

WILLIAMS COLLEGE LIBRARIES

Your unpublished thesis, submitted for a degree at Williams College and administered by the Williams College Libraries, will be made available for research use. You may, through this form, provide instructions regarding copyright, access, dissemination and reproduction of your thesis.

☐ The faculty advisor to the student writing the thesis wishes to claim joint authorship in this work.

In each section, please check the ONE statement that reflects your wishes.

I. PUBLICATION AND QUOTATION: LITERARY PROPERTY RIGHTS

A student author automatically owns the copyright to his/her work, whether or not a copyright symbol and date are placed on the piece. The duration of U.S. copyright on a manuscript--and Williams theses are considered manuscripts--is the life of the author plus 70 years.

☒ I/we do not choose to retain literary property rights to the thesis, and I wish to assign them immediately to Williams College.

Selecting this option will assign copyright to the College. This in no way precludes a student author from later publishing his/her work; the student would, however, need to contact the Archives for a permission form. The Archives would be free in this case to also grant permission to another researcher to publish small sections from the thesis. Rarely would there be any reason for the Archives to grant permission to another party to publish the thesis in its entirety; if such a situation arose, the Archives would be in touch with the author to let them know that such a request had been made.

☐ I/we wish to retain literary property rights to the thesis for a period of three years, at which time the literary property rights shall be assigned to Williams College.

Selecting this option gives the author a few years to make exclusive use of the thesis in up-coming projects: articles, later research, etc.

☐ I/we wish to retain literary property rights to the thesis for a period of _____ years, or until my death, whichever is the later, at which time the literary property rights shall be assigned to Williams College.

Selecting this option allows the author great flexibility in extending or shortening the time of his/her automatic copyright period. Some students are interested in using their thesis in graduate school work. In this case, it would make sense for them to enter a number such as '10 years' in the blank, and line out the words 'or until my death, whichever is the later.' In any event, it is easier for the Archives to administer copyright on a manuscript if the period ends with the individual's death--our staff won't have to search for estate executors in this case--but this is entirely up to each student.

II. ACCESS

The Williams College Libraries are investigating the posting of theses online, as well as their retention in hardcopy.

☒ Williams College is granted permission to maintain and provide access to my thesis in hardcopy and via the Web both on and off campus.

Selecting this option allows researchers around the world to access the digital version of your work.

☐ Williams College is granted permission to maintain and provide access to my thesis in hardcopy and via the Web for on-campus use only.

Selecting this option allows access to the digital version of your work from the on-campus network only.

☐ The thesis is to be maintained and made available in hardcopy form only.

Selecting this option allows access to your work only from the hardcopy you submit. Such access pertains to the entirety of your work, including any media that it comprises or includes.

III. COPYING AND DISSEMINATION

Because theses are listed on FRANCIS, the Libraries receive numerous requests every year for copies of works. If/when a hardcopy thesis is duplicated for a researcher, a copy of the release form always accompanies the copy. Any digital version of your thesis will include the release form.

☒ Copies of the thesis may be provided to any researcher.

Selecting this option allows any researcher to request a copy from the Williams College Libraries, or to make one from an electronic version.

☐ Copying of the thesis is restricted for years, at which time copies may be provided to any researcher.

This option allows the author to set a time limit on copying restrictions. During this period, an electronic version of the thesis will be protected against duplication.

☐ Copying of the thesis or portions thereof, except as needed to maintain an adequate number of research copies available in the Williams College Libraries, is expressly prohibited. The electronic version of the thesis will be protected against duplication.

Selecting this option allows no reproductions to be made for researchers. The electronic version of the thesis will be protected against duplication. This option does not dis-allow researchers from reading/viewing the work in either hardcopy or digital form.

Signed (student author) [redacted]

Signed (faculty advisor) [redacted]

Thesis title Simon de Montfort: Lay Piety and Crusading Ideology in Thirteenth Century England

Date May 18, 2007

Accepted for the Libraries [redacted]

Date accepted 57807

SIMON DE MONTFORT:
Lay Piety and Crusading Ideology in Thirteenth-Century England

by

Kiana M. Scott

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Arts with Honors
in History

Professor Eric Goldberg
Advisor

Williams College
Williamstown, Massachusetts

May 16, 2007

Without your support, I could not have done this. Thank you.

A warm thanks to the Department of History, and especially Professor Chris Waters.
Whether at Mezze, the coffee shop, the classroom or your office, you are a constant inspiration.

To my fellow thesis students; from Martin Luther King, Jr. to decolonization to Grimm's fairy tales to something with Bismark and historiography, you have taught me more than you know. A special thanks to Brian, for making my transitions stronger.

To Professor Goldberg; without your guidance, support and constant motivation, I could not have done this.

To the friends who have supported me, put up with me, brought me coffee and learned more than they ever wanted to know about Simon de Montfort, baronial rebellions and crusading ideology. I will shut up about it now.

The third floor of Sawyer and the people who work there. Caffeine can only get you so far, and then it is up to the people who are there with you. It's been fun.

Most importantly,

To Kendall. Words can't describe how much I love you.

My parents, Doug Scott and Martha Scott. Little did you know what would happen when you took me to England at age nine. Thank you for your constant belief in me, and for your unconditional love and support.

ABBREVIATIONS

The Chronicle of Melrose, in *Church Historians of England*, ed. and trans. Joseph Stevenson Vol. 4.1, (London: Seeley's, 1856)

Melrose Chronicle

Church Historians of England, ed. and trans. Joseph Stevenson Vol. 4.1, (London: Seeley's, 1856)

CHE

Matthew Paris's English History, from the Year 1235-1273, trans. J.A. Giles (London: H.G. Bohn, 1852-1854)

Matthew Paris

English Historical Documents. David C. Douglas, ed. Vol. 3. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975)

EHD

Treharne, R. F. and I. J. Sanders, ed. *Documents of the Baronial Movements of Reform and Rebellion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973)

DBM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION	1
THE PIOUS REBEL	
CHAPTER ONE	11
SIMON DE MONTFORT'S PERSONAL PIETY	
CHAPTER TWO	36
SIMON DE MONTFORT AND THE CRUSADE	
CHAPTER THREE	54
A VOW FULFILLED: THE BARONIAL REBELLION AS A CRUSADE	
CHAPTER FOUR	80
DEATH, MIRACLES, AND MEMORY OF SIMON DE MONTFORT	
CONCLUSION	95
SIMON DE MONTFORT: A CRUSADER'S LEGACY	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	101

INTRODUCTION

THE PIOUS REBEL

On May 14, 1264, Simon de Montfort and his army, wearing the white cross of crusaders, rode into battle against Henry III of England. They had been absolved of their sins by the Bishop of Worcester and were ready to die for their beliefs. Montfort had spent the previous night fasting and praying, contemplating God. The magnitude of their actions was enormous; they were about to embark upon a full-scale battle against their consecrated monarch. What followed was one of the great coups of English military history. Montfort captured both King Henry and his son Edward at the Battle of Lewes, in effect becoming the ruler of England. Montfort was not leading a solely political rebellion; he was crusading against a despotic ruler. The crosses his men wore were freighted with well-understood symbolism.

He arranged his forces, and ordered his soldiers to fasten white crosses on their breasts and backs, above their armour, that they might be known by their enemies, and to show that they were fighting for justice.¹

With the benefit of retrospect, historians traditionally have studied Simon de Montfort as a founding father of English Parliamentary government. But Montfort's rebellion against King Henry cannot be explicated in purely political terms. Montfort must be understood in his own dynamic context of thirteenth-century Christian Europe,

¹ *Matthew Paris's English History, from the Year 1235-1273*, trans. J. A. Giles (London: H.G. Bohn, 1852-1854), 3:347.

not twenty-first century English democracy. The knights, nobles, and clergy of England saw Montfort as a deeply pious Christian leader engaged in a holy war against a tyrant. Montfort did not fight the Baron's Rebellion to democratize English politics. Instead, he believed he was fighting a crusade. This thesis seeks to understand Simon de Montfort and his role in the Baron's Rebellion of 1263-1265 in this thirteenth-century context. By investigating Montfort's career in tandem with his aristocratic identity, deep Christian piety, and fervent crusading ideology, this thesis argues that Montfort saw himself not as an early trailblazer of parliamentary government, but rather as a righteous crusade leader who led the Baron's Rebellion in God's name.

Montfort fought with a specific ideology, adopting symbolism and rhetoric deliberately intended to indicate that his rebellion against Henry III was nothing less than a holy crusade. The choice of this powerful symbolism arose from Montfort's personal piety, informed by his family background, his marriage, his close friends, and his personal habits, and called upon the deepest themes of thirteenth century English religious culture. Montfort was a crusader; he had participated in a crusade to Jerusalem, but his experience there left him frustrated. He saw the war against Henry as both a holy war he fought with God's support and an opportunity to fulfill his crusading vow.

From his first appearance in contemporary chronicles, Simon de Montfort was characterized as a tenacious, determined man with great ambition. Little is known about his life before his arrival in England. He was born, scholars posit, in 1208 in his ancestral home in France, the third son in one of France's oldest aristocratic families. His prospects were not great. The family's expectations rested on his eldest brother; as a younger son, Montfort could have been groomed for the Church or given some property

of little consequence. Without claim to his father's lands in France, Montfort traveled to England in 1231 with the intention of claiming his ancestral rights to property from his mother's side of the family.² He persuaded the Earl of Chester to give up these lands, and thus assumed the noble title of the Earl of Leicester.³

Much of his early success at the English court was the direct result of his friendship with King Henry III. His position among the English nobility was further solidified by his clandestine marriage to the king's sister Eleanor in January of 1238. The widow of the Earl of Pembroke, she was entitled to a dower of one third of her late husband's estate, in addition to inherited wealth of her own. Montfort, a debt-ridden and foreign-born earl, was not an acceptable husband for her. Although he was initially unhappy with the union, Henry ultimately used his influence to force the court to accept his sister and her new husband.⁴ As a relative and close friend of the king, Montfort became fully immersed in court life. Montfort and Eleanor had five sons and one daughter who survived infancy, and named their eldest Henry after Montfort's royal brother-in-law.

² Simon de Montfort's paternal grandmother had inherited a claim to the earldom of Leicester, but the lands had remained in the hands of the English monarchy while the Montfort family held lands in France. Montfort was successfully able to claim them because he forfeited all rights to his French lands, and thus was not a vassal of the French king. The Earl of Chester had possessed the honor of Leicester since Henry presented it to him as a life holding in 1227. A smaller property to one of the wealthiest magnates in England, he seems to have been persuaded by Montfort's words alone to give up the property, proving Montfort's silver-tongued powers of persuasion were present early in his life. He was twenty-two at the time.

³ Montfort was not officially invested with the earldom until 1239, but for purposes of clarity this will be ignored.

⁴ It is likely that Henry was under the impression that Eleanor was pregnant with Montfort's child, and agreed to the marriage in order to avoid a scandal. This would explain his acceptance of a marriage that was both unorthodox and had the potential to harm his alliances with foreign governments, for his sister's eligibility, discussed in Chapter One, was one of his greatest bargaining tools. During these early years, Montfort was one of Henry's closest acquaintances; Henry was known for elevating his favorites beyond their social sphere.

Montfort took the cross and left for the Holy Land in August of 1239, joining a crusade for which he and the English nobility shared considerable enthusiasm. Although little is known of his military success while crusading, he was offered the governorship of Jerusalem, which he declined for unknown reasons. A later attempt to return to Jerusalem in 1248 was foiled when Henry III asked Montfort to become his regent in Gascony, a position he held for seven years, during which his personal resources were stretched to the limit and he established a reputation as a brutal and victorious military leader. Henry refused to repay the debts Montfort had incurred on his behalf, and released and restored to favor the prisoners Montfort had won for him. The Gascony sojourn marked the beginning of the decline of Montfort's friendship with the king. Relations between Montfort and Henry soured further as royal power was exploited by the king and his hated half-siblings. As Henry's relationship with the pope weakened, he demanded money from the nobility. His campaigns in France failed, and his choice of councilors and intimates alienated his citizens. The English nobility believed reform was essential.

The thirteenth century was full of political tension, as England recovered from civil war and the reign of King John, and, with the end of Montfort's rebellion, entered into a new era of peace and prosperity. Political unity had seemed in hand with the Magna Carta at the beginning of the century, but the barons soon began to realize that it was an empty promise of reform.⁵ The Barons' Rebellion responded to the need for reform.

⁵ Robert Barlett, *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings, 1075-1225* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 62-67; Christopher Daniell, *From Norman Conquest to Magna Carta, England 1066-1215* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 50-53.

In 1258, a group of barons forced King Henry to sign the Provisions of Oxford. The Provisions of Oxford marked the first time restraint of the autonomy of the Crown was institutionalized; this had not happened in 1215, and would not occur again with the unrest of 1296-1297 or 1310-1311. In this document, the king, for the first time, recognized the power of Parliament.⁶ Montfort was not fighting against the monarchy as a whole, but against the monarch's ability to abuse power as Henry had done. The Treaty of Paris, in 1259, was a further attempt brokered by Louis IX of France to reconcile the barons with the king. Relations between Henry and Montfort shattered irreparably when Montfort refused to ratify the Treaty until the king repaid the debts Montfort garnered while in action on his behalf in Gascony. In 1261, Henry received a papal bull releasing him from his oath to uphold the Provisions. War between the king and his rebellious barons broke out in 1264.

The Battle of Lewes gave a key victory to Montfort with his capture of both Henry III and the future Edward I. Thus, Montfort became the true power in the kingdom, and in January of 1265 the first Parliament was held at the Palace of Westminster, thenceforth known as the Houses of Parliament. Edward escaped from captivity during the summer of 1265, a pivotal event that led directly to the death of both Simon and his son, Henry de Montfort as Edward rallied the king's supporters to counterattack.

⁶ I.J. Sanders, introduction to *Documents of the Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion 1258-1267*, ed. R. F. Treharne and I. J. Sanders (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 123. The Magna Carta, signed in 1215 by King John, promised reform after John's military failures in France, his impasse with the pope over the investiture of the Archbishop of Canterbury and subsequent excommunication, and his decision to lease England and Ireland to the papacy as fiefdom for a fee, a decision which limited the autonomy of the nobility. The Magna Carta is especially crucial for examining the Baronial Rebellion because it sets the precedent of a king's power being limited, although the Magna Carta did not institutionalize this limitation as the Provisions of Oxford did. See Daniell, *From Norman Conquest to Magna Carta*, 50-53.

The decisive battle was fought on August 4, 1265 outside the tiny hamlet of Evesham, where the death of Simon de Montfort effectively ended the Baronial Rebellion. After Montfort's death, support for his goals wavered, and the rebellion was finally put to rest in 1267 with the Dictum of Kenilworth, and the surrender of the remaining rebels.

Contemporary chroniclers understood that the Barons' Rebellion was an event of national and historic significance; the modern scholar benefits from a wide collection of contemporary works. Chronicles were kept by monks; the clergy predominantly supported the Baronial Rebellion, and that support is reflected in their histories.⁷ That many of Montfort's intimate friends were powerful clergymen likely influenced his ecclesiastic backing.

Matthew Paris and the Chronicle of Melrose are the two most critical records of Montfort and his rebellion.⁸ Matthew Paris, a thirteenth century English monk at St. Albans monastery in Herefordshire, wrote a history of England up to the time of his own death in 1259. He is one of the most reliable witnesses of this history, as he was in contact with both Henry III and Richard of Cornwall, the king's brother. On a visit to St. Albans in 1257, the king spent time with Paris: "As the writer of this book was his constant companion in the palace, at table, and in his chamber, he dictated to him with care and affability."⁹ It is then surprising that Paris's chronicle should be so overwhelmingly unfavorable to the king. The Chronicle of Melrose, written at Melrose

⁷ See *Chronicles of the Mayors and Sheriffs of London, 1259-1266*, in *English Historical Documents*, ed. David C. Douglas (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), 159-196; *Annals of Burton for the years 1258-1259*, EHD, 153-159. These chronicles add to historical knowledge of Simon de Montfort during the Baronial Rebellion, although the Annals of Burton never mentions his by name or title.

⁸ See "Select Chronicles and Narrative Sources," EHD, 46-47.

⁹ Matthew Paris, 3:220.

Abbey in Scotland, is an invaluable source concerning Montfort's religious beliefs and death and emphasizes his piety. The chronicler, although far from the scene of events, appears to have taken a special interest in Montfort's accomplishment; and assures the reader, "I have written nothing about him which I have not received from men whom I consider to be worthy of credit."¹⁰

No study of Simon de Montfort is complete without the works of scholars J. R. Maddicott, David Carpenter, and F. M. Powicke. Powicke, the preeminent scholar of the period, wrote extensively on the reign of Henry III. These scholars differ in their understandings of Montfort's character. Maddicott sees Montfort as a driven, determined and ultimately flawed character whose complexities informed his political and personal choices.¹¹ C. H. Knowles sees Montfort as a self-interested opportunist, while R. F. Treharne saw him as a high-minded idealist.¹² Carpenter understands Montfort as the one consistent politician during this period—one who, sworn to the Provisions of Oxford, never abandons them; by the end of 1261, Montfort was the only baron still with faith in the Provisions, choosing to depart for France rather than be forsworn in his oath.¹³ Modern scholars remain as divided about Montfort's ultimate character and motivation as did Montfort's contemporaries in the halls of Parliament and the vale of Evesham in the

¹⁰ The clearest edition of The Chronicle of Melrose is included in the collection Church Historians of England, a comprehensive collection of contemporary chronicles in translation. *Chronicle of Melrose*, in *Church Historians of England*, ed. and trans. Joseph Stevenson (London: Seeley's, 1856) 4.1:236.

¹¹ J. R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994). I am especially indebted to Dr. Maddicott for his suggestions and advice. His inclusion of previously not translated sources in his work has been invaluable to me in this endeavor, and made many important works accessible.

¹² C.H. Knowles, *Simon de Montfort, 1265-1265* (London: Historical Association, 1965), 28-29; R. F. Treharne, *Simon de Montfort and Baronial Reform: Thirteenth-century Essays*, ed. E. B. Fryde (Ronceverte, WV: Hambledon Press, 1986), 75-102.

¹³ D. A. Carpenter, "Simon de Montfort: The First Leader of a Political Movement in English History" in *The Reign of Henry III* (Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon Press, 1996), 222.

thirteenth century. The work of Jonathan Riley-Smith and Christopher Tyerman is essential to any undertaking involving the crusades.

This thesis follows Powicke and Maddicott most closely in drawing on the complexities in Montfort's character to illuminate the decisions he reached, and the action he took in the Baronial Rebellion. However, no historian has fully explored the issue of Montfort's use of crusading ideology in the rebellion. Maddicott accepts the idea that Montfort was crusading, writing "as the movement gathered pace...it became something like a crusade, a quality which it never lost."¹⁴ This qualified statement does not take into account the deliberate and concerted effort Montfort made to adopt and disseminate a crusading ideology to his followers. In fact, the record demonstrates that he consciously framed the rebellion as a holy war, and his army as Christian soldiers. Christopher Tyerman does see Montfort's rebellion in terms of a political crusade, and offers a clear view of Montfort's motivations.¹⁵ He does not, however, account for Montfort's extraordinary personal piety and frustrated crusading experience, characterizing him as a purely political figure when in fact religion played a central role in Montfort's rebellion. Maddicott's examination of Montfort's personal religious habits is exemplary, but he does not address several crucial aspects of the pope's interference with English politics. Both of these scholars bring vital additions to the aggregate knowledge we have, but neither fully explores Montfort's crusading focus as leader of the Baronial Rebellion, a perspective this thesis explores.

This thesis will examine Simon de Montfort's piety, crusading ideology and rebellion against Henry III in four chapters. Chapter One examines the influences that

¹⁴ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 353.

¹⁵ Christopher Tyerman, *England and the Crusade* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

shaped Montfort's piety, notably his family background, the realization of his belief through personal habits, his marriage to Eleanor, and his close relationships with clergymen such as Robert Grosseteste and Walter de Cantilupe.¹⁶

Montfort's experience as a traditional crusader in the Holy Land is reviewed in Chapter Two. Montfort traveled to Jerusalem with a contingent of English knights and soldiers in 1239 after taking a crusading vow. His experience there left him frustrated; he felt that his vow to fight God's enemies had not been fulfilled by the little military action he lived through. It was during his sojourn to the Holy Land that he gained familiarity with the symbols and rhetoric of the crusades that he would use with such success during the Baronial Rebellion.

Chapter Three analyzes Montfort's conscious use of specific symbols and rhetorical language associated with previous crusades to form an ideology of crusading in terms of the rebellion. He himself had not been intimately involved in the reform efforts that began in 1258; he was no more than one of many aggrieved barons, with only a mild interest in reform. However by 1261, he was unequivocally the leader of the rebellious nobility, and it was his crusading ideology that determined the form taken by the rebellion.

Montfort's rebellion succeeded in 1264, capturing both the king and the heir to England's throne. The government was his, and reforms were enacted. Within a year, however, both he and his cause died on the field at Evesham. Edward's army desecrated Montfort's body in an attempt to humiliate his surviving followers and assure the demise of any surviving interest in reform. This strategem backfired, however, as Montfort was

¹⁶ Walter de Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester, is sometimes referred to in chronicles as "William." I have followed scholastic precedent in choosing to use "Walter" throughout this work. When discrepancies occur in the original document, a note shall be made.

venerated, and in effect canonized, by the common people of England. His dismembered body parts became relics, and miracles were credited to him. Chapter Four examines the desecration of Montfort's body, the subsequent miracles he is said to have performed, and Montfort's cult as a popular saint.

Montfort's legacy has been felt throughout subsequent English history. Like Oliver Cromwell, he was a popular figure who believed in reform, and is credited with pushing England toward a constitutional democracy. Montfort is best remembered as one of the fathers of British political democracy, but his Christianity must be taken into account when discussing his politics. Politics for him were never fully distinct from religion; religion was part of everything he did, and everything for which he fought. He surrounded himself with the most important English theologians of his day, and set himself apart from his peers with his extraordinary piety and stringent practices while acting as one of the monarchy's most influential councilors, fulfilling his duties as a lord, and enacting critical reforms.

Simon de Montfort was a pious soldier, a self-affirmed crusader who rebelled against his king. From crusader to martyr to saint, his personal piety and religious beliefs could not be separated from his political persona. In Simon de Montfort we have an historical figure in whom piety and politics were utterly and completely intertwined.

CHAPTER ONE

SIMON DE MONTFORT'S PERSONAL PIETY

INTRODUCTION

Nearly seven centuries after his death, Simon de Montfort remains an enigma to most scholars. Many of the intricacies of the Baronial Rebellion hang on the paradoxes of Montfort's character and biography.¹⁷ He was a third son who emerged to dizzying heights of power at the English court, a crusade leader in the Holy Land, a devout and spiritual Christian, a principled rebel, and a brilliant military tactician. He was a Frenchman who became the *de facto* ruler of England while struggling to keep foreigners from power, and a military leader who was deeply influenced by the most important theologians of his day. Montfort's intense piety set him apart from his peers. His father's crusading past and reputation, the atmosphere of religious zealotry in which he was raised, questions of morality brought up by his clandestine marriage, and the spiritual advisors he counted among his close friends were all influences whose weight would have lasting effects on both Montfort's beliefs, and his rebellion against the monarchy of Henry III.

Montfort rose to power in the thirteenth century, a tumultuous era in English history. One generation earlier, King John had been forced to sign the Runnymede

¹⁷ For further information and detailed biographies, see Charles Bémont, *Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, 1208-1265*, trans. E. F. Jacob (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930), 1-72; J. R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 1-97; Margaret Wade LaBarge, *Simon de Montfort* (London: Greenwood Press Reprint, 1975); Mandell Creighton, *Life of Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester* (London: Rivingtons, 1877).

Charter (the Magna Carta) in 1215, marking the beginning of baronial reform and parliamentary government.¹⁸ England had been locked in civil war for decades; choosing sides, many noble families were ripped apart irrevocably. The thirteenth century saw the shifting balance of religious power frequently overshadowed by more dramatic political and military movements; yet it was the Church and his own understanding of his place in the religious world in which he lived, that ultimately informed Montfort's understanding of the political disputes in which he was so intimately involved.

While history remembers him for his role as a soldier, Montfort's piety is the lens through which his military successes and failures must be examined. His personal religious beliefs, unusually stringent for an era in which spiritual devotion was expected, gave shape to his political choices, and were themselves shaped by his family background and his marriage. His father's brutality and religious fervor were legendary during his own lifetime, and the early circumstances surrounding his marriage pricked Montfort's conscience throughout his later life.¹⁹ Montfort was a secular lord who exhibited a degree of religiosity unusual for a layman; that religiosity profoundly impacted the rest of his life.

This chapter examines Simon de Montfort's personal piety. In relation to his peers, he stood out as a particularly devout aristocrat; nothing reinforced his piety as much as the ecclesiastic figures within his intimate circle of supporters. Robert Grosseteste, Adam Marsh, and Walter Cantilupe contributed to the political rebellion, but

¹⁸ More further information about the Magna Carta, see Danny Denziger and John Gillingham, *1215: The Year of the Magna Carta* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004); J. R. Maddicott, "The Magna Carta and the Local Community 1215-1259" *Past and Present* 102 (February 1984): 25-65; J. C. Holt, "The Barons and the Great Charter" *The English Historical Review* 70.274 (January 1955): 1-24; Geoffrey Hindley, *The Book of Magna Carta* (London: Constable, 1990).

¹⁹ For further discussions of his marriage, see George Walter Prothero, *The Life of Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1877), 43-47; Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 21-29.

they were critical in shaping Montfort's piety. The atmosphere of crusading zeal and religious faith in which he was raised, as well as his father's reputation, shaped other's opinions of him, as well as his own understanding of the Church. This chapter goes on to review the events surrounding the marriage of Simon de Montfort to Eleanor, Countess of Pembroke, the youngest sister of King Henry III. The vow of chastity that Eleanor had sworn to keep would be violated by their wedding, and this broken oath would return to haunt Montfort. His family, supporters, and marriage were among the most influential factors on Montfort's later political and crusading career.

PIETY

Simon de Montfort came of age in an atmosphere of extreme religious devotion. From the examples set by his family and the clergy surrounding him, he gained an intensely deep faith, and was extraordinarily devout, especially for a layman of his era. His faith was the fundamental source of his later dedication to the reform promised under the Provisions of Oxford. To understand how unusual Montfort's degree of religious devotion was among his peers and contemporaries, one must understand the shifting place of the laity in the thirteenth century Church.

Prior to the thirteenth century, religion for the noble laity focused on intercession by monastics on behalf of their benefactors.²⁰ A wealthy nobleman would make a donation of lands or goods to a spiritual house in exchange for the prayers of the nuns or monks within. The nobility were not primarily responsible for their own salvation except through the mediation of the clergy. This was considered the best route to heaven until a

²⁰ See also Creighton, *Simon de Montfort*, 1-3, for a discussion of the shifting emphasis of the Church in thirteenth-century England.

fundamental shift took place at the beginning of the thirteenth century. Secular men and women assumed responsibility for their own spiritual lives and were thus no longer dependent upon the clergy to act as intermediaries. The increased moral and pastoral emphasis of schools, and an amplified effort on the part of the friars to turn nominal believers into devout believers, both contributed to this movement. A crucial event in this transition was the reform initiated by the Fourth Lateran Council, held by Pope Innocent III in 1215. Confession became an annual requirement for Catholics, and the practice became immediately popular.²¹ Salvation was now less dependent upon mediation by the clergy, and more on personal obedience to Christian doctrines.²²

Montfort was an exemplary and devoted believer who also used his education to further his spiritual needs. Education was run by the Church, and was highly valued by Montfort. He himself was highly educated: he corresponded in Latin with scholars and religious leaders later in life.²³ He presided over a pious and educated family. His son, Amaury, for example, gave a copy of “*Summa de Vitiis et de Virtutibus*” to a religious house.²⁴ This work was essentially a handbook for confessors and an exposition on Christian life mostly read by clerks, yet scholars believe that Montfort gave it to Amaury. His children were educated by Bishop Robert Grosseteste, one of the most learned and respected ecclesiastics of the age.

Even among the devout of the thirteenth century, Montfort was particularly compelled by his faith. His conscience was formidable; as Maddicott states, “Montfort’s spiritual advisors saw confession and the cultivation of conscience as central to their most

²¹ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 84.

²² Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 77-78.

²³ Bémont, *Simon de Montfort*, 2.

²⁴ Translates to, “Study of Works and Ideas.” Maddicott believes this to be written by Guillaume Peyraut, a Dominican prior at Lyons. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 86.

fundamental task of instructing the laity in their Christian duties in order to save their souls.”²⁵ With such increased impact placed on confession and the introspection needed to perform confession faithfully, one’s conscience would have been given greater importance. Montfort was a soldier by profession, a paragon of piety by inclination, and troubled by his marriage; his conscience would have been on primary importance to him.

Simon de Montfort’s religious commitment led him to become increasingly monastic throughout his life as his dedication to the Baronial Rebellion grew. Montfort adopted more stringent religious habits, far surpassing the nominal devotional practices followed by his contemporaries. Modern scholars agree that he was more intense about religion than the average layman of the era, a distinction that his contemporaries also drew.²⁶ The Melrose Chronicler points out that, “He was moderate and frugal; and it was a usual practice of his to watch [i.e. pray] by night, in preference to sleeping,”²⁷ an unusual custom for a man of his social standing. Montfort, chronicles tell us, was temperate in diet, taking neither too much nor too little food and drink, and frugal in his dress. Eleanor, on the other hand, was chastised for her extravagance of costume, want of spousal obedience, and angry temper; it becomes clear that the two of them approached some aspects of religion in extremely different ways.²⁸ In the words of the Melrose Chronicler, “thus we may find an example of holy moderation in Simon.”²⁹ He wore russet (a cheap and common cloth) when with members of his household, and even in the company of other nobles rarely wore scarlet, the most expensive fabric. His habitual

²⁵ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 85.

²⁶ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 79.

²⁷ *Matthew Paris’s English History, from the Year 1235-1273*, trans. J. A. Giles (London: H.G. Bohn, 1852-1854), 1:355. Henceforth known as “Matthew Paris.”

²⁸ Creighton, *Simon de Montfort*, 73.

²⁹ *Chronicle of Melrose*, in *Church Historians of England*, ed. and trans. Joseph Stevenson (London: Seeley’s, 1856) 4.1:230.

clothing choices were usually blue or brown, “possibly that they might the less suspect that his under-garments were of haircloth.”³⁰ Several different sources emphasize the hair shirt Montfort wore: “The hard hair cloth was the garment nearest to his body,” according to Robert of Gloucester.³¹ According to his attendants, he wore it at all hours of the day, even to bed. Hair shirts were far from commonplace, but were worn by some clerics, notably the Archbishop of Canterbury. For a noble of Montfort’s rank to subject himself to the constant irritation and lack of comfort of such a garment, “the sanctity of which must be acknowledged,” would have been exceedingly unusual.³² The notoriety gained by Montfort’s piety would impact his role as leader of a domestic crusade.

FAMILY BACKGROUND

Simon de Montfort came from a family that encouraged strict religious practices. His childhood, ending all too soon with the early and violent death of his father, was full of piety and religion. This was due to strong personalities within his family, and to the particular emphasis his father placed on crusading, an emphasis that would later follow Montfort and influence his career. In the patriarchal society of thirteenth-century France, no one person would have been more influential to an aristocratic youth than his father. Young men, even third sons such as the younger Simon de Montfort, were raised in the expectation of becoming knights, and would look to the lord of the estate (in this case his father) for guidance.

³⁰ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 230.

³¹ *Robert of Gloucester’s Chronicle*, in *The Church Historians of England*, ed. and trans. Joseph Stevenson (London: Seeley’s, 1858), 5.1:375.

³² *Chronicle of Melrose*, 232.

Montfort's father, Simon de Montfort, the fifth earl of Leicester (1160-1218), was a feared and respected soldier known for his religious faith.³³ He was a leader in the Albigensian Crusade (1209-1229) against the heretical Cathars of Languedoc, and appears to have gone on the Fourth Crusade to the Holy Land.³⁴ Powicke refers to him as "that fanatical warrior," a sobriquet he appears to have deserved.³⁵ A brilliant and ultimately brutal military tactician who died early in his son's life, the elder Simon de Montfort and his memory shaped the way in which his son was received by the English aristocracy.³⁶ In the wars against the Cathars, his father used terror as a weapon of war; a garrison that resisted him in Bram had their eyes put out, and he summarily executed rebels whom he saw as insurgents, while those heretics who refused to convert were burned at the stake.³⁷ After the battle of Muret, over 140 Cathars who refused to convert were burned to death.³⁸ His was a total war; he ordered his troops to burn the crops of the enemy in addition to executions and mass slaughter.³⁹

If Montfort the younger, as is probable, spent his boyhood with his family in the south of France, he would have been in an atmosphere of Christian dedication and

³³ See Stephen O'Shea, *A Perfect Heresy: The Revolutionary Life and Death of the Medieval Cathars* (New York: Walter and Co., 2000) 107-109; Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 6.

³⁴ The Cathars, also erroneously known as the Albigensians, were a religious sect active in Languedoc from the eleventh to the twelfth centuries. A combination of Christian and Gnostic beliefs, Catharism was disputed by the Roman Catholic Church, and a crusade against the heretical sect was proclaimed by Pope Innocent III. St. Dominic, the founder of the Dominican order, was influential in the Albigensian Crusade. See Malcolm Lambert, *The Cathars* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998); O'Shea, *The Perfect Heresy*; Malcolm Barber, *The Cathars: Dualistic Heretics in Languedoc in the High Middle Ages* (New York: Longman, 2000).

³⁵ Maurice Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 88.

³⁶ During the Albigensian Crusade, Amaury of Montreal turned against Simon de Montfort after yielding to him. When Amaury and his ninety knights were forced to surrender, they were immediately executed. Amaury's sister was "maltreated" by soldiers before being thrown down a well and stoned to death. Lambert, *The Cathars*, 104. At the Battle of Muret, in 1213, Simon de Montfort and his men routed the enemy, slaughtering 7,000 outright (a mass grave would be discovered in the nineteenth century). O'Shea, *The Perfect Heresy*, 141-148.

³⁷ Lambert, *The Cathars*, 104.

³⁸ Lambert, *The Cathars*, 106; O'Shea, *The Perfect Heresy*, 112-116.

³⁹ O'Shea, *The Perfect Heresy*, 186.

zealous devotion. His father was obviously a fervent supporter of the Albigensian Crusade, but so was his mother; Alice, like Eleanor in 1239, accompanied her husband on crusade in Languedoc. She is described by Bémont as “taking a most energetic share in the Albigensian war.”⁴⁰ Their closest personal friends, like the younger Montfort’s, were clergymen, notably Foulques de Neuilly, who preached the Fourth Crusade.⁴¹ Simon de Montfort the elder attended mass regularly and maintained contact with St. Dominic, a holy man, for long periods.⁴² Like his father, the sixth Earl of Leicester had close and meaningful friendships with clergy, to whom he looked for advice and consultation.

Before the thirteenth century, the Montfort family’s warrior energy had been swept up in boundary disputes (their seat, Montfort l’Amaury, was close to the continental lands held by the English monarchy, a frequent site of conflict), but the focus of Simon de Montfort the elder shifted to the more emotive appeal of the crusades, which gave him a new sense of direction and different field of action.⁴³ His military prowess built up a territorial empire in France, and he gained a reputation of brutality that would dog his son decades later.⁴⁴

Crusading traditions within the Montfort family ran strong. Simon de Montfort the elder had fought previously in the Fourth Crusade. When another Montfort married Amica, co-heiress to the county of Leicester, the family became associated with the

⁴⁰ Bémont, *Simon de Montfort*, 2; O’Shea discusses the incredible and untimely devotion of the elder Simon de Montfort to his wife: they had six children together, and she herself delivered reinforcements to her husband in March 1210. O’Shea, *The Perfect Heresy*, 108.

⁴¹ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 5. Montfort was close with several clerics who preached the crusade.

⁴² Lambert, *The Cathars*, 106.

⁴³ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 2.

⁴⁴ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 3. See also Creighton, *Simon de Montfort*, 15, for further discussion of Simon de Montfort the elder’s reputation and biography.

Beaumont earls, an English family with a long line of crusading tradition.⁴⁵ These ties would also impact Montfort the younger's decision to take the cross. He was no longer just an individual traveling to Jerusalem; he was joining a long and honorable chain of Montfort crusaders. To those who knew his father's eminence as a crusader and military leader, this was only natural for the son. The reputation for brutality that Simon de Montfort the elder gained during the Albigensian Crusade hurt his son's ability to restore order in Gascony once he had achieved military success there in the 1240s.⁴⁶ It was likely that Montfort the elder's reputation also contributed to his son's reputation as a warrior, for no records remain that prove the younger Montfort's worth as a military commander, yet he was immediately entrusted with responsibilities and leadership roles, even among other aristocrats. In a society in which primogeniture and patriarchy were valued, it is only natural that men would want to emulate their fathers; ancestry was important.⁴⁷ As the Melrose Chronicle states, "Simon was descended from war-like ancestors, and was himself no degenerate imitator of those who had gone before him; but he died in battle, fighting on the side of justice; as was the case with his father, his grandfather, and his great-grand-father."⁴⁸ Montfort's familial past influenced opinions of him held by others.

Montfort was devoted to a strict, quasi-monastic regimen of prayer. As the Melrose Chronicler writes, "He knew by heart the primer, the psalter, and other prayers, which he repeated during the night with alacrity and devotion."⁴⁹ He had the reputation

⁴⁵ Michael Lower, *The Barons' Crusade: a Call to Arms and its Consequences* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 47.

⁴⁶ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 110.

⁴⁷ Peter Coss, *The Knight in Medieval England, 1000-1400* (Dover, NH; Alan Sutton, 1993), 60.

⁴⁸ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 237.

⁴⁹ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 230.

from his contemporaries of being truly devout: “What can a man do in this life which is wiser, truer, and better, than to love, honour, and adore his Creator from his innermost heart? That Simon did this I doubt not.”⁵⁰ Just as his father, the elder Simon de Montfort, had a reputation as one of the extremely faithful, so did Montfort gain the name of an exemplary Christian layman.

Although there is little documentation of Simon de Montfort’s early years. When he arrived in England in 1230, contemporaries spoke of him as if he had a credible, established military record:

He was an excellent man, wonderfully skilled and circumspect in making arrangements for military affairs, and in carrying them out into execution after they were planned. He was a good soldier, and also been knighted, and from these considerations the barons selected him to direct them, as well in their counsels as in the war.⁵¹

Chroniclers spoke highly of Montfort, and his peers evidently thought well of his tactical and military skills. It is unclear how they reached this conclusion without substantial proof.⁵² Simon de Montfort the younger’s reputation was essentially a blank slate; in such a patriarchal society it makes sense for the younger Montfort’s character to be assumed to be a reflection of his father, who was known for his fierce fighting. His father had been a figure of monumental impact on his childhood, and his reputation would likely have affected the years during which his son was training to be a soldier. The younger Simon de Montfort’s character was preordained by the examples set by

⁵⁰ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 226.

⁵¹ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 216.

⁵² A few charters and grants prove his existence, but as a third son Simon de Montfort would have been of little interest to contemporary chronicles in his youth. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 4-7. His status as a non-first-born would serve him poorly in history’s memory of his youth, but worked to his benefit in that when nothing was expected of him, he surpassed all expectations.

those surrounding him in his youth, notably his father.⁵³ Montfort's childhood formation as a crusader and Christian was later reinforced by the influential religious figures in his immediate circle.

RELIGIOUS SUPPORTERS

Religious figures were central within Montfort's circle of close allies, and none were more important than Adam Marsh, Robert Grosseteste, and Walter de Cantilupe. The faction of Montfort's spiritual advisors was not limited to these three, but the lasting influence of these men is visible on the particular shape taken by Montfort's reform movement. His circle of spiritual advisors included some of the most important men of his day. King Louis IX of France, Bishop Thomas de Cantilupe, Bishop Walter de Cantilupe, and Bishop Robert Grosseteste were all in his network of friends. Both Louis IX and Thomas de Cantilupe were sainted.⁵⁴ Grosseteste's canonization was attempted but unrealized, and Walter de Cantilupe was said, even by his enemies, to have saint-like qualities.⁵⁵ Through his relationships with these men Montfort formed ideas about politics and morality that shifted the focus of his rebellion from the merely political to the

⁵³ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 7.

⁵⁴ Maddicott places more importance on Louis IX of France as a spiritual influence on Montfort than I deem feasible. Louis IX was recognized for his piety, and Maddicott makes a compelling case about the similarities between these two religious laymen, as well as their close relationship (See Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 90-92). Montfort interacted with Louis frequently in terms of political disputes, both for Henry and for his own family. I posit that Montfort saw the French King primarily as a political ally, and secular lord he admired, but nothing more. He interacted with Marsh, Grosseteste, and Cantilupe primarily as spiritual advisors; Louis' first role was as a political ally. Louis and Montfort have similar qualities, but Montfort's most defining characteristic, aside from his piety, is his military brilliance, whereas Louis was known exclusively for his sanctity. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 350. For Louis, see William Chester Jordan, *Louis IX and the Challenge of the Crusade: A Study in Rulership* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979); Frederick Perry, *Saint Louis: The Most Christian King* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1901); Christopher Tyerman, *God's Wars: A New History of the Crusades* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2006).

⁵⁵ D. A. Callus, ed., *Robert Grosseteste* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 241-246.

loftily moralistic.⁵⁶ Montfort's piety more closely resembled that of a clergyman than that of his lay peers. Aside from his personal practices, Montfort was noted for listening to the counsel of ecclesiastics, and putting faith in the prayers of religious men.⁵⁷ Grosseteste and Marsh, with Cantilupe to a lesser degree, provided a spiritual center for Montfort's circle; this emphasis on piety and religion was critical to the direction Montfort's rebellion would take.

Montfort's dedication to the crusade was also informed by his relationships with these men. Grosseteste and Cantilupe were the two bishops chosen by Pope Innocent IV to raise funds for the crusade in 1247, when Montfort took the cross for the second time.⁵⁸ His intimate acquaintance with these men as they preached the crusade must have influenced his decision to return to the Holy Land. These relationships were increasingly important to Montfort. His monkish habits and personal piety grew stronger as he became more immersed in the rebellion; the depth of his relationships with and reliance on his ecclesiastic allies increased as his devotion to the rebellion grew. He continued to correspond with Marsh and Grosseteste throughout his term in Gascony. This continued contact, written in the 1240s and 1250s, years before the peak of his spiritual awareness, describes Montfort's heightened religious sensibility.

In particular, Simon de Montfort's relationship with Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, was long and close, and influenced him throughout his life and engagement in the reform movement. Robert Grosseteste was Montfort's friend dating from the latter's surprising ascension to the Earldom of Leicester. He served almost as a substitute father figure for the young Earl; in 1230 Montfort was about twenty-two, while Grosseteste was

⁵⁶ Bémont, *Simon de Montfort*, 150.

⁵⁷ Matthew Paris, 3:355.

⁵⁸ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 98.

in his late fifties. This friendship offered Montfort spiritual support, political alliance, and opportunities for religious consultation uncommon to a typical aristocratic layman of the thirteenth century. Grosseteste was the Archdeacon of Leicester when Montfort arrived in 1230; his support for Montfort's expulsion of the Jews of the county implies that the two immediately saw eye to eye on religious matters.⁵⁹ Montfort's first official act as the *dominus de Leicestr*, the 'lord of Leicester,' highlights his ability to combine politics and religion. Between August 1231 and October 1232, Montfort expelled all the Jews from Leicester.⁶⁰ This had the dual purpose of being seen as an act of lordship, and relieving his citizens from the threat of usury. It was also religiously motivated, as seen from then-Archdeacon Grosseteste's support. Montfort was willing to give up the pecuniary advantages of having moneylenders present in order to receive the spiritual privileges of rejecting non-believers.

In 1235 Grosseteste became Bishop of Lincoln, but his friendship with the Earl of Leicester endured until the latter's death on October 9, 1253, before Montfort returned from Gascony.⁶¹ Montfort sent his sons to be educated with the bishop, and corresponded with him regularly throughout his sojourn in Gascony in the 1240s. Montfort and Grosseteste had much in common—both were outspoken, independent, original characters, with tendencies towards extremes.⁶² Grosseteste became one of Montfort's closest supporters, and one of his longest-standing allies; by contrast, it was not until after his marriage to Eleanor that Montfort became allied with the royal family

⁵⁹ R. W. Southern, *Robert Grosseteste: The Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 244-246; Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 79.

⁶⁰ This charter is printed in the appendix of J. Nichols, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester*, (London, 1795-1815) I.i:38. See also Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 15, 56, 57, 79.

⁶¹ See Bémont, *Simon de Montfort*, 42-47, for more details about their relationship.

⁶² Southern, *Robert Grosseteste*, 246; Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 79.

and the peerage of England. Grosseteste's early influence would remain a defining factor of Montfort's religious life.

Grosseteste was a strong political ally of Montfort's as well; he acted as a mediator between King Henry and Montfort, at Montfort's request, after his marriage to Eleanor. In 1244 Grosseteste urged the disgruntled clergy not to separate their cause from that of the barons, adding to the urgency with which the monarchy needed to address the complaints of its subjects.⁶³ Montfort followed Grosseteste's advice after his tenure in Gascony ended, reaching an uneasy truce with his king and returning to England. Grosseteste worked to obtain liberty for the clergy from Rome, and from royal power.⁶⁴

One of the most interesting episodes in Montfort's relationship with the bishop is also one of the most intriguing. It seems that Grosseteste suggested that he and Montfort work together on what Southern identifies as a crusade and preaching journey, a great enterprise for the salvation of souls.⁶⁵ In 1251, Grosseteste suggested that he and Montfort join forces in an effort "for the liberation of souls." We know of this only through the writings of Adam Marsh, a vague source, and nothing ever came of this idea.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, this non-event highlights the deeply spiritual and almost clerical side of Montfort's personality, as well as emphasizing his long-rooted interest in crusading.

⁶³ Bémont, *Simon de Montfort*, 70.

⁶⁴ For a more comprehensive discussion of Grosseteste's political and religious reform, see Bémont, *Simon de Montfort*, 46-47; Southern, *Robert Grosseteste*; James McEvoy, *Robert Grosseteste* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); James McEvoy, *The Philosophy of Robert Grosseteste* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982); Steven Marrone, *William of Auvergne and Robert Grosseteste: New Ideas of Truth in the Early Thirteenth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983).

⁶⁵ Southern, *Robert Grosseteste*, 289.

⁶⁶ *Monumenta Franciscana*, eds. J. S. Brewer and R. Howlett (2 vols., Rolls ser., 1858-1862), 1:111, quoted in Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 98. Maddicott posits that this proposed journey was to assist the Christians of Central Asia who were tyrannized under the rule of the Mongols.

Grosseteste and Montfort shared a friendship that endured political strife with aplomb, and Montfort continued to turn to the bishop for counsel. This was a friendship recognized by their contemporaries. As William de Rishanger wrote, Montfort “was wholly devoted to blessed Robert, called Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln.”⁶⁷ It was also through his earliest ally that Montfort entered a world apart from that of most secular lords, that of the religious, and was introduced to the Franciscan friar Adam Marsh. Marsh was Grosseteste’s pupil—the two clergymen corresponded regularly, and worked together before either met Montfort.⁶⁸

Montfort’s relationship with Adam Marsh, the Franciscan scholar and theologian, has been characterized by Bémont as the easiest of all Montfort’s close friendships with members of the clergy. Marsh, while never committing himself to either the barons or the king, took a sympathetic view of Montfort’s disputes with the monarchy.⁶⁹ He acted as a spiritual counselor and friend to both Montfort and Eleanor, and corresponded corresponding and offering advice and news. Montfort and Marsh grew close only during Montfort’s term in France; in the letters exchanged in this period, Marsh reveals himself as a religious advisor, and conveyor of information.⁷⁰ Marsh’s correspondence with Montfort also reveals the level of Montfort’s intellect. Modern historians are sometimes bogged down with Marsh’s “torturous and allusive” Latin prose; Montfort must have been a good Latinist in order to make it out. Marsh corresponded with Eleanor as well, chastising her for her richness of garb and encouraging her to hold her temper when provoked. The same implications that Marsh’s correspondence with Montfort

⁶⁷ William de Rishanger, *Chronicon de duobus bellis apud Lewes et Evesham*, ed. J. O. Halliwell (Camden Society, 1840), 6, quoted in Bémont, *Simon de Montfort*, 257.

⁶⁸ McEvoy, *Robert Grosseteste*, 156.

⁶⁹ Bémont, *Simon de Montfort*, 42.

⁷⁰ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 80.

reveals hold here; Eleanor's education must have been thorough. This also shows a link between husband and wife; a shared friend, a shared counselor, and shared spiritual needs.⁷¹ Marsh directed Montfort to the Bible for solace, and Gregory the Great's commentary on the Book of Job.⁷² It is clear that Marsh's friendship with Montfort was an important spiritual relationship.

Marsh maintained close ties with the royalists. In a letter to Montfort, he remarks, "The king has spoken with me of your affair. I think that he will be pleased to trust in your advice, for he has great confidence in your devotion, if only his immediate circle favors you."⁷³ Marsh was important as a link between Montfort and Henry, and unique in his complete detachment from political concerns or affiliations. Perhaps this aloofness from the sordid world of politics in which he was now continually immersed was why Montfort trusted Marsh so much. When writing his will, Montfort instructed that whichever member of his circle (in which both Eleanor and his eldest son were included) would serve as an executor of his will should do so in consultation with Adam Marsh.⁷⁴ Montfort's relationship with Marsh, unlike his relationships with Cantilupe and Grosseteste, was apolitical. Marsh was solely a friend in whom he placed his deep personal trust.

Montfort's relationship with Walter de Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester, was primarily one of political and religious alliance, and less a friendship. This is not to say that Montfort and Cantilupe were not companions, but when compared to the depth of affection between Montfort and both Grosseteste and Marsh, Cantilupe's niche was

⁷¹ For further examples of Marsh's epistles to Eleanor, see Bémont, *Simon de Montfort*, 37-38.

⁷² Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 94.

⁷³ Adam Marsh quoted in Bémont, *Simon de Montfort*, 43.

⁷⁴ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 177.

clearly political. After Grosseteste, Cantilupe was the most respected bishop contemporary to Montfort.⁷⁵ Walter de Cantilupe was both a spiritual and a political advisor, and played a central role in forming the rhetorical center of the reform movement. He was an incredibly valuable ally for the barons as a result of his ties to the papacy and his central place, like Grosseteste's, in the English church. Cantilupe was more politically involved than either ecclesiastic ally previously examined. While Grosseteste had, when requested, interceded with the king on Montfort's behalf, Cantilupe actively and passionately opposed the royalist cause. Once the Provisions of Oxford were put into effect, he was a member of the baronial twelve chosen to assist the government, one of four Montfortians.⁷⁶ He was active in all phases of Montfort's government, and each time selected to represent the barons' political goals.

Unlike both Grosseteste and Marsh, Cantilupe and Montfort were social peers, and within the same network of allegiances. Cantilupe was from the same aristocratic background, and was the uncle of Montfortian Peter of Savoy. In many ways this alliance made the most sense; as social peers, Montfort and Cantilupe shared an interest in crusading and the same desire for reform, exhibited in Cantilupe's dedication to the cause. Whereas Montfort's friendships with Grosseteste and Marsh were unusual, his relationship with Cantilupe was less a friendship, and more in the nature of a political and religious alliance which united them under one banner.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 81.

⁷⁶ The others were Richard de Grey, Peter de Montfort, and Hugh Despencer. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 160.

⁷⁷ Like Montfort, Cantilupe wore a hair shirt. After his death, it was bequeathed to his uncle, Thomas de Cantilupe. This almost relic-like reverence for an article of clothing after the owner's death was seen with Montfort's death as well.

Political allies were, of course, crucial to Montfort's cause. Montfort's other immediate friends were barons like Hugh Despencer, Peter de Montfort, Peter of Savoy, and members of the Bigod, Clare, Quincy, and Segrave families.⁷⁸ None of these were the richest, most powerful, or oldest families in England, but their support and comradeship was nonetheless essential for the Baronial Rebellion. It was the value that Montfort placed on his ecclesiastic supporters that set him apart from his lay peers. Grosseteste, Marsh, and Cantilupe were among the preeminent theologians and spiritual leaders of their day; the solid spiritual foundation they provided Montfort informed his political cause, and his personal piety.

MARRIAGE

If Montfort was surrounded by the paramount religious leaders of his day by inclination, he soon was surrounded by the royal family by marriage. Simon de Montfort's union with Eleanor, Henry's sister, boosted him into the ranks of the most powerful aristocrats in the country. In the words of Matthew Paris,

The king in person gave the bride away to the said Simon, who received her the most gratefully, from his disinterested love, her beauty, the rich honours contingent to her, and the excelling and royal descent of the lady; for she was the legitimate daughter of a king and queen, and the sister of a king, an empress and a queen; so that the offspring from such a noble lady would be a royal race.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ Many of these men would later be Montfort's enemies; it was Gilbert de Clare's betrayal that started Montfort down the road to Evesham, and in spite of his early amiability with Peter of Savoy, the queen's relative, Montfort's relations with him would sour, and he would turn against the barons. Montfort was related to the Quincy family by his marriage to Eleanor—her cousin, the daughter of Llewelyn the Great of Wales, married into the family. Family ties were important to the construction of Montfort's inner circle. On the other hand, Henry III was his brother-in-law, and Edward was his nephew. When Montfort met Edward's army at Evesham, many of the opposing barons were related by blood or marriage. Family was just one of the many networks of alliances among thirteenth-century nobility.

⁷⁹ Matthew Paris, 1:117.

Eleanor's eligibility was of great political value to Henry; alliances between foreign powers were formed through matrimony, and there was little collateral as effective as the king's favorite sister. Montfort was cognizant of the fact that his future depended on a brilliant marriage, for he made at least two attempts to marry French heiresses, both of which were halted by the French monarchy.⁸⁰ Eleanor, by virtue of her birth as well as her previous marriage, was one of the wealthiest women in England; this was a matrimonial coup for Montfort, but the match seems have been one primarily of love and affection.⁸¹ Both were praised for their good looks and determined personalities, and contemporary scholars noted the strength of their bond. They were married on January 7, 1238, when she was about twenty-three years old, and he was around thirty. In the words of Robert of Gloucester, who liberally sang the praises of both Eleanor and Montfort,

Sir Simon de Montfort, of whom the repute is great
In the year of grace twelve hundred and seven-and-thirty, truly,
Married Eleanor, the King's sister, the widow of earl William,
The countess of Pembroke, a good woman in every way.⁸²

Gloucester's words make them seem almost peers socially, or at least in the same circle, which they were decidedly not. Eleanor was a matrimonial catch for Montfort; by virtue of her rank, she should have married another royal.⁸³ A faint air of scandal surrounded

⁸⁰ Louis feared that Montfort, with his increased power at the English court, would gain too much power on the Continent as well, and refused to allow either union to proceed. Creighton, *Simon de Montfort*, 18-19.

⁸¹ Eleanor's first husband was William, Earl of Pembroke, one of the wealthiest nobles in England. On his death she inherited a dower of one-third his estate, around £534 yearly, with additional lands in Wales and Ireland that she gave up in exchange for £400 yearly. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 50-51.

⁸² *Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle*, CHE, 5.1:357.

⁸³ The Montfort family was among the most noble in France, and was related by marriage to William the Conqueror. As Prothero points out, Simon the elder's marriage allowed his progeny to claim an equality in point of birth with the English royal family. Eleanor's marriage, however, would have been a matter of state, for princesses were the most valuable bargaining tools a king possessed, and her marriage should have formed an alliance to a foreign power rather than cement the loyalty of an impoverished earl. Prothero, *Life of Simon de Montfort*, 32.

the newly-weds; the marriage had the air of a shotgun wedding, which likely explains why Henry acquiesced.

Henry gave his consent to the marriage, but must have known that it would be greeted, appropriately, with outrage by the disregarded baronage. The ceremony was carried out clandestinely, most likely in response to Henry's knowledge of the wrath coming his way. It was given none of the pomp and publicity associated with the marriage of a royal: "The ceremony was performed, and mass read in the king's small chapel, which is in a corner of his chamber, by Walter, chaplain of the royal chapel of St. Stephen's of Westminster."⁸⁴ This secret ceremony is far from what should have been the celebration of a royal wedding.

The marriage did cause a political crisis upon its discovery.⁸⁵ No members of the baronage were consulted or informed until after the fact, and Richard of Cornwall, brother to both Henry and Eleanor and at that time heir to the throne, was especially angered. As Matthew Paris remarks, "Having heard that this marriage was performed clandestinely, that is, without his knowledge, or the consent of the nobles being obtained, he was justly much enraged."⁸⁶ Richard, as a powerful magnate and blood relative, should have been consulted in such a serious matter of state.

Further complicating their marriage was the vow of chastity that Eleanor had taken, at age sixteen, on the death of her first husband.⁸⁷ This, perhaps the most important violation of Montfort's stringent moral code, would return to prick his

⁸⁴ Matthew Paris, 1:117.

⁸⁵ Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century*, 41.

⁸⁶ Matthew Paris, 1:121.

⁸⁷ Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century*, 76. Much is made of the fact that Eleanor took this vow in the throws of grief, but modern scholars also point out that Pembroke was at least twenty years Eleanor's senior, and lasting affection may not have been the entire story.

conscience later in life.⁸⁸ Her vow was made in front of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Chichester. When she and Montfort exchanged vows, the difference between the ring he gave her and the ring she gave up, symbolizing her status as the bride of Christ, must have been glaring.⁸⁹ Matthew Paris does not discuss this desecration of Eleanor's vow immediately, merely stating, "His holiness the pope, too, gave him a dispensation with her," but this violation of a holy oath seemed to have troubled both Montfort and Henry III.⁹⁰ Soon after their wedding, the new groom set sail for Rome to seek the dispensation of the Pope on behalf of his marriage, leaving Eleanor, pregnant, at their castle of Kenilworth.⁹¹ The trip was obviously a strain on his finances for Paris states that he was forced to borrow money from the citizens of Leicester.⁹² Aristocrats could borrow from professional moneylenders, but we know that Montfort had expelled the Jews, leaving him no further options.

The marriage and violation of Eleanor's holy vow also disturbed members of the clergy, both at home and abroad.⁹³ Edmund Rich, the Archbishop of Canterbury, in particular sought to change Eleanor's mind, but neither she nor Montfort listened. In Rome Montfort's desire to receive a dispensation was realized, although members of the clergy argued that, "the woman in question may not have assumed the habit and veil, yet

⁸⁸ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 86.

⁸⁹ Prothero, *Simon de Montfort*, 43.

⁹⁰ Matthew Paris, 1:117.

⁹¹ Matthew Paris reports the birth of Henry de Montfort eleven months after the marriage of his parents. His birth was a mixed blessing for Henry. "The eldest son of Simon de Montfort, by Eleanor his wife, was born at Kenilworth, to add to the strength and comfort of the kingdom; for it was feared that the queen was barren." Henry's pride, we can safely assume, must have been severely wounded at the thought that if he and his wife could not produce a son, the child of an impoverished and foreign-born earl would someday ascend the throne of England. Thankfully for him, his wife gave birth not long after to Edward. The two boys were raised together, and developed a close bond that lasted until they faced each other across the battlefield at Evesham. When Henry was killed, Edward is said to have attended Mass for his former playmate and cousin. Matthew Paris, 1:155.

⁹² Matthew Paris, 1:124.

⁹³ Creighton, *Simon de Montfort*, 20-23.

she has taken the ring, with which she has devoted, or rather betrothed herself to Christ, and is, therefore, indissolubly united to Christ her spouse.”⁹⁴ Matthew of Westminster says, of Montfort’s meeting with the Pope,

He prevailed on the lord to grant a ratification of the marriage which, not without some injury to his conscience, he had contracted with Eleanor, sister of King Henry the Third. For she had made a solemn vow, before Archbishop Edmund, of continuing in chastity all her life.⁹⁵

As time passed, Henry appears to have moved beyond his early support of Montfort, as he increasingly saw the marriage of his sister as a union based on deceit. Eleanor de Montfort, along with other noble ladies, came to London on August 9, 1239, for the purification ceremony for the queen after the birth of her son, Prince Edward.⁹⁶ Henry, when seeing Montfort and Eleanor, “called him an excommunicated man, and forbade him, as well as his wife, whom he had basely and clandestinely defiled before the marriage had been contracted between them, to be present at the festive solemnities.”⁹⁷ When Montfort and Eleanor returned with apologies and sought to placate the irate ruler, Henry said, according to Paris, “You seduced my sister before marriage, and when I found it out, I gave her to you in marriage, although against my will, in order to avoid scandal.”⁹⁸ This was an implication that Eleanor was pregnant before she and Montfort were married; many at the English court must have been surprised when their son Henry

⁹⁴ Matthew Paris, 1:130.

⁹⁵ Matthew Westminster, *The Flowers of History, Especially such as Relate to the Affairs of Britain From the Beginning of the World to the Year 1307*, trans. C. D. Yonge (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853), 2:185-186.

⁹⁶ Women were considered unclean after giving birth, and wealthy women would go through a ceremony to reaffirm their purity. During their “unclean” period they could not make confession or attend church, a harsh restriction in a society that valued sanctification so highly. This ceremony was also referred to as “churching,” as it welcomed new mothers back into the folds of the Church.

⁹⁷ Matthew Paris, 1:194; Creighton, *Life of Simon de Montfort*, 33.

⁹⁸ Matthew Paris, 1:194.

was not born until eleven months following their marriage. Faced with scandal and loss of support from the monarchy, Montfort and Eleanor fled the country in shame.⁹⁹

It is impossible for scholars to look into the inner workings of this marriage, but it is obvious that Eleanor and Montfort had an extremely close bond. Eleanor renounced her brother and her family for the sake of her husband, giving up her relationship with her brother in favor of an impoverished earl. Creighton has an extremely negative opinion of Eleanor, saying that she behaved poorly throughout the disputes between her husband and brother, and should have served them both better by acting as a mediator, rather than increasing the tension between them.¹⁰⁰ In fact Eleanor, in spite of the unintentional strife surrounding the settlement of her dower, brought the two men closer than they would have been otherwise been. By marrying Montfort, Eleanor joined by marriage the king and the rebel. Montfort was forever elevated above other foreign-born noblemen trying to gain entrée into the English court.

CONCLUSION

The shifting sense of personal responsibility for one's salvation during the early part of the thirteenth century informed Montfort's later dedication to his crusade for reform. As we shall see, coming from a background of such heightened religious ardor, Montfort's passionate refusal to renounce the Provisions of Oxford, to which he had sworn a holy oath in 1258, fit clearly into the context of his personal piety.

Contemporary chronicles noted Montfort's habits, and placed him into the company of holy men who had come before him. He was compared to Thomas à Becket, the holy

⁹⁹ Prothero, *Simon de Montfort*, 47-48.

¹⁰⁰ Creighton, *Life of Simon de Montfort*, 219.

man who disagreed with his king, and was subsequently executed for his beliefs. The Melrose Chronicler compares Simon de Montfort favorably with Simon Peter, the apostle: “How beautifully does the one Simon herein correspond with the other!”¹⁰¹ It is a token of his ecclesiastic support that Montfort, a rebel, could be compared with one of Christ’s apostles.¹⁰²

After Montfort vowed to uphold the Provisions of Oxford,

He began to deny himself, so to speak, and, like Simon Peter, to watch all night; and, in adherence to this custom, he used to rise about midnight, at the warning of some bell, which no one heard save himself, if it be permitted to describe God’s providence as a bell, for it never failed him after he commenced this custom.¹⁰³

His oath to the Provisions seems to have been a turning point in his self-deprivation.

According to the Melrose Chronicler, after the oath he refrained from marital relations with his wife.¹⁰⁴ Montfort’s unease about breaking Eleanor’s holy vow of chastity manifested itself in his own penitential oath of chastity. His piety began to exhibit itself by understanding the war he was fighting as a holy war, a crusade, and himself as a crusader, one of God’s knights. That his more monastic practices should date from the period of his revived faith in the Provisions of Oxford amplifies the correlation between how he understood his faith, and how this faith reinforced his belief in reform.

Simon de Montfort’s personal piety was formed by the religious culture in which he was raised and lived and by those who were closest to him. The clandestine and unsanctified nature of the early years of his marriage continued to undermine his sense of personal spiritual integrity, while the strict example set by his father and family affected

¹⁰¹ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 229.

¹⁰² For further discussion of Montfort as compared to Becket or Simon Peter, see chapters three and four.

¹⁰³ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 229.

¹⁰⁴ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 233.

both his later political career and the reputation he had already acquired when he first came to England in 1230. These early influences would remain pertinent to Simon de Montfort, for throughout his life, the idea of crusading remained his ultimate goal.¹⁰⁵ Here one of Montfort's greatest tensions is revealed; should he follow the example set by his father, full of crusading vigor and militantly spiritual, or the ordered learning and teachings of Marsh and Grosseteste? Crusading was a form of personal piety, a pilgrimage to recover the holiest places in the Christian world, and a physical form of penitence and atonement that would have been irresistible to a man of Montfort's religious and military convictions. It is his life as a crusader that is examined next, and the ultimate effects of his crusade in Jerusalem on his crusade for reform.

¹⁰⁵ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 79.

CHAPTER TWO

SIMON DE MONTFORT AND THE CRUSADE

INTRODUCTION

Simon de Montfort's personal experience as a crusader in Jerusalem and the crusading culture in which he lived were the most important influences on the crusading ideology he applied to the Baronial Rebellion. Montfort came into manhood and political and military power during a period rich in crusading zeal and fervor.¹⁰⁶ Surrounded as he was by a family intent upon crusading, in a culture bombarded with crusading rhetoric, and a faith that influenced every aspect of life, it is hardly surprising that the concept of crusading should have influenced him. However, Montfort's personal enthusiasm for freeing Jerusalem from the infidels went far beyond the faith exhibited by many of his contemporaries. He traveled to Jerusalem once, and it appears that he would have returned but for the interruption of Henry III. His personal piety and military prowess, combined with his uncommon level of intimacy with the ruling family of England and his access to the papal court, made him a valuable and unique crusade leader.

It is frustrating that so little information is available about Montfort's time in the Holy Land. No record remains of his activities there, and no information about his success, or lack thereof, survives. Our analysis, therefore, must rely on the approach of his peers and contemporaries to crusading, and on understanding what a crusade, and the act of crusading, meant in the thirteenth century, for Montfort was a product of his times and culture.

¹⁰⁶ See Mandell Creighton, *Life of Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester* (London: Rivingtons, 1877), 43-49.

Lower identifies a crusade as “a pope’s call for physical force against those he defined as enemies of the faith.”¹⁰⁷ When the First Crusade was preached in 1095 this was perhaps true, but a critical shift took place in contemporary conceptions of what a crusade was during the thirteenth century.¹⁰⁸ This chapter will examine crusading as a phenomenon of that period.

From 1095, when Pope Urban II declared holy war against the infidels of the Holy Land, until Simon de Montfort led a domestic crusade against his king in 1263, the concept of crusading underwent a radical shift. By Montfort’s time, crusading had come to be understood as extending beyond the battle to free Jerusalem from the Saracens to any war against papal enemies. The very specific environment of England as a focus of crusading interest during the thirteenth century must also be examined, before turning to Montfort’s role in the Barons’ Crusade to Jerusalem in 1239. It was his experience as one who wore that cross against God’s enemies in Jerusalem that most critically influenced the shape taken by his crusade against his king two decades later.

THE CRUSADES: IMPACT, HISTORY, AND PURPOSE

To understand the impact of crusading in medieval life, it is necessary to examine the unprecedented support with which the idea of crusading was met. The words and

¹⁰⁷ Michael Lower, introduction to *The Barons’ Crusade: A Call to Arms and its Consequences* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 2.

¹⁰⁸ For a more thorough discussion of the history and impact of European crusades to the East, see Dr. Christopher Tyerman, and Dr. Jonathan Riley-Smith. The work of these two historians is essential to any in-depth examination of issues surrounding European crusading practices. See Christopher Tyerman, *God’s War: A New History of the Crusades* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2006); Christopher Tyerman, *England and the Crusades, 1095-1588* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); Christopher Tyerman, *Fighting for Christendom: Holy War and the Crusades* (New York: Oxford University Press); Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005); Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986); Jonathan Riley-Smith, *What Were the Crusades?* (London: Macmillan, 1977).

concepts brought to the foreground of the medieval consciousness with the coming of crusading were unlike anything that Europe had previously faced. While the language used to promote the crusade called upon past great deeds, it offered a chance to create legends.

May the deeds of your ancestors move you and spur your souls to manly courage—the worth and greatness of Charlemagne, his son Louis and your other kings who destroyed the pagan kingdoms and brought them within the bounds of Christendom.¹⁰⁹

Never before had a rallying call galvanized so many into action. This was an unprecedented idea, and with it Pope Urban revealed himself as a master of public relations. Just as Montfort later adopted his father's reputation as a skilled leader, Urban's speech encouraged Christians to follow the illustrious footsteps of legendary leaders. With this call to arms, the idea of crusading was born.

The First Crusade was preached by Pope Urban II at the Council of Clermont in 1095. The concept of holy warfare existed since Gregory VII formed a papal army in 1074, but this was the first time it was applied to a papal enemy on such a grand scale summoning the energies of all the Christian world.¹¹⁰ By 1099, the Christian army had successfully captured Jerusalem, and the success of the Crusade seemed assured. However, it was a short-lived victory as Saladin re-conquered Jerusalem in 1187, prompting the need for further calls to battle in the Holy Land. The crusading flame that had enveloped Europe a century earlier was reignited, and would not sputter out until

¹⁰⁹ Robert of Reims, 12th century and Carol Sweetenham, ed. *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005), 80.

¹¹⁰ For further discussion, see Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History; The Roots of Conflict Between Christianity and Islam* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 28-31.

1272, when the Ninth Crusade, during the rule of the future Edward I, failed, and the last vestiges of Christian rule in Syria died out.

The crusade was obviously offered as more than a military endeavor; it was religious motivation that spurred thousands to walk to the edges of the known world, braving starvation, illness, destitution, and war. Urban's rhetoric, which would inform Montfort's own construction of a crusade, was flawless. A reward higher than military prowess was offered. Urban II created the crusade in terms that mirrored and amplified contemporary religious practices, meshing current language and symbolism into a new system that offered a particularly direct, clear path to heavenly salvation.¹¹¹ His was a penitential war, a pilgrimage to achieve liberation of Christianity's holiest places with eternal salvation as the reward. For Powicke, the crusade was primarily a spiritual experience, tinged with catharsis and responding was a moral and religious obligation.¹¹² When preaching the First Crusade, Urban II said,

So to whom should the task fall of taking vengeance and wrestling their conquests from them is not to you—you to whom God has given above other nations outstanding glory in arms, greatness of spirit, fitness of body and the strength to humiliate the hairy scalp of those who resist you?¹¹³

As Pope, Urban was the heir of Saint Peter, the living representative of God on Earth.

The language he employed to preach the crusade was calculated for effect; the inflammatory and inspirational words he used convinced men, women, and children that they were God's chosen, promised salvation in the ultimate confrontation with God's

¹¹¹ Urban himself never suggested that joining a crusade would automatically admit a participant into heaven; later leaders and unsanctioned preachers elaborated upon and expanded his message. Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 39.

¹¹² Simon Lloyd, *English Society and the Crusade, 1216-1307* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 3.

¹¹³ *Robert the Monk's History*, 80.

enemies usurping the holiest places on earth. The symbolism of the First Crusade was inventive, both to contemporaries and to those like Montfort who consciously adopted similar systems of representation. Taking the cross was considered the point of junction between pilgrimage and holy war.¹¹⁴

No symbol was more potent than the cross itself.¹¹⁵ Crusaders in the Holy Land in the 1190s wore the cross on their shoulders. Of course, the cross was not the exclusive prerogative of the crusaders; it was part of the universal Christian language of penitence and piety. Once worn in the crusade in the Holy Land, the cross began to infiltrate penitential actions and crusades in other parts of the Christian world. Simon de Montfort the elder and other crusaders against the Albigensians and Moors, wore the cross on their chests, a symbolic use of the cross the younger Simon would emulate in his domestic crusade in 1263.¹¹⁶ There was a wide variability in the ritual of taking the cross; nothing was standardized or regulated.¹¹⁷ Taking the cross, and the pilgrim's staff and purse occurred at different times. Pilgrims had never before sworn an oath to set off on their holy journeys. Riley-Smith posits that, although the exact terms remain unknown, the crusaders' oath combined a promise to pilgrimage to Jerusalem with a vow to capture it by force.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ Michel Villey, "L'Idée de la croisade chez les jurists du moyen âge" *Relazioni del X Congresso internazionale di scienze storiche* (1955), iii, quoted in Christopher Tyerman, *The Invention of the Crusades* (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 79.

¹¹⁵ Tyerman, *Invention of the Crusades*, 76-83. Tyerman discusses the symbolism and overall importance of the cross to the crusaders in detail.

¹¹⁶ Tyerman, *Invention of the Crusades*, 77.

¹¹⁷ Tyerman, *Invention of the Crusades*, 79. As Tyerman points out, even the colors used for the cross were different. Before 1188, the standard color was red, the color favored by the French (who were among the most ardent crusaders). The English wore white with King John in 1215, Henry III in 1217, and Simon de Montfort in 1263-1265. During the Barons' Rebellion of 1263, the Royalists began wearing red crosses in order to not overlap with the rebels. Tyerman, *Invention of the Crusades*, 78.

¹¹⁸ Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 15.

HOW CRUSADING CHANGED

The central idea of what a crusade was underwent a substantive evolution from the First Crusade to the time of the Barons' Rebellion in the early thirteenth century. When the First Crusade was preached, it was as a unifying effort of Christians against infidels, Europeans attempting to recover the most sacred ground of their faith. It amounted to an armed pilgrimage, a penitential war against the enemies of Christ and Christendom, exclusively against infidels who overran Jerusalem. As crusades into the Holy Land continued, the idea broadened as other crusades began in parts of Europe against other enemies of the Church.

In the thirteenth century the crusade became a more general defense of Christendom against its enemies whoever and wherever they were. Crusades were no longer restricted to the Holy Land and ceased to be simply about recapturing holy sites and became broader wars against papal enemies. By 1235, Pope Gregory IX had already called crusades against pagans in the Baltic, Muslims on the Iberian Peninsula, Stedinger peasants in northern Germany, heretics in Croatia, supporters of heretics in Germany, opponents of Cuman Christianization, and political enemies in Italy. Thus, by the thirteenth century, the Holy Land could no longer be considered the automatic goal of the crusade in the thirteenth century, or Muslims the sole target. The papacy came increasingly to use the crusade for causes other than the Holy Land or even the Latin East more generally.¹¹⁹

Crusades against the Muslims of Jerusalem continued throughout this period, even as papal attention shifted elsewhere. There was a particular transition in the

¹¹⁹ For further discussion, see Lloyd, *English Society and the Crusades*, 8.

execution of the barons' Crusade of 1239, however, of which Montfort was a leader. The First Crusade had been formed of a widely unified if disparate fighting force and army. By the time of the Baron's Crusade in 1239, the crusaders were no longer a unified force against the enemies of Christianity. The European contingent traveled primarily according to nationality. The French left over a year before the first English arrived, and the English traveled separately, due to personal disagreements.¹²⁰

There was also a shift in the way crusaders contributed to the crusade. Bouchard argues that the crusades were increasingly seen as a particularly dangerous way to seek salvation, and that family members dreaded the departure of their loved ones. Only the truly fervent, she notes, saw any appeal in setting off on a venture from which few returned.¹²¹ By the thirteenth century, one no longer had to travel to the Holy Land and face the perilous fight with the infidels to receive the papal indulgences due a crusader. By making monetary donations, paying the ecclesiastical taxes, and vowing redemption (cash payments that would purchase crusading indulgences), men and women who could not go on crusade themselves were still involved in the experience. Specially prepared liturgies and individual prayer were stressed as spiritual support for those fighting the infidels. Maintaining peace in Europe in order for military efforts to focus on the Holy Land was also crucial.¹²²

The role of family was still important. Crusading was over 100 years old by the time of the Barons' Crusade. For many, crusading was a family tradition, and later crusaders looked back on ancestors who took part in the First Crusade. The Montforts

¹²⁰ Lower, *The Barons' Crusade*, 6.

¹²¹ Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Strong of Body, Brave and Noble: Chivalry and Society in Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 83.

¹²² Lower, introduction to *The Barons' Crusade*, 1-2.

sent three men to the Barons' Crusade: Simon, Amaury, and Philip. Amaury, Simon de Montfort's older brother, and Philip, his cousin, had made their crusading reputations in both the Holy Land and in the south of France, fighting against Albigensian heretics. It is clear that Montfort was not the only son impacted by his father's legacy: Amaury took over his father's crusade there after the latter's death in 1218, although he proved an unsuccessful leader and was killed in the Holy Land.

ENGLAND AND THE CRUSADES

The approach to crusading in England, and the approach of England to crusading, evolved very differently than in the rest of Europe. England was neglected as a source of personnel for the Crusade by Urban II and other popes of the early twelfth century as they concentrated their recruiting efforts in mainland Europe. No crusades against Frederick II or his sons, the Italian crusades against the Ghibellines, the Aragonese crusade, or crusades against papal political opponents were publicized in England.¹²³ While political crusades had been promoted on the Continent, England received limited attention regarding crusades to Jerusalem only.

The turning point seems to have been the papacy of Alexander III, for after the mid-twelfth century every crusading appeal included England. With the Third Crusade of 1189-1192 and the crusading eagerness of Richard I, England fully became a crusading nation. Enthusiasm was slight until that point. In the thirteenth century, England became

¹²³ Lloyd, *English Society and the Crusades, 1216-1307*, 13.

more actively sought after as a papal ally for crusading efforts, especially after the support provided for the Third Crusade.¹²⁴

England's role as a papal ally in an increasingly hostile Europe was crucial to the papacy's increased interest in England as a recruiting ground for the crusades. Much of the promotion of the Crusade that took place there was a direct response to this new alliance.¹²⁵ The English monarchy was a pivotal and important entity; Henry's court was dependent upon the continuing goodwill of the pope, but was a powerful vassal of the Holy See. Henry III's position as brother-in-law of Frederick II, the Holy Roman Emperor, made him a valuable ally for the excommunicated ruler, and a possible enemy of the papacy. Henry's loyalty remained to Rome. As long as his loyalty to the church was steady, his allegiance was a valuable asset.

By announcing his intention to go on crusade, the English king allied himself with the Vatican. Henry also achieved a publicity coup in which he publicly affirmed his religious faith and enthusiasm for the crusade, proving to his subjects the degree of his religious devotion. Henry III used the cross to demonstrate his personal religious credentials; that he did not actually go on crusade seems almost beside the point. In this case, it was the thought that mattered.¹²⁶

For those who actually went on crusade, lordship was the chief organizing principle of the crusading army. Crusading was a minority activity from its inception; it was difficult for poor serfs to raise the funds to travel across the world.¹²⁷ Knights went as members of aristocratic retinues, for which they evidently received some benefit. In a

¹²⁴ Lloyd, *English Society and the Crusades, 1216-1307*, 10.

¹²⁵ Lloyd, *English Society and the Crusades, 1216-1307*, 13.

¹²⁶ Tyerman, *Invention of the Crusades*, 87.

¹²⁷ Lower, introduction to *Barons' Crusade*, 1.

feudal society such as thirteenth-century England, this was also not a choice. When ordered by his lord to travel to the Holy Land, a knight was bound by oaths of fidelity and vassalage to follow. The Pipe rolls (exchequer rolls) listed 59 knights as exempt from the crusade tax of 1188 because they were participants.¹²⁸

Throughout the thirteenth century the papacy worked to make the crusading experience available to all. Many who were involved in the crusades were not fighting directly; they provided pecuniary support, spiritual support, and kept the peace at home, insuring that a crusader's primary focus was the Holy Land. Not many poor non-combatants followed the Crusaders after 1229, for reasons that are unknown. The Church, as well as beleaguered political leaders, had begun to frown on these hordes, some leaders writing ordinances against them.¹²⁹

CRUSADE TO THE EAST

Simon de Montfort traveled to the Holy Land as part of the Barons' Crusade, which lasted from 1234-1241. The Sixth Crusade of 1228-1229 had ended without success, and the papacy, under the rule of Gregory IX, revived interest in returning to Jerusalem. Gregory had been Pope since 1227, but he had not previously preached a crusade; once he did, in 1234, he gave his full energy. In 1234 he sent a papal bull, *Rachel sum videns*, to every ecclesiastical province. Gregory made attendance at crusade sermons mandatory, an original concept.¹³⁰ Mendicant friars proceeded to preach the

¹²⁸ Peter R. Coss, *Lordship, Knighthood, and Locality: A Study in English Society, c. 1180-1280* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 57.

¹²⁹ Lloyd, *English Society and the Crusades*, 78.

¹³⁰ Lower, introduction to *Barons' Crusade*, 3.

crusade to all aspects of society.¹³¹ No one was excluded, whether poor, sick, or elderly.¹³²

Simon de Montfort left on crusade to the Holy Land in 1240, after several false starts and conflicting orders. On February 25, 1238, Gregory IX sent a legate to the would-be crusaders with “orders to forbid the crusaders to set out on their expedition to the Holy Land until spring, and the passage of March; if they did otherwise, they should not enjoy the indulgence for their sins which had been granted to them.”¹³³ This was less a religious move than a political ploy: he knew that Henry III was concerned that their departure would destabilize his kingdom from the internal forces that threatened it (popular unrest, famine).¹³⁴ The external threats (the Welsh, the Scots, and the French) were all obvious. The barons were giving trouble to the king over financial reforms that had begun in 1236, when Henry’s marriage to Eleanor of Provence and his sister Isabella’s marriage to Emperor Frederick II had drained the royal treasury. The royal council had begun to take back into the crown’s possession royal estates that had been gifted by the king as fiefs to the nobility; that the king reclaimed them was a threat to the barons that they could not ignore.

A further setback arose in 1239. The crusaders were assembled at Lyon, waiting to depart, when the Pope again forbade them to begin the trip. The response of the crusaders was one of disbelief:

¹³¹ The term “Mendicant” stems from the Latin *mendicans*, meaning “begging.” Mendicant priests lived exclusively on charitable donations. Mendicant orders, including Franciscans (1209), Carmelites (1206-1214), and Dominicans (1215), took vows of poverty, and do not own property, so as to focus their entire strength on religious works.

¹³² Lower, *Barons’ Crusade*, 3.

¹³³ *Matthew Paris’s English History, From the Year 1235-1273*, trans. J. A. Giles, (London, H.G. Bohn, 1852-1854), 1:236-237.

¹³⁴ Lower, *Barons’ Crusade*, 134.

Whence arises this fickleness of the Roman court and Pope? Was not this period and this place pre-arranged a long time ago by the legates and preachers of the pope, for our passage across the sea? According to the words and promises of the preachers, we have prepared ourselves for the journey in God's behalf.¹³⁵

It is clear that God was still a higher authority than the Church, but the crusaders listened to the messenger, and awaited the go-ahead from the papacy.

Finally, there were no further problems from the Pope to bar the crusaders' path.¹³⁶ Events in fact pushed Montfort towards the Holy Land. He and Eleanor left from England the night Henry III humiliated him in front of the court with his insinuation of pre-marital relations. More than just shame at his sister's seduction may have motivated Henry's outburst. Montfort intended to go on crusade, but he was already in debt, and had to repay the money owed before embarking. He named Henry as security for his debts without informing the king. This further explains Henry's outburst at court, and Montfort's hasty retreat to France and then the Holy Land.¹³⁷ Montfort's intent to go on crusade was clear, but both Bémont and Maddicott believe this insult was the immediate cause of Montfort's departure; the crusade served to, "get Simon out of a difficulty and open up for him a new sphere of action."¹³⁸

¹³⁵ Matthew Paris, 1:234-235.

¹³⁶ This was due, in large part, to the work of Richard of Cornwall. He petitioned Gregory to lift the ban on crusading, and set his legal experts to work. Gregory acquiesced to the extent that he would lift the ban if Henry agreed, a step he clearly thought unlikely. Henry had already, in fact, been convinced, due in large part to the rebellion Richard had just begun against him after Eleanor's marriage to Montfort. Gregory remained unconvinced, and took further steps to keep the English crusaders in England, but to no avail. Richard of Cornwall swore to fight for God in the Holy Land on November 12, 1239, in Northampton. Gregory seemed to have come to the same conclusion, for on November 17, 1239, he reaffirmed Richard's crusading indulgences, far too soon to have waited for the news of Richard's vow to have traveled to him.

¹³⁷ Lower, *Barons' Crusade*, 141-142.

¹³⁸ Charles Bémont, *Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, 1208-1265*, Trans. E. F. Jacob (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1930), 62; J. R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 29.

He returned to England from France in April 1240 to raise money, and found himself unaccountably restored to favor. Henry's attitude towards Montfort underwent rapid shifts several times, but this must have been the most confusing for Montfort, who had spent the prior years in lonely exile because of Henry's quicksilver temper. Montfort effectively refused papal funding by launching his own expedition: he was able to raise money by leveling his forests at Leicester, which were sold to the Hospitallers for £1000, and selling pasture rights.¹³⁹ Money was, as always, an important and limiting factor, but Montfort was able to afford the crusade, albeit barely, without papal funding.¹⁴⁰

Three distinct crusading groups gathered in England to set off for the Holy Land. These three groups were led by powerful English barons: Richard of Cornwall, William of Forz, and Simon de Montfort. Richard of Cornwall set out from Marseilles at the same time Montfort departed, but with a much larger group. "Sir Richard, earl of Cornwall, that year went also, at midsummer, to the Holy Land, and many a good knight also."¹⁴¹ Scholars agree that Richard and Montfort could not travel together.¹⁴² There was clearly little love between the brother-in-laws, most likely stemming from Montfort's clandestine marriage to Richard's sister.¹⁴³ Richard, as both brother to Eleanor and one of the most powerful barons in England, should have been informed of the marriage, and Henry's

¹³⁹ It was common practice for Crusaders to sell their property to monasteries or other religious houses in order to raise money to go on crusade. The idea, idealistic at best, as Bouchard points out, was that a crusader would return from the Holy Land rich with the spoils of war, and able to redeem his property. This was, sadly, only rarely the case. For further discussion, see Bouchard, *Strong of Body, Brave and Noble*, 166.

¹⁴⁰ Lower, *Barons' Crusade*, 141-142.

¹⁴¹ *Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle* in *Church Historians of England*, trans. Joseph Stevenson (London: Seeley's, 1853), 5.1:357.

¹⁴² Lower, introduction to *Barons' Crusade*, 6; this indicates Montfort's high sense of his own standing, and unwillingness to be a follower. See also Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 30.

¹⁴³ Robert Stacey, *Politics, Policy and Finance Under Henry III, 1216-1245* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 118.

ultimate compliance in the union made the betrayal worse. Richard had risen in revolt against Henry for a brief period after the marriage was announced, and he was placated only when Montfort agreed to step down from the royal council.

Montfort accepted hospitality from Frederick, and traveled through Lombardy and Apulia to Brindisi with a small number of knights and a very pregnant Eleanor, who gave birth to their second son, also named Simon, while Montfort was in the Holy Land.¹⁴⁴ Montfort then embarked from Italy with a contingent of French, English, and Burgundian men, sailing from Brindisi to Acre. It is important to note that the English insisted in fighting only in the Holy Land; they understood their enemy exclusively as the heathens of Jerusalem, not any non-Christian encountered, and held with the specific parameters of the crusade they had followed.¹⁴⁵

Mentions of Simon de Montfort during the crusade are few and far between in the works of Matthew Paris, while information about Richard of Cornwall abounds. This is most likely due to Richard's skillful use of public relations; he ensured knowledge of his travel would spread through his own writing, and by word-of-mouth.¹⁴⁶ Montfort, on the other hand, is not mentioned by name or allusion in the passage discussing his departure:

Some of the nobles of England set out for Jerusalem. Many other nobles of England, took leave of their friends, and commending themselves to the prayers of the religious men, set out in great pomp on their way towards

¹⁴⁴ Riley-Smith posits about 800 knights accompanied the two groups of English crusaders. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A History*, 189. Frederick II, the Holy Roman Emperor and King of the Romans, was constantly at war with the Papal states, and was excommunicated twice during his lifetime, first in 1227 for failing to honor a vow to go on crusade. His second excommunication came when he did go on crusade in 1228, which the papacy could not support since he was excommunicated. He eventually had himself crowned King of Jerusalem, a claim he did not rightfully have since his wife, Yolande of Jerusalem, had passed away, and their son Conrad was the rightful heir. Gregory IX lifted the sentence of excommunication in 1231, but tension between Frederick and the papacy remained. Christopher Tyerman, *God's War*, 726; Creighton, *Simon de Montfort*, 26-29.

¹⁴⁵ Lower, *Barons' Crusade*, 148.

¹⁴⁶ Christopher Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, 101.

Jerusalem, and embarking at the Mediterranean Sea in autumn, sailed forth on their voyage across the sea.¹⁴⁷

No record remains of Montfort's approach to the Holy Land. Over a hundred years after that first endeavor to Jerusalem, Montfort and his contemporaries must have had a greater degree of understanding the journey they were embarking on, and the hardships that were in store. Each successive generation of crusaders must have been better prepared, but the journey remained arduous. It is widely thought that only one out of every four crusaders returned from the East after the First Crusade.¹⁴⁸ By the time Montfort traveled to the Holy Land, logistics were smoother; crusaders sailed from European cities to the crusading port of Acre, and so bypassed the toilsome overland journey.

It is unknown what exactly, if anything, Montfort accomplished in the Holy Land. His military record was not improved with exploits from Jerusalem, and his military prowess does not appear to have been the stuff of legend if it did not survive in some form. No record, with the exception of a letter to Frederick II, account for his time there. In June 1241, the nobility of Jerusalem petitioned Frederick II to appoint Simon de Montfort governor of the kingdom until Conrad came of age, or until another deputy was appointed.¹⁴⁹ The letter read, in part:

¹⁴⁷ Matthew Paris, 1:323.

¹⁴⁸ Crusading remained a demanding pastime. "The famished ate the shoots of beanseeds growing in the fields and many kinds of herbs unseasoned with salt; also thistles, which, being not well cooked because of the deficiency of firewood, pricked the tongues of those eating them; also horses, asses, and camels, and dogs and rats. The poorer ones ate even the skins of the beats and seeds of grain found in manure." Fulcher of Chartres, *The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres* in Edward Peters, *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Course Materials* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), 3.

¹⁴⁹ Conrad was the son of Frederick II and his second wife, Yolande of Jerusalem. After her death, the infant Conrad was the heir apparent to the throne of Jerusalem. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A History*, 180-

The aforesaid Lord Simon de Montfort shall swear to keep and preserve the rights of the Emperor, and of his son, King Conrad, and all those who are in the land, both the going and coming, and the resident, on land and sea, every one in his reason and in his right; and to govern them by the usages and customs, and by the Assizes of the kingdom of Jerusalem.¹⁵⁰

The letter stipulated that those who signed it would, “have sworn and promised upon the Holy Gospel, to keep this peace, and to cause it to be kept to the best of our powers, and not to oppose it so long as it shall endure.”¹⁵¹

Frederick’s response to the petition is unknown, but ultimately nothing came of it. Montfort was an ideal candidate, with appeal to both factions. He was related to both sides of the warring states; through his cousin, Philip de Montfort, a co-signer of the petition to Frederick II, he was related to the Ibelins, and he was Frederick II’s brother-in-law.¹⁵² Montfort could have been the glue that bound Jerusalem to a lasting peace. It was telling that Montfort was requested for this position, rather than one of the leaders of a larger crusading group. In spite of the lack of records about his time in the East, he clearly made a name for himself as a leader, at least to the degree that others would request him to rule. His father’s reputation as a crusading leader, as well, most likely contributed to the aura of leadership surrounding him. Simon de Montfort the elder’s reputation must have been of some importance.

Montfort refused the position, and returned to England and his growing family. We must posit that Montfort returned to fulfill his duty to Henry, his liege lord. The fact that so little information remains about the Barons’ Crusade implies that not only was it

183 for Frederick’s crusade in Jerusalem. Jean Richard, *The Crusades, 1071-1291*, trans. Jean Birrell (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999) 307-312. Bémont, *Simon de Montfort*, 64.

¹⁵⁰ Anonymous to Frederick II, 7 June, 1241, in *Household Manners and Expenses of England in the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, ed. and trans. T.H. Turner (London: Roxburghe Club, 1841), xix.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Tyerman, *God’s War*, 726.

not successful; to Montfort, it did not serve the purpose of a crusade. Montfort, with his rigorous piety and militant Christianity, burdened as he was by the reputation of his father as a brilliant crusader, can only have been deeply frustrated. He had sworn a vow to defend Jerusalem, and instead turned back without the glory of holy war and victory. The frustration left by the seeming unfulfilled nature of his crusade would manifest itself in his belief in the domestic rebellion as a crusade, but that would wait another twenty years.

CONCLUSION

“It is not too much to say that the recovery of the Holy Land, whether as an ideal, a symbol, or as immediate duty, pervaded the minds of men in the thirteenth century. It was inseparable from the air they breathed.”¹⁵³ F.M. Powicke’s famous words reveal an inner truth about crusading during the thirteenth century: it was everywhere. Simon de Montfort’s later domestic political crusade was significantly shaped, both symbolically and in terms of message and metaphor, by his time as a *crucesignatus*. His crusade offered him the opportunity to use the incredibly powerful language and religious symbolism that he was exposed to during his time in Jerusalem. Crusading became the most important element in his life because of its incorporation as a system of practical spirituality. Simon de Montfort called on the images of crusading to sustain his cause in the years of rebellion and civil war. He can truly be said to have spent his life as a crusader. He swore to go to the Holy Land twice, traveled there once, and envisioned his

¹⁵³ F.M. Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953), 80.

later political work in terms of a crusade. This kind of devotion was unheard of before 1187.¹⁵⁴

Years after his return to England, in 1245, Simon de Montfort again took the cross, vowing to return to Jerusalem. His earlier crusade had left him unfulfilled, and his intimacy with the two bishops enjoined by the Pope to preach the crusade must have been influential. English politics, however, would intervene. Henry appointed him regent to Gascony, and he was not able to go. Henry III was bitter about the crusading defeats in 1242, and refused to allow preaching of the crusade in England in 1245, but eventually bowed to the pressure from his barons. In 1247 Henry asked the crusaders to depart a year after the French; they left in 1248, with the same crusade leaders, minus Montfort, and a contingent of 200 knights.¹⁵⁵ Montfort never returned to the Holy Land, and his vow to again take the cross went unfulfilled. His crusade against Henry III, to be examined next, in many ways fulfilled this unmet oath.

After the civil war between Montfort and Henry III, Edward took the cross with permission of his father, and went to Jerusalem in June 1268.¹⁵⁶ This was the last crusade to the Holy Land; there is an irony that Edward I, whose army killed the man who led a crusade against his father, was among the crusaders who lost the last European hold in the Eastern world.

¹⁵⁴ Tyerman, *Invention of the Crusades*, 87.

¹⁵⁵ Richard, *The Crusades*, 340.

¹⁵⁶ Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A History*, 210.

CHAPTER THREE

A VOW FULFILLED

INTRODUCTION

Simon de Montfort's crusade in the Holy Land left him frustrated and unsuccessful, setting the stage for his rebellion against the king, which served to fulfill the vow he had taken to fight against the enemies of God. Montfort fought the Baronial Rebellion of 1263-1265 on behalf of God, against God's enemies. Yet it was also a war that Montfort fought for his own self-interest, for the other barons of England, and for the common people whose cause he championed.¹⁵⁷ His personal piety, unfulfilled crusading efforts and the goals of the reform movement all worked together in his mind to make his war against the king of England a crusade in its own right. Montfort's aims transcended simple redress of political evils by applying his ideology of crusading to what was fundamentally a political movement. He saw explicitly saw himself as a crusader. After leaving England for France in 1261, he returned: "he said he was a *crucesignatus* and was very willing to die fighting wicked Christians for the liberty of England and the Holy

¹⁵⁷ Every biography and study of Simon de Montfort offers a detailed discussion of the Baronial Rebellion. See I. J. Sanders, Introduction to *Documents of the Baronial Movements of Reform and Rebellion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 1-60; D. A. Carpenter, "Simon de Montfort: The First Leader of a Political Movement in English History" in *The Reign of Henry III* (Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon Press, 1996); J. R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 225-331; Claire Valente, *The Theory and Practice of Revolt in Medieval England* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003), 68-107; D. A. Carpenter, "What Happened in 1258?" in *The Reign of Henry III* (Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon Press, 1996), 183-198.

Church against pagans.”¹⁵⁸ Montfort’s faith in his own crusade was central to his construction of crusade ideology.

One point must be made immediately clear: Simon de Montfort, while in England, never participated in a legitimized crusade. Determining a crusade was still the exclusive prerogative of the pontiff; although he and his men fought as *crucesignati*, the pope never mandated this. While Montfort’s supporters among the clergy preached crusading indulgences, the pope was supporting the monarchy of England. Montfort’s faith is such that it is easy to forget his crusade was never enfranchised by the Holy See.

Montfort’s was not the first so-called “political crusade.” Tyerman points out that the papacy provided the impetus and ideological rationale to apply crusading to domestic political crises.¹⁵⁹ King John, Henry III’s father, had donned the white cross of crusaders on Ash Wednesday, March 4, 1215. John’s motives were purely secular, but by claiming he was fighting a crusade his enemies were automatically threatened with excommunication, he had the support of the papacy and the higher moral ground; it was a clever move.

Montfort and his supporters, both lay and of the church, were not the first to apply crusading rhetoric to these political crusades. Unlike King John, however, Montfort fervently believed in the cause for which he was fighting, and took this rhetoric to an unprecedented level.¹⁶⁰ Montfort was also breaking precedent in that he was not a king

¹⁵⁸ Italics in the original. “Crusignatus,” the Latin term from which we coined the word “Crusader.” *Chronica Johannis de Oxenades*, ed. H. Ellis (London: Royal Society, 1859), 226, quoted in Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, 146.

¹⁵⁹ Christopher Tyerman, *England and the Crusades* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 133. Tyerman presents the most thorough discussion of political crusades, drawing comparisons between the Barons’ Rebellion of 1263-1265 and the civil war of 1215-1217. See Chapter 6, “Political Crusades,” 133-151.

¹⁶⁰ Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, 133.

fighting for his throne; he was a rebelling baron, fighting against his monarch. While King John initially received papal support for taking the cross, Montfort's relationship with the papacy would be heavily convoluted.

The audacity of rebelling against one's anointed ruler and the hubris of declaring that God called one to this holy mission meshes well with historians' understanding of Montfort's character. That King Henry feared Montfort was obvious: one particularly illustrative anecdote is included in Matthew Paris's chronicle. Henry was caught in a storm during a boat ride on the Thames. He docked at the house Eleanor and her husband had rented in London, and Montfort,

Went joyfully to meet him, and, by way of comforting him, said,
'What do you fear? The storm has now passed.' To this address
the king replied, not jestingly, but seriously and with a severe look,
'I fear thunder and lighting beyond measure; but, by God's head, I
fear you more than all the thunder and lightening in the world.'¹⁶¹

Relations between Montfort and Henry, never entirely peaceful, broke down completely after 1258. Although the two would be unified in protecting England against all external threats, and collaborated to fend off the papacy's interest in England, Montfort and his brother-in-law never understood each other personally or politically. Montfort had too much arrogance, too little understanding and empathy, while Henry was indecisive, duplicitous, and weak-willed.

This chapter examines the chronology of the Baronial Rebellion before turning to the specific symbolism and rhetoric that Simon de Montfort and his supporters used to win support and credibility. An understanding of the rebellion, and the political turmoil in which Montfort found himself entangled, is crucial to understanding his approach to

¹⁶¹ *Matthew Paris's English History, from the Year 1235-1273*, trans. J. A. Giles (London: H.G. Bohn, 1852-1854), 3:294-295.

this war. The use of symbols linked in popular imagination with crusading—most importantly the cross—gave spiritual weight, while use of crusading rhetoric by Simon de Montfort and his ecclesiastic supporters, gave legitimacy to the war. He consciously used these symbols to create an ideology of what amounted to “domestic” crusading. The papacy’s role in these intrigues was extremely complex. Politically, the papacy supported Henry, but it also gave authority to Montfort and his supporters. From the height of his powers in late 1264 to early 1265, Montfort experienced a short fall to the bloody field of Evesham, but for a brief period he was the de facto ruler of England. This chapter will focus on the period leading up to, and including his rule, and will leave the discussion of his death to Chapter Four.

THE BARONIAL REBELLION

The impetus of the Baronial Rebellion is almost unrelated to Montfort’s later investment in reform. Montfort’s problems with the monarchy dated much earlier than 1258; (as detailed in this chapter) issues of Eleanor’s dower, Henry’s waffling over finances, and the Gascony episode, all contributed to Montfort’s growing displeasure with Henry and his policies. Montfort was not initially engaged with the reform movement. The intricacies of the baronial rebellion are too complex to explore in detail here, but a brief overview is needed to place Montfort’s application of his crusading ideology to his domestic political concerns in a clear context.¹⁶² The period in which Montfort became most interested in reform was brief but memorable; it was not until well into the rebellion that Montfort became vitally engaged. His prior military and political

¹⁶² For a detailed portrait of the political maneuverings of Henry III and Simon de Montfort between 1263 and 1265, see Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 225-345.

career informed his devotion to reform, but he was not directly part of the earlier movement. Montfort would not emerge as a leader of the barons until 1261, although his central place in the reform movement was acknowledged by chroniclers such as Matthew Paris, by his frequent appearance in his chronicle. Modern scholars note that Montfort was more selfishly concerned with his own interests, setting him apart from the barons. In contrast, he wove his own affairs into the ideology and clamor for reform.¹⁶³ His personal animosity towards Henry, and a genuine desire for an end to Henry's despotism more clearly shaped his engagement in the reform movement than any interest in overarching problems with the English political system.

The period between his crusade to Jerusalem and the start of his engagement in the baronial reform efforts was underlined by marked deterioration in Montfort's relations with the king, as discussed above. This included Montfort's frustration that his eagerness to return to the Holy Land in 1247 was stymied by Henry III's desire for him to act as Regent in the troubled province of Gascony.¹⁶⁴ Montfort quickly subdued that rebellion, but complaints arose that he had used unnecessary force, leading to a court trial

¹⁶³ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 154. In 1258 and 1259, Henry III and King Louis IX of France were embroiled in negotiations for the Treaty of Paris, published on December 4, 1259. Louis demanded that Henry, his brother Richard, and his sister Eleanor de Montfort, all renounce their claims to former English lands in France, including Maine, Anjou, Poitou, and Normandy. This gave Montfort a greater bargaining chip that he could have imagined—Henry needed the support of Louis, which he could only get if Eleanor gave up her claims to the lands, a renunciation she and her husband were willing to make only in return for the dower lands she had been promised decades earlier. Montfort, as chief arbitrator for the English King, spent November of 1258 through January of 1260 in France at Louis's court.

¹⁶⁴ For a thorough discussion of Montfort's time in Gascony, see Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 106-124; George Walter Prothero, *The Life of Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1877), 87-107; According to Prothero, Henry's own experiences had led him to distrust the nobles of Gascony, which was threatened simultaneously by the King of Navarre on the south, France in the north, and the constant threat of Gaston de Bearn.

at which he was acquitted.¹⁶⁵ He spent the next five years going back and forth between England and the Continent. He was a progressively more powerful figure, both at home and abroad; Montfort was offered the regency of France by a group of French nobles after the death of the French Queen Mother in 1253, but he instead curbed his frustration with Henry to return to the English court, and spent the next several years ostensibly in support of the king. Along with the queen's uncle, Peter of Savoy, he was instrumental in extricating Henry from the impossible situation he had created for himself in Sicily.¹⁶⁶

As a result of disputes with the papacy and increased demands on his subjects, Henry's hold on power in England was becoming more and more tenuous. He continually asked the barons for money to consign to the depleted exchequer and to fulfill his promise to the Pope in the matter of Sicily. The barons replied that, "they could not in any way, without irreparable ruin to themselves, so often drain themselves, and expend their small substance so often and so uselessly."¹⁶⁷ Baronial support for the king waned under these growing demands.

The altercation between the king and the nobles of the kingdom continued...and day by day complaints increased and multiplied against the king, to the effect that he did not observe his promises,

¹⁶⁵ Prothero, *Simon de Montfort*, 94; Matthew Paris, 2:476-477. "They sent word to the king that the said earl was a most infamous traitor...he had summoned to his councils in a peaceful way certain nobles of Gascony...he treacherously detained them, imprisoned them, and starved them to death."

¹⁶⁶ Henry III had become entangled in Sicily in 1254, when he accepted the throne for Edmund, his second son, in exchange for a large sum and military support, to be given within a set time frame. If he reneged, the pope would excommunicate him, lay England under interdict, and withdraw the offer. In 1257 Pope Alexander let one deadline slide, and in 1257 diplomatic interventions were necessary to appease the papacy. The Pope demanded 5,500 marks immediately, or the complete repayment of 135,000 marks, which Henry could not afford. As Carpenter points out, this precipitated an end to the political stalemate. Henry must pay the sum, under threat of excommunication, and to do so he was forced to appeal to the barons. D.A. Carpenter, *The Reign of Henry III* (London and Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon Press, 1996), 184-185. See also F. M. Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward; The Community of the Realm in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947) 1:371, 1:376.

¹⁶⁷ Matthew Paris, 3:271.

that he treated the keys of the Church with contempt, and violated the conditions of the great charter so often redeemed from him.¹⁶⁸

Henry was not following the Magna Carta of 1215, a major point a contention for his nobles. The barons also complained that the King was treating the Poitevins, his half-siblings, better than his own subjects.¹⁶⁹ William de Valence, his half-brother, “exceeded them all in insolence and audacity.”¹⁷⁰ That these foreign-born relatives of Henry were so favored seemed a conflict of interest, as a king was expected to promote the welfare of his own subjects; that Henry’s favoritism was so obvious aggravated already sore tempers.

Henry’s preference of his half-siblings, as well as his obligation to the papacy over the Sicily debacle, are seen with scholastic hindsight as the immediate causes of the events of 1258.¹⁷¹ The barons,

Most expressly demanded that the king should faithfully keep and observe the conditions of the charter of the liberties of England, which his father, King John, had made and granted to his English subjects...which said charter he, the present King Henry, had many times granted and sworn to observe.¹⁷²

While his relationships with his nobility were weakening, the rapport between Montfort and Henry at this time was cordial, if not friendly. It is clear that Montfort remained in Henry’s inner circle even as the movement for reform began: he was the second witness to a charter from the King to the monks of St. Albans on March 8, 1258.

¹⁶⁸ Matthew Paris, 3:279.

¹⁶⁹ After the death of King John in 1216, his wife Isabelle of Angouleme, Henry’s mother, remarried her daughter’s betrothed, Hugh de Lusignan, the Count of La Marche, and with him had multiple children. These half-siblings were a point of great contention between Henry and his barons, for the favors he bestowed on them and the liberties they took in their brother’s name.

¹⁷⁰ Matthew Paris, 3:279.

¹⁷¹ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 151-152.

¹⁷² Matthew Paris, 3:286.

In April 1258, the disgruntled nobility, led by the Earls of Gloucester, Norfolk, Leicester, together with Hugh Bigod, Peter of Savoy, John Fitz Geoffrey, and Peter de Montfort (no relation), called for a parliament, which was held at Oxford June 9, and at which the barons demanded that Henry faithfully follow the Magna Carta. Twenty-four men were elected to a council to oversee the reform of the government, twelve each representing the King and the barons. Simon de Montfort was the second noble chosen as a member of the baronial twelve.¹⁷³ They came prepared: “In the meantime, the nobles of England—for instance, the earls of Gloucester, Leicester, and Hereford, the earl marshall and others of distinction, leagued themselves together to take precautions.”¹⁷⁴ The group of barons went to Oxford for the parliament “equipped and prepared as if to defend their persons against the attacks to enemies.”¹⁷⁵ They did this out of distrust of the king, carrying weapons and with retinues of knights and soldiers to encourage Henry’s cooperation.¹⁷⁶ Simon de Montfort and the Earl of Gloucester headed the baronial opposition to the king, but the gathering was notable for the new alignment created between greater and lesser nobility, gentry, and knights. The grievances aired were collected in the “Petition of the Barons,” and included issues from freeholders, knights, and nobles.¹⁷⁷

From its very inception, five years before actual war would break out between Montfort and the King, the religious overtones that would characterize the rebellion were clear. The twenty-four representatives, both from the king and the barons, pledged their

¹⁷³ “Provisions of Oxford” in *Documents of the Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion, 1258-1267*, ed. R. F. Treharne and I. J. Sanders (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 101.

¹⁷⁴ Matthew Paris, 3:279-280.

¹⁷⁵ Matthew Paris, 3:285.

¹⁷⁶ Matthew Paris, 3:280.

¹⁷⁷ “Petition of the Barons” DBM, 76-91.

fealty to the cause: “Each swore on the Holy Gospels, that, to the honour of God, his fealty to the king, and to the profit of the realm, he would negotiate and decree, along with the said sworn men, for the reform and redress of the state of the realm.”¹⁷⁸ The oath of the community of England sworn at Oxford used similar language: “We, so and so, cause all people to know that we have sworn on the Holy Gospels, and by that oath are bound together, and promise in good faith...”.¹⁷⁹ This religious tone was characteristic of the culture in which this reform movement took place and in the lives of the nobles. Christian doctrine dictated every aspect of their lives. Oaths sworn on religious figures or relics were taken very seriously—reneging on such a vow was not simply perjury, but blasphemy.

The Provisions of Oxford were drawn up at Oxford in June and July of 1258. Maddicott calls the Provisions, “the most radical assault yet made on the prerogatives of the Crown.”¹⁸⁰ Nothing on this scale would occur again until the English civil war in the seventeenth century. The goal was a total overhaul of the English monarchy, placing the Crown under the direct control of overseers for the first time.

The king, on reflection, acknowledged the truth of the accusations, although late, and humbled himself, declaring that he had been too often imposed upon by evil advice, and he promised and made oath at the altar and shrine of St. Edward, that he would fully and properly amend his old errors, and show favor and kindness to his natural subjects.¹⁸¹

The committee of twenty-four met, and drew up the Provisions. A new council of fifteen was put into place, and new powers (including the committee’s duty to oversee

¹⁷⁸ “The Provisions of Oxford” DBM, 101.

¹⁷⁹ “The Provisions of Oxford” DBM, 101.

¹⁸⁰ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 151.

¹⁸¹ Matthew Paris, 3:279.

royal ministers and appoint officials) were set out.¹⁸² The council would cooperate with the Parliament and twelve representatives from the barons, and would meet three times each year.¹⁸³

The goals of the barons were almost fully realized. The king regretted having sworn to uphold the Provisions of Oxford, but feared that he should incur the charge of perjury if he refused to observe them. He sent privately to the Pope, asking to be absolved of his promise, “which favor he very easily obtained.”¹⁸⁴ The king “determined openly to withdraw from the oath he had made, as he was absolved of it by the pope.”¹⁸⁵ Upon learning of the king’s betrayal, Montfort withdrew in disgust to France.¹⁸⁶ When the nobles heard that the king was no longer held to the oath, they “sent messengers to him, humbly begging him to preserve inviolate that oath he had taken in common with them, and stating that if anything displeased him, he was to point it out to them for amendment.”¹⁸⁷ Later that year, “The earl of Leicester, whose lengthened absence was a source of regret to all the people of England”¹⁸⁸ returned at the behest of his peers. The other nobles needed Montfort as a rallying point for the cause, and because of his appeal

¹⁸² The barons were clearly at an advantage here; seven of their original twelve remained in the new council, compared to three from the royal twelve. Hugh Bigod was named the new Justiciar, and was ordered to collect complaints as he traveled through the counties. There was also reform of the sheriff system, who would now be salaried local landowners elected for one year, a system meant to alleviate much of the corruption that had previously existed. DBM, see below.

¹⁸³ “From the king and the barons of England “ DBM, 72-3, “The Provisions of Oxford” DBM, 100-105; “The grievances of which the king complains” DBM, 222-223.

¹⁸⁴ Matthew Paris, 3:333.

¹⁸⁵ Matthew Paris, 3:338.

¹⁸⁶ Montfort, although he would emerge as a leader, was not intimately involved with much of the grunt work of reform during 1259, as he was in France negotiating the Treaty of Paris on Henry’s behalf. In October of 1259 the Provisions of Westminster were published by Parliament during its Michaelmas meeting. These Provisions addressed grievances to local society, namely sheriffs, exemption from jury duty, and the like. The Provisions of Westminster came to be known collectively with the earlier Provisions as the Provisions of Oxford. All future references to the Provisions refer to these combined decrees.

¹⁸⁷ Matthew Paris, 3:336.

¹⁸⁸ Matthew Paris, 3:320.

to the common people of England. Both Montfort and the cause of the Baron's Rebellion were popular: Montfort's popularity is most evident with the political support he garnered from the common people, and with the rapid rise of his cult after his death. The enthusiasm with which peasants greeted the Barons' Rebellion was seen in the widespread involvement of peasants in physical expressions of support, from raiding enemy property to joining the barons' army.¹⁸⁹

By March of 1260 both the barons and the king were raising troops, after Henry forbade the Candlemas (February) meeting of Parliament while he was away in France. In direct defiance of the king, Montfort then called for the meeting to occur regardless, leading Henry to refuse to allow any new reforms. In December of that year, Henry held a royalist court, restored the exiled William de Valence to favor, and revoked many of the previously ratified reforms. Their reaction to this duplicity brought the barons together in a display of political unification. Simon de Montfort took a leading role, and was now officially called "the leader of the barons."¹⁹⁰

Growing unrest swept England for the next few years, finally coming to a head in 1261, a "year throughout was one of fear to England, and of disquiet to the king and the barons."¹⁹¹ Peasants throughout the country were attacked by "an awful and intolerable pestilence, especially those of the lower orders, and spread death among them in a most lamentable degree."¹⁹² The famine grew worse, and many peasants died of starvation.¹⁹³ Simon de Montfort again "left England, saying he would rather die landless than

¹⁸⁹ D. A. Carpenter, "English Peasants in Politics, 1258-1267" in 136 *Past and Present* (August 1992), 15.

¹⁹⁰ Matthew Paris, 3:340.

¹⁹¹ Matthew Paris, 3:337.

¹⁹² Matthew Paris, 3:282.

¹⁹³ Matthew Paris, 3:291.

withdraw from the truth and be perjured.”¹⁹⁴ Political machinations marked the next few years, but in 1263 Montfort sent a letter to Henry demanding the enforcement of the Provisions, and requiring the king to denounce as mortal enemies all who stood opposed to the reforms. An Ordinance officially dissolving the monarchy’s power was published by Montfort following the ruling of King Louis IX of France in the Mise of Amiens that the Provisions were invalid, and full power should be restored to the monarchy.

With Montfort’s Ordinance, a full-scale rebellion broke out between the barons and the king. After some minor skirmishes, the Battle of Lewes on May 14, 1264, proved decisive. When an outnumbered Montfortian army swept the field, many took it as a sign of God’s favor.¹⁹⁵ Chroniclers started using Christian anthems and symbols to explain Montfort’s success. Montfort captured both Henry and Edward, a coup beyond his wildest dreams. Montfort “went fortified by faith towards the king and his men to fight the Lord’s fight.”¹⁹⁶ The Mise of Lewes, written after the battle, forced Henry to observe all of the Provisions, to pardon the barons, and to restore their property.¹⁹⁷ For the next eighteen months, Montfort was effectively the ruler of England. As Bémont says, “proud, headstrong, and dogmatic, with a limited outlook and a tempestuous heart, capable of inspiring mortal hatred and undying affection, a great character rather than a

¹⁹⁴ *Annals of Dunstable* in EHD, 199.

¹⁹⁵ For a detailed examination of the battle, see R. F. Treharne, “Why the Battle of Lewes Matters in English History” in *The Battle of Lewes, 1264: Its Place in English History* (Friends of Lewes Society, 1964); C. H. Lemmon, “The Field of Lewes, 14th May 1264” in *The Battle of Lewes, 1264: Its Place in English History* (Friends of Lewes Society, 1964); David Carpenter, *The Battles of Lewes and Evesham 1264/1265* (Keele: Mercia Publications, 1987).

¹⁹⁶ *Annals of Dunstable* EHD, 206.

¹⁹⁷ The Mise of Lewes does not survive, but can be pieced together from chronicles. It was known as the Mise of Lewes to contemporaries, and it is by referencing this that the Mise of Amiens received its name.

great man, Simon had all the qualities necessary to a party leader.”¹⁹⁸ He thus provided a sharp contrast with Matthew Paris’s description of the, “fickleness and inscrutable duplicity of the king.”¹⁹⁹

Montfort’s meteoric success ended when Edward escaped from captivity while racing horses and gathered an army outside the small town of Evesham. Montfort’s army was routed, and Montfort, his eldest son, and many of his followers were killed in battle. Chapter Four examines the effects of Montfort’s death, the subsequent call for his sainthood, and the legacy of Montfort’s crusade against political tyranny.

CRUSADING SYMBOLISM

Simon de Montfort’s appropriation of crusading symbolism effectively drew a direct correlation between the war against infidels in the Holy Land and the war against the king of England. Every Christian immediately recognized and understood the symbols of the crusade; Montfort thus gained credibility and power to his cause by using these established symbols to demonstrate that he was fighting God’s fight. It seems clear that Montfort did not use these vital symbols accidentally, but rather consciously created a link to the crusades in order to serve his own political ends. That Montfort adopted symbols of the crusade was remarked on by chroniclers, both his contemporaries and those writing later, as something usual and distinctive to the Baronial Rebellion. He was a political leader with the cleverness to adopt a touch for drama. His personal piety was

¹⁹⁸ Charles Bémont, *Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, 1208-1265*, trans. E. F. Jacob (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930), 151.

¹⁹⁹ Matthew Paris, 3:294.

extreme, as discussed earlier, but his flair for publicity and hype served to highlight the ideology he was consciously creating.

The cross was the single most important symbol adopted by the rebellious barons. It had, as discussed in Chapter One, specific visual associations with the crusade, and a central symbolism to Christianity as an institution. Montfort commandeered this overt symbolism; by doing so he was able to express that he fought for God as well as for the good of the people. He “ordered his soldiers to fasten white crosses on their breasts and backs, above their armour, that they might be known by their enemies, and to show that they were fighting for justice.”²⁰⁰ By wearing the cross, he also preempted any attempt by the royalists to claim God for their side. No contemporary chronicler records the King’s army wearing the cross, yet both Matthew Paris and the *Annals of Dunstable* remark on Montfort’s adoption of it. Henry’s army in fact responded to this by donning red crosses. The fact that no chronicles discuss this fact suggests that Montfort’s seizure of this symbolic link to the crusades was successful in identifying the war the barons were fighting with the popular enthusiasm for the crusades.

Examples of Montfort’s use of the cross were often commented upon when his army was faced with grave danger. He and his men were trapped outside of the London walls as the King’s army approached, and believed themselves to be caught in a death trap. The *Annals of Dunstable* state:

The earl armed himself and his men, and in the name of God had himself and the others marked back and front with the sign of the cross, and meanwhile confessing their sins, they all took the sacrament, ready to meet with onslaught of their enemies and to struggle with them for the sake of the truth.”²⁰¹

²⁰⁰ Matthew Paris, 3:347.

²⁰¹ *Annals of Dunstable*, EHD, 203.

Such moments of specific crusade symbolism are deeply intertwined with a sense of hopelessness, and forthcoming death. The barons tried repeatedly to make peace with the royalists, but to no avail: “the adverse party were fully and finally bent on war.”²⁰² By calling for his soldiers to wear the cross in these times of trial, Montfort ensured both that his soldiers would face battle spurred on by the belief that they fought for God, and that contemporary chroniclers would report these events in terms of a religious war in which he held the most fundamental symbol of Christianity.

It is clear that Montfort’s use of the cross was not in response to action on Henry’s part. When a papal legate was dispatched to England to preach the crusade against the barons and their supporters, Montfort had already adopted the white cross at the Battle of Lewes. The legate was delayed in France, so that news of his arrival did not reach the warring parties until the battle was over.²⁰³ In October 1264, English bishops returned from abroad with papal bulls of excommunication and interdict, and threatened to apply them if the barons did not reconcile themselves to the papal legate sent from the Holy See. These papal bulls were applied on October 20, 1264.²⁰⁴ The legate’s term expired with the death of Pope Urban IV on October 2, 1264, although news of his death did not reach England for weeks. Urban’s death absolved the legate from any concern with English affairs, although he lingered in France for months after his office expired.

²⁰² Matthew Paris, 3:346.

²⁰³ Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, 148.

²⁰⁴ Excommunication (literally, “out of communion”), is the most serious ecclesiastical censure, barring an individual from the religious community. If one dies while excommunicate, burial in hallowed ground is not allowed; the individual is barred from certain other sacraments as well. Interdict, another ecclesiastical penalty, is essentially excommunication of an entire country. All churches were closed, and most sacraments suspended, including the Eucharist, marriage, confession, and anointing the sick. Baptism was still allowed. Interdict was used by pope’s to influence political leaders. Henry had personal experience with this power: England had been placed under interdict from 1208-1215 after King John disagreed with the pope. To someone as devout as Montfort, excommunication would be a grave punishment indeed.

Had Montfort waited until the legate arrived to declare that his side was God's side, much of the dramatic force of his stance would have been lost. In fact, Henry's efforts to regain the symbolic control of the cross was less a matter of his own faith than a recognition that Montfort had appropriated this most potent Christian symbol to great effect.

Much of their use of crusading symbols such as the cross came as the rebels were facing imminent peril. It is when they approached death that thoughts of God were closest, and faith became most important. After receiving news at Evesham that battle was unavoidable, "Earl Simon, thereupon, passed the whole of that night without sleeping, and passed the time in prayer and holy duties, exhorting his companions and followers to make full confession."²⁰⁵ Being shriven before battle would have been a common practice, to ensure that a soldier would still attain heaven if slain in war. Combined with wearing the cross, Montfort's pre-battle ritual of fasting and prayer reflects the central role religion played for him, especially in his understanding of this rebellion.

Popular conceptions of his war were important to Montfort, and nowhere was that more apparent than in chronicles. Contemporary chronicles, and the language used to record these events for posterity are important, therefore, for our understanding of contemporary attitudes towards the figures involved. One symbol described by Robert of Gloucester that conflates Montfort's rebellion with the crusades was that of comets. Comets were believed to be portents or celestial signs, heralding great events or great sorrow to come. A standard in medieval literature and art, comets are seen in such works

²⁰⁵ Matthew Paris, 3:346.

as the Bayeux Tapestry as harbingers of decisive events. By discussing comets in relation to Simon de Montfort, chroniclers were setting him apart, predicting that great events would follow. Since the time of the First Crusade comets were associated with the chronicles of crusaders to the east. Following this literary device, a passage describes the heavens during the baronial rebellion.

“As a tokening of great wo [sic] than yet was come,
Our Lord sent in sight by a wonderful case;
For a star with a lance, which is called Comet...
That each man who saw the star might wonder,
There went from it a gleam that drew towards the north,
Even as it were a lance, red and clear enough.”²⁰⁶

There is a level of apocalyptic thought behind these comets, for signs from the heavens were seen as portentous of the world’s imminent demise. The inclusion of apocalyptic symbols is reminiscent of the civil war between the Empress Matilda and King Steven in the mid-twelfth century, a war of succession that tore the country apart and left chroniclers declaring that the war was so destructive the only explanation was that “Christ and his saints slept,” oblivious to the pain of the common people. Although he consciously constructed an image of himself with clear ideological associations to the crusade, Montfort did not make the link between comets seen during his war and comets seen in the Holy Land; that chroniclers made the leap themselves is, again, testimony to his skills with symbolic maneuvering.

The specific crusading symbols that Montfort appropriated for his Baronial Rebellion must be examined in tandem; it is the combination of wearing the cross, Montfort’s own fasting and prayer, and the use of accepted crusading literary devices the

²⁰⁶ *Robert of Gloucester’s Chronicle in Church Historians of England*, ed. Joseph Stevenson (London: Seeley’s, 1853) 5.1:368.

chroniclers on the comets that forms such a potent mix of religious and political symbolism. These symbols could not exist with such strength on their own, however; they need to be extended through words and arguments.

CRUSADE RHETORIC

The specific rhetoric used by Simon de Montfort and the religious leaders surrounding his cause was a vital link between the ideology of the crusades to the East, and Montfort's crusade against Henry III. Through his own use of language, through the language and arguments of his allies, and most crucially through popular and literary conceptions of his actions as spread by contemporary chronicles, Montfort was able to project and reinforce the idea of his rebellion as a holy war, sanctioned by God as necessary for liberating England from oppression. In drawing a link between the Baronial Rebellion and the crusades in Jerusalem, Montfort elevated his cause beyond mere politics or personal agenda, to the larger issue of Christians versus heretics, good versus evil, and freedom versus tyranny. By backing his use of crusading symbolism with explicit arguments meant to strengthen the likeness between holy war and political war, Montfort demonstrated his skill as a political tactician and propagandist.

The most visible of the similarities Montfort emphasized was his adoption of the promise of erasure of sins for participants in the rebellion. As discussed in Chapter One, this concept dated from the First Crusade as a divine reward for joining God's army, although it was never preached by Pope Urban himself. This promise of salvation remains one of the central ideas of crusading throughout the Middle Ages, setting the crusades apart from mere political strife. That the barons' allies and soldiers would be

absolved of sins was a promise supported by prominent representatives of the Church. Both Robert Grosseteste, already a devoted member of Montfort's immediate circle, and Walter Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester, who was present on the side of the barons at the Parliament of Oxford in 1258, were important and influential clergymen in England, and their support was politically advantageous. After Grosseteste's death in 1253, the Bishop of Worcester moved to the foreground of Montfort's circle.

Robert Grosseteste, the Bishop of Lincoln, was a supporter of Montfort's goals for the English government, even backing him up from a religious point of view:

It was reported that the same bishop had enjoined on him, in order to obtain remission of his sins, to take up this cause, for which he fought even to the death; declaring that the peace of England could not be firmly established except by the sword, and positively assuring him that all who died for it would be crowned with martyrdom.²⁰⁷

Robert Grosseteste was the most important spiritual figure acting in support of the barons. That the rebels were "receiving remission of their sins at the hands of that holy man, Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln" gave their crusade more spiritual clout than it had previously possessed.²⁰⁸ The support of a man as devout and blessed as the Bishop of Lincoln was a vital asset to Montfort and his supporters.

Bishop Grosseteste was by no means the only man of the cloth to extend this absolution to the barons' men. The Bishop of Worcester was present at the Battle of Lewes in 1264, lending both his physical and spiritual presence to the cause. He too promised spiritual salvation for the rebels.

William Cantelupe [sic], bishop of Worcester, also, gave absolution to all of them, and enjoined them, in order to obtain remission of their sins, to

²⁰⁷ Matthew Paris, 3:355.

²⁰⁸ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 223.

fight vigorously and manfully for justice on that day, and promising admission to the kingdom of heaven to all who died in such a cause.²⁰⁹

Robert of Gloucester also reports the Bishop of Worcester's support: "The bishop Walter of Worcester, absolved them all there, and preached to them, so that they had of death the less fear. Then straight they took their way against the foes on God's behalf."²¹⁰

Simon de Montfort emphasized the importance of respecting holy ground, ordering his army to behave with restraint. "The earl had given orders that no one, on pain of decapitation, should dare to enter a sacred church or cemetery for the purpose of plunder, or lay violent hands on religious men or their servants."²¹¹ For an army to respect holy ground was rare—soldiers wages were meager, and it was commonly understood that the spoils of war were meant to make the difference in their paltry wages. Churches were centers of wealth, and many starving Christian soldiers overlooked spiritual scruples in order to bring food home to their families. Montfort's insistence on the sanctity of these Houses of God is a reflection of his earlier refusal to fight against any but the heathen of Jerusalem on his way to the Holy Land during his crusade to the East. This remained his firm commitment. It is certainly possible that his orders had little effect; pillaging was common during wars and it is not realistic that a medieval army completely abstained. Nonetheless, Montfort's insistence on this abstention, and his emphasis on keeping religious and holy property untouched, is notable as another example of his consistent adherence to the rhetoric and behavior that linked his cause to that of all Christians.

²⁰⁹ Matthew Paris, 3:346-347.

²¹⁰ *Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle*, CHE, 5.1: 374.

²¹¹ Matthew Paris, 3:350.

Montfort himself did turn to the Church for financial assistance, again following the crusading tradition. Financing the Baronial Rebellion was both costly and demanding. In 1264, Montfort broke precedence to demand one tenth of all clerical benefices to fund his war against Henry; this was the same amount asked for by the church to finance crusades to the East. The clerical tenth had not been requested to finance a political struggle before, and Montfort was quick to assure his subjects that he would not set this as precedent. The remainder of the money collected was, ironically, used by Pope Clement to repay Edward for the expenses of the Baronial Rebellion after Montfort's defeat and death.²¹²

Montfort and his allies commandeered crusading ideology through popular literature. The rebelling barons, and especially Montfort, were seen by contemporary chroniclers as on the side of God against a hapless and incompetent king. Montfort himself was referred to as, "Simon, Christ's soldier"²¹³ by the Melrose Chronicler. In recording the Battle of Lewes, the Annals of Dunstable declares that the Earl won, "by a miracle and with God's help" in spite of being outnumbered four to one.²¹⁴ Literary treatments of Battle of Lewes unambiguously connect Montfort and God, leading other authors to also conflate Montfort's war with the crusades, furthering this concept in the language they employed. This potent idea was thus spread to the common people, and became ingrained in popular memories of the rebellion.

Montfort's own declarations and the self-portrait he created were important to flavoring others' conception of him, and his cause. When he returned from France, "he

²¹² F. M. Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953), 193; Powicke, *Henry III*, 483.

²¹³ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 231.

²¹⁴ *Annals of Dunstable*, EHD, 207.

said he was a *crucesignatus* and was very willing to die fighting wicked Christians for the liberty of England and the Holy Church against pagans.”²¹⁵ Here he unequivocally draws a parallel between Henry and unbelievers, while painting a picture of himself as a crusader on God’s behalf. Contemporary chroniclers also adopted, likely with his encouragement, piety-filled language when discussing Montfort’s war, giving him an air of sanctity that would be fulfilled after his death.

“No man in his sound sense ought to believe that this Simon was a traitor, or to call him one. He was no traitor, but a most devoted respector and most faithful protector of the church of God which is in England, and the shield and defender of the nation of the English people.”²¹⁶

Montfort and his chroniclers created a figure who was devoted to his cause, and who fought for God against despotism. Many aspects of his personal devotion would have been public knowledge. If a contemporary such as Matthew Paris, at St. Albans in Herefordshire, was aware of Montfort’s personal practices, many others would also have known Montfort’s religious rituals. A military leader whose strong personal piety was well known was an inspirational commander to his army and leader of the common people.

Montfort’s political tact served him well. The pious language and the promised erasure of sins were strikingly linked to the powerful ideology of the crusades. The support of leading members of the church was critical to his success, lending public credibility to his cause. Montfort himself had a flair for the dramatic and rhetorical, and that ability enabled him to discuss his role as a crusader convincingly. The ideological image of “Simon de Montfort, leader of the crusade against monarchical corruption”

²¹⁵ *Chronica Johannis de Oxenades*, ed. H. Ellis (London: Royal Society, 1859), 226, quoted in Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, 146.

²¹⁶ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 218.

reflected Montfort's political brilliance, greatly helping him succeed as a leader who inspired both his army and his country for decades to come.

ROLE OF THE PAPACY

The role of the papacy in the Baronial Rebellion is complex. While a legate was appointed to England to excommunicate those who fought against the king, Montfort was busy usurping the Pope's exclusive authority to preach crusades by deliberately using crusading rhetoric and symbolism to conflate his war with the crusades in the Holy Land. Montfort's dogged pursuit of victory left him blind to the fact that he was actually acting against God's representative on earth. When the pope absolved Henry from his oath to adhere to the Provisions, he made it clear what would happen if a rebellion took place: "If, however, anyone shall presume to attempt this, let him know that he will incur that anger of omnipotent God and of his Apostles, Saint Peter and Saint Paul."²¹⁷ Neither the language nor the powerful underlying meaning here could be more obvious; to oppose the king is to oppose God. How, then, did Simon de Montfort continue to fight for the Provisions, draping himself in the mantle of divine protection and support? His stubbornness and pride, his own faith in his cause, and certainty that he knew what was right fueled his assumption of Christian authority and legitimacy.

Cardinal Gui Foulquois was appointed legate to England by Pope Urban IX, and departed for the beleaguered country under orders to restore both peace and the monarch's authority.²¹⁸ Montfort and the other barons barred the legate from entering

²¹⁷ "Alexander to the king of the English," in DBM, 239.

²¹⁸ A papal legate was a Pope's personal representative to a nation, or a part of the church. Empowered to act on matters of the Church, a high-ranking legate such as a cardinal (a Prince of the Church) would

England, although his presence in France most likely provided some solace to the royalists. Ultimately, the Cardinal returned to Italy soon after the October 2, 1264 death of the pontiff, whereupon he himself was elected Pope Clement IV. The papacy, at this point, was firmly in support for Henry, and by becoming pope himself, the former Cardinal Foulquois gained the ability to excommunicate the rebels and lay England under interdict if needed.²¹⁹ Foulquois was also given the power to commute crusaders' vows in favor of the royalist cause; in essence turning vows to fight infidels in the Holy Land into vows to fight for the King against Montfort and the other rebels.²²⁰

Preaching a crusade had long been the exclusive prerogative of the Pope. Thus Montfort's claims to crusading were filled with tension; not only was his rebellion contrary to the mandate of Pope Urban, but was seen by the papacy as a cause against which to proclaim a holy war. Tyerman states that it was within the legate's power to call for a crusade against the rebels; this statement is not repeated by any other historian, nor is it mentioned in contemporary chronicles. There is no evidence that such preaching took place by Foulquios while he was the legate.²²¹ As pope he appointed a new legate to England, who he ordered to preach the cross against the Montfortians in specific areas of northwestern Europe. The new legate, Cardinal Ottobouno, traveled there in 1265, but circumstances intervened and Montfort was killed at Evesham before any ecclesiastical action took place. The papacy remained involved, however, and in 1266 Clement IV allowed the legate to threaten excommunication if Montfort's widow and children

expect to be treated as the Pope himself; his rule would be absolute, and his tenure usually quite brief. Cardinal Gui Foulquois would have been a "Legatus a Latere," literally, "from the Pope's side," and among the most powerful men of the Catholic Church.

²¹⁹ Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century*, 180; Powicke, *Henry III*, 479-482.

²²⁰ Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, 146; *Registres d'Urbain IV*, ed. L. Dorez and J. Giraud (Paris: 1899-1958), no. 546.

²²¹ Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, 144-150.

continued to resist the king's army. He did in fact excommunicate the garrison of Kenilworth Castle, the Montfort family stronghold that remained under siege for months after the rebellion ended.

It is Tyerman's belief that the papacy was this deeply involved in English politics partially out of self-interest. In 1263 a new crusade to the Holy Land was to be preached, and a war-torn England would not put in the effort that the Holy See expected.²²² Just as Montfort was originally involved in the reform movement out of self-interest, the papacy's involvement was not altruistic. It is partially the complexity of motives that make the Barons' Rebellion so intricate.

We have already seen the importance of the clergy to Montfort's initial success, and it was a clergyman who provided the strongest link, although tense, between the papacy and Montfort's rebellion. Walter de Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester, was seen as Robert Grosseteste's moral successor in England. He was allied to both the Pope and the barons. He was instructed by the Pope to preach a crusade in the East, yet he was strongly aligned with the rebel cause, and present at the Battle of Lewes. His support lent the Montfortians an air of credibility; both armies would have associated Cantilupe with the papacy due to the powers with which he had been invested.²²³ As we have seen, calling a crusade was the prerogative of the Pope; Cantilupe's presence created a tenuous and complex link with the papacy through the powers that had been given to him.²²⁴

²²² Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, 145.

²²³ Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, 148.

²²⁴ Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, 150.

CONCLUSION

Montfort and the rebels deliberately appealed to crusading ideology in order to justify their rebellion. Some historians state that they did this in order to form a “counter-crusade” against the crusade being led by Henry and Edward.²²⁵ Our analysis refutes this claim completely. Montfort used crusading rhetoric, symbolism, and the influence of his allies to create a constructed idea of a domestic crusade not different from the familiar and popular crusades to the East. By contrast, Henry relied on the idea not of fighting for God, but of preserving his power and right to rule. Henry’s army wore the cross only after the Montfortian army adopted it; this is a responsive use of the crusading ideology of others rather than an inherent use of crusading ideology on his own initiative. This will in fact reverse Tyerman’s argument; it was Henry who attempted to launch a counter-crusade against the rebels in an unsuccessful effort to reclaim the powerful imagery of God’s support.

Simon de Montfort’s domestic crusade against Henry III was consciously constructed. Left frustrated by an unfulfilling war against pagans in the Holy Land, Montfort saw his work for reform in England as the fulfillment of his vow to fight God’s war. He deliberately used powerful symbols and rhetoric with which, as a crusader, he was already familiar to build and wield popular support for his political cause. With the collaboration of his supporters in the church, such as the bishops of Lincoln and Worcester, Montfort’s rebellion deepened this rhetorical and symbolic support of a crusade. By themselves, simply wearing the cross, offering absolution from sins and salvation, or having powerful clergy as supporters would not have been enough to give

²²⁵ Tyerman, *England and the Crusade*, 146.

Montfort the “spiritual clout” he needed; it was the skillful combination of his rhetoric, symbolism, and supporters that he combined to create his crusading ideology during the rebellion, and his own self image as crusading leader.

Montfort’s belief in his rebellion as a crusade is crucial to understanding the ideological fallout from his death. Proclaimed by others as a martyr, a saint, a heretic, and a traitor, the complexities and contradictions of Montfort’s personality were in no way alleviated with his death. The hatred and holiness with which his legacy is understood is indicative of the polarization of Simon de Montfort in life, and death.

CHAPTER FOUR

DEATH, MIRACLES, AND MEMORY OF SIMON DE MONTFORT

INTRODUCTION

Simon de Montfort's crusading ideology and his application of it in domestic politics caught the public imagination, and nowhere more so than the legends that surrounded his death. When Montfort was killed at the Battle of Evesham on August 4, 1265, he was at the height of his power.²²⁶ King Henry was in his physical and political control, his sons were providing military support, and the most formidable strongholds were held by his allies. While waiting for his son Simon to arrive in the town of Evesham with reinforcements, Montfort and his army were trapped by Edward's army, and slaughtered. With him died his cause. The Disinherited, a group of nobles who had been deprived of their property for participation in the rebellion, remained opposed to the royalists, garrisoning themselves at the Montfortian stronghold of Kenilworth Castle in 1266. There they held out against the royalist army for almost a year, the longest siege in English history, before surrendering and accepting the Dictum of Kenilworth.²²⁷ Montfort's legacy remained, however. He is properly credited with strengthening the

²²⁶ G. W. Prothero, *The Life of Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1877), 338-350; F. M. Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 201-203; Antonia Gransden, ed. and trans. *The Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds, 1212-1301* (London: Nelson, 1964), 31-32; Matthew of Westminster, *The Flowers of History, Especially such as relate to the Affairs of Britain, from the Beginning of the World to the Year 1307* (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853), 437-441.

²²⁷ "The Dictum of Kenilworth" in *Documents of the Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion, 1258-1267* ed. R. F. Treharne and I. J. Sanders (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 317-337.

fight for democracy in the British Isles, though real change would take another four hundred years.

Montfort was, of course, aware of the mortal peril he faced, the possibility that his crusade for reform could well lead instead to his own death. Chroniclers highlighted this awareness, seeing in his preoccupation with death signs of his holiness and complete devotion to the cause for which he fought. “He said that he would never draw back from the cause which, for God’s sake, he had justly undertaken, the defense of England, neither for life nor for death, ‘Since,’ as he added, ‘I am about to die for it.’”²²⁸ His final battle demonstrated that his deep religious devotion was steady until the end. Before his troops marched into battle, “They committed life and soul to God’s grace each one.”²²⁹ Montfort took solace in his spirituality when he knew he was facing death.

In the Battle of Evesham, Montfort found himself out-maneuvered by Edward with his army trapped, and reinforcements too distant to be of any use.²³⁰ Montfort’s men had the higher ground, but they were no match for Edward’s army. Out-numbered three to one, victory was out of the question.²³¹ “On a Tuesday, they joined battle, all on horseback was the disaster, without any foot soldiers; they struck blows there to great harm with the burnished sword, so that lord Edward’s party won the victory.”²³² This battle is often referred to as a slaughter or massacre, rather than a battle—Edward’s men

²²⁸ *The Chronicle of Melrose*, in *Church Historians of England*, trans. Joseph Stevenson (London: Seeley’s, 1853-1858), 4.1:232.

²²⁹ *Robert of Gloucester’s Chronicle* in *Church Historians of England*, trans. Joseph Stevenson (London: Seeley’s, 1853-1858), 5.1:374.

²³⁰ See F. M. Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward: The Community of the Realm in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947), 2:501-503.

²³¹ Prothero, *Simon de Montfort*, 341.

²³² “Lament for Simon de Montfort” in *English Historical Documents*, ed. David C. Douglas (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953-1977), 916. This is actually a false statement. The majority of soldiers at Evesham, like in any medieval battle, would have been foot soldiers, and not mounted knights. See D. A. Carpenter, “English Peasants in Politics, 1258-1267,” *Past and Present* 136 (August 1992): 11.

pursued the fleeing Welsh soldiers for a distance of up to two miles from the field.²³³

The rebellious barons formed a circle around King Henry, who was still Montfort's captive, but Edward's army overpowered them. Simon de Montfort, his eldest son Henry de Montfort, and members of his immediate circle, including Hugh the Dispenser, Peter de Montfort, and Ralph Basset were all killed. Guy de Montfort was wounded and captured.²³⁴ Montfort's allies collapsed.

Simon de Montfort's crusading ideology lived on, past his life and the end of his cause. The clergy, many of the nobility, and the common people of England were his champions; legends, stories and common beliefs of Montfort's sanctity continued to be told by them. Montfort was hailed as a martyr, a role with clear ideological associations to the crusades. He was compared to Thomas à Becket, his canonization was popularly awaited, and the defilement of his body ended not with the shame his murderers intended, but with tales of miracles performed by his severed limbs. The manner in which Montfort died, the treatment his body received after death, and the cult that grew surrounding his legend contributed to the popular belief in the goals of his reform crusade.

²³³ "Such was the murder of Evesham, for battle it was none." Robert of Gloucester, CHE, 5.1:375. See also D. A. Carpenter, *The Battles of Lewes and Evesham 1264/1265* (Keele: Mercia Publications, 1987), 64.

²³⁴ Guy de Montfort was the only member of the de Montfort family to attain lasting recognition through classical literature. In a cathedral in Viterbo he stabbed Henry of Almain, Richard of Cornwall's son and his cousin, to death before the high altar, after surprising his victim while hearing Mass. For this crime, Dante placed him in his *Inferno*, in the seventh circle of Hell, with the murderers, submerged to the throat in a river of boiling blood: "He pointed out a shade apart, alone: 'In God's bosom that one clove in two/ the heart that on the Thames still drips with blood.'" *Dante's Inferno*, trans. and ed. Robert and Jean Hollander (New York: Doubleday, 2000), xii, 118-120. J. R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 371. Tambling draws a fascinating parallel between the desecration of Montfort's body, and Guy de Montfort's abuse of Henry of Almain's corpse. Guy returned to the church after the murder, and dragged the body in the streets. Henry's own allies then cut out his heart, completing the violation of his body. Jeremy Tambling, "Monstrous Tyranny, Men of Blood: Dante and 'Inferno' XII," *The Modern Language Review* 98, no. 4 (October 2003): 894.

DEATH AND DESECRATION

Simon de Montfort's death was violent, and the treatment of his body was brutal. The royalist army desecrated Montfort's corpse; Carpenter believes that reason for this is dual. A captive rebel leader would serve as a rallying point for the dissatisfied, and the idea of execution following trial was not part of thirteenth century consciousness. Montfort's enemies also abhorred him, and much of the carnage is likely to have been an unplanned response to the elation of the royalist victory.²³⁵ Carpenter points out that to kill a knight wearing a full suit of armor was usually a deliberate, intended action, for it was a feat of requiring some determination. Montfort was allegedly stabbed to death with daggers—this meant that he would have been unhorsed, wrestled to the ground, had his helmet removed, and then struck.²³⁶

The posthumous treatment of Montfort's body was both degrading and violent. "It was worse that they had the good man dismembered, who knew so well all there was to know about fighting and keeping faith."²³⁷ Even in that violent era, mutilating the body of a fallen soldier was extremely offensive. It is unclear if Edward condoned this treatment of his uncle's corpse; contemporary accounts do not name him as one of Montfort's murderers, but also mention no attempt to stop the violence. Montfort's body was dismembered and mutilated, his limbs separated to different parts of England.²³⁸ His limbs served as trophies for the royalists, proof that their enemy was dead, evidence that they had carried the day. The violence with which his body was treated proves the depths of hatred his enemies felt for him. Chroniclers in support of Montfort were outraged by

²³⁵ Carpenter, *Battles of Lewes and Evesham*, 66.

²³⁶ Carpenter, *Battles of Lewes and Evesham*, 66.

²³⁷ "Lament for Simon de Montfort," EHD, 916.

²³⁸ Robert of Gloucester, CHE, 5.1:374.

the defilement: “Our gentle baronage, who for the sake of the peace so long deferred, let themselves be torn asunder, their bodies hacked and dismembered to save England.”²³⁹ Montfort was a polarizing figure, an implacable foe, and unfalteringly loyal to his allies. Williams Mautravers was a staunch supporter during the early years of the rebellion; he fought for the barons’ at the Battle of Lewes. He turned against Montfort, and dismembered Montfort’s body, proving how divisive Montfort’s leadership could be.²⁴⁰

By the desecration of his body, Montfort’s enemies sought to impeach his memory, and humiliate his allies. Beyond merely violating his corpse, they treated the fallen leader without the respect that he should have received.

The head of the earl of Leicester, it is said, was severed from his body, and his testicles cut off and hung on either side of his nose; and in such guise the head was sent to the wife of sir Roger de Mortimer, at Wiggemor castle. His hands and feet were also cut off, and sent to divers [sic] places to enemies of his, as a great mark of dishonour to the deceased; the truck of his body, however, and that only, was given for burial in the church of Evesham.²⁴¹

It is unclear, however, that even this meager burial ever took place. On April 27, 1267, Pope Clement IV inquired about a report heard from Amaury de Montfort asserting that his father’s body had not received ecclesiastical burial. According to the Osney chronicler, Montfort’s body was exhumed after burial and removed to an unknown location.²⁴²

Amaury, who had entered the priesthood at an early age, was a papal chaplain and canon of London and Lincoln.²⁴³ The Pope had his legate, Ottobuono, look into the

²³⁹ “Lament for Simon de Montfort,” EHD, 916.

²⁴⁰ Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward*, 502.

²⁴¹ “Chronicles of the Mayors and Sheriffs of London, 1259-1266,” EHD, 183.

²⁴² *Osney Chronicle in Annales Monastici*, ed. H. R. Luard, Vol. IV (Rolls ser., 1864-1869), quoted in Carpenter, *The Battles of Lewes and Evesham*, 67.

²⁴³ Amaury accompanied his younger sister, Eleanor, on a voyage from France to England, where she was to be married to Llewlyn, Prince of Wales. Edward’s privateers captured their ship, and the siblings were

matter—the same legate dispatched to excommunicate Montfort before Evesham.²⁴⁴ It is unclear exactly what occurred; chronicles offer conflicting accounts of Montfort's burial.

After the battle, certain friends of the earl, weeping and lamenting...came into the field, and collected, on an old and shaky ladder, the remains of his body which lay abandoned under the sky. They covered it with an old cheap cloak, and brought it back to the conventual church of Evesham where, wrapping it in a pure, clean cloth, they placed it in a new grave in which no one had yet lain.²⁴⁵

It is clear that the physical remains of the rebel were treasured by his allies, and feared by his enemies. As relics were held to have great power by both clergy and the laity during the medieval period, the royalists must have feared that Montfort's remains would become objects of worship.

Montfort's death was understood by chroniclers as a great event. "On the same day and at the same hour that the battle took place, there was a very great tempest in London and elsewhere, accompanied with coruscations, lightening, and thunder."²⁴⁶ Contemporary descriptions reflect a literary tradition of chroniclers, but also testify to the importance of Montfort's passing. That a chronicle used this standard literary device to signify that Montfort's death was a critical occurrence implies not only that he was important, but that the chronicler wanted to ensure that his reputation and legacy would remain powerful. Other chronicles used the same device. "On that day about three o'clock there was such a downpour of rain, such thunder and lightening, and the darkness was so profound, that though it was dinner-time those who sat down to eat could scarcely

held captive; Eleanor remained in relative comfort, but Amaury was kept in Corfe Castle, one of the most notorious prisons in England, for three years before being moved and held for an additional four years. The Welsh principality, French Monarchy, and the papacy all argued for his release. At this time two of his brothers, Guy and Simon, had been excommunicated. The Pope's interest in gaining Amaury's freedom again shows the differing attitudes of the papacy to the Montfort family.

²⁴⁴ Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward*, 502.

²⁴⁵ *Osney Chronicle*, quoted by Carpenter, *The Battles of Lewes and Evesham*, 65.

²⁴⁶ "Chronicles of the Mayors and Sheriffs of London, 1259-1266," EHD, 183. *Choruscationes* most likely refers to something along the lines of the Aurora Borealis.

see the food before them.”²⁴⁷ To contemporaries, a storm of such severity occurring simultaneously with such cataclysmic events was a sign from God. Robert of Gloucester makes the connection explicit, saying after Montfort’s death, “Christ was very ill pleased, as He shewed by tokens both terrible and true; for as it to Himself befel, which He died on the cross, There was a great darkness throughout the world.”²⁴⁸

MIRACLES

Montfort’s cult as a holy man, which developed from popular knowledge of his devout religious habits, was furthered by the evidence and legends that arose after the Battle of Evesham. Montfort’s body itself offered confirmation of his devoutness. “Although they hacked him limb from limb, he bled not, as was said.”²⁴⁹ Relics, proof of Montfort’s sanctity, were coveted. “Near his body, that great treasure, they found a hair shirt. The false knaves, they were so wicked, and those who killed him.”²⁵⁰ This physical proof of Montfort’s devotion entered the lore surrounding Montfort’s life, religion, and death, ensuring that he was remembered as a holy figure.

On the other hand, there were those who did not honor the Earl of Leicester and his supporters after death. God punished them for their actions: as the Melrose Chronicler states, “they died a disgraceful death.”²⁵¹ To those of this opinion, miraculous punishments were understood to be God’s penalty to those who had defiled Montfort’s body. One man’s eyes reportedly dropped out of his head after swearing “by God’s eyes,

²⁴⁷ *The Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds*, 31.

²⁴⁸ *Robert of Gloucester’s Chronicle*, CHE, 375.

²⁴⁹ *Robert of Gloucester’s Chronicle*, CHE, 375.

²⁵⁰ “Lament for Simon de Montfort,” EHD, 916.

²⁵¹ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 233.

that Simon was a traitor to the king of England and his nobles.”²⁵² Further evidence of the sacrality of Montfort’s body was reported by chroniclers, and lends a transitive sanctity to his cause.

The miracles that occurred after Montfort’s death were seen as proof that his cause was just, enhancing his status as a holy figure. Even if not a saint recognized by the Catholic Church, the miracles ascribed to Montfort proved to the medieval mind the justness of the war he fought and his own holiness. “Of the rightfulness of their cause no greater proof could be given than that afterwards frequent miracles were wrought.”²⁵³

Since the Battle of Lewes,

They were fighting for a just cause, they died in justice; and therefore, after their deaths, some of them were permitted by God to work miracles, and so to preserve for themselves glory and veneration; in consequence of which it is believed that they are reigning with God in glory.²⁵⁴

The Chronicle of Melrose delves into Montfort’s miracles in detail.²⁵⁵ It makes sense that a religious house such as Melrose Abbey would focus on the religious details of Montfort’s death. The chronicle also emphasizes the similarities already seen between Montfort and his apostolic namesake. It compared miracles performed by Simon de Montfort and miracles performed by Simon Peter, stating that Montfort is the “lesser” Simon, but holy nonetheless.²⁵⁶

²⁵² *Chronicle of Melrose*, 234.

²⁵³ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 223.

²⁵⁴ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 223.

²⁵⁵ “Miracula Simonis de Montfort” was printed as a supplement to William de Rishanger’s *Chronicon de duobus Bellis apud Lewes et Evesham commissis* (London: 1876). It was a collection of over 200 miracles said to be done by Simon de Montfort after his death, and was collected at the Abbey of Evesham. The Chronicle of Melrose, which has been translated into English, is a more accessible account of Montfort’s miracles. The best edition of William de Rishanger is *The Chronicle of William de Rishanger, of the Barons’ Wars: The Miracles of Simon de Montfort*, ed. James Halliwell. (London: Camden Society, 1840).

²⁵⁶ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 228.

The desecration of Montfort's body may have been intended as humiliation and degradation, but this dishonor greatly encouraged the rise of his cult. His various limbs were said to produce miracles ranging from cures of disease to divine worship, and calls for canonization were rampant. Crucial to this cult was the idea that at the time of his death Montfort was crusading on the side of God and justice, evidenced by the miracles ascribed to him: "But did the God Almighty leave Simon unprovided with the power of working miracles? Certainly not."²⁵⁷ Miracles also were said to happen in due justice to those who defiled Montfort's body. The man who castrated him drowned soon afterwards in a river in Scotland.²⁵⁸

Many examples of the miracles Montfort performed survive. His hands and feet were cut off, Melrose chronicler recounts; Edward intended this to be degrading, but in reality it appears to have spread the tales of his miracles. His hand was presented as a gift to the wife of a royalist while she was hearing Mass. The hand levitated in church "in order that this the supremacy of his exaltation might be perceived all the more clearly." Contemporaries understood this as proof that the royalist who possessed the hand was not worthy to keep such a sacred object; Montfort's hand was both a relic, and a focus of guilt. The hand was said to mirror actions Montfort had undertaken during his lifetime, for he would raise his hand in devotion to the Lord then.²⁵⁹

His foot was taken to Alnwick Abbey, Northumberland, and was found to be in perfect condition months after his death; they made a silver shoe for it, and the foot was said to produce miraculous cures. "Before he came so near as to be able to kiss the shoe, the merits of Simon were so effectual with God, that this man was permitted entirely to

²⁵⁷ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 224.

²⁵⁸ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 234.

²⁵⁹ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 225.

recover his health, simply by the sight of the shoe.”²⁶⁰ Montfort’s other foot was sent as a gift to Llewlyn, Prince of Wales and the betrothed of his daughter Eleanor de Montfort, from the victors at Evesham “that by this compliment the prince might perceive how much the English hated him for this connection with Simon.”²⁶¹

MARTYRDOM

“The holy man Simon” was remembered by popular culture as a martyr, one who had given his life for his faith—in this case, his faith in God and his faith in his cause.²⁶² Robert Grosseteste, “it is said, commanded him to struggle and die for the cause of the English Church; he foretold to him that peace could not be established therein by the material sword, and that the martyr’s crown would recompense all who died for her.”²⁶³ Montfort’s religious beliefs were a crucial part of the popular memory of his death. He was conflated with priests, and said to perform their duties: “The Tuesday, to Evesham he went in the morning—and there he and priests sung masses for himself and his people.”²⁶⁴ Montfort kept his faith “in God, even to the death, for the sake of justice to the realm of England.”²⁶⁵ Martyrdom was seen as a second baptism; by shedding blood for God, one’s sins were forgiven and salvation assured.²⁶⁶ That contemporary chronicles consider Montfort’s death that of a martyr fulfills the assurance of erasure of sins promised by his ecclesiastical allies. Montfort’s cause was though to have been validated by his death, and meant that he was seen in the same high order as other men who had

²⁶⁰ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 227.

²⁶¹ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 227.

²⁶² *Chronicle of Melrose*, 235.

²⁶³ *Chronicon de bellis*, quoted in Charles Bémont, *Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, 1208-1265*, trans. E. F. Jacob (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930), 257.

²⁶⁴ *Robert of Gloucester’s Chronicle*, CHE, 5.1373.

²⁶⁵ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 223.

²⁶⁶ Richard P. McBrien, *Lives of the Saints: From Mary and St. Francis of Assisi to John XXIII and Mother Teresa* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2001), 619.

sacrificed their lives for faith. “The venerable Simon de Montfort, who, like Christ, gives himself to death for the many.”²⁶⁷ In death Montfort’s name moved from political fame to religious veneration.

Just as he was compared to Simon Peter, chroniclers also compared Montfort with Thomas à Becket, a comparison drawn from the similarities of their causes.²⁶⁸

No less did Simon die in a just struggle for the lawful rights of the realm of England, than Thomas had formerly done for the lawful rights of the church of England. Each of them had died in his own day, clothed in the penance of haircloth—a penance which sooner than any other leads a man to God—that so they might put on incorruption through means of the penance thus voluntarily assumed by God’s inspiration.²⁶⁹

Physical proximity to Montfort’s burial place was felt to be advantageous. This site was believed to have miraculous properties, and his gravesite became a place of pilgrimage. Many said “they would quite readily have gone to his sepulcher, there to pray to God, as to the great shrine of the holy martyr Thomas.”²⁷⁰ Pilgrims to Montfort’s grave were said to be cured of their illnesses at the site where he was killed. Tradition states that a spring appeared near where he fell. This well was known immediately as “the spring” or “the well of earl Simon,” and later known as “Battlewell.”²⁷¹ Becket’s grave was also venerated in this way.

Comparisons to Becket were rampant, and extended beyond the scope of their causes to the simple fact of their martyrdom. “But by his death earl Montfort won the victory; like the martyr of Canterbury he ended his life. The good Thomas did not want

²⁶⁷ “The Song of Lewes” EHD, 903.

²⁶⁸ While explicit comparisons were drawn between Montfort and Becket, a parallel comparison can be drawn between Guy de Montfort and Simon de Montfort the younger (known as Bran), and Becket’s murderers. As seen above, Guy and Bran killed their cousin, Henry of Almain, in a church while the latter heard Mass; Becket was famously murdered in Canturbury Cathedral.

²⁶⁹ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 233.

²⁷⁰ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 233.

²⁷¹ See Carpenter, *The Battles of Lewes and Evesham*, 62, n.4-5.

the Holy Church to be destroyed; the earl also fought and died without flinching.”²⁷²

Becket was canonized: many of the descriptions and similarities drawn between these two men make some consideration of Montfort’s own canonization plausible.

Montfort’s popular sanctity was a curse to the royalist cause. The Dictum of Kenilworth was drawn up by the monarchy to come to terms with the rebels in 1267. Article Eight, of forty, explicitly and specifically outlaws any celebration of Montfort as a saint.

Humbly begging both the lord legate and the lord king that the lord legate shall absolutely forbid, under distraint of the Church, that Simon, earl of Leicester, be considered to be holy or just as he died excommunicate according to the belief in the Holy Church. And that the vain and fatuous miracles told of him by others shall not at any time pass any lips. And that the king shall agree strictly to forbid this under pain of corporeal punishment.²⁷³

That Edward needed to emphasize and institutionalized Montfort’s excommunicate status indicates the continuing power of his popular legend. The Dictum of Kenilworth officially ended the war and, as well, reflected an urgent attempt to end Montfort’s tenure as a popular-if-uncanonized saint.

Montfort’s legacy as a holy man did not die out quickly, in spite of Edward’s attempts to discredit him. The song *Lament for Simon de Montfort* was written between 1267-1268. The refrain states, “Now he is slain, the flower of fame, who was so versed in warfare, Montfort the earl; the whole land bewailed his cruel death.”²⁷⁴ Powicke relates the story of two women who sang songs about Simon de Montfort to Edward II

²⁷² “Lament for Simon de Montfort,” EHD, 916.

²⁷³ “The Dictum of Kenilworth,” DBM, 323.

²⁷⁴ “Lament for Simon de Montfort,” EHD, 916.

when he toured England in 1323.²⁷⁵ Years after his death he was still honored as the victor of Lewes, and a man who fought a holy war, on behalf of England's citizens. Montfort's reputation as a holy man, a saint among men, lingered, fed by the chronicles from which he emerged as a literary hero.

CONCLUSION

The system of crusading symbols and rhetoric that Simon de Montfort applied to his rebellion against Henry III in order to make it a holy war had lasting repercussions that are obvious in the reaction of people to his death. That Montfort's cause caught the popular imagination is made clear by the evolution of his legacy. The populace believed in Montfort's cause and that it was their cause as well. *The Song for the Barons*, written after Montfort's death, illustrates the faith England's commoners had in Montfort's war: "He loves right and hates wrong and he will get the upper hand."²⁷⁶ By 1264, his legend was still growing, but already Montfort was associated with God. As one chronicler wrote, "Hence it is that I call to remembrance the remark which occurs in that little treatise written about the battle of Lewis, to the effect that Simon was endowed with divine wisdom."²⁷⁷

Edward won decisively at the Battle of Evesham. But the lasting victory was Montfort's. His legacy as a popularly revered, saint-like martyr demonstrates that many of the people of England believed in his crusading ideology. His supporters trusted in the idea that after their deaths their salvation—a central tenant of Montfort's crusading

²⁷⁵ Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century*, 203.

²⁷⁶ "Song of the Barons" in *Anglo-Norman Political Songs*, ed. Isabel S. T. Aspin (Oxford: Blackwell, 1953), 20.

²⁷⁷ *Chronicle of Melrose*, 226.

ideology—would be assured: “Sir Simon, the just man, and his company joyfully go to Heaven above, to everlasting life.”²⁷⁸ It was after his death that, in the words of Knowles, “the myth of Simon de Montfort” was born.²⁷⁹

²⁷⁸ “Lament for Simon de Montfort,” EHD, 916.

²⁷⁹ C. H. Knowles, *Simon de Montfort, 1256-1265* (London: Historical Association, 1965), 29.

CONCLUSION

SIMON DE MONTFORT: A CRUSADER'S LEGACY

Simon de Montfort has secured a lasting place in the public mind as one of the earliest proponents of democracy in England, a lord who fought for the common people of England. As the leader of opposition to Henry's despotism and in favor of the oppressed, he was revered during his lifetime, and venerated in death, a champion of the people who died for their cause. However, Montfort approached the Baronial Rebellion as a holy war, not as a political dispute. His rebellion was not successful: the political reform for which he fought was undone by Edward when he ascended the throne in 1272 and further reform to England's monarchy was not attempted for many years. Nonetheless, Montfort's crusade was successful in a larger sense, as his enduring legacy as a saint demonstrates. Montfort adopted crusading rhetoric and symbolism to win the larger argument against Henry. His most enduring legacy was giving the English people, the common folk, a voice within their government.

Montfort's personal differences with Henry were more formative in his thinking than a desire for political change and his rebellion was not without irony and inconsistency. French-born himself, he rebelled against the English king for allowing foreigners a place in the government. From the Battle of Lewes to the Battle of Evesham, he had more power than the Lusignans he argued against. Much of his initial lack of engagement with the reform movement may have arisen from awareness that he was treading a very thin line between reform and self-imposed exile.

After 1258, and more concretely from 1261 onward, Montfort underwent a conversion. Reform became his political goal, and his deep piety was the lens through which he envisioned that reform. Piety during the thirteenth century was both an expected practice and a shifting concept, with religious autonomy becoming the accepted norm; secular men and women no longer needed priests to intervene with God for them, as a more personal relationship with religion arose. Simon de Montfort was a product of the period in which he lived, and more so a product of those within his closest circle. His father's time crusading irrevocably linked the Montfort name to the concept of "holy war," a link that deeply influenced the younger Montfort in ways unseen. His close friendships with preeminent theologians turned his mind from the battlefield to Heaven. With this background, Montfort's domestic rebellion as a crusade can be seen in the light of one who reconciled two opposing view points: that of a soldier and that of an ecclesiastic.

Simon de Montfort consciously used crusade-specific rhetoric and symbolism to construct his rebellion against Henry III as a domestic holy war. Montfort's actions, although bloody, were seen by contemporary chronicles in terms of admirable fidelity to the holy oath he had sworn to uphold the Provisions of Oxford.²⁸⁰ This oath gave his military endeavors the sanctity of holy war. Montfort thus applied religious ideology to a political rebellion. By doing so, he effectively adopted a deeper sentiment than political loyalty to one's king, reaching beyond fealty and nationalism to harness the very fabric of the human soul.

²⁸⁰ Claire Valente, "1258-1265, the Community of the Realm," in *The Theory and Practice of Revolt in Medieval England* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003), 78.

As reported in the Chronicle of Melrose, “That which more than anything else occasioned the death of this Simon, was the faithful oath which he has made for England; for from the day upon which he took it, he ever afterwards began to grow more strict in his mode of life, until the day of his death.”²⁸¹ Montfort’s religious beliefs and his belief in reform informed and reinforced each other. As he took his vow more seriously, he increasingly renounced the pleasures of the world. And as his habits became more monastic, he became more devoted to the holy oath he had sworn.

The lasting legacy of the Baronial Rebellion was the power it gave the common people of England. During this period, “ideas about the community of the realm had percolated down to the level of the village.”²⁸² Peasants, by far the most numerous of all English socio-economic classes, started to take a stand for their rights. Carpenter reports anecdotes of peasants taking part in essentially political rallies and protests. These disenfranchised serfs and freeholders turned to the barons’ cause for support. The baron’s were rebelling against many of the same injustices to which the peasants objected, seeking redress against feudal oppression and opposition to Henry’s favoritism of his half-siblings, the Lusignans, who had wreaked havoc on England, increasing taxes and killing for sport.²⁸³ The barons and commoners were unlikely allies, but in their reaction to Henry’s despotism, they came together and a new, broader community of English freemen were given a political voice.

Simon de Montfort’s death preceded the end of the crusading movement by a decade. At the Parliament of 1268, Ottobouno preached another crusade to the Holy

²⁸¹ *The Chronicle of Melrose in Church Historians of England*, trans. Joseph Stevenson (London: Seeley’s, 1856), 4.1:232.

²⁸² D. A. Carpenter “English Peasants in Politics, 1258-1267” in *Past and Present* 136 (August 1992), 3.

²⁸³ Carpenter recounts the story of a young man tortured and hung by the Lusignans—this outrage stunned the peasants. Carpenter, “English Peasants in Politics” 21.

Land, mandated by the Pope. Henry had taken the cross years previously; at Northampton, Edward swore to go to the East. According to Powicke, “the crusade was now the fashion, a spiritual adventure which gave a sense of enlargement after much tribulation.”²⁸⁴ Henry never fulfilled his vow. Edward traveled to Jerusalem in 1269, the last Christian crusade against the infidels of Jerusalem. His crusade was lead by Louis IX; unlike Montfort’s crusade, ultimate power rested with a king. Montfort’s domestic rebellion had been influenced by his experience of baronial power without royal leadership in his crusade to the East, whereas Edward’s concept of kingship must have been reinforced by the crusade in which he was a royal leader. He returned from the Holy Land to take the crown in 1272, and the era of crusading ended.

Montfort’s desire to crusade in the holy land was a product of the religious culture of thirteenth century England. However, his father’s influence on his early years, his intimate connections with leading ecclesiastics, and his increasingly monastic habits brought Montfort to a level of religious devotion unusual for a secular aristocrat. By contrast, Powicke believes that Edward’s crusade was the “expression of a general desire to forget the past.”²⁸⁵

Montfort’s enduring legacy overshadows what was his primary focus in his own mind: fulfilling the commands of his personal piety. His crusade was the medium through which he expressed his piety; he most believed that he was fighting God’s war. As Montfort’s commitment to the Baron’s Rebellion grew, the cause became a fundamental moral, not merely political, issue for him. His use of crusading ideology

²⁸⁴ F. M. Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 219.

²⁸⁵ Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century*, 223.

elevated the rebellion beyond a domestic disturbance to an ultimate struggle between good and evil.

After Montfort's death, the Baronial Rebellion collapsed. Eleanor and their children were banished to France; Eleanor never returned, dying in a French priory founded by her husband's sister. Her sons died young and childless; Eleanor, Montfort's daughter, married Llewlyn of Wales and died in childbirth soon after. Her daughter, Gwenllian, was immediately entrusted to the care of a convent, where she lived for over five decades, dying unmarried. The Montfort family, so recently at the height of power in England, ended.

On the eve of his death, Simon de Montfort displayed the tactical military brilliance for which he was well known, and the usual piety for which he was remembered. Montfort's favorite oath chillingly foreshadows his own death. "'By St. James's arm' (such was his usual oath), 'they are approaching with wisdom, and they have learned this method from me, not of themselves. Let us, therefore, commend our souls to God, for our bodies are theirs.'"²⁸⁶ Acts of the Apostles, Book Twelve, verses 1 and 2 state: "Now about that time Herod the king put forth his hands to afflict certain of the church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword."²⁸⁷ Montfort was killed by the army of a king. His arm was severed from his body, and his limbs served as relics.

Simon de Montfort does not conveniently fit into either the idea of a warrior concerned with domestic and international politics, or a saintly lord removed from affairs of the world. Instead, he must be placed in his own unique niche, that of a warrior who

²⁸⁶ *Matthew Paris*, 3:356.

²⁸⁷ *Bible* (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1901), 120.

approached one of the most important domestic wars in English history as a fight with God against his king. The reform for which he fought would not be institutionalized for hundreds of years, but he had laid the groundwork for the democratization of England, a groundwork well remembered by the English people.

Ironically, politics were never Montfort's primary concern. Religion was always his motivating force. His last words, uttered before turning to battle at Evesham, were. "May God have your souls, for your bodies be theirs."²⁸⁸ Montfort's physical occupation was that of a soldier; his crusade was an expression of his desire for a deeper truth.

²⁸⁸ *Robert of Glouster's Chronicle, CHE, 5.1:374.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Annals of Burton for the years 1258-1259 in *English Historical Documents*, ed. David C. Douglas. Vol. 3, 1189-1327. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975: 153-159.

Annals of Dunstable for the years 1260-1264 in *English Historical Documents*, ed. David C. Douglas. Vol. 3, 1189-1327. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975: 197-209.

Aspin, Isabel S. T., ed. *Anglo-Norman Political Songs*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1953.

Bible. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1901.

Chronica Johannis de Oxenades, ed. H. Ellis. London: Royal Society, 1859.

Chronicles of the Mayors and Sheriffs of London, 1259-1266, in *English Historical Documents*, ed. David C. Douglas. Vol. 3, 1189-1327. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975: 159-197.

The Chronicle of Melrose in *Church Historians of England*, trans. Joseph Stevenson, Vol. 4.1. London: Seely's, 1856.

The Chronicle of William de Rishanger, of the Barons' Wars: The Miracles of Simon de Montfort, ed. James Halliwell. London: Camden Society, 1840.

Dante's Inferno, trans. and ed. Robert and Jean Hollander. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

English Historical Documents. David C. Douglas, ed. Vol. 3. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Fulcher of Chartres, *The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres* in *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Course Materials*, edited by Edward Peters, 47-101. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998.

Gransden, Antonia, ed. and trans. *The Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds, 1212-1301*. London: Nelson, 1964.

- Hallam, Elizabeth, ed. *Chronicles of the Age of Chivalry*. London: Weidenfield and Nicholson, 1987.
- Hutton, William Holden, ed. *The Misrule of Henry III: Extracts from the Writings of Matthew Paris, Robert Grosseteste, Adam of Marsh, etc.* London: D. Nutt, 1887.
- Matthew Paris's English History, from the Year 1235-1273*, trans. J.A. Giles. London: H.G. Bohn, 1852-1854.
- Matthew Westminster, *The Flowers of History, Especially such as Relate to the Affairs of Britain From the Beginning of the World to the Year 1307*, trans. C. D. Yonge Vol. 2. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853.
- Monumenta Franciscana*, eds. J. S. Brewer and R. Howlett. 2 vols., Rolls ser., 1858-1862.
- Osney Chronicle in Annales Monastici*, ed. H. R. Luard, Vol. IV. Rolls ser., 1864-1869.
- Registres d'Urbain IV, ed. L. Dorez and J. Giraud. Paris: 1899-1958.
- Rishanger, William de., ed. J. O. Halliwell. London: 11876.
- Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle*, in *The Church Historians of England*, trans. Joseph Stevenson, Vol 5.1. London; Seely's, 1858.
- Shirley, Walter Waddington, ed. *Royal and Other Historical Letters Illustrative of the Reign of Henry III*. London: Longmans, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862-1866.
- Sweetenham, Carol, ed. *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005.
- T. H Turner, ed. and trans. *Manners and Expenses of England in the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*. London: Roxburghe Club, 1841.
- Treharne, R. F. and I. J. Sanders, ed. *Documents of the Baronial movements of Reform and Rebellion*. Oxford: Clarendon press, 1973.
- Vaughan, Richard. *Chronicles of Matthew Paris: Monastic Life in the Thirteenth Century*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Asbridge, Thomas. *The First Crusade: A New History; The Roots of Conflict Between Christianity and Islam*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Barber, Malcolm. *The Cathars: Dualistic Heretics in Languedoc in the High Middle Ages*. New York; Longman, 2000.
- Bartlett, Robert. *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings, 1075-1225*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Bémont, Charles. *Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, 1208-1265*, trans. E. F. Jacob. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.
- Bouchard, Constance Brittain. *Strong of Body, Brave and Noble: Chivalry and Society in Medieval France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- Brown, A. L. *The Governance of Late Medieval England, 1272-1461*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989.
- Callus, D. A. ed., *Robert Grosseteste*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Carpenter, D. A. *The Minority of Henry III*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Carpenter, D. A. "Simon de Montfort: The First Leader of a Political Movement in English History." Chap. 11 in *The Reign of Henry III*. Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon Press, 1996.
- Carpenter, D. A. "What Happened in 1258?" Chap. 9 in *The Reign of Henry III*. Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon Press, 1996.
- Carpenter, D. A. "English Peasants in Politics, 1258-1267." *Past and Present* 136. August 1992: 3-42.
- Carpenter, D.A. *The Reign of Henry III*. London and Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon Press, 1996.
- Carpenter, D. A. *The Battles of Lewes and Evesham 1264/1265*. Keele: Mercia Publications, 1987.
- Creighton, M. *Life of Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester*. London; Rivingtons, 1877.
- Coss, Peter. *The Knight in Medieval England, 1000-1400*. Dover, NH; Alan Sutton, 1993.

- Denholm-Young, Noel. *History and Heraldry, 1254-1310; A Study of the Historical Value of the Rolls of Arms*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- Daniell, Christopher. *From Norman Conquest to Magna Carta, England 1066-1215*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Denziger, Danny and John Gillingham. *1215: The Year of the Magna Carta*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004.
- Gasquet, F. A. *Henry the Third and the Church: A Study of his Ecclesiastical Policy and of the Relations between England and Rome*. London: G. Bell, 1905.
- Harding, Alan. *England in the Thirteenth Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Harvey, Barbara, ed. *The Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, 1066-1280*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Hindley, Geoffrey. *The Book of Magna Carta*. London: Constable, 1990.
- Holt, J. C. "The Barons and the Great Charter." *The English Historical Review* 70, no. 274. January 1955: 1-24.
- Jordan, William Chester. *Louis IX and the Challenge of the Crusade: A Study in Rulership*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- Knowles, C. H. *Simon de Montfort, 1265-1265*. London: Historical Association, 1965.
- LaBarge, Margaret Wade. *Simon de Montfort*. London: Greenwood Press Reprint, 1975.
- LaBarge, Margaret Wade. *A Baronial Household of the Thirteenth Century*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1965.
- Lambert, Malcolm. *The Cathars* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998).
- Lemmon, C. H. "The Field of Lewes, 14th May 1264" in *The Battle of Lewes, 1264: Its Place in English History*. Friends of Lewes Society, 1964.
- Lloyd, Simon. *English Society and the Crusade, 1216-1307*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Lower, Michael. *The Barons' Crusade: a Call to Arms and its Consequences*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.
- Maddicott, J. R. *Simon de Montfort*. New York; Cambridge University Press, 1994.

- Maddicott, J. R. "The Magna Carta and the Local Community 1215-1259." *Past and Present* 102. February 1984: 25-65.
- Marrone, Steven. *William of Auvergne and Robert Grosseteste: New Ideas of Truth in the Early Thirteenth Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- McBrien, Richard P. *Lives of the Saints: From Mary and St. Francis of Assisi to John XXIII and Mother Teresa*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2001.
- McEvoy, James. *Robert Grosseteste*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- McEvoy, James. *The Philosophy of Robert Grosseteste*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Nichols, J. *The History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester*. London, 1795-1815.
- Norgate, Kate. *The Minority of Henry III*. London: Macmillan and Co, Ltd., 1912.
- O'Shea, Stephen. *A Perfect Heresy: The Revolutionary Life and Death of the Medieval Cathars*. New York: Walter and Co., 2000.
- Perry, Frederick. *Saint Louis: The Most Christian King*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1901.
- Powicke, F. M. *Medieval England, 1066-1485*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.
- Powicke, F. M. *King Henry III and the Lord Edward: The Community of the Realm in the Thirteenth Century* Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947.
- Powicke, F. M. *The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Prothero, George Walter. *The Life of Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester*. London; Longmans, Green, and Co., 1877.
- Richard, Jean. *The Crusades, 1071-1291*, trans. Jean Birrell. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Riley-Smith, Jonathan. *The Crusades: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Riley-Smith, Jonathan. *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.
- Riley-Smith, Jonathan. *What Were the Crusades?* London: Macmillan, 1977.

- Rist, Rebecca. "Papal Policy and the Albegensian Crusades: Continuity or Change?" Chap. 6 in *Crusades*, ed. Jonathan Riley-Smith and Benjamin Z. Kedar. Vol. 1. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003.
- Stacey, Robert. *Politics, Policy and Finance Under Henry III, 1216-1245*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Southern, R. W. *Robert Grosseteste: The Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Sweetenham, Carol, ed. *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005.
- Tambling, Jeremy. "Monstrous Tyranny, Men of Blood: Dante and 'Inferno' XII." *The Modern Language Review* 98, no. 4. October 2003: 881-897.
- Treharne, R. F. *The Baronial Plan of Reform*. Manchester: The University Press, 1932.
- Treharne, R. F. "Why the Battle of Lewes Matters in English History" in *The Battle of Lewes, 1264: Its Place in English History*. Friends of Lewes Society, 1964.
- Trehanre, R. F. *Simon de Montfort and Baronial Reform: Thirteenth-century Essays*, ed. E. B. Fryde. Ronceverte, WV: Hambledon Press, 1986.
- Tyerman, Christopher. *The Invention of the Crusades*. Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- Tyerman, Christopher. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2006.
- Tyerman, Christopher. *Fighting for Christendom: Holy War and the Crusades*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Valente, Claire. *The Theory and Practice of Revolt in Medieval England*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003.
- Villey, Michael. "L'Idée de la croisade chez les jurists du moyen âge." *X Congresso internazionale di scienze storiche, Relazioni*. 1955.