

[This is the open access pre-print version. To cite this article, please consult the final published version: Georg Strack, Pope Urban II and Jerusalem: a re-examination of his letters on the First Crusade, in: *The Journal of Religious History, Literature and Culture* 2/1 (2016), 51-70 which can be requested via e-mail (georg.strack@lmu.de)]

Pope Urban II and Jerusalem: a re-examination of his letters on the First Crusade¹

Georg Strack

Urban II is usually seen as the originator of the crusading movement, who first promoted the expedition to the East in a moving sermon at the council of Clermont.² The pope then issued letters in order to ‘publicize his proclamation of war’ in all parts of Europe.³ Since Jerusalem is mentioned in some of the letters and chronicles as aim of the expedition, but not in all of them, there is a long and still virulent debate about the centrality of this place in the papal crusading plans. First, Carl Erdmann challenged the importance of Jerusalem in his book on the origin of the idea of crusade.⁴ Hans Mayer argues for this thesis (with some modifications) again in the last edition of his influential book on the history of the crusades.⁵ Other aspects of Urban’s propaganda are discussed by scholars today, however, most of them are convinced that Jerusalem was ‘the specific target of the expedition’.⁶ Analyzing Urban’s earliest letters and the most important chronicles once again, this paper aims at a new understanding of the pope’s role at the very beginning of the First Crusade. In the first section it will be demonstrated that Urban’s letters to Vallombrosa and Bologna were written on the request of petitioners who defined Jerusalem as main target of the expedition, rather than the pope himself. Only the letter to the Flemings – in which Jerusalem is not explicitly mentioned – was probably issued on the pope’s own initiative. In the second section, the eyewitness accounts of the Clermont council (Baudri of Dol, Robert the Monk, Fulcher of Chartres) will be discussed.⁷ I argue that Baudri’s interpretation of the papal speech and the way he dealt with Jerusalem was influenced by his knowledge of Urban’s letter to the Flemings. Although Robert was also familiar with this text, his version of the papal praise of Jerusalem is primarily drawing on two other letters that were composed in 1098 and 1106. In Fulcher’s interpretation of the Clermont sermon, Jerusalem is not even mentioned, and the focus is on help for the Christians in the East. This concept is strikingly similar to Urban’s letter to the Flemings, which was not used by Fulcher as a source. Such

analogies between the chronicles and the letters and the pope's reason for issuing them have often been neglected. If we take this into consideration, however, we gain a deeper understanding of some key sources of the First Crusade and maybe also the pope's view of the expedition to the East. In addition, one could apply this approach towards the analysis of further narrative accounts and letters (for example to the Catalan counts), which cannot be discussed here in great detail in the interests of concision.⁸

The letter to Vallombrosa

In order to explain Urban's concept of the crusade, scholars chiefly use his letter to the monks, clerics, and lay brothers of the congregation of Vallombrosa to support their arguments. The letter was issued in Cremona in October 1096, was copied into a now-lost liturgical manuscript in the 12th century, and survives in a copy from the 18th century.⁹ John Cowdrey assumes that 'this letter may well be taken as embodying the most balanced statement that survives of Urban's own view of the Crusade.'¹⁰ Interpreting the text, Jean Flori even sought to gain insights into the pope's mind.¹¹ If we consider, however, not only some sections, but the whole text of the 'litterae', we learn more about the problems of the congregation of Vallombrosa, than about the crusading plans of the pope.¹² The text starts with the greeting protocol in the typical form of a papal 'litterae'.¹³ In the following 'narratio' the pope explains to 'have heard that some of ... [the members of the congregation of Vallombrosa] want to set out with the knights who are making for Jerusalem.'¹⁴ Urban concedes that this might be the 'right kind of sacrifice' but 'it is planned by the wrong kind of person.'¹⁵ He wants 'knights to go on this expedition' who can fight the Saracens, whereas clerics and monks should not 'set out in this company without the permission of their bishops and abbots.' According to Alfons Becker, this passage is not a simple prohibition of fighting for members of the clergy. Instead, it makes clear that pastors needed the permission of their superiors if they wanted to travel to the East.¹⁶ In addition, the pope had heard about another problem of the congregation of Vallombrosa that he had to deal with. Since 'the abbot of the monastery of St. Reparata is considering leaving the order shared by your congregation in common', Urban forbids him 'to rule the same monastery any longer without the permission of your common abbot, whom you call your major abbot.'¹⁷ If the abbot or anyone else does not obey to this order, he should be excommunicated. There are no other sources on this conflict,

which was probably settled soon afterwards, because an abbot called ‘Albertus’ ruled the monastery of Santa Reparata from 1095 to 1101.¹⁸

The abstract in the ‘Italia pontificia’ does not make a link between the first and the second part of the letter.¹⁹ On the other hand, most historians suppose that Albertus intended to go with his monks to the Holy Land.²⁰ In this aspect, the text is admittedly not very clear, which might be the reason why many scholars do not discuss the second section of the letter at all.²¹ But an interpretation should consider both parts, even though they might not be linked by the crusading topic. Both sections aim at supporting the authority of the ‘major abbot’ of the Vallombrosa congregation – a title that is mentioned in this document for the first time.²² He should decide about the participation of pastors in the crusade, and about the future status of the abbot of Santa Reparata respectively. From 1092/93 or 1096, Bernard degli Uberti was the major abbot of Vallombrosa.²³ He was relatively new in office and he therefore maybe needed some support. In addition, a conflict between the pope and the congregation about issues of church reform has risen some years before.²⁴ Bernard resolved this dispute and was, in general, very loyal to Urban, who raised him to the cardinalate. According to some historians, Bernard publicized the letter in Vallombrosa and in other monasteries of the congregation.²⁵ I would even argue that he was the petitioner who had asked for the letter. Since the report of a petitioner is typically summarized in the ‘narratio’ of a papal letter, we can assume that Bernardo had talked to the pope (or to someone else at the papal court) about the problems of the congregation.²⁶ Therefore, the pope explains in the narratio ‘to have heard’ about the desire of many members of the congregation to go to Jerusalem. Urban approved this in general, but it was not the order he gave in the letter. In contrast, his intention was to support a loyal abbot who had recently taken office. On Bernard’s request, the pope strengthened his position by giving him authority over the rebel abbot and in issues of the crusade.

The letter to Bologna

Another letter of Urban, from September 19, 1096, survives in a twelfth-century manuscript. Urban dispatched this letter ‘to his dear sons among the clergy and the people of Bologna’ (JL 5670).²⁷ In the introduction, we find an ‘arenga’ with a little etymological wordplay linking the ‘people of Bologna’ (*populus BONoniensis*) with ‘goodness’ (*BONitas vestra*). Urban used this

play on words to refer to the schism that had broken out after the election of anti-pope Clement III, who had invested two bishops in Bologna.²⁸ The imperial party had prevailed in the city until 1093, at which point the reformers became more and more influential.²⁹ Urban praises both those people of Bologna who had remained loyal to him throughout, even though ‘they were in the midst of schismatics and heretics’, and also those who, after recognizing their errors, changed allegiances from the anti-pope to support Urban.³⁰ They should continue on this chosen path, because only the ‘the one who endures to the end will be saved’ (Matthew 10:22). In the next part of the letter, Urban II recommends the new bishop, Bernard, to his supporters in the city.³¹ If they love God, they should show charity towards his *coepiscopus*, whom Urban recently consecrated. After the recommendation of the bishop, Urban deals with issues of the crusade. He explains to ‘have heard that some of ... [the people of Bologna] have conceived the desire to go to Jerusalem’, which is ‘pleasing’ to him.³² But they should know that ‘only those who go for the good of their souls and the liberty of the churches ... will be relieved of the penance for all of their sins, for which they have made a full and perfect confession.’ As we can see, the pope adds further restrictions to the ‘crusading canon’ that was decreed at the council of Clermont and said nothing about ‘full and perfect confession.’³³ In addition, he makes some reservations concerning clerics, monks and laymen: ‘To neither clerics nor monks ... do we concede permission to go without the permission of their bishops or abbots. Let it be the bishops’ duty to permit their parishioners to go only with the advice and provision of the clergy.’³⁴ Finally, the pope blesses his supporters in Bologna, and expresses his hope that they might be strengthened in their fear and love of God. Freed from sin and error they will be led to the perception of the highest truth and true piety.

In analyzing this letter, scholars have focused so far on the measures concerning the crusade which the pope recommended to the bishop.³⁵ They agree that Urban had to be proactive and regulate the departure of vast masses to Jerusalem.³⁶ But no other sources support the assumption that there was a great enthusiasm for the crusade in the Emilia Romagna.³⁷ Therefore, I would argue again that the pope did not write this letter on his own initiative. In contrast, he was asked by a petitioner who reported the situation in Bologna to the pope or another curialist. This is why the pope explains ‘to have heard’ about the desire of many citizens to go to Jerusalem. Urban approved this, but the expedition to Jerusalem was not the order he gave in the letter. Instead, he ordered the people of Bologna to accept the new bishop – an aspect of the text which scholars have often neglected.³⁸ Due to the lack of sources, we do not know

much about Bishop Bernard of Bologna.³⁹ It is hard to decide if he was originally a canon of the city's cathedral chapter⁴⁰ or a member of the papal court.⁴¹ However, according to Amadeo Benati, the bishop publicized the letter in Bologna when he entered his new diocese.⁴² In addition, there are some reasons to believe that he was the petitioner who had requested the letter. As we can see in the introduction, the anti-pope Clement III still had some influence in the diocese of Bologna and consequently the new bishop needed papal assistance. One could speculate that Urban added restrictions to the crusading canon because Bernard did not want too many of his supporters to go on an expedition to the East.⁴³ But the other measures show clearly the pope's intention to strengthen the bishop's position. First, he could decide about the departure of clerics to the Holy Land and, second, he should provide for the spiritual needs of his parishioners who went on crusade. In the first section of the letter, Urban had recommended the new bishop to the people of Bologna. In sum, the letter was written on Bernard's request and aimed chiefly at his support, rather than promoting an expedition to Jerusalem. This was only one of the problems that the petitioner had mentioned in his report to Urban, who did his best to restrict the departure of the people.⁴⁴

The letter to the Flemings

As we can see, the letters to the congregation of Vallombrosa and the people of Bologna have much in common. They differ, however, from Urban's letter that was sent to the Flemings at the end of December 1096 (JL 5608).⁴⁵ This letter only survives in two copies of the seventeenth century. It is addressed to all the faithful in Flanders, princes as well as subjects, to whom the pope first sends 'greeting, apostolic grace, and blessing.'⁴⁶ In the 'narratio' of the letter, the pope explains that they have 'long since learned from many accounts that a barbaric fury has deplorably afflicted and laid waste the churches of God in the regions of the Orient.' The Turks have 'grasped in intolerable servitude its churches and the Holy City of Christ, glorified by His passion and resurrection.' Therefore the pope 'grieving with pious concern ... visited the regions of Gaul' and devoted himself 'largely to urging the princes of the land and their subjects to free the churches of the East.' At the council of Clermont he 'solemnly enjoined upon them ... such an undertaking, as a preparation for the remission of all their sins.' In addition, he had constituted 'Ademar, Bishop of Puy, leader of this expedition and undertaking' in his stead.⁴⁷

Here ends the 'narratio' – next follows the 'dispositio' containing the legal content of the papal letter. First, Urban ordered 'that those who, perchance, may wish to undertake this journey should comply with his [Ademar's] commands, as if they were our own.'⁴⁸ Second, the pope announced the date of departure for the expedition to the holy land, namely August 15, 1096.⁴⁹

Surprisingly, in his first letter dealing exclusively with the crusade, Urban is not referring to the decree he had declared only some months earlier at the council of Clermont.⁵⁰ While the canon defined the crusade as a substitution of penance, the letter guarantees a complete 'remission of all sins'.⁵¹ In the letter, Jerusalem is only implicitly mentioned and in second place, after the churches in the East. Hence, there was good reason for Carl Erdmann to argue that the 'liberation of the churches in the east' had been the aim of the pope and not chiefly the conquest of Jerusalem.⁵² According to Jonathan Riley-Smith this letter shows that 'Urban made quite strenuous efforts to publicize his proclamation of war.'⁵³ Alfons Becker criticized this view, arguing that the letter was giving information about the crusade, rather than proclaiming one.⁵⁴ Becker's view is supported by the fact that the 'proclamation of war' is only part of the introductory 'narratio'. It is not part of the 'dispositio' in which the pope was giving his order. The letter was primarily written in support of bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, the papal legate of the expedition. We do not know who asked the pope for this letter. Maybe it was Adhémar himself, who had great influence on the papal crusading plans in general.⁵⁵ It is also possible that Count Robert of Flanders made a request at the papal court. There was a longer tradition of his family travelling to the Holy Land and supporting the Christians there against the Turks.⁵⁶ But the text does not show clear signs of being the response to a request, so it was probably issued on the pope's own initiative. This would be remarkable, because neither the canon of Clermont was cited, nor was Jerusalem mentioned explicitly. In contrast, the letters to Vallombrosa and Bologna were written on the request of petitioners who mentioned Jerusalem as aim of the expedition, not the pope. In sum, all three letters indicate that Jerusalem was originally not focus of Urban's concept of the crusade.

The chronicle of Baudri of Dol

On the other hand, eyewitness accounts of the Clermont council in chronicles often focus on Urban's praise of Jerusalem. A lot of research has been conducted on these reports of the papal

call for the crusades, which each chronicler interpreted in his own way.⁵⁷ Yet scholars have not investigated in detail the references in these reports to other sources. Consequently, the next section of this paper will discuss this issue and consider above all the references to Urban's letter to the Flemings. As noted above, only two seventeenth-century copies of the letter have survived, in a collection of documents concerning the diocese of Arras. This may indicate that the letter circulated among the higher clergy of northern France, or that it was at least accessible to them. One of its readers might have been Baudri of Dol, who completed his 'Historia Ierosolimitana' between 1105 and 1107.⁵⁸ He was a very learned author and especially famous for his Ovidian poetry. His 'Historia' is not based on crusading experience, but on the 'Gesta Francorum' and other sources. However, most scholars agree that Baudri was an eyewitness of the Clermont sermon, and they praise, for example, the 'clear, if effusive, style' of his narration which 'captures something of the vigor and excitement of Urban's address.'⁵⁹ In general, historians focus on Baudri's use of the Bible, the theme of religious pollution, and his concept of the 'familia Christi' in his version of the papal speech.⁶⁰ Aside from the Bible and church fathers, we do not know much about the sources that Baudri used for his interpretation of the papal sermon.⁶¹

There are, however, some similarities between Urban's letter to the Flemings and Baudri's report of Clermont. For example, the letter reads that Urban came to France 'grieving with pious concern'. This is exactly what Baudri describes in his chronicle. Only in Baudri's synodal account, the pope is 'oppressed by tears and groans, sighs and sobs' while dealing with the atrocities of the pagans. He 'weep[s] and wail[s] ... in ... [his] inmost heart.'⁶² So, the motif of the grieving pope is probably borrowed from the letter to the Flemings, which has more verbatim and structural parallels with the chronicle. In the first paragraph of the letter, Urban explains to believe that the addressee ('your brotherhood') already knows about the servitude to which the Holy City is subjected: 'Fraternitatem vestram ... didicisse credimus ... sanctam civitatem ... suae ... servituti ... mancipasse.' In this context, the (chancery of the) pope uses the rare expression 'servituti(bus) mancipare' that is repeated in the chronicle. Besides, Baudri has Urban say at the beginning that his brothers already know about the events in the East: 'Adivimus, fratres dilectissimi, et audistis, quod ... caro christiana ... servitutibus nefariis mancipatur.'⁶³ Finally, some parts of the letter and the speech are structured in a similar way. In Baudri's chronicle, the pope deals first with Antioch, the city in which 'the blessed Peter first presided as Bishop.'⁶⁴ In the next section, Jerusalem is described in great detail. It is 'the very city, in which

... Christ Himself suffered for us.' It is the place where the Lord 'rested ...; there He died for us; there He was buried.' Although the letter is much shorter, it contains the same sequence of arguments as the speech in the chronicle. Both texts focus first on other churches in the East and describe Jerusalem second as the place of Christ's passion. This is, admittedly, not very specific, and neither these similarities nor the borrowing of motifs or words alone would be convincing. But if we take all these points into consideration, it is more than likely that the letter to the Flemings inspired Baudri to write a lamenting sermon in which Jerusalem was only mentioned in the second place.

The chronicle of Robert the Monk

According to the latest edition, Robert the Monk wrote his chronicle, in which the pope's praise of Jerusalem is of central importance, a little later than Baudri, namely around 1110.⁶⁵ This text was very popular in the Middle Ages and survived in over eighty Latin manuscripts.⁶⁶ Robert reworked the 'Gesta Francorum' without referring to other complete accounts of the First Crusade. His narration was used by poets, such as Gilo of Paris.⁶⁷ Even modern scholars prefer his report of Clermont because he asserts explicitly that he participated in the council.⁶⁸ In addition, the text is often cited or translated because of his literary quality. In this chronicle, the pope is not preaching, but delivers a classical battle speech.⁶⁹ Robert probably borrowed this motif from a saint's *vita* which may have come from southern Italy to France together with the 'Gesta Francorum'. In this text, Pope Leo IX gives a very similar speech to his soldiers before the battle of Civitate in 1053.⁷⁰ Robert referred to some letters written in 1096, 1098, and 1107 to give his interpretation of the Clermont sermon. About one hundred years ago, Heinrich Hagenmeyer identified the similarities between Robert's chronicle and Urban's letter that was sent to the Flemings in 1096.⁷¹ Both texts start with a reference to the success of the Turks and the devastation of Christian churches, which made Urban come to France. In another section, they deal in a similar way with Jerusalem as the place of Christ's passion and resurrection. In the letter and the chronicle, the crusading indulgence guarantees 'remission of sin' and not a substitution of penance, as the canon does.⁷² Recently, Robert Somerville has pointed out 'Robert's use of *ducatum*', which 'echoes' the '*ducem*' used by Urban 'to describe Adhemar' in

the letter to the Flemings.⁷³ Thus there is reason to suppose that Robert knew Urban's letter to the Flemings.

However, it is certain that he used two other letters that often survive in the same manuscripts together with Robert's chronicle. Thirty-six manuscripts of the 'Historia Iherosolimitana' contain the so called 'Epistola Alexii', which seems to be an appeal by the Greek emperor Alexius to Count Robert of Flanders to send him military aid against the Turks.⁷⁴ But the letter is in fact a forgery that was probably produced to support a new crusading campaign in the year 1106.⁷⁵ In this text, we find the description of atrocities of the Turks who 'circumcise Christian boys and youths above Christian baptismal fonts, [and] pour the blood from the circumcision into the fonts in mockery of Christ.'⁷⁶ Citing almost verbatim the 'Epistola Alexii', in Robert's account of Clermont, Urban explains that the Turks 'circumcise Christians, and pour the resulting blood either on the altars or into the baptismal vessels.'⁷⁷ The whole section of the sermon follows the structure of the letter, because both texts deal first with the killing of other men and secondly with 'the appalling treatment of women.'⁷⁸ While the letter describes sexual violence in in great detail, in Robert's chronicle the pope uses the rhetorical device of 'praeteritio' and passes this topic over in silence. A call to arms and references to historical examples then follow in both sources. The next section of Robert's account of the pope's sermon is based on a letter by the Patriarch of Jerusalem, which was written in 1098 and also survives in some manuscripts of Robert's chronicle.⁷⁹ From this text, Robert probably borrowed the prohibition of women participating in the crusade.⁸⁰ More important for our paper, however, is that both texts label Jerusalem as 'a land flowing with milk and honey', referring to the book of Exodus (3,8).⁸¹ In addition, they not only use the same biblical citations, but also the rhetorical device of personification. While in the pope's sermon 'Jerusalem' asks for support, in the letter the 'spiritual mother the Church ... cries' for help.⁸² It is, consequently, very likely that Robert referred to this letter to produce his version of the pope's praise of Jerusalem.

The chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres

Another complete rendition of Urban's speech in Clermont was given by Fulcher of Chartres. He was a cleric who took part in the First Crusade and was also present at the council itself.⁸³ The part of his chronicle containing the speech was completed in 1105 – only ten years after the

council of Clermont.⁸⁴ While most allusions in other crusading chronicles have not been identified, Heinrich Hagenmeyer's critical apparatus to Fulcher's 'Historia Hierosolymitana' provides broad information on textual references. Hagenmeyer has pointed out that Fulcher used the same expression for the indulgence as in the letter to the Flemings.⁸⁵ Both texts promise remission of sins, and not a substitution of penance as the canon does. Since the indulgence is promised only to those who died on the way, Fulcher probably did not refer to the text of the letter. He wrote his chronicle in Jerusalem and had, consequently, no easy access to sources circulating in northern France. The early date of composition and Fulcher's claim to report first hand (while saying nothing about the incompleteness of his synodal account) made this source very trustworthy for its editor and some other historians.⁸⁶ Recently the reliability of the chronicle was challenged, because it reports nothing about the pope's praise of Jerusalem in Clermont.⁸⁷ The main problem, however, might be that Fulcher depicts a scenario of 'celebration', rather than of 'persuasion'.⁸⁸ His account focuses first on the inaugural ceremony of the Clermont council during which the pope delivered his opening speech.⁸⁹ In this address, Urban declared the official *causa* of the council and said nothing about the crusade at all. Instead, he dealt with the problem of church sovereignty, simony and the Truce of God. Due to the fact that only Fulcher reports such a sermon, Jean Flori has argued that it must be an invention.⁹⁰ But there is a long tradition of celebrating the opening of a synod with such a papal speech, to which Fulcher is obviously referring.⁹¹

According to Fulcher's chronicle, Urban's crusade call was part of the closing ceremony of the Clermont council when the legal decisions were declared.⁹² The pope did not deliver an emotional sermon, but explained that the Christian brothers in the East needed the help of the western Church. 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.'⁹³ The Turks killed or captured many of them, destroyed their churches 'and have devastated the kingdom of God.' The pope refers in his speech to the traditional concept of a just war that legitimizes violence in acts of self-defence and the defence of others.⁹⁴ He uses, moreover, the command of Christ and thus defines the crusade as a synthesis of holy and just war.⁹⁵ Urban promises that those who had been fighting against their brothers and relatives 'can now become 'soldiers of Christ'' and 'attain eternal reward.'⁹⁶ As we can see, in this version of the Clermont sermon, the pope does not try to persuade warriors, but rather explains his plans to a group of clerics. Penny Cole has attributed this to Fulcher's 'reportatio style' that has the value of preserving the most

important points, but is ‘without literary embellishment’ and fails ‘to convey the rhetorical eloquence of the speaker.’⁹⁷ It is hard to believe that after this sermon ‘everyone was immediately inspired and promised to go on the expedition.’ Other scholars have pointed out that in Fulcher’s version any reference to Jerusalem, and thus the most convincing argument for the expedition to the East, is missing.⁹⁸ They usually explain this peculiarity of his account by pointing to Fulcher’s close relation to Baldwin of Boulogne, who did not take part in the liberation of Jerusalem.⁹⁹ But all these points are based on the assumption of modern scholars that Urban was proactive in the issue of the crusade and promoted his ideas in Clermont by ‘packaging his message in terms that people would find appealing.’¹⁰⁰ There are, however, many reasons to challenge this interpretation. As far as we know, the lay presence at Clermont was not great –there were probably few in Urban’s audience who could be persuaded to take up arms and go to fight in the East.¹⁰¹ This might be the reason why Fulcher reports a pope who explained his plans only to the higher clergy while celebrating the end of the synod. According to his chronicle, the promotion of the crusade was done afterwards by the participants of the Clermont council and some popular preachers.¹⁰² Since they had to convince the laity to go on the crusade, there was no need in the logic of Fulcher’s narration to show Urban as a very persuasive preacher arguing for the importance of ‘Jerusalem’.

Conclusion

It is, of course, impossible to explain with complete certainty what really happened in the years 1095/96 when the crusading movement developed. However, I would question the view that Urban II was very proactive in the issue of the crusade and that he argued in several letters for an expedition to Jerusalem. Scholars have often discussed the papal letters to Vallombrosa and Bologna, but they never considered that they were written on the request of petitioners and issued with the aim of supporting them. The major abbot of Vallombrosa and the bishop of Bologna were both relatively new in office and had problems that they discussed with Urban (or someone else at the papal court). One of the problems they reported was the desire of many people to go to Jerusalem. Urban approved this in general, but made several restrictions for this expedition. Urban’s letter to the Flemings, however, which was publicized and copied in northern France, does not appear to have been issued in response to petitioning. When Baudri of Dol and Robert the Monk wrote about the beginning of the crusade, they borrowed from this

letter. Such an interpretation is supported by the structure of the arguments and the use of the same vocabulary. Baudri's account and the letter have more in common – for example the strong expressions of grief that are attributed to Urban. Furthermore, both texts focus first on help for other churches in the East, and only secondly on Jerusalem. Robert also cited passages from other letters that were written in 1098 and 1106 when he produced his version of Urban's sermon in Clermont. On the other hand, Fulcher's interpretation of the call for the crusades is very close to the concept found in the letter to the Flemings, which was, however, not used as a source in his chronicle. In sum, the documents discussed above give some reasons to challenge the relevance of 'Jerusalem' in the papal propaganda of the years 1095/96. In order to provide a more definitive answer on this much debated problem, admittedly one must take more sources into consideration. Nevertheless, the approach and findings of this paper will hopefully prove fruitful for further research on papal letters and their influence on narrative sources on the crusades.

¹ An earlier version of this article was presented in May 2014 at the conference ‘Von A nach B – von damals bis heute: Übermittlung und Überlieferung von Briefen (4.–11. Jahrhundert)’. I am grateful to the organisers of this conference, Professor Klaus Herbers and Professor Thomas Deswarte, for the invitation and their feedback. In addition, I wish to express my gratitude to the assistant editor of the present journal, Thomas W. Smith, for commenting on this article and helping me with the translation.

² See for instance Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven: The First Crusade and the Quest for Apocalypse* (New York, 2011), 22–30; Thomas Asbridge, *The Crusades: The War for the Holy Land* (London, 2010), 33–39; Jonathan Phillips, *Holy Warriors: A modern History of the Crusades* (London, 2009), 1–9; Christopher Tyerman, *God’s War: A New History of the Crusades* (Cambridge, 2006), 58–89. However, according to Jean Flori, *Pierre l’Ermite et la première croisade* (Paris, 1999), the initiative of Peter the Hermit was of greater importance than the call for crusade by Urban II.

³ Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, (London, 2009), 2nd edition, 31. Cf. Hans Eberhard Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, Urban Taschenbücher 86 (Stuttgart, 2005), 10th revised edition, 20–21; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders 1095–1131* (Cambridge, 1997), 60–61; H. E. John Cowdrey, ‘Pope Urban II and the Idea of Crusade,’ *Studi Medievali* 36 (1995): 721–42, at 727–28; Alfons Becker, *Papst Urban II. (1088–1099)*, vol. 3, *Der Papst, die griechische Christenheit und der Kreuzzug*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Schriften 19/2 (Stuttgart, 1988), 386–91.

⁴ Carl Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens* (Berlin, 1935; reprint, Stuttgart 1955), 363–77.

⁵ Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, 18–20.

⁶ William J. Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia c.1095-c.1187* (Woodbridge, 2008), 15. In addition to the studies cited above, see also H. E. John Cowdrey, ‘Pope Urban II’s Preaching of the First Crusade’ in *Popes, Monks and Crusaders*, History Series 27 (London, 1984), 177–88, at 186; Jean Flori, *Chroniqueurs et propagandistes: Introduction critique aux sources de la Première croisade*, Hautes études médiévales et modernes 98 (Genf, 2010), 231; Gerd Althoff, ‘Selig sind, die Verfolgung ausüben’: *Päpste und Gewalt im Hochmittelalter* (Darmstadt, 2013), 129–40.

⁷ On these sources, see the classical study by Dana C. Munro, ‘The Speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont 1095,’ *The American Historical Review* 11 (1906): 231–42 and more recently Flori, *Chroniqueurs*; Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf, ed., *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory* (Woodbridge, 2014). Some scholars assume that Guibert de Nogent was also present at the council of Clermont. Guibert admits, however, that he is reporting only the main arguments (*intentiones*) of Urban and not the words of his speech (*verba*). Therefore he will not be considered. Guibert de Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos: Et cinq autres textes*, ed. Robert B. C. Huygens, Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio Mediaevalis 127 (Turnhout, 1996), 111–17; Elizabeth Lapina, ‘*Nec signis nec testibus creditur ...*: The Problem of Eyewitnesses in the Chronicles of the First Crusade,’ *Viator* 38 (2007): 117–139, at 120 n. 19.

⁸ Urban’s letters to the Catalan counts gives probably more reason to challenge the relevance of Jerusalem. In the first letter written in 1089 (JL 5401) the pope explains to favour support for the church of Tarragona instead of pilgrimages to Jerusalem. The second letter was issued between 1096 and 1099 with a similar intention and does not mention Jerusalem at all. Cf. Demetrio Mansilla, ed., *La documentación pontificia hasta Inocencio III (965-1216)*,

Monumenta Hispaniae Vaticana. Sección Registros 1 (Rome, 1955), 46-47 no. 29; Paul F. Kehr, ed., *Papsturkunden in Spanien: Vorarbeiten zur Hispania Pontificia*, vol. 1, *Katalanien*, Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: Philologisch-historische Klasse neue Folge 17/2, (Berlin, 1926), 287-88 no. 23. There are admittedly other less prominent and later texts which report that Urban referred explicitly to Jerusalem, but they cannot be discussed here. On these sources see Asbridge, *The Crusades*, 33 n. 1 (691); Cowdrey, 'Pope Urban,' 181-83; Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, vol. 2, 435-57.

⁹ See Rudolf Hiestand, ed., *Vorarbeiten zum Oriens pontificius III: Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Land*, Abhandlungen der Akademie in Göttingen: Philologisch-historische Klasse 136 (Göttingen, 1985), 88-89 no. 2. Paul F. Kehr, ed., *Italia pontificia: Etruria*, Regesta pontificum Romanorum 3 (Berlin, 1908), 89 no. 8 argues for dating the letter October 9 (*VII id. oct.*) instead of October 7 (*VII. die octobris*). This emendation is convincing because around 1100 'litterae' were usually dated according to the Roman tradition. See Thomas Frenz, *Papsturkunden des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, Historische Grundwissenschaften in Einzeldarstellungen 2 (Stuttgart, 2000), 2nd edition, 24-25.

¹⁰ Cowdrey, 'Pope Urban,' 187.

¹¹ Flori, *Pierre l'Ermite*, 161.

¹² On the congregation of Vallombrosa see Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, 28; Francesco Salvestrini, *Disciplina caritatis: Il monachesimo vallombrosano tra medioevo e prima età moderna*, I libri di Viella 78 (Rome, 2008); Alfons Becker, *Papst Urban II. (1088-1099)*, vol. 3, *Ideen, Institutionen und Praxis eines päpstlichen regimem universale*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Schriften 19/3 (Stuttgart, 2012), 417-419, 424, 427.

¹³ Hiestand, *Vorarbeiten*, 88. On the 'litterae' see Frenz, *Papsturkunden*, 23-27 and on the greeting protocol of this letter also Giordano M. Compagnoni, 'Lo sviluppo delle strutture costituzionali Vallombrosane dalle origini alla fine del '200,' in *L'Ordo Vallisumbrosae tra XII e XIII secolo: Gli sviluppi istituzionali e culturali e l'espansione geografica (1101-1293)*, ed. Giordano Monzio Compagnoni, Archivio Vallombrosano 3 (Vallombrosa, 1999), 33-207, at 82-84.

¹⁴ Hiestand, *Vorarbeiten*, 88-89; translation: Edward Peters, *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials* (Pennsylvania, 1998), 2nd edition, 44.

¹⁵ Hiestand, *Vorarbeiten*, 89; translation: Peters, *The First Crusade*, 45.

¹⁶ Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, vol. 2, 390-91. See also Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, 12-13; Giles Constable, 'Opposition to Pilgrimage in the Middle Ages,' *Studia Gratiana* 19 (1976): 123-46, at 133; Ernst-Dieter Hehl, 'Was ist eigentlich ein Kreuzzug?' *Historische Zeitschrift* 259 (1994): 297-336, at 329-30.

¹⁷ Hiestand, *Vorarbeiten*, 89; translation: Peters, *The First Crusade*, 45. The expression *communis congregationum ordo* is explained by Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, vol. 3, 418 n. 51; Salvestrini, *Disciplina caritatis*, 211.

¹⁸ See Nicola Vasaturo, ed., *Acta capitulorum generalium congregationis Vallis Umbrosae*, vol. 1, *Institutiones abbatum (1095-1310)*, Thesaurus ecclesiarum Italiae 7, 25 (Rome, 1985), 3-4 no. 1, 6-8 no. 3.

¹⁹ Kehr, *Italia pontificia*, 89 no. 8 summarizes the letter as follows: 'Urbanus II monachis et clericis sive conversis Valimbrosanae congregationis: interdicat, religiosos clericos sive monachos in comitatu Hierusalem liberandae

christianitatis gratia proficisci sine episcoporum vel abbatum licentia. Scribit de abbate monasterii s. Reparatae, cui interdicit, ne ulterius in eodem monasterio sine communis abbatis maioris licentia audeat praesidere’.

²⁰ For instance Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, 15; Anna Benvenuti, ‘Sant’Ilario, Vallombrosa e Firenze’, in *L’Ordo Vallisumbrosae tra XII e XIII secol*, 393–417 at 400–401; Nicola Vasaturo, *Vallombrosa. L’abbazia e la congregazione. Note storiche*, ed. Giordano Monzio Compagnoni, Archivio Vallombrosano 1 (Vallombrosa, 1994), 28; Sofia Boesch Gajano, ‘Storia e tradizione vallombrosane,’ *Bulletino dell’istituto storico italiano per il medio evo e Archivio Muratori* 76 (1964): 99–215, at 133–34 n. 3.

²¹ Becker, *Papst Urban II*, vol. 2 and 3; Nicolangelo D’Acunto, ‘Tensioni e convergenze fra monachesimo Vallombrosano, papato e vescovi nel secolo XI,’ in *I Vallombrosani nella società italiana dei secoli XI e XII*, ed. Giordano M. Compagnoni, Archivio Vallombrosano 2 (Vallombrosa, 1995), 57–81, at 79; Giancarlo Andenna, ‘La storiografia Vallombrosana nel dopoguerra,’ in *L’Ordo Vallisumbrosae tra XII e XIII secolo*, 7–30, at 18; Hiestand, *Vorarbeiten*, 88; Wilhelm Wiederhold, ‘Papsturkunden in Florenz,’ *Nachrichten der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 3 (1901): 306–325, at 313–14 no. 6.

²² Compagnoni, ‘Lo sviluppo’, 133–34.

²³ On his biography see Raffaele Volpini, ‘Bernardo degli Uberti,’ *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 9 (1967): 292–300. There is an intricate discussion on dating his period of office, see Nicola Vasaturo, ‘L’Espansione della congregazione Vallombrosana fino alla metà del secolo XII,’ *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia* 16 (1962): 456–485, at 482–485; Jean-René Gaborit, ‘Les plus anciens monastères de l’ordre de Vallombreuse (1037–1115),’ *Mélanges d’Archéologie et d’Histoire* 76 (1964): 451–90, at 458–59; Michael Matzke, *Daibert von Pisa: Zwischen Pisa, Papst und erstem Kreuzzug*, Vorträge und Forschungen: Sonderband 44 (Sigmaringen, 1998), 43–44.

²⁴ See Matzke, *Daibert von Pisa*, 26–46 and more recently Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, vol. 3, 401–2.

²⁵ Boesch Gajano, ‘Storia e tradizione’, 133–34 n. 3; D’Acunto, ‘Tensioni e convergenze’, 79.

²⁶ Frenz, *Papsturkunden*, 12, 34 gives some more information about the procedure of petitioning at the papal court around 1100, which was usually done orally and in person. We know, however, much more about the later Middle Ages, when written supplications were used; see for instance Patrick Zutshi, ‘Petitions to the Pope in the Fourteenth Century’, in *Medieval Petitions: Grace and Grievance*, ed. W. Mark Ormrod, Gwilym Dodd, and Anthony Musson (Woodbridge, 2009), 82–98.

²⁷ There is a new edition with many bibliographic references by Mario Fanti and Lorenzo Paolini, ed., *Codice diplomatico della chiesa Bolognese: Documenti autentici e spuri (secoli IV–XII)*, *Fonti per la storia dell’Italia medievale: Regesta chartarum* 54 (Rome, 2004), 153–55. See additionally Stephan Kuttner and Reinhard Elze, ed., *A Catalogue of Canon and Roman Law Manuscripts in the Vatican Library*, vol. 2, *Codices Vaticani Latini 2300–2746*, *Studi e testi* 328 (Città del Vaticano, 1987), 323; Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, vol. 3, 71–73.

²⁸ Jürgen Ziese, *Wibert von Ravenna: Der Gegenpapst Clemens III. (1084–1100)*, *Päpste und Papsttum* 20 (Stuttgart, 1982).

²⁹ This is the interpretation given by most scholars. See Luigi Simeoni, *La lotta delle investiture a Bologna e la sua azione sulla città e sullo studio* (Bologna, 1941), 14–15; Amadeo Benati, ‘La Chiesa bolognese nell’Alto Medioevo,’ in *Storia della chiesa di Bologna*, vol. 1, ed. Paolo Prodi and Lorenzo Paolini (Bologna, 1997), 7–96, at 76–77; Rolando Dondarini, *Bologna medievale nella storia delle città* (Bologna, 2000), 124. This view was,

however, challenged by Tiziana Lazzari, 'Comitato' senza città: Bologna e l'aristocrazia del territorio nei secoli IX-XI (Turin, 1998), 179–80.

³⁰ Fanti and Paolini, *Codice diplomatico*, 154. The 'arenga' of a papal letter is usually 'filled with rich programmatic declarations of papal ideology' (Detlev Jasper and Horst Fuhrmann, *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages* (Washington, 2001), 14-16), but sometimes it is used to praise the recipient (Frenz, *Papsturkunden*, 12).

³¹ Fanti and Paolini, *Codice diplomatico*, 154.

³² Fanti and Paolini, *Codice diplomatico*, 154–55; translation: Peters, *The First Crusade*, 44.

³³ Robert Somerville, *The Councils of Urban II*, vol. 1, *Decreta Claromontensia*, *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum: Supplementum 1* (Amsterdam, 1972), 74 no. 2* 'Quicumque pro sola devotione, non pro honoris vel pecunie adeptione, ad liberandam ecclesiam Dei Hierusalem profectus fuerit, iter illud pro omni penitentia ei reputetur'. The canon mentions Jerusalem and could thus support the view that the papal crusading concept focused on this topic. However, even scholars who argue for this thesis admit that the canons of Clermont 'were written down as memoranda' so 'an emphasis that was not Urban's may have been introduced.' Cowdrey, 'Pope Urban,' 723–24. The same problem arises in the interpretation of the two other canons on the crusade and the Truce of God (Somerville, *Decreta*, 108 no. 2 and 124 no. 9). In the first one, an 'iter Hierosolimitanum' is mentioned, in the second one the crusade is defined as an 'expeditio ad Ierusalem et alias Asie ecclesias a Sarracenorum potestate eruendas.' See also Robert Somerville, 'Clermont 1095: Crusade and Canons,' in *La primera cruzada. Novecientos años después: el cincilio de Clermont y los orígenes del movimiento cruzado*, ed. Luis García-Guijarro Ramos, (Madrid, 1997), 63–77.

³⁴ Fanti and Paolini, *Codice diplomatico*, 155; translation: Peters, *The First Crusade*, 44.

³⁵ See for instance the summary by Fanti and Paolini, *Codice diplomatico*, 153–54: 'Papa Urbano II ringrazia quanti del clero e del popolo bolognese, pur trovandosi fra scismatici ed eretici, sono rimasti nella fede cattolica e raccomanda al vescovo Bernardo, da lui appena consecrato, che chierici e monaci non partano per la Terra Santa senza il permesso dei superiori, e i mariti senza il consenso delle mogli.'

³⁶ Augusto Vasina, 'La città e il contado dagli albori del Comune alla pace di Costanza (1116–1183),' in *Storia di Bologna*, vol. 2, *Bologna nel medioevo*, ed. Ovidio Capitani (Bologna, 2007), 439–76, at 441; Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, vol 2, 389; Ziese, *Wibert von Ravenna*, 227–28; Augusto Vasina, 'Le crociate nel mondo Emiliane-Romagnolo,' *Atti e memorie della deputazione di storia patria per le province di Romagna: Nuova Serie* 23 (1972): 11–44, at 19.

³⁷ Vasina, 'Le crociate', 19–20 and Dondarini, *Bologna medievale*, 124.

³⁸ This aspect is not mentioned in the summary by Fanti and Paolini, *Codice diplomatico*, 153–54. The whole section is omitted in the translation by Peters, *The First Crusade*, 44.

³⁹ On his biography see Marina Rossi, 'Bernardo,' in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 9 (1967): 240–41.

⁴⁰ Rossi, 'Bernardo,' 240–41; Lazzari, 'Comitato' senza città, 179 argue for this.

⁴¹ For this argue Benati, 'La Chiesa bolognese', 78–79; Simeoni, *La lotta delle investiture*, 13–14.

⁴² Benati, 'La Chiesa bolognese', 77.

⁴³ Maybe this was also the reason to remind young married men that they needed the consent of their wives if they wanted to participate in the crusade, which was the last restriction in the letter. See James A. Brundage, 'The Crusader's Wife: A Canonistic Quandary,' *Studia Gratiana* 12 (1967): 425–41, at 429; Ernst-Dieter Hehl, *Kirche*

und Krieg im 12. Jahrhundert: Studien zu kanonischem Recht und politischer Wirklichkeit, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 19 (Stuttgart, 1980), 11 n. 46.

⁴⁴ Hehl, *Kirche und Krieg*, 18 and Ziese, *Wibert von Ravenna*, 227 have labelled this letter as a call for the crusade (*Kreuzzugsaufruf*), which is not convincing.

⁴⁵ The last edition was made by Claire Giordanengo, ed., *Le registre de Lambert évêque d'Arras (1093-1115)*, Sources d'histoire médiévale 34 (Paris, 2007), 192-193 C. 53. Some scholars, however, argue for dating the letter to February 1096: Becker, *Papst Urban II*, vol. 2, 386-87 n. 254; Lotte Kéry, *Die Errichtung des Bistums Arras 1093/1094*, Beihefte der Francia 33 (Sigmaringen, 1994), 61-66, 70.

⁴⁶ Hagenmeyer, *Epistvlae*, 136; translation: Peters, *The First Crusade*, 42. On the Flemings' response to the call for crusade see David Nicholas, *Medieval Flanders* (London, 1992), 91.

⁴⁷ On Adhémar of Le Puy see Robert Somerville, 'Adhemar of Le Puy, Papal Legate on the First Crusade,' in *Law as Profession and Practice in Medieval Europe: Essays in Honor of James A. Brundage*, ed. Kenneth Pennington and Melodie Harris Eichbauer (Farnham, 2011), 371-85 and Conor Kostick, 'The afterlife of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy,' *Studies in Church History* 45 (2009), 120-29.

⁴⁸ Hagenmeyer, *Epistvlae*, 136-37; translation: Peters, *The First Crusade*, 42. On this part of the letter see also Somerville, 'Adhemar of Le Puy', 373.

⁴⁹ Hagenmeyer, *Epistvlae*, 137.

⁵⁰ See n. 33.

⁵¹ I would agree with Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, 44-48 who argued that this difference is of importance. However, this view is challenged by Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, 29.

⁵² Erdmann, *Die Entstehung*, 373.

⁵³ Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, 31.

⁵⁴ Becker, *Papst Urban II*, vol. 2, 386-87.

⁵⁵ See Somerville, 'Adhemar of Le Puy', 385. This view is challenged by Hans Eberhard Mayer, 'Zur Beurteilung Adhémars von Le Puy', *Deutsches Archiv* 16 (1960): 547-552.

⁵⁶ Nicholas, *Medieval Flanders*, 56-58.

⁵⁷ See n. 2-5 and Georg Strack, 'The Sermon of Urban II in Clermont and the Tradition of Papal Oratory,' *Medieval Sermon Studies* 56 (2012), 30-45.

⁵⁸ On the life and works of Baudri of Dol, and the dating of the chronicle, see Steven Biddlecombe, ed., *The Historia Ierosolimitana of Baldric of Bourgueil* (Woodbridge, 2014), xi-xxx.

⁵⁹ Keith Sidwell, *Reading Medieval Latin* (Cambridge, 1995), 219. See also Biddlecombe, *The Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxvi; Penny J. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095-1270*, Medieval Academy Books 98 (Cambridge, 1991), 15, 19.

⁶⁰ Penny J. Cole, 'O God, the Heathen Have Come into your Inheritance' (Ps. 78,1): The Theme of Religious Pollution in Crusade Documents, 1095-1188,' in *Crusaders and Muslims in twelfth-century Syria*, ed. Maya Shatzmiller, *The Medieval Mediterranean* 1 (Leiden, 1993), 84-111, at 95-97; Sylvia Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City: Crusader Jerusalem and the Catholic West (1099-1187)* (Aldershot, 2005), 15-16; Rubenstein,

Armies of Heaven, 27; Althoff, *Päpste und Gewalt*, 130–32; Biddlecombe, *The Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxxviii–xxxix, l–lv.

⁶¹ Some general information is given by Katherine Allen Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture* (Woodbridge, 2011), 104.

⁶² Biddlecombe, *The Historia Ierosolimitana*, 8; translation: Peters, *The First Crusade*, 31.

⁶³ Hagenmeyer, *Epistvlae*, 136; Biddlecombe, *The Historia Ierosolimitana*, 6–7.

⁶⁴ Biddlecombe, *The Historia Ierosolimitana*, 7; translation: Peters, *The First Crusade*, 30.

⁶⁵ On author and date of the chronicle see Robertus Monachus, *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, ed. Damien Kempf and Marcus Bull (Woodbridge, 2013), xvii–xli; James Naus, ‘The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk and the Coronation of Louis VI,’ in *Writing the Early Crusades*, 105–16. Other scholars argue for the years 1106/7, see Flori, *Chroniqueurs*, 129–30; Carol Sweetenham, ed., *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*, Crusade Texts in Translation 11 (Aldershot, 2005), 7.

⁶⁶ See the list in Robertus, *The Historia Iherosolimitana*, lxxv–lxxiv and Damien Kempf, ‘Towards a textual archaeology of the First Crusade,’ in *Writing the Early Crusades*, 116–26.

⁶⁷ This is argued in Marcus Bull, ‘Robert the Monk and his Source(s),’ in *Writing the Early Crusades*, 127–40.

⁶⁸ Robertus, *The Historia Iherosolimitana*, 3. See for instance Klaus Herbers, *Geschichte des Papsttums im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 2012), 138–39; Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, 7; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History, The Roots of Conflict between Christianity and Islam* (Oxford, 2004), 1; Karl-Friedrich Krieger, ‘Papst Urban II. Aufruf zum Kreuzzug (1095),’ in *Große Reden: Von der Antike bis heute*, ed. Kai Brodersen (Darmstadt, 2002), 28–44, at 42–44; Robert Payne, *The Dream and the Tomb: A History of the Crusades* (New York, 2000), 2nd edition, 31–34; Arno Borst, *Lebensformen im Mittelalter* (Berlin, 1999), 2nd edition, 329–35

⁶⁹ Strack, ‘The Sermon of Urban II’, 34–36.

⁷⁰ Antonio Vuolo, ed., *Agiografia d’autore in area Beneventana: Le ‘vitae’ di Giovanni da Spoleto, Leone IX e Giovanni Crisostomo (secc. XI–XII)*, Quaderni di Hagiographica 8 (Firenze, 2010), 32–33. See Huguette Taviani-Carozzi, *La Terreur du Monde: Robert Guiscard et la conquête normande en Italie, mythe et histoire* (Paris, 1996), 202–203; Charles Munier, *Le pape Léon IX et la réforme de l’église, 1002–1054* (Strassburg, 2002), 212.

⁷¹ Robertus, *The Historia Iherosolimitana*, 5. See the discussion of textual parallels by Hagenmeyer, *Epistvlae*, 136, 210–11 n. 4–6.

⁷² Robertus, *The Historia Iherosolimitana*, 6–7; Hagenmeyer, *Epistvlae*, 136, 211 n. 8 and 14.

⁷³ Somerville, ‘Adhemar of Le Puy’, 376.

⁷⁴ See the edition by Hagenmeyer, *Epistvlae*, 129–36 and the translation with commentary by Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk’s History*, 215–22.

⁷⁵ This is shown by Christian Gastgeber, ‘Das Schreiben Alexios‘ I. Komnenos an Robert I. von Flandern: Sprachliche Untersuchung,’ in *Documenti medievali Greci e Latini: Studi comparativi*, ed. Giuseppe de Gregorio and Otto Kresten, Incontri di studio 1 (Spoleto, 1998), 141–85; Peter Schreiner, ‘Der Brief des Alexios I. Komnenos an den Grafen Robert von Flandern und das Problem gefälschter byzantinischer Kaiserschreiben in den westlichen Quellen,’ in *Documenti medievali Greci e Latini: Studi comparativi*, ed. Giuseppe de Gregorio and Otto Kresten, Incontri di studio 1 (Spoleto, 1998), 111–40.

⁷⁶ Hagenmeyer, *Epistvlae*, 131; translation: Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History*, 219.

⁷⁷ Robertus, *The Historia Iherosolimitana*, 5; translation: Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History*, 79–80.

⁷⁸ Robertus, *The Historia Iherosolimitana*, 5–6; translation: Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History*, 80. Cf. Hagenmeyer, *Epistvlae*, 131–33.

⁷⁹ See the edition with commentary on the manuscript transmission by Hagenmeyer, *Epistvlae*, 68–75, 146–49.

⁸⁰ Robertus, *The Historia Iherosolimitana*, 7. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History*, 81 n. 14 has already drawn attention to the textual parallels. Robert Somerville, 'The Council of Clermont and the First Crusade,' *Studia Gratiana* 20 (1976): 325–337, at 332–33 has discussed the restrictions for clerics and laymen in Robert's synodal account, which are reminiscent of Urban's letter to his supporters in Bologna. However, Robert is not citing this letter verbatim.

⁸¹ Robertus, *The Historia Iherosolimitana*, 7; translation: Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History*, 81. Cf. Hagenmeyer, *Epistvlae*, 148.

⁸² Robertus, *The Historia Iherosolimitana*, 6–7; Cf. Hagenmeyer, *Epistvlae*, 148; translation: Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History*, 223.

⁸³ See Flori, *Chroniqueurs*, 219–21; Susan B. Edgington, 'Fulcher of Chartres (d. c. 1127),' in *The Crusades: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Alan Murray, vol. 2 (Santa Barbara, 2006), 489–90.

⁸⁴ Verena Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres: Studien zur Geschichtsschreibung des ersten Kreuzzuges*, *Studia humaniora* 15 (Düsseldorf, 1990), 26, whereas Edgington, 'Fulcher of Chartres' and Flori, *Chroniqueurs*, 223–24 give the year 1106.

⁸⁵ Fulcherus Carnotensis, *Historia Hierosolymitana: Mit Erläuterungen und einem Anhang*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913), 135–36 n. 21.

⁸⁶ *Ekkehardi Uraugiensis abbatiss Hierosolymita: nach der Waitz'schen Recension mit Erläuterungen und einem Anhang*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Tübingen, 1877), 89–90 n. 10; Reinhold Röhrich, *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs* (Innsbruck, 1901), 238–39; Munro, 'The Speech of Pope Urban II', 232–35; Fulcherus, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, 130–32 n. 1; Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, 20.

⁸⁷ Flori, *Chroniqueurs*, 233; Cowdrey, 'Pope Urban', 724; Frederic Duncalf, 'The Councils of Piacenza and Clermont,' in *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 1, *The First Hundred Years*, ed. Marshall W. Baldwin and Kenneth M. Setton (Madison, 1969), 2nd edition, 220–52, at 244.

⁸⁸ On this topic see Thomas N. Bisson, 'Celebration and Persuasion: Reflections on the Cultural Evolution of Medieval Consultation,' *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 7 (1982): 181–204.

⁸⁹ Fulcherus, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, 121–30. Cf. Somerville, *The Councils*, 101–02; Strack, 'The sermon', 31–34.

⁹⁰ Flori, *Chroniqueurs*, 233.

⁹¹ Strack, 'The sermon', 33–34.

⁹² Fulcherus, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, 132–38; Strack, 'The sermon', 32–33.

⁹³ Fulcherus, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, 133–34; translation: Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem: 1095-1127*, translated by Frances R. Ryan, ed. Harold S. Fink (Knoxville, 1969), 66.

-
- ⁹⁴ Henrik Syse, 'Augustine and Just War: Between Virtue and Duties,' in *Ethics, Nationalism, and Just War: Medieval and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. Henrik Syse and Gregory M. Rechberg (Washington, 2007), 36–50, at 46–47; Frederick H. Russell, *The Just War in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought Series 3/8 (Cambridge, 1975).
- ⁹⁵ Asbridge, *The Crusades*, 38–39; Russell, *The Just War*, 38–39.
- ⁹⁶ Fulcherus, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, 136–37; translation: Fulcher, *A History*, 67.
- ⁹⁷ Cole, *The Preaching*, 12.
- ⁹⁸ Flori, *Chroniqueurs*, 233.
- ⁹⁹ Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, 18 n. 21, 107. Cf. Susan B. Edgington, 'The First Crusade: Reviewing the Evidence,' in *The first Crusade: Origins and Impact*, ed. Jonathan Phillips (Manchester, 1997), 55–77, at 56–57; Edgington, 'Fulcher of Chartres,' 489.
- ¹⁰⁰ Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, 76.
- ¹⁰¹ Somerville, *The Councils*, 103–04; Robert Somerville, 'The Council of Clermont (1095), and Latin Christian Society,' *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 12 (1974): 55–90, at 78–79; Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, 13.
- ¹⁰² Fulcherus, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, 138–40. This interpretation is supported in Duncalf, 'The Councils,' 238.