INTRODUCTION

Jochen Burgtorf, Shlomo Lotan, and Enric Mallorquí-Ruscalleda

"May the incomparable efforts of the knights – alas too few – touch the depths of your heart." It was probably in the year 1120 that Warmund of Picquigny, the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, and Gerard, the prior of the Holy Sepulcher, addressed these words to Diego Gelmírez, the newly elevated archbishop of Santiago de Compostela. Their letter painted a grim picture of the situation in the Holy Land: drought, locusts, and Muslim enemies on all sides were tormenting the Christian inhabitants of the crusader states, and "nobody dare[d] to venture a mile or even less from the walls of Jerusalem or the other places without an armed escort of knights and foot-soldiers."[1] While we cannot be absolutely certain that the "knights" (*milites*) mentioned here were the Templars, there is good reason to believe that their early members were in fact involved in these protective efforts. Let us set the stage.

The "knighthood" (*militia*) of the Templars stood in the ninth year of its existence when its Latin Rule was promulgated at the Council of Troyes (Champagne) on 13 January 1129,[2] which implies that the community must have been formally established sometime in 1120, likely at the so-called "Council" of Nablus in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem on 16 January 1120.[3] Hugh of Payns – the community's first leader – had visited the Holy Land well before 1120,[4] and the idea to form an association of knights to protect

1 *Historia Compostellana*, ed. Emma Falque Rey (Turnhout 1988), 270–2: *descendat at intima cordis incomparabilis labor militum, heu paucorum. . . . Nemo enim a muris Hierusalem aut a ceteris locis audet exire, nisi cum armata manu militum, aut peditum, spatium unius miliarii et eo minus*. For the English translation and the dating of this letter to approximately 1120, see *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims, and Settlers in the 12th–13th Centuries*, trans. Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate (Farnham 2013), 42–4.

2 *Die ursprüngliche Templerregel*, ed. Gustav Schnürer (Freiburg 1903), 130: *anno . . . predicte militie nono*. For the date of the Council of Troyes, see Rudolf Hiestand, "Kardinalbischof Matthäus von Albano, das Konzil von Troyes und die Entstehung des Templerordens," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 99, no. 3 (1988): 295–325.

3 See *Die Urkunden der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem*, ed. Hans Eberhard Mayer (texts by Jean Richard), 4 vols. (Hanover 2010), 1: 223.

4 See Marie Luise Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae domus militiae Templi Hierosolymitani magistri: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Templerordens 1118/19–1314* (Göttingen 1974), 20.

the pilgrims and the Christian inhabitants of the Holy Land may have been on his mind for some time, but he does not appear with the formal title of "master of the knights of the Temple" (*magister militum Templi*) until 2 May 1125, when we find him in a charter issued by King Baldwin II of Jerusalem.[5] Hugh's appearance in this document is noteworthy for two reasons: his title indicates that the "Temple" (in reality the Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem) had by then become the permanent residence of this knightly community; and Hugh's position in the witness list, namely, as the very last of twenty-three distinguished witnesses and not among the ecclesiastical witnesses, suggests that even in the mid-1120s the Templars' exact status was yet to be determined.[6]

So then, what had happened in 1120? While the twelfth-century chronicler William of Tyre harbored an undeniable bias against the religious military orders,[7] we can perhaps largely trust his statement with regard to the origins of the Templars that "some noblemen of knightly rank, devoted to God, pious and God-fearing, placed themselves in the hands of the lord patriarch for the service of Christ, professing the wish to live perpetually in the manner of regular canons in chastity, and obedience, without personal belongings."[8] Yet even here a few doubts are in order: the Templars' Latin Rule draws primarily from the Rule of St. Benedict,[9] so the reference to the "regular canons" tells us more about William of Tyre's preferences than that of the Templars; and the community, according to both its Latin and Old French Rules, permitted temporary members among its ranks,[10] so not all Templars wished "to live perpetually" in the aforesaid manner. The "lord patriarch" in question would have been Warmund of Picquigny, which further strengthens the notion that the knights in his 1120 letter to the archbishop of Santiago de Compostela were indeed the Templars who, after all, may not yet have been referred to by that name. William then informs us that the king (namely, Baldwin II) gave to the new community "a temporary home in his palace [i.e., the Aqsa Mosque] which was on the

5 *Urkunden der lateinischen Könige*, ed. Mayer, 1: 241–7 no. 93.

6 See Christian Vogel, *Das Recht der Templer: Ausgewählte Aspekte des Templerrechts unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Statutenhandschriften aus Paris, Rom, Baltimore und Barcelona* (Münster 2007), 28.

7 Peter Edbury and John Gordon Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge 1988), 125–6.

8 *Willelmi Tyrensis archiepiscopi Chronicon / Guillaume de Tyr, Chronique*, ed. Robert B. C. Huygens (identification of historical sources and determination of dates by Hans Eberhard Mayer and Gerhard Rösch), Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 63–63A (Turnhout 1986), 553 (XII.7): *quidam nobiles viri de equestri ordine, deo devoti, religiosi et timentes deum, in manu domini patriarche Christi servicio se mancipantes, more canonicorum regularium in castitate et obedientia et sine proprio perpetuo vivere professi sunt*. English translation: *The Templars: Selected Sources Translated and Annotated*, trans. Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate (Manchester 2002), 25.

9 Vogel, *Recht der Templer*, 231.

10 *Ursprüngliche Templerregel*, ed. Schnürer, 136 § 5; *La règle du Temple*, ed. Henri de Curzon (Paris 1886), 21 § 9.

south side of the Temple of the Lord [i.e., the Dome of the Rock]."[11] Whether this arrangement was in fact intended to be "temporary" (*ad tempus*) or not, the title used by Hugh of Payns in the 1125 royal charter suggests that it was either made permanent within a matter of years or had been intended as a permanent arrangement all along (of which William of Tyre may not have approved). At any rate, the epithet "of the Temple" stuck, hence the community's collective name – the Templars. William's next statement concerning the community's initial establishment explains that the Templars received "temporarily or in perpetuity certain benefices" from both the kingdom's secular and ecclesiastical lords to sustain their efforts.[12] And finally, William informs us about the task set for this new community, namely, to "maintain the safety of the roads and the highways to the best of their ability, for the benefit of pilgrims in particular, against the attacks of bandits and marauders."[13]

The following picture emerges: by 1120 and even earlier, public safety had become an issue for both permanent residents and visiting pilgrims outside of the fortified places in the crusader states, and something needed to be done. There was a group of "alas too few" European knights, among them Hugh of Payns, who were willing to rise to the challenge. In early 1120, these knights took vows of obedience, chastity, and personal poverty before the Latin patriarch to formally establish a community with a decidedly spiritual orientation. The king of Jerusalem assigned them the Aqsa Mosque – labeled the *Templum Salomonis* ("Temple of Solomon") by contemporaries[14] – as their residence, which would prove to be of paramount importance for the community's self-perception. Baldwin II and the Latin kingdom's secular and ecclesiastical lords also provided for them by means of donations, thereby setting an example for future donors throughout Latin Christendom. Thus the (soon to be known as) "Templars" began their service as a pilgrim escort in the Holy Land, an activity that was both charitable and military in nature. Until early 1129, when they received their Rule at the Council of Troyes, they were – strictly speaking – not an Order; they were a lay community of Brothers-in-arms.

To become a "regulated" establishment of professed religious, the Templars needed a Rule.[15] It is possible – but by no means certain – that some time

11 *Willelmi Tyrensis archiepiscopi Chronicon*, ed. Huygens, 553 (XII.7): *in palatio suo, quod secus Templum Domini ad australem habet partem, eis ad tempus concessit habitaculum*. English translation: *Templars*, trans. Barber and Bate, 25.

12 *Willelmi Tyrensis archiepiscopi Chronicon*, ed. Huygens, 554 (XII.7): *beneficia, quedam ad tempus, quedam in perpetuum*. English translation: *Templars*, trans. Barber and Bate, 25.

13 *Willelmi Tyrensis archiepiscopi Chronicon*, ed. Huygens, 554 (XII.7): *ut vias et itinera maxime ad salutem peregrinorum contra latronum et incursantium insidias pro viribus conservarent*. English translation: *Templars*, trans. Barber and Bate, 26.

14 See Jochen Burgtorf, *The Central Convent of Hospitallers and Templars: History, Organization, and Personnel (1099/1120–1310)* (Leiden 2008), 27–8.

15 *Ursprüngliche Templerregel*, ed. Schnürer; *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon. See also Simonetta Cerrini, "Une expérience neuve au sein de la spiritualité médiévale: L'ordre du Temple (1120–1314):

before October 1126 Baldwin II asked the famous Cistercian abbot Bernard of Clairvaux to provide the Templar community with such a document.[16] While Bernard attended the 1129 Council of Troyes,[17] the extent of his involvement in crafting the actual Rule is unclear. However, he did provide the new Order with something infinitely more valuable, namely, the *Liber ad milites Templi de laude novae militiae* ("Book for the Knights of the Temple in Praise of the New Knighthood"),[18] written sometime in the 1130s at Hugh of Payns's request, a celebratory treatise on the characteristics of this "new knighthood" and a spiritual interpretation of the various pilgrimage destinations in the Holy Land. Bernard's support must have meant a great deal to Hugh, especially since the new Order and some of its latest recruits had just suffered their first severe losses in the context of a military campaign against Damascus – an event Marie Luise Bulst-Thiele has referred to as a "baptism by blood."[19] According to the chronicle of the contemporary Norman Benedictine author Robert of Torigni, "those who Hugh of Payns had brought with him to Jerusalem [from his visit to the West] fared poorly. On the eve of St. Nicholas [5 December 1129], many of the Christians were defeated by a few of the Pagans, which previously tended to happen the opposite way. For, during the Damascene siege, while the great part of the Christians had gone out to search for food, the Pagans surprised the many Christians and, with the strongest ones fleeing like women, the pursuers killed innumerable [of them]."[20] Considering, firstly, that the Templars would acquire a reputation for standing their ground and suffering martyrdom in imitation of Christ rather than desert the battlefield;[21] and, secondly, that the Templars' normative texts considered such flight a crime punishable by expulsion from the Order,[22] it seems relatively safe to assume that, in 1129, Hugh of Payns's Templars had met their end while facing their enemies head-on.

Once the Templars had become a regulated community, albeit an unheard-of hybrid between the two social orders of *oratores* ("those who pray") and *pugnatores* ("those who fight"), the support they received in incomes and real

Étude et édition des règles latines et françaises" (Thèse de doctorat, Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne 1998).

16 See *Urkunden der lateinischen Könige*, ed. Mayer, 1: 77, 234.

17 *Ursprüngliche Templerregel*, ed. Schnürer, 131 § III; *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 15–18 § 5–6.

18 Bernard de Clairvaux, *Éloge de la nouvelle chevalerie*, ed. Pierre-Yves Émery, Sources chrétiennes 367 (Paris 1990).

19 See, for example, Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae domus militiae Templi Hierosolymitani magistri*, 28.

20 *Chronique de Robert de Torigni, abbé du Mont-Saint-Michel*, ed. Léopold Delisle (Rouen 1872), 178–9: *Illis quos Hugo de Paiens . . . secum duxerat ad Jerusalem, male contigit. . . . In vigilia sancti Nicholai a paucis Paganorum multi Christianorum devicti sunt, cum antea soleret e contrario contingere. In obsidione igitur Damascena, cum magna pars Christianorum progressa esset ad victualia perquirenda, mirati sunt Pagani Christianos plures et fortissimos se muliebriter fugientes, et persequentes innumeros occiderunt.*

21 Joachim Rother, *Das Martyrium im Templerorden: Eine Studie zur historisch-theologischen Relevanz des Opfertodes im geistlichen Ritterorden der Templer*, Bamberger Historische Studien 16 (Bamberg 2017).

22 *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 154 § 232; 229 § 419; 298–300 § 574–7.

estate from donors in both East and West increased exponentially.[23] The Order was already enjoying the patronage of the authorities in the crusader states, and its accomplishments were being extolled by the great Bernard of Clairvaux, yet there was another level of endorsement that would prove to be crucial to the Order's long-term success, namely, that of the pope. Granted, Cardinal Bishop Matthew of Albano had attended the 1129 Council of Troyes on behalf of Pope Honorius II – evidence that the community's activities had come to the attention of the Holy See. By the middle of the 1130s (the exact date is unclear), Pope Innocent II was exhorting prelates to admonish their subordinates to take up collections on behalf of the Templars in an early version of the mandate *Milites Templi* ("Knights of the Temple") to which we will return shortly.[24]

On 29 March 1139, Innocent II issued the famous general privilege *Omne datum optimum* ("Every good gift"), urging the Templars to defend the Catholic Church and liberate her wherever she found herself under the "tyranny of the Pagans;" allowing the Templars to keep the spoils of their campaigns; granting them the protection of the Apostolic See; instructing the Brothers to live a religious life in chastity, without personal property, and in obedience to their master in all things; declaring their House (i.e., the "Temple" in Jerusalem) the head of all their other establishments; ordering the free election of their master and the inviolability of their customs (which should henceforth only be changed by the master with the consent of the Order's chapter); prohibiting any and all secular and ecclesiastical authorities from demanding fealty, homage, or oaths from them; instructing both their knights and sergeants to adhere to their stations; exempting the Templars from the obligation to pay tithes; granting them the tithes that had already been donated to them; permitting them to have their own priests who would owe obedience only to the master; ordering new initiates to promise (in the form of a written document to be placed on the altar) to adhere to their stations, change their lives, and fight for the Lord; stating that the episcopal rights with regard to tithes, offerings, and burials would be safeguarded; giving the Templars permission to construct their own oratories for divine service and the burial of their Brothers; and allowing them, their households, and their servants to receive penance and sacraments from honest Catholic priests as needed.[25] In contrast to the papacy's early *maior libertas* documents for the Hospitallers, Cistercians, Premonstratensians, Carthusians, the Order of Santiago, and the Teutonic Knights, which all contain

23 See *Cartulaire général de l'Ordre du Temple 1119?–1150: Recueil des Chartes et des Bulles relatives à l'Ordre du Temple formé par le Marquis d'Albon*, ed. Guigues Alexis Marie Joseph André d'Albon (Paris 1913).

24 Rudolf Hiestand, *Papsturkunden für Templer und Johanniter: Archivberichte und Texte*, Vorarbeiten zum Oriens Pontificius I (Göttingen 1972), 203–4 no. 2.

25 Hiestand, *Papsturkunden: Archivberichte*, 204–10 no. 3. See also the critical edition and extensive commentary in Rudolf Hiestand, *Papsturkunden für Templer und Johanniter: Neue Folge*, Vorarbeiten zum Oriens Pontificius II (Göttingen 1984), 67–103.

wording that these communities had, in fact, requested their respective privileges, there is no evidence that the Templars had asked Innocent II for *Omne datum optimum*.[26] To the Templars, this document must have appeared like its preamble's characterization of their "new knighthood," namely, as "every good gift" (James 1:17), as a truly divine favor. The immense scope of this general privilege established the Templars as an exempt Order of the Church, accountable directly to the pope as God's lieutenant on Earth. Yet as the Templars began to take full advantage of their new status, stretching it to (and perhaps beyond) its limits, critical voices would never be far behind.[27]

The addressees of *Omne datum optimum* had been the Templars themselves, but it was clear to the papacy that the Church needed to enlist her own to help the Templars in their work on behalf of the pilgrims and in defense of the Christian inhabitants of the Holy Land. Thus, on 9 January 1144, Pope Celestine II directed the (subsequently often repeated and originally devised by Innocent II) mandate *Milites Templi* ("Knights of the Temple") to all archbishops, bishops, abbots, and all other prelates, confirming to the Templars the remission of the seventh part of penances imposed on their benefactors and the free right of burial, and instructing the document's ecclesiastical recipients to publicize these liberties in their dioceses and grant the Templars their protection.[28] Of course, such an explicit spiritual benefit made donating to the Templars even more attractive. Just over a year later, on 7 April 1145, Pope Eugenius III (a good friend of Bernard of Clairvaux) issued the mandate *Militia Dei* ("Knighthood of God") and addressed it to the same audience as *Milites Templi*, augmented by "the faithful laypeople of God." This document basically informed all Christendom that the Templars were allowed to receive their own priests into their Order, albeit without diminishing parochial rights, and that they could build their own chapels and cemeteries which prelates were instructed to consecrate at the Order's request.[29]

These papal privileges, in the words of Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate, "laid the jurisdictional foundation of the Order's independence."[30] It was a strong foundation that helped ensure the Order's survival after the crusaders' loss of Jerusalem to the army of the Ayyubid sultan Saladin in 1187, when the Templars had to relocate their headquarters – perhaps first to Tyre (until 1191) but eventually (in 1191) to Acre. In Acre, the Templars built a splendid castle which served as their headquarters until that city's conquest by the forces of the Mamluk sultan Al-Ashraf Khalil in 1291, whereupon they moved their center of operations one

26 See Jochen Burgtorf, "Gab es Reformen im Templerorden?" *Ordines Militares, Colloquia Torunensia Historica: Yearbook for the Study of the Military Orders* 22 (2017): 7–29, here 25.

27 Helen J. Nicholson, *Templars, Hospitallers, and Teutonic Knights: Images of the Military Orders, 1128–1291* (Leicester 1993), 41–3.

28 Hiestand, *Papsturkunden: Archivberichte*, 214–15 no. 8.

29 Hiestand, *Papsturkunden: Archivberichte*, 216–17 no. 10.

30 *Templars*, trans. Barber and Bate, 8.

last time, namely, to Cyprus and probably to that kingdom's capital – Nicosia. The Templars argued passionately and forcefully against suggestions to merge the existing religious military orders into one single Order, pointing to the various communities' complementary strengths, foci, and traditions. Over the course of the thirteenth century, the Templars had expanded their already considerable geographical reach to include Frankish Greece and Eastern Europe, but their identity and impetus remained inextricably linked to the Holy Land and Jerusalem. In this they were not alone, which is evidenced by the fact that both Hospitallers and Teutonic Knights joined the Templars in the latter's final, albeit ill-fated, military campaign, namely, the conquest and occupation of Ruad (1300–1302), a small island off the Eastern Mediterranean coast, considered by contemporaries as a suitable bridgehead for the reconquest of the Holy Land.[31]

Alain Demurger has appropriately described the Templars as "a great hierarchicalized family."[32] The functioning of this family was based on several principles, including "obedience" (*oboedientia*), "care" (*cura*), and "love" (*dilectio*). The Templars took vows of obedience, chastity, and personal poverty, but obedience ranked highest: it was the first vow new recruits had to take when they were received into the Order,[33] and it was due to the master or anyone who had received delegated power from the master,[34] which encompassed all of the Order's officials as well as its priests. In return for this obedience, the Order's officials had to show their care or leadership responsibility both with regard to their subordinates as well as with regard to anything material entrusted to them.[35] Next to these somewhat more "vertical" principles of obedience and care, the third, somewhat more "horizontal" principle, namely, love, derived from Christ's proclamation – which we have already encountered – that "greater love than this has no man, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (John 15:13). As Joachim Rother has shown, this idea of representative martyrdom in imitation of Christ permeated the Templars' normative texts and papal privileges, as well as Bernard of Clairvaux's *De laude novae militiae*.[36] It was no coincidence that the liturgy for the installation of the newly elected Templar master included the hymn *Te Deum laudamus* ("Thee, O God, we praise")[37] which

31 Jochen Burgtorf, "Die Templer auf Ruad (1300–1302)," in *Die Ritterorden in Umbruchs- und Krisenzeiten*, ed. Roman Czaja and Jürgen Sarnowsky, Ordines Militares Colloquia Torunensia Historica 16 (Toruń 2011), 63–92.

32 Alain Demurger, *Vie et mort de l'ordre du Temple* (Paris 1985; new ed. 1993), 89: "une grande famille hiérarchisée."

33 *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 344 § 675.

34 *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 44–5 § 39.

35 See, for example, *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 302 § 581. See also Jochen Burgtorf, "Wind Beneath the Wings: Subordinate Headquarters Officials in the Hospital and the Temple from the Twelfth to the Early Fourteenth Centuries," in *The Military Orders, Volume 2: Welfare and Warfare*, ed. Helen J. Nicholson (Aldershot 1998), 217–24.

36 Rother, *Martyrium*.

37 *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 150–1 § 221.

features the line, "The resplendent army of Martyrs praise Thee." However, while the Order of the Temple was hierarchical, the master was expected to act in agreement with his Order's chapter,[38] and he was surrounded by a group of officers in the central convent who resembled those of a princely court and could (if need be) act as his lieutenants whenever he was absent, namely, a seneschal (until the end of the twelfth century), a grand commander, a marshal, a treasurer, and a draper.[39] The same principles that governed the Order's headquarters applied to its provincial administration in both East and West, as well as its local castles and commanderies.

According to Lauren Hablot, "medieval mentalities and sensitivities were familiar with the potential for *signa* to replace what they expressed."[40] The Templars were recognizable by such *signa* which included their characteristic white habit with the red cross (for knightly members only; sergeants wore a black mantle), a specific banner, and a much-discussed seal. The cross, apart from its obvious allusion to Christianity, signified membership in good standing in the community, meaning that Brothers on penance wore a cope without a cross.[41] In military engagements, the Templars' black-and-white banner, known as the *confanon bauçan*, was carried by the Order's marshal, surrounded by up to ten Brothers to protect the banner.[42] While the Templar statutes stipulate that "two brothers should not ride on one horse," the Templar seal featuring two knights (seemingly) riding on one horse may be the best known sigillographic motif in the history of the religious military orders, and the English chronicler Matthew Paris claimed that it symbolized the Brothers' initial poverty.[43] However, two knights on one horse are neither practical in case of combat nor a prudent use of an animal as valuable as a horse.[44] There may be a more straightforward explanation: one armed man on a horse represents a *miles* (a "knight"), but two armed man on a horse represent a *militia* (a "knighthood"), namely, the Templar community. Including multiple horses that are clearly discernible

38 Hiestand, *Papsturkunden: Neue Folge*, 97: *consentiente tamen saniori parte capituli* ("with the consent of the more reasonable part of the chapter").

39 See Burgtorf, *Central Convent*.

40 Laurent Hablot, "*Ubi armae ibi princeps*: Medieval Emblematics as the Real Presence of the Prince," in *Absentee Authority across Medieval Europe*, ed. Frédérique Lachaud and Michael Penman (Woodbridge 2017), 37–55, here 37.

41 *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 112–13 § 141; 250–1 § 469–70; 259 § 489; 335 § 654. See also Alain Demurger, "Croix," in *Prier et combattre: Dictionnaire européen des ordres militaires au Moyen Âge*, ed. Nicole Bériou and Philippe Josserand (Paris 2009), 282–3.

42 *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 125 § 164; see also 86–7 § 99.

43 *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 212 § 379: *Et II freres ne doivent chevauchier en une beste*. See *Matthaei Parisiensis, monachi Sancti Albani, Historia Anglorum, sive, ut vulgo dicitur, Historia minor*, ed. Frederic Madden, 3 vols. (London 1866–1869), 1: 223: *Qui primo adeo pauperes licet strenui fuerunt, quod unum solum dextrarium illi duo habuerunt; unde propter primitivae paupertatis memoriam, et ad humilitatis observantiam, in sigillo eorum insculpti sunt duo unum equum equitantes*.

44 For horses in the religious military orders, see Ann Hyland, *The Medieval Warhorse from Byzantium to the Crusades* (Stroud 1994), 149–55.

on one seal requires either a larger seal, or one runs the risk, when depicting the horses in two-dimensional profile, of featuring a multi-headed and multi-legged fable creature.

The Templars are well known for their involvement in battles and sieges – such as those of Ascalon (1153), Hattin (1187), Forbie (1244), and Acre (1291);[45] their often spectacularly situated castles and fortifications – such as Safed and 'Atlit in Israel, Tartus and Safita in Syria, as well as Miravet and Peñíscola in Spain; and their beautiful churches and chapels – such as those in London (England), Tomar (Portugal), Perugia (Italy), Metz (France), and Chwarszczany (Poland). Yet the Brothers' daily life in many of their commanderies all across Latin Christendom – apart from fulfilling their obligations with regard to divine services (based on the liturgy of the Holy Sepulcher), canonical hours (adapted from the Rule of St. Benedict), religious holidays, and so forth – was primarily devoted to land and livestock management to generate income that could be used to support the Order's efforts in the Holy Land and other frontier regions.[46] In the Order's central convent, larger commanderies, and castles, the Brothers moved in and out of several particular spaces on a daily basis, including the church, the refectory, the chapter hall (or whatever space was used to conduct chapter meetings), the work stations, stables, armories, and recreational areas, and the dormitory. Ringing the bells reminded the Brothers to move from one activity to the next,[47] and only those whose activities were difficult to interrupt were excused for tardiness in church or elsewhere, namely, Brothers kneading dough, forging hot iron, shoeing a horse, or washing their heads.[48] While the Templars were taking their meals, they were expected to listen to the reading of Scripture or holy lessons. Yet the Order's statutes contain several admonitions reminding the Brothers to be quiet during these readings[49] or to ask quietly if they were unfamiliar with sign language,[50] suggesting that remaining silent was, at times, a challenge. Chapter meetings, since they involved disciplinary procedures and initiation ceremonies, were highly ritualized,[51] and the manuscripts containing the respective instructions show traces of heavy use.[52] According to the Templar Rule, silence was preferable even to good conversations,[53] but Brothers were encouraged to ask questions if anything was unclear to them.[54]

45 It should be noted that a scholarly military history of the Templars has yet to be written.

46 See Helen J. Nicholson, *The Everyday Life of the Templars: The Knights Templar at Home* (Stroud 2017).

47 See, for example, *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 347 § 681.

48 *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 115 § 146; see also 178 § 300.

49 *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 34 § 24; 137 § 187; 173–4 § 288.

50 *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 33–4 § 23.

51 *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 216–84 § 386–543. See also Vogel, *Recht der Templer*, 301–4.

52 See *The Catalan Rule of the Templars: A Critical Edition and English Translation from Barcelona, Archivo de la Corona de Aragón, Cartas Reales, MS 3344*, ed. Judith M. Upton-Ward (Woodbridge 2003), xi–xii.

53 *Ursprüngliche Templerregel*, ed. Schnürer, 145 § 43; *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 52 § 49.

54 *Règle du Temple*, ed. Curzon, 350 § 686.

The astonishing rise and life of the Templars that we have sketched here came to a crushing halt on Friday, 13 October 1307, when all members of the Order were arrested in the kingdom of France by orders of King Philip IV on charges of heresy and other crimes. The drama of the subsequent proceedings, trial, or affair – all three rather sanitized terms for the Templars' incarceration, interrogations, tortures, relocation, confessions, retractions, executions, and so forth – has attracted so much scholarly attention that there is no need to relitigate it here.[55] While Pope Clement V temporarily tried to take charge of things, the issue was eventually agendized at the Council of Vienne where the Order of the Temple was dissolved (22 March 1312) – not because it had been found guilty, but because the proceedings had tarnished its reputation beyond repair – and where its assets were assigned to the Hospitallers. In mid-March 1314,[56] the last master of the Templars, James of Molay, and the Order's commander of Normandy, Geoffrey of Charney, were burned at the stake in the heart of Paris as relapsed heretics. Clement V died within a few weeks (20 April 1314), and Philip IV died later that same year (29 November 1314). The Order's fall was unexpected – at least for its fourteenth-century contemporaries; it was rapid; and it was final. Subsequent efforts to explain the inexplicable generated a plethora of stories and ultimately devolved into a slew of myths also known as "Templarism." The latter is not a topic of this present volume *per se* and has, generally speaking, rather little to do with the legacy of the historical Templars.

The following fifteen chapters recount the history of the Templars' rise, fall, and legacy from a wide range of methodological perspectives and on the basis of a fascinating array of sources. In the opening chapter of Part I (Rise), Karol Polejowski takes us back to the early years of the Templars in Champagne, the home of several of the Templar community's founding members, and presents Andrew de Baudement's kinship network as an example for Templar recruitment and the gathering of donations. On the basis of charter evidence pertaining to the lordship of Caesarea in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, Michael Ehrlich suggests in Chapter 2 that the Templars pursued a land acquisition policy that mirrored that of the Hospitallers to create contiguous territories under the Order's control to maximize systematic land exploitation. In Chapter 3, Marie-Anna Chevalier guides us through the copious narrative sources for the Templars' interaction with the respective rulers of the Christian states in the Eastern Mediterranean, which featured both collaboration and confrontation, grounded in the Order's sense of duty and honor. The next three chapters provide insights into art historical, theological, and archaeological interpretations

55 See, for example, Malcolm Barber, *The Trial of the Templars*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge 2006); *The Debate on the Trial of the Templars (1307–1314)*, ed. Jochen Burgtorf, Paul F. Crawford, and Helen J. Nicholson (Farnham 2010); *A Extinção da Ordem do Templo: Edição comemorativa dos 700 anos da extinção da Ordem do Templo (1312–2012)*, ed. José Albuquerque Carreiras (Tomar 2012); Alain Demurger, *La persécution des Templiers: Journal (1307–1314)* (Paris 2015).

56 The exact date is unclear; see Demurger, *Persécution des Templiers*, 280–1.

of Templar monuments. Sonia Kirch, in Chapter 4, analyzes the decorative elements and paintings in three of the Order's churches in southwestern France to establish their connection to Byzantine military saints. Shlomo Lotan and Joachim Rother, in Chapter 5, showcase 'Atlit (Château Pèlerin) as a remarkable site of Templar spirituality on the pilgrim road between Acre and Jerusalem. Joan Fuguet Sans, in Chapter 6, places the Order's Catalonian castles of Barberà, Gardeny, and Miravet into the wider context of contemporary castle architecture in the Iberian Peninsula and the Holy Land.

With Christian Vogel's Chapter 7 on the Italian Templar corsair Roger de Flor, which demonstrates – on the basis of this enigmatic individual's personal biography – a certain lack of social control with regard to the Templars' operations at sea, the curtain rises on Part II (Fall). In Chapter 8, Ignacio de la Torre proposes a connection between the Order's banking activities and its demise, arguing that, particularly for Philip IV of France, seizing the Templars' assets and deposits presented a solution to the realm's monetary fluctuations and debts. To what extent Templars were able to avoid arrest at the beginning of the proceedings against the Order depended, as Alan Forey shows in Chapter 9, at least in part on how rulers in the respective territories were implementing arrest orders, and while some of these Templar fugitives managed to escape permanently, others later surrendered themselves voluntarily. In Chapter 10, Helen J. Nicholson analyzes the Trial of the Templars in Britain and Ireland, arguing that neither King Edward II nor the Church in his realms (much like the pope himself) were ultimately inclined to resist the French king's demand to investigate the Templars on the charges brought against them, which – after all – also gave Edward II the opportunity to appropriate the Order's assets. Jochen Burgtorf, in Chapter 11, considers the Trial in Germany where the Templars themselves (much like their colleagues in Cyprus and certain locations on the Iberian Peninsula), as well as many of the secular and ecclesiastical princes, resisted the investigation against the Order.

Part III (Legacy) presents four examples of the Templars' long-term impact on history and historiography. In Chapter 12, Klaus Militzer suggests that the Trial of the Templars may well have been one of the determining factors in the Teutonic Knights' decision to move their headquarters from Venice to Marienburg but that it needs to be viewed in the context of other perceived and real threats to that Order's autonomy that had to be averted. José Antonio Guillén Berrendero discusses the image of the Templars in modern Castilian nobiliary treatises in Chapter 13, focusing particularly on the writings of the Benedictine monk and archivist Juan Benito Guardiola (1530–1600) who recounted the history of the Templars in an effort to "aristocratize" the past and emphasize the heroic solidarity of nobles over individualism. In Chapter 14, Elena Bellomo takes us through four centuries of Italian historiography on the Templar Trial, namely, from the contemporary perspectives of the early fourteenth century, including that of Dante Alighieri, to the writings of Angelo Fumagalli in the late eighteenth century, illustrating how a subject matter that seemingly demanded

the taking of sides eventually became one to which the new historical-critical method could be applied.

To conclude this collection, Kristjan Toomaspoeg's Chapter 15 offers a close examination of the recent historiography on the Templars that reaches back to the foundations of this field of study in the late nineteenth century by the Marquis André d'Albon (1866–1912) and his contemporaries, discusses the current areas of research, and outlines the scholarly work that remains to be done. As editors, we echo his statement that the Templars must be studied in their respective contexts (as the contributors to this volume have endeavored to do); that projects to edit and publish (or re-edit and re-publish) Templar primary sources need to be intensified; and that research on a wide range of topics will continue to require more individual and collaborative work, including spirituality, warfare, local history, and prosopography. Returning to this introduction's opening quote, it is our hope that this volume will provide its readers with new and stimulating scholarly perspectives on the "efforts of the knights"—their rise, their fall, and their legacy.