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Thirty years and three popes prior to Pope Urban II’s call for the “First” Crusade at the Council of Clermont in 1095, Pope Alexander II sanctioned the true first crusade on the Iberian Peninsula. A vicious fight between Catholics and Muslims in the city of Barbastro, situated in northeastern Spain, the Crusade of Barbastro raged in August of 1064. Although sometimes referred to as the Siege of Barbastro or the War of Barbastro by historians who do not see it as a true crusade, the Crusade of Barbastro was the first holy war between the Muslims and the Catholics sanctioned by the papacy. However, this was by no means the first war between Catholics and Muslims. Starting in 711, the Muslim Umayyad Caliphate expanded over the majority of the Iberian Peninsula, including Catholic Spain, controlling all but a small section in the northernmost region of the peninsula by 718. Over the next 781 years, the Catholics who had retreated to the Basque region slowly began to work on reconquering their lost peninsula, pushing back the Muslims little by little, through a series of crusades. Although this “Reconquista”, or Reconquest, lasted for nearly eight hundred years, it thus was neither a single crusade, nor was it always able to be characterized as such. Rather, it was a series of wars and battles and crusades all characterized by the same goal: the Catholic reconquest of Spain from the Muslims. The first three hundred-fifty years of the Reconquista were not given special notice by a pope, but in the twelfth century Pope Alexander II had taken interest in the “heroic” Catholic fighters and issued a proclamation applauding their efforts and granting them the same type of indulgences and protections that would later be given to the crusaders heading to the Holy Land. Following the success of the first crusade at Barbastro, a series of other crusades were fought with papal backing on the Iberian Peninsula until the conquest of Granada in 1492, which brought an end to Muslim rule in Spain, making the Reconquista a series of crusades rather than a singular one. This succession of crusades during the Reconquista not only include the first and last of all crusades, but they also have the exceptional quality of being the most successful crusades, actually achieving their goal of reconquering the Iberian Peninsula and managing to keep it under their rule even now, five-hundred years later.

As with most things in pre-modern history, and often in modern history, there is little to no universal agreement on any main part of the crusades. It is almost expected, therefore, for there to be a large debate on what actually deserves to be given the title of “crusade” and when


the first and last ones even took place. Although a great deal of variety exists when speaking on these topics, most historians fall into one of three schools of thought: traditionalists, generalists\textsuperscript{3}, or pluralists.\textsuperscript{4} The “traditionalists” stress that the only military endeavors that are worthy of the title “crusade” followed the Council of Clermont and Urban II’s call to the First Crusade; they must be sanctioned by the pope, be a campaign in the Holy Land (or at least with the goal of going to the Holy Land), be against the Muslims, and include the crusader states. Within these confines, there would have been at most eight crusades ranging from 1096 until the loss of the last crusader state, Acre, in 1291.\textsuperscript{5} In more recent decades, however, historians have begun to acknowledge that crusades took on different forms. Crusade historians known as “generalists” define “crusade” more broadly without discriminating amongst those people who are being fought against. They also do not require papal sanctioning for a Christian holy war to be considered a crusade. They include crusades against the Cathars, pagans, and heretics, although the majority of crusades by any definition were against various groups of Muslims.\textsuperscript{6} A third group of crusade historians falls in-between the two extremes of the generalists and the traditionalists. The “pluralists”, who agree with both the traditionalists and the generalists on some points, do not place a limit on the area in which the crusade must have taken place, but rather they see any war that has received Papal sanctioning along with the rights and protections normally given to crusaders and has active recruitment as worthy of the title “crusade.” Both the generalists and the pluralists allow historians to expand from the Middle East and move into the Iberian peninsula to examine any possible crusading movements that may or may not have taken place there. While the traditionalists would dismiss any claim to crusades on the Peninsula, given that they did not take place in the Holy Land, the pluralists and generalists are willing to look anywhere on a map for a crusade. The generalist group extends too far away from the crusades of the Holy Land and includes numerous wars, so long as the Christians fighting did so in the name of the Catholic Church, making it the murkiest of the three most common schools of thought. The pluralist finds itself as the best group for speaking about the crusades on the Iberian Peninsula, as they received papal sanctioning and support even though they were outside of the Holy Land.
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Even within the pluralist school of thought, however, the entirety of the *Reconquista* cannot be classified as a crusade. The first three hundred fifty years of the *Reconquista* did not feature a united Christian front against a Muslim enemy hated by all, and received no official sanctioning or privileges granted by the popes. Rather, the separate Christian kingdoms that had previously ruled over sections of the Iberian Peninsula hated each other as much, if not more, than the Muslim Caliphate. This is not surprising, however, since the idea of the *Reconquista* as a single, unified movement did not develop until, at the earliest, towards the end of the movement. This is reminiscent of how the crusades were not described as such until historians began speaking about them years after their conclusions. Even though the Popes may have been in favor of the fights against the Muslim inhabitants, the first few centuries of holy wars on the Iberian Peninsula lacked the crusading vows, indulgences, and other necessary characteristics of the crusades. Three hundred-fifty years prior to the Crusade of Barbastro, the Battle of Covadonga had been the real starting point of the *Reconquista* movement, but it had absolutely nothing to do with crusading. Having taken place sometime between 718 and 722, this battle marked the first battle between the Muslims who had just conquered the Peninsula and the Christian resistance which, over the next seven hundred and fifty years, would reconquer modern Spain and Portugal. It was a decisive Christian victory, and, much like the importance of the victory of the Second Siege of Antioch in the First Crusade, it is possible that, without this victory, the rest of the *Reconquista* may not have happened as it became a shining guide and example for the fight against Islam.

The Christian kingdoms slowly formed and gained a foothold on the Peninsula through a series of battles and sieges until four sizable states, León, Navarre, Aragón, and Catalonia, controlled most of the upper fourth of the peninsula. As was previously mentioned, there was no love lost between these groups, and they were as much enemies of each other as they were of the Muslim kings. Without a unified force of all the Christian kingdoms working in cooperation, any hope of driving out the Muslim forces would take a painfully long amount of time, some seven hundred and fifty years. The unification of these kingdoms could only come about from an outside source that they were reliant upon, which, of course, would be the Catholic Church. While the Church has the privilege of claiming the primary responsibility for the transformation of the *Reconquista* from a series of often ill-planned holy wars into thought-out crusades, the influx of the French in the later part of the eleventh century helped a great deal. Prior to the movement of the French across their border with Iberia, the Christians on the Iberian Peninsula had been relatively isolated from the rest of Europe, in part because of their geographical
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location and also due to the near-constant fighting of the Reconquista. This also allowed for the creation of a more targeted, yet inclusive, form of church-sanctioned warfare.

The true first crusade was preached by Pope Alexander II in 1063, when he penned and sent a bull to the Clero Vulturnensi (perhaps referring to the clergy at the Castle of Volturno) in southern Italy that called for their knights to confess their sins prior to setting out for Spain. Within this bull sent to the knights he also gave what would become the basis upon which crusading indulgences and privileges would be built: “we, by the authority of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, relieve them of penance and grant them remission of sins.”12 One sees in this the two main papal indulgences, although not yet given that label, needed to characterize a war as a crusade. The relief of penance and remission of sins would become standards on which to base a crusade, especially after Pope Urban II restated them thirty years later. Unfortunately for those crusade historians who fall into the pluralist view of thought, the writings of Alexander II were not as well documented as the speech made by Urban II at the Council of Clermont, which those who are traditionalists or simply oppose the idea of naming any part of the Reconquista a “crusade” are quick to point out. Or, as is the case with the Epistolae pontificum romanorum ineditae, they simply are not widely available in English.13 Pope Urban II’s Sermon at the Council of Clermont calling for the First Crusade in the Holy Lands was chronicled by four separate individuals, two of whom are thought to have physically been in attendance, and the wording of his sermon was similar to Alexander II’s letter proclaiming the true first crusade. Pope Urban II’s call detailed the supposed reasons the crusade was needed as well as the protections the crusaders would receive should they answer the call. Fulcher of Chartres and Robert the Monk, the two chroniclers thought to have been present at the Council of Clermont, recorded their recollections years after the event had occurred. While they differ slightly in the details, both show Urban much as Alexander had been, promising those who took up the cross remission of sins while also condemning the Muslims for having killed Christian pilgrims to the Holy Land.14 Following his speech at Clermont, Urban II sent a letter of Instruction to the Crusaders in which he reiterated, as Alexander had done, the atrocities allegedly done unto Christians by the
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Muslims showing it was the duty of the Christians to stop them.\textsuperscript{15} As only two other papacies had passed following the death of Alexander prior to the accession of Urban to the job, it is not a stretch to assume Urban was most likely influenced by the writings and actions of Alexander prior to his decision to call for his own crusade. The crusades in the Holy Land, perhaps because their intended targets played so importantly into the history and birth of Christianity, tended to have more support as well as a greater number of Chronicles written about them. While historians have the letter sent by Alexander II to the knights in Italy, it is still unknown to what extent he preached the crusade and called for other Europeans to go to the Peninsula to assist them, which may also partially be the reason it is often ignored by historians who prefer to jump ahead to the “First Crusade.”

In a letter he sent to the bishops of Spain, Alexander justifies his call for a crusade, saying, “one may justly fight against those [the Saracens] who persecute Christians and drive them from their towns and their own homes.”\textsuperscript{16} Although killing directly goes against the teaching of Christ in the New Testament, the pontiff defends his call for bloodshed by asserting that the Muslims are persecuting the innocent, peaceful Christians by running them out of their homes, and that it is the duty of those knights who are able to do so to go and defend the innocent Christians living on the Iberian Peninsula. With Pope Alexander II’s call, especially including the crusader rights offered by him, the true First Crusade was able to take place in Barbastro in 1064, a full thirty-five years prior to the so called “First Crusade.” The crusade resulted in a temporary win for the Christian forces, which were comprised of troops from all over Europe, and a devastating loss for the Muslims who were treated less than kindly by the Christian conquering forces. They were not able to hold Barbastro long, however, and it was retaken by the Muslim kingdom of Zaragoza the following year, although it would permanently fall back into Christian hands thirty-five years later.\textsuperscript{17} Despite the fact that the city was retaken by the Muslims less than a year after it was conquered, the Crusade of Barbastro was a resounding success. Nonetheless, unlike the First Crusade in the Holy Land, it would not be the most important of the crusades during the Reconquista, nor would it be the last one.

Papal support continued to be given to the Christians focused on freeing the Iberian Peninsula from the influence of the Muslim Caliphates following the success of the first Iberian Crusade. Alexander’s two immediate successors, Gregory VII and Victor III, had been focused on the Investiture Controversy sweeping the Church at the time, but they did not completely neglect the plight of the Christian Crusaders in Spain. Gregory VII showed a great deal of
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concern with the situation in Spain and even began drafting plans for a second official Iberian Crusade, but his mind was often occupied with Holy Roman Emperor, Henry IV, later in his reign. He saw Spain as belonging to the Roman Church due to a series of ancient contracts, and now the Muslims had stolen from the Church what Christians believed to be rightfully theirs. While his intentions had, perhaps, been pure, little work was done during his reign thanks to other matters that pulled his attention elsewhere. Gregory’s successor, Victor III, lived for a little over a year after being declared Pope, but truly did little within that time other than deal with the Investiture Controversy. The next Pope in line was, of course, Urban II, who spent most of his papacy dealing in Crusades. Even though his speech at Clermont and subsequent letter may lead one to believe so, Urban was not solely focused on the potential for crusades in the East. He had, after all, come into the papal authority seven years prior to his decisions to announce another crusade and did not use that time idly. Paul Chevedden, a professor at the University of Texas, argues in his journal article, “The View of the Crusades from Rome and Damascus,” that Urban had had every intention of using the momentum of the First Crusade to help liberate the Peninsula and free the Church of God from its oppressors. He had planned to turn it into a two-pronged military attack between the Holy Land and the Mediterranean to continue on with the crusades the prior popes had started. Without an expansion of Crusade ideals away from the Holy Land, it would be difficult to think of any such war outside the East as comparable to the crusades. Unfortunately, it was impossible to turn the crusaders’ minds away from the seductive notion of reconquering the holy city of Jerusalem, and any future crusades in Spain would have to wait until the conclusion of the “First Crusade” if the Pope wanted assistance from other European leaders. But this was not the downfall of the crusading movement on the Iberian Peninsula, but rather it was just the beginning.

While the Crusade of Barbastro definitively qualified as a crusade, the rest of the four hundred years of the Reconquista cannot all be characterized as such. The Reconquista was not a single war relentlessly waged by Catholic monarchs against the Muslim occupants of the Iberian Peninsula, but rather a series of papally-sanctioned crusades mixed with battles that were completely separate from the Church and lacked any unity between the Christian kingdoms. While generalists do not make a distinction between those being persecuted in the crusades, pluralists view it more as a grey area. For the sake of this argument, only crusades against Muslims will be considered a true crusade, without any discrimination being made based upon
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the location of said crusade. But with regards to the different battles on the Iberian Peninsula during this time, one that would not be considered as a crusade involves the massacre of over three hundred Jews living in Aragon in 1320.\textsuperscript{21} While terrible, the massacre of the Jewish population highlights the difference between the crusades on the Iberian Peninsula at this time and the battles and killings unassociated with the papacy. Another, specific, Spanish crusade was the result of the proclamation of the so-called Second Crusade by Pope Eugenius III in 1145, following the 1144 loss of the Crusader State of Edessa, with the papal bull \textit{Quantum praedecessores}, which looked back on the glorious successes of the First Crusade and appealed to European Christians to take up the Cross as their fathers and grandfathers had. Just as Urban had done before him, Eugenius offered the crusaders the same remission of sins, protection of property, and guaranteed entrance into heaven should they die fighting for God.\textsuperscript{22} Two years later he issued the bull \textit{Divina dispensation}, which formally equated the holy wars on the Iberian Peninsula with those being fought in the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{23} Christian leaders in Spain were able to focus and unite their aggressions towards the Muslims and, with the help of the crusaders who landed on the Spanish coast prior to continuing on to the Holy Lands, to conquer Lisbon. This was one of the most successful aspects of the Second Crusade, and most likely the longest lasting.

Pope Eugenius III was in no way the last pope to issue a call to the European Christians to march to the southmost tip of Europe, the Iberian Peninsula, and fight to retake the lands still held by the Muslim Caliphates. In fact, in 1123, twenty years prior to Eugenius’s decision to call for the Second Crusade in both the Holy Lands and Spain, Pope Callixtus II, famous for his role in the end of the Investiture Controversy, had already reissued what had originally been called for by Pope Alexander II. Acting as the spokesperson for the entire Holy See of the Roman Church, he declared that, “we concede to all fighting firmly in this expedition the same remission of sins which we have given to the defenders of the Eastern Church,”\textsuperscript{24} giving the same rights to the Spanish Crusaders while also acknowledging them as equal in importance. Again in 1326, Pope John XXII reiterated the proclamation of Callixtus, saying, “we have thought it worthy to concede those indulgences which in similar cases were accustomed to be given by the Holy See.
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to those going to the aid of the Holy Land.” With both these and other popes placing such great emphasis on the efforts to regain the lands lost to the Muslims on the Iberian Peninsula, it is clear that the Holy See saw them as similar, if not equal, to those Crusades in the Holy Land. The proclamation of John XXII had even come after the end of the crusades in the Holy Land, showing the acknowledgement by the Roman Church that they had not yet ended and, it seems, would not be over until the entirety of the Iberian Peninsula was liberated from Muslim rule.

As for the question of whether any so called “crusades” came after the end of the Reconquista in 1492, since traditionalists end their crusade studies in 1291 with the loss of the last Christian holding in the Holy Land following the devastating Siege of Acre, there is no argument on their side that a crusade occurred following the end of the Reconquista. For those who fall into the pluralist school of thought, however, the loss of Acre in no way marked the end of the crusading era. As was said earlier in this paper, no agreed upon date among pluralists marks the end of the crusades, and some extremists on both the Muslim side and the Christian side argue that crusades are a modern occurrence as well. At the end of the Reconquista, the previous proclamations by Popes still gave their blessing over the crusades to remove the Muslim invaders. That being said, however, the Capture of Granada, led by the Catholic Monarchs, Ferdinand and Isabella, not only ended the Iberian Crusades and the Reconquista, but also finalized the unification of Spain as well.

Urban II has been recognized by history as the father of the Crusades, the first pope to turn from thoughts and plans to action. But when looking at the crusades through a pluralist view, a historian can easily deduce that this is merely a myth. The first pope to truly turn to action was Pope Alexander II, although he did so on the Iberian Peninsula rather than in the Holy Land. He granted the Spanish crusaders papal dispensations, forgiveness of sins, and time off in purgatory so they would be better motivated to do, as he saw it, God’s work here on earth. Urban II followed in his path and, over thirty years later, granted the same to those he called to take back the Holy Land. While the First Crusade, as it is traditionally known, did succeed in its goal of reconquering the Holy Land, the crusaders’ conquests there were lost once again two centuries later. Meanwhile, although it took them hundreds of years to do so, the crusaders of the Iberian Crusades managed to completely reconquer the Peninsula and hold onto it. While the First Crusade in the Holy Land succeeded in its goal of “reclaiming” the Holy Land from the Muslims and instituting crusader states in Edessa, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Tripoli, it failed to establish a lasting rule over these places by neglecting to put a well-established political structure in place. Nearly all of the crusaders began their long trek home to Europe shortly after the successful, but extremely bloody, siege of Jerusalem, leaving behind an inadequate number of soldiers to protect
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the newly formed Crusader Kingdoms. These kingdoms fell, one by one, rather quickly to Muslim forces and even with a succession of eight more crusades in the Holy Lands, they were all lost by 1291.\textsuperscript{28} Over the next several hundred years, various popes applauded the efforts made by crusaders in Spain and reaffirmed the crusader vows and indulgences given to the crusades by their predecessors. Therefore, the Crusade of Barbastro should be allowed to claim the title as the so-called “First Crusade.” Of course, even though the true first crusade took place thirty-two years prior, the “First Crusade” of 1096-1099 has been known as such for so long that it might seem foolish to expect the world to refer to it differently. At the very least, however, the name of the First Crusade should be extended to include “in the Holy Land” so future students of the Crusades do not allow themselves to be tricked into believing there had not been a crusade before. There has been a slow rise in historians adopting the pluralist school of thought as the study of the crusades becomes broader, potentially allowing for a greater amount of importance to be placed on the crusades away from the Holy Land. The Iberian Crusades show the power of “slow and steady wins the race” as five hundred years after the end of the Iberian Crusades, Spain remains in Catholic hands, although the long reign of the Muslims will never be erased.

\textsuperscript{28} Madden, \textit{Concise History of the Crusades}, 165.
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