

Medieval Academy of America

Criticism of Papal Crusade Policy in Old French and Provençal

Author(s): Palmer A. Throop

Source: *Speculum*, Vol. 13, No. 4 (Oct., 1938), pp. 379-412

Published by: [Medieval Academy of America](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2849662>

Accessed: 03-10-2015 22:37 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Medieval Academy of America and Cambridge University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Speculum*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

SPECULUM

A JOURNAL OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

VOL. XIII

OCTOBER, 1938

No. 4

CRITICISM OF PAPAL CRUSADE POLICY IN OLD FRENCH AND PROVENÇAL

By PALMER A. THROOP

THE repeated failure of the crusade against the Moslem in the Holy Land caused more than despair and disappointment in Europe. It aroused the greatest interest in the causes of the failure, an interest most significantly reflected in Old French and Provençal literature.¹ Why did these costly expeditions preached by Holy Church, approved by God, so often result in the defeat of the Cross and the continued triumph of Islam? *Peccatis exigentibus*—because of the sins of Christians, the Church responded, and *peccatis exigentibus* became the classic excuse, the chief theological prop of crusade apologists. It served St Bernard as his principal argument in his explanation of the fiasco of the second crusade²—that first profound shock to the faithful of Europe, certain of the triumph of their holy cause. As failure followed failure, the defense did noble duty in vernacular crusade *excitatoria*,³ and came to be elaborated windily by thirteenth-century clergy.⁴

Peccatis exigentibus, however, was much too vague an explanation to serve as a bulwark against the criticisms of a repeatedly disappointed Christendom. The thirteenth century brought distressing complications that made such an abstract defense much less convincing. After the successful crusade of the iniquitous Fred-

¹ In tracing popular interest in crusade failures the following studies of crusade songs in the vernacular have been of service: J. Bédier and P. Aubry, *Les chansons de croisade avec leurs mélodies* (Paris, 1909); K. Lewent, *Das altprovenzalische Kreuzlied* (Berlin, 1905); F. Oeding, *Das altfranzösische Kreuzlied* (Braunschweig, 1910); H. Schindler, *Die Kreuzzüge in der altprovenzalischen und mittelhochdeutschen Lyrik* (Dresden, 1889); G. Wolfram, 'Kreuzpredigt und Kreuzlied,' *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, xviii (1886), 89 ff.

² See Bernard of Clairvaux, *De consideratione*, ed. J. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* (Paris, 1879), clxxxii, col. 741 ff.

³ G. Wolfram in his study 'Kreuzpredigt und Kreuzlied,' *loc. cit.*, p. 102, has shown the similarity between the statements of the popes as to *peccatis exigentibus* and the German crusade songs. Good examples in Old French may be found in the anonymous 'Parti de mal et a bien aturné,' ed. J. Bédier, *Les chansons de croisade*, p. 71, and in Thibaut iv's 'Au tans plain de felonie,' ed. J. Bédier, *loc. cit.* p. 182. A good example in Provençal may be found in Gavauda's 'Seignors, per los vostres peccatz,' ed. A. Jeanroy, *Romania*, xxxiv (1905), 534. The troubadours also insisted that the sins of Christians hindered the launching of a new crusade. See K. Lewent, *Das altprovenzalische Kreuzlied*, p. 66.

⁴ See Roger de Wendover, *Flores historiarum*, ed. H. G. Hewlett (*Rolls Series* lxxxvii: London, 1887), II, 370, 371.

erick II, excommunicated and most thoroughly damned by the Church,¹ and the humiliating defeat of St Louis,² who was embarrassingly free of sin, *peccatis exigentibus* seemed somewhat inadequate to the more thoughtful among the devout, who found their only refuge in the inscrutability of God.³ Yet God's inscrutability always remained cold comfort to those not blessed with profound faith, and some of the troubadours were certainly not so blessed. Even during the twelfth century the Monk of Montaudon reproached God for permitting the failure of the much-admired crusader Richard Lionheart. 'He is a fool who follows You into battle,' he informed the Deity.⁴ Several thirteenth-century troubadours openly and vigorously proclaimed their disgust with the Almighty for permitting the failure of crusades,⁵ nor is there any evidence that they sought consolation in the thought that the failure was just punishment for a sinful Christendom.

The Church needed and found a less abstract explanation. With complete truth the clergy maintained that a fundamental cause of the failure of the crusades lay in the quarrels among Christian rulers. Throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries a wrangling Christendom was admonished to make peace and present a united front to the hated infidel.⁶ True enough, this defense is nothing more than a concrete application of *peccatis exigentibus*. The quarrels of the leaders obviously arose from sins of greed, vanity, etc., but by placing the responsibility upon certain persons at certain times, the defense must have become far more convincing to the ordinary person. Those writing in Old French and Provençal found this explanation much to their taste. With indignant reproof or sly mockery, they rebuked the quarrelsome rulers who sacrificed the welfare of the Holy Land for their private animosities.⁷

There were yet bolder critics who ascribed to the papacy itself the reverses which overtook the Holy Land during the thirteenth century. The pope, these declared, sent crusades against his enemies in Europe, not against Christ's enemies in the East.⁸ Long before this, indeed as early as the eleventh century,

¹ R. Röhrich, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1874), I, 4 ff.

² L. Bréhier, *L'église et l'Orient au moyen âge: les croisades* (5th edition, Paris, 1928), pp. 222–227, 237–238.

³ Humbert of Romans wrote to Gregory X ca 1272 and reported doubts raised by the death of Louis IX while on his crusade. Humbert stated: 'I do not know by what secret judgment God permits in our times frequent misfortunes to occur to crusaders fighting the Saracens,' Humbert of Romans, *Opus Tripartitum*, ed. E. Brown, *Appendix ad fasciculum rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum prout ab Orthuino Gratio . . . editus* (London, 1690), p. 192. For the dating of the *Opus Tripartitum*, see K. Michel, *Das Opus Tripartitum des Humbertus de Romanis* (Graz, 1926), p. 11 ff.

⁴ Monk of Montaudon, *L'autrier fui en paradis*, ed. O. Klein, *Die Dichtungen des Mönchs von Montaudon (Ausgaben und Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der romanischen Philologie, Heft VII: Marburg, 1885)*, p. 34. Klein dates this poem between June 29, 1193 and February 4, 1194. See p. 31.

⁵ K. Lewent, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

⁶ L. J. Paetow, 'The crusading ardor of John of Garland,' *The Crusades and Other Historical Essays Presented to Dana C. Munro by His Former Students*, ed. L. J. Paetow (New York, 1928), p. 214.

⁷ For a list of rulers reproved by the troubadours, see K. Lewent, *Das altprovenzalische Kreuzlied*, p. 65.

⁸ It is a curious fact that in the thirteenth century nearly all criticisms of this sort written in the vernacular came from France, Italy, and Spain. Of the poets writing in German, it seems that only

there had been denunciations of the pope for offering spiritual rewards to armies fighting his European foes. In the eleventh century, however, when Leo IX and Gregory VII were endeavoring to make theocracy a political reality, objections had revolved about the question of how far the use of armed force was consonant with Christianity.¹ Although this vital question was still raised in the thirteenth century,² the crusade ideal preached by Urban II in 1095 shifted the center of controversy. Urban insisted that Christian should no longer wage war against Christian: all forces should combine against the Moslem, the enemy of all Christians.³ This ideal, upheld in general by the popes of the twelfth century, fell into increasing neglect during the thirteenth.⁴ Christian crusaded against Christian, while the Saracen triumphed in the Holy Land.

This change of policy brought forth a storm of denunciation in Old French and Provençal poetry.⁵ Although a few of the clergy joined in this chorus of discontent, the greater part of the criticism came from laymen. A tailor, a merchant, a judge, court poets, and simple knights expressed their views with more force than courtesy. Not only were these critics from all walks of life, they were from

Walther von der Vogelweide and Freidank criticized the papacy, but even these writers did not offer the sort of criticism discussed in this paper, namely, that the papacy had misdirected the crusades. It is true Walther von der Vogelweide accused the papacy of fostering civil war in the Empire while taxing it and draining it of silver. See 'Ah, wie kristenliche nû der bâbest lachet,' ed. K. Lachman, *Die Gedichte Walthers von der Vogelweide* (Berlin, 1875), p. 34. He also called the pope the 'new Judas' and declared the clergy had become warriors. See 'Wir klagen alle' and 'Ich saz ûf eine steine,' ed. K. Lachman, pp. 33, and 8-9. Yet Walther made no reference to the harm done the Holy Land by the papacy's political ambitions; he was concerned with the harm done his fatherland. Even in the poem in which he expressed his doubt that the money gathered for the Holy Land would ever reach there, he did not state that the money would be used for a crusade in Europe. See 'Sagt an, hêr Stoc, hât iuch der bâbest her gesendet,' ed. K. Lachman, p. 34. Freidank's accusations, although involving the crusades, were of another tenor. Freidank expressed his profound disillusion as an ex-crusader. As a partisan of Frederick II, he had a bad opinion of the pope and Syrian Christians, but he no more than Walther von der Vogelweide criticized the papal crusades for political ends. See Freidank, *Bescheidenheit*, ed. H. E. Bezzenger (Halle, 1872), 208-216.

¹ For a thorough study of this matter, see Carl Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte, VI, Stuttgart, 1935)*, particularly p. 212 ff. See also Carl Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII* (Leipzig, 1894), pp. 456-462.

² See Humbert of Romans, *Opus tripartitum, loc. cit.*, p. 191.

³ D. C. Munro, 'The Speech of Urban II at Clermont,' *American Historical Review*, XI (1905-96), 239.

⁴ There are relatively few instances in the twelfth century of indulgences issued as a reward for fighting the pope's European enemies. See Otto Volk, *Die abendländischhierarchische Kreuzzugs-idee* (Halle, 1911), p. 52.

⁵ The vernacular literature of the thirteenth century also abounds with protests against clerical corruption. Such criticisms, however, unless they are directly connected with papal crusade policy, are not considered here. For a discussion of vernacular criticism of ecclesiastical corruption, see M. M. Wood, *The Spirit of Protest in Old French Literature (Columbia University Studies in Romance Philology and Literature, New York, 1917)*, pp. 74-115; C. A. Pescheck, 'Der religiöse Glaube der gebildeten Laien in Deutschland und die altdeutsche Religionsprache in den Zeiten des Mittelalters, namentlich im dreizehnten Jahrhunderte,' *Stäudlin's Archiv für alte und neue Kirchengeschichte*, IV (1820), part 4, 547 ff. An incomplete collection of Provençal poems expressing anti-clerical sentiments has been poorly edited by E. Brinkmeier, *Rügelieder der Troubadours gegen Rom und die Hierarchie* (Halle, 1846).

many different regions of Europe. The French-speaking peoples were well represented, while those writing in Provençal resided in Castile and northern Italy as well as in Languedoc. It must therefore be kept in mind that this literature is more than individual expression. It represents widespread opinion with political and even religious implications.

Furthermore, some of these poems were written with the clear intent of spreading distrust of the papacy. Such lyrics, it should be remembered, were written to be sung,¹ and thus influenced a far wider circle than the educated few. The Provençal *sirventés* in particular was composed for a large audience. It was frequently adapted to the melody and strophe form of a familiar song: the words could then be spread more rapidly because they could be more easily remembered.² The *sirventés* was always a polemic, often concerned with some question of public life, and usually written in the interest of some lord or political faction.³ For this reason it is by far the most instructive genre from the historical point of view. It undoubtedly represents in many cases the determined attempt of some individual or group to control public opinion.⁴ In short, the Provençal *sirventés* must always carry the suspicion of propaganda and its historical interest is increased, not lessened, by this suspicion.

The earliest criticism of the pope for his neglect of the Holy Land is in a Provençal *sirventés* composed by the troubadour Giraut de Bornelh in the late twelfth century.⁵ Moved by the loss of Jerusalem in 1187 and irritated by Gregory VIII's lack of action in the face of this disaster,⁶ Giraut condemned in general terms both temporal rulers and the pope: 'Many desire an emperor's throne who ill protect our faith, and the pope sleeps between tierce and nones so soundly

¹ The melodies of some of these lyrics have been put into modern notation and edited. See J. Bédier and P. Aubry, *Les chansons de croisade avec leurs mélodies* (Paris, 1909); E. Lommatzsch, *Provenzalisches Liederbuch* (Berlin, 1917); J. Beck, *Les chansonniers des troubadours et des trouvères (Corpus cantilenarum mediæ ævi, Series 1, I, II: Paris 1927)*.

² E. Levy, *Guilhem Figueira* (Berlin, 1880), p. 21.

³ A. Jeanroy, *La poésie lyrique des troubadours* (Paris, 1934), II, 174 ff. See also E. Levy, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

⁴ Diez considered the *sirventés* an expression of public opinion. Jeanroy has pointed out that this conception must be accepted with reservations: the *sirventés* was written to form public opinion. He observed: 'La plupart [des troubadours] étaient les protégés de personnages plus ou moins importants, dont ils sont nécessairement les interprètes, parce qu'ils étaient précisément payés pour cela . . . En quelque sens qu'on la tranche, les *sirventés* n'en conservent pas moins un vif intérêt: s'ils ne sont pas les reflets de "l'opinion public," ils ont pu contribuer à la former. Le fait que les princes en ont fait composer pour défendre leur politique, que parfois ils ont répondu ou fait répondre à ceux où ils étaient attaqués, nous prouve qu'il y avait réellement là, au sentiment général, un moyen d'action que l'histoire n'a pas le droit de négliger.' See A. Jeanroy, *op. cit.*, II, 175, 176.

⁵ Jeanroy considers the *sirventés* 'Tals gen prezich' (no. 67) of doubtful authorship, although, unfortunately, he does not give his reasons. See Jeanroy, *op. cit.*, II, 57, note 2. A. Kolsen, the editor of Giraut de Bornelh, together with Maus and Vossler, considers it authentic. See A. Kolsen, *Sämtliche Lieder des Troubadours Giraut de Bornelh* (Halle, 1935), II, 119. Certainly the content of the poem, particularly the phrase 'Tals quer d'emperi corona' of stanza v, could indicate the interregnum of the thirteenth century. However, Kolsen's authority, based upon literary similarities to undoubted compositions of the twelfth century troubadour, has here been accepted.

⁶ A. Kolsen, *op. cit.*, II, 119.

that I see no lords rise up against the Saracens. Rather they consider him an enemy who says a word about it.¹

In the next stanza, however, Giraut, deserts this fine impartiality and placed all the blame on the pope. 'Jesus Christ,' he wrote, 'wore a crown of thorns to save mankind: the pope basely abandons His Sepulchre.'² His very concision carried a sting. Again and again this complaint of papal indifference to the Holy Land was echoed in the thirteenth century.

Certainly the thirteenth-century Church was quite aware of the dangerous influence of these anti-papal songs. To sing one in public was an offense that came under the jurisdiction of the inquisition, an offense that this authority punished severely. For example, a burgher of Toulouse, Bernart Raimon Baranhon, was convicted by the inquisition of having sung Guillem Figueira's *sirventés* against Rome in the presence of many. The inquisitors also found incriminating his possession of the *Bible* of Guyot de Provins.³

These poets whose works the inquisition considered so dangerous were among the earliest and most violent critics of papal crusade policy. Both protested against the first great diversion of a crusade from the Holy Land, the fourth crusade (1204), which captured Constantinople and set a precedent for yet other crusades against the Greeks.⁴ Guyot de Provins, a Cluniac monk, wrote in Old French a bitter satire on the Church, known as *La Bible*,⁵ which accused the papacy of avarice and, in this connection, pointedly inquired why the crusades were directed only against the Greeks.⁶ Somewhat later the Provençal tailor and troubadour Guillem Figueira repeated this accusation that greed was the motivating force of the crusade against the Greeks. The violence of Figueira's *sirventés* may be better understood when one realizes that it was written in Toulouse in 1229 while the town was besieged by crusaders sent by the pope to crush the Albigensian heretics.⁷ He declared:

¹ Giraut de Bornelh, 'Tals gen prezich' e sermona,' ed. A. Kolsen, *op. cit.* (Halle, 1910), I, 428, 430. See stanza v:

Tals quer d'emperi corona
Que nostra fe mal defen,
E·l pap' entre tertz' e nona
S'endorm aissi planamen
Qu'encontra sarrazina gen
No vei baro que s'opona
Ans an per lor malvolen
Qui d'aisso mot lor sona.

² *Ibid.*, I, 430. See stanza vi:

Jesucristz, per salvar la gen,
Portet d'espinas corona,
E·l papa so monimen
Malamen abandona.

³ A. Jeanroy, *op. cit.*, II, 225, and note 1. ⁴ L. Bréhier, *op. cit.*, p. 144 ff.

⁵ Carl Voretzsch, *Einführung in das Studium der altfranzösischen Literatur* (3rd edition, Halle, 1925), p. 349.

⁶ *La Bible de Guiot de Provins*, ed. J. Orr, *Les œuvres de Guiot de Provins* (Manchester, 1915), p. 34.

⁷ V. de Bartholomaeis, *Poesie provenzali storiche relative all' Italia (Istituto storico italiano: fonti per la storia d'Italia, scrittori secoli XII-XIII, LXXII: Rome, 1931), II, 98, note.*

Deceitful Rome, avarice ensnares you, so that you shear the wool of your sheep too much. May the Holy Ghost, who takes on human flesh, hear my prayer and break your beak, O Rome! You will never have a truce with me because you are false and perfidious with us and with the Greeks¹ . . . Rome, you do little harm to the Saracens, but you massacre Greeks and Latins. In hell-fire and ruin you have your seat, Rome.²

These charges against the papacy are not wholly justifiable. Innocent III was outraged by the diversion of the crusade he had organized to combat the Saracens.³ Yet once Constantinople was captured and the Latin Empire created, the popes felt the necessity of promoting crusades against the schismatic Greeks, who stubbornly refused to acknowledge the Latin rite and planned attacks upon their conquerors.⁴ It would be extremely difficult to prove that these crusades were motivated solely by greed. The significant fact remains, however, that they took many resources, military and financial, that would otherwise have gone to aid the Holy Land.⁵ Ugly suspicions had been aroused.

The failure of the fifth crusade helped spread such suspicions. This expedition had made a good beginning with the capture of Damietta in Egypt, but the crusaders soon lost the important city.⁶ Many found at fault the papal legate Pelagius, whose headstrong conduct and squabbles with other leaders were widely discussed. A Frenchman, Huon de Saint-Quentin, writing shortly after the disaster in Egypt (1221),⁷ placed the full blame of the failure upon the Church, and ascribed clerical avarice as the fundamental cause.⁸ He bluntly declared that the papal legate had betrayed John of Brienne, the chief secular leader of the crusade; the legate was, in his opinion, wholly responsible for the loss of Damietta.⁹

From the evidence of yet other contemporaries of the fifth crusade, it appears that the conduct of the pope's representative aroused a great deal of indignation.

¹ Guillem Figueira, 'D'un sirventes far,' ed. V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, II, 98, 99. See stanza III:

Roma trichairitz, cobeitatz vos engana,
C'a vostras berbitz tondetz trop la lana;
Lo sains Esperitz que receup carn humana
Entenda mos pres
E franha tos becs,
Roma! No m'entrecs,
Car es falsa e trafana
Vas nos e vas Grecs!

² *Ibid.*, p. 99. See stanza VII:

Roma, als Sarrazis faitz vos pauc de dampnatge,
Mas Grecs e Latis metetz e carnalatge;
Inz el foc d'abis, Roma, faitz vostre estatge,
En perdicion.

³ A. Luchaire, *Innocent III: la question d'Orient* (Paris, 1911), pp. 114, 115.

⁴ L. Halphen, *L'essor de l'Europe (Peuples et civilisations)*, VI: Paris, 1932), p. 427 ff.

⁵ L. Bréhier, *op. cit.*, pp. 174, 188. ⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 194-197.

⁷ Dated by G. Paris, 'L'auteur de la Complainte de Jérusalem,' *Romania*, XIX (1890), 294-296.

⁸ Huon de Saint Quentin, 'Rome, Jherusalem se plaint,' ed. K. Bartsch and A. Horning, *La langue et la littérature françaises* (Paris, 1887), cols 373, 375. ⁹ *Ibid.*, col. 379.

Huon's views are repeated by three poets writing in Old French: Moniot,¹ Gautier de Coincy,² and Guillaume le Clerc de Normandie. Of these Guillaume le Clerc is the most explicit. In his satire *Le besant de Dieu*, written in 1226 or 1227,³ he declared:

Because of the legate who governed and led the Christians, everyone says in truth, we lost that city through folly and sin. We should be greatly reproached. For when the clergy take the function of leading knights, certainly that is against law. But the clerk should recite aloud from his Scripture and his psalms and let the knight go to his great battle-fields. Let him [the clerk] remain before his altars and pray for the warriors and shrive the sinners. Greatly should Rome be humiliated for the loss of Damietta.⁴

From this revealing passage it is clear that direct papal control of an army was greatly resented. Indeed, in pointing out the ancient distinction between the duties of priest and warrior, Guillaume seems to be maintaining that it is against canon law. Furthermore, from Guillaume's expression 'every one says in truth,' and from the number of independent critics, one may risk the conclusion that a large body of opinion in French-speaking provinces was becoming increasingly distrustful of the Church's guidance of the crusades.

Among Provençal poets, embittered by the Albigensian crusade then devastating their land, the loss of Damietta was commented upon with far more acerbity. Guillem Figueira in his terrible *sirventés* against Rome observed: 'Rome, you know well that your base cheating and folly caused the loss of Damietta. Evil leader, Rome! God will strike you down because you govern too falsely through money, O Rome of evil race and evil compact.'⁵

¹ Moniot, 'Bien mostre Dieus apertement,' ed. A. Jeanroy and A. Langfors, *Chansons satiriques et bacchiques du XIIIe siècle (Les classiques français du moyen âge, xxiii: Paris, 1921)*, no. 6, p. 10.

² Gautier de Coincy, *Vie de Sainte Léocade*, ed. E. Barbazan, M. Méon, *Fabliaux et contes des poètes français* (Paris, 1808), I, 300.

³ K. Voretzsch, *Altfranzösische Literatur*, p. 406.

⁴ Guillaume le Clerc, 'Le besant de Dieu,' ed. E. Martin (Halle, 1869), p. 73, See verses 2547-2564:

Por un legat qui governot
L'ost des crestiens e menot,
Ceo dist aucun en verite,
Perdimes nus cele cite
E par folie e par pecchie.
Bien nus deit estre reprochie.
Car puis que cler c a la mestrie
De conduire chevalerie,
Certes ceo est contre dreiture.
Mes alt li clers a s'escriture
E a ses psaumes verseiller
E lest aler le chevaler
A ses granz batailles champels
E il seit devant ses autels
E prit por les combateors
E assoille les peccheors.
Mult deust estre Rome mate
De la perte de Damiate.

⁵ Guillem Figueira, 'D'un sirventes far,' ed. V. de Bartholomaeis, *Poesie provenzali*, II, 99. See stanza v:

With similar rancor two knights of Tarascon, the collaborators Tomier and Palazi,¹ jeer at the papal legate in Provence² for his indifference to the fate of Damietta: 'Our cardinal takes his ease, cheats, and lives in fine houses. May God strike him down for it! But he cares very little about the disaster of Damietta.'³

The Church, however, found a defender of its leadership in a poetess of Languedoc, Gormonda de Montpellier. This lady, refuting the charges made by Figueira in his 'D'un sirventes far,' insisted that it was not the cardinal legate who caused the loss of Damietta, but the folly of vile men.⁴ Pope Honorius III made a more cogent defense by accusing Frederick II of bringing about the failure of the expedition through his many empty promises which kept the crusaders waiting in vain for his aid.⁵ This accusation may also be found in a *sirventés* written by a crusader, Peirol, upon the point of returning home from Damietta.⁶ This troubadour, one of the few to engage actively in a crusade, shamed the emperor for the breach of his crusade vow and the neglect of his duty.⁷

There is a great deal to justify the contentions of Peirol and the pope, but justly or unjustly, the loss of Damietta had brought a wide distrust of the Church's leadership. Even when one discounts the attacks of Figueira, Tomier, and Palazi, enemies of the Church writing during the fury of the Albigensian crusade, there still remains a body of protest in Old French that is far from negligible. Papal direction of the crusades was being boldly questioned.

All of these criticisms, however, are mild and innocuous when compared to the vitriolic abuse heaped upon the papacy for directing a crusade against the

Roma, ben sapchatz que vostra avols barata
 E vostra foudatz fetz perdre Damiaia;
 Malamen renhatz, Roma! Dieus vos abata
 En dechazemen
 Car trop falsamen
 Renhatz per argen,
 Roma de mal' esclata
 E de mal coven!

¹ Possibly these two knights of Tarascon were brothers. See A. Jeanroy, *op. cit.*, I, 431.

² De Bartholomaeis has identified the cardinal referred to by Romier and Palazi as Romano Bonaventura of Rome, appointed as papal legate in Provence February 25, 1225. See de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, II, 57, note.

³ Tomier and Palazi, 'De chantar farai,' ed. V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, II, 57. Probably written during siege of Avignon by Louis VIII of France. V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, II, 57. See stanza VIII:

Nostre cardenals
 Sojorna e barata
 E prent bel ostals,
 De qe Deus l'abata!
 Mas pauc sent los mals
 Quant a Damiaia.

⁴ Gormonda de Montpellier, 'Greu m'es a durar,' ed. V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, II, 107, 108. Dated 1228-1229. *Ibid.*, 106.

⁵ F. Rocquain, *La cour de Rome et l'esprit de réforme avant Luther* (Paris, 1895), II, 16.

⁶ See V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, II, 11, 12, note lxxiv.

⁷ Peirol, 'Pos flum Jordan ai vist el Monumen,' ed. V. de Bartholomaeis, II, 13, 14, Stanzas IV, V.

Albigensian heretics. Provence and Languedoc had long been hotbeds of heresy, a fact which one troubadour attributed to the corruption of the Church.¹ When the usual ecclesiastical threats and punishments failed to prevent the spread of heresy, Alexander III felt it necessary to declare a crusade against the heretics in 1179 at the Third Lateran Council.² Yet it was not until 1209, during the pontificate of Innocent III, that the crusade took on serious proportions. Alarmed by the growing strength of the heresy, the popes of the early thirteenth century determined to stamp it out by force of arms. The same spiritual rewards were offered as those gained on the crusade against the Saracen.³ The holy war was brought within the borders of Western Europe. Naturally, the severest critics of this shift in crusade aims were the troubadours, whose rich and beautiful country was devastated by French crusaders. They made very serious charges: the pope was using the crusade to stir up neighbor against neighbor while the real enemy, the Moslem, was left undisturbed in the Holy Land.

One may easily doubt this pious enthusiasm for the Holy Land. The troubadours were not as a rule burdened by their religious aspirations. They frequently wrote with levity of sacred things; sometimes they did not stop at sacrilege. Raimon Jordan preferred a night with his beloved to all paradise.⁴ Bertran d'Alamanon rejoiced when told of the coming of Antichrist because this evil power would enable him to possess a resisting beauty.⁵ Guillem Ademar approved of a crusade solely on the grounds that it took the jealous husband away and left the lover undisturbed with his lady.⁶ Indeed, the troubadours rarely went on crusades, much preferring southern pleasures to the dangers of an expedition overseas.⁷ Although they eloquently urged the faithful to take the cross, their crusade zeal was usually confined to poetry,⁸ poetry for which they may have received material rewards.⁹

¹ Peire Vidal, writing around 1193-94, observed: The pope and the false doctors have put Holy Church in such distress that God is angered. They are so mad and sinful that the heretics have arisen. Peire Vidal, 'A per pauc de chantar n'om lais,' ed. J. Anglade, *Les poésies de Peire Vidal (Les classiques français du moyen âge, XI: Paris, 1913)*, pp. 101, 102. See stanza II:

. . . L'apostolis e'lh fals doctor
 Sancta Gleiza, don Deus s'irais;
 Que tan son fol e peccador
 Per que l'eretge son levat.

² H. Pissard, *La guerre sainte en pays chrétien* (Paris, 1912), pp. 27, 29.

³ N. Paulus, *Geschichte des Ablasses im Mittelalter* (Paderborn, 1923), II, 27, 28.

⁴ V. Lowinsky, 'Zum geistlichen Kunstlied in der altprovenzalischen Literatur,' *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, XX (1898), 164, 165.

⁵ Bertran d'Alamanon, 'Pos anc nous valc amors, seigneur Bertran,' ed. J. J. Salverda de Grave, *Le troubadour Bertran d'Alamanon (Bibliothèque méridionale, series 1, VII: Toulouse, 1902)*, 118.

⁶ Guillem Ademar, 'No pot esser sofer ni atendut,' ed. M. Raynouard, *Choix des poésies des troubadours* (Paris, 1818), III, 197, 198. ⁷ K. Lewent, *Das altprovenzalische Kreuzlied*, pp. 95-100.

⁸ Provençal crusade songs really began with the third crusade (although there are a few which antedate this event, such as the works of Marcabrun) and became less and less frequent as the thirteenth century progressed. A very few belong to the fourteenth century. See K. Lewent, *op. cit.*, p. 76 ff.

⁹ Politics and personalities play such an important part in Provençal crusade songs that they are to be considered as polemical *sirventés* for which the poet was rewarded. See V. Lowinsky, *loc. cit.*, p. 166. Cf. A. Jeanroy, *La poésie lyrique des troubadours*, II, 175 ff.

Although one may suspect the crusade ardor of the Provençaux, there is no doubting the sincerity of their hatred of the papacy which had brought the horrors of war to their beloved country. One troubadour, Perdigon, dared use his talents in behalf of the invading crusaders and was, as a consequence, driven forth and exiled by his countrymen.¹ This shows clearly enough that when the troubadours protested against the crusade in Languedoc and Provence they were voicing the anger and disgust of their compatriots.² The fact that they did not protest as heretics,³ denying all rights to the pope, but as zealous Christians who had the interest of the Holy Land at heart, lent great emphasis to their censure. Their devotion to the Holy Sepulchre was a most effective weapon against the detested papacy. It enabled them to object to the Albigenian crusade on most pious grounds.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the Provençal knights Tomier and Palazi objected to the Albigenian crusade in 1216 precisely on the score that the cause of the Holy Land was being neglected. 'He who abandons the Holy Sepulchre has no sincere faith in God. Certainly the clergy and the French care very little about the shame inflicted upon Him. Yet God will be revenged upon those whose rapacity has cut the roads and closed the ports which lead to Acre and Syria.'⁴

Similar expressions of disgust with the papacy's neglect of the Holy Sepulchre are to be found in two poems of Guillem Rainol.⁵ There is evidence that such charges were quite justifiable. The Christians in the Holy Land sent messengers to Innocent III to protest that the indulgences granted for the Albigenian cru-

¹ F. Diez, *Leben und Werke der Troubadours* (2nd edition, Leipzig, 1882), p. 441.

² It should be noted that some of the troubadours lamented the ruin of their country without criticizing the war as an abuse of the crusades. They said bitter things concerning the greed of the Church, the inquisition, and the French; they attacked the Kings of Aragon and England for not supporting them strongly against their enemies, etc. Such criticisms, unless they are connected with condemnation of papal crusade policy, have not been considered here. For general discussions of the troubadours during the Albigenian crusade, see J. Anglade, *Histoire sommaire de la littérature méridionale au moyen âge* (Paris, 1929), pp. 85-98, and A. Jeanroy, *op. cit.*, II, 212-229.

³ Guillem Figueira, whose *sirventés* was condemned by the inquisition, must be considered a heretic. Jeanroy has noted the similarity between Figueira's invectives and those current among the heretics: *ecclesiam romanam meretricem . . . matrem fornicationum*, etc. See A. Jeanroy, *op. cit.*, II, 220, note 1. Although one may suspect other Provençaux of heresy, there is not enough evidence in their poetry to justify the accusation. One could criticize and even fight against the pope without being a heretic.

⁴ Tomier and Palazi, 'Si col flacs molins torneja,' ed. A. Jeanroy, 'Un sirventés en faveur de Raimon VII,' *Bausteine zur romanischen Philologie, Festgabe für A. Mussafia* (Halle, 1905), p. 631. See stanza VII:

Pauc a en Deu d'esperansa
 Quil sepulcre desenansa
 Car [li] clergue e sel de Fransa
 Preson pauc la desonransa
 De Dieu, qu'en penra venjansa,
 C'ab lur raubarria
 Au tot los camins els portz [e] d'Acre et de Suria.

⁵ K. Lewent, *Das altprovenzalische Kreuzlied*, p. 44, note 2.

sade endangered aid for the Holy Sepulchre.¹ Certainly the zeal shown by the papacy for the crusade against the heretic was a contributing factor to the interminable delay of Innocent III's projected crusade against the Saracen. For example, Honorius III, Innocent's successor, thought it was better to use money destined for the Holy Land in the interest of the Albigensian crusade.²

The Holy Land, it seems, was deprived of warriors as well as money; for, if one is to believe William of Tudela, the French fought the Albigensians with far more enthusiasm than the Saracens.³ The Provençaux had no difficulty explaining such crusade zeal. Their property was the reward of victorious crusaders.⁴ What the local nobility, insisting upon their loyalty to the Church, thought of a crusade that stripped them of their lands is vividly expressed by the anonymous poet who continued the *Chanson de la croisade contre les Albigeois* after William of Tudela.⁵ Having come to the Fourth Lateran Council to protest against the spoliation of his lands, the Count of Foix pleaded his case with fiery eloquence before Innocent III himself.⁶ Accused of heresy and the murder of crusaders by a troubadour Folquet de Marseille, who had attained the high rank of Bishop of Toulouse, the count replied that he had never hurt any true pilgrim, but he rejoiced that he had put out the eyes, cut off the feet, hands, and fingers⁷ of the false traitors and perjurers who assumed the cross for his destruction. His only regret was that some had escaped. As for his accuser the Bishop of Toulouse, he was a traitor to God and his compatriots. He composed lying songs and slan-

¹ Innocent III, Letter to Simon de Montfort, Ep. XII (1209), 123, ed. Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, cccxvi, col. 153.

² A. Molinier, 'Catalogue des actes de Simon et d'Amauri de Montfort,' *Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartes*, xxxiv (1873), 183.

³ William of Tudela, *Chanson de la croisade albigeoise*, ed. E. Martin-Chabot (*Classiques de l'histoire de France au moyen âge*; Paris, 1931), I, laisse 47, p. 112. William of Tudela, a member of the clergy, approved of the Albigensian crusade, and wrote the first part of the *Chanson* between 1210 and 1213. See preface, p. xi.

⁴ The Church claimed the right of offering the property of heretics to the orthodox who helped extirpate heresy. In the sixteenth century this right came to be known as the *exposition en proie*, but in the thirteenth century expressions such as *terram exponere catholicis occupandam* were used. See H. Pissard, *La guerre sainte en pays chrétien*, pp. 37-40, 114, 115.

⁵ The anonymous poet who described this scene wrote between June 25, 1218 and the summer of 1219. His poem stops abruptly after he described the renewal of the siege of Toulouse by the French prince. A bitter opponent of the crusade, it is possible that he was killed during the siege. See P. Meyer, *La chanson de la croisade contre les Albigeois* (Paris, 1875), I, lx, lxi.

⁶ P. Meyer is of the opinion that the poet was a witness of this dramatic episode at the Fourth Lateran Council and conjectures that he came to Rome with one of the Provençaux nobles, possibly the Count of Toulouse or the Count of Foix. The poet described the protests of both these counts in some detail. The tone of this account is quite deferential to Innocent III, although violent against Simon de Montfort and the crusade. See P. Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. lxxvii-lxxv.

⁷ The crusaders mutilated the Provençaux in the same fashion. In an anonymous collection of anecdotes to be used in sermons there is an account of how Folquet, Bishop of Toulouse, was once preaching and described heretics as wolves and the orthodox as sheep. He was interrupted by a heretic whose nose had been cut off and whose eyes had been put out by command of Simon de Montfort. The heretic showed his mutilation and inquired if he had ever seen a wolf so bitten by a sheep. The bishop replied that the Church had dogs to protect its sheep, and that the heretic had been properly bitten by a good and strong dog. See A. Lecoy de la Marche, *Anecdotes historiques d'Etienne de Bourbon* (Paris, 1877), pp. 23, 24, note 3.

derous sayings for the destruction of those who sang or recited them. When he had been a jongleur, the nobility had maintained him with gifts. Now that he was Bishop of Toulouse no one dared defend whatever he attacked. The whole earth was flaming with the conflagration he had lit. He had caused the destruction, body and soul, of more than five hundred thousand.¹ By his acts, words, and conduct he seemed Antichrist rather than a papal legate.²

It is interesting to note that, according to this same anonymous poet, the crusaders themselves were critical of the behavior of the clergy. After the French had been repulsed from Beaucaire in 1216, their leader Simon de Montfort, gathered together the bishops to ask them to explain the failure of God's army.³ Finding their explanations unsatisfactory, one knight, Foucaut de Berzi, marvelled at the fashion in which the clergy granted absolution without penance. A bishop explained in vain that whoever fought the heretics, even though guilty of mortal sin, had done his penance. This Foucaut refused to believe and insisted that the crusaders' defeat at Beaucaire was caused not only by their sins, but by the 'preaching of the clergy' as well.⁴

When Simon de Montfort had his head crushed by a stone which hit just 'where it was necessary' during the siege of Toulouse,⁵ the poet reported that Bishop of Toulouse wished to consider the fallen leader a saint and a martyr, but that the Count of Soissons objected because he had died without confession.⁶ However, it seems that the bishop had his way in the end; for an epitaph was made celebrating the crusader's pious virtues, an epitaph that stirred the author of the *Chanson* to the most terrible indictment of the Albigensian crusade. There could be no more eloquent condemnation of the abuse of the holy war than his stinging reproach of the Church for promising to the greedy and blood-thirsty the greatest spiritual rewards:

And the epitaph relates, to one who can read it, that he [Simon de Montfort] is a saint and a martyr, and that he is destined to rise at the last day and to inherit and enjoy the marvelous bliss of heaven, and to wear the crown and to sit in the kingdom [of heaven]. And I have heard it said that it may well be so: if by killing men, by shedding blood, by destroying souls, by consenting to murders, by following evil counsels, by starting conflagrations, by destroying barons, by bringing the nobility to shame, by seizing lands, by advancing the wicked, by kindling evil, by extinguishing good, by killing women and destroying children, one can gain Jesus Christ in this world, one should wear a crown and shine in heaven!⁷

¹ This estimate, of course, cannot be accepted. It is another example of the mediaeval liking for generous, round numbers.

² *Chanson de la croisade contre les Albigeois*, ed. P. Meyer, lines 3285-3327, I, 146, 147.

³ The poet reported many expressions of doubt from the crusaders after a defeat. Simon de Montfort cried out against God and accused the clergy of betraying him. See *Chanson*, lines 7049-7055, I, 292; lines 7286-7297, I, 300-301; lines 8215-8226, I, 333. God was also bitterly reproached by the crusaders after the death of Simon. See *Chanson*, lines 8459-8468, I, 342; lines 8741-8754, I, 353. These complaints have not been considered in detail here since they were not at all peculiar to the Albigensian crusade. Many similar doubts were expressed after a military failure during the crusade against the Saracens. See K. Lewent, *op. cit.*, p. 7. ⁴ *Chanson*, lines 4330-4347, I, 188, 189.

⁵ *Ibid.*, line 8451, I, 342.

⁶ *Ibid.*, lines 8525-8537, I, 344-345.

⁷ *Ibid.*, lines 8683-8696, I, 354. See part CCVIII:

. . . E ditz el epictafi, cel quil sab ben legir:
Qu'el es sans ez es martirs, e que deu resperir,

As the popes continued in their determined effort to destroy the Albigensian heretics, the Provençal poets were in no way cowed by increasing hardships and brutalities. Rather they were stirred to deeper indignation at the Church for promoting war within Christendom. During the siege of Avignon in 1226 Tomier and Palazi composed another *sirventés* much more violent than the one they had written ten years before. Obviously intended to maintain the morale of the Provençaux during the conflict with the French crusaders, this poem has a martial and catchy refrain which must have made it effective propaganda.¹ All restraint has disappeared. The Tarascon poets now contended that whoever betrayed the Holy Land by joining the 'false crusade' was guilty of heresy:

We shall have mighty aid — I have faith in God — with which we shall conquer the French; of an army which does not fear God, God soon takes his vengeance.

Seignors, we are certain and confident of mighty aid!

Many a person prepares himself to come with a false crusade, but he shall have to flee without [having the time to light] his campfires. For by hitting hard, one easily conquers the rabble.

Seignors, we are certain and confident of mighty aid!

They have deprived the Sepulchre of help and strength — those who have taken the cross against us, and that is heresy. The false fools shall ill enjoy the silver² thus acquired.

Seignors, we are certain and confident of mighty aid!³

E dins el gaug mirable heretar e florir,
 E portar la corona e el regne sezir;
 Ez ieu ai auzit dire c'aisis deu avenir:
 Si per homes aucirre ni per sanc expandir,
 Ni per esperitz perdre ni per mortz cosentir,
 E per mals cosselhs creire, e per focs abrandir,
 E per baros destruire, e per Paratge aunir,
 E per las terras toldre, e per orgolh suffrir,
 E per los mals escendre, e pel[s] bes escantir,
 E per donas aucirre e per efans delir,
 Pot hom en aquest segle Jhesu Crist comquerir,
 El deu portar corona e el cel respandir!

¹ V. de Bartholomaeis gives convincing evidence that this *sirventés* of Tomier and Palazi, 'De chan-tar farai,' was composed while Louis VIII of France was marching on Avignon. He has noted the propa-gandistic aspects of the poem, observing that it must have been composed to be sung on public squares. See *Poesie Provenzali Storiche*, II, 54, 55, note.

² The interpretation of V. de Bartholomaeis has been accepted here. The word *Argenza* is used as a pun, meaning both silver and the district around Beaucaire. *Ibid.*, II, 56, note 46.

³ Tomier and Palazi, 'De chantar farai,' *ibid.*, II, 55, 56. See stanzas II, III, and VI:

II

Ric socors aurem,
 E Deu n'ai fianza,
 Dont gazagnarem
 Sobre cels de Franza;
 D'ost que Deu no tem
 Pren Deus tost venjanza.
 Segur estem, seignors,
 E ferm de ric socors!

III

Tals cuja venir
 Ab falsa croisada

It is obvious that Tomier and Palazi have here exceeded the bounds of orthodoxy: to accuse the Church of heresy is to confess oneself a heretic. The tailor Figueira revealed his heresy in a similar fashion. Writing in 1228, when the war was drawing to its bloody end,¹ he denied the validity of indulgences offered for the conquest of his native land to the detriment of the Holy Sepulchre.

Rome, truly I know without doubt that with the trickery of false pardons you delivered to torment the barons of France. And you killed the good King Louis² with your false preaching — you drew him out of Paris.

Rome, you do little harm to the Saracens, but you massacre Greeks and Latins. In hell fire and ruin you have your seat, Rome. God give me no share in the indulgence nor in the pilgrimage of Avignon.³

Rome, it is most true that you offer too eagerly the false pardons against Toulouse. You bite hands like a mad-dog, Rome, sower of discord. But if the brave count⁴ lives two years more, France will feel the pain of your trickery.⁵

Qel n'er a fozir
Sens fog d'albergada,
Car ab ben ferir
Venz hom leu maisnada.
Segur estem, seignors,
E ferm de ric socors!

VI

Al Sepolcre an tout
Socors e valenza
Cil q'an la croz vout,
Et es descredenza;
Li fals nesci sout
Veiran mal Argenza!
Segur estem, seignors,
E ferm de ric socors!

¹ V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, II, 99, note.

² Louis VIII died October 1226 of dysentery, probably contracted at the siege of Avignon. See A. Luchaire, *Histoire de France*, ed. E. Lavissee (Paris, 1911), III, part 1, 293.

³ Louis VIII laid siege to Avignon in June 1226 and captured it after three months. See A. Luchaire, *op. cit.*, III, 291, 292.

⁴ A reference to Raymond VII of Toulouse, F. Diez, *Leben und Werke der Troubadours*, p. 456, note 4.

⁵ Guillem Figueira, 'D'un sirventes far,' ed. V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, II, 99, 100. See stanzas VI, VII, X:

VI

Roma, veramen sai eu, senes doptanssa,
C'ab galiamen de falsa perdonanssa
Liurez a turmen lo barnatge de Franssa
Lonh de Paradis:
El bon rei Lois,
Roma, avetz aucis,
C'ab falsa predicanssa—
L'traissetz de Paris.

VII

Roma, als Sarrazis faitz vos pauc de damptnatge,
Mas Grecs e Latis metetz e carnalatge;
Enz el foc d'abis, Roma, faitz vostre estatge,

Another poem written in the same desperate year of 1228 reflects not heresy, but the deep contempt and hatred the crusade had inspired. Folquet de Romans, viewing the ruin about him, concluded that the clergy, whose duty it was to maintain virtue, were the worst of a bad world. He declared: "They prefer war to peace, malice and sin please them so much. I would have enjoyed going on the first crusade, but nearly all I see of this one (the Albigensian) repels me."¹

Not only the Provençaux, whose rage is quite understandable, criticized the spectacle of a holy war in Europe while the Moslem was left in peace. Poets writing in Old French did not hesitate to condemn the Albigensian crusade as most unchristian and repellent to God. Nor is there any reason to doubt the sincerity of their testimony: the French gained, not lost, by the Albigensian crusade.

One of the first protests in Old French against the holy war in Languedoc may be found in a vigorous lyric ascribed to Moniot. The poet referred to the defeats of Amauri de Montfort, son of the hated Simon, citing his failure in 1219 as clear evidence that the crusade was against God's will.² Guillaume le Clerc had similar doubts of God's approval. He wondered what God would say to the French knights who went on the crusade, many of whom were as sinful as those against whom they waged war.³ In another passage of *Le Besant de Dieu* Guillaume le Clerc reproved the papacy with a restraint that is more telling than the violence of the troubadour Guillem Figueira:

En perdicion;
Ja Dieus part nom don,
Roma, del perdon
Ni del pelegrinatge
Que fetz d'Avinhon!

X

Roma, vers es plans	que trop foz angoissosa
Dels perdons trafans	que fetz sobre Tolosa:
Trop rosetz las mans	a lei de rabiosa,
Roma descordans!	
Mas, sil Coms prezans	
Viu ancar dos ans,	
Fransa n'er dolorosa	
Dels vostres engans.	

¹ Folquet de Romans, 'Quan cug chantar,' ed. R. Zenker, *Die Gedichte des Folquet von Romans* (*Romanische Bibliothek*, XII: Halle, 1896), p. 59. Dated 1128. *Ibid.*, pp. 22-24. See stanza II:

Tornatz es en pauc de valor
Lo segle, qui'l ver en vol dir,
E'l clergue son ja li peior
Que degran los bes mantenir,
Et an aital uzatge
Que mais amon guerra que patz,
Tan lur plai malez' e peccatz,
Per qu'al premier passatge
M'en volria esser passatz,
Que'l mais de quan vei mi desplatx.

² Moniot (?), 'Bien mostre Dieus apertement,' ed. A. Jeanroy, A. Langfors, *Chansons satiriques et bacchiques du XIIIe siècle* (*Les classiques français du moyen âge*, XXXIII: Paris, 1921), p. 10.

³ Guillaume le Clerc, *Le besant de Dieu*, ed. E. Martin, verses 2485-2490, pp. 71, 72.

Rome should not, I think if one of her sons has fallen into error and wishes to rectify it, send upon him an elder brother to destroy him. Rather should she summon, talk gently, and admonish him than lay waste his country. When the French go against the people of Toulouse, whom they consider heretics, and when the papal legate leads and guides them, that is not at all right in my opinion.¹

One should note that together with Guillaume le Clerc's disapproval of the use of force against heretics there appears the same strong dislike of a papal legate's command of an army which he expressed while commenting upon the loss of Damietta.² It is quite true that the papacy's direct control of the army was much in evidence during the Albigensian crusade before the King of France assumed active leadership.³

Similar disgust with papal crusade policy was voiced by Huon de Saint-Quentin, who felt that early crusading ideals were betrayed by the crusade against the heretic in Europe. Like the troubadours, he protested that the Albigensian crusade was ruinous to the cause of the Holy Land: 'The river, the Sepulchre, the cross, all cry with one voice that Rome plays with false dice. It appeared well in Albi . . .'⁴

That these criticisms in Old French may be representative of a much larger body of opinion is shown by the evidence of Roger de Wendover, a monk of St Albans who wrote shortly after the conquest of Avignon.⁵ Roger related that when King Louis VIII took the cross for a renewal of the Albigensian crusade in 1226 and the Roman legate began to preach, very many entered upon the crusade more because of fear of the king or the desire to curry favor with the legate

¹ *Ibid.*, see verses 2387-2399, p. 69.

Rome ne deit pas, ceo m'est vis,
 Se un de ses fiz ad mespris
 E voille faire adreusement,
 Enveier sus lui erraument
 Son greinor fiz por lui confondre.
 Mult le deust anceis somondre.
 E blandir e amonester
 Que faire son regne gaster.
 Quant Franceis vont sor Tolosans,
 Qu'il tienent a popelicans,
 E la legacie Romaine
 Les i conduit e les i maine,
 N'est mie bien, ceo m'est avis.

² *Ibid.*, verses 2547-2564, p. 73.

³ H. Pissard, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-49, 63-68.

⁴ Huon de Saint-Quentin, 'Rome, Jherusalem se plaint,' ed. K. Bartsch, A. Horning, *La langue et la littérature françaises*, col. 375. Written after 1221. See G. Paris, 'L'auteur de la Complainte de Jérusalem,' *Romania*, XIX (1890), 294-296.

li fluns, li sepulcres, li crois
 crient trestot a une vois
 que Rome joue de faus des;
 il parut bien en Aubegois,
 et la demostra que nos lois
 valt pis qu'ele ne sieut ases.

⁵ Roger de Wendover began writing c. 1231. See H. G. Hewlett, Preface to *Flores historiarum* (*Rolls Series*, LXXXIV: London, 1886), I, vii.

than for their 'zeal for justice.' Many considered it a sin to attack a true Christian and had been very unfavorably impressed by the harshness of the papal legate at the Council of Bruges, where the offers of the Count of Toulouse to submit himself and his territory to an investigation of faith had been summarily refused.¹ After Avignon had been taken through a most unedifying ruse which involved the breach of solemn oaths, Roger de Wendover concluded that from the death, sorrow, and bitterness resulting from this crusade, it was obviously an unjust war, inspired by greed rather than zeal to exterminate heresy.² This opinion, of course, may have been the result of seeing the French king use the crusade as a means of political aggrandizement. Possibly it indicates English dislike of the French monarchy as well as criticism of the Church for permitting such exploitation of the holy war.

There were some, however, who rose to defend the Church's crusade against the heretic and their defense completely substantiates the critics' contention that the Albigensian crusade had injured the crusade in the Holy Land. For example, Gormonda de Montpellier, who answered Guillem Figueira's violent attack on the Church with a *sirventés* no less violent, did not deny the charge that the Church had neglected the crusade against the Saracen for the sake of crushing heresy. On the contrary, she justified the policy by insisting that the wretched heretics were worse than Saracens and with falsed hearts.³ In reply to the charge of 'false indulgences,' she declared that whoever wished to be saved should take the cross to defeat the 'false heretics,'⁴ concluding with the pious wish that Guillem Figueira should be tortured and put to death for having dared criticize the Church.⁵

During the last rebellion of the Albigensians in 1244, Lanfranc Cigala, a Genoese judge⁶ writing in Provençal, took the same position as Gormonda in regard to the relative evil of heretic and Saracen. Although critical of papal crusade policy for other reasons,⁷ he felt that the holy war against heretics was necessary. Addressing the Count of Provence, he wrote:

Count of Provence, the Sepulchre would soon be freed if your means corresponded to the esteem you inspire . . . But I do not have the heart to urge you to cross (the sea), because there is need for your valor to defend the Church from its attackers. On the other side of the sea there are not Turks who are worse.⁸

The statements of Gormonda de Montpellier and Lanfranc Cigala were not aberrations of bigoted zealots. They may be fully justified by papal bulls and

¹ *Ibid.* (London, 1887), II, 305, 306.

² *Ibid.*, 314, 315.

³ Gormonda de Montpellier, 'Greu m'es a durar,' ed. V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, II, 108.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

⁶ F. Diez, *op. cit.*, pp. 458, 459.

⁷ See *infra*, p. 402.

⁸ Lanfranc Cigala, 'Si mos chans fos de joi,' ed. G. Bertoni, *I trovatori d'Italia* (Modena, 1915), p. 352. K. Lewent dates this poem 1244 in *Das altprovenzalische Kreuzlied*, p. 36. See stanza VI:

Coms Proensals, tost fora deliuratz
 Lo Sepulchres si vostra manentia
 Poges tan aut com lo pretz qui vos guia, . . .
 Mas del passar non ai cor que'us destregna,
 C'obs es qe sai vostra valors pro tegna
 A la gleiza d'aitals guerreiadors.
 Ja de lai mar non queiratz Turcs peiors!

theological reasoning. During the thirteenth century the popes had to contend with heretics throughout Europe and they found the crusade a most potent weapon in enforcing religious unity. The Albigensian crusade had set them an example they found expedient to follow.¹ During these wars the questions inevitably arose as to which should have precedence, the crusade against the Saracen in the Holy Land or the heretic in Europe. Innocent III was forced to make his decision during the course of the Albigensian crusade, and it served as a precedent for his successors.

Deeply concerned for the welfare of the Holy Land, Innocent III hesitated at first, it would seem, to offer spiritual rewards equivalent to those granted for the crusade against the Moslem. Perhaps one can measure his increasing fear of heresy by the increasingly generous indulgences offered for the Albigensian crusade, indulgences which in 1208 were finally greater than those offered for the crusade in the Holy Land.² It was precisely in 1208 that Innocent III declared that the heretics were worse than Saracens,³ the opinion echoed by Gormonda de Montpellier and Lanfranc Cigala. The actions of later popes were consistent with this view. Honorius III helped finance the Albigensian crusade from funds collected for the Holy Land.⁴ In a bull of 1254 Innocent IV declared that if necessary he would detain crusaders leaving for the Holy Land and send them against the heretics in Europe, since it was much better to defend the faith at home than in the distant East.⁵

The theological basis for this position was stated later⁶ by Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa Theologica*. Unbelievers who had once accepted the faith, such as heretics and apostates, could be forced even by bodily compulsion into submission to the true Church. On the contrary, compulsion should not be used against the infidels who had never had the true faith; wars were waged against them only to keep them from hindering the Christian faith.⁷ Death was a just penalty for the heretic, who endangered the salvation of others.⁸ From such conclusions it is not difficult to see that when heresy was more threatening at home than the

¹ For example, Gregory IX preached a crusade against the Lucifernians and Stedingers in Northern Europe; he launched another against the Catharists in Bosnia. Innocent IV repeatedly preached the crusade against the Waldensians in Italy. See N. Paulus, *Geschichte des Ablasses im Mittelalter*, II, 27, 28.

² In 1198 for aid against the heretics Innocent III offered an indulgence equivalent to that offered for a pilgrimage to Rome or Compostella. In 1204 and 1207 he offered indulgences equivalent to those for the crusade in Palestine. In 1208 and 1209 he offered indulgence to any one who would fight at least forty days, the usual feudal military service. See N. Paulus, *op. cit.*, I, 208. In addition to these spiritual rewards there was also tempting material recompense: the property of heretics was confiscated and distributed among the faithful crusaders. See H. Pissard, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

³ Innocent III, Letter to Philip of France, Ep. 28, anno XI (1208), ed. Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, cccv, col. 1359.

⁴ A. Molinier, 'Catalogue des actes de Simon et d'Amauri de Montfort,' *Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartes*, xxxiv (1873), 183. ⁵ N. Paulus, *op. cit.*, II, 27, 28.

⁶ Thomas Aquinas' *Summa theologica* was begun between 1267 and 1273. See M. de Wulf, *History of Mediaeval Philosophy* (London, 1926), II, 7.

⁷ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* (Rome, 1928), III, 100, 101. 'Utrum infideles compellendi sint ad fidem,' II, II, Quest. X, Art. viii.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 111, 112. 'Utrum haeretici sint tolerandi,' II, II, Quest. XI, Art. iii.

mere hindrance of Christianity overseas, a crusade against the heretic was of more vital importance to the Church than the crusade against the Moslem. Nothing was more imperative than religious unity. From the very inception of the Albigensian crusade, the declared purpose of the war against heresy had been the preservation of the faithful from error spread by the heretic.¹

After the Albigensian heresy was crushed, denunciation of papal crusade policy grew rather than diminished. The papacy of the thirteenth century was intent upon making theocracy a political reality and used with increasing frequency the crusade against rebellious rulers and cities. The holy war flourished in Europe, not in the Orient. This policy of offering indulgences for war against recalcitrant princes was not at all new. Indeed, the origins of the crusade were closely connected with eleventh-century theocratic theory.² But it remained for Innocent III to give new impetus to the Church's determination to dominate in the political as well as the religious sphere. It was he who offered full crusade indulgence to recover the vassal state of Sicily from Markwald in 1199.³ It was he who declared that Christians rebelling against the Church were 'worse than Saracens' because they stood in the way of the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre.⁴ By preaching a crusade against a defiant ruler, he could call into being an army anywhere in Europe to uphold the political suzerainty of the Church.⁵ Throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the popes followed Innocent's example and proclaimed crusades against their enemies,⁶ either charging their opponents with heresy or declaring that they obstructed the recovery of the Holy Land. The former accusation could be made all the more easily in that anyone who failed to submit to the Church after a year of excommunication was suspected of heresy.⁷

Such crusades were a dreaded weapon in the hands of a politically ambitious papacy and those antagonistic to papal aims were always ready to present the holy war in Europe as a perversion of the crusading motive. Thus their criticism gives an excellent insight into the bitterness of the Guelf-Ghibelline struggle and the decaying prestige of a papacy too inclined to use spiritual weapons for apparently secular aims. This sort of censure began when the pope preached a

¹ H. Pissard, *op. cit.*, p. 31 ff.

² C. Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens*, chaps. iv, v, p. 107 ff.

³ H. Pissard, *op. cit.*, pp. 122-125.

⁴ After John of England had taken the cross, Innocent III made this declaration in his excommunication of rebellious barons: 'Peiores proculdubio Saracenis existentes, cum illum conantur a regno depellere, de quo potius sperabatur, quod deberet succurrere terrae sanctae.' See Roger de Wendover, *Flores historiarum* (Rolls Series, LXXXIV) II, 152. Sub anno 1215. For a repetition of this statement, see *ibid.*, II, 168. Sub anno 1216.

⁵ H. Pissard, *op. cit.*, p. 141 ff.

⁶ The most important of these crusades were against Frederick II and his sons, but there were many others. The popes sometimes directed a crusade against a rebellious city, sometimes against a leader of the opposition. For example, Honorius III preached a holy war against Pisa; Gregory IX preached one against Ezzelino of Romano and another against Viterbo; a crusade was preached against Simon de Montfort as a rebel against the Church's vassal Henry III of England; similarly Martin IV preached a crusade against Peter of Aragon in 1282 after the Sicilian Vespers; Boniface VIII waged a holy war against the Colonna family; John XXI against the Visconti of Milan. N. Paulus, *op. cit.*, II, 29, 30. See also H. Pissard, *op. cit.*, pp. 121-142.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 108-110.

crusade against the excommunicated Frederick II, while that formidable enemy of theocracy was recovering the Holy Sepulchre and establishing claims of overlordship in the East.¹

The crusade against Frederick was preached as the Albigensian holy war was ending. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the Provençal Guillem Figueira railing at the pope for his war on the emperor in his excoriating *sirventés* against Rome. Just as Figueira had denied the validity of indulgences granted for the crusade against the cities of Languedoc,² he similarly labelled the indulgences for the crusade against the emperor as unreasonable and invalid.³ He questioned the pope's authority for permitting violence against Christians in passages that lack nothing in the way of incisive sharpness:

Rome, you have killed many people without reason, and I am not pleased that you hold to a wicked way. You close the door to salvation.

. . . Rome, the evil that is said of you strikes home; for you through mockery have Christians martyred. But in what book, Rome, do you find that one should kill Christians?⁴

After the crusaders had conquered his native land, Figueira fled to Italy where he became a protégé of Frederick II⁵ and loudly proclaimed the necessity of peace between the two heads of Christendom as essential for the success of the crusade in the Holy Land.⁶ It is quite probable that his *sirventés* against Rome already reflected Frederick's propaganda. The emperor's widely-circulated manifesto to Christian princes written after his excommunication has many points in common with Figueira's 'D'un sirventes far.'⁷ And there is yet additional evidence that Figueira was repeating current criticism made by enemies of the Church. A pilgrim gave to Roger de Wendover a letter addressed to Frederick by one of his followers in Sicily and the chronicler quotes this epistle in full. In this suspiciously accessible letter⁸ Frederick is informed that his friends were most astonished to see the pope sending an army against his possessions and even the clergy wondered how the pope's conscience permitted him to make war on Christians.⁹

¹ L. Bréhier, *op. cit.*, p. 197 ff.

² Guillem Figueira, 'D'un sirventes far,' ed. V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, II, 99, 100. Stanzas VI, VII.

³ *Ibid.*, II, 102, 103. See stanza XIX.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 100. See stanzas VIII, IX:

Roma, ses razon avetz mainta gen morta,
E jes nom sab bon car tenetz via torta,
Qu'a salvacion, Roma, serratz la porta . . .

Roma, beis decern lo mals c'om vos deu dire,
Quar faitz per esquern dels Crestians martire;
Mas en cal quadern trobatz c'om deja aucire,
Roma, 'ls Crestians?

⁵ A. Jeanroy, *La poésie lyrique des troubadours*, I, 378, 379.

⁶ Guillem Figueira, 'Del preveire major,' ed. E. Levy, *Guillem Figueira* (Berlin, 1880), p. 31. Dated between 1244 and 1249. *Ibid.*, p. 6. ⁷ V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, I, liii, liv.

⁸ It seems quite obvious that this letter, addressed to Frederick in the East but circulating freely in England, was intended to stir up opinion against the pope.

⁹ Roger de Wendover, *Flores historiarum*, II, 358-360. Sub anno 1229.

Although Frederick made his peace with the pope in 1230, it was only to consolidate his power more firmly in Italy.¹ Considering circumstances propitious in 1236, the emperor began an attack on Lombardy in spite of the pope's exhortation to go on a crusade overseas. With truly diabolical cleverness Frederick pointed to many heretics in northern Italy, especially Milan, and using the pope's own reasoning, declared it would be most ill-advised for him to go to the Holy Land and leave unpunished the false Christians worse than any Saracen.² It was not long, however, before Frederick found himself suspected of heresy, and the inevitable crusade against him soon followed.³

The second phase of the struggle between the pope and Frederick II began just as a crusade was about to depart for the Orient. As one of the greatest powers in the West, the emperor seemed to some the proper leader, but now that he was a declared enemy of the Church the pope was determined that the emperor should not repeat his astonishing crusading exploits of 1228 to the detriment of papal prestige. Consequently, the French crusaders already gathered together at Lyons were threatened with excommunication if they dared accept the leadership of Frederick II.⁴ This caused deep resentment among the French, who in their fury at the pope's prohibition to leave Lyons for their crusade, almost attacked the papal legates.⁵ Much of the army having dispersed, Thibaut IV, Count of Champagne, finally led the remnant of crusaders on this futile expedition.⁶ Thibaut was a poet as well as a warrior and has expressed the general suspicions of his compatriots in a crusade song. Times were, he declared indeed bad, when one beheld excommunicated those who had right on their side.⁷ Thibaut was no exception. Many French noblemen were sympathetic with Frederick's cause.⁸

Not all contemporary poets agreed with Thibaut. Just as the Church had a Provençal defender who justified its crusade against the heretic, it now found a troubadour who considered the crusade against Frederick II praiseworthy. Uc de Saint Circ, who spent part of his life wandering in Lombardy,⁹ where Frederick was none too popular, described the emperor as a monster of heresy, believing in neither immortality nor paradise.¹⁰ Frederick, he charged, planned to humiliate France and the Church. "That is why (he pointed out) the Church and the king should send us an army of crusaders to enable us to go into Apulia

¹ L. Halphen, *L'essor de l'Europe*, 348 ff.

² Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, III, 375. Sub anno 1236.

³ F. Graefe, *Die Publizistik in der letzten Epoche Kaiser Friedrichs II (Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte)*, xxiv: Heidelberg, 1909), pp. 38-40.

⁴ R. Röhrich, 'Die Kreuzzüge des Grafen Theobald von Navarra und Richard von Cornwallis nach dem Heiligen Land,' *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, xxvi (1886), 70.

⁵ Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, III, 614, 615. Sub anno 1239.

⁶ d'Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne* (Paris, 1864), IV, I, 306-312.

⁷ Thibaut IV de Champagne, 'Au tans plains de felonie,' ed. J. Bédier, *op. cit.*, pp. 181, 182.

⁸ F. Graefe, *op. cit.*, pp. 229-236.

⁹ A. Jeanroy, *op. cit.*, II, 162, note 5.

¹⁰ Uc de Saint Circ, 'Un sirventes voill far,' ed. A. Jeanroy, J. J. Salverda de Grave, *Poésies d'Uc de Saint Circ (Bibliothèque méridionale, series 1, xv: Toulouse, 1913)*, no. xxiii, p. 96. Written between 1240-1244. *Ibid.*, p. 159.

and conquer Frederick II; for whoever does not believe in God should not reign.¹

When Frederick found himself again the object of a crusade, his sympathies for suffering Christians seems to have been marvelously quickened. Although he continued to deplore heresy in northern Italy and called the pope the protector of heretics,² he now found it expedient to proclaim a war against the infidel. In 1241 he addressed a letter to Christian princes in which he instructed the pope upon his high duty to Christendom. He complained that Innocent IV preached a crusade against him, 'an arm and advocate of the Church,' rather than against the invading Tartars or the Saracens in the Holy Land.³

Throughout the remaining desperate battle between papacy and empire, the Ghibelline adherents of the Hohenstaufen piped the same tune: the crusade against a Christian ruler was a betrayal of the Holy Sepulchre. They, like the earlier troubadours, enjoyed reading the pope a lesson on his obligations to the Christians in Palestine, and, as in the case of the earlier troubadours, their zeal for the Holy Sepulchre must not always be taken seriously.⁴ Upon one occasion, at least, the partisans of the Emperor sought to use the pope's own weapon of a holy war in Europe. The deacon and chapter of Passau preached quite successfully a so-called crusade against the papal legate in 1240. Many took the cross, certain of their salvation in fighting the pope.⁵ This irony of ironies, a crusade against the pope's representative, speaks eloquently of the degeneration of crusading motives by the middle of the thirteenth century. During the tremendous struggle between pope and emperor the crusade became a convenient military resource, a means of seeking fresh recruits. It is doubtless for this reason that in the Ghibelline town of Ratisbon any one found wearing the cross was immediately condemned to death.⁶

One of the greatest Provençal satirists of the thirteenth century, Peire Cardenal, expressed his eloquent scorn at the sight of the holy war becoming a mere pawn in the complex battle for political domination. The clergy, he maintained, pretended to be shepherds while they were really butchers. They were wolves in sheep's clothing devouring the simple.⁷ To Cardenal the papal monarchy and the coercive measures used to build it up were anathema:

Kings, emperors, dukes, counts, nobles, and knights with them used to rule the world;
now I see authority possessed by the clergy by means of robbery, treachery, hypocrisy,

¹ Uc de Saint Circ, 'Un sirventes voill far,' *loc. cit.*, pp. 97, 98. Stanza v.
Don la gleyza e'l reys hi devon pervezer
Que'ns mandon la cruzada e'ns venhan mantener;
Et anem lai en Polla lo regne conquerer,
Quar selh qu'en Dieu non cre non deu terra tener.

² F. Graefe, *op. cit.*, pp. 20, 21, note 20.

³ Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, IV, 116, 117, 119.

⁴ One should note that during both of Frederick II's struggles with the papacy there were troubadours who took his part, urged an attack upon Milan, etc., without mentioning the Holy Land. For an account of Frederick's partisans see A. Jeanroy, *op. cit.*, II, 233, 234.

⁵ N. Paulus, *Geschichte des Ablasses im Mittelalter*, II, 27, note 1.

⁶ Raynaldus, *Annales ecclesiastici*, sub anno 1248, no. 11.

⁷ Peire Cardenal, 'Li clerc si fan pastor,' ed. C. L. E. Appel, *Provenzalische Chrestomathie* (Leipzig, 1930), no. 76, p. 113. Stanza 1.

force, and preaching; and they are indignant at any one who does not give his all to them; and they will get all, however long it is delayed.¹

Nor did Cardenal disguise his contempt for the laity who let themselves be so duped. Upon hearing a command from the clergy, he sneered, the laity 'will draw their swords towards heaven and get into the saddle.'² If only the clergy order it, the credulous fools will go to pillage their neighbor's territory.³ His intense hatred of the clergy for this abuse of their influence hardly knows bounds. In his poem *Atressi cum per fargar* he does not mince words in damning the Church for stirring up war among Christians:

The clergy send knights to carnage. When they have given them bread and cheese, they place them where one covers them with wounds. They [the clergy] protect their own swinish flesh from every blade, but they do not complain if the brains of others are scattered abroad.

They are so full of evil cunning that with the gloveless hands of others they take the rebellious cat in order that they themselves may suffer no harm. But when they are at their porringers, they are all the equal of Roland.⁴

In Peire Cardenal's none-too-modest opinion, it was precisely this worldly

¹ *Idem.* Stanza II.

Rey et emperador,
duc, comte e comtor
e cavallier ab lor
solon lo mon regir;
ara vey possezir
a clerx la senhoria,
ab tolre et ab trazir
et ab ypocrizia,
ab forsa et ab prezic;
et tenon s'a fastic
qui tot non lor o gic,
et er fag, quan que tric.

² Peire Cardenal, 'Un sirventes trametraï per message,' ed. C. Fabre, 'Estève de Belmont,' *Annales du Midi*, XXI (1909), 22, 23. This poem is dated 1237-1238. *Ibid.*, p. 25.

³ Fabre shows that there is historical basis for the charge that the Church favored the invasions of the places mentioned by Cardenal. *Ibid.*, p. 23, note 2.

⁴ Peire Cardenal, 'Atressi cum per fargar,' ed. C. Fabre, *loc. cit.*, pp. 23, 24.

Clergue gieton cavaliers a carnatge,
Que, quan lur an donat pan e fromatge,
Los meton lay ont hom los encairella.

Mas, la lor porcella
Guardan ben de lamella
E l'autruy cervella
Non planhon si s'espan.

Tan sabon de truella
C'ab l'autruy man, ses gan,
Penran
Lo chat que revella,
Sol qu'els no-y aion dan;
Que quan
Son a l'escudella,
Cascuns val un Rotlan.

ambition of the Church that hindered any new crusade against the Saracen. Mohammedan leaders, he observed sarcastically, had no need to fear that abbot or prior would come to attack them or seize their lands. The clergy much preferred remaining in Europe to devise means of getting possession of the world and ruining Frederick II.¹

Peire Cardenal's accusation that the Church was sacrificing the Holy Land for the crusade against Frederick II is well substantiated by the pope himself. As in the case of the crusade against the Albigensian heretics, the question arose as to the relative importance of the holy war in the East and the holy war in Europe. Again the papacy followed the policy of promoting the crusade in Europe at the sacrifice of the crusade in Palestine. Louis IX of France tried in vain to reconcile Innocent IV with Frederick II, who had, it appeared, offered to spend the rest of his life fighting in the Holy Land.² In 1241 Innocent IV empowered his legate in Hungary to free crusaders from their oath to go to the Holy Land if they would join the crusade against Frederick II.³ In 1247 the pope stated his crusade policy with great clarity. Writing to the papal legate in the Empire, he declared that in the circumstances it was more useful and pleasing to God to fight Frederick II, the rebellious emperor, than to undertake a crusade against the Moslem. The defeat of Frederick would profit the Holy Land while his triumph would not help it.⁴

The Genoese Lanfranc Cigala clearly perceived how greatly the cause of the Holy Land was injured by such a policy. The loss of Jerusalem in 1244 had dramatically revealed the weakness of the Christian States in the Orient.⁵ Cigala placed the blame for this disaster directly upon the battle between papacy and emperor. The war between these two great powers, he maintained, had made impossible the first requisite for a successful crusade, peace among Christian states. Nor did they show, he added, any indication of wanting peace. 'I will not say,' he commented, 'which is at fault. May God inspire the guilty one with better intentions or have him suddenly die.'⁶ His ending, however, completely belied this fine impartiality. 'Pope,' he declared, 'I believe you make war or peace as

¹ Peire Cardenal, 'Li clerc si fan pastor,' ed C. L. E. Appel, *loc. cit.*, p. 113. F. Fabre dates this poem 1245 on the grounds that at the first council of Lyons in 1245 the clergy concerned themselves more with the war on Frederick than with the crusade of Louis IX of France. F. Fabre, *op. cit.*, p. 25, note 1. There is, however, no mention of Louis IX or his crusade in the poem. K. Vossler prefers the date of 1230, giving very weak reasons for doing so. See K. Vossler, 'Peire Cardenal, ein Satiriker aus dem Zeitalter der Albigenserkriege,' *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophische-Philologische und Historische Klasse* (1916), pp. 179, 180. There is no evidence for dating *Li clerc si fan pastor* other than the reference to the Church's attack on Frederick II, which may indicate either the earlier struggle of 1227-30 or the later struggle of 1239-50. Yet from conclusive evidence recently presented by F. Fabre that Peire Cardenal was still writing in 1271-72, it seems more probable that the troubadour referred to the later quarrel between the pope and Frederick. For F. Fabre's proof of Cardenal's literary activity in 1271-72, see 'Un sirventès de Cardinal, encore inédit en partie (1271-72),' in *Miscellany of Studies in Romance Languages and Literature Presented to L. E. Kastner* (Cambridge, 1932), p. 225 ff.

² Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, IV, 524.

³ N. Paulus, *Geschichte des Ablasses im Mittelalter*, II, 28.

⁴ *Idem.* ⁵ L. Bréhier, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

⁶ Lanfranc Cigala, 'Si mos chanz fos de ioi ni de solatz,' ed. G. Bertoni, *I trovatori d'Italia*, pp. 350, 351. See stanza II:

it profits you; for if you continue your usual course, the Holy Sepulchre will not be saved by you.¹

The suspicions thus frankly expressed by Lanfranc Cigala were greatly intensified after the failure of Louis ix's first crusade in 1250. Some rejoiced over the failure, interpreting it, doubtless, as a check to papal prestige.² Some despaired to the point of doubting Christianity.³ Others expressed their distrust of the Church while voicing their sorrow over the calamity. A troubadour, Austorc d'Aurillac, wailed the loss of Louis ix's magnificent army and in a frenzy of exasperation exclaimed: 'Curse Alexandria, curse all the clergy, curse the Turks . . .' He then expressed the wish that Frederick might go on a crusade and make an alliance with the French against the perfidious clergy. He ended his diatribe by observing that St Peter held to the right way, but that the pope now wandered from it when he and his clergy did evil to many for the sake of money.⁴

One finds ample confirmation that those using the vernacular were reflecting popular discontent. Matthew Paris reported that the French were most indignant over the failure of Louis ix's crusade. They ascribed his defeat to the pope because he had refused to make peace with Frederick II and thus dispersed the strength of Christendom. They considered it the pope's fault that the Orient was inundated with Christian blood; his was the blame that so much blood had been uselessly spilt in Germany and Italy.⁵ Frederick II himself, it goes without saying, did not let the opportunity pass of condemning the pope for the disaster, pointing out how Innocent IV had supported the crusade against him to the detriment of the holy war overseas.⁶ A careful scrutiny of the pope's crusade policy makes this charge difficult to refute,⁷ although no one should take seriously Frederick's tone of pious horror.

Eu non dic ges en cui colpa devegna;
 Mas qi mer mal d'aqetz dos granz segnors,
 Dieus lo meillor o l'aucia de cors!

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 352. See stanza VII:

Apostoli, eu crei qe si conveigna
 Que fassatz patz o guerra qui pro teigna,
 Car si totz temps anatz per l'uzat cors,
 Per vos non er lo sainz Sepulcres sors.

² F. Wilken, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Leipzig, 1832), VII, 299, 300.

³ Salimbene reported an intense revulsion of feeling after the failure of Louis ix's crusade. When Dominicans and Franciscans (always great crusade preachers) went begging, the people called other beggars and offered their alms in the name of Mohammed, who had proved himself stronger than Christ. Salimbene, *Chronica*, MGSS, XXXII, 225. Cf. H. Prutz, *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1883), p. 273.

⁴ Austorc d'Aurillac, 'Ai Dieus! per qu'as facha tan gran maleza,' ed. A. Jeanroy, 'Le troubadour Austorc d'Aurillac et son sirventès sur la septième croisade,' *Mélanges Chabaneau: Romanische Forschungen*, XXIII (1907), 83. See stanzas II, IV, VI.

⁵ Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, v, 172, 173.

⁶ J. L. A. Huilliard-Bréholles, *Historia diplomatica Friderici Secundi* (Paris, 1858), VI, 774.

⁷ E. Berger has carefully examined the question as to how much the political crusade against Frederick II injured the interests of Louis ix's crusade against the Moslem. His study, based upon the papal registers of Innocent IV, shows clearly that the pope sacrificed the welfare of Louis ix's expedition to the success of the crusade against Frederick. See *Les registres d'Innocent IV*, ed. E. Berger (*Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, series 2: Paris, 1887), II, clvi-clxix.

The crusade against the Hohenstaufen did not cease with the death of Frederick in 1250. The papacy was determined to destroy the formidable dynasty root and branch. The holy war was preached most zealously against Frederick's legitimate son Conrad iv.¹ The crusade against Manfred, Frederick's illegitimate son who had seized power in Sicily, was pursued with equal vigor. Manfred was accused of heresy and of alliance with the Saracens² — the charge formerly brought against Frederick II. This accusation had good foundation in fact. Both Frederick and Manfred had sought the aid of Saracens,³ but whether such an alliance was cause or effect of papal animosity remains a moot question in the history of the complex struggle. Justifiable as the crusades against the Hohenstaufen were on theocratic grounds, their continuation precisely at the time St Louis was courageously endeavoring to bring victory out of defeat in the Holy Land presented a striking contrast in crusade aims that inevitably aroused a storm of protest.

Perhaps the best evidence of the extraordinary discontent in France may be perceived in the uprising known as the Pastoureaux, led by a mysterious 'master of Hungary' who preached against the clergy and the papal curia. The avowed purpose of this mass movement was the rescue of Louis IX in the Holy Land. Hysterical bands of agricultural and town workers, disapproved by the Church, marched through France viciously attacking priests and monks while on their way to kill the Saracen. At first tacitly approved by the queen mother, Blanche of Castile, the Pastoureaux finally became so disorderly that they were dispersed.⁴ There is no doubt, however, that Blanche of Castile shared the resentment of the lower classes for the papacy's apparent neglect of her son. Of exemplary piety, she nevertheless listened sympathetically when the French nobles denounced the pope's new crusade against Conrad. The pope, they said, was stirring up new and internal wars among Christians in Christian territory while he consigned Louis IX to oblivion in Palestine. Blanche at once ordered the confiscation of the property of all in the royal domain who had taken the cross against Conrad, declaring: 'Let those who fight for the pope be supported from the pope's own means, and let them go, never to return.' The nobles followed the same procedure in their own lands.⁵

In Germany as well as France there were expressions of indignation at the crusade against Conrad. The Bishop of Mainz protested that it was not the duty of priests to kindle war, but to reestablish peace.⁶ Henry of Embrun (Hostiensis), who accompanied the papal legate to Germany in 1251, related in his *Summa Aurea* that he met many who considered a crusade against a Christian ruler most unjust — an opinion Henry refuted by pointing to the close analogy be-

¹ A. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum romanorum* (Berlin, 1875), II, 1170, no. 14170. Letter of Innocent IV dated February 5, 1251. See also *ibid.*, p. 1173, no. 14204. Dated February 19, 1251. Innocent IV declared that the papacy would never permit any descendant of Frederick to have kingdom or empire. *Ibid.*, p. 1177, no. 14258. Dated March 29, 1251. ² H. Pissard, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

³ R. Röhrich, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1878), II, 284, 285, note 42.

⁴ E. Berger, *Histoire de Blanche de Castille, reine de France* (Paris, 1895), pp. 392-401.

⁵ Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, v, 259, 260, 261. Sub anno 1251.

⁶ H. Pissard, *op. cit.*, pp. 132, 133.

tween the conduct of heretics and rebellious Christians, both more sinful than Saracens.¹

The resentment in France and Germany, however, was mild in comparison to the fury of the Italian Ghibellines. Composed in the very arena of the political crusades, the poetry of Italian troubadours reflects the desperate struggle most vividly. One can assume with more certainty that the opinion they expressed was personal, since the Italian troubadours after the death of Frederick II found few princely patrons. Instead of being dependents at a court, the troubadours were self-supporting Italian burghers who cultivated Provençal and used this sharp-edge language in their bitter political feuds.² The pope was not spared; even gutter abuse was not disdained as a weapon against him. For example, Bonifacio de Castellana in a *sirventés* of 1251–1252 accused the clergy of endeavoring to disinherit Conrad in order to make gifts to their bastards.³ Others railed at the Church for its war on Manfred.⁴ Many of these attacks are composed in the same bellicose style used against ordinary secular rulers and contain no reproach for neglect of the Holy Land.⁵ Yet the mistake should not be made of considering such censure entirely a matter of partisan politics. In distant England when the papal legate proclaimed the crusade against Manfred in 1255, the people jeered and laughed at the changeability of preachers who now promised them the same heavenly reward for the shedding of Christian blood they had formerly promised for the destruction of the Saracen.⁶

That the Provençaux had not forgotten their old enmity may be seen from a poem of Bertran d'Alamanon written after Frederick II's death and before 1265.⁷ This Provençal knight charged the pope with keeping the office of emperor vacant in order to receive bribes for his support of claimants. The Empire thus brought him more money than if he owned it outright, the troubadour shrewdly observed. The issue, in Bertran's opinion, could only be decided by letting the claimants fight until one finally attained victory. The conqueror might rest assured that the pope would crown him without difficulty; for the clergy always obeyed a powerful master and then worked for his ruin when they saw his power declining. If this plan did not please the contestants, Bertran added, they could do a hundred times better by going on a crusade against the Saracens.⁸ The pope, he cuttingly added, would give out indulgences generously for the crusade, but little of his money.⁹

¹ N. Paulus, *op. cit.*, II, 30. ² V. de Bartholomæis, *op. cit.*, I, lxi.

³ Bonifacio di Castellana, 'Era, pueis yverns es el fil,' ed. V. de Bartholomæis, *op. cit.*, II, 177. Stanza v.

⁴ For example, see Raimon de Tors, 'Ar es ben dretz,' ed. V. de Bartholomæis, *op. cit.*, II, 212–214, and an anonymous *sirventés*, 'Ma voluntatz me mou guerr' e trebalh,' ed. V. de Bartholomæis, *loc. cit.*, pp. 205–208.

⁵ For a good discussion of these political *sirventés*, see A. Jeanroy, *op. cit.*, II, 234–237, and V. de Bartholomæis, *op. cit.*, I, lxiii–lxv.

⁶ Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, v, 522. Sub anno 1255.

⁷ J. J. Salverda de Grave, *Le troubadour Bertran d'Alamanon* (*Bibliothèque méridionale*, series I, VII: Toulouse, 1902), pp. 57, 58.

⁸ Bertran d'Alamanon, 'D'un sirventes mi ven gran voluntatz,' ed. J. J. Salverda de Grave, *op. cit.*, pp. 54–56. ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

There is evidence to confirm Bertran d'Alamanon's insinuation that the Holy Land did not have the complete financial support of the papacy. The war against the Hohenstaufen as it entered the last phase strained every resource. An army had to be organized and maintained for Charles of Anjou, whom the papacy had invited into Italy to carry on the war against Manfred. After Manfred was defeated in 1266 and Charles had successfully seized Sicily, a second crusade was organized against Corradino, who inherited the claims of his father Conrad IV and came to Italy to recapture former Hohenstaufen possessions.¹ Protesting against the pope's holy war against him, Corradino echoed his grandfather Frederick II: 'See,' he wrote to the princes of the Empire, 'the cross of the Saviour turned against Christians.'²

It was during this last battle between pope and Hohenstaufen that the most despairing comment was made by an inhabitant of the Holy Land itself. Ricaut Bonomel, a Templar in Palestine, hopeless and bitter because of the constant losses of the Christians and the renewed aggression of the Moslems, declared that the Christian God, who used to watch over the faithful, now slept while Mohammed's power brought victory to the Saracens.³ He held the pope largely responsible for these disasters in the Holy Land.

The pope bestows many indulgences for the war of Lombardy in favor of Charles and the French, while for us here [in the Holy Land] he shows great avarice since he redeems our cross for money. Whoever wishes to change the war in the Holy Land for the war in Lombardy has permission from our legate, because they [the clergy] sell God and indulgences for money.

French Lords, Alexandria has done you more harm than Lombardy; for here [in the Orient] the Turks have robbed us of power, taken us, conquered us, and sold us for money.⁴

This accusation that the pope commuted crusade vows for money and that he permitted the substitution of the crusade vow against the Hohenstaufen for the crusade vow against the Saracen is indisputable. Clement IV in 1265 permitted the conversion of crusade vows for the Holy Land to vows for the holy

¹ L. Halphen, *op. cit.*, p. 478.

² H. Pissard, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

³ Ricaut Bonomel, 'Ir' e dolors s'es e mon cor assezo,' ed. V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, II, 222, 223. Stanza II. Dated 1265. *Idem*, note.

⁴ Ricaut Bonomel, *loc. cit.*, II, 224. See stanza V, VI.

V

Lo Papa fai de perdon gran largueza
 Contrals Lombartz a Carl' e als Frances;
 E sai, ves vos, en mostra gran cobeza,
 Que nostras crotz perdona per tornes;
 E qui vol camjar Romania.
 Per la guerra di Lombardia,
 Nostre Legatz lor en dara poder;
 Qu'il vendon Dieu el perdon per aver.

VI

Senhors Frances, Alexandria
 Nos a piegz fag que Lombardia,
 Que sai nos an Turc sobratz de poder,
 Pres e vencutz e donatz per aver.

war in Italy,¹ and it is quite possible that Ricaut Bonomel referred specifically to this papal decision.² However, such substitutions had been a part of crusade policy long before 1265. Innocent IV had permitted them during his war with Frederick II³ and had also used money gathered from crusade vow redemptions for the war against the emperor rather than for the crusade in the Holy Land.⁴ In 1255 Henry III of England was allowed to change his original crusade vow to one against Manfred, and then released from this vow upon the payment of a large sum of money, used in the Italian crusade.⁵

Ricaut Bonomel was not the first critic employing the vernacular to protest against crusade vow redemptions. Earlier in the thirteenth century Huon de Saint Quentin had violently objected to the practice and had even gone so far as to deny the validity of indulgences obtained by those who paid to be released from their vows.⁶ However, as long as the cross was granted to women and others unfit for war, crusade vow redemptions were most necessary.⁷ Yet greedy papal collectors sometimes absolved able warriors from their vows in spite of papal admonitions and rebukes.⁸ Throughout the thirteenth century there were many who deplored this abuse, which nevertheless continued unabated⁹ to the detriment of the Holy Land.

While Ricaut Bonomel was complaining in Palestine of crusade vow redemptions, the troubadours in Italy were not silent. They raged against the Church and Charles of Anjou in their usual virulent style.¹⁰ Shortly before the hated Charles defeated and killed Corradino in the crusade of 1268, Calega Panza, a Genoese cloth merchant with commercial interests in the Orient,¹¹ joined in the chorus of denunciation. In a passage similar to the arraignment of Simon de Montfort's epitaph found in the *Chanson de Croisade contre les Albigeois*,¹²

¹ A. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum romanorum* (Berlin, 1875), II, 1544, no. 19050. Dated March 5, 1265. ² See V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, II, 224, note.

³ E. Berger, *Registres d'Innocent IV*, II, clxvii ff. ⁴ *Ibid.*, clxvi.

⁵ R. Röhrich, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, II, 284, note 41.

⁶ Huon de Saint Quentin, *Jerusalem se plaint*, ed. J. Bédier, *Les chansons de croisade*, pp. 148, 149; *Rome, Jherusalem se plaint*, ed. Bartsch-Horning, *La langue et la littérature françaises au moyen âge*, cols. 373, 374, 378.

⁷ Urban II had insisted that all crusaders should be warriors and had only permitted release from the crusade vow upon the substitution of another warrior. Because of pressing need of money for the crusade, Clement III permitted the granting of crusade indulgences to anyone who would pay a sufficient amount or send a substitute. However, it was really Innocent III, it seems, who permitted the cross to be given to any one who would take it in order to reap crusade vow redemptions from those physically or financially unable to go on a crusade. The amount paid depended upon the resources of the crusader, who after payment still benefited from the indulgence. This practice continued throughout the thirteenth century. See A. Gottlob, *Kreuzablass und Almosenablass* (Stuttgart, 1906), pp. 174-179. Cf. N. Paulus, *op. cit.*, II, 32-39.

⁸ See *Registres de Grégoire IX*, ed. L. Auvray (*Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, series 2: Paris, 1896), I, 958, no. 4222; *Registre caméral d'Urban IV*, ed. J. Guiraud (*Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, series 2: Paris, 1901), I, 86, no. 312; *Registres de Clement IV*, ed. E. Jordan (*Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, series 2: Paris, 1863), I, 478, no. 1608. ⁹ N. Paulus, *Geschichte des Ablasses im Mittelalter*, II, 32-41.

¹⁰ There were many Italian troubadours who did not add the betrayal of the Holy Land to their other charges. For an excellent discussion of Charles of Anjou and Provençal poetry in Italy, see V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, I, lxxv-lxxviii. ¹¹ *Ibid.*, I, lxxxviii. ¹² Lines 8683-8696.

Calega Panza vented his wrath upon the Church for betraying his conception of Christian ideals by sending a crusade against Christians.

He who wishes to kill or live by rapine can quickly and easily attain salvation. He has only to murder a hundred Christians; and whoever should strive to kill a thousand would have a higher place in paradise. You have abandoned the [right] way, the precepts God made pure and holy, and Moses who wrote the commandments.¹

Calega Panza likewise pointed out that the crusade in the Holy Land was being sacrificed to the crusade in Italy. He exclaimed: 'Ah unfaithful [clergy]! You have Tuscany and Lombardy massacred and pay no attention to Syria. You make a truce with the Turks and Persians to kill here French and Germans.'²

Nor was it only overseas, Calega Panza insisted, that the Church was conciliatory to the Mohammedans while preaching crusades against Christians. The Greeks and Latins could get no truce from Charles of Anjou, although this warrior of the pope made a truce with the Saracens of Lucera in Italy, where they were permitted to worship Mohammed as much as they pleased: there were no churches and monasteries. He wondered that the pope should endanger the true faith by such tolerance.³

A somewhat more dispassionate critic writing at about the same time may be found in Guillem Fabre, a burgher of Narbonne.⁴ After condemning the quarrels among princes as a hindrance to the crusade, he revealed his Ghibelline sympathies by declaring:

He who is our head, placed to govern our faith, merits even greater blame. In fact, although the greater part of the known world obeys him, he did not command a crusade

¹ Calega Panza, 'Ar es sazos c'om si deu alegrar,' ed. V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, II, 252. See stanza III.

Qui vol aucir o qi viu de raubar
E tost e lieu pot aver salvamen,
Sol veng' aucir de Crestians un cen;
E quis volgues d'aucir mil esforzar
Em Paradis, en l'auzor luec, seria;
Ai, clergue fals! Laissat aves la via
Els mandamenz qe Dieus fes purs e sanz
E Moyzes, cant escrius los Comanz.

² *Ibid.*, 250, 251. See stanza I:

Ai, desleial! Toscan' e Lombardia
Fais pecejar et nous dol de Suria!
Treg' aves lai ab Turcs et ab Persanz
Per aucir sai Frances et Alamans!

³ Calega Panza, *loc. cit.*, 254, 255. Stanza VIII. Jeanroy points out the possibility of a truce between Charles of Anjou and the Saracens of Lucera, but considers the charge that the pope had a part in it an absurd exaggeration. See A. Jeanroy, 'Un sirventés contre Charles d'Anjou,' *Annales du Midi*, xv (1903), 160, 161. Calega Panza also made the accusation that Charles of Anjou treated Christians more cruelly than he himself had been treated by the Saracens when they held him prisoner in 1250. The Italian chronicler Malavolti made the same reproach. A. Jeanroy, *loc. cit.*, p. 155, note 2.

⁴ There is no way of dating exactly Guillem Fabre's poem, 'Pus dels majors princeps.' It is known, however, that he lived during the late thirteenth century. J. Anglade conjectures that he wrote 'Pus dels majors princeps' around 1269. See J. Anglade, *Deux troubadours narbonnais: Guillem Fabre, Bernard Alanhan* (Narbonne, 1905), p. 30. This dating is unconvincing, however, as Guillem Fabre refers to a pope and there was no pope in 1269. It seems more probable that the poem was written during the pontificate of Clement IV (1265-1268) when the Guef-Ghibelline struggle was most intense.

against the perfidious wretches who hold the Holy Land before the present discord occurred and before the world became bad; for [if he had done this] I believe that all the great who maintain hatred would now be there [in the Holy Land] doing good.¹

After the defeat of the last Hohenstaufen there was a lull in the storm of criticism. Indeed, following the death of Clement iv in 1268 the Holy See was vacant for almost three years² and there was no pope to reproach. During this time Louis ix was preparing his second crusade against the Saracens. This ill-fated expedition which attempted the capture of Tunis ended in failure and Louis' death. Again a cry of despair and doubt arose. Austorc de Segret lamented that either God or the Devil was leading Christians astray since the Saracens were so powerful.³ Raimon Gaucelm de Béziers accused the clergy of indifference and complained that while they once exhorted Christians to take the cross, they now permitted them to get rid of it for a sum of money.⁴ Peire Cardenal reviled the clergy for their hypocrisy and urged Philip of France to go to the aid of Prince Edward of England,⁵ who, after the failure of Louis' attack upon Tunis, had proceeded with a few troops to Palestine.⁶ It should be pointed out that these reproaches were not addressed directly to the papacy which was still vacant at the time of the disaster (1270). They were merely among the great number of accusations made against the clergy for neglect of the crusade against the Saracen during the thirteenth century.⁷ Innocent iii had thundered at his clergy for the same fault.⁸

¹ Guillem Fabre, 'Pus dels majors princeps,' ed. J. Anglade, *loc. cit.*, p. 27, lines 45-54.

Selh qu'es rectors pauzatz en regimen
De nostra fe, n'a d'aitan gran deslau
Quar, pus lo mielhs del mon que hom mentau
Li obezis, no mandet crozamen,
Ans qu'est mesclamen
Fos ni-l segl' enicx
Sobre ls fals mendicx
Quar tug li melhor,
Que teno-l sanctor
Per que l'ira se mante,
Crey qu'er foran lai em be.

² L. Halphen, *L'essor de l'Europe*, p. 480.

³ Austorc de Segret, 'No sai quim so, tan sui desconoissens,' ed. C. Fabre, 'Le sirventes d'Austorc de Segret,' *Annales du Midi*, xxii (1910-11), 469, 470.

⁴ Raimon Gaucelm de Béziers, 'Ab grans trebalh et ab grans marrimens,' ed. G. Azais, 'Les troubadours de Béziers,' *Bulletin de la société archéologique de Béziers*, series 2, i (1858), 190, 191.

⁵ Peire Cardenal, 'Totz lo mons es vestitiz et abrazatz,' ed. F. Fabre, *Miscellany of Studies in Romance Language Presented to L. E. Kastner*, p. 218. Stanzas v, vi. See comment of Fabre, p. 231 ff.

⁶ R. Röhrich, 'La croisade de Prince Edouard d'Angleterre,' *Archives de l'Orient Latin*, i (1881), 621.

⁷ Examples of accusations in the vernacular of the clergy in general, not the pope, for indifference to the Holy Land may be found in the following: Ponz de Capduoill, 'So c'om plus vol e plus es vultos,' ed. V. de Bartholomaeis, *op. cit.*, i, 197, 198; Peire Cardenal, 'Tan vei lo segle cobeitos,' ed. M. Raynouard, *Choix des poésies des troubadours* (Paris, 1820), v, 308; Rutebeuf, 'Complainte d'Outre-Mer,' ed. A. Kressner (Wolfenbüttel, 1885), pp. 21, 22; Rutebeuf, 'La complainte de Constantinople,' *loc. cit.*, p. 26; Rutebeuf, 'La desputizons dou croisié et dou descroisié,' *loc. cit.*, pp. 38, 39. Clergymen with the interest of the Holy Land at heart made similar charges against their fellow clergy. See, for example, Humbert of Romans, *Opus Tripartitum*, *loc. cit.*, p. 198.

⁸ A. Luchaire, *Innocent III et la question d'Orient* (Paris, 1907), p. 9.

It is most ironical that when Gregory x appeared in 1271 to fulfill the wishes of Calega Panza and other critics by devoting himself wholeheartedly to the cause of the Holy Land, he found himself checked on all sides by the incredulity and suspicion they had expressed. The papacy had aroused such distrust during the thirteenth century by its use of the crusades that Gregory x's sincere appeal to forget selfish interests for the sake of a crusade against the Saracen met little response. By reversing the policy of his predecessors and centering everything upon the recovery of the Holy Land Gregory x was confronted with the necessity of pacifying a war-torn Europe, thoroughly suspicious of papal aims.¹

The distrust which made Gregory's crusade plans seem futile in the midst of tangled Guelf-Ghibelline hostilities² was expressed bluntly by Folquet de Lunel, a troubadour patronized by Alfonso of Castile, the Ghibelline claimant to the emperorship.³

It would be a good thing to summon the pope before someone higher than he is, since he gives King Alfonso nothing, King Charles [of Sicily] everything. Also it is time to free Henry,⁴ and the Empire should no longer remain vacant. Then the pope with all the kings that have received baptism should go to Syria to revenge Jesus Christ.⁵

These charges of Folquet de Lunel are not at all justifiable, but they illustrate admirably the suspicions with which Gregory had to contend, suspicions aroused by the crusade policy of the thirteenth century popes. Gregory x had no desire to favor Charles of Sicily unduly,⁶ nor did he deny favors to Alfonso x,⁷ nor did he wish to keep the Empire vacant,⁸ nor was there anything he desired more than

¹ A. Hirsch-Gereuth, *Studien zur Geschichte der Kreuzzugs-idee nach der Kreuzzüge* (Munich, 1897), p. 24 ff.

² A good summary of this complicated political struggle may be found in an account by C. W. Previt -Orton, *Cambridge Medieval History* (New York, 1929), vi, 183 ff.

³ Diez concluded that the pope referred to in Folquet de Lunel's poem 'Al bon rey qu'es reys de pretz' was Gregory x, and dated it between April 1272 and September 1273. See F. Diez, *Leben und Werke der Troubadours*, pp. 473, 479. Salverda de Grave disputed Diez's dating and preferred the date 1269, since it was in this year that Alfonso x of Castile first demanded the release of his brother Henry, whose captivity is mentioned in the poem. See J. J. Salverda de Grave, *Le troubadour Bertran d'Alamanon*, pp. 58, 59. Salverda de Grave is obviously mistaken, however, as there was no pope in 1269 and Folquet de Lunel's poem is largely concerned with criticism of a pope. Diez's dating must be accepted as correct.

⁴ This Henry, a brother of Alfonso x of Castile, was held prisoner by Charles of Anjou. See F. Diez, *op. cit.*, p. 479.

⁵ Folquet de Lunel, 'Al bon rey qu'es reys de pretz,' ed. M. Raynouard, *Choix des po sies des troubadours* (Paris, 1819), iv, 240, 241. Stanza vi.

E qui'l papa pogues citar
 A maior de se fora bo,
 Quar del rey 'N Anfos no vol far
 E del rey Carle bon perdo
 E qu'om rendes N Enric qu'ora seria,
 E l'emperi non estes pus vacan;
 E pueis, ab totz los reys que baptizm 'an,
 Anes venjar Ihesu Crist en Suria.

⁶ C. W. Previt -Orton, *op. cit.*, pp. 193, 194.

⁷ Gregory x was quite willing to grant Alfonso crusade tithes for the crusade against the Saracens of Spain and Africa, a crusade which would benefit Alfonso directly. See A. Hirsch-Gereuth, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 26-28.

the crusade recommended by Folquet. The old Ghibelline charge of betrayal of the Holy Land had by now become a cliché, a valuable criticism which made the Ghibelline more pious than the pope. Yet banal and unfair as these accusations were, one must realize that Gregory's tactics might well seem suspect to contemporaries witnessing the continued ferocity of the Guelf-Ghibelline struggle. The Ghibellines had seen former popes make brave statements about saving the Holy Land only to behold the commutation of crusade vows against the Saracen to crusade vows against the Ghibellines. The openly avowed suspicions of Folquet de Lunel must have appeared quite reasonable to those hostile to the papacy.

After the Moslem conquest in 1291 of Acre, the last Christian stronghold in the Holy Land, the papacy continued to be blamed for the failure of the crusades along with the Hospitalers, the Templars, and the sins of Christendom.¹ The crusade policy of Boniface VIII, whose pontificate soon followed the disastrous loss of Acre, laid the papacy open to the usual accusations.² This ardent exponent of theocracy used the holy war in Europe most effectively against his opponents, including the Colonna cardinals.³ The spectacle of a pope preaching a crusade against some of his own cardinals inspired Dante's lines: 'The prince of the new Pharisees — waging war near to the Lateran, and not with Saracens or Jews; for his enemies were Christians, and those who conquered Acre or traded in the Sultan's lands were not among them . . .'⁴

Dante's indictment is the culmination of a century of simmering resentment against the papal monarchy for its crusade policy. Although Dante was Ghibelline in outlook and had political cause to dislike Boniface VIII,⁵ his sincerity in condemning the use of the crusade for ends which could be interpreted as worldly should not be too hastily discredited. He expressed his indignation in two other passages of the *Divina Commedia* because of the papacy's neglect of the Holy Land.⁶ There is even better reason to believe that much of the criticism in Old French was inspired by moral conviction rather than political expediency. The French did not suffer from the Albigensian crusade and yet Guillaume le Clerc revealed that there existed a religious conception outraged by the use of force, instead of persuasion, in the destruction of heresy.⁷ Nor is there any reason for doubting the moral integrity of Huon de Saint Quentin, Moniot, and Gautier de Coincy.

On the other hand, the Provençaux and the Italians using Provençal had obvious worldly reasons for hating the papal monarchy and all its works. Undoubtedly many of them were Ghibelline propagandists more concerned with damning

¹ An interesting criticism of the Templars and Hospitalers written in Provençal between 1291 and 1310 may be found in Rostaing Berenguier, 'Pos de sa mar man cavalier del Temple,' ed. P. Meyer, 'Les derniers troubadours de la Provence,' *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, xxx (1869), 497, 498. For a brief account of similar criticism to be found in the work of crusade theorists, see L. Bréhier, *op. cit.*, p. 255 ff.

² A summary of Boniface VIII's crusade policy may be found in the work of T. S. R. Boase, *Boniface VIII* (London, 1933), pp. 133-137, 222-227. Cf. H. K. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages* (London, 1932), xviii, 82, 83, 393-399. ³ T. S. R. Boase, *op. cit.*, pp. 177-181.

⁴ Dante, *Inferno*, xxvii, lines 85-90. Also see the revised edition of the *Divina Commedia*, ed. C. H. Grandgent (New York, 1933), p. 244, notes 85, 89. ⁵ H. K. Mann, *op. cit.*, xviii, 22, 23.

⁶ *Paradiso*, ix, 124-126; xv, 142-145. ⁷ See *supra*.

the pope than saving the Holy Sepulchre. Yet their criticism is none the less significant. Their protests show to what an extent the pope lost control of public opinion in his firm determination to establish theocracy. No one should doubt that theocracy was a high ideal, but the means used to make it a reality conflicted dramatically with the twelfth-century conception of an internally peaceful Christendom united against the Moslem. The papacy had once been able to unify Europe with the crusading ideal; the pope had been the great arbiter of international affairs by virtue of his leadership in the cause of the Holy Sepulchre.¹ The papacy, however, could not unify Europe with claims to secular overlordship and when it strove to enforce these claims by means of a crusade, it inevitably laid itself open to suspicion and contempt. A great part of Europe successfully disputed theocracy, and, no longer sharing the aims of the Holy See, lost confidence in papal leadership.

This growing distrust, voiced for the most part by the laity, has been traced in Old French and Provençal literature. As expressions of laymen opposed to ecclesiastical domination and as attempts to turn public opinion against Church policy, these criticisms are a striking manifestation of the increasing secularization of European ideals. Out of this welter of popular resentment, violent accusation and suspicion crystallized reasoned systems of political thought far more hostile to papal claims than the earlier imperial theory of independent sovereignty. The conviction having become sufficiently widespread that the papacy was neglecting the Holy Land and using the crusade to enlarge its temporal power, it is not surprising to find a Pierre Dubois arising to declare that the papacy should be stripped of all its temporal power in the interest of the Holy Sepulchre.² When John XXII preached a crusade against Italian Ghibellines and Louis of Bavaria,³ Marsilius of Padua denounced this use of the holy war for temporal ends and argued that the crusade was one of the many abuses that could be best remedied by the absorption of the Church by the State.⁴ This fourteenth-century radicalism was prepared and made possible by thirteenth-century opinion. The protests in the vernacular made during the thirteenth century prove that the pope as a secular ruler had made himself so feared by his use of arms, both spiritual and military, that a sophisticated society felt it necessary to define with increasing clarity the power⁵ that Folquet de Lunel had naïvely declared should be above the pope to compel him to fulfill his duty⁶ as the protector of Jerusalem.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

¹ A. Luchaire, *op. cit.*, pp. 3, 4.

² Pierre Dubois, *De recuperatione Terre Sancte*, ed. C. V. Langlois (*Collection de textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'histoire*, ix: Paris, 1891), p. 25, no. 33; p. 33, no. 40.

³ The crusades of John XXII were directed principally against the Visconti of Milan in 1317, 1320, 1324. The crusade against Louis of Bavaria was proclaimed in 1326. See H. Pissard, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-139.

⁴ Marsilius of Padua, *Defensor Pacis*, ed. C. W. Previte-Orton (New York, 1928), *Dictio* II, *Capitulum* xxvi, 15, 16, pp. 415-418.

⁵ For an account of the attacks upon the power of the pope during the first part of the fourteenth century see R. Scholz, *Die Publizistik zur Zeit Philipps des Schönen und Bonifaz' VIII* (Stuttgart, 1903), p. 447 ff. ⁶ Folquet de Lunel, 'Al bon rey qu'euys reys de pretz,' *loc. cit.*