THE CRUSADES

I

Men have often thought of what may be called the fatalities of history. Among them has always been counted the duel of East and West. Herodotus began his history by asking why they fought, δι᾽ ἥν αἰτίαν ἐποδέµεναν ἄλλῃσθαι; and our poets still speak to-day of the silent deep disdain of the East for the thundering of Western legions, or celebrate the implacable difference which separates the two for all eternity. The Trojan and the Persian wars of antiquity: the battles of Crussus and Heraclius in Syria: the Crusades and the Ottoman conquests—all seem to make a rhythm and to suggest a regular recurrence. But the duel of East and West is a geographical simplification of a complicated series of historical facts. History is a record of something more than struggles in space; and it is only when we reduce the apparent struggle between 'East' and 'West' into the real struggles, which vary from age to age, between competing churches and races and civilizations, that the story gains point as well as dimension. It is true, indeed, that for a variety of geographical reasons the eastern coast of the Mediterranean, from Constantinople to Alexandria, was for long a vexed region of history. Here, whether by way of the Black Sea, or the Red Sea, or from Beyrout across the desert, Europe touches Asia and the commodities and mysteries of Asia; here, whether in Egypt or Crete, in Jerusalem or Athens, civilizations and religions and philosophies have found their cradle. In such an area many conflicts were bound to arise. Some were economic: some were religious: some were political: some were racial: many were mixed. Each conflict is best understood in itself and its own individuality. One of the greatest is the conflict between the church, the civilization, and the peoples of Western Christianity and the faith, the civilization, and the peoples of Islam. It began, we may say, with the defeat of Heraclius, 'the first of the Crusaders', on the Yarmuk in 636 by the forces of Omar; and who shall give a date to its end? It has at one time been primarily religious, and at another predominantly political: it has been a struggle between different peoples—in the main the Romance and Slavonic on the one side, and the Arab and Turk on the other; but it has always remained a mixed conflict, in which two civilizations have been fundamentally engaged. One of its chapters is the Crusades. That chapter began in 1096: it ended, if we regard it as closed by the loss of the last Christian foothold on the Syrian mainland, in 1291: it lasted, if we look rather to the lingering relics of the old Crusading impulse, till the navigations of the Portuguese and the discoveries of Columbus.

The Crusades have a double aspect. They are, in their original impulse (crossed, it is true, from the first by other strains), a spiritual movement which translated itself into the objective form of a spiritual institution. They are a 'holy war'—a war which, in the theory of the canonists, is not only 'just', but also attains the full measure of consecration; a war which is res Christiana, and unites the Christian commonwealth in common hostilities against the arch-enemy of its faith. But the Crusades are also, in their results, the redemption of the Holy Land: they are a projection of the Christian West into the Muslim East: they are the foundation of a Christian State, the 'Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem', camped on the shores of the Levant, and looking eastward to Mosul and Baghdad and southward to Cairo and Egypt. The former is the broader theme: the latter has its particular and peculiar interest. In the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem the Crusades become specific, and here they show their specific results—the rise of the military orders; the foundation of trading quarters, by the Venetians and Genoese, in the Syrian ports; the growth of trading and missionary connexions with Further Asia. Here (as indeed also in Spain, but here in a way
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which engaged the general attention of Europe as Spain never did) there was a constant conflict and a permanent contact between Christianity and Islam. It is when the eyes are fixed on the Latin Kingdom that the general background comes most clearly into view (like distant mountains rising above the immediate scene)—the geographical background of the Mediterranean basin: the historical background of the previous centuries of oscillation in that basin between Christian and Muhammadan power.

Geographically we may say that there are two Mediterraneans. There is the Mediterranean of the West, closed on its eastern side by Italy and Sicily, with a sea-passage, some 100 miles wide, between Cape Sorello in the south-west of Sicily and Cape Bon in north-eastern Tunis. There is the Mediterranean of the East, from the eastern shores of Sicily (which again and again in history has been the battle-ground or meeting-place of the two Mediterraneans) to the coasts of Asia Minor and Syria. Two halves of one sea, the eastern and the western Mediterranean became, in classical times, the homes of two civilizations. In the West was Latin civilization; and on this basis, as Christianity triumphed, there arose the Roman Church and the Holy Roman Empire of the West. The East was the home of Hellenistic civilization; and here were developed the Greek Church and the Byzantine Empire. Upon this division there superimposed, in the seventh century, the rise of Islam. Spreading with the rapidity of an electric current from its power-house in Mecca, it flashed into Syria; it traversed the whole breadth of north Africa; and then, leaping the Straits of Gibraltar, it ran to the Gates of the Pyrenees. It had fixed itself permanently in both Mediterraneans by the early Middle Ages—on the southern and western shores of the West; on the southern and eastern shores of the East. In both halves of the Mediterranean basin Christianity was engaged in conflicts with it; and these conflicts, even before
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the Crusades, have already something of the nature of a Crusade. But the peculiarity of the Crusades, when their course began at the end of the eleventh century, is that the Latin Christianity of the West moved over into the East, hitherto secluded from it, and that here it came into contact, on the one hand, and nominally as an ally, with the Greek Church and the Eastern Empire, and on the other, in declared hostility, with the Muhammadans of the East. Perhaps the primary and the most fruitful element in the Crusades is this simple fact of the entry of the West into the East. And yet the simple fact has its complications, for the East into which the West made its entry was itself full of complication. Not only had Latin Christianity to make its terms and settle its relations with the Greek Christianity of Byzantium. Muhammadanism also was divided: the Sunnite Turks, who had established themselves in western Asia from the Black Sea on the north to the Red Sea on the south, were confronted, in the debatable land of Syria, by the Shi'ites of Egypt under the Fatimid dynasty; and the Crusading West had to discover, and to use as best it could, an opposition of which it was hardly aware.¹

Historically, the passage of Latin Christianity overseas to fight against Islam may be regarded as the culmination of a long

¹ The position in A.D. 1096 has some similarities with that in 201 B.C. The Romans, when they began to act in the East, were similarly faced by three powers—the Macedonian Kingdom, which ruled Greece and the northern Aegean as far as the Bosphorus: the Seleucids of Asia Minor; and the Ptolemaic dynasty in Egypt. On the other hand there were fundamental differences. The Romans came with a readiness to learn and an admiration for everything in Hellenistic culture. Latin Christianity at the end of the eleventh century had a developed culture of its own; and so far as it could learn from the Muhammadans it was able to do so at home, in Spain and Sicily. Moreover the Romans came into a new and different world: the 'Franks' of the eleventh century found in Byzantium something which, though it had pursued a different line of development, was akin to their own traditions. In the issue, as we shall see, they perhaps learned more from the Byzantines than they did from the Muhammadans of Syria and Egypt.
course of hostilities between Christian and Muslim in the western Mediterranean, and this is a large element in the historical background against which we must set the Crusades. By the end of the seventh century the Arabs had mastered the Berbers of northern Africa; and between 711 and 718 the Arabs and Berbers had conquered Spain as far as the Pyrenees. In the course of the ninth century, between 827 and 878 (when Syracuse fell), the Aghlabids of Kairawân, in northern Africa, had conquered Sicily; and they also harassed, both by temporary forays and the foundation of robber-states, the south of Italy as far as the Campagna and the Abruzzi. Muslims from Spain raided Provence, northern Italy, and even Switzerland; and Corsica and Sardinia were again and again ravaged by corsairs. Only in Spain and Sicily did the civilization of the Muslim attain any height; but in both of these it flourished, and from both of these it transmitted its influence into France and Italy. The philosophy of Cordova and its great teacher Ibn Rushd (Averroes) penetrated to the University of Paris; Arab villas, Arabic geographers and Arabic poets adorned Palermo under its Norman kings and their successor Frederic II. "The blessings of culture which were given to the West by its temporary Islamicic elements", it has been said, "are at least as important as the influence of the East during the time of the Crusades."

But whatever the gifts which it received, the West could not tolerate the occupation of Christian soil by the followers of another faith; and the eleventh century saw a gradual recession of Muslim arms in the western Mediterranean before the advance of the Christians. In Spain, after the death of the great al-Manṣūr in 1002, the small Christian powers of the north—Leon, Castile, Aragon, and Navarre—embarked on a period of expansion. Toledo fell before Alfonso VI of Castile in 1085, and Saragossa was captured by

---

2 His progress received a serious set-back from the new inroad of the Almoravides in 1086; but the set-back, in the issue, proved to be temporary.

Aragon in 1118. South Italy, torn by disputes between Byzantine governors and Arab raiders, fell into the hands of the Normans during the first half of the eleventh century; and between 1060 and 1090 they had also conquered Sicily. Benedict VIII, about 1016, had instigated the Pisans to the occupation of Sardinia; and with the rise of the Genoese and the Venetians the Muslim corsairs ceased to be the terror of the western Mediterranean. By the end of the eleventh century the Muhammadans held only southern Spain and the north of Africa; and during the twelfth century they were to be attacked by the Normans of Sicily even in their African strongholds. A more consolidated and developed West was making itself master in its own house.

This was the juncture of affairs in the West when the call to the Crusade came from the East. It was a double call, if it was due to a single cause. The pressure of the Seljûk Turks—who, beginning as the mercenaries, had become virtually the masters of the Caliphs of Bagdad—had on the one hand, and in Syria, resulted in the capture of Jerusalem from the mild Fatimid Caliphs of Cairo (1070), and on the other hand, and in Asia Minor, in the capital defeat of the Byzantine forces at Manzikart (1071). The needs of Jerusalem and the necessities of Byzantium both called aloud to the West; and the First Crusade (1096–99) was an answer to that double call.

The religious habits and the social development of western Europe conspired to produce the answer. The habit of penitentary pilgrimage for the sake of remission of sins was ancient in the West. Jerusalem—at once the most sacred and the most distant of holy places, and therefore conferring a double grace—had long been the goal of such pilgrimages. The goal was now menaced: the menace must be removed. The Crusade accordingly came as a great armed pilgrimage for the sake of clearing the routes and liberating the goal of future pilgrimages; and it
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was pilgrim knights who founded, as it was pilgrim knights who came afterwards year by year to maintain, the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The social development of feudalism, under the influence of the Church, was another and parallel cause of the Crusade. The bellicose passion of a military society for private war (guerra) had engaged the attention of synods and Popes from the beginning of the eleventh century. At first they attempted to check it by the institutions of the Pax and the Trucas Dei; later they sought to direct it into the channels of 'just' and 'holy' warfare, partly by consecrating the arms of the knight, in the ceremony of his initiation, to the defence of justice and the remedy of oppression (thus helping to create a new chivalry), and partly again by demanding, as Urban II demanded at Clermont in 1095 in preaching the Crusade, that the fratricidal abuse of private war should be turned into the sanctity of battle against the infidel. The cause of internal peace was thus linked with that of a holy war; and synod on synod enjoined, in the same breath, the cause of the truce of God and that of the Christian Crusade.

So far, the Crusade wears the double aspect of a 'Pilgrim's Progress' and of a 'Holy War'. But it was also something more, or something less, than these. It was, in the first place, a solution of the problem of feudal over-population. The younger sons of the feudal nobility had little prospect at home. It would have fared ill with many of the many descendants of Tancred d'Hauteville, for example, if there had been no founding of a Norman Kingdom of Sicily and a Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. Such kingdoms were feudal colonies: they provided an outlet for feudal emigrants. In the second place the Crusades afforded a new vent for the commercial ambitions of the growing Italian ports; and the Venetian, Pisan, and Genoese establishments on the Syrian coast, which served as entrepôts for the great routes of Asiatic trade, were no small factor in the history of the Latin settlement. Italian ships accompanied and aided the progress
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even of the first Crusade; the help of the Italian towns was a necessity in the war of sieges which led to the subsequent growth of the Kingdom of Jerusalem; Italian transports carried the annual flow of pilgrims; and both for good and for evil the commercial motive was added to the spiritual impulse of the Crusade.

It was these various factors, coupled with the happy opportunity of Muhammadan dissensions in Syria, which enabled Baldwin I and Baldwin II to establish and consolidate the Kingdom of Jerusalem between 1100 and 1131. But the kingdom was hardly established when it began to be menaced with destruction. Christian pressure produced a Muslim reaction. The centre of this reaction was Mosul. Here, among the debris of the Seljuk Empire, which had collapsed into fragments even before the first Crusade began its course, there emerged about 1127 the figure of the atabeg Zangi. He extended his power among his rivals, and in 1144 captured Edessa from the Latins—the first serious set-back to their career. His successor Nur-al-Din (1146–74) was already animated by the religious motive of the counter-crusade (the jihād); and during his reign his lieutenants, the Kurd Shirkuh and Shirkuh’s nephew Saladin (Salāh-al-Dīn), brought Egypt under his sway. Menaced both from Mosul and from Cairo, and with the new ardour of the jihād ready to meet the waning passion of their own Crusade, the Latins of the Kingdom soon succumbed. In July 1187 they were defeated at Hīṭṭin: in October of the same year Jerusalem capitulated. Saladin had attained ‘the goal of his desires, and set free the mosque of Aqṣā, to which Allah once led in the night his servant Mahomet’.

The Third Crusade failed to undo the work of Saladin. The Latins still kept for some time the principalities of Antioch and Tripoli in northern Syria; the emperor Frederick II was able for a brief while (1227–44) to recover, by diplomacy and not by
The Crusades

force of arms, the city of Jerusalem; but the Kingdom of Jerusalem had perished. The thirteenth century was full of Crusades; but they were waged, as has been well said, 'everywhere except in Palestine'. They had become uncertain of their goal; and they wandered uncertainly from Constantinople (1202–4) to Egypt (1218–21 and 1249–50) and even to Tunis (1270). The one Crusade which was successful only succeeded in capturing the Christian city of Constantinople, and in dividing the Byzantine Empire, for a time (1204–61), between the French and the Venetians. Constantinople, if it had invoked the Crusades, perished by them; and if it rose again for two centuries of feeble life from 1261 to 1453, it had to leave the French in the Morea, and the Venetians in Crete and the islands of the Archipelago. The First Crusade had been an alliance between French feudalism and the maritime strength of the Italian towns. By the thirteenth century French feudalism was diverted to Greece, and the Venetians and Genoese were founding new entrepôts for Eastern trade in the Crimea and the Sea of Azov. It seemed as if Palestine were left derelict, and the centre of gravity had shifted into the debris of the Eastern Empire.

But a new hope dawned before the middle of the thirteenth century; and a new vicissitude in Asiatic affairs was acclaimed in the West as the promise of better things. A great Mongol Empire, neither Christian nor Muhammadan, had been founded by Jenghiz Khan. It stretched from Pekin on the east to the Dnieper and the Euphrates on the west: the four Khanates, into which it was divided, were each of the dignity of an empire; and the Persian Khanate in particular, with its capital at Tabriz, was near enough to the eastern Mediterranean to be drawn into its affairs. The Mongols were tolerant: the Nestorian Christians of Asia flourished under their sway; why should they not be converted to Christianity, and why should not the fundamental purpose of the Crusades be realized, after all, on a vastly greater scale than had ever been dreamed before? Envoys came and went: Innocent IV sent John de Pian Carpine on a great journey in 1245, and St. Louis dispatched William of Rubruquis on another in 1250: missions were active, and churches were founded as far afield as China. It was all a dream: no help came to Palestine. For a time Antioch and Tripoli, and the few possessions left to the Latins on the coast of the old Kingdom of Jerusalem, were spared. The successors of Saladin were divided by dissensions; and by the grace of those dissensions the Latins survived. But a new and militant Muhammadanism arose with the Mameluke Sultans of Egypt, who seized the throne of Cairo in 1250. The greatest of these Sultans, Baibars, defeated the one attempt of the Mongol Khanate of Persia to establish a footing in Syria: he established himself in Damascus (1260); he crushed and annexed the principality of Antioch (1268). His successor Kala’un conquered and annexed Tripoli (1289); and his son and successor Khalil captured Acre, the last stronghold of the Latins on the Syrian coast (1291). By the end of the thirteenth century Latin Christianity was entirely expelled from the mainland of Asia.

It survived among the islands. Cyprus, captured from the Greeks by Richard I on the Third Crusade, became under its Lusignan kings the refuge of the Latin feudatories of Palestine. It was here that the feudal jurisprudence of the Assizes of Jerusalem was continued and codified; and the Kingdom of Cyprus survived as an independent state until 1488, when it passed into the hands of Venice. In the same way the Knights Hospitallers, after the final loss of Acre, occupied Rhodes in 1309, and maintained themselves in the island until 1523, when they moved to the west and to Malta. It is in these two islands that some of the finest monuments of the presence of the Latins in the eastern Mediterranean during the Middle Ages still sur-

\[ See Stubbs's two lectures on Cyprus in his Lectures on Medieval and Modern History. \]
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vive. While the feudal nobility was thus established in Cyprus and Rhodes, the Venetians held Crete, and a number of islands to the north, as the spoils of the Fourth Crusade; and the Genoese, who had aided in the restoration of the Palaeologoi to the throne of Constantinople in 1261, were not only rewarded with the suburb of Pera, but rewarded themselves with the islands of Lesbos and Chios. In this way Latin Christianity kept a hold in the eastern Mediterranean to the close of the Middle Ages; and even if it was confined to the islands, and although its possessions were rather the debris of the Byzantine Empire than conquests wrested from Muslim power, it still waged a war against Islam from its scattered bases, and only abandoned the struggle when the victory of the Ottoman Turks made the eastern Mediterranean into a mare clausum. Indeed it was not until 1668 that Candia fell, and Venice lost her last great stronghold in the Levant.

II

What were the results of the long adventure of Western Christianity in the Eastern Mediterranean and of its long contact with the Muhammadans of the East? The question is really double. It is a question, in the first place, of the effects of the Crusades considered simply as a mode of contact between the East and the West—a question of the influence upon the West of factors and impulses derived from the East. It is a question, in the second place, of the effects of the Crusades regarded as a general movement operative in the sphere of Western society—a question of the influence upon that society of a movement which at once sprang from it and reacted strongly upon it. The two questions have been too often confused by historians; and the confusion has produced exaggerations which a distinction might have avoided.

We may take as an example of such exaggerations the passage in Henne-am Rhyn’s Allgemeine Kulturgeschichte which deals with the Crusades.1 Here we find the whole development of the Middle Ages ascribed to the Crusades. In the religious sphere they diminished the prestige of the Papacy, irrevocably affected monasticism, and encouraged the growth of heresy. In the social and economic sphere they led to a greater equality of classes, the growth of a free peasantry and of guilds of artisans, and the development of trade and industry. In the field of politics they were followed by the rise of the system of Estates, by a growing centralization of government, and by the appearance of written law and a regular judicial administration. In the great world of culture, philosophy developed its greatest thinkers after the Crusades and the connexion with the Arabs which they brought: even mysticism assumed a scientific character; the study of the ancient languages grew in extent and fertility; historiography and geography acquired a new vigour; a vernacular poetry arose; Gothic architecture succeeded to Romanesque, and a finer taste appeared in sculpture and painting.

Something of the same confusion, the same exaggeration, and the same fallacy of post hoc ergo propter hoc appears even in the learned and imposing Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge of Hans Prutz.2 It is a work of massive erudition, but in some respects it is essentially uncritical. In the first place Prutz is apt to write as if the Crusades were the one factor in the development of Europe during the two centuries between 1100 and 1300, and as if all the causes causantes of those two hundred years—causes which helped to produce the new Europe of the Age of the Renaissance, the Age of Discovery, and the Age of the Reformation—were compact and contained in that one factor. Actually they were only one factor among many; and the fallacy of the ‘single cause’ is added to the fallacy of post hoc ergo propter hoc when we make

2 Berlin, 1883, in five books, of which Book IV (on economic culture) and Book V (on the effects of the Crusades upon the history of culture) deserve special attention.
them a single and universal explanation. In the second place, though Prutz admits that Spain and Sicily were important vehicles of Arabic influence, he is prone in the issue to forget his own admission, and to make Palestine far the greater and almost the only vehicle. ‘In most of the areas of cultural development’, he writes, ‘we find the first permanent connection of Eastern and Western elements among the Franks (of Palestine), and it is this mixed stock ... which must be described as the pioneer in the process of mediation between East and West.’1 Here again we cannot but notice the fallacy of the ‘single cause’, and the fallacy appears the greater when we remember that the other cause (the mixture of Eastern and Western elements in Spain and Sicily) was the more potent and penetrating. Finally, it is impossible to escape the impression, in reading Prutz’s work, that he has both minimized the culture of the Latin West and exaggerated the culture of the Arabic East, as they stood about 1100, in order to leave a larger scope for the influence of the Crusades, and to provide (as it were) an emptier market for a larger importation than our evidence warrants us in accepting. The Western Europe which was just passing through the great Gregorian age—which was witnessing the growth of thought that culminates in Abelard, the rise of the French communes, the vigour of Norman diffusion and Norman architecture, the industrial and commercial revolution that may be traced at the end of the eleventh century—this was no tabula rasa. Nor was the Arabic culture of the East, about the year 1100, in its hey-day. On the contrary, as we shall see, its sun was setting when the Crusades began; and we must always remember that, so far as Kulturgeschichte goes, it was a new and growing West which burst upon an old and waning East.

Crusade is a magic word, and magic words may be magnets

1 P. 442. In justice it must be added that Prutz admits that ‘in the sphere of definitely scientific life an essentially different process appears’.

which draw large tracts of irrelevancy into the sphere of their influence. Not everything which happened in Western Europe during the Crusades was connected with them—far less due to them. Even if there had been no Crusade, Western Christianity, in which town-life and trade were rapidly developing during the latter half of the eleventh century, would probably have pushed its commerce into the Eastern Mediterranean. It would have sought to establish itself at the termini of the Eastern caravan routes—on the north coast of the Black Sea, where it might touch the route that went north of the Caspian and west of the Aral Sea to Bokhara and Samarcand; or again in the Syrian ports, from which it might reach Persia and the Persian Gulf, and so touch the sea-route that led past India to China. What the Crusades did was to establish a feudal Syrian State—occupied partly by individual feudatories and partly by the feudal chartered companies of the Templars and Hospitallers—to which the commercial impulse, for a time, particularly attached itself, and in which it created for itself the various ‘quarters’ occupied by the Venetians, Genoese, and Pisans in the ports along the coast. We have to remember that this commercial impulse was not exclusively tied to these Syrian quarters; that it had also its contacts with Constantinople and the Black Sea; and that after the Fourth Crusade, and during the course of the thirteenth century, these contacts became the richer and the more manifold. But at any rate during the twelfth century, between the First and the Third Crusade, Syria was the particular focus of relations between Christianity and Islam in the Eastern Mediterranean. Here Islam could act upon Western Christianity, partly by its direct impact upon the feudal State and by the repercussions of that impact on the West, and partly by a process of filtration along the routes of commerce. It is this action which we have to study.

But we have to remember, and to repeat, that Islam was also established, and could also act on the West, in Spain and in
Sicily. There was a play of concurrent forces; and though we cannot measure the exact and separate extent of either, we may guess that Islam acted more profoundly on Western Christianity from its bases in Spain and Sicily than it did from its bases in Mosul and Baghdad and Cairo. There are two reasons which support this conjecture. The first is that there was never established in Syria itself the potent influence of a mixture of cultures, such as we find in Sicily under Roger II and Frederic II. The second is that the Latins of Syria were never able to draw on the riches of a Muhammadan culture external but contiguous to themselves, as the Christians of the Western Mediterranean were able to draw on the riches of the culture of Cordova and Muhammadan Spain.

The absence of any mixture of culture, or indeed of any degree of culture of any kind, in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem is a striking thing. In Sicily the mixture of stocks—Greek, Norman, Lombard, and Arab-Berber—produced a remarkable mixed civilization. At the court of the Norman kings we not only find Arabic geographers and poets encouraged; we also find a king’s chancellor translating for William I the Phædo and Meno of Plato, a part of the Meteorologica of Aristotle, and the writings of Diogenes Laërtius. The court of Frederic II was even more famous. Here, as Dante records in the De Vulgari Eloquentia, Italian poetry took its beginnings; here the King could concoct, or have concocted for him, knotty questions on the interpretation of Aristotelian philosophy (Quaestiones Siciliana) which still survive in an Arabic manuscript in the Bodleian Library. The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem was a rude military settlement, without the impulse, or at any rate without the time, for the creation of any achievements of civilization. It was a foreign legion encamped in castles and barracks; it came into no close contact either with the tillers of the soil in the Syrian villages or with the artisans who were busy, then as now, in making carpets and pottery and gold-work in the towns. The Latins were scat-

tered thinly on a narrow littoral, which they had to defend against a vast and dark background of Muhammadism; and though they might feel that they were in the warmth of Jerusalem, the hearth of their faith and the centre of the round earth (umbilicus terrae), they were none the less removed from the great centres of medieval civilization in Rome and Paris.

Nor, if they had the power to draw (and their time was too brief, and their footing too precarious and hostile, for them to do so), was there any neighbouring Muhammadan civilization on which they could draw. The Western Mediterranean had the culture of Arabic Spain before its eyes. Here Ibn Rushd, jurist, physician, and philosopher, was teaching till the end of the twelfth century; here the Jews had come into contact with Arabic philosophy, and Maimonides, under its influence, had attempted to reconcile Aristotle with the Old Testament; and here the Latin Christianity of the West learned, about 1200, a deeper knowledge of Aristotle than it had been able to acquire before from the solitary source of Boethius’ translation of the Organon. The Mosque Library of Toledo which fell to the Spaniards with their conquest of the city, became a resort of scholars; and the Arabic Aristotle of Spain was one of the sources of the scholasticism of the thirteenth century. Nor was this all. The border-warfare south of the Pyrenees became a theme of poetry; and just as the border-warfare of English and Scots produced our own border-ballads, or the struggle of Greeks and Turks in the Taurus produced Byzantine chansons de geste, so the battles of Christian and Paynim in Spain were the theme of the Song of Roland and the legend of the Cid Campeador. It was otherwise in the East. Here Arabic philosophy was beginning to wane by the time of the First Crusade; and no native poetry was stimulated by all the border-battles of the twelfth century. The great Ibn Sinâ had died in Hamadân in
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1037; Ghazālī, a sceptic who has been accused of destroying the philosophy which he professed, died in Khurāsān in 1111; in 1150 the Caliph at Baghdad was committing to the flames a philosophical library, and among its contents were the writings of Ibn Sīnā himself. In days such as those the Latins of the East were hardly likely to become the scholars of the Muhammadans; nor were they stimulated by the novelty of their surroundings to any original production. No new poetry or art arose in the Holy Land; the minstrels who sang the theme of the Crusades were the minstrels of the West; and if historiography flourished with Fīlcher of Chartres or William of Tyre, or law-books were composed by a John of Ibelin or a Philip of Novara, these were the only products which can be celebrated.

In the realm of culture the Latins of the Kingdom thus learned little from Eastern Muhammadanism, and developed little of their own which could influence the West. Indeed it may almost be contended that the chief service of the Crusades to the development of Western civilization was not so much that it brought Latin Christianity into contact with the Muslim East, as that it brought it into relations with the Byzantine Empire and Greek Christianity. Before the First Crusade, the Church and Empire of the West had been separated from the Church and Empire of the East by a gulf of oblivion. Lutprand of Cremona might go on a famous embassy for Otto I to Constantinople in 968; the envoys of Leo IX might appear in Constantinople in 1054, but the relations of East and West were for centuries sparse and infrequent. After 1096 the Comneni are in constant relations with Western powers; after 1204 the Latins are settled in the Eastern Empire. During the thirteenth century the Flemish archbishop of Corinth, William of Moerbeke, and his colleague Henry of Brabant are translating the Ethics and Politics of Aristotle in collaboration with St. Thomas, and opening for the West another avenue to Greek philosophy than that of Spain. At the end of the fourteenth and during the

fifteenth century Byzantine scholars bring to Italy the full wealth of the Greek inheritance, and provide the Italian Renaissance with its material. Constantinople did not lie on the main stream of the Crusades; but it was from Constantinople that the Crusades brought back the richest argosy to the West.

Yet there were ways in which the Crusades, through their direction to Syria, and through the Latin State which they temporarily established there, affected the development of Western Europe. We may appeal, first and foremost, to the evidence of language—to the Western words which flowed into Arabic, and the Arabic words which flowed into Western languages. The borrowed Western words in Arabic are not very numerous. Prutz cites as examples *sibīr* (imperator), *kastal* (castellum), *burj* (burgus), and *ghirsh* (grossus). The borrowed Arabic words in Western languages are far more abundant. We need only think of *caravans* and *dragoman*, *jar* and *syrup*, in our own language; and if we turn to the Romance languages of the continent—which borrowed directly, while we, for the most part, only borrowed through them—we shall realize that the list of Western borrowings from the Arabic may readily be increased (witness words such as *douane*, *gabelle*, *felucca*, *chébec*, and the like). But there are obvious philological difficulties in the attribution of these borrowings. Palestine is not the only place, or the age of the Crusades the only time, in which they may have originated. Spain and Sicily are other possible places of borrowing; and long centuries of contact between the West and the Arab-speaking world—both east and west of Suez; both in the way of commerce and in the way of piracy—are other possible times and ways. The West, it is true, still uses Arabic terms of trade, such as *bazaar*, *dinar*, *tariff*, and *zecchins*; it still uses Arabic terms of sea-faring, such as *admiral* and *arsenal*; it still uses Arabic terms

1 The origin is Persian rather than Arabic.
of domestic life, such as alcove, carafe, mattress, and sofa, or again amulet, elixir, julep, and talisman; it still uses or has used some Arabic terms of music, such as lute and naker. But before we assign the introduction of such terms to the Crusades we must consult both Arabic and Romance philology, and we must be certain both of the original place and the exact time of the introduction.

The Crusades were a series of wars—wars fought against new enemies, armed with new weapons and following, in some respects, a new technique of war. We should naturally expect to find that they exerted some effect on the development of the art of war in the West. Some writers have held that the 'concentric' castle, of the type which became common in England during the reign of Edward I, was modelled upon the military architecture of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, as that in turn was modelled upon the modifications made by the Arabs in the Byzantine forts which they found in Syria. Following this line of argument Prutz suggests that while the general scheme of military defence in Palestine followed the Norman system of castellation (such as we find, for instance, on the Welsh marches and in South Wales), 'Arabic influence may be traced in the disposition of the different parts of the greater fortresses, in the addition of parts unknown to the older military architecture of the West, and in a number of new methods of defence made necessary by the technique of siege tactics developed in the East'.¹ He assigns accordingly to Arabic sources the use of a double line of walls (the essence of the 'concentric' castle) and the erection of an additional tower or keep between the two lines;² and he suggests that the famous

¹ Kulturgeschichte, p. 194.
² An advanced tower of this sort, especially when it is erected over the gate or entrance, is known as a barbican; and it has been suggested that the word may be derived from Arabic (or Persian) words meaning 'house on the wall' or 'gate-house'. (See N.E.D., sub voce.)
Château Gaillard built by Richard I in the Vexin shows indubitable traces of Oriental influence. On the other hand it has been contended that the ‘concentric’ castle was developed in the West, and carried by the Crusaders to the East; and it is at any rate certain that the engineering skill of the adventurous Normans, which showed itself in Western Europe earlier than it did in Palestine, was fully competent to arrive at such a development from its own independent resources. We may assert with more confidence that the Crusades fostered the growth of siege tactics—the use of the art of sapping and mining, the employment of an ‘artillery’ of mangonels and battering-rams, and possibly the application of various fires and combustibles; though even here the original impulse may be Byzantine rather than Arabic, and the skilled engineer from the Holy Land employed by Frederic I at the siege of Créma in 1159 may have been a disciple not of the Arabs but of the Greeks. The cross-bow is said to have been an Oriental import; the use of mail for the knight and his horse is ascribed to the influence of the Crusades; the wearing of cotton quilts or pads under the armour is attributed to the same origin; and the Frankish knight, at any rate when he was fighting in Palestine, learned to use the Arab kafiya for the protection of head and neck against an eastern sun. The employment of carrier-pigeons to convey military information was a device borrowed from the Arabs, though it must be added that we find it commonly mentioned in the records of Norman Sicily; and it has been suggested that the celebration of victory by illuminations and by the display of hangings and carpets on walls and from windows—natural and indigenous as they may seem to the soil of human emotion—were perhaps borrowed from the same source. The practice of the tournament, which has its affinities with the exercises of the jarid, was perhaps fostered by the Crusades; and a growing use of armorial bearings may be due to contact with the Saracens in Syria. They certainly used heraldic devices, such as the double eagle, the fleur-
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de-lis, and the two keys (fig. 10); and many heraldic charges, as well as some of the recognized terms of heraldry (such as azure and possibly gules), spring from this source. It appears to be also due to the Crusades that the rules of armorial bearings became uniform throughout Europe, and that 'the charges and terms and rules of heraldry are identical in all European countries'.

Trade followed in the footsteps of war during the Crusades, and the Italian merchant hurried at the heels of the Frankish knight. It was not only a matter of the products and the wares of Syria; it was also a matter of the products and the wares of India and China and the Spice islands. It is true, and we have already had occasion to mention, that this Eastern trade would have existed, and produced its fruits, even if there had been no Crusades; nor must it be forgotten that Venice had already found her way into the Eastern markets, by way of Byzantium, many years before the beginning of the First Crusade. We cannot therefore ascribe to the Crusades—at any rate we cannot ascribe solely to the Crusades—all the Eastern commodities introduced into western Europe during the Middle Ages, or all the fructification of old trade-routes and markets which followed on that introduction. Equally, however, we cannot deny the great trading impetus which came from the Latin settlement in Syria, with all its native products and manufactures, and with the new access which that settlement gave, on the one hand to the markets of Damascus, and on the other hand (by way of Rağṣa and the Euphrates) to the markets of Baghdad. In this way we may explain the dissemination of new plants and crops and trees from the Levant to the regions of the Western Mediterranean—sesame and carob, maize and rice, lemons and melons, apricots and shallots.1 In this way too we may explain the spread into the West of new manufactures and fashions, or

1 The shallot (French échalote) is the allium Ascalonicum—the onion from Ascalon.

FIG. 10. EXAMPLES OF SARACENIC HERALDRY
at any rate the growing vogue of old manufactures and fashions—cottons; muslins from Mosul; baldachins of Baghdad; damasks and damascenes from Damascus; 'sarsenets' or Saracen stuffs; samites and dimities and diapers from Byzantium (δημύρος, δημύρος, and διημύρος); the 'atlas' (Arabic علش), a sort of silk-satin manufactured in the East; rugs and carpets and tapestries from the Near East and Central Asia; lacquers; new colours such as carmine and lilac (the words are both Arabic); dyes and drugs and spices and scents, such as alum and aloes, cloves and incense, indigo and sandalwood; articles of dress and of fashion, such as camlets and jupes (from the Arabic جبد), or powders and glass-mirrors; works of art in pottery, glass, gold, silver, and enamel; and even the rosary itself, which is said to have come from the Buddhists of India by way of Syria to western Europe.

This Eastern trade, which the Crusades stimulated if they did not produce, and which in the twelfth century was mainly concentrated in Syria, produced no small effects in the development of trade-routes and the growth of new instruments of credit and finance. The great trade-route of medieval Europe, which ran from Venice over the Brenner to Cologne, and bifurcating there turned to Lübeck on the Baltic or Bruges on the North Sea, was fed by this Eastern trade; and it was along this route, in Lombardy and along the Rhine and in Flanders and Northern France, that medieval towns and medieval guilds clustered most thickly. At the same time a regular system of shipping developed in the Mediterranean, partly for the transport of goods and partly for the conveyance of pilgrims: Venice and Marseilles became its head-quarters, and the military orders joined with lay shipowners and shipping companies in the operation of the system. The financial needs both of a far Eastern trade and of pilgrims and knights travelling and sojourning overseas developed a system of credit-notes; firms of bankers arose (Genoese, Pisan, or Sienese) with branches and business in the Levant; the military orders, and especially the Templars, became banks of
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deposit and lending. One of the curious monetary results of the Crusades and of the Eastern trade which they encouraged was the striking by the Venetians of Byzantini Saraceni in the Holy Land. This was a gold coinage (perhaps the earliest gold coinage struck by the Latins) for the purpose of trade with the Muhammadan hinterland; and down to 1249 (when Innocent IV protested) these gold coins bore Arabic inscriptions, with some brief text from the Quran, a reference to the Prophet, and a date calculated from the Hijra. Even in southern France, and as late as the end of the thirteenth century, coins of this character are to be traced.

In building, in the arts and crafts, and in the general framework of daily and domestic life, we may trace some influences that passed from the East to the West during the two centuries of the Crusades. There seems indeed to be little ground for thinking that the Crusades influenced the general architectural development of the West, any more than that they influenced the particular development of the concentric castle. There is no general style of Saracenic architecture. It varied from country to country, according to the type of indigenous building which the conquering Arabs found; and the only uniformity was that of decoration and ornament. The Arabs used a form of pointed arch, but it differed from that of Gothic architecture: they used geometrical designs, because they were forbidden by their religion to copy animal forms, but there is no evidence that their designs influenced the trefoil or cinquefoil of Western Gothic in its geometrical stage.1 The monuments of ecclesiastical architecture in the Holy Land are almost purely Western in style, and constructed on the rules and according to

1 Prutz, op. cit., p. 419, conjectures (but he admits that it is conjecture) that Arabic influences may have introduced into the West the horse-shoe arch and the semicircular arch composed of many small arches, and so have helped to create cinquefoil and the various forms of decorated tracery.
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the plans of Western building. At the most we can say that local factors induced local variations, as when, for example, the lack of timber in Palestine led to the building of flat roofs to churches, or again when local masons and stone-cutters, naturally imbued with Oriental traditions, introduced some Eastern twist or turn into a building generally constructed on Western lines. 1 Arabesques in mural decoration are of Moorish and not of Eastern origin; and if the Crusades introduced any new elements into the sculpture of the West, these elements were Byzantine rather than Arabic. Painting was not an Arabic art; and the mosaics in the churches of the Holy Land were of Byzantine inspiration. It is in the narrower sphere of the domestic arts and crafts that we may perhaps trace Arabic influence most. In the Kingdom of Jerusalem itself the houses of the magnates might follow the Arabic pattern of courtyard, marbles, fountain, and the murmuring of running water; and the internal decoration and furniture might also copy the same model. The importation of Oriental gold-work and jewellery may have influenced the art of design in Italy and especially at Venice; and the ivories, the enamels, the carpets, the tapestries of the East may have exercised a similar influence in the West at large. We may perhaps speak of the 'rebek' or arabesque fashion in the Middle Ages in the same sense in which we speak of the chinoiserie (in wall-papers, lacquers, and furniture) of the eighteenth century. Pilgrims might buy and bring home Arab reliquaries for the keeping of Christian relics; they might wear, and bring back for imitation in Paris, the girdle-purses of the East; or they might bring into the West horns whose blast had once been borne on Syrian echoes.

1 The round 'Temple' churches (of which there are four in England, and which may also be traced in France, Spain, and Germany) are a deliberate imitation of the church of the Sepulchre and the 'Temple' at Jerusalem— analogous to the 'labyrinths' or 'chemins de Jerusalem' in some Western churches, or the 'Jerusalems' in some of the towns of the Teutonic Order in Prussia.
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In the field of science and philosophy it was the Arabs of Spain rather than the Arabs of the East who brought gifts to the Latin West. Some mathematical knowledge may indeed have been imported from the East. Adelard of Bath, who studied the astronomy and geometry of the Arabs, is said to have travelled in Egypt and Asia Minor as well as in Spain during the first half of the twelfth century. Leonardo Fibonacci, the first Christian algebrist, a contemporary of Frederic II, to whom he dedicated his treatise on square numbers, is also recorded as having visited Egypt and Syria. The diffusion of Arabic numerals and arithmetic may have owed something to the lively trade between the Italian ports and Syria. Medicine, like mathematics, was one of the staples of Arabic science; but the home of the staple, and the source of its diffusion, was Spain rather than Syria, and the utmost licence of possible conjecture about Syrian influence is that which would connect the rise of a medical school at Montpellier with the trade between southern France and the Levant. The scholastic philosophy of the thirteenth century, as we have seen, owed no debt directly to the Arabic philosophers of the East. The material which it used, apart from the Christian tradition and the teaching of the fathers, was the Aristotelianism of the Arabs of Spain or the knowledge of Aristotle which it drew directly from Byzantium.¹

In arts and letters the influence of the Crusades was perhaps deeper and more pervasive. One of their direct results was the study of Oriental languages. This development, however, was due less to the Crusades themselves than to the Asiatic mission which succeeded to the Crusades and was directed to the conversion of the Mongols. It was a Catalan, Raymundus Lullus, who first attempted to promote the development of Oriental

¹ Professor C. H. Haskins remarks, in an article on Arabic Science in Western Europe (printed in Isis, vol. vii, p. 3), that 'the Crusades as such had a surprisingly small part in the transmission of Arabic science to Christian Europe.'
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Usama ibn Munkidh, a north Syrian Sheikh, which covers the twelfth century; Ibn al-Athir’s history of the Ababeks; and Bahâ-al-Din’s life of Saladin. But in the West at any rate the story of the Crusade rapidly turned from history to legend. The way had already been shown in the Song of Roland, which is the fruit of the play of poetic imagination on the theme of the border-warfare between Christianity and Islam in northern Spain. Early in the history of the Crusades—perhaps during the First Crusade itself—the same play of imagination began to create a legend which ran by the side of the history but departed widely from it. The legend already appears in the Chanson des Chérisifs (1130) and the Chanson d’Antioche (1180): it glorified Peter the Hermit or Godfrey of Bouillon, as the Song of Roland had glorified Roland and Oliver: it played at will over the Crusades, throwing its limelight now here, now there, and creating a saga which for centuries usurped the place of reality. It is this saga which came to Tasso, and which in his Gerusalemme Liberata he dressed in the conventional heroic dress of the sixteenth century. Nothing shows better how far the Crusades had passed from the heart of Europe. Tasso had wished, says de Sanctis, to write a poem which was seriously heroic, animated by the religious spirit, possibilmente storico e prossimo al vero o verissimo. What had he achieved? Un mondo cavalleresco, fantastico, romantico e voluttuoso, che sente la messe e si fa la cruce.

The Crusades, in reality, never became one of the great ‘matters’ of medieval poetry, like the ‘matter’ of Charlemagne or the ‘matter’ of Britain and the Round Table. They affected, indeed, those two great themes: Charlemagne was made a Crusader, and sent on voyages to Constantinople and even Jerusalem; the poets of the Arthurian cycle learned to put something of a crusading complexion on their story; and the Morte d’Arthur would not have been what it actually was if the Crusades had not filled the Middle Ages. But there is nothing derived from Islam in such influence. It is simply the idea of the fight of faith against unfaith, as the best kind of fight for a fighting age; and this is an idea as old as the fight between Iran and Turan. Islam itself added little to the poetic stock of the Middle Ages, except as the incarnation of unfaith. The author of the canto delle Aucassin and Nicolette may have borrowed something from Arabic sources; but if he did, his borrowing is independent of the Crusades. And if again there be any truth in the ‘Saracenic’ theory, which refers to the East the origin not only of the sonnet, but also of the form of rhymed lyrical verse, that again is independent of the Crusades, and a matter of Sicilian history. It would almost seem as if the story of Troy and the romance of Alexander had given medieval poets their picture of the East even more than the Crusades. One might even hazard the saying that it is not till the days of Count Robert of Paris and The Talisman that the Crusades became the real stuff of Western romance. But themes and motives derived from the Crusades, if not the Crusades themselves, became a part of the romantic tradition of the Middle Ages. There is the theme of the knight imprisoned in Saracen-land and his rescue by the Saracen princess whose love he has won; there is the motif of the wife who after long mourning has abandoned hope of her Crusader husband’s return, and is about to marry again when he

1 See Von Sybel’s Geschichte der ersten Kreuzzüge.
2 De Sanctis, Storia della Letteratura Italiana, ii. 161, 168.
3 Prute remarks (op. cit., p. 494) that the gesta of the early Crusaders, which had once excited an insatiable fund of interest, had already lost that quality by the end of the Crusades. James of Vitry (†1240), the author of a collection of Exemples or edifying stories, notices that any other ‘matter’ was more attractive to writers than the matter of the Crusades.

Prute suggests (p. 450) that an Indian cycle of romances (Caliâ and Dinna) may have been carried by the Crusades to western Europe. He adds that the Intravias incorporated Oriental elements into their lays, and were the bridges by which Eastern tales and fables passed to Boccaccio and the Italian novelists.
The Crusades

reappears—alone, or with a Saracen lady. But these are romantic embroideries, and they do not touch the true matter and essence of the Crusades.¹

III

Apart from the question of the influence which the Muhammadan East exerted in Western Europe through the channel of the Crusades, or through the conduit (if it may so be called) of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, there remains the further and the broader question of the whole general influence of the Crusades themselves, as a movement of Western Europe at large, on the home of their origin and diffusion. That further and broader question lies beyond the limits of our theme; but it may be permissible, by way of an appendix and epilogue, to add some few observations, and, in particular, to draw attention to those general results of the Crusades which affected the relations of East and West.

The Crusades affected the Christian commonwealth of Western Europe in some four ways. In the first place they affected the Church, and particularly the Papacy. In the second place they affected the internal life and economy of each of the several states; and we may trace that effect partly as it shows itself in the action of the Government (the ‘State’ proper), and partly as it appears in the position of the two secular estates—the nobility and the commonalty, more especially the commonalty of the towns. In the third place, they affected the external relations of the different states; and that effect may be traced both in the changes of their relative weight and importance and in the general development of a concert or system of Europe. Finally, they affected the relations of Europe to the continent of Asia; and in the widening ripples of exploration, from the thirteenth century to the end of the fifteenth, we

¹ It is perhaps worth adding that the music of the West may have been influenced, in some small degree, by that of the East in the epoch of the Crusades.

The Church and the Papacy

The clergy were an international Estate; and the Pope, the head of the clergy, was a great European figure. An international and European enterprise such as the Crusade seemed naturally destined to come under clerical and papal control, and thereby to exalt the theocratic tendency already implicit in the Gregorian movement. In the idea of Urban II the Pope was to be the generalissimo of the Holy War; the Crusade was to be the foreign policy of the Papacy, conducted at its nod; and a papal legate was to accompany and rule the army of God. In the event this ambition was far from being realized. The secular ambition of lay princes is already prominent, and indeed dominant, in the First Crusade itself; and the foundation of a lay Kingdom of Jerusalem in 1100, in place of the clerical theocracy of which some seem to have dreamed, is itself significant. In the Second and Third Crusades the emperor and the kings of the West, absentees from the First Crusade, play a foremost part; and we shall have occasion to notice how the lay State imposes its own system of taxes for the sustentation of Jerusalem. None the less, and in spite of lay direction and lay diversion (which were nowhere more conspicuous than in the course of the Fourth Crusade), the Crusades remained essentially connected with the Papacy. It was by Popes that they were preached and organized. It was by Popes that they might be directed, not only against the Muslim of the East, but also against the heretic Albigensian in the West itself; and the time even came, in the reign of Frederick II, when they might be launched by a Pope against an offending Emperor. Not only were they a weapon of papal policy: they were also a part of papal finance. If the lay State imposed its Saladin tithe, the Papacy could also levy a tithe of its own; and tenths of ecclesiastical revenues, on the plea of the Crusade,
were levied regularly from the clergy after the beginning of the thirteenth century, first by the decree of Councils and then by the Pope’s authority, and continued in force in England till the Reformation. As the Crusades added new revenues to the Church, so they also added new orders; and the Templars and the Hospitallers, following a rule based on that of the canons regular, gave to Europe the new spectacle of the warrior-priest who combined the rules of monasticism with the life of a professional soldier.

The mixed character of the military orders admirably illustrates the mixed character of the Crusades, which made them at once papal and anti-papal, clerical and anti-clerical, a support of ecclesiasticism and at the same time a mine beneath its foundations. The Crusades, if they did not remove, at any rate weakened the old clear distinction between sacred and profane, the lay and the clerical, the temporal and the spiritual. They were the consecration of the fighting layman, and in their way they led to the emancipation of the laity. On the Crusade the layman might become something of a priest; and by collaboration with it the lay State might acquire some measure of sanctity. A movement which had proceeded from a temper of otherworldliness, and had been born in an age which seemed set towards theocratic, was thus none the less a contributory force to the development of the lay spirit and the lay power. The day-to-day contact with Muhammadanism in the East—a contact which brought familiarity, and with it the toleration which familiarity can breed—weakened the old opposition of faith and unfaith, just as the Crusades had weakened the distinction between secular and clerical within the bounds of the faith. Not all men in the thirteenth century were of the temper of Frederic II, who used a Saracen army against the Pope, corresponded with Arabic scholars, and negotiated with Muhammadan rulers even when Jerusalem itself was in question. But at any rate scholars showed themselves ready to borrow from Arabic philosophers;

some began to study Arabic; and a new spirit of comprehension arose. There is a difference between St. Louis, the survivor of an earlier age, who would argue with an infidel by plunging his sword into his vitals, and the attitude of the University of Paris which could draw even on Arabic Spain for the *physis et metaphysica* of Aristotle. Scholasticism arose and developed its doctrines independently of the Crusades; but it was only in the new age of comprehension which the Crusades had done something to create that scholasticism could attempt its great task of reconciling the secular wisdom of Aristotle with the received tradition of the Bible and the Church.

The State and the Secular Estates

One of the simplest and clearest results of the Crusades, in the internal life of the States of the West, was the development of a new species of taxation. Taxes had hitherto fallen on land; it is with the Crusades that we get the beginnings of taxes on personal property. Louis VII in 1146 was the first to impose a tax *proprius succentorianem terrae Hierosolymitanae*; he repeated it in 1165; and Henry II of England followed his example in 1166, exacting twopenny in the pound for that year, and one penny for each of the four next succeeding years, from all classes indiscriminately, in respect of personal property and income (*catala et redditus*). In 1184 Philip Augustus and Henry II agreed on the exaction of a similar tax for the next three years in their dominions—though the agreement appears not to have been executed. In 1188, after the fall of Jerusalem, both kings imposed the Saladin tithe. In England, at any rate, the precedent was not forgotten; and in the thirteenth century the tax on *catala et redditus* is made a current feature of the national system of finance. ‘From the needs of the Holy Land’, it has been said, ‘arises modern taxation.’

1 Cartellieri, *Philipp. II August*, vol II, p. 85. A full account of the development is given p. 5 onwards.
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The effects of the Crusades on the secular Estates of the Western Kingdoms are less certain and obvious. It has been said that the Crusades contributed to the dissolution of feudalism and the depression of the baronial Estate. Certainly they drew unquiet spirits away to the East, to find new fields in Syria or to become members of the military orders: perhaps, too, they resulted in some sales of property and some disturbance of the validity of titles; but the feudal baronage could still show itself a lively force till the end of the fifteenth century, and the influence of the Crusades on its members is shown less in any disturbance of their status than in the new methods of their warfare, and the greater vogue of the tournament and of heraldry, of which we have already spoken. In the same way the rise of municipal independence has been often ascribed to the Crusades, and the grant of municipal charters has been assigned to the need of crusading lords for ready money. Here again presumption has outrun proof; and we are on safer ground if we simply say that, so far as the Crusades fostered the growth of trade and commerce, they necessarily encouraged the growth of towns. The great Italian ports certainly owed much of their early prosperity to the Crusades; and the inland route of commerce, by which Venetian goods were carried up the Rhine to the Baltic and the North Sea, was also, as we have seen, the route and the focus of the growth of free towns and free guilds.

The External Relations of States and the System of Europe

The Crusades affected the system of Europe, not only by their influence on the Church and its general position, but also by affording a new bond of European unity. After 1096 we may say that the idea of a united Western Europe is expressed not merely in the formal scheme of a Holy Roman Empire, but also in the actual fact of a common Christian Crusade. It is true that the rulers of European States, when they met on a Crusade, met only to disagree; it is true that national differences were accentuated by the national rivalry which accompanied, for example, the Third Crusade. And yet the feeling of a unity of interests and a common cause was never entirely obliterated. There was no common direction from Baghdad, and no call of the Caliphate, to unite the Muslims of the East: at the most there was the de facto power of Mosul, and the puritan faith of a Nūr-al-Dīn or the ardour of a Saladin. Western Christianity had its Papacy and the papal direction of a Crusade: it was internationalized, as it were, in a common system of offence against its enemy. The idea of a European Commonwealth—a república Christiana, engaged in the res Christiana of defence or offence against the Turk—survives through the centuries. A Dutch scholar, Ter Meulen, has written a work entitled Der Gedanke der internationalen Organisation, in which he traces the various schemes which, from the time of Dubois (1300) to that of the Abbé de Saint-Pierre and Kant (1800), were directed to the foundation of some scheme of European unity or League of Nations. In almost all the basis adduced is the need of common action against the Turk: in almost all we may trace some relic of the lingering idea of the Crusades.

Meanwhile, during the Crusades and in their course, the balance of European States had been altered. The Byzantine Empire had ceased to weigh in the scales against the Empire of the West. It had fallen in 1204; and if by the end of the thirteenth century there were again Greek Empires in Constantinople and Trebizond, they were only the shadows of a great name. The balance of Europe had come to lie in the West. Among the Western States, France had achieved a predominance; and in its achievement the Crusades had played their part. They had been preached on French soil; they had been waged by French knights; it was France which had produced in St. Louis the perfect type of Crusader. French colonists had settled in the Kingdom of Jerusalem and, when it was lost, in that of Cyprus: they had settled in the Morea and the Duchy of
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Athens. 'The noblest chivalry of the world', says a French writer of the fourteenth century, 'is the chivalry of the Moors: as good French is spoken there as in Paris.' The Lingua Franca of the Levant was not 'good French': so far as it had a Latin basis, it derived that basis from the Italian of Venetian and Genoese traders; but if the French language did not survive in the Eastern Mediterranean, the French tradition was never extinguished. The protectorate of the Holy Places, which had been exercised by Charlemagne, was vindicated by Francis I in the sixteenth century; treaty stipulations gave the Latins possession of the grotto of the Nativity and the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem; and these stipulations were still active enough in the nineteenth century to be one of the causes of the Crimean War. Even to-day we may count the French mandate in Syria among the legacies of the Crusades.

The Relations of Europe and Asia

It remains, in conclusion, to speak of the new system of relations between Europe and the continent of Asia which was inaugurated by the Crusades. Not only did Europe find in the Crusades a new form of internal union and a new influence on its own inner life; it also gained in their course a new and vastly extended view of the world. This widening of view, with the growth of exploration and of geographical knowledge by which it was accompanied, is the last, as in its sweep it is the greatest, of the results of the Crusades. Already, during the twelfth century, geography was the richer for the pilgrims' guides, with descriptions of routes and of holy places, and for the military reconnaissances of strategical areas (especially of the area between Palestine and Egypt), which were then undertaken. These only touched the coast fringe of Hither Asia; but in the

---

1 On the peregrinatores see Prutz (op. cit., pp. 470 sqq.), the editions of Itinerarium Hierosolimitanum (e.g. in the Corp. Script. Ecoi. Lat.), and the publications of the Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society.

---

1 See Miss Eileen Power's chapter on 'The opening of the Land Routes to Cathay' in Travel and Travellers of the Middle Ages, edited by Professor A. P. Newton.
establishment) a Genoese company navigated the waters of the Caspian Sea, and a Venetian consul was settled in Tabrīz. All the great hope was in the issue dashed; and the prospect of a great mass-conversion of the Mongols, which would have linked a Christian Asia to a Christian Europe and reduced Islam to a small faith encamped in a portion of Spain and a corner of the Levant, dwindled and disappeared. The Khanates of Persia turned to Muhammadanism in 1316; by the middle of the fourteenth century Central Asia had gone the same way; in 1368–70 the native dynasty of the Ming was on the throne and closing China to foreigners; and the end was a recession of Christianity and an extension of Islam which assumed all the greater dimensions with the growth of the power of the Ottoman Turks. But a new hope dawned for the undefeated West; and this new hope was to bring one of the greatest revolutions in history. If the land was shut, why should Christianity not take to the sea? Why should it not navigate to the East, take Muhammadanism in the rear, and, as it were, win Jerusalem a tergo? This was the thought of the great navigators, who wore the cross on their breasts and believed in all sincerity that they were labouring in the cause of the recovery of the Holy Land; and if Columbus found the Caribbean Islands instead of Cathay, at any rate we may say that the Spaniards who entered into his labours won a continent for Christianity, and that the West, in ways of which it had never dreamed, at last established the balance in its favour.

If we regard their larger scope, and the long after-swell which followed the original impulse, we shall not regard the Crusades as a failure. Nor did they fail altogether even in their original motive—the defence of a common Christianity against the menace of Islam in the Eastern Mediterranean. We may say, it is true, that the Crusades began with the Seljūq Turks encamped at Nicaea on the confines of Asia, and that they ended with the Ottoman Turks encamped in Europe itself on the Danube. We may say, again, from another point of view, that after nearly five hundred years all ended as it had begun, with a Frankish protectorate of the Holy Places in a territory governed by Muhammadans. But territory is not everything; and if the Crusades did not gain, or even maintain, what can be measured on the map, they gained or maintained other things which are more impalpable, but not less real. They defended Western Christianity during the crucial period of the growth of Western civilization in the Middle Ages; they saved it from any self-centred localism; they gave it breadth—and a vision. 'The people that hath no vision perisheth'; and to the peoples of the Middle Ages the vision of the Crusade—seldom seen steadily, perhaps never seen whole—was none the less a saving ideal.

Ernest Barker.