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Scholars have dealt extensively with the sermon held by Urban II at the Council of Clermont to launch the First Crusade. There is indeed much room for speculation, since the original text has been lost and we have to rely on the reports of it in chronicles. But the scholarly discussion is mostly based on the same sort of sources: the chronicles and their references to letters and charters. Not much attention has been paid so far to the genre of papal synodal sermons in the Middle Ages. In this article, I focus on the tradition of papal oratory, using this background to look at the call for crusade from a new perspective. Firstly, I analyse the versions of the Clermont sermon in the crusading chronicles and compare them with the only address held by Urban II known from a non-narrative source. Secondly, I discuss the sermons of Gregory VII as they are recorded in synodal protocols and in historiography. The results support the view that only the version reported by Fulcher of Chartres corresponds to a sort of oratory common to papal speeches in the eleventh century.

The speech that Pope Urban II delivered at Clermont in 1095 to launch the First Crusade is probably one of the most discussed sermons from the Middle Ages. It was a popular motif in medieval chronicles and is still an important source for the history of the crusades. Since we only have the reports of chroniclers and not the manuscript of the pope himself, each analysis of this address faces a fundamental problem: even the three writers who attended the Council of Clermont recorded three different versions, quite distinctive both in content and style. Scholars have dealt with

this problem extensively, but they normally discuss only the reports in the chronicles of three eyewitnesses.²

This paper, however, will reinvestigate Urban’s sermon and take the tradition of papal preaching at a council in the eleventh century into consideration. In the first section, I will analyse the three well-known accounts of the eyewitnesses of the sermon in Clermont (Fulcher of Chartres, Robert the Monk, and Baudri of Dol).³ In doing this, I will show that they are not all ‘sermons’, that is ‘an oral discourse, spoken in the voice of a preacher who addresses an audience, to instruct and exhort them on a topic concerned with faith and morals and based on a sacred text’.⁴ In the second section, the tradition of papal oratory as depicted in other sources of the pontificate of Urban II and his predecessor Gregory VII will be discussed. In the context of this tradition, it will be much clearer what kind of oratory Urban may have been using in 1095.

**Fulcher of Chartres**

Urban’s call for the crusade is first mentioned in the *Gesta Francorum* composed by an anonymous writer around 1100.⁵ There are some remarks in this text about Urban’s preaching in France to launch the crusade, but it does not contain a word-by-word account of the speech. The first complete rendition of Urban’s speech in Clermont was given by Fulcher of Chartres, who wrote this part of his *Historia Hierosolymitana* quite soon after the Council of Clermont, around 1100/05.⁶ Fulcher was a cleric who took part in the First Crusade and was probably present at the council itself.⁷ At least he asserts in his prologue that he has recorded only those events which he saw with his own eyes.⁸ Even though it has been argued that personal experience was of less importance in crusading chronicles,⁹ it is noteworthy

---


³ Some scholars assume that Guibert de Nogent was also present at the Council of Clermont. He admits, however, that he is reporting only the main arguments (*intentiones*) of Urban and not the words of his speech (*verba*) and will therefore not be considered here. Cf. Guibert de Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos: Et cinq autres textes*, ed. by Robert B. C. Huygens, Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio Mediaevalis, 127 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996), pp. 111–17; Elizabeth Lapina, ‘‘Nec signis nec testibus creditur. . .”: The Problem of Eyewitnesses in the Chronicles of the First Crusade’, *Viator*, 38 (2007), 117–39 (p. 120 n. 19).


that Fulcher explicitly mentions this *topos* and other sources do not. The next peculiarity of his account is that he reports not only a call for the crusade but two speeches by the pope. According to this source, Pope Urban first admonished the clergy and declared the official *causae* of the council in an opening sermon.\(^\text{10}\) Probably on the first day, he addressed the gathered ecclesiastical dignitaries with an ‘eloquent address’ (*adlocutio dulciflua*) about the necessity of Church reform.\(^\text{11}\) Firstly, the pope exhorted the assembled bishops and abbots to meet their responsibilities. He explained that they were called shepherds and should, therefore, ‘guard on every side of the flock entrusted to them (John 10. 12–13)’. The pope warned them ‘if through carelessness or neglect a wolf carries off a sheep […] they will certainly […] be summarily hurled into the abode of the damned’.\(^\text{12}\) In order to be able to correct those under their care, the bishops and abbots must first correct themselves and become ‘prudent, far-seeing, modest, learned, peacemaking, truth-seeking, pious, just, equitable, and pure’.\(^\text{13}\) For, the pope asked rhetorically, ‘how can the unlearned make others learned, the immodest others modest, and the impure others pure?’ In this context, Urban cited some sentences from the Bible especially from the New Testament, such as Matthew 5. 13: ‘You are the salt of the earth. But if the salt loses its saltiness, how can it be made salty again?’\(^\text{14}\) Then, he continued to address issues of Church sovereignty. Above all, simony must not take root among the clergy, and the Church must be kept free from secular power. Finally, Urban admonished the assembly to re-pledge themselves to the ‘Truce of God.’\(^\text{15}\) The seizing of clergymen, pilgrims, and merchants should be stopped. All thieves and burners of houses should ‘be banished from the Church and excommunicated’.

The discussion of these *causae* probably lasted several days, before *clerus* and *populus* — that is, the clergy and the participating aristocrats — were willing to approve the decrees by acclamation.\(^\text{16}\) The declaration of the decrees took place at the end of the synod,\(^\text{17}\) and in this context, the pope began his call for the crusade. First of all, he emphasized that the Christian brothers in the East needed the help of the Western Church.\(^\text{18}\) They were attacked by the Turks, a Persian people, who had ‘advanced far into Roman territory’ and seized there ‘more and more of the lands of the Christians’. The Turks killed or captured many of them, destroyed their churches


\(^{16}\) Somerville, *The Councils of Urban II*, pp. 102, 104.


‘and have devastated the kingdom of God’. The pope refers hence in his speech to the traditional concept of a just war that legitimizes violence in acts of self-defence and the defence of others. He argues moreover using the command of Christ and thus defines the crusade as a synthesis of holy and just war. Urban promised, in addition, that all who might die on the way would have immediate remission of sins. And yet while individuals might die, the Christians had the support of the omnipotent God and should easily conquer the Turks. Besides, those who had been fighting against their brothers and relatives, ‘can now become “soldiers of Christ” (Christi milites), the ones “who have been hirelings for a few pieces of silver (Matthew 17. 3) [can] now attain eternal reward”.

These allusions to the Bible are the first reason to define the speeches of Urban II in Fulcher’s chronicle as ‘sermons’. The pope dealt with virtues of the clergy and soldiers, and with the necessity of fighting for the Christian religion, consequently with topics concerned with faith and morals. We find some rhetorical means in both speeches that were often used by speakers and preachers, such as rhetorical questions, exclamatio, and anaphora. The anaphora is sometimes combined with an antithesis contrasting Turks with Christians or the suffering of the Western world with the positive impact of a crusade. In sum, however, the text is not very rhetorical. Penny Cole has explained this with ‘the limitations imposed by the reportatio style which Fulcher used’. This style has the value of preserving the most important points, but is ‘without literary embellishment’ and fails ‘to convey the rhetorical eloquence of the speaker’. She assumes that Fulcher was not an experienced preacher and failed therefore to ‘prepare the reader for the dramatic response that followed’ the speech — the beginning of the crusading movement. Fulcher’s version is admittedly not a good example for a dramatic crusading sermon. Nevertheless, some scholars accept Fulcher’s rendition as the most trustworthy of all. It is indeed not only the first report by a writer who asserts to be an eyewitness, but is also based on the text of the decrees of the Clermont Council. To conclude, Fulcher is reporting two speeches, one at the beginning and one at the end of the synod. He refers thus to an established tradition of opening synods with a speech about the duties of the clergy and the causae, and ending with the declaration of the decrees. In his version, the

26 See evidence in Historia Hierosolymitana, pp. 123–24 n. 1, 130–31 n. 1. Somerville, The Councils of Urban II, p. 8 confirms that ‘beyond Fulcher of Chartres’ rendition of certain of Urban’s addresses in the synod, however, the descriptions of crusading origins at Clermont are insignificant for a study of the canonical transmission’.
27 See also the report of a synod which was held in 1049 by Leo IX, who, however, did not deliver the opening sermon himself: Die Konzilien Deutschlands und Reichsitaliens 1023–1059, ed. by Detlev Jasper, Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Concilia, 8 (Hannover: Hahn, 2010), pp. 233–34, and p. 239 for the declaration of decrees.
call for the crusades has, indeed, not the form of a dramatic sermon; it is part of
the regular declaration of the council’s legal decisions. The pope introduced this
declaration with some quotations from the Bible and framed the address with some
rhetorical means, which allow us to define his speech as a sort of legal oratory.

Robert the Monk

Some historians, however, prefer the version of Robert the Monk who completed his
chronicle in 1107 and reports an elaborate sermon and the ‘dramatic response’ in
Clermont.\(^{28}\) The identification of Robert with a prior of Sénuc and former abbot
of Saint-Rémi has recently been challenged, but seems nevertheless not completely
unlikely.\(^{29}\) In a *sermo apologeticus*, which is a first prologue to the text, Robert
asserts that he was present at the Council of Clermont.\(^{30}\) On the other hand, his task
is explicitly not to write what he saw, but to rework an extant *historia* — most
likely the *Gesta Francorum* — in order to improve the bad style of the text.\(^{31}\) This is
of crucial importance for the interpretation of Urban’s sermon, because the insertion
of elaborate speeches is an important aspect of such stylistic improvement. It is a
typical element of rhetorical dilatation (*dilatatio*).\(^{32}\) In the following *prologus*, Robert
explains other aspects of his task, such as to tell ‘nothing but the truth’.\(^{33}\) In a
medieval chronicle, however, the ‘truth’ (*verum*) should never be equated with
experience.\(^{34}\) Finally, in this *prologus* Robert praises the Franks as a people chosen
by God, which is also of importance for the interpretation of Urban’s speech in this
chronicle.

In the first chapter, Robert depicts the scenario of Urban’s sermon at Clermont.\(^{35}\)
In contrast to Fulcher’s account, the address is presented as taking place in an ‘open

\(^{28}\) *Historia Iherosolimitana*, ed. by Philippe Le Bas, Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occiden-
Crusade*, ed. by Carol Sweetenham, Crusade Texts in Translation, 11 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005). Indeed, the
chronicle offers some information about the ‘organizational schema’ of the crusade, cf. Robert Somerville,
55–90 (pp. 60–62); Robert Somerville, ‘The Council of Clermont and the First Crusade’, *Studia Gratiana*, 20
(1976), 325–37 (pp. 332–34).

\(^{29}\) On Robert’s biography, see for example Peter Orth, ‘Robert of Rheims’, in *The Crusades: An Encyclopedia*,
iv, 1042–43; Carol Sweetenham, ‘Introduction’, in *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*, ed. by
Carol Sweetenham, Crusade Texts in Translation, 11 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 1–71 (pp. 1–4). She is
very critical of this identification, but overemphasizes in my opinion the fact that Robert as former abbot of
Saint-Rémi could not have received a command from another abbot to write a crusading chronicle. Firstly,
the ‘command’ in the *apologeticus sermo* is a highly rhetorical *topos*, and secondly, if Robert was prior in
Sénuc when he wrote this text, he was dependent upon an abbot.

\(^{30}\) *Historia Iherosolimitana*, pp. 721–22; translation: *Robert the Monk’s History*, p. 75.

\(^{31}\) Neither Robert nor other chroniclers were ‘saying [...] that the Gesta Francorum was not theological enough’,
as Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, p. 139 suggests. They criticized primarily the style of the *Gesta*.

\(^{32}\) Rita Copeland and Ineke Sluiter, *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric: Language Arts and Literary Theory*,
300–1475 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 34.

\(^{33}\) *Historia Iherosolimitana*, p. 723; translation: *Robert the Monk’s History*, p. 77.

\(^{34}\) Thomas M. Buck, ‘Von der Kreuzzugs geschichte zum Reisebuch: Zur “Historia Hierosolymitana” des
Robertus Monachus’, *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, 76 (2002),

\(^{35}\) *Historia Iherosolimitana*, pp. 727–29; translation: *Robert the Monk’s History*, pp. 79–82.
space of some size’. Moreover, the pope is not addressing the higher clergy, but the ‘Frenchmen and men from across the mountains’ (gens Francorum, gens transmontana). Another important difference between this version and Fulcher’s is that the call for the crusade is not following a speech about issues of Church reform. The opening of the speech is quite different: in this text, Urban first praises the beautiful setting of the Franks’ land and recalls the faith and the deeds of their ancestors. He reminds the Franks of the glory and greatness of Charlemagne who destroyed the kingdoms of pagans. In great detail, he then describes the misdeeds of the Turks: ‘When they feel like inflicting a truly painful death on some they pierce their navel, pull out the end of their intestines, tie them to a pole and whip them around it until all their bowels pulled out, they fall lifeless to the ground’. Consequently the Franks must not hesitate to enter upon the road to Jerusalem, which is — for the first time — explicitly mentioned. The pope describes extensively the beauty of the Holy Land, thus promising booty for the knights: ‘It is a land more fruitful than any other, almost another Earthly Paradise’. Meanwhile wars and feuds devastate the kingdoms of the West and the Franks fight against each other, because too many people are living in too small a space. The speech ends with explanations about Jerusalem as the site of Christ’s Passion. Then, the enthusiastic crowd answers, crying ‘God wills it’, which the pope defines as the militare signum of the crusaders.

This speech is indeed a good introduction for a book about the crusades, because it seems to explain the enthusiasm of the knights to fight against the infidels. However, it is doubtful if the supposed audience — the Frankish people — understood the Latin oration that was delivered on an ‘open square’ where the acoustic conditions would surely have been very bad. All sources agree that the pope spoke in Latin and there is no evidence for Urban being an eloquent preacher in his mother tongue. Even if we take into consideration the fact that Latin addresses might have had an impact on an illiterate audience, there are some other questions about the rhetorical style of Robert’s account. The praise of the Franks in the exordium of the speech is, for example, a recurrent motif in Robert’s chronicle which was — as mentioned above — introduced in the prologue. Carol Sweetenham assumes that Robert is in

35 Historia Iherosolimitana, p. 727; translation: Robert the Monk’s History, p. 79.
37 Historia Iherosolimitana, p. 729; translation: Robert the Monk’s History, p. 81.
41 Alfons Becker, Papst Urban II. (1088–1099), Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Schriften, 19, 3 vols (Stuttgart: Hirschmann, 1964–2012), ii: Der Papst, die griechische Christenheit und der Kreuzzug (1988), p. 393 refers to Guibert de Nogent, Dei gesta per Francos, p. 111, who is supposed to give evidence that the pope spoke in French and was very fluent in his mother tongue. The text says, however, quite the opposite, namely that Urban was as eloquent in Latin as a laymen was in the vernacular: ‘Eius enim scientiae litterariarum eloquentia cooperatur agilitas, non enim minor et videbatur in Latinae prosecutione locutionis ubertas quam forensi cuilibet potest esse in materno sermone permissita’.
this case a bit ‘selective in what he reports and fits it to his main themes’. Penny Cole emphasizes that his version is in general ‘valuable because he attempted to convey something of its oratorical form’. However, the main problem is the ‘oratorical form’ of his rendition. Even though there are some quotations from the Bible (Psalms 78. 8 and 68. 21, Matthew 10. 37 and 19. 29, and Exodus 3. 8) it is not that of a sermon. The speaker is not primarily dealing with faith and morals in the voice of a preacher, he is agitating for war. Therefore, he describes the misdeeds of the enemy, thus drawing extensively on popular literary motifs. He refers to the example of the ancestors and promises booty in Jerusalem, all of which are typical elements of battle speeches to soldiers in chronicles. The example of Charlemagne could even be found in Robert’s model text, the Gesta Francorum. In sum, his task was to rework the Gesta stylistically. In accordance with the tradition of rhetorical dilatation, he embellished the text and put, for instance, a dramatic battle speech in the mouth of the pope. Consequently, he was more concerned with narrative and rhetoric traditions than with the liturgy of a council.

Baudri of Dol

Around 1108, Baudri, Bishop of Dol, completed his Historia de peregrinatione Jerusolimitana that contains a third version of Urban’s sermon. Baudri was a very learned author and especially famous for his Ovidian poetry. He was probably Robert’s friend and literary patron, and like him, he attended the Council of Clermont but did not take part in the crusade. In the prologue to his crusading chronicle, he admits that he has written about events that he knew from the accounts of others and not about something he has seen himself. Fearing that the bad style of the Gesta Francorum would compromise the memory of the crusades, he aimed to revise the narrative stylistically. This intention is in fact quite similar to Robert’s. According to Baudri’s Historia, Urban was very eloquent and came to France with the aim of disseminating the word of God. In Clermont he ascended a pulpit and spoke to an assembly of bishops, abbots, and powerful nobles. Baudri presents not only a setting that is different from the other versions, but also depicts another

---

46 Sweetenham, ‘Introduction’, p. 80 n. 3.  
48 Gesta Francorum, p. 2.  
opening for the speech. The pope first laments the oppression of the Christian brothers in Jerusalem and Antioch, which is initially mentioned in this version. They were ‘either subjected in their inherited homes to other masters, or driven from them, or they come as beggars among us’.\(^{52}\) He points out how the Christian churches were desecrated and ‘used as stables for the animals’.\(^{53}\) Above all, Jerusalem, where Christ suffered and died, had been taken by the Turks who worshipped their idols in Solomon’s Temple. Dealing with the atrocities of the pagans, the pope is ‘oppressed by tears and groans, sighs and sobs’. He ‘weep[s] and wail[s . . .] in [. . . his] inmost heart’.\(^{54}\) These strong expressions of grief and sorrow distinguish this sermon from other versions. It is in fact typical for the performance of a sermon and the following is also typical. In great detail the pope explains why the ‘Holy Land’ is called ‘holy’; that is, because not only Christ, but also his mother, the apostles, and in addition the first martyrs lived and died there. Then he interprets the conquest of Israel after the Exodus from Egypt as a prefiguration of the crusade. The Christian knights should follow the example of the Israelites and fight against the pagan enemy rather than kill each other in internal wars. The bishops should announce this in their dioceses, preach the way to Jerusalem and pray for a Christian victory. At the end, Baudri also reports the audience’s reaction that differs from the account of Robert: some cried, some trembled, and yet others discussed the matter.\(^{55}\) In contrast to Robert’s version, Baudri conveys the emotional performance and the rhetorical structure of a sermon.\(^{56}\) It contains typical elements, such as quotations from the Bible, or, for example, the interpretation of terms by historical or typological explanations. Since the pope is addressing higher clergy and some nobles, the scenario is that of a synodal sermon. In addition, there are some references to synodal procedures, such as the plea to the bishops to care for the publication of the decrees in their dioceses.\(^{57}\)

In sum, there are three versions that are quite different both in style and content: we find legal oratory, a battle speech and a sermon. There is a long discussion about the question as to why these three authors gave presumably three different accounts, especially in respect to Jerusalem which is not mentioned by Fulcher but by Robert, Baudri, and all later crusading chronicles.\(^{58}\) Scholars normally compare these chronicles to decide what the speech really was about, or they refer to some letters of the pope and charters of the crusaders. But no one has so far analysed these versions in light of the tradition of papal synodal preaching of the eleventh century. In general, we do not know much about the preaching of popes in the central Middle Ages — that is why I am currently preparing a monograph on this topic. However, in the next section of this article, I will point out some general trends from my research. Firstly,

52 *Historia Jerosolimitana*, p. 12; translation: *The First Crusade*, p. 29.
55 *Historia Jerosolimitana*, p. 15.
the versions of Urban’s sermon in Clermont will be compared to sermons of this pope in non-narrative sources. Secondly, I compare them to the sermons of Urban’s predecessor Gregory VII in synodal protocols and in historiography.

Other sermons by Urban II

Jacques-Paul Migne included only two sermons by Urban II, which are not part of a narrative text, in the *Patrologia Latina*. Urban is thought to have delivered one of them at the ordination and consecration of Ivo as Bishop of Chartres. Since Ivo integrated this text in his letter collection, it is widely disseminated. The editor of the collection, Jean Leclercq, defined it also as an ‘allocution’. But I identified this text with a letter that each bishop received during ordination — it is no *oratio*, no speech. The other one is the *Sermo post consecrationem ecclesiae Cluniacensis*. This text begins with the dating (25 October 1095) and gives an account of the consecration of two altars in the church of Cluny. Pope Urban himself consecrated two altars, and three bishops of his entourage consecrated three others in the monastery church. Afterwards, the pope celebrated a mass. During this, he made some *salutis hortamenta*, so he most likely gave a short address exhorting the audience to look out for their salvation. Then, he delivered a ‘sermon to the people’ (*sermonem habuit ad populum*). In this sermon, he deals first with the special connection between the papacy and Cluny. He mentions that he himself was prior of the monastery and served under Hugo who is still the Abbot of Cluny. Even though his predecessors took care of the monastery, he is the first one who personally visits this place. During his visit, he wishes to delight and support the monks with his presence and speech (*accessu et alloquio*). Therefore, he has decided to define an immune area in which the monastery of Cluny should be saved from all sorts of attack, pillage, plunder, or — what is worse — murder, and physical injury. In the next paragraph of the ‘sermon’ more than two-thirds of the text — follows a geographical definition of the immune area. At the end, the pope warns that everyone who does not respect this immunity will be punished with excommunication. So, the pope started with a narration of earlier events (*narratio*), comes to a legal decision (*dispositio*), and defines an area to which his decision applies (*pertinentia*) before framing sanctions.

62 *Sermo post consecrationem ecclesiae Cluniacensis*, in B. *Urbani II pontificis Romani epistolae, diplomata, sermones*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, *Patrologia latina*, 151 (Paris: Migne, 1881), cols 562–64. This edition is based on Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Manuscrit Latin 17 716, fol. 91r (around 1200). There is also a miniature on this page showing the scenario at Urban’s sermon with the pope and his curia on the one side and abbot Hugo and some Cluniacs on the other. It is printed in Joachim Wollasch, *Cluny: Licht der Welt: Aufstieg und Niedergang der klösterlichen Gemeinschaft* (Düsseldorf: Artemis & Winkler, 1996), p. 189, and on the cover of Somerville, *Pope Urban II’s Council of Piacenza*.
63 *Sermo post consecrationem*, col. 561–62.
64 *Sermo post consecrationem*, col. 562–63.
65 *Sermo post consecrationem*, col. 563–64.
(sanctio). These are elements of a papal privilege, rather than of a sermon.66 We have no such privilege for Cluny and some scholars are even uncertain about the attribution to Urban.67 There is, however, a longer tradition of similar speeches by popes of the later eleventh and early twelfth century in favour of exempt monasteries.68 They were usually delivered during a synod to defend the exemption against claims by the local bishops. To show their special connection with these institutions the popes did not just read a papal privilege but added some rhetorical ornament and delivered a speech, which is typical for decrees in the form of a ‘synodal constitution’.69 In this case, the pope addressed local authorities and framed his privilege with some salutis bortamenta and references to his own biography. It could thus be further evidence for Urban II making use of a sort of legal oratory.

Non-narrative sources for the oratory of Gregory VII

Among non-narrative sources for Gregory’s VII pontificate, only two speeches are preserved. One of them is an address which is quite similar to the speech of Urban II in Cluny. Gregory VII delivered it to a Roman council in the year 1080.70 Herbert Cowdrey edited the text in Gregory’s Epistolae vagantes and labelled it as an ‘allocution in praise of Cluny’.71 Actually, it is a short protocol that shows the performance of a papal address: firstly, the pope ‘rose and called all to silence’. Standing beside the throne,72 he started a speech dealing with the special connection between

---

Cluny and the popes. He praises this place because ‘it has come to such a height of excellence and religion under its religious and holy abbots’ and ‘surpasses all other monasteries, even much older ones […] in the service of God and in spiritual fervour’. The monks there have never worshipped idols or ‘bowed the knee to […] Jeroboam’. According to the Old Testament (1 Kings 12. 32), this king erected not only idols, but appointed also priests, which refers to the problem of lay investiture. Rather than this, the monks of Cluny always respected the authority of the Roman See and ‘have remained under the exclusive obedience and protection of St Peter and this church’. Therefore, the pope wills, affirms, and lays down ‘that no one may […] exercise any power against this place and monastery’. Besides he defines the group of persons who should respect the immunity, namely all ecclesiastical (archbishop, bishop and papal legates) and secular authorities (kings, dukes, marquis, princes and counts). The monks of Cluny should possess ‘fully and perpetually the immunity which has been granted to it by this see’ in a former privilege. At the end of the declaration, he asked the assembled clerics, ‘Does this please you? Do you approve?’ They answered, ‘it pleases us, we approve’, and the pope sat down on the throne.

As we can see, the aim of this *allocutio* was the confirmation of the special ecclesiastical status of Cluny. The style of this address is not that of a classical laudatory allocution. It starts with the narration about earlier events (*narratio*) which leads to the decision of the pope (*dispositio*) who refers also to earlier decrees and defines the affected groups. All this is typical for a papal privilege and similar to Urban’s *sermo ad populum* in Cluny and other synodal constitutions for exempt monasteries. Urban had introduced this *sermo* with some *salutis hortamenta* and Gregory referred to some quotations from the Bible. But both protocols indicate that popes in the later eleventh century did not deliver very elaborate speeches. They did not try to persuade the audience with embellished oratory, but rather declared their will in speeches whose rhetoric had the style of legal documents. The last protocol shows quite clearly that the audience gave, nevertheless, signs of approval, because this was simply part of the ritual at a synod. Thus, these documents confirm the plausibility of Fulcher who depicts a scenario where a pope declares the decisions of the synod with very little rhetorical framing.

However, there is also evidence during the pontificate of Gregory VII of a papal address in the form of a sermon. The pope’s register contains the protocol of a synod in November 1083 in the Lateran basilica. The situation was quite desperate, as King Henry was laying siege to Rome and had captured some bishops. On the third day, Gregory VII addressed his last adherents ‘with the voice not of a man but of an angel’. He spoke about ‘Christian religion […] the strength and constancy of mind

---

73 The ‘Epistolae Vagantes’, pp. 96–97.  
75 See footnotes 66, 68 and 69 above.  
that were needful in face of the current affliction’. Thus, he ‘brought practically the whole assembly to groanings and tears’. He opened this moving sermon with explanations de fidei forma that Cowdrey translates as ‘the pattern of faith’.

This term means in fact the Creed, because other authors of the eleventh century use this expression with this same meaning. The notice is rather short, but proves that Gregory’s preaching could also be part of a more emotional performance. Augustine had defined the crying of the audience as a sign of a sermon’s success in his De doctrina Christiana.

This book was well known in the central Middle Ages and hence, tears were probably more than spontaneous effects. They were an emotional way of showing approval with the message of a preacher — in this case with the pope.

Sermons of Gregory VII in narrative sources

The moving sermon about the creed that Gregory delivered in 1083 was some years later cited in a narrative source. Shortly before 1100, Bishop Rangerius of Lucca composed a Vita of his predecessor, St Anselm of Lucca. He did not write something completely new but reworked a very simple biography in accordance with the rules of rhetorical dilatatio. This means, he wrote a longer, elaborate version in verse and inserted many speeches. The most elaborate papal sermon in the Vita Anselmi is set at the beginning of the synod of 1076. Gregory gives a long talk about issues of faith, following the structure of the Creed: he begins with an explanation of the Holy Trinity and continues with the incarnation and the virgin birth of Jesus. Then, he deals with his death and ascension before discussing the relevance of the Church for believers.

While the pope continues with considerations about celibacy and the liberty of the Church, an envoy of the German king interrupts him and requires the pope to come down from his throne, thus citing a famous letter of Henry IV.

Rangerius has invented this stirring scenario for one of the crucial moments in the investiture contest. Being an adherent of the Gregorian party, he possibly participated in the 1083 synod at which the pope preached about the Creed. When, some years later, he wrote the Vita Anselmi, he remodelled the sermon which became the

---

78 The Register of Pope Gregory VII, p. 440.
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opening speech of the synod in 1076. Since this synod had such importance in the conflict between the emperor and the pope, it was often depicted by medieval historians and some followed the scenario of Rangerius. Between the years 1111 and 1115, the monk Donizo who lived in the monastery of Sant’Apollonio in Canossa, wrote a *Vita Matildis*. The *Vita* contains a rendition of the synod of 1076 and also of the pope’s opening sermon. In this version, however, the pope is not speaking about the Creed. Here, he cites Matthew 18. 7 and deals with the dangers that will threaten the Church in the future. His adherents should now ‘be as shrewd as snakes and as innocent as doves’ (Matthew 10. 16). In the aforementioned *De doctrina Christiana*, the Church Father Augustine had defined the ability to sacrifice the body to save the head as the ‘shrewdness’ of the snake. This idea probably connects the quotation from the Bible with the next paragraph, in which the pope requires his audience to die as martyrs for Christ. They should sacrifice their bodies in order to save the Church. In this part of the speech, the pope also interprets a miracle that has just previously happened: A snake had emerged from an egg and suddenly drew back after being struck on its head. The pope explains this as a sign that the words of faith will triumph over evil. At the end of his explanations, the synod shows emphatic approval of the pope’s call for support against the German king. Even though the address is relatively short, it contains typical features of a sermon, such as opening with Biblical quotations, allusions to Augustine and the explanation of a miracle.

This new interpretation of Gregory’s sermon in 1076 was obviously the model for Paul of Bernried who wrote about this council in the *Vita Gregorii*, which was finished in 1128. As in Donizo’s *Vita*, the pope refers first to the Gospel of Matthew. However, the interpretation of the snake and the dove (Matthew 10. 16) is different and is explained in greater detail:

> Just as the pious fathers destroyed the serpent’s cunning with their dovelike innocence and put to flight the innocence of the dove with the cunning of the serpent, so let us retain the gentleness of the bird that is without poison and let us not relinquish the wisdom of the serpent.

---
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Moreover, the pope adds other quotations from the Bible, such as ‘our faith may be more precious than gold that is tested by fire’ (1 Peter 1. 7). He cites the motif of fire again when he exhorts his audience not to fear the success of their enemies, because ‘power is granted to them by the just judge so that the furnace provided for our trial may quickly be consumed in ash and sparks, while we, the proven vessels, may be taken up forever into the service of the Lord’.94 Since ‘fire’ is a main characteristic of Gregory VII in Paul’s Vita, it must not be absent in his opening speech of 1076 — it is a recurrent motif of the narration. In the first chapters, Paul has explained Gregory’s name Hildebrand as ‘burning up of earthly desire’. He has reported a dream in which the later pope is blowing flames ‘out of his mouth that set the whole world on fire’ and has interpreted this as an appearance of the Holy Ghost spreading the words of salvation everywhere.95 In this version of the pope’s speech not only is the motif of fire new, but also the interpretation of the miracle is much more complex. In Paul’s text, the egg ‘represents the [...] holy Church [...] in which indeed the evil are mixed up with the good until the end of the world, as none of the faithful doubts’.96 The snake is a symbol for the German king who has long been hiding his true intentions, but is ‘now attempting to rear his head against the foundation of our faith, as is written, he sets his mouth against the heavens and his tongue struts through the earth (Psalms 72. 9)’. After the pope had concluded his speech, the synod showed the ritual consent.97 Even though the sermon in Paul’s Vita Gregorii contains more quotations from the Bible, new motifs, and more complex allegories, it draws essentially on Donizo’s Vita Mathildis. Donizo’s text depended on Rangerius who embellished the scenario of 1076 by inserting a sermon about the Creed. As we can see, a pope delivering a speech in the form of a sermon was a popular motif in the biographies of the central Middle Ages. Among the writers of crusading chronicles, Baudri of Dol used this rhetorical style in the rendition of Urban’s speech in Clermont. Hence, the scenario in his chronicle can on the one hand be traced back to a literary tradition starting with Rangerius, while on the other hand, there was also evidence for an emotional sermon in Gregory’s register. Narrative and non-narrative sources thus support the plausibility of Baudri’s scenario.

The version of Robert the monk, however, reports a papal address that is more of a classical battle speech with a focus on praising the Franks. But he is also referring to a tradition that can be traced back to Rangerius’ Vita Anselmi. In this text, Gregory VII is said to have delivered similar speeches in the 1080s. In these years, the conflict between pope and emperor worsened again and Henry IV was laying siege to Rome. Under these circumstances, the pope spoke to the Romans and tried to motivate them to fight against the Emperor. Therefore, he referred to the concept of Christian martyrdom, but also added some aspects of holy and just war. The enemy is characterized as a pagan (profanus), and all the faithful will, consequently, have the support of Christ in fighting against him. The emperor Henry is put on the same

level as the Roman emperor Nero — who was well known for his persecution of Christians — and is said to be plotting a new crucifixion of St Peter. However, the pope also reminds the Romans of their historical greatness. He points out, how Rome grew up in dangers and compelled princes to pay tribute but was ruined by luxury. Nowadays she is a sorrowful servant and has forgotten the former virtues, arts and all her earlier strength.\textsuperscript{98} Sometime later, the pope repeats this praise of the Romans. He mentions the great deeds of their ancestors who conquered the world and enlightened their homeland with virtue. By fighting for Christ, the Romans could today regain their leading position.\textsuperscript{99} In the prologue of his chronicle, Rangerius has first shown his admiration for the \textit{ingentia facta} of the Romans who also established the \textit{tuta fides}.\textsuperscript{100} So, the praise of the Romans is a recurrent motif in the \textit{Vita Anselmi} and is therefore an integral part of an invented papal speech that was to motivate the Roman citizens to fight for their faith. This is very similar to the narrative concept of Robert the Monk who first praises the Franks in the \textit{prologus} and then in the speech, which he put into the mouth of the pope.

\section*{Conclusion}

Consequently, there is some evidence for a papal address with elements of a classical battle speech. But the evidence is relatively scarce and can only be found in narrative sources; non-narrative sources do not support the scenario of Robert the Monk. He and Baudri wrote in France, more than ten years after the synod of Clermont, and in order to revise the \textit{Gesta Francorum} stylistically. They thus supported a new campaign to the Holy Land which was backed up by the French court.\textsuperscript{101} Since they knew each other, it is likely that they intentionally varied the style of Urban’s sermon, in order to provide other writers and preachers with a wide range of rhetorical devices and arguments. In this, they were quite successful. Robert’s fanciful story inspired many poets, was translated into the vernacular and was even a popular ‘book of adventures’ in the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{102} Baudri’s version was interpreted as a model sermon and was integrated in some manuscripts of Humbert of Romans’s \textit{De predicacione crucis}.\textsuperscript{103} Since we also have evidence for the emotional performance

of a sermon in non-narrative sources from the later eleventh century, his version is nevertheless not completely unlikely. However, most non-narrative sources support the version of Fulcher of Chartres. He wrote only five years after the Council of Clermont, was not involved in efforts for a new campaign, and assured to write what he saw instead of reworking an extant text. This may explain why he depicted a pope who declared legal documents with very little rhetorical framing. Fulcher was simply reporting a sort of legal oratory, which was, according to protocols, the common and usual style of a papal speech in the eleventh century.