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There is a broad consensus in medieval historiography that Christendom became more critical of the Military Orders, particularly of the Templar Order throughout the thirteenth-century. Supporters of this view include, *inter alia,* Jonathan Riley Smith,[[1]](#footnote-1) Joshua Prawer,[[2]](#footnote-2) A. J. Forey,[[3]](#footnote-3) and Sylvia Schein.[[4]](#footnote-4) Malcolm Barber called attention to the possibility that “*the empathy between the Templars and the interests of lay aristocratic society which can be seen in the twelfth-century had its dangers, for when it began to be believed that the Templars fell short of the ideal, the reaction could be as hostile as the initial reception had been enthusiastic*.”[[5]](#footnote-5) One may inquire, however, about the values and beliefs of twelfth-century aristocracy and, consequently, their expectations from the Templars, given the fact that many, perhaps even most of them, came from the ranks of the nobility.[[6]](#footnote-6) More notably, those who expressed most critical attitudes towards the knights were not aristocrats but members of the clergy and of other monastic orders, which supposedly lost in status and income due to the fighting monks more than any other social sector.[[7]](#footnote-7)

It is the thesis of this paper that the deteriorating status and image of the Templars was shaped by the changing attitudes of Christendom to the crusades and the Holy Land. The growing deceptions following the recurrent Christian defeats in the battlefield blurred the former mystical halo of the *milites Christi,* who did not succeed to ensure the crusaders’ supremacy in the Levant*.*  Notwithstanding the gradual deterioration in both its image and status, there was a clear opposition to the dissolution of the Order, “since the Templars were most powerful, both in riches and renown.”[[8]](#footnote-8) The contradiction between the declining image of the Templars and the opposition to the abolition of the Order thus creates a paradox that justifies further research.

*De laude novae militiae* of Bernard de Clairvaux faithfully reflects the role and the behavior norms that the Cistercian Abbot envisaged for the New Knighthood:

*A new sort of kinghood…unknown to the world is fighting indefatigably a double fight against flesh and blood as well as against the immaterial forces of evil in the skies. Indeed, where resistance is offered to a physical enemy by physical force alone, I do not deem this surprising, nor think it rate that. However, each time war is waged against vices or demons by the force of the mind, then I would not call this miraculous, even if it is laudable, since the world is seen to be full of monks. However, when both sorts of men girds their swords of power and don their belts of nobility, who will not consider this to be most worthy of total admiration is as much as it is clearly unusual ...However, the knights of Christ fight the battles of their Lord in all peace of mind, in no way fearing to sin in killing the enemy or to die in his hands, since indeed death, whether inflicted or suffered, is not minted by crime but is marked by a large degree of glory*.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Bernard de Clairvaux’s vehement rhetoric, however, did not depict those knights fighting in the hard conditions of twelfth-century Palestine, but was meant to encourage support of the Order in its early stages. While emphasizing the contradiction between the new *milites Dei* and the ordinary *malitia seculi*, it further created some expectations that could hardly be fulfilled in actual practice. Indeed, about the same time (c. 1129), Guigo, Prior of the Grand Chartreuse, called attention to the challenging double battle that the Templars took upon themselves:

*It is pointless to wage war against external enemies without first overcoming internal ones. If we are unable first to subject our own bodies to our wills, then it is extremely shameful and unworthy to wish to put under our control any sort of military forces. Who could tolerate our desire to extend our domination abroad over vast tracts of land while we put up with the most ignominious servitude to vices in those minute lamps of earth that are our bodies*?[[10]](#footnote-10)

The very fact that the prior asked the first Master, Hugh of Payns, to read his letter before the whole congregation hints perhaps at his doubts about the knights’ chances to overcome temporal weaknesses. The Latin Rule further established at the same time, the Templars’ commitment to obedience and stability, coupled with their devotion to the Holy Church.[[11]](#footnote-11) The French Rule, written before 1187, further described the social and religious behavior expected from the new knighthood, while showing awareness to the delicate web of relations between them and the members of other ecclesiastical orders:

*Each brother should strive to like honestly and to set a good example to secular people and members of other orders in everything, in such a way that those who see him cannot notice anything bad in his behavior, not in his riding, nor in his walking, nor in his drinking, nor in eating nor in this look, nor in any of his actions and works.*[[12]](#footnote-12)

William of Tyre corroborates the Templars’ piety at their early days, while underlining their subordination to the Patriarch of Jerusalem and their commitment to the defense of vulnerable pilgrims in their way to the holiest Christian shrines in the Holy Land:

*In the same year (1118) some noblemen of knightly rank, devoted to God, pious and God-fearing, placed themselves in the hands of the lord patriarch for the service of Christ, professing the wish to live perpetually in the manner of regular canons in chastity, and obedience, without personal belongings….Their main duty, something that was imposed upon them by the patriarch and the other bishops for the remission of their sins, was that they should maintain the safety of the roads and the highways to the best of their ability, for the benefit of pilgrims in particular, against attacks of bandits and marauders*.[[13]](#footnote-13)

Michael the Syrian, the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, corroborated the Templars’ monastic behavior, which gained them wide admiration across the Mediterranean.[[14]](#footnote-14) Hugo Peccator went much further. While acknowledging that “*people of no wisdom*” condemned “*carrying arms against the enemies of the faith and peace in defense of Christians*”, he claimed that the Templars’ active work is more valuable to God than prayer and contemplation.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Although some theologians did remind the evangelical ban of violence,[[16]](#footnote-16) which obviously contradicted the Templars’ commitment to the Holy War, the emergence of fighting monks did not seem to have aroused considerable opposition. There was some kind of justification, sometimes also admiration, with regard their military superiority and their courage in the battlefield,[[17]](#footnote-17) largely confirmed by Moslem sources.[[18]](#footnote-18) No wonder, therefore, that Pope Innocent II addressed them as “*beloved sons in the Lord…true Israelites and warriors most versed in holy battle…defenders of the Church and assailants of the enemies of Christ”* (29 March 1139).[[19]](#footnote-19) Indeed, as claimed by Jonathan Riley Smith, the raison d’être of the Templars, as other Military Orders, was to serve as an extended branch of the Apostolic See,[[20]](#footnote-20) thus creating a reasonable *quid pro quo* that ensured the knights apostolic blessing and extensive privileges.

The ideal balance between the Apostolic See and the Military Orders with the support of Christendom, however, was not immune to changes and the traumatic Christian downfall at the Horns of Hattin (1187) hints at one of its most critical tests. It further provides a suitable *terminus a quo* to the changing attitudes of Christendom with regard the crusades, the Holy Land, and eventually, the Templars, as well*.*

Conrad of Montferrat – ruler of the Kingdom of Jerusalem as consort of Queen Isabella I – reported to Baldwin, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the tragic consequences of the Christian defeat at the Horns of Hattin from a later perspective (1189):

*God has stood back as if from the defilement of our evil, and Mohammed has taken over; where Christ was prayed to day and night at the appointed hours, now Mohammed is praised with uplifted voice.*[[21]](#footnote-21)

The traditional justification of *peccatis nostris exigentibus* could hardly balance the traumatic experience of the purported victory of Muhammad soldiers over Christ’s knights, thus bringing about a growing sense of frustration and disillusionment. The original dreams of the Holy Land as “a land flowing with milk and honey” (**Ex.** III: 8) were gradually replaced by the ominous Biblical warning of “a land that eateth up the inhabitants thereof” (**Num.** XIII: 32). Thomas Agni of Lentini, papal legate and Bishop of Bethlehem, sadly mourned the resulting increasing negligence of European Christendom with regard the misfortunes of its brothers in the Levant:

 *We have turned a deaf ear to the tribulations suffered by the cities of the eastern regions from afar and from so near that they seemed to come from the other side of the wall. Fear and paralysis have blunted our sense and those of our children*.[[22]](#footnote-22)

The reiterating failures in the battlefield coupled with the crusaders’ feebleness, thus favored a gradual dissociation between European Christendom and the crusaders *Outremer*, which Thomas condemned so deeply. The repeating calamities further encouraged the pursuit of a scapegoat that could offer some responses to the unbearable crisis. The Templars offered in this regard a most convenient target, both because their privileged status and the mythical wealth ascribed to them. Moreover, since their raison d’être was to ensure the Christian victory in the battlefield, their recurring defeats were perceived as a clear proof of God’s disapproval if not antagonism toward the fighting monks.

The first and perhaps most important source of this critical view was William of Tyre,[[23]](#footnote-23) quoted almost verbatim by Matthew Paris, one of the most influential chroniclers in thirteenth-century Christendom:[[24]](#footnote-24)

*They are said to have vast possessions, both on this side of the sea and beyond…and their property is reported to be equal to the riches of kings....For a long time they remained faithful to their noble purpose and carried out their profession wisely enough. At length, however, they began to neglect humility, the guardian of all virtues...They withdrew from the patriarch of Jerusalem, from whom they had received the establishment of their Order and their first privileges, and refused him the obedience which their predecessors had shown him. To the churches of God, also they became very troublesome, for they drew away from them their tithes and first fruits and unjustly disturbed their possessions*.[[25]](#footnote-25)

John of Wurzburg, a German priest who came to the Holy Land around 1165,[[26]](#footnote-26) John of Salisbury,[[27]](#footnote-27) Walter Map,[[28]](#footnote-28) James of Vitry,[[29]](#footnote-29) among others, shared similar claims.[[30]](#footnote-30) Rather clearly, the knights’ exemption from clerical patronage and their release from the tithe became a source of resentment in their dealings with the secular hierarchy, the Patriarch of Jerusalem at their head. As time went by, the Templars’ alleged disparity from their original ideals – at least as defined by Bernard of Clairvaux and corroborated in the Rule -- left its mark on popular sayings like “to drink like a Templar,” to swear like a Templar,” or worse still, the German appellation of *Tempelhaus* for brothel, hinting at the knights’ well-known pursuit of women.[[31]](#footnote-31) Matthew Paris further reminds his readers of the “ancient infamy” of the Templars, who used sometimes to futilely prolong the war against the Saracens, in order to engross their incomes from defenseless pilgrims.[[32]](#footnote-32) It was further said that when King Henry III of England was reprimanded for his behavior, he claimed in his defense that he had married pride to the Templars.[[33]](#footnote-33) No wonder, therefore that no Templar was promoted to sainthood, as members of other Monastic Orders, especially but not only hermits, and only four knights achieved ordination to bishoprics, mostly in areas under the Order’s rule.[[34]](#footnote-34)

 The changing attitudes to the Templars left their mark on the knights’ need for papal intervention in Christendom, not against the Saracens but against the same faithful whom they were expected to defend. Thus, Pope Honorius III found it necessary to remind his flock in Sicily of the knights’ meritorious role (24 November 1218):

*Indeed, we do not believe that you are all unaware of the fact that since the beloved … brothers of the knighthood of the Temple have up until now had a special status among other Christians throughout the world, and still are the defenders of the orthodox faith, their hearts are so fired with the flame of the Holy Spirit that not only do they continually fight the Lord’s battles for which they will receive the crown of martyrdom* …[[35]](#footnote-35)

Papal appeals of this kind were not exceptional: Already Pope Alexander III issued a bull restraining people from pulling Templars off their horses, treating them dishonestly, or abusing them.[[36]](#footnote-36) Notwithstanding these sporadic assaults, the Templars’ heroic aura persisted throughout the thirteenth century across the Mediterranean and sometimes grew.[[37]](#footnote-37) Their participation in the Damietta campaign (May 1218 - September 1220), for example, contributed to draw an almost mythical image of the knights. Hugh, lord of Berze, declared that the Templars "*give up their bodies in martyrdom and defend the sweet land where the Lord died and lived*."[[38]](#footnote-38) Matthew Paris used the occasion to confer on the knights both the mythic image of the biblical Samson and the aura of martyrdom reserved to Christian champions.[[39]](#footnote-39) The Templars’ mythical image further inspired contemporary epic texts that acclaimed the Order.[[40]](#footnote-40) The Cistercian *Queste,*[[41]](#footnote-41) *Parzifal,*[[42]](#footnote-42)the *Nouvelle complainte d’outre-mer,*[[43]](#footnote-43)and the *Speculum Stultorum*[[44]](#footnote-44) exemplify this trend*.*

One may conclude at this point that prior to the Templars’ arrest in France, the condemnation of the knights was neither universal nor conclusive. True, they were often criticized for their pride, avarice, simony, the everlasting struggles with other Military Orders, and for preferring the Order’s benefits in detriment of the Holy Land.[[45]](#footnote-45) On the other hand, their courageous halo as *milites Christi* in most critical situations persisted and was voiced by supporters and detractors throughout generations. Moreover, notwithstanding sporadic disagreements, the Apostolic See proved itself as the most devoted supporter of the Order against the many claims of both ecclesiastics and laity.[[46]](#footnote-46)

This complex and ambiguous situation was the background of the Templars’ arrest in the Kingdom of France:

*In the early hours of the morning, on Friday, 13 October, a strange event occurred, the likes of which have never been heard since ancient times. The Grand Master of the Temple…was arrested in the Temple of Paris and, on the same day, all Templars in France were suddenly arrested and incarcerated in various prisons…*[[47]](#footnote-47)

The testimony of John of St. Victor faithfully reflects the wide-ranging astonishment following the arrest of the Knights Templar in the Kingdom of France.[[48]](#footnote-48) It further hints at the ambiguous reactions of contemporaries to the Capetian aggressive policy against an ecclesiastical, exempted organization.[[49]](#footnote-49) Indeed, the arrest of the Templars was only four years after the Capetian attack of Pope Boniface VIII in Anagni,[[50]](#footnote-50) but not further in a faraway village in the Italian peninsula, but at the heart of the Ile de France and throughout the Capetian kingdom.

While making a *reductio ad unum,* Capetian propaganda aimed at this critical stage to turn the Templars into the main and perhaps the only cause of the downfall of the Crusader Kingdom sixteen years earlier. Once again, Philip the Fair returned to his former, most cherished role of *advocatus ecclesiae*, this time vis-à-vis a weak pope, who chose to expatriate the apostolic curia to Languedoc.[[51]](#footnote-51)

 Gervais du Bus, a Norman clerk in the French court, allegedly expressed the Church’s disappointment of the knights in light of the treason of his spoiled sons. In the atmosphere of fears created by royal pressure coupled with ecclesiastical torture, he thus argued

*The Templars, whom I* (the Church) *love so much*

 *And had so much privileged*

*Had despised and committed felony against me*.[[52]](#footnote-52)

The martyrological fervor attributed to the Templars throughout generations was therefore replaced at once by denunciations of treachery and cowardice. In the meeting with Pope Clement V at Poitiers (May 1308), the senior adviser of Philip the Fair, William of Plaisians, further contended, “*because of their many vices we lost the Holy Land since, as is well known, they made secret agreements with the Moslems*.”[[53]](#footnote-53) The Templars' supposed lack of Christian zeal acquired the weight of fact during their prolonged trial, when Philip the Fair’s representatives looked for any scrap of evidence that might corroborate the accusation of heresy, an accusation that was never expressed before the Templars’ arrest.

 The pact between the *Rex Christianissimus* and the *Summus Pontifex,* however, did not enjoy universal support out of France, notwithstanding the former criticism of the knights’ many vices and the political pressure exerted by Philip the Fair and his envoys. Even in the ecclesiastical order, some members reacted with suspicion, if not open antagonism, to the charges of heresy, as specified and voiced during the Council of Vienne.[[54]](#footnote-54) Langland convincingly solved the paradox between the clergy’s former criticism vis-à-vis its hesitant if not antagonistic reaction to the papal-royal pressure, since

*Bothe riche and religious, ƥat Rode ƥei honoure,*

*Hat in grotes is ygraue and in golde nobles,*

*For coneityse of ƥat crosse, men of holykirke*

*Shul tourney as templeres did, ƥe tyme approcheth faste*.[[55]](#footnote-55)

In other words, not belief on the Templars’ innocence but fears of the unprecedented royal move against traditional ecclesiastical privileges created a fruitful arena for supporting an otherwise hatred Order. Indeed, different concerns if not interests shaped the way of the otherwise surprising reactions towards the abolition of the Templar Order. The hesitant policy of Edward II and his clear suspicions against the motivations of his father in law,[[56]](#footnote-56) allowed the rather comfortable conditions of the Templars in England and the liberal policy of the Council of York (1311), which was ultimately satisfied with the Templars’ oath of innocence.[[57]](#footnote-57)

Faraway of the Capetian sphere of influence, chroniclers from the Holy Roman Empire and the Italian Peninsula were in the forefront of the opposition to the suppression of the Temple. Most authors, indeed, regarded the agreement between Clement V and Philip the Fair as a blow to justice for satisfying the endless ambitions of the King of France.[[58]](#footnote-58) Bernard of Clairvaux’s *De laude novae militiae* inspired Johann von Vitring to echo Abraham’s complain before the Almighty and reproach His vicar, “Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked??” (**Gen.** xviii: 23).[[59]](#footnote-59) According to Dante Alighieri, the dissolution of the Order was perpetrated by a new Pilate – Philip IV -- and would eventually bring about the destruction of Christendom.[[60]](#footnote-60) The burning of the Templar leaders in Paris ultimately brought about the popular worship of their remains as holy relics.[[61]](#footnote-61) In the course of time, furthermore, the suppression of the Templar Order was regarded as one of the main causes of the Black Death.[[62]](#footnote-62) The paradox between conflicting images and expectations ultimately gave rise to new myths,[[63]](#footnote-63) and the knights apparently continued active while encouraging research of their deeds up to this very day.
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