

The Image of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem in the Thirteenth Century

In: Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire. Tome 64 fasc. 4, 1986. Histoire - Geschiedenis. pp. 704-717.

Citer ce document / Cite this document :

Schein Sylvia. The Image of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem in the Thirteenth Century. In: Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire. Tome 64 fasc. 4, 1986. Histoire - Geschiedenis. pp. 704-717.

doi : 10.3406/rbph.1986.3558

http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/rbph_0035-0818_1986_num_64_4_3558

The Image of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem in the Thirteenth Century (*)

Sylvia SCHEIN

It is generally agreed among historians of the crusader kingdom that as its fortunes declined during the thirteenth century, it became increasingly criticized for its inadequacies ; this criticism, it is argued, culminated in Christendom's reaction to the fall of the kingdom in 1291 (1). However, a detailed analysis of this reaction as revealed in chronicles, treatises of the apologists as well as the *De recuperatione Terrae Sanctae* memoranda show surprisingly little adverse comments than those made about the crusader kingdom earlier in the thirteenth century ; it appears more mild and indulgent than one would assume.

The criticism levelled against the kingdom immediately after its fall can be summarily grouped under four headings : endless quarrels and dissensions among the various conflicting factions ; lack of leadership ; the attitude of the Franks towards the Moslem enemy ; finally, the moral conduct of the inhabitants of Outremer. Referring to the government of the kingdom our sources present it as a

(*) This study is partly based on my unpublished Ph. D. thesis : *The West and the Crusade Attitudes and Attempts, 1291-1312* (Cambridge, England, 1980).

(1) See e.g., S. RUNCIMAN, *A History of the Crusades*, Cambridge U.P. 1954 (1971 ed.), vol. III, pp. 414 ff. — G. B. FLAHIFF, "Deus Non Vult : A Critic of the Third Crusade", *Medieval Studies*, IV (1947), 169 n. 32. — E. STICKEL, *Der Fall von Akkon. Untersuchungen zum Abklingen des Kreuzzugsgedankens am Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts*, Frankfurt/M. 1975, *passim*. — J. PRAWER, *Histoire du royaume Latin de Jerusalem*, Paris 1970 (1975 ed.), vol. II, pp. 375 ff. *et passim*.

The following abbreviations will be used : *MGH.SS* for *Moumenta Germaniae historica... Scriptores* ; *RHGF* for *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France* ; *RIS* for *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* ; *RISNS* for *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores Nova Series* ; *RS* for *Rolls Series. Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores* ; *SRG* for *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum* ; *ROL* for *Revue de l'Orient Latin* ; *AOL* for *Archives de l'Orient Latin* ; *HL* for *Histoire Littéraire de la France* ; *RHC.HOcc* for *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades. Historiens Occidentaux* ; *PL* for *Patrologia Latina*.

state of permanent bickering and competition, a war of all against all ⁽²⁾, prominent among them the seven lords of the city : the Templars, the Hospitallers, the Teutonic Knight, the consul of the Pisans, the king of Cyprus, King Charles II of Sicily and the patriarch of Jerusalem. Those seven “disagreed not only about the government but even about the defence of the kingdom” ⁽³⁾. The number of discordant factions in Acre on the eve of its fall amounts in Giovanni Villani’s “Universal History”, written two generations or so after the event, to seventeen ⁽⁴⁾.

Among the ever warring factions the Military Orders and the Communes were particularly criticized. As recently shown by several studies the Military Orders, the Temple and the Hospital of Outremer were especially subject to criticism almost since their foundation ⁽⁵⁾. That criticism at the moment of the loss of Holy Land echoes accusations which were already prevailing : their constant quarrels and jealousies undermined the existence of the crusader state ⁽⁶⁾. And yet did the loss of the Holy Land intensify the existing hostility of public opinion ? Actually

(2) *Gesta Boemundi in Gesta Treverorum*, MGH.SS., XXVI, 475. — *Continuatio Weichardi de Polhaim*, MGH.SS, IX, 813. — *Petrus de Dusbergg Cronica Terre Prussie, Scriptorum Rerum Prussicarum*, ed. Th. HIRSCH et al., Leipzig 1861, I, 208 : *Causa destructionis hujus civitatis fuit duplex, prima diversitas dominorum, qui in defensione ipsius discordabant, secunda, quod cruce signati, quos dominus papa misit in subsidium, erant sine capite et rebelles et treugas continue infrangebant.* — *Eberhardi Archidiaconi Ratisponensis Annales*, MGH.SS, XVII, 594 — *Bernardus Guidonis, Flores Chronicorum*, RHGF, XXI, 709 : *Causa autem proditionis ejusdem fuisse fertur multitudo dominorum et diversitas nationum ibidem, quae faciebant contrarietatem voluntatum...* — *Franciscus Pipinus Chronicon*, RIS, IX, 734 : *causa proditionis fuisse multitudinem Dominorum et diversitatem Nationum ibidem, quae faciebant contrarietatem voluntatum.* — *Johannis Abbatis Victoriensis Liber Certarum Historiarum*, ed. F. SCHNEIDER, I, SRG, Hannover - Leipzig 1909, pp. 302-304. — *Ptolemaeus Lucensis, Annales*, RIS, XI, 1196 : *Una [causa] fuit diversitas voluntatum in dominis quia non simul concordabant in regimine sive defensione terrae. Erant autem ibidem VI vel VII Domini videlicet Templarii, Hospitalarii, Theutonici, Consul Pisanus, Rex Cypri, Rex Carolus, item Patriarcha. Propter hanc igitur diversitatem Soldanus invalescit ad expugnandum civitatem.* — *Joannis Elemosinae Liber Historiarum*, ed. G. GOLUBOVICH, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell' Oriente francescano*, II, Quaracchi 1913, p. 109 : *...Et cum christiani capud principale et ducem exercitus non haberent quia aliqui sequebantur Magistrum Templi et milites eius, alii Magistrum et milites Hospitalis, et alii alios capitaneos et principes, et sic unanimes non erant et in unum concordati...*

(3) See above, n. 2.

(4) Giovanni Villani, *Historia Universalis*, RIS, XIII, 337.

(5) J. RILEY-SMITH, *The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem and Cyprus 1050-1310*, London 1967, pp. 201-202, 385-389. — J. PRÄWER, “Military Orders and Crusader Politics in the Second half of the XIIIth Century”, *Die Geistlichen Ritterorden Europas*, ed. J. FLECKENSTEIN et M. HELLMANN, Sigmaringen 1980, pp. 217-229. — A. J. FOREY, “The Military Orders in the Crusading Proposals of the Late-Thirteenth and Early-Fourteenth Centuries”, *Traditio*, 36 (1980), 317-345.

(6) Weichard de Polhaim, p. 813. — *Eberhardi Archidiaconi Ratisponensis Annales*, p. 594. — *Chronicon Salisburgense*, ed. H. PEZ, *Scriptores Rerum Austriacarum*, I (1791) 390. — *Annales de Dunstaplia*, ed. H. R. LUARD, *Annales Monastici*, III, RS, London 1869, p. 336.

surprisingly few chroniclers put the blame for the calamity upon the Military Orders. If they became a subject of a public debate, this was the result, it seems, of the widely diffused encyclical, the *Dura nimis* of 18 August 1291, which put on the agenda to be discussed by provincial church councils to be convoked all over the Christendom, the formulation of measures for the recovery of the Holy Land and the union of the Hospital and the Temple (7). It is thus possible that it was the papal demand which in a roundabout way shifted the responsibility for the calamity on to the dissenting orders, a view easily assimilated into the local church councils' decisions (8). Thus : "It was the opinion of many that if the brothers of those Houses, that is of the Hospital, Temple and the Teutonic Knights, and the rest of the people had been in agreement, the city of Acre would not have been captured" (9).

The recommendations of the church councils were, it should be remarked, even more radical than those of the *De recuperatione Terrae Sanctae* treatises composed close to the loss of the Holy Land. Neither Fidenzio of Padua, who completed his treatise on the eve of the disaster (before January 1291) (10) nor Ramon Lull, who presented his *Tractatus de modo convertendi infideles seu Lo Passatge* early in 1292 to Pope Nicholas IV (who died on 4 April 1292), ever suggested the merger of the Military Orders (11). As far as the plans for the recovery of the Holy Land are concerned, this demand appeared for the first time in the treatise of Charles II of Anjou, completed during the papal interregnum following the death of Nicholas IV, between 4 April 1292 and 5 July 1294, the date of the election of Celestine V (12).

(7) *Les Registres de Nicholas IV*, ed. M. LANGLOIS, Paris 1886-91, no. 6793-9.

(8) *Chronicon Salisburgense*, p. 390 (for the council of Salzburg). — *Eberhardi Archidiaconi Ratisponensis Annales*, p. 594 (for the same council). — Weichard de Polhaim, p. 813 (also for the council of Salzburg). — *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. G. D. MANSI, XXIV, 1079 (the council of Milano). — *Councils and Synods with Other Documents relating to the English Church*, ed. F. M. POWICKE et C. R. CHENEY, Oxford 1964, II, pp. 1099, 1109, 1113 (the decisions of the council of Canterbury). — Bartholomew Cotton, *Historia Anglicana*, ed. H. R. LUARD, RS, London 1859, p. 913 (the council of Lyons) ; pp. 214-215 (council of Arles). — *Johannis de Thilrode Chronicon*, MGH.SS., XXV, 581 (council of Rheims).

(9) See above, n. 6.

(10) This is the most recent date mentioned in the treatise. See Fidentius de Padua, *Liber recuperationis Terrae Sanctae*, ed. G. GOLUBOVICH, *Biblioteca*, II, Quaracchi 1913, pp. 9, 25. A. S. ATIYA, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, London 1938, pp. 38, 43, 470, points out that the mention of the Hijra year narrows down the completion to the first three days of 1291, but he mistakenly assumes that it was written before the fall of Tripoli (1289). A. J. Forey refers mistakenly to the treatise as composed after the fall of Acre (A. J. FOREY, p. 318).

(11) Ramon Lull, *Tractatus de modo convertendi infidelis*, ed. J. RAMBAUD-BUHOT, *Beati Magistri R. Lulli Opera Latina*, III, Palma 1954, pp. 96 ff.

(12) Charles II de Anjou, "Le Conseil du Roi Charles", ed. G. I. BRATIANU, *Revue du sud-est Européen*, IXI (1942) 356. It is difficult to agree with Bratianu that Charles' *Conseil* was the first of the *De recuperatione Terrae Sanctae* treatises submitted to Pope Nicholas IV after the loss of the Holy Land. The plan was, it seems, stimulated by the papal request for

Moreover the accounts of the events in Acre during its last defence reflect no hostility to the Orders. On the contrary. Some of the members are even presented as achieving the palm of martyrdom. Thus Thadeo of Naples described the deaths of the Grand Master of the Temple, William of Beaujeu, the marshal of the Hospital, Matthew of Clermont, the defenders of the Templar Tower and the Teutonic Knights as “deaths for Christ”, glorious and meaning eternal life with Christ⁽¹³⁾. The Dominican Ricoldo of Monte Croce argued that God should have saved Acre at least for the sake of the Dominican brethren, the patriarch and the courageous Grand Master of the Temple, William of Beaujeu. “I Wonder” – he says – “seeing that once You wished to spare the entire city of Sodom, if therein were found ten just men, why could not ten just men to be found in Tripoli or Acre”⁽¹⁴⁾. William of Nangis, as well as the *Grandes Chroniques de France*, stressed the part of the Orders and especially of Matthew of Clermont and the Grand Master of the Hospital, John of Villiers, during the siege of Acre and declared that “the Templars and the Hospitallers fought vigorously” while the king, Henry II of Lusignan, deserted the city running away to Cyprus *laidement et vilainement*⁽¹⁵⁾.

The other severely criticized faction among the various factions in Acre were, as already stated, the Communes. The criticism directed against them after the fall of the city is familiar. Already the bishop of Acre, Jacques of Vitry (1216-1228) accused them of *invidia et avaritia* as well as endless wars and quarrels among themselves. They “more often join battle against one another than against the treacherous infidels and have more to do with trade and merchandise than with warring for Christ”. And again : “They would be very terrible to the Saracens if they would cease from their jealousy and avarice, and would not continually fight and quarrel one with another”⁽¹⁶⁾. The accusations of Jacques of Vitry were repeated

advice in August 1291 but was finished only after Nicholas’ death, during the papal interregnum as it includes the following : *Item conseille li dis roys... que quant pape sera quil ordenast concile general (ibid., pp. 360-361)*. It follows thus that a part of the treatise at least, was written during the papal interregnum, i.e., between 4 April 1292-5 July 1294, and not, as Bratianu assumed, between August 1291 and 4 April 1292. Cf. BRATIANU in his introduction to Charles II’s *Conseil, loc. cit.*, pp. 293-297. J. FOREY, p. 327 follows Bratianu’s dating of the treatise as written “about the year 1291”.

(13) Thaddeus Neapolitanus, *Hystoria de desolacione et conculcacione civitatis Acconensis et tocius Terre Sancte in A.D. MCCXCI*, ed. P. RIANT, Geneve 1873, pp. 18-25.

(14) Ricoldo da Monte Croce, *Epistolae V Commentariae de perditione Acconis 1291*, ed. R. RÖHRICHT, *AOL*, II (1884) 264-271, 285.

(15) Guillelmus de Nangiaco, *Chronicon, RHGF*, XX, 573. – *Les Grandes Chroniques de France*, ed. J. VIARD, Paris 1834, vol. VIII, pp. 140-144. For the bravery of the Templars who allegedly held on in their Tower for twelve days after the city’s fall see *Chronicon Sampetrinum*, ed. B. STUBEL, *Geschichtsquellen der Provinz Sachsen*, I, Halle 1870, p. 127. For the criticism of King Henry II of Lusignan see also Thaddeus Neapolitanus, p. 26.

(16) *Jacobi de Vitriaco Historia Orientalis*, ed. F. MOSCHUS, Douai 1597, cap. LXXIV, p. 136.

years later by the German pilgrim Ludolph of Sudheim (1336-1341), who argued that "she [Acre] was inhabited by Pisans, Genoese, Lombards, and it was due to their accursed discords that the city was destroyed..." (17).

A different type of criticism of the Communes was that voiced on the eve of the fall of Acre by Fidenzio of Padua who described their members as the "bad Christians" who sell to the Saracens proscribed war materials like, for example, timber and iron. He also referred to the constant discords between the Venetians, Genoese and Pisans and between them and the Crown whom they refused to obey (18). After the loss of the Holy Land the chroniclers continued to repeat their accusations of selfishness, avarice and lack of crusader zeal (19). The fatal role the Communes played in the history of the crusader kingdom was, however, fully understood only by crusade-planners like Charles II of Anjou and later Pierre Dubois (ca. 1306-8), who declared that once the Holy Land was recovered and a new kingdom founded, the Communes and their commerce should be controlled by the Crown (20).

The disaster was sometimes explained in a more general way by the failure or lack of leadership (21). This was already voiced by William of Tyre in the third quarter of the twelfth century as the main cause of the misfortunes of the kingdom (22). During the thirteenth century similar opinions were expressed by historians, chroniclers, troubadours and papal advisers alike. Jacques of Vitry described Acre in a letter written in 1217 as "a monster or a beast with nine heads each one at odds with the other" (23). Many looked back with nostalgia to the assumed glorious age of rulers like Godfrey of Bouillon and his immediate successors; in the 1250s, for example, the French poet Rutebeuf emphasized the necessity of a powerful ruler exclaiming: "Ah Antioch, Holy Land! What a lamentable state you are in when you

(17) *Ludolphi Rectoris Ecclesiae Parochialis in Suchem De Itinere Terre Sanctae*, ed. F. DEYCKS, Stuttgart 1851, p. 41. See also *ibid.*, 42.

(18) Fidentius de Padua pp. 13, 15.

(19) Thaddeus Neapolitanus, pp. 27-28, 38-39 accuses the Communes of "avaritia et cupiditas". He also seems to refer to them when dealing with the "mali Christiani" namely, those from the kingdom who traded with the Saracen enemy (*ibid.*, pp. 37-38). See also Bartholomaeus de Neocastro, *Historia Sicula*, RISNS, XIII³, 132.

(20) Charles II of Anjou, p. 360. — Pierre Dubois, *De recuperatione Terre Sancte*, ed. A. DIOTTI, Florence 1977, p. 158. I deal with this subject in "The Future *Regnum Hierusalem*. A chapter in Medieval State Planning", *Journal of Medieval History*, 10 (1984), 95-105. On the Communes, see my "From *milites Christi* to *mali christiani*. The Italian Communes in Western Historical Literature", *The Italian Communes in the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem*, ed. B. Z. KEDAR, Genoa (forthcoming).

(21) See above, n. 2-4.

(22) Willelmus Tyrensis, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*, ed. R. B. C. HUYGENS, CCCM, LXIII, Brepols 1986, l. XXIII, praefatio, pp. 1061-1062.

(23) *Lettres de Jacques de Vitry*, ed. R. B. C. HUYGENS, Leiden 1960, p. 83. For the date of the letter, see *ibid.*, pp. 52-53.

have no more Godfreys !” (24). And on the eve of Acre’s fall of Fidentio of Padua stressed the national divisions between the Franks : “Dissent hurt strongly the Christian inhabitants of the Holy Land. Among the few Christian inhabitants of the Holy Land there was no love nor charity, but a great discord was ever rife” (25). In his opinion the inhabitants of the crusader state lacked leaders whom they would obey and follow. This was due to the fact that “the Venetians, Genoese, Pisans, the Templars, Hospitallers as well as the barons did not obey and refused to obey the king of Jerusalem”. Thus a Sultan could allegedly declare that whereas he was a serpent with a single head whose tails followed, they were like a serpent with many heads and scarcely a tail to follow them. Because of this state of affairs, the kingdom was in a constant state of war of all against all : “the Venetians, Genoese and Pisans fought each other and all of them together quarrelled with the king. The confraternities of the *Suriani* fought each other. Neither was there charity between the Military Orders. The barons frequently disagreed among themselves. Whereas one city was at peace with the Sultan, others were at war. When one of the Military Orders was signing a truce with the infidels the others [Orders] started war on them” (26).

The internal strife and disputes which troubled Acre on the eve of the Moslem siege were occasionally linked to the attitude of the inhabitants of Outremer to their Moslem neighbours. It was this issue that caused yet another dissension in the kingdom, that between the Franks and the Italian crusaders dispatched by Pope Nicholas IV to the aid of the crusader kingdom, in 1290 (27). According to one of the most prominent Dominican historians at the turn of the century, Bernard Gui, the loss of the Holy Land was caused by three factors : “the multitude of lordships, national divergencies and the provocation of the Sultan by the fools (*futuores*) sent by Nicolas IV” (28). William of Nangis, “Keeper of the Records” of the French Crown, who wrote the official version of the history of France for the years 1285-1300, argued that the disaster was a direct outcome of the conduct of the Italian crusaders who, against the advice of the Templars and the Hospitallers,

(24) Rutebeuf, *La Complainte d’Outre-mer*, ed. E. FARAL-J. BASTIN, *Onze Poèmes de Rutebeuf*, Paris 1946, p. 63.

(25) Fidentius de Padua, p. 15.

(26) *Ibid.*, pp. 13-16, 60.

(27) Ptolemaeus Lucensis p. 1196 : *Secunda [causa] fuit stultitia cruce signatorum. Nicolaus enim Papa post perditionem Tripolitanum fecit praedicari Crucem per regiones et subito transeunt sine capite in Achon.* — Bartholomaeus de Neocastro, p. 132 : *Jam oriuntur in urbe dissidia ; Pisanus quidem populus et adstantes Veneti religiosorum non patiebantur imperia. Crucesignati tui, dum crederemus pro victoria crucis animas tradere, Baccho vacant ; et cum turba ad arma populum excitaret, illi, circa mollia dediti, Marte postpositio, ab amplexibus Veneris pectus et brachia non solvebant.*

(28) Bernard Guidonis, *Flores Chronicorum*, p. 709.

provoked the Moslems to attack Acre⁽²⁹⁾. The German priest of the Teutonic Order, Petrus of Dusberg, described the same crusaders as “without a leader, rebellious and who continuously broke truces”⁽³⁰⁾ whereas the Italian Dominican, Franciscus Pipinus goes as far as to call them – pseudo-Christians⁽³¹⁾.

The conflict between the Italian crusaders and the Franks was one of many others of this kind that characterised the history of the kingdom since the Second Crusade. Its bearing, however, was far more serious than a rather trifling event in the market place of Acre. The underlying problem was that of the attitude to the Moslems, a problem which caused, almost throughout the existence of the kingdom, a constant tension between the Syrian Franks and newly arrived crusaders. Whenever a crusading host was present in the kingdom, conflicts arose between it and the Franks of Outremer regarding the policies to be pursued towards the Moslems ; whereas on the whole the Franks were inclined to truces, the newly arrived crusaders, eager to fulfill their vows, preferred warfare. This policy of the Franks was seen by some of the Europeans as a cause of the failure of the Second Crusade and even the fall of Jerusalem in 1187⁽³²⁾. In the case of the conflict between the belligerent Italian crusaders and the local Franks on the eve of the fall of Acre, however, contemporary chroniclers outspokenly supported the latter. This did not prevent them from blaming the Franks for a policy of tolerance or appeasement towards the infidels. The Franks were even accused of cooperation, connivance and betrayal. They concluded truces with the infidels, traded with them and trusted their promises⁽³³⁾.

Such accusations, as already remarked, were hardly new. They were expressed in an extreme form, at the time of the crusade of Frederick II (1228-1229), in the harsh verses of Freidank, who accompanied the emperor to the Holy Land. The local Franks, Freidank argued, cared more for the infidels than for crusaders coming to their aid from the West ; they mourned more a donkey’s death than that of an army of hundred thousand men ; nay, they hated the Germans so much that they would

(29) Guillelmus de Nangiaco, pp. 572-573 : *Mille quingenti stipendiarii in Terrae Sanctae subsidium a papa Nicolao in Acon missi, contra voluntatem Templi et Hospitalis militia armati de Acon exeuntes trebas cum soldans initas irrumptunt, et versus casalia et Sarracenorum oppida incursantes absque misericordia Sarracenos utriusque sexus quos reperiunt occiderunt, qui pacifice sub trebis initis quiescere se credebant*. See also the French version of William of Nangis’ chronicle : *Les Grandes Chroniques de France*, p. 139.

(30) See cited above n. 2.

(31) Franciscus Pipinus, p. 733. Such criticism of crusaders was current during the thirteenth century. See P. A. THROOP, *Criticism of the Crusade. A Study of Public Opinion and Crusade Propaganda*, Amsterdam 1944, pp. 97-100 *et passim*.

(32) R. GROUSSET, *Histoire des Croisades*, II, Paris 1935, pp. 264-268. FLAHIFF, pp. 165, n. 14, 170 n. 35. A. J. FOREY, “The failure of the siege of Damascus in 1148”, *Journal of Medieval History*, 10 (1984) 13-23.

(33) *Chronicon Estense, RIS, XV, 50*. – Johannes Victoriensis, pp. 302-303.

hand over the Holy Land to the infidels rather than to the Germans⁽³⁴⁾. Freidank's contemporary, the bishop of Acre, Jacques of Vitry, described the Franks' "as brought up in luxury, soft and effeminate, more used to baths than battles... they make treaties with Saracens and are glad to be at peace with Christ's enemies... and often call upon the enemies of faith to help them against Christians"⁽³⁵⁾. Fidenzio of Padua, who served for sometime (since 1266) as the Franciscan Provincial Vicar of the Holy Land, almost paraphrased Jacques of Vitry saying that the Franks are effeminate and indifferent fools with little inclination for fighting. It is he who attributes to Sultan Qualawun the declaration made following his conquest of Tripoli (26 April 1289): "Oh Christians! You are stupid and impudent fools; you neither know how to fight, nor to make peace, not even do you know when to fight!"⁽³⁶⁾.

Other contemporaries of the tragic end of Outremer saw it as the direct result of the moral conduct of the Franks. Consequently they presented the fall of the kingdom as God's punishment of its sinful inhabitants⁽³⁷⁾. This explanation, expressed in the traditional phrase *peccatis exigentibus*⁽³⁸⁾, was based upon what was during the thirteenth century one of the current images of Acre – the city of sinners, a den of vice. Already Jacques of Vitry described (1217) Acre as a contemporary Babylon⁽³⁹⁾. He attacked the *pullani* who did not seem to consider fornication as a deadly sin and described them as "delicate, nourished as children and utterly devoted to carnal pleasures". The Latin clergy and the monks who rented their houses to prostitutes he accused of corrupting by their ruinous example the entire population of the city of Acre. The inhabitants of the city in general, he found guilty of arrogance, greed, luxury as well as frivolous ways of life⁽⁴⁰⁾.

This type of accusation had first been directed against the crusader kingdom by Gerhoh of Reichersberg (ca. 1161-2), following the failure of the Second Crusade, and became a recurrent motive both in the official ecclesiastical propaganda for the reform of the church, and in the apologetics of the crusades. Greed became with Gerhoh one of the favourite themes in Europe's criticism of the Franks of Outremer.

(34) Freidank, *Von Ackers*, trans. K. PANNIER, *Freidanks Bescheidenheit*, Leipzig 1878, pp. 125-131.

(35) Jacobus de Vitriaco *Historia*, cap. LXXIII, pp. 133-134.

(36) Fidentius de Padua, pp. 14-15. Fidenzio's description of the vices of the Franks as fighters was, it should be pointed out, somehow inconsistent with his description of the battles of which he was an eyewitness in the kingdom. While referring to the fall of Safed and Antioch he eulogized Christian warfare. See *ibid.*, pp. 14-15, 24-25, 26-27.

(37) See below, n. 49-53.

(38) For this explanation see also FLAHIFF, p. 169 and n. 31; PRAWER, *Histoire*, II, 11-19; STICKEL, pp. 190-211.

(39) *Lettres de Jacques de Vitry*, pp. 83-88, esp. pp. 86-88. For the date of the letter, see *ibid.*, pp. 52-53.

(40) *Ibid.*, pp. 86-88. – *Idem*, *Historia*, cap. LXVIII-LXXIII, pp. 124-136. For much the same accusations as well as those of treachery and faithlessness see Freidank cited above n. 34.

It was greed alone, in Gerhoh's opinion, which prompted the Franks to call upon the West for assistance ; what they actually desired was not peace but money in the form of offerings from crusaders or bribes from the hard-pressed besieged Moslems (41).

Greed was sometimes linked to luxury. Thus, the English theologian, Ralph Niger, was appalled by the display of riches of the delegation headed by Patriarch Heraclius, dispatched to the West in 1184 to beg aid of men and money for the crusader kingdom. He complained that the jingling of the patriarch's gold and silver prevented people from hearing his words, and that the perfumes he was wearing caused everybody who met him dizzines. "No patriarch of the West", he concluded "would appear in such splendour" (42). After the kingdom's fall (1187) Ralph Niger, writing between 1187/8-1190, claimed that "because of the sins of the Holy Land it was handed over to their enemies. And no wonder as this land was more dissolute than others ; there was no reverence for God and in luxury... it surpassed all the other lands" (43). Among the vices he attributed to the Franks was also gambling with the hatreds and quarrels it engenders (44). At the same time Patriarch Heraclius was accused that because of his greed and avarice he abandoned thousands of the poor captives of Jerusalem to Saracen servitude instead of ransoming them (45).

An even more severe criticism was that voiced by Caesarius of Heisterbach. In his *Dialogus Miraculorum*, composed between 1219-1223, which became one of the most influential and famous treatises of its kind in the middle ages, he refers to the inhabitants of the crusader kingdom, saying that "they were all dedicated to the extravagances of gluttony and carnal pleasures and hardly different from beasts. Pride was ruling them so that they hardly knew how to invent the ways in which their clothes should be cut, sewn and worn" (46).

(41) *Gerhohi Praepositi Reichersbergensis Libelli de Investigatione Antichristi*, MGM. *Libelli de lite*, III, 377-378. — PRAWER, *Histoire*, I, 391-392 ; G. CONSTABLE, "The Second Crusade as seen by Contemporaries", *Traditio*, IX (1953), 268, 273-274.

(42) Radulphus Niger, *De re militari et triplici via peregrinationis Jerosolimitane*, ed. L. SCHMUGGE, Berlin 1977, pp. 186-187, 193-194. — FLAHIFF, pp. 179, 181.

(43) *Ibid.*, p. 186.

(44) *Ibid.*, p. 220 : *Sed et alearum et scaccorum et deciorum variis illusionibus vehementissime studium applicant, et pro modica stipe interdum iras et rixas suscitant. Unde et odia pupulent et alia nonnumquam fiant non minus enormia quam nociva. Et hec quidem in Palestina aliis aliquibus studiis celebriora fuerant, ut forte eorum culpa cum aliis peccatis eius exigentibus fuerit captivata !* See also *ibid.*, pp. 219-220 and n. 1 ; FLAHIFF, p. 169 and n. 32.

(45) *De expugnatione Terrae Sanctae libellus*, ed. J. STEVENSON, RS, London 1875, pp. 246-250. — GROUSSET, *Histoire*, II, 812-814. Cf. B. Z. KEDAR, "The Patriarch Eraclius", *Outremer. Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem*, ed. B. Z. KEDAR et al., Jerusalem 1981, pp. 200-202. For this sort of criticism of the Franks following the fall of the Latin Kingdom in 1187 see also E. SIBERRY, *Criticism of Crusading 1095-1274*, Oxford 1985, pp. 83-84.

(46) *Caesarii Heisterbacensis Monachi Ordinis Cisterciensis Dialogus Miraculorum*, ed. J. STRANGE, I, Cologne 1851, p. 187 : *omnes gulae et carnis illecebris dediti erant, ut nihil*

During the thirteenth century this type of criticism of the Franks became increasingly focused on their capital, Acre. The unattractive image of the city as it appears in Jacques of Vitry's writings⁽⁴⁷⁾ is echoed by others who visited the city. His contemporary Freidank refers to Acre as a "faithless and heartless city"⁽⁴⁸⁾. Joinville, who stayed in Acre with King Louis IX (1250-1254), quotes the papal legate Odo of Châteauroux as saying that "no one knows as well as I do of all the mean and treacherous sins committed in Acre. That is why God will have to exact such vengeance for them that Acre should be washed clean in the blood of its inhabitants and other people come to live there in their place"⁽⁴⁹⁾.

Both Burchard of Mount Sion and Fidenzio of Padua present Acre as a sort of a dumping ground for turbulent and criminal elements from the West. The Dominican Burchard wrote a decade before the fall of Acre (in 1280-1283) and he draws a sorry picture: "When someone was a malefactor, such as a murderer, a robber, a thief or an adulterer, he used to cross the sea, either as a penitent, or else because he feared for his skin and therefore did not dare to stay in his own country; and so they come here [to Acre] from all parts, such as Germany, Italy, France, England, Spain, Hungary and other parts of the world. And while they changed the sky above them, they did not change their minds. Once there [in the Holy Land], after they had spent what they had brought with them, they had to acquire new [funds] and, so, they returned to their vomit, doing the worse of the worst. They lodged pilgrims of their nation. The latter, who did not know to take care of themselves, trusted their hosts, and thus lost their goods and honour. And so they bred sons who imitated the crimes of their fathers and from bad parents descend worse sons, and from them the worst grandchildren who tread upon the holy places with polluted feet. Therefore, because of the sins of its inhabitants against God, this land [the Holy Land]... is brought into contempt"⁽⁵⁰⁾. Fidenzio of Padua wrote a few years later, on the eve of the fall that "to the Holy Land and especially to Acre come and assemble there, many Christians from almost all countries under the sky, who do not consider [the Holy Land] as their *patria* and do not defend it as they should; they are mainly adventurers who speak different languages and live by

omnino a pecoribus differrent. Superbia vero sic in eis regnavit, ut excogitare non sufficerent, quali modo vestimenta sua inciderent, stringerent atque cultellarent.

(47) See above, n. 23, 35.

(48) See above, n. 34.

(49) Jean de Joinville, *Histoire de saint Louis*, ed. J. NATALIS de WAILLY, Paris 1868, p. 219.

(50) Burchardus de Monte Sion, *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae*, ed. J. C. M. LAURENT, *Peregrinatores medii aevi quatuor*, Leipzig 1864, pp. 86-88. — A. GRABOIS, "Christian Pilgrims in the Thirteenth Century and the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem: Burchard of Mount Sion", *Outremer*, pp. 285-296.

different customs and ways of life... Those who stayed and pretended to do great deeds in the Holy Land, do little or nothing... but indulge in carnal pleasures" (⁵¹).

The fact that the kingdom became in the thirteenth century a sort of penal colony evolved from the practice, employed already since the twelfth century, of commutation of certain ecclesiastical penances upon taking a vow of the crusade. These crimes included violence against clerics, sorcery, assisting the Saracen cause, breaking into churches and robbery (⁵²). This practice was enthusiastically supported by Bernard of Clairvaux who wrote to the English on the eve of the Second Crusade, in 1146, that : "He is not trying to bring you down but to raise you up. What is it but a unique and wonderful act of divine generosity when the Almighty God treads murderers, thieves, adulterers, perjurers, and criminals of all kinds as though they were men of righteousness and worthy to be called to his service. Do not hesitate" (⁵³). As a result the kingdom came to be used by secular authorities of the West, especially in the thirteenth century, as a dumping ground for undesirables, for turbulent and criminal elements. This policy of exiling criminals to the Holy Land, condemned by public opinion already during the twelfth century, was at the beginning of the thirteenth century severely criticized by Jacques of Vitry who protested vigorously against the use of the Holy Land as a penal colony : "no race of men and no plague has greater power to hurt [the Holy Land] than criminal and pestilent men, wicked and impious, sacrilegious, thieves and robbers, homicides, parricides, perjurers, adulterers, and traitors, corsairs — that is, pirates, whoremongers, drunkards, minstrels, dice-players, mimes and actors, apostate monks, nuns that are common harlots, and women who left their husbands to live in brothels, or men who have run away from their true wives and taken others in their stead. Wicked people such as these in the West crossed the Mediterranean Sea and took refuge in the Holy Land, where, as they had only changed the sky above their heads and not their character, they defiled it by numberless crimes and shameful deeds..." (⁵⁴).

(51) Fidentius de Padua, pp. 13-14. H. PRUTZ, *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge*, Berlin 1883, pp. 108-122, 522-527. For Outremer as hybrid of people, languages and manners after the Third Crusade see Rostangnus of Cluny, *PL*, CCIX, col. 907 : *Itaque sciendum est quod plebs Hierosolymis dimissa, ex diversis collecta, genere linguarum, diversis moribus et vita dissimiles... Ideoque alter alteri fidem non habebat, sed alter alteri detrahebat. Et Sancta sanctorum sibi a De commissa, obliti beneficiorum Dei, luxuriose vivendo, indigne tractabant, rapinis et furtis inhiantes. Peregrinos vero... dolosificabant*. William of Newburgh, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, I, ed. R. HOWLETT, *RS*, London 1884, p. 254.

(52) M. PURCELL, *Papal Crusading Policy 1244-1291*, Leiden 1975, pp. 114-118. — THROOP, pp. 95-100.

(53) *S. Bernardi Abbatis Clarae-Vallensis Epistolae*, *PL*, CLXXII, epistola CCCLXIII, col. 566. — H. E. MAYER, *The Crusades*, Oxford 1972, pp. 99-100.

(54) Jacobus de Vitriaco *Historia*, cap. LXXXIII, pp. 162-163. This description was copied almost verbatim by Marino Sanudo, *Liber Secretorum Fidelium Crucis*, ed. J. BONGARS, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, II, Hannau 1611, 1.III, p. VIII, cap. V, pp. 186-187. For twelfth century see the criticism of Radulphus Niger in FLAHIFF, pp. 181 and n. 33.

Later during the first years of Gregory X's pontificate, this practice was condemned by Gilbert of Tournay, author of the famous *Collectio de Scandalis Ecclesiae* who complained against the practice of forcing sinners to take the cross as a means of penance⁽⁵⁵⁾.

After 1291, when the strange prophecy of Odo of Châteauroux quoted by Joinville had been partly fulfilled and "the city has certainly been well washed in the blood of its inhabitants"⁽⁵⁶⁾, the already current image of Acre was picked up by chroniclers who wrote after the great calamity. Some of them blamed the doom on the sinful behaviour of Acre. So the Franciscan John of Winterthur, who accused the Franks of arrogance: "It is said that the inhabitants of that city [of Acre] and especially their leaders provoked the wrath of God by their sins"⁽⁵⁷⁾. For the anonymous author of the history of the archbishops of Trier, the city of Acre was another Sodom: "great pride and unlimited greed were the causes of the loss of the Holy Land". The city was "overflowing with people, treasures, arms and armed men as well as riches and delights of the world". However Satan dwelled among its inhabitants, ruled them, caused discords among them and compelled them to sin. Concluding his account of the fall of Acre he comments that "if the inhabitants of the city had followed God, they would have lived there peacefully for ever"⁽⁵⁸⁾. The same opinion is pressed by the *Grandes Chroniques de France* which comment that "Acre, the city which was the succour and the aid of Christianity in the parts of Outremer was destroyed by the enemies of the faith *par leurs pechiez*"⁽⁵⁹⁾. Also Thadeo of Naples, who, like other apologists, tried not only to explain but also to justify the catastrophe, accuses Acre, "a great and beautiful city", of such sins as jealousy, ambition, avarice and lust; its fall was therefore, in his opinion, "God's just judgement"⁽⁶⁰⁾. Some forty years later Villani described Acre as a "flourishing emporium, unfortunately full of sinners"... He remarked also that "it is not a secret that it was the judgement of God that brought about this disaster"⁽⁶¹⁾.

This negative image of Acre was, however, not the only one current before the fall of the city. Another image, a positive one also existed. Thus, Innocent IV addressed

(55) THROOP, p. 95.

(56) Above n. 49.

(57) *Die Chronik Johannis von Winterthur*, ed. F. BAETHGEN, *MGH.SRG*, Berlin 1924, p. 42.

(58) *Gesta Boemundi*, pp. 474-475. For the sin of "luxuria", see *Annales de Dunstaplia*, p. 366: *praecipue propter vitium luxuria quod ibidem regnaverat in confusionem et in mortem tradidit illos Deus*.

(59) *Les Grandes Chroniques*, pp. 143-144. For the sins of arrogance, lust and pride, see also *Chronicon Walteri de Hemingburgh*, *MGH.SS*, XXVIII, p. 635.

(60) Thaddeus Neapolitanus, pp. 50-53.

(61) Giovanni Villani, pp. 456, 471-474.

(17 July 1247) its inhabitants as a “celestial plantation on earth” (62). Later the image evolved of Acre of an asylum, a *refugium*. William of Tripoli, for example, writing ca. 1270-1273, referred to Acre as a place of refuge for Christendom (63). Following the fall of the city this already current image was picked up by papal propaganda and thus perhaps transmitted to the chroniclers. In the widely diffused encyclical *Dirum amaritudinis calicem* (13 August 1291), which announced the fall of Acre, Pope Nicholas IV presented the city as the “most important and principal place of refuge which Christendom had” (64). Whereas he described it as a *refugium* of Christendom the chroniclers, perhaps more appropriately, described Acre as the place of refuge for Christendom overseas (*la crestiente en ycelles parties d'oultre mer*) (65). For the English chronicler of the Cistercian abbey of Waverley, Acre resembled Jerusalem. Both were a place of refuge : Jerusalem of proselytes and Jews ; Acre of all the Catholic nations (66). Half a century later Ludolph of Sudheim still saw crusader Acre as “flos, caput et decor omnium civitatum orientalium” (67).

It follows thus that Europe conceived in the second half of the twelfth century and during the thirteenth century a basically negative image of the crusader kingdom. This can be explained by the need to explain as well as justify the failure of the crusades sent to its aid, as well as the territorial losses which the kingdom suffered. It can be perhaps explained also by the alienation between the Europeans and the Franks. The latter, living in the Levant, were to some extent influenced by Oriental habits and became thus victims of the Europeans' *xenofobia*. At least part of their criticism of the Franks was in fact criticism of the Oriental habits and customs which they adopted as part of their daily life. This was the case, for example, of the delegation of Heraclius. Its members were criticized because they had adopted from the East items of adornment and personal hygiene, like the use of perfume (68).

The loss of the Holy Land did not increase the volume of criticism. On the contrary, it seems that the image of the kingdom became, when it was lost to the

(62) *Les registres d'Innocent IV*, ed. E. BERGER, Paris 1884-1919, no. 4050. — R. RÖHRICHT, “Der Untergang des Königreichs Jerusalem” *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung*, XV (1894) 21-22.

(63) William of Tripoli, *Tractatus de Statu Saracenorum*, ed. H. PRUTZ, *Kulturgeschichte*, p. 589.

(64) *Les Registres de Nicholas IV*, no. 7625.

(65) *Les Grandes Chroniques*, p. 143. — Guillelmus de Nangiaco, p. 573 ; *solum Christianitatis asylum in illis partibus*.

(66) *Annales de Waverleia*, ed. H. R. LUARD, *Annales Monastici*, II, RS, London 1865, p. 410. See also *Flores historiarum*, III, ed. H. R. LUARD, RS, London 1890, p. 74. — *Chronicon de Lanercost*, ed. J. STEVENSON, Edinburgh 1839, p. 138 : *in Asia Catholicae ecclesiae domicillium ac peregrinorum asylum*. — John of Vitring, p. 304, described Acre as *civitas clarrissima, Christianorum domicilium*. — *Balduini Ninovensensis Chronicon*, MGH.SS, XXV, 546 : *...orientalis ecclesiae caput et refugium singulare*.

(67) *Ludolphi... in Suchem Itinere*, p. 44.

(68) See above n. 42.

West, a more positive one. The accounts of the loss of the Holy Land include no other types of criticism than those already current before the disaster. Moreover, there is no, so to say, one current stereotype of either Outremer at large or of Acre. Some of the contemporaries of this calamity did indeed, as those of the fall of Jerusalem a century earlier⁽⁶⁹⁾ invoke the sins of the Franks as its main cause. This however was by no means common to all. On the whole, what was characteristic is that the responsibility was squarely and equally placed on the shoulders of both the inhabitants of Outremer and of Christendom as a whole. Typical is Bartholomew of Neocastro who linked the internal problems of the papacy and the delay in sending military aid to the anarchy in the crusader kingdom and the moral conduct of its inhabitants⁽⁷⁰⁾. The anonymous author of the *De Excidio urbis Acconis*, an account of the disaster, paraphrasing *Lamentations*, mercilessly exposed both the heads of Outremer as well as those of the whole of Christendom : "Cry daughter of Zion over this dear city... Cry over your chiefs, who abandoned you... Cry over your pope, cardinals, prelates, and the clergy of the Church. Cry over the kings, the princes, the barons, the Christian knights, who call themselves great fighters, but fell asleep not in the Valley of Tears, but in the Valley of Sin, who left this city full of Christians defenceless, abandoned, leaving it alone like a lamb among wolves"⁽⁷¹⁾.

(69) For the reaction to the loss of Jerusalem see PRAWER, *Histoire*, II, pp. 11-19 ; FLAHIFF, pp. 162-188. For the criticism of the Franks at that time see *ibid.*, p. 169, n. 32. SIBERRY, pp. 83-84.

(70) Bartholomaeus de Neocastro, pp. 131-133.

(71) *De Excidio Urbis Acconis Libri II*, ed. E. MARTÈNE - U. DURAND, *Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentorum Amplissima Collectio*, V, Paris 1729, col. 783. For Europe's attitude to Outremer as a cause of its fall see also STICKEL pp. 96-211 *et passim* and SCHEIN, *The West and the Crusade*, pp. 50-113.