

BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX AND THE TWO SWORDS

TEMPLARS, CRUSADES, AND CONSIDERATION:
A STUDY ON BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX'S ALLEGORY OF THE TWO
SWORDS

By

TIMOTHY BASILE, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the Department of Religious Studies, McMaster University

In Partial Fulfilment

For the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

© Copyright Timothy Basile, September 2009

MASTER OF ARTS (2009)

McMaster University

(Religious Studies)

Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Templars, Crusades, and Consideration: A Study on Bernard of
Clairvaux's Allegory of the Two Swords

AUTHOR: Timothy Basile, B.A. (Tyndale University)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Peter Widdicombe

NUMBER OF PAGES: iv, 135

Abstract

While most analyses of Bernard's allegory of the two swords frame the discussion from the perspective of Bernard's overall political theology, this approach often ignores the allegory's connection to the Knights Templar. This thesis examines Bernard of Clairvaux's allegory of the Two Swords from a literary and historical perspective. By examining each of Bernard's uses of the allegory separately and in their own contexts, this thesis aims to identify the various ways in which Bernard used the allegory. As well, this work seeks to understand what the allegory can and cannot tell us about Bernard's overall political theology. This thesis argues that Bernard employed the allegory in order to describe the authority by which the pope may protect the Church when it is threatened, but that the allegory's effectiveness for determining Bernard's political theology outside the context of the Church's defence remains limited.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Introduction: Questions of Bernard's Intention	1
Chapter 1: The Two Swords within the Context of In Praise of the New Knighthood	23
Chapter 2: The Two Swords in the Context of the Second Crusade	51
Chapter 3: The Two Swords within the Context of On Consideration.	81
Conclusion: In Case of Emergency	113
Bibliography	131

Introduction: Questions of Bernard's Intention

The allegory of the 'two swords' has a long and storied involvement in the medieval understanding of the relationship between the church and the state. Interpreting Jesus' sardonic remark to his disciples on the eve of his crucifixion as establishing the manner in which society is to be ordered, medieval thinkers argued that the two swords represented the two powers established by God. These two powers correspond to the regal and sacerdotal powers wielded respectively by the prince and by the priest. The biblical passage is as follows:

He said to them, 'But now if you have a purse, take it, and also a bag; and if you don't have a sword, sell your cloak and buy one. It is written: 'And he was numbered with the transgressors'; and I tell you that this must be fulfilled in me. Yes, what is written about me is reaching its fulfillment.' The disciples said, 'See Lord, here are two swords.' 'That is enough,' he replied.¹

This passage in Luke was compared to a similar one in the book of Matthew in which Peter, upon cutting off the ear of the high priest's servant, is told by Christ to sheathe his sword:

Then the men stepped forward, seized Jesus and arrested him. With that, one of Jesus companions reached for his sword, drew it out and struck the servant of the high priest, cutting off his ear. 'Put your sword back in its place,' Jesus said to him, 'for all who draw the sword will die by the sword.'²

Since Peter appears to be given two swords in one passage but told to sheathe one of them in the other, it seemed logical to the medieval mind that another authority should wield this sword on his behalf, namely the temporal rulers personified by

¹ Luke 22:36-38, *New International Version*.

² Matthew 26:50-52.

the emperor. Peter, having already been given the keys of heaven by Christ in Matthew 16:19, is said to wield spiritual authority. He and his successors are therefore said to wield the ‘spiritual’ sword – the sword Christ did not tell Peter to sheathe. In the sword Christ told Peter to sheathe, medieval interpreters saw the theological basis of the temporal power. Since the clerical nature of Peter’s office explicitly forbade the use of violence, it made sense that another, namely the emperor, received the authority to use violence to maintain order and to defend the Church. Here, it may be said that the material sword signified “the coercive power of secular government,” while the spiritual sword signified “the ecclesiastical power of excommunication.”³ Each power ideally presides over a separate sphere of authority, but given that actions by a temporal ruler often have repercussions elsewhere for the church and vice versa, conflict between the two powers is bound to arise. Ultimately, the issues are the question of allegiance and the ordering of society: does one owe ultimate allegiance to the pope or to the emperor? In the event of a conflict, which power should show deference to the other? What role, if any, should the pope play in the political fortunes of Christendom? Does one power legitimate the other? Medieval popes and jurists (as well as a few kings) alike drew on this passage in order to articulate their vision of Christian society. As a result, this allegory formed part of the basis for the medieval understanding of the papacy and Christian society itself.

³ I. S. Robinson, *The Papacy 1073-1198* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 296-297.

In order to frame Bernard of Clairvaux's use of the allegory in its proper historical context, this introduction will offer a brief synopsis of the medieval understanding of the allegory of the two swords. Although the scale of this introduction limits the scope by which a history of the allegory may be discussed, it is nevertheless important to frame Bernard in his historical milieu. This thesis will therefore outline those medieval thinkers who may have exerted influence upon Bernard's thinking as well as later thinkers who interpreted Bernard to suit their own purposes.

The doctrine of the two swords is based on the understanding that there are two powers, one spiritual the other temporal, which have been established by God for the proper ordering of society. In a letter to the Byzantine Emperor Anastasius I (r. 491-518), Pope Gelasius I (r. 492-496) wrote that "the world is chiefly governed by these two: the sacred authority of the bishops and the royal power."⁴ Gelasius was concerned by the emperor's attempts to regulate doctrine on behalf of the Church and by delineating the two separate powers, he explained to Anastasius that his authority extended only over the temporal sphere. To Gelasius, the spiritual power was the greater of the two powers on account of its charge over men's souls.⁵ Furthermore, the pope argued that although the emperor's authority extends over all temporal affairs, he still remains subject to

⁴ I. S. Robinson, "Church and Papacy" in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought* edited by J. H. Burns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 288.

⁵ John B. Morrall, *Political Thought in Medieval Times* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), 22.

the pope on matters of his own faith and salvation.⁶ Although Gelasius never made the link between the two powers and the two swords, his formulation became widely accepted and widely cited by the tenth century jurists who wished to understand the manner in which God had ordered society.⁷

Although a few metaphors involving two swords surface prior to the ninth century, it is in the ninth century that the link between the two swords and the Gelasian powers was made. Robinson notes that it is at this time that “the classic interpretation of the two swords as the material sword of secular coercion and the spiritual sword of excommunication appears in papal letters.”⁸ Walter Ullman argues that the image of the two swords formed the basis of Pope Paschal I’s coronation of the Emperor Lothair I in 823 CE, where emperor was symbolically presented with a sword by the pope in St. Peter’s basilica. Ullmann contends that later articulations of the two swords recapture this imagery.⁹ It is important to note that before the Investiture Contest of the eleventh century, the image was always intended to suggest harmony and mutual accord between the two powers.¹⁰ In other words, prior to this time the allegory was used simply to describe the manner in which God had ordered society rather than as an assertion of the superiority of one power over the other.

⁶ Robinson, *The Papacy*, 296.

⁷ Robinson, *The Papacy*, 291. Robinson notes that of those scholars who did cite the Gelasian definition of the function of the two powers, it was the cooperation of the *regnum* and the *sacerdotium* which was emphasized.

⁸ Robinson, “Church and Papacy,” 303.

⁹ Walter Ullmann, *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 2003), 95. Of course, Morall notes a counter example where by the eleventh century, it became standard practice for the monarch to hand over to a newly installed bishop the ring and crozier, the visible signs of episcopal authority. See Morall 30-31.

¹⁰ Robinson, “Church and Papacy,” 303.

It was during the conflict between the Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV (1050-1106 CE) and Pope Gregory VII (r. 1073-1085) that the two swords came to prominence in the exposition of political theology. Gregory wrote of the superiority of the sacerdotal power over its secular rival. This superiority gave the pope the right “to excommunicate a delinquent monarch and absolve his subjects from their oaths of fealty to him.”¹¹ The ideal king, then, is seen as a vassal of St. Peter and his successors. A wayward monarch who was not “useful to the holy church” was liable to be excommunicated and replaced by another candidate.¹² In order to make his point, Gregory drew on the Gelasian formulation of the two powers, but omitted from his quotation of Gelasius’ letter the limitation that the emperor was only subject to the pope in matters concerning his own faith and salvation. This implied a complete subjection of the emperor to the pope in matters where political actions entailed ecclesiastical consequences.¹³ Henry, in response, appealed to the two swords as an allegorical portrayal of the spiritual and temporal powers. He argued for a strict dualism – there were two swords wielded by two separate powers and that each retained their respective spheres of authority. By drawing on the theory of the two swords, Henry denied that the papacy had any control over the exercise of temporal power which had been implied by Gregory’s excommunication and deposition of the monarch.¹⁴

¹¹ Morall, 33.

¹² Robinson, “Church and Papacy,” 301. Robinson notes that Gregory’s model was based on the removal of the last Merovingian monarch and the installation of a new candidate as king of the Franks in 751 CE by the pope, who had absolved all the Franks from the oath of fidelity to Pippin.

¹³ Robinson, *The Papacy*, 297.

¹⁴ Morall, 34.

Since each power had been established by God independently, Henry argued that Gregory had abused his position as pontiff by unjustly excommunicating the emperor for political purposes. Although it was only Henry who had appealed to the allegory of the two swords in his espousal of dualism, the bitter nature of their conflict ensured that both sides would in time come to employ the allegory to suit their purposes.

Writing a half century after the Gregorian papacy, Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153 CE) used the allegory of the two swords on three separate occasions. Writing to the Knights Templar in his treatise *In Praise of the New Knighthood* around 1130 CE, Bernard placed the two swords in the hands of this small band of knights. Fighting a double-fronted war against the forces of evil, the Knights Templar fight their enemies with martial prowess (the material sword) and a monastic lifestyle (the spiritual sword).¹⁵ Then, after the failure of the Second Crusade in 1149 CE, Bernard assigned the ownership of both swords to the pope in a letter to Pope Eugenius III (r. 1145-1153).¹⁶ Here, he argued that the pope had the duty as Peter's successor to protect Christians in the east, who were now vulnerable to Muslim incursions due to the Crusade's failure. Bernard's final exposition of the two swords occurs in the treatise *On Consideration*, a serial letter to Pope Eugenius on the nature of his office. In this work, Bernard's personal relationship to the pope, who had at one time been a monk at Clairvaux,

¹⁵ Bernard of Clairvaux, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*. In *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux: Treatises III*. Tr. Conrad Greenia (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1997), 129-130.

¹⁶ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter 399* in *The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*. Tr. Bruno Scott James (London: Burns Oates, 1953), 471. Hereafter enumerated simply by letter and page number. All letters are from the James edition unless otherwise noted.

risers to prominence. Bernard writes that both swords belong to the Church and that the material sword is wielded by the knight “at the bidding of the priest and at the command of the Emperor.”¹⁷ It is Bernard’s formulations of the two swords, especially his later two formulations addressed to Pope Eugenius, which would exert tremendous influence upon later generations.¹⁸

Walter Ullmann has argued that Pope Innocent III’s (r. 1198-1216) thesis that the Emperor was merely an officer or an assistant of the pope owed a great deal to Bernard’s articulation of the two swords. Since Bernard placed both swords in the hand of the pope in his crusade letter, Innocent was able to claim that both regal and sacerdotal powers were inherent to the office of St. Peter. Thus, at the time of coronation, the pope conferred the material sword upon the newly crowned emperor, giving him temporal authority. In other words, it was the pope who made the emperor. Innocent argued that the emperor himself did not possess autonomy but had continually to supplicate papal favour to maintain his position.¹⁹

The development of the two swords as an articulation of papal political supremacy would culminate in the papal bull *Unam sanctam* issued by Pope Boniface VIII in 1302. Here, Boniface articulated his vision of a papal monarchic government based on the idea that the church possessed a single head who had no equal, the pope. Owing part of his formulation to Bernard, Boniface argued that

¹⁷ Bernard, *On Consideration* translated by John D. Anderson and Elizabeth T. Kennan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976), 118.

¹⁸ Ullmann, *The Papacy in the Middle Ages*, 182.

¹⁹ Ullmann, *Medieval Political Thought* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975), 109-110.

pope possessed both swords but could not wield the material sword, which was wielded on kings on behalf of the pope.²⁰ In effect, the bull argued for direct political control over Europe's monarchies by the pope, using the allegory of the two swords and the hierarchical ordering of the universe to make its point.²¹

Where Innocent III had applied the allegory only to the emperor, Boniface VIII extended the logic to all Christian monarchs.²² Consequently, Boniface employed the allegory of the two swords as a means to subordinate all monarchs to the pope. The pope, now the supreme monarch of all Christendom, receives spiritual and temporal authority directly from Christ and now appoints monarchs to govern the temporal realm on his behalf.

Interestingly enough, the allegory was also taken up by Dante Alighieri (1265-1321), who argued that the two swords represented the duty of the Church to spread and to defend the faith. For him, the two swords referred to the Church's powers to exercise authority within its own body as part of this mandate.²³ Since this interpretation limits papal power to solely within its ecclesiastical jurisdiction and not directly within the temporal sphere as argued by *Unam Sanctam*, Dante's exposition resists direct papal control over Europe's monarchs. On this point, Steven Botterill argues that Dante's use of the allegory is a deliberate rejection of the exegetical tradition which had increasingly argued

²⁰ Ullmann, *Medieval Political Thought*, 114-115.

²¹ Morall, 86.

²² Ullmann, *Medieval Political Thought*, 110-111.

²³ Steven Botterill, "Not of this World: Spiritual and Temporal Powers in Dante and Bernard of Clairvaux." *Lectura Dantis* 10 (Spring 1992), 18-19.

for a universal papal monarchy.²⁴ Though it is certain that Dante was familiar with Bernard's use of the two swords, whether his own analysis of the two swords accepts or rejects Bernard's formulation depends largely upon one's estimation of Bernard's own writings.²⁵ Given the lack of scholarly agreement on Bernard's use of the allegory, the question of whether any Bernardine echoes may be found in Dante's treatment of the two swords remains inconclusive. Still, Bernard's influence on the Italian writer on other subjects, especially mysticism, has been well noted by modern scholarship.²⁶

Although Bernard's articulation of the doctrine of the two swords remained influential for those who would argue for a form of papal monarchy, his writings are taken by other medieval thinkers as being a rejection of this very type of political theology. Adriaan Bredero notes that figures such as Wycliffe and Luther cited Bernard's *On Consideration*, the work which contains his final and most detailed exposition of the two swords, as a criticism of papal claims of temporal power.²⁷ As such, Bernard's interpreters run the gamut between those

²⁴ Botterill, "Not of this world," 17.

²⁵ Botterill, "Not of this world," 17-19. Botterill offers two possibilities for Dante's response to Bernard's use of the allegory. Given that Bernard's own use of the allegory are brief and undeveloped, Dante is either rejecting Bernard's formulation due its association with later writers and his place in the exegetical tradition, or he is in fact, dusting off Bernard's 'true' interpretation to combat those who would use it in another way. Botterill, however, recognizes that the link between Bernard and Dante on the allegory of the two swords may be tenuous at best. See also "Ideals of the Institutional Church in Dante and Bernard of Clairvaux" *Italica* 78, no. 3 (Autumn, 2001), 309.

²⁶ Adriaan Bredero, for instance, notes Dante's appreciation of Bernard as a mystical writer in the *Paradisio*. Adriaan Bredero, *Bernard of Clairvaux: Between Cult and History* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 161.

²⁷ Bredero, 148-149. Interestingly enough, Bredero also notes that the Germans who founded the Old Catholic Church in 1870 to protest the doctrine of papal infallibility also drew inspiration from Bernard's work. For Luther's use of Bernard's works to protest papal power, see Carl Volz,

who drew upon his writings as a source of political theology which reduced the emperor to the status of vassal to the pope and those who saw these same writings as a criticism of increased papal power. To Popes Innocent III and Boniface VIII, Bernard's formulation of the two swords became a key component of their arguments for papal superiority. To figures such as Wycliffe and Luther, Bernard's criticisms of papal power became employed in the service of their own battles against the papacy.

Modern scholars are just as divided on Bernard's intentions as their medieval counterparts. Since Bernard's passages on the two swords are brief and relatively undeveloped, interpretations of his use of the two swords are generally determined by each interpreter's overall assessment of Bernard's political theology. Part of this problem lies in the fact that Bernard uses the two swords in a manner which suggests that his audience implicitly understands his use of the terms. Perhaps the best example of this is in *On Consideration*, in which Bernard, after presenting Pope Eugenius with an exposition of the two swords, promises that more a detailed account will follow.²⁸ Although Bernard could not keep his promise due to his death shortly after the composition of the work, it is nonetheless significant that Bernard himself recognized the inadequacy of his own formulation. He simply writes to Eugenius assuming that his basic point will be understood and leaves it at that. At no point does Bernard systematically outline

"Martin Luther's Attitude toward Bernard of Clairvaux" in *Studies in Medieval Cistercian History* (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1971), 202

²⁸ See Bernard, *On Consideration*, 118.

any theory of the two swords. In all three uses of the allegory, Bernard is extrapolating what he assumes to be a known doctrine and contextualizes it a specific situation. As such, it is entirely possible to interpret Bernard as a precursor of both *Unam Sanctam* and Dante in his use of the two swords.

This thesis will begin its assessment of modern scholarship with Walter Ullmann's *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages* and *Medieval Political Thought*, before discussing two works by Elizabeth Kennan. It should be noted that although Kennan extensively discusses Ullmann's work amongst others in her review of scholarship, this thesis will begin with Ullmann since modern scholarship remains preoccupied with responding to the assertion that Bernard was an ardent supporter of the Gregorian movement. This assertion, of course, is not limited to Ullmann. However, as Kennan argues, it is in Ullmann's rendering that Bernard's support of papal monarchy and the Gregorian movement occurs in its most ardent form.²⁹ As a result, it is necessary to delineate Ullmann's view of Bernard's allegory of the two swords before moving on to discuss Kennan's review of scholarship. This thesis will then discuss works on the subject of Bernard's allegory of the two swords by Bernard Jacqueline, Adriaan Bredero, and G. R. Evans.

To Walter Ullmann, Bernard's vision of the pope is as a monarch whose true vocation is to stand outside and above Christian society and whose

²⁹ Elizabeth Kennan, "The 'De Consideratione' of St. Bernard of Clairvaux and the Papacy in the Mid-Twelfth Century: A Review of Scholarship" *Traditio* 33 (1967), 81-83.

jurisdiction extends over all of Christendom.³⁰ Here, Bernard's pope becomes the sole mediator between Christ and humanity and has no equal on earth by virtue of his office. Ullmann writes that to Bernard, "both the royal power and sacerdotal authority were uniquely combined in the pope, hence he was 'the supreme priest and king.'³¹ Consequently, Ullmann interprets Bernard's allegory of the two swords as a political theorem which subordinates all Christian monarchs to the pope. In this schema, the spiritual sword represents the priestly coercive power while the material sword represents the regal coercive power normally associated with the Christian monarch. In this case, however, the pope wields both swords.³² The emperor is said to wield the material sword, but it is the pope who gives it to him at his coronation, and this power is exercised at the bidding of the pope.³³ Here, the Christian monarch derives his authority from the pope, who may establish and depose rulers as he sees fit and retains the "full freedom to act and command in all human affairs."³⁴ For Ullmann, the basic underlying premise behind Bernard's view of the pope is the unity of Christendom under a single head. In this case, Bernard stands in the tradition of Pope Gregory VII, whom Ullmann considers to be the leading exponent of developing theme which places

³⁰ Ullmann, *The Papacy in the Middle Ages*, 181.

³¹ Ullmann, *The Papacy in the Middle Ages*, 182.

³² Walter Ullmann, *Medieval Political Thought*, 110. Ullmann notes that this idea of the pope giving the material sword to the emperor had been continuously and symbolically implemented since the imperial coronation of 823 CE. Given that the sword which had been given during this coronation had been taken from the altar of St. Peter's, no one would have missed the symbolism behind the act. As such, Ullmann argues that Bernard gave form to a belief and practice which had already been in effect for more than three centuries. See Ullmann, *The Papacy in the Middle Ages*, 95 and 182.

³³ Ullmann, *Medieval Political Thought*, 110.

³⁴ Kennan, "De Consideratione", 83.

the pope at the helm of Christian society and gives him absolute rulership thereof.³⁵ As such, Bernard's use of the two swords becomes an exposition of the two powers in keeping with Gregory VII's thesis. With this understanding, Bernard's formulation of the two swords consequently becomes the commonly accepted expression in the medieval period. This allows Ullmann to equate Bernard with later thinkers such as Innocent III and Boniface VIII.³⁶

Elizabeth Kennan, in her review of scholarship,³⁷ has noted the broad range of modern interpreters of *On Consideration*. Focusing on the issue of Bernard's so-called 'Gregorian' credentials, Kennan divides scholarship between those who would interpret Bernard's final treatise as emblematic of a Gregorian worldview and those who interpret the work as a criticism of the movement. Though other issues such as Bernard's use of the phrase *plenitudo potestatis* in relation to the pope and his involvement in the Anacletan schism are important to the debate, front and centre remains one's interpretation of Bernard's allegory of the two swords. To those who would interpret Bernard as an unabashed supporter of the Gregorian movement, such as Ullmann, the two swords become a central doctrinal formulation on the relationship between the pope and Christian

³⁵ Kennan, "De Consideratione," 81; Ullmann, *Medieval Political Thought*, 102. See also Ullmann, *The Papacy in the Middle Ages*, 140. Ullmann argues that Gregory VII held that the king's duty was obedience to the pope. All Christians (including the King) were subject to the pope. While this type of 'hierocratic ideology' comes to full maturity during the reign of Gregory VII, for Ullmann he is merely the personification of this ideology. Ullmann places Bernard squarely in this tradition.

³⁶ See Ullmann, *Medieval Political Thought*, 109-111.

³⁷ Kennan, "De Consideratione," 76-94.

monarchs.³⁸ To those who disagree with Ullmann's Gregorian thesis, the two swords are taken as the two sanctions by which the church may defend itself,³⁹ or as disapproval of Eugenius' military action against the Romans.⁴⁰ Kennan notes that the broad range of interpretations exist because of the subjective nature of determining Bernard's motives.

Bernard's character is still controversial and some part of one's account of his work will always rest on a personal estimate of his intentions and outlook. This latter problem makes it improbable that scholars will ever agree upon a single definitive rendering of St. Bernard's theory of the papacy.⁴¹

From here, Kennan's task is to clarify Bernard's terminology in order to narrow the field of interpretation. While differing interpretations of the two swords will always exist, Kennan is quick to point out that Bernard is not using the allegory as a vehicle by which to establish a political theory, but that he is merely referring to the means by which the church may coerce.⁴² She concludes her review of scholarship by arguing that Bernard's use of the two swords within *On Consideration* refers to a specific event and therefore may only possess a limited frame of reference.⁴³ At any rate, Kennan is careful to point out Bernard's use of

³⁸ See Kennan's treatment of Ullmann's interpretation of the two swords, "De Consideratione," 82.

³⁹ Kennan, "De Consideratione," 85.

⁴⁰ Kennan, "De Consideratione," 89.

⁴¹ Kennan, "De Consideratione," 94.

⁴² Kennan, "De Consideratione," 102-104. On this point Kennan is following Stickler's assessment of the two swords. She notes, however, that Stickler assumes that Bernard uses the same terminology as canon lawyers and was conversant with their work.

⁴³ Kennan, "De Consideratione," 111. Kennan notes also that Bernard's other use of the two swords in which he refers to the pope, in the context of the Second Crusade, itself also suggests a limited frame of reference.

antithesis as a rhetorical device within *On Consideration*.⁴⁴ She notes that Bernard is careful to establish a tension between a number of contradictory poles which comprise the papal office. The right course of action and the right understanding of the papacy is found by recognizing this tension. The danger to the modern interpreter, she argues, is to overlook the delicate balance established within the work itself. Indeed, she notes that most historians and political analysts have fallen into this error, and as a result, have largely advanced a single pole as their unique interpretation of *On Consideration*, rather than noting the tension at the heart of Bernard's work.⁴⁵

Bernard Jacqueline begins his assessment of his namesake's allegory of the two swords by comparing the monk to his contemporaries. In contrast to Gratian, Peter the Venerable and others of his age, Bernard of Clairvaux did not simply interpret the swords as the two powers of civil and spiritual authority, where the temporal sword is given to the prince while the spiritual sword is given to the priest, but instead established a more nuanced interpretation dependent upon the context in which he was writing.⁴⁶ Jacqueline notes that in each use of the allegory, the subject who is given the swords is different. Within *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, Bernard assigns the swords to the faithful. In his Crusade letter to Eugenius, Bernard assigns both swords to the pope while in *On*

⁴⁴ Elizabeth Kennan, "Antithesis and Argument in the *De Consideratione*" in *Bernard of Clairvaux: Studies Presented to Dom Jean Leclercq*. (Washington: Cistercian Publications, 1973), 91-2.

⁴⁵ Kennan, "Antithesis and Argument," 93.

⁴⁶ Bernard Jacqueline, *Episcopat et Papauté chez St. Bernard de Clairvaux* (Saint-Lo : Éditions Henri Jacqueline, 1975), 119-121.

Consideration, the swords are assigned to the Church.⁴⁷ Jacqueline's interpretation of the two swords links them to two forms of power rather than the two powers:

Les deux glaives, dans les trois textes, représentent les deux formes de pouvoir coactif, excommunication ou contrainte corporelle et non pas les deux pouvoirs, temporel ou spirituel.⁴⁸

There is a distinct development in Bernard's thought: Jacqueline argues that his formulation in *On Consideration* is the most developed of his three uses since it assigns both swords to the Church as a whole rather than a specific person or group. He argues that Bernard's concern in each circumstance is that the temporal authorities utilize their martial prowess in the service of the Church rather than for their own purposes.⁴⁹ In the end, however, the monk from Clairvaux is simply more interested in specific solutions to concrete problems than he is in constructing an abstract theory relating the temporal powers to the spiritual. To Jacqueline, Bernard's pope is best described as a *villicus*, the serf entrusted to administrate the domain of his master on his behalf. Since the pope is merely managing Christ's affairs rather than exercising a dominion of his own, pontifical authority becomes an expression of service unto humanity rather than an end in itself.⁵⁰

More recently, Adriaan Bredero has emphasized the importance of Bernard's personal relationship with Eugenius in his assessment of Bernard's

⁴⁷ Jacqueline, 124.

⁴⁸ Jacqueline, 124.

⁴⁹ Jacqueline, 124.

⁵⁰ Jacqueline, 214-217.

view of the papacy. Bredero argues that those who have traditionally interpreted Bernard as a sponsor of papal theocracy have by and large ignored the relationship of abbot and novice at the heart of Bernard's writings to Pope Eugenius.⁵¹ Seen in the light of this relationship, Bernard's political thoughts within *On Consideration* "may have had less ideological significance than has repeatedly been assumed."⁵² Though Bernard's comments on the papacy within this work undoubtedly shed light upon his view of the papacy, Bredero places the stress upon this relationship; Bernard is simply advising a novice in his capacity as an abbot. By his own admission, Bredero ignores the allegory's connection to the Templars on account of its lack of connection to the pope and instead chooses to focus upon Bernard's later uses of the allegory in order better to analyze Bernard's view of the papacy rather than the two swords themselves. Here, Bredero notes a distinction between Bernard's use of the allegory in his crusade letter and in *On Consideration* with regard to papal claims to secular power wielded on behalf of the pope. After the Second Crusade, Bernard based his appeal to Eugenius on his responsibility as Peter's successor: Eugenius' task was to see to it that others drew the secular sword in the pope's name. However, in *On Consideration*, Bernard advised the pope to handle only the spiritual sword and leave it to others (specifically the Emperor) to wield the secular sword. Bredero argues that the emphasis placed upon the mutual interaction of the two powers in this later treatise distinguishes it from his crusade letter. In fact,

⁵¹ Bredero, 145.

⁵² Bredero, 146.

Bernard's argument that the pope should be reluctant to commit troops against Arnold of Brescia in Rome is placed distinctively at odds with the situation encountered after the Crusade where the exercise of the material sword is immediately necessary. Bredero resolves this contradiction by noting the situational nature of Bernard's writings: "Bernard based his arguments about the temporal and spiritual power of the pope on concrete situations as they occurred."⁵³ Bredero concludes that there remains insufficient evidence to paint Bernard as an unqualified defender of papal theocracy as formulated by Pope Gregory VII.⁵⁴ For him, Bernard's formulations of the two swords represent situationally driven expositions rather than doctrinal formulations on the nature of the papacy.

Finally, G. R. Evans emphasizes the hierarchical nature of Bernard's political theology and the fact that it is driven by eschatological concerns. At the heart of the matter lies a desire for right order, both at a personal level and in the political realm. Bernard's ultimate concern is proper ordering of one's loves.⁵⁵ Much like Augustine, Bernardine political theology involves ordering society in conformity with the ideal of "loving God best."⁵⁶ To this end, Evans argues that within *On Consideration* and emphasized once more in his letter to Conrad,

⁵³ Bredero, 152.

⁵⁴ Bredero, 153. Bredero's analysis also includes a discussion of Bernard's use of the term *plenitudo potestatis* – Bredero concludes that Bernard uses this term to refer solely to the pope's authority within the church.

⁵⁵ G. R. Evans, *Bernard of Clairvaux* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 152-153.

⁵⁶ Evans emphasizes this link with Augustine, noting that for both thinkers, political theology "never *merely* this-worldly." Evans, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 153 [Italics original]. Evans even goes so far as to label *On Consideration* as Bernard's *City of God*, noting that both writers at the time of composition faced troublesome historical circumstances to which they replied by emphasizing God's providential hand in history. See also 156.

Bernard “takes the pope to be supreme over all secular powers”⁵⁷ since this is the pattern of right order established by God. The two swords are then taken as describing the relationship between Church and state, or more appropriately, as describing the manner by which the two kinds of power, the spiritual and the secular, interact with each other. According to the allegory, both powers are given to the pope, to whom the Emperor must show reverence.⁵⁸ Because the pope cannot himself commit the acts of violence implied by exercise of the material sword, he must entrust this power to another. In other words, “The soldier’s sword belongs to the Pope”⁵⁹ - the pope reigns supreme over all secular powers. Of course, there are limits to papal power; the pope cannot unjustly excommunicate monarchs in order to achieve his political ends, for instance.⁶⁰ For Evans, these limitations are in keeping with Bernard’s understanding of *rectus ordo*; a pope who himself took up arms would be more concerned with maintaining and acquiring political power, a lowly task not in keeping with the office of Peter. More importantly, such an action would run against Bernard’s ideals of love and virtue.

Even until recently, the main issues within studies of Bernard have been whether or not Bernard was an ardent supporter of the Gregorian movement during his own time. The question of Bernard’s political theology in any analysis

⁵⁷ Evans, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 154.

⁵⁸ Evans, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 154.

⁵⁹ Evans, *The Mind of St. Bernard of Clairvaux* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 198.

⁶⁰ Evans, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 154-5. Significantly, while Evans points to Gregory VII’s battle against Henry IV as informing Bernard’s view of the relationship of the pope to the emperor, her example of unjust excommunication is Paschal II’s in his fight against the emperor.

of the two swords, it seems, cannot be divorced from the Gregorian question due to the implications of the movement. Even recent works such as Evans' *Bernard of Clairvaux*, which does not directly deal with this question in her outline of Bernard's political theology, alludes to the fact that the events of Gregory VII's papacy, among others, form the backdrop for Bernard's own intellectual development.⁶¹ Elizabeth Kennan's assertion that one's interpretation of Bernard is largely dependent upon a personal estimation of his outlook undoubtedly holds true.⁶² Nevertheless, a few points may be made. First and foremost, Bernard's personal relationship with Eugenius should not be ignored, an argument made most articulately by Adriaan Bredero.⁶³ Bernard's concern remained first and foremost the spiritual well-being of his disciple rather than a detailed exposition of political theology. Second, Bernard's writings on the two swords are each occasioned by a specific historical circumstance. His formulation of the allegory within *In Praise of the New Knighthood* cannot be divorced from the worsening security of the Crusader states and the formation of the military order, nor can his other references be separated from the failure of the Second Crusade or the Roman populist revolt under Arnold of Brescia, respectively. In each case, the church or the faithful were perceived as being threatened.⁶⁴

While most scholarly discussions of Bernard's political theology freely ignore the allegory's connection to the Knights Templar, this thesis will include

⁶¹ See Evans, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, 154.

⁶² Kennan, "De Consideratione," 94.

⁶³ See Bredero, 145-147.

⁶⁴ See Jacqueline, 123.

the Templar reference because it is analysis of Bernard's use of the allegory rather than of his overall political theology. Moreover, Bernard's use of the allegory within *In Praise of the New Knighthood* sheds light on his understanding of the ideal soldier and in so doing, partially outlines the purpose of the temporal power. By providing a different context to evaluate his use of the allegory, it may well give the reader a better grasp of how the allegory fits into Bernard's political theology and how he uses the allegory in an overall sense. Whatever the place of *In Praise of the New Knighthood* may or may not occupy within Bernard's political theology, he nevertheless used the allegory to refer to the Templars and did so purposely.

While the scope of this work will by no means delve into every issue surrounding Bernard's use of the allegory of the two swords, its aim will be to comprehend the way in which he uses the allegory and the degree to which it fits into and/or reflects his overall political theology. Since Bernard referred to the two swords on three separate occasions, this work will be divided into three chapters, each dealing with a particular use of the allegory. Being his earliest formulation of the allegory, the first chapter will focus on his formulation within the treatise *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, his work on the spiritual and the martial prowess of the Knights Templar. While the literary context will be important, the chapter will also focus on Bernard's own involvement in the fledgling military Order. Next, a chapter will be devoted to Bernard's writings on the Second Crusade and its aftermath, since his second use of the allegory occurs

in a letter to Pope Eugenius III urging him to call what would have been a Third Crusade after the failure of the Second Crusade. Of special relevance to this thesis is the role of the pope in calling a crusade as well as Bernard's own personal involvement in the crusade itself. Finally, a chapter will be devoted to Bernard's use of the allegory within *On Consideration*, the work most associated with his view of the place of the papacy itself. As a result, this final chapter will also focus on Bernard's personal relationship with Eugenius, since it is instrumental for interpreting the work itself. By emphasizing the context in which Bernard used the allegory of the two swords through this thesis, I hope to arrive at a more robust understanding of his formulation.

Chapter 1 - The Two Swords within the Context of *In Praise of the New*

Knighthood

In opening chapter of *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, Bernard describes the Knight of the Temple as one who “powerfully gird[s] himself with both swords.”¹ The image presented is one in which Bernard utilizes an allegorized reading of Luke 22:38 in order to combine the normally incompatible offices of monk and soldier.² For Bernard, the Templars are a unique innovation: Soldiers and monks are common enough, to be sure, but it is the Knight of the Temple who artfully fights the enemy on both the spiritual and temporal fronts. By taking religious vows and adopting the monastic lifestyle, this new type of soldier avoids the excesses normally associated with the conventional military lifestyle and instead devotes his energy towards fighting for the cause of Christ.³ Bernard’s use of the ‘two swords’ allegory within this work presents a problem for those wishing to understand his use of this allegory as only describing the divinely sanctioned power dynamic between the ecclesiastical authorities and their princely counterparts. This is because the context describes the manner in which the Knights Templar are to fight and does not describe the authority of the pope in relation to historical events, unlike Bernard’s ‘two swords’ passages within other

¹ Bernard of Clairvaux, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*. In *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux: Treatises III*. Tr. Conrad Greenia (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1997), 129-130. Bernard uses the image of the two swords a second time on 135, this time occurring in the context of using both swords to drive non-Christians from the holy land.

² See, for instance, Bernard’s own arguments against monks becoming soldiers in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter 80* in *The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*. Tr. Bruno Scott James (London: Burns Oates, 1953), 116-118. It should be noted that all Bernardine letters and their numbering herein are from the James edition unless otherwise noted.

³ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 134. See also 132-133 for Bernard’s critique of the excesses normally associated with the conventional military.

works. Thus, the ‘two swords’ passages within *In Praise of the New Knighthood* have often been downplayed or even outright ignored in scholarly discussions pertaining to Bernard’s theory of spiritual and temporal powers. Adriaan Bredero notes that “The passage is usually, and justifiably, ignored in this connection, since in this treatise the metaphor was not applied to the pope.”⁴ Yet, since Bernard’s use of the allegory first surfaces in the context *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, it may be beneficial also to understand the way in which Bernard uses this allegory here in addition to his views on the fledgling military Order. In order to comprehend better how Bernard uses the allegory of the two swords, this chapter will examine the way in which he describes the Knights Templar themselves. Since he describes these knights as wielding both swords, this chapter will also examine the manner in which Bernard describes the Templars as well his involvement in the movement, since the text in question remained influential in Templar’s own self understanding.

Occasioned by the lack of manpower and deteriorating security situation in the Crusader States after the success of the First Crusade, the Knights Templar were formed in 1118 CE as a means to protect pilgrims in the Holy Land and to safeguard the territory possessed by the Crusaders.⁵ Since many Crusaders returned to Europe after Jerusalem had fallen in 1099 CE, the Crusader States perennially suffered from acute numerical and logistical disadvantages from the

⁴ Adriaan Bredero, *Bernard of Clairvaux: Between Cult and History* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 145.

⁵ Gordon Napier, *The Rise and Fall of the Knights Templar* (Staplehurst: Spellmount, 2003), xi.

outset. Even after a modicum of stability had been established in the Levant, the security of the newly conquered lands remained a pressing issue – a concern rendered all the more severe given the sudden interest in pilgrimage to the holy places as a result of Jerusalem's capture by the Crusaders.⁶ The result was bound to be a perilous expedition for the pilgrims, who had to rely on dangerous roads to make the journey between Jerusalem and the other notable places of pilgrimage. A pilgrim who ventured outside the fortified cities continually remained in severe danger of being ambushed by armed bandits.⁷ Out of the desire to protect these pilgrims, the Knights Templar were formed under the leadership of Hughes de Payens and were shortly thereafter given quarters on the former site of Solomon's Temple by King Baldwin II.⁸ Even though the security situation was never fully resolved, the Templars began instituting regular patrols along the more commonly travelled routes in order to protect pilgrims as they went on their way.⁹ Although the Templars initially faced difficulties establishing their order and acquiring new recruits,¹⁰ they quickly became involved in the politics of the region and

⁶ J. M. Upton-Ward, *Introduction to The Rule of the Templars* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1992), 1.1e

⁷ Malcolm Barber, *The New Knighthood: A History of the Order of the Temple* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 3.

⁸ Peter Partner, *The Knights Templar & Their Myth* (Rochester: Destiny Books, 1990), 3.

⁹ Barber, 5. See also Partner 3.

¹⁰ Barber sees evidence for signs of failing morale within the Order in the years leading up to the council of Troyes where the Templar received papal recognition. Even though Barber sees the story of the nine knights for nine years as suspicious on the grounds of symmetry (never mind that it is contradicted by another chronicle), he nevertheless argues that the early years of the order were characterized by a lack of success. The Templars' place of residence had become dilapidated due to a lack of manpower and resources. See Barber, 10-11; Upton-Ward, 3. Leclercq sees the dual nature of monk and soldier as being the reason why the Templar Order initially faced difficulties getting off the ground. See Jean Leclercq, "Un Document sur les Débuts des Templiers." In *Recueil D'Études sur Saint Bernard et ses Écrits*. (Rome: Edizioni di Storia et Letteratura, 1966), 89.

eventually became an unrivalled military force in both the holy land and in Europe.¹¹

For all the lore surrounding the Knights Templar, their historical significance to this present chapter concerns only those details which are pertinent to Bernard's understanding of their Order and his involvement in their affairs. In regard to the former constraint, it may be said that the Templars represented a unique innovation in the history of Christian practice and thought. In essence, they represented the novel fusion of the traditional offices of monk and soldier. One of the fundamental distinctions of medieval society became muddled when Hughes de Payens formed a military order fashioned according to the Rule of St. Augustine.¹² Prior to the Templar, the lifestyle of the soldier was depicted as being antithetical to that of a religious order. The clergy were absolutely forbidden to shed blood; a monk who took up arms or even participated in crusade was liable to be excommunicated.¹³ Even when a soldier laid down his weapons, there was a general unease about letting such an individual assume a clerical vocation. Peter Partner writes that "even when noblemen of knightly status repented, and in mature years sought the life of the cloister, those within the

¹¹ Napier, xi-xij, 17. Barber notes that by the year 1300, the Templars had built a network of 870 castles, its own maritime fleet, and had as many as 7,000 knights and many times that number of priests, associate members and other personnel in the Order at its height of power. Of course, the suppression of 1312 quickly destroyed the Templar Empire nearly overnight. See Barber, 1-2.

¹² Upton-Ward, 1. See also Napier, 25. This point is itself recognized in a letter by Hughes de Saint-Victor (previously thought to be written by Hughes de Payens), a letter which had been found with *In Praise of the New Knighthood* and *The Rule of the Templars*, suggesting its importance to the Order and hence that the Templars themselves understood this dual nature. See Leclercq, 89.

¹³ Bernard's own argument against monks on crusade may be found in *Letter 396*, 468. Moreover, Bernard himself notes his own ineligibility, due to the nature of his office, to wield weapons even for the cause of Christ, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 127.

monastery who had been nourished there from childhood were often reluctant to welcome the recruit.”¹⁴ Yet, the Templars not only strove to utilize their swords for religious purposes, but also adopted the monastic lifestyle as their own. Through the adoption of monastic practices, the Templars saw themselves as revitalizing the office of the knight which had become corrupted through its desire to plunder and kill.¹⁵ Early in their history, however, the novelty of this dual vocation caused considerable doubt among even Templars themselves, many of whom wished to adopt a more traditional religious lifestyle in place of the armed one adopted by the Templars.¹⁶

Like much else of consequence in the Twelfth Century, Bernard of Clairvaux was extremely influential in the formation of the Knights Templar. For one, Bernard chaired the council of Troyes in 1128 or 1129 CE, the council where the Templars gained papal recognition. Gordon Napier, for instance, attributes the new Order’s recognition to Bernard’s enthusiastic support at the council.¹⁷ More importantly, Bernard himself supervised the drafting of the Latin Rule of the Templars, replacing the Rule of St. Augustine which they had adopted with another more in line with the Benedictine Rule used by the Cistercians.¹⁸ Though Bernard had a hand in its formation, it should be noted that the Rule of the

¹⁴ Partner, 6.

¹⁵ *The Rule of the Templars*. Tr. J. M. Upton-Ward (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1992), 19.

¹⁶ Marie Luise Bulste-Thiele, “The Influence of St. Bernard of Clairvaux on the Formation of the Order of the Knights Templar” in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*. Ed. Michael Gervers (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1992), 58.

¹⁷ Napier, 19. Bernard is listed as a participant in the council, as one whose words were liberally praised, according to *The Rule of the Templars*, 20-21, suggesting a position of honour at the council.

¹⁸ Napier, 25. Upton-Ward, 3.

Templars cannot simply be taken as one of Bernard's works, since "it is impossible to ascertain which parts of the manuscripts were composed by Hugh, the Council, the patriarch, the Chapter of the Order, or Bernard."¹⁹ In addition to chairing the Council of Troyes and supervising the drafting of their Rule, Bernard also had a hand in their early affairs. He wrote a letter to one of the first Templars, Hugh de Champagne, praising him for his decision to join the newly fashioned Order.²⁰ Bernard also received André of Montbard at Clairvaux, his relative and the future fifth Grand Master of the Order, at the behest of King Baldwin II of Jerusalem who had asked Bernard to secure papal recognition.²¹ Perhaps most importantly, Bernard's treatise, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, was instrumental in rallying support for the Order.²² In fact, Malcolm Barber argues that it was partly because of this treatise and the strength of Bernard's personality that the fusion of offices present at the heart of the order was ultimately accepted by the larger medieval world.²³ It is to this treatise that this chapter now turns.

To begin, it may be said that Bernard describes the Order of the Knights Templar as being the unique fusion of the traditionally separate offices of monk

¹⁹ Bulst-Thiele, 59, though Napier argues that Bernard supervised the drafting of the Latin Rule, 25.

²⁰ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter 32*, 65

²¹ Napier, 18.

²² Bulst-Thiele, 59. Bernard's treatise itself was kept in a position of prominence, alongside *The Rule of the Templars* and a letter by Hughes de Saint-Victor, suggesting that the work helped shape the Templar's own self-understanding of their Order. Leclercq, 98. See also Barber, 44.

²³ Barber, 50. More than this, Norman Housely notes that even through *In Praise of the New Knighthood* specifically concerns the Templars, it was cited more frequently than any other treatise in relation to crusading. Norman Housely, *Contesting the Crusades* (Maden: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 54.

and soldier.²⁴ The Knight of the Temple, he writes, is a soldier-monk who fights battles on both the spiritual and temporal fronts. Bernard himself recognizes the novelty of this new order and in fact argues that it is this which gives the Templars their distinctiveness. He remarks that it is a common sight to see men wielding the sword in battle against a fleshly enemy.²⁵ The Knight of the Temple is engaged in the pursuits of the military life, and as such, he wages war against his enemies using physically violent means. In this case, they are tasked with forcibly driving non-Christians from the holy land and protecting pilgrims from bandits.²⁶ So too is it a common sight to see spiritual battles being waged against vices and demons, writes Bernard. The world is, after all, full of monks who ardently engage in such activities.²⁷ Much like for the monk, Bernard writes that the Knight of the Temple holds voluntary poverty, celibacy, discipline and obedience in high regard.²⁸ This unique combination of military prowess and a monastic lifestyle is not simply the adoption of certain aspects of the monastic vocation by a group of knights or of the military armament by a group of monks

²⁴ John Sommerfeld argues that Bernard saw a threefold division of society: the prelate, the monk, and the married person. Though the divisions between prelate and monk may be transgressed to a certain degree, the division between the laity and the clerical and the ascetic vocations are more cut and dry. Sommerfeld argues that Bernard makes clear and self-conscious distinctions between these functions of society, the biggest distinction being the contrast between the chastity of the monks and prelates and the childbearing role of the married. See "The Social Theory of Bernard of Clairvaux" in *Studies in Medieval Cistercian History* (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1971), 39-40, 46.

²⁵ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 129.

²⁶ G. R. Evans, *The Mind of St. Bernard of Clairvaux* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 26.

²⁷ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 129.

²⁸ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 138-139. The *Rule of the Templars* itself describes the Order as being participating in the 'religious life,' a sign that they themselves considered themselves on par with monks, 23. Also note, that *The Rule* regards chastity as a prerequisite of salvation, and hence their reason for adopting it, 24.

but rather the complete fusion of both vocations. Bernard himself seems at a loss for words as for how he should describe this new group:

I do not know if it would be more appropriate to refer to them as monks or as soldiers, unless perhaps it would be better to recognize them as being both. Indeed they lack neither monastic meekness nor military might.²⁹

In short, Bernard sees the Templar as being a unique hybrid between soldier and monk; a soldier charged with defending the holy land and protecting pilgrims while at the same time conforming to the rigours of the monastic vocation.

For Bernard, these two offices are drawn together for the express purpose of protecting the faithful both spiritually and physically. He writes that the Templar, or as he puts it, the 'knight of Christ,'³⁰ fights the non-Christian so that in the end, Christ may be glorified. In killing others, the cause of Christ is furthered.³¹ This does not mean that Bernard favours a wholesale slaughter of non-Christian peoples so that Christ may be glorified by the expansion of Christendom. Rather, this articulation of the efficacy of martial might to further Christ's cause is primarily due to the worsening security situation in the holy land. Bernard is able to describe the military accomplishments of the Templars as furthering the cause of Christ because bandits put Christian pilgrims in harm's way and their efforts to protect them work against this trend. His articulation specifically relates to the political and military superiority of non-Christians over Christ's faithful. He writes:

²⁹ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 140.

³⁰ This usage of this term is mirrored by *The Rule of the Templars*, 19.

³¹ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 134.

I do not mean to say that the pagans are to be slaughtered when there is any other way to prevent them from harassing and persecuting the faithful, but only that it now seems better to destroy them than that the rod of sinners be lifted over the lot of the just, and the righteous perhaps put forth their hands into iniquity.³²

Note that even though Bernard's immediate concern is the persecution of the faithful, his ultimate concern is the spiritual well-being of Christians in the holy land. Bernard is alarmed that otherwise upright Christians might potentially stray from the faith in the face of danger. The establishment of security therefore becomes an important facet of pilgrim spirituality since the pilgrims depend on safe passage in order to visit the holy places. The most effective means to bring this about, Bernard writes, is to drive non-Christians from the holy land.³³

Bernard concludes his thought by noting that: "Thus when the transgressors of divine law have been expelled, the righteous nation that keeps the truth may enter in security."³⁴ True security, then, involves the complete political and military control of the region by Christian forces. Bernard seems to be assuming that a Holy Land populated only by Christians will usher in a new period of security since there will be no one to oppress pilgrims. More Christians would then be free to reap the spiritual rewards offered by pilgrimage to the holy places. This

³² Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 135. Bernard uses a similar argument when writing to English on the eve of the crusade, expressing that the 'pagans' should be killed because they attacked Christians, while the Jews should remain subjugated to Christians (and as such, should be given time to convert). *Letter 391*, 462. See also David Berger, "The Attitude of St. Bernard of Clairvaux toward the Jews," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 40 (1972): 92.

³³ Jacqueline notes here that Bernard normally holds that the best solution is to either convert or subjugate the troublesome non-Christians, but since they represent an immediate danger to Christians, the solution is then to kill them in order not to risk Christian subjugation. See Jacqueline, 140.

³⁴ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 135.

utopian vision is seen as being brought about by a miraculous deliverance by God, using groups such as the Knights Templar and Crusaders to achieve this goal.³⁵

As such, the mission of the Templars becomes all the more significant, since their physical battle takes on a spiritual facet. In fighting bandits and non-Christians, the Templars are able to also contribute to ongoing spiritual warfare conducted by monks, even as they also directly participate in spiritual warfare themselves through prayer and their monastic lifestyle.

It is in this manner that Bernard describes their task as waging a “twofold war both against flesh and blood and against a spiritual army of evil in the heavens.”³⁶ It is not two wars that the Templars fight, one physical and the other spiritual, but rather a single war waged on two fronts. As such, the battle waged trying to reclaim the holy land represents a different facet of the same spiritual war undertaken by monks through prayer.³⁷ This imagery is amply demonstrated in Bernard’s description of the Templar quarters. Having adorned the temple with weapons and armaments instead of jewels and precious metals, the Knights of the Temple have replaced the traditional religious ornaments with military hardware

³⁵ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 135-136. See also Jürgen Miethke, “L’Engagement Politique : La Seconde Croisade” in *Bernard de Clairvaux: Histoire, Mentalités, Spiritualité*. Colloque de Lyon-Cîteaux-Dijon (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992), 488. Though Miethke is speaking specifically of the crusades and their salvific nature, he argues that the war is seen as a penitential exercise, which requires the faithful to complete military tasks on God’s behalf—even if God could theoretically send legions of angels to complete the task himself. God enables a “temps favourable” in which he affords sinners the opportunity to obtain indulgence for their sins by going on Crusade.

³⁶ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 129.

³⁷ Evans, *The Mind of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, 25-27. Bernard himself articulates the spiritual warfare engaged by monks in *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 129 and also in *The Song of Songs I*. Tr. Kilian Walsh (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1981), 6 though this second reference pertains more to the monk’s daily fight against vice (but is still portrayed as spiritual warfare).

more befitting their dual function as monk and soldier.³⁸ Bernard finds this new choice of décor preferable: the austerity of the temple cannot help but reveal the religious fervour of its occupants. As such, this ‘new’ temple is no less glorious than its predecessor which had been arrayed in gold and silver since the new temple points towards that which is spiritual by nature. Of course, there is the obvious point to make that by adorning a holy place with military implements, the Knights of the Temple themselves understood the spiritual significance of their military task.

For a new kind of war, Bernard envisages a new kind of soldier. He writes that the Templar is one who fights not out of a vain desire to achieve glory in itself, but rather one who fights out of a fervent desire to further the cause of Christ. In order to describe the Templars in this way, Bernard contrasts this ‘new knighthood’ with the goals and aspirations of the ‘worldly knighthood.’ Here, Bernard distinguishes between two classes of soldiers, the noble *militia* who embody the chivalric ideal and the derogatory *malitia* – the malicious warriors who fight for their own gain.³⁹ Bernard is not kind in his description of worldly knights. He describes the *malitia* as a lamentable class of knights which serves no purpose other than to unleash sin and death upon themselves and their victims alike. This class of soldiers is also vain and narcissistic: Bernard depicts these worldly knights as effeminately brandishing the entrapments of gold, silver, and

³⁸ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 142.

³⁹ Aryeh Grabois, “*Militia* and *Malitia*: The Bernardine Vision of Chivalry” in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, ed Michael Gervers (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1992), 49.

other jewellery, even to the detriment of their own military prowess. When two such knights meet on the battlefield, the result is “the mortal sin of the victor and the eternal death of the vanquished.”⁴⁰ Bernard paints this type of knight as acting in a manner which is detrimental to his salvation; fighting for a perverse cause (his own glory), the result of his fighting could only be considered evil. Of course, Bernard admittedly recognizes that some soldiers fight for different reasons than others. Some fight for glory, while others fight merely to save their own skin. Yet, even the latter case is considered sinful as the warrior attempts to preserve his body to the detriment of his soul.⁴¹ By fighting for a cause other than Christ, the worldly knight puts his salvation in jeopardy.

By contrast, Bernard paints the Knights Templar, the knights of ‘new knighthood,’ as actively working toward their salvation by fighting “the battles of their Lord.”⁴² Aryeh Grabois notes that although Bernard applies the *militia Christi* qualification exclusively to the Templars within *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, the distinction between *militia* and *malitia* has its roots in the Peace and Truce of God movements of the preceding century. Here, it was understood that the chivalrous knights worked to protect churches, the poor and the oppressed, while the malicious knights fought for their own gain.⁴³ Grabois argues that while Bernard was not the first to distinguish between chivalrous and malicious knights, he nevertheless narrowly adapted this distinction to contrast the

⁴⁰ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 132.

⁴¹ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 131.

⁴² Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 134.

⁴³ Grabois, 51.

Knights of the Temple with their worldly counterparts. Grabois' point about this work being a propaganda treatise and thus liable to overstating points is valid. He notes that Bernard also included the crusaders and other 'good' knights within the *militia* category when writing of the Crusade, even if Bernard is only speaking of the Templars within this present treatise. Bernard's point, Grabois argues, is not so much to distinguish between the Templars and all other knights, but rather to distinguish between the 'good' knights from the 'bad' via their actions and their motives. Bernard's ideal knighthood (which includes the Templars and does not exclude other soldiers) fights on behalf of the church, and protects the poor, rather than those who fight for their own benefit or that of their king.⁴⁴

In the end, the difference between these two classes of warriors lies primarily in their motives, and not just the monastic lifestyle adopted by the Templars. Bernard writes that, in battle, one's motives for fighting remain the determining factor in whether or not the bloodshed is deleterious to one's salvation:

Indeed, danger or victory for a Christian depends on dispositions of his heart and not on the fortunes of war. If he fights for a good reason, the issue of his fight can never be evil; and likewise the result can never be considered good if the reason were evil and the intentions perverse.⁴⁵

Bernard goes beyond simply affirming that those with pure intentions behave in an appropriate manner conducive to their goal. Rather, one's means in warfare are considered to be justified by their ends sought on account of one's

⁴⁴ Grabois, 54.

⁴⁵ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 131.

dispositions. As long as one's motives are correct, that is that one fights for Christ, then the bloodshed is considered justifiable on these grounds. It has already been discussed above, for instance, that Bernard elsewhere justifies the slaughter of non-Christian peoples on the basis that they present a political or military problem to Christians.⁴⁶ In order to assure the safety of Christian penitents, Bernard is prepared to justify the slaughter of non-Christian peoples and even assigns spiritual benefits to participating in this bloodshed. For Bernard, military endeavours such as the Crusades and groups such as the Templars are justified solely because their goals are religiously motivated. Of course, the corollary to this point is that soldiers who fight solely for their own benefit (whether this is to save their own life or to obtain glory) are by default considered to be *malitia* because they do not possess appropriate motives. These knights fight against the purposes of God because they do not fight for Him.⁴⁷ On this point, their means are malicious because the end does not conform to the standard set by the *militia Christi*. In the case of both *militia* and *malitia*, the means used by each group are judged by their overall purpose.

This ends-justifies-the-means approach to warfare means that Bernard can afford to ascribe spiritual benefits to their fight on account of the soldier's motives. If one fights for a spiritual cause, then the benefits of that particular fight would therefore be also on the spiritual level. In other words, since they

⁴⁶ Other than the case of the 'pagans' living in the holy land discussed above, there is also the case where Bernard calls for the wholesale slaughter or conversion of the Wends during the Second Crusade on the grounds that they represent a danger to German Crusaders and German ('Christian') lands. See *Letter 394*, 467.

⁴⁷ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 144.

fight for Christ, the death of the Templar affords status on par with the martyrs – they have died for Christ.⁴⁸ In battle, Christ is glorified through the killing of non-Christians as well as through the death of the Templar who becomes a martyr:

Should he be killed himself, we know that he has not perished, but has come safely into port. When he inflicts death it is to Christ's profit, and when he suffers death, it is for his own gain. The Christian glories in the death of the pagan, because Christ is glorified; while the death of the Christian gives occasion for the King to show his liberality in the rewarding of his knight.⁴⁹

Whether through battle or through death, Bernard writes that the Templars (and in the same vein the Crusaders) contribute to their own salvation by fighting.

Indeed, Bernard sees the historical circumstances which have taken place in the holy land as a divinely instituted means by which more martyrs might die for the Christian faith. God has superintended history in order to bring this opportunity for those warriors who would otherwise fight for their own causes.⁵⁰ If God has permitted danger to arise within the Crusader states then it is merely to provide warriors an opportunity to obtain valour and immortality through their profession.

For Bernard, the Templars represent Christ's triumphant revenge over his enemies. Christ fittingly uses his enemy's own means against him by converting soldiers from the devil's ranks and offering salvific benefits to those who now fight for His cause. In this regard, Bernard sees the Templars as redeeming

⁴⁸ This imagery is explicitly stated in *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 145 and is also implied on pages 130 and 134.

⁴⁹ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 134-135.

⁵⁰ For Bernard's expression of this idea in regard to the Templars see *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 144-145. See also *Letter 391*, 461 for this idea presented in conjunction with the Crusades.

worldly knighthood from its violent and vainglorious trappings. For one, their order represents an opportunity for the warrior class to participate in the benefits of a monastic lifestyle without abandoning their weapons and affords them the chance to utilize their skills in the service of Christ.⁵¹ By adopting the monastic lifestyle, the vanities associated with worldly knighthood disappear. Bernard's own description of the Templar lifestyle indicates that they are to be taken as a model for others to follow.⁵² Here Bernard paints a picture of the ideal knighthood, one which conforms to the Christian faith. Whereas traditional soldiers work against the purposes of Christ and the Church, Bernard's 'new knighthood' is able to assure salvation for those who wield weapons of steel.

Yet, this treatment is not without its problems. Bernard elsewhere vehemently condemns monks who take up arms. As an example, Bernard instructs in a letter to his fellow abbots that all monks who embark on a Crusade, let alone take up arms, shall be excommunicated.⁵³ This interdict is not derived from Bernard's own authority as abbot of Clairvaux, but rather is taken as deriving from the authority of the Roman See itself. Here, Bernard makes it clear that such an individual deliberately trades their religious way of life for what he terms "the glory of the world." By taking part in the Crusade, they have exchanged the inward sign of the cross on their hearts for its outward counterpart on their clothes. Bernard's criticism is based on the fact that in going on a

⁵¹ Napier, 19.

⁵² Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 138.

⁵³ Bernard, *Letter 396*, 469.

Crusade the monk rejects his spiritual life of solitude and the monastic vow which gives shape to his way of life. Here, the inward and the spiritual are rejected in favour of the outward and the temporal: the monk has risked spiritual regression so that he might experience the glory of the Crusades. This holds even if the monk undertakes a crusade for his own spiritual development; Bernard is clear that this represents a case of a greater spiritual calling being exchanged for a lesser one.⁵⁴ Even if Bernard normally views embarking on Crusade as a valid spiritual exercise for the layperson,⁵⁵ he is adamant that such an excursion represents a step backward for the monk, since the true (spiritual) Jerusalem is found within the cloister rather than in the (physical) holy land.⁵⁶

Of course, this is not to say that practical considerations do not also apply. Bernard, writing to the pope, indicates that Cistercian monks ought not to visit Jerusalem even on pilgrimage because by doing so they abandon their responsibilities back home. He writes concerning a fellow abbot within his order, who wishes to observe his monastic vocation in the holy land.⁵⁷ Bernard recommends against him going on the grounds that he is not needed there:

And if he says that he wishes to keep the observances of our Order in that land and for this reason has taken with him a crowd of brethren, who

⁵⁴ Bernard indicates that Christians are allowed to wield the sword, provided that they have not assumed the greater vocation (that is, monasticism). *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 135. Miethke sees this prohibition as proof that Bernard never completely effaced the distinction between monk and layman. See Jürgen Miethke, 491.

⁵⁵ See, for instance letters 391, 392 written to drum up support of a Crusade to the holy land, as well as letter 394, addressed on the occasion of the Wendish Crusade. In each case, Bernard emphasizes the spiritual benefits of participating in the Crusade. More will be said of this in chapter 2 of this thesis.

⁵⁶ Bernard, *Letter 67*, 91.

⁵⁷ The abbot was in charge of one of the daughter houses of Clairvaux's twin monastery, Morimond. Bernard, *Letter 5*, 23. See also Evans, *The Mind of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, 3.

would not be able to see that what is wanted there is soldiers to fight not monks to sing and pray!⁵⁸

Even if this abbot wishes to go out of a genuine desire to further the Cistercian Order in the holy land and to observe his monastic vocation there, Bernard is clear that such an aspiration runs counter to his monastic vocation since he is abandoning the responsibilities of his office. This desire, writes Bernard, is predicated upon ignorance: he has not considered that the spiritual benefits of the monastic vocation are not geographically determined. In other words, having gone to Jerusalem he would find his lifestyle identical to the one he had so recently abandoned back home.⁵⁹ The abbot gains nothing by going to Jerusalem and causes disrepute to come to the Cistercian Order. Bernard's argument against him is that his negative example would lead others to themselves abandon their own responsibilities. Here, crusading becomes an escape mechanism for anyone unsatisfied with his station in life. While it might be one thing for a feudal knight to escape his troubles by embarking on a Crusade since he would contribute to the business of crusading, a monk would not bring any such practical benefits to this cause. In short, the monk would be better served staying in Europe continuing with the business of his monastic vocation.

While these two previous paragraphs touch on the issue of crusading monks and provide useful background information concerning the incompatibilities of the monastic office and the crusade, they do not really get to

⁵⁸ Bernard, *Letter 5*, 23-24.

⁵⁹ Bernard, *Letter 5*, 24.

the heart of the matter concerning the conflation of offices present within the Templar Order. A more pertinent example is found in Bernard's writings on Stephen of Garlande, who simultaneously held the offices Archdeacon of Notre Dame and Seneschal to Louis VI of France.⁶⁰ Bernard's criticisms of this individual are threefold. First, by assuming multiple offices Stephen cannot be particularly successful at any of them. From a practical standpoint, Bernard notes that a monk-turned-soldier makes a poor soldier indeed. As a cleric, Stephen's disposition and skills are not properly suited to the military lifestyle, nor is the king benefiting from hiring a cleric to perform the duties of a soldier. Mocking both the king and his officer, Bernard asks

What king would choose to have an unwarlike cleric at the head of his army rather than one of his most intrepid soldiers? And what cleric would consider it anything but unworthy of his state to be under obedience to a layman? His very tonsure more becomes the knightly state than the condition of a retainer, and on the other hand it is not psalms so much as arms that the throne depends.⁶¹

The issue here is simply that Bernard thinks that a cleric does not make for an effective soldier. Since the political and military fortunes of the king depend upon military might, a monastic background does little to prepare one for a military position. As a cleric, Stephen would not have had much, if any, in the way of military training. By the same token, his military responsibilities would also detract from his clerical duties. In assuming the office of the soldier, Stephen must take time and energy from his archdeaconate and leave the position partially

⁶⁰ See Evans, *The Mind of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, 24-25.

⁶¹ Bernard, *Letter 80*, 117-118.

vacant due to his other responsibilities Bernard writes that “it is the loss of both [offices and] to the advantage of neither”⁶² that he treads the line between cleric and soldier. In treading the line between cleric and soldier, he cannot adequately meet the requirements of either.

Aside from the standpoint of practical business of assuming, maintaining, and being qualified for two offices, Bernard writes that this situation represents an abuse of the normally separate offices of cleric and soldier. He writes that “it is an abuse of both conditions that a deacon should serve the table of a king and that a servant of the king should minister at the holy mysteries of the altar.”⁶³ In the former case, an individual normally focussed upon spiritual matters (the deacon) becomes involved in temporal affairs, while in the latter case the soldier who is normally concerned with military affairs becomes a spiritual leader. The two offices are mutually exclusive. It should be noted that Bernard’s disgust with Stephen of Garlande springs from his holding both offices and not any deficiency of the military vocation itself. Elsewhere, Bernard indicates that it is permissible for Christians to take up arms, provided that they have “not embraced a higher calling.”⁶⁴ Though he clearly regards the military lifestyle as inferior to its monastic or even clerical counterparts, the choice to take up arms is not itself antithetical to the Christian faith. Bernard himself considers Stephen’s military rank to be a dignified title when held by laymen.⁶⁵ Rather, Bernard’s problem

⁶² Bernard, *Letter 80*, 118.

⁶³ Bernard, *Letter 80*, 117.

⁶⁴ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 135.

⁶⁵ Bernard, *Letter 80*, 117.

here is that it is the same person who leads others into battle one minute and then proclaims the gospel in the church the next. For Bernard, these two offices are antithetical to each other because they result in a conflict of priorities. As a seneschal, Stephen serves as “an official of a king of this world,” while as an archdeacon he serves “the King of heaven.”⁶⁶ In essence, Stephen serves two masters, but cannot fulfil the demands of either office due to his divided loyalties.

Bernard writes:

He completely confuses two different states of life, that of a minister of God and that of a minister of the king; and he abuses with great nicety both of them by choosing the honours, but not the labour of the army in the one, and the revenues, but not the service of religion in the other.⁶⁷

Bernard argues that Stephen cannot adequately function in his capacities as archdeacon because the demands of this world placed upon him by the army prevent him from properly serving as a spiritual leader. Though he holds both military and ecclesiastical titles, neither office is served by this confusion by virtue of the nature of the offices themselves. Even if Stephen were an extraordinarily gifted and qualified individual, able to preach and lead an army, he could not properly meet the demands of either office because his attention would be divided. By holding both offices, Stephen disgraces both the king and the church.

Finally, Bernard takes issue with Stephen because he places his military title ahead of the many ecclesiastical titles he has accumulated. Bernard writes

⁶⁶ Bernard, *Letter 80*, 117.

⁶⁷ Bernard, *Letter 80*, 117.

that “although he is archdeacon, deacon, and provost in many churches [...] none of these titles gives him so much pleasure as Seneschal to his Majesty the King.”⁶⁸ Of course, this issue is not so much a criticism of holding both offices as it is a criticism of Stephen’s priorities. As a cleric, Stephen’s focus should by definition be upon spiritual matters. The fact that he relishes in his military title instead of his otherwise distinguished ecclesiastical career reveals that he undoubtedly places the affairs of the military ahead of the affairs of the church. In doing this, Stephen is placing that which is temporal ahead of that which is spiritual. For a layman, this is not much of a problem; for a cleric, however, this represents a failure to give due diligence to the requirements of his office. Even if this criticism is directed only to Stephen and his own individual priorities, it is also an implicit critique of Stephen’s assumption of both offices since it reveals where his priorities lay. In moving from the ecclesiastical office to the military one, Bernard argues that Stephen is simply more concerned with the affairs of the world, and assumed the military title with this frame of reference in mind. Bernard is implicitly arguing that he would never have assumed such a position in the first place had his priorities been directed toward spiritual matters.

If Bernard is usually vehemently against monks or clerics who take up arms or even participate in the business of military endeavours, why is he so quick to praise the Templars for their dual vocation? For one, the nature of their battle markedly differs from, say, that of Stephen of Garlande, who fought for the King

⁶⁸ Bernard, *Letter 80*, 117.

of France and not ‘for Christ,’ as it were. It would be safe to assume that Bernard saw Stephen’s post as largely falling into the *malitia* category, since he fights primarily for his own recognition in the eyes of the king. Yet, even if Bernard could characterize Stephen’s military career as deserving the *militia* designation (for instance, if he went on Crusade or used his position to defend the Church), Bernard is clear that Stephen is clearly losing something by adopting both offices while the Templar are in a position to gain. This double standard is best resolved by analysing the purpose of the Templar Order itself. Where monks and clerics lose something by going on Crusade or assuming a military post, Bernard is quite clear that the soldier in this case has everything to gain by assuming the monastic lifestyle. Not only does such a soldier utilize his skills in the service of Christ, but he also abandons the lifestyle which had previously contributed to his damnation. In every case, a cleric who takes up arms or goes on Crusade trades their previous beneficial position for an inferior one. The soldier who assumes a spiritual vocation, as does the Templar, moves from a spiritually detrimental position to a spiritually beneficial one. This does not apply to every case, as Bernard would obviously not tolerate an armed monk at Clairvaux,⁶⁹ but only in special circumstances such as the Crusades and for the Templars since there was also a spiritual dimension to the fight.⁷⁰ Of course, the most obvious point is that the

⁶⁹ Bernard did tolerate Crusaders who adopted the monastic habit in lieu of participating on Crusade. His reason was that the penitent found the spiritual Jerusalem of the monastery instead of continuing on to the temporal one in the Levant. Again, Bernard allows a change of vocation as long as the decision is spiritually motivated. See Bernard, *Letter 67*, 90-92.

⁷⁰ Evans, for instance, sees Bernard’s toleration of the Knights Templar as being due to the special circumstance of their beginnings and the place in which they served. See Evans, 25.

Templars were largely recruited from the warrior classes; the Templars were experienced soldiers who took up monastic vows rather than monks who learned to fight.⁷¹ They moved in a direction that was spiritually beneficial, instead of the other way around. Note, for instance, that Bernard still viewed the traditional monastic lifestyle as superior even to the Templars and prohibited ‘regular’ monks from joining their ranks.⁷² Bernard quite clearly saw groups such as the Templars as redeeming the business of soldiering by their adoption of the monastic lifestyle. The answer is quite simply that the monk-turned-knight represents a corrupting influence on the business of monasticism whereas the knight-turned-monk possesses the potential to redeem the knighthood itself if done properly. For this reason, Bernard heartily endorses groups such as the Templars⁷³ while simultaneously condemning individuals such as Stephen of Garlande.

Here this essay returns to Bernard’s ‘two swords’ passages in *In Praise of the New Knighthood*. It will be argued that the two swords are taken as simply representing the means by which this war is conducted and thus corresponds to the dual nature of their vocation. Bernard writes:

⁷¹ Napier, 19.

⁷² Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 135.

⁷³ While the Templars were undoubtedly the first Military order, founded in 1118/1119 CE, others, such as the Hospitalier had begun to militarize within Bernard’s lifetime. Bernard, for his part, was at least aware of this Order (See for instance, the greeting given at the end of *Letter 410*, 480) but does not seem particularly concerned with their functioning in the same way that he is with the Templar. Arguing from his writings on the Templar, it would not be a stretch to assume that he approved of this military Order as well, though the differences between the founding of the two orders should be noted.

When someone strongly resists a foe in the flesh, relying solely on the strength of flesh, I would hardly remark it, since this is common enough. And when war is waged by spiritual strength against vices or demons, this, too, is nothing remarkable, praiseworthy as it is, for the world is full of monks. But when one sees a man powerfully girding himself with both swords and nobly marking his belt, who would not consider it worthy of all wonder, the more so since it has been hitherto unknown? He is truly a fearless knight and secure on every side, for his soul is protected by the armour of faith just as his body is protected by armour of steel.⁷⁴

In describing them as wielding both swords, Bernard approvingly articulates the fusion of offices at the heart of the Templar Order. They are soldier-monks who fight a double-fronted war for the cause of Christ. Where some vocations such as monks and knights are able to contribute to this war in only a single manner, the Knight of the Temple wields both swords in the service of Christ. Since Bernard is describing the means by which the Templars fight, this is an articulation of their military and spiritual power just as much as it is a description of their Order. They are doubly invested with the armaments necessary to fight evil: spiritual weapons and armour to fight battles of a spiritual nature and physical weapons and armour to fight battles of flesh and blood. In utilizing the imagery of the two swords to describe the Knights of the Temple, Bernard is simply articulating the dual-faceted nature of their Order.

The other 'two swords' reference in the text appears in the context of Bernard explaining his utopian vision of Christian security and prosperity after the militant non-Christians have been driven out of the holy land. Here, Bernard explains the means by which such a vision might be realized. As one might

⁷⁴ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 129-130.

expect, it is brought about through the successful campaign of this double-fronted warfare. He writes:

Let both swords of the faithful fall upon the necks of the foe, in order to destroy every high thing exalting itself against the knowledge of God, which is the Christian faith, lest the Gentiles should then say, 'Where is their God?'⁷⁵

In this context, each sword represents a specific weapon used in the overarching war against evil, which pits the Christian faith against 'the Gentiles' who also wish to possess the sacred spaces held by the Crusaders. For Bernard, this is a war against evil; the Templar who kills a non-Christian in the heat of battle when defending pilgrims is pictured as directly combating evil through this bloodshed.

⁷⁶ Since it is a two-fronted war, Bernard is simply expressing his desire that the Knights of the Temple use every weapon at their disposal to achieve this goal.

This means fighting a physical battle against bandits and non-Christian armies just as much as it means fighting a spiritual battle against demons through prayer and vices through their monastic lifestyle. Consequently, this reference to the 'two swords' is simply the logical counterpart to the first reference in this treatise.

Where the former reference describes the Knights of the Temple and the armaments by which they equip themselves, the latter quote describes the purpose for such armaments and the reason why they fight.

In this context, therefore, Bernard uses the 'two swords' references as a means to describe the Templar and the means by which they fight. One sword is

⁷⁵ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 135.

⁷⁶ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 134.

physical, describing the means by which the Templars protect pilgrims and aid in the fortification of the crusader states. It also describes the means by which they engage in the business of crusading. Within the context of *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, the physical sword is traditionally wielded by the warrior classes, and applies to anyone worthy of the *militia* designation. It describes the divinely instituted right of the warrior classes to wield weapons in the service of Christ and the Church. The other sword is spiritual, describing the means by which the Templars fight demons and vices on the spiritual plane. The Templars are monks just as much as they are soldiers, after all. This sword also includes the ‘armour of faith’ worn by the Templars and secures their status as martyrs in the event that they should perish on the battlefield. Bernard writes that the Templars’ protection includes the armour of faith just as it does the armour of steel.⁷⁷ Their possession of the spiritual sword serves to describe their complete inclusion in the larger monastic world. Bernard here is not so much formulating the authority by which the Templars possess both swords so much as affirming that they are simultaneously monks and soldiers and that their cause is righteous. Within this treatise, he is simply adopting the imagery of the two swords to describe a group which fights a multi-fronted war using multiple means to do so. In other words, they are a new breed of soldier, developed to fight evil in the holy land, which arises because the historical situation (the Crusades) and offers the warrior classes

⁷⁷ Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 130.

a means to work towards their own salvation by fighting for Christ instead of against Him.⁷⁸

Of course, such an interpretation runs counter to an understanding of the ‘two swords’ as describing the relationship between the political and ecclesiastical authorities of Bernard’s day. More will be said of papal authority in relation to the ‘two swords’ in the next two chapters. For the moment, however, it is important to note that the ‘two swords’ passages within *In Praise of the New Knighthood* are to be taken as explaining the lifestyle, armaments, and means by which the Templars fight a single war to combat evil in the material and spiritual realms. The material sword refers to the material implements by which the Knights Templar defend pilgrims, while the spiritual sword refers to the means by which the order fights evil on the spiritual plane.

⁷⁸ Jacqueline argues that by way of groups such as the Templars, non-Christians are made to understand the rights possessed by the Church (in the sense of the community of believers and not the ecclesiastical authorities) and the Christian faith. For him, the two swords are taken as representing the power of the faithful, spiritually and temporally, which the Templars bring to bear against their enemies. See Jacqueline, 123.

Chapter 2 - The Two Swords in the Context of the Second Crusade

As one who was heavily involved in the Second Crusade, Bernard's writings on the subject remain far from being those of a dispassionate observer. Bernard travelled extensively in support of the Crusade in his role as Crusade preacher. Having had Pope Eugenius III, the pope who launched the Crusade, as a former disciple, Bernard's influence upon the papacy and the Crusade was unparalleled. When the Crusade failed, it was Bernard who was given the task of resuscitating the unsuccessful expedition, and was even chosen to lead the next Crusade, though the project never materialized due to a lack of interest. Given Bernard's extensive involvement in the Crusade, it is hardly surprising that later observers not only held him responsible for the Crusade's launch, but also reckoned him among those responsible for its failure.¹ Yet it is precisely within Bernard's writings on the failure of the Second Crusade (and his unsuccessful attempts to launch a potential Third Crusade) that his use of the 'two swords' allegory surfaces in the context of the Crusades. As such, this chapter will examine Bernard's views on crusading as a means to better understand the way in which he uses this allegory in response to the Crusade's failure. In order to do so, this chapter will primarily examine Bernard's letters which deal with the subject of crusading as well as the brief passage within the second book of *On Consideration* which calls for Pope Eugenius III to launch another crusade in the

¹ John G. Rowe, "The Origins of the Second Crusade: Pope Eugenius III, Bernard of Clairvaux and Louis VII of France" in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*. Edited By Michael Gervers (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 87.

wake of the Second Crusade's failure. It will argue that in this context, Bernard used the image of the two swords to describe the means and the authority by which Eugenius was to launch this potential Third Crusade.

On Christmas Eve 1144, the forces of 'Imad ad-Din Zengi, the Muslim leader of Aleppo and Mosul, captured the Crusader State of Edessa which had been established in the wake of the First Crusade. The town was sacked, its Latin Churches and monasteries were destroyed, and a large number of Franks were massacred.² Though Zengi was later recalled to Mosul, the Muslim threat to the Kingdom of Jerusalem and the other Crusader states loomed larger than ever before. Since the state had been seen as a crucial buffer between the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem and any would-be invaders, its loss now threatened the other Crusader States of the Levant.³ In order to aid the beleaguered remaining Crusader States, Pope Eugenius III issued his crusading bull *Quantum Praedecessores* – the first bull specifically concerning a Crusade.⁴ The Crusade was then launched as a means to bolster the military situation of the remaining Crusader States and was primarily seen as a defensive measure.⁵ By the end of the Second Crusade, other Crusades had also been launched in Iberia and around the Baltic to deal with threats in those areas. Although the main expedition ended

² Jean Richard, *The Crusades* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 153. See also Penny J. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095-1270* (Cambridge: The Medieval Academy of America, 1991), 39-40.

³ Geoffrey Hindley, *A Brief History of the Crusades* (London: Robinson, 2004), 71-72.

⁴ Jonathan Philips, *The Second Crusade* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 38; Cole, 41. Jean Leclercq, "Pour L'Histoire de L'Encyclique de Saint Bernard sur la Croisade" in *Études de Civilisation Médiévale [IX^e-XII^e Siècles]*, (Poitiers: Lussaud, 1974), 482.

⁵ Bernard, for his part, saw both the Crusade as well as his own unsuccessful attempts to launch a Third Crusade as being a defensive measure to protect the Latin Christians and holy places of the Levant. See for instance *Letter 391*, 461; *Letter 392*, 464; and also *Letter 399*, 471.

in the failed siege of Damascus, the Iberian Crusade did enjoy some success in the re-conquest of Lisbon.

To say that Bernard played a large role in the Crusade would be an understatement. For one, Bernard's personal relationship with Eugenius ensured Bernard's active participation in nearly all facets of the Crusade. Having previously been a monk at Clairvaux, the pontiff often looked to Bernard as a source of guidance.⁶ For his part, Eugenius commissioned Bernard with the responsibility of preaching the Crusade.⁷ In other words, Bernard was responsible for the Crusade's recruitment - a task he began with a serious haste and enthusiasm. Bernard's oratory skills are well known. His own letter to Eugenius, for instance, comments on the success of his recruitment: "towns and castles are emptied, one may scarcely find one man among seven women."⁸ His famous Crusading sermon at Vézelay, moreover, resulted in so many recruits that Bernard had to tear up his own garments to make more pilgrim's crosses.⁹ Dispatching letters when he could not reach potential recruits, Bernard's recruitment drive became a pan-European endeavour to involve as many knights as he could. On this point, Norman Housely notes that it was Bernard's preaching which was

⁶ Philips, *The Second Crusade* (London: Yale University Press, 2007), 39. Bernard's work *On Consideration*, addressed to Eugenius, may be read in this vein.

⁷ Cole, 42.

⁸ Bernard, *Letter 323*, 399.

⁹ See Philips, *The Second Crusade*, 68; Hindley, 72; Cole, 42; George Ferzoco, "The Origin of the Second Crusade" in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*. Edited By Michael Gervers (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 92-93.

largely responsible for garnering such a large response for the Crusade.¹⁰ In fact, some scholars suggest that Bernard may have been so zealous in his recruitment efforts that he overstepped his mandate when he recruited the Emperor Conrad III to go on Crusade.¹¹ When the Crusade failed, Bernard's successes worked against him. Despite being uninvolved in the Crusade's military operations, Bernard's involvement in nearly all other facets ensured his blame for the Crusade's failure.¹² Tellingly, after Bernard's death, the Cistercians chose not to chronicle some of the not-so-popular aspects of Bernard's involvement in order to aid the process of his canonization.¹³

In order to outline Bernard's view of the Crusade, it may be best to begin this chapter by explaining why it is Bernard views the Crusade as necessary. Of course, Bernard's most immediate concern is the military insecurity of the region brought about by the fall of Edessa. If something is not done now, the other

¹⁰ That the response was so large despite the fact that Edessa possessed no spiritual significance on its own testifies to this all the more. See Norman Houssely, *Contesting the Crusades* (Maden: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 61.

¹¹ The issue, of course, why Bernard was or was not supposed to recruit Conrad is based on the assumption that Eugenius wished Conrad to remain in Europe as a counterbalance to the renegade Roger of Sicily. Philips disagrees with this assessment based on evidence that Conrad had wished to take up the Crusade on his own account before Bernard had preached to him. Philips also notes that Bernard, being a stickler for authority, would never have knowingly gone against the wishes of Eugenius in preaching to Conrad. Nevertheless, that this debate even surfaces in scholarly works testifies to the efficacy and scope of Bernard's preaching. See Philips, *The Second Crusade*, 91-93 and also "Papacy, Empire, and the Second Crusade" in *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*. Edited by Jonathan Philips and Martin Hoch (New York: Manchester University Press, 2001), 26. For the counter-argument, see Rudolf Hiestand, "The Papacy and the Second Crusade" in *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*. Edited by Jonathan Philips and Martin Hoch (New York: Manchester University Press, 2001), 40; Richard, 40.

¹² Rowe, 87.

¹³ Brenda M. Bolton, "The Cistercians and the Aftermath of the Second Crusade" in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*. Edited By Michael Gervers (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 138-139. The main issue here was Bernard's unsuccessful attempts to launch another Crusade. Bolton notes that Cistercian sources are silent on this matter.

Crusader states may themselves fall victim to the Muslim forces of the region. Yet for Bernard, the alarm is never that a Christian *State* has fallen to non-Christian invaders or may fall, but that elements of Christian *Religion*, or even possibly the Christian Religion itself, have become endangered.¹⁴ For Bernard, the Levant is a Christian land by virtue of Christ's life, death, and resurrection.¹⁵ It has been "made glorious with his miracles, sanctified with his blood, and endowed with his tomb."¹⁶ That the very land which Christ graced with his presence is now in jeopardy and that the holy sanctuaries may become violated by heathen invaders presents a significant threat to the Christian religion for Bernard. He is concerned that the Muslims might "overturn the arsenal of our redemption."¹⁷ In other words, the political and military realities of the holy land threaten to sever the connection between the land in which Christ appeared and the practice of the religion itself. Bernard argues that the land belongs to Christ, and as such it falls to the responsibility of Christians to guard its places of spiritual significance.¹⁸ As such, if the land should fall to these 'pagan' invaders, ramifications would ripple across the spiritual world. For one, the safety of pilgrims could not be guaranteed. More to the point, Bernard appears to be genuinely fearful that once military control of the region is exercised by non-Christians, the destruction of the holy places by the malicious invaders would

¹⁴ This concern is mirrored in Bernard's writings on the Crusade's failure and his attempts to resuscitate the Crusading. For reference, see Bernard, *Letter 399*, 472.

¹⁵ Tomaž Mastnak, *Crusading Peace: Christendom, the Muslim World, and Western Political Order* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 164.

¹⁶ Bernard, *Letter 392*, 464.

¹⁷ Bernard, *Letter 391*, 461.

¹⁸ Bernard, *Letter 392*, 464.

automatically follow. Christians would no longer be able to visit these shrines and benefit from the spiritual rewards offered by pilgrimage to these locations. Therefore, much like the Templars' defence of pilgrims, the military defence of the region takes on a spiritual characteristic due to the significance of the region as the land of Christ. Edessa's loss is grievously felt in the spiritual plane by virtue of spiritual ramifications associated with the danger posed to the newly vulnerable Kingdom of Jerusalem.¹⁹ The places of Christ's life are placed in danger and by extension the Christian faith is itself placed in harm's way.²⁰

Bernard's concern over spiritually significant localities falling into non-Christian hands runs deeper than simply worrying over the spiritual implications of political and military control. For one, he expresses genuine concern over the sanctity of the holy places based on his assumptions of the invader's motives. More to the point, Bernard explains that the non-Christian opponents are also aware of the spiritual significance of the places they threaten to conquer and actively look upon such places with malicious intent. He writes:

They have cast their greedy eyes especially on the holy sanctuaries of our Christian religion, and they long particularly to violate that couch on which, for our sakes, the Lord of our life fell asleep in death.²¹

¹⁹ Marco Meschini argues that for Bernard, the material world, even in the case of a military expedition, possess a religious character due to his sense of divine providence and Christian vision. It is this vision which Bernard presents to potential Crusaders. See Marco Meschini, *San Bernardo e la Seconda Crociata* (Milan: Mercia, 1998), 142.

²⁰ This sense of danger to the Christian faith (not just Christian lands) itself is mirrored by Pope Eugenius III's crusading bull *Quantum Praedecessores*, where Eugenius argues to Louis VII of France that "a great danger threatens the church of God and the whole of Christianity." See "Summons of Pope Eugene III to the Crusade, Dec. 1, 1145." In *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*. Translated and Edited by Ernest F. Henderson (London: George Bell and Sons, 1905), 334. This bull will herein be referred to simply as *Quantum Praedecessores*.

²¹ Bernard, *Letter 391*, 461.

Here, the enemy is specifically presented as actively wishing to defile the Christian shrines which had been recently liberated during the First Crusade. Bernard elsewhere warns of 'pagan' defilement of the Christian holy places in conjunction with an imminent military conquest, though the specific desire of the invaders is never explicitly mentioned.²² Here, however, the link is made much more explicit. One of the primary aims of the invaders, in their conquest of the region, is to violate the sanctity of the Christian holy places, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre pre-eminently. Of course, being an encyclical designed to recruit the maximum number of Crusaders to a specific cause, his words undoubtedly possess an air of hyperbole. Yet, it is nevertheless significant that for Bernard, what is at stake is not political or military control (though this is important by extension) but rather the sanctity of the shrines of the Christian religion. He presents the enemy as being aware of the spiritual significance of these places and his pitch to potential Crusaders underscores this point. While Bernard's description of the motives of the Crusaders' Muslim opponents is undoubtedly tinged with a touch of propaganda, Bernard's overall concern remains, as always, the spiritual well-being of Christendom.

The destruction of these shrines and the failure to protect them would also represent a great embarrassment to the Christian religion and to the current generation of Crusaders. Jean Leclercq notes that Bernard is able to tap into this sense of potential humiliation when preaching the Crusade. Escaping the shame

²² See Bernard, *Letter 392*, 464.

of having the holy shrines of the Christian faith fall to heathen invaders represents a real concern for Bernard's audience, and indeed, for Bernard himself. Leclercq notes that when writing to potential Crusaders, Bernard appeals to their sense of honour and dignity: "Il s'agit pour eux d'éviter l'humiliation que leur lâcheté ferait tomber sur leur génération."²³ For Bernard, the sense of humiliation present in a failure to defend the land of Christ's passion represents a very real possibility. By appealing to a potential Crusader's sense of honour, Bernard is more effectively able to marshal support for the Crusade. Indeed, part of Bernard's own motives for preaching the Crusade stem from this sense of potential humiliation.

Echoing Pope Eugenius III's crusading bull *Quantum Praedecessores*, Bernard argues Christian military weakness in the holy land is a direct result of human sinfulness. Bernard writes that a correlation exists between the military security of the region and the faithfulness (or faithlessness) of Christendom: "and now, for our sins, the enemy of the Cross has begun to lift his sacrilegious head there, and to devastate with the sword that blessed land, that land of promise."²⁴ It is important to note that the sins addressed here are specifically those of Christians in Europe, and it is their sins which are responsible for Jerusalem's danger. Though the Christians living in the holy land are undoubtedly included within the scope of Bernard's 'for our sins,' the thrust of Bernard's address is towards the sins of Western Christendom. Addressing Western Christianity in his

²³ Leclercq, "Pour L'histoire de L'encyclique de saint Bernard sur la Croisade," 483.

²⁴ Bernard, *Letter 391*, 461.

Crusade encyclical, Bernard goads potential recruits into taking decisive action. If it is the sins of Western Christendom which caused this situation to occur, then it follows that it is the responsibility of Western Christians piously to accept his charge. For Bernard, the changing military situation in Palestine may be viewed as a barometer for the spirituality of Christendom as a whole. If God has allowed a Christian state to fall to Muslim invaders, then it is due to the sins of his people. Bernard states a similar theme when discussing the failure of the Second Crusade, though this will be discussed more extensively below.²⁵ Interestingly, *Quantum Praedecessores*, which Bernard is no doubt making use of in his Crusade pitch,²⁶ makes a distinction between “our sins, and those of the people themselves.”²⁷

For Bernard, that Crusader State of Edessa has fallen due to Christian sinfulness is also taken as an opportunity for God to demonstrate His mercy. For Bernard, that the remaining Crusader States are now placed in danger never remains outside the scope of the providence of God. If the danger to the holy places of the Levant is brought about by human sin, then this danger itself demonstrates God’s mercy by affording these very sinners an opportunity to atone for their sins through the Crusade. Bernard writes that God could most certainly defend his land through his omnipotence, but rather chooses to use human instruments to accomplish His ends instead:

²⁵ See for example, Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Consideration*, Translated by John D. Anderson and Elizabeth T. Kennan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976), 47.

²⁶ Rudolf Hiestand notes that Bernard was also largely responsible for the diffusion of the second edition of the bull, particularly in areas where Bernard preached. See Hiestand, 36.

²⁷ *Quantum Praedecessores*, 334.

Could he not send more than twelve legions of angels, or even just say the word and save his land? Most certainly he has the power to do this whenever he wishes, but I tell you that God is trying you.²⁸

For Bernard, the Crusade is this test. By placing God's own land in danger of invasion, God allows Christians to choose whether they will come to his aid. In order to do so, a little deception is necessary on God's part. God feigns this crisis in order to offer his people an opportunity to participate in the Crusade and reap the salvific benefits therein. Bernard writes that "He places himself in need of you, or pretends to do so, in order to help you with the riches of heaven."²⁹ This theme of 'feigned crisis' is repeated in Bernard's other Crusade writings³⁰ and allows Bernard to reconcile God's providence with the current military situation in the holy land. Though the state of affairs may look precarious, it is really an exercise in God's mercy. For Bernard, the crisis is also an appropriate recruiting tool: by feigning crisis, God is able to persuade far more Christians to take the sign of the cross than would otherwise have been possible.³¹ If this crisis was instigated due to human sinfulness, then the crisis itself provides the opportunity for sinners to make amends. Simply put, God permitted the fall of Edessa in order to provide an avenue for Christians to atone for their guilt through the ensuing

²⁸ Bernard, *Letter 391*, 461.

²⁹ Bernard, *Letter 392*, 464.

³⁰ See, for instance Bernard's Crusade Encyclical to the English people, *Letter 391*, 461-462, which was also sent to eastern France and Bavaria. See editor's note, *The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*. Translated by Bruno Scott James (London: Burns Oates, 1953), 463. This theme of crisis in the midst of omnipotence is also addressed in *Letter 394*, 467, though the link is more implicit than in Bernard's other writings. That this theme appears in the context of Bernard's letter on the Wendish Crusade means that this theme is not simply limited to the Levantine Crusade theatre, but is rather seen more generally in conjunction with Crusading.

³¹ Jonathan Philips, *The Second Crusade* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 73.

Crusade.³² If human sin caused Edessa's fall, then the ensuing Crusade provides the avenue by which this sin may be atoned.

For Bernard, the real significance of the Crusade lies in the unique circumstances in which it is situated within the scope of salvation history. That the holy land is being threatened by non-Christians is not a mere accident of history. Rather, Bernard regards himself as being fortunate enough to have been living in the year of God's jubilee. The Crusade represents a unique opportunity for God to demonstrate his grace to his people.³³

This time is not like any time that has gone before, new riches of divine mercy are descending on you from heaven, and happy are we to be alive in this year of God's choice, this year of jubilee, this year of pardon. I tell you, the Lord has never done the like for any former generation, never did our fathers receive so rich an outpouring of grace.³⁴

Much as how Bernard sees the Templars as instituting a 'new knighthood,' the Crusade is presented as a great opportunity for the redemption of the warrior classes of Europe. Here, however, the difference lies in the fact that where his treatise on the Knights Templar was directed at a specific military order, the Crusade was offered to all as a means of redemption. Mastnak notes that "at the heart of the crusade was the deliverance of the souls of western Christians."³⁵ For Bernard, the Crusade jubilee opens up the means by which Europe's soldiers may acquire salvation *en masse* where they had previously been more or less excluded by virtue of their profession. Part of this appeal for Bernard lies in the fact that

³² Meschini, 143.

³³ Mastnak, 165-166.

³⁴ Bernard, *Letter 392*, 463-464.

³⁵ Mastnak, 166.

the Crusade represents a unique moment in salvation history: no such event has occurred before and the opportunity may not come again in their lifetime.

Meschini notes:

Emerge un dato importante della concezione bernardina circa la crociata: non è la crociata in quanto fenomeno che può ripetersi che lo interessa, ma *questa* crociata, *questa* paradossale *occasio salutis* offerta da Dio in favore del Suo popolo, anzi dei cristiani che *ora* possono usufruirne.³⁶

In other words, the Crusade is not a continuous ongoing phenomenon in the sense that one could simply take the sign of the cross whenever one pleased. That this specific moment in history carries great importance from the standpoint of salvation is what lends significance to the Crusade itself. That many are now being saved, in this specific moment rather than as an institution stretching for an extended period of time is where Bernard derives significance from the Crusade. It is a one time event. Even if similar such events have occurred in the past (and possibly will in the future), that God *now* provides the grace to redeem sinners is the true significance of the Crusade.

Interestingly, although Bernard often warns against some of the excesses associated with the First Crusade (though without actually mentioning it),³⁷ he never appeals to it as the basis of his theological reflections on the Second

³⁶ Meschini, 144. Italics original.

³⁷ See for instance, Bernard's warnings against harming the Jews, a notable problem of the First Crusade. Bernard, *Letter 391*, 462-463; *Letter 393*, 465-466, though David Berger argues that this attitude is formulated primarily from a theological perspective, see David Berger "The Attitude of St. Bernard of Clairvaux toward the Jews" *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 40 (1972), especially p. 1-3.

Crusade.³⁸ Bernard, of course, would have undoubtedly been aware of the First Crusade, if only for having transmitted and read *Quantum Praedecessores* himself. Since he views the Crusade as a jubilee and not as an institution, he may not have felt the need to mention it. Possibly more to the point, he simply may not have felt the need to explain the history of papal indulgences when preaching to potential recruits. That it has occurred before does not detract from the significance of this jubilee. Bernard's point is that this is a limited time offer, so one should act now before it is withdrawn. God has instituted the means for soldiers to work towards their salvation without abandoning their weapons or joining the ranks of the military orders. The significance of this event is itself weighty enough without having to refer to its predecessor by name.

Much like his writings on the Order of the Knights Templar, Bernard sees the warfare undertaken by Crusaders as reforming the sinful practices of worldly knighthood. Here, his appeal for the military classes to join the Crusade partially rests on his argument that intra-Christian warfare is not only detrimental to the military strength of Christendom as a whole, but is also detrimental to their souls. By shedding Christian blood, the knight places his salvation in jeopardy because he fights for worldly glory and merit rather than for a spiritual cause. In his

³⁸ This is not the case for Pope Eugenius III who his understanding of papal indulgence when addressing King Louis VII of France on the institution begun by Urban II on the occasion of the First Crusade. See *Quantum Praedecessores*, 335. It should be noted, however that Jean Leclercq argues that Bernard, in his Crusade Encyclical to the English people, follows the pattern outlaid by the indulgences of the Eleventh Century, most notably Urban II. See Leclercq, "Pour L'Histoire de L'Encyclique de Saint Bernard sur la Croisade," 481.

crusade encyclical to the English people,³⁹ Bernard praises the courage and might of the soldiers of their kingdom but laments the waste associated with conventional military endeavours. What is the point, he asks, of fighting amongst each other and risking not only one's life but also one's soul?⁴⁰ Conventional military warfare is nothing but an endless cycle of violence. The soldier kills and he is in turn killed by other soldiers, but for what cause? For Bernard, the soldier entrusted with a sword but who does not brandish it in the service of God uses it in vain. Rather than being consecrated for a spiritual purpose, his sword is consecrated only to rust.⁴¹ Here, Bernard's entreaties to potential Crusaders echo his criticisms of worldly knighthood in *In Praise of the New Knighthood*. War against other Christians is detrimental to one's salvation on account of the blood shed and the sin of pride which the warrior lifestyle engenders.⁴² Writing to potential Crusaders, Bernard is concerned just as much about the spiritually negative effects brought about by such wars as he is the needless bloodshed associated with them.

Having framed conventional wars in this way, Bernard presents his Crusading offer. He enjoins potential recruits to use their military strength for a purpose which is spiritually beneficial and one which positively advances the cause of Christ.

³⁹ It should be noted that this encyclical, matches a similar encyclical (apart from the heading) sent to the clergy and people of Eastern France and Bavaria. See note 30 above.

⁴⁰ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter 391*, 462.

⁴¹ Bernard, *Letter 400*, 473.

⁴² Bernard, *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 131. See also *Letter 391*, 462.

But now, O mighty soldiers, O men of War, you have a cause for which you can fight without danger to your souls: a cause in which to conquer is glorious and for which to die is gain.⁴³

Much like his view of the Knights Templar, Bernard sees the Crusade as an opportunity for the warrior classes to use their skills in a positive manner for the cause of Christ. Bernard's crusading letters, for instance, twice refer to those of the warrior class who carry the sword in vain, and presents the Crusade as the way to overcome this ineffective use of manpower.⁴⁴ Even more to the point, for Bernard the Crusade functions as the divinely instituted means by which sinners may contribute to their own salvation by using a sinful profession for a beneficial purpose. In this way, "God so treats murders, thieves, adulterers, perjurers, and such like, as persons able to find righteousness in his service."⁴⁵ Much like with the Templar, God mercifully offers an appropriate means by which the warrior classes may make amends for their sins and actively contribute to their own salvation. By fighting for a cause which is spiritually beneficial, the Crusader escapes the needless bloodshed associated with conventional warfare.

For Bernard, the indulgence associated with the Crusade is also presented as commercial exchange when he addresses the merchant classes of Europe. In other words, Bernard wishes to convey that it is a 'good deal.'⁴⁶ By exercising a relatively small investment (time and material resources), the Crusader stands to

⁴³ Bernard, *Letter 391*, 462.

⁴⁴ Bernard, *Letter 391*, 463 and *Letter 400*, 473.

⁴⁵ Bernard, *Letter 391*, 461.

⁴⁶ Mastnak, 166.

gain an eternal reward, their salvation.⁴⁷ Even if the Crusader should unfortunately die in the course of the crusade's campaign, he would still be trading a finite investment (the rest of his normal life span) for an eternal reward. Jonathan Phillips argues that this language of commerce goes beyond simple rhetoric. By making his appeal to the merchant classes of Europe and not just the warrior classes, Bernard recognizes the logistical challenges presented by the Crusade. Given the financial hurdles presented by a Crusade, Bernard's appeal to the merchants is logical. More importantly, by addressing merchants directly and using rhetoric designed to secure their participation, he recognizes an important opportunity to afford the rapidly growing merchant classes the spiritual benefits of the Crusade on par with their warrior counterparts. By financing the expedition, they too may profit spiritually.⁴⁸ While launching a Crusade undoubtedly brings with it military and financial issues of which Bernard is no doubt aware,⁴⁹ his concern is always on the spiritual benefits afforded by participation in the Crusade.⁵⁰ It is precisely because there are logistical necessities involved in running a Crusade that Bernard is able to open these spiritual benefits to the merchant classes. His concern is not logistics *per se*, but rather the spiritual benefits accorded because of them. This spiritual focus runs parallel to his

⁴⁷ Bernard, *Letter 391*, 462. .

⁴⁸ Jonathan Phillips, *The Second Crusade*, 74.

⁴⁹ See, for instance Bernard's insistence to Pope Eugenius III that he remains unqualified to lead men into battle on account of his lack of experience – even if problems surrounding his vocation were to be addressed. *Letter 399*, 472.

⁵⁰ Meschini, 146. Meschini cautions that it is easy to read Bernard as instituting a whole range of social, economic, political and theological realities by preaching the Crusade. He notes that with the Crusades, Bernard's focus is always upon the spiritual and the internal rather than the material and the external.

insistence that God does not need warriors to protect the holy land, but is rather instituting a means by which warriors can work towards their salvation. Bernard is opening up the range of participants allowed to partake in the Crusade and thus benefit from its spiritual benefits. Where it had previously been open solely to the knightly classes, Bernard opens the scope of the Crusade to the people at large, to anyone capable of aiding in this military operation.⁵¹

Central to Bernard's understanding of the Crusade lies his appeal to the defence of the holy land in the face of non-Christian aggression. Yet, Bernard regarded the two contemporaneous Crusades in Europe as being on par with the expedition sent to the Levant. The first, the conquest of Lisbon in 1147, involving not only the local Portuguese forces, but also a Crusader fleet of mixed nationality from Northern Europe en route to the holy land, retook the city from their Moorish opponents.⁵² While the attack on Lisbon could arguably be regarded as a side theatre in the larger scope of the Second Crusade, Jonathan Phillips notes that most contemporary accounts of the siege "comfortably assimilated this episode with the expedition to the Holy Land."⁵³ Given that a large number of participants in this battle had taken Crusader vows (and indeed were *en route* to Jerusalem), and were fighting Muslims who had taken what was seen as Christian land, such a view is hardly unsurprising. Bernard, for his part, not only endorses

⁵¹ Hiestand, 37.

⁵² Phillips, *The Second Crusade*, 136-7. For the history of the siege of Lisbon and its relationship to the main Crusader force, see Jonathan Phillips, *The Second Crusade*, 136-167. Phillips notes on 235 that the impetus for this expedition came from the Portuguese in order to harness the privileges afforded by the Crusade for their own purposes.

⁵³ Phillips, *The Second Crusade*, 142.

the siege wholeheartedly, but also affords it status on par with the main expedition. Perhaps most tellingly, it is noted that Bernard actively recruited for this expedition during his preaching tour of Northern Europe.⁵⁴ In a letter to King Alfonso of Portugal, Bernard mentions both the papal indulgence given to the siege's participants as well including the siege among "the battles of the Lord."⁵⁵ Bernard's letter, though short, is particularly telling. His approving mention of the papal indulgence (even using one of his own disciples as its courier) reveals his acceptance of the siege as part of the greater Crusading enterprise. That he views this battle as being spiritually meritorious reveals his outlook further still: for Bernard, this is a battle waged to extend the frontiers of Christendom against those who would denigrate Christ's name. In this way, the siege of Lisbon is viewed in a manner akin to the main expedition. As such, Bernard sees no distinction between this battle and the forthcoming expedition to Jerusalem.

The second side theatre of the Second Crusade, the Wendish Crusade, presents a much more complex problem in trying to determine Bernard's understanding of a Crusade. Fearing an attack by the pagan Wends on their eastern border, a group of Saxon noblemen declined to take Crusader vows at a

⁵⁴ Jonathan Philips, "Bernard of Clairvaux, the Low Countries and the Lisbon Letter of the Second Crusade." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 48, no. 3 (July 1997), 487 and also 493. Philips suggests that Bernard was largely responsible for recruiting those Crusaders who did participate in the siege of Lisbon en route to Jerusalem. Philips also notes that King Alfonso of Portugal and Bernard both not only possessed close ties with the Knights Templar, but also that Alfonso actively participated in Cistercian expansion of his lands – suggesting a motive for Bernard's preaching of the Lisbon expedition. See also Susan B. Edgington, "Albert of Aachen, St. Bernard and the Second Crusade" in *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*. Edited by Jonathan Philips and Martin Hoch (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 60. Edgington specifically notes that Bernard actively preached an expedition "specifically to aid the Christians of Iberia against the Moors."

⁵⁵ Bernard, *Letter 397*, 469.

meeting at Frankfurt in early 1147. True to form, Bernard was present at this meeting and posited a solution: the Crusade was to be extended to the Baltic region in order to eliminate the pagan nuisance on the Germans' eastern flank.⁵⁶ What is highly significant about the Wendish Crusade is that Bernard proceeded to preach this expedition without the approval of Pope Eugenius.⁵⁷ This move is perhaps rendered all the more surprising due to Bernard's insistence on hierarchical authority, as he was when writing about the preaching of his renegade disciple Raoul.⁵⁸ Though Eugenius did later grant a written indulgence which authorized the expedition to the Baltic,⁵⁹ it seems as if Bernard here is acting on his own authority. What then was Bernard's understanding of the Wendish Crusade?

For Bernard, the Wendish Crusade is seen as being a defensive measure designed to secure safe passage to Jerusalem for the other Crusaders. He writes that the Wendish threat to the German eastern flank is a result of the devil's stirring up non-Christian peoples to oppose the Crusade to Jerusalem. If the Crusade represents the supreme instance of God's mercy for this generation, then Bernard reasons that the devil has every reason to oppose such a venture. As a

⁵⁶ Philips, *The Second Crusade*, 235-236.

⁵⁷ Mastnak, 167-168. As further proof, Philips notes that the council of Frankfurt took place between the 11th and 23rd of March, 1147, while Kahl notes that Eugenius' bull on the Wendish Crusade, *eos Christiane religioni subiugare*, was not issued until April 11, 1147. See Philips, *The Second Crusade*, 235 and Hans-Dietrich Kahl, "Crusade Eschatology as Seen by St. Bernard in the Years 1146 to 1148" in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*. Edited by Michael Gervers (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 40. It is possible that while Bernard saw the Wendish crusade as being under the umbrella of the main expedition, Eugenius (by virtue of his new bull) did not. Also, Kahl notes that Bernard's insistence that the Wends be killed or converted in *Letter 394* is not found in Eugenius' bull.

⁵⁸ See for instance, Bernard, *Letter 393*, 465.

⁵⁹ Mastnak, 167-168.

result, Christendom is brought under attack on several fronts by non-Christian peoples.⁶⁰ Though the military failure of the Crusade itself remains one of the devil's goals, Bernard's writings indicate that his primary reason remains the spiritual well being of Christian knights. By inspiring this military threat, the devil is attempting to derail the process of conversion to European knights brought about by the Crusade. If they cannot reach Jerusalem on account of a pagan threat to North-Eastern Europe, then the mechanism by which God's grace is enacted becomes threatened by this menace. Bernard writes:

How good and great is the bounty of God's mercy! But the evil one sees this and resents it, he gnashes his teeth and withers away in fury, for he is losing many of those whom he held bound by various crimes and enormities.⁶¹

To be sure, Bernard portrays the devil as being also concerned by the conversion of pagans brought about by a successful Crusade. His concern here, however, is the spiritual benefits brought about by the expedition to Jerusalem. For Bernard, the primary reason for waging the Wendish Crusade is so that "the road to Jerusalem [is] not closed on their account."⁶² It is this military success of the Levantine expedition, as a spiritual good, which Bernard sees as the motivating factor of the Wendish Crusade.⁶³ By fighting the pagans of Northern Germany, Bernard believes that it will bring further success to the main expedition on both the military and spiritual fronts.

⁶⁰ Bernard, *Letter 394*, 467.

⁶¹ Bernard, *Letter 394*, 466-467.

⁶² Bernard, *Letter 394*, 467.

⁶³ On this point, Meschini notes that "la guerra decisa a Francoforte contro di esse ha lo scopo di rendere piu sicura la partecipazione alla crociata verso Gerusalemme." Meschini, 155.

It is in this sense that Bernard includes the Wendish Crusade as being part of the ‘main Crusade’ in the same way as he views the siege of Lisbon. Bernard sees no distinction between these military endeavours and for this reason he is able to extend the papal indulgence originally given only to those venturing to the Levant to those also fighting in Northern Germany. Describing those who pledged to fight the Wends, Bernard writes that

They have put on the Cross, the sign of our salvation; and we, by virtue of our authority, promised them the same spiritual privileges as those enjoy who set out towards Jerusalem.⁶⁴

Bernard is not simply extending the papal indulgence to a new Crusade. Rather, he is extending the limits of what is entailed by the term ‘Crusade’. For Bernard, the Wendish Crusade is seen as a different part of the main expedition. It is merely a different theatre in the same global conflict. As a result, Bernard instructs those participating in what may be called the ‘Wendish theatre of operations’ that their uniform must match that of the main expedition, “for it is fortified with the same privileges.”⁶⁵ In short, because Bernard is easily able to apply the papal indulgence of the main expedition to the Baltic theatre, it may be said that he sees no distinction in terms of the overall goal of the Crusade itself.

How then does this triple-visioned understanding of the Crusade affect Bernard’s understanding of the Crusade? Bernard saw the Crusade as a global enterprise, one in which enterprises to secondary targets such as Iberia and the Baltic could be salvific by virtue of their association and benefits given to the

⁶⁴ Bernard, *Letter 394*, 467.

⁶⁵ Bernard, *Letter 394*, 467.

main expedition. It may be said that “pour Bernard, dans la croisade, il s’agit d’une confrontation globale entre chrétiens et païens”⁶⁶ Here, Pagans and Muslims are seen in the same light: they are enemies of the cross, obstructing the means of God’s mercy, a point further drawn out by Bernard’s continued practice of referring to Muslims as pagans (either deliberately or ignorantly).⁶⁷ Each expedition is seen in the light of Bernard’s vision of a Crusade which pushes forward the frontiers of Christendom, protects the holy places associated with the life of Christ, and offers salvation to the warrior classes of Europe. For Bernard, the Second Crusade is truly a global enterprise encompassing the frontiers of Christendom.⁶⁸ Some scholars even argue that the Crusade acquired this characteristic only by virtue of Bernard’s involvement.⁶⁹

In the end, the Second Crusade was by and large an unmitigated disaster. Only in Iberia did the Crusaders remotely succeed in achieving their goals. Bernard, for his part, actively campaigned in the years immediately following the failure of the Second Crusade for another Crusade, one which would be successful. At a gathering at Chartres on May 7, 1150, Bernard was chosen as the person to lead this new Crusade. Philips notes that this unorthodox appointment perhaps stemmed from a desire to place a man of Bernard’s piety and stature at

⁶⁶ Jürgen Miethke, “L’Engagement Politique: La Second Croisade” in *Bernard de Clairvaux : Histoire, Mentalités, Spiritualité* (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992), 494.

⁶⁷ See for instance, Bernard, *Letter 391*, 463; also *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, 134.

⁶⁸ It should be noted that Meschini holds that Bernard subordinated the Wendish Crusade to the main expedition, instead of seeing it as part of it. He writes, “La crociata contro gli slavi o vendi fosse subordinata alla realizzazione di quella orientale, l’estensione della indulgenza crociata che si decise a Francoforte fu un gesto gravido di conseguenze...” Meschini, 158.

⁶⁹ For instance, see Rudolf Hiestand, “The Papacy and the Second” in *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*. Edited by Jonathan Phillips and Martin Hoch (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 37. See also Miethke, 476.

the helm of the Crusade so as better to curry God's favour and, of course, to aid recruitment.⁷⁰ Bernard, though enthusiastic about the plans for this new Crusade himself, lamented his appointment as military leader - his inability to lead men into battle on account of his monastic profession and his previous inexperience prevented him from effectively commanding troops.⁷¹ This new Crusade never materialized due to a general lack of interest and a growing understanding that nothing could be done to rectify the failure of the Second Crusade.⁷²

Nevertheless, two of Bernard's works survive, both addressed to Pope Eugenius, which offer a glimpse of Bernard's understanding of the Second Crusade and why it ultimately failed. A letter, dated immediately after the meeting at Chartres in 1150 and a brief passage within *On Consideration* represent Bernard's fervent attempt to resuscitate the Second Crusade. More importantly for the purposes of this thesis, it is within the context of this attempted resuscitation which the second of Bernard's 'two swords' passages is found.

Much like the manner in which he views the fall of Edessa, Bernard views the failure of the Second Crusade as judgement of God for the sins of Christendom. Although Bernard is not one to question the justice of God, he nevertheless remains puzzled over the timing of this justice in relationship to the Second Crusade:

⁷⁰ Philips, 271.

⁷¹ See Bernard, *Letter 399*, 472, and also Timothy Reuter, "The 'Non-Crusade' of 1149-50" in *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*. Edited by Jonathan Philips and Martin Hoch (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 157.

⁷² Reuter, 159.

Clearly, the Lord, provoked by our sins, seems in some way to have judged the earth before the appointed time, justly of course, but unmindful of his mercy. He neither spared his people nor his name.⁷³

For Bernard, this exercise of God's justice remains all the more puzzling considering the fact that he ultimately saw the Crusade as being not only instituted by God, but also occasioned specifically by God's command through the pope. Writing to Eugenius, Bernard notes that "we rushed into this, not aimlessly but at your command, or rather through you at God's command."⁷⁴ That Bernard views that Crusade as being instituted by God through the pope sheds light on the way in which Bernard views the papacy. Here, there is no divide between that which is instituted by God and that which is instituted by the pope. Of course, this is hardly surprising considering that Bernard saw the Crusade as a jubilee designed to offer salvation to the warrior classes of Europe. In this case, papal proclamations merely serve as the vehicle by which God's purposes become enacted in the course of salvation history. For Bernard, the Second Crusade's failure does not so much present cause for doubting the legitimacy of the Crusade itself, but rather merely serves to underscore the unknowable purposes of God. Though one may never know what end is served by God calling of Crusade destined to fail, Bernard takes solace in the Biblical examples which demonstrate

⁷³ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 47. This idea is mirrored in *Letter 399*, 470-471.

⁷⁴ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 48.

that a just cause can indeed fail, albeit if only temporarily.⁷⁵ Bernard's solution to Eugenius is to press forward with the preparations for another Crusade.

It is in the sense of attempting to form another expedition to the holy land which Bernard uses the analogy of the 'two swords' in the context of the Crusades. Writing to Pope Eugenius III, Bernard explains his rationale for wanting to call another Crusade and at the same time outlines his understanding of papal power in the context of the Crusade:

In this second passion of Christ we must draw those two swords that were drawn during the first passion. And who is there to draw them by you? Both of Peter's swords must be drawn whenever necessary; the one by his command, the other by his hand. It seems that Peter was not to use one of these swords, for he was told 'put up thy sword into the scabbard'. Although they both belonged to him, they were not both to be drawn by his hand. I believe that the time has come for both swords to be drawn in defence of the Eastern Church. You hold the position of Peter, and you ought to have his zeal. What could we think of one who held the primacy but neglected the responsibility?⁷⁶

Note that Bernard's primary motive for calling another Crusade is once more the defence of Levantine Christians and the defence of the faith itself.⁷⁷ Even if the Crusade itself would offensively attack the Muslim strongholds of the area, Bernard's concern is still the well-being of the Church in the holy land and as such views the expedition as defensive. He is concerned, especially now that the expedition has failed, that the Muslims might still overrun the Crusader States and

⁷⁵ The two examples used by Bernard are Moses' desert sojourn and the justified (but failed) attack on Benjamin by the other tribes of Israel. In both cases, the just were vindicated, even if they suffered temporary setbacks. See Bernard, *On Consideration*, 48-50.

⁷⁶ Bernard, *Letter 399*, 471.

⁷⁷ Bernard Jacqueline, *Épiscopat et Papauté chez Saint Bernard de Clairvaux* (Saint-Lo: Éditions Henri Jacqueline, 1973), 123. Jacqueline argues that this defensive quality runs through all of Bernard's uses of the 'two swords.' Even in the context of the Knights Templar, the purpose is ultimately seen as defensive.

desecrate Christianity's most important shrines. A renewed offensive would restore the security of the Levant. As such, it may be said that Bernard holds the same motives for launching this potential Third Crusade as he does for the Second.

More importantly, this passage also outlines Bernard's understanding of the power of the papal office in conjunction with the Crusade. Central to Bernard's appeal to Eugenius remains his understanding of Roman episcopal primacy. While Bernard's understanding of the papacy remains the subject of the third chapter of this thesis, a few points may be said here.

First, Bernard's appeal to Eugenius is driven by his understanding of papal authority and responsibility. As pope, Eugenius possesses both the authority and the responsibility of calling a crusade when necessary. This is, of course, a double-edged sword, for the responsibility and authority of the papacy work in conjunction. Indeed, Bernard's appeal to Eugenius focuses more on his responsibility as the successor to Peter than it does the authority resident in his office. "What would we think of one who held the primacy but neglected the responsibility?"⁷⁸ Bernard asks. This focus on responsibility remains a running theme in Bernard's writings on the papacy, particularly in *On Consideration*. As such, any appraisal of Bernard's view of the papacy must take this focus into account. Where authority is resident in the papal office, it is always held in conjunction with a counterbalancing focus on responsibility.

⁷⁸ Bernard, *Letter 399*, 471.

Second, it is worth noting that both swords are given to Peter by Christ.

Whatever may be said of these swords, they are presented as being the exclusive purview of the pope to draw as he sees fit, in keeping with his responsibility.

While Bernard's work on the Knights Templar presents them as wielding the swords, the focus here is specifically the papal office itself. Eugenius possesses these swords by virtue of his holding the office of Peter: Bernard is addressing Eugenius as pope, and as pope he holds this authority given to him by Christ. In this specific context, Bernard does not note that other individuals or groups are permitted to wield the two swords – they are specifically given by Christ to the popes by virtue of their office. As such, a greater understanding of Bernard's view of the papal office cannot but help shed light upon the way in which he uses this phrase in this context, especially in contexts outside the Crusades.

Third, Eugenius' drawing of the two swords is presented in context of the Crusade itself. Here, Bernard presents the failure of the Second Crusade as being akin to a second passion of Christ. This point should not be overlooked. That there is an appealing parallel between Christ originally giving Peter the two swords immediately prior to his passion while Eugenius, Peter's successor, is given the task of drawing these swords during Christ's second passion remains crucial to Bernard's understanding of the Crusade. In both cases, Christ's passion and the Crusade, the result is a new avenue of salvation offered to those previously thought outside the scope of God's grace.

That the two swords were given to Peter and are utilized to describe the pope's authority in conjunction with the Crusade is no accident. By invoking the 'two swords' allegory, Bernard is outlining the means by which Eugenius is commissioned by Christ to call another Crusade. That Peter was given both swords but could not wield one of them conforms to Bernard's understanding of what a Crusade entails. Eugenius is the one who calls the Crusade, yet by virtue of his office as a cleric he cannot lead men into battle. As such, the swords here may be said to represent the twofold authority of the pope as it is given by Christ specifically here in the context of the Crusades. In this case, the first sword, "the one by [Peter's] command" represents the delegated authority by which the Crusade is waged. Although the warrior classes alone are tasked with the actual waging of this type of war, it is nevertheless done at the behest of the pope. Likewise, "the other [sword drawn] by his hand" must then represent the spiritual authority of the papal office with respect to the Crusade. Even as Eugenius delegates responsibility and authority for waging the Crusade, it is still nevertheless the exclusive purview of the papacy to launch Crusades. As such, the two swords in this instance are to be taken as the authority of the pope to launch a Crusade and then delegate its functioning to qualified soldiers willing to lead the expedition.

Of course, that Bernard's use of the allegory here specifically pertains only to the Crusade is no surprise. Yet, since Bernard bases this appeal on the doctrine of Roman Primacy, the ability to extend this interpretation to other aspects of the

papacy as it pertains to divinely instituted authority will depend on how Bernard understands the pontifical office to function in other contexts. Bernard's phrase "I believe that the time has come for both swords to be drawn in defence of the Eastern Church"⁷⁹ implies that papal authority of this sort extends beyond including only the Crusades; there are clearly other contexts in which the pope may draw the two swords. Another phrase, "Both of Peter's swords must be drawn whenever necessary,"⁸⁰ further lends credence to this idea. The shape and scope of these other avenues remains to be seen. Bernard's immediate context, to be sure, is the Crusades. As such, he uses the two swords to describe the mechanism by which and under whose authority the Crusades are launched. Since the content of this twofold authority, however, is resident in the *office* of the pope and not in the *event* of the pope calling the Crusade, more work is needed to understand how deep this framework of Roman Primacy runs in Bernard's thought and what shape it takes in other contexts. For the moment, what is immediately clear is that the image of drawing and delegating swords in the context of the Crusades suggests that Pope Eugenius possesses complete authority over the expedition due to the inherent authority of his office.⁸¹ In order to determine the extent of this authority in other contexts, the next chapter will now

⁷⁹ Bernard, *Letter 399*, 471.

⁸⁰ Bernard, *Letter 399*, 471.

⁸¹ This point is echoed in Eugenius's bull *Quantum Praedecessores*, which bases the pope's authority to call a Crusade on the apostolic authority resident in the office as well as the established fact that it had been a pope, Urban II, who had called the First Crusade. Eugenius' bull states that "We... do grant and confirm by the authority conceded to us by God... that remission of sins which our aforesaid predecessor pope Urban did institute..." See *Quantum Praedecessores*, 335.

turn to Bernard's understanding of the papal office in the context of his work *On Consideration*.

Chapter 3 – The Two Swords within the Context of *On Consideration*.

Bernard's third and final use of his allegory of the 'two swords' is perhaps also the most difficult to interpret. While Bernard's use of it within the context of the Crusades also describes the pope's authority to some extent, its scope beyond the crisis of the Second Crusade's failure remains somewhat limited. The pope, to be sure, may authorize a Crusade in a number of different military theatres for a variety of reasons, but this does not tell us much about the pope's spiritual and temporal authority outside this specific context. Bernard's use of the allegory within *On Consideration*, by contrast, directly places the authority of the papal office within the socio-political context of his day because it also deals with the pope's relationship to Christian monarchs. Given that Bernard's use of the allegory here appears to be undeveloped, interpretations of this passage historically have ranged from Bernard's espousal of a rigid papal monarchism to a scathing criticism of papal secular involvement.¹

Of course, Bernard's use of the analogy here is also motivated by a specific occasion, one far more politically complex than that of his letter on the Crusades. Though the circumstances of this particular use of the analogy concern Pope Eugenius' exile from Rome at the hand of a populist uprising, Bernard is

¹ For a history of the interpretation of *On Consideration*, see Elizabeth Kennan, "The 'De Consideratione' of St. Bernard of Clairvaux and the Papacy in the Mid-Twelfth Century: A Review of Scholarship." *Traditio* 33 (1967). The respective views described belong respectively to Fliche and Vacandard. Kennan's own view argues that Bernard does not prohibit papal political involvement or even political rule, but that Bernard's focus is always that "spiritual criteria must always be its guide." (p. 115) Walter Ullmann argues that Bernard saw the papacy as being "the supreme monarchic overseer [...] of all Christians." In other words, the pope possesses supreme governmental power which is expressed in the allegory of the two swords. Walter Ullmann, *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 2003), 182-183.

also writing to a former disciple on the necessity of spirituality amidst the hectic demands of the papal office. In the end, Eugenius' two exiles involved appeals to multiple heads of state by both Bernard and Eugenius, the realization of a personal papal army to regain the city of Rome, the issue of the papal state, and a rejection of the pope's spiritual authority by the Romans. Though Bernard is by no means outlining a systematic account of the place of the pope within society, his use of the allegory does allow modern interpreters a better window into his political theology than do his other uses of this allegory. As a means by which to better understand the way in which Bernard uses the two swords analogy within *On Consideration*, this chapter will also explore the historical context in which Bernard is writing to Eugenius. In order to do so, it will broadly sketch Bernard's understanding of the place and the role of the papacy within Christian society, using letters and other treatises where necessary.

During the reign of one of Eugenius' predecessors, Innocent II (r. 1130-1143 CE), unrest had been building in the city of Rome. This unrest had been partly due to Innocent's reign following the resolution of the Anacletan schism,² and partly due to popular discontent over the papacy's ever growing involvement in temporal affairs and the trappings of earthly rule. Between his conflict with his rival Anacletus II and the simmering discontent within the city, Innocent II spent

² Adriaan Bredero notes that the Senate's leader was Giodano Pierleone, a brother of Innocent's rival Anacletus II. See Adriaan Bredero, *Bernard of Clairvaux: Between Cult and History* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 146. For a history of the Anacletian Schism and Bernard's involvement in the schism see Ullmann, 175-177.

the better part of his reign consolidating and obtaining possession of Rome.³ Yet near the end of his reign in 1143, the people of Rome rebelled against the pope and the ruling aristocracy of the city, re-establishing a senate along the lines of the ancient Roman model.⁴ Innocent's immediate successors, Celestine II and Lucius II, reigned only briefly and were not able to resolve the situation by the time Eugenius assumed the papacy in 1145. When Eugenius was elected pope, he immediately had to flee the city for fear of being killed, as Lucius had been,⁵ and only regained authority over Rome a year later thanks to an army sent by the German Emperor Conrad.⁶ Though Eugenius had made peace with the Senate upon his return, he was later forced out of Rome again after Arnold of Brescia began rousing populist sympathies once more.⁷ Eugenius would once more temporarily assume control over the Lateran (but not all of Rome) thanks to a personal army given by Roger of Sicily in 1149, but would spend the balance of his pontificate in exile.⁸

³ G. R. Evans, *The Mind of St. Bernard of Clairvaux* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 204.

⁴ Bernard Jacqueline, *Épiscopat et Papauté chez Bernard de Clairvaux* (Saint-Lo : Editions Henri Jacqueline, 1975), 231.

⁵ Pope Lucius II had been fatally wounded during a riot in Rome. See Rudolf Hiestand, "The Papacy and the Second Crusade," in *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences* edited by Jonathan Philips and Martin Hoch (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 32.

⁶ Bredero, 147. Bredero suggests that Eugenius was selected to succeed Lucius by virtue of his relationship with Bernard. Electing Bernard's disciple would ensure Bernard's involvement in the Roman affair which would dramatically increase the likelihood of Conrad's participation also.

⁷ That Arnold of Brescia was only in Rome in order to do penance after he submitted to Eugenius for being a supporter of Peter Abelard (Eugenius was in France at the time), and thus only in Rome at the behest of the Pope to begin with, remains one of the more remarkable episodes of this conflict. See Evans, *The Mind of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, 204. See also Ullmann, 178-179 for a history of Arnold of Brescia prior to his time in Rome.

⁸ Jacqueline, 226, 233. See also Kennan, "De Consideratione and the Papacy," 89.

Although the history of the Roman revolt as it pertains to Eugenius' reign as pope does not immediately pertain to *On Consideration*, it does help better frame Bernard's writings, as his third use of the two swords allegory here occurs amidst Eugenius' attempt to enter Rome a second time. Perhaps just as importantly, Eugenius at this point is fighting the supporters of Arnold of Brescia, a fiery demagogue and disciple of Peter Abelard, who preached for the popes to return to an apostolic poverty and the abolishment of the existing ecclesiastical hierarchy.⁹ Arnold held that the pope ought to have no hand in the administration of Rome, that Eugenius renounce any civil jurisdiction he might have, and that all property owned by clergy belonged to the princes. After forcing Eugenius from the city, he also confiscated the papal revenues.¹⁰ As such, Arnold's bitter condemnation of the pope's temporal connections as diabolical sets the backdrop for Bernard's instructions to Eugenius as he goes to retake the city.¹¹ At issue in the conflict therefore is not only the pope's place as a spiritual authority but also as a political authority. If the revolt was caused in part by a belief that the church may not wield secular authority or acquire possessions, then any advice Bernard gives to Eugenius as he retakes the city will potentially have ramifications for how Bernard views the papacy as a political authority.¹² Before this chapter

⁹ Evans, *The Mind of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, 204. Bernard himself notes the connection between Arnold and Abelard in *Letter 250*, 330.

¹⁰ Jacqueline, 233.

¹¹ Elizabeth Kennan, 'Antithesis and Argument in the *De Consideratione*' In *Bernard of Clairvaux: Studies Presented to Dom Jean Leclercq* (Washington: Cistercian Publications, 1973), 99

¹² Bernard's letters on Arnold of Brescia, though written before he was able to rouse populist sympathies in Rome, accuse him of being a schismatic and a sower of discord. Although Bernard

discusses his advice in *On Consideration*, however, it is first necessary to outline Bernard's other writings on the subject of this revolt.

Bernard's letter to the Romans during this revolt is just as concerned about the disunity of the church caused by forcibly ejecting the pontiff as it is with the inherent rights of Eugenius' office. Given that the pope is the head of the church, any affliction brought to the pope radiates down to the lower members of the body. All members of the church, no matter how insignificant, are spiritually affected by Eugenius' exile.¹³ Bernard writes that "the suffering of the Apostles concerns every Christian."¹⁴ For Bernard, the pope's place at the head of the church is specifically due to the unique privileges bestowed upon the Roman See as a result of Peter's commission.

Why do you arouse against you the king of the earth and the Lord of heaven, by your intolerable ravings, and by attacking rashly and sacrilegiously the Holy and Apostolic See, which is uniquely exalted by divine and royal privileges?¹⁵

Bernard does not spell out in this letter what these royal privileges entail, but it is clear that the divine privileges refer to the doctrine of roman primacy. Bernard had elsewhere explained that the Roman Church, by "a unique privilege, is endowed with a full authority over all the Churches of the world."¹⁶ This

praises Arnold's lifestyle, he writes that it is his doctrine on the Church as well as his association with Peter Abelard which raises his ire. At issue is papal authority. Bernard writes "What possible excuse can there be for flouting the judgement of the Supreme Pontiff?" Bernard, *Letter 251*, 332. See also *Letter 250*, 329-331.

¹³ Bernard, *Letter 319*, 391-392. Bernard includes himself as being 'the least of all,' yet he himself is still negatively affected by these events.

¹⁴ Bernard, *Letter 319*, 392.

¹⁵ Bernard, *Letter 319*, 392.

¹⁶ Bernard, *Letter 140*, 208. That this explanation of papal authority is also found within the context of another conflict, the Anacletan schism, should not be overlooked. In this case, Bernard

authority includes the ability to call or dismiss churchmen and the ability to promote or demote bishops as is seen fit by the pontiff. In the second book of *On Consideration*, Bernard describes Eugenius as having been “called to the fullness of power”¹⁷ whereas other bishops have only been called to a share in the responsibility for souls. While each of the other apostles was given a single church to govern, Peter was given the entire world to oversee by virtue of his commission. As such, Eugenius’ spiritual authority extends even over others who have been given this partial share. Bernard goes so far as to point out that if Eugenius saw fit, he could not only depose a particular bishop, but also give him over to Satan should he desire.¹⁸ The divine privileges extended to the bishop of Rome include complete jurisdiction over other officials in the church as well as the spiritual authority to excommunicate.

Bernard’s reference the royal privileges of the apostolic see is a little more problematic. Given that Arnold of Brescia held that the papacy should relinquish

is writing to the people of Milan, after the schism had been resolved, as to why their city had been demoted from the rank of metropolitan after they had sided with the anti-pope Anacletus II. Bernard’s answer is that the unique privileges bestowed upon the See by virtue of its unique privilege, enable the pontiff to promote and demote, to summon and dismiss, as he sees fit.

¹⁷ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 68. Bernard’s specific term here is ‘*plenitudo potestatis*’ and has historically been used to argue that the pope’s absolute power extends even over the temporal realm. As Elizabeth Kennan notes, the context is the pope’s power over other bishops (and Peter’s jurisdiction over those of the other Apostles) rather than contrasting the pope and monarchs. Kennan argues that the *plenitudo potestatis* “indicates monarchical rule over the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and probably final jurisdiction over all legal disputes involving ‘spiritual questions’ but does not properly describe ordering between church and state. See Elizabeth Kennan, “De Consideratione and the Papacy,” 97. J. W. Gray notes that this term connotes not sovereignty or dominion, but rather Eugenius’ status as the steward of Christ and is primarily a pastoral term. J. W. Gray, “The Problem of Papal Power in the Ecclesiology of St. Bernard.” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (1973), 11.

¹⁸ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 68. Bernard even assigns Peter the ability to decide entrance into heaven as an interpretation of the keys he received from Christ. See Bernard, *On the Song of Songs IV* translated by Irene Edmonds (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1980), 31-32.

all temporal authority, this might well imply that he is in fact arguing for at least some measure of temporal authority. Had this not been the case, he would not have included it as a further reason for Rome to return to the fold. This, of course, is merely speculation. This theme of papal power returns in the fourth book of *On Consideration* and will be discussed in the context of that portion of the work.

As always, Bernard is concerned with the spiritual implications of this revolt. By rebelling, the city of Rome has not only rebelled against Eugenius as pope, but also Eugenius as the bishop of Rome. “Was he not your own head, and were not his eyes your own? What is Rome now but a body without a head, a face with the eyes gouged out, a countenance darkened?”¹⁹ Absent their shepherd, the citizens of Rome themselves suffer from Eugenius’ exile and risk spiritual consequences brought about by the rejection of their bishop. Borrowing an example from Rome’s history, Bernard argues that this particular ‘fall of Rome’ (their revolt against the pope) is worse than the one at the hands of the barbarians since this disaster had been precipitated from within.²⁰ The city, in other words, has been sacked by its own inhabitants – they have rejected their ecclesiastical leader and in so doing have precipitated their own spiritual demise. It is worth noting that one of Bernard’s primary concerns in this conflict is the spiritual well being of not only Christianity as a whole, but also of the city of Rome itself. He is not simply attempting to resolve a conflict involving the

¹⁹ Bernard, *Letter 319*, 392.

²⁰ Bernard, *Letter 319*, 393.

relevant ecclesiastical and political powers of his day; he is also trying to promote the spiritual well being and the unity of the church as well. Rome must recognize Eugenius' ecclesiastical authority in any potential reconciliation. To do otherwise would be to jeopardize the unity of the Catholic Church.

Before moving to an analysis of *On Consideration*, it is worth noting that in his letter urging the Emperor Conrad to take decisive action in the dispute, Bernard bases his petition on the idea of the unity of the Church and the Empire. Here, Bernard appeals to the dual offices of the person of Christ to establish the unity of his body:

The Crown and the Church could not be more sweetly, more cordially, or more closely united and grafted together than in the person of the Lord, since he came to us according to the flesh from the royal and priestly tribes, as both our King and our High Priest.²¹

United through and prefigured by the offices of the person of Christ, the church and the empire stand in mutual accord. Church and empire should ideally be united in purpose, which is the spiritual well being of Christendom. Church and empire each thereby possess a stake in this conflict. In fact, Bernard expressly argues that it is in the interests of Conrad's own crown to intervene on behalf of the pope, giving the Emperor a temporal as well as a spiritual reason for interceding.²²

²¹ Bernard, *Letter 320*, 394.

²² In fact, Bernard takes this argument a step further, asking Conrad whether it would be a benefit to his own kingdom should another prince intervene instead. Bernard's answer, of course, is that it would not. See Bernard, *Letter 320*, 395. Bredero notes that for Conrad, Bernard argues that "the protection of his own crown was a prerequisite for the protection of the church." See Bredero, 153.

While this letter may be read simply as Bernard's attempt to influence the Emperor Conrad to intervene on behalf of Eugenius, it is significant that Bernard portrays this harmonious accord as a relationship between equals. Bredero notes that the relationship between Eugenius and Conrad as described in this letter does not simply imply "that the emperor could only wait until the pope would give him his orders."²³ Though this chapter will be arguing otherwise, it is possible for Bernard's writings in *On Consideration* to be taken as outlining a program whereby the emperor becomes subject to the pope since his authority is given to him by the pope.²⁴ Instead, Bernard's letter to Conrad portrays the unity of Christ's body as necessitating a relationship of equals between the pope and the emperor. Should any imbalance occur between these two representatives of Christ's offices, the unity of His body would be forfeit since one of the offices would then eclipse the other. Bernard would not accept a king or emperor who assumed for himself the responsibilities of the pope, even as he makes it plain that the duty of a king is to protect the church.²⁵ Despite the fact that Christ is both high priest and king, Bernard does not outline a program whereby both of these offices are assumed by a singular individual, be it a monarch or a pope. Thus, Bernard's appeal to the unity of Christ's body as the basis for German

²³ Bredero, 153. Kennan notes that Bernard recognizes an independent origin for secular powers in this instance and that the source of royal prerogatives is not merely derived from Peter's commission. Elizabeth Kennan, "De Consideratione and the Papacy," 99.

²⁴ This, of course, has been the interpretation of Ullmann, who held that Bernard's formulation of the two swords in *On Consideration* indicated that he held that papal authority extends over the entire world, including over the princes in the political realm. See Kennan, "De Consideration and the Papacy," 81.

²⁵ Other than this letter to the Emperor Conrad, Bernard notes this responsibility of a monarch to other heads of state. See, for instance, Bernard's letter to the Emperor Lothair during the Anacletan schism, *Letter 142*, 210.

intervention in Eugenius' exile should be seen as a unity of accord, not a fusion of the offices themselves. Were Bernard to hold that the pope assumed both of Christ's offices, his appeal to Conrad could not have been based on unity of Christ's body, since this unity would have already manifested itself in a singular individual: Eugenius. To be sure, the church would still be in danger, but Bernard's appeal would not include a plea for Conrad to retake what was once his – political and military control of Rome.²⁶ As Bernard makes clear, the city of Rome serves as both the ecclesiastical centre of the church and as the political capital of the empire.²⁷

This letter becomes all the more important once it is recognized that Bernard comes close to using the allegory of the two swords once more when describing Conrad's place within this conflict:

Wherefore I say unto you, gird your sword upon your thigh, most powerful one, and let Caesar restore to himself what is Caesar's and to God what is God's. It is clearly the concern of Caesar both to succour his own crown and to defend the Church. The one befits the king; the other the defender of the Church. Victory, we trust in God, lies in your hands.²⁸

Although one could interpret Conrad's sword as being given by the pope by virtue of his appeal for aid, the letter's stress on mutuality precludes any such understanding. Conrad's interest in this conflict is to retake Rome both as a king reclaiming lost territory and as the defender of the church re-establishing the

²⁶ That the Roman Commune pledged fealty to Conrad is of course moot for Bernard; he would not accept any political arrangement which precluded the pope from also assuming his rightful place in on Peter's throne. Such an arrangement would not be unity requires the preservation of the divinely established order. See Bernard, *On the Song of Songs III* translated by Kilian Walsh and Irene Edmonds (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1979), 26. See also Gray, 6.

²⁷ Bernard, *Letter 320*, 394.

²⁸ Bernard, *Letter 320*, 395.

Roman pontiff to his rightful see. Most importantly, Bernard includes no reference to Conrad's sword as being given at the behest of the pope, as he does with the soldier's sword within *On Consideration*. Nevertheless, it is significant that this still occurs in the context of defending the church. In fact, it may be possible to read each of Bernard's two swords reference as being in the context of the church defending itself in some capacity. More will be said of this in the conclusion of this work. This chapter will now turn to an analysis of Bernard's use of the two swords within the context of *On Consideration*.

Having seen his former disciple elevated to the status of pope, Bernard fashioned himself as a spiritual advisor to Eugenius. Known as Bernard Paganelli prior to his elevation as pontiff, Pope Eugenius III had been educated as a monk at Clairvaux for a number of years before being himself given his own monastery to manage in the vicinity of Rome.²⁹ Despite the fact that his congratulatory letter on the occasion of Eugenius' election largely expresses joy on the occasion,³⁰ Bernard's letter to the Curia laments the decision as being detrimental to the spiritual life of a former monk. Put simply, the demands of his new office would crush his delicate nature; Eugenius is more "accustomed to leisure than to dealing

²⁹ Bredero, 34. That Paganelli had been given the monastery of Tre Fontaine is significant given that the monastery had been previously occupied by Benedictines who had been expelled for their support of Anacletus II. Innocent II, thanks to Bernard's involvement in the dispute, gave the monastery to the Cistercians as a measure of gratitude. Given that Eugenius had also been selected as pope thanks to his relationship with Bernard (see note 6), it would seem that Bernard was largely responsible for much of Eugenius' ecclesiastical career.

³⁰ See, for instance, Bernard's remarks such as "When I heard this my spirit came to life within me and I cast myself prostrate on the ground in thanks to God..." Bernard, *Letter 314*, 384.

in great affairs.”³¹ Having become habituated to life in the cloister, Eugenius would not fair well in the high pressure environment that was the papal court. Though uneasy over the whole situation, Bernard eventually accepted Eugenius’ appointment as the will of God. Who better to lead the church, after all, than one already tasked to look over men’s souls? Nevertheless, Bernard’s letter to the Curia reveals how Bernard envisages Eugenius’ role as pope:

It certainly seems ridiculous to take a man in rags and make him preside over princes, command bishops, and dispose of kingdoms and empires. Ridiculous or miraculous? Either one or the other. I have no doubts that this could be the work of God.³²

Although Eugenius never actually participated in the disposing of kingdoms and empires, Bernard evidently saw this as part of the pope’s authority. If he saw fit, Eugenius could in fact dispose of rulers. It should be noted that it is precisely in the act of presiding over and disposing of rulers which Bernard considers Eugenius ill suited for the position as a former monk. Yet, Bernard’s argument is based on Eugenius’ lack of prior qualification, not his authority to do so as pope. Having spent his life in the cloister, Eugenius would have had no experience dealing in the messy world of statecraft and political intrigue. Nevertheless, Bernard sees his disciple as having the authority as Pope to intervene in world affairs where necessary.

After Eugenius assumed the papacy, his relationship with Bernard continued, with the two maintaining a steady correspondence. At least twice

³¹ Bernard, *Letter 315*, 386.

³² Bernard, *Letter 315*, 386.

during his pontificate, Eugenius made extended visits to Clairvaux. Bernard, for his part, became enmeshed in the workings of the Curia and papal court as a result of Eugenius' election.³³ This thesis has already outlined Bernard's involvement in the Second Crusade which came at Eugenius' request. And, of course, there is the five part serial letter known as *On Consideration* in which "Bernard invite son ancien disciple à une prudence et à une humilité d'autant plus hautes que sa position nouvelle le rend plus puissant."³⁴ Beginning with the first book in 1145 shortly after Eugenius was elected, Bernard would spend the next eight years finishing this treatise and offering advice to his disciple.³⁵ Although *On Consideration* was Bernard's final treatise and deals with issues relating to the papacy, it is first and foremost a practical manual for a single individual.³⁶ Bernard is concerned that the life of the spirit which Eugenius had previously enjoyed in the cloister would be forgotten and his spirit numbed by the incessant grind of the papal court.³⁷ Simply put, Bernard's treatise aims to give advice to a former monk on how inwardly to retain his monastic disposition despite the pressures and stresses of his new position.³⁸

³³ Bredero, 147.

³⁴ Bruno Michel, "La Philosophie: Le Cas du *De Consideratione*" in *Bernard de Clairvaux : Histoire, Mentalités, Spiritualités*. (Paris : Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992), 581.

³⁵ Bredero, 147-148. See also Evans, *The Mind of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, 204.

³⁶ Evans, *The Mind of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, 202. Bredero notes that since Bernard completed this work near the end of his life, many view it as his "spiritual testament." See Bredero, 148.

³⁷ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 27. Bernard here even suggests that Eugenius could lapse into a state of apostasy should he completely forget to cultivate the life of the spirit while in office.

³⁸ In fact, Bernard begins his treatise to the pope by noting that he had been previously enjoying the "pleasant delights of solitude you enjoyed not long ago. You cannot have become unaccustomed to them this quickly." This concern is at the forefront of all Bernard's writings to Eugenius. Bernard, *On Consideration*, 25. See also Evans, *The Mind of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, 205.

The five books of *On Consideration* revolve around the idea of “Consideration” as the key to maintaining this monastic disposition in his new environment. Bernard defines consideration as “thought searching for truth, or the searching of a mind to discover truth.”³⁹ Although he is careful to distinguish between contemplation and consideration, he nevertheless concedes that by custom, the terms are in fact used interchangeably. For Bernard, consideration is a self-reflexive activity through which one seeks to purify the mind of vices, bring greater self understanding, and cultivate virtue. It is an investigation into the unknown: Eugenius’ task is to gain a new understanding of himself and of God in relationship to his surroundings. The act of consideration runs beyond a simple self-examination, but rather forms an integral part of the Christian’s spiritual life. Bernard quotes Psalm 45:11, “Be still and know that I am God” as being central to the worship of God. It is in silent consideration of one’s own being and of God that one may begin to catch a brief understanding of the mysterious ways of God. Here, Bernard expands Augustine’s definition of piety as the worship of God to include consideration since he holds consideration as integral to worship.⁴⁰ Bernard’s re-evaluation of Augustinian ideas here runs further still, as he adapts Augustine’s schema of what may be loved in order to explain what he wishes Eugenius to consider: “Now in order to achieve the fruit of consideration, I think you should consider four things in this order: yourself,

³⁹ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 52.

⁴⁰ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 37.

what is below you, around you and above you.”⁴¹ Once again, Bernard’s exhortation to his disciple is concerned first and foremost with Eugenius’ own spiritual life. To Bernard, there would be no profit for Eugenius to gain the whole world, only to lose his own soul.⁴² As such, any advice Bernard gives to the pope begins with this focus in mind. More precisely, by cultivating the spiritual disciplines of the cloister amid the chaos of the pontifical court, Eugenius will be better able to exercise his authority and responsibility as pontiff.

Part of Bernard’s concern was the growing number of litigants in the papal court which was consuming an ever-growing share of Eugenius’ time and energy. Thanks to the papal election reforms of the eleventh century and the rise of the cardinalate, the growing number of legates in the papal court had turned the Roman Curia into “a court comparable to the most advanced royal court” by the turn of Twelfth Century.⁴³ The result was not only the growing ecclesiastical domination of Rome over local church affairs, but also the “use of the Curia as a court of final jurisdiction in all ‘spiritual causes.’”⁴⁴ In the first book of *On Consideration*, Bernard exhorts Eugenius not to become caught up in the endless process of ecclesiastical appeal and litigation. It is not that he is not qualified to

⁴¹ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 52. Evans suggests that this fourfold formula may be an imitation of Augustine’s *De Doctrina Christiana* in which Augustine considers that which may be loved. See Evans, *The Mind of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, 205.

⁴² Bernard, *On Consideration*, 52-53.

⁴³ Kennan, “The ‘De Consideratione; of St. Bernard of Clairvaux’ and the Papacy,” 74. Walter Ullmann notes that by the 1140s, notwithstanding local Roman difficulties, “the papacy as an institution had been accepted as the organ of government throughout Western Europe.” Walter Ullmann, *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 2003), 181.

⁴⁴ Kennan, “The ‘De Consideratione; of St. Bernard of Clairvaux’ and the Papacy,” 75. Jean Leclercq also notes that this period of history also witnesses a large number of ecclesiastical appeals to the Roman Curia in opposition to local bishops. See Jean Leclercq, *St. Bernard et L’Esprit Cistercien* (Luxembourg: Jran Hengen, 1966), 105.

judge such matters, but rather his mandate as Peter's successor dictates that his attention be devoted to more important matters.

Clearly your power is over sin and not property, since it is because of sin that you have received the keys of the heavenly kingdom, to exclude sinners not possessions... Tell me, which seems to you the greater honour and greater power: to forgive sins or to divide estates? But there is no comparison. These base worldly concerns have their own judge, the kings and princes of this world.⁴⁵

Although Bernard holds Eugenius as qualified to judge temporal affairs, and even suggests that the pope may from time to time intervene in such cases where necessity demands,⁴⁶ his argument is based on his belief that Eugenius should be adjudicating spiritual matters because it is more worthy of his stature as pontiff. Those with temporal grievances have legitimate channels of appeal through their respective courts. The pope's business is to adjudicate spiritual matters first and foremost because that is the task most fitting his stature as pontiff. Should Eugenius become overburdened by dealing with temporal affairs, he would be trading a greater responsibility for a lesser one.

Here, Bernard's treatment of Eugenius' place as a judge of temporal matters balances two separate, but competing strands of thought. On the one hand, it is the jurisdiction of kings and princes to pronounce rulings on temporal matters. Bernard even goes so far as to ask Eugenius, "Why do you put your sickle to someone else's harvest?"⁴⁷ implying that he has no business resolving

⁴⁵ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 36.

⁴⁶ Bernard, *On Consideration*. 36. Bernard's argument is that since Eugenius will judge the world, he is worthy still to judge temporal matters as well as spiritual matters, which is a reference to 1 Corinthians 6:2.

⁴⁷ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 36.

disputes more suited to royal courts than to ecclesiastical ones. Here, sovereign rulers are presented as presiding over a separate sphere of authority. By asking this question, Bernard implies that Eugenius has a separate, though greater authority in the spiritual realm in comparison the authority possessed by Christian sovereigns in the temporal realm.

Yet, Bernard's insistence that the pope may intervene in such affairs where necessity demands it implies a certain degree of papal authority over these temporal matters as well. Since spiritual matters are obviously of greater importance than temporal matters, Eugenius may intervene where necessity demands. That necessity provides the occasion by which Eugenius may interfere in temporal affairs would seem to indicate that certain conditions must be met in order for the spiritual authority to intervene. However, Bernard's concern is not the maintenance of separate spheres of authority but rather Eugenius' own well being and the proper exercise of the spiritual authority. A papal schedule concerned mostly with claims of inheritance would not only destroy Eugenius' spiritual well-being, but would leave him little time to tend to matters of greater significance. As such, although Eugenius could intervene in affairs which are better suited to appeals in royal courts, Bernard cautions him from doing so on the grounds that it would quickly overwhelm the pontiff's already demanding schedule. Bernard's advice against ecclesiastical intervention is not so much that

Eugenius could not act within temporal affairs should he so desire, but more that he should not on the grounds that it would simply not be fitting for the pontiff.⁴⁸

In case Eugenius was tempted to adopt an attitude of self-importance as a result of his elevated position, Bernard is quick to clarify the nature of Eugenius' office. Bernard writes that Eugenius should view himself as a prophet who does what is required of him rather than a sovereign presiding over others. It is the hoe, symbolizing spiritual labour, rather than the sceptre, symbolizing dominion, which best describes Eugenius' ministry.

Spiritual labour is better expressed by the metaphor of the sweating peasant. And, therefore, we will understand ourselves better if we realize that a ministry has been imposed upon us rather than a dominion bestowed.⁴⁹

Bernard wishes his disciple to understand that the papal office entails the hard work of ministry first and foremost rather than the comparatively easy exercise of dominion. Eugenius' task is not to establish dominion, but rather a responsibility for the spiritual well being of all Christians. Bernard even describes his throne, the very symbol of dominion, as a watchtower where he may oversee everything.⁵⁰ In fact, Bernard is adamant here that dominion does not constitute part of Peter's commission, as "dominion is forbidden for Apostles."⁵¹ A pope

⁴⁸ Ullmann argues that Bernard saw the greatest danger to the papacy as being secularization – the organs of papal government were transforming the curia into an organization devoid of meditation and prayer. What troubled Bernard the most, Ullmann argues, is that the intermingling of the mundane with the divine. "The true vocation and function of the pope as monarch was to stand outside and above Christian society, so as not to be caught up in the myriads of squabbles affecting its members." Ullmann, 181-182.

⁴⁹ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 56.

⁵⁰ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 57

⁵¹ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 58-59. Note that Bernard argues that kings are said to be given dominion over their peoples. See Elizabeth Kennan, "De Consideration and the Papacy," 99. This

possessing such power cannot properly fulfil his apostolic commission because it runs counter to the commission itself.⁵² Simply put, Eugenius must not minister via imperial decree but instead must minister to his flock, teach, and take the gospel to the world.⁵³ For Bernard, dominion and ministry are mutually exclusive terms. A pope who exercises dominion cannot minister to his flock. However, despite his harsh criticism of papal dominion, Bernard soberly evaluates the other trappings of the papal office. Although Peter's commission did not include the possession of the material resources now available to the pontiff, Bernard allows Eugenius to keep the riches now associated with his office on the grounds that they are a useful aid in his ministry. Yet even despite this pragmatic approach to papal riches, Bernard urges his disciple to recognize that the use of these riches does not spring from Peter's apostolic commission: "You may claim these things on some other ground but not by apostolic right."⁵⁴ In the fourth book of *On Consideration* in the context of the Roman revolt, Bernard will identify on which foundation Eugenius does, in fact, claim to use papal riches. This will be discussed below. For the moment, it is worth noting that while Bernard is adamantly opposed to papal dominion on the grounds that it interferes with Eugenius' apostolic commission, he pragmatically allows papal riches since they can be useful to his mandate.

point is echoed in another work, in which he writes to the archbishop of Sens: "Ministry, I repeat, not rule." Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Conduct and Office of Bishops*. Translated by Pauline Matarasso. (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 2004), 42.

⁵² In fact, Bernard notes that "if you want to have both of these at the same time, you will lose both." Bernard, *On Consideration*, 59.

⁵³ Jacqueline, 217.

⁵⁴ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 58.

Although Eugenius may not exercise dominion, it is nevertheless clear that Eugenius possesses some temporal authority by virtue of his ecclesiastical office. How then should Eugenius view his own position? Here, Bernard's choice of metaphor is that of an overseer or of a manager. Eugenius possesses this authority, true, but it must be placed in its proper context. Bernard writes to his disciple that he should "go out into [the world] not as a lord, but a steward, to oversee and to manage that for which you must render an account."⁵⁵ In other words, Eugenius should see himself as overseer of Christendom, but one who also considers himself the servant of all. This is the precedent established the apostles, with Peter acting as the pre-eminent example.⁵⁶ Yet, overseers must exercise authority. Here, Bernard argues that the pope's capacity as overseer includes authority over monarchs in cases where the church is threatened or where the church's interests are not served.

If you have moved your heart, now move your tongue. Put on your sword, the sword of the spirit which is the word of God. Glorify our hand and your right arm and deal out vengeance on the nations and punishment on the peoples; bind their kings in chains and their nobles in fetters of iron.⁵⁷

Bernard issues a caution to his disciple: such authority should not be handled lightly and deserves much consideration before it is exercised. It should be noted that Bernard here is speaking of ecclesiastical sanctions, most likely the threat of excommunication, against unruly princes rather than direct papal governance of their lands. As such, Eugenius' authority is primarily spiritual; he may intervene

⁵⁵ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 60.

⁵⁶ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 59.

⁵⁷ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 61-62.

and offer ecclesiastical sanctions in cases where sovereigns work against the Church but he may not exercise dominion over nations. Nevertheless, Bernard explicitly describes this type of authority as a type of sovereignty, one whose task is the spiritual well-being of Christians under the pope's jurisdiction:

This is no ordinary sovereignty: you must expel evil beasts from your boundaries so your flocks may be led to pasture in safety. Vanquish the wolves, but do not lord it over the sheep. You have charge over them not to oppress them but to feed them.⁵⁸

Just as a monarch might have temporal sovereignty over a particular geographical area, Bernard writes that the pope possesses a spiritual sovereignty over the souls of men. As such, Eugenius may do what is necessary provided it is in keeping with his mandate as overseer. While this includes the authority to depose rulers who run against this mandate, Bernard's ideal is always the harmonious cooperation between the pope and Christian monarchs.

In the fourth book of *On Consideration*, Bernard turns to a discussion of Eugenius' role as the bishop of Rome in the midst of the revolt. Eugenius' task first and foremost remains reconciliation with his wayward flock. Here, Bernard makes it clear that the challenge ahead for the exiled pontiff is a daunting one; the Romans' rebellious nature will not make reconciliation easy. "They are wolves, not sheep; but still you are the shepherd of such men."⁵⁹ The fact that the Romans have rebelled against their shepherd does not absolve Eugenius of his responsibilities as the ecclesiastical head of the city. Even if these people remain

⁵⁸ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 61-62.

⁵⁹ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 116.

obstinate, he is still their shepherd. In fact, their rejection makes his task all the more important, since their resistance demonstrates their spiritually wayward nature and their guilt in this conflict. To Bernard, they are wolves, scorpions, and criminals, but Eugenius is still their shepherd. This point is noted because even if Bernard writes that the pope's task is to 'vanquish the wolves,' he still has an obligation to oversee even the wayward and the rebellious.

Despite Bernard's condemnation of the Romans' behaviour, he nevertheless concedes that the trappings of the papal office did not originally belong to Peter. Eugenius' authority as pope is established from his succession of Peter: Eugenius can no more deny his ecclesiastical responsibility to the Romans than he can deny being Peter's heir. Yet significantly, Bernard a second time juxtaposes the attendant pomp associated with Eugenius' office with the apostolic poverty of the original bishop of Rome:

This is Peter, who is known never to have gone in procession adorned with either jewels or silks, covered with gold, carried on a white horse, attended by a knight or surrounded by clamouring servants. But it is without these trappings, he believed it was enough to be able to fulfill the Lord's command, 'If you love me, feed my sheep.'⁶⁰

Bernard makes it clear that the responsibilities of Eugenius' office do not necessitate the material finery and ceremony now associated with the papal office. If Peter did not require such things to fulfill his apostolic mandate, then clearly neither does his successor Eugenius. In perhaps his most poignant criticism of his disciple's reign, Bernard reveals the true source of papal ceremony: "In this

⁶⁰ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 117.

finery,” he writes, “you are the successor not of Peter, but of Constantine.”⁶¹

While on the surface this may appear to corroborate Arnold of Brescia’s belief that the papacy should renounce all temporal authority and return to a state of apostolic poverty, Bernard never indicates this to be the case.⁶² Eugenius, he writes, may keep the trappings of his office, provided they are utilized towards his primary function of his office as a pastor.

I suggest that these things must be allowed for the time being, but are not to be assumed as a right. Rather I urge you on to those things to which I know you have an obligation. You are the heir of the Shepherd and even if you are arrayed in purple and gold, there is no reason for you to abhor your pastoral responsibilities.⁶³

Thus, Bernard establishes a middle ground in this dispute. Eugenius may legitimately maintain these ‘excesses’ of his office provided he recognize that they are to be considered auxiliary to the office itself. Once again Bernard argues that the silks and fine jewellery which Eugenius wears should not be considered

⁶¹ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 117. Elizabeth Kennan notes that this passage, though it appears to be Bernard’s sole allusion to the Donation of Constantine, is too abbreviated and enigmatic to use as the keystone to any understanding of Bernard’s view on papal government. She notes that typically those who interpret Bernard as rejecting any papal claims to temporal power see this passage as a rejection of temporal possessions and authority. Edouard Jordan, for instance, uses this passage to argue this very point. Kennan notes that at the very least, Bernard here is arguing that papal claims to temporal power are nonessential to the office itself. See Kennan, “De Consideratione and the Papacy,” 87-88. Steven Botterill, by contrast, argues that Bernard here is arguing that the Donation was the single greatest cause of the church’s lack of adherence to apostolic tradition. Steven Botterill, “Ideals of the Institutional Church in Dante and Bernard of Clairvaux,” *Italica* Vol 78, no. 3 (Autumn 2001), 299. Bernard, in *On the Office and Conduct of Bishops*, chastises clergy who wear expensive clothes arrive with great pomp, arguing that it separates shepherds from their flock. See *On the Office and Conduct of Bishops*, 42-47.

⁶² I. S. Robinson sees Bernard’s rebuke a response to the intensification of imperial insignia and pomp used by the popes of his day, most notably during Innocent II’s reign as part of his campaign against the anti-pope Anacletus II. Robinson argues that Eugenius continued the practice once elected. See I. S. Robinson, *The Papacy 1073-1198* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 23-24.

⁶³ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 117.

as a right, but as an aid to achieve his apostolic commission.⁶⁴ The pope's primary responsibility is to preach and shepherd his flock. Bernard wishes to remind Eugenius that while he may keep such things for the time being, they are not essential to his office, nor are they essential to his mandate. Even though he resembles a prince, Eugenius must never confuse the trappings of the office with the office itself.

Bernard suggests that the most effective means of establishing the reconciliation between Eugenius and the people of Rome is not by a heavy-handed show of military force, but rather by exercising his authority as pontiff through preaching. Continuing with his discussion of Eugenius' responsibility in this conflict, he contrasts Eugenius' role as a shepherd with the Romans' rebellious nature by placing a note of unease in Eugenius' imagined reply. "You instruct me to feed dragons and scorpions, not sheep,"⁶⁵ he writes. Yet even the Romans' extreme behaviour does not justify Eugenius' use of a personal army to establish himself back in his city. Here, Bernard juxtaposes his responsibility as pontiff with Eugenius' own actions.

⁶⁴ That Bernard considers these effects as an aid to achieve Eugenius' pastoral obligations is curious given that the conflict between Eugenius and Arnold centred on the very question of temporal privileges. For Bernard, the fault lies with the Romans: they cannot understand that such things are indeed auxiliary due to their own spiritual condition. Bernard's writings at the end of this section of *On Consideration* (which will be discussed below) on what Eugenius should do if Rome remains obstinate are particularly revealing since he counsils the pontiff then to take his ministry to the world. The authority of the See of Rome, after all, extends beyond Rome's city limits. Within *On Consideration*, Bernard had previously noted that although Peter did not have the trappings which Eugenius now enjoys, he is nevertheless allowed to use these resources, "not for your own pleasure, but to meet the needs of the time. Thus you will be using them as if you were not using them." See *On Consideration*, 58.

⁶⁵ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 117.

Therefore, I say, attack them all the more, but with the word, not the sword. Why should you try to usurp the sword anew which you were once commanded to sheathe?⁶⁶

Much like in his writings on the Second Crusade, Bernard reaffirms pope's inability on account of his office to personally lead men into battle. His advice, rather, is to re-establish the pope's authority by demonstrating his spiritual authority as Peter's successor. By showing the Romans their sins, Bernard's hope is that they will return to the Catholic Church without the need to resort to the use of force.⁶⁷ Eugenius' task is to preach to the rebellious Romans even if they remain obstinate.⁶⁸

Still, Bernard never denies that Eugenius may resort to the use of force to solve this dispute. The pope's authority includes the warrant to call monarchs to his aid whenever his position as the head of the church is threatened. Bernard notes that this principle was itself demonstrated by Christ when he instructed Peter to sheathe his sword on the night of his crucifixion. For Bernard, Christ's injunction for Peter to sheathe his sword merely demonstrates that while the pope cannot lead men into battle, he nonetheless possess the authority to delegate this task to others on his behalf.

Nevertheless, the person who denies that the sword is yours seems to me not to listen to the Lord when he says, 'Sheathe your sword.' Therefore, this sword also is yours and is to be drawn from its sheath at your command, although not by your hand.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 117-118.

⁶⁷ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 119. Note Bernard's use of Isaiah 58:1; "Show my people their transgressions, the house of Jacob their sins."

⁶⁸ See also Elizabeth Kennan, *Introduction to On Consideration* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976), 14

⁶⁹ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 118.

Bernard's issue with Eugenius is not that he does not possess the authority to reassert his place in Rome, but rather that due to the nature of his office he should delegate this authority to others. Although the pope has the authority to appoint guardians on his behalf, he has no business personally leading an army to reclaim his seat. During Eugenius' first exile, Bernard spoke highly of a solution which brought the pope into Rome at the hand of the Emperor Conrad, even explaining that such a move demonstrated the unity of Christ's body. Here during Eugenius' second exile, Bernard makes known that the favoured solution does not involve military action on Eugenius' part. Eugenius may appoint others to storm the city, but he may not do so himself.⁷⁰

It is in this context which Bernard gives his most detailed exposition of the two swords and their respective interpretations. He writes:

Both swords, that is, the spiritual and the material, belong to the Church; however, the latter is to be drawn for the Church and the former by the Church. The spiritual sword should be drawn by the hand of the priest; the material sword by the hand of the knight, but clearly at the bidding of the priest and at the command of the emperor.⁷¹

Here, each sword represents a specific authority established by God and given to Peter and his successors by Christ. The material sword corresponds to the authority to make war, specifically in the context of defending the church.

Although this authority is given to the Church, the authority to act in this capacity

⁷⁰ Kennan notes here that this point is the emphasis in Bernard's use of the allegory in this instance and that "the function of the remainder is instruction. Who can call and lead an army for you? The Emperor. You may possess the right of self defence, but you do not exercise it physically yourself." Kennan, "De Consideratione and the Papacy," 89.

⁷¹ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 118.

must be delegated to the soldier due to the cleric's inability to wield weapons.

The spiritual sword, by contrast, corresponds to the spiritual authority possessed by the church, and specifically wielded by the pope. This authority includes the authority to preach, the capacity to excommunicate, and the licence to intervene in the affairs of kings where necessary. While it appears as if Bernard here subordinates the temporal authority represented by the soldier to the ecclesiastical authority represented by the priest in all cases, this is in fact limited by the specific context in speaking of the Church's defence. Bernard here indicates that a soldier only wields the temporal sword by virtue of his appointment by the priest but he is speaking in the context of defending the church. Two important points should be highlighted here.

First, the context in which Bernard addresses the issue of the material sword is limited to the right to make war and does not necessarily subordinate the soldier to the priest in all circumstances. The soldier may make war to defend the church, but does so only at the behest of the ecclesiastical authorities. Should the priest revoke this right, the soldier would thus be waging an illegitimate war. The soldier, of course, is also subordinated to the priest in the same way as he is to the emperor. War may not be waged indiscriminately; its exercise must be approved by one's temporal and ecclesiastical superiors. Bernard explains that another condition must be present: the material sword must be wielded specifically in the service of the church. The immediate context of Eugenius' forced exile would definitely qualify as being in this service. Of course, not just anyone may wage

war. Eugenius, himself a priest, remains explicitly barred from wielding the temporal sword by virtue of his vocation even though it is at his bidding that this very sword is to be wielded by the soldier.

Second, while both swords belong to the Church, Bernard does not actually subordinate the emperor to the pope. True, the soldier is subordinated to the priest who must authorize the use of force, but this soldier is also subordinated to the emperor. As such, the emperor's role lies in commanding the soldier to strike with material implements, just as the pope's role lies in authorizing the use of force itself. Although the material sword is given to the soldier by the priest, Bernard is not subordinating Conrad to Eugenius. Both the pope and the emperor must still act in mutual accord in order for the soldier to make war in the defence of the Church. In order for the emperor to come to the aid of the Church, the Church must itself authorize him to do so (as Eugenius had done during his first exile).

Of course, the question arises as to whether or not the emperor may make war without the pope's approval or in a context which does not directly benefit the church. Bernard does not discuss this in *On Consideration*, but in his letter to the Emperor Conrad he notes that "it is clearly the concern of Caesar both to succour his own crown and to defend the Church."⁷² Bernard's appeal here to Conrad is as 'the defender of the Church,'⁷³ and he maintains that this role forms

⁷² Bernard, *Letter 320*, 395.

⁷³ Although Bernard employs this title to the Emperor Conrad, it is clear from the context that this would also apply to other monarchs. Bernard's use of the term 'Caesar' to describe sovereign

part of his responsibility as a monarch. Presumably, a sovereign would require no formal approval from the pope in order wage war in the defence of his own lands provided that it did not run counter to the spiritual well-being of Christendom. As such, the pope's authority does not extend over all aspects of a monarch's governance but only those areas which pertain to ecclesiastical affairs and to the pope's charge as overseer. In this context, however, Bernard speaks of the material sword being drawn by the soldier at the behest of the priest in the defence of the Church, which would require papal authorization.

Bernard's solution to the Roman revolt is not for Eugenius to unsheathe the material sword by employing a personal army, but to unsheathe the spiritual sword by preaching. While an army might solve the immediate problem of Eugenius' exile, it does nothing for the rebellious Romans who stand outside the grace of God due to their schism. Bernard writes to Eugenius that even if reconciliation is brought about even to one person in this manner it is still superior to forcibly retaking the city:

Now, take the sword which has been entrusted to you and strike with, and for their salvation wound, if not everyone, if not even many, at least whomever you can.⁷⁴

Bernard wishes Eugenius to utilize the sword which he was not commanded to sheathe, the spiritual sword which is drawn by the church for the purpose of salvation. By exercising his spiritual authority, Eugenius would provide an

monarchs is not limited strictly to the Emperor Conrad, whom Bernard would literally view as Caesar's successor (or at least Constantine's).

⁷⁴ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 118.

opportunity for the Romans to repent which would not be available should the reconciliation be effected with the blade of a sword. Eugenius is to reassert his authority as Peter's successor by preaching, not as Constantine's successor by using an army. Bernard assures his disciple that not all of those in rebellion are prepared to receive this truth; should the Romans reject Eugenius on these grounds, then he is to take his ministry elsewhere.⁷⁵

In sum, within *On Consideration* the two swords stand for the two types of authority given by Christ to the church. These two types of authority correspond to the authority to preach and the authority to delegate the use of force on the Church's behalf. Both types of authority share the defence of the church as a common element. In a time of need, the pope may call upon kings and princes to come to the church's aid. Far from subordinating the temporal authority to the spiritual authority, Bernard envisages this action as the harmonious operation of Christ's kingly and priestly offices. The spiritual sword represents the spiritual authority possessed by the church in general and the pope in particular. This authority allows the church to intervene in circumstances where the church is being threatened by a particular monarch and includes the threat of ecclesiastical sanctions or excommunication. In the end, however, Bernard's ideal is a harmonious relationship between pope and prince, each working together to promote the spiritual well-being of Christendom. This principle is aptly

⁷⁵ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 119.

demonstrated by Conrad's giving military aid to Eugenius during the pope's first exile.

Here, Bernard uses the two swords to highlight the fundamental differences between the ecclesiastical and royal powers. Besides the defence of his own crown, a monarch's other primary responsibility remains the defence of the Church. As such, Bernard argues that it would be fitting for a monarch to retake Rome at Eugenius' behest rather than having the pope himself lead an army. Simply put, it is not his place to do so. Bernard's argument is that Eugenius should be exercising his spiritual authority by preaching in order to effect reconciliation with the Commune of Rome. Should it be required, Eugenius could delegate the task of military intervention to a monarch. Bernard's concern, of course, is the spiritual well-being of the Romans who have placed themselves outside God's grace by rebelling against Peter's successor. Writing to his disciple, Bernard advises Eugenius to bring about reconciliation with the Romans not so the pope may retake his proper place on the throne of Peter, but so they may return to a state of grace within the church.

While Bernard's analogy of the two swords has often been interpreted as an exposition of the relationship between the secular and ecclesiastical powers, this chapter has argued that it in fact refers to the authority and the means by which the church may defend itself in a time of crisis. The spiritual sword, corresponding to the Church's spiritual authority is drawn by the church itself, employing the threat of ecclesiastical sanctions where necessary. The material

sword, or the physical authority to defend the church in a time of crisis, is possessed by the Church but must be delegated to a temporal authority. Although Bernard's use of this allegory in this instance sheds light upon the relationship between the ecclesiastical and political authorities, he does not use the allegory to outline a systematic understanding of this relationship. He is merely instructing his disciple that the right to make war, even a war centred on the issue of ecclesiastical authority, must be delegated to others.

Conclusion: In Case of Emergency

This thesis has explored the historical and literary contexts in which Bernard used the allegory of the two swords. In his treatise to the Knights Templar, Bernard uses the allegory to describe the lifestyle and the means by which this 'new knighthood' engage in physical and spiritual battles. Here, each sword represents a specific weapon used in the overall war against evil. In response to the worsening security of the Crusader states, the Templars employ the material sword against bandits who would harm pilgrims and against non-Christian armies who threaten to invade. Against demons and vices, the order employs the spiritual sword of prayer and monastic discipline to fight a parallel battle in the spiritual realm. The Templars are not alone in employing these weapons in their fight; Bernard makes it clear that these two swords are in fact wielded by others. Knights who employ their craft in the service of the church or the poor, a category which includes crusaders, are also said to wield the material sword. Monks, including Bernard himself, are also said to wield the spiritual sword in their own spiritual battles. What makes the Knight of the Temple noteworthy, Bernard writes, is that they employ both swords and fight on both fronts simultaneously. Aside from this novelty, the Templars are no different than any other soldier fighting for a proper cause or monks living in the cloister.

In a letter to Pope Eugenius III in the aftermath of the Second Crusade, Bernard places both swords in the hand of the pope. To Bernard, the crusade represents a jubilee, a unique opportunity instituted by God in order to extend

salvation to the warrior classes. The crusade's failure left the Eastern Church vulnerable to Muslim counter attacks. Bernard appeals to Eugenius' responsibility as Peter's successor to call another crusade. By invoking the two swords, Bernard is outlining the means by which Eugenius is commissioned by Christ to call another crusade. In this case, both swords are unique to the office of St. Peter. Here, the material sword represents the delegated authority by which the warrior classes engage in the business of crusading. It is the pope's responsibility to call the crusade, but he cannot conduct the war himself due to the nature of his office. The spiritual sword, which is directly wielded by the pope, represents in this case the authority to call the crusade itself. More specifically, it is the authority to implement the purposes of God in salvation history. Note once more Bernard's comment that "we rushed into this, not aimlessly but at your command, or rather through you at God's command."¹ As such, the two swords here represent the authority of Peter's successor, which includes but is not limited to the responsibility to call a crusade. What is significant is that here, Bernard sees the pope as being responsible for implementing God's plan of salvation for the warrior classes.

Finally, in *On Consideration*, Bernard instructs Eugenius to allow another to employ the material sword on his behalf in the midst of the Roman revolt. It is not appropriate that Eugenius resort to using a personal army in order to regain his See. The task of regaining military and political control over Rome should fall to

¹ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 48.

another, namely the emperor, whose task it is to employ the material sword.

Bernard's advice to the pontiff is to use the spiritual sword which is his spiritual authority as pontiff to effect reconciliation with the rebellious Romans rather than use an army to do so. Even if the Romans remain obstinate, Eugenius is still their shepherd. Once more, the material sword represents the delegated authority to use armed force in the service of the Church. Though Bernard specifically has the Emperor Conrad in mind, it would not be a stretch to assume that this could also apply to other Christian monarchs as it did during the Second Crusade. The image presented here is one of mutual accord between the Emperor and the Pope. In this case, however, Bernard uses the two swords to highlight the fundamental difference between the two powers. Where it is the Emperor's responsibility to defend the Church, it is the Pope's task to care for his flock by preaching. Bernard's use of the allegory, then, becomes an opportunity to outline the respective role of each power in Christian society.

While it may seem as if Bernard's doctrine of the two swords is inconsistent given the disparate historical circumstances and manner in which he employs the allegory, there are nevertheless a few strands of unity running through his use of the terms. First and foremost, in each instance a major theme is the defence of the Church, which has been noted by Bernard Jacqueline.² Within *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, the issue is the defence of pilgrims in the holy land. Even if the Knights Templar also engaged in offensive military campaigns,

² Jacqueline, 123.

particularly in conjunction with the Crusades, Bernard understood the order to be engaged in a defensive war to protect Christ's people and His land. The nature of this defensive battle given the significance of its location was such that it necessitated the creation of a 'new knighthood' to not only protect Christians in the holy land but also provide an avenue for salvation to knights who would be otherwise outside the grace of God. Similarly, after the failure of the Second Crusade, Bernard saw that a Third Crusade would be necessary in order to protect these very same Christians and the holy shrines of the holy land. The crusaders' inability to regain Edessa and their spectacular defeat on the road to Damascus further exposed the north-eastern flank of the Crusader states. Accurately describing the military situation of the Levant, Bernard wrote that it would only be a matter of time before the three remaining Crusader States would be overrun. The danger not just to Christians, but to the Christian religion itself, necessitated that the pope draw both swords to protect the 'Eastern Church.'³ Similarly, Bernard's treatment of the two swords within *On Consideration* is also placed in the context of the Church's defence. Rome's citizens had forced their pontiff to flee the city, causing Eugenius to remain in exile for the majority of his reign. Since the head of the Church is now in danger, the entire body of Christ becomes negatively affected. That the troubles stemming from Eugenius' exile radiated down even to the lowliest members of Christ's body is a serious concern to Bernard. The body of Christ has sustained a serious injury due to the wound

³ This is Bernard's own term for the Christians living in the Crusader states. Bernard, *Letter 399*, 471.

suffered to its head, the pope. Even this situation, however, does not excuse Eugenius' military campaign, as the nature of his office precludes military leadership. Rather, it is the responsibility of the Emperor once more to defend the Church by drawing the material sword, much as he had done during the pontiff's first exile. Each treatment of the two swords therefore shares the common theme of the defence of the Church. In each case Bernard describes the means which the Church may employ to defend itself when it suffers harm or is placed in danger. This applies whether Bernard is describing a new military order trying to defend pilgrims, or he is urging the pope to appoint others to defend the Church on its behalf.

Second, Bernard's understanding of the material sword itself remains remarkably consistent despite the varying contexts in which he portrays it as being unsheathed. In each case it refers to either the means by which war is waged in the defence of the Church or the authority to use such means for this purpose. To the Knights Templar, Bernard writes that they should use the material sword in the same manner as other knights who are worthy of the '*militia Christi*' designation. This sword is traditionally wielded by the warrior classes in the service of Christ and the Church. Likewise, a king or emperor who is given the material sword to go on crusade or to defend the pope utilizes his military capabilities for a similar purpose. Bernard's crusade letter to Pope Eugenius urges him to unleash the military might of Christendom upon the enemy, or in other words, to authorize Christian monarchs to do this on his behalf. During the

Roman revolt, the material sword again refers to the authority to use armed force in the service of the Church, only this time it is employed to aid the beleaguered pontiff instead of defending the holy land. In all three cases, the authority to engage in this type of warfare is seen as being derived from the office of St. Peter. While this is more apparent in the context of the Second Crusade and in *On Consideration* where the pope is tasked with directly appointing monarchs to wage war, it should be noted once more that the Knights Templar themselves received papal recognition at the council of Troyes in 1128/1129 CE thanks to Bernard's efforts.⁴

To be sure, papal recognition of a military order is markedly different from urging a monarch to take up the cross. This is because the Christian monarch (particularly if he is the emperor) is not directly subordinated to the pope in the same manner as a military or monastic order would be. Bernard's letter to Conrad makes it clear that that the unity of Christ's body necessitates a relationship of equals between the pope and the emperor.⁵ Still, that the pope appoints a monarch to defend the Church when it is threatened should not be overlooked. It is still the responsibility of the temporal power, after all, to defend the spiritual power when called upon to do so. In all, it may be said that the material sword refers to the means and the authority by which warriors utilize their martial prowess in the service of the Church.

⁴ Napier, 19.

⁵ Bernard, *Letter 320*, 394-395.

While Bernard's conception of the material sword remains consistent, Bernard's treatment of the spiritual sword changes between his treatise on the Templars and his two later exhortations. In the context of *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, Bernard borrows from the language of monastic spiritual warfare in order to describe the other means by which the Knight of Christ fights evil. Here the spiritual sword refers to the ability to wage war in the spiritual realm and is achieved through prayer and a monastic lifestyle. In this regard, the Templars achieve the same result as Bernard's own Cistercian Order. By contrast, Bernard's crusade letter equates the spiritual sword with the Church's coercive authority to recruit soldiers for the cause of Crusading and the authority to confer upon the Crusade's participants the indulgence. In like manner, Bernard's treatment of the spiritual sword within *On Consideration* describes the spiritual authority given to Peter and his successors to excommunicate and to preach. As such, Bernard's later two discussions of the spiritual sword deal explicitly with the authority resident in the papal office while his earliest discussion describes the spiritual warfare engaged in by monks. Therefore, Bernard's treatment of the spiritual sword changes between *In Praise of the New Knighthood* and his two later discussions to Pope Eugenius. This change should be noted in any analysis of Bernard's treatment of the allegory.

Obviously, since Bernard's articulation of the spiritual sword changes from the spiritual warfare waged by monks to the authority of the pope, his understanding of the material sword must change also. This is because the two

swords may only be understood in terms relative to each other. Why then does it appear as if the Bernard's conception of the material sword stays remarkably consistent despite the fact that his understanding of the spiritual sword changes? The answer may well lie in the other common theme running through Bernard's allegory: the defence of the Church. Bernard writes that the Emperor's task is to defend the church when called upon, and Bernard undeniably has the emperor in focus in his later two treatments of the two swords. Yet, Bernard also saw a place for the Church's defence by military orders such as the Knights Templar. They were a new breed of soldier, created not because traditional forms of knighthood were inadequate to defend the church, but because these 'traditional' knights lacked the means to obtain salvation due to the nature of their profession. That they were also seen as reforming the business of soldiery is no accident. Bernard's ideal knight fights to defend the Church, the poor, and the oppressed. As such, this small band of knights fulfills the *raison d'être* of the temporal power. It is this image of the idealized knighthood that Bernard is thinking of when he writes that the Knights Templar wield both swords in their fight against the enemy. Here, he is using the allegory in a very loose sense, referring not to the two powers established by God but rather providing a description of the ideal temporal power. Bernard's ideal knight fights for a spiritual cause, defends the church, and battles the enemies of the faith. Such a knight must necessarily also assume a monastic vocation, since the *militia Christi* must also avoid the excesses associated with conventional soldiery as well as being able to fight evil and

protect the faithful on all fronts. The spiritual sword, then, in this sense, becomes equated with monastic practice because it furthers Bernard's description of the ideal soldier, who fights a double-fronted war against the enemy.

How then should Bernard's other two treatments of the allegory be understood? In his letter to Pope Eugenius in the wake of the Second Crusade, Bernard clearly places the two swords in the hand of the pope. In *On Consideration*, by contrast, Bernard writes that the two swords are given to the Church and specifically drawn by the hand of the priest and of the knight. Are these two treatments so different so as to suggest that the recipient of the swords changes once more, as Jacqueline suggests?⁶ Though the spiritual sword is drawn by the priest and the material sword is drawn by the knight at the bidding of the priest and the command of the emperor, Bernard clearly has the two powers in view in *On Consideration*. He is speaking of priests and knights wielding the two swords, but he specifically has Eugenius and Conrad in view. Bernard's advice to the pontiff, moreover, explicitly presents Eugenius as wielding the spiritual sword: "Now, take the sword which has been entrusted to you to strike with, and for their salvation wound, if not everyone, if not even many, at least whomever you can."⁷ The swords, then, are given to the Church, but as the head of the Church, it is Eugenius' responsibility to employ them whenever necessary. He, of course, is not alone: others may also unsheathe the swords on the Church's behalf.

⁶ Jacqueline, 123. Jacqueline argues that Bernard successively places the swords in the hands of the faithful (the Templars), the pope (in the Crusade letter), and finally the Church itself (*On Consideration*).

⁷ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 118.

The only difference is that where others have been called to a lesser stake in the responsibility for souls, Peter's successor is "called to the fullness of power" – a reference to the pope's universal jurisdiction.⁸ Eugenius, then, wields the spiritual sword on behalf of the Church but must recognize that others also wield this sword to a lesser degree: "Yours is not the only power from God; there are intermediate and lesser ones."⁹ That the pope is representative of the spiritual power while the emperor is representative of the temporal power does not exclude others from also being considered 'intermediate' powers.

It is with this understanding, then, that Bernard ascribes both swords to the pope in his crusade letter, but to the Church in *On Consideration*. Peter possesses both swords, but he wields them on behalf of the Church as a whole. Of course, it is not necessary for Bernard to spell out the doctrine of lesser and intermediate powers in this context of his letter, since his concern was to launch another crusade. Only a pope, after all, has the authority to launch a crusade and this responsibility remains exclusive to the See of St. Peter by virtue of his primacy. Still, even as Bernard's crusade letter describes the swords as belonging to Peter, the Church still remains in view. The danger now faced threatens to shake "the very foundations of the Church"¹⁰ and consequently, it is the whole Church which must respond to the looming threat. Peter's successor is specifically tasked with

⁸ See *On Consideration*, 67-68 for Bernard's discussion of the universal nature of the See of St. Peter in relation to the jurisdictions of other apostles. Where others are called to share part of the responsibility for souls, the pope is "called to the fullness of power." Where others received only limited geographical jurisdiction, Peter and his successors possess no such limits.

⁹ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 101.

¹⁰ Bernard, *Letter 399*, 472.

the responsibility to draw the two swords, but it is done on behalf of the whole Church. Note Bernard's use of plural pronouns when discussing the necessity of the Crusade, before noting that it is the role of Peter's successor to actually draw the swords: "We must draw these two swords that were drawn during the first passion. And who is there to draw them but you?"¹¹ By design, the crusade is a venture undertaken by the whole church, and involves both powers, even if it is solely via the pope's authority that the Crusade itself becomes legitimized.

Bernard's doctrine of the two swords has historically been interpreted as being equated with the Gelasian powers. While modern interpreters are by and large split on how Bernard uses the two swords, some scholars such as Ullmann do equate the swords with the Gelasian powers. However, this thesis argues that the two swords cannot be directly equated directly with the two powers, since this would directly subordinate the temporal power to the spiritual one in all cases. Were this to be the case, Bernard's treatment of the two swords in his Crusade letter would be the closest articulation of this political subordination, since both swords are placed in the hand of the pope. The pope would then be seen as giving temporal authority to the emperor, effectively rendering all Christian monarchs vassals of the See of St. Peter. Even if this were the case, *On Consideration* paints a more nuanced picture, whereby the material sword is drawn by the hand of the soldier, but only through the cooperation of the pope and the emperor. In

¹¹ Bernard, *Letter 399*, 471. This use of the plural, which suggests Bernard has the whole church in view rather than simply the pope, is a reoccurring theme of the letter. Bernard argues that "we must put forth all our strength to prevent the building from falling," 472.

this work, Bernard is very critical of any pretensions to temporal power which Eugenius may harbour. Even the allegory of the two swords becomes a sharp rebuke of the pope's use of a personal army to regain political control of his own city. Bernard's advice is for Eugenius to strike exclusively with the spiritual sword, that is, to employ his spiritual authority by preaching, and leave the business of brandishing the material sword to another more suited to the task. At any rate, Bernard's letter to the Emperor Conrad places the two powers on an equal footing. The unity of the Church necessitates harmony between the kingly and priestly representatives of Christ's body.

Though Bernard does not equate the two swords with the Gelasian powers, the swords nevertheless describe the relationship between these powers. In *On Consideration*, it has been noted, Bernard frames his discussion of the two swords around the temporal and spiritual powers, signified respectively by the emperor and the pope. Simply put, it is the temporal power's responsibility to come to the defence of the Church while it is the task of the spiritual power to care for Christian souls. Bernard's concern is ultimately salvific: a heavy-handed show of military force would not engender a proper reconciliation between Eugenius and the Romans, leaving many Romans outside the grace of God. Still, in his exposition of the two swords, Bernard does outline the respective roles of the two powers in Christian society. Eugenius is to preach, while Conrad, if military force is necessary, is to be responsible for regaining political control of the city. Similarly, in the context of the Crusade, the respective roles of the two powers are

outlined once more. Here, it is the responsibility of the pope to call a crusade while also appointing temporal rulers to engage in the business of fighting. In both cases, Bernard allegorically reads Peter's possession of the swords, but inability to wield one of them, as description of the role of each power in Christian society.

At the very least, the two powers may be said to be described in relation to each other through the two swords, but only in extraordinary circumstances. Bernard only outlines them in the context of the Church's defence, since these situations are the only ones which occurred in his lifetime that warranted their use. That the Church appoints Christian monarchs physically to defend the Church or to go on a Crusade does not necessarily dictate how two powers relate to each other outside of an emergency situation. The material sword "drawn for the Church"¹² or "drawn whenever necessary"¹³ of course may be employed by the temporal power in the defence of its own realm without recourse to papal authorization. Note once more Bernard's appeal to Conrad which urges him to take action in order to defend his own crown as well as the Church.¹⁴ Bernard is simply describing an ideal whereby the two powers act in mutual accord during an emergency situation. A monarch could very well refuse to go on a Crusade or refuse military aid to the beleaguered pontiff, though this would not be in keeping with his responsibility. To Bernard, the primary function of the temporal power is

¹² Bernard, *On Consideration*, 118.

¹³ Bernard, *Letter 399*, 471.

¹⁴ Bernard, *Letter 320*, 394-395.

to physically defend the spiritual power and to support it where necessary. By using the allegory of the two swords, he is describing the means by which Church appoints monarchs to defend the Church's interest. In doing so the pope is called upon to use his spiritual authority to appoint willing rulers to defend the church on its behalf or to engage in the business of Crusading. Once more, this spiritual authority is not simply limited to appointing defenders, as it also includes the authority to excommunicate unruly monarchs, to appoint and demote bishops, and to implement God's salvific program in history where necessary.

An appropriate example the spiritual sword in action would be Bernard's own recruitment of the Emperor Conrad, with the papal bull in hand, for the Second Crusade. Conrad would have been free to refuse participation, but Bernard's preaching would have reminded him that his responsibility as a monarch necessitated his involvement in the venture. Though Bernard would not consider himself to possess this authority on his own account, his appointment as papal legate would have given him the authority to wield the spiritual sword on behalf of the pope.

Of course, such an understanding of Bernard's two swords does not shed much light on his political theology outside the Church's defence since Bernard never employed the allegory outside of this particular context. Given Bernard's relatively opaque use of the terms, any interpretation of the two swords is dependent on an analysis of his overall political theology. In particular, it is reliant upon Bernard's understanding of the relationship between the two powers

since Bernard has them in view in his later two uses of the allegory. While it is possible to surmise an interpretation of Bernard's two swords outside a context of emergency, but that would require an exposition of his overall political theology rather than an exposition of his conceptions of the two swords themselves.

To borrow a term, Bernard's pope is a chimera.¹⁵ In some respects, Eugenius is the successor of both Peter and of Constantine. Although Bernard makes it well known that the original Petrine commission did not contain the material wealth and political power now enjoyed by Eugenius, Bernard remains quite ambivalent about the 'Constantinian' elements now associated with the papacy. The abbot's advice to his disciple is not to reject this power but rather to use it in the service of Peter's commission, even if he cannot claim such means by apostolic right. Although Bernard parallels Eugenius' spiritual authority over the souls of men to the temporal sovereignty of a monarch, he makes it known that the pope is better seen as a servant than a lord. His throne should be seen as a watchtower rather than as a symbol of dominion. Bernard is quick to stress the pastoral nature of the papacy, which is at the heart of the Petrine commission, rather than any political corollary or consequence brought about by papal action. As a shepherd, Eugenius' attention should be concentrated on the salvation of his flock. This is why Bernard stressed to Eugenius a resolution to the Roman revolt which did not necessarily need to resort to military action. Note that his main concern in *On Consideration* is reconciliation between Rome and their pontiff

¹⁵ This, of course, is Bernard's own self-designation. He lamentably considered himself neither cleric nor layman due to his extensive involvement outside the cloister. *Letter 326*, 402.

since they were now outside God's grace by virtue of their rebellion. By preaching, Eugenius could effect a resolution more in keeping with his ministry than an army could ever have. Even if the exercise of the spiritual sword fails to bring about a desired outcome, Bernard is adamant that Eugenius take his ministry elsewhere rather than attempt a more drastic measure.

Still, this is not to say that Bernard's pope does not wield some degree of political power. Bernard makes it clear in his letter to the Curia on the occasion of Eugenius' election that part of his commission includes the authority to "preside over princes, command bishops, and dispose of kingdoms and empires."¹⁶ Bernard, for instance, most likely has Gregory VII's deposition of Henry IV in view and may well be using it as an example of the dangerous world of statecraft and political intrigue forced upon the naïve abbot from Tre Fontaine. This authority is employed in the service of his role as an overseer, no doubt. The pope's responsibility includes the exercise of authority in the political realm where necessity demands. Following the original Petrine commission, the pope's ministry is, of course, spiritual by nature. By exercising his authority, the pope could presumably only intervene in temporal affairs with ecclesiastical consequences. This exercise of authority would be for a spiritual purpose but could undoubtedly include cases with political consequences.

At the end of the day, the spiritual power remains greater than the temporal power due to the nature of the office, much as Gelasius had argued.

¹⁶ Bernard, *Letter 315*, 386.

This does not include the ability to dictate the day to day workings of the temporal power, nor does it make the Emperor a vassal to the See of St. Peter. What it does grant, however, is the ability to depose, appoint, or excommunicate a ruler for a spiritual purpose in an extraordinary circumstance. The entire world, after all, remains subject to the pope's charge, but Bernard places enough caveats on this so as to eliminate effectively any suggestion of a papal theocracy. The pope is an overseer, but one ideally limited in the exercise of his power. A pope who unjustly exerts his authority in the temporal realm jeopardizes his own ministry and indeed his own spiritual well-being. The material wealth and temporal power now enjoyed by the pope should be used in the service of Peter's commission, not the other way around. The spiritual nature of the Peter's mandate limits the circumstances in which a pope could intervene in the political realm. A pope who is distracted by the acquisition of temporal power fails to fulfill his ministry. As such, the exercise of the pope's authority in the temporal realm may be best seen as a potentiality best left unexercised.

Bernard's later two uses of the allegory of the two swords therefore may be said to refer to the authority given by Christ to Peter and his successors in order to fulfill their ministry and to protect the Church. In the allegory, the two powers and their respective roles within society are related to one another. In each case, the context of Bernard's use of the allegory is in an extraordinary situation. The Church has been placed in danger, and the pope must call upon the temporal power to intervene in the situation. Bernard only applies the allegory to

a select few circumstances involving the defence of the Church but his unfulfilled desire to further delineate the two swords elsewhere may well suggest that the allegory could apply to circumstances outside the Church's defence. This, of course, is merely speculation. Although an analysis of Bernard's political theology may well suggest these other circumstances in which the two swords may be unsheathed, we are limited to the select circumstances in which Bernard did use the allegory. In the end, Bernard's understanding of the papacy, and therefore the two swords, is best summarized by Eugenius' imagined response to Bernard's teachings within *On Consideration*: "You do not deny that I preside, yet you forbid me to rule?"¹⁷ Bernard's pope, then, is one who wields supreme authority but is told never to exercise it; he is the servant of all, but one under whose feet everything has been placed. This understanding of the papacy may well reveal why Bernard only chose to employ the two swords in the contexts he did. The mundane quite simply does not mandate papal intervention in the political realm.

¹⁷ Bernard, *On Consideration*, 80.

Bibliography

Primary Sources: Bernard of Clairvaux

Bernard of Clairvaux. *In Praise of the New Knighthood*. In *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux: Treatises III*, translated by Conrad Greenia, 125-167. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1997.

_____. *On Consideration*, translated by John D. Anderson and Elizabeth Kennan. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976.

_____. *On the Conduct and Office of Bishops*, translated by Pauline Matarasso. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 2004.

_____. *On the Song of Songs I*, translated by Kilian Walsh. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1981.

_____. *On the Song of Songs II*, translated by Kilian Walsh. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976.

_____. *On the Song of Songs III*, translated by Kilian Walsh & Irene Edmonds. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1979.

_____. *On the Song of Songs IV*, translated by Irene Edmonds. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1980.

_____. *The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, translated by Bruno Scott James. London: Burns Oates, 1953.

Other Primary Sources

Holy Bible, *New International Version*. Indianapolis: Kirkbride, 1990.

Quantum Praedecessores. "Summons of Pope Eugene II to the Crusade, Dec. 1, 1145." In *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, translated and edited by Ernest F. Henderson. 333-336. London: George Bell and Sons, 1905.

The Rule of the Templars, translated by J. M. Upton-Ward. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1992.

Secondary Sources

- Barber, Malcolm. *The New Knighthood: A History of the Order of the Temple*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994. Berger, David. "The Attitude of St. Bernard of Clairvaux toward the Jews." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 40 (1972): 89-108.
- Bolton, Brenda M. "The Cistercians and the Aftermath of the Second Crusade" in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, edited by Michael Gervers. 131-140. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Botterill, Steven. "Ideals of the Institutional Church in Dante and Bernard of Clairvaux." *Italica* 78, no. 3 (Autumn 2001), 297-313.
- _____. "Not of this World: Spiritual and Temporal Powers in Dante and Bernard of Clairvaux." *Lectura Dantis* 10 (Spring 1992), 8-21.
- Bredero, Adriaan H. *Bernard of Clairvaux: Between Cult and History*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Bulst-Thiele, Marie. "The Influence of St. Bernard of Clairvaux on the Formation of the Order of the Knights Templar." in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, edited by Michael Gervers. 57-66. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Cole, Penny J. *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095-1270*. Cambridge: The Medieval Academy of America, 1991.
- Constable, Giles. "A Report of a Lost Sermon by St. Bernard on the Failure of the Second Crusade." In *Studies in Medieval Cistercian History*. 49-54. Shannon: Irish University Press, 1971.
- Edgington, Susan B. "Albert of Aachen, St. Bernard and the Second Crusade." In *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*, edited by Jonathan Philips and Martin Hoch. 54-70. New York: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- Evans, G. R. *Bernard of Clairvaux*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- _____. *The Mind of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.

- Ferzoco, George. "The Origin of the Second Crusade" in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, edited by Michael Gervers. 91-100. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Grabois, Aryeh. "Militia and Malitia: The Bernardine Vision of Chivalry" in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, edited by Michael Gervers, 49-56. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Gray, J. W. "The Problem of Papal Power in the Ecclesiology of St. Bernard." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 24 (1973), 1-17.
- Hiestand, Rudolf. "The Papacy and the Second Crusade" in *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*, edited by Jonathan Philips and Martin Hoch. 32-53. New York: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- Hindley, Geoffrey. *A Brief History of the Crusades*. London: Robinson, 2004.
- Housley, Norman. *Contesting the Crusades*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Jacqueline, Bernard. *Episcopat et Papauté chez St. Bernard de Clairvaux*. Saint-Lo: Éditions Henri Jacqueline, 1975.
- Kahl, Hans-Dietrich. "Crusade Eschatology as Seen by St. Bernard in the Years 1146 to 1148." In *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, edited by Michael Gervers. 35-48. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Kennan, Elizabeth. "Antithesis and Argument in the *De Consideratione*." In *Bernard of Clairvaux: Studies Presented to Dom Jean Leclercq*. 91-110. Washington: Cistercian Publications, 1973.
- _____. "Introduction to *On Consideration*." In *On Consideration*, translated by John D. Anderson and Elizabeth Kennan. 3-18. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976.
- _____. "The '*De Consideratione*' of St. Bernard of Clairvaux and the Papacy in the Mid-Twelfth Century: A Review of Scholarship." *Traditio* 33 (1967), 73-115.
- Leclercq, Jean. "Pour L'Histoire de L'Encyclique de Saint Bernard sur la Croisade" in *Études de Civilisation Médiévale [IX^e-XII^e Siècles]*. 479-490. Poitiers : Lussaud, 1974.
- _____. *St. Bernard et l'Esprit Cistercien*. Luxembourg : Hengen, 1966.

- _____. “Un Document sur les Débuts des Templiers.” In *Recueil D'Études sur Saint Bernard et ses Écrits*. 87-99. Rome: Edizioni di Storia et Letteratura, 1965.
- Mastnak, Tomaž. *Crusading Peace : Christendom, the Muslim World, and Western Political Order*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Meschini, Marco. *San Bernardo e la Seconda Crociata*. Milan: Mercia, 1998.
- Miethke, Jürgen. “L’Engagement Politique: La Seconde Croisade” in *Bernard de Clairvaux: Histoire, Mentalités, Spiritualité*. Colloque de Lyon-Cîteaux-Dijon. 475-503. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992.
- Michel, Bruno. “La Philosophie: le Cas du *De Consideratione*.” In *Bernard de Clairvaux: Histoire, Mentalités, Spiritualité*. Colloque de Lyon-Cîteaux-Dijon. 581-603. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992.
- Morall, John B. *Political Thought in Medieval Times*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.
- Napier, Gordon. *The Rise and Fall of the Knights Templar. Staplehurst: Spellmount, 2003*.
- Partner, Peter. *The Knights Templar & Their Myth*. Rochester: Destiny Books, 1990.
- Philips, Jonathan. “Bernard of Clairvaux, the Low Countries and the Lisbon Letter of the Second Crusade. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 48, no. 3 (July 1997): 485-497.
- _____. “Papacy, Empire, and the Second Crusade” in *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*, edited by Jonathan Philips and Martin Hoch. 15-31. New York: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- _____. *The Second Crusade*. London: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Reuter, Timothy. “The Non-Crusade of 1149-50.” In *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*, edited by Jonathan Philips and Martin Hoch. 150-163. New York: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- Richard, Jean. *The Crusades, c. 1071-1291*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Robinson, I. S. "Church and Papacy." In *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, edited by J. H. Burns, 252-305. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 288.

_____. *The Papacy 1073-1198: Continuity and Innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Rowe, John G. "The Origins of the Second Crusade: Pope Eugenius III, Bernard of Clairvaux and Louis VII of France" in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, edited by Michael Gervers. 79-90. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Sommerfeld, John. "Chrismatic and Gregorian Leadership in the Thought of Bernard of Clairvaux." In *Bernard of Clairvaux: Studies Presented to Dom Jean Leclercq*. 73-90. Washington: Cistercian Publications, 1973.

_____. "The Social Theory of Bernard of Clairvaux." In *Studies in Medieval Cistercian History*. 49-54. Shannon: Irish University Press, 1971.

Ullmann, Walter. *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages*. London: Routledge, 2003.

_____. *Medieval Political Thought*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975.

Upton-Ward, J. M. "Introduction to *The Rule of the Templars*." In *The Rule of the Templars*, translated by J. M. Upton-Ward. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1992.

Volz, Carl. "Martin Luther's Attitude toward Bernard of Clairvaux" In *Studies in Medieval Cistercian History*. 186-204. Shannon: Irish University Press, 1971.

