

PART II

Chapter VI

Historians of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem

The second part of this thesis examines those English writers who have specialized in particular aspects of the crusading movement by contrast with those historians considered in the first section of this study who have written general, narrative accounts. Increasing specialisation in the study of the crusades is evident among British writers towards the end of the nineteenth century but this development did not supersede the long tradition of popular narratives of the movement. During this century, an American school of crusading historiography inspired by Dana C. Munro¹ began to dominate this field of historical enquiry with its historians undertaking monographic studies rather than the British "Pisgah view" of the subject.

Initially, interest in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, which was founded in the Levant as a result of the First Crusade, reflected European colonising ambitions in the later nineteenth century.² We have already considered British narrative historians of the crusading movement who interpret crusade as a European colonising venture

-
1. D.C. Munro who was born in 1866, studied in Germany and subsequently taught history at the Universities of Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Princeton. E.P. Cheney, "Dana C. Munro", *The American Historical Review*, Vol. XXXVIII, 1933, p. 618.
 2. T.S.R. Boase, "Recent Developments in Crusading Historiography", *History, The Journal of the Historical Association*, Vol. XXII, September 1937, pp. 110-111. German and French historians led the way with H. Prutz, *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge*, and E. Rey, *Les Colonies franques de Syrie au XIIIe et XIIe siècles*, both published in 1883.

analogous to those of their own times.³ Closer consideration of the settlement and rule of the Franks in Syria is a corollary of this particular view of crusade.

The change in emphasis from the crusading expeditions to the settlement is clear in *The Crusades, The Story of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* by T.A. Archer and C.L. Kingsford, published in 1894,⁴ in which the authors assert that

it is through the history of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, that the true character and importance of the Crusades can alone be discerned.⁵

3. See above, Chapter III, pp. 85-91.

4. Although this work was presented as a joint publication, Kingsford, as a result of Archer's ill-health and subsequent death, re-wrote many of the chapters, re-organized the contents and prepared the material for publication. T.A. Archer and C.L. Kingsford, *The Crusades, The Story of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, T. Fisher Unwin Ltd, London, 1910, [1894], p. viii. C.L. Kingsford who was born in 1862, graduated from Oxford in classics and history. It was during his time at University that he became associated with T.A. Archer. Although Kingsford later devoted his time to writing and research, in the earlier part of his career, these were secondary and more of a hobby. Entry, "C.L. Kingsford", *Dictionary of National Biography, 1922-1930*, J.R.H. Weaver (ed.), Oxford University Press, London, 1937, pp. 471-472.

5. Archer and Kingsford *op.cit.*, p. vii.

For them, the Western settlements in the East were "Latin colonies"⁶ in which the extension of territory was a strategic necessity.⁷ In claiming that in Armenia, a predominantly Christian area, "confusion offered not merely great facilities but some justification, to Frankish conquests", they reveal their pragmatism and, secure in a belief in the benefits of colonialism, they sanction the use of force.⁹

6. *ibid.*, p. 127.

7. *ibid.*, p. 110. Archer and Kingsford postulate:

In its entirety the Frankish dominion should have included all the lands that lay between the sea on the west and the desert on the east. This region, taken as a whole, is one of well-marked characteristics, and, despite certain weak points, not ill-suited for defensive occupation. But, as we shall see, the Franks never did occupy it fully, and the neglect or incapacity to do so may without doubt be classed among the causes which prevented the Frankish principalities from maintaining a more permanent existence.

8. *ibid.*, pp. 60-61. These comments refer to the means by which Baldwin of Boulogne became Count of Edessa in 1098. During the course of the First Crusade, Baldwin was invited to Edessa by Thoros, the ruler, who adopted him. Within a month, Thoros was murdered and Baldwin, who failed to save him, became ruler in his stead. There is no evidence that Baldwin was involved directly in the overthrow of Thoros but he certainly profited from it. Fulcher of Chartres, Baldwin's apologist, who accompanied him to Edessa, provides remarkably few details of the episode but notes in embarrassment that Thoros "had been wickedly murdered". Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095-1127*, F.R. Ryan (trans.), H.S. Fink (ed.), University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville, 1969, Book I, Chapter xv, p. 92.

9. The most infamous example of the British use of force on a wide scale was their reaction to the Indian Mutiny in 1857 which was followed by savage reprisals and by summary executions. Lieutenant-Colonel John Nicholson, a popular British hero at the time, in justifying the use of force, wrote:

Our object is to make an example to terrify others ...
All these should be shot or blown away from guns, as may be most expedient.

John Nicholson to Herbert Edwardes, June 1857, M. Edwardes, *Red Year: The Indian Rebellion of 1857*, Hamish Hamilton, London, 1973, p. 157.

According to Archer and Kingsford, there is no doubt about the need for crusade. Living in an age of contempt for the Ottoman Empire as the "Sick Man of Europe",¹⁰ they assert:

It was an imperative necessity for the welfare of Christendom that the advance of the Turks ... should be stayed.¹¹

Rejecting the views that crusade was a "mere popular delusion", a "deep-laid plot of papal policy", or a "savage outbreak of warlike barbarism",¹² they idealise the movement as "primarily wars of an idea ... for the recovery of the Heritage of Christ".¹³

Archer and Kingsford are faced, however, with the failure of the Latin Kingdom. They attribute this mainly to the climate claiming that it "forbade any hope of success to a regular system of colonisation" because the "lessened vigour of the race intensified the evils inherent in the feudal system".¹⁴

10. The phrase, the "Sick Man of Europe", was derived from Tsar Nicholas' comments to the British Ambassador on the eve of the Crimean War, but it became an accepted and unchallenged view of the Ottoman Empire and dominated European thinking on the subject. A classic statement of this attitude appears in Sir Charles Eliot, *Turkey in Europe*, first published in 1900, in which he analyses the weaknesses of the Empire, speaks of the attitudes of his contemporaries and of the antagonism of the Turks as Moslems for Christian Europe. See C. Eliot, *Turkey in Europe*, Edward Arnold Ltd, London, 1908, especially pp. 153-154.

11. Archer and Kingsford *op.cit.*, p. 449.

12. *ibid.*, p. 446.

13. *ibid.*, pp. 446-447.

14. *ibid.*, p. 185.

In addition, they argue that the half-caste offspring of the Franks

gradually ... gave themselves up to all the corruptions of the climate, and became lazy frequenters of the baths, luxurious, wanton, quarrelsome, and litigious: they took up Eastern habits and adopted an effeminate dress.¹⁵

The colonisers, as Archer and Kingsford present them, became victims of a "corrupt" and "decadent" East.

A similar view appears in Lieutenant-Colonel C.R. Conder's¹⁶ study, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1099 to 1291 A.D.*, published in 1897. The title of Conder's work suggests his major interest which he describes as

the curious social conditions which resulted from the establishment of a feudal society amid Oriental surroundings.¹⁷

Basically, Conder views the Latin Kingdom as a European colonising venture analogous to that of nineteenth-century British India whose vindication was "just and moderate rule".¹⁸ In keeping with this

15. *ibid.*, p. 297.

16. Conder's background, experience and training helped to direct his interests to the Levant. Born in Cheltenham in 1848, a watering place favoured by retired army officers, he was commissioned in the Royal Engineers in 1870, and was chosen by the Palestine Exploration Fund to continue a survey of Palestine under the auspices of that society. Entry, "C.R. Conder", *Dictionary of National Biography, Supplement January 1901-December 1911*, S. Lee (ed.), Oxford University Press, London, 1939, pp. 401-402.

17. C.R. Conder, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1099 to 1291 A.D.*, Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, London, 1897, p. vi.

18. *ibid.*, p. 428.

belief, he aims "to trace the growth of civilisation and prosperity during the two centuries of Latin rule".¹⁹

According to Conder, Western control increased trade²⁰ and improved agricultural productivity;²¹ the feudal system, by checking "tyranny", was a "blessing to the people",²² and "the great Code of Laws" ensured "justice for the bourgeois and the peasant".²³ The Latin Kingdom, as Conder presents it, was prosperous and relatively peaceful personifying the nineteenth-century imperial ideal which was, in the words of William Lecky, "to secure ... life and property, and contract and personal freedom".²⁴

It is consistent with Conder's favourable view of the crusades as colonialism that his presentation of individuals shows them to advantage. Godfrey of Bouillon, described as "the perfect knight, the true soldier of the Cross, the wisest of the princes",²⁵ is for Conder the dominant leader of the First Crusade so that he believes there was no doubt that the "crown" would be offered only to him.²⁶

19. *ibid.*, p. vi.

20. *ibid.*, p. 294.

21. *ibid.*, p. 239.

22. *ibid.*, p. 164.

23. *ibid.*, p. 172.

24. W.E.H. Lecky, *The Empire: Its Value and Its Growth. An Inaugural Address delivered at the Imperial Institute*, Longmans and Co., London, 1893, p. 2. In citing this opinion of Lecky, an ardent defender of the Empire, to epitomise an idealised, self-congratulatory view, I am not overlooking the fact that some contemporaries were beginning to question such assumptions, but there is no indication of this revision of attitudes in Conder's study.

25. Conder *op.cit.*, p. 68.

26. *ibid.*, pp. 67-69. For a discussion of the choice of Godfrey as the first Latin ruler of Jerusalem, see above, Chapter II, p. 40-41.

Conder's description of Baldwin of le Bourg as "like the two former kings, ... tall and strong, fair"²⁷ suggests that physical appearance is important to him. This impression is confirmed by his comment that although Fulk of Anjou was "small of stature and red-haired" he was "like the other kings ... brave and generous, courteous and prudent".²⁸ When Conder juxtaposes the claim that the Kingdom reached its zenith under Fulk with the assertion that he was "the last pure blooded Frankish King",²⁹ he reveals his ethnocentric racial assumptions.

27. Conder *op.cit.*, p. 96. Baldwin of le Bourg, king from 1118 to 1131, was related to Godfrey of Bouillon and participated in the First Crusade. William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, E.A. Babcock and A.C. Krey (trans), Columbia University Press, New York, 1943, 2 vols, Vol. I, Book XII, Chapter iv, pp. 521-522, relying upon hearsay, describes Baldwin II as

tall of stature, of striking appearance and agreeable features. His thin blond hair was streaked with white. His beard though thin, reached to his breast; his complexion was vivid and ruddy for his time of life. Conder's description bears some resemblance, but William describes Baldwin I as

of rather light complexion, with dark-brown hair and beard. His nose was aquiline and his upper lip somewhat prominent. *ibid.*, Vol. I, Book X, Chapter ii, p. 416.

28. Conder *op.cit.*, p. 96. Fulk, Count of Anjou, succeeded Baldwin II as a result of his arranged marriage with Baldwin's daughter, Melisende. He ruled from 1131 to 1143. William of Tyre *op.cit.*, Vol. II, Book XIV, Chapters i-iii, pp. 47-51.

29. Conder *op.cit.*, p. 107. Fulk of Anjou was the first of a number of Westerners who became involved with the Latin Kingdom by marrying an heiress to the throne. Others include Guy of Lusignan and Conrad of Montferrat in the late twelfth century, and John of Brienne and Frederick II in the thirteenth century. He was not, therefore, the "last pure blooded Frankish King".

If Conder is so committed to the Latin Kingdom as a successful colony, how does he reconcile his position with its final collapse? One reason he advances is the "degeneracy of the later generations" resulting from "marriages with native women".³⁰ These wives were able

to trouble the kingdom with intrigues such as the Frank and Norman ladies are not found to have undertaken.³¹

Conder concludes, however, that

the loss of Palestine may mainly be traced to the prejudice of the Popes, and to their fatal quarrel with the Empire.³²

In this way Conder explains failure without condemning colonialism and reveals a bias against the papacy. In assuming European superiority, he advocates separation of the colonisers and the colonised for this predominance to be maintained and for the colony to survive.

30. *ibid.*, p. 181.

31. *ibid.*, p. 92. In blaming such undesirable qualities on the admixture of oriental blood, Conder is idealising racial purity. It is easy to attribute difficulties to those women of "mixed" blood as they became more numerous than Europeans but Eleanor of Aquitaine, wife of Louis VII, during the Second Crusade was a major disruptive influence as a result of her association with and support for her uncle, Raymond of Tripoli. In this case, "purity" of blood was not a determinative of behaviour. William of Tyre *op.cit.*, Vol. II, Book XVI, Chapter xxvii, p. 180. According to William, Eleanor was a foolish woman, Her conduct before and after this time showed her to be, as we have said, far from circumspect.

32. Conder *op.cit.*, p. 403.

These studies by Archer and Kingsford and by Conder, written when imperial assumptions had not been seriously challenged, are self-confident in interpreting crusade as a colonising venture and in justifying it in terms that were meaningful and acceptable to their contemporaries. Their view of the movement and their particular interest in the Latin Kingdom reflect the assumptions and concerns of their times. These British accounts consider the crusades largely from the viewpoint of the colonisers but American writers on the Crusader States are more concerned to analyse the impact of the new situation upon the institutions and life of the colonisers and their relationships with those they colonised.

Developments in historical studies in the United States have differed greatly from those in Britain. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, German historical thought significantly influenced American historians;³³ many American universities adopted the German seminar, encouraged post-graduate research³⁴ and introduced from Germany the degree of doctor of philosophy.³⁵ The premium placed

-
33. J. Higham, L. Krieger and F. Gilbert, *History*, Prentice-Hall Inc., New Jersey, 1965, p. 98, and G.E. Iggers, "The Image of Ranke in American and German Historical Thought", *History and Theory, Studies in the Philosophy of History*, Vol. II, 1962, pp. 17-18.
34. T.F. Tout, after a tour of the United States in the 1920's commented upon these trends about which he expressed some reservations. See T.F. Tout, "History and Historians in the United States", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fourth Series, Vol. XII, 1929, pp. 5-6.
35. W.B. Hesseltine and L. Kaplan, "Doctors of Philosophy in History, A Statistical Study", *The American Historical Review*, Vol. XLVII, 1942, p. 765.

upon dissertations has contributed to a distinctive American approach which, encouraged by D.C. Munro, was applied to the study of the crusading movement.³⁶ As a result of Munro's teaching and influence, he "made of America a recognized centre of crusading historiography".³⁷ From this, the studies under discussion have emerged.

Munro's own interest in the internal history of the Crusader States helps to explain American specialisation in this area of historical enquiry.³⁸ A German scholar, A. Mitteis, suggests that American historians of the crusades tend to concentrate upon the history and institutions of the Latin Kingdom because of their own colonial origins.³⁹ Although La Monte rejects this explanation,⁴⁰

36. The contribution of Munro has been widely acknowledged. See, for example, K.M. Setton (gen.ed.), *A History of the Crusades*, 2 vols, Vol. I, *The First Hundred Years*, M.W. Baldwin (ed.), The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969, Foreword, p. xiv; C.W. David, "American Historiography of the Middle Ages, 1884-1934", *Speculum, A Journal of Medieval Studies*, Vol. X, 1935, p. 133; D.C. Munro, *The Kingdom of the Crusaders*, A.C. Krey (ed.), D. Appleton Century Co., New York, 1935, Preface, p. v, and S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1965, 3 vols, Vol. I, *The First Crusade and the Foundation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, Preface, p. xii.

37. J.L. La Monte, "Some Problems in Crusading Historiography", *Speculum, A Journal of Medieval Studies*, Vol. XV, 1940, p. 60.

38. *ibid.*, p. 59.

39. H. Mitteis, "Review: *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1100 to 1291*, by J.L. La Monte", *Historische Zeitschrift*, Vol. CXLIX, 1934, p. 329.

40. La Monte *op.cit.*, p. 59.

the fact remains that the American school has dominated this field.

The first American study concerned solely with the Crusader States, *Rural Conditions in the Kingdom of Jerusalem, during the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, was published in 1903 by Helen Preston. As its title suggests, it is limited and specialised.⁴¹ In considering the pattern of occupation and settlement, Preston presents Western crusaders as one of the contending groups who "varied in nationality and differed among themselves in their religious tenets".⁴²

41. This study was originally a doctorate presented to the University of Pennsylvania when Munro was teaching there. H.G. Preston, *Rural Conditions in the Kingdom of Jerusalem during the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, Avil Printing Company, Philadelphia, 1903, Title page, no pagination. Munro taught medieval history at Pennsylvania from 1893 to 1902. Entry; "Dana C. Munro", *Dictionary of American Biography*, D. Malone (ed.), Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1943, 20 vols, Vol. XIII, p. 330.

42. Preston *op.cit.*, p. 18. At the time of the crusaders' conquest, the majority of the indigenous population was Moslem, both Sunnite and Shi'ite, and included Bedouins, Turkomans and Seljuks. In addition, there were Christians of Semitic stock, mainly Greek Orthodox as well as Jacobites, Nestorians and Maronites. In a contemporary description, Jacques of Vitry indicates the diversity of the population:

There are many other nations, with different customs, who differ greatly from one another in their divine service and religious rites ... who both for trade, agriculture, and other useful arts are very necessary to the Holy Land.

Jacques of Vitry, *The History of Jerusalem, A.D. 1180*, A. Stewart (trans.), Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society, London, 1896, Chapter lxvii, p. 58.

From this viewpoint, Preston sees the crusaders as "Western conquerors"⁴³ motivated by a "divided zeal for earthly power and heavenly reward".⁴⁴

Preston views the Franks as outsiders and claims that they were not entitled to regard the Latin Kingdom as "peculiarly" their "own" or as a means of "obtaining all the wealth possible".⁴⁵ Although she concedes the "apparent prosperity of the farmers",⁴⁶ she considers peaceful co-existence was impossible more because of "the antipathy based on belief in their dogmas than on any qualities possessed by either of them".⁴⁷ Basically, Preston's approach results in a secular view in which she presents the Franks as interlopers, opposes exploitation of native people and implies that successful colonisation required more than force or material prosperity.

The relationship between the Franks and the native peoples in the Levant is the main focus of D.C. Munro's study, *The Kingdom of the Crusaders*, published posthumously in 1935.⁴⁸ Munro is more

43. Preston *op.cit.*, p. 26.

44. *ibid.*, p. 19.

45. *ibid.*, p. 36.

46. *ibid.*, p. 26. In speaking of farmers, Preston is referring to the indigenous population who were the agriculturalists and labourers.

47. *ibid.*, pp. 27-28.

48. Apart from some articles, this is Munro's only major published work on the crusades which suggests the extent to which his reputation was established by his activities as a teacher. A.C. Krey, a former student of Munro, indicates that Munro had planned,

a detailed and scholarly history of the Crusades based on an extensive and critical use of contemporary sources, but his death prevented its realisation. The work under discussion was prepared originally for the Lowell Lectures at Harvard in 1924. Krey, Preface, Munro *op.cit.*, p. vi.

concerned with "assimilation" than with "conquest".⁴⁹ In assessing Western adaptation, Munro's basic premise is that "to maintain their colonics and power the Crusaders needed the aid of the natives",⁵⁰ and that

a study of the administration and laws shows the care the Franks took to win the good will of the natives.⁵¹

By contrast with British historians of the Crusader States who assume the viewpoint of colonisers,⁵² Munro, a product of a society of colonial origins, stresses cooperation arguing for assimilation as opposed to separation.

Munro's account of life in the Latin Kingdom delineates those features which he sees as successfully establishing a *modus vivendi*. According to Munro, judicially, "the Frankish courts were eminently fair";⁵³ economically, "commerce also brought the Franks and natives together",⁵⁴ and socially, "courtesies were frequently exchanged"⁵⁵.

49. *ibid.*, p. 82.

50. *ibid.*, p. 105.

51. *ibid.*, p. 107.

52. See above, pp. 132-139.

53. Munro *op.cit.*, p. 108.

54. *ibid.*, p. 112. Given the fact that commerce was monopolised by the Italian City States and that the majority of the indigenous people were farmers and labourers, contact between the Franks and the people they ruled was limited especially as far as commercial activities were concerned. Jacques of Vitry *op.cit.*, Chapter lxxiv, p. 67, in speaking of the Syrians, presents a harsher picture when he asserts:

These men are everywhere slaves, always tributaries, kept by their masters for husbandry and other ignoble uses. He also sees relations as being less than harmonious, claiming: For a small sum of money they become spies and tell the secrets of the Christians to the Saracens. *ibid.*

55. Munro *op.cit.*, p. 117. Although there are instances of friendships between Franks and Moslems, Usamah ibn Munquidh, a twelfth-century Arab noble, claims that "they constitute the exception

with "many friendships".⁵⁶ In keeping with his views on assimilation, he believes that the

offspring of the marriages between Franks and natives ... were the most potent intermediaries in causing the adoption of native customs.⁵⁷

Undoubtedly the Franks modified their way of life for reasons of personal comfort,⁵⁸ but Munro interprets such changes as demonstrating a successful colonial relationship in which both benefited.⁵⁹

Despite Munro's rather idealised picture of life in the Latin Kingdom, he accepts that force created and maintained it. In defining crusade as "military expeditions to establish and maintain a Latin power in Syria",⁶⁰ he presents a secular view which is consistent with his interest in the way of life in the Latin Kingdom and with his interpretation of its loss as the Christian inability to match the Moslems militarily.⁶¹ By contrast with those British

55 (cont'd.)

and cannot be treated as a rule". Usamah ibn Munquidh, *An Arab-Syrian Gentleman and Warrior in the Period of the Crusades, Being the Translation of the Memoirs of Usamah ibn Munquidh*, P.K. Hitti (trans.), Columbia University Press, New York, 1929, p. 169.

56. Munro *op.cit.*, p. 116.

57. *ibid.*, p. 120.

58. For a discussion of this aspect, see J. Praver, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, European Colonialism in the Middle Ages*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1972, pp. 514-522.

59. Munro's view is not isolated in American historiography of the crusades. See, for example, a similarly romanticised treatment of the subject, F. Duncalf, "Some Influences of Oriental Environment in the Kingdom of Jerusalem", *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1914*, Washington, 1916, 2 vols, Vol. I, pp. 135-145, *passim*.

60. Munro *op.cit.*, p. 105.

61. *ibid.*, p. 138.

historians who examine crusade as a colonising venture,⁶² Munro does not attribute decline to the effects of the environment but to the colonisers' failure to cooperate in the face of danger and to their granting privileges to the Italian City States and to the Military Orders.⁶³

In a society conscious of its origins, Munro's attitude to the Latin Kingdom shows a propensity for sentimental propaganda when considering its way of life. On the other hand, when he discusses these colonisers as crusaders, he regards them simply as conquerors who conferred benefits upon those they ruled but whose ultimate sanction was military force.

The question of political institutions of the Crusader States is considered in J.L. La Monte's⁶⁴ *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1100 to 1291*, published in 1932.⁶⁵ It may

62. See above, pp. 132-139.

63. Munro *op.cit.*, p. 138.

64. J.L. La Monte who, with D.C. Munro, was probably the most influential American historian of the crusades, was born in 1902 and graduated from Ohio State University. This study is a revision of La Monte's doctorate for Harvard which he completed in 1928 under the supervision of Charles H. Haskins, the most prominent American scholar of his day of medieval institutions. La Monte was professor of medieval history at the University of Pennsylvania which became a centre for crusading studies in the United States and sponsored the publication of a cooperative history of the crusades. "John L. La Monte: Recent Deaths", *The American Historical Review*, Vol. XV, 1950, pp. 476-477.

65. La Monte points out that Gaston Dodu's *Histoire des Institutions Monarchiques dans le Royaume Latin de Jérusalem*, published in 1894, was "the only study hitherto made on the institutions of the kingdom of Jerusalem". J.L. La Monte, *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1100 to 1291*, The Medieval Academy of America, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1932, p. vii.

seem strange that an American medievalist was the pioneer in the English-speaking world of this aspect of the crusades, but American historians whose patriotism did not restrict them to the English situation, were deeply interested in the study of institutions.⁶⁶

As Europe was genetically the source of American civilization, their study of its history is logical and, as their society developed from its transplanted institutions, La Monte's interest in the ways in which the Franks

with their ideas of western feudalism, had to adapt them to the conditions of the country with its Byzantino-Saracen background⁶⁷

is understandable.

As La Monte's study focuses upon feudalism, his institutional approach moulds his definition of crusaders as "vassals of the Church ... in the great war of Christianity against Islam".⁶⁸

66. See C.W. David, "American Historiography of the Middle Ages, 1884-1934", *Speculum, A Journal of Medieval Studies*, Vol. X, 1935, pp. 131-132, in which he comments:

It is to institutional history that we seem most naturally to turn; and it is probably here that we have done our best and most enduring work.

Charles Homer Haskins, La Monte's mentor, whose major study, *Norman Institutions*, was published in 1918, notes:

Of that which is best much has been done in the history of institutions, political and legal, ecclesiastical and economic, for which our national experience helps to furnish the necessary basis of understanding.

C.H. Haskins, "European History and American Scholarship", *The American Historical Review*, Vol. XXVIII, 1922, p. 223.

67. La Monte *op.cit.*, p. xix.

68. *ibid.*, pp. 203-204.

Moreover, he regards 1291 as marking only "the final loss of the continental realm"⁶⁹ because

fourteenth century Cyprus is but a continuation of the state founded by the men of the first crusade.⁷⁰

Crusade for La Monte is primarily concerned with the transplanting of institutions and their development in the East, a view which results in his extending the movement beyond the traditionally accepted date.

When La Monte considers the history of the Crusader States, the contribution of individuals to the structure of government largely determines his assessment of them. For example, he sees Godfrey of Bouillon whose administration was short, as a "man of the second rank",⁷¹ but the reign of Amalric I "marks the zenith" because of "the legislative work which he carried through".⁷² In particular, La Monte regards the *Assise sur la ligece* as Amalric's "greatest contribution"⁷³ for reasons which are not altogether

69. *ibid.*, p. xxvi.

70. *ibid.*, p. xxvii.

71. *ibid.*, p. 4.

72. *ibid.*, p. 19. By the *Assise sur la ligece*, rear-vassals owed liege homage to the king and could appeal directly to him. It also entitled fief holders to membership of the *Haute Cour* which, according to La Monte, was the "sovereign body" of the Latin Kingdom, and the *Assise* legalized revolt under certain conditions. For a discussion of the circumstances behind and the provisions of this measure, see *ibid.*, pp. 22-24.

73. *ibid.*, p. 21.

consistent. On the one hand, he sees it as the measure of a strong king;⁷⁴ on the other, he recognizes that it "guaranteed the supremacy of the *Haute Cour*" at the expense of monarchical power.⁷⁵ If we accept La Monte's view that divisions within the Kingdom developing from the lack of a strong monarchy were ultimately disastrous,⁷⁶ then we must reject his assessment of Amalric's achievements.

It seems, however, that La Monte attaches such significance to the *Assise sur la ligece* largely as a result of his own historical method and political assumptions. In considering constitutional development, La Monte draws mainly from the thirteenth-century jurists associated with John of Ibelin who pleaded a special case based largely upon the baronage's idealisation of feudal rights under the *Assise sur la ligece*.⁷⁷ According to La Monte, while John of Ibelin "fought to maintain the privileges of his class" he was, nevertheless, "ever the lover of the law and the enemy of tyranny"⁷⁸ in pursuing a principle, "the right of revolt", for the protection of feudal prerogatives as established in the *Assise*.⁷⁹

74. *ibid.*, p. 20. La Monte adopts the position that this *Assise* weakened baronial power over their vassals by guaranteeing them access to the king. Yet the barons as members of the *Haute Cour* accepted this proposal which originated in Amalric's need to gain baronial support in a dispute against one of their own number, Gerard of Sidon.

75. *ibid.*, p. 24.

76. *ibid.*, p. 104.

77. La Monte himself admits that these thirteenth century treatises were attempting to justify the actions of the Ibelins in the dispute with Frederick II in terms of precedents from the twelfth century. *ibid.*, p. 1.

78. *ibid.*, p. 70.

79. *ibid.*, p. 83.

It is not simply the fact that La Monte accepts the baronial viewpoint but that he presents the conflict in a way which is reminiscent of the method of American publicists justifying resistance to Britain in the later eighteenth century in terms that have become part of American folk-lore.⁸⁰

The pre-eminence that La Monte sees the *Haute Cour* achieving as a result of the *Assise sur la ligece* is an integral part of his argument that the Latin Kingdom was "an almost ideal system of feudalism".⁸¹ According to La Monte, the *Haute Cour* became the "sovereign body" and the king "a mere president of the council of his vassals",⁸² a situation which exemplifies his definition of feudalism as "a weak monarchy and a strong aristocracy".⁸³ In assessing the functioning of this system, La Monte concludes that "feudal decentralization" was "largely responsible for its final destruction".⁸⁴ As an historian of the Latin Kingdom, La Monte interprets his subject according to his liberal ideas and sees institutions as necessarily feudal and as largely determining success or failure.

80. The Declaration of Independence, in attempting to furnish a moral and legal justification for rebellion against the established political authority, provides a succinct statement of the American arguments. The theme of the pursuit of liberty in the face of tyranny dominates American writing on the subject. See, for example, C.P. Nettels, *The Roots of American Civilization*, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1938, or B. Knollenberg, *Origin of the American Revolution, 1759-1766*, The Free Press, New York, 1965.

81. La Monte *op.cit.*, p. xx.

82. *ibid.*, p. 87.

83. *ibid.*

84. *ibid.*, p. 243.

Apart from American studies of those men who established and maintained the Crusader States,⁸⁵ the subject of the Latin Kingdom has been neglected until comparatively recent times. Undoubtedly, this neglect among British historians was influenced by the decline of imperialism and by the questioning of its assumptions.⁸⁶ In more recent times, the appearance of two studies of the Latin Kingdom suggests a renewed interest in this area when the granting of independence to subject peoples within Asia and Africa and the rise of nationalism in under-developed countries have stimulated debate on the question of neo-colonialism.⁸⁷

In some respects, *Kingdoms and Strongholds of the Crusaders* by the British scholar T.S.R. Boase,⁸⁸ published in 1971, is a romanticised defense of colonialism. Although he does not altogether accept the "cheerful picture of the country's prosperity" of some

85. See below, Chapter VII, pp. 158-178.

86. Probably the most telling and influential critique of British imperialism was J.A. Hobson's *Imperialism, A Study*, published in 1902 after the author's visit to South Africa.

87. Some idea of the magnitude and bitterness of the debate on this matter can be gauged from W.J. Hudson, *Australia and the Colonial Question at the United Nations*, Sydney University Press, Sydney, 1970.

88. T.S.R. Boase who was born in 1898, saw service in the First World War before completing his degree at Oxford. Most of his academic career has been concerned with the history of art, but his publications on Boniface VIII, St Francis of Assisi and his history of England from 1100-1216 show an interest in the medieval period. Entry, "T.S.R. Boase", *Who's Who 1972, An Annual Biographical Dictionary*, Adam and Charles Black, London, 1972, p. 308.

chroniclers, such as Fulcher of Chartres,⁸⁹ he believes that "it is possible to overestimate the continuity of fighting",⁹⁰ points to friendly relations between Moslems and Franks⁹¹ and argues for Frankish assimilation.⁹² Indeed, he implies that the Latin States could have survived claiming that lasting alliances with Sicily,⁹³ the Byzantine Empire⁹⁴ or even with the Mongols⁹⁵ "might have greatly changed the course of history".⁹⁶

89. T.S.R. Boase, *Kingdoms and Strongholds of the Crusaders*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1971, p. 53. Fulcher of Chartres *op.cit.*, Book III, Chapter xxxvii, p. 272, paints a glowing picture of life in the Levant in a celebrated passage in which he claims:

He who was born a stranger is now as one born here;
 he who was born an alien has become as a native ...
 Those who were poor in the Occident, God makes rich in
 this land. Those who had little money there have
 countless bezants here, and those who did not have
 a villa possess here by the gift of God a city.

As Fulcher's prologue reveals that his aim in writing was to encourage further support for crusade, and as his above statement was written in the enthusiasm following the Christian capture of Tyre in 1124, his description is perhaps coloured and over-enthusiastic. See *ibid.*, H.S. Fink, Introduction, pp. 24-25.

90. Boase *op.cit.*, p. 50.

91. *ibid.*, p. 67.

92. *ibid.*

93. *ibid.*, p. 61.

94. *ibid.*, p. 74.

95. *ibid.*, p. 212.

96. *ibid.*, p. 61.

Boase's favourable view of the nature of Frankish society derives mainly from his interpretation of its artistic, architectural and intellectual achievements. In considering surviving illuminated manuscripts, he points to Queen Melisende's psalter as revealing "strong Byzantine influence"⁹⁷ with initials "a mixture of Western and Islamic motifs";⁹⁸ a Bible from Acre "shows a lavish mingling of the Byzantine and Western conventions".⁹⁹ Moreover, he sees the Church of the Nativity as

a great co-operative work of Franco-Byzantine art, the brilliant affirmation of the new relationship between the two powers.¹⁰⁰

These material remains provide evidence for Boase of "the meeting of cultures" and of the extent to which the Franks assimilated.¹⁰¹

The notion that the Franks profited from their association is implicit in Boase's conclusions about the intellectual achievements of the Kingdom. William of Tyre is described as "a leading intellectual"¹⁰² who provides "ample evidence of the crusading achievement".¹⁰³ Another individual whom Boase isolates, is Stephen of Antioch who translated "Arabic medical treatises into Latin".¹⁰⁵ Finally, he commends John of Ibelin for his

learned treatise on the nature and purpose of the laws, a piece of highly intelligent expertise that reflects well on the intellectual life of the Kingdom.¹⁰⁵

97. *ibid.*, p. 98.

98. *ibid.*, p. 100.

99. *ibid.*, p. 194.

100. *ibid.*, p. 122.

101. *ibid.*, p. 194.

102. *ibid.*, p. 127.

103. *ibid.*

104. *ibid.*, p. 72.

105. *ibid.*, p. 179.

Their achievements are undeniable but Boase's limited number of examples are rather slight evidence for his argument.

Although the material remains of the Crusader States are Boase's main interest, he sees crusade as closely related to Jerusalem. Boase speaks of it as "the glorious and sacred city of Christendom's longing"¹⁰⁶ which he describes as "the heart of the crusades".¹⁰⁷ Crusades for Boase were "pilgrimages" providing "an opportunity for contrition and penance".¹⁰⁸ Nevertheless, Boase seems to consider that these were pilgrimages with only one goal, Jerusalem, as he regards the movement as ending only with the Turkish conquest of Rhodes in 1522 when "Jerusalem had become impossibly remote".¹⁰⁹

By contrast with Boase's assessment, Joshua Prawer's¹¹⁰ *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, European Colonialism in the Middle Ages*, published in 1972, is less favourable and intended for a different reader. Prawer sees the movement as "the first European attempt to

106. *ibid.*, p. 42.

107. *ibid.*, p. 144.

108. *ibid.*, p. 93.

109. *ibid.*, p. 240.

110. Joshua Prawer, Professor of Medieval History at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, has published widely on crusade. The present work follows upon his study of the history and institutions of the Latin Kingdom originally published in Hebrew in 1963. See H.E.J. Cowdrey, "The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem", *History, The Journal of the Historical Association*, Vol. LVII, 1972, p. 228. At the time of publication of Prawer's longer work on crusade, he produced a shorter, more popular version, *The World of the Crusaders*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1972.

found and rule a colonial kingdom"¹¹¹ which "was created by conquest and based on strict segregation between conquerors and conquered".¹¹² Colonialism for Praver is the establishment of a society "composed of conquerors and conquered, exploiters and exploited"¹¹³ in which "no integration or even *rapprochement* was possible".¹¹⁴

According to Praver, the colonial nature of Frankish society promoted exclusiveness and intolerance so that any changes in Western life and attitudes were superficial responses to "comfort and adaptation to local needs".¹¹⁵ In analysing society in the Latin Kingdom, Praver argues that politically,

crusader administration never developed beyond the stage of the European feudal system of the eleventh century;¹¹⁶

socially, the Franks remained "the class of *rentiers* and absentee landlords"¹¹⁷ exploiting the native inhabitants economically;¹¹⁸ artistically, they revealed "a natural inclination to import or imitate the homeland",¹¹⁹ and intellectually, "the kingdom itself

111. Praver *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, European Colonialism in the Middle Ages*, p. 60, distinguishes the Latin Kingdom as the first colony from earlier European conquests by the length of time it survived. This seems rather arbitrary criterion but it enables a more dramatic approach to the subject.

112. *ibid.*

114. *ibid.*, p. 507.

116. *ibid.*, p. 158.

118. *ibid.*, p. 505.

113. *ibid.*, p. 506.

115. *ibid.*, p. 514.

117. *ibid.*, p. 381.

119. *ibid.*, p. 443.

provided no intellectual opportunities and no school ever acquired renown".¹²⁰ In fact, Praver sees nothing to commend in crusader society whose features as he presents them exemplify his notion of colonialism.

As a Jew, Praver accepts that Palestine was the "historical homeland" of the Jews¹²¹ who had kept "alive their unique claim ... by assuring a continued physical presence".¹²² Consequently, Praver does not accept the crusaders' right to their conquest; their religious claim assumed that Israel had "forfeited its privileges as the chosen people"¹²³ while Christian attacks upon Jews¹²⁴ were

perpetrated by those who claimed the Holy Land
... by those who went to liberate the sepulchre
of a God of love and peace universal.¹²⁵

As far as Praver is concerned, the crusading conquests could only be ephemeral in the land which he believes, belongs to the Jews by right and by occupation.

120. *ibid.*, p. 188.

121. *ibid.*, p. 233.

122. *ibid.*, p. 234.

123. *ibid.*, p. 39.

124. Praver is referring specifically to the massacres of Jews on the Rhine and the Danube by the followers of Count Emich of Leisingen as they were setting out on crusade in 1096. William of Tyre *op.cit.*, Vol. I, Book I, Chapter xxix, p. 113, does not attempt to justify their actions but strongly criticises them for "mad excesses". Praver, however, speaks emotionally of these events as "one of the greatest and most horrible massacres of Jews in European history, unequalled until our time". Praver *op.cit.*, p. 11.

125. *ibid.*, p. 12.

With the emergence of Israel as a nation in 1947 and with its continuing struggle for survival, it is not surprising that a Jewish historian of the crusading movement should be interested in the internal history of the Latin Kingdom which he argues, was never viable. While he concentrates upon the Westerners, he deals briefly but trenchantly with the Moslems referring to their "bickering",¹²⁶ viewing Zengi's success as the result of "force, cunning or persuasion"¹²⁷ and regarding Saladin as "a mediocre general"¹²⁸ whose conquests indicate Frankish weakness rather than Moslem strength or unity under *jihad*.¹²⁹ Indeed, Praver considers the movement not from the viewpoint of the West who initiated it, but of the Palestine that it sought to colonise.

These accounts of the history of the Crusader States present different views of their viability and achievements. The British historians, writing at the turn of the century, express the optimism and confidence of their own times, regarding the Westerners as successful colonisers, analagous to those of their day, as carrying civilization with them and as conferring benefits upon

126. *ibid.*, p. 24.

127. *ibid.*, p. 25.

128. *ibid.*, pp. 26-27.

129. *ibid.*, pp. 28-30.

the peoples they ruled. Even Boase, assessing the Latin Kingdom when colonialism was under attack, portrays the undertaking favourably by arguing for a rich culture that embodied a successful meeting of East and West. The American historians are not as unified in their reactions with Preston more critical than either Munro or La Monte who are not, however, as full of praise as the British writers, while Praver is condemnatory and highly critical. Apart from the British historians, these writers on the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem have a secular view of the crusading movement in regarding the crusaders as more concerned with conquest and settlement and less with ideals or spiritual goals. Although their works indicate some of the concerns of their own times, they reveal the extent to which their emphases and interpretations have been moulded by their approach in analysing this particular aspect of the crusading movement.

Chapter VII

American Biographers of Crusaders

In general, biographies of individual crusaders form two distinct groups. The first consists of those in which the activities of the subjects in the East are incidental or secondary to their European careers;¹ the second are studies that concentrate upon the actions and lives of crusaders in the East. Since the latter are concerned primarily with detailed assessments in relation to the crusades and to the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, only they will be considered. Individual studies of crusaders were pioneered by French and German scholars during the nineteenth century.² As many crusaders were either French or German in origin and descent, patriotic zeal undoubtedly accounts for this interest in them. Detailed biographies, however, are apt subjects for American doctoral dissertations and the majority of the works to be discussed have developed from this basis.

The first work, *Peter the Hermit, A Story of Enthusiasm*, by D.A. Goodsell³ published in 1906 provides an interesting contrast with later American biographies as it is based almost solely upon

-
1. For example, C.W. David, *Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1920; K. Norgate, *Richard the Lion Heart*, London, 1924.
 2. These are too numerous to list but see A.S. Atiya, *The Crusade, Historiography and Bibliography*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1962, pp. 98-126.
 3. D.A. Goodsell who lived from 1840 to 1909, was a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The work to be considered here is his only attempt at an historical narrative. His other published works are *The Things Which Remain: An Address to Young Ministers*, *The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, and *Nature and Character at Granite Bay*, *The National Union Catalog, Pre-1956 Imprints*, Mansell Information/Publishing Ltd, London, 1972, Vol. CCVI, p. 489.

secondary writers, namely Michaud and Milman.⁴ Although Goodsell is acquainted with the conclusions of Sybel who minimises the importance of Peter,⁵ he rejects his revisions.⁶ It seems that Goodsell justifies his study by attributing a decisive influence to Peter but because of his lack of original research,⁷ Peter remains the figure of legend and this short biography becomes a simple narrative of the First Crusade.

As Goodsell rejects the possibility of spiritual benefits, crusade was simply "war for the Holy Sepulcher".⁸ According to Goodsell, those undertaking it were "blinded by superstition" in believing that

they could find forgiveness while indulging their chief passion, and could wash away their sins by shedding blood.⁹

Although Goodsell regards Peter as "the originator of these astonishing movements",¹⁰ he argues that Urban II used him in order

4. D.A. Goodsell, *Peter the Hermit, A Story of Enthusiasm*, Jennings and Graham, New York, 1906, p. 3.

5. See above Chapter III, p. 61-62.

6. Goodsell *op.cit.*, p. 25.

7. Goodsell justifies his approach by claiming:
Original material for a biography of Peter the Hermit either does not exist in this country, or, if here, does not yield itself readily to knowledge and use.
ibid., p. 3.

8. *ibid.*, p. 39.

9. *ibid.*, p. 40.

10. *ibid.*, p. 25.

"to humble the Antipope and bring the unfriendly kings to his feet".¹¹ When Goodsell indicates that he believes that Peter was probably a "monomaniac",¹² his conclusion only further discredits the crusading movement which he is supposed to have created.

It seems that Goodsell's account is more an attack upon the Medieval Church than an analysis of Peter's career. It does not provide any new insights but it underlines further the importance of a writer's religious position in assessments of the undertaking. Nevertheless, it remains the only English study of Peter who has become increasingly a figure of secondary importance.

In the English-speaking world, biographies of individual crusaders who remained or were born in the East have been the province of American medievalists. If continental historians of the nineteenth century made this field their own because of patriotism, the same motive did not operate for British writers, for whom in any case, broad narrative surveys seem more congenial. Specialisation and the emphasis upon the doctoral dissertation in the United States seem, however, to have resulted in biographical studies based upon the analysis of primary sources.

11. *ibid.*, p. 31. By the time of the First Crusade, Urban's position was not as insecure as Goodsell suggests. In 1094 he was established in Rome and the Emperor, Henry, faced significant opposition from his son, Conrad, who supported Urban. It is perhaps indicative of Urban II's strong position in Europe that he not only sponsored a crusade but also met with such success and support for his undertaking.

12. *ibid.*, p. 44.

The first English biography of Godfrey of Bouillon, Duke of Lower Lorraine, by J.C. Andressohn,¹³ an attempt "to provide a worthy biography of this important leader",¹⁴ indicates the difficulties for an historian in assessing motivation. Andressohn admits, for example, that Godfrey's reasons for taking the cross are "a matter of speculation".¹⁵ After indicating that "the stress placed upon his piety is of later origin",¹⁶ Andressohn suggests only that "the general movement had its effect" upon him.¹⁷ The significance of the fact that Godfrey's father, Eustace II, benefited greatly from participating in the Norman Conquest of England,¹⁸ is not developed by Andressohn, perhaps because he is unwilling to assign such materialistic motives to Godfrey. It suggests, however, the opportunities available especially in view of Godfrey's limited resources in Lorraine.¹⁹

-
13. This work is Andressohn's only publication. Apart from the fact that he was born in 1884, I have been unable to discover any details of his life and career. *The National Union Catalog op.cit.*, Vol. XVI, p. 297.
14. J.C. Andressohn, *The Ancestry and Life of Godfrey of Bouillon*, Indiana University Publications, Bloomington, 1947, p. 6.
15. *ibid.*, p. 48. 16. *ibid.* 17. *ibid.*, p. 50.
18. *ibid.*, p. 23. Eustace II, first married Godo, the sister of Edward the Confessor, and on her death, Ida of Lorraine, who became Godfrey's mother. Although Eustace fought at Hastings under William the Conqueror and gained considerable land as a reward, he participated in a rebellion against William in 1067, but was reconciled to him and retained his possessions. Eustace certainly benefited from being associated with Norman expansion. *ibid.*, pp. 20-24.
19. Godfrey, a second son, became the heir of his uncle, Godfrey the Hunchback. Andressohn claims that the Duchy of Lower Lorraine "sank to an empty dignity" and that Godfrey's "activities seem to have been limited to the castle of Bouillon and the bishopric of Liége". *ibid.*, p. 47.

By concentrating upon one individual, biographers tend to magnify his achievements and Andressohn becomes the victim of his own approach by exaggerating Godfrey's contribution to the success of the First Crusade. Although Andressohn indicates that the sources reveal nothing about Godfrey's activities in the winter during the siege of Antioch, he still makes the point that his "men played a prominent part".²⁰ In addition, he describes Godfrey "as a warrior ... without equal"²¹ with his "massive strength"²² and valour in battle.²³ In considering the capture of Jerusalem, Andressohn minimises Godfrey's responsibility for the ensuing massacre because "his contribution to the bloodshed is a matter of dispute".²⁴ Andressohn's admission, however, that he, "by the merest chance became the ruler of Jerusalem",²⁵ somewhat weakens his argument for the magnitude of Godfrey's achievement.

In Andressohn's study, two other prominent leaders of the First Crusade suffer by comparison with Godfrey. Despite the fact that Bohemond of Taranto, disinherited by his father, Robert Guiscard,²⁶ by dint of military skill and in the face of opposition from his half-brother, established his power in southern Italy,²⁷

20. *ibid.*, p. 82.

21. *ibid.*, p. 122.

22. *ibid.*, p. 80.

23. *ibid.*, p. 100.

24. *ibid.*, p. 102.

25. *ibid.*, p. 105.

26. Anna Comnena, *The Alexiad of Anna Comnena*, E.R.A. Sewter (trans.), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1969, Book I, p. 69.

27. Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, M. Chibnall (trans.), Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1973, 4 vols, Vol. IV, Book VIII, p. 169.

Andressohn dismisses him as "a lackland and an upstart".²⁸ The analysis of Raymond of Toulouse,²⁹ in presenting him as self-seeking and ambitious,³⁰ follows traditional lines³¹ but it seems that Andressohn's claim that he was the "least willing to proceed"

28. Andressohn *op.cit.*, p. 72. In speaking of Godfrey's earlier career, Andressohn indicates:

He inherited, by a chance that is rare in history,
a duchy from his uncle. *ibid.*, p. 5.

The earlier careers of Godfrey and Bohemond suggest that Bohemond does not suffer by comparison with Godfrey.

29. Raymond of Toulouse who fought against the Moslems in Spain, was the most powerful ruler in southern France. William of Tyre *op.cit.*, Vol. I, Book XI, p. 463, emphasizes his power and wealth in France where he was "possessed of extensive ancestral holdings and he might have had in abundance everything he desired". Whatever may have been Raymond's failings during the First Crusade, the magnitude of his possessions suggests that of all the crusading leaders, he is less open to the charge of material ambition in taking the Cross.

30. See especially Andressohn's assessment of Raymond's behaviour after the fall of Antioch and of his ambitions to found his own principality in the north. Andressohn *op.cit.*, pp. 87-91.

31. Gibbon describes Raymond as
haughty, envious, and obstinate; and, though he resigned an ample patrimony for the cause of God, his piety, in the public opinion, was not exempt from avarice and ambition. E. Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, J.B. Bury (ed.), Methuen and Co. Ltd, London, 1912, 7 vols, Vol. VI, p. 280.

Mills says that Raymond "was selfish and avaricious; his pride made him susceptible and retentive of injuries". C. Mills, *The History of the Crusades, for the Recovery and Possession of the Holy Land*, Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, London, 1821, 2 vols, Vol. I, p. 119.

Conder concludes that he was "impetuous and ambitious, hated by his subjects for his obstinate tyranny, and feared as well for his violence". C.R. Conder, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1099 to 1291 A.D.*, Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, London, 1897, p. 21.

Among the American writers, there is a similar attitude to Raymond. Munro comments that "he is well described by a contemporary [whom he fails to identify] 'as fanatical as a monk, as land greedy as a Norman'". D.C. Munro, *The Kingdom of the Crusaders*, D. Appleton Century Inc., New York, 1935, p. 37.

(continued over page)

from Antioch to Jerusalem³² is unduly harsh.³³ It appears, too, that Raymond may have had Godfrey's measure as Andressohn reveals that he was able to effect a temporary reconciliation "by flattery and artifice".³⁴ Although Andressohn indicates that Godfrey "as duke of Lower Lorraine ... held the highest rank among the crusading princes",³⁵ his name only appeared after those of Bohemond and Raymond in the letter written from Antioch to Rome.³⁶

Despite Andressohn's own bias at times, this study confirms his conclusion that Godfrey "was by no means the surpassing leader of later tradition"³⁷ but his biographical approach tends, nevertheless, to magnify Godfrey's achievements and to assign considerable importance to him. A useful corrective to Andressohn's work is Ralph Yewdale's biography of Bohemond³⁸ in which he presents Bohemond's career in relation to the wider issue of "the Norman expansion in the Mediterranean world".³⁹

31 (cont'd.)

La Monte notes simply that he was "unpopular" with his contemporaries. J.L. La Monte, *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1100 to 1291*, The Medieval Academy of America, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1932, p. 3.

32. Andressohn *op.cit.*, p. 87.

33. Undoubtedly, Raymond was unwilling to leave Antioch, but as Andressohn indicates, he did bow to pressure from the crusading ranks and was the first leader to depart. *ibid.* In addition, Andressohn comments that "Godfrey seems to have been singularly passive during this period". *ibid.*, p. 90.

34. *ibid.*, p. 93.

35. *ibid.*, p. 72.

36. *ibid.*, p. 86.

37. *ibid.*, p. 123.

38. This study, originally a doctoral thesis, was supervised by D.C. Munro who prepared the work for publication after Yewdale's early death in 1921. R.B. Yewdale, *Bohemond I, Prince of Antioch*, D.C. Munro, Foreword, University of Princeton Press, Princeton, 1924, no pagination.

39. *ibid.*, p. 1.

Yewdale views the First Crusade largely in terms of a Norman confrontation with the Byzantine Emperor, Alexius I. That Bohemond had probably "already fixed his ambitions upon the possession of Antioch" when he took the Cross is basic to Yewdale's argument.⁴⁰ As Yewdale points out, Alexius, distrusting Bohemond,⁴¹ exacted an oath from him and from some of the other leaders to return any former Byzantine territory conquered from the Turks.⁴² In considering Bohemond's refusal to surrender Antioch to Alexius, Yewdale argues that the "Greeks were guilty of breaking their agreement"⁴³ claiming that the Emperor was "responsible for the breach between the Greeks and the Franks".⁴⁴ Undoubtedly, Yewdale has a case but the crusaders' actions alienated the Emperor and added to their difficulties by making cooperation even more remote.⁴⁵ This account of the First Crusade largely becomes an explanation of how Bohemond won Antioch and a justification for his actions.

40. *ibid.*, p. 44.

41. *ibid.*, p. 42. Bohemond as his father's lieutenant had already participated in an unsuccessful attack upon the western parts of the Byzantine Empire. Anna Comnena *op.cit.*, Book X, p. 329, refers to "Bohemond's secret plans".

42. Yewdale *op.cit.*, pp. 41-42.

43. *ibid.*, p. 59. Yewdale catalogues their failures as the flight of the Greek commander, Taticius, from Antioch, Alexius' refusal to advance from Philomelium to assist the crusaders and his failure to come to receive Antioch after its capture by the Christians. *ibid.*, pp. 81-83.

44. *ibid.*, p. 84.

45. Anna Comnena *op.cit.*, Book XI, pp. 345-350, understandably presents a very different interpretation in which she speaks of the possibility that Alexius "might lose Constantinople as well as Antioch in his eagerness to succour them".

In Yewdale's assessment, Bohemond emerges as the dominant figure of the First Crusade. Bohemond's delay at Constantinople to negotiate further with Alexius indicates, for Yewdale, his "growing ascendancy".⁴⁶ During the siege of Antioch, "the military talents of Bohemond made him the real leading spirit",⁴⁷ while Godfrey's illness and Raymond's absences, left him with "a large part of the responsibility for the siege".⁴⁸ Firuz's negotiations with him suggest to Yewdale that he was recognized as the Christian leader,⁴⁹ and Kerbogha's attack was "defeated largely by his leadership".⁵⁰ Although the Christians retained Antioch which became "the most enduring of all states in the Latin East",⁵¹ it was largely as the result, however, of Tancred's efforts which

46. Yewdale *op.cit.*, p. 45.

47. *ibid.*, p. 55.

48. *ibid.*, pp. 55-56.

49. *ibid.*, p. 65. By some means, Bohemond made contact with Firuz, an Armenian, within Antioch who agreed to betray the city to him. Fulcher of Chartres *op.cit.*, Book I, Chapter xvii, p. 98, piously ascribes Firuz's actions to divine intervention. Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, R. Hill (trans.), Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, London, 1962, Book VIII, Chapter XX, p. 44, a follower of Bohemond, has no real explanation for Firuz contacting Bohemond. He explains simply that Firuz "struck up a great friendship with Bohemond".

50. *ibid.*, p. 72. Kerbogha commanded a Moslem force for the relief of Antioch. If the Christians had not managed to take the city shortly before Kerbogha's arrival, they would have been caught between his forces and the Moslems defending the city. When Kerbogha arrived, he besieged the city and the Christians, facing the prospect of starvation and defeat, inspired by the discovery of the lance that was reputed to have pierced the side of the crucified Christ, took the offensive and defeated Kerbogha in a pitched battle. Anonymous *op.cit.*, Book IX, Chapters xxi-xxix, pp. 49-71.

51. Yewdale *op.cit.*, p. 138.

Yewdale tends to minimise by concentrating upon Bohemond's role in the capture of the city.⁵²

As Yewdale suggests, one outcome of Bohemond's clash with Alexiur̄ was his unsuccessful attack on the Empire in 1107 which he sees as the first use of "crusade" for political purposes.⁵³ Although Yewdale indicates that Bohemond's "own selfish designs for personal aggrandizement" motivated this expedition,⁵⁴ his assertion that it was a "real Crusade" because

it had received the approval of the pope and was preached by the papal legate, and the usual crusading privileges were given to those who took the cross,⁵⁵

is a legalistic view of the movement which denies any relationship with Jerusalem as the immediate or ultimate goal. If Bohemond "cast discredit upon the crusading idea in Europe",⁵⁶ this indicates that his contemporaries did not accept his expedition as a crusade despite its trappings. It suggests, too, that Yewdale's interpretation of crusade is moulded largely by his approach through the career of Bohemond.

52. Tancred who was related to Bohemond, accompanied him on the First Crusade. Tancred was regent of Antioch while Bohemond was prisoner of the Moslems from 1100 to 1103. During Bohemond's absence in Europe, Tancred was again regent. See *ibid.*, pp. 90-91 and p. 102.

53. *ibid.*, p. 108.

54. *ibid.*, p. 135.

55. *ibid.*, p. 115.

56. *ibid.*, p. 135.

The problem of dealing with lesser figures is highlighted in R.L. Nicholson's study of Joscelyn I Prince of Edessa from 1119 to 1131.⁵⁷ Although Joscelyn was a Courtenay, a member of the French nobility, the "sources are disappointingly few" for his earlier life.⁵⁸ As his reasons for taking the cross are obscure, Nicholson suggests that "the success of the First Crusade ... apparently affected" him.⁵⁹ His role in the Crusade of 1101 is "entirely conjectural",⁶⁰ so Nicholson resorts to the expedient of a general account of this expedition.⁶¹ Although he admits the lack of information for the period from 1113 to 1118 when Joscelyn was Lord of Galilee and Tiberias,⁶² he assumes that he developed a "seemingly outstanding military record".⁶³ As Nicholson indicates, it is difficult to view some aspects of Joscelyn's career but he presents a number of unwarranted assumptions in attempting to do so.

This lack of evidence seems to throw doubt on the central theme of the study, Joscelyn's

leading role in the Frankish conquest and political development of Syria and Palestine in the early twelfth century.⁶⁴

57. This biography "is an outgrowth of an interest in the career of Joscelyn" from Nicholson's doctorate, "Tancred: a study of His Career and Work in Their Relation to the First Crusade and the Establishment of the Latin States in Syria and Palestine". R.L. Nicholson, *Joscelyn I, Prince of Edessa*, The University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1954, p. viii.

58. *ibid.*, p. 1.

59. *ibid.*, p. 3.

60. *ibid.*

61. *ibid.*, pp. 4-8.

62. *ibid.*, p. 50.

63. *ibid.*, p. 51.

64. *ibid.*, p. 92.

Arriving in the East as a "penniless adventurer", he was granted land by his cousin, Baldwin of Le Bourg, ruler of Edessa.⁶⁵ In 1108 and 1127, he fought against fellow Christians allying with Moslems to strengthen his own position.⁶⁶ Stripped of his possessions in 1113,⁶⁷ he gained Edessa in 1119 for supporting Baldwin's candidacy for the throne.⁶⁸ As Nicholson admits,

Joscelyn viewed the problem of creating an enduring political establishment in the Holy Land, from a strictly short-run perspective,⁶⁹

a conclusion which considerably modifies his original position by indicating that Joscelyn's career exemplifies self-aggrandizement at the expense of the common Christian good.

The belief that Joscelyn's "role as a warrior is his most enduring claim"⁷⁰ leads Nicholson away from more substantial issues. As ruler of Edessa, he was involved in "ceaseless military activity against the Moslems",⁷¹ but so were other Franks; it was largely a matter of survival. That Joscelyn was captured and imprisoned twice by the Moslems⁷² suggests that he was either foolhardy or careless. Joscelyn may have extended the boundaries of Edessa,⁷³

65. *ibid.*, p. 6.

66. *ibid.*, pp. 19 and 81.

67. *ibid.*, p. 47.

68. *ibid.*, p. 51.

69. *ibid.*, pp. 92-93.

70. *ibid.*, p. 92.

71. *ibid.*

72. Joscelyn was imprisoned from 1104 to 1108 and from 1122 to 1125. See *ibid.*, pp. 10 and 62.

73. *ibid.*, p. 93.

but he faced an enemy weakened by "perennial particularism",⁷⁴ and given the opportunities, the Christian achievements, let alone those of Joscelyn, were not substantial.

Joscelyn remains a shadowy figure with Nicholson's concentration upon his military exploits providing little analysis of conditions within Edessa, the principality he ruled, or of the Moslems he opposed. On the other hand, M.W. Baldwin uses successfully a less narrow approach in *Raymond III of Tripolis and the Fall of Jerusalem (1140-1187)*, published in 1936,⁷⁵ which aims

to explain the situation in the Levant during the years preceding the fall of Jerusalem ... by an analysis of the character Raymond ... and by an interpretation of his motives and actions, and those of his associates in a time of crises.⁷⁶

The work is not merely a biography but a study of the fortunes of the Latin Kingdom in the later twelfth century by focussing upon Raymond, a central character.⁷⁷

The background for Raymond's life which, for Baldwin, "exhibits both the merits and the short-comings of the native-born Syrian-Latin",⁷⁸

74. *ibid.*, p. 79.

75. This biography is a revision of the first part of a doctorate, suggested by D.C. Munro, who supervised the first draft at Princeton. M.W. Baldwin, *Raymond III of Tripolis and the Fall of Jerusalem, (1140-1187)*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1936, p. vii.

76. *ibid.*

77. Raymond of Tripoli, a descendant of Raymond of Toulouse, was related in his paternal and maternal lines to the kings, Baldwin III and Amalric I. As described by his contemporary, William of Tyre, he was of "swarthy complexion" with hair "straight and rather dark in colour". His appearance suggests his Greek and Armenian blood, but he was a *pullani* who did not lack either energy or ambition and according to William was abstemious and self-disciplined. William of Tyre *op.cit.*, Vol. II, Book XXI, Chapter v, p. 403.

is the "Medieval Christian civilization in the Levant".⁷⁹ Its study involves a critical analysis of sources presenting "not one set of villains but two, and a corresponding number of heroes",⁷⁹ each supporting a rival faction, one led by Guy of Lusignan, the other by Raymond.⁸⁰ Undoubtedly, Baldwin's choice of subject enables a

79. *ibid.*, p. 4.

80. *ibid.* Guy of Lusignan married the sister of the king, Baldwin IV, in 1180. After the deaths of Baldwin IV and his successor, Baldwin V, in 1185 and 1186, Guy's wife, Sibylla, succeeded to the throne and crowned Guy as king in the face of considerable opposition from Raymond and his followers. Although William of Tyre died about 1186, and failed to witness the outcome of this clash, his account of Sibylla's marriage to Guy and of the reaction of the baronage to him reveals the emergence of divisions within the Kingdom preoccupied with the question of a regent during the minority and periods of incapacity of the leprous Baldwin IV and for the child, Baldwin V. The basic problem is whether the faction under Raymond of Tripoli was seeking to uphold a constitutional principle or was intent upon defending its own position and power. William of Tyre, a supporter of Raymond, in referring to Miles of Plancy, a newcomer to the Kingdom, who exercised power during the minority of Baldwin IV, states that the baronage opposed him because "they were jealous of his power and could not brook the fact that they were ignored and never summoned, while he alone, with overweening presumption and scorn of others, was always at the side of the king ready to assist him". William of Tyre *op.cit.*, Vol. II, Book XXI, Chapter iii, p. 400.

This comment suggests an antagonism to one who came from outside the established baronage. On the death of Baldwin V, Sibylla as his *plus drait heir aparant* was entitled to the regency, which was questioned by Raymond and his supporters who, according to the writer of the *Chronicle of Reims*, "were exceeding envious of my Lord Guy" and claimed that "he was by no means worthy ... to be King". *Three Old French Chronicles of the Crusades, The History of the Holy War; The History of them that took Constantinople; The Chronicle of Reims*, E.N. Stone (trans.), The University of Washington, Seattle, 1939, Chapter V, p. 263.

broader view because of Raymond's importance and dominant role in the political life of the Latin Kingdom.

Influenced by this biographical approach, however, Baldwin stresses the actions of men rather than the failings of their institutions. Consequently, he believes that the explanation for the factional strife lies in "the personal motives of several influential men and women" rather than in a simple division between the native barons and newcomers to the Holy Land.⁸¹ By concentrating upon individual leaders and their follies, however, Baldwin overestimates the potential strength of the Kingdom in which, he claims,

there was still sufficient man-power, energy and knowledge of military strategy to withstand even a genius such as Saladin.⁸²

Nevertheless, the rapidity of Saladin's conquest after the Battle of Hattin in 1187⁸³ reveals the fundamental weaknesses of the Crusader States whose sanction had been military force.

81. *ibid.*, p. 21.

82. *ibid.*, p. 6.

83. After Saladin's victory at Hattin in July, his forces quickly captured Sidon, Beirut, Jaffa and Ascalon. Jerusalem, after a siege of less than a fortnight surrendered in October. Tyre was the only major city to withstand him and its defense was inspired by Conrad of Montferrat, who arrived from Constantinople during the siege. Imad Ad-Din, a Moslem contemporary, describes Saladin's triumphant advance as "accompanied by victory, escorted by glory" and makes clear the lack of Christian opposition. Imad Ad-Din, *Arab Historians of the Crusades*, F. Gabrielli (trans.), Translated from the Italian by E.J. Costello, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1969, pp. 146-147.

In considering the Christian disaster, Baldwin rejects the most serious charge against Raymond that he was a traitor, maintaining that "his chief concern ... was the Kingdom of Jerusalem".⁸⁴ On the evidence he provides, his case is not convincing; when the "court party" had triumphed, Raymond refused to be reconciled;⁸⁵ facing the threat of a Christian attack, he allied with Saladin in 1186, who Baldwin asserts was the "only person who could aid him".⁸⁶ Although it is conceded that "technically ... the count had committed an act of treason",⁸⁷ Baldwin rationalises that "others had done virtually the same thing under less extenuating circumstances".⁸⁸ The Kingdom had not faced, however, such a real and recognizable danger with a resurgent Islam under the leadership of Saladin. Although Baldwin seeks to justify Raymond's actions, he admits that

a knight of truly lofty character would somehow have contrived to bring less misfortune on his fellow Christians.⁸⁹

Despite Baldwin's special pleading, Raymond's actions indicate that he was not an idealist and that he contributed to the decline of effective government for personal ends.

84. Baldwin *op.cit.*, p. 17.

85. *ibid.*, p. 80. That is, the group which supported Guy and Sibylla.

86. *ibid.*, p. 83.

87. *ibid.*, p. 84.

88. *ibid.*, p. 85.

89. *ibid.*, p. 95.

Later crusading figures have not received the same attention in English as those of the twelfth century. This neglect suggests an interest in the earlier period when Christian success was greater by comparison with the thirteenth century. The only English biography deriving from the subject's career as a crusader in the later period is J.P. Donovan's *Pelagius and the Fifth Crusade*, published in 1950.⁹⁰ In contrast to prevailing, unfavourable interpretations,⁹¹ Donovan believes that Pelagius' reputation has suffered unjustifiably⁹² which probably accounts for the fact that

90. J.P. Donovan who was born in 1911, entered the Jesuits in 1931 and received his B.A. from Gonzago University, Spokane. J.P. Donovan, "The First Crusade as a Contributing Factor in the Growth of Secularism", M.A. thesis, George Town University, Washington, 1940, *Vita*, no pagination.
91. J.L. La Monte, *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1100 to 1291*, The Medieval Academy of America, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1932, p. 55, comments about the Fifth Crusade: Although King John was theoretically the commander-in-chief, divided councils and failure to cooperate, combined with the stubbornness of the papal legate Pelagius, cardinal of Albano, soon caused the crusade to fail utterly, and all the advantages won in 1219-20 were lost in 1221. Coulton considers that Pelagius "rashly prevented John from accepting terms of peace". G.G. Coulton, *Crusades, Commerce and Adventure*, Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, London, 1930, p. 165. Runciman, see below, Chapter XII, pp. 263-274, who was preparing his study of the crusades in the early 1950's, assesses Pelagius as "singularly lacking in tact" commenting: He had been already employed to settle the question of the Greek Churches in the Latin Empire of Constantinople, and had only succeeded in making them more passionately hostile to Rome. His coming to Damietta at once caused trouble. S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1965, 3 vols, Vol. III, *The Kingdom of Acre and the Later Crusades*, p. 155.
92. J.P. Donovan, *Pelagius and the Fifth Crusade*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1950, pp. 96-97.

John La Monte who supervised the study as a thesis, "did not always agree with the author".⁹³

The career of Pelagius who was created a papal legate in 1213, raises the vital issues of the legatine rôle and responsibilities on crusade in the East. Donovan is preoccupied, however, with justifying Pelagius and with exonerating him from the charges levelled against him. In dealing with the criticisms of Pelagius as a papal legate in Constantinople under the Latin Empire,⁹⁴ Donovan justifies his action of entering the city dressed in purple by claiming that "the legate was expected to wear the insignia of apostolic dignity".⁹⁵ Pelagius' expulsion of Greek clergy from their churches is explained as "one perhaps overzealous response to duty"⁹⁶ because he believed their "refused obedience" was "equivalent to rebellion".⁹⁷ Finally, Donovan claims that later

93. *ibid.*, Preface, no pagination.

94. The Latin Empire was established after the crusaders captured Constantinople in 1204. It survived under Latin Christian Emperors until 1261, when Constantinople was recaptured by Michael Palaeologus.

95. *ibid.*, p. 14. Traditionally, the wearing of purple was confined to the Byzantine emperors and to their immediate family who jealously guarded their right. Anna Comnena, for example, in her account of the Comneni coup by which Alexius became emperor in 1081, tells of Nicephorus III, in trying to reach a settlement, suggesting that he should
 enjoy with you [Alexius] the title, the acclamation,
 the right to wear the purple buskin and to live quietly
 in the palace. Anna Comnena *op.cit.*, Book II, p. 100.

96. Donovan *op.cit.*, p. 16.

97. *ibid.*, p. 18.

events indicate that "neither Pelagius nor anyone else could have united the Latins and Greeks in 1215",⁹⁸ but Pelagius' attempts still appear most inept.

A similar lack of critical assessment is apparent in the analysis of Pelagius' rôle in the Fifth Crusade from 1218 to 1221. Given Pelagius' position as a legate, one would expect an examination of his powers and responsibilities as well as papal intentions, but Donovan states simply that "the pope imposed ... the odious task of pacifier and disciplinarian for the crusaders".⁹⁹ In addition, the legate assumed military responsibilities which Donovan suggests were thrust upon him because

Pelagius, having seen the haphazard way in which the war was being fought, seemed to assume more authority, trusted less in King John's counsel, and became more active in maneuvers.¹⁰⁰

Pelagius' increased dominance of the venture, however, involves him in greater responsibility for its ultimate failure.

Although Donovan concedes some liability, he qualifies this concession by arguing that "the battles in Persia undoubtedly altered the course of the crusade".¹⁰¹ Nevertheless, this assertion

98. *ibid.*, p. 23.

99. *ibid.*, p. 44.

100. *ibid.*, p. 64.

101. *ibid.*, p. 73. Donovan sees the Mongol destruction of the Khwarizm shahs, rivals of Egypt, as allowing the Moslems to concentrate upon the defence of Egypt against the Christians.

does not explain Pelagius' own military blunders in his march on Cairo in 1221:¹⁰² his knowledge of of the terrain was inadequate; his forces lacked supplies; the Moslems were able to cut the crusaders' lines of communication to Damietta and to surround their forces.¹⁰³ Although Donovan claims that French historians, by blaming the Cardinal, have diverted attention "from a tarnish on the escutcheon of John de Brienne, the barons and *la belle France*",¹⁰⁴ Pelagius' contribution to the failure still remains.

102. Oliver of Paderborn who was a member of this Crusade and an ardent supporter of Pelagius, notes that even before the forces left Damietta, Pelagius "had an unwilling retinue" and that "the river overflowed at that time". Oliver of Paderborn, *The Capture of Damietta*, J.J. Gavigan (trans.), University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1948, Chapter xlvii, p. 64. Concerning Pelagius' plan, even Oliver concedes:
 King John, reflecting more deeply on the matter, wisely showed that the proposal so often proffered by the enemy ought to be accepted, rather than that the people of the faithful, being led forth on a longer march, should be exposed to chance accidents. *ibid.*, Chapter lxxi, p. 83.
103. See *ibid.*, Chapters lxxii-lxxv, pp. 83-87. Although Oliver's account presents the strategical and tactical blunders of the crusading forces under the leadership of Pelagius, he concludes, nevertheless, that
 the enormity of our evil deeds and the vast number of our crimes were compelling the vengeance of divine decision.
ibid., pp. 88-89.
104. Donovan *op.cit.*, p. 97. John of Brienne, a member of the lesser French aristocracy, was chosen as a husband for Maria, Queen of Jerusalem, whom he married in 1210. On her death after the birth of her daughter, Isabella, he became regent until her marriage to Frederick II. Although John's leadership had been disputed, he commanded the forces of the Fifth Crusade. After the arrival of Pelagius in 1218, tension further increased and John, receiving papal permission, left Egypt in 1220. Oliver of Paderborn's comment that John "feigned many reasons for excusing himself and promised a speedy return, but forgetful of the past, he turned to the future", expresses something of the tensions that had developed among the crusading leaders. Oliver of Paderborn *op.cit.*, Chapter xliii, p. 61.

It is possible that national pride may be involved in these other works, but Donovan, a Catholic, seems unnecessarily respectful of this member of the hierarchy.

Apart from Goodsell's account of Peter the Hermit, the works considered reveal that these biographers, by identifying so closely with their subjects, are too sympathetic and too reluctant to criticise. The majority owe much to the influence of Munro and La Monte who suggested the subjects or supervised the studies. They reveal a similarity of method and a preoccupation with analysing rather limited areas of the crusading period which is in keeping with their origins as doctoral dissertations. By concentrating upon the military activities of their subjects who were, with the exception of Pelagius, soldiers after all, they tend to reinforce the view of them as Western conquerors. In view of the interest of Munro and La Monte in crusading society and its institutions, the failure of these writers to consider these aspects is surprising but it suggests the extent to which these biographers are the victims of their own methods.

Chapter VIII

Military Historians of the Crusades

There have been few detailed studies in the English-speaking world on military aspects of the crusades and the Americans especially have not been involved in this subject. In most respects, the military history of the crusades is a facet of medieval warfare, but some issues arise which are peculiar to the crusades themselves. This present discussion is concerned only with those English historians who concentrate upon military aspects of the movement and with the ways in which this emphasis influences their assessments.

During the nineteenth century, German writers established an approach to military history generally and to military history of the crusades in particular. Historians, such as Martin Baltzer and Max Jähns, discussed the crusades as a part of medieval warfare in general accounts of European military history.¹ General Köhler, a retired Prussian artillery officer, and Otto Heermann examined the strategic and tactical aspects of crusading warfare, and their method of reconstructing battles prevailed for future studies of the subject.² These campaign-accounts serve a necessary function but fail to provide insight into the social, economic and political influences upon military decisions. This particular approach reflected interest in ascertaining universal principles of war³ than increasing

1. R.C. Smail, *Crusading Warfare (1097-1193)*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1967, [1956], pp. 3-4.

2. *ibid.*, pp. 4-7.

3. *ibid.*, p. 5.

understanding of the crusading movement.

This method of limiting military history to strategy and tactics appears in Sir Charles Oman's study, *A History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages*, first published in 1898. As Oman's discussion of the military aspects of the crusades is only part of a longer study, it will not be considered here. Nevertheless, it is the first detailed English analysis of the subject and remained the standard English authority for over fifty years. Oman's reconstruction of crusader battles in Latin Syria is based upon contemporary accounts⁴ and in analysing the strategic and tactical considerations that determined their outcome, he makes a major contribution to this subject.

During the period Oman was writing, Hans Delbrück's *Geschichte der Kriegskunst im Rahmen der politischen Geschichte* presented military history in a wider context.⁵ Delbrück's approach indicated the possibilities of future developments beyond the reconstruction of engagements on the field. R.C. Smail, a lecturer in history at the University of Cambridge, adopts this broader view of military events in his study, *Crusading Warfare (1097-1193)*.

4. C.W. Oman, *A History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages*, A.D. 378-1278, Burt Franklin, New York, 1924, [1898], 2 vols. See, for example, Vol. I, pp. 324-333, his account of the Battle of Hattin in 1187.

5. Smail *op.cit.*, p. 9.

At the outset, Smail indicates that he is attempting "to give due importance to the fact that warfare was an integral part of the whole life of Latin Syria".⁶ After surveying the work of earlier historians of crusading warfare, he indicates that "they have regarded battles as the principal, almost the only, aspect of warfare which requires investigation".⁷ Consequently, he concludes that they are "historians of tactics"⁸ and maintains that "beyond the actions of troops in battle, lie conditions and influences which determined these actions".⁹ Thus, Smail states clearly the proposed lines of his enquiry which distinguish it from earlier work.

Although Smail indicates a broad approach, he tends to view the crusaders more as soldiers than as pilgrims. This emphasis is apparent in his conclusion that the "one main issue" was "the existence of the Latin States"¹⁰ which, he believes, were ultimately destroyed mainly because the crusaders failed to hold "Syria from sea to desert".¹¹ Their failure to do so suggests, however, that military decisions were secondary at times to other considerations.¹²

In view of Smail's stated aims, his conclusions require some

6. *ibid.*, p. v.

7. *ibid.*, p. 11.

8. *ibid.*, p. 12.

9. *ibid.*, p. 16.

10. *ibid.*, p. 1.

11. *ibid.*, p. 19.

12. Jerusalem itself, the goal of the First Crusade, which, because of religious sentiment and tradition, became the capital of the Latin Kingdom, was located at its southern extremity. Other cities surpassed it in size, population and wealth and it lacked any commercial attractions. Economically and strategically, it was more of a liability than an asset.

re-assessment, though it must be admitted that the stress he lays upon the shortage of manpower¹³ does give internal consistency to his arguments.

A major part of Smail's study is concerned with the Moslem and Christian armies. He explains the initial military success of the crusaders as a consequence of the "political weakness of the Seljug empire".¹⁴ As a result, he stresses that the "Turkish armies ... were composite and without effective leadership".¹⁵ Internal divisions meant that Nureddin achieved "limited, piecemeal conquests" because he could rely only upon "his own military resources".¹⁶ By contrast, Saladin was "the ruler who summoned the army" and "commanded it in the field".¹⁷ Smail, therefore, regards the Moslem victory as following from the conjunction of political

13. *ibid.*, p. 93.

14. *ibid.*, p. 66. H.A.R. Gibb defines six separate groups who were in conflict with one another, the Fatimids, the Arabs, the Seljuk princes, the Seljuk amirs, the non Seljuk tribes and the general population. *The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades Extracted and Translated from the Chronicle of Ibn al-Qalanisi*, H.A.R. Gibb (trans.), Luzac and Company, Ltd, London, 1967, Introduction, pp. 14-15. The lack of a concerted response to meet the threat of the European invaders is clear in Ibn al-Qalanisi's account of the Moslem actions. See *ibid.*, pp. 41-49, especially p. 46, when he deals with the Moslem quarrel among themselves about possession of Jerusalem.

15. Smail *op.cit.*, p. 69.

16. *ibid.*, p. 70.

17. *ibid.* Nureddin succeeded his father, Zengi, at Aleppo in 1146, upon whose death his territory and possessions were divided. In the words of Ibn al-Qalanisi, "the armies of the Atabek dispersed like the bands of Saba". Ibn al-Qalanisi *op.cit.*, pp. 271-272.

and military institutions than inspiration from any abstract notion of *jihad*.¹⁸

As Smail views military history in its political setting, he carefully examines relationships between the Latins and the people they ruled. He concedes that the crusader way of life "changed in some externals", but rejects the French and by implication the imperialist view of the meeting of East and West with its assumptions about the rapid assimilation of the Franks.¹⁹ On the contrary, he believes they remained "a numerically small aristocracy" relying upon military force and ruling an unwilling people;²⁰ "Armenian disloyalty" indicates, for Smail, that even "they could not always be fully trusted";²¹ the "native Christians provided no firm basis for Latin rule"²² and "secret or overt hostility from their Moslem subjects was always a possibility".²³ Smail's assessment points out the implications for Frankish rule and stresses the military problems it faced.

18. Theoretically, there is no secular war in Islam but *jihad* or holy war based upon the exhortation of the Koran:

Fight against them until idolatry is
no more and Allah's religion reigns supreme.

The Koran, N.J. Dawood (trans.), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1968, p. 343. For a discussion of crusade and *jihad*, see J.L. La Monte, "Crusade and Jihad. The Religious Motivation in the Crusades and the Moslem Wars against the Latins in Syria in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries", *The Arab Heritage*, N.A. Faris (ed.), Russell and Russell Inc., New York, 1963, pp. 159-197, in which he presents the thesis that *jihad* was in the main a "cloak for political ends". *ibid.*, p. 197.

19. Smail *op.cit.*; pp. 43-45.

20. *ibid.*, p. 62.

21. *ibid.*, p. 48.

22. *ibid.*, p. 52.

23. *ibid.*, p. 55.

Apart from these difficulties, Smail analyses the military weaknesses of the crusaders. After their initial successes, Smail believes that the "problems of the Syrian Franks became more difficult";²⁴ he enumerates the reduction of their material resources by Moslem reconquests,²⁵ the payment of mercenaries,²⁶ and the increased importance of the Military Orders which "cost the feudal rulers full military command of their forces in the field".²⁷ Limited resources meant that "the co-existence of a strong field army and adequate garrisons was not possible".²⁸ This analysis sees military weaknesses as resulting in the Christian loss of Outremer but Smail indicates that their defeat in the field was not merely the consequence of strategic or tactical blunders.

This wider view of military history leads Smail to examine the effect of the Frankish position on their "ideas on the conduct of war".²⁹ Smail believes that since they were aware of their own

24. *ibid.*, p. 99.

25. *ibid.*, p. 101.

26. *ibid.*, p. 102.

27. *ibid.* Secularly and ecclesiastically, the Military Orders were independent within the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem and were answerable only to the papacy. At times, such as the siege of Ascalon in 1153 when the Templars refused to allow any one else through a breach in the walls so that the Christians lost the advantage, they acted quite independently and selfishly. William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, E.A. Babcock and A.C. Krey (trans), Columbia University Press, New York, 1943, 2 vols, Vol. II, Book XVII, Chapter xxvii, p. 227.

28. Smail *op.cit.*, p. 104.

29. *ibid.*, p.126.

limitations; they were not totally committed to waging unceasing war but instead,

the idea of limited warfare, and of achieving a military objective with an economy of effort, commended itself to the Franks.³⁰

In addition, Smail argues that they realized that the "rewards of victory in battle could be won by other means which did not involve the penalties of defeat".³¹ As Smail points out, their pitched battles "have already attracted a disproportionate amount of attention"³² and this is only one aspect of their total military history.

This approach is evident in Smail's analysis of the function of crusader castles. Smail rejects the argument that they were "mainly a means of defending a frontier".³³ He supports his contention by pointing out that the crusaders took over earlier fortifications which made no sense in relation to the frontiers of the Crusader States³⁴ and that the greatest density of castles was in the Haifa-Jaffa region "in the heart of the Latin Kingdom".³⁵ In addition, he notes that many were some distance from borders³⁶ and that those in strategic areas did not prevent movement of Moslem forces.³⁷ When the Franks advanced, castles were their offensive

30. *ibid.*, p. 135.

31. *ibid.*, p. 139.

32. *ibid.*, p. 165.

33. *ibid.*, p. 204.

34. *ibid.*, p. 215.

35. *ibid.*, p. 207.

36. *ibid.*, p. 206.

37. *ibid.*, p. 207.

weapons;³⁸ when they retreated, they were a place of refuge.³⁹

Beyond these military functions, the castles were "essential to the maintenance of Latin overlordship".⁴⁰ Smail concludes that they were "instruments of colonization and the extension of Latin dominion",⁴¹ an assessment which places them within the full context of Frankish society in the East.

Smail's study reveals some of the failings which he criticises in earlier military historians of the crusades. Although he broadens the discussion considerably and extends the implications of crusading warfare, he implicitly subordinates social, economic and political aspects to military considerations. Despite his declared wariness of tactical history, he still attributes considerable importance to the outcome of battles. Thus, Smail speaks more as an historian of campaigns than as a military historian when he states that "the fate of the kingdom of Jerusalem was decided by the defeat ... at Hattin".⁴² In one sense, this is undeniable but Saladin's victory in 1187 confirmed the already existing situation.

This discussion of the military aspects of crusade until 1193 indicates that Smail attempts to show that "war was a part, and an essential part, of the whole life of Latin Syria".⁴³ His assessment

38. *ibid.*, p. 209.

39. *ibid.*, p. 214.

40. *ibid.*, p. 208.

41. *ibid.*, p. 213.

42. *ibid.*, p. 16.

43. *ibid.*, p. 2.

indicates a swing away from the nineteenth-century pre-occupation with tactics and strategy to the position that military history both influences and is a product of human society. It cannot, therefore, be studied in isolation. However, even Smail's study with its broad military focus, has a tendency to reduce the crusades to "military conquest" and to "the acquisition of further territories".⁴⁴

The consideration of military history requires specialised knowledge and presupposes a certain attitude to history and a specific cultural background which develops such an interest. The Prussian domination of the subject suggests the importance of military considerations in their society, while Sir Charles Oman was the product of the later nineteenth-century English *Kriegsspiel* mentality.⁴⁵ The military history of the crusades has not attracted many English scholars and Smail's study stands as the only published monograph on the subject.

Some attention has been given to the crusader castles, which survive as tangible evidence of the Latin Kingdom. These are the subject of study by T.E. Lawrence. Originally, Lawrence's discussion was presented as a thesis, "The Influence of the Crusades on European Military Architecture to the End of the Twelfth Century",

44. *ibid.*, p. 23.

45. See A. Wilson, *War Gaming*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1968, pp. 15-20.

for his final examination in History at Oxford in 1910.⁴⁶ The work was published in 1936 in the general wave of studies which followed his accidental death in 1935.⁴⁷ This publication is more of a curiosity which, as an architectural study, has limited value for crusading historiography.

Lawrence's research reveals his originality and meticulous care as he travelled widely in Europe, Syria and Northern Palestine.⁴⁸ The condition that the thesis had to deal with some aspect of "The First Three Crusades, 1095-1193" partly determined his choice of subject.⁴⁹ It was not published after submission because of the cost of reproducing the illustrations and because Lawrence himself regarded the study as incomplete.⁵⁰ As Lawrence points out, too, it "must of necessity be minute and technical" and its appeal was, therefore, limited.⁵¹

The thesis was basically an attack on some of Charles Oman's conclusions. Lawrence intended to disprove Oman's assertion that the "Western builders were for many years timid copyists of the crusading architects"⁵² and that "the Crusaders copied ... the Greeks".⁵³ From a detailed examination of the architectural

46. T.E. Lawrence, *Crusader Castles*, Golden Cockerel Press, London, 1936, 2 vols, Vol. I, p. 3.

47. Entry, "Thomas Edward Lawrence", *Dictionary of National Biography, 1931-1940*, L.G. Wickham Legg (ed.), Oxford University Press, London, 1949, p.

48. Lawrence *op.cit.*, p. 3.

49. *ibid.*

50. *ibid.*, p. 4.

51. *ibid.*, p. 13.

52. *ibid.*

53. *ibid.*, p. 14.

features of European and crusader castles, Lawrence argues that

in the early state of the Latin Kingdom ... the castles erected in Syria were of a purely Western pattern.⁵⁴

The Military Orders who developed "rival styles" derived from Europe and from the Byzantine Empire, were responsible for later variations.⁵⁵ Unfortunately, Lawrence does not attempt to account for these variant developments as the study is concerned only with description and comparison of architectural details.

Many crusader castles have survived in a remarkable state of preservation. Modern developments in aerial and colour photography have been used to study them. In more recent times, publishers have sought to cater for a wide market with eye-catching and glossy publications. The most recent study of crusader castles by R. Fedden and J. Thomson, published in 1957, incorporates this approach. The text is short and there are few historical details while the accompanying photographs are numerous and impressive.

Fedden and Thomson describe their work as "a brief history of the military architecture of the Crusades" based largely upon an examination of the various castles.⁵⁶ In a short consideration of the castles' functions, they emphasize their defensive role in relation to border areas but do not claim that their purpose was

54. *ibid.*

55. *ibid.*, p. 14.

56. R. Fedden and J. Thomson, *Crusader Castles*, John Murray, London, 1957, p. 9.

the actual defence of a frontier.⁵⁷ When they extend the function of the castles beyond purely defensive considerations to "vital centres of business and administration",⁵⁸ Smail's influence is apparent. One minor original contribution is that Fedden and Thomson have discovered, probably from their field observations, that there are lines of intervisibility between many castles.⁵⁹ They do not, however, develop this aspect and their discussion is mainly a simplification of Smail's work.

Catering for a non-specialist reader influences the level of discussion and the style. An idealised picture of Frankish life in Outremer emerges with Fedden and Thomson claiming that "a process of assimilation set in from the moment the Franks arrived in the East".⁶⁰ Indeed, they argue that friendship was readily established between individual Latin Christians and the Moslems, citing as an example the alliance of Raymond III of Tripolis with Saladin in 1186.⁶¹ Though these instances occurred, Fedden and Thomson neglect that such political expediency did not affect the position of the

57. *ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

58. *ibid.*, p. 19.

59. *ibid.*, p. 12.

60. *ibid.*, p. 74.

61. *ibid.*, p. 77. Raymond allied with Saladin after he had opposed unsuccessfully Guy of Lusignan's coronation as king. It was a desperate measure to assist in maintaining his power and to receive military help in the event of a Christian attack upon him for his refusal to submit. *The Chronicle of Reims, Three Old French Chronicles of the Crusades, The History of the Holy War; The History of them that took Constantinople; The Chronicle of Reims*, E.N. Stone (trans.), University of Washington, Seattle, 1939, Books V-VI, pp. 262-264.

Franks as alien conquerors.⁶² The crusades were, for Fedden and Thomson, a "splendid and fantastic enterprise",⁶³ a view reinforced by their interpretation of Latin-Moslem relationships.

The descriptions of the castles concentrate upon those aspects designed to appeal to a general reader. There are many references to their atmosphere and imposing features with "finely wrought masonry in a wild landscape".⁶⁴ Such comments as "whole villages, dusty, throbbing with the cycle of copulation, birth, disease and death"⁶⁵ and "one expects the chink of armour, the sound of voices, but all is silence"⁶⁶ appeal to the emotions. This study of crusader castles is, therefore, more an exercise in popular writing than a serious contribution to the subject.

English assessments of military aspects of the crusades in specialised studies are relatively few. It is possible that the subject has not attracted a great deal of interest because it does not lend itself readily to general narrative as it requires a more analytic approach. Smail attempts to view crusading military history within its social, economic and political background. Nevertheless, his assessment reveals a tendency to regard the crusades largely as military undertakings and to ascribe an

62. For a discussion of this question, see above, Chapter VI, pp. 154-155.

63. Fedden and Thomson *op.cit.*, p. 117.

64. *ibid.*

65. *ibid.*, p. 13.

66. *ibid.*, p. 107.

unwarranted influence to the outcome of battles, except he does explain the military conditions and problems that enabled some particular battle to be so decisive. These failings are an occupational hazard of military historians and indicate the extent to which they fail to consider warfare in relation to more general historical problems of the crusades.