alive. This account demonstrated that, although the master and many brothers had escaped, the courage and martyrdom of Brother Matthew had more than proven the virtue of the order. By brushing over the deeds of William de Beaujeu, and belittling the Templars' efforts at defending their house after the city was lost (they are shown as ineffectual and principally concerned to save their treasure) this account effectively removed the order of the Temple from the limelight and gave all the glory for the defence of the city to the Hospital. This can have been of no little importance at the trial of the Temple.

The significance of this version of events was even greater than appears at first sight, for, as Jacquemart Giélée shows, the Templars claimed to be solely responsible for the defence of the Holy Land, even claiming that, if they were to withdraw, there would be nothing to stop the Muslims overrunning the Holy Land and Europe as well.¹¹ Thaddeo of Naples endorsed Giélée's description of the Temple's claims and extended it, showing that the master of the Temple was particularly responsible for the safety of Acre. Rutebuef had also made this clear in his poem *Nouvelle Complaint d'Outremer*, while Bar Hebraeus' continuator called William de Beaujeu the Franks' 'Governor, the great count.' If he had not been killed, the city would not have fallen. Towards the middle of the fourteenth century, the Italian chronicler Giovanni Villani would repeat this belief still more forcibly: William had been *capitano generale della guerra, e della guardia della Terra*.¹²

Ricoldo de Monte Cruce, however, made an observation on

¹¹Renart *le Nouvel*, lines 7558-7581.

¹²Thaddeo of Naples, pp.18-20; Rutebuef, 1 p.508, lines 327-335; Bar Hebraeus, pp.492-3; *Cronica di Giovanni Villani*, ed. G. Antonelli, 4 vols. (Firenze, 1823) 2 pp.353-4.

the master's death which will bear further consideration. If William de Beaujeu had not died, the city could have been held; but he was shot by a Saracen, pierced by an arrow between stomach and liver, like a second Ahab. The reference is to the First Book of Kings, chapter 22, verses 34-35, and appears innocent enough; but Ricoldo was a Friar Preacher, and knew his Bible better than most. The reference to Ahab may be considered curiously appropriate in view of William de Beaujeu's royal connections, his international reputation, his great worldly influence, his alliances with Muslims. For Ahab, king of Israel, was a man of great international reputation; the king of Judah was subject to him; he built an ivory house and many cities; and he had an alliance with the pagan monarch of Sidon, to whose daughter, Jezebel, he was married. Yet Ahab is perhaps the most memorably unworthy king of the Old Testament: 'Never was a man who sold himself to do what is wrong in the Lord's eyes as Ahab did.' The implication of Ricoldo's analogy appears to have been that, just as Ahab, king of Israel, was unworthy to rule the kingdom of Israel, so William de Beaujeu, master of the Temple, was unworthy to hold the city of Acre; and, therefore, neither was his order.¹³

¹³ 'Lettres de Ricoldo de Monte Cruce,' ed. R. Röhrich, AOL 2 292; 1 Kings chapters 16 verse 29 to 22 verse 40, especially 21 verse 25.

APPENDIX II:
DONATIONS TO THE MILITARY ORDERS, 1128-1291.

What follows is an analysis of several cartularies of the major military orders. There are problems in identifying donations, as some apparent donations in alms were actually sales. In addition, the evidence is often incomplete. Early charters were often lost, or the donation never recorded in writing. Many Templar cartularies, such as those for the houses of Douzens, Richerenches, and Vaour, as well as Clovis Brunel's collection of charters in Provençal, only cover the twelfth century. In others the charters are not dated and are now virtually undateable, as, for example, in the case of the cartulary of the Hospitaller sisters of Minchin Buckland in Somerset.¹ Moreover, in the case of a modern compilation of charters, the criteria for the selection of charters are often unclear, as, for example, in the case of J. Delaville le Roulx' cartulary of the Hospital. The evidence of this cartulary may, therefore, be distorted for our purposes.

Michael Gervers, analysing gifts to the Hospital in Essex, produced the following figures: of 190 grants made to the order in the thirteenth century, 80% were made between 1220 and 1260, and one third in the 1230's. He suggested that this was related to the fact that Jerusalem was in Christian hands 1229-1244, but it is possible that it was the result of an alms-collecting drive by the Hospital to compensate for their loss of revenue in Sicily following the confiscations of the emperor Frederick II. It may also be not so much an increase as the peak before the fall: donations were rising 1200-1240 but then fell following the unsuccessful crusades of 1239 and 1240, and the loss of Jerusalem and disaster at La Forbie in 1244.²

¹A cartulary of Buckland Priory in the county of Somerset, ed. F. W. Weaver, Somerset Record Society, 25 (1909).

²Gervers, *Cartulary*, pp.xlv-xlvi; Cart.,no.1973.

Gervers noted that the type of donations changed with time. After 1240, the proportion of rents donated became higher than the proportion of land; whereas in the twelfth century only 11% of grants had been of rent alone, in the period 1200-1240 this rose to 38%, and between 1240 and 1260 it became 65%; however, between 1260 and 1270 the proportion of gifts of land rose again. What was more, the value of rents rose; whereas 33% of rents granted between 1230 and 1240 were over 9d., this rose to 43% between 1240 and 1250, and 46% between 1250 and 1260; after 1260, the number of grants in general fell. The last grant of rent in the thirteenth century was in 1283, and of land was in 1285. This was largely due to the Statute of Mortmain of 1279.³

The analysis which follows has been drawn from the Sandford cartulary (Temple, England), the Provins cartulary (Temple, France), the Beauvoir cartulary (Teutonic order, France), the Thuringian cartulary (Teutonic order, Germany), the Hesse cartulary (Teutonic order, Germany) and the general cartulary of the Hospitallers published by Delaville le Roulx. These cartularies were selected as those covering the longest period, and a broad geographical area, but are not free from problems: the cartulary of Provins becomes fragmentary after 1240, while the dating of many charters is uncertain or approximate. The analysis includes only donations, exemptions and privileges given in alms, and excludes papal charters.

³Gervers, *Cartulary*, pp. xlvi-xlvii.

	Sand.	Prov.	Beau. ⁴	Thur.	Hesse. ⁵	Cart.
1130-1139	4	1				29
1140-1149	11	-				44
1150-1159	11	1				45
1160-1169	10	1				52
1170-1179	8	1				69
1180-1189	17	-				68
1190-1199	31	4				59
1200-1209	18	1		2	1	65
1210-1219	26	20	2	7	2	55
1220-1229	38	6	13	10	7	53
1230-1239	16	14	10	5	10	54
1240-1249	20	5	4	12	3	39
1250-1259	21	2	-	12	16	45
1260-1269	9	1	2	19	16	52
1270-1279	21 ⁶	-	2	38	20	34
1280-1289	-	-	-	62	20	41
1290-1291	-	-	-	7	4	9

This survey suggests that, while donations in England and France fell after 1240 or 1250, donations in Germany continued to rise. This may be confirmed by an analysis of the cartulary of the Hospitallers for the thirteenth century.

⁴Lalore, ed., `Chartes de la commanderie de Beauvoir de l'ordre Teutonique,` *Collection des Principaux Cartulaires du diocese de Troyes*, 7 vols. (Paris/Troyes, 1875ff) 3 pp.177-328. The first donation to the Teutonic order at Beauvoir was made in 1219.

⁵The earliest charters of the commanderies of Thuringia and Hesse date from the first decade of the thirteenth century.

⁶Nineteen of these are very small grants of land by one donor.

	Germany and Eastern Europe	Elsewhere	Total	% German
1200-09	10	55	65	15
1210-19	14	41	55	25
1220-29	18	35	53	34
1230-39	10	44	54	19
1240-49	17	22	39	23
1250-59	24	21	45	53
1260-69	30	22	52	58
1270-79	18	16	34	53
1280-89	29	12	41	71
1290-91	4	5	9	44

This analysis bears out the impression given by the cartularies for individual houses, that donations in Germany rose rather than fell during the thirteenth century, whereas those elsewhere fell. The cartulary of the Hospitallers suggests that donations peaked at the beginning of the thirteenth century, fell, rose again during the 1230s and then fell after 1240. The rise in the 1230s is not mirrored in every other cartulary, but it does appear that donations in England and France began to fall off 1240-1250. Irregularities between houses may be due to local variations in opinion, or to dating of undated charters by the editors of the text.

However, where this information is available, I have not found that Michael Gerber's findings in Essex concerning changes in donations from land to rents after 1240 occurred elsewhere. Gifts of rent were never important at Sandford, and although the number of donations of rent did rise, from two between 1201 and 1210 to three between 1241 and 1250, the value of rents given fell. This difference is probably due to differences in the availability of land in Oxfordshire and central southern England and in Essex. A survey of gifts to the Hospital 1200-1250 indicates that rents were given where land was in short supply, that is, the Holy Land and N.E. France/Flanders.

The fact that donations seem to fall after 1210 according to the general cartulary of the Hospital, whereas not until

1250/1260 according to the cartularies of Sandford and Essex, may be a result of the different social levels of the donors. The majority of charters of donation in the Hospitallers' cartulary are from the high nobility, whereas the Sandford and Essex cartularies contain mainly gifts from the lesser landholders, knightly tenants and the free peasantry. In a study of the Clare family in England, J. C. Ward noted that the family's flow of monastic endowment was reduced towards the end of the twelfth century, and suggested that the family felt that sufficient land and revenues had been given to monasteries. In the thirteenth century, the Clares maintained close contact only with Tewkesbury abbey; their patronage of the friars was less enthusiastic than their earlier patronage of monasteries. Attitudes to almsgiving appear to have changed; this trend is discernable among the higher nobility throughout western Europe.⁷ In contrast, the smaller landowners, anxious to underline and stimulate their rise in social status by charitable and monastic donations to the most prestigious causes, continued to give generously. In Germany and eastern Europe, where the military orders were relative newcomers, they continued to attract generous donations throughout the thirteenth century from all classes; while the Teutonic order, as a national order, was particularly popular.

⁷Ward, 'Fashions in Monastic Endowment,' 446-51; Raban, *Mortmain Legislation*, pp.131-3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This includes the sources given in the footnotes, and also works not specifically cited but which significantly contributed to this thesis.

Primary sources.

- `L'abbaye de Bordesley et les livres de Guy de Beauchamp,` ed.
M. Blaess, *Romania* 78 (1957) 511-518
- Abou `L-Feda, `Annals,` in RHC Or 1
- Abu Shamah, `The Book of the Two Gardens,` in RHC Or 4-5
- Acta Imperii adhuc inedita: Acta Imperii inde ab Henrico I ad Henricum VI usque adhuc inedita. Urkunden des Kaiserreiches aus dem X, XI, und XII Jahrhundert,* ed. K. F. Stumpf- Bretano, 2 vols. (Innsbruck, 1865-1881): vol.3 of K. F. Stumpf-Bretano, *Die Reichkanzler vernehmlich des X, XI und XII Jahrhunderts nebst einem Beitrage zu den Regesten und zur Kritik der Kaiserurkunden Dieser Zeit*
- Acta inedita seculi XIII: Urkunden und Briefe zur Geschichte des Kaiserreichs und des Königreichs Sicilien in den Jahren 1198 bis 1273,* ed. E. Winkelmann (Innsbruck, 1880)
- Actes du Parlement de Paris,* ed. E. Boutaric, 2 vols (Paris, 1863-7, reprinted Hildesheim/New York, 1975)
- Albert von Beham: C. Höfler, ed., *Albert von Beham und regesten Innocenz IV,* BLVS 16.2 (Stuttgart, 1847)
- Albert Milioli, `Liber de temporibus et aetatibus et Chronica imperatorum,` ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGHS 31
- Alexander III, `Epistolae,` in PL 200
- Alexander IV, *Registres,* ed. C. Bourel de la Roncière, et al., 3 vols., BEFAR (Paris, 1896-1953)
- Alexander Minorita, *Expositio in Apocalypsim,* ed. A. Wachtel, MGH Die Deutschen Geschichtsquellen des Mittelalters 500-1500, Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 1 (Weimar, 1955)
- Aliscans, chanson de geste,* ed. F. Guessard and A. de Montaiglon (Paris, 1890, reprinted Nendeln, 1966)
- Alphonse de Poitiers, *Correspondance Administrative,* ed. A.

- Molinier, 2 vols., Collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France (Paris, 1894-1900)
- Ambroise, *Estoire de Guerre Sainte: Histoire en vers de la troisième croisade*, ed. G. Paris, Collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, (Paris, 1897)
- Anglo-Norman Political Songs*, ed. I. S. T. Aspin, Anglo-Norman Texts 11 (Oxford, 1953)
- The Anglo-Saxon chronicle: a revised translation*, ed. D. Whitelock, D. C. Douglas and S. Tucker (London, 1965)
- Annali Genovesi di Caffaro e de'suoi continuatori dal MXCIX al MCCXCIII*, ed. L. T. Belgrano and C. I. di Sant'Angelo, new edn., 5 vols., Fonti per la Storia Italia nos. 11-14bis (Rome, 1890-1929) and ed. G. H. Pertz, MGHS 18
- 'Annales Casinenses,' ed. G. H. Pertz, MGHS 19
- Annales Cestrienses, or the Chronicle of the Abbey of St. Werburg at Chester*, ed. R. C. Christie, Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society, 14 (1886)
- 'Annales Colmarienses maiores,' ed. P. Jaffé, MGHS 17
- 'Annales Colmarienses minores,' ed. P. Jaffé, MGHS 17
- 'Annales Colonienses Maximi,' ed. K. Pertz, MGHS 17
- 'Annales Herbipolenses,' ed. G. H. Pertz, MGHS 16
- 'Annales Ianuenses,' in *Annali Genovesi di Caffaro* 3
- Annales Monastici*, ed. H. R. Luard, 5 vols., RS 36 (London, 1864-1869)
- 'Annales S. Pataleonis Coloniensis,' ed. H. Cardauns, MGHS 22
- 'Annales S. Rutberti Salisburgensis,' ed. D. W. Wattenbach, MGHS 9
- 'Annales de Terre Sainte,' ed. R. Röhricht and G. Raynaud, AOL 2 427-461
- Annals of Burton, in *Annales Monastici* 1
- Annals of Dunstable, in *Annales Monastici* 3
- Annals of Osney, in *Annales Monastici* 4
- Annals of Tewkesbury, in *Annales Monastici* 1
- Annals of Walden, in *Monasticon Anglicanum* 4
- Annals of Waverley, in *Annales Monastici* 2
- Annals of Winchester, in *Annales Monastici* 2
- Anonymous of Béthune, RHGF 24 pp.750-775
- Anonymous of Passau, in *Quellen zur Geschichte der Waldenser*, ed. A. Patschovsky and K.-V. Selge, Texte zur Kirchen und

- Theologiegeschichte, Heft 18 (Gütersloh, 1973)
- Anonymous Pilgrim 5,2 in *Anonymous pilgrims I-VIII (11th and 12th centuries)* trans. A. Stewart, PPTS 6 (London, 1894)
- Anselm, bishop of Havelburg, 'Dialogi,' in PL 188
- 'Antéchrist,' in 'Notice du manuscrit 'French 6' de la John Rylands Library, Manchester,' ed. R. Fawtier and E. C. Fawtier-Jones, *Romania* 49 (1923) IX, 331-340
- St. Antony of Padua, *Sermones Dominicales et in Solemnitatibus*, vol. 1 ed. A. M. Locatelli, vol. 2 ed. J. Muranon et al., (Padua, 1895-1903)
- Arnold, Abbot of Lubeck, 'Chronicon Slavorum,' ed. B. V. M. Ill. I. M. Lappenberg, MGHS 21
- Aubrey des Trois-Fontaines, 'Chronicon,' ed. P. Scheffer-Boichorst, MGHS 23
- 'Aucharium Aquicinense,' ed. D. L. C. Bethmann, MGHS 6
- Baldwin of Ninove, 'Chronicon,' ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGHS 25
- Bar Hebraeus: *The chronography of Gregory Abū'l-Faraj (1225-1286) the son of Aaron, the Hebrew Physician, commonly known as Bar Hebraeus, being the first part of his history of the world*, trans. E. A. W. Budge, 2 vols. (London, 1932, reprinted Amsterdam, 1976) 1
- Bartholomew Cotton, *Historia Anglicana*, ed. H. R. Luard, RS 16 (London, 1859)
- Bartholomew de Neocastro, 'Historia Sicula,' ed. G. Paladino, RIS ns 13.3
- La Bataille Loquifer*, ed. J. Runsberg, Acta Societatis Scienciarum Fenniae, 38 no.2 (Helsingfors, 1913)
- Benjamin of Tudela, *Itinerary*, ed. M. N. Adler (London, 1907)
- Bernard of Clairvaux, 'Liber ad milites Templi de laude novae militiae,' in *Opera*, ed. J. Leclercq and H. M. Rochais, 8 vols. (Rome, 1957-77) 3 pp.205-239
- 'Epistolae,' PL 182
- Bernart Sicart de Marvejols, 'Ab greu cossire,' in M. Raynouard, ed., *Choix des poésies originales des troubadours*, 4
- Bertrand de Bar-sur-Aube, *Girart de Vienne*, ed. W. van Emden, SATF (Paris, 1977)
- 'Du Bon William Longespee,' in A. Jubinal, ed., *Nouveau recueil*

de contes, dits, fabliaux, et autres pièces inédits des XIIIe, XIVe et XVe siècles, pour faire suite aux collections legrand d'Aussy, Barbazan et Méon, mis au jour pour la première fois, 2 vols. (Paris, 1839-42) 2 pp.339-353

Bruno, bishop of Olmütz, `Bericht am Papst Gregor X,` in C. Höfler, `Analecten zur Geschichte Deutschlands und Italiens,` part 1, *Abhandlungen der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, series 3, 4 part 3 (1846)*

Bueve de Hantone:

- *Der anglonormannische Bueve de Haumtone*, ed. A. Stimming, Bibliotheca Normannica, 7 (Halle, 1899)
- *Der festländische Bueve de Hantone: Fassung I*, ed. A. Stimming, GRL 25 (Dresden, 1911)
 - *Fassung II*, ed. A. Stimming, 2 vols., GRL 30, 41 (Dresden, 1912-1918)
 - *Fassung III*, ed. A. Stimming, 2 vols., GRL 34, 42 (Dresden, 1914-1920)

Burton Annals, in *Annales Monastici* 1

The Burton Lazars cartulary: a medieval Leicestershire estate, Burton Lazars research group, ed. T. Bourne and D. Marcombe (University of Nottingham, Dept. of Adult Education, 1987)

Caesarius of Heisterbach: *Caesarii Heisterbachensis monachi ordinis Cisterciensis Dialogus Miraculorum*, ed. J. Strange, 2 vols. (Cologne, Bonn and Brussels, 1851)

Calendar of the Charter Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office, 1ff., 1226ff. (London, 1903ff.)

Calendar of the Close Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office. Edward I, vols. 1-3 (London, 1900-4)

Calendar of the Liberate Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III, 6 vols. (London, 1916-64)

Calendar of the Patent Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office, 1216ff. (London, 1901ff.)

Carmina Burana: lateinische und deutsche Lieder und Gedichte; einer Handschrift des XIII Jahrhunderts ed. J. A. S., BLVS 16.1 (Stuttgart, 1847)

- Cartulaire de la commanderie de Richerenches de l'ordre du Temple (1136-1214)* ed. le Marquis de Ripert-Monclar (Avignon, 1907)
- Cartulaire Général de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de S. Jean de Jérusalem, 1100-1310*, ed. J. Delaville le Roulx, 4 vols., (Paris, 1894-1905)
- Cartulaire Général de Paris*, ed. R. de Lasteyrie, 1 (528-1180) (Paris, 1887)
- Cartulaire Général de l'ordre du Temple, 1119?-1150*, ed. le Marquis d'Albon (Paris, 1913)
- Cartulaire Normand de Philippe-Auguste, Louis VIII, Saint Louis et Philippe le Hardi*, ed. L. Delisle (Caen, 1882, reprinted Geneva, 1978)
- Cartulaire de la commanderie de Beauvoir, de l'ordre Teutonique*, in L'Abbé Lalore, ed., *Collection des principaux cartulaires du diocèse de Troyes*, 7 vols. (Paris/Troyes, 1875ff.) 3
- Cartulaires des Templiers de Douzens*, ed. P. Gérard and E. Magnou, *Collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France*, série in 8°, 3 (Paris, 1965)
- Cartulaire des Templiers de Vaour (Tarn)*, ed. C. Portal and E. Cabié, *Archives Historiques de l'Albigeois*, fasc.1 (Albi, 1894)
- A Cartulary of Buckland Priory in the county of Somerset*, ed. F. W. Weaver, *Somerset Record Society*, 25 (1909)
- The Cartulary of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in England, Secunda Camera. Essex*, ed. M. Gervers. *Records of Social and Economic History*, new series 6, published for the British Academy (Oxford, 1982)
- Casus monasterii Petrihusensis*, ed. O. Abel and L. Weiland, MGHS 20
- La chanson de Roland*, ed. F. Whitehead (Oxford, 1946)
- Charters of the Honour of Mowbray, 1107-1191*, ed. D. Greenway, *Records of Social and Economic History*, new series 1 (London, 1972)
- Chartes de Départ et de Retour des comtes de Dampierre-en-Astenois, I^{ve} et Ve croisades*, ed. A. de Barthélemy, AOL 2 184-207
- Chartes du Terre Sainte*, ed. J. Delaville le Roulx, ROL 11

(1908) 181-191

- La chastelaine de Vergi, poème du XIII siècle*, ed. G. Raynaud, 2nd ed. revised par L. Foulet, CFMA 1 (Paris, 1912)
- La chevalerie d'Ogier de Danemarche*, ed. M. Eusebi (Milan and Varese, 1953)
- Choix des poésies originales des troubadours*, ed. M. Raynouard, 6 vols. (Paris, 1816-21)
- Chrestien, *Guillaume de l'Angleterre, roman du XII siècle*, ed. M. Wilmotte, CFMA 55 (Paris, 1978)
- Chrestien de Troyes, *Cligès*, ed. A. Micha, CFMA 84 (Paris, 1982)
- Chronica Buriensis, the Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds 1212-1301*, ed. A. Gransden (London and Edinburgh, 1964)
- Chronica Johannis de Oxenedes*, ed. H. Ellis, RS 13 (London, 1859)
- The chronicle of Melrose: a facsimile edition*, ed. A. O. and M. O. Anderson (London, 1936) and extr. ed. R. Pauli in MGHS 27
- The chronicle of Novgorod 1016-1471*, trans. R. Mitchell and N. Forbes, Camden 3rd series 25 (London, 1914)
- Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I*, ed. R. Howlett, 4 vols., RS 82 (London, 1884-89)
- 'Chronicon Hanoniense quod dicitur Balduini Avennensis,' ed. J. Heller, MGHS 25, and extr. RHGF 21.
- Chronicon de Lanercost, MCCI-MCCCXLVI*, ed. J. Stevenson, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1839)
- 'Maius Chronicon Lemovicense,' RHGF 21
- 'Chronicon Montis Sereni,' ed. E. Ehrenfeuchter, MGHS 23
- 'Chronicon Rotomagensis.' extr. RHGF 23
- 'Chronicon Turonense,' extr. RHGF 18
- Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le trésorier*, ed. L. de Mas Latrie, SHF (Paris, 1871)
- 'Chroniques de St. Denis,' extr. RHGF 12, 17, 21
- Li romans de Claris et Laris*, ed. J. Alton, BLVS 169 (Tübingen, 1884; reprinted Amsterdam, 1966)
- Clement IV, *Registres*, ed. E. Jordan, BEFAR (Paris, 1893-1945)
- Close Rolls of the reign of Henry III preserved in the Public Record Office*, 1227ff. (London, 1902ff.)
- Codex Diplomaticus et Epistolaris regni Bohemiae*, ed. G.

- Friedrich et al., 5 vols. in 7 (Prague, 1904-1981)
Codex Diplomaticus Brandenburgensis. Sammlung der Urkunden, Chroniken und sonstigen Geschichtsquellen für die Geschichte der Mark Brandenburg und ihrer Regenten, ed. A. F. Riedel, 41 vols. (Berlin, 1838-69)
- `De Constructione castri Saphet,` ed. R. B. C. Huygens, *Studi Medievali*, 3rd. series, 6 (1965) 355-387
- `Continuatio Aquicinctina,` ed. D. L. C. Bethmann, MGHS 6
- `Continuatio Cuonradi praepositi Urspergensis,` ed. O. Abel and L. Weiland, MGHS 23
- `Continuatio 1 Minoritae Erphordiensis,` ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGHS 24
- `Continuatio Premonstratensis` ed. D. L. C. Bethmann, MGHS 6
- La continuation de Guillaume de Tyr, (1184-97)*, ed. M. R. Morgan (Paris, 1982)
- `La continuation de Guillaume de Tyr, de 1228 à 1261, dit du manuscrit de Rothelin,` in RHC Occ 2
- The continuations of the Old French Perceval of Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. W. Roach et al., 5 vols. in 6 (Philadelphia, 1949-83)
- `The Council of Pisa, 1135: a re-examination of the evidence for the canons,` ed. R. Somerville, *Speculum* 45 (1970) 98-114
- Councils and Synods with other documents relating to the English Church*, ed. D. Whitelock, F. M. Powicke et al., 2 vols. in 4, (Oxford, 1964-81)
- Le couronnement de Louis: chanson de geste du XIIe siècle*, ed. E. Langlois, CFMA 22 (Paris, 1984)
- `Cronica S. Petri Erfordiensis Moderna,` ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGHS 30
- Crusaders as conquerors. The chronicle of the Morea, translated from the Greek*, by H. E. Lurier (New York and London, 1964)
- Daspol, `Seinhos, aujas, c'aves saber e sen,` in `Les derniers troubadours de Provence`
- `La Défense du Temple devant le concile de Lyons en 1274,` ed. P. Amargier, in *1274: L'année charnière: Mutations et continuités, Lyon-Paris 30 Septembre-5 Octobre 1974,*

- Colloques internationaux du Centre national de la
recherche scientifique (Paris, 1977) pp.495-501
- `Les Derniers Troubadours de la Provence d'après le chansonnier
donné à la Bibliothèque impériale par M. Ch. Giraud,` ed.
P. Meyer, BEC 5, 6ème série (1869) 245-97, 461-531, 649-87
- `Descente de Saint Paul en enfer,` in `Les versions françaises
inédites de la descente de Saint Paul en enfer: 1,` ed.
L.-E. Kastner, *Revue des Langues Romanes* 48 (1905) 385-95
- Diplomatarium Suecarum*, ed. J. G. Lijegren, 1 (Holm, 1829)
- Diplomatic Documents preserved in the Public Record Office*, 1
(1101-1272) ed. P. Chaplais (London, 1964)
- `Un document sur les débuts des Templiers,` ed. J. Leclercq
Revue de l'histoire ecclésiastique, 52 (1957) 81-91
- Le Dossier de l'affaire des Templiers*, ed. G. Lizerand (Paris,
1923)
- `The downfall of the Templars and a letter in their defence,`
ed. C. H. Cheney, in C. H. Cheney, ed., *Medieval Texts and
Studies* (Oxford, 1973) pp.314-327
- The legend of Duke Ernst*, trans. J. W. Thomas and C. Dussère
(Lincoln (Neb.) and London, 1979)
- Dunstable Annals, in *Annales Monastici* 3
- Eberhard, archdeacon of Ratisbon, `Annales,` ed. P. Jaffé,
MGHS 17
- `Emprunts de Saint Louis en Palestine et en Afrique.
Appendice,` ed. G. Servois, BEC 19 (1858) 283-293
- Escanors*, ed. H. Michelant, BLVS 178 (Tübingen, 1886)
- Esclarmonde, Clarisse et Florent, Yde et Olive, drei
Forsetzungen der chanson von Hugh de Bordeaux*, ed. M.
Schweigel, Ausgaben und Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete für
romanische Philologie, ed. E. Stengel, 83 (Marburg, 1889)
- `Etoire de Eracles empereur et la conquete de la Terre
d'Outremer,` in RHC Occ 2
- Etudes sur les actes de Louis VII*, ed. A. Luchaire (Paris,
1885)
- Eudes Rigord, *Registrum visitationum archiepiscopi
Rothomagensis: Journal des visites pastorales d'Eudes
Rigaud, archevêque de Rouen*, ed. T. Bonnin (Rouen, 1852)
- `De Excidio urbis Acconis Libri II,` in E. Martène and U.

Durand, eds., *Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentum*, 5 (Paris, 1729) col.757ff.

Fidenzio de Padua, `Liber recuperationis Terrae Sanctae,` in P. G. Golubovich, *Bibliotheca Bio-Bibliographia Della Terra Sancta e dell'oriente francescano*, 2 (Quarrachi, 1913) pp.9-60

La Fille du comte de Ponthieu, nouvelle du XIIIe siècle, ed. C. Brunel, CFMA 52 (Paris, 1926)

Foedera, conventiones, litterae et cuiuscumque generis acta publica inter reges Angliae et alios quosvis imperatores, reges, pontifices, principes vel communitates, ed. T. Rymer, R. Sanderson, enlarged and amended by A. Clark and F. Holbrooke, 4 vols. in 7 parts (Record Commission, London, 1816-69)

Fontes Egmundenses, ed. O. Oppermann, Werken uitgegeven door het Historisch Genootschap (Gevestigd te Utrecht) derde Serie, no.61 (Utrecht, 1933), also ed. G. H. Pertz, in MGHS 16

`Fragment d'un cartulaire de l'ordre de Saint-Lazare en Terre Sainte,` ed. Comte de Marsy, AOL 2, Documents, 121-157

`Fragmentum de captione Damiatiae,` in *Quinti Belli Sacri Scriptores*

Gautier de Tournai, *L'Histoire de Gille de Chyn*, ed. E. B. Place (Chicago, 1941, reprinted New York, 1970)

Geoffrey de Callone, `Chronicon,` extr. RHGF 22

Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia regum Britanniae I*, ed. N. Wright (Cambridge, 1985)

Gerald of Wales, *Opera*, ed. J. S. Brewer et al., 8 vols., RS 21 (London, 1861-91)

Gerhoh of Reichersberg, `De investigatione Antichristi,` ed. E. Sackur, MGH *Libelli de Lite Imperatorum et Pontificum*, 3 (Hanover, 1897)

Gervase of Canterbury, *Historical Works*, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols., RS 73 (London, 1879-90)

`Gesta crucigerorum Rhenanorum,` in *Quinti Belli Sacri Scriptores*

`Gesta obsidionis Damiatiae,` in *Quinti Belli Sacri Scriptores*

- and ed. O. Holder-Egger, in MGHS 31
- Les Gestes des Chyprois, recueil de chroniques françaises écrites en orient en XIII et XIV siècles*, ed. G. Raynaud, SOL (Paris, 1887, reprinted Osnabrück, 1968)
- Ghislebert, `Chronicon Hanoniense,` ed. W. Arndt, MGHS 21
- Gilbert of Tournai, `Collectio de Scandalis Ecclesiae,` ed. A. Stroick, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 24 (1931) 33-62
- Giovanni Villani, *Cronica*, ed. G. Antonelli, 4 vols. (Firenze, 1823)
- Godfrey of Viterbo, `Pantheon,` ed. G. Waitz, MGHS 22
- Gontier de Soignies: *Gontier de Soignies: il canzoniere*, ed. L. Formisano (Milan and Naples, 1980)
- Gregory IX, *Registres*, ed. L. Auvray, 4 vols., BEFAR (Paris, 1896-1955)
- Gregory X, *Registres*, ed. J. Guiraud, BEFAR (Paris, 1892-1960)
- Gregory of Tours, *Histoire de Francs*, ed. H. Omont and G. Collon, Collection de textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'histoire, 2 vols. (Paris, 1886-1893)
- Guigues, abbot of La Grande Chartreuse, letter to the order of Temple, in *Lettres des premiers Chartreux*, I, Sources Chrésiennes no.88 (Paris, 1962)
- Guilhem de Berguedan: `El testamento de trovador Guilhem de Berguedan,` ed. M. de Riquier, *Mélanges de linguistique et de littérature romanes à la mémoire d'Istvan Frank*, *Annales Universitatis Sarraviensis* 6 (1957) 573-583
- Guilhem Figueira, ein provenzlicher Troubadour*, ed. E. Levy (Berlin, 1880)
- Guillaume le Clerc, *Le Besant de Dieu*, ed. P. Ruelle (Brussels, 1973)
- Guillaume de Puylaurens, `Historia Albigensium,` RHGF 19
- Guiot de Provins, `La Bible,` in *Les oeuvres de Guiot de Provins, poète lyrique et satirique*, ed. J. Orr (Manchester, 1915)
- Guy of Bazoches: in Aubrey des Trois-Fontaines` chronicle.
- Hadrian IV, `Epistolae,` in PL 188
- Henry of Livonia, `Chronicon Lyvoniae,` ed. W. Arndt, MGHS 23
- Historia diplomatica Fridericii Secundi*, ed. J. L. A. Huillard-Bréholles, 6 vols. in 11 (Paris, 1852-61, reprinted Turin,

1963)

Historia pontificum et comitum Engolismensium, ed. J. Boussard,
Bibliothèque Elzéviriennne (Paris, 1957)

Histoire et Cartulaire des Templiers de Provins, ed. V.
Carrière (Paris, 1919)

*Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal, comte de Striguil et de
Pembroke*, ed. P. Meyer, 3 vols., SHF (Paris, 1891-1901)

Historical documents of Ireland, ed. J. T. Gilbert, RS 53
(London, 1878)

Honorius III, *Regesta*, ed. P. Pressutti, 2 vols. (Rome, 1888-
95, reprinted Hildersheim/New York, 1978)

Honorius IV, *Registres*, ed. M. Prou, BEFAR (Paris, 1888)

*The Hospitallers` Riwle (Miracula et Regula Hospitalis Sancti
Johannis Jerusolimitani)*, ed. K. V. Sinclair, Anglo-Norman
texts 42 (Oxford, 1984)

Hugh, lord of Berzé: *La `Bible` au seigneur de Berzé*, ed. F.
Lecoy (Paris, 1938)

Hugh de Neville: M. S. Giuseppe, `On the testament of Sir Hugh
de Neville, written at Acre, 1267` *Archaeologia*, 56 (1899)
351-370.

Hugh `Peccator,` in J. Leclercq, ed., `Un document sur les
débutés des Templiers, *Revue de l`histoire ecclésiastique*,
52 (1957) 81-91; and C. Sclafert, ed., `Lettre inédite de
Hugues de Saint-Victor aux chevaliers du Temple,` *Revue
d`ascétique et de mystique*, 34 (1958) 275-299

Hugo von Trimberg, *Der Renner*, ed. G. Ehrismann, 4 vols., BLVS
247-8, 252, 256 (Tübingen, 1909)

Humbert de Romans, `De eruditione Praedictorum, Liber II: de
Modo Prompte cudiendi Sermones ad omne hominum et
negotiorum genus,` in M. de la Bigne, ed., *Maxima
Bibliotheca veterum patrum et antiquorum scriptorum
ecclesiasticorum*, 27 vols. (Lyons, 1677) 25, p.424ff.

- `Opus Tripartium,` in *Fasciculus rerum Expetendarum et
Fugiendarum*, 2, *Appendix*, ed. E. Brown, 2 vols. (London,
1690) p.185ff.

Ibn Alatyry, `El-Kamel Altevarylch,` in RHC Or 1

Ibn al-Qalanisi, `Chronicle,` extr. and trans. in *The Damascus
chronicle of the Crusades*, by H. A. R. Gibb (London, 1932)

- `Imâd ad-Din al-Isfahâni, *Conquête de la Syrie et de la Palestine par Saladin (al-Fath al-qussi fi l-fath al qudsi)*, trans. H. Mascé (Paris, 1972)
- Innocent III, *Letters concerning England and Wales. A Calendar with an appendix of texts*, ed. C. R. Cheney and M. G. Cheney (Oxford, 1967)
- `Liber registorum sive epistolarum,` 3 vols., PL 214-216 (`Registers`)
 - *Die Register Innocenz` III*, ed. O. Hageneder and A. Haidacher, 2 vols. in 4 (Graz-Cologne, 1964-8, Rome-Vienna, 1979-83)
- Innocent IV, *Registres*, ed. E. Berger, 4 vols., BEFAR (Paris, 1884-1921)
- Letters: P. Sambin, *Problemi Politici attraverso lettere inedite di Innocenzo IV*, Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed Arti Venezia, Memorie classe di scienze morali e lettere, 31 fasc.3 (Venice, 1955)
- Issac of Étoile, `Sermones,` in PL 194.
- Itinerarium Peregrinorum et gesta Regis Ricardi*, in W. Stubbs, ed., *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I*, 2 vols., RS 38 (London, 1864-5) 1
- Jacobo d`Oria, `Annales,` in *Annali Genovesi* 5
- Jacquemart Giélee, *Renart le Nouvel*, ed. H. Roussel, SATF (Paris, 1961)
- Jacques de Vitry, `Historia Orientalis,` in J. Bongars, ed., *Gesta Dei per Francos*, 2 vols. in 3 (Hanover, 1611) 1,2 pp.1047-1124
- (attrib.) `Historia Damiatina,` in *Gesta Dei per Francos* 1,2 pp.1125-1145
 - *Lettres*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens (Leiden, 1960)
 - `Sermones vulgares,` in J. B. Pitra, ed., *Analecta novissima spicilegii Solesmensis: Altera continuatio 2, Tusculana* (Paris, 1888)
- James I, King of Aragon, *Chronicle*, trans. J. Forster, 2 vols. (London, 1883)
- Jaufré Rudel, *Chansons*, ed. A. Jeanroy, CFMA 15 (Paris, 1924)
- Jean de Joinville: *La vie de Saint Louis: le témoignage de Jehan, seigneur de Joinville. Texte du XIVE siècle*, ed.

- N. L. Corbett (Quebec, 1977)
- Jean Renart, *L'Escoufle, Roman d'aventure*, ed. F. Sweetser, TLF 211 (Geneva, 1974)
- *Le Roman de la Rose, ou Guillaume de Dole*, ed. F. Lecoy, CFMA 91 (Paris, 1962)
- Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 1099-1185*, ed. J. Wilkinson, J. Hill and W. F. Ryan, Hakluyt Society, 2nd series, 167 (London, 1988)
- Johannes de Columna, *'Mare Historiarum,'* extr. RHGF 23
- Johannes de Tulbia, *'de domino Johanne Rege Ierusalem,'* in *Quinti Belli Sacri Scriptores*
- John of Fordun, *Chronica gentis Scotorum*, ed. W. F. Skerne, The Historians of Scotland, 1 (Edinburgh, Edmonton and Douglas, 1871)
- John Peckham, archbishop of Canterbury, *Registrum Epistolarum*, ed. C. T. Martin, 3 vols., RS 77 (London, 1882-5)
- *Tractatus Tres de Paupertate*, ed. C. L. Kingsford, A. G. Little, and F. Tocco (Aberdeen, 1910)
- John of Pontoise: *Registrum Johannis de Pontissara, episcopi Wyntoniensis AD MCCLXXXII-MCCCXIV*, ed. C. Deedes, 2 vols., Canterbury and York Society 19, 30 (London, 1915-24)
- John le Romeyn: *The register of John Le Romeyn, lord archbishop of York, 1286-1296*, ed. W. Brown, 2 vols, Surtees Society 123, 128 (Durham, London and Berlin, 1913-16)
- John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, ed. C. C. J. Webb, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1909)
- *Historia Pontificalis*, ed. M. Chibnall (London and Edinburgh, 1956)
- *Letters*, ed. W. J. Miller, et al., 2 vols. (London, 1955 and Oxford, 1979)
- John Thilrode, *'Chronicon,'* ed. J. Heller, MGHS 25
- John of Würzburg, *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae*, in PL 155
- Die Königsaalger Geschichts-Quellen, mit den zusätzen und der Fortsetzung des Domherrn Franz von Prag*, ed. J. Loserth, Fontes rerum Austriacarum 1,8 (Vienna, 1875)
- Lambert Waterlos, *'Annales Cameracenses,'* ed. G. H. Pertz, MGHS 16

- Lancelot, roman en prose du XIIIe siècle*, ed. A. Micha, 9 vols., TLF 247 etc. (Geneva, 1978-83)
- Layettes du Trésor des chartes*, ed. A. Teulet et al., 5 vols. (Paris, 1863-1909)
- The Letters of Gilbert Foliot*, ed. Z. N. Brooke, A. Mory, C. N. L. Brooke (Cambridge, 1962)
- `Lettre des Chrétiens de Terre-Sainte à Charles d'Anjou, (22 avril 1260) ed. H. F. Delaborde, ROL 2 (1894) 206-215
- `Lettres inédits concernant les croisades (1275-1307),` ed. Ch. Kohler and Ch. V. Langlois, BEC 52 (1891) 46-63
- Lettres de rois, reines et autres personnages des cours de France et d'Angleterre depuis Louis VII jusqu'à Henri IV*, ed. Champollion-Figeac, 1 (Paris, 1839)
- Libellus de expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum*, in Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon Anglicanum*
- `Liber Duelli Christiani in obsidione Damiate exacti,` in *Quinti Belli Sacri Scriptores* and ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGHS 31
- Livländische Reimchronik*, ed. F. Pfeiffer, BLVS 7B (Stuttgart, 1844)
- Le Livre des Juges. Les cinq textes de la version française faite au XII siècle pour les chevaliers du Temple*, ed. le Marquis d'Albon, Société des Bibliophiles Lyonnais (Lyons, 1913)
- The Mabinogion*, trans. J. Gantz (Harmondsworth, 1976)
- `Maius chronicon Lemovicense,` RHGF 21
- Manessier, *The Third Continuation*, in *Continuations of the Old French Perceval*, 5
- Marcabru, *Poésies complètes*, ed. J. M. L. Dejeanne (Toulouse, 1909, reprinted New York and London, 1971)
- Der Marner*, ed. P. Strauch (Strasbourg, 1876, reprinted Berlin, 1965)
- Martin IV, *Registres*, ed. F. Oliver-Martin, BEFAR (Paris, 1913-1935)
- Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, ed. J. C. Robertson, 7 vols., RS 51 (London, 1875-85)
- Matheolus, *Les Lamentations*, ed. A.-G. Van Hamel (Paris, 1892)
- Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ed. H. R. Luard, 7 vols., RS 57

- (London, 1872-83)
- *Flores Historiarum*, ed. H. R. Luard, 3 vols., RS 95 (London, 1890)
 - *Historia Anglorum, sive...Historia Minor, item...Abbreviatio Chronicorum Angliae*, ed. F. Madden, 3 vols., RS 44 (London, 1866-9)
- Maugis d'Aigremont, chanson de geste*, ed. P. Vernay, Romanica Helvetica 93 (Berne, 1980)
- Menko, 'Chronicon,' ed. L. Weiland, MGHS 23
- Michael the Syrian: *Le chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche, 1166-1199*, ed. J. B. Chabot, 4 vols. (Paris, 1899-1910)
- Armenian translation in RHC DocArm 1
- Monasticon Anglicanum: a history of the abbies and other monasteries, hospitals, frieries, and cathedral and collegiate churches, with their dependencies, in England and Wales..* ed. W. Dugdale, new edn. ed. J. Caley, H. Ellis and B. Bandinel, 6 vols. in 8 (London, 1817-30)
- Le Moniage Guillaume: Les deux rédactions en vers du Moniage Guillaume, chansons de geste du XIIe siècle*, ed. W. Cloetta, 2 vols. SATF (Paris, 1906-11)
- Le Moniage Rainouart 1: publié d'après les manuscrits de L'Arsenal et de Boulogne*, ed. G. A. Bertin, SATF (Paris, 1973)
- Monumenta Corbeiensia*, ed. P. Jaffé, Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum, 1 (Berlin, 1864)
- MGH *Constitutiones et acta Publica imperatorum et regum*, ed. L. Weiland, 3 vols. (Hanover, 1893), in MGH *Legum Sectio IV (Leges 2. Quarto)*
- MGH *Epistolae Selectae XIII e regestis pontificum Romanorum selecti*, ed. G. H. Pertz and K. Rodenburg, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1883-94)
- MGH *Legum*, series in folio, ed. G. H. Pertz, vol. 2 (Hanover, 1887)
- MGH *Scriptores*, ed. G. H. Pertz et al., 32 vols. (Hanover, 1826-1934)
- Monumenta ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum Historica, 3: Acta capitulorum Generalium*, ed. B. M. Reichert, 1 (Rome and Stuttgart, 1898)

- Monuments Historiques*, ed. J. Tardif (Paris, 1866)
La Mort le roi Artu, Roman du XIIIe siècle, ed. J. Frappier,
 TLF 58 (Geneva, 1964)
- Nicholas III, *Registres*, ed. J. Gay, BEFAR (Paris, 1938)
 Nicholas IV, *Registres*, ed. E. Langlois, 1 vol. in 2, BEFAR
 Paris, 1905)
- Niccolò da Calvi, 'La vita d'Innocenzo IV,' ed. F. Pagnotti,
Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria 21
 (1898) 7-120
- Nigel de Longchamps, *Speculum Stultorum*, ed. J. H. Mozley and
 R. R. Raymo (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1960)
- 'Notice sur le manuscrit Fr 24862 de la Bibliothèque Nationale
 contenant divers ouvrages composés ou écrits
 en Angleterre,' ed. P. Meyer, *Notices et extraits des
 manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et autres
 Bibliothèques* 35 (1896) 131-168
- 'Un Nouveau manuscrit de la Règle du Temple,' ed. J. Delaville
 le Roulx, *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de
 France* 26 pt.2 (1889) 185-214
- Nouveau recueil complet des fabliaux*, ed. W. Noomen and N. von
 den Boorgaard, 3 vols. (Assen/Maastricht, 1983-6)
- 'Nouveaux monuments des croisés recueillis en Terre Sainte,'
 ed. Clermont-Ganneau, *AOL* 2, C, 457-64
- Odo de Deuil, *De profectioe Ludovici VII in orientem*, ed. V.
 G. Berry (New York, 1948)
- Odo, bishop of Tusculanum, letter to Innocent IV, in
Spicilegium 3
- The Old French Crusade Cycle, vol.V: Les Chétifs*, ed. G. M.
 Myers (Alabama, 1981)
- *vol.VII: the Jérusalem Continuations, Part 1: La chrétienté
 Corbaran*, ed. P. W. Grillo (Alabama, 1984)
- Oliver *Scholasticus*, 'Historia regum Terrae Sanctae,' and
 'Historia Damiatina,' in *Die Schriften des Kölner
 Domscholasters, Späteren Bischofs von Paderborn und
 Kardinalbischofs von S. Sabina, Oliverus*, ed. H. Hoogeweg,
 BLVS 202 (Tübingen, 1894)
- Oliver Sutton, *The Rolls and register of Bishop Oliver Sutton*,

- 1280-1299, ed. R. T. Hill, 8 vols., Lincoln Record Society 39, 43, 48 etc. (1948-86)
- Oliver le Templer, 'Estat aurai lonc temps en pessamen,' in Raynouard, *Choix de Poésies*, 5
- Les Olim ou registres des Arrêts rendus par la cour du Roi*, ed. le comte Beugnot, 4 vols. (Paris, 1839-48)
- Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History*, ed. M. Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1969-80)
- Orendal*, ed. H. Steinger, Altdeutsches Textbibliothek 36 (Halle, 1935)
- Orneit und Wolfdietrich nach der Wiener Piaristenhandschrift*, ed. J. Lunzer, BLVS 239 (Tübingen, 1906)
- Ornit und die Wolfdietriche nach Müllenhofs vorarbeiten*, ed. A. Amelung and O. Jänicke, Deutsches Heldenbuch 3-4 (reprinted Dublin/Zurich, 1968)
- Orson de Beauvais, chanson de geste du XIIe siècle*, ed. G. Paris, SATF (Paris, 1899)
- Osney Annals, in *Annales Monastici*, 4
- Otto, Bishop of Friesing, 'Chronicon,' ed. R. Wilmans, MGHS 20
- Otto of St. Blasien, 'Continuatio Sanblasiana,' ed. R. Wilmans, MGHS 20
- Ottoboni: 'Letters of Cardinal Ottoboni,' ed. R. Graham, *English Historical Review* 15 (1900) 87-120
- Papsturkunden für Templer und Johanniter*, ed. R. Hiestand, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil-hist. Klasse, dritte folge no.77 (Göttingen, 1972)
- Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*, ed. J. P. Migne, 217 vols., and 4 vols. of indexes (Paris, 1834-64)
- Peire Cardenal, 'Mon chanter vueil retraire,' in *Poésies complètes*, ed. R. Lavaud (Toulouse, 1957)
- Peirol, troubadour of Auvergne*, ed. S. C. Aston (Cambridge, 1953)
- Peregrinatores medii aevi quatuor*, ed. J. C. M. Laurent, 2nd. edn., (Leipzig, 1873)
- Perlesvaus: le Haut livre du Graal*, ed. W. A. Nitze and J. Atkinson Jenkins, 2 vols. (reprinted New York, 1972)
- Peter von Dusberg, *Chronik des Preussenlandes*, ed. K. Scholz and D. Wojtecki, *Ausgewählte Quellen zur Deutschen*

- Geschichte des Mittelalters, Freiherr von Stein-Gedächtnisausgabe, Band 25 (Darmstadt, 1984)
- Peter the Venerable, *Letters*, ed. G. Constable, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1967)
- Philip Mousket, 'Historia Regum Francorum,' extr. ed. A. Tobler, MGHS 26, and as 'chronique rimée,' extr. in RHGF 22
- Philip de Nanteuil, 'En chantant veil mon Duel faire,' in J. Bédier and P. Aubry, eds., *Les Chansons de croisade* (Paris, 1909, reprinted Geneva, 1974)
- Philip of Novara, 'Memoirs,' in *Les Gestes des Chyprois*
- Philippus, 'Descriptio Terrae Sanctae,' in W. A. Neumann, ed., 'Drei mittelalterliche Pilgerschriften III,' *Oesterreichische Vierteljahresschrift für katholische Theologie* 11 (1872) 1-78
- Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernay, 'Historia Albigensium,' RHGF 19
- Placita de Quo Warranto temporibus Edw. I, II & III in curia receptae Scaccarii Westm. asservata* (London, 1818)
- Les Plus Anciennes Chartes en Langue Provençale: recueil des pièces originales antérieures du XIIIe siècle*, ed. C. Brunel, 2 vols. (Paris, 1926-52)
- 'Un poème contemporain sur Saladin,' ed. G. Paris, ROL 1 (1893) 433-444
- Pommerellisches Urkundenbuch*, ed. M. Perlbach (Danzig, 1881-1916)
- Pommersches Urkundenbuch*, ed. K. Conrad, R. Prümers, et al., 10 vols. (Stettin and Cologne, 1868-1984)
- Le Premier Budget de la monarchie française*, ed. F. Lot and R. Fawtier, Bibliothèque de l'école des Hautes-Etudes (Paris, 1932)
- 'Les premiers versions occidental de la légende de Saidnaia,' ed. P. Devos, *Analecta Bollandiana* 65 (1947) 245-278
- Preußisches Urkundenbuch*, ed. A. Philipps et al., 6 vols. (Königsberg, Aalen and Marburg, 1882-1986)
- Primat, 'Chronique,' trans. Jean du Vignay, RHGF 23
- Procès des Templiers, (1307-9)*, ed. J. Michelet, 2 vols., Collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, 1ère série (Paris, 1841-51)

- La Queste del Saint Graal, roman du XIIIe siècle*, ed. A. Pauphilet, CFMA 33 (Paris, 1980)
- Quinti Belli Sacri Scriptores Minores*, ed. R. Röhricht, SOL (Geneva, 1879)
- Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. J. Stevenson, RS 66 (London, 1875)
- Ralph of Diceto, *Historical Works*, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols., RS 68 (London, 1876)
- Ralph Niger, *De re militari et triplici via peregrinationis ierosolymitane*, ed. L. Schmugge (Berlin, 1977)
- Ramon Llull, 'Blanquerna,' in *Obras Literarias*, ed. M. Batllori and M. Caldentey (Madrid, 1948)
- Ramon Muntaner, *Chronik des Edlen en Ramon Muntaner*, ed. K. Lanz, BLVS 8 (Stuttgart, 1844)
- Raoul, *La vengeance Raguidel*, ed. M. Friedwagner (Halle, 1909)
- Raoul de Cambrai, Chanson de geste*, ed. P. Meyer and A. Longnon, SATF (Paris, 1882)
- Raoul de Houdenc, *Meraugis de Portlesguez*, ed. M. Friedwagner (reprinted Geneva, 1975)
- *La songe d'Enfer*, ed. M. T. Mihm, Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, Band 190 (Tübingen, 1984)
- 'Rebus de Alsaticis ineuntis saeculis XIII,' ed. P. Jaffé, MGHS 17
- The Receipt Roll of the Exchequer for Michaelmas Term xxxi Henry II, AD 1185*, ed. H. Hall, Studies in Economics and Political Science 7 (London, 1899)
- Récits d'un Ménestrel de Reims au treizième siècle*, ed. N. de Wailly, SHF (Paris, 1876)
- Records of the Templars in England in the Twelfth Century; the Inquest of 1185 with illustrative charters and documents*, ed. B. A. Lees, Records of Social and Economic History of England and Wales, 9 (London, 1935)
- Records of the Wardrobe and Household, 1285-89*, ed. B. F. Byerly and C. R. Byerly, 2 vols. (London, 1977-86)
- Recueil des Actes de Henri II, roi d'Angleterre et Duc de Normandie, concernant les provinces françaises et les affaires de France*, ed. L. Delisle and E. Berger, Introduction (Paris, 1906) and 3 vols. (Paris, 1916-27)

- Recueil des Actes de Philippe Auguste, roi de France*, ed. H.-Fr. Delaborde, C. Petit-Dutaillis et al., 4 vols. (Paris, 1916-79)
- Recueil Général des Jeux-partis français*, ed. A. Långfors, A. Jeanroy and L. Brandin, 2 vols. in 1, SATF (Paris, 1926)
- Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*, pub. Académie des Inscriptions et de Belles-Lettres, 16 vols. (Paris, 1841-1906)
- Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed. Bouquet et al., new edition ed. L. Delisle, 24 vols. (Paris, 1878)
- Regesta Imperii*, ed. J. Böhmer, 5: *Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs unter Philipp, Otto IV, Friedrich II, Heinrich (VII), Conrad IV, Heinrich Raspe, Wilhelm und Richard, 1190-1271*, ed. J. F. Böhmer, J. Ficker et al., 4 vols. (Innsbruck, Cologne and Vienna, 1881-1983)
- 6: *Die regesten des Kaiserreichs unter Rudolf, Adolf, Albrecht, Heinrich VII, 1273-1313*, ed. J. F. Böhmer, O. Redlich and V. Samanek, 2 vols. (Innsbruck, 1898-1948)
- Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ab condita Ecclesia ad Annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII*, ed. P. Jaffé, 2 edn. ed. G. Wattenbach et al., 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1885-8)
- Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani, and Additamentum*, ed. R. Röhrich (Innsbruck, 1893, 1904)
- Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum, (1066-1154)*, 3, (1135-1154) ed H. A. Cronne, R. H. C. Davis (Oxford, 1968)
- Regesta Regum Scottorum, 1153-1424*, 1: *The Acts of Malcolm IV, King of Scots 1153-1165*, ed. G. W. S. Barrow (Edinburgh, 1960)
- 2: *The Acts of William I, King of Scots 1165-1214*, ed. G. W. S. Barrow and W. W. Scott (Edinburgh, 1971)
- Reginald of Durham, *Libellus de Vita et Miraculis S. Godrici, Heremitaе de Finchale*, ed. J. Stevenson, Surtees Society 20 (London and Edinburgh, 1844)
- I Registri della cancelleria Angioina*, ed. R. Filangieri, 1 ff., (Naples, 1950ff.)
- La Règle du Temple*, ed. H. de Curzon, SHF (Paris, 1886)
- `Regni Iherosolymitani Brevis Historia,' in *Annali Genovesi* 1
- Reinfrid von Braunschweig*, ed. K. Bartsch, BLVS 109 (Tübingen, 1871)

- Renaus de Montauban oder die Haimonskinder, Altfranzösisches Gedicht*, ed. H. Michelant, BLVS 67 (Stuttgart, 1862)
- Renaut de Montauban. Edition critique du manuscrit Douce*, ed. J. Thomas, TLF 371 (Geneva and Paris, 1989)
- Rerum Italicarum Scriptores: Raccolta degli storici Italiani dal cinquecento ad millcinquecento*, ed. L. Muratori, new edition ed. G. Carducci, V. Fiorini, P. Fedele (Citta di Castello, Bologna, 1900ff.)
- ‘Ribston and the Knights Templars,’* ed. R. V. Taylor, *Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal*, 7 (1882) 429-52, 8 (1884) 259-99, 9 (1886) 71-98
- Ricaud Bonomel, *‘Ir`e dolors s`es dins mon cor asseza,’* ed. A. de Bastard, *‘La colère et la douleur d`un templier en Terre Sainte,’* *Revue des langues romanes*, 81 (1974) 333-373
- Richard Gravesend: *Rotuli Ricardi Gravesend diocesis Lincolniensis*, ed. F. N. Davis, et al., Canterbury and York Society 31 (Oxford, 1925)
- Richard of Poitou, *‘Chronica,’* extr. ed. G. Waitz, MGHS 26
- Riccardus de S. Germano, *‘Chronico,’* ed. G. H. Pertz, MGHS 19; also in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed. L. A. Muratori, 25 vols. (Milan, 1723-51) 7
- Ricoldo de Monte Cruce, *‘Lettres,’* ed. R. Röhricht, AOL 2, Documents, 258-96
- Robert the canon of St. Marianus of Auxerre, *‘Chronicon,’* ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGHS 26
- Robert Grosseteste: *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste, Episcopi Lincolniensis*, ed. F. N. Davis, Canterbury and York Society, 10 (London, 1913)
- Robert of Torigny, *Chronicle*, in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, 4
- Roger Bacon, *Opus Maius*, ed. J. H. Bridges, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1877-1900, reprinted Frankfurt, 1964)
- Roger of Howden, *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi: The chronicle of the reigns of Henry II and Richard I*, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols., RS 49 (London, 1867)
- *Chronica*, ed. W. Stubbs, 4 vols., RS 51 (London, 1868-71)
- Roger of Wendover, *Flores Historiarum*, ed. H. R. Hewlett, 3 vols., RS 84 (London, 1886-9)

- Rostanh Berenguer, 'Pos de sa mar man cavalier del Temple,' in
P. Meyer, 'Les derniers troubadours'
'Rothelin,' in RHC Occ 2
- Rotuli Chartarum in Turri Londonensi asservati*, ed. T. D.
Hardy, 1 vol, (1199-1216) (London, 1837)
- Rotuli Hundredonum temp. Hen. III & Edw. I in turri Lond. et
curia receptae Scaccarii Westm. asservati*, 2 vols.
(London, 1812-8)
- Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum in Turri Londonensi asservati*, ed.
T. D. Hardy, 2 vols. (London, 1833-44)
- Rotuli Litterarum Patentium in Turri Londonensi asservati*, ed.
T. D. Hardy (London, 1835)
- Rotuli Parliamentorum: ut et petitiones et placita in
Parlamento*, 6 vols. (Record Commission, London 1767-77) 1
(tempore Edwardi R.I)
- Royal and other historical letters illustrative of the reign of
Henry III, from the originals in the Public Record Office*,
ed. W. W. Shirley, 2 vols., RS 27 (London, 1862-66)
- 'The Rule of the Templars and a courtly ballade,' ed. J.
Oliver, *Scriptorium* 35 (1981) 303-6
- Rutebuef, *Oeuvres Complètes*, ed. E. Faral and J. Bastin, 2
vols. (Paris, 1959-60)
- Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. J. D.
Mansi, et al., 55 vols. (Florence, Venice, Paris, Arnhem,
Leipzig, 1759-1962)
- Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica*, ed. G. Scalia, 2 vols. (Bari, 1966)
and ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGHS 32
- The Sandford Cartulary*, ed. A. M. Leys, 2 vols., Oxfordshire
Record Society nos. 19, 22 (Oxford, 1938, 1941)
- Schlesisches Urkundenbuch*, ed. H. Appelt et al., vol. 1ff.
(Graz, Vienna and Cologne, 1963ff)
- A Scottish chronicle known as the Chronicle of Holyrood*, ed. M.
O. and A. O. Anderson, Publications of the Scottish
History Society, 3rd series 30 (Edinburgh, 1938)
- Le siège de Barbastre*, ed. J.-L. Perrier, CFMA 54 (Paris, 1926)
- Simon of St. Bertin, 'Gesta abbatum Sancti Bertini Sithensium,'
ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGHS 13
- Sone von Nausay*, ed. M. Goldschmidt, BLVS 216 (Tübingen, 1899)

- Spicilegium sive collectio veterum aliquot scriptorum qui in Galliae Bibliothecis delituerant*, ed. L. d'Achery, new edn. ed. L. F. T. de la Barre, 3 (Paris, 1723)
- Die Statuten des Deutschen Ordens nach den Altesten Handschriften*, ed. M. Perlbach (Halle, 1890)
- Stephen of Bourbon: *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues tirés du recueil inédit d'Etienne de Bourbon, Dominicain du XIIIe siècle*, ed. A. Lecoy de la Marche, SHF (Paris, 1877)
- Suger, Abbot of St. Denis: `Epistolae,` PL 186
- Tabulae Ordinis Theutonici ex tabularii regii Berolinensis codice potissimum*, ed. E. Strehlke, new edition with preface by H. E. Mayer (Jerusalem, 1975)
- Tewkesbury Annals, in *Annales Monastici* 1
- Thadeo of Naples, *Historia de desolacione et conculcacione civitatis Acconensis et tocius terre sancte, in A.D. MCCXCI*, ed. P. Riant (Geneva, 1873)
- `Thais,` ed. P. Meyer in `Notice sur le manuscrit Fr 24862` 147-151
- Theodoric, *Libellus de Locis Sanctis*, ed. M. L. and W. Bulst (Heidelberg, 1976)
- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Blackfriars edition, 60 vols. (London, 1964-76)
- Thomas of Spalato, `Historia Pontificum Salonitanorum et Spalatinorum,` ed. L. von Heinemann, MGHS 29
- Thomas Tuscus, `Gesta Imperatorum et Pontificum,` ed. E. Ehrenfeuchter, MGHS 22
- Thomas Wykes, *Annales*, in *Annales Monastici*, 4.
- Le roman de Tristan en prose*, ed. R. Curtis, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1985)
- Le roman de Tristan en prose*, ed. P. Ménard, 1, TLF 353 (Geneva, 1987)
- `A Twelfth century Oxford disputation concerning the privileges of the Knights Hospitallers,` ed. J. A. Brundage, *Medieval Studies* 24 (1962) 153-160
- Ulger, bishop of Anjou, `Epistolae,` PL 180
- Ulrich von Etzenbach, *Wilhelm von Wenden*, ed. H.-F. Rosenfeld,

- Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters 49 (Berlin, 1957)
- Urban IV, *Registres*, ed. J. Guiraud, et al., 5 vols., BEFAR
(Paris, 1899-1958)
- Urkundenbuch der Deutschordensballei Hessen*, ed. A. Wyss, 3
vols., Publication aus den K. Preussischen Staatsarchiven,
nos. 3, 19, 73: Hessisches Urkundenbuch 1 (1879-1899,
reprinted Osnabrück, 1965) 1
- Urkundenbuch der Deutschordensballei Thüringen*, ed. K. H.
Lampe, vol.1, Thüringische Geschichtsquellen, neue Folge 7
(Jena, 1936)
- Urkundenbuch für die Geschichte Niederrheins*, ed. T. J.
Lacomblet, 4 vols. (reprinted Aalen, 1840-56)
- Urkundenbuch des Hochstifts Halberstadt und seiner Bischöfe*,
ed. G. Schmidt, vol. 2, Publicationen aus den K.
Preußischen Staatsarchiven, 21 (Leipzig, 1884)
- Urkundenbuch der Stadt Friedburg* 1 (1216-1410) ed. M. Foltz
(Marburg, 1904)
- Usamah ibn-Munqidh, *Memoirs*, in *Memoirs of an Arab-Syrian
Gentleman, or, an Arab Knight in the Crusades: the Memoirs
of Usamah ibn-Munqidh*, trans. P. K. Hitti (Beirut, 1964)
- `Vitas Patrum,' extr. ed. P. Meyer, `Notice sur le manuscrit
Fr. 24862`
- Le Voyage de Charlemagne à Jérusalem et à Constantinople*, ed.
P. Aebischer, TLF 115 (Geneva, 1965)
- Walter Giffard: *The register of Walter Giffard, lord archbishop
of York 1266-1279*, ed. W. Brown, Surtees society 109
(Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1904)
- Walter Gray, *The register, or rolls, of Walter Gray, lord
archbishop of York*, ed. J. Raine, Surtees Society 56
(Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1872)
- Walter of Guisborough, *Chronicle*, ed. H. Rothwell, Camden
Society 3rd series, 89 (London, 1957)
- Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, ed. M. R. James, C. N. L.
Brooke and R. A. B. Myers (Oxford, 1983)
- Waverley Annals, in *Annales Monastici* 2
- `Wenceslai I regis historia,' ed. D. R. Köpke, MGHS 9
- William the Breton, `Gesta Philippi Augusti,' in *Oeuvres*

- de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton, historiens de Philippe Auguste*, ed. H. F. Delaborde, 2 vols. (Paris, 1882-5)
- William of Andres, 'Chronica' ed. J. Heller, MGHS 24, and interpolating the 'Historia regum Francorum' of Andrew of Marchian, ed. G. Waitz, MGHS 26
- William de Nangis, 'Gesta Ludovici IX,' in RHGF 20
 - 'Gesta Philippi Tertii Francorum Regis,' in RHGF 20
 - 'Chronicon,' in RHGF 20
- William of Newburgh, *Historia rerum Anglicarum*, in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, 1-2.
- William Rishanger, *Chronica et annales*, ed. H. T. Riley, RS 28,2 (London, 1865)
- William of Rubruck: *The Journey of William of Rubruck to the Eastern parts of the world, as narrated by himself*, trans. and ed. W. W. Rockhill, Hakluyt Society, 2nd series 4 (London, 1900, reprinted Nendeln, 1967)
- William of San Stefano, 'Comment la sainte maison de l'Hospital de S. Johan de Jerusalem commença,' in RHC Occ 5
- William fitz Stephen, 'Vita Sancti Thomae,' in *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, 3
- William, Archbishop of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, 2 vols., Corpus Christianorum - continuatio medievalis 63 (Turnholt, 1986)
- William Wickwane, *The Register of William Wickwane, lord archbishop of York 1279-1285*, ed. W. Brown, Surtees Society 114 (Durham, London and Berlin, 1907)
- Winchester Annals, in *Annales Monastici*, 2
- Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Parzival*, ed. K. Lachmann and W. Spiewok, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1981)
 - trans. A. T. Hatto (Harmondsworth, 1980)
 - *Titirel*, in *Wolframs von Eschenbach Parzival und Titirel*, ed. E. Martin, part 1 (Halle, 1920)
- 'Ein zeitgenössisches Gedicht auf die Belagerung Accons,' ed. H. Prutz, *Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte*, 21 (1881) 449-494

Secondary sources

- Acta Sanctorum*, ed. J. Bollandus et al., (Antwerp, 1643ff., reprinted Brussels, 1966)
- H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, 'L'ordre Teutonique en France,' *BEC* 32 (1871) 63-83
- 'Catalogue d'actes des comtes de Brienne, 950-1356' *BEC* 33 (1872) 141-186
- B. Arnold, *German Knighthood 1050-1300* (Oxford, 1985)
- U. Arnold, 'Entstehung und Frühzeit des Deutschen Ordens, zu Gründung und innerer Struktur des Deutschen Hospitals von Akkon und des Ritterordens in der ersten Hälfte des 13 Jahrhunderts,' in Fleckenstein and Hellmann, eds., *Geistlichen Ritterorden*, pp.81-107
- M. Barber, 'The origins of the order of the Temple,' *Studia Monastica*, 12 (1970) 219-240
- 'Propaganda in the Middle Ages: the charges against the Templars,' *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 17 (1973) 42-57
- 'The Social Context of the Templars,' *RHST* 34 (1984) 27-46
- G. Barrow, 'The aftermath of war: Scotland and England in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries,' *TRHS* 28 (1978) 103-125
- E. Baumgartner, 'Les techniques narratives dans le roman en prose,' in N. J. Lacy, D. Kelly and K. Busby, eds., *The Legacy of Chrétien de Troyes*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1987) pp.167-190
- J. M. A. Beer, *Narrative conventions of truth in the Middle Ages* (Geneva, 1981)
- K. H. Bender, ed., *Les Epopées de la Croisade: premier colloque international*, Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur. Beiheft 11 (Stuttgart, 1987)
- P. Bertrand de la Grassière, *L'ordre militaire et hospitalier de Saint-Lazare de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1960)
- Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, Istituto Giovanni XXIII nella pontificia Università Lateranense, 12 vols. (Rome, 1961-70)
- B. Bolton, 'A mission to the Orthodox? The Cistercians in Romania,' in D. Baker, ed., *Studies in Church History*, 13: *The Orthodox Churches and the West* (Oxford, 1976) pp.169-

- `Via Ascetica: a papal quandary,` in W. J. Sheils, ed., *Studies in Church History 22: Monks, Hermits and the ascetic tradition* (Oxford, 1985) pp.161-191
- G. Bonath, `Reflets des croisades dans la littérature allemand,` in K. H. Bender, ed., *Les Épopées de la croisade*, pp.105-118
- H. Boockmann, *Der Deutsche Orden: Zwölf Kapitel aus seiner Geschichte* (Munich, 1982)
- H. de Boor, ed., *Geschichte der Deutschen Literatur 1: Der Deutsche Literatur von Karl dem Grossen bis zum beginn der Höfischen Dichtung, 770-1170* (Munich, 1949)
- I. Bosio, *Dell'Istoria della sacra religione et illustrissima militia di S. Giovanni Gierosol.^{no}*, 3 parts, new ed. (Rome, 1621-1684)
- C. B. Bouchard, *Sword, Miter and Cloister: nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198* (Ithaca and London, 1987)
- A. Boutémy, *Nigellus de Longchamp dit Wireker* (Paris, 1959)
- P. A. Brand, `Control of Mortmain alienation in England, 1200-1300,` in J. H. Baker, ed., *Legal Records and the Historian*, (London, 1978) pp.29-40
- E. A. R. Brown, `The Prince is Father of the King: the character and childhood of Philip the Fair of France,` *Medieval Studies*, 49 (1987) 282-334
- M. L. Bulst-Thiele, `Templer in Königlichen und Päpstlichen Diensten,` in P. Classen and P. Scheibert, eds., *Festschrift Percy Ernst Schramm*, 2 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1964) pp.289-308
- Review of H. Mayer, ed., `Das Itinerarium Peregrinorum,` *Historische Zeitschrift* 198 (1964) 380-387
- `Noch einmal das Itinerarium Peregrinorum,` *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 21 (1965) 593-606
- `Zur Geschichte der Ritterorden und des Königreichs Jerusalem im 13 Jahrhundert bis zur Schlacht bei la Forbie am 17 Okt 1244,` *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 22 (1966) 197-226
- *Sacrae Domus Militiae Templi Hierosolymitani Magistri: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Templerordens 1118/9-1314*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften

- in Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, nr. 86 (Göttingen, 1974)
- 'Der Prozeß gegen der Templerorden,' in Fleckenstein and Hellmann, eds., *Geistlichen Ritterorden*, pp.375-402
- R. I. Burns, *The crusader kingdom of Valencia: reconstruction on a thirteenth-century frontier*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1967)
- Butler's Lives of the Saints*, edited, revised and supplemented by H. Thurston and D. Attwater, 4 vols. (London, 1956)
- F. L. Carsten, *The origins of Prussia* (Oxford, 1954)
- Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts, British Museum*, ed. H. L. D. Ward, 2 vols. (London, 1883-93)
- E. Christiansen, *The Northern Crusades: the Baltic and the Catholic Frontier 1100-1525* (London, 1980)
- C. T. Clay, 'The Family of Amundeville,' *Reports and Papers of the Lincolnshire Architectural and Archaeological Society* 3 (1945) 109-136
- G. Constable, 'The Second Crusade as seen by Contemporaries,' *Traditio* 9 (1953) 213-279
- D. Corner, 'The *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi* and *Chronica* of Roger, Parson of Howden,' *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 56 (1983) 126-144
- I. B. Cowan, P. H. R. Mackay, A. Macquarrie, eds., *The Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in Scotland*, ed. Scottish History Society, 4th series, 19 (Edinburgh, 1983)
- H. E. J. Cowdrey, 'The Eleventh Century Peace and Truce of God,' *Past and Present* 46 (1970) 42-67
- L. Dailliez, *Bibliographie du Temple* (Paris, 1972)
- R. H. C. Davis, 'William of Tyre,' in D. Baker, ed., *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages* (Edinburgh, 1987) pp.64-76
- E. Delaruelle, 'Templiers et Hospitaliers en Languedoc pendant le croisade contre les Albigeois,' *Cahiers de Fanjeaux*, 4: *Paix de Dieu et guerre sainte en Languedoc au XIIIe siècle* (1969) 315-334
- H. Delehaye, 'Saints de Chypre,' *Analecta Bollandiana* 26 (1907) 161-301

- L. Delisle, `Mémoire sur les opérations financières des
Templiers,` *Mémoires de l'Institut National de France,
Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 33,2 (1889)
- A. Demurger, *Vie et mort de l'ordre du Temple, 1118-1314*
(Paris, 1985)
- M. A. Du Bourg, *Ordre de Malte: Histoire du Grand Prieuré de
Toulouse* (Toulouse, 1883)
- G. Duby, *The chivalrous society*, trans. C. Postan (London,
1977)
- *The Three Orders: Feudal Society imagined*, trans. A.
Goldhammer (Chicago, 1980)
- S. Duparc-Quioc, *La chanson d'Antioche - Etude Critique* (Paris,
1978)
- P. W. Edbury and J. G. Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the
Latin East* (Cambridge, 1988)
- K. Eistert, `Der Ritterorden der Tempelherren in Schlesien,`
Archiv für Schlesische Kirchengeschichte, 14 (1956) 1-23
- C. Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica medii aevi, sive summorum
Pontificum SRE cardinalium ecclesiarum Antistitum series.
ab anno 1198 usque ad annum 1431 perducta* (Munster, 1898,
second edition 1913)
- M. L. Favreau-Lillie, `The Teutonic Knights in Acre after the
fall of Montfort (1271): some reflections,` in Kedar *et
al.*, eds., *Outremer*, pp.272-284
- M. Fischer, `Criticism of Church and Crusade in Ottokar`s
Österreichische Reimchronik,` *Forum for Modern Language
Studies*, 22 (1986) 157-171
- J. Fleckenstein, ed., *Probleme um Friedrich II*, Vorträge und
Forschungen, 16 Sigmaringen, 1974)
- J. Fleckenstein and M. Hellmann, eds., *Die Geistlichen
Ritterorden Europas*, Vorträge und Forschungen, 26
(Sigmaringen, 1980)
- J. Flori, `La notion de chevalerie dans les chansons de geste
du XIIe siècle. Etude historique de vocabulaire,` *Le
Moyen Age*, 81 (1975) 211-44, 407-45
- `Pour une histoire de la chevalerie: l'adoubement dans les
romans de Chrétien de Troyes,` *Romania* 100 (1979) 21-53

- `La chevalerie selon Jean de Salisbury (Nature, Fonction, Idéologie)` *Revue de l'histoire ecclésiastique* 77 (1982) 35-77
- *Idéologie du glaive: préhistoire de la chevalerie* (Geneva, 1983)
- *L'Essor de la chevalerie, XIe-XIIe siècles* (Geneva, 1986)
- A. J. Forey, `The order of Mountjoy,` *Speculum* 46 (1971) 250-66
- `The crusading vows of Henry III,` *Durham University Journal* 65 (1972-3) 229-247
- *The Templars in the Corona de Aragon* (London, 1973)
- `The military order of St. Thomas of Acre,` *English Historical Review*, 92 (1977) 481-503
- `The military orders in the crusading proposals of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries,` *Traditio* 36 (1980) 317-345
- `The failure of the siege of Damascus in 1148,` *Journal of Medieval History*, 10 (1984) 13-23
- `The militarization of the Hospital of St. John,` *Studia Monastica*, 26 (1984) 75-89
- `The military orders and the Spanish reconquest in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,` *Traditio* 40 (1984) 197-234
- `The emergence of the military order in the twelfth century,` *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 36 (1985) 175-195
- `Recruitment to the military orders (twelfth to mid-fourteenth centuries)` *Viator* 17 (1986) 139-171
- `Novitiate and Instruction in the Military Orders during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,` *Speculum* 61 (1986) 1-17
- `Women and the military orders in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,` *Studia Monastica* 29 (1987) 63-92
- `A thirteenth century dispute between Templars and Hospitallers in Aragon,` *Durham University Journal* 80 (1988) 181-192
- `The Military Orders and Holy War against Christians in the Thirteenth Century,` *English Historical Review*, 104 (1989) 1-24
- J. Frappier, `Le Graal et la chevalerie,` *Romania* 75 (1954) 165-210

- R. Frydrychowicz, `Der Ritterorden von Calatrava in Tymau bei Mewe,` *Altpreussische Monatschrift*, neue Folge 27 (1890) 315-320
- A. Grabois, `Christian pilgrims in the thirteenth century and the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem: Burchard of Mount Sion,` in Kedar *et al.*, eds., *Outremer*, pp.285-296
- A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1307* (London, 1974)
- C. V. Graves, `The economic activities of the Cistercians in medieval England (1128-1307) *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis* 13 (1957) 3-60
- L`Abbé A. Guillotin de Corson, `Traditions populaires concernant le Temple et l`Hôpital en Bretagne,` *Bulletin archéologique de l`association Breton* 19 (1901) 215-266
- E. Hallam, `Henry II, Richard I and the order of Grandmont,` *Journal of Medieval History*, 1 (1975) 165-186
- *Capetian France, 987-1327* (London and New York, 1980)
- `Royal burial and the cult of kingship in France and England, 1060-1330,` *Journal of Medieval History*, 8 (1982) 359-380
- B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: the secular Church* (London, 1980)
- *Religion in the Medieval West* (London, 1986)
- H. von Hammerstein, `Der Besitz der Tempelherren in Lotharingen,` *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für lothringische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 7,1 (1895) 1-29
- F. Hellwald, *Bibliographie méthodique de l`ordre souv. de St. Jean de Jérusalem* (Rome, 1885)
- K. Helm and W. Ziesemer, *Die Literatur des Deutschen Ritterordens* (Giessen, 1951)
- R. Hiestand, `Die Anfänge der Johanniter,` in Fleckenstein and Hellmann, eds., *Geistlichen Ritterorden*, 31-80
- R. Hill, `Fourpenny retirement: the Yorkshire Templars in the fourteenth century,` W. J. Sheils and D. Wood, eds., *Studies in Church History 24: the Church and Wealth* (Oxford, 1987) pp.123-8
- J. W. Hillgarth, *Ramon Lull and Lullism in fourteenth century*

- France (Oxford, 1971)
- J. C. Holt and R. Mortimer, eds., *Acta of Henry II and Richard I: Handlist of documents surviving in the original in repositories in the united kingdom*, List and Index Society, Special series, 21 (London, 1986)
- N. Housley, *The Italian Crusades. The Papal-Angevin Alliance and the crusades against Christian lay powers, 1254-1343* (Oxford, 1982)
- 'Politics and Heresy in Italy: Anti-Heretical Crusades, Orders and Confraternities, 1200-1500,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 33 (1982) 193-208
- W. Hubatsch, 'Der Johanniterorden in Ost- und Westpreußen,' *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung Länder und Völker im östlichen Mitteleuropa* 21 (1972) 1-19
- P. Jackson, 'The crisis in the Holy Land in 1260,' *English Historical Review* 95 (1980) 481-513
- 'The end of Hohenstaufen rule in Syria,' *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 59 (1986) 20-36
 - 'The crusades of 1239-41 and their aftermath,' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 50 (1987) 32-60
- F. Jégou, 'Les Templiers et le culte de Saint Nicolas,' *Revue de Bretagne et de Vendée* 4th series, 8 (1875) 81-88
- H. Jewell, *English local administration in the Middle Ages* (Newton Abbot, 1972)
- H. Johnstone, 'Poor relief in the royal households of thirteenth century England,' *Speculum* 4 (1929) 148-167
- B. Z. Kedar, H. E. Mayer and R. C. Smail, eds., *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem presented to Joshua Prawer* (Jerusalem, 1982)
- B. Z. Kedar, 'Gerald of Nazareth: a neglected twelfth-century writer in the latin east. A contribution to the intellectual monastic history of the crusader states,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 37 (1983) 55-77
- *Crusade and Mission: European approaches towards the Muslims*, (Princeton, 1984)
- M. Keen, *Chivalry* (New Haven and London, 1984)

- E. Kennan, 'Innocent III, Gregory IX and Political Crusades: a study in the disintegration of papal power,' in G. F. Lytle, ed., *Reform and authority in the medieval and reformation Church* (Washington D. C., 1981) pp.15-35
- E. J. King, *The Knights Hospitallers in the Holy Land* (London, 1931)
- Ch. Kohler, 'Rerum et personarum quae in Actis Sanctorum Bollandistis et analectis Bollandianis obviae ad orientem latinum spectant. Index analyticus,' *ROL* 5 (1897) 460-561
- H. Krauss, 'La chanson de geste dans le système des genres littéraires,' in K. H. Bender, ed., *Les épopées de la croisade*, pp.170-176
- W. Kuhn, 'Ritterorden als Grenzhüter des Abendlandes gegen das östliche Heidentum,' *Ostdeutsche Wissenschaft* 6 (1959) 7-70
- 'Kirchliches Siedlung als Grenzschutz 1200 bis 1250, (am Beispiel des mittleren Oderraumes)' *Ostdeutsche Wissenschaft* 9 (1962) 6-55
- G. Labuda, 'Die Urkunden über die Anfänge des Deutschen Ordens im Kulmerland und in Preußen in den Jahren 1226-1243,' in Fleckenstein and Hellmann, eds., *Geistlichen Ritterorden*, pp.299-316
- J. L. La Monte, *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem 1100-1291* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932)
- E. Langlois, *Table des noms propres de toute nature compris dans les chansons de geste* (Paris, 1904)
- C. H. Laurence, *Medieval monasticism: forms of religious in western Europe in the Middle Ages* (London and New York, 1984)
- L. von Ledebur, 'Die Tempelherren und ihre Besitzungen im Preußischen Staate. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Statistik des ordens,' *Allgemeines Archiv für die Geschichtskunde des Preußischen Staates* 16 (1835) 97-120, 242-268, 289-336
- M. D. Legge, *Anglo-Norman literature and its background*, (Oxford, 1963)
- List of Ancient Correspondence of the Chancery and Exchequer preserved in the Public Record Office*, P. R. O. Lists and

- Indexes 15 (reprinted New York, 1968)
- List of Inquisitions ad quod damnum preserved in the Public Record Office*, 2 vols., P. R. O. Lists and Indexes 17 (London, 1892-1912, reprinted New York, 1963)
- S. Lloyd, *English Society and the Crusade, 1216-1307* (Oxford, 1988)
- E. Loseth, *Le roman de Tristan, le roman de Palamède et la complilation de Rusticien de Pise. Analyse critique d'après les manuscrits de Paris* (Paris, 1891, reprinted New York, 1970)
- E. Lourie, 'The will of Alfonso I, 'El Batallador,' king of Aragon and Navarre: a reassessment,' *Speculum*, 50 (1975) 635-651
- F. Lundgreen, *Wilhelm von Tyrus und der Templeorden*, Historische Studien veröffentlicht von E. Ebering, Heft 97 (Berlin, 1911)
- H. Lüpke, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Templeordens im Gebiet der nordostdeutschen Kolonisation: Inaugural-Dissertation* (Bernburg, 1933)
- 'Das Land Tempelburg. Ein historisch-geographische Untersuchung,' *Baltische Studien*, 35 (1933) 43-97
- A. Macquarrie, *Scotland and the Crusades, 1095-1560* (Edinburgh, 1985)
- E. Magnou, 'Oblature, classe chevaleresque et servage dans les maisons méridionales du Temple au XIIe siècle,' *Annales du Midi* 73 (1961) 377-97
- L. de Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'Ile de Chypre sous le règne des princes de la maison de Lusignan*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1852-61)
- E. Mason, 'Timeo barones et dona ferentes,' in D. Baker, ed., *Studies in Church History 15: Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian* (Oxford, 1978) pp.61-75
- 'Fact and fiction in crusading tradition: the earls of Warwick in the 12th century,' *Journal of Medieval History* 14 (1988) 81-95
- H. E. Mayer, 'Studies in the History of Queen Melisende of Jerusalem,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 26 (1972) 93-182
- 'Henry II of England and the Holy Land,' *English*

- Historical Review*, 97 (1982) 721-739
- *The crusades*, trans. J. Gillingham, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1988)
 - M. Melville, *La vie des Templiers* (Paris, 1951)
 - S. Menache, 'Contemporary attitudes concerning the Templars' affair: Propaganda's fiasco?' *Journal of Medieval History*, 8 (1982) 135-147
 - P. Ménard, *Les Fabliaux: contes à rire du moyen âge* (Paris, 1983)
 - M. Méras, *Le Beaujolais au Moyen Age* (Villefranche-en-Beaujolais, 1956)
 - A. Moisan, *Répertoire des noms propres de personnes et de lieux cités dans les chansons de geste françaises et les oeuvres étrangères dérivées*, 5 vols. (Geneva/Paris, 1986)
 - M. R. Morgan, *The chronicle of Ernoul and the Continuations of William of Tyre* (Oxford, 1973)
 - 'The Rothelin continuation of William of Tyre,' in Kedar et al., eds., *Outremer*, pp. 244-257
 - C. Morris, 'Propaganda for war: the dissemination of the crusading ideal in the twelfth century,' in W. J. Sheils, ed., *Studies in Church History 20: The Church and War* (Oxford, 1983) pp. 79-101
 - *The papal monarchy. The western church from 1050 to 1250* (Oxford, 1989)
 - G. M. Myers, 'Les Chétifs - Etude sur le Développement de la chanson,' *Romania* 105 (1984) 63-87
 - P. Noble, 'Attitudes to social class as revealed by some of the older *chansons de geste*,' *Romania* 94 (1973) 359-85
 - Z. Nowak, 'Milites Christi de Prussia. Der Orden von Dobrin und seine Stellung in der preußischen Mission,' in Fleckenstein and Hellmann, eds., *Geistlichen Ritterorden* pp. 339-352
 - P. Partner, *The lands of St. Peter - the Papal State in the Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance* (London, 1972)
 - *The murdered magicians: the Templars and their myth*, (Oxford, 1982)
 - C. Perkins, 'The Knights Templars in the British Isles,' *English Historical Review* 25 (1910) 209-230

- E. Petit, *Histoire des ducs de Bourgogne de la race Capétienne, avec des documents inédits et des pièces justificatives*, 9 vols. (Paris, 1885-1905)
- C. Petit-Dutaillis, *L'Étude sur la vie et le règne de Louis VIII, (1187-1226)* (Paris, 1894)
- J. Piquet, *Des Banquiers au moyen âge: Les Templiers: Étude sur leurs opérations financières* (Paris, 1939)
- J. M. Powell, *Anatomy of a Crusade, 1213-1221* (Philadelphia, 1986)
- J. Praver, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Jerusalem, 1972)
- 'Military orders and crusader politics in the second half of the XIIIth century,' in Fleckenstein and Hellmann, eds., *Geistlichen Ritterorden*, pp.217-229
- H. Prutz, *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1883)
- M. Purcell, *Papal Crusading Policy: the chief instruments of papal crusading policy and crusade to the Holy Land from the final loss of Jerusalem to the loss of Acre (1244-1291)* (Leiden, 1975)
- S. Raban, *Mortmain legislation and the English Church, 1279-1500*, (Cambridge, 1982)
- C. Régnier, review of H. Roussel's thesis, 'Étude sur Renart le Nouvel du poète lillois Jacquemart Gielée' (Lille, 1956), *Revue du Nord* 41 (1959) 116-119
- W. Rees, *A History of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem in Wales and on the Welsh Border, including an account of the Templars* (Cardiff, 1947)
- 'The Templar manor of Llanmadoc,' *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 13 (1949) 144-5
- P. Riant, *Expéditions et Pèlerinages des Scandinaves en Terre Sainte au Temps des Croisades*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1865-9)
- J. Richard, *Le comté de Tripoli sous la dynastie Toulousaine (1102-1187)* (Paris, 1945)
- *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, trans. J. Shirley, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1979)
- 'Les Templiers et les Hospitaliers en Bourgogne et en Champagne méridionale (XIIe-XIIIe siècles), in Fleckenstein and Hellmann, eds., *Geistlichen Ritterorden*, pp.231-242

- J. Riley-Smith, *The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem and Cyprus, c.1050-1310* (London, 1967)
- 'The Templars and the castle of Tortosa in Syria: an unknown document concerning the acquisition of the fortress,' *English Historical Review* 84 (1969) 278-289
 - 'A note on confraternities in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem,' *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 44 (1971) 301-8
 - *What were the Crusades?* (London and Basingstoke, 1977)
 - 'The Templars and the Teutonic knights in Cilician Armenia,' in T. S. R. Boase, ed., *The Cilician kingdom of Armenia*, (Edinburgh, 1978) pp.278-289
 - 'Crusading as an act of love,' *History*, 65 (1980) 177-192
- I. S. Robinson, 'Gregory VII and the soldiers of Christ,' *History* 58 (1973) 169-192
- J. H. Round, 'Garnier de Nablous, prior of the Hospital of England, and Grand Master of the order of Jerusalem,' *Archaeologia* 58 (1903) 383-390
- P. Rousset, 'La description du monde chevaleresque chez Orderic Vitalis,' *Le Moyen Age* 75 (1969) 423-44
- E. Roy, 'Les dates et les allusions historiques dans les chansons d'Ogier le Danois,' in *Mélanges de Linguistique et de Littérature offerts à M. Alfred Jeanroy par ses élèves et ses amis* (Paris, 1928) pp.415-25
- F. H. Russell, *The Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1975)
- A. Sandys, 'The financial and administrative importance of the London Temple in the thirteenth century,' in A. G. Little and F. M. Powicke, eds., *Essays in Medieval History presented to Thomas Frederick Tout* (Manchester, 1925) pp.147-162
- H. M. Schaller, 'Die Kaiseridee Friedrichs II,' in Fleckenstein, ed., *Probleme um Friedrich II*, pp.109-134
- S. Schein, 'Between Mount Moriah and the Holy Sepulchre: the changing traditions of the Temple Mount in the Central Middle Ages,' *Traditio* 40 (1984) 175-195
- 'The image of the crusader kingdom of Jerusalem in the thirteenth century,' *Revue Belge de Philologie et*

- d'Histoire 64 (1986) 704-717
- B. Schirok, *Parzivalrezeption im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1982)
- M. Schüpferling, *Der Tempelherren-orden in Deutschland. Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde von der philos. fakultät der Universität Freiburg in der Schweiz* (Bamberg, 1915)
- K. Setton, ed., *A History of the Crusades*, 1: M. W. Baldwin, ed., *The First Hundred Years* (Philadelphia, 1958)
 - 2: R. L. Wolff and H. W. Hazard, ed., *The Later Crusades, 1189-1311* (Madison and London, 1969)
 - 5: N. P. Zacour and H. W. Hazard, eds., *The impact of the crusades on the near east* (Madison and London, 1985)
- E. Siberry, *Criticism of Crusading, 1095-1274* (Oxford, 1985)
 - 'Troubadours, Trouvères, Minnesingers and the crusades,' *Studi Medievali* 3rd series 29 (1988) 19-43
- K. V. Sinclair, 'The Anglo-Norman miracles of the foundation of the Hospital of St. John in Jerusalem,' *Medium Aevum* 55 (1986) 102-8
- R. C. Smail, 'Latin Syria and the West, 1149-1187,' *RHST* 5th series 19 (1969) 1-21
- R. C. Stacey, *Politics, Policy and Finance under Henry III, 1216-1245* (Oxford, 1987)
- I. Sterns, 'Crime and punishment among the Teutonic Knights,' *Speculum* 57 (1982) 84-111
 - 'The Teutonic Knights in the Crusader States,' in Setton, ed., *A History of the Crusades*, 5 pp.315-378
- E. Stickel, *Der Fall von Akkon. Untersuchungen zum Abklingen des Kreuzzugsgedankens am Ende des 13 Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt/Munich, 1975)
- E. A. Synan, 'St. Thomas Aquinas and the profession of arms,' *Medieval Studies* 50 (1988) 404-437
- B. B. Szczesniak, *The Knights Hospitallers in Poland and Lithuania* (The Hague and Paris, 1969)
- S. Thiolier-Mejean, *Les poésies satiriques et morales des troubadours du XIIe siècle à la fin du XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1978)
- P. A. Throop, 'Criticism of papal crusade policy in Old French and Provençal,' *Speculum*, 13 (1938) 379-412

- F. Tommasi, 'L'ordine dei Templari a Perugia,' *Bolletino della deputazione di Storia Patria per l'Umbria* 78 (1981) 1-79
- D. A. Trotter, *Medieval French Literature and the Crusades, 1100-1300* (Geneva, 1987)
- P. M. Tumlner, *Der Deutsche Orden in Werden, Washsen und Wirken bis 1400 mit einem Abriß der Geschichte des Ordens von 1400 bis zur neuesten Zeit* (Montreal and Vienna, 1955)
- C. Tyerman, *England and the Crusades, 1095-1588* (Chicago and London, 1988)
- D. B. Tyson, 'Patronage of French vernacular history writers in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,' *Romania* 100 (1979) 180-222
- W. Ullmann, *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages* (London, 1972)
- W. Urban, *The Baltic Crusade* (Decatur, 1975)
- *The Prussian Crusade* (Lanham, 1980)
- J. C. Van Cleve, *The emperor Frederick II of Hohenstaufen: Immutator Mundi* (Oxford, 1972)
- R. Vaughan, *Matthew Paris* (Cambridge, 1958)
- V. Venuti, 'Dell'esistenza, professione e culto di S. Nicasio martire. Discorso storico-critico,' in F. Testa, ed., *Opuscoli di auctori Siciliani*, 7 (Palermo, 1762)
- B. Ward, *Miracles and the Medieval Mind: theory, record and event, 1000-1215* (Aldershot, 1987)
- J. C. Ward, 'Fashions in monastic endowment: the foundations of the Clare family, 1066-1314,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 32 (1981) 427-51
- W. L. Warren, *King John* (London, 1961)
- *Henry II* (London, 1973)
- F.-W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert, *Kreuzzugsdictung des Mittelalters. Studien zu ihrer Geschichtlichen und Dichterischen Wirklichkeit* (Berlin, 1960)
- W. E. Wightman, *The Lacy family in England and Normandy, 1066-1194* (Oxford, 1966)
- E. Winkelmann, *Jahrbücher der Deutschen Geschichte: Philippe von Schwaben und Otto IV von Braunschweig*, 2

vols.(Leipzig, 1873-8)

- *Kaiser Friedrich II*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1889-1897)

- D. Wojtecki, *Studien zur Personengeschichte des Deutschenordens im 13 Jahrhundert*, Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des östlichen Europa, 3 (Wiesbaden, 1971)
- 'Der Deutsche Orden unter Friedrich II,' in Fleckenstein, ed., *Probleme um Friedrich II*, pp.187-224
- H. Wood, 'The Templars in Ireland,' *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 26C (1907) 327-377
- M. M. Wood, *The Spirit of Protest in Old French Literature* (New York, 1917)

Unpublished Theses

- B. Beebe, 'Edward I and the Crusades,' (Ph.D., St. Andrew's, 1970)
- E. Hallam, 'Aspects of the monastic patronage of the English and French royal houses, c.1130-1270,' (Ph.D., London, 1976)
- S. Schein, 'The West and the Crusade, 1291-1313; Attitudes and Attempts,' (Ph.D., Cambridge, 1980)
- N. Thorpe, ed., 'La chanson de Jérusalem - a critical edition,' (Ph.D., Reading, 1980)
- J. Upton-Ward, 'Attitudes towards the Templars (c.1119 to 1312),' (M.A., Reading, 1986)