**Disinformation in Medieval Chronicles:**

**Motives and Effects**

The political use of disinformation is at the center of public debate in our postindustrial society, marked by social media and virtual communities. [[1]](#footnote-1) Under complete different socioeconomic conditions, however, the use of disinformation for political purposes could be detected in the Middle Ages, as well. It is the premise of this study that the very lack of definition/categorization of some occurrence – disinformation -- does not per se invalidate its existence in pre-modern society.

This paper focus on three case studies of disinformation in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: the Jewish-Mongol plot, as reported by Matthew Paris; the French plot prior to the election of Pope Clement V, as recounted by Giovanni Villani; and the Capetian disinformation campaign against the Temple and the chroniclers’ responses it aroused. The selection of these particular cases is largely justified by the gradual but continuous expansion of the audience to whom they appealed, from the monastic sector to the urban Italian population, and ultimately, the whole Kingdom of France and the political elites of Christendom.

Beyond both reporting fictional plots, Matthew Paris and Giovanni Villani represent different and perhaps opposing worlds: Matthew Paris (1200–1259), the historian of St. Albans, wrote the seminal *Chronica Majora*, one of the most important universal chronicles of thirteenth-century England. He was a devoted member of the Benedictine Order, who spent most of his life in his religious house.[[2]](#footnote-2) Giovanni Villani (1276–1348), in stark contrast, was an Italian [banker](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bank), a businessperson and diplomat, who traveled often abroad, and took an active role in Florence political and military affairs. His masterpiece was the [*Nuova Cronica*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuova_Cronica) on the [history of the](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Florence) city.[[3]](#footnote-3) The arrest and trial of the Templars, on the other hand, brought about an unprecedented response in contemporary chronicles in their scope and intensity. Matthew Paris, Giovanni Villani, and the chroniclers who responded to the Templar trial were contemporary to the disinformation they reported, a fact that intensifies the questions about their motives, the audience whom they approached, and the historical background or circumstances surrounding their story.

**Matthew Paris and the Jewish-Mongol Plot**

The Mongols began a full-scale attack westward by the second decade of the thirteenth century, stimulated by ecological changes that endangered their economy, especially their basic nutrition, and the regression of trade. They invaded and destroyed Volga Bulgaria, Kievan Rus' -- with the exception of Novgorod and Pskov **–** to be followed by Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, [Croatia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Croatia_in_union_with_Hungary), and some areas of the [Latin Empire](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Latin_Empire), thus integrating much of [Eastern European](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eastern_Europe) territory into the [Golden Horde](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Golden_Horde).[[4]](#footnote-4)

Against this menacing, terrifying background, Mathew Paris reported *ad annum* 1241[[5]](#footnote-5) a mysterious story, its main accomplices combining the most dangerous threats to Christendom: the approaching Mongols – also known as Tartars – together with the age-old treacherous foe, the Jews. According to Matthew, some Jews*, "thinking that these Tartars…were a portion of their race,”* met secretly for helping them, while conspiring against the Holy Roman Empire. The Jews secretly collected as much arms as they could and stowed them in casks, in their hope to provide them to the Tartars, thus strengthening the enemy and speeding up the fall of Christendom. To conceal their treachery, the Jews told the Christian authorities that since the Tartars were actually of Jewish ancestry, they were not allowed to drink but only *kosher* wine, i.e., one that was made by their brothers according to Jewish precepts. They further alleged that they had intoxicated the wine, to bring about the Tartars' massive injury, thus helping to the eventual victory of the Christian armies. The perfidious Jews thus safely departed, until they approached some distant place in the border. When the local master unexpectedly asked to inspect the casks – a move that Matthew explained as Providence opportune intervention -- the barrels were opened and no wine flowed out, so that the whole plot was exposed. Matthew thus reproduces the master's cry *“Oh, unheard-of treachery, why do we allow such people to live among us*?” He further took care to finish the story with a “happy” note, since the Jews were condemned to perpetual imprisonment or, perhaps even more appealingly, to be slain with their own swords.[[6]](#footnote-6)

 The whole story, however, appealing as it was, lacks any corroboration in other sources, neither Christian or Jewish, notwithstanding the attention the supposed plot and the grave punishment would have attracted had they truly occurred. [[7]](#footnote-7) Most historians thus consider Matthew’s report as one of the many inaccuracies that plagued the *Chronica Majora.*  Still, as claimed by Matthew’s biographer, Richard Vaughan, “as a mirror of his age, Matthew is second to none.”[[8]](#footnote-8) With this assessment in mind, the imaginary tale would be reevaluated as a true reflection of contemporary attitudes toward Anglo-Jewry, and the extensive dissatisfaction with the tolerant policy of the Angevin rulers toward them, in their selfish efforts to engross their revenues while endangering their loyal Christian subjects.[[9]](#footnote-9) Notwithstanding its imaginary essence, Matthew Jewish-Mongol plot acquires additional relevance when analyzed vis-a-vis the Jewish expectations for an upcoming Redemption, Matthew's approach to Anglo-Jewry, and the discouraging climate of opinion following the Mongol conquests.

 The Mongols’ approach to Western Christendom towards 1240, corresponded to the year 5000 in the Jewish calendar, one of the many dates expected to witness the coming of the Messiah,[[10]](#footnote-10) There are convincing testimonies, indeed, of both the Jews’ expectations and the Mongol use of misinformation to attach additional allies, Jews among them.[[11]](#footnote-11) So, it is reasonable to assume that the Jews' belief in their congenial links with the Mongols—believed to be one the lost tenth tribes -- was actually propagated by the Mongols, to encourage their cooperation. It is further possible that the historical core of Matthew's story, as well, was actually based on Mongol disinformation. Matthew's willingness to adopt the Mongol narrative, if indeed this was the case, was not exceptional but part and parcel of his continuous search for information, on the one hand, and his hostile approach to Anglo-Jewry, on the other.[[12]](#footnote-12) Being England the source of medieval blood libels in the medieval period (Norwich, 1144),[[13]](#footnote-13) the *Chronica Majora* analyzes in detail the accusations of ritual murders against Jews in Gloucester (1168), Bury St. Edmunds (1181), and Bristol (1183), to be followed by the case of Little Hugh of Lincoln, later on (1255).[[14]](#footnote-14) Against this rich background of Jews' crimes against the Christian population of medieval England,[[15]](#footnote-15) the Jewish-Mongol plot thus appears as its complementation from a wider perspective, of Christendom as a whole. Thus, Matthew’s story could support the attempt to "clean" Christian society from their presence,[[16]](#footnote-16) while justifying their expulsion from England and Aquitaine by Edward I fifty years later (1290).[[17]](#footnote-17)

 Matthew further contributed a scapegoat to his audience/readers, while the traditional ‘enemies of the true faith,’ mainly the Jews, were turned into a most convenient internal target, vis-à-vis the Mongol external threat. Matthew’s disinformation thus provides some keys for understanding one of the defense mechanisms developed against the frightening, unprecedented Mongol threat. In other words, the Jewish-Mongol plot reflects Matthew’s personal effort to understand the challenge presented by the Mongol repeated victories against a vulnerable Christendom, while transforming the enigmatic, mysterious enemy into more familiar and, as such, less frightening. It further represents the political efforts of the chronicler of St. Albans to intensify the hatred against Anglo-Jewry while strengthening the hostile opinions against them thus facilitating and eventually also supporting their expulsion later on.

**Giovanni Villani and the French Plot**

The use of disinformation to substantiate political views is further illustrated by the French plot, as reported by Giovanni Villani. The Florentine historian alleges the existence of an early agreement between Philip the Fair, King of France, and Bertrand de Got, Archbishop of Bordeaux, which actually brought about the latter's election to the Apostolic See. Villani depicts how Cardinal Niccolò Albertini da Prato, whom he portrays as a manipulative and sinister prelate, promoted Bertrand’s candidacy in the conclave. Considering the archbishop to be a man “lacking honor and nobility, since he is Gascon, who are essentially rapacious,”[[18]](#footnote-18) Cardinal da Prato encouraged the Capetian King to reach an early agreement with his candidate, before the conclave. The cardinal’s advice supposedly led to a secret meeting between king and archbishop at St. Jean d’Angély, where the conditions for royal support were presented, namely:

* Reacceptance of the king and his supporters into the Church.
* A formal denunciation of Pope Boniface VIII’s memory.
* A five-year tithe to finance the war in Flanders.
* The nomination of cardinals friendly to France.
* A “mysterious and great” secret, to be communicated in due time.

Bertrand de Got’s obsequious response, according to Villani, satisfied the king and ensured his support: “You will command and I will obey, and it will always be settled in this way.” [[19]](#footnote-19)

 In this rather convincing way, with dialogues strengthening the authenticity of the disinformation provided, Villani hints at the hostile climate of opinion that followed the election of a non-Italian pope in the peninsula. [[20]](#footnote-20) Once again, we have conclusive evidence that the supposed meeting between king and archbishop never occurred, nor there is any slightly proof of a geographical proximity between them both before the papal election.[[21]](#footnote-21) Suspicions about Villani’s account, moreover, accompanied western historiography, at least since the seventeenth century.[[22]](#footnote-22)Nonetheless, the royal exigencies, as detailed by Villani, became part and parcel of late medieval chroniclers and historians, as well, not as the aftermath of an imaginary meeting but as characterizing Clement’s nine-year pontificate and the reactions its policy aroused.[[23]](#footnote-23)

The wide reception of Villani’s speculations could be understood in light of the historical background at the beginning of the Avignon Period, which Petrarch had defined as the ‘Babylonian captivity of the papacy.’[[24]](#footnote-24) It further reflects the papal urgent need to improve the tense relationship with the Capetian court, two years after an armed force led by Guillaume de Nogaret, the king’s main councilor, had attacked and imprisoned Pope Boniface VIII at Anagni (7 September 1303).[[25]](#footnote-25) The unprecedented measure against the Vicar of Christ resulted from a long conflict between the pope and the King of France about the Church’s exemption in both its members and patrimony.[[26]](#footnote-26) Though Boniface’s claims – as redacted in the masterpiece of the medieval papacy, *Unam Sanctam,[[27]](#footnote-27)* had nothing new, the crisis was inevitable in light of Philip’s efforts to pave the way for a centralistic rule, due to his basic belief on the all-embracing royal rule in his kingdom (*rex Francorum imperator est in regno suo)*.[[28]](#footnote-28)

 Clement’s intentions to start a new phase, more congenial with the *rex Christianissimus* – a most vital partner for his plans to renew the crusade[[29]](#footnote-29) – was clearly manifested in the pope’s gestures of good will following his coronation.[[30]](#footnote-30) Clement, however, was less cooperative with regard to Boniface’s memory and his condemnation *post mortem.* Though Guillaume de Nogaret was exonerated *ad cautelam* only by 1311,[[31]](#footnote-31) and Clement was ready to annul much of his predecessor's legislation, allegedly against France and the king, the pope did successfully avoid any harm to Boniface *ad personam,* or what was closely related, to the papal plenitude of power.

 On the other hand, Clement repeatedly renounced on tenth revenues in the Kingdom of France – in complete antagonism to Boniface’s policy, as authoritatively canonized in *Clericis laicos*.[[32]](#footnote-32) Clement’s concessions appeared the most desirable in light of the critical situation of the Capetian treasure due to the continuous expenses in military and administrative endeavors.[[33]](#footnote-33) Though apostolic largess towards France and its king – pending royal theoretical commitment to depart on crusade -- has nothing new,[[34]](#footnote-34) Clement’s generosity aroused much criticism, a few years after the fall of the Crusader Kingdom and his failure to renew the crusade.[[35]](#footnote-35)

 A similar, cooperative apostolic approach could be detected in Clement’s nominations to the Sacred College. First and foremost, Clement returned the two cardinals Colonna – whom Philip considered dearest friends -- to the College of Cardinals, after being excommunicated and expulsed by Boniface. Besides, nine of the ten cardinals appointed in the first nomination (1305) were from the Kingdom of France; the same goes for the five cardinals chosen in 1310, while the nine cardinals appointed in 1312 came all from Southern France, the Languedoc.[[36]](#footnote-36) The sectarian essence of papal policy was not only geographical. but nepotistic, as well, and, as such was hardly criticized.[[37]](#footnote-37) By the end of Clement’s pontificate, indeed, there were only six cardinals from the Italian Peninsula and twenty-four from France. By breaking the Roman-Italian monopoly of former generations, Clement thus paved the way for the Avignon period, with its grave consequences on the universal aura of papacy and the Catholic Church.

As to the ‘mysterious and great’ secret alluded to by Villani, there is wide consensus as to its allusion to the Templar affair, the third part of this paper devoted to its analysis.

Villani’s disinformation with regard an imaginary meeting between *rex et sacerdos* thus served two main political goals: to explain the decline of the Italian cardinals in the papal curia as the result of a Capetian-Gascon conspiration, and the following papal exile from Rome, both moves thus lacking legitimacy. In this peculiar way, he gave voice to the hostile climate of opinion in fourteenth century Italy, with the merchant sector at the forefront of the opposition to the Avignon papacy, due to the decline of pilgrimage and the loss of income during the papal exile in southern France. Thus, the disinformation reported by both Matthew Paris and Giovanni Villani represent challenging historiographical sources because of their valuable insights of the fears, expectations, and prejudices in medieval society. Indeed, both chroniclers attempted to understand the inner logic of historical developments within the limitations imposed by their religious-cultural and socioeconomic heritage.

**Capetian Disinformation and the Chroniclers’ Response**

Against the disinformation analyzed above, John of St. Victor, librarian at the Parisian monastery, [[38]](#footnote-38) provides one of the most authentic reports of the Templars’ arrest in France and the reactions it aroused (*ad a.* 1307). As such, it deserves a full quotation:

*In the early hours of the morning, on Friday the 13th of 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. Everybody was stunned by such action [but assumed that] it was ordered by the Roman curia, in consultation with the king, and carried out by the knights Guillaume de Nogaret and Reginald de Roy....On the following Sunday [15 October], a public preaching was held in the king’s gardens. The reasons for the arrest were there explained to the people and the aforesaid matter was discussed, first by the Dominicans and then by the king’s officers, so that the people might not be too violently shocked by the sudden arrest, since the Templars were most powerful, both in riches and renown.[[39]](#footnote-39)*

John thus accurately reported: the unprecedented royal move against an exempted Order; the general surprise it aroused, only four years after the imprisonment of Pope Boniface VIII at Anagni; the assumptions it generated about the needed cooperation between *rex et sacerdos;* and the Capetian court’s awareness of the general commotion, thence its immediate attempts to shape a favorable public opinion.[[40]](#footnote-40)

The 127 articles against the Templars can be summarized as follows: [[41]](#footnote-41)

* When a new brother was received into the Order, he was encouraged by his receptors to abjure Jesus Christ and sometimes also the Holy Virgin and the saints.[[42]](#footnote-42)
* The Templars revered idols, Baphomet among them.[[43]](#footnote-43)
* They did not believe in the sacraments, and their priests omitted the words of consecration during Mass.
* They maintained that the Grand Master and other leaders could hear their confessions and absolve them from sin, despite the fact that many leaders were laymen.
* The receptors of new brothers kissed them on the mouth, the navel, the stomach, the buttocks, and the spine. Homosexuality was encouraged and, indeed, enjoined on them.[[44]](#footnote-44)
* The Templars sought gain for the Order by whatever means came to hand, whether lawful or not.
* Chapter meetings and receptions were held in secret, at night, under heavy guard, and only Templars were present. Brothers who revealed to an outsider what had occurred were punished by imprisonment or death.[[45]](#footnote-45)

To these serious allegations, Guillaume de Plaisians, another chief advisor of Philip the Fair, added later another fault, that of treason to the Holy Land, since

* The Templars had betrayed the Christian enterprise overseas while conducting secret negotiations with the Moslems, thus actually causing the loss of the Holy Land.[[46]](#footnote-46)

Notwithstanding the disinformation in most accusations, there were also some authentic seeds. Thus, vis-à-vis the bravery attributed to the Templars throughout generations,[[47]](#footnote-47) there were also rumors about their cooperation with the Moslems, a most convenient scape-goat for the fall of the Crusader Kingdom, a few years earlier.[[48]](#footnote-48) Still, the accusation of heresy was never heard before. Moreover, in both their content and propagandistic attempts, the Capetian accusations against the Templars followed disinformation patterns well known through the Capetian campaign against Pope Boniface VIII, hardly four years earlier.[[49]](#footnote-49) The *Rex Christianissimus* further enlisted all the means at his disposal in his passionate effort to appear as the defender of the Catholic faith. They include the summon of General Assemblies,[[50]](#footnote-50) royal messengers *ad hoc* throughout the whole kingdom, and the massive recruitment of supporting letters (*lettres d’adhésion*). Reinforced by some knights’ confessions under heavy torture -- the Grand Master, James of Molay, at their front[[51]](#footnote-51) -- Philip himself eventually came to the Council of Vienne with an impressive committee, an intimidating measure that reinforced the prelates’ final decision against the Order.[[52]](#footnote-52)

 As clearly assumed by Jean of St. Victor, the arrest of the Templars and their following trial, could be only a papal initiative, the Order being under direct apostolic patronage and, as such, exempted from any external intervention either ecclesiastical or secular. Still, and in open contrast to Villani’s assertion, the first response of Clement was of surprise and even disgust. In his admonition letter to Philip, immediately after the arrest, Clement canceled any previous knowledge, let alone apostolic consent to the unprecedented royal move against an exempted Order.[[53]](#footnote-53) Faced to a fait-accompli,[[54]](#footnote-54) however, it was Clement who ordered the detention of the Templars throughout Christendom – an apostolic mandate that actually sanctioned Philip’s policy, only five weeks after the Templars were arrested.[[55]](#footnote-55) Following endless apostolic postponements, on the one hand, and coercive, continuous pressure of the Capetian court, on the other, the Council of Vienne ultimately bestowed apostolic legitimacy on the eradication of the Temple, but without pronouncing a guilty verdict on the Order (*Vox in excelso,* 22 March 1312).[[56]](#footnote-56) Notwithstanding the papal decision of transferring all Templar property to the Hospitallers *(Ad providam*, 2 May),[[57]](#footnote-57) Philip kept much of the knights’ treasury, 260,000 *livres Tourneau*: 200,000 as compensation for his and his ancestors’ contributions to the Order, and rather ironically, the remaining 60,000 for the expenses generated during the trial, which he himself had instigated.[[58]](#footnote-58)

 Bearing in mind the early reservations of the rulers of Aragon, the Holy Roman Empire and England to cooperate with Philip the Fair and, in parallel, the reluctance of the Parisian masters of theology to endorse Capetian policy,[[59]](#footnote-59) Philip’s campaign against the Templars was only partially successful.[[60]](#footnote-60) The initial hesitance and even reluctance of Christian rulers was probably due to their assumption that the property of the Templars, if found guilty, would be kept for the recovery of the Holy Land, as concluded by the Parisian masters. This was indeed the primary goal of Pope Clement, who tried to transfer all Templar property to the Hospitallers, but which eventually did not succeed.[[61]](#footnote-61) The charges of heresy, furthermore,were not deemed sufficient to revoke the immunity of an exempted Order, let alone to justify the independent royal move against it. As to the hesitations of the sociopolitical elite of France, as predicted by Piers Plowman, “as a time is approaching when men of the Holy Church would share the Templars’ fate.” “[[62]](#footnote-62) The policy of the most Christian king, indeed, became a kind of Job omen not only for members of the Gallican Church, but also for the lay aristocracy, jealous of its ancestral privileges, of which many Templars have been part.

The reactions in the Italian Peninsula and the Holy Roman Empire were much more extreme and did not leave place for doubts about the perfidious, cynical motivations of Philip the Fair. Indeed, in his *History of Florence* Giovanni Villani claimed that “moved by his avarice, Philip forced the pope to dissolve the Templar Order while arising many heretical charges against them.”[[63]](#footnote-63) Dante Alighieri designated Philip as ‘another Pilate,’ who entered the Lord’s temple with no right.[[64]](#footnote-64) *De laude novae militiae* inspired Johann von Vitring to reproach the pope by echoing Patriarch Abraham’s grievance to the Almighty: “Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked?” (Gen.18.23).[[65]](#footnote-65) The burning of Templar leaders in Paris ultimately brought about the popular worship of their remains as holy relics.[[66]](#footnote-66) When the Black Death struck Europe, furthermore, it was blamed as divine retribution for the iniquity of suppressing the Templar Order.[[67]](#footnote-67)

On the other hand, in both the Kingdoms of France and England one can detect an impressive reception of Capetian disinformation, to the point that some researchers qualified the case as one of the first instances of government divulgation of fake-news.[[68]](#footnote-68) Philip and his representatives indeed succeeded to convince the delegates of the third state – a new component of the General Assembly[[69]](#footnote-69)—and many of the chroniclers at the Capetian Kingdom. In most cases, belief in the Templars’ heresy hinted at the acceptance of the royal initiative *de iure* or *de facto*.[[70]](#footnote-70) Consequently, most reactions to the arrest and subsequent trial did not focus on the question of heresy, but on royal power and the web of relations between *rex et sacerdos*. Some chroniclers, faithful to the king, voiced the Capetian version that the arrests had been made ‘according to the order of the king of France, Philip the Fair, and the authorization and consent of the sovereign pontiff, Pope Clement.’[[71]](#footnote-71) Accordingly, Philip had acted out of his genuine belief in the Templars’ heresy, [[72]](#footnote-72) while Clement’s later hesitations were dictated by his cupidity, since, according to Jean d’Hocsem, the pope was ‘greedy of gold and full of simony.’[[73]](#footnote-73) While echoing much of the Capetian accusations of idolatry and sodomy, the annalist of Ghent incorporated the charge of usury, a possible reflection of his conservative approach against the financial activities of the Templars.[[74]](#footnote-74) The arrest was warmly supported by Guillaume le Maire and Gervais du Bus, who regarded Philip’s actions to be in tune with his grandfather, St. Louis’, spiritual heritage.[[75]](#footnote-75) Most chroniclers in England were also receptive to the Capetian version while considering Philip the Fair to be merely the executor of apostolic will.[[76]](#footnote-76)

The wide, international echo aroused by the Capetian disinformation campaign was undoubtedly due to two main factors, mainly, the Templars’ ubiquity in Christendom and the intensity and scope of Capetian propaganda. Both features brought about the unprecedented enlargement of the communication network, when against the more conservative approach of the privileged aristocracy, both lay and ecclesiastical, the Capetian court searched for and eventually detected a more cooperative ally in the *tiers état*.[[77]](#footnote-77)

**Conclusions**

The disinformation case-studies discussed above offer additional perspectives of historical developments in three cardinal issues of medieval history, namely, the expulsion of the Jews from England (1290), the election of Clement V and the beginning of the Avignon period (1305), and the dissolution of the Templar Order (1312). All three cases were based on disinformation, such as the imaginary conspiration of German Jews, the secret meeting between the King of France and the Archbishop of Bordeaux, and most of the heretical practices attributed to the Order of the Temple as a whole. On the other hand, all three cases encapsulated some authentic elements, such as the growing opposition to Anglo-Jewry, the pro-French policy of Clement V, and the disorders known and criticized in the Templar Order. One should further note the gradual but persistent expansion of the audience to which the authors actually wrote. Though Matthew's *Chronica* was essentially written to monastic, local audiences, Giovanni Villani appealed to larger urban, commercial sectors in the Italian peninsula, while the Capetian disinformation campaign aimed to reach all corners of the Kingdom of France and eventually of Christendom, thus bringing about the enlargement of the communication political network. This is perhaps the most evident gap between the chroniclers’ initiatives in the first two cases, in their limited social scope, vis-à-vis the disinformation campaign initiated and propagated by the Capetian court, which embraced much of Christendom. In all three cases, however, the ambition to shape contemporary opinions assumed the existence of additional information sources, thence the need to thwart them with calculated disinformation.

It seems that medieval chroniclers could hardly be considered the most successful heirs of Herodotus. Nevertheless, perhaps they did follow the footsteps of the Greek historian in their attempt to understand the inner logic of historical developments within the limitations imposed by their Catholic faith and their *weltanschauung* in general. Their reports of non-events should therefore be regarded and consequently evaluated as faithful reflections of the *zeitgeist* within which they were written.
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